

Propagation of chaos: a review of models, methods and applications

Louis-Pierre CHAINTRON¹ and Antoine DIEZ²

¹ DMA, École Normale Supérieure, 45 rue d'Ulm, 75005 Paris, France
lchaintron@clipper.ens.fr

² Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus,
London, SW7 2AZ, UK,
antoine.diez18@imperial.ac.uk

28th June 2021

Abstract

The notion of propagation of chaos for large systems of interacting particles originates in statistical physics and has recently become a central notion in many areas of applied mathematics. The present review describes old and new methods as well as several important results in the field. The models considered include the McKean-Vlasov diffusion, the mean-field jump models and the Boltzmann models. The first part of this review is an introduction to modelling aspects of stochastic particle systems and to the notion of propagation of chaos. The second part presents concrete applications and a more detailed study of some of the important models in the field.

Keywords: Kac's chaos, McKean-Vlasov, Boltzmann models, mean-field limit, particle system

AMS subject classification: 82C22, 82C40, 35Q70, 65C35, 92-10.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Models and properties	8
2.1	Particle systems, setting and conventions	8
2.2	Mean-field models	12
2.2.1	Abstract mean-field generators and mean-field limits	12
2.2.2	McKean-Vlasov diffusion	13
2.2.3	Mean-field jump processes and PDMPs	17
2.3	Boltzmann models	22
2.3.1	General form	22
2.3.2	Parametric Boltzmann models	27
2.3.3	Classical models in collisional kinetic theory	30

3	Notions about chaos	34
3.1	Topology reminders: metrics and convergence for probability measures	34
3.1.1	Distances on the space of probability measures	34
3.1.2	Convergence in the space of probability measures	37
3.1.3	Entropic convergence	40
3.2	Representation of symmetric particle systems	41
3.2.1	Finite particle systems	41
3.2.2	Infinite particle systems and random measures	44
3.3	Kac's chaos	47
3.3.1	Definition and characterisation	47
3.3.2	Quantitative versions of Kac's chaos	49
3.4	Propagation of chaos	51
4	Proving propagation of chaos	54
4.1	Coupling methods	55
4.1.1	Definition	55
4.1.2	Synchronous coupling.	56
4.1.3	Reflection coupling for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion.	57
4.1.4	Optimal jumps	58
4.1.5	Analysis in Wasserstein spaces: optimal coupling	59
4.2	Compactness methods	60
4.2.1	Martingale methods.	60
4.2.2	Gradient flows.	61
4.3	A pointwise study of the empirical process	62
4.3.1	The empirical generator.	63
4.3.2	A toy-example using the measure-valued formalism	63
4.3.3	The limit semi-group and the nonlinear measure-valued process	67
4.3.4	More on the limit generator	69
4.3.5	The abstract theorem	71
4.4	Large Deviation Related Methods	73
4.4.1	Chaos through Large Deviation Principles	74
4.4.2	Chaos from entropy bounds	76
4.4.3	Tools for concentration inequalities	80
4.5	Tools for Boltzmann interactions	82
4.5.1	Series expansions	82
4.5.2	Interaction graph	83
5	McKean-Vlasov diffusion models	85
5.1	Synchronous coupling	86
5.1.1	McKean's theorem and beyond for Lipschitz interactions	86
5.1.2	Towards more singular interactions	91
5.1.3	Gradient systems and uniform in time estimates	96
5.2	Other coupling techniques	104
5.2.1	Reflection coupling for uniform in time chaos	104
5.2.2	Chaos via Glivenko-Cantelli	106
5.2.3	Optimal coupling and WJ inequality	107
5.3	Compactness methods for mixed systems and gradient flows	110
5.3.1	Pathwise chaos via martingale arguments	110
5.3.2	Gradient systems as gradient flows	118
5.4	Entropy bounds with very weak regularity	120
5.4.1	An introductory example in the L^∞ case	120
5.4.2	With $W^{-1,\infty}$ kernels	122
5.5	Concentration inequalities for gradient systems	125
5.6	General interactions	127

5.6.1	Extending McKean's theorem	127
5.6.2	Chaos via Girsanov theorem	129
5.6.3	Other techniques	129
6	Boltzmann models	132
6.1	Kac's theorem via series expansions	132
6.2	Pathwise Kac's theorem via random interaction graphs	138
6.3	Martingale methods	140
6.4	SDE and coupling	143
6.5	Some pointwise results in unbounded cases via the empirical process	149
6.6	Lanford's theorem for the deterministic hard-sphere system	150
7	Applications and modelling	155
7.1	Classical PDEs in kinetic theory: derivation and numerical methods	156
7.1.1	Stochastic particle methods for the McKean-Vlasov model	156
7.1.2	The Burgers equation	157
7.1.3	The vorticity equation and other singular kernels	158
7.1.4	The Landau equation	159
7.1.5	DSMC for the Boltzmann equation	161
7.2	Models of self-organization	164
7.2.1	Phase transitions and long-time behaviour: the example of the Kuramoto model	165
7.2.2	Swarming models	166
7.2.3	Neuron models	170
7.2.4	Socio-economic models	171
7.3	Applications in data sciences and optimization	173
7.3.1	Some problems related to Monte Carlo integration	173
7.3.2	Agent Based Optimization	179
7.3.3	Overparametrized Neural Networks	180
7.4	Beyond propagation of chaos	183
7.4.1	Fluctuations	183
7.4.2	Measure-valued limits: an example	184
A	A strengthened version of Hewitt-Savage theorem and its partial system version	186
B	Generator estimates against monomials	189
C	A combinatorial lemma	194
D	Probability reminders	195
D.1	Convergence of probability measures	195
D.2	Skorokhod's topology and tightness on the Skorokhod space	196
D.3	Stochastic processes and martingales	198
D.3.1	Martingales	198
D.3.2	Local martingales and quadratic variation	199
D.3.3	Semimartingales	200
D.3.4	D -semimartingales	202
D.4	Tightness for càdlàg semimartingales and D -semimartingales	203
D.5	Markov processes and Markov representation for PDEs	204
D.5.1	Time-homogeneous Markov processes and linear PDEs	204
D.5.2	Time-inhomogeneous Markov processes	209
D.5.3	Non-linear Markov processes	211
D.6	Large Deviation Principles and Sanov theorem	212

D.7	Girsanov transform	213
D.8	Poisson random measures	213

References

215

1 Introduction

When Boltzmann published his most famous article [Bol72] one century and a half ago, the study of large systems of interacting particles was entirely motivated by the microscopic modelling of thermodynamic systems. Although it was far from being an accepted idea at that time, Boltzmann postulated that since a macroscopic volume of gas contains a myriad of elementary particles, it is both hopeless and needless to keep track of each particle and one should rather seek a statistical description. He thus derived the equation that now bears his name and which gives the time evolution of the continuum probability distribution (in the phase space) of a typical particle. With the H-theorem, he also extended and justified the pioneering works of Maxwell and Clausius for equilibrium thermodynamic systems, paving the way alongside Gibbs for a consistent kinetic theory of gases. The Boltzmann equation is derived from first principles under a crucial assumption, called *molecular chaos*. This assumption was already known from Maxwell and is often called the *Stosszahlansatz* since Ehrenfest. Informally, it translates the idea that, despite the multitude of interactions, two particles taken at random should be statistically independent when the total number of particles grows to infinity. It is not so clear how the appearance of probability theory should be interpreted in this context. In the following years, the *Stosszahlansatz* and its consequences (the H-theorem) were the object of a fierce debate among physicists as they seem to break the microscopic reversibility. Beyond the scientific debate, it has raised metaphysical and philosophical questions about the profound nature of time and randomness.

The rigorous justification of the work of Boltzmann and the status of molecular chaos became true mathematical questions when Hilbert addressed them in his Sixth Problem at the Paris International Congress of Mathematicians in 1900. Quoting Hilbert, the problem which motivates the present work is to “[develop] mathematically the limiting processes [...] which lead from the atomistic view to the laws of motion of continua”. Our starting point will be the seminal article of Kac [Kac56]. More than half a century after Hilbert, Kac gave the first rigorous mathematical definition of chaos and introduced the idea that for time-evolving systems, chaos should be propagated in time, a property therefore called the *propagation of chaos*. Kac was still motivated by the mathematical justification of the classical collisional kinetic theory of Boltzmann for which he developed a simplified probabilistic model. Soon after Kac, McKean [McK69] introduced a class of diffusion models which were not originally part of Boltzmann theory but which satisfy Kac’s propagation of chaos property. In the classical kinetic theory of Boltzmann, the problem is the derivation of continuum models starting from deterministic, Newtonian, systems of particles. In comparison, the fundamental contribution of Kac and McKean is to have shown that the classical equations of kinetic theory also have a natural stochastic interpretation. This philosophical shift is addressed in the enlightening introduction of Kac [Kac73] written for the centenary of the Boltzmann equation.

Kac and McKean introduced a new mathematical formalism, gave many insights on the stochastic modelling in kinetic theory and proved the two building block theorems (Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 6.1). Their works have stimulated the development of a rich and still active *mathematical kinetic theory*. Keeping strong connections with the original theory of Boltzmann, some fundamental questions raised several decades ago have been answered only recently (see for instance [BGS16; GST14; MM13]). On the other hand, systems of interacting particles are ubiquitous in many applications now and over the last two decades, the tools and concepts developed in kinetic theory have somehow escaped the realm of pure statistical physics. This review paper is motivated by the growing number of models in ap-

plied mathematics where the notion of chaos plays a central role. Some recent new domains of applications include the following ones. In mathematical biology and social sciences, self-organization models describe systems of indistinguishable particles (birds, insects, bacteria, crowds...) with a behaviour which can hardly be predicted at the microscopic scale but which are (sometimes) well explained by continuum models derived within the framework of mathematical kinetic theory [BDT17; BDT19; NPT10; MT14; Deg18; Alb+19; VZ12]. In another context, the recent theory of mean-field games studies the asymptotic properties of games with a large numbers of players [Car+19; Car10; CD18a; CD18b]. Even more recently, systems of particles have been used to model complex phenomena in data sciences, with applications in Markov Chain Monte Carlo theory [Del98; Del04; Del13], in optimization [Pin+17; Tot21; GP20; Car+21], or for the training of neural networks [MMN18; RV19; SS20; CB18; De +20]. Compared to the models in statistical physics, many aspects should be reconsidered. To cite a few examples: the basic conservation laws (of momentum, energy...) do not always hold for biological systems and may be replaced by other types of constraints (optimization constraints, geometrical constraints...); the intrinsic randomness (or uncertainty) of the models in applied sciences is often a crucial modelling assumption; the complexity of the interaction mechanisms entails new analytical tools etc. These differences have motivated many new techniques, new insights on the question of propagation of chaos and in the end, new results.

This review article on propagation of chaos is not the first one on the subject. The course of Sznitman at Saint-Flour [Szn91] studies many of the most important historical probabilistic models. The probabilistic methods are explained in details in the book [TT96] (in particular the courses of Méléard [Mél96] and Pulvirenti [Pul96]). More recently, the review of Jabin and Wang [JW17] focuses on McKean mean-field systems and PDE applications. By its nature, the notion of chaos lies in the interplay between probability theory and Partial Differential Equations. The present review discusses both analytic and probabilistic methods and includes many (very) recent results. We also refer to the article by Hauray and Mischler [HM14] which is to our knowledge, the most complete reference on Kac's chaos (without propagation of chaos). For deterministic systems which will not be considered here, we refer to the very thorough reviews [Jab14; Gol16].

Outline. The article is organised as follows.

Section 2 introduces the setting and the conventions that will be used throughout the article. A gallery of the models which will be studied is presented; we will distinguish McKean's mean-field jump and diffusion models (Section 2.2) and Boltzmann-Kac models (Section 2.3).

Section 3 is devoted to the description of the fundamental tools and concepts needed in the study of exchangeable particle systems. The central notions of chaos (Section 3.3) and propagation of chaos (Section 3.4) are defined in this section.

Section 4 is a review of the methods used to prove propagation of chaos. Several probabilistic and analytical techniques are described as well as abstract theorems which will be applied to specific models in the following sections.

Section 5 and Section 6 are devoted to the review of the main results in the literature respectively for McKean-Vlasov models and Boltzmann models. We emphasize that although none of the results presented are new, we include some proofs that we did not find or hardly found in the literature in this form, in particular: the proofs of McKean's and Kac's theorems (Section 5.1.1 and Section 6.1), the functional law of large numbers by martingale arguments (Section 5.3.1) and the proof of propagation of chaos for Boltzmann models via coupling methods (Section 6.4).

Section 7 is an introductory section to various recent modelling problems and practical applications of the concept of propagation of chaos. A selection of examples which motivate and often extend the results of the previous sections is presented, including some open problems and current research trends.

Several appendices complete this work. Some corollaries of the quantitative Hewitt-Savage theorem are gathered in Appendix A. Generalised high-order expansions of the particle generators against monomial test functions are shown in Appendix B. Finally, for the reader's convenience, we collect in Appendix D useful notions and results in Probability theory regarding Markov processes, martingale methods, large deviations, the Girsanov transform and the theory of Poisson random measures.

Notations and conventions

Sets

$C(I, E)$	The set of continuous functions from a time interval $I = [0, T]$ to a set E , endowed with the uniform topology.
$C_b(E), C_b^k(E)$	Respectively the set of real-valued bounded continuous functions and the set of functions with $k \geq 1$ bounded continuous derivatives on a set E .
$C_c(E)$	The set of real-valued continuous functions with compact support on a locally compact space E .
$C_0(E)$	The set of real-valued continuous functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact space E , i.e. $\varphi \in C_0(E)$ when for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subset E$ such that $ \varphi(x) < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in E$ outside K_ε .
$D(I, E)$	The space of functions which are right continuous and have left limit everywhere from a time interval $I = [0, T]$ to a set E , endowed with the Skorokhod $J1$ topology. This is the space of the so-called <i>càdlàg</i> functions. This space is also called the <i>Skorokhod space</i> or the <i>path space</i> .
$L^p(E)$ or $L_\mu^p(E)$	The set of measurable functions φ defined almost everywhere on a measured space (E, μ) such that the $ \varphi ^p$ is integrable for $p \geq 1$. When $p = +\infty$, this is the set of functions with a bounded essential supremum. We do not specify the dependency in μ when no confusion is possible.
$\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$	The set of d -dimensional square real matrices.
$\mathcal{M}(E)$	The set of signed measures on a measurable space E .
$\mathcal{M}^+(E)$	The set of positive measures on a measurable space E .
$\mathcal{P}(E)$	The set of probability measures on a space E .
$\mathcal{P}_p(E)$	The set of probability measures with bounded moment of order $p \geq 1$ on a space E .
$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E)$	The set of empirical measures of size N over a set E , that is measures of the form $\mu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i}$, where $x^i \in E$.
\mathbb{R}_+	The set $[0, +\infty)$.
\mathfrak{S}_N	The permutation group of the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$.
\mathbb{S}^{d-1}	The sphere of dimension $d - 1$.

Generic elements and operations

C	A generic nonnegative constant, the value of which may change from line to line.
$C(a_1, \dots, a_n)$	A generic nonnegative constant which depends on some fixed parameters denoted by a_1, \dots, a_n . Its value may change from line to line.
$\text{diag}(x)$	The d -dimensional diagonal matrix whose diagonal coefficients x_1, \dots, x_d are the components of the d -dimensional vector x .

$\nabla \cdot V$	The divergence of a vector field $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ or of a matrix field $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$, respectively defined by $\nabla \cdot V = \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i} V_i$ or componentwise by $(\nabla \cdot V)_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_{x_j} V_{ij}$.
$A : B$ and $\ A\ $	The Frobenius inner product of two matrices $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ defined by $A : B := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d A_{ij} B_{ij}$ and the associated norm $\ A\ := \sqrt{A : A}$.
$\nabla^2 V$	The Hessian matrix of a scalar field $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined componentwise by $(\nabla^2 V)_{ij} = \partial_{x_i, x_j}^2 V$.
I_d	The d -dimensional identity matrix.
Id	The identity operator on a vector space.
$\langle x, y \rangle$ or $x \cdot y$	The Euclidean inner product of two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $\langle x, y \rangle \equiv x \cdot y := \sum_{i=1}^d x^i y^i$. One notation or the other may be preferred for typographical reasons in certain cases.
M_{ij}	The (i, j) (respectively row and column indexes) component of a matrix M .
$P(u)$	The projection matrix $P(u) := I_d - \frac{u \otimes u}{ u ^2}$ on the plane orthogonal to a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
$\varphi \in C_b(E)$	A generic test function on E .
$\varphi_N \in C_b(E^N)$	A generic test function on the product space E^N .
$\Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$	A generic test function on the set of probability measures on E .
$u \otimes v, \mu \otimes \nu$ or $\varphi \otimes \psi$	Respectively, the matrix tensor product of two vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ defined componentwise by $(u \otimes v)_{ij} = u_i v_j$; the product measure on $E \times F$ of two measures μ, ν respectively on E and F ; the product function on $E \times F$ defined by $(\varphi \otimes \psi)(x, y) = \varphi(x)\psi(y)$ for two real-valued function φ, ψ respectively on E and F .
$\text{Tr } M$	The trace of the matrix M .
M^T	The transpose of the matrix M .
$\mathbf{x}^N = (x^1, \dots, x^N)$	A generic element of a product space E^N . The components are indexed with a superscript.
$\mathbf{x}^{M,N} = (x^1, \dots, x^M)$	The M -dimensional vector in E^M constructed by taking the M first components of \mathbf{x}^N .
$x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^T$ and $ x $	A generic element of a d -dimensional space and its norm. The coordinates are indexed with a subscript. The norm of x denoted by $ x $ is the Euclidean norm.

Probability and measures

$K \star \mu$	The convolution of a function $K : E \times F \rightarrow G$ with a measure μ on F defined as the function $K \star \mu : x \in E \mapsto \int_F K(x, y) \mu(dy) \in G$. When $E = F = G = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $K \star \mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(x - y) \mu(dy)$.
δ_x	The Dirac measure at the point x .
$\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}$	The empirical measure defined by $\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i}$ where $\mathbf{x}^N = (x^1, \dots, x^N)$.
$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\varphi]$	Alternative expression for $\langle \mu, \varphi \rangle$ when μ is a probability measure. When $\mu = \mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P})$, the expectation is simply denoted by \mathbb{E} .
$H(\nu \mu)$	The relative entropy (or Kullback-Leibler divergence) between two measures μ, ν , see Definition 3.16.
$\langle \mu, \varphi \rangle$	The integral of a measurable function φ with respect to a measure μ .
$\text{Law}(X)$	The law of a random variable X as an element of $\mathcal{P}(E)$ where X takes its value in the space E .

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P})$	A filtered probability space. Unless otherwise stated, all the random variables are defined on this set. The expectation is denoted by \mathbb{E} .
$\sigma(X^1, X^2, \dots)$	The σ -algebra generated by the random variables X^1, X^2, \dots .
$T_{\#}\mu$	The pushforward of the measure μ on a set E by the measurable map $T : E \rightarrow F$. This is a measure on the set F defined by $T_{\#}\mu(\mathcal{A}) = \mu(T^{-1}(\mathcal{A}))$ for any measurable set \mathcal{A} of F .
$\ \cdot\ _{\text{TV}}$	The Total Variation (TV) norm for measures.
W_p	The Wasserstein- p distance between probability measures (see Definition 3.1).
$X \sim \mu$	It means that the law of the random variable X is μ .
$(X_t)_t$ or $(Z_t)_t$	The canonical process on the path space $D(I, E)$ defined by $X_t(\omega) = \omega(t)$.
$(\mathbf{X}_t^N)_t$ or $(\mathbf{Z}_t^N)_t$	The canonical process on the product space $D(I, E)^N$ with components $\mathbf{X}_t^N = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^N)$.

Systems of particles and operators

E	The state space of the particles, assumed to be at least a Polish space.
f_t^N	The N -particle distribution in $\mathcal{P}(E^N)$ at time $t \geq 0$.
$f_t^{k,N}$	The k -th marginal of f_t^N .
f_I^N	The N -particle distribution on the the path space in $\mathcal{P}(D(I, E^N))$ or $\mathcal{P}(C(I, E^N))$ for a time interval $I = [0, T]$. We identify $D(I, E^N) \simeq D(I, E)^N$.
f_t	The limit law in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ at time $t \geq 0$.
f_I	The limit law on the path space in $\mathcal{P}(D(I, E))$ or $\mathcal{P}(C(I, E))$.
F_t^N	The law of the empirical process in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ at time $t \geq 0$.
$F_I^{\mu,N}$	The weak pathwise law of the empirical process in $\mathcal{P}(D(I, \mathcal{P}(E)))$ on the time interval $I = [0, T]$.
F_I^N	The strong pathwise law of the empirical process in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D(I, E)))$ on the time interval $I = [0, T]$.
\mathcal{L}_N	The N -particle generator acting on (a subset of) $C_b(E^N)$.
\mathcal{L}^N	The N -particle generator acting on $\mathcal{P}(E^N)$ defined as the formal adjoint of \mathcal{L}_N .
$L \diamond_i \varphi_N$	The action of an operator L on (a subset of) $C_b(E)$ against the i -th variable of a function φ_N in $C_b(E^N)$, defined as the function in (a subset of) $C_b(E^N)$ $L \diamond_i \varphi_N : (x^1, \dots, x^N) \mapsto L[x \mapsto \varphi_N(x^1, \dots, x^{i-1}, x, x^{i+1}, \dots, x^N)](x^i)$. The definition readily extends to the case of an operator $L^{(2)}$ acting on $C_b(E^2)$ and two indexes $i < j$ in which case we write $L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N$.
$(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$	The N -particle process, with components $\mathcal{X}_t^N = (X_t^{1,N}, \dots, X_t^{N,N}) \in E^N$. Often we write $X_t^{i,N} \equiv X_t^i$ and $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t \equiv \mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N$.
$(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$	An alternative notation for the N -particle process with $\mathcal{Z}_t^N = (Z_t^{1,N}, \dots, Z_t^{N,N})$. Often used for Boltzmann particle systems or kinetic systems.

2 Models and properties

2.1 Particle systems, setting and conventions

The starting point of this review is a system of N particles

$$\mathcal{X}_I^N \equiv (\mathcal{X}_t^N)_{t \in I} \equiv (X_t^{1,N}, \dots, X_t^{N,N})_{t \in I},$$

where each particle $(X_t^{i,N})_{t \in I}$ is a stochastic process with values in the state space E which is at least Polish (i.e. separable and completely metrizable) and defined on a time interval $I = [0, T]$ with $T \in (0, +\infty]$. When no confusion is possible, we drop the N superscript and

only write $X_t^i \equiv X_t^{i,N}$ for the i -th particle. The N -particles are not independent; they are said to *interact*.

Throughout this review, $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$ is a nice stochastic process in E^N which satisfies the strong Markov property and which has càdlàg sample paths (the related topology is the $J1$ Skorokhod topology, see definition D.5). Several examples will be given in the next sections but to fix ideas, the particle system will either be a Feller diffusion process in $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ (or in a Borel subset or in a manifold) or a jump process in a more general state space which satisfies the C_b -Feller property (i.e. the transition operator is strongly continuous and maps $C_b(E^N)$ to $C_b(E^N)$). One may also consider mixed jump-diffusion processes. The N -particle process will often be given as the solution of a Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) but in full generality, it will be described by its generator denoted by \mathcal{L}_N acting on $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_N) \subset C_b(E^N)$. The generator determines what is called the *interaction mechanism*. The only but crucial assumption that is made on this interaction mechanism is the symmetry or *exchangeability*.

Definition 2.1 (Exchangeability). A family $(X^i)_{i \in I}$ of random variables is said to be *exchangeable* when the law of $(X^i)_{i \in I}$ is invariant under every permutation of a finite number of indexes $i \in I$.

In a dynamical setting, the *pathwise exchangeability* is assumed in the sense that exchangeability holds for the family of processes $(X_I^{i,N})_{1 \leq i \leq N}$, at the level of trajectories. Taking the time-coordinate (i.e. the push-forward of the family law by the map $\omega \mapsto \omega(t)$), this implies the *pointwise exchangeability* i.e. exchangeability for the position vector $(\mathcal{X}_t^{1,N}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_t^{N,N})$ at any time $t \geq 0$. Formally, \mathcal{X}_t^N can be seen as an element of E^N/\mathfrak{S}_N , where \mathfrak{S}_N denotes the group of all permutations of $\{1, \dots, N\}$, although for simplicity we will keep using E^N as the state space. Such a particle system will be called *exchangeable*.

The statistical description. In statistical physics, the previous description in terms of stochastic process is sometimes called the *microscopic scale* because the trajectory of each individual particle is recorded. When N is *large*, the microscopic scale contains too much information and a *statistical description* is sought. There are at least three statistical points of view on the particle system, detailed below.

1. The easiest one, is simply given by the N -particle distribution $f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ at time $t \in I$. From the general theory of Markov processes (see Appendix D.5), f_t^N satisfies the forward Kolmogorov equation written in weak form:

$$\forall \varphi_N \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_N), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^N, \varphi_N \rangle = \langle f_t^N, \mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N \rangle. \quad (1)$$

Here and throughout this review, the bracket notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the integral of a test function (here φ_N) against a probability measure (here f_t^N).

Remark 2.2. Note that

$$\langle f_t^N, \varphi_N \rangle = \langle f_0^N, u_N(t, \cdot) \rangle,$$

where for $\mathbf{x}^N \in E^N$, $u_N \equiv u_N(t, \mathbf{x}^N) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi_N(\mathcal{X}_t^N) | \mathcal{X}_0^N = \mathbf{x}^N]$ solves the backward Kolmogorov equation

$$\partial_t u_N = \mathcal{L}_N u_N.$$

The equation (1) thus describes the dynamics of an *observable* of the system.

Equation (1) is also called the *master equation* in a probabilistic context and is better known as the *Liouville equation* in classical (deterministic) kinetic theory. In this review, we follow this latter terminology and Equation (1) will be called the (*weak*) *Liouville equation*. The forward Kolmogorov equation, or (strong) Liouville equation, reads

$$\partial_t f_t^N = \mathcal{L}^N f_t^N,$$

where $\mathcal{L}^N \equiv \mathcal{L}_N^*$ is the dual operator of \mathcal{L}_N . In general, no explicit expression for \mathcal{L}^N is available and it is thus easier to focus on the weak point of view. From the weak Liouville equation, it is possible to compute the time evolution of any *observable* of the particle system, that is of any of the averaged quantities $\langle f_t^N, \varphi_N \rangle$ for a test function φ_N . The drawback is that $f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ belongs to a high dimensional space (since N is large). However, by the exchangeability assumption, the law f_t^N is a symmetric probability measure and it is thus possible to define for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the k -th marginal $f_t^{k,N} \in \mathcal{P}(E^k)$ by:

$$\forall \varphi_k \in C_b(E^k), \quad \langle f_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle := \langle f_t^N, \varphi_k \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-k)} \rangle.$$

The exchangeability ensures that the term on the right-hand side does not depend on the indexes of the k variables; for instance, it would be equivalent to take $1^{\otimes(N-k)} \otimes \varphi_k$ as a test function instead of $\varphi_k \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-k)}$. Each marginal distribution satisfies a Liouville equation obtained from (1) by taking φ_k as a test function. This equation may not be closed in the sense that, depending on \mathcal{L}_N , the right-hand side may depend on f_t^N or on the other marginals.

Remark 2.3. Note that with a slight abuse we take φ_k in the space $C_b(E^k)$ although we should say that φ_k belongs to a subset of $C_b(E^k)$ and is such that $\varphi_k \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-k)}$ belongs to $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_N)$. We will often keep doing that in the following.

2. From the point of view of stochastic analysis, the particle system \mathcal{X}_I^N can be seen as a random element of $D(I, E^N) \simeq D(I, E)^N$ so its law is a probability measure on the path space, denoted by $f_I^N \in \mathcal{P}(D(I, E^N))$. This *pathwise law* is generally given as the unique solution of the following martingale problem (probability reminders can be found in Appendix D).

Definition 2.4 (Particle martingale problem). Let $T \in (0 + \infty]$. A pathwise law $f_{[0,T]}^N \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E^N))$ is said to be a solution of the martingale problem associated to the particle system issued from $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ whenever for all $\varphi_N \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_N)$,

$$M_t^{\varphi_N} := \varphi_N(\mathbf{X}_t^N) - \varphi_N(\mathbf{X}_0^N) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N(\mathbf{X}_s^N) ds, \quad (2)$$

is a $f_{[0,T]}^N$ -martingale, where $(\mathbf{X}_t^N)_{t \geq 0}$ denotes the canonical process on the path space $D([0, T], E^N)$ defined for $\omega \in D([0, T], E^N)$ by $\mathbf{X}_t^N(\omega) = \omega(t)$.

Note that the time marginal or *pointwise law* is given by $f_t^N = (\mathbf{X}_t^N)_\# f_I^N$. The weak Liouville equation (1) can be recovered by taking the expectation in (2). This description is called *pathwise* and the previous one *pointwise*.

3. Finally an exchangeable particle system can also be described by its empirical measure:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_t^{i,N}} \in \mathcal{P}(E). \quad (3)$$

Contrary to f_t^N , the measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ is a *random object*: it can be seen as a measure-valued random variable whose law is the push-forward measure of f_t^N by the application $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N : \mathbf{x}^N \in E^N \mapsto \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Thanks to the exchangeability, the expectation of the empirical measure gives the first marginal of f_t^N :

$$\forall \varphi \in C_b(E), \quad \mathbb{E} \langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t^{1,N}, \varphi \rangle.$$

It follows that from the empirical measure, it is possible to reconstruct the law of any individual particle. As we shall see later, in fact, it characterises the full N -particle distribution f_t^N . Its pathwise version is the empirical measure on the path space:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}_I^N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i^i} \in \mathcal{P}(D(I, E)),$$

where each particle X_t^i is seen as a $D(I, E)$ -valued process.

The mesoscopic scale. The main concern of this review is the description of the limit dynamics when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. This will be given by a *nonlinear* object which describes the *average* behaviour of the system. Various points of view may be adopted: from the previous discussion, a natural idea is to study the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ of the statistical objects $f_t^{k,N}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, or $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$. The central notion of this review is the *propagation of chaos* property which states that for all $t \in I$ there exists $f_t \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that,

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad f_t^{k,N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_t^{\otimes k}, \quad (4)$$

for the weak convergence of probability measures and provided that this property holds true when $t = 0$. As we will see in the following, the property (4) is equivalent to

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_t, \quad (5)$$

for the convergence in law (note that the limit is a deterministic object). The term *propagation* introduced by Kac [Kac56] refers to the idea that the above convergence at $t = 0$ is sufficient to prove the convergence at a later time. As we shall see in the following, the status of the time variable is a central question: one may try to quantify the convergence speed with respect to t , analyse its behaviour when the time interval $I = [0, +\infty)$ is infinite or study the more general question of the pathwise convergence of the trajectories. All these aspects will define as many notions of propagation of chaos.

In (4), the tensor product indicates that any k particles taken among the N become statistically independent when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Any subsystem of the N -particle system thus behaves as a system of i.i.d processes with common law f_t (note that the particles are always identically distributed by the exchangeability assumption). This translates the physical idea that for large systems, the correlations between two (or more) given particles which are due to the interactions become negligible. By looking at the whole system, only an averaged behaviour can be observed instead of the detailed correlated trajectories of each particle. This level of description is called the *mesoscopic scale* in statistical physics.

The central question is therefore the description of the limit law f_t . It turns out that in most cases, it is relatively easy to see that f_t is formally the solution of one of the following nonlinear problems.

1. The solution of a (nonlinear) Partial Differential Equation (PDE) obtained from the Liouville equation by some closure assumption. In some cases, f_t can also be seen as the law of a nonlinear Markov process in the sense of McKean, typically the law of a nonlinear SDE (these notions will be properly defined later). Just as in the classical case, the two approaches are linked by Itô's formula.
2. The solution of a (nonlinear) martingale problem. This description is more general than the previous one since it gives a probability measure on the path space $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D(I, E))$ with time marginals $(f_t)_t$.

For each of the particle systems considered in this review, the program is thus the following:

- (1) Prove that the limit (4) or (5) exists in a suitable topology.
- (2) Identify the limit as the solution of a nonlinear problem.
- (3) Prove that the nonlinear problem is wellposed so that the limit is uniquely defined.

Note that the three steps can be carried out in any order. In this review the main concern will be the first step, which is the core of the propagation of chaos property. This also provides an existence result for the nonlinear problem of the second step. The third step is often proved beforehand. Actually, in many cases, the nonlinear problem has its own dedicated literature; many of its properties are known and may be useful to carry out the first step.

We conclude this introductory section by a brief overview of the models studied in this work and which will be detailed in the following subsections.

Section 2.2.2 is devoted to the description of various diffusion processes, starting from the prototypical example introduced in the seminal work of McKean [McK69; McK66]. At the microscopic scale, the particle system is defined as a system of interacting Itô processes, where the interaction depends only on (observables of) the empirical measure (3). Physically, it means that each particle interacts with a single averaged quantity in which the other particles contribute with a weight of the order $1/N$. This type of interaction is called *mean-field interaction* and the propagation of chaos is a particular instance of a *mean-field limit*. In section 2.2.3 the diffusion interaction is replaced by a jump mechanism.

Section 2.3 presents another class of models which extends the work of Kac [Kac56] on the Boltzmann equation. The N -particle process is driven by time-discrete pairwise interactions which update the state of only two particles at each time. In classical kinetic theory, the particles are said to *collide*.

Remark 2.5 (Notational convention). We will adopt the following notational convention: the N -particle mean-field processes are denoted by the letter \mathcal{X} and the Boltzmann N -particle processes by the letter \mathcal{Z} . Historically, many of the Boltzmann models that we are going to study are spatially homogeneous versions of a Boltzmann kinetic system. We thus also use the letter \mathcal{Z} for kinetic systems, that is systems where each particle Z_t^i is defined by its position and its velocity, respectively denoted by the letters X_t^i and V_t^i .

2.2 Mean-field models

2.2.1 Abstract mean-field generators and mean-field limits

A *mean-field particle system* is a system of N particles characterised by a generator of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i \varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N), \quad (6)$$

where given a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, L_μ is the generator of a Markov process on E . Throughout this review, the notation $L \diamond_i \varphi_N$ denotes the action of an operator L defined on (a subset of) $C_b(E)$ against the i -th variable of a function $\varphi_N \in C_b(E^N)$; in other words, $L \diamond_i \varphi_N$ is defined as the function:

$$L \diamond_i \varphi_N : (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in E^N \mapsto L[x \mapsto \varphi_N(x^1, \dots, x^{i-1}, x, x^{i+1}, \dots, x^N)](x^i) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

There are two main classes of mean-field models, depending on the form of the generator L_μ .

1. In Section 2.2.2, L_μ is the generator of a diffusion process, and the associated N -particle system is called a *McKean-Vlasov diffusion*.
2. In Section 2.2.3, L_μ is the generator of a jump process and the N -particle system is called a *mean-field jump process*. When L_μ is the sum of a pure jump generator and the generator of a deterministic flow, the process is called a mean-field Piecewise Deterministic Markov Process (PDMP for short).

It is also possible to consider *mixed processes* when L_μ is the sum of a diffusion generator and a jump generator.

It is classically assumed that the domain of the generator L_μ does not depend on μ . This domain will be denoted by $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(E)$.

In that case, it is easy to guess the form of the associated nonlinear system obtained when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Taking a test function of the form

$$\varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N) = \varphi(x^1),$$

where $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$, one obtains the one-particle Kolmogorov equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^{1,N}, \varphi \rangle = \int_{E^N} L_{\mu_{x^N}} \varphi(x^1) f_t^N(dx^N).$$

Note that the right-hand side depends on the N -particle distribution. As already discussed in the introduction, if the limiting system exists then, its law f_t at time $t \geq 0$ is typically obtained as the limit of the empirical measure process: when $\mathcal{X}_t^N \sim f_t^N$,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_t.$$

This also implies $f_t^{1,N} \rightarrow f_t$. Reporting formally in the previous equation, it follows that f_t should satisfy

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t, L_{f_t} \varphi \rangle. \quad (7)$$

This is the weak form of an equation that is called *the (nonlinear) evolution equation*. Note that the evolution equation is nonlinear due to the dependency of L on the measure argument f_t . With a slight abuse, we will often simply write $C_b(E)$ instead of \mathcal{F} in the following.

This is a very analytical derivation. Its probabilistic counterpart is the following nonlinear martingale problem.

Definition 2.6 (Nonlinear mean-field martingale problem). Let $T \in (0, +\infty]$ and let us write $I = [0, T]$. A pathwise law $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$ is said to be a solution of the nonlinear mean-field martingale problem issued from $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ whenever for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$M_t^\varphi := \varphi(\mathbf{X}_t) - \varphi(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^t L_{f_s} \varphi(\mathbf{X}_s) ds, \quad (8)$$

is a f_I martingale, where $(\mathbf{X}_t)_t$ is the canonical process and for $t \geq 0$, $f_t := (\mathbf{X}_t)_\# f_I$. the natural filtration of the canonical process is denoted by \mathcal{F} .

Note that f_I contains much more information than the evolution equation (7) and as the notation implies, $f_t = (\mathbf{X}_t)_\# f_I \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ solves the evolution equation. If the nonlinear martingale problem is wellposed then the canonical process $(\mathbf{X}_t)_t$ is a time inhomogeneous Markov process on the probability space $(D([0, T], E), \mathcal{F}, f_I)$. This may seem a little bit abstract for now but in what follows, we will see that most often, given the usual abstract probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, one can define a process on Ω such that its (pathwise) law is a solution of the nonlinear martingale problem. Such process is called *nonlinear in the sense of McKean* or simply *nonlinear* for short.

2.2.2 McKean-Vlasov diffusion

Let be given two functions

$$b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R}) \quad (9)$$

respectively called the *drift* vector and the *diffusion* matrix. For a fixed $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the following generator is the generator of a diffusion process in \mathbb{R}^d :

$$\forall \varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad L_\mu \varphi(x) := b(x, \mu) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(x, \mu) \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \varphi, \quad (10)$$

where $a(x, \mu) := \sigma(x, \mu) \sigma(x, \mu)^\top$. The N -particle generator (6) associated to this class of diffusion generators defines a process called a *McKean-Vlasov diffusion process*. The associated N -particle process is governed by the following system of SDEs:

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad dX_t^{i,N} = b(X_t^{i,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) dt + \sigma(X_t^{i,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) dB_t^i \quad (11)$$

where B_t^1, \dots, B_t^N are N independent Brownian motions. In this case, the evolution equation (7) can be written in a strong form and reads:

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = -\nabla_x \cdot \{b(x, f_t) f_t\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \{a_{ij}(x, f_t) f_t\} \quad (12)$$

This is a nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation which is used in many important modelling problems (see Example 2.8). This equation was obtained (formally) previously using only the generators when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Here, there is an alternative way to derive the limiting system: looking at the SDE system (11), the empirical measure can be formally replaced by its expected limit f_t . Since all the particles are exchangeable, this can be done in any of the N equations. The result is a process $(\bar{X}_t)_t$ which solves the SDE:

$$d\bar{X}_t = b(\bar{X}_t, f_t) dt + \sigma(\bar{X}_t, f_t) dB_t. \quad (13)$$

where B_t is a Brownian motion and $\bar{X}_0 \sim f_0$. Moreover, since for all i , X_t^i has law $f_t^{1,N}$ and since it is expected that $f_t^{1,N} \rightarrow f_t$, the process \bar{X}_t and the distribution f_t should be linked by the relation

$$f_t = \text{Law}(\bar{X}_t).$$

The dependency on its law of the solution of a SDE is a special case of what is called a nonlinear process in the sense of McKean. It would now be desirable to prove that the process (13) is well defined or (equivalently) that the PDE (12) or the martingale problem (8) are wellposed. The following result gives the reference framework in which all these objects are well defined.

Proposition 2.7. *Let us assume that the functions b and σ are globally Lipschitz: there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ it holds that:*

$$|b(x, \mu) - b(y, \nu)| + |\sigma(x, \mu) - \sigma(y, \nu)| \leq C(|x - y| + W_2(\mu, \nu)),$$

where W_2 denotes the Wasserstein-2 distance (see Definition 3.1). Assume that $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then for any $T > 0$ the SDE (13) has a unique strong solution on $[0, T]$ and consequently, its law is the unique weak solution to the Fokker-Planck equation (12) and the unique solution to the nonlinear martingale problem (8).

The proof of this proposition is fairly classical. In some special linear cases (see below), it can be found in [McK69, Section 3], [Szn91, Theorem 1.1] or [Mél96, Theorem 2.2]. For the most general case which includes the above proposition, we refer to [Car16, Theorem 1.7]. The proof is based on a fixed point argument that is sketched below.

Proof. Let us define the map:

$$\Psi : \mathcal{P}_2(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)), \quad m \mapsto \Psi(m),$$

where for $m \in \mathcal{P}_2(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$, $\Psi(m)$ is the law (on the path space) of the solution $(X_t^m)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ of the following SDE:

$$dX_t^m = b(X_t^m, m_t) dt + \sigma(X_t^m, m_t) dB_t.$$

Note that the map $t \in [0, T] \mapsto m_t \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is continuous for the W_2 -distance where m_t is the time marginal of m . The goal is to prove that Ψ admits a unique fixed point. Let $m, m' \in \mathcal{P}_2(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$ and let $t \in [0, T]$. Then by the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality (see Proposition D.22) and the Lipschitz assumptions on b and σ , one can prove that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_s^m - X_s^{m'}|^2 \right] \\ & \leq CT \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq r \leq s} |X_r^m - X_r^{m'}|^2 \right] ds + \int_0^t W_2^2(m_s, m'_s) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

A similar computation will be detailed in the proof of Theorem 5.1. By Gronwall lemma, we obtain that for a constant $C(T)$ it holds that:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X_s^m - X_s^{m'}|^2 \right] \leq C(T) \int_0^t W_2^2(m_s, m'_s) ds.$$

Let us denote by \mathcal{W}_2 the Wasserstein-2 distance on the space of probability measures on a path space of the form $C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d)$ for a given $t \in [0, T]$ not specified in the notation. For any $t \in [0, T]$, we also write $m_{[0, t]} \in \mathcal{P}_2(C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d))$ for the restriction of m on $[0, t]$. Then by definition of Ψ and \mathcal{W}_2 , we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_2^2(\Psi(m_{[0, t]}), \Psi(m'_{[0, t]})) &\leq C(T) \int_0^t W_2^2(m_s, m'_s) ds \\ &\leq C(T) \int_0^t \mathcal{W}_2^2(m_{[0, s]}, m'_{[0, s]}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By iterating this inequality, the k -th iterate Ψ^k of Ψ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_2^2(\Psi^k(m), \Psi^k(m')) &\leq c(T)^k \int_0^T \frac{(T-s)^k}{(k-1)!} \mathcal{W}_2^2(m_{[0, s]}, m'_{[0, s]}) ds \\ &\leq \frac{(c(T)T)^k}{k!} \mathcal{W}_2^2(m, m'), \end{aligned}$$

from which it can be seen that Ψ^k is a contraction and thus admits a unique fixed point for k large enough. \square

Example 2.8. Depending on the form of the drift and diffusion coefficients, the McKean-Vlasov diffusion can be used in a wide range of modelling problems. Some examples are gathered below and many other will be given in Section 7.

1. The first case is obtained when b and σ depend linearly on the measure argument. Namely, for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let us consider two functions

$$K_1 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m, \quad K_2 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and let us take

$$b(x, \mu) = \tilde{b}(x, K_1 \star \mu(x)), \quad \sigma(x, \mu) = \tilde{\sigma}(x, K_2 \star \mu(x)),$$

where $\tilde{b} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$. When K_1, K_2 and $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}$ are Lipschitz and bounded, the propagation of chaos result is the given by McKean's theorem (Theorem 5.1).

In many applications, σ is a constant diffusion matrix, $K_1(x, y) \equiv K(y - x)$ for a fixed symmetric radial kernel $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b(x, \mu) = K \star \mu(x)$. The case where K has a singularity is much more delicate (see Section 5.1.2, Section 5.4, Section 5.2.2) but contains many important cases. For instance, in fluid dynamics, when K is the Biot and Savart kernel $K(x) = x^\perp / |x|^2$ in dimension $d = 2$ and $\sigma(x, \mu) \equiv \sqrt{2\sigma} I_2$ for a fixed $\sigma > 0$, the limit Fokker-Planck equation reads:

$$\partial_t f_t + \nabla \cdot (f_t K \star f_t) = \sigma \Delta f_t, \tag{14}$$

By invariance by translation, the quantity $\omega = f_t - 1$ is the solution of the so-called *vorticity equation* which can be shown to be equivalent to the 2D incompressible Navier-Stokes system (see [JW18]).

In biology, still in dimension $d = 2$ but with $K(x) = x/|x|^2$, the equation (14) is an example of the Patlak-Keller-Segel model for chemotaxis (see [BJW19]). Other

examples in mathematical physics and mathematical biology are presented in Section 7.1.

Another important model of this form is the Kuramoto model obtained when $E = \mathbb{R}$ and $K(\theta) = K_0 \sin(\theta)$ for a given $K_0 > 0$. In this case, the particles model the frequencies of a system of *oscillators* which tends to synchronize, see for instance [Ace+05; Luç15; BGP09; BGP14] and Section 7.2.1.

2. The case of the so-called *gradient systems* is a sub-case of the previous one when $\sigma(x, \mu) \equiv \sigma I_d$ for a constant $\sigma > 0$ and

$$b(x, \mu) = -\nabla V(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla W(x-y) \mu(dy), \quad (15)$$

where V, W are two symmetric potentials on \mathbb{R}^d respectively called the confinement potential and the interaction potential. The limit Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial f_t = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta f_t + \nabla \cdot (f_t \nabla (V + W \star f_t)),$$

is called the granular-media equation and will be studied in Section 5.1.3. An important issue is the long-time behaviour of gradient systems which is often studied under convexity assumptions on the potentials (see Section 5.1.3, Section 5.2.1, Section 5.2.3).

3. A kinetic particle $Z_t^{i,N} = (X_t^{i,N}, V_t^{i,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a particle defined by two arguments, its position $X_t^{i,N}$ and its velocity $V_t^{i,N}$ defined as the time derivative of the position. The evolution of a system of kinetic particles is usually governed by Newton's laws of motion. In a random setting, the typical system of SDEs is thus the following: for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^{i,N} &= V_t^{i,N} dt \\ dV_t^{i,N} &= F(X_t^{i,N}, V_t^{i,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) dt + \sigma(X_t^i, V_t^{i,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) dB_t^i, \end{cases}$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Note that it is often assumed that the force field induced by the interactions between the particles depends only on their positions, which is why we have written

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_t^{i,N}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

instead of $\mu_{Z_t^N} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. This special case of the McKean-Vlasov diffusion in $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is also often called a *second order system* by opposition to the *first order systems* when $E = \mathbb{R}^d$. Several examples of kinetic particle systems are given in Section 7.2.2 which deals with swarming models. For instance, the (stochastic) Cucker-Smale model [CS07; HLL09; Car+10; CDP18] describes a system of bird-like particles which interact by aligning their velocities to the ones of their neighbours:

$$dV_t^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} K(|X_t^j - X_t^i|) (V_t^j - V_t^i) + \sigma dB_t^i,$$

where $\sigma \geq 0$ is a noise parameter and $K : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a smooth nonnegative function vanishing at infinity which models the vision of the particles. Other classical models of this form include the attraction-repulsion models [DOr+06; CDP09] or the stochastic Vicsek models [DM08; DFL15; Deg+19].

4. The general case (9), where b and σ have a possibly nonlinear dependence on μ can be extended to even more general cases. A simple extension is the case of time-dependent

functions b and σ . They may also be random themselves and the x and μ arguments may be replaced respectively by a full trajectory on $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ and a pathwise probability distribution on $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$. The most general setting is thus:

$$b : [0, T] \times \Omega \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Such cases may be very difficult to handle but have recently been used in the theory of mean-field games [Car+19; Lac18; CD18a; CD18b; Car10]. Under strong Lipschitz assumptions (in the appropriate topology), some very general results can be obtained by a relatively simple adaptation of the proofs valid in the linear case (see Section 5.6.1). For more general systems, we will only briefly mention some existing results in Section 5.6.2 and Section 5.6.3.

Remark 2.9 (Martingale measures). Starting from an arbitrary nonlinear Fokker-Planck with operator (10), one may wonder if it can always be written (at least formally) as the limit of a particle system. The McKean-Vlasov diffusion positively answers when the diffusion matrix in the Fokker-Planck equation is of the form $a(x, \mu) = \sigma(x, \mu)\sigma(x, \mu)^T$. For more general matrices a , the situation is more complicated. For instance the Landau equation would correspond to a matrix of the form $a(x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(x, y)\sigma(x, y)^T \mu(dy)$. In this case, the problem has been studied with a stochastic point of view in [Fun84] and later in [MR88] and [FGM09] where an explicit approximating particle system is given (see also Section 7.1.4). The N -particle system is characterised as the solution of a system of N SDEs similar to (11) but where the N Brownian motions are replaced by N *martingale measures* with intensity $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(dy) \otimes dt$. The notion of martingale measure which originates in the Stochastic PDE literature is studied for instance in [EM90]. Except for the cases investigated in the aforementioned works and although it seems to generalise many of the models presented in this review, there is, to the best of our knowledge, no general theory of propagation of chaos for particle systems driven by martingale measures.

2.2.3 Mean-field jump processes and PDMPs

In this section E is any Polish space. Let us be given a family of probability measures called the *jump measures*:

$$P : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E), (x, \mu) \mapsto P_\mu(x, dy),$$

and a positive function, called the *jump rate*:

$$\lambda : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, (x, \mu) \mapsto \lambda(x, \mu),$$

For a given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ the following generator is the generator of a *pure jump process*:

$$L_\mu \varphi(x) = \lambda(x, \mu) \int_E \{\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)\} P_\mu(x, dy).$$

We will also consider the case of a PDMP when

$$L_\mu \varphi(x) = a \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) + \lambda(x, \mu) \int_E \{\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)\} P_\mu(x, dy), \quad (16)$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, $a \cdot \nabla$ denotes the transport flow associated to a function $a : E \rightarrow E$. Using the family of generators (16), the N -particle system with mean-field generator (6) can be constructed as follows.

- To each particle $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ is attached a Poisson clock with jump rate $\lambda(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, X_t^i)$. The jump times of particle i are denoted by $(T_n^i)_n$.
- Between two jump times, the motion of a particle is purely deterministic:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall t \in [T_n^i, T_{n+1}^i), \quad dX_t^i = a(X_t^i)dt, \quad (17)$$

- At each time T_n^i , a new state is sampled from the jump measure on E :

$$X_{T_n^i}^i \sim P_{\mu_{X_{T_n^i-}^i}} \left(X_{T_n^i-}^i, dy \right) \in \mathcal{P}(E). \quad (18)$$

One expects that in the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$, the law f_t of a particle will satisfy the evolution equation (7) which, in this case, reads:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t, a \cdot \nabla_x \varphi \rangle + \iint_{E \times E} \lambda(x, f_t) \{ \varphi(y) - \varphi(x) \} P_{f_t}(x, dy) f_t(dx), \quad (19)$$

for all $\varphi \in C_b(E)$. Two important cases are given in the following examples.

Example 2.10 (Nanbu particle system). Let us take $a = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$ for simplicity. When the jump measure is linear in μ , i.e. is of the form:

$$P_\mu(x, dy) = \int_{z \in E} \Gamma^{(1)}(x, z, dy) \mu(dz),$$

where $\Gamma^{(1)} : E \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$, then the mean-field generator (6) describes a N -particle system where at each jump, a particle with state x chooses uniformly another particle, say which has a state z , and sample a new state according to the law $\Gamma^{(1)}(x, z, dy)$. In [GM97], this particle system is called a *Nanbu particle system* in honour of Nanbu who introduced a similar system in [Nan80] and used it as an approximation scheme for the Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics (38). This equation will be described more thoroughly in Section 2.3.3. When $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is an abstract law, the associated mean-field jump particle system generalizes the one introduced by Nanbu and the limit equation is the following *general Boltzmann equation* (written in weak form):

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \int_{E \times E \times E} \varphi(y) \Gamma^{(1)}(x, z, dy) f_t(dx) f_t(dz) - \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle,$$

for all $\varphi \in C_b(E)$. A more classical derivation of the general Boltzmann equation will be given in Section 2.3 and the subsequent Example 2.17 provides an alternative point of view on the Nanbu particle system.

Example 2.11 (BGK type model). In kinetic theory the state space is $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and the N particles are given by $Z_t^i = (X_t^i, V_t^i)$ with X_t^i the position and V_t^i the velocity of particle i at time t . Without external force, it is natural to expect that the particles evolve deterministically and continuously between two jumps as

$$dX_t^i = V_t^i dt, \quad dV_t^i = 0.$$

Moreover, the post-jump distribution and the jump rate often do not depend specifically on the pre-jump velocity of the jumping particle but only on its position and on the distribution of particles. Thus we take:

$$P_\mu((x, v), dx', dv') = \delta_x(dx') \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\mu, x}(v') dv',$$

where given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathcal{M}_{\mu, x}$ is a probability density function. In this case, Equation (7) becomes:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t, v \cdot \nabla_x \varphi \rangle + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \lambda(f_t, x) \{ \varphi(x, v') - \varphi(x, v) \} \mathcal{M}_{f_t, x}(v') dv' f_t(dx, dv),$$

and its strong form reads:

$$\partial_t f_t(x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t(x, v) = \lambda(x, f_t) \left(\rho_{f_t}(x) \mathcal{M}_{f_t, x}(v) - f_t(x, v) \right),$$

where the spatial density of the particles at time t is defined by:

$$\rho_{f_t}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_t(x, v) dv.$$

When $\mathcal{M}_{f_t, x}$ is the Maxwellian distribution

$$\mathcal{M}_{f_t, x}(v) = \frac{\rho_f}{(2\pi T)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|v - u|^2}{2T}\right),$$

with $(\rho_f u, \rho_f |u|^2 + \rho_f T) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v, |v|^2) f_t(x, v) dv$, then this equation is called the Bhatnagar-Gross-Krook (BGK) equation [BGK54]. It is used in mathematical physics as a simplified model of rarefied gas dynamics (for a detailed account of the subject, we refer the interested reader to the reviews [Deg04] and [Vil02] or to the book [CIP94]).

In this review, we found useful to distinguish a class of mean-field jump models that we call *parametric models* which are defined by a jump measure of the form

$$P_\mu(x, dy) = \left(\psi(x, \mu, \cdot) \# \nu\right)(dy),$$

where $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ is a probability measure on a fixed parameter space Θ and

$$\psi : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \times \Theta \rightarrow E.$$

In this case, for all test function $\varphi \in C_b(E)$,

$$\int_E \varphi(y) P_\mu(x, dy) = \int_\Theta \varphi(\psi(x, \mu, \theta)) \nu(d\theta).$$

The N -particle process associated to a parametric model admits a SDE representation using the formalism of Poisson random measure which is briefly recalled in Appendix D.8.

Example 2.12 (SDE representation for parametric models). Let us assume for all $\theta \in \Theta$, the function $\psi(\cdot, \cdot, \theta) : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow E$ is Lipschitz for the distance on E and the Wasserstein-1 distance on $\mathcal{P}(E)$, with a Lipschitz constant $L(\theta) > 0$ and a function $L \in L^1_\nu(\Theta)$. This (classical) hypothesis will ensure the wellposedness of the SDE representations of both the particle system and its nonlinear limit, see [ADF18, Section 3.1] and [Gra92a, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 2.1].

To each particle $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ is attached an independent Poisson random measures $\mathcal{N}^i(ds, du, d\theta)$ on $[0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \times \Theta$ with intensity measure $ds \otimes du \otimes \nu(d\theta)$ where dt and du denote the Lebesgue measure. The N independent random measures \mathcal{N}^i play a comparable role to the N independent Brownian motions which define a McKean-Vlasov diffusion in (11). In the present case, the mean-field jump N -particle process is the solution of the following system of SDEs driven by the measures \mathcal{N}^i

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^i &= X_0^i + \int_0^t a(X_s^i) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^{+\infty} \int_\Theta \left\{ \psi\left(X_{s-}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{s-}^N}, \theta\right) - X_{s-}^i \right\} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \lambda(X_{s-}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{s-}^N}))}(u) \mathcal{N}^i(ds, du, d\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In neurosciences, the variable X_t^i represents the membrane potential of a neuron indexed by i at time t and the Poisson random measures model the interactions between the neurons due to the chemical synapses. A random jump is called a *spike*. In the model introduced by [FL16], the effect of the spikes is to reset the potential of the membrane to a fixed value, fixed to 0. In Equation (20) this corresponds to the simple case where $X_t^i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\psi \equiv 0$. Note that in this particular case there is no need to consider a parameter space Θ and \mathcal{N}^i is a

Poisson random measures on $[0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$ only. Note that in [FL16], the deterministic drift $a \equiv a(x, \mu)$ also depends on the empirical measure of the system: it models the effect of electrical synapses which tends to relax the membrane potential of the neurons towards the average potential of the system. An additional interaction mechanism is described in the subsequent example.

Example 2.13 (Simultaneous jumps). The neurons models [De +15; FL16; ADF18] extend the (parametric) mean-field jump model (20) to allow *simultaneous jumps* at each jump time T_n^i . It models the effect that at each spiking event of a neuron i , the membrane potential of all the other neurons $j \neq i$ is also increased by a small amplitude.

In the parametric setting with $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ (or more generally when E has a vector space structure), the mean-field jump model with simultaneous jumps is defined by the following objects.

- The jump rate function:

$$\lambda : (x, \mu) \in E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \mapsto \lambda(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

- A symmetric probability measure ν_N on the N -fold product of the parameter space Θ^N . We also assume that there exists a symmetric probability measure on $\Theta^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that ν_N coincides with the projection of ν on the first N coordinates. This assumption is natural to be able to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$. In [ADF18], the parameter space is $\Theta = [0, 1]$.

- The main jump measure

$$P_\mu(x, dy) = \left(\psi(x, \mu, \cdot) \# \nu \right)(dy),$$

where

$$\psi : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \times \Theta \rightarrow E, \quad (x, \mu, \theta) \mapsto x + \alpha(x, \mu, \theta),$$

and $\alpha : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \times \Theta \rightarrow E$ is the jump amplitude.

- The collateral jump measures

$$\tilde{P}_\mu^N(x, z, dy) = \left(\tilde{\psi}^N(x, z, \mu, \cdot) \# \nu_2 \right)(dy),$$

where

$$\tilde{\psi}^N : E \times E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \times \Theta^2 \rightarrow E, \quad (x, z, \mu, \theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto x + \frac{\tilde{\alpha}(x, z, \mu, \theta_1, \theta_2)}{N},$$

and $\tilde{\alpha} : E \times E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \times \Theta^2 \rightarrow E$ is the collateral jump amplitude. It satisfies $\tilde{\alpha}(x, x, \mu, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 0$ for all $x \in E$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$. In [FL16], the amplitude is fixed $\tilde{\alpha}(x, z, \mu, \theta_1, \theta_2) \equiv 1$ for $x \neq z$.

The N -particle process can be defined as before by an algorithmic description. At each time T_n^i , a parameter $\theta \sim \nu_N$ is drawn and then the state of particle i is updated by adding the jump amplitude

$$\alpha \left(X_{T_n^i-}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{T_n^i-}^N}, \theta_i \right).$$

But in this case, at time T_n^i , all the other particles $j \neq i$ also jumps by the amplitude

$$\frac{\tilde{\alpha} \left(X_{T_n^i-}^j, X_{T_n^i-}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{T_n^i-}^N}, \theta_j, \theta_i \right)}{N}.$$

When the parameters $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}$ satisfy the Lipschitz integrability conditions of [ADF18, Section 3.1], a SDE representation of the particle system can also be given. As before, let

$\mathcal{N}^i(ds, du, d\theta)$ be a set of N independent Poisson random measures on $[0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \times \Theta^{\mathbb{N}}$ with intensity $ds \otimes du \otimes \nu$, where ds and du denote the Lebesgue measure. The SDE representation of the N -particle system is given by the following system of SDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^i &= X_0^i + \int_0^t a(X_s^i) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\Theta^{\mathbb{N}}} \left\{ \psi \left(X_{s-}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{s-}^N}, \theta_i \right) - X_{s-}^i \right\} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \lambda(X_{s-}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{s-}^N})]}(u) \mathcal{N}^i(ds, du, d\theta) \\ &+ \sum_{j \neq i} \int_0^t \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\Theta^{\mathbb{N}}} \left\{ \tilde{\psi}^N \left(X_{s-}^i, X_{s-}^j, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{s-}^N}, \theta_i, \theta_j \right) - X_{s-}^i \right\} \times \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1}_{(0, \lambda(X_{s-}^j, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{s-}^N})]}(u) \mathcal{N}^j(ds, du, d\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Compared to the previous framework, in addition to the main jump operator (16), each particle is also subject to the *collateral jump generator* defined for all test function $\varphi \in C_b(E)$ and $x \in E$ by:

$$\tilde{L}_\mu^N \varphi(x) := N \iint_{E \times E} \lambda(z, \mu) \{ \varphi(y) - \varphi(x) \} \tilde{P}_\mu^N(x, z, dy) \mu(dz). \quad (22)$$

Note that this generator depends on N but it satisfies the weak limit: for all $\varphi \in C_b^1(E)$, $x \in E$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$,

$$\tilde{L}_\mu^N \varphi(x) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{L}_\mu \varphi(x) := \iint_{E \times \Theta^2} \lambda(z, \mu) \tilde{\alpha}(x, z, \mu, \theta_1, \theta_2) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \mu(dz) \nu_2(d\theta_1, d\theta_2).$$

The N -particle system is thus defined by the mean-field generator (6) which takes the form:

$$\forall \varphi_N \in C_b(E^N), \quad \mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N := \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ L_\mu \diamond_i \varphi_N + \tilde{L}_\mu^N \diamond_i \varphi_N \right\}.$$

In the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$, the nonlinear evolution equation (7) is expected to become:

$$\forall \varphi \in C_b^1(E), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t, L_{f_t} \varphi \rangle + \langle f_t, \tilde{L}_{f_t} \varphi \rangle.$$

Note that this is the equation satisfied by the law of the solution of the following nonlinear SDE:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_t &= \bar{X}_0 + \int_0^t a(\bar{X}_s) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\Theta^{\mathbb{N}}} \alpha(\bar{X}_{s-}, f_s, \theta_1) \mathbb{1}_{(0, \lambda(\bar{X}_{s-}, f_s)]}(u) \mathcal{N}(ds, du, d\theta) \\ &+ \int_0^t \iint_{E \times \Theta^2} \lambda(z, f_s) \tilde{\alpha}(\bar{X}_s, z, f_s, \theta_1, \theta_2) f_s(dz) \nu_2(d\theta_1, d\theta_2) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with $\text{Law}(\bar{X}_s) = f_s$. In the last equation, $\mathcal{N}(ds, du, d\theta)$ is a Poisson random measure on $[0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \times \Theta^{\mathbb{N}}$ with intensity $ds \otimes du \otimes \nu(d\theta)$ where ds and du denote the Lebesgue measure.

Mean-field jump processes and PDMPs are not so common in the literature compared to the McKean-Vlasov diffusion models or the Boltzmann models (Section 2.3). The Nanbu particle system serves as a simplified Boltzmann model (see Example 2.17). Mean-field jump processes can also be used as an approximation of a McKean-Vlasov diffusion. Since the

dynamics only relies on a sampling mechanism on the state space E , compared to diffusion processes, it allows more flexibility and avoids some technicalities for instance when E has a more complex geometrical structure, typically when E is a manifold. In applications, mean-field jump processes model a motion called *run and tumble* which is classical in the study of the dynamics of populations of bacteria. As already mentioned, Example 2.13 corresponds to a toy example of neuron model. More realistic examples often consider a combination of (simultaneous) jumps and a diffusive behaviour, see [ADF18] and the references therein. The nonlinear martingale problem associated to mixed jump-diffusion models is studied in [Gra92b] where the wellposedness is proved under classical Lipschitz and boundedness assumptions on the parameters (see also Section 5.3). Other neuron models based on a mean-field jump process will be described in Section 7.2.3.

2.3 Boltzmann models

2.3.1 General form

Given a Polish space E , a Boltzmann model is a N -particle system with an infinitesimal generator acting on $\varphi_N \in C_b(E^N)$ of the form:

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N = \sum_{i=1}^N L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_N + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N. \quad (24)$$

The operator $L^{(2)}$ acts on two-variable test functions. We recall the notation for $i < j$:

$$L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N : (z^1, \dots, z^N) \in E^N \mapsto L^{(2)}[(u, v) \mapsto \varphi_N(z^1, \dots, z^{i-1}, u, z^{i+1}, \dots, z^{j-1}, v, z^{j+1}, \dots, z^N)](z^i, z^j) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The operator $L^{(1)}$ acts on one-variable test functions and describes the individual flow of each particle and possibly the boundary conditions. Typical examples include

- (Free transport) $L^{(1)}\varphi(x, v) = v \cdot \nabla_x \varphi$,
- (Diffusion) $L^{(1)}\varphi(x) = \Delta_x \varphi$.

The operator $L^{(2)}$ is the central object in Boltzmann models. The form of the generator \mathcal{L}_N indicates that particles interact by pair. When two particles interact, they are said to *collide* and the operator $L^{(2)}$ describes what results from this collision. In its most abstract form, the operator $L^{(2)}$ is assumed to satisfy the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.14. *The operator $L^{(2)}$ satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) *The domain of the operator $L^{(2)}$ is a subset of $C_b(E^2)$.*
- (2) *There exist a continuous map called the post-collisional distribution*

$$\Gamma^{(2)} : (z_1, z_2) \in E \times E \mapsto \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \in \mathcal{P}(E \times E),$$

and a symmetric function called the collision rate

$$\lambda : (z_1, z_2) \in E \times E \mapsto \lambda(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

such that for all $\varphi_2 \in C_b(E^2)$ and all $z_1, z_2 \in E$,

$$L^{(2)}\varphi_2(z_1, z_2) = \lambda(z_1, z_2) \iint_{E \times E} \{\varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) - \varphi_2(z_1, z_2)\} \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2). \quad (25)$$

- (3) *For all $z_1, z_2 \in E$, the post-collisional distribution is symmetric in the sense that*

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) = \Gamma^{(2)}(z_2, z_1, dz'_2, dz'_1). \quad (26)$$

(4) The function λ is continuous on $\{(z_1, z_2) \in E^2, z_1 \neq z_2\}$ and for all $z \in E$, $\lambda(z, z) = 0$.

Note that when E is a locally compact Polish space, the Riesz-Markov-Kakutani theorem states that any linear operator on the space of two-variable test functions in $C_c(E \times E)$ can be written in the form (25). The third assumption ensures that the law f_t^N defined by the backward Kolmogorov equation remains symmetric for all time provided that f_0^N is symmetric. This follows from the observation that under (26), the action of any transposition $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_N$ on $C_b(E^N)$ commutes with \mathcal{L}_N :

$$\tau^{-1} \mathcal{L}_N \tau = \mathcal{L}_N.$$

Example 2.15 (Jump amplitude). When $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ (or more generally when E has a vector space structure), the interaction law $\Gamma^{(2)}$ is often given in terms of jump amplitudes. Given the law $\widehat{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ of the jump amplitudes of the form:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{(2)} : (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \widehat{\Gamma}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dh, dk) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d),$$

the post-collisional law $\Gamma^{(2)}$ is the image measure of $\widehat{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ by the translation

$$(h, k) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto (z_1 + h, z_2 + k) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \\ = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_2(z_1 + h, z_2 + k) \widehat{\Gamma}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dh, dk). \end{aligned}$$

This is the case investigated in [Mél96; GM97].

A very simple N -particle process with generator \mathcal{L}_N of the form (24) is given in the following straightforward proposition.

Proposition 2.16. Let $\mathcal{Z}_t^N = (Z_t^1, \dots, Z_t^N)$ be the N -particle process defined by the three following rules.

- (i) For each (unordered) pair of particles (i, j) , consider an independent non homogeneous Poisson process with rate $\lambda(Z_t^i, Z_t^j)/N$.
- (ii) Between two jump times, the particles evolve independently according to $L^{(1)}$.
- (iii) At each jump time T_{ij} of a pair (i, j) , update the states of the particles by:

$$\left(Z_{T_{ij}}^i, Z_{T_{ij}}^j \right) \sim \Gamma^{(2)} \left(Z_{T_{ij}^-}^i, Z_{T_{ij}^-}^j, dz'_1, dz'_2 \right). \quad (27)$$

Then the generator of $(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$ is \mathcal{L}_N given by (24) under Assumption 2.14.

Note that if $\lambda(z_1, z_2)$ remains of order 1, the factor $1/N$ on the right-hand side of (24) ensures that any particle undergoes on average $\mathcal{O}(1)$ collisions per unit of time, which is crucial to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Let us now describe what this limit may look like. Ultimately, the goal is to describe the limiting behaviour of the one-particle distribution function $f_t^{1,N}$. More generally, taking a test function of the form

$$\varphi_N = \varphi_s \otimes 1^{N-s},$$

for $s < N$ and $\varphi_s \in C_b(E^s)$, the weak Liouville equation (1) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^{s,N}, \varphi_s \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^s \langle f_t^{s,N}, L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_s \rangle + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} \langle f_t^{s,N}, L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_s \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{N-s}{N} \sum_{i=1}^s \langle f_t^{s+1,N}, L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,s+1} (\varphi_s \otimes 1) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This equation is not closed and involves the $(s + 1)$ -marginal. This hierarchy of equations is called the BBGKY hierarchy (see Section 3.2.1). The nonlinear model associated to the Boltzmann particle system is obtained by taking the closure:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \exists f_t \in \mathcal{P}(E), \forall s \in \mathbb{N}, \quad f_t^{s,N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_t^{\otimes s}, \quad (28)$$

which is called the *chaos assumption*. The fundamental question in this review is to justify when this property holds. If the chaos assumption holds, then taking $s = 1$ in the Liouville equation shows formally that the one-particle distribution converges towards the weak measure solution f of:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t, L^{(1)} \varphi \rangle + \langle f_t^{\otimes 2}, L^{(2)}(\varphi \otimes 1) \rangle,$$

which is called the *general Boltzmann equation*. Using Assumption 2.14, this equation can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle &= \langle f_t, L^{(1)} \varphi \rangle \\ &+ \int_{E^3} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \{ \varphi(z'_1) - \varphi(z_1) \} \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, E) f_t(dz_1) f_t(dz_2), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

or in a more symmetric form, using (26):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle &= \langle f_t, L^{(1)} \varphi \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{E^4} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \{ \varphi(z'_1) + \varphi(z'_2) - \varphi(z_1) - \varphi(z_2) \} \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) f_t(dz_1) f_t(dz_2) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

All the Boltzmann type equations in this review are special instances of this general equation for a specific choice of λ and $\Gamma^{(2)}$. Note that the general Boltzmann equation (29) is written in weak form. Examples of $\Gamma^{(2)}$ which lead to more classical Boltzmann type equations used in the modelling of rarefied gas dynamics and written in strong form are given in Section 2.3.3. Here, we can only formally write the dual version of (29):

$$\partial_t f_t = L^{(1)*} f_t + Q(f_t, f_t),$$

where Q is called the *collision operator* which is a (symmetric) quadratic operator on $\mathcal{P}(E) \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(E)$, defined weakly, for $\varphi \in C_b(E)$, by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi \rangle &= \\ &\frac{1}{2} \int_{E^4} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \{ \varphi(z'_1) + \varphi(z'_2) - \varphi(z_1) - \varphi(z_2) \} \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \mu_1(dz_1) \mu_2(dz_2). \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.17 (Nanbu particle system, continuation of Example 2.10). The general Boltzmann equation (29) only depends on the marginals of $\Gamma^{(2)}$. In other words, the detail of the interaction mechanism at the particle level is lost in the limit. As a consequence, one can construct different mechanisms which lead to the same Boltzmann equation. For instance, let the marginal of $\Gamma^{(2)}$ be denoted by:

$$\forall (z_1, z_2) \in E^2, \quad \Gamma^{(1)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1) := \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, E).$$

Let us consider the new post-collisional law:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) &= \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\Gamma^{(1)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1) \otimes \delta_{z_2}(dz'_2) + \Gamma^{(1)}(z_2, z_1, dz'_2) \otimes \delta_{z_1}(dz'_1) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and let us denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ the new corresponding N -particle generator (with $L^{(1)}$ unchanged). This is the generator associated to a particle system such that when a collision occurs, only one particle among the two updates its state (according to the law $\Gamma^{(1)}$) while the state of the other particle remains unchanged. Such mechanism is called a Nanbu interaction mechanism following the terminology of [GM97; Nan80]. Nevertheless, one can check that the Boltzmann equation associated to this process is exactly (29) with an interaction rate λ replaced by $\lambda/2$. In the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$, one cannot distinguish this system from the system where both the particles update their states after a collision.

Note that as explained in Example 2.10 the Nanbu particle system is also a special case of a mean-field jump process (see Section 2.2.3) with:

$$\lambda(z, \mu) = \int_E \lambda(z, z') \mu(dz') \equiv (\lambda \star \mu)(z),$$

and

$$P_\mu(z, dz') = \frac{\int_{z'' \in E} \lambda(z, z'') \Gamma^{(1)}(z, z'', dz') \mu(dz'')}{\int_{z'' \in E} \lambda(z, z'') \mu(dz'')}.$$

The two following examples are two variants of the Boltzmann model.

Example 2.18 (External clock). The authors of [CDW13] consider a model where the time between two collisions is given by a Poisson process with fixed rate ΛN , $\Lambda > 0$, independently of the particles. When a collision occurs, the pair (i, j) of particles which interact is chosen among all the pairs of particles with probability $p_{i,j}(\mathcal{Z}^N)$, normalised so that for all $\mathcal{Z}^N \in E^N$

$$\sum_{i < j} p_{i,j}(\mathcal{Z}^N) = 1.$$

In this case,

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N(\mathcal{Z}^N) = \Lambda N \sum_{i < j} p_{i,j}(\mathcal{Z}^N) L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N(\mathcal{Z}^N).$$

The situation differs from the previous case where a collision rate is attached to each pair of particles and no normalisation constraint is imposed. Dropping the normalisation constraint and taking $p_{i,j}(\mathcal{Z}^N) = \lambda(Z^i, Z^j)/\Lambda$ would give exactly (24). In the case

$$\forall i < j, \quad p_{i,j}(\mathcal{Z}^N) = \frac{2}{N(N-1)},$$

that is when all the pairs are chosen with the same probability, then the situation is equivalent to the previous case with all the collision rates equal to the constant Λ . In [CDW13], propagation of chaos is proved in this case only. It is believable that propagation of chaos does not hold when interactions are driven by a clock independent of the particles.

Example 2.19 (Non cutoff models). In this review, we made the choice to distinguish the jump rate λ and the post-collisional distribution $\Gamma^{(2)}$. An alternative choice in the literature (see for instance [Mél96]) is to consider $\lambda \equiv 1$ and a *collision kernel*

$$\Gamma^{(2)} : (z_1, z_2) \in E \times E \mapsto \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \in \mathcal{M}^+(E \times E),$$

which is a positive measure but not necessarily a probability distribution. The collision rate λ is thus directly encoded in the total mass of the collision kernel. Two cases may happen, for given $z_1, z_2 \in E$, either

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, E, E) < +\infty$$

or

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, E, E) = +\infty.$$

The first case is called the cutoff case. This case is equivalent to the previous case (24) with Assumption 2.14 and the following post-collisional law and collision rate:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) = \frac{\Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2)}{\Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, E, E)}, \quad \tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2) = \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, E, E).$$

In the second case, called the non-cutoff case, the lack of integrability means that there are an infinite number of collisions in finite time. Such system therefore cannot be simulated by a particle system as in Proposition 2.16. Nevertheless it still makes sense to consider the abstract Markov process defined by the generator \mathcal{L}_N . Non-cutoff models are historically important as explained in Section 2.3.3. Non-cutoff models are often handled by approximating them by cutoff models. In this review we implicitly consider cutoff models but we will occasionally specify when a technique can be extended to non-cutoff cases.

The nonlinear limit can also be defined as the solution of a more general martingale problem.

Definition 2.20 (Nonlinear Boltzmann martingale problem). Let $T > 0$ and $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. We write $I = [0, T]$. We say that $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$ is a solution to the nonlinear Boltzmann martingale problem with initial law f_0 when for any test function $\varphi \in \text{Dom}(L^{(1)})$,

$$M_t^\varphi = \varphi(Z_t) - \varphi(Z_0) - \int_0^t \{L^{(1)}\varphi(Z_s) + K\varphi(Z_s, f_s)\} ds,$$

is a f_I -martingale, where $(Z_t)_t$ is the canonical process, $f_s = (Z_s)_\# f_I$ and for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $z_1 \in E$,

$$K\varphi(z_1, \mu) := \iint_{E \times E} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \{\varphi(z'_1) - \varphi(z_1)\} \Gamma^{(1)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1) \mu(dz_2).$$

Existence and uniqueness for the nonlinear Boltzmann martingale problem holds under classical Lipschitz and boundedness assumptions on the parameters. It is a special case of the model studied in [Gra92b]. Note that this martingale problem is also a special case of the nonlinear mean-field martingale problem (Definition 2.6) with

$$L_\mu\varphi(z) = L^{(1)}\varphi(z) + K\varphi(z, \mu).$$

This translates the fact that the Boltzmann equation is obtained as the limit of both the Boltzmann model and the Nanbu particle system which is a special case of mean-field jump process.

We end this section with a classical useful proposition which states that when the collision rate λ is uniformly bounded, then the situation is essentially the same as when it is constant.

Proposition 2.21 (Uniform clock trick). *Assume that*

$$\sup_{z_1, z_2 \in E} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \leq \Lambda < \infty, \tag{31}$$

and let $(\tilde{Z}_t^N)_t$ be the process defined by the three following rules.

- (i) To each pair of particles is attached an independent Poisson process with rate Λ/N .
- (ii) Between two jump times, the particles evolve independently according to $L^{(1)}$.
- (iii) When the clock of the pair (i, j) rings at time T_{ij} , then the states of the particles is updated with probability $\lambda(\tilde{Z}_t^i, \tilde{Z}_t^j)/\Lambda$ by:

$$\left(\tilde{Z}_{T_{ij}^+}^i, \tilde{Z}_{T_{ij}^+}^j \right) \sim \Gamma^{(2)}\left(\tilde{Z}_{T_{ij}^-}^i, \tilde{Z}_{T_{ij}^-}^j, dz'_1, dz'_2 \right),$$

and with probability $(1 - \lambda(\tilde{Z}_t^i, \tilde{Z}_t^j)/\Lambda)$, nothing happens (this case is called a fictitious collision).

Then the law of $(\tilde{Z}_t^N)_t$ is equal to the law of the process constructed in Proposition 2.16.

Proof. Let us compute the generator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ of the process $(\tilde{Z}_t^N)_t$. It holds that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N \varphi_N = \sum_{i=1}^N L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_N + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} \tilde{L}^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N,$$

with, given $\varphi_2 \in C_b(E^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}^{(2)} \varphi_2(z_1, z_2) &= \Lambda \int_0^1 \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{\eta \leq \frac{\lambda(z_1, z_2)}{\Lambda}} \left(\iint_{E \times E} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{1}_{\eta \geq \frac{\lambda(z_1, z_2)}{\Lambda}} \varphi_2(z_1, z_2) \right\} d\eta - \Lambda \varphi_2(z_1, z_2) \\ &= \Lambda \times \frac{\lambda(z_1, z_2)}{\Lambda} \iint_{E \times E} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \\ &\quad + \Lambda \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(z_1, z_2)}{\Lambda} \right) \varphi_2(z_1, z_2) - \Lambda \varphi_2(z_1, z_2) \\ &= L^{(2)} \varphi_2(z_1, z_2), \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\mathcal{L}_N = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ and the two processes are equal in law. \square

2.3.2 Parametric Boltzmann models

In many applications, the post-collisional distribution is explicitly given as the image measure of a known parameter space (Θ, ν) endowed with a probability measure ν (or a positive measure with infinite mass in the non cutoff case). Analogously to the case of mean-field jump models (see Example 2.12), in this review, we distinguish this particular class of models and we call them *parametric Boltzmann models*.

Definition 2.22 (Parametric Boltzmann model). Let be given two measurable functions

$$\psi_1 : E \times E \times \Theta \rightarrow E, \quad \psi_2 : E \times E \times \Theta \rightarrow E,$$

which satisfy the symmetry assumption

$$\forall (z_1, z_2) \in E^2, \quad \psi_1(z_1, z_2, \cdot)_{\#} \nu = \psi_2(z_2, z_1, \cdot)_{\#} \nu. \quad (32)$$

Let us define the function

$$\psi : E \times E \times \Theta \rightarrow E^2, \quad (z_1, z_2, \theta) \mapsto (\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta), \psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta)).$$

A parametric Boltzmann model with parameters (Θ, ψ) is a Boltzmann model of the form (24) with Assumption 2.14 and a post-collisional distribution of the form:

$$\forall (z_1, z_2) \in E^2, \quad \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) = \psi_{\#} \nu.$$

The symmetry assumption (32) is the equivalent of (26) in this special case. In particular, for any two-variable test function $\varphi_2 \in C_b(E^2)$ and any $(z_1, z_2) \in E \times E$,

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{E \times E} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) &= \int_{\Theta} \varphi_2(\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta), \psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta)) \nu(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \varphi_2(\psi_2(z_2, z_1, \theta), \psi_1(z_2, z_1, \theta)) \nu(d\theta), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (32). A sufficient condition for (32) to hold is the case investigated in [Szn84a] with:

$$\psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta) = \psi_1(z_2, z_1, \theta).$$

In terms of particle systems, following Proposition 2.16, in a parametric model, when a collision occurs, a parameter $\theta \sim \nu$ is sampled first and then the states of the particle is updated by:

$$\left(Z_{T_{ij}^+}^i, Z_{T_{ij}^+}^j \right) = \psi \left(Z_{T_{ij}^-}^i, Z_{T_{ij}^-}^j, \theta \right).$$

Example 2.23 (Symmetrization). Wagner [Wag96] treats the case of particle systems with a generator of the form: for $\mathbf{z}^N = (z^1, \dots, z^N) \in E^N$ and $\varphi_N \in C_b(E^N)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N(\mathbf{z}^N) &= \sum_{i=1}^N L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_N(\mathbf{z}^N) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i \neq j} \tilde{\lambda}(z^i, z^j) \int_{\tilde{\Theta}} \{ \varphi_N(\mathbf{z}^N(i, j, \tilde{\theta})) - \varphi_N(\mathbf{z}^N) \} \tilde{\nu}(d\tilde{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\tilde{\lambda} : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a parameter set endowed with a probability measure $\tilde{\nu}$ and $\mathbf{z}^N(i, j, \tilde{\theta})$ is the N dimensional vector whose k component is equal to

$$z^k(i, j, \tilde{\theta}) = \begin{cases} z^k & \text{if } k \neq i, j \\ \tilde{\psi}_1(z^i, z^j, \tilde{\theta}) & \text{if } k = i \\ \tilde{\psi}_2(z^i, z^j, \tilde{\theta}) & \text{if } k = j \end{cases},$$

for two given functions $\tilde{\psi}_1, \tilde{\psi}_2 : E \times E \times \tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow E$. The main difference with the generator (24) is that Wagner distinguishes the pairs (i, j) and (j, i) while in (24) we consider unordered pairs of particles but add the symmetry assumption (26). Nevertheless, using a simple symmetrization procedure, the model (33) fits into the previous general framework with

$$\Theta = \tilde{\Theta} \times [0, 1], \quad \nu(d\theta) = \tilde{\nu}(d\tilde{\theta}) \otimes d\sigma,$$

where $\theta = (\tilde{\theta}, \sigma) \in \Theta$, $d\sigma$ is the uniform probability measure on $[0, 1]$ and for $z_1, z_2 \in E$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\lambda}(z_2, z_1)}{2}, \\ \psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta) &= \mathbb{1}_{\sigma \leq \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}{2\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}} \tilde{\psi}_1(z_1, z_2, \tilde{\theta}) + \mathbb{1}_{\sigma > \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}{2\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}} \tilde{\psi}_2(z_2, z_1, \tilde{\theta}), \\ \psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta) &= \mathbb{1}_{\sigma \leq \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}{2\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}} \tilde{\psi}_2(z_1, z_2, \tilde{\theta}) + \mathbb{1}_{\sigma > \frac{\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}{2\tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2)}} \tilde{\psi}_1(z_2, z_1, \tilde{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

One can check that the functions ψ_1 and ψ_2 satisfy (32) and that the generator (24) of the associated parametric model (Definition 2.22) is equal to (33). In this case, the Boltzmann equation (29) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle &= \langle f_t, L^{(1)} \varphi \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Theta} \times E^2} \left\{ \tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2) [\varphi(\tilde{\psi}_1(z_1, z_2, \tilde{\theta})) - \varphi(z_1)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tilde{\lambda}(z_2, z_1) [\varphi(\tilde{\psi}_2(z_2, z_1, \tilde{\theta})) - \varphi(z_1)] \right\} \tilde{\nu}(d\tilde{\theta}) f_t(dz_1) f_t(dz_2), \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently after the change of variables $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto (z_2, z_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle &= \langle f_t, L^{(1)} \varphi \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Theta} \times E^2} \tilde{\lambda}(z_1, z_2) \left\{ \varphi(\tilde{\psi}_1(z_1, z_2, \tilde{\theta})) + \varphi(\tilde{\psi}_2(z_1, z_2, \tilde{\theta})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \varphi(z_1) - \varphi(z_2) \right\} \tilde{\nu}(d\tilde{\theta}) f_t(dz_1) f_t(dz_2). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The introductory section of [Wag96] contains many examples of such models, in particular models (in Russian) due to Leontovich in the 30's and Skorokhod in the 80's that we did not manage to find. A more recent example inspired by economic models of wealth distribution [MT08] is given in [CF16b]. The authors assume $E = \mathbb{R}$ with $L^{(1)} = 0$, $\lambda = 1$, $\tilde{\Theta} = \mathbb{R}^4$ and

$$\tilde{\psi}_1(z_1, z_2, (L, R, \tilde{L}, \tilde{R})) = Lz_1 + Rz_2,$$

and

$$\tilde{\psi}_2(z_1, z_2, (L, R, \tilde{L}, \tilde{R})) = \tilde{L}z_2 + \tilde{R}z_1.$$

In this model, the state of a particle represents the wealth of an individual and the parameters $(L, R, \tilde{L}, \tilde{R})$ specify how a trade between two individuals affect their wealth. This model generalises a famous model due to Kac [Kac56] which will be discussed in the next section. From the modelling point of view, it is more natural to use generators of the form (33); several additional examples will be given in particular in Section 7.2.4 for socio-economic models. On the other hand, the generator form (24) will simplify some computations in Section 6.

In the parametric framework, the particle system can be advantageously written as the solution of a system of SDEs driven by Poisson measures. In a famous article, Tanaka [Tan78] proposed a SDE approach to study the nonlinear Boltzmann system of rarefied gas dynamics (which will be presented in the next section). He introduced a class of nonlinear SDEs driven by Poisson random measures which will be described in Section 6.4. As we shall see, although it is relatively easy to write a system of coupled SDEs which describes the particle system, its relationship with Tanaka's SDE is not completely straightforward. Around the same time, Murata [Mur77] tackled the question and proved the propagation of chaos (for a specific model) using a coupling argument between the two systems of SDEs. The idea is of course reminiscent of the well-known McKean's theorem and all the works reviewed in Section 5.1 for McKean-Vlasov systems. Note however that Murata's work is among the first ones which use the very fruitful idea of coupling to prove propagation of chaos. His argument is based on a clever but not so easy optimal coupling argument which seems to have been largely forgotten in the subsequent literature. A recent series of articles [FM16; CF16b; CF18] has proposed a more contemporary point of view on the question. The arguments are very similar to Murata's but take advantage of the development of the theory of optimal transport. Let us also mention that these articles seem to be based on [FGM09] which also introduces an optimal coupling argument reminiscent of Murata's but in a different context, namely the derivation of the Landau equation from a system of interacting diffusion processes. We will continue this discussion in Section 6.4.

Example 2.24 (Semi-parametric model). A natural extension of the parametric model would consider a measure on Θ which depends on the state of the particles, for instance one can consider a post-collisional distribution of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{E \times E} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \varphi_2(\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta), \psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta)) q(z_1, z_2, \theta) \nu(d\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where for all $z_1, z_2 \in E$, $q(z_1, z_2, \cdot)$ is a probability density function with respect to the measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$. Wagner [Wag96] considered such model that will be called *semi-parametric* in this review. If there exists $M > 0$ and $q_0(\theta)$ a probability density function with respect to ν such that

$$\forall z_1, z_2 \in E, \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad q(z_1, z_2, \theta) \leq M q_0(\theta), \quad (36)$$

then the situation can be reduced to the parametric case thanks to an accept-reject scheme similar to the one in Proposition 2.21. Namely in the extend parameter space

$$\tilde{\Theta} = \Theta \times [0, 1],$$

endowed with the probability measure $q_0(\theta)d\theta \otimes d\eta$, let us define the function

$$\tilde{\psi}(z_1, z_2, (\theta, \eta)) = \begin{cases} (\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta), \psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta)) & \text{if } \eta \leq \frac{q(z_1, z_2, \theta)}{Mq_0(\theta)} \\ (z_1, z_2) & \text{if } \eta > \frac{q(z_1, z_2, \theta)}{Mq_0(\theta)} \end{cases}.$$

Then up to a time rescaling $t \rightarrow tM$, the parametric model $(\tilde{\Theta}, \tilde{\psi})$ is equivalent in law to the semi-parametric model. Note that (36) automatically holds when Θ is compact and q bounded.

2.3.3 Classical models in collisional kinetic theory

The foundations of kinetic theory lie in the seminal work of Boltzmann and Maxwell who attempted to understand the large scale behaviour of a gas of particles defined in the phase space $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by their position and velocity. Many interactions mechanisms can be considered, depending on the physical assumptions. The starting point is the Newton equations satisfied by the N -particle system $(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX_t^i}{dt} = V_t^i \\ \frac{dV_t^i}{dt} = -\sum_{j=1}^N \nabla V(|X_t^j - X_t^i|) \end{cases}, \quad (37)$$

where V is a (smooth) repulsive potential, typically an inverse power law. Another important system is the hard-sphere system which will be described in Example 2.28. Without any other assumption, it is not clear that this set of equations defines a binary collision process. In fact, it is more reminiscent of a mean-field system without the (crucial) $1/N$ scaling in front of the sum. Boltzmann and Maxwell considered the case of dilute gases (also called *rarefied gas*), that is gases where the density of particles is so small that in the sum in (37), there is typically no more than one non-zero term. The dynamics of each particle is therefore mainly driven by the free transport until the particle comes very close to another particle which induces a deviation of its trajectory (as well as the trajectory of the other particle) depending on the potential V . During this process, everything is deterministic and the only source of randomness comes from the initial condition. The probabilistic interpretation presented in this section is due to Kac. Boltzmann derived the equation satisfied by the one-particle distribution when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. In its most general form, the Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics reads (in strong form):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f_t(x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} B(v - v_*, \sigma) \left(f_t(x, v'_*) f_t(x, v') - f_t(x, v_*) f_t(x, v) \right) dv_* d\sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} v' = \frac{v + v_*}{2} + \frac{|v - v_*|}{2} \sigma \\ v'_* = \frac{v + v_*}{2} - \frac{|v - v_*|}{2} \sigma \end{cases}, \quad (39)$$

are the post-collisional velocities. The parameter $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is often called the scattering angle. This transformation preserves energy and momentum. The function $B : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is of the form

$$B(u, \sigma) = \Phi(|u|)\Sigma(\theta), \quad (40)$$

with $\cos \theta = \frac{u}{|u|} \cdot \sigma$, $\theta \in [0, \pi]$. The function Φ is called the velocity cross-section and the function Σ is called the angular cross-section. The function B is referred as the collision kernel (in the literature, it is also sometimes called the cross-section). It is customary to write $B(u, \sigma) \equiv B(|u|, \cos \theta)$. Depending on the choice of the potential V , some of the most important collision kernels derived by Maxwell are listed below.

- (Hard-sphere)

$$\Phi(|u|) = |u|, \quad \Sigma(\theta) = 1. \quad (41)$$

- (Inverse-power law potentials)

$$\Phi(|u|) = |u|^\gamma, \quad \gamma = \frac{s - (2d - 1)}{s - 1}, \quad s > 2,$$

and Σ has a non-integrable singularity when $\theta \rightarrow 0$, so that

$$\int_0^\pi \Sigma(\theta) d\theta = +\infty$$

- (Maxwell molecules)

$$\Phi(|u|) = 1, \quad \int_0^\pi \Sigma(\theta) d\theta = +\infty. \quad (42)$$

- (Maxwell molecules with Grad's cutoff)

$$\Phi(|u|) = 1, \quad \int_0^\pi \Sigma(\theta) d\theta < +\infty. \quad (43)$$

We will not go further into the description of the Boltzmann equation. The interested reader will find a thorough discussion and analysis of these different models in the reviews [Vil02; Deg04] or in the classical books [Cer88; CIP94]. We also mention the book [Cer06] which contains a very interesting biography of Ludwig Boltzmann as well as a scientific discussion of the physics of his time and of his legacy.

This review is focused on the rigorous derivation of the Boltzmann equation from a system of particles. On the right-hand side of (38), the variable x (position) only appears as a parameter: this is the limit where collisions between two particles happen only when the two particles are at the same position. From a mathematical point of view, this purely local interaction mechanism makes the derivation very difficult if not impossible with stochastic tools (see [Mél96]). A deterministic example (Lanford's theorem) is nevertheless given in Example 2.28 and Section 6.6. Apart from this result we will focus on simplified mechanisms: either spatially homogeneous *Kac models* (Example 2.25 and Example 2.26) or kinetic mollified models (Example 2.27). Both cases have a natural probabilistic interpretation which fits into the framework of Section 2.3.1.

Example 2.25 (Spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation). In the case of a spatially homogeneous problem, the difficulty due to the local interaction does not appear. In this case the so-called spatially-homogeneous Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics describes a gas of particles defined by their velocity only:

$$\partial_t f(t, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} B(v - v_*, \sigma) \left(f_t(v'_*) f_t(v') - f_t(v_*) f_t(v) \right) dv_* d\sigma, \quad (44)$$

This last equation can be shown to be the strong form of the Boltzmann equation (29) with a specific parametric post-collisional distribution given by the cross-section B . The N -particle stochastic process associated to this equation is given by Proposition 2.16. More precisely, the (spatially-homogeneous) hard-sphere model and the (spatially-homogeneous) model of Maxwell molecules with Grad's cutoff fit into the framework of Section 2.3.2 with:

$$\psi_1(v, v_*, \theta) = v', \quad \psi_2(v, v_*, \theta) = v'_*,$$

and

$$\lambda(v, v_*) = \Phi(|v - v_*|) \int_0^\pi \Sigma(\theta) d\theta,$$

$$\Gamma(v, v_*, dz', dv_*, dv'_*) = \psi(v, v_*, \cdot) \# \left(\frac{\Sigma}{\int_0^\pi \Sigma(\theta) d\theta} \right).$$

To be more precise, with this particular choice of the parameters, the weak-form of the general Boltzmann equation (30) reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left\{ \varphi(v') + \varphi(v'_*) - \varphi(v) - \varphi(v_*) \right\} f_t(v) f_t(v_*) B(v - v_*, \sigma) dv dv_* d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

The strong form (44) is obtained thanks to the following classical involutive unit Jacobian changes of variables which allow to exchange (v, v_*) and (v', v'_*) :

$$(v, v_*, \sigma) \rightarrow (v', v'_*, \vec{k}), \quad (v, v_*) \rightarrow (v_*, v),$$

with $\vec{k} = (v - v_*)/|v - v_*|$ (see [Vil02, Chapter 1, Section 4.5]). The collision kernel B is invariant by these changes of variables so we can keep its arguments unchanged.

The non-cutoff cases are more difficult to handle due to the non-integrability of the angular cross-section (see Example 2.19).

The following example describes the so-called Kac model, which is a caricature of a gas of Maxwellian molecules in dimension one. Beyond the relative simplicity of the model, the seminal article of Kac [Kac56] is of particular importance because it introduces the mathematical definition of propagation of chaos.

Example 2.26 (Kac model). Within the framework of Section 2.3.2, the Kac model is defined in $E = \mathbb{R}$ by $L^{(1)} = 0$ and the post-collisional distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \\ := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \varphi_2(z_1 \cos \theta + z_2 \sin \theta, -z_1 \sin \theta + z_2 \cos \theta) d\theta \end{aligned}$$

and the collision rate $\lambda(z_1, z_2) = \nu = \text{constant}$. Then the weak Boltzmann equation becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \varphi, f_t \rangle = \frac{\nu}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \{ \varphi(z_1 \cos \theta + z_2 \sin \theta) - \varphi(z_1) \} f_t(dz_1) f_t(dz_2).$$

With the change of variable (with θ fixed)

$$(z'_1, z'_2) = (z_1 \cos \theta + z_2 \sin \theta, -z_1 \sin \theta + z_2 \cos \theta),$$

followed by $\theta \mapsto -\theta$ (both changes of variable have unit jacobian), Kac obtained the following equation in strong form:

$$\partial_t f_t(z_1) = \frac{\nu}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \{ f(z'_1) f(z'_2) - f_t(z_1) f_t(z_2) \} dz_2 d\theta.$$

We refer the reader to [Car+08; Mis12] for a thorough analysis and discussion of the Kac model and its generalisations in kinetic theory. Keeping a collision rate λ constant the authors of [CDW13] generalised the arguments of the proof of the propagation of chaos to a larger class of models. This generalised result, that we will call *Kac's theorem*, will be discussed in Section 6.1. As already mentioned in Section 2.3.2, the Kac model is also a special instance of the model studied in [CF16b] within a framework which will be described in Section 6.4.

The work of Kac had a very strong influence on the literature so that Boltzmann models with $L^{(1)} = 0$ are sometimes called Kac models, or also *homogeneous* Boltzmann models.

Example 2.27 (Mollified Boltzmann models). The interaction mechanism of a kinetic particle system is said to be *purely local* when, within the framework of Section 2.3.1, the collision rate is taken equal to

$$\lambda((x_1, v_1), (x_2, v_2)) = \delta_{x_1, x_2}.$$

This indicates that two particles interact if and only if they are exactly at the same position. As explained in [Mél96], the probabilistic interpretation of purely local models is extremely difficult and one can rather consider the smoothed version:

$$\lambda((x_1, v_1), (x_2, v_2)) = K(|x_1 - x_2|),$$

where K is a smooth mollifier with fixed radius (i.e. a non negative radial function which tends to zero at infinity and which integrates to one). The post-collisional distribution is unchanged and acts only on the velocity variable:

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) \equiv \Gamma^{(2)}(v_1, v_2, dv'_1, dv'_2) \otimes \delta_{x_1}(dx'_1) \otimes \delta_{x_2}(dx'_2).$$

This model is called a mollified Boltzmann model. Its probabilistic treatment is discussed in [GM97] and [Mél96]. Note that with a general state space E , all the models in Section 2.3.1 and in particular the one in Proposition 2.16 are implicitly mollified Boltzmann models. Most of the models reviewed in Section 6 are mollified models. Purely local Boltzmann models can be recovered by letting the mollifier converge to a Dirac delta $K \rightarrow \delta_0$ (formally or with a quantitative control). Another example of purely local Boltzmann model is the hard-sphere system defined in the next Example 2.28.

Example 2.28 (Hard-sphere system). A *hard-sphere* is a spherical particle defined by its position, its velocity and its diameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, it is assumed that two hard-spheres cannot overlap. A system of N hard-spheres is thus defined on the domain:

$$\mathcal{D}_N := \{\mathbf{z}^N = (x^i, v^i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^N, \forall i \neq j, |x^i - x^j| \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

The dynamics of the hard-sphere system is a special degenerate case of (37) with a vanishing potential but with an additional boundary condition which tells what happens on the boundary of \mathcal{D}_N , that is when two particles are at a distance ε (the term collision is here self-explanatory). The collision of two hard-spheres is an elastic collision which preserves energy and momentum. Starting with a pair of pre-collisional velocities (v^i, v^j) , writing down the conservation laws leads to the following formula for the post-collisional velocities:

$$\begin{aligned} v^{i*} &= v^i - \nu^{i,j} \cdot (v^i - v^j) \nu^{i,j} \\ v^{j*} &= v^j + \nu^{i,j} \cdot (v^i - v^j) \nu^{i,j} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $\nu^{i,j} := (x^i - x^j)/|x^i - x^j| \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. This representation is not the same as the representation (39) but it can be shown that they are actually equivalent [Vil02, Chapter 1, Section 4.6]. Pre-collisional means that (v^i, v^j) are such that $(v^i - v^j) \cdot \nu^{i,j} < 0$. It can also be checked that the post-collisional velocities satisfy $(v^{i*} - v^{j*}) \cdot \nu^{i,j} > 0$. Note that this transformation is an involution in the sense that if $(v^i - v^j) \cdot \nu^{i,j} > 0$ (that is the v^i and v^j are in a post-collisional configuration), then (45) gives the pre-collisional velocities. Note also that this dynamical system is completely deterministic.

The large scale behaviour when $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is given by the Boltzmann equation (38) with the hard-sphere cross-section. Under the chaoticity assumption (28) at time $t = 0$, Lanford's theorem [Lan75] states that in the Boltzmann-Grad limit $N\varepsilon^{d-1} \rightarrow 1$, (28) also holds for later time. This scaling was introduced by Grad in [Gra63]. The proof of Lanford's theorem is extremely difficult. We will briefly review the main ideas in Section 6.6. Our presentation will follow closely [GST14].

3 Notions about chaos

3.1 Topology reminders: metrics and convergence for probability measures

Since propagation of chaos is about the convergence of probability measures, we first need to present the topological tools that will be constantly used in the following. The content of this section is fairly classical, most of the results specific to our topic can be found in [HM14], see also [Jab14, Section 3.4], [MM13, Section 2.5], [MMW15, Section 3] or [Vil01]. A more general overview of the topology of the space of probability measures can be found in the classical books [Vil09b; Bil99; Par67].

3.1.1 Distances on the space of probability measures

Let $(\mathcal{E}, d_{\mathcal{E}})$ be a Polish space. For $p \geq 1$, a measure μ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ admits a *finite p -th moment* when there exists $x_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} [d_{\mathcal{E}}(X, x_0)^p] := \int_{\mathcal{E}} d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, x_0)^p \mu(dx) < +\infty.$$

This property does not depend on x_0 . The space of probability measures with finite p -th moment is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{E})$. The Wasserstein distance on $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{E})$ will be the most important one in the following.

Definition 3.1 (Wasserstein distances). For $p \geq 1$, the Wasserstein- p distance between the probability measures μ and ν in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{E})$ is defined by

$$W_{d_{\mathcal{E}}, p}(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, y)^p \pi(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p} = \inf_{\substack{X \sim \mu \\ Y \sim \nu}} \mathbb{E} [d_{\mathcal{E}}(X, Y)^p]^{1/p}$$

where $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of all couplings of μ and ν , that is to say, the set of probability measures on $E \times E$ with first and second marginals respectively equal to μ and ν .

The total variation distance can be understood as a Wasserstein-1 distance with the trivial distance $d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, y) = \delta_{x, y}$.

Definition 3.2 (Total variation norm). The total variation distance between two probability measures μ and ν in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is defined by

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = 2 \inf_{\substack{X \sim \mu \\ Y \sim \nu}} \mathbb{P}(X \neq Y).$$

Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ can be seen as a subset of the dual space $C_b(\mathcal{E})^*$, natural strong norms on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ are induced by usual norms on functional spaces. The following proposition links these distances to dual norms:

Proposition 3.3 (Duality formulae). *The total variation and Wasserstein-1 distances satisfy:*

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{E}} \varphi(x) \mu(dx) - \int_{\mathcal{E}} \varphi(x) \nu(dx) \right\}$$

and

$$W_{d, 1}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_{\mathcal{E}}} \leq 1} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{E}} \varphi(x) \mu(dx) - \int_{\mathcal{E}} \varphi(x) \nu(dx) \right\}$$

where

$$\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_{\mathcal{E}}} := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|}{d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, y)}.$$

Proof. See [Vil03, Theorem 1.14] □

Another important class of dual norms is given by the negative Sobolev norms $W^{-s,p}$. Let us emphasize two special cases.

Definition 3.4 (Some negative Sobolev norms). When $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the following norms.

- For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ and $s > \frac{d}{2}$

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{H^{-s}}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{\mu}(\xi) - \hat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 \frac{d\xi}{(1 + |\xi|^2)^s},$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ is the Fourier transform of μ .

- The dual norm of the Euclidean Lipschitz semi-norm

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{W^{-1,\infty}} := \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq 1} \langle \mu - \nu, \varphi \rangle$$

where the $W^{1,\infty}$ Sobolev norm is $\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} = \|\varphi\|_{\infty} + \|\nabla\varphi\|_{\infty}$.

An important property of the negative Sobolev norm H^{-s} is its polynomial structure (see [HM14, Lemma 2.9]).

Lemma 3.5. *The negative Sobolev norm H^{-s} , $s > d/2$ on \mathbb{R}^d satisfies for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \nu\|_{H^{-s}}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Phi_s(x - y)(\mu^{\otimes 2} - \mu \otimes \nu)(dx, dy) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Phi_s(x - y)(\nu^{\otimes 2} - \nu \otimes \mu)(dx, dy) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $\Phi_s(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-iz \cdot \xi} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-s} d\xi$.

Proposition 3.6 (Comparison of distances). *Assume the distance $d_{\mathcal{E}}$ to be bounded. The following uniform topological equivalences hold.*

- The TV distance dominates the Wassertein-1 distance W_1 .
- $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}, d_{\mathcal{E}}}$ is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ (see [HM14, Equations (2.4) and (2.5)]) and this implies the same for W_1 and $\|\cdot\|_{W^{-1,\infty}}$ distances.
- The W_2 -distance dominates the W_1 -distance, and for $s > \frac{d+1}{2}$ the W_1 -distance dominates the square of the H^{-s} -distance.
- For measures in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{E})$ with $p > 0$ and $s \geq 1$, the H^{-s} distance dominates the W_1 distance up to a positive exponent.
- For measures in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{E})$ with $p > 2$, the W_1 -distance dominates the W_2 -distance up to a positive exponent.

Proof. See [HM14, Lemma 2.1], which gives a quantitative version of this. □

Finally, let $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi^k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable and separating subset of $C_b(\mathcal{E})$ (see Definition 3.9 below) and such that $\|\varphi^k\|_{\infty} \leq 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following expression defines a distance on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ for any $p \geq 1$

$$D_p(\mu, \nu) := \left(\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} |\langle \mu - \nu, \varphi^k \rangle|^p \right)^{1/p}. \quad (47)$$

In the literature, the most encountered distances are D_1 and D_2 which are used as a convenient tool to metricise the notion of weak convergence defined below (see Example 3.10). To conclude, we summarise the main cases of interest for the Wasserstein distance and other related distances.

Definition 3.7. In problems related to propagation of chaos, the Wasserstein distances are often used in the following cases.

- When $\mathcal{E} = E$ is the state space of the particles, endowed with a distance d_E , we do not specify the dependency in d_E :

$$W_{d_E, p} \equiv W_p$$

When $E = \mathbb{R}^d$, the bounded moment assumption can be removed by using the bounded distance $\tilde{d}_E(x, y) := \inf(|x - y|, 1)$.

- When $\mathcal{E} = E^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is a product space of the state space (E, d_E) , unless otherwise specified we follow [HM14] and use the normalised distance: for $\mathbf{x}^k = (x^1, \dots, x^k)$ and $\mathbf{y}^k = (y^1, \dots, y^k)$,

$$d_{E^k}(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k d_E(x^i, y^i),$$

and we simply write $W_{d_{E^k}, p} \equiv W_p$. When we use the non-normalised distance

$$\tilde{d}_{E^k}(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) := \sum_{i=1}^k d_E(x^i, y^i),$$

we write $W_{\tilde{d}_{E^k}, p} \equiv \widetilde{W}_p$. In the special case $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ endowed with the Euclidean norm, we will rather use the normalised distance,

$$d_{E^k}^p(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k |x^i - y^i|^p,$$

and the non-normalised one

$$\tilde{d}_{E^k}^p(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{y}^k) := \sum_{i=1}^k |x^i - y^i|^p,$$

so that $\widetilde{W}_p^p(\mu, \nu) = kW_p^p(\mu, \nu)$.

- The continuous path space $\mathcal{E} = C([0, T], \mathcal{F})$ is endowed with the uniform topology

$$d_{\mathcal{E}}((X_t)_t, (Y_t)_t) := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_{\mathcal{F}}(X_t, Y_t)$$

Two important cases are $\mathcal{F} = E$ and $\mathcal{F} = E^k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and is useful to note that

$$C([0, T], E^k) \simeq C([0, T], E)^k$$

- The Skorokhod space $\mathcal{E} = D([0, T], \mathcal{F})$ is endowed with the Skorokhod distance (see Section D.2). It is often more convenient to use the uniform topology although it does not make the space complete. However, as the uniform topology is stronger than the Skorokhod topology, any estimate in Wasserstein distance for the uniform topology implies the same estimate for the Skorokhod topology, see [ADF18, Section 3].
- When $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ is a probability space over a space \mathcal{F} which is typically one of the aforementioned spaces, we will mainly encounter three cases:

$$\mathcal{W}_p := W_{W_p, p} \quad \mathcal{W}_{D_1} := W_{D_1, 1} \quad \mathcal{W}_{H^{-s}} := W_{H^{-s}, 2}$$

3.1.2 Convergence in the space of probability measures

Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is a subset of $C_b(\mathcal{E})^*$, a weak topology is induced by the weak- \star topology on $C_b(\mathcal{E})^*$.

Definition 3.8. (Weak convergence) The weak convergence of a sequence of probability measures $(\mu_N)_N$ towards $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is defined as the related weak- \star convergence in $C_b(\mathcal{E})^*$. More precisely, a sequence of probability measures $(\mu_N)_N$ is said to converge weakly towards μ when

$$\forall \varphi \in C_b(\mathcal{E}), \quad \langle \mu_N, \varphi \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle \mu, \varphi \rangle.$$

The corresponding topology is the *weakest* topology which makes the evaluation maps $\nu \mapsto \langle \nu, \varphi \rangle$ measurable. In probability theory, the related convergence for μ_N -distributed random variables is also called *convergence in law* or *convergence in distribution*.

In many examples, the set of continuous bounded test functions is too large and it is necessary to work with a smaller subspace, for instance the domain of a generator. The minimal needed assumptions on a subspace of test functions are given by the following definition (see [EK86, p.112]).

Definition 3.9 (Separating and convergence determining class). A subset $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(\mathcal{E})$ is called *separating* whenever for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$, the condition

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \langle \mu, \varphi \rangle = \langle \nu, \varphi \rangle,$$

implies that $\mu = \nu$. The subset \mathcal{F} is said to be *convergence determining* whenever for any sequence $(\mu_N)_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$, the condition

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \langle \mu_N, \varphi \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle \mu, \varphi \rangle,$$

implies that $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu$ weakly. Note that a convergence determining set is also separating (the converse is false in general).

Example 3.10. The following sets are convergence determining.

- By the Portmanteau theorem [Bil99, Theorem 2.1], the set $UC_b(\mathcal{E})$ of bounded uniformly continuous functions on \mathcal{E} is convergence determining (for any equivalent metric on \mathcal{E}).
- When \mathcal{E} is locally compact, the space $C_c(\mathcal{E})$ of continuous functions with compact support is convergence determining [EK86, Chapter 3, Proposition 4.4]. The space $C_0(\mathcal{E})$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity is thus also convergence determining. Note that the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is not a closed subspace of $C_c(\mathcal{E})^*$ (nor of $C_0(\mathcal{E})^*$).
- When \mathcal{E} is locally compact, the Stone-Weierstrass theorem implies that $C_0(\mathcal{E})$ is separable. Thus, any dense countable subset $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi^k, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset C_0(\mathcal{E})$ is convergence determining. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\|\varphi^k\|_\infty \leq 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, the distance (47) metricises the weak-convergence. Indeed, since each term of the series (47) is bounded by 2^{-k} , the convergence $D_p(\mu_N, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ is equivalent to $\langle \varphi^k, \mu_N \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mu, \varphi^k \rangle$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It is also possible to take φ^k Lipschitz with a Lipschitz constant bounded by 1 for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and vanishing at infinity.
- In general $C_b(\mathcal{E})$ is not separable so there is no obvious other countable convergence determining set. There exists nevertheless another classical choice when \mathcal{E} is only separable. By a theorem due to Urysohn, any separable metric space can be topologically imbedded in $[0, 1]^\mathbb{N}$ and it is therefore possible to construct on \mathcal{E} an equivalent metric $\tilde{d}_\mathcal{E}$ which makes $(\mathcal{E}, \tilde{d}_\mathcal{E})$ a totally bounded set. The completion $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ of this space is therefore compact and the set $UC_b(\mathcal{E})$ under this metric is isomorphic to the set $C_b(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})$ which is separable since $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is compact (by Stone-Weierstrass theorem). In conclusion,

there exists a countable dense subset $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi^k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $UC_b(\mathcal{E})$. Up to replacing φ^k by $\varphi^k / \|\varphi^k\|_\infty$ one can assume that the φ^k are bounded by 1 and the distance (47) thus metricises the weak convergence, see [Par67, Theorem 6.6] and [SV97, Theorem 1.1.2]. Note that $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}), D_1)$ is separable and D_1 is equivalent to a complete metric, see the remark which follows [SV97, Theorem 1.1.2] and [Daw93, Remark 3.2.2].

- Since the space $\text{Lip}(\mathcal{E})$ is dense in the space $C_b(\mathcal{E})$, the functions φ^k in the above examples can be taken Lipschitz (with a Lipschitz constant bounded by 1).

The weak convergence is thus metricised by a D_1 distance. Since this distance is weaker than the Wasserstein-1 distance (it can be seen by Proposition 3.3), this implies that the topology induced by the Wasserstein distance is stronger than the topology induced by the weak convergence. The topology induced by the Wasserstein distance is described by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.11 (Wasserstein topology). *Let $(\mathcal{E}, d_{\mathcal{E}})$ be a Polish space and $p \geq 1$. The Wasserstein distance $W_{d_{\mathcal{E}}, p}$ metricises the weak convergence in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{E})$, defined as the convergence against bounded continuous test functions and the convergence of the p -th moments.*

Proof. [Vil09b, Theorem 6.9] □

In the following, an important case is the case $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P}(E)$. Weak convergence of measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is thus defined as the convergence against test functions in $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. Their representation is not intuitive, except for *linear* test functions of the kind $\mu \mapsto \langle \mu, \varphi \rangle$ where φ belongs to $C_b(E)$. The following results (stated in a more probabilistic framework) show that these functions are sufficient to prove weak convergence.

Proposition 3.12 (Measure-valued convergence in \mathcal{W}_{D_1}). *Let D_1 be a distance given by (47) and Example 3.10 which metricises the weak convergence on $\mathcal{P}(E)$. Consider a sequence $(\mu_N)_N$ of $\mathcal{P}(E)$ -valued random variables and another random probability measure μ . The following properties hold.*

- (i) *If $\mathcal{W}_{D_1}(\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ then $(\mu_N)_N$ converges in law towards μ .*
- (ii) *If $\mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi \rangle| \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ for all $\varphi \in UC_b(E)$, then it holds that $\mathcal{W}_{D_1}(\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ and $(\mu_N)_N$ converges in law towards μ .*

Proof. Let us recall [Par67, Theorem 6.1] that the space of bounded uniformly continuous functions is convergence determining. Thus, let $\Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$ be a function which is uniformly continuous for the metric D_1 . For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$,

$$D_1(\mu, \nu) \leq \delta(\varepsilon) \Rightarrow |\Phi(\mu) - \Phi(\nu)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

The first point then directly stems from the Markov inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \text{Law}(\mu_N) - \text{Law}(\mu), \Phi \rangle| &\leq \mathbb{E}|\Phi(\mu_N) - \Phi(\mu)| \leq \varepsilon + 2\|\Phi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}(|\Phi(\mu_N) - \Phi(\mu)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \frac{2\|\Phi\|_\infty}{\delta(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{E}D_1(\mu_N, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for any $\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)$ -distributed random variables μ_N, μ this finally gives

$$|\langle \text{Law}(\mu_N) - \text{Law}(\mu), \Phi \rangle| \leq \varepsilon + \frac{2\|\Phi\|_\infty}{\delta(\varepsilon)} \mathcal{W}_{D_1}(\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)),$$

and the conclusion follows. For the second point, using the expression (47) for $D_1(\mu_N, \mu)$, the monotonic convergence theorem gives

$$\mathcal{W}_{D_1}(\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi^k \rangle|,$$

and then the dominated convergence theorem concludes the proof. □

Remark 3.13 (Comparison to \mathcal{W}_1). For E locally compact, it has been proven at the same time that

$$\mathcal{W}_{D_1}(\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)) \leq \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi \rangle|.$$

Since

$$\sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi \rangle| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} |\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi \rangle| \right] = \mathbb{E}W_1(\mu_N, \mu),$$

this pinpoints, taking the infimum on the $\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)$ -distributed random variables μ_N, μ , that \mathcal{W}_1 is stronger than \mathcal{W}_{D_1} and both are stronger than the weak convergence on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$.

Corollary 3.14 (Sufficient conditions in a deterministic case). *With the same assumptions as above, if μ is a deterministic $\mathcal{P}(E)$ -valued random variable (i.e. $\text{Law}(\mu) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is a Dirac mass), then the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\mathcal{W}_{D_1}(\text{Law}(\mu_N), \text{Law}(\mu)) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$
- (ii) For all bounded uniformly continuous function φ on E , $\mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi \rangle| \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$.

The second assertion is also equivalent to $\mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_N - \mu, \varphi \rangle|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ for all bounded uniformly continuous function φ on E .

Proof. The direct implication uses the fact \mathcal{W}_{D_1} metricises the convergence in law of measure-valued random variables and that $\nu \mapsto |\langle \nu - \mu, \varphi \rangle|$ is continuous for the weak- \star topology on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ when μ is deterministic. The converse implication is the second point of the previous proposition. \square

The previous results can be found in [Del98, Section 2] or in [Vil01, Section 5, Lemma 10] for an equivalent argument in $E = \mathbb{R}^d$. In the previous lemma, only *linear* test functions are used. This notion can be generalised by considering the algebra of *polynomials* on $\mathcal{P}(E)$. Its definition and main properties are stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.15. *Let E be a Polish space. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$, the monomial function of order k on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is defined by:*

$$R_{\varphi_k} : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \mu \mapsto \langle \mu^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle.$$

The linear span of the set of monomial functions is called the algebra of polynomial functions on $\mathcal{P}(E)$. The following properties hold.

- (i) Every monomial is bounded and continuous on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ for the weak topology.
- (ii) The algebra of polynomial functions is a convergence determining subset of $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$.
- (iii) If E is compact then the algebra of polynomials is dense in $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$.

Proof. (i) First it is clear that every monomial and thus every polynomial is bounded. Let $(\mu_N)_N$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and any tensorized test function $\varphi_k \in \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k \in C_b(E^k)$, it holds that

$$\langle \mu_N^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle = \prod_{j=1}^k \langle \mu_N, \varphi^j \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle \mu^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle.$$

Then using [EK86, Chapter 3, Proposition 4.6], the set $C_b(E)^{\otimes k} \subset C_b(E^k)$ is convergence determining and thus $\mu_N^{\otimes k} \rightarrow \mu^{\otimes k}$. It implies that for all $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$, $R_{\varphi_k}(\mu_N) \rightarrow R_{\varphi_k}(\mu)$ and R_{φ_k} is therefore continuous.

- (ii) From the first point, the algebra of polynomials is a subset of $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. Let D_1 be a metric of the form (47) such that $(\mathcal{P}(E), \tilde{D}_1)$ is a Polish space for a metric \tilde{D}_1 which is equivalent to D_1 . A set of functions $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is said to strongly separates points when for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, and $\delta > 0$, there exists a finite set $\{\Phi^1, \dots, \Phi^k\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\inf_{\nu: D_1(\mu, \nu) \geq \delta} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} |\Phi^j(\nu) - \Phi^j(\mu)| > 0.$$

Since D_1 is equivalent to a complete metric, [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 4.5] states that \mathcal{F} is convergence determining if \mathcal{F} strongly separates points. It is thus enough to prove that the algebra of polynomial functions contains a subset which strongly separates points. Let $(\varphi^k)_k$ be the sequence of functions in $C_b(E)$ which defines D_1 . Then the set $\{R_{\varphi^k}, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$ strongly separates points. Indeed, let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, let $\delta > 0$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2^{-m} < \delta/4$. For any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that $D_1(\mu, \nu) \geq \delta$, it holds that

$$\sum_{k=1}^m |\langle \mu, \varphi^k \rangle - \langle \nu, \varphi^k \rangle| \geq \frac{\delta}{2},$$

and hence $\max_{1 \leq k \leq m} |\langle \mu, \varphi^k \rangle - \langle \nu, \varphi^k \rangle| \geq \delta/(2m)$. The conclusion follows.

- (iii) This follows from the Stone-Weierstrass theorem, since $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is compact in this case. \square

3.1.3 Entropic convergence

Powerful tools to compare measures are also given by the Kullback-Leibler divergence, which is traditionally called the *relative entropy* in our context, and the related Fisher information.

Definition 3.16 (Entropy, Fisher information and entropic convergence). Given two probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ (or more generally two measures), the relative entropy and Fisher information are respectively defined by

$$H(\nu|\mu) := \int_{\mathcal{E}} \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \log \left(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right) d\mu, \quad I(\nu|\mu) := \int_{\mathcal{E}} \left| \nabla \log \left(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right) \right|^2 d\mu,$$

where $d\nu/d\mu$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative. When the two measures are mutually singular, by convention, the relative entropy and Fisher information are set to $+\infty$. These quantities are dimensionally super-additive, equality being achieved only for tensorized distributions, in the sense that given $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E})$ with marginals $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$, then

$$H(\nu|\mu \otimes \mu) \geq H(\nu_1|\mu) + H(\nu_2|\mu),$$

equality being achieved if only if $\nu = \nu_1 \otimes \nu_2$. Moreover $H(\nu|\mu) \geq 0$ and $H(\nu|\mu) = 0$ if and only if $\mu = \nu$. The *entropic convergence* of a sequence $(\mu_N)_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ towards μ is defined by the convergence of the relative entropy:

$$H(\mu_N|\mu) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

The relative entropy between two probability measures is also called the *Kullback-Leibler divergence*.

Remark 3.17 (Towards dimension free quantities). For $\mu^N, \nu^N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{E}^N)$, the normalized entropy $H_N(\nu^N|\mu^N) := \frac{1}{N} H(\nu^N|\mu^N)$ can be handful, since it leads to estimates which do not depend on N when $\mu^{\otimes N} = \mu^{\otimes N}$ is tensorized; the same holds for $W_1(\mu^{\otimes N}, \nu^{\otimes N})$ when W_1 is defined using the normalized distance on E^N , see [HM14, Proposition 2.6]. An extension to random measures $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ is provided in [HM14] setting $\mathcal{H}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim \pi} H(\nu|\mu)$ for a given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$.

The entropic convergence is stronger than the strongest distance.

Proposition 3.18 (Pinsker inequality). *The following inequality implies that the entropy convergence is stronger than the convergence in total variation norm:*

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq 2H(\nu|\mu). \quad (48)$$

The link with the Wassertein-2 distance can be recovered through the following proposition.

Proposition 3.19 (HWI inequality). *Under mild assumptions (see [OV00]), there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that*

$$H(\nu|\mu) \leq W_2(\mu, \nu) \sqrt{I(\nu|\mu)} - \frac{\lambda}{2} W_2^2(\mu, \nu).$$

Further results which link the relative entropy and the distances on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ will be given in Section 4.4.3. The relative entropy will play an important role in Section 4.4.2.

3.2 Representation of symmetric particle systems

This section introduces the various points of view to describe a system of particles. So far, we have mainly discussed the case of finite systems described by the N -particle distribution function f_t^N at time t . The first Section 3.2.1 will detail more of its properties. Then, as the goal is to deal with the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$, a framework for infinite particle systems is needed, this will be described in Section 3.2.2.

3.2.1 Finite particle systems

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed finite number of particles. In full generality, there is only one property of the N -particle distribution function that is always true: at any time and for any of the models considered, it is a symmetric probability measure on E^N (the particle system is said to be exchangeable). Let us therefore consider in this section a symmetric probability measure $f^N \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{sym}}(E^N)$ (in a static framework, it does not depend on the time). There exist two main representations of f^N which are based on this symmetry assumption.

The marginal distributions and the BBGKY hierarchy. The symmetry assumption implies that for any $k \leq N$, we can define the k -th marginal distribution on E^k by:

$$\forall \varphi_k \in C_b(E^k), \quad \langle f^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle = \langle f^N, \varphi_k \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-k)} \rangle,$$

and $f^{k,N} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{sym}}(E^k)$ is itself a symmetric probability measure. The N -th marginal is of course the measure f^N itself. However, keeping in mind that the final goal is to take $N \rightarrow +\infty$, one can consider for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the limit of $f^{k,N}$ in $\mathcal{P}(E^k)$, which is not possible for f^N directly since it belongs to a space which depends on N . As we shall see in the following, it is often enough to treat the case $k = 2$.

In a dynamic framework, when f_t^N solves the Liouville equation (1), for each given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a natural idea is to derive an equation for the k -th marginal distribution by considering a test function in (1) of the form $\varphi_N = \varphi_k \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-k)}$ with $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$. For Boltzmann models, this computation as already been sketched in Section 2.3.1 and gave:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^k \langle f_t^{k,N}, L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_k \rangle + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \langle f_t^{k,N}, L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_k \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{N-k}{N} \sum_{i=1}^k \langle f_t^{k+1,N}, L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,k+1} (\varphi_k \otimes 1) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

For mean-field systems, let us look at the special linear case:

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad L_\mu \varphi(x) = \int_E \tilde{L}_x \varphi(y) \mu(dy),$$

where for any $x \in E$, \tilde{L}_x is a Markov operator on \mathcal{F} (such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ and $y \in E$, the map $x \mapsto \tilde{L}_x \varphi(y)$ is measurable). Then one can check similarly (using the symmetry of f_t^N) that the k -th marginal of the Liouville equation satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} \int_{E^k} \tilde{L}_{x^i} \diamond_i \varphi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{i,j}) f_t^{k,N}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}^k) \\ &\quad + \frac{N-k}{N} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{E^{k+1}} \tilde{L}_{x^i} \diamond_i \varphi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{i,k+1}) f_t^{k+1,N}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{x}^{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where we recall the notation $\mathbf{x}^k = (x^1, \dots, x^k) \in E^k$ and for $i \leq k$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{i,j}$ denotes the vector in E^k where the i -th element is replaced by x^j .

In both equations (49) and (50), the important point to notice is that the leading term (in N) on the right-hand side depends on the $(k+1)$ -th marginal. Since $f_t^{k,N}$ depends on $f_t^{k+1,N}$ for any $k < N$, this gives a hierarchy of N equations, the N -th one being the Liouville equation itself. This hierarchy is called the BBGKY hierarchy, from the names of the mathematicians Bogolioubov, Born, Green, Kirkwood and Yvon. It is more customary to write the BBGKY in the forward form. For the classical Boltzmann model of Section 2.3.3, using the notations of (38) and (39), the first equation of the hierarchy reads,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f_t^{1,N}(x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t^{1,N} \\ = \frac{N-1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} B(v - v_*, \sigma) \left(f_t^{2,N}(x, v'_*, x, v') - f_t^{2,N}(x, v_*, x, v) \right) dv_* d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to the classical reference [CIP94] for a more detailed derivation of the BBGKY hierarchy associated to this model and to [Car+13] for another class of Boltzmann models.

For the mean-field case, let us consider the diffusion operator in $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ given by:

$$\tilde{L}_x \varphi(y) = K(x, y) \cdot \nabla_y \varphi(y) + \Delta_y \varphi(y),$$

where $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a symmetric function with $K(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the first equation of the BBGKY hierarchy in forward form reads:

$$\partial_t f_t^{1,N}(x) = -\frac{N-1}{N} \nabla_x \cdot \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(x, z) f_t^{2,N}(x, z) dz \right\} + \Delta_x f_t^{1,N}(x).$$

Note that in both cases, if

$$f_t^{2,N} = f_t^{1,N} \otimes f_t^{1,N}, \quad (51)$$

then, up to the factor $(N-1)/N$, the first marginal $f_t^{1,N}$ solves the nonlinear limit problem, respectively the Boltzmann equation (38) and the Fokker-Planck equation (12) (with $b(x, \mu) = K \star \mu(x)$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{2}I_d$). The relation (51) is called a *closure assumption* because under this assumption, the marginals (here the first one) satisfy a closed equation. The question of Kac's chaos and the propagation of chaos is precisely to justify this closure assumption in the asymptotic limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Indeed, the relation (51) is never true since it means that any two particles are statistically independent (which is not the case since they interact).

The BBGKY hierarchy is useful only in the linear cases described above. For general mean-field models with an operator L_μ which has a more complicated dependence in μ , it is not possible to derive a BBGKY hierarchy: this procedure would only say that $f_t^{k,N}$ depends on the whole distribution f_t^N which is not informative. For the Boltzmann model described above, the proof of the propagation of chaos and the justification of the closure assumption (51) are reviewed in Section 6.6 (this result is the renown Lanford's theorem). We also mention that, beyond propagation of chaos, different closure assumptions than (51) can be considered as an approximating procedure in a numerical perspective, see for instance [Ber+19] for the mean-field model described above.

The empirical measure. With a more probabilistic point of view, a symmetric measure $f^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ means that any system $\mathcal{X}^N = (X^1, \dots, X^N) \in E^N$ of f^N -distributed random variables is invariant in law under any permutation of the indexes. Such an exchangeable system is equivalently described by its (random) empirical measure

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X^i} \in \mathcal{P}(E), \quad (52)$$

as this measure contains all the statistical information up to the particle numbering (a quantitative version is stated in the Lemma 3.21 below). One can immediately see the advantage of such representation: it is possible to work with only one element which belongs to the fixed space $\mathcal{P}(E)$, in contrast to $f^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ or to the N marginal distributions. To be completely rigorous, one should work in the quotient space E^N/\mathfrak{S}_N , whose elements $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^N$ gather all the permutations of the vector $\mathbf{x}^N \in E^N$. There is the one to one mapping:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_N : E^N/\mathfrak{S}_N \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E), \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}^N \mapsto \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \quad (53)$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E)$ denotes the space of empirical measures of size N on E . Since $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E) \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a random element, a somehow unfortunate complication arises for the space of observables $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$: in this framework, test functions are continuous bounded functions on (a subset of) the set of probability measures (endowed with the weak topology). This is clearly more difficult to handle than usual test functions on E^N or E^k .

Remark 3.20. Note that the two sets $C_b(E^N/\mathfrak{S}_N)$ and $C_b(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E))$ are naturally identified by taking the composition with the previous map. Moreover, since all the measures considered are symmetric, integration on E^N/\mathfrak{S}_N is equivalent to integration on E^N . This is why, with a slight abuse, the test functions always belong to $C_b(E^N)$.

From the point of view of measure theory, the representation (52) means that the law f^N is replaced by its push-forward by the map (53) (seen as a map $E^N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$), defined by:

$$F^N := (\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)_\# f^N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E)).$$

The following lemma shows that F^N is enough to characterise f^N .

Lemma 3.21 (Approximation rate of marginals). *For $k \leq N$, let the moment measure $F^{k,N} \in \mathcal{P}(E^k)$ be defined by:*

$$\forall \varphi_k \in C_b(E^k), \quad \langle F^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes k}, \varphi \rangle F^N(d\nu).$$

Then as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, it holds that:

$$\|f^{k,N} - F^{k,N}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2 \frac{k(k-1)}{N}. \quad (54)$$

Coming back to the probabilistic point of view, F^N is the law of the random measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ where $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$. The moment measures can thus be written

$$F^{k,N} = \mathbb{E}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k}],$$

where this expression is understood in the weak sense, for all $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$,

$$\langle F^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle = \langle \mathbb{E}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k}], \varphi_k \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle].$$

Proof. Given a test function $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$, using the symmetry of $f^{k,N}$, it holds that:

$$\langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle = \int_{E^N} \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle f^N(d\mathbf{x}^N),$$

and

$$\langle f^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle = \int_{E^N} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_N} \varphi_k(x^{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x^{\sigma(k)}) f^N(d\mathbf{x}^N).$$

Consequently,

$$\left| \langle f^{k,N} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle \right| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x}^N \in E^N} \left| \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_N} \varphi_k(x^{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x^{\sigma(k)}) - \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle \right|.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_N} \varphi_k(x^{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x^{\sigma(k)}) = \frac{1}{A_N^k} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{pairwise distinct}}} \varphi_k(x^{i_1}, \dots, x^{i_k}),$$

and

$$\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle = \frac{1}{N^k} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{pairwise distinct}}} \varphi_k(x^{i_1}, \dots, x^{i_k}) + R_{k,N},$$

where $A_N^k := N!/(N-k)!$ and $R_{N,k} \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty (1 - A_N^k/N^k)$. The conclusion follows by noticing that

$$1 - \frac{A_N^k}{N^k} \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{N}\right)^k \leq \frac{k(k-1)}{N},$$

and using Proposition 3.3. \square

This (elementary) lemma is known at least since [Grü71] where it was used to prove propagation of chaos (see Section 4.3). This lemma can also be seen as finite system version of the de Finetti theorem, see [DF80, Theorem 13]. The case of infinite systems is discussed in the following section. Note that the result of [DF80, Theorem 13] is actually an *existence* result for a measure $F^N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ which satisfies (54). Finally the empirical measure map is an isometry for the Wasserstein distance as shown in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.22 (Proposition 2.14 in [HM14]). *Let f^N, g^N be two symmetric probability measures on E^N and let $F^N = (\mu_N)_\# f^N$ and $G^N = (\mu_N)_\# g^N$ be the associated empirical law in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$. Then it holds that*

$$W_1(f^N, g^N) = W_1(F^N, G^N).$$

This result also holds for the Wasserstein-2 distance [CDP20, Lemma 11].

3.2.2 Infinite particle systems and random measures

In the previous section, finite exchangeable particle systems are described either by the marginal distributions or by the empirical measure. In this section the framework to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ is presented. An infinite set of exchangeable random variables $(\bar{X}^1, \bar{X}^2, \dots)$ is described by one of the two following objects.

1. The infinite hierarchy of marginals distributions $f^k \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{sym}}(E^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$f^k = \text{Law}(\bar{X}^1, \dots, \bar{X}^k).$$

They satisfy the compatibility relation: for every $1 \leq j \leq k$,

$$\forall \varphi_j \in C_b(E^j), \quad \langle f^k, \varphi_j \otimes 1^{\otimes(k-j)} \rangle = \langle f^j, \varphi_j \rangle. \quad (55)$$

In other words, the j -particle marginal of f^k is f^j .

2. The infinite sequence of random empirical measures of size N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu_{\bar{X}^N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\bar{X}^i}. \quad (56)$$

The two representations are linked by the de Finetti and Hewitt-Savage theorems stated below. Let us first state some preliminary useful results.

Given an infinite system of exchangeable particles $(\bar{X}^i)_{i \geq 1}$, important measurable events are given by two particular σ -algebras.

Definition 3.23 (Symmetric and asymptotic σ -algebras). Let $C_{\text{sym}}(E^N)$ denote the set of symmetric continuous \mathbb{R} -valued functions on E^N which are invariant under permutations of their arguments.

- The σ -algebra of *exchangeable* events (i.e. events which do not depend on any finite permutation of the \bar{X}^i) is defined by:

$$\mathcal{S}_\infty := \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \sigma\left(\sigma(\varphi_k(\bar{X}^1, \dots, \bar{X}^k), \varphi_k \in C_{\text{sym}}(E^k)), \bar{X}^{k+1}, \bar{X}^{k+2}, \dots\right),$$

where we recall that $\sigma(X^1, X^2, \dots)$ is the σ -algebra generated by the random variables X^1, X^2, \dots .

- The *asymptotic* σ -algebra (whose events do not depend on any finite number of the \bar{X}^i) is defined by:

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty := \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \sigma(\bar{X}^{k+1}, \bar{X}^{k+2}, \dots).$$

The fundamental result for exchangeable systems is the following proposition.

Proposition 3.24 ([Let89]). *For exchangeable systems, the following equality holds*

$$\mathcal{S}_\infty = \mathcal{A}_\infty.$$

Corollary 3.25 (Hewitt-Savage 0-1 law). *In the special case where the \bar{X}^i are i.i.d. variables (and then automatically exchangeable), then any event in the σ -algebra \mathcal{S}_∞ or in the σ -algebra \mathcal{A}_∞ has measure 0 or 1. This is known as the Kolmogorov 0-1 law for \mathcal{A}_∞ and the Hewitt-Savage 0-1 law for \mathcal{S}_∞ .*

Since the empirical measures (56) are random measures, a criteria for the convergence in law in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is often needed; this motivate the following results. A thorough discussion of the theory of random measures can be found in [Daw93]. An important notion is the notion of moment measure already introduced earlier and properly defined below.

Definition 3.26 (Moment measures). For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k -th moment measure of a measure $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is defined by:

$$\pi^k := \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \nu^{\otimes k} \pi(d\nu) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim \pi} [\nu^{\otimes k}] \in \mathcal{P}(E^k).$$

This definition is understood in the weak sense, so that $\langle \pi^k, \varphi_k \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim \pi} \langle \nu^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle$ for any φ_k in $C_b(E^k)$.

Note that the sequence of moment measures $(\pi^k)_k$ satisfies the compatibility property. They also characterise the convergence in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$.

Lemma 3.27 (Convergence of random measures). *A sequence $(\pi_N)_N$ of random measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ converges weakly towards $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ if and only if*

$$\forall k \geq 1, \quad \pi_N^k \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \pi^k,$$

where the convergence is the weak convergence in $\mathcal{P}(E^k)$.

Proof. The direct implication stems from the fact the maps $\pi \mapsto \pi^k$ are continuous for the respective weak- \star topologies. For the converse, the weak convergence of $(\pi_N^k)_N$ towards π^k implies that for all $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$, $\langle \pi_N, R_{\varphi_k} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \pi, R_{\varphi_k} \rangle$ where R_{φ_k} is the monomial function:

$$R_{\varphi_k} : \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E) \mapsto \int_{E^k} \varphi_k(x^1, \dots, x^k) \nu^{\otimes k}(dx^1, \dots, dx^k) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The conclusion follows from Lemma 3.15. \square

The following lemma is a useful tightness criterion in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$; it can be found in [Szn91, Proposition 2.2 (2.5)], where the first moment measures π^1 is referred as the *intensity measure* related to π (this terminology reminiscent of the intensity of a Poisson random measure).

Lemma 3.28 (Tightness for random measures). *The tightness of a sequence $(\pi_N)_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is equivalent to the tightness of the sequence $(\pi_N^1)_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(E)$.*

Proof. The direct implication stems from the fact the map $\pi \mapsto \pi^1$ is continuous for the respective weak- \star topologies. For the converse, assume the $(\pi_N^1)_N$ is tight. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact subset $K_\varepsilon^c \subset E$ such that $\pi_N^1(K_\varepsilon^c) \leq \varepsilon$ for every N . By the Markov inequality, for every $k \geq 1$ and every $N \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\pi_N \left(\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \nu(K_{\varepsilon(k2^k)}^c) \geq \frac{1}{k} \right\} \right) \leq k \pi^1(K_{\varepsilon(k2^k)}^c) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k},$$

so that

$$\pi_N \left(\bigcap_{k \geq 1} \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \nu(K_{\varepsilon(k2^k)}^c) \leq \frac{1}{k} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k} = 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Since the intersection at the last line is a compact subset of $\mathcal{P}(E)$, the sequence $(\pi_N)_N$ is tight. \square

Example 3.29 (The case of empirical measures). This lemma is particularly interesting for random empirical measures $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$, since it reduces the question of tightness of $(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ to tightness of $(X^{1,N})_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(E)$.

The following theorems are the two main results of this section. The first one states that (the law of) a random measure can always be represented by an infinite exchangeable particle system. This theorem is due to de Finetti and can be found in [Daw93, Theorem 11.2.1].

Theorem 3.30 (De Finetti representation theorem for random measures). *Let $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$. Then there exists a sequence $(\bar{X}^i)_{i \geq 1}$ of E -valued exchangeable random variables such that the following properties hold.*

- (1) For any $k \geq 1$, $(\bar{X}^1, \dots, \bar{X}^k)$ has joint distribution π^k .
- (2) The weak limit

$$\mu = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \delta_{\bar{X}^i} \in \mathcal{P}(E),$$

exists almost surely and μ is π -distributed.

- (3) The random measure μ is \mathcal{S}_∞ -measurable, and conditionally on \mathcal{S}_∞ the random variables \bar{X}^i are independent and μ -distributed.

Example 3.31. A famous example is given in [Daw93]: a de Finetti representation of the Fleming-Viot measure-valued process is given by the Moran particle system.

Note that the last property says that exchangeability implies *conditional* independence and thus exchangeable particles are not so far from i.i.d. variables.

Conversely, an infinite exchangeable particle system is always associated to a unique element in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$. The following theorem is also due to de Finetti in the case of Bernoulli random variables. It has been generalised to any exchangeable Borel measurable variables in a Polish space by Hewitt and Savage. The following quantitative version of the Hewitt-Savage theorem is due to [HM14, Theorem 5.1].

Theorem 3.32 (De Finetti, Hewitt-Savage). *Let E be a locally compact Polish space. Let $(f^N)_N$ be an infinite sequence of symmetric probability measures on E^N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$, which satisfy the compatibility relation (55). Then the following properties hold.*

(1) *There exists a unique $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ such that:*

$$f^N = \pi^N := \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \nu^{\otimes N} \pi(d\nu).$$

(2) *When $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a Borel set, for any $s > d/2$, the sequence $(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}))_{N \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ for the distance $\mathcal{W}_{H^{-s}}$ (see Definition 3.7) : for any $N, M \geq 1$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_{H^{-s}}^2(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}), \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^M})) \leq 2\|\Phi_s\|_\infty \left(\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{M} \right),$$

where Φ_s is defined by (46) and $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$. The limit of this sequence is the measure π characterised above.

Proof (some ideas). The original argument of Hewitt and Savage is based on the Krein-Milman theorem and the fact that tensorised measures are extreme points of the convex set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sym}}(E)$. A constructive quantitative approach due to Diaconis and Freedman is based on the approximation Lemma 3.21, see [DF80, Theorem 14] in the compact case. An alternative argument based on the density of polynomial functions in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ (thanks to the Stone-Weierstrass theorem) is due to Pierre-Louis Lions. We refer the interested reader to [Rou15, Section 2.1] and the references therein. For the second point proved in [HM14, Theorem 5.1], the Cauchy-estimates relies on the polynomial structure of the H^{-s} -norm (46) combined with the observation that f^{N+M} is a transference plan between f^M and f^N (by the compatibility property). It turns the problem into controlling $\mathbb{E}\|\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} - \mu_{\mathcal{X}^M}\|_{H^{-s}}^2$ for $(\mathcal{X}^N, \mathcal{X}^M) \sim f^N \otimes f^M$. Once convergence is shown, the limit is identified by the moment measures and Lemma 3.21. Convergence can be obtained in stronger metrics than $\mathcal{W}_{H^{-s}}^2$, see Corollary A.1 in the appendix. \square

3.3 Kac's chaos

3.3.1 Definition and characterisation

The notion of chaos was introduced in the seminal article of Mark Kac [Kac56].

Definition 3.33 (Kac's chaos). *Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. A sequence $(f^N)_{N \geq 1}$ of symmetric probability measures on E^N is said to be *f-chaotic* when for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any function $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle f^N, \varphi_k \otimes 1^{\otimes N-k} \rangle = \langle f^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle. \quad (57)$$

It means that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k -th marginal satisfies $f^{k,N} \rightarrow f^{\otimes k}$ for the weak topology. Kac's chaos can be equivalently defined by considering only tensorized test functions $\varphi_k = \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k$, since the algebra of tensorized functions in $C_b(E)$ is a convergence-determining class according to [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 4.6, pp.113-115].

Interpreting f^N as the law of an exchangeable system of N particles, the property (57) means that for any group of k particles, the particles become statistically independent as N tends to $+\infty$, hence the terminology of chaos. The results of the previous sections on finite and infinite exchangeable systems lead to the following useful characterization of Kac's chaos.

Lemma 3.34. *Each of the following assertions is equivalent to Kac's chaos.*

- (i) *There exists $k \geq 2$ such that $f^{k,N}$ converges weakly towards $f^{\otimes k}$.*
- (ii) *The random measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ with $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$ converges in law towards the deterministic measure f .*

This classical result can be found in [Szn91, Proposition 2.2].

Proof. Clearly, Kac's chaos implies (i). Then using Proposition 3.12, it can be proved that (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$. It is enough to prove that for any $\varphi \in C_b(E)$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} - f, \varphi \rangle|^2 \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Assume (57) with $k = 2$; it then also holds for $k = 1$. Using the symmetry of f^N , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} - f, \varphi \rangle|^2 &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^i)\varphi(X^j)] - \frac{2}{N} \langle f, \varphi \rangle \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^i)] + \langle f, \varphi \rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^1)^2] + \frac{N-1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^1)\varphi(X^2)] - 2\langle f, \varphi \rangle \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^1)] \\ &\quad + \langle f, \varphi \rangle^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the symmetry of f^N has been used. Since φ is bounded, the first term goes to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The remaining expression vanishes using (57) with $k = 1, 2$. This proves (ii). Then the condition (ii) implies Kac's chaos. If $F^N := \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}) \rightarrow \delta_f$, then according to Lemma 3.27, the k -th moment measure $F^{k,N}$ converges weakly towards $f^{\otimes k}$ for every $k \geq 1$. The approximation Lemma 3.21 implies that $f^{k,N}$ converges weakly towards $f^{\otimes k}$ for every $k \geq 1$. \square

Remark 3.35 (Chaos as a limit of de Finetti representations). Kac's chaos tells that the marginals $f^{k,N}$ converge towards the marginals of an infinite system $(\bar{X}^i)_{i \geq 1}$ of i.i.d. f -distributed particles. By the de Finetti and Hewitt-Savage theorems, the sequence of empirical measures of this latter system converges towards a random measure μ which is $\mathcal{S}_\infty = \mathcal{A}_\infty$ -measurable. By the Hewitt-Savage 0-1 law, this σ -algebra is trivial so that μ is a deterministic measure. The last part of de Finetti representation Theorem 3.30 tells that conditionally on \mathcal{S}_∞ , the \bar{X}^i are μ -distributed so this allows to conclude $\text{Law}(\mu) = \delta_f$.

Remark 3.36 (Chaos as a law of large numbers). Fix $\varphi \in C_b(E)$. Given a bounded continuous function $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the function $\nu \mapsto \theta(\langle \nu, \varphi \rangle)$ is still bounded and weakly- \star continuous on $\mathcal{P}(E)$. The convergence in law of $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ towards f thus implies that

$$\frac{\varphi(X^{1,N}) + \dots + \varphi(X^{N,N})}{N} - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^{1,N})] = \langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle - \langle f^{1,N}, \varphi \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

where the convergence is the convergence in law. This relation is reminiscent of the law of large numbers. If the X^i were moreover i.i.d. (in this case no need to write $X^{i,N}$, X^i is enough) the law of large numbers would state

$$\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^1)] \quad \text{a.s.},$$

so that almost surely $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} \rightarrow \text{Law}(X^1)$ weakly. In the general case where particles $X^{i,N}$ are only exchangeable (no more i.i.d.), Kac's chaos states an analogous but weaker result since the convergence of $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ towards f is only weak; but it however differs since f is the law of a typical particle in the limit system, and not the law of $X^{1,N}$ as in the i.i.d. case, because $X^{1,N}$ still depends on N (i.e. on the other particles). Fluctuations of $\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle$ in the law of large numbers are described through the central limit theorem; the same can be done for chaos with concentration inequalities and large deviation principles (see Section 7.4.1).

Remark 3.37 (Chaos, limit hierarchy and moment measures). Taking (formally) the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ in the BBGKY hierarchy (Section 3.2.1) gives an infinite set of coupled equations on $(f_t^k)_{k \geq 1}$ which satisfy the compatibility relation (55). This system is Kac's chaotic when this limit hierarchy has the *factorisation property*, that is to say $f_t^k = f_t^{\otimes k}$ for every $k \geq 1$; this implies that the related $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ -representation of the system is δ_{f_t} . This infinite hierarchy is called the Boltzmann hierarchy in kinetic theory (see [CIP94] and Section 6.6) By the Hewitt-Savage Theorem 3.32 it is uniquely associated to an element $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$. We thus point out that the Boltzmann hierarchy coincides with the system of moment measures of π : this object is also commonly used, in another context, in the study of measure-valued processes [Daw93].

The following property will be useful for time-dependent systems, its proof is straightforward, see [Szn91, Proposition 2.4].

Proposition 3.38 (Chaos transportation). *Let $(f^N)_N$ be a f -chaotic sequence and let $\mathbb{T} : E \rightarrow F$ be a f -almost surely continuous map between Polish spaces. Then the sequence $(\mathbb{T}_\# f^N)_N$ is $\mathbb{T}_\# f$ -chaotic.*

3.3.2 Quantitative versions of Kac's chaos

Kac's chaos is a non quantitative property which relies only on the weak convergence. Quantitative (stronger) versions can naturally be defined using the topological framework of Section 3.1. The following definitions of quantitative chaos can be found in [HM14]. A starting point is the notion of chaos in Wasserstein distance. In practise, W_2 is well-adapted to the study of diffusion processes, while W_1 is often used for jump processes.

Definition 3.39 (Chaos in Wasserstein- p distance). Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(f^N)_N$ be a sequence of symmetric measures on E^N and let $f \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. The following three notions of chaos in Wasserstein- p distance were introduced in [HM14]:

- (*Wasserstein- p Kac's chaos*). For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Omega_k(f^N, f) := W_p(f^{k,N}, f^{\otimes k}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (58)$$

- (*Infinite dimensional Wasserstein- p chaos*).

$$\Omega_N(f^N, f) := W_p(f^N, f^{\otimes N}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (59)$$

- (*Wasserstein- p empirical chaos*). For $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$,

$$\Omega_\infty(f^N, f) := W_p(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}), \delta_f) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0, \quad (60)$$

where W_p is a Wasserstein- p distance on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ (see Definition 3.7 for the conventions used when $p = 1, 2$).

When moment bounds are available and $p = 1$, the three notions of chaos (58), (59) and (60) are actually equivalent. Such a result would not hold if the Wasserstein-1 distance were replaced by another Wasserstein- p distance.

Theorem 3.40 (Equivalence in Wasserstein-1 distance). *Let $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $q \geq 1$ such that the sum of moments of order q of f and $f^{1,N}$ are bounded by a constant $\mathcal{M}_q \in (0, \infty)$. Then for any constant $\gamma < (d+1+d/q)^{-1}$, there exists $C = C(d, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ such that for any $k, \ell \in \{1, \dots, N\} \cup \{\infty\}$ with $\ell \neq 1$:*

$$\Omega_k(f^N, f) \leq C \mathcal{M}_q^{1/q} \left(\Omega_\ell(f^N, f) + \frac{1}{N} \right)^\gamma,$$

where Ω_k and Ω_ℓ are defined in Definition 3.39 with $p = 1$.

Proof (some ideas). See [HM14, Theorem 1.2] and [HM14, Theorem 2.4]. In particular, the link between (60) and (59) stems from Proposition 3.22 which states that

$$W_1(f^N, f^{\otimes N}) = \mathcal{W}_1(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}), \text{Law}(\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}^N})),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^N \sim f^{\otimes N}$ -distributed. Given such $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^N$, $\mathcal{W}_1(\text{Law}(\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}^N}), \delta_f) \leq \mathbb{E}W_1(\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}, f)$ and the quantitative laws of large numbers from [FG15] can be applied. \square

Definition 3.41 (Strong entropic and TV chaos). Stronger notions can also be defined using stronger norms.

- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-TV chaotic* when for every $k \geq 1$, $\|f^{k,N} - f^{\otimes k}\|_{\text{TV}} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$.
- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-strong entropic chaotic* when for every $k \geq 1$, $H(f^{k,N}|f^{\otimes k}) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$.

The second one is stronger than the first one by Pinsker's inequality (48).

In Definition 3.41 and in (58), a stronger convergence can be obtained when the fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is replaced by a function $k \equiv k(N)$ which depends on N . In that case, the chaos is said to hold *for blocks of size $k(N)$* . The infinite dimensional chaos (60) corresponds to the case $k(N) = N$.

When $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ (or $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$) is endowed with the Lebesgue measure denoted by σ , other stronger versions of Kac's chaos can also be defined using the notions of entropy and Fisher information. The following notions can be found in [HM14].

Definition 3.42 (Entropy and Fisher chaos). Let σ^N denote the Lebesgue measure on E^N .

- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-entropy chaotic* when $f^{1,N} \rightarrow f$ weakly and $\frac{H(f^N|\sigma^N)}{N} \rightarrow H(f|\sigma)$.
- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-Fisher chaotic* when $f^{1,N} \rightarrow f$ weakly and $\frac{I(f^N|\sigma^N)}{N} \rightarrow I(f|\sigma)$.

Using sharp versions of the HWI inequality, these notions are classified in a quantitative way in [HM14].

Proposition 3.43. *Each of the below assertions implies the following.*

- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-Fisher chaotic*.
- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-Kac chaotic* with $\left(\frac{I(f^N|\sigma^N)}{N}\right)_N$ bounded.
- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-entropy chaotic*.
- $(f^N)_N$ is *f-Kac chaotic*.

In classical kinetic theory, another important notion of quantitative chaos arises when the N particles are constrained to evolve on the so-called Kac's sphere:

$$E_N = \{\mathbf{v}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N, |v^1|^2 + \dots + |v^N|^2 = N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N,$$

or on the Boltzmann's sphere:

$$E_N = \{\mathbf{v}^N \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^N, |v^1|^2 + \dots + |v^N|^2 = N, v^1 + \dots + v^N = 0\} \subset (\mathbb{R}^3)^N.$$

In these cases, the adapted notions of entropy chaos and Fisher chaos using a dedicated sequence of reference measures $(\sigma^N)_N$ are defined in [HM14] and [Car+08].

Finally, for any quantitative version of Kac's chaos, a convergence rate is considered as optimal (i.e. of the same order of the fluctuations) when it implies:

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \varphi_k \in C_b(E^k), \quad |\langle f^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle - \langle f^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle| = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N}).$$

3.4 Propagation of chaos

This section finally presents the central concept of this review, the notion of propagation of chaos, which is a dynamical version of Kac's chaos. Let us fix a final time $T \in [0, +\infty]$ and let us write $I = [0, T]$. Let $\mathcal{X}_I^N = (\mathcal{X}_t^N)_{t \in I}$ be a time-evolving (stochastic) càdlàg system of N -exchangeable particles in E with a f_0 -chaotic initial distribution $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ where $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. One aims to compare the law of a typical particle with a limit flow of measures $(f_t)_{t \in I}$, where $f_t \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. The propagation of chaos property is said to hold when the initial chaos is propagated at later times. This property can hold either at the level of the law or at the level of trajectories.

Definition 3.44 (Pointwise and pathwise propagation of chaos). Let $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ be the initial f_0 -chaotic distribution of \mathcal{X}_0^N at time $t = 0$.

- *Pointwise propagation of chaos* holds towards a flow of measures $(f_t)_t \in C(I, \mathcal{P}(E))$ when the law $f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ of \mathcal{X}_t^N is f_t -chaotic for every time $t \in I$. Note that the flow of measures is continuous in time as it is the solution of a PDE, but the (random) trajectories of the particles are càdlàg.
- *Pathwise propagation of chaos* holds towards a distribution $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D(I, E))$ on the path space when the law $f_I^N \in \mathcal{P}(D(I, E)^N)$ of the process \mathcal{X}_I^N (seen as a random element in $D(I, E)^N$) is f_I -chaotic.

The pointwise level is the analytical point of view where $(f_t)_t$ is the solution of a PDE. At the pathwise level, the limit distribution $f_{[0, T]}$ is often identified as the solution of a nonlinear martingale problem.

Quantitative and uniform in time propagation of chaos. As in Section 3.3.2, it is possible to define quantitative versions of the propagation of chaos by using any of the quantitative notions of Kac's chaos. Then, one can wonder if the propagation of chaos holds uniformly in time, i.e. independently on T . For instance, a typical quantitative pointwise propagation of chaos estimate reads:

$$\delta(f_t^{k,N}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq \varepsilon(N, k, T) \left(1 + \delta(f_0^{k,N}, f_0^{\otimes k})\right), \quad (61)$$

where δ is any of the distances on E^k defined in Section 3.1, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed, $t \in [0, T]$ and $\varepsilon(N, k, T) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Propagation of chaos holds uniformly in time when $\varepsilon(N, k, T)$ does not depend on T . As we shall see, it is usually possible to prove propagation of chaos uniformly in time only for physical models which enjoy some conservation properties. A closely related question when propagation of chaos holds on $I = [0, +\infty)$ is the ergodicity of the process as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. For instance, one may wonder if it possible to take the double limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $t \rightarrow +\infty$ in (61). It would be possible for instance if propagation of chaos held uniformly in time and f_t converged towards an equilibrium f_∞ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. This would give a relaxation estimate on $\delta(f_t^{k,N}, f_\infty^{\otimes k})$. This question is of particular importance in the study of the Boltzmann equation (38) in view of the famous H-theorem. Relaxation towards equilibrium at the particle level, will be mentioned in Section 6.5 for the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation (44) and in Section 5.1.3 for diffusion processes associated to the granular media and Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equations. On the other hand, it is sometimes possible to prove that propagation of chaos does *not* hold uniformly in time, an example is given in [Car+13; CDW13].

Pointwise from pathwise. Pathwise propagation of chaos is more general since it keeps tracks of the whole trajectory of the particles. When pathwise propagation of chaos holds, it implies pointwise propagation of chaos: since the coordinate maps are continuous, this directly stems from Proposition 3.38 (it is also a consequence of the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 7.8]). Note however, that this does not preserve the convergence rates. The converse does not always hold (see the counterexample below). In general, pathwise results are more difficult to obtain and can be proved only on finite time intervals. Pointwise propagation of chaos provides also more flexibility since it allows to work on $C(I, \mathcal{S})$, where \mathcal{S} may be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(E)$ or a larger topological space. For instance, useful spaces to study pathwise fluctuations are the class of tempered distributions in [DG87] or negative weighted Sobolev spaces in [Mél96]. In a more analytical perspective, when $(f_t)_t$ solves a known PDE, \mathcal{S} is more naturally identified to a functional space, for instance a Sobolev space [JM98; MMW15].

Propagation of chaos via the empirical process. The characterisation of Kac's chaos via the empirical measure given in Lemma 3.34 implies that pointwise propagation of chaos is equivalent to the convergence in law of the random measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ towards the deterministic measure f_t for any $t \in [0, T]$. At the pathwise level, there are two notions of pathwise empirical propagation of chaos which are presented below. To begin with, a slightly more general definition of the empirical measure map is needed. Given a set \mathcal{E} the empirical measure map is defined by:

$$\mu_N^{\mathcal{E}} : \mathcal{E}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}), \quad \mathbf{x}^N \mapsto \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}.$$

In the following, \mathcal{E} is a Polish space; it will be either the state space E (in which case we may omit the superscript E as in (53)) or the path space. The following maps link the pathwise and pointwise properties.

- **(The evaluation map).** For any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbf{X}_t^{\mathcal{E}} : D([0, T], \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}, \quad \omega \mapsto \omega(t).$$

- **(The projection map).**

$$\Pi^{\mathcal{E}} : \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{E})) \rightarrow D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})), \quad \mu \mapsto ((\mathbf{X}_t^{\mathcal{E}})_{\#} \mu)_{0 \leq t \leq T}.$$

The pathwise and pointwise N -particle distributions are linked by

$$f_t^N = (\mathbf{X}_t^{E^N})_{\#} f_{[0, T]}^N = \Pi^{E^N} \left(f_{[0, T]}^N \right) (t).$$

The *empirical measure process* is the measure-valued process defined by:

$$(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})_t \equiv (\mu_N^E(\mathcal{X}_t^N))_t.$$

Since this is the image of a process this readily defines the laws for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$F_t^N := (\mu_N^E)_{\#} f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E)),$$

and the pathwise version:

$$F_{[0, T]}^{\mu, N} := (\mu_N^E \circ)_{\#} f_{[0, T]}^N \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))),$$

where $\mu_N^E \circ$ is the natural extension of μ_N^E on the path space defined by:

$$\mu_N^E \circ : D([0, T], E^N) \rightarrow D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E)), \quad \omega \mapsto \mu_N^E \circ \omega.$$

Hence, it holds that

$$F_t^N = \Pi^{\mathcal{P}(E)} \left(F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N} \right) (t) = (\mathbf{X}_t^{\mathcal{P}(E)})_{\#} F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N}.$$

But there is another choice: it is also possible to define the pathwise empirical distribution as the push-forward of the N -particle pathwise distribution by the empirical map:

$$F_{[0,T]}^N := (\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^{\mathcal{D}})_{\#} f_{[0,T]}^N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))),$$

where we write $\mathcal{D} = D([0, T], E)$. This probability distribution is linked to F_t^N and $F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N}$ by:

$$F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N} = (\Pi^E)_{\#} F_{[0,T]}^N, \quad F_t^N = (\mathbf{X}_t^{\mathcal{P}(E)} \circ \Pi^E)_{\#} F_{[0,T]}^N.$$

In summary, there are three levels of description of the empirical process. In the following diagram, each space on the top row is a probability space endowed with a probability measure which is the law of the specific version of the random empirical process in the bottom row. The spaces are linked by the maps Π^E and $\mathbf{X}_t^{\mathcal{P}(E)}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \left(\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E)), F_{[0,T]}^N \right) & \xrightarrow{\Pi^E} & \left(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E)), F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N} \right) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{X}_t^{\mathcal{P}(E)}} & \left(\mathcal{P}(E), F_t^N \right) \\ \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N} & \longmapsto & (\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})_{0 \leq t \leq T} & \longmapsto & \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} \end{array}.$$

This gives three notions of empirical propagation of chaos.

Definition 3.45 (Empirical propagation of chaos). Let $(f_t)_t \in C([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))$ be a flow of measures and let $f_{[0,T]} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$ be such that for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$f_t = \Pi^E(f_{[0,T]})(t).$$

There are three notions of empirical propagation of chaos defined below (the convergence is the weak convergence).

1. (*Pointwise empirical propagation of chaos*). For all $t \in [0, T]$, the law F_t^N satisfies

$$F_t^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_{f_t} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E)). \quad (62)$$

2. (*Functional law of large numbers*). The law $F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N}$ satisfies

$$F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_{\Pi^E(f_{[0,T]})} \equiv \delta_{(f_t)_t} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))). \quad (63)$$

3. (*(Strong) pathwise empirical propagation of chaos*). The law $F_{[0,T]}^N$ satisfies

$$F_{[0,T]}^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_{f_{[0,T]}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))). \quad (64)$$

The (strong) pathwise property (64) is stronger than the functional law of large numbers (63) which is stronger than the pointwise property (62).

Remark 3.46. The functional law of large numbers (63) is also a pathwise property which is weaker than (64). To distinguish it with the pathwise empirical propagation chaos (64) we may occasionally call the latter property *strong pathwise empirical propagation of chaos*.

The implication (64) \Rightarrow (63) is not straightforward because the map Π^E is not continuous everywhere. The result holds because the limit is a Dirac mass, this is proved in [Mél96, Theorem 4.7] using a result of Léonard [Léo95a, Lemma 2.8]. The implication (63) \Rightarrow (62) is more classical, this is the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions stated in [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 7.8].

The converse implications do not hold in general. In fact, since the map Π^E is not injective the strong pathwise property is meaningless when only the flow of measures $(f_t)_t$ is

known and $f_{[0,T]}$ is not specified. A counterexample is given in [Szn91, Chapter 1, Section 3(e)]. Sznitman builds two one-dimensional processes $\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{[0,T]}^N$ such that for both processes, the strong pathwise empirical propagation chaos holds but with two different limits $f_{[0,T]}$ and $\tilde{f}_{[0,T]}$ and with the equality of the flows of time-marginals $\Pi^E(f_{[0,T]}) = \Pi^E(\tilde{f}_{[0,T]})$. The process $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{[0,T]}^N$ is obtained by a re-ordering procedure from $\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N$ which thus ensures the equality of the empirical measure processes:

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} = \mu_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}.$$

Finally, by Lemma 3.34, the pointwise empirical propagation of chaos is equivalent to the pointwise propagation of chaos in the sense of Definition 3.44. Similarly, the strong pathwise empirical propagation of chaos is equivalent to the pathwise propagation of chaos. On the other hand the functional law of large numbers is an intermediate notion in between pointwise and pathwise propagation of chaos.

4 Proving propagation of chaos

Several methods are available to prove propagation of chaos. The choice of the method depends on several aspects, including the following ones.

- **How is the particle system defined?** A SDE representation allows to control directly the trajectory of each particle. If the system is an abstract Markov process defined by its generator only, one has to pass to the limit inside a “statistical object”: for instance the Liouville equation (1) or a martingale problem (Definition 2.4).
- **How well is the limit process known?** As mentioned in Section 2.1, it is sometimes possible to prove at the same time the propagation of chaos and an existence result for the limit object. Many “historical” proofs are based on this idea and exploit at the particle level a property of completeness (as in McKean’s original proof, Section 5.1.1), a compactness criterion based on a martingale formulation (Section 5.3) or an explicit series expansion for the solution of the Liouville equation in the case of a Boltzmann problem (as in Kac’s original proof, Section 6.1). Over the years, the study of the limit problem, in parallel to the question of propagation of chaos, has stimulated the development of new techniques where wellposedness results or regularity properties of the limit problem are used to control the particle system. Ultimately, a trade-off has always to be done between regularity of the N -particle system and regularity of the limit process. The key idea is to write the N -particle system and the limit process in a common framework which allows to compare them.
- **Which kind of propagation of chaos?** In Sections 3.3 and 3.4, several notions of chaos and propagation of chaos are introduced. The first distinction to keep in mind is between pathwise and pointwise properties. Then one may seek quantitative estimates. Pathwise chaos is stronger and it is often simpler to get pointwise quantitative estimates.

Keeping these aspects in mind, the present section is organised as follows. Section 4.1 is devoted to an introduction of coupling methods in several cases. These methods (or most of them) exploit a SDE representation of the particle system (it therefore requires some regularity at the microscopic level and often a wellposedness result for the limit system) and lead to the quantitative pathwise or pointwise propagation of chaos. Section 4.2 introduces some ideas to prove the tightness (and thus the compactness) of the law of the empirical process. This leads to non-quantitative pathwise propagation of chaos results, but as it is only based on the properties of the generator of the N -particles process, it remains valid for a wide class of models. A pointwise study of the empirical process via the asymptotic analysis of its generator is described in Section 4.3. This leads to a quantitative abstract theorem with a comparable range of applications as the compactness methods. In Section 4.4,

some ideas related to large deviations are presented. It leads to strong (non quantitative) abstract results which go beyond but include the propagation of chaos. Although these results are often too strong or too abstract to be used in practise, the ideas can be reinterpreted to prove propagation of chaos for particle systems with a very weak regularity or with a complex interaction mechanism which are difficult to handle with other methods. Finally, in the case of Boltzmann models, specific tools can be used as described in Section 4.5.

We recall that several applications of these methods will be presented in the next Sections 5 and 6.

4.1 Coupling methods

4.1.1 Definition

Definition 4.1 (Chaos by coupling the trajectories). Let be given a time $T \in (0, \infty]$, a distance d_E on E and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Propagation of chaos holds by coupling the trajectories when for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist

- a system of particles $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$ with law $f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ at time $t \leq T$,
- a system of *independent* processes $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_t^N)_t$ with law $f_t^{\otimes N} \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ at time $t \leq T$,
- a number $\varepsilon(N, T) > 0$ such that $\varepsilon(N, T) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0$,

such that (pathwise case)

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} d_E(X_t^i, \overline{X}_t^i)^p \right] \leq \varepsilon(N, T), \quad (65)$$

or (pointwise case)

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E} [d_E(X_t^i, \overline{X}_t^i)^p] \leq \varepsilon(N, T). \quad (66)$$

By definition of the Wasserstein- p distance (Definition 3.1) and Jensen inequality, the bounds (65) and (66) imply the infinite dimensional chaos (Definition 3.39), respectively:

$$W_p \left(f_{[0, T]}^N, f_{[0, T]}^{\otimes N} \right) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0, \quad \sup_{t \leq T} W_p(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

where we recall that the Wasserstein- p distance is associated to the normalised distance on E^N (Definition 3.7). The definition can also be weakened by assuming that only the first $k(N) < N$ particles are coupled instead of the whole system of the N particles. This would imply propagation of chaos of the form (58).

Remark 4.2. Note that by exchangeability of the particles all the expectations in the sums (65) and (66) are equal and the assertions therefore imply the convergence of the one-particle distribution in Wasserstein- p distance on $\mathcal{P}(E)$.

The coupling between the trajectories also implies the quantitative empirical chaos stated in the following lemma in the pointwise case. This is a simple application of [FG15].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ and assume that f_t has a bounded moment of order $q > p$. If there exists a (pointwise) coupling as in Definition 4.1 then*

$$\sup_{t \leq T} \mathcal{W}_p^p(F_t^N, \delta_{f_t}) \leq \varepsilon(N, T) + \beta_d(N),$$

where $\beta_d(N)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_d(N) \\ &= C(p, q) \begin{cases} N^{-1/2} + N^{-(q-p)/q} & \text{if } p > d/2 \text{ and } q \neq 2p \\ N^{-1/2} \log(1 + N) + N^{-(q-p)/q} & \text{if } p = d/2 \text{ and } q \neq 2p \\ N^{-p/d} + N^{-(q-p)/q} & \text{if } p < d/2 \text{ and } q \neq d/(d-p), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for a constant $C(p, q) > 0$ which depends only on p and q .

Proof. By the triangle inequality, for all $t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p^p(f_t^{\mu, N}, \delta_{f_t}) &\leq \mathbb{E}W_p^p(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, f_t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}W_p^p(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}) + \mathbb{E}W_p^p(\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}, f_t). \end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right-hand side of the last inequality is bounded by $\beta_d(N)$ using [FG15, Theorem 1]. Moreover the bound (66) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}W_p^p(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}) \leq \varepsilon(N, T).$$

□

Note that the convergence rate depends on the dimension. When moments of sufficiently high order are available, $\beta_d(N)$ is of the order $N^{-1/2}$ for $p > d/2$ and $N^{-p/d}$ for $p < d/2$.

We now summarise the most common methods used to construct a coupling in the sense of Definition 4.1.

4.1.2 Synchronous coupling.

When the particle system can be written as the solution of a system of SDEs as in (11) or (20), a simple coupling choice consists in constructing N nonlinear processes by taking respectively the same Brownian motions and Poisson random measures as those defining the particle system. This choice is called *synchronous coupling*.

For the McKean-Vlasov diffusion, the synchronous coupling is thus based on the N independent processes $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N = (\bar{X}_t^1, \dots, \bar{X}_t^N)$ defined as the solutions of the N SDEs:

$$d\bar{X}_t^i = b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t)dt + \sigma(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t)dB_t^i, \quad (67)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ where $(B_t^i)_t$ is the same Brownian motion as in (11) and where we recall that $f_t = \text{Law}(\bar{X}_t^i)$. Since the Brownian motions B_t^i are independent, this gives N independent copies of (13). The Theorem 5.1 (and Theorem 5.34) in Section 5.1.1 will show that this coupling choice leads to an optimal convergence rate (in N) for any $T > 0$ but with a constant which depends exponentially in T . This comes from the fact that comparing the trajectories of (67) and (11) is similar to a stability analysis of the N processes $X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i$. When the coefficients are globally Lipschitz, the classical Gronwall-based methods imply the stability on any time interval but with an constant which grows exponentially with the time variable.

The synchronous coupling is by far the most popular choice of coupling method in the literature since [Szn91]. We point out that this was not the original choice of McKean: in the seminal work [McK69], McKean uses a synchronous coupling between the N -particle system and the subsystem of the N first particles of a system of $M > N$ particles. The proof thus does not necessitate to prove the well-posedness of the nonlinear SDE (13) as a preliminary step (since it is never used). It is actually a proof of existence which constructs a solution of (67) by a completeness argument together with a probabilistic reasoning (based on Hewitt-Savage 0-1 law) to recover the independence.

Similar ideas can be applied for parametric mean-field jump processes (with or without simultaneous jumps). Given the N SDEs (20), the synchronous coupling is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_t^i &= X_0^i + \int_0^t a(\bar{X}_s^i)ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\Theta} \{\psi(\bar{X}_{s-}^i, f_s, \theta) - \bar{X}_{s-}^i\} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \lambda(\bar{X}_{s-}^i, f_s)]}(u) \mathcal{N}^i(ds, du, d\theta), \quad (68) \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, where $f_t = \text{Law}(\bar{X}_t^i)$ and where the Poisson random measures \mathcal{N}^i are the same as in (20). Equation (68) can be extended straightforwardly to the case of simultaneous jumps (Example 2.13). It is then possible to prove similar results as in the case of the McKean-Vlasov diffusion. A complete analysis can be found in [ADF18] (see also Section 5.6).

To end this section, let us also mention the recent coupling method introduced in [Hol16] which reverses the role of the empirical particle system and the nonlinear law. The author introduces the particle system defined conditionally on \mathcal{X}_t^N by:

$$d\tilde{X}_t^i = b(\tilde{X}_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})dt + \sigma(\tilde{X}_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})d\tilde{B}_t^i.$$

Note that the processes \tilde{X}_t^i are not independent. More details on how to close the argument (using a generalised Glivenko-Cantelli theorem for SDEs) will be given in Section 5.2.2. The main advantage is that it allows more singular interactions, namely only Hölder instead of Lipschitz.

Remark 4.4. Coupling methods should still be possible when no SDE is available, since it is always possible to write an evolution equation for an observable $\varphi(\mathcal{X}_t^N)$ using the general Itô's formula for Markov processes (see Section D.3.4). The analog of an SDE can then be recovered taking for φ some coordinate functions.

4.1.3 Reflection coupling for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion.

Except in specific cases (see Section 5.1.3), it is usually not possible or difficult to get uniform in time estimates using a synchronous coupling. One reason is that the strategy can be seen as a stability analysis for the nonlinear system (13) which classically leads to Gronwall type estimates with a constant which depends exponentially in T . The recently introduced *reflection coupling* [Ebe16; EGZ19] tries to make a better use of the diffusion part to get (hopefully) uniform in times estimates under mild assumptions.

To better understand the idea, let us start with the case of two classical diffusion processes. The solution (X_t, Y_t) of the following system of SDEs in \mathbb{R}^d is called a coupling by reflection:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= b(X_t)dt + \sigma dB_t \\ dY_t &= b(Y_t)dt + \sigma(I_d - 2e_t e_t^T)dB_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the (locally Lipschitz) drift function, $\sigma > 0$ is a constant and

$$e_t = (X_t - Y_t)/|X_t - Y_t|.$$

Moreover, after the coupling time $T := \inf\{t \geq 0, X_t = Y_t\}$, for $t \geq T$ the processes are set to $X_t = Y_t$. Let b satisfy for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\langle x - y, b(x) - b(y) \rangle \leq -\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\kappa(|x - y|)|x - y|^2,$$

where $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \kappa(r) > 0$. In order to measure the discrepancy between the two processes $r_t := |X_t - Y_t|$, for any fixed smooth function f , Itô's formula gives:

$$df(r_t) = r_t^{-1} \langle X_t - Y_t, b(X_t) - b(Y_t) \rangle f'(r_t)dt + 2\sigma^2 f''(r_t)dt + dM_t,$$

where M_t is a martingale. Compared to what the synchronous coupling would give, thanks to Itô's correction, the coupling by reflection adds a new term in the drift. Using the assumptions on b , the drift term is now bounded by

$$2\sigma^2 \left(f''(r_t) - \frac{1}{4}r_t\kappa(r_t)f'(r_t) \right).$$

If f is such that there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $r \geq 0$

$$f''(r) - \frac{1}{4}r\kappa(r)f'(r) \leq -\frac{c}{2\sigma^2}f(r), \quad (69)$$

then it gives:

$$\mathbb{E}[f(r_t)] \leq e^{-ct}\mathbb{E}[f(r_0)]. \quad (70)$$

The idea of [Ebe16] is to introduce a positive concave function f so that $d_f(x, y) := f(|x - y|)$ defines a distance on \mathbb{R}^d and such that the bound (69) holds. From (70), this finally gives the following exponential “contraction bound” in Wasserstein distance:

$$W_{1,d_f}(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq e^{-ct}W_{1,d_f}(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad (71)$$

where $\mu_t, \nu_t \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ are the laws of X_t, Y_t at time $t \geq 0$. This strategy is successfully applied in [Ebe16; EGZ19] to get quantitative contraction and convergence rates for linear and nonlinear gradient McKean-Vlasov systems, even in non convex settings.

Coming back to particle systems, in [Dur+20; LWZ20], the authors have shown that this idea can be applied to McKean-Vlasov systems (11) (which can be seen as a classical diffusion equation in the high-dimensional space \mathbb{R}^{dN}). They use a componentwise reflection coupling between a particle system and a system of N independent nonlinear McKean-Vlasov systems. The analog of the exponential contraction rate (71) thus provides a proof of the uniform in time propagation of chaos for gradient systems with milder assumptions than the ones in Section 5.1.3 obtained with a synchronous coupling. This will be reviewed in Section 5.2.1.

Remark 4.5 (Extension to more general diffusions). This idea is more natural but not restricted to the case where the diffusion matrix is constant. It can be extended to more general diffusion matrices by “twisting” the metric in \mathbb{R}^d to recover a constant diffusion matrix in a modified metric. See [Ebe16] for additional details as well as [Mal01] for a similar reasoning in a different context.

4.1.4 Optimal jumps

For mean-field jump processes and Boltzmann models, the particles interact only at discrete (random) times. They update their state according to a sampling mechanism with respect to a known measure which depends on the empirical measure of the system (see (18) and (27)). The strategy adopted in [Die20] for mean-field jump processes (see Section 2.2.3) consists in constructing a trajectorial representation of the particle and the nonlinear systems in which the jumps are coupled optimally. Taking the same sequence of jump times $(T_n^i)_n$ for the particle X_t^i and its coupled nonlinear version \bar{X}_t^i , a post-jump state is sampled for the nonlinear process first:

$$\bar{X}_{T_n^i}^i \sim P_{f_{T_n^i}}(\bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i, dy),$$

and then the post-jump state for the particle is defined as the image:

$$X_{T_n^i}^i = \mathbb{T}(\bar{X}_{T_n^i}^i), \quad (72)$$

where \mathbb{T} is an optimal transfer map for the W_1 distance between the jump measures:

$$\mathbb{T}_{\#}P_{f_{T_n^i}}(\bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i, dy) = P_{\mu_{X_{T_n^{i-}}^i}}(X_{T_n^{i-}}^i, dy),$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_{T_n^i}^i - X_{T_n^i}^i| = W_1\left(P_{f_{T_n^i}}(\bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i, dy), P_{\mu_{X_{T_n^{i-}}^i}}(X_{T_n^{i-}}^i, dy)\right).$$

The existence of the optimal transfer map \mathbb{T} is a classical result in optimal transport theory; it holds under mild assumptions, see [CD11; FM01a] and the references therein. Under Lipschitz assumptions on the jump measure, it can be deduced that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \bar{X}_{T_n^i}^i - X_{T_n^i}^i \right| \leq C \left(\left| \bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i - X_{T_n^{i-}}^i \right| + W_1 \left(f_{T_n^i}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{T_n^i}^N} \right) \right). \quad (73)$$

This crude estimate may be refined when the jump measure has a known expression. Note that in the case of a parametric model (Example 2.12), the synchronous coupling of the Poisson random measures (68) gives an alternative coupling and an explicit transfer map:

$$\bar{X}_{T_n^i}^i = \psi \left(\bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i, f_{T_n^i}, \theta \right), \quad X_{T_n^i}^i = \psi \left(X_{T_n^{i-}}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i}, \theta \right), \quad (74)$$

where $\theta \sim \nu(d\theta)$ is the same random variable for the two post-jump states. This coupling is not necessarily optimal but under Lipschitz assumptions on ψ it still implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \bar{X}_{T_n^i}^i - X_{T_n^i}^i \right| &= \int_{\Theta} \left| \psi \left(\bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i, f_{T_n^i}, \theta \right) - \psi \left(X_{T_n^{i-}}^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i}, \theta \right) \right| \nu(d\theta) \\ &\leq C \left(\left| \bar{X}_{T_n^{i-}}^i - X_{T_n^{i-}}^i \right| + W_1 \left(f_{T_n^i}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{T_n^i}^N} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Both couplings (72) and (74) ensure that the N nonlinear processes $(\bar{X}_t^i)_t$ remain independent, which is crucial. At each jumping time T_n^i , the error between X_t^i and \bar{X}_t^i due to the jump is controlled by (73). A discrete stability analysis then ensures the propagation of the error exponentially in time. Between the jumps, the trajectories are either deterministic or can be controlled by a standard synchronous coupling. This proves the propagation of chaos on any time interval but with a (very) bad behaviour with respect to time.

For Boltzmann models, the situation is more difficult because two particles “jump” at the same time. As discussed in Section 2.3.2, it is also not completely straightforward to build a SDE representation of the nonlinear process. Moreover, contrary to the mean-field jump processes where the jump measures are typically assumed to have a smooth density, for Boltzmann models, the jumps are obtained by sampling directly from the empirical measure of the system. Since this measure is singular but the solution of the Boltzmann equation is not, an optimal transfer map may not exist. The strategy adopted in [Mur77] and then in [CF16b; CF18; FM16] is based on the analysis of the optimal transfer plan (which exists) between the empirical measure of the particle system and the law of the nonlinear system at each jump time. This strategy also needs a kind of synchronous coupling for the jump times. As in the previous cases, propagation of chaos then results from a Gronwall type estimate with a bad behaviour in time, and in this case only for marginals (or block) of size $k(N) = o(N)$. This will be discussed more thoroughly in Section 6.4.

4.1.5 Analysis in Wasserstein spaces: optimal coupling

The Liouville equation associated to a McKean-Vlasov process with interaction parameters

$$b(x, \mu) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x, y) \mu(dy), \quad \sigma(x, \mu) \equiv \sigma I_d, \quad \sigma > 0,$$

can be written:

$$\partial_t f_t^N = -\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{b}^N f_t^N) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta f_t^N, \quad (75)$$

where

$$\mathbf{b}^N : \mathbf{x}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{dN} \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b(x^1, x^i), \dots, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b(x^N, x^i) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{dN}.$$

This equation can be rewritten as a continuity equation:

$$\partial_t f_t^N = -\nabla \cdot \left(\left(\mathbf{b}^N - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log f_t^N \right) f_t^N \right). \quad (76)$$

Similarly, the associated nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equation is a continuity equation in \mathbb{R}^d with velocity vector

$$b \star f_s - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log f_s.$$

Continuity equations are strongly linked to the theory of gradient flows [AGS08; DS14], which in turn provides new insights on the study of McKean-Vlasov processes. In addition to the present section, see also Section 5.3.2.

The two recent works [Sal20; DT19] are based on a classical result in gradient flow theory (see for instance [Vil09b, Theorem 23.9]) which gives an explicit dissipation rate between the solutions of two continuity equations. In the present case, it gives an explicit control of the time derivative of $W_2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N})$ in terms of the so-called maximizing Kantorovich potential ψ_t^N which links the two laws by:

$$(\nabla \psi_t^N)_\# f_t^{\otimes N} = f_t^N, \quad W_2^2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} |\nabla \psi_t^N(\mathbf{x}^N) - \mathbf{x}^N|^2 f_t^{\otimes N}(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}^N).$$

The existence of ψ_t^N is ensured by Brenier's theorem [Vil09b, Theorem 9.4]. This approach of propagation of chaos follows the work of [BGG12; BGG13] where the authors have derived explicit contraction rates in Wasserstein-2 distance for linear Fokker-Planck equations and for the nonlinear granular media equation (which is the nonlinear mean-field limit associated to the gradient system (15)). Starting from the same result [Vil09b, Theorem 23.9], the authors of [BGG12; BGG13] introduced a new transportation inequality, the so-called WJ inequality which is then exploited at the particle level in [Sal20; DT19]. This analysis provides uniform in time propagation of chaos and convergence to equilibrium results for gradient systems in non globally convex settings. The work of [Sal20] also provides a new unifying analytical vision of previous coupling approaches. These techniques will be detailed in Section 5.2.3.

4.2 Compactness methods

In this section the main ideas to prove propagation of chaos via compactness arguments are presented. The main advantage of this approach is its wide range of applicability as it can be adapted to jump, diffusion, Boltzmann or even mixed models. The main drawback is that it does not provide any convergence rate.

Compactness methods are based on the empirical representation of the process described in Section 3.4. It therefore reduces the problem of the convergence of a sequence of probability measures on a space which does not depend on N but which in turn is much more delicate to handle than E as it is itself a probability space. The first approach described below is the stochastic analysis approach which is by now classical; the second approach is a more recent analytical approach based on the theory of gradient-flows.

4.2.1 Martingale methods.

Starting from the martingale characterisation of the particle system (Definition 2.4), it is possible to prove the functional law of large numbers (63) and the strong pathwise empirical propagation of chaos (64) using the traditional sequence of arguments in stochastic analysis (see for instance [JM86]).

- (1) First prove the tightness of the sequence $(F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N})_N$ (functional law of large numbers) or $(F_{[0,T]}^N)_N$ (strong pathwise). This will come from usual tightness criteria (see Section D.2 and Section D.4) but requires some care regarding the spaces (namely, the

path space with values in a set of probability measures). The classical and more advanced tools which are used are reminded in Appendix D. By Prokhorov theorem, it is then possible to extract a converging subsequence towards a limit, respectively $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E)))$ (functional law of large numbers) or $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E)))$ (strong pathwise).

- (2) Then identify the π -distributed limit points as solutions respectively of the weak limit PDE or the limit martingale problem. Again, this may require some care, in particular for càdlàg processes due to the topology of the Skorokhod space.
- (3) Finally prove the uniqueness of the solution of the previous problem. Usually well-posedness (that is existence and uniqueness) can be proved beforehand although existence is not required (it is automatically provided by the tightness). In conclusion, π is a Dirac delta at the desired limit point.

Strong pathwise empirical chaos (64) is not significantly harder to prove than the weaker functional law of large numbers (63) but it requires the uniqueness property of the limit martingale problem which is a stronger assumption than the corresponding one for the weak limit PDE. The strong pathwise case is detailed in Méléard's course [Mél96, Section 4].

This approach is historically linked to the study of the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics (44): Tanaka [Tan83] proved weak pathwise empirical chaos for hard-spheres and inverse power Maxwellian molecules. Strong pathwise empirical chaos is proved in [Szn84a] for a class of parametric Boltzmann models which includes the stochastic hard-sphere model. See also [Wag96] for a functional law of large numbers applied to a large class of parametric Boltzmann models. The martingale method is exploited to treat the case of the McKean-Vlasov diffusion in [Szn84b] (with boundary conditions) and in [Oel84; Gär88] (functional law of large numbers with general interaction functions), see also [Léo86]. Strong pathwise empirical chaos is proved for a mixed jump-diffusion mean-field model in [GM97; Mél96]. See also [FM01b, Theorem 4.1] for a strong pathwise result on a cutoff approximation of a non-cutoff Boltzmann model.

The corresponding results will be detailed in Section 5.3.1 in the mean-field case and in Section 6.3 for Boltzmann models.

4.2.2 Gradient flows.

This second approach gives a pointwise version of the empirical propagation of chaos and is restricted to the McKean-Vlasov gradient system (15). It is entirely analytical and exploits recent results of the theory of gradient flows [AGS08; DS14; Vil09b]. We briefly recall one definition of gradient-flows in a metric space.

Definition 4.6 (Gradient flows in $(\mathcal{E}, d_{\mathcal{E}})$). Let $(\mathcal{E}, d_{\mathcal{E}})$ be a geodesic metric space.

1. **(Absolutely continuous curves and metric derivative)**. A \mathcal{E} -valued continuous curve $\mu : (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is said to be absolutely continuous whenever there exists $m \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(a, b)$ such that

$$\forall a < s \leq t < b, \quad d_{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_s, \mu_t) \leq \int_s^t m(r) dr.$$

In this case, the limit

$$|\mu'| (t) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{d_{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_s, \mu_t)}{|t - s|},$$

exists for almost every $t \in (a, b)$ and is called the metric derivative of μ at the point t .

2. **(Gradient flow)**. Let $T \in (0, +\infty]$ and let $\mu \in C([0, T], \mathcal{E})$ be an absolutely continuous curve. Let us consider $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and a λ -convex map $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Then μ

is called a λ -gradient flow associated to the energy \mathcal{F} whenever $\mathcal{F}(\mu_t) < +\infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and μ satisfies the following *Evolution Variational Inequality* (EVI) :

$$\forall \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \forall \nu \in \mathcal{E}, \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} d_{\mathcal{E}}^2(\mu_t, \nu) + \frac{\lambda}{2} d_{\mathcal{E}}^2(\mu_t, \nu) \leq \mathcal{F}(\nu) - \mathcal{F}(\mu_t). \quad (77)$$

In the following, gradient flows will be considered in the two cases $(\mathcal{E}, d_{\mathcal{E}}) = (\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), W_2)$ and $(\mathcal{E}, d_{\mathcal{E}}) = (\mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)), \mathcal{W}_2)$. The fundamental result to keep in mind is that evolutionary PDEs, as defined below, have a unique distributional solution which is a gradient-flow.

Definition 4.7 (Evolutionary PDEs). An evolutionary PDE is a PDE of the form

$$\partial_t \rho = \nabla \cdot \left(\rho \nabla \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}(\rho)}{\delta \rho} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and where the first variation of \mathcal{F} is defined as the unique (up to an additive constant) measurable function $\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}(\rho)}{\delta \rho} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the equality

$$\left. \frac{d}{dh} \mathcal{F}(\rho + h\chi) \right|_{h=0} = \int \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}(\rho)}{\delta \rho} d\chi,$$

holds for every measure χ such that $\rho + h\chi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for small enough h .

In a recent article [CDP20], the authors prove the pointwise empirical propagation of chaos for gradient systems (15) using a gradient flow characterisation of $(f_t^N)_t$ and $(F_t^N)_t$ seen as time continuous curves with values respectively in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{dN})$ and $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. The argument is based on a compactness criterion in the space $C([0, T], \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)))$ which follows from Ascoli's theorem. Under the initial chaos hypothesis, the limit of $(F_t^N)_t$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ is also identified as a gradient-flow and is shown to be the curve $(\delta_{f_t})_t \in C([0, T], \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)))$. Gradient flows are identified by the EVI (77) which plays a comparable role as the martingale characterisation in a stochastic context.

The results of [CDP20] will be summarised in Section 5.3.2.

4.3 A pointwise study of the empirical process

This section is devoted to an analytical pointwise study of the empirical process within the framework developed in [MM13; MMW15] following an idea of [Grü71]. We also refer to [Mis12] for a review of these results.

The goal is to obtain a quantitative control of the evolution of the law F_t^N of the empirical process seen as the law of a $\mathcal{P}(E)$ -valued process. This control is obtained via a careful asymptotic analysis of the infinitesimal generator of the empirical process which is shown to converge (in a sense to define) towards the generator of the flow of the limit PDE starting from a random initial condition and also seen as a measure-valued process. This method is intrinsically very abstract and can be applied to a wide range of models (in theory, at least to all the models studied in the present review). The main idea traces back to Grünbaum and his study of the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann hard-sphere model (44) [Grü71]. However, the seminal article of Grünbaum was incomplete and based on an unproven assumption (which happened to be false in some cases). The study of measure-valued Markov processes is in general very delicate. This is mainly due to the fact that $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is only a metric space and not a vector space which causes several technical problems, the most important one being the precise definition of the notion of infinitesimal generator. A probabilistic point of view can be found in [Daw93]. In the framework introduced by [MM13; MMW15], a new notion of differential calculus in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is defined in order to give a rigorous definition of the limit generator. The question of propagation of chaos is then stated in a very abstract framework which leads to an abstract theorem (Theorem 4.14) which can be applied to various models after a careful check of a set of five assumptions (Assumption 4.13). Most of

these assumptions are related to the regularity of the nonlinear solution operator semigroup of the limit PDE. A notable application of this method is the answer to many of the questions raised by Kac in his seminal article [Kac56] related to the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation (44). This will be reviewed in Section 6.5.

The rest of this section is organised as follows. The generator and transition semigroup of the empirical process are defined next. An introductory toy example using this formalism is presented in Subsection 4.3.2. This leads to propagation of chaos for only a very small class of linear models. The next two Subsections 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 present the core of the abstract framework and the main difficulties of the approach, in particular the notion of differential calculus needed to define the limit generator. In the last Subsection 4.3.5 the five assumptions and the abstract theorem of [MMW15] are stated.

4.3.1 The empirical generator.

In Section 3.4, the empirical process has been defined as the image of the N -particle process by the empirical measure map μ_N . This process is a $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E)$ -valued Markov process and it is possible to define its transition semi-group and generator by pushing-forward those of the N -particle process. More precisely, the empirical transition semi-group is given by:

$$\widehat{T}_{N,t}\Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) = T_{N,t}[\Phi \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N), \quad (78)$$

and the empirical generator by:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N\Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) = \mathcal{L}_N[\Phi \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N). \quad (79)$$

This is a consequence of the identity:

$$\widehat{T}_{N,t}\Phi(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\Phi(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{t+s}^N}) \mid \mathcal{X}_s^N\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[(\Phi \circ \mu_N)(\mathcal{X}_{t+s}^N) \mid \mathcal{X}_s^N\right] = T_{N,t}[\Phi \circ \mu_N](\mathcal{X}_s^N).$$

Note that the empirical semi-group and generator are well defined as operators $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E)) \rightarrow C_b(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E))$ and the initial law $F_0^N = (\mu_N)_\# f_0^N$ is a probability measure on $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E)$. Nonetheless, in order to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$, it is more convenient to look at the empirical process as a $\mathcal{P}(E)$ -valued process since $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E) \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$.

Example 4.8 (The empirical generator for a mean-field jump process). For mean-field generators, this simply reads

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N\Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) = \sum_{i=1}^N L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\Phi \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N).$$

In the special case of a mean-field jump process, one has a more explicit formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N\Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_E \lambda(x^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \left[\Phi\left(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} - \frac{1}{N}\delta_{x^i} + \frac{1}{N}\delta_y\right) - \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \right] P_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}(x^i, dy) \\ &= N \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \lambda(\cdot, \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \int_E \left[\Phi\left(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} - \frac{1}{N}\delta_\cdot + \frac{1}{N}\delta_y\right) - \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \right] P_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}(\cdot, dy) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

4.3.2 A toy-example using the measure-valued formalism

The model presented in this section is a simple introduction to the measure-valued formalism. We follow an idea which was originally suggested to us by P.-E. Jabin. As we shall see, simple computations can lead to propagation of chaos in the limited case of linear models. Let us consider $\mathcal{X}_t^N = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^N)_t$ be a PDMP (see Section 2.2.3) defined by

- a deterministic flow:

$$dX_t^i = a(X_t^i)dt,$$

where a is C^1 and globally Lipschitz,

- a jump transition kernel $P : E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$, $(x, \mu) \mapsto P_\mu(x, dy)$,
- a constant jump rate $\lambda \equiv 1$.

We take $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ for simplicity. From (79), the associated empirical process is a measure-valued Markov process with generator:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N \Phi(\mu) = (a \cdot \nabla \Phi)(\mu) + N \iint_{E \times E} \left\{ \Phi \left(\mu - \frac{1}{N} \delta_x + \frac{1}{N} \delta_y \right) - \Phi(\mu) \right\} P_\mu(x, dy) \mu(dx),$$

where $\Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E)) \subset C_b(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E))$ is a test function on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and $(a \cdot \nabla \Phi)$ is well defined when Φ is a polynomial. We recall the notation $F_0^N(d\mu) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ for the initial law (supported on the set of empirical measures) and $F_t^N(d\mu) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ for the law at time t of the measure-valued Markov process with generator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^N$. For all test functions $\Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$, one can write the evolution equation for the observables of the empirical process:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \Phi(\mu) F_t^N(d\mu) + \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \Phi(\mu) \nabla \cdot (a F_t^N)(d\mu) \\ = N \int_{E \times E \times \mathcal{P}(E)} \left\{ \Phi \left(\mu - \frac{1}{N} \delta_x + \frac{1}{N} \delta_y \right) - \Phi(\mu) \right\} P_\mu(x, dy) \mu(dx) F_t^N(d\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

The right-hand side is the jump operator and on the left-hand side there is a transport operator, again well defined for Φ polynomial. Let us also recall the associated nonlinear jump operator acting on $C_b(E)$:

$$L_\mu \varphi(x) := \int_E \{\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)\} P_\mu(x, dy). \quad (81)$$

Its associated carré du champ operator is denoted by Γ_μ . Our goal is to try to prove pointwise empirical propagation of chaos: namely that for any $t > 0$,

$$F_t^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_{f_t},$$

where $f_t \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is the solution of the following weak PDE:

$$\forall \varphi \in C_b(E), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle + \langle a \cdot \nabla \varphi, f_t \rangle = \langle f_t, L_{f_t} \varphi \rangle.$$

To this purpose, we will try a “direct analytical approach” and compare directly F_t^N to its limit with a weak distance. Note that it is possible to do that because we work in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ which is a space which does not depend on N (it is one of the main clear advantage of the approach).

Let us consider the distance \mathcal{W}_{D_2} , which is the Wasserstein-1 distance on the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ associated to the distance D_2 on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ (see Definition 3.7). Since the limit is a Dirac mass, it holds that

$$\mathcal{W}_{D_2}^2(F_t^N, \delta_{f_t}) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} D_2^2(\mu, f_t) F_t^N(d\mu) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_t, \varphi_n \rangle^2 F_t^N(d\mu),$$

and it is then enough to bound the quantity

$$g_N(t) := \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_t, \varphi \rangle^2 F_t^N(d\mu). \quad (82)$$

Let us fix a test function $\varphi \in \text{Lip}_1(E)$. In order to control the deterministic flow, we define the (time-dependent) ‘‘modified test function’’ $\tilde{\varphi} \equiv \tilde{\varphi}(s, x)$ as the solution of the backward transport equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s \tilde{\varphi} + a \cdot \nabla_x \tilde{\varphi} &= 0 \\ \tilde{\varphi}(s = t, x) &= \varphi(x) \end{cases} \quad (83)$$

Since a is a globally Lipschitz vector-field, the function $\tilde{\varphi}$ is Lipschitz for all $s \leq t$ with Lipschitz semi-norm:

$$\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq e^{(t-s)\|a\|_{\text{Lip}}}. \quad (84)$$

We define

$$\tilde{g}_\varphi(s) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 F_s^N(d\mu), \quad (85)$$

where we do not specify the dependency in N for notational simplicity. In order to apply a Gronwall-like argument, we fix $t > 0$ and for $s < t$, thanks to (80), we compute the time derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}'_\varphi(s) &= \frac{d}{ds} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 F_s^N(d\mu) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \left[\int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 F_s^N(d\mu) - 2\langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle F_s^N(d\mu) + \langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 \partial_s F_s^N(d\mu) - 2\langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \partial_s F_s^N(d\mu) \\ &\quad - 2\langle \partial_s f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle F_s^N(d\mu) + 2\langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \langle \partial_s f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \langle \mu, \partial_s \tilde{\varphi} \rangle F_s^N(d\mu) \\ &\quad - 2\langle f_s, \partial_s \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle F_s^N(d\mu) \\ &\quad - 2\langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \partial_s \tilde{\varphi} \rangle F_s^N(d\mu) + 2\langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \langle f_s, \partial_s \tilde{\varphi} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that for two test functions $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C_b(E)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \varphi_1 \rangle \langle \mu, \varphi_2 \rangle \partial_s F_s^N(d\mu) &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \left\{ \langle \mu, a \cdot \nabla_x \varphi_1 \rangle \langle \mu, \varphi_2 \rangle + \langle \mu, \varphi_1 \rangle \langle \mu, a \cdot \nabla_x \varphi_2 \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \mu, \varphi_1 \rangle \langle \mu, L_\mu \varphi_2 \rangle + \langle \mu, L_\mu \varphi_1 \rangle \langle \mu, \varphi_2 \rangle + \frac{1}{N} \langle \mu, \Gamma_\mu(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \rangle \right\} F_s^N(d\mu), \end{aligned}$$

a direct computation shows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}'_\varphi(s) &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \left(\langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle - \langle f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \right) \left(\langle \mu, L_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \rangle - \langle f_s, L_{f_s} \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \right) F_s^N(d\mu) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \Gamma_\mu(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\varphi}) \rangle F_s^N(d\mu) \end{aligned}$$

By the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}'_\varphi(s) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 F_s^N(d\mu) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \left(\langle \mu, L_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \rangle - \langle f_s, L_{f_s} \tilde{\varphi} \rangle \right)^2 F_s^N(d\mu) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu, \Gamma_\mu(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\varphi}) \rangle F_s^N(d\mu). \end{aligned}$$

The last term on the right-hand side can be controlled using a mild moment assumption:

$$\exists \gamma > 0, \forall x \in E, \int_E |x - y|^2 P_\mu(x, dy) \leq \gamma,$$

which implies

$$\Gamma_\mu(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\varphi}) \leq \gamma \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \leq \gamma e^{2(t-s)\|a\|_{\text{Lip}}}.$$

we deduce that:

$$\tilde{g}'_\varphi(s) \leq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{g}_\varphi(s) + \frac{\gamma e^{2(t-s)\|a\|_{\text{Lip}}}}{N} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} (\langle \mu, L_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \rangle - \langle f_s, L_{f_s} \tilde{\varphi} \rangle)^2 F_s^N(d\mu). \quad (86)$$

Unfortunately it is not possible in general to close the argument. One would like to bound the last term on the right-hand side of (86) by a quantity of the form (85) (possibly with a different φ). This is hopeless in general because (85) depends on (the square of) a linear quantity in μ but due to the nonlinearity, the collision operator

$$\langle Q(\mu), \tilde{\varphi} \rangle := \langle \mu, L_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \rangle$$

is at least quadratic in μ (or controlled by a quadratic quantity as soon as P_μ is Lipschitz in μ for a Wasserstein distance). This fact is analogous to the BBGKY hierarchy at the level of the empirical process. It is possible to close the argument only in linear cases, for instance when

$$P_\mu(x, dy) = \int_{z \in E} K(y, z) \mu(dz) dy,$$

where $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a fixed symmetric interaction kernel with $\int_E K(y, z) dy = 1$ for all $z \in E$. In this case the collision operator is a linear operator:

$$\langle Q(\mu), \tilde{\varphi} \rangle = \langle \mu, K \star \tilde{\varphi} \rangle - \langle \mu, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle. \quad (87)$$

Reporting into (86), we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}'_\varphi(s) \leq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{g}_\varphi(s) + \frac{\gamma e^{2(t-s)\|a\|_{\text{Lip}}}}{N} + \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_s, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 F_s^N(d\mu) \\ + \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \mu - f_s, K \star \tilde{\varphi} \rangle^2 F_s^N(d\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Since the Lipschitz norm of $\tilde{\varphi}$ is controlled by (84) and that this bound is preserved by the convolution with K , using (82), we conclude that:

$$\tilde{g}'_\varphi(s) \leq \frac{5}{2} g_N(s) e^{2(t-s)\|a\|_{\text{Lip}}} + \frac{\gamma e^{2(t-s)\|a\|_{\text{Lip}}}}{N}.$$

Integrating between 0 and t , and taking the supremum over φ on the left-hand side, we can apply Gronwall lemma and conclude that

$$\mathcal{W}_{D_2}^2(F_t^N, \delta_{f_t}) \leq g_N(t) \leq C(\gamma, a, t) \left(\mathcal{W}_{D_2}^2(F_0^N, \delta_{f_0}) + \frac{1}{N} \right). \quad (88)$$

Note that the first term on the right-hand side depends only on the initial condition and can be controlled using [FG15]: this will determine the final rate of convergence since it is worst than the optimal rate $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$.

Remark 4.9. Note that despite its relative simplicity, the model (87) has its own interest. In [CDW13; Car+13] it is called the “choose the leader” model. In population dynamics, it is also a time-continuous version of the so-called Moran model [Daw93]. It describes the “neutral” evolution of a population of individuals where the death and reproduction events happen simultaneously. The kernel K plays the role of a mutation kernel. A different scaling which leads to a different limit is presented in Section 7.4.2.

4.3.3 The limit semi-group and the nonlinear measure-valued process

The previous approach is too coarse as it tries to compare directly the empirical law F_t^N to its limit δ_{f_t} . By looking only at the expectation of some fixed (though infinitely many) observables, we do not keep track of the detailed dynamics of the particle system. In this section we give some insights on an approach which is originally due to Grünbaum [Grü71] but which has been made rigorous in [MMW15; MM13]. Rather than looking only at the law F_t^N , the idea is to compare the empirical process and a “nonlinear” measure-valued process through their semi-groups and generators, thus effectively keeping track of the dynamics. Note that we could define an “obvious” nonlinear empirical process by taking the image by μ_N of N i.i.d. f_t -distributed processes. This would lead us to compare $\widetilde{F}_t^N = (\mu_N)_\# f_t^{\otimes N}$ to $F_t^N = (\mu_N)_\# f_t^N$ but this would not be simpler than comparing directly f_t^N to $f_t^{\otimes N}$. This could be handled by the coupling approach (Section 4.1). Instead, the approach of [MM13; MMW15] considers the nonlinear dynamics in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ from the PDE point of view. In the most abstract setting, the limiting nonlinear law f_t is the solution of

$$\partial_t f_t = Q(f_t), \quad (89)$$

where Q is a nonlinear operator. Assuming that this PDE is wellposed, this gives rise to a nonlinear time-continuous semi-group $(\overline{S}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ acting on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ such that the solution of (89) is given as:

$$f_t = \overline{S}_t(f_0),$$

where $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is the initial condition and

$$\overline{S}_{t+s} = \overline{S}_t \circ \overline{S}_s = \overline{S}_s \circ \overline{S}_t, \quad \partial_t \overline{S}_t = Q \circ \overline{S}_t.$$

From the stochastic point of view, the operator \overline{S}_t is the dual of the transition operator $T_t^{f_0}$ of a nonlinear Markov process in the sense of McKean (see Appendix D.5). The main observation is that the deterministic dynamics (89) can be seen as a stochastic process in $\mathcal{P}(E)$, for instance, it is possible to choose a random initial condition: although it is expected to be a given $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, it is also natural to take as initial condition the same as the one of the empirical process, that is a random empirical measure with N points sampled from f_0^N . Remember that f_0^N is assumed to be initially f_0 -chaotic. With this choice, the goal is to compare the empirical process $(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})_t$ and the nonlinear process $(\overline{S}_t(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_0^N}))_t$. The laws of these processes in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ at time $t > 0$ are respectively given by:

$$F_t^N = (\mu_N)_\# S_t^N(f_0^N), \quad \overline{F}_t^N := (\overline{S}_t \circ \mu_N)_\# f_0^N, \quad (90)$$

where S_t^N denotes the N -particle semigroup acting on $\mathcal{P}(E^N)$, so that $f_t^N = S_t^N(f_0^N)$. The semigroups $(S_t^N)_t$ and $(\overline{S}_t)_t$ describe the forward dynamics of the probability distributions. The dynamics of the observables is described by the dual operators acting on the space of test functions on $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. As explained at the beginning of this section, for the particle dynamics, everything is given in terms of $(T_{N,t})_t$ which is the semigroup acting on $C_b(E^N/\mathfrak{S}_N)$. For the nonlinear system, the following operator is defined in [MMW15; MM13]:

$$\forall \Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E)), \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \quad T_{\infty,t} \Phi(\nu) := \Phi(\overline{S}_t(\nu)), \quad (91)$$

so that

$$\int_{E^N} T_{\infty,t} \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) f_0^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) = \langle \overline{F}_t^N, \Phi \rangle = \int_{E^N} \Phi(\overline{S}_t(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N})) f_0^N(d\mathbf{x}^N).$$

Note that the dependence on N is only in the initial condition. On the other hand, it holds that:

$$\int_{E^N} \widehat{T}_{N,t} \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) f_0^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) = \langle F_t^N, \Phi \rangle,$$

so very loosely speaking, the goal is to prove the convergence of the semi-groups:

$$\widehat{T}_{N,t} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} T_{\infty,t}.$$

In a classical setting, the convergence of a sequence of semi-groups acting on a set of test functions over a Banach space is solved by Trotter [Tro58] by proving the convergence of the generators. The generator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N$ associated to $\widehat{T}_{N,t}$ is defined by (79), although its image is restricted to the subdomain $C_b(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E)) \subset C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. The generator of $(T_{\infty,t})_t$ is much more delicate to define because $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is only a metric space and not a Banach space. Its precise and rigorous definition is one of the main contributions of [MMW15; MM13]. We will give insights on this later, but for now let us assume that it is possible to define a generator \mathcal{L}_∞ on a sufficiently large subset of $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$ and such that for Φ in this subset,

$$\frac{d}{dt}T_{\infty,t}\Phi = \mathcal{L}_\infty[T_{\infty,t}\Phi] = T_{\infty,t}\mathcal{L}_\infty\Phi. \quad (92)$$

We now briefly explain how generator estimates will give an estimate on the discrepancy between F_t^N and \overline{F}_t^N . First, using Lemma 3.21, it is sufficient to look at the moment measures $F_t^{k,N}, \overline{F}_t^{k,N} \in \mathcal{P}(E^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$ be a test function and let

$$R_{\varphi_k}(\nu) \equiv \Phi_k(\nu) := \langle \nu^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle,$$

be the associated polynomial function. We recall that the operators $T_{N,t}$ and \mathcal{L}_N are directly linked to their empirical versions (78), (79) by μ_N and the linear transpose map:

$$\mu_N^T : C_b(\mathcal{P}(E)) \rightarrow C_b(E^N), \quad \Phi \mapsto \Phi \circ \mu_N.$$

By definition, it holds that:

$$\langle F_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle = \langle F_t^N, \Phi_k \rangle = \langle f_0^N, T_{N,t}[\Phi_k \circ \mu_N] \rangle = \langle f_0^N, T_{N,t}[\mu_N^T \Phi_k] \rangle,$$

and

$$\langle \overline{F}_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle = \langle \overline{F}_t^N, \Phi_k \rangle = \langle f_0^N, T_{\infty,t}\Phi \circ \mu_N \rangle = \langle f_0^N, \mu_N^T[T_{\infty,t}\Phi_k] \rangle.$$

The difference between these two quantities is controlled by using the formula for $0 \leq t \leq T$:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{N,t}\mu_N^T - \mu_N^T T_{\infty,t} &= - \int_0^t \frac{d}{ds} [T_{N,t-s}\mu_N^T T_{\infty,s}] ds \\ &= \int_0^t T_{N,t-s} [\mathcal{L}_N \mu_N^T - \mu_N^T \mathcal{L}_\infty] T_{\infty,s} ds, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle F_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle - \langle \overline{F}_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle \right| &\leq \int_0^t |\langle f_0^N, T_{N,t-s} [\mathcal{L}_N \mu_N^T - \mu_N^T \mathcal{L}_\infty] T_{\infty,s} \Phi_k \rangle| ds \\ &= \int_0^t |\langle f_{t-s}^N, [\mathcal{L}_N \mu_N^T - \mu_N^T \mathcal{L}_\infty] T_{\infty,s} \Phi_k \rangle| ds \\ &= \int_0^t |\langle f_{t-s}^N, \mathcal{L}_N [T_{\infty,s} \Phi_k \circ \mu_N] - \mathcal{L}_\infty [T_{\infty,s} \Phi_k] \circ \mu_N \rangle| ds \\ &\leq T \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left\| \left(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N [T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k] - \mathcal{L}_\infty [T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k] \right) \circ \mu_N \right\|_\infty. \quad (93) \end{aligned}$$

At this point, in order to obtain a convergence bound in N , a generator estimate is needed to compare the behaviour of the empirical generator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N$ to the one of \mathcal{L}_∞ against $T_{\infty,t}\Phi_k$ (the map μ_N is just an artefact to write this comparison in E^N).

Remark 4.10. The estimate (93) can be made more uniform in time as soon as the particle system preserves some quantity $m : E^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, in which case (93) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle F_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle - \langle \overline{F}_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle \right| &\leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N [T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k] - \mathcal{L}_\infty [T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k] \right) \circ \mu_N \right\|_\infty \int_0^T \langle f_{t-s}^N, m \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

In Section 4.3.5 we will review the abstract theorem of [MMW15] which shows how to recover propagation of chaos in the usual framework from an estimate on (93). Before doing that, we give more insights on the definition of the generator \mathcal{L}_∞ within the framework of [MMW15].

4.3.4 More on the limit generator

As an introductory example, let us consider a mean-field generator of the form (6) and a tensorized test function of order two:

$$\varphi_2 = \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2,$$

as well as the associated polynomial function on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ defined by $\Phi_2(\nu) = \langle \nu^{\otimes 2}, \varphi_2 \rangle$. We recall that it is not a restriction to consider tensorized test functions [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 4.6, pp.113-115]. Then, a direct computation which is detailed in Lemma B.1 (a similar computation is also used in the proof of Theorem 5.19) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N[\Phi_2 \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N) &= \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1 \rangle \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi^2 \rangle + \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi^1 \rangle \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2 \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where Γ is the carré du champ operator. In order to have

$$\|(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N[\Phi_2] - \mathcal{L}_\infty[\Phi_2]) \circ \mu_N\|_\infty \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

the operator \mathcal{L}_∞ should necessarily satisfy:

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi_2(\nu) = \langle \nu, L_\nu \varphi^1 \rangle \langle \nu, \varphi^2 \rangle + \langle \nu, \varphi^1 \rangle \langle \nu, L_\nu \varphi^2 \rangle.$$

This computation is generalised (see Lemma B.2) to any k -fold tensorized test function

$$\varphi_k = \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k,$$

and the operator \mathcal{L}_∞ is defined against monomial functions by:

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi_k(\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle Q(\nu), \varphi^i \rangle \prod_{j \neq i} \langle \nu, \varphi^j \rangle, \quad (94)$$

where $\Phi_k(\nu) = \langle \nu^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle$ and with a slight abuse of notation, we write

$$\langle Q(\nu), \varphi \rangle \equiv \langle \nu, L_\nu \varphi \rangle,$$

for the integral of a test function φ against $Q(\nu)$ (which is not a probability measure). The relation (94) can be extended to any polynomial by linearity. We would also get the same relation (with a different operator Q) for a Boltzmann operator (see Lemma B.3).

A natural idea would be to use the relation (94) as a *definition* of an operator acting on polynomials and then extend it to the completion of the space of polynomials, which is a large Banach subset of $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. However, this would not necessarily imply that the right-hand side of (93) goes to zero for any Φ (since for a given polynomial, the convergence implied by Lemma B.2 may not be uniform in the degree or number of monomials) and proving this convergence does not seem to be an easy task. We recall that the final goal is to apply \mathcal{L}_∞ to the test functions

$$T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k(\nu) = \langle \overline{S}_t(\nu)^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle, \quad (95)$$

which are not polynomial in general. In particular, the relation (94) needs to be extended to be able to write

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi_k(\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle Q(\bar{S}_t(\nu)), \varphi^i \rangle \prod_{j \neq i} \langle \bar{S}_t(\nu), \varphi^j \rangle,$$

in order to have (92).

Remark 4.11. The stochastic point of view gives more insight on the form of the nonlinearity in (95). Under the assumption that f_t is the law of a nonlinear Markov process in the sense of McKean (see Appendix D.5), one can write the dual form when $\varphi_k = \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k$:

$$T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k(\nu) = \prod_{i=1}^k \langle \nu, T_t^\nu \varphi^i \rangle, \quad (96)$$

where T_t^ν is the nonlinear transition operator of the process. Up to the dependency of T_t^ν on the measure argument ν , the test function $T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k$ is thus close to be a polynomial. When T_t^ν does not depend on ν , $f_t = \bar{S}(f_0)$ is the law of a classical time homogeneous Markov process and thus satisfies a linear equation. In this case, everything is much simpler because the operator $T_{\infty,t}$ acts on the space of polynomial and it is not necessary to extend \mathcal{L}_∞ to a larger subspace of $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. One could actually bypass the definition of the limit generator. Note also that the linear case is the framework of our toy example in Section 4.3.2. Unfortunately, in the nonlinear case, the dual backward form (96) does not really seem to be more helpful since T_t^ν has no reason to behave well with respect to its measure argument. We finally point out that all the argument in [MMW15; MM13] is more general as it is entirely based on (95) and does not use the fact that f_t is the law of a nonlinear Markov process in the sense of McKean (even though it is the underlying application case).

In his seminal article [Grü71], Grünbaum originally relies on a clever completion of the space of polynomial functions. He then identifies \mathcal{L}_∞ and proves the convergence of the generators on a class C' of “continuously differentiable functions” on $\mathcal{P}(E)$. In order to apply Trotter’s result on $T_{\infty,t}$, Grünbaum uses an unproven smoothness assumption on the nonlinear operator \bar{S}_t which ensures that (95) belongs to the class C' . This assumption has since been proved to be false for some models.

The generator \mathcal{L}_∞ is rigorously defined in [MMW15; MM13] using a new notion of differential calculus on the space $\mathcal{P}(E)$ that is very briefly sketched below. The fundamental idea is to consider a distance on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ inherited from a normed vector space \mathcal{G} . Let $m_{\mathcal{G}} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be given together with the weighted subspace of probability measures:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) := \{f \in \mathcal{P}(E), \langle f, m_{\mathcal{G}} \rangle < +\infty\}.$$

The weight function $m_{\mathcal{G}}$ may typically be a polynomial function (in which case $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the space of probability measures with a bounded moment) but may also depend on the normed vector space \mathcal{G} which is assumed to contain the space of increments:

$$\mathcal{IP}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) := \{f_1 - f_2, f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)\} \subset \mathcal{G}. \quad (97)$$

This naturally defines a distance on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ by:

$$\forall f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E), \quad d_{\mathcal{G}}(f_1, f_2) := \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Several examples and their relation with the distances defined in Section 3.1 are detailed in [MMW15, Section 3.2]. With this notion of distance, a test function $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be continuously differentiable at $f \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ when there exists a continuous linear application $d\Phi[f] : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that:

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E), \quad |\Phi(g) - \Phi(f) - \langle d\Phi[f], g - f \rangle_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}}| \leq C d_{\mathcal{G}}(f, g). \quad (98)$$

Note that the bracket in the inequality is the duality bracket between \mathcal{G}' and \mathcal{G} . The main difference with the usual notion of differentiability in a Banach space is that the space of increments (97) has no vectorial structure. More details on this notion of differential calculus is given in [MMW15, Section 3.3 and Section 3.4] with a special focus on polynomial functions. This definition can be extended to higher order differentiability and to functions with values in $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}}(E)$ instead of \mathbb{R} (which is the case of the operator \overline{S}_t).

The definition of \mathcal{L}_∞ then directly comes from the differentiation of the definition of the pullback semigroup (91): let Φ be a continuously differentiable function on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$, then for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$, by the composition rule (see [MMW15, Lemma 3.12]), it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi(\nu) &= \left. \frac{d}{dt} T_{\infty,t} \Phi(\nu) \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \Phi(\overline{S}_t(\nu)) \right|_{t=0} = \left\langle d\Phi[\nu], \left. \frac{d}{dt} \overline{S}_t(\nu) \right|_{t=0} \right\rangle \\ &= \langle d\Phi[\nu], Q(\nu) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

This computation is almost rigorous up to the assumption that $Q(\nu) \in \mathcal{G}$. The precise assumptions on $(\overline{S}_t)_t$ which make this computation fully rigorous are given by [MMW15, Assumption (A2)] and will be summarised in the next section.

Example 4.12 (Generators estimate for jump processes). Quite formal computations may also motivate the introduction of a proper notion of differential calculus on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and lead to generators estimates. Taking the example of jump processes, we have seen that:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_E \lambda(x^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \left[\Phi \left(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} - \frac{1}{N} \delta_{x^i} + \frac{1}{N} \delta_y \right) - \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \right] P_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}(x^i, dy).$$

The term in the integral is precisely of the form (98) with an increment of size $1/N$. Assuming that it is possible to differentiate Φ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_E \lambda(x^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \left[\left\langle d\Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}), -\frac{1}{N} \delta_{x^i} + \frac{1}{N} \delta_y \right\rangle + o\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right] P_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}(x^i, dy) \\ &= \langle d\Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}), Q(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \rangle + o(1) = \mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where Q is given in the weak form by the left-hand side of (19) (with $a = 0$).

4.3.5 The abstract theorem

The main theorem [MMW15, Theorem 2.1] is based on the following set of assumptions. The first one is the only one which concerns the particle system (it is always implicitly assumed). The second and third ones are motivated by the previous sections. The fourth and fifth ones are stated more informally, more details on their role will be given in the sketch of the proof of the main theorem.

Assumption 4.13. *The following assumptions are respectively numbered (A1) to (A5) in [MMW15].*

- (1) **(On the particle system).** *The N -particle semigroup $(T_{N,t})_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup on $C_b(E^N)$ with generator \mathcal{L}_N .*
- (2) **(Existence of the pull-back semigroup).** *There exists a Banach space \mathcal{G} such that the nonlinear semigroup $(\overline{S}_t)_t$ on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ is Lipschitz for the distance $d_{\mathcal{G}}$ uniformly in time. The operator $Q : \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is bounded and δ -Hölder for a $\delta \in (0, 1]$. This implies the existence of the limit generator \mathcal{L}_∞ defined by (99) (see [MMW15, Lemma 4.1]).*

- (3) (**Generators estimate**). There exists a sequence $\varepsilon(N)$ such that $\varepsilon(N) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and such that for sufficiently regular test functions Φ on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$,

$$\|(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N \Phi - \mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi) \circ \mu_N\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon(N) \|\Phi\|_{C^{k,1}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E))}, \quad (100)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{C^{k,1}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(E))}$ is a norm related to the notion of higher order differentiability.

- (4) (**Differential stability of the nonlinear semigroup**). The nonlinear semi-group $(\overline{S}_t)_t$ is differentiable (for the generalised version of the notion of differentiability mentioned above) and its derivatives are uniformly controlled in time.
- (5) (**Weak stability of the nonlinear semigroup**). For a Banach space $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ possibly different from \mathcal{G} , the nonlinear semi-group is Lipschitz for the distance $d_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}$. More generally this can be replaced by the existence of a concave modulus of continuity $\Theta_T : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $f_0, g_0 \in \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}(E)$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} d_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}(\overline{S}_t(f_0), \overline{S}_t(g_0)) \leq \Theta_T(d_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}(f_0, g_0)).$$

The following abstract theorem is stated and proved in [MMW15, Theorem 2.1].

Theorem 4.14 (The abstract theorem in [MMW15]). *Let Assumption 4.13 hold true. Let $T > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \geq 2k$. Then there exist a continuously embedded subset $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(E)$ and some absolute constants $C, C(T) > 0$ such that for any tensorized test function*

$$\varphi_k = \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k \in \mathcal{F}^{\otimes k},$$

it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\langle f_t^{k,N} - f_t^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle| &\leq C \frac{k^2 \|\varphi_k\|_\infty}{N} + k^2 C(T) \|\varphi_k\|_{\mathcal{F}_1} \varepsilon(N) \\ &\quad + k \|\varphi_k\|_{\mathcal{F}_2} \Theta_T \left(\mathcal{W}_{d_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}}(\overline{F}_0^N, \delta_{f_0}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where $\varepsilon(N)$ is defined in Assumption 4.13(3), $\mathcal{W}_{d_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}}$ is a Wassertein distance on the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ related to $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ given by Assumption 4.13(5) and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_2}$ are some norms on $C_b(E^k)$ which are defined in the complete version of Assumption 4.13 (see [MMW15, Section 4]).

Proof (main ideas). The proof in [MMW15] relies on three main steps:

- Approximate $f_t^{k,N}$ by $F_t^{k,N}$ thanks to Lemma 3.21.
- Approximate $f_t^{\otimes k} = \overline{S}_t^{\otimes k}(f_0)$ by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}_0^N} \overline{S}_t^{\otimes k}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_0^N}^N) = \overline{F}_t^{k,N}$. Since initial chaos $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_0^N}^N \rightarrow f_0$ is assumed, this should stem from the regularity on the limit equation.
- Compare the time evolution of $F_t^{k,N}$ to the one of $\overline{F}_t^{k,N}$, which motivates the content of Section 4.3.3 and Section 4.3.4.

We recall that $F_t^{k,N}$ and $\overline{F}_t^{k,N}$ are the moment measures (Definition 3.26) associated to the laws F_t^N and \overline{F}_t^N defined by (90). Each of the three terms on the right-hand side of (101) thus comes from the splitting:

$$\langle f_t^{k,N} - f_t^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle = \langle f_t^{k,N} - F_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle + \langle F_t^{k,N} - \overline{F}_t^{k,N}, \varphi_k \rangle + \langle \overline{F}_t^{k,N} - f_t^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle. \quad (102)$$

The first term on the right-hand side is handled with rate $\mathcal{O}(k^2 N^{-1})$ by the approximation Lemma 3.21, using purely combinatorial arguments. The second term is technically the most difficult one. Assumption 4.13(2) gives a precise meaning of the relation (93) formally derived earlier. The role of Assumption 4.13(3) is thus self-explanatory and Assumption 4.13(4) ensures that $\Phi = T_{\infty,t} \Phi_k$ has enough regularity to be taken as a test function in (100). The third term contains two approximations: the first one is how well the initial data is approximated by a (random) empirical measure and then how well this error is propagated in time, which is Assumption 4.13(5). \square

Applications of the abstract Theorem 4.14 to classical models can be found in [MMW15]. The assumptions are rigorously justified for Maxwell molecules with cut-off (see Section 2.3.3), the classical McKean-Vlasov diffusion (with a non-optimal convergence rate) and a mixed jump-diffusion model. The main advantage of this abstract method is its wide range of applicability, although each model requires a careful and dedicated verification of the five assumptions. The choice of the different spaces \mathcal{G} indeed strongly depends on the structure of the model. In the companion paper [MM13], the abstract method is developed in a more general framework: the five assumptions are modified to include conservation relations in order to treat the case of Boltzmann models with unbounded collision rates, possibly uniformly in time. The results will be summarised in Section 6.5.

Remark 4.15 (BBGKY hierarchy, statistical solution and limit generator). We previously made the remark that taking the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in the BBGKY hierarchy (49) or (50) leads to an infinite hierarchy of equations called the Boltzmann hierarchy (Remark 3.37). By the Hewitt-Savage theorem, at every time $t > 0$, the Boltzmann hierarchy is associated to a unique $\pi_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ which is sometimes called a *statistical solution* of the limit problem. In [MM13, section 8], the authors show that for cutoff Boltzmann models, given an initial $\pi_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$, the statistical solution π_t is the unique solution to the evolution equation

$$\partial_t \pi = \mathcal{L}^\infty \pi_t,$$

where \mathcal{L}^∞ is the formal adjoint of the limit generator \mathcal{L}_∞ on $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. It means that π_t satisfies the weak equation

$$\forall \Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E)), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle \pi_t, \Phi \rangle = \langle \pi_t, \mathcal{L}_\infty \Phi \rangle.$$

When $\pi_0 = \delta_{f_0}$, there exists a unique statistical solution which is *chaotic* in the sense that this solution is equal to δ_{f_t} where f_t solves the nonlinear PDE. As already explained many times, this fact is equivalent to the propagation of chaos. Moreover it is proven in [MM13, section 8] that the operators which generate (in a sense which is made rigorous) the BBGKY-hierarchy converge towards the generators of the processes related to moment measures of π_t . However it should be noted that in general there exists many other statistical solutions. The notion of statistical solution is an important notion in fluid mechanics, where it originates.

4.4 Large Deviation Related Methods

Various approaches related to large deviations theory are investigated here. It is possible to motivate them by looking back at Remark 3.36, which suggests that chaos can be seen as a kind of weak law of large numbers, as it implies the weak convergence:

$$\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}^N} [\varphi(X^{1,N})] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

When a strong law of large numbers holds, it is natural to look at the fluctuations of $\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle$ by establishing some weak central limit theorem. Nonetheless one can look at this issue the other way round, trying to deduce some weak law of large numbers from a fluctuation result. Indeed, the usual central limit theorem implies a weak version of the law of large numbers, although the latter is classically proven using quite different tools. Note however that if one is only interested in the law of large numbers, a large deviation result may be quite overworked. Moreover, quantitative results which usually out of the scope of large deviations theory which focuses on asymptotic results. Nonetheless, as we shall see, large deviation theory provides new tools and useful insights on propagation of chaos. In Section 4.4.1 we give a mostly historical description of large deviation results which imply as a byproduct a weak form propagation of chaos in some specific cases. These results are related to Laplace's theory of fluctuations, which has been widely used in statistical physics to study out of equilibrium systems. The relative entropy functional (Definition 3.16) plays a crucial role

in this analysis: in Section 4.4.2, we gather classical results which link propagation of chaos and entropy bounds. Section 4.4.3 is devoted to the study of (quantitative) concentration inequalities which will be useful in the following sections to strengthen propagation of chaos results. We will later give a brief overview of “pure” large deviation results which go beyond propagation of chaos in Section 7.4.1. Some classical material on large deviation theory can be found in Appendix D.6.

4.4.1 Chaos through Large Deviation Principles

In the seminal article [BB90], the authors improve results from [KT84] and [Bol86] on Large Deviation Principles (LDP) for Gibbs measure and obtain as a byproduct a pathwise propagation of chaos result for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion. Firstly, [BB90, Theorem A] below states a large deviation principle for Gibbs measures with a polynomial potential.

Theorem 4.16 (Polynomial Potential). *Let \mathcal{E} be a Polish measurable space. Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$. Let us consider a random vector \mathcal{X}^N in \mathcal{E}^N , distributed according to the Gibbs measure:*

$$\mu^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) = \frac{1}{Z_N} \exp[NG(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N})] \mu_0^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N), \quad (103)$$

where Z_N is a normalization constant and G is a polynomial function on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ (called the energy functional) of the form:

$$G(\mu) = \sum_{k=2}^r \langle \mu^{\otimes k}, V_k \rangle,$$

for some symmetric continuous bounded functions V_k on \mathcal{E}^k . Then the laws of $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ satisfy a large deviation principle in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ with speed N^{-1} and rate function $\mu \mapsto H(\mu|\mu_0) - G(\mu) - \inf_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})} (H(\cdot|\mu_0) - G)$.

Denote by m_0 the infimum of $H(\cdot|\mu_0) - G$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ and \mathcal{P}^{m_0} the set of probability measures which achieve it. The study of \mathcal{P}^{m_0} is related to the study of the quadratic form Θ_ν on $L_0^2(\mathcal{E}, d\nu)$ (the space of centered square ν -integrable functions on E) defined for any ν in \mathcal{P}^{m_0} by:

$$\forall f, g \in L_0^2(\mathcal{E}, d\nu), \quad \langle \Theta_\nu f, g \rangle := \sum_{k=2}^r k(k-1) \langle \nu^k, f \otimes g \otimes 1^{k-2} V_k \rangle.$$

The following [BB90, Theorem B] quantifies the fluctuations of $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ in the *non-degenerate case*. Analogous results for the degenerate case are given in [BB90, Theorem C].

Theorem 4.17 (Chaos and Fluctuations). *Assume that \mathcal{P}^{m_0} is non degenerate in the sense that for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}^{m_0}$,*

$$\text{Ker}(\text{Id} - \Theta_\nu) = \{0\}.$$

In this case, let us consider the quantities:

$$d(\nu) := [\det(\text{Id} - \Theta_\nu)]^{-1/2}, \quad \bar{d}(\nu) := \frac{d(\nu)}{\sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{P}^{m_0}} d(\nu')}.$$

Then the following properties hold.

1. *The set \mathcal{P}^{m_0} is finite.*
2. $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} e^{Nm_0} Z_N = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}^{m_0}} d(\nu)$.
3. *For any integer $k \geq 1$ and any φ in $C_b(\mathcal{E}^k)$,*

$$\langle \mu^N, \varphi \otimes 1^{\otimes N-k} \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}^{m_0}} \bar{d}(\nu) \langle \nu^{\otimes k}, \varphi \rangle.$$

4. The random measures $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ satisfy local and global Central Limit Theorems.

When \mathcal{P}^{m_0} reduces to a single non-degenerate minimizer f , then the third assertion exactly tells that the sequence $(\mu^N)_N$ is f -chaotic.

Going back to an interacting particle system, let $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ be an initial law and $f_{[0,T]}^N \in \mathcal{P}(C([0,T], E^N)) \simeq \mathcal{P}(C([0,T], E)^N)$ be the pathwise law of the particle system with initial law f_0^N . In the same way, let $f_{[0,T]} \in \mathcal{P}(C([0,T], E))$ be the law of the targeted limit nonlinear process with initial law $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Following [BB90] and [BZ99], pathwise chaos on $[0, T]$ can be recovered from the above theorem, essentially by taking $\mathcal{E} = C([0, T], E)$.

Corollary 4.18 (Pathwise chaos from LDP). *Assume that the following properties hold.*

1. f_0^N is a Gibbs measure of the form (103) with respect to $f_0^{\otimes N}$ for a polynomial energy functional $G \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$.
2. The functional $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E) \mapsto H(\mu|f_0) - G(\mu)$ admits a unique minimizer μ_* which is non-degenerate.
3. $f_{[0,T]}^N$ is a Gibbs measure of the form (103) with respect to $f_{[0,T]}^{\otimes N}$ for a polynomial energy functional $\mathcal{G} \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(C([0,T], E)))$.
4. The functional $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(C([0,T], E)) \mapsto H(\nu|f_{[0,T]}) - \mathcal{G}(\nu)$ has a unique minimizer $f_{[0,T]}^*$ which is non-degenerate. Moreover, $f_{[0,T]}^*$ is the pathwise law of the nonlinear process with initial condition μ_* .

Then the sequence $(f_{[0,T]}^N)_N$ is $f_{[0,T]}^*$ -chaotic.

The two first two assumptions are related to the initial data. The *propagated* property is more the LDP than the chaoticity since the initial measure is assumed to be Gibbsian and no more chaotic as usual. To recover the usual setting, the first assumption has to be replaced by the f_0 -chaoticity of f_0^N , that is to say $G = 0$. The unique minimizer of $H(\cdot|\mu_0)$ is thus in this case $\mu_* = f_0$ and $f_{[0,T]}^* = f_{[0,T]}$ is the desired law for the limit nonlinear process. The third assumption tells that the Gibbs form of the density is also valid at the pathwise level. For a McKean-Vlasov diffusion with regular coefficients (typically Lipschitz [DH96],[Mal01]), the Gibbs density $\frac{d f_{[0,T]}^N}{d f_{[0,T]}^{\otimes N}}$ can typically be computed using Girsanov's formula (see Appendix D.7). Thus the remaining difficulty often lies in the fourth point.

Example 4.19 (Application to several models). Checking that the above assumptions hold can be very technical. To give a flavour of the possible applications, we mention here a few examples.

- (*McKean-Vlasov system with regular gradient forces and constant diffusion*). The assumptions are exhaustively checked in the original paper [BB90], leading to the desired pathwise chaos on finite time intervals.
- (*McKean-Vlasov system with only continuous drift and Hölder position dependent diffusion*). Pathwise chaos is proved in the seminal work [DG87] by establishing a LDP principle and by showing that the limit law is the only minimizer of the related rate function. The method is close to the one which is described above, but it is driven in some abstract dual spaces in order to weaken the regularity conditions: the diffusion can depend on the position with Hölder-regularity (but does not depend on its law), but no such regularity is needed for the non-linear drift.
- (*Hamiltonian systems with random medium interactions*). Pathwise chaos is proved in [DH96] by extending the above method. The main difficulty in this system comes from the control of the random jumps and from the random medium.
- (*Curie-Weiss and Kuramoto models*). Once again, it is an application of the above method. The Curie-Weiss model is obtained as a corollary in [DG87] and [DH96], while the Kuramoto model is the last part of [DH96]. The method is applied to analogous jump processes with random interactions in [Léo95b]. See also Section 7.2.1.

4.4.2 Chaos from entropy bounds

The results stated in the previous Section 4.4.1 strongly suggest that the relative entropy (between the N -particle distribution and the tensorised limit law) is an important quantity to look at. In fact, Pinsker inequality (48) implies that

$$\|f_t^N - f_t^{\otimes N}\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq 2H(f^N|f^{\otimes N}),$$

so if the right-hand side goes to zero as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, it implies propagation of chaos in Total Variation norm. But as it can be expected, it is very demanding to prove that the relative entropy vanishes. The following lemma shows that a simple bound may be sufficient for a slightly weaker result.

Lemma 4.20 (Dimensional bounds on entropy, [Csi84]). *Let \mathcal{E} be a measurable space. For every symmetric probability measure f^N on \mathcal{E}^N , and every nonnegative integer $k(N) \leq N$, it holds that*

$$H(f^{k(N),N}|f^{\otimes k(N)}) \leq \frac{k(N)}{N}H(f^N|f^{\otimes N}). \quad (104)$$

A bound on $H(f^N|f^{\otimes N})$ thus implies propagation of chaos in Total Variation norm for blocks of size $k(N) = o(N)$. This technique is by now classical and various applications will be presented in the following sections.

Remark 4.21. Note that a bound on $H(f^N|f^{\otimes N})$ implies that the normalised entropy goes to zero as $N \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$\tilde{H}(f^N|f^{\otimes N}) := \frac{1}{N}H(f^N|f^{\otimes N}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

A first historical example of entropy bound for Gibbs measures (with a continuous bounded but non necessarily polynomial potential) can be found in the article [BZ99] subsequent to [BB90].

Theorem 4.22 (Entropy bound for Gibbs measures, [BZ99]). *Let μ^N be a non degenerate Gibbs measure of the form (103). Then, with the same notations as in Theorem 4.17, the measure $\mu_\star^N = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}^{m_0}} \bar{d}(\nu)\nu^{\otimes N}$ satisfies the entropy bound*

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow +\infty} H(\mu^N|\mu_\star^N) < +\infty.$$

Note that this result strengthens [BZ99, Theorem B] (Theorem 4.17). As before, this readily implies pathwise propagation of chaos.

Corollary 4.23 (Pathwise McKean-Vlasov, C_b^2 potentials [BZ99]). *Under the non degeneracy assumption [BZ99, Assumption (A1)], the pathwise entropy bound on $[0, T]$ holds for McKean-Vlasov gradient systems with C_b^2 coefficients.*

Theorem 4.22 is very strong and quite general. It is mainly intended for true Gibbs measures and in our case, it may look too powerful (besides, the hypothesis may not be easily checked). In the literature, there are more direct approaches to bound the entropy.

The two following lemmas are valid respectively in the pathwise and the pointwise cases for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion. Under very weak assumptions on the drift, Girsanov theorem (Appendix D.7) provides an explicit expression of the relative entropy as an observable of the particle system. The classical application is a strengthening result: if this observable can be controlled by a weak form of propagation of chaos, then the entropy bound strengthens the weak propagation of chaos result into strong (pathwise) propagation of chaos in TV norm, see for instance Corollary 5.3.

Lemma 4.24 (Pathwise entropy bound). *Let $T > 0$ and $I = [0, T]$. Assume that the nonlinear martingale problem associated to the McKean-Vlasov diffusion (Definition 2.6 and (10)) with*

$$b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma = I_d,$$

is wellposed and let $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$ be its solution. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_I^N \in \mathcal{P}(C([0, T], (\mathbb{R}^d)^N))$ be the law of the associated particle system $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$. Then, for any $k \leq N$ it holds that

$$H(f_I^{k,N} | f_I^{\otimes k}) \leq \frac{k}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |b(X_t^1, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^1, f_t)|^2 dt \right]. \quad (105)$$

This lemma is a mere application of Girsanov's theorem; for simplicity, the result is stated in the case of a constant diffusion matrix but it is also valid in the case of a diffusion matrix which depends on the positional argument but not on the measure argument (see Remark 4.25).

Proof. Since the nonlinear martingale is wellposed, it is well-known (see [KS98, Chapter 5, Proposition 4.6] or [EK86, Chapter 5, Proposition 3.1]) that we can construct a filtration and N independent adapted f_I -Brownian motions $(\overline{B}_t^i)_t$ on the path space such that

$$d\mathbf{X}_t^i = b(\mathbf{X}_t^i, f_t)dt + d\overline{B}_t^i, \quad (106)$$

where we recall that $\mathbf{X}_t^N = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^N)$ is the canonical process on $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{dN}) \simeq C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)^N$. In other words, the canonical process is a weak solution of the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov SDE on the path space $(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d), \mathcal{F}, f_I)$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ let us define the processes:

$$\Delta_t^i = b(\mathbf{X}_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_t^N}) - b(\mathbf{X}_t^i, f_t).$$

and

$$H_t^N := \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\int_0^t \Delta_s^i \cdot d\overline{B}_s^i - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |\Delta_s^i|^2 ds \right].$$

It is classical to check that $\exp(H^N)$ defines a f_I -martingale (see [KS98, Chapter 3, Corollary 5.16]). Then by Girsanov theorem (see Appendix D.7) on the product space $(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)^N, \mathcal{F}^{\otimes N}, f_I^{\otimes N})$, it is possible to define a probability measure f_I^N on $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)^N$ such that for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the processes

$$B_t^i := \overline{B}_t^i - \int_0^t X_s^i ds \quad (107)$$

are N independent f_I^N -Brownian motions. Reporting (107) into (106) we see that

$$d\mathbf{X}_t^i = b(\mathbf{X}_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_t^N})dt + dB_t^i.$$

In other words, $(\mathbf{X}_t^N)_t$ is a weak solution of the McKean-Vlasov particle system on the path space $(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)^N, \mathcal{F}, f_I^N)$ and, as the notation implies, f_I^N is the N -particle distribution. Moreover, the Girsanov theorem gives a formula for the Radon-Nikodym derivative:

$$\frac{df_I^N}{df_I^{\otimes N}} = \exp(H_T^N) = \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\int_0^T \Delta_s^i \cdot d\overline{B}_s^i - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\Delta_s^i|^2 ds \right] \right).$$

As an immediate consequence, it is possible to compute the relative entropy as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
H(f_I^N | f_I^{\otimes N}) &:= \mathbb{E}_{f_I^N} \left[\log \frac{df_I^N}{df_I^{\otimes N}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{f_I^N} [H_T^N] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{f_I^N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\int_0^t \Delta_t^i \cdot d\bar{B}_t^i - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |\Delta_t^i|^2 dt \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{f_I^N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\int_0^T \Delta_t^i \cdot dB_t^i + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\Delta_t^i|^2 dt \right] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{f_I^N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^T |\Delta_t^i|^2 dt \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which, by exchangeability, eventually gives:

$$H(f_I^N | f_I^{\otimes N}) = \frac{N}{2} \mathbb{E}_{f_I^N} \left[\int_0^T |b(X_t^1, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t^N}) - b(X_t^1, f_t)|^2 dt \right].$$

Coming back to our usual notations on the abstract probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ on which a particle system $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t \sim f_I^N$ is defined, it simply means that

$$H(f_I^N | f_I^{\otimes N}) = \frac{N}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |b(X_t^1, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^1, f_t)|^2 dt \right].$$

The conclusion follows from Lemma 4.20. \square

Remark 4.25. The inequality (105) is actually an equality (see the proof of [Lac18, Theorem 2.6(3)]). This relatively direct computation can be seen as a very special case of [Léo11, Theorem 2.4]. The result readily extends to the case of time-dependent parameters b, σ and to the case of a non constant diffusion matrix $\sigma \equiv \sigma(t, x)$ which does not depend on the measure argument and which is assumed to be invertible everywhere. The only difference in (105) is that b should be replaced by $\sigma^{-1}b$. An even more general setting is the one given in [Lac18] where

$$b : [0, T] \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma : [0, T] \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R}),$$

are assumed to be jointly measurable. This does not affect the final result (105) nor the argument.

Remark 4.26. It is worth noticing that this approach does not seem to be restricted to diffusion processes. On the one hand, the full Girsanov theory can be applied to jump processes as well (see [Léo11] and the references therein) and it is actually a very powerful and general result in the theory of stochastic integration [Le 16, Section 5.5]. On the other hand, any model presented in this review can be written as the solution of a very general martingale problem. To the best of our knowledge, an analogous generalised result does not seem to exist in the literature yet. For the Nanbu system, it may be contained in [Léo86, Theorem 2.11].

In a pointwise setting, the time derivative of the relative entropy can be directly computed using the generator of the particle system.

Lemma 4.27 (General bound on the time-derivative entropy). *Let $f_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the solution of (12) at time t with*

$$b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma = I_d,$$

and let $f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$ be the law of the associated particle system. Then for every $\alpha > 0$ it holds that

$$\frac{d}{dt} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} I(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) + \frac{N}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[|b(X_t^1, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^1, f_t)|^2 \right]. \quad (108)$$

The following proof is mostly formal as we assume that the limit f_t and $\log f_t$ are regular enough to be taken as test functions. The computations can be fully justified in the cases where the lemma will be applied.

Proof. Let us recall that the generator of the N -particle system is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i \varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N),$$

where, given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$,

$$L_\mu \varphi(x) := \langle b(x, \mu), \nabla \varphi \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \varphi.$$

The Kolmogorov equation for the N -particle system reads:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^N, \varphi_N \rangle = \langle f_t^N, \mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N \rangle.$$

The Kolmogorov equation associated to a system of N independent f_t -distributed particles reads:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \varphi_N \rangle = \langle f_t^{\otimes N}, L_{f_t}^{\otimes N} \varphi_N \rangle,$$

where we define the generator

$$L_{f_t}^{\otimes N} \varphi_N := \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_t} \diamond_i \varphi_N.$$

The relative entropy is defined by:

$$H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}_t^N \sim f_t^N} \left[\log \frac{df_t^N}{df_t^{\otimes N}}(\mathcal{X}_t^N) \right] \equiv \left\langle f_t^N, \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle.$$

In the last term, $\frac{df_t^N}{df_t^{\otimes N}}$ has been replaced by $\frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}}$, which makes sense since f_t^N and f_t are probability density functions. Using the product derivation rule:

$$\frac{d}{dt} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) = \left\langle f_t^N, \mathcal{L}_N \left(\log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right) \right\rangle + \left\langle f_t^N, \frac{d}{dt} \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle$$

The last term can be written

$$\left\langle f_t^N, \frac{d}{dt} \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle = \left\langle f_t^N, \frac{f_t^{\otimes N}}{f_t^N} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle = \left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \frac{d}{dt} \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle.$$

The mass conservation for f_t^N gives

$$\left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle = \langle f_t^N, 1 \rangle = 1,$$

and therefore

$$\left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \frac{d}{dt} \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle = - \left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, L_{f_t}^{\otimes N} \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right\rangle.$$

Using the definition of the generator, we get:

$$L_{f_t}^{\otimes N} \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}}(\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle b(x^i, f_t), \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}}(\mathbf{x}^N) \nabla_{x^i} \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}}(\mathbf{x}^N) \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \left(\frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right).$$

And thus it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) &= \mathbb{E}_{f_t^N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, f_t), \nabla_{x^i} \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}}(\mathcal{X}_t^N) \right\rangle \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle f_t^N, \Delta \left(\log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right) \right\rangle - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \Delta \left(\frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right) \right\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{f_t^N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, f_t), \nabla_{x^i} \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}}(\mathcal{X}_t^N) \right\rangle \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \left| \nabla \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right|^2 \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

and the last term involves

$$\left\langle f_t^{\otimes N}, \left| \nabla \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right|^2 \right\rangle = \left\langle f_t^N, \left| \nabla \log \frac{f_t^N}{f_t^{\otimes N}} \right|^2 \right\rangle =: I(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}).$$

Therefore Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Young inequality give for any $\alpha > 0$

$$\frac{d}{dt} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} I(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[|b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, f_t)|^2 \right].$$

The conclusion follows since particles are exchangeable. \square

Remark 4.28. Several points should be noticed :

- It is possible to take $\alpha = 1$ in order to get rid of the Fisher information as in [GM20], but a further control on $W_2(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, f_t)$ is then needed, see [GM20].
- Before the splitting which introduces α , Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality would have led to a bound close to the *HWI* inequality in our special case.

To end this section, we would like to emphasize the fact that these results do not require any particular regularity on the drift (this is a well-known but remarkable property of Girsanov's transform). As a general rule, entropy related methods are well suited to handle cases with singular interactions. An example with exceptionally weak regularity assumptions will be given in Section 5.4. Another example with a complex abstract interaction mechanism will be presented in Section 5.6.2.

4.4.3 Tools for concentration inequalities

Large Deviation principles imply propagation of chaos, but they do not always give a way to quantify it since their result is often purely asymptotic (for instance, Sanov theorem is non-quantitative). In this section, we gather some results which quantify the deviation of an empirical measure of N samples around its mean. These results are valid for any fixed (sufficiently large) N . We first state a classical concentration inequality, obtained as the consequence of a Log-Sobolev inequality. This inequality and other related functional inequalities are deep structural properties of the system which will also be used to study ergodic properties and long-time propagation of chaos (Section 5.1.3). Then we state quantitative versions of Sanov theorem which strengthen the above concentration inequality.

The following Log-Sobolev inequality is another kind of entropy bound.

Definition 4.29 (Log-Sovolev Inequality). For $\lambda > 0$, a probability measure μ with finite second moment satisfies a Logarithmic-Sobolev Inequality $LSI(\lambda)$ when for all ν in $\mathcal{P}(E)$

$$H(\nu|\mu) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} I(\nu|\mu),$$

where I is the Fisher information (Definition 3.16).

An important consequence is the following lemma.

Lemma 4.30 (Concentration, see Ledoux [Led99]). *If a probability measure μ satisfies a $LSI(\lambda)$ then for any Lipschitz test function φ with Lipschitz constant bounded by 1 and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{X \sim \mu}(|\varphi(X) - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)]| \geq \varepsilon) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\lambda\varepsilon^2}{2}}. \quad (110)$$

This lemma is typically applied in E^N for $\mathcal{X}_t^N \sim f_t^N$ with the function

$$\bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_t^N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(X_t^i),$$

where φ is 1-Lipschitz on E . The Lipschitz norm of the function $\bar{\varphi}$ is bounded by $1/\sqrt{N}$.

A classical result [OV00, Theorem 1] shows that under mild assumptions, the Log-Sobolev inequality also implies the following Talagrand inequality.

Definition 4.31 (Talagrand Inequalities). For any real $p \geq 1$ and $\lambda > 0$, a probability measure μ with finite p -th moment satisfies a Talagrand inequality $T_p(\lambda)$ when for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$,

$$W_p(\nu, \mu) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2H(\nu|\mu)}{\lambda}}. \quad (111)$$

This inequality is all the more strong as λ and p are big (it is a consequence of Jensen's inequality). It is known that T_2 implies some Poincaré inequality and a handful characterization is available for T_1 inequalities, see [BV05]. Talagrand inequalities are also useful to quantify ergodicity with respect to the Wassertein distance. Here is another characterization.

Lemma 4.32 (Square-exponential moment). *A probability measure μ with finite expectation satisfies a T_1 inequality if and only if there exist $\alpha > 0$ and $x \in E$ such that $\int_E e^{\alpha|x-y|^2} \mu(dy) < +\infty$.*

Note that Talagrand inequalities allow to recover usual Wassertein convergence (and then convergence in law) from entropic convergence. Concentration inequalities can also stem from Talagrand inequalities, although the stronger Logarithmic Sobolev inequality is more often used in this context. The Logarithmic Sobolev inequality can be established thanks to the following criterion.

Proposition 4.33 (Bakry, Emery [BÉ85; Bak94]). *Consider a diffusion process with semi-group $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$, generator \mathcal{L} and carré du champ operator $\Gamma : (\varphi, \psi) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{L}(\varphi\psi) - \varphi\mathcal{L}(\psi) - \psi\mathcal{L}(\varphi)]$. Assume that there exists a real λ such that for every regular function φ*

$$\Gamma_2(\varphi) \geq \lambda\Gamma(\varphi)$$

where $\Gamma_2(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{L}(\Gamma(\varphi)) - 2\Gamma(\varphi\mathcal{L}(\varphi))]$. Then the following properties hold.

- For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $t > 0$, if $P_0 = \delta_x$, then P_t satisfies $LSI\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-e^{-\lambda t}}\right)$ (where the semi-group P_t is identified with the transition probability measure that it generates).

- If $\lambda > 0$, the semi-group is ergodic and P_t converges towards the invariant measure μ with rate

$$H(P_t|\mu) \leq Ce^{-2\lambda t}.$$

In the previous concentration result (110), the test function is fixed before computing the probability. One could take the supremum over all 1-Lipschitz test functions, this would correspond to a weak chaos for the D_1 distance. To get stronger estimates on the Wasserstein distance between $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ and f_t , the supremum needs to come inside the probability. This is not an easy task, it requires a quantitative version of Sanov theorem, which is proved in [BGV06, Theorem 2.1].

Theorem 4.34 (Pointwise Quantitative Sanov [BGV06]). *Consider a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d which satisfies $T_p(\lambda)$ for $p \in [1, 2]$ and $\lambda > 0$ and which has a bounded square-exponential moment. Let $\mathcal{X}^N \sim \mu^{\otimes N}$ be a system of N i.i.d μ -distributed random variables. Then for any $\lambda' < \lambda$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant N_ε (which depends also on d and the square-exponential moment of μ) such that for all $N \geq N_\varepsilon$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(W_p(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \mu) > \varepsilon) \leq e^{-\gamma_p \frac{\lambda'}{2} N \varepsilon^2},$$

where $\gamma_p > 0$ is an explicit constant which depends only on p .

The following pathwise generalization is proved in [Bol10, Theorem 1].

Theorem 4.35 (Pathwise Quantitative Sanov and Pathwise chaos [Bol10]). *Under the same assumptions, the above theorem holds for a measure μ on the Hölder space $C^{0,\alpha}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$.*

Except the last one, the results in this section are stated in a static framework. Examples of time dependent systems and applications to propagation of chaos are detailed in Section 5.5.

4.5 Tools for Boltzmann interactions

4.5.1 Series expansions

Let us consider first the homogeneous Boltzmann system with $L^{(1)} = 0$. When the collision rate λ satisfies the uniform bound (31), then it can be directly checked that the operator \mathcal{L}_N is continuous for the L^∞ norm:

$$\forall \varphi_N \in C_b(E^N), \quad \|\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N\|_\infty \leq \Lambda(N-1) \|\varphi_N\|_\infty.$$

Without loss of generality (see Proposition 2.21), we will assume here that $\lambda \equiv \Lambda$ is constant. As a consequence, the exponential series $e^{t\mathcal{L}_N}$ is absolutely convergent for $t < 1/(\Lambda(N-1))$ and there is a semi explicit formula for an observable $\varphi_N \in C_b(E^N)$ at any time $t \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_N(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)] = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k \varphi_N \rangle,$$

where $(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$ is the particle process with initial law $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$. Then, considering a test function $\varphi_N \equiv \varphi_s \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-s)}$ which depends only on s variables for a fixed $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the term on the right-hand side depends only on N through known quantities, namely the initial law f_0^N and the operator \mathcal{L}_N . The initial law f_0^N is assumed to be f_0 -chaotic so there is an asymptotic control of all its marginals when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. In its seminal article [Kac56], Kac managed to pass to the limit directly in the series on the right-hand side using a dominated convergence theorem argument. This necessitates in particular to prove the absolute convergence of the series on a time interval independent of N when s is fixed. The argument has been generalised in [CDW13] and will be thoroughly discussed in Section 6.1.

As a byproduct it will show the existence of a solution of the Boltzmann equation in the form of an explicit series expansion. The final formula (190) will be a direct extension of the “exponential formula” obtained by McKean in [McK67a] for the solution of a simpler Boltzmann model in $E = \{-1, 1\}$ (the so-called 2-state Maxwellian gas). In a famous work [Wil51], Wild showed that the solution of the Boltzmann equation for cut-off Maxwellian molecules has a semi-explicit representation in the form of an infinite sum (see also [Vil02, Chapter 4, Section 1], [CCG00] and the references therein). McKean showed that for the 2-state Maxwellian gas, the Formula (190) obtained by propagation of chaos can be interpreted as the dual version of a Wild sum.

This approach is only focused on the evolution of observables of the form $\langle f_t^N, \varphi_N \rangle$ for a fixed φ_N and does not study directly the evolution of the N -particle law f_t^N . The evolution of f_t^N is given by the forward Kolmogorov equation. This dual point of view on Kac’s theorem is studied in [Pul96] and will also be reviewed in Section 6.1. The starting point is the BBGKY hierarchy:

$$\partial_t f_t^{s,N} = \frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}^s f_t^{s,N} + \frac{N-s}{N} \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f_t^{s+1,N},$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} : \mathcal{P}(E^{s+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E^s)$ is defined for $f^{(s+1)} \in \mathcal{P}(E^{s+1})$ and $\varphi_s \in C_b(E^s)$ by

$$\langle \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f^{(s+1)}, \varphi_s \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^s \int_{E^{s+1}} L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,s+1} [\varphi_s \otimes 1](\mathbf{z}^{s+1}) f^{(s+1)}(d\mathbf{z}^{s+1}).$$

Let $\mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t) = \exp(t \frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}^s)$ denote the semi-group acting on $\mathcal{P}(E^s)$ generated by $\frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}^s$. Then, interpreting the last term on the right-hand side as a perturbation of a linear differential equation, Duhamel’s formula reads:

$$f_t^{s,N} = \mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t) f_0^{s,N} + \frac{N-s}{N} \int_0^t \mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t-\tau) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f_\tau^{s+1,N} d\tau.$$

Iterating this formula gives a semi-explicit series expansion in terms of the initial condition:

$$f_t^{s,N} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \alpha_N^{(s,k)} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t-t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} \mathbf{T}_N^{(s+1)}(t_1-t_2) \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2} \dots \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k} \mathbf{T}_N^{(s+k)}(t_k) f_0^{s+k,N} dt_1 \dots dt_k,$$

where $\alpha_N^{(s,k)} = (N-s) \dots (N-s-k+1)/N^k$ if $s+k \leq N$ and $\alpha_N^{(s,k)} = 0$ otherwise. Taking the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in this series is the dual viewpoint of the previous approach. If the limit exists, propagation of chaos holds whenever the result can be identified as the infinite hierarchy of tensorised laws $f_t^{\otimes s}$ where f_t solves the Boltzmann equation. Note that this approach can be easily extended to inhomogeneous Boltzmann systems where $L^{(1)} \neq 0$, in which case the semi-group $\mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}$ should be replaced by the semi-group generated by $\sum_{i=1}^s L^{(1)*} \diamond_i + \frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}^s$. A famous example is given by Lanford’s theorem (see Section 6.6). The study of the evolution of observables is however more natural for abstract systems when there is no known explicit formula for the dual operators \mathcal{L}^s and $\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1}$ acting on the particle probability distributions.

4.5.2 Interaction graph

Binary interactions are also described by graphs structures which retain the genealogical information of a particle or a group of particles (i.e. the history of the collisions). A minimal construction of what is called an *interaction graph* is detailed below.

Definition 4.36 (Interaction graph). Let $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ be the index of a particle. The interaction graph of particle i at time $t > 0$ is defined by




FIGURE 1: An interaction graph. The vertical axis represents time. Each particle is represented by a vertical line parallel to the time axis. The index of a given particle is written on the horizontal axis. The construction is done backward in time starting from time t where only particle i is present. At each time t_ℓ , if i_ℓ does not already belong to the graph, it is added on the right (with a vertical line which starts at t_ℓ). The couple $r_\ell = (i_\ell, j_\ell)$ of interacting particles at time t_ℓ is depicted by an horizontal line joining two big black dots on the vertical line representing the particles i_ℓ and j_ℓ . for instance, on the depicted graph, $r_2 = (i_2, i_1)$. Note that at time t_3 , $r_3 = (i_1, i_2)$ (or indifferently $r_3 = (i_2, i_1)$) where i_1 and i_2 were already in the system. Index i_3 is skipped and at time t_4 , the route is $r_4 = (i_4, i_1)$. The *recollision* occurring at time t_3 is depicted in red.

1. a k -tuple $\mathcal{T}_k = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$ of interaction times $t > t_1 > t_2 > \dots > t_k > 0$,
2. a k -tuple $\mathcal{R}_k = (r_1, \dots, r_k)$ of pairs of indexes, where for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the pair denoted by $r_\ell = (i_\ell, j_\ell)$ is such that $j_\ell \in \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{\ell-1}\}$ with the convention $i_0 = i$ and $i_\ell \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

The interaction graph is denoted by $\mathcal{G}_i(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{R}_k)$.

The interaction graph of particle i retains the minimal information needed to define the state of particle i at time $t > 0$. It should be interpreted in the following way.

- The set (i_1, \dots, i_k) is the set of indexes of the particles which interacted directly or indirectly with particle i during the time interval $(0, t)$ (an indirect interaction means that the particle has interacted with another particle which interacted directly or indirectly with particle i) — note that the i_ℓ 's may not be all distinct.
- The times (t_1, \dots, t_k) are the times at which an interaction occurred.
- For $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the indexes (i_ℓ, j_ℓ) are the indexes of the two particles which interacted together at time t_ℓ .

Following the terminology of [GM97], a *route* of size q between i and j is the union of q elements $r_{\ell_k} = (i_{\ell_k}, j_{\ell_k})$, $k = 1, \dots, q$ such that $i_{\ell_1} = i$, $i_{\ell_{k+1}} = j_{\ell_k}$ and $j_{\ell_q} = j$. A route of size 1 (*i.e.* a single element r_ℓ) is simply called a route. A route which involves two indexes which were already in the graph before the interaction time (backward in time) is called a *recollision*.

This construction is more easily understood with the graphical representation of an interaction graph shown on Figure 1.

The definition of interaction graph can be extended straightforwardly starting from a group of particles instead of only one particle. This representation does not take into account the physical trajectories of the particles, it only retains the history of the interactions among

a group of particles. Note that the graph is not a tree in general since the i_ℓ 's are not necessarily distinct. It is a tree when no recollision occurs.

Interaction graphs are a classical tool in the study of Boltzmann particle systems. As we shall see in Section 6.6 they are particularly useful to give a physical interpretation of the series expansions discussed in the previous section. The connections between interaction graphs and series expansions are more thoroughly discussed in [McK67a] and [CCG00]. In a more probabilistic setting, when λ satisfies the uniform bound (31) and given an interaction graph, it is possible to construct a (forward) trajectorial representation of the particle $(Z_t^i)_t$ up to time $t > 0$ as follows:

1. At time $t = 0$, the particles $Z_0^{i_\ell}$ are distributed according to the initial law.
2. Between two collision times, the particles evolve according to $L^{(1)}$.
3. At a collision time t_ℓ , with probability $\lambda(Z_{t_\ell}^{i_\ell}, Z_{t_\ell}^{j_\ell})/\Lambda$, the new states of particles i_ℓ and j_ℓ are sampled according to

$$\left(Z_{t_\ell^+}^{i_\ell}, Z_{t_\ell^+}^{j_\ell} \right) \sim \Gamma^{(2)} \left(Z_{t_\ell^-}^{i_\ell}, Z_{t_\ell^-}^{j_\ell}, dz_1, dz_2 \right).$$

If the interaction graph is sampled beforehand according to the following definition, then the particle Z_t^i is distributed according to $f_t^{1,N}$.

Definition 4.37 (Random interaction graph). Let $\Lambda > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $t > 0$. Let $(T^{k,\ell})_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq N}$ be $N(N-1)/2$ independent Poisson processes with rate Λ/N . For each Poisson process $T^{k,\ell}$ we denote by $(T_n^{k,\ell})_n$ its associated increasing sequence of jump times. The sets of times $\mathcal{T}_k = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$ and routes $\mathcal{R}_k = (r_1, \dots, r_k)$ are defined recursively as follows. Initially, $t_0 = t$ and $i_0 = i$ and for $k \geq 0$,

$$t_{k+1} = \max_{\ell, p, n} \{ T_n^{i_\ell, p} \mid T_n^{i_\ell, p} < t_k, \ell \leq k \}. \quad (112)$$

Then, given (ℓ, p, n) such that $t_{k+1} = T_n^{i_\ell, p}$, $i_{k+1} = p$ and $j_{k+1} = i_\ell$ so that $r_{k+1} = (i_{k+1}, j_{k+1})$. The procedure is stopped once the set on the right-hand side of (112) is empty (it happens almost surely after a finite number of iterations). The resulting interaction graph $\mathcal{G}_i(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{R}_k)$ is called the random interaction graph with rate Λ rooted on i at time t . The definition is extended similarly starting from a finite number of indexes (i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) instead of just i .

This trajectorial construction of a particle (sub-)system is used in [GM97; M el96]. Using purely combinatorial arguments the authors prove a pathwise version of Kac's theorem with an explicit optimal convergence rate in total variation norm. The main idea is that it is possible to compute the probability of sampling a *bad* interaction graph, that is a graph which would give a system of particles with too much correlation. When $N \rightarrow +\infty$, this probability goes to zero. As a consequence, when N is large, with high probability, the particle system is close to a system of independent particles which are shown to be distributed according to the solution of the Boltzmann equation. This will be reviewed in Section 6.2. As in the proof of Lanford's theorem (Section 6.6), a fundamental idea is to reduce the problem to the estimation of the number of recollisions in a sampled graph or to the number of graphs in which two given particles are linked by a route of arbitrary size. Indeed, in the probabilistic setting, if a random binary *tree* with branching rate Λ is sampled first and then a particle system is constructed as above but starting from independent particles, then this gives a trajectorial representation of a process whose law is the solution of the Boltzmann equation (29).

5 McKean-Vlasov diffusion models

Since the seminal work of McKean [McK69], later extended by Sznitman [Szn91], a very popular method of proving propagation of chaos for mean-field systems is the synchronous

coupling method (Section 5.1). Over the last years, some alternative coupling methods have been proposed to handle either weaker regularity or to get uniform in time estimates under mild physically relevant assumptions (Section 5.2). Alternatively to these SDE techniques, the empirical process can be studied using stochastic compactness methods [Szn84b; GM97], leading to (non quantitative) results valid for mixed jump-diffusion models (Section 5.3). Recent works focus on large deviation techniques, in particular the derivation of entropy bound from Girsanov transform [JW18; Lac18], this allows interactions with a very weak regularity (Section 5.4) or with a very general form (Section 5.6).

5.1 Synchronous coupling

In this section, we give several examples of the very fruitful idea of synchronous coupling presented in Section 4.1.2. The first instance of synchronous coupling that we are aware of is due to McKean himself although the most popular form of the argument is due to Sznitman. This will be discussed in Section 5.1.1. This original argument is valid under strong Lipschitz and boundedness assumptions but it can be extended to more singular cases, as explained in Section 5.1.2. Finally, in Section 5.1.3, the strategy is successfully applied to gradient systems and leads to uniform in time and ergodicity results.

5.1.1 McKean's theorem and beyond for Lipschitz interactions

The following theorem due to McKean is the most important result of this section.

Theorem 5.1 (McKean). *Let the drift and diffusion coefficients in (11) be defined by*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad b(x, \mu) := \tilde{b}(x, K_1 \star \mu(x)), \quad \sigma(x, \mu) = \tilde{\sigma}(x, K_2 \star \mu(x)), \quad (113)$$

where $K_1 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $K_2 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\tilde{b} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ are globally Lipschitz and K_1, K_2 are bounded. Then pathwise chaos by coupling in the sense of Definition 4.1 holds for any $T > 0$, $p = 2$, with the synchronous coupling

$$X_t^{i,N} = X_0^i + \int_0^t \tilde{b}(X_s^{i,N}, K_1 \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}(X_s^{i,N})) ds + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^{i,N}, K_2 \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}(X_s^{i,N})) dB_s^i, \quad (114)$$

and

$$\bar{X}_t^{i,N} = X_0^i + \int_0^t \tilde{b}(\bar{X}_s^{i,N}, K_1 \star f_s(\bar{X}_s^{i,N})) ds + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}(\bar{X}_s^{i,N}, K_2 \star f_s(\bar{X}_s^{i,N})) dB_s^i. \quad (115)$$

It means that the trajectories satisfy:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon(N, T),$$

where the convergence rate is given by

$$\varepsilon(N, T) = \frac{c_1(b, \sigma, T)}{N} e^{c_2(b, \sigma, T)T}, \quad (116)$$

for some absolute constants $C, \tilde{C}, C_{\text{BDG}} > 0$ not depending on N, T ,

$$c_1(b, \sigma, T) := CT \left(T \|K_1\|_\infty^2 \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 + C_{\text{BDG}} \|K_2\|_\infty^2 \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \right), \quad (117)$$

and

$$c_2(b, \sigma, T) := \tilde{C} \left(T(1 + \|K_1\|_{\text{Lip}}^2) \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 + C_{\text{BDG}} (1 + \|K_2\|_{\text{Lip}}^2) \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \right). \quad (118)$$

We present two proofs of this result. The first one is the original proof due to McKean [McK69]. The second one is due to Sznitman [Szn91]. Sznitman's proof is a slightly shorter and more general version of McKean's proof. We chose to include McKean's original argument for three reasons. First it gives an interesting and somehow unusual probabilistic point of view on the interplay between exchangeability and independence (see Section 3.2.2). This is an underlying idea for all the models presented in this review which is made very explicit in McKean's proof. Secondly, although the computations in both proofs are very much comparable, McKean's proof is philosophically an existence result while Sznitman's proof is based on the wellposedness result stated in Proposition 2.7. Finally, it seems that McKean's proof has been somehow forgotten in the community or is sometimes confused with Sznitman's proof which in turn has become incredibly popular. McKean's argument was first published in [McK67b] and then re-published in [McK69]. Both references are not easy to find nowadays and it is probably the source of the confusion between the two proofs.

Proof (McKean). The originality of this proof is that the nonlinear process is not introduced initially. It appears as the limit of a Cauchy sequence of coupled systems of particles with increasing size. Let $(B_t^i)_t$, $i \geq 1$ be an infinite collection of independent Brownian motions and for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we recall the notation

$$\mathcal{X}_t^N = (X_t^{1,N}, \dots, X_t^{N,N}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N,$$

where $(X_t^{i,N})_t$ solves (114). The idea is to prove that the sequence (in N) of processes $(X_t^{1,N})_t$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$ and then to identify the limit as the solution of (115). The proof is split into several steps.

Step 1. Cauchy estimate

Let $M > N$ and let us consider the coupled particle systems \mathcal{X}^N and \mathcal{X}^M where the N first particles in \mathcal{X}^M have the same initial condition as $X^{1,N}, \dots, X^{N,N}$ and are driven by the same Brownian motions B^1, \dots, B^N . Using (114) and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality it holds that for a constant $C_{\text{BDG}} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^{1,M} - X_t^{1,N}|^2 \right] &\leq 2T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left| b(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M}) - b(X_t^{1,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 dt \\ &\quad + 2C_{\text{BDG}} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left| \sigma(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M}) - \sigma(X_t^{1,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 dt. \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

For the first term on the right-hand side of (119), we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| b(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M}) - b(X_t^{1,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left| b(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M}) - b(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M}}) \right|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left| b(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M}}) - b(X_t^{1,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

where $\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M} = (X_t^{1,M}, \dots, X_t^{N,M}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$. Each of the two terms on the right-hand side of (120) is controlled using (113), the Lipschitz assumptions and the fact that the $X^{j,M}$ are

identically distributed. For the first term, expanding the square gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| b \left(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M} \right) - b \left(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M}} \right) \right|^2 \\
& \leq \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M K_1 \left(X_t^{1,M}, X_t^{j,M} \right) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K_1 \left(X_t^{1,M}, X_t^{j,M} \right) \right|^2 \\
& \leq \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \left(\frac{1}{M} + \frac{1}{N} - 2 \frac{N}{MN} \right) \mathbb{E} \left| K_1 \left(X_t^{1,M}, X_t^{2,M} \right) \right|^2 \\
& \quad + \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \left(\frac{M-1}{M} + \frac{N-1}{N} - 2 \frac{M(N-1)}{MN} \right) \times \\
& \quad \quad \quad \times \mathbb{E} \left[K_1 \left(X_t^{1,M}, X_t^{2,M} \right) \cdot K_1 \left(X_t^{1,M}, X_t^{3,M} \right) \right] \\
& \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{M} \right) \|K_1\|_{\infty}^2 \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term, the Lipschitz assumptions leads to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| b \left(X_t^{1,M}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M}} \right) - b \left(X_t^{1,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} \right) \right|^2 \\
& \leq 2 \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[|X_t^{1,N} - X_t^{1,M}|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \left. + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K_1 \left(X_t^{1,M}, X_t^{j,M} \right) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K_1 \left(X_t^{1,N}, X_t^{j,N} \right) \right|^2 \right] \\
& \leq 2 \left(1 + 2 \|K_1\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \right) \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \mathbb{E} |X_t^{1,N} - X_t^{1,M}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The same estimates hold for the diffusion term on the right-hand side of (119) with σ instead of b and K_2 instead of K_1 . Gathering everything thus leads to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^{1,M} - X_t^{1,N}|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{M} \right) c_1(b, \sigma, T) + c_2(b, \sigma, T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} |X_t^{1,N} - X_t^{1,M}|^2 dt
\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are defined by (117) and (118). Using (a generalisation of) Gronwall lemma, it follows that:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^{1,M} - X_t^{1,N}|^2 \right] \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{M} \right) c_1(b, \sigma, T) e^{c_2(b, \sigma, T)T}. \quad (121)$$

Step 2. Cauchy limit and exchangeability

The previous estimate implies that the sequence $(X^{1,N})_N$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$. Since this space is complete, this sequence has a limit denoted by $\overline{X}^1 \equiv (\overline{X}_t^1)_t$. Applying the same reasoning for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an infinite collection of processes \overline{X}^k , defined for each $k \geq 1$ as the limit of $(X^{k,N})_N$. These processes are identically distributed and their common law depends only on $(X_0^i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(B^i)_{i \geq 1}$ which are independent random variables. Moreover, knowing (X_0^1, B^1) and for any measurable set \mathcal{B} , any event of the type $\{\overline{X}^1 \in \mathcal{B}\}$ belongs to the σ -algebra of exchangeable events generated by the random variables $(X_0^i)_{i \geq 2}$ and $(B^i)_{i \geq 2}$. Since these random variables are i.i.d, Hewitt-Savage 0-1 law states that this σ -algebra is actually trivial. It follows that \overline{X}^1 is a functional of X_0^1 and B^1 only. The same reasoning applies for each \overline{X}^k and hence the processes \overline{X}^k are also independent.

Step 3. Identification of the limit

At this point, propagation of chaos is already proved and it only remains to identify the law of the \bar{X}_t^k as the law of the solution of (115). To do so, McKean defines for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ the processes

$$\tilde{X}_t^{i,N} = X_0^i + \int_0^t b(\bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^N}) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(\bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^N}) dB_s^i,$$

where $\bar{X}_t^N = (\bar{X}_t^1, \dots, \bar{X}_t^N)$. From the independence of the processes and by the strong law of large numbers, the right hand side converges almost surely as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ towards the right hand side of (115) with f_s being the law of \bar{X}_s^i (which is the same for all i). Moreover, direct Lipschitz estimates lead to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\tilde{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{N},$$

where C is a constant which depends only on $T, \|K_1\|_{\text{Lip}}, \|K_2\|_{\text{Lip}}$. By uniqueness of the limit, it follows that \bar{X}_t^i satisfies (115). Moreover, the bound (116) is obtained by taking the limit $M \rightarrow +\infty$ in (121). \square

The following proof is due to Sznitman [Szn91] in the case where σ is constant and with $p = 1$ in Definition 4.1. The following (direct) adaptation to the model of Theorem 5.1 can be found in [JM98, Proposition 2.3].

Proof (Sznitman). With a more direct approach, the strategy is to introduce both the particle system and its (known) limit given respectively by (114) and (115) and to estimate directly the discrepancy between the two processes. Using the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, it holds that for a constant $C_{\text{BDG}} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 \right] &\leq 2T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 dt \\ &\quad + 2C_{\text{BDG}} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left| \sigma(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - \sigma(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 dt. \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

The drift term on the right-hand side of (122) is split into two terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

For the first term on the right-hand side of (123), the assumption (113) and the Lipschitz assumptions give:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 &\leq \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left| K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^j) \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^j) \right\} \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the square, it leads to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{N^2} \sum_{k, \ell=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^k)) \cdot (K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^\ell)) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{4\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \|K_1\|_\infty^2}{N} \\
& \quad + \frac{\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{N^2} \sum_{k \neq \ell} \mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^k)) \cdot (K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^\ell)) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

When $k \neq \ell$, using the fact that \bar{X}^k and \bar{X}^ℓ gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^k)) \cdot (K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^\ell)) \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^k)) \cdot (K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^\ell)) \middle| \bar{X}_t^i \right] \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^k)) \middle| \bar{X}_t^i \right] \mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^\ell)) \middle| \bar{X}_t^i \right] \right] \\
& = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain the last inequality observe that since $k \neq \ell$ at least one of them is not equal to i , let us assume that $\ell \neq i$. Then since $\text{Law}(\bar{X}_t^\ell) = f_t$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(K_1 \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^\ell)) \middle| \bar{X}_t^i \right] = 0.$$

In conclusion,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 \leq \frac{4\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \|K_1\|_\infty^2}{N}. \quad (124)$$

For the second-term on the right-hand side of (123), the Lipschitz assumptions give:

$$\mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{X_t^N}) \right|^2 \leq C \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 (1 + \|K_1\|_{\text{Lip}}^2) \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2. \quad (125)$$

The same estimates hold when b and K_1 are replaced by σ and K_2 . Gathering everything leads to:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 \right] & \leq \frac{1}{N} c_1(b, \sigma, T) + c_2(b, \sigma, T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 dt \\
& \leq \frac{1}{N} c_1(b, \sigma, T) + c_2(b, \sigma, T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} |\bar{X}_s^i - X_s^i|^2 \right] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows by Gronwall lemma. \square

Remark 5.2. 1. The same synchronous coupling result holds (at least) with $p = 1$ (see [ADF18, Corollary 3.3]) and $p = 4$ (see [JM98, Proposition 2.3]) in Definition 4.1.

2. Pointwise chaos in Definition 4.1 is a consequence of pathwise chaos but it can also be proved directly with the same line of argument but where the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality is replaced by the Itô isometry.
3. The starting inequality (Equation (119) in McKean's proof and Equation (122) in Sznitman's proof) can be replaced by an equality using Itô's lemma. This may bring a

small improvement in the constants c_1 and c_2 . For instance, in the common case where σ is a constant, we can write (in Sznitman's framework),

$$|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 = 2 \int_0^t \langle b(\bar{X}_s^i, f_s) - b(X_s^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}), \bar{X}_s^i - X_s^i \rangle ds.$$

And we would obtain for some constants $C, \tilde{C} > 0$ (see for instance the introduction of [Sal20]):

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 \right] \leq C \frac{\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \|K_1\|_{\infty}^2}{N} e^{\tilde{C} \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}} (1 + \|K_1\|_{\text{Lip}}) T},$$

and therefore propagation of chaos holds over a time interval $T \sim \log N$. Several example will be given in the following (see in particular Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 5.5).

When $\sigma = I_d$, the following corollary shows that the pathwise particle system is strongly chaotic in TV norm. This result has been proved in [Mal01, Theorem 5.5].

Corollary 5.3 (Pathwise TV chaos). *Under the same assumptions as in McKean's theorem but with $\sigma = I_d$, for all $k < N$ it holds that*

$$\|f_{[0,T]}^{k,N} - f_{[0,T]}^{\otimes k}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C(T) \sqrt{\frac{k}{N}}.$$

Proof. By the Pinsker inequality (48) and the inequality (104), it holds that

$$\|f_{[0,T]}^{k,N} - f_{[0,T]}^{\otimes k}\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq 2 \frac{k}{N} H(f_I^N | f_I^{\otimes N}).$$

Using (105), the right-hand side is bounded by:

$$\|f_{[0,T]}^{k,N} - f_{[0,T]}^{\otimes k}\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq 2k \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |b(X_t^1, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^1, f_t)|^2 \right].$$

By McKean's theorem, the expectation on the right-hand side is bounded by $\frac{C(T)}{N}$ and the conclusion follows. \square

McKean's theorem can be directly generalised to more general, yet Lipschitz, settings as we shall see in Section 5.6.1.

5.1.2 Towards more singular interactions

The hypotheses of McKean's theorem (bounded and globally Lipschitz interactions) are most often too strong in practice. Even though there is no real hope for better results at this level of generality, many directions have been explored to weaken the hypotheses in specific cases.

1. **(Moment control).** A commonly admitted idea is that propagation of chaos should also hold for only locally Lipschitz interaction functions with polynomial growth provided that moment estimates can be proved (both at the particle level and for the limiting nonlinear system).
2. **(Moderate interaction and cut-off).** If one is mainly interested in the derivation of a singular nonlinear system, another idea is to smoothen the interaction at the particle level, for instance by adding a cutoff parameter or by convolution with a sequence of mollifiers. Such procedures typically depend on a smoothing parameter ε that will go to zero. For a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ McKean's theorem gives a (quantitative) error estimate between the particle system and a smoothened nonlinear system. Then the idea is to take a smoothing parameter $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon_N$ which depends on N such that $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Taking advantage of the quantitative bound given by McKean's theorem, the goal is to choose an appropriate ε_N (usually a very slowly converging sequence) to pass to the limit directly from the smooth particle system to the singular nonlinear system.

In the present section, we give some examples of these ideas which naturally extend Sznitman's proof of McKean's theorem using synchronous coupling. Note that all the proofs crucially depend at some point of a well-posedness result for the nonlinear system. In practice, for singular interactions, proving propagation of chaos therefore largely depends on the considered model. Several examples for classical PDEs in kinetic theory can be found in Section 7.1.

Moment control. In [BCC11] the authors introduce some sufficient conditions on the interaction kernels K_1 and K_2 to extend the result of McKean's theorem to non globally Lipschitz bounded settings. This comes at the price of a strong assumption on the boundedness of the moments. Other examples using similar ideas will be detailed in Section 5.1.3. We first give a simple version of [BCC11, Theorem 1.1]

Theorem 5.4 ([BCC11]). *Let b, σ as in McKean's theorem with $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}$ globally Lipschitz and assume that there exists $\gamma > 0, p \geq 1$ such that for $i = 1, 2, K_i$ satisfy for all $x, y, x', y' \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|K_i(x, y) - K_i(x', y')| \leq \gamma (|x - y| + |x' - y'|) (1 + |x|^p + |y|^p + |x'|^p + |y'|^p). \quad (126)$$

Assume that there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that for any $T > 0$,

$$\sup_N \sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[e^{\kappa |X_t^i|^p}] < +\infty, \quad \sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[e^{\kappa |\bar{X}_t^i|^p}] < +\infty. \quad (127)$$

Assume that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\sup_{t \leq T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |K_i(x, y)|^2 f_t(dx) f_t(dy) < +\infty. \quad (128)$$

Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $t \leq T$,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N e^{-Ct}}.$$

Moreover, if the moment bound (127) holds for $p' > p$ instead of p then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and for all $t \leq T$,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N^{1-\varepsilon}}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of McKean's theorem using Sznitman's synchronous coupling but starting from Itô's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 &= 2\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\|\sigma(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - \sigma(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \rangle &= \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with the same classical argument as before but replacing the boundedness of K_1 by (128) gives:

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}) \rangle \leq (\mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2)^{1/2} \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{X_t^N}) \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{X_t^N}) \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i| |b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) - b(X_t^i, \mu_{X_t^N})| \\
&\leq \frac{\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i| |K_1(\bar{X}_t^i, \bar{X}_t^j) - K_1(X_t^i, X_t^j)| \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[(|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 + |\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i| |\bar{X}_t^j - X_t^j|) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times (1 + |\bar{X}_t^i|^p + |\bar{X}_t^j|^p + |X_t^i|^p + |X_t^j|^p) \right] \\
&=: \frac{\gamma\|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}[I_{ij}]
\end{aligned}$$

For a given (i, j) and $R > 0$, the authors of [BCC11] define the event

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ |\bar{X}_t^i| \leq R, |\bar{X}_t^j| \leq R, |X_t^i| \leq R, |X_t^j| \leq R \right\}.$$

Then they distinguish the two cases inside the expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_{ij}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}} I_{ij}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c} I_{ij}] \\
&\leq C(1 + 4R^p) \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c} I_{ij}] \\
&\leq C(1 + 4R^p) \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 \\
&\quad + (\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c}])^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[(1 + |\bar{X}_t^i|^p + |\bar{X}_t^j|^p + |X_t^i|^p + |X_t^j|^p)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

The probability of \mathcal{R}^c is controlled by the Markov inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{|\bar{X}_t^i| \leq R}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{|\bar{X}_t^j| \leq R}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{|X_t^i| \leq R}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{|X_t^j| \leq R}] \\
&\leq C e^{-\kappa R^p}
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $r = \kappa R^p/2$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{ij}] \leq C(1 + r) \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2 + C e^{-r}.$$

A similar reasoning applies for the term with σ and therefore, the function

$$y(t) := \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2,$$

satisfies:

$$y'(t) \leq C(1 + r)y(t) + C e^{-r} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{y(t)} \leq C(1 + r)y(t) + C e^{-r} + \frac{C}{N}.$$

A complicated Gronwall-like argument terminates the proof. \square

The authors of [BCC11] write a detailed proof in the kinetic case with

$$b(x, v, \mu) = -F(x, v) - H \star \mu(x, v), \quad \sigma(x, v, \mu) = \sqrt{2}I_d,$$

where $F, H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy a slightly weaker assumption, namely:

$$-\langle v - w, F(x, v) - F(x, w) \rangle \leq \gamma_1 |v - w|^2,$$

and

$$|F(x, v) - F(y, v)| \leq \gamma_2 \min(1, |x - y|)(1 + |v|^p),$$

and similarly for H . They also prove [BCC11, Theorem 1.2] which gives sufficient conditions on F and G for the well-posedness of both the particle and the nonlinear systems and such that the hypotheses of Theorem 5.4 are satisfied. Theorem 5.4 corresponds to a combination of the so-called variant (V3), of the case given in Section 1.2.2 and of the case given in Section 1.2.3 of [BCC11, Theorem 1.1].

Moderate interaction. In [Oel85], Oelschläger introduced the concept of *moderately interacting particles*. He studied systems of the form (113) with a constant diffusion matrix $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{2}I_d$ and with a symmetric interaction kernel K_1 which *depends on N* as follows:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad K_1(x, y) \equiv K_1^N(y - x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon_N^d} K_0 \left(\frac{y - x}{\varepsilon_N} \right), \quad (129)$$

where $K_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed symmetric radial kernel and $(\varepsilon_N)_N$ is a sequence such that $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. The strength of the interaction between two particles is thus of the order $\sim \varepsilon_N^{-d} N^{-1}$. Oelschläger considered the case $\varepsilon_N = N^{-\beta/d}$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$. The two extreme cases $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = 1$ correspond respectively to a *weak interaction* of order $\sim 1/N$ (actually what is usually called the mean-field scaling) and a *strong interaction* of order ~ 1 (it would be hopeless to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in this case without further assumptions, see Section 2.3.3). More generally, the term *moderate interaction* refers to any situation in which $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ and $\varepsilon_N^{-d} N^{-1} = o(1)$. In this case

$$K_1^N(x, \cdot) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_x,$$

in the distributional sense, which allows to recover singular *purely local* interactions.

When the diffusion matrix $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{2}I_d$ is constant, the main result of [Oel85, Theorem 1] is a functional law of large numbers which states the convergence of the empirical measure valued process $(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})_t$ towards the deterministic singular limit f_t solution of

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = -\nabla_x \cdot \{ \tilde{b}(x, f_t(x)) f_t(x) \} + \Delta_x f_t.$$

We call this interaction purely local because the drift term no longer depends on the convolution $K_1 \star f_t(x)$ but only on the local quantity $f_t(x)$. The strategy is roughly the same as the one explained in Section 5.3.1. The first step is a relative compactness result in $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)))$, the second step is the identification of the limit process which is shown to be almost surely the solution of a deterministic equation. The last step and in this case, the most difficult one, is the uniqueness of the solution of this deterministic equation. In the case of a gradient system, well-posedness results in Hölder spaces are available in the PDE literature [LSU68].

Later, Oelschläger studied the fluctuations around the limit [Oel87] and applied these results to a multi-species reaction-diffusion system [Oel89]. A pathwise extension of Oelschläger's results can be found in [MR87].

The martingale approach of [Oel85] is very restricted to the case when the diffusion matrix is equal to the identity. In the general case, the problem is revisited in [JM98]. The

approach is based on a careful control of the convergence rate in McKean's theorem and *ad hoc* well-posedness results for the limiting purely local equation (133). First note that the L^∞ and Lipschitz norms of K_1^N are controlled by

$$\|K_1^N\|_\infty = \frac{C_0}{\varepsilon_N^d}, \quad \|K_1^N\|_{\text{Lip}} = \frac{C_1}{\varepsilon_N^{d+1}},$$

for some constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$ depending on K_0 . We also assume that K_2 is of the form (129) (possibly with another K_0). Thus, McKean's theorem gives for all N an estimate of the form

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^{i,N} - \bar{X}_t^{i,N}|^2 \right] \leq \tilde{c}_1 \frac{\varepsilon_N^{-2d}}{N} \exp \left(\tilde{c}_2 \varepsilon_N^{-2(d+1)} \right), \quad (130)$$

for some constants $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2 > 0$ depending only on T, K_0, \tilde{b} and $\tilde{\sigma}$ and where $\bar{X}_t^{i,N}$ satisfies

$$d\bar{X}_t^{i,N} = \tilde{b} \left(\bar{X}_t^{i,N}, K_1^N \star f_t^{(N)} \left(\bar{X}_t^{i,N} \right) \right) dt + \tilde{\sigma} \left(\bar{X}_t^{i,N}, K_2^N \star f_t^{(N)} \left(\bar{X}_t^{i,N} \right) \right) dB_t^i,$$

with $f_t^{(N)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the law of $\bar{X}_t^{i,N}$. It satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f_t^{(N)}(x) = & -\nabla_x \cdot \left\{ \tilde{b} \left(x, K_1^N \star f_t^{(N)}(x) \right) f_t^{(N)}(x) \right\} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \left\{ a_{ij} \left(x, K_2^N \star f_t^{(N)}(x) \right) f_t^{(N)}(x) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

where $a \equiv (a_{ij}) = \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma}^T$. In order to take $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in (130), Jourdain and Méléard [JM98] assume that $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ slowly enough so that the right-hand side of (130) still converges to zero. A sufficient condition is

$$\varepsilon_N^{-2(d+1)} \leq \delta \log N, \quad (132)$$

for a small $\delta > 0$. In the bound (130), the nonlinear process $(\bar{X}_t^{i,N})_t$ still depends on N (through K_1^N and K_2^N) so it is not possible to simply take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, the goal is to prove propagation of chaos towards the solution f_t of the purely local PDE:

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = -\nabla_x \cdot \left\{ \tilde{b}(x, f_t(x)) f_t(x) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \left\{ a_{ij}(x, f_t(x)) f_t(x) \right\}. \quad (133)$$

Well-posedness results for the PDEs (131) and (133) can be found in [JM98, Section 1]. The approach of [JM98] is based on the work of [LSU68] on parabolic PDEs. The main assumptions are the regularity of the drift and diffusion coefficients (respectively at least C^2 and C^3) and of the initial condition (at least C^2 with an Hölder continuous second order derivative), together with the following non-negativity assumption on a :

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall p \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \langle x, (a'(z, p)p + a(z, p))x \rangle \geq 0,$$

where for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $a'(z, p)$ denotes the derivative of $p \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto a(z, p) \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Then, [JM98, Proposition 2.5] shows that (133) is well-posed, that the associated nonlinear SDE is well-posed and that the solution \bar{X}_t^i of

$$d\bar{X}_t^i = \tilde{b} \left(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) \right) dt + \sigma \left(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) \right) dB_t^i,$$

satisfies:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\bar{X}_t^{i,N} - \bar{X}_t^i|^4 \right] \leq C \varepsilon_N^{4\beta}, \quad (134)$$

for some $\beta > 0$. The proof of this proposition is based on PDE arguments. In particular, since the law of $\bar{X}_t^{i,N}$ solves (131), using Ascoli's theorem (or other compactness criteria)

it is possible to extract a convergent subsequence $f_t^{(N)} \rightarrow f_t$ where f_t solves (133) with an explicit convergence rate. Combining (130) and (134) leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^{i,N} - \bar{X}_t|^2 \right] \leq \left(C \varepsilon_N^{2\beta} + \tilde{c}_1 \frac{\varepsilon_N^{-2d}}{N} \exp \left(\tilde{c}_2 \varepsilon_N^{-2(d+1)} \right) \right),$$

and the conclusion follows as soon as ε_N satisfies (132).

Recent applications of these results can be found in [Che+20] and [Die20]. The reference [Che+20] presents a generalisation of [JM98] to a multi-species system with non globally Lipschitz interactions. The article contains very detailed well-posedness results for the different systems involved. In [Die20], the diffusion process is replaced by a Piecewise Deterministic process on a (compact) manifold.

5.1.3 Gradient systems and uniform in time estimates

In this section, the case case of gradient system of the following form is investigated:

$$b(x, \mu) = -\nabla V(x) - \nabla W \star \mu(x), \quad \sigma(x, \mu) \equiv \sigma I_d, \quad \sigma > 0, \quad (135)$$

where $V, W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are symmetric potentials, respectively called the confinement potential and the interaction potential. The law of the corresponding nonlinear McKean-Vlasov process satisfies the so-called granular media equation:

$$\partial f_t = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta f_t + \nabla \cdot (f_t \nabla (V + W \star f_t)). \quad (136)$$

For the modelling details, we refer the reader to [BCP97; Ben+98] who first derived this equation. The granular media equation has been studied analytically in [CMV03; CMV06] and later in [BG13]. The fundamental question, which also motivates this section, is the long-time asymptotic of the solution, in particular the existence of stationary solutions and the convergence to equilibrium. The probabilistic counterpart of the granular media equation is the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov process (13) with b, σ given by (135). The long-time behaviour of this process is not simpler than the direct study of (136) but this probabilistic approach strongly suggests to consider the (linear) McKean particle system (11) as a starting point, the idea being to replace the nonlinearity in dimension d by a linear system of particles in high dimension dN . Since the behaviour of linear diffusion systems is well-established, this may be simpler provided that it is possible to prove convergence results with rates independent of the dimension. In a series of works reviewed in this section, it has been shown that quantitative convergence to equilibrium for the nonlinear system may follow from the study of the particle system. The crucial result is the uniform in time propagation of chaos. In this section we review some results in this sense under various convexity assumptions on the potentials. Note that uniform in time propagation of chaos is strongly linked to the uniqueness of a stationary measure for the nonlinear process. Uniform in time propagation of chaos may not hold as soon as the nonlinear system admits more than one stationary measure (in the cases studied below, this is a consequence of the fact that the particle system admits a unique equilibrium). In general uniform in time propagation of chaos and the existence of a unique stationary measure for the nonlinear process hold simultaneously. We start by stating the main theorem of this section which is due to Malrieu [Mal01].

Theorem 5.5 (Uniform in time propagation of chaos [Mal01]). *Let b, σ be given by (135) where the potentials V, W satisfy the following properties.*

- *V is uniformly convex: there exists $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle x - y, \nabla V(x) - \nabla V(y) \rangle \geq \beta |x - y|^2.$$

- W is symmetric and convex:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle x - y, \nabla W(x) - \nabla W(y) \rangle \geq 0.$$

- ∇W is locally Lipschitz and has polynomial growth of order p .

Let the initial law $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ have bounded moments of order $2p$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on β and p such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} |X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N}. \quad (137)$$

All the well-posedness results for both the particle system and the nonlinear process are proved in [CGM08, Section 2]. The proof of Theorem 5.5 is given below. This is an extension of Sznitman's proof of McKean's theorem by synchronous coupling to the case of unbounded interactions. In a one-dimensional setting, a similar result is proved in [BRV98, Theorem 3.1]. It has been adapted to the current setting in [Mal01, Theorem 3.3]. The uniform convexity of V allows a uniform in time control of the trajectories. To deal with unbounded interactions, the following lemma will be needed to control the moments of the nonlinear system uniformly in time (see also [BRV98, Proposition 3.10] and [CGM08, Corollary 2.3, Proposition 2.7]).

Lemma 5.6 (Moment bound). *Let $(\bar{X}_t)_t$ be the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov process (13). Under the convexity assumptions of Theorem 5.5, it holds that for all $p > 0$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_t|^{2p} < +\infty.$$

Proof. Itô's formula gives:

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{X}_t|^{2p} &= |\bar{X}_0|^{2p} + 2p \int_0^t \langle |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} \bar{X}_s, -\nabla V(\bar{X}_s) - \nabla W \star f_s(\bar{X}_s) \rangle ds \\ &\quad + \sigma^2 dp \int_0^t |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} ds + 2p(p-1)\sigma^2 \int_0^t |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} ds \\ &\quad + \sigma \int_0^t \langle 2p |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} \bar{X}_s, dB_s \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation and using the uniform convexity of V leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_t|^{2p} &\leq \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_0|^{2p} - 2p \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_s|^{2p} ds + 2p\sigma(d + 2(p-1)) \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} ds \\ &\quad - 2p \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \langle |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} \bar{X}_s, \nabla W \star f_s(\bar{X}_s) \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\bar{Y}_t)_t$ be an independent copy of $(\bar{X}_t)_t$. Then using the fact that ∇W is odd and that W is convex, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} \bar{X}_s, \nabla W \star f_s(\bar{X}_s) \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \langle |\bar{X}_s|^{2(p-1)} (\bar{X}_s - \bar{Y}_s), \nabla W(\bar{X}_s - \bar{Y}_s) \rangle \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote the moment of order $2p$ by $\mu_{2p}(t) := \mathbb{E} |\bar{X}_t|^{2p}$. Then

$$\mu_{2p}(t) \leq \mu_{2p}(0) - \lambda(p) \int_0^t \mu_{2p}(s) ds + c(p) \int_0^t \mu_{2(p-1)}(s) ds,$$

where $\lambda(p), c(p) > 0$ depend on p only. The conclusion follows by Gronwall lemma by noting that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for all $x \in E$,

$$|x|^{2(p-1)} \leq K + \varepsilon|x|^{2p}.$$

□

Proof (of Theorem 5.5). The proof proceeds similarly as in Sznitman's approach but the convexity assumptions are used to get a better uniform in time control of the trajectories. This time, the starting point is Itô's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 &= -2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, \nabla V(X_s^i) - \nabla V(\bar{X}_s^i) \rangle ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, \nabla W \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}(X_s^i) - \nabla W \star f_t(\bar{X}_s^i) \rangle ds \\ &\leq -2\beta \int_0^t |X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, \nabla W \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}(X_s^i) - \nabla W \star \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_s^N}(\bar{X}_s^i) \rangle ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, \nabla W \star \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_s^N}(\bar{X}_s^i) - \nabla W \star f_s(\bar{X}_s^i) \rangle ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the uniform convexity assumption on V is used and the introduction of the term $\nabla W \star \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_s^N}$ in the second term on the right-hand side is forced as in the proof of McKean's theorem. For the second term on the right-hand side of the last inequality, summing over i leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, \nabla W \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}(X_s^i) - \nabla W \star \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_s^N}(\bar{X}_s^i) \rangle ds \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, \nabla W(X_s^i - X_s^j) - \nabla W(\bar{X}_s^i - \bar{X}_s^j) \rangle ds \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \leq j} \int_0^t \langle (X_s^i - X_s^j) + (\bar{X}_s^i - \bar{X}_s^j), \nabla W(X_s^i - X_s^j) - \nabla W(\bar{X}_s^i - \bar{X}_s^j) \rangle ds \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the convexity and symmetry of W are used.

Then after summing over $i = 1, \dots, N$, dividing by N and taking the expectation the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the last term gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 &\leq -2\beta \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbb{E}|X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i|^2)^{1/2} r_s^i ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$r_s^i = \left(\mathbb{E} |\nabla W \star \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_s^N}(\bar{X}_s^i) - \nabla W \star f_s(\bar{X}_s^i)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

As in Sznitman's proof, it holds that

$$|r_s^i|^2 = \mathbb{E} |\nabla W \star \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_s^N}(\bar{X}_s^i) - \nabla W \star f_s(\bar{X}_s^i)|^2 = \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} |\nabla W(\bar{X}_s^i - \bar{X}_s^j)|^2,$$

since the processes \bar{X}^i are independent. Using the polynomial growth of ∇W and Lemma 5.6, it follows that there exists a constant C_p depending on p only such that

$$|r_s^i|^2 \leq \frac{C_p}{N}.$$

Finally, by exchangeability, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 &\leq -2\beta \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 ds \\ &\quad + \frac{2C_p}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 \right)^{1/2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, setting

$$y(t) := \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

it holds that

$$y'(t) \leq -\beta y(t) + \frac{C_p}{\sqrt{N}},$$

and the conclusion follows by Gronwall lemma. \square

As a corollary, we state the main application of this theorem which is the exponentially fast convergence to equilibrium of the nonlinear process. Once again, this result is proved in [Mal01].

Corollary 5.7. *The following properties hold under the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.5 with $\sigma = \sqrt{2}$ for simplicity.*

1. (**Entropic chaos**). *There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq C.$$

2. (**Ergodicity of the nonlinear process**). *There exists a unique $\mu_\infty \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,*

$$\|f_t - \mu_\infty\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C e^{-\beta t/2}.$$

Proof (sketch). 1. The first property is proved in [Mal01, Proposition 3.13] and follows from a log-Sobolev inequality satisfied by f_t . More generally, it is possible to use the general bound given by Lemma 4.27 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ in (108). Thanks to the Bakry-Emery criterion (Proposition 4.33), it can be shown that f_t (and thus $f_t^{\otimes N}$) satisfies the LSI

$$-\frac{1}{4} I(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{2} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}),$$

see [Mal01, Proposition 3.12]. Then the quantity,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \nabla W(X_t^i - X_t^j) - \nabla W \star f_t(X_t^i)$$

is controlled by $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2$ and the square moments of \bar{X}_t^i which are both bounded uniformly in time by Theorem 5.5. Reporting in (108), this eventually gives a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{2} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) + C$$

and the conclusion follows by Gronwall lemma.

2. This is the content of [Mal01, Theorem 3.18]. The existence and uniqueness of f_∞ is proved for instance in [Ben+98, Theorem 2.2]. To get a quantitative convergence bound, the idea is to introduce the particle system as a pivot:

$$\|f_t - f_\infty\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|f_t - f_t^{1,N}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|f_t^{1,N} - \mu_\infty^{1,N}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\mu_\infty^{1,N} - f_\infty\|_{\text{TV}}, \quad (138)$$

where $\mu_\infty^{1,N}$ is the first marginal of the probability measure μ_∞^N with density

$$\mu_\infty^N(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^N V(x^i) - \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N W(x^i - x^j)\right) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}.$$

Note that μ_∞^N is the unique invariant measure of the N -particle process. The first and third terms on the right-hand side of (138) are bounded by K/\sqrt{N} using the first property thanks to the Pinsker inequality. The second term on the right-hand side of (138) is bounded by $K\sqrt{N}e^{-\beta t}$ using a classical application of the Bakry-Emery criterion (Proposition 4.33). Thus,

$$\|f_t - f_\infty\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{N}} + K\sqrt{N}e^{-\beta t},$$

and the conclusion follows by taking N of the order of $e^{\beta t/2}$. □

It is also possible to go beyond Theorem 5.5 and prove concentration inequalities by showing that the N -particle law satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with a constant independent of N . These questions will be discussed in Section 5.5.

The uniform convexity assumption is generally understood as too strong to cover cases of physical interest. Some extensions of Theorem 5.5 with weaker convexity assumptions are discussed below.

- (a) **No confinement.** The key assumption is the uniform convexity of V (the confinement potential) which allows a uniform in time control of the trajectories. In [CMV03], the authors studied analytically the granular media equation which corresponds to the law of the nonlinear system when $V = 0$. However, at the particle level, it has been shown in [BRV98] and [Mal01, Section 4], [Mal03, Section 2] that propagation of chaos does not hold uniformly in time. This is unfortunate as it annihilates any hope of studying the long-time behaviour of the nonlinear system with a probabilistic point of view as in the case when V is uniformly convex. Nevertheless, Malrieu [Mal03] showed that uniform in time propagation of chaos does hold for the system defined by

$$Y_t^i = X_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N X_t^j, \quad (139)$$

which is the projection of the particle system on the set

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \sum_{j=1}^N x^j = 0 \right\}.$$

The proof proceeds similarly as before but requires the potential W to be uniformly convex (and not only convex as in Theorem 5.5). It also requires a uniform in time control of the moments of the nonlinear system, proved in dimension one in [BRV98, Proposition 3.10] and more generally in [Mal03, Lemma 5.2]. Details can be found in [Mal03, Theorem 5.1] as well as a probabilistic proof of the convergence to equilibrium for the granular media equation [Mal03, Theorem 6.2].

- (b) **Non uniformly convex potentials.** In Theorem 5.5 and in the case $V = 0$ as in [Mal03], at least one of the potentials has to be uniformly convex. This condition is relaxed in [CGM08] and replaced by the so-called $C(A, \alpha)$ -condition already introduced in [CMV03] : there exists $A, \alpha > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle x - y, \nabla W(x) - \nabla W(y) \rangle \geq A\varepsilon^\alpha(|x - y|^2 - \varepsilon^2).$$

This condition is weaker than uniform convexity and includes important cases such as $W(x) = |x|^{2+\alpha}$. Uniform in time propagation of chaos holds either for the particle system X_t^i when V satisfies the $C(A, \alpha)$ condition or for the projected system Y_t^i (139) when $V = 0$ and W satisfies the $C(A, \alpha)$ condition. In both cases, the convergence rate obtained in [CGM08, Theorem 3.1] is $N^{-1/(\alpha+1)}$ instead of N^{-1} in Theorem 5.5.

- (c) **Convexity outside a ball of confinement and large diffusion.** As already explained, uniform in time propagation is strongly linked to the existence of a unique stationary solution to the nonlinear equation (136). It has been proved in [HT10; Tug13; Tug14] that such uniqueness does not hold in general without a convexity assumption. However, uniqueness may hold even in non convex settings provided that the diffusion σ is large enough and with the assumption of convexity outside a ball of confinement. This includes important cases such as double-well potentials. Convergence to equilibrium for the nonlinear system is studied in particular in [Tug13; Tug14; BGG13]. Extending these results at the particle level has been the subject of many recent works. To prove uniform in time propagation of chaos, new coupling approaches, which go beyond the traditional synchronous coupling, have been developed. They will be discussed in more details in the following sections. Let us mention in particular the reflection coupling method [Dur+20] (Section 5.2.1) and the optimal coupling approach of [Sal20; DT19] (Section 5.2.3).

We end this section by reviewing some cases which go beyond the gradient setting.

More general diffusion matrices. Taking a general diffusion matrix $\sigma \equiv \sigma(x, \mu)$ would add two terms in Itô's formula in the proof of Theorem 5.5:

$$\int_0^t \|\sigma(X_s^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}) - \sigma(\bar{X}_s^i, f_s)\|^2 ds$$

and

$$2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^i - \bar{X}_s^i, (\sigma(X_s^i, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}) - \sigma(\bar{X}_s^i, f_s)) dB_s^i \rangle.$$

The same proof would work for σ globally Lipschitz with a sufficiently small Lipschitz constant $L > 0$.

Non-gradient systems. The proof does not really depend on the form of the drift. To get uniform in time propagation of chaos, more general interactions can be considered provided that they satisfy the same convexity and growth assumptions satisfied by ∇V and ∇W . The gradient system setting seems more natural to study ergodic properties as already discussed. However, similar results than the ones presented in this section but in a very general, yet restrictive, framework can be found for instance in [Ver06]. See also [MV20; Wan18] for additional weak and strong well-posedness results on the corresponding nonlinear process.

Kinetic systems. These ideas can be extended to the case of a kinetic system $\mathcal{Z}_t^N = ((X_t^1, V_t^1), \dots, (X_t^N, V_t^N)) \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^N$ defined by the N coupled SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^i &= V_t^i dt \\ dV_t^i &= -F(V_t^i)dt - G(X_t^i)dt - H \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(X_t^i)dt + \sigma dB_t^i \end{cases}, \quad (140)$$

where $F, G, H : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are respectively called the friction force, the exterior confinement force and the interaction force and $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ denotes the x -marginal of $\mu_{\mathcal{Z}_t^N}$, so that

$$H \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(X_t^i) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N H(X_t^i - X_t^j).$$

The corresponding nonlinear McKean-Vlasov process is obtained by replacing the empirical measure of the particle system by the law $f_t(x, v) dx dv$ of the nonlinear process which is the solution of the so-called Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t f_t + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t - H \star \rho[f_t](x) \cdot \nabla_v f_t = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta_v f_t + \nabla_v \cdot ((F(v) + G(x)) f_t), \quad (141)$$

where $\rho[f_t](x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_t(x, v) dv$.

Theorem 5.8 ([BGM10]). *Assume that the forces satisfy the following properties.*

- There exists $\alpha, \alpha' > 0$ such that for all $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|F(v) - F(w)| \leq \alpha |v - w|, \quad \langle v - w, F(v) - F(w) \rangle \geq \alpha' |v - w|^2.$$

- There exists $\beta, \delta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$G(x) = \beta x + \tilde{G}(x), \quad |\tilde{G}(x) - \tilde{G}(y)| \leq \delta |x - y|.$$

- There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|H(x) - H(y)| \leq \gamma |x - y|.$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $0 \leq \gamma, \delta < \varepsilon_0$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 + |V_t^i - \bar{V}_t^i|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{N}.$$

The proof of Theorem 5.8 again follows from a classical synchronous coupling. However, the standard approach would not give uniform in time estimates (it would only be a special instance of McKean's theorem in a Lipschitz setting which do not take advantage of the form of the interactions). The idea of [BGM10, Theorem 1.2] is to introduce a new metric on the state space $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ which is equivalent to the usual Euclidean metric but for which some dissipativity can be recovered. Namely, the authors shows that there exists $a, b, c > 0$ such that the quadratic form on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$Q(x, v) = a|x|^2 + b\langle x, v \rangle + c|v|^2,$$

satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[Q(X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i, V_t^i, \bar{V}_t^i)] \leq -\mathbb{E}[|X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 + |V_t^i - \bar{V}_t^i|^2] + \frac{C}{N},$$

from which the result follows.

Remark 5.9. This approach is strongly inspired by the so-called hypocoercivity methods [Vil09a]. In fact, in the same article [BGM10, Theorem 1.1] the authors also show the exponential convergence to equilibrium of the nonlinear process, using a synchronous coupling method (between two nonlinear processes) and a perturbed Euclidean metric. This extends a classical result of Villani [Vil09a, Theorem 56] to a non-compact setting but for a weaker distance (the Wasserstein distance). Note that unlike [Mal01], convergence to equilibrium for the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation follows only from its nonlinear stochastic interpretation but does not use its particle approximation. The same method could also be applied to the granular media equation [BGM10, Remark 2.2].

Although very general, a drawback of Theorem 5.8 is that it only works for close to linear confinement force and small interactions. When the forces derive from potentials, similarly to Theorem 5.5, it becomes possible to prove stronger results by using the explicit expression of the equilibria of the particle system (which is not known in general). The following theorem due to Monmarché [Mon17, Theorem 3] considers the uniformly convex case.

Theorem 5.10 ([Mon17]). *Assume that the following properties hold.*

- *There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$F(v) = -\gamma v.$$

- *There exists a smooth potential $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with bounded derivatives of order larger than 2 and such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$G(x) = \nabla V(x).$$

Moreover, V is uniformly convex in the sense that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that $\nabla^2 V \geq c_1$.

- *There exists a smooth symmetric potential $W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with bounded derivatives of order larger than 2 and such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$H(x) = \nabla W(x).$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $c_2 < \frac{1}{2}c_1$ such that $\nabla^2 W \geq -c_2$.

Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ admit a smooth density in $L \log L$. Then there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} W_2(f_t^{1,N}, f_t) \leq \frac{C}{N^\alpha},$$

and the same estimate also holds in total variation norm.

Within this setting, the N -particle process admits a unique stationary distribution given by its density:

$$\mu_\infty^N(dx, dv) \propto \exp \left(-\frac{2\gamma}{\sigma^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N V(x^i) + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N W(x^i - x^j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N |v^i|^2 \right) \right) dx dv.$$

one of the main results of [Mon17, Theorem 1] is the exponential decay of the relative entropy for the N -particle process with a rate which does not depend on N , namely there exist $C, \chi > 0$ such that

$$H(f_t^N | \mu_\infty^N) \leq C e^{-\chi t} H(f_0^N | \mu_\infty^N). \quad (142)$$

Combined with McKean's theorem, as in [Mal01], it is then possible to prove the exponential convergence towards equilibrium for the nonlinear process [Mon17, Lemma 8, Proposition 13]. Namely, there exist $\mu_\infty(dx, dv) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$W_2^2(f_t, \mu_\infty) \leq C e^{-\chi t}. \quad (143)$$

Combining this long-time estimate with the short-term bound given by McKean's theorem, it is possible to improve the propagation of chaos result to get a uniform in time convergence. For $t \leq \varepsilon \log N$, McKean's theorem already gives two constants $C, b > 0$ such that

$$W_2(f_t^{1,N}, f_t) \leq \frac{C}{N^{1/2-b\varepsilon}}.$$

Then for $t \geq \varepsilon \log N$, using the normalised distance on E^N (see Definition 3.7),

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(f_t^{1,N}, f_t) &\leq W_2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) \\ &\leq W_2(f_t^N, \mu_\infty^N) + W_2(\mu_\infty^N, \mu_\infty^{\otimes N}) + W_2(\mu_\infty^{\otimes N}, f_t^{\otimes N}) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{N^{\varepsilon\chi}} + \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

The first and third terms on the right-hand side of the second line are bounded by $CN^{-\varepsilon\chi}$ using (142) and (143). The second term is bounded by [Mon17, Lemma 8]. Theorem 5.10 follows by taking $\varepsilon = (\chi + 2b)^{-1}$. Note that unlike the previous theorems in this section, the final uniform in time estimate is not at the level of the trajectories. In the work of Malrieu, convexity is used to prove uniform in time propagation of chaos and to prove that the N -particle law satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality. Since the previous argument relies on the classical McKean's theorem, convexity is only used to obtain the bound (142). In a recent work [GM20], Guillin and Monmarché use the results of [Gui+19] to remove the convexity assumptions, allowing a broader class of potentials, notably potentials which are convex outside a ball of confinement.

5.2 Other coupling techniques

In this section, we review some of the main results obtained by the other types of couplings presented in Section 4.1.

5.2.1 Reflection coupling for uniform in time chaos

Let us consider a gradient system of the form (135). Following the work of [Ebe16; EGZ19] on reflection coupling (Section 4.1.3), we first state the following technical lemma which is the cornerstone of [Ebe16; Dur+20].

Lemma 5.11 ([Ebe16; Dur+20]). *Assume that V is such that there exists a continuous function $\kappa : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\liminf_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \kappa(r) > 0$ and*

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle x - y, \nabla V(x) - \nabla V(y) \rangle \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \kappa(|x - y|) |x - y|^2. \quad (144)$$

Then there exists an increasing C^2 concave function $f : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ so that

$$d_f : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto f(|x - y|) \quad (145)$$

induces a distance on \mathbb{R}^d and which satisfies for all $r \geq 0$,

$$f''(r) - \frac{1}{4} r \kappa(r) f'(r) \leq -\frac{c_0}{2\sigma^2} f(r), \quad (146)$$

for a constant $c_0 > 0$.

The proof of Lemma 5.11 can be found in [Dur+20, Section 2.1] which follows closely the framework introduced in [Ebe16, Section 2.1]. The function f and the constant c_0 have an explicit but somehow not particularly enlightening expression as a function of κ . Their construction is nevertheless motivated and detailed in [Ebe16, Section 4] (see also Section 4.1.3).

The condition (144) on V implies the existence of two constants $m_V > 0$ and $M_V \geq 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\langle x - y, \nabla V(x) - \nabla V(y) \rangle \geq m_V |x - y|^2 - M_V.$$

This implies uniform convexity outside a ball and thus allows non globally convex settings, the prototypical example being the double well potential

$$V(x) = |x|^4 - a|x|^2.$$

We now state the main theorem of this section, it is due to [Dur+20].

Theorem 5.12 ([Dur+20]). *Let V be such that there exist a function f and a constant c_0 given by Lemma 5.11. Assume that the interaction potential W is symmetric, that ∇W is η -Lipschitz for the distance induced by f and that there exists $M_W \geq 0$ such that $\nabla^2 W \geq -M_W$. Let the N particles be initially i.i.d with law $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then for all $t \geq 0$, it holds that:*

$$W_{1,d_f}(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq e^{-2(c_0-\eta)t} W_{1,d_f}(\tilde{f}_0, f_0) + \frac{C(c_0, \eta)}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where we recall that W_{1,d_f} denotes both the Wasserstein-1 distance on \mathbb{R}^d for the distance d_f defined by (145) and the Wasserstein-1 distance on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^N$ for the normalised distance induced by d_f .

Proof (sketch). The strategy is to use a componentwise reflection coupling in $(\mathbb{R}^d)^N$ between a particle system \mathcal{X}_t^N and a system $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N$ of independent nonlinear McKean-vlasov processes. Since the reflection coupling badly behaves on the diagonal, [Ebe16; Dur+20] introduced the following interpolation between reflection and synchronous coupling:

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{X}_t^i &= -\nabla V(\bar{X}_t^i)dt - \nabla W \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i)dt + \sigma \left\{ \phi^\delta(E_t^i)dB_t^i + (1 - \phi^\delta(E_t^i))d\tilde{B}_t^i \right\} \\ dX_t^i &= -\nabla V(X_t^i)dt - \nabla W \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(X_t^i)dt \\ &\quad + \sigma \left\{ \phi^\delta(E_t^i)(I_d - 2e_t^i(e_t^i)^T)dB_t^i + (1 - \phi^\delta(E_t^i))d\tilde{B}_t^i \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(B_t^i)_t$ and $(\tilde{B}_t^i)_t$ are $2N$ independent Brownian motions, where

$$E_t^i := \bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i, \quad e_t^i := E_t^i/|E_t^i|,$$

and where $\phi^\delta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz function such that

$$\phi^\delta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| \geq \delta \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq \delta/2 \end{cases},$$

for a parameter $\delta > 0$ (ultimately $\delta \rightarrow 0$). It is also assumed that $\mathcal{X}_0^N \sim \tilde{f}_0^{\otimes N}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_0^N \sim f_0^{\otimes N}$ are optimally coupled for the distance W_{1,d_f} .

Using [Dur+20, Lemma 7], Itô's formula gives:

$$df(|E_t^i|) = \left(f'(|E_t^i|)C_t^i + 2\sigma^2 f''(|E_t^i|)\phi^\delta(E_t^i)^2 \right)dt + f'(|E_t^i|)A_t^i dt + dM_t^i,$$

where

$$C_t^i = -\langle \nabla V(\bar{X}_t^i) - \nabla V(X_t^i), e_t^i \rangle,$$

and $(A_t^i)_t$ is an adapted stochastic process such that

$$A_t^i \leq \left| \nabla W \star f_t(\bar{X}_t^i) - \nabla W \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(X_t^i) \right|,$$

and M_t^i is a martingale. As usual the drift term is split into two parts, the “non-interacting” part which involves C_t^i and the “interacting” part which involves A_t^i . Similarly to the proof of Theorem 5.5, the Durmus et al. take advantage of the non-interacting part to get a uniform

in time control and they treat the interacting part as a perturbation. The main difference is that, thanks to (146), the reflection coupling gives a better control, namely it holds that:

$$f'(|E_t^i|)C_t^i + 2\sigma^2 f''(|E_t^i|)\phi^\delta(E_t^i)^2 \leq -2cf(|E_t^i|) + \omega(\delta) + 2c_0f(\delta),$$

where $\omega(r) = \sup_{s \in [0, r]} s\kappa(s)^-$. The interacting part is controlled as usual by forcing the introduction of a nonlinear term:

$$A_t^i \leq \left| \nabla W \star \mu_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}(\overline{X}_t^i) - \nabla W \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(X_t^i) \right| + \left| \nabla W \star \mu_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}(\overline{X}_t^i) - \nabla w \star f_t(\overline{X}_t^i) \right|.$$

Using the hypotheses on W and a uniform in time moment control (similar to Lemma 5.6, see [Dur+20, Lemma 8]), we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}A_t^i \leq \frac{\eta}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}f(|E_t^i|) + \frac{C(\eta)}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $C(\eta) > 0$ does not depend on t . This yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}f(|E_t^i|) \leq -2\frac{c_0 - \eta}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}f(|E_t^i|) + \omega(\delta) + 2c_0f(\delta) + \frac{C(\eta)}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

The conclusion follows by Gronwall lemma and by letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ since it holds that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \omega(\delta) = 0$ and $f(0) = 0$. \square

The fact that the results holds for the distance W_{1,d_f} may seem unsatisfactory compared to Theorem 5.5 and its extensions which hold in W_2 distance or Theorem 5.32 which holds in W_1 distance. This directly comes from the somehow ad hoc estimate (146). The result has been recently improved in [LWZ20], where instead of the function f , the authors consider the function h solution of the following Poisson equation

$$4h''(r) + r\kappa(r)h'(r) = -r, \quad r > 0.$$

Using the same reflection coupling strategy, the authors obtain a similar uniform in time propagation of chaos result in W_1 distance, in both the pathwise and pointwise settings, see [LWZ20, Theorem 2.9]. This article also contains many results in W_1 distance regarding concentration inequalities and explicit exponential rates of convergence towards equilibrium (independent of N) for the particle system. The choice of the function h avoids some technicalities in the definition of the function f (see [EGZ19] and Lemma 5.11). The setting is quite general so we do not give all the details here. We only mention that it applies to cases where V is convex outside a ball but has potentially many wells. An assumption on $\nabla^2 W$ is also made in order to prevent phase transitions (which would forbid uniform in time estimates), see [LWZ20, Section 2.2].

5.2.2 Chaos via Glivenko-Cantelli

In a recent article [Hol16], Holding proves pathwise chaos on finite times using a coupling on vector-fields instead of particles for a system of the form (113) with constant diffusion matrix $\sigma = I_d$. The interaction kernel K_1 is less than Lipschitz, it can be Hölder (with and exponent larger than $2/3$ for kinetic systems). There is no strong assumption on the initial data. The argument is based on a new Glivenko-Cantelli theorem for vector fields which moves the need for regularity properties from the SDE system onto the limit equation.

Holding introduces the random measure $\tilde{f}_t^{b_N} \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, solution of the equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{f}_t^{b_N} + \nabla_x \cdot \left(b(x, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \tilde{f}_t^{b_N} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x \tilde{f}_t^{b_N}, \quad \tilde{f}_0^{b_N} = f_0. \quad (147)$$

From a SDE point of view, the coupling introduced by [Hol16] is given by the following exchangeable particle system, defined conditionally on the random vector-field $b_N := b(\cdot, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N})$

$$\tilde{X}_t^{i,N} = \tilde{X}_0^{i,N} + \int_0^t b\left(\tilde{X}_s^{i,N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}\right) ds + \tilde{B}_t^i,$$

where \tilde{B}_t^i are independent Brownian motions. The starting point of the proof is then similar to the one of McKean's theorem but with the splitting step:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[W_2^2\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, f_t\right)\right] \leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[W_2^2\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \tilde{f}_t^{b_N}\right)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[W_2^2\left(\tilde{f}_t^{b_N}, f_t\right)\right]. \quad (148)$$

The main difference with (123) is that $\tilde{f}_t^{b_N}$ replaces $\mu_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}$.

Conditionally on the random vector-field $b_N := b(\cdot, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N})$, the particles $X_t^{i,N}$ are $\tilde{f}_t^{b_N}$ -distributed random variables which is reminiscent of a law of large numbers. However, contrary to the law of large numbers, the $X_t^{i,N}$ are not independent here. Given a fixed (smooth) vector field $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ (random or not), we denote by $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N|b}$ the empirical measure of the N -particle system (113) where the drift is replaced by this fixed b . Note that $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N|b_N} = \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$. Similarly we denote by \tilde{f}_t^b the solution of (147) with b_N replaced by b . Then the first term on the right-hand side of (148) reads:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[W_2^2\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \tilde{f}_t^{b_N}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[W_2^2\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N|b_N}, \tilde{f}_t^{b_N}\right) \middle| b_N\right]\right]. \quad (149)$$

One of the main result [Hol16, Corollary 2.3] is a generalized Glivenko-Cantelli theorem for SDE which gives the explicit bound:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} W_2^2\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N|b}, \tilde{f}_t^b\right)\right] \leq \varepsilon(N, T),$$

where \mathcal{B} is a subset of Hölder regular vector fields and $\varepsilon(N, T) \rightarrow 0$ is an explicit polynomial rate of convergence. Taking the supremum in (149) over all the vector fields in \mathcal{B} , this controls the first term on the right-hand side of (148). To conclude, the control of the second term on the right-hand side of (148) shall result from stability estimates on the solution of the limit equation with respect to its vector-field parameter b .

With a traditional synchronous coupling, the Lipschitz regularity of b is used to control the particle system and a crude L^∞ estimate is used to control the error term which depends on the limit equation. With this approach, the need for regularity on b is weakened by the generalized Glivenko-Cantelli theorem and the control of the error term can take advantage of the regularity properties of the limit equation. This idea is successfully applied in [Hol16] to various first-order and kinetic systems, at the pathwise level.

5.2.3 Optimal coupling and WJ inequality

This section is devoted to the analytical coupling approach of [Sal20] described in the introductory Section 4.1.5. In this section, this approach is mainly applied to gradient-systems but, as explained in [Sal20, Section 2.2], it also allows to recover, at the level of the laws, many of the results obtained by synchronous or reflection coupling for more general McKean-Vlasov systems. The strategy originated from the earlier works [BGG12; BGG13] where the author prove the convergence to equilibrium of the solution of respectively the linear Fokker-Planck equation and the nonlinear granular media equation. The strategy is adapted and carried out at the particle level in [Sal20] and in [DT19] to prove at the same time the convergence to equilibrium and the propagation of chaos in a non globally convex setting.

In this section, we recall (see Definition 3.7) that \tilde{W}_2 denotes the non-normalised Wasserstein distance on E^N defined by $\tilde{W}_2^2(f^N, g^N) = NW_2^2(f^N, g^N)$ for $f^N, g^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$.

The starting point of the argument is the following observation. For general (linear) McKean-Vlasov systems of the form described in Section 4.1.5, the laws f_t^N and $f_t^{\otimes N}$ are both absolutely continuous solutions of continuity equations in \mathbb{R}^{dN} . It is therefore possible to compute the dissipation rate in \widetilde{W}_2 distance between them using a result which originates from the theory of gradient-flows [Vil09b, Theorem 23.9], namely it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{W}_2^2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} \left\langle \mathbf{b}^N(\mathbf{x}^N) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log f_t^N(\mathbf{x}^N), \nabla \psi_t^{N*}(\mathbf{x}^N) - \mathbf{x}^N \right\rangle f_t^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} \left\langle \left(b \star f_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log f_t \right)^{\otimes N}(\mathbf{x}^N), \nabla \psi_t^N(\mathbf{x}^N) - \mathbf{x}^N \right\rangle f_t^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N), \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

where ψ_t^N is the so-called maximizing Kantorovich potential between $f_t^{\otimes N}$ and f_t^N given by Brenier's theorem [Vil09b, Theorem 9.4] and defined by

$$\widetilde{W}_2^2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} |\nabla \psi_t^N(\mathbf{x}^N) - \mathbf{x}^N|^2 f_t^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N), \quad (151)$$

that is, the coupling $(\nabla \psi_t^N)_\# f_t^{\otimes N} = f_t^N$ is optimal for the \widetilde{W}_2 distance. The relation (150) can be obtained by a formal derivation of (151), the rigorous proof is the content of [Vil09b, Theorem 23.9]. The cornerstone of [Sal20] is the following proposition, which gives an explicit bound for the right-hand side of (150). For now on we fix $\sigma(x, \mu) = \sqrt{2}I_d$ for simplicity.

Proposition 5.13. *Given a symmetric probability measure $g^N \in \mathcal{P}_2((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, Salem introduces the quantity:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(g^N | \mathbf{b}^N, \nu^{\otimes N}) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} (\Delta \psi^N(\mathbf{x}^N) + \Delta \psi^{N*}(\nabla \psi^N) - 2dN) \nu^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \langle b(\nabla_i \psi^N(\mathbf{x}^N), \nabla_j \psi^N(\mathbf{x}^N)) - b(x^i, x^j), \nabla_i \psi^N(\mathbf{x}^N) - x^i \rangle \nu^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N), \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

where ψ^N is the maximizing Kantorovich potential such that $(\nabla \psi^N)_\# \nu^{\otimes N} = g^N$. Assume that the vector fields $(\mathbf{b}^N - \nabla \log f_s^N)_s$ and $(b \star f_s - \nabla \log f_s)_s$ are locally Lipschitz and satisfy for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} |\mathbf{b}^N - \nabla \log f_s^N|^2 d f_s^N ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b \star f_s - \nabla \log f_s|^2 d f_s ds < +\infty. \quad (153)$$

Then for all $\eta > 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}_2^2(f_t^{\otimes N}, f_t^N) &\leq \widetilde{W}_2^2(f_0^{\otimes N}, f_0^N) - 2 \int_0^t \mathcal{J}(f_s^N | \mathbf{b}^N, f_s^{\otimes N}) ds \\ &\quad + \eta \int_0^t \widetilde{W}_2^2(f_s^{\otimes N}, f_s^N) ds + \eta^{-1} \int_0^t \mathcal{F}_N(b, f_s) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_N(b, f_s) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} |b(x^i, x^j) - b \star f_s(x^i)|^2 f_s^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N). \quad (155)$$

The proof is detailed in [Sal20, Proposition 1]. Under mild local Lipschitz assumptions on b , the functional \mathcal{F}_N can be easily bounded uniformly in N . The whole point is therefore to find a good control of the functional \mathcal{J} . Two main ideas are given.

- First, it is possible to prove (see [BGG12, Lemma 3.2]):

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} (\Delta\psi_s^N(x) + \Delta\psi_s^{N*}(\nabla\psi_s^N) - 2dN)\mu_s^{\otimes N}(dx) \geq 0. \quad (156)$$

From this crude estimate, one can just neglect the corresponding term in (154) and retrieve all the results based on synchronous coupling (in particular McKean's theorem and Theorem 5.5).

- More generally, in order to apply Gronwall lemma in (154), it is desirable to bound \mathcal{J} from below by a W_2 distance. This lead [BGG12] and later [Sal20; DT19] to introduce the so-called WJ inequality. In this context, a probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to satisfy a symmetric WJ(κ) inequality for a constant $\kappa > 0$ when for all symmetric probability measure $g^N \in \mathcal{P}_2((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$, it holds that

$$\kappa \widetilde{W}_2^2(g^N, \nu^{\otimes N}) \leq \mathcal{J}(g^N | \mathbf{b}^N, \nu^{\otimes N}). \quad (157)$$

For a gradient system which possesses a unique stationary measure μ_∞ , [Sal20, Proposition 3] shows that μ_∞ satisfies a WJ(κ) inequality.

The main results [Sal20, Theorem 2.2, Corollary 1] are summarised in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.14 ([Sal20]). *Assume that $\sigma(x, \mu) = \sqrt{2}I_d$ and $b(x, \mu) \equiv b \star \mu(x)$ where*

$$b(x, y) = -\nabla V(x) - \varepsilon \nabla W(x - y),$$

with $V(x) = |x|^4 - a|x|^2$ and $W(x) = -|x|^2$, where $a, \varepsilon > 0$. Let $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}_6(\mathbb{R}^{dN}) \cap L \log L(\mathbb{R}^{dN})$. Then there exist $a_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $a < a_0$ and $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, then the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equation has a unique stationary solution $\mu_\infty \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and there exist two constants $C, \alpha > 0$ such that (for the normalised Wasserstein distance):

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad W_2^2(f_t^N, \mu_\infty^{\otimes N}) \leq W_2^2(f_0^N, \mu_\infty^{\otimes N}) e^{-\alpha t} + \frac{C}{N}.$$

Moreover if $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_6(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L \log L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f_0^N = f_0^{\otimes N}$ then there exists $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} W_2^2(f_t^{\otimes N}, f_t^N) \leq CN^{-\beta}.$$

Proof (summary). Let us summarise the main steps of the proof.

1. As usual, some a priori bounds are needed. In [Sal20, Lemma 4.1], the potentials are shown to satisfy an explicit property of convexity at infinity as well as an explicit L^∞ bound near the origin. Then it is possible to prove classical moment estimates which ensure that if the initial conditions have sufficiently many moments, then the moments of any order of both f_t^N and f_t are uniformly bounded in time.
2. The fundamental property is stated in [Sal20, Proposition 3]. First, by [BGG13, Proposition 4.4 (iii)], given potentials which satisfy [Sal20, Lemma 4.1], there exists a stationary solution μ_∞ of the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equation. Such a measure is a minimizer of the free energy of the system. Then for a, ε sufficiently small, such a measure μ_∞ is shown to satisfy a symmetric WJ(κ) inequality (157) for some $\kappa > 0$. This implies the uniqueness of μ_∞ .
3. In order to apply Proposition 5.13, it is necessary to check the assumption (153), which again follows from the preliminary bounds derived in [Sal20, Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2]. Then since \mathcal{F}_N can be bounded uniformly in N by a constant $C(a, \varepsilon)$, the inequality (154) gives for any $\eta > 0$:

$$\widetilde{W}_2^2(\mu_\infty^{\otimes N}, f_t^N) \leq \widetilde{W}_2^2(\mu_\infty^{\otimes N}, f_0^N) - (\kappa - \eta) \int_0^t \widetilde{W}_2^2(\mu_\infty^{\otimes N}, f_s^N) ds + \frac{tC(a, \varepsilon)}{\eta},$$

from which the first point of Theorem 5.14 immediately follows using Gronwall lemma.

4. The above point gives an optimal convergence rate towards the stationary measure μ_∞ . To control the distance to $f_t^{\otimes N}$ at any time $t > 0$, the classical strategy is to use on the one hand the exponential convergence of f_t towards μ_∞ to control the long-time behaviour and on the other hand the non uniform in time McKean's theorem to control the short time behaviour. First using [Vil09b, Theorem 23.9] and the WJ(κ) inequality satisfied by μ_∞ , it holds that

$$W_2^2(f_t, \mu_\infty) \leq W_2^2(f_0, \mu_\infty)e^{-\kappa t}.$$

Since the inequality is preserved by tensorization, the triangle inequality yields

$$W_2^2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq W_2^2(f_0^N, \mu_\infty^{\otimes N})e^{-C(a,\varepsilon)t} + \frac{C}{N} + W_2^2(f_0, \mu_\infty)e^{-\kappa t}. \quad (158)$$

Moreover for $f_0^N = f_0^{\otimes N}$, using (154) and (156) (or equivalently, McKean's theorem), it holds that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$W_2^2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq \frac{Ce^{C(a,\varepsilon,\eta)t}}{N}. \quad (159)$$

Choosing $T_N = \delta \log N$, the result follows by combining (158) for $t \geq T_N$ and (159) for $t \leq T_N$. □

A similar result is obtained in [DT19, Theorem C, Corollary D] also by means of a WJ inequality but in the equivalent case where σ is taken large enough. The authors consider a broader class of potentials, though the main assumption remains convexity of V outside a ball of confinement. In fact, it seems that the result of [Sal20] holds for potentials which satisfy [Sal20, Lemma 4.1], which is very similar to [DT19, Assumptions (A-1)-(A-10)]. The main difference with [Sal20] is that the authors do not derive the general inequality (154) but prove an improved version of McKean's theorem (using a synchronous coupling) in the case of non independent initial conditions, see [DT19, Proposition B]. Both approaches are motivated by [BGG12; BGG13]. More precisely, they are based on [BGG12, Proposition 3.4] which gives a criterion for an invariant measure μ_∞ to satisfy a WJ inequality. This leads to the equivalent results [Sal20, Proposition 3] and [DT19, Proposition 2.3].

5.3 Compactness methods for mixed systems and gradient flows

The content of this section develops the compactness arguments introduced in Section 4.2 in two cases. Section 5.3.1 focuses on the functional law of large numbers and the strong pathwise empirical propagation of chaos via martingale arguments (see Definition 3.45). Section 5.3.2 uses the gradient-flow formulation to prove a pointwise empirical propagation of chaos result for gradient systems.

5.3.1 Pathwise chaos via martingale arguments

We first state the assumptions on the generator of the particles process. In all this section we consider a subspace of the set of test functions $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(E)$ such that $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq C_{\mathcal{F}}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. We assume that \mathcal{F} is contained in the domain of L_μ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $\mathcal{F}^{\otimes N} \subset \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_N)$.

Assumption 5.15 (Mean-field generator and initial well-posedness). *The generator of the process $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_{t \geq 0}$ is of the mean-field type (6) and the associated martingale problem (Definition 2.4) is wellposed. Moreover the initial law $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}(E^N)$ satisfies the moment bound:*

$$\sup_N \mathbb{E} |X_0^{i,N}|^2 < +\infty.$$

Since L_μ can involve any differential operator with no homogeneous term and any integral jump operator, this generator covers the case of the McKean-Vlasov diffusion and of the mean-field jump processes. It can also be a mixed jump-diffusion generator.

Assumption 5.16 (Bounds on the limit generator). *There exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that*

$$\forall x \in E, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(E)} \left\{ |L_\mu \varphi(x)|^2 + \Gamma_{L_\mu}(\varphi, \varphi)(x) \right\} \leq C_L(1 + |x|^2).$$

The main consequence of Assumption 5.16 is to ensure the uniform control of the second moment on any interval $[0, T]$ (weaker assumptions could thus be sufficient in specific cases):

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |X_t^{1,N}|^2 \right] \leq C_T \left(1 + \mathbb{E} |X_0^{1,N}|^2 \right), \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |M_t^{1,N}|^2 \right] \leq C_T \left(1 + \mathbb{E} |X_0^{1,N}|^2 \right), \quad (160)$$

where $X_t^{1,N} = X_0^{1,N} + M_t^{1,N} + A_t^{1,N}$ is the semimartingale decomposition of $X_t^{1,N}$ (see Appendix D.3.4). This is proved in [JM86, Lemma 3.2.2]. It relies on the use of Gronwall lemma in Itô's formula: the bound on the generator controls the integral term and the bound on the carré du champ operator controls the martingale part (see also Proposition D.35). For the jump and diffusion processes, Assumption 5.16 holds under the usual global Lipschitz assumptions which also ensure the wellposedness of both the particle process and the nonlinear system. We also recall that for the mean-field jump process

$$\Gamma_{L_\mu}(\varphi, \varphi)(x) = \int_E [\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)]^2 P_\mu(x, dy),$$

and for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion,

$$\Gamma_{L_\mu}(\varphi, \varphi)(x) = 2(\nabla \varphi(x))^T a(x, \mu) \nabla \varphi(x).$$

The main difference between the functional law of large numbers (Theorem 5.19) and the strong pathwise empirical propagation of chaos result (Theorem 5.23) will be the assumption on the limit law.

Functional law of large numbers. We first prove a functional law of large numbers, that is the convergence of the sequence of

$$F_{[0,T]}^{\mu,N} = \text{Law} \left((\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})_{0 \leq t \leq T} \right) \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))), \quad (161)$$

which means that the empirical process is seen as a random càdlàg measure-valued process $t \mapsto \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$, where $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$ is the N -particle process given by Assumption 5.15. Two additional assumptions are needed.

Assumption 5.17 (Limit continuity). *The following function is continuous in both variables (for the weak topology):*

$$(\mu, \varphi) \in \mathcal{P}(E) \times \mathcal{F} \mapsto \langle \mu, L_\mu \varphi \rangle \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This assumption is satisfied in particular for generators which are differential or integral operators with continuous integrable coefficients. This assumption is necessary to take the limit within an equation, instead of using direct càdlàg characterizations. The last assumption concerns the limit law.

Assumption 5.18 (Limit uniqueness). *For every $T > 0$ and any $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, the limit nonlinear weak PDE (7) has at most one unique solution in $C([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))$.*

Note that existence is not required as it will be included in the following propagation of chaos result.

Theorem 5.19 (Functional law of large numbers). *Let $(f_0^N)_N$ be an initial f_0 -chaotic sequence and let $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$ be the E^N -valued N -particle process given by Assumption 5.15 with initial distribution f_0^N . Assume that Assumptions 5.15, 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18 hold true. Then the nonlinear weak PDE (7) is well-posed and its solution $(f_t)_t \in C([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))$ satisfies:*

$$F_{[0, T]}^{\mu, N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_{(f_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))).$$

where $F_{[0, T]}^{\mu, N}$ is the law of the measure-valued empirical process defined by (161).

To prove this theorem, we will follow a method which can be found in [Mer16] and which we adapt to the more abstract present framework.

Proof. The proof is split into several steps: using (the general) Itô's formula, we start with some preliminary computations in the linear case which will be used to prove a tightness result on the weak pathwise law $F_{[0, T]}^{\mu, N}$. Then we identify the limit points by controlling the stochastic remainder.

Step 1. *Some preliminary computations for linear test functions.*

Let us consider a one-particle test functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ and let us define the average N -particle test function

$$\bar{\varphi}_N : \mathbf{x}^N \mapsto \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi \rangle.$$

By Assumption 5.15, it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}_N \bar{\varphi}_N(\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{N} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi(x^i) = \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi \rangle, \quad (162)$$

so that Itô's formula gives

$$\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \varphi \rangle = \langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_0^N}, \varphi \rangle + \int_0^t \langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}} \varphi \rangle ds + M_t^{N, \varphi}, \quad (163)$$

where $M_t^{N, \varphi}$ is martingale. Using Assumption 5.15 again, the carré du champ operator reads:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\bar{\varphi}_N, \bar{\varphi}_N)(\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N [L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\bar{\varphi}_N^2](\mathbf{x}^N) - 2 \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi \rangle L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i \bar{\varphi}_N(\mathbf{x}^N)].$$

Since $L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}$ is linear and vanishes on constant functions, one obtains for any index $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$N^2 L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\bar{\varphi}_N^2](\mathbf{x}^N) = L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^2](x^i) + 2 \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \varphi(x^j) \right) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi(x^i),$$

and

$$2N^2 \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi \rangle L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i \bar{\varphi}_N(\mathbf{x}^N) = 2\varphi(x^i) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi(x^i) + 2 \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \varphi(x^j) \right) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi(x^i).$$

We conclude that:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\bar{\varphi}_N, \bar{\varphi}_N)(\mathbf{x}^N) = \frac{1}{N} \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi, \varphi) \rangle. \quad (164)$$

The right-hand side goes to 0 as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ thanks to (160) and Assumption 5.16.

Step 2. *Tightness of the sequence $(F_{[0, T]}^{\mu, N})_{N \geq 1}$.*

We follow the method of [Mer16]. The tightness is proved using Jakubowski's criterion (Theorem D.9).

(i) We first prove that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} \in K_\varepsilon) > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Since for every $M > 0$ and $x_0 \in E$, the set

$$\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \int_E d_E^2(x, x_0) \nu(dx) \leq M \right\}$$

is compact for the weak topology on $\mathcal{P}(E)$, it is enough to prove that the uniform L^2 moment bound on $f_0^{1,N}$ is propagated on $[0, T]$ uniformly in N . Thanks to Assumption 5.16, this is the content of (160).

(ii) The set of linear functions on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ $\Phi : \nu \mapsto \langle \nu, \varphi \rangle$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ separates points and is closed under addition. We therefore fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ and we prove the tightness of the laws in $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$ of the real-valued process $(\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \varphi \rangle)_t$. To do that, we use Aldous criterion (Theorem D.8) and we use the decomposition (163). Since the process is bounded, the first condition is automatically satisfied. Then, let us fix two \mathcal{F}_t -adapted stopping times $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \tau_1 + \theta$ for a fixed $\theta > 0$. On the one hand, by Doob's optional sampling theorem, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}|M_{\tau_2}^{N,\varphi} - M_{\tau_1}^{N,\varphi}|^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[|M_{\tau_2}^{N,\varphi}|^2 - |M_{\tau_1}^{N,\varphi}|^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} d\langle M^{N,\varphi} \rangle_t\right].$$

Using Lemma D.28 and (164), we deduce that:

$$\mathbb{E}|M_{\tau_2}^{N,\varphi} - M_{\tau_1}^{N,\varphi}|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\bar{\varphi}_N, \bar{\varphi}_N)(\mathcal{X}_t^N) dt\right] \leq C_\varphi \frac{\theta}{N}.$$

On the other hand, using (162), Assumption 5.16 and (160), one gets (up to changing the constant)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \mathcal{L}_N \bar{\varphi}_N(\mathcal{X}_t^N) dt\right)^2\right] \leq C_\varphi \theta^2.$$

Formula (163) therefore leads to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{\tau_2}^N} - \mu_{\mathcal{X}_{\tau_1}^N}, \varphi \rangle^2\right] \leq C_\varphi \left[\theta^2 + \frac{\theta}{N}\right].$$

We conclude using the Markov inequality that the conditions of Aldous criterion are fulfilled.

Step 3. Skorokhod representation for limit points and well-posedness.

For any $T > 0$, the sequence $(F_{[0,T]}^{\mu, N})_{N \geq 1}$ is thus relatively compact for the weak topology on $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E)))$. Let π be a limit point. Skorokhod representation theorem provides then a probability space Ω on which a realisation of $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ converges almost surely (up to an extraction which we do not relabel) towards a π -distributed $D([0, T], \mathcal{P}(E))$ -valued random variable $(\bar{f}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, such that a.s. $\bar{f}_0 = f_0$ thanks to the initial chaos assumption. We want to prove that \bar{f}_t is almost surely a solution of (7). Using Assumption 5.18, we will deduce that this PDE is well-posed and that π is the Dirac mass at this solution. Using the BDG inequality, it holds that:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(M_t^{N,\varphi}\right)^2\right] \leq 4\mathbb{E}[M^{N,\varphi}_T] = 4\mathbb{E}[\langle M^{N,\varphi} \rangle_T],$$

where we have used that $([M^{N,\varphi}]_t - \langle M^{N,\varphi} \rangle_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is a martingale. Then using Lemma D.28 and Step 1 we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(M_t^{N,\varphi} \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{4}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}}}(\varphi, \varphi) \right\rangle dt \right] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

where we have used Assumption 5.16. Up to extracting once more, we can assume that the above L^2 convergence is almost sure:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} M_t^{N,\varphi} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (165)$$

By the continuity Assumption 5.17, we can take the limit in (163) and we obtained by dominated convergence that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \quad \langle \bar{f}_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle \bar{f}_0, \varphi \rangle + \int_0^t \langle \bar{f}_s, L_{\bar{f}_s} \varphi \rangle ds \quad \text{a.s.}$$

To recover the limit equation, one needs to invert the “ $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ ” term and the “almost surely” mention. To do that, let us consider a dense countable subset $(\varphi^n)_n$ of \mathcal{F} (it exists because E is a Polish space). The previous steps tells that for each φ^n , the set of issues in Ω such that the equality $\frac{d}{dt} \langle \bar{f}_t, \varphi^n \rangle = \langle \bar{f}_t, L_{\bar{f}_t} \varphi^n \rangle$ does not hold for some $0 \leq t \leq T$ is negligible. By countable union, the set of issues such that this equality does not hold for every $0 \leq t \leq T$ for any of the φ^n is still negligible. We then use the continuity with respect to φ from Assumption 5.17 to conclude by density that $(\bar{f}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ almost surely solves

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle \bar{f}_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle \bar{f}_t, L_{\bar{f}_t} \varphi \rangle.$$

Theorem D.10 now proves that $t \mapsto \bar{f}_t$ is almost surely continuous: indeed the vanishing of jumps directly stems from the decomposition (163) together with Equation (165), as required by Theorem D.10 (note this condition is reminiscent from Aldous criterion in Step 2). This shows that any π -distributed random function is almost surely a solution of (7). Since this solution is unique by Assumption 5.18, this shows the well-posedness of (7) and proves that $\pi = \delta_{(f_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}}$ where f_t is the unique solution of (7). \square

Example 5.20. In addition to the historical works [Oel84; Gär88] already mentioned, this method has been recently applied in [Mer16] in a coagulation-fragmentation model leading to the 4-wave kinetic equation and in [Die20] for a mean-field PDMP on a manifold leading to a BGK equation. This approach also works to prove moderate interaction results [Oel85]. This proof remains true for Boltzmann molecules, in which case the first step (which corresponds to Lemma B.1) has to be replaced by Lemma B.3.

Remark 5.21 (The need for quadratic estimates). This proof may seem surprising because only one-particle test functions on E are considered even though it leads to a convergence result on random measure-valued process. The quadratic estimates actually lie in the computation of the quadratic variation of the martingale $M_t^{N,\varphi}$ in Step 2 and in the control of the carré du champ operator (164). This last computation is a special case of the more general result in Lemma B.1 about the behaviour of the generator for polynomial test functions of order two. Namely, taking $\varphi_2 = \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2 \in \mathcal{F}^{\otimes 2}$ and denoting by

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \quad R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\nu) = \langle \nu^{\otimes 2}, \varphi_2 \rangle,$$

the associated polynomial function on $\mathcal{P}(E)$, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N [R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N] (\mathbf{x}^N) &= R_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2} (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and the carré du champ estimate (164) stems from that since

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\bar{\varphi}_N^1, \bar{\varphi}_N^2)(\mathbf{x}^N) &= \mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N) \\ &\quad - R_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) - R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}), \end{aligned} \quad (166)$$

thanks to the mean-field property $\mathcal{L}_N \bar{\varphi}_N = \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi \rangle$. Note that purely one particle-related methods are not possible, because the weak convergence of $f_t^{k,N}$ characterizing Kac's chaos has to hold at least with $k \geq 2$ (Lemma 3.34).

Strong pathwise empirical chaos. For the strong pathwise result, the goal is to prove the convergence of the sequence of

$$F_{[0,T]}^N = \text{Law}\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N}\right) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E))), \quad (167)$$

which means that the empirical process is seen as a random empirical measure on the path space $D([0,T], \mathcal{P}(E))$, to which belongs each component of the N -particle process $\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N$ given by Assumption 5.15.

The proof of the following theorem can be found in [GM97; Mé196] and relies on the classical and powerful framework described [JM86]. The starting point is a strong uniqueness result for the limit martingale problem.

Assumption 5.22 (Uniqueness for the limit martingale problem). *Given an initial value $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, there exists at most one solution $f_{[0,T]} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E))$ to the nonlinear mean-field martingale problem (Definition 2.6).*

Note once more that existence is not needed.

Theorem 5.23 (Strong pathwise empirical chaos). *Let $(f_0^N)_N$ an initial f_0 -chaotic sequence and let $\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N \in D([0,T], E^N)$ be the N -particle process given by Assumption 5.15 with initial distribution f_0^N . Assume that Assumptions 5.15, 5.16, and 5.22 hold true. Then the nonlinear mean-field martingale problem (Definition 2.6) is well-posed and its solution $f_{[0,T]} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E))$ satisfies:*

$$F_{[0,T]}^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_{f_{[0,T]}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E))),$$

where $F_{[0,T]}^N$ is the pathwise empirical law defined by (167).

Proof. The first step is to show the tightness of the sequence $(F_{[0,T]}^N)_N$ in the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E)))$.

Step 1. Tightness.

Thanks to the exchangeability and Lemma 3.28, it is sufficient to prove the tightness of the sequence of the first moment measures $F_{[0,T]}^{1,N}$. Note that:

$$F_{[0,T]}^{1,N} = \text{Law}\left(X_{[0,T]}^{1,N}\right) \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E)).$$

The process $(X_t^{1,N})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ can be characterized as a D -semimartingale (see Definition D.27) thanks to Assumption 5.15 by taking $\varphi_N = \varphi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-1)}$ as a test function, given a one-particle test function $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$. It implies that

$$M_t^{\varphi,1,N} := \varphi(X_t^{1,N}) - \varphi(X_0^{1,N}) - \int_0^t L_{\mu_{X_s^{1,N}}} \varphi(X_s^{1,N}) ds,$$

is a martingale. The Joffe-Metivier criterion D.35 can then be applied: Assumption 5.16 implies the tightness of $(F_{[0,T]}^{1,N})_{N \geq 1}$. Moreover, using Lemma D.28 and Assumption 5.15 the predictable quadratic variation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M^{\varphi,1,N} \rangle_t &= \int_0^t \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}_N} \left(\varphi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-1)}, \varphi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-1)} \right) (\mathcal{X}_s^N) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}}} (\varphi, \varphi) (X_s^{1,N}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $k \leq N$, taking $\varphi_N = 1^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes \varphi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-k)}$, the following process is a martingale:

$$M_t^{\varphi,k,N} := \varphi(X_t^{k,N}) - \varphi(X_0^{k,N}) - \int_0^t L_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}} \varphi(X_s^{k,N}) ds.$$

The predictable cross variation can be computed the same way taking as a test function $\varphi_N = \varphi \otimes \psi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-2)}$,

$$\langle M^{\varphi,1,N}, M^{\psi,2,N} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}_N} (\varphi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-1)}, 1 \otimes \psi \otimes 1^{\otimes(N-2)}) (\mathcal{X}_s^N) ds = 0. \quad (168)$$

It will be useful for Step 3.

Step 2. *Skorokhod representation for limit points and continuity points.*

Let $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E)))$ be a limit point of $(F_{[0,T]}^N)_{N \geq 1}$. Using Skorokhod representation theorem, it is possible to consider a probability space and a π -distributed random variable $f_{[0,T]} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E))$ such that (for the weak topology):

$$\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_{[0,T]} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Consider now $n \geq 1$ with some positive real numbers $s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n \leq s < t$ and some functions $\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^n \in \mathcal{F}$ and let us consider the function:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t} : \nu \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E)) \\ \mapsto \left\langle \nu, \left(\varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_s) - \int_s^t L_{\nu_r} \varphi(X_r) dr \right) \varphi^1(X_{s_1}) \dots \varphi^n(X_{s_n}) \right\rangle \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nu_r = (X_r)_\# \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ denotes the r -marginal of ν . Note that $F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}$ is not continuous since the coordinates maps $X \mapsto X_t$ are not continuous in general for the Skorokhod topology. However for u in \mathbb{R}_+ , consider the event

$$A_u := \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E)) : Q(\{X \in D([0,T], E) : |\Delta X_u| > 0\}) > 0 \right\}.$$

Adapting a proof from [GM97], let us show that the set

$$J := \{u \in \mathbb{R}_+, \pi(A_u) > 0\},$$

is at most countable. The key idea is that given $k \geq 1$, a càdlàg function X on a compact time-interval admits a finite numbers of jumps with amplitudes bigger than $1/k$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{J}(X, 1/k, [0, k])$ the number of jumps of X with amplitude $|\Delta X_t| > 1/k$ for $t \in [0, k]$. Define then for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_u^{k,m} := \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{P}(D([0,T], E)) : \right. \\ \left. Q(\{X \in D([0,T], E) : |\Delta X_u| > 1/k \text{ and } \mathcal{J}(X, 1/k, [0, k]) \leq mk\}) > 1/k \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the following properties hold.

- The sequence $\left(\bigcup_{m \geq 1} A_u^{k,m}\right)_{k \geq 1}$ is non-decreasing (for the set inclusion) in k .
- For a fixed $k \geq 1$, the sequence $(A_u^{k,m})_{m \geq 1}$ is non-decreasing in m .
- The set A_u can be decomposed as

$$A_u = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bigcup_{m \geq 1} A_u^{k,m}.$$

The monotonic convergence of probability measures thus gives

$$\pi(A_u) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \pi\left(\bigcup_{m \geq 1} A_u^{k,m}\right) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \pi(A_u^{k,m}).$$

Introducing

$$J^{k,m} := \{u \in [0, k], \pi(A_u^{k,m}) > 1/k\},$$

the same trick leads to

$$J = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bigcup_{m \geq 1} J^{k,m}.$$

Let us now prove that $J^{k,m}$ is finite. If it were not, there would exist a sequence $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of pairwise distinct numbers in $[0, k]$ such that

$$\forall n \geq 1, \quad \pi(A_{u_n}^{k,m}) > 1/k.$$

We apply now (the consequence of) Lemma C.1 to $(A_{u_n}^{k,m})_{n \geq 1}$ in the probability space $\Omega = \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$ and $P = \pi$: for every $n \geq 1$, there exists an intersection involving n of the A_{u_i} which has positive π -measure, and this leads to the existence of integers $i_1^n < \dots < i_n^n$ such that

$$\pi\left(\left\{Q \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E)) : \forall 1 \leq j \leq n, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. Q\left(\left\{X \in D([0, T], E) : |\Delta X_{u_{i_j^n}}| > \frac{1}{k} \text{ and } \mathcal{J}(X, 1/k, [0, k]) \leq mk\right\}\right) > \frac{1}{k}\right\}\right) > 0.$$

The same reasoning can be applied within the probability, considering a probability measure $Q \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$ such that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$Q\left(\left\{X \in D([0, T], E) : |\Delta X_{u_{i_j^n}}| > 1/k \text{ and } \mathcal{J}(X, 1/k, [0, k]) \leq mk\right\}\right) > 1/k,$$

and applying Lemma C.1 with $P = Q$ and $\Omega = D([0, T], E)$ to the events

$$\left(\left\{X \in D([0, T], E) : |\Delta X_{u_{i_j^n}}| > 1/k \text{ and } \mathcal{J}(X, 1/k, [0, k]) \leq mk\right\}\right)_{1 \leq j \leq n}.$$

Since n can be taken arbitrarily large, this allows to consider an arbitrary large intersection of these events which has Q -positive measure. This is contradictory since the number of jumps with amplitude bigger than $1/k$ allowed on $[0, k]$ is at most mk .

This proves the finiteness of $J^{k,m}$ for any $k, m \geq 1$, so J is at most countable by countable union. This implies the π -almost sure continuity of $F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}$ for s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t outside an at most countable set D_π . Outside of this set

$$F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0, T]}^N}\right) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}(f_{[0, T]}).$$

Note this proof does not use the (true) continuity of the limit process as in the weak pathwise proof: this argument is more general and can be adapted to Maxwell molecules as in [GM97]. It also allows to get rid of Assumption 5.17.

Step 3. *Identifying the limit points using the martingale problem.*

To recover $\langle \pi, F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t} \rangle$, it is now sufficient to take the expectation. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and then Fatou's lemma, it holds that for s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t outside of D_π

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \pi, |F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}|^2 \rangle &\leq \langle \pi, F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}^2 \rangle \\
&\leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{f_{[0, T]}^N} \left[F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}^2 \left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0, T]}^N} \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{f_{[0, T]}^N} \left[\left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (M_t^{\varphi, i, N} - M_s^{\varphi, i, N}) \varphi^1(\mathbf{X}_{s_1}^{1, N}) \dots \varphi^n(\mathbf{X}_{s_n}^{1, N}) \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{f_{[0, T]}^N} \left[\left\{ (M_t^{\varphi, 1, N} - M_s^{\varphi, 1, N}) \varphi^1(\mathbf{X}_{s_1}) \dots \varphi^n(\mathbf{X}_{s_n}) \right\}^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{N-1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{f_{[0, T]}^N} \left[(M_t^{\varphi, 1, N} - M_s^{\varphi, 1, N}) (M_t^{\varphi, 2, N} - M_s^{\varphi, 2, N}) \times \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \varphi^1(\mathbf{X}_{s_1}^{1, N}) \dots \varphi^n(\mathbf{X}_{s_n}^{1, N}) \varphi^1(\mathbf{X}_{s_1}^{2, N}) \dots \varphi^n(\mathbf{X}_{s_n}^{2, N}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Assumption 5.16 ensures that $\mathcal{M}_t^{\varphi, 1, N}$ is bounded in L^2 by the carré du champ vector, so that the first term on the right-hand side vanishes as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. For the second one, we write:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[M_t^{\varphi, 1, N} M_s^{\varphi, 2, N} \mid \sigma((\mathbf{X}_r)_{0 \leq r \leq s}) \right] = M_s^{\varphi, 1, N} M_s^{\varphi, 2, N}.$$

Then, since the cross-brackets (168) are equal to zero, taking the expectation leads to:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[M_t^{\varphi, 1, N} M_s^{\varphi, 2, N} \right] = 0.$$

So the second term is actually equal to zero.

This proves $F_{s_1, \dots, s_n, s, t}$ is 0 π -almost surely: this holds for every $0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n \leq s < t$ outside the countable set D_π , so that $\varphi^1(\mathbf{X}_{s_1}) \dots \varphi^n(\mathbf{X}_{s_n})$ can be replaced by any $\sigma((\mathbf{X}_r)_{0 \leq r \leq s})$ -measurable function to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(\mathbf{X}_t) - \varphi(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^t L_{f_r} \varphi(\mathbf{X}_r) dr \mid \sigma((\mathbf{X}_r)_{0 \leq r \leq s}) \right] \\
= \varphi(\mathbf{X}_s) - \varphi(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^s L_{f_r} \varphi(\mathbf{X}_r) dr,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $f_{[0, T]}$ being π -distributed. This proves that every such $f_{[0, T]}$ solves the martingale problem of Assumption 5.22. Consequently, this proves existence for this problem and since uniqueness holds, the problem is well-posed and π has to be a Dirac measure $\delta_{f_{[0, T]}}$ which concludes the proof. \square

Example 5.24. In [Chi94], the argument is reversed: Theorem 5.23 states only an existence result which is then used to prove the strong uniqueness result using a synchronous coupling argument. Propagation of chaos follows. This allows to treat the case of McKean-Vlasov diffusions with more general interaction functions.

5.3.2 Gradient systems as gradient flows

In this section we consider McKean-Vlasov gradient systems with:

$$b(x, \mu) = -\nabla V(x) - \nabla W \star \mu(x), \quad \sigma = \sqrt{2} I_d.$$

The following theorem states that the McKean-Vlasov gradient systems can be characterised as gradient flows at the three levels of description: the nonlinear solution of the limit equation, the N -particle distribution and the $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ -valued curve inherited from the nonlinear semigroup defined in Section 4.3.3.

Theorem 5.25 (McKean-Vlasov as gradient flows). *Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f_0^N \in \mathcal{P}_4^{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{R}^{dN})$ admit a density. Let V, W be respectively a confinement potential and an interaction potential which are both bounded below, λ -convex for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume also that W is symmetric and satisfies the doubling condition*

$$\exists C > 0, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad W(x+y) \leq C(1+W(x)+W(y)).$$

1. In $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let the energy \mathcal{F} be defined by:

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x) \log \rho(x) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) \rho(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W(x-y) \rho(x) \rho(y) dy,$$

whenever ρ has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure and $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = +\infty$ otherwise. Then there exists a unique 2λ -gradient flow f_t such that $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} f_t = f_0$ in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover f_t is a weak distributional solution of the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation (12).

2. In $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{dN})$, let the energy \mathcal{F}^N be defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^N(\rho^N) := & \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} \rho^N(\mathbf{x}^N) \log \rho^N(\mathbf{x}^N) d\mathbf{x}^N + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} V(x^i) \rho^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\ & + \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dN}} W(x^i - x^j) \rho^N(d\mathbf{x}^N). \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists a unique 3λ -gradient flow f_t^N for \mathcal{F}^N such that $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} f_t^N = f_0^N$ in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{dN})$. Moreover f_t^N is a weak distributional solution of the N -particle Liouville equation (75).

3. In $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, let the energy \mathcal{F}^∞ be defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^\infty(\pi) := \int_{\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \mathcal{F}(\rho) \pi(d\rho).$$

Then there exists a unique 3λ -gradient flow π_t for \mathcal{F}^∞ such that $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \pi_t = \pi_0 := \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} F_0^N \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Moreover π_t is explicitly given by

$$\pi_t = (\overline{S}_t)_\# \pi_0,$$

where $\overline{S}_t : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the nonlinear semi-group generated by the McKean-Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation defined in Section 4.3.3.

The first two points are classical, see [DS14, Theorem 6.31] or [AGS08, Chapter 11]. The third point is proved in [CDP20, Lemma 19]. Within this setting, propagation of chaos is proved in [CDP20, Theorem 2].

Theorem 5.26 ([CDP20]). *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.25 and with the same notations, for all $T > 0$ it holds that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_2(f_t^N, \pi_t^N) = 0,$$

where π_t^N is the N -th moment measure of π_t defined by:

$$\pi_t^N = \int_{\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \rho^{\otimes N} \pi_t(d\rho) = \int_{\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \overline{S}_t(\rho)^{\otimes N} \pi_0(d\rho).$$

In particular if f_0^N is f_0 -chaotic, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_2(f_t^N, f_t^{\otimes N}) = 0.$$

The key result is [CDP20, Lemma 13]. It is based on Ascoli's theorem in the space $C([0, T], \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)))$ and states that there exists $\pi = (\pi_t)_t \in C([0, T], \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)))$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{W}_2^2(F_t^N, \pi_t) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

up to extracting a subsequence and where $\mathcal{W}_2 \equiv W_{2, W_2}$ is the Wasserstein-2 distance on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ (see Definition 3.7). Using the fact that the push-forward by the empirical measure map is an isometry for the Wasserstein distance, it is possible to prove that this convergence is equivalent to the convergence of the N -particle distribution:

$$\sup_{[0, T]} W_2^2(f_t^N, \pi_t^N) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

See for instance [CDP20, Lemma 10] or [HM14, Theorem 5.3]. Once a converging subsequence is extracted, the limit π is identified as the unique gradient flow with energy \mathcal{F}^∞ by passing to the limit in the EVI (77) with energy \mathcal{F}^N using a Γ -convergence result [CDP20, Lemma 16].

5.4 Entropy bounds with very weak regularity

In this section, the problem is to weaken the regularity assumptions of Theorem 5.1 for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion with coefficients:

$$b(x, \mu) = \tilde{b}(x, K \star \mu(x)), \quad \sigma = I_d, \quad (169)$$

where $\tilde{b} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is still assumed to be Lipschitz but the interaction kernel $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ has a very weak regularity. Among the methods that are introduced in Section 4, the entropy-based methods (Section 4.4.2) are particularly adapted to handle weak regularity. From a probabilistic point of view, the relative entropy functional (Definition 3.16) naturally arises as the rate function of a large deviation principle and entropy bounds are classically obtained as an application of Girsanov theorem which does not require any particular regularity assumptions (see for instance Lemma 4.24). The content of this section will be based on the entropy methods introduced in [JW16; JW18] and which can be seen as an analytical counterpart of these observations. The main object of study will therefore be the Liouville equation (rather than the system of SDEs) for which it is possible to define a notion of entropy solution which is well adapted to the context (see Definition 5.29 below). For the limit solution f of (12), things are easier because it is possible to propagate the regularity of f_0 and it is therefore possible to assume that f can be taken very regular. The starting point is the evolution equation for $H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N})$ derived in Lemma 4.27.

Remark 5.27. We would like to emphasize the importance of the Girsanov theorem as the underlying idea although this section contains purely analytical arguments. A probabilistic pathwise version of the results presented in this section which are directly based on Girsanov theorem can be found in [Lac18] and [Jab19]. These works focus more on the ability to take an abstract general interaction function b rather than on regularity questions. We will discuss these aspects in Section 5.6.2.

5.4.1 An introductory example in the L^∞ case

As an introductory example to the work of [JW18], let us first start with the case where $K \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (that is, compared to McKean's theorem, the Lipschitz and continuity assumptions on K are removed). The following computations are essentially formal but the ideas will be used in a rigorous framework in the next paragraph. In particular, we assume that f_t is regular enough so that $\log f_t$ can be taken as a test function in the weak Liouville equation (1). Using the entropy dissipation relation on f_t^N which defines the notion of entropy solution, the

computations in the proof Lemma 4.27 can be fully justified. With $\alpha = 1$ in the conclusion, we recall that we obtained (in integrated form):

$$H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq H(f_0^N | f_0^{\otimes N}) + N \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{f_s^N} \left[|b(X_s^1, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_s^N}) - b(X_s^1, f_s)|^2 \right] ds. \quad (170)$$

The goal is to find a uniform bound (in N) for the expectation on the right-hand side in terms of $H(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N})$. Gronwall lemma will then give a bound on the entropy and propagation of chaos will follow as explained in Section 4.4.2. Note that this quantity is not very far from (124) in the proof of McKean's theorem. The main difference is that the expectation on the right-hand side is an expectation with respect to f_t^N instead of an expectation with respect to $f_t^{\otimes N}$. Of course the latter is more amenable as it allows to use the very simple but efficient argument of Sznitman based on the law of large number and which uses only the boundedness of K . The next idea is thus a change of measure argument which is the content of [JW18, Lemma 1]: for all $\eta > 0$ and all $\varphi_N \in L^\infty(E^N)$,

$$\int_{E^N} \varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N) f_t^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \leq \frac{1}{\eta N} \left(H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) + \log \int_{E^N} e^{\eta N \varphi_N(\mathbf{x}^N)} f_t^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N) \right). \quad (171)$$

This identity simply comes from the positivity of the relative entropy $H(f_t^N | u)$ for the probability density $u := e^{\eta N \varphi_N} / \int e^{\eta N \varphi_N}$. Using this relation gives:

$$\begin{aligned} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) &\leq H(f_0^N | f_0^{\otimes N}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^t H(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \log \int_{E^N} \exp\left(\eta N |b(x^1, \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) - b(x^1, f_s)|^2\right) f_s^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the square and using (169) as in the proof of McKean's theorem leads to:

$$H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq H(f_0^N | f_0^{\otimes N}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^t H(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) ds + \int_0^t \log Z_N ds,$$

with

$$Z_N := \int_{E^N} \exp\left(\frac{\eta \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \psi(x^1, x^i) \psi(x^1, x^j)\right) f_s^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{x}^N),$$

where

$$\psi(x, y) = K(x, y) - K \star f_s(x). \quad (172)$$

The goal is to prove that Z_N is bounded; the conclusion will then follow by Gronwall lemma. Note that there is still the cancellation

$$\forall x \in E, \quad \int_E \psi(x, y) f_s(dy) = 0,$$

but it is not possible to use it directly as in the proof of McKean's theorem because now, this quantity appears inside the exponential. Note however that Z_N can be seen as the partition function of a Gibbs measure with a potential which, up to the first variable which plays a special role, is very much reminiscent of a polynomial potential of order two in Theorem 4.16. The second assertion in Theorem 4.17 precisely implies that Z_N is bounded. However, in this context, there is a way to bound Z_N more directly (for η small enough): this is the content of [JW18, Theorem 3]. The proof is based on the series expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(\frac{\eta \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \psi(x^1, x^i) \psi(x^1, x^j)\right) \\ = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{\eta^k \|\tilde{b}\|_{\text{Lip}}^{2k}}{N^k} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \psi(x^1, x^i) \psi(x^1, x^j) \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by expanding the power term Jabin and Wang recover polynomial terms in ψ and by separating the terms with $k < N$ from the ones with $k > N$, they use combinatorial arguments to identify the right cancellations (using (172)) which lead to the conclusion. In conclusion, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) = H(f_0^N | f_0^{\otimes N}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^t H(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) ds + Ct,$$

and the result follows.

5.4.2 With $W^{-1,\infty}$ kernels

In [JW18], the above arguments are presented in a completely rigorous framework in the fully linear case

$$b(x, \mu) = F(x) + K \star \mu(x), \quad \sigma = I_d,$$

where the state space is the d -dimensional torus $E = \mathbb{T}^d$. The force term F is implicitly regular (to ensure that f can be taken regular) but the interaction kernel $K : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ is less than bounded, it is assumed to be an element of the following functional space.

Definition 5.28. A vector field K such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} K = 0$ is said to belongs to $\dot{W}^{-1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ when there exists a matrix field V in $L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $K = \nabla \cdot V$. The definition extends similarly to scalar functions.

The regularity on K is extremely weak. It includes the case $K \in L^\infty$ which is the original framework of [JW16] but it is also possible to consider singular kernels and in particular the Biot-Savart kernel in dimension 2:

$$K(x) = \alpha \frac{x^\perp}{|x|^2} + K_0(x),$$

where x^\perp is the rotation of $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by π and K_0 is a correction which makes K periodic. Other examples of relevant kernels include collision-like kernels where two particles interact when they are exactly at a given distance. We refer the interested reader to [JW18, Section 1.3] and to the end of this section for further examples. It is not easily possible to construct SDE solutions of the particle system with this weak regularity, Jabin and Wang thus introduce the following notion of entropy solution for the solution of the Liouville equation.

Definition 5.29 (Entropy solution). A probability density $f_t^N \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^{dN})$ for $t \in [0, T]$ is an entropy solution to the Liouville equation (1) when it solves (1) in the sense of distributions and for almost every $t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} f_t^N \log f_t^N + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} \frac{|\nabla f_s^N|^2}{f_s^N} ds \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} f_0^N \log f_0^N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} (\nabla \cdot F(x^i) + \nabla \cdot K(x^i - x^j)) f_s^N(\mathbf{x}^N) d\mathbf{x}^N ds. \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

It is much easier to prove that there exists an entropy solution, this typically comes from a regularisation argument with a smoothened kernel [JW18, Proposition 1]. The entropy dissipation inequality (173) classically comes from a formal derivation of the entropy $\int f_t^N \log f_t^N$ and here it is taken as a definition. For the limit equation (12), one can ask for a stronger regularity as in the main theorem [JW18, Theorem 1] stated below.

Theorem 5.30 (Pointwise McKean-Vlasov, $\dot{W}^{-1,\infty}$ kernel [JW18]). *Assume that $\nabla \cdot F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and that $K \in \dot{W}^{-1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\nabla \cdot K \in \dot{W}^{-1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Let f_t^N be an entropy solution of the Liouville equation in the sense of Definition 5.29. Assume the the limit law satisfies*

$f \in L^\infty([0, T], W^{2,p}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ for any $p < \infty$ and $\inf f > 0$. Then the following entropy bound holds:

$$H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) \leq e^{Ct} (H(f_0^N | f_0^{\otimes N}) + 1), \quad (174)$$

where $C > 0$ depends on d , the derivative bounds on K , F , f and the initial condition.

We sketch the main arguments of the proof in the case $F = 0$ for simplicity. The starting point is as before the computations in Lemma 4.27 but with a much finer analysis based on the divergence form of the kernel $K = \nabla \cdot V$.

Proof (main ideas). The computations of Lemma 4.27 become fully rigorous with the notion of entropy solution and the regularity assumptions on f [JW18, Lemma 2]. Carrying on the computations up to the last step (109) and using (173), Jabin and Wang obtained the following inequality (in integrated form):

$$\begin{aligned} H(f_t^N | f_t^{\otimes N}) &\leq H(f_0^N | f_0^{\otimes N}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} (K \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(x^i) - K \star f_s(x^i)) \nabla \log f_s^{\otimes N}(\mathbf{x}^N) f_s^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) ds \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} (\nabla \cdot K \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} - \nabla \cdot K \star f_s) f_s^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t I(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (175)$$

In Lemma 4.27, the terms involving K are handled by using the Young inequality. Here, owing to the assumptions on K , Jabin and Wang use the decomposition

$$K = \overline{K} + \tilde{K},$$

where $\overline{K} = \nabla \cdot V \in \dot{W}^{-1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\nabla \cdot \overline{K} = 0$, $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\tilde{K} \in L^\infty$. The term involving \tilde{K} is slightly more technical because of the divergence term but it can be handled following the same ideas than the ones used for \overline{K} and leads to the same conclusion (see [JW18, Lemma 4]). We skip the computations and focus on \overline{K} (this is [JW18, Lemma 3]). By integration by parts, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} (\overline{K} \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(x^i) - \overline{K} \star f_s(x^i)) \nabla \log f_s^{\otimes N}(\mathbf{x}^N) f_s^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (V \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(x^i) - V \star f_t(x^i)) : \nabla_{x^i} f_s^{\otimes N} \nabla_{x^i} \left(\frac{f_s^N}{f_s^{\otimes N}} \right)^\top d\mathbf{x}^N \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} (V \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(x^i) - V \star f_t(x^i)) : \frac{\nabla_{x^i}^2 f_s^{\otimes N}}{f_s^{\otimes N}} f_s^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\ &=: A(s) + B(s). \end{aligned}$$

The two terms A and B are of different nature. For the first one, it is possible to use the similar trick as the one at the end of the proof of Lemma 4.27. Using Cauchy-Schwarz

inequality and Young inequality, for any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
A(s) &\leq \frac{\gamma}{2} I(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) + \frac{C}{2\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} |V \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(x^i) - V \star f_s(x^i)|^2 f_t^N(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&= \frac{\gamma}{2} I(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) \\
&\quad + \frac{C}{2\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} |V_{\alpha, \beta} \star \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(x^i) - V_{\alpha, \beta} \star f_t(x^i)|^2 f_s^N(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&=: \frac{\gamma}{2} I(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) + \frac{C}{2\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^d A_{\alpha, \beta}^i(s)
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ comes from the bounds on f and $V_{\alpha, \beta}$ are the coordinates of V . Choosing the appropriate γ will cancel the Fisher information term in (175). It remains to bound the terms $A_{\alpha, \beta}^i(s)$ and $B(s)$ (the term which involves \tilde{K} in (175) would give analogous terms). As in the conclusion of Lemma 4.27 and (170), since they are observables of the particle system and it is possible to use the change of measure identity (171). For each $A_{\alpha, \beta}^i(s)$, since $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ it will give exactly the same kind of terms as at the beginning of this section. They can be bounded uniformly in N using [JW18, Theorem 3]. For $B(s)$, For $B(s)$, the change of measure identity (171) yields:

$$B(s) \leq \frac{1}{\eta} H(f_s^N | f_s^{\otimes N}) + \log Z_N,$$

where Z_N is of the form

$$Z_N = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{dN}} \exp[\eta N G(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N})] f_s^{\otimes N}(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}^N),$$

with $G : \mu \mapsto \langle \mu \otimes \mu, \varphi_2 \rangle$ is polynomial function of order two. Namely:

$$G(\mu) = \langle \mu \otimes \mu, \phi_2 \rangle,$$

where

$$\phi_2(x, z) = (V(x - z) - V \star f_s(x)) : \frac{\nabla^2 f_s(x)}{f_s(x)}.$$

If V were continuous, Theorem 4.17 would say that $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} e^{Nm_0} Z_N$, exists and is finite for a computable $m_0 \geq 0$, which is more than what is needed here. However, in this case V is only bounded. The authors thus introduce a ‘‘modified law of large numbers’’ [JW18, Theorem 4] which implies that Z_N is bounded by a universal constant. The proof of [JW18, Theorem 4] follows similar but much more difficult combinatorial arguments as the ones in the proof of [JW18, Theorem 3]. It is based on a fine use of the two cancellations:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi_2(x, z) f_s(\mathrm{d}z) = 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi_2(x, z) f_s(\mathrm{d}x) = 0,$$

for all $x, z \in \mathbb{T}^d$. It also needs L^p bounds on ϕ_2 which depend on the regularity of f_s . The final bound (174) then follows from Gronwall lemma as before. \square

We conclude this section with some additional remarks and extensions of Theorem 5.30.

1. It is interesting to see how the tricky combinatorial results [JW18, Theorem 3, Theorem 5] can lead to the desired law of large numbers: an insightful use of exchangeability allows to remove extra continuity assumptions.

2. A reminiscent pattern is the compromise between regularity whether on the initial equation through coefficients, or on the limit process by strong well-posedness result. Here very weak regularity is taken for the particle process, but strong regularity on the limit measure is required. This is in a sense, the opposite of what is done in Section 5.1.2.
3. The setting of Theorem 5.30 is in fact more general as it also allows a diffusion coefficient σ_N which depends on N (we took $\sigma = 1$). The behaviour is different depending on whether $\sigma_N \geq \sigma_0 > 0$ (non-degenerate case) or $\sigma_N \rightarrow 0$ (vanishing diffusion case). The first case would add an additional term which depends on $|\sigma_N - \sigma|$ in the final bound (174). The vanishing diffusion case is handled by [JW18, Theorem 2] under slightly stronger regularity assumptions on K .
4. The kinetic case (in \mathbb{R}^d) is the original one investigated in [JW16]. The modified law of large number [JW16, Theorem 2] analogous to [JW18, Theorem 4] is slightly simpler because of the symplectic structure of the system.
5. Recent extensions concern gradient systems with an interaction kernel of the form $K = -\nabla W$. The analysis in [BJW19; Ser19; Due16] is based on a new modulated free energy which includes in its definition the Gibbs equilibrium measures of the particle and nonlinear systems.

5.5 Concentration inequalities for gradient systems

In this section, we make a step forward after propagation of chaos and briefly state two large deviation results for gradient systems. The first one is a weaker result which follows from Theorem 5.5 and the Bakry-Emery criterion. The second result is stronger but requires a significant amount of work which will not be detailed here.

The Bakry-Emery criterion (Proposition 4.33) is applied to McKean-Vlasov gradient systems in Malrieu [Mal01] to obtain concentration inequalities at the particle level. For each observable φ , it provides a quantitative estimate in both N and t of the deviation between the N -particle system and its McKean-Vlasov limit. When the latter converges as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ towards its unique invariant measure μ_∞ (see Corollary 5.7), this also provides confidence interval for the convergence of the N -particle system towards μ_∞ . The following theorem summarises the results of [Mal01].

Theorem 5.31 (Concentration inequalities for gradient systems). *Let f_0 satisfy a LSI with constant λ_0 and assume that the N -particles are initially i.i.d. with common law f_0 . The following properties hold under the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.5.*

1. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$,*

$$\sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(X_t^i) - \int_E \varphi(x) f_t(dx) \right| \geq \varepsilon + \sqrt{\frac{C}{N}} \right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{N\lambda_t \varepsilon^2}{2}}. \quad (176)$$

2. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$,*

$$\sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(X_t^i) - \int_E \varphi(x) \mu_\infty(dx) \right| \geq \varepsilon + \sqrt{\frac{C}{N}} + Ce^{-\beta t} \right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{N\lambda_t \varepsilon^2}{2}}, \quad (177)$$

where $\lambda_t > 0$ is bounded from below and above and will be given in the proof.

Proof (sketch). A straightforward computation (see [Mal01, Lemma 3.5]) shows that the N -particle system satisfies the Bakry-Emery criterion (Proposition 4.33) with constant β . Then,

if f_0 satisfies $LSI(\lambda_0)$, [Mal01, Corollary 3.7] shows that the one-particle distribution $f_t^{1,N}$ satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant λ_t such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_t} = \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda t}}{\lambda} + \frac{e^{-2\lambda t}}{\lambda_0}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 4.30, it implies that $f_t^{1,N}$ is concentrated around its mean with an explicit error estimate. The first property therefore follows from the uniform in time bound (137). Then, the distance between f_t and μ_∞ can be quantified in Wasserstein distance:

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(f_t, \mu_\infty) &\leq W_2(f_t, f_t^{1,N}) + W_2(f_t^{1,N}, \mu_\infty^{1,N}) + W_2(\mu_\infty^{1,N}, \mu_\infty) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} + \sqrt{\frac{C}{N} H(f_t^N | \mu_\infty^N)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} + Ce^{-\beta t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first and third terms on the right-hand side of the first line are bounded by $CN^{-1/2}$ by (137), the second term is controlled by the relative entropy by the Talagrand inequality (111) and the last line follows as in the proof Corollary 5.7. Letting $N \rightarrow +\infty$ leads to

$$W_2(f_t, \mu_\infty) \leq Ce^{-\beta t}.$$

The second property (177) thus follows by inserting this last bound in (176) (since the Wasserstein-2 distance controls the Wasserstein-1 distance and using Proposition 3.3). \square

Theorem 5.31 quantifies how the empirical measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ is close from its limit (in N and t) for the distance D_1 given by (47). The topology induced by D_1 is equivalent to the weak topology and thus much weaker than, say, the topology induced by the Wasserstein distance. Such stronger result has been shown by [BGV06] using different techniques, based on the quantitative version of Sanov theorem given by Theorem 4.34. Note that compared to Malrieu's results (176) and (177), the goal is to interchange the supremum and the probability (thanks to the Monge-Kantorovich duality formula Proposition 3.3). This comes at the price of stronger assumptions and with an eventually worse rate of convergence. The following theorem summarises the results of [BGV06, Theorem 2.9 and Theorem 2.12].

Theorem 5.32 (Pointwise W_1 concentration inequalities). *Assume that there exist some constants $\beta, \gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the potentials V, W satisfy*

$$\nabla^2 V \geq \beta I_d, \quad \gamma I_d \leq \nabla^2 W \leq \gamma' I_d$$

and

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall a > 0, \quad |\nabla V(x)| = \mathcal{O}(e^{a|x|^2}).$$

Assume that the initial data admits a finite square exponential moment:

$$\exists \alpha_0 > 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\alpha_0 |x|^2} f_0(dx) < +\infty.$$

Then the following properties hold.

1. For all $T > 0$, there exists $\lambda, C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_ε such that for $N \geq N_\varepsilon$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} W_1(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, f_t) > \varepsilon\right) \leq C(1 + T\varepsilon^{-2})e^{-\lambda N\varepsilon^2}.$$

2. In the uniformly convex case $\beta > 0$ and $\beta + 2\gamma > 0$, there exists $\lambda, C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_ε such that for $N \geq N_\varepsilon$:

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left(W_1(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \mu_\infty) > \varepsilon \right) \leq C(1 + \varepsilon^{-2})e^{-\lambda N \varepsilon^2},$$

where μ_∞ is the unique invariant measure of the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov system.

A pathwise generalisation is done in [Bol10] in the case of a bounded time interval.

Theorem 5.33 (Pathwise W_1 concentration inequality). *With the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.32, for all $T > 0$, there exist $\lambda, C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_ε such that for $N \geq N_\varepsilon$:*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(W_1(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N}, f_{[0,T]}) > \varepsilon \right) \leq C(1 + T\varepsilon^{-2})e^{-\lambda N \varepsilon^2},$$

where W_1 denotes the Wasserstein-1 distance on the path space $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Definition 3.7).

5.6 General interactions

In this section, we discuss some results in the very general case of a McKean-Vlasov diffusion of the form

$$b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R}), \quad (178)$$

without assuming any particular form for these functions.

5.6.1 Extending McKean's theorem

When b and σ are Lipschitz for the Wasserstein distance, then McKean's theorem and its proof can be easily extended.

Theorem 5.34. *Let the drift and diffusion coefficients (178) satisfy the following Lipschitz bound for all $(x, y) \in E^2$ and $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(E)^2$:*

$$\max \left(|b(x, \mu) - b(y, \nu)|, |\sigma(x, \mu) - \sigma(y, \nu)| \right) \leq L \left(|x - y| + W_2(\mu, \nu) \right).$$

Assume that $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_q(E)$ for some $q > 2$. Then pathwise propagation of chaos in the sense of Definition 4.1 holds for any $T > 0$, with $p = 2$ and with the synchronous coupling introduced in Theorem 5.1. The convergence rate is given by

$$\varepsilon(N, T) = C(b, \sigma, T)\beta(N),$$

where $C(b, \sigma, T) > 0$ is a constant depending only on b, σ, q and T and $\beta(N)$ is given by [FG15, Theorem 1] :

$$\beta(N) = \begin{cases} N^{-1/2} + N^{-(q-2)/q} & \text{if } d < 4 \text{ and } q \neq 4 \\ N^{-1/2} \log(1 + N) + N^{-(q-2)/q} & \text{if } d = 4 \text{ and } q \neq 4 \\ N^{-2/d} + N^{-(q-2)/q} & \text{if } d > 4 \text{ and } q \neq d/(d-2) \end{cases}$$

Proof (sketch). We follow the same line of argument of Sznitman's proof. The main change is that (124) should be replaced by

$$\mathbb{E} \left| b(\bar{X}_t^i, f_t) - b(\bar{X}_t^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}) \right|^2 \leq L \mathbb{E} W_2^2(\mu_{\bar{X}_t^N}, f_t) \leq C(T)\beta(N),$$

where the last inequality (with a constant $C(T) > 0$) comes from [FG15, Theorem 1] since the \bar{X}_t^k are independent and using a uniform moment bound on $[0, T]$. The inequality (125) still holds (with a different constant) thanks to the straightforward inequality

$$\mathbb{E}W_2^2\left(\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}\right) \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^j - X_t^j|^2 = \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}_t^i - X_t^i|^2,$$

for any $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ by symmetry. The rest of the proof proceeds as before. \square

The proof of Theorem 5.34 is also detailed very concisely but precisely in [Car16, Section 1].

Remark 5.35 (Completeness and exchangeability). It may also be interesting to try to adapt McKean's argument (Section 5.1.1) to the setting of Theorem 5.34. Most of the proof remains unchanged, the main difficulty (which arises just after (120)) is the control the quantity

$$\mathbb{E}W_2^2\left(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M}}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M}\right),$$

that is, we need to control the Wasserstein distance between two empirical measures with different numbers of samples.

To do that, we can mimic the proof of the Hewitt-Savage Theorem 3.32 in [HM14, Theorem 5.1] and replace the Wasserstein distance by a Sobolev norm H^{-s} (Definition 3.4). Under some moment assumptions, it defines a distance which is equivalent to the Wasserstein distances [HM14, Lemma 2.1]. Taking advantage of the polynomial structure property stated in Lemma 3.5, it is shown in Proposition A.2 that:

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M}} - \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^M}\|_{H^{-s}}^2 \leq 2\|\Phi_s\|_\infty \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{M}\right).$$

As a general rule, if b, σ are globally Lipschitz for a Wasserstein metric, then it is possible to extend any result obtained by (synchronous) coupling. The price to pay is a possibly bad convergence rate, in particular with respect to the dimension d . Since the convergence rate typically comes from the quantitative Glivenko-Cantelli theorem [FG15] which is sharp in general, it seems hard to obtain better results with this technique. One can also readily check that the approach of Section 5.1.3 based on Itô's formula can be applied under convexity assumptions, for instance when

$$b(x, \mu) = -\nabla V(x) + b_0(x, \mu),$$

where V is convex and $b_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is globally Lipschitz. Following these ideas, the most general and comprehensive article that we are aware of is [ADF18]. The authors use the synchronous coupling method to prove pathwise propagation of chaos in various Lipschitz and non Lipschitz cases for a mixed jump-diffusion model with simultaneous jumps (see Example 21). Because of the jump interactions, the authors work in a more amenable L^1 framework (the results are stated for the W_1 distance). Compared to the L^2 framework of Theorem 5.34 this brings some additional technicalities regarding the diffusion part but it does not modify the argument. See also [Gra92a] for an earlier work on jump-diffusion models in a L^2 framework but using martingale arguments similar to [Szn84a; Szn84b].

Finally, the globally Lipschitz framework of [ADF18] has recently been weakened in [Ern21] where the author proves the well-posedness and the propagation of chaos for general jump-diffusion McKean models with local Lipschitz coefficients but with an additional assumption about bounded exponential moments. This result is reminiscent from [BCC11] (see Section 5.1.2).

5.6.2 Chaos via Girsanov theorem

When $\sigma = I_d$ (or more generally when σ is non singular and does not depend on the measure argument), under a Lipschitz assumption on the drift, it is also possible to prove strong pathwise chaos in TV norm via a Girsanov transform argument as in Corollary 5.3. When the drift is Lipschitz in Wasserstein distance, this follows immediately from Theorem 5.34, Lemma 4.24 and [FG15] (this extends Corollary 5.3).

A recent strategy improves this idea without requiring the preliminary propagation of chaos result which holds only with strong Lipschitz assumptions. The following theorem is a weakened version of [Lac18, Theorem 2.6].

Theorem 5.36 ([Lac18]). *Fix $T > 0$ and $I = [0, T]$. Assume that $\sigma = I_d$. Assume that b is bounded and that $b(x, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz for the total variation norm uniformly in x . Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} H(f_I^{k,N} | f_I^{\otimes k}) = 0.$$

This result relies of course on Lemma 4.24. The strategy of [Lac18] is then to use a crude large deviation principle to show that the right-hand side of (105) goes to zero as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. The key argument is the following result: there exists a constant $C > 0$ which depends only on b such that for all measurable open neighbourhood of f_I ,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_I^N} \notin U) = e^{-CT} \inf_{\nu \notin U} H(\nu | f_I).$$

This result is a kind of Sanov theorem obtained by a change of measure argument from the classical Sanov theorem applied to an i.i.d sequence of f_I -distributed random variables. This is [Lac18, Theorem 2.6 (1)]. This result implies that $\Phi(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_I^N}) \rightarrow \Phi(f_I)$ in probability for all bounded continuous measurable Φ on $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$ (see [Lac18, Remark 2.8]). The conclusion follows by noting that the right-hand side of (105) is precisely an observable of this form. The detailed proof is actually written in a much more general setting than (178), since it is assumed that b and σ are of the form:

$$b : [0, T] \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma : [0, T] \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R}),$$

that is they depend on the time argument and on the full pathwise trajectories of the particles (instead of their local in time state). The diffusion matrix is assumed to be invertible everywhere and does not depend on the measure argument. The power of Girsanov theorem is precisely that despite this level of generality, the argument is not much modified and the proof remains relatively short. The main change is maybe the more careful look at the topology (since we work fully on the path space) and the questions of measurability which are discussed in [Lac18, Sections 2.1 and 2.2]. Various well-posedness results for the particle and the nonlinear systems within this setting are also presented.

A drawback of the previous result is that it is not quantitative (as it relies on a large deviation principle). A sharper analysis of the Girsanov transform argument is presented in [Jab19, Theorem 2.1] and leads to the same kind of result with a quantitative optimal rate of convergence. The argument is very probabilistic and can be understood as the probabilistic counterpart of [JW18] (see Section 5.4). The assumptions are taken to ensure a fine control of the computations in Girsanov theorem and may not be easily interpreted within our usual setting but various detailed applications to more usual forms of McKean-Vlasov diffusion are presented, for instance the case with only bounded coefficients (as in Section 5.4.1).

5.6.3 Other techniques

It turns out that it quickly becomes quite challenging to go beyond the nice globally Lipschitz setting. Depending on the chosen topology, even seemingly simple linear cases such as

$$b(x, \mu) = K \star \mu(x), \quad K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d,$$

can become problematic: if K is unbounded, even if it has a linear growth, then b is not continuous any more for the weak topology. In addition to the continuity, a sufficient set of assumptions under which wellposedness and propagation of chaos can be proved are given in [Gär88, Section 5]. We reproduce it below.

Assumption 5.37 ([Gär88]). *Given $p \geq 2$ and $R > 0$, let us define*

$$\mathcal{P}_{p,R}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p \mu(dx) \leq R \right\},$$

endowed with the weak topology. Assume that $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is equipped with the “inductive topology” defined by: $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is open if and only if $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{P}_{p,R}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is open in $\mathcal{P}_{p,R}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for each $R > 0$. Assume that there exists $p \geq 2$ such that

$$b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$$

are continuous and that $\sigma(x, \mu)$ is invertible for all $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Assume that there exists $C > 0$ and $C_R > 0$ for each $R > 0$ such that b, σ satisfy the following properties.

- **(Coercivity and growth).** *For all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with compact support*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [(p-1)\|\sigma(x, \mu)\|^2 + 2\langle x, b(x, \mu) \rangle] |x|^{p-2} \mu(dx) \leq C \left(1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p \mu(dx) \right),$$

and for all $R > 0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p,R}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|\sigma(x, \mu)\|^2 + 2\langle x, b(x, \mu) \rangle \leq C_R(1 + |x|^2).$$

- **(Monotonicity).** *For all $R > 0$, for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{p,R}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for any coupling $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ between μ, ν ,*

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} [\|\sigma(x, \mu) - \sigma(y, \nu)\|^2 + 2\langle x - y, b(x, \mu) - b(y, \nu) \rangle]_+ \Pi(dx, dy) \leq C_R,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\|\sigma(x, \mu) - \sigma(y, \nu)\|^2 + 2\langle x - y, b(x, \mu) - b(y, \nu) \rangle) \Pi(dx, dy) \\ \leq C_R \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 \Pi(dx, dy). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.38. Note that the inductive topology on $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is not so far from the topology induced by the W_p distance. Actually, from [Gär88, Proposition B.3], a sequence $(\mu_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ converges towards μ for the inductive topology if and only if

$$\mu_n \rightarrow \mu, \quad \sup_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p \mu_n(dx) < +\infty,$$

where the convergence is the weak convergence. A slightly simpler set of assumptions expressed in the space $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d), W_p)$ is given for instance in [Wan18, Section 2]. See also the recent [MV20]. Note however that the inductive topology can also be defined when the bound on the p -th moment is replaced by a bound on $\langle \mu, \varphi \rangle$ for a fixed nonnegative continuous test function φ on \mathbb{R}^d , usually called a Lyapunov function. The main results of [Gär88] are proved within this generalised setting. Additional topological details are given in [Gär88, Appendix B].

The very detailed article of Gärtner [Gär88] proves (weak) pathwise wellposedness and propagation of chaos using martingale arguments. This extends earlier works due to Funaki [Fun84] (for the wellposedness of the nonlinear system only) and Léonard [Léo86]. For further works using martingale and compactness arguments, let us also mention [Chi94] for a slightly weakened Lipschitz assumption and [DV95] for a generalised case where the particles depend on possibly correlated Brownian motions. Note that in this last case, propagation of chaos does not always hold and the empirical measure process converges weakly towards a (non-deterministic) measure-valued process.

While propagation of chaos has never stopped being an active field of research, it seems that, regarding the case of very general interaction functions (178), the work of Gärtner has long stayed one of the most, if not the only, complete and general result. Almost three decades later, this question enjoyed a sudden resurgence of interest, motivated mainly on the one hand by biological models (in particular neuron models) and on the other hand by the theory of mean-field games. In addition to the aforementioned works [ADF18; Car16; Lac18], we will conclude this section with some recent directions of research which originate in the mean-field games community. Note that due to the (necessary) higher degree of technicality, we will not enter into much details. Classical references on the mean-field games theory include [Car+19; Car10; CD18b; CD18a].

- In [CST19], the authors prove a very neat bound of the form

$$\left| \Phi(f_t) - \mathbb{E}\Phi(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}) \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_j}{N^j} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N^k}\right),$$

where $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the constants C_j do not depend on N and k depends on the regularity of Φ , b and σ . In this context, regularity means differentiability in the Wasserstein space $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), W_2)$. As we have already seen in Section 4.3.4 regarding [MMW15; MM13], defining a differential calculus on the space of measures is not an easy task. The framework detailed in [CST19, Section 2] is based on the notion of “linear functional derivatives” and “L-derivatives” introduced in [Car+19]. Note that the authors still assume at least a uniform bound on the diffusion matrix but also that b and σ are globally Lipschitz for the W_2 distance. But contrary to the results obtained using the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem [FG15], the constants C_j do not depend on the dimension. In fact, the framework of [CST19] is also applicable to the static case of N μ -distributed i.i.d random variables \mathcal{X}^N and thus it provides explicit convergence rate of $\mathbb{E}\Phi(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})$ towards $\Phi(\mu)$ for smooth observables on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The above result in both the static and McKean-Vlasov cases is obtained when Φ is “ $(2k+1)$ -times differentiable with respect to the functional derivative”.

- In [CF19b] (see also [Cha20]) the authors revisit the question of the wellposedness of the martingale problem associated to McKean-Vlasov equations with general interactions and relate this question with the study of a class of (linear) parabolic type PDEs on the Wasserstein space (the backward Kolmogorov equation with source term and terminal condition). In the subsequent work [CF19a], the problem is investigated at the particle level which provides (quantitative) propagation of chaos results concerning the trajectories of the particles, the convergence of their distribution and the convergence of the empirical measure process. The results hold when b and σ are bounded, Hölder continuous in space and with two bounded and Hölder continuous linear functional derivatives in the measure argument and when σ is also uniformly elliptic. The strategy is also linked to the notion of regularization by noise and the Zvonkin transform, see [Zvo74; Ver81].

6 Boltzmann models

The probabilistic treatment of the Boltzmann model has been initiated by Kac in the seminal article [Kac56]. The original treatment of Kac model (Example 2.26) is based on the continuity of the generator \mathcal{L}_N on the space of test functions $(C_b(E^N), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$. The arguments have been later generalised [Car+13] for a wider class of models under boundedness assumptions at the pointwise level (Section 6.1). A pathwise generalisation of Kac's theorem is due to [GM97] (Section 6.2). Many physical models (see Section 2.3.3) do not fit into this framework because of the strong boundedness assumption on the collision rate. To prove more general results, we will first discuss the historical stochastic martingale arguments [Tan83; Szn84a] (Section 6.3) and then three historical arguments which have recently been brought up to date and completed: first the SDE and coupling method due to Murata [Mur77] (Section 6.4); then the pointwise study of the generator of the empirical process initiated by Günbaum [Grü71] (Section 6.5); finally, we briefly present Lanford's approach [Lan75] on the deterministic hard-sphere system (Section 6.6).

6.1 Kac's theorem via series expansions

The following theorem, originally due to Kac, is the most important result of this section.

Theorem 6.1 (Kac). *Let $(f_0^N)_N$ be a sequence of symmetric probability measures on E^N which is f_0 -chaotic for a given $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Let $(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$ be the N -particle process with initial law f_0^N and with generator*

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N,$$

with $L^{(2)}$ given by (25) with the uniform bound (31). Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \geq 2$, and let $\varphi_s \in C_b(E^s)$ be a test function. Then for any time $t > 0$ there exists $f_t \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_s(\mathcal{Z}_t^{s,N})] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle f_t^{\otimes s}, \varphi_s \rangle.$$

where we recall that $\mathcal{Z}_t^{s,N}$ denotes the process in E^s extracted from the s first components of \mathcal{Z}_t^N . Moreover f_t is a weak measure solution of the general Boltzmann equation (29).

We present two proofs of this theorem. The two are based on the explicit solution of the Liouville equation given by a series expansion. The first proof works at the level of observables. The second proof is slightly shorter but also requires a L^1 framework to work at the level of the laws (forward Kolmogorov point of view). The first proof is due to Kac [Kac56] for a one-dimensional caricature of a Maxwellian gas. The arguments are generalised in [CDW13]. Our presentation is also inspired by the work of McKean [McK67a]. The second proof is the probabilistic version of Lanford's approach on the deterministic hard-sphere system (see Section 6.6). The bound (31) and the fact that the interactions are delocalised considerably simplify the proof. The detail of the proof can be found in [Pul96].

Proof (at the level of the observables). Let us recall that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_s(\mathcal{Z}_t^{s,N})] = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k \varphi_s \rangle. \quad (179)$$

The strategy is to apply the dominated convergence theorem to pass to the limit in this series. The crucial observation is that the series converges for t small enough, uniformly in N . Using only the continuity estimate

$$\|\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_s\|_\infty \leq C(\Lambda)N \|\varphi_s\|_\infty,$$

would give the convergence on a time interval $t < 1/(NC(\Lambda))$ and it would not be possible to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$. However, when $s \geq 1$ is fixed, better estimates are available which are summarised in the following lemma. The basic idea is to split the general term of the series into two parts (180), one of order $1/N$ which vanishes when s is fixed and a leading term of order one which converges and which will give the desired limit.

Lemma 6.2. *Let us consider the linear operator \mathbf{D} on $C_b(E^\infty) := \cup_{\ell \geq 0} C_b(E^\ell)$ defined for $\varphi_s \in C_b(E^s)$ by:*

$$(\mathbf{D}\varphi_s)(z^1, \dots, z^s, z^{s+1}) := \sum_{i=1}^s (L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,s+1} (\varphi_s \otimes 1))(z^1, \dots, z^s, z^{s+1}).$$

Note that since $C_b(E^\ell) \subset C_b(E^{\ell+1})$ by the inclusion $\varphi_s \mapsto \varphi_s \otimes 1$, the space $C_b(E^\infty)$ is actually a vector space. The following properties hold.

(1) For all k, s such that $k + s \leq N$,

$$\langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k \varphi_s \rangle = \frac{u_{s,k}(\varphi_s)}{N} + \alpha_N^{(s,k)} \langle f_0^{s+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^k \varphi_s \rangle, \quad (180)$$

where $u_{s,k}(\varphi_s)$ satisfies

$$|u_{s,k}(\varphi_s)| \leq C(\Lambda)^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty \frac{(s+k-2)!}{(s-1)!} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (s+\ell)^2, \quad (181)$$

and

$$\alpha_N^{(s,k)} := \frac{(N-s) \dots (N-s-k+1)}{N^k}. \quad (182)$$

(2) There exists $t_0 > 0$ which depends only on s and Λ such that the series (179) converges absolutely, uniformly in N and $t \in [0, t_0]$.

(3) For each $k \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k \varphi_s \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s+k)}, \mathbf{D}^k \varphi_s \rangle. \quad (183)$$

The second point is proved in [CDW13, Lemma 3.1]. The only difference is that in our setting, we have to take into account the constant Λ . Their proof is based on an estimate similar to (181) obtained by a combinatorial argument which does not use the splitting (180). The third point is essentially the content of [CDW13, Lemma 3.3]. We give an alternative proof here based on the properties of the operator \mathbf{D} which was introduced by McKean [McK67a].

Proof. Let us start from the following observation: for all $z^1, \dots, z^N \in E$,

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_s(z^1, \dots, z^N) = \frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s(z^1, \dots, z^s) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=s+1}^N (\mathbf{D}\varphi_s)(z^1, \dots, z^s, z^\ell). \quad (184)$$

Note that $\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_s$ is a function of N variables but it can be written as the sum of s functions of s variables and $(N-s)$ functions of $(s+1)$ variables. By symmetry we deduce that:

$$\langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N \varphi_s \rangle = \frac{s}{N} \langle f_0^{s,N}, \mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s \rangle + \frac{N-s}{N} \langle f_0^{s+1,N}, \mathbf{D}\varphi_s \rangle. \quad (185)$$

Moreover, the following continuity estimates hold for all $s \geq 1$,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s\|_\infty \leq C(\Lambda)s \|\varphi_s\|_\infty, \quad \|\mathbf{D}\varphi_s\|_\infty \leq C(\Lambda)s \|\varphi_s\|_\infty, \quad (186)$$

where $C(\Lambda)$ depends only on Λ .

- (1) The first point is proved by induction on $k \leq N$. The case $k = 0$ is the initial chaoticity assumption and the case $k = 1$ immediately follows from (185) and (186). Let us assume the result for $k \geq 1$ and let us take $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s + k + 1 \leq N$. Using (184), by exchangeability it holds that

$$\langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^{k+1} \varphi_s \rangle = \frac{s}{N} \langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s) \rangle + \frac{N-s}{N} \langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k(\mathbf{D} \varphi_s) \rangle.$$

Since $\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s$ is a function of s variables and $\mathbf{D} \varphi_s$ is a function of $(s+1)$ variables with $(s+1) + k \leq N$, the induction hypothesis for each of the two terms on the right-hand side gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^{k+1} \varphi_s \rangle &= \frac{s}{N} \left(\frac{u_{s,k}(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s)}{N} + \alpha_N^{(s,k)} \langle f_0^{s+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^k(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s) \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{N-s}{N} \left(\frac{u_{s+1,k}(\mathbf{D} \varphi_s)}{N} + \alpha_N^{(s+1,k)} \langle f_0^{s+1+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^{k+1} \varphi_s \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

First we note that:

$$\alpha_N^{(s,k+1)} = \frac{N-s}{N} \alpha_N^{(s+1,k)},$$

as expected. Then we set:

$$u_{s,k+1}(\varphi_s) := \frac{s}{N} u_{s,k}(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s) + s \alpha_N^{(s,k)} \langle f_0^{s+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^k(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s) \rangle + \frac{N-s}{N} u_{s+1,k}(\mathbf{D} \varphi_s). \quad (187)$$

The induction hypothesis (181) can be used again to bound $u_{s,k+1}(\varphi_s)$. First we note that

$$\frac{(s+k-2)!}{(s-1)!} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (s+\ell)^2 \leq \frac{(s+k-1)!}{s!} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (s+1+\ell)^2.$$

Thus using the continuity bounds (186) and the induction hypothesis (181), we deduce that:

$$\frac{s}{N} |u_{s,k}(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s)| + \frac{N-s}{N} |u_{s+1,k}(\mathbf{D} \varphi_s)| \leq C(\Lambda)^{k+1} \|\varphi_s\|_\infty \frac{(s+k-1)!}{(s-1)!} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (s+1+\ell)^2. \quad (188)$$

Moreover, it holds that $\alpha_N^{(s,k)} \leq 1$, so using (186) again leads to

$$s \alpha_N^{(s,k)} \langle f_0^{s+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^k(\mathcal{L}_s \varphi_s) \rangle \leq C(\Lambda)^{k+1} s^2 \frac{(s+k-1)!}{(s-1)!} \|\varphi_s\|_\infty. \quad (189)$$

Reporting (188) and (189) into (187) finally gives:

$$|u_{s,k+1}(\varphi_s)| \leq C(\Lambda)^{k+1} \|\varphi_s\|_\infty \frac{(s+k-1)!}{(s-1)!} \sum_{\ell=0}^k (s+\ell)^2,$$

which concludes the proof of the first point.

- (2) Let us split the series (179) into two parts, the first one for $k = 0, \dots, N-s$ and the second one for $k \geq N-s+1$. For the second part, we use the crude estimate:

$$\|\mathcal{L}_N^k \varphi_s\|_\infty \leq C(\Lambda) N^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty.$$

Then using Stirling's formula, the series

$$\sum_{k=N-s+1}^{+\infty} \frac{(C(\Lambda)t)^k}{k!} N^k \leq \sum_{k=N-s+1}^{+\infty} \frac{(C(\Lambda)t)^k}{k!} (k+s-1)^k,$$

is convergent for $t < \frac{1}{2C(\Lambda)e}$. Then using the first point it holds that:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^N, \mathcal{L}_N^k \varphi_s \rangle \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \frac{t^k}{k!} u_{s,k}(\varphi_s) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^{s+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^k \varphi_s \rangle.$$

From (181), the following elementary estimate holds for $k \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t^k}{k!} |u_{s,k}(\varphi_s)| &\leq (C(\Lambda)t)^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty \frac{(s+k-2)!}{k!(s-1)!} k(s+k-1)^2 \\ &\leq (C(\Lambda)t)^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty \binom{s+k-2}{s-1} (s+k-1)^2 \\ &\leq (C(\Lambda)t)^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty e^{s-1} \left(1 + \frac{k-1}{s-1}\right)^{s-1} (s+k-1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the series whose general term is $(t^k/k!)u_{s,k}(\varphi_s)$ is absolutely convergent uniformly in N for t small enough. Similarly, for the series whose general term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t^k}{k!} |\langle f_0^{s+k,N}, \mathbf{D}^k \varphi_s \rangle| &\leq (C(\Lambda)t)^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty \binom{s+k-1}{s-1} \\ &\leq (C(\Lambda)t)^k \|\varphi_s\|_\infty e^{s-1} \left(1 + \frac{k}{s-1}\right)^{s-1}, \end{aligned}$$

the same conclusion holds. This concludes the proof of the second point.

- (3) This follows immediately from the first point, the fact that $\alpha_N^{(s,k)} \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and the initial chaoticity assumption. □

Once the lemma is proved, it follows that for any $t < t_0$ there exists a family of probability measures $(f_t^{(s)})_s$ on E^s such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_s(\mathcal{Z}_t^{s,N})] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle f_t^{(s)}, \varphi_s \rangle := \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s+k)}, \mathbf{D}^k \varphi_s \rangle. \quad (190)$$

It remains to prove that $f_t^{(s)} = f_t^{\otimes s}$ where $f_t = f_t^{(1)}$. The following argument is due to McKean [McK67a] who noted that the operator \mathbf{D} is a derivation in the sense that for any $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbf{D}(\varphi_{s_1} \otimes \varphi_{s_2}) = \mathbf{D}\varphi_{s_1} \otimes \varphi_{s_2} + \varphi_{s_1} \otimes \mathbf{D}\varphi_{s_2}.$$

Leibniz rule therefore implies that for any $s_1 + s_2 = s$ and $\varphi_{s_1} \in C_b(E^{s_1})$, $\varphi_{s_2} \in C_b(E^{s_2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_t^{(s)}, \varphi_{s_1} \otimes \varphi_{s_2} \rangle &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \binom{k}{\ell} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s_1+s_2+k)}, \mathbf{D}^\ell \varphi_{s_1} \otimes \mathbf{D}^{k-\ell} \varphi_{s_2} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \binom{k}{\ell} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s_1+\ell)}, \mathbf{D}^\ell \varphi_{s_1} \rangle \langle f_0^{\otimes(s_2+k-\ell)}, \mathbf{D}^{k-\ell} \varphi_{s_2} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s_1+k)}, \mathbf{D}^k \varphi_{s_1} \rangle \sum_{\ell=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^\ell}{\ell!} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s_2+\ell)}, \mathbf{D}^\ell \varphi_{s_2} \rangle \\ &= \langle f_t^{(s_1)}, \varphi_{s_1} \rangle \langle f_t^{(s_2)}, \varphi_{s_2} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

From which it follows that $f_t^{(s)} = f_t^{(s_1)} \otimes f_t^{(s_2)}$ and therefore $f_t^{(s)} = f_t^{\otimes s}$. Then, by absolute convergence of all the series, it is possible to differentiate with respect to time and directly check that f_t is a weak-measure solution of the Boltzmann equation: for a test function $\varphi \in C_b(E)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^{\otimes(k+2)}, \mathbf{D}^{k+1} \varphi \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^{\otimes(k+2)}, \mathbf{D}^k [\mathbf{D} \varphi] \rangle \\ &= \langle f_t^{\otimes 2}, \mathbf{D} \varphi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (190) with $s = 2$. Finally, since t_0 does not depend on the initial condition, the same reasoning applies on $[t_0, 2t_0]$ and so on and therefore the result holds for any $t > 0$. \square

Remark 6.3 (Convergence rate). Although we did not write it in the statement of the theorem, it can be seen from the proof (Equation (181)) that for any φ_s , $\mathbb{E}[\varphi_s(\mathcal{Z}_t^{s,N})]$ converges towards $\langle f_t^{\otimes s}, \varphi_s \rangle$ at rate $1/N$ (with a constant which depends on φ_s and s). This rate is optimal since it implies

$$\mathbb{E} |\varphi_s(\mathcal{Z}_t^{s,N}) - \langle f_t^{\otimes s}, \varphi_s \rangle|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/N).$$

Within this approach, the limit f_t is defined weakly and the above proof is actually a proof of existence of a weak-measure solution of the Boltzmann equation. The dual proof follows the same arguments at the level of the laws. For simplicity, we present it in a L^1 framework and follow closely the arguments of [Pul96].

Proof (Forward point of view). Let the initial law $f_0^N \in L^1(E^N)$ be in $L^1(E^N)$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $f_t^{s,N}$ the s -marginal of the law of the particle system at time $t > 0$. The dual of the BBGKY hierarchy reads:

$$\partial_t f_t^{s,N} = \frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}^s f_t^{s,N} + \frac{N-s}{N} \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f_t^{s+1,N}, \quad (191)$$

where the operator $\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} : \mathcal{P}(E^{s+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E^s)$ is defined as the dual of \mathbf{D} restricted to $C_b(E^s)$, for $f^{(s+1)} \in \mathcal{P}(E^{s+1})$ and $\varphi_s \in C_b(E^s)$,

$$\langle \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f^{(s+1)}, \varphi_s \rangle := \langle f^{(s+1)}, \mathbf{D} \varphi_s \rangle.$$

Equation (191) can be re-written using Duhamel's formula:

$$f_t^{s,N} = \mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t) f_0^{(s,N)} + \frac{N-s}{N} \int_0^t \mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t-t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f_{t_1}^{s+1,N} dt_1,$$

where $\mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}$ is the Markov semi-group acting on $\mathcal{P}(E^s)$ generated by $\frac{s}{N} \mathcal{L}^s$. Iterating this formula gives an explicit formula for the solution of (191), namely:

$$\begin{aligned} f_t^{s,N} &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \alpha_N^{(s,k)} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}(t-t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} \mathbf{T}_N^{(s+1)}(t_1-t_2) \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2} \dots \\ &\quad \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k} \mathbf{T}_N^{(s+k)}(t_k) f_0^{s+k,N} dt_1 \dots dt_k, \quad (192) \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_N^{(s,k)}$ is given by (182). Just as in the previous proof, the goal is to show from this series expansion that it is possible to take the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in the series and that the limit defines a f_t -chaotic family where f_t solves the Boltzmann equation. The strategy is again to

show the uniform convergence of the series for small t and then the term-by-term convergence. The uniform convergence of the series is straightforward in a L^1 framework since the operator $\mathbf{T}_N^{(s)}$ is an isometry in $L^1(E^s)$ and for all $s \geq 1$:

$$\forall f^{(s+1)} \in L^1(E^{s+1}), \quad \|\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f^{(s+1)}\|_{L^1(E^s)} \leq sC(\Lambda) \|f^{(s+1)}\|_{L^1(E^{s+1})}.$$

Thus the series of the L^1 norms are bounded by,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} s(s+1)\dots(s+k-1) \frac{t^k}{k!} C(\Lambda)^k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (2C(\Lambda)t)^k,$$

and uniform convergence in L^1 holds for $t < 1/(2C_\Lambda)$. Assume that it is possible to prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution f_t of the Boltzmann equation, as an element of $C([0, t_0], L^1(E))$ (typically by a fixed point method). Then a direct computation shows that starting from $f_0^{\otimes s}$ the function $f_t^{\otimes s}$ satisfies:

$$f_t^{\otimes s} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2} \dots \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k} f_0^{\otimes(s+k)}. \quad (193)$$

Each term of this series is exactly the limit in L^1 of the corresponding term in the series (192) since

$$\forall f^{(s)} \in L^1(E^s), \quad \|(\mathbf{T}_N^{(s)} - Id)f^{(s)}\|_{L^1(E^s)} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

The proof can be terminated by iterating the argument for all $t > 0$ as in the previous proof. \square

Extension to non-homogeneous systems To conclude this section, we briefly explain how to extend the result to more general interaction mechanisms of the form:

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N = \sum_{i=1}^N L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_N + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij} \varphi_N,$$

provided that $L^{(1)}$ is continuous for the L^∞ norm and that it generates a continuous Markov semi-group acting on $L^1(E)$ (forward approach). In the first approach, the proof is exactly the same with \mathbf{D} replaced by $\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{S}$ where \mathbf{S} is the linear operator on $C_b(E^\infty)$ defined by

$$\forall \varphi_s \in C_b(E^s), \quad \mathbf{S} \varphi_s = \sum_{i=1}^s L^{(1)} \diamond_i \varphi_s.$$

The exponential formula (179) does not converge when \mathbf{S} is not continuous for the L^∞ norm, which includes many interesting case such as free transport or diffusion. However, when \mathbf{S} generates a backward semi-group \mathbf{T} on $C_b(E^\infty)$ which is continuous for the L^∞ norm, one can write

$$\langle f_t^N, \varphi_s \rangle = \langle f_0^{s,N}, \mathbf{T}(t) \varphi_s \rangle + \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt_1} \langle f_{t_1}^N, \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle dt_1.$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt_1} \langle f_{t_1}^N, \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle = \langle f_{t_1}^N, \mathcal{L}_N^B \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_N^B = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} L^{(2)} \diamond_{ij}$. Iterating this formula, one gets the backward series expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_t^N, \varphi_s \rangle = & \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \langle f_0^N, \mathbf{T}(t_k) \mathcal{L}_N^B \mathbf{T}(t_{k-1} - t_k) \dots \\ & \dots \mathcal{L}_N^B \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle dt_1 \dots dt_k. \end{aligned}$$

Tedious combinatorial arguments lead to the term-by-term convergence:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_0^N, \mathbf{T}(t_k) \mathcal{L}_N^B \mathbf{T}(t_{k-1} - t_k) \dots \mathcal{L}_N^B \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle \\ \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s+k)}, \mathbf{T}(t_k) \mathbf{D} \mathbf{T}(t_{k-1} - t_k) \dots \mathbf{D} \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that when the exponential series $\mathbf{T}(t) = e^{t\mathbf{S}}$ converges, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s+k)}, \mathbf{T}(t_k) \mathbf{D} \mathbf{T}(t_{k-1} - t_k) \dots \mathbf{D} \mathbf{T}(t - t_1) \varphi_s \rangle dt_1, \dots, dt_k \\ = \frac{t^k}{k!} \langle f_0^{\otimes(s+k)}, (\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{T})^k \varphi_s \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

With the second approach, the non-homogeneous case is thoroughly detailed in [Pul96]. The main difference with the proof in the homogeneous case is that Equation (193) should be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} f_t^{\otimes s} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \mathbf{T}_\infty^{(s)}(t - t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} \mathbf{T}_\infty^{(s+1)}(t_1 - t_2) \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2} \dots \\ \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k} \mathbf{T}_\infty^{(s+k)}(t_k) f_0^{\otimes(s+k)} dt_1 \dots dt_k. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{T}_\infty^{(s)}$ is the Markov semi-group generated by $\sum_{i=1}^s L^{(1)\diamond_i}$. The domination part is similar to the homogeneous case and the term-by-term convergence becomes

$$\|(\mathbf{T}_N^{(s)} - \mathbf{T}_\infty^{(s)}) f^{(s)}\|_{L^1(E^s)} \rightarrow 0.$$

6.2 Pathwise Kac's theorem via random interaction graphs

Under the same (strong) hypotheses of Kac's theorem, a more powerful result is due to Graham and Méléard [GM97; Mélé96]. The proof follows a completely different strategy and relies on a trajectorial representation of the process based on the notion of interaction graphs presented in the introductory Section 4.5.2. Kac's theorem states a pointwise result, the following theorem works at the pathwise level.

Theorem 6.4. *Let \mathcal{L}_N be of the form (24) with Assumption 2.14 and let us assume the uniform bound (31). Let $T > 0$ be a fixed time and $I = [0, T]$. Let $f_I^N \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E)^N)$ be the pathwise law of the N -particle system defined by \mathcal{L}_N and denote by $f_I^{s,N} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E)^s)$ its s -marginal for $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following properties hold.*

- (i) *There is propagation of chaos in total variation norm: there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\|f_I^{s,N} - (f_I^{1,N})^{\otimes s}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C s(s-1) \frac{\Lambda T + \Lambda^2 T^2}{N}, \quad (194)$$

where the TV norm is the s -dimensional total variation norm.

- (ii) *There exist $C > 0$ and a probability measure $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$ such that*

$$\|f_I^{1,N} - f_I\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \frac{C e^{\Lambda T}}{N},$$

moreover f_I solves the nonlinear Boltzmann martingale problem (see Definition 2.20).

- (iii) *Let $(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$ be a particle process with law f_I^N . Then for all $\Phi \in C_b(D([0, T], E))$,*

$$\mathbb{E} |\langle \mu_{\mathcal{Z}_t^N} - f_I, \Phi \rangle|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/N).$$

The main result is the propagation of chaos in total variation norm with an explicit convergence rate. The other properties follow more easily so we focus on the first point.

Proof (sketch). The proof is based on the observation that given an interaction graph $\mathcal{G}_i(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{R}_k)$, it is possible to construct a (forward) trajectorial representation of the process $(Z_t^i)_t$ of particle i on $[0, T]$. To do so, the particles at time $t = 0$ ($Z_0^i, Z_0^{i_1}, \dots, Z_0^{i_k}$) are distributed according to $f_0^{k'+1, N}$, where k' is the number of distinct indices i_1, \dots, i_k . At each $t_\ell \in \mathcal{T}_k$, the two corresponding particles collide according to the chosen interaction mechanism and between two collisions, the particles evolve independently according to $L^{(1)}$.

If a random interaction graph is first sampled with rate Λ and rooted on i at time T , then $(Z_t^i)_t$ is distributed according to $f_I^{1, N} \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$.

Now let be given two indexes (i, j) and \mathcal{G}_{ij}^N the random interaction graph with rate Λ rooted on (i, j) at time T . Starting from either i or j and following the graph backward in time, it is possible to extract two interaction subgraphs, denoted respectively by $\mathcal{G}_{ij}^{i, N}$ for the subgraph rooted on i and $\mathcal{G}_{ij}^{j, N}$ for the subgraph rooted on j . Two cases may happen: either \mathcal{G}_{ij}^N is a connected graph or \mathcal{G}_{ij}^N has two (disjoint) connected components given by the two subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_{ij}^{i, N}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{ij}^{j, N}$. We denote by \mathcal{A}_{ij}^N the event “ \mathcal{G}_{ij}^N is a connected graph”. Conditionally on the event \mathcal{A}_{ij}^N , the processes $Z^i = (Z_t^i)_t$ and $Z^j = (Z_t^j)_t$ are independent since their trajectorial representations depend on two disjoint sets of independent random variables. Moreover, $\text{Law}(Z^i) = \text{Law}(Z^j) = f_I^{1, N}$ and $\text{Law}(Z^i, Z^j) = f_I^{2, N}$. Therefore,

$$f_I^{2, N} - f_I^{1, N} \otimes f_I^{1, N} = \left(\text{Law}(Z^i, Z^j | \mathcal{A}_{ij}^N) - \text{Law}(Z^i | \mathcal{A}_{ij}^N) \otimes \text{Law}(Z^j | \mathcal{A}_{ij}^N) \right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{ij}^N),$$

and it holds that

$$\|f_I^{2, N} - f_I^{1, N} \otimes f_I^{1, N}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{ij}^N).$$

The question of propagation of chaos is thus reduced to the computation of the probability of sampling a connected graph. This probability can be bounded by:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{ij}^N) \leq \sum_{q=1}^{+\infty} Q_q^N(T),$$

where $Q_q^N(T) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_q^N(T))$ and $\mathcal{Q}_q^N(T)$ denotes the event “there is a route of size q joining i and j on $[0, T]$ ”, as depicted on the figure below:




FIGURE 2: A route of size q between i and j . The chain of interactions which links i and j are depicted by horizontal lines as explained in Section 4.5.2.

Clearly,

$$Q_1^N(T) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\Lambda}{N}T\right) \leq \frac{\Lambda T}{N},$$

since this event is equal to $\{\inf_n T_n^{i, j} < T\}$. Then for $q \geq 2$, to construct a route of size q it is necessary to first construct a route of size 1 from either i or j and then a route of size $q - 1$

from the the new index created to the other index i or j . Since branching happens with a rate bounded by Λ , it holds that

$$Q_q^N(T) \leq \int_0^T Q_{q-1}^N(T-t) 2\Lambda \exp(-2\Lambda t) dt = Q_{q-1}^N \star e_{2\Lambda}(T),$$

where $e_{2\Lambda}$ is the density of the exponential law with parameter 2Λ . Therefore

$$Q_q^N(T) \leq Q_1^N \star e_{2\Lambda}^{*(q-1)}(T),$$

and a direct computation shows that

$$\sum_{q=1}^{+\infty} Q_q^N(T) \leq C \frac{\Lambda T + (\Lambda T)^2}{N}.$$

The same reasoning extends for any interaction graph rooted on an arbitrary number of particles and gives the estimate (194). This ends the proof of the first point of the theorem. The remaining steps are sketched below.

1. With a similar reasoning, it is possible to prove that the law of any particle converges towards the law f_I of the process constructed on a limit Boltzmann tree with rate Λ . To do so, the argument is based on an estimate on the probability that there is a recollision in the sampled random graph. Since as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ the number of branches is bounded (of the order $e^{\Lambda T}$), and that the Poisson processes have rate Λ/N it holds that

$$\|f_I^{1,N} - f_I\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C \frac{e^{\Lambda T}}{N}.$$

2. Since the convergence holds in total variation norm, the empirical measure process converges in probability and in law towards f_I .
3. It remains to prove that the law f_I satisfies the nonlinear martingale problem. As in the McKean-Vlasov case (see Section 5.3), it can be proved by passing to the limit in the martingale problem satisfied by the N -particle system (which is possible thanks to the previous step).

We refer the reader to [Mél96] for the details of the proof. □

6.3 Martingale methods

The probabilistic treatment of the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation (44) and the question of proving propagation of chaos via martingale techniques has been initiated by [Tan83]. Such techniques lead to very powerful results as they only rely on abstract compactness criteria which apply on the path space. A drawback of the approach is that it does not provide any rate of convergence. The framework is explained in the introductory Section 4.2. The paradigmatic proof of strong pathwise empirical chaos is due to Sznitman [Szn84a]. The strategy is quite general, it does not restrict to Boltzmann-like models and can be applied to various models, in particular diffusion or jump models. A complete example in the case of McKean-Vlasov diffusion with jumps is shown in Section 5.3.1. In this section we make some comments specific to Boltzmann models and state the final result of [Szn84a]. Then we extend the functional law of large numbers (Theorem 5.19) proved in the mean-field case to general Boltzmann models.

Strong pathwise empirical chaos. Sznitman [Szn84a] considers Boltzmann parametric models (Definition 2.22) in $E = \mathbb{R}^d$, with

$$\psi(z_1, z_2, \theta) \equiv \psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta) = \psi_2(z_2, z_1, \theta).$$

The assumptions on the the interaction function ψ are as follows.

Assumption 6.5. *There exists a continuous function $m : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $m \geq 1$, $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow +\infty} m(z) = +\infty$ and such that the interaction function ψ and the interaction rate λ satisfy:*

(i) *for all $z_1, z_2 \in E$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$,*

$$m(\psi(z_1, z_2, \theta)) + m(\psi(z_2, z_1, \theta)) \leq m(z_1) + m(z_2),$$

(ii) *for all $z_1, z_2 \in E$ and all $0 \leq p \leq 1$*

$$\lambda(z_1, z_2) \leq m(z_1)^p + m(z_2)^p.$$

In most cases, the function m is a polynomial function of the form $m(z) = 1 + |z|^k$ and the above assumptions are thus mostly used to control the moments of the particle system or of the limiting equation which is often a crucial in Boltzmann models. Sznitman uses the martingale characterisation of the N -particle system.

Assumption 6.6. *For any $T \in [0, +\infty]$, wellposedness holds true for the martingale problem associated to the particle system (Definition 2.4) supplemented with the condition: for all $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D(\mathbb{R}_+, E)^N} m(\mathbf{Z}_t^{1,N}) + \dots + m(\mathbf{Z}_t^{N,N}) df_t^N(d\mathbf{Z}^N) \\ \leq \int_{E^N} m(z^1) + \dots + m(z^N) df_0^N(d\mathbf{z}^N). \end{aligned}$$

The main result [Szn84a, Theorem 3.3] is the following.

Theorem 6.7. *Let us assume that Assumptions 6.5 and 6.6 hold true. Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and let $(f_0^N)_N$ a sequence of f_0 -chaotic probability measures on E^N . Assume that*

(i) *there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $N \geq 1$, $\frac{m(Z^1) + \dots + m(Z^N)}{N} \leq C f_0^N$ -almost surely,*

(ii) $\sup_N \int_{E^N} m(z)^{1+p} f_0^{1,N}(dz) < +\infty$.

Then the laws $f_t^N \in \mathcal{P}(D(\mathbb{R}_+, E)^N)$ are f_I -chaotic where $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D(\mathbb{R}_+, E))$ satisfies the nonlinear Boltzmann martingale problem (Definition 2.20) supplemented with the condition

$$\forall T > 0, \quad \sup_{t \leq T} \int_{D(\mathbb{R}_+, E)} m(\mathbf{Z}_t) df_t(d\mathbf{Z}) < +\infty.$$

The theorem states the usual pathwise propagation of chaos result. It is obtained as a consequence of the strong pathwise empirical propagation of chaos. This setting includes the case of the hard-sphere cross-section.

Functional law of large numbers. Wagner [Wag96] proves a functional law of large numbers for Boltzmann parametric models (Section 2.3.2 and Example 2.23) with $L^{(1)} \neq 0$. The proof is based on compactness arguments and a pointwise martingale characterisation of the particle system. The nonlinear process is defined by a series expansion reminiscent from Kac theorem (Theorem 6.1).

To conclude this section, we wish now to briefly discuss the extension of the method of Theorem 5.19 to Boltzmann-type collision systems. The first part of Assumption 5.15 has to be replaced by

Assumption 6.8 (Boltzmann generator). *The generator of the process $(\mathcal{X}_t^N)_t$ is a Boltzmann generator (24) with $L^{(1)} = 0$ and $L^{(2)}$ which satisfies Assumption 2.14. Moreover the associated martingale problem (Definition 2.4) is wellposed and the initial distribution has bounded high order moments uniformly in N .*

We define the symmetrized version of $L^{(2)}$

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}\varphi_2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{L^{(2)}\varphi_2(z_1, z_2) + L^{(2)}\varphi_2(z_2, z_1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\lambda(z_1, z_2)}{2} \iint_{E^2} \left\{ \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) + \varphi_2(z'_2, z'_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \varphi_2(z_1, z_2) - \varphi_2(z_2, z_1) \right\} \Gamma^{(2)}(z'_1, z'_2 dz'_1, dz'_2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies $L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2] = L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes \varphi^1]$ for every $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \mathcal{F}$. For the limit generator, given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, we define L_μ as

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \forall x \in E, \quad L_\mu \varphi(x) := \left\langle \mu, L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi \otimes 1](x, \cdot) \right\rangle = \left\langle \mu, L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi \otimes 1](\cdot, x) \right\rangle, \quad (195)$$

and equivalently $\varphi \otimes 1$ can be taken instead of $1 \otimes \varphi$ in the above definition. With this definition, the general Boltzmann equation (30) can be rewritten as in the mean-field case:

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle f_t, L_{f_t} \varphi \rangle. \quad (196)$$

we recall the notation:

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \quad R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\nu) := \langle \nu^{\otimes 2}, \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2 \rangle,$$

for the polynomial function on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ associated to $\varphi_2 = \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2 \in \mathcal{F}^{\otimes 2}$. We will need the following quadratic estimate:

Lemma 6.9 (Quadratic estimate for Boltzmann collisions). *The quadratic estimates reads*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N [R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N) &= R_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} R_{L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2]}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Lemma B.3 in the appendix. \square

Compared to the mean-field case (166), a correcting crossed-term appears for Boltzmann collisions, but this term can be handled in the same way by Assumption 5.16. One can eventually state the propagation of chaos theorem.

Theorem 6.10 (Functional law of large numbers for Boltzmann models). *Let us assume that Assumptions 6.8, 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18 hold true for L_μ given by (195). Then the weak Boltzmann equation (196) is wellposed and weak pathwise empirical propagation of chaos towards its solution holds for the Boltzmann model on every time interval $[0, T]$.*

Proof (sketch). The proof is exactly the same as the one in the mean-field case (Theorem 5.19). The mean-field property reads this time

$$\mathcal{L}_N \bar{\varphi}_N(\mathbf{x}^N) = \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} \otimes \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi \otimes 1] \right\rangle = \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi \right\rangle,$$

and Itô's formula can be written the same way to complete Step 1. The control of the carré du champ is provided by Lemma 6.9 above. Step 2 and Step 3 are identical provided that L_μ satisfies the boundedness continuity and uniqueness assumptions. \square

6.4 SDE and coupling

In this section, we continue the discussion started at the end of Section 2.3.2 and we prove propagation of chaos for a class of Boltzmann parametric models (Definition 2.22) using a coupling argument based on a SDE representation of the particle system. The main theorem of this section is due to Murata [Mur77] in the particular case of the 2D true Maxwellian molecules (non-cutoff). The technique of the proof has recently been revisited in [CF16b; CF18]. The proof in this section globally follows the same presentation as in [Mur77] although we sometimes use modernised optimal transport arguments taken from [CF16b]. The classical nonlinear SDE representation of the Boltzmann equation originally due to Tanaka [Tan78] for (44) can be found in the proof. Let us first recall the setting. We take $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ and we assume that the post-collisional distribution $\Gamma^{(2)}$ is of the following form: for any $\varphi_2 \in C_b(E^2)$,

$$\iint_{E \times E} \varphi_2(z'_1, z'_2) \Gamma^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, dz'_1, dz'_2) = \int_{\Theta} \varphi_2(\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta), \psi_2(z_1, z_2, \theta)) \nu(d\theta), \quad (197)$$

with $\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \cdot)_{\#} \nu = \psi_2(z_2, z_1, \cdot)_{\#} \nu$. We make the following reasonable Lipschitz and growth assumptions.

Assumption 6.11. *The interaction functions ψ_1, ψ_2 satisfy the following properties.*

(i) (Lipschitz). *There exists a function $L \in L^1_v(\Theta)$ such that for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\forall(\theta, z_1, z_2, z'_1, z'_2) \in \theta \times E^4, \quad |\psi_i(z_1, z_2, \theta) - \psi_i(z'_1, z'_2, \theta)| \leq L(\theta)(|z_1 - z'_1| + |z_2 - z'_2|).$$

(ii) (Linear growth). *There exists a function $M \in L^1_v(\Theta)$ such that for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\forall(\theta, z_1, z_2) \in \Theta \times E \times E, \quad |\psi_i(z_1, z_2, \theta)| \leq M(\theta)(1 + |z_1| + |z_2|).$$

Remark 6.12. One can alternatively assume (it is maybe more classical) that:

$$\forall(z_1, z_2, z'_1, z'_2) \in E^4, \quad \int_{\Theta} |\psi_i(z_1, z_2, \theta) - \psi_i(z'_1, z'_2, \theta)| \nu(d\theta) \leq C(|z_1 - z'_1| + |z_2 - z'_2|),$$

for a constant $C > 0$ and similarly for the linear growth assumption.

Under the assumption of linear growth, it follows easily using Gronwall lemma that the moments of all order are exponentially controlled for the nonlinear process.

Lemma 6.13. *There exist $C > 0$ such that for all $p \geq 1$ and all $t > 0$,*

$$\int_E |z|^p f_t(dz) \leq \left(\int_E |z|^p f_0(dz) \right) e^{Ct}.$$

Without loss of generality (up to redefining a process with fictitious collisions), we also assume that the interaction rate is constant and for all $\theta \in \Theta, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\psi_i(z, z, \theta) = z$.

A system of stochastic differential equations corresponding to the particle system is given by:

$$Z_t^i = Z_0^i + \sum_{j \neq i} \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} a(Z_{s-}^i, Z_{s-}^j, \theta, \sigma) \mathcal{N}_{ij}(ds, d\theta, d\sigma). \quad (198)$$

where

$$a(z_1, z_2, \theta, \sigma) = (1 - \sigma)\psi_1(z_1, z_2, \theta) + \sigma\psi_2(z_2, z_1, \theta) - z_1.$$

For all i, j , \mathcal{N}_{ij} is a Poisson random measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\}$ with intensity $\frac{\Lambda}{N} dt \nu(d\theta) d\sigma$, where $d\sigma$ is the uniform measure on $\{0, 1\}$. We also assume that for all i, j , the Poisson measure satisfy:

$$\mathcal{N}_{ij} = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{ji},$$

where for a Poisson measure \mathcal{N} on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\}$ with intensity $\frac{\Lambda}{N} dt\nu(d\theta)d\sigma$, we write

$$\check{\mathcal{N}}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{N}(\check{\mathcal{B}}),$$

where given a measurable set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\}$,

$$\check{\mathcal{B}} := \{(t, \theta, \sigma) \mid (t, \theta, 1 - \sigma) \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Classical results and classical references on this type of SDEs can be found in Appendix D.8.

The main result of this section is the following coupling estimate.

Theorem 6.14. *Let $T > 0$. Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_1(E)$ and $(Z_0^i)_{i \leq N}$ be N independent initial random variables with common law f_0 . Let us assume that \mathcal{L}_N is of the form (24) with $\Gamma^{(2)}$ given by (197), together with Assumption 6.11. Then there exists a N -particle system \mathcal{Z}_t^N with law f_t^N and N nonlinear processes \bar{Z}_t^N which are independent and identically distributed with common law f_t solution of the Boltzmann equation (29) such that for all $i \leq k(N)$ with $k(N) = o(N)$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Z_t^i - \bar{Z}_t^i| \right] \leq c_1 \left(\frac{k(N)}{N} \right)^\eta e^{c_2 T},$$

where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are two constants and $\eta < (d + 1 + d/k(N))^{-1}$.

Proof. Following Murata's work, the proof is split into several steps. The first step is devoted to the construction of the particle system. In the second step, the particle system is coupled with a system of independent nonlinear SDEs *à la* Tanaka. The third step introduces an intermediate system of non independent processes which is used as a pivot between the particle system and the nonlinear system. In the fourth and fifth steps we use the coupling to derive explicit error estimates and we conclude the proof.

Step 1. *Construction of a particle system.*

Following Murata's work, let us define N^2 independent Poisson random measures $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_{ij}$, indexed by $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\} \times (0, \frac{1}{N}]$ with intensity $\Lambda dt\nu(d\theta)d\sigma d\alpha$. We consider the following filtration:

$$\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma \left(Z_0^i, \mathcal{N}_{ij}(\mathcal{B}), 1 \leq i, j \leq N, \mathcal{B} \text{ measurable subset} \right).$$

We define:

$$\mathcal{N}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{ij} & \text{if } i \leq j \\ \check{\mathcal{N}}_{ji} & \text{if } j > i \end{cases},$$

so that $\mathcal{N}_{ij} = \check{\mathcal{N}}_{ji}$. We write

$$\mathcal{N}_{ij}(ds, d\theta, d\sigma) \equiv \int_{\alpha \in (0, 1/N]} \mathcal{N}_{ij}(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha),$$

so that $\mathcal{N}_{ij}(ds, d\theta)$ is a random Poisson measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta$ with intensity $\frac{\Lambda}{N} dt\nu(d\theta)$. With this choice of Poisson measures, let $(\mathcal{Z}_t^N)_t$ be the \mathcal{F}_t -adapted particle system given by Equation (198). We can write:

$$Z_t^i = Z_0^i + \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0, 1\}} \int_0^1 a(Z_{s^-}^i, Z_{s^-}^\mu, \theta, \sigma) \mathcal{N}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha), \quad (199)$$

where for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $t \in [0, T]$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we define

$$Z_t^\mu(\omega, \alpha) := \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{(\frac{j-1}{N}, \frac{j}{N}]}(\alpha) Z_t^j(\omega),$$

and for \mathcal{B} a measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\} \times [0, 1]$, we define the Poisson random measure:

$$\mathcal{N}_i(\mathcal{B}) := \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{N}_{ij}(\mathcal{B}_j),$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_j := \left\{ (t, \theta, \sigma, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\} \times (0, 1/N] \mid (t, \theta, \sigma, \alpha + (j-1)/N) \in \mathcal{B} \right\}.$$

The key observation is the following: for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $Z_t^\mu(\omega, \alpha)$ is a E -valued process constructed on the probability space $([0, 1], d\alpha)$ such that the α -law of $Z_s^\mu(\omega)$ is $\hat{\mu}_{Z_t^\mu}(dz)$. In the following, we call α -random variable a random variable constructed on $([0, 1], d\alpha)$, its law is called the α -law and we denote by \mathbb{E}_α the expectation on this space.

Step 2. Construction of a nonlinear system and coupling.

First let us define the random Poisson measures on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0, 1\} \times [0, 1]$:

$$\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{ij}(\mathcal{B}_j).$$

They are independent. In [Tan78], Tanaka introduced the following stochastic version of the Boltzmann equation:

$$\bar{Z}_t^i = Z_0 + \int_0^t \int_\Theta \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_0^1 a(\bar{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}, \theta, \sigma) \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha), \quad (200)$$

where for each t and ω , $\bar{Y}_t(\omega, \alpha)$ is a E -valued α -random variable with α -law $\text{Law}(\bar{Z}_t^i)$. It can be checked that the \bar{Z}_t^i are independent and identically distributed with common law f_t the solution of the Boltzmann equation. Note that as in the McKean-vlasov case, this defines a class of processes given by a SDE which depends on the own law of the process.

Note that the above nonlinear processes are already coupled with the particle system (198) through the Poisson random measure. We go one step further by choosing an appropriate process Y which couples optimally the solution of the Boltzmann equation and the empirical measure of the particle system. We take the process Y given by the following key lemma.

Lemma 6.15 (Optimal empirical coupling). *There exists a process $Y = Y_t(\omega, \alpha)$ such that*

- (i) $(Y_t)_t$ is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable
- (ii) For each t and ω , the α -law of $Y_t(\omega)$ is f_t .
- (iii) For each t and ω ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\alpha[Z_t^\mu(\omega) - Y_t(\omega)] = W_1(\mu_{Z_t^\mu}, f_t).$$

Proof. Using [Vil09b, Corollary 5.22], we know that there exists a measurable mapping

$$\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E \times E), \quad (t, \omega) \mapsto \pi_{t,\omega},$$

such that $\pi_{t,\omega}$ is an optimal transfer plan between $\mu_{Z_t^\mu}$ and f_t . Let us define for $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and \mathcal{B} a measurable subset of E ,

$$G_{t,\omega}^j(\mathcal{B}) = \frac{\pi_{t,\omega}(\mathcal{B} \times \{Z_t^j\})}{\pi_{t,\omega}(E \times \{Z_t^j\})} =: \pi_{t,\omega}(\mathcal{B} \times \{Z_t^j\} | E \times \{Z_t^j\}).$$

Using a randomization lemma there exists an α -random variable $g_{t,\omega}^j(\alpha)$ on the probability space $([0, \frac{1}{N}], N d\alpha)$ such that the α -distribution of $g_{t,\omega}^j$ is equal to $G_{t,\omega}^j$. Then, let us define for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$Y_t(\omega, \alpha) := \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{I_j}(\alpha) g_{t,\omega}^j \left(\alpha - \frac{j-1}{N} \right),$$

where $I_j = [(j-1)/N, j/N]$. Then one can check that

$$\mathbb{P}_\alpha(\{Y_t(\alpha) \in \mathcal{B}\} \cap \{Z_t^\mu(\alpha) = Z_t^j\}) = \pi_{t,\omega}(\mathcal{B} \times \{Z_t^j\}),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

The third property (optimal coupling) and the above proof are exactly the content of [CF16b, Lemma 3]. Murata was obviously not aware of the optimal transport results that we used but he managed to prove the existence of a coupling which is optimal up to an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ which is enough for the rest of the argument.

Note that with this choice of Y , it is not clear anymore whether the nonlinear processes (200) remain independent. Fortunately they are, as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.16. *The processes $(\bar{Z}_t^N)_t$ satisfy the following properties.*

1. *They are well defined \mathcal{F}_t -adapted processes*
2. *They are identically distributed and their law is a weak measure solution of the Boltzmann equation (29).*
3. *They are independent.*

Proof (sketch). The first two properties follow from Tanaka's construction [Tan78] which are summarised in Murata's article [Mur77, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2]. The independence is proved in [Mur77, Lemma 6.4]. The idea is to prove (using elementary martingale properties) the independence of the measures defined by

$$\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i^\#(\mathcal{B}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \{0,1\} \times [0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}}(s, \theta, \sigma, Y_s(\omega, \alpha)) \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha)$$

for any measurable subset $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \times \sigma \times E$. \square

Step 3. *An intermediate process.*

At this point, we have defined N couples of processes (Z^i, \bar{Z}^i) with the correct laws and the nonlinear processes are independent. We are exactly in the good position to prove the theorem. To carry out the proof let us notice that there are actually two couplings. In addition to the optimal coupling defined by Lemma 6.15, there is also a coupling between the jump times and between the jump random variables given by the Poisson measures \mathcal{N}_i and $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i$ which are not independent. As in Murata's proof, we separate these two sources of discrepancy by writing:

$$\mathbb{E}|Z_t^i - \bar{Z}_t^i| \leq \mathbb{E}|Z_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i| + \mathbb{E}|\tilde{Z}_t^i - \bar{Z}_t^i|, \quad (201)$$

where the process \tilde{Z}_t^i is defined by:

$$\tilde{Z}_t^i = Z_0 + \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_0^1 a(\tilde{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}, \theta, \sigma) \mathcal{N}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha).$$

Note that the processes \tilde{Z}^i are not independent. In [CF16b], Cortez and Fontbona consider only (an analog of) these processes and introduce later the nonlinear processes. Independence is recovered for blocks of size $k(N)$ as shown in the following lemma. This result can be found in both works, [CF16b, Lemma 6] and [Mur77, Lemma 6.5].

Lemma 6.17. *There exist two constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $i \leq k(N)$ with $k(N) = o(N)$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{Z}_t^i - \bar{Z}_t^i| \right] \leq c_1 \frac{k(N)}{N} e^{c_2 T}. \quad (202)$$

Proof. Using the definition of the Poisson random measures \mathcal{N}_i and $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_i$, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\overline{Z}_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i| \\ & \leq \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_{\frac{i-1}{N}}^1 |a(\overline{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}, \theta, \sigma) - a(\tilde{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}, \theta, \sigma)| \overline{\mathcal{N}}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j < i} \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_0^{1/N} |a(\overline{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}(\omega, \alpha + \frac{j-1}{N}), \theta, \sigma) - a(\tilde{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}(\omega, \alpha + \frac{j-1}{N}), \theta, \sigma)| \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{ij}(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j < i} \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_0^{1/N} |a(\tilde{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}(\omega, \alpha + \frac{j-1}{N}), \theta, 1 - \sigma) - a(\overline{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_{s-}(\omega, \alpha + \frac{j-1}{N}), \theta, 1 - \sigma)| \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{ji}(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Using the assumptions on the functions ψ_1 and ψ_2 leads after taking the expectation to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\overline{Z}_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i| & \leq c_1 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\overline{Z}_s^i - \tilde{Z}_s^i| ds + c_2 \frac{k(N)}{N} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[|\overline{Z}_s^i| + |\tilde{Z}_s^i| \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2c_3 \sum_{j < i} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(j-1)/N}^{j/N} |Y_s(\omega, \alpha)| d\alpha \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

With the notations of the proof of Lemma 6.15, one can see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(j-1)/N}^{j/N} |Y_s(\omega, \alpha)| d\alpha \right] = \mathbb{E} \int_E |z| \pi_{t,\omega}(dz \times \{Z_s^j\} | E \times \{Z_t^j\}).$$

By exchangeability, we see that this expression is independent of j and is thus equal to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(j-1)/N}^{j/N} |Y_s(\omega, \alpha)| d\alpha \right] = \frac{1}{N} \int_E |z| f_s(ds).$$

The conclusion thus follows from Gronwall lemma and Lemma 6.13 □

Step 4. Coupling bound.

Let us now focus on the estimate of the first term on the right-hand side of (201). We write:

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i| & \leq \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_0^1 |a(Z_{s-}^i, Z_{s-}^\mu(\omega, \alpha), \theta, \sigma) \\ & \quad - a(\tilde{Z}_{s-}^i, Y_s(\omega, \alpha), \theta, \sigma)| \mathcal{N}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha) \\ & \leq \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \int_{\{0,1\}} \int_0^1 \left\{ (1 + L(\theta)) |Z_{s-}^i - \tilde{Z}_{s-}^i| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + L(\theta) |Z_{s-}^\mu(\omega, \alpha) - Y_s(\omega, \alpha)| \right\} \mathcal{N}_i(ds, d\theta, d\sigma, d\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation gives a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|Z_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i| & \leq M \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[|Z_{s-}^i - \tilde{Z}_{s-}^i| + \int_0^1 |Z_{s-}^\mu(\omega, \alpha) - Y_s(\omega, \alpha)| d\alpha \right] ds \\ & \leq M \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[|Z_{s-}^i - \tilde{Z}_{s-}^i| + W_1(\mu_{Z_s^N}, f_s) \right] ds \\ & \leq M \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[|Z_{s-}^i - \tilde{Z}_{s-}^i| + \frac{1}{N} \sum_j |Z_{s-}^j - \tilde{Z}_{s-}^j| + W_1(\mu_{\tilde{Z}_s^N}, f_s) \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is actually an equality and comes from the optimal coupling property (Lemma 6.15) and the third inequality follows from the triangular inequality and:

$$W_1(\mu_{Z_s^N}, \mu_{\tilde{Z}_s^N}) \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |Z_{s-}^j - \tilde{Z}_{s-}^j|.$$

By classical arguments, we first sum this relation over i and then divide by N to obtain that the process $S_t := \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \mathbb{E} |Z_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i|$ satisfies:

$$S_t \leq M \int_0^t \mathbb{E} W_1(\mu_{\tilde{Z}_s^N}, f_s) ds + 2M \int_0^t S_s ds,$$

thus by Gronwall lemma and by exchangeability we get:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |Z_t^i - \tilde{Z}_t^i| \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} S_t \right] \leq \left(M \int_0^T \mathbb{E} W_1(\mu_{\tilde{Z}_s^N}, f_s) ds \right) e^{2MT}. \quad (203)$$

Step 5. Conclusion.

It remains to estimate the quantity

$$\mathbb{E} W_1(\mu_{\tilde{Z}_s^N}, f_s).$$

To do so, Murata proved a “decorrelation lemma” [Mur77, Lemma 6.6] to directly estimate quantities of the form

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(\tilde{Z}_t^k) \varphi(\tilde{Z}_t^\ell) - \langle \varphi, f_t \rangle^2 \right],$$

but as noted by [CF16b], we can skip these computations using a recent result on exchangeable systems (see [HM14, Theorem 1.2] and Theorem 3.40) which implies the equivalence between the different notions of chaos in Wasserstein-1 distance. Namely it holds that,

$$\mathbb{E} W_1(\mu_{\tilde{Z}_s^N}, f_s) \leq C \left(W_1(\text{Law}(\tilde{Z}_s^1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_s^{k(N)}), f_s^{\otimes k(N)}) + \frac{1}{N} \right)^\gamma, \quad (204)$$

for all $\gamma < (d + 1 + d/k(N))^{-1}$ where the constant C depends on the moment of order 1. The right-hand side is controlled by Lemma 6.17 (and the control of the moments). The conclusion thus follows by gathering (204), (203), (202) and (201). \square

We end this section with some additional remarks on the theorem and its proof and a few more bibliographical comments.

1. The same proof works in the case of a non constant but bounded interaction rate. In such case we do as usual and allow fictitious collisions. The probability of a fictitious collision can be added in the Poisson random measure.
2. Keeping a constant interaction rate, we have never used the fact that $\nu(d\theta)$ is a probability measure. The only thing that we need is that the Lipschitz and growth functions $L(\theta)$ and $M(\theta)$ are integrable. This theoretically allows us to consider the case of non-cutoff particles when $\int_{\Theta} \nu(d\theta) = +\infty$. This was one of the original motivations of [Mur77] which treats the case of non-cutoff Maxwell molecules.
3. One of the advantages of such coupling technique is that it gives an explicit convergence rate. In our example we use crude Lipschitz and growth estimates which classically lead to a bad behaviour with time. Just as in the McKean-Vlasov case, uniform in time estimates can be obtained for specific models. An example can be found in [CF16b]. The authors study a “generalised” Kac model with linear interactions and various conservation laws (which in particular imply uniform in time control of the moments of the nonlinear law). The same method (together with an additional coupling argument) leads to quantitative uniform in time propagation of chaos for 3D Maxwell molecules (with an optimal rate) in [CF18].

4. Similar techniques and in particular an “optimal coupling” argument are also used in [FG15] for a Nanbu system, so without binary collisions. This work illustrates the power of coupling techniques as it treats a much more difficult case than the one treated in this section. The authors managed to treat the case of hard-sphere particles (unbounded cross section) but also hard-potential particles (unbounded cross section and non integrable interaction law). For similar results in the case of binary collisions, see the recent article [Hey20].
5. Finally, we also point out that the idea of working with an optimal coupling between the empirical measure of a particle system and its limit law also appears in an earlier work [FGM09] by one of the authors of [CF16b; CF18]. In [FGM09], the authors propose a derivation of the Landau equation from a system of interacting diffusions. The stochastic interpretation of the Landau equation is given by a nonlinear SDE (in the sense of McKean) driven by a space-time white noise (instead of a classical Brownian motion in the usual McKean-Vlasov case). The associated particle system is actually better understood as a system of SDEs driven by martingale measures as described in [MR88]. This setting goes beyond this review and we refer the interested reader to the aforementioned articles for more details. In a sense, with modern eyes, Murata’s work [Mur77] may look incomplete, essentially because it does not (could not) benefit from the recent development of optimal transport. It should be noted however that the idea of optimal coupling appeared simultaneously in [Mur77] and [FGM09], apparently independently, in two different contexts.

6.5 Some pointwise results in unbounded cases via the empirical process

In this section we gather some of the results obtained in [MMW15] in two classical unbounded cases: the true Maxwell molecules (i.e. without cutoff) and the hard-sphere molecules, both in the spatially homogeneous setting (see Section 2.3.3 and Example 2.25). These results are obtained via the abstract method developed in [MM13; MMW15] following the seminal (incomplete) work of [Grü71]. The general method is described in Section 4.3 and Theorem 4.14. It reduces the problem to the careful check of five assumptions which are stated in a simple form in Assumption 4.13 but which are extended and stated in a more complex form in [MM13, Section 3.1] in order to treat unbounded cases and the uniform in time propagation of chaos.

Theorem 6.18 ([MMW15]). *Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be compactly supported with zero momentum and finite energy:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f_0(dv) = 0, \quad \mathcal{E} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f_0(dv),$$

and let f_t be the solution at time $t > 0$ of the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation (44) with initial condition f_0 and collision kernel $B(u, \sigma)$ given by (40). For $N \geq 1$, the Kac sphere (or Boltzmann sphere) is defined by:

$$\mathcal{S}^N(\mathcal{E}) := \left\{ \mathbf{v}^N \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |v^i|^2 = \mathcal{E}, \sum_{i=1}^N v^i = 0 \right\}.$$

Fix $T \in (0, +\infty]$. Assume that the initial N -particle distribution f_0^N is either tensorized $f_0^N = f_0^{\otimes N}$ or is f_0 -chaotic and constrained on the Kac sphere $\mathcal{S}^N(\mathcal{E})$ (see [MM13, Lemma 4.4 and 4.7]).

- **(Maxwell molecules).** Let B be of the form (42) or (43). Then there exist a subset $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and come constants $C(T) > 0$ and $\kappa(d) > 0$, which depend respectively only on T and d , such that for any $\varphi_k \in \mathcal{F}^{\otimes k}$, $2k \leq N$, it holds that

$$\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \langle f_t^{k,N} - f_t^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle \right| \leq \frac{C(T)k^2}{N^{\kappa(d)}} \|\varphi_k\|_{\mathcal{F}^{\otimes k}}.$$

Moreover when $T = +\infty$ then $\kappa(d)$ is given by [FG15, Theorem 1] or [MM13, Lemma 4.2]. In the cutoff case (43), for any $T < +\infty$, the result holds with the optimal rate $\kappa(d) = \frac{1}{2}$.

- **(Hard-spheres).** Let B be of the form (41). Then when $T < +\infty$, there exist a subset $\mathcal{F} \subset C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and some constants $C(T) > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $\varphi_k \in \mathcal{F}^{\otimes k}$, $2k \leq N$, it holds that

$$\sup_{t \leq T} |\langle f_t^{k,N} - f_t^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle| \leq \frac{C(T)k^2}{(1 + |\log N|)^\alpha} \|\varphi_k\|_{\mathcal{F}^{\otimes k}}.$$

Moreover if f_0 is instead assumed to be bounded and to have a bounded exponential moment and if f_0^N is f_0 -chaotic and constrained on the Kac sphere $\mathcal{S}^N(\mathcal{E})$, then so is the N -particle distribution f_t^N for all $t > 0$ and the previous estimate holds with $T = +\infty$.

The results of this theorem also imply the propagation of finite and infinite dimensional Wasserstein-1 chaos as defined in Definition 3.39 (see [MM13, Theorems 5.2 and 6.2]). The authors also prove the propagation of entropic chaos (Definition 3.42) for the cutoff Maxwell molecules and the hard-spheres together with the relaxation towards equilibrium with a rate independent of N (see [MM13, Theorem 7.1]). These results positively answer many of the conjectures raised by Kac in his seminal article [Kac56] (also known as the *Kac's program in kinetic theory* [MM13, Section 1.4]). In particular, it provides a “satisfactory justification of Boltzmann H-theorem” for unbounded models (which, with a modernised terminology, corresponds to the notion of entropic chaos in the sense of Definition 3.42).

In the hard-sphere case, the results have recently been improved in a pathwise setting in [Hey19]. The improvement is due to a better Hölder stability result [Hey19, Theorem 1.6] for the nonlinear Boltzmann flow which improves the control of the third term on the right-hand side of (102) and leads to a polynomial convergence rate (instead of logarithmic).

6.6 Lanford’s theorem for the deterministic hard-sphere system

This section is the only one which concerns a completely deterministic system, namely the hard-sphere system defined in Example 2.28. We chose to include it in this review because of its historical importance. This is also at the same time one of the simplest physical model and one of the most difficult to analyse and less well understood. Rigorous analytical results are available only for short times, way too short to be physically relevant. In fact, the well-posedness of the Boltzmann equation (38) is itself a long-standing problem of interest.

The first formal derivation of the Boltzmann equation from a system of interacting particles is due to Grad [Gra58; Gra63] in the scaling $N\varepsilon^{d-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$, nowadays called the Boltzmann-Grad scaling. A few decades later, Lanford [Lan75] provided the first almost complete proof of the convergence of the BBGKY hierarchy towards the Boltzmann hierarchy and thus propagation of chaos for short times for the hard-sphere system (Example 2.28). The extension to particles interacting via short-range potentials was achieved in [Kin75]. Lanford’s proof has then been improved and completed over the following years, let us cite in particular the classical references [Uch88a; CIP94]. The most complete and up-to-date reference on the subject is [GST14] (in both the hard-sphere and short-range potentials cases). Following the seminal idea of Lanford, the very detailed proof is based on a fine analysis of what the so-called “recollision trees” (see also Section 4.5.2). This section presents a quite general and very brief overview of Lanford’s theorem and its proof. In addition to the reference article [GST14], we also refer the interested reader to the reviews [Saf16] and [Gol15].

Before stating Lanford’s theorem, we recall the notion of BBGKY hierarchy in the specific case of the hard-sphere system. As we shall see, the proof of Lanford’s theorem follows roughly the same ideas as the forward point of view of Kac theorem (Theorem 6.1). The notion of Boltzmann hierarchy for the nonlinear limit system will also be needed. We recall

the notation

$$\mathbf{z}^s = (x^1, v^1, \dots, x^s, v^s),$$

for a generic element of $(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^s$.

Definition 6.19 (mild BBGKY and Boltzmann hierarchies for hard-spheres). Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

- For each $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the domain of the system of s hard-spheres of diameter $\varepsilon > 0$ is defined by:

$$\mathcal{D}_s := \{\mathbf{z}^s \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^s, \forall i \neq j, |x^i - x^j| \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

A set of N functions $(f_t^{s,N})_t \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_s))$, $s \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, is said to satisfy the (mild) BBGKY hierarchy when it satisfies:

$$f_t^{s,N}(\mathbf{z}^s) = \mathbf{T}_s(t) f_0^{s,N}(\mathbf{z}^s) + \int_0^t \mathbf{T}_s(t - \tau) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} f_\tau^{s+1,N}(\mathbf{z}^s) d\tau,$$

where \mathbf{T}_s is the backward flow associated to the s -particle hard-sphere system and the collision operator $\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} : L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_{s+1}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_s)$ is defined for a test function $g^{s+1} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_{s+1})$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} g^{s+1}(\mathbf{z}^s) \\ & := (N - s) \varepsilon^{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^s \int_{\mathbb{S}_1^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \nu \cdot (v^{s+1} - v^i) g^{s+1}(\mathbf{z}^s, x^i + \varepsilon \nu, v^{s+1}) d\nu dv^{s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

- For each $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the following set is the formal limit of \mathcal{D}_s when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$\Omega_s := \{\mathbf{z}^s \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^s, \forall i \neq j, x^i \neq x^j\}.$$

An infinite set of functions $(f_t^s)_t \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, L^\infty(\mathcal{D}_s))$, indexed by $s \in \mathbb{N}$, is said to satisfy the (mild) Boltzmann hierarchy when it satisfies:

$$f_t^s(\mathbf{z}^s) = \mathbf{S}_s(t) f_0^s(\mathbf{z}^s) + \int_0^t \mathbf{S}_s(t - \tau) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1}^0 f_\tau^{s+1}(\mathbf{z}^s) d\tau,$$

where \mathbf{S}_s is the backward free-flow associated to the s -particle system and the collision operator $\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1}^0 : L^\infty(\Omega_{s+1}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega_s)$ is defined for $g^{s+1} \in L^\infty(\Omega_s)$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1}^0 g^{s+1}(\mathbf{z}^s) & = \sum_{i=1}^s \int_{\mathbb{S}_1^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\nu \cdot (v^{s+1} - v^i))_+ \\ & \quad \times \left[g^{s+1}(\mathbf{z}^{s*}, x^i, v^{(s+1)*}) - g^{s+1}(\mathbf{z}^s, x^i, v^{s+1}) \right] d\nu dv^{s+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that the star notation \mathbf{z}^{s*} and $v^{(s+1)*}$ refers to the transformation (45) for the velocities (between the i -th and $(s+1)$ -th coordinates) with angle ν .

As explained in Section 3.2.1, the BBGKY hierarchy can be formally derived by taking the marginals of the Liouville equation. It is slightly more technical for the hard-sphere system because of the boundary conditions, see for instance [GST14, Section 4.2] and [CIP94]. The Boltzmann hierarchy is the formal limit of the BBGKY hierarchy when $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in the Boltzmann-Grad limit $N\varepsilon^{d-1} \rightarrow 1$. The rigorous proof of this limit is the core of Lanford's theorem. At this point, let us point out some hidden technicalities, in particular regarding the well-posedness of the two hierarchies.

- A first observation is that the set of *pathological* initial configurations (leading to collisions involving more than two particles or to grazing collisions) is of measure zero [GST14, Proposition 4.1.1].

- An unfortunate consequence of the previous observation is that all the functions that we are considering are now defined only almost everywhere. In particular it is not clear whether the collision operators $\mathcal{C}_{s,s+1}$ make sense since they involve integration over a set of zero measure (the sphere). This problem has been addressed (for the first time only) in [GST14, Section 5.1].
- The well-posedness of the BBGKY and Boltzmann hierarchies can be shown for short times for initial data which satisfy an energy bound given in [GST14, Theorem 6 and Theorem 7]. The main assumption is an estimate on the initial condition of the form: for almost every $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$f_0(x, v) \leq e^{-\mu_0 - \beta_0 |v|^2}.$$

The following form of Lanford's theorem is the one given in [GST14, Theorem 8].

Theorem 6.20 (Lanford). *Let $(f_0^{s,N})_{s \leq N}$ and $(f_0^s)_{s \geq 1}$ two initial data which satisfy the well-posedness results [GST14, Theorem 6 and Theorem 7] and which are admissible in the sense that they are compatible and satisfy for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$f_0^{s,N} \rightarrow f_0^s \tag{205}$$

locally uniformly in Ω_s as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in the Boltzmann-Grad limit. Let $(f_t^{s,N})$ and (f_t^s) be the solutions of the BBGKY and Boltzmann hierarchies respectively associated to the initial data $(f_0^{s,N})_{s \leq N}$ and $(f_0^s)_{s \geq 1}$. Then there exists a time $T > 0$ such that, uniformly in $t \in [0, T]$, the following convergence in the sense of observables holds:

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \varphi_s \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^{ds}), \int_{\mathbb{R}^{ds}} \varphi_s(\mathbf{v}^s) \left(f_t^{s,N}(\mathbf{x}^s, \mathbf{v}^s) - f_t^s(\mathbf{x}^s, \mathbf{v}^s) \right) d\mathbf{v}^s \rightarrow 0$$

locally uniformly on $\{\mathbf{x}^s \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^s, \forall i \neq j, x^i \neq x^j\}$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in the Boltzmann-Grad limit.

Tensorized initial Boltzmann data $(f_0^{\otimes s})_{s \geq 1}$ are admissible in the sense that there exists a BBGKY initial data which satisfy (205). This is a consequence of Hewitt-Savage theorem (see [GST14]). In this case the first marginal $f_t^{1,N}$ of the BBGKY hierarchy converges towards the solution of the Boltzmann equation.

We now briefly sketch the main ideas of the proof. Similarly to Kac's theorem (Theorem 6.1), the dominated convergence theorem is used for the iterated BBGKY and Boltzmann hierarchies (see the forward point of view of Kac's theorem). The term-by-term convergence is however way more difficult. Let us fix $s \in \mathbb{N}$. By iterating the definition of mild solution, the s -marginal can be written as a finite sum:

$$f_t^{s,N}(\mathbf{z}^s) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \mathbf{T}_s(t-t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} \mathbf{T}_{s+1}(t_1-t_2) \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2} \dots \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k} \mathbf{T}_{s+k}(t_k) f_0^{s+k,N} dt_1 \dots dt_k.$$

Compared to the initial formula, this may look more complicated but the key observation is that now, it involves only the initial condition. Of course the sum becomes infinite when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. In [GST14] it is therefore written directly as an infinite series, up to setting $f_{N,0}^{(s)} \equiv 0$ for $s > N$. For an observable φ_s , the quantity to control is therefore:

$$I_s(t, \mathbf{x}^s) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} I_{s,k}(t, \mathbf{x}^s),$$

where

$$I_{s,k}(t, \mathbf{x}^s) := \int d\mathbf{v}^s \varphi_s(\mathbf{v}^s) \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \mathbf{T}_s(t-t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1} \mathbf{T}_{s+1}(t_1-t_2) \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2} \dots \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k} \mathbf{T}_{s+k}(t_k) f_0^{s+k,N} dt_1 \dots dt_k.$$

Similarly for the Boltzmann hierarchy, the authors of [GST14] define:

$$I_s^0(t, \mathbf{x}^s) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} I_{s,k}^0(t, \mathbf{x}^s),$$

where

$$I_{s,k}^0(t, \mathbf{x}^s) := \int d\mathbf{v}^s \varphi_s(\mathbf{v}^s) \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \mathbf{S}_s(t-t_1) \mathcal{C}_{s,s+1}^0 \mathbf{S}_{s+1}(t_1-t_2) \mathcal{C}_{s+1,s+2}^0 \dots \mathcal{C}_{s+k-1,s+k}^0 \mathbf{S}_{s+k}(t_k) f_0^{s+k} dt_1 \dots dt_k.$$

The strategy is to use the dominated convergence theorem to prove that :

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} I_{s,k}(t, \mathbf{x}^s) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} I_{s,k}^0(t, \mathbf{x}^s).$$

in the Boltzmann-Grad limit and locally uniformly in \mathbf{x}^s .

The domination part is the easiest one (see [Gol15, Section 5.3] and [GST14, Theorem 6]). The term-by-term convergence is way more technical and is based on the reformulation of the observables in terms of pseudo-trajectories. For typographical reasons, in the following definition, we change our usual convention and we write the time as an argument and not as a subscript: $Z(t) \equiv Z_t$ (it is also a usual convention for deterministic systems). In the following definition, we also recall the notion of *interaction tree* which is an interaction graph as defined in Section 4.5.2 which is assumed to be without recollision.

Definition 6.21 (Pseudo-trajectory). Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $t > 0$, and

$$\tilde{Z}^{s,\varepsilon}(t) = (\tilde{X}^{1,\varepsilon}(t), \tilde{V}^{1,\varepsilon}(t), \dots, \tilde{X}^{s,\varepsilon}(t), \tilde{V}^{s,\varepsilon}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^{2ds}.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{(1,\dots,s)}(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{R}_k)$ be an interaction tree with $i_\ell = s + \ell$, $\ell \geq 1$. Given a k -tuple of velocities $\mathbf{v}^k = (v^1, \dots, v^k) \in \mathbb{R}^{ds}$ and angles $\nu^k = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k) \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, the BBGKY pseudo-trajectory $\tilde{Z}_{s+\ell}^\varepsilon(\tau)$ at time $\tau \geq 0$, $\ell \geq 0$ is defined recursively backward in time by:

- for $\tau \in (t_\ell, t_{\ell-1}]$, $\tilde{Z}^{s+\ell-1,\varepsilon}(\tau)$ is given by the particle backward flow (with boundary conditions) starting from $\tilde{Z}^{s+\ell-1,\varepsilon}(t_{\ell-1})$ with the convention $t_0 = t$,
- at time t_ℓ^+ , a particle is adjoined to the system at position $\tilde{X}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^+) + \varepsilon \nu_\ell$ with velocity v^ℓ ,
- the state of the system $\tilde{Z}^{s+\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^-)$ after adjunction of the particle $s + \ell$ depends on whether the velocities $(j_\ell, s + \ell)$ at t_ℓ^+ are pre- or post-collisional, namely we take:

$$\begin{cases} (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^-), \tilde{V}^{s+\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^-)) &= (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^+), v^\ell) & \text{if } \nu_\ell \cdot (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^+) - v^\ell) < 0 \\ (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^-), \tilde{V}^{s+\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^-)) &= (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^+)^*, v^{\ell*}) & \text{if } \nu_\ell \cdot (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell,\varepsilon}(t_\ell^+) - v^\ell) > 0, \end{cases}$$

where (v^*, w^*) denotes the pre-collisional velocities associated to (v, w) after scattering, defined by (45).

When $\varepsilon = 0$, $\tilde{Z}^{s+\ell,0}(\tau)$ for $\tau \in (t_\ell, t_{\ell-1}]$ is defined similarly by replacing the particle backward flow by the backward free-transport flow. The dynamical system $\tilde{Z}^{s+\ell,0}$ is called the Boltzmann pseudo-trajectory.

The BBGKY observable can be re-written in terms of pseudo-trajectory as:

$$I_{s,k}(t, \mathbf{x}_s) = \int d\mathbf{v}_s \varphi_s \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \dots \dots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dk}} \int_{(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^k} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathbf{v}^k, \nu^k) f_0^{s+k,N}(\tilde{Z}^{s+k,\varepsilon}(0)) d\mathcal{T}_k d\mathbf{v}^k d\nu^k, \quad (206)$$




FIGURE 3: At time t_1^+ , there is only one particle, at the same position for the BBGKY (in white) and Boltzmann (in red) pseudo-trajectories. At time t_1^+ , a particle (dotted) is added next to the white particle in a pre-collisional way. At time t_2^+ , a particle (dashed) is added next to the dotted particle in a post-collisional way. Due to a recollision at time $\tau \in (t_3, t_2)$, the Boltzmann and BBGKY pseudo-trajectories of the white/red particle are no longer close to each other at time t_3 .

where

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathbf{v}^k, \nu^k) := \prod_{\ell=1}^k \nu_\ell \cdot (\tilde{V}^{j_\ell, \varepsilon}(t_\ell^+) - v^\ell), \quad d\mathcal{T}_k = dt_1 \dots dt_k$$

and similarly for the Boltzmann observable. In order to take the Boltzmann-Grad limit $N\varepsilon^{d-1} \rightarrow 1$ in (206) it is necessary to prove that

$$\tilde{Z}^{s+k, \varepsilon} \longrightarrow \tilde{Z}^{s+k, 0},$$

where the pseudo-trajectories are defined taking the same initial condition at time t and giving the same interaction tree and new velocities and deviation angles. The convergence needs to be strong enough to imply the uniform convergence of the observables. The adjunction of a new particle only gives an error of size ε (since it is added exactly at the position $\tilde{X}^{j_\ell, 0}$ in the Boltzmann case and at a distance ε in the BBGKY case) which is then transported (backward) in time and can then be controlled. The fundamental difference between the BBGKY and Boltzmann pseudo-trajectories is that BBGKY pseudo-trajectories are subject to recollisions due to the boundary conditions, that is collisions which happen between two times t_ℓ and which are not encoded in the collision tree $\mathcal{G}_{(1, \dots, s)}(\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{R}_k)$. Such recollisions do not exist for the Boltzmann pseudo-trajectory since the particles have zero radius. When a recollision occurs, the situation is illustrated on Figure 3.

The fundamental idea of Lanford is to add the particles in such a way that there is no recollision. The proof thus consists in constructing approximate observables by truncating the integration domain in (206). One of the main contributions of [GST14] is an explicit control on the size of the integration domain which leads to recollisions and which is shown to converge to zero fast enough in the Boltzmann-Grad limit. This relies on several geometrical arguments detailed in [GST14, Section 12]. We end this section with a few additional bibliographical comments on old and recent problems raised by Lanford's theorem.

1. The case of short-range potentials follows globally the same ideas as the hard-sphere case. On the other hand, the case of long-range interactions is mostly open. A derivation of the linear Boltzmann equation from a system of particles interacting via long-range potentials can be found in [Ayi17].
2. Lanford's theorem is valid only for short times. Results on the long-time behaviour are known only for systems close to equilibrium. In the subsequent article [BGS16], the authors study a system close to the equilibrium and prove that the linear Boltzmann equation can be obtained as the limit of a system of hard-spheres on a time interval growing to infinity with the number of particles. The proof is based on the same pruning procedure as in Lanford's theorem. The authors also study the motion of a *tagged* particle and show that under the proper scaling, it converges towards a Brownian motion. The striking point is that this derivation starts from a purely deterministic system. See also [BGS17] for the derivation of the Stokes-Fourier equations with a similar method.
3. The derivation of the Boltzmann equation has long been the source of controversies and somehow metaphysical debates around the question of time reversal and the emergence of irreversibility: the hard-sphere system obeys the Newton laws of motion which are time reversible but the Boltzmann equation is irreversible (it is a consequence of the famous H-theorem). These quite fundamental questions were addressed in relation with Lanford's theorem already in King's thesis (see for instance the remarks at the end of [Kin75, Chapter 3]). More recent articles also focus on a kind of large-deviation analysis and on the measurement of the *size of chaos* [PS17; Bod+18; Bod+20].

7 Applications and modelling

In Section 5 and Section 6, we have presented the prototypical application cases of the methods introduced in Section 4. In this last section, we go one step further and present a selection of mostly recent applications of these ideas to more concrete problems. Most of the examples presented are not simple direct applications of the previous results. One common and important issue (that we have already discussed) is the difficulty to handle weak regularity. Other topics which will be considered in this section include: time-discrete models which naturally arise in numerical problems, the modelling of noise and the source of stochasticity, the long-time behaviour of particle systems and their behaviour under other scaling limits. The primary objective of this section is to show through various examples how concrete modelling problems lead to these new tough theoretical questions. However, although we hope to give a panorama as faithful as possible of current research, this example-based section is by no means exhaustive and we will mainly stay at an introductory level. One important topic that will not be addressed is the theory of mean-field games. The specific question of propagation of chaos in mean-field games is discussed in great details in [Car+19] and its introduction is itself a quite complete and self-contained review on the subject. Other classical references on mean-field games include [Car10; CD18a; CD18b].

In Section 7.1 we detail the particle interpretation of various classical PDEs in mathematical physics, with a special emphasis on the numerical consequences of these ideas. Section 7.2 is devoted to a gallery of models of self-organization, mostly inspired by biological systems. Nowadays, mean-field models also have applications in data sciences, either to design more efficient algorithms or to prove their convergence; examples are given in Section 7.3. Finally, in the last Section 7.4, we give a glimpse on some results which go beyond the pure propagation of chaos property.

7.1 Classical PDEs in kinetic theory: derivation and numerical methods

The derivation of classical equations in mathematical kinetic theory is the first *raison d'être* of the propagation of chaos theory. We have already presented some of the main examples: the Fokker-Planck equation, the BGK equation, the granular media equation or the various variants of the Boltzmann equation. In this section, we present further results for the Burgers equation (Subsection 7.1.2), the vorticity equation (Subsection 7.1.3) and the Landau equation (Subsection 7.1.4). In all these cases, the propagation of chaos results derived before cannot be directly applied so we will discuss (without proof) the necessary adaptations.

Another motivation for this section is the observation that it is usually difficult to numerically solve these kinetic equations using deterministic quadrature methods. Going back to their particle interpretation, the propagation of chaos theory naturally suggests to simulate the underlying particle system and directly use it as a basis for the approximation of the solution of the associated kinetic PDE. In the smooth case, an example is shown in Subsection 7.1.1. Despite their inherent stochasticity, all the particle systems that have been studied in this review are relatively easy to simulate and modern computers can easily handle from thousands to millions of particles (it remains very far from the $\sim 10^{23}$ order of magnitude in thermodynamics, though). Note however that particle methods may suffer from a high complexity (typically quadratic in N), the convergence may be slow (at best $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$) and the convergence analysis may be difficult. Still, stochastic particle methods have been used with great success in particular for the Boltzmann equation, following the *Direct Simulation Monte Carlo* (DSMC) methods developed by Bird in the sixties (Subsection 7.1.5).

7.1.1 Stochastic particle methods for the McKean-Vlasov model

The propagation of chaos theory for the McKean-Vlasov diffusion with smooth coefficients has been treated in Section 5.1.1. The (quantitative) result Theorem 5.1 readily suggests to approximate the limit Fokker-Planck PDE by a smoothed version of the empirical measure of the particle system. In dimension one, a detailed algorithm and its convergence analysis is due to Bossy and Talay [BT97]. The algorithm is based on the Fokker-Planck equation satisfied by the cumulative distribution function $V(t, x) := \int_{-\infty}^x f_t(x) dx$, namely with the notations of Theorem 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V(t, x) = & - \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} K_1(x, y) \partial_x V(t, y) dy \right] \partial_x V(t, x) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x \left\{ \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} K_2(x, y) \partial_x V(t, y) dy \right]^2 \partial_x V(t, x) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (207)$$

Given the a sequence of time steps $t_k = k\Delta t$ for $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$, the particle system (11) is approximated by a first order Euler-Maruyama scheme:

$$Y_{t_{k+1}}^i = Y_{t_k}^i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K_1(Y_{t_k}^i, Y_{t_k}^j) \Delta t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K_2(Y_{t_k}^i, Y_{t_k}^j) (W_{t_{k+1}}^i - W_{t_k}^i), \quad (208)$$

where $(W_{t_k}^i)_{i,k}$ are KN independent standard Gaussian random variables and Y_0^i are N points in \mathbb{R} . Then the solution $V(t_k, \cdot)$ of (207) is approximated at time t_k by the empirical cumulative distribution function:

$$V_{t_k}^N(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H(x - Y_{t_k}^i),$$

where H is the Heaviside function $H(z) := \mathbb{1}_{z \geq 0}$. The main results [BT97, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2] prove the convergence bounds:

$$\mathbb{E} \|V(t_k, \cdot) - V_{t_k}^N\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \left(\|V(0, \cdot) - V_0^N\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \sqrt{\Delta t} \right),$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| f_{t_k} - \Phi_\varepsilon \star \mu \mathcal{Y}_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \left[\varepsilon^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\|V(0, \cdot) - V_0^N\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \sqrt{\Delta t} \right) \right],$$

where Φ_ε is the density of the Gaussian law $\mathcal{N}(0, \varepsilon^2)$. Similarly to Theorem 5.1, the proof relies on an analogous synchronous coupling for the time discrete system (208), see [BT97, Lemma 2.8]. Still in a regular setting, we also mention that for the granular media equation, the concentration inequality of Theorem 5.32 leads to an explicit convergence rate for the smoothed empirical measure towards the invariant measure of the nonlinear system, see [BGV06, Theorem 2.14].

For more singular kernels, general results are difficult to obtain and the “good” approach most often depends on the specific properties of the model considered. In the next subsections, we give a brief overview of important results for classical equations in mathematical physics. When available, we also discuss their numerical approximation via particle methods. On this last topic, a much more complete reference is the review [Bos05].

7.1.2 The Burgers equation

In his seminal article [McK69], McKean raised the problem of the derivation of the Burgers equation from an interacting particle system. The Burgers equation is the following one-dimensional PDE on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = -f_t(x) \partial_x f_t(x) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx}^2 f_t(x). \quad (209)$$

In view of Theorem 5.1, the associated particle system should be given by (11) with

$$b(x, \mu) = \frac{1}{2} \mu, \quad \sigma(x, \mu) \equiv \sigma = \text{constant},$$

or equivalently, with the notations of Theorem 5.1,

$$\tilde{b}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} y, \quad K_1(x, y) = \delta_{x, y}.$$

Clearly, K_1 is much too singular to satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1. The main approaches to tackle the problem are the following, sorted in chronological order.

- In [CP83, Theorem 3.1], the Dirac delta K_1 is approximated by a smooth function with a smoothing parameter $\varepsilon(N)$ which depends on N . Using McKean’s quantitative approach of Theorem 5.1, Calderoni and Pulvirenti show a moderate interaction result (see Section 5.1.2) and prove that there exists a sequence $\varepsilon(N)$ for which the propagation of chaos result holds towards the (singular) solution of the Burgers equation.
- In [OK85], Osada and Kotani use a more analytical approach based on the observation that the generator of the particle system with $K_1(x, y) = \delta_{x, y}$ can be written in divergence form and after a change of time, this generator can be seen as a perturbation of order N^{-1} of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator. The result then follows from a careful analysis of the associated N -particle semigroup written as a series expansion via the iterated Duhamel formula.
- In [Szn86] (see also [Szn91, Chapter 2]), Sznitman replaces the deterministic drift $\delta_{X_t^i, X_t^j} dt$ by the symmetric local time in 0 of $X_t^i - X_t^j$.

- In [BT97] and in [Jou97], Bossy, Talay and Jourdain use a different particle system: they interpret the Burgers Equation (209) as the equation satisfied by the cumulative distribution function (207) of the solution of the McKean-Vlasov equation with the kernel $K_1(x, y) = H(x-y)$ where H is the Heaviside function (and a constant diffusion). Still, the kernel does not satisfies the hypothesis of McKean theorem because of the discontinuity in zero. The dedicated propagation of chaos result is proved using the strong pathwise martingale method (similar Theorem 5.23), see [BT96, Theorem 3.2] and the generalised result [Jou97, Proposition 2.4]. In [BT96, Theorem 3.1], Bossy and Talay also prove the convergence of the particle scheme (208) with the same convergence rate as in the Lipschitz framework.
- In [Lac18], Lacker shows that the Burgers equation can be derived by a direct application of the generalised McKean Theorem 5.36 using the Girsanov transform.

7.1.3 The vorticity equation and other singular kernels

In dimension 2, the vorticity formulation of the Navier-Stokes equation reads

$$\partial_t w_t(x) = (K \star w_t)(x) \cdot \nabla_x w_t(x) + \nu \Delta_x w_t(x), \quad (210)$$

where $\nu > 0$ is called the viscosity and K is the Biot and Savart kernel

$$K(x) = \frac{x^\perp}{|x|^2} = \frac{1}{|x|^2}(-x_2, x_1)^\top. \quad (211)$$

It is important to note that the solution w_t of (210) is not assumed to be positive so its interpretation as the law of a limit particle system is not obvious. A particle system associated to (210) has been introduced by Chorin in [Cho73] as a simple numerical method to solve the vorticity equation. Later, computational improvements have been proposed in [GR87] to cope with the high complexity of the algorithm, which is quadratic in the number of particles. The idea is based on a clever specific treatment of the short and long range interactions. The method is known as the *fast multipole method*.

The mathematical treatment of Chorin algorithm and more generally the problem of the derivation of Equation (210) from a particle system was initiated in the 80's and is still an active topic. Important progress have been made very recently. The particle system is described below and the propagation of chaos result is stated (informally).

Let be given N real-valued random variables $(m_i^N)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$ called the *circulations*. The N particle system is a standard linear McKean-Vlasov system where the convolution with the drift kernel K is “weighted” by the circulations:

$$dX_t^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} m_j^N K(X_t^j - X_t^i) dt + \sigma dB_t^i,$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is such that $\nu = \sigma^2/2$ and the B_t^i are N independent Brownian motions. Note that the circulations do not depend on time. The problem is to prove the propagation of chaos for the system $(X_t^i, m_i^N)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$ towards the law of the nonlinear random variable (\bar{X}_t, \bar{m}) defined by the SDE:

$$d\bar{X}_t = K \star w_t(\bar{X}_t) dt + \sigma dB_t,$$

where B_t is a Brownian motion and w_t is the measure on \mathbb{R}^2 defined by

$$\forall \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad w_t(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{E}[\bar{m} \mathbb{1}_{\bar{X}_t \in \mathcal{B}}] = \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{B}} m f_t(dm, dx),$$

where $f_t(dm, dx) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ is the law of (\bar{m}, \bar{X}_t) . It can be shown that w_t is a weak solution of the vorticity Equation (210). Moreover, the propagation of chaos result implies

that the random measure

$$W_t^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N m_t^N \delta_{X_t^i} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

converges weakly towards w_t (in the space of measures).

Compared to the classical setting, the main difficulty is that the Biot and Savart kernel (211) is singular in $(0, 0)^T$. To deal with the problem, some of the historical stepping stones include the following. In [MP82], Marchioro and Pulvirenti use a regularised kernel and prove a moderate interaction result by coupling the trajectories. The result is improved by Méléard in [Mél00; Mél01] who proves the pathwise propagation of chaos with more general initial data. A different approach, without regularisation, is due to Osada in [Osa86]. Similarly to [OK85], it is based on the analytical study of the generator of the particle system. The propagation of chaos result holds under the assumptions of a large viscosity and a bounded initial data. Two recent works have improved these results using two different approaches.

- In [FHM14, Theorem 2.12], Fournier, Hauray and Mischler use a martingale compactness method (similar to the one presented in Section 5.3.1). To cope with the singularity of the Biot and Savart kernel, new entropy estimates are derived which, among other things, imply that any two particles do not stay too close to each other, see [FHM14, Lemma 3.3]. We also refer to the introduction of the article which contains a much more complete review of the existing works on the subject, also including deterministic models.
- In [JW18], Jabin and Wang have analytically derived entropy bounds which imply the propagation of chaos in TV norm for the system with constant circulations $m_t^N = 1$. Compared to the previous approach, the result is quantitative. The strategy is reviewed in Section 5.4.

To conclude, we discuss some extensions of these ideas to other important singular kernels derived from a Coulomb potential, namely $K(x) = Cx/|x|^d$ in dimension d , for a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$. In dimension $d = 2$, the attractive case $C > 0$ is called the Keller-Segel kernel. Following the probabilistic methods of [FHM14], recent works on the corresponding particle model include [FJ17; GQ15; LY16], see also the references therein. More analytical methods include [HS11; BÖ19; BJW19] and the references therein.

Another natural extension concerns kinetic systems on the product space $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for which the particle system is defined by the Newton equations with random noise:

$$dX_t^i = V_t^i dt, \quad dV_t^i = K \star \mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}(X_t^i) dt + \sigma dB_t^i,$$

where $K(x) = Cx/|x|^d$ on \mathbb{R}^d . The limit equation obtained as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ is called the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck equation on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\partial_t f_t(x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t + (K \star \rho_t)(x) \cdot \nabla_v f_t(x, v) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta_v f_t(x, v),$$

where $\rho_t(dx) = \int_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d} f_t(dx, dv)$. The propagation of chaos result via entropy bounds is proved in [JW16]. More recently, the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck is derived in [CCS19] from a regularised particle system via a moderate interaction result. A better cutoff size is obtained in [HLP20]. See also the references therein for a more detailed account of earlier works on the subject.

7.1.4 The Landau equation

The Landau operator is obtained as a *grazing collision limit* [Tos98; Vil02] of the Boltzmann operator defined on the right-hand side of (38) when the angular cross-section $\Sigma = \Sigma^\varepsilon(\theta)$ depends on a parameter $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\Sigma^\varepsilon(\theta) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0,$$

uniformly on any interval $[\theta_0, \pi]$, $\theta_0 > 0$ and

$$\int_0^\pi \sin^2(\theta/2) \Sigma^\varepsilon(\theta) d\theta \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Lambda \in (0, +\infty).$$

In the spatially homogeneous case, it leads to the Landau equation:

$$\partial_t f_t(v) = \nabla_v \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(v - v_*) [f_t(v_*) \nabla_v f_t(v) - f_t(v) \nabla_v f_t(v_*)] dv_*, \quad (212)$$

where for $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we define the matrix $a(u) = \tilde{\Phi}(|u|)P(u)$, where $\tilde{\Phi}$ is explicit in terms of the velocity cross section Φ and the constant Λ , and $P(u) := I_3 - \frac{u \otimes u}{|u|^2}$ is the orthogonal projection matrix on u^\perp . As usual, we refer to the classical reviews [Vil02] and [Deg04] for a more complete overview of the Landau equation in kinetic theory.

The formal derivation of (212) from the Boltzmann equation has been made rigorous in a probabilistic framework in [GM03]. Similarly to the Boltzmann equation, the Landau equation is shown to be associated to a nonlinear martingale problem. Then using the strong pathwise martingale compactness method (see Section 4.2), it is obtained as the limit of a Boltzmann particle system when both parameters N and ε converge, $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, see [GM03, Theorem 4.1]. This procedure also gives a Monte Carlo algorithm for the approximation of the Landau equation, using a Bird simulation algorithm which will be discussed below.

The Landau equation can also be obtained as the $N \rightarrow +\infty$ limit of a system of N diffusion processes. In [FGM09], the authors consider the particle system driven by N^2 independent Brownian motions $(B_t^{ij})_{i,j}$ and defined by the system of SDEs:

$$dX_t^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N b(X_t^i - X_t^j) dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma(X_t^i - \sigma_t^j) dB_t^{ij}, \quad (213)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, where $b : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_3(\mathbb{R})$ are defined by

$$b(u) = \nabla \cdot a(u), \quad \sigma(u)\sigma(u)^\top = a(u),$$

for the matrix a in (212). The nonlinear limit SDE is not a classical McKean-Vlasov system as it is driven by a space-time white noise instead of a standard Brownian motion. To prove the propagation of chaos, Fontbona, Guérin and Méléard have developed a dedicated optimal coupling method which leads to a quantitative convergence estimate. A non quantitative result was obtained before in [MR88] using martingale methods and martingale measures (see Remark 2.9).

A more standard McKean-Vlasov system of the form (11) is given in [Fou09] with still $b = \nabla \cdot a$ and this time, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\sigma(x, \mu)$ is the unique square root of the matrix:

$$a \star \mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(x - y) \mu(dy).$$

When the matrix a is sufficiently smooth (roughly when $\tilde{\Phi}(|u|) = |u|^2$), the propagation of chaos result thus follows from a standard synchronous coupling method, using some ad hoc preliminary estimates. A numerical scheme and its convergence analysis is also presented. When the velocity cross section is such that $\tilde{\Phi}(|u|) = |u|^{2+\gamma}$ with $\gamma \in (-2, 0)$ (this is the case of the so-called moderately soft potentials), then a (and thus σ) is not smooth. The propagation of chaos is proved in [FH16] using a new optimal coupling method for diffusion processes. The coupling is based on the observation that in order to couple the solutions of the two diffusion SDEs:

$$dX_t^1 = \sigma_1 dB_t^1, \quad dX_t^2 = \sigma_2 dB_t^2,$$

for two different diffusion matrices σ_1 and σ_2 , then an *optimal* choice is:

$$B_t^2 = U(a_1, a_2)B_t^1,$$

where $a_k = \sigma_k \sigma_k^T$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and

$$U(a_1, a_2) := a_2^{-1/2} a_1^{-1/2} (a_1^{1/2} a_2 a_1^{1/2})^{1/2}.$$

This coupling is a “dynamical” version of the optimal coupling between the normal laws $\mathcal{N}(0, a_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}(0, a_2)$. Since the matrix $U(a_1, a_2)$ is orthogonal, it follows that $U(a_1, a_2)B_t^2$ is a standard Brownian motion. A non quantitative result using martingale methods is also shown in [FH16].

Yet another particle system has been proposed in [Car15]. The SDE system (213) is the same as in [FGM09] but the Brownian motions are not independent, they satisfy $B_t^{ij} = -B_t^{ji}$. Contrary to the previous one, this particle system preserves the momentum and energy. The propagation of chaos result is proved using the pointwise empirical approach described in Section 4.3. The same particle system is also studied in [FG17] where the authors use the optimal coupling method of [FH16] for the case $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.

7.1.5 DSMC for the Boltzmann equation

As already discussed many times in this review, the propagation of chaos towards the Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics (38) is a long standing problem which becomes extremely difficult in the unbounded cases described in Section 2.3.3. In the easiest case of the Maxwell molecules with cutoff, the propagation of chaos follows for instance from Kac’s Theorem 6.1 but in fact, from any of the methods described in Section 6. In the unbounded cases, most results are known only in the spatially homogeneous setting. For the hard-sphere cross section and for the (true) Maxwell molecules, the first complete and rigorous results are due to Sznitman [Szn84a] using martingale methods (see Theorem 6.7) and Murata [Mur77] using a coupling approach (in dimension two). For the true Maxwell molecules, in a series of papers [DGM99], [FM01b; FM01c; FM01d], [FM02], the authors combined Tanaka’s probabilistic representation of the Boltzmann equation with the martingale method of Sznitman and obtained existence results and particle approximation results respectively in dimension one, two and three. The strategy is based on a cutoff approximation with a vanishing cutoff parameter when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Lately, the analytical approach developed in [MM13] has lead to quantitative results in both the hard sphere and true Maxwell molecules cases. The latest results on the subject are summarised in Section 6.5 and we refer the interested reader to the introduction of [MM13] for a more detailed review of known results.

The numerical treatment of the Boltzmann equation is also an old question, with many techniques available. The difficulty comes from the approximation of the collision integral, on the right-hand side of (38). In dimension three, this is an integral over a (3+2)-dimensional space which makes any naive deterministic quadrature method practically inefficient. We will not discuss how efficient deterministic methods could be implemented (it is an active research area, see for instance [MP06; DP14; PR20] and the references therein) and we will focus on a brief overview of stochastic particle methods which can be seen as a natural application of the propagation of chaos property.

An exact simulation algorithm. Since the Boltzmann equation is obtained as the limit of a system of particles interacting according to (24), a natural idea is to simulate this particle system on any time interval $[0, T]$ and to take (a possibly smoothed version of) its empirical measure as an approximation of the solution of the Boltzmann equation. It is important to note that it only makes sense to simulate cutoff mollified models so for physical cases of interest (hard spheres or Maxwell molecules), one also needs to introduce a cutoff approximation of the cross section. An advantage of this method is that the particle system

can be simulated *exactly* so the only errors comes from the N -particle discretization (that is, the convergence rate in the propagation of chaos) and the cutoff approximation. This method is called the *Direct Simulation Monte Carlo* (DSMC) method and has been developed in the 60's by Bird [Bir70]. We will discuss below Bird's algorithm but before that, we give the algorithmic form of Proposition 2.21 and Example 2.24: this leads to a particle system which is easily simulated in the semi-parametric cutoff case, i.e. assuming (31), (35) and (36).

```

Set  $t = 0$  ;
Draw the initial states  $Z_0^1, \dots, Z_0^N$  ;
while  $t \leq T$  do
    Draw  $\tau$  from an exponential law with parameter  $\Lambda M(N - 1)/2$  ;
    Update each particle in  $(Z_t^1, \dots, Z_t^N)$  on  $[t, t + \tau]$  according to  $L^{(1)}$  ;
    Draw  $(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, N\}^2$  uniformly among the  $N(N - 1)/2$  pairs ;
    Draw  $\theta \sim q_0(\theta)\nu(d\theta)$  ;
    Draw  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  uniformly ;
    if  $\eta \leq \frac{\lambda(Z_{t+\tau}^i, Z_{t+\tau}^j)q(Z_{t+\tau}^i, Z_{t+\tau}^j, \theta)}{\Lambda M q_0(\theta)}$  then
         $Z_{t+\tau}^i \leftarrow \psi_1(Z_{t+\tau}^i, Z_{t+\tau}^j, \theta)$  ;
         $Z_{t+\tau}^j \leftarrow \psi_2(Z_{t+\tau}^i, Z_{t+\tau}^j, \theta)$  ;
    end
     $t \leftarrow t + \tau$  ;
end

```

Algorithm 1: Exact simulation

This algorithm and some variants can be found in [GM97], [FM01d; FM01c], [Mél98b] or in [GM03] for an application to the Landau equation. Note that if a process with generator $L^{(1)}$ can be simulated exactly (for instance if it is the generator of a transport operator) or in the spatially homogeneous case, then it is not necessary to discretize time. However, it is necessary to simulate a Poisson process with a parameter which is $\mathcal{O}(N)$; the accumulation of jumps on small time intervals may become difficult to handle when N is very large.

In the kinetic non spatially homogeneous case, the state space is $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with the following assumptions:

- the operator $L^{(1)}$ acts only on the space variable and includes the boundary conditions;
- the interactions are purely local: for $x, v, x_*, v_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lambda((x, v), (x_*, v_*)) \equiv \lambda(v, v_*)\delta_{x, x_*};$$

- the post-collisional distribution depends only on the velocity variable: for $x, v, x_*, v_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$q((x, v), (x_*, v_*), \theta) \equiv q(v, v_*, \theta).$$

As explained in Example 2.27, the only way to treat this very singular case (due to the local interaction) is to consider a mollified model. For instance, Méléard [Mél01] considers a bounded spatial domain which is divided into a finite number of cells of equal volume δ^d , $\delta > 0$. In the case of a torus \mathbb{T}^d a possible choice is simply to consider a uniform spatial grid. Then the following mollified collision rate is considered:

$$\lambda^\delta((x, v), (x_*, v_*)) \equiv \lambda(v, v_*)I_\delta(x, x_*),$$

where I_δ is the sum over the cells G :

$$I^\delta(x, y) := \frac{1}{\delta^d} \sum_G \mathbb{1}_{x, y \in G}.$$

It physically means that two particles are allowed to interact only when they are in the same cell. The scaling ensures that the purely local Boltzmann equation is (formally) recovered when $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the mollified Boltzmann equation. The rigorous proof of the propagation of chaos property for this model when $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and $N \rightarrow +\infty$ can be found in [Mél98b]. Since the simulation is exact, the propagation of chaos is also a convergence proof of Algorithm 1. Since the algorithm is by nature sequential in time (the collisions are treated sequentially one by one), a drawback of this method is that most of the collisions will be fictitious: the if-loop will almost never be entered into. This comes from the fact that the accept-reject scheme is as efficient as the bound on λ and q are small.

The Bird algorithm. In the 60's, Bird [Bir70] introduced a simulation algorithm of the Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics (38) which can be understood as a time-discrete version of Algorithm 1 with parallelized collisions over the cells. First, the time interval $[0, T]$ is discretized uniformly with a time step Δt and the goal is to construct a time discrete approximation of the particles at the times $t_k = k\Delta t$ for $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$.

```

Draw the initial states  $Z_0^1, \dots, Z_0^N$  ;
for  $k = 0$  to  $K$  do
    Update each position  $X_{t_k}^i$  according to  $L^{(1)}$  until  $t_{k+1}$  ;
    Set  $V_k^i = V_{t_k}^i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  ;
    Decompose the domain into disjoint equal cells of volume  $\delta^d$  ;
    for each cell  $G$  do
        Set  $t_c = t_k$  ;
        while  $t_c \leq t_{k+1}$  do
            Set  $N_G$  the number of particles in the cell  $G$  ;
            Draw uniformly two particles  $V_k^i$  and  $V_k^j$  in the cell  $G$  ;
            Draw  $\theta \sim q_0(\theta)\nu(d\theta)$  ;
            Draw  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  uniformly ;
            if  $\eta \leq \frac{\lambda(V_k^i, V_k^j)q(V_k^i, V_k^j, \theta)}{\Lambda M q_0(\theta)}$  then
                Set  $\Delta t_{ij} = \left( \frac{N_G(N_G-1)}{2} \frac{\lambda(V_k^i, V_k^j)}{N} \frac{1}{\delta^d} \right)^{-1}$  ;
                 $V_k^i \leftarrow \psi_1(V_k^i, V_k^j, \theta)$  ;
                 $V_k^j \leftarrow \psi_2(V_k^i, V_k^j, \theta)$  ;
                 $t_c \leftarrow t_c + \Delta t_{ij}$  ;
            end
        end
    end
    Set  $V_{t_{k+1}}^i = V_k^i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  ;
end

```

Algorithm 2: Bird algorithm

A short heuristic description of the algorithm is the following.

1. The flow of $L^{(1)}$ and the boundary conditions are treated separately from the collision process. At each time step t_k , the positions are updated first and the positions at time t_{k+1} are used to update the velocities from t_k to t_{k+1} .
2. At each time step, each cell is treated independently: formally, it is equivalent to solve the spatially homogeneous problem in each cell during the time step Δt .

3. Instead of computing an exact simulation based on a Poisson process, a time counter is attached to each cell. Collision events are proposed and each time a collision is accepted, the time counter is incremented by a fixed time which is computed from the theoretical average time between two collisions. If N_G denotes the number of particles in the cell G , then the parameter of the Poisson process which gives the (inverse of the) average time between two collisions in G is bounded by:

$$\frac{\Lambda}{N} \sum_{x^i, x^j \in G} I_\delta(x^i, x^j) = \frac{N_G(N_G - 1)}{2} \frac{\Lambda}{N} \frac{1}{\delta^d}.$$

Since the collision probability depends on the current state of the particles (pairs of particles do not collide with the same probability), the previous bound is used in an accept-reject scheme and for the computation of the time counter. Note that this method does not necessitate to compute the jump probabilities which is an expensive $\mathcal{O}(N_G^2)$ operation. Note also that it is possible to re-compute better bounds Λ and M at each iteration: a global bound is not necessary and it is enough to know a bound over the parameters of the $N(N - 1)/2$ pairs of particles.

The convergence proof of the Bird algorithm is due to Wagner [Wag92, Theorem 4.1] using (non quantitative) martingale methods. The main result of Wagner is a propagation of chaos result via the empirical measure: Wagner proves that if the empirical measure of the initial state converges then this also holds true for the empirical measure of the output of the Bird algorithm at any later time (note that the algorithm actually defines a time continuous Markov process). The (heuristic) relationship between the limit of the Bird algorithm and the Boltzmann equation is explained in [Wag92, Section 5]. Algorithm 2 is referred as the “modified Bird algorithm with fictitious collisions”.

Remark 7.1. This method simulates the Boltzmann equation in *weak form* (since it is based on the simulation of the post-collisional distribution). For the main application case (38), which is written in strong form, there is nothing else to do thanks to the invariance of the collision kernel by the pre- and post-collisional changes of variables, see Example 2.25.

After Bird, Nanbu [Nan80] proposed an algorithm which is roughly speaking a time discretization of the mean-field jump model described at the beginning of Section 2.2.3. At each time step, each particle updates its velocity by choosing a “collision partner” which does not update its state during this collision. As before, the collision is accepted or rejected with a probability which depends on the collision rate. The relationship with the Boltzmann equation is shown in Example 2.17. A drawback is that in the physical case of the Boltzmann equation of rarefied gas dynamics (38) the algorithm does not preserve the energy and momentum. Another version was thus proposed by Babovsky [Bab86]: at each time step, the N -particle system is randomly uniformly separated into two groups of equal size from which $N/2$ randomly uniformly sampled collision pairs are obtained. Similarly to the Bird algorithm, if a collision is accepted, the two particles update their states. The main difference with Bird algorithm is that each particle can collide at most once per time step. This has a strong influence on the time accuracy. The convergence analysis of the Nanbu-Babovsky algorithm can be found in [BI89]. A detailed review and comparison of the Bird and Nanbu-Babovsky algorithms can be found in [CIP94, Chapter 10] as well as several variants. We also refer the interested reader to the lecture notes [PR01].

7.2 Models of self-organization

So far, we have been quite vague about what the particles represent. In this section, we present more concrete modelling problems which further motivate the study of particle systems. In the following examples, particles will be used to model large animal societies (Section 7.2.2), neuronal networks (Section 7.2.3) and socio-economic agents (Section 7.2.4). Similarly to Statistical Physics models, the common feature of all these systems is the spontaneous

emergence of a large scale complex global dynamics out of the simple and seemingly unorganized motion of many indistinguishable particles. The detailed study of such behaviour is not the primary interest of this review and the following will focus on the first step of the analysis which is the derivation of PDE models which can serve as a theoretical basis to explain *self-organized* phenomena. In order to illustrate the potential complexity of this approach even for seemingly simple models, the next Section 7.2.1 is devoted to a brief overview of recent results on the renown Kuramoto model.

There is a vast and growing literature on self-organization and collective dynamics models. Further much more detailed examples can be found in the books and review articles [BDT17; BDT19; NPT10; MT14; Deg18; Alb+19; VZ12].

7.2.1 Phase transitions and long-time behaviour: the example of the Kuramoto model

The Kuramoto model is the most classical model for synchronization phenomena between populations of *oscillators*, which may be used to model a clapping crowd, a population of fireflies or a system of neurons to cite a few examples. Despite its formal simplicity, the Kuramoto model exhibits a complex long-time behaviour which has motivated a vast literature, see for instance the reviews [Ace+05; Luc15] or the articles [BGP09; BGP14] and the references therein. This section is focused on two recent works [BGP14; DGP21] which prove, among other things, that the propagation of chaos does not always hold uniformly in time for the Kuramoto model and some of its variants. The main reason is a phase transition phenomenon. Both works actually prove some kind of large deviation results. Earlier results in this direction can be found in [DH96; Daw83; DG87].

Let N *oscillators* be defined by N angles $\theta_t^i \in \mathbb{R}$ (defined modulo 2π so that they can actually be seen as elements of the circle) which satisfy the following McKean-Vlasov SDE:

$$d\theta_t^i = \xi_i dt - \frac{K}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sin(\theta_t^i - \theta_t^j) dt + dB_t^i,$$

where $K \in \mathbb{R}$ is a real parameter of the model and $(\xi_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$ are N i.i.d. random variables which model the natural frequency of the oscillators (also called the *disorder*). When a realization of the natural frequency is chosen beforehand, then the model is said to be of *quenched* type. At least when $\xi_i = 0$ for all i , the propagation of chaos on any finite time interval follows immediately from McKean's Theorem 5.1. A natural question is therefore the long-time behaviour of the system and the uniform in time propagation of chaos. The limit Fokker-Planck equation can be shown to admit the following family of stationary solutions:

$$M_{\kappa, \theta_0}(\theta) \propto \exp(\kappa \cos(\theta - \theta_0)), \quad (214)$$

where $\kappa \geq 0$ solves the compatibility equation $\kappa = 2KI_1(\kappa)/I_0(\kappa)$ and I_0 and I_1 are the modified Bessel functions of order 0 and 1. The parameter $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ can be taken arbitrarily (by rotational invariance). The probability density function (214) is called the *von Mises distribution with concentration parameter κ and center θ_0* . The trivial solution $\kappa = 0$ is always a solution of the compatibility equation, it corresponds to the trivial disorder equilibrium where all the oscillators are asymptotically uniformly distributed over the circle. If $K > 1$ then there exists also a nontrivial solution of the compatibility equation and the associated family of stationary becomes *asymptotically stable*. This phenomenon is called a *phase transition* and a complete description of the long-time dynamics of the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation can be found in [GPP12; DFL15].

Consequently, if the propagation of chaos holds uniformly in time then the empirical measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ necessarily converges towards (214) as $N, t \rightarrow +\infty$. This is not always the case as shown by the large deviation principle proved in [BGP14, Theorem 1.1]. More precisely, let $K > 1$ and let $\kappa > 0$ be a nontrivial solution of the compatibility equation. Fix also a

constant $T > 0$. Assume that f_0^N is f_0 -chaotic. Then Bertini et al. show that there exist $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence of processes $(W_t^{N,T})_{t \in [0,T]}$ which converges weakly to a standard Brownian motion such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tau \in [C(K)/N, T]} \left\| \mu_{\mathcal{X}_\tau^N} - M_{\kappa, \theta_0 + D(K)W_\tau^{N,T}} \right\|_{H^{-1}} \leq \varepsilon \right) = 1,$$

where $C(K), D(K) > 0$ depend only on K , the initial condition and ε . As a consequence, the propagation of chaos is *not* uniform in time and breaks down at times proportional to N .

Another way to study the long-time behaviour of particle systems is to consider an appropriate scaling limit. For the Kuramoto model and more generally for McKean-Vlasov gradient systems, the natural scaling is the *diffusive* scaling defined by

$$f_t^{\varepsilon, N}(\mathbf{x}^N) := \varepsilon^{Nd} f_{t/\varepsilon^2}^N(\varepsilon \mathbf{x}^N) = \text{Law}(\varepsilon X_{t/\varepsilon^2}^1, \dots, \varepsilon X_{t/\varepsilon^2}^N),$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is the scaling parameter. In the case of the Kuramoto model, this is the law of a highly oscillating system with a frequency of order ε^{-1} and $K = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$. The authors of [DGP21] study a class of McKean-Vlasov gradient systems on the torus which generalizes the Kuramoto model. Using a gradient flow framework (see Section 4.2), one of the main results of the article is an explicit counter example which proves that for some chaotic initial conditions, the two limits $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ do not commute above the phase transition. Consequently, the propagation of chaos cannot hold uniformly in time.

7.2.2 Swarming models

Over the last twenty years, there has been a growing interest in both the Mathematics and Physics communities for theorizing the underlying principles of large animal societies. Among the most common examples of such systems, flocks of birds, fish schools, large herds of mammals or ant colonies exhibit a collective coherent complex behaviour without any obvious exterior organizing principle such as a leader. Other examples can be found in the microscopic world (for instance colonies of bacteria or spermatozoa) or in human societies (for instance crowds phenomena or traffic flows). In all these systems, each individual can be roughly described as a kinetic particle (X_t^i, V_t^i) and the underlying principles which model the global motion of the system should obey the Newton's laws (plus noise) $dX_t^i = V_t^i dt$ and $dV_t^i = F(\mathcal{X}_t^N) dt$, where F is a force or a sum of forces. This section is devoted to the description of some examples of elementary mechanisms commonly used in *swarming models*. Most of them are based on the assumption that particles have a sensing region and interact with the other particles which belong to this region. The easiest way to model this is to take an *observation kernel* $K : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which vanishes at infinity, for instance $K(r) = \mathbb{1}_{[0,R]}(r)$ for a fixed interaction radius R , and to consider that the sensing region of a particle at position X_t^i depends on the map $x \mapsto K(|x - X_t^i|)$. Then one has to define which kind of behaviour a particle will adopt: for instance it can try to avoid the other particles in its sensing region or on the contrary to move closer to the center of mass of its neighbours. Alternatively, a particle can simply try to align its velocity with the velocities of the other particles in order to create a coherent motion, this is called a *flocking model*. A gallery of models can be found for instance in the reviews [VZ12] or [Alb+19]. Note that unlike classical physical systems, the particles are able to produce their own energy for self-propulsion, so there are no a priori conservation laws (a part from mass conservation). In the Physics literature, such particle system is called *active matter*.

The next objective is to consider large systems and thus to derive (rigorously) the $N \rightarrow +\infty$ limit. When propagation of chaos holds, this reduces the problem to the analysis of a single kinetic PDE. Following the principles of statistical physics, one can also try to compute the *hydrodynamic* limit of the solution of the kinetic PDE to study the system on larger time

and space scales. This naturally raises the problem of uniform in time propagation of chaos but for the examples below, we will focus on modelling aspects and we will not address this question; we refer the interested reader to the quoted references and to Section 7.2.1 for an example which demonstrates that the question can become very delicate.

Attraction-Repulsion. One of the first deterministic mathematical swarming model, due to D’Orsogna et al. [DOr+06], is based on the combination of self-propulsion and an attraction-repulsion force. With the mean-field scaling introduced in [CDP09], the model reads:

$$\frac{dV_t^i}{dt} = (\alpha - \beta|V_t^i|^2)V_t^i - \frac{1}{N}\nabla_{x^i} \sum_{j \neq i} U(|X_t^i - X_t^j|),$$

where $U(r) = -C_a e^{-r/\ell_a} + C_r e^{-r/\ell_r}$ is the Morse potential. The nonnegative constants $\alpha, \beta, C_a, \ell_a, C_r, \ell_r$ are respectively the propulsion coefficient, the friction coefficient, the strength of alignment, the typical alignment length, the strength of the repulsion and the typical repulsion length. Due to the propulsion and friction forces, each particle tends to adopt the fixed cruising speed $\sqrt{\alpha/\beta}$. Although entirely deterministic, the propagation of chaos is covered by [BCC11] and the limit PDE reads:

$$\partial_t f_t(x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t = -\nabla_v \cdot ((\alpha - \beta|v|^2)v f_t) + (\nabla_x U \star \rho[f_t]) \cdot \nabla_v f_t,$$

where $\rho[f_t](dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_t(dx, dv)$. The analysis of the limit kinetic PDE and its hydrodynamic limit in [CDP09] gives a rigorous theoretical explanation for the emergence of complex patterns such as rotating mills which were observed in numerical simulations only in [DOr+06].

Flocking. The alignment mechanism introduced by Cucker and Smale [CS07] reads:

$$\frac{dV_t^i}{dt} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} K(|X_t^j - X_t^i|)(V_t^j - V_t^i),$$

where K is an observation kernel which is typically taken equal to $K(r) = (1 + |r|^2)^{-\gamma/2}$, $\gamma > 0$. The main result is that if the observation kernel is large enough in the sense that $\int_0^{+\infty} K(r)dr = +\infty$, then the particle system satisfies for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$|V_t^i - V_\infty| \leq C_1 e^{-\lambda t}, \quad |X_t^i - X_t^j| \leq C_2,$$

for some constants $C_1, C_2, \lambda > 0$ and for an asymptotic velocity $V_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that since the momentum is preserved, $V_\infty = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_0^i$. This property is called *flocking*. There is an extensive literature on the deterministic Cucker-Smale model that we will not discuss here, see the reviews [Car+10; CCH14; Alb+19].

On the other hand, there are various ways to add a stochastic component to the Cucker-Smale model. Maybe the most obvious way in this context, is to consider the McKean-Vlasov model introduced in [HLL09]:

$$dV_t^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} K(|X_t^j - X_t^i|)(V_t^j - V_t^i) + \sigma dB_t^i,$$

for N independent Brownian motions $(B_t^i)_t$. In this case and despite the fact the drift is not globally Lipschitz and bounded, the propagation of chaos is proved in [BCC11] using the synchronous coupling method (see also Section 5.1.2) or in [Péd18] using martingale arguments (see also Section 5.3.1). The limit Fokker-Planck equation reads:

$$\partial_t f_t(x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f_t = -\nabla_v \cdot (\xi[f_t] f_t) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta_v f_t, \quad (215)$$

with

$$\xi[f_t](x, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} K(|x' - x|)(v' - v)f_t(dx', dv').$$

More refined models can also be considered with a non constant diffusion matrix, with boundary conditions [CS18] or when the observation kernel is anisotropic. In this last case, one can for instance consider an observation kernel $K(|X_t^j - X_t^i|) \equiv K_{V_t^i}(|X_t^j - X_t^i|)$ which also depends on the velocity of the i -th particle: this includes the biologically relevant case where the observation kernel is the indicator function of a cone of vision centered around the velocity of the particle. In this case, propagation of chaos is proved in [CS19a] using a synchronous coupling argument.

In [AH10], Ahn and Ha considered the Cucker-Smale with a random environmental noise:

$$dV_t^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} K(|X_t^j - X_t^i|)(V_t^j - V_t^i) + \sigma(Z_t^i, \mu_{Z_t^N})dB_t,$$

where $(B_t)_t$ is a Brownian motion which is the same for all the particles (also called *common noise*) and σ is a possibly non constant diffusion matrix. In this case, the propagation of chaos does not hold in the usual sense. For general McKean-Vlasov systems of this form, given a realization of the common noise, a *conditional* propagation of chaos property can be shown [CF16a] by revisiting the classical arguments of Dobrushin [Dob79] in the deterministic case. However the limit law f_t is not deterministic and satisfies a *stochastic* PDE which depends on the common noise (roughly speaking, it is the PDE (215) where the Laplacian is replaced by a Brownian motion). For the Cucker-Smale system, this type of result can be found in [CS19b].

There exist many other Cucker-Smale models where the stochasticity is incorporated through a diffusive behaviour. For further examples, we refer the interested reader to the review [CDP18] and the references therein. Lately, [FK20] proposed a stochastic Cucker-Smale model based on a Nanbu interaction mechanism (Example 2.17). The propagation of chaos for this model is proved using martingale arguments.

Flocking with geometrical constraints. In the 90's, Vicsek et al. [Vic+95] introduced a time discrete “flocking algorithm” using the minimal assumption that the particle move at a fixed constant speed. The Vicsek model has quickly become one of the most prominent models in the active matter literature. Several works have numerically exhibited the emergence of complex patterns at the particle level; see for instance [Cha+08] where the emergence of high-density band-like structures on a compact spatial domain is studied. From a mathematical point of view, since the speed of the particles is fixed, then the velocity of each particle is defined by its *orientation* which is an element of the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . The motion can thus be interpreted as a constrained dynamical system on a manifold. Following this idea, Degond and Motsch [DM08] gave a mean-field time-continuous interpretation of the Vicsek model defined by a system of Stratonovich SDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^i &= c_0 V_t^i dt \\ dV_t^i &= \nu(|J_t^i|)P(V_t^i)\Omega_t^i dt + \sqrt{2\sigma(|J_t^i|)}P(V_t^i) \circ dB_t^i, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is the speed of the particles, $\nu, \sigma > 0$ are respectively the intensity of the alignment and the strength of the diffusion and

$$\Omega_t^i := \frac{J_t^i}{|J_t^i|} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \quad J_t^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N K(|X_t^j - X_t^i|)V_t^j \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Given $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the matrix $P(v) := I_d - \frac{v \otimes v}{|v|^2}$ is the projection on the plane orthogonal to v . The SDE is written in the Stratonovich sense (indicated by the symbol \circ), so that for all i

and all $t \geq 0$, $V_t^i \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ provided that $|V_0^i| = 1$. In this model, the alignment force exerted on particle i belongs to the tangent plane of the orientation V_t^i and is directed towards the local average orientation Ω_t^i . The strength of this force may depend on the norm of J_t^i which plays the role of a (local) *order parameter*: when the system is in a disordered state with all the orientations uniformly scattered on the sphere, then $|J_t^i|$ tends to zero. In the opposite case of a flocking state, $|J_t^i|$ concentrates around a fixed point of the sphere, with a concentration parameter which depends on the observation kernel.

The propagation of chaos property is proved in [BCC12] in the case $\nu(|J|) = |J|$ using the synchronous coupling method in the whole space $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and a regularisation argument for the projection matrix (which is singular at the origin). The system is then shown to stay constrained on the manifold $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. The results is extended in [BM21] in particular in the more singular case $\nu(|J|) = 1$. The limit Fokker-Planck equation reads:

$$\partial_t f_t(x, v) + c_0 v \cdot \nabla_x f_t = \nu(|J[f_t]|) \nabla_v \cdot (P(v) \Omega[f_t] f_t) + \sigma(|J[f_t]|) \Delta_v f_t, \quad (216)$$

where

$$J[f_t](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(|x' - x|) v' f_t(dx', dv') \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \Omega[f_t] = \frac{J[f_t]}{|J[f_t]|} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$$

and Δ_v , $\nabla_v \cdot$ denote respectively the Laplace-Beltrami and the divergence operators on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} .

An analogous mean-field jump particle system is introduced in [DM16] and the corresponding propagation of chaos result which leads to a BGK equation is proved in [Die20]. Keeping the key assumption of the fixed speed, a Boltzmann interaction mechanism is proposed in [BDG06; BDG09] and the propagation of chaos for various Boltzmann models is studied in [Car+13; CDW13].

The behaviour of the spatially-homogeneous version of the kinetic Fokker-Planck PDE (216) is well-understood: well-posedness results and long-time convergence results are proved in [FKM18; KM16; BM21] in the case $\nu(|J|) = 1$ and phase transition phenomena are explored in depth in [DFL15] in particular in the case $\nu(|J|) = |J|$. The stationary solutions of the spatially-homogeneous PDE belong to the family of von Mises distributions on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} thus generalizing the framework of the Kuramoto model to higher dimensions (the Kuramoto model is equivalent to the one dimensional spatially-homogeneous Vicsek model). Finally, the hydrodynamic limit is derived in [DM08; DM16]. However, the analysis of the spatially-inhomogeneous case remains mostly open. To the best of our knowledge, and despite some numerical evidence, a complete theory able to explain the phenomena reported at the particle level in [Cha+08] is still lacking. For Boltzmann models, very few is known in the mathematics literature even at the kinetic level [Car+15].

The framework of the Vicsek model can also be used to model alignment mechanisms on other manifolds than the sphere. For instance, in dimension 3, the particles may be defined by their full *body-orientation* which is a rotation matrix in $SO_3(\mathbb{R})$, see the lecture notes [Deg+19] for an extension of the Vicsek model to this case. In the liquid crystal literature, a different alignment mechanism called *nematic* is used, which roughly speaking, corresponds to replacing the sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} by the projective space $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}/\pm \text{Id}$, see for instance [DM20] and the references therein.

Topological interactions. There is experimental and numerical evidence [Bal+08] to support the idea that in order to maintain cohesion in a bird flock, the interactions between the individuals are rather based on their *rank* than on their relative distance. It means that given a particle i , the influence of a particle j on i at time t depends on the rank $R(X_t^i, X_t^j) \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ of particle j defined such that particle j is the $R(X_t^i, X_t^j)$ -th nearest neighbour of i :

$$R(X_t^i, X_t^j) := \#\{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}, |X_t^i - X_t^k| < |X_t^i - X_t^j|\}.$$

In a mean-field framework, it is more natural to use the normalised rank defined by $r[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}](X_t^i, X_t^j) = R(X_t^i, X_t^j)/N$ where given $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$r[\mu](x, y) := \langle \mu, \psi(x, y, \cdot) \rangle, \quad \psi(x, y, z) := \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]} \left(\frac{|x-z|}{|x-y|} \right). \quad (217)$$

All the models previously described can be alternatively defined using *topological interactions* by replacing the metric observation kernel $K(|X_t^i - X_t^j|)$ by the rank-based observation kernel $K(r[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}](X_t^i, X_t^j))$, where in this case $K : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a smooth given function. This change has two consequences: first the interaction is no longer symmetric (this is not a real difficulty) and secondly, this adds a new source of nonlinearity but since it is of mean-field type (i.e. it only depends on the empirical measure), the limit can be easily derived, at least formally. Note however that since the function ψ in (217) is not Lipschitz, an ad hoc argument is needed, for instance a regularisation procedure (see Section 5.1.2). For the (deterministic) Cucker-Smale model, this is investigated in [Has13]. For Boltzmann (Nambu) interactions with a collision rate which depends on $K(r[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}](X_t^i, X_t^j))$, several models are discussed in [BD16; BD17] and a rigorous propagation of chaos result is proved in [DP19].

7.2.3 Neuron models

The modelling of (biological) neuronal networks has a long story that we do not intend to extensively review here. We will only give a glimpse on the subject by quoting some recent models relevant with our subject.

Mean-field jump models. A neuron is mainly described by its membrane potential in \mathbb{R}_+ and maybe also by some other variables which depend on the model considered. In an abstract setting $X_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will denote the state of neuron $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ at time t . The value of the membrane potential is typically linked to the jump rate of random events called *spikes*. When a neuron spikes, its membrane potential is automatically reset at a default value and this spiking event increases the membrane potentials of the other (neighbouring) neurons. In a mean-field setting, this small potential increase is proportional to $1/N$. This small toy model is exactly a mean-field jump model with simultaneous jumps considered in Example 2.13. Such model was considered first in [De +15] and then in [FL16]. The propagation of chaos can be proved using compactness or coupling methods. More recently, the question is also addressed in various very general cases which include diffusion models in [ADF18].

Diffusion models. Another popular class of neuron models is based on McKean-Vlasov diffusion processes. In the abstract setting described in [Tou14], the neurons are clustered into $P(N)$ populations. Each population of neurons α has N_α neurons and $N = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{P(N)} N_\alpha$. Each population α is located at a position $r_\alpha \in \Gamma$ where Γ is a nice space modelling the cerebral cortex. The spike of a neuron at location r_γ produces a time continuous current which affects the other neurons at location r_α with a delay $\tau(r_\alpha, r_\gamma) \geq 0$. The state of the neuron X_t^i belonging to population α is thus governed by the SDE:

$$dX_t^i = F(t, r_\alpha, X_t^i)dt + \frac{1}{P(N)} \sum_{\gamma=1}^{P(N)} \frac{1}{N_\gamma} \sum_{p(j)=\gamma} b(r_\alpha, r_\gamma, X_t^i, X_{t-\tau(r_\alpha, r_\gamma)}^j)dt + \sigma(r_\alpha)dB_t^i,$$

where $b : \Gamma \times \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the current function, $p(j) \in \{1, \dots, P(N)\}$ is the population index of particle j and the functions $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ denote the intrinsic deterministic dynamics and the external noise exerted on the neuron. The limit Fokker-Planck equation is not of one of the types previously studied: it involves a time delay and an intricate spatial dependence which both raise wellposedness issues. On top of that, for classical neuron models such as the FitzHugh-Nagumo model, the parameters are not

globally Lipschitz. The adaptation to this complex framework of the classical synchronous coupling method of Sznitman can be found in [BFT15; Tou14].

Point processes models. Finally, forgetting the details of the membrane potential, the neuronal activity can also be modelled by N counting processes (i.e. non-decreasing integer-valued jump processes) with a jump parameter which depends on the number of past and neighbouring jumps. These processes are called (*interacting*) *Hawkes processes* or *self-exciting counting processes*. The state of the neuron $X_t^i \in \mathbb{N}$ is simply defined as the number of spikes up to time t . The mean-field analysis of such models has been initiated in [DFH16]. Shortly later, Chevallier [Che17] introduced a class of *age dependent Hawkes processes* for which the jumping rate of the neuron X_t^i depends on the elapsed time since the last spike, called the *age* and denoted by:

$$S_{t-}^i := t - \sup\{T^i \in X^i, T^i < t\},$$

where we write $T^i \in X^i$ when $T^i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a jump time of the counting process $(X_t^i)_t$. Moreover each spiking event affects the jump rate of the other neurons. In summary, the jump rate of neuron i is defined by:

$$\lambda_t^i := \psi \left(S_{t-}^i, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\int_0^{t-} H_{ij}(t-\tau) X^j(d\tau) + F_{ij}(t) \right) \right),$$

where $H_{ij}, F_{ij} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are random interaction functions, $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is called the *intensity function*, and X^j denotes the random measure (or point process) associated to the process $(X_t^j)_t$. In this expression, the communication function H_{ij} models how the spike of a neuron j at time τ affects the spike rate of neuron i at time t . In our usual setting, it means that X_t^i satisfies the SDE:

$$X_t^i = \int_0^t \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{1}_{u \leq \psi \left(S_{s-}^i, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\int_0^{s-} H_{ij}(s-\tau) X^j(d\tau) + F_{ij}(s) \right) \right)} \mathcal{N}^i(ds, du),$$

where the \mathcal{N}^i are N independent Poisson random measures on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with intensity $ds \otimes du$. Using a synchronous coupling argument, it is shown in [Che17] that the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ exists and the distribution of the age S_{t-}^i of each neuron at time t converges towards the solution of the PDE:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n(s, t) + \partial_s n(s, t) + \psi(s, m(t) + F_0(t)) n(s, t) = 0, \\ n(0, t) = \int_0^{+\infty} \psi(s, m(t) + F_0(t)) n(s, t) ds, \\ m(t) = \int_0^t h(t-\tau) n(0, \tau) d\tau, \end{cases}$$

where F_0 and h denote the expectations of the functions F_{ij} and H_{ij} . The solution $n(s, t)$ is the distribution of neurons with age s at time t . This PDE was studied before by Pakdaman, Perthame and Salort. On this subject, see for instance [CY18] and the references therein.

7.2.4 Socio-economic models

In this section, the particles model interacting socio-economic agents (human beings) with all the variety of possible interactions that one can imagine: to give a flavour of some recent modelling trends, we present a selection of models for opinion dynamics, wealth distribution or rating score in games. More on the subject can be found in the book [NPT10]. The only modelling assumption is that an interaction involves only two agents so that all the models presented are Boltzmann models. Interactions which involve more than two but still a finite fixed number of agents could also be relevant in some situations but we will not discuss this point [TTZ20]. The following parametric Boltzmann models are defined using the notations of Example 2.23.

Opinion dynamics. In the opinion formation model considered in [Tos06], an opinion is a real number in $[-1, 1]$ and an interaction between two agents with opinions (z_1, z_2) leads to the post-collisional opinions:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\psi}_1(z_1, z_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) &= z_1 - \gamma P(|z_1|)(z_1 - z_2) + \eta_1 D(|z_1|), \\ \tilde{\psi}_2(z_1, z_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) &= z_2 - \gamma P(|z_2|)(z_2 - z_1) + \eta_2 D(|z_2|),\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$ and the functions P and D model respectively the intrinsic tendency to the consensus and the diffusion. Typically, for extreme opinions, one expects P and D to be small. The parameters (η_1, η_2) are independent zero mean random variables with a fixed variance σ^2 . A similar model posed on the whole real line \mathbb{R} and written in Nanbu form is studied in [Deg+17] with $P(|z|) = 1$ and $D(|z|) = 1$. The collision rate may depend on the individual opinions of the agents or of the difference between their opinions (typically, two agents with far-away opinions are less likely to interact). In [Deg+17] collision rates which depend on a mean-field quantity are also considered. In both works, the authors study the long-time dynamics and the equilibrium distributions of the model. An important assumption is the grazing collision scaling $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, $\sigma^2/\gamma \rightarrow \kappa$ for a fixed κ . This choice turns the Boltzmann equation into a more amenable (Landau) Fokker-Planck equation (see [Tos98; Vil02] and Section 7.1.4). Phase transitions phenomena for this equation are investigated in [Deg+17] as well as non-spatially homogeneous versions of this model.

Wealth distribution. Below Example 2.23, we have already introduced a wealth distribution model due to [MT08]. With the same notations as before, it is assumed that the parameters $(L, R, \tilde{L}, \tilde{R})$ are distributed so that $\mathbb{E}[L + R] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{L} + \tilde{R}] = 1$. This model is called *conservative*, which means that during a trade, the wealth of each agent is conserved in average. Several other examples of conservative and non conservative models are presented in [MT08]. The rigorous propagation of chaos property is proved in [CF16b] using a coupling method (Section 6.4).

Lately, the authors of [Dür+20] introduced the non-conservative model

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\psi}_1(z_1, z_2, R) &= R(z_1 + z_2), \\ \tilde{\psi}_2(z_1, z_2, R) &= (1 - R)(z_1 + z_2),\end{aligned}$$

where R is a parameter drawn from the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. The model is originally written in a discrete time and discrete space setting (meaning that the wealth's z_1, z_2 belong to \mathbb{N}). The continuum and mean-field limits are investigated using a martingale approach. Then, the limit Boltzmann equation is shown to admit several families of equilibria depending on the initial wealth distribution.

Elo rating system. In this example, the particles are players in a one-versus-one game, for instance during a chess competition or during a sport or e-sport event. Each player is characterised by its intrinsic strength ρ (which is fixed) and a rating r . The goal of the Elo rating system is to update the ratings of the players at each game so that they match the intrinsic strengths of the players. Following the Elo system, a simple model for a game is a Boltzmann collision which updates the ratings of two players $z_1 = (r_1, \rho_1)$ and $z_2 = (r_2, \rho_2)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}(r_1, r_2) &= \lambda w(|r_1 - r_2|), \\ \tilde{\psi}_1(r_1, r_2, \theta) &= r_1 + \gamma(S(\rho_1, \rho_2, \theta) - b(r_1 - r_2)), \\ \tilde{\psi}_2(r_1, r_2, \theta) &= r_2 - \gamma(S(\rho_1, \rho_2, \theta) - b(r_1 - r_2)),\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda, \gamma > 0$ are given parameters, $S(\rho_1, \rho_2, \theta) \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the *score* of the game (1 means a win) and $b : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ is an odd increasing function which predicts the score of the game

given the difference of ratings. The parameter $\theta \sim \nu(d\theta)$ is assumed to be such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu[S(\rho_1, \rho_2, \theta)] = b(\rho_1 - \rho_2),$$

which means that the probability of a win for the player 1 is equal to

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu(S(\rho_1, \rho_2, \theta) = 1) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}b(\rho_1 - \rho_2).$$

The collision rate w depends only on the absolute difference between the ratings (typically a game involves players with similar rating scores). The Boltzmann equation (34) reads in weak form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi(r, \rho) f_t(dr, d\rho) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \Theta} w(|r_1 - r_2|) \left\{ \varphi(r_1 + \gamma(S(r_1, r_2, \theta) - b(r_1 - r_2)), \rho_1) \right. \\ & \quad + \varphi(r_2 - \gamma(S(r_1, r_2, \theta) - b(r_1 - r_2)), \rho_2) \\ & \quad \left. - \varphi(r_1, \rho_1) - \varphi(r_2, \rho_2) \right\} f_t(dr_1, d\rho_1) f_t(dr_2, d\rho_2) \nu(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

In the grazing collision limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma\lambda \rightarrow \kappa$ for a fixed $\kappa > 0$, a first order Taylor expansion gives, at least formally, the following equation in strong form:

$$\partial_t f_t(r, \rho) + \partial_r(a[f_t]f_t) = 0, \tag{218}$$

where

$$a[f_t](r, \rho) := \kappa \partial_r \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} w(|r_* - r|) (b(\rho_* - \rho) - b(r_* - r)) f_t(dr_*, d\rho_*).$$

This is the equation derived in [JJ15] from a time-discrete model. A more elaborated model is proposed in [DTW19] to incorporate a *learning procedure* which increases the intrinsic strength of the players at each game. The long-time behaviour of the grazing collision limit Fokker-Planck equation is then investigated theoretically and numerically. In particular, the solution of (218) is shown to concentrate on the diagonal $\{\rho = r\}$ as expected.

7.3 Applications in data sciences and optimization

Nowadays, the development of data sciences has pushed the development of ever more efficient algorithms. Typical tasks they are discussed below include sampling and filtering (Section 7.3.1), optimization (Section 7.3.2) and the training of neural networks (Section 7.3.3). All these situations are challenging, in particular due to the curse of dimensionality, to the high computational cost of naive methods or to the difficulty of finding a satisfactory theoretical framework to prove the convergence of the algorithms. To cope with these problems, various *metaheuristic* methods based on the simulation of systems of particles have been developed. The models in Section 7.2 illustrate how simple interaction mechanisms can lead to a complex behaviour. In this section, we explore some ideas to design good interaction mechanisms to be used to solve difficult numerical problems. The motivation is twofold: on the one hand, particle systems are easy to simulate and on the other hand, the mean-field theory gives a natural theoretical foundation for the convergence proof of the methods.

7.3.1 Some problems related to Monte Carlo integration

Let π be an unknown probability density function on a state space E called the *target distribution*. In Bayesian statistics, π is typically a *posterior* distribution which gives the

distribution of the parameters of a model given the observations. To get an estimate of these parameters, one needs to compute various observables of the form $\langle \pi, \varphi \rangle$ for a test function $\varphi \in C_b(E)$. In general it is not possible to compute directly such an integral because the value of π at each point can be computed only up to a multiplicative normalising constant or because the dimension of the state space is too high to use standard quadrature methods. The Monte Carlo paradigm is based on the law of large numbers: if $X^1, \dots, X^N \sim \pi$ are independent samples, then an asymptotic estimate of the observable is $\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle$. However, constructing *good* samples is not easy: in this section, we present a selection of known methods to achieve this goal and illustrate them with some applications. The underlying idea is to look at the samples as particles which are chaotic or, in a dynamical framework, which propagates chaos towards the target distribution: this thus provide many samples which becomes asymptotically i.i.d. and π -distributed. A classical reference on Monte Carlo methods is [RC04].

Scaling limits of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. In a series of famous articles [MU49; Met+53; Has70] Metropolis, Hastings et al. have introduced an algorithm to construct a Markov chain which is ergodic with stationary distribution π . This renown algorithm has become a building block for many more advanced methods. In its most basic form, it produces a single ergodic time-discrete Markov chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{Law}(X_k) \rightarrow \pi$ when $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and $X_k, X_{k'}$ are asymptotically independent when $|k-k'| \rightarrow +\infty$. Although very efficient in simple cases, the convergence of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm is often slow, in particular when π is multimodal. This is due to the sequential nature of the algorithm: typically, the desired π -distributed samples are extracted from the states of only one Markov chain at different times, well spaced in time and after an initial burn-in phase.

Among the many extensions and improvements of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, the recent article [CDF21] studies a more efficient parallelised version of the Metropolis-Hasting algorithm which is directly inspired by the theory of propagation of chaos. The starting point is a map $E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$, $(x, \mu) \mapsto \Theta_\mu(dy|x)$ called the *proposal distribution*. Let α_μ and h be the functions defined for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $x, y \in E$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\alpha_\mu(x, y) := \frac{\Theta_\mu(y|x)\pi(x)}{\Theta_\mu(x|y)\pi(y)}, \quad h(u) := \min(1, u).$$

The algorithm in [CDF21] constructs the Markov chain $\mathcal{X}_k^N = (X_k^1, \dots, X_k^N)$ on E^N such that each component $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ is updated at step $k \in \mathbb{N}$ according to the transition kernel:

$$X_{k+1}^i \sim K_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_k^N}}(X_k^i, dy),$$

where for $x \in E$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, the transition kernel is of the form

$$K_\mu(x, dy) := \underbrace{h(\alpha_\mu(x, y))\Theta_\mu(dy|x)}_{\text{accept}} + \underbrace{\left[1 - \int_{z \in E} h(\alpha_\mu(x, z))\Theta_\mu(dz|x)\right]}_{\text{reject}} \delta_x(dy).$$

From an algorithmic point of view, at each iteration k and for each particle i , a proposal $Y_k^i \sim \Theta_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_k^N}}(dy|X_k^i)$ is sampled first; then the state of particle i at the next iteration is set to $X_{k+1}^i = Y_k^i$ with probability $h(\alpha_{\mu_{\mathcal{X}_k^N}}(X_k^i, Y_k^i))$ (accept) and to $X_{k+1}^i = X_k^i$ otherwise (reject).

The classical Metropolis-Hasting algorithm corresponds to the case where Θ_μ does not depend on the measure argument μ , in which case the previous construction simply gives N independent Markov chains. When the proposal distribution depends on the empirical measure of the system, then this algorithm defines an interacting mean-field jump particle system in discrete time. Note that in this case $\pi^{\otimes N}$ is generally not a stationary distribution of the particle system. To get back to the traditional continuous time framework, it is possible to simply attach to each particle an independent Poisson process which triggers the jumps

or a global Poisson process which triggers the simultaneous jumps of the N particles. The result is a particle system of the form described in Section 2.2.3. Under appropriate Lipschitz regularity assumptions on Θ_μ which are detailed in [CDF21], then, when $N \rightarrow +\infty$, the propagation of chaos property holds towards the solution of the integro-differential equation:

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = \int_E \pi(x) \Theta_{f_t}(y|x) h(\alpha_{f_t}(x, y)) \left(\frac{f_t(y)}{\pi(y)} - \frac{f_t(x)}{\pi(x)} \right) dy. \quad (219)$$

This result is proved in [CDF21] using the optimal coupling argument described in Section 5.2.3. Note that when Θ does not depend on its measure argument, then Equation (219) is nothing more than the forward Kolmogorov equation associated to the time continuous version of the Metropolis-Hasting Markov chain. In both the interacting and non interacting cases, it can readily be seen that π is a stationary solution of (219). The propagation of chaos also ensures the asymptotic independence of the particles as expected.

This mean-field interpretation of the Metropolis-Hasting algorithm has two main advantages: first the exponential convergence of the solution of (219) towards π with an explicit convergence rate can be deduced from a purely analytical study of Equation (219). In [CDF21, Section 5], such result follows from the entropy-dissipation structure of the equation. Secondly, this analysis gives some rationale for the choice of the proposal distribution, which is critical in all Metropolis-Hasting based methods. In [CDF21], the best convergence rate is obtained for $\Theta_\mu(dy|x) = K \star \mu(y)dy$ for a normalised symmetric observation kernel K on $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $K \rightarrow \delta_0$. In this case, at the particle level, the proposal distribution is a random perturbation with law K of the state of another uniformly sampled particle. Other choices of proposal distributions which produce good results in practice can be found in [CDF21, Section 3].

In this example, the mean-field limit reduces the analysis of a complex particle system to the analysis of a (hopefully) simpler PDE. Another example of such idea can be found in [JLM15] where an algorithm similar to the one in [CDF21] is studied. The main difference is that at each time step, the proposals are accepted or rejected globally for the N particles and not individually. In other words, the algorithm is a simple Metropolis-Hasting algorithm on a product space E^N with a tensorized target distribution $\pi^{\otimes N}$. When $E = \mathbb{R}$, under a proper diffusive time-rescaling, each component of the chain (i.e. each particle) satisfies the propagation of chaos property when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. The limit nonlinear process is a McKean-Vlasov diffusion process whose law satisfies the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t f_t = \partial_x \left\{ G(f_t) V' f_t + \Gamma(f_t) \partial_x f_t \right\},$$

where G and Γ are explicit functions of f_t and V, V', V'' and V is a Gibbs potential such that $\pi = e^{-V}$. The long-time convergence analysis of the solution can be found in [JLM14] using also the entropy-dissipation properties of the equation.

Ensemble Kalman Sampling. A common inverse problem is to reconstruct the parameter $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from an observation $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ which is given by:

$$y = \mathcal{G}(x) + \eta,$$

where $\mathcal{G} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ and η is a Gaussian random noise $\mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma)$. In the Bayesian framework, the parameter x is assumed to be distributed according to a prior distribution π_0 on \mathbb{R}^d and the posterior distribution of x knowing the observation y is computed using Bayes' formula. The posterior distribution is given by

$$\pi(x) \propto \exp(-\Phi(x)) \pi_0(x),$$

where the likelihood function $e^{-\Phi}$ is the Gibbs potential of the loss function:

$$\Phi(x) := \frac{1}{2} |y - \mathcal{G}(x)|_\Gamma^2 = \langle y - \mathcal{G}(x), \Gamma^{-1/2}(y - \mathcal{G}(x)) \rangle.$$

To keep things simple, we will assume that π_0 is a centered Gaussian law with covariance matrix Γ_0 . The target posterior distribution is thus (up to a normalisation constant):

$$\pi(x) \propto \exp(-\Phi_R(x)), \quad \Phi_R(x) := \Phi(x) + \frac{1}{2}|x|_{\Gamma_0}^2. \quad (220)$$

In order to reconstruct x , one can either draw samples from the posterior distribution π or compute the points which maximise π , the so-called Maximum A Posteriori (MAP). The recent Ensemble Kalman Inversion (EKI) methods propose various metaheuristic diffusion interacting particle schemes to solve these sampling and optimization problems. Unlike the Metropolis-Hasting algorithm, these methods exploit the specific form of the target distribution.

When the target distribution is in Gibbs form (220), a simple diffusion process with stationary distribution π , called the *Langevin dynamics*, is given by the SDE:

$$dX_t = -\nabla\Phi_R(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t.$$

The law f_t of X_t solves the Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t f_t = \nabla \cdot (f_t \nabla \Phi_R) + \Delta f_t.$$

Similarly to the Metropolis-Hasting case, it is possible to simply simulate a Langevin dynamics and use its ergodic properties to get samples from π . Note, however, that on a computer it is not possible to construct a time-continuous process and in practice the method thus relies on a discretization scheme which introduces a bias in the stationary distribution. For this reason, rather than being used as a direct sampling method, the discretized Langevin dynamics is more often plugged into the proposal distribution of a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm in order to corrects this bias (it is then called the *Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm*). Moreover, the Langevin dynamics requires to evaluate the gradient of Φ_R which can be impossible or very costly. In the present case the gradient of the potential reads:

$$\nabla\Phi_R(x) = \nabla\mathcal{G}(x)\Gamma^{-1}(\mathcal{G}(x) - y) + \Gamma_0^{-1}u. \quad (221)$$

In [Gar+20], the authors introduce the following modified Fokker-Planck equation in order to speed up the convergence of the Langevin dynamics:

$$\partial_t f_t = \nabla \cdot (f_t \text{Cov}[f_t] \nabla \Phi_R) + \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}[f_t] \nabla^2 f_t), \quad (222)$$

where for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $\text{Cov}[\mu]$ is the covariance matrix:

$$\text{Cov}[\mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (x - m[\mu]) \otimes (x - m[\mu]) \mu(dx), \quad m[\mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x \mu(dx).$$

The nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation (222) is the formal mean-field limit of the following McKean-Vlasov interacting particle system (called *ensemble* in this context):

$$dX_t^i = -\text{Cov}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}] \nabla\Phi_R(X_t^i)dt + \sqrt{2\text{Cov}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}]} dB_t^i, \quad (223)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and where the B_t^i are N independent Brownian motions. In [Gar+20], the system (223) is called the *Ensemble Kalman Sampler* (EKS) and the long-time behaviour of (222) is studied using a gradient-flow approach. To obtain a derivative-free algorithm, the authors also use the following approximation, for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$,

$$\text{Cov}[\mu] \nabla\mathcal{G}(x) \simeq \text{Cov}[\mu, \mathcal{G}] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (x - m[\mu]) \otimes (\mathcal{G}(x) - \langle \mu, \mathcal{G} \rangle) \mu(dx). \quad (224)$$

Using (221) and the approximation (224) the EKS (223) thus becomes derivative-free:

$$dX_t^i = -\text{Cov}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \mathcal{G}] \Gamma^{-1}(\mathcal{G}(X_t^i) - y)dt - \text{Cov}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}, \mathcal{G}] \Gamma_0^{-1} X_t^i dt + \sqrt{2\text{Cov}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}]} dB_t^i. \quad (225)$$

Unfortunately, the approximation (224) is exact only when \mathcal{G} is linear and in general, the derivative-free EKS (225) does not converge towards the correct target distribution. In the linear case the propagation of chaos for the system (223) is shown in [DL21b]. Since the covariance matrix is a quadratic quantity, the Lipschitz assumptions of McKean's theorem do not hold. One of the methods described in Section 5.1.2 might be used; however the authors of [DL21b] introduce a new bootstrapping method. The starting point is the classical synchronous coupling of Sznitman. Then, Ding and Li prove the following properties.

1. If f_0 has bounded moments of order $p \geq 2$, then the nonlinear system and the particle system also have bounded moments of order $p \geq 2$ on any finite time interval, see [DL21b, Lemma 5.2] and [DL21b, Proposition 5.4].

2. Let $Y_t^i = X_t^i - \bar{X}_t^i$. The crucial property [DL21b, Lemma 5.4] states that if there exists $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_t^i|^2 \leq CN^{-\alpha}, \quad (226)$$

then for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left|Y_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_t^j\right|^2 \leq CN^{-1/2-\alpha/2+\varepsilon}. \quad (227)$$

3. Under the hypothesis (226) and using (227), it is possible to prove [DL21b, Lemma 5.5]:

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_t^i|^2 \leq CN^{-1/2-\alpha/2+\varepsilon}. \quad (228)$$

The proof is based on Itô's formula and a bound on

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|\text{Cov}[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}] - \text{Cov}[\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}]\right\|^2 \leq C \left(N, \mathbb{E}\left|Y_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_t^j\right|^2 \right).$$

4. From (228) and (226), by a bootstrapping argument starting from $\alpha = 0$, we deduce that (228) holds with $\alpha = 1 - 2\varepsilon$, which gives the optimal convergence rate up to ε .

The proof crucially uses the linearity of \mathcal{G} . In [DL21a], the weakly nonlinear case where $\mathcal{G}(x) = Ax + g(x)$ for a small g is investigated as well as the corresponding time-discrete algorithm. The present method as well as various other EKI methods are investigated numerically in [RW21]. A new methodology for nonlinear settings can be found in [PSV21].

Filtering problems. The two previous examples focus on a static target. Filtering can be understood as a “dynamic sampling” problem. An example of filtering problem which extends some of the notions that we have discussed is the so-called *Kalman filter*. The goal is to estimate a time-evolving signal $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which evolves according to the following SDE

$$dX_t = F(X_t)dt + \Sigma_1^{1/2}dB_t^1,$$

with known parameters $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Sigma_1 \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and B_t^1 a Brownian motion. The signal is not measured directly and it is only observed through the noisy linear transformation $Y_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ defined by:

$$dY_t = GX_t + \Sigma_2^{1/2}dB_t^2,$$

with a known linear map $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ seen as a matrix, $\Sigma_2 \in \mathcal{M}_k(\mathbb{R})$ and B_t^2 an independent Brownian motion. The goal is to compute the conditional distribution π_t of X_t for any $t \geq 0$ knowing the observed path $Y_{[0,t]}$, i.e. for any test function $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the goal is to compute:

$$\langle \pi_t, \varphi \rangle := \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t) | \mathcal{F}_t],$$

where $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Y_s, s \leq t)$. In the linear case $F(X_t) \equiv FX_t$ with $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ a linear map seen as matrix, the Bayes theorem implies that π_t is a Gaussian law with mean \hat{X}_t and covariance matrix P_t which satisfy the equations:

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{X}_t &= F\hat{X}_t dt + P_t G^T \Sigma_2^{-1} (dY_t - G\hat{X}_t dt), \\ \frac{d}{dt} P_t &= FP_t + P_t F^T - P_t G^T \Sigma_2^{-1} G P_t + \Sigma_1. \end{aligned}$$

The equation on P_t is a matrix-valued Riccati equation. The equation on \hat{X}_t is called the *Kalman-Bucy filter*. Unfortunately, the solutions of these equations cannot be computed easily in general so an approximation method is needed. The key observation is their link with the conditional nonlinear McKean-Vlasov diffusion defined by:

$$d\bar{X}_t = F\bar{X}_t + \Sigma_1^{1/2} dW_t + \text{Cov}[f_t] C^T \Sigma_2^{-1} (dY_t - G\bar{X}_t dt - \Sigma_2^{1/2} dV_t),$$

where W_t, V_t are independent Brownian motions and $f_t = \text{Law}(\bar{X}_t | \mathcal{F}_t)$. Then it can be shown that

$$\hat{X}_t = \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_t | \mathcal{F}_t], \quad P_t = \text{Cov}[f_t].$$

This readily suggests that the solutions of the Kalman-Bucy filter and the Riccati equation can be approximated by an interacting particle system, in this context called a *particle filter*. The propagation of chaos thus appears as the crucial theoretical foundation of the method. The lack of Lipschitz regularity and the fact that the law is only defined conditionally to the random process Y_t make things quite difficult and the result is not already covered by a theorem in the present review. Rigorous results are proved by Del Moral, Kurtzmann and Tugaut in [DT18] in the linear case and in [DKT17] in the nonlinear case. The methodology of the proofs is non standard and the complexity of the model prevents us to give a faithful presentation here.

The time continuous Kalman-Bucy filter that has been presented is one example but maybe not the most representative example of filtering problem. In practice, there are only time discrete processes, because they are part of a numerical simulation or because the signal is observed only at discrete times. A more traditional abstract filtering problem in discrete time, also called a *state-space model*, is given by the two Markov chains with transition kernels:

$$X_{k+1} \sim K(dx|X_k), \quad Y_{k+1} \sim g(dy|X_k),$$

The *hidden Markov chain* $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is observed only through the *observation process* $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is defined conditionally on $(X_k)_k$. The goal is to compute the conditional distribution $\pi_{k|k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, defined for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by:

$$\langle \pi_{k|k}, \varphi \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_k) | Y_{0:k}],$$

where $Y_{0:k} = (Y_0, \dots, Y_k)$. Bayes theorem gives the recursion formula:

$$\pi_{k|k}(dx) \propto g(Y_k|x) \pi_{k|k-1}(dx), \quad \pi_{k|k-1}(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \pi_{k-1|k-1}(dz) K(dx|z).$$

In general it is not possible to obtain the expression of $\pi_{k|k}$ in closed form. For this reason, the class of *Sequential Monte Carlo* (SMC) methods, also known as *particle filters* aim at approximating it by an empirical measure $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_k^N}$ where \mathcal{X}_k^N is understood as a time evolving particle system. Most often, the SMC methods rather rely on a weighted empirical measure, where the weights of the particles are obtained using a so-called *importance sampling* method. The convergence of the approximating empirical measure or of the importance weights is naturally related to propagation of chaos. The connection between the two domains is due to Del Moral [Del98] at the end of the 90's. Since then, SMC methods have become increasingly popular with real-world applications in engineering, signal processing and more

recently in machine learning to cite a few. For further details, we refer the interested reader to the short surveys [Kan+09; CD02] for a practical introduction to the subject and to the larger monographs [Del04; Del13] and [DFG01] for the theoretical foundations, in particular the links with mean-field theory.

7.3.2 Agent Based Optimization

In its most abstract form, an optimization problem consists in finding the point $x_* \in E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, assumed to be unique, which minimizes a given function $G : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. The problem is notoriously difficult in high dimensional spaces or when G has many local minima. In the 90's, Kennedy and Eberhart [KE95] introduced a class of optimization algorithms based on a swarm of interacting agents. The *Particle Swarm Optimization* (PSO) methods are inspired by biological concepts: each agent (or particle) follows a set of simple rules which is a mix between an individual exploration behaviour of the state space and a collective exploitation of the swarm knowledge in order to efficiently find and converge to the global minimum of G . From an algorithmic point of view, the algorithm is appealing by its (relative) simplicity and its versatility as it does not requires expensive computations like the gradient of G . In the last decades, many variants and practical implementations of the original PSO algorithm have been proposed and a full inventory of these so-called *Swarm Intelligence* (SI) methods would go beyond the present review. Although these algorithms have proved their efficiency for notoriously difficult problems, their main drawback is their lack of theoretical mathematical foundations. Most of the SI methods are based on metaheuristic principles which can hardly be turned into rigorous convergence results, in particular when the number of agents involved becomes large. Lately, there has been a growing interest for the convergence analysis of SI methods using the tools developed in the kinetic theory community for mean-field particle systems in Physics or Biology. At this point in the present review, it becomes blatantly clear that a rigorous mean-field interpretation of SI methods could be of primary interest as it reduces the difficult analysis of a many particle system into the analysis of a single PDE for which many tools are already available to study its long-time convergence properties.

Following these ideas, a very simple though quite efficient method has recently been introduced by Pinneau et al. [Pin+17]. This method called *Consensus Based Optimization* (CBO) is based on the following McKean-Vlasov particle system:

$$dX_t^i = -\lambda \left(X_t^i - v[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}] \right) H^\varepsilon \left(G(X_t^i) - G(v[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}]) \right) dt + \sqrt{2}\sigma |X_t^i - v[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}]| dB_t^i, \quad (229)$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $\sigma \geq 0$, H^ε is a smoothed version of the Heaviside function $H(u) = \mathbb{1}_{u \geq 0}$ and given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$v[\mu] := \frac{1}{\langle \mu, \omega^\alpha \rangle} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x \omega^\alpha(x) \mu(dx), \quad \omega^\alpha(x) := \exp(-\alpha G(x)), \quad \alpha > 0.$$

The quantity $v[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}]$ is a weighted average of the positions of the particles. Particles which are located near a minimum of G have a larger weight. The drift term is thus an *exploitation* term: it is a standard gradient relaxation (for a quadratic potential) towards the current weighted average position of the swarm. The diffusion term is an *exploration* term which becomes as large as the particle is far from the current weighted average. The particular choice of the weight ω^α is better understood by taking the formal mean-field limit. First, let us recall the Laplace principle which states that if a probability measure f is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and if x_* belongs to the support of f , then

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \left(-\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \langle f, \omega^\alpha \rangle \right) = G(x_*).$$

Applying this result with the mean field-limit solution of the Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = -\lambda \nabla \cdot \left((x - v[f_t]) H^\varepsilon(G(x) - G(v[f_t])) f_t \right) + \sigma^2 \Delta(|x - v[f_t]|^2 f_t), \quad (230)$$

this result suggests that for α large enough, the Gibbs-like measure $\omega^\alpha f_t / \langle f_t, \omega^\alpha \rangle$ is close to δ_{x^*} and the weighted average of the particles thus satisfies

$$v[\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} v[f_t] \simeq x_*,$$

for t also large enough. A consensus is said to be attained when $f_t \rightarrow \delta_{x^*}$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

The analytical study of the PDE (230) and in particular the proof that a consensus is attained can be found in [Car+18]. However, the rigorous propagation of chaos result remains open in the general case. A rigorous result is available in [For+20] in the constrained case where G is minimized over a compact submanifold of \mathbb{R}^d . The proof follows the classical Sznitman coupling approach. A crucial ingredient [For+20, Lemma 3.1] is the bound:

$$\mathbb{E} \left| v[\mu_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}_t^N}] - v[f_t] \right|^2 \leq CN^{-1},$$

where the system $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_t^N$ is i.i.d. with law f_t . Note that this bound is actually a large deviation estimate.

Further developments on the CBO method can be found in [Car+21] where a modification of the diffusion coefficient is introduced in order to obtain dimension free convergence results. A review and a comparison of recent SI methods, including the CBO method and the original PSO algorithm, can be found in [Tot21] and a numerical comparison can be found in the short note [Tot+18]. We also quote the recent article [GP20] which gives a more unifying framework for the mean-field interpretation of PSO and CBO methods. In particular, a time-continuous mean-field interpretation of the original PSO algorithm is introduced which, unlike (229), is based on a *kinetic* McKean-Vlasov diffusion system:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^i &= V_t^i dt, \\ dV_t^i &= -\gamma V_t^i dt + \lambda_1 (Y_t^i - X_t^i) dt + \lambda_2 (Y_t^{\min} - X_t^i) dt \\ &\quad + \sigma_1 \text{diag}(Y_t^i - X_t^i) dB_t^{1,i} + \sigma_2 \text{diag}(Y_t^{\min} - X_t^i) dB_t^{2,i}, \\ dY_t^i &= \nu (X_t^i - Y_t^i) \mathbb{1}_{G(X_t^i) \leq G(Y_t^i)} dt, \\ Y_t^{\min} &= \text{argmin} \{G(Y_t^1), \dots, G(Y_t^N)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where (X_t^i, V_t^i) is the couple position-velocity, Y_t^i is the best position of particle i and Y_t^{\min} is the best position of the whole system. The evolution of the velocity is a combination of a (technical) friction force, two drift forces towards the best positions Y_t^i and Y_t^{\min} and two noise terms with a norm which depends on the distance to the best positions.

7.3.3 Overparametrized Neural Networks

Training neural networks can be understood as an optimization task. Should the commonly used algorithms converge to the good optimum is in many cases still an open question. Recent independent works [MMN18; RV19; SS20; CB18] have shown that the training process of neural networks possesses a natural mean-field interpretation which gives new insights towards a rigorous theoretical justification to this convergence problem.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(X_k, Y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. π -distributed random variables called the *training data set*, where $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R})$ is an unknown distribution. The random variable X_k is an object (e.g. an image) and Y_k is its label. A (single hidden layer) neural network composed of N neurons is characterised by N parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^N = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^N) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$. The training task of the neural network consists in finding the parameters which minimize the risk functional:

$$R^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^N) := \mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi} \left[\ell(Y, \widehat{y}(X, \boldsymbol{\theta}^N)) \right],$$

where for a data $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the predicted label \hat{y} is of the form:

$$\hat{y}(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}^N) := \langle \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^N}, \sigma(x, \cdot) \rangle.$$

The function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given function called the *activation function*. The *loss function* $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is taken equal to $\ell(y, \hat{y}) := |y - \hat{y}|^2$. Note that the risk functional depends only on the empirical measure so it can actually be rewritten $R^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^N) = R(\mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^N})$, where the risk functional R is defined on the whole set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad R(\mu) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}} \ell(y, \langle \mu, \sigma(x, \cdot) \rangle) \pi(dx, dy).$$

Since the distribution π is unknown, the parameters of the neural network are updated sequentially each time a new π -distributed data pair object-label is given. The most common updating rule is the (noisy) Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), which updates each parameter $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ at iteration k by following the gradient of the risk functional:

$$\theta_{k+1}^i = \theta_k^i + 2s_k(Y_k - \hat{y}(X_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N)) \nabla_{\theta^i} \sigma(X_k, \theta_k^i) + \sqrt{\frac{2s_k}{\beta}} W_k^i. \quad (231)$$

where $s_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a step size, $\beta \in (0, +\infty]$ and W_k^i are independent standard Gaussian random variables. In the noisy case $\beta < +\infty$, it is customary to add a confinement potential to the risk functional in order to ensure good convergence properties. We do not add it here to keep the presentation as light as possible. The whole point is to interpret (231) as the time discretization of a McKean-Vlasov particle system, where the particles are the parameters of the neural network θ_k^i . Since the (X_k, Y_k) are assumed to be i.i.d., the CLT suggests the approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} -2(Y_k - \hat{y}(X_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N)) \nabla_{\theta^i} \sigma(X_k, \theta_k^i) &= N \nabla_{\theta^i} \ell(Y_k, \hat{y}(X_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N)) \\ &\simeq N \nabla_{\theta^i} R^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N) + \Sigma^{1/2}(\theta_k^i, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N}) \widetilde{W}_k^i, \end{aligned} \quad (232)$$

where \widetilde{W}_k^i is a standard d -dimensional Gaussian random variable and the covariance matrix is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\theta_k^i, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N}) &:= N^2 \mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi} \left[\nabla_{\theta^i} \ell(Y, \hat{y}(X, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N)) \nabla_{\theta^i} \ell(Y, \hat{y}(X, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N))^{\text{T}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi} \left[\left| \partial_{\hat{y}} \ell(Y, \hat{y}(X, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N)) \right|^2 \nabla_{\theta^i} \sigma(X, \theta_k^i) \nabla_{\theta^i} \sigma(X, \theta_k^i)^{\text{T}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since R^N is actually a function of the empirical measure, the SGD dynamics (231) can be rewritten with our usual notations:

$$\theta_{k+1}^i = \theta_k^i + s_k b(\theta_k^i, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N}) + \sqrt{s_k} \sigma_k(\theta_k^i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N) G_k^i, \quad (233)$$

where G_k^i is a standard Gaussian random variable,

$$\sigma_k(\theta_k^i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N) := \left(s_k \Sigma(\theta_k^i, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N}) + \frac{2}{\beta} I_d \right)^{1/2},$$

and

$$b(\theta_k^i, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N}) = -N \nabla_{\theta^i} R^N(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N) = -\mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi} \left[\partial_{\hat{y}} \ell(Y, \hat{y}(X, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^N)) \nabla_{\theta^i} \sigma(X, \theta_k^i) \right].$$

Finally, taking a time-step $s_k = \varepsilon \xi(\varepsilon k)$ for ξ a smooth function and $\varepsilon > 0$ small, the Equation (233) becomes the standard Euler-Maruyama discretization of the (time inhomogeneous) McKean-Vlasov particle system:

$$d\theta_t^i = \xi(t) b(\theta_t^i, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t^N}) dt + \sqrt{\frac{2\xi(t)}{\beta}} dB_t^i \quad (234)$$

The main difference with (11) is the time dependent coefficient $\xi(t)$ but it does not affect the argument of most of the techniques investigated in Section 5. In particular, the propagation of chaos results implies that in the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the distribution f_t of the neurons satisfies the Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t f_t(\theta) = -\xi(t)\nabla_\theta \cdot (b(\theta, f_t)f_t) + \xi(t)\Delta_\theta f_t. \quad (235)$$

This informal derivation is made rigorous in the following works.

1. In [MMN18], the authors prove the simultaneous double limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ from the rescaled empirical measure μ_{θ^N} of the discrete SGD (231) to the time-continuous solution of (235), without directly using the approximating time-continuous particle system (234). The key estimate [MMN18, Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.6] is a concentration inequality which controls the discrepancy between the rescaled SGD and a synchronously coupled system of nonlinear McKean-Vlasov diffusion processes. The Azuma-Hoffding inequality gives a quantitative bound for the analogous of the approximation (232) in this case. In this time-discrete framework, the synchronous coupling is obtained by taking the Gaussian random variables in (231) equal to the integral of the Brownian motion of the coupled McKean-Vlasov diffusion on each time step. The parameter $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon_N$ in the time step is linked to N : it can be taken equal to any inverse power $\varepsilon_N = N^{-\gamma}$, $\gamma > 0$. A very similar coupling approach is used in [De +20] with the difference that the authors prove the propagation of chaos for the time-continuous particle system (234) only. In the regime where the next order approximation in (232) is kept, the final diffusion matrix depends on Σ . Both works are based on the global Lipschitz and boundedness assumptions of McKean's Theorem 5.1.
2. In [SS20], the authors use a compactness argument with ad hoc estimates to prove the convergence of the rescaled empirical measure of the SGD, without using the time continuous approximation (234). The proof is non quantitative and is written in the case $\beta = +\infty$ but it can accommodate more singular cases, without global Lipschitz assumptions but with the assumption of bounded moments for π and the initial distribution.
3. In [CB18], the authors solve a more general problem: using the fact that the functional $R^N(\theta^N) \equiv R(\mu_{\theta^N})$ defines a gradient flow on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^N$, they prove that as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ the empirical measure of this gradient flow converges towards the Wasserstein gradient flow defined by the risk functional R on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The proof is quite similar in spirit to what has been presented in Section 4.2 (i.e. a compactness argument for curves using Ascoli's theorem) but it is relatively simpler in this case because the framework is entirely deterministic (in particular, the empirical measure is a deterministic object).

Of course, proving the propagation of chaos is only a first step (and in a sense the easiest one) towards the rigorous analysis of the optimization problem outlined above. As illustrated many times in this section, the goal is now to exploit the long-time convergence properties of the limit Fokker-Planck equation (235). When $\ell(y, \hat{y}) = |y - \hat{y}|^2$ a key observation is that this equation has a gradient flow structure. Using the fact that in this case:

$$R(\mu) = R_0 + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(\theta)\mu(d\theta) + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} W(\theta, \theta')\mu(d\theta)\mu(d\theta'),$$

where $R_0 = \mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi}[Y^2]$ and defining the potentials

$$V(\theta) := -\mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi}[Y\sigma(X, \theta)], \quad W(\theta, \theta') := \mathbb{E}_{X, Y \sim \pi}[\sigma(X, \theta)\sigma(X, \theta')],$$

then for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the drift function is equal to

$$b(\theta, \mu) = -\nabla_\theta \frac{\delta R(\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\theta),$$

so that (235) is an evolutionary PDE in the sense of Definition 4.7 and thus a gradient flow. This gradient flow structure is exploited in [CB18] and [MMN18] to prove the long-time convergence of the SGD (231) and of the solution of (235) towards a global minimizer of R .

7.4 Beyond propagation of chaos

In this last section, we give a glimpse on some results which extend or complete the question of propagation of chaos. We discuss two natural directions: the fluctuation theory when the propagation of chaos property holds (Section 7.4.1) and another other type of many-particle limit when the propagation of chaos does *not* hold (Section 7.4.2).

7.4.1 Fluctuations

Propagation of chaos can be interpreted as a kind of law of large numbers where the empirical process $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N}$ converges towards the deterministic limit f_t . The next stage is to consider the asymptotic behaviour when $N \rightarrow +\infty$ of the fluctuation process

$$\eta_t^N := \sqrt{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N} - f_t), \quad (236)$$

thus giving a form of Central Limit Theorem. The first problem is to identify a suitable space to which η_t^N and its (potential) limit belong. From its definition, η_t^N belongs to the space of signed measures. It may not be the case for the limit and as we shall see, the “good” point of view is to look at η_t^N as an element of a space of distributions. In his subsection, we denote by \mathcal{H}' this space, defined as the dual of a space \mathcal{H} of test functions. Then, the second problem is to identify and characterise the limit as a process in \mathcal{H}' . A choice is to study the limit of the finite dimensional distributions

$$(\langle \eta_{t_1}^N, \varphi^1 \rangle, \langle \eta_{t_2}^N, \varphi^2 \rangle, \dots, \langle \eta_{t_k}^N, \varphi^k \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}^k, \quad (237)$$

for $\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^k \in \mathcal{H}$ and $(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$. If the limit exists, the finite dimensional distributions characterise a process $(\eta_t)_t \in C([0, T], \mathcal{H}')$. An equivalent approach is the study of the asymptotic behaviour of the characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \langle \eta_t^N, \varphi \rangle} \right], \quad (238)$$

for $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$. The final step is to find the SDE (in \mathcal{H}') which governs the evolution of the limit process η_t . The expected behaviour is a kind of infinite dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

In the following, we briefly review the main results for the two classes of models studied before, the Boltzmann models and the mean-field McKean models.

Boltzmann models. The study of fluctuations for Boltzmann models has been initiated by Kac and McKean for McKean’s 2-speed caricature of a Maxwellian gas [Kac73; McK75]. The case of the three dimensional hard-sphere gas is also discussed in [McK75], within the framework of [Grü71]. The one-dimensional Kac model (Example 2.26) is studied by Tanaka [Tan82a] in the equilibrium case and by Uchiyama [Uch83b] in the non equilibrium case. This last work is based on the following chain of arguments.

- (1) Using the generator of the particle system, identify formally the limit generator of the real-valued process $h(\langle \eta_t^N, \varphi \rangle)$, where $h \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ belongs to the Schwartz space of functions rapidly decaying at infinity and $\eta_t^N \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ is seen as a tempered distribution.
- (2) Show that the sequence of laws of the processes $(\eta_t^N)_N$ is tight in the space $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{S}'_\delta(\mathbb{R})))$ where $\mathcal{S}'_\delta(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ is a subset of the space of tempered distributions. Check that any limit point concentrates on $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathcal{S}'_\delta(\mathbb{R})))$.

- (3) Identify any limit point as the solution of a martingale problem using the expression derived in the first step.

This method is then applied to a more realistic three-dimensional (cutoff) model in [Uch83a] (see also [Tan83]). The method of Uchiyama is extended to more general Boltzmann models in [FFG92]. The limit of the characteristic functions (238) is studied for a Boltzmann model with simultaneous jumps in a countable state space in [Uch88b].

Mean-field models. The fluctuations of the simple one-dimensional McKean-Vlasov diffusion $b(x, \mu) = -\lambda x$, $\lambda > 0$ and $\sigma = I_d$ are studied in [TH81]. The starting point is the proof that for the pathwise version of (238) has an explicit limit:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \langle \eta_{[0,T]}^N, \xi \rangle} \right] = e^{-Q(\xi)/2}, \quad (239)$$

for an explicit functional $Q(\xi)$, where ξ belongs to a subspace of the space of test functions on $C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ built using the finite-dimensional polynomial functions:

$$\xi(\omega) = \varphi_k(\omega(t_1), \dots, \omega(t_k)),$$

where φ_k is a polynomial. Then a SDE which governs the “gaussian random field” with characteristic function (239) is obtained in an appropriate space of distributions. The general linear case with $b(x, \mu) = \tilde{b} \star \mu(x)$ is investigated in [Tan82b]. Tanaka uses a method originally due to Braun and Hepp in a deterministic case which consists in studying the (pathwise) “fluctuation field” :

$$\langle \eta_{[0,T]}^N, \xi \rangle = \sqrt{N} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi \left(X_{[0,T]}^{i,N} \right) - \langle f_{[0,T]}, \xi \rangle \right),$$

where $f_{[0,T]} \in \mathcal{P}(C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$ and ξ is a smooth function on the path space for a specific notion of differentiability. The idea is to write $X_{[0,T]}^{i,N}$ as the flow of a SDE which depends on $\mu_{\mathcal{X}_{[0,T]}^N}$. Then, under smoothness assumptions, a theorem due to Braun and Hepp which is generalised in [Tan82b] implies the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions (237) and/or of the (pathwise) characteristic function. A large deviation principle with an explicit rate function I is also obtained.

The differentiability assumptions of [Tan82b] are weakened by Sznitman in [Szn84b] using a Girsanov transform argument. The result is valid in \mathbb{R}^d and in a bounded domain with reflecting boundary conditions. The method of Sznitman is employed in [ST85] for a mean-field jump process.

Following the ideas and results of Sznitman, Hitsuda and Mitoma [HM86] prove the tightness of the fluctuation process in a space of distributions (using a trajectorial representation and a synchronous coupling argument) and derive a SDE for the limit. The model is studied in dimension one only. The result is improved in [FM97] where the authors identify a minimal (in a certain sense) space of distributions for the fluctuation process (a weighted negative Sobolev space). This approach is then carried out for a moderate interaction model in [JM98] and for a very general jump-diffusion model in [Mél98a]. A detailed presentation can be found in Méléard’s course [Mél96, Section 5].

7.4.2 Measure-valued limits: an example

As explained many times in this review, the propagation of chaos property is equivalent to the convergence of the empirical process towards a deterministic limit. It means that the law of the limit is a Dirac delta. In some cases, propagation of chaos does not hold but the empirical process still has a limit when $N \rightarrow +\infty$. This limit is thus a (random) measure-valued process with a law which is not a Dirac delta. A classical reference on measure-valued processes is Dawson’s course [Daw93].

To give a flavour of the subject, let us give a semi-informal derivation of the most important measure-valued process, the so-called *Fleming-Viot process*, starting from the toy example of Section 4.3.2. We recall here its construction and highlight the differences which lead from the propagation of chaos to a measure valued limit. A similar presentation can be found in Dawson's course [Daw93].

- We assume that E is compact, say $E = \mathbb{T}^d$ the torus in dimension d and that the motion is a pure jump process, without deterministic drift (for simplicity).
- Instead of a constant jump rate $\lambda \equiv 1$, we speed up the process and take a jump rate $\lambda_N = N$ which depends on the number of particles. Compared to our usual setting in the Boltzmann case, it means that each *pair* of particles update its state in average $\mathcal{O}(1)$ times during one unit of time. To prove the propagation of chaos, we assumed that each *particle* updates its state in average $\mathcal{O}(1)$ times during one unit of time.
- The jump is still sampled from a linear jump transition measure: for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and $x \in E$, $P_\mu(x, dy) = K_N \star \mu(dy)$ where $K_N : E \rightarrow E$ is a symmetric kernel. We assume this time that K_N is not fixed: it is a smooth mollifier when $N \rightarrow +\infty$ with Taylor expansion:

$$\int_E \varphi(y) K_N(y - x) dy = \varphi(x) + \frac{\sigma}{N} \Delta \varphi(x) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \quad (240)$$

where φ is a smooth function on $E = \mathbb{T}^d$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in E$.

With these modifications, the empirical process $(\mu_{\mathcal{X}_t^N})_t$ is measure-valued with generator

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N \Phi(\mu) = N^2 \iint_{E \times E} \left\{ \Phi\left(\mu - \frac{1}{N} \delta_x + \frac{1}{N} \delta_y\right) - \Phi(\mu) \right\} (K_N \star \mu)(dy) \mu(dx), \quad (241)$$

where we assume that the test function $\Phi \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$ is a polynomial function

$$\Phi(\mu) = \langle \mu^{\otimes k}, \varphi_k \rangle,$$

with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi_k \in C_b(E^k)$. We recall that when E is compact, the set of polynomial functions on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is dense in $C_b(\mathcal{P}(E))$. Note that a polynomial function can be extended to the space of signed measures. Following Dawson's course [Daw93], the first order derivative of Φ at $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is defined as the function on E :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta \Phi(\mu)}{\delta \mu} : x \in E &\mapsto \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Phi(\mu + \varepsilon \delta_x) - \Phi(\mu)}{\varepsilon} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{E^{k-1}} \varphi_k(x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, x, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^k) \prod_{\ell \neq j} \mu(dx^\ell) \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (242)$$

and similarly,

$$\frac{\delta \Phi^2(\mu)}{\delta^2 \mu} : (x, y) \in E^2 \mapsto \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon_1 \partial \varepsilon_2} \Phi(\mu + \varepsilon_1 \delta_x + \varepsilon_2 \delta_y) \Big|_{\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 0} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (243)$$

Similarly to what we have presented in Section 4.3.4, the goal is to write an expansion of the generator (241) as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. This time we work on the space of polynomials and we use the notion differentiability defined above. Reporting (240), (242) and (243) into (241), a direct computation gives the expansion as $N \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_N \Phi(\mu) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{FV}} \Phi(\mu) + R_N,$$

where $|R_N| = \mathcal{O}(1/N)$ and \mathcal{L}_{FV} is the Fleming-Viot generator defined by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FV}} \Phi(\mu) := \sigma \int_E \Delta \left(\frac{\delta \Phi(\mu)}{\delta \mu} \right) (x) \mu(dx) + \iint_{E \times E} \frac{\delta \Phi^2(\mu)}{\delta^2 \mu} (x, y) Q_\mu(dx, dy), \quad (244)$$

where $Q_\mu(dx, dy) := \mu(dx) \otimes \delta_x(dy) - \mu(dx) \otimes \mu(dy)$. It can be proved that the Fleming-Viot generator (244) defines a $\mathcal{P}(E)$ -valued Markov process, called the Fleming-Viot process, which can also be characterised using the various points of view developed in the previous sections: the convergence of the N -particle semi-group, the infinite system of moment measures, the solution of a martingale problem. Everything is well detailed in Dawson's course [Daw93, Sections 2.5 to 2.9] in the equivalent situation where $K_N = \delta_0$ but the particles are subject to a Brownian noise between the jumps. The properties of the Fleming-Viot process are studied in the reference articles [DH82; DK96].

In population dynamics, the space E is the space of types (or alleles) and each jump is interpreted as the simultaneous death of an individual and the birth of a new individual with a type sampled uniformly among the population with a mutation given by K_N . The particle model is called the Moran model. The state space is often a discrete space. Historically, Fleming and Viot [FV79] derived the measure-valued limit using a suitable discretization of the continuous state space and taking the limit in a martingale problem when both $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and the discretization step goes to zero. Alternatively to the Moran particle process, the Fleming-Viot process is also the measure-valued limit of the so-called Wright-Fisher model. The main difference with the Moran process is that all the N particles update their state at the same time. For an introduction to the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in this case using martingale arguments, see [EK86, Chapter 10, Section 4] and the references therein. Finally, the lectures [Eth00] and [Eth11] contain more recent references on the subject as well as many applications in mathematical biology.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Pierre Degond for his precious advice and careful proofreading of this manuscript. The authors also thank Paul Thevenin for fruitful comments and discussions.

A A strengthened version of Hewitt-Savage theorem and its partial system version

The following computation gives the Cauchy-estimate of Theorem 3.32 using stronger metrics.

Corollary A.1 (Extending Cauchy-estimates to other metrics). *The Cauchy-estimate of Theorem 3.32 can be obtained in $W_{\delta,p}$ -distance for $M \leq N$ with rate $\varepsilon(M)$, where δ is any metric on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ such that a law of large numbers of the kind $\mathbb{E}[\delta^p(\mu_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}^N}, f)]^{1/p} \leq \varepsilon(N) \rightarrow 0$ holds as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for any $f^{\otimes N}$ -distributed vector $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^N$, and uniformly for every f in $\mathcal{P}_p(E)$. This includes all the Wassertein- p metrics thanks to [FG15].*

Proof. In order to couple \mathcal{X}^M to the sub-vector $\mathcal{X}^{M,N}$ of \mathcal{X}^N , we choose the transference plane $(\mu_{M,N}, \mu_N)_{\#} \pi^N \otimes \pi^N$: this is well defined thanks to the compatibility property for $\pi^{M,N}$ and π^N . Thus

$$W_{\delta,p}^p(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^M}), \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}^N \sim \pi^N} [\delta^p(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{N,M}}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})] = \langle \pi^N, \delta^p(\mu_{M,N}, \mu_N) \rangle.$$

Theorem 3.32 showed that π^N is the N -th moment measure of the limit π in $\mathcal{W}_{H^{-s}}$ -distance,

allowing to take advantage of superposing i.i.d. states:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi^N, \delta^p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{M,N}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes N}, \delta^p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{M,N}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \rangle \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})(d\nu) \\ &\leq C(p) \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes N}, \delta^p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{M,N}, \nu) \rangle \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})(d\nu) \\ &\quad + C(p) \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes N}, \delta^p(\nu, \boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \rangle \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})(d\nu), \end{aligned}$$

for a constant $C(p)$ which only depends on p . Since $\nu^{\otimes N}$ is the law of a vector of i.i.d. particles

$$\langle \nu^{\otimes N}, \delta^p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{M,N}, \nu) \rangle = \langle \nu^{\otimes M}, D^p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_M, \nu) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}^M \sim \nu^{\otimes M}} [\delta^p(\mu_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}^M}, \nu)],$$

and the quantitative assumption on the δ^p -law of large numbers concludes. \square

The following proposition gives a useful Cauchy-estimate for the empirical measure of a sub-system of a finite exchangeable particle system. More precisely, let $M < N$ and let $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$ be a finite exchangeable particle system. One wish to compare $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ and $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{M,N}}$. This is not possible by a direct coupling argument since the two empirical measures do not have the same size. We thus use an alternative argument based on the special polynomial structure of the H^{-s} norm (see Lemma 3.5). This argument is also used in the proof of the Hewitt-Savage Theorem 3.32.

Proposition A.2 (Block empirical measures approximation). *Let $s > d/2$. Let $M < N$ and let $\mathcal{X}^N \sim f^N$ be a finite exchangeable particle system. It holds that*

$$\mathcal{W}_{H^{-s}}(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{M,N}}), \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^M})) \leq 2\|\Phi_s\|_\infty \left(\frac{1}{M} - \frac{1}{N} \right),$$

where $\Phi_s(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-iz \cdot \xi} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-s} d\xi$.

Proof. Thanks to the identity (46), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\|\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{M,N}} - \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}\|_{H^{-s}}^2] \\
&= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^N} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s(x-y) [\mu_{\mathbf{x}^{M,N}}^{\otimes 2} - \mu_{\mathbf{x}^{M,N}} \otimes \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}] (dx, dy) \right) f^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&\quad + \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^N} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s(x-y) [\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes 2} - \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N} \otimes \mu_{\mathbf{x}^{M,N}}] (dx, dy) \right) f^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^N} \left(\frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{k,\ell=1}^M \Phi_s(x^k - x^\ell) - \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N \Phi_s(x^k - x^j) \right) f^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&\quad + \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^N} \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \Phi_s(x^i - x^j) - \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^M \Phi_s(x^i - x^\ell) \right) f^N(d\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&= \left(\frac{M}{M^2} - \frac{M}{NM} \right) \Phi_s(0) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{M^2 - M}{M^2} - \frac{NM - M}{NM} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s(x-y) f^{2,N}(dx, dy) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{N}{N^2} - \frac{M}{NM} \right) \Phi_s(0) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{N^2 - N}{N^2} - \frac{NM - M}{NM} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s(x-y) f^{2,N}(dx, dy) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{M} - \frac{1}{N} \right) \left(\Phi_s(0) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s(x-y) f^{2,N}(dx, dy) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since Φ_s is bounded, this gives the desired estimate. \square

In order to compare the empirical measures of two sub-systems with different sizes but which come from the same exchangeable finite particle system, one can use the same method as in Corollary A.1. However, we need to replace the marginals $f^{k,N}$ by their moment measures approximation. Thanks to Lemma 3.21, this error term is quantitative which gives an explicit maximal size for the subsystems.

Proposition A.3 (Strong Cauchy-estimates for block empirical measures). *Under the assumptions of Corollary A.1, let $M < N$ and let $k(M) < k(N)$ such that $\varepsilon(k(N)) \geq k(N)^2 N^{-1}$. Then it holds that*

$$W_{\delta,p}^p(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(M),N}}), \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(N),N}})) \leq \varepsilon(k(M)).$$

Proof. The transference plane is the same as in Corollary A.1. Let us consider for simplicity the Wasserstein-2 distance (other adaptations are straightforward). Assuming the distance on $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ to be bounded, the condition on $k(N)$ allows to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[W_2^2(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(M),N}}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(N),N}})] &= \langle f^{k(N),N}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M),k(N)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(N)}) \rangle \\
&= \langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k(N)}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M),k(N)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(N)}) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(k(N)^2 N^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k(N)}$ is the $k(N)$ -th moment measure of $\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}^{\otimes k(N)}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M),k(N)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(N)}) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes k(N)}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M),k(N)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(N)}) \rangle \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})(d\nu) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes k(N)}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M),k(N)}, \nu) \rangle \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})(d\nu) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{P}(E)} \langle \nu^{\otimes N}, W_2^2(\nu, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(N)}) \rangle \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N})(d\nu). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu^{\otimes k(N)}$ is the law of a vector of i.i.d. particles

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu^{\otimes k(N)}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M),k(N)}, \nu) \rangle &= \langle \nu^{\otimes k(M)}, W_2^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k(M)}, \nu) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}^{k(M)} \sim \nu^{\otimes k(M)}} W_2^2(\mu_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}^{k(M)}}, \nu), \end{aligned}$$

and the quantitative law of large numbers for the Wassertein-2 distance in [FG15] concludes. \square

Remark A.4 (Recovering Cauchy-estimates on finite marginals). If the Wassertein-1 distance is considered instead, this leads to Cauchy estimates on $f^{k(N),N}$ thanks to Proposition 3.22

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(f^{k(M),M}, f^{k(N),N}) &= \mathcal{W}_1(\text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(M),M}}), \text{Law}(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(N),N}})) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_1(\mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(M),M}}, \mu_{\mathcal{X}^{k(N),N}})]. \end{aligned}$$

B Generator estimates against monomials

Generators estimates are required in particular in Section 4.3.3 and for compactness methods in Section 5.3.1 and Section 6.3. Their purpose is to compare the generator $\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi_k} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu}_N]$ of the empirical Markov process to the composition $\mathcal{L}_\infty[R_{\varphi_k} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu}_N]$, computed from the generator \mathcal{L}_∞ of the limit measure-valued process defined in section 4.3.3. This latter generator requires most of the time a specific formalism to be computed. We consider here the case of tensorized functions φ_k : this relies on combinatorial and symmetry arguments, in a way which is reminiscent of [JW16]. The first and most important example is $k = 2$ (see the compactness methods, where it is a key result). For mean-field generators, the target generator against degree-2 monomials reads

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty[R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu}_N] = R_{L_{\mu_N} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_N} \varphi^2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N),$$

as in Section 4.3.3.

Lemma B.1 (Quadratic estimates for mean-field generators). *Let \mathcal{L}_N be a mean-field generator of the form (6). Let $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \text{Dom}(L_\mu)$ such that $\varphi^1 \varphi^2 \in \text{Dom}(L_\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Then it holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu}_N] = R_{L_{\mu_N} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu}_N + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_N} \varphi^2} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu}_N + \frac{1}{N} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_N, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_N}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \rangle.$$

Proof. Starting from $\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N]$ at $\mathbf{x}^N = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in E^N$, let us compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N) &= \sum_{i=1}^N L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\mathbf{x}^N \mapsto \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi^1 \rangle \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi^2 \rangle](\mathbf{x}^N) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^1 \varphi^2](x^i) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N \varphi^2(x^j) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1(x^i) + \varphi^1(x^j) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2(x^i) \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{ L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^1 \varphi^2](x^i) - \varphi^2(x^i) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1(x^i) - \varphi^1(x^i) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2(x^i) \} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \varphi^1(x^j) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2(x^i) + \varphi^2(x^j) L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1(x^i) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \rangle + R_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}),
\end{aligned}$$

and the last term is exactly the desired expression. \square

Once again, the carré du champ controls the quadratic quantities. Let us try now to extend this estimate to any degree- k monomial. A possible goal of this is to control the limit generator against polynomials, in order to approach its behaviour against any function by density. Unfortunately this fails here since the bound obtained still requires some growth comparison condition between k and N (see Section 4.3.4).

Lemma B.2 (Extension to large-degree monomials). *For every $j \geq 0$, let us define the operators $\Gamma_{L_\mu}^{(j+2)} : C_b(E^j) \rightarrow C_b(E)$ for $\mu \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_N(E)$ by:*

$$\Gamma_{L_{\mu_N}}^{(j+2)}(\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^{j+2}) = L_{\mu_N}[\varphi^1 \dots \varphi^{j+2}] - \sum_{i=1}^{j+2} \varphi^i L_{\mu_N} \prod_{\substack{\ell=1 \\ \ell \neq i}}^{j+2} \varphi^\ell, \quad (245)$$

where we implicitly assume that any product of test functions belong to the domain of the generator L_μ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Let us assume that for any $0 \leq j \leq k-2$, there exists $C_j > 0$ such that for any $\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{j+2}\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)} \sup_{\|\varphi^1\|_\infty, \dots, \|\varphi^k\|_\infty \leq 1} \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k-1-j}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}^{(j+2)}(\varphi^{\ell_1}, \dots, \varphi^{\ell_{j+2}}) \otimes \varphi^{\ell_{j+3}} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{\ell_k} \rangle \leq C_j, \quad (246)$$

where $\{\ell_{j+1}, \dots, \ell_k\} = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\}$. Then for every $k \geq 2$ and \mathcal{L}_N of the form (6), the following generator estimate holds with $\varphi_k = \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k$

$$\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi_k} \circ \mu_N] = \sum_{i=1}^k R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{i-1} \otimes L_{\mu_N} \varphi^i \otimes \varphi^{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k} \circ \mu_N + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \binom{k}{j+2} \frac{C_j}{N^j}.$$

In particular, if $C_j = \mathcal{O}(C^j)$ for a fixed $C > 0$, then the remainder is controlled by $\mathcal{O}\left(N^{-1}k^2\left(1 + \frac{C}{N}\right)^k\right)$.

Note that for $j = 2$, the usual carré du champ operator $\Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}^{(2)} = \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}$ is recovered.

Proof. Let us consider a tensorized k -particle test function $\varphi_k = \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k$. The generator \mathcal{L}_N is of the form (6) so we have

$$\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi_k} \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\mathbf{x}^N \mapsto \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k}, \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k \rangle](\mathbf{x}^N).$$

We then use the linearity of $L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}$ and the fact that it vanishes on constants. To compute the term $L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\cdot]$ term, it is sufficient to develop the $\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k}$ -sum and to discriminate on how many times x^i appears. If there are j occurrences, this leads to the sum

$$N^{-k} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k} \\ i \notin \{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}\}}} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^{\ell_1} \dots \varphi^{\ell_j}] (x^i) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_{j+1}, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell (x^{i_\ell}),$$

where we recall that for a given $\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, we write $\{\ell_{j+1}, \dots, \ell_k\} = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\}$. The term $L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \diamond_i [\cdot]$ is then obtained by summing over $1 \leq j \leq k$. Summing then over i gives

$$\mathcal{L}_N [R_{\varphi_k} \circ \mu_N] (\mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{j=1}^k S_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}), \quad (247)$$

using the shortcut

$$\begin{aligned} S_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) &:= N^{-k} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell_j}, \dots, i_{\ell_k} \\ i_{\ell_j} \notin \{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}\}}} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^{\ell_1} \dots \varphi^{\ell_j}] (x^{i_{\ell_j}}) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_{j+1}, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell (x^{i_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Introduce now for $1 \leq j \leq k$

$$\begin{aligned} R_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) &:= N^{-k} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell_j}, \dots, i_{\ell_k} \\ i_{\ell_j} \in \{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}\}}} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^{\ell_1} \dots \varphi^{\ell_j}] (x^{i_{\ell_j}}) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_{j+1}, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell (x^{i_\ell}), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} S_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + R_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) &= N^{-k} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell_j}, \dots, i_{\ell_k} \\ i_{\ell_j} \in \{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}\}}} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} [\varphi^{\ell_1} \dots \varphi^{\ell_j}] (x^{i_{\ell_j}}) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_{j+1}, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell (x^{i_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover $R_k^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + R_1^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) &= N^{-k} \sum_{\ell_1=1}^k \sum_{i_{\ell_1}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^{\ell_1} (x^{i_{\ell_1}}) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_2, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell (x^{i_\ell}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{i-1} \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^i \otimes \varphi^{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{i-1} \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^i \otimes \varphi^{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k} (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}). \end{aligned} \quad (248)$$

An alternative way to write $R_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N})$ is

$$\begin{aligned} R_j^k (\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) &= N^{-k} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{j+1}\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}}} \sum_{m=1}^{j+1} \left\{ \varphi^{\ell_m} L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \prod_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{j+1} \varphi^{\ell_n} \right\} (x^{i_{\ell_j}}) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_{j+2}, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell (x^{i_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the j -carré du champ (245), we have the telescopic expression for $1 \leq j < k$:

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{j+1}^k + R_{j+1}^k - R_j^k \\ &= N^{-k} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{j+1}\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \sum_{i_{\ell_{j+1}}, \dots, i_{\ell_k}} \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}^{(j+1)}}(\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^{j+1})(x^{i_{\ell_{j+1}}}) \prod_{\ell \in \{\ell_{j+2}, \dots, \ell_k\}} \varphi^\ell(x^{i_\ell}) \\ &= N^{-j} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{j+1}\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k-j}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}^{(j+1)}}(\varphi^{\ell_1}, \dots, \varphi^{\ell_{j+1}}) \otimes \varphi^{\ell_{j+2}} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{\ell_k} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We then sum this expression over $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, we add $S_1^k + R_1^k$ and we use that $R_k^k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) = 0$. From (247) and (248), we conclude that $\mathcal{L}_N[R_{\varphi_k} \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N)$ is equal to the sum of the expected generator

$$\sum_{i=1}^k R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{i-1} \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^i \otimes \varphi^{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^k}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}),$$

with the remainder

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} N^{-1-j} \sum_{\substack{\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{j+2}\} \\ \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} \left\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}^{\otimes k-1-j}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}^{(j+2)}}(\varphi^{\ell_1}, \dots, \varphi^{\ell_{j+2}}) \otimes \varphi^{\ell_{j+3}} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi^{\ell_k} \right\rangle.$$

The final estimate then follows using the boundedness assumption (246), the number of combinations $\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_j\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ and the binomial expansion. \square

Consider now the situation of the Boltzmann models. The Boltzmann generator is described in Section 2.3.1:

$$\mathcal{L}_N \varphi_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,j} \varphi_N$$

where $L^{(2)}$ reads

$$L^{(2)} \varphi_2(x^1, x^2) = \lambda(x^1, x^2) \int_{E^2} [\varphi_2(x'^1, x'^2) - \varphi_2(x^1, x^2)] \Gamma^{(2)}(x^1, x^2, dx'^1, dx'^2),$$

where λ and $\Gamma^{(2)}$ satisfy Assumption 2.14. The symmetry properties imply a nice shape for the symmetrized version of $L^{(2)}$

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)} \varphi_2(x^1, x^2) &= \frac{L^{(2)} \varphi_2(x^1, x^2) + L^{(2)} \varphi_2(x^2, x^1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\lambda(x^1, x^2)}{2} \int_{E^2} \left\{ \varphi_2(x'^1, x'^2) + \varphi_2(x'^2, x'^1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \varphi_2(x^1, x^2) - \varphi_2(x^2, x^1) \right\} \Gamma^{(2)}(x^1, x^2, dx'^1, dx'^2), \end{aligned}$$

this implies $L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2] = L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes \varphi^1]$ for every $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \mathcal{F}$. For the limit generator, this symmetry suggests to define L_μ as

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{F}, \forall x \in E, \quad L_\mu \varphi(x) := \left\langle \mu, L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi \otimes 1](x, \cdot) \right\rangle = \left\langle \mu, L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi \otimes 1](\cdot, x) \right\rangle,$$

and equivalently $\varphi \otimes 1$ can be taken instead of $1 \otimes \varphi$ in the above definition. The needed estimate is now the following.

Lemma B.3 (Quadratic estimates for Boltzmann collisions). *The quadratic estimate for degree-2 monomials reads*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N [R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N] &= R_{L_{\mu_N} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_N} \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N + \frac{1}{N} R_{L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2]} \circ \mu_N \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \mu_N, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that compared to Lemma B.1, an additional symmetrizing term appears.

Proof. It is a direct computation. Let us start with

$$\mathcal{L}_N [R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N](\mathbf{x}^N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,j} [\mathbf{x}^N \mapsto \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi^1 \rangle \langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \varphi^2 \rangle](\mathbf{x}^N).$$

We then develop the expression inside the term $L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,j} [\cdot]$. Since $L^{(2)}[1 \otimes 1] = 0$, the only remaining terms are (up to a factor N^{-2})

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi^1 \varphi^2(x^i) + \varphi^1 \varphi^2(x^j) + \varphi^1(x^i) \varphi^2(x^j) + \varphi^1(x^i) \varphi^2(x^j) \\ &\quad + [\varphi^1(x^i) + \varphi^1(x^j)] \sum_{k \neq i,j} \varphi^2(x^k) + [\varphi^2(x^i) + \varphi^2(x^j)] \sum_{k \neq i,j} \varphi^1(x^k). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $L^{(2)} \diamond_{i,j}$, the total expression is now (up to a factor N^{-3}) the sum over $1 \leq i < j \leq N$ of the terms

$$\begin{aligned} &L^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \varphi^2 \otimes 1] + L^{(2)}[1 \otimes \varphi^1 \varphi^2] + L^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2] + L^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes \varphi^1] \\ &\quad + [L^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes 1] + L^{(2)}[1 \otimes \varphi^1]] \sum_{k \neq i,j} \varphi^2(x^k) \\ &\quad + [L^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes 1] + L^{(2)}[1 \otimes \varphi^2]] \sum_{k \neq i,j} \varphi^1(x^k), \end{aligned}$$

where all the functions are evaluated at the point (x^i, x^j) . The property $\lambda(x, x) = 0$ implies

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} [L^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes 1] + L^{(2)}[1 \otimes \varphi^1]] = \sum_{i,j=1}^N L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes 1].$$

Note also that up to a factor N^{-3} , $R_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}) + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}} \varphi^2}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N})$ equals the sum (evaluated at the point (x^i, x^j)) over $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ of

$$\begin{aligned} &L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes 1] \sum_{k \neq i,j} \varphi^2(x^k) + L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes 1] \sum_{k \neq i,j} \varphi^1(x^k) \\ &\quad + [\varphi^2(x^i) + \varphi^2(x^j)] L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes 1] + [\varphi^1(x^i) + \varphi^1(x^j)] L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes 1]. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, $\langle \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \rangle$ equals up to a factor N^{-2} the sum (evaluated at the point (x^i, x^j)) over $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ of

$$\begin{aligned} &L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \varphi^2 \otimes 1] - [\varphi^2(x^i) + \varphi^2(x^j)] L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes 1] \\ &\quad - [\varphi^1(x^i) + \varphi^1(x^j)] L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^2 \otimes 1]. \end{aligned}$$

At the end of the day, summing everything with the adequate power of N , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N [R_{\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N] &= R_{L_{\mu_N} \varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N + R_{\varphi^1 \otimes L_{\mu_N} \varphi^2} \circ \mu_N + \frac{1}{N} R_{L_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}[\varphi^1 \otimes \varphi^2]} \circ \mu_N \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \mu_N, \Gamma_{L_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}}(\varphi^1, \varphi^2) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

C A combinatorial lemma

This combinatorial lemma is used in Section 5.3.1 to control the jumps of the limit process.

Lemma C.1. *Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space, and consider two integers $2 \leq p \leq N$. Let $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ be a sequence of events in \mathcal{F} such that $P(A_i) > 1/p$, and assume the existence of an integer $q \geq 1$ such that any intersection involving $(q+1)$ of the A_i is P -negligible. Then*

$$\frac{N}{p} < q.$$

As a corollary, from a sequence $(A_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of events such that $P(A_n) > 1/p$ (for a given $p \geq 2$), it is possible to build a non-negligible intersection involving an arbitrary as large as desired number of A_n .

Proof. For $1 \leq j \leq q$, consider the set of j -intersections

$$\mathcal{A}_j = \left\{ \bigcap_{\ell=1}^j A_{i_\ell}, i_1, \dots, i_j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ pairwise distinct and } P\left(\bigcap_{\ell=1}^j A_{i_\ell}\right) > 0 \right\}.$$

From this, we construct a partition of $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} A_i$ which is composed of j intersections. Let us first define the class of sets which are intersections of at most j subsets.

$$\mathcal{R}_j := \left\{ a \cap \left(\bigcup_{k \geq j+1} \bigcup_{a' \in \mathcal{A}_k} a' \right)^c, a \in \mathcal{A}_j \right\}.$$

The intersections a within $\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq q} \mathcal{R}_j$ are pairwise disjoint, because the recovering of two j -intersections belongs at least to a $(j+1)$ -intersection. Then, by definition of q , $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} A_i$ is P -a.s. covered by $\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq q} \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{R}_j} a$. As a consequence,

$$P\left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} A_i\right) = \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{a \in \mathcal{R}_j} P(a). \quad (249)$$

For any i and $a \in \mathcal{R}_j$, define now the contribution of A_i to a as $f_i(a) := P(a \cap A_i)$. Since

$$\forall 1 \leq k \leq j, \quad P\left(A_{i_k} \cap \bigcap_{l=1}^j A_{i_l}\right) = P\left(\bigcap_{l=1}^j A_{i_l}\right)$$

it is straightforward to check that

$$f_i(a) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \cap A_i = \emptyset \\ P(a) & \text{if } a \cap A_i \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (250)$$

From the definition of \mathcal{R}_j , exactly j of the A_i positively contribute to an intersection $a \in \mathcal{R}_j$. Using this and (250), it follows that

$$\forall a \in \mathcal{R}_j, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(a) = jP(a).$$

We sum this relation over $a \in \mathcal{R}_j$, then divide by j , and eventually sum over $1 \leq j \leq q$. Injecting this into (249) gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{j} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{R}_j} f_i(a) = P\left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} A_i\right) \leq 1. \quad (251)$$

Since $A_k \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} A_i$ for every $1 \leq k \leq q$, the mass $P(A_i)$ shall be recovered as

$$P(A_i) = \sum_{a \in \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq q} \mathcal{R}_j} P(a \cap A_i) = \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{a \in \mathcal{R}_j} f_i(a),$$

using the previous partition of $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} A_i$. Since $\frac{1}{j}$ remains bigger than $\frac{1}{q}$, (251) then leads

$$\frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^N P(A_i) \leq 1.$$

The conclusion follows by the definition of p . □

D Probability reminders

For the convenience reader, classical elements of stochastic analysis and probability theory which are used throughout this review are gathered in this section. The Sections D.1, D.2, D.3 and D.4 are devoted to the classical construction and tightness criteria for stochastic processes on the Skorokhod space. Notions related to the theory of Markov processes and their links with linear and nonlinear PDEs can be found in Section D.5. Section D.6, Section D.7 and Section D.8 summarize probability results regarding respectively large deviations, the Girsanov theorem and Poisson random measures.

D.1 Convergence of probability measures

The two following classical theorems complete the results of Section 3.1.1 and Section 3.1.2 to study the limit of sequences of probability measures.

The first theorem links weak convergence and almost sure convergence of random variables.

Theorem D.1 (Skorokhod's representation theorem). *Let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of probability measures on a Polish space E which converges weakly towards $f \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Then there exist a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and some E -valued random variables X, X_n defined on this space for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$\text{Law}(X_n) = f_n, \quad \text{Law}(X) = f, \quad X_n(\omega) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} X(\omega), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

The second theorem is the widely used Prokhorov's theorem which gives a helpful characterization of compactness for the weak convergence topology. The following results can be found for instance in [Bil99, Section 5]. Compactness is linked to the notion of tightness defined below.

Definition D.2 (Tightness). A family $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ of probability measures on a separable metric space E (endowed with its Borel σ -field) is said to be *tight* when for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subset E$ such that

$$\forall i \in I, \quad f_i(K_\varepsilon) > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

A sequence of random variables is said to be tight when the sequence of their laws is tight.

Theorem D.3 (Prokhorov's Theorem). *A tight sequence $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on E is weakly relatively compact. Conversely, if E is also complete, any weakly relatively compact family $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight.*

D.2 Skorokhod's topology and tightness on the Skorokhod space

A stochastic process is a random function from a time interval to a state space (E, ρ) assumed to be Polish. Throughout this article, the stochastic process are assumed to belong (at least) to the Skorokhod space of càdlàg functions.

Definition D.4 (càdlàg). Let T in $(0, +\infty]$. A function $x : [0, T] \rightarrow E$ is said to belongs to the Skorokhod space $D([0, T], E)$ of càdlàg functions when x is right-continuous and has a left-limit at any time $t \in [0, T]$:

$$x(t^-) := \lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow t \\ s < t}} x(s) \text{ exists, } \quad x(t) = x(t^+).$$

We recall that a càdlàg function admits an at most countable number of discontinuities.

The law of a stochastic process is therefore an element of $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], E))$. In order to characterize the compact sets of this space, it is first necessary to precise the topology on $D([0, T], E)$. For a much more detailed study of the Skorokhod space, we refer to [Bil99, Section 12].

Definition D.5 (Skorokhod J_1 topology). Let Λ denote the set of strictly increasing homeomorphisms from $[0, T]$ onto itself. The Skorokhod J_1 metrics on $D([0, T], E)$ is defined by

$$d(x, y) := \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho(x(t), y(\lambda(t))) + \sup_{s < t} \left| \log \frac{\lambda(t) - \lambda(s)}{t - s} \right| \right\}.$$

Endowed with this metric, the Skorokhod space $D([0, T], E)$ is complete and separable.

This topology is weaker than the one of continuous functions, which does not make $D([0, T], E)$ a complete space. However, estimates in the strong $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ metrics implies estimates a complete metric, up to a fixed multiplicative constant. In practise, working with the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ metrics is thus often sufficient.

Let us recall that for a continuous function $x \in C([0, T], E)$, the continuity modulus is defined for $0 < \delta < T$ by

$$w_x(\delta) := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T - \delta} w_x[t, t + \delta], \quad w_x I = \sup_{s, t \in I} \rho(x(t), x(s)).$$

A function x belongs to $C([0, T], E)$ if and only if $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} w_x(\delta) = 0$. For càdlàg functions, another notion of modulus is defined.

Definition D.6 (càdlàg modulus). The càdlàg-modulus on $D([0, T], E)$ is defined by

$$w'_x(\delta) := \inf_{\{t_i\}} \max_i w_x[t_{i-1}, t_i],$$

where the infimum is taken over sub-divisions $\{t_i\}$ of $[0, T]$ such that $\min_i t_{i+1} - t_i > \delta$. A function x belongs to $D([0, T], E)$ if and only if $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} w'_x(\delta) = 0$.

An analog of the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem in the space of càdlàg functions is given by [Bil99, Theorem 12.3]. It states that a subset $A \subset D([0, T], E)$ is relatively compact if and only if

- (1) $\sup_{x \in A} \|x\|_\infty < \infty$;
- (2) $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x \in A} w'_x(\delta) = 0$.

In some cases, it is easier to use the modulus

$$w''_x(\delta) := \sup_{\substack{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2 \\ t_2 - t_1 \leq \delta}} |x(t_1) - x(t)| \wedge |x(t) - x(t_2)|,$$

see [Bil99, Theorem 12.4]. Using these results the following tightness criterion for probability measures on $D([0, T], E)$ is proved in [EK86, Chapter 3, Corollary 7.4]).

Theorem D.7 (Basic tightness criterion in D). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(X_t^n)_t$ be an adapted E -valued càdlàg process on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P})$. The sequence $(X_t^n)_t$ is tight if and only if the following two conditions hold.*

- (1) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every rational number $t \geq 0$, there exists a compact set $K_{\varepsilon, t} \subset E$ such that*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(X_t^n \in K_{\varepsilon, t}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

- (2) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $T > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(w'_{X^n|_{[0, T]}}(\delta) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Still, this criterion requires to find a suitable partition of the time interval to evaluate the càdlàg modulus. The following criterion due to Aldous is easier to verify in practise.

Theorem D.8 (Aldous criterion). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(X_t^n)_t$ be an adapted càdlàg process on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P})$. Assume that the sequence of processes satisfies the following conditions.*

- (i) *For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $K > 0$ such that*

$$n \geq n_0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \leq N} |X_t^n| > K\right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

- (ii) *For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that*

$$\lim_{\theta \downarrow 0} \limsup_n \sup_{S, T \in \mathcal{T}_N: S \leq T \leq S + \theta} \mathbb{P}(|X_T^n - X_S^n| \geq \varepsilon) = 0, \quad (252)$$

where \mathcal{T}_N denotes the set of all $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ -stopping times that are bounded by N .

Then the sequence of processes $(X_t^n)_t$ is tight.

Proof. See [JS03, Chapter VI, Section 4a] or [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 8.6]. \square

This criterion can be extended to a more general Polish space (E, ρ) by replacing the first condition by the tightness of $(X_t^n)_{n \geq 0}$ for each t in a dense subset of \mathbb{R}_+ . In the second condition (252), the norm $|X_T^n - X_S^n|$ has to be replaced by the distance $\rho(X_T^n, X_S^n)$.

The following theorem reduces the question of tightness in $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{E}))$ for an arbitrary space \mathcal{E} to the simpler question of tightness in $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$.

Theorem D.9 (Jakubowski). *Let \mathcal{E} be a completely regular topological space with metrisable compacts. Let \mathcal{F} be a family of continuous functions on \mathcal{E} which satisfies the following properties.*

- (i) \mathcal{F} separates points in \mathcal{E} .
(ii) \mathcal{F} is closed under addition, i.e. if $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\Phi_1 + \Phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}$.

Let $T \in (0, +\infty]$. Let $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a family of probability measures in $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathcal{E}))$. Then the family $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight if and only if the following properties hold.

- (i) *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all $t > 0$ there exists a compact set $K_{t, \varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{E}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mu_n(D([0, t], K_{t, \varepsilon})) > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

and we can consider only $t = T$ when $T < +\infty$.

- (ii) *The family $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is \mathcal{F} -weakly tight in the sense that for all $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}$, the family of probability measures $(\tilde{\Phi} \# \mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in $\mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathbb{R}))$ where $\tilde{\Phi}$ denotes the natural extension of Φ on $D([0, T], \mathcal{E})$:*

$$\tilde{\Phi} : D([0, T], \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow D([0, T], \mathbb{R}), \quad \omega \mapsto \Phi \circ \omega.$$

Proof. See [Jak86, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.6]. □

Theorem D.9 is used in this review with $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P}(E)$ and \mathcal{F} the family of linear functions $\Phi(\mu) = \langle \varphi, \mu \rangle$ with $\varphi \in C_b(E)$. In this case, a similar result also appears in [Roe86, Theorem 2.1].

Finally, the following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the weak limit of a sequence of càdlàg processes to be almost surely continuous.

Theorem D.10 (Continuity mapping in D). *Let us define for x in $D([0, T], E)$,*

$$J(x) := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-t} \left[1 \wedge \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \rho(x(s^-), x(s)) \right] dt.$$

Let $((X_t^n)_t)_n$ be a sequence of adapted E -valued càdlàg processes which converges in law towards a càdlàg process X . Then X is a.s. continuous if and only if $J(X^n)$ converges in law towards 0.

Proof. See [EK86, Chapter 3, Theorem 10.2]. □

D.3 Stochastic processes and martingales

In the following, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. This section reminds the reader of the basic properties related to stochastic processes and martingales. An exhaustive rigorous study can be found in the classical books [EK86, Chapter 2], [JS03], [RY99] or [Le 16]. The present section also summarizes elements of [JM86].

D.3.1 Martingales

Definition D.11 (Stochastic process). *A stochastic process with state space E (a measurable space) and indexed by a set I (often $I = [0, T]$) is a function $X : I \times \Omega \rightarrow E$ such that $X_t = X(t, \cdot)$ is a E -valued random variable (that is to say $\omega \mapsto X_t(\omega)$ is measurable) for every $t \in I$.*

- (1) The (pathwise) *law* of $(X_t)_t$ is the push-forward measure $f_I = X_{\#} \mathbb{P}$ on a space $\mathcal{F}(I, E)$ of functions $I \rightarrow E$.
- (2) The *time marginal laws* are the push-forward measures on E defined for any $t \in I$ by $f_t = X_t^E_{\#} f_I$, provided that the evaluation maps $X_t^E : \mathcal{F}(I, E) \rightarrow E, \omega \mapsto \omega(t)$ are measurable.

The stochastic process $X = (X_t)_{t \in I}$ can be seen as a $\mathcal{F}(I, E)$ -valued random variable. For a given $\omega \in \Omega$, $(X_t(\omega))_{t \geq 0}$ is called a *sample path* (or trajectory) of X .

From now on let $I = [0, T]$ with $T \in (0, +\infty]$.

Example D.12 (Canonical stochastic process). Given a probability distribution on the space of functions $I \rightarrow E$, $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}(I, E))$, the *canonical stochastic process with law f_I* is $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_t^E)_{t \in I}$ defined on the probability space $(\mathcal{F}(I, E), \mathcal{F}, f_I)$: the law of \mathbf{X} is indeed $\mathbf{X}_{\#} f_I = f_I$.

Definition D.13 (Filtration). A filtration is an increasing family of σ -algebras $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, i.e. such that $\mathcal{F}_s \subset \mathcal{F}_t$ for $s \leq t$. A filtration is said to be:

- (1) *complete* when

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \{\mathcal{A} \subset \Omega, \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) = 0\} \subset \mathcal{F}_t;$$

- (2) *right-continuous* when

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_{t+}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{t+} := \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathcal{F}_{t+\varepsilon}.$$

In the following, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space, whose filtration is assumed to be complete and right-continuous, together with $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t$.

Definition D.14 (Regularity for stochastic processes). A stochastic process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is said to be

- (1) *adapted* to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ when the random variable X_t is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable;
- (2) *predictable* when X is measurable for the σ -algebra generated by the sets $(s, t] \times F$ for $0 \leq s \leq t$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}_s$;
- (3) *with finite variation paths* when a.s. $(X_t(\omega))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ has bounded variation on any finite time-interval $[0, T]$;
- (4) *continuous* (resp. càdlàg, right-continuous...) when for \mathbb{P} -almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, the sample path $(X_t(\omega))_{t \geq 0}$ is a continuous (resp. càdlàg, right-continuous...) function of t .

Definition D.15 (Martingale and sub-martingale). An adapted real-valued process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that $\mathbb{E}|X_t| < +\infty$ for every $t \geq 0$ is a $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ -martingale when

$$\forall t, s \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[X_{t+s} | \mathcal{F}_t] = X_t.$$

It is a *sub-martingale* when

$$\forall t, s \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[X_{t+s} | \mathcal{F}_t] \geq X_t.$$

These definitions are extended componentwise to \mathbb{R}^N -valued processes.

Sub-martingales enjoy many useful properties, starting with the following proposition [EK86, Chapter 2, Proposition 2.9].

Proposition D.16 (Càdlàg modification). *If $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a sub-martingale, then there exists an adapted real-valued process $Y = (Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad P(X_t = Y_t) = 1, \tag{253}$$

and Y is càdlàg outside a countable set of times t . In the following this set is assumed to be \emptyset , so (sub-)martingales will be considered as càdlàg processes.

Equation (253) means that Y is a *modification* of X . The following inequality controls the growth of sub-martingales.

Proposition D.17 (Doob's maximal inequality). *Given a sub-martingale $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, $T > 0$ and any $p > 1$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} X_t \right|^p \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)^p \mathbb{E}|X_T|^p.$$

D.3.2 Local martingales and quadratic variation

In order to define a stochastic integral, the notion of martingale needs to be weakened to the notion of local martingale.

Definition D.18 (Local martingale). A real-valued process $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a *local martingale* when there exists a sequence $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of stopping times such that $\tau_n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $(M_{t \wedge \tau_n})_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale for every $n \geq 0$. This definition is extended componentwise to \mathbb{R}^N -valued processes.

Definition D.19 (Quadratic variation). The quadratic variation $[M] = ([M]_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of a (local) square integrable martingale $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined as the limit in probability

$$[M]_t := \lim_{\delta(\pi) \rightarrow 0} \sum_{t_n \in \pi} (M_{t_{n+1} \wedge t} - M_{t_n \wedge t})^2,$$

where π is a subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ of \mathbb{R}_+ with mesh $\delta(\pi) = \sup_n (t_{n+1} - t_n)$. It is the only (up to modification) adapted increasing process with jumps $\Delta[M]_t = \Delta M_t^2 = M_t^2 - M_{t-}^2$ such that $(M_t^2 - [M]_t)_t$ is a (local) martingale.

Example D.20 (The case of finite variation paths). When $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ has finite variation paths, it is straightforward to check that

$$[M]_t = \sum_{s \leq t} (\Delta M_s)^2.$$

Definition D.21 (Cross-variation). The cross-variation $[M, N] = ([M, N]_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of two (local) square integrable martingales $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined by

$$[M, N]_t := \frac{1}{2}([M + N]_t - [M]_t - [N]_t).$$

It is the only (up to modification) adapted increasing process with jump at time $t > 0$, $\Delta[M, N]_t = \Delta(MN)_t = M_t N_t - M_{t-} N_{t-}$ such that $(M_t N_t - [M, N]_t)_t$ is a (local) martingale.

Proposition D.22 (BDG inequality). *For every $p \geq 1$, there exist two constants $c_p, C_p > 0$ such that for any local martingale $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$, the supremum $M_t^* := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |M_s|$ can be controlled by the quadratic variation in L^p -norm:*

$$c_p \mathbb{E}[M]_t^{p/2} \leq \mathbb{E}(M_t^*)^p \leq C_p \mathbb{E}[M]_t^{p/2}.$$

Definition D.23 (Predictable quadratic and cross-variation). The predictable quadratic variation $\langle M \rangle = (\langle M \rangle_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of a (local) square integrable martingale $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the unique *predictable* càdlàg increasing process (with finite variation paths) such that

$$(M_t^2 - \langle M \rangle_t)_{t \geq 0}$$

is a (local) martingale. The existence of the predictable quadratic variation stems from the Doob-Meyer decomposition theorem for DL -supermartingales (see [EK86, Chapter 2, Proposition 5] for more details). The predictable cross-variation of two (local) square integrable martingales M, N is defined the same way, setting

$$\langle M, N \rangle_t := \frac{1}{2}(\langle M + N \rangle_t - \langle M \rangle_t - \langle N \rangle_t).$$

Note that by subtracting the martingale characterizations of the quadratic variation and of the predictable quadratic variation, we get that $([M]_t - \langle M \rangle_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a (local) square integrable martingale. The predictable quadratic variation is said to be the *compensator* of the quadratic variation. Moreover, the equality $[M] = \langle M \rangle$ holds as soon as $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a continuous process.

D.3.3 Semimartingales

The notion of local martingales is then extended to the notion of semimartingale, which forms a large class of processes against which a stochastic integral can be defined (a notion that will not be detailed here).

Definition D.24 (Semimartingale). A real-valued process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a semimartingale when it can be decomposed as

$$X_t = M_t + A_t,$$

where $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale and $(A_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is an adapted process with finite variation paths. This definition is extended component-wise to \mathbb{R}^N -valued processes.

The cross-variation $[X, Y]$ and predictable cross-variation $\langle X, Y \rangle$ can be extended to semimartingales $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as the limit in probability

$$[X, Y]_t = \lim_{\delta(\pi) \rightarrow 0} \sum_{t_n \in \pi} (X_{t_{n+1} \wedge t} - X_{t_n \wedge t})(Y_{t_{n+1} \wedge t} - Y_{t_n \wedge t}).$$

Writing $X_t = M_t + A_t$, note that $[X] = [M]$ and $\langle X \rangle = \langle M \rangle$ because A has finite variation paths.

For vector-valued semimartingales, the cross-variation is defined componentwise as follows.

Definition D.25 (Vectorial cross-variation). Let $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a \mathbb{R}^d -valued semimartingale with the notation $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^d)$, the matrix-valued cross-variations are defined by

$$[\mathbf{X}] = ([X^i, X^j])_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}, \quad \langle \mathbf{X} \rangle = (\langle X^i, X^j \rangle)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d},$$

and the related scalar quantities are the traces of these matrices (defined as the sum of diagonal elements)

$$[\mathbf{X}] = \text{Tr}([\mathbf{X}]), \quad \langle \mathbf{X} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\langle \mathbf{X} \rangle).$$

The integration of locally bounded predictable processes $(H_t)_{t \geq 0}$ against finite variation processes is well-defined using Stieltjes formalism. The theory of stochastic integration extends this to integrate $(H_t)_{t \geq 0}$ against any square integrable semimartingale $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Notable identities are the Itô isometry

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t H_{s-} dX_s \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t H_{s-}^2 d[X]_s \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t H_{s-}^2 d\langle X \rangle_s \right],$$

(the last equality holds because $[X] - \langle X \rangle$ is a local martingale) and the integration by parts formula

$$X_t Y_t = X_0 Y_0 + \int_0^t X_{s-} dY_s + \int_0^t Y_{s-} dX_s + [X, Y]_t,$$

for general semimartingales $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Given a (local) square integrable martingale $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$, the process

$$\left(\int_0^t H_{s-} dM_s \right)_{t \geq 0}$$

is built in such a way that it is a (local) square integrable martingale.

Example D.26 (Dynkin's representation formula). Anticipating on the next section, a Markov process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with generator L is such that for any φ in $\mathcal{D}(L)$ (see Theorem D.48)

$$M_t^\varphi := \varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_0) - \int_0^t L\varphi(X_s) ds,$$

is a martingale. In this case, the predictable quadratic variation $\langle M^\varphi \rangle$ can be computed as

$$\langle M^\varphi \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_L(\varphi, \varphi)(X_s) ds,$$

involving the *carré du champ operator*

$$\Gamma_L(\varphi, \psi) := L[\varphi\psi] - \varphi L\psi - \psi L\varphi,$$

for any $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}(L)$. These properties can be generalized to obtain a wider class of semimartingales, which are non-necessarily Markov processes.

D.3.4 D -semimartingales

Dynkin's formula can be turned into a definition to obtain a wider class of (non-necessarily Markov) \mathbb{R}^d -valued semimartingales, named class D (in the honour of Dynkin). The following definition can be found in [JM86]. The notation π_i denotes the coordinate function $\mathbf{x}^d \mapsto x^i$.

Definition D.27 (Semimartingale of class D). A \mathbb{R}^d -valued semimartingale \mathbf{X}_t belongs to the class D when there exist an increasing càdlàg function $t \mapsto A(t)$, a vector space \mathcal{C} of \mathbb{R} -valued continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^d and a mapping $L : \mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following properties hold.

- (1) For every $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, π_i and $\pi_i \pi_j$ belong to \mathcal{C} .
- (2) For every $(\mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega$, the map $\varphi \mapsto L(\varphi, \mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega)$ is linear and maps \mathcal{C} to itself. Moreover for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, the map $(\mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega) \mapsto L(\varphi, \mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega)$ is measurable for the σ -algebra on \mathbb{R}^d of Borel sets, and the one of predictable events on Ω .
- (3) For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$M_t^\varphi := \varphi(\mathbf{X}_t) - \varphi(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^t L(\varphi, \mathbf{X}_{s-}, s, \cdot) dA(s),$$

is a local square integrable martingale.

To this process are associated the *local coefficients*

$$b_i(\mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega) = L(\pi_i, \mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega), \quad a_{ij}(\mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega) = \Gamma_{L(\cdot, \mathbf{x}^d, t, \omega)}(\pi_i, \pi_j)(\mathbf{x}^d),$$

and the *drift vector* $\mathbf{b} = (b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ and the *diffusion matrix* $\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$. In the following we often omit to write the dependency in ω .

The following lemma is proved in [JM86, Lemma 3.1.3].

Lemma D.28 (Predictable variation). *Given a D -semimartingale \mathbf{X} , define*

$$\mathbf{M}_t := \mathbf{X}_t - \mathbf{X}_0 - \int_0^t \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, s) dA(s).$$

Then $(\mathbf{M}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a \mathbb{R}^d -valued local square integrable martingale, whose (scalar) predictable quadratic variation reads

$$\langle \mathbf{X} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \text{Tr}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, s)) dA(s) - \sum_{s \leq t} \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, s)\|^2 |\Delta A(s)|^2.$$

Remark D.29 (Generalized SDE and intrinsic randomness). The previous notions naturally extend the notion of diffusion SDE, since at least formally

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, t) dA(t) + \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, t) d\mathbf{M}_t.$$

This parallel could be used to extend coupling and completeness methods to irregular processes or even non-Markov ones. However, remember that in this case, the generator L depends on ω and has therefore *its own source of randomness*, together with the local coefficients \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{a} .

Similarly to Markov processes, a convenient way to build a D -semimartingale on $\Omega = D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ (for $T \in (0, +\infty]$) is to solve a martingale problem.

Definition D.30 (Martingale problem). A probability distribution on the path space $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d))$ is a solution to the martingale problem issued from $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ whenever for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$M_t^\varphi := \varphi(\mathbf{X}_t) - \varphi(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^t L(\varphi, \mathbf{X}_{s-}, s, \cdot) dA(s),$$

is a f_I -martingale, where \mathbf{X}_t is the canonical process $D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

D.4 Tightness for càdlàg semimartingales and D -semimartingales

The basic tightness criterion for semimartingales is due to Rebolledo.

Theorem D.31 (Rebolledo criterion). *Let $((X_t^n)_{t \geq 0})_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of càdlàg square integrable semimartingales. Let us write the decomposition $X_t^n = A_t^n + M_t^n$, where $(M_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ is a local square integrable martingale and $(A_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ is an adapted finite variation paths process. If the two following conditions are fulfilled, then the sequences of processes $(M_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$, $([M^n]_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(X_t^n)_t$ are tight.*

- (i) *For every t within a dense subset of \mathbb{R}_+ , $(M_t^n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $(A_t^n)_{n \geq 0}$ are tight sequences.*
- (ii) *Both processes $([M^n])_{n \geq 0}$ and $(A^n)_{n \geq 0}$ satisfy condition (252).*

Proof. See [JM86, Theorem 2.3.2, Corollary 2.3.3]. □

Finally, based on the Rebolledo criterion, a useful tightness criterion for D -semimartingales is proved in [JM86]. This result is based on the three assumptions stated below. In the following $((\mathbf{X}_t^n)_{t \geq 0})_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of \mathbb{R}^d -valued D -semimartingales and we use the notations of Definition D.27 and Lemma D.28.

Assumption D.32. *There exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence of positive adapted processes such that $(C_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ a.s. (recall that \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{a} are random processes):*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \forall \mathbf{x}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}^d, t)\|^2 + \text{Tr } \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}^d, t) \leq C_t^n (C + \|\mathbf{x}^d\|^2),$$

and for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[C_t^n] < +\infty, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} C_t^n > r\right) = 0. \quad (254)$$

Assumption D.33. *The initial sequence $(X_0^n)_{n \geq 0}$ of random variables is such that*

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_0^n\|^2 < +\infty.$$

These two first assumptions are necessary to guaranty a L^2 Grönwall-like bound on \mathbf{X}_t^n proved in [JM86, Lemma 3.2.2]. The next one is more technical but not difficult to check in practise.

Assumption D.34. *There exist a positive function α on \mathbb{R}_+ and a decreasing sequence of numbers $(\rho_n)_n$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \alpha(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_n = 0$, and for all $0 < s < t$ and $n \geq 0$,*

$$A^n(t) - A^n(s) \leq \alpha(t - s) + \rho_n.$$

This assumption implies that the jumps of A^n are smaller than ρ_n . Throughout the applications in the present article, we consider that $A(t) = t$ so this assumption is automatically fulfilled.

Theorem D.35 (Joffe-Metivier criterion). *If Assumptions D.32, D.33 and D.34 are verified, then the sequence $((\mathbf{X}_t^n)_{t \geq 0})_{n \geq 0}$ of D -semimartingales is tight. If moreover convergence in law is assumed for the initial sequence in Assumption D.33, then the canonical process is continuous in probability under the law of any limit point of the sequence.*

Proof. See [JM86, Proposition 3.2.3] and [JM86, Theorem 3.3.1]. Under additional assumptions, this latter theorem also characterizes any limit point of the sequence as the solution of a martingale problem. □

D.5 Markov processes and Markov representation for PDEs

The purpose of this section is to briefly review the probabilistic framework for linear and nonlinear Markov processes. Classical references and review articles on the subject include [EK86; RY99; BSW13; BC10]. The prototypical nonlinear Markov process is the solution of the McKean-Vlasov SDE:

$$dX_t = b(X_t, f_t)dt + \sigma(X_t, f_t)dB_t, \quad X_t \sim f_t,$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion and f_t the law of the random variable X_t at time t . Such a process is said to be nonlinear (in the sense of McKean) since its definition depends on its own law. This type of nonlinearity has been introduced in the seminal [McK69]. Unlike, classical (linear) Markov process, the law f_t of the nonlinear Markov process satisfies the nonlinear the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = -\nabla_x \cdot \{b(x, f_t)f_t\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \{a_{ij}(x, f_t)f_t\},$$

where the matrix $a = (a_{ij})$ is defined by $a = \sigma\sigma^T$. This kind of equations is derived in the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in the Kolmogorov equations associated to large interacting particle systems defined by N linear Markov processes. While the theory of linear Markov processes is well-established, nonlinear Markov processes are not so classical in the literature and require specific tools to be built (for instance, the well-posedness result proved in Proposition 2.7 for the McKean-Vlasov SDE).

The classical theory of time homogeneous linear Markov processes is presented in Section D.5.1. Elements of the theory of time-inhomogeneous Markov processes can be found in Section D.5.2. Using these concepts and following [Joh68] and [McK66], a theoretical framework is presented in Section D.5.3 for nonlinear Markov processes (in the sense of McKean). Before that, we first recall the basic notions about Markov process (linear or not). Following [EK86, Chapter 4], the very general definition of Markov processes is the following.

Definition D.36 (Markov process). A stochastic process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ when for every $s, t \geq 0$

$$\forall \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(E), \quad \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \in \mathcal{A} | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq t}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \in \mathcal{A} | X_t). \quad (255)$$

On the left-hand side the probability is conditioned by the filtration generated by the process, but stronger definitions could involve wider filtrations. The relation (255) will be referred as the *Markov property*. When the time t is replaced by a random *stopping time*, this relation is called the *strong Markov property*.

This means the law of X_{s+t} at time $s+t$ conditionally on the past history up to time t , is the same as the law at time $s+t$ conditionally on the state at time t only. The definition can be equivalently written in terms of bounded measurable test functions $\varphi \in B_b(E)$ as

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{s+t}) | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq t}] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t+s}) | X_t]. \quad (256)$$

This definition remains abstract and does not tell how to *build* a Markov process. If the law f_I is known (built from given processes or e.g. by solving a martingale process), a Markov process with law f_I is given by the canonical process $X^E = (X_t^E)_{t \geq 0}$ on the probability space $\Omega = D(I, E)$ endowed with f_I and an adequate filtration (see Example D.12). Further constructions which are closer to the PDE point of view are presented in the next subsections.

D.5.1 Time-homogeneous Markov processes and linear PDEs

The content of this section is quite classical and can be found in the classical reference [EK86].

Transition functions. A usual way to present Markov processes is to first think about time discrete Markov chains with jumps which are given by a transition kernel (or transition matrix when E is discrete). This definition can be generalized to the time continuous framework using the notion of transition function.

Definition D.37 (Transition functions, homogeneous case). A family of maps $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ where $P_t : E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a family of transition functions when the following properties hold.

- The map $(t, x) \mapsto P_t(x, \cdot)$ is a measurable map $[0, \infty) \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$.
- For all $x \in E$, $P_0(x, \cdot) = \delta_x$.
- For all $s, t \geq 0$ and all $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(E)$, $P_{s+t}(x, \mathcal{A}) = \int_E P_s(y, \mathcal{A}) P_t(x, dy)$.

This last relation is called the *Chapman-Kolmogorov property*.

A family of transition functions $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is said to be *adapted to the Markov process* $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ when for all $s, t \geq 0$, and all $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(E)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \in \mathcal{A} | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq t}) = P_s(X_t, \mathcal{A}),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t+s}) | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq t}] = \int_E \varphi(y) P_s(X_t, dy),$$

for any bounded Borel measurable test function $\varphi \in B_b(E)$. Note that this relation and the Markov property (255) imply the Chapman-Kolmogorov property with $x = X_r$ for $r \geq 0$. Moreover given the initial distribution $X_0 \sim f_0$, the finite dimensional distributions of $(X_t)_t$ can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0, X_{t_1} \in \mathcal{A}_1, \dots, X_{t_n} \in \mathcal{A}_n) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} \dots \int_{\mathcal{A}_{n-1}} P_{t_n - t_{n-1}}(y_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}_n) P_{t_{n-1} - t_{n-2}}(y_{n-2}, dy_{n-1}) \\ & \dots P_{t_1}(y_0, dy_1) f_0(dy_0), \end{aligned} \quad (257)$$

for any $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ and $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n$. In fact transition functions are sufficient to build a Markov process; this is a consequence of the Kolmogorov extension theorem (or more generally of the Ionescu-Tulcea theorem), see for instance [EK86, Chapter 4, Theorem 1.1] or [RY99, Chapter 3, Theorem 1.5].

Theorem D.38 (Markov process built from transition functions). *Let E be a Polish space and $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Given the transition functions $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$, there exists a Markov process whose finite dimensional distributions are uniquely determined by (257). Its law on the path space is a probability measure $f_I \in \mathcal{P}(D(I, E))$.*

If $f_0 = \delta_x$, then f_I is denoted by f_I^x and [EK86, Chapter 4, Proposition 1.2] proves that the map $x \mapsto f_I^x(\mathcal{B})$ is measurable for any Borel set $\mathcal{B} \subset D(I, E)$.

Example D.39 (Brownian motion). Transition functions are not explicit in general. A notable exception is the d -dimensional Brownian motion for which

$$P_t(x, \mathcal{A}) = (2\pi t)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathcal{A}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{2t}\right) dy.$$

Note that the map $t \mapsto P_t(x, dy)$ is the measure solution of the 1D heat equation $\partial_t u = \partial_{xx}^2 u$ with initial condition $u(t=0, \cdot) = \delta_x$.

Semigroup representation. The connection between Markov processes and linear PDEs is given by the semigroup representation as explained below. For $t \geq 0$, let the linear operator T_t acting on be defined by:

$$T_t\varphi(x) := \int_E \varphi(y)P_t(x, dy), \quad (258)$$

for any test functions $\varphi \in B_b(E)$. Thanks to the Chapman-Kolmogorov property, this defines a positive measurable semigroup of contractions on $B_b(E)$, where we recall that a family of bounded operators $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on a closed subspace $\mathcal{D} \subset B_b(E)$ is a semigroup when $T_0 = \text{Id}$ and $T_{t+s} = T_t T_s$ for all $s, t \geq 0$. It is said to be a contraction semigroup when the operators are bounded with norm smaller or equal to 1. The semi-group $(T_t)_t$ is said to correspond to a Markov process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ when

$$\forall s, t \geq 0, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}, \quad T_t\varphi(X_{t+s}) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{s+t}) | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq t}]$$

The semi-group representation characterises a Markov process, as stated in [EK86, Chapter 4, Proposition 1.6].

Theorem D.40. *Let E be a Polish space and let $\mathcal{D} \subset B_b(E)$ be a closed subspace assumed to be separating. Let f_0 in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and let $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a semigroup on \mathcal{D} corresponding to a Markov process $(X_t)_t$. Then the finite dimensional distributions of $(X_t)_t$ are determined by $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and f_0 .*

In the following, starting from a a semigroup $(T_t)_t$, the goal is to construct a corresponding Markov process. With the notable exception of jump processes, stronger assumptions on E and $(T_t)_t$ are often needed, as the ones given in the following definition.

Definition D.41 (Feller semigroup). Let E be a locally compact Polish space. A semi-group $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Feller semigroup when its elements satisfy the following properties.

- (1) **(Feller)**. For all $t \geq 0$, T_t maps $C_0(E)$ to $C_0(E)$, where $C_0(E)$ is the space of continuous functions vanishing at infinity. It means that

$$\forall \varphi \in C_0(E), \quad T_t\varphi \in C_0(E).$$

- (2) **(Contraction)**. For all $t \geq 0$ and all $\varphi \in C_0(E)$, $\|T_t\varphi\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty$.
- (3) **(Mass preserving)**. For all $t \geq 0$, $T_t 1 = 1$.
- (4) **(Positivity)**. For all $t \geq 0$ and all $\varphi \in C_0(E)$ such that $\varphi \geq 0$, then $T_t\varphi \geq 0$.
- (5) **(Strongly continuous)**. For all $\varphi \in C_0(E)$, $\|T_t\varphi - \varphi\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ when $t \rightarrow 0$.

The properties (2) to (4) hold when T_t is defined from (258). Also note that every semigroup defined on $C_0(E)$ can be uniquely extended to the whole space $B_p(E)$ (see [BSW13, Theorem 1.5]). A Markov process corresponding to a Feller semigroup is called a *Feller process*. There is a one-to-one correspondence between Feller semigroups and Feller processes; this is a consequence of the Riesz representation theorem, see for instance [BSW13, Section 1.2], [RY99, Chapter 3, Proposition 2.2] or [EK86, Chapter 4, Theorem 2.7].

Theorem D.42 (Càdlàg Markov process from a Feller semigroup). *Let E be a locally compact Polish space and let $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Let $(T_t)_t$ be a Feller semigroup on E . Then there exists a unique transition function $(P_t)_t$ on E such that (258) holds. As a consequence, there exists a Markov process corresponding to $(T_t)_t$ with initial distribution f_0 , whose finite dimensional distributions are uniquely determined by $(T_t)_t$. Moreover this process has a càdlàg modification and satisfies the strong Markov property with respect to the right-continuous filtration $\mathcal{G}_t = \cap_{\varepsilon > 0} \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq t + \varepsilon})$.*

Example D.43 (Brownian motion). The d -dimensional Brownian motion is a Feller process. More generally diffusion processes are Feller processes under mild assumptions on the diffusion coefficients.

Example D.44 (Markov jump processes and C_b -Feller processes). The definition of Feller process is not universal in the literature. An important variant is the notion of C_b -Feller process for which the space $C_0(E)$ is replaced by $C_b(E)$ in Definition D.41. In this case, the local compactness assumption on E can be dropped. Diffusion processes are *not* C_b -Feller processes because the diffusion semigroup is not strongly continuous on $C_b(E)$ (see [BSW13, Example 1.7d]). The main class of C_b -Feller process that are considered in this review is the class of Markov jump processes, defined by the transition function:

$$\forall x \in E, \quad P_t(x, dy) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-t} t^k}{k!} P^k(x, dy),$$

where $P : E \times \mathcal{B}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a transition probability and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in E$ and $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(E)$,

$$P^k(x, \mathcal{A}) = \int_E P(x, dy) P^{k-1}(y, \mathcal{A}).$$

An explicit construction of a Markov jump process can be found in [EK86, Chapter 4, Section 2], see also [RY99, Chapter 3, Exercise 1.8]. Markov jump processes are more easily understood through their generator as defined below. More generally, the strong continuity property holds on $C_b(E)$ for semigroups which have a bounded generator (for the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ topology). Further links between Feller semigroups, C_b -Feller semigroups and other notions of Feller semigroups can be found in [BSW13, Section 1.1] and the references therein.

Infinitesimal generator and PDE. Strongly continuous contraction semigroups are determined by their infinitesimal generator.

Definition D.45 (Infinitesimal generator). The infinitesimal generator L of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on a closed subspace $\mathcal{D} \subset B_p(E)$ is the linear operator defined by

$$L\varphi = \lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow 0 \\ t > 0}} \frac{T_t\varphi - \varphi}{t}$$

on the domain $\mathcal{D}(L) \subset \mathcal{D}$ of functions φ such that the limit exists (for the topology on \mathcal{D}).

The first connection between Markov processes and PDE comes from the observation that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(L)$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} T_t\varphi = T_t L\varphi, \quad \frac{d}{dt} T_t\varphi = L T_t\varphi, \quad (259)$$

which are called the *Kolmogorov equations*. The first equation is called the forward Kolmogorov equation and the second, the backward Kolmogorov equation. The terminology will appear more clearly in the time-inhomogeneous setting below. Since T_t and L commute, the two equations are of course equivalent but each one has its own physical interpretation. The backward equation gives a Markov representation of the solution of the linear PDE $\partial_t u = Lu$ with initial condition φ as the conditional expectation $u(t, x) = T_t\varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t) | X_0 = x]$. The backward equation thus describes the evolution of an observable of the Markov process. A more general version when source terms or boundary conditions are added is the Feynman-Kac formula. More on the forward equation is given in the next paragraph. Note that the generator L can include differential and jump terms in which case the (backward) Kolmogorov equation is an integro-differential PDE.

Example D.46. The generator of the d -dimensional Brownian motion is $L\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\varphi$ and $\mathcal{D}(L) \subset C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The generator of a Markov jump process on a space E is

$$L\varphi(x) = \int_E \{\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)\} P(x, dy),$$

and L is bounded on $(C_b(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.

In stochastic analysis, we often use the notion of *full generator* which turns the (forward) Kolmogorov equation into a definition.

Definition D.47 (Full generator). The full generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_t)_t$ on \mathcal{D} is the subset

$$\widehat{L} := \left\{ (\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}, T_t \varphi - \varphi = \int_0^t T_s \psi \, ds \right\}.$$

The (forward) Kolmogorov equation says that $\{(\varphi, L\varphi), \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(L)\} \subset \widehat{L}$. The full generator is often used in connection with the martingale characterisation of a Markov process due to Stroock and Varadhan, see [BSW13, Corollary 1.37] and [EK86, Chapter 4, Section 3].

Theorem D.48. Let $(X_t)_t$ be a strong Markov process with full generator \widehat{L} . For $\varphi, \psi \in B_p(E)$, let us define for $t \geq 0$,

$$M_t^{\varphi, \psi} := \varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_0) - \int_0^t \psi(X_s) \, ds.$$

Then the full generator is characterised by

$$\widehat{L} = \left\{ (\varphi, \psi) \in B_p(E) \times B_p(E), (M_t^{\varphi, \psi})_t \text{ is a } \sigma(X)\text{-martingale} \right\}.$$

Taking $\psi = L\varphi$ shows that

$$M_t^\varphi = \varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_0) - \int_0^t L\varphi(X_s) \, ds$$

is a martingale. The (forward) Kolmogorov equation is retrieved by simply taking the expectation.

Conversely, a linear operator (bounded or unbounded) L with domain $\mathcal{D} \subset B_p(E)$ is the generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup (and thus is the generator of a Markov process) if and only if it satisfies the Hille-Yosida theorem. In the context of Feller processes, the result is stated in [BSW13, Theorem 3.1] or [EK86, Chapter 4, Theorem 2.2]. The following example is a classical and important application. Further examples using various points of view (SDE, martingale problem...) can be found in [BSW13, Chapter 3].

Example D.49. The second order differential operator on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$L\varphi(x) = c(x)\varphi(x) + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(x) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j},$$

is the generator of a Feller semigroup when a_{ij} , b_i and c are respectively $C_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $c(x) \leq 0$ and the matrix $a = (a_{ij})$ is uniformly elliptic in the sense that there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\forall x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle a(x)\xi, \xi \rangle \geq \lambda|x|^2.$$

The corresponding Feller process is said to be a diffusion process.

The dual semi-group. Let E be locally compact and let $(T_t)_t$ be a Feller semigroup. To obtain a forward (or strong) version of the PDE representation (259), let the dual version of (258) be given by:

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \quad \varphi \in C_0(E) \mapsto \langle S_t \nu, \varphi \rangle := \langle \nu, T_t \varphi \rangle \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By the Riesz representation theorem, this defines a family of operator $(S_t)_t$ on $\mathcal{P}(E)$. For all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $S_t\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and by the Chapman-Kolmogorov property, the family of operators $(S_t)_t$ also forms a semigroup. When transition functions $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are available, this duality relation implies

$$S_t\nu(dy) = \int_E P_t(x, dy)\nu(dx).$$

Given the generator L of the semigroup $(T_t)_t$, the dual semigroup $(S_t)_t$ satisfies the dual Kolmogorov equations:

$$\partial_t S_t = L^* S_t, \quad \partial_t S_t = S_t L^*,$$

where L^* is the dual operator of L . This time, the forward Kolmogorov equation (the first one) can be interpreted as the initial value problem $\partial_t f_t = L^* f_t$. According to (257), the solution of the forward equation $f_t = S_t f_0$ is the law at time $t \geq 0$ of the Feller process with initial distribution f_0 .

Example D.50. The law f_t of a diffusion process (see Example D.49) satisfies the forward Kolmogorov equation, also called the Fokker-Planck equation in this context:

$$\partial f_t(x) = c(x)f_t(x) - \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \{b_i(x)f_t(x)\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \{a_{ij}(x)f_t(x)\}.$$

D.5.2 Time-inhomogeneous Markov processes

One of the goal of this subsection is to extend this formalism to cases where the generator L_t has a time-dependence. The analog of transition functions is the following time-inhomogeneous version.

Definition D.51 (Transition functions, inhomogeneous case). A family of maps $(P_{s,t})_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ where $P_{s,t} : E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a family of time-inhomogeneous transition functions when the following properties hold.

- The map $(s, t, x) \mapsto P_{s,t}(x, \cdot)$ is a measurable map $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$.
- For all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and for all $x \in E$, $P_{t,t}(x, \cdot) = \delta_x$.
- For all $0 \leq r \leq s \leq t$, for all $x \in E$ and for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(E)$,

$$P_{r,t}(x, \mathcal{A}) = \int_E P_{s,t}(y, \mathcal{A})P_{r,s}(x, dy).$$

This last relation is the equivalent of the Chapman-Kolmogorov property.

Similarly to the time-homogeneous case, the transition functions $(P_{s,t})_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ are said to be adapted to the time-inhomogeneous Markov process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ when

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t \in \mathcal{A} | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq s}) = P_{s,t}(X_s \in \mathcal{A}),$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t) | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq s}] = \int_E \varphi(y)P_{s,t}(X_s, dy),$$

for every $0 \leq s \leq t$ and any $\varphi \in B_b(E)$. The time-homogeneous setting is recovered when $P_{s,t} \equiv P_{t-s}$ depends on $t - s$ only. Moreover given the initial distribution $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, the finite dimensional distributions can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0, X_{t_1} \in \mathcal{A}_1, X_{t_2} \in \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, X_{t_n} \in \mathcal{A}_n) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} \dots \int_{\mathcal{A}_{n-1}} P_{t_{n-1}, t_n}(y_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}_n) P_{t_{n-2}, t_{n-1}}(y_{n-2}, dy_{n-1}) \\ & \quad \dots P_{0, t_1}(y_0, dy_1) f_0(dy_0), \end{aligned}$$

so that given f_0 , a time inhomogeneous Markov process is fully characterised by the time-inhomogeneous transition functions. The link with PDEs is retrieved similarly by introducing the operators

$$\forall \varphi \in B_p(E), \quad T_{s,t}\varphi(x) := \int_E \varphi(y) P_{s,t}(x, dy).$$

The family $(T_{s,t})_{s \leq t}$ is an evolution system in the following sense, see [Böt14], [RSW16] and the references therein.

Definition D.52 (Evolution system). An evolution system $(T_{s,t})_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ is a family of bounded linear operators on a closed subspace $\mathcal{D} \subset B_p(E)$ such that

- for all $t \geq 0$, $T_{t,t} = \text{Id}$;
- for all $0 \leq s \leq t$, $T_{s,t}1 = 1$;
- for all $0 \leq r \leq s \leq t$, $T_{r,t} = T_{r,s}T_{s,t}$.

These properties can be directly checked in the case of a system defined by time inhomogeneous transition functions.

An evolution system is said to correspond to a Markov process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ when

$$\forall 0 \leq s \leq t, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}, \quad T_{s,t}\varphi(X_s) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t) | (X_r)_{0 \leq r \leq s}].$$

The previous notion of Feller semigroup readily extends to evolution systems in a time-inhomogeneous setting with the strong continuity property being replaced by

$$\forall \varphi \in C_0(E), \quad \|T_{s,t}\varphi - \varphi\|_\infty \xrightarrow{(s,t) \rightarrow (0,0)} 0.$$

In the time inhomogeneous case, there are two notions of infinitesimal generators, depending on if the derivative is taken from the left or from the right. The left and right generators are defined respectively by

$$L_t^- \varphi := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{T_{t-\varepsilon,t}\varphi - \varphi}{\varepsilon}, \quad L_t^+ \varphi = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{T_{t,t+\varepsilon}\varphi - \varphi}{\varepsilon}.$$

They are respectively defined on the domains denoted by $\mathcal{D}(L_t^-)$ and $\mathcal{D}(L_t^+)$. Note that in both cases, the generators depend on a time variable. In general, the left and right generators do not coincide but they do under stronger uniform continuity assumptions with respect to the time variable, see [Böt14, Lemma 2.2]. They also coincide for time homogeneous systems.

If $(T_{s,t})_{s \leq t}$ is strongly continuous then the forward and backward Kolmogorov equations reads, respectively:

$$\frac{d^\pm}{dt} T_{s,t} = T_{s,t} L_t^\pm, \quad \frac{d^\pm}{ds} T_{s,t} = -L_s^\pm T_{s,t},$$

where $\frac{d^+}{dt}$ (resp. $\frac{d^-}{dt}$) denotes the right (resp.) left derivative. Given $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(L_s^-)$ and a fixed $t > 0$, the solution of the backward Kolmogorov equation is

$$u(s, x) = T_{s,t}\varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t) | X_s = x].$$

The terminology *backward* refers to the fact that u satisfies a final value problem with terminal condition φ at $s = t$. In the time homogeneous setting,

$$T_{s,t} = T_{0,t-s} \equiv T_{t-s},$$

and consequently for $\tau \leq t$, the quantity

$$U(\tau, x) := u(t - \tau, x) = T_\tau \varphi(x),$$

satisfies

$$\partial_\tau U = LU, \quad U(\tau = 0) = \varphi,$$

which is the backward Kolmogorov equation previously obtained (since in this case $L_s^+ = L_s^- = L$ does not depend on s).

As before, the forward equation is better understood with the dual formulation. Given $s \leq t$, the operator $S_{s,t}$ acting on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is defined by

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E), \forall \varphi \in B_p(E), \quad \langle S_{s,t}\nu, \varphi \rangle = \langle \nu, T_{s,t}\varphi \rangle.$$

This duality relation implies

$$S_{s,t}\nu(dy) = \int_E P_{s,t}(x, dy)\nu(dx)$$

Let $f_0(xdx)$ be the initial distribution. Then

$$f_t(dx) := S_{0,t}f_0(dx) = \int_E P_{0,t}(y, dx)f_0(dy),$$

is the law of the associated Markov process at time t . In this last equality, note the change of variables which exchanges the roles of the y and x variables. Since the family of operators $(S_{s,t})_{s \leq t}$ satisfies the dual Chapman-Kolmogorov property $S_{s,t}S_{r,s} = S_{r,t}$ for $r \leq s \leq t$, then $S_{s,t}f_s = f_t$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t$. Let us assume that the left and right generators coincide and let L_t^* be the formal adjoint of $L_t = L_t^+$. Then, the forward Kolmogorov equation becomes:

$$\partial_t S_{s,t} = L_t^* S_{s,t},$$

which is an initial value problem for the density f_t with initial condition f_s at s .

Example D.53. The time inhomogeneous setting allows to consider diffusion processes with time variable coefficients (see Example D.49). The backward Kolmogorov equation reads:

$$-\partial_s u(s, x) = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(s, x) \partial_{x_i} u(s, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(s, x) \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} u(s, x), \quad u(t, x) = \varphi(x),$$

and the forward Kolmogorov equation (or Fokker-Planck equation) is:

$$\partial_t f_t(x) = - \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \{b_i(t, x) f_t(x)\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \{a_{ij}(t, x) f_t(x)\}, \quad f_{t=0}(x) = f_0(x).$$

D.5.3 Non-linear Markov processes

The previous steps have given Markov representations for linear PDEs (with and without time varying coefficients). The class of *nonlinear* PDEs studied in this review can also be seen as the forward Kolmogorov equation associated to a particular class of time-inhomogeneous Markov processes. This point of view was introduced by the seminal work of McKean [McK66; McK69] and Johnson [Joh68].

Let us first introduce an extension of the notion of transition functions.

Definition D.54 (Transition functions, nonlinear case). A family of maps $(P_t^\nu)_{t \geq 0}$ from $E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ defined for any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a family of non-linear transition functions when it satisfies the following properties.

- The map $(t, x, \nu) \mapsto P_t^\nu(x, \cdot)$ is a measurable map $[0, \infty) \times E \times \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$.
- For all $x \in E$ and for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $P_0^\nu(x, \cdot) = \delta_x$.
- For all $s, t \geq 0$, for all $x \in E$, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(E)$, it holds that

$$P_{s+t}^\nu(x, \mathcal{A}) = \int_E P_s^{\int_E P_t^\nu(x, dy)\nu(dx)}(y, \mathcal{A}) P_t^\nu(x, dy).$$

This last relation is a nonlinear version of the Chapman-Kolmogorov property; the linear case is recovered when P_t^ν does not depend on ν .

At this point, it is natural to introduce the nonlinear operator $\bar{S}_t : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ defined for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ by

$$\bar{S}_t(\nu)(dy) = \int_E P_t^\nu(x, dy)\nu(dx),$$

so that the non-linear Chapman-Kolmogorov relation reads

$$P_{s+t}^\nu(x, \cdot) = \int_E P_s^{\bar{S}_t(\nu)}(y, \cdot)P_t^\nu(x, dy). \quad (260)$$

Integrating against ν , this gives

$$\bar{S}_{t+s}(\nu) = \int_E P_s^{\bar{S}_t(\nu)}(y, \cdot) \left(\int_E P_t^\nu(x, dy)\nu(dx) \right) = \bar{S}_s(\bar{S}_t(\nu)). \quad (261)$$

In particular $\bar{S}_0 = \text{Id}$, and $(\bar{S}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ appears to be a *non-linear semi-group*: the bar notation reminds of the non-linearity when writing \bar{S}_t alone. The semigroup $(\bar{S}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the analog of the previous dual semi-group.

Finally a nonlinear Markov process in the sense of McKean with initial distribution $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a time-inhomogeneous Markov process with transition functions of the form

$$\bar{P}_{s,t} = P_{t-s}^{\bar{S}_s(f_0)},$$

for $s \leq t$. This corresponds to the construction of Johnson [Joh68] established when the state space E is the 2-state space $E = \{-1, +1\}$.

The nonlinear evolution system is defined for any $s \leq t$ by

$$\forall \varphi \in B_p(E), \quad \bar{T}_{s,t}\varphi(x) = \int_E \varphi(y)\bar{P}_{s,t}(x, dy) = \int_E \varphi(y)P_{t-s}^{f_s}(x, dy).$$

In the above expression, $f_s := \bar{S}_s(f_0)$ is the law at time s of the associated nonlinear Markov process in the sense of McKean. Its right generator is given by:

$$L_{f_t}\varphi(x) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{T}_{t,t+\varepsilon}\varphi(x) - \varphi(x)}{\varepsilon} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_E \varphi(y)P_\varepsilon^{f_t}(x, dy) - \varphi(x)}{\varepsilon},$$

from which it can be seen that it depends on f_t only. With this particular form for the dependence in time, the forward Kolmogorov equation given in Example D.53 thus appears to be the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation satisfied by the law of the solution of the McKean-Vlasov diffusion SDE

$$d\bar{X}_t = b(\bar{X}_t, f_t)dt + \sigma(\bar{X}_t, f_t)dB_t, \quad \bar{X}_t \sim f_t,$$

the wellposedness of which has been studied in Proposition 2.7.

D.6 Large Deviation Principles and Sanov theorem

Definition D.55 (Large Deviation Principle). Given a sequence sequence $(a_N)_N$ of positive numbers $a_N \rightarrow 0$ and a non-negative lower-semicontinuous function I on E , a sequence $(\mu_N)_N$ in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ satisfies a Large Deviation Principle (LDP) with speed a_N and rate function I when for any Borel set $A \subset E$, it holds that

$$-\inf_{\bar{A}} I \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} a_N \log \mu_N(A) \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} a_N \log \mu_N(A) \leq -\inf_{\bar{A}} I,$$

where \bar{A} and $\overset{\circ}{A}$ denote respectively the interior and closure of A .

Given a sequence $(X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of i.i.d. real-valued random variables, Cramér's theorem states that the sequence of the laws $\text{Law}(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X^i)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfies a LDP with rate function $\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} (tx - \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX^1)])$ and speed $a_N = 1/N$. By taking the image random variables $\varphi(X^1), \varphi(X^2), \dots$ for a fixed test function φ , a LDP can be obtained for the sequence of laws $\text{Law}(\langle \mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}, \varphi \rangle)$, where $\mathcal{X}^N = (X^1, \dots, X^N)$. However, in this case, the rate function depends on the choice of the test function φ . A more precise theorem which gives a LDP for the laws of the sequence of empirical measures is Sanov theorem.

Theorem D.56 (Sanov). *Let μ be a probability measure on a Polish space E , and let $(X^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent μ -distributed random variables. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we recall the notation $\mathcal{X}^N = (X^1, \dots, X^N) \in E^N$. Then the laws in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(E))$ of the measure-valued random variables $\mu_{\mathcal{X}^N}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with speed N^{-1} and rate function the relative entropy $\nu \mapsto H(\nu|\mu)$.*

D.7 Girsanov transform

There are many versions of Girsanov theorem. We do not give the most general result (which can be found for instance in [Le 16, Theorem 5.22]) but only the one which will be used in this review and which can be found in [KS98, Chapter 3, Theorem 5.1].

Theorem D.57 (Girsanov). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space and let $(B_t)_t$ be a d -dimensional Brownian motion on this space with $\mathbb{P}(B_0 = 0) = 1$. Let $(X_t)_t$ be a \mathbb{R}^d -valued adapted measurable process and let the process be defined (whenever it exists) for $t < +\infty$ by:*

$$H_t := \int_0^t X_s \cdot dB_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |X_s|^2 ds.$$

Let \mathbb{Q} the probability measure on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) defined by its Radon-Nikodym derivative on each \mathcal{F}_T , $T < +\infty$:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_T} = \exp(H_T).$$

Assume that $\exp(H)$ is a martingale and let us define the process

$$\tilde{B}_t = B_t - \int_0^t X_s ds.$$

Then for each fixed $T \in [0, +\infty)$, $(\tilde{B}_t)_{t \leq T}$ is a Brownian motion on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_T})$.

D.8 Poisson random measures

This section briefly explains how to model jump processes using Poisson random measures. The theory of random measures is explained in great details in [JS03]. Another classical reference on stochastic integration with respect to random measures is [IW89]. The following presentation is also inspired by [BM15, Appendix A] and [Mur77, Section 3].

Let us fix a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P})$.

Definition D.58 (Poisson random measure). Let (\mathcal{E}, μ) be a measurable Polish space endowed with a σ -finite measure μ . Let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E})$ be the set of all measures λ on \mathcal{E} which are expressed as a countable sum of Dirac measures on \mathcal{E} and such that $\lambda(\mathcal{A}) < +\infty$ for any μ -finite set \mathcal{A} . A Poisson random measure with intensity μ is a mapping $\mathcal{N} : \Omega \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E})$ with the following properties.

- (i) The mapping $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto \mathcal{N}(\omega, \mathcal{A})$ is measurable for any μ -finite set \mathcal{A} .
- (ii) For every disjoint μ -finite sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$, the random variables $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A}_j)$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, are independent and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A}_j)$ follows a Poisson distribution on \mathbb{N} with parameter $\mu(\mathcal{A}_j)$.

We will only consider the case $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta$ where Θ is a Polish space and μ is of the form $\mu(dt, dx) = dt \otimes \nu(d\theta)$. The results below also extend to the case where ν is replaced by a family of σ -finite measures $(\nu_t)_t$ on Θ which depend on the time parameter. The Poisson random measure \mathcal{N} is assumed to be *adapted* which means that it satisfies the following properties.

- (i) $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A})$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable for each Borel measurable set $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, t] \times \Theta)$ with $t > 0$
- (ii) The σ -field generated by $\{\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}((t, +\infty) \times \Theta)\}$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_t .

Some ideas on the construction of the stochastic integral against \mathcal{N} are gathered below.

To better understand what a Poisson random measure does, it is useful to consider first the case $\nu(\Theta) < +\infty$. In this case, on every finite time interval $[0, T]$, $\mathcal{N}_t(\Theta) := \mathcal{N}((0, t] \times \Theta)$ defines a classical Poisson process. The Poisson random measure \mathcal{N} can be shown to admit the representation:

$$\mathcal{N}(dt, d\theta) = \sum_{n=1}^{\gamma} \delta_{(T_n, \theta_n)}(dt, d\theta),$$

where T_1, \dots, T_γ are the jump times of $\mathcal{N}_t(\Theta)$ and θ_n are i.i.d. random variables with distribution $\nu(d\theta)/\nu(\Theta)$. For any measurable function $a \equiv a(\omega, t, \theta)$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta$ with values in \mathbb{R} , the integral with respect to \mathcal{N} is defined by:

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Theta} a(\omega, s, \theta) \mathcal{N}(ds, d\theta) := \sum_{n=1}^{\gamma} a(\omega, T_n, \theta_n).$$

That is to say, it is the sum of the random amplitudes $a(\omega, T_n, \theta_n)$ added at each jumping time T_n .

To extend the previous construction to the case $\nu(\Theta) = +\infty$, let us consider a predictable real-valued function $a \equiv a(\omega, t, \theta)$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta$. We do not write the dependence in ω in the following. We recall that $(\Theta, \nu(d\theta))$ is σ -finite, so there exists an increasing sequence of subsets $(\Theta_p)_p$ such that $\nu(\Theta_p) < +\infty$ and $\Theta = \cup_p \Theta_p$. By the previous construction, the integral of a against \mathcal{N} is well-defined on each subset $[0, T] \times \Theta_p$. There are two cases to distinguish.

1. When a satisfies the L^1 condition

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \int_{\Theta} |a(s, \theta)| \nu(d\theta) ds \right] < +\infty,$$

it is possible to show that the sequence $\left(\int_0^T \int_{\Theta_p} a(s, \theta) \mathcal{N}(ds, d\theta) \right)_p$ is Cauchy in L^1 .

Its limit is denoted by $\int_0^T \int_{\Theta} a(s, \theta) \mathcal{N}(ds, d\theta)$. In this case, the process

$$M_t = \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} a(s, \theta) \mathcal{N}(ds, d\theta) - \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} a(s, \theta) \nu(d\theta) ds, \quad (262)$$

is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale (in fact, M_t characterises \mathcal{N}).

2. When a satisfies the L^2 condition

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \int_{\Theta} |a(s, \theta)|^2 \nu(d\theta) ds \right] < +\infty,$$

then it is possible to prove that (262) still defines a square integrable martingale with quadratic variation

$$\langle M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} |a(s, \theta)|^2 \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(ds, d\theta),$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(dt, d\theta) := \mathcal{N}(dt, d\theta) - \nu(d\theta)dt,$$

is called the compensated measure of \mathcal{N} . Note however that the quantity $\int_0^T \int_{\Theta} a(s, \theta) \mathcal{N}(ds, d\theta)$ may not be defined.

The next step is to make sense of the jump-diffusion SDE:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \alpha(X_{s-}, \theta) \mathcal{N}(ds, d\theta) \\ + \int_0^t \int_{\Theta} \tilde{\alpha}(X_{s-}, \theta) \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(ds, d\theta), \end{aligned} \quad (263)$$

where this time $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha} : E \times \Theta \rightarrow E$ for $E = \mathbb{R}^d$. We always assume the following Lipschitz integrability conditions:

- (i) For all $x \in E$ and $T > 0$, it holds that $\int_0^T \int_{\Theta} |\alpha(x, \theta)| \nu(d\theta) < +\infty$ and $\int_0^T \int_{\Theta} |\tilde{\alpha}(x, \theta)|^2 \nu(d\theta) < +\infty$.
- (ii) There exists $C > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in E$,

$$|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|^2 + |b(x) - b(y)|^2 + \int_{\Theta} |\tilde{\alpha}(x, \theta) - \tilde{\alpha}(y, \theta)|^2 \nu(d\theta) \leq C|x - y|^2.$$

In the classical theory of SDE (see [IW89, Chapter IV, Section 9]) the Lipschitz integrability condition

$$\int_{\Theta} |\alpha(x, \theta) - \alpha(y, \theta)|^p \nu(d\theta) \leq C|x - y|^p$$

with $p = 2$ is also assumed. However, from a modelling point of view, it makes more sense in the context of this review to assume this condition with $p = 1$ (see [ADF18, Remark 2.1] or the introduction of [Gra92a]). In this L^1 setting, strong existence and uniqueness for the SDE (263) is proved in [Gra92a, Theorem 1.2]. Moreover, the generator of the process is the sum of the three generators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\varphi(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^d b(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d (\sigma \sigma^T)_{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \varphi(x), \\ \mathcal{J}\varphi(x) &= \int_{\Theta} \{\varphi(x + \alpha(x, \theta)) - \varphi(x)\} \nu(d\theta), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{J}}\varphi(x) &= \int_{\Theta} \{\varphi(x + \tilde{\alpha}(x, \theta)) - \varphi(x) - \tilde{\alpha}(x, \theta) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x)\} \nu(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

References

- [Ace+05] J. A. Acebrón, L. L. Bonilla, C. J. Pérez Vicente, F. Ritort, and R. Spigler. “The Kuramoto model: A simple paradigm for synchronization phenomena”. In: *Rev. Modern Phys.* 77.1 (2005), pp. 137–185.
- [AH10] S. M. Ahn and S.-Y. Ha. “Stochastic flocking dynamics of the Cucker–Smale model with multiplicative white noises”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 51.10 (2010), p. 103301.
- [Alb+19] G. Albi, N. Bellomo, L. Fermo, S.-Y. Ha, J. Kim, L. Pareschi, D. Poyato, and J. Soler. “Vehicular traffic, crowds, and swarms: From kinetic theory and multiscale methods to applications and research perspectives”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 29.10 (2019), pp. 1901–2005.

- [AGS08] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient Flows in Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. 2nd ed. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2008.
- [ADF18] L. Andreis, P. Dai Pra, and M. Fischer. “McKean–Vlasov limit for interacting systems with simultaneous jumps”. In: *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 36.6 (2018), pp. 960–995.
- [Ayi17] N. Ayi. “From Newton’s Law to the Linear Boltzmann Equation Without Cut-Off”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 350.3 (2017), pp. 1219–1274.
- [Bab86] H. Babovsky. “On a simulation scheme for the Boltzmann equation”. In: *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 8.1 (1986), pp. 223–233.
- [BI89] H. Babovsky and R. Illner. “A convergence proof for Nanbu’s simulation method for the full Boltzmann equation”. In: *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 26.1 (1989), pp. 45–65.
- [Bak94] D. Bakry. “L’hypercontractivité et son utilisation en théorie des semi-groupes”. In: *Lectures on Probability Theory: Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXII-1992*. Ed. by D. Bakry, R. D. Gill, S. A. Molchanov, and P. Bernard. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1994, pp. 1–114.
- [BÉ85] D. Bakry and M. Émery. “Diffusions hypercontractives”. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XIX 1983/84*. Ed. by J. Azéma and M. Yor. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1123. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985, pp. 177–206. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Mathematics.
- [Bal+08] M. Ballerini, N. Cabibbo, R. Candelier, A. Cavagna, E. Cisbani, I. Giardinà, V. Lecomte, A. Orlandi, G. Parisi, A. Procaccini, M. Viale, and V. Zdravkovic. “Interaction ruling animal collective behavior depends on topological rather than metric distance: Evidence from a field study”. In: *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 105.4 (2008), pp. 1232–1237.
- [BM15] V. Bansaye and S. Méléard. *Stochastic Models for Structured Populations*. Mathematical Biosciences Institute Lecture Series 1.4. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2015.
- [BDT17] N. Bellomo, P. Degond, and E. Tadmor, eds. *Active Particles, Volume 1: Advances in Theory, Models, and Applications*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [BDT19] N. Bellomo, P. Degond, and E. Tadmor, eds. *Active Particles, Volume 2: Advances in Theory, Models, and Applications*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [BB90] G. Ben Arous and M. Brunaud. “Methode de Laplace: étude variationnelle des fluctuations de diffusions de type “champ moyen””. In: *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports* 31.1-4 (1990), pp. 79–144.
- [BZ99] G. Ben Arous and O. Zeitouni. “Increasing propagation of chaos for mean field models”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 35.1 (1999), pp. 85–102.

- [BRV98] S. Benachour, B. Roynette, and P. Vallois. “Nonlinear self-stabilizing processes – II: Convergence to invariant probability”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 75 (1998), pp. 203–224.
- [Ben+98] D. Benedetto, E. Caglioti, J. A. Carrillo, and M. Pulvirenti. “A Non-Maxwellian Steady Distribution for One-Dimensional Granular Media”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 91.5/6 (1998), pp. 979–990.
- [BCP97] D. Benedetto, E. Caglioti, and M. Pulvirenti. “A kinetic equation for granular media”. In: *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 31.5 (1997), pp. 615–641.
- [Ber+19] L. Berlyand, R. Creese, P.-E. Jabin, and M. Potomkin. “Continuum Approximations to Systems of Correlated Interacting Particles”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 174.4 (2019), pp. 808–829.
- [BÖ19] R. J. Berman and M. Önnheim. “Propagation of Chaos for a Class of First Order Models with Singular Mean Field Interactions”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 51.1 (2019), pp. 159–196.
- [BDG06] E. Bertin, M. Droz, and G. Grégoire. “Boltzmann and hydrodynamic description for self-propelled particles”. In: *Phys. Rev. E* 74.2 (2006), p. 022101.
- [BDG09] E. Bertin, M. Droz, and G. Grégoire. “Hydrodynamic equations for self-propelled particles: microscopic derivation and stability analysis”. In: *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 42 (2009), p. 445001.
- [BGP09] L. Bertini, G. Giacomin, and K. Pakdaman. “Dynamical Aspects of Mean Field Plane Rotators and the Kuramoto Model”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 138 (2009), pp. 270–290.
- [BGP14] L. Bertini, G. Giacomin, and C. Poquet. “Synchronization and random long time dynamics for mean-field plane rotators”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 160.3-4 (2014), pp. 593–653.
- [BGK54] P. L. Bhatnagar, E. P. Gross, and M. Krook. “A Model for Collision Processes in Gases. I. Small Amplitude Processes in Charged and Neutral One-Component Systems”. In: *Phys. Rev.* 94.3 (1954), pp. 511–525.
- [Bil99] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. 2nd ed. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. New York: Wiley, 1999.
- [Bir70] G. A. Bird. “Direct Simulation and the Boltzmann Equation”. In: *Phys. Fluids* 13.11 (1970), p. 2676.
- [BD16] A. Blanchet and P. Degond. “Topological Interactions in a Boltzmann-Type Framework”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 163.1 (2016), pp. 41–60.
- [BD17] A. Blanchet and P. Degond. “Kinetic Models for Topological Nearest-Neighbor Interactions”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 169.5 (2017), pp. 929–950.
- [BGS16] T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, and L. Saint-Raymond. “The Brownian motion as the limit of a deterministic system of hard-spheres”. In: *Invent. math.* 203.2 (Feb. 2016), pp. 493–553.

- [BGS17] T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, and L. Saint-Raymond. “From Hard Sphere Dynamics to the Stokes–Fourier Equations: An Analysis of the Boltzmann–Grad Limit”. In: *Ann. PDE* 3.1 (2017), p. 2.
- [Bod+18] T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, and S. Simonella. “One-sided convergence in the Boltzmann–Grad limit”. In: *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)* 27.5 (2018), pp. 985–1022.
- [Bod+20] T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, and S. Simonella. “Statistical dynamics of a hard sphere gas: fluctuating Boltzmann equation and large deviations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.10403* (2020).
- [Bol10] F. Bolley. “Quantitative concentration inequalities on sample path space for mean field interaction”. In: *ESAIM Probab. Stat.* 14 (2010), pp. 192–209.
- [BCC11] F. Bolley, J. A. Cañizo, and J. A. Carrillo. “Stochastic mean-field limit: non-Lipschitz forces and swarming”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 21.11 (2011), pp. 2179–2210. Publisher: World Scientific.
- [BCC12] F. Bolley, J. A. Cañizo, and J. A. Carrillo. “Mean-field limit for the stochastic Vicsek model”. In: *Appl. Math. Lett.* 25.3 (2012), pp. 339–343. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [BGG12] F. Bolley, I. Gentil, and A. Guillin. “Convergence to equilibrium in Wasserstein distance for Fokker–Planck equations”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 263.8 (2012), pp. 2430–2457.
- [BGG13] F. Bolley, I. Gentil, and A. Guillin. “Uniform Convergence to Equilibrium for Granular Media”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 208.2 (May 2013), pp. 429–445.
- [BGM10] F. Bolley, A. Guillin, and F. Malrieu. “Trend to equilibrium and particle approximation for a weakly selfconsistent Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation”. In: *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 44 (2010), pp. 867–884.
- [BGV06] F. Bolley, A. Guillin, and C. Villani. “Quantitative concentration inequalities for empirical measures on non-compact spaces”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 137 (2006), pp. 541–593.
- [BV05] F. Bolley and C. Villani. “Weighted Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequalities and applications to transportation inequalities”. In: *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)* 14.3 (2005), pp. 331–352.
- [Bol86] E. Bolthausen. “Laplace approximations for sums of independent random vectors”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 72.2 (1986), pp. 305–318.
- [Bol72] L. Boltzmann. “Weitere Studien über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter Gasmolekülen”. In: *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften* 66 (1872), pp. 275–370. Translation : Further studies on the thermal equilibrium of gas molecules, in *Kinetic Theory 2*, 88–174, Ed. S.G. Brush, Pergamon, Oxford (1966).
- [Bos05] M. Bossy. “Some stochastic particle methods for nonlinear parabolic PDEs”. In: *ESAIM Proc.* 15 (Jan. 2005).

- [BC10] M. Bossy and N. Champagnat. “Markov Processes”. In: *Encyclopedia of Quantitative Finance*. Ed. by R. Cont. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2010.
- [BFT15] M. Bossy, O. Faugeras, and D. Talay. “Clarification and Complement to “Mean-Field Description and Propagation of Chaos in Networks of Hodgkin–Huxley and FitzHugh–Nagumo Neurons””. In: *J. Math. Neurosci.* 5.19 (2015).
- [BT96] M. Bossy and D. Talay. “Convergence rate for the approximation of the limit law of weakly interacting particles: application to the Burgers equation”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 6.3 (1996).
- [BT97] M. Bossy and D. Talay. “A Stochastic Particle Method for the McKean–Vlasov and the Burgers Equation”. In: *Math. Comp.* 66.217 (1997), pp. 157–192.
- [Böt14] B. Böttcher. “Feller evolution systems: Generators and approximation”. In: *Stoch. Dyn.* 14.03 (2014), p. 1350025.
- [BSW13] B. Böttcher, R. Schilling, and J. Wang. *Lévy Matters III. Lévy-type processes: construction, approximation and sample path properties*. Lévy Matters 3. Springer International Publishing, 2013.
- [BJW19] D. Bresch, P.-E. Jabin, and Z. Wang. “On mean-field limits and quantitative estimates with a large class of singular kernels: Application to the Patlak–Keller–Segel model”. In: *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 357.9 (2019), pp. 708–720.
- [BM21] M. Briant and S. Merino-Aceituno. “Cauchy theory and mean-field limit for general Vicsek models in collective dynamics”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2004.00883* (2021).
- [CP83] P. Calderoni and M. Pulvirenti. “Propagation of chaos for Burgers’ equation”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Physique théorique* 39.1 (1983), pp. 85–97.
- [CY18] J. A. Cañizo and H. Yolda. “Asymptotic behaviour of neuron population models structured by elapsed-time”. In: *Nonlinearity* 32 (Mar. 2018).
- [Car10] P. Cardaliaguet. “Notes on mean field games (from P.-L. Lions’ lectures at Collège de France)”. In: *Lecture given at Tor Vergata*. 2010, pp. 1–59.
- [Car+19] P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, J.-M. Lasry, and P.-L. Lions. *The Master Equation and the Convergence Problem in Mean Field Games*. Annals of Mathematics Studies 201. Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [Car+15] E. Carlen, M. C. Carvalho, P. Degond, and B. Wennberg. “A Boltzmann model for rod alignment and schooling fish”. In: *Nonlinearity* 28.6 (2015), pp. 1783–1803.
- [CCG00] E. Carlen, M. C. Carvalho, and E. Gabetta. “Central limit theorem for Maxwellian molecules and truncation of the Wild expansion”. In: *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 53.3 (2000), pp. 370–397.
- [Car+08] E. Carlen, M. C. Carvalho, J. Le Roux, M. Loss, and C. Villani. “Entropy and chaos in the Kac model”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 3 (Sept. 2008).

- [Car+13] E. Carlen, R. Chatelin, P. Degond, and B. Wennberg. “Kinetic hierarchy and propagation of chaos in biological swarm models”. In: *Phys. D* 260 (Oct. 2013), pp. 90–111.
- [CDW13] E. Carlen, P. Degond, and B. Wennberg. “Kinetic limits for pair-interaction driven master equations and biological swarm models”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 23.7 (2013), pp. 1339–1376.
- [Car16] R. Carmona. *Lectures on BSDEs, Stochastic Control, and Stochastic Differential Games with Financial Applications*. SIAM, 2016.
- [CD18a] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I, Mean Field FBSDEs, Control, and Games*. Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling 83. Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [CD18b] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications II, Mean Field Games with Common Noise and Master Equations*. Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling 84. Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [Car15] K. Carrapatoso. “Propagation of chaos for the spatially homogeneous Landau equation for Maxwellian molecules”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 9.1 (Oct. 2015), pp. 1–49.
- [Car+18] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, C. Totzeck, and O. Tse. “An analytical framework for consensus-based global optimization method”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 28.06 (2018), pp. 1037–1066.
- [Car+10] J. A. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, G. Toscani, and F. Vecil. “Particle, kinetic, and hydrodynamic models of swarming”. In: *Mathematical Modeling of Collective Behavior in Socio-Economic and Life Sciences*. Ed. by G. Naldi, L. Pareschi, and G. Toscani. Birkhäuser Boston, 2010, pp. 297–336.
- [Car+21] J. A. Carrillo, S. Jin, L. Li, and Y. Zhu. “A consensus-based global optimization method for high dimensional machine learning problems”. In: *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 27 (2021), S5.
- [CCH14] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and M. Hauray. “The derivation of swarming models: Mean-field limit and Wasserstein distances”. In: *Collective Dynamics from Bacteria to Crowds*. Ed. by A. Muntean and F. Toschi. CISM International Centre for Mechanical Sciences 553. Springer, Vienna, 2014, pp. 1–46.
- [CCS19] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and S. Salem. “Propagation of chaos for the Vlasov–Poisson–Fokker–Planck equation with a polynomial cut-off”. In: *Commun. Contemp. Math.* 21.4 (2019).
- [CDP09] J. A. Carrillo, M. R. D’Orsogna, and V. Panferov. “Double milling in self-propelled swarms from kinetic theory”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 2.2 (2009), pp. 363–378.
- [CDP20] J. A. Carrillo, M. Delgadino, and G. Pavliotis. “A λ -convexity based proof for the propagation of chaos for weakly interacting stochastic particles”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 279.10 (2020).

- [CMV03] J. A. Carrillo, R. J. McCann, and C. Villani. “Kinetic equilibration rates for granular media and related equations: entropy dissipation and mass transportation estimates”. In: *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* 19 (2003), pp. 971–1018.
- [CMV06] J. A. Carrillo, R. J. McCann, and C. Villani. “Contractions in the 2-Wasserstein Length Space and Thermalization of Granular Media”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 17 (Feb. 2006), pp. 217–263.
- [CGM08] P. Cattiaux, A. Guillin, and F. Malrieu. “Probabilistic approach for granular media equations in the non-uniformly convex case”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 140 (2008), pp. 19–40.
- [CDP18] P. Cattiaux, F. Delebecque, and L. Pédèches. “Stochastic Cucker–Smale models: Old and new”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 28.5 (2018).
- [Cer88] C. Cercignani. *The Boltzmann Equation and Its Applications*. Applied Mathematical Sciences 67. Springer New York, 1988.
- [Cer06] C. Cercignani. *Ludwig Boltzmann, the Man Who Trusted Atoms*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [CIP94] C. Cercignani, R. Illner, and M. Pulvirenti. *The Mathematical Theory of Dilute Gases*. Applied Mathematical Sciences 106. Springer-Verlag New York, 1994.
- [CD11] T. Champion and L. De Pascale. “The Monge problem in \mathbb{R}^d ”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 157.3 (2011), pp. 551–572.
- [CST19] J.-F. Chassagneux, L. Szpruch, and A. Tse. “Weak quantitative propagation of chaos via differential calculus on the space of measures”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.02556* (2019).
- [Cha+08] H. Chaté, F. Ginelli, G. Grégoire, and F. Raynaud. “Collective motion of self-propelled particles interacting without cohesion”. In: *Phys. Rev. E* 77.4 (2008), p. 046113.
- [Cha20] P.-E. Chaudru de Raynal. “Strong well posedness of McKean–Vlasov stochastic differential equations with Hölder drift”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 130 (2020), pp. 79–107.
- [CF19a] P.-E. Chaudru de Raynal and N. Frikha. “From the backward Kolmogorov PDE on the Wasserstein space to propagation of chaos for McKean–Vlasov SDE’s”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01410* (2019).
- [CF19b] P.-E. Chaudru de Raynal and N. Frikha. “Well-posedness for some non-linear diffusion processes and related PDE on the Wasserstein space”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:1811.06904* (2019). arXiv: 1811.06904.
- [Che+20] L. Chen, E. S. Daus, A. Holzinger, and A. Jüngel. “Rigorous derivation of population cross-diffusion systems from moderately interacting particle systems”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2010.12389* (2020). arXiv: 2010.12389.
- [Che17] J. Chevallier. “Mean-field limit of generalized Hawkes processes”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 127.12 (2017), pp. 3870–3912.

- [Chi94] T.-S. Chiang. “McKean-Vlasov equations with discontinuous coefficients”. In: *Soochow Journal of Mathematics* 20.4 (1994), pp. 507–526.
- [CB18] L. Chizat and F. Bach. “On the Global Convergence of Gradient Descent for Over-parameterized Models using Optimal Transport”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31 (NeurIPS 2018)*. Ed. by S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett. Montreal, Canada: Curran Associates, Inc., 2018, pp. 3040–3050.
- [CS18] Y.-P. Choi and S. Salem. “Propagation of chaos for aggregation equations with no-flux boundary conditions and sharp sensing zones”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 28.02 (2018), pp. 223–258.
- [CS19a] Y.-P. Choi and S. Salem. “Collective behavior models with vision geometrical constraints: Truncated noises and propagation of chaos”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 266.9 (2019), pp. 6109–6148.
- [CS19b] Y.-P. Choi and S. Salem. “Cucker-Smale flocking particles with multiplicative noises: Stochastic mean-field limit and phase transition”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 12.3 (2019), pp. 573–592.
- [Cho73] A. J. Chorin. “Numerical study of slightly viscous flow”. In: *J. Fluid Mech.* 57.4 (1973), pp. 785–796.
- [CDF21] G. Clarté, A. Diez, and J. Feydy. “Collective Proposal Distributions for Nonlinear MCMC samplers: Mean-Field Theory and Fast Implementation”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:1909.08988* (2021).
- [CF16a] M. Coghi and F. Flandoli. “Propagation of chaos for interacting particles subject to environmental noise”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 26.3 (2016).
- [CF16b] R. Cortez and J. Fontbona. “Quantitative propagation of chaos for generalized Kac particle systems”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 26.2 (2016), pp. 892–916.
- [CF18] R. Cortez and J. Fontbona. “Quantitative Uniform Propagation of Chaos for Maxwell Molecules”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 357.3 (Feb. 2018), pp. 913–941.
- [CD02] D. Crisan and A. Doucet. “A survey of convergence results on particle filtering methods for practitioners”. In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 50.3 (2002), pp. 736–746.
- [Csi84] I. Csiszár. “Sanov Property, Generalized I-Projection and a Conditional Limit Theorem”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 12.3 (1984), pp. 768–793.
- [CS07] F. Cucker and S. Smale. “On the mathematics of emergence”. In: *Jpn. J. Math.* 2.1 (2007), pp. 197–227.
- [DOr+06] M. R. D’Orsogna, Y. L. Chuang, A. L. Bertozzi, and L. S. Chayes. “Self-Propelled Particles with Soft-Core Interactions: Patterns, Stability, and Collapse”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96.10 (2006), p. 104302.
- [DH96] P. Dai Pra and F. den Hollander. “McKean-Vlasov limit for interacting random processes in random media”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 84 (Aug. 1996), pp. 735–772.

- [DS14] S. Danieri and G. Savaré. “Lecture notes on gradient flows and optimal transport”. In: *Optimal Transportation*. Ed. by H. Pajot, Y. Ollivier, and C. Villani. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 100–144.
- [Daw93] D. Dawson. “Measure-valued Markov processes”. In: *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXI-1991*. Ed. by P. Hennequin. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1541. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1993.
- [DG87] D. Dawson and J. Gärtner. “Large deviations from the McKean-Vlasov limit for weakly interacting diffusions”. In: *Stochastics* 20.4 (1987).
- [DV95] D. Dawson and J. Vaillancourt. “Stochastic McKean-Vlasov equations”. In: *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 2 (1995), pp. 199–229.
- [Daw83] D. A. Dawson. “Critical dynamics and fluctuations for a mean-field model of cooperative behavior”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 31.1 (Apr. 1983), pp. 29–85.
- [DH82] D. A. Dawson and K. J. Hochberg. “Wandering Random Measures in the Fleming-Viot Model”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 10.3 (1982).
- [De +20] V. De Bortoli, A. Durmus, X. Fontaine, and U. Simsekli. “Quantitative Propagation of Chaos for SGD in Wide Neural Networks”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2007.06352* (2020).
- [De +15] A. De Masi, A. Galves, E. Löcherbach, and E. Presutti. “Hydrodynamic Limit for Interacting Neurons”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 158.4 (2015), pp. 866–902.
- [DP19] P. Degond and M. Pulvirenti. “Propagation of chaos for topological interactions”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 29.4 (2019).
- [Deg04] P. Degond. “Macroscopic limits of the Boltzmann equation: a review”. In: *Modeling and Computational Methods for Kinetic Equations*. Ed. by N. Bellomo, P. Degond, L. Pareschi, and G. Russo. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser Boston, 2004, pp. 3–57. Series Title: Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology.
- [Deg18] P. Degond. “Mathematical models of collective dynamics and self-organization”. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians ICM 2018*. Vol. 4. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Aug. 2018, pp. 3943–3964.
- [DFL15] P. Degond, A. Frouvelle, and J.-G. Liu. “Phase Transitions, Hysteresis, and Hyperbolicity for Self-Organized Alignment Dynamics”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 216.1 (2015), pp. 63–115.
- [Deg+19] P. Degond, A. Frouvelle, S. Merino-Aceituno, and A. Trescases. “Alignment of Self-propelled Rigid Bodies: From Particle Systems to Macroscopic Equations”. In: *Stochastic Dynamics Out of Equilibrium, Institut Henri Poincaré, Paris, France, 2017*. Ed. by G. Giacomin, S. Olla, E. Saada, H. Spohn, and G. Stoltz. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 282. Springer, Cham, 2019, pp. 28–66.
- [Deg+17] P. Degond, J.-G. Liu, S. Merino-Aceituno, and T. Tardiveau. “Continuum dynamics of the intention field under weakly cohesive social interaction”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 27.01 (2017), pp. 159–182.

- [DM20] P. Degond and S. Merino-Aceituno. “Nematic alignment of self-propelled particles: From particle to macroscopic dynamics”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 30.10 (2020), pp. 1935–1986.
- [DM08] P. Degond and S. Motsch. “Continuum limit of self-driven particles with orientation interaction”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 18.Suppl. (2008), pp. 1193–1215.
- [DT18] P. Del Moral and J. Tugaut. “On the stability and the uniform propagation of chaos properties of Ensemble Kalman–Bucy filters”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 28.2 (2018).
- [Del98] P. Del Moral. “Measure-valued processes and interacting particle systems. Application to nonlinear filtering problems”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 8 (1998), pp. 438–495.
- [Del04] P. Del Moral. *Feynman-Kac Formulae, Genealogical and Interacting Particle Systems with Applications*. Probability and Its Applications. Springer-Verlag New York, 2004.
- [Del13] P. Del Moral. *Mean field simulation for Monte Carlo integration*. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability 126. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2013.
- [DKT17] P. Del Moral, A. Kurtzmann, and J. Tugaut. “On the Stability and the Uniform Propagation of Chaos of a Class of Extended Ensemble Kalman-Bucy Filters”. In: *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 55.1 (Jan. 2017), pp. 119–155.
- [DT19] P. Del Moral and J. Tugaut. “Uniform propagation of chaos and creation of chaos for a class of nonlinear diffusions”. In: *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 37.6 (2019), pp. 909–935.
- [DFH16] S. Delattre, N. Fournier, and M. Hoffmann. “Hawkes processes on large networks”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 26.1 (2016).
- [DGP21] M. G. Delgadino, R. S. Gvalani, and G. A. Pavliotis. “On the Diffusive-Mean Field Limit for Weakly Interacting Diffusions Exhibiting Phase Transitions”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* (2021).
- [DGM99] L. Desvillettes, C. Graham, and S. Méléard. “Probabilistic Interpretation and Numerical Approximation of a Kac Equation without Cut-off”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 84.1 (1999), pp. 115–135.
- [DF80] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman. “Finite Exchangeable Sequences”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 8.4 (Aug. 1980), pp. 745–764.
- [Die20] A. Diez. “Propagation of chaos and moderate interaction for a piecewise deterministic system of geometrically enriched particles”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 25 (2020).
- [DM16] G. Dimarco and S. Motsch. “Self-alignment driven by jump processes: Macroscopic limit and numerical investigation”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 26.07 (2016), pp. 1385–1410.
- [DP14] G. Dimarco and L. Pareschi. “Numerical methods for kinetic equations”. In: *Acta Numerica* 23 (2014), pp. 369–520.

- [DL21a] Z. Ding and Q. Li. “Ensemble Kalman inversion: mean-field limit and convergence analysis”. In: *Stat. Comput.* 31.1 (2021), p. 9.
- [DL21b] Z. Ding and Q. Li. “Ensemble Kalman Sampler: Mean-field Limit and Convergence Analysis”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 53.2 (2021), pp. 1546–1578.
- [Dob79] R. L. Dobrushin. “Vlasov equations”. In: *Funct. Anal. Appl.* 13.2 (Apr. 1979), pp. 115–123.
- [DK96] P. Donnelly and T. G. Kurtz. “A countable representation of the Fleming-Viot measure-valued diffusion”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 24.2 (1996).
- [DFG01] A. Doucet, N. Freitas, and N. Gordon, eds. *Sequential Monte Carlo Methods in Practice*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer-Verlag New York, 2001.
- [Due16] M. Duerinckx. “Mean-Field Limits for Some Riesz Interaction Gradient Flows”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 48.3 (2016), pp. 2269–2300.
- [Dür+20] B. Düring, N. Georgiou, S. Merino-Aceituno, and E. Scalas. “Continuum and thermodynamic limits for a simple random-exchange model”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2003.00930* (2020).
- [DTW19] B. Düring, M. Torregrossa, and M.-T. Wolfram. “Boltzmann and Fokker–Planck Equations Modelling the Elo Rating System with Learning Effects”. In: *J. Nonlinear Sci.* 29.3 (2019), pp. 1095–1128.
- [Dur+20] A. Durmus, A. Eberle, A. Guillin, and R. Zimmer. “An elementary approach to uniform in time propagation of chaos”. In: *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* (2020).
- [Ebe16] A. Eberle. “Reflection couplings and contraction rates for diffusions”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 166 (2016), pp. 851–886.
- [EGZ19] A. Eberle, A. Guillin, and R. Zimmer. “Quantitative Harris-type theorems for diffusions and McKean-Vlasov processes”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 371 (2019), pp. 7135–7173.
- [EM90] N. El Karoui and S. Méléard. “Martingale measures and stochastic calculus”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 84.1 (1990), pp. 83–101.
- [Ern21] X. Erny. “Well-posedness and propagation of chaos for McKean-Vlasov equations with jumps and locally Lipschitz coefficients”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2102.06472* (2021).
- [Eth00] A. Etheridge. *An introduction to superprocesses*. University Lecture Series 20. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [Eth11] A. Etheridge. *Some Mathematical Models from Population Genetics. École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXIX-2009*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
- [EK86] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. New York: Wiley, 1986.

- [FM01a] M. Feldman and R. J. McCann. “Monge’s transport problem on a Riemannian manifold”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 354.4 (2001), pp. 1667–1697.
- [FFG92] R. Ferland, X. Fernique, and G. Giroux. “Compactness of the Fluctuations Associated with some Generalized Nonlinear Boltzmann Equations”. In: *Canad. J. Math.* 44.6 (Dec. 1992), pp. 1192–1205.
- [FM97] B. Fernandez and S. Méléard. “A Hilbertian approach for fluctuations on the McKean-Vlasov model”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 71.1 (Oct. 1997), pp. 33–53.
- [FKM18] A. Figalli, M.-J. Kang, and J. Morales. “Global Well-posedness of the Spatially Homogeneous Kolmogorov–Vicsek Model as a Gradient Flow”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 227.3 (2018), pp. 869–896.
- [FV79] W. H. Fleming and M. Viot. “Some Measure-Valued Markov Processes in Population Genetics Theory”. In: *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 28.5 (1979), pp. 817–843.
- [FGM09] J. Fontbona, H. Guérin, and S. Méléard. “Measurability of optimal transportation and convergence rate for Landau type interacting particle systems”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 143.3-4 (2009), pp. 329–351.
- [For+20] M. Fornasier, H. Huang, L. Pareschi, and P. Sünnen. “Consensus-based optimization on hypersurfaces: Well-posedness and mean-field limit”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 30.14 (2020), pp. 2725–2751.
- [Fou09] N. Fournier. “Particle approximation of some Landau equations”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 2.3 (2009), pp. 451–464.
- [FG15] N. Fournier and A. Guillin. “On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 162.3-4 (2015), pp. 707–738. Publisher: Springer.
- [FG17] N. Fournier and A. Guillin. “From a Kac-like particle system to the Landau equation for hard potentials and Maxwell molecules”. In: *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* 50 (2017), pp. 157–199.
- [FH16] N. Fournier and M. Hauray. “Propagation of chaos for the Landau equation with moderately soft potentials”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 44.6 (2016).
- [FHM14] N. Fournier, M. Hauray, and S. Mischler. “Propagation of chaos for the 2D viscous vortex model”. In: *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 16.7 (2014), pp. 1423–1466.
- [FJ17] N. Fournier and B. Jourdain. “Stochastic particle approximation of the Keller–Segel equation and two-dimensional generalization of Bessel processes”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 27.5 (2017).
- [FL16] N. Fournier and E. Löcherbach. “On a toy model of interacting neurons”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 52.4 (2016).
- [FM01b] N. Fournier and S. Méléard. “A Markov Process Associated with a Boltzmann Equation Without Cutoff and for Non-Maxwell Molecules”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 104.1/2 (2001), pp. 359–385.

- [FM01c] N. Fournier and S. Méléard. “Monte-Carlo Approximations and Fluctuations for 2D Boltzmann Equations without Cutoff”. In: *Markov Process. Related Fields* 7.1 (2001), pp. 159–191.
- [FM01d] N. Fournier and S. Méléard. “Monte-Carlo approximations for 2d homogeneous Boltzmann equations without cutoff and for non Maxwell molecules”. In: *Monte Carlo Methods Appl.* 7.1-2 (2001).
- [FM02] N. Fournier and S. Méléard. “A Stochastic Particle Numerical Method for 3D Boltzmann Equations without Cutoff”. In: *Math. Comp.* 71.238 (2002), pp. 583–604.
- [FM16] N. Fournier and S. Mischler. “Rate of convergence of the Nanbu particle system for hard potentials and Maxwell molecules”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 44.1 (Jan. 2016), pp. 589–627.
- [FK20] M. Friesen and O. Kutoviy. “Stochastic Cucker-Smale flocking dynamics of jump-type”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 13.2 (2020), pp. 211–247.
- [Fun84] T. Funaki. “A Certain Class of Diffusion Processes Associated with Non-linear Parabolic Equations”. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 67 (1984), pp. 331–348.
- [GST14] I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, and B. Texier. “From Newton to Boltzmann: Hard Spheres and Short-Range Potentials”. In: *Zur. Lect. Adv. Math.* 18 (2014).
- [Gar+20] A. Garbuno-Inigo, F. Hoffmann, W. Li, and A. M. Stuart. “Interacting Langevin Diffusions: Gradient Structure and Ensemble Kalman Sampler”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* 19.1 (2020), pp. 412–441.
- [Gär88] J. Gärtner. “On the McKean-Vlasov limit for Interacting Diffusions”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 137 (1988), pp. 197–248.
- [GPP12] G. Giacomin, K. Pakdaman, and X. Pellegrin. “Global attractor and asymptotic dynamics in the Kuramoto model for coupled noisy phase oscillators”. In: *Nonlinearity* 25.5 (2012), pp. 1247–1273.
- [GQ15] D. Godinho and C. Quiñinao. “Propagation of chaos for a subcritical Keller–Segel model”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 51.3 (2015).
- [Gol15] F. Golse. “De Newton à Boltzmann et Einstein: validation des modèles cinétiques et de diffusion, d’après T. Bodineau, I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, B. Texier”. In: *Séminaire Bourbaki, volume 2013/2014, exposés 1074-1088*. Vol. 367-368. Astérisque, Société Mathématique de France, 2015, pp. 285–326.
- [Gol16] F. Golse. “On the Dynamics of Large Particle Systems in the Mean Field Limit”. In: *Lecture notes. arXiv:1301.5494* (2016), pp. 1–144. arXiv: 1301.5494.
- [Gra58] H. Grad. “Principles of the Kinetic Theory of Gases”. In: *Thermodynamics of Gases*. Ed. by S. Flügge. Encyclopedia of Physics 12. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1958, pp. 205–294.

- [Gra63] H. Grad. “Asymptotic theory of Boltzmann equation”. In: *Phys. Fluids* 6.2 (1963), pp. 147–181.
- [Gra92a] C. Graham. “McKean-Vlasov Itô-Skorohod equations, and nonlinear diffusions with discrete jump sets”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 40 (1992), pp. 69–82.
- [Gra92b] C. Graham. “Nonlinear diffusion with jumps”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 28.3 (1992), pp. 393–402.
- [GM97] C. Graham and S. Méléard. “Stochastic particle approximations for generalized Boltzmann models and convergence estimates”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 25.1 (1997), pp. 115–132.
- [GP20] S. Grassi and L. Pareschi. “From particle swarm optimization to consensus based optimization: stochastic modeling and mean-field limit”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2012.05613* (2020).
- [GR87] L. Greengard and V. Rokhlin. “A fast algorithm for particle simulations”. In: *J. Comput. Phys.* 73.2 (1987), pp. 325–348.
- [Grü71] F. A. Grünbaum. “Propagation of chaos for the Boltzmann equation”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 42 (1971).
- [GM03] H. Guérin and S. Méléard. “Convergence from Boltzmann to Landau Processes with Soft Potential and Particle Approximations”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 111.3/4 (2003), pp. 931–966.
- [Gui+19] A. Guillin, W. Liu, L. Wu, and C. Zhang. “Uniform Poincaré and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for mean field particles systems”. In: *arxiv preprint: arXiv:1909.07051* (Sept. 2019). arXiv: 1909.07051.
- [GM20] A. Guillin and P. Monmarché. “Uniform long-time and propagation of chaos estimates for mean field kinetic particles in non-convex landscapes”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.00735* (2020).
- [HLL09] S.-Y. Ha, K. Lee, and D. Levy. “Emergence of time-asymptotic flocking in a stochastic Cucker-Smale system”. In: *Commun. Math. Sci.* 7.2 (2009), pp. 453–469.
- [Has13] J. Haskovec. “Flocking dynamics and mean-field limit in the Cucker–Smale-type model with topological interactions”. In: *Phys. D* 261 (2013), pp. 42–51.
- [HS11] J. Haškovec and C. Schmeiser. “Convergence of a Stochastic Particle Approximation for Measure Solutions of the 2D Keller-Segel System”. In: *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 36.6 (2011), pp. 940–960.
- [Has70] W. K. Hastings. “Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications”. In: *Biometrika* 57.1 (1970), pp. 97–109.
- [HM14] M. Hauray and S. Mischler. “On Kac’s chaos and related problems”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 266 (2014), pp. 6055–6157.
- [HT10] S. Herrmann and J. Tugaut. “Non-uniqueness of stationary measures for self-stabilizing processes”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 120.7 (July 2010), pp. 1215–1246.

- [Hey19] D. Heydecker. “Pathwise convergence of the hard spheres Kac process”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 29.5 (2019), pp. 3062–3127.
- [Hey20] D. Heydecker. “Kac’s Process with Hard Potentials and a Moderate Angular Singularity”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.12943* (2020).
- [HM86] M. Hitsuda and I. Mitoma. “Tightness problem and stochastic evolution equation arising from fluctuation phenomena for interacting diffusions”. In: *J. Multivariate Anal.* 19.2 (Aug. 1986), pp. 311–328.
- [Hol16] T. Holding. “Propagation of chaos for Hölder continuous interaction kernels via Glivenko-Cantelli”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.02877* (2016).
- [HLP20] H. Huang, J.-G. Liu, and P. Pickl. “On the Mean-Field Limit for the Vlasov–Poisson–Fokker–Planck System”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 181.5 (2020), pp. 1915–1965.
- [IW89] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe. *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*. North-Holland Mathematical Library 24. Elsevier, 1989.
- [Jab14] P.-E. Jabin. “A review of the mean field limits for Vlasov equations”. In: *Kinet. Relat. Models* 7 (2014), pp. 661–711.
- [JJ15] P.-E. Jabin and S. Junca. “A Continuous Model For Ratings”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 75.2 (2015), pp. 420–442.
- [JW16] P.-E. Jabin and Z. Wang. “Mean field limit and propagation of chaos for Vlasov systems with bounded forces”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 271 (2016), pp. 3588–3627.
- [JW17] P.-E. Jabin and Z. Wang. “Mean Field Limit for Stochastic Particle Systems”. In: *Active Particles, Volume 1 : Advances in Theory, Models, and Applications*. Ed. by N. Bellomo, P. Degond, and E. Tadmor. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Birkhäuser Basel, 2017, pp. 379–402.
- [JW18] P.-E. Jabin and Z. Wang. “Quantitative estimates of propagation of chaos for stochastic systems with $W^{-1,\infty}$ kernels”. In: *Invent. Math.* 214 (2018), pp. 523–591.
- [Jab19] J.-F. Jabir. “Rate of propagation of chaos for diffusive stochastic particle systems via Girsanov transformation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.09096* (2019).
- [JS03] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Second edition. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 288. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003.
- [Jak86] A. Jakubowski. “On the Skorokhod topology”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 22.3 (1986), pp. 263–285.
- [JM86] A. Joffe and M. Métivier. “Weak convergence of sequences of semimartingales with applications to multitype branching processes”. In: *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* 18.1 (1986), pp. 20–65.
- [Joh68] D. P. Johnson. “On a class of stochastic processes and its relationship to infinite particle gases”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 132.2 (1968), pp. 275–275.

- [Jou97] B. Jourdain. “Diffusions with a nonlinear irregular drift coefficient and probabilistic interpretation of generalized Burgers’ equations”. In: *ESAIM Probab. Stat.* 1 (1997), pp. 339–355.
- [JLM14] B. Jourdain, T. Lelièvre, and B. Miasojedow. “Optimal scaling for the transient phase of Metropolis Hastings algorithms: The longtime behavior”. In: *Bernoulli* 20.4 (2014).
- [JLM15] B. Jourdain, T. Lelièvre, and B. Miasojedow. “Optimal scaling for the transient phase of the random walk Metropolis algorithm: The mean-field limit”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 25.4 (2015).
- [JM98] B. Jourdain and S. Méléard. “Propagation of chaos and fluctuations for a moderate model with smooth initial data”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 34.6 (1998), pp. 727–766. Publisher: Gauthier-Villars.
- [Kac56] M. Kac. “Foundations of kinetic theory”. In: *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*. Vol. 3. University of California Press Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1956, pp. 171–197.
- [Kac73] M. Kac. “Some Probabilistic Aspects of the Boltzmann Equation”. In: *The Boltzmann Equation. Acta Physica Austriaca (Supplementum X Proceedings of the International Symposium “100 Years Boltzmann Equation” in Vienna 4th–8th September 1972)*. Ed. by E. G. D. Cohen and W. Thirring. Springer Vienna, 1973, pp. 379–400.
- [KM16] M.-J. Kang and J. Morales. “Dynamics of a spatially homogeneous Vicsek model for oriented particles on the plane”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:1608.00185* (2016).
- [Kan+09] N. Kantas, A. Doucet, S. S. Singh, and J. M. Maciejowski. “An Overview of Sequential Monte Carlo Methods for Parameter Estimation in General State-Space Models”. en. In: *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* 42.10 (2009), pp. 774–785.
- [KS98] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 113. Springer-Verlag New York, 1998.
- [KE95] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart. “Particle swarm optimization”. In: *Proceedings of ICNN’95 - International Conference on Neural Networks*. Vol. 4. Perth, WA, Australia: IEEE, 1995, pp. 1942–1948.
- [Kin75] F. G. King. “BBGKY Hierarchy for Positive Potentials”. PhD Thesis. Berkeley: University of California, 1975.
- [KT84] S. Kusuoka and Y. Tamura. “Gibbs measures for mean field potentials”. In: *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* 31 (1984), pp. 223–245.
- [Lac18] D. Lacker. “On a strong form of propagation of chaos for McKean-Vlasov equations”. In: *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 23.45 (2018), pp. 1–11.
- [LSU68] O. A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Solonnikov, and N. N. Ural’ceva. *Linear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs 23. American Mathematical Soc, 1968.

- [Lan75] O. E. Lanford. “Time evolution of large classical systems”. In: *Dynamical Systems Theory and Application, Battelle Seattle 1974 Rencontres*. Ed. by J. Moser. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1975.
- [Le 16] J.-F. Le Gall. *Brownian Motion, Martingales, and Stochastic Calculus*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 274. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [Led99] M. Ledoux. “Concentration of measure and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities”. In: *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg* 33 (1999), pp. 120–216.
- [Léo86] C. Léonard. “Une loi des grands nombres pour des systèmes de diffusions avec interaction et à coefficients non bornés”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 22.2 (1986), pp. 237–262.
- [Léo95a] C. Léonard. “Large deviations for long range interacting particle systems with jumps”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 31.2 (1995), pp. 289–323.
- [Léo95b] C. Léonard. “On large deviations for particle systems associated with spatially homogeneous Boltzmann type equations”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 101.1 (1995), pp. 1–44.
- [Léo11] C. Léonard. “Girsanov theory under a finite entropy condition”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:1101.3958* (2011).
- [Let89] G. Letta. “Sur les théorèmes de Hewitt-Savage et de de Finetti”. In: *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg* 23 (1989), pp. 531–535.
- [LY16] J.-G. Liu and R. Yang. “Propagation of chaos for large Brownian particle system with Coulomb interaction”. In: *Res. Math. Sci.* 3.1 (2016), p. 40.
- [LWZ20] W. Liu, L. Wu, and C. Zhang. “Long-time behaviors of mean-field interacting particle systems related to McKean-Vlasov equations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.09462* (2020).
- [Luç15] E. Luçon. “Large Population Asymptotics for Interacting Diffusions in a Quenched Random Environment”. In: *From Particle Systems to Partial Differential Equations II*. Ed. by P. Gonçalves and A. J. Soares. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 129. Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 231–251.
- [Mal01] F. Malrieu. “Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for some nonlinear PDE’s”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 95 (2001), pp. 109–132.
- [Mal03] F. Malrieu. “Convergence to equilibrium for granular media equations and their Euler schemes”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 13.2 (2003), pp. 540–560.
- [MP82] C. Marchioro and M. Pulvirenti. “Hydrodynamics in two dimensions and vortex theory”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 84.4 (1982), pp. 483–503.
- [MT08] D. Matthes and G. Toscani. “On Steady Distributions of Kinetic Models of Conservative Economies”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 130.6 (Mar. 2008), pp. 1087–1117.

- [McK66] H. P. McKean. “A class of Markov processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equations”. In: *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 56.6 (1966), p. 1907. Publisher: National Academy of Sciences.
- [McK67a] H. P. McKean. “An exponential formula for solving Boltzmann’s equation for a Maxwellian gas”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* 2.3 (May 1967), pp. 358–382.
- [McK67b] H. P. McKean. “Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations”. In: *Stochastic Differential Equations*. Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ. Arlington, Va.: Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Office of Aerospace Research, 1967, pp. 41–57.
- [McK69] H. P. McKean. “Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations”. In: *Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Volume 2*. Ed. by A. K. Aziz. Van Nostrand Mathematical Studies 19. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1969, pp. 177–194.
- [McK75] H. P. McKean. “Fluctuations in the Kinetic Theory of Gases”. In: *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 28 (1975), pp. 435–455.
- [MMN18] S. Mei, A. Montanari, and P.-M. Nguyen. “A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks”. In: *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 115.33 (2018), E7665–E7671.
- [Mél96] S. Méléard. “Asymptotic Behaviour of some interacting particle systems; McKean-Vlasov and Boltzmann models”. In: *Probabilistic Models for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Ed. by D. Talay and L. Tubaro. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1627. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [Mél98a] S. Méléard. “Convergence of the fluctuations for interaction diffusions with jumps associated with Boltzmann equations”. In: *Stochastics* 63 (1998), pp. 195–225.
- [Mél98b] S. Méléard. “Stochastic approximations of the solution of a full Boltzmann equation with small initial data”. In: *ESAIM Probab. Stat.* 2 (1998), pp. 23–40.
- [Mél00] S. Méléard. “A trajectorial proof of the vortex method for the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equation”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 10.4 (2000).
- [Mél01] S. Méléard. “Monte-Carlo approximations for 2d Navier-Stokes equations with measure initial data”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 121.3 (Nov. 2001), pp. 367–388.
- [MR87] S. Méléard and S. Roelly-Coppoletta. “A propagation of chaos result for a system of particles with moderate interaction”. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 26 (1987), pp. 317–332.
- [MR88] S. Méléard and S. Roelly-Coppoletta. “Systèmes de particules et mesures-martingales : un théorème de propagation du chaos”. In: *Séminaire de probabilités (Strasbourg)* 22 (1988), pp. 438–448.

- [Mer16] S. Merino-Aceituno. “Isotropic wave turbulence with simplified kernels: Existence, uniqueness, and mean-field limit for a class of instantaneous coagulation-fragmentation processes”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 57.12 (2016), p. 121501.
- [Met+53] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller. “Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing Machines”. In: *J. Chem. Phys.* 21.6 (1953), pp. 1087–1092.
- [MU49] N. Metropolis and S. Ulam. “The Monte Carlo Method”. In: *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 44.247 (1949), pp. 335–341.
- [Mis12] S. Mischler. “Kac’s chaos and Kac’s program”. In: *Séminaire Laurent Schwartz - EDP et applications*. Vol. 2012-2013. Institut des hautes études scientifiques & Centre de mathématiques Laurent Schwartz, 2012, Exposé no XXII, 1–17.
- [MM13] S. Mischler and C. Mouhot. “Kac’s program in kinetic theory”. In: *Invent. Math.* 193.1 (2013), pp. 1–147. Publisher: Springer.
- [MMW15] S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, and B. Wennberg. “A new approach to quantitative propagation of chaos for drift, diffusion and jump processes”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 161 (2015), pp. 1–59.
- [MV20] Y. S. Mishura and A. Y. Veretennikov. “Existence and uniqueness theorems for solutions of McKean-Vlasov stochastic equations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.02212* (2020).
- [Mon17] P. Monmarché. “Long-time behaviour and propagation of chaos for mean field kinetic particles”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 127 (2017), pp. 1721–1737.
- [MP06] C. Mouhot and L. Pareschi. “Fast algorithms for computing the Boltzmann collision operator”. In: *Math. Comp.* 75.256 (July 2006), pp. 1833–1852.
- [MT14] A. Muntean and F. Toschi, eds. *Collective Dynamics from Bacteria to Crowds: An Excursion Through Modeling, Analysis and Simulation*. CISM International Centre for Mechanical Sciences 553. Springer, Vienna, 2014.
- [Mur77] H. Murata. “Propagation of chaos for Boltzmann-like equation of non-cutoff type in the plane”. In: *Hiroshima Math. J.* 7.2 (1977), pp. 479–515.
- [NPT10] G. Naldi, L. Pareschi, and G. Toscani, eds. *Mathematical Modeling of Collective Behavior in Socio-Economic and Life Sciences*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Birkhäuser Boston, 2010.
- [Nan80] K. Nanbu. “Direct Simulation Scheme Derived from the Boltzmann Equation. I. Monocomponent Gases”. In: *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* 49.5 (1980), pp. 2042–2049.
- [Oel84] K. Oelschläger. “A Martingale Approach to the Law of Large Numbers for Weakly Interacting Stochastic Processes”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 12.2 (May 1984), pp. 458–479.

- [Oel85] K. Oelschläger. “A law of large numbers for moderately interacting diffusion processes”. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 69.2 (Mar. 1985), pp. 279–322. Publisher: Springer Nature America, Inc.
- [Oel87] K. Oelschläger. “A fluctuation theorem for moderately interacting diffusion processes”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 74.4 (1987), pp. 591–616.
- [Oel89] K. Oelschläger. “On the derivation of reaction-diffusion equations as limit dynamics of systems of moderately interacting stochastic processes”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 82.4 (1989), pp. 565–586.
- [Osa86] H. Osada. “Propagation of chaos for the two dimensional Navier-Stokes equation”. In: *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.* 62.1 (1986), pp. 8–11.
- [OK85] H. Osada and S. Kotani. “Propagation of chaos for the Burgers equation”. In: *J. Math. Soc. Japan* 37.2 (Apr. 1985), pp. 275–294.
- [OV00] F. Otto and C. Villani. “Generalization of an Inequality by Talagrand and Links with the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 173 (2000), pp. 361–400.
- [PR20] L. Pareschi and T. Rey. “On the stability of equilibrium preserving spectral methods for the homogeneous Boltzmann equation”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2011.05811* (2020). arXiv: 2011.05811.
- [PR01] L. Pareschi and G. Russo. “An introduction to Monte Carlo method for the Boltzmann equation”. In: *ESAIM Proc.* 10 (2001), pp. 35–75.
- [Par67] K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability Measures on Metric Spaces*. Academic Press, 1967.
- [PSV21] G. A. Pavliotis, A. M. Stuart, and U. Vaes. “Derivative-free Bayesian Inversion Using Multiscale Dynamics”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2102.00540* (2021).
- [Péd18] L. Pédèches. “Asymptotic properties of various stochastic Cucker-Smale dynamics”. In: *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 38.6 (2018), pp. 2731–2762.
- [Pin+17] R. Pinnau, C. Totzeck, O. Tse, and S. Martin. “A consensus-based model for global optimization and its mean-field limit”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 27.01 (2017), pp. 183–204.
- [Pul96] M. Pulvirenti. “Kinetic limits for stochastic particle systems”. In: *Probabilistic Models for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Ed. by D. Talay and L. Tubaro. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1627. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [PS17] M. Pulvirenti and S. Simonella. “The Boltzmann–Grad limit of a hard sphere system: analysis of the correlation error”. In: *Invent. Math.* 207 (2017), pp. 1135–1237.
- [RW21] S. Reich and S. Weissmann. “Fokker-Planck Particle Systems for Bayesian Inference: Computational Approaches”. In: *SIAM/ASA J. Uncertain. Quantif.* 9.2 (2021), pp. 446–482.

- [RY99] D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. 3rd. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 293. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.
- [RC04] C. P. Robert and G. Casella. *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2004.
- [Roe86] S. Roelly-Coppoletta. “A criterion of convergence of measure-valued processes: application to measure branching processes”. In: *Stochastics* 17.1-2 (1986), pp. 43–65.
- [RV19] G. M. Rotskoff and E. Vanden-Eijnden. “Trainability and Accuracy of Neural Networks: An Interacting Particle System Approach”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:1805.00915* (2019).
- [Rou15] N. Rougerie. “De Finetti theorems, mean-field limits and Bose-Einstein condensation”. In: *Lectures notes from a course at the LMU, Munich*. arXiv:1506.05263 (2015).
- [RSW16] L. Rueschendorf, A. Schnurr, and V. Wolf. “Comparison of time-inhomogeneous Markov processes”. In: *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* 48.4 (2016), pp. 1015–1044.
- [Saf16] C. Saffirio. “Derivation of the Boltzmann Equation: Hard Spheres, Short-Range Potentials and Beyond”. In: *From Particle Systems to Partial Differential Equations III*. Ed. by P. Gonçalves and A. J. Soares. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 162. Springer International Publishing, 2016, pp. 301–321. Series Title: Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics.
- [Sal20] S. Salem. “A gradient flow approach to propagation of chaos”. In: *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 40.10 (2020), pp. 5729–5754.
- [Ser19] S. Serfaty. “Systems of points with Coulomb interactions”. en. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2018)*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: World Scientific, 2019, pp. 935–977.
- [ST85] T. Shiga and H. Tanaka. “Central Limit Theorem for a System of Markovian Particles with Mean Field Interactions”. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 69 (1985), pp. 439–459.
- [SS20] J. Sirignano and K. Spiliopoulos. “Mean Field Analysis of Neural Networks: A Law of Large Numbers”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 80.2 (2020), pp. 725–752.
- [SV97] D. W. Stroock and S. R. S. Varadhan. *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.
- [Szn84a] A.-S. Sznitman. “Équations de type de Boltzmann, spatialement homogènes”. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 66 (1984), pp. 559–592.
- [Szn84b] A.-S. Sznitman. “Nonlinear Reflecting Diffusion Process, and the Propagation of Chaos and Fluctuations Associated”. In: *J. Funct. Anal.* 56 (1984), pp. 311–336.
- [Szn86] A.-S. Sznitman. “A Propagation of Chaos Result for Burgers’ Equation”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 71 (1986), pp. 581–613.

- [Szn91] A.-S. Sznitman. “Topics in propagation of chaos”. In: *Éc. Été Probab. St.-Flour XIX—1989*. Springer, 1991, pp. 165–251.
- [TT96] D. Talay and L. Tubaro, eds. *Probabilistic Models for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1627. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [Tan78] H. Tanaka. “Probabilistic Treatment of the Boltzmann Equation of Maxwellian Molecules”. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 46 (1978), pp. 67–105.
- [Tan82a] H. Tanaka. “Fluctuation Theory for Kac’s One-Dimensional Model of Maxwellian Molecules”. In: *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A* 44.1 (1982), pp. 23–46.
- [Tan82b] H. Tanaka. “Limit theorems for certain diffusion processes with interaction”. In: *Stochastic Analysis, Proceedings of the Taniguchi International Symposium on Stochastic Analysis*. Ed. by K. Itō. 1982, pp. 469–488.
- [Tan83] H. Tanaka. “Some probabilistic problems in the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation”. In: *Theory and Application of Random Fields, Proceedings of the IFIP-WG 7/1 Working Conference, Bangalore 1982*. Ed. by G. Kallianpur. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1983, pp. 258–267.
- [TH81] H. Tanaka and M. Hitsuda. “Central limit theorem for a simple diffusion model of interacting particles”. In: *Hiroshima Math. J.* 11.2 (1981), pp. 415–423.
- [Tos98] G. Toscani. “The grazing collisions asymptotics of the non cut-off Kac equation”. In: *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 32.6 (1998), pp. 763–772.
- [Tos06] G. Toscani. “Kinetic models of opinion formation”. In: *Commun. Math. Sci.* 4.3 (2006), pp. 481–496.
- [TTZ20] G. Toscani, A. Tosin, and M. Zanella. “Kinetic modelling of multiple interactions in socio-economic systems”. In: *Netw. Heterog. Media* 15.3 (2020), pp. 519–542.
- [Tot21] C. Totzeck. “Trends in Consensus-based optimization”. In: *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2104.01383* (2021).
- [Tot+18] C. Totzeck, R. Pinnau, S. Blauth, and S. Schotthöfer. “A Numerical Comparison of Consensus-Based Global Optimization to other Particle-based Global Optimization Schemes”. In: *PAMM. Proc. Appl. Math. Mech.* 18.1 (2018).
- [Tou14] J. Touboul. “Propagation of chaos in neural fields”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 24.3 (2014). Updated version of 2016. arXiv:1108.2414.
- [Tro58] H. F. Trotter. “Approximation of semi-groups of operators”. In: *Pacific J. Math.* 8.4 (1958), pp. 887–919.
- [Tug13] J. Tugaut. “Convergence to the equilibria for self-stabilizing processes in double-well landscape”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 41.3A (May 2013), pp. 1427–1460.

- [Tug14] J. Tugaut. “Phase transitions of McKean–Vlasov processes in double-wells landscape”. In: *Stochastics* 86.2 (Mar. 2014), pp. 257–284.
- [Uch88a] K. Uchiyama. “Derivation of the Boltzmann equation from particle dynamics”. In: *Hiroshima Math. J.* 18.2 (1988), pp. 245–297.
- [Uch88b] K. Uchiyama. “Fluctuations in a Markovian system of pairwise interacting particles”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 79.2 (1988), pp. 289–302.
- [Uch83a] K. Uchiyama. “A fluctuation problem associated with the Boltzmann equation for a gas of molecules with a cutoff potential”. In: *Japanese journal of mathematics. New series* 9.1 (1983), pp. 27–53.
- [Uch83b] K. Uchiyama. “Fluctuations of Markovian systems in Kac’s caricature of a Maxwellian gas”. In: *J. Math. Soc. Japan* 35.3 (1983).
- [Ver81] A. Y. Veretennikov. “On strong solutions and explicit formulas for solutions of stochastic integral equations”. In: *Math. USSR Sb.* 39.3 (1981), pp. 387–403.
- [Ver06] A. Y. Veretennikov. “On ergodic measures for McKean–Vlasov stochastic equations”. In: *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2004*. Ed. by H. Niederreiter and D. Talay. 2006, pp. 471–486.
- [Vic+95] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet. “Novel Type of Phase Transition in a System of Self-Driven Particles”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75.6 (1995), pp. 1226–1229.
- [VZ12] T. Vicsek and A. Zafeiris. “Collective motion”. In: *Phys. Rep.* 517.3-4 (2012), pp. 71–140.
- [Vil01] C. Villani. “Limite de champ moyen”. In: *Cours de DEA* (2001).
- [Vil02] C. Villani. “A Review of Mathematical Topics in Collisional Kinetic Theory”. In: *Handbook of Mathematical Fluid Dynamics*. Ed. by S. Friedlander and D. Serre. Vol. 1. Elsevier Science, 2002, pp. 71–74.
- [Vil03] C. Villani. *Topics in Optimal Transportation*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 58. American Mathematical Society, 2003.
- [Vil09a] C. Villani. “Hypocoercivity”. In: *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 202.950 (2009).
- [Vil09b] C. Villani. *Optimal Transport, Old and New*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 338. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [Wag92] W. Wagner. “A convergence proof for Bird’s direct simulation Monte Carlo method for the Boltzmann equation”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 66.3-4 (1992), pp. 1011–1044.
- [Wag96] W. Wagner. “A functional law of large numbers for Boltzmann type stochastic particle systems”. In: *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 14.5 (1996), pp. 591–636.
- [Wan18] F.-Y. Wang. “Distribution dependent SDEs for Landau type equations”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 128 (2018), pp. 595–621.
- [Wil51] E. Wild. “On Boltzmann’s equation in the kinetic theory of gases”. In: *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 47.3 (1951), pp. 602–609.

- [Zvo74] A. K. Zvonkin. “A transformation of the phase space of a diffusion process that removes the drift”. In: *Math. USSR Sb.* 22.1 (1974), pp. 129–149.