

An Infinite-dimensional McKean-Vlasov Stochastic Equation

NILS DETERING * JEAN-PIERRE FOUQUE † TOMOYUKI ICHIBA ‡

December 3, 2024

Abstract

We consider large linear systems of interacting diffusions and their convergence, as the number of diffusions goes to infinity. Our limiting results contain two complementary scenarios, (i) a mean-field interaction where propagation of chaos takes place, and (ii) a local chain interaction where neighboring components are highly dependent. We describe them by an infinite-dimensional, nonlinear stochastic differential equation of McKean-Vlasov type. Furthermore, we determine a dichotomy of presence or absence of mean-field interaction, and we discuss the problem of detecting its presence from the observation of a single component process.

Key Words and Phrases: Interacting stochastic processes, stochastic equation with constraints, law of large numbers, particle system approximation, detecting mean-field.

AMS 2010 Subject Classifications: Primary 60H10; secondary 60K35

1 Introduction

Let us consider a linear torus directed graph (or directed network) of vertices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ in the sense that each node i in the network connects only with its neighboring vertex $i+1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, and the boundary vertex n connects with vertex 1. On some probability space, we consider a process $X_{t,i}$ and a Brownian motion $W_{t,i}$, $t \geq 0$ at each vertex i defined by the simple Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type system (or a Gaussian cascade)

$$\begin{aligned} dX_{t,i} &= (X_{t,i+1} - X_{t,i})dt + dW_{t,i}; \quad t \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ dX_{t,n} &= (X_{t,1} - X_{t,n})dt + dW_{t,n} \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

with initial independent and identically distributed random variables $X_{0,i}$, independent of $(W_{\cdot,i})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. We assume that these Brownian motions $(W_{\cdot,i})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ are independent for now.

We view $(X_{\cdot,1}, \dots, X_{\cdot,n})$ as an interacting particle system through the graph. Let us call such interaction a *chain* interaction. Intuitively, because of the mean-reverting feature of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type drifts, the particle $X_{\cdot,i}$ at vertex i in (1.1) tends to be close to the neighboring particle $X_{\cdot,i+1}$ *locally*.

* Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, South Hall, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA (E-mail: detering@pstat.ucsb.edu)

† Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, South Hall, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA (E-mail: fouque@pstat.ucsb.edu).

‡ Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, South Hall, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA (E-mail: ichiba@pstat.ucsb.edu).

For comparison, on the same probability space, we also consider a typical mean-field interacting system where each particle is attracted towards the mean, defined by

$$dX_{t,i} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_{t,j} - X_{t,i} \right) dt + dW_{t,i}; \quad t \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1.2)$$

The particle $X_{t,i}$ at node i is *directly* attracted towards the mean $(X_{t,1} + \dots + X_{t,n})/n$ of the system. This model has been considered in Carmona, Fouque & Sun (2015) as a Nash equilibrium of a stochastic game in the context of financial systemic risk.

Questions. What is the essential difference between the system (1.1) and (1.2) for large n ? Can we detect the type of interaction from the particle behavior at one node?

To answer these questions, in this paper, we shall examine the difference between (1.1) and (1.2) for large interacting particle systems. Let us introduce a mixed system of linear equations:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_{t,i} &= \left(u \cdot X_{t,i+1} + (1-u) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_{t,j} - X_{t,i} \right) dt + dW_{t,i}; \quad t \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1 \\ dX_{t,n} &= \left(u \cdot X_{t,1} + (1-u) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_{t,j} - X_{t,n} \right) dt + dW_{t,n} \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

with the initial random variables $X_{0,i}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and for fixed $u \in [0, 1]$. If $u = 0$, (1.3) becomes (1.1), while if $u = 1$, (1.3) becomes (1.2). In the following, we shall observe that the limit of such a system (or a slight generalization of) (1.3) converges to a system of nonlinear equations, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and then we will examine the difference between the case $u = 0$ and $u = 1$. The limit becomes an infinite-dimensional extension of the famous McKean-Vlasov stochastic equation.

Motivation of our study is to understand effects of graph (network) structure on the stochastic system of interacting diffusions. The interacting diffusions have been studied in various contexts: nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equations, propagation of chaos results, large deviation results, stochastic control problems in the large infinite particle systems, and their applications to Probability and Mathematical Physics, and more recently to Mathematical Economics and Finance in the context of the mean-field games. One of the advantages of introducing the mean-field dependence and the corresponding limits is to obtain a clear description of the complicated system, in terms of the representative particle, by the law of large numbers. It often comes with the propagation of chaos, and then consequently the local dependence in the original system disappears in the limit. Here, we present a simple idea to consider the system (1.3) (or its slight generalization) and attempt to describe both mean-field and local dependence in the interacting particles.

In section 2 we discuss existence and uniqueness of solution to an infinite-dimensional McKean-Vlasov stochastic equation (2.1) of a pair of interacting stochastic processes with distributional constraints (2.3). In section 3 we propose a particle approximation of the solution to (2.1), we provide a simple estimate in Proposition 3.2, and we study the convergence of joint empirical measures (3.6) and an integral equation (3.8) with (3.9) for the limiting joint distribution in Proposition 3.1. Consequently, we see that the adjacent two particles in the limit of interacting particle systems of type (1.3) can be described by the solution of the infinite-dimensional equation (2.1) under some assumptions. In section 4, coming back to the linear case as a case study, we describe a connection to the infinite-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, we examine the corresponding Gaussian processes under presence or absence of the mean-field interaction, and consequently, we discuss a problem of detecting the mean-field interaction, where we shall answer the above questions and propose further questions. Appendix includes some technical proofs.

2 An infinite-dimensional McKean-Vlasov stochastic equation

On a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$, given a constant $u \in [0, 1]$ and a measurable functional $b : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let us consider a non-linear diffusion pair $(X_t^{(u)}, \tilde{X}_t^{(u)})$, $t \geq 0$, described by the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t^{(u)} = b(t, X_t^{(u)}, F_t^{(u)}) dt + dB_t; \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

driven by a Brownian motion $(B_t, t \geq 0)$, where $F_t^{(u)}$ is the weighted probability measure

$$F_t^{(u)}(\cdot) := u \cdot \delta_{\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}}(\cdot) + (1 - u) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{X_t^{(u)}}(\cdot) \quad (2.2)$$

of the Dirac measure $\delta_{\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}}(\cdot)$ of $\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}$ and the law $\mathcal{L}_{X_t^{(u)}} = \text{Law}(X_t^{(u)})$ of $X_t^{(u)}$ with corresponding weights $(u, 1 - u)$ for $t \geq 0$. We shall assume that the law of $X_t^{(u)}$ is identical to that of $\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}$, and $\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}$ is independent of the Brownian motion, i.e.,

$$\text{Law}((X_t^{(u)}, t \geq 0)) \equiv \text{Law}((\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}, t \geq 0)) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}, t \geq 0) \perp\!\!\!\perp \sigma(B_t, t \geq 0). \quad (2.3)$$

Let us also assume that the Brownian motion B is independent of the initial value $(X_0^{(u)}, \tilde{X}_0^{(u)})$.

Here $\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}$ is a copy of $X_t^{(u)}$ but not necessarily independent of $X_t^{(u)}$. They can be independent when $u = 0$, as in Remark 2.1 below. Rather, we are interested in the joint law of the pair $(X_t^{(u)}, \tilde{X}_t^{(u)})$ which satisfies (2.1) and is generated from Brownian motion(s) in a non-linear way through their probability law for each $u \in [0, 1]$. The description (2.1) with the constraints (2.2)-(2.3) has an infinite-dimensional feature, because of non-trivial dependence between the unknown continuous processes $\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}$ and $X_t^{(u)}$ for $u \in (0, 1]$.

We shall call (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3) an infinite-dimensional McKean-Vlasov stochastic equation. Let us denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ (and $\mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$, respectively) the family of probability measures on \mathbb{R} (and $C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, respectively). Our following existence and uniqueness result relies on some standard assumptions to simplify the presentation.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that $b : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz, in the sense that there exists a measurable function $\tilde{b} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that b is represented as*

$$b(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(t, x, y) \mu(dy); \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}), \quad (2.4)$$

and for every $T > 0$ there exists a constant $C_T > 0$ such that

$$|\tilde{b}(t, x_1, y_1) - \tilde{b}(t, x_1, y_2)| \leq C_T(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2|); \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.5)$$

With the same constant C_T , let us also assume that \tilde{b} is of linear growth, i.e.,

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |\tilde{b}(s, x, y)| \leq C_T(|x| + |y|); \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

Then, for each $u \in [0, 1]$ there exists a weak solution $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$, $(X_t^{(u)}, \tilde{X}_t^{(u)}, B_t)$ to the infinite-dimensional McKean-Vlasov equation (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3). This solution is unique in law.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. First, let us assume the boundedness of the drift coefficients, i.e.,

$$|\tilde{b}(t, x_1, y_1) - \tilde{b}(t, x_1, y_2)| \leq C_T(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2| \wedge 1); \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.7)$$

in order to simplify our proof. We shall evaluate the Wasserstein distance $D_T(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ between two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on the space $C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ of continuous functions, namely

$$D_t(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \inf \left\{ \int \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_s(\omega_1) - X_s(\omega_2)| \wedge 1 \right) d\mu(\omega_1, \omega_2) \right\} \quad (2.8)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$, where the infimum is taken over all the joint distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$ such that their marginal distributions are μ_1 and μ_2 , respectively, that is,

$$\text{Law}(X_s(\omega_i), 0 \leq s \leq T) = \mu_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Law}(X_s(\omega_1), X_s(\omega_2), 0 \leq s \leq T) = \mu.$$

Here $X_s(\omega) = \omega(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq T$ is the coordinate map of $\omega \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$. $D_T(\cdot, \cdot)$ defines a complete metric on $\mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$, which gives the topology of weak convergence to it.

Given a probability measure $m \in \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$ and the canonical process \tilde{X}^m of the law m , let us consider a map $\Phi : \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R})) \mapsto \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$\Phi(m) := \text{Law}(X_t^m, 0 \leq t \leq T), \quad (2.9)$$

where on a given filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, given a fixed Brownian motion B . on it, X^m is defined from a solution (X^m, \tilde{X}^m) of the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t^m = b(t, X_t^m, u \delta_{\tilde{X}_t^m} + (1-u)m_t)dt + dB_t; \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \quad (2.10)$$

That is, under the probability measure \mathbb{P} , X^m is an (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted process and the associated (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted process \tilde{X}^m has the law

$$m = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_t^m, 0 \leq t \leq T) \quad \text{with} \quad \text{Law}(X_0^m) = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_0^m).$$

Here m_t in (2.10) is the marginal distribution of \tilde{X}_t^m for $t \geq 0$. Assume B . is independent of the σ -field $\sigma(\tilde{X}_t^m, 0 \leq t \leq T) \vee \sigma(X_0^m)$.

Thanks to the theory (e.g., Karatzas & Shreve (1991)) of stochastic differential equation with Lipschitz condition (2.5) and the growth condition (2.6), a solution X^m of (2.10) exists, given the probability measure $m \in \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$ and the associated canonical process \tilde{X}^m of the law m , hence the map Φ is defined. Indeed, the solution X^m in (2.10) can be given as a functional of m , \tilde{X}^m and B ., i.e., there exists a functional $\Phi : [0, T] \times \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R})) \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$X_t^m = \Phi(t, (m), (\tilde{X}^m), (B)); \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (2.11)$$

where the value X_t^m at t is determined by the restrictions $(m_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$, $(\tilde{X}_s^m)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$, $(B_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ of elements on $[0, t]$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$. Note that here the filtration generated by \tilde{X}^m is not the Brownian filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^B)_{t \geq 0}$ generated by the fixed Brownian motion B . but we assume it is independent of $(\mathcal{F}_t^B)_{t \geq 0}$. Thus, we cannot expect the solution pair (X^m, \tilde{X}^m) to be a strong solution with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^B)_{t \geq 0}$.

We shall find a fixed point m^* of this map Φ in (2.9), i.e., $\Phi(m^*) = m^*$ to show the uniqueness of solution to (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3) in the sense of probability law.

For $m_i \in \mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$, $i = 1, 2$, on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and a fixed Brownian motion B . on it, let us consider $\Phi(m_i) = \text{Law}(X_t^{m_i}, 0 \leq t \leq T)$ in (2.9), where $(X^{m_i}, \tilde{X}^{m_i})$ that satisfies $m_i = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_t^{m_i}, 0 \leq t \leq T)$ and

$$X_t^{m_i} = X_0^{m_i} + \int_0^t b(s, X_s^{m_i}, u \delta_{\tilde{X}_s^{m_i}} + (1-u)m_{i,t}) dt + dB_t; \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

We also assume that the initial points are the same, i.e., $X_0^{m_1} = X_0^{m_2}$, $\tilde{X}_0^{m_1} = \tilde{X}_0^{m_2}$ almost surely, and $\text{Law}(X_0^{m_1}, X_0^{m_2}) = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_0^{m_1}, \tilde{X}_0^{m_2})$.

Then, by the form (2.4) of b with the Lipschitz property (2.5) and the standard technique (see e.g., Sznitman (1991)) we obtain the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |X_s^{m_1} - X_s^{m_2}| &\leq \int_0^s |b(v, X_v^{m_1}, u \delta_{\tilde{X}_v^{m_1}} + (1-u)m_{1,v}) - b(v, X_v^{m_2}, u \delta_{\tilde{X}_v^{m_2}} + (1-u)m_{2,v})| dv \\ &= \int_0^s \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_1}, y) (u \delta_{\tilde{X}_v^{m_1}}(dy) + (1-u)m_{1,v}(dy)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y) (u \delta_{\tilde{X}_v^{m_2}}(dy) + (1-u)m_{2,v}(dy)) \right| dv \\ &\leq u \int_0^s \left| \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_1}, \tilde{X}_v^{m_1}) - \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, \tilde{X}_v^{m_2}) \right| dv \\ &\quad + (1-u) \int_0^s \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_1}, y) m_{1,v}(dy) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y) m_{2,v}(dy) \right| dv, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where we evaluate the convex combination of the first term

$$\int_0^s \left| \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_1}, \tilde{X}_v^{m_1}) - \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, \tilde{X}_v^{m_2}) \right| dv \leq C_T \left(\int_0^s (|X_v^{m_1} - X_v^{m_2}| + |\tilde{X}_v^{m_1} - \tilde{X}_v^{m_2}|) \wedge 1) dv \right) \quad (2.13)$$

for every $0 \leq s \leq T$, and the second term with the integrand

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_1}, y) m_{1,v}(dy) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y) m_{2,v}(dy) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_1}, y) - \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y)) m_{1,v}(dy) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, z) m_{1,v}(dz) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y) m_{2,v}(dy) \right| \\ &\leq C_T (|X_v^{m_1} - X_v^{m_2}| \wedge 1) + C_T D_v(m_1, m_2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where $D_v(m_1, m_2)$ is the Wasserstein distance between m_1 and m_2 in $[0, v]$ for $0 \leq v \leq T$. Here note that in the last equality of (2.14), we used (2.7) and an almost-sure inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, z) m_{1,v}(dz) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y) m_{2,v}(dy) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}^{1,2} [\tilde{b}(v, x, \omega_1) - \tilde{b}(v, x, \omega_2)] \Big|_{\{x=X_v^{m_2}\}} \right| \leq C_T \mathbb{E}^{1,2} [|\omega_{1,v} - \omega_{2,v}| \wedge 1], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}^{1,2}$ is an expectation under a joint distribution of $(\omega_{1,v}, \omega_{2,v})$ with fixed marginals $m_{1,v}$ and $m_{2,v}$ for every $0 \leq v \leq T$. Here, since the expectation on the left of \leq only depends on the marginals, taking the infimum on the right of \leq over all the joint distributions with fixed marginals $m_{1,v}$ and $m_{2,v}$, we obtained the last inequality in (2.14) from

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, z) m_{1,v}(dz) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(v, X_v^{m_2}, y) m_{2,v}(dy) \right| \leq C_T D_v(m_1, m_2); \quad 0 \leq v \leq T.$$

Combining (2.12)-(2.14) and taking the supremum over $s \in [0, t]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_s^{m_1} - X_s^{m_2}| \wedge 1 &\leq C_T \int_0^t (|X_v^{m_1} - X_v^{m_2}| \wedge 1) dv + C_T \int_0^t (u(|\tilde{X}_v^{m_1} - \tilde{X}_v^{m_2}| \wedge 1) + (1-u)D_v(m_1, m_2)) dv \\ &\leq C_T \int_0^t (\sup_{0 \leq s \leq v} |X_s^{m_1} - X_s^{m_2}| \wedge 1) dv + C_T \int_0^t (u(|\tilde{X}_v^{m_1} - \tilde{X}_v^{m_2}| \wedge 1) + (1-u)D_v(m_1, m_2)) dv \end{aligned}$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. Applying Gronwall's lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_s^{m_1} - X_s^{m_2}| \wedge 1 &\leq C_T e^{C_T T} \int_0^t (u(|\tilde{X}_v^{m_1} - \tilde{X}_v^{m_2}| \wedge 1) + (1-u)D_v(m_1, m_2)) dv \\ &\leq C_T e^{C_T T} \int_0^t (u(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq v} |\tilde{X}_s^{m_1} - \tilde{X}_s^{m_2}| \wedge 1) + (1-u)D_v(m_1, m_2)) dv \end{aligned}$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. Taking expectations of both sides and taking the infimum over all the joint measures with marginals (m_1, m_2) , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_t(\Phi(m_1), \Phi(m_2)) &\leq C_T e^{C_T T} \int_0^t (uD_v(m_1, m_2) + (1-u)D_v(m_1, m_2)) dv \\ &= C_T e^{C_T T} \int_0^t D_v(m_1, m_2) dv \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. Note that the upper bound in (2.15) is uniform over $u \in [0, 1]$.

For every $m \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, iterating (2.15) and the map Φ , k times, we observe the inequality

$$D_T(\Phi^{(k+1)}(m), \Phi^{(k)}(m)) \leq \frac{(C_T T e^{C_T T})^k}{k!} \cdot D_T(\Phi(m), m); \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{2.16}$$

and hence, we claim $\{\Phi^{(k)}(m), k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ forms a Cauchy sequence converging to a fixed point $m^* = \Phi(m^*)$ of Φ on $\mathcal{M}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$. This fixed point $m^*(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot)$ is a weak solution to (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3). It is unique in the sense of probability distribution. To relax the condition (2.7) and to show the result under the weaker condition (2.5), we divide the time interval $[0, T]$ into time-intervals of short length and establish the uniqueness in the short time intervals, and then piece the unique solution together to get the global uniqueness by the standard method. \square

Remark 2.1. In Proposition 2.1 the processes $(X^{(u)}, \tilde{X}^{(u)})$, $u \in [0, 1]$ form a class of diffusions which contains two *extreme* cases $u = 0, 1$:

- When $u = 0$, we set $(X^\bullet, \tilde{X}^\bullet) := (X^{(0)}, \tilde{X}^{(0)})$ and distinguish it from other cases. X^\bullet satisfies a McKean-Vlasov diffusion equation

$$dX_t^\bullet = b(t, X_t^\bullet, \mathcal{L}_{X_t^\bullet}) dt + dB_t; \quad t \geq 0, \tag{2.17}$$

and the corresponding copy \tilde{X}^\bullet is not appearing, that is, we may take $\tilde{X}^\bullet - \tilde{X}_0^\bullet$ independent of $X^\bullet - X_0^\bullet$ because of the solvability of (2.17) and the restriction (2.3). In particular, if \tilde{X}_0^\bullet is independent of X_0^\bullet , then \tilde{X}^\bullet is independent of X^\bullet .

- When $u = 1$, we set $(X^\dagger, \tilde{X}^\dagger) := (X^{(1)}, \tilde{X}^{(1)})$. The pair satisfies a stochastic equation

$$dX_t^\dagger = b(t, X_t^\dagger, \delta_{\tilde{X}_t^\dagger}) dt + dB_t; \quad t \geq 0, \tag{2.18}$$

where \tilde{X}^\dagger has the same law as X^\dagger , independent of Brownian motion, i.e., $\text{Law}(X^\dagger) = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}^\dagger)$ and $\sigma(\tilde{X}_t^\dagger, t \geq 0) \perp\!\!\!\perp \sigma(B_t, t \geq 0)$. The corresponding non-linear contribution from the law $\text{Law}(X^\dagger)$ of X^\dagger disappears from (2.18). \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let us assume that the function \tilde{b} in (2.4) also satisfies the linear growth condition (2.6). Assume also $\mathbb{E}[|X_0|] < \infty$. Then, there exists a constant $c(> 0)$, such that the solution (X, \tilde{X}) , given in Proposition 2.1, satisfies for every $T > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t|\right] \leq (\mathbb{E}[|X_0|] + c)e^{cT}. \quad (2.19)$$

Proof. Suppose that (X, \tilde{X}) is the solution to (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3) for a fixed $u \in [0, 1]$. Thanks to (2.6) and $\text{Law}(X_t) = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_t)$, $t \geq 0$, we have

$$|b(s, X_s, F_s^{(u)})| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(s, X_s, y) dF_s^{(u)}(y) \right| \leq C_T (u(|X_s| + |\tilde{X}_s|) + (1-u)(|X_s| + \mathbb{E}[|X_s|]))$$

for $0 \leq s \leq T$. By an application of Gronwall's lemma to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_s|\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|X_0|] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |W_s|\right] + C_T \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t (u(|X_s| + |\tilde{X}_s|) + (1-u)(|X_s| + \mathbb{E}[|X_s|])) ds\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|X_0|] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |W_s|\right] + \int_0^t 2C_T \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} |X_u|\right] ds; \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \end{aligned}$$

we verify (2.19) for some constant $c(> 0)$, because $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |W_s|] = \sqrt{2t/\pi}$ for $t \geq 0$. \square

Remark 2.2. We may generalize Proposition 2.2 for the the estimates of higher moments, assuming $\mathbb{E}[|X_0|^p] < +\infty$ for $p \geq 1$.

3 Particle system approximation

Let us consider a sequence of finite systems of particles $(X_{t,i}^{(u)}, t \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ defined by the system of stochastic differential equations

$$dX_{t,i}^{(u)} = b(t, X_{t,i}^{(u)}, \hat{F}_{t,i}^{(u)}) dt + dW_{t,i}; \quad t \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\hat{F}_{t,i}^{(u)}(\cdot) := u \cdot \delta_{X_{t,i+1}^{(u)}}(\cdot) + (1-u) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{X_{t,j}^{(u)}}(\cdot), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1$$

with the boundary particle

$$dX_{t,n}^{(u)} = b\left(t, X_{t,n}^{(u)}, u \cdot \delta_{X_{t,1}^{(u)}} + (1-u) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{X_{t,j}^{(u)}}\right) dt + dW_{t,n}. \quad (3.2)$$

Here $W_{\cdot,i}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are standard independent Brownian motions on a filtered probability space, independent of the initial values $X_{0,i}^{(u)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and of B . in (2.1). We assume the distribution of $X_{0,i}$ is common with $\mathbb{E}[|X_{0,1}|^2] < +\infty$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and independent of each other. Thanks to the assumption on b , the resulting particle system is well-defined, and in particular, we have the symmetry $\text{Law}(X_{\cdot,i}^{(u)}) = \text{Law}(X_{\cdot,1}^{(u)})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and

$$\text{Law}(X_{\cdot,i}^{(u)}, X_{\cdot,i+1}^{(u)}) = \text{Law}(X_{\cdot,1}^{(u)}, X_{\cdot,2}^{(u)}); \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (3.3)$$

Thus, it is natural to write $X_{\cdot, n+1}^{(u)} \equiv X_{\cdot, 1}^{(u)}$, so that (3.1) and (3.3) hold for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Under the setup of Proposition 2.2 we shall also consider a sequence of finite particle systems $\bar{X}_{t,i}$, $t \geq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n+1$, $n \geq 1$, defined recursively from the pair $(\bar{X}_{\cdot, n}, \bar{X}_{\cdot, n+1}) := (X_{\cdot}^{(u)}, \tilde{X}_{\cdot}^{(u)})$ of the solution to (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3), that is, the corresponding stochastic equation

$$d\bar{X}_{t,n} = b(t, \bar{X}_{t,n}, u \cdot \delta_{\bar{X}_{t,n+1}} + (1-u) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_{t,n}})dt + dW_{t,n}; \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.4)$$

and then for $j = n-1, n-2, \dots, 1$, given $\bar{X}_{\cdot, j+1}$, we solve

$$d\bar{X}_{t,j} = b(t, \bar{X}_{t,j}, u \cdot \delta_{\bar{X}_{t,j+1}} + (1-u) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_{t,j}})dt + dW_{t,j}; \quad t \geq 0 \quad (3.5)$$

with the restrictions for each pair $(\bar{X}_{\cdot, j}, \bar{X}_{\cdot, j+1})$, corresponding to (2.3). We set the common law $m^* = \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{\cdot, i})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n+1$, and we also assume the initial values are the same as $X_{0,i}^{(u)} = \bar{X}_{0,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ almost surely.

For $n \geq 1$ with $X_{\cdot, n+1}^{(u)} \equiv X_{\cdot, 1}^{(u)}$ let us assign the weight $1/n$ to the Dirac measure at $(X_{t,i}^{(u)}, X_{t,i+1}^{(u)})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and consider the law of the joint empirical measure process

$$M_{t,n} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(X_{t,i}^{(u)}, X_{t,i+1}^{(u)})}, \quad \text{with the marginal} \quad m_{t,n} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_{t,i}^{(u)}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (3.6)$$

in the space $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_1)$ of probability measures on the topological space $\Omega_1 := D([0, T], (\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2), \|\cdot\|_1))$ of càdlàg functions on $[0, T]$ equipped with the Skorokhod topology, where $(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2), \|\cdot\|_1)$ is the space of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^2 equipped with the metric $\|\mu - \nu\|_1 := \sup_f \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x) d(\mu - \nu)(x)$. Here the supremum is taken over the bounded Lipschitz functions $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} |f(x)| \leq 1$ and $\sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} |f(x) - f(y)| / \|x - y\| \leq 1$. By the construction the sequence of the law of the initial empirical measure converges to the Dirac measure concentrated in M_0 (say), i.e.,

$$\text{Law}(M_{0,n}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \delta_{M_0} \quad \text{weakly in} \quad \mathcal{M}((\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2), \|\cdot\|_1)). \quad (3.7)$$

We denote by $m_0(dy) := M_0(\mathbb{R} \times dy) = M_0(dy \times \mathbb{R})$ the marginal of M_0 .

Proposition 3.1. *Fix $u \in [0, 1]$. Under the same assumptions for the functional b as in Proposition 2.2, the law of empirical measure process $M_{\cdot, n}$, defined in (3.6), of the finite particle system (3.1) with $X_{\cdot, n+1}^{(u)} \equiv X_{\cdot, 1}^{(u)}$ converges in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_1)$ to the Dirac measure concentrated in the deterministic measure-valued process $M_t, 0 \leq t \leq T$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Law}(M_{t,n}, 0 \leq t \leq T) = \delta_{(M_t, 0 \leq t \leq T)} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{M}(\Omega_1).$$

The marginal laws of M . are the same, i.e., $M_t(\mathbb{R} \times dy) = M_t(dy \times \mathbb{R}) =: m_t(dy)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, and the joint M . and its marginal m . satisfy the integral equation

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) m_t(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) m_0(dx) + \int_0^t [\mathcal{A}_s(M)g] ds; \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (3.8)$$

for every test function $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_s(M)g := u \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{b}(s, y_1, y_2) g'(y_1) M_s(dy_1 dy_2) + (1-u) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{b}(s, y_1, y_2) g'(y_1) m_s(dy_1) m_s(dy_2)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g''(y_1) m_s(dy_1); \quad 0 \leq s \leq T. \quad (3.9)$$

Moreover, $M.$ is the joint distribution of the solution pair $(X., \tilde{X}.)$ of (2.1) with (2.2)-(2.3), unique in the sense of distribution with the common marginal $m. = \text{Law}(X.) = \text{Law}(\tilde{X}.)$.

Remark 3.1. When $u = 0$, the integral equation (3.8) for $M.$ reduces to the integral equation only for the marginal $m.$, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) m_t(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) m_0(dx) + \int_0^t ds \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{b}(s, y_1, y_2) g'(y_1) m_s(dy_1) m_s(dy_2) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g''(y_1) m_s(dy_1) \right]$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$. \square

Proof. The idea of the proof utilizes the assumptions on the coefficient b as in Proposition 2.2 and the symmetry (3.3) of the finite particle system (3.1). We take the martingale approach discussed in Oelschläger (1984). By the standard argument with Gronwall's lemma we claim

Lemma 3.1. (a) *With the joint empirical measure processes $M.,n$ and its marginal $m.,n$*

$$e^{-4C_T t} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^k dm_{t,n}(x) - t \right), 0 \leq t \leq T \quad \left(e^{4C_T t} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^k dm_{t,n}(x) + t \right), 0 \leq t \leq T, \text{ respectively} \right)$$

is a supermartingale (submartingale, respectively) for $k = 1, 2$, and hence, so is

$$e^{-4C_T t} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|y\|^2 dM_{t,n}(y) - 2t \right), 0 \leq t \leq T \quad \left(e^{4C_T t} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|y\|^2 dM_{t,n}(y) + 2t \right), 0 \leq t \leq T, \text{ respectively} \right),$$

because $\sum_{i=1}^n |X_{\cdot,i}^{(u)}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n |X_{\cdot,i+1}^{(u)}|^2 = (1/2) \sum_{i=1}^n (|X_{\cdot,i}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{\cdot,i+1}^{(u)}|^2)$.

(b) *Similarly, we have with $k = 1, 2$*

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^k | \mathcal{F}_s] \leq e^{2kC_T(t-s)} (|X_{s,i}^{(u)}|^k + (t-s)^{k/2}) \quad (3.10)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, and

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_{t+\delta,i}^{(u)} - X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 8C_T(T \vee 1) e^{4C_T T} (|X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{t,i}^{(u)}| + 1) \delta \quad (3.11)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T - \delta$, $\delta > 0$.

Using this lemma and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we claim that there exist positive constants $c_k (> 0)$, $k = 1, 2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_{t+\delta,i}^{(u)} - X_{t,i}^{(u)}| | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}[|X_{t+\delta,i}^{(u)} - X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t])^{1/2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (8C_T(T \vee 1) e^{4C_T T} \delta (|X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{t,i}^{(u)}| + 1))^{1/2} \leq \frac{c_1 \sqrt{\delta}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (|X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{t,i}^{(u)}| + 1) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\delta} c_1 \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_{T,i}^{(u)}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \cdot e^{4C_T(T-t)} + T - t + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_{T,i}^{(u)}| | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \cdot e^{2C_T(T-t)} + \sqrt{T-t} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\delta} c_2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (|X_{T,i}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{T,i}^{(u)}| + 1) | \mathcal{F}_t \right] = \sqrt{\delta} c_2 \mathbb{E} [|X_{T,1}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{T,1}^{(u)}| + 1 | \mathcal{F}_t]$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T - \delta$, where we used the symmetry in the last equality. It follows from (3.10) and the moment assumption of the initial distribution that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} [|X_{T,1}^{(u)}|^k] \leq e^{2kC_T T} (\mathbb{E} [|X_{0,1}^{(u)}|^k] + T^{k/2}) < \infty; \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Thus, using these inequalities again with the symmetry (3.3) we claim that there exists a random variable $f(\delta) := 2\sqrt{\delta} c_2 (|X_{T,1}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{T,1}^{(u)}| + 1)$, such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [(|X_{t+\delta,i}^{(u)} - X_{t,i}^{(u)}|^2 + |X_{t+\delta,i+1}^{(u)} - X_{t,i+1}^{(u)}|^2)^{1/2} | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \mathbb{E} [f(\delta) | \mathcal{F}_t]; \quad 0 \leq t \leq T - \delta, \quad (3.12)$$

with $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} [f(\delta)] = 0$. Here we set $X_{\cdot, n+1}^{(u)} \equiv X_{\cdot, 1}^{(u)}$.

Moreover, by the super/submartingale properties in Lemma 3.1 (a) we may evaluate the total variation $\|\mathbb{M}_{t,n}|_{B_\lambda^c}\|_{TV}$ of $\mathbb{M}_{\cdot, n}$ restricted outside the ball $B_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\| \leq \lambda\}$ of radius $\lambda(> 0)$, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\mathbb{M}_{t,n}|_{B_\lambda^c}\|_{TV} > \varepsilon \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|y\|^2 d\mathbb{M}_{t,n} > \lambda^2 \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{4C_T t} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|y\|^2 d\mathbb{M}_{t,n} + t \right) > \lambda^2 \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{4C_T T} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|y\|^2 d\mathbb{M}_{T,n} + T \right) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{8C_T T} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|y\|^2 d\mathbb{M}_{0,n} + 2T \right) \right] = \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{8C_T T} (|X_{0,1}^{(u)}|^2 + 2T) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the symmetry of the particle system. Taking sufficiently large λ , using Prohorov's theorem, we claim that $(\mathbb{M}_{t,n}, 0 \leq t \leq T)$, $n \geq 1$ of the empirical measures is tight in $(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^2), |\cdot|_1)$. Then combining this observation with (3.12), we claim by Theorem 8.6 (b) of Ethier & Kurtz (1986) that the sequence $(\mathbb{M}_{t,n}, 0 \leq t \leq T)$, $n \geq 1$ is relatively compact in the space $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_1)$, where $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_1)$ is equipped with the weak topology.

We shall characterize the limit points of $(\mathbb{M}_{t,n}, 0 \leq t \leq T)_{n \geq 1}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let us call a limit law $\mathbb{M}_t, 0 \leq t \leq T$. Thanks to the symmetry in the construction of (3.1), its marginals must be the same for every limit point, i.e., $\mathbb{M}_t(\mathbb{R} \times dy) = \mathbb{M}_t(dy \times \mathbb{R}) =: m_t(dy)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$ with the initial marginal measure $m_0(dy)$. Applying Itô's formula to the system (3.1), we see

$$\begin{aligned} f(\langle m_{t,n}, g \rangle) - f(\langle m_{0,n}, g \rangle) - \int_0^t f'(\langle m_{s,n}, g \rangle) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g'(X_{s,i}^{(u)}) b(s, X_{s,i}^{(u)}, \widehat{F}_{s,i}^{(u)}) + \frac{1}{2} \langle m_{s,n}, g'' \rangle \right) ds \\ - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t f''(\langle m_{s,n}, g \rangle) \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n |g'(X_{s,i}^{(u)})|^2 ds = \int_0^t f'(\langle m_{s,n}, g \rangle) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g'(X_{s,i}^{(u)}) dW_{s,i}, \end{aligned}$$

is a martingale for every $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R})$, $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$, where we use the notation $\langle \mu, g \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) d\mu(x)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$. Taking the limits with (3.7) and using the equivalence of certain martingales, we observe that $\exp(\sqrt{-1} \theta \eta_t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ is a martingale for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, where we define

$$\eta_t := \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) dm_t(x) - \int_0^t [\mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{M}_s)g] ds$$

and $\mathcal{A}_t(M_t)g$ as in (3.9) for $0 \leq t \leq T$. This implies that the characteristic function of η_t satisfies $\mathbb{E}[e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta\eta_t}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta\eta_0}] = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta\langle m_0, g \rangle}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence, $\eta_t = \langle m_0, g \rangle$ for every t in any countable subset of $[0, T]$ and for every g in any countable subset of $C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$. Because of the separability of $C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$ and right continuity of $t \mapsto M_t$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) dm_t(x) - \int_0^t [\mathcal{A}_s(M_s)g] ds = \eta_t = \langle m_0, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) dm_0(x)$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$. Thus we claim M_t satisfies the integral equation (3.8). With the uniqueness in Proposition 2.1 the last part of Proposition 3.1 can be shown as in Lemmas 8-10 of Oelschläger (1984). \square

Corollary 3.1. *Fix $u \in [0, 1]$. Under the same assumptions for the functional b as in Proposition 2.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the first 2 components $(X_{t,1}^{(u)}, X_{t,2}^{(u)}, t \geq 0)$ of the finite particle system in (3.1) converge weakly to the solution $(X_t^{(u)}, \tilde{X}_t^{(u)}, t \geq 0)$ in (2.1).*

Proposition 3.2. *In addition to the same assumptions for the functional b as in Proposition 2.2, we assume that the marginal distribution $m_t(dy) = m_t^*(dy)$ of $(X_t^{(u)}, t \geq 0)$ has the density $m_t(\cdot)$ (i.e., $m_t(dy) = m_t(y)dy$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$) with $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |y|^2 m_0(dy) < \infty$ and assume there exists a constant C_T such that*

$$\left| \tilde{b}(t, x_1, y_1) \cdot \frac{m_t(x_1)}{m_t(y_1)} - \tilde{b}(t, x_2, y_2) \cdot \frac{m_t(x_2)}{m_t(y_2)} \right| \leq C_T(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2|) \quad (3.13)$$

for every $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $i = 1, 2$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ and

$$\left| \tilde{b}(t, x, y) \cdot \frac{m_t(x)}{m_t(y)} \right| \leq C_T(|x| + |y|) \quad (3.14)$$

for every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $0 \leq t \leq T$. Then for the difference between (3.1) – (3.2) and (3.4)-(3.5) we have the estimate

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_{s,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{s,i}|] < \infty. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. Substituting

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b}(s, X_{s,i}^{(u)}, X_{s,j}^{(u)}) &= (\tilde{b}(s, X_{s,i}^{(u)}, X_{s,j}^{(u)}) - \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, X_{s,j}^{(u)})) \\ &\quad + (\tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, X_{s,j}^{(u)}) - \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j})) + \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \end{aligned}$$

into the differences

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,i} &= u \int_0^t (\tilde{b}(s, X_{s,i}^{(u)}, X_{s,i+1}^{(u)}) - \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,i+1})) ds \\ &\quad + (1-u) \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{b}(s, X_{s,i}^{(u)}, X_{s,j}^{(u)}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, y) m^*(dy) \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, and the difference

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t,n}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,n} &= u \int_0^t (\tilde{b}(s, X_{s,n}^{(u)}, X_{s,1}^{(u)}) - \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,n}, \bar{X}_{s,n+1})) ds \\ &\quad + (1-u) \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{b}(s, X_{s,n}^{(u)}, X_{s,j}^{(u)}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,n}, y) m^*(dy) \right) ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

at the boundary for $0 \leq t \leq T$, applying the triangle inequality and (2.5), and then taking the supremum, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_{t,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,i}| \\
& \leq 2C_T \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{0 \leq t \leq s} |X_{t,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,i}| ds + 2C_T u \int_0^T (|X_{s,1}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{s,n+1}| - |X_{s,1}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{s,1}|) ds \quad (3.18) \\
& \quad + (1-u) \int_0^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \right| ds \\
& \leq 2C_T \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{0 \leq t \leq s} |X_{t,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,i}| ds + 2C_T u \int_0^T |\bar{X}_{s,n+1} - \bar{X}_{s,1}| ds \\
& \quad + (1-u) \int_0^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \right| ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where we set $\bar{b}(s, x, z) := \tilde{b}(s, x, z) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(s, x, y) m^*(dy)$ for $x, z \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq s \leq T$. Here we used $|x| - |y| \leq |x - y|$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ in the last inequality. This way we take care of the particle at the boundary. After using Gronwall's lemma, taking expectation, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_{t,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,i}| \right] \leq 2C_T e^{2C_T T} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\bar{X}_{s,n+1} - \bar{X}_{s,1}| ds + \int_0^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \right| ds \right],$$

where there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that we evaluate the first term

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\bar{X}_{s,n+1} - \bar{X}_{s,1}| ds \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} |\bar{X}_{u,n+1}| + \sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} |\bar{X}_{u,1}| \right) ds \right] \leq 2T (\mathbb{E}[|\bar{X}_{0,1}|] + c) e^{cT}, \quad (3.19)$$

by (2.19) in Proposition 2.2 and then with (3.13)-(3.14) we evaluate the second term

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \right| ds \right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n^2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \right|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} ds \leq c\sqrt{n} \quad (3.20)$$

by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the (Markov) chain structure of the particle system $\bar{X}_{\cdot,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, that is, by the map Φ in (2.11), $\bar{X}_{\cdot,i} = \Phi(\cdot, (m_s^*)_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot}, (\bar{X}_{s,i+1})_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot}, (W_{s,i})_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot})$ for $i = n-1, \dots, 1$. Note that $\bar{X}_{\cdot,i}$ and $\bar{X}_{\cdot,j}$ are dependent for $i \neq j$, while $\bar{X}_{\cdot,i+1}$ and $W_{\cdot,i}$ are independent for $i = n-1, \dots, 1$. Some technical details are given in Appendix. Finally, combining these inequalities, we conclude the proof of (3.15) by

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_{t,i}^{(u)} - \bar{X}_{t,i}| \right] \leq 2C_T e^{2C_T T} \sup_{n \geq 1} \left(\frac{2T}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbb{E}[|\bar{X}_{0,1}|] + c) e^{cT} + c \right) < \infty.$$

□

Remark 3.2. The set-up and conditions on the drift function b can be generalized and relaxed. For example, in a more realistic problem of large network objects (financial networks associated with blockchains, biological networks, neural networks, data networks etc.), it is of interest to analyze

more complicated infinite (random) graph structures rather than the simple local interaction of infinite linear chains considered above. Also, a Lipschitz continuous diffusion coefficient can be introduced in (2.1), instead of the unit diffusion coefficient. Here we take the simplest form for the presentation of the essential idea of the infinite linear chain interaction. The fluctuation results suggested from Proposition 3.2 are ongoing research topics. We conjecture that Corollary 3.1 still holds if we replace (3.2) by another process, e.g., a standard Brownian motion, as long as the effect of the boundary process on the first two components in (3.1) diminishes sufficiently fast in the limit, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

4 Case of linear drift functional

4.1 Connection to the infinite-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process

Let us take a linear functional $b(t, x, \mu) := -\int_{\mathbb{R}}(x - y)\mu(dy)$ for $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ of mean-reverting type. Then, (2.1) is reduced to the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t^{(u)} = -(u(X_t^{(u)} - \tilde{X}_t^{(u)}) + (1 - u)(X_t^u - \mathbb{E}[X_t^{(u)}])) dt + dB_t; \quad t \geq 0 \quad (4.1)$$

for each $u \in [0, 1]$. Particularly, the McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equation (2.17) becomes

$$dX_t^\bullet = -(X_t^\bullet - \mathbb{E}[X_t^\bullet])dt + dB_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (4.2)$$

when $u = 0$, i.e., $X_t^\bullet := X_t^{(0)}$, and the chain equation (2.18) with $u = 1$, $X_t^\dagger := X_t^{(1)}$ becomes

$$dX_t^\dagger = -(X_t^\dagger - \tilde{X}_t^\dagger)dt + dB_t, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Setting a fixed initial value $X_0^{(u)} = 0$, we see that the expectations are constant in time

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^{(u)}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}] = \mathbb{E}[X_t^\bullet] = \mathbb{E}[X_t^\dagger] = 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad u \in [0, 1], \quad (4.4)$$

with an explicitly solvable Gaussian pair $(X^{(u)}(t), \tilde{X}^{(u)}(t))$ for $t \geq 0$, $u \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{(u)} &= \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} u \tilde{X}_s^{(u)} ds + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)} dB_s, \\ \tilde{X}_t^{(u)} &= \int_0^t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_{0,k}(t-s; u) dW_{s,k}, \quad \mathfrak{p}_{0,k}(t-s; u) := \frac{u^k (t-s)^k}{k!} e^{-(t-s)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $(W^k, k \geq 0)$ is a sequence of independent, one-dimensional standard Brownian motions, independent of the Brownian motion $B(\cdot)$. Note that the integrand $\mathfrak{p}_{0,k}(t-s; u)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ in (4.5) is a (taboo) transition probability $\mathbb{P}(M(t-s) = k | M(0) = 0)$ of a continuous-time Markov chain $M(\cdot)$ in the state space \mathbb{N}_0 with generator matrix $\mathbf{Q} = (q_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ with $q_{i,i+1} = u \in [0, 1]$, $q_{i,i} = -1$ and $q_{i,j} = 0$ for the other entries $j \neq i, i+1$. When $u = 0$, \mathbf{Q} is the generator of Markov chain with jump rate 1 from state i and killed immediately. When $u = 1$, \mathbf{Q} is the generator of a Poisson process with rate 1. When $u \in (0, 1)$, the jump rate from i to $i+1$ is 1 and killed with probability $(1-u)$ (and hence, success probability u of jumps from i to $i+1$). Thus we interpret $\mathfrak{p}_{0,k}(t-s; u)$ as $(0, k)$ -element of the $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ -dimensional matrix exponential $e^{(t-s)\mathbf{Q}}$, i.e.,

$$(\mathfrak{p}_{i,j}(t-s; u) := \mathbb{P}(M(t-s) = j | M(0) = i), i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0) \equiv ((e^{(t-s)\mathbf{Q}})_{i,j}, i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0); \quad t \geq s \geq 0.$$

For the matrix exponential $e^{t\mathbf{Q}}$, $t \geq 0$ of such \mathbf{Q} , see for example, Friedman (1971). Then we have a Feynman-Kac representation formula

$$\tilde{X}_t^{(u)} = \mathbb{E}^M \left[\int_0^t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{M(t-s)=k\}} dW_{s,k} | M(0) = 0 \right]; \quad t \geq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the probability induced by the Markov chain $M(\cdot)$, independent of the Brownian motions $(W_{\cdot,k}, k \in \mathbb{N}_0)$.

Indeed, by Corollary 3.1, the solution (4.5) is obtained by an infinite particle approximation

$$dX_{t,k}^{(u)} = -(X_{t,k}^{(u)} - uX_{t,k+1}^{(u)})dt + dW_{t,k}; \quad t \geq 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (4.7)$$

of the simplified form of (4.1), that is,

$$dX_t^{(u)} = -(X_t^{(u)} - u\tilde{X}_t^{(u)})dt + dB_t; \quad t \geq 0.$$

Here we assume $\sigma(X_{t,k+1}^{(u)}, t \geq 0)$ and $\sigma(W_{t,k}, t \geq 0)$ are independent for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The infinite particle system (4.7) can be represented schematically as an infinite-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck stochastic differential equation or more generally, stochastic evolution equation (see e.g., Dawson (1972), Da Prato & Zabczyk (1992), Kallianpur & Xiong (1995), Batt, Kallianpur, Karandikar, & Xiong (1998), Athreya, Bass & Perkins (2005) for more general results in Hilbert spaces)

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{X}_t dt + d\mathbf{W}_t, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_\cdot := (X_{\cdot,k}^{(u)}, k \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ with $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{W}_\cdot := (W_{\cdot,k}, k \in \mathbb{N}_0)$. Note that the transition probabilities $\mathbb{P}(M(t) = k | M(0) = i) = (e^{t\mathbf{Q}})_{i,k}$, $i, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ of the continuous-time Markov chain $M(\cdot)$ defined in the previous paragraph satisfies the backward Kolmogorov equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} e^{t\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{Q} e^{t\mathbf{Q}}; \quad t \geq 0.$$

Thus, by Itô's formula we directly verify

$$d\left(\int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathbf{Q}} d\mathbf{W}_s\right) = \left(\mathbf{Q} \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathbf{Q}} d\mathbf{W}_s\right) dt + d\mathbf{W}_t; \quad t \geq 0,$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)\mathbf{Q}} d\mathbf{W}_s; \quad t \geq 0,$$

is a solution to (4.8). Therefore, (4.5) is the solution to (4.1). Although \mathbf{Q} has the specific form here, it is easy to see that in general, the Feynman-Kac formula (4.6) still holds for the infinite-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with a class of generators \mathbf{Q} which form a Banach algebra (e.g., the generator of the discrete-state, compound Poisson processes, see Friedman (1971)).

4.2 Asymptotic Dichotomy

With $X_0^{(u)} = 0$ still, the asymptotic behaviors of their variances as $t \rightarrow \infty$ are dichotomous

$$\text{Var}(X_t^{(u)}) = \int_0^t e^{-2v} I_0(2uv) dv = \begin{cases} O(1), & u \in [0, 1), \\ O(\sqrt{t}), & u = 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

with $\text{Var}(X_t^{(0)}) = \text{Var}(X_t^\bullet) = \frac{1 - e^{-2t}}{2}$, $\text{Var}(X_t^{(1)}) = \text{Var}(X_t^\dagger) = te^{-2t}(I_0(2t) + I_1(2t))$

for $t \geq 0$. Here $I_\nu(\cdot)$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind with index ν , defined by

$$I_\nu(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(x/2)^{2k+\nu}}{\Gamma(k+1) \cdot \Gamma(\nu+k+1)}; \quad x > 0, \nu \geq -1.$$

Note that the Bessel functions $I_0(x)$ and $I_1(x)$ grow with the order of $O(e^x / \sqrt{2\pi x})$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 4.1 (Asymptotic dichotomy of (4.1)). The process $X^{(u)}$ defined by (4.1) has dichotomous long-term behaviors:

1. When $u \in [0, 1)$, the process $X^{(u)}$ is positive recurrent and its stationary distribution is Gaussian with mean 0 and variance

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(X_t^{(u)}) = \int_0^\infty e^{-2v} I_0(2uv) dv = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-u^2}} < \infty. \quad (4.10)$$

In particular, when $u = 0$, $X^{(0)} = X^\bullet$ is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with a stationary Gaussian distribution of mean 0 and variance $1/2$.

2. When $u = 1$, the process $X^{(1)} = X^\dagger$ is a mean zero Gaussian process with growing variance of the order $O(\sqrt{t})$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(X_t^\dagger) = \infty$, given by (4.9) and covariances

$$\mathbb{E}[X_s^\dagger X_t^\dagger] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_s^\dagger \tilde{X}_t^\dagger] = e^{-(t-s)} \int_0^s e^{-2v} I_0(2\sqrt{(t-s+v)v}) dv; \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^\dagger \tilde{X}_u^\dagger] = \int_0^t e^{t-s} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_s^\dagger \tilde{X}_u^\dagger] ds = \int_0^t e^{t-s} \mathbb{E}[X_s^\dagger X_u^\dagger] ds; \quad t, u \geq 0.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E}[X_s^\dagger X_t^\dagger] = O(e^{-(t-2\sqrt{(t+s)s})} t^{-1/4})$ for large $t \rightarrow \infty$.

This asymptotic dichotomy is an answer to the first question posed in section 1. Namely, the large system of type (1.1) diverges widely, while the large system of type (1.2) converges to the stationary distribution as $t \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Remark 4.2 (Repulsive case). Instead of mean-reverting, if the drift functional b is of *repulsive* type $b(t, x, \mu) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (x - y) \mu(dy)$, then the resulting paired process in (2.1) with $u = 1$ is described by

$$dX_t^{\ddagger} = (X_t^{\ddagger} - \tilde{X}_t^{\ddagger}) dt + dB_t; \quad t \geq 0 \quad (4.11)$$

with the conditions (2.2)-(2.3). The solution with the initial values $X_0^{\ddagger} = \tilde{X}_0^{\ddagger} = 0$ is given by

$$X_t^{\ddagger} = \int_0^t e^{t-s} \tilde{X}_s^{\ddagger} ds + \int_0^t e^{t-s} dB_s, \quad \tilde{X}_t^{\ddagger} = \int_0^t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{t-s} \cdot \frac{(-1)^k (t-s)^k}{k!} dW_{s,k}; \quad t \geq 0$$

for independent Brownian motions $W_{\cdot,k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, independent of B_{\cdot} . In this case the variance grows *exponentially* fast, i.e.,

$$\text{Var}(X_t^{\ddagger}) = te^{2t}(I_0(2t) - I_1(2t)); \quad t \geq 0.$$

\square

4.3 Detecting the presence of mean-field interaction

The value u in (4.1) indicates how much $X^{(u)}$ is attracted towards the neighborhood $\tilde{X}^{(u)}$ and $(1 - u)$ indicates how much it is attracted towards the average $\mathbb{E}[X_t^{(u)}]$ ($= 0$). Let us briefly consider the following detection problem of a single observer. The observer only observes $X_t^{(u)}$, $t \geq 0$ but does neither know the value $u \in [0, 1]$ nor $\tilde{X}_t^{(u)}$, $t \geq 0$ in (4.5). Only given the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^X := \sigma(X_s^{(u)}, 0 \leq s \leq t)$, $t \geq 0$, can the observer detect the value $u \in [0, 1]$?

Let us denote by \mathcal{F}_t , $t \geq 0$ the filtration generated by the solution pair $(X, \tilde{X}) := (X^{(u)}, \tilde{X}^{(u)})$. Thanks to the Girsanov theorem, the log Radon-Nykodim derivative of the solution $\mathbb{P}^{(u)}$ with respect to the Wiener measure \mathbb{P}_0 is given by

$$\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{(u)}}{d\mathbb{P}_0} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_T} = \int_0^T (X_t - u\tilde{X}_t) dX_t + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (X_t - u\tilde{X}_t)^2 dt.$$

Thus given \mathcal{F}_T^X , the observer may maximizes the conditional log likelihood function

$$\mathbb{E} \left[-\log \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{(u)}}{d\mathbb{P}_0} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_T} \right) \Big| \mathcal{F}_T^X \right]$$

with respect to u , and formally obtain a unique maximizer

$$\hat{u} := \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_T^X] dt \right)^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T X_t \tilde{X}_t dt + \int_0^T \tilde{X}_t dX_t \Big| \mathcal{F}_T^X \right] \quad (4.12)$$

as an estimator of u . Evaluation of these conditional expectations in (4.12) is a filtering problem.

The detailed study of \hat{u} still remains an open problem. If we replace \tilde{X} by X in (4.12), then we obtain a modified estimator

$$\hat{u}_m := \left(\int_0^T X_t^2 dt \right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\int_0^T X_t^2 dt + \int_0^T X_t dX_t \right) = 1 - \left(2 \int_0^T X_t^2 dt \right)^{-1} (T - X_T^2). \quad (4.13)$$

It follows from (4.10) that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}_m = 1 - \sqrt{1 - u^2} \leq u \in [0, 1]$. Thus this modified estimator \hat{u}_m underestimates the value u asymptotically as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Another typical method of estimation of u is known as the method of moments. We may obtain the method of moments estimator by matching the second moment in the limit, i.e.,

$$\hat{u}_M = \left[1 - \left(\frac{2}{T} \int_0^T X_t^2 dt \right)^{-1/2} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (4.14)$$

It follows from (4.10) directly that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}_M = u \in [0, 1]$. Thus this method of moments estimator \hat{u}_M is asymptotically consistent to the value u as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

5 Appendix

We shall sketch the poof of (3.20) for Proposition 3.2. First note that by the construction, $\bar{X}_{\cdot, i}$ in (3.4)-(3.5) is determined by the iteration $\bar{X}_{\cdot, i} = \Phi(\cdot, (m_s)_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot}, (\bar{X}_{s, i+1})_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot}, (W_{s, i})_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot})$ as in (2.11), where $\bar{X}_{\cdot, i+1}$ is independent of $W_{\cdot, i}$ for $i = n, n-1, \dots, 1$, that is, with this random iterative map and a slight abuse of notation, we may write and view

$$\eta_{t, i} := \bar{X}_{t, i} = \Phi \circ \Phi \circ \dots \circ \Phi_t(\bar{X}_{\cdot, n+1}; W_{\cdot, i}, \dots, W_{\cdot, n}) = \Phi_t^{(n+1-i)}(\eta_{n+1}; W_{\cdot, i}, \dots, W_{\cdot, n}) \quad (5.1)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$ as an element in the space $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) = C([0, T])$ of continuous functions. Thus, η_i , $i = n+1, n, n-1, \dots, 1$ possess a discrete-time Markov chain structure. In particular, for $j < k < i$, given η_k , the distribution of η_i and η_j are conditionally independent.

Let us write $\mathbf{W} := (W_{\cdot,1}, \dots, W_{\cdot,n})$ for simplicity. For every Lipschitz function $\varphi(\cdot)$ with Lipschitz constant K , there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the difference between the conditional expectation, given $\overline{X}_{s,n+1}$, $0 \leq s \leq T$ and the unconditional expectation of $\varphi(\overline{X}_{t,1})$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\overline{X}_{t,1}) | \overline{X}_{s,n+1}, 0 \leq s \leq T] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\overline{X}_{t,1})] \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \int_{C([0,T])} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_{C([0,T])} \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{W}}[\varphi(\Phi_t^{(n)}(\eta_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}))] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{W}}[\varphi(\Phi_t^{(n)}(\tilde{\eta}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}))] \right) \mathfrak{m}(d\tilde{\eta}_{n+1}) \right|^2 \mathfrak{m}(d\eta_{n+1}) \\ &\leq \int_{C([0,T])^2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{W}} \left[|\varphi(\Phi_t^{(n)}(\eta_{n+1}; \mathbf{W})) - \varphi(\Phi_t^{(n)}(\tilde{\eta}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}))|^2 \right] \mathfrak{m}(d\tilde{\eta}_{n+1}) \mathfrak{m}(d\eta_{n+1}) \\ &\leq K^2 \int_{C([0,T])^2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{W}} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\Phi_t^{(n)}(\eta_{n+1}) - \Phi_t^{(n)}(\tilde{\eta}_{n+1})|^2 \right] \mathfrak{m}(d\tilde{\eta}_{n+1}) \mathfrak{m}(d\eta_{n+1}) \leq \frac{c^n}{n!}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{W}}$ is the expectation with respect to \mathbf{W} and the last inequality is verified as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, thanks to the Lipschitz continuity (2.5) of functional $b(\cdot)$. Similarly, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that we have the estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(x, \overline{X}_{t,j}) | \overline{X}_{s,k}, 0 \leq s \leq T] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(x, \overline{X}_{t,j})] \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c^{k-j}}{(k-j)!}; \quad k > j \quad (5.2)$$

for a Lipschitz function $\varphi(x, y) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $|\varphi(x_1, y_1) - \varphi(x_2, y_2)| \leq K(|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2|)$.

Second, note that because of the definition of $\tilde{b}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ appeared in (3.20), for every $j = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, x, \overline{X}_{s,j})] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(s, x, z) \mathfrak{m}_s(dz) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(s, x, y) \mathfrak{m}_s(dy) = 0; \quad s \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Combining this observation and the Markov chain structure with (5.2), for $j < k < i$ we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,j}) \tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,k})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,k}) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,j}) | \overline{X}_{\cdot,i}, \overline{X}_{\cdot,k}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,k}) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, x, \overline{X}_{s,j}) | \overline{X}_{\cdot,i}, \overline{X}_{\cdot,k}]_{x=\overline{X}_{s,i}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,k}) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, x, \overline{X}_{s,j}) | \overline{X}_{\cdot,k}]_{x=\overline{X}_{s,i}}] \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,k})|^2])^{1/2} \cdot (\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(s, x, \overline{X}_{s,j}) | \overline{X}_{\cdot,k}]_{x=\overline{X}_{s,i}}]^2])^{1/2} \leq C \cdot \left[\frac{c^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \right]^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where the constant c does not depend on (s, i) and we used the Lipschitz continuity of $b(\cdot)$ and the similar technique as in the proof of Proposition 2.2 to show $\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} (\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{b}(s, \overline{X}_{s,i}, \overline{X}_{s,k})|^2])^{1/2} \leq C$ for some constant C which does not depend on (i, k) . This is the case $1 \leq j < k < i \leq n$.

For the case $i < j < k$ or the case $j < i < k$ we need the estimates

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(x, \overline{X}_{t,k}) | \overline{X}_{s,j}, 0 \leq s \leq T] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(x, \overline{X}_{t,k})] \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c^{k-j}}{(k-j)!}; \quad k > j. \quad (5.4)$$

This is similar to (5.2) but the condition in the conditional expectation is reverse in discrete-time. We shall construct time-reversal of the discrete-time Markov chain structure (5.1). We claim that

the joint distribution of the following pair $(X_t, Y_t), t \geq 0$ is the same as the joint distribution of $(X_t, \tilde{X}_t), t \geq 0$, where given the process X . with the marginal law $m(\cdot) = m^*(\cdot)$, Y . is defined by another stochastic differential equation

$$dY_t = \left[u \tilde{b}(t, Y_t, X_t) \cdot \frac{m_t(Y_t)}{m_t(X_t)} + (1-u) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{b}(t, Y_t, z) m_t(dz) \right] dt + d\hat{B}_t \quad (5.5)$$

driven by a standard Brownian motion \hat{B} ., independent of X . and the initial value Y_0 with the condition $\text{Law}(Y_t) \equiv \text{Law}(X_t) = m_t$ for $t \geq 0$.

Indeed, thanks to (3.13)-(3.14) and Propositions 2.1 and 3.1, the weak solution pair (Y, X) exists and its joint distribution \hat{M} satisfies the integral equation

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) m_t(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) m_0(dx) + \int_0^t [\hat{A}_s(\hat{M})g] ds; \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (5.6)$$

similar to (3.8), for every test function $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_s(\hat{M})g := & u \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{b}(s, y_1, y_2) \cdot \frac{m_s(y_1)}{m_s(y_2)} g'(y_1) \hat{M}_s(dy_1 dy_2) + (1-u) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \tilde{b}(s, y_1, y_2) g'(y_1) m_s(dy_1) m_s(dy_2) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g''(y_1) m_s(dy_1); \quad 0 \leq s \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Comparing (3.8) with (5.6), we obtain the time-reversible relation

$$m_s(y_1) \hat{M}_s(dy_1 dy_2) = m_s(y_2) M_s(dy_1 dy_2); \quad 0 \leq s \leq T, (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Thus repeating the derivation of (5.2) with this reversed discrete-time Markov chain, we obtain (5.4), and hence for the cases $j < i < k$ and $i < j < k$ there exist constants c and C such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,k})] \leq C \cdot \left[\frac{c^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \right]^{1/2}.$$

Therefore, we conclude (3.20), because there exist constants $c, C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,j}) \bar{b}(s, \bar{X}_{s,i}, \bar{X}_{s,k})] \leq \frac{2C}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=j}^n \left[\frac{c^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \right]^{1/2} \leq 2C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[\frac{c^k}{k!} \right]^{1/2} < +\infty.$$

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Professors I. Karatzas, M. Shkolnikov and K. Ramanan for several helpful discussions in the early stage of this paper. We are also thankful to Drs. E. R. Fernholz and I. Karatzas for kindly sharing with us their unpublished manuscripts on the Gaussian cascades. Research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant NSF-DMS-1409434 for the second author and under grants NSF-DMS-13-13373 and NSF-DMS-16-15229 for the third author.

Bibliography

- ATHREYA, S.R., BASS, R.F. & PERKINS, E.A. (2005) Hölder norm estimates for elliptic operators on finite and infinite-dimensional spaces *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **357** 5001–5029.
- BATT, A.G., KALLIANPUR, G., KARANDIKAR, R.L. & XIONG, J. (1998) On interacting systems of Hilbert-space-valued differential equations. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **37** 151–188.
- CARMONA, R., FOUQUE, J.-P., & SUN, L.-H. (2015) Mean Field Games and Systemic Risk. *Comm. in Math. Sci.*, **13**(4) 911–933.
- DA PRATO, G. & ZABCZYK, J. (1992) *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- DAWSON, D.A. (1972) Stochastic evolution equations. *Math. Biosci.* **15** 287–316.
- ETHIER, S.N. & KURTZ, T.G. (1985) *Markov processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, New York.
- FRIEDMAN, D. (1971) *Markov Chains* Holden-Day, San Francisco.
- KALLIANPUR, G. & XIONG, J. (1995) Stochastic differential equations in infinite dimensions *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, **26** Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- KARATZAS, I. & SHREVE, S.E. (1991) *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. Springer-Verlag, NY.
- OELSCHLÄGER, K. (1984) Martingale approach to the law of large numbers for weakly interacting stochastic processes. *Ann. Probab.* **2** 458–479.
- SZNITMAN, A.S. (1991) Topics in propagation of chaos. École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX – 1989 In *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1464** 165–251, Springer Berlin.