

Optimal Control of McKean–Vlasov Branching Diffusion Processes

Julien Claisse ^{*} Jiazhi Kang[†] Tianxu Lan[‡] Xiaolu Tan[§]

December 2, 2025

We study an optimal control problem of McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion processes, in which the interaction term is determined by the marginal measure induced by all alive particles in the system. Accordingly, the value function is defined on the space of finite nonnegative measures over the Euclidean space. Within the framework of Lipschitz continuous closed-loop controls, and by using the uniqueness of solution to the associated nonlinear Fokker–Planck equation, we establish the dynamic programming principle. Further, under the regularity assumptions, we show that the value function satisfies a Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) master equation defined on the space of finite nonnegative measures. We next provide a corresponding verification theorem. Finally, we study a linear–quadratic controlled branching processes problem, for which explicit solutions are derived in terms of Riccati-type equations.

1 Introduction

The optimal control problem for McKean–Vlasov (or mean-field) dynamics has received significant attention in recent years. The McKean–Vlasov stochastic differential equations (SDEs) are motivated by the modelling of the limiting behaviour of large population interacting particle systems as the population size tends to infinity (see, e.g., [18, 24, 9]). In a similar spirit, the McKean–Vlasov optimal control problems arise as the mean-field limits of optimal control problems for large population systems (see, e.g., Carmona and Delarue [4]). For this new variation of the optimal control problem, both the dynamic programming and the maximum principle approaches have been developed (see, e.g., Carmona and Delarue [3], Pham and Wei [22], etc.), and explicit solutions have also been obtained in the linear–quadratic setting (see, e.g., Yong [25], etc.).

While classical McKean–Vlasov dynamics typically describe populations of constant size over the time horizon, one may also incorporate population-size dynamics through branching mechanisms. Within the framework of stochastic differential games, a mean-field game with branching was studied by Claisse, Ren and Tan [7]. The McKean–Vlasov dynamics combined with birth–death processes have also been investigated by Fontbona and Méléard [11], Fontbona and Muñoz-Hernández [12]. More recently, in Claisse, Kang and Tan [8], we studied a more general class of McKean–Vlasov branching SDEs, establishing well-posedness results together with the propagation of chaos property. In another recent work Cao, Ren and Tan [2], a quantitative weak propagation of chaos result has also been obtained.

^{*}Université Paris-Dauphine, PSL University, CNRS, CEREMADE, Paris. claisse@ceremade.dauphine.fr

[†]Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. jzkang@math.cuhk.edu.hk

[‡]Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. txlan@math.cuhk.edu.hk

[§]Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. xiaolu.tan@cuhk.edu.hk, Research supported by Hong Kong RGC General Research Fund (projects 14302921).

For branching diffusion processes without interaction, the associated optimal control problems have also been explored in the literature. The study dates back to Nisio [20], who applied a controlled semigroup approach. Recently, Claisse [6] investigated the optimal control of branching processes via a dynamic programming approach, with particular attention to the associated Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation. More recently, a target control problem of the branching processes has been studied by Kharroubi and Ocello [16]. Let us also mention the paper of Hambly and Jettkant [14] which studies the maximum principle of a controlled Fokker–Planck equation problem, which corresponds to the branching diffusion processes.

The main objective of this paper is to study the optimal control problem for McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion processes, building upon our well-posedness results established in [8] and by using a dynamic programming approach. In contrast to the branching diffusion model with path-dependent coefficients studied in [8], we focus here on the Markovian setting, where the coefficients depend on both the particle position and the marginal measure induced by all alive particles. As a consequence, the value function of the control problem is defined as a functional on the space of finite nonnegative measures on \mathbb{R}^d . Although distinct particle-tree configurations may induce the same marginal finite measure on \mathbb{R}^d , we show that they nevertheless yield the same cost value by using a uniqueness condition of solutions to the associated nonlinear Fokker–Planck equation. We also provide sufficient conditions (and a methodology) to establish the existence and uniqueness of this nonlinear Fokker–Planck equation, which should be of independent interest.

Next, following Pham and Wei [22], we introduce a closed-loop control formulation, where admissible controls are Lipschitz functionals of the particle positions. This framework enables the application of the well-posedness results for McKean–Vlasov branching SDEs obtained in [8], from which we deduce the dynamic programming principle (DPP). In our setting without common noise, the marginal measures induced by the branching diffusion process evolve as a deterministic flow of measures, so that the DPP takes a particularly tractable form.

Under suitable smoothness assumptions on the value function, and by using a standard extension of Itô’s formula along the flow of measures induced by branching diffusion processes, one checks that the value function provides a classical solution to a Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) master equation on the space of finite nonnegative measures. Conversely, we establish a verification theorem, which ensures that the value function as well as the optimal closed-loop control can be recovered from a smooth solution to the HJB master equation. Notice also that a notion of viscosity solution for this class of master equation is also developed in Ekren, He, Lan and Tan [10].

Finally, we specialize to the linear–quadratic (LQ) setting and derive an explicit solution to the HJB master equation based on a Riccati-type ordinary differential equation (ODE). By applying the verification theorem, we confirm that this explicit solution coincides with the value function of the controlled branching diffusion problem and obtain the corresponding optimal control.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the controlled McKean–Vlasov branching SDE and derive several a priori estimates. Section 3 presents the closed-loop control formulation and the associated value function. We then establish the dynamic programming principle and derive the corresponding HJB equation on the space of finite nonnegative measures. Finally, Section 4 focuses on the linear–quadratic case, where we obtain an explicit representation of the solution via a Riccati-type equation.

Notations (i) Let (X, ρ) be a non-empty metric space. We denote by $\mathcal{P}(X)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}(X)$) the space of all Borel probability (resp. finite nonnegative) measures on X . For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and a

μ -integrable function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote the integral of f with respect to μ by

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle := \int_X f(x) \mu(dx).$$

For $p \geq 1$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$ the space of all probability measures on X with finite p -th moment, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_p(X) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \int_X \rho(x, x_0)^p \mu(dx) < +\infty \right\},$$

for some (and hence for all) fixed $x_0 \in X$. The space $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$ is equipped with the p -Wasserstein distance \mathcal{W}_p defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda(\mu, \nu)} \left(\int_{X \times X} \rho(x, y)^p \lambda(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p},$$

where $\Lambda(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the collection of all Borel probability measures on $X \times X$ with marginals μ and ν .

Similarly, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_p(X)$ the space of all finite non-negative Borel measures on X with finite p -th moment, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}_p(X) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) : \int_X \rho(x, x_0)^p \mu(dx) < +\infty \right\}.$$

Following [7, Appendix B], we introduce a Wasserstein metric on $\mathcal{M}_p(X)$ as follows. Let $\bar{X} := X \cup \{\partial\}$ be an extended space of X with cemetery point ∂ . Fix $x_0 \in X$ and define $\rho(x, \partial) := \rho(x, x_0) + 1$ for $x \in X$, so that (\bar{X}, ρ) is again a metric space. For $m > 0$, we set

$$\mathcal{M}_{p,m}(\bar{X}) := \{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_p(\bar{X}) : \mu(\bar{X}) = m \},$$

and for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{p,m}(\bar{X})$, define

$$\mathcal{W}_{p,m}(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}(\mu, \nu)} \left(\int_{\bar{X} \times \bar{X}} \rho(x, y)^p \lambda(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p},$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the set of all finite non-negative Borel measures on $\bar{X} \times \bar{X}$ with marginals μ and ν . Then, for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_p(X)$, we define the extended Wasserstein distance

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_p(\mu, \nu) := \mathcal{W}_{p,m}(\bar{\mu}_m, \bar{\nu}_m),$$

where $m \geq \mu(X) \vee \nu(X)$ and

$$\bar{\mu}_m := \mu(\cdot \cap X) + (m - \mu(X)) \delta_\partial(\cdot), \quad \bar{\nu}_m := \nu(\cdot \cap X) + (m - \nu(X)) \delta_\partial(\cdot).$$

Notice that, by its definition, $\bar{\mathcal{W}}_p$ is independent of the constant m as soon as it is chosen to be greater than $\mu(X) \vee \nu(X)$.

Throughout the paper, when $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, it is equipped with the Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$ or the truncated distance

$$\rho(x, y) := |x - y| \wedge 1, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and the corresponding Wasserstein distance $\bar{\mathcal{W}}_p$ on $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined with truncated distance ρ .

(ii) To describe the genealogy of the branching process, we use the classical Ulam–Harris–Neveu notation. Let

$$\mathbb{K} := \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty} \mathbb{N}^n.$$

Each element $k = k_1 \dots k_n \in \mathbb{K}$ represents a finite sequence of natural numbers, where \emptyset denotes the ancestor (root). For $k, k' \in \mathbb{K}$, we define the concatenation

$$kk' := k_1 \dots k_n k'_1 \dots k'_m,$$

and we write $k \prec k'$ if there exists $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $k' = k\tilde{k}$, i.e., k is an ancestor of k' . We next define the configuration space of branching particles by

$$E := \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} \delta_{(k, x^k)} : K \subset \mathbb{K} \text{ finite, } x^k \in \mathbb{R}^d, \text{ and for all } k, k' \in K, k \not\prec k' \right\}.$$

Equipping \mathbb{K} with the discrete topology, the space E is a closed subset of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ under the topology of weak convergence of measures, and hence E is a Polish space.

We introduce a metric d_E on E compatible with the weak convergence topology: for any $e_1, e_2 \in E$ such that $e_1 = \sum_{k \in K_1} \delta_{(k, x^k)}$ and $e_2 = \sum_{k \in K_2} \delta_{(k, y^k)}$, we set

$$d_E(e_1, e_2) := \#(K_1 \triangle K_2) + \sum_{k \in K_1 \cap K_2} (|x^k - y^k| \wedge 1), \quad (1)$$

where $K_1 \triangle K_2 := (K_1 \setminus K_2) \cup (K_2 \setminus K_1)$, and $\#(K_1 \triangle K_2)$ denotes the cardinality of $K_1 \triangle K_2$. For a measurable function $f = (f^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}} : \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $e = \sum_{k \in K} \delta_{(k, x^k)} \in E$, we define

$$\langle e, f \rangle := \sum_{k \in K} f^k(x^k).$$

We also fix a reference point $e_0 \in E$, the null configuration, corresponding to the empty particle system (i.e., the zero measure).

2 The controlled McKean–Vlasov branching SDE

Let us first introduce the controlled McKean–Vlasov branching stochastic differential equation (SDE), and then derive some a priori estimates for the associated controlled processes. Throughout the paper, we fix a closed convex subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, which serves as the control space, i.e. the control processes take values in A .

2.1 The controlled McKean–Vlasov branching SDE

Let us first describe the McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion process in a heuristic way. The coefficients of the controlled branching diffusion are given by

$$(b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}) : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times A \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times [0, \bar{\gamma}] \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}},$$

where $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ is a fixed constant. Namely, b and σ are the drift and diffusion coefficients for the dynamic of each particle, γ is the death rate, and $(p_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the probability mass function of the

progeny distribution. In particular, it holds that $p_\ell(\cdot) \in [0, 1]$ for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} p_\ell(\cdot) = 1$. Let us also define a partition $(I_\ell(\cdot))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $[0, 1]$ by

$$I_\ell(\cdot) := \left[\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i(\cdot), \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} p_i(\cdot) \right), \quad \text{for each } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space, with filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, equipped with a family of d -dimensional Brownian motion $(W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ and Poisson random measures $(Q^k(ds, dz))_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ on $[0, T] \times [0, \bar{\gamma}] \times [0, 1]$ with Lebesgue intensity measure $ds \times dz$. The random element $(W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ and $(Q^k(ds, dz))_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ are mutual independent. Moreover, \mathcal{F}_0 is rich enough to support a E -valued random variable ξ of any distribution.

Now, for any initial time $t \in [0, T]$, and E -value \mathcal{F}_0 -random variable ξ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle] < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, |\cdot|^2 \rangle] < \infty, \quad (2)$$

we consider a controlled branching diffusion process with an initial state ξ . It is represented as a E -valued process $(Z_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$ given by

$$Z_s := \sum_{k \in K_s} \delta_{(s, X_s^k)}, \quad s \in [t, T], \quad (3)$$

where K_s denotes the collection of all labels of particles alive at time $s \in [t, T]$ and X_s^k denotes the position of particle $k \in K_t$. In particular, the initial condition of the branching process is given as

$$Z_t = \xi = \sum_{k \in K_t} \delta_{(t, X_t^k)}.$$

The branching process induces a flow of marginal measures $(\mu_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$, with $\mu_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ being defined by

$$\langle \varphi, \mu_s \rangle := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_s} \varphi(X_s^k) \right], \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (4)$$

The control process is given by $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ with

$$\alpha_s^k := \alpha_s(X_s^k), \quad s \in [t, T], \quad k \in \mathbb{K}, \quad (5)$$

with some Lipschitz function $\alpha_s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow A$. The dynamic of each alive particle $k \in K_s$ is given by the controlled SDE:

$$dX_s^k = b(s, X_s^k, \mu_s, \alpha_s^k)ds + \sigma(s, X_s^k, \mu_s, \alpha_s^k)dW_s^k. \quad (6)$$

Denote further by S_k the birth time of particle k . In particular, it holds that $S_k = 0$ for each initial particle $k \in K_t$. Then each particle k runs a death clock with intensity $\gamma(s, X_s^k, \mu_s, \alpha_s^k)$, i.e., its death time T_k is given by

$$T_k := \inf \{ s > S_k : Q^k(\{s\} \times [0, \gamma(s, X_s^k, \mu_s, \alpha_s^k)] \times [0, 1]) = 1 \}.$$

Let U_k be the random variable satisfying

$$Q^k(\{T_k\} \times [0, \gamma(T_k, X_{T_k}^k, \mu_{T_k}, \alpha_{T_k}^k)] \times \{U_k\}) = 1,$$

and note that U_k is uniformly distributed over the interval $[0, 1]$. In case that at time T_k and $U_k \in I_\ell(T_k, X_{T_k}^k, \mu_{T_k}, \alpha_{T_k})$, the particle k dies and gives birth to ℓ offspring particles $\{k1, \dots, k\ell\}$, so that

$$K_{T_k} = (K_{T_k-} \setminus \{k\}) \cup \{k1, \dots, k\ell\}.$$

In particular, the birth time of the offspring particles corresponds to the death time of the parent particle, *i.e.*, $S_{ki} := T_k$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Further, the offspring particles start from the position of the parent particle, *i.e.*,

$$X_{S_{ki}}^{ki} = X_{T_k-}^k, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, \ell.$$

Moreover, we define X_s^{ki} as its ancestor position before the birth time, *i.e.*, $X_s^{ki} = X_s^k$ for $s < S_k$ and $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Finally, let us provide a definition by SDE of the controlled McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion process described above. Denote by \mathcal{L} the infinitesimal generator of the diffusion (b, σ) , *i.e.*, for all $(s, x, m) \in [t, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi(s, x, m, a) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\sigma \sigma^\top(s, x, m, a) \nabla_x^2 \varphi(x) \right) + b(s, x, m, a) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi(x), \quad (7)$$

where we denote by ∇_x, ∇_x^2 the gradient and Hessian operators acting on the space variables respectively. Then the McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion with initial condition ξ can be characterized as the solution to the following SDE: for all $f := (f^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \in C_b^2(\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $s \in [t, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Z_s, f \rangle &= \langle \xi, f \rangle + \int_t^s \sum_{k \in K_u} \mathcal{L} f^k(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) du + \int_t^s \sum_{k \in K_u} \nabla_x f^k(X_u^k) \sigma(s, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) dW_u^k \\ &+ \int_{(t, s] \times [0, \bar{\gamma}] \times [0, 1]} \sum_{k \in K_{u-}} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f^{ki} - f^k \right) (X_u^k) \mathbb{1}_{[0, \gamma(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)] \times I_\ell(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)}(z) Q^k(du, dz), \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that the interaction term μ_u is defined in (4).

Definition 2.1. Let $t \in [0, T]$, and ξ be a E -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -random variable, and $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be given by (5). A strong solution to SDE (8) with initial data (t, ξ) and control $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ is a E -valued \mathbb{F} -adapted càdlàg process $Z := (Z_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$ such that (8) holds true for all $s \in [t, T]$.

The coefficients functions will be assumed to satisfy the following conditions.

Assumption 2.1. (i) The coefficient functions b, σ, γ are Lipschitz in (x, m, a) in the sense that, there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that

$$|(b, \sigma, \gamma)(s, x, m, a) - (b, \sigma, \gamma)(s, x', m', a')| \leq L(|x - x'| + \bar{W}_1(m, m') + |a - a'|),$$

for all $(s, x, x', m, m', a, a') \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times A \times A$.

(ii) The coefficient functions b and σ have linear growth in x , in the sense that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $(s, x, m, a) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times A$,

$$|b(s, x, m, a)| + |\sigma(s, x, m, a)| \leq C(1 + |x| + m(\mathbb{R}^d) + |a|).$$

(iii) The function $\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \ell p_\ell$ is uniformly bounded by the constant $M_1 > 0$. And there exist positive constants $(C_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0}$ such that $M := \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \ell C_\ell < \infty$ and

$$|p_\ell(s, x, m, a) - p_\ell(s, x', m', a')| \leq C_\ell(|x - x'| + \bar{W}_1(m, m') + |a - a'|),$$

for all $(s, x, x', m, m', a, a') \in [t, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times A \times A$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.2 Wellposedness and a priori estimates

We next prove that the controlled branching diffusion SDE has a unique solution and then provide some a priori estimates. Let us introduce a function $h : \mathcal{P}_1(E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_1(E)$,

$$\langle h(\nu), \varphi \rangle := \int_E \text{Id}_\varphi(e) \nu(de), \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (9)$$

so that the marginal measure μ_s in (4) can be equivalently defined as $\mu_s := h(\mathcal{L}(Z_s))$.

Lemma 2.2. *The function $h : \mathcal{P}_1(E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as defined in (9) is Lipschitz continuous in the sense that*

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_1(h(\mu_1), h(\mu_2)) \leq 2\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad \text{for all } \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(E).$$

Proof. Let us consider $\lambda \in \Lambda(\mu_1, \mu_2) \subset \mathcal{P}(E \times E)$. One identifies two E -valued random variables Z_1, Z_2 such that $Z_1 = \sum_{k \in K_1} \delta_{(k, X^k)}$ and $Z_2 = \sum_{k \in K_2} \delta_{(k, Y^k)}$ with $\mu_1 = \mathbb{P} \circ Z_1^{-1}$ and $\mu_2 = \mathbb{P} \circ Z_2^{-1}$. In view of [7, Lemma B.1], we have the dual representation:

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_1(h(\mu_1), h(\mu_2)) = \sup_{\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1^0(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{h(\mu_1)(\varphi) - h(\mu_2)(\varphi)\} + |h(\mu_1)(\mathbb{R}^d) - h(\mu_2)(\mathbb{R}^d)|$$

where $\text{Lip}_1^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of 1-Lipschitz functions on \mathbb{R}^d with a reference point:

$$\text{Lip}_1^0(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ \varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq \rho(x, y), \text{ and } \exists x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \varphi(x_0) = 0 \right\}$$

where consider the Lipschitz property in the sense of the truncated metric on \mathbb{R}^d . Then, for any $\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, by Lipschitz property of φ , one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} & |h(\mu_1)(\varphi) - h(\mu_2)(\varphi)| \\ &= |\langle \text{Id}_\varphi, \mu_1 \rangle - \langle \text{Id}_\varphi, \mu_2 \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \langle Z_1, \varphi \rangle - \langle Z_2, \varphi \rangle, \mathbb{P} \rangle| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_1 \cap K_2} (\varphi(X^k) - \varphi(Y^k)) + \sum_{k \in K_1 \setminus K_2} \varphi(X^k) - \sum_{k \in K_2 \setminus K_1} \varphi(Y^k) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_1 \cap K_2} |X^k - Y^k| \wedge 1 + \sum_{k \in K_1 \setminus K_2} |X^k - x_0| \wedge 1 + \sum_{k \in K_2 \setminus K_1} |Y^k - x_0| \wedge 1 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_1 \cap K_2} |X^k - Y^k| \wedge 1 + \sum_{k \in K_1 \setminus K_2} |X^k - x_0| \wedge 1 + \sum_{k \in K_2 \setminus K_1} |Y^k - x_0| \wedge 1 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_1 \cap K_2} |X^k - Y^k| \wedge 1 + \#(K_1 \triangle K_2) \right] \end{aligned}$$

For the rest term, it follows easily that

$$|h(\mu_1)(\mathbb{R}^d) - h(\mu_2)(\mathbb{R}^d)| = |\mathbb{E}[\#K_1 - \#K_2]| \leq \mathbb{E}[\#(K_1 \triangle K_2)].$$

One concludes that

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_1(h(\mu_1), h(\mu_2)) \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_1 \cap K_2} |X^k - Y^k| \wedge 1 + \#(K_1 \triangle K_2) \right] = 2\mathbb{E}[d_E(Z_1, Z_2)].$$

Taking infimum over all $\lambda \in \Lambda(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, we obtain the desired estimation. \square

In the following, let us fix a function $\alpha : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for some constant $C > 0$,

$$|\alpha(s, x) - \alpha(s, y)| \leq C|x - y|, \quad |\alpha(s, x)| \leq C(1 + |x|), \quad \text{for all } (s, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (10)$$

and then fix a closed-loop control $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ by $\alpha_t^k := \alpha(t, X_t^k)$ as in (5).

Proposition 2.3. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold true, (t, ξ) be the initial condition with $t \in [0, T]$ and ξ being a \mathcal{F}_0 -random variable such that $\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle] < \infty$, and $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be a closed-loop control defined by (5) with α satisfying (10). Then there exists a unique solution of the controlled branching SDE (8) in sense of Definition 2.1.*

Proof. We will apply the wellposedness results of the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE in Claisse, Kang, Tan [8, Theorem 2.3]. First, by the Lipschitz continuity of $h : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in Lemma 2.2 as well as the Lipschitz property of the closed-loop control, it follows that $(x, m) \mapsto (b, \sigma, \gamma, p_\ell)(t, x, h(m), \alpha(x))$ is also Lipschitz continuous. Similarly, one can check the linear growth condition of $x \mapsto (b, \sigma)(t, x, h(m), \alpha(x))$ as required in the [8, Theorem 2.3]. \square

We next provide some a priori estimates on the solutions to the controlled McKean-Vlasov branching SDEs.

Lemma 2.4. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold true, (t, ξ) be the initial condition with $t \in [0, T]$ and ξ being a \mathcal{F}_t -random variable, and $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be a closed-loop control defined by (5) with α satisfying (10). Then with the constant M_1 in Assumption 2.1, one has first order estimate*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \#K_s^{\bar{\alpha}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle] e^{\bar{\gamma} M_1 (T-t)}. \quad (11)$$

Proof. The result follows by Claisse [6, Proposition 2.1]. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold, ξ be a \mathcal{F}_t -random variable such that $\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle] + \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, |\cdot|^2 \rangle] < \infty$, and $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ be a closed-loop control defined by (5) with α satisfying (10). Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \sum_{k \in K_s^{\bar{\alpha}}} |X_s^{k, \bar{\alpha}}|^2 \right] < \infty.$$

Proof. For notational simplicity, we omit $\bar{\alpha}$ in superscripts. Let $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of stopping times defined as follows:

$$\theta_n := \inf \left\{ s \geq t : \sum_{k \in K_s} |X_s^k|^2 \geq n \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $(Z_{s \wedge \theta_n})_{t \leq s \leq T}$ satisfies (8). Applying (8) with function $f(x) := |x|^2$, we obtain for any $s \in [t, T]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in K_{s \wedge \theta_n}^{\alpha}} |X_{s \wedge \theta_n}^k|^2 \\ &= \langle \xi, |\cdot|^2 \rangle + \int_t^{s \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} 2X_u^{k \top} \sigma(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) dW_u^k \\ &+ \int_t^{s \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} 2X_u^{k \top} b(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) du + \int_t^{s \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)) du \\ &+ \int_{(t, s \wedge \theta_n] \times [0, \bar{\gamma}] \times [0, 1]} \sum_{k \in K_u} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell - 1) |X_u^k|^2 \mathbb{1}_{[0, \gamma(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)] \times I_\ell(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)}(z) Q^k(du, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we take supremum of s over the interval $[t, T]$ and take expectation. We study the upper bounds of each term in the right hand side. By martingale property, we can apply the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality to the second term. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on σ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \int_t^{s \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} 2X_u^k{}^\top \sigma(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) dW_u^k \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_u^k|^2 \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)) du \right)^{1/2} \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_u^k|^2 du \right)^{1/2} \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[1 + \int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_u^k|^2 du \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied the usual inequality $\sqrt{x} \leq 1 + x$ in the last line. Now we deal with terms associated with infinitesimal generator. From assumptions on b, σ , the third and the fourth terms are treated as follows. For some constant $C > 0$ depending only on σ that may vary from line to line, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \int_t^{s \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} \left(2X_r^k \cdot b(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) + \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)) \right) du \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \int_t^{s \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} \left(|X_r^k|^2 + |b(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)|^2 + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2 \right) du \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \#K_u + \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_u^k|^2 + \sum_{k \in K_u} \mathbb{E}[\#K_u]^2 + \sum_{k \in K_u} |\alpha_u^k|^2 du \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the common inequality $2|x \cdot y| \leq |x|^2 + |y|^2$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the linear growth condition on b . By Lemma 2.4, one shows

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \#K_u du \right] \leq (T - t) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [t, T]} \#K_u \right] \leq (T - t) \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle] e^{\bar{\gamma} M(T-t)},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} \mathbb{E}[\#K_u]^2 du \right] \leq (T - t) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [t, T]} \#K_u \right]^3 \leq (T - t) \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle]^3 e^{3\bar{\gamma} M(T-t)},$$

Lastly, the branching term can be written as for some constant $C > 0$ depending on $\bar{\gamma}, M$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \int_{(t, s \wedge \theta_n) \times [0, \bar{\gamma}] \times [0, 1]} \sum_{k \in K_{u-}} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell - 1) |X_u^k|^2 \mathbb{1}_{[0, \gamma(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)] \times I_\ell(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k)}(z) Q^k(du, dz) \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_{u-}} \gamma(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) |X_u^k|^2 \sum_{\ell \geq 1} (\ell - 1) p_\ell(u, X_u^k, \mu_u, \alpha_u^k) du \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \theta_n} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_u^k|^2 du \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have all the ingredients for the estimate. By combining all of them, we have for some constants $C_1, C_2, C > 0$ depending on $\sigma, \bar{\gamma}, M, T, \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, 1 \rangle], \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi, |\cdot|^2 \rangle]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \sum_{k \in K_s} |X_{s \wedge \theta_n}^k|^2 \right] &\leq C_1 \left(1 + \int_t^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_s} |\alpha_s^k|^2 \right] ds \right) + C_2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T \sup_{u \in [t, s]} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_{u \wedge \theta_n}^k|^2 du \right] \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T \sup_{u \in [t, s]} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_{u \wedge \theta_n}^k|^2 du \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [t, T]} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_{u \wedge \theta_n}^k|^2 \right] \leq n$. Applying Grönwall's Lemma, it follows that there is some constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [t, T]} \sum_{k \in K_u} |X_{u \wedge \theta_n}^k|^2 \right] \leq C.$$

One then conclude the proof by sending $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

3 The Closed-Loop Control Problem

We now introduce a closed-loop McKean-Vlasov branching process control problem, inspired by the classical closed-loop McKean-Vlasov control problem in [22]. In this setting, the control process is a deterministic function of the time and the state of the state process. More precisely, we introduce the space \mathcal{A} of all admissible controls as follows.

3.1 The value function

Definition 3.1. Let us define \mathcal{A} as the space of all control processes $(\alpha^k)_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ such that $\alpha_s^k = \alpha(s, X_s^k)$ for some $\alpha : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow A$, where $\alpha(\cdot)$ satisfies the following conditions: there exists a constant L_α such that

$$|\alpha(s, x) - \alpha(s, x')| \leq L_\alpha |x - x'|, \quad \text{and} \quad |\alpha(s, x)| \leq L_\alpha (1 + |x|),$$

for all $(s, x, x') \in [t, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Recall that, for any control $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, the existence and uniqueness for SDE (8) is guaranteed by Proposition 2.3.

Let functions $L : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the cost function. We assume the following conditions.

Assumption 3.1. For all $(s, x, m, a) \in [t, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times A$, there exists constants C_L, C_g such that

$$\begin{aligned} |L(s, x, m, a)| &\leq C_L (1 + |x|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 m(dy) + m(\mathbb{R}^d) + |a|^2), \\ |g(x, m)| &\leq C_g (1 + |x|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 m(dy) + m(\mathbb{R}^d)). \end{aligned}$$

Let $t \in [0, T]$, ξ be a E -valued \mathcal{F}_t -random variable and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we denote by

$$Z_s^{t, \xi, \alpha} := \sum_{k \in K_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}} \delta_{(k, X_s^{k, t, \xi, \alpha})}, \quad s \in [t, T]$$

the unique solution of (8). The cost function associated with the McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion process is given by

$$\begin{aligned} J(t, \xi, \alpha) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T \sum_{k \in K_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}} L(s, X_s^{k, t, \xi, \alpha}, \mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}, \alpha_s(X_s^{k, t, \xi, \alpha})) ds + \sum_{k \in K_T^{t, \xi, \alpha}} g(X_T^{k, t, \xi, \alpha}, \mu_T^{t, \xi, \alpha}) \right] \\ &= \int_t^T \langle L(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)), \mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha} \rangle ds + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t, \xi, \alpha}), \mu_T^{t, \xi, \alpha} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}$ is defined for any $s \in [t, T]$ and for any $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\langle \varphi, \mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha} \rangle := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}} \varphi(X_s^{k, t, \xi, \alpha}) \right]. \quad (14)$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1 hold true, then the cost functional J in (13) is well-defined and finite.*

Proof. For simplicity, let us omit the superscripts t, ξ, α in the proof. Then by using the properties of admissible control in Definition 3.1, and Lemmas 2.4 2.5, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J(t, \xi, \alpha) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T \sum_{k \in K_s} L(s, X_s^k, \mu_s, \alpha(s, X_s^k)) ds + \sum_{k \in K_T} g(X_T^k, \mu_T) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T \sum_{k \in K_s} C_L (1 + |X_s^k|^2 + \langle |\cdot|^2, \mu_s \rangle + \mu_s(\mathbb{R}^d) + |\alpha(s, X_s^k)|^2) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K_T} C_g (1 + |X_T^k|^2 + \langle |\cdot|^2, \mu_T \rangle + \mu_T(\mathbb{R}^d)) \right] \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \#K_s \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \#K_s \right]^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \sum_{k \in K_s} |X_s^k|^2 \right] \right) \\ &\quad + C \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \#K_s \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \sum_{k \in K_s} |X_s^k|^2 \right] \right) \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and the desired result follows. \square

For all $(t, \nu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let us define

$$\Xi(t, \nu) := \{ \xi \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-measurable } E\text{-valued random variable s.t. } h(\mathcal{L}(\xi)) = \nu \}.$$

Equivalently, $\Xi(t, \nu)$ is the set of all \mathcal{F}_t -measurable E -valued random variables $\xi = \sum_{k \in K} \delta_{X_t^k}$ such that $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in K} \varphi(X_t^k) \right] = \langle \nu, \varphi \rangle$ for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is clear that $\Xi(t, \nu)$ is non-empty for all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let us then introduce the value function of our controlled branching processes problem:

$$v(t, \nu) := \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \inf_{\xi \in \Xi(t, \nu)} J(t, \xi, \alpha), \quad \text{for all } (t, \nu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (15)$$

We will in fact show that $J(t, \xi_1, \nu) = J(t, \xi_2, \nu)$ for all $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Xi(t, \nu)$, so that one can replace the infimum over ξ in (15) by taking an arbitrary $\xi \in \Xi(t, \nu)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold true, $(t, \nu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ be a closed loop control. Then*

$$\mu_s^{t, \xi_1, \alpha} = \mu_s^{t, \xi_2, \alpha}, \quad \text{for all } \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Xi(t, \nu).$$

Consequently, one can denote $\mu^{t, \nu, \alpha} := \mu^{t, \xi, \alpha}$ with an arbitrary $\xi \in \Xi(t, \nu)$, where $(\mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha})_{s \in [t, T]}$ is the flow of marginal measure defined in (14), so that

$$v(t, \nu) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} J(t, \xi, \alpha),$$

and

$$v(t, \nu) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \int_t^T \langle L(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t, \nu, \alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)), \mu_s^{t, \nu, \alpha} \rangle ds + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t, \nu, \alpha}), \mu_T^{t, \nu, \alpha} \rangle \right\}. \quad (16)$$

The proof will be completed in Appendix. It is based on the uniqueness result of solution to the Fokker–Planck equation associated to the branching diffusion process (in particular that in [14, Proposition 2.4]), together with the wellposedness as well as the stability of the McKean–Vlasov branching SDEs in [8].

3.2 Dynamic Programming Principle

We now provide the dynamic programming principle of the controlled branching processes problem. Recall that $\mu^{t, \nu, \alpha} := \mu^{t, \xi, \alpha}$ with an arbitrary $\xi \in \Xi(t, \nu)$, where the latter is defined in (14).

Lemma 3.4. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold true. Then we have the flow property for the measure $\mu^{t, \nu}$ in the sense that for all $t \leq u \leq s \leq T$,*

$$\mu_s^{t, \nu, \alpha} = \mu_s^{u, \mu_u^{t, \nu, \alpha}, \alpha}.$$

Proof. We fix a control $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ throughout the following argument. Let $\xi = \sum_{k \in K_t} \delta_{(k, X_t^k)} \in E$ be a random variable such that $h(\mathbb{P} \circ (\xi)^{-1}) = m$. Let $Z^{t, \xi, \alpha}$ be the unique solution to the SDE (8) with initial condition ξ and control α . We denote by $\mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}$ the measure induced by $Z_s^{t, \xi, \alpha}$ for any $s \in [t, T]$ as in (4). By the uniqueness of solution to the SDE, we have the cocycle property for the process:

$$Z_s^{t, \xi, \alpha} = Z_s^{u, Z_u^{t, \xi, \alpha}, \alpha} \quad \text{for any } s \in [t, T] \text{ and } u \in [t, s].$$

Then we have

$$\mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha} = \mu_s^{u, Z_u^{t, \xi, \alpha}, \alpha} \quad \text{for any } s \in [t, T] \text{ and } u \in [t, s].$$

Lastly, one applies Lemma 3.3 to conclude that

$$\mu_s^{t, \nu, \alpha} = \mu_s^{t, \xi, \alpha} = \mu_s^{u, Z_u^{t, \xi, \alpha}, \alpha} = \mu_s^{u, \mu_u^{t, \nu, \alpha}, \alpha}.$$

□

Theorem 3.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1 be true, and v be the value function of the controlled branching process in (16). Then, for all $(t, \nu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $s \in [t, T]$, one has*

$$v(t, \nu) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \int_t^s \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t, \nu, \alpha}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t, \nu, \alpha} \rangle du + v(s, \mu_s^{t, \nu, \alpha}) \right\} \quad (17)$$

Proof. We follow the pipeline of the proof for a deterministic dynamic programming principle. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_t^T \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle du + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t,\nu,\alpha}), \mu_T^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle \\
&= \int_t^s \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle du \\
&\quad + \int_s^T \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle du + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t,\nu,\alpha}), \mu_T^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle \\
&\geq \int_t^s \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle du + v(s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\alpha}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the flow-property in Lemma 3.4 that $\mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} = \mu_u^{s, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \alpha}$. This implies

$$v(t, \nu) \geq \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \int_t^s \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle du + v(s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\alpha}) \right\}.$$

For the reverse inequality, we consider controls $\alpha_u(\cdot)$ for $u \in [t, s]$ and $\beta_u^{\mu_u^{t,\nu,\beta}}(\cdot)$ for $u \in (s, T]$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$. We concatenate these two controls as $\gamma_u^{\mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma}}(\cdot) = \mathbb{1}_{u \in [t, s]} \alpha_u(\cdot) + \mathbb{1}_{u \in (s, T]} \beta_u^{\mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma}}(\cdot)$. Clearly $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
v(t, m) &\leq \int_t^T \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma}, \gamma_u^{\mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma}}(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma} \rangle du + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t,\nu,\gamma}), \mu_T^{t,\nu,\gamma} \rangle \\
&= \int_t^s \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma}, \alpha_u(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\gamma} \rangle du + \int_s^T \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\gamma}}, \beta_u^{\mu_s^{t,\nu,\gamma}}(\cdot)), \mu_u^{s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\gamma}} \rangle du \\
&\quad + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\gamma}}), \mu_T^{s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\gamma}} \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

and this yields

$$v(t, \nu) \leq \int_t^T \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}, \alpha_u^{\mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha}}(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,\nu,\alpha} \rangle du + v(s, \mu_s^{t,\nu,\alpha}).$$

By the arbitrariness of α , we obtain the desired result. \square

3.3 Differentiation and Itô's formula

We now define the linear derivative of functional defined on the space of finite nonnegative measures, and then recall from [2] the Itô's formula on the functional of flow of marginal measures induced by the branching diffusion process.

Definition 3.5. (i) For a function $F : \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say $\frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu} : \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a linear (functional) derivative of F , if $\frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu}$ has at most quadratic growth, uniformly in μ , and

$$F(m) - F(m') = \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu}(\lambda m + (1 - \lambda)m', x)(m - m')(dx) d\lambda, \text{ for all } m, m' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Further, we say $D_\mu F : \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is an intrinsic derivative of F if there exists a linear derivative $\frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu}$ such that

$$D_\mu F(m, x) = D_x \frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu}(m, x) = \left(\partial_{x_i} \frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu}(m, x) \right)_{i=1}^d, \text{ for all } (m, x) \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(ii) For a function $F : [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say $F \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ if the derivatives $\partial_t F$, $\delta_\mu F$, $D_\mu F$, $D_{xx}^2 \delta_\mu F$ exist and are continuous, and have at most quadratic growth in x uniformly in (t, μ) .

Proposition 3.6. *Let $F \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, and $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be given by (4) for a controlled branching diffusion process Z with control α . Then, for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & F(t, \mu_t) - F(s, \mu_s) \\ &= \int_s^t \partial_t F(u, \mu_u) + \left\langle b(u, \cdot, \mu_u, \alpha_u(\cdot)) \cdot D_\mu F(\mu_u, \cdot) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(u, \cdot, \mu_u, \alpha_u(\cdot))) \partial_x D_\mu F(\mu_u, \cdot) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \gamma(u, \cdot, \mu_u, \alpha_u(\cdot)) \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell - 1) p_\ell(u, \cdot, \mu_u, \alpha_u(\cdot)) \frac{\delta F}{\delta \mu}(\mu_u, \cdot), \mu_u \right\rangle du. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

3.4 Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation and verification theorem

Let \mathcal{G}_t^α be defined for any $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_t^\alpha v(\nu)(x) &:= b(t, x, \nu, \alpha_t(x)) \cdot D_\mu v(t, \nu)(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(t, x, \nu, \alpha_t(x))) \partial_x D_\mu v(t, \nu)(x) \\ & \quad + \gamma(t, x, \nu, \alpha_t(x)) \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell - 1) p_\ell(t, x, \nu, \alpha_t(x)) \frac{\delta v}{\delta \mu}(t, \nu)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.7. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1 hold true. Suppose in addition that $v \in C^{1,2}([t, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then v satisfies the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(t, m) + \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \{ \langle L(t, \cdot, m, \alpha(\cdot)), m \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_t^\alpha v(t, m)(\cdot), m \rangle \} = 0, & \text{on } [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ v(T, m) = \langle g(\cdot, m), m \rangle, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Proof. We first fix a control $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $h > 0$ be fixed, then by the dynamic programming principle (17), we have

$$v(t, m) \leq \int_t^{t+h} \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*}, \alpha^*(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*} \rangle du + v(t+h, \mu_{t+h}^{t, m, \alpha^*}). \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, one applies the Itô's formula (18) to v from (t, m) to $(t+h, \mu_{t+h}^{t, m})$ to obtain

$$v(t+h, \mu_{t+h}^{t, m, \alpha^*}) - v(t, m) = \int_t^{t+h} \partial_t v(u, \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*}) du + \int_t^{t+h} \langle \mathcal{G}_u^{\alpha^*} v(\mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*}), \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*} \rangle du. \quad (21)$$

Combining (20) and (21), we obtain

$$0 \leq \int_t^{t+h} \left(\partial_t v(u, \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*}) + \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*}, \alpha^*(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_u^{\alpha^*} v(\mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*}), \mu_u^{t, m, \alpha^*} \rangle \right) du.$$

We follow by the classical argument to obtain the first inequality as

$$0 \leq \partial_t v(t, m) + \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \langle L(t, \cdot, m, \alpha(\cdot)), m \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_t^\alpha v(m), m \rangle \right\}. \quad (22)$$

For the reverse inequality, we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and we can find a ε -control $\alpha^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$v(t, m) \geq \int_t^{t+h} \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}, \alpha^\varepsilon(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon} \rangle du + v(t+h, \mu_{t+h}^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}) - \varepsilon.$$

Thus, it follows again from Itô's formula that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \int_t^{t+h} \left(\partial_t v(u, \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}) + \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}, \alpha^\varepsilon(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_u^{\alpha^\varepsilon} v(\mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}), \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon} \rangle \right) ds \\ &\geq \int_t^{t+h} \partial_t v(u, \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}) du + \int_t^{t+h} \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \langle L(u, \cdot, \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}, \alpha(\cdot)), \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon} \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \mathcal{G}_u^{\alpha^\varepsilon} v(\mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon}), \mu_u^{t,m,\alpha^\varepsilon} \rangle \right\} du. \end{aligned}$$

By sending $h \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the reverse inequality

$$0 \geq \partial_t v(t, m) + \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \langle L(t, \cdot, m, \alpha(\cdot)), m \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_t^\alpha v(m), m \rangle \right\}. \quad (23)$$

By combining (22) and (23), the desired result follows. \square

Theorem 3.3. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1 hold true, and $u \in C_b^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Suppose that u is a solution to (19), and there exists $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}$ which attains the infimum in (19). Then $u(t, m) = J(t, m, \hat{\alpha}) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} J(t, m, \alpha)$, for all $m \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. We apply the Itô's formula (18) to u from (t, m) to $(T, \mu_T^{t,m})$ with arbitrary control $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ as followed:

$$\begin{aligned} u(T, \mu_T^{t,m,\alpha}) &= u(t, m) + \int_t^T \partial_t u(s, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}) ds + \int_t^T \langle b(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)) \cdot D_\mu u(s, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)) \partial_x D_\mu u(s, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha})) \\ &\quad + \gamma(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)) \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell - 1) p_\ell(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)) \frac{\delta u}{\delta \mu}(s, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}) \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since u satisfies the HJB equation (19), one derives

$$\langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t,m,\alpha}), \mu_T^{t,m,\alpha} \rangle \geq u(t, m) - \int_t^T \langle L(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha}, \alpha_s(\cdot)), \mu_s^{t,m,\alpha} \rangle ds.$$

By the arbitrariness of α , it follows

$$u(t, m) \leq v(t, m). \quad (24)$$

Then, since $\hat{\alpha}$ attains the infimum in (19), one derives the following equality using the same argument as above with control $\hat{\alpha}$:

$$u(t, m) = \int_t^T \langle L(s, \cdot, \mu_s^{t,m,\hat{\alpha}}, \hat{\alpha}_s(\cdot)), \mu_s^{t,m,\hat{\alpha}} \rangle ds + \langle g(\cdot, \mu_T^{t,m,\hat{\alpha}}), \mu_T^{t,m,\hat{\alpha}} \rangle \geq v(t, m).$$

Together with (24), we conclude that

$$v(t, m) \geq u(t, m) = J(t, m, \hat{\alpha}) \geq v(t, m)$$

which results in the equalities of above relation. \square

4 A linear-quadratic control problem

In this section, we provide a simple example of the control problem in the linear-quadratic case, inspired by the computation in [22]. At the same time, we also give an explicit solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation associated with the LQ control problem. Without loss of generality, we consider a 1-dimensional controlled McKean–Vlasov branching diffusion process with coefficients in the following sense:

$$b(s, x, m, a) = b_1(s)x + b_2(s)m(\mathbb{R}) + b_3(s)a, \quad \sigma(s, x, m, a) = \sigma, \quad \gamma(s, x, m, a) = \gamma, \quad p_\ell(s, x, m, a) = p_\ell, \quad (25)$$

where we assume that:

$$(b_1, b_2, b_3) \in C([t, T], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}), \quad (\sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \bar{\gamma}] \times [0, 1]^\mathbb{N},$$

and $\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \ell p_\ell$ is strictly positive and bounded from above.

Remark 4.1. *In fact, we consider a branching diffusion process with a constant rate of branching, i.e., γ is a positive constant. Moreover, we assume that the progeny follows a pre-known distribution.*

For simplicity, we denote $\theta := \gamma \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\ell - 1)p_\ell$ and in the rest of this section, we keep the following notations, for any $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$:

$$\bar{m} := m(\mathbb{R}), \quad m_1 := \int_{\mathbb{R}} xm(dx), \quad m_2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 m(dx).$$

To define the control problem, we introduce the quadratic cost functionals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L(s, x, m, a) &:= L_1(s)x^2 + L_2(s)\bar{m} + L_3(s)m_1 + L_4(s)a^2, \\ g(x, m) &:= g_1x^2 + g_2\bar{m} + g_3m_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$(L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4) \in C([t, T], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^*),$$

and g_1, g_2, g_3 are constants valued in \mathbb{R} .

Proposition 4.2. *In the linear-quadratic settings given above, the control problem is well-defined.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the coefficient function b is Lipschitz continuous. The Lipschitz continuity on spatial position x is trivial. Let $m^1, m^2 \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})$, and $s \in [t, T]$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |b_2(s)| |m^1(\mathbb{R}) - m^2(\mathbb{R})| &\leq |b_2(s)| \left(\sup_{\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1^0} \{ \langle \varphi, m^1 - m^2 \rangle \} + |m^1(\mathbb{R}) - m^2(\mathbb{R})| \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in [t, T]} |b_2(s)| \bar{\mathcal{W}}_1(m^1, m^2). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the coefficient function b is Lipschitz continuous as in Assumption 2.1. The growth condition is also satisfied by the fact that $|b(s, 0, 0, 0)| = 0$ for all $s \in [t, T]$. On the other hand, we check the quadratic growth condition for cost functionals. For any $m \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and $s \in [t, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |L_3(t)m_1| &\leq \sup_{s \in [t, T]} |L_3(s)| (m(\mathbb{R}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^2 m(dx))^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{s \in [t, T]} |L_3(s)| (m(\mathbb{R}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^2 m(dx)) \end{aligned}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the usual inequality $2ab \leq (a^2 + b^2)$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Under this LQ framework, we define a function $w : [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ by*

$$w(t, m) := \Lambda(t)m_2 + \Gamma_1(t)\bar{m} + \Gamma_2(t)\bar{m}m_1 + \Gamma_3(t)\bar{m}^2 + \Gamma_4(t)\bar{m}^3,$$

with $\Lambda, \Gamma_i \in C^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ satisfying the following system of Riccati ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda'(t) - \frac{1}{L_4(t)}(b_3\Lambda)(t)^2 + L_1(t) + 2(b_1\Lambda)(t) + \theta\Lambda(t) = 0, \\ \Lambda(T) = g_1. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_1'(t) + \sigma^2\Lambda(t) + \Gamma_1(t) = 0, \\ \Gamma_1(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_2'(t) - \frac{1}{L_4(t)}(b_3^2\Lambda\Gamma_2)(t) + (2b_2\Lambda + b_1\Gamma_2)(t) + 2\Gamma_2(t) + L_3(t), \\ \Gamma_2(T) = g_3. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_3'(t) + L_2(t) + 2\Gamma_3(t) = 0, \\ \Gamma_3(T) = g_2. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_4'(t) - \frac{1}{4L_4(t)}(b_3\Gamma_2)(t)^2 + (b_2\Gamma_2)(t) + 3\Gamma_4(t) = 0, \\ \Gamma_4(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Then $w(t, m) = v(t, m) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} J(t, m, \alpha)$.

Proof. Since all terms could be written as cylindrical functions with respect to m . By direct computation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t w(t, m) &= \Lambda'(t)m_2 + \Gamma_1'(t)\bar{m} + \Gamma_2'(t)\bar{m}m_1 + \Gamma_3'(t)\bar{m}^2 + \Gamma_4'(t)\bar{m}^3 \\ \frac{\delta w}{\delta \mu}(t, m)(x) &= \Lambda(t)x^2 + \Gamma_1(t) + \Gamma_2(t)m_1 + \Gamma_2(t)\bar{m}x + 2\Gamma_3(t)\bar{m} + 3\Gamma_4(t)\bar{m}^2 \\ D_\mu w(t, \mu)(x) &= 2\Lambda(t)x + \Gamma_2(t)\bar{m} \\ \partial_x D_\mu w(t, \mu)(x) &= 2\Lambda(t). \end{aligned}$$

For any $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\langle L(t, \cdot, m, \alpha_t(\cdot)), m \rangle = L_1(t)m_2 + L_2(t)\bar{m}^2 + L_3(t)\bar{m}m_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_4(t)\alpha_t(x)^2 m(dx), \quad (31)$$

and the terminal cost as

$$\langle g(\cdot, m), m \rangle := g_1m_2 + g_2\bar{m}^2 + g_3\bar{m}m_1. \quad (32)$$

Then we can calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{G}_t^\alpha w(t, m), m \rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_4(t)\alpha_t(x)^2 m(dx) &= 2(b_1\Lambda)(t)m_2 + (2b_2\Lambda + b_1\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m}m_1 + (b_2\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m}^3 \\ &\quad + 2\Lambda(t)\bar{m} + \theta(\Lambda(t)m_2 + \Gamma_1(t)\bar{m} + 2\Gamma_2(t)\bar{m}m_1 + 2\Gamma_3(t)\bar{m}^2 + 3\Gamma_4(t)\bar{m}^3) + \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} H_t^m(\alpha) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where we denote all the terms that contain α in the Bellman equation by H_t^m defined as follows:

$$H_t^m(\alpha) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_4(t)\alpha_t(x)^2 m(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (2(b_3\Lambda)(t)x + (b_3\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m})\alpha_t(x)m(dx),$$

and we would like to minimize $H_t^m(\alpha)$. To this end, we minimize the integrand pointwisely for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The integrand is quadratic in $\alpha(x)$:

$$L_4(t)\alpha_t(x)^2 + C(t, x, m)\alpha_t(x)$$

where

$$C(t, x, m) = 2(b_3\Lambda)(t)x + (b_3\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m}.$$

Since L_4 is valued in \mathbb{R}_+^* , the optimal α^* satisfies:

$$2L_4(t)\alpha^*(t, x) + C(t, x, m) = 0.$$

Then the desired optimal control is given by

$$\alpha^*(t, x, m) = -\frac{C(t, x, m)}{2L_4(t)} = -\frac{2(b_3\Lambda)(t)x + (b_3\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m}}{2L_4(t)}. \quad (34)$$

This optimal control is well-defined as it satisfies the Lipschitz continuity condition and linear growth in Definition 3.1 hence $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{A}$. And we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_t^m(\alpha^*) &= -\frac{1}{4L_4(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} 4(b_3\Lambda)(t)^2 x^2 + 4(b_3^2\Lambda\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m}x + (b_3\Gamma_2)(t)^2 \bar{m}^2 m(dx) \\ &= -\frac{1}{L_4(t)}(b_3\Lambda)(t)^2 m_2 - \frac{1}{L_4(t)}(b_3^2\Lambda\Gamma_2)(t)\bar{m}m_1 - \frac{1}{4L_4(t)}(b_3\Gamma_2)(t)^2 \bar{m}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Therefore, by (31), (33) and (35), we rewrite the HJB equation and verifies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t w(t, m) + \langle L(t, \cdot, m, \alpha_t^{*m}(\cdot)), m \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_t^{\alpha^*} w(t, m), m \rangle \\ &= \left(\Lambda'(t) - \frac{1}{L_4(t)}(b_3\Lambda)(t)^2 + L_1(t) + 2(b_1\Lambda)(t) + \theta\Lambda(t) \right) m_2 + \left(\Gamma_1'(t) + \sigma^2\Lambda(t) + \Gamma_1(t) \right) \bar{m} \\ &\quad + \left(\Gamma_2'(t) - \frac{1}{L_4(t)}(b_3^2\Lambda\Gamma_2)(t) + (2b_2\Lambda + b_1\Gamma_2)(t) + 2\Gamma_2(t) + L_3(t) \right) \bar{m}m_1 \\ &\quad + \left(\Gamma_3'(t) + L_2(t) + 2\Gamma_3(t) \right) \bar{m}^2 + \left(\Gamma_4'(t) - \frac{1}{4L_4(t)}(b_3\Gamma_2)(t)^2 + (b_2\Gamma_2)(t) + 3\Gamma_4(t) \right) \bar{m}^3 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the coefficients of m_2 , \bar{m} , $\bar{m}m_1$, \bar{m}^2 and \bar{m}^3 satisfies the system of Riccati ODEs (26) - (30), we verify that $\partial_t w(t, m) + \langle L(t, \cdot, m, \alpha_t^{*m}(\cdot)), m \rangle + \langle \mathcal{G}_t^{\alpha^*} w(t, m), m \rangle = 0$. Lastly, we check the terminal condition:

$$g_1 m_2 + g_2 \bar{m}^2 + g_3 \bar{m}m_1 = \Lambda(T)m_2 + \Gamma_1(T)\bar{m} + \Gamma_2(T)\bar{m}m_1 + \Gamma_3(T)\bar{m}^2 + \Gamma_4(T)\bar{m}^3.$$

Thus, we conclude the proof by the terminal condition given in the statement of the proposition. \square

A Wellposedeness of non-linear Fokker-Planck equation and proof of Lemma 3.3

Our dynamic programming results depends essentially on Lemma 3.3, which states that flow of marginal measures induced by the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE depends only on the initial measure ν_0 , but independent of the E -valued random variable ξ which induces ν_0 . Below we

provide the proof of Lemma 3.3, by using a uniqueness result of the linear Fokker-Planck equation, together with the uniqueness and stability results of the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE in [8].

For simplicity, we ignore the control term and consider the following Fokker-Planck equation with uncontrolled coefficient functions $(b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$:

$$\partial_t \mu + \partial_x (b(t, x, \mu_t) \mu) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx}^2 \text{Tr}[\sigma \sigma^\top(t, x, \mu_t) \mu] + \pi(t, x, \mu_t) \mu = 0, \quad (36)$$

with initial condition $\mu_0 = \nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where

$$\pi(t, x, m) := \gamma(t, x, m) \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (\ell - 1) p_\ell(t, x, m), \quad \text{for all } (t, x, m) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Definition A.1. A function $\mu \in C([0, T], \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is called a *distributional solution* to the Fokker-Planck equation (36) with initial condition ν_0 if, for all $\varphi \in C_0^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\langle \varphi(t, \cdot), \mu_t \rangle = \langle \varphi(0, \cdot), \nu_0 \rangle + \int_0^t \langle \partial_t \varphi(s, \cdot) + \mathcal{L}_s^{\mu_s} \varphi(s, \cdot) + \pi(s, \cdot, \mu_s) \varphi(s, \cdot), \mu_s \rangle ds,$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{\mu_s} \varphi(s, x) := b(s, x, \mu_s) \partial_x \varphi(s, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma \sigma^\top(s, x, \mu_s) \partial_{xx}^2 \varphi(s, x).$$

Theorem A.1. Suppose that $(b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0})$ satisfies the conditions in Assumption 2.1. Assume in addition that ν_0 has a density function such that

$$\|\nu_0\|_\eta^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\eta(x)} \nu_0(x)^2 dx < \infty, \quad \text{with } \eta(x) := \eta_0 \sqrt{1 + |x|^2}, \quad \text{for some } \eta_0 > 0, \quad (37)$$

and b and σ are uniformly bounded, $\sigma \sigma^\top(\cdot) \geq c_0 I_d$ for some constant $c_0 > 0$, $x \mapsto \sigma \sigma^\top(t, x, m)$ has a weak derivative. Then the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation (36) has a unique distributional solution given by the marginal measures $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined in (4) by using the solution $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to the mean-field branching SDE (8) with initial condition $Z_0 = \xi \in \Xi(0, \nu_0)$.

Proof. First, given a distributional solution $(\hat{\mu}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, to the Fokker-Planck equation (36), one considers the coefficient functions $(t, x) \mapsto (b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0})(t, x, \hat{\mu}_t)$, which allows one to define a classical (no mean-field) branching diffusion process $\hat{Z} = (\hat{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ whose induced marginal measures $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a distributional solution to the linear Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \mu + \partial_x (b(t, x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx}^2 \text{Tr}[\sigma \sigma^\top(t, x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu] + \pi(t, x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu = 0, \quad (38)$$

with initial condition $\mu_0 = \nu_0$. At the same time, with the above additional conditions on (b, σ) and ν_0 , it follows by Hambly and Jettkant [14, Proposition 2.4] that (38) has a unique distributional solution, so that one must have

$$\mu_t = \hat{\mu}_t, \quad t \geq 0.$$

This implies that \hat{Z} is in fact a solution to the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE with coefficient functions $(t, x, m) \mapsto (b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0})(t, x, m)$. It follows by the uniqueness of solution to the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE under Assumption 2.1 ([8, Theorem 2.3]) that $(\hat{\mu}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the unique distributional solution to the Fokker-Planck equation (36). \square

Next, given an initial random variable ξ , we denote by $(Z_t^\xi)_{t \geq 0}$ the unique solution to the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE with coefficient functions $(b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0})$, and by $(\mu_t^\xi)_{t \geq 0}$ the induced marginal measure.

Proposition A.2. *Suppose that $(b, \sigma, \gamma, (p_\ell)_{\ell \geq 0})$ satisfies the conditions in Assumption 2.1. Then for all $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Xi(0, \nu_0)$, one has*

$$\mu_t^{\xi_1} = \mu_t^{\xi_2}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Proof. Let $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\xi = \sum_{k \in K_0} \delta_{X_0^k} \in \Xi(0, \nu_0)$ be a E -valued r.v. We next define $X_0^{k, \varepsilon} := (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \vee X^k \wedge \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon Z_0^k$ where Z_0^k is an independent r.v. with standard normal distribution, and then let $\xi_\varepsilon := \sum_{k \in K_0} \delta_{X_0^{k, \varepsilon}}$ so that the induced measure ν_0^ε satisfies the condition (37). Let us also consider the approximation

$$b_\varepsilon(\cdot) := (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \vee b(\cdot) \wedge \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_\varepsilon \sigma_\varepsilon^\top(\cdot) := (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \vee \sigma \sigma^\top(\cdot) \wedge \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon I_d.$$

Then it is clear that $(b_\varepsilon, \sigma_\varepsilon, \nu_0^\varepsilon)$ all the conditions in Theorem A.1 so that the corresponding non-linear Fokker-Planck equation (36) has a unique distributional solution $(\mu_t^{\xi, \varepsilon})_{t \geq 0}$ induced by the corresponding McKean-Vlasov branching SDE. At the same time, any two $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Xi(0, \nu_0)$ induces the two random variables $\xi_1^\varepsilon, \xi_2^\varepsilon$ which induce the same marginal measure ν_0^ε , so that

$$\mu_t^{\xi_1^\varepsilon} = \mu_t^{\xi_2^\varepsilon}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By using the stability results of the McKean-Vlasov branching SDE in [8, Proposition A.1], it follows that

$$\mu_t^{\xi_1} = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mu_t^{\xi_1^\varepsilon} = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mu_t^{\xi_2^\varepsilon} = \mu_t^{\xi_2}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

□

Remark A.3. *The proof of Lemma 3.3 follows directly by Proposition A.2.*

References

- [1] Buckdahn R, Li J, Peng S, Rainer C. (2017) Mean-field stochastic differential equations and associated PDEs. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(2): 824-878.
- [2] Cao W, Ren Z, & Tan X. (2025) Quantitative Weak Propagation of Chaos for Branching Diffusions, In preparation.
- [3] Carmona R, Delarue F. (2015) Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and controlled McKean-Vlasov dynamics, *The Annals of Probability*, 43(5): 2647-2700.
- [4] Carmona R, Delarue F. (2018) Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications I-II[M]. Berlin: Springer Nature.
- [5] Chaintron, L. P., & Diez, A. (2021). Propagation of chaos: a review of models, methods and applications. II. Applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14812.
- [6] Claisse J. (2018) Optimal control of branching diffusion processes: A finite horizon problem. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 28(1):1-34.

- [7] Claisse J, Ren Z, Tan X. (2023) Mean field games with branching. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(2): 1034-1075.
- [8] Claisse J, Kang J, Tan X. (2024) On the McKean–Vlasov SDE with branching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12964*.
- [9] Dawson D, Vaillancourt J. (1995) Stochastic mckean-vlasov equations. *Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications NoDEA*, 2(2):199-229.
- [10] Ekren I, He X, Lan T and Tan X. (2025), Comparison of viscosity solutions for a class of second-order PDEs on the space of finite nonnegative measures, in preparation.
- [11] Fontbona J, Méléard S. (2015) Non local Lotka-Volterra system with cross-diffusion in an heterogeneous medium. *Journal of mathematical biology*, 70(4):829-854.
- [12] Fontbona J, Muñoz-Hernández F. (2022) Quantitative mean-field limit for interacting branching diffusions. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 27:1-32.
- [13] Guo X, Pham H, Wei X. (2023) Itô’s formula for flows of measures on semimartingales. *Stochastic Processes and their applications*, 159:350-90.
- [14] Hambly B, Jettkant P. (2026) Optimal control of the nonlinear stochastic Fokker–Planck equation, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, Volume 191.
- [15] Jacod J, Shiryaev AN. (2003) Limit theorems for stochastic processes, *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Vol. 288.
- [16] Kharroubi I and Ocello A. (2024) A stochastic target problem for branching diffusion processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 170(2):104278.
- [17] Lions PL, Delarue F, Lasry JM. (2019) The Master Equation and the Convergence Problem in Mean Field Games: (AMS-201), Vol(2).
- [18] McKean HP. (1967) Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations. *Stochastic Differential Equations (Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ.)*, 41-57.
- [19] Martini M. (2023) Kolmogorov equations on spaces of measures associated to nonlinear filtering processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 161:385-423.
- [20] Nisio M. (1985) Stochastic control related to branching diffusion processes. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University*, 25(3):549-75.
- [21] Ocello A. (2023) Relaxed formulation for Controlled Branching Diffusions, Existence of an Optimal Control and HJB Equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07064*.
- [22] Pham H, Wei X. (2018) Bellman equation and viscosity solutions for mean-field stochastic control problem. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 24(1):437-61.
- [23] Roelly-Coppoletta S. (1986). A criterion of convergence of measure-valued processes: application to measure branching processes. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 17(1-2), 43-65.
- [24] Sznitman AS. (1991) Topics in propagation of chaos. In *Ecole d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, (pp. 165-251). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

- [25] Yong J. (2013). A linear-quadratic optimal control problem for mean-field stochastic differential equations, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51, 2809-2838.