

Social Optima of Linear Forward-Backward Stochastic System*

Guangchen Wang[†] Shujun Wang[‡] Jie Xiong[§]

Abstract

A linear quadratic (LQ) stochastic optimization system involving large population, which is driven by *forward-backward stochastic differential equation (FBSDE)*, is investigated in this paper. Agents cooperate with each other to minimize the so-called social objective, which is rather different from mean field (MF) game. Employing forward-backward person-by-person optimality principle, we derive an auxiliary LQ control problem by decentralized information. A decentralized strategy is obtained by virtue of an MF-type forward-backward stochastic differential equation consistency condition. Applying *Riccati equation* decoupling method, we solve the consistency condition system. We also verify the asymptotic social optimality in this framework.

Key words: Forward-backward stochastic differential equation, Riccati equation, social optima, mean field game.

AMS subject classification: 91A07, 91A15, 93E03, 93E20

1 Introduction

In this section, we first present some notation and introduce the main motivations of this work. Then a *forward-backward stochastic LQ MF social optima problem* is posed, which will be investigated in this paper.

1.1 Notation

For $T > 0$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space, on which a N -dimensional standard Brownian motion $\{W_i(t), 1 \leq i \leq N\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is defined. $W(t) := (W_1(t), \dots, W_N(t))^T$. Let $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in [0, T]\}$ denote the filtration generated by $\{W_i(s), \xi_i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ and augmented by $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{P}}$ (which is the class of all $\mathbb{P}$ -null sets of $\mathcal{F}$). Let $\mathcal{F}_t^i$ denote the augmentation of $\sigma\{W_i(s), \xi_i, 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ by $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{P}}, 1 \leq i \leq N$. Here, $\xi_i, 1 \leq i \leq N$ are initial values of states which will be defined later.

In this paper, the Euclidean inner product is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. A^T stands for the transpose of a matrix (or vector) A . Let $\mathbb{S}^n$ denote the set of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices. If $A \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is positive (semi) definite, we write $A > (\geq) 0$. We write $A \gg 0$, if $M - \epsilon I \geq 0$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. We introduce the following spaces:

- $L_{\mathcal{F}}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ \zeta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid \zeta \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-measurable and } \mathbb{E}|\zeta|^2 < \infty \right\};$
- $L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ \zeta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid \zeta \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-measurable and uniformly bounded} \right\};$
- $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)) := \left\{ \zeta(\cdot) : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid \zeta(\cdot) \text{ is continuous and } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-adapted satisfying } \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\zeta(s)|^2 \right] < \infty \right\};$

*This work was firstly completed in May 2021, and we arrive the current version after many revisions. The first author was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1006103), the NSFC for Distinguished Young Scholars (No. 61925306), the NSFC (No. 11831010), and the NSF of Shandong Province (Nos. ZR2020ZD24 and ZR2019ZD42). The second author was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China (Nos. 2022YFA1006104, 2023YFA1009203), the Taishan Scholars Young Program of Shandong (No. TSQN202211032) and the Young Scholars Program of Shandong University. The third author was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1006102), and the NSFC (No. 11831010).

[†]School of Control Science and Engineering, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong 250061, China (wguangchen@sdu.edu.cn).

[‡]Corresponding author. School of Management, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong 250100, China (wangshujun@sdu.edu.cn).

[§]Department of Mathematics and SUSTech International Center for Mathematics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, Guangdong 518055, China (xiongjie@sustech.edu.cn).

- $L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ \zeta(\cdot) : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid \zeta(\cdot) \text{ is an } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-progressively measurable process satisfying } \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\zeta(s)|^2 ds < \infty \right\};$
- $L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ \zeta(\cdot) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid \int_0^T |\zeta(s)|^2 ds < \infty \right\};$
- $L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}) := \left\{ \zeta(\cdot) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \mid \zeta(\cdot) \text{ is uniformly bounded} \right\}.$

1.2 Motivation

Consider a controlled large population (also called multi-agent) system in which the dynamic of the agent $\mathcal{A}_i$ is modelled by a stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = b(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t))dt + \sigma(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t))dW_i(t), \\ X_i(0) = x_{i0}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

with cost functional

$$\mathcal{J}_i(x_{i0}, u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T L(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t))dt + \Phi(x_{i0}, X_i(T)) \right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $X^{(N)}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i(\cdot)$ denotes the state-average of agents; $u(\cdot) = (u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot))$, $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i := \left\{ u_i(\cdot) \mid u_i(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \right\}$, $x_{i0} \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Define

$$\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u(\cdot)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{J}_i(x_{i0}, u(\cdot))$$

as the aggregated functional of N agents. Then we can pose a classical MF optimal control problem.

Problem 0. Find a strategy $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_N)$ where $\bar{u}_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\bar{u}(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i, 1 \leq i \leq N} \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_i(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot)). \quad (1.3)$$

In recent years, the large population system has been extensively discussed due to its wide applications in many areas, such as social science, engineering, economics, etc. In this structure, we should point out that each individual agent seems to be negligible, however we cannot ignore the effects of the statistical behaviors. Readers may refer to [4], [5], [6], [14], [19], [23], [24], [33] and the references therein for MF game study. Contrast to the aforementioned works where the agents are competitive, cooperative team optimization problem has attracted a lot of attentions in last ten years, which is the so-called *social optima problem*. In [17] authors investigated social optima in mean field LQG control and provided an asymptotic team-optimal solution. [2] focused on team-optimal control with finite population and partial information. [13] investigated the homogeneity, heterogeneity and quasi-exchangeability of forward mean-field team. [35] studied a mean field social optimal problem in which a Markov jump parameter appears as a common source of randomness for all agents. For more literature, one can refer to [30] for dynamic collective choice by finding a social optimum, [25] for social optima in economic models subject to idiosyncratic shocks, [32] for reinforcement learning algorithms for mean field teams, [18] for major and minor study of social optima problem, [31] for stochastic dynamic teams and their mean field limit, [36] for uniform stabilization of mean field linear quadratic control, [15] for volatility uncertainty problem, etc. For more researches and applications readers can be referred to [3], [7], [29], [34] and the references therein.

It is well known that objective expectation $\mathbb{E}$ partially represents people's preference. Alternatively, we apply the so-called *generalized expectation* which seems to be subjective in some sense. Based on the theory of backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE), [27] introduced the so-called g -expectation (nonlinear expectation), which is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_g$. Replacing $\mathbb{E}$ by $\mathcal{E}_g$ in (1.2), we obtain an extension of **Problem 0**, which may be considered as nonlinear preferences. In details, let $g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{1+N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a given map, $\eta_i \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, and $Y_i(\cdot)$ satisfy the BSDE

$$dY_i(t) = g(t, Y_i(t), Z_i(t))dt + Z_i(t)dW(t), \quad Y_i(T) = \eta_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N. \quad (1.4)$$

Define $\mathcal{E}_g[\eta_i] := Y_i(0; \eta_i)$, $\eta_i \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. $\mathcal{E}_g[\eta_i]$ is called the g -expectation of η_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$, if $g(t, y, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$ holds for $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, a.s. ([27, 40]). In fact, g -expectation is related to *stochastic differential utility* introduced in [10]. According to [10], we regard $Y_i(\cdot)$ as the *stochastic differential utility process* of η_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$ with the so-called aggregator $g(\cdot)$. In this case, the operator $\mathcal{E}_g : L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ possesses most properties of $\mathbb{E}$ except the linearity. By virtue of the above theory, we replace (1.2) by

$$\mathcal{J}_g^i(x_{i0}, u(\cdot)) = \mathcal{E}_g \left\{ \int_0^T L(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t)) dt + \Phi(x_{i0}, X_i(T)) \right\} = Y_i(0), \quad (1.5)$$

with $(Y_i(t), Z_i(t))$ being the unique adapted solution of BSDE

$$\begin{cases} dY_i(t) = g(t, Y_i(t), Z_i(t)) dt + Z_i(t) dW(t), \\ Y_i(T) = \int_0^T L(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t)) dt + \Phi(x_{i0}, X_i(T)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

If we define $X_i^*(t) := \int_0^t L(s, X_i(s), u_i(s), X^{(N)}(s)) ds$, then **Problem 0** becomes the one to minimize

$$\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)*}(u(\cdot)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{J}_g^i(x_{i0}, u(\cdot)),$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_g^i(x_{i0}, u(\cdot)) = Y_i(0) = \mathcal{E}_g \left\{ X_i^*(T) + \Phi(x_{i0}, X_i(T)) \right\}$$

subject to

$$\begin{cases} d \begin{pmatrix} X_i^*(t) \\ X_i(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} L(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t)) \\ b(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t)) \end{pmatrix} dt + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sigma(t, X_i(t), u_i(t), X^{(N)}(t)) \end{pmatrix} dW_i(t), \\ dY_i(t) = g(t, Y_i(t), Z_i(t)) dt + Z_i(t) dW(t), \\ \begin{pmatrix} X_i^*(0) \\ X_i(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_{i0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_i(T) = X_i^*(T) + \Phi(x_{i0}, X_i(T)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Indeed, (1.7) is a controlled FBSDE with large population structure.

The next motivation involves a recursive utility problem. Assume that a market contains N participants. The dynamic $x_i(\cdot)$ of the individual underlying state (asset) for i th participant is given by

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = (AX_i(t) + B\pi_i(t) + FX^{(N)}(t)) dt + D\pi_i(t) dW_i(t), \\ X_i(0) = x_{i0} > 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N. \end{cases}$$

Here, $X^{(N)}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i(\cdot)$ is the average asset; A, B, F, D, x_{i0} are constants; $(W_i(\cdot), 1 \leq i \leq N)$ is a N -dimensional standard Brownian motion; $\pi_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}$ is regarded as some economic indicator such as the investment strategy of the i^{th} participant, $1 \leq i \leq N$.

Let $c_i(\cdot)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ be a continuous consumption rate process. Assume that a terminal reward $\Phi X_i(T)$ is involved. By [11], the recursive utility operates as a solution of a BSDE, which is denoted by $Y_i^{c_i, \pi_i}(\cdot)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Suppose that $Y_i^{c_i, \pi_i}(\cdot)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -dY_i(t) = (HY_i(t) + Kc_i(t) + MX^{(N)}(t)) dt - Z_i(t) dW(t), \\ Y_i(T) = \Phi X_i(T). \end{cases}$$

Define $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\{W_i(s); 0 \leq s \leq t, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. To find an $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process $(\bar{c}_i(\cdot), \bar{\pi}_i(\cdot))$ such that

$$J_{soc}^{(N)}(\bar{c}_i, \bar{\pi}_i) := \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{\bar{c}_i, \bar{\pi}_i}(0) = \max_{(c_i, \pi_i)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{c_i, \pi_i}(0) \right),$$

is identified as a recursive optimal control problem.

It should be noticed that the above models are illustrated by FBSDE, which has been extensively discussed in literature. Readers are referred to [8], [9], [22], [28], [37], [38], [40], [41] and the references therein for backgrounds and applications of FBSDE. For backward LQ problems, one may refer to [16], [20], [21], etc.

1.3 Problem formulation

Motivated by the above problems, with consideration to obtain some explicit results, in this paper we study an LQ large population system in which K types of heterogeneous agents $\{\mathcal{A}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ are involved, where the dynamics of the agents satisfy a class of linear FBSDEs with MF coupling: that is, for $1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = [A_{\theta_i}(t)X_i(t) + B(t)u_i(t) + F(t)X^{(N)}(t)]dt + [D(t)u_i(t) + \sigma_i(t)]dW_i(t), \\ X_i(0) = \xi_i, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dY_i(t) = -[H_{\theta_i}(t)Y_i(t) + K(t)u_i(t) + L(t)X_i(t) + M(t)X^{(N)}(t)]dt + Z_i(t)dW(t), \\ Y_i(T) = \Phi X_i(T) + \eta_i, \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

where $X^{(N)}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i(\cdot)$ stands for the forward state-average of the agents. In this system, “heterogeneous” means that the agents in different types are not identical statistically. In the MF social optima problem of this paper, for $1 \leq i \leq N$, $(Y_i(\cdot), Z_{ij}(\cdot), 1 \leq j \leq N) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)) \times L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; (\mathbb{R}^m)^N)$ is called the *solution* of BSDE (1.9). We should point out that $(Z_{ij}(\cdot), 1 \leq j \leq N)$ is a part of the *solution* introduced to make $Y_i(\cdot)$ satisfy the adaptation requirement. The coefficients $(A_{\theta_i}(\cdot), B(\cdot), F(\cdot), D(\cdot), H_{\theta_i}(\cdot), K(\cdot), L(\cdot), M(\cdot), \sigma_i(\cdot))$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ depend on time variable t , which is often suppressed if no confusion is caused. Φ is an $m \times n$ matrix; ξ_i and η_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$ are random variables. θ_i is a number, standing for a dynamic parameter relevant to $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ which is used to illustrate the heterogeneous feature. For notational simplicity, here we assume that only $A(\cdot)$ and $H(\cdot)$ depend on θ_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$. If other parameters also depend on θ_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$, corresponding analysis is similar, and thus we will not give the details. We also assume that θ_i , $1 \leq i \leq N$ take values in the finite set Θ defined as $\Theta := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. $\mathcal{A}_i$ is called a *type- k agent* if $\theta_i = k \in \Theta$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. For $1 \leq k \leq K$ and a given N , define $\mathcal{I}_k := \{i | \theta_i = k, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, $N_k := |\mathcal{I}_k|$, where $|\mathcal{I}_k|$ is the cardinality of the index set $\mathcal{I}_k$. For $1 \leq k \leq K$, we define $\pi_k^{(N)} := \frac{N_k}{N}$. Then $\pi^{(N)} = (\pi_1^{(N)}, \dots, \pi_K^{(N)})$ is a probability vector representing the empirical distribution of $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N$. Introduce the following assumption:

(A1) There exists a probability mass vector $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K)$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \pi^{(N)} = \pi$, $\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \pi_k > 0$.

(A2) For $1 \leq i \leq N$, $\xi_i \in L_{\mathcal{F}_0}^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\eta_i \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$. ξ_i and ξ_j (*resp.* η_i and η_j) are identically distributed if $\theta_i = \theta_j = k$, and this type- k variable is typically denoted by $\xi^{(k)}$ (*resp.* $\eta^{(k)}$) when only their distribution is concerned. Here $\mathcal{F}_t^i$ is the filtration generated by the Brownian motion W_i .

(A3) $A_{\theta_i}(\cdot), F(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$, $B(\cdot), D(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, $H_{\theta_i}(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})$, $L(\cdot), M(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$, $K(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, $\sigma_i(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, the centralized admissible strategy set for $\mathcal{A}_i$ is defined by $\mathcal{U}_i^c = \{u_i(\cdot) | u_i(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)\}$. Correspondingly, the decentralized one for $\mathcal{A}_i$ is given by $\mathcal{U}_i^d = \{u_i(\cdot) | u_i(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}^i}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)\}$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Actually, $\mathcal{U}_i^d$ is a subset of $\mathcal{U}_i^c$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. It follows from (A1)-(A3) that (1.8)-(1.9) admits a unique solution for all $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^c$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. In fact, we can rewrite (1.8)-(1.9) as a high-dimensional FBSDE and derive the wellposedness by the classical theory of FBSDE.

Denote by $u = (u_1, \dots, u_N)$, $u_{-i} = (u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_N)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. The cost functional of $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_i(u_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot)) = & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q(t) (X_i(t) - S(t)X^{(N)}(t)), X_i(t) - S(t)X^{(N)}(t) \rangle \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \langle R_{\theta_i}(t)u_i(t), u_i(t) \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma Y_i(0), Y_i(0) \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

The aggregated team functional of N agents is

$$\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u(\cdot)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{J}_i(u_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot)). \quad (1.11)$$

We impose an assumption on the coefficients of (1.10).

(A4) $Q(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^n)$, $Q(\cdot) \geq 0$, $S(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$, $R_{\theta_i}(\cdot) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^d)$,
 $R_{\theta_i}(\cdot) \gg 0$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $\Gamma \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.

Corresponding to (1.8)-(1.11), we will propose a *forward-backward stochastic LQ MF social optima problem* below. It should be noticed that the expressions, such as “social optima”, “cooperative team optimization”, “optimal team problem”, etc, illustrate similar meanings of cooperative optimization problem. For the sake of uniformity, hereafter we adopt “social optima” to express relevant meaning.

Problem 1. Find a strategy set $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_N)$ where $\bar{u}_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i^c$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\bar{u}(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i^c, 1 \leq i \leq N} \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_i(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot)). \quad (1.12)$$

If $\Gamma = 0$ (*resp.* $L(\cdot) \equiv 0$, $M(\cdot) \equiv 0$, $\Phi = 0$, $Q(\cdot) \equiv 0$), it degenerates to (*forward*) *stochastic LQ MF social optima problem* (*resp.* *backward stochastic LQ optimal control problem*).

Definition 1.1 A strategy $\tilde{u}_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i^d$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ is an ε -social decentralized optimal strategy if there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(N) > 0$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(N) = 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \left(\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u}(\cdot)) - \inf_{u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i^c, 1 \leq i \leq N} \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u(\cdot)) \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Remark 1.1 Notice that $Y_i(\cdot)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ is $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted because $X^{(N)}(\cdot)$ is involved in the dynamic. Therefore in (1.9) $Z_{ij}(\cdot)$ appears to represent the information of $\mathcal{A}_i$ associated with $W_j(\cdot)$, $1 \leq j \leq N$. It refers to the characteristic of backward (forward-backward) stochastic optimal control problem.

Remark 1.2 In (1.9)-(1.10), for $1 \leq i \leq N$, $Z_{ij}(\cdot)$, $1 \leq j \leq N$ do not appear in the generator of the backward dynamic and the cost functional. It is because if $Z_i(\cdot)$ do, we need to make the error estimation between $\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i(\cdot)$ and some related quantity as those in Proposition 3.1 below. However, this seems to be an impossible task based on existing BSDE theory. Similarly, it is worthy pointing out that due to the difficulties of error estimations of BSDE, $X_i(\cdot)$ does not enter into the diffusion term in (1.8). As a future work, we hope to overcome this difficulty with the help of some new technique. Besides, if (1.10) contains the linear term of $Y_i(0)$, similar analysis can be employed, and for simplicity of writing, here we just include the quadratic term.

Now we briefly present the route of study of **Problem 1**:

- Firstly, we focus on solving a fully-coupled FBSDE system (so-called consistency condition system) by Riccati equation analysis.
- Based on forward-backward person-by-person optimality principle and variational synthesis technique, we obtain an auxiliary LQ control problem. Stochastic maximum principle (cf. [26]) is applied to solve it.
- By virtue of standard estimations of FBSDE, we verify that the decentralized strategy is asymptotically optimal for centralized strategy.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The consistency condition system and its solvability are established in Section 2. We apply forward-backward person-by-person optimality principle to derive an auxiliary LQ control problem of each agent in Section 3. In Section 4, the asymptotic optimality of decentralized strategy is obtained. Section 5 concludes this paper.

2 Consistency condition system

In this section, we do some preparatory work. We present the consistency condition system and its wellposedness, based on which some quantities related to (3.5) and (3.16) (see below in Section 3) will be determined, and furthermore the decentralized strategy will be derived. For the sake of presentation, we let $n = m$ here. There is no essential difference if $n \neq m$.

Consider the following stochastic system: for $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} d\alpha_k(t) &= \left[A_k \alpha_k - BR_k^{-1} (B^\top \tilde{\beta}_k + D^\top \tilde{\gamma}_k + K^\top \tilde{\alpha}_k) + F \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right] dt \\ &\quad + \left[-DR_k^{-1} (B^\top \tilde{\beta}_k + D^\top \tilde{\gamma}_k + K^\top \tilde{\alpha}_k) + \sigma_k(t) \right] dW^{(k)}(t), \\ d\beta_k(t) &= - \left[H_k \beta_k - KR_k^{-1} (B^\top \tilde{\beta}_k + D^\top \tilde{\gamma}_k + K^\top \tilde{\alpha}_k) + L \alpha_k + M \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right] dt + \gamma_k dW^{(k)}(t), \\ d\tilde{\beta}_k(t) &= - \left[A_k^\top \tilde{\beta}_k + L^\top \tilde{\alpha}_k + Q \alpha_k - (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top \vartheta_l + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l (F^\top \mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_l - M^\top \tilde{X}_l) \right] dt + \tilde{\gamma}_k dW^{(k)}(t), \\ d\tilde{\alpha}_k(t) &= H_k^\top \tilde{\alpha}_k dt, \\ d\tilde{X}_k(t) &= H_k^\top \tilde{X}_k dt, \\ d\tilde{Y}_k(t) &= - \left[A_k^\top \tilde{Y}_k - L^\top \tilde{X}_k + Q \alpha_k \right] dt + \tilde{Z}_k dW^{(k)}(t), \\ d\vartheta_k(t) &= - \left[A_k^\top \vartheta_k - (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top \vartheta_l + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l (F^\top \mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_l - M^\top \tilde{X}_l) \right] dt, \\ \alpha_k(0) &= \xi^{(k)}, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_k(0) = \Gamma \beta_k(0), \quad \tilde{X}_k(0) = -\Gamma \beta_k(0), \\ \tilde{Y}_k(T) &= -\Phi^\top \tilde{X}_k(T), \quad \vartheta_k(T) = 0, \quad \beta_k(T) = \Phi \alpha_k(T) + \eta^{(k)}, \quad \tilde{\beta}_k(T) = \Phi^\top \tilde{\alpha}_k(T). \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.1)$$

It should be noticed that stochastic system (2.1) is a fully-coupled FBSDE which contains three forward SDEs, four BSDEs and some MF terms. From the analysis in Section 3, it represents some consistency properties and hence it is called *consistency condition system*. The solvability of consistency condition is crucial for all large population and social optima problems. Without it the theoretical analysis will lose its significance and error estimations cannot be proceeded.

In the following, we pose a proposition to solve consistency condition system (2.1). Before that, we introduce some notation. Denote by $\mathbb{X} = (\alpha_1^\top, \dots, \alpha_K^\top, \tilde{\alpha}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_K^\top, \tilde{X}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{X}_K^\top)^\top$, $\mathbb{Y} = (\beta_1^\top, \dots, \beta_K^\top, \tilde{\beta}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_K^\top, \tilde{Y}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{Y}_K^\top, \vartheta_1^\top, \dots, \vartheta_K^\top)^\top$, $\mathbb{Z} = (\gamma_1^\top, \dots, \gamma_K^\top, \tilde{\gamma}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_K^\top, \tilde{Z}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{Z}_K^\top)^\top$, MF FBSDE (2.1) then takes the form of

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} d\mathbb{X} &= [\mathbb{A}_1 \mathbb{X} + \mathbb{B}_1 \mathbb{Y} + \mathbb{B}_2 \mathbb{Z} + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}]] dt + [\mathbb{C} \mathbb{X} + \mathbb{D}_1 \mathbb{Y} + \mathbb{D}_2 \mathbb{Z} + \Sigma_0] \circ d\mathbb{W}(t), \\ d\mathbb{Y} &= - [\mathbb{A}_2 \mathbb{Y} + \mathbb{A}_3 \mathbb{X} + \mathbb{B}_3 \mathbb{Z} + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}] + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_3 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}]] dt + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d\mathbb{W}(t) \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbb{X}(0) &= \Xi + \bar{\Gamma} \mathbb{Y}(0), \quad \mathbb{Y}(T) = \bar{\Phi} \mathbb{X}(T) + \Sigma, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\mathbb{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & -BR_1^{-1}K^\top & 0 & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & A_K & & & \\ 0 & & & H_1^\top & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & \\ & & & & H_K^\top & \\ 0 & & & & & H_1^\top \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & \\ & & & & & H_K^\top \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{B}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -BR_1^{-1}B^\top & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & -BR_K^{-1}B^\top & 0 & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & & 0 & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 0 & & & \\ & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{B}_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -BR_1^{-1}D^\top & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & -BR_K^{-1}D^\top \\ & & & \ddots \\ 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{D}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -DR_1^{-1}B^\top & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & 0 & & -DR_K^{-1}B^\top & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbb{C} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -DR_1^{-1}K^\top & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & -DR_K^{-1}K^\top \\ & & & \ddots \\ 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{A}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} L & -KR_1^{-1}K^\top & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & L & & -KR_K^{-1}K^\top & 0 \\ Q & & L^\top & & -M^\top \pi_1 \dots -M^\top \pi_K \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ Q & Q & & L^\top & -M^\top \pi_1 \dots -M^\top \pi_K \\ & & 0 & & -L^\top \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & Q & & 0 & -L^\top \\ & & 0 & & -M^\top \pi_1 \dots -M^\top \pi_K \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ & 0 & & 0 & -M^\top \pi_1 \dots -M^\top \pi_K \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbb{D}_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -DR_1^{-1}D^\top & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & -DR_K^{-1}D^\top \\ & & & \ddots \\ 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\mathbb{A}}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} F\pi_1 \dots F\pi_K & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ & F\pi_1 \dots F\pi_K & 0 \\ 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{W} = \begin{pmatrix} W^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ W^{(K)} \\ W^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ W^{(K)} \\ W^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ W^{(K)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbb{A}_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & -KR_1^{-1}B^\top & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & H_K & & -KR_K^{-1}B^\top & 0 \\ 0 & & A_1^\top & & F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & & A_K^\top & F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \\ & & 0 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A_1^\top & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & A_K^\top & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & A_1^\top + F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ & 0 & & 0 & F^\top \pi_1 \dots A_K^\top + F^\top \pi_K \end{pmatrix}, \\
\bar{\mathbb{A}}_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \\ & & & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & 0 & F^\top \pi_1 \dots F^\top \pi_K \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\mathbb{A}}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} M\pi_1 & \dots & M\pi_K & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & M\pi_1 & \dots & M\pi_K & 0 \\ -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_1 \dots & & -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_K & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_1 \dots & & -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_K & 0 & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & \\ -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_1 \dots & & -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_K & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_1 \dots & & -(QS+S^\top Q-S^\top QS)\pi_K & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbb{B}_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -KR_1^{-1}D^\top & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & -KR_K^{-1}D^\top \\ & & & \ddots \\ 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\Phi} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ 0 & \Phi & \Phi^\top & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \ddots \\ 0 & & 0 & \Phi^\top & -\Phi^\top \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\Phi^\top \\ & \ddots & & \ddots & \\ & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ \eta^{(K)} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ \Gamma & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ -\Gamma & & \Gamma & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ & & -\Gamma & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & & & & & \\ & & & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_K \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \Xi = \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ \xi^{(K)} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, “ $\circ$ ” denotes the *generalized* Hadamard product. It is well known that Hadamard product (also called Schur product or entry-wise product) is a binary operation between two matrices of the same dimensions, and it produces another matrix in which each element (i, j) is the product of the elements (i, j) in the original matrices. In this part we formally express the Hadamard product (called the *generalized* Hadamard product), though dimension of the dynamic is n , which is different from that of the Brownian motion (1-dimension).

Proposition 2.1 *Under (A1)-(A4), assume that*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\phi} + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3) + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\phi + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\phi + \mathcal{A}_3 \\ \quad - [\phi(\mathcal{B}_2 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_3) + \mathcal{B}_3][\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}]^{-1}[\phi\mathcal{C} + \phi(\mathcal{C}\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\phi] = 0, \\ \phi(T) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{A}_j + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_j & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{A}_j \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{B}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{B}_j & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{B}_j \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbb{C} & \mathbb{C} \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{D}_l = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbb{D}_l & \mathbb{D}_l \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\hat{I} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ I & I \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}_{8Kn \times 6Kn}, \bar{I} = \begin{pmatrix} I - \bar{\Phi}\bar{\Gamma} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I \end{pmatrix}^{-1}, \hat{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Gamma} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \hat{\Phi} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Phi} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \bar{\Phi} \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad l = 1, 2$$

admits a unique solution $\phi(\cdot)$ over $[0, T]$ such that $\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}$ is invertible. Then, consistency condition system (2.1) has a solution.

Proof Taking the expectation on both sides of (2.2), we have

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}] = [(\mathbb{A}_1 + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_1)\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}] + \mathbb{B}_1\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}] + \mathbb{B}_2\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Z}]]dt, \\ d\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}] = -[(\mathbb{A}_2 + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_2)\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}] + (\mathbb{A}_3 + \bar{\mathbb{A}}_3)\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}] + \mathbb{B}_3\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Z}]]dt, \\ \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}](0) = \mathbb{E}[\Xi] + \bar{\Gamma}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}](0), \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}](T) = \bar{\Phi}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}](T) + \mathbb{E}[\Sigma]. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}] \\ \mathbb{X} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}] \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}] \\ \mathbb{Y} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Y}] \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Z}] \\ \mathbb{Z} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Z}] \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{W} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{W} \\ \mathbb{W} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Xi} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\Xi] \\ \Xi - \mathbb{E}[\Xi] \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\Sigma] \\ \Sigma - \mathbb{E}[\Sigma] \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Sigma}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \Sigma_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus MF FBSDE (2.2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} d\mathcal{X} = [\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{Z}]dt + [\mathcal{C}\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{Z} + \hat{\Sigma}_0] \circ d\mathcal{W}(t), \\ d\mathcal{Y} = -[\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{B}_3\mathcal{Z}]dt + \hat{I}(\mathcal{Z} \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)), \\ \mathcal{X}(0) = \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{Y}(0), \quad \mathcal{Y}(T) = \hat{\Phi}\mathcal{X}(T) + \hat{\Sigma}. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Define $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(t) = \mathcal{X}(t) - \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{Y}(t) - \hat{\Xi}$, $t \in [0, T]$. Then $\mathcal{X}(0) = \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{Y}(0)$ implies $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(0) = 0$. By (2.5) and $d\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = d\mathcal{X} - \hat{\Gamma}d\mathcal{Y}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = [(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3)\tilde{\mathcal{X}} + (\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\mathcal{Y} + (\mathcal{B}_2 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_3)\mathcal{Z} \\ \quad + (\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3)\hat{\Xi}]dt + [\mathcal{C}\tilde{\mathcal{X}} + (\mathcal{C}\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\mathcal{Y} + (\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I})\mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{C}\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}_0] \circ d\mathcal{W}(t), \\ d\mathcal{Y} = -[(\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\mathcal{Y} + \mathcal{A}_3\tilde{\mathcal{X}} + \mathcal{B}_3\mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Xi}]dt + \hat{I}(\mathcal{Z} \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{X}}(0) = 0, \quad \mathcal{Y}(T) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(T) + \bar{I}(\hat{\Phi}\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}), \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

which is a standard fully-coupled FBSDE. Here, $\bar{I}$ is defined by $\begin{pmatrix} I - \bar{\Phi}\bar{\Gamma} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I \end{pmatrix}^{-1}$. In fact, we can easily obtain that $\begin{pmatrix} I - \bar{\Phi}\bar{\Gamma} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I \end{pmatrix}$ is a lower triangular matrix and the diagonal elements are all one. Thus it is invertible. Assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ have the following relationship

$$\mathcal{Y}(t) = \phi(t)\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(t) + \psi(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $\phi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{8Kn \times 6Kn}$ is a deterministic matrix-valued function and $\psi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{8Kn}$ is an $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process. Now we will derive $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\psi(\cdot)$. The terminal values of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ imply that $\phi(T) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}$, $\psi(T) = \bar{I}(\hat{\Phi}\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma})$. Since $\hat{\Xi} \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_0^W}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{6Kn})$, $\hat{\Sigma} \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T^W}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{8Kn})$, and $\psi(\cdot)$ is required to be $\{\mathcal{F}_t^W\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, we suppose that $\psi(\cdot)$ satisfies a BSDE

$$\begin{cases} d\psi(t) = a(t)dt + \tilde{I}(b(t) \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)), \\ \psi(T) = \bar{I}(\hat{\Phi}\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}), \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

where $(a(\cdot), b(\cdot)) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}^W}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{8Kn}) \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}^W}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{6Kn})$ is undetermined; $\tilde{I}$ is the $8Kn \times 6Kn$ -dimensional matrix, in which the elements are all 1. Here, the given matrix $\tilde{I}$ plays a role in increasing the dimension of $b(t) \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)$ to coincide with $\psi(t)$. Applying Itô's formula to $\phi(t)\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(t) + \psi(t)$ and comparing the coefficients with the second equation in (2.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\dot{\phi} + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3) + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\phi + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\phi + \mathcal{A}_3 \right] \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \\ & + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\psi + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\psi + \phi(\mathcal{B}_2 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_3)\mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{B}_3\mathcal{Z} \\ & + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3)\hat{\Xi} + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Xi} + a = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi \left(\left[(C + (C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\phi)\tilde{\mathcal{X}} + (\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I})\mathcal{Z} + (C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\psi + C\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}_0 \right] \circ d\mathcal{W}(t) \right) \\ & + \tilde{I}(b(t) \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)) = \hat{I}(\mathcal{Z} \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

By some matrix calculations, we derive

$$\left[\phi C + \phi(C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\phi \right] \tilde{\mathcal{X}} + \phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I})\mathcal{Z} + \phi(C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\psi - \hat{I}\mathcal{Z} + \phi(C\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}_0) + \tilde{I}b = 0.$$

Since $\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}$ is invertible, it follows that

$$\mathcal{Z} = -[\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}]^{-1} \left[(\phi C + \phi(C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\phi)\tilde{\mathcal{X}} + \phi(C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\psi + \phi(C\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}_0) + \tilde{I}b \right].$$

Noticing (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a = & - \left[\phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\psi + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\psi + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3)\hat{\Xi} + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Xi} \right. \\ & \left. - [\phi(\mathcal{B}_2 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_3) + \mathcal{B}_3][\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}]^{-1}[\phi(C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1)\psi + \phi(C\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}_0) + \tilde{I}b] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then equation (2.7) has the form of

$$\begin{cases} d\psi = - \left\{ \left[\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1) \right. \right. \\ \quad \left. \left. - [\phi(\mathcal{B}_2 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_3) + \mathcal{B}_3][\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}]^{-1}\phi(C\hat{\Gamma} + \mathcal{D}_1) \right] \psi + [\phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3) \right. \\ \quad \left. + \mathcal{A}_3]\hat{\Xi} - [\phi(\mathcal{B}_2 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{B}_3) + \mathcal{B}_3][\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}]^{-1}(\phi C\hat{\Xi} + \phi\hat{\Sigma}_0 + \tilde{I}b) \right\} dt \\ \quad + \tilde{I}(b(t) \circ d\mathcal{W}(t)), \quad \psi(T) = \bar{I}(\hat{\Phi}\hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Sigma}). \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

If (2.3) admits a solution $\phi(\cdot)$ such that $\phi(\mathcal{D}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}\hat{I}) - \hat{I}$ is invertible, BSDE (2.8) admits a unique adapted solution $(\psi(\cdot), b(\cdot))$. Then the equation of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ (SDE) admits a unique solution $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(\cdot)$. Further, $(\mathcal{Y}(\cdot), \mathcal{Z}(\cdot))$ is derived. Then $\mathcal{X}(\cdot)$ is obtained. The proof is complete. $\square$

Remark 2.1 Notice that (2.5) is a fully-coupled FBSDE, in which $\mathcal{Y}(T)$ depends on $\mathcal{X}(T)$ and $\mathcal{X}(0)$ depends on $\mathcal{Y}(0)$. This kind of FBSDE has been studied, see e.g., [20, 21], etc. However, (2.5) is quite different from those of the existing works. It should be noticed that $\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3 \neq \mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma}$ in general, which implies ϕ is asymmetric. It follows from the above analysis that $\mathbb{Y}$ and $\mathbb{X}$ have different dimensions, which leads to the asymmetry of ϕ . Thus this asymmetry is brought by the characteristics of the social optimisation problem itself. Actually, it is a challenge to derive the solvability of Riccati equation (2.3). For constant coefficient case, explicit solution may be obtained by direct calculations under additional conditions (see e.g., [1, 39], etc).

Now we look at a special case. We let either $\mathcal{B}_2 = 0$, $\mathcal{B}_3 = 0$, or $\mathcal{C} = 0$, $\mathcal{D}_1 = 0$, which means either $B = 0$, $K = 0$, or $D = 0$, $H_k = 0$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$). In this case, (2.3) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\phi} + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3) + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\phi + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\phi + \mathcal{A}_3 = 0, \\ \phi(T) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}. \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Proposition 2.2 Let (A1)-(A4) hold. Let $(U(\cdot), V(\cdot))$ be the solution of the ODE

$$\begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{U}(t) \\ \dot{V}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3 & \mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1 \\ -\mathcal{A}_3 & -(\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U(t) \\ V(t) \end{pmatrix}, & t \in [0, T], \\ \begin{pmatrix} U(T) \\ V(T) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I \\ \bar{I}\hat{\Phi} \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases}$$

and $U(\cdot)$ is nonsingular on $[0, T]$. Then $\phi(t) = V(t)U^{-1}(t)$ is the unique solution of (2.9).

Proof We adapt the method of [12, Theorem 5.12]. Differentiation of the identity $U(t)U^{-1}(t) = I$ gives

$$\dot{U}(t)U^{-1}(t) + U(t)\frac{d}{dt}\{U^{-1}(t)\} = 0,$$

which implies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\{U^{-1}(t)\} = -U^{-1}(t)\dot{U}(t)U^{-1}(t).$$

Define $\phi(t) = V(t)U^{-1}(t)$. Then we obtain that $\phi(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\dot{\phi} + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3) + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\phi + \phi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\phi + \mathcal{A}_3 = 0$$

with $\phi(T) = V(T)U^{-1}(T) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}$. Hence the conclusion. $\square$

Another result on the solvability of Riccati equation (2.9) is as follows.

Proposition 2.3 Let (A1)-(A4) hold. For $s \in [0, T]$, let $\Psi(\cdot, s)$ be the solution of the ODE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}\Psi(t, s) = \hat{\mathbf{A}}(t)\Psi(t, s), & t \in [s, T], \\ \Psi(s, s) = I, \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}(\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3 + (\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\bar{I}\hat{\Phi} & \mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1 \\ -[\bar{I}\hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3)] & -[\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)] \\ +(\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\bar{I}\hat{\Phi} + \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\bar{I}\hat{\Phi} + \mathcal{A}_3 & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Suppose that

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \Psi(T, t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \in L^1(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{8Kn \times 8Kn}).$$

Then (2.3) admits a unique solution $\phi(\cdot)$, which is given by

$$\phi(t) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi} - \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \Psi(T, t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \Psi(T, t) \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.11)$$

Proof Define $\Pi(t) = \phi(t) - \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}$, $t \in [0, T]$. $\phi(T) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}$ implies $\Pi(T) = 0$. By $\phi(t) = \Pi(t) + \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}$, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Pi} + \Pi(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3 + (\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\bar{I}\hat{\Phi}) + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} \\ + \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1))\Pi + \Pi(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\Pi \\ + \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}_1 + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3) + (\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma})\bar{I}\hat{\Phi} + \bar{I}\hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{A}_1\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_3\hat{\Gamma} + \hat{\Gamma}\mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_1)\bar{I}\hat{\Phi} \\ + \mathcal{A}_3 = 0, \quad \Pi(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

According to [39, Theorem 5.3], we have

$$\Pi(t) = - \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \Psi(T, t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \Psi(T, t) \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then we get (2.11). $\square$

The following proposition further discusses the explicit solutions of $\phi(\cdot)$.

Proposition 2.4 Assume that $\hat{\mathbf{A}}(\cdot)$ is a constant-valued matrix and denoted by $\hat{\mathbf{A}}(t) \equiv \Lambda$. Suppose that

$$\det \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} e^{\Lambda t} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} \right\} > 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

holds. Then (2.3) admits a unique solution $\phi(\cdot)$ as

$$\phi(t) = \bar{I}\hat{\Phi} - \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} e^{\Lambda(T-t)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} e^{\Lambda(T-t)} \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.12)$$

Proof Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.3, (2.12) is obtained by [22, Theorem 4.3]. $\square$

3 Stochastic optimal control problem for $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$

Now, we make some person-by-person analysis, introduce an optimal control problem, solve it and get the decentralized control in this section.

3.1 Forward-backward person-by-person optimality

It is well-known that by freezing the state-average term we can always derive an auxiliary control problem in MF game scheme. Actually, due to the difference of cost functional, MF social optima scheme and MF game scheme are rather different. In MF social optima scheme the person-by-person optimality is regarded as an effective method to derive the auxiliary control problem, see e.g. Section 3.2 below or [15]. In this section, we will apply variation method to analyze the MF approximation by virtue of person-by-person optimality principle. Due to forward-backward structure, we call it *forward-backward person-by-person optimality*.

Let $\{\bar{u}_i, \bar{u}_{-i} \in \mathcal{U}_i^c\}_{i=1}^N$ denote all centralized optimal strategies. Take the perturbation into account that $\mathcal{A}_i$ uses $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^c$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, while the other agents use $\bar{u}_{-i} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_{i-1}, \bar{u}_{i+1}, \dots, \bar{u}_N)$. States satisfying (1.8)-(1.9) associated with $(u_i, \bar{u}_{-i})$ and $(\bar{u}_i, \bar{u}_{-i})$ are denoted by (X_i, Y_i, Z_i) and $(\bar{X}_i, \bar{Y}_i, \bar{Z}_i)$, respectively, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. For $1 \leq j \leq N$, define

$$\delta u_j = u_j - \bar{u}_j, \quad \delta X_j = X_j - \bar{X}_j, \quad \delta Y_j = Y_j - \bar{Y}_j, \quad \delta Z_j = Z_j - \bar{Z}_j.$$

Therefore, variation of the dynamic for $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ is

$$\begin{cases} d\delta X_i = [A_{\theta_i}\delta X_i + B\delta u_i + F\delta X^{(N)}]dt + D\delta u_i dW_i(t), \\ d\delta Y_i = -[H_{\theta_i}\delta Y_i + K\delta u_i + L\delta X_i + M\delta X^{(N)}]dt + \delta Z_i(t)dW(t), \\ \delta X_i(0) = 0, \quad \delta Y_i(T) = \Phi\delta X_i(T), \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

and for $\mathcal{A}_j$, $j \neq i$,

$$\begin{cases} d\delta X_j = [A_{\theta_j}\delta X_j + F\delta X^{(N)}]dt, \\ d\delta Y_j = -[H_{\theta_j}\delta Y_j + L\delta X_j + M\delta X^{(N)}]dt + \delta Z_j(t)dW(t), \\ \delta X_j(0) = 0, \quad \delta Y_j(T) = \Phi\delta X_j(T). \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

For $1 \leq k \leq K$, we define $\delta X_{(k)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \delta X_j$ and $\delta Y_{(k)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \delta Y_j$. We then have

$$d\delta X_{(k)} = \left[A_k \delta X_{(k)} + (N_k - I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)) F \delta X^{(N)} \right] dt, \quad \delta X_{(k)}(0) = 0,$$

and

$$d\delta Y_{(k)} = - \left[H_k \delta Y_{(k)} + L \delta X_{(k)} + (N_k - I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)) M \delta X^{(N)} \right] dt + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \delta Z_j \cdot dW(t),$$

$$\delta Y_{(k)}(T) = \Phi \delta X_{(k)}(T).$$

Here, $I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(\cdot)$ denotes the indicative function. Define $\Delta \mathcal{J}_j = \mathcal{J}_j(u_j, \bar{u}_{-j}) - \mathcal{J}_j(\bar{u}_j, \bar{u}_{-j})$. By elementary calculations, we further derive the variation of cost functional for $\mathcal{A}_i$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{J}_i = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\langle Q \left(\bar{X}_i - S \bar{X}^{(N)} \right), \delta X_i - S \delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt \right. \\ \left. + \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $j \neq i$, variation of cost functional for $\mathcal{A}_j$ is

$$\Delta \mathcal{J}_j = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\langle Q \left(\bar{X}_j - S \bar{X}^{(N)} \right), \delta X_j - S \delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), \delta Y_j(0) \rangle \right\}.$$

Thus it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \left\langle Q \left(\bar{X}_j - S \bar{X}^{(N)} \right), \delta X_j - S \delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), \delta Y_j(0) \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

In the following, based on (3.3) we will obtain another representation of $\Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}$ which is affected by δX_i , δu_i , δY_i and some error terms. We will further derive the decentralized auxiliary cost functional.

Proposition 3.1 *The variation of $\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}$ has the following form*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)} \\ = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q \bar{X}_i, \delta X_i \rangle - \langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, \delta X_i \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \langle \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k, \delta X_i \rangle \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \sum_{k=1}^K \langle \pi_k (F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_k - M^\top \mathbf{X}_k), \delta X_i \rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle \right\} + \sum_{l=1}^9 \varepsilon_l, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where $(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_k)$ stands for a type- k representative of (X_1^j, Y_1^j) when only the distribution is concerned. $\hat{X}$, X_k^{**} , X_j^* , Y_j^* , Z_j^* are the approximations of $\bar{X}^{(N)}$, $\delta X_{(k)}$, $N_k \delta X_j$, $N_k \delta Y_j$, $N_k \delta Z_j$, respectively. For $j \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $j \neq i$,

$$\begin{cases} dX_1^j = H_k^\top X_1^j dt, \\ dY_1^j = \left[-A_k^\top Y_1^j + L^\top X_1^j - Q \bar{X}_j \right] dt + Z_1^j \cdot dW(t), \\ dY_2^k = \left[-A_k^\top Y_2^k + (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l (F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_l - M^\top \mathbf{X}_l) \right. \\ \quad \left. - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top Y_2^l \right] dt, \\ X_1^j(0) = -\Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), \quad Y_1^j(T) = -\Phi^\top X_1^j(T), \quad Y_2^k(T) = 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) (\hat{X} - \bar{X}^{(N)}), N\delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_3 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \langle Q\bar{X}_j, N_k \delta X_j - X_j^* \rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_4 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), N_k \delta Y_j(0) - Y_j^*(0) \rangle, \\ \varepsilon_5 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \pi_k M^\top \mathbf{X}_k - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \pi_k M^\top X_1^j, \delta X_i \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_6 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle -\pi_k F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_k + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \pi_k F^\top Y_1^j, \delta X_i \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_7 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l M^\top \mathbf{X}_l - \sum_{l=1}^K \frac{\pi_l}{N_l} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_l, j \neq i} M^\top X_1^j, X_k^{**} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_8 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle -\sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_l + \sum_{l=1}^K \frac{\pi_l}{N_l} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_l, j \neq i} F^\top Y_1^j, X_k^{**} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_9 &= -\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)}{N_k} \left\langle \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k, \delta X_i \right\rangle dt. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Proof For the proof we may divide it into three steps.

Step I: Replacing $\bar{X}^{(N)}$ in (3.3) by MF term $\hat{X}$ which will be determined later. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\langle Q(\bar{X}_i - S\bar{X}^{(N)}), \delta X_i \right\rangle - \left\langle Q(\bar{X}_i - S\bar{X}^{(N)}), S\delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \left\langle QS\bar{X}^{(N)}, \delta X_j \right\rangle + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \left\langle Q\bar{X}_j, \delta X_j \right\rangle \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \left\langle Q(\bar{X}_j - S\bar{X}^{(N)}), S\delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), \delta Y_j(0) \rangle \Big\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\langle Q\bar{X}_i, \delta X_i \right\rangle - \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, \delta X_i \right\rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, \delta X_{(k)} \right\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \langle Q\bar{X}_j, N_k \delta X_j \rangle \\ &\quad \left. + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), N_k \delta Y_j(0) \rangle \Big\} + \varepsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

Step II: For $1 \leq k \leq K$, introduce X_k^{**} to replace $\delta X_{(k)}$. For $j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i$, introduce X_j^* to replace

$N_k \delta X_j$ and (Y_j^*, Z_j^*) to replace $(N_k \delta Y_j, N_k \delta Z_j)$, where

$$\begin{cases} dX_k^{**} = \left[A_k X_k^{**} + F \pi_k \delta X_i + F \pi_k \sum_{l=1}^K X_l^{**} \right] dt, \\ dX_j^* = \left[A_k X_j^* + F \pi_k \delta X_i + F \pi_k \sum_{l=1}^K X_l^{**} \right] dt, \\ dY_j^* = - \left[H_k Y_j^* + L X_j^* + M \pi_k \delta X_i + M \pi_k \sum_{l=1}^K X_l^{**} \right] dt + Z_j^* dW(t), \\ X_k^{**}(0) = 0, \quad X_j^*(0) = 0, \quad Y_j^*(T) = \Phi X_j^*(T). \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q \bar{X}_i, \delta X_i \rangle - \langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, \delta X_i \rangle \right. \right. \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, X_k^{**} \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \langle Q \bar{X}_j, X_j^* \rangle \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), Y_j^*(0) \rangle \right\} + \sum_{l=1}^4 \varepsilon_l. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Step III: Substitute X_j^* , Y_j^* and X_k^{**} by dual method. Introduce the adjoint processes (X_1^j, Y_1^j, Z_1^j) and Y_2^k of the terms (Y_j^*, Z_j^*, X_j^*) and X_k^{**} , respectively, which are assumed to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} dX_1^j = \alpha_1 dt, & X_1^j(0) = -\Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), \\ dY_1^j = \alpha_2 dt + Z_1^j dW(t), & Y_1^j(T) = -\Phi^\top X_1^j(T), \quad j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i, \\ dY_2^k = \alpha_3 dt + Z_2^k dW_k, & Y_2^k(T) = 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ will be determined later. Applying Itô's formula to $\langle X_1^j, Y_j^* \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle X_1^j, Y_j^* \rangle &= \left[\left\langle X_1^j, - \left(H_k Y_j^* + L X_j^* + M \pi_k \delta X_i + M \pi_k \sum_{l=1}^K X_l^{**} \right) \right\rangle + \langle \alpha_1, Y_j^* \rangle \right] dt \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^N (\cdots) dW_j(t). \end{aligned}$$

For $j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i$, integrating from 0 to T and taking expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \langle X_1^j(T), \Phi X_j^*(T) \rangle + \mathbb{E} \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_j(0), Y_j^*(0) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle X_1^j(T), Y_j^*(T) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle X_1^j(0), Y_j^*(0) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle \alpha_1 - H_k^\top X_1^j, Y_j^* \rangle - \langle L^\top X_1^j, X_j^* \rangle - \sum_{l=1}^K \langle \pi_k M^\top X_1^j, X_l^{**} \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \langle \pi_k M^\top X_1^j, \delta X_i \rangle \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Similarly, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathbb{E} \langle \Phi^\top X_1^j(T), X_j^*(T) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle Y_1^j(T), X_j^*(T) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle Y_1^j(0), X_j^*(0) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle \alpha_2 + A_k^\top Y_1^j, X_j^* \rangle + \sum_{l=1}^K \langle \pi_k F^\top Y_1^j, X_l^{**} \rangle + \langle \pi_k F^\top Y_1^j, \delta X_i \rangle \right] dt, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathbb{E} \left\langle Y_2^k(T), X_k^{**}(T) \right\rangle - \mathbb{E} \left\langle Y_2^k(0), X_k^{**}(0) \right\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\left\langle \alpha_3 + A_k^\top Y_2^k, X_k^{**} \right\rangle + \sum_{l=1}^K \left\langle \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k, X_l^{**} \right\rangle + \left\langle \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k, \delta X_i \right\rangle \right] dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Letting

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1 = H_k^\top X_1^j, \\ \alpha_2 = -A_k^\top Y_1^j + L^\top X_1^j - Q \bar{X}_j, \\ \alpha_3 = -A_k^\top Y_2^k + (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top \mathbb{E} Y_1^l + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l M^\top X_1^l \\ \quad - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top Y_2^l, \end{cases}$$

and substituting (3.8)-(3.10) into (3.7), we derive (3.4). Notice that (X_1^j, Y_1^j) are exchangeable for all $j \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $j \neq i$. Here, “exchangeable” means there is no essential difference for (X_1^j, Y_1^j) in the same type- k in distribution sense. Thus we apply $(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_k)$ to stand for (X_1^j, Y_1^j) for the type- k representative when the expectations are involved. The proof is complete. $\square$

Based on the above analysis, we pose the following auxiliary cost functional with perturbation

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta J_i &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q \bar{X}_i, \delta X_i \rangle - \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X}, \delta X_i \right\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \langle \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k, \delta X_i \rangle \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{k=1}^K \left\langle \pi_k (F^\top \hat{Y}_k - M^\top \hat{X}_k), \delta X_i \right\rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \bar{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \bar{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Remark 3.1 It should be noticed that X_1^j is deterministic, satisfying the ODE in (3.5) because its initial value $X_1^j(0)$ is deterministic. Since $\bar{X}_j$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted, Z_1^{jl} ($1 \leq l \leq N$) cannot be omitted, though the terminal value $Y_1^j(T)$ is deterministic. By contrast, the drift term of Y_2^k (the second BSDE in (3.5)) is deterministic (It follows from (3.15) that $\hat{X}$ is deterministic (see below)) and the terminal value $Y_2^k(T)$ is zero, thus we derive that Z_2^k should be zero, which implies Y_2^k is deterministic indeed. Therefore, system (3.6) is a coupled FBSDE, and adjoint system (3.5) is made up by two ODEs and a BSDE.

Remark 3.2 In **Step III**, $2N + K$ adjoint equations are introduced to ensure $\Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}$ to break up with the dependence on X_j^*, Y_j^* and X_k^{**} . This problem is caused by the existence of $X^{(N)}$ in state equations, that is $F(\cdot)$, $M(\cdot) \neq 0$. On the contrary, if $F(\cdot) \equiv 0$, $M(\cdot) \equiv 0$, then $X_j^*(\cdot) \equiv 0$, $Y_j^*(\cdot) \equiv 0$ and $X_k^{**}(\cdot) \equiv 0$. There is no additional adjoint equation required to obtain auxiliary control problem.

3.2 Decentralized strategy

Motivated by (3.11), we will pose an auxiliary forward-backward LQ optimal control problem. Firstly we substitute $X^{(N)}(\cdot)$ with $\hat{X}(\cdot)$ in dynamics (1.8)-(1.9) and get the new dynamics in decentralized sense. Secondly, taking (3.11) as the perturbation of the auxiliary cost functional, one can also guess a quadratic cost functional in decentralized manner. Then we have

Problem 2. Minimize $J_i(u_i)$ over $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^d$ subject to

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = \left[A_{\theta_i}(t) X_i(t) + B(t) u_i(t) + F(t) \hat{X}(t) \right] dt + \left[D(t) u_i(t) + \sigma_i(t) \right] dW_i(t), \\ X_i(0) = \xi_i, \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dY_i(t) = - \left[H_{\theta_i}(t) Y_i(t) + K(t) u_i(t) + L(t) X_i(t) + M(t) \hat{X}(t) \right] dt + Z_i(t) dW_i(t), \\ Y_i(T) = \Phi X_i(T) + \eta_i, \end{cases} \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$J_i(u_i) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle QX_i, X_i \rangle - 2\langle \Theta, X_i \rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} u_i, u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma Y_i(0), Y_i(0) \rangle \right\}, \quad (3.14)$$

with

$$\Theta = (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \hat{X} - \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k - \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k (F^\top \hat{Y}_k - M^\top \hat{X}_k).$$

Here, $\hat{X}, \hat{X}_k, \hat{Y}_k, Y_2^k$ can be chosen as

$$\left(\hat{X}, \hat{X}_k, \hat{Y}_k, Y_2^k \right) = \left(\sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l, \check{X}_k, \mathbb{E} \check{Y}_k, \vartheta_k \right), \quad (3.15)$$

where $(\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \tilde{\alpha}_k, \tilde{\beta}_k, \tilde{\gamma}_k, \check{X}_k, \check{Y}_k, \check{Z}_k, \vartheta_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq K$, with $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \tilde{\beta}_k, \check{Y}_k \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}W(k)}(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n))$, $\gamma_k, \tilde{\gamma}_k, \check{Z}_k \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}W(k)}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_k, \vartheta_k \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the solution to consistency condition system (2.1).

Now, we solve this problem by applying stochastic maximum principle, see e.g. [26]. Introduce an adjoint equation

$$\begin{cases} dp_i(t) = - \left[A_{\theta_i}^\top p_i + L^\top q_i + QX_i - \Theta \right] dt + \bar{p}_i dW_i(t), \\ dq_i(t) = H_{\theta_i}^\top q_i dt, \\ p_i(T) = \Phi^\top q_i(T), \quad q_i(0) = \Gamma Y_i(0). \end{cases}$$

The stochastic maximum principle implies

$$\bar{u}_i(t) = -R_{\theta_i}^{-1}(t) (B^\top(t) p_i(t) + D^\top(t) \bar{p}_i(t) + K^\top(t) q_i(t)).$$

The related Hamiltonian system becomes

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = \left[A_{\theta_i}(t) X_i(t) - B(t) R_{\theta_i}^{-1}(t) (B^\top(t) p_i(t) + D^\top(t) \bar{p}_i(t) + K^\top(t) q_i(t)) \right. \\ \quad \left. + F(t) \hat{X}(t) \right] dt + \left[-D(t) R_{\theta_i}^{-1}(t) (B^\top(t) p_i(t) + D^\top(t) \bar{p}_i(t) \right. \\ \quad \left. + K^\top(t) q_i(t)) + \sigma_i(t) \right] dW_i(t), \\ dY_i(t) = - \left[H_{\theta_i}(t) Y_i(t) - K(t) R_{\theta_i}^{-1}(t) (B^\top(t) p_i(t) + D^\top(t) \bar{p}_i(t) + K^\top(t) q_i(t)) \right. \\ \quad \left. + L(t) X_i(t) + M(t) \hat{X}(t) \right] dt + Z_i(t) dW_i(t), \\ dp_i(t) = - \left[A_{\theta_i}^\top(t) p_i(t) + L^\top(t) q_i(t) + Q(t) X_i(t) - \Theta \right] dt + \bar{p}_i(t) dW_i(t), \\ dq_i(t) = H_{\theta_i}^\top(t) q_i(t) dt, \\ X_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad Y_i(T) = \Phi X_i(T) + \eta_i, \quad p_i(T) = \Phi^\top q_i(T), \quad q_i(0) = \Gamma Y_i(0). \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

Remark 3.3 *Similar to large population problem, in social optima scheme the state (resp. problem) corresponding to the external variable $\hat{X}(\cdot)$ is always called auxiliary (or limiting) state (resp. problem); while the state (resp. problem) corresponding to weakly coupled term $X^{(N)}(\cdot)$ is always called real state (resp. problem).*

Remark 3.4 *Thanks to Section 2, we derive the wellposedness of consistency condition system (2.1). Based on (2.1) and (3.15), one also obtains the wellposedness of (3.5) and (3.16).*

4 Asymptotic ε -optimality

We start this section with the representation of social cost, which is to be applied to verify the asymptotic optimality.

4.1 Representation of social cost

System (1.8)-(1.9) is rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{A}_\theta \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{B}u)dt + \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{D}_i u + \bar{\sigma}_i) dW_i(t), \\ d\mathbf{Y} = -(\mathbf{H}_\theta \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{K}u + \mathbf{M}\mathbf{X})dt + \mathbf{Z}d\mathbf{W}(t), \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = \bar{\xi}, \quad \mathbf{Y}(T) = \Phi \mathbf{X}(T) + \bar{\eta}, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X} &= \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ \vdots \\ X_N \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ \vdots \\ Y_N \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{Z} = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ i \\ \vdots \\ N \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z_{11} & Z_{12} & \cdots & Z_{1i} & \cdots & Z_{1N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ Z_{i1} & Z_{i2} & \cdots & Z_{ii} & \cdots & Z_{iN} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ Z_{N1} & Z_{N2} & \cdots & Z_{Ni} & \cdots & Z_{NN} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{A}_\theta &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{\theta_1} + \frac{F}{N} & \frac{F}{N} & \cdots & \frac{F}{N} \\ \frac{F}{N} & A_{\theta_2} + \frac{F}{N} & \cdots & \frac{F}{N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{F}{N} & \frac{F}{N} & \cdots & A_{\theta_N} + \frac{F}{N} \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{H}_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} H_{\theta_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & H_{\theta_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & H_{\theta_N} \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{D}_i = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ i \\ \vdots \\ N \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & D & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{M} &= \begin{pmatrix} L + \frac{M}{N} & \frac{M}{N} & \cdots & \frac{M}{N} \\ \frac{M}{N} & L + \frac{M}{N} & \cdots & \frac{M}{N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{M}{N} & \frac{M}{N} & \cdots & L + \frac{M}{N} \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\sigma}_i = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ i \\ \vdots \\ N \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_i \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_N \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\eta} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \eta_N \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{B} &= \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & B & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & K & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & K \end{pmatrix}, \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \Phi \end{pmatrix}, u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_N \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{W} = \begin{pmatrix} W_1 \\ \vdots \\ W_N \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the social cost takes the form of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q(t)(X_i(t) - S(t)X^{(N)}(t)), X_i(t) - S(t)X^{(N)}(t) \rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \langle R_{\theta_i}(t)u_i(t), u_i(t) \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma Y_i(0), Y_i(0) \rangle \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{R}u, u \rangle \right] dt + \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{Y}(0), \mathbf{Y}(0) \rangle \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q} &= \begin{pmatrix} Q + \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) & \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) & \cdots & \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) \\ \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) & Q + \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) & \cdots & \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) & \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) & \cdots & Q + \frac{1}{N}(S^\top QS - QS - S^\top Q) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{R} &= \begin{pmatrix} R_{\theta_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & R_{\theta_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & R_{\theta_N} \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \Gamma \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Psi_1(\cdot)$, $\Psi_2(\cdot)$ be the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} d\Psi_1(t) = \mathbf{A}_\theta(t)\Psi_1(t)dt, & t \in [0, T], \quad \Psi_1(0) = I, \\ d\Psi_2(s) = \mathbf{H}_\theta(s)\Psi_2(s)ds, & s \in [t, T], \quad \Psi_2(t) = I. \end{cases}$$

Then the strong solution $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ of (4.1) admits

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(t) = \Psi_1(t)\bar{\xi} + \Psi_1(t) \int_0^t \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(s)u(s)ds \\ \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \Psi_1(t) \int_0^t \Psi_1(s)^{-1} (\mathbf{D}_i u(s) + \bar{\sigma}_i) dW_i(s), \\ \mathbf{Y}(t) = \mathbb{E} \left[(\Phi \mathbf{X}(T) + \bar{\eta}) \Psi_2(T) + \int_t^T (\mathbf{K}(s)u(s) + \mathbf{M}(s)\mathbf{X}(s)) \Psi_2(s)ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Define eight operators by

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_1 u(\cdot))(\cdot) &:= \Psi_1(\cdot) \left\{ \int_0^\cdot \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(s)u(s)ds + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^\cdot \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{D}_i u(s) dW_i(s) \right\}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1 u(\cdot) &:= (\mathcal{L}_1 u(\cdot))(T), \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(\cdot) &:= \Psi_1(\cdot)\bar{\xi} + \sum_{i=1}^N \Psi_1(\cdot) \int_0^\cdot \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_i dW_i(s), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2(\bar{\xi}) := \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(T), \\ (\mathcal{L}_3 u(\cdot))(\cdot) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\int^\cdot \left(\mathbf{K}(s)u(s) + \mathbf{M}(s)\Psi_1(s) \left\{ \int_0^s \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(s)u(s)ds \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^s \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{D}_i u(s) dW_i(s) \right\} \right) \Psi_2(s)ds \middle| \mathcal{F} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \Psi_1(T) \left\{ \int_0^T \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(s)u(s)ds \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^T \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \mathbf{D}_i u(s) dW_i(s) \right\} \Psi_2(T) \middle| \mathcal{F} \right], \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 u(\cdot) := (\mathcal{L}_3 u(\cdot))(0), \\ \mathcal{L}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})(\cdot) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\int^\cdot \mathbf{M}(s)\Psi_1(s) \left(\bar{\xi} + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^s \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_i(s) dW_i(s) \right) \Psi_2(s)ds \middle| \mathcal{F} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Phi \Psi_1(T) \left(\bar{\xi} + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^T \Psi_1(s)^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_i(s) dW_i(s) \right) + \bar{\eta} \right) \Psi_2(T) \middle| \mathcal{F} \right], \\ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) &:= \mathcal{L}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})(0). \end{aligned} \right.$$

Correspondingly, $\mathcal{L}_1^*$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^*$ are defined as the adjoint operators of $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3$ w.r.t. the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (see e.g. [41]), respectively. That is $\forall \zeta_1 \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\forall \zeta_2 \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m)$, $\forall \zeta_3 \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \langle (\mathcal{L}_1 u(\cdot))(t), \zeta_1(t) \rangle dt = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \langle u(t), (\mathcal{L}_1^* \zeta_1(\cdot))(t) \rangle dt, \\ \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 u(\cdot), \zeta_2(t) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \langle u(t), (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^* \zeta_2(\cdot))(t) \rangle dt, \\ \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 u(\cdot), \zeta_3 \rangle = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \langle u(t), (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^* \zeta_3)(t) \rangle dt. \end{cases}$$

Given any admissible $u(\cdot)$, we express $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$ as

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(\cdot) = (\mathcal{L}_1 u(\cdot))(\cdot) + \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(\cdot), & \mathbf{X}(T) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1 u(\cdot) + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2(\bar{\xi}), \\ \mathbf{Y}(\cdot) = (\mathcal{L}_3 u(\cdot))(\cdot) + \mathcal{L}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})(\cdot), & \mathbf{Y}(0) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 u(\cdot) + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}). \end{cases}$$

Hence, we rewrite the social cost as

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u) &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{R}u, u \rangle \right] dt + \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{Y}(0), \mathbf{Y}(0) \rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle (\mathcal{L}_1^* \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{L}_1 u(\cdot))(t), u(t) \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{L}_1^* \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(t), u(t) \rangle \right. \\
&\quad + \langle \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(t), \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(t) \rangle + \langle \mathbf{R}u(t), u(t) \rangle + \langle (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^* \mathbf{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 u(\cdot))(t), u(t) \rangle \\
&\quad \left. + 2\langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^* \mathbf{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})(t), u(t) \rangle \right] dt + \langle \mathbf{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}), \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) \rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\langle (\mathcal{L}_1^* \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{L}_1 u(\cdot))(t) + \mathbf{R}u(t) + (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^* \mathbf{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 u(\cdot))(t), u(t) \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{L}_1^* \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3^* \mathbf{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})(t), u(t) \rangle + \langle \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(t), \mathcal{L}_2(\bar{\xi})(t) \rangle \right] dt + \langle \mathbf{\Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}), \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) \rangle \\
&:= \langle \mathcal{M}_2 u(\cdot), u(\cdot) \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_1, u(\cdot) \rangle + \mathcal{M}_0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_2$ is an L^2 bounded self-adjoint positive definite linear operator; $\mathcal{M}_1$ is an L^2 bounded operator and $\mathcal{M}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$; $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product of different space.

4.2 Agent $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ perturbation

Let $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_N)$ denote the set of decentralized strategies given by

$$\tilde{u}_i(t) = -R_{\theta_i}^{-1}(t)(B^\top(t)p_i(t) + D^\top(t)\bar{p}_i(t) + K^\top(t)q_i(t)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

where

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} dX_i(t) &= \left[A_{\theta_i} X_i - BR_{\theta_i}^{-1}(B^\top p_i + D^\top \bar{p}_i + K^\top q_i) + F \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right] dt \\ &\quad + \left[-DR_{\theta_i}^{-1}(B^\top p_i + D^\top \bar{p}_i + K^\top q_i) + \sigma_i \right] dW_i(t), \\ dY_i(t) &= - \left[H_{\theta_i} Y_i - KR_{\theta_i}^{-1}(B^\top p_i + D^\top \bar{p}_i + K^\top q_i) + LX_i + M \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right] dt \\ &\quad + Z_i dW_i(t), \\ dp_i(t) &= - \left[A_{\theta_i}^\top p_i + L^\top q_i + QX_i - (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top Y_2^l + \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l (F^\top \hat{Y}_l - M^\top \hat{X}_l) \right] dt + \bar{p}_i dW_i(t), \\ dq_i(t) &= H_{\theta_i}^\top q_i dt, \\ X_i(0) &= \xi_i, \quad Y_i(T) = \Phi X_i(T) + \eta_i, \quad p_i(T) = \Phi^\top q_i(T), \quad q_i(0) = \mathbf{\Gamma} Y_i(0) \end{aligned} \right. \quad (4.3)$$

with α_l , Y_2^l , $\hat{X}_l$, $\hat{Y}_l$ being given by (3.15). Actually the wellposedness of (4.3) can be obtained similar to (2.1) (or (2.2)) and we omit it. So do the following coupled FBSDEs (4.4).

Correspondingly, the real state $(\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_N, \tilde{Y}_1, \dots, \tilde{Y}_N)$ under the decentralized strategy satisfies

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} d\tilde{X}_i(t) &= \left[A_{\theta_i} \tilde{X}_i - BR_{\theta_i}^{-1}(B^\top p_i + D^\top \bar{p}_i + K^\top q_i) + F \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right] dt \\ &\quad + \left[-DR_{\theta_i}^{-1}(B^\top p_i + D^\top \bar{p}_i + K^\top q_i) + \sigma_i \right] dW_i(t), \\ d\tilde{Y}_i(t) &= - \left[H_{\theta_i} \tilde{Y}_i - KR_{\theta_i}^{-1}(B^\top p_i + D^\top \bar{p}_i + K^\top q_i) + L\tilde{X}_i + M \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right] dt + \tilde{Z}_i dW(t), \\ \tilde{X}_i(0) &= \xi_i, \quad \tilde{Y}_i(T) = \Phi \tilde{X}_i(T) + \eta_i, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (4.4)$$

and $\tilde{X}^{(N)}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_i(\cdot)$. For $1 \leq j \leq N$, define the perturbation as

$$\delta u_j = u_j - \tilde{u}_j, \quad \delta X_j = \check{X}_j - \tilde{X}_j, \quad \delta Y_j = \check{Y}_j - \tilde{Y}_j, \quad \Delta \mathcal{J}_j = \mathcal{J}_j(u_j, \tilde{u}_{-j}) - \mathcal{J}_j(\tilde{u}_j, \tilde{u}_{-j}).$$

It should be noticed that hereafter the notation $(\check{X}_j, \check{Y}_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq N$ stands for the state of $\mathcal{A}_j$ when applying an alternative strategy u_j while $\mathcal{A}_l, l \neq j$ applies $\tilde{u}_l$. Similar to the computations in Section 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)} = & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\langle Q \tilde{X}_i, \delta X_i \right\rangle - \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l, \delta X_i \right\rangle \right. \right. \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^K \left\langle \pi_l F^\top Y_2^l, \delta X_i \right\rangle + \sum_{l=1}^K \left\langle \pi_l (F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_l - M^\top \mathbf{X}_l), \delta X_i \right\rangle + \left\langle R_{\theta_i} \tilde{u}_i, \delta u_i \right\rangle \Big] dt \\ & \left. + \left\langle \Gamma \tilde{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \right\rangle \right\} + \sum_{l=1}^9 \varepsilon_l, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \left(\sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l - \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right), N \delta X^{(N)} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l, X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_3 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \left\langle Q \tilde{X}_j, N_k \delta X_j - X_j^* \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_4 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \left\langle \Gamma \tilde{Y}_j(0), N_k \delta Y_j(0) - Y_j^*(0) \right\rangle, \\ \varepsilon_5 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \pi_k M^\top \mathbf{X}_k - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \pi_k M^\top X_1^j, \delta X_i \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_6 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle -\pi_k F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_k + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \pi_k F^\top Y_1^j, \delta X_i \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_7 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l M^\top \mathbf{X}_l - \sum_{l=1}^K \frac{\pi_l}{N_l} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_l, j \neq i} M^\top X_1^j, X_k^{**} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_8 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle -\sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_l + \sum_{l=1}^K \frac{\pi_l}{N_l} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_l, j \neq i} F^\top Y_1^j, X_k^{**} \right\rangle dt, \\ \varepsilon_9 &= -\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)}{N_k} \left\langle \pi_k F^\top Y_2^k, \delta X_i \right\rangle dt. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Now, we consider the situation that $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ applies an alternative strategy u_i while $\mathcal{A}_j, j \neq i$ applies $\tilde{u}_j$. The real state with the i^{th} agent's perturbation is

$$\begin{cases} d\check{X}_i(t) = [A_{\theta_i} \check{X}_i + B u_i + F \check{X}^{(N)}] dt + [D u_i + \sigma_i] dW_i(t), \\ d\check{Y}_i(t) = -[H_{\theta_i} \check{Y}_i + K u_i + L \check{X}_i + M \check{X}^{(N)}] dt + \check{Z}_i \cdot dW(t), \\ \check{X}_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad \check{Y}_i(T) = \Phi \check{X}_i(T) + \eta_i, \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d\check{X}_j(t) = [A_{\theta_j} \check{X}_j - B R_{\theta_j}^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + F \check{X}^{(N)}] dt \\ \quad + [-D R_{\theta_j}^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + \sigma_j] dW_i(t), \\ d\check{Y}_j(t) = -[H_{\theta_j} \check{Y}_j - K R_{\theta_j}^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + L \check{X}_j + M \check{X}^{(N)}] dt \\ \quad + \check{Z}_j \cdot dW(t), \\ \check{X}_j(0) = \xi_j, \quad \check{Y}_j(T) = \Phi \check{X}_j(T) + \eta_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N, \quad j \neq i, \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

where $\check{X}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \check{X}_i$.

To obtain the asymptotic optimality, we first derive some estimations. In all the proofs hereafter, C will denote a nonnegative constant and its value may change from line to line. Similar to the proof of [14, Lemma 5.1], by virtue of estimations of FBSDE, we derive

Lemma 4.1 *Under (A1)-(A4), there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left[|\alpha_l(t)|^2 + |\tilde{\alpha}_l(t)|^2 + |\beta_l(t)|^2 + |\tilde{\beta}_l(t)|^2 + |\check{X}_l(t)|^2 + |\check{Y}_l(t)|^2 + |\vartheta_l(t)|^2 \right] \\ & + \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left[|\tilde{X}_i(t)|^2 + |\tilde{Y}_i(t)|^2 \right] + \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[|\gamma_l(t)|^2 + |\tilde{\gamma}_l(t)|^2 + |\check{Z}_l(t)|^2 \right] dt \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Similar to Lemma 4.1, by the L^2 boundness of $u_i, \xi_i, \eta_i, \sigma_i$ and $\xi_j, \eta_j, \sigma_j, p_j, \bar{p}_j, q_j$ ($1 \leq j \leq N, j \neq i$), we have

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left[|\check{X}_i(t)|^2 + |\check{Y}_i(t)|^2 \right] \leq C. \quad (4.9)$$

Lemma 4.2 *Under (A1)-(A4), there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)}(t) - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l(t) \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} + C \epsilon_N^2, \quad (4.10)$$

where $\epsilon_N = \sup_{1 \leq l \leq K} |\pi_l^{(N)} - \pi_l|$.

Proof For $1 \leq k \leq K$, state average of the k -type agent is defined by

$$\tilde{X}^{(k)} := \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \tilde{X}_j, \quad \tilde{Y}^{(k)} := \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \tilde{Y}_j.$$

thus

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{X}^{(k)}(t) = \left[A_k \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} B R_k^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + F \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right] dt \\ \quad + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left[-D R_k^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + \sigma_j \right] dW_j(t), \\ d\tilde{Y}^{(k)}(t) = - \left[H_k \tilde{Y}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} K R_k^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + L \tilde{X}^{(k)} \right. \\ \quad \left. + M \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right] dt + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \tilde{Z}_j dW_j(t), \\ \tilde{X}^{(k)}(0) = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \xi_j, \quad \tilde{Y}^{(k)}(T) = \Phi \tilde{X}^{(k)}(T) + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \eta_j. \end{cases}$$

Noticing that

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbb{E} \alpha_k(t) = \left[A_k \mathbb{E} \alpha_k - B R_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} (B^\top \mathbf{P}_k + D^\top \bar{\mathbf{p}}_k + K^\top \mathbf{Q}_k) + F \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right] dt, \\ \mathbb{E} \alpha_k(0) = \mathbb{E} \xi^{(k)}, \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} d\left(\tilde{X}^{(k)}(t) - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k(t)\right) &= \left[A_k\left(\tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k\right) - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} B R_k^{-1} \left(B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + K^\top q_j - \mathbb{E}(B^\top \mathbf{P}_k + D^\top \bar{\mathbf{p}}_k + K^\top \mathbf{Q}_k) \right) + F\left(\tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l\right) \right] dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left[-D R_k^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + \sigma_j \right] dW_j(t), \\ \left(\tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k\right)(0) &= \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \xi_j - \mathbb{E}\xi^{(k)}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Here, we apply $\mathbf{P}_k, \bar{\mathbf{P}}_k, \mathbf{Q}_k$ to denote the k -type representative when the expectations are involved as $(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_k)$ before. Under (A2), for $1 \leq k \leq K$, $\{\xi_j, j \in \mathcal{I}_k\}$ are identically independent distributed (i.i.d). Notice that $(p_j(\cdot), \bar{p}_j(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{F}_t^j$, $q_j(\cdot) \in \mathcal{F}_0^j$. Therefore $\{(p_j, \bar{p}_j), j \in \mathcal{I}_k\}$ are i.i.d and $\{q_j, j \in \mathcal{I}_k\}$ are deterministic. Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and estimations of SDE, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k \right|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} (\xi_j - \mathbb{E}\xi^{(k)}) \right|^2 + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left[\left| \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k \right|^2 + \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right|^2 \right] ds \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j - \mathbb{E}(B^\top \mathbf{P}_k + D^\top \bar{\mathbf{p}}_k + K^\top \mathbf{Q}_k)) \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left| -D R_k^{-1} (B^\top p_j + D^\top \bar{p}_j + K^\top q_j) + \sigma_j \right|^2 ds \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k \right|^2 ds + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right|^2 ds + \frac{C}{N_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Gronwall inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_k \right|^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right|^2 ds + \frac{C}{N_k}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l &= \sum_{l=1}^K \left(\pi_l^{(N)} \tilde{X}^{(l)} - \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l^{(N)} \left(\tilde{X}^{(l)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right) + \sum_{l=1}^K \left(\pi_l^{(N)} - \pi_l \right) \mathbb{E}\alpha_l, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right|^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| \tilde{X}^{(l)} - \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right|^2 + C \epsilon_N^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E}\alpha_l \right|^2 ds + \frac{C}{N} + C \epsilon_N^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the result follows from Gronwall inequality. $\square$

By Lemma 4.2, we easily derive the following result.

Lemma 4.3 Under (A1)-(A4), there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \left[\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_j(t) - \tilde{X}_j(t)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_j(t) - \tilde{Y}_j(t)|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{N} + C\epsilon_N^2. \quad (4.11)$$

Lemma 4.4 Under (A1)-(A4), there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N, j \neq i} \left[\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\delta X_j(t)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\delta Y_j(t)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sum_{l=1}^N |\delta Z_{jl}(t)|^2 dt \right] \\ \leq \frac{C}{N^2} \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Proof According to (3.1)-(3.2), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_i|^2 &\leq C \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right) + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X^{(N)}|^2 ds, \\ \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta Y_i|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \sum_{l=1}^N |\delta Z_{il}|^2 ds &\leq C\mathbb{E} |\delta X_i(T)|^2 + C \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right) \\ &\quad + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta Y_i|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X^{(N)}|^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

for $j \neq i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_j|^2 &\leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_j|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X^{(N)}|^2 ds, \\ \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta Y_j|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \sum_{l=1}^N |\delta Z_{jl}|^2 ds \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E} |\delta X_j(T)|^2 + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta Y_j|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_j|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X^{(N)}|^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_{(k)}|^2 \leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_{(k)}|^2 ds + CN^2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X^{(N)}|^2 ds.$$

Noticing that

$$\delta X^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \delta X_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^K \delta X_{(l)},$$

we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_i|^2 \leq C \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right) + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds + \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_{(l)}|^2 ds,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_{(k)}|^2 \leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_{(k)}|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds + C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_{(l)}|^2 ds.$$

Therefore, it follows from Gronwall inequality that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_i|^2 + \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_{(l)}|^2 \leq C \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right).$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X^{(N)}|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N^2} \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right).$$

Using Gronwall inequality again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N, j \neq i} \left[\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta X_j|^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\delta Y_j|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \sum_{l=1}^N |\delta Z_{jl}|^2 ds \right] \\ & \leq \frac{C}{N^2} \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.5 *Under (A1)-(A4), there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_l^{**}(t) - \delta X_{(l)}(t)|^2 \leq \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right), \quad (4.13)$$

for $j \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $j \neq i$, $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |N_k \delta X_j(t) - X_j^*(t)|^2 \leq \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right), \quad (4.14)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |N_k \delta Y_j(t) - Y_j^*(t)|^2 \leq \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right). \quad (4.15)$$

Proof First,

$$\begin{cases} d(X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)}) = \left[A_k(X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)}) + F \left(\pi_k - \frac{N_k - I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)}{N} \right) \delta X_i \right. \\ \quad \left. + F \pi_k \sum_{l=1}^K (X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}) + F \left(\pi_k - \frac{N_k - I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)}{N} \right) \sum_{l=1}^K \delta X_{(l)} \right] dt, \\ (X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)})(0) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and for $j \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $j \neq i$,

$$\begin{cases} d(X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j) = \left[A_k(X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j) + F \left(\pi_k - \pi_k^{(N)} \right) \delta X_i + F \left(\pi_k - \pi_k^{(N)} \right) \sum_{l=1}^K X_l^{**} \right. \\ \quad \left. + F \pi_k^{(N)} \sum_{l=1}^K (X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}) \right] dt, \\ (X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j)(0) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d(Y_j^* - N_k \delta Y_j) = - \left[H_k(Y_j^* - N_k \delta Y_j) + L(X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j) + M \left(\pi_k - \pi_k^{(N)} \right) \delta X_i \right. \\ \quad \left. + M \left(\pi_k - \pi_k^{(N)} \right) \sum_{l=1}^K X_l^{**} + M \pi_k^{(N)} \sum_{l=1}^K (X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}) \right] dt + (Z_j^* - N_k \delta Z_j) dW(t), \\ (Y_j^* - N_k \delta Y_j)(T) = \Phi(X_j^*(T) - N_k \delta X_j(T)). \end{cases}$$

According to Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)}|^2 & \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)}|^2 ds + C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}|^2 ds \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left[|\delta X_i|^2 + \sum_{l=1}^K |\delta X_{(l)}|^2 \right] ds \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_k^{**} - \delta X_{(k)}|^2 ds + C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}|^2 ds \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}|^2 &\leq C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of Gronwall inequality, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_l^{**}(t) - \delta X_{(l)}(t)|^2 \leq \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j|^2 ds + C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C\epsilon_N^2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left[|\delta X_i|^2 + \sum_{l=1}^K |X_l^{**}|^2 \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the first equation of (3.6), we derive

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_k^{**}|^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_k^{**}|^2 ds + C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_l^{**}|^2 ds + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds.$$

It follows from Gronwall inequality that

$$\sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_l^{**}|^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds.$$

Then noticing (4.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j|^2 ds + C \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_l^{**} - \delta X_{(l)}|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C\epsilon_N^2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\delta X_i|^2 ds \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X_j^* - N_k \delta X_j|^2 ds + \left(\frac{C}{N^2} + C\epsilon_N^2 \right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\delta u_i|^2 ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.14). With the help of the estimations of BSDE, (4.15) is derived. $\square$

Applying the above estimations, by the standard estimations of FBSDE, the L^2 boundness of $\xi_i, \eta_i, \sigma_i, p_i, \bar{p}_i, q_i$, (3.5) and (4.4), we get the following result.

Lemma 4.6 *Under (A1)-(A4), there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \mathbf{X}_k(t) - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j(t) \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} + C\epsilon_N^2, \quad (4.16)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_k(t) - \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Y_1^j(t) \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} + C\epsilon_N^2. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof It follows from (3.5) that

$$\begin{cases} d\left(\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j\right) = \frac{H_k^\top}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j dt, \\ d\left(\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Y_1^j\right) = \left[-\frac{A_k^\top}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Y_1^j + \frac{L^\top}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j - \frac{Q}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \tilde{X}_j \right] dt \\ \quad + \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Z_1^j dW(t), \\ \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j(0) = -\frac{\Gamma}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \tilde{Y}_j(0), \quad \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Y_1^j(T) = -\frac{\Phi^\top}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j(T). \end{cases}$$

By the definition of $\mathbf{X}_k$, $\mathbf{Y}_k$, we have

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbf{X}_k = H_k^\top \mathbf{X}_k dt, \\ d\mathbf{Y}_k = \left[-A_k^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_k + L^\top \mathbf{X}_k - Q \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k \right] dt, \\ \mathbf{X}_k(0) = -\Gamma \mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k(0), \quad \mathbf{Y}_k(T) = -\Phi^\top \mathbf{X}_k(T), \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{X}_k$, $\tilde{Y}_k$ denote the optimal states of k -type corresponding to (4.4) and $\mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k$, $\mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k = \left[A_k \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k - B R_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} (B^\top \mathbf{p}_k + D^\top \bar{\mathbf{p}}_k + K^\top \mathbf{q}_k) + F \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right] dt, \\ d\mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k = - \left[H_k \mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k - K R_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} (B^\top \mathbf{p}_k + D^\top \bar{\mathbf{p}}_k + K^\top \mathbf{q}_k) + L \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k + M \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}^{(N)} \right] dt, \\ \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k(0) = \mathbb{E} \xi^{(k)}, \quad \mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k(T) = \Phi \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k(T) + \mathbb{E} \eta_k. \end{cases}$$

Recall the notations $\tilde{X}^{(k)}$ and $\tilde{Y}^{(k)}$ defined in the proof of Lemma 4.2. Noticing

$$\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \tilde{X}_j = \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \frac{I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)}{N_k} \tilde{X}_i, \quad \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} \tilde{Y}_j = \tilde{Y}^{(k)} - \frac{I_{\mathcal{I}_k}(i)}{N_k} \tilde{Y}_i,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j - \mathbf{X}_k \right|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j - \mathbf{X}_k \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \left(\left| \tilde{Y}^{(k)}(0) - \mathbb{E} \beta_k(0) \right|^2 + |\mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k(0) - \mathbb{E} \beta_k(0)|^2 + \frac{1}{N_k^2} |\tilde{Y}_i(0)|^2 \right), \\ \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Y_1^j - \mathbf{Y}_k \right|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j(T) - \mathbf{X}_k(T) \right|^2 \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} Y_1^j - \mathbf{Y}_k \right|^2 ds + C \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left| \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k, j \neq i} X_1^j - \mathbf{X}_k \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left(|\tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E} \alpha_k|^2 + |\mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k - \mathbb{E} \alpha_k|^2 + \frac{1}{N_k^2} |\tilde{X}_i|^2 \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the L^2 boundness of $\xi_i, \eta_i, \sigma_i, p_i, \bar{p}_i, q_i$, it is easy to get $\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} (|\tilde{X}_i|^2 + |\tilde{Y}_i|^2) \leq C$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k - \mathbb{E} \alpha_k|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right|^2 ds, \\ \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} |\mathbb{E} \tilde{Y}_k - \mathbb{E} \beta_k|^2 &\leq C |\mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k(T) - \mathbb{E} \alpha_k(T)|^2 + C \mathbb{E} \int_t^T |\mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_k - \mathbb{E} \alpha_k|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left| \tilde{X}^{(N)} - \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l \right|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

With the help of the proof of Lemma 4.2, one gets

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \tilde{X}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E} \alpha_k \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} + C \epsilon_N^2, \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \tilde{Y}^{(k)} - \mathbb{E} \beta_k \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} + C \epsilon_N^2.$$

Then (4.16) and (4.17) are obtained based on above inequalities, Lemma 4.2 and Gronwall inequality. $\square$

4.3 Asymptotic optimality

To verify the asymptotic optimality, we just need to investigate the perturbation $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^c$, $1 \leq i \leq N$ satisfying $\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(u_1, \dots, u_N) \leq \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_N)$. Obviously,

$$\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_N) \leq CN,$$

where C is a nonnegative constant independent of N . Therefore we need only to investigate the perturbation $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^c$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |u_i|^2 dt \leq CN. \quad (4.18)$$

Let $\delta u_i = u_i - \tilde{u}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Now we consider a perturbation $u = \tilde{u} + (\delta u_1, \dots, \delta u_N) := \tilde{u} + \delta u$. Recalling Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5, there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ independent of N such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N, j \neq i} \left[\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\delta X_j(t)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\delta Y_j(t)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sum_{l=1}^N |\delta Z_{jl}(t)|^2 dt \right] &\leq \frac{C}{N^2}, \\ \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_l^{**}(t) - \delta X_{(l)}(t)|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{N^2} + C \epsilon_N^2, \\ \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |N_k \delta X_j(t) - X_j^*(t)|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{N^2} + C \epsilon_N^2, \\ \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |N_k \delta Y_j(t) - Y_j^*(t)|^2 &\leq \frac{C}{N^2} + C \epsilon_N^2. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by Section 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u} + \delta u) &= \langle \mathcal{M}_2(\tilde{u} + \delta u), \tilde{u} + \delta u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_1, \tilde{u} + \delta u \rangle + \mathcal{M}_0 \\ &= \langle \mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}_2 \delta u, \delta u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u}, \delta u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_1, \tilde{u} \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_1, \delta u \rangle + \mathcal{M}_0 \\ &= 2\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u}) + \langle \mathcal{M}_2 \delta u, \delta u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u}, \delta u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_1, \delta u \rangle \\ &= 2\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u}) + 2\langle \mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1, \delta u \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}_2 \delta u, \delta u \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1$ denotes the Fréchet differential of $\mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}$ corresponding to $\tilde{u}$.

Theorem 4.1 Under (A1)-(A4), $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_N)$ is a $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \epsilon_N\right)$ -social decentralized optimal strategy, where $\epsilon_N = \sup_{1 \leq l \leq K} |\pi_l^{(N)} - \pi_l|$.

Proof By virtue of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u}) - \mathcal{J}_{soc}^{(N)}(\tilde{u} + \delta u) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N |\mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1|^2 \sum_{i=1}^N |\delta u_i|^2} - \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathcal{M}_2 \delta u, \delta u \rangle \leq |\mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1| O(N). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$|\mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1| = o(1)$$

ensures the asymptotic optimality. According to Section 4.2, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1| \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q \tilde{X}_i, \delta X_i \rangle - \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l, \delta X_i \right\rangle + \sum_{l=1}^K \langle \pi_l F^\top Y_2^l, \delta X_i \rangle \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{l=1}^K \langle \pi_l (F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_l - M^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_l), \delta X_i \rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \tilde{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \tilde{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle \right\} + \sum_{l=1}^9 \varepsilon_l. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

According to the optimality of $\tilde{u}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle Q \tilde{X}_i, \delta X_i \rangle - \left\langle (QS + S^\top Q - S^\top QS) \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_l \mathbb{E} \alpha_l, \delta X_i \right\rangle + \sum_{l=1}^K \langle \pi_l F^\top Y_2^l, \delta X_i \rangle \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{l=1}^K \langle \pi_l (F^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Y}_l - M^\top \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_l), \delta X_i \rangle + \langle R_{\theta_i} \tilde{u}_i, \delta u_i \rangle \right] dt + \langle \Gamma \tilde{Y}_i(0), \delta Y_i(0) \rangle \right\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemmas 4.2-4.6, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^9 \varepsilon_l = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \epsilon_N\right).$$

Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{M}_2 \tilde{u} + \mathcal{M}_1| = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \epsilon_N\right).$$

□

5 Conclusion

This paper focuses on solving an LQ stochastic optimization problem in MF social optima scheme while the dynamic is driven by FBSDE. An auxiliary LQ control problem is formulated and a decentralized strategy is obtained with the help of consistency condition system. We also develop a Riccati equation and a BSDE to decouple the MF-type FBSDE. At last, we verify the asymptotic optimality. In the future, enlightened by the first motivation in Section 1.2 one possible research direction is to study the case that the dynamic satisfies a nonlinear system, which may be more valuable but more complicated than the LQ structure shown in this work. Another research problem is LQ MF social optima with partial observation, which may involve more applications in practice and bring more challenges in theory.

References

- [1] H. Abou-Kandil, G. Freiling, V. Ionescu and G. Jank. Matrix Riccati Equation in Control and Systems Theory, Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland, 2003.
- [2] J. Arabneydi and A. Mahajan. Team-optimal solution of finite number of mean-field coupled LQG subsystems. In 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2015, 5308-5313.

- [3] J. Barreiro-Gomez, T. Duncan and H. Tembine. Linear-quadratic mean-field-type games: jump-diffusion process with regime switching. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 64(2019), 4329-4336.
- [4] A. Bensoussan, K. Sung, S. Yam and S. Yung. Linear-quadratic mean field games. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 169(2016), 496-529.
- [5] R. Buckdahn, J. Li and S. Peng. Nonlinear stochastic differential games involving a major player and a large number of collectively acting minor agents. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 52(2014), 451-492.
- [6] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(2013), 2705-2734.
- [7] Y. Chen, A. Bušić and S. Meyn. State estimation for the individual and the population in mean field control with application to demand dispatch. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 62(2016), 1138-1149.
- [8] J. Cvitanic and J. Ma. Hedging options for a large investor and forward-backward SDE's. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, 6(1996), 370-398.
- [9] J. Cvitanic, X. Wan and J. Zhang. Optimal contracts in continuous-time models. *J. Appl. Math. Stochastic Anal.*, 2006(2006), 1-27.
- [10] D. Duffie and L. Epstein. Stochastic differential utility. *Econometrica*, 60(1992), 353-394.
- [11] N. El Karoui, S. Peng and M. C. Quenez. Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Math. Finance*, 7(1997), 1-71.
- [12] J. C. Engwerda. *LQ Dynamic Optimization and Differential Games*, Chichester, Wiley, 2005.
- [13] X. Feng, Y. Hu and J. Huang. A unified approach to linear-quadratic-Gaussian mean-field team: homogeneity, heterogeneity and quasi-exchangeability. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 33 (2023), no. 4, 2786-2823.
- [14] Y. Hu, J. Huang and T. Nie. Linear-quadratic-Gaussian mixed mean-field games with heterogeneous input constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 56(2018), 2835-2877.
- [15] J. Huang, B. Wang and J. Yong. Social optima in mean field linear-quadratic-Gaussian control with volatility uncertainty. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 59(2021): 825-856.
- [16] J. Huang, S. Wang and Z. Wu. Backward mean-field linear-quadratic-Gaussian (LQG) games: full and partial information. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 61(2016): 3784-3796.
- [17] M. Huang, P. E. Caines and R. P. Malhamé. Social optima in mean field LQG control: centralized and decentralized strategies. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 57(2012): 1736-1751.
- [18] M. Huang and S. Nguyen. Linear-quadratic mean field social optimization with a major player. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03346*, 2019.
- [19] J. M. Lasry and P. L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(2007), 229-260.
- [20] X. Li, J. Sun and J. Xiong. Linear quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field backward stochastic differential equations. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 80(2019), 223-250.
- [21] A. E. Lim and X. Y. Zhou. Linear-quadratic control of backward stochastic differential equations. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 40(2001), 450-474.
- [22] J. Ma and J. Yong. *Forward-Backward Stochastic Differential Equations and Their Applications*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [23] S. Nguyen, D. Nguyen and G. Yin. A stochastic maximum principle for switching diffusions using conditional mean-fields with applications to control problems. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 26(2020), 1-26.
- [24] M. Nourian and P. E. Caines. ϵ -Nash mean field game theory for nonlinear stochastic dynamical systems with major and minor agents. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(2013), 3302-3331.

- [25] G. Nuno and B. Moll. Social optima in economies with heterogeneous agents. *Review Econ. Dynam.*, 28(2018), 150-180.
- [26] S. Peng. Backward stochastic differential equations and applications to optimal control. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 27(1993), 125-144.
- [27] S. Peng. Backward SDE and related g-expectation, in *Backward Stochastic Differential Equations* (Paris, 1995-1996). Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser. 364, Longman, Harlow, 141-159, 1997.
- [28] S. Peng and Z. Wu. Fully coupled forward-backward stochastic differential equations and applications to optimal control. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37(1999), 825-843.
- [29] B. Piccoli, F. Rossi and E. Trélat. Control to flocking of the Kinetic Cucker–Smale model. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 47(2015), 4685-4719.
- [30] R. Salhab, J. L. Ny and Malhamé. Dynamic collective choice: Social optima. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 63 (2018), 3487-3494.
- [31] S. Sanjari and S. Yuksel. Convex symmetric stochastic dynamic teams and their mean-field limit, in *Proceedings of the 58th IEEE Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, 2019, 4662-4667.
- [32] J. Subramanian, R. Seraj and A. Mahajan. Reinforcement learning for mean-field teams, in *Workshop on Adaptive and Learning Agents at International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 2018.
- [33] J. Sun, H. Wang and Z. Wu. Mean-field linear-quadratic stochastic differential games. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 296(2021), 299-334.
- [34] P. R. de Waal and J. H. van Schuppen. A class of team problems with discrete action spaces: Optimality conditions based on multimodularity. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 38(2000), 875-892.
- [35] B. Wang and J. Zhang. Social optima in mean field linear-quadratic-Gaussian models with Markov jump parameters. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 55(2017), 429-456.
- [36] B. Wang, H. Zhang and J. Zhang. Mean field linear-quadratic control: uniform stabilization and social optimality. *Automatica*, 121(2020), 109088.
- [37] G. Wang, Z. Wu and J. Xiong. Maximum principles for forward-backward stochastic control systems with correlated state and observation noises. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(2013), 491-524.
- [38] G. Wang, Z. Wu and J. Xiong. A linear-quadratic optimal control problem of forward-backward stochastic differential equations with partial information. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 60(2015), 2904-2916.
- [39] J. Yong. Linear forward-backward stochastic differential equations with random coefficients. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 135(2006), 53-83.
- [40] J. Yong. A stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problem with generalized expectation. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.*, 26(2008), 1136-1160.
- [41] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou. *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.