HAL open science

Existence of optimal controls for stochastic Volterra equations

Andrés Cárdenas, Sergio Pulido, Rafael Serrano

▶ To cite this version:

Andrés Cárdenas, Sergio Pulido, Rafael Serrano. Existence of optimal controls for stochastic Volterra equations. 2022. hal-03720342

HAL Id: hal-03720342
https://hal.science/hal-03720342v1

Preprint submitted on 11 Jul 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Existence of optimal controls for stochastic Volterra equations*

Andrés Cárdenas† Sergio Pulido‡ Rafael Serrano§

July 8, 2022

Abstract

We provide sufficient conditions that guarantee the existence of relaxed optimal controls in the weak formulation of control problems for stochastic Volterra equations (SVEs). Our study can be applied to rough processes which arise when the kernel appearing in the controlled SVE is singular at zero. The proof of existence of relaxed optimal policies relies on the interaction between integrability hypotheses on the kernel, growth conditions on the running cost functional and on the coefficients of the controlled SVEs, and certain compactness properties of the class of Young measures on Suslin metrizable control sets. Under classical convexity assumptions, we also deduce the existence of optimal strict controls.

Keywords: stochastic Volterra equations, rough processes, relaxed control, Young measures, tightness, weak formulation.

MSC2010 classifications: 93E20, 60G22, 60H20.

1 Introduction

Interest in stochastic Volterra equations (SVEs) of convolution type has been increasing rapidly because they provide suitable models for applications that benefit from the memory and the varying levels of regularity of their dynamics. Such applications include, among others, turbulence modeling in physics (Barndorff-Nielsen and Schmiegel, 2008; Barndorff-Nielsen et al., 2011), modeling of energy markets (Barndorff-Nielsen et al., 2013), and modeling of rough volatility in finance (Gatheral et al., 2018).

*Andrés Cárdenas and Rafael Serrano thank Alianza EFI-Colombia Cientifica grant, codes 60185 and FP44842-220-2018 for financial support. The research of the Sergio Pulido benefited from the financial support of the chairs "Deep finance & Statistics" and "Machine Learning & systematic methods in finance" of École Polytechnique. Sergio Pulido acknowledges support by the Europlace Institute of Finance (EIF) and the Labex Louis Bachelier, research project: "The impact of information on financial markets".

†Universidad del Rosario, andres.cardenas@urosario.edu.co

‡Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, ENSIIE, Univ Evry, Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Modélisation d'Evry (LaMME), sergio.pulidonino@ensiie.fr

§Universidad del Rosario, rafael.serrano@urosario.edu.co

In this paper we consider finite-horizon control problems for SVEs of convolution type driven by a multidimensional Brownian motion with linear-growth coefficients and control policies with values on a metrizable topological space of Suslin type. We are particularly interested in singular kernels, such as fractional kernels proportional to $t^{H-\frac{1}{2}}$ with $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. These kernels are important because they allow modeling trajectories which are strictly less regular than those of classical Brownian motion. They have been used, for instance, in financial models with rough volatility which reproduce features of time series of estimated spot volatility (Gatheral et al., 2018) and implied volatility surfaces (Alòs et al., 2007; Bayer et al., 2016).

Several studies have investigated optimal control of SVEs. Yong (2006) uses the maximum principle method to obtain optimality conditions in terms of an adjoint backward stochastic Volterra equation. Agram and Øksendal (2015) also use the maximum principle together with Malliavin calculus to obtain the adjoint equation as a standard backward SDE. Although the kernel considered in these papers is not restricted to be of convolution type, the required conditions do not allow singularity of K at zero. Recently, an extended Bellman equation has been derived in Han and Wong (2019) for the associated controlled Volterra equation.

The particular case of linear-quadratic control problems for SVEs, with controlled drift and additive fractional noise with Hurst parameter $H > 1/2$, has been studied in Kleptsyna et al. (2003). Similarly, in Duncan and Pasik-Duncan (2013) the authors consider a general Gaussian noise with an optimal control expressed as the sum of the well-known linear feedback control for the associated deterministic linear-quadratic control problem and the prediction of the response of a system to the future noise process. Recently, Wang (2018) investigated the linear-quadratic problem of stochastic Volterra equations by providing characterizations of optimal control in terms of a forward-backward system, but leaving aside its solvability, and under some assumptions on the coefficients that preclude (singular) fractional kernels of interest.

Abi Jaber et al. (2021b) studied control problems for linear SVEs with quadratic cost function and kernels that are the Laplace transforms of certain signed matrix measures which are not necessarily finite. They establish a correspondence between the initial problem and an infinite dimensional Markovian problem on a certain Banach space. Using a refined martingale verification argument combined with a completion of squares technique, they prove that the value function is of linear quadratic form in the new state variables, with a linear optimal feedback control, depending on nonstandard Banach space-valued Riccati equations. They also show that the value function of the stochastic Volterra optimization problem can be approximated by conventional finite dimensional Markovian linear-quadratic problems.

We propose to study the existence problem by means of so-called relaxed controls in a weak probabilistic setting. This approach compactifies the original control system by embedding it into a framework in which control policies are probability measures on the control set, and the probability space is also part of the class of admissible controls. Thus,

in this setting, the unknown is no longer only the control-state process but rather an array consisting of the stochastic basis and the control-state pair solution to the relaxed version of the controlled SVE.

In the stochastic case, relaxed control of finite-dimensional stochastic systems goes back to Fleming and Nisio (1984). Their approach was followed extensively by El Karoui et al. (1987), Haussmann and Lepeltier (1990), Kurtz and Stockbridge (1998), Mezerdi and Bahlali (2002) and Dufour and Stockbridge (2012). Relaxed controls have also been used to study singular control problems (Haussmann and Suo, 1995; Kurtz et al., 2001; Andersson, 2009), mean-field games (Lacker, 2015; Fu and Horst, 2017; Cecchin and Fischer, 2020; Benazzoli et al., 2020; Bouveret et al., 2020; Barrasso and Touzi, 2020), mean-field control problems (Bahlali et al., 2017), continuous-time reinforcement learning (Wang et al., 2020; Wang and Zhou, 2020), and optimal control of piece-wise deterministic Markov processes (Costa and Dufour, 2010a,b; do Valle Costa and Dufour, 2013; Bäuerle and Rieder, 2009; Bauerle and Lange, 2018).

The main purpose of this paper is to provide a set of conditions that ensures existence of optimal relaxed controls, see Theorem 3.1. Our main contribution is that we allow kernels that are singular at zero, for instance, fractional Kernels proportional to $t^{H-\frac{1}{2}}$ with $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and coefficients that are not necessarily bounded in the control variable. Under one additional assumption on the coefficients and cost function, familiar in relaxed control theory since the work of Filippov (1962), we prove that the optimal relaxed value is attained by strict policies on the original control set, see Theorem 3.2.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we establish some preliminary results on controlled stochastic Volterra equations (CSVEs). In Section 3 we describe the weak relaxed formulation of the control problem, state our main results, namely Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, and provide some examples. Section 4 contains the proofs of the main results. In Appendix A we recall an important measurability result needed for the existence of optimal strict controls. Appendix B contains an overview of the main results on relative compactness and limit theorems for Young measures that are used in the proofs of the main theorems.

2 Controlled stochastic Volterra equations (CSVEs)

Let $T > 0$ and $d, d' \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. We consider the control problem of minimizing a cost functional of the form

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T h(t, X_t, u_t)dt + g(X_T)\right] \tag{1}$$

subject to $X = (X_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ being a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued solution to the controlled stochastic Volterra equation (CSVE) of the form

$$X_t = x_0(t) + \int_0^t K(t-s)b(s, X_s, u_s)\, ds + \int_0^t K(t-s)\sigma(s, X_s, u_s)\, dW_s,\ t \in [0,T] \tag{2}$$

over a certain class of control processes $(u_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ taking values in a measurable control set M. The function $K \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ is a given kernel, the initial condition x_0 is a deterministic $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued continuous function on $[0,T]$, and $(W_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a d'-dimensional Brownian motion defined on a probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbf{P})$ endowed with a filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, satisfying the usual conditions. In our main existence results, we will consider solutions to (2) in a weak sense, see Definition 3.2.

Throughout, we will assume the following condition on the kernel K:

Assumption I. *There exist $r \in (2,\infty)$ and $\gamma \in (0,2]$ such that $K \in L^r_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ and*

$$\int_0^h |K(t)|^2\,dt = \mathcal{O}(h^\gamma), \quad \textit{and} \quad \int_0^T |K(t+h)-K(t)|^2\,dt = \mathcal{O}(h^\gamma).$$

The following are examples of kernels that satisfy Assumption I:

1. Let K be locally Lipschitz. Then K satisfies Assumption I with $\gamma = 1$ and for any $r \in (2,\infty)$.

2. The fractional kernel $K(t) = t^{H-\frac{1}{2}}$ with $H \in (0,\frac{1}{2})$ satisfies Assumption I with $r \in (2, \frac{2}{1-2H})$ and $\gamma = 2H$.

We consider, for now, a control set M which is assumed to be a Hausdorff topological space endowed with the Borel $\sigma-$algebra $\mathcal{B}(M)$. We will assume later more specific conditions on M.

Assumption II. *1. The coefficients $b : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times M \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times M \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d'}$ are continuous in $u \in M$, and in $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ uniformly with respect to u.*

2. There exists a measurable function $\eta_1 : [0,T]\times M \to [0,+\infty]$ and a constant $c_{\text{lin}} > 0$ such that

$$|b(t,x,u)| + |\sigma(t,x,u)| \leq c_{\text{lin}}|x| + \eta_1(t,u), \quad (t,x,u) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times M. \tag{3}$$

The following result extends the a-priori estimates of Lemma 3.1 of Abi Jaber et al. (2019) to the case of CSVEs.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that Assumption II holds and that $K \in L^r_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ for some $r > 2$. Let $(u_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a M-valued adapted control process such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \eta_1(t,u_t)^p\,dt < \infty$$

for some p satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{2}$. Let X be a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued solution to the controlled equation (2) with initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \mathbb{E}\left[|X_t|^m\right] \leq c, \tag{4}$$

for all $m > 2$ satisfying $\frac{1}{m} \in \left[\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, where the constant c depends on $m, p, c_{\text{lin}}, T, C_B$[1]*, $|x_0|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)}$, $\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \eta_1(t,u_t)^p\,dt$ and L^2-continuously on $K|_{[0,T]}$.*

Proof. For simplicity, but without loss of generality, we take $d = d' = 1$. Let $t \in [0,T]$ be fixed. Then, for any $m > 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|X_t|^m &\leq 3^{m-1}\left[|x_0|^m + \left|\int_0^t K(t-s)b(s,X_s,u_s)\,ds\right|^m + \left|\int_0^t K(t-s)\sigma(s,X_s,u_s)\,dW_s\right|^m\right]\\ &= 3^{m-1}\left[|x_0|^m + I + II\right].\end{aligned}$$

Using Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, and Jensen's inequality with the measure $\mu(ds) = K(t-s)^2\,ds/\int_0^t |K(t-\tau)|^2\,d\tau$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[II] &\leq C_B\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_0^t K(t-s)^2\sigma(s,X_s,u_s)^2\,ds\right|^{m/2}\right]\\ &\leq C_B\,\|K\|_{L^2}^{m-2}\int_0^t |\sigma(s,X_s,u_s)|^m\,|K(t-s)|^2\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

By condition (3)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[II] &\leq C_B 2^{m-1}c_{\text{lin}}^m\,\|K\|_{L^2}^{m-2}\left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\,|X_s|^m\,K(t-s)^2\,ds + c_{\text{lin}}^{-m}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \eta_1(s,u_s)^m K(t-s)^2\,ds\right)\\ &= k_1\left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\,|X_s|^m\,|K(t-s)|^2\,ds + k_2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Note that κ_2 is finite since by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\kappa_2 = c_{\text{lin}}^{-m}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \eta_1(s,u_s)^m K(t-s)^2\,ds \leq c_{\text{lin}}^{-m}T^{1-\frac{m}{p}-\frac{2}{r}}\left[\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \eta_1(s,u_s)^p\,ds\right]^{m/p}\|K\|_{L^r}^2.$$

A similar argument for the first term I yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[I] &\leq t^{m/2}2^{m-1}c_{\text{lin}}^m\,\|K\|_{L^2}^{m-2}\left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\,|X_s|^m\,K(t-s)^2\,ds + c_{\text{lin}}^{-m}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \eta_1(s,u_s)^m K(t-s)^2\,ds\right)\\ &= t^{m/2}C_B^{-1}k_1\left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\,|X_s|^m\,|K(t-s)|^2\,ds + k_2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\tau_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X_t| \geq n\} \wedge T$. By the Corollary of Theorem II.18 in Protter (2005) we have that,

$$|X_t|^m\,\mathbb{1}_{\{t<\tau_n\}} \leq \left|x_0 + \int_0^t K(t-s)(b(s,X_s\mathbb{1}_{\{s<\tau_n\}},u_s)\,ds) + \sigma(s,X_s\mathbb{1}_{\{s<\tau_n\}},u_s)\,dW_s)\right|^m.$$

[1] C_B is the constant in the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, see e.g. Section 4, Chapter IV in Protter (2005).

Let $f_n(t) = \mathbb{E}\,|X_t|^m \mathbb{1}_{\{t<\tau_n\}}$. Then, by (6) and (5) we have

$$f_n \leq \bar{k}k_2 + \bar{k}\,|K|^2 * f_n$$

where $\bar{k} = k_1(1 + T^{m/2}C_B^{-1})$. Using the same argument in the proof of Lemma 3.1 of Abi Jaber et al. (2019), this yields (4) with a constant that only depends on $m, p, c_{\text{lin}}, C_B$, $T, |x_0|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)}$ and L^m-continuously, on $K|_{[0,T]}$. □

Corollary 2.1. *Under the same Assumptions of Theorem 2.1, suppose further Assumption I also holds with γ satisfying $\gamma > 2/m$, where $\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}$. Then X admits a version with paths in $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{1}{m}\right)$. For this version, denoted again with X, we have the following:*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|X - x_0|^m_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)}\right] \leq c, \tag{7}$$

with c depending on $m, p, c_{\text{lin}}, T, C_B, |x_0|_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)}, \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \eta_1(t,u_t)^p\,dt$ and L^2-continuously on $K|_{[0,T]}$.

Proof. Follows directly from the estimate (4) and Lemma 2.4 in Abi Jaber et al. (2019). □

In particular, one can prove the following existence result for solutions to the CSVE (2).

Corollary 2.2. *Let u be a M-valued $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process. Assume that K satisfies Assumption I, b and σ satisfy Assumption II and they are Lipschitz uniformly with respect to $(t,u) \in [0,T] \times M$, and*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \eta_1(t,u_t)^p\,dt < \infty$$

for some p satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose further that $\gamma > 2\left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}\right)$. Then there exists a unique continuous solution X to the CSVE (2).

Proof. Using Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1, the proof is completely analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.3 in Abi Jaber et al. (2019). □

We will also frequently use the following result in the proof of the main existence result of relaxed controls. This alternative formulation of stochastic Volterra equations, by considering the integrated process $\int_0^\cdot X_s\,ds$, is inspired by the martingale problem approach in Abi Jaber et al. (2021a) and facilitates the justification of convergence arguments that will be useful in our setting.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that Assumption II holds, $K \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ and*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \eta_1^2(t,u_t)dt\right] < \infty.$$

Let X be a solution to the CSVE (2) and let Z be the controlled process $Z_t = \int_0^t b(s, X_s, u_s)\, ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_s, u_s)\, dW_s$. If X has paths in L^2_{loc} then

$$\int_0^t X_s\, ds = \int_0^t x_0(s)\, ds + \int_0^t K(t-s) Z_s\, ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \tag{8}$$

Conversely, if X satisfies (8) with paths in L^2_{loc} then it solves the CSVE (2).

Proof. Follows from Lemma 3.2 of Abi Jaber et al. (2021a). □

3 Relaxed control formulation

The use of stochastic relaxed controls is inspired by the works of El Karoui et al. (1987) and Haussmann and Lepeltier (1990). In what follows, $\mathcal{P}(M)$ denotes the set of all probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(M)$ endowed with the $\sigma-$algebra generated by the projection maps

$$\pi_C : \mathcal{P}(M) \ni q \mapsto q(C) \in [0, 1], \quad C \in \mathcal{B}(M).$$

We associate a relaxed control system to the original control problem (1)-(2) as follows. First, we extend the definition of coefficients and cost functionals with the convention

$$\bar{F}(t, x, q) = \int_M F(t, x, u)\, q(du)$$

provided that for each $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the map $F(t, x, \cdot)$ is integrable with respect to $q \in \mathcal{P}(M)$.

Definition 3.1. *A stochastic process $q = (q_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ with values in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ is called a* stochastic relaxed control *(or relaxed control process) on M if the map*

$$[0, T] \times \Omega \ni (t, \omega) \mapsto q_t(\omega, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(M)$$

is predictable. In other words, a stochastic relaxed control on M is a predictable process with values in $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

Given a relaxed control process $(q_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$, the associated relaxed controlled equation now reads

$$X_t = x_0(t) + \int_0^t K(t-s)\bar{b}(s, X_s, q_s) ds + \int_0^t K(t-s)\bar{\sigma}(s, X_s, q_s)\, dW_s, \; t \in [0, T], \tag{9}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}$ is defined, with a slight abuse of notation, so that the following holds:

$$\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^\top(t, x, q) = \int_M \sigma\sigma^\top(t, x, u)\, q(du), \quad t \in [0, T],\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\, q \in \mathcal{P}(M).$$

For the existence of $\bar{\sigma}$ see e.g, Theorem 2.5-a in El Karoui et al. (1987). The relaxed cost functional is defined as

$$J(X,q) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \bar{h}(t, X_t, q_t)\, dt + g\left(X_T\right)\right].$$

Notice that the original system (1)-(2) controlled by a M-valued process $u = (u_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ coincides with the relaxed system controlled by the Dirac measures $q_t = \delta_{u_t}$, $t \in [0,T]$. Moreover, since relaxed controls are just usual (strict) controls with control set $\mathcal{P}(M)$, the results for strict controls in the previous section also hold for relaxed controls, with the control system defined in terms of the relaxed versions of coefficients, running cost and $\bar{\eta}_1(t,q)$.

3.1 Weak formulation of optimal control problem

We study the existence of an optimal control for the stochastic relaxed control system in the following weak formulation.

Definition 3.2. *Let $T > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ be fixed. A weak admissible relaxed control for (K, b, σ) is a system*

$$\pi = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbb{F}, W, X, q) \tag{10}$$

such that the following hold:

1. *$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ is a complete probability space endowed with a filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$, satisfying the usual conditions,*
2. *$W = (W_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a m-dimensional Brownian motion with respect to $\mathbb{F}$,*
3. *$q = (q_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process with values in $\mathcal{P}(M)$,*
4. *$X = (X_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a $\mathbb{F}$-adapted solution to the relaxed controlled equation (9).*
5. *The map $[0,T]\times\Omega \ni (t,\omega) \mapsto \bar{h}(t, X_t(\omega), q_t(\omega)) \in \mathbb{R}$ belongs to $L^1([0,T]\times\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ and $g(X_T) \in L^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$.*

The set of weak admissible relaxed control systems with time horizon $[0,T]$ and initial value x_0 will be denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0,T)$. Under this weak formulation, the relaxed cost functional is defined as

$$\bar{J}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\left[\int_0^T \bar{h}(s, X_s^\pi, q_s^\pi)\, ds + g\left(X_T^\pi\right)\right], \quad \pi \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0,T). \tag{11}$$

The relaxed control problem **(RCP)** consists in minimizing $\bar{J}$ over $\bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0,T)$. Namely, we seek $\tilde{\pi} \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0,T)$ such that

$$\bar{J}(\tilde{\pi}) = \inf_{\pi\in\bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0,T)} \bar{J}(\pi). \tag{12}$$

3.2 Main existence result

In order to complete the set of assumptions for the main existence result, we need the following definition.

Definition 3.3. *A function $\eta : M \to [0, +\infty]$ is called* inf-compact *if for every $R \geq 0$ the level set $\{\eta \leq R\} = \{u \in M : \eta(u) \leq R\}$ is compact.*

Observe that, since M is Hausdorff, for every inf-compact function η the level sets $\{\eta \leq R\}$ are closed. Therefore, every inf-compact function is lower semi-continuous and hence Borel-measurable. If M is compact, the converse holds too, i.e. every lower semi-continuous function is inf-compact. We will denote by $IC(0, T; M)$ the class of measurable functions $\eta : [0, T] \times M \to [0, +\infty]$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ the map $\eta(t, \cdot)$ is inf-compact.

Assumption III.

1. *The **control set** M is a metrizable **Suslin** space i.e. there exists a Polish space S and a continuous mapping $\varphi : S \to M$ such that $\varphi(S) = M$.*
2. *The **running cost** function $h : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times M \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ is measurable in $t \in [0, T]$ and lower semi-continuous with respect to $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times M$.*
3. *There exist $\eta_2 \in IC(0, T; M)$ and constants $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $C_2 > 0$ such that h satisfies the following **coercivity** condition:*

$$\eta_2(t, u)^p \leq C_1 + C_2 h(t, x, u), \quad (t, x, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times M \tag{13}$$

   for some $p \geq 1$.
4. *The **final cost** function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.*

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.1 (Existence of optimal relaxed controls)**.** *Let $T > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be fixed. Suppose that Assumptions I, II and III hold with $r > 2$, $\gamma \in (0, 2]$ and p satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\gamma > 2\left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}\right)$. Suppose further that $\eta_1 \leq \eta_2$ and there exists $\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0, T)$ such that $\bar{J}(\pi) < +\infty$, then* **(RCP)** *admits a weak optimal relaxed control.*

Example 3.1 (Fractional kernel)**.** *For simplicity, we fix $d = d' = 1$, and consider the fractional kernel $K(t) = t^{H-\frac{1}{2}}$ with $H \in \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Suppose the coefficients and running cost function have the form*

$$\begin{aligned} b(t, x, u) &= b_0(t, u) + b_1(t, u)x \\ \sigma(t, x, u) &= \sigma_0(t, u) + \sigma_1(t, u)x \\ h(t, x, u) &= h_0(t, u) + h_1(x) \end{aligned}$$

with

- *b_i, σ_i measurable and continuous in $u \in M$, uniformly with respect to $t \in [0,T]$, for $i = 0, 1$,*
- *b_1, σ_1 uniformly bounded in (t, u),*
- *$h_0 \in IC(0,T;M)$ and h_1 LSC and bounded from below.*

Suppose further that $|f(t,u)|^p \leq Ch_0(t,u)$ for both $f = b_0, \sigma_0$, some constant $C > 0$ and p sufficiently large satisfying $\frac{1}{p} < 2H - \frac{1}{2}$. Then, there exists $r > 2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} - H < \frac{1}{r} < H - \frac{1}{p}$$

so that Assumption I holds for this choice of r and $\gamma = 2H$. Assumptions II, III hold with $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = (Ch_0)^{1/p}$, $C_1 = -C \inf h_1$ and $C_2 = C$. Then, existence of an optimal relaxed control follows from Theorem 3.1.

Remark 3.1. *Recently, Abi Jaber et al. (2021b) proved an existence result for Linear-Quadratic control problems for linear Volterra equations, and obtained a linear feedback characterization of optimal controls. Unlike Abi Jaber et al. (2021b), we do not assume linearity in the coefficients with respect to the control variable. Our assumptions, however, do not cover cost functions with 'quadratic growth' in the control variable, since we are forced to choose p strictly larger than 2.*

3.3 Existence of strict controls

Our main result on the existence of optimal strict controls requires one additional assumption, familiar in relaxed control theory since the work of Filippov (1962), to ensure existence of an optimal strict control.

Assumption IV. *1. M is a closed subset of a Euclidean space.*

2. For each $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the set

$$\Gamma(t,x) = \Big\{ \big(\sigma\sigma^\top(t,x,u), b(t,x,u), z\big) : u \in M,\ z \geq h(t,x,u) \Big\} \tag{14}$$

is a convex and closed subset of $\mathcal{S}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3.2 (Existence of optimal strict controls)**.** *Suppose that Assumption IV holds. Then, for each $\pi = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbb{F}, W, X, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0, T)$ there exists a M-valued $\mathbb{F}$-predictable control process $u = (u_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ such that*

1. X satisfies the Volterra equation (2) controlled by the strict control process $u = (u_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$.

2. $\int_0^T \bar{h}(s, X_s, q_s)\, ds \geq \int_0^T h(s, X_s, u_s)\, ds$, $\mathbf{P}$-*a.s.*

In particular, if the Assumptions of Theorem 3.1 also hold, there exists a weak optimal strict control for (1)-(2).

Example 3.2. *Let $M = \mathbb{R}$ or $M = [-\tilde{M}, \tilde{M}]$, with $0 < \tilde{M} < \infty$, $d = d' = 1$ and $K(t) = t^{H-\frac{1}{2}}$ with $H \in \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Suppose the coefficients have the form*

$$\begin{aligned} b(t,x,u) &= b_0(t,x) + b_1(t,x)u^2 \\ \sigma(t,x,u) &= \sigma_1(t,x)u \\ h(t,x,u) &= h_0(t,u^2) + h_1(x), \end{aligned}$$

where

- *b_i, σ_1 measurable and continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}$, uniformly respect to $t \in [0,T]$, for $i = 0, 1$,*
- *b_1, σ_1 uniformly bounded in (t,x) and $|b_0(t,x)| \leq K\,|x|\,,$ with $K > 0$,*
- *$h_0(t,.)$ is a function convex on $\mathbb{R}^+$, for each $t \in [0,T]$, $h_0 \in IC(0,T;M^2)$ and h_1 LSC bounded from below.*

Suppose further that $|\phi(t,u)|^p \leq Ch_0(t,u)$, with $\phi(t,u) = \max\{|u|^2, |u|\}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, and p satisfying $\frac{1}{p} < 2H - \frac{1}{2}$. As in the Example 3.1 there exists $r > 2$ such that Assumptions II, III hold with $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = (Ch_0)^{1/p}$, $C_1 = -C \inf h_1$ and $C_2 = C$. By Theorem 3.1 there is an optimal relaxed control. Let $\Gamma^1(t,x) = \left\{(\widetilde{u}, z) : \widetilde{u} \in M^2, z \geq h_0(t,\widetilde{u}) + h_1(x)\right\}$. Then Γ in (14) can be written as an affine transformation of Γ^1. More precisely, $\Gamma(t,x) = \boldsymbol{b}(t,x) + \boldsymbol{A}(t,x)\Gamma^1(t,x)$ where

$$\boldsymbol{b}(t,x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ b_0(t,x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(t,x) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2(t,x) & 0 \\ b_1(t,x) & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Since h_0 is a function convex on $\mathbb{R}_+$ the epigraph Γ^1 is a convex set, then Γ is a convex set and by Theorem 3.2 there is an optimal strict control.

Remark 3.2. *If σ does not depend on $u \in M$, Assumption IV holds if the set $\left\{(b(t,x,u), z) : u \in M, z \geq h(t,x,u)\right\}$ is convex and closed in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. This is the case, for instance, if the drift coefficient is affine in u, i.e. it has the form $b(t,x,u) = b_0(t,x) + b_1(t,x)u$ and if $h(t,x,\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous and convex.*

4 Proofs of the main theorems

4.1 Relaxed controls and Young measures

Definition 4.1. *Let* $\mathrm{Leb}(\cdot)$ *denote the Lebesgue measure on* $[0,T]$ *and* λ *be a bounded non-negative* $\sigma-$*additive measure on* $\mathcal{B}(M\times[0,T])$*. We say that* λ *is a* Young measure *on* M *if and only if* λ *satisfies*

$$\lambda(M\times D)=\mathrm{Leb}(D),\quad D\in\mathcal{B}([0,T]), \tag{15}$$

i.e. the marginal of λ *on* $\mathcal{B}([0,T])$ *is equal to the Lebesgue measure* Leb*. We denote by* $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ *the set of Young measures on* M*. We endow* $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ *with the* stable topology *defined as the weakest topology for which the mappings*

$$\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)\ni\lambda\mapsto\int_D\int_M f(u)\,\lambda(du,dt)\in\mathbb{R}$$

are continuous, for every $D\in\mathcal{B}([0,T])$ *and* $f\in\mathcal{C}_b(M)$*.*

The following result connects random Young measures with predictable relaxed controls. For the proof, see e.g. Section 3.3 of Kushner (2012) or Section 2.4 of Cecchin and Fischer (2020).

Lemma 4.1 (**Predictable disintegration of random Young measures**)**.** *Let* $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbf{P})$ *be a probability space and let* M *be a Radon space. Let* $\lambda:\Omega\to\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ *be such that, for every* $J\in\mathcal{B}(M\times[0,T])$*, the mapping*

$$\Omega\ni\omega\mapsto\lambda(w)(J)=\lambda(\omega,J)\in[0,T]$$

is measurable. Then there exists a stochastic relaxed control $(q_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ *on* M *such that for* $\mathbf{P}-$*a.e.* $\omega\in\Omega$ *we have*

$$\lambda(\omega,C\times D)=\int_D q_t(\omega,C)\,dt,\quad C\in\mathcal{B}(M),\ D\in\mathcal{B}([0,T]). \tag{16}$$

Moreover, if $\mathbb{F}=(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ *is a given filtration that satisfies the usual conditions and* $\lambda([0,\cdot)\times C)$ *is* $\mathbb{F}-$*adapted, for all* $C\in\mathcal{B}(M)$*, then* q *is a* $\mathbb{F}-$*predictable process.*

Remark 4.1. *We will denote the disintegration formula (16) by* $\lambda(du,dt)=q_t(du)\,dt$*. Note that* $q_t(C)$ *can be seen as the time-derivative of* $\lambda([0,t)\times C)$ *that exists for almost every* $t\in[0,T]$*, for all* $C\in\mathcal{B}(M)$*.*

Remark 4.2. *It can be proved (see e.g. Remark 3.20 Crauel (2002)) that if* M *is a separable and metrisable topological space, then* $\lambda:\Omega\to\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ *is measurable with*

respect to the Borel $\sigma-$algebra generated by the stable topology if and only if for every $J \in \mathcal{B}(M \times [0,T])$ the mapping

$$\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \lambda(w)(J) \in [0,T]$$

is measurable. This justifies referring to the maps considered in Lemma 4.1 as random Young measures.

For the two following Lemmas, E denotes a Euclidean space with norm $|\cdot|_E$ and inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times M \to E$ be a Borel-measurable function, continuous in $u \in M$, and continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ uniformly with respect to $u \in M$, satisfying the growth condition*

$$|f(t,x,u)|_E \leq c_{\text{lin}}|x|^\delta + \eta(t,u) \tag{17}$$

with $\eta \in IC(0,T;M)$, for some $\delta \geq 1$. For $\beta \geq 1$ fixed, we denote

$$\mathcal{Y}^\beta(0,T;M) := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M) : \eta \in L^\beta(\lambda) \right\}.$$

Then, for each $t \in [0,T]$, the mapping $\Sigma_t : \mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{Y}^\beta(0,T;M) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$\Sigma_t(x,\lambda) = \int_0^t \int_M f(s,x(s),u)\, \lambda(du,ds), \tag{18}$$

is Borel-measurable.

Proof. We fix $t \in [0,T]$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ define

$$\phi_N^i(\lambda) = \int_0^t \int_M \min\{N, f^i(s,x(s),u)\}\, \lambda(du,ds), \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{Y}^\beta(0,T;M).$$

The integrand in the above expression is bounded and continuous with respect to $u \in M$. Therefore, by Lemma B.3 ϕ_N is continuous for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and by dominated convergence, $\phi_N^i(\lambda) \to \Sigma_t^i(x,\lambda)$ as $N \to \infty$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{Y}^\beta(0,T;M)$. Hence, $\Sigma_t(x,\cdot)$ is measurable. Now, we prove that for $\lambda \in \mathcal{Y}^\beta(0,T;M)$ fixed, the map $\Sigma_t(\cdot,\lambda)$ is continuous. Let $x_n \to x$ in $\mathcal{C}\left(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d\right)$. Then, by assumption we have

$$\left|f(s,x(s),u) - f(s,x_n(s),u)\right|_E \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \quad (s,u) \in [0,t] \times M.$$

Moreover, since (x_n) converges in $\mathcal{C}\left(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, it is bounded and there exists $\bar{\rho} > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in [0,T]} \left|x_n(s) - x(s)\right| < \bar{\rho}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore by (17), we have

$$\big|f(s,x(s),u)-f(s,x_n(s),u)\big|_E \le c_{\rm lin}\left[(1+2^{\delta-1})\,|x|^{\delta}_{\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)}+2^{\delta-1}\bar{\rho}^{\delta}\right]+2\eta(s,u)$$

As η belongs to $L^1([0,T]\times M;\lambda)$, so does the right side of the above inequality. Therefore, by the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem we have

$$|\Sigma_t(x,\lambda)-\Sigma_t(x_n,\lambda)| \le \int_0^t\int_M |f(s,x(s),u)-f(s,x_n(s),u)|\;\lambda(du,ds)\to 0$$

as $n\to\infty$, that is, $\Sigma_t(\cdot,\lambda)$ is continuous. Since $\mathcal{Y}^{\beta}(0,T;M)$ is separable and metrisable, by Lemma 1.2.3 in Castaing et al. (2004) it follows that Σ_t is jointly measurable. □

Recall that $\phi^n \rightharpoonup \phi$ weakly in $L^1([0,T]\times\Omega;E)$ if

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \langle \phi^n(t),\psi(t)\rangle\;dt \to \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \langle \phi(t),\psi(t)\rangle\;dt,\quad \forall \psi\in L^{\infty}([0,T]\times\Omega;E).$$

We have the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $f:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times M\to E$ be a Borel-measurable function, continuous in $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ uniformly with respect to $u\in M$, satisfying the growth condition (17) for some $\delta\ge 1$, with $\eta\in IC(0,T;M)$. Let $(X^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes, and $\lambda^n(du,dt)=q^n_t(du)\,dt$ a sequence of stochastic relaxed controls defined on the same probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbf{P})$ such that $X^n\to X$ point-wise $\mathbf{P}$-a.s. and in $L^{\beta\delta}(\Omega\times[0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $\beta>1$, and $\lambda^n\to\lambda$ in the stable topology $\mathbf{P}$-a.s., with $\lambda(du,dt)=q_t(du,dt)$. Suppose further*

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{P}}\int_0^T\int_M \eta(t,u)^{\beta}\,\lambda^n(du,dt)<\infty. \tag{19}$$

For each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, set $f^n_t=\bar{f}(t,X^n_t,q^n_t)$, $\hat{f}^n_t=\bar{f}(t,X_t,q^n_t)$, $t\in[0,T]$. Then

1. *$f^n-\hat{f}^n\to 0$, (strongly) in $L^1([0,T]\times\Omega;E)$.*
2. *$\hat{f}^n\rightharpoonup f$, weakly in $L^1([0,T]\times\Omega;E)$.*

with $f_t=\bar{f}(t,X_t,q_t)$, $t\in[0,T]$.

Proof. We first prove

$$f^n-\hat{f}^n\to 0,\qquad \text{(strongly) in } L^1([0,T]\times\Omega;E). \tag{20}$$

By uniform continuity with respect to $u\in M$, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$I^n_t=\int_M\big|f(t,X^n_t,u)-f(t,X_t,u)\big|_E\,q^n_t(du)\le \sup_{u\in M}\big|f(t,X^n_t,u)-f(t,X_t,u)\big|_E\to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$ for $t \in [0,T]$, $\mathbf{P}-$a.s. From (17) and (19), we get

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |I_t^n|^\beta \, dt < +\infty.$$

Hence, $\{I^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable on $\Omega \times [0,T]$. Lemma 4.11 Kallenberg (2002) implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left| f_t^n - \hat{f}_t^n \right|_E dt \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T I_t^n \, dt \to 0, \qquad \text{as} \;\; n \to \infty,$$

and (20) follows. Now, we will prove that

$$\hat{f}^n \rightharpoonup f, \qquad \text{weakly in} \;\; L^1([0,T]\times\Omega; E). \tag{21}$$

Let $\psi \in L^\infty([0,T]\times\Omega; E)$ be fixed. We denote $g(t,u) = \langle f(t,X_t,u), \psi_t \rangle$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \langle \hat{f}_t^n, \psi_t \rangle \, dt = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \int_M f(t,X_t,u)\, q_t^n(du), \psi_t \right\rangle dt = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_M g(t,u)\, \lambda^n(du,dt)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ be fixed and take $C_\varepsilon > \max\{\frac{R}{\varepsilon}, 1\}$ with R defined as the supremum in (19), and let $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon = \left\{(t,u) \in [0,T]\times M : \eta(t,u)^{\beta-1} > C_\varepsilon\right\}$. Then, for this choice of C_ε, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\lambda_n(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)\right] = \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \lambda_n(du,dt) \leq \frac{1}{C_\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \eta(t,u)^{\beta-1}\, \lambda_n(du,dt) < \varepsilon.$$

We write

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_M g(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du,dt) = \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^c} g(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du,dt) + \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} g(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du,dt)$$

and observe first that by Lemma B.3 we have $\mathbf{P}-$a.s.

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^c} g(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du,dt) \to \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^c} g(t,u)\, \lambda(du,dt)$$

as $n \to \infty$ and, by (17),

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^c} g(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du,dt) \leq \left[c_{\text{lin}} \left|X\right|^\delta_{L^1(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)} + C_\varepsilon^{1/(\beta-1)} \right] |\psi|_{L^\infty(0,T;E)}, \quad \mathbf{P}-\text{a.s.}$$

The right side of the last inequality has finite expectation by the hypothesis about ψ and the Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality. Thus, using Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem we get

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^c} g(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du,dt) \to \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon^c} g(t,u)\, \lambda(du,dt)$$

as $n \to \infty$. Now, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the measure $\mu_n(du, dt, d\omega) = \lambda_n(\omega)(du, dt)\mathbf{P}(d\omega)$ on $\mathcal{B}(M) \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,T]) \otimes \mathbb{F}$, so we have

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \Big| g(t,u) \Big| \, \lambda_n(du, dt) \leq \int_\Omega \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \varphi(t) \, \mu_n(du, dt, d\omega) + \int_\Omega \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \eta(t,u) \, |\psi_t|_E \; \mu_n(du, dt, d\omega)$$

with $\varphi = c_{\text{lin}} \big|X\big|^\delta \, |\psi|_E \in L^\beta([0,T] \times \Omega)$, since $\big|X\big|^\delta \in L^\beta([0,T] \times \Omega)$ and $\psi \in L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega)$. Using Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \varphi(t) \, \mu_n(du, dt, d\omega) &\leq \left[\int_\Omega \int_0^T \int_M \varphi(t)^\beta \, \mu_n(du, dt, d\omega) \right]^{1/\beta} \cdot \big(\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_n \big(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \big) \right] \big)^{1-1/\beta} \\ &< \|\varphi\|_{L^\beta([0,T] \times \Omega)} \, \varepsilon^{1-1/\beta} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \eta(t,u) \, |\psi(t)|_E \; \mu_n(du, dt, d\omega) &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega; E)} \int_\Omega \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \eta(t,u) \, \mu_n(du, dt, d\omega) \\ &= \|\psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega; E)} \, \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \frac{\eta(t,u)^\beta}{\eta(t,u)^{\beta-1}} \, \lambda_n(du, dt) \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega; E)} \, \frac{1}{C_\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \eta(t,u)^\beta \, \lambda_n(du, dt) \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega; E)} \, \frac{R}{C_\varepsilon} \\ &< \|\psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega; E)} \, \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and this holds uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\eta(t, \cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous for all $t \in [0,T]$, by Lemma B.1 and Fatou's lemma we have

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_M \eta(t,u)^\beta \, \lambda(du, dt) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_M \eta(t,u)^\beta \, \lambda_n(du, dt) \leq R.$$

Therefore, the same estimates hold for λ, that is,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \big| g(t,u) \big| \, \lambda(du, dt) \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\beta([0,T] \times \Omega)} \, \varepsilon^{1-1/\beta} + \|\psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega; E)} \, \varepsilon$$

and since $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_M g(t,u) \, \lambda_n(du, dt) \to \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_M g(t,u) \, \lambda(du, dt)$$

as $n \to \infty$, and (21) follows. $\square$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let $\pi^n = (\Omega^n, \mathbb{F}^n, \mathbf{P}^n, W^n, q^n, X^n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a minimizing sequence of weak admissible relaxed controls, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{J}(\pi^n) = \inf_{\pi\in\bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0,T)} \bar{J}(\pi).$$

From this and Assumption III it follows that there exists $R > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}^n \int_0^T \int_M \eta_2(t,u)^p \, q_t^n(du)\, dt \le C_1 + C_2 \mathbb{E}^n \int_0^T \int_M h(t, X_n(t), u)\, q_t^n(du)\, dt \le R \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbb{E}^n$ denotes expectation with respect to $\mathbf{P}^n$. We will divide the proof in several steps.
Step 1. Define m by $\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r}$ and let $\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{1}{m}\right)$ be fixed. By Corollary 2.1 and (22) the processes X^n admit versions, which we also denote with X^n, with paths in $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}^n \left[|X^n - x_0|^m_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)} \right] < \infty.$$

Since $C^\alpha(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ is compactly embedded in $\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$, by Chebyshev's inequality it follows that the family of laws of $\{X^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$. Using Lemma 2.1, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the process X^n satisfies

$$\int_0^t X_s^n\, ds = \int_0^t x_0(s) ds + \int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\zeta_s^n + M_s^n\right) ds, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

where

$$\zeta_t^n = \int_0^t \bar{b}(s, X_s^n, q_s^n)\, ds \quad \text{and} \quad M_t^n = \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(s, X_s^n, q_s^n)\, dW_s^n.$$

A similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1 with K replaced by the identity matrix of size d ensures that $\{\zeta^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{M^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are also tight in $C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the random Young measure

$$\lambda_n(du, dt) = q_t^n(du)\, dt. \tag{23}$$

We also claim that the family of laws of $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$. Indeed, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ define the set

$$K_\varepsilon = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M) : \int_0^T \int_M \eta_2(t,u)^p\, \lambda(du,dt) \le \frac{R}{\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

By Theorems B.1 and B.2, K_ε is relatively compact in the stable topology of $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$, and by Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\mathbf{P}^n\left(\lambda_n \in \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M) \setminus \bar{K}_\varepsilon\right) \le \mathbf{P}^n\left(\lambda_n \in \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M) \setminus K_\varepsilon\right) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{R}\, \mathbb{E}^n \int_0^T \int_M \eta_2(t,u)^p\, \lambda_n(du,dt) \le \varepsilon$$

and the tightness of the laws of $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ follows. We use now Prohorov's theorem to ensure existence of a probability measure μ on $C\left([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d\right)^3 \times \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ and a subsequence of $\{X^n,\zeta^n,M^n,\lambda_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, which we denote using the same index $n\in\mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\text{law}\,(X^n,\zeta^n,M^n,\lambda_n)\to\mu,\quad n\to\infty. \tag{24}$$

Step 2. Dudley's generalization of the Skorohod representation theorem (see Theorem 4.30 in Kallenberg (2002)) ensures existence of a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}},\tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ and a sequence of random variables $\{\tilde{X}^n,\tilde{\zeta}^n,\tilde{M}^n,\tilde{\lambda}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with values in $\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)^3\times\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$, defined on $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}},\tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, such that

$$(\tilde{X}^n,\tilde{\zeta}^n,\tilde{M}^n,\tilde{\lambda}_n)\overset{d}{=}(X^n,\zeta^n,M^n,\lambda_n),\quad n\in\mathbb{N}, \tag{25}$$

and, on the same stochastic basis $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}},\tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, a random variable $\left(\tilde{X},\tilde{\zeta},\tilde{M},\tilde{\lambda}\right)$ with values in $\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)^3\times\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ such that

$$(\tilde{X}_n,\tilde{\zeta}_n,\tilde{M}_n)\to(\tilde{X},\tilde{\zeta},\tilde{M}),\quad \text{in}\ \ \mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)^3,\ \ \tilde{\mathbb{P}}-\text{a.s.} \tag{26}$$

and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n\to\tilde{\lambda},\quad \text{stably in}\ \ \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M),\ \ \tilde{\mathbb{P}}-\text{a.s.} \tag{27}$$

Step 3. For each $t\in[0,T]$ let φ_t denote the evaluation map $\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)\ni\zeta\mapsto\zeta(t)\in\mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\Gamma_t : C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)^2\times\mathcal{Y}^p(0,T;M)\to\mathbb{R}^d$ be defined as

$$\Gamma_t(x,\zeta,\lambda)=\Sigma_t(x,\lambda)-\varphi_t(\zeta),\ \ (x,\zeta)\in C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)^2,\ \ \lambda\in\mathcal{Y}^p(0,T;M)$$

with Σ_t as in (18) with $f=b$. Using Lemma 4.2 with $\eta=\eta_1$, it follows that Γ_t is measurable. Hence by (25) and the definition of ζ^n, for each $t\in[0,T]$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\tilde{\zeta}^n_t=\int_0^t\int_M b(s,\tilde{X}^n_s,u)\,\tilde{\lambda}^n(du,ds)$$

By Theorem 6.1 in Gripenberg et al. (1990), the map $Z\mapsto\int_0^t K(t-s)Z_s\,ds$ is continuous from $\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ to itself. In particular, it is measurable, so we also have

$$\int_0^t\tilde{X}^n_s\,ds=\int_0^t x_0(s)\,ds+\int_0^t K(t-s)\left[\tilde{\zeta}^n_s+\tilde{M}^n_s\right]ds. \tag{28}$$

Since M is a Suslin space, it also separable and Radon, see e.g. Ch. II in Schwartz (1973). In particular, Lemma 4.1 applies, so there exists a relaxed control process $(\tilde{q}^n_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ defined on $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}},\tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ such that

$$\tilde{\lambda}^n(du,dt)=\tilde{q}^n_t(du)\,dt,\quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}-\text{a.s.}$$

Now, M^n is a $\mathbb{F}^n$-martingale with quadratic variation

$$\langle M^n\rangle_t=\int_0^t(\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^\top)(s,X^n_s,q_s)\,ds,\quad t\in[0,T]$$

and $(X_n, q^n) \overset{d}{=} (\tilde{X}_n, \tilde{q}^n)$. Then, using once again Lemma 4.2, now with $f = \sigma\sigma^\top$ and $\eta = \eta_1^2$, it follows that $\tilde{M}^n$ is also a martingale with respect to the filtration

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n = \sigma\left\{(\tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{q}_s^n) : s \in [0,t]\right\}, \quad t \in [0,T]$$

and quadratic variation $\langle \tilde{M}^n \rangle_t = \int_0^t (\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^\top)(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{q}_s^n)\, ds$. Again, using continuity of the map $Z \mapsto \int_0^t K(t-s) Z_s\, ds$ from $\mathcal{C}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^d)$ to itself, we obtain

$$\int_0^t \tilde{X}_s\, ds = \int_0^t x_0(s)\, ds + \int_0^t K(t-s)\left[\tilde{\zeta}_s + \tilde{M}_s\right] ds.$$

We use Lemma 4.1 one last time to ensure the existence of a relaxed control process $(\tilde{q}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ defined on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ such that

$$\tilde{\lambda}(du, dt) = \tilde{q}_t(du)\, dt, \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - \text{a.s.} \tag{29}$$

The filtration $\tilde{\mathbb{F}} = \left\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\right\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma\{(\tilde{X}_s, \tilde{q}_s) : s \in [0,t]\}, \qquad t \in [0,T].$$

We now claim that $\tilde{M}$ is a $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$-martingale. Indeed, From (26) we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left|\tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_t\right|^2 \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - \text{a.s.} \tag{30}$$

By Theorem 2.1, Corollary 2.1 and (25), it follows that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left|\tilde{X}_t\right|^m\right] < \infty. \tag{31}$$

Also by Theorem 2.1, and Chebyshev's inequality, the random variables in (30) are uniformly integrable. Then, by Lemma 4.11 in Kallenberg (2002) we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left|\tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_t\right|^2\right] \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{32}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left|\tilde{M}_t^n - \tilde{M}_t\right|^2\right] \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{33}$$

This, in conjunction with the martingale property of $\tilde{M}^n$, implies that for all $0 < s < t \leq T$ and for all

$$\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b\left(\mathcal{C}(0,s;\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{Y}(0,s;M)\right)$$

we have that as $n \to \infty$

$$0 = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left(\tilde{M}_t^n - \tilde{M}_s^n\right)\phi(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{\lambda}^n)\right] \to \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left(\tilde{M}_t - \tilde{M}_s\right)\phi(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\lambda})\right],$$

which implies that $\tilde{M}$ is a $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}-$martingale.

Step 4. We now pass to the limit to identify the process $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ as a solution of the equation controlled by $(\tilde{q}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$. Using Lemma 4.3 with $E = \mathbb{R}^d$, $f = b$, $\beta = p > 1$, $\delta = 1$, and $\eta = \eta_1$ we obtain

$$\tilde{b}^n \rightharpoonup \tilde{b}, \quad \text{weakly in } \; L^1([0,T] \times \tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^d) \tag{34}$$

with $\tilde{b}_t = \bar{b}(t, \tilde{X}_t, \tilde{q}_t),\ t \in [0,T]$. We claim that the process $\tilde{M}$ satisfies

$$\int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds = \int_0^t x_0(s)ds + \int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\int_0^s \tilde{b}_\tau \, d\tau + \tilde{M}_s\right) ds. \tag{35}$$

By (32) and (33), for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an integer $\bar{m} = \bar{m}(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ for which

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left|\tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_t\right| + \left|\tilde{M}_t^n - \tilde{M}_t\right|\right] < \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq \bar{m}. \tag{36}$$

From (34) we have

$$\tilde{b} \in \overline{\{\tilde{b}^{\bar{m}}, \tilde{b}^{\bar{m}+1}, \ldots\}}^w \subset \overline{\text{co}\{\tilde{b}^{\bar{m}}, \tilde{b}^{\bar{m}+1}, \ldots\}}^w$$

where $\text{co}(\cdot)$ and $\overline{\cdot}^w$ denote the convex hull and weak-closure in $L^1([0,T] \times \tilde{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^d)$ respectively. By Mazur's, see for example Theorem 2.5.16 in Megginson (2012)

$$\overline{\text{co}\{\tilde{b}^{\bar{m}}, \tilde{b}^{\bar{m}+1}, \ldots\}}^w = \overline{\text{co}\{\tilde{b}^{\bar{m}}, \tilde{b}^{\bar{m}+1}, \ldots\}}.$$

Therefore, there exist an integer $\bar{N} \geq 1$ and $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\bar{N}}\}$ with $\alpha_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha_i = 1$, such that

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha_i \tilde{b}^{\bar{m}+i} - \tilde{b}\right\|_{L^1([0,T]\times\tilde{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^d)} < \varepsilon. \tag{37}$$

Let $t \in [0,T]$ be fixed. Using the α_i's and (28) we can write

$$\int_0^t x_0(s)ds = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha_i \left\{\int_0^t \tilde{X}_s^{\bar{m}+i} ds - \int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v^{\bar{m}+i} \, dv + \tilde{M}_s^{\bar{m}+i}\right) ds\right\}.$$

Thus, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I &= \Big|\int_0^t x_0(s)ds + \int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v\, dv + \tilde{M}_s\right) ds - \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds\Big| \\
&= \Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha_i \left\{\int_0^t \tilde{X}_s^{\bar{m}+i} ds - \int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v^{\bar{m}+i}\, dv + \tilde{M}_s^{\bar{m}+i}\right) ds\right\} \\
&+ \int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v\, dv + \tilde{M}_s\right) ds - \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds\Big| \\
&\leq \Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s^{\bar{m}+i} ds - \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds\Big| + \Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \int_0^t K(t-s)\tilde{M}_s^{\bar{m}+i} ds - \int_0^t K(t-s)\tilde{M} ds\Big| \\
&+ \Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \int_0^t K(t-s)\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v^{\bar{m}+i}\, dv\, ds - \int_0^t K(t-s)\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v\, dv\, ds\Big| = II + III + IV.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, by (36), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(II) &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s^{\bar{m}+i} ds - \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds\Big|\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\int_0^t (\tilde{X}_s^{\bar{m}+i} - \tilde{X}_s) ds\Big|\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\int_0^t \sup_{s\in[0,T]} \big|\tilde{X}_s^{\bar{m}+i} - \tilde{X}_s\big|\, ds\right] \leq \varepsilon T.
\end{aligned}
$$

By Fubini's theorem and (36), it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(III) &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \int_0^t K(t-s)\tilde{M}_s^{\bar{m}+i}\, ds - \int_0^t K(t-s)\tilde{M}_s\, ds\Big|\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\tilde{M}_s^{\bar{m}+i} - \tilde{M}_s\right) ds\Big|\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}} \alpha^i \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\int_0^t K(t-s)\left(\tilde{M}_s^{\bar{m}+i} - \tilde{M}_s\right) ds\Big|\right] \leq \varepsilon \left\|K\right\|_{L^1(0,T)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using twice Jensen's inequality and (37),

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(IV) &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\int_0^t K(t-s)\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v^{\bar{m}+i}\,dv\,ds - \int_0^t K(t-s)\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v\,dv\,ds\Big|\right]\\ &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\Big|\int_0^t K(t-s)\int_0^s\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\tilde{b}_v^{\bar{m}+i}-\tilde{b}_v\Big)\,dv\,ds\Big|\right]\\ &\le \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[t\int_0^t |K(t-s)|\int_0^s\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\tilde{b}_v^{\bar{m}+i}-\tilde{b}_v\Big|\,dv\,ds\right] \le \varepsilon T\,\|K\|_{L^1(0,T)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Then, $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(I)\le[T+\|K\|_{L^1(0,T)}(T+1)]\varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary, (35) follows.

Step 5. Set $\tilde{\sigma}_t=\bar{\sigma}(t,\tilde{X}_t,\tilde{q}_t)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_t^n=\bar{\sigma}(t,\tilde{X}_t^n,\tilde{q}_t^n)$, $t\in[0,T]$. Using Lemma 4.3 with $E=\mathbb{S}^d$, $f=\sigma\sigma^\top$, $\delta=2$, $\eta=\eta_1^2$ and $\beta=p/2>1$, we obtain

$$\tilde{\sigma}^n\tilde{\sigma}^{n,\top}\rightharpoonup\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}^\top,\qquad \text{weakly in}\ \ L^1([0,T]\times\tilde{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^d).$$

Let $t\in[0,T]$ be fixed. By (33) and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality we have $\langle\tilde{M}^n\rangle_t\to\langle\tilde{M}\rangle_t$ in $L^2(\tilde{\Omega})$. Then, for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists an integer $\bar{m}=\bar{m}(\varepsilon)\ge1$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\big|\langle\tilde{M}^n\rangle_t-\langle\tilde{M}\rangle_t\big|\Big]<\varepsilon,\quad\forall n\ge\bar{m}.$$

As in the proof of Step 5, there also exists an integer $\bar{N}\ge1$ and $\{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{\bar{N}}\}$ with $\alpha_i\ge0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha_i=1$, such that

$$\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha_i\tilde{\sigma}^{\bar{m}+i}\tilde{\sigma}^{(\bar{m}+i),\top}-\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}^\top\Big\|_{L^1([0,T]\times\tilde{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^m)}<\varepsilon.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\langle\tilde{M}\rangle_t-\int_0^t\tilde{\sigma}_s\tilde{\sigma}_s^\top\,ds\Big|\\ &=\Big|\langle\tilde{M}\rangle_t-\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\langle\tilde{M}^{\bar{m}+i}\rangle_t+\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\int_0^t\tilde{\sigma}_s^{\bar{m}+i}\tilde{\sigma}_s^{(\bar{m}+i),\top}\,ds-\int_0^t\tilde{\sigma}_s\tilde{\sigma}_s^\top\,ds\Big|\\ &\le\Big|\langle\tilde{M}\rangle_t-\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\langle\tilde{M}^{\bar{m}+i}\rangle_t\Big|+\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{N}}\alpha^i\int_0^t\tilde{\sigma}_s^{\bar{m}+i}\tilde{\sigma}_s^{(\bar{m}+i),\top}\,ds-\int_0^t\tilde{\sigma}_s\tilde{\sigma}_s^\top\,ds\Big|.\end{aligned}$$

As in Step 4, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\Big|\langle\tilde{M}\rangle_t-\int_0^t\tilde{\sigma}_s\tilde{\sigma}_s^\top\,ds\Big|\Big]<(1+T)\varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \in [0,T]$ are arbitrary, it follows $\langle \tilde{M} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}_s \tilde{\sigma}_s^\top \, ds$ $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. for all $t \in [0,T]$. By the martingale representation theorem (see e.g. Theorem 4.2 in Chapter 3.4 Karatzas and Shreve (1991)) there exist an extension of the probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, which we also denote $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, and a d'-dimensional Brownian motion $(\tilde{W}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, such that

$$\tilde{M}_t = \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(s, \tilde{X}_s, \tilde{q}_s) \, d\tilde{W}_s, \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - \text{a.s.}, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

By (35), it follows that

$$\int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds = \int_0^t x_0(s) ds + \int_0^t K(t-s) \left(\int_0^s \tilde{b}_v \, dv + \tilde{M}_s \right) ds, \ \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - \text{a.s.}$$

for each $t \in [0,T]$. By Lemma 2.1 this is equivalent to $\tilde{X}$ being solution to stochastic Volterra equation controlled by $\tilde{q}$. In other words, $\tilde{\pi} = \left(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{q} \right)$ is a weak admissible relaxed control. By the Fiber Product Lemma B.2 we have

$$\underline{\delta}_{\tilde{X}^n} \otimes \lambda_n \to \underline{\delta}_{\tilde{X}} \otimes \lambda, \quad \text{stably in} \ \ \mathcal{Y}(0,T; \mathbb{R} \times M), \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\mathbb{R} \times M$ is also a metrisable Suslin space, using Lemma B.1 and Fatou's Lemma we get

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}} \int_0^T \int_M h(t, \tilde{X}_t, u) \, \tilde{\lambda}(du, dt) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \int_0^T \int_M h(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, u) \, \tilde{\lambda}_n(du, dt)$$

and since $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{\lambda}^n) \stackrel{d}{=} (X^n, \lambda^n)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{J}(\tilde{\pi}) &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \int_0^T \int_M h(t, \tilde{X}_t, u) \, \tilde{\lambda}(du, dt) + \tilde{\mathbb{E}} g(\tilde{X}_T) \\
&\leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^n \int_0^T \int_M h(t, X_t^n, u) \, \lambda_n(du, dt) + \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^n g(X_T^n) \\
&\leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \left[\mathbb{E}^n \int_0^T \int_M h(t, X_t^n, u) \, \lambda_n(du, dt) + \mathbb{E}^n g(X_T^n) \right] = \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)} \bar{J}(\pi),
\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\tilde{\pi}$ is a weak optimal relaxed control for **(RCP)**, and this concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Let $\pi = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbb{F}, X, W, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}(x_0, T)$. Define $\kappa : [0,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\kappa(t, \omega) := (\bar{\sigma} \bar{\sigma}^\top, \bar{b}, \bar{h})(t, X_t(\omega), q_t(\omega)).$$

By Assumption IV, we have that $\kappa(t,\omega) \in \Gamma(t, X_t(\omega))$, as defined in (14), for all $(t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$. We also define

$$c^1(t,\omega) := (\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^\top, \bar{b})(t, X_t(\omega), q_t(\omega)), \quad c^2(t,\omega) := \bar{h}(t, X_t(\omega), q_t(\omega)).$$

By Lemma 4.1, c^1 and c^2 are measurable with respect to the predictable σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}$ on $Y = [0,T] \times \Omega$. Using Theorem A.1 we conclude the existence of a function $u : [0,T] \times \Omega \to M$ measurable with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ such that

$$c^1(t,\omega) = (\sigma\sigma^\top, b)(t, X_t(\omega), u_t(\omega)), \quad c^2(t,\omega) \geq h(t, X_t(\omega), u_t(\omega)), \quad (t,\omega) \in Y \tag{38}$$

and the desired result follows.

A Auxiliary results

Let $(Y, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$ be a measure space, k, m be natural numbers, and M a closed subset of a Euclidean space. Let

$$c^1 : Y \to \mathbb{R}^k, \quad c^2 : Y \to \mathbb{R}^m, \quad \phi : Y \times M \to \mathbb{R}^k, \quad \psi : Y \times M \to \mathbb{R}^m_+,$$

be given measurable functions with $u \to \phi(y,u)$ continuous and $u \to \psi_i(y,u)$ lower semi-continuous, for each $y \in Y$ and $i = 1, 2, ...m$. Define

$$\Gamma(y, M) = \left\{ (\phi(y,u), z) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^m : u \in M, z_i \geq \psi_i(y,u) \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m \right\}.$$

Theorem A.1. *If $(c^1(y), c^2(y)) \in \Gamma(y, M)$ for all $y \in Y$, then there exists a measurable function $u : Y \to M$ such that $c^1(y) = \phi(y, u(y))$ and $c^2_i(y) \geq \psi_i(y, u(y))$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$.*

Proof. See Theorem A.9 of Haussmann and Lepeltier (1990). □

B Relative compactness and limit theorems for Young measures

Young measures on metrisable Suslin control sets have been studied by Balder (2001) and de Fitte (2003). We refer to the book by Castaing et al. (2004) for more details.

Proposition B.1. *Let M be metrisable (resp. metrisable Suslin). Then the space $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ endowed with the stable topology is also metrisable (resp. metrisable Suslin).*

Proof. For the metrisability part, see Proposition 2.3.1 in Castaing et al. (2004). For the Suslin part, see Proposition 2.3.3 in Castaing et al. (2004). □

The notion of tightness for Young measures that we use was introduced by Valadier (1990). See also the book by Crauel (2002). Recall that a set-valued function $[0,T] \ni t \mapsto K_t \subset M$ is said to be *measurable* if and only if for every open set $U \subset M$,

$$\{t \in [0,T] : K_t \cap U \neq \varnothing\} \in \mathcal{B}([0,T]).$$

Definition B.1. *We say that a set $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ is* flexibly tight *if, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a measurable set-valued mapping $[0,T] \ni t \mapsto K_t \subset M$ such that K_t is compact for all $t \in [0,T]$ and*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{J}} \int_0^T \int_M \mathbf{1}_{K_t^c}(u)\, \lambda(du, dt) < \varepsilon.$$

Theorem B.1 (**Equivalence theorem for flexible tightness**)**.** *For any $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ the two following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *$\mathfrak{J}$ is flexibly tight*
2. *There exists $\eta \in IC([0,T],M)$ such that*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{J}} \int_0^T \int_M \eta(t,u)\, \lambda(du, dt) < +\infty.$$

Proof. See e.g. (Balder, 1998, Definition 3.3). □

Theorem B.2 (**Prohorov criterion for relative compactness**)**.** *Let M be a metrisable Suslin space. Then every flexibly tight subset of $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ is sequentially relatively compact in the stable topology.*

Proof. See (Castaing et al., 2004, Theorem 4.3.5). □

Lemma B.1. *Let M be a metrisable Suslin space and $g \in L^1(0,T;\mathbb{R})$. Let us assume that*

$$h : [0,T] \times M \to [-\infty, +\infty]$$

is a measurable function such that $h(t,\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous for every $t \in [0,T]$ and satisfies one of the two following conditions:

1. *$|h(t,u)| \leq g(t)$, a.e. $t \in [0,T]$,*
2. *$h \geq 0$.*

If $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ stably in $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$, then

$$\int_0^T \int_M h(t,u)\, \lambda(du, dt) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \int_0^T \int_M h(t,u)\, \lambda_n(du, dt).$$

Proof. If (1) holds, the result follows from Theorem 2.1.3–Part G in Castaing et al. (2004). If (2) holds, the result follows from Proposition 2.1.12–Part (d) in Castaing et al. (2004). □

It is worth mentioning that these last two results are, in fact, the main reasons why it suffices for the control set M to be only metrisable and Suslin, in contrast with the existing literature on stochastic relaxed controls. Indeed, Theorem B.2 is key to obtain tightness of the laws of random Young measures in the proof of the main existence result, and Lemma B.1 is used to prove the lower semi-continuity of the relaxed cost functionals as well as Theorem B.3 below.

Theorem B.3. *Let M be a metrisable Suslin space. If $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ stably in $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$, then for every $f \in L^1(0,T;\mathcal{C}_b(M))$ we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T \int_M f(t,u)\,\lambda_n(du,dt) = \int_0^T \int_M f(t,u)\,\lambda(dt,du).$$

Proof. Use Lemma B.1 with f and $-f$. □

We will need the following version of the so-called Fiber Product Lemma. For a measurable map $y : [0,T] \to M$, we denote by $\underline{\delta}_{y(\cdot)}(\cdot)$ the *degenerate Young measure* defined as $\underline{\delta}_{y(\cdot)}(du,dt) = \delta_{y(t)}(du)\,dt$.

Lemma B.2 (Fiber Product Lemma). *Let $\mathcal{S}$ and M be separable metric spaces and let $y_n : [0,T] \to \mathcal{S}$ be a sequence of measurable mappings which converge pointwise to a mapping $y : [0,T] \to \mathcal{S}$. Let $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ stably in $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;M)$ and consider the following sequence of Young measures on $\mathcal{S} \times M$:*

$$(\underline{\delta}_{y_n} \otimes \lambda_n)(dx,du,dt) = \delta_{y_n(t)}(dx)\,\lambda_n(du,dt), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$(\underline{\delta}_{y} \otimes \lambda)(dx,du,dt) = \delta_{y(t)}(dx)\,\lambda(du,dt).$$

Then $\underline{\delta}_{y_n} \otimes \lambda_n \to \underline{\delta}_{y} \otimes \lambda$ stably in $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;S \times M)$.

Proof. Proposition 1 in Valadier (1993) implies that $\underline{\delta}_{y_n} \to \underline{\delta}_{y}$ stably in $\mathcal{Y}(0,T;\mathcal{S})$, and the result follows from Corollary 2.2.2 and Theorem 2.3.1 in Castaing and de Fitte (2004). □

References

Abi Jaber, E., Cuchiero, C., Larsson, M., and Pulido, S. (2021a). A weak solution theory for stochastic Volterra equations of convolution type. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(6):2924–2952.

Abi Jaber, E., Larsson, M., Pulido, S., et al. (2019). Affine Volterra processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 29(5):3155–3200.

Abi Jaber, E., Miller, E., and Pham, H. (2021b). Linear-quadratic control for a class of stochastic Volterra equations: solvability and approximation. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(5):2244–2274.

Agram, N. and Øksendal, B. (2015). Malliavin calculus and optimal control of stochastic Volterra equations. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 167(3):1070–1094.

Alòs, E., León, J. A., and Vives, J. (2007). On the short-time behavior of the implied volatility for jump-diffusion models with stochastic volatility. *Finance and Stochastics*, 11(4):571–589.

Andersson, D. (2009). The relaxed general maximum principle for singular optimal control of diffusions. *Systems & Control Letters*, 58(1):76–82.

Bahlali, K., Mezerdi, M., and Mezerdi, B. (2017). Existence and optimality conditions for relaxed mean-field stochastic control problems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 102:1–8.

Balder, E. J. (1998). Lectures on Young measure theory and its applications in economics.

Balder, E. J. (2001). On ws-convergence of product measures. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 26(3):494–518.

Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Benth, F. E., and Veraart, A. E. (2011). Ambit processes and stochastic partial differential equations. In *Advanced mathematical methods for finance*, pages 35–74. Springer.

Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Benth, F. E., Veraart, A. E., et al. (2013). Modelling energy spot prices by volatility modulated Lévy-driven Volterra processes. *Bernoulli*, 19(3):803–845.

Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. and Schmiegel, J. (2008). Time change, volatility, and turbulence. In *Mathematical control theory and finance*, pages 29–53. Springer.

Barrasso, A. and Touzi, N. (2020). Controlled diffusion mean field games with common noise, and McKean-Vlasov second order backward SDEs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.07542*.

Bauerle, N. and Lange, D. (2018). Optimal control of partially observable piecewise deterministic Markov processes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 56(2):1441–1462.

Bäuerle, N. and Rieder, U. (2009). MDP algorithms for portfolio optimization problems in pure jump markets. *Finance and Stochastics*, 13(4):591–611.

Bayer, C., Friz, P., and Gatheral, J. (2016). Pricing under rough volatility. *Quantitative Finance*, 16(6):887–904.

Benazzoli, C., Campi, L., and Di Persio, L. (2020). Mean field games with controlled jump–diffusion dynamics: Existence results and an illiquid interbank market model. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130(11):6927–6964.

Bouveret, G., Dumitrescu, R., and Tankov, P. (2020). Mean-field games of optimal stopping: a relaxed solution approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 58(4):1795–1821.

Castaing, C. and de Fitte, P. R. (2004). On the fiber product of Young measures with application to a control problem with measures. In *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, pages 1–38. Springer.

Castaing, C., De Fitte, P. R., and Valadier, M. (2004). *Young measures on topological spaces: with applications in control theory and probability theory*, volume 571. Springer Science & Business Media.

Cecchin, A. and Fischer, M. (2020). Probabilistic approach to finite state mean field games. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 81(2):253–300.

Costa, O. L. V. and Dufour, F. (2010a). Average continuous control of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48(7):4262–4291.

Costa, O. L. V. and Dufour, F. (2010b). The policy iteration algorithm for average continuous control of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 62(2):185–204.

Crauel, H. (2002). *Random probability measures on Polish spaces*, volume 11. CRC press.

de Fitte, P. R. (2003). Compactness criteria for the stable topology. *Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci., Math*, 51(4):343–363.

do Valle Costa, O. L. and Dufour, F. (2013). *Continuous average control of piecewise deterministic Markov processes*. Springer.

Dufour, F. and Stockbridge, R. H. (2012). On the existence of strict optimal controls for constrained, controlled Markov processes in continuous time. *Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 84(1):55–78.

Duncan, T. E. and Pasik-Duncan, B. (2013). Linear-quadratic fractional gaussian control. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(6):4504–4519.

El Karoui, N., Du Huu, N., and Jeanblanc-Picqué, M. (1987). Compactification methods in the control of degenerate diffusions: existence of an optimal control. *Stochastics*, 20(3):169–219.

Filippov, A. (1962). On certain questions in the theory of optimal control. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Series A: Control*, 1(1):76–84.

Fleming, W. H. and Nisio, M. (1984). On stochastic relaxed control for partially observed diffusions. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, 93:71–108.

Fu, G. and Horst, U. (2017). Mean field games with singular controls. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(6):3833–3868.

Gatheral, J., Jaisson, T., and Rosenbaum, M. (2018). Volatility is rough. *Quantitative Finance*, 18(6):933–949.

Gripenberg, G., Londen, S.-O., and Staffans, O. (1990). *Volterra integral and functional equations*, volume 34. Cambridge University Press.

Han, B. and Wong, H. Y. (2019). Time-consistent feedback strategies with Volterra processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11378*.

Haussmann, U. and Lepeltier, J. (1990). On the existence of optimal controls. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 28(4):851–902.

Haussmann, U. G. and Suo, W. (1995). Singular optimal stochastic controls i: Existence. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 33(3):916–936.

Kallenberg, O. (2002). *Foundations of modern probability*. Springer-Verlag, 2 edition.

Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. (1991). Brownian motion and stochastic calculus. *Graduate texts in mathematics*.

Kleptsyna, M., Breton, A. L., and Viot, M. (2003). About the linear-quadratic regulator problem under a fractional brownian perturbation. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 7:161–170.

Kurtz, T., Stockbridge, R., et al. (2001). Stationary solutions and forward equations for controlled and singular martingale problems. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 6.

Kurtz, T. G. and Stockbridge, R. H. (1998). Existence of Markov controls and characterization of optimal Markov controls. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 36(2):609–653.

Kushner, H. (2012). *Weak convergence methods and singularly perturbed stochastic control and filtering problems*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Lacker, D. (2015). Mean field games via controlled martingale problems: existence of markovian equilibria. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125(7):2856–2894.

Megginson, R. E. (2012). *An introduction to Banach space theory*, volume 183. Springer Science & Business Media.

Mezerdi, B. and Bahlali, S. (2002). Necessary conditions for optimality in relaxed stochastic control problems. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 73(3-4):201–218.

Protter, P. E. (2005). Stochastic differential equations. In *Stochastic integration and differential equations*, pages 249–361. Springer.

Schwartz, L. (1973). Radon measures on arbitrary topological spaces and cylindrical measures.

Valadier, M. (1990). Young measures, methods of nonconvex analysis, 152-188. *Lecture Notes in Math, Springer, Berlin.*

Valadier, M. (1993). A course on Young measures. In *Rendiconti dellistituto di matematica dellUniversita di Trieste, 26, suppl.: 349–394 (1994). Workshop di Teoria della Misura et Analisi Reale Grado.*

Wang, H., Zariphopoulou, T., and Zhou, X. Y. (2020). Reinforcement learning in continuous time and space: A stochastic control approach. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(198):1–34.

Wang, H. and Zhou, X. Y. (2020). Continuous-time mean–variance portfolio selection: A reinforcement learning framework. *Mathematical Finance*, 30(4):1273–1308.

Wang, T. (2018). Linear quadratic control problems of stochastic Volterra integral equations. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 24(4):1849–1879.

Yong, J. (2006). Backward stochastic Volterra integral equations and some related problems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 116(5):779–795.