

STOCHASTIC SOLUTIONS TO HAMILTON–JACOBI–BELLMAN DIRICHLET PROBLEMS

DAVID CRIENS

ABSTRACT. We consider a nonlinear Dirichlet problem on a bounded domain whose Hamiltonian is given by a Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman operator with merely continuous and bounded coefficients. The objective of this paper is to study the existence question from a stochastic point of view. Using a relaxed control framework, we define a candidate for a viscosity solution. We prove that this stochastic solution satisfies viscosity sub- and supersolution properties and we establish a strong Markov selection principle, which shows that the stochastic solution can be realized through a strong Markov family. Building on the selection principle, we investigate regularity properties of the stochastic solution. For certain elliptic cases, we show that the strong Markov selection is even a Feller selection, which entails the continuity of the stochastic solution.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Λ be a compact metrizable space and let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with $d \geq 1$. Consider the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -H(x, u) = 0, & x \in D, \\ u(x) = f(x), & x \in \partial D, \end{cases}$$

whose Hamiltonian H is given by the Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) operator

$$H(x, \varphi) = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} [a(\lambda, x) \nabla^2 \varphi(x)] + \langle b(\lambda, x), \nabla \varphi(x) \rangle - k(\lambda, x) \varphi(x) + g(\lambda, x) : \lambda \in \Lambda \right\}.$$

Such equations occur naturally in the context of stochastic optimal control and the first existence and uniqueness results for viscosity solutions were proved in [22, 23] by probabilistic methods under Lipschitz conditions on the coefficients, see also [4] for bibliographic remarks. Later, existence and uniqueness results for more general nonlinear equations have been established by purely analytic methods, cf., e.g., [13, 14, 18, 26] and the references in [4]. A very general existence theory was set up in the paper [5]. To the best of our knowledge, the stochastic approach to the existence question was not pursued beyond the Lipschitz case, although stochastic solutions have appealing properties, as they are sufficiently explicit to be intuitive and, from a technical side, it is possible to analyze them efficiently through stochastic calculus.

The objective of this paper is to revisit the stochastic approach to the above Dirichlet problem when the coefficients are only continuous and bounded. Under such weak conditions on the coefficients we cannot rely on the strong control framework that was used

Date: April 29, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35C99; 35Q93; 49L12; 49L25; 60H30; 93E03.

Key words and phrases. Dirichlet problem; Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equation; viscosity solution; relaxed control framework; Markov selection principle; Feller selection principle.

in the classical treatment from [22, 23]. Instead, to defined a candidate for a stochastic solution, we use the relaxed control framework as studied in [9, 10, 11]. Namely, we define

$$v(x) := \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[f(X_{\tau_D}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_D} \int k(X_s, \lambda) \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda) ds \right\} \right. \\ \left. + \int_0^{\tau_D} \int g(X_t, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \int k(X_s, \mu) \mathbf{m}_s(d\mu) ds \right\} \mathbf{m}_t(d\lambda) dt \right],$$

where $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is the set of relaxed control rules with starting value x , X is the controlled process, the kernel $\mathbf{m}$ models the control and $\tau_D = \inf\{t \geq 0: X_t \notin D\}$ is the exit time from the domain D . Under mild assumptions, we prove that the stochastic solution v is a pre-viscosity solution to the above Dirichlet problem. This means that v has the viscosity sub- and supersolution properties without necessarily being continuous.

To gain a better understanding of the stochastic solution, we show that the solution can be realized via a strong Markov family. Let us explain this result in more detail. Under suitable assumptions, that are imposed in this paper, it was proved in [9] that the uncertainty sets $\mathcal{R}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, are compact. Hence, provided the map

$$P \mapsto E^P \left[f(X_{\tau_D}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_D} \int k(X_s, \lambda) \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda) ds \right\} \right. \\ \left. + \int_0^{\tau_D} \int g(X_t, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \int k(X_s, \mu) \mathbf{m}_s(d\mu) ds \right\} \mathbf{m}_t(d\lambda) dt \right]$$

is bounded and lower semicontinuous, there are measures $Q_x \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ such that

$$v(x) = E^{Q_x} \left[f(X_{\tau_D}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_D} \int k(X_s, \lambda) \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda) ds \right\} \right. \\ \left. + \int_0^{\tau_D} \int g(X_t, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \int k(X_s, \mu) \mathbf{m}_s(d\mu) ds \right\} \mathbf{m}_t(d\lambda) dt \right].$$

We establish the existence of such a representation family $\{Q_x: x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ that has the strong Markov property. This corresponds to a strong Markov selection principle in the language of stochastic optimal control.

Lastly, we investigate the continuity of the stochastic solution for certain special cases where g and k are independent of the control. This part of our study provides stochastic existence results for certain Dirichlet problems. The special cases we consider are the one-dimensional situation and multidimensional semilinear cases, where the control acts only on the drift component.

For the one-dimensional case, we show that v is continuous under the weak ellipticity conditions $a > 0$. An example from [28] for the non-existence of a Feller selection for martingale problems shows that stochastic solutions may fail to be continuous without such an ellipticity assumption. In the multidimensional case, we establish a similar continuity result when the diffusion coefficient is independent of the control, uniformly elliptic and continuous.

We end this introduction with comments on related literature and on our proofs. To the best of our knowledge, the literature lacks a discussion of the relation of Dirichlet problems and stochastic solutions formulated within the relaxed framework. Furthermore, we are not aware of any systematic study of the continuity of the stochastic solution without Lipschitz assumptions on the coefficients. A strong Markov selection principle for the case $k \equiv g \equiv 0$ was established in [12] within a weak control framework under an additional convexity

assumption, which is not needed here due to the relaxed approach. Indeed, the relaxed framework can be interpreted as a convexification of the control space. For certain time-dependent value functions in a relaxed control framework, a strong Markov selection was proved in [9]. Both of these approaches are based on Krylov's Markov selection method as outlined in the monograph [28]. We also use this technique to establish the strong Markov selection in our framework. The arguments distinguish on a technical level.

Our proof for the continuity of the stochastic solution is based on an idea from the recent paper [6]. Namely, we show that the strong Markov selection is actually a Feller selection, i.e., that it has a continuity property in the initial value. In conjunction with the continuous mapping theorem, the continuity of the stochastic solution can be inferred from this Feller selection principle. In the recent works [6, 7], this approach has been applied in parabolic settings arising in the context of stochastic processes under parameter uncertainty. We highlight that the strong Markov selections from [6, 7] were time-inhomogeneous, while we get a time-homogeneous selection in our setting.

Next, we comment on the proofs for the existence of Feller selections. In the one-dimensional elliptic case we prove that all measures in $\mathcal{R}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, have an irreducibility property, which is called regularity in the context of one-dimensional diffusions. This is an interesting observation, given that $\mathcal{R}(x)$ contains non-Markovian laws. As a consequence, all strong Markov selections from $\{\mathcal{R}(x): x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ are regular diffusions in the sense of [15] and hence, they have the Feller property thanks to a theorem from [27]. This line of argument is different from the approach in [6] that uses fine results on the structure of Markovian semimartingales, localizations and a powerful result from [28] on the strong Feller property of solutions to martingale problems.

For the semilinear case, we adapt a strategy from [7] that is based on a change of measure technique which is adapted from the monograph [28].

The paper is organized as follows. Our main results are formulated in Section 2. Their proofs are given in the remainder. We indicated the location of each proof before the statement of the corresponding result.

2. STOCHASTIC SOLUTIONS TO THE HJB DIRICHLET PROBLEM

Let Λ be a compact metrizable space, take a dimension $d \geq 1$ and let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain. As usual, the boundary of D is denoted by $\partial D := \overline{D} \setminus D$, where $\overline{D}$ denotes the closure. Let $\mathbb{S}_+^d$ be the set of all symmetric positive semidefinite $d \times d$ matrices with real entries. We take five functions

$$\begin{aligned} a: \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d, \\ b: \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \\ k: \Lambda \times \overline{D} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \\ g: \Lambda \times \overline{D} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ f: \overline{D} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

which serve as coefficients for the Dirichlet problem under consideration. Throughout this paper, we impose the following:

STANDING ASSUMPTION 2.1. a, b, k, g and f are bounded and continuous. Furthermore, if $g \neq 0$, then

$$\inf \left\{ k(\lambda, x): (\lambda, x) \in \Lambda \times \overline{D} \right\} > 0.$$

For $x \in D$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\varphi \in C^2(D; \mathbb{R})$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, \lambda, \varphi) &:= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} [a(\lambda, x) \nabla^2 \varphi(x)] + \langle \nabla b(\lambda, x), \varphi(x) \rangle, \\ H(x, \varphi) &:= \inf \{ L(x, \lambda, \varphi) - k(\lambda, x) \varphi(x) + g(\lambda, x) : \lambda \in \Lambda \}. \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in stochastic solutions to the Dirichlet problem

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} -H(x, u) = 0, & x \in D, \\ u(x) = f(x), & x \in \partial D. \end{cases}$$

More specifically, we consider viscosity solutions, which are defined as follows:

DEFINITION 2.2 ((Pre-)Viscosity solutions). *A function $u: \overline{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a pre-viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.1) if $u = f$ on ∂D and the following sub- and supersolution properties hold:*

(sub) *for all $\varphi \in C_b^2(D; \mathbb{R})$ and $x \in D$ such that $u \leq \varphi$ and $u(x) = \varphi(x)$, it holds that*

$$-H(x, \varphi) \leq 0.$$

(sup) *for all $\varphi \in C_b^2(D; \mathbb{R})$ and $x \in D$ such that $u \geq \varphi$ and $u(x) = \varphi(x)$, it holds that*

$$-H(x, \varphi) \geq 0.$$

A pre-viscosity solution u is called viscosity solution in case $u \in C(\overline{D}; \mathbb{R})$.

In the paper [8], pre-viscosity solutions are called “weak sense viscosity solutions”.

We now define a candidate for a stochastic pre-viscosity solution, building on the so-called relaxed control framework, cf. [9, 10, 11].

Let Ω be the space of continuous function from $\mathbb{R}_+$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$ and endow it with the local uniform topology. The coordinate process on Ω is denoted by X . Further, $\mathcal{F}$ and $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are the canonical σ -field and filtration generated by X .

Let $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Lambda)$ be the set of all Radon measures on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Lambda$ and define $\mathbb{M}$ to be its subset of all measures in $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Lambda)$ whose projections on $\mathbb{R}_+$ coincide with the Lebesgue measure. We endow $\mathbb{M}$ with the vague topology, which turns it into a compact metrizable space ([10, Theorem 2.2]). The coordinate map on $\mathbb{M}$ is denoted by M . Define the σ -field

$$\mathcal{M} := \sigma(M_t(\phi); t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Lambda; \mathbb{R})),$$

where

$$M_t(\phi) := \int_0^t \int \phi(s, \lambda) M(ds, d\lambda).$$

In the following, we work with the product space $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$. Adapting our above notation, we denote the coordinate process on this space by (X, M) . For $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$, define

$$C(\varphi) := \varphi(X) - \int_0^\cdot \int L(X_s, \lambda, \varphi) M(ds, d\lambda).$$

A *relaxed control rule* with initial value $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a probability measure P on the product space $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ such that $P(X = x \text{ on } [0, t]) = 1$ and such that the processes $(C_s(\varphi))_{s \geq t}$, with $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$, are P -martingales for the filtration

$$\mathcal{G}_s := \sigma(X_r, M_r(\phi); r \leq s, \phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Lambda; \mathbb{R})), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Finally, for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$\mathcal{K}(t, x) := \{\text{all relaxed control rules with initial value } (t, x)\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}(x) := \mathcal{K}(0, x).$$

The first exit time of X from a set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by

$$\tau_U := \inf\{t \geq 0: X_t \notin U\}.$$

CONDITION 2.3. *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$, $P(\tau_D < \infty) = 1$.*

Condition 2.3 holds under a mild ellipticity assumption, see Lemma 5.1 below. Provided Condition 2.3 holds, we can define the “stochastic solution” to the Dirichlet problem (2.1) by

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) := \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P & \left[f(X_{\tau_D}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_D} \int k(X_s, \lambda) M(ds, d\lambda) \right\} \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^{\tau_D} \int g(X_t, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \int k(X_s, \mu) M(ds, d\mu) \right\} M(dt, d\lambda) \right] \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. As a consequence of Standing Assumption 2.1, the random variable in the expectation is always bounded.

For $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and a suitable real-valued function φ , we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_t^s(\varphi) := \varphi(X_s) \exp & \left\{ - \int_{t \wedge s}^s \int k(X_z, \lambda) M(dz, d\lambda) \right\} \\ & + \int_{t \wedge s}^s \int g(X_z, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_{t \wedge s}^z \int k(X_y, \alpha) M(dy, d\alpha) \right\} M(dz, d\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

In case $s = \tau_D$, we may also set $\Gamma_t^{\tau_D} := \Gamma_t^{\tau_D}(f)$.

CONDITION 2.4. *For every $x \in D$, $B = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d: \|y - x\| < r\} \subset \subset D$, $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and every $P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$, $E^P[\tau_B] < \infty$ and $\Gamma_0^{\tau_B}(\varphi)$ is P -a.s. lower semicontinuous.*

REMARK 2.5. In the setup of Condition 2.4, if τ_B is P -a.s. continuous, then the same is true for $\Gamma_0^{\tau_B}(\varphi)$. Indeed, it is straightforward to show that, for a metrizable space G and a continuous bounded function $\kappa: G \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the map

$$(g, t, M) \mapsto \int_0^t \int \kappa(g, s, \lambda) M(ds, d\lambda)$$

is continuous. This observation shows the continuity of $\Gamma_0^{\tau_B}(\varphi)$ at any continuity point ω of the hitting time τ_B such that $\tau_B(\omega) < \infty$. Explicit conditions for the almost sure continuity of τ_B are established in the Lemmata 5.3 and 6.1 below.

Our first observation is that the stochastic solution is truly a pre-viscosity solution. The proof is given in Section 4 below.

THEOREM 2.6. *Assume that the Conditions 2.3 and 2.4 hold. The stochastic solution v is a pre-viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.1).*

We now investigate the structure of the stochastic solution.

CONDITION 2.7. *Condition 2.3 holds and, for every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and every $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$, the map $\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}$ is P -a.s. lower semicontinuous.*

It has been proved in the paper [9] that each set $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is nonempty and compact in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$, where latter is the space of probability measures on $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ with the weak topology of convergence in distribution. Consequently, as lower semicontinuous

functions attain minima on compact sets, under Condition 2.7, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists a measure $Q_x \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) = E^{Q_x} \Big[& f(X_{\tau_D}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_D} \int k(X_s, \lambda) M(ds, d\lambda) \right\} \\ & + \int_0^{\tau_D} \int g(X_t, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \int k(X_s, \mu) M(ds, d\mu) \right\} M(dt, d\lambda) \Big]. \end{aligned}$$

A family $\{Q_x: x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ with this property is called a *realization family* for the stochastic solution v . It turns out that one can select a measurable realization family with a strong Markov property.

To provide a precise statement, recall that a family $\{P_x: x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is said to be *strong Markov* if $x \mapsto P_x$ is measurable and the strong Markov property holds, i.e., for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, all finite $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ -stopping times τ , and all bounded measurable functions $\varphi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, P_x -a.s. $E^{P_x}[\varphi(X_{\cdot+\tau}) | \mathcal{F}_\tau] = E^{P_{x_\tau}}[\varphi]$. The following is proved in Section 3 below.

THEOREM 2.8. *Assume that Condition 2.7 holds. Then, there exists a realization family $\{Q_y: y \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$ such that $y \mapsto Q_y$ is measurable and $\{Q_y \circ X^{-1}: y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is strong Markov.*

Next, we deal with the analytic question under what conditions the stochastic solution v is continuous and hence a viscosity solution (and not only a pre-viscosity solution). Sufficient conditions have to take the domain D and the coefficients a, b, f, k and g into consideration. Indeed, from the classical Brownian Dirichlet problem we know that certain “regularity” properties of D are needed for the continuity of v . A (deterministic, degenerate, without controls) example for a discontinuous v can be found on p. 1129 in [22]. In a non-linear setting comparable to ours, but within a strong control framework, [22] established sufficient conditions for continuity. The approach from [22] relies on the strong control framework (and hence uses certain Lipschitz assumptions).

In the following, we investigate continuity in two important situations. For both we will assume that k and g are independent of their control variable but we will not assume that b and a have additional regularity properties, which appears to be new. First, we consider the general one-dimensional case and second, the multidimensional situations that is regularized via an elliptic uncontrolled term.

CONDITION 2.9. *$d = 1$, that $a > 0$, and that k, g are independent of their Λ -variable.*

In Corollary 6.2 below, we show that Condition 2.9 entails the Conditions 2.4 and 2.7. Therefore, under Condition 2.9, the Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 show that the stochastic solution is always a pre-viscosity solution that can be realized by a strong Markov family. The following result completes the picture in terms of additional regularity of the stochastic solution. Its proof is given in Section 6 below.

THEOREM 2.10. *Assume that Condition 2.9 holds. Then, v is a viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.1).*

REMARK 2.11. Theorem 2.10 fails without the ellipticity assumption $a > 0$ from Condition 2.9. Indeed, the example from [28, Exercise 12.4.3] can be used to produce a counterexample where the stochastic solution is not necessarily continuous and hence, fails to be a true viscosity solution (although it is a pre-viscosity solution by Theorem 2.6).

Next, we consider the semilinear Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}\Delta u(x) - \inf \{ \langle b(\lambda, x), \nabla u(x) \rangle : \lambda \in \Lambda \} + k(x)u(x) - g(x) = 0, & x \in D, \\ u(x) = f(x), & x \in \partial D. \end{cases}$$

For this semilinear elliptic setting, we can establish continuity of v under the hypothesis that the domain D is regular. Let us recall what we mean by a regular domain. On $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, define the stopping time

$$\sigma_D := \inf\{t > 0: X_t \notin D\}.$$

Let $(\mathcal{W}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ be the d -dimensional Wiener family, i.e., $\mathcal{W}_x$ is the law of a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion with starting value x , which is a probability measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. A boundary point $p \in \partial D$ is called *regular* if $\mathcal{W}_p(\sigma_D = 0) = 1$, i.e., a Brownian path starting at p does *not* immediately return to D . A point $p \in \partial D$ is called *irregular* if $\mathcal{W}_p(\sigma_D = 0) < 1$, which, by Blumenthal's zero-one law, is equivalent to $\mathcal{W}_p(\sigma_D = 0) = 0$. The domain D is called regular if all points $p \in \partial D$ are regular. We recall some well-known examples (see, e.g., [19, Sections 4.2.B, 4.2.C]).

- EXAMPLE 2.12. (i) In case $d = 1$, all points in ∂D are regular.
(ii) If the boundary of D is Lipschitz, then D is regular.
(iii) In case $d \geq 2$, for $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 < \|x\| < 1\}$ the origin is irregular while all other boundary points are regular.
(iv) An example for a domain with a connected boundary that contains an irregular point is Lebesgue's thorn as described in [19, Example 4.2.17].

CONDITION 2.13. $d \geq 2$, the domain D is regular, $a \equiv \text{Id}_d$ and k, g are independent of their Λ -variable.

See Section 5 below for the proof of the next result.

THEOREM 2.14. Assume that Condition 2.13 holds. Then, v is a viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.1).

Of course, as we may take $b \equiv k \equiv g \equiv 0$, our setting includes the classical Dirichlet problem and hence, regularity of D is a minimal assumption. As all one-dimensional domains are regular, the regularity assumption is also contained in Theorem 2.10.

The proofs of the Theorems 2.10 and 2.14 adapt an idea introduced in the paper [6] for a one-dimensional Cauchy problem. The tactic is to show that any strong Markov representing family is a Feller family (in the sense that it is continuous in the initial value). The Feller property then entails the continuity of the stochastic solution.

Let us also comment on an extension of Theorem 2.14. Under slightly stronger assumptions on the domain D , it is possible to replace the assumption $a \equiv \text{Id}_d$ by the assumption that a is independent of its Λ -variable and uniformly elliptic. This extension follows by similar methods, taking [24, Theorem 2.3.3] into account. At this point, we will only state the result and skip a detailed proof for brevity.

CONDITION 2.15. $d \geq 2$, the functions a, k and g are independent of their Λ -variable. Further, assume that there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\langle \xi, a(x)\xi \rangle \geq \alpha \|\xi\|^2$$

for all $x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Finally, assume that D satisfies the exterior cone condition, i.e., for every point $p \in \partial D$ there exists a cone C in D^c with base at p .

THEOREM 2.16. *If Condition 2.15 holds, then v is a viscosity solution to (2.1).*

Given our previous results, under additional assumptions on the coefficients (that are not necessarily of Lipschitz type), more regularity properties of the stochastic solution can be inferred from analytic results as for example given in [26], see also Section 1 from [5] for more comments on related literature. We leave the precise statements to the reader.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.8

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.8. We start with a few preparations, which are then put together.

3.1. Preparations. By [21, Lemma 3.2], there exists a $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -predictable probability kernel $\mathbf{m}: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{B}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad M(ds, d\lambda) = \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda)(M)ds.$$

For $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\bar{\omega}, \bar{\alpha} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$ with $X_t(\bar{\omega}) = X_t(\bar{\alpha})$, we define a “path” $\bar{\omega} \otimes_t \bar{\alpha} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$ such that

$$(X_s, \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda))(\bar{\omega} \otimes_t \bar{\alpha}) := \begin{cases} (X_s, \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda))(\bar{\omega}), & s < t, \\ (X_s, \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda))(\bar{\alpha}), & s \geq t. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for $P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$, a finite $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -stopping time τ and a transition kernel $\bar{\omega} \mapsto Q_{\bar{\omega}}$ from $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ into $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ such that $Q_{\bar{\omega}}(X_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} = (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega})) = 1$ for P -a.a. $\bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$, we set

$$(P \otimes_{\tau} Q)(G) := \iint \mathbb{1}_G(\bar{\omega} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} \bar{\alpha}) Q_{\bar{\omega}}(d\bar{\alpha}) P(d\bar{\omega}), \quad A \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

Finally, we recall that $\mathcal{G}_{\tau}$ is countably generated for any $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -stopping time τ , cf. [9, Notations 6.1]. Consequently, for $P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$, there exists a regular conditional expectation w.r.t. $\mathcal{G}_{\tau}$ that we denote by $P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{\tau})$.

DEFINITION 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{U}: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$ be a set-valued map. We say that $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t, x)$ is*

- (i) *stable under conditioning if for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $P \in \mathcal{U}(t, x)$, any $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ -stopping time $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with P -a.s. $t \leq \tau < \infty$, and every transition kernel $\bar{\omega} \mapsto \Pi_{\bar{\omega}}$ from $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ into itself with*

$$\Pi_{\bar{\omega}}(X_s = (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}), s \leq \tau(\bar{\omega})) = 1 \text{ for all } \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M},$$

there exists a P -null set $N \in \mathcal{G}_{\tau}$ such that

$$\Pi_{\bar{\omega} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}) \in \mathcal{U}(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}))$$

for all $\bar{\omega} \notin N$;

- (ii) *stable under pasting if for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $P \in \mathcal{U}(t, x)$, any $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ -stopping time $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with P -a.s. $t \leq \tau < \infty$, every $\mathcal{G}_{\tau}$ -measurable map $\bar{\omega} \mapsto Q_{\bar{\omega}} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$ such that*

$$Q_{\bar{\omega}}(X_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} = (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega})) = 1 \text{ for all } \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M},$$

and any transition kernel $\bar{\omega} \mapsto \Pi_{\bar{\omega}}$ from $(\Omega \times \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ into itself with

$$\Pi_{\bar{\omega}}(X_s = (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}), s \leq \tau(\bar{\omega})) = 1 \text{ for all } \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M},$$

the following implication holds:

$$\begin{aligned} P\text{-a.a. } \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M} \quad \Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} Q_{\bar{\omega}} \in \mathcal{U}(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega})) \\ \implies P \otimes_{\tau} Q \in \mathcal{U}(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 3.2. *Under Condition 2.3, the set-valued map $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ is stable under conditioning and pasting.*

PROOF. This follows from [9, Theorems 6.2, 6.3]. $\square$

For $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we define the shift operator $\theta_t: \Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ by

$$(X_s, \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda))(\theta_t(\bar{\omega})) := (X_{s+t}, \mathbf{m}_{s+t}(d\lambda))(\bar{\omega})$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Furthermore, we define the “right inverse shift” $\gamma_t: \Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ by

$$(X_s, \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda))(\gamma_t(\bar{\omega})) := (X_{(s-t) \vee 0}, \mathbf{m}_{(s-t) \vee 0}(d\lambda))(\bar{\omega})$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We notice that

$$\theta_t \circ \gamma_t = \text{id},$$

which explains that γ_t can be seen as the right inverse of θ_t .

LEMMA 3.3. *Take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

- (i) *If $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$, then $P \circ \theta_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}(0, x) = \mathcal{R}(x)$.*
- (ii) *$P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ if and only if $P \circ \gamma_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$.*

PROOF. This follows readily from [16, Lemma 2.9], the identity $\theta \circ \gamma = \text{id}$ and the definition of the sets $\mathcal{K}(t, x)$ and $\mathcal{R}(x)$. $\square$

LEMMA 3.4. *Suppose that the Conditions 2.3 and 2.7 hold. Then, the set-valued map*

$$\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{K}^*(t, x) := \left\{ P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x) : E^P[\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^Q[\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] \right\}$$

is measurable with nonempty and compact values and it is stable under conditioning and pasting. Moreover, for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $P \in \mathcal{K}^(t, x)$ implies that $P \circ \theta_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}^*(0, x)$.*

PROOF. We adapt the proof of [28, Lemma 12.2.2], cf. also [12, Lemma 3.4]. At this point, we recall that $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ is an upper hemicontinuous set-valued map with nonempty compact values, in particular it is measurable, cf. [9, Lemma 5.8, Proposition 5.10].

Thanks to the Conditions 2.3 and 2.7, the function $\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}$ is P -a.s. bounded and lower semicontinuous for every $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ and $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, by the Portmanteau theorem, the map $P \mapsto E^P[\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}]$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathcal{K}(t, x)$, for every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$. This shows that $\mathcal{K}^*$ has nonempty and compact values by [1, Theorem 2.43]. Moreover, [1, Theorem 18.10] and [28, Lemma 12.1.7] imply that $\mathcal{K}^*$ is measurable.

Next, we show that $\mathcal{K}^*$ is stable under conditioning. Take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $P \in \mathcal{K}^*(t, x)$, let τ be an $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ -stopping time such that P -a.s. $t \leq \tau < \infty$ and let Π be as in part (i) of Definition 3.1. In the following, we take a version of $P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{\tau})$ such that $P(X_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} = (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}) | \mathcal{G}_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}) = 1$ for all $\bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$. Define

$$P_{\bar{\omega}} := \Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{\tau})(\bar{\omega}), \quad \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M},$$

and

$$N := \{ \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M} : P_{\bar{\omega}} \notin \mathcal{K}(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_{\tau})(\bar{\omega})) \},$$

$$A := \{\bar{\omega} \notin N : P_{\bar{\omega}} \notin \mathcal{K}^*(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_\tau)(\bar{\omega}))\}.$$

As $\mathcal{K}$ is stable under conditioning, we have $P(N) = 0$. By [28, Lemma 12.1.9], $N, A \in \mathcal{G}_\tau$. As we already know that $\mathcal{K}^*$ is measurable, by virtue of [28, Theorem 12.1.10], there exists a measurable map $(s, y) \mapsto R(s, y)$ such that $R(s, y) \in \mathcal{K}^*(s, y)$. Set

$$R_{\bar{\omega}} := R(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_\tau)(\bar{\omega})), \quad \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}.$$

Clearly, $\bar{\omega} \mapsto R_{\bar{\omega}}$ is $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ -measurable. Further, we set

$$Q_{\bar{\omega}} := \begin{cases} R_{\bar{\omega}}, & \bar{\omega} \in N \cup A, \\ P_{\bar{\omega}}, & \bar{\omega} \notin N \cup A. \end{cases}$$

By definition of R and N , $Q_{\bar{\omega}} \in \mathcal{K}(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_\tau)(\bar{\omega}))$ for all $\bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$. As $\mathcal{K}$ is stable under pasting, it follows readily that $P \otimes_\tau Q \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{Q^* \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^{Q^*} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] \\ & \leq E^{P \otimes_\tau Q} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] \\ & = \iint \Gamma_t^{\tau_D}(\bar{\omega} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} \bar{\alpha}) Q_{\bar{\omega}}(d\bar{\alpha}) P(d\bar{\omega}) \\ & = E^P \left[\left(\exp \left\{ - \int_t^\tau \int kdM \right\} E^Q [\Gamma_{\tau(\cdot)}^{\tau_D}] + \int_t^\tau \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_t^\cdot \int kdM \right\} dM \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \leq \tau_D\}} \right] \\ & \quad + E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau > \tau_D\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, recalling that $P(N) = 0$, we obtain, for P -a.a. $\bar{\omega} \in \{\tau < \tau_D\}$, that

$$E^{Q_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}] = \mathbf{1}_A(\bar{\omega}) E^{R_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}] + \mathbf{1}_{A^c}(\bar{\omega}) E^{P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_\tau)(\bar{\omega})} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}].$$

Putting these pieces together, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E^{P \otimes_\tau Q} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] &= \int_{A \cap \{\tau < \tau_D\}} \exp \left\{ - \int_t^\tau \int kdM \right\} (\bar{\omega}) \\ & \quad (E^{R_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}] - E^{P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_\tau)(\bar{\omega})} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}]) P(d\bar{\omega}) + E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}]. \end{aligned}$$

As $P \in \mathcal{K}^*(t, x)$, we have

$$E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = \inf_{Q^* \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^{Q^*} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}],$$

and consequently,

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{A \cap \{\tau < \tau_D\}} \exp \left\{ - \int_t^\tau \int kdM \right\} (\bar{\omega}) (E^{R_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}] - E^{P_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}]) P(d\bar{\omega}) \geq 0.$$

Since $E^{R_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}] < E^{P_{\bar{\omega}}} [\Gamma_{\tau(\bar{\omega})}^{\tau_D}]$ for all $\bar{\omega} \in A \cap \{\tau < \tau_D\}$, we conclude that $P(A, \tau < \tau_D) = 0$. On $\{\tau \geq \tau_D\}$, for all $P \in \mathcal{K}(\tau, X_\tau)$, we have

$$E^P [\Gamma_{\tau(\cdot)}^{\tau_D}] = f(X_{\tau_D}).$$

This means that $A \cap \{\tau \geq \tau_D\} = \emptyset$. It follows that $\mathcal{K}^*$ is stable under conditioning.

Next, we prove stability under pasting. Take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $P \in \mathcal{K}^*(t, x)$, and τ , $\bar{\omega} \mapsto Q_{\bar{\omega}}$, $\bar{\omega} \mapsto \Pi_{\bar{\omega}}$ as in part (ii) of Definition 3.1 such that

$$P\text{-a.a. } \bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M} \quad \Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} Q_{\bar{\omega}} \in \mathcal{K}^*(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_\tau)(\bar{\omega})).$$

Because $\mathcal{K}$ is stable under pasting, we have $P \otimes_\tau Q \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$. Hence,

$$\inf_{Q^* \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^{Q^*} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] \leq E^{P \otimes_\tau Q} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}].$$

Let us now bound the right hand side. Recalling that

$$\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{\tau(\bar{\omega})} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_\tau)(\bar{\omega}) \in \mathcal{K}(\tau(\bar{\omega}), (X_\tau)(\bar{\omega}))$$

for P -a.a. $\bar{\omega} \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$, as $\mathcal{K}$ is stable under conditioning, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E^{P \otimes_\tau Q} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] &= E^P \left[\left(\exp \left\{ - \int_t^\tau \int k dM \right\} E^{\Pi \otimes_\tau Q} [\Gamma_{\tau(\cdot)}^{\tau_D}] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_t^\tau \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_t^\cdot \int k dM \right\} dM \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < \tau_D\}} + \Gamma_t^{\tau_D} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_D \leq \tau\}} \right] \\ &\leq E^P \left[\left(\exp \left\{ - \int_t^\tau \int k dM \right\} E^{\Pi \otimes_\tau P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_\tau)} [\Gamma_{\tau(\cdot)}^{\tau_D}] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_t^\tau \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_t^\cdot \int k dM \right\} dM \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < \tau_D\}} + \Gamma_t^{\tau_D} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_D \leq \tau\}} \right] \\ &= E^P \left[E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D} | \mathcal{G}_\tau] \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < \tau_D\}} + \Gamma_t^{\tau_D} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_D \leq \tau\}} \right] \\ &= E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = \inf_{Q^* \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^{Q^*} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $P \otimes_\tau Q \in \mathcal{K}^*(t, x)$, finishing the proof of stability under pasting.

It is left to prove the final claim, namely, for every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we need to show that $P \in \mathcal{K}^*(t, x)$ implies $P \circ \theta_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}^*(0, x)$. We already know from Lemma 3.3 that $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ implies $P \circ \theta_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}(0, x)$. Now, if $x \notin D$, then $\mathcal{K}^*(\cdot, x) = \mathcal{K}(\cdot, x)$ and the claim holds. We now discuss the case $x \in D$. Let us establish the following three properties:

(a) For all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times D$ and $P \in \mathcal{K}(0, x)$,

$$E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] = E^{P \circ \gamma_t^{-1}} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}].$$

(b) For all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times D$ and $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$,

$$E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = E^{P \circ \theta_t^{-1}} [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}].$$

(c) For all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times D$,

$$\inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(0, x)} E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}].$$

For (a) and (b), recall that $\theta \circ \gamma = \text{id}$ and notice that $\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_t = \Gamma_t^{\tau_D}$ on $\{t < \tau_D\}$. As $x \in D$, for $P \in \mathcal{K}(0, x)$, we have $P \circ \gamma_t^{-1}$ -a.s. $t < \tau_D$ and consequently,

$$E^{P \circ \gamma_t^{-1}} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = E^{P \circ \gamma_t^{-1}} [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_t] = E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_t \circ \gamma_t] = E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}],$$

which means that (a) holds. Similarly, if $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$, then P -a.s. $t < \tau_D$ and

$$E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_t] = E^{P \circ \theta_t^{-1}} [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}],$$

which establishes (b). Now, for (c), using (a) and Lemma 3.3 (ii) yields that

$$\inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(0, x)} E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(0, x)} E^{P \circ \gamma_t^{-1}} [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] \geq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)} E^P [\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}],$$

and conversely, (b) and Lemma 3.3 (i) yield

$$\inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(t,x)} E^P[\Gamma_t^{\tau_D}] = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(t,x)} E^{P \circ \theta_t^{-1}}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] \geq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{K}(0,x)} E^P[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}].$$

The property (c) is proved. Finally, the properties (a) – (c) easily complete the proof. $\square$

Take a bounded continuous function $\ell: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a constant $\alpha > 0$ and set

$$\Xi_t(\ell, \alpha) := \int_t^\infty e^{-\alpha s} \ell(X_s) ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

The following lemma can be proved in the same manner as Lemma 3.4, cf. [28, Lemma 12.2.2]. We omit the details for brevity.

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t, x)$ be a measurable set-valued map with compact values that is stable under conditioning and pasting. The set-valued map*

$$\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{T}^*(t, x) := \left\{ P \in \mathcal{U}(t, x) : E^P[\Xi_t(\ell, \alpha)] = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{U}(t, x)} E^Q[\Xi_t(\ell, \alpha)] \right\}$$

is measurable with nonempty and compact values and it is stable under conditioning and pasting. Moreover, for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $P \in \mathcal{T}^(t, x)$ implies $P \circ \theta_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{T}^*(0, x)$.*

We are in the position to establish the strong Markov selection principle.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.8. We adapt the proofs of [28, Theorems 6.2.3 and 12.2.3], cf. also the proofs of [9, Proposition 6.6] and [12, Proposition 3.2].

Let $\{\sigma_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a dense subset of $(0, \infty)$ and let $\{\phi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a dense subset of $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, let $(\alpha_N, \ell_N)_{N=1}^\infty$ be an enumeration of $\{(\sigma_m, \phi_m) : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$. For $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$, define inductively

$$\mathcal{K}_0^*(t, x) := \mathcal{K}^*(t, x),$$

and, for $N \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{K}_{N+1}^*(t, x) := \left\{ P \in \mathcal{K}_N^*(t, x) : E^P[\Xi_t(\ell_{N+1}, \alpha_{N+1})] = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{K}_N^*(t, x)} E^Q[\Xi_t(\ell_{N+1}, \alpha_{N+1})] \right\}.$$

Moreover, we set

$$\mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t, x) := \bigcap_{N=0}^\infty \mathcal{K}_N^*(t, x).$$

Notice that $\mathcal{K}(t, x)$ is convex, which is immediate from its very definition. Further, by [1, Lemma 18.4] and the Lemmata 3.4 and 3.5, it follows that $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t, x)$ is a measurable map with nonempty, compact and convex values that is stable under conditioning. Here, the fact that $\mathcal{K}^*(t, x)$ is nonempty follows from Cantor's intersection theorem, which states that the intersection of a nested sequence of nonempty compact sets is nonempty itself.

Thanks to the measurability of the set-valued map $x \mapsto \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(0, x)$, [28, Theorem 12.1.10] yields the existence of a measurable selection $x \mapsto Q_x$, i.e., a measurable map $x \mapsto Q_x$ with $Q_x \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(0, x)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{K}_\infty^*(0, x) \subset \mathcal{K}^*(0, x)$, it follows that $\{Q_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a realization family for v . It remains to prove that $\{Q_x \circ X^{-1} : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a strong Markov family. This is the program for the remainder of this proof.

For $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we set

$$\mathcal{I}_\infty^*(t, x) := \{Q \circ X^{-1} : Q \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t, x)\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega).$$

In the following, we show that each $\mathcal{I}_\infty^*(t, x)$ is a singleton, i.e., $\mathcal{I}_\infty^*(t, x) = \{P_{(t,x)}\}$.

Take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $P, Q \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t, x)$. For all $T > t$, $t \leq t_1 < \dots < t_n \leq T$ and $g_1, \dots, g_n \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$, we will prove that

$$(3.3) \quad E^P \left[\prod_{i=1}^n g_i(X_{t_i}) \right] = E^Q \left[\prod_{i=1}^n g_i(X_{t_i}) \right].$$

We proceed by induction. For all $N \geq 1$,

$$E^P [\Xi_t(\ell_N, \alpha_N)] = \inf_{R \in \mathcal{K}_{N-1}^*(t, x)} E^R [\Xi_t(\ell_N, \alpha_N)] = E^Q [\Xi_t(\ell_N, \alpha_N)].$$

This means that, for all $n, m \geq 1$,

$$\int_t^\infty e^{-\sigma_m s} E^P [\phi_n(X_s)] ds = \int_t^\infty e^{-\sigma_m s} E^Q [\phi_n(X_s)] ds.$$

By the continuity of $s \mapsto E^P[\phi_n(X_s)]$ and $s \mapsto E^Q[\phi_n(X_s)]$, the uniqueness of the Laplace transform shows that

$$E^P [\phi_n(X_s)] = E^Q [\phi_n(X_s)], \quad n \geq 1, s \geq t.$$

This implies the induction base.

Next, we establish the induction step. Take $T > t, t = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{n+1} \leq T$, $g_1, \dots, g_{n+1} \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and assume that (3.3) holds. Define $\mathcal{V}_n := \sigma(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})$. Since

$$E^P \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n+1} g_k(X_{t_k}) \right] = E^P \left[E^P [g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}}) | \mathcal{V}_n] \prod_{k=1}^n g_k(X_{t_k}) \right],$$

it suffices to show that P -a.s.

$$E^P [g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}}) | \mathcal{V}_n] = E^Q [g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}}) | \mathcal{V}_n].$$

Let Π be a transition kernel as in part (i) of Definition 3.1 with $\tau \equiv t_n$. As $\mathcal{K}_\infty^*$ is stable under conditioning, there exists a P -null set $N_1 \in \mathcal{G}_{t_n}$ such that $\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{t_n})(\bar{\omega}) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t_n, X_{t_n}(\bar{\omega}))$ for all $\bar{\omega} \notin N_1$. By the tower rule, there exists a P -null set $N_2 \in \mathcal{V}_n$ such that, for all $\bar{\omega} \in N_2^c$ and all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $P(X_{t_n} = X_{t_n}(\bar{\omega}) | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega}) = 1$ and

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int (\Pi_{\bar{\omega}'} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{t_n})(\bar{\omega}'))(A \times \mathbb{M}) P(d\bar{\omega}' | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega}) \\ = (\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega}))(A \times \mathbb{M}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $N_3 := \{P(N_1 | \mathcal{V}_n) > 0\} \in \mathcal{V}_n$. Clearly, $E^P[P(N_1 | \mathcal{V}_n)] = P(N_1) = 0$, which implies that $P(N_3) = 0$. Take $\bar{\omega} \in N_2^c \cap N_3^c$. Notice that for $P(\cdot | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega})$ -a.a. $\bar{\omega}' \in \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$

$$\Pi_{\bar{\omega}'} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{t_n})(\bar{\omega}') \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t_n, X_{t_n}(\bar{\omega})).$$

As $\mathcal{K}_\infty^*$ has convex and compact values, we get that

$$\int (\Pi_{\bar{\omega}'} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{t_n})(\bar{\omega}'))(\cdot \times \mathbb{M}) P(d\bar{\omega}' | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega}) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t_n, X_{t_n}(\bar{\omega})).$$

Consequently, by virtue of (3.4), we conclude that

$$(\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega}))(\cdot \times \mathbb{M}) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t_n, X_{t_n}(\bar{\omega})).$$

Similarly, there exists a Q -null set $N_4 \in \mathcal{V}_n$ such that

$$(\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{t_n} Q(\cdot | \mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega}))(\cdot \times \mathbb{M}) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(t_n, X_{t_n}(\bar{\omega}))$$

for all $\bar{\omega} \in N_4^c$. Set $N := N_2 \cup N_3 \cup N_4$. As $P = Q$ on $\mathcal{V}_n$, we get that $P(N) = 0$. For all $\bar{\omega} \in N^c$, the induction base implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E^P[g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}})|\mathcal{V}_n](\bar{\omega}) &= E^{\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{t_n} P(\cdot|\mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega})}[g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}})] \\ &= E^{\Pi_{\bar{\omega}} \otimes_{t_n} Q(\cdot|\mathcal{V}_n)(\bar{\omega})}[g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}})] \\ &= E^Q[g_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}})|\mathcal{V}_n](\omega). \end{aligned}$$

The induction step is complete and hence, $P \circ X^{-1} = Q \circ X^{-1}$.

We proved that $\mathcal{I}_\infty^*$ is singleton-valued and, as above, we write $\mathcal{I}_\infty^*(t, x) = \{P_{(t,x)}\}$. Clearly, $Q_x \circ X^{-1} = P_{(0,x)} =: P_x$. It remains to prove that $\{P_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a strong Markov family. Take an initial value $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, a bounded $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ -stopping time τ , a set $G \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and fix a time $s \geq 0$. Let Π be as in Definition 3.1 (i) with $\tau \equiv \varrho$. Then, for every $A \in \mathcal{F}_\varrho$, we obtain that

$$E^{P_x}[\mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{s+\varrho} \in G\}}] = E^{Q_x}[\mathbb{1}_A (\Pi \otimes_\varrho Q_x(\cdot|\mathcal{G}_\varrho) \circ \theta_\varrho^{-1} \circ X^{-1})(X_s \in G)].$$

Now, Q_x -a.s. $\Pi \otimes_\varrho Q_x(\cdot|\mathcal{G}_\varrho) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(\varrho, X_\varrho)$, as $\mathcal{K}_\infty^*$ is stable under conditioning. Notice that $R \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(s, y)$ implies $R \circ \theta_s^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(0, y)$, as all $\mathcal{K}_N^*$, $N = 1, 2, \dots$, have this property by Lemmata 3.4 and 3.5. Hence, Q_x -a.s. $\Pi \otimes_\varrho Q_x(\cdot|\mathcal{G}_\varrho) \circ \theta_\varrho^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^*(0, X_\varrho)$ and in turn, $\Pi \otimes_\varrho Q_x(\cdot|\mathcal{G}_\varrho) \circ \theta_\varrho^{-1} \circ X^{-1} \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^*(0, X_\varrho) = \{P_{X_\varrho}\}$. This proves the strong Markov property (the extension to path-dependent functions is routine, see [19, Section 2.6.B]). The proof is complete. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.6

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2.6. Our first step is a suitable dynamic programming principle. After this is established, the proof is completed in the remainder of this section.

4.1. A Dynamic Programming Principle. For a strong control framework, the following dynamic programming principle is given in [22, Theorem B]. Our proof follows the standard path as outlined in [11].

PROPOSITION 4.1 (Dynamic Programming Principle). *Take a domain $U \subset \subset D$. Then, for all $x \in D$,*

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P &\left[v(X_{\tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} k(X_s, \lambda) M(ds, d\lambda) \right\} \right. \\ &\left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g(X_t, \lambda) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t k(X_s, \mu) M(ds, d\mu) \right\} M(dt, d\lambda) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. First, notice that the equation becomes trivial once $x \in D \setminus U$, because then P -a.s. $\tau_U = 0$ for all $P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$. Therefore, it suffices to consider $x \in U$.

Let us start with the inequality “ $\geq$ ”. The tower rule shows that

$$v(x) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[\exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} k dM \right\} E^P[\Gamma_{\tau_U}^{\tau_D} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_U}] + \int_0^{\tau_U} g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^\cdot k dM \right\} dM \right].$$

In the following, we take a $P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$. Observe that P -a.s. $\tau_U < \tau_D$, thanks to the hypothesis $U \subset \subset D$, and that P -a.s.

$$\tau_D \circ \theta_{\tau_U} = \tau_D - \tau_U, \quad (X_{\tau_D}) \circ \theta_{\tau_U} = X_{\tau_D}.$$

Hence, P -a.s. $\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_{\tau_U} = \Gamma_{\tau_U}^{\tau_D}$. As $\mathcal{K}$ is stable under conditioning (see Lemma 3.2), and using Lemma 3.3, we get that P -a.s.

$$P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_U}) \circ \theta_{\tau_U}^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}(X_{\tau_U}).$$

Using these facts, we obtain that P -a.s.

$$E^P[\Gamma_{\tau_U}^{\tau_D} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_U}] = E^{P(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_U}) \circ \theta_{\tau_U}^{-1}}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] \geq v(X_{\tau_U}).$$

In summary, we proved the inequality “ $\geq$ ”.

Let us now turn to the converse. Take $\varepsilon > 0$ and recall from [9, Lemma 5.8, Proposition 5.10] that the set-valued map $(t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ is upper hemicontinuous with compact values. In particular, it has a measurable graph ([1, Theorem 18.6]). As $P \mapsto E^P[\psi]$ is measurable whenever ψ is a bounded and measurable ([3, Theorem 8.10.61]), we can apply [2, Proposition 7.50], which yields the existence of an analytically measurable map $y \mapsto P_y$ such that

$$P_y \in \mathcal{R}(y), \quad v(y) \geq E^{P_y}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] - \varepsilon.$$

As above, P -a.s. $\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_{\tau_U} = \Gamma_{\tau_U}^{\tau_D}$ for all $P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$. By Lemma 3.3,

$$\bar{\omega} \mapsto Q_{\bar{\omega}} := P_{(X_{\tau_U})(\bar{\omega})} \circ \gamma_{\tau_U(\bar{\omega})}^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}(\tau_U(\bar{\omega}), (X_{\tau_U})(\bar{\omega})),$$

and using that $\mathcal{K}$ is stable under conditioning (see Lemma 3.2), it follows that $P \otimes_{\tau_U} Q \in \mathcal{R}(x)$. Taking these two observations into account, and using that $\theta \circ \gamma = \text{id}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[v(X_{\tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} \int k dM \right\} + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\cdot} \int k dM \right\} dM \right] \\ & \geq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[E^{P_{X_{\tau_U}}}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} \int k dM \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\cdot} \int k dM \right\} dM \right] - \varepsilon \\ & = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[E^Q[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} \circ \theta_{\tau_U}] \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} \int k dM \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\cdot} \int k dM \right\} dM \right] - \varepsilon \\ & = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[E^Q[\Gamma_{\tau_U}^{\tau_D}] \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} \int k dM \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\cdot} \int k dM \right\} dM \right] - \varepsilon \\ & = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^{P \otimes_{\tau_U} Q}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] - \varepsilon \\ & \geq v(x) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we conclude that also the inequality “ $\leq$ ” holds. The proof is complete. $\square$

4.2. Proof of Theorem 2.6. We start with the subsolution property. Take $\varphi \in C_b^2(D; \mathbb{R})$ and $x \in D$ such that $v \leq \varphi$ and $v(x) = \varphi(x)$. For contradiction, presume that $H(x, \varphi) < 0$. By the compactness of Λ , there exists a $\lambda^* \in \Lambda$ such that

$$K(x, \lambda^*, \varphi) := L(x, \lambda^*, \varphi) - k(\lambda^*, x)\varphi(x) + g(\lambda^*, x) = H(x, \varphi) < 0.$$

By the continuity of $x \mapsto L(x, \lambda^*, \varphi)$, there are small numbers $r, \delta > 0$ such that $U := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|y - x\| < r\} \subset \subset D$ and

$$K(y, \lambda^*, \varphi) \leq -\delta$$

for all $y \in \overline{U}$. Let $P^* \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ be a probability measure such that P^* -a.s. $M(ds, d\lambda) = ds \delta_{\lambda^*}(d\lambda)$. The existence of P^* is a well-known consequence of Skorokhod's existence theorem for stochastic differential equations (cf., e.g., [19, Theorem 5.4.22]). The DPP as given by Proposition 4.1, and $v \leq \varphi$, yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x) = v(x) &= \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[v(X_{\tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} \int k dM \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^\cdot \int k dM \right\} dM \right] \\ &\leq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P \left[\varphi(X_{\tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} \int k dM \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} \int g \exp \left\{ - \int_0^\cdot \int k dM \right\} dM \right] \\ &\leq E^{P^*} \left[\varphi(X_{\tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} k(\lambda^*, X_s) ds \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{\tau_U} g(\lambda^*, X_s) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(\lambda^*, X_z) dz \right\} ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

An application of Itô's formula yields that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} E^{P^*} \left[\varphi(X_{t \wedge \tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_U} k(\lambda^*, X_s) ds \right\} \right] \\ = \varphi(x) + E^{P^*} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_U} \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(\lambda^*, X_z) dz \right\} L(X_s, \lambda^*, \varphi) ds \right. \\ \left. - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_U} \varphi(X_s) k(\lambda^*, X_s) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(\lambda^*, X_z) dz \right\} ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the hypothesis $E^{P^*}[\tau_U] < \infty$ from Condition 2.4, we can take $t \rightarrow \infty$ and use the dominated convergence theorem to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} E^{P^*} \left[\varphi(X_{\tau_U}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_U} k(\lambda^*, X_s) ds \right\} \right] \\ = \varphi(x) + E^{P^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_U} \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(\lambda^*, X_z) dz \right\} L(X_s, \lambda^*, \varphi) ds \right. \\ \left. - \int_0^{\tau_U} \varphi(X_s) k(\lambda^*, X_s) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(\lambda^*, X_z) dz \right\} ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq E^{P^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_U} \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(\lambda^*, X_z) dz \right\} K(\lambda^*, X_s, \varphi) ds \right] \\ &\leq -\delta E^{P^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_U} e^{-s\|k\|_\infty} ds \right] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction and consequently, v has the subsolution property.

We turn to the supersolution property. Take $\varphi \in C_b^2(D; \mathbb{R})$ and $x \in D$ such that $v \geq \varphi$ and $v(x) = \varphi(x)$. For contradiction, presume that $H(x, \varphi) > 0$. By the compactness of Λ , Berge's maximum theorem ([1, Theorem 17.31]) yields continuity of $y \mapsto H(y, \varphi)$. Hence, there are small numbers $r, \delta > 0$ such that $U := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|y - x\| < r\} \subset \subset D$ and $H(y, \varphi) \geq \delta$ for all $y \in \overline{U}$. The DPP (Proposition 4.1), and $v \geq \varphi$, yield that

$$\varphi(x) = v(x) \geq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{R}(x)} E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_U}(\varphi)].$$

By Condition 2.4, and in view of our Standing Assumption 2.1, the continuous mapping theorem yields that the map $P \mapsto E^P [\Gamma_0^{\tau_U}(\varphi)]$ is bounded and lower semicontinuous. Hence, as $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is compact (by [9, Lemma 5.8]), there exists a measure $P^* \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ such that

$$\varphi(x) \geq E^{P^*} [\Gamma_0^{\tau_U}(\varphi)].$$

Using Itô's formula as in the proof for the subsolution part, we obtain that

$$0 \geq E^{P^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_U} \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s \int k dM \right\} H(X_s, \varphi) ds \right] \geq \delta E^{P^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_U} e^{-s\|k\|_\infty} ds \right] > 0.$$

Again, this is a contradiction. We conclude that v has also the supersolution property. Hence, the proof is complete. $\square$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.14

This section is organized as follows. First, we discuss the Conditions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.7 under the prerequisites of Theorem 2.14 and provide a Girsanov-type formula. Finally, we prove Theorem 2.14.

5.1. Some Preparations. A sufficient criterion for Condition 2.3 is given by the weak ellipticity condition in the following lemma.

LEMMA 5.1. *Let $U \subset D$ be a domain such that there exists a $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with*

$$\min\{a_{jj}(\lambda, x) : (\lambda, x) \in \Lambda \times \overline{U}\} > 0, \quad a(\lambda, x) = (a_{ij}(\lambda, x))_{i,j=1}^d.$$

Then, for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup \left\{ E^P [\tau_U] : P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x), (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \right\} < \infty.$$

PROOF. The claim follows similar to the proof of [19, Lemma 5.7.4]. We provide the details. In case $x \notin U$, we have P -a.s. $\tau_U = 0$ for all $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ and there is nothing to prove. Therefore, take $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times U$. We set

$$A := \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda, z \in \overline{U}} a_{jj}(\lambda, z) > 0$$

and $\nu > 2\|b\|_\infty/A$, where j is as in the hypothesis. Consider the function $\psi(z) := -\mu \exp\{\nu z_j\}$ for $z \in \overline{U}$ and a constant $\mu > 0$ that we determine later. Then, for $z \in \overline{U}$,

$$-L(z, \lambda, \psi) = \mu\nu\psi(z)b_j(\lambda, z) + \frac{\mu\nu^2}{2}a_{jj}(z)\psi(z) \geq \frac{\mu\nu A}{2}\psi(z)(\nu - 2\|b\|_\infty/A).$$

Take $\mu > 0$ large enough such that $L(z, \lambda, \psi) \leq -1$ for all $z \in \overline{U}$. Let $\phi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ be such that $\phi = \psi$ on $\overline{U}$. From the definition of $\mathcal{K}(t, x)$, the process

$$\phi(X_s) - \int_t^s L(X_r, \lambda, \phi)M(dr, d\lambda): \quad s \geq t,$$

is a P -martingale. As P -a.s. $\tau_U > t$, for all $s \geq t$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &= E^P[\phi(X_{s \wedge \tau_U})] - E^P\left[\int_t^{s \wedge \tau_U} L(X_r, \lambda, \psi)M(dr, d\lambda)\right] \\ &\geq E^P[\phi(X_{s \wedge \tau_U})] + E^P[\tau_U \wedge s] - t. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$E^P[\tau_U \wedge s] \leq 2\|\phi\|_\infty + T.$$

Taking $s \nearrow \infty$, and using the monotone convergence theorem, finishes the proof. $\square$

Under the prerequisites of Theorem 2.14, all measures from $\mathcal{K}(t, x)$ can be related to the Wiener family $(\mathcal{W}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$. This observation turns out to be crucial for the proof of Theorem 2.14. We denote equivalence of measures by $\sim$ and the stochastic exponential by $\mathcal{E}\{\cdot\}$.

LEMMA 5.2. *Assume that $a \equiv \text{Id}_d$. Take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$. Then, $P \circ X^{-1} \sim \mathcal{W}_x \circ \gamma_t^{-1}$ on $\mathcal{F}_s$ for every $s \geq 0$. In particular, with*

$$Z_s := \mathcal{E}\left\{-\int_t^{s \vee t} \left\langle \int_t^r \int b(X_z, \lambda)M(dz, d\lambda), d\overline{X}_r \right\rangle\right\},$$

where

$$\overline{X} := X - \int_t^{\cdot \vee t} \int b(X_z, \lambda)M(dz, d\lambda),$$

for all $G \in \mathcal{F}_s$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_x \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(G) = E^P[Z_s \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in G\}}].$$

Moreover, $P \circ X^{-1} \sim \mathcal{W}_x \circ \gamma_t^{-1}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_D}$ with density (in the above sense) Z_{τ_D} , and, for every $\beta > 0$ and every stopping time τ ,

$$E^P[|Z_{t+\beta \wedge \tau} - 1|] \leq \sqrt{\exp\{\beta\|b\|_\infty^2\} - 1}.$$

PROOF. The first claim is a direct consequence of Girsanov's theorem (cf. [19, Theorem 3.5.1] or [17, Theorem III.3.24]), see [28, Lemma 6.4.1] for the same statement in a pure diffusion framework (without controls). The second claim follows from [17, Theorem III.3.3] once noticed that

$$\mathcal{W}_x \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(\tau_D < \infty) = 1 = P(\tau_D < \infty),$$

by Lemma 5.1. The moment estimate for the density process is straightforward, cf. [28, p. 186]. $\square$

LEMMA 5.3. *Suppose that $a \equiv \text{Id}_d$, that D is regular and take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for every $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$, the map τ_D is P -a.s. continuous.*

PROOF. Take $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$ and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain such that $D \subset\subset U$. By Lemma 5.2,

$$P \circ X^{-1} \sim \mathcal{W}_x \circ \gamma_t^{-1} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_{\tau_U}.$$

Because D is regular, using the strong Markov property of Brownian motion, we get that

$$\mathcal{W}_x \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(\tau_D < \tau_{\overline{D}}) = \mathcal{W}_x(\tau_D < \tau_{\overline{D}}) = E^{\mathcal{W}_x}[\mathcal{W}_{X_{\tau_D}}(\tau_{\overline{D}} > 0)] = 0.$$

Hence, as $\{\tau_D < \tau_{\overline{D}}, X_0 = x\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau_U}$, because $\tau_{\overline{D}} < \tau_U$ on $\{X_0 = x\}$, also

$$P(\tau_D < \tau_{\overline{D}}) = P \circ X^{-1}(\tau_D < \tau_{\overline{D}}) = 0.$$

This means that P -a.s. $\tau_D = \tau_{\overline{D}}$. As τ_D is lower semicontinuous and $\tau_{\overline{D}}$ is upper semicontinuous (cf. [28, Exercise 11.5.5]), we conclude that τ_D is P -a.s. continuous. $\square$

Putting the previous observations together, we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY 5.4. *In case D is regular and Condition 2.13 holds, also the Conditions 2.4 and 2.7 hold.*

PROOF. To see that τ_B from Condition 2.4 is a.s. continuous, recall that balls are regular domains. $\square$

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.14.** By Theorem 2.6 and Corollary 5.4, we already know that the stochastic solution v is a pre-viscosity solution.

Recall from Theorem 2.8, which we may apply by virtue of Corollary 5.4, that there exists a realization family $\{Q_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ such that $\{Q_x \circ X^{-1} : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is strong Markov. We set $P_x := Q_x \circ X^{-1}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In the following, we adapt ideas from [6, 7] and show that the strong Markov selection $\{P_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is actually a Feller selection, which implies certain continuity properties. More specifically, we prove that the map $x \mapsto P_x$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}^d$ into $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

For every compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the set $\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{R}(x)$ is relatively compact (in the space $\mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$) by [9, Lemma 5.8]. Consequently, the set $\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \{Q \circ X^{-1} : Q \in \mathcal{R}(x)\}$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. As $\{P_x : x \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is contained in this set, we conclude that it is also relatively compact (in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$). In summary, for the continuity of $x \mapsto P_x$, it suffices to establish the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions (FDD). This is the program for the remainder of this section.

In the following we use ideas from [28, Theorem 7.1.9]. Take $x, y \in \overline{D}$ and a constant $\beta > 0$, which we choose small in the following. Furthermore, for $n \geq 1$, fix times $\beta < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n < \infty$ and a function $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ with $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1$. We set

$$\Phi(z) := E^{P_z}[\varphi(X_{t_1-\beta}, \dots, X_{t_n-\beta})], \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

By the (strong) Markov property of $\{P_z : z \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, we get

$$E^{P_x}[\varphi(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})] = E^{P_x}[E^{P_{X_\beta}}[\varphi(X_{t_1-\beta}, \dots, X_{t_n-\beta})]] = E^{P_x}[\Phi(X_\beta)].$$

Let Z be as in Lemma 5.2 with $t \equiv 0$. Then, we obtain that

$$E^{Q_x}[Z_\beta \Phi(X_\beta)] = E^{\mathcal{W}_x}[\Phi(X_\beta)].$$

Recall also from Lemma 5.2 that

$$E^{Q_x}[|Z_{\beta \wedge \tau_D} - 1|] \leq \sqrt{\exp\{\beta \|b\|_\infty\} - 1}.$$

In summary, we conclude that

$$\left| E^{P_x}[\varphi(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})] - E^{P_y}[\varphi(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})] \right|$$

$$\leq \left| E^{\mathcal{W}_x}[\Phi(X_\beta)] - E^{\mathcal{W}_y}[\Phi(X_\beta)] \right| + 2\sqrt{\exp\{\beta\|b\|_\infty\} - 1}.$$

Taking β close to zero, the final term can be made arbitrarily small. By the continuity of $z \mapsto \mathcal{W}_z$, when $x \rightarrow y$, also the first term tends to zero. We conclude that $x \mapsto P_x$ is continuous in the FDD convergence topology. This proves that $x \mapsto P_x$ is continuous in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

We are in the position to finish the proof. Take $x \in \overline{D}$. By Lemma 5.3 and Standing Assumption 2.1, the map

$$\Gamma_0^{\tau_D} = f(X_{\tau_D}) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\tau_D} k(X_s) ds \right\} + \int_0^{\tau_D} g(X_s) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^s k(X_z) dz \right\} ds$$

is bounded and Q_x -a.s. continuous. Consequently, we get from the continuous mapping theorem that

$$v(y) = E^{P_y}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] = E^{Q_y}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] \longrightarrow E^{Q_x}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] = v(x), \quad y \rightarrow x.$$

This means that v is continuous. The proof is complete. $\square$

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.10

In this section, we work in the one-dimensional setting, i.e., we assume that $d = 1$ without mentioning it again.

6.1. Some Preparations. The following lemma should be compared to Lemma 5.3.

LEMMA 6.1. *Take a bounded open interval $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $a > 0$. Then, for every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times U$ and all $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$, the map τ_U is P -a.s. continuous.*

PROOF. Take $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times U$ and $P \in \mathcal{K}(t, x)$. By Girsanov's theorem (cf. [19, Theorem 3.5.1], [17, Theorem III.3.24] or Lemma 5.2 above), it suffices to consider the case $b \equiv 0$. By the Doeblin, Dambis, Dubins–Schwarz theorem ([25, Theorem V.1.6]), there exists a Brownian motion $B = (B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that P -a.s.

$$X = B_{\langle X, X \rangle}.$$

Thanks to the hypothesis $a > 0$, the quadratic variation $t \mapsto \langle X, X \rangle_t$ is continuous and strictly increasing, hence invertible. Consequently, as P -a.s. $\tau_U(B) = \tau_{\overline{U}}(B)$ by the strong Markov property of Brownian motion, we get P -a.s.

$$\tau_U = \langle X, X \rangle_{\tau_U(B)}^{-1} = \langle X, X \rangle_{\tau_{\overline{U}}(B)}^{-1} = \tau_{\overline{U}}.$$

As τ_U is lower semicontinuous and $\tau_{\overline{U}}$ is upper semicontinuous (cf. [28, Exercise 11.5.5]), we conclude that τ_U is P -a.s. continuous. $\square$

Recalling Lemma 5.1, we immediately deduce the following:

COROLLARY 6.2. *If Condition 2.9 is in force, the Conditions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.7 hold.*

For $y \in \mathbb{R}$, set

$$T_y := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = y\}.$$

We call a probability measure P from $\mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{M})$, or $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, *regular* if $P(T_y < \infty) > 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

LEMMA 6.3. *In case $a > 0$, all measures in $\bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{R}(x)$ are regular.*

PROOF. Because $a > 0$, we can define

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{a}(x) &:= \inf \{a(\lambda, x) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}, \\ \bar{b}(x) &:= \sup \{b(\lambda, x)/a(\lambda, x) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}, \\ \underline{b}(x) &:= \inf \{b(\lambda, x)/a(\lambda, x) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}.\end{aligned}$$

As Λ is compact and b and a are continuous by Standing Assumption 2.1, $\underline{a}$, $\bar{b}$ and $\underline{b}$ are continuous by Berge's maximum theorem ([1, Theorem 17.31]). Furthermore, $\underline{a} > 0$. Take a number $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Later we will choose c either large or small enough. The Lebesgue measure is denoted by λ . Thanks to [19, Lemma 5.5.26], there are two differentiable functions $v_1, v_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with absolutely continuous derivatives and the following properties:

- (a) v_1 and v_2 are strictly increasing in (c, ∞) and strictly decreasing in $(-\infty, c)$;
- (b) $v_1(c) = 1, v_1'(c) = 0$ and λ -a.e.

$$\frac{1}{2}\underline{a}v_1'' + \underline{a}\bar{b}v_1' = v_1;$$

- (c) $v_2(c) = 1, v_2'(c) = 0$ and λ -a.e.

$$\frac{1}{2}\underline{a}v_2'' + \underline{a}bv_2' = v_2.$$

Notice that λ -a.e.

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{1}{2}v_1'' + \bar{b}v_1' = \frac{v_1}{\underline{a}} \geq 0, \quad \frac{1}{2}v_2'' + \underline{b}v_2' = \frac{v_2}{\underline{a}} \geq 0.$$

Let $P \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By definition of the set $\mathcal{R}(x)$, the coordinate process X is a P -semimartingale and that the density of its quadratic variation process is given by

$$a_s^P := \int a(X_s, \lambda) \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda) > 0, \quad s \geq 0,$$

where $\mathbf{m}$ is the kernel from (3.1). Thanks to its strict positivity and the occupation time formula ([20, Theorem 29.5]), we get P -a.s.

$$(6.2) \quad N \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \lambda(N) = 0 \implies \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_N(X_s) ds = 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Take $y < x$ and then choose c such that $c > x$. The density of the drift component of X is denoted by

$$b_s^P := \int b(X_s, \lambda) \mathbf{m}_s(d\lambda), \quad s \geq 0.$$

Using (6.1), (6.2) and $v_1' \leq 0$ on $(-\infty, c)$, we get from the generalized Itô formula ([20, Theorem 29.5]) that P -a.s., for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}e^{-t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} v_1(X_{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y}) &= v_1(x) + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} v_1'(X_s) dX_s^c \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} (b_s^P v_1'(X_s) + \frac{1}{2} a_s^P v_1''(X_s) - v_1(X_s)) ds \\ &\geq v_1(x) + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} v_1'(X_s) dX_s^c \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} (a_s^P (\bar{b}(X_s) v_1'(X_s) + \frac{1}{2} v_1''(X_s)) - v_1(X_s)) ds\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq v_1(x) + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} v_1'(X_s) dX_s^c \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} (\underline{a}(X_s) (\bar{b}(X_s) v_1'(X_s) + \tfrac{1}{2} v_1''(X_s)) - v_1(X_s)) ds \\
&= v_1(x) + \int_0^{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} v_1'(X_s) dX_s^c,
\end{aligned}$$

where X^c denotes the continuous local P -martingale part of X . As $(x, \lambda) \mapsto a(x, \lambda)$ is bounded, the stopped stochastic integral process

$$\int_0^{\cdot \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} e^{-s} v_1'(X_s) dX_s^c$$

is a P -martingale and we obtain that

$$E^P[e^{-t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} v_1(X_{t \wedge T_c \wedge T_y})] \geq v_1(x), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ and using the dominated convergence theorem yields that

$$E^P[e^{-T_c \wedge T_y} v_1(X_{T_c \wedge T_y}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_c \wedge T_y < \infty\}}] \geq v_1(x).$$

Now, if $P(T_y = \infty) = 1$, we get

$$v_1(x) \leq E^P[e^{-T_c} v_1(c) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_c < \infty\}}] \leq v_1(c),$$

which is a contradiction to the fact that v_1 is strictly decreasing in $(-\infty, c)$. Hence, we conclude that $P(T_y < \infty) > 0$. Finally, take $y > x$ and choose c such that $c < x$. As above, only this time using that $v_2' \geq 0$ on (c, ∞) , we obtain that P -a.s.

$$e^{-\cdot \wedge T_c \wedge T_y} v_2(X_{\cdot \wedge T_c \wedge T_y}) \geq \text{martingale starting at } v_2(x).$$

Again, this inequality yields that $P(T_y = \infty) = 1$ implies the contradiction $v_2(x) \leq v_2(c)$, and we conclude that $P(T_y < \infty) > 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

6.2. Proof of Theorem 2.10. Thanks to Corollary 6.2, Theorem 2.6 shows that the stochastic solution v is a pre-viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem (2.1). It remains to prove its continuity on $\overline{D}$. We use the same tactic as in the proof of Theorem 2.14.

Let $\{Q_x : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be as in Theorem 2.8, which we can apply by Corollary 6.2. Then, by Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 6.3, the family $\{Q_x \circ X^{-1} : x \in \overline{J}\}$ is a regular diffusion in the sense of [15]. In particular, by [27, Corollary 1], $x \mapsto Q_x \circ X^{-1}$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}$ into $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. Take $x \in \overline{D}$. The stopping time τ_D is $Q_x \circ X^{-1}$ -a.s. continuous by Lemma 6.1. Consequently, $\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}$ is bounded and $Q_x \circ X^{-1}$ -a.s. continuous by Standing Assumption 2.1. Using the continuous mapping theorem, we finally conclude that

$$v(y) = E^{Q_y \circ X^{-1}}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] \longrightarrow E^{Q_x \circ X^{-1}}[\Gamma_0^{\tau_D}] = v(x), \quad \overline{D} \ni y \rightarrow x.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis and K. B. Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 3rd ed., 2006.
- [2] D. P. Bertsekas and S. E. Shreve. *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete Time Case*. Academic Press, 1978.
- [3] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.

- [4] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii and P.-L. Lions. User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 27(1), 1–67, 1992.
- [5] M. G. Crandall, M. Kocan, P. L. Lions and A. Świech. Existence results for boundary problems for uniformly elliptic and parabolic fully nonlinear equations. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 1999(24), 1–20, 1999.
- [6] D. Criens and L. Niemann. Markov selections and Feller properties of nonlinear diffusions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 173, 104354, 2024.
- [7] D. Criens and L. Niemann. A class of multidimensional nonlinear diffusions with the Feller property. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 208, 110057, 2024.
- [8] D. Criens and L. Niemann. Nonlinear continuous semimartingales. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28(146):1–40, 2023.
- [9] N. El Karoui, D. Nguyen and M. Jeanblanc-Picqué. Compactification methods in the control of degenerate diffusions: existence of an optimal control. *Stochastics*, 20(3):169–219, 1987.
- [10] N. El Karoui, D. Nguyen and M. Jeanblanc-Picqué. Existence of an optimal Markovian filter for the control under partial observations. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, 26(5):1025–1061, 1988.
- [11] N. El Karoui and X. Tan. Capacities, measurable selection and dynamic programming part II: application in stochastic control problems. arXiv:1310.3364v2, 2015.
- [12] U. G. Haussmann. Existence of optimal Markovian controls for degenerate diffusions. In: *Stochastic differential systems*, Proc. 3rd Bad Honnef Conf. 1985, Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci. 78, 171–186, 1986.
- [13] H. Ishii. On uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic PDE's. *Communications in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 42(1), 15–45, 1989.
- [14] H. Ishii and P.-L. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic partial differential equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 83, 26–78, 1990.
- [15] K. Itô and H. P. McKean, Jr. *Diffusion Processes and their Sample Paths*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [16] J. Jacod. Weak and strong solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Stochastics*, 3:171–191, 1980.
- [17] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2nd ed., 2003.
- [18] R. Jensen. The maximum principle for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order partial differential equations. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 101, 1–27, 1988.
- [19] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. Springer New York, 2nd ed., 1991.
- [20] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 3rd ed., 2021.
- [21] D. Lacker. Mean field games via controlled martingale problems: Existence of Markovian equilibria. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125:2856–2894, 2015.
- [22] P. L. Lions. Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Part 1: The dynamic programming principle and applications. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 8(10):1101–1174, 1983.

- [23] P. L. Lions. Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Part 2: Viscosity solutions and uniqueness. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 8(11):1229–1276, 1983.
- [24] R. G. Pinsky. Positive Harmonic Functions and Diffusion. *Cambridge University Press*, 1995.
- [25] D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 3rd ed., 1999.
- [26] N. S. Trudinger. On regularity and existence of viscosity solutions of nonlinear second order, elliptic equations. In: *Partial differential equations and the calculus of variations. Essays in Honor of Ennio De Giorgi*, 939–957, 1989.
- [27] C. Stone. Limit theorems for random walks, birth and death processes, and diffusion processes. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 7, 638–660, 1963.
- [28] D. W. Stroock and S.R.S. Varadhan. *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, reprint of 1997 ed., 2006.

ALBERT-LUDWIGS UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG, ERNST-ZERMELO-STR. 1, 79104 FREIBURG, GERMANY
Email address: david.criens@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de