

# Nonlinear systems coupled through multi-marginal transport problems

Maxime Laborde \*

## Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a dynamical urban planning model. This leads us to study a system of nonlinear equations coupled through multi-marginal optimal transport problems. A simple case consists in solving two equations coupled through the solution to the Monge-Ampère equation. We show that the Wasserstein gradient flow theory provides a very good framework to solve this highly nonlinear system. At the end, an uniqueness result is presented in dimension one based on convexity arguments.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, Kinderlehrer, Monsaingeon and Xu proposed in [16] a gradient flow approach to solve the Poisson-Nernst-Planck system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho_1 - \alpha \Delta \rho_1^m - \operatorname{div}(\rho_1 \nabla (V_1 + \varphi)) = 0, \\ \partial_t \rho_2 - \beta \Delta \rho_2^m - \operatorname{div}(\rho_2 \nabla (V_2 - \varphi)) = 0, \\ -\Delta \varphi = \rho_1 - \rho_2. \end{cases}$$

This system is, for instance, used to model ionic transport of several interacting species. Inspired by this work we are interested in a "nonlinear" version where species  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  are coupled through the Monge-Ampère equation instead of the Poisson equation,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho_1 - \alpha \Delta \rho_1^m - \operatorname{div}(\rho_1 \nabla (V_1 + \varphi)) = 0, \\ \partial_t \rho_2 - \beta \Delta \rho_2^m - \operatorname{div}(\rho_2 \nabla (V_2 + \varphi^c)) = 0, \\ \det(I - D^2 \varphi) \rho_2 (Id - \nabla \varphi) = \rho_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\varphi^c$  is the c-transform of  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi^c(x) = \sup_y |x - y|^2 - \varphi(y)$  and  $|x|^2 - \varphi$  is convex.

This kind of systems can arise naturally in urban planning. In a series of works [6, 7, 12, 9, 10, 21, 22, 23] (non-exhaustive list), static models of urban planning were proposed. A simplified model consists in considering an urban area region  $\Omega$  where residents and services, given by two probability densities on  $\Omega$ ,  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ , want to minimize a quantity,  $\mathcal{E}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ , to reach an ideal organization in the city. The total cost has to take into account a transportation cost between residential areas and service areas, a congestion effect for residential areas due to the fact that the population does not want to live in very crowded area and, on the contrary, services want to be more concentrated in order to increase

---

\*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, Montreal, CANADA (maxime.laborde@mcgill.ca)

efficiency and decrease management costs. Particularly, the cost functional  $\mathcal{E}$  can be taken as

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = W_c(\rho_1, \rho_2) + \mathcal{F}(\rho_1) + \mathcal{G}(\rho_2), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $W_c$  is the value of an optimal transport problem with cost  $c$ . Several interpretations may be given to this cost. For example, it might represent the gas cost paid by workers to reach services area and then workers want to live close to services in order to decrease car travel.  $\mathcal{F}$  is an internal energy given by a convex superlinear function  $F$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} F(\rho(x)) dx & \text{if } F(\rho) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $F$  is superlinear and convex,  $\mathcal{F}$  can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{F(\rho)}{\rho} \rho,$$

where  $\rho \mapsto \frac{F(\rho)}{\rho}$  is an increasing function which can be seen as the unhappiness of a citizen when he lives in a place where the population density is  $\rho$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{G}$  is on the form

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho) = \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} h(|x - y|) d\rho(x) d\rho(y),$$

where  $h$  is an increasing function modeling interactions between different services.

However, since a city is constantly evolving, it seems natural to study how evolve  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  in time. This leads to study the gradient flow of  $\mathcal{E}$  in a Wasserstein product space. In the case where  $c$  is the quadratic cost, at least formally, we find a system on the form (1.1) where  $\varphi$  is a Kantorovich potential of  $W_2(\rho_1, \rho_2)$  which implies that it satisfies the Monge-Ampère equation

$$\det(I - D^2\varphi)\rho_2(Id - \nabla\varphi) = \rho_1.$$

In this paper, we propose to investigate a generalization of problem (1.1). We extend to more than two populations, then the transport problem becomes a multi-marginal transport problem. In other hand, the cost that workers want to minimize is not the same as the one of services or firms. Indeed, they have to take into account the gas cost to reach their work whereas this cost is not relevant for services. Thus it is natural to assume that each population wants to minimize a transport problem with its own cost. Since the system is not a gradient flow anymore, we will use a semi-implicit JKO scheme introduced in [13] to deal with these different costs.

The organization of the paper is the following. Section 2 recalls results from Optimal Transport and Multi-Marginal Transport theories. In section 3, we specify our problem and state our main result. Section 4 is devoted to the demonstration of the existence of solutions for the evolution problem (1.1). The proof is based on a semi-implicit JKO scheme and on an extension of the Aubin-Lions Lemma in order to obtain strong regularity. At the end in section 5, by convexity arguments, we give a uniqueness result in dimension one for some class of functionals.

## 2 Preliminaries

In the sequel,  $\Omega$  represents a smooth open bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

## 2.1 Wasserstein space

For a detailed exposition, we refer to reference textbooks [25, 26, 3, 24]. We denote  $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$  the set of nonnegative finite Radon measures on  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  the space of probability measures on  $\Omega$ , and  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)$ , the subset of  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  of probability measures on  $\Omega$  absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For all  $\rho, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , we denote  $\Pi(\rho, \mu)$ , the set of probability measures on  $\Omega \times \Omega$  having  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  as first and second marginals, respectively. If  $\gamma \in \Pi(\rho, \mu)$ , then  $\gamma$  is called a transport plan between  $\rho$  and  $\mu$ . For all  $\rho, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , we denote by  $W_2(\rho, \mu)$  the Wasserstein distance between  $\rho$  and  $\mu$ ,

$$W_2^2(\rho, \mu) = \inf \left\{ \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y) : \gamma \in \Pi(\rho, \mu) \right\}.$$

Since this optimal transportation problem is a linear problem under linear constraint, it admits a dual formulation given by

$$W_2^2(\rho, \mu) = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \varphi(x) d\rho(x) + \int_{\Omega} \psi(y) d\mu(y) : \varphi(x) + \psi(y) \leq |x - y|^2 \right\}.$$

Optimal solutions of the dual problem are called Kantorovich potentials between  $\rho$  and  $\mu$ . If  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)$ , Brenier proves in [5] that the optimal transport plan,  $\gamma$ , is unique and induced by an optimal transport map,  $T$ , i.e  $\gamma$  is on the form  $(Id \times T)_{\#}\rho$ , where  $T_{\#}\rho = \mu$  and  $T$  is the gradient of a convex function. Moreover, the optimal transport map is given by  $T = Id - \nabla\varphi$  where  $\varphi$  is a Kantorovich potential between  $\rho$  and  $\mu$ .

It is well known that  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  endowed with the Wasserstein distance defines a metric space and  $W_2$  metrizes the narrow convergence of probability measures. If  $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$  are in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)^l$ , we define the product distance by

$$\mathbf{W}_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^l W_2^2(\rho_i, \mu_i) \right)^{1/2}.$$

## 2.2 Multi-marginal transportation problem

In this section, we recall some results from the multi-marginal transport theory that we will use in the sequel. We refer, for instance, to [19, 14] for a complete survey on this topic. The usual transport optimal can be extended to several marginals  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Let  $c$  be a cost function from  $\Omega^l$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , the multi-marginal transport problem,  $\mathcal{W}_c$ , is defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega^l} c(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_l) : \lambda \in \Pi(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) \right\},$$

where  $\Pi(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) := \{ \lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega^l) : \pi_i_{\#}\lambda = \rho_i \}$  and  $\pi^i$  denotes the canonical projection from  $\Omega^l$  to  $\Omega$ . By standard arguments, the existence of an optimal transport plan is guaranteed as in the two marginals case. Then, if we assume that  $c$  is continuous on  $\overline{\Omega^l}$ , the following dual formulation holds

$$\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} u_i(x_i) d\rho_i(x_i) : \sum_{i=1}^l u_i(x_i) \leq c(x_1, \dots, x_l) \right\}.$$

Any optimal  $u_1, \dots, u_l$  for the dual formulation are called Kantorovich potentials and are

$c$ -conjugate functions, i.e

$$u_i(x_i) = \inf \left\{ c(x_1, \dots, x_l) - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^l u_j(x_j), x_j \in \Omega \right\}, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, l.$$

For any  $\lambda$  optimal transport plan and  $u_1, \dots, u_l$  Kantorovich potentials, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^l u_i(x_i) = c(x_1, \dots, x_l), \quad \lambda - a.e.$$

In addition, assuming that  $\rho_i$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and  $c$  is differentiable in the  $i$ -th variable, then  $u_i$  is a Lipschitz function and

$$\nabla u_i(x_i) = \nabla_{x_i} c(x_1, \dots, x_l), \quad \lambda - a.e. \quad (2.1)$$

### 3 Assumptions and main result

In the following, we assume that we have  $l > 1$  different populations. The congestion functional associated to the population  $\rho_i$  is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} F_i(\rho(x)) dx & \text{if } F_i(\rho) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where  $F_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a strictly convex superlinear function of class  $\mathcal{C}^2$ . Define  $P_i(x) := xF_i'(x) - F_i(x)$  the pressure associated to  $F_i$ , we assume

$$F_i(0) = 0 \text{ and } P_i(x) \leq C(1 + F_i(x)). \quad (3.1)$$

The typical examples of energies with have in mind are  $F(\rho) := \rho \log(\rho)$ , which gives a linear diffusion driven by the Laplacian, and  $F(\rho) := \rho^m$  ( $m > 1$ ), which corresponds to the porous medium diffusion.

The multi-marginal interaction energy  $\mathcal{W}_i : \mathcal{P}(\Omega)^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega^l} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_l) : \lambda \in \Pi(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) \right\}.$$

where the cost function  $c_i : \Omega^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is assumed to be continuous on  $\overline{\Omega}^l$  and differentiable with respect to  $x_i$  such that  $\nabla_{x_i} c_i$  is continuous on  $\overline{\Omega}^l$  and bounded on  $\overline{\Omega}^l$ .

**Example 3.1** (Barycenter). Assume  $l = 3$  and  $\rho_1$  evolves minimizing at each step the functional

$$(\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3) \mapsto \alpha W_2^2(\rho_1, \rho_2) + \beta W_2^2(\rho_1, \rho_3).$$

That means that  $\rho_1$  wants to reach the barycenter in the Wasserstein space of  $\rho_2, \rho_3$  with weight  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ , see [2]. This functional can be rewritten as the multi-marginal problem

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3)} \int_{\Omega} c(x, y, z) d\gamma(x, y, z),$$

where  $c(x, y, z) = \alpha|x - y|^2 + \beta|x - z|^2$  satisfies the assumptions above.

The goal of this paper is to study existence and uniqueness of solution to the following nonlinear diffusion system with nonlocal interactions

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho_i = \Delta P_i(\rho_i) + \operatorname{div}(\rho_i \nabla u_i) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega, \\ \rho_i|_{t=0} = \rho_{i,0}, \end{cases}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, l\}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $u_i$  is an optimal Kantorovich potential of

$$\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega^l} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_l) : \lambda \in \Pi(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Since  $\Omega$  is a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , (3.2) is supplemented with Neumann boundary conditions on  $\partial\Omega$ ,

$$(\nabla P_i(\rho_i) + \nabla u_i \rho_i) \cdot \nu = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^+ \times \partial\Omega, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\nu$  is the outward normal to  $\partial\Omega$ . To simplify the exposition, we do not treat potentials or nonlocal interactions in (3.3) even if this can be added easily.

The main difficulty is to handle the nonlinear cross term  $\operatorname{div}(\rho_i \nabla u_i)$ . However, we remark that if  $\lambda_i$  is an optimal transport plan in (3.3) and  $\rho_i$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure then, by (2.1),

$$\nabla u_i(t, x_i) = \nabla_{x_i} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l), \quad \lambda_i(t) - a.e. \quad (3.5)$$

Consequently, for all  $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty([0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\Omega} \rho_i(t, x) \nabla u_i(t, x) \cdot \nabla \Phi(t, x) dx dt \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\Omega^l} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l) \cdot \nabla \Phi(t, x_i) d\lambda_i(t, x_1, \dots, x_l) dt, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\lambda_i(t)$  solves  $\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ ,  $t$ -a.e, and (3.5). Since the right hand side is a linear term with respect to  $\lambda_i$ , it is easier to work with this one and then, we define a weak solution of (3.2)-(3.4) in the following way.

**Definition 3.2.** *A weak solution of (3.2)-(3.4) is a curve  $t \in (0, +\infty) \mapsto (\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t)) \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l$  such that  $\nabla P_i(\rho_i) \in \mathcal{M}^n((0, T) \times \Omega)$ , for all  $T < +\infty$ , and*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{+\infty} \left( \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \Phi \rho_i dx - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \Phi \cdot d\nabla P_i(\rho_i) \right) \\ & - \int_{\Omega^l} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l) \cdot \nabla \Phi(t, x_i) d\lambda_i(t, x_1, \dots, x_l) dt = - \int_{\Omega} \Phi(0, x) \rho_{i,0}(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

for every  $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty([0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ , where  $\lambda_i(t)$  is an optimal transport plan of  $\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ ,  $t$ -a.e.

Our main result is the following:

**Theorem 3.3.** *If  $\rho_{i,0} \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)$  satisfy*

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,0}) < +\infty, \quad (3.6)$$

*Then (3.2)-(3.4) admits at least one weak solution.*

**Remark 3.4.** To simplify the analysis we assume that each population has an individual diffusion. This implies that solutions are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and then the Kantorovich potentials are Lipschitz. Theorem 3.3 can be generalized replacing  $\nabla u_i$  by

$$U_i(x_i) = \int_{\Omega^{l-1}} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\lambda_i^{x_i}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_l)$  and  $\lambda_i^{x_i}$  is obtained by disintegrating the optimal transport plan  $\lambda_i$  with respect to  $\rho_i$ ,

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_i^{x_i} \otimes \rho_i.$$

## 4 Existence result

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is based on a variant of the well-known JKO scheme introduced by Jordan, Kinderlehrer and Otto, [15]. We construct by induction with a semi-implicit Euler scheme  $l$  sequences  $(\rho_{i,h}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^{ac}(\Omega)$ , where  $h > 0$  is a given time step. Since the multi-marginal functional  $\mathcal{W}_i$  depends on the density  $i$ , system (3.2)-(3.4) is not a gradient flow in a Wasserstein product space. We introduce the functional  $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\mu})$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$ , defined by

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i(\rho|\boldsymbol{\mu}) := \mathcal{W}_i(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, \rho, \mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_l).$$

In other words,  $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i(\rho|\boldsymbol{\mu})$  is the multi-marginal problem with marginals  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, \rho, \mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_l$ .

Sequences  $(\rho_{i,h}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  are then constructed using the following semi-implicit JKO scheme: for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, l \rrbracket$ ,  $\rho_{i,h}^0 = \rho_{i,0}$  and for all  $k \geq 0$ ,  $\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$  minimizes

$$\mathcal{E}_{i,h}(\rho|\boldsymbol{\rho}_h^k) := W_2^2(\rho, \rho_{i,h}^k) + 2h \left( \mathcal{F}_i(\rho) + \overline{\mathcal{W}}_i(\rho|\boldsymbol{\rho}_h^k) \right), \quad (4.1)$$

on  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^{ac}(\Omega)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\rho}_h^k := (\rho_{1,h}^k, \dots, \rho_{l,h}^k)$ . At each step, all the marginals are frozen except the  $i$ -th marginal in the functional (3.3).

These sequences are well defined by standard arguments. Define the piecewise constant interpolations by,  $\rho_{i,h}(0) = \rho_{i,0}$  and for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\rho_{i,h}(t) := \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} \text{ if } t \in (hk, h(k+1)]. \quad (4.2)$$

Let  $\lambda_{i,h}^{k+1}$  be an optimal transport map for  $\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_{1,h}^k, \dots, \rho_{i-1,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}, \rho_{i+1,h}^k, \dots, \rho_{l,h}^k)$  and  $\lambda_{i,h}$  be the piecewise constant interpolation defined by

$$\lambda_{i,h}(t) := \lambda_{i,h}^{k+1} \text{ if } t \in (hk, h(k+1)]. \quad (4.3)$$

### 4.1 Basic a priori estimates

In this section we retrieve the usual estimates in the Wasserstein gradient flow theory. First, we show that  $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i$  is Lipschitz in the Wasserstein space.

**Lemma 4.1.** *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l) \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)^l$ , and for all  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{P}^{ac}(\Omega)$ ,*

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i(\rho_1|\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \overline{\mathcal{W}}_i(\rho_2|\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq CW_2(\rho_1, \rho_2).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma$  be the  $W_2$ -optimal transport plan between  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  and  $T$  the  $W_2$ -optimal transport map associated to  $\gamma$  i.e  $\gamma = (T \times I)_{\#} \rho_2$ . Let  $\lambda \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, \rho_2, \mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_l)$  optimal for  $\overline{W}_i(\rho_2|\boldsymbol{\mu})$ . Define  $\lambda_T$  by

$$\int_{\Omega^l} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\lambda_T(x_1, \dots, x_l) := \int_{\Omega^l} \varphi(x_1, \dots, T(x_i), \dots, x_l) d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_l),$$

for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega^l)$ . By definition,  $\lambda_T \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, \rho_1, \mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_l)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}_i(\rho_1|\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \overline{W}_i(\rho_2|\boldsymbol{\mu}) &\leq \int_{\Omega^l} [c_i(x_1, \dots, T(x_i), \dots, x_l) - c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l)] d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_l) \\ &\leq \|\nabla_{x_i} c_i\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\Omega^l} |T(x_i) - x_i| d\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_l) \\ &\leq CW_2(\rho_1, \rho_2), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption on  $\nabla_{x_i} c_i$  and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.  $\square$

In the next proposition, we state usual estimates from JKO scheme.

**Proposition 4.2.** *For all  $T > 0$ , there exists  $C_T > 0$  such that, for all  $h, k$ , with  $hk < T$ ,  $N = \lfloor \frac{T}{h} \rfloor$ , for  $i \in \llbracket 1, l \rrbracket$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k) \leq C_T, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \leq C_T h. \quad (4.5)$$

*Proof.* We first prove (4.5). Since  $\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$  is optimal in the minimization of (4.1) and  $\rho_{i,h}^k$  is a competitor, we have

$$W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \leq 2h \left( \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) + \overline{W}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k|\boldsymbol{\rho}_h^k) - \overline{W}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}|\boldsymbol{\rho}_h^k) \right). \quad (4.6)$$

Then using Lemma 4.1 in (4.6) and Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) &\leq 2h \left( \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) + CW_2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \right) \\ &\leq 2h \left( \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) + \frac{1}{4h} W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) + 4C^2 h \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can thus absorb the  $W_2^2$  term in the left-hand side,

$$\frac{1}{2} W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \leq 2h \left( \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) + Ch \right).$$

Summing over  $k$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) &\leq 4h \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (\mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^k) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1})) + C^2 T \right) \\ &\leq 4h \left( \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,0}) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^N) + C^2 T \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Since  $\Omega$  is bounded,  $\mathcal{F}_i$  is bounded from below and using the assumption (3.6), we conclude (4.5). The proof is completed noticing that the estimate (4.4) comes from (4.7) and (3.6).  $\square$

## 4.2 Refined a priori estimates

The goal of this section is to obtain stronger estimates on  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  in order to deal with the nonlinear diffusion term.

**Proposition 4.3.** *For all  $i \in \llbracket 1, l \rrbracket$  and for all  $k \geq 0$ , we have  $P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$  and*

$$h \left( \nabla u_{i,h}^{k+1} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} + \nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \right) = -\nabla \varphi_{i,h}^{k+1} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} \quad a.e, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\varphi_{i,h}^{k+1}$  is a Kantorovich potential (so that its gradient is unique  $\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$ -a.e.) from  $\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$  to  $\rho_{i,h}^k$  for  $W_2$ .

*Proof.* The proof is the same as in [1, 17] for example. We start by taking the first variation in the semi-implicit JKO scheme. Let  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$  be given and  $\Phi_\tau$  the corresponding flow defined by

$$\partial_\tau \Phi_\tau = \xi \circ \Phi_\tau, \quad \Phi_0 = Id.$$

Define the perturbation  $\rho_\tau$  of  $\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$  by  $\rho_\tau := \Phi_{\tau\#} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$ . Then we get

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \left( \mathcal{E}_{i,h}(\rho_\tau | \rho_h^k) - \mathcal{E}_{i,h}(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1} | \rho_h^k) \right) \geq 0. \quad (4.9)$$

By standard computations, we have

$$\limsup_{\tau \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} (W_2^2(\rho_\tau, \rho_{i,h}^k) - W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}, \rho_{i,h}^k)) \leq \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} (x - y) \cdot \xi(x) d\gamma_{i,h}^{k+1}(x, y), \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\gamma_{i,h}^{k+1}$  is an  $W_2$ -optimal transport plan in  $\Pi(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}, \rho_{i,h}^k)$  and  $\gamma_{i,h}^{k+1} = (Id \times T_{i,h}^{k+1})\# \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}$  with  $T_{i,h}^{k+1} = Id - \nabla \varphi_{i,h}^{k+1}$ . Moreover, by (3.1), (4.4) and Lebesgue's dominated convergence Theorem, we obtain

$$\limsup_{\tau \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} (\mathcal{F}_i(\rho_\tau) - \mathcal{F}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1})) \leq - \int_{\Omega} P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}(x)) \operatorname{div}(\xi(x)) dx. \quad (4.11)$$

Finally, by definition of  $\lambda_{i,h}^{k+1}$ , we have

$$\limsup_{\tau \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} (\overline{W}_i(\rho_\tau | \rho_h^k) - \overline{W}_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1} | \rho_h^k)) \leq \int_{\Omega^l} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(x_1, \dots, x_l) \cdot \xi(x_i) d\lambda_{i,h}^{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_l) \quad (4.12)$$

Combining (3.5), (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12), and replacing  $\xi$  by  $-\xi$ , we find, for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \varphi_{i,h}^{k+1} \cdot \xi \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} - h \int_{\Omega} P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \operatorname{div}(\xi) + h \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{i,h}^{k+1} \cdot \xi \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

Now we claim that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ . Indeed, since  $P_i$  is controlled by  $F_i$ , (4.4) gives  $P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \in L^1(\Omega)$  and, by (4.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \operatorname{div}(\xi) \right| &\leq \left[ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla \varphi_{i,h}^k(y)|}{h} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} + \|\nabla_{x_i} c_i\|_{L^\infty} \right] \|\xi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \left[ \frac{W_2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1})}{h} + C \right] \|\xi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$



By duality, this implies  $P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) \in BV(\Omega)$  and  $\nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) = \left( -\nabla u_{i,h}^{k+1} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} - \frac{\nabla \varphi_{i,h}^{k+1}}{h} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} \right)$  in  $\mathcal{M}^n(\Omega)$ . In fact,  $P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1})$  is in  $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$  because  $\nabla u_{i,h}^{k+1} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} + \frac{\nabla \varphi_{i,h}^k}{h} \rho_{i,h}^{k+1} \in L^1(\Omega)$  and then (4.8) is proved.  $\square$

We deduce from (4.8) an  $L^1((0, T), BV(\Omega))$  estimate for  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$ .

**Corollary 4.4.** *For all  $T > 0$ , we have*

$$\|P_i(\rho_{i,h})\|_{L^1((0,T);W^{1,1}(\Omega))} \leq CT.$$

*Proof.* Integrating (4.8), we obtain

$$h \int_{\Omega} |\nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1})| \leq W_2(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}) + Ch,$$

Then summing from  $k = 0$  to  $N - 1$  and thanks to (4.5), we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h})| \leq CT.$$

We conclude thanks to (3.1) and (4.4).  $\square$

### 4.3 Convergences and proof of Theorem 3.3

#### 4.3.1 Weak and strong convergences of $\rho_{i,h}$

From the total square distance estimate (4.5), we deduce the classical  $W_2$ -convergence,

**Proposition 4.5.** *For all  $T > 0$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ , there exists  $\rho_i \in \mathcal{C}^{1/2}([0, T], \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega))$  such that, up to extraction of a discrete subsequence,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_2(\rho_{i,h}(t), \rho_i(t)) \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* The proof is classical and is a consequence of (4.5) and a refined version of Arzelà-Ascoli's Theorem [3, Proposition 3.3.1].  $\square$

In order to handle the nonlinear diffusion term, the next proposition proves strong convergence in time and space.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Up to a subsequence, for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ ,  $\rho_{i,h}$  converges strongly in  $L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$  to  $\rho_i$  and  $\nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  converges narrowly to  $\nabla P_i(\rho_i)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is now well-known. We apply an extension of Aubin-Lions Lemma proved by Rossi and Savaré [20, Theorem 2], see for example [17, 11]. Then we obtain that  $\rho_{i,h}$  converges to  $\rho_i$  strongly in  $L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$ .

It remains to prove that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  converges strongly to  $P_i(\rho_i)$  in  $L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$ . First, we know that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty((0, T), L^1(\Omega))$ , using (3.1), and thanks to Corollary 4.4, we have that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^1((0, T), W^{1,1}(\Omega))$ . Then the Sobolev embedding gives that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty((0, T), L^1(\Omega)) \cap L^1((0, T), L^{n/n-1}(\Omega))$ . We deduce that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^{(n+1)/n}((0, T) \times \Omega)$ , [11, Lemma 5.3]. This implies that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  is uniformly integrable and Vitali's convergence Theorem gives that  $P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  converges strongly to  $P_i(\rho_i)$  in  $L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$ . Then we conclude the narrow convergence of  $\nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h})$  to  $\nabla P_i(\rho_i)$  in  $\mathcal{M}^n((0, T) \times \Omega)$  thanks to Corollary 4.4.  $\square$

### 4.3.2 Convergence of $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i$ -optimal transport plans

First, let us recall some notations. Let  $\lambda_{i,h}^{k+1}$  be an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_i \left( \rho_{1,h}^k, \dots, \rho_{i-1,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1}, \rho_{i+1,h}^k, \dots, \rho_{l,h}^k \right)$  and  $\lambda_{i,h}$  the piecewise constant interpolation of  $(\lambda_{i,h}^k)_k$ , defined in (4.3).

In this section, the goal is to prove that  $\lambda_{i,h}$  converges to  $\lambda_i$ , where  $\lambda_i(t)$  is an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ ,  $t$ -a.e. To simplify the exposition, we focus on the case  $i = 1$  and the analysis is similar for  $i > 1$ . We introduce the shifted piecewise constant interpolations for all  $i \in \{2, \dots, l\}$ ,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{i,h}(t) := \rho_{i,h}^k \text{ if } t \in (hk, h(k+1)] \text{ and } \tilde{\rho}_{i,h}(0) := \rho_{i,0} \text{ if } t = 0.$$

and we denote,  $\tilde{\rho}_{1,h}$ , the  $(l-1)$ -tuple  $(\tilde{\rho}_{2,h}, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_{l,h})$  so that  $\lambda_{1,h}(t) \in \Pi(\rho_{1,h}(t), \tilde{\rho}_{1,h}(t))$ , for all  $t > 0$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *For all  $T > 0$ ,  $\lambda_{1,h}$  narrowly converges to  $\lambda_1$  in  $\mathcal{P}([0, T] \times \Omega^l)$  and  $\lambda_1(t) \in \Pi(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ ,  $t$ -a.e.*

*Proof.* Proposition 4.5 implies that  $\tilde{\rho}_{i,h}$  narrowly converges to  $\tilde{\rho}_1 := (\rho_2, \dots, \rho_l)$  in  $L^\infty([0, T], \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^{l-1})$ . Define  $\lambda_{1,h}^T := T^{-1} \lambda_{1,h}(t) \otimes dt \in \mathcal{P}([0, T] \times \Omega^l)$ . Since  $[0, T] \times \Omega^l$  is bounded, the sequence  $\lambda_{1,h}^T$  is tight then, by Prokhorov's Theorem,  $\lambda_{1,h}^T$  narrowly converges to  $\lambda_1^T$  in  $\mathcal{P}([0, T] \times \Omega^l)$ . It remains to show that  $\lambda_1^T$  can be written as  $T^{-1} \lambda_1(t) \otimes dt$ , where  $\lambda_1(t) \in \Pi(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$   $t$ -a.e. Denote  $\pi^1, \pi^{1,i}$  the projections from  $[0, T] \times \Omega^l$  to  $[0, T] \times \Omega$  and  $[0, T]$  with  $\pi^{1,i}(t, x_1, \dots, x_l) = (t, x_i)$ , and  $\pi^1(t, x_1, \dots, x_l) = t$ . Then we have  $\pi_{\#}^{1,1} \lambda_{1,h} = \rho_{1,h}(t) dt$ ,  $\pi_{\#}^{1,i} \lambda_{1,h} = \tilde{\rho}_{i,h}(t) dt$ , for  $i \neq 1$  and  $\pi_{\#}^1 \lambda_{1,h} = T^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{|[0, T]}$ . When  $h$  goes to 0, since  $\rho_{1,h}(t) dt$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_{i,h}(t) dt$  narrowly converge to  $\rho_1(t) dt$  and  $\rho_i(t) dt$ , we obtain  $\pi_{\#}^{1,i} \lambda_1 = \rho_i(t) dt$  and  $\pi_{\#}^1 \lambda_1 = T^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{|[0, T]}$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

It remains to prove that the transport plan obtained in the last Proposition 4.7,  $\lambda_1(t)$ , is optimal for  $\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ . We start establishing an approximation result for an optimal transport plan between  $\rho_1(t), \rho_2(t), \dots, \rho_l(t)$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $\bar{\lambda}_1(t)$  be an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ . There exists a sequence of transport plans  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t) \in \Pi(\rho_{1,h}(t), \tilde{\rho}_{1,h}(t))$  such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_1(\bar{\lambda}_1(t), \bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t)) \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* The proof is an adaptation of the one from [4, Lemma 6.2]. Let  $\gamma_1(t) \in \Pi(\rho_1(t), \rho_{1,h}(t))$  be the optimal transport plan for  $W_2$  and, for  $i > 1$ , let  $\tilde{\gamma}_i(t) \in \Pi(\rho_i(t), \tilde{\rho}_{i,h}(t))$  be the optimal transport plan for  $W_2$ . Let us disintegrate  $\gamma_1(t)$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_i(t)$  as  $\gamma_1(t) = \rho_1(t) \otimes \gamma_1^x(t)$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_i(t) = \tilde{\rho}_i(t) \otimes \tilde{\gamma}_i^x(t)$ . Now define  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t)$  by

$$\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t) = \int_{\Omega^l} \gamma_1^{x_1}(t) \otimes \tilde{\gamma}_2^{x_2}(t) \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\gamma}_l^{x_l}(t) d\bar{\lambda}_1(t, x_1, \dots, x_l).$$

By construction,  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t) \in \Pi(\rho_{1,h}(t), \tilde{\rho}_{1,h}(t))$ . Then we introduce  $\pi$  a transport plan between  $\bar{\lambda}_1(t)$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t)$  defined, for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega^{2l})$ , by

$$\int_{\Omega^{2l}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) d\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\Omega^l} \left( \int_{\Omega^l} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \gamma_1^{x_1}(t, dy_1) \tilde{\gamma}_2^{x_2}(t, dy_2) \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\gamma}_l^{x_l}(t, dy_l) \right) \bar{\lambda}_1(t, d\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_l)$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_l)$  are in  $\Omega^l$ . Since  $\pi \in \Pi(\bar{\lambda}_1(t), \bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t))$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(\bar{\lambda}_1(t), \bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t)) &\leq \int_{\Omega^{2l}} (|x_1 - y_1| + \sum_{i=2}^l |x_i - y_i|) d\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega^2} |x_1 - y_1| \gamma_1^{x_1}(t, dy_1) \rho_1(t, dx_1) + \sum_{i=2}^l \int_{\Omega^2} |x_i - y_i| \tilde{\gamma}_i^{x_i}(t, dy_i) \tilde{\rho}_i(t, dx_i) \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega^2} |x - y| \gamma_1(t, dx, dy) + \sum_{i=2}^l \int_{\Omega^2} |x - y| \tilde{\gamma}_i(t, dx, dy) \\
&\leq W_2^2(\rho_{1,h}(t), \rho_1(t)) + \sum_{i=2}^l W_2^2(\rho_{i,h}(t), \tilde{\rho}_i(t)).
\end{aligned}$$

Then Proposition 4.5 concludes the proof.  $\square$

From the previous Lemma, we show that  $\lambda_1(t)$  is optimal for  $\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$   $t$ -a.e in  $[0, T]$ .

**Proposition 4.9.** *For almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\lambda_1(t)$  is optimal for  $\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{\lambda}_1(t)$  be an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t))$ . First, define  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t)$  as in Lemma 4.8. Since, by definition,  $\lambda_{1,h}$  is optimal for  $\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_{1,h}, \tilde{\rho}_{1,h})$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t) \in \Pi(\rho_{1,h}, \tilde{\rho}_{1,h})$ , we have

$$\int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t, d\mathbf{x}) \geq \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_{1,h}(t, d\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_l)$ . So, for all nonnegative function  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty([0, T])$ , we get

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt \geq \int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_{1,h}(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt.$$

Since  $\Omega$  is bounded and according to Lemma 4.8,

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\lambda}_{1,h}(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\lambda}_1(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt,$$

as  $h \rightarrow 0$ . In addition, since  $\lambda_{1,h}$  narrowly converges to  $\lambda_1$  in  $\mathcal{P}([0, T] \times \Omega^l)$ , we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_{1,h}(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_1(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt.$$

And then

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\lambda}_1(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt \geq \int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_1(t, d\mathbf{x}) \varphi(t) dt.$$

The inequality holds for all nonnegative function  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty([0, T])$ , we thus obtain, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\rho_1(t), \dots, \rho_l(t)) \geq \int_{\Omega^l} c_1(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_1(t, d\mathbf{x}),$$

and the proof is concluded.  $\square$

### 4.3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

First, we show that  $(\rho_{1,h}, \dots, \rho_{l,h})$  is solution of a discrete approximation of system (3.2).

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $h > 0$ , for all  $T > 0$ , let  $N$  such that  $Nh = T$  and for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty([0, T] \times \Omega)$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_\Omega \rho_{i,h}(t, x) \partial_t \phi(t, x) dx dt &= h \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_\Omega \nabla P_i(\rho_{i,h}^{k+1}(x)) \cdot \nabla \phi(t_k, x) dx \\ &+ h \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Omega^l} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla \phi(t_k, x_i) d\lambda_{i,h}^{k+1}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \mathcal{R}[\phi(t_k, \cdot)](x, y) d\gamma_{i,h}^{k+1}(x, y) \\ &- \int_\Omega \rho_{i,0}(x) \phi(0, x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with, for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$|\mathcal{R}[\phi](x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|D^2 \phi\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \Omega)} |x - y|^2,$$

$\gamma_{i,h}^{k+1}$  is an optimal transport plan in  $\Gamma(\rho_{i,h}^k, \rho_{i,h}^{k+1})$ .

*Proof.* This is a consequence of (4.8) (see [1, 17]).  $\square$

Now, we have to take the limit in the system of Proposition 4.10. The linear term (with time derivative) and the diffusion term converge to the desired result thanks to Proposition 4.6. The remainder term goes to 0 as  $h$  goes to 0 because of (4.5). So it remains to check the convergence of multi-marginal interaction terms. By Proposition 4.7,  $\lambda_{i,h}$  converges to  $\lambda_i$  in  $\mathcal{P}([0, T] \times \Omega^l)$  and then,

$$h \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Omega^l} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla \phi(t_k, x_i) d\lambda_{i,h}^{k+1}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\Omega^l} \nabla_{x_i} c_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla \phi(t, x_i) d\lambda_i(t, \mathbf{x}) dt.$$

and, by Proposition 4.9,  $\lambda_i(t)$  is an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_i(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l)$ .

## 5 Uniqueness in dimension one

In this section,  $\Omega$  is a compact convex subset in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We give an uniqueness result based on a displacement convexity argument and some examples of functionals satisfying this condition. Although Theorem 5.7 holds in dimension higher than one, we restrict ourselves to the dimension one because as far as we know, there is no example of multi-marginal functional geodesically convex in higher dimension.

### 5.1 Displacement convexity in product Wasserstein space

For the purpose of this paper, it is enough to restrict ourselves to absolutely continuous probability measures. Given  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  in  $\mathcal{P}^{ac}(\Omega)$ , there exists a unique optimal transport map  $T$  between  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  i.e  $T\# \rho_0 = \rho_1$  and

$$W_2^2(\rho_0, \rho_1) = \int_\Omega |x - T(x)|^2 \rho_0(x) dx.$$

In addition,  $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is a nondecreasing map.

The Wasserstein geodesic between  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  is the curve  $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \rho_t$  given by the McCann's interpolation

$$\rho_t := T^t \# \rho_0,$$

where  $T^t = (1-t)Id + tT$  is the optimal transport map between  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_t$ , and  $\rho_t$  is a constant speed geodesic:

$$W_2(\rho_t, \rho_s) = |t - s|W_2(\rho_0, \rho_1).$$

Now we recall the definition of geodesically convex functional in Wasserstein product space.

**Definition 5.1.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . A functional  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{P}(\Omega)^l \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is said  $\lambda$ -geodesically convex in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)^l$  if for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, l \rrbracket$  and for every couple  $(\mu_i^0, \mu_i^1) \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)^2$*

$$\mathcal{W}(\mu_1^t, \dots, \mu_l^t) \leq (1-t)\mathcal{W}(\mu_1^0, \dots, \mu_l^0) + t\mathcal{W}(\mu_1^1, \dots, \mu_l^1) - \frac{\lambda}{2}t(1-t)\mathbf{W}_2^2((\mu_1^0, \dots, \mu_l^0), (\mu_1^1, \dots, \mu_l^1)),$$

where  $\mu_i^t$  is a constant speed geodesic between  $\mu_i^0$  and  $\mu_i^1$  and  $\mathbf{W}_2$  is the product distance on  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)^l$ .

Note that if  $F : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies McCann's condition i.e. the map

$$r \in (0, +\infty) \mapsto r^n F(r^{-n}) \text{ is convex nonincreasing,} \quad (5.1)$$

then it is well-known that

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} F(\rho) & \text{if } F(\rho) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is geodesically convex ( $\lambda = 0$ ), see [18].

In the following we give a class of multi-marginal functionals geodesically convex. First, we provide a characterization of the co-monotone transport plan as in [24, Lemma 2.8].

**Lemma 5.2.** *For  $l \geq 2$ , let  $\gamma$  be a transport plan having  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l$  as marginals. If  $\gamma$  satisfies the property*

$$(x_1, \dots, x_l), (y_1, \dots, y_l) \in \text{supp } \gamma \Rightarrow [x_1 < y_1 \Rightarrow \forall i, x_i \leq y_i], \quad (5.2)$$

then  $\gamma = \gamma_{mon} := (G_1^{[-1]}, \dots, G_l^{[-1]}) \# \mathcal{L}_{[0,1]}^1$ , where  $G_i^{[-1]}$  is the pseudo-inverse of the cumulative distribution function of  $\rho_i$ ,  $G_i(a) = \rho_i((-\infty, a])$ .

*Proof.* This lemma is an extension of [24, Lemma 2.8] (where the case  $l = 2$  is studied) and the proof is similar. First, for all  $a_1, \dots, a_l \in \mathbb{R}$ , we know that  $\gamma_{mon}((-\infty, a_1] \times \dots \times (-\infty, a_l]) = \min_i G_i(a_i)$ . Indeed, by definition of  $\gamma_{mon} \in \Pi(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{mon}((-\infty, a_1] \times \dots \times (-\infty, a_l]) &= \left| \{x \in [0, 1] : \forall i, G_i^{[-1]}(x) \leq a_i\} \right| \\ &= \left| \{x \in [0, 1] : \forall i, x \leq G_i(a_i)\} \right| \\ &= \min_i G_i(a_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since the knowledge of  $\gamma((-\infty, a_1] \times \dots \times (-\infty, a_l])$ , for all  $a_1, \dots, a_l \in \mathbb{R}$  is enough to characterize  $\gamma$ , we just need to show that

$$\gamma((-\infty, a_1] \times \dots \times (-\infty, a_l]) = \min_i G_i(a_i),$$

to conclude the proof. Define for all  $i$ , the set  $A_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} [a_j, +\infty) \times (-\infty, a_i] \times \prod_{j=i+1}^l [a_j, +\infty)$ . Since  $\gamma$  satisfies (5.2), for all  $i \neq j$  we cannot have both  $\gamma(A_i) > 0$  and  $\gamma(A_j) > 0$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma((-\infty, a_1] \times \cdots \times (-\infty, a_l]) &= \min_i \gamma((-\infty, a_1] \times \cdots \times (-\infty, a_l] \cup A_i) \\ &= \min_i \gamma(\mathbb{R} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, a_i] \times \mathbb{R} \cdots \times \mathbb{R}) \\ &= \min_i \rho_i((-\infty, a_i]) \\ &= \min_i G_i(a_i). \end{aligned}$$

□

This lemma allows us to study the geodesic convexity of multi-marginal functionals for a large class of costs.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $c : \Omega^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\mathcal{C}^2$  convex function satisfying  $\partial_{i,j} c \leq 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ . The functional  $\mathcal{W}_c : \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by*

$$\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega^l} c(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\gamma(x_1, \dots, x_l) : \gamma \in \Pi(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l) \right\},$$

is geodesically convex in  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l$ .

*Proof.* Given  $(\rho_1^0, \dots, \rho_l^0)$  and  $(\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_l^1)$  in  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l$ , define the constant speed geodesic between  $\rho_i^0$  and  $\rho_i^1$ ,  $\rho_i^t = T_{i\#}^t \rho_i^0$ . Let  $\gamma_0$  be an optimal transport plan for the multi-marginal problem  $\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^0, \dots, \rho_l^0)$ . By [8, Theorem 4.1], there exist  $l-1$  nondecreasing maps  $S_2, \dots, S_l$  such that  $\gamma_0 = (Id, S_2, \dots, S_l)_{\#} \rho_1^0$ .

Define the interpolation plan  $\gamma_t$  by

$$\gamma_t = (T_1^t, \dots, T_l^t)_{\#} \gamma_0 = (T_1^t, T_2^t \circ S_2, \dots, T_l^t \circ S_l)_{\#} \rho_1^0.$$

Observe that  $\gamma_1 = (T_1, T_2 \circ S_2, \dots, T_l \circ S_l)_{\#} \rho_1^0$  and since  $T_1$  and for all  $i \geq 2$ ,  $T_i \circ S_i$  are nondecreasing maps,  $\gamma_1$  satisfies (5.2). We want to show that  $\gamma_1$  is an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_l^1)$ . Theorem 4.1 from [8] says that the optimal transport plan  $\gamma_{\text{opt}}$  of  $\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_l^1)$  is of the form  $\gamma_{\text{opt}} = (Id, \tilde{S}_2, \dots, \tilde{S}_l)_{\#} \rho_1^1$ , where  $\tilde{S}_i$  is nondecreasing. Then  $\gamma_{\text{opt}}$  also satisfies (5.2) and then by Lemma 5.2, we conclude that  $\gamma_1$  is an optimal transport plan for  $\mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_l^1)$ .

By convexity of  $c$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^t, \dots, \rho_l^t) &\leq \int_{\Omega^l} c(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\gamma_t \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega^l} c(T_1^t(x_1), \dots, T_l^t(x_l)) d\gamma_0 \\ &\leq (1-t) \int_{\Omega^l} c(x_1, \dots, x_l) d\gamma_0 + t \int_{\Omega^l} c(T_1(x_1), \dots, T_l(x_l)) d\gamma_0 \\ &\leq (1-t) \mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^0, \dots, \rho_l^0) + t \mathcal{W}_c(\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_l^1), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. □

**Remark 5.4.** *This result cannot be generalized in higher dimension. Indeed, in dimension  $n > 1$ , it is well known that  $W_2(\cdot, \sigma)$  is not  $\lambda$ -convex along geodesic on  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  (see example 9.1.5 from [3]).*

## 5.2 Wasserstein contraction

First, let us define the Fréchet subdifferential for  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  by extending the definition given in [3].

**Definition 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be a functional and let  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_l) \in L^2((\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l), \Omega)$ , i.e*

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} |\xi_i|^2 \mu_i < +\infty.$$

*We say that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  is in the Fréchet subdifferential  $\partial\mathcal{W}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$  if*

$$\liminf_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}} \frac{\mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) - \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} \langle \xi_i(x), T_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}(x) - x \rangle \mu_i(x) dx}{\mathbf{W}_2(\boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\mu})} \geq 0, \quad (5.3)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$  and  $T_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}$  is the optimal transport map between  $\mu_i$  and  $\nu_i$ .

The next proposition characterizes the subdifferential of  $\lambda$ -geodesically convex functionals.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be a  $\lambda$ -geodesically convex functional. Then a vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Omega)$  belongs to the Fréchet subdifferential of  $\mathcal{W}$  at  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  if and only if*

$$\mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) - \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} \langle \xi_i(x), T_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}(x) - x \rangle \mu_i(x) dx + \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbf{W}_2^2(\boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (5.4)$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)^l$ . Moreover, if  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \partial\mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \partial\mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu})$  then

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} \langle \xi_i(x) - \kappa_i(T_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}(x)), T_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}(x) - x \rangle \mu_i(x) dx \leq -\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}). \quad (5.5)$$

*Proof.* The proof is the same as in the characterization by Variational inequalities and monotonicity done in [3] p. 231. □

We can now prove the following uniqueness result.

**Theorem 5.7.** *Assume  $F_i$  satisfies (5.1) and  $\mathcal{W}_i$  is a  $\lambda_i$ -geodesically convex functional. Let  $\boldsymbol{\rho}^1 := (\rho_1^1, \dots, \rho_l^1)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\rho}^2 := (\rho_1^2, \dots, \rho_l^2)$ , in  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(\Omega)$ , two weak solutions of (3.2) with initial conditions  $\rho_i^1(0, \cdot) = \rho_{i,0}^1$  and  $\rho_i^2(0, \cdot) = \rho_{i,0}^2$ . If for all  $T < +\infty$ ,*

$$\int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^l \|v_{i,t}^1\|_{L^2(\rho_{i,t}^1)} dt + \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^l \|v_{i,t}^2\|_{L^2(\rho_{i,t}^2)} dt < +\infty, \quad (5.6)$$

with, for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ,

$$v_{i,t}^j := -\nabla F_i'(\rho_{i,t}^j) - \nabla u_i^j,$$

then for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\mathbf{W}_2^2(\boldsymbol{\rho}_t^1, \boldsymbol{\rho}_t^2) \leq e^{-(2\sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i)t} \mathbf{W}_2^2(\boldsymbol{\rho}_0^1, \boldsymbol{\rho}_0^2),$$

*Proof.* Using Theorem 5.24, Corollary 5.25 from [24] and assumption (5.6), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{2} W_2^2(\rho_{i,t}^1, \rho_{i,t}^2) \right) = \int_{\Omega} \langle x - T_i^t(x), v_{i,t}^1(x) - v_{i,t}^2(T_i^t(x)) \rangle \rho_i^1(x) dx,$$

where  $T_i^t$  is the optimal transport map between  $\rho_{i,t}^1$  and  $\rho_{i,t}^2$ . Since  $F_i$  satisfies McCann's condition, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle x - T_i^t(x), \nabla F_i'(\rho_{i,t}^2(T_i^t(x))) - \nabla F_i'(\rho_{i,t}^1(x)) \rangle \rho_{i,t}^1(x) dx \leq 0.$$

In addition,  $W_i$  is  $\lambda_i$ -geodesically convex then (5.5) gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla u_{i,t}^1(x) - \nabla u_{i,t}^2(T_i^t(x)), T_i^t(x) - x \rangle \rho_{i,t}^1(x) dx \leq - \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i W_2^2(\rho_t^1, \rho_t^2).$$

Summing over  $i$  and combining these inequalities, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} (W_2^2(\rho_t^1, \rho_t^2)) \leq - \left( 2 \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i \right) W_2^2(\rho_t^1, \rho_t^2).$$

Gronwall's Lemma concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 5.8.** Assumption (5.6) in Theorem 5.7 is made to ensure the absolute continuity of  $W_2(\rho_{i,t}^1, \rho_{i,t}^2)$  and can be checked using (4.8) (see for example [17, Proposition 7.3]).

## References

- [1] M. Agueh. Existence of solutions to degenerate parabolic equations via the Monge-Kantorovich theory. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 10(3):309–360, 2005.
- [2] M. Agueh and G. Carlier. Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(2):904–924, 2011.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [4] J.-B. Baillon and G. Carlier. From discrete to continuous Wardrop equilibria. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 7(2):219–241, 2012.
- [5] Y. Brenier. Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 44(4):375–417, 1991.
- [6] G. Buttazzo and F. Santambrogio. A model for the optimal planning of an urban area. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 37(2):514–530, 2005.
- [7] G. Buttazzo and F. Santambrogio. A mass transportation model for the optimal planning of an urban region. *SIAM Rev.*, 51(3):593–610, 2009.
- [8] G. Carlier. On a class of multidimensional optimal transportation problems. *J. Convex Anal.*, 10(2):517–529, 2003.



- [9] G. Carlier and I. Ekeland. The structure of cities. *J. Global Optim.*, 29(4):371–376, 2004.
- [10] G. Carlier and I. Ekeland. Equilibrium structure of a bidimensional asymmetric city. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 8(3):725–748, 2007.
- [11] G. Carlier and M. Laborde. A splitting method for nonlinear diffusions with nonlocal, nonpotential drifts. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 150:1 – 18, 2017.
- [12] G. Carlier and F. Santambrogio. A variational model for urban planning with traffic congestion. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 11(4):595–613, 2005.
- [13] M. Di Francesco and S. Fagioli. Measure solutions for non-local interaction PDEs with two species. *Nonlinearity*, 26(10):2777–2808, 2013.
- [14] S. Di Marino, A. Gerolin, and L. Nenna. Optimal transportation theory with repulsive costs. In *Topological optimization and optimal transport*, volume 17 of *Radon Ser. Comput. Appl. Math.*, pages 204–256. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2017.
- [15] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- [16] D. Kinderlehrer, L. Monsaingeon, and X. Xu. A Wasserstein gradient flow approach to Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 23(1):137–164, 2017.
- [17] M. Laborde. On some nonlinear evolution systems which are perturbations of Wasserstein gradient flows. In *Topological optimization and optimal transport*, volume 17 of *Radon Ser. Comput. Appl. Math.*, pages 304–332. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2017.
- [18] R. J. McCann. A convexity principle for interacting gases. *Adv. Math.*, 128(1):153–179, 1997.
- [19] B. Pass. Multi-marginal optimal transport: theory and applications. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 49(6):1771–1790, 2015.
- [20] R. Rossi and G. Savaré. Tightness, integral equicontinuity and compactness for evolution problems in Banach spaces. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 2, 2003.
- [21] F. Santambrogio. Transport and concentration problems with interaction effects. *J. Global Optim.*, 38(1):129–141, 2007.
- [22] F. Santambrogio. *Variational problems in transport theory with mass concentration*, volume 4 of *Tesi. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Series) [Theses of Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)]*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2007. Dissertation, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 2006.
- [23] F. Santambrogio. Models and applications of optimal transport in economics, traffic, and urban planning. In *Optimal transportation*, volume 413 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 22–40. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [24] F. Santambrogio. *Optimal Transport for Applied Mathematicians*. Progress in Non-linear Differential Equations and Their Applications 87. Birkasuser Verlag, Basel, 2015.

- [25] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [26] C. Villani. *Optimal transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.