

**A PROBLEM OF SINGULAR STOCHASTIC  
CONTROL WITH DISCRETIONARY STOPPING**

By

**M.H.A. Davis**

and

**M. Zervos**

**IMA Preprint Series # 1143**

June 1993

# A PROBLEM OF SINGULAR STOCHASTIC CONTROL WITH DISCRETIONARY STOPPING<sup>1</sup>

M.H.A.DAVIS and M.ZERVOS

Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine.

In this paper a simple problem of combined singular stochastic control and optimal stopping is formulated and solved. We find that the optimal strategies can take qualitatively different forms, depending on parameter values. We also study a variant on the problem in which the value function is inherently non-convex. The proofs employ the generalised Itô formula applicable for differences of convex functions.

## 1 Introduction.

Problems of combined continuous control and optimal stopping have been studied by several authors. Krylov (1980, Section 6.4) gives some general condition for optimality, while in a recent paper Beneš (1992) gives an explicit solution for an “LQG”-type problem with discretionary stopping. Here we study a variant of this problem in which the continuously acting control takes the form of *singular* control rather than the controlled drift of Beneš (1992). Singular control arises when the control acts additively on the system model and a cost is paid for the total variation of control effort, representing the use of fuel. Several problems of this sort have been solved in recent years; a typical example, taken from Karatzas (1983), is described in Section 2 below. Discretionary stopping in singular control arises in at least two applications. One is in target tracking problems where one has to decide when one is “sufficiently close” to the target. A second application is in consumption/investment problems of financial economics. It is shown in Davis and Norman (1990) that trading strategies are naturally of singular control type in models including transaction costs, and if an American option is held in a portfolio, then its exercise time -a stopping time- is an additional decision variable.

The purpose of this paper is to analyse a simple model involving both singular control and discretionary stopping, with a view to discovering what the nature of optimal strategies is for such problems. The model is described in Section 3 where the main results of the paper are stated. Briefly, we find that qualitatively different kinds of optimal behaviour can occur, depending on parameter values. Proofs are given in Section 4 and involve the use of a generalised Itô formula applicable to differences of convex functions. A variant of the problem, whose value function is inherently non-convex, is studied in Section 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by the UK Defence Research Agency under Agreement no 2037/393/RAE.

AMS 1980 *subject classifications*. Primary 93E20, 60G40; secondary 60J65.

*Key words and phrases*. Singular stochastic control, optimal stopping, Brownian motion, local time, reflecting diffusions.

## 2 An example of singular control.

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  be a probability space equipped with a filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  satisfying the usual conditions of right continuity and augmentation by  $P$ -negligible sets and carrying a standard one-dimensional  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -Brownian motion  $\{w_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the set of  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -adapted, right-continuous processes  $\xi$  such that with probability 1 the sample path  $t \rightarrow \xi_t(\omega)$  has bounded variation on any compact subset of  $[0, \infty)$ , and  $\xi_{0-}(\omega) = 0$ . A process  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$  will be represented as  $\xi_t = \xi_t^+ - \xi_t^-$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , where the processes  $\xi_t^\pm \in \mathcal{C}$  are non-decreasing and the representation is minimal, so that the total variation  $\check{\xi}$  of  $\xi$  on the interval  $[0, t]$  can be written in the form  $\check{\xi}_t = \xi_t^+ + \xi_t^-$ . Also, note that throughout this paper, we use the notation “ $\int_0^t$ ” for integrals of the form “ $\int_{[0,t]}$ ”. For  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  define

$$x_t = x + w_t + \xi_t \quad (1)$$

and

$$J_x(\xi) = E \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \left[ \lambda x_t^2 dt + d\check{\xi}_t \right] \quad (2)$$

where  $\lambda, \delta > 0$  are given constants. The problem is to minimise  $J_x(\xi)$  over  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$ . The solution to this problem is described as follows (Karatzas (1983)). Suppose that an even  $C^2$  function  $v$  satisfies for some  $b > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad & \frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 = 0 & x \in [-b, b] \\ \text{(b)} \quad & v(x) = x - b + v(b) & x \geq b \\ \text{(c)} \quad & v(x) = -x - b + v(b) & x \leq -b \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The  $C^2$  property implies that  $v'(b-) = 1$  and  $v''(b-) = 0$ . Now define the process  $\tilde{\xi}_t := \tilde{\xi}_t^+ - \tilde{\xi}_t^-$  where the processes  $\tilde{\xi}_t^\pm$  are the unique solution to the pair of functional equations

$$\tilde{\xi}_t^+ = \max \left[ 0, \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ -x - w_s + \tilde{\xi}_s^- - b \right\} \right] \quad (4)$$

and

$$\tilde{\xi}_t^- = \max \left[ 0, \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ x + w_s + \tilde{\xi}_s^+ - b \right\} \right] . \quad (5)$$

It can be shown by an application of the Doléans-Dade-Meyer change of variable formula that  $\tilde{\xi}_t$  is optimal in  $\mathcal{C}$  and that  $v(x) = J_x(\tilde{\xi})$ .

In fact, equations (3) have a unique  $C^2$  solution. The general solution of (3.a) is

$$v(x) = A \cosh \sqrt{2\delta} x + B \sinh \sqrt{2\delta} x + \frac{\lambda}{\delta} x^2 + \frac{\lambda}{\delta^2} \quad (6)$$

If  $v$  is even then  $B = 0$  and the boundary conditions  $v'(b) = 1$  and  $v''(b) = 0$  provide a pair of transcendental equations for the two remaining parameters  $b$  and  $A$ . It is shown in Karatzas (1983) that these equations have a unique solution.

Note from (4) and (5) that the optimal strategy involves three “tactics”: *move*, *wait* and *reflect*. If we start from  $x > b$  (or  $x < -b$ ) there is an immediate *move* to  $b$  (or  $-b$ ). The controller takes no action (i.e. *waits*) while  $x_t \in (-b, b)$ , whereas at  $\pm b$  it takes “minimal action” (*reflect*) to keep  $x_t$  inside  $[-b, b]$ .

### 3 Discretionary stopping.

We now include the possibility of stopping in the above problem, thus adding *stop* to the above repertoire of tactics. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the class of all  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -stopping times. For  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ , define

$$J_x(\xi, \tau) = E \left\{ \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \lambda x_t^2 dt + d\xi_t \right] + e^{-\delta\tau} \alpha x_\tau^2 \right\} \quad (7)$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  is a further parameter. We now seek a pair  $(\xi, \tau)$  to minimise  $J_x(\xi, \tau)$ .

Some immediate simplifications can be made to this problem formulation. First, it is clear that the process should be stopped at 0 if 0 is ever reached and that it cannot be optimal to “jump across” 0, i.e. introduce a control  $\xi_t$  such that for some  $t$ ,  $x_{t-} > 0$  and  $x_t < 0$  or conversely. Also, a simple contradiction argument shows that no control with  $d\xi_t^+ > 0$  when  $x_t > 0$  or  $d\xi_t^- < 0$  when  $x_t < 0$  can be optimal. All of these assertions can be checked *post facto*. For these reasons, we can assume for the rest of this section that  $x > 0$  and that the processes  $x_t$  evolve on the positive half-line  $\mathbb{R}^+$  with monotone control  $\xi_t = -\xi_t^-$  (the situation for starting points  $x < 0$  being just the mirror image of this).

By convention,  $\xi_{0-} = 0$  so that  $\xi_0$  denotes the jump in  $\xi_t$  at  $t = 0$ . Since the stopping cost  $\alpha x^2$  is minimum at  $x = 0$ , it is natural to envisage that the optimal stopping set is a neighbourhood of zero. One possible strategy is “move-and-stop”, i.e. for some  $a \geq 0$ , take  $\tilde{\xi}_0 = 0$  if  $x \leq a$ ,  $\tilde{\xi}_0 = x - a$  if  $x > a$ , and  $\tilde{\tau} = 0$ . The cost of this strategy is

$$J_x(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\tau}) = \begin{cases} \alpha x^2 & , \quad x \leq a \\ x - a + \alpha a^2 & , \quad x \geq a \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Clearly, the best choice of  $a$  is the abscissa of the point at which a straight line with slope 1 is tangent to the function  $\alpha x^2$ , that is  $a = 1/2\alpha$  (see Figure 1). Thus the cost of the best “move-and-stop” strategy is the  $C^1$  function

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha x^2 & , \quad x \leq 1/2\alpha \\ x - 1/4\alpha & , \quad x \geq 1/2\alpha \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Is “move-and-stop” the best strategy? Answer: yes, if  $\alpha\delta \leq \lambda$  (see Theorem 1 below).

Bearing in mind the solution when  $\tau \equiv \infty$  of Section 2, another possible strategy is to introduce a stopping barrier at some point  $a \geq 0$  and a reflecting barrier at some point  $b > a$ . The corresponding controlled process is

$$\bar{\xi}_t = \max \left[ 0, \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{x + w_s - b\} \right] \quad (10)$$

and the corresponding stopping time is

$$\bar{\tau} = \inf \{ t \geq 0 : x_t \in [0, a] \} \quad (11)$$

By the recurrence property of Brownian motion,  $P[\bar{\tau} < \infty] = 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We conjecture that if this strategy is optimal for some  $a$  and  $b$ , then the corresponding cost function

$v(x) = J_x(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\tau})$  will be  $C^2$  at  $b$  (as in Section 2) and  $C^1$  at  $a$  (the “smooth pasting” condition of optimal stopping). Since there is no control in the open set  $(a, b)$ ,  $v$  will satisfy

$$\frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 = 0 \quad , \quad x \in (a, b) \quad (12)$$

and the conjectured boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} v(a) &= \alpha a^2 & v'(b) &= 1 \\ v'(a) &= 2\alpha a & v''(b) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The general solution of (12) is of the form (6), and we therefore have four boundary conditions (13) to settle the four parameters  $a, b, A$  and  $B$ . Outside  $(a, b)$ ,  $v$  is described by

$$v(x) = \alpha x^2 \quad , \quad x \in [0, a] \quad (14)$$

and

$$v(x) = x - b + v(b) \quad , \quad x \geq b \quad (15)$$

It turns out that a strategy of this form is optimal whenever  $\alpha\delta > \lambda$ .

**Theorem 1** *For the process  $x_t$  given by (1), consider the problem of minimising the cost function given by (7) over all strategies  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ .*

**I.** *If  $\alpha\delta \leq \lambda$ , then the “move-and-stop” strategy, i.e.  $\tilde{\xi}_0^+ = \max\{0, -x - a\}$ ,  $\tilde{\xi}_0^- = \max\{0, x - a\}$  and  $\bar{\tau} = 0$ , is optimal, with stopping barrier  $a = 1/2\alpha$ .*

**II.** *If  $\alpha\delta > \lambda$ , then there exist  $a, b$  with  $0 < a < b < \infty$  such that the strategy  $(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\tau})$  described by  $\bar{\xi}_t^+ = \max[0, \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{0, -x - w_s - b\}]$ ,  $\bar{\xi}_t^- = \max[0, \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{0, x + w_s - b\}]$  and  $\bar{\tau} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : x_t \in [-a, a]\}$  is optimal with cost  $v(x)$  which is an even function of  $x$  and satisfies (12)-(15). The parameters  $a$  and  $b$  are uniquely fixed by the requirement that  $v(x)$  satisfy (12), (14), (15) and be  $C^1$  at  $a$  and  $C^2$  at  $b$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in the next Section. We have to show (in Case II.) that the free boundary problem (12), (13) has a unique solution, and then (in either case) that the conjectured solutions are indeed optimal.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.

Denote the infimum of  $J_x(\xi, \tau)$  by  $v(x)$ . It will become clear in the development of the proof of Theorem 1 that the optimal cost  $v(x)$  must satisfy the following variational inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \text{i.} \quad & v(x) \leq \alpha x^2 & \text{iii.} \quad & \frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 \geq 0 \\ \text{ii.} \quad & |v'(x)| \leq 1 & \text{iv.} \quad & (v(x) - \alpha x^2)(|v'(x)| - 1) \left( \frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

In the next three Lemmas we consider the “reduced” problem where  $x \geq 0$ . The following Lemma describes the  $C^1$  solution to the variational inequalities i)-iv) when the “move-and-stop” strategy is optimal.

**Lemma 2** *The function defined by*

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha x^2 & , \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1/2\alpha \\ x - 1/4\alpha & , \quad 1/2\alpha \leq x \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

*satisfies inequalities i) and ii) for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , and equation iv) for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+ - \{1/2\alpha\}$ . Also, it satisfies inequality iii) for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+ - \{1/2\alpha\}$  if and only if  $\alpha\delta - \lambda \leq 0$ .*

**Proof.** It is straightforward to verify the first three assertions. Inequality iii) is equivalent to the following two inequalities

$$-(\alpha\delta - \lambda)x^2 + \alpha \geq 0 \quad , \quad 0 \leq x < 1/2\alpha \quad (17)$$

$$\lambda x^2 - \delta x + \frac{\delta}{4\alpha} \geq 0 \quad , \quad 1/2\alpha < x \quad (18)$$

If  $\alpha\delta - \lambda \leq 0$ , then (17) holds trivially, and (18) holds because the quadratic appearing on its left hand side has no real roots or one double root (since its discriminant is  $\Delta = \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda)/\alpha \leq 0$ ). On the other hand, assuming that  $\alpha\delta - \lambda > 0$ , it is easy to verify that  $1/2\alpha$  is strictly smaller than the largest root of the quadratic on the left hand side of (18), and so (18) cannot hold.  $\square$

The next Lemma proves that the free boundary value problem described in Section 3 has actually a unique solution.

**Lemma 3** *The differential equation*

$$\frac{1}{2}f''(x) - \delta f(x) + \lambda x^2 = 0 \quad (19)$$

*with boundary values*

$$\begin{aligned} f(a) &= \alpha a^2 & f'(b) &= 1 \\ f'(a) &= 2\alpha a & f''(b) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

*has a unique solution with  $b > a > 0$  if and only if  $\alpha\delta - \lambda > 0$ .*

**Proof.** The general solution of the differential equation (19) is

$$f(x) = Ae^{\sqrt{2\delta}x} + Be^{-\sqrt{2\delta}x} + \frac{\lambda}{\delta}x^2 + \frac{\lambda}{\delta^2} \quad (21)$$

The boundary values (20) give rise to the following system of transcendental equations

$$Ae^{\sqrt{2\delta}a} = \frac{1}{2\delta^2} \left[ \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 + \sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a - \lambda \right] \quad (22)$$

$$Be^{-\sqrt{2\delta}a} = \frac{1}{2\delta^2} \left[ \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 - \sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a - \lambda \right] \quad (23)$$

$$Ae^{\sqrt{2\delta}b} = \frac{1}{4\delta^2} \left[ -2\lambda - \sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) \right] \quad (24)$$

$$Be^{-\sqrt{2\delta}b} = \frac{1}{4\delta^2} \left[ -2\lambda + \sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) \right] \quad (25)$$

If  $A \geq 0$ , then (24) implies  $-2\lambda \geq \sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta)$  and so  $B < 0$  by (25). On the other hand, if  $B \geq 0$  then (25) holds if  $\sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) \geq 2\lambda$  and hence  $A < 0$  by (24). Consequently, at least one of  $A, B$  must be negative.

Either of the quadratic forms which appear on the right hand side of equations (22) and (23) has one positive and one negative root. Hence, since at least one of  $A, B$  is negative,  $a$  must be smaller than the largest of their roots

$$a < \frac{\sqrt{2\delta}(\alpha\delta - \lambda) + \sqrt{2\delta(\alpha^2\delta^2 - \lambda^2)}}{2\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda)} =: \rho_1 \quad (26)$$

Consequently, if (19) and (20) has a solution, then  $a \in [0, \rho_1)$  and  $B < 0$ . Dividing (24) by (22) and (23) by (25) yields

$$e^{\sqrt{2\delta}(b-a)} = \frac{-2\lambda - \sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta)}{2 \left[ \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 + \sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a - \lambda \right]} \quad (27)$$

and

$$e^{\sqrt{2\delta}(b-a)} = \frac{2 \left[ \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 - \sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a - \lambda \right]}{-2\lambda + \sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta)} \quad (28)$$

Equating the right hand sides of (27) and (28) leads to

$$2\delta (2\lambda b - \delta)^2 = 4\delta^2(\alpha\delta - \lambda) \left[ 2\alpha - (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 \right] a^2 \quad (29)$$

If  $\alpha\delta - \lambda < 0$ , the right hand side of this equation is negative, and so, there can be no solution. On the other hand, if  $\alpha\delta - \lambda = 0$ , (29) and (22)-(25) imply  $a = b$ . Hence, (19) and (20) do not accept a solution with  $b > a \geq 0$  for  $\alpha\delta - \lambda \leq 0$ . Note also, that it is straightforward to verify that  $\rho_1^2 < 2\alpha/(\alpha\delta - \lambda)$ .

Equation (29) gives rise to two possible cases:

**Case I.**  $\sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) \leq 0$

Assume that the system of equations (27) (or (28)) and (29) has (at least) one solution. Since  $B < 0$ ,  $b > a$  implies  $B \exp \{-\sqrt{2\delta} b\} > B \exp \{-\sqrt{2\delta} a\}$ , and using (23) and (25)

$$-\sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) < -2\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 + 2\sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a \quad (30)$$

The left hand side of this inequality is non-negative by assumption, and so, the inequality is equivalent to the one obtained by squaring its two sides. Hence, using (29) and after some simple calculations, (30) is shown to be equivalent to

$$\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 - \sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a - \lambda > 0$$

But then,  $B > 0$  by (23), which is a contradiction.

**Case II.**  $\sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) > 0$

In this case, equation (29) gives

$$b = \frac{\delta}{2\lambda} + \frac{\sqrt{2\delta}(\alpha\delta - \lambda)}{2\lambda} a \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha\delta - \lambda} - a^2} \quad (31)$$

Substitution in equation (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1(a) &:= \left[ -\lambda - \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha\delta - \lambda} - a^2} \right] \left[ \delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 + \sqrt{2\delta}(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a - \lambda \right]^{-1} = \\
&= \exp \left\{ \frac{\delta\sqrt{2\delta}}{2\lambda} + \frac{\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda)}{\lambda} a \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha\delta - \lambda} - a^2} - \sqrt{2\delta} a \right\} =: g_2(a) \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

The numerator of the function  $g_1$  is bounded and negative in the interval  $[0, \rho_1)$ . The denominator of  $g_1$  has a root in  $[0, \rho_1)$ , denote it by  $\rho_2$ , and is negative in the interval  $[0, \rho_2)$  and positive in the interval  $(\rho_2, \rho_1)$ . Consequently, since  $g_1(0) = 1$ , the function  $g_1$  is increasing from 1 to  $+\infty$  as  $a$  moves from 0 to  $\rho_2$ , and is negative in the interval  $(\rho_2, \rho_1)$ . On the other hand, the function  $g_2$  is bounded and positive in  $[0, \rho_1)$ . Hence, since  $g_2(0) = \exp\{\delta\sqrt{2\delta}/2\lambda\} > 1$ , equation (32) has at least one solution which lies in  $(0, \rho_2)$ . It is a tedious but straightforward exercise to verify that  $\frac{d}{da} \ln g_1(a) > \frac{d}{da} \ln g_2(a)$  for any  $a$  in the interval of interest. Hence the equation  $\ln g_1(a) = \ln g_2(a)$  which is equivalent to (32) has a unique solution. Also, note that since the unique solution of (32) lies in  $(0, \rho_2)$ , we have  $A, B < 0$ .

In order to see that  $b > a$ , observe that since  $A < 0$ ,  $b > a$  if and only if  $A \exp\{\sqrt{2\delta} b\} < A \exp\{\sqrt{2\delta} a\}$ . Using (22) and (24) this is equivalent to

$$-\sqrt{2\delta} (2\lambda b - \delta) < 2\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 + 2\sqrt{2\delta} (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a \quad (33)$$

But this inequality holds identically since its left hand side is negative by assumption and its right hand side is positive.  $\square$

**Remark 1** In order to obtain some qualitative feeling about how big the “gap”  $b - a$  can be, fix  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  and parametrise  $a$  and  $b$  by  $\delta > \lambda/\alpha$ . With reference to inequality (26), observe that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \rho_1(\delta) = 0$ , and hence  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} a(\delta) = 0$ . On the other hand, (31) implies that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} b(\delta) = \infty$ . We conclude that the “gap”  $b - a$  can be arbitrarily large, depending on how large  $\delta$  is. As an example, in Figure 2 we plot the barriers  $a$  and  $b$  as functions of  $\delta$  for  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\lambda = 2$ . Similar observations hold if we parametrise  $a$  and  $b$  by  $\alpha$  or  $\lambda$ .  $\square$

The following Lemma describes the the  $C^1$  solution to the variational inequalities i)-iv) for Case II of Theorem 1.

**Lemma 4** *Let  $\alpha\delta - \lambda > 0$ , and let the positive real numbers  $a$ ,  $b$  and the function  $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  solve the problem stated in Lemma 3. The function defined by*

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha x^2 & , \quad 0 \leq x \leq a \\ f(x) & , \quad a \leq x \leq b \\ x - b + \lambda b^2/\delta & , \quad b \leq x \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

*satisfies inequalities i) and ii) for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , and inequality iii) and equation iv) for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+ - \{a\}$ .*

**Proof.** The first step is to prove that  $v$  is convex. Clearly,  $v''(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in [0, a) \cup [b, \infty)$ . For  $x \in (a, b)$ , use equations (22) and (23) to obtain

$$v'''(x) = \frac{2\sqrt{2\delta}}{\delta} \left\{ [\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 - \lambda] \sinh \sqrt{2\delta}(x - a) + \sqrt{2\delta}(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a \cosh \sqrt{2\delta}(x - a) \right\} \quad (35)$$

Equation  $v'''(x) = 0$  is then equivalent to

$$\tanh \sqrt{2\delta}(x - a) = -\frac{\sqrt{2\delta}(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a}{\delta(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 - \lambda} \quad (36)$$

The right hand side of (36) is positive and smaller than 1, and so, (36) has a unique solution, denoted  $r$ . Since  $v''(a+) = 2(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 > 0$ ,  $v''(b-) = 0$  and  $v'''(a+) = 4(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a > 0$  by (35),  $r \in (a, b)$  and  $v''(x)$  increases (strictly) from some positive constant as  $x$  moves from  $a$  to  $r$  and then decreases (strictly) to zero as  $x$  moves from  $r$  to  $b$ . Consequently,  $v''(x) > 0$  for any  $x$  in  $(a, b)$ . Hence, the function  $v$  is convex.

Since  $\alpha\delta - \lambda > 0$  is equivalent to  $2\lambda/\delta < 2\alpha$ , and the parameters  $A$  and  $B$  appearing in the proof of Lemma 3 are both negative,  $v''(x) < 2\lambda/\delta < 2\alpha$ ,  $\forall x \in (a, b)$ . Consequently,  $v''(x) \leq 2\alpha$  for any  $x$ , and so  $v(x) \leq \alpha x^2$  for all  $x$  (since  $v(0) = 0$  and  $v'(0) = 0$ ).

For  $x \geq b$ ,  $v'(x) = 1$ . For  $0 \leq x \leq b$ ,  $0 \leq v'(x) \leq 1$  because the function  $v'$  is increasing, since  $v$  is convex. Hence,  $v$  satisfies inequality ii) for any  $x \geq 0$ .

The facts that  $v''(x) \leq 2\alpha$  for any  $x$ ,  $v''(a+) = 2(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2$  and that  $v''$  is strictly increasing at  $x = a+$  imply

$$(\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 < \alpha \quad (37)$$

For  $x \in [0, a)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 = \alpha - (\alpha\delta - \lambda) x^2 \geq \alpha - (\alpha\delta - \lambda) a^2 > 0 \quad (38)$$

with the last inequality holding because of (37). For  $x \in (a, b)$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 = 0$  by construction. For  $x \in [b, \infty)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda x^2 = (x - b) [\lambda(x + b) - \delta] \geq (x - b)(2\lambda b - \delta) > 0 \quad (39)$$

with the last inequality holding because of Lemma 3 (see Case II in which the solution is attained). Consequently, inequality iii) holds for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+ - \{a\}$ .

Finally, equation iv) holds trivially for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+ - \{a\}$  by the construction of the function  $v$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.** First, extend the functions  $v$  appearing in Lemmas 2, and 4, in the whole real line by even symmetry, and note that the “extended” functions are  $C^2$  at 0. In the case that  $\alpha\delta - \lambda \leq 0$ , consider the function  $v$  described in Lemma 2, and in the case that  $\alpha\delta - \lambda > 0$ , consider the function  $v$  described in Lemma 4.

Since the function  $v$  is  $C^1$  and its second derivative is piecewise continuous, it can be written as the difference of the convex functions

$$v_1(x) = v(0) + xv'(0) + \int_0^x \int_0^y [f''(r)]^+ dr dy \quad \text{and} \quad v_2(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^y [f''(r)]^- dr dy$$

Hence, Meyer-Itô's formula (Protter (1992), Theorem IV.51, or Meyer (1976), VI.II) can be applied to yield

$$v(x_t) - v(x_{0-}) = \int_0^t v'(x_{s-}) dx_s + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} L_t^a \mu(da) + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} [v(x_s) - v(x_{s-}) - v'(x_{s-}) \Delta x_s] \quad (40)$$

where  $x_t$  is given by (1) for arbitrary  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $x_{0-} = x$ ,  $L_t^a$  is the local time of the semimartingale  $x_t$  at  $a$ , and  $\mu$  is the signed measure which is the second derivative of  $v$  in the generalised function sense. But  $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$  implies that  $v''$  exists for Lebesgue almost all  $x$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} L_t^a \mu(da) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} L_t^a v''(a) da \\ &= \int_0^t v''(x_{s-}) ds \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

the second equality following from Corollary 1 to Theorem IV.51 in Protter (1992). Now consider the finite variation, previsible process  $y_t = e^{-\delta t}$  and the semimartingale  $z_e = v(x_t)$ , and recall the integration by parts formula (Meyer (1976), IV.38)

$$y_\tau z_\tau - y_0 z_{0-} = \int_0^\tau y_t dz_t + \int_0^\tau z_{t-} dy_t \quad (42)$$

Equations (42), (40) and (41) give

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\delta \tau} v(x_\tau) - v(x) &= \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} v'(x_{t-}) dw_t + \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \frac{1}{2} v''(x_t) - \delta v(x_t) \right] dt \\ &+ \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} v'(x_{t-}) d\xi_t + \sum_{0 \leq t \leq \tau} e^{-\delta t} [v(x_t) - v(x_{t-}) - v'(x_{t-}) \Delta x_t] \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Adding

$$\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \lambda x_t^2 dt + d\check{\xi}_t \right] + e^{-\delta \tau} \alpha x_\tau^2$$

to both sides of (43), rearranging terms and using the identities (valid since  $\Delta x_t = \Delta \xi_t$ )

$$\xi_t = [\xi^c]_t^+ - [\xi^c]_t^- + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \Delta x_s \quad (44)$$

$$\check{\xi}_t = [\xi^c]_t^+ + [\xi^c]_t^- + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\Delta x_s| \quad (45)$$

where  $\xi^c$  is the continuous part of  $\xi$  with  $\xi_0^c = 0$ , gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \lambda x_t^2 dt + d\check{\xi}_t \right] + e^{-\delta \tau} \alpha x_\tau^2 &= v(x) + e^{-\delta \tau} [\alpha x_\tau^2 - v(x_\tau)] + \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} v'(x_{t-}) dw_t \\ &+ \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \frac{1}{2} v''(x_t) - \delta v(x_t) + \lambda x_t^2 \right] dt \\ &+ \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left\{ [1 + v'(x_{t-})] d[\xi^c]_t^+ + [1 - v'(x_{t-})] d[\xi^c]_t^- \right\} \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq t \leq \tau} e^{-\delta t} [v(x_t) - v(x_{t-}) + |\Delta x_t|] \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Now let any admissible strategy  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ . Since the function  $v$  satisfies the variational inequalities i)-iii) (see Lemma 2 or 4 according to the case), it is clear that except for the stochastic integral, all the terms on the right hand side of (46) are non-negative, and so

$$\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \lambda x_t^2 dt + d\check{\xi}_t \right] + e^{-\delta\tau} \alpha x_\tau^2 \geq v(x) + \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} v'(x_{t-}) dw_t \quad (47)$$

Taking expectations, and noting that the expectation of the stochastic integral is zero, the above inequality yields

$$E \left\{ \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \left[ \lambda x_t^2 dt + d\check{\xi}_t \right] + e^{-\delta\tau} \alpha x_\tau^2 \right\} \geq v(x) \quad (48)$$

In order to complete the proof, a strategy with cost given by  $v$  must be constructed, and this is possible because the functions  $v$  satisfy equality iv).

If  $\alpha\delta - \lambda \leq 0$  then the “move-and-stop” strategy  $\bar{\xi}$  and  $\bar{\tau}$ , clearly yields a cost which is equal to  $v(x)$ .

Hence, consider  $\alpha\delta - \lambda > 0$ , and let  $x > 0$ . A careful inspection of equation (46) reveals that inequality (48) will hold with equality if the stopping strategy  $\bar{\tau}$  is equal to the hitting time of the set  $[-a, a]$ , and the control strategy  $\bar{\xi} = \bar{\xi}^+ - \bar{\xi}^-$  is constructed so that  $\bar{\xi}^+ = 0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{a) } & x_t = x + w_t - \bar{\xi}_t^- \leq b \\ \text{b) } & \bar{\xi}_t^- \text{ is nondecreasing, and} \\ \text{c) } & \bar{\xi}_t^- \text{ is flat off } \{t \geq 0 : x_t \leq b\}, \text{ i.e. } \int_0^\tau I_{\{x_s < b\}} d\bar{\xi}_t^- = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

But (49) is a Skorohod equation and it admits the unique, continuous solution (see for example Karatzas and Shreve (1988), Lemma 3.6.14)

$$\bar{\xi}_t^- = \max \left[ 0, \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{x + w_s - b\} \right] \quad (50)$$

Finally, the situation when  $x < 0$  is treated similarly (it is the mirror image of the situation when  $x > 0$ ).  $\square$

**Remark 2** Note that the proof of Theorem 1 essentially contains a new verification theorem for one-dimensional problems (for example it is not a special case of Theorem VIII.4.1 in Soner and Fleming (1993) because the optimal cost function  $v$  is not required to be twice continuously differentiable on the set  $\{x : |v'(x)| < 1\}$ ). To see this, consider some general functions  $h(x)$  and  $g(x)$  (satisfying certain smoothness assumptions) in place of the functions  $\lambda x^2$  and  $\alpha x^2$  respectively. If a  $C^1$  function  $w$  satisfies the inequalities i)-iii), then it can be shown as until equation (48) that  $w(x)$  is smaller or equal to the optimal cost  $v(x)$ . On the other hand, satisfaction of equality iv) suggests that  $w$  is indeed the optimal cost function, with optimal strategy which “switches” among the tactics described in Sections 2 and 3 according to whether inequality i), ii) or iii) holds with equality. Note also that convexity of the value function was established in the proof of Lemma 4 only in order to show that  $|v'(x)| \leq 1$ . Convexity plays no role in the “verification” argument given above.  $\square$

## 5 A problem with inherently non-convex value function.

In this Section we sketch the solution to a further problem involving singular control and discretionary stopping. Again, we find qualitative dependence of the optimal strategy on parameter values, but the real interest lies in the fact that this example exhibits a genuinely nonconvex character.

Everything else being the same as before, consider the minimisation of the cost

$$I_x(\xi, \tau) = E \left\{ \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} [\lambda dt + d\xi_t] + e^{-\delta \tau} \alpha x_\tau^2 \right\} \quad (51)$$

By considering the cost associated with the two extreme strategies, namely stop immediately and do nothing, we can see that in this problem the optimal cost function  $v$  must satisfy for all  $x$

$$v(x) \leq \min \left\{ \alpha x^2, \frac{\lambda}{\delta} \right\} \quad (52)$$

Hence, being bounded, equal to 0 at  $x = 0$  and positive elsewhere, the optimal cost function cannot be convex.

The variational inequalities for this problem are inequalities i) and ii) of the previous Section and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{v.} \quad & \frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda \geq 0 \\ \text{vi.} \quad & (v(x) - \alpha x^2) (|v'(x)| - 1) \left( \frac{1}{2}v''(x) - \delta v(x) + \lambda \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

As in Section 3, consider (without real loss of generality)  $x \geq 0$ . One possible strategy is to “do nothing” while being inside the set  $(a, \infty)$  for some  $a > 0$ , and to stop as soon as the process hits the set  $[0, a]$ . Noting that the solution of the differential equation  $\frac{1}{2}f''(x) - \delta f(x) + \lambda = 0$  is

$$f(x) = Ae^{\sqrt{2\delta}x} + Be^{-\sqrt{2\delta}x} + \frac{\lambda}{\delta} \quad (53)$$

the cost of this strategy is given by the function

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha x^2 & , \quad 0 \leq x \leq a \\ Be^{-\sqrt{2\delta}x} + \lambda/\delta & , \quad a < x \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

where we have used  $A = 0$  since  $v$  has to be bounded. Assuming  $C^1$  fit at the point  $a$ , we obtain a system of two equations for the unknowns  $a$  and  $B$ . The solution to this is

$$a = \frac{-\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha(\alpha + 2\lambda)}}{\alpha\sqrt{2\delta}} \quad , \quad B = -\frac{2\alpha a}{\sqrt{2\delta}} e^{\sqrt{2\delta}a} \quad (55)$$

Using rather simple analytic arguments, we can show that the function  $v$  defined by (54), and (55) satisfies the variational inequalities i), ii), v) and vi) if and only if

$$\lambda \leq \frac{\delta + 2\alpha\sqrt{2\delta}}{4\alpha} \quad (56)$$

Because of this condition, we have to look for a further possible strategy. The natural generalisation of the strategy just described is to consider two barrier points  $0 < a < b$ . Whenever the process is inside the set  $(b, \infty)$ , the controller takes no action at all. The process being inside the set  $(a, b]$ , the controller moves it immediately to the point  $a$ . Finally, the process is stopped as soon as it hits the set  $[0, a]$ . The cost associated with this strategy is then given by

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha x^2 & , \quad 0 \leq x \leq a \\ x - a + \alpha a^2 & , \quad a < x \leq b \\ B e^{-\sqrt{2\delta}x} + \lambda/\delta & , \quad b < x \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

Again, assuming  $C^1$  fit at both points  $a$  and  $b$ , we obtain a system of three equations for the three unknowns  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $B$ . The solution to this system is

$$a = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \quad , \quad b = \frac{1}{4\alpha} + \frac{\lambda}{\delta} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\delta}} \quad , \quad B = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\delta}} e^{\sqrt{2\delta}b} \quad (58)$$

From (58) we can easily calculate that  $a < b$  if and only if

$$\lambda > \frac{\delta + 2\alpha\sqrt{2\delta}}{4\alpha} \quad (59)$$

which is the logical complement of condition (56). Again, we can easily show that in this case the function defined by (57) and (58) satisfies the variational inequalities i), ii), v) and vi) (using also inequality (59)).

Finally, the verification that the strategies described above are indeed optimal (according to whether (56) or (59) holds) can be done in exactly the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1 (see also Remark 2).

At this point, note that  $b \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , showing that the “move-and-stop” strategy as described in Section 3 is always optimal for the cost function (51) with no discounting ( $\delta = 0$ ). This has the same form as the cost function considered by Beneš (1992).

**Acknowledgements.** The first author would like to acknowledge helpful discussions on this problem with Kurt Helmes. These took place at the Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Montréal, during the Workshop on Stochastic Systems, November 1992, organised by Peter E. Caines, to whom a word of appreciation is also due. The paper was finalised while both authors were visiting the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications at the University of Minnesota.

## References

- BENEŠ, V.E., SHEPP, L.A. AND WITSENHAUSEN, H.S. (1980). Some solvable stochastic control problems, *Stochastics*, 39-83.
- BENEŠ, V.E. (1992). Some combined control and stopping problems, paper presented at the *CRM Workshop on Stochastic systems*, Montréal, November 1992.

- DAVIS, M.H.A. AND NORMAN, A.R. (1990). Portfolio selection with transaction costs, *Math. of Operations Research* **19**, 676-713.
- FLEMING, W.H. AND SONER, H.M. (1993). *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, Applications of Mathematics **25**, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- KARATZAS, I. (1983). A class of singular stochastic control problems, *Adv. Appl. Probability* **15**, 225-254.
- KARATZAS, I. AND SHREVE, S.E. (1988). *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- KRYLOV, N.V. (1980). *Controlled Diffusion Processes*, Applications of Mathematics **14**, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- MEYER, P.A. (1976). Un cours sur les intégrales stochastiques, *Séminaire de Probabilités X*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **511**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg.
- PROTTER, P. (1992). *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*, Applications of Mathematics **21**, Springer-Verlag, New York.

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING  
IMPERIAL COLLEGE  
EXHIBITION ROAD  
LONDON, SW7 2BT




FIGURE 1: Optimal “move-and-stop” policy.




FIGURE 2: Barriers  $a$  and  $b$  as functions of  $\delta$  with fixed  $\alpha = 1, \lambda = 2$ .

#	Author/s	Title
1063	<b>Eduardo Casas &amp; Jiongmin Yong</b>	Maximum principle for state-constrained optimal control problems governed by quasilinear elliptic equations
1064	<b>Suzanne M. Lenhart &amp; Jiongmin Yong</b>	Optimal control for degenerate parabolic equations with logistic growth
1065	<b>Suzanne Lenhart</b>	Optimal control of a convective-diffusive fluid problem
1066	<b>Enrique Zuazua</b>	Weakly nonlinear large time behavior in scalar convection-diffusion equations
1067	<b>Caroline Fabre, Jean-Pierre Puel &amp; Enrike Zuazua</b>	Approximate controllability of the semilinear heat equation
1068	<b>M. Escobedo, J.L. Vazquez &amp; Enrike Zuazua</b>	Entropy solutions for diffusion-convection equations with partial diffusivity
1069	<b>M. Escobedo, J.L. Vazquez &amp; Enrike Zuazua</b>	A diffusion-convection equation in several space dimensions
1070	<b>F. Fagnani &amp; J.C. Willems</b>	Symmetries of differential systems
1071	<b>Zhangxin Chen, Bernardo Cockburn, Joseph W. Jerome &amp; Chi-Wang Shu</b>	Mixed-RKDG finite element methods for the 2-D hydrodynamic model for semiconductor device simulation
1072	<b>M.E. Bradley &amp; Suzanne Lenhart</b>	Bilinear optimal control of a Kirchhoff plate
1073	<b>Héctor J. Sussmann</b>	A cornucopia of abnormal subriemannian minimizers. Part I: The four-dimensional case
1074	<b>Marek Rakowski</b>	Transfer function approach to disturbance decoupling problem
1075	<b>Yuncheng You</b>	Optimal control of Ginzburg-Landau equation for superconductivity
1076	<b>Yuncheng You</b>	Global dynamics of dissipative modified Korteweg-de Vries equations
1077	<b>Mario Taboada &amp; Yuncheng You</b>	Nonuniformly attracting inertial manifolds and stabilization of beam equations with structural and Balakrishnan-Taylor damping
1078	<b>Michael Böhm &amp; Mario Taboada</b>	Global existence and regularity of solutions of the nonlinear string equation
1079	<b>Zhangxin Chen</b>	BDM mixed methods for a nonlinear elliptic problem
1080	<b>J.J.L. Velázquez</b>	On the dynamics of a closed thermosyphon
1081	<b>Frédéric Bonnans &amp; Eduardo Casas</b>	Some stability concepts and their applications in optimal control problems
1082	<b>Hong-Ming Yin</b>	$\mathcal{L}^{2,\mu}(Q)$ -estimates for parabolic equations and applications
1083	<b>David L. Russell &amp; Bing-Yu Zhang</b>	Smoothing and decay properties of solutions of the Korteweg-de Vries equation on a periodic domain with point dissipation
1084	<b>J.E. Dunn &amp; K.R. Rajagopal</b>	Fluids of differential type: Critical review and thermodynamic analysis
1085	<b>Mary Elizabeth Bradley &amp; Mary Ann Horn</b>	Global stabilization of the von Kármán plate with boundary feedback acting via bending moments only
1086	<b>Mary Ann Horn &amp; Irena Lasiecka</b>	Global stabilization of a dynamic von Kármán plate with nonlinear boundary feedback
1087	<b>Vilmos Komornik</b>	Decay estimates for a petrovski system with a nonlinear distributed feedback
1088	<b>Jesse L. Barlow</b>	Perturbation results for nearly uncoupled Markov chains with applications to iterative methods
1089	<b>Jong-Shenq Guo</b>	Large time behavior of solutions of a fast diffusion equation with source
1090	<b>Tongwen Chen &amp; Li Qiu</b>	$\mathcal{H}_\infty$ design of general multirate sampled-data control systems
1091	<b>Satyanad Kichenassamy &amp; Walter Littman</b>	Blow-up surfaces for nonlinear wave equations, I
1092	<b>Nahum Shimkin</b>	Asymptotically efficient adaptive strategies in repeated games, Part I: certainty equivalence strategies
1093	<b>Caroline Fabre, Jean-Pierre Puel &amp; Enrique Zuazua</b>	On the density of the range of the semigroup for semilinear heat equations
1094	<b>Robert F. Stengel, Laura R. Ray &amp; Christopher I. Marrison</b>	Probabilistic evaluation of control system robustness
1095	<b>H.O. Fattorini &amp; S.S. Sritharan</b>	Optimal chattering controls for viscous flow
1096	<b>Kathryn E. Lenz</b>	Properties of certain optimal weighted sensitivity and weighted mixed sensitivity designs
1097	<b>Gang Bao &amp; David C. Dobson</b>	Second harmonic generation in nonlinear optical films
1098	<b>Avner Friedman &amp; Chaocheng Huang</b>	Diffusion in network
1099	<b>Xinfu Chen, Avner Friedman &amp; Tsuyoshi Kimura</b>	Nonstationary filtration in partially saturated porous media
1100	<b>Walter Littman &amp; Baisheng Yan</b>	Rellich type decay theorems for equations $P(D)u = f$ with $f$ having support in a cylinder
1101	<b>Satyanad Kichenassamy &amp; Walter Littman</b>	Blow-up surfaces for nonlinear wave equations, II
1102	<b>Nahum Shimkin</b>	Extremal large deviations in controlled I.I.D. processes with applications to hypothesis testing
1103	<b>A. Narain</b>	Interfacial shear modeling and flow predictions for internal flows of pure vapor experiencing film condensation
1104	<b>Andrew Teel &amp; Laurent Praly</b>	Global stabilizability and observability imply semi-global stabilizability by output feedback
1105	<b>Karen Rudie &amp; Jan C. Willems</b>	The computational complexity of decentralized discrete-event control problems

- 1106 **John A. Burns & Ruben D. Spies**, A numerical study of parameter sensitivities in Landau-Ginzburg models of phase transitions in shape memory alloys
- 1107 **Gang Bao & William W. Symes**, Time like trace regularity of the wave equation with a nonsmooth principal part
- 1108 **Lawrence Markus**, A brief history of control
- 1109 **Richard A. Brualdi, Keith L. Chavey & Bryan L. Shader**, Bipartite graphs and inverse sign patterns of strong sign-nonsingular matrices
- 1110 **A. Kersch, W. Morokoff & A. Schuster**, Radiative heat transfer with quasi-monte carlo methods
- 1111 **Jianhua Zhang**, A free boundary problem arising from swelling-controlled release processes
- 1112 **Walter Littman & Stephen Taylor**, Local smoothing and energy decay for a semi-infinite beam pinned at several points and applications to boundary control
- 1113 **Srdjan Stojanovic & Thomas Svobodny**, A free boundary problem for the Stokes equation via nonsmooth analysis
- 1114 **Bronislaw Jakubczyk**, Filtered differential algebras are complete invariants of static feedback
- 1115 **Boris Mordukhovich**, Discrete approximations and refined Euler-Lagrange conditions for nonconvex differential inclusions
- 1116 **Bei Hu & Hong-Ming Yin**, The profile near blowup time for solution of the heat equation with a nonlinear boundary condition
- 1117 **Jin Ma & Jiongmin Yong**, Solvability of forward-backward SDEs and the nodal set of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations
- 1118 **Chaocheng Huang & Jiongmin Yong**, Coupled parabolic and hyperbolic equations modeling age-dependent epidemic dynamics with nonlinear diffusion
- 1119 **Jiongmin Yong**, Necessary conditions for minimax control problems of second order elliptic partial differential equations
- 1120 **Eitan Altman & Nahum Shimkin**, Worst-case and Nash routing policies in parallel queues with uncertain service allocations
- 1121 **Nahum Shimkin & Adam Shwartz**, Asymptotically efficient adaptive strategies in repeated games, part II: Asymptotic optimality
- 1122 **M.E. Bradley**, Well-posedness and regularity results for a dynamic Von Kármán plate
- 1123 **Zhangxin Chen**, Finite element analysis of the 1D full drift diffusion semiconductor model
- 1124 **Gang Bao & David C. Dobson**, Diffractive optics in nonlinear media with periodic structure
- 1125 **Steven Cox & Enrique Zuazua**, The rate at which energy decays in a damped string
- 1126 **Anthony W. Leung**, Optimal control for nonlinear systems of partial differential equations related to ecology
- 1127 **H.J. Sussmann**, A continuation method for nonholonomic path-finding problems
- 1128 **Yung-Jen Guo & Walter Littman**, The null boundary controllability for semilinear heat equations
- 1129 **Q. Zhang & G. Yin**, Turnpike sets in stochastic manufacturing systems with finite time horizon
- 1130 **I. Györi, F. Hartung & J. Turi**, Approximation of functional differential equations with time- and state-dependent delays by equations with piecewise constant arguments
- 1131 **I. Györi, F. Hartung & J. Turi**, Stability in delay equations with perturbed time lags
- 1132 **F. Hartung & J. Turi**, On the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of a state-dependent delay equation
- 1133 **Pierre-Alain Gremaud**, Numerical optimization and quasiconvexity
- 1134 **Jie Tai Yu**, Resultants and inversion formula for  $N$  polynomials in  $N$  variables
- 1135 **Avner Friedman & J.L. Velázquez**, The analysis of coating flows in a strip
- 1136 **Eduardo D. Sontag**, Control of systems without drift via generic loops
- 1137 **Yuan Wang & Eduardo D. Sontag**, Orders of input/output differential equations and state space dimensions
- 1138 **Scott W. Hansen**, Boundary control of a one-dimensional, linear, thermoelastic rod
- 1139 **Robert Lipton & Bogdan Vernescu**, Homogenization of two phase emulsions with surface tension effects
- 1140 **Scott Hansen & Enrique Zuazua**, Exact controllability and stabilization of a vibrating string with an interior point mass
- 1141 **Bei Hu & Jiongmin Yong**, Pontryagin Maximum principle for semilinear and quasilinear parabolic equations with pointwise state constraints
- 1142 **Mark H.A. Davis**, A deterministic approach to optimal stopping with application to a prophet inequality
- 1143 **M.H.A. Davis & M. Zervos**, A problem of singular stochastic control with discretionary stopping
- 1144 **Bernardo Cockburn & Pierre-Alain Gremaud**, An error estimate for finite element methods for scalar conservation laws
- 1145 **David C. Dobson & Fadil Santosa**, An image enhancement technique for electrical impedance tomography
- 1146 **Jin Ma, Philip Protter, & Jiongmin Yong**, Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly — a four step scheme
- 1147 **Yong Liu**, The equilibrium plasma subject to skin effect
- 1148 **Ulrich Hornung**, Models for flow and transport through porous media derived by homogenization
- 1149 **Avner Friedman, Chaocheng Huang, & Jiongmin Yong**, Effective permeability of the boundary of a domain
- 1150 **Gang Bao**, A uniqueness theorem for an inverse problem in periodic diffractive optics
- 1151 **Angelo Favini, Mary Ann Horn, & Irena Lasiecka**, Global existence and uniqueness of regular solutions to the dynamic von Kármán system with nonlinear boundary dissipation