

One-dimensional reflected BSDEs with quadratic growth generators

Shiqiu Zheng*, Lidong Zhang, Xiangbo Meng

(College of Sciences, Tianjin University of Science and Technology, Tianjin 300457, China)

Abstract: In this paper, we study the existence, uniqueness and comparison theorem for solutions of one-dimensional reflected backward stochastic differential equations (RBSDEs) with one continuous obstacle. The generators of such RBSDEs have a quadratic growth in z , with the quadratic term taking the form $f(y)|z|^2$, where the function f is defined on an open interval D and local integral. Our proofs mainly depend on a transformation based on f and a domination method based on RBSDEs with two obstacles. As an application, we give a probabilistic interpretation of an obstacle problem for a quadratic PDE with local integral coefficient.

Keywords: Backward stochastic differential equation; quadratic growth; Snell envelope; comparison theorem; viscosity solution

AMS Subject Classification: 60H10.

1 Introduction

In the seminal paper [24], Pardoux and Peng firstly obtained the existence and uniqueness of solutions to backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) with Lipschitz continuous generators. Since then, many results on the existence and uniqueness of BSDEs were obtained under more general conditions. One of the important cases is that the generators are only continuous and have a quadratic growth in variable z . The quadratic term of such generators can be represented by the form $f(y)|z|^2$. In the one-dimensional case, when the function f is a constant, the existence and uniqueness of solutions was firstly obtained by Kobylanski [18] for bounded terminal variables, and then by Briand and Hu [6][7] for exponential integrable terminal variables. When the function f is global integral on \mathbf{R} , the existence and uniqueness of solutions was firstly studied by Bahlali et al. [2] for L^2 integrable terminal variables, and then by Yang [28] for L^p ($p \geq 1$) integrable terminal variables. Furthermore, Bahlali et al. [1] considered the case that the function f is local integral on \mathbf{R} , and Bahlali and Tangpi [3] considered the case that $f(y) = \frac{1}{y}$. Recently, Zheng et al. [29] studied the BSDE with generator $f(y)|z|^2$, where the function f is defined on an open interval D and locally integrable.

El Karoui et al. [10] introduced the notion of one-dimensional reflected BSDEs (RBSDEs) with one lower obstacle L_t . Roughly speaking, a RBSDE can be considered as a BSDE with an additional increasing process K to keep the solution Y_t above a given obstacle L_t . It is

*Corresponding author. E-mail: shiqiumath@163.com

well-known that RBSDEs can be used to deal with the pricing of American options and obstacle problems for PDEs (see [4], [10] and [19], etc.). In this paper, we firstly focus on the existence and uniqueness of solutions to RBSDEs, whose generators have a quadratic growth in variable z , with the quadratic term taking the form $f(y)|z|^2$, where f is defined on an open interval D and local integral. Specifically, for bounded and unbounded terminal variables (u_f -integrable), we obtain the following results:

- Existence and uniqueness for the RBSDE with generator $g(t, y, z) = G_f(t, y, z) + f(y)|z|^2$, where G_f is continuous and has a linear growth in z , and f is defined on an open interval D and local integral. (see Theorem 4.7);
- Existence for the RBSDE with generator g satisfying $|g(t, y, z)| \leq H_f(y) + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2$ or $|g(t, y, z)| \leq \delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2$, where $H_f(y)$ is continuous and f is defined on an open interval D (D satisfies the condition: $x \in D \Rightarrow |x| \in D$), continuous and nonnegative. (see Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2).

We also obtain some existence and uniqueness results for the corresponding BSDEs. It is clear that the range of solution Y_t to such RBSDE or BSDE is included in the open interval D . This means that such equations can be applied to some related problems with singular structure. Note that when f is a constant and $D = \mathbf{R}$, the related studies on quadratic RBSDEs have been done in [4], [19] and [21], etc, in which the proofs mainly depend on exponential transformation, estimates and approximation techniques. Inspired by [1] and [2], our proof mainly uses a transformation u_f and a domination method. u_f is an exponential transformation in the case that f is a constant. To my knowledge, in BSDEs literature, such transformation was firstly used by [18] in the case that f is a constant, and then developed by [2]. It can be used to remove the quadratic term $f(y)|z|^2$ of generators. The domination method was firstly used by [2] in a special case, and then generalized by [1]. It is based on a general existence result of RBSDEs with double obstacles studied by [13], and can be used to obtain the existence of solutions to BSDEs (see [1], [2]). To deal with our problem, we use a transformation u_f defined on the open interval D with $u_f(\alpha) = 0$, for some constant α in D (u_f in [2] is defined on \mathbf{R} with $u_f(0) = 0$), and introduce a domination method for RBSDEs with one obstacle, whose proof is slightly different from [1] and [2]. (see Remark 3.5(i)).

Comparison theorem is one of the most important properties for BSDE and RBSDEs. To my knowledge, comparison theorem can be usually obtained by linearization method for Lipschitz continuous generators (see Theorem 2.2 in [12]), approximation method for linear growth generators (see Proposition 1.4 in [11]), and θ -method for quadratic generators with convexity or concavity in z (see Theorem 5 in [7]), etc. In this paper, we use a domination method to prove comparison theorems for quadratic RBSDEs and BSDEs without convexity or concavity assumption on z . This method also can be applied to RBSDEs and RBSDEs under other conditions. We firstly construct a RBSDE with two obstacles or a RBSDE with one obstacle, then the comparison theorems can be obtained naturally, by reducing such equation to a RBSDE with one obstacle or a BSDE, respectively.

As an application of the RBSDE with generator $G_f + f(y)|z|^2$, we study an obstacle problem for PDEs with the term $f(v(t, x))|\sigma^* \nabla_x v(t, x)|^2$, where f is defined on an open interval D , continuous and nonpositive. Using the relation between the RBSDE with generator $G_f + f(y)|z|^2$ and a RBSDE with Lipschitz continuous generator, we give a viscosity solution of such obstacle problem by a solution of a Markovian RBSDE.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we will present some assumptions and lemmas. In Section 3, we will introduce a domination method for RBSDEs and BSDEs. In Section 4, Section 5, and Section 6, we will study the existence, uniqueness and comparison of solutions. In Section 7, we will give a probabilistic interpretation of the viscosity solution of an obstacle problem.

2 Preliminaries

Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a complete probability space, on which a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined. Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ denote the natural filtration generated by $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$, augmented by the P -null sets of \mathcal{F} . Let $|z|$ denote its Euclidean norm, for $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Let $T > 0$ be a given real number and $\mathcal{T}_{t,T}$ be the set of all stopping times τ satisfying $t \leq \tau \leq T$. Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}$ be an open interval which may take one of the following forms:

$$(a, b), (a, +\infty), (-\infty, b), \text{ or } (-\infty, +\infty),$$

where a and b are two real numbers such that $a < b$. We define the following usual spaces:

$$L_{1,loc}(D) = \{f : f : D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, \text{ is measurable and locally integrable}\};$$

$$L_D(\mathcal{F}_T) = \{\xi : \mathcal{F}_T\text{-measurable random variable whose range is included in } D\};$$

$$L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T) = \{\xi : \text{random variable in } L_D(\mathcal{F}_T) \text{ such that } E[|\xi|^p] < \infty\}, p \geq 1;$$

$$\mathcal{C}_D = \{\psi : \text{continuous predictable process whose range is included in } D\};$$

$$\mathcal{S}_D^p = \{\psi : \text{process in } \mathcal{C}_D \text{ such that } E\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\psi_t|^p\right] < \infty\}, p > 0;$$

$$\mathcal{S}_D^\infty = \{\psi : \text{process in } \mathcal{C}_D \text{ and } \|\psi\|_\infty = \text{esssup}_{(\omega,t) \in \Omega \times [0,T]} |\psi_t| < \infty\};$$

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\psi : \text{increasing and continuous } \mathbf{R}\text{-valued process with } \psi_0 = 0\};$$

$$\mathcal{A}^p = \{\psi : \text{process in } \mathcal{A} \text{ with } \psi_T \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)\}, p > 0;$$

$$H^p = \{\psi : \mathbf{R}^d\text{-valued predictable process such that } \int_0^T |\psi_t|^p dt < \infty\}, p \geq 1;$$

$$\mathcal{H}^p = \{\psi : \mathbf{R}^d\text{-valued predictable process such that } E\left[\left(\int_0^T |\psi_t|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] < \infty\}, p > 0;$$

$W_{1,loc}^2(D) = \{f : f : D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, \text{ such that } f \text{ and its generalized derivation } f' \text{ and } f'' \text{ are all locally integrable measurable functions}\}.$

Note that when $D = \mathbf{R}$ or the domain is clear, we simplify the notation $L(\mathcal{F}_T) := L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $L^p(\mathcal{F}_T) := L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}_D$, $\mathcal{S}^p := \mathcal{S}_D^p$ and $\mathcal{S}^\infty := \mathcal{S}_D^\infty$.

In this paper, we define a function:

$$g(\omega, t, y, z) : \Omega \times [0, T] \times D \times \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto \mathbf{R},$$

such that for each $(y, z) \in D \times \mathbf{R}^d$, $(g(t, y, z))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is progressively measurable. Let $\xi \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $L_t \in \mathcal{C}_D$ be given. We always assume that L_t belongs to Class [D]¹ with $L_T \leq \xi$. This paper mainly considers the following one-dimensional RBSDE:

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds + K_T - K_t - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, & t \in [0, T], \\ \forall t \in [0, T], & Y_t \geq L_t, \\ \int_0^T (Y_t - L_t) dK_t = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

¹A process $(\eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of Class [D] if $(\eta_\tau)_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{0, T}}$ is uniformly integrable.

where T is the terminal time, ξ is the terminal variable, g is the generator, and L_t is the lower obstacle. The equation (1) was introduced in [10]. We denote it by $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t)$.

Definition 2.1 A solution of the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t)$ is a triple of processes $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{C}_D \times H^2 \times \mathcal{A}$, which satisfies $\int_0^T |g(s, Y_s, Z_s)| ds < \infty$ and (1).

When the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t)$ is not restricted by the lower obstacle L_t , it will become the following classic BSDE(g, ξ):

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2)$$

Definition 2.2 A solution of the BSDE(g, ξ) is a pair of processes $(Y_t, Z_t) \in \mathcal{C}_D \times H^2$, which satisfies $\int_0^T |g(s, Y_s, Z_s)| ds < \infty$ and (2).

When the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t)$ is further restricted by an upper obstacle U_t , it will become a RBSDE with two obstacles L_t and U_t :

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds + K_T - K_t - V_T + V_t - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, & t \in [0, T], \\ \forall t \in [0, T], \quad U_t \geq Y_t \geq L_t, \\ \int_0^T (Y_t - L_t) dK_t = 0 \text{ and } \int_0^T (U_t - Y_t) dV_t = 0, \\ K_t \text{ and } V_t \text{ are both continuous, increasing with } K_0 = V_0 = 0, \\ dK_t \perp dV_t, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

which was introduced by [9]. We denote it by $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t, U_t)$. A general existence result for $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t, U_t)$ was obtained by Theorem 3.2 in [13] and it will play an important role in this paper.

Definition 2.3 A solution of the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t, U_t)$ is a quadruple of processes $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t, V_t) \in \mathcal{C}_D \times H^2 \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$, which satisfies $\int_0^T |g(s, Y_s, Z_s)| ds < \infty$ and (3).

3 A domination method for existence and comparison

Motivated by the work of [1], we introduce a domination method, which can be used to obtain some existence and comparison results for BSDE(g, ξ, L_t) and BSDE(g, ξ).

Assumption (A) For the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t)$, there exists a semimartingale $Y_t^1 \in \mathcal{C}_D$:

$$Y_t^1 = Y_T^1 + \int_t^T h_1(s) ds + A_T - A_t - \int_t^T Z_s^1 dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $A_t^1 \in \mathcal{A}$, $Z_t \in H^2$ and $h_1(s)$ is a progressively measurable process satisfying $\int_0^T |h_1(t)| dt < \infty$, such that

- (i) for each $t \in [0, T]$, $g(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \leq h_1(t)$;
- (ii) $Y_T^1 \geq \xi$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq L_t$;
- (iii) $g(t, y, z)$ is continuous in (y, z) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [L_t, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$,

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq |\eta_t| + |C_t| |z|^2,$$

where $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$ and η_t is a progressively measurable process such that $\int_0^T |\eta_t| dt < \infty$.

When the lower obstacle L_t in Assumption (A) is a semimartingale, we have the following Assumption (B). A slightly different domination condition was introduced by Definition 3.1 in [1].

Assumption (B) For the BSDE(g, ξ), there exist two semimartingales $Y_t^1 \in \mathcal{C}_D$ and $Y_t^2 \in \mathcal{C}_D$:

$$Y_t^1 = Y_T^1 + \int_t^T h_1(s) ds + A_T^1 - A_t^1 - \int_t^T Z_s^1 dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

$$Y_t^2 = Y_T^2 + \int_t^T h_2(s) ds - A_T^2 + A_t^2 - \int_t^T Z_s^2 dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $A_t^i \in \mathcal{A}$, $Z_t^i \in H^2$ and $h_i(s)$ is a progressively measurable process satisfying $\int_0^T |h_i(t)| dt < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, such that

- (i) for each $t \in [0, T]$, $g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq h_2(t)$ and $g(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \leq h_1(t)$;
- (ii) $Y_T^1 \geq \xi \geq Y_T^2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$;
- (iii) $g(t, y, z)$ is continuous in (y, z) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [Y_t^2, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$,

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq |\eta_t| + |C_t| |z|^2,$$

where $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$ and η_t is a progressively measurable process such that $\int_0^T |\eta_t| dt < \infty$.

To establish comparison theorems for BSDEs, we give a one-sided domination condition.

Assumption (C) For the BSDE(g, ξ), there exist a semimartingale $Y_t^2 \in \mathcal{C}_D$:

$$Y_t^2 = Y_T^2 + \int_t^T h_2(s) ds - A_T^2 + A_t^2 - \int_t^T Z_s^2 dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $A_t^2 \in \mathcal{A}$, $Z_t^2 \in H^2$ and $h_2(s)$ is a progressively measurable process satisfying $\int_0^T |h_2(t)| dt < \infty$, such that

- (i) for each $t \in [0, T]$, $g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq h_2(t)$;
- (ii) $\xi \geq Y_T^2$;
- (iii) the RBSDE(g, ξ, Y_t^2) has a solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) .

Proposition 3.1 *Let the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) satisfy Assumption (A). Then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t \leq Y_t^1$.*

Proof. By Assumption (A)(ii)(iii) and Theorem 3.2 in [13], we get that the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t, Y_t^1) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t, V_t) . We will show $V_T = 0$. Clearly, for $r \leq t$,

$$\begin{aligned} (Y_t^1 - Y_t) &= (Y_r^1 - Y_r) - \int_r^t (h_1(s) - g(s, Y_s, Z_s)) ds - \int_r^t dA_s^1 \\ &\quad + \int_r^t (dK_s - dV_s) + \int_r^t (Z_s^1 - Z_s) dB_s. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, by applying Tanaka's formula to $(Y_t^1 - Y_t)^+$, for $r \leq t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(Y_t^1 - Y_t)^+ &= (Y_r^1 - Y_r)^+ - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}}(h_1(s) - g(s, Y_s, Z_s))ds - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}}dA_s^1 \\
&\quad + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}}(dK_s - dV_s) + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}}(Z_s^1 - Z_s)dB_s \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}L_t^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s) - \frac{1}{2}L_r^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s), \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where $L_t^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s)$ is the local time of $Y_s^1 - Y_s$ at time t and level 0. Since $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t$, we have $(Y_t^1 - Y_t)^+ = (Y_t^1 - Y_t)$, which together with (4) and (5), gives

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(h_1(s) - g(s, Y_s, Z_s))ds - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}dA_s^1 \\
&\quad + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(dK_s - dV_s) + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(Z_s^1 - Z_s)dB_s - \frac{1}{2}L_t^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s) + \frac{1}{2}L_r^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$Z_s^1 = Z_s, \quad dt \times dP - a.e., \quad \text{on the set } \{Y_s^1 = Y_s\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(dK_s - dV_s) &= \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(h_1(s) - g(s, Y_s, Z_s))ds + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}dA_s^1 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}L_t^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s) - \frac{1}{2}L_r^0(Y_s^1 - Y_s).
\end{aligned}$$

By the above two equalities and Assumption (A)(i), we get that, for any $r \leq t$,

$$\int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(dK_s - dV_s) \geq 0,$$

which implies that for any progressively measurable set $\mathcal{Q} \subset \{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}$, we have

$$\int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{G}}(dK_s - dV_s) \geq 0. \tag{6}$$

By the relation $dK_t \perp dV_t$,² there exists a progressively measurable set \mathcal{O} such that

$$E \int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{O}}dK_s = E \int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{O}^c}dV_s = 0. \tag{7}$$

Since $\int_0^T (Y_t^1 - Y_t)dV_t = 0$, we have $E \int_0^T 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}}dV_t = 0$. This together with (7) implies that if there exists a progressively measurable set \mathcal{G} such that $P(\int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{G}}dV_s > 0) > 0$, then we will have

$$P\left(\int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{O} \cap \{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}dV_s\right) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad E \int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{O} \cap \{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}dK_s = 0.$$

This implies

$$P\left(\int_0^T 1_{\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{O} \cap \{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}}(dK_s - dV_s) < 0\right) > 0. \tag{8}$$

² K_t and V_t are singular (see Definition 2.1 in [13]).

Then, (6) together with (8) gives a contradiction. Thus we have $EV_T = E \int_0^T dV_s = 0$, which implies $V_T = 0$. The proof is complete. \square

In Section 6, we will find that Proposition 3.1 also provides a method to compare the solutions Y_t of RBSDEs with one obstacle. The following Proposition 3.2 further shows that if we can compare the solutions Y_t , then we can compare solutions K_t .

Proposition 3.2 *Let the RBSDE($h_1(s), \xi_1, L_t^1$) have a solution (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) and the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) have a solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) . If for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq L_t^1$ and $h_1(s) \geq g(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $dY_t^1 \leq dY_t$.³*

Proof. Since $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t$, we have $(Y_t^1 - Y_t)^+ = (Y_t^1 - Y_t)$. Then, similar as the proof of Proposition 3.1, by using $(Y_t^1 - Y_t)^+ - (Y_t^1 - Y_t)$, we can deduce for $r \leq t$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} (h_1(s) - g(s, Y_s, Z_s)) ds - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s^1 \\ &\quad + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} (Z_s^1 - Z_s) dB_s - \frac{1}{2} L_t^0 (Y_s^1 - Y_s) + \frac{1}{2} L_r^0 (Y_s^1 - Y_s). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$Z_s^1 = Z_s, \quad dt \times dP - a.e., \quad \text{on the set } \{Y_s^1 = Y_s\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s - \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s^1 &= \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} (h_1(s) - g(s, Y_s^1, Z_s^1)) ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} L_t^0 (Y_s^1 - Y_s) - \frac{1}{2} L_r^0 (Y_s^1 - Y_s). \end{aligned}$$

Since $h_1(s) \geq g(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$, by the above two equalities, we have

$$\int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s \geq \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s^1.$$

Since $Y_s \geq L_s^1$, we have

$$\int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}} dK_s^1 \leq \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > L_s^1\}} dK_s^1 = 0.$$

Then by the above two inequalities, we have, for any $r \leq t$,

$$K_t - K_r \geq \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s \geq \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s^1 + \int_r^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 > Y_s\}} dK_s^1 = K_t^1 - K_r^1.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 3.3 *Let the BSDE(g, ξ) satisfy Assumption (B). Then the BSDE(g, ξ) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $\lambda \otimes$*

³ $dY_t^1 \leq dY_t$ means that for any $r \leq t$, $K_t^1 - K_r^1 \leq K_t - K_r$.

$P(\{g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > h_2(t)\}) > 0$,⁴ then $Y_t > Y_t^2$, $dt \times dP - a.e.$, on the set $\{g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > h_2(t)\}$.

Proof. Step 1. By Assumption (B)(ii)(iii) and Theorem 3.2 in [13], the RBSDE(g, ξ, Y_t^2, Y_t^1) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t, V_t) . Then by the same argument as the proof of Proposition 3.1, we have $V_T = 0$.

Step 2. Since $Y_t \geq Y_t^2$, we have $(Y_t - Y_t^2)^+ = (Y_t - Y_t^2)$. Then, similar as the proof of Proposition 3.1, by using $(Y_t - Y_t^2)^+ - (Y_t - Y_t^2)$, we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} (g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - h_2(s)) ds - \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} dK_s \\ &\quad - \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} dA_s^2 + \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} (Z_s - Z_s^2) dB_s - \frac{1}{2} L_t^0 (Y_s - Y_s^2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$Z_s = Z_s^2, \quad dt \times dP - a.e., \quad \text{on the set } \{Y_s = Y_s^2\},$$

and

$$\int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} (g(s, Y_s^2, Z_s^2) - h(s)) ds + \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} dK_s + \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} dA_s^2 + \frac{1}{2} L_t^0 (Y_s - Y_s^2) = 0.$$

By the above two equalities and Assumption (B)(i), we have

$$\int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} dK_s = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} (g(s, Y_s^2, Z_s^2) - h(s)) ds = 0.$$

which imply

$$K_t = \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s = Y_s^2\}} dK_s + \int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s > Y_s^2\}} dK_s = 0,$$

and

$$Y_t > Y_t^2, \quad dP \times dt - a.e., \quad \text{on the set } \{g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > h_2(t)\},$$

respectively. The proof is complete. \square

The following Proposition 3.4 provides a method to study comparison theorems for BSDEs.

Proposition 3.4 *Let the BSDE(g, ξ) satisfy Assumption (C). Then the BSDE(g, ξ) has a solution (Y_t, Z_t) such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $\lambda \otimes P(\{g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > h_2(t)\}) > 0$, we have $Y_t > Y_t^2$, $dt \times dP - a.e.$, on the set $\{g(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > h_2(t)\}$.*

Proof. Since BSDE(g, ξ) satisfies Assumption (C), then by the same argument as Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 3.3, we can complete this proof. \square

Remark 3.5 We give two remarks concerning the Proposition 3.1.

- (i) Our proof of Proposition 3.1 is slightly different from the proof of Lemma 3.1 in [1], in which the equality $\int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s = 0$ is directly used. In fact, we may have $\int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s > 0$

⁴ λ is the Lebesgue measure and $\lambda \otimes P$ is the product measure of λ and P .

in our setting. For example, if lower obstacle $L_t = 3 - 3t$, $t \in [0, 1]$, then $\text{RBSDE}(1, 1, L_t)$ satisfies Assumption (A) with

$$Y_t^1 = \begin{cases} 3 - 3t, & t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 2 - t, & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases},$$

whose dynamic is

$$Y_t^1 = 1 + \int_t^1 h_1(s)ds, \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad \text{with } h_1(t) = \begin{cases} 3, & t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 1, & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}.$$

In our method, the $\text{RBSDE}(1, 1, L_t, Y_t^1)$ will be considered. It is not hard to check that the $\text{RBSDE}(1, 1, L_t, Y_t^1)$ has a solution

$$Y_t = \begin{cases} 3 - 3t, & t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 2 - t, & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}, \quad Z_t = 0, \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad K_t = \begin{cases} 2t, & t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 1, & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}, \quad V_t = 0, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

From this, we get

$$\int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s = \int_0^t 1d(2s) = 2t > 0, \quad t \in (0, \frac{1}{2}].$$

Thus, the equality $\int_0^t 1_{\{Y_s^1 = Y_s\}} dK_s = 0$ is not always true in our proof. Instead, the singular relation $dK_t \perp dV_t$ is used.

- (ii) In fact, by Theorem 3.2 in [13], the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t, Y_t^1)$ in the proof of Proposition 3.1 has a minimal solution y_1 and a maximal solution y_2 , in the sense that for a solution Y_t of the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t, Y_t^1)$, we have $y_1 \leq Y_t \leq y_2$. Thus, it is not hard to check that the $\text{RBSDE}(g, \xi, L_t)$ in Proposition 3.1 has a minimal solution y_1 .

4 Existence and uniqueness for $\text{RBSDE}(G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t)$

Let $f \in L_{1,loc}(D)$ be given. For $\alpha \in D$, we define a transformation $u_f^\alpha(x)$:

$$u_f^\alpha(x) := \int_\alpha^x \exp\left(2 \int_\alpha^y f(z)dz\right) dy, \quad x \in D.$$

We will find that the different choices of $\alpha \in D$ in the definition of $u_f^\alpha(x)$ do not change the solution of RBSDEs (see Remark 4.11(i)). Consequently, we assume that $\alpha \in D$ is given and denote $u_f^\alpha(x)$ by $u_f(x)$. When $D = \mathbf{R}$, we will always choose $\alpha = 0$. Let $V := \{y : y = u_f(x), x \in D\}$. Then V is an open interval (see Lemma 4.1(iv)). We introduce some properties for $u_f(x)$, which come from Lemma 2.1 in [29].

Lemma 4.1 *The following properties of $u_f(x)$ hold true.*

- (i) $u_f(x) \in W_{1,loc}^2(D)$, in particular, $u_f(x) \in C^1(D)$;
- (ii) $u_f(x)$ is strictly increasing;
- (iii) $u_f''(x) - 2f(x)u_f'(x) = 0$, a.e. on D ;
- (iv) V is an open interval and $u_f^{-1}(x) \in W_{1,loc}^2(V)$, in particular, $u_f^{-1}(x) \in C^1(V)$ and is strictly increasing;

(v) If $g \in L_{1,loc}(D)$ and $g(x) \leq f(x)$, a.e. on D , then for every $x \in D$, $u_g(x) \leq u_f(x)$.

Let the constants $\delta \geq 0$, $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\kappa \geq 0$ be given. We define a function:

$$F(\omega, t, y, z) : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d \longmapsto \mathbf{R},$$

such that for each $(y, z) \in \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d$, $(F(t, y, z))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is progressively measurable. We always assume that F satisfies Assumption (D).

Assumption (D) For each $t \in [0, T]$, and $(y, z), (\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$|F(t, 0, 0)| \leq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad |F(t, y, z) - F(t, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})| \leq \gamma|y - \tilde{y}| + \kappa|z - \tilde{z}|.$$

We define a function G_f :

$$G_f(t, y, z) := \frac{F(t, u_f(y), u'_f(y)z)}{u'_f(y)}, \quad (t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times D \times \mathbf{R}^d.$$

Since F satisfies Assumption (D), we get that G_f is continuous in (y, z) and has a linear growth in z . We list some examples for function G_f .

Example 4.2 (i) Let $F(t, a, b) = \kappa_1 b$ or $F(t, a, b) = |\kappa_1 b|$, where $|\kappa_1| \leq \kappa$. Then

$$G_f(t, y, z) = \kappa_1 z \quad \text{or} \quad G_f(t, y, z) = |\kappa_1 z|.$$

(ii) Let $D = \mathbf{R}$ and $f = 0$. If we choose $\alpha = 0$, then $u_f(y) = y$ and $G_f(t, y, z) = F(t, y, z)$.

(iii) Let $D = (0, \infty)$, $f = \frac{\beta}{y}$, $\beta \neq -\frac{1}{2}$, $\beta \neq 0$, and $F(t, a, b) = \delta_1 + \gamma_1(a + \frac{\alpha}{1+2\beta}) + \kappa_1 b$, where $|\gamma_1| \leq \gamma$, $|\kappa_1| \leq \kappa$ and $|\delta_1 + \frac{\gamma_1 \alpha}{1+2\beta}| \leq \gamma$. Then

$$u_f(y) = \frac{\alpha}{1+2\beta} \left(\left(\frac{y}{\alpha} \right)^{2\beta+1} - 1 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad G_f(t, y, z) = \frac{\delta_1 \alpha^{2\beta}}{y^{2\beta}} + \frac{\gamma_1}{1+2\beta} y + \kappa_1 z.$$

(iv) Let $D = (0, \infty)$, $f = -\frac{1}{2y}$ and $F(t, a, b) = \delta_1 + \gamma_1 a + \kappa_1 b$, where $|\delta_1| \leq \delta$, $|\gamma_1| \leq \gamma$ and $|\kappa_1| \leq \kappa$. If we choose $\alpha = 1$, then

$$u_f(y) = \ln y \quad \text{and} \quad G_f(t, y, z) = \delta_1 y + \gamma y \ln(y) + \kappa_1 z.$$

(v) Let $D = \mathbf{R}$, $f = \frac{\mu}{2}$, $\mu \neq 0$ and $F(t, a, b) = \delta_1 + \gamma_1(a + \frac{1}{\mu}) + \kappa_1 b$, where $|\gamma_1| \leq \gamma$, $|\kappa_1| \leq \kappa$ and $|\delta_1 + \frac{\gamma_1}{\mu}| \leq \gamma$. If we choose $\alpha = 0$, then

$$u_f(y) = \frac{1}{\mu}(\exp(\mu y) - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad G_f(t, y, z) = \frac{\delta_1}{\exp(\mu y)} + \frac{\gamma_1}{\mu} + \kappa_1 z.$$

In this section, we will study the existence and uniqueness of solution to the RBSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$):

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T (G_f(s, Y_s, Z_s) + f(Y_s)|Z_s|^2) ds + K_T - K_t - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, & t \in [0, T], \\ \forall t \in [0, T], \quad Y_t \geq L_t, \\ \int_0^T (Y_t - L_t) dK_t = 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

By the same arguments as in Theorem 2 in [28], we can get the following Itô-Krylov formula. The proof is omitted here.

Lemma 4.3 *Let (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) be a solution of the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t). Then for any $u \in W_{1,loc}^2(D)$, we have*

$$u(Y_t) = u(Y_0) + \int_0^t u'(Y_s) dY_s + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t u''(Y_s) |Z_s|^2 ds, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

We firstly consider two special cases of RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t).

Proposition 4.4 (i) *Let $\xi \in L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $L_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, $p > 1$. Let $e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma t}(L_t^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_D$. Then the RBSDE(F, ξ, L_t) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Moreover, we have $e^{\gamma t}(y_t^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_D$ and*

$$y_t = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} E_Q \left[\int_t^\tau F(s, 0, 0) e^{\int_t^s a_r dr} ds + e^{\int_t^\tau a_r dr} \eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

where $\eta_\tau := L_\tau 1_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\tau = T\}}$ and Q is a probability measure equivalent to P .

(ii) *If (y_t, z_t, k_t) is a solution to the RBSDE(F, ξ, L_t) such that $y_t \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$, then $(z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$.*

Proof. Proof of (i): By Theorem 3.1 in [8] and a classic linearization method, we get that the RBSDE(F, ξ, L_t) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$ such that

$$y_t = \xi + \int_0^T (F(s, 0, 0) + a_s y_s + b_s z_s) ds + k_T - k_t - \int_t^T z_s dB_s, \quad (10)$$

where

$$a_s = \frac{F(s, y_s, z_s) - F(s, 0, z_s)}{y_s} 1_{\{|y_s| > 0\}} \quad \text{and} \quad b_s = \frac{(F(s, 0, z_s) - F(s, 0, 0)) z_s}{|z_s|^2} 1_{\{|z_s| > 0\}}.$$

Clearly, $|a_s| \leq \gamma, |b_s| \leq \kappa$. Let Q be a probability measure such that

$$\frac{dQ}{dP} = \exp \left\{ \int_0^T b_s dB_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |b_s|^2 ds \right\}.$$

Then $X_t := \exp \left\{ \int_0^t b_s dB_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |b_s|^2 ds \right\}$ is a solution of the linear SDE:

$$X_t = 1 + \int_0^t b_s X_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

such that for each $r > 1$, $X_t \in \mathcal{S}^r$ (see Theorem 4.4 on page 61 and Lemma 2.3 on page 93 in [23]). By Girsanov's theorem, $\bar{B}_t = B_t - \int_0^t b_s ds$ is a standard Brownian motion under Q . Then (10) can be rewritten by

$$y_t = \xi + \int_0^T (F(s, 0, 0) + a_s Y_s) ds + k_T - k_t - \int_t^T z_s d\bar{B}_s.$$

By Itô's formula, we get

$$e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} y_t = e^{\int_0^T a_r dr} \xi + \int_t^T F(s, 0, 0) e^{\int_0^s a_r dr} ds + \int_t^T e^{\int_0^s a_r dr} dk_s - \int_t^T e^{\int_0^s a_r dr} z_s d\bar{B}_s. \quad (11)$$

Since $|a_s| \leq \gamma$ and for each $r > 1$, $X_t \in \mathcal{S}^r$, by Hölder's inequality, we have, for $1 < q < p$,

$$E_Q \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} y_t|^q \right] \leq e^{\gamma T q} E \left[X_T \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |y_t|^q \right] \leq e^{\gamma T q} E \left[|X_T|^{\frac{p}{p-q}} \right]^{\frac{p-q}{p}} E \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |y_t|^p \right]^{\frac{q}{p}} < \infty.$$

Similarly, we can also get $e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} z_t \in \mathcal{H}^q$, $\int_0^t e^{\int_0^s a_r dr} dk_s \in \mathcal{A}^q$ and $e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} L_t \in \mathcal{S}^q$ under probability measure Q . Thus, $(e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} y_t, e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} z_t, \int_0^t e^{\int_0^s a_r dr} dk_s) \in \mathcal{S}^q \times \mathcal{H}^q \times \mathcal{A}^q$ is a solution of RBSDE($F(t, 0, 0)e^{\int_0^t a_r dr}, e^{\int_0^T a_r dr} \xi, e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} L_t$) under probability measure Q . Then by the proof of Proposition 2.3 in [10] and (11), we have

$$e^{\int_0^t a_r dr} y_t = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} E_Q \left[\int_t^\tau F(s, 0, 0) e^{\int_0^s a_r dr} ds + e^{\int_0^\tau a_r dr} \eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

where $\eta_\tau := L_\tau 1_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\tau = T\}}$. Thus, we have

$$y_t = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} E_Q \left[\int_t^\tau F(s, 0, 0) e^{\int_t^s a_r dr} ds + e^{\int_t^\tau a_r dr} \eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

Since $|F(s, 0, 0)| \leq \delta$ and $|a_s| \leq \gamma$, we have

$$L_t \leq y_t \leq E_Q \left[\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} e^{\gamma(\tau-t)} (\delta(\tau-t) + \eta_\tau^+) | \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

Thus, we have

$$L_t \leq y_t \leq E_Q \left[\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{0, T}} e^{\gamma\tau} (\delta\tau + L_\tau^+) \vee e^{\gamma T} (\delta T + \xi^+) | \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad (12)$$

and

$$e^{\gamma t} (L_t^+ + \delta t) \leq e^{\gamma t} (y_t^+ + \delta t) \leq E_Q \left[\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{0, T}} e^{\gamma\tau} (\delta\tau + L_\tau^+) \vee e^{\gamma T} (\delta T + \xi^+) | \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

which implies $y_t \in L_D$ and $e^{\gamma t} (y_t^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_D$. Thus, (i) holds true.

Proof of (ii): We set

$$\tau_n := \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \left(\int_0^t |z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + |k_t|^p > n \right\} \wedge T, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Then we have $\tau_n \rightarrow T$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $y_t \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$, then by Theorem 2.1 in [8], we can deduce that there exists a constant C such that

$$E \left(\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} |z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + |k_{\tau_n}|^p \right) \leq CE \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |y_t|^p + \delta T \right).$$

By dominated convergence theorem, we have $(z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Thus, (ii) holds true. \square

When $F = 0$ in Proposition 4.4, we further have

Proposition 4.5 (i) Let $\xi \in L_D^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then the RBSDE($0, \xi, L_t$) has a unique solution (y_t, z_t, k_t) such that

$$y_t = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} E[\eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t], \quad (13)$$

where $\eta_\tau := L_\tau 1_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\tau = T\}}$. Moreover, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, $(y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^r \times \mathcal{H}^r \times \mathcal{A}^1$.

(ii) Let $\xi \in L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $L_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, $p > 1$. If (y_t, z_t, k_t) is a solution to the RBSDE(0, ξ , L_t), then we have

$$"y_t \text{ satisfies (13)}" \iff y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \iff (z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p.$$

Proof. Proof of (i): Set $\eta_\tau := L_\tau 1_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\tau = T\}}$. Since $\xi \in L_D^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and L_t belongs to Class [D], we get that η_t belongs to Class [D]. Set

$$y_t := \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} E[\eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

By the theory of Snell envelopes (see Theorem 3.1 in [17] and Proposition 2.1(1) in [16]), we get that y_t is a continuous supermartingale of Class [D], such that $y_t \geq L_t$. By Doob-Meyer's decomposition, we have the following unique representation:

$$y_t = \xi + k_T - k_t - (N_T - N_t), \quad (14)$$

where k_t is a continuous and increasing process with $k_0 = 0$ and N_t is a continuous uniformly integral martingale. Then by a general martingale representation (see Corollary 3 in Protter [25], page 189) and a localization method, we can get that there a unique process $z_t \in H^2$ such that

$$y_t = \xi + k_T - k_t - \int_t^T z_s dB_s. \quad (15)$$

By Lemma 1 in [26], we can further show $\int_0^T (y_t - L_t) dk_t = 0$. In view of

$$L_t \leq y_t = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} E[\eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq E[\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \eta_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t] = E[\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} L_\tau \vee \xi | \mathcal{F}_t], \quad (16)$$

we get that the range of y_t is included in D . From the above arguments, we get that the RBSDE(0, ξ , L_t) has a unique solution (y_t, z_t, k_t) satisfying (13). Since $N_t = N_T - \int_t^T z_s dB_s$ and N_t is a continuous uniformly integral martingale, by Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3 in [5], we get that for each $r \in (0, 1)$, $(N_t, z_t) \in \mathcal{S}^r \times \mathcal{H}^r$. Since $y_0 = \xi + k_T - N_T$, we have $k_T \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then by (14), we have

$$E[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |y_t|^r] \leq E|\xi|^r + 2E|k_T|^r + E|N_T|^r + E[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |N_t|^r] < \infty, \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

Thus (i) holds true.

Proof of (ii): If y_t satisfies (13), then by (16), we have

$$|y_t| \leq 2 \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |L_t| + E[|\xi| | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

By Doob's martingale inequality, we obtain $y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$. Thus " y_t satisfies (13)" $\implies y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$. If $y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, then by Proposition 4.4(ii), we have $(z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Thus $y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \implies (z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. If $(z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$, then by BDG inequality and (15), we can get $y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$. Then by the proof of Proposition 2.3 in [10], we get that y_t satisfies (13). Thus $(z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p \implies "y_t \text{ satisfies (13)}"$. We obtain (iii). \square

In order to discuss the existence of solutions to $\text{RBSDE}(G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t)$, we give a necessary condition, which shows that ξ must satisfy $u_f(\xi) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, when $u_f(x)$ is bounded from below. Some examples of function f satisfying $u_f \geq \beta$ can be found in the Example 3.1 in [29].

Proposition 4.6 *Let (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) be a solution to the $\text{RBSDE}(f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t)$. If there exists a constant β such that for each $x \in D$, $u_f(x) \geq \beta$, then we have $u_f(\xi) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 4.3 to $u_f(Y_t)$, and then by Lemma 4.1(iii), we have

$$u_f(Y_t) = u_f(\xi) + \int_t^T u'_f(Y_s) dK_s - \int_t^T u'_f(Y_s) Z_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

We set

$$\tau_n = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0, \int_0^t |u'_f(Y_s)|^2 |Z_s|^2 ds \geq n \right\} \wedge T, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Then by the two equalities above and the fact that $\int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s \geq 0$, we have

$$u_f(Y_0) \geq E[u_f(Y_{\tau_n})]. \quad (17)$$

Since $\tau_n \rightarrow T$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by the continuity of Y_t and u_f (see Lemma 4.1(i)), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_f(Y_{\tau_n}) = u_f(\xi).$$

Then by $u_f(x) \geq \beta$, Fatou's lemma and (17), we have

$$\beta \leq E[u_f(\xi)] = E[\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_f(Y_{\tau_n})] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[u_f(Y_{\tau_n})] \leq u_f(Y_0),$$

which implies $u_f(\xi) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. \square

The following existence and uniqueness theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.7 (i) *Let $u_f(\xi) \in L^p_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V$, $p > 1$. Let $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi)^+ + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma t}(u_f(L_t)^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_V$. Then the $\text{RBSDE}(G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t)$ has a unique solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Moreover, we have $e^{\gamma t}(u_f(Y_t)^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_V$ and*

- (i.1) *If f is integrable on D , then $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p_D \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$.*
- (i.2) *If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the range of Y_t is included in a closed interval $[c, d] \subset D$.*
- (i.3) *If G_f satisfies Example 4.2(i) (or Example 4.2(v) with $\mu > 0, \delta_1 = 0$), $L_t \in \mathcal{S}^p_D$ and there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that $f \geq \beta$, a.e. on D , then $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p_D \times \mathcal{H}^{2p} \times \mathcal{A}^p$.*

(ii) *If (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) is a solution of the $\text{RBSDE}(G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t)$, then $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s)$ is a solution of the $\text{RBSDE}(F, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t))$. Moreover, if $u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V$, $p > 1$, then we have $(u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$.*

Proof. Proof of (i): By Proposition 4.4(i), the RBSDE($F, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t)$) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. By Lemma 4.1(iv), we can apply Lemma 4.3 to $u_f^{-1}(y_t)$, and then, by setting

$$(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) := \left(u_f^{-1}(y_t), \frac{z_t}{u'_f(u_f^{-1}(y_t))}, \int_0^t \frac{1}{u'_f(u_f^{-1}(y_t))} dk_s \right), \quad (18)$$

and Lemma 4.1(iii), we get that the RBSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L$) has a solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s)dK_s) = (y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Now, we prove the uniqueness. For a solution $(\bar{Y}_t, \bar{Z}_t, \bar{K}_t)$ of RBSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L$), by Lemma 4.1(i), we can apply Lemma 4.3 to $u_f(\bar{Y}_t)$, and then by Lemma 4.1(iii), we have

$$u_f(\bar{Y}_t) = u_f(\xi) + \int_0^t F(s, u_f(\bar{Y}_s), u'_f(\bar{Y}_s)\bar{Z}_s)ds + \int_t^T u'_f(\bar{Y}_s)d\bar{K}_s - \int_t^T u'_f(\bar{Y}_s)\bar{Z}_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

which means that $(u_f(\bar{Y}_t), u'_f(\bar{Y}_t)\bar{Z}_t, \int_0^t u'_f(\bar{Y}_s)d\bar{K}_s)$ is a solution of RBSDE($F, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t)$). Then by Proposition 4.4(i) and Lemma 4.1(ii), we can obtain the uniqueness.

Since f is integrable on D , by Lemma A.1 in [2], there two positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that for each $x, y \in D$, we have

$$c_1|x - y| \leq |u_f(x) - u_f(y)| \leq c_2|x - y|,$$

which together with (i) gives (i.1).

If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then by Lemma 4.1(ii), we get $u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t) \in [u_f(a), u_f(b)]$. By (12), (18) and Lemma 4.1(iv), we get (i.2).

Now we prove (i.3). We consider the case $G_f(z) = |\kappa_1 z|$. Since $f > 0, a.e.$ on D , by Lemma 4.1(v), we have

$$u_f(Y_t) \geq u_0(Y_t) = Y_t - \alpha \geq L_t - \alpha,$$

which implies $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$.

By (9), the assumption $f \geq \beta, a.e.$ on D , and the fact that $K_s \geq 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds &\leq \int_0^T f(Y_s)|Z_s|^2 ds \\ &= Y_0 - \xi - \int_0^T G_f(s, Y_s, Z_s)ds - K_T + \int_0^T Z_s dB_s \\ &\leq Y_0 - \xi^- + \int_0^T \kappa |Z_s| ds + \int_0^T Z_s dB_s. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Since $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, then by Jensen's inequality, (19) and BDG inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta^p \left(E \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \right)^2 \\ &\leq E \left[\left(\beta \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq C_1 \left(|Y_0|^p + E[|\xi^-|^p] + E \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] + E \left(\left| \int_0^T Z_s dB_s \right|^p \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C_2 \left(1 + E \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \right), \quad (20)$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are constants depending on $|Y_0|^p, E[|\xi^-|^p], T, \kappa$ and p . By solving the quadratic inequality (20) with $E[(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds)^{\frac{p}{2}}]$ as the unknown variable, we get $E \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] < \infty$. Plugging this inequality into (20), we get

$$E \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^p \right] < \infty. \quad (21)$$

By (9) and the assumption $f \geq \beta, a.e., D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq K_T &\leq Y_0 - \xi - \int_0^T G_f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \beta \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds + \int_0^T Z_s dB_s \\ &\leq |Y_0| + \xi^- + \int_0^T \kappa |Z_s| ds + \beta \int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds + \left| \int_0^T Z_s dB_s \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Since $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, then by BDG inequality and (21), we get $K_t \in \mathcal{A}^p$. We obtain (i.3).

Proof of (ii): By the proof of (i) and Proposition 4.4(ii), we obtain (ii). \square

When $G_f = 0$ in Theorem 4.7, we further have

Theorem 4.8 (i) *Let $u_f(\xi) \in L_V^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t)$ belong to Class [D]. Then the RBSDE($f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$) has a unique solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that*

$$u_f(Y_t) = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} E[u_f(\eta_\tau) | \mathcal{F}_t], \quad (23)$$

where $\eta_\tau := L_\tau 1_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\tau = T\}}$. Moreover, we have

- (i.1) $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s)$ is a solution of the RBSDE($0, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t)$) such that for each $r \in (0, 1)$, $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s) \in \mathcal{S}^r \times \mathcal{H}^r \times \mathcal{A}^1$;
- (i.2) If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the range of Y_t is included in $[a, b]$.
- (i.3) If $\xi \in L_D^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $\xi^- \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that $f \geq \beta, a.e.$ on D , then $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \times \mathcal{H}^{2p} \times \mathcal{A}^p$, when $p > 1$, and $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^r \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^1$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$;

(ii) *Let $u_f(\xi) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$, $p > 1$. If (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) is a solution of the RBSDE($f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$), then*

$${}^n u_f(Y_t) \text{ satisfies (23)} \iff u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p \iff \left(u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s) dK_s \right) \in \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p.$$

Proof. Proof of (i): By Proposition 4.5(i), the RBSDE($0, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t)$) has a unique solution (y_t, z_t, k_t) satisfying (13). Moreover, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, $(y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^r \times \mathcal{H}^r \times \mathcal{A}^1$. Set

$$(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) := \left(u_f^{-1}(y_t), \frac{z_t}{u'_f(u_f^{-1}(y_t))}, \int_0^t \frac{1}{u'_f(u_f^{-1}(y_t))} dk_s \right).$$

Then by a similar argument as the proof of Theorem 4.7(i), we get that the RBSDE($f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L$) has a uniqueness solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) satisfying (23), and $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s)dK_s)$ is a solution of the RBSDE($0, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t)$). Thus, (i.1) holds true.

If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then by (23) and Lemma 4.1(ii)(iv), we obtain (i.2).

Now, we prove (i.3). When $p \geq 1$, since $\xi^- \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, by the similar arguments as in (19) and (20), we can get for $p \geq 1$,

$$E \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds \right)^p \right] < \infty. \quad (24)$$

Since $f > 0, a.e.$ on D , by the definition of u_f and Lemma 4.1(iv), we get that $(u_f^{-1})'$ is not increasing, which implies that u_f^{-1} is concave. Then by (23), Lemma 4.3(ii)(iv), the concavity of u_f^{-1} and Jensen's inequality, we have

$$Y_t = u_f^{-1}(\text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} E[u_f(\eta_\tau)|\mathcal{F}_t]) \geq u_f^{-1}(E[u_f(\xi)|\mathcal{F}_t]) \geq E[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq -E[\xi^-|\mathcal{F}_t]. \quad (25)$$

Since $\xi^- \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $p \geq 1$, then by Lemma 6.1 in [5], we have for $r \in (0, 1)$, $E[\xi^-|\mathcal{F}_t] \in \mathcal{S}^r$, when $p = 1$, and by Doob's martingale inequality, we have $E[\xi^-|\mathcal{F}_t] \in \mathcal{S}^p$, when $p > 1$. By (9), (25), the assumption $f \geq \beta, a.e., D$, and the fact that $K_s \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -E[\xi^-|\mathcal{F}_t] \leq Y_t &\leq Y_0 - \int_0^t f(Y_s)|Z_s|^2 ds - K_t + \int_0^t Z_s dB_s \\ &\leq Y_0 - \int_0^t \beta|Z_s|^2 ds + \int_0^t Z_s dB_s. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (24), we get $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, when $p > 1$, and $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^r$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$.

By a similar argument as in (22), we get $K_t \in \mathcal{A}^p$, when $p \geq 1$. We obtain (i.3).

Proof of (ii): By the proof of (i), we get that $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s)dK_s)$ is a solution of RBSDE($0, u_f(\xi), u_f(L_t)$). Then by Proposition 4.5(ii), we obtain (ii). \square

Now, we consider the BSDEs case.

Proposition 4.9 (i) Let $\xi \in L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $p > 1$, and $e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T)$, $-e^{\gamma T}(\xi^- + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then the BSDE(F, ξ) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \times \mathcal{H}^p$. Moreover, we have $e^{\gamma t}(y_t^+ + \delta t)$, $-e^{\gamma t}(y_t^- + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_D$.

(ii) If (y_t, z_t) is a solution to the BSDE(F, ξ) such that $y_t \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$, then $z_t \in \mathcal{H}^p$.

Proof. The proof is similar to Proposition 4.4. By Theorem 4.2 in [5], the BSDE(F, ξ) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p \times \mathcal{H}^p$. Then by (11) in Proposition 4.4(i), we can get

$$y_t = E_Q \left[\int_t^T F(s, 0, 0) e^{\int_t^s a_r dr} ds + e^{\int_t^T a_r dr} \xi | \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

where Q is a probability measure equivalent to P . This implies

$$E_Q \left[\int_t^T -\delta e^{\int_t^s \gamma dr} ds - e^{\int_t^T \gamma dr} \xi^- | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \leq y_t \leq E_Q \left[\int_t^T \delta e^{\int_t^s \gamma dr} ds + e^{\int_t^T \gamma dr} \xi^+ | \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

which together with $e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T)$, $-e^{\gamma T}(\xi^- + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$ implies $y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D$ and $e^{\gamma t}(y_t^+ + \delta t)$, $-e^{\gamma t}(y_t^- + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_D$. By a similar argument as in Proposition 4.4(ii), we get (ii). \square

By Proposition 4.9, we have.

Corollary 4.10 (i) Let $u_f(\xi) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $p > 1$, and $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi)^+ + \delta T)$, $-e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi)^- + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then the BSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi$) has a unique solution (Y_t, Z_t) such that $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p \times \mathcal{H}^p$. Moreover, we have $e^{\gamma t}(u_f(Y_t)^+ + \delta t)$, $-e^{\gamma t}(u_f(Y_t)^- + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_V$, and

- (i.1) If f is integrable on D , then $(Y_t, Z_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \times \mathcal{H}^p$.
- (i.2) If the ranges of ξ is included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the range of Y_t is included in a closed interval $[c, d] \subset D$.
- (i.3) If G_f satisfies Example 4.2(i), $\xi \in L_D^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is bounded from below, and there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that $f \geq \beta$, a.e. on D , then $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \times \mathcal{H}^{2p} \times \mathcal{A}^p$.

(ii) If (Y_t, Z_t) is a solution of the BSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi$), then $(u_f(Y_t), u'_f(Y_t)Z_t)$ is a solution of the BSDE($F, u_f(\xi)$). Moreover, if $u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$, $p > 1$, then $u'_f(Y_t)Z_t \in \mathcal{H}^p$.

Proof. We only prove (i.3). The other results can be derived from Proposition 4.9 and the proof of Theorem 4.7, directly. If G_f satisfies Example 4.2(i), then by (11), we have

$$u_f(Y_t) = E_Q[u_f(\xi)|\mathcal{F}_t],$$

where Q is a probability measure equivalent to P . Since $\xi \in L_D^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is bounded from below, by a similar argument as in (25), we get Y_t is bounded from below. This together with $u_f(Y_t) \geq Y_t - \alpha$ gives $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$. Then by similar arguments as in (21) and (22), we can get $(Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{H}^{2p} \times \mathcal{A}^p$. \square

Remark 4.11 We give some remarks concerning the results obtained in this section.

- (i) By the uniqueness of Theorem 4.7(i) and Lemma 4.1(ii), we get that the solution will not change for a different choice of $\alpha \in D$ in the definition of $u_f(x)$. In Theorem 4.7(i) and Corollary 4.10, in order to let the range of Y_t be included in D , we assume that F satisfies Lipschitz condition. If we let $D = \mathbf{R}$, then it is possible that the existence and uniqueness is obtained under more general conditions.
- (ii) We consider Example 4.2(iii). If $\beta > 0$, then $V = (-\frac{\alpha}{1+2\beta}, \infty)$. Clearly, $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi)^+ + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma t}(u_f(L_t)^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_V$. Thus, by Theorem 4.7(i), if $\xi^{2\beta+1} \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $L_t^{2\beta+1} \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$, then the RBSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$) has a unique solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $Y_t^{2\beta+1} \in \mathcal{S}^p$. Moreover, if $\xi > c > e^{\gamma T}\delta T(1 + 2\beta)$ for some constant c , then by choosing $\alpha = c$, we have $u_f(\xi) > 0$, which implies $-e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi)^- + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Thus, by Corollary 4.8(i), the BSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi$) has a unique solution (\bar{Y}_t, \bar{Z}_t) such that $\bar{Y}_t^{2\beta+1} \in \mathcal{S}^p$.
- (iii) It is clear from (ii) that, in Theorem 4.7 and Corollary 4.10, the range of terminal variable ξ may be further restricted in some cases. However, if G_f satisfy Example 4.2(i), then by the proof of Proposition 4.4(i), in Theorem 4.7(i), the assumption will become $u_f(\xi) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$, $p > 1$, and in Corollary 4.10(i), the assumption will become $u_f(\xi) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $p > 1$.

5 Existence results for quadratic RBSDEs and BSDEs

Using the domination method and the existence results obtained in Section 3 and Section 4, we will study the existence of solution to quadratic RBSDEs and BSDEs in this section.

Assumption (E) (i) D satisfies the condition: $x \in D \Rightarrow |x| \in D$.

(ii) D satisfies the condition: $x \in D \Rightarrow -|x| \in D$.

(iii) f is continuous, and there exists a constant $\beta \geq 0$ such that $f \geq \beta$.

(iv) f is increasing.

(v) $g(t, y, z)$ is continuous in (y, z) , and $\forall (t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times D \times \mathbf{R}^d$,

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq H_f(y) + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \quad \text{where } H_f(y) = \frac{\delta}{u'_f(y)} + \frac{\gamma|u_f(y)|}{u'_f(y)}.$$

(vi) $g(t, y, z)$ is continuous in (y, z) , and $\forall (t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times D \times \mathbf{R}^d$,

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq \delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2.$$

We first give some existence results for quadratic RBSDEs.

Theorem 5.1 *Let Assumption (E)(iii)(v) hold true. Let $u_f(\xi) \in L^p_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V$, $p > 1$. Let $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi)^+ + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(L_t)^+ + \delta T) \in \mathcal{S}_V$. Then we have*

(i) *The RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V$;*

(ii) *If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that the range of Y_t is included in a closed interval $[c, d] \subset D$;*

(iii) *If Assumption (E)(i) holds true, $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(\xi^+) + \delta T) \in L^p_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(|L_t|)^+ + \delta T) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $u_f(|Y_t|) \in \mathcal{S}^p_V$. In particular, $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}^p_D$.*

Proof. We can check that if $F(t, y, z) = \delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z|$, then $G(t, y, z) = H_f(y) + \kappa|z|$. Thus, by Theorem 4.7(i), the RBSDE($H_f(y) + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$) has a unique solution (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) such that $u_f(Y_t^1) \in \mathcal{S}^p$ and $Y_t^1 \geq L_t$. By Assumption (E)(iii)(v), for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [L_t, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |g(t, y, z)| \\ & \leq H_f(y) + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2 \\ & \leq \kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} H_f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) + (\kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1))|z|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} H_f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) \in H^1$. Thus, the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^1 . By Proposition 3.1, we get that the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq L_t. \tag{26}$$

By Theorem 4.7, Lemma 4.1(ii) and (26), we get (i) and (ii).

We prove (iii). If Assumption (E)(i) holds true, then we have $\xi^+ \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $L_t^+, |L_t| \in \mathcal{S}_D$. Since $f \geq 0$, by Lemma 4.1(ii)(v), we have

$$e^{\gamma T}(u_f(|L_t|)^+ + \delta T) \geq u_f(|L_t|) \geq u_f(L_t^+) \geq u_0(L_t^+) \geq -\alpha,$$

$$e^{\gamma T}(u_f(|L_t|)^+ + \delta T) \geq e^{\gamma T}(u_f(L_t^+)^+ + \delta T) \geq u_f(L_t) \quad \text{and} \quad u_f(\xi^+)^+ \geq u_f(\xi^+) \geq u_0(\xi^+) \geq -\alpha,$$

which implies $u_f(\xi^+) \in L_D^p$ and $u_f(L_t^+), u_f(|L_t|), e^{\gamma T}(u_f(L_t^+)^+ + \delta T) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$. Then by Theorem 4.7(i) again, the RBSDE($H_f(y) + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \xi^+, L_t^+$) has a unique solution (Y_t^2, Z_t^2, K_t^2) such that $u_f(Y_t^2) \in \mathcal{S}^p$ and $Y_t^2 \geq L_t^+$. Similarly, we can check that the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^2 . By Proposition 3.1 again, we get that the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that

$$Y_t^2 \geq Y_t \geq L_t, \tag{27}$$

By Lemma 4.1(ii)(v), (27) and $u_0(x) = x - \alpha$, we have

$$0 \leq |Y_t| \leq u_f(|Y_t|) + \alpha \leq (u_f(Y_t^2) + \alpha) \vee (u_f(|L_t|) + \alpha) \leq u_f(Y_t^2) + u_f(|L_t|) + 2\alpha.$$

which gives (iii). \square

Theorem 5.2 *Let Assumption (E)(i)(iii)(iv)(vi) hold true. Let $e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $u_f(e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T)) \in L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $e^{\gamma t}(|L_t| + \delta t) \in \mathcal{C}_D$ and $u_f(e^{\gamma t}(|L_t| + \delta t)) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, $p > 1$. Then we have*

(i) *The RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that $u_f(e^{\gamma t}(|Y_t| + \delta t)) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$. In particular, $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$;*

(ii) *If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that the range of Y_t is included in a closed interval $[c, d] \subset D$.*

Proof. We divide this proof into several steps.

Step 1. By Theorem 4.7(i) and Remark 4.11(iii), the RBSDE($\kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T), e^{\gamma t}(L_t^+ + \delta t)$) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t, k_t) \in \mathcal{S}_D^p \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Clearly, $y_t \geq y_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t \geq e^{\gamma t}L_t^+ \geq L_t^+$. This implies that $y_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t \in \mathcal{C}_D$.

Step 2. By Assumption (E)(iii)(iv), we have $\kappa|z_t| + f(y_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t)|z_t|^2 \leq \kappa|z_t| + f(y_t)|z_t|^2$, and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [e^{\gamma t}(L_t^+ + \delta t), y_t]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$,

$$|\kappa|z| + f(y - e^{\gamma t}\delta t)|z|^2| \leq \kappa + (f(y_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t) + \kappa)|z|^2,$$

where $f(y_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t) \in \mathcal{C}$. Then the RBSDE($\kappa|z| + f(y - e^{\gamma t}\delta t)|z|^2, e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T), e^{\gamma t}(L_t^+ + \delta t)$) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination y_t . By Proposition 3.1, we get that the RBSDE($\kappa|z| + f(y - e^{\gamma t}\delta t)|z|^2, e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T), e^{\gamma t}(L_t^+ + \delta t)$) has a solution $(\bar{y}_t, \bar{z}_t, \bar{k}_t)$ such that $e^{\gamma t}(L_t^+ + \delta t) \leq \bar{y}_t \leq y_t$. Set $\hat{y}_t = \bar{y}_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t$, $\hat{z}_t = \bar{z}_t$, $\hat{k}_t = \bar{k}_t$. By Itô's formula, we get that $(\hat{y}_t, \hat{z}_t, \hat{k}_t)$ is a solution to the RBSDE($\gamma e^{\gamma t}\delta t + e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, e^{\gamma T}\xi^+, e^{\gamma t}L_t^+$) and $e^{-\gamma t}\hat{y}_t \in \mathcal{C}_D$.

Step 3. By Assumption (E)(iii)(iv), and $\hat{y}_t \geq 0$, we have $e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa|z_t| + e^{-\gamma t}f(e^{-\gamma t}\hat{y}_t)|\hat{z}_t|^2 \leq \gamma e^{\gamma t}\delta t + e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa|z_t| + f(\hat{y}_t)|\hat{z}_t|^2$, and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [e^{\gamma t}L_t^+, \hat{y}_t]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$|e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa|z| + e^{-\gamma t}f(e^{-\gamma t}y)|z|^2| \leq e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa + (e^{-\gamma t}f(e^{-\gamma t}\hat{y}_t) + \kappa)|z|^2,$$

where $e^{-\gamma t}f(e^{-\gamma t}\hat{y}_t) + \kappa \in \mathcal{C}$. Then the RBSDE($e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa|z| + e^{-\gamma t}f(e^{-\gamma t}y)|z|^2, e^{\gamma T}\xi, e^{\gamma t}L_t^+$) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination \hat{y}_t . By Proposition 3.1, the RBSDE($e^{\gamma t}\delta + \kappa|z| + e^{-\gamma t}f(e^{-\gamma t}y)|z|^2, e^{\gamma T}\xi^+, e^{\gamma t}L_t^+$) has a solution $(\tilde{y}_t, \tilde{z}_t, \tilde{k}_t)$ such that $e^{\gamma t}L_t^+ \leq \tilde{y}_t \leq \hat{y}_t$.

Step 4. Set

$$Y_t^1 = e^{-\gamma t}\tilde{y}_t, Z_t^1 = e^{-\gamma t}\tilde{z}_t, K_t^1 = \int_0^t e^{-\gamma s}d\tilde{k}_s. \quad (28)$$

By Itô's formula, we check that (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) is a solution to the RBSDE($\delta + \gamma y + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \xi^+, L_t^+$). By the arguments above, we have

$$e^{\gamma t}L_t^+ \leq \tilde{y}_t \leq \hat{y}_t = \bar{y}_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t \leq y_t - e^{\gamma t}\delta t. \quad (29)$$

By (28) and (29), we have

$$0 \leq L_t^+ \leq Y_t^1 \leq e^{-\gamma t}y_t - \delta t. \quad (30)$$

Clearly, (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) is also a solution to the RBSDE($\delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \xi^+, L_t^+$).

Step 5. By Assumption (E)(iii)(iv), for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [L_t, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq \delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(|y|)|z|^2 \leq \delta + \kappa + \gamma(Y_t^1 + |L_t|) + (f(Y_t^1) + \kappa)|z|^2,$$

where $f(Y_t^1) + \kappa \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\delta + \kappa + \gamma(Y_t^1 + |L_t|) \in H^1$. Then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^1 . Thus by Proposition 3.1 again, the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq L_t. \quad (31)$$

Step 6. By (30) and (31), we have

$$e^{\gamma t}(|Y_t| + \delta t) \leq y_t \vee e^{\gamma t}(|L_t| + \delta t),$$

Then by Lemma 4.1(ii)(v) and $u_0(x) = x - \alpha$, we deduce that

$$0 \leq |Y_t| \leq u_f(e^{\gamma t}(|Y_t| + \delta t)) + \alpha \leq u_f(y_t) + u_f(e^{\gamma t}(|L_t| + \delta t)) + 2\alpha,$$

which gives (i). By (30), (31) and Theorem 4.7(i.2), we can obtain (ii). The proof is complete \square

Proposition 5.3 *Let Assumption (E)(iii)(iv) hold true with $\delta = \gamma = \kappa = 0$, $u_f(\xi) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t)$ belong to Class [D]. Then we have*

- (i) *The RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) ;*
- (ii) *If $u_f(\xi) \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(L_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, when $p > 1$, and $u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^r$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$;*
- (iii) *If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that the range of Y_t is included in $[a, b]$.*
- (iv) *If β in Assumption (E)(iii) is positive, $\xi^- \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $L_t \in \mathcal{S}^p$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}^p$, when $p > 1$, and $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}^r$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$;*

Proof. By Theorem 4.8(i), the RBSDE($f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$) has a solution (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) and $Y_t^1 \geq L_t$. By Assumption (E)(iii)(iv), for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [L_t, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq f(y)|z|^2 \leq \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1)|z|^2,$$

where $\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^1 . By Proposition 3.1, the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq L_t$. Then by Theorem 4.8(i)(ii), Theorem 4.7(i), Remark 4.11(2) and Lemma 4.1(ii), we can complete this proof. \square

Now, we consider the BSDEs case.

Proposition 5.4 *Let Assumption (E) hold true. Let $e^{\gamma T}(|\xi| + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(e^{\gamma T}(|\xi| + \delta T)) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then we have*

(i) *The BSDE(g, ξ) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) such that $u_f(|Y_t|) \in \mathcal{S}^p$. In particular, $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$;*

(ii) *If the ranges of ξ and L_t are both included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that the range of Y_t is included in a closed interval $[c, d] \subset D$.*

Proof. Since $\xi, -|\xi| \in L_D$, $e^{\gamma T}(|\xi| + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, we have $e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T), e^{\gamma T}(\xi^- + \delta T) \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, which together with $u_f(e^{\gamma T}(|\xi| + \delta T)) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ gives $u_f(e^{\gamma T}(\xi^+ + \delta T)), u_f(e^{\gamma T}(\xi^- + \delta T)) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then by Theorem 5.2, the RBSDE($\delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \xi^+, 0$) has a solution (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) such that $u_f(e^{\gamma t}Y_t^1 + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$ and $Y_t^1 \geq 0$. Similarly, the RBSDE($\delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2, \xi^-, 0$) has a solution (Y_t^2, Z_t^2, K_t^2) such that $u_f(e^{\gamma t}Y_t^2 + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$ and $Y_t^2 \geq 0$. Then $-Y_t^2 \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$ and

$$-Y_t^2 = -\xi^- + \int_t^T (-\delta - \gamma|Y_s^2| - \kappa|Z_s^2| - f(Y_s^2)|Z_s^2|^2)ds - K_T^2 + K_t^2 - \int_t^T -Z_s^2 dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

By Assumption (E)(iv)(vi), we also have

$$-\delta - \gamma|Y_s^2| - \kappa|Z_s^2| - f(Y_s^2)|Z_s^2|^2 \leq -\delta - \gamma|Y_s^2| - \kappa|Z_s^2| - f(-Y_s^2)|Z_s^2|^2 \leq g(s, -Y_s^2, -Z_s^2),$$

and

$$\delta + \gamma|Y_s^1| + \kappa|Z_s^1| + f(Y_s^1)|Z_s^1|^2 \geq g(s, Y_s^1, Z_s^1).$$

By Assumption (E)(iii)(iv), for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [-Y_t^2, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq \delta + \gamma|y| + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2 \leq \delta + \kappa + \gamma(Y_t^1 + Y_t^2) + (f(Y_t^1) + \kappa)|z|^2,$$

where $f(Y_s^1) + \kappa \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\delta + \kappa + \gamma(Y_t^1 + Y_t^2) \in H^1$. Thus, the BSDE(g, ξ) satisfies Assumption (B) with dominations Y_t^1 and $-Y_t^2$. Then by Proposition 3.3, we get that the BSDE(g, ξ) has a solution (Y_t, Z_t) such that

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq -Y_t^2.$$

By a similar argument as in (27), we have

$$|Y_t| \leq u_f(e^{\gamma t}|Y_t| + \delta t) + \alpha \leq u_f(e^{\gamma t}Y_t^1 + \delta t) + u_f(e^{\gamma t}Y_t^2 + \delta t) + 2 + \alpha.$$

Then by the two inequalities above and Theorem 5.2, we can complete this proof. \square

Proposition 5.5 *Let Assumption (E)(iii)(iv) hold true with $\delta = \gamma = \kappa = 0$, and $c \in D$ be a constant such that $u_f(\xi \vee c), u_{-f}(\xi \wedge c) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then we have*

(i) *The BSDE(g, ξ) has least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) ;*

(ii) *If $u_f(\xi \vee c), u_{-f}(\xi \wedge c) \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then the BSDE(g, ξ) has least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) , such that $u_{-f}(Y_t), u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, when $p > 1$, and $u_{-f}(Y_t), u_f(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^r$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$. In particular, $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, when $p > 1$, and $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^r$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$;*

(iii) *If the range of ξ is included in a closed interval $[a, b] \subset D$, then the BSDE(g, ξ) has least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) , such that the range of Y is included in $[a, b]$;*

(iv) *If β in Assumption (E)(iii) is positive, $\xi \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then the BSDE(g, ξ) has least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) , such that $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^p$, when $p > 1$, and $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}_D^r$, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, when $p = 1$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2 in [29], the BSDE($f(y)|z|^2, \xi \vee c$) and the BSDE($-f(y)|z|^2, \xi \wedge c$) have solutions (Y_t^1, Z_t^1) and (Y_t^2, Z_t^2) , respectively, such that

$$u_f(Y_t^1) = E[u_f(\xi \vee c)|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq E[u_f(c)|\mathcal{F}_t] = u_f(c)$$

and

$$u_{-f}(Y_t^2) = E[u_{-f}(\xi \wedge c)|\mathcal{F}_t] \leq E[u_{-f}(c)|\mathcal{F}_t] = u_{-f}(c),$$

which implies that $Y_t^1 \geq c \geq Y_t^2$. By Assumption (E)(iii)(iv), for each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [Y_t^2, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$|g(t, y, z)| \leq f(y)|z|^2 \leq \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha Y_s^1 + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^2)|z|^2,$$

where $\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha Y_s^1 + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^2) \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, the BSDE(g, ξ) satisfies Assumption (B) with dominations Y_t^1 and Y_t^2 . Then by Proposition 3.3, the BSDE(g, ξ) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t) such that $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq Y_t^2$. This together with Lemma 4.1(ii)(v) and $u_0(x) = x - \alpha$, gives

$$u_f(Y_t^1) \geq u_f(Y_t) \geq Y_t - \alpha \geq u_{-f}(Y_t) \geq u_{-f}(Y_t^2).$$

Since $\xi \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is equivalent to $\xi \vee c, \xi \wedge c \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then by the above arguments and Theorem 3.2 in [29], we can complete this proof. \square

Remark 5.6 From Example 4.2, it is clear that Theorem 5.1 does not imply Theorem 5.2, and Theorem 5.2 also does not imply Theorem 5.2. We give a case of Theorem 5.2(i). When $D = \mathbf{R}$, $f = \frac{\mu}{2}$, $\mu > 0$, then $u_f(x) = \frac{1}{\mu}(\exp(\mu x) - 1)$. By Theorem 5.2(i), if for some $p > 1$, $E \exp(p\mu e^{\gamma T} \xi^+) < \infty$ and $\exp(\mu e^{\gamma T} |L_t|) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, then the RBSDE(g, ξ, L_t) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) such that $\exp(\mu e^{\gamma T} |Y_t|) \in \mathcal{S}^p$. This case has been considered by Theorem 2.1 in [21] for the bounded L_t and $p = 2$, and Theorem 3.2 in [4] for the unbounded L_t and $p > 1$, respectively.

6 Comparison theorems for reflected BSDEs and BSDEs

In this section, we will use the domination method to study comparison theorems for reflected BSDEs and BSDEs. We firstly give some results for reflected BSDEs with quadratic growth,

whose proofs are based on Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 6.1 *Let $\tilde{G}_i(t, y, z) = G_f^i + f_i(y)|z|^2$, where $G_f^i = \frac{F_i(t, u_{f_i}(y), u'_{f_i}(y)z)}{u'_{f_i}(y)}$ with F_i satisfying Assumption (D), and $f_i \in L_{1,loc}(D)$ is continuous, $i = 1, 2$. Then we have*

(i) *Let $\xi_i \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $L_t^i \in \mathcal{C}_D$ such that $\xi_i \geq L_T^i$. Let $u_{f_i}(\xi_i) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_{f_i}(L_t^i) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$, $p > 1$. Let $e^{\gamma T}(u_{f_i}(\xi_i)^+ + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $e^{\gamma t}(u_{f_i}(L_t^i)^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_V$. Let (Y_t^i, Z_t^i, K_t^i) be the solution of the RBSDE($\tilde{G}_i, \xi_i, L_t^i$) satisfying $u_{f_i}(Y_t^i) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $i = 1, 2$. If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$, $f_1 \geq f_2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \geq L_t^2$ and $\tilde{G}_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \geq \tilde{G}_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $dK_t^1 \leq dK_t^2$;*

(ii) *Let $u_{f_i}(\xi_i) \in L_D^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, and $e^{\gamma T}(u_{f_i}(\xi_i)^+ + \delta T)$, $-e^{\gamma T}(u_{f_i}(\xi_i)^- + \delta T) \in L_V(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $p > 1$. Let (Y_t^i, Z_t^i) be the solution of the BSDE(\tilde{G}_i, ξ_i) satisfying $u_{f_i}(Y_t^i) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $i = 1, 2$. If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$ and $\tilde{G}_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \geq \tilde{G}_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $\lambda \otimes P(\{\tilde{G}_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) > \tilde{G}_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)\}) > 0$, then we have $Y_t^1 > Y_t^2$, $dt \times dP - a.e.$, on the set $\{\tilde{G}_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) > \tilde{G}_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)\}$.*

Proof. Proof of (i): By a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we can show that the RBSDE($\tilde{G}_2, \xi_2, L_t^2$) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^1 . Then by Proposition 3.1, the RBSDE($\tilde{G}_2, \xi_2, L_t^2$) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq L_t^2$. Since $f_1 \geq f_2$, by Lemma 4.1(ii)(v), we get

$$u_{f_2}(L_t^2) \leq u_{f_2}(Y_t) \leq u_{f_2}(Y_t^1) \leq u_{f_1}(Y_t^1),$$

which implies $u_{f_2}(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$. Then by Theorem 4.7(i)(ii), we have $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) = (Y_t^2, Z_t^2, K_t^2)$. Thus, for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $L_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$, by Proposition 3.2, we get $dK_t^1 \leq dK_t^2$.

Proof of (ii): By Corollary 4.10, we have $e^{\gamma t}(u_{f_2}(Y_t^2)^+ + \delta t) \in \mathcal{S}_V$. Then by Theorem 4.7(i), the RBSDE($\tilde{G}_1, \xi_1, Y_t^2$) has a solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that $u_{f_1}(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$. Thus, the BSDE(\tilde{G}_1, ξ_1) satisfies Assumption (C) with domination Y_t^2 . Then by Proposition 3.4, we get that the BSDE(\tilde{G}_1, ξ_1) has a solution (Y_t, Z_t) such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $\lambda \otimes P(\{\tilde{G}_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) > \tilde{G}_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)\}) > 0$, then $Y_t^1 > Y_t^2$, $dt \times dP - a.e.$, on the set $\{\tilde{G}_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) > \tilde{G}_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)\}$. Since $u_{f_1}(Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, by Corollary 4.10, we have $(Y_t, Z_t) = (Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$. Thus, (ii) holds true. \square

Proposition 6.2 *Let Assumption (E)(i)(iii)(iv) hold true for g_1 and g_2 . Let $\xi_i \in L_D(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $L_t^i \in \mathcal{C}_D$ such that $\xi_i \geq L_T^i$, $i = 1, 2$. Let (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) be a solution to the RBSDE(g_1, ξ_1, L_t^1). If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \geq L_t^2$ and $g_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \geq g_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$, then the RBSDE(g_2, ξ_2, L_t^2) has at least one solution (Y_t^2, Z_t^2, K_t^2) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $dK_t^1 \leq dK_t^2$.*

Proof. For each $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in [L_t^2, Y_t^1]$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |g(t, y, z)| \\ & \leq H_f(y) + \kappa|z| + f(y)|z|^2 \\ & \leq \kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} H_f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) + (\kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1))|z|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\kappa + \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} H_f(\alpha L_s + (1 - \alpha)Y_s^1) \in H^1$. Thus, the RBSDE(g_2, ξ_2, L_t^2) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^1 . Then

by Proposition 3.1, we get that the RBSDE (g_2, ξ_2, L_t^2) has at least one solution (Y_t^2, Z_t^2, K_t^2) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $L_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$, then by Proposition 3.2, we have $dK_t^1 \leq dK_t^2$. The proof is complete. \square

By Proposition 3.4, we can establish comparison theorems for BSDEs.

Proposition 6.3 *Let Assumption (E)(iii)(iv) hold for g_1 and g_2 with $\delta = \gamma = \kappa = 0$. Let $u_f(\xi_i \vee c), u_{-f}(\xi_i \wedge c) \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $p > 1$, $i = 1, 2$, for constant $c \in D$. Let (Y_t^2, Z_t^2) be a solution to the BSDE (g_2, ξ_2) such that $u_f(Y_t^2) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$. If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $g_1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq g_2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)$, then the BSDE (g_1, ξ_1) has at least one solution (Y_t^1, Z_t^1) satisfying $u_f(Y_t^1) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$, such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $\lambda \otimes P(\{g_1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > g_2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)\}) > 0$, then $Y_t^1 > Y_t^2$, $dP \times dt - a.e.$, on the set $\{g_1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > g_2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)\}$.*

Proof. Since $u_f(\xi_1 \vee c), u_{-f}(\xi_1 \wedge c) \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$, By Lemma 4.1(ii)(v), we can get $u_f(\xi_1) \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then by Proposition 5.3(ii), we get that the RBSDE (g_1, ξ_1, Y_t^2) has at least one solution (Y_t^1, Z_t^1, K_t^1) , such that $u_f(Y_t^1) \in \mathcal{S}^p$, $p > 1$. Thus, the BSDE (g_1, ξ_1) satisfies Assumption (C) with domination Y_t^2 . Then by Proposition 3.4, we can complete this proof. \square

From above, it is clear that Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.4 provide a method to study the comparison theorems for RBSDEs and BSDEs. In the end of this section, we will use this method to revisit the classic comparison theorems. Proposition 6.4 generalizes the comparison theorems obtained by Theorem 4.1 in [10] and Proposition 4.3 in [15]. Proposition 6.5 is comparison theorem for BSDEs with linear growth.

Proposition 6.4 *Let g_1 and g_2 both satisfy Assumption (D). Let $\xi_i \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ with $\xi_i \geq L_T^i$, $L_t^i \in \mathcal{S}^2$, $i = 1, 2$. Let $(Y_t^i, Z_t^i, K_t^i) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2$ be a solution to the RBSDE (g_i, ξ_i, L_t^i) , $i = 1, 2$. If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \geq L_t^2$ and $g_1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \geq g_2(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1)$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $dK_t^1 \leq dK_t^2$.*

Proof. Clearly, the RBSDE (g_2, ξ_2, L_t^2) satisfies Assumption (A) with domination Y_t^1 . By Proposition 3.1, we get that the RBSDE (g_2, ξ_2, L_t^2) has at least one solution (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) , such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t \geq L_t^2$. Thus $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}^2$. By Proposition 4.4(ii), we have $(Z_t, K_t) \in \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2$. Then by Proposition 5.1 in [10], we have $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) = (Y_t^2, Z_t^2, K_t^2)$. Thus for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if for each $t \in [0, T]$, $L_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$, then by Proposition 3.2, for each $t \in [0, T]$, $dK_t^1 \leq dK_t^2$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 6.5 *Let g_1 and g_2 both satisfy Assumption (E)(v) with $f = 0$. Let $\xi_i \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $(Y_t^i, Z_t^i) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2$ be the maximal solution to the BSDE (g_i, ξ_i) , $i = 1, 2$. If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, $g_1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq g_2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$. Moreover, if $\lambda \otimes P(\{g_1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > g_2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)\}) > 0$, then $Y_t^1 > Y_t^2$, $dt \times dP - a.e.$, on the set $\{g_1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) > g_2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)\}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1 in [22], the RBSDE (g_1, ξ_1, Y_t^2) has a maximal solution $(Y_t, Z_t, K_t) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2$. Thus, the BSDE (g_1, ξ_1) satisfies Assumption (C) with domination Y_t^2 . Then by Proposition 3.4, the BSDE (g_1, ξ_1) has a solution $(Y_t, Z_t) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2$ such that for each

$t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t \geq Y_t^2$. If the BSDE(g_1, ξ_1) has another solution $(\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Z}_t) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2$ such that for each $t \in [0, T]$, $\tilde{Y}_t \geq Y_t^2$, then $(\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Z}_t, 0)$ is a solution to RBSDE(g_1, ξ_1, Y_t^2). This implies $\tilde{Y}_t \leq Y_t$. Then by the uniqueness of the maximal solution of BSDEs with linear growth (see [20]), we have $(Y_t^1, Z_t^1) = (Y_t, Z_t)$. The proof is complete. \square

7 Application of RBSDE to an obstacle problem

In this section, we will apply the RBSDE($G_f + f(y)|z|^2, \xi, L_t$) to the following obstacle problem for a quadratic PDE

$$\begin{cases} \min\{v(t, x) - h(t, x), -\partial_t v(t, x) - \mathcal{L}v(t, x) - \tilde{G}(t, v(t, x), \sigma^* \nabla_x v(t, x))\} = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^d; \\ v(T, x) = g(x), & x \in \mathbf{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

where $\tilde{G}(t, y, z) = G_f(t, y, z) + f(y)|z|^2$, $g(x) : \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto D$, $h(t, x) : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto D$, and \mathcal{L} is the infinitesimal generator of the solution $X_s^{t,x}$ of SDE

$$X_s^{t,x} = x + \int_t^s b(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr + \int_t^s \sigma(r, X_r^{t,x}) dB_r, \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^d, \quad s \in [t, T],$$

where $b : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto \mathbf{R}^d$, $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^d \mapsto \mathbf{R}^{d \times d}$. The operator \mathcal{L} is given by

$$\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d (\sigma \sigma^*)_{i,j}(s, x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(s, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}.$$

Assumption (F) (i) $G_f(t, y, \cdot)$ is concave and $f(\cdot)$ is continuous and nonpositive.

(ii) $g(\cdot)$ is measurable with $h(T, \cdot) \leq g(\cdot)$, $u_f(g(\cdot))$ has a polynomial growth and the range of $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(g(\cdot))^+ + \delta T)$ is included in V .

(iii) $u_f(h(\cdot, \cdot))$ is continuous, $u_f(h(t, \cdot))$ has a polynomial growth and the range of $e^{\gamma T}(u_f(h(t, \cdot))^+ + \delta t)$ is included in V .

(iv) $b(t, \cdot)$ and $\sigma(t, \cdot)$ are uniformly Lipschitz continuous with linear growth.

Let Assumption (F) hold. By Corollary 4.2 on page 60 and Theorem 4.4 on page 61 in [23], we have for each $p > 1$, $u_f(g(X_T^{t,x})) \in L_V^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $u_f(h(t, X_s^{t,x})) \in \mathcal{S}_V^p$. Then by Theorem 4.7(i), the following Markovian RBSDE

$$\begin{cases} Y_s^{t,x} = g(X_T^{t,x}) + \int_s^T \tilde{G}(t, Y_r^{t,x}, Z_r^{t,x}) dr + K_T^{t,x} - K_s^{t,x} - \int_s^T Z_r^{t,x} dB_r, & s \in [t, T], \\ Y_s^{t,x} \geq h(s, X_s^{t,x}), \\ \int_0^T (Y_s^{t,x} - h(s, X_s^{t,x})) dK_s^{t,x} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

has a unique solution $(Y_s^{t,x}, Z_s^{t,x}, K_s^{t,x})$, such that $(u_f(Y_s^{t,x}), u'_f(Y_s^{t,x})Z_s^{t,x}, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s^{t,x}) dK_s^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{S}^p \times \mathcal{H}^p \times \mathcal{A}^p$. Set $v(t, x) := Y_t^{t,x}$. Then we have the following probabilistic representation for a viscosity solution of obstacle problem (32). The definition of this viscosity solution can be find in Definition 7.1 in [4].

Theorem 7.1 $v(t, x)$ is a viscosity solution of obstacle problem (32).

Proof. By Proposition 4.4(i) and Theorem 4.7(i)(ii), the RBSDE($F, u_f(g(X_T^{t,x})), u_f(h(s, X_s^{t,x}))$) has a unique solution $(y_s^{t,x}, z_s^{t,x}, k_s^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2$ such that

$$(y_s^{t,x}, z_s^{t,x}, k_s^{t,x}) = \left(u_f(Y_s^{t,x}), u'_f(Y_s^{t,x})Z_s^{t,x}, \int_0^t u'_f(Y_s^{t,x})dK_s^{t,x} \right).$$

Since $u_f(v(t, x)) = u_f(Y_t^{t,x}) = y_t^{t,x}$, by Theorem 8.5 and Theorem 8.6 in [10], we get that $u_f(v(t, x))$ is continuous in (t, x) and grows at most polynomially at infinity. By the uniqueness of the solution to the Markovian RBSDE($F, u_f(g(X_T^{t,x})), u_f(h(s, X_s^{t,x}))$), we can deduce

$$u_f(Y_s^{t,x}) = y_s^{t,x} = y_s^{s, X_s^{t,x}} = u_f(v(s, X_s^{t,x})), \quad s \in [t, T].$$

Then by Lemma 4.1(ii), we get that $v(t, x)$ is continuous in (t, x) and for $s \in [t, T]$,

$$Y_s^{t,x} = v(s, X_s^{t,x}). \quad (34)$$

Step 1. We will show that $v(t, x)$ is a viscosity supersolution of obstacle problem (32). Let $\phi(t, x) \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times R^d)$ and (t, x) be a local minimum point of $v - \phi$. Without loss of generality, we assume $v(t, x) = \phi(t, x)$. If

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(t, x) + \mathcal{L}\phi(t, x) + \tilde{G}(t, v(t, y), \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(t, x)) > 0,$$

then by continuity, there exist $\beta \in (0, T - t]$, $c > 0$ and $C > 0$, such that for $s \in [t, t + \beta]$ and $y \in [x - c, x + c]$, we have

$$v(s, y) \geq \phi(s, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(s, y) + \mathcal{L}\phi(s, y) + \tilde{G}(s, v(s, y), \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(s, x)) \geq C. \quad (35)$$

We define a stopping time $\tau = \inf\{s \geq t; |X_s^{t,x} - x| \geq c\} \wedge (t + \beta)$, then $t < \tau \leq t + \beta$ and $x - c \leq X_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x} \leq x + c, s \in [t, t + \beta]$. By (33) and (34), we deduce that the following RBSDE

$$\bar{Y}_s = v(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) + \int_s^{t+\beta} 1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} \tilde{G}(r, v(r, X_r^{t,x}), \bar{Z}_r) dr + \bar{K}_\tau^{t,x} - \bar{K}_s^{t,x} - \int_s^{t+\beta} \bar{Z}_r B_r, \quad s \in [t, t + \beta], \quad (36)$$

has a solution $(\bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s, \bar{K}_s) = (Y_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x}, 1_{\{s \leq \tau\}} Z_s^{t,x}, K_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty \times H^2 \times \mathcal{A}$. Applying Itô's formula to $\phi(s, X_s^{t,x})$ on $s \in [t, \tau]$, we deduce that the following BSDE

$$\tilde{Y}_s = \phi(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) + \int_t^{t+\beta} -1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(r, X_r^{t,x}) + \mathcal{L}\phi(r, X_r^{t,x}) \right) dr - \int_t^{t+\beta} \tilde{Z}_r B_r, \quad s \in [t, t + \beta], \quad (37)$$

has a solution $(\tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{Z}_s) = (\phi(s \wedge \tau, X_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x}), 1_{\{s \leq \tau\}} \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(s, X_s^{t,x})) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty \times H^2$. By (35), we have $v(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) \geq \phi(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_t^{t+\beta} 1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} \left(-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(s, X_r^{t,x}) - \mathcal{L}\phi(s, X_r^{t,x}) - \tilde{G}(r, v(r, X_r^{t,x}), \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(r, X_r^{t,x})) \right) dr \\ & \leq -C(\tau - t) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption (F)(i), we get that $1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} f(v(r, X_r^{t,x}))$ is nonpositive and bounded in $[t, t + \beta]$, and $G_f(r, v(r, X_r^{t,x}), z)$ is concave in z . Thus, the generator $\tilde{G}(r, v(r, X_r^{t,x}), z)$ of RBSDE(36)

is concave in z and has a quadratic growth in z , with quadratic term $\beta|z|^2$, where β is a constant. Then by (36), (37) and the strict comparison theorem (see Proposition 5.1 in [4]), we have $v(t, x) = \bar{Y}_t > \tilde{Y}_t = \phi(t, x)$. This induces a contradiction. Thus $v(t, x)$ is a viscosity supersolution of obstacle problem (32).

Step 2. We will show that $v(t, x)$ is a viscosity subsolution of obstacle problem (32). Let $\phi(t, x) \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times R^d)$ and (t, x) be a local maximum point of $v - \phi$. Without loss of generality, we assume $v(t, x) = \phi(t, x)$. If $v(t, x) > h(t, x)$, and

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(t, x) + \mathcal{L}\phi(t, x) + \tilde{G}(t, v(t, y), \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(t, x)) < 0,$$

then by continuity, there exist $\beta \in (0, T - t]$, $c > 0$ and $C > 0$, such that for $s \in [t, t + \beta]$ and $y \in [x - c, x + c]$, we have $v(s, y) \leq \phi(s, y)$,

$$v(s, y) \geq h(s, y) + C \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(t, x) + \mathcal{L}\phi(t, x) + \tilde{G}(s, v(s, y), \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(s, x)) \leq -C. \quad (38)$$

We define a stopping time $\tau = \inf\{s \geq t; |X_s^{t,x} - x| \geq c\} \wedge (t + \beta)$, then $t < \tau \leq t + \beta$ and $x - c \leq X_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x} \leq x + c$, $s \in [t, t + \beta]$. Thus, by (34) and (38), we have for $s \in [t, \tau]$,

$$Y_s^{t,x} = v(s, X_s^{t,x}) \geq h(s, X_s^{t,x}) + C,$$

which implies that for $s \in [t, \tau]$, $dK_s^{t,x} = 0$. Then by (33) and (34), we deduce that the following BSDE

$$\bar{Y}_s = v(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) + \int_s^{t+\beta} 1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} \tilde{G}(r, v(r, X_r^{t,x}), \bar{Z}_r) dr - \int_s^{t+\beta} \bar{Z}_r B_r, \quad s \in [t, t + \beta], \quad (39)$$

has a solution $(\bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s) = (Y_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x}, 1_{\{s \leq \tau\}} Z_s^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty \times H^2$. Applying Itô's formula to $\phi(s, X_s^{t,x})$ on $s \in [t, \tau]$, we deduce that the following BSDE

$$\tilde{Y}_s = \phi(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) + \int_t^{t+\beta} -1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(r, X_r^{t,x}) + \mathcal{L}\phi(r, X_r^{t,x}) \right) dr - \int_t^{t+\beta} \tilde{Z}_r B_r, \quad s \in [t, t + \beta], \quad (40)$$

has a solution $(\tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{Z}_s) = (\phi(s \wedge \tau, X_{s \wedge \tau}^{t,x}), 1_{\{s \leq \tau\}} \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(s, X_s^{t,x})) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty \times H^2$. By (38), we have $v(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) \leq \phi(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_t^{t+\beta} 1_{\{r \leq \tau\}} \left(-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(s, X_r^{t,x}) - \mathcal{L}\phi(s, X_r^{t,x}) - \tilde{G}(r, v(r, X_r^{t,x}), \sigma^* \nabla_x \phi(r, X_r^{t,x})) \right) dr \\ & \geq C(\tau - t) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by a similar argument as in Step 1, we can get $v(t, x) = \bar{Y}_t < \tilde{Y}_t = \phi(t, x)$, which induces a contradiction. Thus, $v(t, x)$ is a viscosity subsolution of obstacle problem (32).

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 7.2 In Theorem 7.1, if G_f satisfies Example 4.2(i), then by Remark 4.11(iii), Assumption(ii)(iii) can be reduced to

- (ii)' $g(\cdot)$ is measurable with $h(T, \cdot) \leq g(\cdot)$, and $u_f(g(\cdot))$ has a polynomial growth.
- (iii)' $u_f(h(\cdot, \cdot))$ is continuous, and $u_f(h(t, \cdot))$ has a polynomial growth.

Acknowledgements The authors are supported by the Humanities and Social Science Foundation of Ministry of Education of China (No. 20YJCZH245).

References

- [1] Bahlali K. Solving unbounded quadratic BSDEs by a domination method. arXiv:1903.11325.(2019)
- [2] Bahlali K., Eddahbi M., and Ouknine Y. Quadratic BSDEs with L^2 -terminal data existence results, Krylov's estimate and Itô-Krylov's formula. Ann. Probab. 45(4), 2377-2397 (2017)
- [3] Bahlali K., Tangpi L. BSDEs driven by $|z|^2/y$ and applications. arXiv:1810.05664v2 (2018)
- [4] Bayraktar E., and Yao S. Quadratic reflected BSDEs with unbounded obstacles. Stochastic processes and their applications, 122(4), 1155-1203 (2012)
- [5] Briand P., Delyon B. Hu Y., Pardoux E. and Stoica L. L^p of backward stochastic differential equations. Stochastic processes and their applications, 108, 109-129 (2003)
- [6] Briand P., and Hu Y. BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 136(4), 604-618 (2006)
- [7] Briand P., and Hu Y. Quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal value. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 141, 543-567 (2008)
- [8] Bouchard B., Possamai D., Tan, X., and Zhou, C. A unified approach to a priori estimates for supersolutions of BSDEs in general filtrations. In Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques, 54, 154-172 (2018)
- [9] Cvitanic, J., Karatzas, I., 1996. Backward SDEs with reflection and Dynkin games. Ann. Probab. 24(4), 2024-2056.
- [10] El Karoui, N., Kapoudjian, C., Pardoux, E., Peng, S., Quenez, M.C., 1997. Reflected backward SDE's, and related obstacle problems for PDE's. Ann. Probab. 25(2), 702-737.
- [11] El Karoui N., Hamadène S., and Matoussi A. Backward stochastic differential equations and applications. In R. Carmona, editor, Indifference Pricing: Theory and Applications, Princeton Series in Financial Engineering, pages 267-320. Princeton University Press, (2009)
- [12] El Karoui, N., Peng, S., and Quenez, M. C. Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. Mathematical finance, 7(1), 1-71 (1997).
- [13] Essaky, E. H., Hassani, M. Generalized BSDE with 2-reflecting barriers and stochastic quadratic growth. Journal of Differential Equations, 254(3), 1500-1528 (2013).
- [14] Hamadène, S. and Popier, A. L^p -solutions for reflected backward stochastic differential equations. Stochastics and Dynamics, 12(02), 1150016.(2012).
- [15] Hamadène, S., Lepeliter, J.P., Matoussi, A. Double barrier backward SDEs with continuous coefficient, In: El Karoui N., Mazliak L.(eds.), Backward Stochastic Differential Equations, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, No. 364. Longman, Harlow, pp. 161-175. (1997)
- [16] Hdhiri I, and Karouf M. Risk sensitive impulse control of non-markovian processes. Mathematical Methods of Operations Research, 74(1), 1-20 (2011)
- [17] Jamshidian, F. The duality of optimal exercise and domineering claims: a Doob-Meyer decomposition approach to the Snell envelope. Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 79(1-2), 27-60 (2007)
- [18] Kobylanski M. Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth. Ann. Probab. 28(2), 558-602 (2000)
- [19] Kobylanski, M., Lepeltier, J. P., Quenez, M. C., and Torres, S. Reflected BSDE with superlinear quadratic coefficient. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, 22 (2002)
- [20] Lepeltier, J. P., and San Martin, J. Backward stochastic differential equations with continuous coefficient. Statistics and Probability Letters, 32(4), 425-430 (1997)

- [21] Lepeltier, J. P., and Xu, M. Reflected BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. arXiv preprint arXiv:0711.0619 (2007)
- [22] Matoussi A. Reflected solutions of backward stochastic differential equations with continuous coefficient, 347-354 (1997)
- [23] Mao X. Stochastic differential equation with applications, Second edition. Woodhead Publishing (2007)
- [24] Pardoux E. and Peng, S. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. Systems Control Lett. 14 55-61 (1990)
- [25] Protter P. Stochastic integration and differential equation. Springer (2005).
- [26] Shashashvili, M. Semimartingale inequalities for the Snell envelopes. Stochastics and Stochastic Reports, 43(1-2), 65-72 (1993)
- [27] Xu, M. Backward stochastic differential equations with reflection and weak assumptions on the coefficients. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 118(6), 968-980 (2008)
- [28] Yang H. L^p -solutions of quadratic BSDEs. arXiv:1506.08146v2 (2017)
- [29] Zheng, S., Zhang, L., and Feng, L. On the backward stochastic differential equation with generator $f(y)|z|^2$. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 500(1), 125102 (2021)