

Viscosity Solutions to First Order Path-Dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations *

Jianjun Zhou

College of Science, Northwest A&F University,
Yangling 712100, Shaanxi, P. R. China
E-mail:zhoujianjun@nwsuaf.edu.cn

Abstract

In this article, a notion of viscosity solutions is introduced for first order path-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (PHJB) equations associated with optimal control problems for path-dependent differential equations. We identify the value functional of the optimal control problems as the unique viscosity solution to the associated PHJB equations. We also show that our notion of viscosity solutions is consistent with the corresponding notion of classical solutions, and satisfies a stability property.

Key Words: Path-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations; Viscosity solutions; Optimal control; Path-dependent differential equations

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 35D40; 35F21; 35Q93; 35R10; 93C23; 49L20; 49L25.

1 Introduction

In the early 1980's, Crandall and Lions [5] introduced the notion of viscosity solutions to first order Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equations. Lions [17] applied this notion to deterministic optimal control problems. From then on, a large number of papers have been published developing the theory of viscosity solutions. We refer to the survey paper of Crandall, Ishii and Lions [4]. Soon afterwards, Crandall and Lions [6], [7], [8], [9] and [10] systematically introduced the corresponding theory for viscosity solutions in infinite dimensional Hilbert space. Then, Li and Yong [16] studied the general unbounded first-order HJB equations in infinite dimensional Hilbert space.

For the path-dependent case, the theory of viscosity solutions is more difficult. Lukoyanov [18] developed a theory of viscosity solutions to fully non-linear path-dependent first order Hamilton-Jacobi equations. The existence and uniqueness theorems are proved when Hamilton function \mathbf{H} is d_p -locally Lipschitz continuous in the path function. For the second order path-dependent case, a viscosity solution approach has been successfully initiated by Ekren, Keller, Touzi and Zhang [13] in the semilinear context, and further extended to fully nonlinear equations by Ekren, Touzi, and Zhang [14, 15], elliptic equations by Ren [19], obstacle problems by Ekren [12], and degenerate second-order equations by Ren, Touzi, and Zhang [20] and Ren and Rosestolato [21]. Cosso, Federico, Gozzi, Rosestolato, and Touzi [3] studied a class of semilinear second order Path-dependent partial differential equations with a linear unbounded operator on Hilbert space.

*This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11401474), the Natural Science Foundation of Shaanxi Province (Grant No. 2017JM1016) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. 2452019075).

In this paper, we consider the following controlled path-dependent differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{X}^{\gamma_t, u}(s) = F(X_s^{\gamma_t, u}, u(s)), & s \in [t, T], \\ X_t^{\gamma_t, u} = \gamma_t \in \Lambda_t. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

In the equation above, the control $u(\cdot)$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}[t, T] := \{u(\cdot) : [t, T] \rightarrow U \mid u(\cdot) \text{ is measurable}\}$ with (U, d) is a metric space; $T > 0$ is an arbitrarily fixed finite time horizon; the unknown $X^{\gamma_t, u}$ is an R^d -valued function on $[0, T]$, denote by $X^{\gamma_t, u}(s)$ the value of $X^{\gamma_t, u}$ at time s , and $X_s^{\gamma_t, u}$ the whole history path of $X^{\gamma_t, u}$ from time 0 to s ; Λ_t denotes the set of all continuous R^d -valued functions defined over $[0, t]$ and $\Lambda = \bigcup_{t \in [0, T]} \Lambda_t$; γ_t is an element of Λ_t and denote by $\gamma_t(s)$ the value of γ_t at time s . We define a norm on Λ_t and a metric on Λ as follows: for any $0 \leq t \leq \bar{t} \leq T$ and $\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}} \in \Lambda$,

$$\|\gamma_t\|_0 := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\gamma_t(s)|, \quad d_\infty(\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) := |t - \bar{t}| + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq \bar{t}} |\gamma_t(s \wedge t) - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}(s)|.$$

We assume the coefficient $F : \Lambda \times U \rightarrow R^d$ satisfies Lipschitz condition under $\|\cdot\|_0$ with respect to the path function.

We wish to minimize a cost functional of the form:

$$J(\gamma_t, u(\cdot)) := \int_t^T q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + \phi(X_T^{\gamma_t, u}), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda, \quad (1.2)$$

over $\mathcal{U}[t, T]$. Here $q : \Lambda \times U \rightarrow R$ and $\phi : \Lambda_T \rightarrow R$ satisfy Lipschitz conditions under $\|\cdot\|_0$ with respect to the path function. We define the value functional of the optimal control problem as follows:

$$V(\gamma_t) := \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]} J(\gamma_t, u(\cdot)), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda. \quad (1.3)$$

The goal of this article is to characterize this value functional V . We consider the following path-dependent HJB (PHJB) equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t V(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x V(\gamma_t)) = 0, & (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda, \\ V(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, p) = \inf_{u \in U} [(p, F(\gamma_t, u))_{R^d} + q(\gamma_t, u)], \quad (t, \gamma_t, p) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times R^d.$$

Here $(\cdot, \cdot)_{R^d}$ denotes the scalar product of R^d , ∂_t and ∂_x denote formally the so-called pathwise (or functional or Dupire; see [11, 1, 2]) derivatives, where ∂_t is known as horizontal derivative, while ∂_x is vertical derivative.

The primary objective of this article is to develop the concept of viscosity solutions to equation (1.4). To focus on the main idea, we address the Lipschitz case under $\|\cdot\|_0$. We shall show that the value functional V defined in (1.3) is the unique viscosity solution to equation given in (1.4).

The main difficulty for our case lies in both facts that the path space Λ_T is an infinite dimensional Banach space, and that the maximal norm $\|\cdot\|_0$ is not Gâteaux differentiable. In order to study the PHJB equations defined in path space Λ , we need to give a suitable definition to ensure that the value functional is a viscosity solution of the PHJB equations. It is more important to guarantee the uniqueness of the solutions. With our assumptions of coefficients F , q and ϕ , the value functional is only Lipschitz continuous under $\|\cdot\|_0$ with respect to the path function, then the auxiliary function in the proof of uniqueness should include the term $\|\cdot\|_0^2$ or a functional which is equivalent to

$\|\cdot\|_0^2$. The lack of Gâteaux differentiability of $\|\cdot\|_0^2$ makes the definition of viscosity solutions more complex.

As mentioned above, the notion of viscosity solutions for second order PHJB equations has been developed by many authors. However, none of the results we know are directly applicable to our situation. In the papers, Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [14] and [15], Ekren [12] and Ren [19], in particular, the nondegeneracy assumption required on the Hamilton function \mathbf{H} is not fulfilled if the diffusion term is identically equal zero. In Ren, Touzi and Zhang [20] and Ren and Rosestolato [21], the degenerate case is taken into consideration, but in order to apply these results one has to require that the coefficients F , q and ϕ are d_p -uniformly continuous with respect to the path function. We notice that the first order PHJB equations were also studied in Section 8 of Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [14], and the comparison principle was established when the Hamilton function \mathbf{H} is locally uniformly continuous under d_∞ in the path function. However, this condition is not satisfied in our case, as our Hamilton function $\mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, p)$ includes the term $(p, F(\gamma_t, u))_{R^d}$ for every $(t, \gamma_t, p, u) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times R^d \times U$.

Our main contributions are as follows. We want to extend the results in [18] to Lipschitz continuous case under $\|\cdot\|_0$. This extension is nontrivial since the maximal norm $\|\cdot\|_0$ is not Gâteaux differentiable. To overcome this difficulty, we define a functional $\Upsilon^2 : \Lambda \rightarrow R$ by

$$\Upsilon^2(\gamma_t) = S(\gamma_t) + 2|\gamma_t(t)|^2, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda,$$

where

$$S(\gamma_t) = \begin{cases} \frac{(\|\gamma_t\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t)|^2)^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2}, & \|\gamma_t\|_0 \neq 0, \\ 0, & \|\gamma_t\|_0 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda.$$

This functional is the key to prove the uniqueness of viscosity solutions. We first show that it is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_0^2$ and study its regularity in the horizontal/vertical sense mentioned above. We next obtain that Υ^2 satisfies a functional formula. This is important as functional Υ^2 is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_0^2$. Then we can define an auxiliary function which includes the functional Υ^2 and prove the uniqueness of viscosity solutions. Regarding existence, we notice that the solution $X^{\gamma_t, u}(\cdot)$ to equation (1.1) is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the time $s \in [t, T]$, then as in Lukoyanov [18], we can give a definition of viscosity solutions in a sequence of bounded and uniformly Lipschitz continuous paths spaces which are compact subsets of Λ , and prove that the value functional V is a solution under our definition by dynamic programming principle.

The remaining of this article is organized as follows. In the following section, we introduce some basic notations to be used throughout this paper, and prove Theorem 2.4 and Lemmas 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10 which are the key of the existence and uniqueness results of viscosity solutions. In Section 3, we introduce preliminary results on path-dependent optimal control problems. We give the dynamic programming principle, which will be used in the following sections. In Section 4, we introduce our notion of viscosity solutions to equation (1.4) and prove that the value functional V defined by (1.3) is a viscosity solution. We also show the consistency with the notion of classical solutions and the stability result. The uniqueness of viscosity solutions for equation (1.4) is proven in Section 5. Finally, in the Appendix we present some additional results.

2 Preliminary work

Let $T > 0$ be a fixed number. For each $t \in [0, T]$, define $\hat{\Lambda}_t := D([0, t]; R^d)$ as the set of càdlàg R^d -valued functions on $[0, t]$. We denote $\hat{\Lambda}^t = \bigcup_{s \in [t, T]} \hat{\Lambda}_s$ and let $\hat{\Lambda}$ denote $\hat{\Lambda}^0$.

A very important remark on the notations: as in Dupire [11], we will denote elements of $\hat{\Lambda}$ by lower case letters and often the final time of its domain will be subscripted, e.g. $\gamma \in \hat{\Lambda}_t \subset \hat{\Lambda}$ will be denoted by γ_t . Note that, for any $\gamma \in \hat{\Lambda}$, there exists only one t such that $\gamma \in \hat{\Lambda}_t$. For any $0 \leq s \leq t$, the value of γ_t at time s will be denoted by $\gamma_t(s)$. Moreover, if a path γ_t is fixed, the path $\gamma_t|_{[0,s]}$, for $0 \leq s \leq t$, will denote the restriction of the path γ_t to the interval $[0, s]$. We also point out that the space $\hat{\Lambda}^t$ does not possess an algebraic structure since $\gamma_s + \eta_l$ is not well defined for each $\gamma_s, \eta_l \in \hat{\Lambda}^t$ when $s \neq l$.

Following Dupire [11], for $x \in R^d, \gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}_t, 0 \leq t \leq \bar{t} \leq T$, we define $\gamma_t^x \in \hat{\Lambda}_t$ and $\gamma_{t,\bar{t}} \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\bar{t}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_t^x(s) &= \gamma_t(s), \quad s \in [0, t]; \quad \gamma_t^x(t) = \gamma_t(t) + x; \\ \gamma_{t,\bar{t}}(s) &= \gamma_t(s), \quad s \in [0, t]; \quad \gamma_{t,\bar{t}}(s) = \gamma_t(t), \quad s \in (t, \bar{t}].\end{aligned}$$

We define a norm on $\hat{\Lambda}_t$ and a metric on $\hat{\Lambda}$ as follows: for any $0 \leq t \leq \bar{t} \leq T$ and $\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}} \in \hat{\Lambda}$,

$$\|\gamma_t\|_0 := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\gamma_t(s)|, \quad d_\infty(\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) := |t - \bar{t}| + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq \bar{t}} |\gamma_{t,\bar{t}}(s) - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}(s)|. \quad (2.1)$$

It is clear that $(\hat{\Lambda}_t, \|\cdot\|_0)$ is a Banach space for every $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, from Lemma 6.1 in the Appendix, it follows that $(\hat{\Lambda}^t, d_\infty)$ is a complete metric space. We also clarify that, for every $t \in (0, T]$, the Banach space $(\hat{\Lambda}_t, \|\cdot\|_0)$ is not separable. This does not create problems here, as the Banach space $(\hat{\Lambda}_t, \|\cdot\|_0)$ is only used to study the regularity of functional S which will be defined in (2.8), and our optimal control problems and the associated PHJB equations are considered in the continuous path space.

Now we define the pathwise derivatives of Dupire [11].

Definition 2.1. (*Pathwise derivatives*) Let $t \in [0, T)$ and $f : \hat{\Lambda}^t \rightarrow R$.

- (i) Given $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T) \times \hat{\Lambda}^t$, the horizontal derivative of f at γ_s (if the corresponding limit exists and is finite) is defined as

$$\partial_t f(\gamma_s) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0, h > 0} \frac{1}{h} [f(\gamma_{s,s+h}) - f(\gamma_s)]. \quad (2.2)$$

For the final time T , the horizontal derivative of f at $\gamma_T \in \hat{\Lambda}^t$ (if the corresponding limit exists and is finite) is defined as

$$\partial_t f(\gamma_T) := \lim_{s \uparrow T, s < T} \partial_t f(\gamma_T|_{[0,s]}).$$

If the above limit exists and is finite for every $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^t$, the functional $\partial_t f : \hat{\Lambda}^t \rightarrow R$ is called the horizontal derivative of f with domain $\hat{\Lambda}^t$.

- (ii) Given $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^t$, the vertical derivative of f at γ_s (if all the corresponding limits exist and are finite) is defined as

$$\partial_x f(\gamma_s) := (\partial_{x_1} f(\gamma_s), \partial_{x_2} f(\gamma_s), \dots, \partial_{x_d} f(\gamma_s)), \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\partial_{x_i} f(\gamma_s) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} [f(\gamma_s^{he_i}) - f(\gamma_s)], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (2.4)$$

with e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d is the standard orthonormal basis of R^d . If all the above limits exist and are finite for every $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^t$, the map $\partial_x f := (\partial_{x_1} f, \partial_{x_2} f, \dots, \partial_{x_d} f) : \hat{\Lambda}^t \rightarrow R^d$ is called the vertical derivative of f with domain $\hat{\Lambda}^t$.

We take the convention that γ_s is column vector, but $\partial_x f$ denotes row vector.

Definition 2.2. Let $t \in [0, T)$ and $f : \hat{\Lambda}^t \rightarrow R$ be given.

- (i) We say $f \in C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$ if f is continuous in γ_s on $\hat{\Lambda}^t$ under d_∞ .
- (ii) We say $f \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t) \subset C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$ if $\partial_{x_1} f, \partial_{x_2} f, \dots, \partial_{x_d} f$ and $\partial_t f$ exist on $\hat{\Lambda}^t$ and are in $C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$.

For each $t \in [0, T]$, let $\Lambda_t := C([0, t], R^d)$ be the set of all continuous R^d -valued functions defined over $[0, t]$. We denote $\Lambda^t = \bigcup_{s \in [t, T]} \Lambda_s$ and let Λ denote Λ^0 . Clearly, $\Lambda := \bigcup_{s \in [0, T]} \Lambda_s \subset \hat{\Lambda}$, and each $\gamma \in \Lambda$ can also be viewed as an element of $\hat{\Lambda}$. $(\Lambda_t, \|\cdot\|_0)$ is a Banach space, and (Λ^t, d_∞) is a complete metric space. $f : \Lambda^t \rightarrow R$ and $\hat{f} : \hat{\Lambda}^t \rightarrow R$ are called consistent on Λ^t if f is the restriction of \hat{f} on Λ^t . For every $t \in [0, T]$, $\mu > 0$ and $M_0 > 0$, we also define \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^μ by

$$\mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu := \left\{ \gamma_s \in \Lambda^t : \|\gamma_s\|_0 \leq M_0, \sup_{0 \leq l < r \leq s} \frac{|\gamma_s(l) - \gamma_s(r)|}{|l - r|} \leq \mu(1 + M_0) \right\}.$$

For simplicity, we let $\mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$ denote \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^μ when $t = 0$.

We remark that, following Dupire [11], we study PHJB equation (1.4) in the metric space (Λ, d_∞) in the present paper, while some literatures (for example, [3] and [14]) study PHJB equations in a complete pseudometric space. The reason to do this is that it is convenient to define \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^μ in our framework, which will be used to define our notion of viscosity solutions.

Definition 2.3. Let $t \in [0, T)$ and $f : \Lambda^t \rightarrow R$ be given.

- (i) We say $f \in C^0(\Lambda^t)$ if f is continuous in γ_s on Λ^t under d_∞ .
- (ii) We say $f \in C^1(\Lambda^t) \subset C^0(\Lambda^t)$ if there exists $\hat{f} \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$ which is consistent with f on Λ^t .

The following theorem is needed to prove the existence of viscosity solutions.

Theorem 2.4. Suppose X is a continuous function on $[0, T]$ and an absolutely continuous function on $[\hat{t}, T]$, and $u \in C^1(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ for some $\hat{t} \in [0, T)$. Then for any $t \in [\hat{t}, T]$:

$$f(X_t) = f(X_{\hat{t}}) + \int_{\hat{t}}^t \partial_t f(X_s) ds + \int_{\hat{t}}^t \partial_x f(X_s) dX(s), \quad t \in [\hat{t}, T]. \quad (2.5)$$

Here and in the following, for every $s \in [0, T]$, $X(s)$ denotes the value of X at time s , and X_s the whole history path of X from time 0 to s .

The proof is similar to Theorem 4.1 in Cont & Fournie [2] (see also Dupire [11]). For the convenience of readers, here we give its proof.

Proof. For any $t \in [\hat{t}, T]$, denote $X^n(s) = X(s)\mathbf{1}_{[0, \hat{t})}(s) + \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} X(t_{i+1})\mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(s) + X(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}}(s)$, $s \in [0, t]$. Here $t_i = \hat{t} + \frac{i(t-\hat{t})}{2^n}$. For every $(s, \gamma_s) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}$, define $\gamma_{s-} \in \hat{\Lambda}$ by

$$\gamma_{s-}(\theta) = \gamma_s(\theta), \quad \theta \in [0, s), \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{s-}(s) = \lim_{\theta \uparrow s} \gamma_s(\theta).$$

We start with the decomposition

$$f(X_{t_{i+1}-}^n) - f(X_{t_i-}^n) = f(X_{t_{i+1}-}^n) - f(X_{t_i}^n) + f(X_{t_i}^n) - f(X_{t_i-}^n). \quad (2.6)$$

Let $\psi(l) = f(X_{t_i, t_i+l}^n)$, we have $f(X_{t_{i+1}-}^n) - f(X_{t_i}^n) = \psi(h) - \psi(0)$, where $h = \frac{t-\hat{t}}{2^n}$. Let ψ_{t+} denote the right derivative of ψ , then

$$\psi_{t+}(l) = \lim_{\delta > 0, \delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\psi(l+\delta) - \psi(l)}{\delta} = \lim_{\delta > 0, \delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(X_{t_i, t_i+l+\delta}^n) - f(X_{t_i, t_i+l}^n)}{\delta} = \partial_t f(X_{t_i, t_i+l}^n), \quad l \in [0, h].$$

By

$$d_\infty(X_{t_i, t_i+l_1}^n, X_{t_i, t_i+l_2}^n) = |l_1 - l_2|, \quad l_1, l_2 \in [0, h],$$

and $f \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$, we have ψ and ψ_{t+} is continuous on $[0, h]$, therefore,

$$f(X_{t_{i+1}-}^n) - f(X_{t_i}^n) = \psi(h) - \psi(0) = \int_0^h \psi_{t+}(l)dl = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \partial_t f(X_{t_i, l}^n)dl, \quad i \geq 0.$$

The term $f(X_{t_i}^n) - f(X_{t_i-}^n)$ in (2.6) can be written $\pi(X(t_{i+1}) - X(t_i)) - \pi(0)$, where $\pi(x) = f(X_{t_i-}^n + x\mathbf{1}_{\{t_i\}})$. Since $f \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$, π is a C^1 function and $\pi'(x) = \partial_x f(X_{t_i-}^n + x\mathbf{1}_{\{t_i\}})$. Thus, we have that:

$$\pi(X(t_{i+1}) - X(t_i)) - \pi(0) = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \partial_x f(X_{t_i-}^n + (X(s) - X(t_i))\mathbf{1}_{\{t_i\}})dX(s), \quad i \geq 1.$$

Summing over $i \geq 0$ and denoting $i(s)$ the index such that $s \in [t_{i(s)}, t_{i(s)+1})$, we obtain

$$f(X_t^n) - f(X_{\hat{t}}^n) = \int_{\hat{t}}^t \partial_t f(X_{t_{i(s)}, s}^n)ds + \int_{t_1}^{t \vee t_1} \partial_x f(X_{t_{i(s)-}^n} + (X(s) - X(t_{i(s)}))\mathbf{1}_{\{t_{i(s)}\}})dX(s).$$

$f(X_t^n)$ converges to $f(X_t)$. Since all approximations of X appearing in the various integrals have a $\|\cdot\|_0$ -distance from X_s less than $\|X_s^n - X_s\|_0 \rightarrow 0$, $f \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$ implies that the integrands appearing in the above integrals converge respectively to $\partial_t f(X_s)$ and $\partial_x f(X_s)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By X is continuous and $f \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$, the integrands in the various above integrals are bounded. The dominated convergence then ensure that the Lebesgue-Stieltjes integrals converge to the terms appearing in (2.5) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

By the above Theorem, we have the following important results.

Lemma 2.5. *For every $t \in [0, T]$, let $f \in C^1(\Lambda^t)$ and $\hat{f} \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$ such that \hat{f} is consistent with f on Λ^t , then the following definition*

$$\partial_t f := \partial_t \hat{f}, \quad \partial_x f := \partial_x \hat{f}, \quad \text{on } \Lambda^t$$

is independent of the choice of \hat{f} . Namely, if there is another $\hat{f}' \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$ such that \hat{f}' is consistent with f on Λ^t , then the derivatives of \hat{f}' coincide with those of \hat{f} on Λ^t .

Proof. By the definition of the horizontal derivative, it is clear that $\partial_t \hat{f}(\gamma_s) = \partial_t \hat{f}'(\gamma_s)$ for every $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$. We claim that $\partial_x \hat{f}(\gamma_s) = \partial_x \hat{f}'(\gamma_s)$ also holds for every $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$. In fact, if not, there exist a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$ such that

$$|\partial_x \hat{f}(\gamma_s) - \partial_x \hat{f}'(\gamma_s)| \geq \varepsilon > 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume

$$|\partial_{x_1} \hat{f}(\gamma_s) - \partial_{x_1} \hat{f}'(\gamma_s)| \geq \varepsilon > 0.$$

By the regularity $\partial_{x_1} \hat{f}, \partial_{x_1} \hat{f}' \in C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$, we can assume $s < T$. Define $X : [0, T] \rightarrow R^d$ by

$$X(\sigma) = \gamma_s(\sigma), \quad \sigma \in [0, s], \quad X(\sigma) = \gamma_s(s) + (\sigma - s)e_1, \quad \sigma \in (s, T].$$

It is clear that X is continuous on $[0, T]$ and absolutely continuous on $[s, T]$. Then by Theorem 2.4,

$$\int_s^l \partial_{x_1} \hat{f}(X_\sigma) d\sigma = \int_s^l \partial_{x_1} \hat{f}'(X_\sigma) d\sigma, \quad l \in [s, T]. \quad (2.7)$$

On the other hand, by also the regularity $\partial_{x_1}\hat{f}, \partial_{x_1}\hat{f}' \in C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^t)$, there exists a constant $\hat{l} \in (s, T]$ such that

$$|\partial_{x_1}\hat{f}(X_\sigma) - \partial_{x_1}\hat{f}'(X_\sigma)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in [s, \hat{l}].$$

Therefore,

$$\int_s^l |\partial_{x_1}\hat{f}(X_\sigma) - \partial_{x_1}\hat{f}'(X_\sigma)| d\sigma \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |l - s|, \quad l \in [s, \hat{l}],$$

which contradict to (2.7). \square

We conclude this section with the following four lemmas which will be used to prove the stability and uniqueness of viscosity solutions.

Lemma 2.6. (see Proposition 1 in [22]) For $t \in [0, T]$, $\mu > 0$ and $M_0 > 0$, \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^μ is a compact subset of (Λ^t, d_∞) .

For every fixed $(\hat{t}, a_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}_{\hat{t}}$, define $g^{a_{\hat{t}}} : \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}} \rightarrow R$ by

$$g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_t) := \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t}, t}\|_H^2, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}},$$

where

$$\|\gamma_t\|_H^2 = \int_0^t |\gamma_t(s)|^2 ds, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}.$$

We also define $S : \hat{\Lambda} \times \hat{\Lambda} \rightarrow R$ by

$$S(\gamma_t, \gamma'_t) = \begin{cases} \frac{(\|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t) - \gamma'_t(t)|^2)^2}{\|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0^2}, & \|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0 \neq 0; \\ 0, & \|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (t, \gamma_t), (t, \gamma'_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}. \quad (2.8)$$

For simplicity, we let $S(\gamma_t)$ denote $S(\gamma_t, \gamma'_t)$ when $\gamma'_t(l) \equiv 0$ for all $l \in [0, t]$.

Lemma 2.7. For every fixed $(\hat{t}, a_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}_{\hat{t}}$, $g^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$.

Proof. It is clear that $g^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$ and $\partial_x g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_s) = 0$ for all $(s, \gamma_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}}$. Now we consider $\partial_t g^{a_{\hat{t}}}$. For every $(s, \gamma_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}}$,

$$\partial_t g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_s) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0, h > 0} \frac{g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_{s, s+h}) - g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_s)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0, h > 0} \frac{\int_s^{s+h} |\gamma_s(s) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 d\sigma}{h} = |\gamma_s(s) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2.$$

For $\gamma_T \in \hat{\Lambda}_T$,

$$\partial_t g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_T) := \lim_{s \nearrow T} \partial_t g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_T|_{[0, s]}) = \left| \lim_{s \rightarrow T} \gamma_T(s) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) \right|^2.$$

It is clear that $\partial_t g^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$. Thus, we show that $g^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$. \square

Lemma 2.8. For every fixed $(\hat{t}, a_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}_{\hat{t}}$, define $S^{a_{\hat{t}}} : \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}} \rightarrow R$ by

$$S^{a_{\hat{t}}}(\gamma_t) := S(\gamma_t, a_{\hat{t}, t}), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}}.$$

Then $S^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$. Moreover,

$$\frac{3 - 5^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \|\gamma_t\|_0^2 \leq S(\gamma_t) + |\gamma_t(t)|^2 \leq 2\|\gamma_t\|_0^2, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof . First, by the definition of S^{a_i} , it is clear that $S^{a_i} \in C^0(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ and $\partial_t S^{a_i}(\gamma_t) = 0$ for all $(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}}$. Second, we consider $\partial_{x_i} S^{a_i}$. For every $(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}}$,

$$\partial_{x_i} S^{a_i}(\gamma_t) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{S^{a_i}(\gamma_t^{he_i}) - S^{a_i}(\gamma_t)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{S(\gamma_t^{he_i}, a_{\hat{t},t}) - S(\gamma_t, a_{\hat{t},t})}{h}.$$

For every $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}$, let $\|\gamma_t\|_{0-} = \sup_{0 \leq s < t} |\gamma_t(s)|$ and $\gamma_t^i(t) = \gamma_t(t)e_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Then, if $|\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_{0-}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_i} S^{a_i}(\gamma_t) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t) + he_i - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2)^2 - (\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2)^2}{h\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2} \\ &= -\frac{4(\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2)(\gamma_t^i(t) - a_{\hat{t}}^i(\hat{t}))}{\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2}; \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

if $|\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| > \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_{0-}$,

$$\partial_{x_i} S^{a_i}(\gamma_t) = 0; \quad (2.11)$$

if $|\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| = \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_{0-} \neq 0$, since

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\gamma_t^{he_i} - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t) + he_i - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, & |\gamma_t(t) + he_i - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| \geq |\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|, \\ |\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 - |\gamma_t(t) + he_i - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2, & |\gamma_t(t) + he_i - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < |\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$0 \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{S^{a_i}(\gamma_t^{he_i}) - S^{a_i}(\gamma_t)}{h} \right| \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{h^2(h + 2(\gamma_t^i(t) - a_{\hat{t}}^i(\hat{t})))^2}{h\|\gamma_t^{he_i} - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2} \right| = 0; \quad (2.12)$$

if $|\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| = \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_{0-} = 0$,

$$\partial_{x_i} S^{a_i}(\gamma_t) = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

From (2.10), (2.11), (2.12) and (2.13) we obtain that, for all $(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$,

$$\partial_{x_i} S^{a_i}(\gamma_t) = \begin{cases} -\frac{4(\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2)(\gamma_t^i(t) - a_{\hat{t}}^i(\hat{t}))}{\|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2}, & \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 \neq 0, \\ 0, & \|\gamma_t - a_{\hat{t},t}\|_0^2 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

It is clear that $\partial_{x_i} S^{a_i} \in C^0(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$. Thus, we have show that $S^{a_i} \in C^1(\hat{\Lambda}^{\hat{t}})$.

Now we prove (2.9). It is clear that

$$S(\gamma_t) + |\gamma_t(t)|^2 \leq 2\|\gamma_t\|_0^2, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}.$$

On the other hand, for every $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}$,

$$S(\gamma_t) + |\gamma_t(t)|^2 \geq \frac{3 - 5^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}\|\gamma_t\|_0^2, \quad \text{if } \|\gamma_t\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t)|^2 \leq \frac{5^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1}{2}\|\gamma_t\|_0^2,$$

and

$$S(\gamma_t) + |\gamma_t(t)|^2 \geq \frac{(\frac{5\frac{1}{2}-1}{2})^2 \|\gamma_t\|_0^4}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2} = \frac{3-5\frac{1}{2}}{2} \|\gamma_t\|_0^2 \quad \text{if} \quad \|\gamma_t\|_0^2 - |\gamma_t(t)|^2 > \frac{5\frac{1}{2}-1}{2} \|\gamma_t\|_0^2.$$

Thus, we have (2.9) holds true. The proof is now complete. \square

For every constant $M > 0$, define

$$\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t) := S(\gamma_t) + M|\gamma_t(t)|^2, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda};$$

and

$$\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t, \eta_s) = \Upsilon^M(\eta_s, \gamma_t) := \Upsilon^M(\eta_s - \gamma_{t,s}), \quad 0 \leq t \leq s \leq T, \quad \gamma_t, \eta_s \in \hat{\Lambda}.$$

The following lemma will be used to prove Lemma 5.3.

Lemma 2.9. *For $M \geq 2$, we have that*

$$2\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t) + 2\Upsilon^M(\gamma'_t) \geq \Upsilon^M(\gamma_t + \gamma'_t), \quad (t, \gamma_t, \gamma'_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda} \times \hat{\Lambda}. \quad (2.15)$$

Proof . If one of $\|\gamma_t\|_0$, $\|\gamma'_t\|_0$ and $\|\gamma_t + \gamma'_t\|_0$ is equal to 0, it is clear that (2.15) holds. Then we may assume that all of $\|\gamma_t\|_0$, $\|\gamma'_t\|_0$ and $\|\gamma_t + \gamma'_t\|_0$ are not equal to 0. By the definition of Υ^M , we get, for every $(t, \gamma_t, \gamma'_t) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda} \times \hat{\Lambda}$,

$$\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t + \gamma'_t) = \|\gamma_t + \gamma'_t\|_0^2 + \frac{|\gamma_t(t) + \gamma'_t(t)|^4}{\|\gamma_t + \gamma'_t\|_0^2} + (M-2)|\gamma_t(t) + \gamma'_t(t)|^2.$$

Letting $x := \|\gamma_t + \gamma'_t\|_0^2$ and $a := |\gamma_t(t) + \gamma'_t(t)|^2$, we have

$$\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t + \gamma'_t) = f(x, a) := x + \frac{a^2}{x} + (M-2)a.$$

By

$$f_x(x, a) = 1 - \left(\frac{a}{x}\right)^2 \geq 0, \quad f_a(x, a) = 2\frac{a}{x} + M-2 \geq 0, \quad \forall x > 0, a \geq 0,$$

and

$$\|\gamma_t + \gamma'_t\|_0^2 \leq 2\|\gamma_t\|_0^2 + 2\|\gamma'_t\|_0^2, \quad |\gamma_t(t) + \gamma'_t(t)|^2 \leq 2|\gamma_t(t)|^2 + 2|\gamma'_t(t)|^2,$$

we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t + \gamma'_t) \leq \|\gamma_t\|_0^2 + \|\gamma'_t\|_0^2 + \frac{(|\gamma_t(t)|^2 + |\gamma'_t(t)|^2)^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2 + \|\gamma'_t\|_0^2} + (M-2)(|\gamma_t(t)|^2 + |\gamma'_t(t)|^2).$$

Combining with

$$\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t) + \Upsilon^M(\gamma'_t) = \|\gamma_t\|_0^2 + \|\gamma'_t\|_0^2 + \frac{|\gamma_t(t)|^4}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2} + \frac{|\gamma'_t(t)|^4}{\|\gamma'_t\|_0^2} + (M-2)(|\gamma_t(t)|^2 + |\gamma'_t(t)|^2),$$

we have

$$\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t) + \Upsilon^M(\gamma'_t) - \frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t + \gamma'_t) \geq \frac{|\gamma_t(t)|^4}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2} + \frac{|\gamma'_t(t)|^4}{\|\gamma'_t\|_0^2} - \frac{(|\gamma_t(t)|^2 + |\gamma'_t(t)|^2)^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2 + \|\gamma'_t\|_0^2}.$$

Let $c = \frac{|\gamma_t(t)|^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^2}$, $b = \frac{|\gamma'_t(t)|^2}{\|\gamma'_t\|_0^2}$, $z = \|\gamma_t\|_0^2$ and $y = \|\gamma'_t\|_0^2$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\|\gamma_t\|_0^2 + \|\gamma'_t\|_0^2)[\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t) + \Upsilon^M(\gamma'_t) - \frac{1}{2}\Upsilon^M(\gamma_t + \gamma'_t)] \\ & \geq (z + y)(c^2z + b^2y) - (cz + by)^2 = (c - b)^2zy \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (2.15) holds true. The proof is now complete. \square

Combing Theorem 2.4 and Lemmas 2.5, 2.7 and 2.8, we obtain

Lemma 2.10. *For every fixed $(\hat{t}, a_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda_{\hat{t}}$, if restrict $g^{a_{\hat{t}}}$ and $S^{a_{\hat{t}}}$ on $\Lambda^{\hat{t}}$ still denoted by themselves, then $g^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^1(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ and $S^{a_{\hat{t}}} \in C^1(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$. Moreover, if X is a continuous function on $[0, T]$ and an absolutely continuous function on $[\hat{t}, T]$, we have*

$$g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(X_s) = g^{a_{\hat{t}}}(X_{\hat{t}}) + \int_{\hat{t}}^s |X(\sigma) - a_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 d\sigma, \quad s \in [\hat{t}, T];$$

and

$$S^{a_{\hat{t}}}(X_s) = S^{a_{\hat{t}}}(X_{\hat{t}}) + \int_{\hat{t}}^s \partial_x S^{a_{\hat{t}}}(X_{\sigma}) dX(\sigma), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, T],$$

where

$$\partial_x S^{a_{\hat{t}}} = (\partial_{x_1} S^{a_{\hat{t}}}, \partial_{x_2} S^{a_{\hat{t}}}, \dots, \partial_{x_d} S^{a_{\hat{t}}})$$

with $\partial_{x_i} S^{a_{\hat{t}}}$ is defined in (2.14) for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$.

3 A DPP for optimal control problems.

In this section, we consider the controlled state equation (1.1) and value functional (1.3). Let (U, d) is a metric space. An admissible control $u(\cdot) := \{u(r), r \in [t, s]\}$ on $[t, s]$ (with $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T$) is a measurable function taking values in U . The set of all admissible controls on $[t, s]$ is denoted by $\mathcal{U}[t, s]$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{U}[t, s] := \{u(\cdot) : [t, s] \rightarrow U \mid u(\cdot) \text{ is measurable}\}.$$

Let us make the following assumptions.

Hypothesis 3.1. *$F : \Lambda \times U \rightarrow R^d$, $q : \Lambda \times U \rightarrow R$ and $\phi : \Lambda_T \rightarrow R$ are continuous, such that for some constant $L > 0$, for all (t, γ_t, u) , $(t, \gamma'_t, u) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times U$ and $\eta_T, \eta'_T \in \Lambda_T$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\gamma_t, u) - F(\gamma'_t, u)| &\vee |q(\gamma_t, u) - q(\gamma'_t, u)| \leq L \|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0; \\ |F(\gamma_t, u)| \vee |q(\gamma_t, u)| &\leq L(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0); \\ |\phi(\eta_T) - \phi(\eta'_T)| &\leq L \|\eta_T - \eta'_T\|_0; \\ |\phi(\eta_T)| &\leq L(1 + \|\eta_T\|_0). \end{aligned}$$

We remark that Hypothesis 3.1 dose not include the linear-quadratic case. Here, to focus on the main idea, we prefer to work with the Lipschitz case and leave the linear-quadratic case for future study.

The following theorem is standard, but we do not find it in the existing literature. For the convenience of readers, we give its proof.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Then for every $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$ and $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$, equation (1.1) admits a unique solution $X^{\gamma_t, u}$. Moreover,*

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |X^{\gamma_t, u}(s)| \leq C_1(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0), \quad (3.1)$$

where the constant C_1 depends only on L and T .

Proof . We define a mapping Φ from $C([0, T]; R^d)$ to itself by the formula

$$\Phi(X)(s) = \gamma_t(t) + \int_t^s F(X_{\sigma}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad s \in [t, T], \quad \Phi(X)(s) = \gamma_t(s), \quad s \in [0, t],$$

and show that it is a contraction, under an equivalent norm $\|X\| = \sup_{s \in [0, T]} e^{-\beta s} |X(s)|$, where $\beta > 0$ will be chosen later. By Hypothesis 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(X)\| &\leq \|\gamma_t\|_0 + L \sup_{s \in [t, T]} \left[e^{-\beta s} \int_t^s (1 + \|X_\sigma\|_0) d\sigma \right] \\ &\leq \|\gamma_t\|_0 + LT + L \sup_{s \in [t, T]} \int_t^s e^{-\beta(s-\sigma)} e^{-\beta\sigma} \|X_\sigma\|_0 d\sigma \\ &\leq \|\gamma_t\|_0 + LT + \frac{L}{\beta} \|X\|. \end{aligned}$$

This show that Φ is a well defined mapping on $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. If X, X' are functions belonging to this space, similar passages show that

$$\|\Phi(X) - \Phi(X')\| \leq \frac{L}{\beta} \|X - X'\|.$$

Therefore, for $\beta > L$, the mapping is a contraction. In particular, we obtain $\|X^{\gamma_t, u}\| \leq C_1(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0)$, which prove the estimate (3.1). \square

Let us now consider the continuous dependence of the solution $X^{\gamma_t, u}(\cdot)$ to equation (1.1) on the initial condition, the property will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Then, constant $C_2 > 0$ exists that depend only on L and T , such that, for every $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$, and $\gamma_{t_1}^1, \gamma_{t_2}^2 \in \Lambda$,*

$$\sup_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_1, T]} \left\| X_T^{\gamma_{t_1}^1, u} - X_T^{\gamma_{t_2}^2, u} \right\|_0 \leq C_2 \left[\|\gamma_{t_1, t_2}^1 - \gamma_{t_2}^2\|_0 + (1 + \|\gamma_{t_1}^1\|_0) (t_2 - t_1) \right]. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. For any $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$ and $\gamma_{t_1}^1, \gamma_{t_2}^2 \in \Lambda$, let $X_s^{u, i}$ denote $X_s^{\gamma_{t_i}^i, u}$ for $s \in [t_i, T]$, where $i = 1, 2$. Thus, we obtain

$$\left\| X_l^{u, 1} - X_l^{u, 2} \right\|_0 \leq \|\gamma_{t_1, t_2}^1 - \gamma_{t_2}^2\|_0 + L \left(1 + \left\| X_{t_2}^{u, 1} \right\|_0 \right) (t_2 - t_1) + L \int_{t_2}^l \left\| X_\sigma^{u, 1} - X_\sigma^{u, 2} \right\|_0 d\sigma.$$

Using the Gronwall-Bellman inequality, by (3.1), we obtain the following result, for a constant $C_2 > 0$ depending only on L and T ,

$$\left\| X_T^{u, 1} - X_T^{u, 2} \right\|_0 \leq C_2 \left[\|\gamma_{t_1, t_2}^1 - \gamma_{t_2}^2\|_0 + (1 + \|\gamma_{t_1}^1\|_0) (t_2 - t_1) \right].$$

Applying the supremum i.e., $\sup_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_1, T]}$, to both sides of the previous inequality, we get (3.2). \square

The following theorem show that the solution $X^{\gamma_t, u}(\cdot)$ to equation (1.1) is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the time $s \in [t, T]$ even if the initial value (t, γ_t) belongs to $[0, T] \times \Lambda$. The result will be used to prove the existence of viscosity solutions in Theorem 4.5.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Then, constant $C_3 > 0$ exists that depend only on L and T , such that, for every $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$,*

$$\sup_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]} |X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_2) - X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_1)| \leq C_3(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0) |s_2 - s_1|, \quad t \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq T. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. For any $0 \leq t \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq T$ and $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, by (3.1), we obtain the following result:

$$|X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_2) - X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_1)| \leq L(1 + C_1(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0))|s_2 - s_1|.$$

Taking the supremum in $\mathcal{U}[t, T]$, we obtain (3.3). \square

Our first result about the value functional is the local boundedness and two kinds of continuities.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that Hypothesis 3.1 holds true. Then, there exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that, for every $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T$ and $\gamma_t, \eta_t, \gamma'_s \in \Lambda$,*

$$|V(\gamma_t)| \leq C_4(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0); \quad |V(\gamma_t) - V(\eta_t)| \leq C_4\|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0; \quad (3.4)$$

$$|V(\gamma_t) - V(\gamma'_s)| \leq C_4(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0 \vee \|\gamma'_s\|_0)d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_s). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. By Hypothesis 3.1, (3.1) and (3.2), for any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |J(\gamma_t, u(\cdot)) - J(\gamma'_s, u(\cdot))| \\ & \leq L \int_t^s (1 + \|X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}\|_0) d\sigma + L(T+1)\|X_T^{\gamma_t, u} - X_T^{\gamma'_s, u}\|_0 \\ & \leq L(T+1)C_2(\|\gamma_{t,s} - \gamma'_s\|_0 + (1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0)(s-t)) + L(1 + C_1(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0))(s-t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking the infimum in $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$, we can find a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that (3.5) holds. By the similar procedure, we can show (3.4) holds true. The theorem is proved. \square

Now we present the dynamic programming principle (DPP) for optimal control problems (1.1) and (1.3).

Theorem 3.6. *Assume the Hypothesis 3.1 holds true. Then, for every $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ and $s \in [t, T]$, we have that*

$$V(\gamma_t) = \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]} \left[\int_t^s q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + V(X_s^{\gamma_t, u}) \right]. \quad (3.6)$$

The proof is very similar to the case without path-dependent (see Theorem 2.1 in page 160 of [23]). For the convenience of readers, here we give its proof.

Proof. First of all, for any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s, T]$, $s \in [t, T]$ and any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, s]$, by putting them concatenatively, we get $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$. Let us denote the right-hand side of (3.6) by $\bar{V}(\gamma_t)$. By (1.3), we have

$$V(\gamma_t) \leq J(\gamma_t, u(\cdot)) = \int_t^s q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + J(X_s^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\cdot)), \quad u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T].$$

Thus, taking the infimum over $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[s, T]$, we obtain

$$V(\gamma_t) \leq \int_t^s q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + V(X_s^{\gamma_t, u}).$$

Consequently,

$$V(\gamma_t) \leq \bar{V}(\gamma_t).$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $u^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} V(\gamma_t) + \varepsilon & \geq J(\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) = \int_t^s q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)) d\sigma + J(X_s^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \\ & \geq \int_t^s q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)) d\sigma + V(X_s^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}) \geq \bar{V}(\gamma_t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3.6) follows. \square

4 Viscosity solutions to HJB equations: Existence theorem.

In this section, we consider the first order PHJB equation (1.4). As usual, we start with classical solutions.

Definition 4.1. (Classical solution) A functional $v \in C^1(\Lambda)$ is called a classical solution to the PHJB equation (1.4) if it satisfies equation (1.4) point-wisely.

We shall get that the value functional V defined by (1.3) is a viscosity solution of equation (1.4). We give the following definition for the viscosity solutions.

For every $M_0 > 0$, $\mu > 0$, $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ and $w \in C^0(\Lambda)$, define

$$J_{\mu, M_0}^+(\gamma_t, w) := \left\{ \varphi \in C^1(\Lambda^t) : 0 = (w - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = \sup_{\eta_s \in \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu} (w - \varphi)(\eta_s) \right\},$$

and

$$J_{\mu, M_0}^-(\gamma_t, w) := \left\{ \varphi \in C^1(\Lambda^t) : 0 = (w + \varphi)(\gamma_t) = \inf_{\eta_s \in \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu} (w + \varphi)(\eta_s) \right\}.$$

Definition 4.2. Let $w \in C^0(\Lambda)$.

- (i) For any $\mu > 0$, w is called a viscosity μ -subsolution (resp., μ -supersolution) of equation (1.4) if the terminal condition $w(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T)$ (resp., $w(\gamma_T) \geq \phi(\gamma_T)$), $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$ is satisfied, and for every $M_0 > 0$, whenever $\varphi \in J_{\mu, M_0}^+(\gamma_s, w)$ (resp., $\varphi \in J_{\mu, M_0}^-(\gamma_s, w)$) with $(s, \gamma_s) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$ and $|\gamma_s(s)| < M_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_s) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_s, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_s)) &\geq 0, \\ (\text{resp., } -\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_s) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_s, -\partial_x \varphi(\gamma_s)) &\leq 0). \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) w is called a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) of equation (1.4) if there exists a $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\mu \geq \mu_0$, w is a viscosity μ -subsolution (resp., μ -supersolution) of equation (1.4).

- (iii) $w \in C^0(\Lambda)$ is said to be a viscosity solution of equation (1.4) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

Remark 4.3. Assume that the coefficients $F(\gamma_t, u) = \bar{F}(t, \gamma_t(t), u)$, $q(\gamma_t, u) = \bar{q}(t, \gamma_t(t), u)$ and $\phi(\eta_T) = \bar{\phi}(\eta_T(T))$ for all $(t, \gamma_t, u) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times U$ and $\eta_T \in \Lambda_T$. Then there exists a function $\bar{V} : [0, T] \times R^d \rightarrow R$ such that $V(\gamma_t) = \bar{V}(t, \gamma_t(t))$ for all $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$, and the PHJB equation (1.4) reduces to the following HJB equation:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{V}_{t+}(t, x) + \bar{\mathbf{H}}(t, x, \nabla_x \bar{V}(t, x)) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times R^d, \\ \bar{V}(T, x) = \bar{\phi}(x), & x \in R^d; \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}(t, x, p) = \inf_{u \in U} [(p, \bar{F}(t, x, u))_{R^d} + \bar{q}(t, x, u)], \quad (t, x, p) \in [0, T] \times R^d \times R^d.$$

Here and in the sequel, ∇_x denotes the standard first order derivative with respect to x . However, slightly different from the HJB literature, \bar{V}_{t+} denotes the right time-derivative of \bar{V} .

The following theorem show that our definition of viscosity solutions to PHJB equation (1.4) is a natural extension of classical viscosity solutions to HJB equation (4.1).

Theorem 4.4. *Consider the setting in Remark 4.3. Assume that V is a viscosity solution of PHJB equation (1.4) in the sense of Definition 4.2. Then \bar{V} is a viscosity solution of HJB equation (4.1) in the standard sense (see Definition 2.4 on page 165 of [23]).*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we shall only prove the viscosity subsolution property. First, from V is a viscosity subsolution of equation (1.4), it follows that, for every $x \in R^d$,

$$\bar{V}(T, x) = V(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T) = \bar{\phi}(x),$$

where $\gamma_T \in \Lambda$ with $\gamma_T(T) = x$.

Next, let $\bar{\varphi} \in C^1([0, T] \times R^d)$ and $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times R^d$ such that

$$0 = (\bar{V} - \bar{\varphi})(t, x) = \sup_{(s, y) \in [0, T] \times R^d} (\bar{V} - \bar{\varphi})(s, y).$$

Define $\varphi : \Lambda \rightarrow R$ by

$$\varphi(\gamma_s) = \bar{\varphi}(s, \gamma_s(s)), \quad (s, \gamma_s) \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda},$$

and define $\hat{\gamma}_t \in \Lambda_t$ by

$$\hat{\gamma}_t(s) = x, \quad s \in [0, t].$$

It is clear that $\varphi \in C^1(\Lambda) \subset C^1(\Lambda^t)$ and

$$\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_s) = \bar{\varphi}_t(s, \gamma_s(s)), \quad \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_s) = \nabla_x \bar{\varphi}(s, \gamma_s(s)), \quad (s, \gamma_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda.$$

Let $M_0 > 0$ be large enough such that $|x| < M_0$, since $\hat{\gamma}_t \in \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu$ for all $\mu > 0$, by the definitions of V and φ , we get that, for all $\mu > 0$,

$$0 = (V - \varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_t) = (\bar{V} - \bar{\varphi})(t, x) = \sup_{(s, y) \in [0, T] \times R^d} (\bar{V} - \bar{\varphi})(s, y) = \sup_{\gamma_s \in \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu} (V - \varphi)(\gamma_s).$$

Therefore, for all $\mu > 0$, we have $\varphi \in J_{\mu, M_0}^+(\hat{\gamma}_t, V)$ with $(t, \hat{\gamma}_t) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$ and $|\hat{\gamma}_t(t)| < M_0$. Since V is a viscosity subsolution of PHJB equation (1.4), there exists a $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\mu \geq \mu_0$,

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_t) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_t, \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_t)) \geq 0.$$

Thus,

$$\bar{\varphi}_t(t, x) + \bar{\mathbf{H}}(t, x, \nabla_x \bar{\varphi}(t, x)) \geq 0.$$

By the arbitrariness of $\bar{\varphi} \in C^1([0, T] \times R^d)$, we see that \bar{V} is a viscosity subsolution of HJB equation (4.1), and thus completes the proof. \square

We are now in a position to give the existence proof for viscosity solutions.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Then the value functional V defined by (1.3) is a viscosity solution to equation (1.4).*

Proof. First, for every $M_0 > 0$, let $\mu_0 = C_3 > 0$. For every $\mu \geq \mu_0$, we let $\varphi \in J_{\mu, M_0}^+(\gamma_t, V)$ with $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$ and $|\gamma_t(t)| < M_0$. For fixed $u \in U$, by Theorem 3.4, we can let $\delta > 0$ be small enough such that $t + \delta \leq T$, $\|X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}\|_0 \leq M_0$ and

$$\sup_{t \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq t+\delta} \frac{|X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_2) - X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_1)|}{|s_2 - s_1|} \leq C_3(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0) \leq \mu(1 + M_0).$$

Combining with $\gamma_t \in \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$, we have $X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u} \in \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu$. Then by the DPP (Theorem 3.6), we obtain that

$$\varphi(\gamma_t) = V(\gamma_t) \leq \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + V(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}) \leq \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + \varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}). \quad (4.2)$$

As $\varphi \in C^1(\Lambda^t)$, by Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 we show that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u}, u(\sigma)) d\sigma + \frac{1}{\delta} [\varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}) - \varphi(\gamma_t)] \right] \\ &= q(\gamma_t, u) + \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + (\partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t), F(\gamma_t, u))_{\mathbb{R}^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the minimum in $u \in U$, we have

$$0 \leq \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t)).$$

On the other hand, it is clear that $V(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T)$ for all $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$. Then V is a viscosity μ -subsolution of equation (1.4) for all $\mu \geq \mu_0$. Thus V is a viscosity subsolution of equation (1.4).

Next, for every $M_0 > 0$, let $\mu_0 = C_3 > 0$. For every $\mu \geq \mu_0$, we let $\varphi \in J_{\mu, M_0}^-(\gamma_t, V)$ with $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$ and $|\gamma_t(t)| < M_0$. By Theorem 3.4, we can let $\delta > 0$ be small enough such that $t + \delta \leq T$, $\sup_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]} \|X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}\|_0 \leq M_0$ and

$$\sup_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]} \sup_{t \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq t+\delta} \frac{|X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_2) - X^{\gamma_t, u}(s_1)|}{|s_2 - s_1|} \leq C_3(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0) \leq \mu(1 + M_0).$$

Combining with $\gamma_t \in \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$, we have $X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u} \in \mathcal{C}_{t, M_0}^\mu$ for all $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, by the DPP (Theorem 3.6), one can find a control $u^\varepsilon(\cdot) \equiv u^{\varepsilon, \delta}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$ such that

$$\varepsilon \delta \geq \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)) d\sigma + V(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}) - V(\gamma_t) \geq \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)) d\sigma - \varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}) + \varphi(\gamma_t).$$

Then, applying Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 to φ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)) d\sigma - \frac{\varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon}) - \varphi(\gamma_t)}{\delta} \\ &= -\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + \frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} [q(\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)) - (\partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t), F(\gamma_t, u^\varepsilon(\sigma)))_{\mathbb{R}^d}] d\sigma + o(1) \\ &\geq -\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + \inf_{u \in U} [q(\gamma_t, u) - (\partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t), F(\gamma_t, u))_{\mathbb{R}^d}] + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta \downarrow 0$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we show that

$$0 \geq -\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, -\partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t)).$$

Moreover, we also have $V(\gamma_T) \geq \phi(\gamma_T)$ for all $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$. Therefore, V is also a viscosity μ -supsolution of (1.4) for all $\mu \geq \mu_0$. Thus V is a viscosity supsolution of equation (1.4). This completes the proof. \square

Now, let us give the result of classical solutions, which show the consistency of viscosity solutions.

Theorem 4.6. *Let V denote the value functional defined by (1.3). If $V \in C^1(\Lambda)$, then V is a classical solution of equation (1.4).*

Proof . First, using the definition of V yields $V(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T)$ for all $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$. Next, for fixed $(t, \gamma_t, u) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda \times U$, from the DPP (Theorem 3.6), we obtain the following result:

$$0 \leq \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_s^{\gamma_t, u}, u) d\sigma + V(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}) - V(\gamma_t), \quad 0 < \delta < T - t. \quad (4.3)$$

By Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 2.5, the inequality above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\delta} \left[\int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_s^{\gamma_t, u}, u) d\sigma + V(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u}) - V(\gamma_t) \right] \\ &= \partial_t V(\gamma_t) + (F(\gamma_t, u), \partial_x V(\gamma_t))_{R^d} + q(\gamma_t, u). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the minimum in $u \in U$, we have that

$$0 \leq \partial_t V(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x V(\gamma_t)). \quad (4.4)$$

On the other hand, let $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda$ be fixed. Then, by DPP (Theorem 3.6) and $V \in C^1(\Lambda)$, there exists an $\tilde{u}(\cdot) \equiv u^{\varepsilon, \delta}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < T - t$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \delta &\geq \int_t^{t+\delta} q(X_s^{\gamma_t, \tilde{u}}, \tilde{u}(s)) ds + V(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, \tilde{u}}) - V(\gamma_t) \\ &= \partial_t V(\gamma_t) \delta + \int_t^{t+\delta} q(\gamma_t, \tilde{u}(\sigma)) d\sigma + \left(\partial_x V(\gamma_t), \int_t^{t+\delta} F(\gamma_t, \tilde{u}(\sigma)) d\sigma \right)_{R^d} + o(\delta) \\ &\geq \partial_t V(\gamma_t) \delta + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x V(\gamma_t)) \delta + o(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Then, dividing through by δ and letting $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, we obtain that

$$\varepsilon \geq \partial_t V(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x V(\gamma_t)).$$

The desired result is obtained by combining the inequality given above with (4.4). \square

We conclude this section with the stability of viscosity solutions.

Theorem 4.7. Let $\mu > 0$, F, q, ϕ satisfy Hypothesis 3.1, and $v \in C^0(\Lambda)$. Assume

- (i) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $F^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon$ and $v^\varepsilon \in C^0(\Lambda)$ such that $F^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon$ satisfy Hypothesis 3.1 and v^ε is a viscosity μ -subsolution (resp., μ -supersolution) of equation (1.4) with generators $F^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon$;
- (ii) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $(F^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ converge to (F, q, ϕ, v) uniformly in the following sense:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{(t, \gamma_t, u) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times U} \sup_{\eta_T \in \Lambda_T} [(|F^\varepsilon - F| + |q^\varepsilon - q|)(\gamma_t, u) + |\phi^\varepsilon - \phi|(\eta_T) + |v^\varepsilon - v|(\gamma_t)] = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Then v is a viscosity μ -subsolution (resp., μ -supersolution) of equation (1.4) with generators F, q, ϕ .

Proof . Without loss of generality, we shall only prove the viscosity subsolution property. First, from v^ε is a viscosity μ -subsolution of equation (1.4) with generators $F^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon$, it follows that

$$v^\varepsilon(\gamma_T) \leq \phi^\varepsilon(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$v(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T.$$

Next, for every $M_0 > 0$, we let $\varphi \in J_{\mu, M_0}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, v)$ with $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T) \times \mathcal{C}_{M_0}^\mu$ and $|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < M_0$. Denote $\varphi_1(\gamma_t) := \varphi(\gamma_t) + |t - \hat{t}|^2 + \|\gamma_t - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t}\|_H^2$ for all $(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$. By Lemma 2.10, we have

$\varphi_1 \in C^1(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, from Lemma 2.6 it follows that there exists $(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, M_0}^\mu$ such that

$$(v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) = \sup_{\gamma_s \in \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, M_0}^\mu} (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_s).$$

We claim that $d_\infty(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, if not, by Lemma 2.6, we may assume there exist $(\bar{t}, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, M_0}^\mu$ and a subsequence of $(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)$ still denoted by themselves such that $(\bar{t}, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) \neq (\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$ and $d_\infty(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (v - \varphi)(\bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (v - \varphi)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \leq (v - \varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = (v - \varphi_1)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} [(v - v^\varepsilon)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})] \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} [(v - v^\varepsilon)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)] \\ &= (v - \varphi)(\bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) - |\bar{t} - \hat{t}|^2 - \|\gamma_{\bar{t}} - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_H^2, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting $|\bar{t} - \hat{t}|^2 + \|\gamma_{\bar{t}} - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_H^2 > 0$. Then, for any $\rho > 0$, by (4.5) there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$\hat{t} \leq t_\varepsilon < T, \quad |\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon)| < M_0, \quad 2|t_\varepsilon - \hat{t}| + |\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 \leq \frac{\rho}{4},$$

and

$$|\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})| \leq \frac{\rho}{4}, \quad |I| \leq \frac{\rho}{4}, \quad |II| \leq \frac{\rho}{4},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \mathbf{H}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) - \mathbf{H}(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)), \\ II &= \mathbf{H}(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) - \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{H}^\varepsilon(\gamma_t, p) = \inf_{u \in U} [(p, F^\varepsilon(\gamma_t, u))_{R^d} + q^\varepsilon(\gamma_t, u)], \quad (t, \gamma_t, p) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times R^d.$$

Since v^ε is a viscosity μ -subsolution of equation (1.4) with generators $F^\varepsilon, q^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon$, we have

$$\partial_t \varphi_1(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + \mathbf{H}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi_1(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) \geq 0.$$

Notice that $\partial_x \varphi_1(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) = \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + 2(t_\varepsilon - \hat{t}) + |\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{H}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) - \mathbf{H}(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) - \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \\ &\leq \partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) + \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\rho \downarrow 0$, we show that

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \geq 0.$$

Since $\varphi \in C^1(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ is arbitrary, we see that v is a viscosity μ -subsolution of equation (1.4) with generators F, q, ϕ , and thus completes the proof. \square

5 Viscosity solutions to HJB equations: Uniqueness theorem.

This section is devoted to a proof of uniqueness of viscosity solutions to equation (1.4). This result, together with the results from the previous section, will be used to characterize the value functional defined by (1.3).

We now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Let $W_1 \in C^0(\Lambda)$ (resp., $W_2 \in C^0(\Lambda)$) be a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to equation (1.4) and let there exist constant $L > 0$, such that, for any $(t, \gamma_t), (s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$,*

$$|W_1(\gamma_t)| \vee |W_2(\gamma_t)| \leq L(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0); \quad (5.1)$$

$$|W_1(\gamma_t) - W_1(\eta_s)| \vee |W_2(\gamma_t) - W_2(\eta_s)| \leq L(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0 \vee \|\eta_s\|_0) d_\infty(\gamma_t, \eta_s). \quad (5.2)$$

Then $W_1 \leq W_2$.

Theorems 4.5 and 5.1 lead to the result (given below) that the viscosity solution to the PHJB equation given in (1.4) corresponds to the value functional V of our optimal control problem given in (1.1) and (1.3).

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that Hypothesis 3.1 holds. Then the value functional V defined by (1.3) is the unique viscosity solution to equation (1.4) in the class of functionals satisfying (5.1) and (5.2).*

Proof . Theorem 4.5 shows that V is a viscosity solution to equation (1.4). Thus, our conclusion follows from Theorems 3.5 and 5.1. \square

Next, we prove Theorem 5.1. Let W_1 be a viscosity subsolution of equation (1.4). We note that for $\delta > 0$, the functional defined by $\tilde{W} := W_1 - \frac{\delta}{t}$ is a viscosity subsolution for

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{W}(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x \tilde{W}(\gamma_t)) = \frac{\delta}{t^2}, & (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda, \\ \tilde{W}(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T. \end{cases}$$

As $W_1 \leq W_2$ follows from $\tilde{W} \leq W_2$ in the limit $\delta \downarrow 0$, it suffices to prove $W_1 \leq W_2$ under the additional assumption given below:

$$\partial_t W_1(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, \partial_x W_1(\gamma_t)) \geq c, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda, \quad c := \frac{\delta}{T^2}.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1 The proof of this theorem is rather long. Thus, we split it into several steps.

Step 1. Definitions of auxiliary functions.

By the definition of viscosity solutions, there exists a $\mu_0 > 0$ such that W_1 (resp., W_2) is a viscosity μ -subsolution (resp., μ -supersolution) to equation (1.4) for all $\mu \geq \mu_0$.

We only need to prove that $W_1(\gamma_t) \leq W_2(\gamma_t)$ for all $(t, \gamma_t) \in [T - \bar{a}, T) \times \Lambda$. Here,

$$\bar{a} = \frac{1}{96L} \wedge T.$$

Then, we can repeat the same procedure for the case $[T - i\bar{a}, T - (i-1)\bar{a})$. Thus, we assume the converse result that $(\check{t}, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) \in [T - \bar{a}, T) \times \Lambda$ exists such that $2\tilde{m} := W_1(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) - W_2(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) > 0$. Because $\cup_{\mu \geq \mu_0, M > 0} \mathcal{C}_{\check{t}, M}^\mu$ is dense in $\Lambda^{\check{t}}$, by (5.2) there exist $\hat{\mu} \geq \mu_0, M_0 > 0, \tilde{t} \in [T - \bar{a}, T)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{t}, M_0}^{\hat{\mu}}$ such that $W_1(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) - W_2(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) > \tilde{m}$.

Let $\nu = 1 + \frac{1}{96TL}$, and consider that $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small number such that

$$W_1(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) - W_2(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) - 2\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \tilde{t}}{\nu T} (S(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) + |\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}(\tilde{t})|^2) > \frac{\tilde{m}}{2},$$

and

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} \leq \frac{c}{2}. \quad (5.3)$$

Next, we define for any $(t, \gamma_t, \eta_t) \in [T - \bar{a}, T] \times \Lambda \times \Lambda$,

$$\Psi(\gamma_t, \eta_t) = W_1(\gamma_t) - W_2(\eta_t) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \Upsilon^2(\gamma_t, \eta_t) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} (S(\gamma_t) + S(\eta_t) + |\gamma_t(t)|^2 + |\eta_t(t)|^2).$$

Finally, for the fixed $\hat{\mu} \geq \mu_0$ and every $M \geq M_0$, we can apply Lemma 2.6 to find $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \in [T - \bar{a}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_M^{\hat{\mu}} \times \mathcal{C}_M^{\hat{\mu}}$ such that

$$\Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \Psi(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}, \tilde{\eta}_{\tilde{t}}) > \frac{\tilde{m}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \Psi(\gamma_t, \eta_t), \quad (t, \gamma_t, \eta_t) \in [T - \bar{a}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_M^{\hat{\mu}} \times \mathcal{C}_M^{\hat{\mu}}.$$

We should note that the point $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})$ depends on $\alpha, \hat{\mu}, \varepsilon, M$.

Step 2. For the fixed $\hat{\mu} \geq \mu_0$ and every $M \geq M_0$, the following result holds true:

$$\alpha \Upsilon^2(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \leq |W_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - W_1(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})| + |W_2(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - W_2(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \alpha \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (5.4)$$

Let us show the above. By the definition of $(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})$, we have

$$2\Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \Psi(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}). \quad (5.5)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \Upsilon^2(\gamma_t, \eta_t) &\leq |W_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - W_1(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})| + |W_2(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - W_2(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})| \\ &\leq 2L(2 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0) \leq 4L(1 + M). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Letting $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$, we get

$$\Upsilon^2(\gamma_t, \eta_t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \alpha \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Then from (2.9) it follows that

$$\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \alpha \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (5.7)$$

Combining (5.2), (5.6) and (5.7), we see that (5.4) holds.

Step 3. For the fixed $\hat{\mu} \geq \mu_0$, there exist $\hat{M} \geq M_0$ and $N > 0$ such that $\hat{t} \in [T - \bar{a}, T]$, $\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}$ and $|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| \vee |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < \hat{M}$ for all $\alpha \geq N$.

First, noting $\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + 96TL}$, by the definition of Ψ , there exists an $\hat{M} \geq M_0$ that is sufficiently large that $\Psi(\gamma_t, \eta_t) < 0$ for all $t \in [T - \bar{a}, T]$ and $|\gamma_t(t)| \vee |\eta_t(t)| \geq \hat{M}$. Thus, we have $|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| \vee |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < \hat{M}$.

Next, for the fixed $\hat{M} > 0$, by (5.7), we can let $N > 0$ be a large number such that

$$L\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 \leq \frac{\tilde{m}}{4},$$

for all $\alpha \geq N$. Then we have $\hat{t} \in [T - \bar{a}, T)$ for all $\alpha \geq N$. Indeed, if say $\hat{t} = T$, we will deduce the following contradiction:

$$\frac{\tilde{m}}{2} \leq \Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \leq \phi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \phi(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \leq L \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 \leq \frac{\tilde{m}}{4}.$$

Step 4. Completion of the proof.

From above all, for the fixed $\hat{\mu} \geq \mu_0$ in step 1 and the fixed $\hat{M} \geq M_0$ and $N > 0$ in step 3, we find $\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}$ satisfying $\hat{t} \in [T - \bar{a}, T)$ and $|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| \vee |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < \hat{M}$ for all $\alpha \geq N$ such that

$$\Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \Psi(\gamma_t, \eta_t), \quad (t, \gamma_t, \eta_t) \in [T - \bar{a}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}} \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}. \quad (5.8)$$

Now we consider the functional, for $(t, \gamma_t), (s, \eta_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda$,

$$\Psi_{\delta}(\gamma_t, \eta_s) = W_1'(\gamma_t) - W_2'(\eta_s) - \alpha(\Upsilon^2(\gamma_t, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) + \Upsilon^2(\eta_s, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}})) - \frac{1}{\delta}|s - t|^2, \quad (5.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_1'(\gamma_t) &= W_1(\gamma_t) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} (S(\gamma_t) + |\gamma_t(t)|^2) - \varepsilon(|t - \hat{t}|^2 + \|\gamma_t - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t}\|_H^2), \\ W_2'(\eta_s) &= W_2(\eta_s) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - s}{\nu T} (S(\eta_s) + |\eta_s(s)|^2) + \varepsilon(|s - \hat{t}|^2 + \|\eta_s - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}, s}\|_H^2), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}} = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} + \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}}{2}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, it has a maximum at some point $(\check{t}, \check{s}, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}})$ in $[\hat{t}, T] \times [\hat{t}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}} \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}$. By the following Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{1}{\delta} |\check{t} - \check{s}|^2 + d_{\infty}(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + d_{\infty}(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \right] = 0. \quad (5.10)$$

From $\hat{t} < T$ and $|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| \vee |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| < \hat{M}$ for all $\alpha \geq N$ and (5.10), it follows that, for every fixed $\alpha > N$, constant $K_{\alpha} > 0$ exists such that

$$|\check{t}| \vee |\check{s}| < T, \quad |\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}(\check{t})| \vee |\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}(\check{t})| < \hat{M}, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \delta < K_{\alpha}.$$

Now, for every $\alpha > N$ and $0 < \delta < K_{\alpha}$, since W_1 (resp., W_2) is a viscosity $\hat{\mu}$ -subsolution (resp., $\hat{\mu}$ -supersolution) to equation (1.4), from Lemma 2.10 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{\delta}(\check{t} - \check{s}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} (S(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) + |\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}(\check{t})|^2) + \varepsilon |\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}(\check{t}) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 + 2\varepsilon(\check{t} - \hat{t}) \\ & + \mathbf{H} \left(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \check{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) + 2\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}(\check{t})) + 4\alpha(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}(\check{t}) - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) \right) \geq c; \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{\delta}(\check{t} - \check{s}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} (S(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) + |\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}(\check{s})|^2) - \varepsilon |\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}(\check{s}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 - 2\varepsilon(\check{s} - \hat{t}) \\ & + \mathbf{H} \left(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}, -\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \check{s}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) + 2\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}(\check{s})) - 4\alpha(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}(\check{s}) - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) \right) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Combining (5.11) and (5.12), and letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& c + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} (S(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 + S(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2) \\
& \leq \mathbf{H} \left(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, 2\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + 2\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \right) \\
& \quad - \mathbf{H} \left(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}, 2\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + 2\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \right). \tag{5.13}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by a simple calculation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H} \left(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, 2\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + 2\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \right) \\
& \quad - \mathbf{H} \left(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}, 2\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + 2\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \right) \\
& \leq \sup_{u \in U} (J_1 + J_2), \tag{5.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \left(F(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u), 2\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + 2\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) + \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \right)_{R^d} \\
& \quad - \left(F(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}, u), 2\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} (\partial_x S(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + 2\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})) - \alpha \partial_x S^{\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}}(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \right)_{R^d} \\
& \leq 4\alpha L |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| \times \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 + 6\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} L |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| (1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0) \\
& \quad + 6\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} L |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})| (1 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0); \tag{5.15}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$J_2 = q(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u) - q(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}, u) \leq L \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0. \tag{5.16}$$

Combining (5.13)-(5.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
c &\leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} (S(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 + S(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + |\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2) + 2\alpha L (|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2) \\
& \quad + L \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 + 12\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} L (1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2). \tag{5.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling $\nu = 1 + \frac{1}{96TL}$ and $\bar{a} = \frac{1}{96L} \wedge \frac{T}{2}$, by (2.9), we have

$$c \leq 2\alpha L (|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^2 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2) + L \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T}.$$

Then, letting $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, by (2.9), (5.3) and (5.4), the following contradiction is induced:

$$c \leq \frac{c}{2}.$$

The proof is now complete. \square

To complete the previous proof, it remains to state and prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *The maximum point $(\check{t}, \check{s}, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}})$ of $\Psi_\delta(\gamma_t, \eta_s)$ defined by (5.9) in $[\hat{t}, T] \times [\hat{t}, T] \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}} \times \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}$ satisfies condition (5.10).*

Proof . By the definition of the maximum point $(\check{t}, \check{s}, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}})$, we have

$$2\Psi_\delta(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) \geq \Psi_\delta(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) + \Psi_\delta(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}}).$$

This implies that

$$\frac{2}{\delta}|\check{t} - \check{s}|^2 \leq |W'_1(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) - W'_1(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}})| + |W'_2(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) - W'_2(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}})|.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$|\check{t} - \check{s}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $\check{t} \leq \check{s}$. By the definition of Ψ_δ and (2.15), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\delta(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) &\geq \Psi_\delta(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) = \Psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \Psi(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}, \check{s}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) \\ &= W_1(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}, \check{s}}) - W_2(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\Upsilon^2(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}, \check{s}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \check{s}}{\nu T} (S(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}, \check{s}}) + S(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) + |\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}(\check{t})|^2 + |\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}(\check{s})|^2) \\ &\geq \Psi_\delta(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}}) + \frac{1}{\delta}|\check{t} - \check{s}|^2 - L(1 + \hat{M})|\check{t} - \check{s}| + \varepsilon(|\check{t} - \hat{t}|^2 + |\check{s} - \hat{t}|^2 + \|\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}} - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, \check{t}}\|_H^2 + \|\check{\eta}_{\check{s}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}, \check{s}}\|_H^2). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{\delta}|\check{t} - \check{s}|^2 + \varepsilon(|\check{t} - \hat{t}|^2 + |\check{s} - \hat{t}|^2 + \|\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}} - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, \check{t}}\|_H^2 + \|\check{\eta}_{\check{s}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}, \check{s}}\|_H^2) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, since $\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \check{\eta}_{\check{s}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}$ and $|\check{t} - \hat{t}| + |\check{s} - \hat{t}| \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we may assume $d_\infty(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \bar{\gamma}_{\check{t}}) + d_\infty(\check{\eta}_{\check{s}}, \bar{\eta}_{\check{t}}) \rightarrow 0$ for some $\bar{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \bar{\eta}_{\check{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\hat{t}, \hat{M}}^{\hat{\mu}}$. Then we have that

$$\|\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}} - \bar{\gamma}_{\check{t}, \check{t}}\|_H^2 + \|\check{\eta}_{\check{s}} - \bar{\eta}_{\hat{t}, \check{s}}\|_H^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} = \bar{\gamma}_{\check{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} = \bar{\eta}_{\check{t}}$, and we get that (5.10) holds true. The proof is now complete. \square

6 Appendix

In this Appendix, we prove $(\hat{\Lambda}^t, d_\infty)$ is a complete metric space.

Lemma 6.1. *$(\hat{\Lambda}^t, d_\infty)$ is a complete metric space for every $t \in [0, T)$.*

Proof. Assume $\{\gamma_{t_n}^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a cauchy sequence in $(\hat{\Lambda}^t, d_\infty)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for all $m, n \geq N(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$d_\infty(\gamma_{t_n}^n, \gamma_{t_m}^m) = |t_n - t_m| + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |\gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_m}^m(s \wedge t_m)| < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, there exists $\hat{t} \in [t, T]$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \hat{t}$. Moreover, for all $s \in [0, T]$,

$$|\gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_m}^m(s \wedge t_m)| < \varepsilon, \quad (\forall m, n \geq N(\varepsilon)). \quad (6.1)$$

For fixed $s \in [0, T]$, we see that $\{\gamma_{t_n}^n(t_n \wedge s)\}$ is a cauchy sequence, thereby the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{t_n}^n(t_n \wedge s)$ exists and denoted by $\gamma_T(s)$. Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ in (6.1), we obtain that

$$|\gamma_T(s) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (\forall n \geq N(\varepsilon)).$$

Taking the supremum over $s \in [0, T]$, we get

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\gamma_T(s) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (\forall n \geq N(\varepsilon)). \quad (6.2)$$

We claim that $\gamma_T(s) = \gamma_T(\hat{t})$ for all $s \in (\hat{t}, T]$. In fact, if there exists a subsequence $\{t_{n_l}\}_{l \geq 0}$ of $\{t_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\{t_{n_l}\}_{l \geq 0} \leq \hat{t}$, then we have, for every $s \in (\hat{t}, T]$,

$$\gamma_T(s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{t_n}^n(t_n) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{t_{n_l}}^n(t_{n_l}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{t_{n_l}}^n(t_{n_l} \wedge \hat{t}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{t_n}^n(t_n \wedge \hat{t}) = \gamma_T(\hat{t}).$$

Otherwise, we may assume $\{t_n\}_{n \geq 0} > \hat{t}$. Letting $s = t_m$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$ in (6.1), we obtain, for all $s \in (\hat{t}, T]$,

$$|\gamma_{t_n}^n(\hat{t}) - \gamma_T(s)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (\forall n \geq N(\varepsilon)).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$|\gamma_T(\hat{t}) - \gamma_T(s)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } s \in (\hat{t}, T].$$

Then, by (6.2) we obtain

$$d_\infty(\eta_{\hat{t}}, \gamma_{t_n}^n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.3)$$

Here we let $\eta_{\hat{t}}$ denote $\gamma_T|_{[0, \hat{t}]}$. Now we prove $\eta_{\hat{t}} \in \hat{\Lambda}^t$. First, we prove $\eta_{\hat{t}}$ is right-continuous. For every $0 \leq s < \hat{t}$ and $0 < \delta \leq \hat{t} - s$, we have

$$|\eta_{\hat{t}}(s + \delta) - \eta_{\hat{t}}(s)| \leq |\gamma_T(s + \delta) - \gamma_{t_n}^n((s + \delta) \wedge t_n)| + |\gamma_{t_n}^n((s + \delta) \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n)| + |\gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n) - \gamma_T(s)|.$$

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, by (6.2), there exists $n > 0$ independent of δ , which is large enough such that

$$|\gamma_T(s + \delta) - \gamma_{t_n}^n((s + \delta) \wedge t_n)| + |\gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n) - \gamma_T(s)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

For the fixed n , since $\gamma_{t_n}^n \in \hat{\Lambda}^t$, there exists a constant $0 < \Delta \leq \hat{t} - s$ such that, for all $0 \leq \delta < \Delta$,

$$|\gamma_{t_n}^n((s + \delta) \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s \wedge t_n)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then $|\eta_{\hat{t}}(s + \delta) - \eta_{\hat{t}}(s)| < \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq \delta < \Delta$. Next, let us prove $\eta_{\hat{t}}$ has left limit in $(0, \hat{t}]$. For every $0 < s \leq \hat{t}$ and $0 \leq s_1, s_2 < s$, we have

$$|\eta_{\hat{t}}(s_1) - \eta_{\hat{t}}(s_2)| \leq |\gamma_T(s_1) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_1 \wedge t_n)| + |\gamma_T(s_2) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_2 \wedge t_n)| + |\gamma_{t_n}^n(s_1 \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_2 \wedge t_n)|.$$

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, by (6.2), there exists $n > 0$ be large enough such that

$$|\gamma_T(s_1) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_1 \wedge t_n)| + |\gamma_T(s_2) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_2 \wedge t_n)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

For the fixed n , if $t_n < s$, we can let $\Delta > 0$ be small enough such that $t_n < s - \Delta$, then for all $s_1, s_2 \in [s - \Delta, s]$,

$$|\gamma_{t_n}^n(s_1 \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_2 \wedge t_n)| = |\gamma_{t_n}^n(t_n) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(t_n)| = 0;$$

if $t_n \geq s$, since $\gamma_{t_n}^n \in \hat{\Lambda}^t$, there exists a constant $\Delta > 0$ such that, for all $s_1, s_2 \in [s - \Delta, s]$,

$$|\gamma_{t_n}^n(s_1 \wedge t_n) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_2 \wedge t_n)| = |\gamma_{t_n}^n(s_1) - \gamma_{t_n}^n(s_2)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then there exists a constant $\Delta > 0$ such that $|\eta_{\hat{t}}(s_1) - \eta_{\hat{t}}(s_2)| < \varepsilon$ for all $s_1, s_2 \in [s - \Delta, s]$. The proof is now complete. \square

References

- [1] R. Cont and D.-A. Fournié, Change of variable formulas for non-anticipative functionals on path space, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 259 (2010), no. 4, 1043-1072.
- [2] R. Cont and D.-A. Fournié, Functional Itô calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales, *Ann. Probab.*, 41 (2013), 109-133.
- [3] A. Cosso, S. Federico, F. Gozzi, M. Rosestolato, N. Touzi, Path-dependent equations and viscosity solutions in infinite dimension, *Ann. Probab.*, 46 (2018), no. 1, 126-174.
- [4] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P. L. Lions, Users guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 27 (1992), 1-67.
- [5] M. G. Crandall, and P. L. Lions, Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 277 (1983), 1-42.
- [6] M. G. Crandall, and P. L. Lions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, I: Uniqueness of viscosity solutions, *J. Func. Anal.*, 62 (1985), 379-396.
- [7] M. G. Crandall, and P. L. Lions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, II: Existence of viscosity solutions, *J. Func. Anal.*, 65 (1986), 368-425.
- [8] M. G. Crandall, and P. L. Lions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, III, *J. Func. Anal.*, 68 (1986), 214-247.
- [9] M. G. Crandall, and P. L. Lions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, IV: Hamiltonians with Unbounded linear terms, *J. Func. Anal.*, 90 (1990), 237-283.
- [10] M. G. Crandall, and P. L. Lions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, V: Unbounded linear terms and B-continuous solutions, *J. Func. Anal.*, 97 (1991), 417-465.
- [11] B. Dupire, Functional Itô calculus, Preprint. Available at papers.ssrn.com, (2009).
- [12] I. Ekren, Viscosity solutions of obstacle problems for fully nonlinear path-dependent PDEs, *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 127 (2017), 3966-3996.
- [13] I. Ekren, C. Keller, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, On viscosity solutions of path dependent PDEs, *Ann. Probab.*, 42 (2014), 204-236.
- [14] I. Ekren, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic path dependent PDEs: Part I, *Ann. Probab.*, 44 (2016), 1212-1253.
- [15] I. Ekren, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic path dependent PDEs: Part II, *Ann. Probab.*, 44 (2016), 2507-2553.
- [16] X. Li, J. Yong, *Optimal Control Theory for Infinite-Dimensional Systems*, Birkhauser, Boston, 1995.
- [17] P. L. Lions, *Generalized Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations*, Pitman Research Notes in Math., No. 69, Pitman, Boston, 1982.
- [18] N. Y. Lukoyanov, On viscosity solution of functional Hamilton-Jacobi type equations for hereditary systems, *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 259 (2007), S190-S200.

- [19] Z. Ren, Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic path dependent partial differential equations, *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 26 (2016), 3381-3414.
- [20] Z. Ren, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang, Comparison of viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear degenerate parabolic Path-dependent PDEs, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49 (2017), 4093-4116.
- [21] Z. Ren, M. Rosestolato, Viscosity solutions of path-dependent PDEs with randomized time, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52 (2020), 1943-1979.
- [22] S. Tang, F. Zhang, Path-dependent optimal stochastic control and viscosity solution of associated Bellman equations, *Discrete cont. Dyn-A*, 35 (2015), no. 11, 5521-5553.
- [23] J. Yong, X. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.