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Abstract

Backward stochastic partial differential equations of parabolic type in bounded domains are studied in the setting where the coercivity condition is not necessary satisfied and the equation can be degenerate. Some generalized solutions based on the representation theorem are suggested. In addition to problems with a standard Cauchy condition at the terminal time, problems with special non-local boundary conditions are considered. These non-local conditions connect the terminal value of the solution with a functional over the entire past solution. Uniqueness, solvability and regularity results are obtained. Some applications to portfolio selection problem are considered.
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1 Introduction

Partial differential equations and stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) have fundamental significance for natural sciences, and various boundary value problems for them were widely studied. Usually, well-posedness of a boundary value depends on the choice of the boundary value conditions.

Boundary value problems for SPDEs are well studied in the existing literature for the case of forward and backward parabolic Ito equations with the Cauchy condition at initial time or terminal time respectively (see, e.g., Alós et al (1999), Bally et al (1994), Da Prato and Tubaro (1996), Gyöngy (1998), Krylov (1999), Maslowski (1995), Pardoux (1993), Rozovskii (1990),
Walsh (1986), Zhou (1992), and Dokuchaev (1992), (2005), (2011), (2012) and the bibliography there). Many results have been also obtained for the pairs of forward and backward equations with separate Cauchy conditions at initial time and the terminal time respectively; see, e.g., Yong and Zhou (1999).

Usually, SPDEs of parabolic types are considered under some assumptions of coercivity such as Condition 2.2 below with $\delta_1 > 0$. Without this condition, an equation is regarded as degenerate. Regularity is a difficult issue for degenerate equations. For the degenerate backward SPDEs in the whole space, i.e., without boundaries, regularity results were obtained in Rozovskii (1990), Ma and Yong (1996, 1997), Hu et al (2002). The methods applied in these works cannot be applied the case of a domain with boundary since because of regularity issues that prevent using of approximation of the differential operator by a non-degenerate one. It turns out that the theory of degenerate SPDEs in domains is much harder than in the whole space and was not studied yet in the existing literature. We address this problem here. We consider parabolic type homogeneous backward SPDEs that can be degenerate; the coercivity condition is not necessary satisfied. We suggest a generalized solutions based on the representation theorem and some regularity results (Theorem 3.1).

In addition to boundary problems with standard Cauchy conditions at the terminal time, there are some results for SPDEs with boundary conditions connecting the solution at different times, for instance, at initial time and at terminal time. This category includes stationary type solutions for forward SPDEs (see, e.g., Caraballo et al (2004), Chojnowska-Michalik (1998), Chojnowska-Michalik and Goldys (1995), Duan et al (2003), Mattingly (1999) Mohammed et al (2008), Sinai (1996), and the references here). Periodic solutions of SPDEs were also studied (Chojnowska-Michalik (1990), Feng and Zhao (2012), Klienger (2001)). As was mentioned in Feng and Zhao (2012), it is difficult to expect that, in general, a SPDE has a periodic in time solution $u(\cdot, t)|_{t\in[0,T]}$ in a usual sense of exact equality $u(\cdot, t) = u(\cdot, T)$ that holds almost surely given that $u(\cdot, t)$ is adapted to some Brownian motion. The periodicness of the solutions of stochastic equations was usually considered in the sense of the distributions. In Feng and Zhao (2012), the periodicness was established in a stronger sense as a ”random periodic solution (see Definition 1.1 from Feng and Zhao (2012)).

The present paper addresses these and related problems with non-local boundary conditions again. We consider linear Dirichlet condition at the boundary of the state domain. In addition, we consider the case where the standard boundary value Cauchy condition at the one fixed time is replaces by a condition that mixes in one equation the terminal value of the solution and a functional of the entire solution. This setting covers conditions such as $\theta^{-1}\int_0^\theta u(\cdot, t)dt = u(\cdot, T)$ a.s.,
as well as more general conditions. We present sufficient conditions for existence and regularity of the solutions for the problems with non-local boundary conditions and with degenerate equations (Theorem 4.1). These results open a way to extend applications of degenerate backward SPDEs on the problems with non-local boundary conditions. As an example of applications, a solution of portfolio selection problem is obtained for diffusion market model (Theorem 5.1).

2 The problem setting and definitions

We are given a standard complete probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)\) and a right-continuous filtration \(\mathcal{F}_t\) of complete \(\sigma\)-algebras of events, \(t \geq 0\). We assume that \(\mathcal{F}_0\) is the \(P\)-augmentation of the set \(\{\emptyset, \Omega\}\). We are given also a \(N\)-dimensional Wiener process \(w(t)\) with independent components; it is a Wiener process with respect to \(\mathcal{F}_t\).

Assume that we are given a bounded open domain \(D \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) with \(C^2\)-smooth boundary \(\partial D\). Let \(T > 0\) be given, and let \(Q \triangleq D \times [0,T]\).

We will study the following boundary value problem in \(Q\)

\[
d_t u + (Au + \varphi) dt + \sum_{i=1}^{N} B_i \chi_i dt = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \chi_i(t) dw_i(t), \quad t \geq 0, \tag{2.1}
\]

\[
u(x,t,\omega) = 0 \quad \text{on } x \in \partial D \tag{2.2}
\]

\[
u(\cdot, T) - \Gamma u(\cdot) = \xi. \tag{2.3}
\]

Here \(u = u(x,t,\omega)\), \(\chi_i = \chi_i(x,t,\omega)\), \(\varphi = \varphi(x,t,\omega)\), \(\xi = \xi(x,\omega)\), \((x,t) \in Q\), \(\omega \in \Omega\).

In (2.3), \(\Gamma\) is a linear operator that maps functions defined on \(Q \times \Omega\) to functions defined on \(D \times \Omega\). For instance, the case where \(\Gamma u = u(\cdot, 0)\) is not excluded; this case corresponds to the periodic type boundary condition

\[
u(\cdot, T) - \nu(\cdot, 0) = \xi. \tag{2.4}
\]

In (2.1),

\[
Av = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} b_{ij}(x,t,\omega) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x,t,\omega) \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}(x) + \lambda(x,t,\omega)v(x), \tag{2.5}
\]

where \(b_{ij}, f_i, x_i\) are the components of \(b, f, \text{ and } x\) respectively, and

\[
B_i v \triangleq \frac{dv}{dx}(x) \beta_i(x,t,\omega), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{2.6}
\]

We assume that the functions \(b(x,t,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \beta_j(x,t,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n, f(x,t,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}, \lambda(x,t,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}, \varphi(x,t,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } \chi_i(x,t,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}\), are progressively measurable with respect to \(\mathcal{F}_t\) for all \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\), and the function \(\xi(x,\omega) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}\) is \(\mathcal{F}_0\)-measurable for all \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\).
Spaces and classes of functions

We denote by $\| \cdot \|_X$ the norm in a linear normed space $X$, and $(\cdot, \cdot)_X$ denote the scalar product in a Hilbert space $X$.

We introduce some spaces of real valued functions.

Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open domain, then $W^m_q(G)$ denote the Sobolev space of functions that belong to $L_q(G)$ together with the distributional derivatives up to the $m$th order, $q \geq 1$.

We denote by $| \cdot |$ the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^k$, and $\bar{G}$ denote the closure of a region $G \subset \mathbb{R}^k$.

Let $H^0 \triangleq L_2(D)$, and let $H^1 \triangleq W^1_2(D)$ be the closure in the $W^1_2(D)$-norm of the set of all smooth functions $u : D \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u|_{\partial D} \equiv 0$. Let $H^2 = W^2_2(D) \cap H^1$ be the space equipped with the norm of $W^2_2(D)$. The spaces $H^k$ and $W^k_2(D)$ are called Sobolev spaces, they are Hilbert spaces, and $H^k$ is a closed subspace of $W^k_2(D)$, $k = 1, 2$.

Let $H^{-1}$ be the dual space to $H^1$, with the norm $\| \cdot \|_{H^{-1}}$ such that if $u \in H^0$ then $\|u\|_{H^{-1}}$ is the supremum of $(u, v)_{H^0}$ over all $v \in H^1$ such that $\|v\|_{H^1} \leq 1$. $H^{-1}$ is a Hilbert space.

We shall write $(u, v)_{H^0}$ for $u \in H^{-1}$ and $v \in H^1$, meaning the obvious extension of the bilinear form from $u \in H^0$ and $v \in H^1$.

We denote by $\tilde{\ell}_k$ the Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}^k$, and we denote by $\mathcal{B}_k$ the $\sigma$-algebra of Lebesgue sets in $\mathbb{R}^k$.

We denote by $\bar{P}$ the completion (with respect to the measure $\tilde{\ell}_1 \times P$) of the $\sigma$-algebra of subsets of $[0, T] \times \Omega$, generated by functions that are progressively measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_t$.

We introduce the spaces

$$X^k(s, t) \triangleq L^2([s, t] \times \Omega, \bar{P}, \tilde{\ell}_1 \times P; H^k),$$

$$Z^k_t \triangleq L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; H^k),$$

$$C^k(s, t) \triangleq C \left([s, t]; Z^k_T \right), \quad k = -1, 0, 1, 2,$$

$$X^k_c = L^2([0, T] \times \Omega, \bar{P}, \tilde{\ell}_1 \times P; C^k(D)), \quad Z^k_c \triangleq L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P; C^k(D)), \quad k \geq 0.$$ 

The spaces $X^k(s, t)$ and $Z^k_t$ are Hilbert spaces.

We introduce the spaces

$$Y^k(s, t) \triangleq X^k(s, t) \cap C^{k-1}(s, t), \quad k = 1, 2,$$

with the norm $\| u \|_{Y^k(s, t)} \triangleq \| u \|_{X^k(s, t)} + \| u \|_{C^{k-1}(s, t)}$. For brevity, we shall use the notations $X^k \triangleq X^k(0, T)$, $C^k \triangleq C^k(0, T)$, and $Y^k \triangleq Y^k(0, T)$. 
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Let \( \tilde{V} = L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, C(\tilde{D})) \), and let \( V \) be the set of all \( v \in \tilde{V} \) such that \( v(x)|_{x \in \partial D} = 0 \) a.s equipped with the norm of \( V \).

For a set \( S \) and a Banach space \( X \), we denote by \( B(S; X) \) the Banach space of bounded functions \( x : S \to X \) equipped with the norm \( \| x \|_B = \sup_{s \in S} \| x(s) \|_X \).

Let \( U = B([0,T]; V) \cap X^0 \cap C^0 \). Note that \( U \) is a Banach space equipped with the norm \( B([0,T]; V) \). We also introduce the space \( U_{PC} \) equipped with the norm \( \| u \| \) such that \( u \in U_{PC} \) if and only if either \( u \in U \) or there exists \( \theta = \theta(u) \in [0,T] \) such that \( u(x,t,\omega) = \bar{u}(x,t,\omega)I_{\{t \leq \theta\}} \), where \( u \in U \).

Sometimes we shall omit \( \omega \).

**Conditions on the domain and the coefficients**

To proceed further, we assume that Conditions 2.1-2.3 remain in force throughout this paper.

**Condition 2.1** The matrix \( b = b^\top \) is symmetric, bounded, and such that there exists a constant \( \delta_0 > 0 \) such that
\[
y^\top b(x,t,\omega) y \geq \delta_0 |y|^2 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ (x,t) \in D \times [0,T], \ \omega \in \Omega.
\]

**Condition 2.2** There exists a constant \( \delta_1 \geq 0 \) such that
\[
y^\top b(x,t,\omega) y - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |y^\top \beta_i(x,t,\omega)|^2 \geq \delta_1 |y|^2 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ (x,t) \in D \times [0,T], \ \omega \in \Omega.
\]

Condition 2.2 with \( \delta_1 > 0 \) is usually called the coercivity condition. If Condition 2.2 is satisfied for \( \delta_1 = 0 \) only, \( (2.1) \) is usually referred as a degenerate equation. This important case is not excluded.

**Condition 2.3** The functions \( f(x,t,\omega), \lambda(x,t,\omega), \) and \( \beta_i(x,t,\omega) \) are bounded. These functions are differentiable in \( x \) for a.e. \( t, \omega, \) and the corresponding derivatives are bounded. In addition, \( b \in \mathcal{X}_c^3, \ \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{X}_c^2, \ \lambda \in \mathcal{X}_c^1, \ \beta_i \in \mathcal{X}_c^3, \) and \( \beta_i(x,t,\omega) = 0 \) for \( x \in \partial D, \ i = 1,\ldots,N. \)

**The definition of solution**

**Solution from \( Y^1 \)**

**Proposition 2.1** Let \( \zeta \in X^0 \), let a sequence \( \{\zeta_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty} \subset L_\infty([0,T] \times \Omega, \ell_1 \times \mathcal{P}; C(D)) \) be such that all \( \zeta_k(\cdot,t,\omega) \) are progressively measurable with respect to \( \mathcal{F}_t \), and let \( \| \zeta - \zeta_k \|_{X^0} \to 0 \). Let \( t \in [0,T] \) and \( j \in \{1,\ldots,N\} \) be given. Then the sequence of the integrals \( \int_0^t \zeta_k(x,s,\omega)dw_j(s) \) converges in \( Z^0_t \) as \( k \to \infty \), and its limit depends on \( \zeta \), but does not depend on \( \{\zeta_k\} \).
Proof follows from completeness of $X^0$ and from the equality

$$
E \int_0^t \|\zeta_k(\cdot, s, \omega) - \zeta_m(\cdot, s, \omega)\|_{H_0}^2 ds = \int_D dx E \left( \int_0^t (\zeta_k(x, s, \omega) - \zeta_m(x, s, \omega)) dw_j(s) \right)^2.
$$

**Definition 2.1** Let $\zeta \in X^0$, $t \in [0, T]$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, then we define $\int_0^t \zeta(x, s, \omega) dw_j(s)$ as the limit in $Z_T^0$ as $k \to \infty$ of a sequence $\int_0^t \zeta_k(x, s, \omega) dw_j(s)$, where the sequence $\{\zeta_k\}$ is such as in Proposition 2.1.

**Definition 2.2** We say that equations (2.1)-(2.2) are satisfied for $u \in Y^1$ if there exists $(\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_N) \in Y^1 \times (X^0)^N$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_T^r u(\cdot, t, \omega) = & \int_T^t (Au(\cdot, s, \omega) + \varphi(\cdot, s, \omega)) ds \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_t^T B_i \chi_i(\cdot, s, \omega) ds - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_t^T \chi_i(\cdot, s) dw_i(s)
\end{align*}
$$

for all $r, t$ such that $0 \leq r < t \leq T$, and this equality is satisfied as an equality in $Z_T^{-1}$.

Note that the condition on $\partial D$ is satisfied in the sense that $u(\cdot, t, \omega) \in H^1$ for a.e. $t, \omega$. Further, $u \in Y^1$, and the value of $u(\cdot, t, \omega)$ is uniquely defined in $Z_T^0$ given $t$, by the definitions of the corresponding spaces. The integrals with $dw_i$ in (2.7) are defined as elements of $Z_T^0$. The integral with $ds$ in (2.7) is defined as an element of $Z_T^{-1}$. In fact, Definition 2.2 requires for (2.1) that this integral must be equal to an element of $Z_T^0$ in the sense of equality in $Z_T^{-1}$.

In the case where $\delta_1 = 0$, Condition 2.2 is too weak to ensure solvability of problem (2.1)-(2.3) in $Y^1$. Therefore, we will need a relaxed version of solution that does not require $Y^1$-type regularity of $u$.

**Solution in the representation sense**

For simplicity, we assume in this section that $\varphi \equiv 0$.

Without a loss of generality, we assume that there exist functions $\bar{\beta}_i : Q \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, such that

$$
2b(x, t, \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i(x, t, \omega) \beta_i(x, t, \omega)^\top + \sum_{j=1}^M \bar{\beta}_j(x, t, \omega) \bar{\beta}_j(x, t, \omega)^\top,
$$

and $\bar{\beta}_i$ has the similar properties as $\beta_i$. (Note that, by Condition 2.2 $2b \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i \beta_i^\top$.)
Let $\tilde{w}(t) = (\tilde{w}_1(t), \ldots, \tilde{w}_M(t))$ be a new Wiener process independent on $w(t)$. Let $a \in L_2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a vector such that $a \in D$. We assume also that $a$ is independent from $(w(t) - w(t_1), \tilde{w}(t) - \tilde{w}(t_1))$ for all $t > t_1 > s$. Let $s \in [0, T)$ be given. Consider the following Ito equation

$$dy(t) = f(y(t), t) \, dt + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i(y(t), t) \, dw_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \tilde{\beta}_j(y(t), t) \, d\tilde{w}_j(t),$$

$$y(s) = x. \tag{2.7}$$

Let $y(t) = y^{x,s}(t)$ be the solution of (2.7), and let $\tau^{x,s} \triangleq \inf\{t \geq s : y^{x,s}(t) \notin D\}$.

To proceed further, we have to impose more conditions.

Let $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $r_1 < r_2$.

For the case where $n = 1$, set $O \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R} : r_1 < x < r_2\}$. For the case where $n > 1$, we assume that $r_1 > 0$ and $O \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : r_1 < |x| < r_2\}$, i.e., it is a spherical layer.

We assume that the following condition is satisfied.

**Condition 2.4** At least one of the following conditions is satisfied.

(i) The functions $f(x, t), \beta_i(x, t), \tilde{\beta}_i(x, t)$ are non-random; or

(ii) There exists a bijection $\phi : D \to O$ such that the process $\tilde{y}^{x,s}(t) \triangleq \phi(y^{x,s}(t))$ is such that, for any $(x, s) \in Q$, there exist bounded random processes $\tilde{f}^{x,s} : [0, +\infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h^{x,s}(t) = (h^{x,s}_1(t), \ldots, h^{x,s}_N(t)) : [s, +\infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ that are progressively measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_t$ such that

$$dr^{x,s}(t) = \tilde{f}^{x,s}(t) \, dt + \sum_{k=1}^{N} h^{x,s}_k(t) \, dw_k(t) + \sum_{k=N+1}^{N+M} h^{x,s}_k(t) \, d\tilde{w}_{k-N}(t), \quad t > 0, \tag{2.8}$$

where $r(t) = |\tilde{y}^{x,s}(t)|$. In addition, $d_h \triangleq \inf_{x,s} \text{ess inf}_{t,\omega} |h^{x,s}(t, \omega)|^2 > 0$.

Condition 2.4(ii) covers two cases:

- $n = 1$, and $D$ is a connected interval; or

- $n > 1$, and $D \triangleq D_1 \setminus D_0$, where $D_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are domains with $C^2$-smooth boundaries $\partial D_i$, $i = 0, 1$, such that $D_0 \subset D_1$ and $\partial D_0 \cap \partial D_1 = \emptyset$. In other words, there is a lacuna $D_0$ in the domain $D$.

Note that, in the both cases, there exists a bijection $\phi : D \to O$ such that $\phi$ is continuously twice differentiable inside $D$, and the derivatives are uniformly bounded. The verification of the conditions required is straightforward.
For \( t \geq s \), set
\[
\gamma^{x,s}(t) \triangleq \exp \left( - \int_s^t \lambda(y^{x,s}(t), t) \, dt \right).
\]  
\hfill (2.9)

**Definition 2.3** We say that differential equation \((2.1)\) with \( \varphi = 0 \) is satisfied for \( u \in U \) in the representation sense if, for any \((x,s) \in Q\),

\[
\text{the process } \gamma^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau)u(y^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau) \text{ is a martingale.}
\]  
\hfill (2.10)

**Remark 2.1** Definition \(2.3\) allows to consider solutions of differential equation \((2.1)\) without any requirements on their differentiability.

A justification for this definition is the following. First, assume that \( \xi \in V \) is given and \( \Gamma = 0 \). In this case, \( u \in U \) is uniquely defined by \((2.10)\) and \((2.3)\), since it follows from these equations that
\[
u(x,s) = E\{\gamma^{x,s}(T \wedge \tau)\xi(y^{x,s}(T \wedge \tau), T \wedge \tau)|\mathcal{F}_s\}. \]  
\hfill (2.11)

In addition, \((2.2)\) holds for any \( u \in U \). Second, property \((2.10)\) holds for the traditional solution from Definition \(2.2\); this can be seen from the following.

**Theorem 2.1** Assume that Condition \(2.2\) holds with some \( \delta_1 > 0 \). Let \( \xi \in V \cap Z^0_T \), and let equations \((2.1)-(2.2)\) with \( \varphi = 0 \) be satisfied for \( u \in Y^1 \) in the sense of Definition \(2.2\) with \( \chi_i \in X^0 \). Then \((2.10)\) holds for this \( u \). In other words, equation \((2.1)\) is satisfied for this \( u \) in the representation sense.

**Remark 2.2** Alternative, solution of boundary problem \((2.1)-(2.3)\) could be defined directly by \((2.11)\) without requiring \((2.10)\). We prefer Definition \(2.3\) since it allows to consider differential equation \((2.1)\) separately from the boundary conditions.

### 3 Backward SPDEs with the standard terminal condition

In this section, we assume that \( \Gamma = 0 \). In this case, condition \((2.3)\) can be rewritten as
\[
u(\cdot,T) = \xi.
\]  
\hfill (3.1)
Lemma 3.1 Assume that Condition 2.2 holds with $\delta_1 > 0$. Let $k = 0$ or $k = 1$. Then problem (2.1)-(2.2), (3.1) has an unique solution a unique solution $(u, \chi_1, \ldots, \chi_N)$ in the class $Y^{k+1} \times (X^1)^N$ for any $\varphi \in X^{k-1}$ and $\xi \in Z_T^k$, and
\[
\|u\|_{Y^{k+1}} + \sum_{i=1}^N \|\chi_i\|_{X^k} \leq C(\|\varphi\|_{X^{k-1}} + \|\xi\|_{Z_T^k}),
\]
where $C > 0$ does not depend on $\xi$.

For $k = 1$, this result is well known; see, e.g., Dokuchaev (1991) or Theorem 4.2 from Dokuchaev (2010). For $k = 2$, Lemma 3.1 is a reformulation of Theorem 3.1 from Du and Tang (2012), or Theorem 3.4 from Dokuchaev (2011), or Theorem 4.3 from Dokuchaev (2012) (the preprint of this paper web-published in 2006). Note that in Dokuchaev (2011, 2012) some strengthened version of Condition 2.2 was required (Condition 3.5 in Dokuchaev (2012) or equivalent Condition 4.1 in Dokuchaev (2012)). The result in Du and Tang (2012) was obtained without this restriction, i.e., under Condition 2.2 only.

The following lemma covers the most difficult degenerate case, i.e., where Condition 2.2 holds with $\delta_1 = 0$ only.

Theorem 3.1 For any $\xi \in \mathcal{V}$, there is an unique $u \in U$ such that equations (2.1)-(2.2) are satisfied in the representation sense, and that (3.1) is satisfied as an equality in $Z^0_T$. In addition,
\[
\|u\|_U \leq C_\lambda \|\xi\|_\mathcal{V},
\]
where $C_\lambda = \exp(T \sup_{x,t,\omega} \max(0, \lambda(x,t,\omega)))$.

4 Backward SPDEs with a non-local boundary condition

In this section, we assume that the following conditions are satisfied.

Condition 4.1 $\lambda(x,t,\omega) \leq 0$ a.e.

Condition 4.2 The mapping $\Gamma : U_{PC} \to \mathcal{V}$ is linear and continuous and such that at least one of the following condition holds:

(i) $\|\Gamma u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|u\|_U$ for any $u \in U$, and that there exists $\theta < T$ such that $\Gamma u = \Gamma(\mathbb{I}_{\{t \leq \theta\}} u)$.

(ii) There exists $c \in (0,1)$ such that $\|\Gamma u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq c \|u\|_U$ for any $u \in U$.

Example 4.1 Condition 4.2(i) is satisfied for the following operators:
(i) $\Gamma u = \kappa u(\cdot, 0)$, $\kappa \in [-1, 1]$;

(ii) $(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \kappa u(x, t_1, \omega)$, $t_1 \in [0, T]$;

(iii) $(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \zeta(\omega)u(x, t_1, \omega)$, $t_1 \in [0, T)$, $\zeta \in L_{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbf{P})$, $|\zeta(\omega)| \leq 1$ a.s.;

(iv) $(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \alpha_1 u(x, t_1, \omega) + \alpha_2 u(x, t_2, \omega)$, $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T)$, $|\alpha_1| + |\alpha_2| \leq 1$;

(v) $$(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \int_{0}^{\theta} k(t)u(x, t, \omega)dt, \quad \theta \in [0, T), \quad k(\cdot) \in L_{\infty}(0, \theta), \quad \int_{0}^{\theta} |k(t)|dt \leq 1;$$

(vi) $$(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \int_{0}^{\theta} dt \int_{D} k(t, y, x, \omega)u(y, t, \omega)dy,$$

where $\theta \in [0, T)$, $k(\cdot) : [0, \theta] \times D \times D \times \Omega$ is a bounded measurable function from $L_{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbf{P}, L_{\infty}([0, \theta] \times D \times D))$ such that

$$\text{ess sup}_{(x, \omega) \in D \times \Omega} \int_{0}^{\theta} dt \int_{D} |k(t, x, y, \omega)|dy \leq 1.$$

Convex combinations of the operators from this list are also covered.

**Example 4.2** Condition 4.2(ii) is satisfied for the following operators:

(i) $$(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \int_{0}^{T} k(t)u(x, t, \omega)dt, \quad k(\cdot) \in L_{\infty}(0, \theta), \quad \int_{0}^{T} |k(t)|dt < 1;$$

(ii) $$(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = \int_{0}^{T} dt \int_{D} k(t, y, x, \omega)u(y, t, \omega)dy,$$

where $\theta \in [0, T)$, $k(\cdot) : [0, T] \times D \times D \times \Omega$ is a bounded measurable function from $L_{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbf{P}, L_{\infty}([0, \theta] \times D \times D))$ such that

$$\text{ess sup}_{(x, \omega) \in D \times \Omega} \int_{0}^{T} dt \int_{D} |k(t, x, y, \omega)|dy < 1.$$

Convex combinations of the operators from this list are also covered.

Additional examples of admissible $\Gamma$ can be found is Section 5 below.

**Theorem 4.1** For any $\xi \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists and unique $u \in U$ such that equations (2.1)-(2.2) are satisfied in the representation sense, and

$$\|u\|_U \leq C\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{V}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $C > 0$ does not depend on $\xi$. 
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5 Application: portfolio selection problem

Theorem 4.1 can be applied to portfolio selection problem for continuous time diffusion market model, where the market dynamic is described by stochastic differential equations. Examples of these models can be found in, e.g., Ma and Yong (1997) and Karatzas and Shreve (1998).

We consider the following stripped to the bone model of a securities market consisting of a risk free bond or bank account with the price $B(t)$, $t \geq 0$, and a risky stock with price $S(t)$, $t \geq 0$. The prices of the stocks evolve as

$$dS(t) = S(t) (a(t)dt + \sigma(t)dw(t)), \quad t > 0,$$

where $w(t)$ is a Wiener process, $a(t)$ is an appreciation rate, $\sigma(t)$ is a volatility coefficient. The initial price $S(0) > 0$ is a given deterministic constant. The price of the bond evolves as

$$B(t) = e^{rt}B(0),$$

where $B(0)$ is a given constant, $r \geq 0$ is a short rate. For simplicity, we assume that $r = 0$ and $B(t) \equiv B(0)$.

We assume that $w(\cdot)$ is a standard Wiener process on a given standard probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, where $\Omega$ is a set of elementary events, $\mathcal{F}$ is a complete $\sigma$-algebra of events, and $P$ is a probability measure.

Let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the filtration generated by $w(t)$. In particular, this means that $\mathcal{F}_t$ is independent from $\{w(t_2) - w(t_1)\}_{t_2 \geq t_1 \geq t}$, and $\mathcal{F}_0$ is trivial, i.e., it is the $P$-augmentation of the set $\{\emptyset, \Omega\}$.

We assume that the processes $a(t)$, $\sigma(t)$, and $\sigma(t)^{-1}$ are bounded and $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted and continuous. In particular, this means that the process the process $a(t)$ can be random.

Strategies for bond-stock-options market

The rules for the operations of the agents on the market define the class of admissible strategies where the optimization problems have to be solved.

Let $X(0) > 0$ be the initial wealth at time $t = 0$ and let $X(t)$ be the wealth at time $t > 0$.

We assume that the wealth $X(t)$ at time $t \in [0, T]$ is

$$X(t) = \beta(t)B(t) + \gamma(t)S(t).$$

(5.2)

Here $\beta(t)$ is the quantity of the bond portfolio, $\gamma(t)$ is the quantity of the stock portfolio, $t \geq 0$. The pair $(\beta(\cdot), \gamma(\cdot))$ describes the state of the bond-stocks securities portfolio at time $t$. Each of these pairs is called a strategy.
A pair \((\beta(\cdot), \gamma(\cdot))\) is said to be an admissible strategy if the processes \(\beta(t)\) and \(\gamma(t)\) are progressively measurable with respect to the filtration \(\mathcal{F}_t\).

In particular, the agents are not supposed to know the future (i.e., the strategies have to be adapted to the flow of current market information).

In addition, we require that

\[
E \int_0^T (\beta(t)^2 B(t)^2 + S(t)^2 \gamma(t)^2) \, dt < +\infty.
\]

A pair \((\beta(\cdot), \gamma(\cdot))\) is said to be an admissible self-financing strategy, if

\[
dX(t) = \beta(t) dB(t) + \gamma(t) dS(t).
\]

Since \(B(t) \equiv B(0)\), this means that

\[
X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t \gamma(s) dS(s),
\]

and the process \(\gamma(t)\) alone defines the strategy.

Let \(P_*\) be an equivalent probability measure such that \(S(t)\) is a martingale under \(P_*\). By the assumptions on \((a, \sigma)\), this measure exists and is unique. Under this measure, \(X(t)\) is a martingale as well.

**A special goal achieving problem**

In portfolio theory, a typical problem is creation of a strategy such that the wealth replicates a given contingent claim. The structure of these claims can be quite complicated; in particular, these claims may represent payoffs for the derivatives to be hedged. It will be demonstrated below that Theorem 4.1 can be applied to replication of certain exotic contingent claims depending on the past portfolio value.

Let us consider the following example.

Let \(\theta \in (0, T]\), \(s_L \in (0, S(0))\), \(s_U \in (S(0), +\infty)\), \(W_L \in (0, +\infty)\), \(W_U \in (W_L, +\infty)\), and \(\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in [0, 1]\) be given, \(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq 1\). Further, let \(k(t, \omega)\) be a given random process such that \(k(t)\) is \(\mathcal{F}_T\)-measurable for any \(t\) and

\[
\int_0^\theta |k(t)| dt \leq 1 \quad \text{a.s.}
\]

In addition, we require that if \(\theta = T\) then there exists \(\bar{c} \in [0, 1]\) such that

\[
\int_0^T |k(t)| dt \leq \bar{c} \quad \text{a.s.}
\]
Further, let \( \zeta = \zeta(x, \omega) \in V \) be given. Here \( V \) is defined as above with \( n = 1 \) and \( D = (s_L, s_U) \).

Let \( \tau = \inf\{ t : S(t) \notin [s_L, s_U] \} \).

We consider the following goal-achieving problem: find an initial wealth \( X(0) \) and a self-financing portfolio strategy such that the corresponding wealth \( X(t) \) is bounded and such that

\[
X(t) = W_L \quad \text{if} \quad t \geq \tau, \quad S(\tau) = s_L, \quad (5.3)
\]

\[
X(t) = W_U \quad \text{if} \quad t \geq \tau, \quad S(\tau) = s_U, \quad (5.4)
\]

\[
X(T) = \kappa_1 \int_0^\theta k(s)X(s)ds + \kappa_2 E \int_0^\theta k(s)X(s)ds + \zeta(S(T)) \quad \text{if} \quad \tau > T. \quad (5.5)
\]

This toy example still has an economic meaning. In (5.3)-(5.5), \( \tau \) is the liquidation time when portfolio is converted into cash. Conditions (5.3)-(5.4) may describe preferences for the case of the extreme event \( \tau < T \); this can be considered as an extreme event if \( s_L \) is sufficiently small and \( s_U \) is sufficiently large. Condition (5.5) can be illustrated by the following examples. Let \( \kappa_1 = 1 \),

\[
k(t) = \frac{1}{\theta \wedge \tau} \mathbb{I}_{(t<\theta \wedge \tau)} \rho, \quad (5.6)
\]

where \( \rho > 0 \) is given. In this case, the value

\[
\int_0^\theta k(s)X(s)ds = \frac{1}{\theta \wedge \tau} \int_0^{\theta \wedge \tau} \rho X(s)ds
\]

may represent the proportional hedge management fees paid with given annual proportion rate \( \rho \). In this model, the management fees are being paid until the liquidation time \( \tau \). In another example, Condition (5.5) with \( k(t) \equiv \theta^{-1}, \theta < T \), and with large positive \( \zeta \) may represent a goal of a hedge fund manager who wishes to demonstrate strong relative grows at the end of the term (for \( \kappa_1 = 1 \)) or stronger than originally expected grows at the end of the term (for \( \kappa_2 = 1 \)).

Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \) be such that \( \ell(s_L) = W_L \) and \( \ell(s_U) = W_U \), where \( \ell(x) = ax + b \).

Let us consider problem (2.1)-(2.3) with \( n = N = 1 \), \( D = (s_L, s_U) \),

\[
A v = \frac{1}{2} \sigma(t)^2 x^2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x), \quad B_1 v \triangleq \sigma(t)x \frac{dv}{dx},
\]

\[
(\Gamma u)(x, \omega) = (\Gamma u)(\omega) = \kappa \int_0^\theta k(t)u(S(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau) dt + \kappa_2 E \int_0^\theta k(t)u(S(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau) dt,
\]

and with

\[
\xi(x) = \xi(x, \omega) = \zeta(x) + \kappa \int_0^\theta k(t)\ell(S(t \wedge \tau)) dt + \kappa_2 E \int_0^\theta k(t)\ell(S(t \wedge \tau)) dt - \ell(S(T \wedge \tau)).
\]
In other words, we consider the following problem

\begin{align}
&d_t u(x,t) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma(t)^2 x^2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + \sigma(t)x \frac{d\chi}{dx}(x,t) = \chi(x,t)dw(t), \quad t < T, \tag{5.7} \\
u(s_L, t) = u(s_U, t) = 0, \quad \tag{5.8} \\
u(x, T) - (\Gamma u)(x) = \xi(x). \quad \tag{5.9}
\end{align}

The assumptions of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied for this problem. By this theorem, there exists a unique solution \( u(x,t,\omega) : [s_L,s_U] \times [0,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) of problem (5.7)-(5.9) such that \( u \in U \) and equation (5.7) is satisfied in the representation sense. In particular, this means that \( u(x,0) = \mathbb{E}\{u(S(T),T)I_{\{\tau>T\}}|S(0) = x\} \).

Let

\[ H(x,t,\omega) = u(x,t,\omega) + \ell(x). \]

**Theorem 5.1** The investment problem (5.3)-(5.5) has a solution with the wealth \( X(t) = H(S(t\land \tau),t\land \tau), \quad t \in [0,T] \).

**Remark 5.1** The statement of Theorem 5.1 holds also for the limit case where \( \theta \to 0 \), i.e., where (5.5) is replaced by the constraints

\[ X(T) = X(0) + \zeta(S(T)), \quad \tau > T. \]

In this case, the goal achieving problem (5.3)-(5.5) can be reduced to replication of a European barrier option. The corresponding wealth process can be found using traditional methods without Theorem 4.1. For instance, if \( W_L = W_U = 0 \), then \( X(0) \) can be found from the equation

\[ X(0) = \mathbb{E}_*X(T) = \mathbb{E}_*\mathbb{I}_{(\tau>T)}(X(0) + \zeta(S(T))), \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad X(0) = (1 - \mathbb{P}_*(\tau > T))^{-1}\mathbb{E}_*\mathbb{I}_{(\tau>T)}\zeta(S(T)). \]

Similarly, the case where \( \kappa_1 = 1 \) and the process \( k(t) \) is \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-adapted can be considered by traditional methods as replication problem with consumption.

**Remark 5.2** The problem for the case of non-random \( \sigma(t) \) and with \( k(t) \) defined by (5.6) can be reduced to solution of degenerate deterministic backward parabolic Kolmogorov equation for the Markov process \( (z(t),S(t)) \), where \( z(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{I}_{(s<\theta\land \tau)}ds \). In this setting, \( X(t) \) can be found as a deterministic function of \( (z(t),S(t)) \) defined by the solution of this Kolmogorov equation.

**Remark 5.3** Our approach does not allow to extend Theorem 5.1 on the case where \( \theta = T \) and \( \bar{c} = 1 \).
6 Proofs

For the brevity, we will use notations $P_s(\cdot) \triangleq P(\cdot | F_s)$ and $E_s(\cdot) \triangleq E(\cdot | F_s)$.

We need the following auxiliary lemma.

**Lemma 6.1**  
(i) For any $\vartheta > 0$, there exists $\nu = \nu(\vartheta) \in (0,1)$ that depends only on $D, A, B_j$ and such that $P_s(\tau^{x,s} > s + \vartheta) \leq \nu$ a.s. for all $s \geq 0$, and for any $x \in D$.

(ii) For any $\vartheta > 0$, $P_s(\tau^{x,s} > s + \vartheta) \to 0$ in $L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ as dist $(x, \partial D) = \inf_{y \in \partial D} |x - y| \to 0$.

(iii) $P_s(\tau^{x,s} < s) \to 0$ in $L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ as $s - s \to 0$ for any $x \in D$, $s < s < T$.

**Proof of Lemma 6.1.** Assume that Condition 2.4(i) is satisfies. In this case, the process $y^{x,s}(t)$ is a Markov diffusion process. Statement (i) is a reformulation of Lemma 2.1 from Dokuchaev (2004). Statements (ii)-(iii) are well known for Markov diffusion processes.

Assume that Condition 2.4(ii) is satisfies. We will follow the approach from Dokuchaev (2004), p.296.

Let $\mu = (f, \beta, x, s)$ and $D_r \triangleq (r_1, r_2)$.

For $(x, s) \in D \times [0, T)$, we have that $\tau^{x,s} = \inf\{t \geq s : \tau^{x,s}(t) \notin D_r\}$. We have that

$$P_s(\tau^{x,s} > s + \vartheta) = P_s(\tau^{x,s}(t) \in D_r \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]).$$  

Let

$$M^\mu(t) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^N \int_s^t h_k^{x,s}(r)dw_k(r) + \sum_{k=N+1}^{N+M} \int_s^t h_k^{x,s}(r)d\tilde{w}_k(r), \quad t \geq s.$$  

We have that

$$h_k^{x,s}(t)^\top h_k^{x,s}(t) = |h_k^{x,s}(t)|^2 \geq \delta_h > 0.$$  

Clearly, $M^\mu(t)$ is a martingale conditionally given $F_s$ vanishing at $s$ with quadratic variation process

$$[M^\mu]_t \triangleq \int_s^t |h(y^{x,s}(r), r)|^2 dr, \quad t \geq s.$$  

Let $\theta^\mu(t) \triangleq \inf\{r \geq s : [M^\mu]_r > t - s\}$. Note that $\theta^\mu(s) = s$, and the function $\theta^\mu(t)$ is strictly increasing in $t > s$ given $(x, s)$. By Dambis–Dubins–Schwarz Theorem (see, e.g., Revuz and Yor (1999)), the process $B^\mu(t) \triangleq M(\theta^\mu(t))$ is a Brownian motion conditionally given $F_s$ vanishing at $s$, i.e., $B^\mu(s) = 0$, and $M^\mu(t) = B^\mu(s + [M^\mu]_t)$.

Let us prove statement (i). Let $\tilde{D}_r \triangleq (r_1 + K_1, r_2 + K_2)$, where $K_1 \triangleq -r_2 - \vartheta \sup_{x,s,t,\omega} |\tilde{f}^{x,s}(t,\omega)|$, $K_2 \triangleq -r_1 + \vartheta \sup_{x,s,t,\omega} |\tilde{f}^{x,s}(t,\omega)|$. It is easy to see that

$$P_s(\tau^{x,s}(t) \in D_r \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]) \leq P_s(M^\mu(t) \in \tilde{D}_r \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]).$$  

(6.3)
By (6.2), \([M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta} \geq c_2 \vartheta\) a.s. for all \(x, s\). Hence

\[
P_s(B^\mu(q) \in \hat{D}_r \quad \forall r \in [s, s + [M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta}]) \leq P_s(B^\mu(q) \in \hat{D}_r \quad \forall q \in [s, s + \delta_h \vartheta]).
\] (6.5)

By (6.1)–(6.3) and (6.4)–(6.5), it follows that

\[
\nu = \sup_{\mu} P_s(B^\mu(q) \in \hat{D}_r \quad \forall q \in [s, s + \delta_h \vartheta]),
\]

and \(\nu = \nu(\mathcal{P}) \in (0, 1)\). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1(i).

Let us prove statement (ii). Clearly, \(\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial D) \to 0\) if and only if \(\phi(x) \to r_1\) or \(\phi(x) \to r_2\).

Assume that \(\phi(x) \to r_2\). Let \(\hat{D}_r \triangleq (r_1 - KT, r_2)\), where \(K \triangleq \sup_{x,s,t,\omega} |\hat{f}^{x,s}(t, \omega)|\). We have that

\[
P_s(r^{x,s}(t) \in D_r \quad \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]) \leq P_s(\phi(t) + M^\mu(t) - K(t - s) \in \hat{D}_r \quad \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]).
\] (6.6)

Clearly,

\[
P_s(\phi(t) + B^\mu(s + [M^\mu]_t) - K(t - s) \in \hat{D}_r \quad \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]) \leq P_s(B^\mu(q) - K\theta^\mu() \in [r_1 - r_2 - KT, r_2 - \phi(x)] \quad \forall q \in [s, s + [M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta}]).
\] (6.7)

By (6.2), \([M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta} \geq \delta_h \vartheta\) a.s. for all \(x, s\). Hence

\[
P_s(\phi(t) + B^\mu(q) - K\theta^\mu(q) \in D_r \quad \forall q \in [s, s + [M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta}]) \leq P_s(B^\mu(q) - K\theta^\mu(q) \in [r_1 - r_2 - KT, r_2 - \phi(x)] \quad \forall q \in [s, s + \delta_h \vartheta]).
\] (6.8)

By (6.1), (6.3), (6.8), it follows that

\[
P_s(\tau^{x,s} > s + \vartheta) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}) \quad \text{as} \quad \phi(x) \to r_2.
\]

The case where \(\phi(x) \to r_1\) can be considered similarly. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1(ii).

Let us prove statement (iii). Clearly, \(\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial D) > 0\) if and only if \(r_1 < \phi(x) < r_2\).

Let \(\hat{D}_r(t) \triangleq (r_1 + K(t - s), r_2 - K(t - s))\), where \(K \triangleq \sup_{x,s,t,\omega} |\hat{f}^{x,s}(t, \omega)|\), and where \(t\) is close enough to \(s\) such that \(r_1 + K(t - s) < r_2 - K(t - s)\). We have that

\[
P_s(r^{x,s}(t) \in D_r \quad \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]) \geq P_s(\phi(t) + M^\mu(t) \in \hat{D}_r(t) \quad \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]).
\] (6.9)
Clearly,
\[ P_s(\phi(x) + B^\mu(s + [M^\mu]_t) \in \tilde{D}_r(t) \quad \forall t \in [s, s + \vartheta]) \]
\[ \geq P_s(B^\mu(q) - K \theta^\mu(q) \in \tilde{D}_r(\theta^\mu(q)) \quad \forall q \in [s, s + [M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta}). \quad (6.10) \]

By (6.2), 
\[ [M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta} \in [\delta h, C h] \text{ a.s. for all } x, s \text{ for some } C_h > 0. \]
Hence
\[ P_s(\phi(x) + B^\mu(q) - K \theta^\mu(q) \in D_r) \quad \forall q \in [s, s + [M^\mu]_{s+\vartheta}). \quad (6.11) \]

By (6.1), (6.9)–(6.11), it follows that
\[ P_s(\tau^{x,s} > s + \vartheta) \rightarrow 1 \text{ in } L_\infty(\Omega, F, P) \text{ as } \vartheta \rightarrow 0 +. \]

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1 \( \square \)

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For the case where \( u \in X^2_c \) and \( \chi_j \in X^1_c \), this theorem follows immediately from the proof of Lemma 4.1 from Dokuchaev (2011).

Remark 6.1 The results in Dokuchaev (2011) were stated under some more restrictive condition than Condition 2.2 with \( \delta_1 > 0 \) (Condition 3.5 in the cited paper). Thanks to Theorem 3.1 from Du and Tang (2012), this additional condition can be lifted, i.e., all results from Dokuchaev (2011) are still valid if Condition 3.5 from this paper is replaced by Condition 2.2.

Let us consider the general case. We introduce operators
\[ A^* v = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} (b_{ij}(x,t)v(x)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (f_i(x,t)v(x)) + \lambda(x,t)v(x) \]
and
\[ B^*_i v = -\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\beta_{ik}(x,t,\omega) v(x)), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N. \]

Here \( b_{ij}, x_i, \beta_{ik} \) are the components of \( b, \beta, \) and \( x \).

Let \( \rho \in Z^0_s \), and let \( p = p(x,t,\omega) \) be the solution of the problem
\[ dt p = A^* p dt + \sum_{i=1}^{N} B^*_i p dw_i(t), \quad t \geq s, \]
\[ p|_{t=s} = \rho, \quad p(x,t,\omega)|_{x \in \partial D} = 0. \]

By Theorem 3.4.8 from Rozovskii (1990), this boundary value problem has an unique solution \( p \in Y^1(s,T) \). Introduce an operator \( M_s : Z^0_s \rightarrow Y^1(s,T) \) such that \( p = M_s \rho \), where \( p \in Y^1(s,T) \) is the solution of this boundary value problem.
Let \( \rho \in Z_s^0 \) be such that \( \rho \geq 0 \) a.e. and \( \int_D \rho(x)dx = 1 \) a.s. Let \( a \in L_2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}^n) \) be such that \( a \in D \) a.s. and it has the conditional probability density function \( \rho \) given \( \mathcal{F}_s \). We assume that \( a \) is independent from \( (w(t_1) - w(t_0), \tilde{w}(t_1) - \tilde{w}(t_0)) \), \( s < t_0 < t_1 \). Let \( p = \mathcal{M}_s \rho \), and let \( y^{a,s}(t) \) be the solution of Ito equation (2.7) with the initial condition \( y(s) = a \).

To prove the theorem, it suffices to show that

\[
\gamma(t \land \tau^{x,s}) u(y^{x,s}(t \land \tau^{x,s}), t \land \tau^{x,s}) = \mathbb{E}_t \gamma(T \land \tau^{x,s}) u(y^{x,s}(T \land \tau^{x,s}), T \land \tau^{x,s}) \quad \text{a.s.}
\]

for any \( t \). For this, it suffices to prove that

\[
\mathbb{E} \int_D \rho(x) \gamma(t \land \tau^{x,s}) u(y^{x,s}(t \land \tau^{x,s}), t \land \tau^{x,s}) dx = \mathbb{E} \int_D \rho(x) \mathbb{E}_t \gamma(T \land \tau^{x,s}) u(y^{x,s}(T \land \tau^{x,s}), T \land \tau^{x,s}) dx
\]

for any \( \rho \in Z_s^0 \) such as described above.

By Theorem 6.1 from Dokuchaev (2011) and Remark 6.1, we have that

\[
\int_D p(x,t)u(x,t)dx = \mathbb{E}_t \gamma^{a,s}(t \land \tau^{a,s}) u(y^{a,s}(t \land \tau^{a,s}), t \land \tau^{a,s})
\]

and

\[
\int_D p(x,T)u(x,T)dx = \mathbb{E}_T \gamma(T \land \tau^{a,s}) u(y^{a,s}(T \land \tau^{a,s}), T \land \tau^{a,s}).
\]

By the duality established in Theorem 3.3 from Dokuchaev (2011) and Remark 6.1 it follows that

\[
\mathbb{E} \int_D p(x,t)u(x,t)dx = \mathbb{E} \int_D p(x,T)u(x,T)dx.
\]

This means that \( \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_tq(a,s,t)) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_Tq(a,s,T)) \), where

\[
q(a,s,t) = \gamma^{a,s}(t \land \tau^{a,s}) u(y^{a,s}(t \land \tau^{a,s}), t \land \tau^{a,s}).
\]

Hence

\[
\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_tq(a,s,t)) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_tq(a,s,T)). \tag{6.13}
\]

Without loss of generality, we shall assume that \( a \) is a random vector on the probability space \( (\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{P}) \), where \( \hat{\Omega} = \Omega \times \Omega' \), where \( \Omega' = D, \hat{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_s \otimes \mathcal{B}_D \), where \( \mathcal{B}_D \) is the set of Borel subsets of \( D \), and

\[
\hat{P}(S_1 \times S_2) = \int_{S_1} P(d\omega) P'(\omega, S_2), \quad P'(\omega, S_2) = \int_{S_2} \rho(x, \omega)dx.
\]
for $S_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ and $S_2 \in \mathcal{B}_D$. The symbol $\tilde{E}$ denotes the expectation in $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. We suppose that $\tilde{\omega} = (\omega, \omega')$, $\tilde{\Omega} = \{\tilde{\omega}\}$, and $a(\tilde{\omega}) = \omega'$.

We have that

$$\text{E}(E_t q(a, s, t)) = \text{E} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\omega|\mathcal{F}_t)q(\omega', s, t, \omega) = \text{E} \int_{D} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\omega') \rho(\omega') \int_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}(d\omega|\mathcal{F}_t)q(\omega', s, t, \omega)}$$

$$= \text{E} \int_{D} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\omega') \rho(\omega', s, t, \omega) = \text{E} \int_{D} \rho(\omega') q(\omega', s, t, \omega)d\omega'$$

$$= \text{E} \int_{D} \rho(x) \gamma^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}) u(y^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}), t \wedge \tau^{x,s}) dx$$

and

$$\text{E}(E_t q(a, s, T)) = \text{E} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\omega|\mathcal{F}_t)q(\omega', s, T, \omega) = \text{E} \int_{D} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\omega') \rho(\omega') \int_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}(d\omega|\mathcal{F}_t)q(\omega', s, T, \omega)}$$

$$= \text{E} \int_{D} \rho(\omega') E_t q(\omega', s, T, \omega)d\omega' = \text{E} \int_{D} \rho(x) \gamma^{x,s}(T \wedge \tau^{x,s}) E_t u(y^{x,s}(T \wedge \tau^{x,s}), T \wedge \tau^{x,s}) dx.$$
Further,

\[ u(x, s) = E_x \gamma_{x,s}(\tau_{x,T}^s) \xi(y_{x,s}(\tau_{x,T}^s)) = E_x 1_{\{\tau_{x,s} > T\}} \gamma_{x,s}(\tau_{x,T}^s) \xi(y_{x,s}(T)). \]

Hence

\[ |u(x, s)| \leq [E_x 1_{\{\tau_{x,s} > T\}}]^{1/2} [E_x \gamma_{x,s}(\tau_{x,T}^s)^2 \xi(y_{x,s}(T))^2]^{1/2} \]

\[ = (P_s(\tau_{x,s} > T)) \gamma_{x,s}(\tau_{x,T}^s)^2 \xi(y_{x,s}(T))^2 \]

By Lemma 6.1(iii), we have that \( P_s(\tau_{x,s} > T) \to 0 \) a.s. as \( \text{dist}(x, \partial D) \to 0 \). Hence \( u(x, s) \to 0 \) as \( \text{dist}(x, \partial D) \to 0 \). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.2. \( \square \)

**Lemma 6.3** Let \( \xi \in \mathcal{V} \), and let \( u \) be defined by (2.11). Then (2.10) holds for this \( u \).

**Proof of Lemma 6.3** Let \( \xi \in \mathcal{V} \) be given, and let \( u \) be defined by (2.11). It suffices to show that (2.10) holds. Let \( \tilde{B} = 2b - \sum_j B_j^2 \). By Condition 2.2, the matrix \( \tilde{B} = \tilde{B}(x, t, \omega) \) is non-negatively defined for all \((x, t, \omega)\). Let \( y_{x,s}^\delta(t) \) and \( \gamma_{x,s}^\delta(t) \) be defined similarly to \( y_{x,s}^\delta(t) \) and \( \gamma_{x,s}^\delta(t) \) such that the corresponding \( \tilde{B}_j \) are selected such that \( \sum_j \tilde{B}_j^2 \equiv B + \delta I \), where \( I \) is the unit matrix in \( \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). Let \( \tau_{x,s}^\delta = \inf\{t > s : y_{x,s}^\delta \notin D\} \) and \( \tau_{x,s,T}^\delta = T \wedge \tau_{x,s}^\delta \).

By Theorem II.8.1 from Krylov (1980) applied on the conditional probability space given \( \mathcal{F}_s \),

\[ E_x \sup_{t \in [s,T]} |y_{x,s}^\delta(t) - y_{x,s}^\delta(t)|^2 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta \to 0. \quad (6.16) \]

In addition,

\[ E_x |\tau_{x,s}^\delta - \tau_{x,s,T}^\delta| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta \to 0. \quad (6.17) \]

If Condition 2.3(i) is satisfied, then (6.17) follows from Theorem 2.3 from Dokuchaev (2004). If Condition 2.3(ii) is satisfied, then (6.17) follows from Theorem 2 from Dokuchaev (2008) applied on the conditional probability space given \( \mathcal{F}_s \).

Let \( u_\delta \) be defined by (2.11) with \( y_{x,s}^\delta(t) \) and \( \tau_{x,s}^\delta \) replaced by \( y_{x,s}^\delta(t) \) and \( \tau_{x,s}^\delta \) respectively. By (6.16) and (6.17), it follows that, for any \((x, s)\), there exists a sequence \( \delta = \delta_i \to 0 \) such that

\[ \sup_{t \in [s,T]} |y_{x,s}^\delta(t) - y_{x,s}^\delta(t)| \to 0, \quad |\tau_{x,s}^\delta - \tau_{x,s,T}^\delta| \to 0 \quad \text{a.s. as} \quad \delta_i \to 0 \quad (6.18) \]

and

\[ |y_{x,s}^\delta(\tau_{x,T}^s) - y_{x,s}^\delta(\tau_{x,T}^s)| \to 0, \quad |\gamma_{x,s}^\delta(\tau_{x,T}^s) - \gamma_{x,s}^\delta(\tau_{x,T}^s)| \to 0 \quad \text{a.s. as} \quad \delta_i \to 0. \quad (6.19) \]
Let us show that, for all $s$,

\[ u_\delta(x,s) \to u(x,s) \quad \text{a.s. for all } x \quad \text{as} \quad \delta = \delta_i \to 0. \quad (6.20) \]

Let $(x,s) \in Q$ be given. Let

\[ z(t) = \gamma^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s})u(y^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s})), \quad z_\delta(t) = \gamma^{x,s}_\delta(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}_\delta)u_\delta(y^{x,s}_\delta(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}_\delta)). \]

By the definitions,

\[ u(x,s) = E_x\gamma^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}_T)\xi(y^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}_T)) = E_xz(T), \quad u_\delta(x,s) = E_x\gamma^{x,s}_\delta(\tau^{x,s}_T\delta)\xi(y^{x,s}_\delta(\tau^{x,s}_T)) = E_xz_\delta(T). \]

Hence

\[ |u_\delta(x,s) - u(x,s)| = |E_xz_\delta(T) - E_xz(T)| \leq E_x|\gamma^{x,s}_\delta(\tau^{x,s}_T\delta)\xi(y^{x,s}_\delta(\tau^{x,s}_T)) - \xi(y^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}_T))| \]

\[ + E_x|\gamma^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}_T\delta) - \gamma^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}_T)| |\xi(y^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}_T))| \]

By (6.18)-(6.19) and by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, (6.20) holds.

Further, let us estimate the value

\[ E \int_s^T |z_\delta(t) - z(t)|dt = \tilde{\psi}_1 + \tilde{\psi}_2, \quad (6.21) \]

where

\[ \tilde{\psi}_1 = E \int_s^{\tau^{x,s}_T \wedge \tau^{x,s}_\delta \wedge T} |z_\delta(t) - z(t)|dt, \quad \tilde{\psi}_2 = E \int_{\tau^{x,s}_T \wedge \tau^{x,s}_\delta \wedge T} |z_\delta(t) - z(t)|dt. \]

We have that

\[ \tilde{\psi}_1 = E \int_s^{\tau^{x,s}_T \wedge \tau^{x,s}_\delta \wedge T} |\gamma^{x,s}_\delta(t)u_\delta(y_\delta(t),t) - \gamma^{x,s}(t)u(y(t),t)|dt \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta = \delta_i \to 0, \]

and

\[ \tilde{\psi}_2 \leq (\text{ess sup}_{t,\omega} |z_\delta(t)| + \text{ess sup}_{t,\omega} |z(t)|)E|(\tau^{x,s}_T \vee \tau^{x,s}_\delta) \wedge T - \tau^{x,s}_T \wedge \tau^{x,s}_\delta \wedge T| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta = \delta_i \to 0. \]

The last two limits hold by (6.16)-(6.20) and by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem. Hence expectation (6.21) converges to zero as $\delta = \delta_i \to 0$. Since the processes $z_\delta(t)$ and $z(t)$ are uniformly bounded, it follows that there exists a subsequence $\{\delta_k\}$ of the sequence $\{\delta_i\}$ such that

\[ E \int_s^T |z_\delta(t) - z(t)|^2dt \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta = \delta_k \to 0. \quad (6.22) \]
In addition, it follows from (6.18)-(6.19) that \( \gamma_{x,s}^{\tau(x,s)} \to \gamma^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}) \) a.s. as \( \delta = \delta_k \to 0 \). Similarly to (6.22), we obtain that

\[
E|z_\delta(T) - z(T)|^2 = E|\gamma_{\delta}^{\tau(x,s)}(\gamma_{\delta}^{\tau(x,s)} - \gamma^{x,s}(\tau^{x,s}))|^2 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta = \delta_k \to 0.
\]

By Theorem 3.1, \( z_\delta(t) = E_t z_\delta(T) \) for any \( t \), i.e., this process is a martingale in \( t \in [s,T] \). Therefore, the limit process \( z(t) \) is also a martingale. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.3.

□

Lemma 6.4 Let \( \xi \in \mathcal{V} \), and let \( u \) be defined by (2.11). Then \( u \in \mathcal{C}_0 \).

Proof of Lemma 6.4. Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) be given. Let us show that

\[
\|u(\cdot,s) - u(\cdot,t)\|_{Z^0_T} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |s-t| \to 0.
\]

By the definitions,

\[
E|u(x,s) - u(x,t)|^2 \leq \Psi_1(x,s,t) + \Psi_2(x,s,t),
\]

where

\[
\Psi_1(x,s,t) = E|u(x,s) - u(y^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}), t \wedge \tau^{x,s})|^2,
\]

\[
\Psi_2(x,s,t) = E|u(y^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}), t \wedge \tau^{x,s}) - u(x,t)|^2.
\]

Let \( \eta(x,s,t) = u(y^{x,s}(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}), t \wedge \tau^{x,s}) \). By Theorem 3.1 (2.10) holds. By the Martingale Representation Theorem, it follows that

\[
\eta(x,s,t) = \eta(x,s,s) + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{s}^{\tau^{x,s} \wedge \tau^{x,s}} \pi_k(x,s,q) dw_k(q) + \sum_{k=N+1}^{N+M} \int_{s}^{T} \pi_k(x,s,q) d\tilde{w}_k(q)
\]

for some functions \( \pi_k(x,s,t) : Q \times [s,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) that are \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-adapted and such that

\[
\sup_{x,s} E \sum_{k=1}^{N+M} \int_{s}^{T} \pi_k(x,s,q)^2 dt \leq 2\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{V}}.
\]

By (2.10), it follows that

\[
\Psi_1(x,s,t) = E|E_s \eta(x,s,t) - \eta(x,s,t)|^2 \leq E \sum_{k=1}^{N+M} \int_{s}^{t} \pi_k(x,s,q)^2 dq \to 0
\]

as \( |s-t| \to 0 \) for all \( x \). By the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem,

\[
\|\Psi_1(\cdot.,s,t)\|_{Z^0_T} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad s-t \to 0.
\]
Let us estimate $\Psi_2$. Clearly,
\[
E_s^{|y^x,s(t \wedge \tau^{x,s}) - x|^2} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |s - t| \to 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x.
\]
By Lemma 6.1(iii),
\[
P_s(t \wedge \tau^{x,s} = t) \to 1 \quad \text{as} \quad |s - t| \to 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x.
\]
Hence $\Psi_2(x,s,t) \to 0$ as $s - t \to 0$ for all $x$. By the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, $\|\Psi_2(\cdot,s,t)\|_{Z^0_T} \to 0$ as $s - t \to 0$. The proof of Lemma 6.4 follows from this limit and from (6.23)–(6.24). □

Proof of Theorem 3.1 follows immediately from Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4.

Estimate (3.3) follows from (2.11). □

To proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.1, we need to introduce first some additional definitions. Let $s \in (0,T]$, $\varphi \in X^{-1}$ and $\Phi \in Z^0_s$. Consider the problem
\[
d_t u + (Au + \varphi) dt + \sum_{i=1}^N B_i \chi_i(t) dt = \sum_{i=1}^N \chi_i(t) dw_i(t), \quad t \leq s,
\]
\[
u(x,t,\omega) \big|_{x \in \partial D},
\]
\[
u(x,s,\omega) = \Phi(x,\omega).
\]

(6.25)

Assume that $\delta_1 = 0$ in Condition 2.2. Introduce operators $L_T : V \to U$, such that $u = L_T \Phi$, where $u$ is the solution of problem (6.25) in the representation sense. By Theorem 3.1 these linear operators are continuous.

Introduce operators $Q : V \to V$ a such that $Q \Phi = \Gamma L_T \Phi$, i.e., $Q \Phi = \Gamma u$, where $u \in U$ is the solution in the representation sense of problem (6.25) with $\Phi \in V$. Since the operator $\Gamma : U \to V$ is continuous, the operators $Q : V \to V$ is linear and continuous. In particular, $\|Q\| \leq \|\Gamma\| \|L_T\|$, where $\|Q\|$, $\|\Gamma\|$, and $\|L_T\|$, are the norms of the operators $Q : V \to V$, $\Gamma : U \to V$, and $L_T : V \to U$, respectively.

Lemma 6.5 If the operator $(I - Q)^{-1} : V \to V$ is continuous then problem (6.25) has a unique solution $u \in U$ in the representation sense for any $\xi \in V$. For this solution,
\[
u = L_T (I - Q)^{-1} \xi
\]
and
\[
\|u\|_U \leq C \|\xi\|_V,
\]
where $C > 0$ does not depend on $\xi$.
Proof of Lemma 6.5. Clearly, \( u \in U \) is the solution of problem (2.1)-(2.3) if and only if
\[
\begin{align*}
u &= L_T u(\cdot, T), \quad (6.27) \\
u(\cdot, T) - \Gamma u &= \xi. \quad (6.28)
\end{align*}
\]
Since \( \Gamma u = Q u(\cdot, T) \), equation (6.28) can be rewritten as
\[
u(\cdot, T) - Q u(\cdot, T) = \xi. \quad (6.29)
\]
By the continuity of \((I - Q)^{-1}\), equation (6.29) can be rewritten as
\[
u(\cdot, T) = (I - Q)^{-1} \xi.
\]
Therefore, equations (6.27)-(6.28) imply that
\[
u = L_T \varphi + L_T u(\cdot, T) = L_T (I - Q)^{-1} \xi.
\]
Further, let us show that if (6.26) holds then equations (6.27)-(6.28) hold. Let \( u \) be defined by (6.26). Since \( u = L_T u(\cdot, T) \), it follows that \( u(\cdot, T) = (I - Q)^{-1} \xi \). Hence
\[
u(\cdot, T) - Q u(\cdot, T) = \xi,
\]
i.e., \( u(\cdot, T) - \Gamma L_T u(\cdot, T) = \xi \). Hence
\[
u(\cdot, T) - \Gamma L_T u(\cdot, T) = \xi.
\]
This means that (6.27)-(6.28) hold. Then the proof of Lemma 6.5 follows. \( \square \)

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let \( \|Q\|_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}} \) be the norm of the operator \( Q = \Gamma L_T : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V} \). By (2.11), we have for \( u = L_T \Phi \) that
\[
\sup_{s \in [0,T]} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{V}}.
\]
Hence
\[
\|L_T \Phi\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{V}}. \quad (6.30)
\]
By the assumptions on \( \Gamma \), it follows that \( \|\Gamma u\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq c \|u\|_{U} \), where \( c < 1 \) if Condition 4.2(ii) is satisfied. It follows that if Condition 4.2(ii) holds then
\[
\|Q\|_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}} \leq c < 1. \quad (6.31)
\]
Let us assume that Condition 4.2(i) is satisfied.

Let \( u = \mathcal{L}_T \Phi \), \( s \in [0, T] \). Let \( y(t) = y^{x,s}(t) \) be the solution of Ito equation (2.7) with the initial condition \( y(s) = x \). By (2.11), it follows that

\[
\|u(\cdot, s)\|_V = \text{ess sup}_{x, \omega} \mathbb{E}_x \gamma^{x,s}(T) \Phi(y^{x,s}(T)) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau^{x,s} \geq T\}} \\
\leq \text{ess sup}_{x, \omega} \left[ \mathbb{E}_x \gamma^{x,s}_2(\tau^{x,s} \geq T) \right]^{1/2} \text{ess sup}_{x, \omega} \left[ \mathbb{E}_x \Phi(y^{x,s}(T))^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
\leq \text{ess sup}_{x, \omega} \left[ \mathbb{E}_x \gamma^{x,s}_2(\tau^{x,s} \geq T) \right]^{1/2} \|\Phi\|_V = \text{ess sup}_{x, \omega} \mathbb{P}_s(\tau^{x,s} \geq T)^{1/2} \|\Phi\|_V.
\]

If \( s < \theta \) then \( \{\tau^{x,s} \geq T\} \subseteq \{\tau^{x,s} \geq s + \vartheta\} \), where \( \vartheta \triangleq T - \theta > 0 \). Hence

\[
\|u(\cdot, s)\|_V \leq \text{ess sup}_{x, \omega} \mathbb{P}_s(\tau^{x,s} \geq s + \vartheta)^{1/2} \|\Phi\|_V, \ s \leq \theta.
\]

It follows that

\[
\|u(\cdot, s)\|_V \leq \nu^{1/2}\|\Phi\|_V, \ s \leq \theta
\]

and

\[
\|\mathbb{I}_{\{s \leq \theta\}} u\|_V \leq \nu^{1/2}\|\Phi\|_V.
\]

By Condition 4.2(ii) on \( \Gamma \), it follows that

\[
\|Q\Phi\|_V = \|\Gamma u\|_V = \|\Gamma(\mathbb{I}_{\{s \leq \theta\}} u)\|_V \leq \nu^{1/2}\|\Phi\|_V, \ s \leq \theta, \ u = \mathcal{L}_T \Phi.
\]

It follows that if Condition 4.2(i) holds then

\[
\|Q\|_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}} \leq \nu^{1/2} < 1. \tag{6.32}
\]

By (6.31) and (6.32), it follows that the operator \((I - Q)^{-1} : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}\) is bounded. Let

\[
u = \mathcal{L}_T(I - Q)^{-1} \xi. \tag{6.33}
\]

By the assumptions on \( \Gamma \) and by (6.30), it follows that \( \xi + \mathcal{T} \varphi = \xi \in \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{V} \). Hence \((I - Q)^{-1} \xi \in \mathcal{V} \). By the properties of \( \mathcal{L}_T \), it follows that \( u \in U \). Similarly to the proof of Lemma 6.5, it can be shown that \( u \) is a solution of problem (2.1)-(2.3) in the representation sense. Estimate 4.1 follows from the continuity of the corresponding operators in (6.33). Then the proof of Theorem 4.1 follows. □

**Proof of Theorem 5.1** Without a loss of generality, we assume that \( \mathbf{P} \) is a martingale probability measure, i.e., \( S(t) \) is a martingale and \( dS(t) = \sigma(t)S(t)dw(t) \). Assume that the
terminal wealth is defined as $X(T) = H(S(T \wedge \tau), T \wedge \tau)$. By the Martingale Representation Theorem, there exists $\psi(t)$ such that

$$H(S(\tau_T), \tau_T) = \mathbb{E}H(S(\tau_T), \tau_T) + \int_0^T \psi(t)dw(t) = \mathbb{E}H(S(\tau_T), \tau_T) + \int_0^T \gamma(t)dS(t),$$

where $\tau_T = T \wedge \tau$ and $\gamma(t) = \psi(t)S(t)^{-1}\sigma(t)^{-1}$. Therefore, $X(t) \overset{\Delta}{=} \mathbb{E}\{H(S(\tau_T), \tau_T)|\mathcal{F}_t\}$ is the wealth for the self-financing strategy such that $X(0) = \mathbb{E}H(S(\tau_T), \tau_T)$.

By the linearity of $\ell$ and martingale property of $S(t)$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\ell(S(\tau_T))|\mathcal{F}_t\} = \ell(S(t \wedge \tau)).$$

Since $u$ is the solution of problem (2.1)-(2.3) in the representation sense, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\{u(S(\tau_T), \tau_T)|\mathcal{F}_t\} = u(S(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau).$$

Hence $X(t) = H(S(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau)$.

By the choice of $u$ and $\ell$, conditions (5.3)-(5.4) are satisfied for this $X(t)$.

Let us show that condition (5.5) is satisfied for this $X(t)$. If $\tau > T$ then, by the definitions,

$$X(T) - \kappa_1 \int_0^\theta k(t)dt - \kappa_2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^\theta k(t)X(t)dt = H(S(T), T) - \kappa_1 \int_0^\theta k(t)H(S(t), t)dt - \kappa_2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^\theta k(t)H(S(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau)dt$$

$$= u(S(T), T) + \ell(S(T)) - \kappa_1 \int_0^\theta k(t)u(S(t), t)dt - \kappa_1 \int_0^\theta k(t)\ell(S(t))dt - \kappa_2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^\theta k(t)u(S(t \wedge \tau), t \wedge \tau)dt - \kappa_2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^\theta k(t)\ell(S(t \wedge \tau))dt$$

$$= u(S(T), T) - (\Gamma u)(S(T)) + \zeta(S(T)) - \xi(S(T)) = \zeta(S(T)).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1. $\square$
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