Abstract

We consider optimal control of a new type of stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs), in which the dynamics of the system state at a point also depends on the space-mean of values at neighbouring points. This is a model with many applications, e.g. to population growth studies and epidemiology. Both sufficient and necessary maximum principles for the optimal control of such systems are proved. We also prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions of such equations. As an illustration, we apply the results to an optimal harvesting problem from a population whose density is modelled as a space-mean stochastic reaction-diffusion equation.
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1 Introduction

Let us start by summarising various models for population growth:

- Exponential growth in a constant deterministic environment:
  Let \( Y(t) \) be the density of a population at time \( t \). Then the associated evolution equation is
  \[
  \frac{dY(t)}{dt} = cY(t);
  \]
where \( c \) (constant) is a relative population growth.

To get a better model we allow \( c \) to vary with time. For example, if we want to model a situation with a changing unpredictable noisy environment, we get the following model:

- **Exponential growth in a noisy environment:**
  Heuristically, the density \( Y(t) \) now satisfies the equation
  \[
  \frac{dY(t)}{dt} = (\alpha + \beta” noise”)Y(t),
  \]
  with ”noise” = ”\( dB(t) \)”; \( B \) being a Brownian motion and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) being given constants.
  A mathematically rigorous interpretation of this equation is that \( Y(t) \) satisfies the following Itô type SDE:
  \[
  dY(t) = \alpha Y(t)dt + \beta Y(t)dB(t).
  \]

- To get an even better model let us assume that the population has a particular space to live in. Then diffusion in space also has to be taken into account. Doing this we arrive at the following stochastic reaction-diffusion equation in \( Y(t,x) \), where \( Y(t,x) \) is the density at time \( t \) and at the point \( x \):
  \[
  dY(t,x) = \Delta Y(t,x)dt + \alpha Y(t,x)dt + \beta Y(t,x)dB(t);
  \]
  where \( \Delta Y(t,x) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 Y(t,x)}{\partial x_k^2} \), i.e. \( \Delta \) is the Laplacian operator acting on \( x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \). We refer to Smoller [18] and the references therein for more information about reaction-diffusion equations.

In this paper we will in addition allow interaction from neighbouring sites. For example, define \( G \) to be a space-averaging operator of the form
  \[
  G(x, \varphi) = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} \varphi(x+y)dy; \quad \varphi \in L^2(D),
  \]
  where \( V(\cdot) \) denotes Lebesgue volume and
  \[
  K_\theta = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n; |y| < \theta\}
  \]
  is the ball of radius \( r > 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) centered at 0.

**Example 1.1** With \( G \) as in (1.1), suppose the density \( Y(t,x) \) of a population at the time \( t \) and the point \( x \) satisfies the following space-mean version of a reaction-diffusion equation:
  \[
  \begin{cases}
  dY(t,x) &= \left( \frac{1}{2} \Delta Y(t,x) + \alpha Y(t,x) - u(t,x) \right) dt \\
  &\quad + \beta Y(t,x)dB(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma(t, \zeta)Y(t,x)\tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad t \geq 0, \\
  Y(0,x) &= \xi(x); \quad x \in D, \\
  Y(t,x) &= \eta(t,x); \quad (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \partial D,
  \end{cases}
  \]
where

\[ \bar{Y}(t,x) = G(x,Y(t,\cdot)) \]

and, as before,

\[ \Delta \phi(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_k^2} \]

is the Laplace operator and \( \tilde{N}(dt,d\zeta) \) is the compensated Poisson random measure.

Then (1.2) is a natural model for population growth in an environment with space interactions. By space interactions we mean that the dynamics of the population density at a point \( x \) depends not only on its value and derivatives at \( x \), but also on the density values in a neighbourhood of \( x \).

If \( u(t,x) \) represents a harvesting intensity at \((t,x)\), we define the total expected utility \( J_0(u) \) of the harvesting by

\[ J_0(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \int_0^T U_1(u(t,x))dt \, dx + \int_D U_2(Y(T,x)) \, dx \right], \]

where \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) are given utility functions. The problem to find the optimal harvesting rate \( u^* \) is the following:

**Problem 1.1** Find \( u^* \in \mathcal{U} \) such that

\[ J_0(u^*) = \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} J_0(u), \]

where \( \mathcal{U} \) is a given family of admissible controls.
We will come back to this example later, after the discussion below of the general problem.

The purpose of the current paper is to consider an even more advanced model and to study stochastic optimal control of a system whose state $Y(t, x)$ at time $t$ and at the point $x$ satisfies an SPDE with space-mean dynamics of the following type:

$$
\begin{cases}
    dY(t, x) = A_x Y(t, x) dt + b(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x)) dt \\
    + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x), \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \\
    Y(0, x) = \xi(x); \\
    Y(t, x) = \eta(t, x); \\
    x \in \overline{D}.
\end{cases}
$$

(1.3)

Here $dY(t, x)$ denotes the differential with respect to $t$ while $A_x$ is the partial operator with respect to $x$, and $D$ is a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a Lipschitz boundary $\partial D$ and closure $\overline{D}$. We extend $Y(t, x)$ to be a function on all of $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ by setting

$$Y(t, x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D.$$

Example 1.2 In particular, the partial differential operator $A_x$ could be the Laplacian $\Delta$, or more generally an operator of the div−grad-form

$$A_x(\varphi) = \text{div}(a(x) \nabla \varphi)(x); \quad \varphi \in C^2(D),$$

where div denotes the divergence operator, $\nabla$ denotes the gradient and

$$a(x) = [a_{i,j}(x)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

is a nonnegative definite matrix for each $x$. Equations of this type are of interest because they represent important models in many situations, e.g. in physics (among others fluid flow in random media, see e.g. Holden et al. [4]), in epidemiology and in biology, e.g. in population growth where $Y(t, x)$ represents the population density at $t, x$. 
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The new feature with this paper, is that we in addition to the operator \( A_x \) also allow a space dependence in the dynamics of the equation, represented by the term \( Y(t, \cdot) \) in (1.3).

In the classical case when there is no interaction from neighbouring places, it is well-known that the adjoint process obtained when we use the stochastic maximum principle approach to solve an optimal control problem of an SPDE is a backward SPDE. We refer for example to Bensoussan [1], [2], [3], Hu and Peng [6] and Øksendal et al [9], [10], [11], [12]. In the case of a control problem for an SPDE with space-mean dynamics we derive an adjoint process, which is a backward SPDE with space-mean dependence.

For more details about the theory of SPDE, we refer for example to Da Prato and Zabczyk [15], Pardoux [13], [14], Hairer [7], Prévôt and Röckner [16] and to Röckner and Zhang [17].

Here is a summary of the content of this paper:

- In the next section we prove existence and uniqueness of solutions of space-mean backward SPDEs.
- Subsequently, in Section 3 we study the optimization problem for such a system. We derive both sufficient and necessary maximum principles for the optimal control.
- Finally, as an illustration of our results, in Section 4 we study an example about optimal harvesting from an environment with space-mean interactions.

## 2 Existence and uniqueness of solutions of space-mean backward SPDEs

The purpose of this section is to study space-mean backward SPDEs. They are defined in a similar way as a backward stochastic differential equations but with the basic equation being an SPDE rather than a stochastic ordinary differential equation. More precisely, we will study the following class of backward SPDEs

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dp(t, x)}{dt} &= - [A_x p(t, x) + F(t, x, p(t, x), \bar{p}(t, x), q(t, x), \bar{q}(t, x), r(t, x, \cdot, \bar{r}(t, x, \cdot), \omega)] dt \\
&\quad + q(t, x)dB(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(t, x, \zeta)\tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\
p(t, x) &= 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D, \\
p(T, x) &= \zeta(x); \quad x \in \overline{D}.
\end{align*}
\]

(2.1)

Here \( B = \{B(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]} \) and \( \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta) \) is a \( d \)-dimensional Brownian motion and a compensated Poisson random measure, respectively, defined in a complete filtered probability space \( (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}) \). The filtration \( \mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) is assumed to be the \( \mathbb{P} \)-augmented filtration generated by \( B \) and \( \tilde{N} \).

We mean by \( dp(t, x) \) the differential operator with respect to \( t \), while \( A_x \) is the partial differential operator with respect to \( x \), and
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{p}(t, x) &= G(x, p) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{K_\theta} p(x + y) dy, \\
\bar{q}(t, x) &= G(x, q) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{K_\theta} q(x + y) dy, \\
\bar{r}(t, x, \cdot) &= G(x, r(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{K_\theta} r(x + y, \cdot) dy.
\end{align*}
\]

We assume that the driver
\[
F(t, x, p, \bar{p}, q, \bar{q}, r(\cdot), \bar{r}(\cdot), \omega) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times L^2_\nu \times L^2_\nu \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}
\]
is \mathcal{F}_t\text{-measurable and } \varsigma \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_T\text{-measurable for all } x, \text{ such that}
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \varsigma^2(x) dx \right] < \infty,
\]
where \(L^2_\nu\) consists of Borel functions \(k : \mathbb{R}_0 \to \mathbb{R}\), such that
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} k^2(\zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right] < \infty.
\]

As we mentioned above, this type of equations appears as adjoint equations in the maximum principle approach to optimal control of SPDEs.

In the continuous case (Brownian motion driven), solutions of backward SPDE have been studied for example by Hu et al [5], Ma and Yong [8] and for the discontinuous setting (jump diffusion) we refer to Øksendal et al [10].

When studying existence and uniqueness of solutions of equation, it is convenient to put them into a more general context, as follows:

Let \(V, H\) be two separable Hilbert spaces such that \(V\) is continuously, densely imbedded in \(H\). Identifying \(H\) with its dual we have
\[
V \subset H \cong H^* \subset V^*,
\]
where we have denoted by \(V^*\) the topological dual of \(V\). Let \(A\) be a bounded linear operator from \(V\) to \(V^*\) satisfying the following Gårding inequality (coercivity hypothesis): There exist constants \(\alpha > 0\) and \(\lambda \geq 0\) so that
\[
2\langle Au, u \rangle + \lambda \|u\|_H^2 \geq \alpha \|u\|_V^2 \quad \text{for all } u \in V,
\]
(2.2)

where \(\langle Au, u \rangle = Au(u)\) denotes the action of \(Au \in V^*\) on \(u \in V\) and \(\|\cdot\|_H\) (resp. \(\|\cdot\|_V\)) the norm associated to the Hilbert space \(H\) (resp. \(V\)). We will also use the following spaces:

- \(L^2(D)\) is the set of all Lebesgue measurable \(p : D \to \mathbb{R}\) such that
\[
\|p\|_{L^2(D)} := \left( \int_D |p(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.
\]
• \( L^2_\nu(H) \) is the set of measurable functions \( r : D \times \mathbb{R}_0 \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) such that
\[
\| r \|_{L^2_\nu(H)} := \left( \int_D \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(x, \zeta)^2 \nu(d\zeta) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.
\]

• \( L^2(H) \) is the set of \( \mathcal{F}_T \)-measurable \( H \)-valued random variables \( \varsigma \) such that \( \mathbb{E}[\| \varsigma \|_H^2] < \infty \).

We let \( V := W^{1,2}(D) \) and \( H = L^2(D) \).

We now consider the backward SPDE (2.1) as a backward stochastic evolution equation for \( V \times H \times L^2_\nu(H) \)-valued process \((p(t), q(t), r(t, \cdot))\):
\[
\begin{aligned}
&dp(t) = -[A_x p(t) + F(t, p(t), \overline{p}(t), q(t), \overline{q}(t), r(t, \cdot), \overline{r}(t, \cdot))] dt \\
&\quad + q(t) dB(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(t, \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad t \in (0, T),
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
p(t) = 0; \quad \text{on} \quad \partial D,
\]
\[
p(T) = \varsigma,
\]
where \( F(t, p, \overline{p}, q, \overline{q}, r(\cdot), \overline{r}(\cdot)) : [0, T] \times H \times H \times H \times L^2_\nu(H) \times L^2_\nu(H) \) is now regarded as an \( \mathbb{F} \)-adapted \( H \)-valued process.

The following result is useful for our approach:

**Lemma 2.1** For all \( \varphi \in H \) and \( G(\cdot, \varphi) \) as in (1.1), we have
\[
\| G(\cdot, \varphi) \|_H \leq \| \varphi \|_H. \tag{2.4}
\]

**Proof.** Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the Fubini theorem repeatedly, we get, with \( V = V(K_\theta) \),
\[
\begin{aligned}
\| G(\cdot, \varphi) \|_H^2 &= \int_D \left( \frac{1}{V} \int_{K_\theta} \varphi(x + y) dy \right)^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_D \left( \frac{1}{V^2} \int_{K_\theta} \varphi^2(x + y) dy \right) \left( \int_{K_\theta} dy \right) dx \\
&= \int_D \frac{1}{V} \left( \int_{K_\theta} \varphi^2(x + y) dy \right) dx = \int_D \frac{1}{V} \left( \int_{x + K_\theta} \varphi^2(z) dz \right) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{V} \int_D \left( \int_{z - K_\theta} dx \right) \varphi^2(z) dz = \frac{1}{V} \int_D V(z - K_\theta) \varphi^2(z) dz \\
&= \int_D \varphi^2(z) dz = \| \varphi \|_H^2.
\end{aligned}
\]

We shall now state and prove our main result of existence and uniqueness of solutions to backward SPDE.
Theorem 2.2 (Existence and uniqueness of solutions) The space-mean backward SPDE (2.3) has a unique solution \((p, q, r) \in V \times H \times L^2_\nu(H)\) such that:

\[
\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[ \|p(t)\|_V^2 + \|q(t)\|_H^2 + \|r(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2_\nu(H)}^2 \right] dt < \infty,
\]

provided that the following assumptions hold:

(i) The terminal condition \(\varsigma\) is \(\mathcal{F}_T\)-measurable random variable and satisfies

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\varsigma\|_H^2 \right] < \infty.
\]

(ii) The driver is \(\mathbb{F}\)-progressively measurable and

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|F(t, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)\|_H^2 dt \right] < \infty.
\]

(iii) There exists a constant \(C > 0\) such that

\[
\|F(t, y_1, \overline{y}_1, z_1, \overline{z}_1, k_1, \overline{k}_1) - F(t, y_2, \overline{y}_2, z_2, \overline{z}_2, k_2, \overline{k}_2)\|_H \\
\leq C (\|y_1 - y_2\|_H + \|\overline{y}_1 - \overline{y}_2\|_H + \|z_1 - z_2\|_H + \|\overline{z}_1 - \overline{z}_2\|_H \\
+ \|k_1 - k_2\|_{L^2_\nu(H)} + \|\overline{k}_1 - \overline{k}_2\|_{L^2_\nu(H)})
\]

for all \(t, y_i, \overline{y}_i, z_i, \overline{z}_i, k_i, \overline{k}_i; i = 1, 2\).

Proof We decompose the proof into three steps:

**Step 0:** Assume that \(F(t, p(t), \overline{p}(t), q(t), \overline{q}(t), r(t, \cdot), \overline{r}(t, \cdot)) = F(t)\) is independent of \(p, \overline{p}, q, \overline{q}, r\) and \(\overline{r}\) such that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|F(t)\|_H^2 dt \right] < \infty.
\]

Then by Lemma 4.2 in Øksendal et al. [10] there exists a unique triplet \((p, q, r) \in V \times H \times L^2_\nu(H)\) solution to

\[
p(t) = \varsigma + \int_t^T [A_x p(s) + F(s)] ds - \int_t^T q(s) dB(s) - \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(s, \zeta) \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta); \quad t \in (0, T).
\]

**Step 1:** Assume that the driver \(F\) is independent of \(p\) and \(\overline{p}\) such that the triplet \((p, q, r) \in V \times H \times L^2_\nu(H)\) satisfies

\[
p(t) = \varsigma + \int_t^T [A_x p(s) + F(s, q(s), \overline{q}(s), r(s, \cdot), \overline{r}(s, \cdot))] ds - \int_t^T q(s) dB(s) \\
- \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(s, \zeta) \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta); \quad t \in (0, T).
\]

(2.5)
Existence:
Set \( q^0(t) = r^0(t, \zeta) = 0 \). For \( n \geq 1 \), define \( (p^n, q^n, r^n) \) to be the unique solution of the space-mean backward SPDE

\[
p^n(t) = \zeta + \int_t^T [A_x p^n(s) + F(s, q^{n-1}(s), \overline{q}^{n-1}(s), r^{n-1}(s, \cdot), \overline{r}^{n-1}(s, \cdot))] \, ds
- \int_t^T q^n(s) dB(t) - \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r^n(s, \zeta) \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta).
\]

(2.6)

We are going to show that the sequence \( (p^n, q^n, r^n) \) forms a Cauchy sequence. For that we will use the Picard iteration method. Applying the Itô formula to \( ||p^{n+1}(t) - p^n(t)||^2_H \) between \( t \) and \( T \), we get

\[
||p^{n+1}(t) - p^n(t)||^2_H = -2 \int_t^T \langle p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s), A_x (p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)) \rangle \, ds
-2 \int_t^T \langle p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s), F(s, q^n(s), \overline{q}(s), r^n(s, \cdot), \overline{r}(s, \cdot)) \rangle \, ds
-\int_t^T \langle F(s, q^{n-1}(s), \overline{q}^{n-1}(s), r^{n-1}(s, \cdot), \overline{r}^{n-1}(s, \cdot)) \, ds \rangle
+2 \int_t^R \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \langle p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s), r^n(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta) \rangle \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta)
+ \int_t^R \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} |r^n(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)|^2 \nu(d\zeta) \, ds.
\]

(2.7)

Let us estimate each term of the right hand side of the equality above:
Using Hypothesis (2.2), we have

\[
-2 \int_t^T \langle p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s), A_x (p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)) \rangle \, ds
\leq \lambda \|p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)\|_H^2 - \alpha \|p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)\|_V^2.
\]

(2.8)

By the Lipschitz assumption on \( F \) and standard majorisations, we get for \( \varepsilon > 0 \)

\[
2 \int_t^T \langle p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s), F(s, q^n(s), \overline{q}(s), r^n(s, \cdot), \overline{r}(s, \cdot)) \rangle \, ds
-\int_t^T \langle F(s, q^{n-1}(s), \overline{q}^{n-1}(s), r^{n-1}(s, \cdot), \overline{r}^{n-1}(s, \cdot)) \, ds \rangle
\leq \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \int_t^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H \, ds + 8C^2 \varepsilon \int_t^T (||q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)||^2_H + ||\overline{q}^n(s) - \overline{q}^{n-1}(s)||^2_H + ||r^n(s, x, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, x, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(H)} + ||\overline{r}^n(s, x, \zeta) - \overline{r}^{n-1}(s, x, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(H)}) \, ds.
\]

(2.9)

Moreover, from Lemma 2.1, we have the following estimate
\[
\int_t^T \left( ||\varphi^n(s) - \varphi^{n-1}(s)||^2_{H} + ||\varphi^n(s, \zeta) - \varphi^{n-1}(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} \right) ds \\
\leq \int_t^T \left( ||q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)||^2_{H} + ||r^n(s, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} \right) ds.
\] (2.10)

Substituting (2.8)-(2.10) into (2.7) and taking expectation, we can choose \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ ||p^{n+1}(t) - p^n(t)||^2_{H} \right] + \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] \\
+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right] \\
\leq (\lambda + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)||^2_H ds \right] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^n(s, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right].
\] (2.11)

Putting \( \beta = \lambda + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \), we have

\[
- \frac{d}{dt} \left( e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] \right) + \alpha e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] \\
+ e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] + e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right] \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \frac{1}{2} e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^n(s, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right].
\]

Integrating both sides, we obtain

\[
e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \alpha \int_0^t e^{\beta s} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] \right) ds \\
+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right] ) dt \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t e^{\beta s} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^n(s, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right] \right) ) dt.
\] (2.12)

In particular,

\[
\int_0^T e^{\beta t} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right] \right) dt \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T e^{\beta t} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)||^2_H ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r^n(s, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, \zeta)||^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} ds \right] \right) dt.
\]
Hence
\[
\int_0^T e^{\beta t} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \|q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)\|_H^2 ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \|r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)\|_{L^2(H)}^2 ds \right] \right) dt \
\leq K \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n,
\]
for some constant $K$. Substituting this in (2.12), yields
\[
e^{\beta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)\|_H^2 ds \right] \leq K \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n.
\]

Thus, we have from (2.11)
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)\|_H^2 ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)\|_{L^2(H)}^2 ds \right] \
\leq K \beta \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|q^n(s) - q^{n-1}(s)\|_H^2 ds \right] \
+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|r^n(s, \zeta) - r^{n-1}(s, \zeta)\|_{L^2(H)}^2 ds \right].
\]
(2.13)

Repeating the argument above, we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|q^{n+1}(s) - q^n(s)\|_H^2 ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) - r^n(s, \zeta)\|_{L^2(H)}^2 ds \right] \leq K \beta n \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n + K_1 \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n.
\]
(2.14)

Combining (2.11) and (2.13), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|p^{n+1}(s) - p^n(s)\|_V^2 ds \right] \leq K \beta (n + 1) \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n.
\]
(2.15)

In view of (2.14) and (2.15), we conclude that for $n \geq 1$ the sequence $(p^n, q^n, r^n)$ converges to some limit $(p, q, r)$. Letting $n \to \infty$ in (2.6), we see that $(p, q, r)$ satisfies
\[
p(t) + \int_t^T [A_p(s) + F(s, q(s), \overline{q}(s), r(s, \cdot), \overline{r}(s, \cdot))] ds - \int_t^T q(s) dB(s) \
- \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(s, \zeta) \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta) = \varsigma,
\]
i.e, $(p, q, r)$ is a solution of (2.5).
Uniqueness: Suppose that we have two solutions: \((p, q, r)\) and \((\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, \tilde{r})\). Repeating the same arguments as for the existence, we get

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ ||p(t) - \tilde{p}(t)||_V^2 \right] + \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p(s) - \tilde{p}(s)||_V^2 ds \right] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q(s) - \tilde{q}(s)||_H^2 ds \right] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r(s, \zeta) - \tilde{r}(s, \zeta)||_{L_2(H)}^2 ds \right] \\
\leq (\lambda + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p(s) - \tilde{p}(s)||_H^2 ds \right] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||q(s) - \tilde{q}(s)||_H^2 ds \right] \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||r(s, \zeta) - \tilde{r}(s, \zeta)||_{L_2(H)}^2 ds \right].
\]

In particular,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ ||p(t) - \tilde{p}(t)||_V^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} (\lambda + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T ||p(s) - \tilde{p}(s)||_H^2 ds \right].
\]

By Gronwall’s Lemma, we have

\[ p(t) = \tilde{p}(t), \]

which further implies

\[ q(t) = \tilde{q}(t), \quad r(t, \zeta) = \tilde{r}(t, \zeta). \]

**Step 2:** Assume the driver \(F\) is general. Set \(p^0(t) = 0\). For \(n \geq 1\), define \((p^n, q^n, r^n)\) to be the unique solution of the space-mean backward SPDE

\[
p^{n+1}(t) = \zeta + \int_t^T [A_s p^{n+1}(s) + F(s, p^n(s), \bar{p}^n(s), q^{n+1}(s), \bar{q}^{n+1}(s), r^{n+1}(s, \cdot), \bar{r}^{n+1}(s, \cdot))] ds \\
- \int_t^T q^{n+1}(s) dB(t) - \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r^{n+1}(s, \zeta) \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta).
\]

Similarly as in the previous case, we can prove that the sequence \((p^n, q^n, r^n)\) converges to a limit \((p, q, r)\), which is the unique solution to the equation (2.3).

\[ \square \]

3 The Optimization Problem

3.1 Fréchet derivatives and dual operators

In this subsection we review briefly the Fréchet differentiability and we introduce some dual operators, which will be used when we in the next sections study Pontryagin’s maximal principles for our stochastic control problem.

Let \(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}\) be two Banach spaces and let \(F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\). Then
We say that \( F \) has a directional derivative (or Gâteaux derivative) at \( v \in \mathcal{X} \) in the direction \( w \in \mathcal{X} \) if
\[
D_w F(v) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (F(v + \varepsilon w) - F(v))
\]
exists in \( \mathcal{Y} \).

We say that \( F \) is Fréchet differentiable at \( v \in \mathcal{X} \) if there exists a continuous linear map \( A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y} \) such that
\[
\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{\|h\|_{\mathcal{X}}} \|F(v + h) - F(v) - A(h)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} = 0,
\]
where \( A(h) = \langle A, h \rangle \) is the action of the linear operator \( A \) on \( h \). In this case we call \( A \) the gradient (or Fréchet derivative) of \( F \) at \( v \) and we write
\[
A = \nabla_v F.
\]

If \( F \) is Fréchet differentiable at \( v \) with Fréchet derivative \( \nabla_v F \), then \( F \) has a directional derivative in all directions \( w \in \mathcal{X} \) and
\[
D_w F(v) = \nabla_v F(w) = \langle \nabla_v F, w \rangle.
\]

In particular, note that if \( F \) is a linear operator, then \( \nabla_v F = F \) for all \( v \).

### 3.2 The Hamiltonian and the adjoint BSPDE

We now give a general formulation of the problem we consider.

Let \( T > 0 \) and let \( D \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open set with a Lipschitz boundary \( \partial D \). Specifically, we assume that the state \( Y(t, x) \) at time \( t \in [0, T] \) and at the point \( x \in \overline{D} := D \cup \partial D \) satisfies the generalised quasilinear stochastic heat equation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dY(t, x)}{dt} &= A_x Y(t, x)dt + b(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x))dt + \sigma(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x))dB(t) \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \gamma(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x), \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\
Y(0, x) &= \xi(x); \quad x \in \overline{D}, \\
Y(t, x) &= \eta(t, x); \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \partial D.
\end{align*}
\]

We denote by \( A_x \) the second order partial differential operator acting on \( x \) given by

\[
A_x \phi(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i(x) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i}, \quad \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n),
\]

where \( (\alpha_{ij}(x))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \) is a given nonnegative definite \( n \times n \) matrix with entries \( \alpha_{ij}(x) \in C^2(D) \cap C(\overline{D}) \) for all \( i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) and \( \beta_i(x) \in C^2(D) \cap C(\overline{D}) \) for all \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \).
Let $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the set of real measurable functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For each $t, x, y, u, \zeta$ the functions

$$\varphi \mapsto b(t, x, y, \varphi, u) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\varphi \mapsto \sigma(t, x, y, \varphi, u) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \to \mathbb{R},$$
$$\varphi \mapsto \gamma(t, x, y, \varphi, u, \zeta) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \times \mathbb{R}_0 \to \mathbb{R},$$

are $C^1$ functionals on $L^2(D) = L^2(D, m)$, where $dm(x) = dx$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We call the equation (3.1) a \textit{stochastic partial differential equation with space-mean dynamics}. In general, the formal adjoint $A^*$ of an operator $A$ on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is defined by the identity

$$(A\phi, \psi) = (\phi, A^*\psi), \text{ for all } \phi, \psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $(\phi_1, \phi_2)_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} := (\phi_1, \phi_2) = \int_\mathbb{R} \phi_1(x)\phi_2(x)dx$ is the inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In our case we have

$$A_x^*\phi(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} (a_{ij}(x)\phi(x)) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\beta_i(x)\phi(x)); \quad \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

We interpret $Y$ as a weak (variational) solution to (3.1), in the sense that for $\phi \in C_0^\infty(D)$,

$$\langle Y(t), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} = \langle \xi(x), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} + \int_0^t \langle Y(s), A_x^*\phi \rangle ds$$
$$+ \int_0^t \langle b(s, Y(s)), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} ds + \int_0^t \langle \sigma(s, Y(s)), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} dB(s)$$
$$+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \langle \gamma(s, Y(s), \zeta), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} \tilde{N}(ds, d\zeta),$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ represents the duality product between $W^{1,2}(D)$ and $W^{1,2}(D)^*$, $W^{1,2}(D)$ is the Sobolev space of order 1. For simplicity, in the above equation we have not written all the arguments of $b, \sigma, \gamma$.

The process $u(t, x) = u(t, x, \omega)$ is our control process, assumed to have values in a given convex set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. We assume that $u(t, x)$ is $\mathbb{F}$-predictable for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times D$. We call the control process $u(t, x)$ admissible if the corresponding SPDE with space-mean dynamics (3.1) has a unique strong solution $Y \in L^2(\lambda \times \mathbb{P})$ where $\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, T] \times D$ with values in a given set $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The set of admissible controls is denoted by $\mathcal{U}$.

The performance functional associated to the control $u$ is assumed to have the form

$$J(u) = \mathbb{E}\left[ \int_0^T \int_D f(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x)) dx dt + \int_D g(x, Y(T, x), Y(T, \cdot)) dx \right]; \quad u \in \mathcal{U},$$

(3.3)
where for each \( t, x, y, u \) the functions \( \varphi \mapsto f(t, x, y, \varphi, u) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \to \mathbb{R} \), and \( \varphi \mapsto g(x, y, \varphi) : D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{R} \), are \( C^1 \) functionals on \( L^2(D) \).

The general problem we consider in this paper is the following:

**Problem 3.1** Find \( \hat{u} \in U \) such that

\[
J(\hat{u}) = \sup_{u \in U} J(u). \tag{3.4}
\]

Let \( \mathcal{R} \) denote the set of (measurable) functions \( r : \mathbb{R}_0 \times D \to \mathbb{R} \), and define the Hamiltonian \( H : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) by

\[
H(t, x, y, \varphi, u, p, q, r) := H(t, x, y, \varphi, u, p, q, r, \omega) = f(t, x, y, \varphi, u) + b(t, x, y, \varphi, u)p + \sigma(t, x, y, \varphi, u)q + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma(t, x, y, \varphi, u, \zeta)r(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta). \tag{3.5}
\]

We assume that \( H, f, b, \sigma, \gamma \) and \( g \) are continuously differentiable (\( C^1 \)) and they admit Fréchet derivatives with respect to \( y \) and bounded Fréchet derivatives with respect to \( \varphi \) and \( u \).

In general, if \( h : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D) \) is Fréchet differentiable, we denote its Fréchet derivative (gradient) at \( \varphi \in L^2(D) \) by \( \nabla \varphi h \), and we denote the action of \( \nabla \varphi h \) on a function \( \psi \in L^2(D) \) by \( \langle \nabla \varphi h, \psi \rangle \).

**Definition 3.2** We say that the Fréchet derivative \( \nabla \varphi h \) of a map \( h : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D) \) has a dual function \( \nabla^* \varphi h \in L^2(D \times D) \) if

\[
\langle \nabla \varphi h, \psi \rangle(x) := \int_D \nabla^* \varphi h(x, y)\psi(y)dy; \quad \text{for all} \; \psi \in L^2(D). \tag{3.6}
\]

**Remark 3.3**

- Note in particular that if \( h : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D) \) is linear, then \( \nabla \varphi h = h \) for all \( \varphi \in L^2(D) \) and hence \( \nabla^* \varphi h(x, y) = h(x, y) \).

- Also note that from (3.6) it follows by the Fubini theorem that

\[
\int_D \langle \nabla \varphi h, \psi \rangle(x)dx = \int_D \int_D \nabla^* \varphi h(x, y)\psi(y)dydx = \int_D \int_D \nabla^* \varphi h(y, x)\psi(x)dxdy
\]

\[
= \int_D \left( \int_D \nabla^* \varphi h(y, x)dy \right) \psi(x)dx = \int_D \nabla^* \varphi h(x, y)\psi(x)dx,
\]

where

\[
\nabla^* \varphi h(x) := \int_D \nabla^* \varphi h(y, x)dy. \tag{3.7}
\]
Example 3.1 a) Assume that $h : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D)$ is given by

$$h(\varphi) = \langle h, \varphi \rangle(x) = G(x, \varphi(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} \varphi(x + y) dy. \quad (3.8)$$

Then

$$\langle \nabla_\varphi h, \psi \rangle(x) = \langle h, \psi \rangle(x) = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} \psi(x + y) dy.$$

Therefore $\nabla_\varphi^* h(x, y)$ is given by the identity

$$\int_D \nabla_\varphi^* h(x, y) \psi(y) dy = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} \psi(x + y) dy; \quad \psi \in L^2(D).$$

Substituting $z = x + y$ this can be written

$$\int_D \nabla_\varphi^* h(x, y) \psi(y) dy = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{x + K_\theta} \psi(z) dz = \int_D \frac{1_{x+K_\theta}(y)}{V(K_\theta)} \psi(y) dy.$$

Since this is required to hold for all $\psi$, we conclude the following:

b) Suppose that $h$ is given by \eqref{eq:3.8}. Then

$$\nabla_\varphi^* h(x, y) = \frac{1_{x+K_\theta}(y)}{V(K_\theta)},$$

and

$$\nabla_\varphi^* h(x) = \int_D \nabla_\varphi^* h(y, x) dy = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_D 1_{y+K_\theta}(x) dy = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_D 1_{x-K_\theta}(y) dy \quad (3.9)$$

since $K_\theta = -K_\theta$.

We associate to the Hamiltonian the following backward SPDE in the unknown (adjoint) predictable processes $p(t, x), q(t, x), r(t, x, \zeta)$:

$$\begin{cases}
{dp(t, x) = -\left[ A_x^* p(t, x) + \frac{\partial H(t, x)}{\partial y} + \nabla_\varphi^* H(t, x) \right] dt + q(t, x) dB(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); t \in [0, T]; x \in D, \\
p(T, x) = \partial_x^2 (T, x) + \nabla_\varphi g(T, x); x \in \partial D, \\
p(t, x) = 0; (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D,
\end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

where we have used the simplified notation

$$H(t, x) = H(t, x, y, \varphi, u, p, q, r) |_{y=Y(t,x), \varphi=Y(t,\cdot), u=u(t,x), p=p(t,x), q=q(t,x), r=r(t,x,\zeta)},$$

and similarly with $g$.

We will give examples in Section 4, where we can find $\nabla_\varphi^* H(t, x)$ explicitly.
3.3 A Sufficient Maximum Principle Approach (I)

We now formulate a sufficient version (a verification theorem) of the maximum principle for the optimal control of the problem (3.1)-(3.4).

**Theorem 3.4 (Sufficient Maximum Principle (I))** Suppose \( \hat{u} \in \mathcal{U} \), with corresponding \( \hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot) \). Suppose the functions \( (y, \varphi) \mapsto g(x, y, \varphi) \) and \( (y, \varphi, u) \mapsto H(t, x, y, \varphi, u, \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)) \) are concave for each \( (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D \). Moreover, suppose that, for all \( (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D \),

\[
\max_{v \in \mathcal{U}} H(t, x, \hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{Y}(t, \cdot), v, \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)) = H(t, x, \hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{Y}(t, \cdot), \hat{u}(t, x), \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)).
\]

 Then \( \hat{u} \) is an optimal control.

**Proof.** Consider

\[
J(u) - J(\hat{u}) = I_1 + I_2,
\]

where

\[
I_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ f(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), u(t, x)) - f(t, x, \hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{Y}(t, \cdot), \hat{u}(t, x)) \right\} dx dt \right],
\]

and

\[
I_2 = \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ g(x, Y(T, x), Y(T, \cdot)) - g(x, \hat{Y}(T, x), \hat{Y}(T, \cdot)) \right] dx.
\]

By concavity on \( g \) together with the identities (3.6)-(3.7), we get

\[
I_2 \leq \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial g}{\partial y}(T, x)(Y(T, x) - \hat{Y}(T, x)) + \left\langle \nabla_{\varphi} g(T, x), (Y(T, \cdot) - \hat{Y}(T, \cdot)) \right\rangle \right] dx
\]

\[
= \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial g}{\partial y}(T, x)(Y(T, x) - \hat{Y}(T, x)) + \nabla_{\varphi} g(T, x)(Y(T, x) - \hat{Y}(T, x)) \right] dx
\]

\[
= \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{p}(T, x)(Y(T, x) - \hat{Y}(T, x)) \right] dx
\]

\[
= \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{p}(T, x)\hat{Y}(T, x) \right] dx.
\]

Applying the Itô formula to \( \hat{p}(t, x)\hat{Y}(t, x) \), we have

\[
I_2 \leq \int_0^T \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{p}(t, x) \left\{ A_x \hat{Y}(t, x) + \tilde{b}(t, x) \right\} - \hat{Y}(t, x) \left\{ A_x^* \hat{p}(t, x) \\
+ \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial y}(t, x) + \nabla_{\varphi} \hat{H}(t, x) \right\} + \hat{q}(t, x)\tilde{r}(t, x) \right. \\
+ \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \hat{r}(t, x, \zeta)\tilde{g}(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right] dx dt.
\]

(3.11)
By the first Green formula (see e.g. Wolka [19], page 258) there exist first order boundary differential operators $A_1, A_2$ such that

$$\int_D \left\{ \hat{p}(t, x) A_2 \tilde{Y}(t, x) - \tilde{Y}(t, x) A_2^\dagger \hat{p}(t, x) \right\} \, dx$$

$$= \int_{\partial D} \left\{ \hat{p}(t, x) A_1 \tilde{Y}(t, x) - \tilde{Y}(t, x) A_2 \hat{p}(t, x) \right\} \, dS,$$

where the integral on the right is the surface integral over $\partial D$. We have that

$$\tilde{Y}(t, x) = \hat{p}(t, x) \equiv 0, \quad (3.12)$$

for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D$.

Substituting (3.12) in (3.11), yields

$$I_2 \leq \int_0^T \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{p}(t, x) \tilde{b}(t, x) - \tilde{Y}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial y}(t, x) + \nabla_{\varphi} \hat{H}(t, x) \right\} \right]$$

$$+ \tilde{q}(t, x) \tilde{\sigma}(t, x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \hat{r}(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{\gamma}(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right] \, dx \, dt.$$

Using the definition of the Hamiltonian $H$, we get

$$I_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) \tilde{u}(t, x) - \tilde{p}(t, x) \tilde{b}(t, x) - \tilde{q}(t, x) \tilde{\sigma}(t, x) \right. \right.$$

$$\left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \hat{r}(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{\gamma}(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right\} \, dx \, dt \right].$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) \tilde{u}(t, x) + \left\langle \nabla_{\varphi} \hat{H}(t, x), \tilde{Y}(t, \cdot) \right\rangle \right. \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) \tilde{u}(t, x) - \hat{p}(t, x) \tilde{b}(t, x) - \tilde{q}(t, x) \tilde{\sigma}(t, x) \right. \right.$$

$$\left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \hat{r}(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{\gamma}(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right\} \, dx \, dt \right].$$

where the last inequality holds because of the concavity assumption of $H$.

Summing (3.13) and (3.14), and using (3.6), (3.7), we end up with

$$I_1 + I_2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) \tilde{u}(t, x) \, dx \, dt \right].$$

By the maximum condition of $H$ we have

$$J(u) - J(\tilde{u}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) \tilde{u}(t, x) \, dx \, dt \right] \leq 0.$$

Remark 3.5 The problem of proving the existence and uniqueness of a solution of the coupled system (3.1) & (3.10) of forward-backward SPDE with space mean, is a challenging problem that will not be discussed in this paper.
3.4 A Necessary Maximum Principle Approach (I)

We now go to the other version of the necessary maximum principle which can be seen as an extension of Pontryagin’s maximum principle to SPDE with space-mean dynamics. Here concavity assumptions are not required. We consider the following:

Given arbitrary controls \( u, \hat{u} \in U \) with \( u \) bounded, we define

\[
u^\theta := \hat{u} + \theta u, \quad \theta \in [0, 1].
\]

Note that, thanks to the convexity of \( U \), we also have \( \nu^\theta \in U \). We denote by \( Y^\theta \) the solution processes of (3.1) corresponding to \( \nu^\theta \) and \( \hat{u} \), respectively.

Define the derivative process \( Z(t, x) \) by the following equation, which is obtained by differentiating \( Y^\theta(t, x) \) with respect to \( \theta \) at \( \theta = 0 \):

\[
\begin{cases}
    dZ(t, x) = \left\{ A_x Z(t, x) + \frac{\partial b}{\partial y}(t, x) Z(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi b(t, x), Z(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right\} dt \\
     &+ \left\{ \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial y}(t, x) Z(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi \sigma(t, x), Z(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right\} dB(t) \\
     &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \left\{ \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial y}(t, x, \zeta) Z(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi \gamma(t, x), Z(t, \cdot) \rangle \right\} \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\
    Z(t, x) = 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D, \\
    Z(0, x) = 0; \quad x \in \overline{D}.
\end{cases}
\]

(3.16)

**Theorem 3.6 (Necessary Maximum Principle (I))** Let \( \hat{u}(t, x) \) be an optimal control and \( \hat{Y}(t, x) \) the corresponding trajectory and adjoint processes \( (\hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)) \). Then we have

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u} \bigg|_{u=\hat{u}} (t, x) = 0; \quad \text{a.s.} \ dt \times d\mathbb{P}.
\]

Proof Since \( \hat{u} \) is optimal, we have

\[
0 \geq \lim_{\theta \to 0} \frac{J(u^\theta) - J(\hat{u})}{\theta}.
\]

Hence, by the definition of \( J \)

\[
0 \geq \lim_{\theta \to 0} \frac{J(u^\theta) - J(\hat{u})}{\theta} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{g}}{\partial y}(T, x) \hat{Z}(T, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi \hat{g}(T, x), \hat{Z}(T, \cdot) \rangle \right\} dx \right] \\
+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial y}(t, x) \hat{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi \hat{f}(t, x), \hat{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right\} dx dt \right].
\]

(3.17)
By (3.6) and the BSPDE for \( \hat{p}(t, x) \), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial \tilde{g}}{\partial y}(T, x) \tilde{Z}(T, x) + \langle \nabla \varphi \tilde{g}(T, x), \tilde{Z}(T, \cdot) \rangle \right\} dx \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \hat{p}(T, x) \tilde{Z}(T, x) dx \right].
\]

By the Itô formula and the equations for \( \hat{p}, \hat{Z}, \hat{H} \), we get
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \hat{p}(T, x) \tilde{Z}(T, x) dx \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \hat{q}(t, x) \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial y}(t, x) \tilde{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla \varphi \sigma(t, x), Z(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right) + \hat{r}(t, x, \zeta) \left( \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial y}(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla \varphi \gamma(t, x, \zeta), Z(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right) \nu(d\zeta) \right\} dt dx \right]
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \hat{p}(t, x) \left( A_x \tilde{Z}(t, x) + \frac{\partial b}{\partial y}(t, x) \tilde{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla \varphi b(t, x), \tilde{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right) + \hat{Z}(t, x) \left( - A^*_x \hat{p}(t, x) - \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial y}(t, x) - \nabla \varphi \hat{H}(t, x) \right) \right. \right.
\]
\[
+ \left\{ \hat{q}(t, x) \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial y}(t, x) \tilde{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla \varphi \sigma(t, x), \tilde{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right) + \hat{r}(t, x, \zeta) \left( \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial y}(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla \varphi \gamma(t, x, \zeta), \tilde{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) \right) \nu(d\zeta) \right\} dt dx \right].
\]

Substituting this in (3.17), we get
\[
0 \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) u(t, x) dx dt \right].
\]

In particular, if we apply this to
\[
u(t, x) = 1_{[s, T]}(t)\alpha(x),
\]

where \( \alpha(x) \) is bounded and \( \mathcal{F}_s \)-measurable we get
\[
0 \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^T \int_D \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x) \alpha(x) dx dt \right].
\]

Since this holds for all such \( \alpha \) (positive or negative) and all \( s \in [0, T] \), we conclude that
\[
0 = \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u}(t, x); \quad \text{for a.a.} \ t, x.
\]

\( \square \)
3.5 Controls Independent of $x$

In many situations, for example in connection with partial observation control, it is of interest to study the case when the controls $u(t) = u(t, \omega)$ are not allowed to depend on the space variable $x$. See for example Bensoussan [1], [2], [3] and Pardoux [13], [14]. Let us denote the set of such controls $u \in \mathcal{U}$ by $\overline{U}$. Then the corresponding control problem is to find $\hat{u} \in \overline{U}$ such that

$$J(\hat{u}) = \sup_{u \in \overline{U}} J(u).$$

The equations for $J$, $Y$, $H$ and $p$ are as before, except that we replace $u(t, x)$ by $u(t)$. As in Øksendal [9] we handle this situation by introducing integration with respect to $dx$ in the Hamiltonian. We state the corresponding modified theorems without proofs:

**Theorem 3.7 (Sufficient Maximum Principle (II))** Suppose $\hat{u} \in \overline{U}$, with corresponding $\hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)$. Suppose the functions $(y, \varphi) \mapsto g(x, y, \varphi)$ and $(y, \varphi, u) \mapsto H(t, x, y, \varphi, u, \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot))$ are concave for each $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times D$. Moreover, suppose the following average maximum condition,

$$\max_{v \in \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \int_D H(t, x, \hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{Y}(t, \cdot), v, \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)) dx \right\}$$

$$= \int_D H(t, x, \hat{Y}(t, x), \hat{Y}(t, \cdot), \hat{u}(t), \hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot)) dx.$$

Then $\hat{u}$ is an optimal control.

**Theorem 3.8 (Necessary Maximum Principle (II))** Let $\hat{u}(t)$ be an optimal control and $\hat{Y}(t, x)$ the corresponding trajectory and adjoint processes $(\hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x), \hat{r}(t, x, \cdot))$. Then we have

$$\int_D \left. \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial u} \right|_{u=\hat{u}} (t, x) dx = 0; \quad a.s. \ dt \times d\mathbb{P}.$$

4 Application to Population Growth

We study a model for population growth in an environment with space-mean interactions given in the introduction.

4.1 Optimal Harvesting (I)

Recall that $G$ is a space-averaging operator of the form

$$G(x, \varphi) = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} \varphi(x + y) dy; \quad \varphi \in L^2(D),$$

(4.1)
where $V(\cdot)$ denotes Lebesgue volume and

$$K_\theta = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n; |y| < \theta \}$$

is the ball of radius $\theta > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ centered at 0. Suppose the density $Y(t, x)$ of a population at the time $t$ and the point $x$ satisfies the following space-mean reaction-diffusion equation

$$\begin{cases}
dY(t, x) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \Delta Y(t, x) + \alpha Y(t, x) - u(t, x) \right) dt + \beta Y(t, x) dB(t) \\
+ \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma_0(\zeta) Y(t, x) dN(dt, d\zeta); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D,
Y(0, x) = \xi(x) \geq 0; \quad x \in \overline{D},
Y(t, x) = \eta(t, x) \geq 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D,
\end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ are given constants,

$$\bar{Y}(t, x) = G(x, Y(t, \cdot)), \quad$$

and

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$$

is the Laplacian. If $u(t, x)$ represents a harvesting rate at $(t, x)$, we define the total expected utility $J_0(u)$ of the harvesting by

$$J_0(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \int_0^T \log(u(t, x)) dtdx + \int_D \log(Y(T, x)) dx \right], \quad (4.3)$$

The problem is to find the optimal harvesting rate. Here we have chosen the logarithmic utilities.

We will apply our result on the maximum principle above to solve this problem. In this case the associated Hamiltonian functional is

$$H(t, x, y, \bar{y}, u, p, q, r(\cdot)) = \log(u) + [\alpha \bar{y} - u]p \\
+ \beta \bar{y}q + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma_0(\zeta) \bar{y}r(\zeta) \nu(d\zeta),$$

where, as before,

$$\bar{y}(x) = G(x, y(\cdot)),$$

and $G$ is the space averaging operator defined in (4.1).

Since the Laplacian is a self-adjoint operator, we have the following backward SPDE for the adjoint processes $(p, q, r)$
\[
\begin{aligned}
dp(t, x) &= -\left[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta p(t, x) + \nabla_y^* H(t, x) \right] dt + q(t, x) dB(t) \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0^+} r(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad t \in [0, T]; x \in D, \\
p(T, x) &= \frac{1}{Y(T, x)}; \quad x \in \bar{D}, \\
p(t, x) &= 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D.
\end{aligned}
\]

By Example 3.1, we see that
\[
\nabla_y^* H(t, x) = v_D(x) \left\{ \alpha p(t, x) + \beta q(t, x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma_0(\zeta) r(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right\},
\]
where
\[
v_D(x) := \frac{V((x + K_\theta) \cap D)}{V(K_\theta)}.
\]

Hence the backward SPDE for \((p, q, r)\) becomes
\[
\begin{aligned}
dp(t, x) &= -\left[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta p(t, x) + v_D(x) \left\{ \alpha p(t, x) + \beta q(t, x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma_0(\zeta) r(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right\} \right] dt \\
&\quad + q(t, x) dB(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad t \in [0, T]; x \in D, \\
p(T, x) &= \frac{1}{Y(T, x)}; \quad x \in \bar{D}, \\
p(t, x) &= 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D.
\end{aligned}
\]  \(\text{(4.4)}\)

Maximizing the Hamiltonian with respect to \(u\) we get the following equation for the optimal control \(u^*\):
\[
u(t, x) = \frac{1}{p^*(t, x)},
\]  \(\text{(4.5)}\)
where \((p^*, q^*, r^*)\) is the solution of \(\text{(4.4)}\) corresponding to \(u = u^*, Y = Y^{u^*}\).

Remark 4.1 Note that if the control is not allowed to depend on \(x\), then the optimal control \(\hat{u}(t)\) is given by
\[
\hat{u}(t) = \frac{1}{\int_D \hat{p}(t, x) dx},
\]
where \((\hat{p}, \hat{q}, \hat{r})\) is the solution of \(\text{(4.4)}\) corresponding to \(u = \hat{u}, Y = Y^{\hat{u}}\).

### 4.2 Optimal Harvesting (II)

Now we modify the performance criterion of the previous example to
\[
J_1(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \frac{u^p(t, x)}{\rho} dx dt + \int_D \mu(x) Y(T, x) dx \right],
\]  \(\text{(4.6)}\)
where $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu(x) > 0$ is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and satisfies

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \mu^2(x) dx \right] < \infty.
$$

The Hamiltonian associated to the problem (4.2)-(4.6) takes the form

$$H(t, x, y, \overline{y}, u, p, q, r(\cdot)) = \frac{w^0(t, x)}{\rho} + (\alpha \overline{y} - u) p$$

$$+ \beta y q + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma_0(\zeta) \overline{y} r(\zeta) \nu(d\zeta),$$

where the triplet $(p, q, r)$ is the solution of the corresponding backward SPDE

$$\begin{cases}
 dp(t, x) = - \left[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta p(t, x) + v_D(x) \left\{ \alpha p(t, x) + \beta q(t, x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \gamma_0(\zeta) r(t, x, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta) \right\} \right] dt \\
 + q(t, x) dB(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} r(t, x, \zeta) \tilde{N}(dt, d\zeta); \quad t \in [0, T]; \ x \in D, \\
 p(T, x) = \mu(x); \quad x \in \overline{D}, \\
 p(t, x) = 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D.
\end{cases}$$

In this case, the candidate for the optimal control $\hat{u}(t, x)$ becomes

$$\hat{u}(t, x) = \left( \bar{p}(t, x) \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho - 1}}. \quad (4.7)$$

**Remark 4.2** Because of the general nature of the backward SPDE, in both cases (4.5)-(4.7) we cannot write the optimal control explicitly. Partial results are given in the continuous case by Øksendal [9].
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