ļ	REPORT D	OCUMENTATION	PAGE	OME	ADDITUNUU NG. 0706-0188	
	Author regarding during her this contestion of a gathering and maintaining the data needed. a	THENE THE BURGEN OF				
	Carm mynum. Sure 1304. Artington, VA 2220	12-1302, and to the Office of Management	I ARE BURGET, Passenare Assurban Pro	DATES COVER		
			Reprint			
A TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Adjoint Process in Stochastic Optimal Control				S. FUNDING NU AFOSR-8 61102F	JMBERS 6-0332 2304/A1	
(AUTHOR(S) Robert J. Elliott Nichael Kohlmann					2	
	7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	L. PERFORMEN	S ORGANIZATION			
	Department of Statis University of Albert Edmonton, Alberta, C T6G 2Gl	90-"	0593			
	. SPONSORING / MONITORING A	SENCY NAME(S) AND ADORES	S(ES)	18. SPONSORI	A MONITORING	
	AFOSR/NM Building 410 Bolling AFB, DC 203	32-6448		AFOSR-8	6-0332	
	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	olease ;		12b. OISTRIBUT	TON CODE	
	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 12. DESTRUCTION / AVAILABILITY Approved for public r distribution unlimit 13. ABSTRACT (Memmum 200 wo	olease; ed.		125. OISTRIBUT	10N COOL	
	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 12. OSTRUUTION/AVARABLITY Approved for public r distribution unlimit 13. ASSTRACT (Meanum 200 work Using controlled using at derived using an e	statement olease; ed. stochastic flows a minimum ochastic open loop controls. explicit formula for the integ	n principle is obtained w An equation for the adjo rand in a certain stochast	125. OISTREUT	is cn	
	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 122. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY Approved for public r distribution unlimit 13. ABSTRACT (Maxmum 200 woo Using controlled using at derived using an e	stochastic flows a minimum ochastic flows a minimum ochastic open loop controls. xplicit formula for the integ	n principle is obtained w An equation for the adjo rand in a certain stochast	125. OISTRIBUT	is en	
	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 122. DESTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY Approved for public r distribution unlimit 13. AESTRACT (Maximum 200 wood Using controlled using at derived using an e	stochastic flows a minimum ochastic open loop controls. xplicit formula for the integ	n principle is obtained w An equation for the adjo rand in a certain stochast	122. OISTRIBUT then a diffusion int process is the ic integral.	is en NUMBER OF PAGES	
	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 122. DESTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY Approved for public r distribution unlimit 13. ABSTRACT (Maxmum 200 wood Using controlled using at derived using an e	stochastic flows a minimum ochastic open loop controls. xplicit formula for the integ DTIC ELECTE MAY 2 9 1990 D CE	m principle is obtained w An equation for the adjo rand in a certain stochast	125. OISTRIBUT hen a diffusion int process is the ic integral. 15. N 16. P PICATION 28. L	is en WABER OF PAGES NICE COOR JANTATION OF ABSTI	

The Adjoint Process in Stochastic Optimal Control

ROBERT J. ELLIOTT DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND APPLIED PROBABILITY UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, ALBERTA CANADA T6G 2G1

MICHAEL KOHLMANN FAKULTÄT FÜR WIRSTSCHAFTSWISSENSCHAFTEN UND STATISTIK UNIVERSITÄT KONSTANZ, POSTFACH 5560 D-7750 F.R. GERMANY

Abstract. Using stochastic flows a minimum principle is obtained when a diffusion is controlled using stochastic open loop controls. An equation for the adjoint process is then derived using an explicit formula for the integrand in a certain stochastic integral.

1. Introduction.

There have been many proofs of minimum principles in stochastic control. For a small sample see the works of Kushner [15], Bismut [2], Haussmann $\{10\}, [11], [12], Davis and Varaiya [6], and the book by Elliott [8]? In this paper we consider a diffusion and stochastic open loop controls, that is, controls which are adapted to the filtration of the driving Brownian motion process. For such controls the dynamical equations have strong solutions, and the results on the differentiability of the solution, due originally to Blagovescenskii and Freidlin [1], can be applied. The work of Kunita [14] and Bismut-[2] on stochastic flows enables the variation in the expected cost, due to a perturbation of the optimal control, to be calculated explicitly. The minimum principle follows by differentiating this quantity.$

If the optimal control is Markov the stochastic integral representation result of [9] is applied to give an expression for a quantity associated with the adjoint process. Stochastic calculus is then used to derive the equation satisfied by the adjoint process. $(|CP\rangle)$

(^C OPY INSPECTED	NTIS DTIC	CRA&I TAB			•
× 2	Unanci Justific	ou ce d ation	Ō		
	By Distribution /				
	See Sector		in the second	in la Standa	
	Dist	Avail e Spe	and / or cial		
	A-1				

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. Dr. Kohlmann wishes to thank the Department of Statistics and Applied Probability of the University of Alberta for hospitality and support during the spring of 1987, when this work was carried out. Both authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada under grant A-7964. The work of the first author was also partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, United States Air Force, under grant AFOSR-86-0332 and European Office of Aerospace Research and Development, London, England.

2. Dynamics.

Suppose the state of a system is described by a stochastic differential equation:

$$d\xi_{t} = f(t, \xi_{t}, u)dt + g(t, \xi_{t})dw_{t}$$

$$\xi_{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, \quad \xi_{0} = x_{0}, \quad 0 \le t \le T.$$
 (2.1)

The control parameter u will take values in a compact subset U of some Euclidean space R^k . We shall make the following assumptions.

 $A_1: f: [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is Borel measurable, continuous in u for each (t, x), continuously differentiable in x and for some constant K

$$(1+|x|)^{-1}|f(t,x,u)|+|f_x(t,x,u)| \le K_1.$$

A₂: $g: [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ is a matrix valued, Borel measurable function, continuously differentiable in x, and for some constant K_2

$$|g(t,x)|+|g_x(t,x)|\leq K_2.$$

The columns of g will be denoted by $g^{(k)}$ for k = 1, ..., n.

A₃: $w = (w^1, ..., w^n)$ is an n-dimensional Brownian motion on a probability space (Ω, F, P) with a right continuous, complete filtration $\{F_t\}, 0 \le t \le T$.

DEFINITION 2.1. The set of admissible controls \underline{U} will be the F_t -predictable functions on $[0,T] \times \Omega$ with values in U. These are sometimes called 'stochastic open loop' controls, [3].

REMARKS 2.2. For each $u \in \underline{U}$ there is, therefore, a strong solution of (2.1), and we shall write $\xi_{s,t}^u(x)$ for the solution trajectory given by

$$\xi_{s,t}^{u}(x) = x + \int_{s}^{t} f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x), u_{r}) dr + \int_{s}^{t} g(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x)) dw_{r}.$$
(2.2)

Then, because u is a (predictable) parameter, the result of Blagovenscenskii and Freidlin [1] extends to this situation, so the Jacobian $\frac{\partial \xi_{s,t}^u}{\partial x}(x) = D_{s,t}^u$ exists and is the solution of

$$D_{s,t}^{u} = I + \int_{s}^{t} f_{\xi}(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x), u_{r}) D_{s,r}^{u} dr + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{s}^{t} g_{\xi}^{(k)}(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x)) D_{s,r}^{u} dw_{r}^{k}.$$
 (2.3)

Here I is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. In fact, if the coefficients f and g are C^k the map $x \to \xi^u_{s,t}(x)$ is C^{k-1} .

Consider the matrix valued process H defined by:

$$H_{s,t}^{u} = I - \int_{s}^{t} H_{s,r}^{u} \left(f_{\xi}(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x), u_{r}) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} g_{\xi}^{(k)}(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x))^{2} \right) dr$$
$$- \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{s}^{t} H_{s,r}^{u} g_{\xi}^{(k)}(r, \xi_{s,r}^{u}(x)) dw_{r}^{k}.$$
(2.4)

Then using the Ito rule we see $d(H_{s,t}^u D_{s,t}^u) = 0$ and $H_{ss}^u D_{ss}^u = I$, so $H_{s,t}^u = (D_{s,t}^u)^{-1}$.

Write $\|\xi^u(x_0)\|_t = \sup_{0 \le t \le t} |\xi^u_{0,t}(x_0)|$. Then, as in Lemma 2.1 of [12], for any p, $1 \le p < \infty$, using Gronwall's and Jensen's inequalities

$$\|\xi^{u}(x_{0})\|_{T}^{p} \leq C\Big(1+|x_{0}|^{p}+\Big|\int_{0}^{t}g(r,\xi^{u}_{0,r}(x_{0}))dw_{r}\Big|^{p}\Big)$$

almost surely for some constant C. Therefore, using Burkholder's inequality and hypothesis A_2 , $\|\xi^u(x_0)\|_T$ is in L^p for all $p, 1 \le p < \infty$. Write

$$\|D^{u}\|_{T} = \sup_{0 \le s \le T} |D^{u}_{0,s}|$$
$$\|H^{u}\|_{T} = \sup_{0 \le s \le T} |H^{u}_{0,s}|.$$

Then, because f_{ξ} and g_{ξ} are bounded, an application of Gronwall's, Jensen's and Burkholder's inequalities again implies

$$\|D^u\|_T$$
 and $\|H^u\|_T$ are in L^p for all $p, 1 \le p < \infty$.

COST 2.3. Suppose for simplicity that the cost associated with the process is purely terminal and given by a bounded C^2 function

$$c(\xi_{0,T}^{u}(x_{0})).$$

A₄: We suppose $|c(x)| + |c_x(x)| + |c_{xx}(x)| \le K_3(1 + |x|^q)$ for some $q < \infty$.

The expected cost if a control $u \in \underline{U}$ is used is, therefore,

$$J(u) = E[c(\xi_{0,\Gamma}^{u}(x_{0}))].$$

119

We shall suppose there is an optimal control $u^* \in \underline{U}$ so

$$J(u^*) \leq J(u)$$
 for all $u \in \underline{U}$.

NOTATION 2.4. If u^{*} is an optimal control write ξ^* for ξ^{u^*} , D^* for D^{u^*} etc.

REMARKS 2.5. Consider a d-dimensional semimartingale of the form

 $z_t = z_s + A_t$

where Λ is a predictable bounded variation process. Then Kunita's formula [14] for the composition of processes can be applied, (see also Bismut [5]), and we have

$$\xi_{a,t}^{*}(z_{t}) = z_{a} + \int_{a}^{t} f(r, \xi_{a,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}^{*}) dr + \int_{a}^{t} \frac{\partial \xi_{a,r}^{*}}{\partial x}(z_{r}) dA_{r} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{a}^{t} g^{(k)}(r, \xi_{a,r}^{*}(z_{r})) dw_{r}^{k}.$$
(2.5)

DEFINITION 2.6. Consider perturbations of the optimal control u^* of the following kind: For $s \in [0,T]$, h > 0 such that $0 \le s < s + h < T$, and $A \in F_s$ define, for any other admissible control $\tilde{u} \in \underline{U}$,

$$u(t,w) = \begin{cases} u^*(t,w) & \text{if } (t,w) \notin [s,s+h] \times A \\ \tilde{u}(t,w) & \text{if } (t,w) \in [s,s+h] \times A. \end{cases}$$

Applying (2.5) we have, similarly to Theorem 5.1 of [4], the following result.

THEOREM 2.7. For the perturbation u of u^{*} consider the process

$$z_{t} = x + \int_{a}^{t} \left(\frac{\partial \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r})}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \left(f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}) - f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}^{*}) \right) dr.$$
(2.6)

Then the process $\xi_{s,t}^{*}(z_t)$ is indistinguishable from $\xi_{s,t}^{u}(x)$.

PROOF. Substituting (2.6) in (2.5) we see

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{s,t}^{\star}(z_t) &= x + \int_s^t f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r), u_r^{\star}) dr \\ &+ \int_s^t \left(\frac{\partial \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r)}{\partial x} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \left(f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r), u_r) - f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r), u_r^{\circ}) \right) dr \\ &+ \int_s^t g(r, \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r)) dw_r \\ &= x + \int_s^t f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r), u_r) dr + \int_s^t g(r, \xi_{s,r}^{\star}(z_r)) dw_r. \end{aligned}$$

However, the solution to (2.2) is unique so $\xi_{s,t}^*(z_r) = \xi_{s,t}^*(x)$.

REMARKS 2.8. Note that $u(t) = u^*(t)$ if t > s + h so $z_t = z_{s+h}$ if t > s + h.

Therefore

÷ •,

$$\xi_{s,t}^{*}(z_{t}) = \xi_{s,t}^{*}(z_{s+h}) = \xi_{s+h,t}^{*}(\xi_{s,s+h}^{*}(x))$$

if t > s + h.

3. A Minimum Principle.

Now

$$J(u^{*}) = E[c(\xi_{0,T}^{*}(z_{0}))]$$

= $E[c(\xi_{0,T}^{*}(x))]$ where $x = \xi_{0,*}(x_{0}),$

because, by uniqueness, $\xi_{0,T}^{*}(x_0) = \xi_{s,T}^{*}(x)$. Similarly,

$$J(u) = E[c(\xi_{0,T}^{u}(x_{0}))]$$

= $E[c(\xi_{s,T}^{u}(x))]$
= $E[c(\xi_{s,T}^{s}(z_{s+h}))].$

Therefore,

$$J(u) - J(u^*) = E[c(\xi^*_{s,T}(z_{s+h})) - c(\xi^*_{s,T}(z))].$$

Because $\xi_{s,T}^{*}(\cdot)$ is differentiable this is

$$=E\Big[\int_{a}^{a+h}c_{\xi}(\xi_{a,T}^{*}(z_{r}))\frac{\partial\xi_{a,T}^{*}(z_{r})}{\partial x}\cdot\left(\frac{\partial\xi_{a,r}^{*}(z_{r})}{\partial x}\right)^{-1}(f(r,\xi_{a,r}^{*}(z_{r}),u_{r})-f(r,\xi_{a,r}^{*}(z_{r}),u_{r}^{*}))dr\Big].$$
(3.1)

This gives an explicit formula for the change in the cost resulting from a 'strong' variation. in the optimal control. It involves only a time integration. The only remaining problem is to justify the differentiation of the right hand side of (3.1).

to justify the differentiation of the right hand side of (3.1). Write $\Gamma(s, r, z_r) = c_{\ell}(\xi^*_{s,T}(z_r)) \frac{\partial \xi^*_{s,T}(z_r)}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial \xi^*_{s,r}(z_r)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1}$.

Then

$$J(u) - J(u^{*}) = \int_{x}^{x+h} E\left[\left(\Gamma(s, r, z_{r}) - \Gamma(s, r, x)\right)\left(f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}) - f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}^{*})\right)\right]dr$$

$$+ \int_{x}^{x+h} E\left[\left(\Gamma(s, r, x) - \Gamma(r, r, x)\right)\left(f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}) - f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}^{*})\right)\right]dr$$

$$+ \int_{x}^{x+h} E\left[\Gamma(r, r, x)(f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}) - f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(z_{r}), u_{r}^{*}) - f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(x), u_{r}) + f(r, \xi_{s,r}^{*}(x), u_{r}^{*})\right]dr$$

$$+ \int_{x}^{x+h} E\left[\Gamma(r, r, x)(f(r, \xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{r}) - f(r, \xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{r}^{*}))\right]dr$$

$$= I_{1}(h) + I_{2}(h) + I_{3}(h) + I_{4}(h), \quad \text{say.}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1}(h)| &\leq K_{4} \int_{s}^{s+h} E\Big[|\Gamma(s,r,z_{r}) - \Gamma(s,r,x)|(1+||\xi^{u}(x_{0})||_{s+h})\Big]dr \\ &\leq K_{4}h \sup_{s \leq r \leq s+h} E\Big[|\Gamma(s,r,z_{r}) - \Gamma(s,r,x)|(1+||\xi^{u}(x_{0})||_{s+h})\Big] \\ |I_{2}(h)| &\leq K_{5} \int_{s}^{s+h} E\Big[|\Gamma(s,r,x) - \Gamma(r,r,x)|(1+||\xi^{u}(x_{0})||_{s+h})\Big]dr \\ &\leq K_{5}h \sup_{s \leq r \leq s+h} E\Big[|\Gamma(s,r,z_{r}) - \Gamma(r,r,x)|(1+||\xi^{u}(x_{0})||_{s+h}]\Big] \\ |I_{3}(h)| &\leq K_{6} \int_{s}^{s+h} E\Big[|\Gamma(r,r,x)| ||x-z_{r}||\Big]dr \\ &\leq K_{6}h \sup_{s \leq r \leq s+h} E\Big[|\Gamma(r,r,x)| ||x-z_{r}||\Big]dr \end{aligned}$$

The differences $|\Gamma(s, r, z_r) - \Gamma(s, r, x)|$, $|\Gamma(s, r, x) - \Gamma(r, r, x)|$ and $||x - z||_{s+h}$ are all uniformly bounded in some L^p , p > 1, and

$$\lim_{r \to s} |\Gamma(s, r, z_r) - \Gamma(s, r, x)| = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

$$\lim_{r \to s} |\Gamma(s, r, x) - \Gamma(r, r, x)| = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

$$\lim_{h \to 0} ||x - x_{\cdot}||_{s+h} = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{r \to a} \|\Gamma(s, r, z_r) - \Gamma(s, r, x)\|_p = 0$$
$$\lim_{r \to a} \|\Gamma(s, r, x) - \Gamma(r, r, x)\|_p = 0$$
and
$$\lim_{r \to a} \|(\|x - z\|_{s+k})\|_p = 0 \text{ for some } p.$$

Consequently, $\lim_{k \to 0} h^{-1} I_k(h) = 0$, for k = 1, 2, 3.

The only remaining problem concerns the differentiability of

$$I_{4}(h) = \int_{a}^{a+h} E\Big[\Gamma(r,r,x)(f(r, \xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{r}) - f(r, \xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{r}^{*}))\Big]dr.$$

The integrand is almost surely in $L^1([0,T])$ so $\lim_{h\to 0} h^{-1} I_4(h)$ exists for almost every $s \in [0,T]$. However, the set of times $\{s\}$ where the limit may not exist might depend on the

control u. Consequently we must restrict the perturbations u of the optimal control u^* to perturbations from a countable dense set of controls. In fact:

- 1) Because the trajectories are, almost surely, continuous, F_{ρ} is countably generated by sets $\{A_{i\rho}\}$, i = 1, 2, ... for any rational number $\rho \in [0, T]$. Consequently F_t is countably generated by the sets $\{A_{i\rho}\}$, $r \leq t$.
- Let G_t denote the set of measurable functions from (Ω, F_t) to U ⊂ R^k. (If u ∈ U then u(t, w) ∈ G_t.) Using the L¹-norm, as in [7], there is a countable dense subset H_ρ = {u_{jρ}} of G_ρ, for rational ρ ∈ [0, T]. If H_t = ⋃_{ρ≤t} H_ρ then H_t is a countable dense subset of G_t. If u_{jρ} ∈ H_ρ then, as a function constant in time, u_{jρ} can be considered as an admissible control over any time interval [t, T] for t ≥ ρ.
- 3) The countable family of perturbations is obtained by considering sets $A_{i\rho} \in F_{l}$, functions $u_{j\rho} \in H_{l}$, where $\rho \leq t$, and defining as in 3.1

$$u_{j\rho}^*(s,w) = \begin{cases} u^*(s,w) & \text{if } (s,w) \notin [t,T] \times A_{i\rho} \\ u_{j\rho}(s,w) & \text{if } (s,w) \in [t,T] \times A_{i\rho}. \end{cases}$$

Then for each i, j, p

$$\lim_{h \to 0} h^{-1} \int_{a}^{a+h} E \Big[\Gamma(r,r,x) (f(r, \xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{j\rho}^{*}) - f(r, \xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}), u^{*})) \Big] dr \qquad (3.2)$$

exists and equals

$$E\left[\Gamma(s, s, x)(f(s, \xi_{0,s}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{j, 0}) - f(s, \xi_{0,s}^{*}(x_{0}), u^{*}))I_{A_{i, 0}}\right]$$

for almost all $s \in [0, T]$.

Therefore, considering this perturbation we have

$$\lim_{k \to 0} h^{-1} \left(J(u_{j_{\rho}}^{*}) - J(u^{*}) \right) = E \left[\Gamma(s, s, x) (f(s, \xi_{0, \rho}^{*}(x_{0}), u_{j_{\rho}}) - f(s, \xi_{0, \rho}^{*}(x_{0}), u^{*})) I_{\mathcal{K}_{\rho}} \right]$$

$$\geq 0 \quad \text{for almost all } s \in [0, T].$$

Consequently there is a set $S \subset [0,T]$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that, if $s \notin S$, the limit in (3.2) exists for all i, j, ρ , and gives

$$E\left[\Gamma(s,s,x)(f(s,\ \xi^*_{0,s}(x_0),\ u_{j\rho})-f(s,\ \xi^*_{0,s}(x_0),\ u^*))I_{A_{i\rho}}\right]\geq 0.$$

Using the monotone class theorem, and approximating an arbitrary admissible control $u \in \underline{U}$ we can deduce that if $s \notin S$

$$E\left[\Gamma(s,s,x)(f(s, \xi_{0,*}^{*}(x_{0}), u) - f(s, \xi_{0,*}^{*}(x_{0}), u^{*}))I_{A}\right] \ge 0 \quad \text{for any } u \in U \text{ and } A \in F_{4}.$$
(3.3)

Write

:

$$p_{s}(x) = E\left[c_{\xi}(\xi_{0,T}^{*}(x_{0}))\frac{\partial \xi_{s,T}^{*}(x)}{\partial x} \mid F_{s}\right] = E[\Gamma(s,s,x) \mid F_{s}]$$
(3.4)

where, as before, $x = \xi_{0,s}^*(x_0)$. Then $p_s(x)$ is the adjoint variable and we have in (3.3) proved the following minimum principle:

THEOREM 5.1. If $u^* \in \underline{U}$ is an optimal control there is a set $S \subset [0,T]$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that if $s \notin S$

$$p_s(x)f(s,x,u^*) \leq p_s(x)f(s,x,u)$$
 a.s.

That is, the optimal control u^* almost surely minimizes the Hamiltonian and the adjoint variable is $p_*(x)$.

REMARKS 3.2. Under certain conditions the minimum cost attainable under the stochastic open loop controls is equal to the minimum cost attainable under the Markov, feedback controls of the form $u(s, \xi_{0,s}^u(x_0))$. See for example [2], [10]. If u_M is a Markov control, with a corresponding, possibly weak, solution trajectory ξ^{u_M} , then u_M can be considered as a stochastic open loop control $u_M(w)$ by putting

$$u_{\mathcal{M}}(w) = u_{\mathcal{M}}(s, \xi_{0, \bullet}^{u_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, w)).$$

This means the control in effect 'follows' its original trajectory ξ^{*M} than any new trajectory. That is the control is similar to the adjoint strategies considered by Krylov [13]. The significance of this is that when we consider variations in the state trajectory ξ , and derivatives of the map $x \to \xi_{s,t}(x)$, the control does not react, and so we do not introduce derivatives in the u variable.

If the optimal control u^* is Markov the process ξ^* is Markov and

$$p_{\theta}(x) = E[\Gamma(s, s, x) | F_{\theta}]$$
$$= E[\Gamma(s, s, x) | x].$$
(3.5)

4. The Adjoint Process.

Suppose the optimal control u^* is Markov. As noted above, u^* can and will be considered as an open loop control. The Jacobian $\frac{\partial \xi_{s,T}^*}{\partial x}$ exists, as does $\left(\frac{\partial \xi_{s,T}^*}{\partial x}\right)^{-1}$ and higher derivatives.

THEOREM 4.1. Suppose the optimal control u' is Markov. Then

$$p_{*}(x) = E_{i}^{t}c_{\xi}(\xi_{0,T}^{*}(x_{0}))D_{0,T}] - \int_{0}^{*} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))f_{\xi}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}),u_{r}^{*})dr$$

+
$$\int_{0}^{*} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))g(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))dw_{r}$$

-
$$\int_{0}^{*} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))g(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))g_{\xi}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))dr.$$

PROOF. Write $f_{\ell}(r)$ for $f_{\ell}(r, \xi_{0,r}^*(x_0), u_r^*)$ and g(r) for $g(r, \xi_{0,r}^*(x_0))$, etc. By uniqueness of the solutions to (2.1)

$$\xi_{0,T}^{*}(x_{0}) = \xi_{s,T}^{*}(\xi_{0,s}^{*}(x_{0}))$$
(4.1)

so, differentiating,

$$D_{0,T} = D_{s,T} D_{0,s} \tag{4.2}$$

where $D_{0,T} = D_{0,T}^*$ etc. (without the *).

From (3.4) and (3.5)

$$p_{s}(x) = E[c_{\xi}(\xi_{0,T}^{*}(x_{0}))D_{s,T} | F_{s}]$$

so from (4.2)

$$p_{\bullet}(x)D_{0,\bullet} = E[c_{\ell}(\xi_{0,T}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))D_{0,T} | F_{\bullet}]$$
(4.3)

and this is a $(P, \{F_t\})$ martingale. Write $x = \xi_{0,s}^*(x_0)$, $D = D_{0,s}$. From the martingale representation result [9], the integrand in the representation of $y_s(x)D$ as a stochastic integral is obtained by the Ito rule, noting that only the stochastic integral terms will appear. These involve the derivatives in x and D. Therefore

$$p_{s}(x)D = E[c_{\xi}(\xi_{0,T}(x_{0}))D_{0,T}] + \int_{0}^{a} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))g(r)dw_{r}D_{0,r} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{a} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{*}(x_{0}))g_{\xi}^{(k)}(r)D_{0,r}dw_{r}^{k}.$$

$$(4.4)$$

Recall from (2.4) that $H_{0,s} = D^{-1}$ so forming the product of (2.4) and (4.4), using the Ito rule:

$$p_{\bullet}(x) = (p_{\bullet}(x)D)H_{0,\bullet}$$

$$= E[c_{\ell}(\xi_{0,T}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))D_{0,T}] - \int_{0}^{4} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))f_{\ell}(r)dr$$

$$- \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{4} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))g_{\ell}^{(k)}(r)dw_{r}^{k} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{4} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))(g_{\ell}^{(k)}(r))^{2}dr$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{4} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))g(r)dw_{r} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{4} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))g_{\ell}^{(k)}(r)dw_{r}^{k}$$

$$- \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{4} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))g(r)g_{\ell}^{(k)}(r)dr - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{4} p_{r}(\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))(g_{\ell}^{(k)}(r))^{2}dr$$

$$= E[c_{\ell}(\xi_{0,T}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))D_{0,T}] - \int_{0}^{4} p_{r}(\xi_{0,T}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))f_{\ell}(r)dr$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{2} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))g(r)dw_{r} - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{4} p_{x}(r,\xi_{0,r}^{\bullet}(x_{0}))g(r)g_{\ell}^{(k)}(r)dr$$

so establishing the result.

This verifies by a simple, direct method the formula of Haussman [10].

References

- [1] J.N. Blagovescenskii and M.I. Freidlin, Some properties of diffusion processes depending on a parameter. Dokl. Akad. Nauk. 138(1961), Soviet Math. 2(1961), 633-636.
- [2] J.M. Bismut, Theorie probabiliste du contrôle des diffusions. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 167(1976).
- [3] J.M. Bismut, An introductory approach to duality in optimal stochastic control. SIAM Review 20(1978), 62-78.
- [4] J.M. Bismut, Mecanique Aléatoire. In Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour X. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 929, Springer-Verlag 1982, 1-100.
- [5] J.M. Bismut, A generalized formula of Ito and some other properties of stochastic flows. Zeits. für Wahrs. 55(1981), 331-350.
- [6] M.H.A. Davis and P.P. Varaiya, Dynamic programming conditions for partially observable stochastic systems, SIAM Jour. Control 11(1973), 226-261.
- [7] R.J. Elliott, The optimal control of a stochastic system. SIAM Jour. Control and Opt. 15(1977), 756-778.
- [8] R.J. Elliott, Stochastic Calculus and Applications. Applications of Math. Vol. 18, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [9] R.J. Elliott and M. Kohlmann, A short proof of a martingale representation result. University of Alberta, pre-print.
- [10] U.G. Haussmann, On the adjoint process for optimal control of diffusion processes. SIAM Jour. Control and Opt. 19(1981), 221-243, and 710.
- [11] U.G. Haussmann, Extremal controls for completely observable diffusions. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 42, Springer-Verlag 1982, 149-160.
- [12] U.G. Haussmann, A Stochastic Minimum Principle for Optimal Control of Diffusions. Pitman/Longman Research Notes in Mathematics 151, Longman U.K., 1986.
- [13] N.V. Krylov, Controlled Diffusion Processes. Applications of Math. Vol. 14. Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [14] H. Kunita, Some extensions of Ito's formula. Lecture Notes in Math. 850, Springer-Verlag 1980, 118-141.
- [15] H. Kushner, Necessary conditions for continuous parameter stochastic optimization problems, SIAM Jour. Control 10(1972), 550-565.

an an waa waa waa ƙasar