

Comparison principle

1. HJB equation:

Consider the HJB equation in the form

$$-\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} + \beta w - H(t, x, D_x w, D_x^2 w) = 0 \quad \text{on } [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1)$$

with a Hamitonian

$$H(t, x, p, M) = \sup_{a \in A} \left[b(x, a) \cdot p + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma(x, a) \sigma'(x, a) M) + f(t, x, a) \right] \quad (2)$$

for $(t, x, p, M) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times S_n$, where A is a subset of \mathbb{R}^m , S_n is $n \times n$ symmetric matrix and $\beta(t, x)$ is a function which has lower bound.

2. Assumptions:

- $b(x, a), \sigma(x, a)$ admit the linear growth condition and satisfy a uniform Lipschitz condition in x ,
- $\beta(t, x)$ is lower bounded,
- f is uniformly continuous in (t, x) , uniformly in $a \in A$.

3. Comparison principle:

Let U (resp. V) be a u.s.c. viscosity subsolution (resp. l.s.c. viscosity supersolution) with polynomial growth condition to (1), such that $U(T, \cdot) \leq V(T, \cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}^n , then $U \leq V$ on $[0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof: Step 1. Let $\tilde{U}(t, x) = e^{\lambda t} U(t, x)$ and $\tilde{V}(t, x) = e^{\lambda t} V(t, x)$. Then a straightforward calculation shows that \tilde{U} (resp. \tilde{V}) subsolution (resp. supersolution) to

$$-\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} + (\beta(t, x) + \lambda)w - \tilde{H}(t, x, D_x w, D_x^2 w) = 0 \quad \text{on } [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$$

where \tilde{H} has the same form as H with f replaced by $\tilde{f}(t, x) = e^{\lambda t} f(t, x)$. Therefore, as $\beta(t, x)$ is lower bounded, we can take a λ so that $\beta(t, x) + \lambda > 0$, and possibly replacing (U, V) by (\tilde{U}, \tilde{V}) , we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\beta(t, x) > 0$ for any $(t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Step 2, penalization and perturbation of supersolution. From the polynomial growth condition on U, V , we may choose an integer p greater than 1 such that

$$\sup_{[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|U(t, x) + V(t, x)|}{1 + |x|^p} < \infty$$

and we consider the function $\phi(t, x) = e^{-\lambda t}(1 + |x|^{2p}) = e^{-\lambda t}\psi(x)$. From linear growth condition on b, σ , there exists positive constant c such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \beta \phi - \sup_{a \in A} [b \cdot D_x \phi + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma' D_x^2 \phi) + f] \\ &= \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \psi(x) + \beta e^{-\lambda t} \psi(x) - \sup_{a \in A} [b \cdot e^{-\lambda t} D_x \psi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma' e^{-\lambda t} D_x^2 \psi(x)) + f] \\ &= e^{-\lambda t} \left\{ (\beta + \lambda) \psi(x) - \sup_{a \in A} [b \cdot D_x \psi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma' D_x^2 \psi(x)) + e^{\lambda t} f] \right\} \\ &\geq e^{-\lambda t} (\beta + \lambda - c) \psi \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by taking $\lambda \geq c - \beta$. This implies that for all $\epsilon > 0$, the function

$$V_\epsilon = V + \epsilon \phi$$

is a supersolution to (1). Furthermore, from the growth condition on U, V, ϕ , we have for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{[0, T]} (U - V_\epsilon)(t, x) = -\infty.$$

Step 3. From the step 1 and step 2, we may assume w.l.o.g. that $\beta(t, x) > 0$ for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and the supreme of the u.s.c. function $U - V$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is attained on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{O}$ for some open bounded set \mathcal{O} of \mathbb{R}^n .

To prove $U \leq V$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we argue by contradiction, which yields

$$M = \sup_{[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n} (U - V) = \sup_{[0, T] \times \mathcal{O}} (U - V) > 0. \quad (3)$$

We consider a bounded sequence $(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)_\epsilon$ that maximizes for all $\epsilon > 0$, the function Φ_ϵ on $[0, T]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with

$$\Phi_\epsilon(t, s, x, y) = U(t, x) - V(s, y) - \phi_\epsilon(t, s, x, y) \quad (4)$$

where

$$\phi_\epsilon(t, s, x, y) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon} [|t - s|^2 + |x - y|^2]. \quad (5)$$

Next we show that

$$M_\epsilon \rightarrow M \text{ and } \phi_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \rightarrow 0 \quad (6)$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. For any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_\epsilon &\geq \sup_{s, y} (U(t, x) - V(s, y) - \phi_\epsilon(t, s, x, y)) \\ &\geq U(t, x) - V(t, x) - \phi_\epsilon(t, t, x, x) \\ &= U(t, x) - V(t, x), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\sup_{t, x} M_\epsilon = M_\epsilon \geq \sup_{t, x} (U(t, x) - V(t, x)) = M.$$

Thus for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} M &\leq M_\epsilon = U(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - V(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) - \phi_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \\ &\leq U(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - V(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

The bounded sequence $(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)_\epsilon$ converges, up to a subsequence, to some $(\bar{t}, \bar{s}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in [0, T]^2 \times \bar{\mathcal{O}}^2$. Moreover, since the sequence $(U(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - V(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon))_\epsilon$ is bounded and the sequence $(\phi_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon))_\epsilon$ is also bounded, which implies $\bar{t} = \bar{s}$ and $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$. By sending ϵ to 0, we have

$$M \leq U(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - V(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \leq M$$

and so $M = (U - V)(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ with $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{O}$. By sending ϵ to 0, we can get (6).

With $\phi(t, s, x, y) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}[|t - s|^2 + |x - y|^2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) &= -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial s}(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = \frac{t_\epsilon - s_\epsilon}{\epsilon}, \\ D_x \phi(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) &= -D_y \phi(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = \frac{x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon}{\epsilon}, \\ D_{xy}^2 \phi(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} \begin{pmatrix} I_n & -I_n \\ -I_n & I_n \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(D_{xy}^2 \phi(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon))^2 = \frac{2}{\epsilon} D_{xy}^2 \phi(t_\epsilon, s_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon).$$

Furthermore, by choosing $\eta = \epsilon$ in the Ishii's lemma, then we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ 0 & -N \end{pmatrix} \leq \frac{3}{\epsilon} \begin{pmatrix} I_n & -I_n \\ -I_n & I_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

This implies that for any $n \times d$ matrices C, D ,

$$\text{tr}(CC' M - DD' M) \leq \frac{3}{\epsilon} |C - D|^2. \quad (7)$$

By the Ishii's lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}(t_\epsilon - s_\epsilon), \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon), M \right) &\in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+} U(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) \\ \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}(t_\epsilon - s_\epsilon), \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon), N \right) &\in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-} V(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

From the viscosity subsolution and supersolution characterization of U and V in terms of superjets and subjets, we then have

$$-\frac{1}{\epsilon}(t_\epsilon - s_\epsilon) + \beta U(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - H\left(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon), M\right) \leq 0 \quad (8)$$

$$-\frac{1}{\epsilon}(t_\epsilon - s_\epsilon) + \beta V(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) - H\left(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon), N\right) \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

By subtracting of (8) and (9), applying the (7) to $C = \sigma(x_\epsilon, a)$ and $D = \sigma(y_\epsilon, a)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta[U(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - V(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)] &\leq H\left(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon), M\right) - H\left(s_\epsilon, y_\epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon), N\right) \\ &\leq \mu\left(|t_\epsilon - s_\epsilon| + |x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon| + \frac{2}{\epsilon}|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^2\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow 0$. By sending ϵ to 0, we have $\beta M \leq 0$. As $\beta(t, x) > 0$ for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{O}$, we can get $M < 0$, which contradicts to (3).