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Abstract. We study stochastic motion planning problems which involve a controlled process, with possibly discontinuous sample paths, visiting certain subsets of the state-space while avoiding others in a sequential fashion. For this purpose, we first introduce two basic notions of motion planning, and then establish a connection to a class of stochastic optimal control problems concerned with sequential stopping-times. A weak dynamic programming principle (DPP) is then proposed, which characterizes the set of initial states that admit the existence of a policy enabling the process to execute the desired maneuver with probability at least as much as some pre-specified value. The proposed DPP consists of some auxiliary value functions defined in terms of discontinuous payoff functions. An application of the DPP is demonstrated in the context of controlled diffusion processes thereafter. It turns out that the aforementioned set of initial states can be characterized as the level set of a discontinuous viscosity solution to a sequence of partial differential equations, for which the first one has a known boundary condition, while the boundary conditions of the subsequent ones are determined by the solutions to the preceding steps. Finally, the generality and flexibility of the theoretical results are illustrated with the aid of an example involving biological switches.

1. Introduction

Motion planning can be viewed as a scheme of excursions to visiting certain specific sets in a specific order according to a specified time schedule. In the context of motion planning for controlled dynamical systems, the central issue is to determine whether there exists an admissible policy to drive the process through some sets while visiting certain targets in a pre-assigned order and scheduled times. In the deterministic setting, motion planning problems have been studied extensively from different perspectives; here we cite two representative articles [Sus91, CS98] and refer to the references therein for further details of the literature. In this article we focus on the stochastic counterpart of the motion planning. The basic motion planning problem involving two targets and obstacle sets has been investigated in different contexts, e.g., from computational standpoint in finite probability spaces for a class of continuous-time Markov decision processes (CTMDPs) [BHKH05], or in discrete-time stochastic hybrid systems based on a dynamic programming approach in [CCL11, SL10]. In our earlier works [MECL11] and [MECL12] we focused on reachability of controlled diffusion processes; the reachable sets in these works were characterized as superlevel sets of value functions which are given by the discontinuous viscosity solutions to certain partial differential equations with some associated boundary conditions. Here we continue our study by moving beyond reachability to more complex motion planning specifications for a larger class of stochastic processes with possibly discontinuous sample paths.

We first introduce different motion planning scenarios in the context of piecewise continuous processes. We address the following natural question: for which set of initial states does there...
exist an admissible policy such that the controlled stochastic processes satisfy the motion planning specifications with a probability greater than a given value $p$? To characterize this set of initial states, we establish a connection between the motion planning specifications to a class of stochastic optimal control problems involved sequential stopping times. We shall be concerned with a stochastic process started and stopped when it hits certain subsets of the state-space, or equivalently, the process obtained by concatenating segments of the original process between consecutive stopping times.

Under certain mild assumptions on the admissible policies, the stochastic process, and the sets concerned the motion planning, we propose a Dynamic Programming Principle (DPP) in which some auxiliary value functions are required. The DPP is introduced in a weak version in the spirit of [BT11]; this formulation does not require measurability of the value functions. In the following sections we shall focus on a class of diffusion processes as the strong solution of a stochastic differential equation (SDE), in which the required assumptions of the DPP are investigated. In light of the proposed DPP, we develop a new framework to characterize the desired initial sets based on tools from partial differential equations (PDE's). Due to the discontinuities in the value functions corresponding to these problems, all the PDE's are understood in the generalized notion of the so called viscosity solutions. It turns out to solve the value functions a series of PDEs are considered, in which the preceding PDE provides the boundary condition of the proceeding PDE, i.e., the PDEs are solved in a recursive fashion. In order to numerically compute the desired initial sets by means of off-the-shelf PDE solvers, some numerical issues are discussed thereafter.

Mention may be made of the fact that the techniques proposed here suffer from the curse of dimensionality. Given a continuous-time controlled stochastic process, e.g., a controlled diffusion, one approach to solving motion planning problems may proceed with a discretization of the state-space, constructing a controlled Markov chain on the discretized space that approximates the original process in a certain way, and then to deal with this Markov chain insofar as motion planning is concerned. While it may appear that this discretized setting is conceptually simpler, it does not lead to dimensionality reduction, and moreover, introduces the non-trivial issue of the quality of the approximation and the associated errors due to the discretization involved. Furthermore, to our knowledge, there appears to be no off-the-shelf software that algorithmically leads to the aforementioned discretization. In contrast, our techniques deal directly with the given controlled stochastic process. The implementation of our techniques require employment of off-the-shelf PDE solvers, which is a well-studied topic. The errors in our numerical solutions occur only due to the employment of PDE solvers.

The article is organized as follows: in §2 we formally introduce the stochastic motion planning problems on the prescribed probability space. In §3 we construct a connection between the motion planning problems to a class of stochastic optimal control problems, for which a weak DPP is proposed in §4 in terms of some auxiliary value functions. An application of the proposed DPP is illustrated in §5, which leads to an alternative characterization of the motion planning objective by a series of PDE’s in a recursive fashion. To validate the performance of the proposed methodology, in §6 the theoretical results are applied to a biological two-gene network, where the quality of the biological switch is investigated. For better readability, some of the technical proofs of §3 and §5 are moved to Appendix A and B, respectively.

**Notation**

For the ease of readers, we provide here a partial notation list which will be also explained in more details later throughout the article:
• \( T \) (resp. \( V \)): minimum (resp. maximum) operator;
• \( A^c \) (resp. \( A^\circ \)): complement (resp. interior) of the set \( A \);
• \( B_t(x) \): open Euclidian ball centered at \( x \) and radius \( r \);
• \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{A}) \): Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra on a topological space \( \mathcal{A} \);
• \( \mathcal{U} \): set of admissible policies at time \( t \);
• \( (X^{t,x,u}_{s})_{s \geq 0} \): stochastic process under the control policy \( u \) and convention \( X^{t,x,u}_0 := x \) for all \( s \leq t \);
• \( (W_i \overset{\rightarrow}{\rightarrow} G_i)_{i \leq T_i} \) (resp. \( W_i \overset{T_i}{\rightarrow} G_i \)) : motion-planning events of reaching \( G_i \) sometime before time \( T_i \) (resp. at time \( T_i \)) while staying in \( W_i \), see Definition 2.1;
• \( (\Theta_i^{A_n})_{i=1}^n \) : sequential exit-times from the sets \( (A_i)_{i=1}^n \) in order, see Definition 3.1;
• \( V^\ast \) (resp. \( V_\ast \)) : upper (resp. lower) semicontinuous envelope of the function \( V \);
• \( L^u \): Dynkin operator, see Definition 5.5.

2. General Setting and Problem Description

Consider a filtered probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})\) whose filtration \( \mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0} \) is generated by an \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued process \( z := (z_s)_{s \geq 0} \) with independent increments. Let this natural filtration be enlarged by its right-continuous completion, i.e. it satisfies the usual conditions of completeness and right continuity [K591, p. 48]. For future purposes, we introduce an auxiliary subfiltration \( \mathcal{F}_t := (\mathcal{F}_{ts})_{s \geq 0} \), where \( \mathcal{F}_{ts} \) is the \( \mathbb{F} \)-completion of \( \sigma(z, \tau, s \leq t \leq s \vee s) \). Note that for \( s \leq t \), \( \mathcal{F}_{ts} \) is the trivial \( \sigma \)-algebra, and any \( \mathcal{F}_{ts} \)-random variable is independent of \( \mathcal{F}_t \). By definitions, it is obvious that \( \mathcal{F}_{ts} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_s \) with equality in case of \( t = 0 \).

The object of our study is an \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued controlled random process \( (X^{t,x,u}_s)_{s \geq t} \) initialized at \((t, x)\) under the control policy \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \), where \( \mathcal{U}_t \) is the set of admissible policies at time \( t \). Let \( T > 0 \) be a fixed time horizon, and let \( S := [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \). Throughout this work we assume that for every \((t, x) \in S \) and \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \), the process \((X^{t,x,u}_s)_{s \geq t} \) is \( \mathbb{F} \)-adapted process with RCLL sample paths.\(^1\) We denote by \( T \) the collection of all \( \mathbb{F} \)-stopping times; for \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \in T \) with \( \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \) \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s. we let the subset \( T_{[\tau_1, \tau_2]} \) denote the collection of all \( \mathbb{F}_{\tau_1} \)-stopping times \( \tau \) such that \( \tau_1 \leq \tau \leq \tau_2 \) \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s. Measurability on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) will always refer to Borel measurability, and \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{A}) \) stands for the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra on a topological space \( \mathcal{A} \). Throughout this article all the (in)equalities between random variables are understood in almost sure sense.

Given sets \((W_i, G_i) \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), we are interested in a set of initial conditions \((t, x) \in S \) such that there exists an admissible strategy \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \) steering the process \( X^{t,x,u}_s \) through the sets \((W_i)_{i=1}^n \) while visiting \((G_i)_{i=1}^n \) in a pre-assigned order. In fact, \( W_i \) and \( G_i \) stand for “Way” and “Goal” respectively. One may pose this objective from different perspectives based on different time scheduling for the excursions between the sets. We formally introduce some of these notions which will be addressed throughout this article.

**Definition 2.1** (Motion-Planning Events). Consider a fixed initial condition \((t, x) \in S \) and admissible policy \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \). Given a sequence of pairs \((W_i, G_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and horizon times \((T_i)_{i=1}^n \subset [t, T] \), we introduce the following motion-planning events:

\[
(1a) \quad \left\{ X^{t,x,u}_s \mid ([W_1 \overset{\rightarrow}{\rightarrow} G_1] \circ \cdots \circ [W_n \overset{\rightarrow}{\rightarrow} G_n])_{s \leq T} \right\} :=
\]

\[
\{ \begin{array}{l}
\exists (s_i)_{i=1}^n \subset [t, T] \mid X^{t,x,u}_{s_i} \in G_i \text{ and } X^{t,x,u}_{s_i} \in W_i \setminus G_i, \forall r \in [s_{i-1}, s_i], \forall i \leq n,
\end{array}\]

\[
(1b) \quad \left\{ X^{t,x,u}_s \mid (W_1 \overset{T_1}{\rightarrow} G_1) \circ \cdots \circ (W_n \overset{T_n}{\rightarrow} G_n) \right\} :=
\]

\(^1\)That is, processes with paths that are right continuous with left limits.
\[
\left\{ X_{T_i}^{t,x,u} \in G_i \text{ and } X_{r}^{t,x,u} \in W_i, \quad \forall r \in [T_{i-1},T_i], \quad \forall i \leq n \right\},
\]
where in the above definitions \( s_0 = T_0 := t \).

The set in (1a), roughly speaking, contains those events that the trajectory \( X_{T_i}^{t,x,u} \), initialized at \((t,x) \in S\) and controlled via \( u \in U_t \), succeeds in visiting the sets \((G_i)_{i=1}^n\) in a certain order, while the entire duration between the two visits to \( G_{i-1} \) and \( G_i \) is spent in \( W_i \), all within the time horizon \( T \). In other words, the journey from \( G_{i-1} \) to the next destination \( G_i \) must belong to the way \( W_i \) for all \( i \). Figure 1(a) depicts a sample path that successfully contributes to the first three phases of the excursion in the sense of (1a).

In the case of (1b), the set of paths is more restricted in comparison to (1a). Indeed, not only is the trajectory confined to the ways \( W_i \), but also there is a time schedule \((T_i)_{i=1}^n\) that a priori forces the process to be at the goal sets \( G_i \) at the specific times \((T_i)_{i=1}^n\). Figure 1(b) demonstrates one sample path in which the first three phases of the excursion are successfully fulfilled.

Note that once a trajectory belonging to the set in (1a) visits \( G_i \) for the first time, it is required to remain in the way \( W_{i+1} \) until the next goal \( G_{i+1} \) is reached, whereas a trajectory belonging to the set in definition (1b) may visit the destination \( G_i \) several times, while staying in \( W_i \), until the intermediate time schedule \( T_i \). The only requirement, in contrast to (1a), is to confine the trajectory to be at the goal \( G_i \) at the time \( T_i \).

As an illustration, one can easily inspect that the successful sample path in Figure 1(b) indeed violates the requirements of the definition (1a) as it leaves \( W_2 \) after it visits the goal set \( G_1 \) for the first time. In other words, the definition (1a) changes the admissible way set \( W_i \) immediately after the trajectory visits the goal set \( G_i \), while the definition (1b) only changes the admissible way set only after the intermediate time \( T_i \) irrespective of whether the trajectory visits the goal set \( G_i \) prior to \( T_i \).
From the technical standpoint, if the target set $G_i$ is not closed, then it is not difficult to see that there could be some continuous transitions through the boundary of the goal $G_i$ that are not admissible in view of the definition (1a) since the trajectory must reside in $W_i \setminus G_i$ for the whole interval $[s_{i-1}, s_i]$ and just hit the set $G_i$ at the time $s_i$. Notice that we do not need to consider this issue for the set in definition (1b) since in this case the trajectory only visits the sets $G_i$ at the specific times $T_i$, while any continuous transition and maneuver inside the target sets $G_i$ are allowed. In order to address the aforementioned issue, we may impose the following:

**Assumption 2.2.** The sets $(G_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are closed.

Having discussed about the properties of motion planning as detailed in Definition 2.1, one may conclude that in general none of the definitions of (1) is more restrictive than the other. However, in the particular motion planning case where the family of the way sets $(W_i)_{i=1}^n$ is nested, i.e., $W_i \subseteq W_{i+1}$, one can see that the motion planning definition of (1b) actually imposes more constraints on the trajectories of the random process in light of the right continuity of $X_{t,x,u}^{r}$ and Assumption 2.2. The following Fact formally addresses this issue.

**Fact 2.3.** Consider a family of set pairs $(W_i, G_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $(G_i)_{i=1}^n$ satisfies Assumption 2.2 and $(W_i)_{i=1}^n$ is nested, i.e. $W_i \subseteq W_{i+1}$. Then, for all initial condition $(t, x) \in \mathcal{S}$, intermediate times $(T_i)_{i=1}^n \subset [t, T]$, and control policy $u \in U_i$, it holds that

$$\left\{ X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega} = (W_1 \overset{T_1}{\rightarrow} G_1) \circ \ldots \circ (W_n \overset{T_n}{\rightarrow} G_n) \right\} \subseteq \left\{ X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega} = [(W_1 \rightsquigarrow G_1) \circ \ldots \circ (W_n \rightsquigarrow G_n)]_{t \leq T} \right\}$$

**Proof.** Let $\omega$ be contained in the set defined in (1b). This means that $X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in G_i$, and for all $r \in [T_{i-1}, T_i]$ we have $X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in W_i$. Due to the right continuity of the sample paths and Assumption 2.2, one can see that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ there exists $s_i \in [T_{i-1}, T_i]$ so that $X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in G_i$ while $X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in W_i \setminus G_i$ for all $r \in [T_{i-1}, s_i]$, where $T_0 := t$. Since the sets $(W_i)_{i=1}^n$ are nested, $X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in W_{i-1} \subseteq W_i$ for all $r \in [s_{i-1}, T_{i-1}]$. An induction argument quickly leads to

$$X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in G_i, \quad X_{t,x,u}^{r,\omega}(\omega) \in W_i \setminus G_i, \quad \forall r \in [s_{i-1}, s_i],$$

where $s_0 := t$. In fact one may introduce $s_i$ as the first hitting time of the set $G_i$ after time $T_{i-1}$.\[\square\]

Let us note that to satisfy the order of visiting the goal/target sets $(G_i)_{i=1}^n$, it only suffices to exclude the target sets $(G_i)_{i=k+1}^n$ from the set $W_k$. Therefore, the hypothesis in Fact 2.3 concerning the nested way sets $W_i$ does not really impose any restriction on the motion planning objectives.

**Remark 2.4.** The motion planning scenarios for only two sets $(W_1, G_1)$ are essentially the basic reachability maneuver that was studied in our earlier work [MECL12]. The definition (1a) suggests the same Reach-Avoid problem as in [MECL12, Definition 2.4], where the target and obstacle sets are $G_1$ and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus W_1$ respectively. In this special case, the definition (1b) also follows the same concept as Reach-Avoid problem in [MECL12, Definition 3.4] with the same target and obstacle sets.

**Remark 2.5.** A particular case of the Definition 2.1 is the following: $G_i := A_{i+1} \setminus A_i$ and $G_i := A_{i+1} \cap A_i$ for the definitions (1a) and (1b) respectively. Here the motion planning objective is to pass through $n$ given sets $(A_i)_{i=1}^n$ in a certain order.

\[2\]The formal definition of this stopping time and its application are considered later for Fact 3.3.
The events introduced in Definition 2.1 depend, of course, on the control policy \( u \in \mathcal{U} \) and initial condition \((t, x) \in \mathcal{S}\). The central objective of this work is to determine the set of initial conditions \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) such that there exists an admissible policy \( u \) where the probability of the above path-planning events is higher than a certain threshold. To this end, we formally introduce these sets as follows:

**Definition 2.6 (Motion-Planning Initial Set).** Consider a fixed initial time \( t \in [0, T] \). Given a sequence of set pairs \((W_1, G_1)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) and horizon times \((T_i)_{i=1}^n \subset [t, T]\), we define the following motion-planning initial sets:

\[
\begin{align*}
(2a) \quad \mathbb{P}P(t, p; (W_i, G_i)_{i=1}^n, T) & := \\
& \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \exists u \in \mathcal{U} : \mathbb{P} \left\{ X^{t,x,u} \mid ([W_1 \leadsto G_1] \circ \cdots \circ [W_n \leadsto G_n])_{t \leq \tau} \right\} > p \right\}, \\
(2b) \quad \bar{\mathbb{P}}P(t, p; (W_i, G_i)_{i=1}^n, (T_i)_{i=1}^n) & := \\
& \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \exists u \in \mathcal{U} : \mathbb{P} \left\{ X^{t,x,u} \mid (W_1 \leadsto \tau_1 G_1) \circ \cdots \circ (W_n \leadsto \tau_n G_n) \right\} > p \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

3. Connection to Stochastic Optimal Control

In this section we establish a connection from stochastic motion-planning initial sets \( \mathbb{P}P \) and \( \bar{\mathbb{P}}P \), defined in Definition 2.6, and a class of stochastic optimal control problems involving stopping times. We introduce a sequence of random times that corresponds to the times that the process \( X^{t,x,u} \) for the first time exits from the sequence of sets one after another in a certain order:

**Definition 3.1.** Given an initial condition \((t, x) \in \mathcal{S}\) and a sequence of measurable sets \((A_i)_{i=k}^n \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\), the sequence of random times \((\Theta^{A_k:n} i=k)_{i=k}^n \) defined by

\[
\Theta^{A_k:n}_i(t, x) := \inf \left\{ r \geq \Theta^{A_k:n}_{i-1}(t, x) : X^{t,x,u}_r \notin A_i \right\}, \quad \Theta^{A_k:n}_{k-1}(t, x) := t,
\]

is called the sequential exit-time through the set \( A_k \) to \( A_n \).

Note that the sequential exit-time \( \Theta^{A_k:n}_i \) depends on the control policy \( u \) in addition to the initial condition \((t, x)\), but here and later in the sequel we shall suppress this dependence. For notational simplicity, we also drop \((t, x)\) in the subsequent sections.

In Figure 2 a sample path of the process \( X^{t,x,u} \) along with the sequential exit-times \((\Theta^{A_k:n} i=k)_{i=k}^n \) is depicted for different \( k \in \{1, \ldots, 3\} \). Note that since the initial condition \( x \) does not belong to \( A_3 \), the first exit-time of the set \( A_2 \) is indeed the start time \( t \), i.e., \( \Theta^{A_3} A_3 = t \). Let us highlight the difference between stopping times \( \Theta^{A_1:3} \) and \( \Theta^{A_2:3} \). The former is the first exit-time of the set \( A_2 \) after the time that the process leaves \( A_1 \), whereas the latter is the first exit-time of the set \( A_2 \) from the very beginning.\(^4\)

Given a stopping time \( \theta \in \mathcal{T}_{[t,T]} \), let \( \omega \in \Omega \) be a sample realization such that the process \( (X^{t,x,u}_s(\omega))_{t \leq s \leq \theta(\omega)} \) successfully visits the first sets \( (A_j)_{j=1}^{i-1} \). For this \( \omega \), it then follows from Definition 3.1 that the sequential stopping times \( \Theta^{A_1:n}_j \) of visiting the sets \( (A_j)_{j=1}^{i-1} \) starting at the initial condition \((t, x)\) is the same as the sequential exit-times \( \Theta^{A_1:n}_j \) of visiting the sets \( (A_j)_{j=1}^{i-1} \) starting at \((\theta(\omega), X^{t,x,u}_{\theta(\omega)}) \). Figure 3 depicts one of these sample paths where \( \Theta^{A_1:3}(\omega) \leq \theta(\omega) < \Theta^{A_2:3}(\omega) \). It is obvious from the figure that starting from an initial condition \((t, x)\),

\(^3\)By convention, \( \inf \emptyset = \infty \).

\(^4\)In §5 we shall see that these differences will lead to different definitions of value functions in order to derive a dynamic programming argument.
the process views the exit-times of $A_2$ and $A_3$ after leaving $A_1$ as if it starts from the initial condition $(\theta,X^t_{\theta};u_\theta)$ and proceeds to exit from the set $A_2$ and $A_3$ irrespective of the history before $\theta$. Lemma 3.2 formally presents this result and will be employed later to prove one of the main results of this article, i.e., Theorem 4.5.

**Lemma 3.2.** Consider a control policy $u \in U$ and initial condition $(t,x) \in S$. Given a sequence of measurable sets $(A_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and stopping time $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{[t,T]}$, for all $k \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and $j \geq i \geq k$ we have

$$\Theta_{A_k:n}(t,x) = \Theta_{A_i:n}(\tau_{A_i}(t,x);X^t_{\theta} + \theta, X^t_{\theta} + \frac{s}{\theta})$$

on $\{\Theta_{A_k:n}(t,x) \leq \theta \leq \Theta_{A_i:n}(t,x)\}$.

We need to establish that the sequential stopping-times are well-defined, hence:

**Fact 3.3 (Measurability).** Consider a sequence of measurable sets $(A_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and initial condition $(t,x) \in S$. The sequential exit-time $\Theta_{A_i:n}(t,x)$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping time for all $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, i.e., $\{\Theta_{A_i:n}(t,x) \leq s\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for all $s \geq 0$.

**Proof.** Let $\tau_A$ be the first exit-time from the set $A_i$:

$$\tau_{A_i}(t,x) := \inf\{s \geq 0 : X^t_{t+s} \notin A_i\}.$$ 

We know that $\tau_A$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping time [EK86, Theorem 1.6, Chapter 2]. Let $\omega(\cdot) \mapsto \vartheta_\omega(\cdot) := \omega(s + \cdot)$ be the time-shift operator. From the definition it follows that for all $i \geq 0$

$$\vartheta_{\Theta_{A_i:n}} = \Theta_{A_i:n} + \tau_{A_i} \circ \vartheta_{\Theta_{A_i:n}}.$$ 

Now the assertion follows directly in light of the measurability of the mapping $\vartheta$ and right continuity of the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$.

For technical reasons we stipulate that the way sets satisfy the following:

---

5See, for instance, [EK86, Proposition 1.4, Chapter 2] for more details in this regard.
Assumption 3.4. The sets \((W_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) are open.

Under Assumption 3.4, the following fact is an immediate consequence of right continuity of the stochastic process \(X^{t,x,u}\):

**Fact 3.5.** Fix a control policy \(u \in U_t\) and an initial condition \((t,x) \in S\). Let measurable sets \((W_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) be given, and suppose that Assumption 3.4 holds for \((W_i)_{i=1}^n\). Then, for all \(i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}\)

\[
X^{t,x,u}_{\Theta_{W_i}^{1:n}} \notin W_i, \quad \text{on} \quad \{\Theta_{W_i}^{1:n} < \infty\},
\]

where \((\Theta_{W_i}^{1:n})_{i=1}^n\) are the sequential exit-times introduced as in Definition 3.1.

Given \((W_i,G_i,T_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times [t,T]\), we introduce two value functions \(V, \tilde{V}: S \to [0,1]\) defined by

\[
(4a) \quad V(t,x) := \sup_{u \in U_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n I_{G_i} \left( X^{t,x,u}_{\eta_i} \right) \right], \quad \eta_i := \Theta_{W_i}^{1:n} \land T, \quad B_i := W_i \setminus G_i,
\]

\[
(4b) \quad \tilde{V}(t,x) := \sup_{u \in U_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n I_{G_i \cap W_i} \left( X^{t,x,u}_{\tilde{\eta}_i} \right) \right], \quad \tilde{\eta}_i := \Theta_{W_i}^{1:n} \land T_i,
\]

where \(\Theta_{W_i}^{1:n}, \Theta_{G_i}^{1:n}\) are the sequential exit-times in the sense of Definition 3.1. Figure 4(a) and 4(b) illustrate the sequential exit-times corresponding to the sets \(B_i\) and \(W_i\), respectively; the sample trajectories are the same as Figure 1. The main result of this section, Proposition 3.6 below, establishes a connection from the sets \(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}\) and superlevel sets of the value functions \(V\) and \(\tilde{V}\).

![Sequential exit-times related to motion-planning event](image1)

(a) Sequential exit-times related to motion-planning event (1a)

![Sequential exit-times related to motion-planning event](image2)

(b) Sequential exit-times related to motion-planning event (1b)

**Figure 4.** Sequential exit-times corresponding to different motion-planning events as introduced in (1)
Proposition 3.6. Fix a probability level $p \in [0, 1]$, a sequence of set pairs $(W_i, G_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, an initial time $t \in [0, T]$, and intermediate times $(T_i)_{i=1}^n \subset [t, T]$. Then,

$$\text{PP}(t, p; (W_i, G_i)_{i=0}^n) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid V(t, x) > p \}. \tag{5}$$

Moreover, suppose Assumption 3.4 holds. Then,

$$\tilde{\text{PP}}(t, p; (W_i, G_i)_{i=0}^n, (T_i)_{i=1}^n) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \tilde{V}(t, x) > p \}, \tag{6}$$

where the value functions $V$ and $\tilde{V}$ are as defined in (4).

Proof. See Appendix A. \hfill \Box

Remark 3.7 (Mixed Motion-Planning Events). In this section we focus on two sets of events as introduced in Definition 2.1, and will continue doing so for our subsequent results. However, it is of interest to consider an event that consists of a mixture of the events in (1), e.g., $(W_1 \sim G_1) \leq r \circ (W_2 \sim G_2)$. One can observe that essentially the same analytical techniques as the ones proposed here can be employed to address these mixed motion planning objectives, and establish a connection to a class of optimal control problems with some appropriate sequential stopping times. We shall provide an example of this nature in §6.

4. Dynamic Programming Principle

The objective of this section is to derive a DPP for the value functions $V$ and $\tilde{V}$ introduced in (4). We proceed with a more abstract setting for transparent elucidation in the following fashion: Let $(T_i)_{i=1}^n \subset [0, T]$ be a sequence of times, $(A_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a family of open sets, and payoff functions $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ that are measurable and bounded, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We define the sequence of value functions $V_k : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$V_k(t, x) := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^n \ell_i \left( X_{t}^{i,x,u} \right) \right], \quad T^k_i(t, x) := \Theta_{i}^{A_k, \cdot}(t, x) \wedge T_i, \quad i \in \{k, \ldots, n\}, \tag{7}$$

where the stopping times $(\Theta_{i}^{W_k, \cdot})_{i=k}^n$ are sequential exit-times in the sense of Definition 3.1. Notice that the sequential exit-times of the value function $V_k$ correspond to an excursion through the sets $(A_i)_{i=k}^n$ irrespective of the first $(k-1)$ sets. It is straightforward to observe that the value functions $V$ and $\tilde{V}$ in (4) are particular cases of the value function $V_1$ defined as in (7) for an appropriate selection of the sets $(A_i)_{i=1}^n$, functions $(\ell_i)_{i=1}^n$, and intermediate times $(T_i)_{i=1}^n$.

To state the main result of this section, Theorem 4.5 below, some technical definitions and assumptions concerning the stochastic processes $X^{t,x,u}$, admissible strategies $\mathcal{U}_t$, and the payoff functions $\ell_i$, are needed: Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a metric space, and let $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function. The lower and upper semicontinuous envelopes, respectively, of $f$ are defined as:

$$f_0(x) := \lim inf_{x' \to x} f(x') \quad f^*(x) := \lim sup_{x' \to x} f(x').$$

We denote by USC($\mathcal{A}$) and LSC($\mathcal{A}$) the collection of all upper-semicontinuous and lower-semicontinuous functions from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathbb{R}$, respectively.

Assumption 4.1. We stipulate the following assumptions on

a. Admissible control policies:

i. Non-anticipative policy: Given a control set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, any $u \in \mathcal{U}_t$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted stochastic process;
ii. Stability under concatenation: The set of admissible control policies at time \( t \), \( \mathcal{U}_t \), is closed under concatenation. That is, for all \( \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathcal{U}_t \) and stopping time \( \theta \in \mathcal{T}_{[t,T]} \), it holds that

\[
I_{[t,\theta]} \mathbf{u}_1 + I_{]\theta,T]} \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathcal{U}_t;
\]

b. Stochastic process \( X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}} \):

i. Causality: For all initial conditions \( (t,x) \in \mathcal{S} \), any control policies \( \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathcal{U}_t \), and stopping time \( \theta \in \mathcal{T}_{[t,T]} \), it holds that

\[
I_{[t,\theta]} \mathbf{u}_1 = I_{[t,\theta]} \mathbf{u}_2 \implies I_{[t,\theta]} X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}_1} = I_{[t,\theta]} X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}_2}
\]

ii. Strong Markov property: Given initial condition \( (t,x) \in \mathcal{S} \), control policy \( \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_t \), and stopping time \( \theta \in \mathcal{T}_{[t,T]} \), for all bounded measurable functions \( \ell : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( s \geq 0 \) it holds that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \ell \left( X^{t,s;\mathbf{u}}_{t+s} \right) \big| F_\theta \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \ell \left( X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}}_t \right) \big| X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}}_\theta \right] \quad \text{P-a.s.}
\]

iii. Continuity of exit-time: Given initial condition \( (t_0,x_0) \in \mathcal{S} \) and control policy \( \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_t \), for all \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( i \in \{k, \ldots, n\} \) the stochastic mapping \( (t,x) \mapsto X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}}_{\tau^k_t(t,x)} \) is P-a.s. continuous at the point \( (t_0,x_0) \) where the stopping time \( \tau^k_t \) is defined as in (7);

c. Payoff functions:

\( (\ell_i)_{i=1}^n \) are lower semicontinuous, i.e., \( \ell_i \in \text{LSC}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) for all \( i \leq n \).

Remark 4.2. Some remarks on the above assumptions are in order:

- Assumption 4.1.a.i. implies that admissible strategies \( \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_t \) take action at time \( t \) independent of future information arriving at \( s > t \). This is known as a non-anticipative strategy [Bor05], and is a standard assumption.
- Assumption 4.1.a.ii. is also standard for dynamic programming arguments and it holds for a large class of admissible strategies, e.g., progressively measurable processes.
- Assumption 4.1.b. imposes three constraints on the process \( X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}} \) defined on the prescribed probability space: i) causality of the solution processes for a given admissible policy ii) strong Markov property iii) continuity of exit-time. The causality property is always satisfied in practical applications; uniqueness of the solution process \( X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}} \) under any admissible control process \( \mathbf{u} \) guarantees it. The class of Markovian processes is fairly large; for instance, it contains the solution of SDEs under some mild assumptions on the drift and diffusion terms [Kry09, Theorem 2.9.4]. The almost sure continuity of the exit-time with respect to the initial condition of the process is the only restrictive. Note that this condition does not always hold even for deterministic processes with continuous trajectories. One may need to impose conditions on the process and possibly the sets involved in motion planning in order to satisfy continuity of the mapping \( (t,x) \mapsto X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}}_{\tau^k_t(t,x)} \) at the given initial condition with probability one.

We shall elaborate on this issue and its ramifications to a class of diffusions in §5.

We present two Lemmas preparatory to our main result. For \( k = 1, \ldots, n \), we define the function \( J_k : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R} \) as:

\[
J_k(t,x;\mathbf{u}) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^n \ell_i \left( X^{t,x;\mathbf{u}}_{\tau^k_t} \right) \right],
\]

where \( (\tau^k_t)_{i=k}^n \) are as defined in (7).

Lemma 4.3. Consider the value function \( V_k \) and \( J_k \) as defined in (7) and (8) respectively. Then, for any \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \),

\[
V_k(t,x) = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}} J_k(t,x;\mathbf{u}), \quad \forall (t,x) \in \mathcal{S}.
\]
Proof. Note that all the admissible policies \( u \in \mathcal{U} \) are also contained in \( \mathcal{U} \). Therefore, the inequality “\( \geq \)” between the left- and right-hand sides is immediate. In order to show the reverse inequality, observe that any control policy \( u \) is a measurable function of the process \( (z_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T} \). For any fixed \( (z_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T} \) it holds that \( u := u((z_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) = \tilde{u}((z_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}, (z_s - z_t)_{t \geq s \geq T}) \), where \( \tilde{u} \) can be viewed as a policy independent of \( \mathcal{F}_t \) due to independent increments of \( z \). By [BT11, Remark 5.2] the inequality “\( \leq \)” also follows, and the assertion of the lemma follows. \( \square \)

**Lemma 4.4.** Under Assumptions 4.1.b.iii. and 4.1.c., the function \( S \ni (t, x) \mapsto J_k(t, x; u) \in \mathbb{R} \) is lower semicontinuous for all \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and control policy \( u \in \mathcal{U} \).

**Proof.** Fix \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \). It is obvious that the function \( J_k \) is uniformly bounded since \( \ell_k \) are.

\[
\liminf_{(s, y) \to (t, x)} J_k(s, y; u) = \liminf_{(s, y) \to (t, x)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^{n} \ell_i(X^s_{t}, u) \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \liminf_{(s, y) \to (t, x)} \prod_{i=k}^{n} \ell_i(X^s_{t}, u) \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^{n} \ell_i(X^t_{t}, u) \right] = J_k(t, x; u),
\]

where the inequality in the first line follows from the Fatou’s lemma, and the second inequality in the second line is a direct consequence of Assumptions 4.1.b.iii. and 4.1.c. \( \square \)

The following Theorem, the main result of this section, establishes a dynamic programming argument for the value function \( V_k \) in terms of the “successor” value functions \( (V_j)_{j=k+1}^n \) all defined as in (7). For ease of notation we shall introduce deterministic times \( \tau_{k-1}, \tau_{n+1} \), and a trivial constant value function \( V_{n+1} \).

**Theorem 4.5.** Consider the value functions \( (V_j)_{j=1}^n \) and the sequential stopping times \( (\tau_j)_{j=k}^n \) introduced in (7). Under Assumption 4.1, for all initial conditions \( (t, x) \in S \), stopping times \( \theta \in [t, T] \), \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) we have

\[
V_k(t, x) \leq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau_j)} V^*_j(\theta, X^t_{\tau_{j-1}}, u) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^t_{\tau_{i}}, u) \right],
\]

\[
V_k(t, x) \geq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau_j)} V^*_j(\theta, X^t_{\tau_{j-1}}, u) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^t_{\tau_{i}}, u) \right],
\]

where \( V^*_j \) and \( V^* s \) are upper and lower semicontinuous envelopes of the value function \( V_j \), respectively, \( \tau^k_{-1} := t, \tau^k_{n+1} \equiv T, \) and \( \tau^k_{n+1} \) can be chosen any constant time strictly greater than \( T \), say \( \tau^k_{n+1} := T + 1 \).

**Proof.** The proof extends the main result of our earlier work [MECL12, Theorem 4.7] on the so-called “reach-avoid” motion planning maneuver. Based on the tower property of conditional expectation [Kal97, Theorem 5.1], we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^{n+1} \ell_i(X^t_{\tau_{i}}, u) | \mathcal{F}_\theta \right] = \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau_j)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^t_{\tau_{i}}, u) | \mathcal{F}_\theta \right] \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^t_{\tau_{i}}, u) \]

\[
= \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau_j)} J_j(\theta, X^t_{\tau_{j-1}}, u) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^t_{\tau_{i}}, u)
\]

\[\text{For a similar result in the context of SDEs, see [Kry09, Theorem 3.1.7, p. 132].}\]
\[ (10b) \leq \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{(\tau^+_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau^+_j)} V_j(\theta, X^{t,x,u}_\theta) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^{t,x,u}_{\tau^+_i}) \]

where (10a) and (10b) follow from Assumption 4.1.b.ii., and Lemma 3.2, respectively. In the light of the tower property of conditional expectation [Kal97, Theorem 5.1], arbitrariness of \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \), and obvious inequality \( V_j \leq V_j^* \), we arrive at (9a).

To prove (9b), we define a sequence of uniformly bounded upper semicontinuous functions \( (\phi_j)_{n=k}^{n+1} \subset \text{USC}(S) \) such that \( \phi_j \leq V_j^* \) on \( S \). Mimicking the ideas in the proof of our earlier work [MECL12, Theorem 4.7], it is possible to establish that given \( \epsilon > 0 \) for all \( j \in \{k, \cdots, n\} \) there exists an admissible control policy \( u_j^\epsilon \) such that

\[ \phi_j(t,x) - 3\epsilon \leq J_j(t,x; u_j^\epsilon) \quad \forall (t,x) \in S. \]

Let us fix \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \), and define

\[ v^\epsilon := \mathbb{I}_{[t,\theta]} u + \mathbb{I}_{[\theta,T]} \sum_{j=k}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{(\tau^+_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau^+_j)} u_j^\epsilon, \]

where \( u_j^\epsilon \) satisfies (11). Notice that Assumption 4.1.a. guarantees \( v^\epsilon \in \mathcal{U}_t \). In accordance with (11), (12) and in light of Assumption 4.1.i., one obtains the tower property from (10a) as follows:

\[ V_k(t,x) \geq J_k(t,x; v^\epsilon) = \mathbb{E}\left[ \mathbb{E}\left[ \prod_{i=k}^{n+1} \ell_i(X^{t,x,v^\epsilon}_{\tau^+_i}) \bigg| X_{\theta}^t \right] \right] \]
\[ = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{(\tau^+_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau^+_j)} J_j(\theta, X^{t,x,v^\epsilon}_{\theta}; u_j^\epsilon) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^{t,x,v^\epsilon}_{\tau^+_i}) \right] \]
\[ = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{(\tau^+_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau^+_j)} \left( \phi_j(\theta, X^{t,x,v^\epsilon}_{\theta}) - 3\epsilon \right) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^{t,x,v^\epsilon}_{\tau^+_i}) \right]. \]

Since \( V_j^* \) is lower semicontinuous, in view of [Ren99, Lemma 3.5] one may pick a sequence of increasing continuous functions \( (\phi_j^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \) that converges point-wise to \( V_j \). By boundedness of \( (\ell_j)_{i=1}^{n+1} \) and the dominated convergence Theorem, we get

\[ V_k(t,x) \geq \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{j=k}^{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{(\tau^+_{j-1} \leq \theta < \tau^+_j)} \left( V_j^*(\theta, X^{t,x,u}_{\theta}) - 3\epsilon \right) \prod_{i=k}^{j-1} \ell_i(X^{t,x,u}_{\tau^+_i}) \right] \]

Since \( u \in \mathcal{U}_t \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \) are arbitrary, this implies the assertion (9b).

\[ \square \]

**Remark 4.6.** Theorem 4.5 introduces DPP’s in a weaker sense than the standard DPP in stochastic optimal control problems [FS06]. Namely, one does not need to verify the measurability of the value functions \( V_k \) in (4) so as to apply the DPP’s. Notice that in general this measurability issue is non-trivial due to the supremum operation running over possibly uncountably many policies.

### 5. Applications to Controlled Diffusions

The objective of this section is to demonstrate how the weak DPP derived in §4 adapts to the context of controlled diffusion processes. This application results in a series of Hamilton-Javobi-Bellman PDE’s, where each PDE is understood in the discontinuous viscosity sense with some boundary conditions both in viscosity and Dirichlet (pointwise) senses. To this end, we shall first introduce formally the standard probability space setup for SDEs, then proceed with some preliminaries so as to pave the ground for the required Assumptions 4.1 to hold. The
section consists of subsections concerning PDE derivation and boundary conditions along with further discussions so as to deploy the existing PDE solvers to numerically compute our PDE characterization.

Let $\Omega$ be $C([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d)$, the set of continuous functions from $[0,T]$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the canonical process, i.e., $z_t(\omega) := \omega_t$. We consider $\mathbb{P}$ as the Wiener measure on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the smallest right continuous filtration on $\Omega$ such that the process $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is adapted to. Let us recall that $\mathbb{F}_t := (\mathcal{F}_t, s \geq 0)$ is the auxiliary subfiltration defined as $\mathcal{F}_{t,s} := \sigma(z_r - z_t, t \leq r \leq t \vee s)$.

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a control set, and $\mathcal{U}$ denote the set of all $\mathbb{F}_T$-progressively measurable mappings into $U$. For every $u = (u_t)_{t \geq 0}$, we consider the following $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued SDE:

\begin{equation}
\label{SDE}
dX_t = f(X_t, u_t) \, dt + \sigma(X_t, u_t) \, dW_t, \quad X_0 = x,
\end{equation}

where $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_i}$ are measurable maps, and $W_t := z_t$ is the canonical process.

**Assumption 5.1.** We stipulate that

a. $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact;

b. $f$ and $\sigma$ are continuous and Lipschitz in its first argument uniformly with respect to the second;

c. The diffusion term $\sigma$ of the SDE (13) is uniformly non-degenerate, i.e., there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in U$, $\|\sigma \sigma^\top\| > \delta$.

It is well-known [Bor05] that under Assumptions 5.1.a. and 5.1.b. there exits a unique strong solution to the SDE (13); let us denote it by $(X^{x,u}_s)_{s \geq t}$. For future notational simplicity, we slightly modify the definition of $X^{x,u}_s$ and extend it to the whole interval $[0,T]$ where $X^{x,u}_s := x$ for all $s$ in $[0,t]$.

In addition to Assumptions 5.1 on the SDE (13), we impose the following assumption on the motion planning sets that allows us to guarantee the continuity of sequential exit-times as required for the DPP obtained in the preceding section.

**Assumption 5.2 (Exterior Cone Condition).** The open sets $(A_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy the following condition: for every $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, there are positive constants $h, r$ an $\mathbb{R}^d$-value bounded map $\eta : A_i^c \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

\[ B_r(x + \eta(x)t) \subset A_i^c \quad \text{for all } x \in A_i^c \text{ and } t \in (0,h) \]

where $B_r(x)$ denotes an open ball centered at $x$ and radius $r$ and $A_i^c$ stands for the complement of the set $A_i$.

**Remark 5.3.** If the set $A_i$ is bounded and its boundary $\partial A_i$ is smooth, then Assumption 5.2 holds. Furthermore, boundaries with corners may also satisfy Assumption 5.2; Figure 5 depicts two different examples.

### 5.1. Sequential Partial Differential Equations

This subsection establishes a connection between the DPP introduced in Theorem 4.5 and a sequence of PDEs, all of the latter are meant in the sense of discontinuous viscosity solutions; for the general theory of viscosity solutions we refer to [CIL92] and [FS06]. For numerical solutions to these PDEs, one also needs some boundary conditions, and that will be the objective of the next subsection.

---

We slightly abuse notation and earlier used $\sigma$ for the sigma algebra as well. However, it will be always clear from the context to which $\sigma$ we refer.
To apply the proposed DPP, one has to make sure that Assumptions 4.1 are satisfied. As pointed out in Remark 4.2, the only nontrivial assumption in the context of SDEs is Assumption 4.1.b.iii. The following proposition addresses this issue, and allows us to employ the DPP of Theorem 4.5 for the main result of this subsection.

**Proposition 5.4.** Consider the SDE (13) where Assumptions 5.1 hold. Suppose that the open sets \((A_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) satisfy the exterior cone condition in Assumption 5.2. Let \((\Theta_i^{A_i})_{i=1}^n\) be the respective sequential exit-times as defined in Definition 3.1. Given intermediate times \((T_i)_{i=1}^n\) and control policy \(u \in \mathcal{U}_t\), for any \(i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\), initial condition \((t,x) \in \mathcal{S}\), and sequence of initial conditions \((t_m,x_m) \to (t,x)\), we have

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \tau_i(t_m,x_m) = \tau_i(t,x) \quad \text{P.-a.s.}
\]

Moreover, one can show that the above result readily leads to the continuity of the stochastic mapping \((t,x) \mapsto X_{\tau_i(t,x)}^{t_m,x_m,u}\) with probability one, i.e.,

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} X_{\tau_i(t_m,x_m)}^{t_m,x_m,u} = X_{\tau_i(t,x)}^{t,x,u} \quad \text{P.-a.s. for all } i.
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix B. 

**Definition 5.5 (Dynkin Operator).** Given \(u \in \mathcal{U}\), we denote by \(\mathcal{L}^u\) the Dynkin operator (also known as the infinitesimal generator) associated to the controlled diffusion (13) as

\[
\mathcal{L}^u \Phi(t,x) := \partial_t \Phi(t,x) + f(x,u) \partial_x \Phi(t,x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\sigma \sigma^\top(x,u) \partial^2_x \Phi(t,x)],
\]

where \(\Phi\) is a real-valued function smooth on the interior of \(\mathcal{S}\), with \(\partial_t \Phi\) and \(\partial_x \Phi\) denoting the partial derivatives with respect to \(t\) and \(x\) respectively, and \(\partial^2_x \Phi\) denoting the Hessian matrix with respect to \(x\). We refer to [Kal97, Theorem 17.23] for more details on the above differential operator.

Theorem 5.6 is the main result of this subsection, which provides a characterization of the value functions \(V_k\) in terms of Dynkin operator in Definition 5.5 in the interior of the set of interest, i.e., \([0,T_k] \times A_k\). This result is a direct consequence of the DPP in Theorem 4.5, and Itô's formula; for similar technique we refer to the proof of [MECL12, Theorem 4.10].

**Theorem 5.6.** Consider the system (13), and suppose that Assumptions 5.1 hold. Let the value functions \(V_k : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}^d, k = 1, \ldots, n\) be as defined in (7), where the sets \((A_i)_{i=1}^n\) satisfy the Assumption 5.2, and the payoff functions \((\ell_i)_{i=1}^n\) are all lower semicontinuous. Then,
the lower semicontinuous envelope of \( V_k \) is a viscosity supersolution of
\[
-\sup_{u \in U} L^a V^*_k(t,x) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } [0, T_k] \times A_k;
\]

the upper semicontinuous envelope of \( V \) is a viscosity subsolution of
\[
-\sup_{u \in U} L^a V^*_k(t,x) \leq 0 \quad \text{on } [0, T_k] \times A_k.
\]

**Proof.** We refer to Appendix B for a sketch of proof and [MECL12, Theorem 4.10] for a detailed analysis of the same technique. \( \square \)

5.2. **Boundary Conditions.** To numerically solve the PDE characterization of the previous part, one needs some boundary value conditions on the complement set of the PDE, which is addressed in the following:

**Proposition 5.7.** Suppose that the hypotheses of Theorem 5.6 hold. Then the value functions \( V_k \) introduced in (7) satisfy the following boundary value conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
V_k(t,x) &= V_{k+1}(t,x)\ell_k(x) \quad \text{on } [0, T_k] \times A_k \bigcup \{T_k\} \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (14a) \\
V^*_k(t,x) &\leq V^*_{k+1}(t,x)\ell^*_k(x) \quad \text{on } [0, T_k] \times A_k \bigcup \{T_k\} \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (14b)
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix B, along with a preparatory lemma. \( \square \)

Proposition 5.7 provides boundary conditions for the value function \( V_k \) not only in Dirichlet (pointwise) \((14a)\) sense but also in the discontinuous viscosity sense \((14b)\). Observe that the value functions \( V_k \) are all lower semicontinuous since each of them is the supremum over family of lower semicontinuous functions \( J_k \), see Lemma B.1. It then follows that the pointwise boundary condition \((14a)\) indicates the other side of viscosity boundary condition of \((14b)\), i.e., \( V_k(t,x) \geq V_{k+1}(t,x)\ell_k(x) \).

5.3. **Discussion on Numerical Issues.** The objective of the current section was to propose an alternative characterization of the value functions \( V_k : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) in \((7)\) for the case of controlled diffusion processes governed via the SDE \((13)\). To this end, §5.1 developed a PDE characterization of the value function \( V_k \) within the set \([0, T_k] \times A_k\) along with some boundary conditions in terms of the successor value function \( V_{k+1} \) provided in §5.2. Given value function \( V_{k+1} \), to obtain the value function \( V_k \), the only non-trivial set of initial conditions becomes \([0, T_k] \times A_k\) for which it is required to solve a certain PDE with some boundary (possibly both terminal and lateral) conditions. Since \( V_{n+1} \equiv 1 \), one can infer that Theorem 5.6 and Proposition 5.7 suggest a series of PDE equations for which the first one has known boundary condition \( \ell_n \), while the boundary conditions of the subsequent steps are determined by the solution of the preceding PDE step, i.e., \( V_{k+1} \) provides boundary conditions for the PDE corresponding to the value function \( V_k \). Let us highlight once again that the basic motion planning maneuver involving only two sets is effectively the same as the first step of this series of PDEs and was studied in our earlier work [MECL12].

Before proceeding to apply the PDE characterization of this section to obtain the desired motion-planning initial sets introduced in Definition 2.6, we need to properly justify the following two concerns:

(i) On the one hand, for the definition \((2a)\) we need to assume that the goal set \( G_i \) is closed so as to allow continuous transition into \( G_i \); see Assumption 2.2 and the discussion preceding it. On the other hand, in order to invoke the DPP argument of §4 and its consequent PDE
in §5.1, we need to impose that the payoff functions \((\ell_i)_{i=1}^n\) are all lower semicontinuous; see Assumption 4.1.c. In the case of the value function \(V\) in (4a), this constraint results in \((G_i)_{i=1}^n\) all being open which is obviously in contradiction to our earlier assumption in accordance to (2a).

(ii) Due to the numerical issues, most of existing PDE solvers provide theoretical guarantees for continuous viscosity solutions, e.g., [Mit05], whereas our characterization is indeed in discontinuous form. Therefore, it is a natural question whether we could employ the existing off-the-shelf toolbox to numerically calculate our desired value function.

Let us initially highlight the following points: Concerning (i) it should be mentioned that this contradiction is not applicable for the motion-planning initial set (2b) since the goal set \(G_i\) can be simply chosen to be open without confining the continuous transitions. Concerning (ii), we would like to stress that this discontinuous formulation is inevitable since the value functions defined in (4) are in general discontinuous, and any PDE approach has to rely on discontinuous versions.

Moreover, we next propose an \(\epsilon\)-conservative but precise way of characterizing the motion-planning initial set of (2a) as well as justifying the numerical concern in (ii) to employ the existing off-the-shelf PDE solvers. Given \((W_i, G_i) \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\), let us construct a smaller goal set \(G_i^\epsilon \subset G_i\) such that \(G_i^\epsilon := \{x \in G_i \mid \text{dist}(x, G_i) \geq \epsilon\}\). For sufficiently small \(\epsilon > 0\) one may observe that \(W_i \setminus G_i^\epsilon\) satisfies Assumption 5.2. Note that this is always possible if \(W_i \setminus G_i\) satisfies Assumption 5.2 since one can simply take \(\epsilon < h/2\), where \(h\) is as defined in Assumption 5.2. Figure 6 depicts this situation.

Formally we define the payoff function \(\ell_i^\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}\) as follows:

\[
\ell_i^\epsilon(x) := \left(1 - \frac{\text{dist}(x, G_i)}{\epsilon}\right) \vee 0.
\]

Replacing the goal sets \(G_i\) and payoff functions \(\ell_i\) in (4a), we arrive at the value functions

\[
V^\epsilon(t, x) := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n \ell_i^\epsilon(X_t^{i, x; u_i}) \right], \quad \eta_i^\epsilon := \Theta_i^{B_i^\epsilon} \wedge T, \quad B_i^\epsilon := W_i \setminus G_i^\epsilon.
\]

It is straightforward to inspect that \(V^\epsilon \leq V\) since the goal sets are smaller with respect to the actual goal sets \(G_i\). Moreover, one can show that \(V(t, x) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} V^\epsilon(t, x)\) on the set \((t, x) \in [t, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\), which indicates that the approximation scheme can be arbitrarily precise. Note that the approximated payoff functions \(\ell_i^\epsilon\) are, by construction, Lipschitz continuous that in light of uniform continuity of the process, Lemma B.1, yields to the continuity of the value function \(V^\epsilon\). Hence, the discontinuous PDE characterization of §5.1 is simplified to continuous

\[\text{dist}(x, A) := \inf_{y \in A} \|x - y\|,\] where \(\|\cdot\|\) stands for the Euclidean norm.
regime, for which there exist PDE solvers for numerical computations. We refer to [MECL12, Section 5] for a detailed analysis of the proposed approximation scheme.

6. Numerical Example: Chemical Langevin Equation for a Biological Switch

In this section we apply the theoretical results in the preceding sections to a biological switch network. Multistable biological systems are often seen in nature [BSS01]. The inherent stochasticity in these systems can be substantial—they influence convergence, or may even lead to switching behavior from one equilibrium to another. The pioneer works on modeling reactions in biochemical network are based on countable state Markov chains, which describe the evolution of molecular numbers. Due to the Markov property of chemical reactions, one can track the time evolution of the probability distribution for molecular populations as a family of ordinary differential equations called the chemical master equation (CME) [AGA09, ESKPG05]; it is also known as the forward Kolmogorov equation.

An SDE approach toward modeling the stochastic molecular numbers of species has been proposed in the literature. It is, of course, assumed that a molecular species number may take non-integer numbers. This assumption is usually reasonable for large molecular populations, whereas for low copy numbers, it may not be reliable—a small number, say, 0.1 protein copies can lead to an entirely different dynamic behavior than one would observe from exactly 0 copies. The time-continuity of stochastic processes makes the analysis significantly more tractable than the CME. In this method, one can approximate the molecular numbers via continuous time Markov processes, where the latter is an approximation of the jump Markov process that underlines the CME. This stochastic continuous-time approximation is called the chemical Langevin equation or the diffusion approximation, see [Kha] and the reference therein for further details on modeling and analysis of stochastic biochemical networks.

Another difficulty with the diffusion approximation is that the model is typically not well-posed since it may assign a negative number to a molecular species. Nevertheless, this issue can be neglected when the focus of observation is away from low numbers of each species. In this section we consider the following chemical Langevin formulation of a two gene network:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{X}_t &= (f(Y_t, u_x) - \mu_x X_t) dt + \sqrt{f(Y_t, u_x) \mu_x X_t} dW^1_t, \\
\dot{Y}_t &= (g(X_t, u_y) - \mu_y Y_t) dt + \sqrt{g(X_t, u_y) \mu_y Y_t} dW^2_t,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(X_0 = x_0\) and \(Y_0 = y_0\). Functions \(f\) and \(g\) are repression functions that describe the impact of each protein on the other’s rate of synthesis controlled via some external inputs \(u_x\) and \(u_y\).

In the absence of exogenous control signals, the authors of [Che00] study sufficient conditions on the drifts \(f\) and \(g\) under which the system dynamic (15) without the diffusion term has two (or more) stable equilibria. In this case, system (15) can be viewed as a biological switch network. The aforementioned theoretical results are also experimentally investigated in [GCC00] for a genetic toggle switch in *Escherichia coli*.

In this article we consider the biological switch dynamics such that the degradation rates of proteins are influenced by some external control signals. The practical feasibility of this assumption has successfully been experimented in [MSSO+11]. The level of repression is described by a **Hill** function, which models cooperativity of binding as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
f(y, u) &= \frac{\theta_y^{n+1} k_1}{y^{n+1} + \theta_1^{n+1} u}, \\
g(x, u) &= \frac{\theta_x^{n+2} k_2}{x^{n+2} + \theta_2^{n+2} u},
\end{align*}
\]
where $\theta_i$ are the threshold of the production rate with respective exponents $n_i$, and $k_i$ are the production scaling factors. The parameter $u$ represents the role of external signals that affect the production rates, for which the control sets are $U_x := [\underline{u}_x, \overline{u}_x]$ and $U_y := [\underline{u}_y, \overline{u}_y]$ with nominal value $\bar{u} := 1$. As explained in [Che00], the nullclines of the system are $f(y, \bar{u})$ and $g(x, \bar{u})$, which determine whether the system has multiple stable equilibria. In this example we consider system (15) with the following parameters: $\theta_i = 40$, $\mu_i = 0.04$, $k_i = 4$ for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and exponents $n_1 = 4, n_2 = 6$. Figure 7(a) depicts the drift nullclines and the equilibria of the system. The equilibria $z_a$ and $z_c$ are stable, while $z_b$ is the unstable one. We should remark that the “stable equilibrium” of SDE (15) is understood in the absence of the diffusion term, as the noise may very well push the states from one stable equilibrium to another.

![Figure 7](attachment:image.png)

**Figure 7.** State space of the biological switch (15) with desired motion planning sets.

In this simulation, we first aim to steer the number of proteins towards a target set around the unstable equilibrium by synthesizing appropriate input signals $u_x$ and $u_y$ within a certain time horizon, say $T_1$. During this task we opt to avoid the region of attraction of the stable equilibria as well as low numbers for each protein; the latter justifies our model being well-posed in the region of interest. The aforementioned target and avoid sets are denoted, respectively, by the closed sets $B$ and $A$ in Figure 7(b). In the second phase of the task, once the trajectory visits the target set $B$, it is required to keep the molecular populations within a slightly larger margin around equilibria for some time, say $T_2$; Figure 7(b) depicts this maintenance margin by the open set $C$. In the context of reachability, the second phase is known as viability [Aub91]; for an almost-sure stochastic counterpart see for instance [AD90, AP98].

Let us highlight two technical points here: (i) set $C$ must be chosen strictly larger than $B$ in order to allow the process to maneuver inside the interior of the maintenance set $C$ once it hits the target set $B$. From a theoretical standpoint, this is necessary since the probability of hitting set $B$ and remaining inside $B$ for all future has zero probability; this is due to the non-degenerate property of SDE (15), see the proof of Proposition 5.4 for a rigorous analysis of this issue. (ii) Since the process is non-degenerate, in principle the noise can push the process...
success in the second phase of the motion planning task decreases with the time horizon $T$, anywhere in the long-run with positive probability. This fact indicates that the probability of success in the second phase of the motion planning task decreases with the time horizon $T_2$, and it tends to zero as $T_2$ goes to $\infty$.

Therefore, the motion planning consists of two parts: reaching the target set $A$ within the certain horizon $T_1$, and staying in the set $C$ for the certain time $T_2$ after visiting the set $B$ for the first time. In view of motion-planning events introduced in Definition 2.1, the first phase of the path can be expressed as $(A^c \not\sim B) \leq T_1$, and the second phase as $(C \stackrel{T_2}{\longrightarrow} C)$; see (1) for detailed definitions of these symbols. By defining the joint process $Z^t, x, u := [X^t, x, u, Y^t, w, u]$, with the initial condition $z := (x, y)$, the desired excursion is a combination of the events studied in the preceding sections and, with a slight abuse of notation, can be expressed by

$$\left\{ Z^t, x, u | (A^c \not\sim B) \leq T_1 \circ (C \stackrel{T_2}{\longrightarrow} C) \right\}.$$

The above event depends, of course, on the initial condition $(t, x)$ and control policy $u$, and the objective is to maximize its probability over all admissible policies $u \subseteq [u_x, u_y]$. The desired path is not exactly in the framework of Definition 2.1 but, nonetheless, one can invoke the same ideas as in §3 and introduce the following value functions:

\begin{align*}
V_1(t, z) &:= \sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{I}_B(Z_{\tau_1}^{t, x, u})\mathbb{I}_C(Z_{\tau_2}^{t, x, u})\right], \\
V_2(t, z) &:= \sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{I}_C(Z_{\tau_2}^{t, x, u})\right],
\end{align*}

(16a) (16b)

where $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ are defined in a same spirit as (7) with given sets $A_1 := (A \cup B)^c$ and $A_2 := C$. However, the stopping time $\tau_1$ requires a slight modification so as to address the combination of both motion-planning events introduced in Definition 2.1: $\tau_1 := \Theta_2^{A_1 \sim} \wedge (\tau_1 + T_2)$.

The solution of our motion planning objective is the value function $V_1$ in (16a), which in view of Theorem 5.6 is characterized by the Dynkin differential operator in the interior of $[0, T_1] \times (A \cup B)^c$. However, we need first to solve for the auxiliary value function $V_2$ in (16b) in order to provide boundary conditions for the PDE corresponding to $V_1$ by

$$V_1(t, z) = \mathbb{I}_B(z)V_2(t, z), \quad (t, x) \in [0, T_1] \times (A \cup B) \cup \{T_1\} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(17)

It is straightforward to observe that the boundary condition for the value function $V_2$ is

$$V_2(t, z) = \mathbb{I}_C(z), \quad (t, x) \in [0, T_1 + T_2] \times C^c \cup \{T_1 + T_2\} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Therefore, we need to solve the PDE of $V_2$ with the above boundary condition backward from the time $T_1 + T_2$ to the time $T_1$, and then at time $T_1$ restrict the value function $V_2$ onto the set $B$ to provide boundary conditions for the value function $V_1$. Thus, the value function $V_1$ can be computed via solving the same PDE from $T_1$ to 0 but along with different boundary conditions provided by the preceding step. According to Definition 5.5 for any smooth function $\phi := \phi(t, x, y)$ the Dynkin operator $\mathcal{L}^u$ can be simplified to

$$\sup_{u \in U} \mathcal{L}^u \phi(t, x, y) = \max_{u \in U} \left[ \partial_t \phi + \partial_x \phi(f(y, u_x) - \mu_x x) + \partial_y \phi(g(x, u_y) - \mu_y y) \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \partial^2_x \phi(f(y, u_x) + \mu_x x) + \frac{1}{2} \partial^2_y \phi(g(x, u_y) + \mu_y y) \right]$$

$$= \partial_t \phi - \left( \partial_x \phi - \frac{1}{2} \partial^2_x \phi \right) \mu_x x - \left( \partial_y \phi - \frac{1}{2} \partial^2_y \phi \right) \mu_y y.$$
\begin{align*}
+ \max_{u_x \in \{\mu_x, \pi_x\}} \left[ f(y, u_x) \left( \partial_x \phi + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 \phi \right) \right] + \max_{u_y \in \{\mu_y, \pi_y\}} \left[ g(x, u_y) \left( \partial_y \phi + \frac{1}{2} \partial_y^2 \phi \right) \right].
\end{align*}

On account of Theorem 5.6 and linearity of the drift terms in $u$, one can propose an optimal policy in terms of derivatives of the value functions $V_1$ and $V_2$ in (16), respectively, for the first and second phase of the motion:

\begin{align*}
    u^*_x(t, x, y) &= \begin{cases} 
    \pi_x(t, x, y) & \text{if } \partial_x V_i(t, x, y) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 V_i(t, x, y) \geq 0, \\
    u_x(t, x, y) & \text{if } \partial_x V_i(t, x, y) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 V_i(t, x, y) < 0,
    \end{cases} \\
    u^*_y(t, x, y) &= \begin{cases} 
    \pi_y(t, x, y) & \text{if } \partial_y V_i(t, x, y) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_y^2 V_i(t, x, y) \geq 0, \\
    u_y(t, x, y) & \text{if } \partial_y V_i(t, x, y) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_y^2 V_i(t, x, y) < 0,
    \end{cases}
\end{align*}

where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ corresponds to the phase of the path.

(a) \( V_2 \) in case of full controllability over both production rates.

(b) \( V_2 \) in case of half controllability over only the production rate of protein \( x \).

**Figure 8.** The value function \( V_2 \) as defined in (16b) corresponding to probability of staying in \( C \) for 120 time units.

In the sequel we investigate two scenarios: first, when full control over both production rates is possible, i.e., \( u_x = u_y = 0 \) and \( \pi_x = \pi_y = 2 \); second, when we only have access to the production rate of protein \( x \), i.e., \( \pi_y = u_y = \hat{u} \). Figure 8 depicts the probability distribution of staying in set \( C \) within the time horizon \( T_2 = 120 \) time units in terms of the initial conditions \((x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2\). \( V_2 \) is zero outside set \( C \), as the process has obviously left \( C \) if it starts outside it. Figures 8(a) and 8(b) demonstrate the first and second control scenarios, respectively. Note that in the second case the probability of success dramatically decreases in comparison with the first. This result indicates the importance of full controllability of the production rates for the achievement of the given control objective.

Figure 9 depicts the probability of successively reaching set \( B \) within the time horizon \( T_1 = 60 \) time units and staying in set \( C \) for \( T_2 = 120 \) time units thereafter. Since the objective is to avoid set \( A \), the value function \( V_1 \) takes zero value on \( A \). Figures 9(a) and 9(b) demonstrate the first and second control scenarios, respectively. It is easy to observe the non-smooth behavior of the value function \( V_1 \) on the boundary of set \( B \) in Figure 9(b). This is indeed a consequence of the boundary condition explained in (17). All simulations in this subsection were obtained using the Level Set Method Toolbox [Mit05] (version 1.1), with a grid 121 \( \times \) 121 in the region of simulation.

\footnote{Notice that the half-life of each protein is assumed to be 17.32 time units}
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Figure 9. The value function $V_1$ as defined in (16a) corresponding to probability of staying in $C$ for 120 time units, once it reaches $B$ while avoiding $A$ within 60 time units.

7. Conclusion and Future Directions

In this article we introduced different notions of stochastic motion planning problems, with RCLL sample-paths realizations. Based on a class of stochastic optimal control problems, we proposed an alternative characterization of the set of initial conditions from which there exists an admissible policy to execute the desired maneuver with probability at least as much as some pre-specified value. We then established a weak DPP, which does not need to verify the measurability of the value functions, in terms of some auxiliary value functions. Subsequently, we focused on a case of diffusions as the solution of an SDE, and investigated the required conditions to apply the proposed DPP in the preceding section. It turned out that invoking the DPP one can solve a series of PDEs in a recursive fashion so as to numerically compute the desired initial set as well as admissible policy for the motion planning specifications. Finally, the performance of the proposed stochastic motion-planning notions was illustrated for a biological switch network.

For future work, in light of Theorem 4.5 which is in fact developed for RCLL processes, we aim to study the required conditions of the proposed DPP, Assumptions 4.1, for a larger class of stochastic processes, e.g., controlled Markov jump-diffusions.

Appendix A.

This appendix collects the missing proofs of the results presented in §3.

Proof of Proposition 3.6. We first show (5). Observe that it suffices to prove that

\begin{equation}
X^{t,x;u}_{s_i} = \left[ (W_1 \sim G_1) \circ \cdots \circ (W_n \sim G_n) \right]_{s_i} \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ X^{t,x;u}_{\eta_i} \in G_i \right\}
\end{equation}

for all initial conditions $(t,x)$ and policies $u$, where the stopping time $\eta_i$ is as defined in (4a). Let $\omega$ belong to the left-hand side of (18). In view of the definition (1a), there exists a set of instants $(s_i)_{i=1}^{n} \subseteq [t,T]$ such that for all $i$, $X^{t,x;u}_{\eta_i}(\omega) \in G_i$ while $X^{t,x;u}_{\eta_i}(\omega) \in W_i \setminus G_i =: B_i$ for all $r \in [s_{i-1},s_i]$, where we set $s_0 = t$. It also follows by an induction argument that
\( \eta_i(\omega) = \Theta_i^{B_i,n} = s_i \), which immediately leads to \( X_{\eta_i(\omega)}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in G_i \) for all \( i \leq n \). This proves the relation “\( \subset \)” between the left- and right-hand sides of (18). Now suppose that \( \omega \) belongs to the right-hand side of (18). Then, for all \( i \leq n \) we have \( X_{\eta_i(\omega)}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in G_i \). In view of the definition of stopping times \( \eta_i \) in (4a), it follows that \( X_{\eta_i(\omega)}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in B_i := W_i \setminus G_i \) for all \( r \in [\eta_i(\omega), \eta_i(\omega)] \). Introducing the time sequence \( s_i := \eta_i(\omega) \) implies the relation “\( \supset \)” between the left- and right-hand sides of (18). Together with preceding argument, this implies (18).

To prove (6) we only need to show that

\[
\left\{ X^{t,x,u} = (W_1 \xrightarrow{T_1} G_1) \circ \cdots \circ (W_n \xrightarrow{T_n} G_n) \right\} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ X_{\tilde{\eta}_i}^{t,x,u} \in G_i \cap W_i \right\}
\]

for all initial conditions \((t, x)\) and policies \( u \), where the stopping time \( \tilde{\eta}_i \) is introduced in (4b).

To this end, let us fix \((t, x) \in \mathbb{S} \) and \( u \in \mathcal{U}_i \), and assume that \( \omega \) belongs to the left-hand side of (19). By definition (1b), for all \( i \leq n \) we have \( X_{T_i}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in G_i \) and \( X_{r_i}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in W_i \) for all \( r \in [T_{i-1}, T_i] \). By a straightforward induction, we see that \( \tilde{\eta}_i(\omega) = T_i \), and consequently \( X_{\tilde{\eta}_i}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in G_i \cap W_i \) for all \( i \leq n \). This establishes the relation “\( \subset \)” between the left- and right-hand sides of (19). Now suppose \( \omega \) belongs to the right-hand side of (19). Then, for all \( i \leq n \) we have \( X_{\tilde{\eta}_i(\omega)}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in G_i \cap W_i \). By virtue of Fact 3.5 and an induction argument once again, Assumption 3.4 guarantees that \( \tilde{\eta}_i(\omega) = T_i \), and consequently it follows that \( X_{T_i}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in G_i \) and \( X_{r_i}^{t,x,u}(\omega) \in W_i \) for all \( r \in [T_{i-1}, T_i] \). This establishes the relation “\( \supset \)” in (18), and the assertion (19) follows.

\[\square\]

### Appendix B.

This appendix contains missing proofs of §5.

#### Proof of Proposition (5.4).

The key step in the proof relies on the two Assumptions 5.1.c. and 5.2. There is a classical result on non-degenerate diffusion processes indicating that if the process starts from the tip of a cone, then it enters the cone with probability one [RB98, Corollary 3.2, p. 65]. This hints at the possibility that the aforementioned Assumptions together with almost sure continuity of the strong solution of the SDE (13) result in the continuity of sequential exit-times \( \Theta_i^{1,n} \) and consequently \( \tau_i \). In the following we shall formally work around this idea.

Let us assume that \( t_m \leq t \) for notational simplicity, but one can effectively follow similar arguments for \( t_m > t \). By the definition of the SDE (13),

\[
X_{t_m,x,m,u}^{t,x,u} = X_{t_m,x,m,u}^{t,x,u} + \int_t^{t_m} f(X_{s,x,m,u}^{t,x,u}, u_s) \, ds + \int_t^{t_m} \sigma(X_{s,x,m,u}^{t,x,u}, u_s) \, dW_s \quad \text{P-a.s.}
\]

By virtue of [Kry09, Theorem 2.5.9, p. 83], for all \( q \geq 1 \) we have

\[
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [t,T]} \| X_{t,x,u}^{t,x,u} - X_{t_m,x,m,u}^{t,x,u} \|^{2q} \right] \leq C_1(q, T, K) E \left[ \| x - X_{t_m,x,m,u}^{t,x,u} \|^{2q} \right]
\]

\[
\leq 2^{2q-1} C_1(q, T, K) E \left[ \| x - x_m \|^{2q} + \| x_m - X_{t_m,x,m,u}^{t,x,u} \|^{2q} \right],
\]

whence, in light of [Kry09, Corollary 2.5.12, p. 86], we get

\[
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [t,T]} \| X_{t,x,u}^{t,x,u} - X_{t_m,x,m,u}^{t,x,u} \|^{2q} \right] \leq C_2(q, T, K, \| x \|) \left( \| x - x_m \|^{2q} + |t - t_m|^q \right).
\]

In the above inequalities, \( K \) is the Lipschitz constant of \( f \) and \( \sigma \) mentioned in Assumption 5.1.b.; \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are constant depending on the indicated parameters. Hence, in view of Kolmogorov’s continuity criterion [Pro05, Corollary 1 Chap. IV, p. 220], one may consider a version of the
stochastic process $X^{t,x;m}$ which is continuous in $(t,x)$ in the topology of uniform convergence on compacts. This leads to the fact that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., for any $\epsilon > 0$, for all sufficiently large $m$,

$$X_{t,m,x,m}^{s} \in B_{\epsilon}(X_{t,m,x,0}^{s}), \quad \forall r \in [t_{m}, T],$$

where $B_{\epsilon}(y)$ denotes the ball centered at $y$ and radius $\epsilon$. For simplicity, let us define the shorthand $\tau_{i}^{m} := \tau_{i}(t_{m}, x_{m})$.\footnote{This notation is only employed in this proof.} By the definition of $\tau_{i}$ and Definition 3.1, since the set $A_{i}$ is open, we conclude that

$$\exists \epsilon > 0, \quad \bigcup_{r \in [\tau_{i}^{m}, \tau_{i}^{m}]} B_{\epsilon}(X_{t,m,x,0}^{s}) \cap A_{i}^{c} = \emptyset \quad \mathbb{P}$-a.s.$$

By definition $\tau_{i}^{0} := \tau_{i}(0, x_{0}) = t_{0}$. As an induction hypothesis, let us assume $\tau_{i}^{0}$ is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. continuous, and we proceed with the induction step. One can deduce that (22) together with (23) implies that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all sufficiently large $m$,

$$X_{t,m,x,m}^{s} \in A_{i}, \quad \forall r \in [t_{m}, \tau_{i}^{0}].$$

In conjunction with $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. continuity of sample paths, this immediately leads to

$$\liminf_{m \to \infty} \tau_{i}^{m} := \liminf_{m \to \infty} \tau_{i}(t_{m}, x_{m}) \geq \tau_{i}(0, x_{0}) \quad \mathbb{P}$-a.s.$$

On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, the Assumptions 5.1.c. and 5.2 imply that the set of sample paths that hit the boundary of $A_{i}$ and do not enter the set is negligible [RB98, Corollary 3.2, p. 65]. Hence

$$\forall \delta > 0, \quad \exists s \in A_{i}^{c} \cup (A_{i}^{c})^\circ,$$ \quad $X_{t,m,x,m}^{s} \in \partial_{\epsilon}(X_{t,m,x,0}^{s})$ \quad $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

where $(A_{i}^{c})^\circ$ denotes the interior of the set $A_{i}^{c}$. Hence, in light of (21), $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. there exists $\epsilon > 0$, possibly depending on $\delta$, such that for all sufficiently large $m$ we have

$$X_{t,m,x,m}^{s} \in B_{\epsilon}(X_{t,m,x,0}^{s}) \subset A_{i}^{c}.$$

Recalling the induction hypothesis, we note that in accordance with the definition of sequential stopping times $\Theta_{i}^{A_{i}^{c}}$, one can infer that $\Theta_{i}^{A_{i}^{c}}(t_{m}, x_{m}) \leq s < \Theta_{i}^{A_{i}^{c}}(0, x_{0}) + \delta$. From arbitrariness of $\delta$ and the definition of $\tau_{i}$, this leads to

$$\limsup_{m \to \infty} \tau_{i}(t_{m}, x_{m}) := \limsup_{m \to \infty} \left( \Theta_{i}^{A_{i}^{c}}(t_{m}, x_{m}) \wedge T_{i} \right) \leq \tau_{i}(0, x_{0}) \quad \mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

where in conjunction with (23), $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. continuity of the map $(t, x) \mapsto \tau_{i}(t, x)$ at $(0, x_{0})$ for any $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ follows. The assertion follows by induction.

The continuity of the mapping $(t, x) \mapsto X_{t,x}^{t,x,m}$ follows immediately from the almost sure continuity of the stopping time $\tau_{i}(t, x)$ in conjunction with the almost sure continuity of the version of the stochastic process $X_{t,x}^{t,x,m}$ in $(t, x)$; for the latter let us note again that Kolmogorov’s continuity criterion guarantees the existence of such a version in light of (20).

\textbf{Proof of Theorem 5.6.} Here we briefly sketch the proof in words, and refer the reader to [MECL12, Theorem 4.10] for detailed arguments concerning the same technology to prove the assertion of the Theorem. Note that any $\mathcal{F}_{T}$-progressively measurable policy $u \in \mathcal{U}_{i}$ satisfies Assumptions 4.1.a.. It is a classical result [Oks03, Chap. 7] that the strong solution $X_{t,x}^{t,x,m}$ satisfies Assumptions 4.1.b.i. and 4.1.b.ii. Furthermore, Proposition 5.4 together with almost sure path-contiuity of the strong solution guarantees Assumption 4.1.b.iii. Hence, having met all the required assumptions of Theorem 4.5, one can employ the DPP (9). Namely, to establish the assertion concerning the supersolution, for the sake of contradiction, one can assume that there exists $(t_{0}, x_{0}) \in [0, T_{k} \times A_{k})$, and a smooth function $\phi$ dominated by the value function $V_{k}$, where $(V_{k} - \phi)(t_{0}, x_{0}) = 0$, such that for some $\delta > 0$, $-\sup_{u \in U} L_{u} \phi(t_{0}, x_{0}) < -2\delta$. Since $\phi$ is
smooth, the map \((t, x) \mapsto L^u\phi(t, x)\) is continuous. Therefore, there exist \(u \in \mathbb{U}\) and \(r > 0\) such that \(B_r(t_0, x_0) \subset \{0, T_k^i \times \mathbb{A}_k\} \) and \(-L^u\phi(t, x) < -\delta\) for all \((t, x) \in B_r(t_0, x_0)\). Let us define the stopping time \(\theta(t, x)\) as the first exit time of trajectory \(X^{t, x; u}\) from the ball \(B_r(t_0, x_0)\). Note that by continuity of solutions to (13), \(t < \theta(t, x)\) \(\mathbb{P}\) a.s. for all \((t, x) \in B_r(t_0, x_0)\). Therefore, selecting \(r > 0\) sufficiently small so that \(\theta < \tau_k\), and applying Itô’s formula, we see that for all \((t, x) \in B_r(t_0, x_0)\), \(\phi(t, x) < \mathbb{E}[\phi(\theta(t, x), X^{t, x; u})]\). Now it suffices to take a sequence \((t_m, x_m, V_k(t_m, x_m))_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\) converging to \((t_0, x_0, V_k(t_0, x_0))\). For sufficiently large \(m\) we have \(V(t_m, x_m) < \mathbb{E}[V_k(\theta(t_m, x_m), X^{t_m, x_m; u})]\), which, in view of the fact that \(\theta(t_m, x_m) < \tau_k \land T_k\), contradicts the DPP in (9n). The \textit{subsolution} property is proved effectively in a similar fashion. \(\square\)

In order to provide boundary conditions, in the discontinuous viscosity sense, for the PDE equation in Theorem 5.6 we need a preparatory preliminary lemma that contains a stronger assertion than Proposition 5.4. \(\text{Lemma B.1.}\)

Suppose that the conditions of Proposition 5.4 hold. Given a sequence of control policies \((u_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{U}\) and initial conditions \((t_m, x_m) \rightarrow (t, x)\), we have

\[
\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \begin{vmatrix}
X^{t, x; u_{m}}_{\tau_i(t, x)} - X^{t_m, x_m; u_{m}}_{\tau_i(t_m, x_m)}
\end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.,} \quad \tau_i(t, x) = \Theta_k^{A_{k}^{i-1}}(t, x) \land T_i.
\]

Note that Lemma B.1 is indeed a stronger statement than Proposition 5.4 as the desired continuity is required uniformly with respective to control policy. Let us highlight that the stopping times \(\tau_i(t, x)\) and \(\tau_i(t_m, x_m)\) are both effected by control policies \(u_m\). But nonetheless, the mapping \((t, x) \mapsto X_i^{t, x; u_{m}}\) is almost surely continuous irrespective of the policies \((u_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\). For the proof we refer to an identical technique used in [MECL12, Lemma 4.11]

\textit{Proof of Proposition 5.7.}\) The boundary condition in (14a) is in a pointwise sense, and is an immediate consequence of the definition of the sequential exit-times introduced in Definition 3.1. Namely, for any initial state \(x \in \mathbb{A}_k\) we have \(\Theta_k^{A_{k+1}^{i-1}}(t, x) = t\), and in light of Lemma 3.2 for all \(i \in \{k, k+1, \ldots, n\}\)

\[
\Theta_k^{A_{k}^{i-1}}(t, x) = \Theta_k^{A_{k+1}^{i-1}}(t, x), \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T_k] \times \partial \mathbb{A}_k \cup \{T_k\} \times \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

This leads to \(X_i^{t, x; u_{k}} = x\) on the boundaries, and yields to the pointwise boundary condition (14a).

The boundary condition (14b) is in a discontinuous viscosity sense, and is a standard boundary condition in this said context. To prove the assertion, let \((t_m, x_m, V_k(t_m, x_m)) \rightarrow (t, x, V_k^{*}(t, x))\) where \(t_m < T_k\). Invoking the DPP in Theorem 4.5 once again and introducing \(\theta := \tau_{k+1}^{*}\) in (9a), we arrive at

\[
V_k(t_m, x_m) \leq \sup_{u \in \mathbb{U}_k} \mathbb{E}\left[V_k^{*}(\tau_{k+1}^{*}, X_{\tau_{k+1}^{*}; u_{k}})\ell_k(X_{\tau_{k+1}^{*}; u_{k}})\right].
\]

Note that one can replace a sequence of policies in the above inequalities to attain the supremum running over all policies. This sequence, of course, depends on the initial condition \((t_m, x_m)\). Hence, let us denote it via two indices \((u_{m,j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\). One can deduce that there exists a subsequence of \((u_{m,j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\) such that

\[
V_k^{*}(t, x) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} V_k(t_m, x_m) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[V_k^{*}(\tau_{k+1}^{*}, X_{\tau_{k+1}^{*}; u_{m,j}})\ell_k(X_{\tau_{k+1}^{*}; u_{m,j}})\right] \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[V_k^{*}(\tau_{k+1}^{*}, X_{\tau_{k+1}^{*}; u_{m,j}})\ell_k(X_{\tau_{k+1}^{*}; u_{m,j}})\right]
\]
\[
V_{k+1}(t,x) = \mathbb{E} \lim_{j \to \infty} V_{\tau_k}^* \left( \tau_k^j, X_{\tau_k^j}; u_{m_j} \right) \ell_k^u \left( X_{\tau_k^j}; u_{m_j} \right)
\]

where (24) and (25) follow, respectively, from Fatou’s lemma and the uniform continuity assertion in Lemma B.1. Let us recall that by Lemma B.1 we know \( \tau_k^j \to \tau_k(t,x) \) as \( m \to \infty \) uniformly with respect to the policies \((u_{m_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\). It should be mentioned that the other side of discontinuous viscosity boundary condition (14b), i.e. \( V_{k+1}(t,x) \geq V_k(t,x) \ell_k^u(x) \), is an immediate result of pointwise boundary condition since the value functions \( (V_k)_{k=1}^n \) and \( \ell_k^u \) are all lower semicontinuous.
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