

# PROBABILISTIC MAX-PLUS SCHEMES FOR SOLVING HAMILTON-JACOBI-BELLMAN EQUATIONS

MARIANNE AKIAN AND ERIC FODJO

**ABSTRACT.** We consider fully nonlinear Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations associated to diffusion control problems involving a finite set-valued (or switching) control and possibly a continuum-valued control. In previous works (Akian, Fodjo, 2016 and 2017), we introduced a lower complexity probabilistic numerical algorithm for such equations by combining max-plus and numerical probabilistic approaches. The max-plus approach is in the spirit of the one of McEneaney, Kaise and Han (2011), and is based on the distributivity of monotone operators with respect to suprema. The numerical probabilistic approach is in the spirit of the one proposed by Fahim, Touzi and Warin (2011). A difficulty of the latter algorithm was in the critical constraints imposed on the Hamiltonian to ensure the monotonicity of the scheme, hence the convergence of the algorithm. Here, we present new probabilistic schemes which are monotone under rather weak assumptions, and show error estimates for these schemes. These estimates will be used in further works to study the probabilistic max-plus method.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider a finite horizon diffusion control problem on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  involving at the same time a “discrete” control taking its values in a finite set  $\mathcal{M}$ , and a “continuum” control taking its values in some subset  $\mathcal{U}$  of a finite dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^p$  (for instance a convex set with nonempty interior), which we next describe.

Let  $T$  be the horizon. The state  $\xi_s \in \mathbb{R}^d$  at time  $s \in [0, T]$  satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$(1) \quad d\xi_s = f^{\mu_s}(\xi_s, u_s)ds + \sigma^{\mu_s}(\xi_s, u_s)dW_s \quad ,$$

where  $(W_s)_{s \geq 0}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}, P)$ . The control processes  $\mu := (\mu_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$  and  $u := (u_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$  take their values in the sets  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  respectively and they are admissible if they are progressively measurable with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ . We assume that, for all  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , the maps  $f^m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\sigma^m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are continuous and satisfy properties implying the existence of the process  $(\xi_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$  for any admissible control processes  $\mu$  and  $u$ .

Given an initial time  $t \in [0, T]$ , the control problem consists in maximizing the following payoff:

$$J(t, x, \mu, u) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s \delta^{\mu_\tau}(\xi_\tau, u_\tau) d\tau} \ell^{\mu_s}(\xi_s, u_s) ds + e^{-\int_t^T \delta^{\mu_\tau}(\xi_\tau, u_\tau) d\tau} \psi(\xi_T) \mid \xi_t = x \right] \quad ,$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 93E20, 49L20, 49M25, 65M75.

*Key words and phrases.* Stochastic control, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations, Max-plus numerical methods, Tropical methods, Probabilistic schemes.

The first author was partially supported by the ANR project MALTHY, ANR-13-INSE-0003, by ICODE, and by PGM0, a joint program of EDF and FMJH (Fondation Mathématique Jacques Hadamard).

where, for all  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\ell^m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\delta^m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , and  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are given continuous maps. We then define the value function of the problem as the optimal payoff:

$$v(t, x) = \sup_{\mu, u} J(t, x, \mu, u) ,$$

where the maximization holds over all admissible control processes  $\mu$  and  $u$ .

Let  $\mathbb{S}_d$  denotes the set of symmetric  $d \times d$  matrices and let us denote by  $\leq$  the Loewner order on  $\mathbb{S}_d$  ( $A \leq B$  if  $B - A$  is nonnegative). The Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the above control problem is defined as:

$$(2a) \quad \mathcal{H}(x, r, p, \Gamma) := \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{H}^m(x, r, p, \Gamma) ,$$

with

$$(2b) \quad \mathcal{H}^m(x, r, p, \Gamma) := \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{H}^{m,u}(x, r, p, \Gamma) ,$$

$$(2c) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{m,u}(x, r, p, \Gamma) := & \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} (\sigma^m(x, u) \sigma^m(x, u)^\top \Gamma) + f^m(x, u) \cdot p \\ & - \delta^m(x, u) r + \ell^m(x, u) . \end{aligned}$$

Under suitable assumptions, the value function  $v : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the unique (continuous) viscosity solution of the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

$$(3a) \quad - \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} - \mathcal{H}(x, v(t, x), Dv(t, x), D^2v(t, x)) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in [0, T),$$

$$(3b) \quad v(T, x) = \psi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

satisfying also some growth condition at infinity (in space).

In [6], Fahim, Touzi and Warin proposed a probabilistic numerical method to solve such fully nonlinear partial differential equations (3), inspired by their backward stochastic differential equation interpretation given by Cheridito, Soner, Touzi and Victoir in [5]. This method consists in two steps, the first one being a time discretization of the partial differential equation using the Euler discretization of the stochastic differential equation of an uncontrolled diffusion (thus different from the controlled one). The second step of the method is based on the simulation of the discretized diffusion and linear regression estimations which can be seen as an alternative to a space discretization.

In [8, 10], McEneaney, Kaise and Han proposed an idempotent numerical method which works at least when the Hamiltonian with fixed discrete control,  $\mathcal{H}^m$ , correspond to linear quadratic control problems. This method is based on the distributivity of the (usual) addition operation over the supremum (or infimum) operation, and on a property of invariance of the set of quadratic forms. It computes in a backward manner the value function  $v(t, \cdot)$  at time  $t$  as a supremum of quadratic forms. However, as  $t$  decreases, the number of quadratic forms generated by the method increases exponentially (and even become infinite if the Brownian is not discretized in space) and some pruning is necessary to reduce the complexity of the algorithm.

In [1], we introduced an algorithm combining the two above methods at least in their spirit. The algorithm applies the first step (the time discretization) of the method of [6] to the HJB equations obtained when the discrete control is fixed, then using the simulation of as many uncontrolled stochastic processes as discrete controls, it applies a max-plus type space discretization in the spirit of the method of [8, 10]. Then, without any pruning, the number of quadratic forms representing the value function is bounded by the sampling size [1]. Hence, the complexity of the algorithm is bounded polynomially in the number of discretization time steps and the sampling size.

The convergence of the probabilistic max-plus algorithm proposed in [1] is based, as for the one of [6], on the monotonicity of the time discretization scheme. In particular [6], this monotonicity allows one to apply the theorem of Barles and Souganidis [3].

However, for this monotonicity to hold, critical constraints are imposed on the Hamiltonian: the diffusion matrices  $\sigma^m(x, u)\sigma^m(x, u)^\top$  need at the same time to be bounded from below (with respect to the Loewner order) by a symmetric positive definite matrix  $a$  and bounded from above by  $(1 + 2/d)a$ . Such a constraint is restrictive, in particular it may not hold even when the matrices  $\sigma^m(x, u)$  do not depend on  $x$  and  $u$  but take different values for  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ . In [7], Guo, Zhang and Zhuo proposed a monotone scheme exploiting the diagonal part of the diffusion matrices and combining a usual finite difference scheme to the scheme of [6]. This scheme can be applied in more general situations than the one of [6], but still does not work for general control problems. In [2], we proposed a new probabilistic discretization scheme of the second order derivatives which allowed us to obtain the monotonicity of the time discretization of HJB equations (3) with bounded coefficients and an ellipticity condition. Indeed, the monotonicity holds when the first order terms of the HJB equation are dominated by the second order ones.

Here, we propose a new probabilistic scheme for the first order derivatives which is in the spirit of the upwind discretizations used by Kushner for optimal control problems, see for instance [9]. This allows one to solve also degenerate equations or to use time discretizations based on the simulation of a diffusion with same variance as the controlled process.

As soon as the convergence of the algorithm holds, one may expect to obtain estimates on the error leading to bounds on the complexity as a function of the error. Both depend on the error of the time discretization on the one hand, and the error of the ‘‘space discretization’’ on the other hand. We shall only study here the error of the time discretization, for which we obtain error estimates similar to the ones in [6], using the results of Barles and Jakobsen [4]. We shall also show how to adapt the method of [1, 2] with the new time discretization scheme.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the scheme of [6]. Then, monotone probabilistic discretizations of second order and first order derivatives are presented in Section 3, with error estimates for regular functions. These discretizations and error estimates are applied to Hamilton-Jacobi-equations in Section 4, for which the error on a bounded Lipschitz solution is obtained by using the results of Barles and Jakobsen [4]. In Section 5, we recall the algorithm of [1, 2] and show how it can be combined with the scheme of Section 4.

## 2. THE PROBABILISTIC TIME DISCRETIZATION OF FAHIM, TOUZI AND WARIN

Let us first recall the first step of the probabilistic numerical scheme proposed by Fahim, Touzi and Warin in [6], which can be viewed as a time discretization.

Let  $h$  be a time discretization step such that  $T/h$  is an integer. We denote by  $\mathcal{T}_h = \{0, h, 2h, \dots, T - h\}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h = \{0, h, 2h, \dots, T\}$  the set of discretization times of  $[0, T)$  and  $[0, T]$  respectively. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be any hamiltonian of the form (2). Let us decompose  $\mathcal{H}$  as the sum of the (linear) generator  $\mathcal{L}$  of a diffusion (with no control) and of a nonlinear elliptic Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{G}$ , that is  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{G}$  with

$$\mathcal{L}(x, r, p, \Gamma) = \mathcal{L}(x, p, \Gamma) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(a(x)\Gamma) + \underline{f}(x) \cdot p ,$$

$a(x) = \underline{\sigma}(x)\underline{\sigma}(x)^\top$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $a(x)$  is positive definite and  $\partial_\Gamma \mathcal{G}$  is positive semi-definite, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_d$ . Denote by  $\hat{X}$  the Euler discretization of the diffusion with generator  $\mathcal{L}$ :

$$(4) \quad \hat{X}(t+h) = \hat{X}(t) + \underline{f}(\hat{X}(t))h + \underline{\sigma}(\hat{X}(t))(W_{t+h} - W_t) .$$

The time discretization of (3) proposed in [6] has the following form:

$$(5) \quad v^h(t, x) = T_{t,h}(v^h(t+h, \cdot))(x), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_h ,$$

with

$$(6) \quad T_{t,h}(\phi)(x) = \mathcal{D}_{t,h}^0(\phi)(x) + h\mathcal{G}(x, \mathcal{D}_{t,h}^0(\phi)(x), \mathcal{D}_{t,h}^1(\phi)(x), \mathcal{D}_{t,h}^2(\phi)(x)) ,$$

where, for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{t,h}^i(\phi)$  is the approximation of the  $i$ th differential of  $e^{h\mathcal{L}}\phi$  obtained using the following scheme:

$$(7a) \quad \mathcal{D}_{t,h}^i(\phi)(x) = \mathbb{E}(D^i\phi(\hat{X}(t+h)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x)$$

$$(7b) \quad = \mathbb{E}(\phi(\hat{X}(t+h))\mathcal{P}_{t,x,h}^i(W_{t+h} - W_t) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x) ,$$

where,  $D^i$  denotes the  $i$ th differential operator, and for all  $t, x, h, i$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{t,x,h}^i$  is the polynomial of degree  $i$  in the variable  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  given by:

$$(8a) \quad \mathcal{P}_{t,x,h}^0(w) = 1 ,$$

$$(8b) \quad \mathcal{P}_{t,x,h}^1(w) = (\underline{\sigma}(x)^\top)^{-1}h^{-1}w ,$$

$$(8c) \quad \mathcal{P}_{t,x,h}^2(w) = (\underline{\sigma}(x)^\top)^{-1}h^{-2}(ww^\top - hI)(\underline{\sigma}(x))^{-1} ,$$

where  $I$  is the  $d \times d$  identity matrix. Note that the second equality in (7) holds for all  $\phi$  with exponential growth [6, Lemma 2.1].

In [6], the convergence of the time discretization scheme (5) is proved by using the theorem of Barles and Souganidis of [3], under the above assumptions together with the critical assumption that  $\partial_\Gamma \mathcal{G}$  is lower bounded by some positive definite matrix (for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_d$ ) and that  $\text{tr}(a(x)^{-1}\partial_\Gamma \mathcal{G}) \leq 1$ .

Indeed, let us say that an operator  $T$  between any partially ordered sets  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  of real valued functions (for instance the set of bounded functions from some set  $\Omega$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , or  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) is  $L$ -almost monotone, for some constant  $L \geq 0$ , if

$$(9) \quad \phi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}, \phi \leq \psi \implies T(\phi) \leq T(\psi) + L \sup(\psi - \phi) ,$$

and that it is *monotone*, when this holds for  $L = 0$ .

The above conditions together with the boundedness of  $\partial_p \mathcal{G}$  are used to show (in Lemma 3.12 and 3.14 of [6]) that the operator  $T_{t,h}$  is a  $Ch$ -almost monotone operator over the set of Lipschitz continuous functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then, this property, together with other technical assumptions, are used to obtain the assumptions of the theorem of Barles and Souganidis of [3], and also estimates in the same spirit as in [4].

In [1], we proposed to bypass the critical constraint, by assuming that the Hamiltonians  $\mathcal{H}^m$  (but not necessarily  $\mathcal{H}$ ) satisfy the critical constraint, and applying the above scheme to the Hamiltonians  $\mathcal{H}^m$ .

In [2], we proposed an approximation of  $\mathbb{E}(D^2\phi(\hat{X}(t+h)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x)$  or  $D^2\phi(x)$  that we recall in the next section. It is expressed as a conditional expectation as in (7b) but depend on the derivatives of  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to  $\Gamma$  at the given point, via the matrices  $\sigma^m(x, u)$  of the control problem. Below, we also propose an approximation of  $\mathbb{E}(D\phi(\hat{X}(t+h)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x)$  or  $D\phi(x)$  which is monotone in itself and thus allows one to consider the case where the derivatives of  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to  $\Gamma$  are zero or degenerate nonnegative matrices.

### 3. MONOTONE PROBABILISTIC APPROXIMATION OF FIRST AND SECOND ORDER DERIVATIVES AND THEIR ESTIMATES

We first describe the approximation of the second order derivatives proposed in [2]. Consider any matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times \ell}$  with  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and let us denote by  $\Sigma_{\cdot j}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ , its columns. We denote by  $\mathcal{C}^k([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  or simply  $\mathcal{C}^k$  the set of functions from  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with continuous partial derivatives up to order  $k$  in  $t$  and  $x$ , and by  $\mathcal{C}_b^k([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  or  $\mathcal{C}_b^k$  the subset of functions with bounded such derivatives. Then, for any  $v \in \mathcal{C}^2$ , we have

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\underline{\sigma}(x)\Sigma\Sigma^\top \underline{\sigma}^\top(x) D^2v(t, x)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \Sigma_{\cdot j}^\top \underline{\sigma}^\top(x) D^2v(t, x) \underline{\sigma}(x) \Sigma_{\cdot j} .$$

For any integer  $k$ , consider the polynomial:

$$(11a) \quad \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \|\Sigma_{\cdot j}\|_2^2 \left( c_k \left( \frac{[\Sigma^\top w]_j}{\|\Sigma_{\cdot j}\|_2} \right)^{4k+2} - d_k \right),$$

with

$$(11b) \quad c_k := \frac{1}{(4k+2)\mathbb{E}[N^{4k+2}]} , \quad d_k := \frac{1}{4k+2} ,$$

where  $N$  is a one dimensional normal random variable, and where we use the convention that the  $j$ th term of the sum is zero when  $\|\Sigma_{\cdot j}\|_2 = 0$ . This is the sum of the same expression defined for each column  $\Sigma_{\cdot j}$  instead of  $\Sigma$ .

Let  $v \in \mathcal{C}_b^4$ , and  $\hat{X}$  as in (4), then, the following expression is an approximation of (10) with an error in  $O(h)$  uniform in  $t$  and  $x$  [2, Th. 1]:

$$(12) \quad h^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(h^{-1/2}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x \right].$$

In order to obtain error estimates, we need the more precise following result. For  $p$  and  $q$  two integers and  $\phi$  a function from  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with partial derivatives up to order  $p$  in  $t$  and  $q$  in  $x$ , we introduce the following notation :

$$|\partial_t^p D^q \phi| = \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ (\beta_i)_i \in \mathbb{N}^d, \sum_i \beta_i = q}} \left| \frac{\partial^{i+q} \phi}{\partial t^p \partial x_1^{\beta_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\beta_d}}(t, x) \right|$$

In the sequel,  $\|\cdot\|$  will denote any norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  or on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Also  $[x]_i$  will denote the  $i$ th coordinate of any vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $[A]_{ij}$  will denote the  $(i, j)$  entry of any matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times \ell}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\hat{X}$  as in (4), and denote  $W_h^t = W_{t+h} - W_t$ . Consider any matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times \ell}$  with  $\ell \leq d$ . Assume that  $\underline{f}$  and  $\underline{\sigma}$  are bounded by some constant  $C$  uniformly in  $(t)$  and  $x$ , and let  $M$  be an upper bound of  $\|\Sigma \Sigma^\top\|$ . Then, there exists  $K = K(C, M) > 0$  such that, for all  $v \in \mathcal{C}_b^4([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have, for all  $(t, x) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| h^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(h^{-1/2} W_h^t) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\underline{\sigma}(x) \Sigma \Sigma^\top \underline{\sigma}^\top(x) D^2 v(t, x)) \right| \\ & \leq K(1 + \sqrt{h})^4 \left[ h(|\partial_t^1 D^2 v| + |\partial_t^0 D^3 v| + |\partial_t^0 D^4 v|) + \right. \\ & \quad \left. h\sqrt{h}|\partial_t^1 D^3 v| + h^2|\partial_t^2 D^2 v| + h^2\sqrt{h}|\partial_t^3 D^1 v| + h^3|\partial_t^4 D^0 v| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

*Sketch of proof.* The proof follows from the following lemma and the property that  $h^{-1/2} W_h^t$  is a normal random vector and that normal random variables have all their moments finite.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $v, W_h^t$  and  $\Sigma$  be as in Theorem 3.1. We have, for all  $(t, x) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & h^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(h^{-1/2} W_h^t) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\underline{\sigma}(x) \Sigma \Sigma^\top \underline{\sigma}^\top(x) D^2 v(t, x)) + \frac{h}{2} \text{tr}(\underline{\sigma}(x) \Sigma \Sigma^\top \underline{\sigma}^\top(x) \frac{\partial D^2 v(t, x)}{\partial t}) \\ & \quad + \frac{h}{2} \sum_{i,j,p} \left( \frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_p}(t, x) [\underline{\sigma}(x) \Sigma \Sigma^\top \underline{\sigma}^\top(x)]_{ij} [\underline{f}(x)]_p \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ M^4(v, t, x, W_h^t) \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(h^{-1/2} W_h^t) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where there exists  $(s, \xi)$  (random) equal to a convex combination of  $(t, x)$  and  $(t + h, x + \underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t)$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
M^4(v, t, x, W_h^t) &= \frac{h^3}{24} \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial t^4}(s, \xi) \\
&+ \frac{h^2}{6} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial t^3 \partial x_i}(s, \xi) [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_i \\
&+ \frac{h}{4} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial t^2 \partial x_i \partial x_j}(s, \xi) [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_i [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_j \\
&+ \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i,j,p} \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial t \partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_p}(s, \xi) [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_i [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_j \\
&\quad [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_p \\
&+ \frac{1}{24h} \sum_{i,j,p,q} \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_p \partial x_q}(s, \xi) [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_i [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_j \\
&\quad [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_p [\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t]_q .
\end{aligned}$$

*Sketch of proof.* Apply a Taylor expansion of  $v$  around  $(t, x)$  and use the property that for each  $j$ , there exists a unitary matrix  $U$  with  $j$ th column equal to  $\Sigma_{\cdot j} / \|\Sigma_{\cdot j}\|_2$ , so that  $U^\top (h^{-1/2}W_h^t)$  is a  $d$ -dimensional normal random vector with  $j$ th coordinate equal to  $[\Sigma^\top (h^{-1/2}W_h^t)]_j / \|\Sigma_{\cdot j}\|_2$ .  $\square$

Let us also introduce the following approximation of the first order derivatives. For any vector  $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , consider the piecewise linear function  $\mathcal{P}_g^1$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  :

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{P}_g^1(w) = 2(g_+ \cdot w_+ + g_- \cdot w_-) ,$$

where for any vector  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mu_+, \mu_- \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are defined such that  $[\mu_+]_i = \max([\mu]_i, 0)$ ,  $[\mu_-]_i = -\min([\mu]_i, 0)$ . Note that  $\mathcal{P}_g^1$  is nonnegative. We shall show that

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ (v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) - v(t, x)) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t) \right]$$

is a monotone approximation of

$$(\underline{\sigma}(x)g) \cdot Dv(x) .$$

Before this, let us note that if  $\underline{\sigma}(x) = 1$ ,  $\underline{f}(x) = 1$  and  $h^{-1/2}W_h^t$  is discretized by a random variable taking the values 1 and  $-1$  with probability 1/2, then the discretization  $\mathcal{D}_{t,h}^i(v(t+h, \cdot))(x)$  defined in (7b) is equivalent to a centered discretization of  $Dv(x)$  with space step  $\Delta x = h^{1/2}$ , whereas (14) corresponds to the Kushner (upwind) discretization [9]

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \left[ [g_i]_+ \frac{v(t+h, x+h^{1/2}e_i) - v(t, x)}{h^{1/2}} + [g_i]_- \frac{v(t+h, x-h^{1/2}e_i) - v(t, x)}{h^{1/2}} \right] .$$

Using the same proof arguments as above we obtain the following results, where Theorem 3.3 uses Lemma 3.4.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\hat{X}$  as in (4), and denote  $W_h^t = W_{t+h} - W_t$ . Consider any vector  $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Assume that  $\underline{f}$  and  $\underline{\sigma}$  are bounded by some constant  $C$  uniformly in  $(t, x)$ , and let  $M$  be an upper bound of  $\|g\|$ . Then, there exists  $K = K(C, M) > 0$  such*

that, for all  $v \in \mathcal{C}_b^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have, for all  $(t, x) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (\underline{\sigma}(x)g) \cdot Dv - \mathbb{E} \left[ (v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) - v(t, x)) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t) \right] \right| \\ & \leq K(1 + \sqrt{h})^2 \left[ \sqrt{h}(|\partial_t^1 D^0 v| + |\partial_t^0 D^1 v| + |\partial_t^0 D^2 v|) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + h(|\partial_t^1 D^1 v|) + h\sqrt{h}|\partial_t^2 D^0 v| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $v$ ,  $W_h^t$  and  $g$  be as in Theorem 3.3. For all  $(t, x) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $(s, \xi)$  (random) equal to a convex combination of  $(t, x)$  and  $(t+h, x + \underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t)$  such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} (\underline{\sigma}(x)g) \cdot Dv &= 2\mathbb{E} \left[ (v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) - v(t, x)) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t) \right] \\ & - 2h \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t, x) + \underline{f}(x) \cdot Dv(t, x) \right) \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t)] \\ & - h^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial t^2}(s, \xi) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t) \right] \\ & - 2h \mathbb{E} \left[ (\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} Dv(s, \xi) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t) \right] \\ & - \mathbb{E} \left[ (\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t)^\top D^2 v(s, \xi) (\underline{f}(x)h + \underline{\sigma}(x)W_h^t) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}W_h^t) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We shall also need the following bound, that can be proved along the same lines as the previous theorems. We do not give the proof since it can be bypassed by using alternatively the proof of Lemma 3.22 in [6].

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\hat{X}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{t,h}^0$  be as in Section 2. Denote  $W_h^t = W_{t+h} - W_t$ . Assume that  $\underline{f}$  and  $\underline{\sigma}$  are bounded by some constant  $C$  uniformly in  $(t$  and  $x$ ). Then, there exists  $K = K(C) > 0$  such that, for all  $v \in \mathcal{C}_b^4([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have, for all  $(t, x) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| h^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{t,h}^0(v(t+h, \cdot)) - v(t, x)) - (\partial_t^1 v + \mathcal{L}(x, Dv(t, x), D^2 v(t, x))) \right| = \\ & \left| h^{-1}(\mathbb{E}(v(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x) - v(t, x)) - (\partial_t^1 v + \mathcal{L}(x, Dv(t, x), D^2 v(t, x))) \right| \\ & \leq K(1 + \sqrt{h})^4 \left[ h(|\partial_t^0 D^2 v| + |\partial_t^1 D^1 v| + |\partial_t^2 D^0 v| + |\partial_t^0 D^3 v| + |\partial_t^1 D^2 v| + |\partial_t^0 D^4 v|) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + h\sqrt{h}|\partial_t^1 D^3 v| + h^2(|\partial_t^2 D^2 v| + |\partial_t^2 D^1 v|) + h^2\sqrt{h}|\partial_t^3 D^1 v| + h^3|\partial_t^4 D^0 v| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

#### 4. MONOTONE PROBABILISTIC SCHEMES FOR HJB EQUATIONS

We shall apply the above approximations of the first and second order derivatives in (3) in the same way as in [2]. Let us decompose the hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}^{m,u}$  of (2c) as  $\mathcal{H}^{m,u} = \mathcal{L}^m + \mathcal{G}^{m,u}$  with

$$\mathcal{L}^m(x, p, \Gamma) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(a^m(x)\Gamma) + \underline{f}^m(x) \cdot p,$$

and  $a^m(x) = \underline{\sigma}^m(x)\underline{\sigma}^m(x)^\top$ , and denote by  $\hat{X}^m$  the Euler discretization of the diffusion with generator  $\mathcal{L}^m$ . We may choose the same linear operator  $\mathcal{L}^m$  for different values of  $m$ , which is the case in Algorithm 5.4 below. Assume that  $a^m(x)$  is positive definite and that  $a^m(x) \leq \sigma^m(x, u)\sigma^m(x, u)^\top$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , and denote by  $\Sigma^m(x, u)$  any  $d \times \ell$  matrix such that

$$(15) \quad \sigma^m(x, u)\sigma^m(x, u)^\top - a^m(x) = \underline{\sigma}^m(x)\Sigma^m(x, u)\Sigma^m(x, u)^\top \underline{\sigma}^m(x)^\top.$$

One may use for instance a Cholesky factorization of the matrix  $\underline{\sigma}^m(x)^{-1}(\sigma^m(x, u)\sigma^m(x, u)^\top - a^m(x))(\underline{\sigma}^m(x))^\top$  in which zero columns are eliminated to obtain a rectangular matrix  $\Sigma^m(x, u)$  of size  $d \times \ell$  when the rank of the initial matrix is equal to  $\ell < d$ .

Denote also by  $g^m(x, u)$  the  $d$ -dimensional vector such that

$$(16) \quad f^m(x, u) - \underline{f}^m(x) = \underline{\sigma}^m(x)g^m(x, u) .$$

Define

$$(17a) \quad \mathcal{G}_1^m(x, p, g) := (\underline{\sigma}^m(x)g) \cdot p$$

$$(17b) \quad \mathcal{G}_2^m(x, \Gamma, \Sigma) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} (\underline{\sigma}^m(x)\Sigma\Sigma^\top \underline{\sigma}^m(x)^\top \Gamma)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{G}^{m,u}(x, r, p, \Gamma) = \ell^m(x, u) - \delta^m(x, u)r + \mathcal{G}_1^m(x, p, g^m(x, u)) + \mathcal{G}_2^m(x, \Gamma, \Sigma^m(x, u)) .$$

Applying Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 and Lemma 3.5, we deduce the following result which shows the consistency of the scheme (18), together with estimates that are necessary to apply the results of Barles and Jakobsen in [4].

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\underline{\sigma}^m$ ,  $\underline{f}^m$ ,  $\hat{X}^m$  and  $\mathcal{L}^m$  be as above. Let us consider the following “discretization” operators from the set of functions from  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  to the set of functions from  $\mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(t+h, \hat{X}^m(t+h)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x \right] \\ \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,g}^1(r, \phi)(t, x) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ (\phi(t+h, \hat{X}^m(t+h)) - r) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x \right] \\ \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,\Sigma,k}^2(\phi)(t, x) &:= h^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(t+h, \hat{X}^m(t+h)) \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(h^{-1/2}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \mid \hat{X}^m(t) = x \right] , \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathcal{P}_g^1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2$  as in (13) and (11) respectively.

Then, consider the following discretization of (3):

$$(18) \quad \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, v(t, x), v) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d ,$$

where  $v$  is a map  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}$  is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, \phi) = & - \max_{m \in M, u \in \mathcal{U}} \left\{ h^{-1} (\mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x) - r) \right. \\ & \left. + \ell^m(x, u) - \delta^m(x, u)r + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,g^m(x,u)}^1(r, \phi)(t, x) + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,\Sigma^m(x,u),k}^2(\phi)(t, x) \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Assume that  $\underline{\sigma}^m$ ,  $\underline{f}^m$ ,  $g^m$  and  $\Sigma^m$  are bounded maps (in  $x$  and  $u$ ). Then, there exists  $K$  depending on these bounds, such that, for any  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ ,  $\tilde{K}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty$  satisfying

$$|\partial_t^p D^q v| \leq \tilde{K} \epsilon^{1-2p-q} \quad \text{for all } p, q \in \mathbb{N} ,$$

we have,

$$|\mathcal{K}(h, t, x, v(t, x), v) + \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t, x) + \mathcal{H}(x, v(t, x), Dv(t, x), D^2v(t, x))| \leq E(\tilde{K}, h, \epsilon) ,$$

for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with

$$E(\tilde{K}, h, \epsilon) = K \tilde{K} \left( h \epsilon^{-3} (1 + \sqrt{h})^4 (1 + \sqrt{h} \epsilon^{-1})^4 + \sqrt{h} \epsilon^{-1} (1 + \sqrt{h})^2 (1 + \sqrt{h} \epsilon^{-1})^2 \right) .$$

**Lemma 4.2.** *If  $\delta^m \geq 0$ , or if  $\delta^m$  is lower bounded and  $h$  is small enough, the discretized equation (18) can be rewritten as the solution of the iterative equation (5) with  $T_{t,h}$  defined by:*

$$(19) \quad T_{t,h}(\phi)(x) = \max_{m \in M, u \in \mathcal{U}} \frac{T_{t,h,m,u}^N(\phi)(x)}{T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x)} ,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} T_{t,h,m,u}^N(\phi)(x) &= \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x) + h \{ \ell^m(x, u) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,g^m(x,u)}^1(0, \phi)(t, x) + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,\Sigma^m(x,u),k}^2(\phi)(t, x) \} \\ T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x) &= 1 + h \delta^m(x, u) + h \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{P}_{g^m(x,u)}^1(h^{-1}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \right] . \end{aligned}$$



Note that  $T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x) = 1 + O(\sqrt{h})$  when  $\delta^m$  and  $g^m$  are upper bounded.

**Remark 4.3.** When  $\delta^m(x, u)$  and  $g^m(x, u)$  are zero, the above operator  $T_{t,h}$  coincides with the operator proposed in [2], which corresponds to

$$(20a) \quad T_{t,h}(\phi)(x) = \max_{m \in M, u \in \mathcal{U}} T_{t,h,m,u}(\phi)(x)$$

$$(20b) \quad T_{t,h,m,u}(\phi)(x) = \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x)(1 - \delta^m(x, u)h) + h\{\ell^m(x, u)$$

$$(20c) \quad + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t,h,m,g^m(x,u)}^1(\phi)(t, x) + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,\Sigma^m(x,u),k}^2(\phi)(t, x)\},$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t,h,m,g}^1(\phi)(t, x) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(t+h, \hat{X}^m(t+h))g \cdot (h^{-1}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \mid \hat{X}(t) = x \right].$$

When  $k = 0$ , and  $\mathcal{L}^m = \mathcal{L}$  does not depend on  $m$ , the former operator coincides with the operator (6) proposed in [6], see [2]. Note that when  $\delta^m(x, u) \neq 0$ , one need to replace  $-\delta^m(x, u)r$  by  $-\delta^m(x, u)\mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x)$  in the expression of  $\mathcal{K}$  in order to recover the operators of [6] and [2].

When the sign of  $\delta^m$  is not fixed or  $\delta^m$  is not lower bounded, one can replace  $-\delta^m(x, u)r$  by

$$-\delta^m(x, u)_+r + \delta^m(x, u) - \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x)$$

in the expression of  $\mathcal{K}$  so that in all cases, the discretized equation (18) can be rewritten as the solution of the iterative equation (5) with  $T_{t,h}$  defined by (19) and

$$T_{t,h,m,u}^N(\phi)(x) = \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x) + h\{\ell^m(x, u) + \delta^m(x, u) - \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x) \\ + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,g^m(x,u)}^1(0, \phi)(t, x) + \mathcal{D}_{t,h,m,\Sigma^m(x,u),k}^2(\phi)(t, x)\}$$

$$T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x) = 1 + h\delta^m(x, u)_+ + h\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{P}_{g^m(x,u)}^1(h^{-1}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \right].$$

In [2, Theorem 3.3], we proved that the operator  $T_{t,h}$  is monotone for  $h$  small enough over the set of bounded continuous functions  $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , under the assumption that  $\bar{a} < 4k + 2$  with  $\bar{a}$  an upper bound of  $\text{tr}(\Sigma^m(x, u)\Sigma^m(x, u)^\top)$  (for all  $x$  and  $u$ ) and that  $\delta^m$  is upper bounded, and that there exists a bounded map  $\tilde{g}^m$  such that  $g^m(x, u) = \Sigma^m(x, u)\tilde{g}^m(x, u)$ . This was already a generalization of [6, Lemma 3.12], since the latter corresponds to the case where  $k = 0$ . Here, we shall only need that  $g^m$  is bounded. This will allow to apply the result to degenerate matrices  $\Sigma^m(x, u)\Sigma^m(x, u)^\top$ . Also  $\delta^m$  need not to be upper bounded at this point because the expression of  $\mathcal{K}$  uses  $-\delta^m(x, u)r$  instead of  $-\delta^m(x, u)\mathcal{D}_{t,h,m}^0(\phi)(t, x)$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be as in Theorem 4.1. Assume that the map  $\text{tr}(\Sigma^m(x, u)\Sigma^m(x, u)^\top)$  is upper bounded in  $x$  and  $u$  and let  $\bar{a}$  be an upper bound. Assume also that  $\delta^m$  is lower bounded. Then, for  $k$  such that  $\bar{a} \leq 4k + 2$ ,  $\mathcal{K}$  is monotone in the sense of [4]. Also, there exists  $h_0$  such that the operator  $T_{t,h}$  of Lemma 4.2 is monotone for  $h \leq h_0$  over the set of bounded continuous functions  $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* Adapting the definition of monotonicity of [4, (S1)] to our setting (backward equations and a time discretization only), we need to prove that there exists  $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$ ,  $h_0 > 0$  such that if  $h \leq h_0$ ,  $v, v'$  are bounded continuous functions from  $\mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $v \leq v'$  and  $\psi(t) = e^{\mu(T-t)}(a + b(T-t)) + c$  with  $a, b, c \geq 0$ , then :

$$(21) \quad \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r + \psi(t), v + \psi) \geq \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, v') + b/2 - \lambda c \text{ in } \mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let us first show the inequality for  $\psi = 0$ . Using the notations of Lemma 4.2, we have

$$(22) \quad \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, \phi) = - \max_{m \in M, u \in \mathcal{U}} h^{-1} (T_{t,h,m,u}^N(\phi(t+h, \cdot))(x) - T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x)r).$$

Also

$$T_{t,h,m,u}^N(\phi)(x) = h\ell^m(x, u) \\ + \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(\hat{X}^m(t+h))\mathcal{P}^{h,m,u,x}(h^{-1/2}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \mid \hat{X}^m(t) = x \right],$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}^{h,m,u,x}(w) = 1 + h\mathcal{P}_{g^m(x,u)}^1(h^{-1/2}w) + \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma^m(x,u),k}^2(w) .$$

Since  $\mathcal{P}_g^1 \geq 0$  for all  $g$  and  $\mathcal{P}_\Sigma^2 \geq -\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma\Sigma^\top)}{4k+2}$  for all  $\Sigma$ , we get that  $\mathcal{P}^{h,m,u,x}(w) \geq 1 - \frac{\bar{a}}{4k+2}$ . Assume now that  $\bar{a} \leq 4k+2$ . Then,  $\mathcal{P}^{h,m,u,x}(w) \geq 0$ , so if  $v \leq v'$ , then  $T_{t,h,m,u}^N(v) \leq T_{t,h,m,u}^N(v')$  and  $\mathcal{K}(h,t,x,r,v) \geq \mathcal{K}(h,t,x,r,v')$ .

To show (21), it is now sufficient to show the same inequality for  $v = v'$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(h,t,x,r+\psi(t),v+\psi) - \mathcal{K}(h,t,x,r,v) &\geq - \max_{m \in M, u \in \mathcal{U}} \left\{ h^{-1}(\psi(t+h) - \psi(t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \delta^m(x,u)\psi(t) + (\psi(t+h) - \psi(t))\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}_{g^m(x,u)}^1(h^{-1}(W_{t+h} - W_t))] \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Let us take for  $\lambda$  an upper bound of  $-\delta^m$ . From  $\psi(t+h) - \psi(t) \leq 0$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_g^1 \geq 0$  for all  $g$ , we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(h,t,x,r+\psi(t),v+\psi) - \mathcal{K}(h,t,x,r,v) &\geq -h^{-1}(\psi(t+h) - \psi(t)) - \lambda\psi(t) \\ &= be^{\mu(T-t-h)} + e^{\mu(T-t)} \left( \frac{1 - e^{-\mu h}}{h} - \lambda \right) (a + b(T-t)) - \lambda c \\ &\geq b - \lambda c , \end{aligned}$$

if  $1 - e^{-\mu h} \geq \lambda h$ . Taking  $\mu > \lambda$ , there exists  $h_0$  such that  $1 - e^{-\mu h} \geq \lambda h$  for all  $h \leq h_0$ , leading to the previous inequality and so to (21) for  $v = v'$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{K}$  is monotone in the sense of [4].

Since  $\mathcal{P}_g^1 \geq 0$  for all  $g$ , and  $\lambda \geq -\delta^m$ , we get also that  $T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x) \geq 1 - \lambda h$  and so  $T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x) > 0$  for  $h \leq h_0$  if  $h_0 < 1/\lambda$ . Since we already proved that  $T_{t,h,m,u}^N$  is monotone, for all  $m, u$ , we obtain that the operator  $T_{t,h}$  of Lemma 4.2 is well defined and monotone for  $h \leq h_0$  over the set of bounded continuous functions  $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

We shall say that an operator  $T$  between any sets  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  of partially ordered sets of real valued functions, which are stable by the addition of a constant function (identified to a real number), is *additively  $\alpha$ -subhomogeneous* if

$$(23) \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda \geq 0, \phi \in \mathcal{F} \implies T(\phi + \lambda) \leq T(\phi) + \alpha\lambda .$$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Assume that  $\delta^m$  is lower bounded in  $x$  and  $u$  and let  $T_{t,h}$  be as in Lemma 4.2. Then, there exists  $h_0 > 0$  such that for  $h \leq h_0$ ,  $T_{t,h}$  is additively  $\alpha_h$ -subhomogeneous over the set of bounded continuous functions  $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , for some constant  $\alpha_h = 1 + Ch$  with  $C \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\lambda$  is an upper bound of  $-\delta^m$ , take  $C = 2\lambda$  and  $h_0$  such that  $1 - \lambda h_0 \geq 1/2$ .  $\square$

With the monotonicity, the  $\alpha_h$ -subhomogeneity implies the  $\alpha_h$ -Lipschitz continuity of the operator, which allows one to show easily the stability as follows, see [2, Corollary 3.5] for the proof.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let the assumptions and conclusions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.4 hold and assume also that  $\psi$  and  $\ell^m$  are bounded. Then, there exists a unique function  $v^h$  on  $\mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying (18) or equivalently (5) with  $T_{t,h}$  as in Lemma 4.2 and  $v^h(T, x) = \psi(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Moreover  $v^h$  is bounded (independently of  $h$ ).*

Note that the assumptions can be summarized in ‘‘all the maps  $\psi$ ,  $\ell^m$ ,  $\underline{\sigma}^m$ ,  $\underline{f}^m$ ,  $g^m$  and  $\Sigma^m$  are bounded, and the map  $\delta^m$  is lower bounded (which is equivalent to say that the map  $e^{-\delta^m}$  is bounded). This implies that  $f^m$  and  $\sigma^m(\sigma^m)^\top$  are bounded, and, if  $\sigma^m$  is symmetric then  $\sigma^m$  is also bounded, but we do not need this directly.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let the assumptions and conclusions of Corollary 4.6 hold. Assume also that all the maps  $\psi$ ,  $\delta^m$ ,  $\ell^m$ ,  $\underline{\sigma}^m$ ,  $\underline{f}^m$ ,  $g^m$  and  $\Sigma^m$  are continuous with respect to  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , uniformly in  $x$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Then the unique solution  $v^h$  of (18), with the initial condition  $v^h(T, x) = \psi(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , is uniformly continuous on  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h$  is finite, we just need to show that  $v^h(t, \cdot)$  is uniformly continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $t \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_h$ . Since  $v^h(T, \cdot) = \psi$  which is already bounded and uniformly continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we only need to show that the operator  $T_{t,h}$  of Lemma 4.2 sends the set of bounded and uniformly continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to itself. From the proof of Corollary 4.6, it sends bounded functions to bounded functions. So, it is sufficient to show that  $T_{t,h,m,u}^D$  is uniformly continuous, uniformly in  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and that  $T_{t,h,m,u}^N$  sends bounded uniformly continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to functions that are uniformly continuous in  $x$  uniformly in  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . The first property is due to the uniform continuity of  $\delta^m$  and  $g^m$  uniformly in  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . For the second one, one uses that if  $\hat{X}^m(t) = x$ , then  $\hat{X}^m(t+h) = x + \underline{f}^m(x)h + \underline{\sigma}^m(x)(W_{t+h} - W_t)$  which is uniformly continuous in  $x$ , for all given values of  $W_{t+h} - W_t$ , since  $\underline{\sigma}^m$  and  $\underline{f}^m$  are uniformly continuous in  $x$ . Hence, when  $\phi$  is bounded and uniformly continuous with respect to  $x$ , then  $\phi(\hat{X}^m(t+h))$  is bounded and uniformly continuous with respect to  $x$ , for all given values of  $W_{t+h} - W_t$ . Since all moments of  $W_{t+h} - W_t$  are finite and the maps  $\ell^m$ ,  $g^m$  and  $\Sigma^m$  are uniformly continuous with respect to  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , uniformly in  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , we deduce that  $T_{t,h,m,u}^N(\phi)$  is uniformly continuous in  $x$ , uniformly in  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

The previous result shows that the map  $v^h$  can be extended in a continuous function over  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, the convergence of the scheme can be obtained as in [2] by applying the theorem of Barles and Souganidis [3]:

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let the assumptions of Corollary 4.7 hold. Assume also that (3) has a strong uniqueness property for viscosity solutions and let  $v$  be its unique viscosity solution. Let  $v^h$  be the unique solution of (18), with the initial condition  $v^h(T, x) = \psi(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let us extend  $v^h$  on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  as a continuous and piecewise linear function with respect to  $t$ . Then, when  $h \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $v^h$  converges to  $v$  locally uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

To apply the theorem of Barles and Jakobsen [4], we also need the following regularity result (corresponding to **(S2)** in [4]) which is comparable to the previous one.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let the assumptions of Corollary 4.7 hold. Assume also that  $\delta^m$  is bounded. Then, for all continuous and bounded function  $v$  on  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , the function  $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, v(t, x), v)$  is bounded and continuous in  $\mathcal{T}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Moreover, the function  $r \mapsto \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, v)$  is uniformly continuous for bounded  $r$ , uniformly in  $(t, x) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

*Proof.* Using the arguments of the proof of Corollary 4.7 and the rewriting of  $\mathcal{K}$  in (22), one gets that  $x \mapsto \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, v)$  is uniformly continuous in  $x$ , uniformly in  $r$  bounded. Also since  $\delta^m$  and  $g^m$  are bounded, then  $T_{t,h,m,u}^D$  is bounded, so  $(x, r) \mapsto \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, v)$  is uniformly continuous in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r$  in a bounded set of  $\mathbb{R}$ . This shows in particular that  $r \mapsto \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, r, v)$  is uniformly continuous in  $r$  bounded, uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Also, since  $v$  is bounded and uniformly continuous, this implies that  $x \mapsto \mathcal{K}(h, t, x, v(t, x), v)$  is bounded and continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_h$  is a finite set, the assertions of the lemma follow.  $\square$

We also need the following assumptions which correspond to the assumptions with same names in [4].

For a function  $v$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $|v|_0$  and  $|v|_1$  will denote respectively the norm on the space of bounded functions (that is the sup-norm) and the norm on the space of bounded Lipschitz continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (that is the sup-norm plus the minimal Lipschitz constant). More generally, for a function defined on  $Q = [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $|v|_0$  will

denote the sup-norm, while  $|v|_1$  will denote a norm on the space of bounded functions that are Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $x$  and  $1/2$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $t$ :

$$|v|_0 = \sup_{(t,x) \in Q} |v(t,x)|, \quad |v|_1 = |v|_0 + \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in Q \\ (t',x') \in Q' \\ (t,x) \neq (t',x')}} \frac{|v(t',x') - v(t,x)|}{(t' - t)^{1/2} + |x' - x|}.$$

(A1) There exists a constant  $K > 0$ , such that

$$|\phi|_1 \leq K$$

for  $\phi = \psi$  and for all the maps  $\phi = h(\cdot, u)$  with  $h$  being any coordinate of the maps  $f^m, \sigma^m, \delta^m, \ell^m$ , and any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .

(A2) For every  $\delta > 0$ , there is a finite subset  $\mathcal{U}_F$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that for any  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , there exists  $u_F \in \mathcal{U}_F$  such that

$$|h(\cdot, u) - h(\cdot, u_F)|_0 \leq \delta$$

for all the maps  $h$  being any coordinate of the maps  $f^m, \sigma^m, \delta^m, \ell^m$ , and any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Applying [4, Theorem 3.1], we obtain the following estimations which are of the same order as the ones obtained for usual explicit finite difference schemes with  $\Delta x$  in the order of  $\sqrt{h}$  [4] or for the scheme of [6].

**Corollary 4.10.** *Let the assumptions of Corollary 4.7 hold. Assume also (A1) and (A2). Let  $v$  be the unique viscosity solution of (3) and  $v^h$  be the unique solution of (18), with the initial condition  $v^h(T, x) = \psi(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, there exists  $C_1, C_2$  depending on  $|v|_1$  such that, for all  $(t, x) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_h \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have*

$$-C_1 h^{1/10} \leq (v^h - v)(t, x) \leq C_2 h^{1/4}.$$

## 5. THE PROBABILISTIC MAX-PLUS METHOD

In [6], the solution  $v^h$  of the time discretization (5) of the partial differential equation (3) is obtained by using the following method which can be compared to a space discretization. The conditional expectations in (7) are approximated by any probabilistic method such as a regression estimator: after a simulation of the processes  $W_t$  and  $\hat{X}(t)$ , one apply at each time  $t \in \mathcal{T}_h$  a regression estimation to find the value of  $\mathcal{D}_{t,h}^i(v^h(t+h, \cdot))$  at the points  $\hat{X}(t)$  by using the values of  $v^h(t+h, \hat{X}(t+h))$  and  $W_{t+h} - W_t$ . The regression can be done over a finite dimensional linear space approximating the space of bounded Lipschitz continuous functions, for instance the linear space of functions that are polynomial with a certain degree on some “finite elements”. Hence, the value function  $v^h(t, \cdot)$  is obtained by an estimation of it at the simulated points  $\hat{X}(t)$ . This method can also be used for the scheme (5) obtained in the previous section, since the new one also involve conditional expectations.

In the probabilistic max-plus method proposed in [1] and used in [2], the aim was to replace the (large) finite dimensional linear space of functions used in the regression estimations by the max-plus linear space of max-plus linear combinations of functions that belong to a small dimensional linear space (such as the space of quadratic forms). The idea is that stochastic control problems involve at the same time an expectation which is a linear operation and a maximization which is a max-plus linear operation. Note that a direct regression estimation on such a non linear space is difficult. We rather used the distributivity property of monotone operators over suprema operations, recalled in Theorem 5.1 below, a property which generalizes the one shown in Theorem 3.1 of McEneaney, Kaise and Han [10]. This allowed us to reduce the regression estimations to the small dimensional linear space of quadratic forms.

The algorithm of [1] was based on the scheme of [6], that is (5) with  $T_{t,h}$  as in (6). The one of [2] was based on (5) with  $T_{t,h}$  involving the discretization of second order terms as in Theorem 3.1 with  $k$  large enough in such a way that the scheme is monotone, that is the scheme of Theorem 4.1 but with a discretization of zero and first order terms as in (6), see Remark 4.3. Here, we shall explain how the algorithm can be adapted to the case of the discretization of Theorem 4.1.

In the sequel, we denote  $\mathcal{W} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  the set of measurable functions from  $\mathcal{W}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with at most some given growth or growth rate (for instance with at most exponential growth rate), assuming that it contains the constant functions.

**Theorem 5.1** ([1, Theorem 4]). *Let  $G$  be a monotone additively  $\alpha$ -subhomogeneous operator from  $\mathcal{D}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , for some constant  $\alpha > 0$ . Let  $(Z, \mathfrak{A})$  be a measurable space, and let  $\mathcal{W}$  be endowed with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $\phi : \mathcal{W} \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable map such that for all  $z \in Z$ ,  $\phi(\cdot, z)$  is continuous and belongs to  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $v \in \mathcal{D}$  be such that  $v(W) = \sup_{z \in Z} \phi(W, z)$ . Assume that  $v$  is continuous and bounded. Then,*

$$G(v) = \sup_{\bar{z} \in \bar{Z}} G(\bar{\phi}^{\bar{z}})$$

where  $\bar{\phi}^{\bar{z}} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W \mapsto \phi(W, \bar{z}(W))$ , and

$$\bar{Z} = \{\bar{z} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow Z, \text{ measurable and such that } \bar{\phi}^{\bar{z}} \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

To explain the algorithm, assume that the final reward  $\psi$  of the control problem can be written as the supremum of a finite number of concave quadratic forms. Denote  $\mathcal{Q}_d = \mathbb{S}_d^- \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathbb{S}_d^-$  is the set of nonpositive symmetric  $d \times d$  matrices, and let

$$(24) \quad q(x, z) := \frac{1}{2} x^\top Q x + b \cdot x + c, \quad \text{with } z = (Q, b, c) \in \mathcal{Q}_d,$$

be the quadratic form with parameter  $z$  applied to the vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then for  $g_T = q$ , we have

$$v^h(T, x) = \psi(x) = \sup_{z \in Z_T} g_T(x, z)$$

where  $Z_T$  is a finite subset of  $\mathcal{Q}_d$ .

The application of the operator  $T_{t,h}$  of Lemma 4.2 to a (continuous) function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x \mapsto \phi(x)$  can be written, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , as

$$(25a) \quad T_{t,h}(\phi)(x) = \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} G_{t,h,x}^m(\tilde{\phi}_{t,h,x}^m),$$

where

$$(25b) \quad S_{t,h}^m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, (x, W) \mapsto S_{t,h}^m(x, W) = x + \underline{f}^m(x)h + \underline{\sigma}^m(x)W,$$

$$(25c) \quad \tilde{\phi}_{t,h,x}^m = \phi(S_{t,h}^m(x, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{D} \quad \text{if } \phi \in \mathcal{D},$$

and  $G_{t,h,x}^m$  is the operator from  $\mathcal{D}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  given by

$$(26) \quad G_{t,h,x}^m(\tilde{\phi}) = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \frac{G_{t,h,x,m,u}^N(\tilde{\phi})}{T_{t,h,m,u}^D(x)},$$

with

$$(27) \quad G_{t,h,x,m,u}^N(\tilde{\phi}) = D_{t,h}^0(\tilde{\phi}) + h \{ \ell^m(x, u) + D_{t,h,g^m(x,u)}^1(\tilde{\phi}) + D_{t,h,\Sigma^m(x,u),k}^2(\tilde{\phi}) \},$$

$$D_{t,h}^0(\tilde{\phi}) = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\phi}(W_{t+h} - W_t)),$$

$$D_{t,h,g}^1(\tilde{\phi}) = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\phi}(W_{t+h} - W_t) \mathcal{P}_g^1(h^{-1}(W_{t+h} - W_t))),$$

$$D_{t,h,\Sigma,k}^2(\tilde{\phi})(x) := h^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\phi}(W_{t+h} - W_t) \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma,k}^2(h^{-1/2}(W_{t+h} - W_t)) \right],$$

$g^m(x, u)$  and  $\Sigma^m(x, u)$ , as in Section 4, and  $\mathcal{P}_g^1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\Sigma, k}^2$  as in (13) and (11) respectively. Indeed, the Euler discretization  $\hat{X}^m$  of the diffusion with generator  $\mathcal{L}^m$  satisfies

$$(28) \quad \hat{X}^m(t+h) = S_{t,h}^m(\hat{X}^m(t), W_{t+h} - W_t) .$$

Using the same arguments as for Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 4.5, one can obtain the stronger property that for  $h \leq h_0$ , all the operators  $G_{t,h,x}^m$  belong to the class of monotone additively  $\alpha_h$ -subhomogeneous operators from  $\mathcal{D}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . This allows us to apply Theorem 5.1. In [1], we shown the following result.

**Theorem 5.2** ([1, Theorem 2], compare with [10, Theorem 5.1]). *Consider the control problem of Section 1. Assume that, for each  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\delta^m$  and  $\sigma^m$  are constant,  $\sigma^m$  is nonsingular,  $f^m$  is affine with respect to  $(x, u)$ ,  $\ell^m$  is concave quadratic with respect to  $(x, u)$ , and that  $\psi$  is the supremum of a finite number of concave quadratic forms. Consider the scheme (5), with  $T_{t,h}$  as in (20),  $\underline{\sigma}^m$  constant and nonsingular,  $\Sigma^m$  constant and nonsingular and  $\underline{f}^m$  affine. Assume that the operators  $G_{t,h,x}^m$  belong to the class of monotone additively  $\alpha_h$ -subhomogeneous operators from  $\mathcal{D}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , for some constant  $\alpha_h = 1 + Ch$  with  $C \geq 0$ . Assume also that the value function  $v^h$  of (5) belongs to  $\mathcal{D}$  and is locally Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $x$ . Then, for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , there exists a set  $Z_t$  and a map  $g_t : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $z \in Z_t$ ,  $g_t(\cdot, z)$  is a concave quadratic form and*

$$(29) \quad v^h(t, x) = \sup_{z \in Z_t} g_t(x, z) .$$

Moreover, the sets  $Z_t$  satisfy  $Z_t = \mathcal{M} \times \{\bar{z}_{t+h} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow Z_{t+h} \mid \text{Borel measurable}\}$ .

Theorem 5.2 uses Theorem 5.1 together with the property that, for each  $m$ , the operator  $T_{t,h}^m$  such that  $T_{t,h}^m(\phi)(x) = G_{t,h,x}^m(\tilde{\phi}_{t,h,x}^m)$ , with  $G_{t,h,x}^m$  defined in the same way as in (26) but for  $T_{t,h}$  as in (20), sends a random (concave) quadratic form that is upper bounded by a deterministic quadratic form into a (concave) quadratic form. This means that if  $\bar{z}$  is a measurable function from  $\mathcal{W}$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_d$  and  $\tilde{q}_x$  denotes the measurable map  $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W \mapsto q(S_{t,h}^m(x, W), \bar{z}(W))$ , with  $q$  as in (24), and if there exists  $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  such that  $\tilde{q}_x \leq q(x, \bar{z})$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then the function  $x \mapsto G_{t,h,x}^m(\tilde{q}_x)$  is a concave quadratic form, that is it can be written as  $q(x, z)$  for some  $z \in \mathcal{Q}_d$ , see [1, Lemma 3].

If we replace the operator  $T_{t,h}$  of (20) by the one of Lemma 4.2, the previous property does not hold because of the expressions  $g^+$  and  $g^-$  and so one cannot deduce directly a result like Theorem 5.2. However, one can still obtain the following result:

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let us consider the notations and assumptions of Theorem 5.2, except that  $T_{t,h}$  is replaced by the operator of Lemma 4.2. For each  $m$ , consider the operator  $T_{t,h}^m$  such that  $T_{t,h}^m(\phi)(x) = G_{t,h,x}^m(\tilde{\phi}_{t,h,x}^m)$  with  $G_{t,h,x}^m$  as in (26). Let  $\bar{z}$  be a measurable function from  $\mathcal{W}$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_d$ . Let  $\tilde{q}_{t,h,x}^{m,\bar{z}}$  be the map  $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $W \mapsto q(S_{t,h}^m(x, W), \bar{z}(W))$ , with  $q$  as in (24). Assume that there exists  $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  such that  $q(x, \bar{z}(W)) \leq q(x, \bar{z})$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, the function  $\bar{q} : x \mapsto G_{t,h,x}^m(\tilde{q}_{t,h,x}^{m,\bar{z}})$  is upper bounded by a quadratic map and there exists  $C > 0$  and  $z \in \mathcal{Q}_d$ , such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$q(x, z) \leq \bar{q}(x) \leq q(x, z) + Ch\sqrt{h}(\|x\|^2 + 1)^{3/2} .$$

This justify the application of the same algorithm as in [2], that we recall below for completeness for the operator of Lemma 4.2. Recall that in the same spirit as in [6], we proposed in [1] and [2] to compute the expression of the maps  $v^h(t, \cdot)$  by using simulations of the processes  $\hat{X}^m$ . These simulations are not only used for regression estimations of conditional expectations, which are computed there only in the case of random quadratic forms, leading to quadratic forms, but they are also used to fix the

“discretization points”  $x$  at which the optimal quadratic forms in the expression (29) are computed.

**Algorithm 5.4** ([2, Algorithm1]).

*Input:* A constant  $\epsilon$  giving the precision, a time step  $h$  and a horizon time  $T$  such that  $T/h$  is an integer, a 3-uple  $N = (N_{\text{in}}, N_x, N_w)$  of integers giving the numbers of samples, such that  $N_x \leq N_{\text{in}}$ , a subset  $\overline{\mathcal{M}} \subset \mathcal{M}$  and a projection map  $\pi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ . A finite subset  $Z_T$  of  $\mathcal{Q}_d$  such that  $|\psi(x) - \max_{z \in Z_T} q(x, z)| \leq \epsilon$ , for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $\#Z_T \leq \#\overline{\mathcal{M}} \times N_{\text{in}}$ . The operators  $T_{t,h}$  and  $G_{t,x,h}^m$  as in (25-26) and the process  $\hat{X}^m(t)$  satisfying (28) for  $t \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , with  $\mathcal{L}^m$  (and thus  $\hat{X}^m$  and  $G_{t,x,h}^m$ ) depending only on  $\pi(m)$ .

*Output:* The subsets  $Z_t$  of  $\mathcal{Q}_d$ , for  $t \in \mathcal{T}_h \cup \{T\}$ , and the approximate value function  $v^{h,N} : (\mathcal{T}_h \cup \{T\}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

- *Initialization:* Let  $\hat{X}^m(0) = \hat{X}(0)$ , for all  $m \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ , where  $\hat{X}(0)$  is random and independent of the Brownian process. Consider a sample of  $(\hat{X}(0), (W_{t+h} - W_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}_h})$  of size  $N_{\text{in}}$  indexed by  $\omega \in \Omega_{N_{\text{in}}} := \{1, \dots, N_{\text{in}}\}$ , and denote, for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}_h \cup \{T\}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_{N_{\text{in}}}$ , and  $m \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ ,  $\hat{X}^m(t, \omega)$  the value of  $\hat{X}^m(t)$  induced by this sample. Define  $v^{h,N}(T, x) = \max_{z \in Z_T} q(x, z)$ , for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $q$  as in (24).

- For  $t = T - h, T - 2h, \dots, 0$  apply the following 3 steps:

- (1) Choose a random sampling  $\omega_{i,1}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N_x$  among the elements of  $\Omega_{N_{\text{in}}}$  and independently a random sampling  $\omega'_{1,j}$   $j = 1, \dots, N_w$  among the elements of  $\Omega_{N_{\text{in}}}$ , then take the product of samplings, that is consider  $\omega_{(i,j)} = \omega_{i,1}$  and  $\omega'_{(i,j)} = \omega'_{1,j}$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ , leading to  $(\omega_\ell, \omega'_\ell)$  for  $\ell \in \Omega_{N_{\text{rg}}} := \{1, \dots, N_x\} \times \{1, \dots, N_w\}$ .

Induce the sample  $\hat{X}^m(t, \omega_\ell)$  (resp.  $(W_{t+h} - W_t)(\omega'_\ell)$ ) for  $\ell \in \Omega_{N_{\text{rg}}}$  of  $\hat{X}^m(t)$  with  $m \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$  (resp.  $W_{t+h} - W_t$ ). Denote by  $\mathcal{W}_t^N \subset \mathcal{W}$  the set of  $(W_{t+h} - W_t)(\omega'_\ell)$  for  $\ell \in \Omega_{N_{\text{rg}}}$ .

- (2) For each  $\omega \in \Omega_{N_{\text{in}}}$  and  $m \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ , denote  $x_t = \hat{X}^m(t, \omega)$  and construct  $z_t \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  depending on  $\omega$  and  $m$  as follows:

- (a) Choose  $\bar{z}_{t+h} : \mathcal{W}_t^N \rightarrow Z_{t+h} \subset \mathcal{Q}_d$  such that, for all  $\ell \in \Omega_{N_{\text{rg}}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^{h,N}(t+h, S_{t,h}^m(x_t, (W_{t+h} - W_t)(\omega'_\ell))) \\ = q(S_{t,h}^m(x_t, (W_{t+h} - W_t)(\omega'_\ell)), \bar{z}_{t+h}((W_{t+h} - W_t)(\omega'_\ell))) . \end{aligned}$$

Extend  $\bar{z}_{t+h}$  as a measurable map from  $\mathcal{W}$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_d$ . Let  $\tilde{q}_{t,h,x}$  be the element of  $\mathcal{D}$  given by  $W \in \mathcal{W} \mapsto q(S_{t,h}^m(x, W), \bar{z}_{t+h}(W))$ .

- (b) For each  $\bar{m} \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\pi(\bar{m}) = m$ , compute an approximation of  $x \mapsto G_{t,h,x}^{\bar{m}}(\tilde{q}_{t,h,x})$  by a linear regression estimation on the set of quadratic forms using the sample  $(\hat{X}^{\bar{m}}(t, \omega_\ell), (W_{t+h} - W_t)(\omega'_\ell))$ , with  $\ell \in \Omega_{N_{\text{rg}}}$ , and denote by  $z_t^{\bar{m}} \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  the parameter of the resulting quadratic form.

- (c) Choose  $z_t \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  optimal among the  $z_t^{\bar{m}} \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  at the point  $x_t$ , that is such that  $q(x_t, z_t) = \max_{\pi(\bar{m})=m} q(x_t, z_t^{\bar{m}})$ .

- (3) Denote by  $Z_t$  the set of all the  $z_t \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  obtained in this way, and define

$$v^{h,N}(t, x) = \max_{z \in Z_t} q(x, z) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d .$$

Recall that no computation is done at Step (3), which gives only a formula to be able to compute the value function at each time step and state  $x$  by using the sets  $Z_t$ .

Contrarily to what happened in [2], the map  $x \mapsto G_{t,h,x}^{\bar{m}}(\tilde{q}_{t,h,x})$  is not necessarily a quadratic form, but for  $x$  in a bounded set and  $h$  small enough, it can be approximated by a quadratic form, see Lemma 5.3. Then, the regression estimation over the set of quadratic forms gives an approximation of order  $O(h\sqrt{h})$  which add an error in  $O(\sqrt{h})$  to the value function at time 0. In [1, Proposition 5], under suitable assumptions, we shown the convergence  $\lim_{N_{\text{in}}, N_{\text{rg}} \rightarrow \infty} v^{h,N}(t, x) = v^h(t, x)$ . Here, we may expect that  $\limsup_{N_{\text{in}}, N_{\text{rg}} \rightarrow \infty} |v^{h,N}(t, x) - v^h(t, x)| \leq C\sqrt{h}$ . However a further study is needed to obtain a precise estimation of the error depending on  $N_{\text{in}}$ ,  $N_{\text{rg}}$  and  $h$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Marianne Akian and Eric Fodjo. A probabilistic max-plus numerical method for solving stochastic control problems. In *55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC 2016)*, Las Vegas, United States, December 2016. Also arXiv:1605.02816.
- [2] Marianne Akian and Eric Fodjo. From a monotone probabilistic scheme to a probabilistic max-plus algorithm for solving Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. ArXiv:1709.09049, 2017.
- [3] G. Barles and P. E. Souganidis. Convergence of approximation schemes for fully nonlinear second order equations. *Asymptotic Anal.*, 4(3):271–283, 1991.
- [4] Guy Barles and Espen R. Jakobsen. Error bounds for monotone approximation schemes for parabolic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. *Math. Comp.*, 76(260):1861–1893, 2007.
- [5] Patrick Cheridito, H. Mete Soner, Nizar Touzi, and Nicolas Victoir. Second-order backward stochastic differential equations and fully nonlinear parabolic PDEs. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(7):1081–1110, 2007.
- [6] Arash Fahim, Nizar Touzi, and Xavier Warin. A probabilistic numerical method for fully nonlinear parabolic PDEs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 21(4):1322–1364, 2011.
- [7] Wenjie Guo, Jianfeng Zhang, and Jia Zhuo. A monotone scheme for high-dimensional fully nonlinear PDEs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 25(3):1540–1580, 2015.
- [8] Hidehiro Kaise and William M. McEneaney. Idempotent expansions for continuous-time stochastic control: compact control space. In *Proceedings of the 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Atlanta, Dec. 2010.
- [9] Harold J. Kushner and Paul G. Dupuis. *Numerical methods for stochastic control problems in continuous time*, volume 24 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992.
- [10] William M. McEneaney, Hidehiro Kaise, and Seung Hak Han. Idempotent method for continuous-time stochastic control and complexity attenuation. In *Proceedings of the 18th IFAC World Congress, 2011*, pages 3216–3221, Milano, Italie, 2011.

M. AKIAN: INRIA AND CMAP, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE CNRS. ADDRESS: CMAP, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, ROUTE DE SACLAY, 91128 PALAISEAU CEDEX  
*E-mail address*, M. Akian: [Marianne.Akian@inria.fr](mailto:Marianne.Akian@inria.fr)

E. FODJO: I-FIHN CONSULTING AND INRIA AND CMAP, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE CNRS. ADDRESS: CMAP, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, ROUTE DE SACLAY, 91128 PALAISEAU CEDEX  
*E-mail address*, E. Fodjo: [eric.fodjo@polytechnique.edu](mailto:eric.fodjo@polytechnique.edu)