

Deterministic Differential Games in Infinite Horizon Involving Continuous and Impulse Controls

Brahim El Asri* and Hafid Lalioui†

Abstract

We consider a two-player zero-sum deterministic differential game where each player uses both continuous and impulse controls in infinite-time horizon. We assume that the impulses supposed to be of general term and the costs depend on the state of the system. We use the dynamic programming principle and viscosity solutions approach to show existence and uniqueness of a solution for the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs (HJBI) partial differential equations (PDEs) of the game. We prove under Isaacs condition that the upper and lower value functions coincide.

Keywords: Deterministic differential game, Infinite horizon, Continuous-impulse controls, Dynamic programming principle, Viscosity solutions, Isaacs condition, HJBI quasi-variational inequalities.

AMS classifications: 49K35, 49L25, 49N70, 90C39, 93C20.

1 Introduction

We study zero-sum deterministic differential games involving both continuous and impulse controls in infinite horizon. Zero-sum deterministic differential games with continuous controls alone, started with the work of L.S. Pontryagin et al [10] and R. Isaacs [27], have been studied in M. Bardi and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta [3] and in L.C. Evans and P.E. Souganidis [26] with Non-anticipative strategy in the viscosity solution framework. Differential games with impulse controls were studied in G. Barles [5], J.M. Yong [34] and G. Barles et al [6] for deterministic case with only one impulse control and recently in A. Cosso [11], P. Azimzadeh [1] and B. El Asri and S. Mazid [21] for zero-sum stochastic games with two impulse controls. In the previous literature of differential games one can find those of mixed type, S. Dharmatti et al [19], where the state is controlled by a combination of both continuous and discrete actions, and those with continuous, switching, hybrid and impulse controls, S. Dharmatti and A.J. Shaiju [16, 18], S. Dharmatti and M. Ramaswamy [15, 17] and G. Barles et al [7]. Let us just mention that in J.M. Yong [32, 33] differential games with both players use switching controls are studied. In [34], where differential games involving impulse controls are considered, one player is using continuous control whereas the opponent uses impulse control. We also mention that [16] extends the work in [34] to a two-person zero-sum differential game involving continuous, switching and impulse

*Ibn Zohr University, Labo. LISAD, Equipe. Aide à la decision, ENSA, B.P. 1136, Agadir, Morocco. e-mail: b.elasri@uiz.ac.ma.

†Ibn Zohr University, Labo. LISAD, Equipe. Aide à la decision, ENSA, B.P. 1136, Agadir, Morocco. e-mail: hafid.lalioui@edu.uiz.ac.ma. Financially supported by CNRST, Rabat, Morocco (Grant 17 UIZ 2019).

controls, where the existence of value and its characterization as the unique viscosity solution of the associated system of quasi-variational inequalities (QVIs) have been proved.

In this paper, we consider a two-player zero-sum deterministic differential game in infinite-time horizon where the two players adopting both continuous and impulse controls, with general in term of the form and cost of impulses. The state $y(\cdot)$ of the continuous-impulse controls game considered evolves according to the following dynamical system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}_x(t) = b(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)), & t \neq \tau_m, t \neq \rho_k; \\ y_x(\tau_m^+) = y_x(\tau_m^-) + g_\xi(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}}, & \tau_m \geq 0, \xi_m \neq 0; \\ y_x(\rho_k^+) = y_x(\rho_k^-) + g_\eta(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k), & \rho_k \geq 0, \eta_k \neq 0; \\ y_x(0) = x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ (initial state)}. \end{cases} \quad (\mathbf{S})$$

Here b is a function from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l$ into \mathbb{R}^n , $t \rightarrow \theta_1(t)$ and $t \rightarrow \theta_2(t)$ being the two continuous controls, are any functions from Θ_1 and Θ_2 the spaces of measurable functions from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R}^l , respectively. The two functions g_ξ and g_η are from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p$ into \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^q$ into \mathbb{R}^n , respectively. The sequences $(\{\tau_m\}, \{\xi_m\})$ and $(\{\rho_k\}, \{\eta_k\})$ represent the two impulse controls, where $(\tau_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are two non-decreasing sequences of non-negative real numbers which satisfy:

$$\tau_m \rightarrow +\infty \text{ when } m \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ and } \rho_k \rightarrow +\infty \text{ when } k \rightarrow +\infty,$$

and $(\xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are two sequences of elements of \mathbb{R}^p and \mathbb{R}^q , respectively.

We mention that the state $y(\cdot)$ of the controlled system starts from $y_x(0) = x$, states its values in \mathbb{R}^n , with $y_x(t)$ the state at time t which is driven by two continuous controls $\theta_1(\cdot)$ and $\theta_2(\cdot)$ for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$, respectively. In addition, both players are allowed to use impulse controls, u for *player* $-\xi$ and v for *player* $-\eta$. The impulse controls u and v are defined by the double sequences $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $v := (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, respectively, where the actions ξ_m and η_k belong to the spaces of impulse control actions $U \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}^q$, respectively. The infinite product $\prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}}$ signify that when the two players act together on the system at the same time using the impulse controls, we take into account only the action of *player* $-\eta$.

The gain (resp. cost) functional J for *player* $-\xi$ (resp. *player* $-\eta$) is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J(x; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) &:= \int_0^\infty f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\ &\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k), \end{aligned} \quad (\mathbf{J})$$

where $y_x(t) := y_x(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v)$, c and χ are the zero lower bound impulse cost functions for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$, respectively, which represent the cost of impulse actions for both players. We note that the cost of a player is the gain for the other (zero-sum), meaning that when a player performs an action he/she has to pay a positive cost, resulting in a gain for the other player. The function f from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l$ into \mathbb{R} represents the running gain and the positive real λ being the discount factor.

The terminology of a quasi-variational inequality (QVI), introduced to deal with impulse control problems in A. Bensoussan and J.L. Lions [8], the definition of lower and upper value functions for

differential games, defined in R.J. Elliott and N.J. Kalton [24, 25] and in [26]. The viscosity solution approach in M.G. Crandall and P.L. Lions [12] and M.G. Crandall et al [13, 14], lead to characterize the value of a game as the unique viscosity solution of its related QVI. The relationship between the two-player zero-sum deterministic differential games and the theory of viscosity solutions was first shown in [26], N. Barron et al [2] and P.E. Souganidis [29, 31].

Our aim in this work is to investigate, via the theory of viscosity solutions, the two-player zero-sum deterministic, continuous-impulse controls game given by the system **(S)**, in infinite-time horizon. Indeed, we describe the problem by the following associated double-obstacle lower and upper Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs (HJBI) equations **(L)** and **(U)**, respectively, where the Hamiltonians H^- and H^+ involve only the first order partial derivatives:

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H^-(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right\} = 0, \quad (\mathbf{L})$$

and

$$\max \left\{ \min \left[H^+(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) \right\} = 0, \quad (\mathbf{U})$$

where $Dv(\cdot)$ denotes the gradient of the function $v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the lower Hamiltonian H^- is given by:

$$H^-(x, v(x), Dv(x)) := \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} (\lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)),$$

and the upper Hamiltonian H^+ is defined as follows:

$$H^+(x, v(x), Dv(x)) := \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} (\lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)).$$

The first (resp. second) obstacle is defined through the use of the minimum (resp. maximum) cost operator \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x (resp. \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c), where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) &:= \inf_{\eta \in V} \left[v(x + g_\eta(x, \eta)) + \chi(x, \eta) \right] \\ (\text{resp. } \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) &:= \sup_{\xi \in U} \left[v(x + g_\xi(x, \xi)) - c(x, \xi) \right]). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we prove, under classical assumptions of the impulse control problems using the dynamic programming principle (DPP) for the differential game studied, the existence of the lower and upper value functions as viscosity solutions of the lower HJBI QVI **(L)** and upper HJBI QVI **(U)**, respectively. Moreover, we establish a comparison theorem that shows the uniqueness results in the viscosity solution sense for these HJBI QVIs, then we state the Isaacs condition $H^- = H^+$ for the game to have a value. We mention that the following assumptions, usually used to deal with impulse control problems (see [34, 16]) for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in U$ and $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in V$, are dropped:

$$c(x, \xi_1 + \xi_2) < c(x, \xi_1) + c(x, \xi_2) \text{ and } \chi(x, \eta_1 + \eta_2) < \chi(x, \eta_1) + \chi(x, \eta_2),$$

and we cite the work by P. Bettiol et al [9], a recent related work in which the game evolves according to two continuous controls only and admits a value under Isaacs condition and some inward pointing conditions.

The outline of the paper is the following: in section 2, we present the infinite horizon zero-sum, deterministic, continuous-impulse controls game studied and we give its related definitions and assumptions. Further, we give regularity results for the associated lower and upper value functions V^- and V^+ of the game, we show first that both satisfy the DPP property, then we prove that they are bounded and uniformly continuous (BUC) in \mathbb{R}^n . Section 3 is devoted to the viscosity characterization of the corresponding lower and upper HJBI QVIs **(L)** and **(U)** by deducing that the lower and upper value functions are viscosity solutions to these QVIs, respectively. In the last section, we establish a comparison theorem which gives the uniqueness result for both lower and upper HJBI QVIs **(L)** and **(U)**. Hence, under Isaacs condition, we show that the game admits a value.

2 Statement of the Continuous-Impulse Controls Game and Classic Results

2.1 Zero-Sum Deterministic, Continuous-Impulse Controls Differential Game

We consider the two-player zero-sum deterministic differential game in \mathbb{R}^n described, in the introduction show, by the system **(S)** in which both players are allowed to use continuous as well as impulse controls. We are given $y_x(t) := y_x(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v)$ the solution of **(S)** which characterize the state of the game at time t with initial state $y_x(0) = x$ at $t = 0$. The evolution of the system, described by the mapping $t \rightarrow y_x(t)$, is provided by a deterministic model $\dot{y}_x(t) = b(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t))$, where b is a function from $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l$ to \mathbb{R}^n and $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ and $\theta_2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2$ are, respectively, the continuous controls for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$ defined, respectively, in Θ_1 and Θ_2 the spaces of measurable functions from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R}^l . The state undergoes impulses (jumps) ξ_m and η_k , at certain impulse stopping times τ_m and ρ_k , respectively, that is:

$$y_x(\tau_m^+) = y_x(\tau_m^-) + g_\xi(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}}, \quad \tau_m \geq 0, \quad \xi_m \neq 0;$$

$$y_x(\rho_k^+) = y_x(\rho_k^-) + g_\eta(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k), \quad \rho_k \geq 0, \quad \eta_k \neq 0,$$

where the impulse time sequences $\{\tau_m\}_{m \geq 0}$ and $\{\rho_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are two non-decreasing sequences of $[0, \infty]$ such that $\tau_m, \rho_k \rightarrow +\infty$ when $m, k \rightarrow +\infty$, the impulse value sequences $\{\xi_m\}_{m \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are two sequences of elements of $U \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}^q$, respectively, and the form of impulses is of general term (depends on non linear functions g_ξ and g_η for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$ respectively).

We call $\Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ and $\Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$, respectively, the spaces of continuous-impulse controls $(\theta_1(\cdot), u)$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v)$ for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$, respectively. We denote $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \geq 0} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $v := (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \geq 0} \in \mathcal{V}$ the two impulse controls such that $\xi_m \in U$ and $\eta_k \in V$. Thus $(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$ denote, respectively, the involved continuous-impulse controls for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$. For any initial state x the controls $(\theta_1(\cdot), u)$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v)$ generate a trajectory $y_x(\cdot)$ solution of the system **(S)**. Thus the state $y_x(\cdot)$ is driven by two continuous-impulse controls, $(\theta_1(\cdot), u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \geq 0})$ control of *player* $-\xi$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v := (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \geq 0})$ control of *player* $-\eta$. The infinite product $\prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}}$ signifies that when the two players act together on the system at the same time, only the action of *player* $-\eta$ is tacking into account.

We are also given, in the following equation **(J)**, a gain (resp. cost) functional $J(x; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v)$

for *player* $-\xi$ (resp. *player* $-\eta$):

$$\begin{aligned}
J(x; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) &:= \int_0^\infty f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\
&\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k),
\end{aligned} \tag{J}$$

where $(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$ being the continuous-impulse controls. The functional J represents the criterion which the *player* $-\xi$ wants to maximize and the *player* $-\eta$ wants to minimize. In the other words, $-J$ is the cost the *player* $-\eta$ has to pay, so the sum of the costs of the two player is null, which explains the name *zero-sum*. We mention that c and χ are the (depend on $y(\cdot)$) cost functions for *player* $-\xi$ and *player* $-\eta$, respectively, f is the running gain and $\lambda > 0$ the discount factor.

We assume that one player knows just the current and past choices of the control made by his opponent, thus we are given an information pattern for the two players prescribing that each of them choose his/her own control at each instant of time without knowing the future choices of the opponent. This is made rigorous by introducing, hereafter in the sense of Elliott-Kalton [24, 25], the notion of *non-anticipative strategy*.

Definition 1. (*Non-anticipative strategy*) A strategy for the *player* $-\xi$ is a map $\alpha : \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$; it is *non-anticipative*, if, for any $\theta_2^1(\cdot), \theta_2^2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2, v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t > 0, \theta_2^1(s) = \theta_2^2(s)$ and $v_1 \equiv v_2$ implies $\alpha(\theta_2^1(s), v_1) \equiv \alpha(\theta_2^2(s), v_2)$ for all $s \leq t$.

We denote with \mathcal{A} the set of all *non-anticipative strategies* α for *player* $-\xi$. Similarly, the set of all *non-anticipative strategies* β for *player* $-\eta$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \beta : \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V} : \theta_1^1(s) = \theta_1^2(s) \text{ and } u_1 \equiv u_2 \text{ for all } \theta_1^1(\cdot), \theta_1^2(\cdot) \in \Theta_1, u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}, \right. \\
\left. t > 0 \text{ and } s \leq t; \text{ implies } \beta(\theta_1^1(s), u_1) \equiv \beta(\theta_1^2(s), u_2) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can define the lower and upper value functions of the differential game studied.

Definition 2. The lower value function of the game with the gain/cost functional $J : \mathbb{R}^n \times \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U} \times \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$V^-(x) := \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J(x; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)) \tag{Lower Value}$$

and the upper value function is

$$V^+(x) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \inf_{(\theta_2(\cdot), v) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}} J(x; \alpha(\theta_2(\cdot), v), \theta_2(\cdot), v). \tag{Upper Value}$$

If $V^-(x) = V^+(x)$ we say that the game with initial point x has a value, and we denote the value function of the game

$$V(x) := V^-(x) = V^+(x). \tag{Value}$$

Note that the inequality $V^-(x) \leq V^+(x)$ for all x , which would justify the terms *lower* and *upper*, is not obvious at first glance. Since in the definition of V^- the inf is taken over non-anticipative strategies whereas in the definition of V^+ it is taken over controls, and similarly the sup is taken over different sets in the two definitions, then the inequality $V^+(x) \leq V^-(x)$ is false in general. We prove, in a rather indirect way by using the associated lower and upper HJBI QVIs **(L)** and **(U)**, that the infinite horizon zero-sum, deterministic differential game involving continuous-impulse controls studied in the present paper has a value.

Apart from the mathematical interest in its own right, the deterministic differential games enjoy a wide range of applications in various fields of engineering. We introduce, for the zero-sum games studied here, the following example:

Example 1. (*Portfolio optimization*) A typical example that provides an interesting framework of the theory of infinite horizon zero-sum, deterministic games involving continuous-impulse controls, developed in the present paper, is the portfolio optimization problem described by the system **(S $^\pi$)** below, where the market (player – ξ) is playing against the investor (player – η) and wishes to minimize his terminal utility (i.e., maximize his cost). We give the following illustrative dynamical system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}_x^\pi(t) = b^\pi(y_x^\pi(t); \theta_1^\pi(t), \theta_2^\pi(t)), & t \neq \tau_m, t \neq \rho_k; \\ y_x^\pi(\tau_m^+) = y_x^\pi(\tau_m^-) + g_\xi(y_x^\pi(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}}, & \tau_m \geq 0, \xi_m \neq 0; \\ y_x^\pi(\rho_k^+) = y_x^\pi(\rho_k^-) + g_\eta(y_x^\pi(\rho_k^-), \eta_k), & \rho_k \geq 0, \eta_k \neq 0; \\ y_x^\pi(0) = x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \quad (\mathbf{S}^\pi)$$

where x denotes the initial value of the investor's portfolio π , $y_x^\pi(t)$ represents the portfolio value (investor's wealth) at time t controlled by:

- (i) Two continuous controls $\theta_1^\pi(\cdot)$ and $\theta_2^\pi(\cdot)$ which represent, respectively, the market's and the investor's instantaneous portfolio compositions. Thus, for example, $\theta_2^\pi(t)$ corresponds to the vector of number of units of stocks in the investor's portfolio at the instant t ;
- (ii) Two Impulse controls $(\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ which describe, respectively, a new market's and investor's portfolio compositions at some jump instants. That is whenever the continuous controls $\theta_1(\cdot)$ and $\theta_2(\cdot)$ don't perform, the corresponding player uses a new optimal portfolio composition determined, respectively, at some impulse instants τ_m and ρ_k with the impulse values ξ_m and η_k , respectively.

We denote $(\theta_1^\pi(\cdot), (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}})$ and $(\theta_2^\pi(\cdot), (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$ the continuous-impulse controls for player – ξ and player – η , respectively, and we assume that the investor reacts immediately to the market whereas the market is not so quick in reacting to investor's moves, i.e., the investor's action comes first whenever the impulse times for the two players coincide. Moreover, we assume that the investor does not consume wealth in the process of investing but is only interested to maximize his terminal utility, that is, minimizing the following payoff:

$$\begin{aligned} J^\pi(x; \theta_1^\pi(\cdot), u, \theta_2^\pi(\cdot), v) &:= \int_0^\infty f^\pi(y_x^\pi(t); \theta_1^\pi(t), \theta_2^\pi(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\ &\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c^\pi(y_x^\pi(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi^\pi(y_x^\pi(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k), \end{aligned} \quad (\mathbf{J}^\pi)$$

where the functional (\mathbf{J}^π) represents the investor's cost, with the following components:

- (i) The running cost of integral type giving by the stokes holding cost function f^π ;
- (ii) The maximizer's (market) (resp. minimizer's (investor)) cost function c^π (resp. χ^π) that corresponds to the cost of selling/buying stokes at impulse instants τ_m (resp. ρ_k).

The market moves according to the continuous control $\theta_1^\pi(\cdot)$, creates jumps at impulse instants τ_m and tries to minimize the terminal utility of the investor, that is, maximizing his cost (\mathbf{J}^π), whereas the investor creates jumps at impulse instants ρ_k and uses continuous control $\theta_2^\pi(\cdot)$, obviously, tries to minimize the cost functional (\mathbf{J}^π). We make the assumption that the flow of funds is between the investor and the market which makes our zero-sum game framework.

Because of the advantage giving to the player using strategies, it is reasonable to believe that any more fair game has an outcome between $V^-(x)$ and $V^+(x)$. For this reason it is interesting to give the assumptions bellow ensuring the existence of a value, that is, the equality $V^-(x) = V^+(x)$ for all x .

2.2 Assumptions

In all the paper, we assume that n, p, q and l are some fixed positive integers, $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $T \in (0, +\infty]$, and we let the discount factor λ be a fixed positive real. We denote by $|\cdot|$ and $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean vector norm in \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^n , respectively, and by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ the infinite norm in the space of bounded and continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^n .

We investigate the **Lower Value, Upper Value** of the game and the related HJBI QVIs (**L**) and (**U**) under the following less restrictive assumptions on the dynamics b, g_ξ, g_η , the running gain f and the cost functions c and χ , where $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ and $\theta_2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2$:

[H_b] **Dynamic b :** We assume that the function $b, \mathbb{R}^n -$ valued, satisfies for some constant $C_b > 0$, all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $t \geq 0$ the following:

$$\left\| b(x; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) - b(y; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \right\| \leq C_b \|x - y\|,$$

and belongs to $C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l)$, i.e., bounded and continuous in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l$.

[H_g] **Impulses form g_ξ and g_η :** We let the functions $g_\xi : (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow g_\xi(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g_\eta : (x, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow g_\eta(x, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be Lipschitz continuous with respect to x , uniformly in ξ and η , respectively, with constant $C_{g_\xi} > 0$ and $C_{g_\eta} > 0$, respectively.

[H_f] **Running gain f :** We assume that the function $f, \mathbb{R} -$ valued running gain, belongs to $C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l)$, and satisfies for some constant $C_f > 0$, all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $t \geq 0$ the following:

$$\left| f(x; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) - f(y; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \right| \leq C_f \|x - y\|.$$

[$H_{c,\chi}$] **Impulses cost c and χ :** The impulse cost functions $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\chi : \mathbb{R}^n \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ are from \mathbb{R}^n and two subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , U and V , respectively, into \mathbb{R}^+ , non negative and satisfy the zero lower bound property given by:

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \xi \in U} c(x, \xi) > 0 \text{ and } \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \eta \in V} \chi(x, \eta) > 0. \quad (1)$$

The functions $(x, \xi) \rightarrow c(x, \xi)$ and $(x, \eta) \rightarrow \chi(x, \eta)$ are Lipschitz continuous with respect to x , uniformly in ξ and η , respectively, with constant $C_c > 0$ and $C_\chi > 0$, respectively. Moreover, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in U$ and $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in V$, we let the impulse costs satisfy

$$c(x, \xi_1 + \xi_2) \leq c(x, \xi_1) + c(x, \xi_2),$$

and

$$\chi(x, \eta_1 + \eta_2) \leq \chi(x, \eta_1) + \chi(x, \eta_2).$$

It follows, regarding assumptions $[H_b]$ and $[H_g]$, that there exists a unique global solution $y_x(\cdot)$ to the above dynamical system **(S)**, while the assumptions $[H_f]$ and $[H_{c,\chi}]$ provide the classical framework for the study of the infinite horizon zero-sum, deterministic differential game involving continuous-impulse controls in the viscosity solution framework.

2.3 Classic Results

2.3.1 Dynamic Programming Principle

Now we will prove the DPP property in the following theorem, meaning that an optimal control viewed from today will remain optimal when viewed from tomorrow and stands for a most commonly used approach in solving optimal control problems:

Theorem 1. (*Dynamic programming principle*) Assume H_b, H_g, H_f and $H_{c,\chi}$. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T > 0$, the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value** satisfy, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} V^-(x) = \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} & \left\{ \int_0^T f\left(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \beta(\theta_1(t))\right) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \right. \\ & - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\ & + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_k \leq T\}} \\ & \left. + V^-\left(y_x(T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u))\right) \exp(-\lambda T) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V^+(x) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \inf_{(\theta_2(\cdot), v) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}} & \left\{ \int_0^T f\left(y_x(t); \alpha(\theta_2(t)), \theta_2(t)\right) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \right. \\ & - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\ & + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_k \leq T\}} \\ & \left. + V^+\left(y_x(T; \alpha(\theta_2(\cdot), v), \theta_2(\cdot), v)\right) \exp(-\lambda T) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta(\theta_1(\cdot)) \equiv \theta_2(\cdot)$ and $\alpha(\theta_2(\cdot)) \equiv \theta_1(\cdot)$.

Proof. We give only the proof for the **Lower Value**, similarly for the **Upper Value**. Let $T > 0$, fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and denote by $W_T(x)$ the right-hand side of (2). We first prove that $V^-(x) \leq W_T(x)$. For any $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we pick a non-anticipative strategy $\beta_z \in \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$V^-(z) \geq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J\left(z; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta_z(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right) - \varepsilon, \quad (3)$$

then we choose $\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}$ a non-anticipative strategy for *player* $-\eta$ that satisfies, for $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} W_T(x) \geq & \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \int_0^T f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \right. \\ & - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\ & + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\bar{\rho}_k^-), \bar{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\rho}_k \leq T\}} \\ & \left. + V^-\left(y_x(T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \bar{\beta}(\theta_1(\cdot), u))\right) \exp(-\lambda T) \right\} - \varepsilon, \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{\beta}(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\bar{\theta}_2(\cdot), (\bar{\rho}_k, \bar{\eta}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}).$$

Next, we define $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, a non-anticipative strategy for *player* $-\eta$, as follows:

$$\beta(\theta_1(t), u) := \begin{cases} \bar{\beta}(\theta_1(t), u), & t \leq T; \\ \beta_z(\theta_1^z(t - T), u^z), & t > T, \end{cases}$$

where $z := y_x(T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \bar{\beta}(\theta_1(\cdot), u))$, $\theta_1^z(\cdot) \equiv \theta_1(\cdot + T)$ and $u^z := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\tau_m > T$. Since we have for all $t > 0$,

$$y_x(t + T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)) = y_z(t; \theta_1^z(\cdot), u^z, \beta(\theta_1^z(\cdot), u^z)),$$

then by the change of variables $s = t + T$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} J\left(z; \theta_1^z(\cdot), u^z, \beta_z(\theta_1^z(\cdot), u^z)\right) &= \int_T^{+\infty} f(y_x(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \exp(-\lambda(s - T)) ds \\ & - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m > T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\ & + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_k > T\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}).$$

Then by (3) and (4) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
W_T(x) &\geq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \right. \\
&\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \rho_k\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k) \\
&\quad \left. + V^-\left(y_x(T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u))\right) \exp(-\lambda T) \right\} - 2\varepsilon \\
&\geq V^-(x) - 2\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

thus, since ε is arbitrary, we get the desired inequality.

We next prove $W_T(x) \leq V^-(x)$. For any $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we pick the non-anticipative strategy $\beta_z \in \mathcal{B}$ which satisfies the inequality (3). We pick $(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u} := (\bar{\tau}_m, \bar{\xi}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$, the continuous-impulse controls for *player* $-\xi$ that satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_T(x) &\leq \int_0^T f(y_x(t); \bar{\theta}_1(t), \theta_2^z(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\
&\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\bar{\tau}_m^-), \bar{\xi}_m) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \rho_k^z\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^z^-), \eta_k^z) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k^z) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_k^z \leq T\}} \\
&\quad + V^-\left(y_x(T; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta_z(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}))\right) \exp(-\lambda T) + \varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where

$$\beta_z(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), (\bar{\tau}_m, \bar{\xi}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}) := (\theta_2^z(\cdot), (\rho_k^z, \eta_k^z)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}).$$

Let $\underline{\theta}_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ and $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{U}$. We define the continuous control $\tilde{\theta}_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ for *player* $-\xi$ as follows:

$$(\tilde{\theta}_1(t), u) := \begin{cases} (\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{u}), & t \leq T; \\ (\underline{\theta}_1(t - T), \underline{u}), & t > T. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

where $\underline{u} := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\tau_m > T$. Moreover, we define $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ a non-anticipative strategy for *player* $-\eta$ as follows:

$$\beta(\underline{\theta}_1(t), \underline{u}) := \beta_z(\tilde{\theta}_1(t + T), \underline{u}). \tag{7}$$

Next, set

$$z_1 := y_x\left(T; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta_z(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u})\right), \tag{8}$$

and choose $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that

$$V^-(z_1) \leq J\left(z_1; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right) + \varepsilon. \tag{9}$$

Observe that by (6) and (7) we get

$$y_x\left(s; \tilde{\theta}_1(\cdot), u, \beta_z(\tilde{\theta}_1(\cdot), u)\right) = \begin{cases} y_x\left(s; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta_z(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u})\right), & s \leq T; \\ y_{z_1}\left(s - T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right), & s > T, \end{cases}$$

so by the change of variable $s = t + T$ we deduce for $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} J(z_1; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)) &= \int_T^{+\infty} f(y_x(s); \tilde{\theta}_1(s), \tilde{\theta}_2(s)) \exp(-\lambda(s - T)) ds \\ &\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda\tau_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m > T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_m \neq \tilde{\rho}_k\}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\tilde{\rho}_k^-), \tilde{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda\tilde{\rho}_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\rho}_k > T\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\beta_z(\tilde{\theta}_1(\cdot), u) := (\tilde{\theta}_2(\cdot), (\tilde{\rho}_k, \tilde{\eta}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}),$$

Now we use (5), (6), (8), (9) and (10) to get

$$W_T(x) \leq J(x; \tilde{\theta}_1(\cdot), u, \beta_z(\tilde{\theta}_1(\cdot), u)) + 2\varepsilon,$$

thus, from this inequality and (3), we deduce $W_T(x) \leq V^-(x) + 3\varepsilon$. Then, since ε is arbitrary, we obtain the desired inequality. \square

2.3.2 Estimate on the Trajectories

Let $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and denote $y_x(\cdot)$ and $y_z(\cdot)$ the trajectories generated from x and z by the controls $(\theta_1(\cdot), u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v := (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$. We then have the following estimate on the trajectories:

Proposition 1. *Assume H_b and H_g . We have, for all $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \geq 0$, the usual estimate on the trajectories:*

$$\left\| y_x(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) - y_z(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) \right\| \leq \exp(Ct) \|x - z\|,$$

for all $(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ and $(\theta_2(\cdot), v) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$, where $C > 0$.

Proof. By Gronwall's lemma, using assumption H_b we have for all $t \in [0, \tau_0 \wedge \rho_0]$,

$$\left\| y_x(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) - y_z(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) \right\| \leq \exp(C_b t) \|x - z\|,$$

moreover, from assumption H_g , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| y_x(\tau_0^+ \wedge \rho_0^+; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) - y_z(\tau_0^+ \wedge \rho_0^+; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) \right\| &\leq (1 + C_g) \exp(C_b(\tau_0 \wedge \rho_0)) \\ &\quad \times \|x - z\|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_g = C_{g_\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0 < \rho_0\}} + C_{g_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0 \geq \rho_0\}}.$$

Repeating inductively the same argument, then, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| y_x(\tau_m^+ \wedge \rho_m^+; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) - y_z(\tau_m^+ \wedge \rho_m^+; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) \right\| &\leq (1 + 2\tilde{C}_g)^N \exp(C_b(\tau_m \wedge \rho_m)) \\ &\quad \times \|x - z\|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$N = m - \sum_{i=0}^m \{\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_i = \rho_i\}}\};$$

$$\tilde{C}_g = \max\{C_{g_\xi}, C_{g_\eta}\}.$$

Thus, for all $t \in [\tau_m \wedge \rho_m, \tau_{m+1} \wedge \rho_{m+1}]$, we get the existence of $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| y_x(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) - y_z(t; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \theta_2(\cdot), v) \right\| \leq \exp(Ct) \|x - z\|,$$

which completes the proof. \square

2.3.3 Regularity of the Value Functions

We give hereafter some results concerning the boundedness and the regularity of the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value**.

Theorem 2. *Assume H_b, H_g, H_f and $H_{c,\chi}$. Then the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value** are in $BUC(\mathbb{R}^n)$, i.e., bounded and uniformly continuous in \mathbb{R}^n .*

Proof. We give only the proof for the **Lower Value**, similarly for the **Upper Value**. We proceed for the proof in two steps:

Step 1: Boundedness. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ be any non-anticipative strategy for *player* $-\eta$, we have

$$V^-(x) \leq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J(x; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)),$$

considering the set of non-anticipative strategies $\beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$ where there is no impulse time, i.e., $\rho_0 = +\infty$, for $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, we get

$$V^-(x) \leq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\tau_m^-), \xi_m) \exp(-\lambda \tau_m) \right\}.$$

Fix now $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists a continuous-impulse controls $(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u} := (\bar{\tau}_m, \bar{\xi}_m)) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ for *player* $-\xi$ such that

$$V^-(x) \leq \int_0^{+\infty} f(y_x(t); \bar{\theta}_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\bar{\tau}_m^-), \bar{\xi}_m) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) + \varepsilon.$$

From assumptions $H_{c,\chi}$ and H_f , c is a non negative function and f is bounded, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$V^-(x) \leq C.$$

Similarly, for $(\theta_1(\cdot), u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$, the set of continuous-impulse controls for *player* $-\xi$ for which there is no impulse time, i.e., $\tau_0 = +\infty$, we have, for $v := (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$,

$$V^-(x) \geq \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\rho_k^-), \eta_k) \exp(-\lambda \rho_k) \right\},$$

where

$$\beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), v).$$

There exists a non-anticipative strategy $\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}$ for *player* $-\eta$ which provides a continuous-impulse controls $(\bar{\theta}_2(\cdot), \bar{v} := (\bar{\rho}_k, \bar{\eta}_k)) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$ that satisfies, for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$V^-(x) \geq \int_0^{+\infty} f(y_x(t); \theta_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)) \exp(-\lambda t) dt + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\bar{\rho}_k), \bar{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) - \varepsilon.$$

Recall assumptions $H_{c,\chi}$ and H_f , χ is a non negative function and f is bounded, then there exists $C' > 0$ such that

$$V^-(x) \geq -C'.$$

Which gives the desired result.

Step 2: Uniform Continuity. We fix $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and first pick $\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}$ a non-anticipative strategy for *player* $-\eta$ that satisfies

$$V^-(z) \geq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J\left(z; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \bar{\beta}(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

then we pick $(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u} := (\bar{\tau}_m, \bar{\xi}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$, the continuous-impulse controls for *player* $-\xi$ that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} V^-(x) &\leq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J\left(x; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \bar{\beta}(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right) \\ &\leq J\left(x; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \bar{\beta}(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u})\right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$V^-(x) - V^-(z) \leq J\left(x; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \bar{\beta}(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u})\right) - J\left(z; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \bar{\beta}(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u})\right) + \varepsilon.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} V^-(x) - V^-(z) &\leq \int_0^{+\infty} \left[f(y_x(t); \bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)) - f(y_z(t); \bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)) \right] \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\ &\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\bar{\tau}_m), \bar{\xi}_m) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\bar{\rho}_k), \bar{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_z(\bar{\tau}_m), \bar{\xi}_m) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_z(\bar{\rho}_k), \bar{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Then, from the DPP (2) for $T > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V^-(x) - V^-(z) &\leq \int_0^T \left[f(y_x(t); \bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)) - f(y_z(t); \bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)) \right] \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\
&\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_x(\bar{\tau}_m), \bar{\xi}_m) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_x(\bar{\rho}_k), \bar{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\rho}_k \leq T\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{m \geq 0} c(y_z(\bar{\tau}_m), \bar{\xi}_m) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\
&\quad - \sum_{k \geq 0} \chi(y_z(\bar{\rho}_k), \bar{\eta}_k) \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\rho}_k \leq T\}} \\
&\quad + V^-\left(y_x(T; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}))\right) \exp(-\lambda T) \\
&\quad - V^-\left(y_z(T; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}))\right) \exp(-\lambda T) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by assumption H_f and $H_{c,\chi}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V^-(x) - V^-(z) &\leq \int_0^T C_f \|y_x(t) - y_z(t)\| \exp(-\lambda t) dt \\
&\quad - \sum_{m \geq 0} C_c \|y_x(\bar{\tau}_m) - y_z(\bar{\tau}_m)\| \exp(-\lambda \bar{\tau}_m) \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \leq T\}} \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} C_\chi \|y_x(\bar{\rho}_k) - y_z(\bar{\rho}_k)\| \exp(-\lambda \bar{\rho}_k) \\
&\quad + \left| V^-\left(y_x(T; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}))\right) - V^-\left(y_z(T; \bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}, \beta(\bar{\theta}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}))\right) \right| \\
&\quad \times \exp(-\lambda T) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1 and the boundedness of V^- , we deduce that there exists a constant $C_v > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
V^-(x) - V^-(z) &\leq C_f \|x - z\| \int_0^T \exp((C - \lambda)t) dt \\
&\quad - C_c \|x - z\| \sum_{m \geq 0, \bar{\tau}_m \leq T} \exp((C - \lambda)\bar{\tau}_m) \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau}_m \neq \bar{\rho}_k\}} \\
&\quad + C_\chi \|x - z\| \sum_{k \geq 0, \bar{\rho}_k \leq T} \exp((C - \lambda)\bar{\rho}_k) \\
&\quad + 2C_v \exp(-\lambda T) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Therefore, if $\lambda \neq C$ since in the right-hand side of (11) the sums are finite, there exists $0 < K < +\infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
V^-(x) - V^-(z) &\leq \frac{C_f}{C - \lambda} \|x - z\| \left[\exp((C - \lambda)T) - 1 \right] \\
&\quad + K \|x - z\| + 2C_v \exp(-\lambda T) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Now we choose T such that $\exp(-CT) = \|x - z\|^{1/2}$ with $\|x - z\| < 1$. Hence, in the right-hand side of (12), the first term goes to 0 when $x \rightarrow z$, i.e., $T \rightarrow \infty$, indeed, it is equal to

$$\frac{C_f}{C - \lambda} \|x - z\|^{1/2} \left(\exp(-\lambda T) - \|x - z\|^{1/2} \right),$$

while the term $\exp(-\lambda T)$ goes to 0 where $T \rightarrow \infty$. We then deduce, by letting $x \rightarrow z$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the upper semi-continuity of the lower value function:

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow z} V^-(x) \leq V^-(z).$$

In the case where $\lambda = C_b$, it suffice to let some $\hat{\lambda} < \lambda = C_b$, so we go back to (11) and we proceed, since $\exp((C_b - \lambda)T) < \exp((C_b - \hat{\lambda})T)$ and $\exp(-\lambda T) < \exp(-\hat{\lambda}T)$, as above with the case $\hat{\lambda} \neq C_b$, we then conclude by letting $x \rightarrow z$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Analogously we get the lower semi-continuity:

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow z} V^-(x) \geq V^-(z).$$

Moreover the right-hand side of (12) can be made less than 2ε for $\|x - z\|$ small enough and T large which proves the uniform continuity of V^- and completes the proof since x and z play symmetrical roles. \square

Next, we prove the following useful proposition:

Proposition 2. *If the function v is uniformly continuous in \mathbb{R}^n , so is the two functions $\mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v$ and $\mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v$.*

Proof. We give the proof for $\mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v$, similarly for $\mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v$. Let v be a uniformly continuous function, $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and choose $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta_\varepsilon \in V$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(z) + \varepsilon \geq v(z + g_\eta(z, \eta_\varepsilon)) + \chi(z, \eta_\varepsilon),$$

thus

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(z) \leq v(x + g_\eta(x, \eta_\varepsilon)) + \chi(x, \eta_\varepsilon) - v(z + g_\eta(z, \eta_\varepsilon)) - \chi(z, \eta_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon.$$

It follows from assumption $H_{c,\chi}$ the existence of $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(z) \leq C\|x - z\| + \varepsilon,$$

since x and z play symmetrical roles, the right-hand side of the last inequality can be made less than 2ε for $\|x - y\|$ small enough, then $\mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v$ is uniformly continuous. \square

3 Viscosity Characterization of the Game

3.1 Lower and Upper Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs QVIs

For the zero-sum deterministic, continuous-impulse controls game studied the associated lower and upper HJBI QVIs are derived from the DPP and given, respectively, by the following equations (L) and (U):

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H^-(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right\} = 0 \quad (\text{L})$$

and

$$\max \left\{ \min \left[H^+(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(x) \right\} = 0, \quad (\text{U})$$

where $Dv(\cdot)$ denotes the gradient of the function $v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, H^- is the lower Hamiltonian given by the following:

$$H^-(x, v(x), Dv(x)) := \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} (\lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)),$$

H^+ being the upper Hamiltonian defined as follows:

$$H^+(x, v(x), Dv(x)) := \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} (\lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)),$$

and the two obstacles are defined through the use of the minimum and maximum cost operators \mathcal{H}_{inf}^χ and \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c , respectively, where

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^\chi v(x) := \inf_{\eta \in V} [v(x + g_\eta(x, \eta)) + \chi(x, \eta)]$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) := \sup_{\xi \in U} [v(x + g_\xi(x, \xi)) - c(x, \xi)].$$

In this paper, our aim is to show that the zero-sum deterministic, continuous-impulse controls game considered has a value, we proceed in two steps:

- (i) First, we study the existence of the solution in viscosity sense for both QVIs **(L)** and **(U)**.
- (ii) Next, we show that both lower HJBI QVI **(L)** and upper HJBI QVI **(U)** admit, under Isaacs condition, the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value** as unique solution in the viscosity sense.

Thus, the game admit the value function (**Value**), i.e., $V^-(x) = V^+(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

3.2 Viscosity Characterization

In the rest of this section, we aim to prove the fact that the **Lower Value** (resp. **Upper Value**) is a viscosity solution of the lower HJBI QVI **(L)** (resp. upper HJBI QVI **(U)**). We adopt the following definition of the viscosity solution:

Definition 3. (*Viscosity solution*) Let $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. V is called:

- (i) A viscosity sub-solution of the lower HJBI QVI **(L)** (resp. upper HJBI QVI **(U)**) if for any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any function $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $V(\bar{x}) = \phi(\bar{x})$ and \bar{x} is a local maximum point of $V - \phi$, we have:

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H^-(\bar{x}, V(\bar{x}), D\phi(\bar{x})), V(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^\chi V(\bar{x}) \right], V(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\bar{x}) \right\} \leq 0$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } \max \left\{ \min \left[H^+(\bar{x}, V(\bar{x}), D\phi(\bar{x})), V(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\bar{x}) \right], V(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^\chi V(\bar{x}) \right\} \leq 0 \right).$$

- (ii) A viscosity super-solution of the lower HJBI QVI **(L)** (resp. upper HJBI QVI **(U)**) if for any $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any function $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $V(\underline{x}) = \phi(\underline{x})$ and \underline{x} is a local minimum point of $V - \phi$, we have:

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H^-(\underline{x}, V(\underline{x}), D\phi(\underline{x})), V(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^\chi V(\underline{x}) \right], V(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\underline{x}) \right\} \geq 0$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } \max \left\{ \min \left[H^+(\underline{x}, V(\underline{x}), D\phi(\underline{x})), V(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\underline{x}) \right], V(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^\chi V(\underline{x}) \right\} \geq 0 \right).$$

(iii) A viscosity solution of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) (resp. upper HJBI QVI (**U**)) if it is both a viscosity sub-solution and super-solution of lower HJBI QVI (**L**) (resp. upper HJBI QVI (**U**)).

Next, we give the proof for the following lemmas which will be useful to prove the existence of the viscosity solution for the HJBI QVIs (**L**) and (**U**):

Lemma 1. Assume H_b, H_g, H_f and $H_{c,\chi}$. The lower value function (**Lower Value**) satisfies for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the following properties:

(i) $V^-(x) \leq \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V^-(x)$;

(ii) If $V^-(x) < \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V^-(x)$ then $V^-(x) \geq \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V^-(x)$.

The same properties hold true for the upper value function (**Upper Value**).

Proof. We give only the proof for V^- , similarly for V^+ . First, we let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ and $u := (\tau_m, \xi_m)_{m \geq 0} \in \mathcal{U}$, then we consider, for player $-\eta$, the non-anticipative strategy $\beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), v := (\rho_k, \eta_k)_{k \geq 0}) \in \Theta_2 \times \mathcal{V}$ where $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$. Next, choose $\beta' \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\beta'(\cdot, u) := (\cdot, (0, \eta; \rho_1, \eta_1; \rho_2, \eta_2; \dots))$, we then obtain

$$V^-(x) \leq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J\left(x; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta'(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right),$$

thus

$$V^-(x) \leq \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} J\left(x + g_\eta(x, \eta); \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right) + \chi(x, \eta),$$

from which we get

$$V^-(x) \leq V^-(x + g_\eta(x, \eta)) + \chi(x, \eta).$$

then the inequality (i) follows from the arbitrariness of η .

Now let us assume that $V^-(x) < \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V^-(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. From the DPP for V^- (2), by taking $T = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} V^-(x) = & \inf_{\substack{\theta_2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2 \\ \rho_0 \in \{0, +\infty\}, \eta \in \mathcal{V}}} \sup_{\substack{\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1 \\ \tau_0 \in \{0, +\infty\}, \xi \in U}} \left[-c(x, \xi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0=0\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0=+\infty\}} + \chi(x, \eta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0=0\}} \right. \\ & \left. + V^-(x + g_\xi(x, \xi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0=0\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0=+\infty\}} + g_\eta(x, \eta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0=0\}}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} V^-(x) = & \inf_{\substack{\theta_2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2 \\ \rho_0 \in \{0, +\infty\}}} \left[\inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{V}} \left[\chi(x, \eta) + V^-(x + g_\eta(x, \eta)) \right] \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0=0\}} \right. \\ & \left. + \sup_{\substack{\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1 \\ \tau_0 \in \{0, +\infty\}, \xi \in U}} \left[-c(x, \xi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0=0\}} + V^-(x + g_\xi(x, \xi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0=0\}}) \right] \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0=+\infty\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $V^-(x) < \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V^-(x)$, we get

$$V^-(x) = \sup_{\tau_0 \in \{0, +\infty\}, \xi \in U} \left[-c(x, \xi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0=0\}} + V^-(x + g_\xi(x, \xi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_0=0\}}) \right].$$

Therefore

$$V^-(x) \geq \sup_{\xi \in U} \left[V^-(x + g_\xi(x, \xi)) - c(x, \xi) \right],$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2. Assume H_b and H_f . Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that

$$H^-(x, \phi(x), D\phi(x)) = \gamma > 0,$$

then there exists $\beta^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$ a non-anticipative strategy for player $-\eta$ such that for all $(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}$ and $t > 0$ small enough,

$$\int_0^t \left\{ -\lambda \phi(y_x(s)) + D\phi(y_x(s)) \cdot b(y_x(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) + f(y_x(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \right\} \exp(-\lambda s) ds \leq \frac{-\gamma t}{4},$$

where, for $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $y_x(s) := y_x(s; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta^\gamma(\theta_1(\cdot), u))$ and $\beta^\gamma(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), v)$.

A similar result can be obtained for the upper Hamiltonian H^+ .

Proof. We give only the proof for H^- , similarly for H^+ . Following [3], let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t > 0$ and $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that

$$H^-(x, \phi(x), D\phi(x)) = \gamma > 0, \tag{13}$$

and define for $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(\theta_1(\cdot), \theta_2(\cdot)) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2$,

$$\Gamma(z; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) = \lambda \phi(z) - D\phi(z) \cdot b(z; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) - f(z; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)).$$

By (13) and the definition of lower Hamiltonian H^- we get

$$\inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \Gamma(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) = \gamma,$$

so for any $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ there exists $\theta_2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2$ such that $\Gamma(x; \theta_1(t), \theta_2(t)) \geq \gamma$. Since $\theta \rightarrow \Gamma(x; \theta, \theta_2(\cdot))$ is uniformly continuous in \mathbb{R}^l , we have in fact

$$\Gamma(x; \zeta(\cdot), \theta_2(\cdot)) \geq \frac{3\gamma}{4} \text{ for all } \zeta(\cdot) \in B_{r(\cdot)}(\theta_1(\cdot)) \cap \Theta_1,$$

where $B_{r(\cdot)}(\theta_1(\cdot))$ denotes the open ball of radius $r(\cdot) := r(\theta_1(\cdot)) > 0$ centered at $\theta_1(\cdot)$.

Without loss of generality, for κ a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^l and Θ_1 being κ -valued, there exist finitely many points $(\theta_1^1(\cdot), \theta_1^2(\cdot), \dots, \theta_1^n(\cdot))$ and $(r_1(\cdot), r_2(\cdot), \dots, r_n(\cdot))$ such that $\theta_1^i(\cdot) \subset \kappa$, $r_i(\cdot) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and

$$\Theta_1 \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n B_{r_i(\cdot)}(\theta_1^i(\cdot)),$$

where $r_i(\cdot) := r_i(\theta_1^i(\cdot)) > 0$, and for $\theta_2^i(\cdot) := \theta_2(\theta_1^i(\cdot)) \in \Theta_2$

$$\Gamma(x; \zeta(\cdot), \theta_2^i(\cdot)) \geq \frac{3\gamma}{4} \text{ for all } \zeta(\cdot) \in B_{r_i(\cdot)}(\theta_1^i(\cdot)) \cap \Theta_1.$$

Next, we define $\psi : \Theta_1 \rightarrow \Theta_2$ by

$$\psi(\theta_1(\cdot)) = \theta_2^k(\cdot) \text{ if } \theta_1(\cdot) \in B_{r_k(\cdot)}(\theta_1^k(\cdot)) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{k-1} B_{r_i(\cdot)}(\theta_1^i(\cdot)).$$

It is easy to prove that, for any $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$, $\psi(\theta_1(\cdot))$ is measurable, so we can define $\beta^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$, a non-anticipative strategy for *player* – η , by

$$\beta^\gamma(\theta_1(t), \cdot) := (\psi(\theta_1(t)), \cdot).$$

By definition of ψ

$$\Gamma\left(x, \theta_1(\cdot), \psi(\theta_1(\cdot))\right) \geq \frac{3\gamma}{4} \text{ for all } \theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1,$$

and by the continuity of Γ and Proposition 1 there exists $t > 0$ such that

$$\Gamma\left(y_x(s), \theta_1(s), \psi(\theta_1(s))\right) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \text{ for all } 0 \leq s \leq t \text{ and all } \theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1.$$

Finally we multiply both sides of the last inequality by $\exp(-\lambda s)$ and integrate from 0 to t to obtain the result for t small enough. \square

Hence, we can prove the existence result for the game studied in this paper, i.e., we are ready to give the viscosity characterization of the lower and upper HJBI QVIs (**L**) and (**U**):

Theorem 3. *Assume H_b, H_g, H_f and $H_{c,x}$. Then the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value** are viscosity solutions of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) and the upper HJBI QVI (**U**), respectively.*

Proof. We give only the proof for the lower HJBI QVI (**L**), similarly for the upper HJBI QVI (**U**). We first prove the sub-solution property. Let ϕ be a function in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $V^- - \phi$ achieves a local maximum at \bar{x} and $V^-(\bar{x}) = \phi(\bar{x})$. If $V^-(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V^-(\bar{x}) \leq 0$ there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, for $\varepsilon > 0$ we assume that $V^-(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V^-(\bar{x}) \geq \varepsilon > 0$, then we proceed by contradiction. Since, from Lemma 1, we have $V^-(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x V^-(\bar{x}) \leq 0$ we only need to assume that

$$H^-(\bar{x}, \phi(\bar{x}), D\phi(\bar{x})) = \gamma > 0,$$

then, by Lemma 2, one can find $\beta^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$ a non-anticipative strategy for *player* – η such that for all $\theta_1(\cdot) \in \Theta_1$ and $t > 0$ small enough

$$\int_0^t \left\{ -\lambda \phi(y_{\bar{x}}(s)) + D\phi(y_{\bar{x}}(s)) \cdot b(y_{\bar{x}}(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) + f(y_{\bar{x}}(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \right\} \exp(-\lambda s) ds \leq \frac{-\gamma t}{4},$$

where, for $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $y_{\bar{x}}(s) := y_{\bar{x}}\left(s; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta^\gamma(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right)$ and

$$\beta^\gamma(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), v),$$

thus,

$$\int_0^t f(y_{\bar{x}}(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \exp(-\lambda s) ds + \exp(-\lambda t) \phi(y_{\bar{x}}(t)) - \phi(\bar{x}) \leq \frac{-\gamma t}{4}. \quad (14)$$

Since $V^- - \phi$ has a local maximum at \bar{x} and $V^-(\bar{x}) = \phi(\bar{x})$ we have, for t small enough,

$$\|y_{\bar{x}}(t) - \bar{x}\| \rightarrow 0,$$

which gives

$$\exp(-\lambda t) \phi(y_{\bar{x}}(t)) - \phi(\bar{x}) \geq \exp(-\lambda t) V^-(y_{\bar{x}}(t)) - V^-(\bar{x}).$$

By plugging this into (14) we obtain, for $\beta(\theta_1(\cdot)) \equiv \theta_2(\cdot)$ and $t = T$ small enough,

$$\inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \int_0^T f(y_{\bar{x}}(t); \theta_1(t), \beta(\theta_1(t))) \exp(-\lambda t) dt + V^- \left(y_{\bar{x}} \left(T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \right) \right) \exp(-\lambda T) \right\} - V^-(\bar{x}) \leq \frac{-\gamma T}{4} < 0.$$

Which, without loss of generality when $T < \tau_0 \wedge \rho_0$, is a contradiction to the DPP (2), then V^- is a viscosity sub-solution of the lower HJBI QVI (L).

Next, we show the super-solution property. Let ϕ be a function in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $V^- - \phi$ achieves a local minimum in $B_\delta(\underline{x})$, where $B_\delta(\underline{x})$ is the open ball of center \underline{x} and radius $\delta > 0$, and $V^-(\underline{x}) = \phi(\underline{x})$. Now we suppose, for $\varepsilon > 0$, that $V^-(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V^-(\underline{x}) < \varepsilon < 0$. Then, without loss of generality, we can assume that $V^-(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V^-(\underline{x}) < \varepsilon < 0$ on $B_\delta(\underline{x})$, then from Lemma 1 we deduce $V^-(\underline{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V^-(\underline{x}) \geq 0$. Next, we define

$$t' = \inf \{ t \geq 0 : y_{\underline{x}}(t) \notin B_\delta(\underline{x}) \}.$$

We let $0 < t \leq t'$ and we proceed by contradiction. Assuming that

$$H^-(\underline{x}, \phi(\underline{x}), D\phi(\underline{x})) = -\gamma < 0,$$

then, by the definition of H^- , one can find $\alpha^\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ a non-anticipative strategy for *player* $-\xi$ such that, for all $\theta_2(\cdot) \in \Theta_2$,

$$\lambda \phi(\underline{x}) - D\phi(\underline{x}) \cdot b(\underline{x}; \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) - f(\underline{x}; \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \leq -\gamma,$$

where, for $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and any $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\alpha^\gamma(\theta_2(\cdot), v) := (\theta_1(\cdot), u),$$

thus, for t small enough and any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\lambda \phi(y_{\underline{x}}(s)) - D\phi(y_{\underline{x}}(s)) \cdot b(y_{\underline{x}}(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) - f(y_{\underline{x}}(s); \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \leq \frac{-\gamma}{2},$$

where, $0 \leq s \leq t$ and for $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $y_{\underline{x}}(s) := y_{\underline{x}}(s; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u))$ and

$$\beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u) := (\theta_2(\cdot), v).$$

Now we multiply both sides of the last inequality by $\exp(-\lambda s)$ and integrate from 0 to t to obtain

$$\phi(\underline{x}) - \exp(-\lambda t) \phi(y_{\underline{x}}(t)) - \int_0^t f(y_{\underline{x}}; \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \exp(-\lambda s) ds \leq \frac{-\gamma t}{4}. \quad (15)$$

Since $V^- - \phi$ has a local minimum at \underline{x} and $V^-(\underline{x}) = \phi(\underline{x})$ we have for t small enough

$$\|y_{\underline{x}}(t) - \underline{x}\| \rightarrow 0,$$

which gives

$$\exp(-\lambda t) \phi(y_{\underline{x}}(t)) - \phi(\underline{x}) \leq \exp(-\lambda t) V^-(y_{\underline{x}}(t)) - V^-(\underline{x}),$$

thus

$$\exp(-\lambda t)V^-(y_{\underline{x}}(t)) + \int_0^t f(y_{\underline{x}}; \theta_1(s), \theta_2(s)) \exp(-\lambda s) ds \geq \frac{\gamma t}{2} + V^-(\underline{x}).$$

By plugging this into (15), for $\beta(\theta_1(\cdot)) \equiv \theta_2(\cdot)$ and $t = T$ small enough, we obtain

$$\inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{(\theta_1(\cdot), u) \in \Theta_1 \times \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \int_0^T f(y_{\underline{x}}(t); \theta_1(t), \beta(\theta_1(t))) \exp(-\lambda t) dt + V^-\left(y_{\underline{x}}\left(T; \theta_1(\cdot), u, \beta(\theta_1(\cdot), u)\right)\right) \exp(-\lambda T) \right\} - V^-(\underline{x}) > 0.$$

Which, without loss of generality when $T < \tau_0 \wedge \rho_0$, is a contradiction to the DPP (2), then V^- is a viscosity super-solution of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**). The proof is now complete. \square

Now, analogously we can introduce the two following HJBI QVIs related, respectively, to the lower Hamiltonian H^- and the upper Hamiltonian H^+ :

$$\max \left\{ \min \left[H^-(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(x) \right\} = 0, \quad (\mathbf{L}_{\max})$$

and

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H^+(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right\} = 0 \quad (\mathbf{U}_{\min})$$

Similarly, we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4. Assume H_b , H_g , H_f and $H_{c,\mathcal{X}}$. Then the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value** are viscosity solutions of the HJBI QVI (\mathbf{L}_{\max}) and the upper HJBI QVI (\mathbf{U}_{\min}), respectively.

4 Uniqueness of the Viscosity Solution

In this section we prove the main result of the paper, namely uniqueness. First, in Proposition 3, we give a new formulation of the definition of viscosity solution for the HJBI QVIs (**L**) and (**U**), which, combined with Lemma 3 bellow, will be useful to prove the comparison result (Theorem 5 hereafter). Next, we conclude in Corollary 2.

Proposition 3. (Viscosity Solution) A continuous function V in \mathbb{R}^n is a viscosity solution of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) (resp. upper HJBI QVI (**U**)) if and only if the two following properties hold:

- (i) Viscosity sub-solution: For any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any function $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $V(\bar{x}) = \phi(\bar{x})$ and \bar{x} is a local maximum point of $V - \phi$, we have:

$$\lambda V(\bar{x}) \leq \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ D\phi(\bar{x}) \cdot b(\bar{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(\bar{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} + j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V(\bar{x}) \right] + i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\bar{x}) \right\}$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } \lambda V(\bar{x}) \leq \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ D\phi(\bar{x}) \cdot b(\bar{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(\bar{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} + j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\bar{x}) \right] + i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X V(\bar{x}) \right\} \right).$$

(ii) Viscosity super-solution: For any $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any function $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $V(\underline{x}) = \phi(\underline{x})$ and \underline{x} is a local minimum point of $V - \phi$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda V(\underline{x}) &\geq \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ D\phi(\underline{x}).b(\underline{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(\underline{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + j\lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x V(\underline{x}) \right] + i\lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\underline{x}) \right\} \\ \left(\text{resp. } \lambda V(\underline{x}) &\geq \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ D\phi(\underline{x}).b(\underline{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(\underline{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + j\lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c V(\underline{x}) \right] + i\lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x V(\underline{x}) \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We give only the proof for the lower HJBI QVI (**L**), similarly for the upper HJBI QVI (**U**). For any positive numbers a, b, a' and b' , solving a QVI of the form

$$\min \left\{ \max[A, B], C \right\} = 0$$

is equivalent to solve the following equation

$$\min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i)a \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j)a' A + jb' B \right] + ibC \right\} = 0. \quad (16)$$

The same for the inequalities

$$\min \left\{ \max[A, B], C \right\} \leq 0 \text{ and } \min \left\{ \max[A, B], C \right\} \geq 0.$$

We use (16), for $a = a' = 1$ and $b = b' = \lambda$, to rewrite the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ \lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + j\lambda(v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x)) \right] + i\lambda(v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x)) \right\} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where v being a continuous function in \mathbb{R}^n and x an element of \mathbb{R}^n .

We then get

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[\lambda v(x) - j\lambda v(x) + (1-j) \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ -Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + j\lambda(v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x)) \right] + i\lambda(v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x)) \right\} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[\lambda v(x) - (1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - j\lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) \right] + i\lambda(v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x)) \right\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we deduce

$$\max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[-\lambda v(x) + (1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)\} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + j\lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) \right] - i\lambda(v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x)) \right\} = 0,$$

thus

$$\max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ -\lambda v(x) + (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)\} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + j\lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) \right] + i\lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right\} = 0.$$

Finally we deduce the following expression of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**)

$$\lambda v(x) = \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) + f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2)\} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + j\lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^x v(x) \right] + i\lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(x) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

which, using the definition of viscosity solution for (17), completes the proof. \square

Next, we prove the following useful lemma:

Lemma 3. *If a continuous function v is a viscosity solution to the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) (resp. upper HJBI QVI (**U**)) then for any $0 < \mu < 1$, μv is a viscosity solution to the following QVI:*

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H_{\mu}^{-}(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{x, \mu} v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} v(x) \right\} = 0 \\ \left(\text{resp. } \max \left\{ \min \left[H_{\mu}^{+}(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{x, \mu} v(x) \right\} = 0 \right),$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{x, \mu} v(x) := \inf_{\eta \in V} \left[v(x + g_{\eta}(x, \eta)) + \mu \chi(x, \eta) \right],$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} v(x) := \sup_{\xi \in U} \left[v(x + g_{\xi}(x, \xi)) - \mu c(x, \xi) \right],$$

and

$$H_{\mu}^{-}(x, v(x), Dv(x)) := \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left(\lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - \mu f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right)$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } H_{\mu}^{+}(x, v(x), Dv(x)) := \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left(\lambda v(x) - Dv(x).b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) - \mu f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right) \right).$$

Proof. We give only the proof for the lower HJBI QVI (**L**), similarly for the upper HJBI QVI (**U**). Let v be a continuous viscosity solution of QVI (**L**), ϕ_{μ} be a function in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a local maximum point of $\mu v - \phi_{\mu}$ where $\mu v(\bar{x}) = \phi_{\mu}(\bar{x})$. Then, for all $x \in B_{\delta}(\bar{x})$ the open ball of radius δ centered at \bar{x} , since $0 < \mu < 1$, we get that

$$v(x) - \frac{\phi_{\mu}(x)}{\mu} \leq v(\bar{x}) - \frac{\phi_{\mu}(\bar{x})}{\mu},$$

which means that \bar{x} is a local maximum point of $v - \phi$, where $\phi := \phi_\mu/\mu$. Since v is a viscosity solution of QVI (**L**), we can get, either $v(\bar{x}) \leq \inf_{\eta \in V} \left[v(\bar{x} + g_\eta(\bar{x}, \eta)) + \chi(\bar{x}, \eta) \right]$, then from assumption $H_{c,\chi}$ and the fact that $0 < \mu < 1$, we deduce $\mu v(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi,\mu} \mu v(\bar{x}) \leq 0$. In addition, we get $H^-(\bar{x}, v(\bar{x}), D\phi(\bar{x})) \leq 0$, with $0 < \mu < 1$ yields to

$$\inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} (\lambda \mu v(\bar{x}) - D\phi_\mu(\bar{x}) \cdot b(\bar{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2) - \mu f(\bar{x}; \theta_1, \theta_2)) \leq 0.$$

Or, from the fact that v is a viscosity solution of QVI (**L**), we get $v(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(\bar{x}) \leq 0$, which gives $\mu v(\bar{x}) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu} \mu v(\bar{x}) \leq 0$ for $0 < \mu < 1$. Hence we obtain that μv is a viscosity sub-solution of

$$\min \left\{ \max \left[H_\mu^-(x, v(x), Dv(x)), v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi,\mu} v(x) \right], v(x) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu} v(x) \right\} = 0,$$

we then use, for the viscosity super-solution sense, the same reasoning than above to complete the proof. \square

Now we are ready to establish the following comparison theorem which leads us to the uniqueness result for the HJBI QVIs (**L**) and (**U**):

Theorem 5. (*Comparison theorem*) Assume H_b , H_g , H_f and $H_{c,\chi}$. If u is a bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity sub-solution of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) and v is a bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity super-solution of the lower HJBI QVI (**L**), then for all x in \mathbb{R}^n we have $u(x) \leq v(x)$. The same result holds true for the upper HJBI QVI (**U**).

Proof. This proof is inspired from [6, 23]. We give only the proof for the lower HJBI QVI (**L**), similarly for the upper HJBI QVI (**U**). Let u and v be, respectively, a bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity sub-solution and super-solution to the lower HJBI QVI (**L**). For all $0 < \mu < 1$, applying Proposition 3 and Lemma 3, we get that μu is a viscosity sub-solution to the following QVI:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda V(x) = \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \{ DV(x) \cdot b(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) + \mu f(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) \} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi,\mu} V(x) \right] + i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu} V(x) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi,\mu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu}$ are defined as in Lemma 3 and $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Let us assume that $M = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (u(x) - v(x)) > 0$, if it is not the case, i.e., $M \leq 0$, then the proof is finished. Then, if $\|u\|_\infty = 0$ we have

$$M_\mu = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\mu u(x) - v(x)) > 0,$$

otherwise, it suffice to let $1 - M/2\|u\|_\infty \leq \mu < 1$ to get that $M_\mu > 0$. The proof will now be divided into three steps:

Step 1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and consider for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the following test function:

$$\psi_{\mu,\varepsilon,\beta}(x, y) = \mu u(x) - v(y) - \frac{\|x - y\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} - \beta(\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2).$$

Let (x_m, y_m) be a maximum point of $\psi_{\mu, \varepsilon, \beta}$ which exists, since this is a continuous function going to infinity when x or y does, and denote

$$M_{\psi_{\mu, \varepsilon, \beta}} = \psi_{\mu, \varepsilon, \beta}(x_m, y_m).$$

By definition of (x_m, y_m) we have for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mu u(x_m) - v(y_m) - \frac{\|x_m - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} - \beta(\|x_m\|^2 + \|y_m\|^2) \geq \mu u(x) - v(y) - \frac{\|x - y\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} - \beta(\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2). \quad (19)$$

- Firstly, we use (19) with $y = y_m$ to get that x_m is a maximal point of $\mu u(x) - \phi_u(x)$, where

$$\phi_u(x) = \frac{\|x - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} + \beta\|x\|^2,$$

then, since μu is viscosity sub-solution of (18), we get

$$\lambda \mu u(x_m) \leq \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{2\|x_m - y_m\|}{\varepsilon^2} + 2\beta x_m, b(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\rangle + \mu f(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\} + j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u(x_m) \right] + i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} \mu u(x_m) \right\}. \quad (20)$$

- Secondly, we use (19) with $x = x_m$ to get that y_m is a minimal point of $v(y) - \phi_v(y)$, where

$$\phi_v(y) = -\frac{\|x_m - y\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} - \beta\|y\|^2,$$

then, since v is viscosity super-solution of lower HJBI QVI (L), by applying Proposition 3 we get

$$\lambda v(y_m) \geq \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{2\|x_m - y_m\|}{\varepsilon^2} - 2\beta y_m, b(y_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\rangle + f(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\} + j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi} v(y_m) \right] + i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(y_m) \right\}. \quad (21)$$

Hence, using inequalities (20) and (21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \left(\mu u(x_m) - v(y_m) \right) &\leq \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \min_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \inf_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{2\|x_m - y_m\|}{\varepsilon^2} + 2\beta x_m, \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. b(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\rangle + \mu f(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\} + j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u(x_m) \right] + i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} \mu u(x_m) \right\} \\ &\quad + \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left\{ -\left\langle \frac{2\|x_m - y_m\|}{\varepsilon^2} - 2\beta y_m, \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. b(y_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\rangle - f(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\} - j \lambda \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi} v(y_m) \right] - i \lambda \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(y_m) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mu u(x_m) - v(y_m)) &\leq \min_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ (1-i) \max_{j \in \{0,1\}} \left[(1-j) \inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \sup_{\theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^l} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{2\|x_m - y_m\|}{\varepsilon^2}, \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. b(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) - b(y_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\rangle + 2\beta \langle x_m, b(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \rangle + 2\beta \langle y_m, b(y_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \mu f(x_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) - f(y_m; \theta_1, \theta_2) \right\} + j\lambda(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u(x_m) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi} v(y_m)) \right] \\ &\quad \left. + i\lambda(\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} \mu u(x_m) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v(y_m)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mu u(x_m) - v(y_m)) &\leq \min \left\{ \max \left[2C_b \frac{\|x_m - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} + 2\beta \|b\|_{\infty} (\|x_m\| + \|y_m\|) + (1-\mu) \|f\|_{\infty}, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \lambda \left(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u(x_m) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u(y_m) + \|(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi} v)^+\|_{\infty} \right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \lambda \left(\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} \mu u(x_m) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} \mu u(y_m) + \|(\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c, \mu} \mu u - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v)^+\|_{\infty} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

In the last two steps we investigate the equation in the right-hand side of (22), step 2 is devoted to the first term of the equation whereas step 3 concerns the obstacles.

Step 2. We will prove, in the following, that

$$\forall \eta > 0, \exists \varepsilon_0 > 0, \beta_0 > 0, \forall \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0, \beta \leq \beta_0 : \frac{\|x_m - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} + \beta(\|x_m\|^2 + \|y_m\|^2) \leq \eta. \quad (23)$$

We use inequality (19) for $x = y$ then

$$M_{\psi_{\mu, \varepsilon, \beta}} \geq \mu u(x) - v(x) - 2\beta \|x\|^2,$$

and we let $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\mu u(x) - v(x))$ be reached, within $\delta > 0$ arbitrary small, in a point x^* ,

$$\mu u(x^*) - v(x^*) \geq M_{\mu} - \delta.$$

We choose δ and β such that $M_{\mu} - \delta - 2\beta \|x^*\|^2 > 0$, which is possible since x^* depends only on δ . Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\psi_{\mu, \varepsilon, \beta}} &\geq \mu u(x^*) - v(x^*) - 2\beta \|x^*\|^2 \\ &\geq M_{\mu} - \delta - 2\beta \|x^*\|^2 \\ &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Let $r^2 = \mu \|u\|_{\infty} + \|v\|_{\infty}$, then

$$\|u\|_{\infty} \leq M_{\psi_{\mu, \varepsilon, \beta}} \leq r^2 - \frac{\|x_m - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} - \beta(\|x_m\|^2 + \|y_m\|^2),$$

it follows that

$$\|x_m - y_m\| \leq r\varepsilon. \quad (25)$$

Therefore we introduce the following increasing function:

$$m(w) = \sup_{\|x-y\| \leq w} |v(x) - v(y)|,$$

then, combining with (25), we obtain

$$\mu u(x_m) - v(y_m) = \mu u(x_m) - v(x_m) + v(x_m) - v(y_m) \leq M_\mu + m(r\varepsilon).$$

From the definition of $M_{\psi_{\mu,\varepsilon,\beta}}$ and (24) we get

$$M_\mu - \delta - 2\beta\|x^*\|^2 \leq M_{\psi_{\mu,\varepsilon,\beta}} \leq M_\mu + m(r\varepsilon) - \frac{\|x_m - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} - \beta(\|x_m\|^2 + \|y_m\|^2),$$

then

$$\frac{\|x_m - y_m\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} + \beta(\|x_m\|^2 + \|y_m\|^2) \leq \delta + 2\beta\|x^*\|^2 + m(r\varepsilon).$$

Now we choose $\eta < 4M_\mu/3$ and we take $\delta = \eta/4$ and $\beta_0 = 1$ if $\|x^*\| = 0$, $\beta_0 = \varepsilon/4\|x^*\|^2$ if $\|x^*\| \neq 0$, to get (23), the desired inequality.

We also get for any $\beta \leq \beta_0$,

$$0 < M_\mu - \frac{3\eta}{4} \leq M_\mu - \delta - 2\beta\|x^*\|^2 \leq M_{\psi_{\mu,\varepsilon,\beta}} \leq \mu u(x_m) - v(y_m). \quad (26)$$

Step 3. We deduce the contradiction. By (23), for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $\beta \leq \beta_0$ we have

$$2C_b\|x_m - y_m\|^2/\varepsilon^2 \leq 2C_b\eta, \quad \beta\|x_m\| \leq \sqrt{\beta\eta} \text{ and } \beta\|y_m\| \leq \sqrt{\beta\eta}.$$

Then, for all $\beta \leq \beta_1 = \min\{\beta_0, \eta/\|b\|_\infty^2\}$, we get $2\beta\|b\|_\infty(\|x_m\| + \|y_m\|) \leq 4\eta$. Moreover, for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1 = \min\{\varepsilon_0, \sqrt{\eta}/C_f\}$, we have $C_f(\|x_m - y_m\|) \leq \eta$.

By Proposition 2, $\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{X,\mu}\mu u$ and $\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu}\mu u$ are uniformly continuous, then, tacking into account (25), we find $\varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$ such that for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_2$,

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{X,\mu}\mu u(x_m) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{X,\mu}\mu u(y_m) \leq \eta \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu}\mu u(x_m) - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu}\mu u(y_m) \leq \eta.$$

Thus, tacking into account (22), we get for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_2$ and $\beta \leq \beta_1$,

$$\lambda(\mu u(x_m) - v(y_m)) \leq \min \left\{ \max \left[(1-\mu)\|f\|_\infty, \lambda\|(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{X,\mu}\mu u - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v)^+\|_\infty \right], \right. \\ \left. \lambda\|(\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu}\mu u - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v)^+\|_\infty \right\} + (5 + 2C_b + \lambda)\eta,$$

using (26) and the fact that η is arbitrary we deduce

$$\lambda\|(\mu u - v)^+\|_\infty \leq \min \left\{ \max \left[(1-\mu)\|f\|_\infty, \lambda\|(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{X,\mu}\mu u - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v)^+\|_\infty \right], \right. \\ \left. \lambda\|(\mathcal{H}_{sup}^{c,\mu}\mu u - \mathcal{H}_{sup}^c v)^+\|_\infty \right\},$$

thus

$$\lambda\|(\mu u - v)^+\|_\infty \leq \max \left[(1-\mu)\|f\|_\infty, \lambda\|(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{X,\mu}\mu u - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^X v)^+\|_\infty \right]. \quad (27)$$

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

$$\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u(x) - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi} v(x) \leq \sup_{\eta \in V} \left(\mu u(x + g_{\eta}(x, \eta)) - v(x + g_{\eta}(x, \eta)) \right) + \sup_{\eta \in V} ((\mu - 1)\chi(x, \eta)). \quad (28)$$

We recall that from assumption $H_{c, \chi}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\eta \in V$, $\chi(x, \eta) > 0$. Then, since $0 < \mu < 1$, from (28) we get

$$\|(\mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi, \mu} \mu u - \mathcal{H}_{inf}^{\chi} v)^+\|_{\infty} < \|(\mu u - v)^+\|_{\infty}.$$

Therefore (27) and the last inequality imply

$$\lambda \|(\mu u - v)^+\|_{\infty} \leq (1 - \mu) \|f\|_{\infty}.$$

Finally, by letting $\mu \rightarrow 1$ and since f is bounded, we obtain $\|(u - v)^+\|_{\infty} \leq 0$, which leads us to a contradiction and gives the desired comparison, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(x) \leq v(x)$. \square

Corollary 1. *Under assumptions H_b , H_g , H_f and $H_{c, \chi}$, the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) has a unique bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity solution. The same result holds true for the upper HJBI QVI (**U**) and the HJBI QVIs (**L**_{max}) and (**U**_{min}).*

Proof. Assume that v_1 and v_2 are two viscosity solutions to the lower HJBI QVI (**L**). We first use v_1 as a bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity sub-solution and v_2 as a bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity super-solution and we recall the comparison theorem. Then we change the role of v_1 and v_2 to get $v_1(x) = v_2(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

Next, in the following we give the uniqueness result for the game studied in this paper:

Theorem 6. *Assume H_b , H_g , H_f , $H_{c, \chi}$ and Isaacs Condition $H^- = H^+$. Both the lower and upper HJBI QVIs (**L**) and (**U**) admit the value function (**Value**) as the unique bounded and uniformly continuous viscosity solution.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Theorem 3, Theorem 4 and Corollary 1 because (**L**) and (**U**) coincide with (**U**_{min}) and (**L**_{max}), respectively, if $H^- = H^+$. \square

Corollary 2. *Under assumptions H_b , H_g , H_f , $H_{c, \chi}$ and Isaacs Condition $H^- = H^+$, the **Lower Value** and **Upper Value** coincide and the value function (**Value**) $V := V^- = V^+$ of the infinite horizon zero-sum, deterministic differential game involving continuous-impulse controls is the unique viscosity solution to the lower HJBI QVI (**L**) (or, upper HJBI QVI (**U**)).*

References

- [1] P. Azimzadeh, Zero-sum stochastic differential game with impulses, precommitment and unrestricted cost functions. Appl. Math. Optim., 1-32 (2017).
- [2] N. Barron, L.C. Evans and R. Jensen, Viscosity solutions of Isaacs' equations and differential games with Lipschitz controls. J. Diff. Eqns., **53**, 213-233 (1984).
- [3] M. Bardi and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Birkhäuser, Boston (1997).
- [4] G. Barles, Deterministic impulse control problems. SIAM J. Control Optim., **23**, 419-432 (1985).

- [5] G. Barles, Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi. Collection SMAI, Springer-Verlag Berlin (1994).
- [6] G. Barles, P. Bernhard and N. El Farouq, Deterministic minimax impulse control. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, **61**, 353-378 (2010) DOI: 10.1007/s00245-009-9090-0.
- [7] G. Barles, S. Dharmatti and M. Ramaswamy, Unbounded viscosity solutions of hybrid control systems. *ESAIM: COCV*, **16**, 176-193 (2010) DOI: 10.1051/cocv/2008076.
- [8] A. Bensoussan and J.L. Lions, Impulse control and quasi-variational inequalities. Bordes, Paris (1984).
- [9] P. Bettiol, M. Quincampoix and R.B. Vinter, Existence and characterization of the values of two player differential games with state constraints. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, **80**, 765-799 (2019) DOI: 10.1007/s00245-019-09608-8.
- [10] V.G. Boltyanskii, R.V. Gamkrelidze, E.F. Mishchenko and L.S. Pontryagin, The mathematical theory of optimal processes. Interscience, New York (1962).
- [11] A. Cosso, Stochastic differential games involving impulse controls and double-obstacle quasi-variational inequalities. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **51**(3), 2102-2131 (2013).
- [12] M.G. Crandall and P.L. Lions, Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **277**, 1-42 (1983).
- [13] M.G. Crandall, L.C. Evans and P.L. Lions, Some properties of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **282**, 487-502 (1984).
- [14] M. Crandall, H. Ishii and P.L. Lions, Users guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **27**, 1-67 (1992).
- [15] S. Dharmatti and M. Ramaswamy, Hybrid control systems and viscosity solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **44**(4), 1259-1288 (2005).
- [16] S. Dharmatti and A.J. Shaiju, Differential games with continuous, switching and impulse controls. *Nonlinear Anal.*, **63**, 23-41 (2005).
- [17] S. Dharmatti and M. Ramaswamy, Zero-sum differential games involving hybrid controls. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **128**, 75-102 (2006).
- [18] S. Dharmatti and A.J. Shaiju, Infinite dimensional differential games with hybrid controls. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math.*, **117**, 233-257 (2007).
- [19] S. Dharmatti, R. Mallikarjuna and K.G. Mrinal, Differential games of mixed type with control and stopping times. *Nonlinear Diff. Equ. Appl.*, **16**, 143-158 (2009).
- [20] B. El Asri, Deterministic minimax impulse control in finite horizon: the viscosity solution approach. *ESAIM: Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, **19**, 63-77 (2013) DOI: 10.1051/cocv/2011200.
- [21] B. EL Asri and S. Mazid, Zero-sum stochastic differential game in finite horizon involving impulse controls. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 1-33 (2018).

- [22] B. El Asri, H. Lalioui and S. Mazid, A zero-sum deterministic impulse controls game in infinite horizon with a new HJBI QVI. Preprint, arXiv:2101.11669 [math.OC] (2021).
- [23] N. El Farouq, Deterministic impulse control problems: Two discrete approximations of the quasi-variational inequality. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, **309**, 200-218 (2017).
- [24] R.J. Elliott and N.J. Kalton, The existence of value in differential games. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **126** (1972).
- [25] R.J. Elliott and N.J. Kalton, Cauchy problems for certain Isaacs-Bellman equations and games of survival. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **198**, 45-72 (1974).
- [26] L.C. Evans and P.E. Souganidis, Differential games and representation formulas for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **33**(5), 773-797 (1984).
- [27] R. Isaacs, *Differential games. A mathematical theory with applications to warfare and pursuit, control and optimization.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney (1965).
- [28] P.L. Lions, *Generalized solution of Hamilton-Jacobi equations.* Pitman, Boston (1982).
- [29] P.E. Souganidis, Approximation schemes for viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *J. Diff. Eqns.*, **57**, 1-43 (1985).
- [30] P.E. Souganidis, Approximation schemes for viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with applications to differential games. *J. Non. Anal., TMA* **9**, 217-257 (1985).
- [31] J.M. Yong, Systems governed by ordinary differential equations with continuous, switching and impulse controls. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, **20**, 223-235 (1989).
- [32] J.M. Yong, Differential games with switching strategies. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **145**, 455-469 (1990).
- [33] J.M. Yong, A zero-sum differential game in a finite duration with switching strategies. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **28**, 1234-1250 (1990).
- [34] J.M. Yong, Zero-sum differential games involving impulse controls. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, **29**, 243-261 (1994).