

---

---

# A Brief on Optimal Transport

---

---

SPECIAL LECTURE  
MISSOURI S&T : ROLLA, MO

PRESENTATION BY

AUSTIN G. VANDEGRIFFE

## Acknowledgement

I want to recognize my friend and colleague, Louis Steinmeister<sup>1</sup>, for introducing and motivating my studies in pure mathematics. Without Louis, I likely would not have discovered the intricacies of measure theory, which lead me to optimal transport, for a while longer. I would also like to thank Dr. Jason C. Murphy<sup>2</sup> for guiding me through some proofs and for the sanity checks; his input was of great value.

---

<sup>1</sup>Louis Steinmeister: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=BFSEaMkAAAAJ&hl=en>

<sup>2</sup>Jason Murphy: [https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=32q4x\\_cAAAAJ&hl=en](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=32q4x_cAAAAJ&hl=en)

# Preliminaries\*

---

\*This section has not been developed in detail as the focus of this text is optimal transport. The details are left as a future work.

# 1 Topology

**Definition 1.1** (Topology, Open/Closed Sets, and Metrizable). *Let  $\Omega$  be a non-empty set, then a collection  $\tau \subseteq 2^\Omega$  is a topology if*

- i.  $\emptyset, \Omega \in \tau$
- ii.  $T_1, T_2 \in \tau \implies T_1 \cap T_2 \in \tau$
- iii.  $(T_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \subset \tau \implies \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} T_i \in \tau$

*Sets in  $\tau$  are called open, if  $T^c \in \tau$  then  $T$  is closed, and if  $T$  is both open and closed it is clopen. If  $\exists$  a metric on  $\Omega$  which induces the topology, then  $(\Omega, \tau)$  is called metrizable, that is,  $\exists d : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\forall x_i \in \Omega$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ )*

- i.  $d(x_1, x_2) \geq 0$  with  $d(x_1, x_2) = 0 \iff x_1 = x_2$
- ii.  $d(x_1, x_2) = d(x_2, x_1)$
- iii.  $d(x_1, x_3) \leq d(x_1, x_2) + d(x_2, x_3)$

and  $\tau = \{ \{x \in \Omega : d(x_0, x) < r\} : r \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_0^+ \text{ \& } x_0 \in \Omega \}$ .

**Definition 1.2** (Hausdorff Condition).  $(\Omega, \tau)$  is called Hausdorff if  $\forall x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Omega \exists U_i \in \tau |_{\exists x_i}$  s.t.  $U_{x_1} \cap U_{x_2} = \emptyset$ .

**Definition 1.3** (Polish Space). *A topological space  $(\Omega, \tau)$  is Polish if it is a separable, completely metrizable, topological space, that is, a space homeomorphic to a complete metric space that has a countable dense subset.*

**Definition 1.4** (Lower Semicontinuity). *Let  $(\Omega, \tau)$  be a topological space, a function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is lower semicontinuous if one of the following holds*

- i.  $\{x : f(x) > \alpha\} \in \tau \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$
- ii.  $\{x : f(x) \leq \alpha\}^c \in \tau \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$
- iii. If  $\tau$  is metrized by  $d$ ,  $\forall (x_0 \in \Omega, \epsilon > 0) \exists \delta(x_0, \epsilon) = \delta > 0$  s.t.

$$d(x_0, x) < \delta \implies f(x) > f(x_0) - \epsilon$$

**Definition 1.5** (Limit Points and Convergence). *A point  $x^*$  is a limit point of  $A \subset \Omega$  if  $\forall U \in \tau |_{\exists x^*} A \cap U \neq \emptyset$ . A sequence  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges to a point  $x^* \in \Omega$  if  $\forall U \in \tau |_{\exists x^*} \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $x_n \in U \quad \forall n \geq N$ ; if  $\tau$  is metrized by  $d$ , then the former can be formulated as*

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } d(x^*, x_n) < \epsilon \quad \forall n \geq N$$

**Theorem 1.6** (Equivalence of Compactness (Theorem 28.2, pg. 179 [8])). *If a set  $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$  is compact, then the following are equivalent*

- i.  $\forall (\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R}, (T_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq \tau)$  s.t.  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} T_i \exists (C_n)_{n=1}^{N < \infty} \subseteq (T_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  s.t.  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^N C_n$*
- ii.  $\forall (x_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \exists (x_{n_k})_{k \geq 1} \subseteq (x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  &  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  s.t.  $x_{n_k} \xrightarrow{k \uparrow \infty} x$*
- iii. Every infinite subset of  $\mathcal{C}$  has a limit point*

**Theorem 1.7** (Tychonoff's Compactness (Theorem 37.3, pg. 234 [8])). *An arbitrary product of compact spaces is compact in the product topology.*

## 2 Measure Theory

**Definition 2.1** ( $\sigma$ -Algebra). Let  $\Omega$  be a non-empty set. A collection  $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^\Omega$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra if

- i.  $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$
- ii.  $A \in \mathcal{F} \implies A^c \in \mathcal{F}$
- iii.  $(A_i)_{i \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{F} \implies \bigcup_{i \geq 1} A_i \in \mathcal{F}$

**Definition 2.2** (Measurable Maps / Random Variables). A map  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  is called measurable if

$$X^{-1}(\mathcal{F}') \subset \mathcal{F}$$

**Definition 2.3** (Measure). Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space, the set function  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$  is a measure if

- i.  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$
- ii.  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{i \geq 1} A_i) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu(A_i)$

**Definition 2.4** (Image Measure / Distribution). Let  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  be a random variable, then we can endow  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  with the distribution, often called the image measure,  $\mu = X\#\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P} \circ X^{-1}$

**Theorem 2.5** (Eq. 1.2 pg. 18 in [1]). Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable Polish space and  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), then  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  if

$$\int_{\Omega} \phi \, d\mu_1 = \int_{\Omega} \phi \, d\mu_2 \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(\Omega)$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $(X, d)$  is a metric space and let  $F$  be a closed subset of  $X$ . For  $S \subset X$  and  $x \in S$ , define  $d(x, S) := \inf\{d(x, y), y \in S\}$ . Let  $O_n := \{x \in X, d(x, F) < n^{-1}\}$ . Then  $O_n$  is open and the map

$$f_n : x \mapsto \frac{d(x, X \setminus O_n)}{d(x, X \setminus O_n) + d(x, F)}$$

is continuous and bounded. It converges pointwise and monotonically to the characteristic function of  $F$ . So we get by monotone convergence that  $\mu(F) = \nu(F)$  for all closed set  $F$ . Now given a Borel set  $B$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find a closed set  $F$  and an open set  $O$  such that  $F \subset B \subset O$  and  $\mu(O \setminus F) \leq \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.6** (Tightness). A family of finite measures  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{F})$  is called tight if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \text{ compact } \mathcal{K} \subset \Omega \text{ s.t. } \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}} (\mu(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{K})) < \varepsilon$$

**Lemma 2.7** (Ulam's theorem). *If  $(\Omega, \tau)$  is a Polish space, and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\tau), \mu)$  is a probability space, then  $\mu$  is tight.*

*Proof.* Result from measure theory, see Theorem 2.49 in [4]. □

**Lemma 2.8** (Prokhorov's theorem). *If  $(\Omega, \tau)$  is a Polish space, then a set  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}(\tau))$  is precompact for the weak topology if and only if it is tight.*

*Proof.* Result from measure theory, see Theorem 13.29 in [3]. □

**Definition 2.9** (Narrow / Weak\* Convergence). *A sequence of measures  $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges narrowly to  $\mu$  if  $\forall f \in C_b^0(\Omega)$*

$$\int f \, d\mu_n \xrightarrow{n \uparrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu$$

# Introduction to Optimal Transport



### 3 Coupling and Transport Plans

**Definition 3.1** (Coupling). *Given two probability spaces,  $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \mu_1)$  and  $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mu_2)$ , a coupling of  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , is a measure  $\pi$  on  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$  with marginals  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ , that is,*

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(F_1 \times \Omega_2) &= \mu_1(F_1) \quad \forall F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1 \\ \pi(\Omega_1 \times F_2) &= \mu_2(F_2) \quad \forall F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2\end{aligned}$$

*Alternatively, one can view a coupling as a pair of random variables  $X_i : (\Omega_*, \mathcal{F}_*, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$  satisfying  $\mu_i = X_{i\#}\mathbb{P}$ . Just find a pair  $(X_1, X_2)$  satisfying  $\pi = \mathbb{P} \circ (X_1^{-1}, X_2^{-1})$ ; there are existence theorems (Theorem 1.104 in [3]) which show that, for a given distribution, there exists a random variable which generates that distribution.*

**Claim 3.2.**  *$\pi$  is a coupling of the probability measures  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  iff  $\forall (\phi_1, \phi_2) \in L^1(\Omega_1, \mu_1) \times L^1(\Omega_2, \mu_2)$ , or equivalently  $L^\infty(\Omega_1, \mu_1) \times L^\infty(\Omega_2, \mu_2)$ , we have*

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} (\phi_1 \oplus \phi_2)(x, y) d\pi(x, y) = \int_{\Omega_1} \phi_1(x) d\mu_1(x) + \int_{\Omega_2} \phi_2(y) d\mu_2(y)$$

*Proof.* “ $\implies$ ” Take  $\phi_i = \mathbb{1}_{A^{(i)}}$  for some  $A^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , then

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_1 + \phi_2 d\pi = \sup_{(F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2} (\pi(A^{(1)}, F^{(2)}) + \pi(F^{(1)}, A^{(2)}))$$

by definition of Lebesgue integration. Since measures are monotone and  $A^{(1)} \times F^{(2)} \subset A^{(1)} \times \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \forall F^{(2)} \in \mathcal{F}_2$  and similarly for  $F^{(1)} \times A^{(2)}$ , the integral is maximized when  $(F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}) = (\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$ , and by the marginal restrictions of  $\pi$  we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_1 + \phi_2 d\pi = \mu_1(A^{(1)}) + \mu_2(A^{(2)})$$

Then proceed to simple functions and then limits of simple functions.

“ $\impliedby$ ” Take  $\phi_i = \mathbb{1}_{F^{(i)}}$  for  $F^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}_i$  and  $\phi_2 = 0$ , then

$$\pi(F^{(1)} \times \Omega_2) = \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_1 d\pi = \int_{\Omega_1} \phi_1 d\mu_1 = \mu(F^{(1)})$$

Similarly with  $\phi_2$  we obtain the result. □

**Definition 3.3** (Transport Plans). *The set of transport plans is the set of couplings on  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$  for  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , that is,*

$$\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \{\pi : \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\} \mid \pi \text{ couples } (\mu_1, \mu_2)\}$$

**Claim 3.4.** *Given two probability spaces,  $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \mu_1)$  and  $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mu_2)$ , the set of transport plans is nonempty.*

*Proof.*  $(\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2) \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  □

## 4 Kantorovich' O. T. & Basic Properties

Let  $c : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}$  be a loss metric and  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$  a probability space. The Kantorovich optimal transport problem is finding a  $\pi^*$  satisfying

$$\pi^* \in \underset{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)}{\operatorname{arg\,inf}} \mathbb{K}_c(\pi) = \underset{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)}{\operatorname{arg\,inf}} \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} c(x, y) d\pi(x, y)$$

where the quantity ' $c(x, y) d\pi(x, y)$ ' can be interpreted as "moving the amount  $d\pi(x, y)$  from  $x$  to  $y$  at a cost  $c(x, y)$ ." The minimal cost will be denoted  $\mathcal{C}_c(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \mathbb{K}_c(\pi^*)$ . The problem can also be posed with random variables, using the same notation as in Definition 3.1, we have

$$(X_1^*, X_2^*) \in \underset{\substack{X_i \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ \mu_i = X_{i\#} \mathbb{P}}}{\operatorname{arg\,inf}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} [c(X_1, X_2)]$$

We want to prove the following:

**Theorem 4.1** (Existence of an optimal coupling). *Let  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) be two Polish probability spaces, i.e. a separable, completely metrizable, topological, probability space; let  $a_i \in L^1(\Omega_i, \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \mu_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) be two upper semicontinuous functions. Let  $c : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  be a lower semicontinuous cost function, such that  $c(x, y) \geq a_1(x) + a_2(y)$  for all  $x, y$ . Then there is a coupling of  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  which minimizes the total cost  $\mathbb{E}[c(X_1, X_2)]$  among all possible couplings  $(X_1, X_2)$ .*

**Note.** The lower bound for  $c(\bullet, \bullet)$  in Theorem 4.1 guarantees a lower bound for the Kantorovich problem, this is because, by Claim 3.2,

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int a_1 + a_2 d\pi = \int a_1 + a_2 d(\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2) \leq \mathbb{K}_c(\pi^*)$$

and since the ' $a_i$ 's are integrable, we obtain a lower bound.  $\square$

To prove Theorem 4.1, we will first need a few lemmas.

**Lemma 4.2** (Baire's Theorem). *If  $f$  is a nonnegative lower semicontinuous function on  $\Omega$ , then  $\exists (f_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega)$  such that  $f_n \uparrow f$  pointwise.*

*Proof.* Let

$$f_n(\bullet) = \inf_{z \in \Omega} (f(z) + n \cdot d(\bullet, z))$$

Then all we must show is that  $f_n$  is (i) increasing, (ii) continuous, (iii) convergent to  $f$ .

- (i) We have the inequality  $f(z) + n \cdot d(x, z) \leq f(z) + (n+1) \cdot d(x, z)$ . Now taking the inf in  $z$  on both sides yields

$$\inf_{z \in \Omega} (f(z) + n \cdot d(x, z)) = f_n(x) \leq f_{n+1}(x) = \inf_{z \in \Omega} (f(z) + (n+1) \cdot d(x, z))$$

Also note that  $z$  can be  $x$ , so we have  $d(x, x) = 0$  and hence

$$f_n \leq f \tag{\star}$$

(ii) Choose  $x, y, z \in \Omega$ , then, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$f(z) + n \cdot d(z, x) \leq f(z) + n \cdot d(z, y) + n \cdot d(y, x)$$

Taking the inf in  $z$  on both sides and subtracting  $f_n(y)$  from both sides

$$f_n(x) - f_n(y) \leq n \cdot d(y, x)$$

Since  $x$  and  $y$  were arbitrary one obtains

$$|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| \leq n \cdot d(x, y)$$

Now let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{n}$ , then we have

$$d(x, y) < \delta \implies |f_n(x) - f_n(y)| \leq n \cdot d(y, x) < n \cdot \left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}\right) = \epsilon \quad \forall x, y$$

and we have uniform continuity.

(iii) Lower semicontinuity yields, for a fixed  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , that  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$  such that

$$d(x_0, z) < \delta \implies f(z) > f(x_0) - \epsilon \quad (\star\star)$$

Now suppose  $d(x_0, z) > \delta$ , then  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall n \geq N$

$$f(z) + n \cdot d(x_0, z) \geq n \cdot \delta > f(x_0)$$

since  $f > 0$ . However, we have, from  $(\star)$ , that  $f_n \leq f \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so

$$d(x_0, \arg \inf_{z \in \Omega} (f(z) + n \cdot d(x_0, z))) < \delta$$

But, for all  $z \in \Omega$  s.t.  $d(x_0, z) < \delta$  we have, from  $(\star\star)$ ,

$$f(z) + n \cdot d(x_0, z) \geq f(z) > f(x_0) - \epsilon$$

and so

$$\inf_{\substack{z \in \Omega \\ d(x_0, z) < \delta}} (f(z) + n \cdot d(x_0, z)) = f_n(x_0) > f(x_0) - \epsilon$$

Therefore,

$$f(x_0) - \epsilon \leq f_n(x_0) \leq f(x_0)$$

and so, taking  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$  and  $n \uparrow \infty$ , we have  $f_n(x_0) \rightarrow f(x_0)$ . Since  $x_0 \in \Omega$  was arbitrary, we have that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise. □

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $f$  be a nonnegative lower semicontinuous function on  $\Omega$ . If  $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$  converges narrowly to  $\mu$ , then*

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu_n$$

*Proof.* Since  $g$  is lower semicontinuous  $\exists (f_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{C}_b^0(\Omega)$  such that  $f_n \uparrow f$  by Lemma 4.2. Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , by the Beppo-Levi lemma for nonnegative increasing measurable functions, we have that  $\exists K \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\forall k > K$

$$\left| \int f \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu \right| = \int f \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu \leq \epsilon$$

rearranging we obtain

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \int f_k \, d\mu + \epsilon \quad (\star)$$

Now, by narrow convergence, we have that  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\forall n \geq N$

$$\left| \int f_k \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu_n \right| < \epsilon$$

by definition of the absolute value we have

$$-\epsilon < \int f_k \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu_n < \epsilon$$

and then we add  $\epsilon$  to both sides

$$0 < \int f_k \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu_n < \int f_k \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu_n + \epsilon < 2\epsilon \quad (\star\star)$$

“Adding zero” to  $(\star)$ , applying  $(\star\star)$ , then recalling that  $\int f_k \, d\mu_n \leq \int f \, d\mu_n$  since  $f_k \leq f \, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int f \, d\mu &\leq \int f_k \, d\mu \pm \int f_k \, d\mu_n + \epsilon \\ &= \int f_k \, d\mu_n + \left( \int f_k \, d\mu - \int f_k \, d\mu_n \right) + \epsilon \\ &\leq \int f_k \, d\mu_n + 3\epsilon \\ &\leq \int f \, d\mu_n + 3\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Now, by taking the  $\liminf$  in  $n$  and taking  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$  we obtain the result

$$\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \leq \liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu_n$$

□

**Lemma 4.4** (Lower semicontinuity of the cost functional). *Let  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  be two Polish spaces, and  $c : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  a lower semicontinuous cost function. Let  $h : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  be an upper semicontinuous function such that  $c \geq h$  everywhere. Let  $(\pi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of probability measures*

on  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ , converging weakly to some  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ , in such a way that  $h \in L^1(\pi_k) \cap L^1(\pi)$ , and

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} h \, d\pi_k \xrightarrow{k \uparrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} h \, d\pi$$

Then

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} c \, d\pi \leq \liminf_{k \uparrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} c \, d\pi_k$$

*Proof.* Replace  $c$  by  $c - h$ , a non-negative lower semicontinuous function, and apply the previous lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5** (Tightness of transference plans). *Let  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  be two Polish spaces. Let  $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2 \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2)$  be tight subsets of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2)$  respectively. Then the set  $\Pi(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$  of all transference plans whose marginals lie in  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  respectively, is itself tight in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$ ,  $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2$ , and  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ . By Ulam's tightness theorem (and by assumption), we have that

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \text{ compact } \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(i)} \subset \Omega_i \ (\perp \mu_i) \text{ s.t. } \mu_i(\Omega_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(i)}) \leq \epsilon$$

Let  $(X_1, X_2)$  be a coupling of  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , that is,  $\text{law}(X_i) = X_{i\#}\mathbb{P} = \mu_i$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies \mathbb{P}((X_1, X_2) \notin \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)} \times \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\{\omega \mid X_1(\omega) \notin \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)}\} \cap \{\omega \mid X_2(\omega) \notin \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)}\}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_1^{-1}(\Omega_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)}) \cap X_2^{-1}(\Omega_2 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)})) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_1^{-1}(\Omega_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)}) \cup X_2^{-1}(\Omega_2 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)})) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_1^{-1}(\Omega_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)})) + \mathbb{P}(X_2^{-1}(\Omega_2 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)})) \\ &= \mu_1(\Omega_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)}) + \mu_2(\Omega_2 \setminus \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)}) \\ &\leq \epsilon + \epsilon = 2\epsilon \perp \mu_i \end{aligned}$$

And since  $\mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(i)}$  is compact, we have, by Theorem 1.7 (Tychonoff), that  $\mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(1)} \times \mathcal{K}_\epsilon^{(2)} \subset \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$  too is compact; therefore,  $\Pi(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$  is tight.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Since  $\Omega_i$  is a Polish space, we have, by Theorem 2.7 (Ulam), that  $\mu_i$  is tight and, by Lemma 4.5, that  $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  is tight, and so by Theorem 2.8 (Prokhorov) this set has a compact closure. Now, take  $(\pi_k)_{k \geq 1} \subset \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  s.t.  $\pi_k \xrightarrow{k \uparrow \infty} \pi$  in the narrow sense; we want to show that  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , i.e. has margins  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . Let  $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in L^1(\mu_1) \times L^1(\mu_2)$ , then we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_1 + \phi_2 \, d\pi_k = \int_{\Omega_1} \phi_1 \, d\mu_1 + \int_{\Omega_2} \phi_2 \, d\mu_2 \xrightarrow{k \uparrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_1 + \phi_2 \, d\pi$$

hence

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_1 + \phi_2 \, d\pi = \int_{\Omega_1} \phi_1 \, d\mu_1 + \int_{\Omega_2} \phi_2 \, d\mu_2$$

and by Claim 3.2 we conclude that  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ ; hence,  $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  is closed, and since it has a compact closure, we have that it is compact. Now let  $(\pi_k)_{k \geq 1}$  be the minimizing sequence for  $\int c \, d\pi_k$  which converges to the optimal transport cost. Since  $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  is compact, take a narrowly convergent subsequence to  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ . Notice that

$$h : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \ni (x_1, x_2) \mapsto a_1(x_1) + a_2(x_2) = h(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is  $L^1(\pi_k) \cap L^1(\pi)$  and, by assumption,  $c \geq h$  everywhere; moreover,

$$\int h \, d\pi_k = \int h \, d\pi = \int a_1 \, d\mu_1 + \int a_2 \, d\mu_2$$

Therefore, with Lemma 4.4 on  $c - h$ , we have

$$\int c \, d\pi \leq \liminf_{k \uparrow \infty} \int c \, d\pi_k$$

thus  $\pi$  is minimizing.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.6** (Optimality is inherited by restriction). *Let  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) be two Polish spaces,  $a_i \in L^1(\Omega_i, \mu_i)$ , and let  $c : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  be a measurable cost function such that  $c \geq a_1 + a_2$ ; let  $\mathcal{C}_c(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  be the optimal transport cost from  $\mu_1$  to  $\mu_2$ . Assume  $\mathcal{C}_c(\mu_1, \mu_2) < \infty$  and let  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  be an optimal transport plan. Let  $\tilde{\pi}$  be a nonnegative measure on  $\mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$  such that  $\tilde{\pi} \leq \pi$  and  $\pi(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2) > 0$ . Then the probability measure*

$$\pi' = \frac{\tilde{\pi}}{\tilde{\pi}(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)} = \frac{\tilde{\pi}}{\tilde{Z}}$$

is an optimal transference plan between its marginals  $\mu'_1$  and  $\mu'_2$ .

Moreover, if  $\pi$  is the unique optimal transference plan between  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ , then  $\pi'$  is the unique optimal transference plan between  $\mu'_1$  and  $\mu'_2$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\pi'$  is not optimal, then  $\exists \pi''$  such that, for all  $F^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}_i$ ,

$$\pi''(\bullet \times F^{(2)}) = \mu'_1, \quad \pi''(F^{(1)} \times \bullet) = \mu'_2$$

and

$$\int c \, d\pi'' < \int c \, d\pi'$$

Now, consider

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi} &= (\pi - \tilde{\pi}) + \tilde{Z}\pi'' \\ &= \left(\pi - \tilde{Z}\frac{\tilde{\pi}}{\tilde{Z}}\right) + \tilde{Z}\pi'' \\ &= \left(\pi - \tilde{Z}\pi'\right) + \tilde{Z}\pi'' \\ &= \pi + \tilde{Z}(\pi'' - \pi') \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{Z} = \tilde{\pi}(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2) > 0$  by assumption. It is clear that  $\hat{\pi}$  is nonnegative since  $\tilde{\pi} \leq \pi$  and  $\pi'' \geq 0$ . Note that  $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , that is, for all  $F^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}_i$

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\pi}(F^{(1)} \times \Omega_2) = \mu_1(F^{(1)}) + \tilde{Z} ( \mu'_1(F^{(1)}) - \mu'_1(F^{(1)}) ) = \mu_1(F^{(1)}) \\ \hat{\pi}(\Omega_1 \times F^{(2)}) = \mu_1(F^{(2)}) + \tilde{Z} ( \mu'_2(F^{(2)}) - \mu'_2(F^{(2)}) ) = \mu_2(F^{(2)}) \end{cases}$$

Since  $\int c d(\tilde{Z}(\pi'' - \pi')) < 0$ , we obtain

$$\int c d\hat{\pi} = \int c d\pi + \int c d(\tilde{Z}(\pi'' - \pi')) < \int c d\pi$$

which contradicts the optimality of  $\pi$ ; therefore,  $\pi'$  is optimal. Now suppose  $\pi$  is a unique optimal transference plan, let  $\pi'$  and  $\pi'' \in \Pi(\mu'_1, \mu'_2)$  be optimal, define  $\hat{\pi}$  as above and note that  $\hat{\pi} \leq \pi$  (since  $\pi$  is optimal), hence  $\hat{\pi} = \pi$  yielding

$$\int \phi d\hat{\pi} = \int \phi d\pi + \int \phi d(\tilde{Z}(\pi'' - \pi')) = \int \phi d\pi$$

$\forall \phi \in L^1(\pi)$ , and so, by Claim 2.5 (bounded continuous equality, **not**  $L^1(\pi)$ , suppose  $\infty$  at a point where  $\pi \neq 0$  and  $\pi' = 0$ ) on  $(\mu'_1, \mu'_2)$ ,  $\pi' = \pi''$  and so  $\pi'$  is unique.  $\square$

## 5 The Wasserstein Distance

We want to be able to say that

$$\mathcal{C}_c(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathbb{K}_c(\pi)$$

is the “distance between  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ ”, but, in general,  $\mathcal{C}_c(\bullet, \bullet)$  does not satisfy the axioms of a distance function, i.e. a metric; however, we obtain such a metric characteristic when  $c$  is a metric such as  $\ell^p$  for some  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $(\Omega, d)$  be a Polish metric space, and let  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . For any two probability measures  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  in  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ , the Wasserstein distance of order  $p$  between  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  is defined by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) &= \mathcal{C}_{d^p(\bullet, \bullet)}^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \left( \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\Omega} d^p(x, y) d\pi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \inf_{\substack{X_i \in \mathcal{F} \\ \text{law}(X_i) = \mu_i}} \left( \mathbb{E}[d^p(X_1, X_2)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 5.2** (Hahn-Banach Extension). Let  $(\Theta, \|\bullet\|)$  be a normed linear space, let  $\Theta' \subset \Theta$  be a linear subspace and let  $\ell \in (\Theta')^*$ , then  $\exists \tilde{\ell} \in \Theta^*$  such that  $\ell(\omega) = \tilde{\ell}(\omega) \forall \omega \in \Theta'$ .

**Definition 5.3** (Riesz Space). A Riesz space  $\mathcal{R}$  is a vector space endowed with a partial order, that is,  $\forall x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathcal{R}$

- i.  $x_1 \leq x_2 \implies x_1 + x_3 \leq x_2 + x_3$
- ii.  $\forall \alpha \geq 0, x_1 \leq x_2 \implies \alpha x_1 \leq \alpha x_2$
- iii.  $\exists \sup(x_1, x_2)$

**Definition 5.4** (Positive Linear Functional & Sublinear).  $\ell \in \Omega^*$  is positive linear if

$$\forall \omega \geq 0 \implies \ell(\omega) \geq 0$$

and is sublinear if  $\forall \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$

- i.  $\ell(\omega_1 + \omega_2) \leq \ell(\omega_1) + \ell(\omega_2)$
- ii.  $\ell(\alpha \omega_1) = \alpha \ell(\omega_1)$

**Theorem 5.5** (Hahn-Banach Positive Extension ([6], Theorem 8.31, pg. 330)). Let  $\Theta$  be a Riesz space,  $\Theta' \subset \Theta$  be a Riesz subspace, and let  $\ell \in (\Theta')^*$  be **positive linear**, then  $\ell$  extends to a **positive linear functional** on all of  $\Theta$  if and only if there is a monotone sublinear functional  $\rho \in \Theta^*$  satisfying  $\ell(\theta') \leq \rho(\theta') \forall \theta' \in \Theta'$ .



*Proof.* “ $\implies$ ”: Let  $\tilde{\ell} \in \Theta^*$  extend  $\ell$  and set  $\rho(\theta) = \hat{\ell}(\theta^+) = \hat{\ell}(\mathbf{1}(\theta \geq 0) \cdot \theta)$   
“ $\impliedby$ ”: Suppose  $\rho : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is monotone sublinear with  $\ell(\theta') \leq \rho(\theta') \forall \theta' \in \Theta'$ .  
By the Hahn-Banach Extension Theorem  $\exists \hat{\ell} \in \Theta^*$  extending  $\ell$  and satisfying  $\ell(\theta) \leq \rho(\theta) \forall \theta \in \Theta$ . Then for  $\theta \geq 0$

$$-\hat{\ell}(\theta) = \hat{\ell}(-\theta) \leq \rho(-\theta) \leq \rho(0) = 0$$

and multiplying both sides by  $-1$  we obtain

$$\theta \geq 0 \implies \hat{\ell}(\theta) \geq 0$$

hence  $\hat{\ell}$  is a positive extension of  $\ell$ . □

**Theorem 5.6** (Riesz Representation ([5], Theorem 7.3, pg. 22)). *Let  $(\Theta, d)$  be a metric space, then  $\forall$  **positive**  $\ell \in C_b^0(\Theta)^* \exists$  tight  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}(\Theta, d))$  s.t.*

$$\ell(f) = \int_{\Theta} f d\mu \quad \forall f \in C_b(\Theta)$$

**Note:** In the following I add a *compactness* assumption to  $\Omega$  which has not been there up to now. As I work through [2] and build the presentation for a more general approach to optimal transport, I will add similar theorems with weaker assumptions.

**Theorem 5.7** ( $\mathcal{W}_p$  is a metric on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ ). *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, d)$  be a measurable compact Polish metric space, then  $\mathcal{W}_p$  is a metric on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ .*

**Lemma 5.8** (Gluing Lemma). *Let  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) be a compact measured Polish space with associated transport plans  $\pi_{12} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  and  $\pi_{23} \in \Pi(\mu_2, \mu_3)$ , then  $\exists \pi_{123} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \times \mathcal{F}_3)$  with marginals  $\pi_{12}$  and  $\pi_{23}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $V \subset C_b^0(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \Omega_3)$  be the vector space

$$V = \{\phi_{12}(x_1, x_2) + \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) : \phi_{12} \in C_b^0(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2), \phi_{23} \in C_b^0(\Omega_2 \times \Omega_3)\}$$

and define a functions  $G : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$G(\phi_{12} + \phi_{23}) = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_{12} d\pi_{12} + \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_{23} d\pi_{23}$$

We will now show that  $G$  is well defined. Let  $\phi_{12} + \phi_{23} = \hat{\phi}_{12} + \hat{\phi}_{23}$ , lets perturb  $x_1$  by  $\Delta x_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{12}(x_1 + \Delta x_1, x_2) - \tilde{\phi}_{12}(x_1 + \Delta x_1, x_2) &= \tilde{\phi}_{23}(x_2, x_3) - \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \\ &= \phi_{12}(x_1, x_2) - \tilde{\phi}_{12}(x_1, x_2) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for  $x_3$  we obtain, with the equality restriction, that  $\phi_{12}(x_1, x_2) - \tilde{\phi}_{12}(x_1, x_2)$  and  $\tilde{\phi}_{23}(x_2, x_3) - \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3)$  are functions of  $x_2$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_{12} - \tilde{\phi}_{12} \, d\pi_{12} &= \int_{\Omega} \phi_{12} - \tilde{\phi}_{12} \, d\mu_2 \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \phi_{23} - \tilde{\phi}_{23} \, d\mu_2 \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_{23} - \tilde{\phi}_{23} \, d\pi_{23} \end{aligned}$$

and, by rearranging, we obtain

$$G(\phi_{12} + \phi_{23}) = G(\tilde{\phi}_{12} + \tilde{\phi}_{23})$$

and so  $G$  is well defined. Clearly  $G$  is bounded and linear (its an integral), we must show that it is *positive* linear. Let

$$\phi_{12}(x_1, x_2) + \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \geq 0$$

then, with both sides being functions of  $x_2$ , we have

$$\phi_{12}(x_1, x_2) \geq -\phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \geq -\inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3)$$

and that the infimum exists since  $\phi_{23}$  is bounded. We now have

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_{12} \, d\pi_{12} \geq \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} -\inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \, d\pi_{12} \geq -\int_{\Omega_2} \inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \, d\mu_2 \\ \int_{\Omega_2 \times \Omega_3} \phi_{23} \, d\pi_{23} \geq \int_{\Omega_2 \times \Omega_3} \inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \, d\pi_{23} \geq \int_{\Omega_2} \inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \, d\mu_2 \end{cases}$$

Using the above lower bounds, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(\phi_{12} + \phi_{23}) &= \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} \phi_{12} \, d\pi_{12} + \int_{\Omega_2 \times \Omega_3} \phi_{23} \, d\pi_{23} \\ &\geq -\int_{\Omega_2} \inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \, d\mu_2 + \int_{\Omega_2} \inf_{x_3} \phi_{23}(x_2, x_3) \, d\mu_2 \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $G$  is a positive linear functional. So, by Theorem 5.5 (Hahn-Banach Positive Extension)[with  $\Theta = C_b^0(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \Omega_3)$  and  $\Theta' = V$ , and  $\rho(\bullet) = \sup_{x \in \Omega}(\bullet)$

in the definition],  $\exists \hat{G} : \mathcal{C}_b^0(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times \Omega_3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and by the Theorem 5.6 (Riesz representation) we have  $\exists \pi_{123} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \times \mathcal{F}_3)$  corresponding to  $\hat{G}$  yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega^{\otimes 3}} \phi_{12} + \phi_{23} \, d\pi_{123} &= \hat{G}(\phi_{12} + \phi_{23}) \\ &= G(\phi_{12} + \phi_{23}) \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_{12} \, d\pi_{12} + \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_{23} \, d\pi_{23} \quad \forall (\phi_{12} + \phi_{23}) \in V \end{aligned}$$

and we have, from Theorem 2.5, that  $\pi_{123}$  has marginals  $\pi_{12}$  and  $\pi_{23}$  as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.7.* We must show that  $\mathcal{W}_p$  satisfies the properties of a metric in Definition 1.1. It is clear that  $\mathcal{W}_p$  is non-negative, symmetric, and finite (since the infimum is achieved). Now, suppose  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu$ , then there exists a random variable  $X : (\Omega_*, \mathcal{F}_*, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  such that  $\mu = X_{\#}\mathbb{P}$ , then, with  $X_1 = X_2 = X$  in the definition of the Kantorovich problem, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_*} d^p(X(\omega), X(\omega)) \, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = 0$$

so  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \mu) = 0 \, \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ . Now let  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$  (not necessarily equal), if  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) = 0$ , then  $\pi^*$  must concentrate all of its mass on the diagonal  $\Delta_\Omega \subset \Omega \times \Omega$ ; suppose it didn't, then  $\exists F \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \mid_{\Delta_\Omega^c}$  s.t.  $\pi^*(F) > 0$  and  $\sup_{(x_1, x_2) \in F} (d(x_1, x_2)) > 0$ , so we have

$$\left( \int_F d^p(x_1, x_2) \, d\pi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2)$$

which contradicts  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) = 0$ . With this, we have that  $\forall u \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(\Omega)$

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x) \, d\mu_1(x) = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} u(x) \, d\pi(x, y) = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} u(y) \, d\pi(x, y) = \int_{\Omega} u(y) \, d\mu_2(y)$$

and thus we have  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  by Theorem 2.5.

Now let  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ),  $\pi_{12} \in \mathbb{K}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ ,  $\pi_{23} \in \mathbb{K}(\mu_2, \mu_3)$ , and, by the Lemma 5.8,  $\pi_{123} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes 3})$  coupling  $\pi_{12}$  and  $\pi_{23}$ . Letting  $\pi_{13}(\bullet, \bullet) =$

$\pi_{123}(\bullet, \Omega, \bullet)$  (not necessarily optimal), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_3) &\leq \left( \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} d^p(x_1, x_2) d\pi_{13} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \left( \int_{\Omega^{\otimes 3}} d^p(x_1, x_3) d\pi_{123} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left( \int_{\Omega^{\otimes 3}} [d(x_1, x_2) + d(x_2, x_3)]^p d\pi_{123} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left( \int_{\Omega^{\otimes 3}} d^p(x_1, x_2) d\pi_{123} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left( \int_{\Omega^{\otimes 3}} d^p(x_2, x_3) d\pi_{123} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \left( \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} d^p(x_1, x_2) d\pi_{12} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left( \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} d^p(x_2, x_3) d\pi_{23} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_2, \mu_3)
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the triangle inequality.  $\square$

## References

- [1] C. Villani, *Topics in Optimal Transport*. American Mathematical Society, 2003. ISBN: 0-8218-3312-X
- [2] C. Villani, *Optimal Transport: Old and New*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4471-5361-0 Available: <https://ljk.imag.fr/membres/Emmanuel.Maitre/lib/exe/fetch.php?media=b07.stflour.pdf>
- [3] A. Klenke, *Probability Theory: A Comprehensive Course*. London: Springer, 2014. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4471-5361-0
- [4] P. Orbanz, *Probability Theory II*. London: Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit at UCL, 2016.
- [5] O. van Gaans, *Probability measures on metric spaces*. Netherlands: Universiteit Leiden.
- [6] C. Aliprantis, K. Border, *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*. Springer, 2006. ISBN: 978-3540295860.
- [7] O. Chodosh *Optimal Transport and Ricci Curvature: Wasserstein Space Over the Interval*. arXiv:1105.2883v2, 2012.
- [8] J. Munkres *Topology*. Prentice Hall, 2000. ISBN: 0-13-181629-2