On the value of a general stochastic differential game with ergodic payoff
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Abstract. In this paper we study a type of zero-sum stochastic differential games with ergodic payoff in which the diffusion system does not need to be non-degenerate. We first show the existence of a viscosity solution of the associated ergodic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation under the dissipativity condition. With the help of this viscosity solution, we then give the estimates for the upper and lower ergodic value functions by constructing a series of non-degenerate approximating processes and using the sup- and inf-convolution techniques. Finally, we obtain the existence of a value under the Isaacs condition and its representation formulæ. In addition, we apply our results to study a type of pollution accumulation problems with the long-run average social welfare.
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1 Introduction

The study of the two-player zero-sum stochastic differential games (SDGs) has been rapidly developed since the pioneering work [21]. In their work, Fleming and Souganidis proved that the lower and upper value functions satisfy the dynamic programming principle (DPP) and thus they are the unique viscosity solutions of the associated Bellman-Isaacs equations. Under the Isaacs condition, these two value functions coincide which implies that the value exists. Under this framework, there are many works on SDGs in different situations, such as SDGs with recursive payoffs [11, 28], with jumps [5, 8], with reflection [12], with asymmetric information [18], without Isaacs condition [13, 27], etc. All these works focus on the finite time horizon SDGs.

For infinite horizon problems, two payoff criteria, the discounted payoff criterion and the ergodic one (i.e., the long-run average of a given payoff function), are usually considered for SDGs. Borkar, Ghosh [9] studied SDGs with these two criteria based on occupation measures. In order to ensure
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the existence of the invariant measure of the state processes, they considered a type of relaxed feedback controls for both players. Arapostathis, Borkar, Kumar [4] introduced a relative value iteration scheme to study the game problems similar to [9]. Notice that in both [9] and [4] the diffusion coefficient needs to be non-degenerate and independent of the controls. Alvarez, Bardi [3] proved the existence of the value of SDGs with the ergodic payoff via the long time limit of the value function of the finite horizon games and characterized the value of the game in terms of the related Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation. However, in their work, the diffusion coefficient of the dynamics also needs to be non-degenerate and the coefficients of the dynamics as well as the performance function of ergodic payoff need to be periodic with respect to the state variables.

As a result, how to study the infinite time horizon SDGs without non-degenerate assumption in the ergodic settings (i.e., the value independent of the initial condition) becomes an interesting problem and is one of the main challenges in differential game theory (See, Section 3 in [7] for more details). Very little is known without such an assumption for infinite time horizon SDGs. The difficulty comes from in some sense the fact that the value of the game may depend upon the initial conditions, i.e., SDGs under non ergodic settings. There have been some results on this topic, such as [10, 29, 37] for the control problems and [14] for game problems. In these works certain suitable non-expansivity conditions are given in order to study the existence of asymptotic values. Another difficulty is that the traditional partial differential equations (PDEs) techniques (see [21]) used to prove the existence of values in the field of finite time SDGs may fail to work for infinite time SDGs. Some new approach should be introduced for such a problem. Ghosh, Rao [30] studied this problem in the framework of the deterministic situation. They first showed that the existence of a viscosity solution of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation and then obtained the existence of the value with the help of this viscosity solution. Compared with the traditional way introduced in [21] to investigate SDGs, this approach in some sense is a reverse process and it was first introduced by Swiech to obtain the sub- and super-optimality principles of DPP for deterministic differential games in [39] and SDGs in [40]. In this paper, we mainly focus on two-player zero-sum SDGs with long-run average payoff without the non-degeneracy assumption in a more general but still ergodic setting. We adopt the approach introduced in [40] to deal with our problem and extend the results of [30] to stochastic cases. To be more specific, the dynamics of our game problem is driven by a doubly controlled stochastic differential equation (SDE)

\[
\begin{aligned}
&dX_{s}^{x,u,v} = b(X_{s}^{x,u,v}, u_s, v_s)ds + \sigma(X_{s}^{x,u,v}, u_s, v_s)dB_s, \quad s \geq 0, \\
&X_{0}^{x,u,v} = x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\end{aligned}
\] (1.1)

and the ergodic payoff function is large time $T$ limit of average payoff of the following form

\[
J(T, x, u, v) = \frac{1}{T}E\left[\int_0^T f(X_{s}^{x,u,v}, u_s, v_s)ds\right],
\] (1.2)

where $u$ and $v$ are admissible controls for Player 1 and Player 2, respectively, and the assumptions on $b, \sigma$ and $f$ are given in Section 2. Our objective is to study the existence of the value of such a game when $T$ tends to infinity, i.e., the consistency of the upper ergodic value function $\rho^+(x)$ and the lower ergodic value function $\rho^-(x)$ (see, (2.2) for the definitions of $\rho^+$ and $\rho^-$).

We first study the existence of viscosity solutions of the associated equations (2.3) and (2.4) by vanishing the limit of SDGs with discounted payoff (Theorem 3.1). As is shown in [9, 14, 9], the non-degeneracy condition ensures the ergodic property of the diffusion process and plays an important role in the study of infinite horizon SDGs. In order to overcome the absence of the non-degeneracy assumption, we construct a series of non-degenerate diffusion processes, which is different from those constructed in [10], to approximate our state process (Lemma 4.1). Notice
that we consider an infinite time horizon problem and the constructed non-degenerate processes are non-Markovian, the classical Gaussian’s upper bound for the density function of non-degenerate process can not applied to our problem (see Remark 4.1 for more details). For this, we prove a weaker upper bound for the density function by using pure probabilistic approach (Proposition 4.1). With the help of this upper bound and sup-convolution technique, we give the estimates for the upper ergodic value function $\rho^+(x)$ and the lower ergodic value function $\rho^-(x)$ in terms of viscosity solutions of equations (2.3) and (2.4), respectively (Theorem 4.1). These estimates allow us to conclude the existence of the value of SDGs with ergodic payoff under the Isaacs condition (Theorem 4.2) and the uniqueness result for the corresponding ergodic Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation (Corollary 4.1). As a byproduct, we obtain the DPP for our SDGs and several representation results for the ergodic value (Theorem 3.2 Corollary 4.2). In addition, we apply our results to address a type of pollution accumulation problem with long-run average social welfare.

Our paper is organised as follows: the basic settings of our SDGs, such as the dynamics, the ergodic payoff criterion, admissible controls and strategies as well as the related PDE, are introduced in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to studying the existence of the viscosity solution of the associated PDE and the long time behaviour of the solution of the related finite horizon PDE. Section 4 gives the estimates for the upper and lower ergodic value functions and consequently the existence of the ergodic value. Moreover, the uniqueness result of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation and some characterization results as well as DPP are presented also in this section. An example on the pollution accumulation model is given in Section 5 to illustrate our results. The property of sup-convolution and inf-convolution used in the viscosity solution theory is given in Appendix.

2 Formulation of the SDGs

Let $W = (B, B^1)$ be a standard $(d + n)$-dimensional Brownian motion defined on a completed probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and we denote by $\mathbb{F}^B = (\mathcal{F}^B_t)_{t \geq 0}$, $\mathbb{F}^{B^1} = (\mathcal{F}^{B^1}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, and $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the completed filtrations generated by Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$, $(B^1_t)_{t \geq 0}$, and $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$, respectively. We remark that the $n$-dimensional Brownian motion $B^1$ will not be used until Section 4.

Let $U$ and $V$ be two compact metric spaces which represent the control state spaces for Players 1 and 2, respectively. We introduce the admissible control spaces for player 1 and 2, respectively,

$$U = \{u : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \to U \text{ is } (\mathcal{F}^B_t)_{t \geq 0}\text{-progressively measurable process}\};$$
$$V = \{v : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \to V \text{ is } (\mathcal{F}^B_t)_{t \geq 0}\text{-progressively measurable process}\}.$$

We assume that the mappings

$$b : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times V \to \mathbb{R}^n, \; \sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times V \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \; f : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times V \to \mathbb{R},$$

satisfy the following standard conditions

(H1) For every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $b, \sigma, f$ are continuous in $(u, v) \in U \times V$;

(H2) For $l = b, \sigma, f$, there exists a constant $C_l$ such that, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in U$, $v \in V$,

$$|l(x, u, v) - l(y, u, v)| \leq C_l|x - y|, \; |\sigma(x, u, v)| \leq C_\sigma.$$
Under the conditions (H1) and (H2), it is easy to check that \( b \) and \( f \) are of linear growth in \( x \), uniformly with respect to controls \( (u, v) \). Then for any given \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and every admissible controls \( (u, v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \), SDE (1.1) has a unique \( \mathbb{R}^n \)-valued, \( \mathcal{F}_t^\mathcal{B} \)-adapted continuous solution \( (X^{x,u,v}_t)_{t \geq 0} \) under assumptions (H1) and (H2). Moreover, we impose the following monotone condition for the coefficient \( b \).

**(H3)** There exists a constant \( K > C^2_\sigma \) such that, for all \( (u, v) \in U \times V, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \),

\[
2(x - y)(b(x, u, v) - b(y, u, v)) \leq -K|x - y|^2.
\]

**Remark 2.1.** Assumptions (H2) and (H3) imply the classical dissipativity condition, i.e., for all \( (u, v) \in U \times V, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \),

\[
2(x - y)(b(x, u, v) - b(y, u, v)) + \|\sigma(x, u, v) - \sigma(y, u, v)\|^2 \leq -(K - C^2_\sigma)|x - y|^2.
\]

It is well known that this condition will ensure the existence and the uniqueness of the invariant measure of flows generated by the solution of SDE (1.1) when either the coefficients \( b, \sigma \) are independent of the controls \( u, v \) or \( u, v \) are feedback controls (See, e.g. Proposition 2.1 in [16], Theorem 6.3.2 in [19]). However, the corresponding transition probability function of the state process \( X^{x,u,v} \) is not time-homogenous due to the presence of the controls \( (u, v) \) in our framework. Thus, neither the classical theory of ergodicity for homogeneous Markov semigroup nor the recent development of ergodic theory of time periodic Markov semigroup in [19] may apply immediately to our problem.

From the standard estimates for the solution of SDE (1.1) we can get the following result.

**Lemma 2.1.** Under the assumptions (H1)-(H3), there exist constants \( C, c > 0 \) such that for all \( t > 0, \delta > 0, (u, v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we have the following estimates,

\[
\begin{align*}
E|X^{x,u,v}_t|^2 & \leq C(1 + |x|^2 e^{-ct}); \\
E|X^{x,u,v}_t - X^{y,u,v}_t|^2 & \leq e^{-ct}|x - y|^2; \\
E[\sup_{t \leq \delta \leq t + \delta} |X^{x,u,v}_s - X^{x,u,v}_t|^2] & \leq C(\delta^2 + \delta). 
\end{align*}
\tag{2.1}
\]

It is worth to point out that the first and the second estimates in (2.1) can be proved without the Lipschitz condition of the coefficient \( b \) in \( x \) as given in assumption (H2) (see, e.g. subsection 2.1 in [20]).

**Definition 2.1.** An admissible strategy for Player 1 is a mapping \( \alpha : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{U} \) satisfying the following non-anticipative property: For all \( t \in [0, \infty) \) and all controls \( v, v' \in \mathcal{V} \), if \( v = v' \), dsdP-a.e., on \([0, t]\), then \( \alpha(v) = \alpha(v') \), dsdP-a.e., on \([0, t]\). The set of all admissible strategies for Player 1 is denoted by \( \mathcal{A} \).

Similarly, an admissible strategy for Player 2 is a mapping \( \beta : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{V} \) satisfying the following non-anticipative property: For all \( t \in [0, \infty) \) and all controls \( u, u' \in \mathcal{V} \), if \( u = u' \), dsdP-a.e., on \([0, t]\), then \( \beta(u) = \beta(u') \), dsdP-a.e., on \([0, t]\). The set of all admissible strategies for Player 2 is denoted by \( \mathcal{B} \).

We consider, for \((T, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n, (u, v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \), the average payoff criterion over \([0, T]\) of the form (1.2). Under the assumptions (H1)-(H3), it is easy to check that the payoff \( J \) is bounded.
and Lipschitz in $x$, uniformly with respect to $(T,u,v) \in (0,\infty) \times U \times V$. Let us now introduce the following upper and lower ergodic value functions:

$$
\rho^+(x) = \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in U} \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T,x,u,\beta(u)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

$$
\rho^-(x) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in V} \liminf_{T \to \infty} J(T,x,\alpha(v),v), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
$$

(2.2)

**Remark 2.2.** In [30], the authors considered the lower ergodic value function $\rho^-(x)$ as the upper limit of $J$, i.e.,

$$
\rho^-(x) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in V} \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T,x,\alpha(v),v).
$$

We here make a slight modification for the definition of the function $\rho^-(x)$ in order to consider a general case.

If for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$
\rho^+(x) = \rho^-(x) = \rho,
$$

where $\rho$ is a constant, we say that the SDG with ergodic payoff criterion has a value (we also say that the long time average cost game is ergodic; see [3] for more details). Our main aim in this paper is to study the existence of the value of the SDGs associated with (1.1) and (1.2). In order to prove the existence of the value of our game problem, we consider the following related *ergodic* Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs (HJBI, for short) equations,

$$
\rho = \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x,Dw(x),D^2w(x),u,v), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

(2.3)

and

$$
\rho = \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x,Dw(x),D^2w(x),u,v), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

(2.4)

where Hamiltonian function

$$
H(x,p,A,u,v) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\sigma\sigma^*)(x,u,v) \cdot A) + b(x,u,v) \cdot p + f(x,u,v),
$$

$(x,p,A,u,v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}(n) \times U \times V$ and $\mathcal{S}(n)$ denotes the set of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices.

### 3 The existence of the viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI

In this section we study the existence of the viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI equation (2.3) and (2.4) by vanishing limit in the discounted payoff case. On the other hand, the long time behaviour of the corresponding finite horizon nonlinear (possibly degenerate) second order Hamilton-Jacobi equation is also investigated with the help of the viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI equation (2.3).

For the convenience of the reader, we first give the definition of the viscosity solution of (2.3). The reader is also referred to [17] for more details. The viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI equation (2.4) is defined similarly.

**Definition 3.1.** (i) A viscosity subsolution of (2.3) is a pair $(\rho, w)$, where $\rho$ is a real number and $w$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a test function $\varphi \in C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$
\rho \leq \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x,D\varphi(x),D^2\varphi(x),u,v),
$$

$\text{Tr} \{ (\sigma \sigma^*)(x,u,v) \cdot A \} + b(x,u,v) \cdot p + f(x,u,v),$

$x, p, A, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}(n) \times U \times V$ and $\mathcal{S}(n)$ denotes the set of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices.

---

$C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{ h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} | h, Dh, D^2h \text{ are bounded and Lipschitz continuous} \}$.
whenever \( w - \varphi \) has a local maximum at \( x \).

(ii) A viscosity supersolution of (2.3) is a pair \((\rho, w)\), where \( \rho \) is a real number and \( w \) is continuous on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) such that for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and a test function \( \varphi \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^n) \), we have

\[
\rho \geq \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, D\varphi(x), D^2\varphi(x), u, v),
\]

whenever \( w - \varphi \) has a local minimum at \( x \).

(iii) A viscosity solution of (2.3) is a pair \((\rho, w)\) that is both viscosity subsolution and supersolution of (2.3).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let Assumptions (H1)-(H3) hold. Then ergodic HJBI equation (2.3) (resp. (2.4)) has a viscosity solution \((\rho, w)\) where \( w \) satisfies the following property: there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), it holds

\[
|w(x) - w(y)| \leq C|x - y|, \quad |w(x)| \leq C|x|.
\]

**Proof.** For any fixed \( \lambda > 0 \), from Theorem 4.1 in [14], we know that

\[
w_\lambda(x) = \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} E\left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, u, \beta(s)) ds \right]
\]

is the unique viscosity solution of the following HJBI equation

\[
\lambda w_\lambda(x) = \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, Dw_\lambda(x), D^2w_\lambda(x), u, v), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

From Lemma 2.1, we know for all \( u \in U, \beta \in B, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[
|\lambda w_\lambda - \lambda w_\lambda| \leq \frac{C_f}{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}} |x - y| \leq C|x - y|,
\]

where the constant \( C \) only depends on the Lipschitz constant of \( f \) and the constant \( c \) in Lemma 2.1. It follows from (3.2) and (3.3) that

\[
w_\lambda(x) \leq \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} \left( E\left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, u, \beta(s)) ds \right] + C|x - y| \right) = w_\lambda(y) + C|x - y|,
\]

\[
w_\lambda(x) \geq \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} \left( E\left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, u, \beta(s)) ds \right] - C|x - y| \right) = w_\lambda(y) - C|x - y|.
\]

Then we get

\[
|\lambda w_\lambda(x) - \lambda w_\lambda(y)| \leq C|x - y|.
\]

For any \( \lambda > 0 \), we now define

\[
\rho_\lambda = \lambda w_\lambda(0), \quad \varphi_\lambda(x) = w_\lambda(x) - w_\lambda(0), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

It follows from (2.1) and (3.2) that, for every fixed \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \{\lambda w_\lambda(x)\}_{\lambda > 0} \) is bounded, uniformly with respect to \( \lambda > 0 \). In particular, \( \{\rho_\lambda\}_{\lambda > 0} \) is also bounded, which means that there exists a subsequence \( \{\rho_{\lambda_k}\}_{k \geq 1} \) with \( \lambda_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \) such that \( \{\rho_{\lambda_k}\} \) converges and we denote

\[
\rho = \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_k w_{\lambda_k}(0).
\]
On the other hand, from (3.6) we get for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \)
\[
|\varphi_\lambda(x) - \varphi_\lambda(y)| \leq C|x - y|, \sup_\lambda |\varphi_\lambda(x)| \leq C|x|.
\]

Using diagonal arguments, we conclude that there exists a subsequence of \( \{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \) such that \( \varphi_{\lambda_k}(x) \) converges to a continuous function \( w(x) \). Indeed, let \( \mathcal{D} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\} \) be a dense subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

Since \( \varphi_\lambda(x_1) \) is bounded, there exists a subsequence \( \{\lambda_{1k}\} \) with \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_{1k} = 0 \) such that
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \varphi_{\lambda_{1k}}(x_1) = w(x_1).
\]

Similarly, we can choose a subsequence \( \{\lambda_{2k}\} \subseteq \{\lambda_{1k}\} \) with \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_{2k} = 0 \) such that
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \varphi_{\lambda_{2k}}(x_2) = w(x_2).
\]

Repeating this process, we obtain a series of subsequences \( \{\lambda_{1k}\} \supseteq \{\lambda_{2k}\} \supseteq \cdots \). Taking diagonal sequence \( \{\lambda_{kk}\} \), denoted by \( \{\lambda_k\} \), we get
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \varphi_{\lambda_k}(x) = w(x), \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{D}.
\]

Due to the uniformly Lipschitz property of \( \varphi_\lambda(x) \), we can extend the Lipschitz function \( w \) to all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

We now show that \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity solution of (2.3). For \((x, \eta, p, A) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times S(n)\), denote
\[
G_k(x, \eta, p, A) = \rho \lambda_k + \lambda_k \eta - \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, p, A, u, v),
\]
\[
G(x, \eta, p, A) = \rho - \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, p, A, u, v).
\]

Then equation (3.3) can be rewritten as
\[
G_k(x, \varphi_{\lambda_k}(x), D\varphi_{\lambda_k}(x), D^2\varphi_{\lambda_k}(x)) = 0.
\]

From the fact that \( G_k \to G \), as \( k \to \infty \) and the stability property of viscosity solution (see Remark 6.3 in [17]), we know that \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity solution of (2.3) and the property (3.1) follows directly from (3.6). \(\square\)

We now turn our attention to the long time behaviour of the solution of the following second order HJBI equation
\[
\begin{cases}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) = \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, DV(t, x), D^2V(t, x), u, v), & (t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\
V(0, x) = \Phi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \Phi \) is a Lipschitz function on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). We now consider the existence and the uniqueness of the viscosity solution of equation (3.7). For every fixed \( T > 0 \), from [11] we know the following PDE
\[
\begin{cases}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{V}(t, x) + \inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, D\bar{V}(t, x), D^2\bar{V}(t, x), u, v) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\
\bar{V}(T, x) = \Phi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\end{cases}
\]

has a unique viscosity solution which can be represented as
\[
\bar{V}(t, x) = \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} E\left[ \int_t^T f(X^x_s, u_s, \beta(u), u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds + \Phi(X^x_T, \beta(u)) \right].
\]
Notice that (3.7) is obtained from (3.8) by “reversing time”, i.e., \( V(t, x) = \overline{V}(T-t, x), \ (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \). Then \( V \) is the unique viscosity solution of (3.7) and

\[
V(t, x) = \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} E[\int_{T-t}^{T} f(X^x_s, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds + \Phi(X^x_T, \beta(u))].
\]

(3.10)

In particular,

\[
V(T, x) = \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} E[\int_{0}^{T} f(X^x_s, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds + \Phi(X^x_T, \beta(u))].
\]

(3.11)

**Theorem 3.2.** Suppose \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI equation (2.3) and denote

\[
W(T, x) = V(T, x) - (\rho T + w(x)), \ (T, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Then there exists a positive constant \( C \) (independent of \( T \)) such that

\[
-C(1 + |x|) \leq W(T, x) \leq C(1 + |x|).
\]

(3.12)

In particular, it holds that \( \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{V(T, x)}{T} = \rho \).

**Proof.** Notice that for any \( T > 0 \), \( w(x) \), as the viscosity solution of equation (2.3), is also a viscosity solution of the following PDE

\[
\begin{cases}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, x) + \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{ H(x, D \varphi(t, x), D^2 \varphi(t, x), u, v) - \rho \} = 0, \ (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\
\varphi(T, x) = w(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\end{cases}
\]

(3.12)

Since \( w(x) \) is of at most linear growth, it follows from the uniqueness of the viscosity solution of (3.12) (see, Theorem 5.3 in [11]) that \( w(x) \) is the unique viscosity solution of (3.12). Moreover, it has the following representation

\[
w(x) = \varphi(t, x) = \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} E[\int_{0}^{T} f(X^x_s, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds + w(X^x_T, \beta(u))].
\]

(3.13)

Similar to (3.5), from (3.11) and (3.13) we have

\[
|W(T, x)| \leq \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |E[\Phi(X^x_T, \beta(u)) - w(X^x_T, \beta(u))]| \leq C(1 + |x|).
\]

(3.14)

**Remark 3.1.** When the diffusion coefficient is non-degenerate, Alvarez, Barri [2] obtained a similar convergence result (Proposition 5, [2]) for a singular perturbation problem by using PDE techniques. In our case, we do not need the non-degeneracy assumption. We study the long time behaviour of the viscosity solution of equation (3.7) with the help of the related SDGs.

A similar result to Theorem 3.2 is also obtained in [16] (see Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 therein). They studied a type of fully nonlinear HJB equations and obtained the long time behaviour of its solutions based on the related stochastic control problem and backward stochastic differential equation theory, which allowed them to avoid the non-degenerate assumption on the diffusion \( \sigma \). Compared with their work, our ergodic HJBI equation is different and totally new. Moreover, we do not need the existence of an invariant measure, which played an important role in their approach.
The existence of the value of our SDGs

In this section, without non-degenerate assumption on the diffusion system we will first prove the upper ergodic value function $\rho^+(x)$ (resp., lower ergodic value function $\rho^-(x)$) to be the scalar quantity $\rho$ which is independent of $x$, where $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI equation (2.3) (resp., (2.4)). Then we derive the uniqueness of the viscosity solution of ergodic HJBI equations (2.3) and (2.4), and we prove that the value of our SDGs exists under the Isaacs condition with the help of the uniqueness results.

For this, we need to construct an approximation of possibly degenerate controlled process $X^{r,x,u,v}$ by nondegenerate ones. For $r > 0$, we define the $n \times (d + n)$-matrix $\sigma^r$ as follows:

$$\sigma^r(x, u, v) = \left( \sigma(x, u, v), rI \right),$$

where $I$ is a $n \times n$-dimensional identity matrix. Then we construct a linear SDE associated with the diffusion coefficient $\sigma^r$ and Brownian motion $W$ as follows

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
    \mathrm{d}X^{r,x,u,v}_s = \left[ p^{x,u,v}_s \cdot X^{r,x,u,v}_s + b(0, u_s, v_s) \right] \mathrm{d}s + \sigma^r(X^{r,x,u,v}_s, u_s, v_s) \mathrm{d}W_s, \ s \in [0, \infty), \\
    X^{r,x,u,v}_0 = x,
\end{array} \right. \ (4.1)$$

where $X^{x,u,v}$ is the solution of SDE (1.1) and the process $p^{r,u,v}$ has the following form

$$p^{r,u,v}_s = \begin{cases}
        \frac{b(X^{r,x,u,v}_s, u_s, v_s) - b(0, u_s, v_s)}{|X^{r,x,u,v}_s|^2} X^{r,x,u,v}_s, & \text{if } X^{r,x,u,v}_s \neq 0, \\
        -K/2, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

Here $K$ is the constant given in the assumption (H3). Then it follows that the controlled process $X^{r,x,u,v}$ is nondegenerate due to

$$\langle \sigma^r(\sigma^r)^* (x, u, v) \xi, \xi \rangle \geq r^2 |\xi|^2, \text{ for any } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Under the assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3), SDE (4.1) has a unique solution $X^{r,x,u,v}$ for each $r \in (0, 1]$ and admissible controls $(u, v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, the first estimate in (2.1) still hold for the solution of SDE (4.1). At the same time, it follows from the uniqueness of the solution of SDE that $X^{r,x,u,v}|_{r=0} = X^{x,u,v}, (x, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$.

The following lemma shows the convergence of the solution $X^{r,x,u,v}$ when $r$ tends to 0.

**Lemma 4.1.** Suppose that the assumptions (H1)-(H3) are satisfied. Let $X^{x,u,v}$ and $X^{r,x,u,v}$ be the unique solution of SDE (1.1) and (4.1), respectively. Then there exists a constant $C$ such that for all $t > 0$ and $(x, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V},$

$$E[|X^{r,x,u,v}_t - X^{x,u,v}_t|^2] \leq Cnr^2.$$

**Proof.** From standard estimates of SDE, we get

$$d \left( E[|X^{r,x,u,v}_t - X^{x,u,v}_t|^2] - \frac{nr^2}{K} \right) \leq -K \left( E[|X^{r,x,u,v}_t - X^{x,u,v}_t|^2] - \frac{nr^2}{K} \right) dt.$$

Now using Gronwall’s inequality, we obtain

$$E[|X^{r,x,u,v}_t - X^{x,u,v}_t|^2] \leq - \frac{nr^2}{K} \exp\{-Kt\} + \frac{nr^2}{K} \leq \frac{nr^2}{K}, \ t \geq 0.$$
We give the upper bound for the density function of the solution \( X^{r,x,u,v} \) of SDE (4.1).

**Proposition 4.1.** Suppose that the assumptions (H1)-(H3) hold and let \( X^{r,x,u,v} \) be the solution of SDE (4.1). Then for any Borel set \( D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \), there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) (only depends on the Lipschitz constant \( C_b \) of the coefficient \( b \), the constant \( K \) in Assumption (H3) and \( n \)), such that for all \((u,v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}\) it holds

\[
P\{X_{s}^{r,x,u,v} \in D\} \leq Cr^{-n}[1 - e^{-Cs}]^{-\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Leb}(D).
\]

**Remark 4.1.** For any Borel set \( D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \), we denote by \( h \) the density function of the process \( X^{r,x,u,v} \), i.e.,

\[
h(0,x; s,D) = P\{X_s^{r,x,u,v} \in D\}.
\]

Then, Proposition 4.1 says that

\[
h(0,x; s,y) \leq Cr^{-n}[1 - e^{-Cs}]^{-\frac{n}{2}}.
\]

We remark that this upper bound is weaker than the classical Gaussian’s type bound (see, e.g. (4.2)), which states that

\[
h(0,x; s,y) \leq Ms^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\{-\frac{N|x - y|^2}{s}\}.
\]

(4.2)

When the coefficients \( b \) and \( \sigma \) are deterministic, it is well-known that the density function of the nondegenerate process \( X^{r,x,u,v} \) can be characterized as the solution of the related Fokker-Planck equation. In this situation, there have been plenty of works on the two-sides or one-sides bounds of the fundamental solution of the associated parabolic equation under different conditions. However, this PDE approach can not apply to our framework due to the presence of admissible controls \((u,v)\). Indeed, for any given \((u,v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}\), one may define

\[
b^{u,v}(t,x) = b(x,u_t,v_t), \quad \sigma^{r,u,v}(t,x) = \sigma^{r}(x,u_t,v_t),
\]

which are obviously not deterministic and then the solution \( X^{r,x,u,v} \) is not Markovian. Moreover, we consider an infinite time horizon problem whereas the upper bound (4.2) is obtained for some finite time horizon \([0,T]\). To this end, we apply a probabilistic method to provide a weaker Gaussian’s type upper bound for our density function. Our approach allows us to consider the upper bound of the fundamental solution of the related parabolic equation with infinite time horizon and stochastic coefficients \( b \) and \( \sigma \).

We give the proof of Proposition 4.1.

**Proof.** Applying Itô’s formula to \( e^{-\int_0^s b^{r,u,v} \cdot dt} \cdot X_{s}^{r,x,u,v} \) (for simplicity, we omit the indication of \( \{x,u,v\} \) in the following proof), it is easy to check that the solution \( X^{r} \) has the following form

\[
X_{s}^{r} = Y_{s} + rZ_{s} \int_0^s (Z_t)^{-1} dB_t^1,
\]

(4.3)

where

\[
Y_{s} = x \cdot e^{\int_0^s p^1 \cdot dt} + \int_0^s e^{\int_t^s p^1 \cdot dt} \cdot b(0,u_t,v_t)dt + \int_0^s e^{\int_t^s p^1 \cdot dt} \cdot \sigma(X_t,u_t,v_t)dB_t,
\]

\[
Z_{s} = e^{\int_0^s p^2 \cdot dt}.
\]
Since the process $p$ is $\mathcal{F}_s^B$-adapted, we get that $Y_s \in \mathcal{F}_s^B$, $Z_s \in \mathcal{F}_s^B$. Then, for any Borel set $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$P\{X_s^p \in D\} = E[E[I_{\{X_t^p \in D\}}|\mathcal{F}_s^B]] = E[E[I_{\{y+z_1 f_0^s(z)^{-1}dB_t^1 \in D\}}|\mathcal{F}_s^B]] = E[I_{\{y+z_1 f_0^s(z)^{-1}dB_t^1 \in D\}}].$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

From the assumptions (H2) and (H3), we get, for all $w \in \Omega$, $s \geq 0$,

$$-(C_b + \frac{K}{2}) \leq p_s \leq -\frac{K}{2}, \quad e^{-(C_b + \frac{K}{2})s} \leq Z_s \leq e^{-\frac{K}{2}s}.$$

Denote $M_s = r \int_{0}^{s}(z)^{-1}dB_t^1$, $s \geq 0$. Then $\{M_s\}_{s \geq 0}$ is a continuous local martingale with

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} \langle M \rangle_s = \lim_{s \to \infty} r^2 \int_{0}^{s} (z)^{-2}dt \geq \lim_{s \to \infty} r^2 \int_{0}^{s} e^{Kt}dt = \lim_{s \to \infty} \frac{r^2}{K}[e^{Ks} - 1] = \infty, \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Then the time-changed process defined as follows

$$\overline{B}_s = M_{\tau(s)}, \quad \text{with } \tau(s) = \inf\{t \geq 0|\langle M \rangle_t > s\},$$

is a standard $\mathcal{F}^B_{\tau(s)}$ Brownian motion with $M_s = \overline{B}_{\langle M \rangle_s}$ (see, e.g. Theorem 4.6 in [25]). Therefore,

$$E[I_{\{y+z_1 f_0^s(z)^{-1}dB_t^1 \in D\}}] = E[I_{\{y+z_1 \overline{B}_{\langle M \rangle_s} \in D\}}]$$

$$= \int_D \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi z_1^2 r^2 f_0^s(z)^{-2}dt^n}} \cdot \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{z_1^2 r^2 f_0^s(z)^{-2}dt} |z - y|^2\}dz$$

$$\leq (2\pi r^2)^{-\frac{\pi}{2}} [z_1^2 \int_0^s (z)^{-2}dt]^{-\frac{1}{2}} Leb(D).$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.5)

Since

$$Z_s^2 \int_0^s (Z_t)^{-2}dt = \int_0^s e^{f_{t}^{s}2\rho_0dt}dt \geq \int_0^s e^{-2(C_b + \frac{K}{2})(s-t)}dt = \frac{1}{2(C_b + \frac{K}{2})}(1 - e^{-2(C_b + \frac{K}{2})s}),$$

from (4.4) and (4.5), we get

$$P\{X_s^p \in D\} \leq \left(\frac{\pi}{C_b + \frac{K}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} r^{-1} \left[1 - e^{-2(C_b + \frac{K}{2})s}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} Leb(D).$$

We give the estimate for $\rho^+$ and $\rho^-$ in terms of viscosity solutions of ergodic HJBI equations (2.3) and (2.4), respectively.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Suppose that $w$ is Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then we have

(i) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity subsolution of equation (2.3) then

$$\rho \leq \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} \lim_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, u, \beta(u)).$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.6)

(ii) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity supersolution of equation (2.3) then

$$\rho \geq \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} \lim_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, u, \beta(u)).$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.7)
(iii) If \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity subsolution of equation \((2.4)\) then
\[
\rho \leq \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \liminf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v).
\] (4.8)

(iv) If \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity supersolution of equation \((2.4)\) then
\[
\rho \geq \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v).
\] (4.9)

Proof. Step 1. We first prove that this theorem holds for \(w \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^n)\). We only give the proof of
(iii) and (iv), (i) and (ii) can be proved similarly.

Proof of (iii). Notice that \(w \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^n)\), \((\rho, w)\) is the subsolution of ergodic HJBI equation \((2.4)\)
in the classical sense, namely,
\[
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \Lambda(x, v), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\] (4.10)
where \(\Lambda(x, v) = \inf_{w \in \mathcal{U}} H(x, Dw(x), D^2w(x), u, v)\). Since \(\Lambda\) is Lipschitz in \(x\) and continuous in \(v\)
on compact space \(\mathcal{V}\), we have that \(\Lambda\) is uniformly continuous on \(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{V}\). Let \(\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\) be a dense set in \(\mathcal{V}\), \(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\) be a dense set in \(\mathbb{R}^n\). From \([1,10]\), for any \(\varepsilon > 0\) and for each \(x_{i_0} \in \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\), there exists \(v_{i_0} \in \{v_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\) such that
\[
\rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \leq \Lambda(x_{i_0}, v_{i_0}).
\]
By the uniform continuity of \(\Lambda\) with respect to \(x\), there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that for any \(x \in B_\delta(x_{i_0})\)
we have
\[
\rho - \frac{2}{3} \varepsilon \leq \Lambda(x_{i_0}, v_{i_0}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \leq \Lambda(x, v_{i_0}).
\]
Now by the uniform continuity of \(\Lambda\) with respect to \(v\), there exists \(\delta^* > 0\) such that for any \(v \in B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_0})\) and \(x \in B_\delta(x_{i_0})\) we have
\[
\rho - \varepsilon \leq \Lambda(x, v_{i_0}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \leq \Lambda(x, v).
\]
It follows from the compactness of \(\mathcal{V}\) that there exists a finite number of \(B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k}), k = 1, 2, \cdots, M\), such that \(\bigcup_{k=1}^{M} B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k}) = \mathcal{V}\). For \(k = 1, 2, \cdots, M\), we define
\[
U_{i_k} := \{x|\Lambda(x, v) \geq \rho - \varepsilon, \text{ for all } v \in B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k})\} \supseteq B_\delta(x_{i_k}).
\]
Denote
\[
U^{*}_{i_1} = U_{i_1}, \ U^{*}_{i_k} = U_{i_k} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} U_{i_j}, \ k = 2, \cdots, M.
\]
We claim that \(\{U^{*}_{i_k}\}_{k=1}^{M}\) is a Borel partition of \(\mathbb{R}^n\), that is, \(U^{*}_{i_k} \cap U^{*}_{i_j} = \emptyset\), when \(k \neq j\), and \(\bigcup_{k=1}^{M} U^{*}_{i_k} = \mathbb{R}^n\). If not, there exists \(x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{M} U^{*}_{i_k}\). Then from \([4.10]\) there exists \(v^* \in \mathcal{V}\) such that \(\Lambda(x^*, v^*) \geq \rho - \varepsilon\). Since \(x^* \notin \bigcup_{k=1}^{M} U^{*}_{i_k} = U^{*}_{i_k}\), from the definition of \(U_{i_k}\) we have \(v^* \notin \bigcup_{k=1}^{M} B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k})\). As a result, we proved that \(v^* \in \mathcal{V}\) and \(v^* \notin \bigcup_{k=1}^{M} B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k})\) and this is a contradiction since \(\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{M} B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k})\).

Thus for \(k = 1, 2, \cdots, M\),
\[
\rho - \varepsilon \leq \Lambda(x, v), \text{ for all } x \in U^{*}_{i_k} \text{ and } v \in B_{\delta^*}(v_{i_k}).
\] (4.11)
Define a mapping $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to V$ by

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} v_{ik} \cdot I_{\{x \in U_{ik}^\ast\}}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (4.12)$$

Then $\psi$ is a $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)\mathcal{B}(V)$ measurable mapping and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, u \in U$,

$$\rho - \varepsilon \leq \Lambda(x, \psi(x)) \leq H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), u, \psi(x)). \quad (4.13)$$

Let $m$ be a positive integer and set $\delta = \frac{1}{m}$,

$$v^m(s) = \psi(x), \ s \in [0, \delta).$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{U}$ be arbitrary and fixed. Then SDE (1.1) exists a unique solution $X_{x,u,v}^m$ on $[0, \delta)$ with $v = v^m$. Once having $X^m_\delta$, we then define

$$v^m(s) = \psi(X^m_{x,u,v} \mid [\delta, 2\delta]), \text{ if } s \in [i\delta, (i+1)\delta),$$

for Player 2. Applying Itô formula to $w(X_{x,u,v}^m)$, we get

$$E[w(X_{x,u,v}^{m_{(i+1)\delta}}) - w(X_{x,u,v}^{m_i})]$$

$$= E \int_{i\delta}^{(i+1)\delta} b(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) \cdot Dw(X_{x,u,v}^m)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} tr((\sigma\sigma^*)(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) \cdot D^2 w(X_{x,u,v}^m)) ds$$

$$= E \int_{i\delta}^{(i+1)\delta} b(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) \cdot Dw(X_{x,u,v}^m)$$

$$- b(X_{x,u,v}^{m_{(i+1)\delta}}, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) \cdot Dw(X_{x,u,v}^m)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} tr((\sigma\sigma^*)(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) \cdot D^2 w(X_{x,u,v}^m))$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} tr((\sigma\sigma^*)(X_{x,u,v}^{m_{(i+1)\delta}}, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) \cdot D^2 w(X_{x,u,v}^m))$$

$$+ f(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) - f(X_{x,u,v}^{m_{(i+1)\delta}}, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) ds$$

$$+ E \int_{i\delta}^{(i+1)\delta} H(X_{x,u,v}^m, Dw(X_{x,u,v}^m), D^2 w(X_{x,u,v}^m), u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) ds$$

$$- E \int_{i\delta}^{(i+1)\delta} f(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) ds.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.14)

Combined with (4.13) and (2.1), it follows (4.14) that

$$E[w(X_{x,u,v}^{m_{(i+1)\delta}}) - w(X_{x,u,v}^{m_i})] \geq - C\delta(E[\sup_{i\delta \leq s \leq (i+1)\delta} |X_{x,u,v}^m - X_{x,u,v}^{m_i}|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\rho - \varepsilon)\delta - E \int_{i\delta}^{(i+1)\delta} f(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) ds$$

$$\geq - C\delta(\delta + \delta^2) + (\rho - \varepsilon)\delta - E \int_{i\delta}^{(i+1)\delta} f(X_{x,u,v}^m, u_s, \psi(X_{x,u,v}^m)) ds.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.15)
Taking $\sum_{i=0}^{T-1}$ on both side of (4.15), we obtain
\[
E[w(X^x_{T}, u^m_{T}) - w(x)] \geq -CT(\delta + \delta^\frac{1}{2}) + (\rho - \varepsilon)T - E \int_0^T f(X^x_s, u^m_s, v^m_s) ds.
\] (4.16)

Letting $T \to \infty$, we have
\[
\rho - \varepsilon \leq C(\delta + \delta^\frac{1}{2}) + \lim \inf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, u, v^m).
\] (4.17)

For each $\alpha \in A$, we start to construct a strategy $\beta^m \in B$ and a pair of controls $(\tilde{u}^m, \tilde{v}^m) \in U \times V$ by induction on the interval $[i\delta, (i+1)\delta)$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. For $s \in [0, \delta)$, we define
\[
\beta^m(u)_s = \psi(x), \quad \text{for } u \in U,
\]
\[
\tilde{v}^m_s = \psi(x), \quad \tilde{u}^m_s = \alpha(\tilde{v}^m_s).
\]

Then we can obtain $X^x, \tilde{u}^m, \tilde{v}^m|_{[0, \delta)}$, the solution of SDE (4.11) associated with $\tilde{u}^m, \tilde{v}^m$ on time interval $[0, \delta)$. Once having $\beta^m, \tilde{u}^m, \tilde{v}^m$ and $X^x, \tilde{u}^m, \tilde{v}^m$ on $[i\delta, (i+1)\delta)$, we define, for $u \in U$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$,
\[
\beta^m(u)_s = \psi(X^x_{i\delta}, \tilde{u}^m_s), \quad \tilde{u}^m_s = \alpha(\tilde{v}^m_s) = \alpha(\psi(X^x_{i\delta}, \tilde{v}^m|_{[0, \delta)})), \quad s \in [i\delta, (i+1)\delta).
\]

It is easy to check that $\beta^m \in B$, $(\tilde{u}^m, \tilde{v}^m) \in U \times V$ and the following relation holds
\[
\alpha(\tilde{v}^m) = \tilde{u}^m, \quad \beta^m(\tilde{u}^m) = \tilde{v}^m, \quad dsdP \text{-a.e., on } [0, \infty).
\] (4.18)

Then, from (4.17), we can conclude that for each $\alpha \in A$
\[
C(\delta + \delta^\frac{1}{2}) + \sup_{v \in V} \lim \inf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v) \geq C(\delta + \delta^\frac{1}{2}) + \lim \inf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(\tilde{v}^m), \tilde{v}^m) \geq \rho - \varepsilon,
\]
which implies that
\[
C(\delta + \delta^\frac{1}{2}) + \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \lim \inf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v) \geq \rho - \varepsilon.
\] (4.19)

Letting $m \to \infty$ (i.e., $\delta \to 0$) and $\varepsilon \to 0$, we finally get
\[
\inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \lim \inf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v) \geq \rho.
\] (4.20)

Proof of (iv). Similar to (4.10), we have
\[
\rho \geq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), u, v) \geq \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), u, v), \quad (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times V.
\] (4.21)

Notice that $H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), u, v)$ is uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n \times U \times V$. Similar to (4.11), for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist a sequence $\{u_{i_k}\}_{k=1}^M \subseteq U$ and a partition $\{U^*_k\}_{k=1}^M$ of $\mathbb{R}^n \times V$ such that
\[
\rho + \varepsilon \geq H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), u, v), \quad \text{for all } (x, v) \in U^*_k \text{ and } u \in B_{\delta^*}(u_{i_k}).
\] (4.22)

Define a mapping $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times V \to U$ by
\[
\psi(x, v) = \sum_{k=1}^M u_{i_k} \cdot I_{\{(x, v) \in U^*_k\}}.
\] (4.23)
This is similar to (4.12), but here the mapping $\psi$ relies also on the control variable $v$. Then $\psi$ is a measurable mapping and for all $v \in V, x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$
\[
\rho + \varepsilon \geq H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), \psi(x, v), v). \tag{4.24}
\]

Let $m$ be a positive number large enough and put $\delta = \frac{1}{m}$. Similar to the construction of $\beta^m$ in Proof of (iii), we can construct $\alpha^m \in \mathcal{A}$ as follows. Define $\alpha^m(v)_s = \psi(x, v_s)$, $s \in [0, \delta]$, $v \in V$. Then we get the unique solution $X^{x, \alpha^m(v), v}$ of SDE (1.1) on $[0, \delta]$. Assuming that both the strategy $\alpha^m$ and the solution $X^{x, \alpha^m(v), v}$ is obtained on $[0, i\delta]$, we generalize its definition to the interval $[0, (i+1)\delta]$. For this, we define
\[
\alpha^m(v)_s = \psi(X^{x, \alpha^m(v), v}_s, v_s), \quad s \in [i\delta, (i+1)\delta], \quad v \in V.
\]

It is easy to check that $\alpha^m \in \mathcal{A}$. Similar to (4.17), we get for any $v \in V$
\[
\rho + \varepsilon \geq -C(\delta + \delta^2) + \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha^m(v), v). \tag{4.25}
\]

From the arbitrariness of $v \in V$, we have
\[
\rho + \varepsilon \geq -C(\delta + \delta^2) + \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in V} \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v). \tag{4.26}
\]

Letting $\delta \to 0$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$, we finally get
\[
\rho \geq \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in V} \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v). \tag{4.27}
\]

Step 2. We now consider the general case, i.e., $w$ is only Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We only give the proof of (iii), the arguments for (i), (ii) and (iv) are analogous.

Let $(\rho, w)$ be a viscosity subsolution of (2.4). For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, let $w^\varepsilon$ be the sup-convolution of $w$, that is,
\[
w^\varepsilon(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{w(y) - \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\varepsilon}\}. \tag{4.28}
\]

Since $w$ is Lipschitz, it is straightforward to check that $w^\varepsilon$ converges to $w$ uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $w^\varepsilon$ is of linear growth for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, Lipschitz continuous, semiconvex with semiconvex constant $\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}$ (i.e., $w^\varepsilon(x) + \frac{|x|^2}{2\varepsilon}$ is convex) (see [40] for more details, see also [28]). It follows from Lemma 6.1 in Appendix that $(\rho, w^\varepsilon)$ is a viscosity subsolution of the following PDE
\[
\rho = \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw^\varepsilon(x), D^2 w^\varepsilon(x), u, v) + k(\varepsilon), \tag{4.29}
\]

where $k(\varepsilon) \to 0$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Since $w^\varepsilon$ is semiconvex, from Theorem A.2 in [17] we have $w^\varepsilon$ is twice differentiable almost everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^n$, which indicates that $w^\varepsilon$ satisfies a.e. on $\mathbb{R}^n$
\[
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw^\varepsilon(x), D^2 w^\varepsilon(x), u, v) + k(\varepsilon). \tag{4.30}
\]

For any given $\delta > 0$, let $w^\delta_\varepsilon$ be the smooth approximation of $w^\varepsilon$, i.e.,
\[
w^\delta_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\delta^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^\varepsilon(y) \cdot \varphi\left(\frac{x - y}{\delta}\right) dy, \tag{4.31}
\]

where $\varphi$ is a standard mollifier on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with compact support and satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) dx = 1$. Then $w^\delta_\varepsilon \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $w^\delta_\varepsilon$ converge uniformly to $w^\varepsilon$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $Dw^\delta_\varepsilon$, $D^2 w^\delta_\varepsilon$ converge to $Dw^\varepsilon$, $D^2 w^\varepsilon$ for a.e.
\( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), respectively, as \( \delta \to 0 \). Moreover, \( w^\varepsilon \) have the same Lipschitz and semiconvexity constants as \( w^\varepsilon \) and have the following property (see, e.g. Lemma A.2 in [15])

\[
D^2 w^\varepsilon_0 \geq -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} I_{n \times n},
\]

where \( I_{n \times n} \) is the \( n \times n \)-identity matrix. Then, from (4.30) we obtain that \( w^\varepsilon_0 \) satisfy on \( \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw^\varepsilon_0(x), D^2 w^\varepsilon_0(x), u, v) + k(\varepsilon) + g_0(x),
\]

where \( (g_0)_+ \) are uniformly continuous in \( x \), uniformly bounded in \( \delta \), and \( g_0(x) \to 0 \) for a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \). In fact, from the semiconvexity of \( w^\varepsilon \) there exists a countable subset \( N \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( \text{Leb}(N) = 0 \) such that \( w^\varepsilon \) is twice differentiable on \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus N \). For all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus N \), there exists a constant \( C \) such that

\[
H(x, Dw^\varepsilon_0(x), D^2 w^\varepsilon_0(x), u, v) - H(x, Dw^\varepsilon(x), D^2 w^\varepsilon(x), u, v) \\
\leq C \cdot |D^2 w^\varepsilon_0(x) - D^2 w^\varepsilon(x)| + C(1 + |x|) \cdot |Dw^\varepsilon_0(x) - Dw^\varepsilon(x)|.
\]

For any \( x \in N \), there exists a sequence \( \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus N \) such that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = x \). Then, we define

\[
g_0(x) = \begin{cases} C \cdot |D^2 w^\varepsilon_0(x) - D^2 w^\varepsilon(x)| + C(1 + |x|) \cdot |Dw^\varepsilon_0(x) - Dw^\varepsilon(x)|, & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus N, \\ \lim_{n \to \infty} g_0(x_n), & \text{for } x \in N. \end{cases}
\]

Since \( Dw^\varepsilon_0, D^2 w^\varepsilon_0 \) converge uniformly to \( Dw^\varepsilon, D^2 w^\varepsilon \) on \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus N \), we get \( g_0 \) is bounded in \( \delta \), linear growth and uniformly continuous in \( x \) (with moduli of continuity possibly depending on \( \delta \)).

Without loss of generality, we assume that \( g_0 \) is Lipschitz continuous, otherwise we can construct a sequence of Lipschitz continuous functions to approximate \( g_0 \) (see Lemma 3.1 in [33]). For \( (x, p, A, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}^{n \times n} \times U \times V \), we denote

\[
H^{r,\varepsilon}(x, p, A, u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\sigma^\varepsilon \sigma^r)(x, u, v) \cdot A) + b(x, u, v) \cdot p + f^{r,\varepsilon}(x, u, v),
\]

where \( f^{r,\varepsilon}(x, u, v) = f(x, u, v) + k(\varepsilon) + g_0(x) + \frac{r^2 n}{2\varepsilon} + C\sqrt{n}r \). Then it follows from (4.33) and (4.32) that

\[
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H^{r,\varepsilon}(x, Dw^\varepsilon_0(x), D^2 w^\varepsilon_0(x), u, v).
\]

Noting that the results of Step 1 are also true if we consider SDE (4.1) instead of SDE (1.1). We remark that herein the admissible control \( \alpha^n \) and admissible strategy \( \alpha^n \) in Step 1 are all constructed by the solution \( X^{r, u, v} \) rather than \( X^{r, x, u, v} \) in order to guarantee they belong to \( \mathcal{U} \) and \( \mathcal{A} \), respectively. Then applying the results of Step 1 to \( w^\varepsilon_0 \) and the relation between \( X^{r, x, u, v} \) and \( X^{r, u, v} \) (see Lemma 4.1), from (4.35) we obtain

\[
\rho \leq \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} E \left[ \int_0^T f^{r,\varepsilon}(X^{r, x, x, \alpha(v), u, v}) ds \right]
\]

\[
= \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} E \left[ \int_0^T f(X^{r, x, \alpha(v), u, v}, \alpha(v), v) ds \right] + g_0(X^{r, x, \alpha(v), u, v}) ds \right] + k(\varepsilon) + \frac{r^2 n}{2\varepsilon} + C\sqrt{n},
\]

where \( X^{r, x, \alpha(v), u, v} \) is the solution of SDE (4.1) with \( (\alpha, v) \) and parameter \( r \).

We now pass to the limits. Let \( R > 0 \) be arbitrarily fixed and \( E_R \) be a subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( \text{Leb}(E_R) \leq \frac{1}{R} \), such that \( g_0 \to 0 \) uniformly on \( B_R(0) \setminus E_R \), where \( B_R(0) \) represents the
open ball of radius $R$ centred at 0. In fact, from (4.34) it is easy to check that there exists some modulus $h(\delta)$ such that $|g_\delta(x)| \leq h(\delta)(1 + |x|)$ on $B_R(0)\setminus E_R$ and $h(\delta) \to 0$, as $\delta \to 0$. From Markov inequality there exists a constant $C > 0$ (independent of controls $u$ and $v$) such that

$$
\frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^T I_{\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}| > R\}} \cdot |g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u})| \, ds \right] \\
\leq \frac{1}{T} \left( E\left[ \int_0^T I_{\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}| > R\}} \, ds \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( E\left[ \int_0^T |g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u})|^2 \, ds \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq \frac{C}{T} \left( \int_0^T P\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}| > R\} \, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_0^T 1 + E|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}|^2 \, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{C}{R}.
$$

(4.37)

From Proposition 4.1, we get

$$
\frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_1^T I_{\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u} \in E_R\}} \cdot |g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u})| \, ds \right] \leq \frac{C \sqrt{T}}{T} \left( \int_1^T P\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u} \in E_R\} \, ds \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}.
$$

(4.38)

Therefore, from (4.37), (4.38) and the fact that $\frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^1 |g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u})| \, ds \right] \leq \frac{C}{T}$, we get

$$
\frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^T |g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u})| \, ds \right] \leq \frac{C}{T^2} + \frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^T I_{\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}| \leq R\}} \cdot |g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u})| \, ds \right] \\
\leq \frac{C}{R} + \frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^T I_{\{|X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}| \leq R\}} \cdot h(\delta)(1 + |X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}|) \, ds \right] + \frac{C}{T} + \frac{C}{T^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{T^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}} \\
\leq \frac{C}{R} + Ch(\delta) + \frac{C}{T} + \frac{C}{T^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{T^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}} \leq \frac{C}{R} + Ch(\delta).
$$

(4.39)

Recall from Lemma 4.1, we have

$$
\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T E|X_s^{r,x,u,v} - X_s^{r,x,u,v}|^2 \, ds \leq C nr^2.
$$

(4.40)

Then, from (4.36), (4.39) and (4.40), we finally get

$$
\rho \leq \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \liminf_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^T f(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}, \alpha(v), u) \, ds \right] + C \sqrt{nr} + \frac{C}{R} + Ch(\delta) + \frac{C}{\sqrt{nr} R} + k(\varepsilon) + \frac{r^2 n}{2\varepsilon}.
$$

(4.41)

Let $R \to \infty$ first and $\delta, r, \varepsilon \to 0$ in a sequential order, we obtain

$$
\rho \leq \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \liminf_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} E\left[ \int_0^T f(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),u}, \alpha(v), u) \, ds \right] = \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \liminf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v).
$$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1, we obtain the following comparison principle and the uniqueness result for ergodic HJBI equation (2.24). One can also obtain similar result for ergodic HJBI equation (2.23).
Corollary 4.1. (i) Let \((\rho_1, w_1)\) and \((\rho_2, w_2)\) be a viscosity subsolution and supersolution of \((2.4)\), respectively. Then it holds that \(\rho_1 \leq \rho_2\).

(ii) Let \((\rho_1, w_1)\) and \((\rho_2, w_2)\) be two viscosity solutions of \((2.4)\). Assume that, for some positive constant \(R\) large enough (which will be refined in Remark 4.2),

\[
w_1 \equiv w_2, \text{ on } B_R(0).
\] (4.42)

Then \(\rho_1 = \rho_2, w_1 \equiv w_2\) on \(\mathbb{R}^n\).

**Proof.** We only give the proof of (ii) since the statement (i) can be obtained directly from Theorem 4.1. The uniqueness of \(\rho\) is obtained from (i) and then we need to prove \(w_1 = w_2\). For this, we consider the case \(w_1, w_2 \in C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^n)\) and the general case follows similarly as the Step 2 in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

We now only need to prove \(w_1(x) \leq w_2(x)\), on \(\mathbb{R}^n\), when \((\rho, w_1)\) (resp. \((\rho, w_2)\)) is a subsolution (resp. supersolution) of \((2.4)\), since it is easy to check that \(w_1(x) \geq w_2(x)\) by using a symmetric argument. For simplicity, we denote \(w(x) = w_1(x) - w_2(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^n\). To complete the proof, we are going to show

\[
w(x) \leq \varepsilon x^2, x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\] (4.43)

for any \(\varepsilon > 0\). Then we obtain the desired result by letting \(\varepsilon \to 0\).

Notice that \(w(x) \equiv 0\), when \(|x| \leq R\), we only need to show that (4.43) holds when \(|x| \geq R\). Since \(w(x) - \varepsilon x^2\) is bounded from above when \(|x| \geq R\), there exists \(x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n\) with \(|x_0| \geq R\) such that

\[
w(x_0) - \varepsilon x_0^2 = \max_{x \in (B_R(0))^c} (w(x) - \varepsilon x^2).
\] (4.44)

We claim that the point \(x_0\) satisfying \(|x_0| = R\). Otherwise, it follows from (4.44) that

\[
D(w(x) - \varepsilon x^2)|_{x=x_0} = 0,
\]

\[
|D^2(w(x) - \varepsilon x^2)|_{x=x_0} < 0.
\]

Therefore, we have

\[
\sup_{u \in U, \ v \in V} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr(\sigma^*(x, u, v)D^2(w(x) - \varepsilon x^2)) + b(x, u, v)D(w(x) - \varepsilon x^2) \right\}_{x=x_0} = 0.
\] (4.45)

On the other hand, since \((\rho, w_1)\) (resp. \((\rho, w_2)\)) is a subsolution (resp. supersolution) of \((2.4)\), we get

\[
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr(\sigma^*(x, u, v)D^2w_1(x)) + b(x, u, v)Dw_1(x) + f(x, u, v) \right\},
\]

and

\[
\rho \geq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr(\sigma^*(x, u, v)D^2w_2(x)) + b(x, u, v)Dw_2(x) + f(x, u, v) \right\},
\]

which means that, for all \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\),

\[
\sup_{u \in U, v \in V} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr(\sigma^*(x, u, v)D^2w(x)) + b(x, u, v)Dw(x) \right\} \geq 0.
\] (4.46)
Noting that \( D^2 x = 2x \) and \( D^2 x^2 = 2 \cdot I_{n \times n} \) (\( I_{n \times n} \) represents the \( n \times n \) identity matrix), it holds, for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( |x| \geq R \),
\[
\sup_{u \in U, v \in V} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma^*(x, u, v)D^2 x^2) + b(x, u, v)Dx^2 \right\}
= \sup_{u \in U, v \in V} \left\{ \text{tr}(\sigma^*(x, u, v)) + 2x(b(x, u, v) - b(0, u, v)) + 2xb(0, u, v) \right\}
\leq C_\sigma^2 - Kx^2 + K'x^2 + \frac{1}{K'} \sup_{u \in U, v \in V} |b(0, u, v)|^2 \tag{4.47}
\leq - (K - K')x^2 + C_\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{K'} \sup_{u \in U, v \in V} |b(0, u, v)|^2 < 0,
\]
where \( K' \) is a given constant belonging to \((0, K)\). Combining (4.46) and (4.47), we get
\[
\sup_{u \in U, v \in V} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma^*(x, u, v)D^2 (w(x) - \epsilon x^2)) + b(x, u, v)D(w(x) - \epsilon x^2) \right\} > 0, \text{ for all } |x| \geq R, \tag{4.48}
\]
which contradicts with (4.45). Therefore, \( x_0 \) satisfies \( |x_0| = R \).

Finally, from (4.44), we conclude that, for all \( |x| \geq R \),
\[
w(x) - \epsilon x^2 \leq w(x_0) - \epsilon R^2 = -\epsilon R^2 < 0,
\]
which implies that \( w(x) < \epsilon x^2 \). Letting \( \epsilon \downarrow 0 \), we get \( w_1(x) \leq w_2(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \). \( \square \)

**Remark 4.2.** It is easy to verify from (4.47) that the large enough constant \( R \) assumed in Corollary 4.1 can be refined to
\[
R^2 > \frac{1}{K - K'} \left( C_\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{K'} M \right),
\]
where \( M = \sup_{u \in U, v \in V} |b(0, u, v)|^2 \). We remark that the idea of the proof of Corollary 4.1 is inspired by the uniqueness proof given in [7], where they considered the uniqueness of the associated viscosity solution directly. Different with their work, we consider a type of ergodic HJBI equations and apply a family of functions with adequate regularities to approximate our viscosity solution. As a result, our uniqueness proof looks being more simplified than those used in [6] with the help of some new techniques.

It is worth to point out that some additional condition such as (4.42) is needed to obtain the uniqueness result for ergodic HJBI equation (2.4). In fact, for all constants \( C \), it is obvious that \((\rho, w + C)\) are the classical solutions of ergodic HJBI (2.4) if \((\rho, w)\) is a classical solution. However, the condition (4.42) may not the weakest condition to guarantee the uniqueness result for such type ergodic HJBI equation. As a result, the study of the weakest condition is an interesting problem and we will leave it for the future research.

**Theorem 4.2.** Suppose that the conditions (H1)-(H3) are satisfied. Then our SDGs with ergodic payoff has a value under the classical Isaacs condition
\[
\inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} H(x, p, A, u, v) = \inf_{v \in V} \sup_{u \in U} H(x, p, A, u, v), \ (x, p, A) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}(n),
\]
where \( \mathcal{S}(n) \) denotes the set of \( n \times n \) symmetric matrices.
Proof. From Theorem 3.1, we know that ergodic HJBI equation (2.3) (resp. (2.4)) has a viscosity solution \((\rho_1, w_1)\) (resp. \((\rho_2, w_2)\)). Then we get from Theorem 4.1 that
\[
\rho_1 \geq \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} \liminf_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, u, \beta(u)) \geq \rho_1,
\]
\[
\rho_2 \geq \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \limsup_{T \to \infty} J(T, x, \alpha(v), v) = \rho_2,
\]
which concludes that \(\rho_1 = \rho^+(x)\), \(\rho_2 = \rho^-(x)\), for \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\). Under the Isaacs condition, ergodic HJBI equations (2.3) and (2.4) coincide. Then from Corollary 4.1-(i), we get \(\rho_1 = \rho_2\), which implies the existence of the value for our stochastic differential game with ergodic payoff.

We give the characterization of the ergodic value \(\rho\) in terms of the finite horizon SDGs. Let 
\[
w^+(T, x) = \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} E[\int_0^T f(X^x_{s,u,v}, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds],
\]
\[
w^-(T, x) = \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} E[\int_0^T f(X^x_{s,u,v}, \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds].
\]

Corollary 4.2. (1) Let \((\rho^+, w)\) be a viscosity solution of equation (2.3). Then
\[
\rho^+ = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{w^+(T, x)}{T}.
\]
(2) Let \((\rho^-, w)\) be a viscosity solution of equation (2.4). Then
\[
\rho^- = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{w^-(T, x)}{T}.
\]

Proof. Note that we can interchange the orders of taking limits as \(T \to \infty\) and taking infimum and supremum over controls in the proof of Theorem 4.1. To see this, we take the proof of (iii) in Theorem 4.1 as an example. We take infimum over all controls \(v \in V\) and supremum over all strategies \(\alpha \in A\) on both sides of (4.16) first, then take the limits as \(T \to \infty\). Thus, we obtain
\[
\rho^- \leq \liminf_{T \to \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} \frac{1}{T} E[\int_0^T f(X^x_{s,u,v}, \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds] = \liminf_{T \to \infty} \frac{w^-(T, x)}{T}.
\]
Similar to the above process (changing the orders), it follows from the proof of (iv) in Theorem 4.1 that
\[
\rho^- \geq \limsup_{T \to \infty} \sup_{\alpha \in A} \inf_{v \in V} \frac{1}{T} E[\int_0^T f(X^x_{s,u,v}, \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds] = \limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{w^-(T, x)}{T}.
\]
Therefore, we get \(\rho^- = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{w^-(T, x)}{T}\). Statement (1) can be analogously proved.

Remark 4.3. Under the Isaacs condition, from Corollaries 4.1 and 4.2 we get that the ergodic value \(\rho\) has the following characterization
\[
\rho = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{V(T, x)}{T},
\]
where \(V(T, x)\) is the value of the corresponding finite horizon SDGs. This characterization has been obtained in Theorem 3.2 by using a different approach.
The following theorem is similar to Theorem 4.1 but in the framework of discounted cases. Its proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.1. For reader’s convenience, we give a sketch proof of (iii), the proofs of (i), (ii) and (iv) are analogous.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let $(H1)$-(H3) be satisfied. Suppose that $w$ is Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then we have

(i) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity subsolution of equation (2.3) then

$$\rho \leq \lim \inf_{\lambda \to 0} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,u,\beta(u)}, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds \right].$$

(ii) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity supersolution of equation (2.3) then

$$\rho \geq \lim \sup_{\lambda \to 0} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,u,\beta(u)}, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds \right].$$

(iii) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity subsolution of equation (2.4) then

$$\rho \leq \lim \inf_{\lambda \to 0} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,\alpha(v),v}, \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds \right].$$

(iv) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity supersolution of equation (2.4) then

$$\rho \geq \lim \sup_{\lambda \to 0} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,\alpha(v),v}, \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds \right].$$

**Proof.** Step 1. We show that (4.52) holds for $w \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We notice that (4.13) and $v^m \in \mathcal{V}$ constructed in the proof of Theorem 4.1 still hold in this case. For arbitrary but fixed $u \in \mathcal{U}$, applying Itô formula to $e^{-\lambda s} w(X_s^{x,u,v^m})$, similar to (4.15), we have

$$E[e^{-\lambda \delta} w(X_s^{x,u,v^m}_s) - e^{-\lambda \delta} w(X_{s_0}^{x,u,v^m})] = E \int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-\lambda s} \left( -\lambda w(X_s^{x,u,v^m}) + b(X_s^{x,u,v^m}, u_s, v^m_s) \cdot Dw(X_s^{x,u,v^m}) \right) ds$$

$$\geq -\lambda E \left[ \sup_{i \leq s \leq i+1} |X_s^{x,u,v^m} - X_{s_0}^{x,u,v^m}|^2 \right] \int_{i \delta}^{(i+1)\delta} e^{-\lambda s} ds - E \left[ \int_{i \delta}^{(i+1)\delta} e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,u,v^m}, u_s, v^m_s) ds \right]$$

Taking $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1}$ and multiplying $\lambda$ on both sides, we get

$$\lambda E[e^{-\lambda T} w(X_T^{x,u,v^m})] - \lambda w(x) \geq \left( -\lambda C + \rho - \varepsilon - C(\delta + \delta^2) \right) (1 - e^{-\lambda T}) - \lambda E \left[ \int_0^T e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,u,v^m}, u_s, v^m_s) ds \right].$$

Letting $T \to \infty$, it follows that

$$\rho - \varepsilon + \lambda w(x) \leq \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^{x,u,v^m}, u_s, v^m_s) ds \right] + C + C(\delta + \delta^2).$$
For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, similar to (4.18), we can find $\beta^m \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(u^m, v^m) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ such that $\alpha(v^m) = u^m$, $\beta^m(u^m) = v^m$. Therefore,

$$\rho - \varepsilon + \lambda w(x) \leq \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, \alpha(v), \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds \right] + \lambda C + C(\delta + \delta^2).$$

Let $\lambda, \delta, \varepsilon$ tend to 0, we get

$$\rho \leq \liminf_{\lambda \to 0} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, \alpha(v), \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds \right].$$

Step 2. The general case.

We can construct an approximation sequence $w^m \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of $w$ in a same manner as defined in (4.28) and (4.31). Then combining Step 1 and (4.35), similar to (4.36) we obtain

$$\rho \leq \liminf_{\lambda \to 0} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, \alpha(v), \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds \right].$$

From Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} |X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),v} - X_s^{x,\alpha(v),v}| ds \right] \leq C \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} \sqrt{n} ds = C \sqrt{n}. \quad (4.54)$$

Similar to (4.39), we obtain, for all $R > 0$,

$$\lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} g_\delta(X_s^{r,x,\alpha(v),v}) ds \right] \leq \frac{C}{R} + Ch(\delta) + C(1 - e^{-\lambda}) + \frac{C}{r^2 \sqrt{R}}. \quad (4.55)$$

From (4.54), (4.55) and (4.56), we conclude that

$$\rho \leq \liminf_{\lambda \to 0} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda E \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(X_s^x, \alpha(v), \alpha(v)_s, v_s) ds \right] + C \sqrt{n} + \frac{C}{R} + Ch(\delta) + \frac{C}{r^2 \sqrt{R}} + k(\varepsilon) + \frac{r^2 n}{2\varepsilon}. \quad (4.57)$$

Letting $R \to \infty$ first and $r, \delta, \varepsilon \to 0$ in a sequential order, we obtain the desired result. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.4.** Let $(\rho, w)$ be a viscosity solution of equation (2.3), from Theorem 4.1, Corollary 4.1, and Theorem 4.3 we get the following property

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \lambda E \left[ f(X_s^{x,u,\beta(u)}, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds \right] = \rho$$

$$= \sup_{\lambda \to 0^+} \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \lambda E \left[ f(X_s^{x,u,\beta(u)}, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds \right].$$

This property can be seen as the generalization of the classical Abelian-Tauberian theorem (see, [2, 38]), stating that

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi(t) dt = \lim_{\lambda \to 0^+} \lambda \int_0^\infty \varphi(t) e^{-\lambda t} dt,$$

if either one of the two limits exists, to the stochastic differential game cases.
Finally, we present a dynamic programming principle for the viscosity solution of (2.3) and (2.4).

**Theorem 4.4.** Suppose that (H1) and (H2) are satisfied. Then,

(i) If \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity solution of (2.3), then for any \(T > 0\),

\[
w(x) = \sup_{\beta \in B} \inf_{u \in U} E\left[ \int_0^T f(X_s^{x,u,\beta(u)}, u_s, \beta(u)_s) ds + w(X_T^{x,u,\beta(u)}) \right] - \rho T.
\] (4.58)

(ii) If \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity solution of (2.4), then for any \(T > 0\),

\[
w(x) = \inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} E\left[ \int_0^T f(X_s^{x,\alpha(v),v}, v_s, \alpha(v)_s) ds + w(X_T^{x,\alpha(v),v}) \right] - \rho T.
\] (4.59)

**Proof.** The proof of this Theorem is the same as that of Theorem 4.1 without letting \(T \to \infty\), we only give the proof of (ii), (i) can be similarly proved.

If \((\rho, w)\) is a viscosity solution of (2.4), taking supremum over all controls \(v\) and infimum over all strategies \(\alpha\) for both sides of (4.16) we obtain

\[
\inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} E\left[ w(X_T^{x,\alpha(v),v}) + \int_0^T f(X_s^{x,\alpha(v),v},\alpha(v)_s,v_s) ds \right] \geq w(x) - C T (\delta + \delta^2) + (\rho - \varepsilon) T.
\]

Letting \(\delta \to 0\) and \(\varepsilon \to 0\), we get

\[
\inf_{\alpha \in A} \sup_{v \in V} E\left[ w(X_T^{x,\alpha(v),v}) + \int_0^T f(X_s^{x,\alpha(v),v},\alpha(v)_s,v_s) ds \right] \geq w(x) + \rho T.
\]

The other inequality can be proved analogously.

**Remark 4.5.** It is worth to point that the assumption (H3) is not required in Theorem 4.4 while this condition is necessary to Theorem 4.1. This is mainly because that (H3) guarantees the boundedness of the state process on infinite time horizon \([0, \infty)\) (See, Lemma 2.1), then the term \(\frac{1}{T} E[w(X_T^{x,u,v^m}) - w(x)]\) in (1.16) tends to 0 as \(T \to \infty\). However, for Theorem 4.4 we consider the related DPP for fixed finite \(T\).

5 Application in pollution accumulation problems with long-run average welfare

We apply our results to study a type of pollution accumulation and consumption problem, which has been a major topic of dynamic economics and environmental policy making (see, [32, 35]). We consider that an economy consumes some good and meanwhile generates pollution. Suppose that the stock of pollution is gradually degraded and described by \(X_t = \max\{Y_t, 0\}\) at time \(t\), where \(Y\) is a controlled Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and given by

\[
dY_t = [u_t - v_t Y_t] dt + \kappa dB_t, \quad Y_0 = x > 0.
\] (5.1)

Here, the processes \(u_t\) and \(v_t\) represent the flow of consumption and the decay rate of pollution at time \(t\), respectively, \(\kappa\) is a \(d\)-dimensional constant vector. We remark that the decay rate of the pollution is no longer a constant as considered in [31] since there exists some uncertainty on the values of this decay rate (see [24] for more details). More specifically, the control \(v\) can be seen as a
parameter and interpreted as natural cleaning of pollution via winds, rains, etc., which is obviously unknown and non-observable to us. Assume that the control state spaces

\[ U = [0, \gamma], \ V = [a, b], \]

where the constant \( \gamma \) is usually imposed by worldwide protocols (e.g. Kyoto Protocol) in order to promote sustainable development, \( a \) and \( b \) are given positive constants.

The associated long-run average social welfare is given by the utility of the consumption net of the disutility of pollution, i.e.,

\[ J(x, u, v) = \liminf_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} E \left[ \int_0^T g(u_t) - f(X_t) dt \right], \quad (5.2) \]

where \( g \in C^2(0, \infty) \) and \( f \in C(0, \infty) \) represent the utility of consumption and the disutility function of pollution, respectively. Moreover, they are assumed to satisfy the following properties:

\[ g'(\infty) = g(0) = 0, \ g'(0+) = g(\infty) = \infty; \]
\[ f(x) \geq 0, \ \text{convex and Lipschitz}. \]

The objective is to find an optimal consumption rate \( u^* \) that maximize the long-run average social welfare \( J(x, u, v) \) under the worst-case scenario (or robust control) \( v^* \).

When the decay rate is a constant, such a problem has been studied by many authors, among others, Kawaguchi and Morimoto \[31\], Nguyen and Yin \[34\] with switching diffusion system. In this situation, it can be regarded as a stochastic control problem and the optimal consumption rate can be derived from the related Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. When the decay rate is no longer a constant, we address this problem via our two-player infinite time horizon SDG model with one controller (controlling \( u \)) against “nature” (controlling \( v \)), where the dynamics is given by \( (5.1) \) and the ergodic payoff criterion \( J \) has the following equivalent form

\[ J(x, u, v) = \liminf_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} E \left[ \int_0^T g(Y_t + \frac{1}{2} |Y_t|^2) dt \right]. \]

It is worth to point out that similar formulation was also studied in \[24\], in which some additional conditions such as non-degenerate condition, Lyapunov stability condition and feedback control, were required in order to study the robust optimal consumption rate. The advantage of our approach is that these additional assumptions are not necessary, which may suggest that our approach would be more applicable.

The related Hamiltonian function \( H \) has the following form

\[ H(y, p, A, u, v) = [pu + g(u)] - ypv + \frac{1}{2} |\kappa|^2 A - f\left(\frac{y + |y|}{2}\right), \quad (y, p, A, u, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times U \times V. \]

It is easy to check that the assumptions (H1)-(H3) are satisfied and the Isaac condition holds. Since \( H \) is continuous on compact metric spaces \( U \) and \( V \), there exists mappings \( \bar{u} : \mathbb{R} \to U \) and \( \bar{v} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to V \) such that

\[ \bar{u}(p) = \arg\sup_{u \in U} [pu + g(u)], \quad \bar{v}(y, p) = \arg\inf_{v \in V} (ypv). \quad (5.3) \]

Then applying Theorem \[14,2\] we get the following results.
Theorem 5.1. Let \((\rho, w)\) be a viscosity solution of the ergodic HJBI equation

\[
\rho = \sup_{u \in U} \inf_{v \in V} H(y, Dw(y), D^2 w(y), u, v), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}.
\]  

(5.4)

Then \(\rho\) is the value for the long-run average social welfare associated with (5.1) and (5.2). In addition, the optimal consumption rate and the worst case decay rate of pollution is given by the following feedback form

\[
u^*(y) = \bar{u}(Dw(y)), \quad \nu^*(y) = \bar{v}(y, Dw(y)),
\]

where the mappings \(\bar{u}\) and \(\bar{v}\) are given in (5.3).

Remark 5.1. (i) Since the stock of the pollution is nonnegative, we can consider directly the following constrained equation

\[
\rho = \sup_{u \in U} \inf_{v \in V} H(x, Dw(x), D^2 w(x), u, v), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^+.
\]  

(5.5)

We can still obtain the existence of the viscosity solution by vanishing limit in the discounted cases, which is similar to Theorem 3.1.

(ii) If we take \(g(u) = 2u^{1/2}\), \(f(x) = d \cdot x\) with some constant \(d > 0\), then it is easy to check that

\[
\rho = -\frac{d}{a} \text{dist}^2\left(\frac{a}{d}, [0, \sqrt{\gamma}]\right) + \frac{a}{d}, \quad w(x) = -\frac{d}{a} x,
\]

is a classical solution of ergodic HJBI equation (5.5). In this situation, the optimal consumption rate \(u^* = \text{Proj}_{[0, \sqrt{\gamma}]}^2(\frac{a}{d})\) and the worst case decay rate of pollution \(v^* = a\). As shown in the expression of \(\rho\), the long-run average welfare is independent of the upper value of the decay rate \(b\). The reason is that we consider the problem under the worst case scenario, which means that the decision maker is risk aversion. Moreover, if lower value of the decay rate \(a\) is bigger than \(d \sqrt{\gamma}\), then the long-run average welfare and the optimal consumption rate have the following forms

\[
\rho = 2 \sqrt{\gamma} - \gamma \left(\frac{d}{a}\right), \quad u^* = \gamma,
\]

which gives the relation between the long-run average welfare and the robust decay rate. Meanwhile, it shows that the lowest decay rate is \(d \sqrt{\gamma}\) if one always wants to pursuit the largest consumption rate \(\gamma\).

6 Appendix: The approximation of viscosity solution

We first recall the definition of sup-convolution and inf-convolution. We say that \(w_\varepsilon(x)\) and \(w^\varepsilon(x)\) is the inf-convolution and sup-convolution of \(w\), respectively, if

\[
w_\varepsilon(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{w(y) + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\varepsilon}\}, \quad w^\varepsilon(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{w(y) - \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\varepsilon}\}.
\]

It is well known that the sup-convolution and inf-convolution yield good approximations of viscosity subsolution and supersolution, respectively (see, [17, 23, 26]). We adapt this property to our framework and the following statement involving two controls is new. Its proof is standard and for reader’s convenience we give the proof here.
Lemma 6.1. (1) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity supersolution of equation (2.4). Then, $(\rho, w_\varepsilon)$ is a viscosity supersolution of the following equation

$$
\rho = \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw_\varepsilon(x), D^2w_\varepsilon(x), u, v) - k(\varepsilon),
$$

where $k(\varepsilon) \to 0$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

(2) If $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity subsolution of equation (2.4). Then, $(\rho, w_\varepsilon)$ is a viscosity subsolution of the following equation

$$
\rho = \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} H(x, Dw_\varepsilon(x), D^2w_\varepsilon(x), u, v) + k(\varepsilon),
$$

where $k(\varepsilon) \to 0$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Proof. We only prove (2), the proof of (1) is analogous.

Let $\phi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a test function such that $w_\varepsilon - \phi$ has a local maximum at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We can find $y_0 \in B(x_0, 2M\varepsilon)$ such that

$$
w_\varepsilon(x_0) = w(y_0) - \frac{|x_0 - y_0|^2}{2\varepsilon},
$$

where $M$ is the Lipschitz constant of $w$. Define $\psi(y) = \phi(x_0 - y_0 + y) + \frac{|x_0 - y_0|^2}{2\varepsilon}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Obviously, $\psi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $w - \psi$ attains local maximum at $y_0$. Since $(\rho, w)$ is a viscosity subsolution of ergodic HJBI equation (2.4) and $D\psi(y_0) = D\phi(x_0)$, $D^2\psi(y_0) = D^2\phi(x_0)$, we get

$$
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr \left( \sigma \sigma^*(y_0, u, v) \cdot D^2 \psi(y_0) \right) + b(y_0, u, v) \cdot D\psi(y_0) + f(y_0, u, v) \right\}
$$

$$
= \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr \left( \sigma \sigma^*(y_0, u, v) \cdot D^2 \phi(x_0) \right) + b(y_0, u, v) \cdot D\phi(x_0) + f(y_0, u, v) \right\}.
$$

Using the Assumption (H2) and (6.3), we have

$$
\rho \leq \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} tr \left( \sigma \sigma^*(x_0, u, v) \cdot D^2 \phi(x_0) \right) + b(x_0, u, v) \cdot D\phi(x_0) + f(x_0, u, v) \right\} + k(\varepsilon),
$$

where $k(\varepsilon) = C\varepsilon$. Thus, we get that $(\rho, w_\varepsilon)$ is a viscosity subsolution of (6.2).
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