

# Solving A Class of Mean-Field LQG Problems

Yun Li, Qingshuo Song, Fuke Wu, George Yin

## Abstract

In this work, we study a class of mean-field linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) problems. Under suitable conditions, explicit solutions of the distribution-dependent optimal control problems are obtained. Riccati systems are derived by directly solving the associated master equations. Some extensions on controls with partial observations are also considered.

## Index Terms

Controlled diffusion, LQG control, McKean-Vlasov equation, partially observable system.

## I. INTRODUCTION

We consider a one-dimensional LQG problem. Suppose the controlled process  $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$  is the solution of a stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = (A_t X_t + B_t u_t)dt + \sigma_t dW_t, \quad (1)$$

where  $A_t$ ,  $B_t$ , and  $\sigma_t$  are suitable functions of  $t$ ,  $W_t$  is a standard real-valued Brownian motion, and  $u_t$  is the control. The objective is to minimize an expected cost function of the form

$$J(x, u) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^T (R_t X_t^2 + Q_t u_t^2) dt \right] + \hat{g}(X_T),$$

where  $R_t X_t^2 + Q_t u_t^2$  is the running cost rate and  $\hat{g}(X_T)$  is the terminal cost.

If the terminal cost is  $\hat{g}(X_T) = \mathbb{E}[X_T^2]$ , it is the classical LQG problem; see, for example, Fleming and Rishel [4] and Yong and Zhou [19], among others. There is a vast literature for LQG control problems under complete observations as well as partial observations; see for example, [4], [7], [8], [19] and related works in [3], [9], [11], [12], among others. It is now standard that the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equations can be solved by the associated Riccati equations provided if the cost function is quadratic in the states and controls.

Y. Li is with Huazhong University of Science and Technology, (li\_yun@hust.edu.cn). The research of this author was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.61873320).

Q. Song is with Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and City University of Hong Kong, (qsong@wpi.edu). The research of this author was supported in part by the RGC of Hong Kong CityU (11201518).

F. Wu is with Huazhong University of Science and Technology, (wufuke@hust.edu.cn). The research of this author was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.61873320).

G. Yin is with the University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269-1009, USA, (gyin@uconn.edu). The research of this author was supported in part by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant FA9550-18-1-0268.

The authors are grateful to Professor Peter Caines for several stimulating discussions on this work during his visit to Hong Kong City University in summer 2019.

In this work, we study the control problem with terminal cost given by a function not of the state but the distribution  $\mu_T$  of the terminal state  $X_T$ . For instance, consider  $\hat{g}(X_T) = g(\mu_T) = (\mathbb{E}[X_T])^2$ . Then it does not belong to traditional setup of LQG problem. As noted in [17] and [1], this problem belongs to the class of time-inconsistent control problems. Indeed, in such a problem, the dynamic programming principle (DPP) is not applicable.

An extensive literature is devoted to time-inconsistent control problems; see [2], [18], [16], [1], [21] and the references therein. It is worth mentioning because of no time-consistent optimal controls, the focus in the above references is to find “locally optimal” time-consistent controls, which is referred to as “equilibrium solution”.

We emphasize that the optimal solutions are strictly different from the equilibrium solution discussed in the aforementioned references. For the optimal solution, [17] provides Riccati system based on decoupling technique for FBSDE; see also Example 1.2 of [18], Section 6.7 of [6], [13], and [20].

In contrast to the aforementioned works, our aim is to obtain explicit solutions by solving its associated master equation directly in Section III. The solution will provide us with insight on the dependence of the solution on the associated distribution. The key is to identify the time-inconsistent problem as a LQ control problem in a suitable sense, where linear and quadratic structure is referred to the functions with domains being suitable measure spaces. Similar to the approach of traditional LQG, we also guess the solution of the master equation as a quadratic function of the associate measure. This approach successfully reduces originally infinite dimensional master equation to a finite dimensional Riccati system after explicit computations using L-derivatives; see Section II and [5], [6] for a brief introduction of L-derivatives. Using our new approach, Example 2 in this paper recovers Example 1.2 of [18]. As a result, the optimal trajectory is a Gaussian process, which justifies the underlying LQ problem being linear quadratic Gaussian.

Section IV is concerned with an extension of mean-field LQG in which the system is only partially observable. The optimal control can be obtained by a separation principle to convert the partially observed system to a fully observed one. Finally, we conclude the paper with a brief discussion in Section V.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Polynomials and Derivatives on Measure Space

Suppose  $\mu$  is a distribution on Borel sets  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is a real-valued function. We write

$$\langle f, \mu \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \mu(dx),$$

if the integral exists. We denote by

$$[\mu]_m := \langle x^m, \mu \rangle$$

the  $m$ th moment for any  $m \geq 1$ . If a distribution  $\mu$  has a finite  $m$ th moment  $[\mu]_m$ , then we write it as  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_m$ . For instance, for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , a Dirac measure  $\delta_x$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_m$  for any  $m \geq 1$ , since  $[\delta_x]_m = x^m$  holds.

Polynomials on  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are defined as a linear combination of the monomials defined in this below.

- 1) A 1-monomial is given by a function in the form of

$$f(\mu) = \langle \phi, \mu \rangle$$

for some appropriate function  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ .

2) An  $n$ -monomial is a product of  $n$  many 1-monomials,

$$f(\mu) = \prod_{i=1}^n \langle \phi_i, \mu \rangle,$$

for some coefficients  $\phi_i$ .

We use a notion of L-derivative on the functions of probability measures in a lifted space. We summarize below a few useful results to be used in this paper.

1) The derivative of 1-monomial becomes  $\mu$ -invariant,

$$\partial_\mu \langle \phi, \mu \rangle = \phi'(x).$$

2) Chain rule and product rules can be used as usual, which yields that the derivative of  $n$ -monomial becomes  $(n - 1)$ -monomial. For instance, we have

$$\partial_\mu ([\mu]_m)^n = n[\mu]_m^{n-1} m x^{m-1}.$$

Note that the notion of L-derivative  $\partial_\mu f$  is taken from [6], which is equivalent to the intrinsic derivative  $D_\mu f$  introduced by [5], that is,

$$\partial_\mu f(\mu, x) = D_\mu f(\mu, x) = \partial_x \frac{\delta f}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x).$$

### B. Verification Theorem

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$  be a complete filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions, where  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is the filtration on which there exists an  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted Brownian motion  $W$ . Given a controlled SDE

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t b(s, X_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s, \quad (2)$$

we denote by  $\mu_t$  the probability law of  $X_t$  and consider the cost function

$$J(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \ell(t, X_t, u_t) dt \right] + g(\mu_T). \quad (3)$$

In the above,  $u$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_t$  progressively measurable control process,  $\ell(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  is the running cost function, and  $g(\cdot)$  is the terminal cost. Our objective is to minimize the cost function  $J$  over an admissible control space  $\mathcal{U}$ , i.e.,

$$V^* = J(u^*) \leq J(u), \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}. \quad (4)$$

*Definition 1:* A random process  $u : [0, T] \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be admissible if  $u$  together with  $(X, J)$  satisfies (2)-(3) and

$$u_t = a(t, \mu_t, X_t) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T] \quad (5)$$

for some controller  $a$  in the feedback form of  $(t, \mu_t, X_t)$ . The collection of all such admissible controls is denoted by  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Since the terminal cost is a function of a measure, we lift the optimal value  $V^*$  to a value function of the form  $V(t, \mu)$  such that  $V^* = V(0, \delta_x)$  accordingly. The verification theorem says that under sufficient regularity, the value function  $V(t, \mu)$  solves the following master equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{a \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})} \langle H(t, \cdot, \mu, v, a(\cdot)), \mu \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^2 \langle \partial_{x\mu} v(t, \mu, \cdot), \mu \rangle + \partial_t v(t, \mu) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with the terminal condition

$$v(T, \mu) = g(\mu), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}(D)$  is the collections of all real-valued measurable mappings on a metric space  $D$ , and  $H$  is given as

$$H(t, x, \mu, v, a) = b(t, x, a) \partial_\mu v(t, \mu, x) + \ell(t, x, a).$$

Throughout the rest of the paper, we use the convention  $f(t, \mu)(x) = f(t, \mu, x)$ . To proceed, we say a function  $f : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is partial  $\mathcal{C}^{1,2}$  if there exists continuous derivatives  $\partial_t f, \partial_\mu f, \partial_{x\mu} f : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2 \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . For convenience, we denote by  $\mathcal{C}_I$  all partial  $\mathcal{C}^{1,2}$  functions  $f$  satisfying a growth condition  $\langle |\partial_{x\mu} f|^2, \mu \rangle \leq C(1 + [\mu]_2^m)$  for some  $C, m > 0$ . Recalling the chain rule [6, Proposition 5.102], a function  $f \in \mathcal{C}_I$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} f(t, \mu_t) &= f(0, \mu_0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\partial_\mu f(s, \mu_s, X_s) b(s, X_s, u_s)] ds \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\sigma_s^2 \partial_{x\mu} f(s, \mu_s, X_s)] ds + \int_0^t \partial_t f(s, \mu_s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

*Proposition 2:* Let  $b$  and  $\ell$  be Lipschitz continuous in  $(t, x)$ . Suppose there exists a solution  $v \in \mathcal{C}_I$  of the master equation (6)-(7) and a feedback form  $a^* : (0, T) \times \mathcal{P}_2 \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the optimality condition

$$H(t, x, \mu, v, a^*(t, \mu, x)) = \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} H(t, x, \mu, v, a), \quad (8)$$

for all  $(t, \mu, x) \in (0, T) \times \mathcal{P}_2 \times \mathbb{R}$ . In addition, if there exists an optimal pair  $(X^*, u^*)$  of state trajectory and admissible control satisfying

$$u_t^* = a^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*),$$

then the optimal value is

$$V^* = v(0, \delta_x).$$

PROOF: Applying the chain rule to the solution  $v$  of the master equation, for any control  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} v(t, \mu_t) &= g(\mu_T) - \int_t^T \partial_t v(s, \mu_s) ds \\ &- \int_t^T \mathbb{E}[\partial_\mu v(s, \mu_s, X_s) b(s, X_s, u_s)] ds \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \sigma_s^2 \mathbb{E}[\partial_{x\mu} v(s, \mu_s, X_s)] ds \end{aligned}$$

Since  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v$  solves (6), there exists feedback form  $u_t = a(t, \mu_t, X_t)$  and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \langle H(s, \cdot, \mu_s, v, a(s, \mu_s, \cdot)), \mu_s \rangle \} + \\ & \frac{1}{2} \sigma_s^2 \langle \partial_{x\mu} v(s, \mu_s, \cdot), \mu_s \rangle + \partial_t v(s, \mu_s) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with the definition of  $H(\cdot)$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial_\mu v(s, \mu_s, X_s) b(s, X_s, u_s)] + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_s^2 \mathbb{E}[\partial_{x\mu} v(s, \mu_s, X_s)] + \partial_t v(s, \mu_s) \geq -\mathbb{E}[\ell(s, X_s, u_s)].$$

This implies that

$$v(0, \mu_0) \leq g(\mu_T) + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\ell(t, X_t, u_t)] dt = J(u)$$

for any control  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and initial distribution  $\mu_0$ . The other direction  $V^* = J(u^*) \leq J(u)$  is straightforward.  $\square$

The verification theorem has been studied in various forms for McKean-Vlasov control problems, for instance, Proposition 6.32 of [6]. Proposition 2 is tailor-made for our calculation compared to Proposition 6.32 of [6] in that Proposition 2 characterizes  $v(t, \mu)$  while the latter does the verification of its kernel  $V(t, x, \mu)$ . In this sense, Proposition 2 can be considered as a generalization of Proposition 5.108 of [6] with general cost structure. It is also worth mentioning that the  $\inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} H(\cdot)$  is used for the optimality condition (8) to simplify our calculation, but it can be replaced by  $\inf_{a \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})} \langle H(\cdot), \mu \rangle$  for a general purpose. As mentioned, our main objective in this paper is to obtain explicit solutions of the control problems.

### III. LQG: FULLY OBSERVABLE CASE

#### A. Setup

We consider the following simplified version of mean-field LQG problem. It appears to be more instructive to choose a simpler formulation so that we can bring out the main feature of the underlying problem. For general setup (2), (3), and (4), the coefficients or the functions are given as

$$b(t, x, u) = A_t x + B_t u, \quad \ell(t, x, u) = Q_t u^2, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mu_T) &= D_1 [\mu_T]_2 + D_2 [\mu_T]_1^2 \\ &= D_1 \mathbb{E}[X_T^2] + D_2 (\mathbb{E}[X_T])^2, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for some continuous and bounded  $A_t, B_t, Q_t$  and constants  $D_1, D_2$ . Note that  $g$  is polynomial of degree 2 in  $\mu$ .

*Example 1:* (A standard LQG.) If

$$A \equiv 0, B \equiv 1, \sigma \equiv 1, Q \equiv 1, D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, \quad (11)$$

then the problem is a standard LQG problem. Note that terminal cost  $g(\mu_T) = [\mu_T]_2$  is linear in measure. In this case, the dynamic programming principle is applicable and its HJB can be explicitly solved.

*Example 2:* This problem is taken from [18]. Let

$$A \equiv 0, B \equiv 1, \sigma \equiv 1, Q \equiv 1, D_2 = 1, D_1 = 0. \quad (12)$$

Note that, the terminal cost  $g(\mu_T) = [\mu_T]_1^2$  is a quadratic function in  $\mu_T$  and the HJB does not hold.

### B. Semi-Explicit Solution in Terms of Riccati Equations

In this section, we solve explicitly the master equation (6)-(7) and apply Proposition 2 to the control problem.

(A1)  $Q_t > 0$  for all  $t$ .

With parameters given by (9), the Hamiltonian in the optimality condition (8) is quadratic in action  $a$ ,

$$H(t, x, \mu, v, a) = (A_t x + B_t a) \partial_\mu v(t, \mu, x) + Q_t a^2.$$

Since  $Q_t > 0$ , the infimum over  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  is attained at

$$a^*(t, \mu, x) = -\frac{B_t \partial_\mu v(t, \mu, x)}{2Q_t}$$

with its minimum

$$\inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} H(t, x, \mu, v, a) = A_t x \partial_\mu v - \frac{B_t^2}{4Q_t} |\partial_\mu v|^2.$$

Therefore, master equation (6) becomes

$$\langle L_0 v(t, \mu, \cdot), \mu \rangle + \partial_t v(t, \mu) = 0, \quad (13)$$

where the operator  $L_0$  is defined by

$$L_0 v := \left( A_t x \partial_\mu v - \frac{B_t^2}{4Q_t} |\partial_\mu v|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^2 \partial_{x\mu} v \right).$$

Similar to the traditional approach in LQG, we start with a guess of the value function in a quadratic function form

$$v(t, \mu) = \phi_1(t) [\mu]_2 + \phi_2(t) [\mu]_1^2 + \phi_3(t).$$

Then we use the method of un-determined ‘‘coefficients’’ to determine the three dimensional vector function  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$ . One can directly write the derivative as

$$\partial_\mu v(t, \mu, x) = 2\phi_1(t)x + 2\phi_2(t)[\mu]_1,$$

which is a polynomial in  $x$ . Moreover, we have

$$\partial_t v(t, \mu) = \phi_1'(t) [\mu]_2 + \phi_2'(t) [\mu]_1^2 + \phi_3'(t),$$

and

$$\partial_{x\mu} v(t, \mu, x) = 2\phi_1(t).$$

By plugging the derivatives in (13) and combining the like terms, the master equation yields that

$$0 = [\mu]_2 L_1 \phi(t) + [\mu]_1^2 L_2 \phi(t) + L_3 \phi(t), \quad (14)$$

where  $L = [L_1, L_2, L_3] : C^1((0, T), \mathbb{R}^3) \mapsto C((0, T), \mathbb{R}^3)$  are operators acted on the vector function  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 \phi(t) &= \phi_1'(t) - \frac{B_t^2}{Q_t} \phi_1^2(t) + 2A_t \phi_1(t), \\ L_2 \phi(t) &= \phi_2'(t) - \frac{B_t^2}{Q_t} \phi_2^2(t) - \frac{2B_t^2}{Q_t} \phi_1(t) \phi_2(t) + 2A_t \phi_2(t), \\ L_3 \phi(t) &= \phi_3'(t) + \sigma_t^2 \phi_1(t). \end{aligned}$$

Since (14) holds for all  $\mu$  together with terminal condition, we have the following system of ODEs in terms of the first-order differential operator  $L$

$$L\phi(t) = 0, \forall t \in (0, T), \text{ with } \phi(T) = (D_1, D_2, 0). \quad (15)$$

Note that  $L\phi$  is a linear combination of  $\phi'(\cdot)$  and quadratic functions in  $\phi$ . Such a system  $L\phi = 0$  is referred to as a system of Riccati equations. One can easily verify the growth condition for  $\partial_{x\mu}v$ , and carry out verification theorem to conclude the following result. Furthermore, one can readily verify that the optimal path follows Gaussian process.

*Theorem 3:* Suppose  $Q_t > 0$  for all  $t$ , and there exists  $\phi \in C^1((0, T), \mathbb{R}^3)$  for Riccati system (15). Then the pair  $(v, a^*)$  given by

$$v(t, \mu) = \phi_1(t)[\mu]_2 + \phi_2(t)[\mu]_1^2 + \phi_3(t),$$

and

$$a^*(t, \mu, x) = -\frac{B_t}{Q_t}(\phi_1(t)x + \phi_2(t)[\mu]_1)$$

solves the master equation (6)-(7) and the optimality condition (8). Moreover, if  $J(u^*)$  of (3) with parameter sets (9)-(10) is well defined via  $(X^*, u^*)$  satisfying (2)-(3) and

$$u_t^* = a^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*),$$

then  $(X^*, u^*)$  are optimal trajectory and optimal control, and the optimal value is

$$V^* = v(0, \delta_x).$$

### C. Examples: Explicit Solutions

We use Theorem 3 to solve both traditional LQG Example 1 and mean-field LQG Example 2. In both cases, the Riccati system (15) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1' &= \phi_1^2, \\ \phi_2' &= \phi_2^2 + 2\phi_1\phi_2, \\ \phi_3' &= -\phi_1, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

1) *Solution of Example 1:* This problem can be solved using traditional LQG approach; see [19]. To use Theorem 3, one can solve (16) with terminal condition

$$\phi_1(T) = 1, \phi_2(T) = \phi_3(T) = 0.$$

The solution for this Riccati system can be written as follows. For all  $t \in (0, T)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2(t) &= 0, \\ \phi_1(t) &= \frac{1}{1+T-t}, \\ \phi_3(t) &= \ln(1+T-t), \end{aligned}$$

which yields the optimal strategy

$$u_t^* = -\frac{X_t^*}{1+T-t},$$

and the value function

$$v(t, \mu) = \frac{[\mu]_2}{1+T-t} + \ln(1+T-t).$$

Thus, the optimal value is

$$V^* = v(0, \delta_x) = \frac{x^2}{1+T} + \ln(1+T).$$

2) *Solution of Example 2:* The solution given by [18] is attained by decoupling FBSDEs and we recover it using Theorem 3. We solve the Riccati system (16) but with different terminal conditions

$$\phi_2(T) = 1, \phi_1(T) = \phi_3(T) = 0.$$

The solution for this Riccati system can be written as: For all  $t \in (0, T)$

$$\phi_1(t) = \phi_3(t) = 0, \text{ and } \phi_2(t) = \frac{1}{1+T-t}.$$

Hence, the optimal strategy is

$$u_t^* = -\frac{\mathbb{E}[X_t^*]}{1+T-t}$$

and the value function is

$$v(t, \mu) = \frac{1}{1+T-t} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mu(dx) \right)^2,$$

which implies the optimal value

$$V^* = \frac{x^2}{1+T}.$$

#### IV. MEAN-FIELD LQG: CONTROLLED SYSTEMS UNDER PARTIAL OBSERVATIONS

The following interesting question considered in [15] motivates our second example. Given a  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  progressively measurable process  $u : [0, T] \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , we say  $u \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}$  if  $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T |u_s|^2 ds] < \infty$ . A deterministic function  $u : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $u \in L^2([0, T])$ , if  $\int_0^T |u_s|^2 ds < \infty$ . Note that both  $L^2_{\mathbb{F}}$  and  $L^2([0, T])$  are both Hilbert spaces. We ask the question:

- How does the optimal value of (2)-(4) change if  $L^2_{\mathbb{F}}$  is replaced by  $L^2([0, T])$ ?

Roughly speaking, the question can be interpreted as: What is the infimum that can be achieved if the control  $u$  is only allowed to be a deterministic process instead of a random one? It is obvious that the optimal value achieved in the space of deterministic controls is no less than the value with random controls due to  $L^2([0, T]) \subset L^2_{\mathbb{F}}$ . In what follows, we consider more general questions.

##### A. Setup

Recall that we are working with  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$ . Suppose that on this filtered probability space, there exist two independent Brownian motions  $\hat{W}$  and  $\tilde{W}$ , respectively. For simplicity, we assume  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}^{\hat{W}} \times \mathbb{F}^{\tilde{W}}$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T^{\hat{W}} \times \mathcal{F}_T^{\tilde{W}}$ , where  $\mathbb{F}^{\hat{W}} = (\mathcal{F}_t^{\hat{W}})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  and  $\mathbb{F}^{\tilde{W}} = (\mathcal{F}_t^{\tilde{W}})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  are the filtrations generated by  $\hat{W}$  and  $\tilde{W}$ , respectively.

Let  $\hat{\sigma}, \tilde{\sigma}, \hat{\eta}, \tilde{\eta}$  be nonnegative constants satisfying

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 + \tilde{\sigma}^2 = 1, \hat{\eta}^2 + \tilde{\eta}^2 = 1.$$

A generic player with its initial state  $X_s$  at time  $s$  has its evolution under control  $u$  in the form of

$$X_t = X_s + \int_s^t u_r dr + \int_s^t \hat{\sigma} d\hat{W}_r + \int_s^t \tilde{\sigma} d\tilde{W}_r. \quad (17)$$

For simplicity, we require  $X_s$  to have a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(x, s)$  given by

$$X_s = x + \hat{\eta}\hat{W}_s + \tilde{\eta}\tilde{W}_s. \quad (18)$$

The cost functional to be minimized is given by

$$J(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^T u_r^2 dr \right] + D_1[\mu_T]_2 + D_2[\mu_T]_1^2. \quad (19)$$

The distinction of the current problem compared with the previous control problem is the following crucial point. Though the player wants to minimize the cost functional, he or she cannot directly access to the state  $X_t$  due to the lack of the knowledge for  $\tilde{W}_t$  and hence for  $W_t$ . Instead, he or she is up to design a controller using the prediction process

$$\hat{X}_t = \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_t^{\hat{W}}]. \quad (20)$$

We denote by  $\hat{\mu}_t$  the distribution induced by  $\hat{X}_t$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mu}_t = \mathbb{P}^{\hat{X}_t^{-1}}$ . Indeed,  $\hat{X}_t$  can be written as

$$\hat{X}_t = x + \hat{\eta}\hat{W}_s + \int_s^t u_r dr + \int_s^t \hat{\sigma} d\hat{W}_r, \quad (21)$$

Now we are ready to define the optimal value under partial observation by

$$V^* = \inf_{u \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}} J(u), \quad (22)$$

where the control space is defined as

*Definition 4:* A random process  $u : [0, T] \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be admissible if  $u \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}$  together with  $(X, J)$  satisfies (17)-(19) and

$$u_t = a(t, \hat{\mu}_t, \hat{X}_t) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T] \quad (23)$$

for some controller  $a$ . The collection of all such admissible controls is denoted by  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ .

Note that if  $u \in L^2([0, T])$ , then one can verify with  $a(t, \mu, x) = u_t$  that  $u \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}$  by definition. We remark that if  $s = 0$  and  $\hat{\sigma} = 0$ , then  $\hat{X}_t$  of (21) is deterministic,  $L^2([0, T]) = \hat{\mathcal{U}}$  holds.

### B. Semi-Explicit Solution: Separation Principle

We use the separation principle in filtering theory. The treatment of the problem is outlined below.

Step 1: Let  $\hat{X}$  be the prediction of  $X$  given by (20) and  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $P$  are the error term and variance of the error term:

$$\mathcal{E}_t = X_t - \hat{X}_t, \quad P_t = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t^2].$$

Then,  $\mathcal{E}$ , and  $P$  satisfy

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \tilde{\eta}\tilde{W}_s + \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{W}_t - \tilde{W}_s),$$

and

$$P_t = \tilde{\eta}^2 s + \tilde{\sigma}^2(t - s).$$

Recall that  $\hat{\mu}_t$  to denote the distribution of  $\hat{X}_t$ . Owing to

$$[\mu_T]_1 = [\hat{\mu}_T]_1, \quad [\mu_T]_2 = [\hat{\mu}_T]_2 + P_T,$$

we can rewrite the cost by

$$J(u) = \hat{J}(u) + D_1 P_T,$$

where

$$\hat{J}(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^T u_r^2 dr \right] + D_1 [\hat{\mu}_T]_2 + D_2 [\hat{\mu}_T]_1^2. \quad (24)$$

Step 2: Since  $P_T$  is independent to the control  $u$ , to minimize  $J(u)$ , it is sufficient to minimize  $\hat{J}(u)$ . Next we can apply Theorem 3 with parameters

$$A \equiv 0, \quad B \equiv 1, \quad \sigma_t = \hat{\sigma}, \quad Q \equiv 1$$

for

$$\hat{V}^* = \inf_{u \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}} \hat{J}(u)$$

with  $\hat{J}$  of (24) subject to the process  $\hat{X}$  of (21). This yields the Riccati system

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_1 &= \phi_1^2, \\ \phi'_2 &= \phi_2^2 + 2\phi_1\phi_2, \\ \phi'_3 &= -\hat{\sigma}^2\phi_1, \\ \phi_1(T) &= D_1, \quad \phi_2(T) = D_2, \quad \phi_3(T) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Now we summarize the result in the following proposition.

*Proposition 5:* Suppose  $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) \in C^1([0, T], \mathbb{R}^3)$  solves Riccati system (25). Then, the optimal strategy for the control problem (22) is

$$u_t^* = -\phi_1(t)\hat{X}_t^* - \phi_2(t)\mathbb{E}[\hat{X}_t^*], \quad \forall t \in (s, T),$$

and the value is

$$\begin{aligned} V^* &= \phi_1(s)(x^2 + \hat{\eta}^2 s) + \phi_2(s)x^2 \\ &\quad + \phi_3(s) + D_1(\hat{\eta}^2 s + \hat{\sigma}^2(T - s)). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

PROOF: By Theorem 3, the solution of the master equation  $\hat{v}^*$  and the optimized controller  $\hat{a}^*$  associated to  $\hat{J}$  of (24) and the state prediction  $\hat{X}$  of (21) are given by

$$\hat{v}^*(t, \hat{\mu}) = \phi_1(t)[\hat{\mu}]_2 + \phi_2(t)[\hat{\mu}]_1^2 + \phi_3(t),$$

and

$$\hat{a}^*(t, \hat{\mu}, \hat{x}) = -\phi_1(t)\hat{x} - \phi_2(t)[\hat{\mu}]_1.$$

Moreover, the strategy

$$\begin{aligned} u_t^* &= \hat{a}^*(t, \hat{\mu}_t, \hat{X}_t^*) \\ &= -\phi_1(t)\hat{X}_t^* - \phi_2(t)\mathbb{E}[\hat{X}_t^*], \quad \forall t \in (s, T) \end{aligned}$$

makes  $\hat{X}^*$  of (21) well defined as a Gaussian process. So,  $u^*$  given above is optimal and the corresponding value for (24) is given by  $\hat{V}^* = \hat{v}^*(s, \hat{\mu}_s)$ , and finally the value of (22) is

$$V^* = \hat{V}^* + D_1 P_T,$$

which yields the desired conclusion.  $\square$

### C. Two Examples

*Example 3:* (linear terminal cost in measure) With  $(D_1, D_2) = (1, 0)$ , we solve the optimization of (22) defined through partially observed system (17), (18), (19). Solving the Riccati system (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(t) &= \frac{1}{1+T-t}, \\ \phi_2 &\equiv 0, \\ \phi_3(t) &= \hat{\sigma}^2 \ln(1+T-t).\end{aligned}$$

Then, the optimal strategy is

$$u_t^* = -\frac{\hat{X}_t^*}{1+T-t}, \quad \forall t \in (s, T)$$

and the value is

$$\begin{aligned}V^* &= \frac{1}{1+T-s}(x^2 + \hat{\eta}^2 s) \\ &\quad + \hat{\sigma}^2 \ln(1+T-s) + \tilde{\eta}^2 s + \tilde{\sigma}^2(T-s).\end{aligned}$$

It is noted that the above value with  $s = 0$  is

$$V^* \Big|_{s=0} = \frac{x^2}{1+T} + \hat{\sigma}^2 \ln(1+T) + \tilde{\sigma}^2 T,$$

Moreover, if  $\hat{\sigma} = 1$  and  $\tilde{\sigma} = 0$ , then the above value recovers the solution of fully observable traditional LQG; see Example 1 in Section III-C1.

*Example 4:* (quadratic terminal cost in measure) With  $(D_1, D_2) = (0, 1)$ , we solve the optimization of (22) defined through (17), (18), (19). Solving the Riccati system (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_2(t) &= \frac{1}{1+T-t}, \\ \phi_1 &\equiv 0, \\ \phi_3 &\equiv 0.\end{aligned}$$

Then, the optimal strategy is given by

$$u_t^* = -\frac{\mathbb{E}[\hat{X}_t^*]}{1+T-t}, \quad \forall t \in (s, T)$$

and the value is

$$V^* = \frac{x^2}{1+T-s}.$$

Note that the above value with  $s = 0$  and  $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\eta} = 1$  recovers the solution of fully observable mean field LQG; see Example 2 of Section III-C2. Interestingly, the value is invariant with respect to the observability, i.e.,  $\partial_{\hat{\sigma}} V^* = 0$ .

The computations above both agree with our intuition; the value is non-increasing with respect to  $\hat{\sigma}$ . Interestingly, as  $\hat{\sigma}$  increases, the value is strictly decreasing for Example 3, while stays constant for Example 4. With that being said, observation of the noise does not help in minimization for the proper quadratic terminal cost.

## V. SUMMARY

This paper focuses on mean-field LQGs with some examples. These simplified frameworks make it possible to obtain some explicit solutions that provide us with valuable insight to a potentially complicated system. For instance, Proposition 5 along with Example 3 and 4 clearly indicates that the value function of a partially observable system depends not only on the distribution  $\mu_s$  of the initial state  $X_s$ , but on its joint distribution of  $(\hat{X}_s, X_s - \hat{X}_s)$  in the observable probability space and its orthogonal probability space. Thus, to characterize the value function in the form of  $V(t, \mu)$  depending only on the time and initial distribution is not sufficient (cf. (4.7) in [14]).

The result can be extended to multidimensional problems with no essential difficulty but more complex notation. For instance, we consider the process  $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and the cost given by

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= (A_t X_t + B_t u_t) dt + \sigma_t dW_t, \\ J(u) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T u_t^\top Q_t u_t dt \right] + g(\mu_T) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$g(\mu_T) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x^\top D_1 x \mu_T(dx) + [\mu_T]_1^\top D_2 [\mu_T]_1.$$

Solving the master equation yields the following Riccati system:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1'(t) - \phi_1^\top(t) B_t Q_t^{-1} B_t^\top \phi_1(t) + 2A_t^\top \phi_1(t) &= 0, \\ \phi_2'(t) - 2\phi_2^\top(t) B_t Q_t^{-1} B_t^\top \phi_1(t) - \\ \phi_2^\top(t) B_t Q_t^{-1} B_t^\top \phi_2(t) + 2A_t^\top \phi_2(t) &= 0, \\ \phi_3'(t) + \text{tr}[\sigma_t \sigma_t^\top \phi_1(t)] &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

with the terminal condition

$$\phi_1(T) = D_1, \phi_2(T) = D_2, \phi_3(T) = 0.$$

More challenging generalization is to consider more general cost. For instance, going back to 1-d problem (2), (3), (4), (9) with terminal cost

$$g(\mu_T) = \mathbb{E}[X_T^2] + (\mathbb{E}[\Psi(X_T)])^2,$$

one shall solve the master equation with a guess

$$v = \phi_1 \langle \psi, \mu \rangle^2 + \phi_2 \langle x^2, \mu \rangle + \phi_3 + \phi_4 \langle \psi, \mu \rangle \langle x, \mu \rangle + \phi_5 \langle x, \mu \rangle^2.$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Tomas Bjork, Mariana Khapko, and Agatha Murgoci. Time inconsistent stochastic control in continuous time: Theory and examples. *Finance Stochastics*, 2016.
- [2] T. Björk, A. Murgoci, and X.Y. Zhou. Mean-variance portfolio optimization with state-dependent risk aversion. *Mathematical Finance*, 24(1):1–24, 2014.
- [3] P.E. Caines. *Linear stochastic systems*, volume 77. SIAM, 2018.
- [4] W.H. Fleming and R.W. Rishel, *Deterministic and Stochastic Optimal Control*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975.
- [5] Pierre Cardaliaguet, François Delarue, Jean-Michel Lasry, and Pierre-Louis Lions. *The Master Equation and the Convergence Problem in Mean Field Games*, volume 201. Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [6] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*, Vol. 83 *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018.

- [7] V. Dragan, H. Mukaidani, and P. Shi, The linear quadratic regulator problem for a class of controlled systems modeled by singularly perturbed Itô differential equations, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50, No. 1, 448–470.
- [8] K. Helmes and R. Rishel, The solution of a partially observed stochastic optimal control problem in terms of predicted miss. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **37** (1992), no. 9, 1462–1464.
- [9] M.Y. Huang, P.E. Caines, and R.P. Malhamé, Social optima in mean field LQG control: Centralized and decentralized strategies, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, **57** (2012), 1736–1751.
- [10] H. Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *The journal of finance*, 7(1), 1952.
- [11] S.L. Nguyen and M. Huang. Linear-quadratic-Gaussian mixed games with continuum-parametrized minor players. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(5):2907–2937, 2012.
- [12] S. Nguyen, D. Nguyen, and G. Yin. A stochastic maximum principle for switching diffusions using conditional mean-fields with applications to control problems. to appear in *ESAIM: Control, Optim. Calculus of Variations*, 2019.
- [13] H. Pham. Linear quadratic optimal control of conditional mckean-vlasov equation with random coefficients and applications. *Probability, Uncertainty and Quantitative Risk*, 1(1):7, 2016.
- [14] H. Pham and X. Wei. Dynamic programming for optimal control of stochastic McKean-Vlasov dynamics. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 55(2):1069–1101, 2017.
- [15] C. Wu and J. Zhang. Viscosity solutions to parabolic master equations and McKean-Vlasov SDEs with closed-loop controls. *arXiv*, 2019.
- [16] Jiongmin Yong. Time-inconsistent optimal control problems and the equilibrium HJB equation. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 2(3):271–329, 2012.
- [17] Jiongmin Yong. Linear-quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field stochastic differential equations. *SIAM journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(4):2809–2838, 2013.
- [18] J. Yong. Linear-quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field stochastic differential equations–time-consistent solutions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Society*, 369(8): 5467-5523, 2017.
- [19] J. Yong and X.Y. Zhou. *Stochastic controls*, volume 43 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations.
- [20] Haiyan Zhang. An optimal control problem for linear sde of mean-field type with terminal constraint and partial information. *Advances in Difference Equations*, 2019(1):160, 2019.
- [21] X.Y. Zhou and G. Yin, Markowitz mean-variance portfolio selection with regime switching: A continuous-time model, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **42** (2003), 1466–1482.