

WEAK SOLUTIONS TO THE MASTER EQUATION OF POTENTIAL MEAN FIELD GAMES

ALEKOS CECCHIN AND FRANÇOIS DELARUE

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this work is to introduce a notion of weak solution to the master equation of a potential mean field game and to prove that existence and uniqueness hold under quite general assumptions. Remarkably, this is achieved without any monotonicity constraint on the coefficients. The key point is to interpret the master equation in a conservative sense and then to adapt to the infinite dimensional setting earlier arguments for hyperbolic systems deriving from a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. Here, the master equation is indeed regarded as an infinite dimensional system set on the space of probability measures and is formally written as the derivative of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation associated with the mean field control problem lying above the mean field game. To make the analysis easier, we assume that the coefficients are periodic, which allows to represent probability measures through their Fourier coefficients. Most of the analysis then consists in rewriting the master equation and the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation for the mean field control problem as partial differential equations set on the Fourier coefficients themselves. In the end, we establish existence and uniqueness of functions that are displacement semi-concave in the measure argument and that solve the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation in a suitable generalized sense and, subsequently, we get existence and uniqueness of functions that solve the master equation in an appropriate weak sense and that satisfy a weak one-sided Lipschitz inequality. As another new result, we also prove that the optimal trajectories of the associated mean field control problem are unique for almost every starting point, for a suitable probability measure on the space of probability measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

Mean field games is by now a well-established theory for the analysis of equilibria within a continuum of rational dynamic players, see for instance [44, 45, 54, 55, 56, 58] for pioneering contributions on the field and [20, 25, 26, 43] for a non-exhaustive list of surveys or monographs on the subject. Whilst most of the first works in the domain were dedicated to the formulation of the problem and to the study of existence and uniqueness of equilibria, more efforts have been spent recently on the analysis of the so-called master equation. Very briefly, the master equation is a Partial Differential Equation (PDE) set on a space comprising both physical states and probability measures, and it provides an Eulerian description of the value of the game. In this sense, it corresponds, in the infinite dimensional mean field setting, to the usual standard Nash system in differential games. As a main feature of the theory, the characteristics of the master equation write in the form of a forward-backward system, comprising either two coupled PDEs, one forward Fokker-Planck equation and one backward Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, or two coupled forward and backward Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs) of McKean-Vlasov type. The forward-backward PDE system is usually referred to as the Mean Field Game (MFG) system and plays a key role in many of the aforementioned references since

Date: June 30, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35L40, 35Q89, 49L12, 49N80, 60J60, 91A16.

Key words and phrases. Mean field games, master equation, weak one-sided Lipschitz solutions, mean field control problem, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation on the space of probability measures, displacement semi-concave solutions, Rademacher theorem on the space of probability measures.

A. Cecchin benefited from the support of LABEX Louis Bachelier Finance and Sustainable Growth - project ANR-11-LABX-0019, ECOREES ANR Project, FDD Chair and Joint Research Initiative FiME. F. Delarue is supported by French ANR project ANR-19-P3IA-0002 – 3IA Côte d’Azur – Nice – Interdisciplinary Institute for Artificial Intelligence.

the forward component of any solution of the MFG system encodes the statistical state of an equilibrium.

A brief review of the monotone setting. Despite many recent progresses, the master equation remains only partially understood. The very first works in this direction were devoted to the analysis of classical solutions, see for instance [18, 29, 40, 59], see also [10] for a related presentation. While this looks a very natural and fundamental step in the study of the master equation, this leads in fact to results with a rather limited scope in practice because of the assumptions that they require. The master equation can be indeed regarded as a kind of system of hyperbolic nonlinear PDEs set on the space of probability measures and indexed by a continuum of states. As such, it manifests the same phenomena as finite systems of nonlinear PDEs on the Euclidean space: solutions may develop singularities in finite time. Accordingly, the analysis carried out in [40] just holds in small time (we refer to [3, 17] for more recent studies over a small enough time interval, the former for MFGs with local interactions and the latter for MFGs with a common noise). Differently, in the three contributions [59, 18, 29], the absence of singularities over an arbitrary time horizon is ensured under a suitable form of monotonicity, which is usually referred to as Lasry-Lions' condition. For instance (but this is by far not the only example), the Lasry-Lions monotonicity condition is satisfied by the derivative of a convex function defined on the wider space of signed measures. Briefly, monotonicity is known to guarantee uniqueness of the equilibria to the corresponding MFG and also to enforce strong stability properties, which play a key role in the analysis of the regularity of the solutions to the master equation. Noticeably, several of the most recent works on the master equation are also written within the same monotone framework, see for instance [11, 23, 61] (see also [12], which is the counterpart of [11] but for MFGs on a finite state space). In all these papers, the objective is to define, in the monotone setting, a relevant notion of solution to the master equation that does not require the existence and the continuity of all the derivatives that appear therein. As well expected, this allows to work with less regular coefficients. However, monotonicity remains of a crucial use: Obviously, as it implies uniqueness of the equilibria, it makes trivial the definition of the value function of the game, with the latter being then the natural candidate for solving the master equation; Moreover, as it induces a form of stability of the equilibria, it forces the value function of the game to be at least continuous. Accordingly, in all the aforementioned references, the solution to the master equation is indeed continuous in the measure argument.

At this stage, it is worth mentioning that, although it is the most popular one, the Lasry-Lions condition is not the only assumption that enforces uniqueness and stability of the equilibria to MFGs. Indeed, another form of monotonicity, known as displacement monotonicity, has been also studied. To highlight the differences with the former notion used by Lasry and Lions, one may think of the following illustrative example, in the same vein as before: the Wasserstein derivative of a function that is displacement convex on the space of probability measures is displacement monotone. The very main point in this example is that neither the notion of derivative nor the type of convex perturbation are the same as in the corresponding example for the Lasry-Lions condition; in brief, convex perturbations (in the definition of the displacement convexity) are achieved in the space of random variables (living above the space of probability measures) and not in the space of measures itself. The fact that displacement monotonicity implies uniqueness of the equilibria was noticed in the earlier paper [1] and in the book [25]. In [29], it was also shown to help in the analysis of the master equation for cost coefficients that are also convex in the space variable. A more systematic study of the master equation in the displacement monotone setting has been carried out recently, in [38] (for potential mean field games with displacement convex costs) and in [39] (which allows for a quite complicated 'non-separated' structure of the Hamiltonian), see also [63] for a related study of uniqueness within a similar framework. Finally, we refer to the very recent work [62] for another notion of *anti-monotonicity*, which is distinct from the aforementioned two notions of monotonicity, and under which the master equation can be also shown to have a classical solution.

Road map for potential games. The understanding of the master equation remains however much more limited when equilibria are no longer unique. The very first difficulty in this case

is that the value of the game then ceases to be canonically defined and just exists *a priori* as a set-valued function. The properties of this set-valued function were studied recently in [46]. However, there has not been so far any systematic procedure for selecting, within the set-valued function, one true function that could indeed solve the master equation in a relevant sense. A related difficulty is that, as soon as equilibria cease to be unique, the master equation can no longer have a classical solution. As shown by the example studied in [33] (see also [8, 9, 27] for examples in the finite state case), even continuity may be lost, which clearly demonstrates the need to have a weaker form of solution. This is precisely our objective here to address these questions and to provide in particular a notion of weak solution to the master equation for which existence and uniqueness hold, and which, in turn, allows to select one possibly discontinuous value for the game. Our approach to do so is inspired from our earlier work [28] and in particular from Section 6 therein, in which we addressed the same problem but for mean field games on a finite set. Here, the mean field game under study is set on \mathbb{T}^d , for a dimension $d \geq 1$, with the choice to work in the periodic setting being explained later on. In fact, the key similarity with [28] is that we here restrict the analysis to so-called potential mean field games, which were first introduced in [55, 56] and then studied in detail in (among others) [14, 19]. Briefly, an MFG is said to be potential if there exists a Mean Field Control Problem (MFCP), *i.e.* a control problem over dynamics taking values in the space of probability measures, whose optimal trajectories are equilibria of the MFG. Equivalently, the MFG then characterizes the critical points of the functional underpinning the MFCP, with the following obvious but fundamental observation: any minimizer of the MFCP is a critical point of the latter functional and hence an equilibrium of the MFG, but the converse may not be true. This provides a way to restrict the analysis to a smaller class of equilibria by focusing on the minimizers of the MFCP and not on the whole set of equilibria: for example, in [28], using the results from [16], it is shown that the MFCP has (under suitable conditions) a unique minimizer for almost every initial condition (namely, at points of differentiability of the value function). Another generic result from [28] is that, when the state space is finite, the (hence finite-dimensional) HJB equation¹ associated with the MFCP has a unique viscosity solution, which is also the unique function that is semi-concave in space and that solves the HJB equation almost everywhere; for sure, this unique solution is nothing but the value function of the MFCP. Although this latter result is formulated in [28] in a way that fits exactly the framework of MFCPs on a finite state space, it has in fact a much longer history in the theory of HJB equations. Briefly, it goes back to the earlier notion of generalized semi-concave solutions for HJB equations in finite dimension, which was introduced before the development of viscosity solutions, see [37, 50], see also [22] for another application to MFGs². The equivalence between the two notions of solutions was established later on, in [60]. Compared with viscosity solutions, the very benefit of generalized solutions manifests in the analysis of the MFG deriving from the MFCP. Indeed, in the framework of [28], the almost everywhere derivative in space of the value function is a weak solution of the master equation, when the latter is written in a conservative manner, which formulation indeed exists because of the potential structure of the MFG. Following the earlier work [51], this weak formulation of the conservative master equation can be proved to be uniquely solvable (within a suitable class of weakly one-sided Lipschitz functions) by proving that any such solution in fact derives from a semi-concave potential that solves the HJB equation almost everywhere. In [28], these results are shown to hold on a finite state space. Here, we want to prove similar results when the state space is \mathbb{T}^d .

¹The reader who is not aware of the theories of MFCP and MFG should make a distinction between the HJB equation associated with the MFCP and the aforementioned HJB equation arising in the MFG system. They are not the same. The HJB equation arising in the MFG system is posed on the state space of the MFG, whilst the HJB equation associated with the MFCP is posed on the wider space of probability measures. In the rest of the introduction, the HJB equation refers to the HJB equation associated with the MFCP.

²Notably, semi-concave almost everywhere solutions were indeed also employed in the recent work [22] in order to study the stochastic HJB equation arising in an MFG system with a common noise but without idiosyncratic noise.

Probability measures with a finite Fourier expansion and discretization of the HJB equation. The first difficulty that we are facing in this work is that, to the best of our knowledge, the theory for HJB equations for MFCEPs (over \mathbb{T}^d or \mathbb{R}^d) is much less well established than in the finite dimensional setting. To appreciate the difficulties, it is worth mentioning that the controlled dynamics we are dealing with in the paper describe the motion of particles forced by independent Brownian motions. This is an important feature. In the analysis of viscosity solutions associated with MFCEPs, the stochastic case is indeed notoriously known to be more challenging than the deterministic one. For MFCEPs set over deterministic trajectories, existence and uniqueness results for viscosity solutions to the HJB equation may be found (among others) in [21], where a particular equation is studied, and in [48], where solutions are defined in an intrinsic manner on the Wasserstein space. Another main contribution is [41], where two definitions are given: an intrinsic one, relying on the notion of subdifferential introduced in [4, 5], and an extrinsic one, formulated in a Hilbert space of random variables by means of the *Lions lift* introduced in [58] (see also [25, 20]). These two notions are in fact shown to be equivalent, which permits to invoke earlier results on first order viscosity solutions on Hilbert spaces in order to prove uniqueness. In a similar setting, we refer to the recent work [47] for an alternative definition of solution based on suitable test functions. In contrast, the theory of viscosity solutions for MFCEPs set over stochastic dynamics is not yet mature, as many contributions on the topic have appeared recently. Existence results, for notions of solutions formulated in the Crandall-Lions sense by means of appropriate test functions, are provided in [6, 32, 64], but uniqueness remains a challenging question, with some partial results or some complete results in specific cases available in [15, 66]. Notably, the extrinsic approach based on Lions' lift is no longer appropriate to get uniqueness from earlier results for equations set on Hilbert spaces. This is due to the additional second order term that arises in the HJB equation when the controlled trajectories are stochastic. In the very recent work [31], updated just two months before the republication of ours, a general comparison principle is proven for the intrinsic Crandall-Lions formulation (which means that the test functions are defined on the space of probability measures). This achievement is certainly an important milestone in the theory. Finally, in [30], another approach based on gradient flows is introduced to deal with the stochastic case, as the heat equation (which describes the evolution of the marginal law of a Brownian motion) can be rewritten as a gradient flow deriving from an entropy, see [49]. The latter yields a form of comparison principle, but existence of solutions to this formulation has not been shown yet.

Although we believe that the recent results from [31] could be applied to our setting, and thus could permit to characterize the value function of the MFCEP as the unique viscosity solution of the associated HJB equation, we follow another approach very much inspired from the aforementioned works [37, 50, 51, 60] on generalized semi-concave solutions to finite dimensional HJB equations. Indeed, we prove here a tailor-made result of existence and uniqueness for the HJB equation associated with the MFCEP within the class of functions that are Lipschitz in time and space (the space variable living here in the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of probability measures on \mathbb{T}^d and being equipped with a suitable topology) and displacement semi-concave in space. This result is completely new and is disjoint from the comparison principle obtained in [31]. It is in particular a crucial step in the analysis of the master equation to the related MFG and the same study would not be possible with the notion of viscosity solutions addressed in [31]. In fact, we are not aware of any equivalence result between viscosity and semi-concave generalized solutions for infinite dimensional equations, even in the simpler case of first order equations on a Hilbert space. In our approach, the HJB equation is understood in a generalized sense, since the derivatives that appear therein are not required to exist everywhere. Heuristically, we would like to say that, since the candidates for solving the HJB equation are Lipschitz continuous, their derivatives exist almost everywhere, whence the term *generalized* in the notion of solution, but this requires a preliminary discussion about the choice of a probability measure \mathbb{P} on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ under which Rademacher's theorem is indeed true. The latter choice is by far not canonical, see for instance [35] for a different example than ours together with the references therein for related questions. Here, we address directly the existence of such a measure \mathbb{P} , our construction being in fact dictated by our formulation of the HJB equation. Roughly speaking, the measure \mathbb{P} is built

as the limit of probability measures on finite dimensional slices of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and, accordingly, the HJB equation is reformulated in the form of an approximate equation on those finite dimensional slices. In fact, this procedure looks like finding a finite dimensional approximation of the HJB equation and thus requires an appropriate discretization of the space variable, which is here an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. While a natural idea for discretizing the space of probability measures would consist in approximating measures by means of discrete measures (think of uniform measures on finite sets, or equivalently of empirical measures, see for instance [61]), we choose here to approximate probability measures by probability measures with a finite Fourier expansion, whence our choice to work on the torus. This looks a completely new idea in the field (although the second author already introduced part –but certainly not the main part– of the idea in an earlier contribution on the long time behaviour of McKean-Vlasov equations, see [34]), whose motivation is as follows. The key observation in this regard is that the discretization of the HJB equation is very sensitive to the shape of the MFCP itself. Here, it is worth emphasizing again that the $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -valued controlled dynamics studied in the paper write in the (by now standard) form of a second-order Fokker-Planck equation: the first order term therein contains the control, whilst the second order term is driven by a Laplacian (associated with the Brownian motions driving the underlying particles in the population). As we already mentioned, the Laplacian in the Fokker-Planck equation induces, in the HJB equation associated with the MFCP, higher order derivatives of the solution: these derivatives are the most difficult terms to control in the HJB equation and, even more, they are very sensitive to the discretization procedure. Our claim is that working with truncated Fourier expansions is very well adapted to our problem since the Fourier functions are precisely the eigenfunctions of the Laplacian. In other words, our discretization has a limited impact on the shape of the controlled trajectories and in turn on the HJB equation itself. In contrast, discretizing the measure by means of empirical measures does not look, at least from the computations we did, a successful strategy, precisely because this does not combine well with the derivatives induced by the Laplacian in the Fokker-Planck equation (or, equivalently, by the Brownian motions in the associated cloud of particles).

Unique solvability of the HJB equation. To sum-up, our interpretation of the HJB equation stipulates that solutions must satisfy an approximate version of the latter when reduced to probability measures with a finite number of non-zero Fourier coefficients, with the accuracy of the approximation (in the HJB equation) getting better and better as the level of truncation in the Fourier expansions increases. As a first result, we show under appropriate regularity properties that the value function of the MFCP satisfies our notion of solution. The next step is to prove that the value function is in fact the only possible solution within a class of functions that are displacement semi-concave in the measure argument. This is in the end the most demanding result in the paper. In fact, this is also the point where the benefit for reducing the analysis to finite dimensional slices becomes clear. Roughly speaking, the core of the proof for uniqueness is to use semi-concavity in order to show that the characteristic flow generated on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ by any solution cannot accumulate around some point. In finite dimension, this result can be easily formulated: basically, the marginal law of the flow must have a bounded density when the initial condition also has a bounded density. Formulating a similar statement in infinite dimension is certainly more challenging. Although obtaining such a statement remains an interesting direction of research, we felt it easier to reduce, as much as possible, the proof of uniqueness to the finite dimensional framework, whence our choice to discretize the problem. Notice, however, that in the end, we are able to obtain the expected properties on the whole space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (and not on slices): uniqueness is formulated on the entire $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and, even more, we finally prove that we can construct a probability measure \mathbb{P} on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, with a full support, such that, for any initial time and almost every initial measure, the MFCP has a unique solution. This second result looks also completely new and complements earlier counter-examples about non-uniqueness. Its proof is achieved in two steps. Uniqueness is first shown to hold at points where the value function has directional derivatives (using earlier results from [14]) and is thus established almost everywhere by the Rademacher-type result mentioned above. As we already said, this result is standard for finite dimensional systems (see [16]). In fact, it also known to

hold true under some conditions for infinite dimensional deterministic systems on Hilbert spaces. All this analysis holds true with a smooth Hamiltonian that is required to be strictly convex in the dual variable, but there is no need of convexity in the space or measure arguments. For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that our study of generalized solutions to the HJB equation can be completed by the concomitant but independent work [24], in which the value function is in fact shown to be smooth on an open dense subset, under slightly more demanding assumptions on the coefficients.

Weak solutions of the master equation. The second main step in the paper is to study the conservative version of the master equation of the MFG. Again, this requires to have a proper form of weak solutions and we do so by formulating approximated versions of the master equation on the same finite dimensional slices as before. As in the finite dimensional setting addressed in [28], the key step is to prove that any solution to this weak formulation derives from a potential and that this potential is semi-concave in the space argument if the solution in hand satisfies a weak one-sided Lipschitz condition. This allows to identify the potential with the solution of the HJB equation of the MFCP and thus with the value function of the latter. In turn, the conservative version of the master equation is shown to have a unique weak solution, which is the almost everywhere (under the same probability \mathbb{P} as before) derivative in space of the value function. This result also is new and is certainly the first one to identify a solution to the master equation for a wide class of MFGs that are not required to be uniquely solvable. As a side result of our analysis, we show that any classical solution to the master equation is (up to a centering operation) a weak solution, which proves the consistency of our approach.

Further prospects. While we believe that this work is an interesting step forward toward a better understanding of the master equation, it obviously leaves open interesting extensions, which we feel better to address in future contributions. The main questions concern the choice of the controlled trajectories underpinning both the MFG and the MFCP. Here, the presence of the Brownian motion has a somewhat dramatic impact on the analysis. On the one hand, the very good point is that, because of the smoothing effect of the Laplacian, the MFG system has very strong regularity properties with respect to the finite dimensional variable (accounting for the private state of a tagged player in the continuum). These regularity properties are by now well documented in the theory of MFGs and we make here an intense use of them in order to control the decay of the various Fourier coefficients appearing in the analysis. On the other hand, the bad point is that the Brownian motion manifests in the HJB equation associated with the MFCP in the form of a mixed second order derivative, obtained by taking the gradient (in \mathbb{T}^d) of the Wasserstein derivative of the solution. This second order derivative creates substantial difficulties which, as we mentioned before, were already reported in the analysis of viscosity solutions and which makes quite subtle any approximation by finite dimensional derivatives. As we said, this is precisely the point where the Fourier approach introduced in this paper becomes fully relevant. In turn, this raises the following two equations: (i) What happens for a more complicated non-degenerate second order operator than the Laplacian itself? (ii) What happens when the trajectories are no longer assumed to be forced by a noise? As for (i), our guess is that our analysis could be adapted to more general non-degenerate cases, but the extension would certainly not be straightforward. As we already mentioned, the fact that the Fourier basis is diagonal for the Laplace operator is indeed very helpful here. Anyhow, even though the latter is no longer true when the second order operator is more general, we believe that an approximation similar to the one we use here for handling the non-linearity in the HJB equation would solve the issue. In short, the action of the second order operator on a probability measure with a finite Fourier expansion would no longer have a finite Fourier expansion and, hence, should be truncated. As for question (ii), the picture is more subtle since the aforementioned second order derivative would no longer appear in the new HJB equation. In turn, the interest of the Fourier approach becomes questionable in the deterministic case. While the reader may find it a drawback of our method, we recall that we spotted a similar distinction between the stochastic and deterministic cases in the study of viscosity solutions, as the former is more difficult to handle. In brief, this should not be a surprise if the stochastic

case is more demanding than the deterministic one. This is even more true that first order Fokker-Planck equations (as those satisfied by the forward equation in the MFG system when the trajectories are deterministic) are notoriously known to preserve ‘empirical measures’, such a stability property being false for second order Fokker-Planck equations. Even for models without control, this substantial difference is part of the standard knowledge in mean field theory, as it prevents some of the arguments used in the deterministic case from being used in the stochastic case. As for MFCEs and MFGs, the fact that ‘empirical measures’ are preserved by first order Fokker-Planck equations also plays a key role in the analysis of the master equation carried out in [38] when the trajectories are deterministic and the costs are monotone. In the end, we strongly believe that, for potential MFGs driven by deterministic trajectories, we should use an empirical measure based approach instead of a Fourier based approach in order to construct the finite dimensional approximate HJB and master equations. In short, the point would be to discretize elements of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ by means of empirical measures and not by means of measures with a finite Fourier expansion. However, this claim should be clarified in a separate work, since, meanwhile, most of the smoothness to the MFG system is lost when the noise is absent, which may cause other difficulties. Back to models driven by stochastic trajectories, a related question is to wonder whether the Fourier based approach can help in any way for the understanding of viscosity solutions to the HJB equation describing the MFCE and for connecting our approach with the one developed in [31].

A very last remark concerns the extension to the Euclidean setting, i.e. to \mathbb{R}^d . Certainly, we may think of using an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$, for a suitable measure μ , instead of the Fourier basis. For instance, a natural choice would be to work with μ being a Gaussian measure and thus with the Hermite instead of Fourier basis. This intuition would also deserve a careful inspection.

Organization and references to the main results. The paper is organized as follows. The potential MFG under study and the related MFCE are introduced in Section 2. Therein, we clarify the shape of the master equation, both in non-conservative and conservative forms, and we also provide the form of the HJB equation associated with the MFCE. However, we do not provide yet, in this section, the precise definitions of the weaker solutions to these two equations. Instead, we just give in Meta-Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 a meta form of the statements that will certainly help the reader to understand the main contributions of the paper. The rigorous versions of Meta-Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 require additional material about Fourier expansions of probability measures on \mathbb{T}^d . Most of this material is introduced in Section 3. Therein, we introduce in particular a mollification procedure that plays a key role in our analysis, see Definition 3.13. We also define the aforementioned probability measure \mathbb{P} , the main characteristics of which are summarized in the statement of Theorem 3.5. In Theorem 3.10, we then provide the form of Rademacher’s theorem that holds true on $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P})$ and which plays a key role in the identification of the weak solutions to the master equation. Although a bit lengthy, this preliminary Section 3 is however crucial for the rest of the paper. Indeed, using the tools introduced in this latter section, we address in Section 4 generalized solutions to the HJB equation, the definition of which is given in Definition 4.1. Their existence and uniqueness are established in Theorem 4.12. Application to potential MFGs is explained in Section 5. The definition of a weak solution is given in Definition 5.1 and the main unique solvability result is stated in Theorem 5.4. Section 6 is an appendix, which is mostly devoted to the proofs of Theorems 3.5 and 3.10.

Useful notation.

Standard notation. For an element $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we denote by \bar{z} the conjugate of z , and by $\Re[z]$ and $\Im[z]$ the real and imaginary parts of z . For x and y two elements of a set E , we denote by $\mathbf{1}_{\{x=y\}}$ the symbol that is equal to 1 if $x = y$ and to 0 otherwise. Moreover, we denote by Leb_d the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d and by I_d the identity matrix in dimension d . The Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d is denoted by $|\cdot|$ and the corresponding inner product between two vectors x and y is denoted by $\langle x, y \rangle$ or by $x \cdot y$ (depending on the context). For X a random

variable, defined on some probability space and taking values in some Polish space, we denote the law of X by $\mathcal{L}(X)$.

Space of probability measures on \mathbb{T}^d . The space of probability measures on the torus \mathbb{T}^d is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. When a probability measure m has a density (with respect to the Lebesgue measure), we identify m and its density dm/dx : we thus write $x \mapsto m(x)$ for the density.

In the paper, we equip \mathbb{T}^d with the Euclidean metric:

$$d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(x, y) := \inf_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |x - y + k|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

with $|\cdot|$ denoting the standard d -dimensional Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, we use the following two standard distances on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$: the total variation distance d_{TV} and the 1-Wasserstein distance d_{W_1} , the definitions of which are as follows:

$$d_{\text{TV}}(m, m') := \sup_{\|\phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) d(m - m')(x) \right|, \quad d_{W_1}(m, m') := \sup_{\|\phi\|_{1,\infty} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) d(m - m')(x) \right|,$$

where, in the above two supremums, $\|\phi\|_\infty$ and $\|\phi\|_{1,\infty}$ denote (respectively) the L^∞ norm and the Lipschitz constant of ϕ . Since ϕ can always be assumed to satisfy $\phi(0) = 0$, we notice that $\|\phi\|_{1,\infty} \leq 1 \Rightarrow \|\phi\|_\infty \leq c_0$, for a constant c_0 only depending on the dimension d . In particular, $d_{W_1} \leq c_0 d_{\text{TV}}$. We recall that the space $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), d_{W_1})$ is compact. Except when explicitly mentioned, the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is implicitly equipped with the 1-Wasserstein distance.

Derivatives on the space of probability measures. For a real-valued function ϕ defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, ϕ is said to be Gâteaux differentiable at m if there exists a bounded measurable function $x \mapsto [\delta\phi/\delta m](m)(x)$ such that, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{\phi((1 - \varepsilon)m + \varepsilon\mu) - \phi(m)}{\varepsilon} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta m}(m)(x) d(\mu - m)(x). \quad (1)$$

The function ϕ is said to be continuously differentiable if the function $(m, x) \mapsto [\delta\phi/\delta m](m)(x)$ is continuous (and thus uniformly continuous), when $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with d_{W_1} . In that case, the above limit is uniform in (m, μ) . Moreover, when $x \mapsto [\delta\phi/\delta m](m)(x)$ is differentiable in x (for a given m), we let

$$\partial_\mu \phi(m)(x) := \partial_x \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta m}(m, x). \quad (2)$$

Notice that $\delta\phi/\delta m$ is uniquely defined up to a constant. We may take

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta m}(m)(x) dx = 0 \quad (3)$$

as centering condition but this specific choice is mostly for convenience (see in particular Definition 5.1) and other choices would be fine. We recall the following property, proven in [18, Appendix]. If $\partial_\mu \phi$ is continuous on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d$, then, for any two square integrable \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables X, Y (defined on some arbitrary probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$),

$$\phi(\mathcal{L}(Y)) - \phi(\mathcal{L}(X)) = \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \left[\partial_\mu \phi \left(\mathcal{L}(\lambda Y + (1 - \lambda)X) \right) (\lambda Y + (1 - \lambda)X) \cdot (Y - X) \right] d\lambda, \quad (4)$$

where, for Z taking values in \mathbb{R}^d , $\mathcal{L}(Z)$ is here understood as the trace of the law of Z on \mathbb{T}^d , namely as the probability measure $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ defined by $m(A) = \mathbf{P}(\{\tau_X(0) \in A\})$ for any Borel subset A of \mathbb{T}^d , with $(\tau_y)_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ denoting the group of translations on \mathbb{T}^d . Moreover, in this writing, the function $x \mapsto \partial_\mu \phi(\mathcal{L}(\lambda Y + (1 - \lambda)X))(x)$ is implicitly regarded as a periodic function on \mathbb{R}^d .

Functional spaces. We denote by $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the space of continuous functions on \mathbb{T}^d . We also make use of the classical space and time-space Hölder spaces: for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we let $\mathcal{C}^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be the space of γ -Hölder continuous functions in space and, for $T > 0$, we let $\mathcal{C}^{\gamma/2, \gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ be the space of time-space functions that are $\gamma/2$ -Hölder in time and γ -Hölder in space. The corresponding Hölder norms are respectively denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\gamma$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\gamma/2, \gamma}$. We also let $\mathcal{C}^{2+\gamma}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be the space of twice differentiable functions ϕ on \mathbb{T}^d with γ -Hölder continuous derivatives of order 1 and 2,

and $\mathcal{C}^{1+\gamma/2, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ be the space of time-space functions that are once differentiable in time and twice in space, with u , $\partial_x u$, $\partial_x^2 u$ and $\partial_t u$ belonging to $\mathcal{C}^{\gamma/2, \gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$. We use the similar notation $\mathcal{C}^{1+\gamma/2, 2+\gamma}((0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ for functions whose restriction to $[\epsilon, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}^{1+\gamma/2, 2+\gamma}([\epsilon, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, T)$.

The L^1 and L^2 norms on the torus are denoted by $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$.

2. MEAN FIELD GAME AND CONTROL PROBLEM

2.1. Mean field game and standing assumption. The Mean Field Game (MFG) under study is described by means of the following (standard) forward-backward system of PDEs

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t m_t(x) - \operatorname{div}_x \left(\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x)) m_t(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x m_t(x) &= 0, \\ \partial_t u_t(x) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x u_t(x) - H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x)) + f(x, m_t) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$, with $u_T(x) = g(x, m_T)$ as terminal boundary condition. Above, the boundary condition for the dynamics of $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is prescribed at time 0: m_0 is an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. The coefficients f and g are real-valued Lipschitz continuous functions on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. We assume f and g to be differentiable in x , and the derivatives $\partial_x f$ and $\partial_x g$ to be Lipschitz continuous on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ when $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with d_{W_1} . We also require g to satisfy

$$\sup_{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \|g(\cdot, m)\|_{2+\gamma} < \infty,$$

for some $\gamma > 0$.

Very importantly, we do not assume that f and g are monotone, but we assume below that they derive from a potential, namely

$$f(x, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(y, m) dy = \frac{\delta F}{\delta m}(m)(x), \quad g(x, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g(y, m) dy = \frac{\delta G}{\delta x}(m)(x), \quad (6)$$

for two differentiable functions $F : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $G : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

As for the Hamiltonian H , it is assumed to be twice continuously differentiable in (x, p) , periodic in x and strictly convex in the variable p , uniformly in x , with the following bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d, p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d: |\xi|=1} \langle \xi, \partial_{pp}^2 H(x, p) \xi \rangle &> 0, \\ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d, p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[|\partial_{pp}^2 H(x, p)| + |\partial_x H(x, p)| + |\partial_{xx}^2 H(x, p)| \right] &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d, p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\frac{|\partial_p H(x, p)|}{1 + |p|} \right] < \infty.$$

We recall the following statement on existence of classical solutions; see for instance [20, Theorems 1.4 & 1.5, pages 29 and 33].

Proposition 2.1. *Under the standing assumption, for any initial condition $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ to the forward equation, the system (5) has at least one classical solution (m, u) , i.e. such that $m \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\gamma/2, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ and $u \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\gamma/2, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$.*

Importantly, any solution to (5), as given by Proposition 2.1, can be interpreted as a fixed point of a mapping that sends a continuous path $(\mu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ onto the flow of marginal laws of a stochastic control problem. In order to clarify this interpretation (which is in fact standard in MFG theory), we fix a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and a d -dimensional Brownian motion $(B_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$. We also define the convex conjugate L of H as

$$L(x, \alpha) := \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[-p \cdot \alpha - H(x, p) \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (7)$$

which is of quadratic growth in α , uniformly in x , locally Lipschitz in α , the Lipschitz constant being of linear growth in α , uniformly in x , and Lipschitz in x , uniformly in α . By [68], we know that L is differentiable and uniformly convex in α , i.e., there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall \alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad L(x, \alpha') - L(x, \alpha) \geq \partial_\alpha L(x, \alpha) \cdot (\alpha' - \alpha) + c_0 |\alpha' - \alpha|^2. \quad (8)$$

We also recall the standard formula

$$L(x, -\partial_p H(x, p)) = p \cdot \partial_p H(x, p) - H(x, p), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \quad p \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (9)$$

Then, for $(m_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ a solution to (5), $u_t(x)$ can be written, for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$, as the optimal cost

$$u_t(x) = \inf_{(\pi_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}} \mathbf{E} \left[g(X_T, m_T) + \int_t^T \left(f(X_s, m_s) + L(X_s, \pi_s) \right) ds \right], \quad (10)$$

the infimum being taken over controlled trajectories

$$dX_s = \pi_s ds + dB_s,$$

starting from $X_t \sim m_t$ and driven by \mathbb{R}^d -valued processes $(\pi_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ that are progressively-measurable with respect to the (\mathbf{P} -completion of the) filtration generated by $(B_s - B_t)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ and that satisfy

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\int_t^T |\pi_s|^2 ds \right] < \infty. \quad (11)$$

The optimal feedback is the function $(s, x) \mapsto -\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_s(x))$ and the marginal laws of the optimal trajectory solves the forward Fokker-Planck equation in (5).

Noticeably, the MFG system (5) can be seen as the system of characteristics to the so-called master equation, which is a PDE stated on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t U(t, x, m) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x U(t, x, m) - H(x, \nabla_x U(t, x, m)) + f(x, m) \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_p H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) \cdot \partial_\mu U(t, x, m)(y) m(dy) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr}[\partial_y \partial_\mu U(t, x, m)(y)] m(dy) = 0, \\ & U(T, x, m) = g(x, m). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Existence of classical solutions, when f and g are monotone and smooth in the measure argument, is established in [18]. Here, we address weak solutions in the sense of distributions, which is the main objective of this paper. The main result in this regard is Theorem 5.4, which ensures existence and uniqueness of such weak solutions when the equation is understood in a conservative form (see Subsection 2.3 for more details about this conservative formulation).

2.2. Mean field control problem. The key assumption in our analysis is (6). It says that the MFG in hand is potential, meaning that it derives from a Mean Field Control Problem (MFCP). At this stage, we first state some useful properties about MFCPs, independently of the MFG system (5). In particular, we state the MFCP in both stochastic and deterministic formulations, and then show that the two formulations are equivalent; notably, we make use of both of them in the paper.

To state the MFCP in the stochastic strong formulation with open-loop controls, we use the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and the same d -dimensional Brownian motion $(B_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ as before. The MFCP then consists in minimizing

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi) := G(\mathcal{L}(X_T)) + \int_0^T \left(F(\mathcal{L}(X_s)) + \mathbf{E} \left[L(X_s, \pi_s) \right] \right) ds, \quad (13)$$

over processes $(X_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ solving dynamics of the form

$$dX_s = \pi_s ds + dB_s, \quad (14)$$

where $(\pi_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ is a progressively measurable process with respect to the (\mathbf{P} -completion of the) filtration generated by $(B_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and by X_0 , and is required to be square-integrable over $([0, T] \times \Omega, \text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbf{P})$, namely (11) holds true with $t = 0$ therein.

If the controls are in Markovian feedback form, that is $\pi_s = \alpha_s(X_s)$ for a measurable function $\alpha : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, then the MFCP can be reformulated in a deterministic way. We take α to be bounded and measurable, so that (14) admits a unique strong solution. Then the deterministic formulation of the MFCP consists in minimizing the cost functional

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{det}}(\alpha) = \int_0^T \left(F(m_t) + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L(x, \alpha_t(x)) dm_t(x) \right) dt + G(m_T) \quad (15)$$

over trajectories given by the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t m_t(x) + \text{div}_x \left(\alpha_t(x) m_t(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x m_t(x) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \quad (16)$$

and bounded feedback functions $\alpha : [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proposition 2.2. *Under the standing assumption, the functions F and G are d_{W_1} -Lipschitz-continuous. Denoting their Lipschitz constants by ℓ_F and ℓ_G , there exists an optimal control for the MFCP in the stochastic formulation (13)-(14). Moreover, any optimal control is in Markovian feedback form and is bounded by a fixed constant M , which only depends on T , ℓ_F , ℓ_G , the constant c_0 in (8), the Lipschitz constant of L in x and the supremum norm of $\partial_\alpha L(\cdot, 0)$.*

Therefore, any optimal control to the stochastic formulation (13)-(14) induces an optimal control to the deterministic formulation (15)-(16). Also, the stochastic formulation (13)-(14) and the deterministic formulation (15)-(16) are equivalent, in the sense that

$$\min_{\pi} \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi) = \min_{\alpha} \mathcal{J}_{\text{det}}(\alpha).$$

Remark 2.3. *The reader may wonder why we restrict the minimization of \mathcal{J}_{det} to bounded feedback functions. Obviously, we could consider more general feedback functions such that the cost (15) remains well-defined and the Fokker-Planck equation (16) remains solvable. For instance, so is the case in [14]. Therein, the MFCP is formulated in terms of a pair $(m_t, w_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, with w_t being a vector valued signed measure with a finite mass that is absolutely continuous with respect to m_t , in which case α_t is identified with the density dw_t/dm_t . In fact, there would not be any strong interest in doing so in our context. Indeed, [14, Proposition 3.1] shows that, in the end, the optimizers over such a wider class of controls are in fact driven by bounded feedback functions. In this respect, the statement right above permits to identify a bound for the optimal controls.*

Last but not least, the reader must understand our main concern here. We want to have a simple framework in which the deterministic and stochastic formulations are equivalent, hence allowing us to use next both representations. The reader will find a more up-to-date review of the connection between the two formulations in [53]. The reader may also notice that the proof below requires in fact much weaker regularity on the coefficients than what we stated in the standing assumptions. Actually, the same proposition also holds true for more general MFCPs (not only those related to potential MFGs) for which the cost does not split as a function of α plus a function of m . We chose to write here this general simple result, whose proof does not employ the MFG system, and to state later on the deeper results that are truly related to the potential structure, see Proposition 2.6.

Proof. We start with the Lipschitz property of F . It follows from the identity

$$F(m') - F(m) = \int_0^1 \frac{\delta F}{\delta m} \left(\lambda m' + (1 - \lambda)m \right) (x) d(m' - m)(x)$$

and then from the Lipschitz property of $f = [\delta F / \delta m]$ in the variable x . The same argument holds for G .

The fact that an optimal control exists and is in feedback form is proved in [52, Theorems 2.2 and 2.3]. Thanks to the uniform convexity of the Lagrangian, the same proof shows that any optimal control is in fact in feedback form. Note however that those statements address MFCPs

formulated in a weak sense (which means that the probability space is part of the unknown), but the results also hold true for the strong formulation (with a fixed probability space) if any optimal control can be shown to be bounded (since the dynamics (14) become a strongly well-posed stochastic differential equation when $\pi_s = \alpha_s(X_s)$ for a bounded measurable feedback function α). In order to prove the latter (together with the fact that the bound only depends on the parameters quoted in the statement of Proposition 2.2), suppose by contradiction that π is optimal and such that $(\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbf{P})\{|\pi_t| > K\} > 0$ for an arbitrary $K > M$, with M a constant as in the statement whose value is fixed next. We show that the truncated control $\pi_t^K = \pi_t \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| \leq K\}}$ is such that $\mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi^K) < \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi)$, which contradicts the optimality and concludes the proof.

Denote by X and X^K the solutions to (14) with controls π and π^K respectively. We clearly have

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t^K - X_t| \right] \leq \mathbf{E} \int_0^T |\pi_t^K - \pi_t| dt = \mathbf{E} \int_0^T |\pi_t| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| > K\}} dt.$$

The d_{W_1} -Lipschitz-continuity of F and G and then the above estimate yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi) - \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi^K) \\ & \geq \int_0^T \mathbf{E} \left[L(X_t, \pi_t) - L(X_t^K, \pi_t^K) \right] dt - \ell_F \int_0^T \mathbf{E} |X_t - X_t^K| dt - \ell_G \mathbf{E} |X_T - X_T^K|. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the fact that L is Lipschitz continuous in x , uniformly in α (we denote by $\ell_{L,x}$ the related Lipschitz constant) and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi) - \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi^K) \\ & \geq \mathbf{E} \int_0^T \left[L(X_t, \pi_t) - L(X_t, 0) \right] \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| > K\}} dt - \left(T\ell_F + T\ell_{L,x} + \ell_G \right) \mathbf{E} \int_0^T |\pi_t| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| > K\}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

And then, by (8) (with $\alpha = 0$ therein),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi) - \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi^K) \\ & \geq c_0 \mathbf{E} \int_0^T |\pi_t|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| > K\}} dt - \left[T(\ell_F + \ell_{L,x} + \|\partial_\alpha L(\cdot, 0)\|_\infty) + \ell_G \right] \int_0^T |\pi_t| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| > K\}} dt, \end{aligned}$$

and then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi) - \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(\pi^K) & \geq \left[c_0 K - T(\ell_F + \ell_{L,x} + \|\partial_\alpha L(\cdot, 0)\|_\infty) - \ell_G \right] \mathbf{E} \int_0^T |\pi_t| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\pi_t| > K\}} dt \\ & \geq \left[c_0 K - T(\ell_F + \ell_{L,x} + \|\partial_\alpha L(\cdot, 0)\|_\infty) - \ell_G \right] K (\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbf{P})\{|\pi_t| > K\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is strictly positive, if we choose $M := [T(\ell_F + \ell_{L,x} + \|\partial_\alpha L(\cdot, 0)\|_\infty) + \ell_G]/c_0$ and then recall that $K > M$. \square

In light of the deterministic formulation (15)-(16), we define the *value function* $V : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the MFCP as

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, m) & := \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_t} \mathcal{J}_{\text{det}}(t, m, \alpha), \\ \mathcal{J}_{\text{det}}(t, m, \alpha) & := G(m_T) + \int_t^T \left(F(m_s) + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L(x, \alpha_s(x)) dm_s(x) \right) ds, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $(m_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ solves the Fokker-Planck equation (16) starting at $m_t = m$ and the infimum is taken over the set \mathcal{A}_t of feedback functions $\alpha : [t, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ that are bounded and measurable. By the above proposition, it is equivalent to restrict the optimization problem to feedback functions that are bounded by M .

Moreover, the value function can be equivalently defined in the open-loop framework. On the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, in addition to B , we assume that there is a sub- σ -algebra \mathcal{G} independent of B and rich enough so that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) = \{\mathcal{L}(\xi) : \xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d \text{ is } \mathcal{G}\text{-measurable}\}$. For any $0 \leq t < T$, we then denote by Π_t the collection of \mathbb{F}^t -progressively-measurable \mathbb{R}^d -valued

processes $(\pi_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ that are square-integrable (see (11)), where \mathbb{F}^t is the \mathbf{P} -completion of the filtration generated by \mathcal{G} and $(B_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$. We have

$$V(t, m) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_t} \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, m, \pi),$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, m, \pi) := G(\mathcal{L}(X_T)) + \int_t^T \left(F(\mathcal{L}(X_s)) + \mathbf{E}[L(X_s, \pi_s)] \right) ds, \quad (18)$$

over processes $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ solving (14) with $\mathcal{L}(X_t) = m$, with X_t being \mathcal{G} -measurable.

The interest of this representation is that it permits to prove easily some important properties of the value function. The first one is related to the following notion of semi-concavity:

Definition-Proposition 2.4. *Under the standing assumption, the functions F and G are displacement semi-concave, i.e. there exist two constants C_F and C_G such that, for any two random variables in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$F(\mathcal{L}(\xi + Y)) + F(\mathcal{L}(\xi - Y)) - 2F(\mathcal{L}(\xi)) \leq C_F \mathbf{E}[|Y|^2], \quad (19)$$

and similarly for G and C_G , with the same convention as in (4) for the various laws that appear in the above inequality.

The definition of displacement semi-concavity stated in (19) is shown to be equivalent to the usual notion used in optimal transport, which is formulated by means of geodesics in the Wasserstein space, see [38, Lemma 3.6]. In fact, (19) means that the lift of F in the space of L^2 random variables is semi-concave, see again [38].

Proof. We use (4) to get:

$$F(\mathcal{L}(\xi \pm Y)) - F(\mathcal{L}(\xi)) = \pm \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \left[\partial_\mu F(\mathcal{L}(\xi \pm \lambda Y))(\xi \pm \lambda Y) \cdot Y \right] d\lambda,$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\mathcal{L}(\xi + Y)) + F(\mathcal{L}(\xi - Y)) - 2F(\mathcal{L}(\xi)) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \int_0^1 \left[\left(\partial_\mu F(\mathcal{L}(\xi + \lambda Y))(\xi + \lambda Y) - \partial_\mu F(\mathcal{L}(\xi - \lambda Y))(\xi - \lambda Y) \right) \cdot Y \right] d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\partial_\mu F = \partial_x f$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we complete the proof. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Under the standing assumption, the value function $V : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous in space with respect to d_{W_1} and displacement semi-concave, uniformly in time, in the sense that there exists a constant C_0 such that, for any $t \in [0, T]$ and any two \mathcal{G} -measurable random variables X and Y ,*

$$V(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi + Y)) + V(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi - Y)) - 2V(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi)) \leq C_0 \mathbf{E}[|Y|^2]. \quad (20)$$

Proof. The first step in the proof is to notice that the Lagrangian L in (7) has bounded first and second order derivatives in x . This is a mere consequence of the uniform strict convexity of H in p and of the bounds for $\partial_x H$ and $\partial_{xx}^2 H$, see for instance [26, Lemma 5.44]. Then, the Lipschitz property of V in space is almost immediate. Fix t and take $m, \tilde{m} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and two random variables $\xi, \tilde{\xi}$ such that $d_{W_1}(m, \tilde{m}) = \mathbf{E}[d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\xi, \tilde{\xi})]$. Fixing an optimal open-loop control π for (t, m) , the Lipschitz property of F and G in m and the Lipschitz property of L in x give

$$V(t, \tilde{m}) - V(t, m) \leq \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, \tilde{m}, \pi) - \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, m, \pi) \leq C \mathbf{E}[d_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\xi, \tilde{\xi})],$$

which provides the Lipschitz-continuity of V . To show the semi-concavity, let again $\pi \in \Pi_t$ be optimal for (t, m) and ξ such that $\mathcal{L}(\xi) = m$. Denote the processes in (14) corresponding to the control π and the initial conditions ξ and $\xi \pm Y$ at time t by (respectively) $(X_s := \xi + \int_t^s \pi_r dr + B_s - B_t)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ and $(X_s^\pm := \xi \pm Y + \int_t^s \pi_r dr + B_s - B_t)_{t \leq s \leq T}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & V(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi + Y)) + V(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi - Y)) - 2V(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi)) \\ & \leq \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi + Y), \pi) + \mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi - Y), \pi) - 2\mathcal{J}_{\text{sto}}(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi + Y), \pi) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= G(\mathcal{L}(X_T^+)) + G(\mathcal{L}(X_T^-)) - 2G(\mathcal{L}(X_T)) + \int_t^T \left[F(\mathcal{L}(X_s^+)) + F(\mathcal{L}(X_s^-)) - 2F(\mathcal{L}(X_s)) \right] ds \\
&\quad + \int_t^T \left[L(X_s^+, \pi_s) + L(X_s^-, \pi_s) - 2L(X_s, \pi_s) \right] ds \\
&\leq C\mathbf{E}|Y|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

the last line following from Definition-Proposition 2.4 and from the identity $X_s^\pm = X_s \pm Y$, for $s \in [t, T]$. \square

An important tool to study control problems is the *dynamic programming principle*. We make use of it only for the deterministic formulation of the MFPCP for which its proof is straightforward: we have, for any $0 \leq t \leq \tau \leq T$,

$$V(t, m) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_t} \left\{ V(\tau, m_\tau) + \int_t^\tau \left(F(m_s) + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L(x, \alpha_s(x)) dm_s(x) \right) ds \right\}. \quad (21)$$

We refer to [7] and [36] for the statement and proof of the dynamic programming principle for the stochastic formulation of the MFPCP, in a much more general framework. We refer to [57, 64] for results directly formulated with controls in feedback form.

Formally, if V is smooth, then, by the dynamic programming principle, it solves the HJB equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t V(t, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(y, \partial_\mu V(t, m)(y)) dm(y) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y \partial_\mu V(t, m, y) \right] dm(y) + F(m) &= 0, \\
V(T, m) &= G(m),
\end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

see for instance [18, Section 3.7].

In Section 4, we define a notion of generalized solution to the HJB equation and we prove an existence and uniqueness result for it, see Theorem 4.12, which is one of the main results of this paper.

2.3. Connection with the MFG system. The analysis of the HJB equation (22) plays a key role in the derivation of existence and uniqueness of weak solutions to the master equation (12). Before we clarify the precise form of the master equation that we study next, we first recall the connection between the MFPCP and the potential MFG introduced in Subsection 2.1. The following key result is taken from [14, Proposition 3.1]:

Proposition 2.6. *For any initial condition $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and for any optimal feedback function α (whose existence is already guaranteed by Proposition 2.2) with corresponding optimal trajectory m , there exists $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ such that (m, u) is a classical solution to the MFG system (5) and $\alpha_t(x) = -\nabla u_t(x)$ for any $0 < t \leq T$ and any $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$.*

As a consequence, the infimum in the definition of the value function (17) can be equivalently taken over feedback functions that are bounded (by M in Proposition 2.2) and Lipschitz continuous in x (with a fixed Lipschitz constant determined by the data only).

Below, we say (abusively) that $(m_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ in Proposition 2.6 is an MFG solution that minimizes the cost functional \mathcal{J}_{det} . As we already noticed in Remark 2.3, the optimization problem is in fact defined in [14] over a wider class of controls, namely over measures of the form $\alpha(t, x)m(t, dx)$. Obviously, this does not change the validity of Proposition 2.2. We also stress the following point: In [14], f and g are satisfied to require $f(x, m) = [\delta F / \delta m](m)(x)$ and $g(x, m) = [\delta G / \delta m](m)(x)$, which is in fact stronger than the condition stated in (6) as it forces $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x, m) dx$ and $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g(x, m) dx$ to be equal to 0, see (2). However, as remarked in [14], there is in fact no need to require f and g to be centered with respect to m since, in the end, f and g are always integrated against a difference of two probability measures.

Importantly, let us finally observe that, formally, if V is C^2 in the measure argument, then, by applying the Schwarz identity (see [18, §2.2.2], but with a different centering condition)

$$\frac{\delta^2 V}{\delta m^2}(t, m)(x, y) = \frac{\delta^2 V}{\delta m^2}(t, m)(y, x),$$

its derivative

$$\tilde{U}(t, x, m) := \frac{\delta V}{\delta m}(t, m)(x), \quad (t, x, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d,$$

satisfies the following two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \tilde{U}(t, x, m) \\ & + \frac{\delta}{\delta m} \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(y, \nabla_y \tilde{U}(t, y, m)) dm(y) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 \tilde{U}(t, y, m) \right] dm(y) + F(m) \right\} (x) = 0, \\ & \tilde{U}(T, m) = \frac{\delta G}{\delta m}(m)(x), \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

together with

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \tilde{U}(t, x, m) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x \tilde{U}(t, x, m) - H(x, \nabla_x \tilde{U}(t, x, m)) + f(x, m) \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_p H(y, \nabla_y \tilde{U}(t, y, m)) \cdot \partial_\mu \tilde{U}(t, x, m)(y) m(dy) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y \partial_\mu \tilde{U}(t, x, m)(y) \right] m(dy) \\ & - C_t(m) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

$$\tilde{U}(T, x, m) = g(x, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g(y, m) dm(y),$$

where $C_t(m)$ is a penalization term that makes the above equation consistent with the condition $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \tilde{U}(t, x, m) dx = 0$. Equivalently, (24) says that the gradient $\nabla_x \tilde{U}$ solves the derivative of the master equation (12). The fact that (24) only coincides with (12) up to the additional remainder $C_t(m)$ was already reported in [28] for games on a finite set. In fact, the key point in this formulation is that it allows to identify (at least formally) $\nabla_x \tilde{U}$ in (24) with $\nabla_x U$ in (12): this is crucial since $\nabla_x \tilde{U}$ is precisely the term inside the nonlinearity; once the nonlinear term in (12) has been solved, the equation becomes easier to handle.

The fact that \tilde{U} solves both (23) and (24) prompts us to call Equation (23) ‘the conservative form of the master equation’. This is precisely this version for which we prove an existence and uniqueness result in Theorem 5.4: in short, the unique solution is shown to be the derivative of the value function V , the notion of derivative being understood in a relaxed sense.

In order to check the accuracy of our result, we prove that the centered version of any smooth solution to the master equation (12) is in fact a solution of the conservative form of the equation, see Proposition 5.9. As a by-product, the proof clarifies the form of the penalization term $C_t(m)$ in (24).

2.4. Summary of the main results. We here provide a short summary of the mains results that are established in the paper. We draw reader’s attention to the fact that these are only meta-statements: proper versions can only be given next, once the required tools have been carefully introduced. We start with the MFCP:

Meta-Theorem 2.7. *There exists a notion of generalized solution to the HJB equation (22), under which a solution must satisfy almost everywhere finite-dimensional approximations of (22) and for which existence and uniqueness hold true. The unique solution is the value function V defined in (17).*

Moreover, there exists a probability measure \mathbb{P} on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, with full support, such that, for any $t \in [0, T]$ and \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the MFCP (17) issued from (t, m) has a unique optimal trajectory. In fact, we also have that, for any $t \in [0, T]$ and \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $V(t, \cdot)$ has directional derivatives at m along $\mu - m = \cos(2\pi k \cdot)$ and $\mu - m = \sin(2\pi k \cdot)$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, in the sense specified in (1).

This meta-statement is addressed in Section 4. The notion of generalized solution is defined in Definition 4.1. The mains rigorous results encompassing Meta-Theorem 2.7 are Theorems 4.4 and 4.12. The definition and the properties of the measure $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ are given in Theorem 3.5. The existence of directional derivatives to V are guaranteed by a tailor-made version of Rademacher’s theorem on $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P})$, which is rigorously stated in Theorem 3.10.

As for the MFG, we have:

Meta-Theorem 2.8. *There exists a notion of weak solution to the conservative master equation (23) for which existence and uniqueness hold true, uniqueness being understood everywhere in time, \mathbb{P} almost everywhere in the measure argument and everywhere in the space argument, for the same \mathbb{P} as in the statement of Meta-Theorem 2.7. The hence unique solution coincides with the derivative of the value function V with respect to the measure argument, which is known to exist in a directional sense from Meta-Theorem 2.7, everywhere in time and \mathbb{P} almost everywhere in the measure argument.*

Moreover, any classical solution to the master equation (12) is, after centering, a solution of the conservative form of the equation.

The definition of a weak solution is given in Definition 5.1 and the main unique solvability result is stated in Theorem 5.4. The last part of the statement is shown in Proposition 5.9.

3. ELEMENTS OF FOURIER ANALYSIS

We provide some elements of Fourier analysis that are needed in the rest of the work. The very basic idea of our approach is to regard a function $\phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as a function of the Fourier coefficients $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, defined by

$$\widehat{m}^k := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} e^{i2\pi k \cdot y} dm(y),$$

with $i^2 = -1$. For simplicity, we write e_k for $e_k(x) = e^{i2\pi k \cdot x}$. From time to time, we also write $e_k(\cdot)$ instead of e_k in order to emphasize the fact that e_k is a function (on the torus).

3.1. Probability measures with finitely many non-zero Fourier coefficients.

3.1.1. *Bochner's theorem.* We recall Bochner's theorem: A complex-valued sequence $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the sequence of Fourier coefficients of a probability measure if and only if

$$(i) \widehat{m}^0 = 1, \widehat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{m}^k} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\},$$

$$(ii) \text{ for any } N \geq 1, \text{ any } (z_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\mathbb{N}^d|}, \quad \sum_{k, k' \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d} \widehat{m}^{k-k'} z_k \overline{z_{k'}} \geq 0.$$

Obviously, for $k, k' \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d$, $k - k'$ belongs to $F_N := \{-N + 1, \dots, N - 1\}^d$. Next, we introduce a few more notations in order to reformulate the above condition. For an element $k \in \mathbb{N}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we define $\sharp(k) := \inf\{j \in \{1, \dots, d\} : k_j \neq 0\}$ (i.e., $\sharp(k)$ is the first-non zero coordinate in k). For $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we call

$$F_N^{+,j} := \{k \in F_N : \sharp(k) = j \text{ and } k_j > 0\},$$

which allows us to let $F_N^+ := \bigcup_{j=1}^d F_N^{+,j} = \{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\} : k_{\sharp(k)} > 0\}$. This notation is very convenient to eliminate the conjugaison constraints in (i). Indeed, we can rewrite

$$\sum_{k, k' \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d} \widehat{m}^{k-k'} z_k \overline{z_{k'}} = \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d} |z_k|^2 + \sum_{k, k' \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d : k-k' \in F_N^+} (\widehat{m}^{k-k'} z_k \overline{z_{k'}} + \overline{\widehat{m}^{k-k'} z_k \overline{z_{k'}}}).$$

And then, we let

$$\mathcal{O}_N := \left\{ (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} : \inf_{\sum_{k \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^d} |z_k|^2 \leq 1} 2\Re \left[\sum_{k, k' \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^d : k-k' \in F_N^+} \widehat{m}^{k-k'} z_k \overline{z_{k'}} \right] > -1 \right\}.$$

It must be stressed that in the above definition, the infimum is taken over all sequences $(z_k)_{k \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^d}$ such that $\sum_{k \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^d} |z_k|^2 \leq 1$. In particular, if we are given $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$, we can complete the collection into a wider collection $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ by letting

$$\widehat{m}^0 = 1; \quad \widehat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{m}^k} \text{ if } k \in F_N^+; \quad \widehat{m}^k = 0 \text{ if } k \notin F_N. \quad (25)$$

By Bochner's theorem, the extended collection $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ hence defines a probability measure, which we may denote by $\mathcal{S}_N((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+})$. Below, we thus say that a probability measure $m \in$

$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ belongs to \mathcal{P}_N if $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$ and $\widehat{m}^k = 0$ if $k \notin F_N$. In this sense, \mathcal{O}_N and \mathcal{P}_N are one-to-one (through the mapping \mathcal{I}_N).

Equivalently, elements of \mathcal{P}_N can be identified with strictly positive density measures on \mathbb{T}^d whose Fourier coefficients above N are equal to 0. Indeed, if $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$, then we can find $c > 1$ such that

$$\inf_{\sum_{k \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^d} |z_k|^2 \leq 1} 2\Re \left[\sum_{k, k' \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^d : k - k' \in F_N^+} \widehat{m}^{k-k'} z_k \bar{z}_{k'} \right] > -1/c,$$

which, in turn, yields from Bochner's theorem that $1 + c(m - 1)$ is a probability measure, namely $m \geq 1 - 1/c$. In the end, \mathcal{O}_N can be reformulated as

$$\mathcal{O}_N = \left\{ (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} : \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left[1 + 2\Re \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \right) \right] > 0 \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Next, we clearly have

Proposition 3.1. *When complex numbers are identified with two-dimensional real vectors, \mathcal{O}_N is an open subset of real dimension $D_N := 2|F_N^+| = 2 \sum_{j=1}^d |F_N^{+,j}|$. The dimension D_N is less than $2(2N - 1)^d$.*

Proof. The proof for the upper bound of D_N is as follows. We observe that $F_N^+ \subset F_N$ and $|F_N| \leq (2N - 1)^d$. Therefore, there are at most $(2N - 1)^d$ complex-valued entries in elements of \mathcal{O}_N and, therefore, at most $2(2N - 1)^d$ real-valued entries. \square

3.1.2. Bochner-Herglotz' Theorem. In fact, there is a systematic construction of elements of \mathcal{P}_N . This is based on Bochner-Herglotz' theorem, which we recall now. The function

$$f_N : \theta \in \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{k, k' \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d} \exp(i2\pi(k - k') \cdot \theta) = \frac{1}{N^d} \left| \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}^d} \exp(i2\pi k \cdot \theta) \right|^2$$

is a density on \mathbb{T}^d . Its Fourier coefficients are given by

$$(i) \quad \widehat{f}_N^k = \prod_{j=1}^d \left(1 - \frac{|k_j|}{N}\right), \quad k \in F_N,$$

$$(ii) \quad \widehat{f}_N^k = 0, \quad k \notin F_N.$$

If $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, then the convolution $m * f_N$ is (obviously) a probability measure and its Fourier coefficients are given by

$$(i) \quad \widehat{m * f_N}^k = \prod_{j=1}^d \left(1 - \frac{|k_j|}{N}\right) \widehat{m}^k, \quad \text{if } k \in F_N; \quad (ii) \quad \widehat{m * f_N}^k = 0, \quad \text{if } k \notin F_N.$$

Obviously, by (26), we have

Proposition 3.2. *Let $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, $m * f_N \in \mathcal{P}_N$ if and only if $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} (m * f_N)(x) > 0$.*

3.1.3. Weak convergence of $(f_N)_{N \geq 1}$. Clearly, $(f_N)_{N \geq 1}$ converges in the weak sense to δ_0 . The following result is completely standard. Since we will use it many times, we feel it more convenient to have it in the form of a lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let \mathcal{K} be a compact subset of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{K}} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |(h * f_N)(x) - h(x)| = 0.$$

3.2. From probability measures on \mathcal{O}_N to a probability measure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. In Subsection 6.1, we construct a probability measure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ that satisfies Theorem 3.5 below. Before we make the statement clear, we recall that, except when explicitly mentioned, the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with the 1-Wasserstein distance. The Borel σ -algebra on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is the σ -algebra generated by the mappings $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) dm(x)$, for h in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Quite often, we use the following characterization of the Borel σ -algebra:

Lemma 3.4. *The Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is generated by the mappings $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto \hat{m}^k$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$.*

Proof. It suffices to observe that, for any $h \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and any $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) dm(x) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) d(m * f_N)(x) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in F_N} \hat{m}^k \hat{f}_N^k h^{-k}.$$

□

In brief, the probability measure provided by Theorem 3.5 below is obtained by means of a limiting argument, which relies on the following notations. For any $N \geq 1$, we equip \mathcal{O}_N with the (truncated) Gaussian density (in the definition below, \hat{m}^k is implicitly regarded as a two-dimensional vector, namely $(\Re(\hat{m}^k), \Im(\hat{m}^k))$):

$$\Gamma_N \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) := \frac{1}{Z_N} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_N} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\hat{m}^k|^2 \right), \quad (27)$$

for a real $p \geq 5$ that is fixed throughout the paper, and define on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ $\mathbb{P}_N := \Gamma_N \circ \mathcal{I}_N^{-1}$, where we recall that

$$\mathcal{I}_N : (\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N \mapsto m = 1 + 2 \sum_{k \in F_N^+} \Re[\hat{m}^k e_{-k}(\cdot)] = \sum_{k \in F_N} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad (28)$$

with the convention that $\hat{m}_0 = 1$ and $\hat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\hat{m}^k}$ for $k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$. (Since \mathcal{I}_N is obviously continuous, \mathbb{P}_N is well-defined.) Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is compact, the sequence $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ has weak limits. These weak limits are the measures on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ that we are interested in.

Here is now our main statement in this subsection:

Theorem 3.5. *The sequence $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is weakly converging to a probability measure \mathbb{P} on the Borel space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ equipped with the 1-Wasserstein measure. The latter satisfies the following items:*

(i) \mathbb{P} has full support and, for \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, m has a continuously differentiable strictly positive density.

(ii) For any $N \geq 1$, the image of \mathbb{P} by the projection mapping

$$\pi_N^{(1)} : m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto (\hat{m}^k \hat{f}_N^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$$

is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure (on \mathcal{O}_N). Similarly, the image of the subprobability measure $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_N}(m) \cdot \mathbb{P}$ by the projection mapping

$$\pi_N^{(2)} : m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto (\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$$

is supported by \mathcal{O}_N and is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure (on \mathcal{O}_N).

(iii)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\phi: \mathbb{R}^{D_N} \rightarrow [-1,1]} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \phi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}_N)(m) \right| = 0,$$

where, for any $N \geq 1$, ϕ in the argument of the supremum is required to be measurable.

Items (i) and (iii) will be used next, when addressing generalized and weak solutions to the HJB equation of the MFCP and the master equation of the MFG. In the rest of this section, we just make use of item (ii). It serves us as a way to pass from properties that are almost everywhere satisfied on \mathcal{O}_N (under the finite-dimensional Lebesgue measure) to properties that are almost everywhere satisfied on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ under \mathbb{P} (or under $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_N} \cdot \mathbb{P}$). In this regard, it is worth observing that the need for considering the subprobability measure $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_N} \cdot \mathbb{P}$ instead of the measure \mathbb{P} itself in item (ii) comes from the fact that, for $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \setminus \mathcal{P}_N$, the collection $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ may not be in \mathcal{O}_N .

A useful tool to pass from Lebesgue almost everywhere properties on $(\mathcal{O}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ to \mathbb{P} almost sure properties on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is the following lemma:

Lemma 3.6. *Let \mathbb{P} be as in the statement of Theorem 3.5. In addition, let, for any $N \geq 1$, A_N be a full Borel subset of \mathcal{O}_N .*

Then, we can find an event $A_\infty \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(A_\infty) = 1$ and $\pi_N^{(1)}(A_\infty) \subset A_N$ for any $N \geq 1$.

Proof. The measurability of the mapping $\pi_N^{(1)}$ is absolutely obvious since it is continuous. Then, we notice that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : \pi_N^{(1)}(m) \in A_N^c\right\}\right) = \mathbb{P} \circ (\pi_N^{(1)})^{-1}(A_N^c) = 0,$$

since $\mathbb{P} \circ (\pi_N^{(1)})^{-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{O}_N . Then, it suffices to let

$$A_\infty := \bigcap_{N \geq 1} \left\{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : \pi_N^{(1)}(m) \in A_N\right\}.$$

□

3.3. Restriction of a function defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Throughout this subsection, we take a function $\phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which we regard as a function of $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$. Under the assumption that ϕ has a linear functional derivative, we are interested in the shape of the derivatives of ϕ , when computed with respect to the Fourier coefficients.

3.3.1. Connection between flat derivatives and derivatives w.r.t. Fourier coefficients. We start with

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that ϕ has a linear functional derivative at $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$. Then, for $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$, denote by r the function*

$$r(\cdot) := 2 \sum_{k \in F_N^+} \Re[\widehat{r}^k e_{-k}(\cdot)] = \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k e_{-k}(\cdot),$$

with the convention that, in the above sum, $\widehat{r}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{r}^k}$ if $k \in F_N^+$. Then, for ε small enough, $m + \varepsilon r \in \mathcal{P}_N$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \phi(m + \varepsilon r) \\ &= \sum_{k \in F_N} \widehat{r}^k \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)(y) e_{-k}(y) dy \\ &= \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k \overline{\frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot)}^{-k} = 2 \sum_{k \in F_N^+} \left(\Re[\widehat{r}^k] \Re \left[\overline{\frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot)}^k \right] + \Im[\widehat{r}^k] \Im \left[\overline{\frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot)}^k \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is quite straightforward. Below, we will write

$$\partial_{\Re[\widehat{m}^k]} \phi(m) := 2 \Re \left[\overline{\frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot)}^k \right], \quad \partial_{\Im[\widehat{m}^k]} \phi(m) := 2 \Im \left[\overline{\frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot)}^k \right], \quad (29)$$

which is rather abusive as it means that the function ϕ is implicitly regarded as a function of the Fourier coefficients. Accordingly, we let, for $k \in F_N^+$,

$$\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} \phi(m) := \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\Re[\widehat{m}^k]} \phi(m) - \frac{i}{2} \partial_{\Im[\widehat{m}^k]} \phi(m) = \overline{\frac{\delta \phi}{\delta m}(m)}(\cdot)^{-k}, \quad (30)$$

so that

$$\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} \phi(m) \widehat{r}^k + \overline{\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} \phi(m) \widehat{r}^k} = \partial_{\Re[\widehat{r}^k]} \phi(m) \Re[\widehat{r}^k] + \partial_{\Im[\widehat{r}^k]} \phi(m) \Im[\widehat{r}^k]. \quad (31)$$

When $-k \in F_N^+$, we let $\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} \phi(m) = \overline{\partial_{\widehat{m}^{-k}} \phi(m)}$. However, the symbol $\partial_{\widehat{m}^k}$ is by no means an holomorphic derivative in the complex plain. This is just a shorten notation that refers to (real) differentiability with respect to $(\Re(\widehat{m}^k), \Im(\widehat{m}^k))$. This notation is fully legitimated by the fact that, each time this term appears, its complex conjugate also appears (in a common sum).

3.3.2. Almost everywhere differentiability of restrictions of Lipschitz functions. A function ϕ defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ can be restricted to \mathcal{P}_N . This induces a function, denoted by $\widetilde{\phi}_N$ and defined by

$$\widetilde{\phi}_N : (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N \mapsto \phi \circ \mathcal{I}_N \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) = \phi \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k} \right), \quad (32)$$

with $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ as in (25) and \mathcal{I}_N as in (28). When $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$, $\phi(m)$ and $\widetilde{\phi}_N((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+})$ (with $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ being here regarded as the Fourier coefficients of m) coincide. For this reason, we sometimes merely write $\widetilde{\phi}_N((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+})$ as $\phi((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+})$, even though the notation is rather abusive. Moreover, it is quite straightforward to see from the formula stated in Proposition 3.7 that the restriction of ϕ to \mathcal{P}_N is differentiable at $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ if and only if $\widetilde{\phi}_N$ is differentiable (in the real sense) at $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$.

The following statement is straightforward, but very useful:

Proposition 3.8. *Let ϕ be a Lipschitz function with respect to the total variation distance. Then, for any $N \geq 1$, the function $\widetilde{\phi}_N$ is almost everywhere differentiable on \mathcal{O}_N , when the latter is equipped with the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{O}_N .*

In particular, the restriction of the function ϕ to \mathcal{P}_N is almost everywhere differentiable on \mathcal{P}_N , when the latter is equipped with the image of the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{O}_N by the canonical embedding $\mathcal{I}_N : (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \mapsto \sum_{k \in F_N^+} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}$, with $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ being as in (25).

Notice that ϕ is assumed to be Lipschitz continuous with respect to the total variation distance. This includes the case when ϕ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the 1-Wasserstein distance.

Proof. It suffices to notice that, for two probability measures m_1 and m_2 in \mathcal{P}_N ,

$$|\phi(m_1) - \phi(m_2)| \leq C d_{\text{TV}}(m_1, m_2) \leq C \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |\widehat{m}_1^k - \widehat{m}_2^k|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where C is the Lipschitz constant of the function ϕ . We then apply standard (finite-dimensional) Rademacher's theorem. It says that ϕ , when regarded as a function on \mathcal{O}_N , is almost everywhere differentiable. \square

By Lemma 3.6, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 3.9. *Let \mathbb{P} be as in the statement of Theorem 3.5 and ϕ be a Lipschitz function with respect to the total variation distance. Then, for \mathbb{P} -almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, for any $N \geq 1$, the restriction of the function ϕ to \mathcal{P}_N is differentiable at $m * f_N$.*

In fact, we have the following version of Rademacher's theorem on the entire $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$:

Theorem 3.10. *Let \mathbb{P} be as in the statement of Theorem 3.5 and ϕ be a Lipschitz function with respect to the total variation distance. Then, for \mathbb{P} -almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, ϕ is differentiable at m in the directions $\mathfrak{R}[e_k]$ and $\mathfrak{S}[e_k]$ (or equivalently with respect to $\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^k]$ and $\mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^k]$) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$.*

Moreover, the following convergences hold true (as N tends to ∞) for the weak-star topology $\sigma^((L^\infty(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}); (L^1(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P})))$:*

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}, \quad \partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi(m * f_N) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi(m), \quad (33)$$

where the derivative in the left-hand side is understood as the Lebesgue almost everywhere derivative of the restriction of ϕ to \mathcal{P}_N whilst the derivative in the right-hand side is understood as the \mathbb{P} almost everywhere derivative of ϕ (as given by the hence stated form of Rademacher's theorem on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$).

Theorem 3.10 is proved in Subsection 6.2. The identification of the \mathbb{P} almost everywhere derivative as the limit of finite dimensional derivatives, as stated in (33), plays a key role in the identification of the solution of the weak formulation to the master equation given below.

3.4. Projection of a function defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that the restriction of ϕ to \mathcal{P}_N is differentiable at $m * f_N$, then the function*

$$\phi \star f_N(\cdot) := \phi(f_N * \cdot),$$

is differentiable in any direction at m and, for any $r \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}|_{\varepsilon=0} \phi \star f_N((1-\varepsilon)m + \varepsilon r) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} (\partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi)(m * f_N) e_k(y) f_N(x-y) dy \right) d(r-m)(x).$$

In words, the above statement allows to identify $\frac{\delta}{\delta m}[\phi \star f_N(m)]$ as

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta m} \phi \star f_N(m)(\cdot) = \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} (\partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi)(m * f_N) e_k \right) * f_N(\cdot).$$

Proof. It suffices to observe from Proposition 3.7 and (30) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}|_{\varepsilon=0} \phi \star f_N((1-\varepsilon)m + \varepsilon r) &= \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi(m * f_N) (\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k) \hat{f}_N^k \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi(m * f_N) \hat{f}_N^k e_k(x) d(r-m)(x), \end{aligned}$$

and the identity easily follows. \square

3.5. Mollification. In line with the material that we have introduced so far, we introduce a mollification procedure of real-valued functions on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ based on the Fourier coefficients of the measure.

Definition 3.12. *For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we call $\delta_{N,\varepsilon}$ given by*

$$\delta_{N,\varepsilon} := \frac{\varepsilon}{dN^2 |F_N|}$$

the regularization threshold.

The regularization threshold plays a key role in the whole paper. In particular, it manifests in the following definition:

Definition 3.13. Let ρ be a smooth density on \mathbb{R}^2 with a support included in the ball of center 0 and radius $\delta_{N,\varepsilon}$, for ε and N as in Definition 3.12. Then, for a real-valued function ϕ defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we call mollification $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ of ϕ the function

$$\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \phi\left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]),$$

with the notation

$$m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) := \varepsilon \text{Leb}_d + (1 - \varepsilon) \left(m + 2 \sum_{j \in F_N^+} \mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j e_{-j}] \right) = \varepsilon \text{Leb}_d + (1 - \varepsilon) \left(m + \sum_{j \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \hat{r}^j e_{-j} \right),$$

and with the convention that $\hat{r}^{-j} = \overline{\hat{r}^j}$.

For the sake of convenience, we often write

$$\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \phi\left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j,$$

but again the notation is abusive.

Of course, it should be stressed that, in the above proposition, the Fourier coefficients that belong to the support of ρ satisfy the inequality

$$\left| \sum_{j \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \hat{r}^j e_{-j}(x) \right| < \delta_{N,\varepsilon} |F_N| < \varepsilon,$$

which guarantess that $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r)$ is a positive density.

The key fact is that $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ only depends on m through the Fourier coefficients $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N}$. Obviously, it is a smooth function of the latter, which proves that $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is differentiable with respect to m . We have:

Proposition 3.14. For an integer N , a real $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a smooth density ρ with a support of radius less than $\delta_{N,\varepsilon}$, and for a bounded measurable real-valued function ϕ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the function $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is continuously differentiable with respect to m , with the following writing for the derivative:

$$\frac{\delta \phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}}{\delta m}(m)(x) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left[\left(\phi(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k \right) * f_N \right](x) \partial_{\hat{r}^k} \left[\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right] \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j,$$

for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$. Moreover, if ϕ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to d_{TV} , then the following formula also holds true:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta \phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}}{\delta m}(m)(x) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left[\left(\partial_{\hat{m}^k} \phi(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k \right) * f_N \right](x) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j, \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$.

Proof. The proof of a very similar result is already exposed in the appendix of [34]. Briefly, the first identity in the statement can be proved in two steps. The first step is to write $\phi(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)$ in the definition of $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m)$ as a function of $(\hat{m}^k + \hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ and then to make a change a variable (with respect to $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$) in order to pass the dependence upon $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ into the function ρ . We hence get that $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is smooth with respect to $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$. The second step is then to check, very much in the spirit of Proposition 3.11, that the differentiability of $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ with respect to $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ implies the existence of $\delta \phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} / \delta m$. Once the first identity has been proved, the second one easily follows by a standard integration by parts, using the fact that the derivatives of ϕ with respect to $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ exist almost everywhere. \square

As for the convergence of $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ to ϕ , it is ensured under a standard continuity property:

Lemma 3.15. *Assume that the function ϕ in Definition 3.13 is continuous for d_{W_1} at some $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, $\phi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m)$ converges to $\phi(m)$ when (N, ε) tends to $(\infty, 0)$ (it being understood that ρ varies along the prescription of Definition 3.13).*

Proof. We first compute $d_{\text{TV}}(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r), m^{N,\varepsilon}(0))$, for r in the support of ρ :

$$d_{\text{TV}}(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r), m^{N,\varepsilon}(0)) = (1 - \varepsilon) \sup_{\|h\|_\infty \leq 1} \sum_{j \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) \widehat{r}^j e_{-j}(x) dx \leq \delta_{N,\varepsilon} |F_N| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Next we have, in a similar way, $d_{\text{TV}}(m^{N,\varepsilon}(0), m) \leq 2\varepsilon$, which gives $d_{\text{TV}}(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r), m) \leq 3\varepsilon$, and then $d_{\text{TV}}(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N, m * f_N) \leq 3\varepsilon$. It remains to recall from Lemma 3.3 that $d_{W_1}(m * f_N, m)$ tends to 0 as N tends to ∞ . Using the fact that $d_{W_1} \leq c_0 d_{\text{TV}}$ (with c_0 as in the notation introduced in Section 1), $d_{W_1}(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N, m)$ (with r in the support of ρ) tends to 0 as (N, ε) tends to $(\infty, 0)$. This completes the proof. \square

Below, we apply Proposition 3.14 to time-space dependent functions $\varphi : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Following Definition 3.13, we let:

$$\varphi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \varphi\left(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\Re[\widehat{r}^j], \Im[\widehat{r}^j]) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d(\Re[\widehat{r}^j], \Im[\widehat{r}^j]),$$

for $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. We then have the following corollary:

Corollary 3.16. *For an integer N , an $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a smooth density ρ with a support of radius less than $\delta_{N,\varepsilon}$, and for a continuous real-valued function φ on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the function $\varphi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is differentiable with respect to m and the derivative $\delta\varphi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}/\delta m$ is continuous on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Moreover, for any $t \in [0, T]$, the following formula holds true, for any $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and any $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta\varphi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}}{\delta m}(t, m)(x) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left[\left(\partial_{\widehat{m}_k} \varphi\left(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\right) e_k \right) * f_N \right](x) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, if the function φ is also Lipschitz continuous in t , uniformly in m , then, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, for any $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the function $\varphi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is differentiable at (t, m) and $\partial_t[\varphi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t, m) = [\partial_t\varphi(t, \cdot)]^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m)$.

3.6. Weak formulation of semi-concavity. This step is crucial in our analysis. We provide a reformulation of the semi-concavity property through the Fourier coefficients. We start with the following reformulation of (displacement) semi-concavity (the proof may be skipped ahead on a first reading):

Proposition 3.17. *If $\phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is displacement semi-concave and ϕ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the measure d_{-2} on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ defined by*

$$d_{-2}(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{C}^2: \|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) d(\mu - \nu)(x) \right|,$$

then, for any constant $c > 1$, there exists a constant C depending on c and on ϕ through its Lipschitz constant only such that, for any probability measure m with a density such that $m \geq 1/c$, any smooth vector field $b : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, any integer N and any real $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $\varepsilon/(dN^2) < 1/(2c)$, and any smooth density ρ with a support of radius δ less than $\delta_{N,\varepsilon}$ in Definition 3.12,

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \phi\left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\right) \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j + t\widehat{\text{div}}^j) \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2.$$

Proof. First Step. For a smooth vector field $b : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and for an initial measure $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ that is smooth and positive, we consider the stochastic process

$$X_t^\pm := X_0 \pm t \frac{b}{m_0}(X_0), \quad t \geq 0,$$

with X_0 a random variable of law m_0 . Then, we let $m_t^\pm := \mathcal{L}(X_t^\pm)$, $t \geq 0$. For t small enough, $m_0 \pm t \operatorname{div}_x(b)$ is a probability measure (using the fact that $m_0 > 0$ and b is smooth). Since the function ϕ in the statement is d_{-2} -Lipschitz, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \phi(m_t^+) - \phi(m_0 - t \operatorname{div}_x(b)) \right| \\ & \leq C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \left[h\left(x + t \frac{b}{m_0}(x)\right) - h(x) \right] m_0(x) + t h(x) \operatorname{div}_x(b)(x) \right\} dx \right| \\ & = C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \left[h\left(x + t \frac{b}{m_0}(x)\right) - h(x) \right] m_0(x) - t \nabla h(x) \cdot b(x) \right\} dx \right| \\ & \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2 t^2, \end{aligned}$$

where C only depends on the Lipschitz constant of ϕ and on c such that $m_0 \geq 1/c$.

Proceeding similarly with m_t^- (and allowing the constant C to vary from line to line), we get

$$\phi(m_0 + t \operatorname{div}_x(b)) + \phi(m_0 - t \operatorname{div}_x(b)) - 2\phi(m_0) \leq \phi(m_t^-) + \phi(m_t^+) - 2\phi(m_0) \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2 t^2.$$

Second Step. We now want to replace m_0 by $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N$, for $N \geq 1$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, m as in the statement and $r \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|}$ such that $(\widehat{r}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{r}^k})_{k \in F_N^+}$ and

$$\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} |\widehat{r}^k| \leq \frac{1}{2c}.$$

For such an r , we have $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) \geq 1/(2c)$ and $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \geq 1/(2c)$. Modifying b into $b * f_N$, we get (using the same notation as in (32) for $\widetilde{\phi}_N$, which is a real-valued function on \mathcal{O}_N)

$$\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \overline{m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N}^k + \overline{t \operatorname{div}(b * f_N)}^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) + \widetilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \overline{m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N}^k - \overline{t \operatorname{div}(b * f_N)}^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \\ & - 2\widetilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \overline{m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N}^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \\ & \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2 t^2, \end{aligned}$$

for a constant C , only depending on the Lipschitz constant of ϕ and on c such that $m \geq 1/c$. Then, replacing $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r)$ by its definition, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \left(\varepsilon \delta_{k,0} + (1 - \varepsilon)(\widehat{m}^k + \widehat{r}^k) + t \widehat{\operatorname{div} b}^k \right) \widehat{f}_N^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \\ & + \widetilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \left(\varepsilon \delta_{k,0} + (1 - \varepsilon)(\widehat{m}^k + \widehat{r}^k) - t \widehat{\operatorname{div} b}^k \right) \widehat{f}_N^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \\ & - 2\widetilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \left(\varepsilon \delta_{k,0} + (1 - \varepsilon)(\widehat{m}^k + \widehat{r}^k) \right) \widehat{f}_N^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2 t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to ρ as in Definition 3.13, with the radius δ of the support of ρ satisfying $\rho < 1/(2c|F_N|)$, which is indeed the case if $\varepsilon/(dN^2) < 1/(2c)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \tilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \left(\varepsilon \delta_{k,0} + (1-\varepsilon)(\widehat{m}^k + \widehat{r}^k) + t \widehat{\operatorname{div}} b^k \right) \widehat{f}_N^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \tilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \left(\varepsilon \delta_{k,0} + (1-\varepsilon)(\widehat{m}^k + \widehat{r}^k) - t \widehat{\operatorname{div}} b^k \right) \widehat{f}_N^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \\ & - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \tilde{\phi}_N \left(\left\{ \left(\varepsilon \delta_{k,0} + (1-\varepsilon)(\widehat{m}^k + \widehat{r}^k) \right) \widehat{f}_N^k \right\}_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2 t^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields to (implicitly replacing b by $(1-\varepsilon)b$)

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \phi \left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j + t \widehat{\operatorname{div}} b^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \leq C \|b\|_\infty^2.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We have the following corollary:

Corollary 3.18. *In the framework of Proposition 3.17, it holds for any collection of complex numbers $(z^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ and for any non-negative symmetric matrix S of dimension d ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \phi \left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \right) \sum_{i=1}^d \operatorname{Trace} \left\{ \left(k_i \overline{z^k} \otimes [S\ell]_i \overline{z^\ell} \right)^\top \partial_{\widehat{r}^k, \widehat{r}^\ell}^2 \left[\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \right] \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \\ & \leq C |S| \sum_{q=1}^d \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

with C depending on c such that $m \geq 1/c$.

In the above formula, we used the following notation (very much in the spirit of (30) and (31)): for a smooth function ϕ , $\partial_{\widehat{r}^k, \widehat{r}^\ell}^2 \phi$ denotes the 2×2 matrix

$$\partial_{\widehat{r}^k, \widehat{r}^\ell}^2 \phi = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{\Re[\widehat{r}^k], \Re[\widehat{r}^\ell]}^2 \phi & -\partial_{\Re[\widehat{r}^k], \Im[\widehat{r}^\ell]}^2 \phi \\ -\partial_{\Im[\widehat{r}^k], \Re[\widehat{r}^\ell]}^2 \phi & \partial_{\Im[\widehat{r}^k], \Im[\widehat{r}^\ell]}^2 \phi \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, $k_i z^k \otimes l_i z^\ell$ denotes the 2×2 matrix

$$k_i z^k \otimes l_i z^\ell = \begin{pmatrix} \Re[k_i z^k] \Re[l_i z^\ell] & \Re[k_i z^k] \Im[l_i z^\ell] \\ \Im[k_i z^k] \Re[l_i z^\ell] & \Im[k_i z^k] \Im[l_i z^\ell] \end{pmatrix},$$

and similarly for $k_i \overline{z^k} \otimes [S\ell]_i \overline{z^\ell}$. In particular, using \mathfrak{P} as a generic notation for \Re, \Im , the main inequality in the statement of Corollary 3.18 can be rewritten as (with the dot product in the second line below being an inner product)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \phi \left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \sum_{\mathfrak{P}, \tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \Re, \Im} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[\left(\mathfrak{P}[z^k] k \right) \cdot \left(\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[z^\ell] S \ell \right) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\widehat{r}^k], \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\widehat{r}^\ell]}^2 \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\Re[\widehat{r}^j], \Im[\widehat{r}^j]) \right) \right] \Big\} \\ & \quad \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\Re[\widehat{r}^j], \Im[\widehat{r}^j] \right) \\ & \leq C |S| \sum_{q=1}^d \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Proof. Given the same non-negative symmetric matrix S as in the statement, we call $S^{1/2}$ a symmetric (non-negative) square root of S . We then apply Proposition 3.17 with the following vector field

$$b^{q'}(x) = [S^{1/2}]_{q,q'} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} z^k e_{-k}(x), \quad q' = 1, \dots, d,$$

with $z^{-k} = \overline{z^k}$, where q is a frozen integer in $\{1, \dots, d\}$ and $[S^{1/2}]_{q,q'}$ the element (q, q') of the matrix $S^{1/2}$. Then, we have

$$\operatorname{div}(b)(x) = -i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left(\sum_{q'=1}^d [S^{1/2}]_{q,q'} k_{q'} \right) z^k e_{-k}(x) = -i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} (S^{1/2} k)_q z^k e_{-k}(x).$$

In turn,

$$\widehat{\operatorname{div}(b)}^k = -i2\pi (S^{1/2} k)_q z^k.$$

We now apply Proposition 3.17, from which we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \phi \left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \sum_{\mathfrak{P}, \tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[\left(\mathfrak{P}[\widehat{\operatorname{div}(b)}^k] \right) \left(\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\widehat{\operatorname{div}(b)}^\ell] \right) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{r}^k], \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^\ell]}^2 \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \right) \right] \\ & \quad \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j] \right) \\ & \leq C |S| \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \phi \left(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \sum_{\mathfrak{P}, \tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \mathfrak{P}[iz^k] \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[iz^\ell] (S^{1/2} k)_q (S^{1/2} \ell)_q \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{r}^k], \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^\ell]}^2 \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \right) \\ & \quad \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j] \right) \\ & \leq C |S| \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By summing over $q \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and by changing $(z^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ into $(-iz^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$, we easily complete the proof. \square

4. GENERALIZED SOLUTIONS TO THE HJB EQUATION

The purpose of this section is to clarify and to prove Meta-Theorem 2.7. .

4.1. Interpretation of the spatial derivatives. We start with an informal discussion to explain our ideas.

Basically, the purpose is to reformulate the equation at points $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ at which the restriction at level N (see (32)) of a candidate W for solving (22) is differentiable. Here we use W (and not V) as a notation for a generic candidate since, at this stage, W may not be the value function of the MFCP (17). To ease the exposition, we do throughout this informal subsection as if W were smooth (even though it is obviously not true).

Crossed derivatives. We here address the term

$$T[m, W] := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y \partial_\mu W(t, m)(y) \right] dm(y)$$

in (22). If $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$, then we can identify the measure and its density and write (using an obvious integration by parts)

$$T[m, W] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy = - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \widehat{m}^k \overline{\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W(t, m)}^{-k}.$$

Recall from Proposition 3.7 the formula

$$\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) = \overline{\frac{\delta W}{\delta m}(t, m)}^{-k}, \quad k \in F_N^+,$$

from which we get

$$T[m, W] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy = - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) \widehat{m}^k.$$

We feel useful to stress the interest of the above formula: the quantity $T[m, W]$ can be reformulated in terms of the sole derivatives of W with respect to \widehat{m}^k , for $k \in F_N$. This property may be recast in another way: the differential operator that maps a real-valued smooth function ϕ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ onto the function

$$m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Trace} \left[\partial_y \partial_\mu \phi(m)(y) \right] dm(y)$$

has the heat equation as characteristics, that is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \phi(m_t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Trace} \left[\partial_y \partial_\mu \phi(m_t)(y) \right] dm_t(y), \quad \text{for } \partial_t m_t(y) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_y m_t(y) = 0,$$

where $t \geq 0$ and $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Since the heat equation keeps the space \mathcal{P}_N invariant, this strongly advocates for expanding probability measures in Fourier series.

Quadratic term. We now address the term

$$S[m, W] := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(y, \partial_\mu W(t, m)(y)) dm(y)$$

in (22). The big difficulty with this term is that it contains all the Fourier modes of $\delta W / \delta m$: differently from $T[m, W]$, $S[m, W]$ cannot be expressed in terms of the sole derivatives of W with respect to \widehat{m}^k , for $k \in F_N$. This is one of the main difficulty in our analysis. Anyway, it makes perfect sense in our context to assume that, whenever it exists, $\partial_\mu W(t, m)(y)$ is Hölder continuous in y : the reason is that the function $\partial_\mu W$ is expected to benefit from the presence of the heat operator in the direction y (this point is clarified in Proposition 4.10 below). In turn, we can assume that the d components of $y \mapsto \partial_\mu W(t, m)(y)$ are in a compact set of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. We then recall that, for any compact subset \mathcal{K} of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{k \notin F_N} |\widehat{f}^k|^2 = 0. \quad (35)$$

In that case, we can write

$$S[m, W] = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H \left(y, -i2\pi \left(\sum_{k \in F_N} k \overline{\frac{\delta W}{\delta m}(t, m)}^k e_{-k}(y) + \sum_{k \notin F_N} k \overline{\frac{\delta W}{\delta m}(t, m)}^k e_{-k}(y) \right) \right) dm(y).$$

Therefore, by expanding the Hamiltonian, we can reasonably postulate

$$S[m, W] = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H \left(y, -i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \overline{\frac{\delta W}{\delta m}(t, m)}^k e_{-k}(y) \right) dm(y) + O(\eta_N),$$

where η_N tends to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly on measures m whose density is bounded by the same constant. Finally, by (30),

$$S[m, W] = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(y)\right) dm(y) + O(\eta_N),$$

Beware that this is not a proof. This is just a hint that motivates the definition right below.

4.2. Definition of a generalized solution.

Definition 4.1. *For a constant $c > 1$, let $A_N(c) := [0, T] \times B_N(c)$ with $B_N(c) := \mathcal{P}_N \cap B(c)$ and $B(c) := \{m : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m(x)| \leq c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 1/c\}$. Then, we call a generalized solution to the HJB equation (22) a function $W : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is time-space Lipschitz continuous when $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with d_{TV} and that satisfies the following property: For any $c > 1$, there exists a sequence $(\eta_N(c))_{N \geq 1}$ converging to 0, such that, for any $N \geq 1$, $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}_N$ almost everywhere on $A_N(c)$, the following bound holds true:*

$$\left| \partial_t W(t, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(y)\right) dm(y) - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m) \hat{m}^k + F(m) \right| \leq \eta_N(c). \quad (36)$$

Of course, in this definition, the ‘ $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}_N$ almost everywhere’ should be equivalently understood as ‘almost everywhere’ for the product of the Lebesgue measure on $[0, T]$ and of the image of the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{O}_N by the canonical embedding \mathcal{S}_N in (28). In this regard, the need for W to be Lipschitz continuous is clear: this is a way to guarantee the existence of the derivatives, almost everywhere (see Proposition 3.8). In fact, the interest of this formulation is twofold: Not only does it permit to use directly the standard finite-dimensional Rademacher’s theorem (even though Proposition 3.10 provides an infinite-dimensional version in our context), but it also allows us to implement next the finite-dimensional regularization procedure introduced in Definition 3.13. The latter is a key ingredient in the proof of uniqueness, see in particular the forthcoming Proposition 4.11.

Very interestingly, by means of Theorem 3.5, the ‘almost-everywhere’ that is here understood for each $N \geq 1$ can be ‘factorized’ into a single ‘almost-everywhere’ (below, \mathbb{P} denotes the same probability measure as in the statement of Theorem 3.5):

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that W is a generalized solution to (22). Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exist a Borel subset D_ε of $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, such that $[\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}](D_\varepsilon^c) \leq \varepsilon$, and a sequence $(\eta_N(\varepsilon))_{N \geq 1}$ converging to 0 such that, for any $(t, m) \in D_\varepsilon$ and any $N \geq 1$,*

$$\left| \partial_t W(t, m * f_N) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m * f_N) e_k(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m * f_N) \hat{m}^k \hat{f}_N^k + F(m * f_N) \right| \leq \eta_N(\varepsilon). \quad (37)$$

In other words, the combination of Theorem 3.5 and of the mollification procedure reported in §3.1.2 makes it possible to have a definition that holds at ‘almost every’ point of the state space. Of course, what makes this definition interesting in this regard is that the measure \mathbb{P} has a full support.

Proof. We call E the set of points $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that m has a (strictly) positive continuously differentiable density. Theorem 3.5 says that $\mathbb{P}(E) = 1$. For any $m \in E$, we have $\inf_{N \geq 1} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m * f_N(x) > 0$ and $\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m * f_N(x)| < \infty$. In particular,

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{N \geq 1} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m * f_N(x) \geq 1/c\right\} \cap \left\{\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m * f_N(x)| \leq c\right\}\right) = 1.$$

Hence, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we can find $c_\varepsilon > 1$ such that $\mathbb{P}(E_\varepsilon) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, with

$$E_\varepsilon := \left\{ \inf_{N \geq 1} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m * f_N(x) \geq 1/c_\varepsilon \right\} \cap \left\{ \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m * f_N(x)| \leq c_\varepsilon \right\}.$$

Now, for any $c \geq 1$ and any $N \geq 1$, we call $\tilde{A}_N(c)$ the collection of points $(t, m) \in A_N(c)$ (see Definition 4.1 for the notation) at which (36) does not hold. Clearly $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}_N(\tilde{A}_N(c)) = 0$. We then make use of item (ii) in the statement of Theorem 3.5. By combining with an obvious adaptation of Lemma 3.6, we deduce that there exists a full subset D of $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that, for any $(t, m) \in D$ and for any $N \geq 1$, the point $(t, \pi_N^{(1)}(m))$ belongs to $\cap_{c \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} (\tilde{A}_N(c))^c$. We thus let

$$D_\varepsilon := ([0, T] \times E_\varepsilon) \cap D.$$

Clearly,

$$[\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}](D_\varepsilon^c) \leq T\varepsilon.$$

If $(t, m) \in D_\varepsilon$, then $(t, m * f_N) \in A_N(c_\varepsilon) \cap (\tilde{A}_N(c_\varepsilon))^c$. In particular, (36) holds true with respect to the sequence $(\eta_N(c_\varepsilon))_{N \geq 1}$, which we simply denote by $(\eta_N(\varepsilon))_{N \geq 1}$ in the statement. \square

Remark 4.3. *A natural question is to determine whether we can pass to the limit over N in (37) and then get that (22) is satisfied $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}$ almost everywhere.*

*The answer is twofold. On the one hand, it seems that we cannot do so a priori. The reason is that the passage from the derivative $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m * f_N)$ to the derivative $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m)$ (with the existence of the latter following from our own version of Rademacher's theorem, see Theorem 3.10) is just known to hold in the weak sense, see again the statement of Theorem 3.10. In particular, it seems impossible to address (at least in the current framework) the limit of the gradients inside the Hamiltonian H driving the HJB equation. On the other hand, it seems that the same passage to the limit can be in fact achieved a posteriori, once the generalized solutions are known to coincide with the value function V , which identification follows from Theorem 4.12 if we restrict ourselves to generalized solutions with sufficient regularity properties. The proof would follow from a combination of Theorem 4.4, Lemma 4.6 and Remark 4.7 right below. In short, the former statement says that, for $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}$ almost every initial condition, the MFCP has a unique solution. In turn, we conjecture that, for $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}$ almost every $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, any sequence of optimal trajectories issued from $((t, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ should converge in a suitable sense to the optimal trajectory issued from (t, m) . However, since optimal trajectories satisfy the MFG system (5), this convergence property can be certainly reformulated as a convergence property on any sequence of solutions to (5) that start from $((t, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ and that minimize \mathcal{J}_{det} . It then remains to observe that Lemma 4.6 and Remark 4.7 below permit to identify $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m * f_N)$ and $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m)$ with solutions of the backward equation in the MFG system (5) when initialized from $(t, m * f_N)$ and (t, m) respectively. Combined with the convergence property of the MFG system, this should imply in the end that $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m * f_N)$ converges to $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m)$ $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}$ almost everywhere, which is almost what we need to pass to the limit in the Hamiltonian. Indeed, once the convergence of the derivatives with respect to any \hat{m}^k has been shown, the convergence of the Fourier series encoding the derivatives with respect to m is quite easy to address, see for instance Proposition 4.10 which provides strong bounds on the decay of $\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m)$.*

Of course, this result should be formalized in the form of a more rigorous statement. However, we feel useless to address the details here since the real benefit for our analysis would be small in the end. Indeed, the result would come only in the end, once uniqueness of the generalized solution has been proven. Moreover, our feeling is precisely that (at least at this stage of our understanding) it is in fact much easier to work with finite dimensional formulations of the HJB equation.

4.3. The value function as a generalized solution. We have the following main statement:

Theorem 4.4. *The value function V , as defined in (17), is a generalized solution of the HJB equation. It is Lipschitz continuous in time and space when the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with*

respect to d_{-2} (see the definition in Proposition 3.17) and it is semi-concave (see Proposition 2.5).

Moreover, if, for some $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $V(t, \cdot)$ has directional derivatives at m along $\mathfrak{R}[e_k]$ and $\mathfrak{S}[e_k]$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then the MFCP introduced in Subsection 2.2 has a unique optimizer when the trajectories (16) are initialized from m at time t . In particular, uniqueness holds for $\text{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}$ -almost every point $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, with \mathbb{P} denoting the same probability measure as in the statement of Theorem 3.5.

Remark 4.5. The reader may compare the almost everywhere uniqueness result stated right above with the counter-example to uniqueness provided in [14, Subsection 3.2]. In the latter reference, non-unique solutions are constructed at probability measures m whose density is symmetric with respect to the first coordinate x_1 of $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$. In turn, this says that those measures satisfy $\mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^k] = 0$ when $k = (1, 0, \dots)$. Obviously, the collection of such probability measures has zero mass under \mathbb{P}_N , when $N \geq 2$, and also under \mathbb{P} by (iii) in the statement of Theorem 3.5.

In preparation for the proof, we state the following three lemmas (the proofs of which are given in the next subsection):

Lemma 4.6. For $N \geq 1$, take a point $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ such that the restriction $\tilde{V}_N(0, \cdot)$ of $V(0, \cdot)$ to \mathcal{O}_N is differentiable at $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$. Then, whatever the solution $(m_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ to the MFG system (5) (see Proposition 2.1, with $m_0 = m$) that minimizes \mathcal{J}_{\det} (see Proposition 2.6), it holds that

$$\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m) = \hat{u}_0^{-k}, \quad k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}.$$

Remark 4.7. In fact, a similar statement holds when $V(0, \cdot)$ has a directional derivative along $\mathfrak{R}[e_k]$ and $\mathfrak{S}[e_k]$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, at a point $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. The same proof shows that, in that case,

$$\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m) = \hat{u}_0^{-k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}.$$

We will use this extension in order to prove uniqueness of the optimal trajectories for almost every starting point, as described in the second part of the statement of Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 4.8. For any constant $c > 0$, there exist two positive-valued sequences $(\epsilon_N)_{N \geq 1}$ and $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$, with $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$ converging to 0 and with both satisfying the following property. If, for an initial condition m_0 such that $\|\nabla m_0\|_\infty \leq c$ and $\hat{m}_0^k = 0$ when $k \notin F_N$, for a control $\alpha : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c$, and for $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ the α -controlled trajectory defined in (16), we let $(\mu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ be the function-valued trajectory defined by

$$\hat{\mu}_t^k := \begin{cases} \hat{m}_t^k & \text{if } k \in F_N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

then, for any $t \in [0, \epsilon_N]$, $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $d_{W_1}(m_t, \mu_t) \leq \eta_N t$.

Lemma 4.9. The value function is time and space Lipschitz continuous, when the space of probability measures is equipped with d_{-2} (see Proposition 3.17 for the definition of the latter).

For the time being, we switch to the proof of our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. By Proposition 2.5, the value function is Lipschitz in space, when $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with d_{W^1} . In fact, Lipschitz property in time and space, with $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ being equipped with d_{-2} , is a consequence of Lemma 4.9, whose proof is independent. Obviously, Lemma 4.9 subsumes Proposition 2.5.

First step. We consider a probability measure m at which the restriction of V to $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ is time-space differentiable at $(0, m * f_N)$ (i.e., using the notation of (32), the function \tilde{V}_N is time-space differentiable at $(0, (\hat{m}^k \hat{f}_N^k)_{k \in F_N^+})$).

For simplicity, we let $m_0 = m * f_N$. We fix $c > 0$ such that $\|\nabla m_0\|_\infty \leq c$ and we choose a control $\alpha : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c$. Then, for $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ the

corresponding α -controlled trajectory and for $(\mu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ being defined as in the statement of Lemma 4.8, μ_t is a probability measure for $t \in [0, \epsilon_N]$ and

$$d_{W_1}(m_t, \mu_t) \leq \eta_N t, \quad t \in [0, \epsilon_N],$$

where, throughout the proof, $(\epsilon_N)_{N \geq 1}$ and $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$ denote generic positive-valued sequences that tend to 0 and whose choices only depend on the value of c . Since V is time-space Lipschitz continuous (when $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is equipped with d_{W_1}), we obtain

$$|V(t, m_t) - V(t, \mu_t)| \leq C\eta_N t. \quad (39)$$

Using the fact that the restriction of V is differentiable at $(0, m_0)$ together with the fact that $(\mu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq \epsilon_N}$ takes values in \mathcal{P}_N , we get, for $t \in [0, \epsilon_N]$,

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, \mu_t) &= V(0, m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) + \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) (\hat{\mu}_t^k - \hat{m}_0^k) + o_N(t), \\ &= V(0, m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) + \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) (\hat{m}_t^k - \hat{m}_0^k) + o_N(t), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where we used (38) to pass from the first to the second line. In the above notation, the bound in the Landau symbol $o_N(\cdot)$ may depend on N (as the differentiation is performed in finite-dimension). Next, we notice that, for $k \in F_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \hat{m}_t^k &= -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \hat{m}_t^k + i2\pi \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot \alpha_t(x) e_k(x) dm_t(x) \\ &= -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \hat{m}_0^k + i2\pi \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot \alpha_t(x) e_k(x) m_0(x) dx + O_N(t^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where we used in the second line the obvious fact that $\|m_t - m_0\|_2 \leq C\sqrt{t}$. The latter follows from the reformulation of the Fokker-Planck equation (16) in a non-divergence form, namely

$$\partial_t m_t(x) + \alpha_t(x) \cdot \nabla_x m_t(x) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x m_t(x) + \operatorname{div}_x(\alpha_t)(x) m_t(x) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Since $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c$ and $\|\nabla m_0\|_\infty \leq c$, standard Schauder's estimates guarantee that the solution to the above equation is Lipschitz continuous in space and 1/2-Hölder continuous in time, which proves the announced estimate for $\|m_t - m_0\|_2$.

Therefore, inserting (41) into (40), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, \mu_t) &= V(0, m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) - t2\pi^2 \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) |k|^2 \hat{m}_0^k \\ &\quad + i2\pi \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) e_k(x) \right) \cdot \alpha_s(x) m_0(x) dx ds + o_N(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let now

$$v^N(x) := i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) e_k(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (42)$$

Then, combining with (39), we obtain, for $t \in [0, \epsilon_N]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| V(t, m_t) - \left(V(0, m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) - t2\pi^2 \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) |k|^2 \hat{m}_0^k \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v^N(x) \cdot \alpha_s(x) m_0(x) dx ds \right) \right| \leq C\eta_N t + o_N(t). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Importantly, we recall from Lemma 4.6 that $v^N(x) = i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \hat{u}_0^{-k} e_k(x)$, where u_0 is the initial value of the backward component of any solution to the MFG system (5) that minimizes \mathcal{J}_{\det} (with m_0 as initial condition). Proposition 2.1 says that there exists a constant C , independent of N , such that $\|v^N\|_2 \leq C$. As a consequence, if we let

$$\alpha_t^N(x) := \sum_{k \in F_N} \hat{\alpha}_t^k e_{-k}(x), \quad (44)$$

then we can easily replace α_t by α_t^N in (43). Indeed, from the assumption $\|\nabla_x \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c$, we deduce (see for instance (35)) that the sequence $(|\hat{\alpha}_t^k|)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is square-integrable, uniformly in α_t satisfying $\|\nabla_x \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c$.

Second Step. Using the same notation as in the first step, we now consider the cost

$$\mathcal{J}_{\det}^{0,t}(\alpha) := \int_0^t \left(F(m_s) + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L(x, \alpha_s(x)) m_s(dx) \right) ds + V(t, m_t).$$

By recalling (43) together with the fact that $\|m_t - m_0\|_2 \leq Ct^{1/2}$ and by using the quadratic growth of L , we obtain

$$\left| \mathcal{J}_{\det}^{0,t}(\alpha) - \left(V(0, m_0) + tF(m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) - t2\pi^2 \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) |k|^2 \hat{m}_0^k + \int_0^t \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v^N(x) \cdot \alpha_s^N(x) m_0(x) dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L(x, \alpha_s(x)) m_0(x) dx \right] ds \right) \right| \leq C\eta_N t + o_N(t).$$

We now use the local Lipschitz property of L with respect to the control parameter. And, once again, we use the fact that the sequence $(|\hat{\alpha}_t^k|)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is square-integrable, uniformly in α_t satisfying $\|\nabla_x \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c$. We get

$$\left| \mathcal{J}_{\det}^{0,t}(\alpha) - \left(V(0, m_0) + tF(m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) - t2\pi^2 \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) |k|^2 \hat{m}_0^k + \int_0^t \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v^N(x) \cdot \alpha_s^N(x) m_0(x) dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L(x, \alpha_s^N(x)) m_0(x) dx \right] ds \right) \right| \leq C\eta_N t + o_N(t).$$

Third step. We now make use of the dynamic programming principle (21), which says that

$$V(0, m_0) = \mathcal{J}_{\det}^{0,t}(\alpha),$$

if α is an optimal strategy of the MFCP. We thus consider a solution to the MFG system (5) that minimizes the MFCP (see Proposition 2.6). We call it $(m_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ (with m_0 as initial condition) and we choose $\alpha_t(x) = -\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x))$. By Proposition 2.1, $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla_x \alpha_t\|_\infty \leq c'$ for a constant c' only depending on the various data in the assumption stated in Subsection 2.1. Invoking Lemma 4.6 again, using the same notations as in (42) and (44), using the Lipschitz property of $\partial_p H$ with respect to the variable p and the bound for $\|\nabla_x^2 u_0\|_\infty$ provided by Proposition 2.1, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\alpha_0^N(x) + \partial_p H(x, v^N(x))|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\alpha_0^N(x) - \alpha_0(x)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_0(x)) - \partial_p H(x, v^N(x))|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\alpha_0^N(x) - \alpha_0(x)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} + C \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla_x u_0(x) - v^N(x)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C\eta_N. \end{aligned}$$

Using time-continuity of $\nabla_x u_t$ (see again Proposition 2.1), invoking once again the local-Lipschitz property of L and inserting (9) into the conclusion of the second step, we obtain

$$\left| tF(m_0) + t\partial_t V(0, m_0) - t2\pi^2 \sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(0, m_0) |k|^2 \hat{m}_0^k - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(x, v^N(x)) m_0(x) dx ds \right| \leq C\eta_N t + o_N(t),$$

which yields, by dividing by t , (36) at point $(0, m_0)$. Obviously, we can proceed in a similar manner when the initial time is some $t \in (0, T]$ (it is easily checked that the sequences $(\epsilon_N)_{N \geq 1}$ and $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$ do not depend on the choice of the initial condition, as we prescribed in the first step of the proof).

Fourth Step. We now prove the second part of the statement. The proof relies on Remark 4.7. Combined with Theorem 3.10, it says that, for any $t \in [0, T]$ (replacing 0 by t in Remark 4.7) and, for almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the optimal trajectories issued from (t, m) satisfy the MFG system (5) with a prescribed initial value for the backward equation (since the Fourier coefficients are uniquely determined). By [14, Proposition 2.1], uniqueness follows at such points (t, m) . \square

4.4. Proof of the auxiliary lemmas.

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Following the statement, we fix $N \geq 1$ and we take a point $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ such that the restriction of $V(0, \cdot)$ to \mathcal{O}_N is differentiable at $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$. Moreover, we call $(m_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ a solution to the MFG system that minimizes \mathcal{J}_{\det} .

The proof then relies on the principle of super-jets. We know that for another point $m' \in \mathcal{P}_N$,

$$V(0, m') \leq \int_0^T \left(F(m'_t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(x, -\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x))) dm'_t(x) \right) dt + G(m'_T),$$

for $(m'_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t m'_t(x) - \operatorname{div} \left(\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x)) m'_t(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta m'_t(x) = 0, \quad (45)$$

with $m'_0 = m'$ as initial condition.

In turn,

$$\begin{aligned} V(0, m') - V(0, m) &\leq \int_0^T \left(F(m'_t) - F(m_t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(x, -\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x))) d(m'_t - m_t)(x) \right) dt \\ &\quad + G(m'_T) - G(m_T), \end{aligned}$$

And then, thanks to the fact that F and G have Lipschitz continuous derivatives,

$$\begin{aligned} &V(0, m') - V(0, m) \\ &\leq \int_0^T \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta F}{\delta m}(m_t)(y) d(m'_t - m_t)(y) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(x, -\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x u_t(x))) d(m'_t - m_t)(x) \right\} dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \frac{\delta G}{\delta m}(m_T)(y) d(m'_T - m_T)(y) + C \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m'_t(y) - m_t(y)|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using the stability properties of the linear equation (45), the last term is less than $C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m'(y) - m(y)|^2 dy$ (for a new value of C), where we notice that m and m' have a finite number of non-zero Fourier coefficients and thus have a smooth density.

We now replace $[\delta G / \delta m](m_T)(y)$ by $g(y, m_T) = u_T(y)$ and $[\delta F / \delta m](m_t)(y)$ by $f(y, m_t)$ and we use the MFG system (5) and the probabilistic representation (10). We get

$$V(0, m') - V(0, m) \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_0(y) d(m' - m)(y) + C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m'_0(y) - m_0(y)|^2 dy. \quad (46)$$

We deduce that for $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|}$

$$\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\hat{m}_k} V(m) \hat{r}^k \leq \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus \{0\}} \hat{u}_0^{-k} \hat{r}^k.$$

(Above, it is implicitly understood that $\hat{r}^k = -\overline{\hat{r}^k}$.) And we should have equality by changing r into $-r$. This is sufficient to identify the real and imaginary parts of $\partial_{\hat{m}_k} V(m)$ and \hat{r}^{-k} (consistently with the definition (30)). This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.8. We observe that $\hat{\mu}_t^0 = 1$, hence μ_t has mass 1 for any $t \in [0, T]$. However, μ_t may become negative valued for t away from 0. In order to prove that μ_t stays positive for t close to 0, recall the equation (16) satisfied by $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. Since the initial condition is Lipschitz continuous and bounded (as it is a density) and since the drift α therein is also Lipschitz continuous in space, we can invoke standard estimates for parabolic equations to deduce that the function $(t, x) \mapsto m_t(x)$ is 1/2-Hölder continuous in time and Lipschitz continuous in space

on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$, for some Hölder and Lipschitz constants only depending on c . In particular, we can find $\epsilon_N(c) > 0$ only depending on c and N , such that

$$\sum_{k \in F_N} |\widehat{m}_t^k - \widehat{m}_0^k| \leq \frac{c}{2},$$

if $t \in [0, \epsilon_N(c)]$. And then, replacing \widehat{m}_t^k by $\widehat{\mu}_t^k$ and recalling that $\widehat{m}_0^k = 0$ if $k \notin F_N$,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\mu_t(x) - m_0(x)| \leq \frac{c}{2},$$

which shows that μ_t is positive (and thus is a probability measure) if $t \in [0, \epsilon_N(c)]$ (since m_0 is lower bounded by c).

Next, we consider a test function h that is 1-Lipschitz continuous. Then, for $t \in [0, \epsilon_N(c)]$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) d(m_t - \mu_t)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (h(x) - h * f_N(x)) d(m_t - \mu_t)(x),$$

where we used the fact that $\widehat{h * f_N}^k = 0$ if $k \notin F_N$ and $\widehat{m}_t^k = \widehat{\mu}_t^k$ if $k \in F_N$. Now, since h is 1-Lipschitz, there exists a sequence $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$ converging to 0 (and independent of h in the class of 1-Lipschitz continuous functions) such that $\|h - h * f_N\|_\infty \leq \eta_N$. We deduce that

$$d_{W_1}(m_t, \mu_t) \leq \eta_N \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m_t(x) - \mu_t(x)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} = \eta_N \left(\sum_{k \notin F_N} |\widehat{m}_t^k|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (47)$$

Now, we compute the dynamics of \widehat{m}_t^k for $k \notin F_N$. By integrating (16) with respect to e_k , we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \widehat{m}_t^k = -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \widehat{m}_t^k - \operatorname{div}(\widehat{\alpha_t m_t})^k.$$

Letting for simplicity $\beta_t = \operatorname{div}(\alpha_t m_t)$, we obtain, for $k \notin F_N$ (using the fact that $\widehat{m}_0^k = 0$),

$$|\widehat{m}_t^k| \leq \int_0^t |\widehat{\beta}_s^k| ds.$$

Recalling that α_t and m_t are Lipschitz continuous in space (uniformly in t), we deduce that there exists a constant $C(c)$ such that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\widehat{\beta}_t^k|^2 \leq C(c).$$

Inserting in (47), we get $t\eta_N \sqrt{C(c)}$ as upper bound for $d_{W_1}(m_t, \mu_t)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.9. We first prove that V is Lipschitz in space with respect to d_{-2} . Without any loss of generality, we can prove the Lipschitz property at time $t = 0$.

By (46) in the proof of Lemma 4.6, we know that, for any two $m, m' \in \mathcal{P}_N$, for some $N \geq 1$,

$$V(0, m') - V(0, m) \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u_0(y) d(m' - m)(y) + C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m'(y) - m(y)|^2 dy,$$

where $(m_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is a solution of the MFG system (5) that minimizes \mathcal{J}_{\det} . By Proposition 2.6, the function u_0 is C^2 and we have a bound for $\|\nabla^2 u_0\|_\infty$ that only depends on the data in the assumption stated in Subsection 2.1. Therefore,

$$V(0, m') - V(0, m) \leq C d_{-2}(m', m) + C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m'(y) - m(y)|^2 dy,$$

with C being independent of m and m' .

By choosing iteratively (m, m') as (m_i, m_{i+1}) with $m_i = (1 - i/n)m + (i/n)m'$, for $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and for an integer $n \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} V(0, m') - V(0, m) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n [V(0, m_{i+1}) - V(0, m_i)] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n C d_{-2}(m_{i+1}, m_i) + C \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m_{i+1}(y) - m_i(y)|^2 dy \\ &= C d_{-2}(m', m) + \frac{C}{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |m'(y) - m(y)|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

Letting n tend to ∞ , we get

$$V(0, m') - V(0, m) \leq C d_{-2}(m', m).$$

The above is true when m and m' are in \mathcal{P}_N . For any two general m and m' , we can apply the above to $m * f_N$ and $m' * f_N$. We then observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{-2}(m' * f_N, m * f_N) &= \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2: \|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) (m' * f_N - m * f_N)(x) dx \\ &= \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2: \|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\phi * f_N)(x) d(m' - m)(x) \\ &\leq d_{-2}(m', m). \end{aligned}$$

In the end, we have

$$V(0, m' * f_N) - V(0, m * f_N) \leq C d_{-2}(m', m).$$

By Proposition 2.5, V is continuous for the 1-Wasserstein distance. We can easily pass to the limit in the left-hand side and then get that $V(0, \cdot)$ is C -Lipschitz continuous for d_{-2} . The same argument can be applied at any time $t \in (0, T]$.

It now remains to prove that V is Lipschitz continuous in time. In order to do so, we use the dynamic programming principle as follows. Using the d_{-2} -Lipschitz property in space, we know that, for any $t \in (0, T]$ and an optimal control $(\alpha_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ (regarded as a bounded time-space feedback function),

$$|V(t, m_t) - V(t, m_0)| \leq C d_{-2}(m_t, m_0)$$

where $(m_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ solves (16) with m_0 as initial condition.

Now, using the form of the Fokker-Planck equation, we get

$$d_{-2}(m_t, m_0) = \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2: \|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) d(m_t - m_0)(x) \leq Ct,$$

for a constant C that depends on $\|\alpha\|_\infty$, but, by Proposition 2.6, the latter can be assumed to be bounded independently of the initial condition m_0 .

It then remains to see from the dynamic programming principle that (for a possibly new value of C)

$$|V(t, m_t) - V(0, m_0)| \leq Ct.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4.5. Mollification of d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous and semi-concave generalized solutions. The aim of this subsection is to show that, provided that they are d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous and semi-concave (in space), generalized solutions can be mollified into functions that ‘nearly’ solve the original HJB equation on the whole space (and not only almost everywhere). This is a key result to obtain uniqueness of d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous and semi-concave generalized solutions.

For W a generalized solution of the HJB equation and for the same parameters N, ε and ρ as in Definition 3.13, we call the corresponding mollification $W^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}$ (which implicitly depends on ρ , as emphasized in Definition 3.13). We start with the following observation:

Proposition 4.10. *If $W : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous in space, uniformly in time, then there exists a constant C such that, for any $N \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \partial_x \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) \right| &\leq C, \\ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \partial_{xx}^2 \left[\left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k \right) * f_N \right] (x) \right| &\leq C, \end{aligned}$$

at any point $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ at which the restriction $\widetilde{W}_N(t, \cdot)$ of $W(t, \cdot)$ to \mathcal{O}_N is differentiable. Moreover, at those points,

$$\sum_{k \in F_N} |k|^4 |\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m)|^2 \leq C.$$

Proof. We recall that \mathcal{O}_N is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$. Therefore, for a point $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ of differentiability of \widetilde{W}_N , we can choose $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that, for any $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$ with $\widehat{r}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{r}^k}$ and $\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} |\widehat{r}^k|^2 \leq 1$, $(\widehat{m}^k + \varepsilon \widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \in \mathcal{P}_N$. By the d_{-2} -Lipschitz property of W , we obtain

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \widetilde{W}_N \left(t, (\widehat{m}^k + \varepsilon \widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \right) \leq C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k \widehat{\phi}^{-k}.$$

for a constant C only depending on the d_{-2} -Lipschitz constant of W in space and whose value is allowed to vary from line to line. And then,

$$\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) \leq C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k \widehat{\phi}^{-k}.$$

Obviously, we can relax the condition $\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} |\widehat{r}^k|^2 \leq 1$ in the above inequality (as it is linear). In other words, the above holds true for any $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$ with $\widehat{r}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{r}^k}$ for $k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$. In particular, we can replace $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$ by $(k_q k_{q'} \widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$, for some $q, q' \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, from which we get

$$\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} k_q k_{q'} \widehat{r}^k \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) \leq C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k (k_q k_{q'} \widehat{\phi}^{-k}). \quad (48)$$

The argument appearing in the supremum in the right-hand side can be rewritten (up to a multiplicative constant) $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r(x) \partial_{x_q x_{q'}}^2 \phi(x) dx$ with $r(x) = \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k e_{-k}(x)$. Since the test function ϕ satisfies $\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1$, we get in the end

$$\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} k_q k_{q'} \widehat{r}^k \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |r(x)| dx. \quad (49)$$

This yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r(x) \partial_{x_q x_{q'}}^2 \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) dx \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |r(x)| dx. \quad (50)$$

We now use (50) in order to derive the last two claims in the statement. In order to prove the second claim, we choose $r(x) = (s * f_N)(x)$ in (50), for an arbitrary function $s : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |s(x)| dx < \infty$. Since f_N is even, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s(x) \partial_{x_q x_{q'}}^2 \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k * f_N(x) \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r(x) \partial_{x_q x_{q'}}^2 \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) dx \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |r(x)| dx \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |s(x)| dx, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the second claim.

As for the last claim in the statement, it also follows from (50), by choosing therein $r(x) = \partial_{x_q x_{q'}}^2 \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right)$.

It then remains to derive the first claim in the statement. To do so, we rewrite (48)–(49) in the following manner. Instead of using $(k_q k_{q'} \widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$ in (48), we just use $(k_q \widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$, for some $q \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Then, for $r(x) = \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{r}^k e_{-k}(x)$, we reformulate (49) as

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r(x) \partial_{x_q} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) dx \leq C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} r(x) \partial_{x_q} \phi(x) dx.$$

If we now take a square integrable function $s : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and apply the above inequality to $r(x) = s_N(x)$, with $s_N(x) = \sum_{k \in F_N} \widehat{s}^k e_{-k}(x)$ being the (cubic) Fourier sum of order N at x , then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s(x) \partial_{x_q} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s_N(x) \partial_{x_q} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) dx \\ &\leq C \sup_{\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s_N(x) \partial_{x_q} \phi(x) dx \\ &= \sup_{\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s(x) \left[\partial_{x_q} \phi \right]_N(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with $[\partial_{x_q} \phi]_N(x) = \sum_{k \in F_N} \widehat{\partial_{x_q} \phi}^k e_{-k}(x)$. Here, a d -dimensional version of Dini theorem (see [42, Section 3], [67, Corollary 2.1.2] or [2, Chapter 1, &2.2]) asserts that $\|[\partial_{x_q} \phi]_N - \partial_{x_q} \phi\|_\infty$ converges to 0 as N tends to ∞ , uniformly in ϕ satisfying $\|\nabla^2 \phi\|_\infty \leq 1$. As a result, we write the above bound as

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} s(x) \partial_{x_q} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m) e_k(x) \right) dx \leq C \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |s(x)| dx.$$

By an obvious density argument, we can easily pass from $s \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ to $s \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ in this inequality. This proves the first claim in the statement. \square

We then have our main mollification result:

Proposition 4.11. *Let W be a generalized solution of the HJB equation that is d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous and semi-concave in space, uniformly in time. For any $c > 1$, there exist two families $(\eta_{N,\varepsilon})_{N,\varepsilon}$ (of positive reals) and $(R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})_{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ (of compactly supported bounded functions from $[0, T] \times \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|}$ into \mathbb{R} , with the support and the bound depending on N and ε and not on ρ and t) such that, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, for any $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\|\nabla m\|_\infty \leq c$ and $m \geq 1/c$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_t W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(x, \partial_\mu W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x)) d(m * f_N)(x) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Trace} \left[\partial_x \partial_\mu W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) \right] dm(x) + F^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m) \right| \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon} + R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} \left(t, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $\lim_{(N,\varepsilon) \rightarrow (\infty,0)} \eta_{N,\varepsilon} = 0$, and, for any t, N, ε fixed,

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \delta_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} \left(t, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \right| \otimes_{k \in F_N^+} d(\mathfrak{R}[\widehat{m}^k], \mathfrak{S}[\widehat{m}^k]) = 0.$$

Above, the convergence $\rho \rightarrow \delta_0$ is understood as the weak convergence of ρ to δ_0 , the Dirac point mass at 0 (in \mathbb{R}^2).

The reader will notice the difference between Definition 4.1 and Proposition 4.11: not only the main inequality in Proposition 4.11 is stated everywhere in space, but also the derivatives are derivatives on the space of probability measures (as opposed to the derivatives in Definition 4.1, which are just finite dimensional). This is more consistent with the original formulation of the HJB equation, see (22). See also Remark 4.3 for a related comment.

Proof. Throughout the proof, the constant $c > 1$ is kept fixed. We recall the following notation from Definition 4.1: $A_N(c) = [0, T] \times B_N(c)$ with $B_N(c) := \mathcal{P}_N \cap B(c)$ and $B(c) := \{m : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m(x)| \leq c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 1/c\}$.

First Step. From the Definition 4.1 of a generalized solution, there exists a full subset $\tilde{A}_N(c)$ of $A_N(c)$ (for the image of the Lebesgue measure by the mapping $(t, (\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N}) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{O}_N \mapsto (t, \mathcal{I}_N((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N}))$, see Proposition 3.8) such that

$$\left| \partial_t W(t, m * f_N) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m * f_N) e_k(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m * f_N) \widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_N^k + F(m * f_N) \right| \leq \eta_N(c),$$

when $(t, m * f_N) \in \tilde{A}_N(c)$. Above, we specified the dependence of the sequence $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$ upon the constant c by writing $(\eta_N(c))_{N \geq 1}$.

Fix now $m \in B(c)$, that is $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $\|\nabla m\|_\infty \leq c$ and $m \geq 1/c$. Fix also $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\{m' : (t, m') \in \tilde{A}_N(2c)\}$ is a full subset of $(\mathcal{P}_N \cap \{m' : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m'(x)| \leq 2c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m'(x) \geq 1/(2c)\})$: by Fubini's theorem, the set of such t 's is a full subset of $[0, T]$. By definition of $\delta_{N,\varepsilon}$ (which we merely denote by δ in the rest of the proof) in Definition 3.12, we observe that, for $r = (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ such that $|\hat{r}^k| \leq \delta$, the probability measure $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r)$ (as given by Definition 3.13) satisfies $\|\nabla m^{N,\varepsilon}(r)\|_\infty \leq 2c$ and $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) \geq 1/(2c)$ for ε small enough (independently of N). Therefore, $(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)$ belongs to $\tilde{A}_N(2c)$. Since the image of the Lebesgue measure by the mapping $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \mapsto m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N \in \mathcal{P}_N$ is obviously absolutely-continuous, we deduce that $(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \in \tilde{A}_N(2c)$, for almost every $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ satisfying $|\hat{r}^k| \leq \delta$ for all $k \in F_N^+$. Hence, we get, for almost every $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$,

$$\left| \partial_t W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)\right) d(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)(y) \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{m}^{N,\varepsilon}(r)^k \widehat{f}_N^k + F(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right| \leq \eta_N(2c). \quad (51)$$

Second Step. The conclusion (51) of the first step right above holds true for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, for any $m \in B(c)$, and for almost every $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ satisfying $|\hat{r}^k| \leq \delta$ for all $k \in F_N^+$.

Therefore, integrating (51) over $(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^k], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^k])_{k \in F_N^+}$ with respect to $\otimes_{k \in F_N^+} \rho$ and recalling Corollary 3.16 (for the existence of the time-derivative below), we obtain, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ and for any $m \in B(c)$,

$$\left| \partial_t W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) + F^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(m) - T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) - T_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) \right| \leq \eta_N(2c), \quad (52)$$

with

$$T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) \\ := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)\right) d(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)(y) \right\} \\ \times \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j,$$

and

$$T_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) := \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{m}^{N,\varepsilon}(r)^k \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right) \hat{f}_N^k.$$

We recall from Proposition 3.14 (see also Corollary 3.16) that, for any $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times B_N(c)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}}{\delta m}(t, m)(x) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left[\left(\partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k \right) * f_N \right](x) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left[\partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \hat{f}_N^k e_k(x) \right] \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where we used on the last line the fact that $e_k * f_N(x) = e_k(x) \hat{f}_N^{-k} = e_k(x) \hat{f}_N^k$. We deduce that

$$\overline{\left\{ \frac{\delta W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}}{\delta m}(t, m) \right\}}^{-k} = (1 - \varepsilon) \hat{f}_N^k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j, \quad (54)$$

for $k \in F_N$.

Third Step. The main difficulty of the proof is to handle $T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)$. The goal is to identify it with the second term in the main inequality of the statement. In order to do so, we first observe that this latter term can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, \partial_\mu W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, -i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \overline{\left\{ \frac{\delta W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}}{\delta m}(t, m) \right\}}^k e_{-k}(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi(1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k \in F_N} \hat{f}_N^k k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j\right) \\ & \quad \times d(m * f_N)(y), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

which prompts us to let

$$T_3^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j\right) \times d(m * f_N)(y).$$

(Pay attention that there is no $1 - \varepsilon$ and no \hat{f}_N^k inside H in the above right-hand side.) By the local Lipschitz property of H , we can find a constant C , only depending on the parameters in the assumptions, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, \partial_\mu W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) - T_3^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) \right| \\ & \leq C \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \left| \sum_{k \in F_N} \hat{f}_N^k k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right| \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \left| \sum_{k \in F_N} k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right| \right\}^2 d(m * f_N)(y) \right]^{1/2} \\ & \quad \times \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left| \sum_{k \in F_N} ((1 - \varepsilon) \hat{f}_N^k - 1) k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times d(m * f_N)(y) \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now show that the term on the last two lines above tends to 0 as (N, ε) tends to 0. The same strategy would permit to show that the term on the first two lines of the right-hand side is bounded by a constant $C(c)$ depending on the parameters in the assumptions and on the value of c . In order to proceed, we observe that m and $m * f_N$ are bounded by $c + 1$ since $m \in B_N(c)$. Therefore, allowing the constant C to depend on c and thus writing $C(c)$ instead of C , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left| \sum_{k \in F_N} ((1 - \varepsilon) \widehat{f}_N^k - 1) k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes d\widehat{r}^j \right|^2 \\ & \quad \times d(m * f_N)(y) \\ & \leq C(c) \sum_{k \in F_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |k|^2 |(1 - \varepsilon) \widehat{f}_N^k - 1|^2 \left| \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right|^2 \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes d\widehat{r}^j dy. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the following three facts: First, $|\widehat{f}_N^k| \leq 1$; Second, \widehat{f}_N^k tends to 1 when N tends to ∞ and k is fixed; Third, Proposition 4.10 gives a bound for the series $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |k|^4 |\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N)|^2$ (at points where the derivatives exist). Then, for a fixed integer N_0 , we can separate the sum in the above right-hand side depending whether $|k| \leq N_0$ or $|k| > N_0$. For $|k| \leq N_0$, we can easily use the fact that $(1 - \varepsilon) \widehat{f}_N^k$ tends to 1 as (N, ε) tends to $(\infty, 0)$. For $|k| \geq N_0$, we can easily bound $|k|^2$ by $|k|^4/N_0^2$. All in all, this proves that the right-hand side tends to 0 as (N, ε) tends to $(\infty, 0)$. We finally have

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, \partial_\mu W^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) - T_3^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m) \right| \leq \eta_{N, \varepsilon}(c), \quad (56)$$

where $\eta_{N, \varepsilon}(c)$ is a generic notation for a sequence that may depend on c (but not on (t, m)) and that tends to 0 as (N, ε) tends to $(\infty, 0)$.

Fourth Step. We now let

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m) \\ & := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)\right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes d\widehat{r}^j \right. \\ & \quad \left. - H\left(y, i2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes d\widehat{r}^j\right) \right\} d(m * f_N)(y). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Using the notation introduced in the third step, this is also equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m) & := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)\right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes d\widehat{r}^j \right\} \\ & \quad \times d(m * f_N)(y) \\ & \quad - T_3^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m). \end{aligned}$$

By convexity of the Hamiltonian, $\psi^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)$ is obviously non-negative. Moreover, in (57), we can regard each $\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(0) * f_N)$ as a (almost-everywhere well-defined) function of vectors $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$ such that $(\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_N^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$: in order to clarify the notation, we write it in the form $\widetilde{\beta}^{N, \varepsilon, k}(t, (\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$, with $\widetilde{\beta}^{N, \varepsilon, k}(t, \cdot)$ being seen as an element of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|})$ that is equal to 0 at vectors $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ such that $(\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_N^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \notin \mathcal{O}_N$. Then, we rewrite (57) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m) \\ & = \sum_{\ell \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \widetilde{\beta}^{N, \varepsilon, k}\left(t, (\widehat{m}^j + \widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) e_k(y)\right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes d\widehat{r}^j \right. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

$$- H\left(y, i2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{k \in F_N} k \tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}\left(t, (\hat{m}^j + \hat{r}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) e_k(y) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j\right) \Big\} \hat{m}^\ell \hat{f}_N^\ell e_{-\ell}(y) dy.$$

Notice that we expanded the convolution product $m * f_N$ in Fourier coefficients. This is a way to emphasize the fact that $\psi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, \cdot)$ can be here regarded as a real-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$. To make the identification clear, we can denote the right-hand side in the above equality by $\tilde{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$, with $\tilde{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We then have $\psi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) = \tilde{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$. We now make the following observation. If $\rho(\hat{r}^j) d\hat{r}^j$ were formally set equal to $\delta_0(d\hat{r}^j)$ and if $\beta^{N,\varepsilon,k}$ were continuous in the second argument, the term on the right-hand side would be equal to 0, hence leaving us with

$$\tilde{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\delta_0}(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}) = 0, \quad (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|},$$

where the symbol δ_0 in the left-hand side is for the Dirac mass at 0 and is to indicate that $\rho \equiv \delta_0$. In turn, if $\tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}$ were continuous in the second argument, the right-hand side in (58) would converge to 0 as ρ tends to δ_0 . Obviously, $\tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}$ is not continuous in our setting. However, by standard mollification results in finite dimension, we can approximate (for any t) the functions $(\tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}(t, \cdot))_{k \in F_N^+}$ by continuous functions in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|})$. For (N, ε, k) and t fixed, we can indeed find a collection of real-valued continuous functions $(\check{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| \tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}\left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) - \check{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k,n}\left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) \right| \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{m}^j = 0.$$

Since each $\tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}(t, \cdot)$ is bounded and zero outside $\{(\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|} : (\hat{m}^j \hat{f}_N^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N\}$, we can assume that the functions $(\check{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded and are zero outside a common bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$. Denoting by $\check{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho,n}((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$ the right-hand side in (58) when $\tilde{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k}$ therein is replaced by $\check{\beta}^{N,\varepsilon,k,n}$ and using the local Lipschitz property of H , we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| \tilde{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}\left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) - \check{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho,n}\left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) \right| \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{m}^j = 0,$$

the convergence being uniform with respect to ρ satisfying the prescription of Definitions 3.12 and 3.13. Using the fact that, for each fixed n , $\check{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho,n}$ converges to 0 in sup norm as ρ tends to δ_0 , we deduce that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \delta_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| \tilde{\psi}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}\left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}\right) \right| \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{m}^j = 0. \quad (59)$$

Of course, the rate in the above convergence depends on N and ε . Importantly, for N and ε fixed, the function $\psi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, \cdot)$ is bounded uniformly in ρ and t : this follows from Proposition 4.10. In short, this provides the function $R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ in the statement.

Fifth Step. By combining the third and fourth steps, we now rewrite (56) in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, \partial_\mu W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) + \psi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W\left(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\right) e_k(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right| \\ & \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon}(c). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Back to the second step, we can compare the term on the second line with $T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ introduced in the second step. The main difference between the two comes from the measure that is used for integrating in y . Here, it is $m * f_N$, while it is $m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N$ in $T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$. In order to pass from one term to the other, we recall from the choice of δ in Definition 3.12 that

$$\|m - m^{N,\varepsilon}(r)\|_\infty \leq C(c)\varepsilon,$$

when $r = (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ is in the support of $\bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+} \rho$ and for $C(c)$ depending on c . Therefore,

$$\|m * f_N - m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N\|_\infty \leq C(c)\varepsilon. \quad (61)$$

By using once again Proposition 4.10 in order to bound the L^∞ -norm of the function $y \mapsto i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)$ and by invoking the local Lipschitz property of H , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)\right) d(m * f_N)(y) \right\} \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \times \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\ & \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_k(y)\right) d(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)(y) \right\} \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \times \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \left. \right| \\ & \leq C(c)\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As we already mentioned, the second term in the left-hand side is nothing but $T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)$. Therefore, (60) yields

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, \partial_\mu W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(y)\right) d(m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)(y) + \psi^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) - T_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) \right| \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon}(c). \quad (62)$$

Sixth Step. We now address the term $T_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ defined in the second step. We recall

$$T_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) = \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \hat{f}_N^k \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{m^{N,\varepsilon}(r)}^k \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right).$$

Back to the analysis of $T[m, W]$ in Subsection 4.1, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy = - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m) \hat{m}^k.$$

Using Equation (53), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy \\ & = -(1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \hat{f}_N^k \hat{m}^k \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j. \end{aligned}$$

We then proceed as in the second step in order to remove the product $(1 - \varepsilon) \hat{f}_N^k$ from the summand in the right-hand side. In short, we observe that the family of Fourier coefficients $(\hat{m}^k)_k$ is square-integrable, uniformly in $m \in B(c)$ (see (35)). Moreover, by Proposition 4.10, the sum $\sum_{k \in F_N} |k|^4 |\partial_{\hat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)|^2$ is finite, uniformly in N, ε, m and r . Therefore,

we deduce that (as before, for any $t \in [0, T]$ and any $m \in B(c)$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{m}^k \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \right| \leq \eta_{N, \varepsilon}(c), \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left(\sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{m}^{N, \varepsilon}(0)^k \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \right| \leq \eta_{N, \varepsilon}(c). \end{aligned}$$

Recall now that, from our choice of $\delta_{N, \varepsilon}$ in Definition 3.12,

$$\sum_{k \in |F_N|} |k|^2 |m^{N, \varepsilon}(0)^k - m^{N, \varepsilon}(r)^k| \leq \varepsilon,$$

when $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ is in the support of $\otimes_{k \in F_N^+} \rho$. We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Trace} \left[\partial_y \partial_\mu W^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(y) \right] m(y) dy + T_2^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m) \right| \\ & = \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta m} W^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(y) \right] \Delta m(y) dy + T_2^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m) \right| \leq \eta_{N, \varepsilon}(c). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (52), (59) and (60), this completes the proof. \square

4.6. Uniqueness of Lipschitz, semi-concave admissible generalized solutions. Here is now the main statement of this section:

Theorem 4.12. *There is a unique generalized solution to the HJB equation (22) that is d_{-2} -Lipschitz and semi-concave in space uniformly in time.*

Proof. Main lines. We use the notation from Definition 4.1, namely $A_N(c) = [0, T] \times B_N(c)$ with $B_N(c) = \mathcal{P}_N \cap B(c)$ and $B(c) := \{m : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m(x)| \leq c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 1/c\}$, for $c \geq 1$.

Given two solutions V_1 and V_2 of (22) that are d_{-2} -Lipschitz and semi-concave in space, uniformly in time, we let

$$\begin{aligned} D\mathcal{H}_\lambda^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x) & := \partial_p H \left(x, \lambda \partial_\mu V_1^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x) + (1 - \lambda) \partial_\mu V_2^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x) \right), \\ D\mathcal{H}^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x) & := \int_0^1 D\mathcal{H}_\lambda^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x) d\lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

For any $c \geq 1$, there exist two families $(\eta_{N, \varepsilon})_{N, \varepsilon}$ and $(R^{N, \varepsilon, \rho})_{N, \varepsilon, \rho}$ as in Proposition 4.11 such that, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, for any $m \in B(c)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial_t (V_1^{N, \varepsilon, \rho} - V_2^{N, \varepsilon, \rho})(t, m) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Trace} \left[\partial_x \partial_\mu (V_1^{N, \varepsilon, \rho} - V_2^{N, \varepsilon, \rho})(t, m)(x) \right] dm(x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} D\mathcal{H}^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x) \cdot \partial_\mu (V_1^{N, \varepsilon, \rho} - V_2^{N, \varepsilon, \rho})(t, m)(x) d(m * f_N)(x) \right| \\ & \leq \eta_{N, \varepsilon} + R^{N, \varepsilon, \rho} \left(t, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

The very idea of the proof is to consider the characteristics associated with the differential operator appearing in the left-hand side. Strictly speaking, this should be a (non-linear) Fokker-Planck equation driven by the field $(t, m, x) \mapsto D\mathcal{H}^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, m)(x)$. However, this is not what we use next. Because of our definition of a generalized solution, which is based on a truncation of

the Fourier expansion of the measure argument m , we switch to ‘approximate characteristics’, given by the Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t m_t(x) - \operatorname{div}\left(D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x)(m_t * f_N)(x)\right) - \frac{1}{2}\Delta m_t(x) = 0, \quad (65)$$

with an initial condition m_0 such that $\widehat{m}_0^k = 0$ for $|k| \geq N$, for some integer N , and $m_0 \geq 1/c$ for some $c \geq 1$. Importantly, the Fokker-Planck equation has a solution that is a probability measure for N large enough (whilst the total mass is obviously preserved by the dynamics, the sign may not be). Even more, we can find a constant $c' \geq 1$ (depending on c) such that, for N large enough, the solution $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is lower bounded by $1/c'$ and its gradient (in space) is bounded by c' , see Theorem 6.15. The thrust of (65) is that the equation satisfied by the Fourier coefficients $(\widehat{m}_t^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ is closed (meaning that it does not depend on the higher Fourier modes $(\widehat{m}_t^k)_{k \notin F_N^+}$): intuitively, equation (65) is ‘almost’ a finite dimensional ordinary differential equation.

Once (65) has been solved, we want to plug $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ into (64) and then expand $((V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})(t, m_t))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. The very main point of the proof is then to show that, whenever N and ε are fixed, the remainder

$$\left(R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, (\widehat{m}_t^j)_{j \in F_N^+})\right)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \quad (66)$$

tends to 0 when ρ tends to the Dirac mass δ_0 (compare if needed with the statement of Proposition 4.11). This is however a challenging fact because $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ itself depends on ρ (although the notation does not make it clear). And, even more, the reader must recall that, although $R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is known to tend to 0 as ρ tends to δ_0 (when N and ε are fixed), the convergence just holds true in L^1 (once again, we refer to the statement of Proposition 4.11). Some work is thus needed to adapt the result of Proposition 4.11 to (66).

Roughly speaking, the idea is to prove that the flow generated by the Fokker-Planck equation (65) cannot accumulate mass: If, instead of m_0 , the initial condition of (65) is taken as a small random perturbation of m_0 in $B_N(c)$, with the perturbation having a bounded density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$, then the law of $(\widehat{m}_t^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$ also has a bounded density, the bound depending on N and ε , but not on t and ρ . This claim is stated in the form of Lemma 4.13 below, which we use in the rest of this proof and which we prove separately.

Application. Following our plan, we take an initial condition $m_0 \in B_N(c)$. For $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$, we let $m_0(r)$ be the element of \mathcal{P}_N defined by:

$$\widehat{m_0(r)}^k := \begin{cases} \widehat{m}_0^k + \widehat{r}^k, & k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}, \\ 0, & k \notin F_N, \end{cases}$$

with the usual convention that $\widehat{r}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{r}^k}$. If we choose $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$ such that

$$\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} |k| |\widehat{r}^k| < \frac{1}{2c}, \quad (67)$$

then $m_0(r) \in B_N(2c)$ and we can still solve the Fokker-Planck equation (65) with $m_0(r)$ as initial condition provided that $N \geq N_c$ for some threshold N_c only depending on c , on the regularity properties of H in the variables x and p and on the d_{-2} -Lipschitz constant of V_1 and V_2 , see Theorem 6.15 in the appendix. We call the solution $(m_t(r))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$: Theorem 6.15 asserts that $(m_t(r))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ forms a flow of probability measures. Even more, Theorem 6.15 also says that there exists $c' \geq 1$, independent of N , ε and ρ (but depending on c), such that each $m_t(r)$ belongs to $B(c')$.

We now expand $((V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})(t, m_t(r)))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ by means of the chain rule for real-valued functions defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Although this chain rule is well documented (see for instance [25, Chapter 5]), it here requires a modicum of care since the time derivative of $(V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})$

is just known to exist for almost every t , for all m , see Corollary 3.16. The proof is as follows. If $(V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})$ were smooth, then [25, Chapter 5] would yield

$$\begin{aligned} & [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](T, m_T(r)) = [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](0, m_0(r)) \\ & + \int_0^T \left\{ \partial_t [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t, m_t(r)) \right. \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t(r))(x) \cdot \partial_\mu [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t, m_t(r))(x) d[m_t(r)](x) \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Trace} \left[\partial_x \partial_\mu [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t, m_t(r))(x) \right] d[m_t(r)](x) \right\} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Under our assumption, we can apply the above chain rule to a mollified version of $(V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})$, for instance $\int_{\mathbb{R}} [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t-s, m) \zeta(s) ds$, for a smooth compactly supported density ζ on \mathbb{R} . The most difficult term to handle in the resulting form of (68) is

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_t [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t-s, m_t(r)) \zeta(s) ds dt.$$

By Corollary 3.16, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, the function $(t, m) \mapsto \partial_t [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t, m)$ is continuous in m , with a modulus of continuity independent of t . Therefore we can easily approximate the argument $m_t(r)$ appearing in the integrand by $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i-1}, t_i)}(t) m_{t_i}(r)$ for a finite subdivision $t_0 = 0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T$ of $[0, T]$ with an arbitrarily small step. Using this approximation, it is pretty easy to prove that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_t [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t-s, m_t(r)) \zeta(s) ds dt \rightarrow \int_0^T \partial_t [V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}](t, m_t(r)) \zeta(s) dt,$$

as ζ tends to δ_0 in the weak sense. As a corollary, we deduce that (68) holds true under the standing assumption. Since $V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ and $V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ coincide at time T , we deduce from (64) that

$$\left| (V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})(0, m_0(r)) \right| \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon} + \int_0^T R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} \left(t, \left(\widehat{m_t(r)} \right)_{k \in F_N^+}^k \right) dt.$$

For ρ_0 a kernel similar to ρ , with a radius (compare if needed with Definition 3.12, the choice of the radius being here adapted to the constraint (67)) less than $1/(2c\sqrt{dN}|F_N|)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| (V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})(0, m_0(r)) \right| \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\ & \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon} + \int_0^T \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} \left(t, \left(\widehat{m_t(r)} \right)_{k \in F_N^+}^k \right) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here is now the place where we invoke Lemma 4.13 (whose statement is given next): For any $t \in [0, T]$, we perform the change of variable $y = m_t(r)$, i.e. $\hat{y}^k = \widehat{m_t(r)}^k$, for $k \in F_N^+$. As a corollary of Lemma 4.13, we deduce that there exists a constant C_{N,ρ_0} , depending on N and ρ_0 , but independent of ε and ρ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| (V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})(0, m_0(r)) \right| \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\ & \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon} + C_{N,\rho_0} \int_0^T \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} \left(t, (\hat{y}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{y}^j \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

From the standing assumption, we know that V_1 and V_2 are Lipschitz continuous with respect to d_{-2} and thus with respect to d_{W_1} . Therefore, by a straightforward adaptation of the proof

of Lemma 3.15, $V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(0, \cdot)$ (resp. $V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(0, \cdot)$) converges uniformly to $V_1(0, \cdot)$ (resp. $V_2(0, \cdot)$) as (N, ε) tends to $(\infty, 0)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{(N,\varepsilon) \rightarrow (\infty,0)} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} (V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} - V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho})(0, m_0(r)) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right. \\ & \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} (V_1 - V_2)(0, m_0(r)) \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (69) can be rewritten in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} |(V_1 - V_2)(0, m_0(r))| \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\ & \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon} + C_{N,\rho_0} \int_0^T \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, (\hat{y}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{y}^j \right] dt, \end{aligned}$$

for a possibly new value of the family $(\eta_{N,\varepsilon})_{N,\varepsilon}$, which still satisfies $\lim_{(N,\varepsilon) \rightarrow (\infty,0)} \eta_{N,\varepsilon} = 0$, and then, using the form of ρ_0 and following the proof of Lemma 3.15,

$$\left| (V_1 - V_2)(0, m_0) \right| \leq \eta_{N,\varepsilon} + C_{N,\rho_0} \int_0^T \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} R^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, (\hat{y}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{y}^j \right] dt. \quad (70)$$

We recall that (70) holds true for $m_0 \in B_N(c)$. Next, we can take $m_0 \in B_{N_0}(c)$, for some fixed N_0 and then choose $N \geq N_0$, in which case we indeed have $m_0 \in B_N(c)$. Now, for a given threshold $\epsilon > 0$ (the reader should distinguish from ε), we can choose N and ε such that $\eta_{N,\varepsilon} < \epsilon/2$ and then, by the second identity in Proposition 4.11, δ (encoding the support of ρ) small enough such that the second term in the right-hand side is also less than $\epsilon/2$. Therefore, the left-hand side of (70) can be made smaller than ϵ . Since ϵ is arbitrary, we easily deduce that $V_1(0, m_0)$ and $V_2(0, m_0)$ must coincide. This holds for any $m_0 \in B_{N_0}(c)$. By an obvious density argument, we obtain uniqueness. \square

Lemma 4.13. *For a real $c \geq 1$, recall the notation $B_N(c) = \mathcal{P}_N \cap \{m : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m(x)| \leq c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 1/c\}$ and let $C_N(c) := \{(\hat{z}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|} : \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} |k| |\hat{z}^k| < 1/(2c)\}$, with the usual convention that $\hat{z}^{-k} = \overline{\hat{z}^k}$.*

For an element $m_0 \in B_N(c)$ and for $r = (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in C_N(c)$, define $m_0(r)$ the element of $B_N(2c)$ by

$$\widehat{m_0(r)}^k := \begin{cases} \widehat{m}_0^k + \hat{r}^k, & k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}, \\ 0, & k \notin F_N, \end{cases}$$

and call $(m_t(r))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ the solution of the non-linear Fokker-Planck equation (65) with $m_0(r)$ as initial condition, for the same parameters N, ε and ρ as therein.

Then, we can find a constant N_c , only depending on c , on the strict convexity property of H in the variable p and on the d_{-2} -Lipschitz and semi-concave properties of V_1 and V_2 in (65), and a constant K , independent of ε and ρ such that, if $N \geq N_c$, for any $t \in [0, T]$, the law of the mapping

$$r = (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in C_N(c) \mapsto \left(\widehat{m_t(r)}^k \right)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$$

has a density, bounded by K .

Proof. The strategy of proof is quite clear but the implementation is demanding: The whole point is to address the system of Fourier coefficients satisfied by the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation (65) and to regard it as (a finite-dimensional) system of ODEs. The solutions generates a flow of diffeomorphisms and the key step is to provide a lower bound for the Jacobian that is independent of t, ρ and ε . This is the point where semi-concavity comes in explicitly.

Throughout the proof, we use the notation $V_{2-\lambda}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} := \lambda V_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho} + (1-\lambda)V_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$, and similarly without the superscript N, ε, ρ .

First Step. For an initial condition $m_0 \in B_N(c)$ and for $k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \widehat{m}_t^k = -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \widehat{m}_t^k - i2\pi \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x) e_k(x) (m_t * f_N)(x) dx. \quad (71)$$

From Proposition 3.14, we now recall that, for every $t \in [0, T]$, for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, any $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta}{\delta m} V_{2-\lambda}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left[\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{f}_N^k e_k(x) \right] \right\} \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_\mu V_{2-\lambda}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) \\ &= i2\pi(1 - \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} k \left[\partial_{\widehat{m}^k} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{f}_N^k e_k(x) \right] \right\} \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j. \end{aligned}$$

In turn, recalling the notation (63), the last term in (71) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & i2\pi \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) e_k(x) (m * f_N)(x) dx \\ &= i2\pi \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot \partial_p H \left(x, i2\pi(1 - \varepsilon) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{\ell \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \ell \left[\partial_{\widehat{m}^\ell} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \widehat{f}_N^\ell e_\ell(x) \right] \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \right) \\ & \quad \times e_k(x) (m * f_N)(x) dx d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that we can interpret $\partial_{\widehat{m}^\ell} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)$ as the complex number (see (30)):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\widehat{m}^\ell} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\Re[\widehat{m}^\ell]} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) - \frac{i}{2} \partial_{\Im[\widehat{m}^\ell]} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \\ &= \overline{\partial_{\widehat{m}^{-\ell}} W(t, m^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N)}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that \widehat{f}_N^ℓ is real, this allows us to rewrite (71) in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{m}_t^k = -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \widehat{m}_t^k \\ & \quad - i2\pi \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot \partial_p H \left(x, -4\pi(1 - \varepsilon) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \sum_{\ell \in F_N^+} \ell \Im \left[\partial_{\widehat{m}^\ell} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) e_\ell(x) \right] \widehat{f}_N^\ell \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \right) \\ & \quad \times e_k(x) (m_t * f_N)(x) dx d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

By integration by parts, this can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{m}_t^k = -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \widehat{m}_t^k \\ & \quad - i2\pi \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot \partial_p H \left(x, 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \sum_{\ell \in F_N^+} \left\{ \ell \left[\Im[e_\ell(x)] \partial_{\Re[\widehat{r}^\ell]} \rho(\widehat{r}^\ell) - \Re[e_\ell(x)] \partial_{\Im[\widehat{r}^\ell]} \rho(\widehat{r}^\ell) \right] \prod_{j \in F_N^+, j \neq \ell} \rho(\widehat{r}^j) \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{r}^j \right) \\ & \quad \times e_k(x) (m_t * f_N)(x) dx d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

$$= -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \widehat{m}_t^k$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2\pi \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot \partial_p H \left(x, -2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right. \\
& \quad \times \sum_{\ell \in F_N^+} \left\{ \ell \left[\left(\Re[ie_\ell(x)], \Im[ie_\ell(x)] \right) \cdot \nabla_{\Re[\hat{r}^\ell], \Im[\hat{r}^\ell]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\
& \quad \times ie_k(x) (m_t * f_N)(x) dx d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that we passed the i in front of the second line to $ie_k(x)$ inside the integral on the penultimate line. Also, the symbol \cdot on the same penultimate line is used to denote the inner product in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Second Step. We now compute the derivative of the flow with respect to the real and imaginary parts of the Fourier coefficients of the initial condition. In order to avoid to repeat the computations twice, once for the derivative with respect to the real part and once for the derivative with respect to the imaginary part, we introduce the generic notation $\mathfrak{P}[z]$ for a complex number z , which may stand for $\Re[z]$ or $\Im[z]$.

Now, it makes sense to compute the derivative of the flow $\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \hat{m}_t^k$, for $k, k' \in F_N^+$ and $\mathfrak{P} = \Re, \Im$. By representing $m * f_N$ in the last line of (73) in the form

$$m * f_N(x) = 1 + 2 \sum_{\ell' \in F_N^+} \Re \left[\hat{m}^{\ell'} \hat{f}_N^{\ell'} e_{-\ell'}(x) \right],$$

we get, using both (71) and (73),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \left(\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \hat{m}_t^k \right) = -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \hat{m}_t^k \\
& \quad + 4\pi^2 (1 - \varepsilon) \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} d\lambda \left(\otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right) \\
& \quad \times \left[\sum_{\ell, \ell' \in F_N^+} k \cdot (\partial_{pp}^2 H(\lambda, t) \ell) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^{\ell'}]} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \hat{f}_N^{\ell'} \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \hat{m}_t^{\ell'} \right. \\
& \quad \times \left. \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\left(\Re[ie_\ell(x)], \Im[ie_\ell(x)] \right) \cdot \nabla_{\Re[\hat{r}^\ell], \Im[\hat{r}^\ell]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] ie_k(x) (m_t * f_N)(x) dx \right] \\
& \quad - 4\pi \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x) ie_k(x) \sum_{\ell' \in F_N^+} \Re \left[\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \hat{m}_t^{\ell'} \hat{f}_N^{\ell'} e_{-\ell'}(x) \right] dx,
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{pp}^2 H(\lambda, t) &= \partial_{pp}^2 H \left(x, -2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right. \\
& \quad \times \sum_{\ell \in F_N^+} \left\{ \ell \left[\left(\Re[ie_\ell(x)], \Im[ie_\ell(x)] \right) \cdot \nabla_{\Re[\hat{r}^\ell], \Im[\hat{r}^\ell]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Expanding $\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \hat{m}_t^k$ as $(\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \Re[\hat{m}_t^k], \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \Im[\hat{m}_t^k])$, we get a linear system of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \left(\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{m}_t^k] \right) &= -2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{m}_t^k] \\
& \quad + \sum_{\ell \in F_N^+} \left[A_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}, \Re}(t) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \Re[\hat{m}_t^\ell] + A_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}, \Im}(t) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \Im[\hat{m}_t^\ell] \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{\ell \in F_N^+} \left[B_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}, \Re}(t) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \Re[\hat{m}_t^\ell] + B_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}, \Im}(t) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \Im[\hat{m}_t^\ell] \right],
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}},\mathfrak{P}}(t) &= \epsilon_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}},\mathfrak{P}} 4\pi^2 (1-\varepsilon) \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} d\lambda \left(\bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\tilde{r}^j \right) \\ &\times \left[\sum_{\ell' \in F_N^+} k \cdot (\partial_{pp}^2 H(\lambda, t) \ell') \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^{\ell'}]} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \hat{f}_N^{\ell'} \right. \\ &\times \left. \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\left(\mathfrak{R}[ie_{\ell'}(x)], \mathfrak{S}[ie_{\ell'}(x)] \right) \cdot \nabla_{\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^{\ell'}], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^{\ell'}]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[ie_k(x)] (m_t * f_N)(x) dx \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}},\mathfrak{P}} = 1$ except if $(\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathfrak{P}) = (\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S})$ in which case $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{S}} = -1$ (those choices following from the standard relationships $\mathfrak{R}[zz'] = \mathfrak{R}[z]\mathfrak{R}[z'] - \mathfrak{S}[z]\mathfrak{S}[z']$ and $\mathfrak{S}[zz'] = \mathfrak{R}[z]\mathfrak{S}[z'] + \mathfrak{S}[z]\mathfrak{R}[z']$, for $z, z' \in \mathbb{C}$, which explains why only $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{S}}$ is here equal to -1), and with

$$B_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}},\mathfrak{P}}(t) = -\epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} 4\pi \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} k \cdot D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x) \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[ie_k(x)] \mathfrak{P}[\hat{f}_N^{\ell'} e_{-\ell'}(x)] dx,$$

where $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} = 1$ if $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}$ and -1 if $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{S}$.

We now recall the following standard fact from the theory of ODEs. If we let

$$J_t = \det \left(\left(\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}_0^{k'}]} \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{m}_t^{k'}] \right)_{k, k' \in F_N^+, \mathfrak{P}, \tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \right),$$

then

$$\frac{d}{dt} J_t = J_t \sum_{k \in F_N^+} \left(-4\pi |k|^2 + A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{R}}(t) + A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{S},\mathfrak{S}}(t) + B_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{R}}(t) + B_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{S},\mathfrak{S}}(t) \right). \quad (74)$$

Third Step. The goal is now to prove that the sum in the right-hand side of (74) is lower bounded, by a constant that is independent of ε and ρ . The easiest term to handle is the sum $\sum_{k \in F_N^+} [B_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{R}}(t) + B_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{S},\mathfrak{S}}(t)]$. Indeed, in the definition of $B_{k,\ell}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}},\mathfrak{P}}(t)$, $D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}$ is bounded independently of (N, ε, ρ) , since V_1 and V_2 are d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous, see (63) and Proposition 4.10.

The term $\sum_{k \in F_N^+} [A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{R}}(t) + A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{S},\mathfrak{S}}(t)]$ is much more difficult to handle. We get

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{P},\mathfrak{P}}(t) &= 4\pi^2 (1-\varepsilon) \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} d\lambda \left(\bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\tilde{r}^j \right) \\ &\times \left[\sum_{\ell' \in F_N^+} k \cdot (\partial_{pp}^2 H(\lambda, t) \ell') \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]} V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \hat{f}_N^k \right. \\ &\times \left. \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\left(\mathfrak{R}[ie_{\ell'}(x)], \mathfrak{S}[ie_{\ell'}(x)] \right) \cdot \nabla_{\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^{\ell'}], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^{\ell'}]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] \mathfrak{P}[ie_k(x)] (m_t * f_N)(x) dx \right], \end{aligned}$$

which, by integration by parts, can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{P},\mathfrak{P}}(t) &= -4\pi^2 \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} d\lambda \left(\bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\tilde{r}^j \right) \\ &\times \left[\sum_{\ell' \in F_N^+} k \cdot (\partial_{pp}^2 H(\lambda, t) \ell') V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N,\varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right. \\ &\times \left. \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \left[\mathfrak{P}[ie_k(x)] \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[ie_{\ell'}(x)] \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{r}^k], \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^{\ell'}]}^2 \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] (m_t * f_N)(x) dx \right], \end{aligned}$$

and then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in F_N^+, \mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{P}}(t) &= -4\pi^2 \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} d\lambda \left(\bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right) \left[V_{2-\lambda}(t, m_t^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right. \\ &\times \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[\left(\mathfrak{P}[ie_k(x)]k \right) \cdot \left(\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[ie_\ell(x)] \partial_{pp}^2 H(\lambda, t) \ell \right) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{r}^k], \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^\ell]}^2 \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \right) \right] \\ &\times (m_t * f_N)(x) dx \Big]. \end{aligned}$$

We can now apply Corollary 3.18 since $V_{2-\lambda}$ is displacement semi-concave. Using the fact that H is convex with respect to p , we deduce that

$$\sum_{k \in F_N^+, \mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} A_{k,k}^{\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{P}}(t) \geq -C_N, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

for a constant C_N depending on N , but independent of ρ and ε , from which we deduce that $J_t \geq -C_N$, for any $t \in [0, T]$. The result follows from a mere change of variable at any time t , using the lower bound for the Jacobian J_t . \square

5. APPLICATION TO MEAN FIELD GAMES

Following our agenda, we now address weak solutions to the conservative form of the master equation (23).

5.1. Notion of weak solution. We start with the following definition:

Definition 5.1. *We call a weak solution to the master equation a bounded measurable function $\mathcal{Z} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that the system of Fourier coefficients*

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \ni (t, m) \mapsto \overline{\left\{ \mathcal{Z}(t, m, \cdot) \right\}}^{-k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (75)$$

satisfies $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^0 \equiv 0$ together with the following two properties:

(i) *There exists a sequence of functions $(\zeta_N : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R})_{N \geq 1}$, such that, for any $N \geq 1$, for $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}$, the following equation holds true in the distributional sense on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} \partial_t \mathfrak{P}[\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m)] - \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H \left(y, i2\pi \sum_{j \in F_N} j \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^j(t, m) e_j(y) \right) dm(y) \right\} \\ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |j|^2 \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]} \left(\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^j(t, m) \hat{m}^j \right) + \mathfrak{P} \left[\frac{\delta F}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot) \right]^k + \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]} (\zeta_N(t, m)) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

for any $k \in F_N^+$, where $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{R}} = 1$ and $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{S}} = -1$, and the following limit holds true for any $c > 1$:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{m \in B_N(c)} |\zeta_N(t, m)| = 0, \quad (77)$$

with the same notation as in Definition 4.1 for $B_N(c)$, i.e. $B_N(c) = \mathcal{P}_N \cap \{m : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m(x)| \leq c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 1/c\}$.

(ii) *For any $N \geq 1$ and $k \in F_N^+$, for any smooth and compactly supported function $\varphi : \mathcal{O}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the function*

$$t \in [0, T] \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) \varphi \left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right)$$

is continuous and matches, at $t = T$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \frac{\partial G}{\partial m}(m)(\cdot) \varphi \left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right),$$

where m in the latter two integrands is implicitly understood as $\mathcal{S}_N((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$ with \mathcal{S}_N as in (28).

The reader will find a clear explanation of the choice $\hat{Z}^0 \equiv 0$ in Proposition 5.2. In brief, when \mathcal{Z} is the m -derivative of a potential $Z : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the condition $\hat{Z}^0 \equiv 0$ is consistent with the centering condition (3).

Following (29)–(30)–(31), (76) can be rewritten in the following compact form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \hat{Z}^k(t, m) - \partial_{\hat{m}^k} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H \left(y, i2\pi \sum_{j \in F_N} j \hat{Z}^j(t, m) e_j(y) \right) dm(y) \right\} \\ & - \sum_{j \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |j|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} \left(\hat{Z}^j(t, m) \hat{m}^j \right) + \overline{\frac{\delta F}{\delta m}(m)(\cdot)}^{-k} + 2\partial_{\hat{m}^k}(\zeta_N(t, m)) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

for any $k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$. It indeed suffices to take the operator $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} \mathfrak{P}[\cdot]$ in the above equation and to recall that $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} \mathfrak{P}[\partial_{\hat{m}^k}] = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]}$.

We then have:

Proposition 5.2. *The value function V , as defined in (17), induces a weak solution to the master equation, in the sense that there exists a bounded measurable function $\mathcal{V} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Definition 5.1 together with the following two items:*

- (1) *for any integer $N \geq 1$, the Fourier coefficients $(\hat{\mathcal{V}}^k)_{k \in F_N}$ of \mathcal{V} , seen as complex-valued functions defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with the same form as in (75), coincide everywhere in time and \mathbb{P}_N almost everywhere in space with the Fourier coefficients of the (space)-derivatives of V on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$, namely*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m) &= \overline{\frac{\delta V}{\delta m}(t, m)(\cdot)}^{-k} \left(= \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m) \right), \quad k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}, \\ \hat{\mathcal{V}}^0(t, m) &= \overline{\frac{\delta V}{\delta m}(t, m)(\cdot)}^0 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ and for \mathbb{P}_N almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ (or, equivalently, for almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ when \mathcal{P}_N is equipped with the image of the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{O}_N by the canonical mapping \mathcal{S}_N in (28));

- (2) *the coefficients $(\hat{\mathcal{V}}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ of \mathcal{V} coincide everywhere in t and \mathbb{P} almost everywhere in m with the Fourier coefficients of the (space)-derivatives of V on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, as defined by Theorem 3.10, namely (79) holds for every $t \in [0, T]$, for \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (with \mathbb{P} the probability measure defined in the statement of Theorem 3.5) and for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$;*
- (3) *for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, for any $t \in [0, T]$, for any integer $N_0 \geq 1$ and for any bounded (measurable) function φ defined on \mathcal{O}_{N_0} ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \hat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m * f_N) \varphi \left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \hat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m) \varphi \left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m).$$

In fact, the reader will notice from Theorem 3.10 that items (2) and (3) are redundant, as the combination of (1) and (3) implies (2).

Proof. The proof relies on the following main observation: for a given integer $N_0 \geq 1$, \mathcal{P}_{N_0} is of zero measure under \mathbb{P}_N (or equivalently when it is regarded as a subset of \mathcal{P}_N equipped with the image of the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{O}_N by the canonical mapping \mathcal{S}_N in (28)); this follows from the fact that the elements of \mathcal{P}_{N_0} are required to have zero Fourier coefficients of modes k with $|k| \geq N_0$. Therefore, we can define \mathcal{V} inductively, by first assigning values on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathbb{T}^d$, and then on $[0, T] \times (\mathcal{P}_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}_1) \times \mathbb{T}^d$, so on and so forth... To make it clear, there is no difficulty for defining \mathcal{V} such that, for every $N \geq 1$, for every $t \in [0, T]$, for almost every m in \mathcal{P}_N and for

any $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$,

$$\mathcal{V}(t, m, x) = \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \left\{ \overline{\frac{\delta V}{\delta m}(t, m)(\cdot)}^k e_{-k}(x) \right\} = \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m) e_k(x). \quad (80)$$

We then let $\hat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m) := \overline{\mathcal{V}(t, m)(\cdot)}^{-k} (= \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m))$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} 2\zeta_N(t, m) &:= \partial_t V(t, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H \left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \hat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m) e_k(y) \right) dm(y) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \hat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m) \hat{m}^k + F(m) \\ &= \partial_t V(t, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H \left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m) e_k(y) \right) dm(y) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m) \hat{m}^k + F(m), \end{aligned}$$

which satisfies (77) thanks to (36).

Multiplying, for each value of $k \in F_N^+$, both sides of the definition of $\zeta_N(t, m)$ above by $(1/2)\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]}\varphi(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$ for an arbitrary smooth test function on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{O}_N$ with a support included in $(0, T) \times \mathcal{O}_N$, we easily get (76) (in a distributional sense). Indeed, it suffices to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \partial_t V(t, m) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]}\varphi \left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]} V(t, m) \partial_t \varphi \left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right) \\ &= \epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \mathfrak{P} \left[\mathcal{V}^k(t, m) \right] \partial_t \varphi \left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right), \end{aligned}$$

with m in the above three lines being understood as $m = \mathcal{I}_N((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$ and with the last line following from (30). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} F \left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]}\varphi \left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{m}^k]} F \left((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \varphi \left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right) \\ &= - \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \mathfrak{P} \left[\overline{\frac{\delta F}{\delta m}(m, \cdot)}^k \right] \varphi \left(t, (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d \left(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{m}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{m}^j] \right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (i) in Definition 5.1. As for (ii) in the same definition, it follows from an obvious integration by parts.

We prove that the values of \mathcal{V} that are hence defined are bounded by a common constant. In order to do so, we use the fact that V is Lipschitz continuous (in space) for the d_{-2} -distance and thus for the d_{TV} -distance. Indeed, Proposition 4.10 says that there exists a constant C such that, for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\text{esssup}_{(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \partial_x \left(\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m) e_k(x) \right) \right| \leq C.$$

By (80), this proves that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \operatorname{esssup}_{(t,m) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \operatorname{esssup}_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\partial_x \mathcal{V}(t, m, x)| \leq C. \quad (81)$$

Since $\mathcal{V}(t, m, \cdot)$ has zero mean, this yields

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \operatorname{esssup}_{(t,m) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \operatorname{esssup}_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\mathcal{V}(t, m, x)| \leq C. \quad (82)$$

It then remains to extend \mathcal{V} to the whole $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d$ by taking a weak-star limit, in the $\sigma^*(L^\infty; L^1)$ sense, of the bounded sequence $([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \ni (t, m, x) \mapsto \mathcal{V}(t, m * f_N, x))_{N \geq 1}$. Weak limits are defined almost everywhere under $\operatorname{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P} \otimes \operatorname{Leb}_d$. Since $\cup_{N \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_N$ is of zero measure under \mathbb{P} (the argument is given next), we can easily modify any weak limit such that it coincides with \mathcal{V} itself on $[0, T] \times (\cup_{N \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_N) \times \mathbb{T}^d$: the weak limit then provides an extension of \mathcal{V} to the whole $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d$, which shows (1). The main difficulty is to prove that there is in fact only one limit point. In order to do so, we proceed as follows. For any subsequence $(N_n)_{n \geq 1}$ for which the sequence $([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \ni (t, m, x) \mapsto \mathcal{V}(t, m * f_{N_n}, x))_{n \geq 1}$ is converging in the weak sense, we can apply Lemma 5.7 below with $\mathcal{W}(m * f_N, x) = \mathcal{V}(t, m * f_N, x)$ and $W^{(N)}(m) = V(t, m)$ and then invoke Lemma 5.8 with \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 being two possible limiting points of $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \ni (t, m, x) \mapsto \mathcal{V}(t, m * f_N, x))_{N \geq 1}$ and with $W_1 = W_2 = V$. The key point in this respect is that the sequence $([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \ni (t, m) \mapsto V(t, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ converges to the function $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \ni (t, m) \mapsto V(t, m)$. Therefore, Lemma 5.8 says that the sequence $([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \ni (t, m, x) \mapsto \mathcal{V}(t, m * f_N, x))_{N \geq 1}$ has a unique limit point (in the weak sense) and is thus convergent (in the weak sense). This proves (2) in the statement.

It then remains to prove that each \mathcal{P}_N is of zero measure under \mathbb{P} . It suffices to recall from Theorem 3.5 that, for $N' > N$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}_N) = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_N} \cdot \mathbb{P})(\mathcal{P}_N) = (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_N} \cdot \mathbb{P}) \left(\bigcap_{k \in F_{N'}^+ \setminus F_N^+} \{m : [\pi_{N'}^{(2)}(m)]^k = 0\} \right) = 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Importantly, we stress (once again) the fact that the function \mathcal{V} defined in the above statement inherits the d_{-2} -Lipschitz property and the semi-concavity of V . By Proposition 4.10 and by (80), we have (see (81) for the first line below)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{N \geq 1} \operatorname{esssup}_{(t,m) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\partial_x \mathcal{V}(t, m, x)| &< \infty, \\ \sup_{N \geq 1} \operatorname{esssup}_{(t,m) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \sum_{k \in F_N} |k|^4 |\widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(t, m)|^2 &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we recall from Corollary 3.18 (see in particular (34)) that, with ρ as in Definition 3.13, for any $N \geq 1$, for any $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with m having a strictly positive density, for any collection of complex numbers $(z^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ and any non-negative symmetric matrix S ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+}} \left\{ V(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \right. \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}, k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[(\mathfrak{P}[z^k]k) \cdot (\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[z^\ell]S\ell) \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\tilde{r}^k], \tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\tilde{r}^\ell]}^2 \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\Re[\tilde{r}^j], \Im[\tilde{r}^j]) \right) \right] \Big\} \\ &\quad \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d(\Re[\tilde{r}^j], \Im[\tilde{r}^j]) \\ &\leq C|S| \sum_{q=1}^d \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

with C depending on c such that $m \geq 1/c$. By integration by parts, this can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \sum_{\mathfrak{P}=\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[\partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\hat{r}^k]} V(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N) \hat{f}_N^k \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \times \left[(\mathfrak{P}[z^k]k) \cdot (\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[z^\ell]S\ell) \partial_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^\ell]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \right) \right] \right] \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \\ & \leq C|S| \sum_{q=1}^d \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \sum_{\mathfrak{P}=\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[\mathfrak{P}[\hat{v}^k(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N)] \hat{f}_N^k \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \times \left[(\mathfrak{P}[z^k]k) \cdot (\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[z^\ell]S\ell) \partial_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^\ell]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \right) \right] \right] \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \tag{85} \\ & \leq C|S| \sum_{q=1}^d \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which prompts us to introduce the following definition:

Definition 5.3. A bounded measurable function $\mathcal{Z} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be one-sided Lipschitz in the weak sense if, for any $c > 1$, there exists a constant C such that, for any $N \geq 1$, any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any ρ as in Definition 3.13, it holds, for any $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with m having a density lower bounded by $1/c$, and for any collection of complex numbers $(z^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ and any symmetric matrix S ,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \sum_{\mathfrak{P}=\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{k, \ell \in F_N^+} \left[\mathfrak{P}[\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r) * f_N)] \hat{f}_N^k \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \times \left[(\mathfrak{P}[z^k]k) \cdot (\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[z^\ell]S\ell) \partial_{\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}[\hat{r}^\ell]} \left(\prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \right) \right] \right] \right\} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d(\mathfrak{R}[\hat{r}^j], \mathfrak{S}[\hat{r}^j]) \\ & \leq C|S| \sum_{q=1}^d \left(\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k_q| |z^k| \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) = \overline{\mathcal{Z}(t, m, \cdot)}^{-k}$.

5.2. Uniqueness of weak solutions. Here is now the main theorem:

Theorem 5.4. Let \mathbb{P} be the probability measure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ introduced in the statement of Theorem 3.5. Then, uniqueness holds everywhere on $[0, T]$, \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and everywhere on \mathbb{T}^d within the class of bounded measurable functions

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

satisfying (with the same notation as in (75))

- (1) $\sup_{N \geq 1} \operatorname{esssup}_{(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \sum_{k \in F_N} k \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) e_k(x) \right| + \sum_{k \in F_N} |k|^4 |\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m)|^2 \right] < \infty;$
- (2) \mathcal{Z} is one-sided Lipschitz in the weak sense, see Definition 5.3;

(3) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, for any $t \in [0, T]$, for any bounded (measurable) function φ defined on \mathcal{O}_{N_0} , for some $N_0 \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m * f_N) \varphi((\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+}) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) \varphi((\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+}) d\mathbb{P}(m).$$

In particular, for every $t \in [0, T]$, for \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and for every $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, $\mathcal{Z}(t, x, m)$ is equal to $\mathcal{V}(t, x, m)$, with \mathcal{V} being as in the statement of Proposition 5.2.

The following remarks are in order.

Remark 5.5. Item (1) in the statement of Theorem 5.4 says that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \operatorname{esssup}_{(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \partial_x \left(\sum_{k \in F_N} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) e_k(x) \right) \right| < \infty.$$

Thus, for any $N \geq 1$ and for almost every $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$, the function $x \in \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \sum_{k \in F_N} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) e_k(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous, with a Lipschitz constant that is independent of N , t and m .

Remark 5.6. It is worth noticing that the formulation of uniqueness depends on the choice of the measure \mathbb{P} in the statement of Theorem 3.5. This is an intriguing observation since our choice for the measure \mathbb{P} is somewhat arbitrary, recall the definition (27) of the approximating measure \mathbb{P}_N . Alternatively, in order to formulate uniqueness without imposing a specific choice for \mathbb{P} , we could also wonder about identifying $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m)$ for $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$, for a fixed N , but this looks rather challenging. In fact, with our approach and with item (iii) in Theorem 3.5, we identify

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m * f_N) \varphi((\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+}) d\mathbb{P}_N(m)$$

up to a remainder that tends to 0 as N tends to ∞ . This remainder depends on φ but can be made uniform when φ is taken in a compact family of continuous functions. Interestingly, the above integral can be reformulated as an integral on \mathcal{O}_N equipped with the Lebesgue measure, which makes the interpretation easier.

Proof. First Step. We start with an arbitrary weak solution, as given in Definition 5.1. We observe from (76) that, for any $N \geq 1$, the functions $(\mathfrak{R}[\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k], \mathfrak{S}[\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k])_{k \in F_N^+}$ satisfy a system of hyperbolic equations of the form

$$\epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} \partial_t \mathfrak{P} \left[\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) \right] + \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\widehat{m}^k]} H_N \left(t, m, \left(\mathfrak{R}[\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^j(t, m)], \mathfrak{S}[\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^j(t, m)] \right)_{j \in F_N^+} \right) = 0,$$

for $\mathfrak{P} \in \{\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}\}$, $k \in F_N^+$ and $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$, with \mathcal{P}_N being identified with \mathcal{O}_N and with $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{R}} = 1$ and $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{S}} = -1$.

Following the proof of Theorem 6.6 in [28] (which is itself adapted from [51]), we deduce that, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, we can find a function $U^{(N)}(t, \cdot) : \mathcal{P}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, almost everywhere on \mathcal{P}_N ,

$$\epsilon_{\mathfrak{P}} \mathfrak{P} \left[\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) \right] = \partial_{\mathfrak{P}[\widehat{m}^k]} U^{(N)}(t, m), \quad k \in F_N^+,$$

which can be easily reformulated by means of (30) as

$$\overbrace{\left\{ \mathcal{Z}(t, m, \cdot) \right\}}^{-k} = \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) = \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} U^{(N)}(t, m).$$

Then, the function U^N can be easily assumed to measurable in time (assuming for instance that $t \mapsto U^N(t, m_0)$ is measurable for a fixed $m_0 \in \mathcal{O}_N$). Following the same mollification procedure as in the second and third steps of the proof of [28, Theorem 6.6] and expanding the form of H_N , we can even assume that $U^{(N)}$ is Lipschitz in time and space on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ and satisfies,

almost everywhere, the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t U^{(N)}(t, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H\left(y, i2\pi \sum_{k \in F_N} k \partial_{\hat{m}^k} U^{(N)}(t, m) e_k(y)\right) dm(y) \\ - \sum_{k \in F_N} 2\pi^2 |k|^2 \partial_{\hat{m}^k} U^{(N)}(t, m) \hat{m}^k + F(m) + 2\zeta_N(t, m) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

with $U^{(N)}(T, m) = G(m)$ as boundary condition. Intuitively, the above equation is obtained by taking the anti-derivative in (78).

Second Step. For the same value of N , and for ε and ρ and with the same notation as in Definition 3.13, we now consider the function

$$\tilde{U}^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)} : m \in \mathcal{P}_N \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} U^{(N)}(t, m^{N, \varepsilon}(r)) \prod_{k \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^k) \otimes_{k \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^k.$$

Pay attention that $\tilde{U}^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)}$ is not the same as $(U^{(N)})^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}$ in Definition 3.13 and in Corollary 3.16, since the measure argument in $U^{(N)}$ is not convoluted by f_N .

For a given $t \in [0, T]$, $\tilde{U}^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)}$ is continuously differentiable with respect to $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$. Moreover, for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, for any two $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{P}_N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & U^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)}(t, m_2) - U^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)}(t, m_1) \\ &= \int_0^1 \left[\sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} U^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)}(t, \lambda m_2 + (1 - \lambda)m_1) (\hat{m}_2^k - \hat{m}_1^k) \right] d\lambda \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_0^1 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left[\sum_{k \in F_N} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} U^{(N)}\left(t, \lambda m_2^{N, \varepsilon}(r) + (1 - \lambda)m_1^{N, \varepsilon}(r)\right) (\hat{m}_2^k - \hat{m}_1^k) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right\} d\lambda \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_0^1 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k\left(t, \lambda m_2^{N, \varepsilon}(r) + (1 - \lambda)m_1^{N, \varepsilon}(r)\right) e_k(x) \right] d(m_2 - m_1)(x) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \right\} d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

By means of Remark 5.5, we know that, for almost every $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$, the function $x \in \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m) e_k(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous (in x), uniformly in (t, m) and in $N \geq 1$. This shows that the Lipschitz constant of $\tilde{U}^{(N, \varepsilon, \rho)}(t, \cdot)$ in $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ with respect to the distance d_{W_1} is uniform with respect to $N \geq 1$ and almost every $t \in [0, T]$. Letting ρ converge to the Dirac mass δ_0 and then ε tend to 0, we deduce that the same is true for $U^{(N)}$: its Lipschitz constant in $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$ with respect to d_{W_1} is uniform in $N \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$ (since $U^{(N)}$ is already known to be continuous, it is quite straightforward to pass from almost every $t \in [0, T]$ to any $t \in [0, T]$).

Moreover, by using the growth properties of the Hamiltonian and by using item (1) in the statement of Theorem 5.4 together with (77), we deduce that the essential supremum norm of $\partial_t U^{(N)}$ is bounded, uniformly with respect to t and N , on any subset of \mathcal{P}_N of the form $\{m \in \mathcal{P}_N : \|m\|_\infty \leq c\}$, for any $c > 1$. In particular, using the fact that $U^{(N)}(T, \cdot) = G(\cdot)$, we deduce that, for any $c > 1$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} |U^{(N)}(t, m)| \mathbf{1}_{\{m \in \mathcal{P}_N : \|m\|_\infty \leq c\}} d\mathbb{P}_N(m)$$

is bounded by a constant independent of N . For $c > 1$, the subset $\{m \in \mathcal{P}_N : \|m\|_\infty \leq c\}$ is of positive measure under \mathbb{P}_N (as it contains a neighborhood of the Lebesgue measure), from

which we deduce that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \inf_{m \in \mathcal{P}_N} |U^{(N)}(t, m)| < \infty.$$

Using the Lipschitz property of $U^{(N)}$ in space, we get

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{m \in \mathcal{P}_N} |U^{(N)}(t, m)| < \infty. \quad (86)$$

Third Step. By assumption (1) in the statement, we observe that $U^{(N)}$ satisfies the two main conclusions of Proposition 4.10, for a fixed value of N therein and for almost every $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$. Similarly, using the weak one-sided Lipschitz property of \mathcal{Z} in Definition 5.3 and reverting the computations in (83)–(84)–(85), we can easily deduce that $U^{(N)}$ satisfies the conclusions of Corollary 3.18, say in the form of (34), again for a fixed value of N . Importantly, this suffices to repeat the arguments underpinning the proof of Theorem 4.12. Notice indeed that, for a given value of N , the fact that $U^{(N)}$ is defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ suffices to give a meaning to $(U^{(N)})^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}$ in Definition 3.13 and then to follow the computations of Proposition 4.11 and Theorem 4.12 when N therein is fixed. The key fact is that, by combining the assumption (77) with Theorem 6.15 (which permit to handle the remainder ζ_N along the characteristics (65)), we still have (70), namely for an initial $m_0 \in B_N(c) = \mathcal{P}_N \cap \{m : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla m(x)| \leq c, \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 1/c\}$ for a constant $c > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left| (V^{N, \varepsilon, \rho} - (U^{(N)})^{N, \varepsilon, \rho})(0, m_0(r)) \right| \prod_{j \in F_N^+} \rho_0(\hat{r}^j) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{r}^j \\ & \leq \eta_{N, \varepsilon} + C_{N, \rho_0} \int_0^T \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} R^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}(t, (\hat{y}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}) \mathbf{1}_{\{y \in \mathcal{P}_N\}} \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{y}^j \right] dt, \end{aligned}$$

with $\lim_{(N, \varepsilon) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)} \eta_{N, \varepsilon} = 0$, with C_{N, ρ_0} depending on N , ρ_0 and c , but independent of ε and ρ , and with the remainder $R^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}$ being as in the statement of Proposition 4.11.

Letting ρ tend to the Dirac mass at 0 for a fixed value of N and invoking Proposition 4.11, we can get rid of the term containing $R^{N, \varepsilon, \rho}$ in the above inequality. Using the regularity of V and $U^{(N)}$ with respect to d_{W_1} , we deduce that there exists a sequence $(\eta'_N)_{N \geq 1}$, converging to 0, such that $|V(0, m_0) - U^{(N)}(0, m_0)| \leq \eta'_N$ when $m_0 \in B_N(c)$. Replacing m_0 by $m * f_N$, we deduce that $(V(0, m * f_N) - U^{(N)}(0, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ tends to 0 for any $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with a continuously differentiable strictly positive density. Recalling from (i) in Theorem 3.5 that, for \mathbb{P} almost every m , m has a continuously differentiable strictly positive density, we deduce that, for \mathbb{P} almost every m , $(V(0, m * f_N) - U^{(N)}(0, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ tends to 0. Obviously, the same holds true for any initial time $t \in [0, T]$ instead of 0.

We eventually deduce that, for any $t \in [0, T]$, the sequence $(m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto U^{(N)}(t, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ converges to $V(t, \cdot)$ for the weak-star topology $\sigma^*(L^\infty(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}); L^1(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}))$. The next step is to apply Lemma 5.8 below to $(\mathcal{W}_1, W_1) = (\mathcal{Z}, V)$ and $(\mathcal{W}_2, W_2) = (\mathcal{V}, V)$, from which we deduce that \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{V} are equal. The key point is indeed to observe from assumption (3) in the statement that, for any $t \in [0, T]$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, the sequence $(m \mapsto \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ converges to $m \mapsto \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^k(t, m)$ for the weak-star topology $\sigma^*(L^\infty(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}); L^1(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}))$. In this respect, the form of assumption (3) is sufficient to identify uniquely any weak limit: this follows from the description of the Borel σ -algebra on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ provided by Lemma 3.4 together with a monotone class argument. We deduce that, for any $t \in [0, T]$, for \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the two functions $\mathcal{V}(t, m, \cdot)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(t, m, \cdot)$ coincide. \square

5.3. Auxiliary lemmas. We now provide two important auxiliary lemmas that we invoked in the proofs of Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 5.4.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $W : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded measurable functions such that for a collection of bounded functions $(W^{(N)} : \mathcal{P}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R})_{N \geq 1}$, with each $W^{(N)}$ being Lipschitz continuous, the following three assumptions hold true:*

(i) For any $N \geq 1$, any $k \in F_N^+$ and almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}_N$, $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^k(m) = \partial_{\widehat{m}^k} W^{(N)}(m)$, with $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^k(m) := \widehat{\mathcal{W}(m, \cdot)}^{-k}$;

(ii) Up to a common subsequence, the functions $(m \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^k(m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ converge, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, to $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^k$ for the weak-star topology $\sigma^*(L^\infty(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}); L^1(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}))$;

(iii) Up to the same subsequence as in (ii), the functions $(m \mapsto W^{(N)}(m * f_N))_{N \geq 1}$ converge to W for the same weak-star topology $\sigma^*(L^\infty(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}); L^1(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P}))$.

Then, for any $\delta > 0$ and $c > 1$, there exists an integer $N_{c,\delta}$ such that, for any $N_0 \geq N_{c,\delta}$, any $k_0 \in F_{N_0}^+$, any smooth function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose support is included in $\{(\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_{N_0}^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} : 1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}(x)] \geq 1/c\}$,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W(m) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) + \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{k_0}(m) - 2W(m) |k_0|^{2pd} \widehat{m}^{k_0} \right\} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| \leq C\delta,$$

for a constant C independent of N_0 and depending on φ only through $\|\varphi\|_\infty$ and $\|\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi\|_\infty$.

Notice that the role of N_0 in the statement is to adjust the size of the support of the test function φ .

Proof. Throughout the proof, we fix $\delta > 0$ and $c > 1$ and then choose $N_0 \geq 1$, $\vartheta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in the statement. Without any loss of generality, we also do as if the subsequences in assumptions (ii) and (iii) were the full sequence $(N)_{N \geq 1}$ itself.

By item (iii) in the statement, we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W(m) \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m).$$

Using the fact that the functions $(W^{(N)})_{N \geq 1}$ are uniformly bounded to get the first equality and invoking (iii) in the statement of Theorem 3.5, the above limit can be reformulated as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W(m) \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m). \quad (87)$$

Here, we can easily replace φ by its partial derivative $\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi$, for a given $k_0 \in F_{N_0}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W(m) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m). \end{aligned}$$

We now recall the form of \mathbb{P}_N in (27)–(28) in order to study the left-hand side. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+} d\widehat{m}^k, \end{aligned}$$

with $p \geq 5$ fixed (see (27) for the original occurrence of p) and with m in the second line being obviously identified with $\mathcal{S}_N((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+})$.

Fix now $N \geq 1$. By Lemmas 6.3 and 6.5 in the appendix, we can choose N_0 large enough such that, if $N \geq N_0$ and the support of φ is included in $\mathcal{S}_N^{-1}(A_{N_0})$ (with A_{N_0} as in the statement

of Lemma 6.3), then

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \text{support}(\varphi) \right\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{m}^k| \geq \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \leq \delta, \quad (88)$$

for a_0 fixed as in the statement of Lemma 6.3 (in particular, a_0 only depends on the dimension). By the same statement, the simple fact that

$$\mathcal{J}_{N_0}((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}) \in A_{N_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{m}^k| < \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}}$$

implies that $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$. For such a choice, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \right. \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \\ & \quad \left. \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{m}^k| < a_0/|k|^{5d/2}\}} \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{k \in F_N^+} d\widehat{m}^k \right| \leq C\delta, \end{aligned}$$

with C depending on φ through $\|\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi\|_\infty$, but being independent of N .

Then, we can make an integration by parts in the second term in the left-hand side. This leads to two terms: (a) one derivative is acting on $W^{(N)}$ and leads to $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{k_0}$ (using item (i) in the statement); (b) the other derivative is acting on the density. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left\{ \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \widehat{f}_N^{k_0} - 2W^{(N)}(m * f_N) |k_0|^{2pd} \widehat{m}^{k_0} \right\} \\ & \quad \left. \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{m}^k| < a_0/|k|^{5d/2}\}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{k \in F_N^+} d\widehat{m}^k \right| \\ & \leq C\delta, \end{aligned}$$

and then, using once again (88) together with the bound $\sup_{N \geq 1} \text{essup}_{m \in \mathcal{P}_N} |\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} W^{(N)}(m)| = \sup_{N \geq 1} \text{essup}_{m \in \mathcal{P}_N} |\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{k_0}(m)| < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left\{ \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) \widehat{f}_N^{k_0} - 2W^{(N)}(m * f_N) |k_0|^{2pd} \widehat{m}^{k_0} \right\} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \right| \\ & \leq C\delta, \end{aligned}$$

with C now depending on φ through $\|\varphi\|_\infty$ and $\|\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi\|_\infty$. Recalling again that $\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} W^{(N)}(m * f_N) = \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{k_0}(m * f_N)$ almost everywhere, we can use assumption (ii) in the statement in order to pass to the limit in the term $\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} W^{(N)}(m * f_N)$. Recalling (87) and letting N tend to ∞ , we eventually get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} W(m) \partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^{k_0}(m) - 2W(m) |k_0|^{2pd} \widehat{m}^{k_0} \right\} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| \leq C\delta, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let (\mathcal{W}_1, W_1) and (\mathcal{W}_2, W_2) be two pairs of functions satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 5.7. If W_1 and W_2 are equal almost everywhere under \mathbb{P} , then \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 are also equal almost everywhere under \mathbb{P} .*

Proof. We apply Lemma 5.7 to (\mathcal{W}_i, W_i) , for $i = 1, 2$, and then use the fact that $W_1 = W_2$. We deduce that, for $\delta > 0$ and $c > 1$, there exists an integer $N_{c,\delta}$ such that, for $N_0 \geq N_{c,\delta}$, for any $k_0 \in F_{N_0}^+$ and any smooth function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose support is included in $\{(\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_{N_0}^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} : 1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}(x)] \geq 1/c\}$,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_1^{k_0}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^{k_0}(m) \right) \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| \leq C\delta, \quad (89)$$

for a constant C only depending on φ through $\|\varphi\|_\infty$ and $\|\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}} \varphi\|_\infty$. By an obvious regularization procedure, the same holds if φ is merely bounded and Lipschitz continuous, in which case the constant C depends on φ through the bound and the Lipschitz constant of φ .

For $\vartheta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, a c -Lipschitz function that is equal to 0 on $]-\infty, 1/c[$, let

$$\Theta \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) = \vartheta \left(1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re[\widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x)] \right), \quad (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_{N_0}^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}.$$

Observe that the support of Θ is included in \mathcal{O}_{N_0} . Moreover, for $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_{N_0}^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$ and $\widehat{r}^{k_0} \in \mathbb{C}$, with $k_0 \in F_{N_0}^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Theta \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} + \mathbf{1}_{\{k=k_0\}} \widehat{r}^{k_0} \right) - \Theta \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right| \\ & \leq 2c \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) - \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} (\widehat{m}^k + \mathbf{1}_{\{k=k_0\}} \widehat{r}^{k_0}) e_{-k}(x) \right| \leq 2c |\widehat{r}^{k_0}|, \end{aligned}$$

hence proving that Θ is $2c$ -Lipschitz with respect to \widehat{m}^{k_0} . In particular, for a continuously differentiable test function ϕ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we deduce from (89) that, for N_0 large enough,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_1^{k_0}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^{k_0}(m) \right) \phi(m * f_{N_0}) \vartheta \left(1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re[\widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x)] \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| \leq C(c)\delta,$$

with $C(c)$ depending on c , but being independent of N_0 and δ . Above, $\phi(m * f_{N_0})$ is regarded as a smooth function on \mathcal{O}_{N_0} .

As before, $m * f_{N_0}$ converges to m for the Wasserstein distance as N_0 tends to ∞ . Moreover, Lemma 6.13 below says that, \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere, the series $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\widehat{m}^k|$ is absolutely convergent hence proving that $1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} 2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re[\widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x)]$ converges to $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x)$ with m being identified with its density. Therefore, we can let N_0 tend to ∞ . We thus get

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_1^{k_0}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^{k_0}(m) \right) \phi(m) \vartheta \left(\inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) = 0.$$

There is no difficulty for sending c to $+\infty$ in the definition of ϑ since \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ has a (strictly) positive density. We obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_1^{k_0}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^{k_0}(m) \right) \phi(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) = 0,$$

for any continuously differentiable test function ϕ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. By the approximation procedure defined in Proposition 3.14, the same holds true if ϕ is merely continuous on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. And, then the same is true if ϕ is bounded and measurable on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, see [65]. This suffices to identify $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_1^{k_0}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_2^{k_0}$. \square

5.4. Classical solutions to the master equation as weak solutions. We now prove the following result, which legitimates Definition 5.1:

Proposition 5.9. *If U is a classical solution to the master equation, with $\partial_t U$, $\partial_x U$, $\partial_{xx}^2 U$, $\partial_\mu U$, $\partial_y \partial_\mu U$ being continuous (with y denoting the last argument in the derivative $\partial_\mu U(t, x, m)(y)$), then the centered version*

$$\tilde{U}(t, x, m) := U(t, x, m) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} U(t, y, m) dy, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \quad m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

satisfies the conservative version (24) of the master equation. In particular, \tilde{U} is a weak solution to the master equation, in the sense of Definition 5.1.

Proof. For any starting point $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we can construct a solution to the system (5) by solving the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t m_t(x) - \operatorname{div}_x \left(\partial_p H(x, \nabla_x U(t, x, m_t)) m_t(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_x m_t(x) = 0,$$

and then, by letting, $u_t(x) = U(t, x, m_t)$. In fact, this solution can be proven to be unique, see for instance [25, Proposition 5.106].

By Proposition 2.6, the forward component of this unique solution, i.e. $(m_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, must coincide with the (hence unique) optimal path of the MFCP, when initialized from (t, m) . In turn, Lemma 4.6 implies, for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\partial_{\hat{m}^k} V(t, m) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} U(t, x, m) e^{-2i\pi k \cdot x} dx, \quad k \in F_N \setminus \{0\},$$

for almost every $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ under the probability measure $\operatorname{Leb}_1 \otimes \mathbb{P}_N$. By continuity of U in the right-hand side, we deduce that V is differentiable with respect to \hat{m}^k on the entire $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$. We deduce from Schwarz' theorem that, for every $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_N$ and for any $k, \ell \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_{\hat{m}^\ell} U(t, x, m) e^{-2i\pi k \cdot x} dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_{\hat{m}^k} U(t, x, m) e^{-2i\pi \ell \cdot x} dx, \quad k, \ell \in F_N \setminus \{0\},$$

which rewrites

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) e^{-2i\pi k \cdot x} e^{-2i\pi \ell \cdot y} dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) e^{-2i\pi k \cdot y} e^{-2i\pi \ell \cdot x} dx dy,$$

for $k, \ell \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$. By invoking the continuity of U and by approximating any measure $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ by the sequence $(m * f_N)_{N \geq 1}$, the above holds true for any $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and any $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$. This shows

$$\frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) - \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, y, m)(x) = \psi(y) - \phi(x), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

for two real-valued functions ϕ and ψ defined on \mathbb{T}^d (both depending on m). Integrating the above identity in y and then in x with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^d , we get from (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, y, m)(x) dy &= \phi(x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi(y) dy, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) dx &= \psi(y) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d$. Integrating again in x the first line, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) dx,$$

and then

$$\frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) - \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, y, m)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, y, m)(x) dy,$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta}{\delta m} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) dm(y) \right\} (x) \\
&= H(x, \nabla_y U(t, x, m)) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_p H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) \cdot \partial_y \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, y, m)(x) dm(y) \\
&= H(x, \nabla_y U(t, x, m)) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_p H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) \cdot \partial_y \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) dm(y) \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_p H(y, \nabla_y U(t, y, m)) \cdot \partial_y \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) dx dm(y),
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta}{\delta m} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 U(t, y, m) \right] dm(y) \right\} (x) \\
&= \text{Tr} \left[\partial_x^2 U(t, x, m) \right] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 U(t, y, m) \right] dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, y, m)(x) \right] dm(y) \\
&= \text{Tr} \left[\partial_x^2 U(t, x, m) \right] - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 U(t, y, m) \right] dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) \right] dm(y) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{Tr} \left[\partial_y^2 \frac{\delta U}{\delta m}(t, x, m)(y) \right] dx dm(y).
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion easily follows: it suffices to integrate the equation (12) in x with respect to the Lebesgue measure, to make the difference between (12) and the hence integrated version of (12) and then to insert the latter two identities, noticing that $\nabla_x U = \nabla_x \tilde{U}$.

The last claim then follows since \tilde{U} solves (76) in the classical sense. Indeed, we can argue as in Subsection 4.1, the computations being here legitimate because the solution is smooth. \square

6. APPENDIX

6.1. Construction of a probability measure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ satisfying Theorem 3.5. This (long) subsection is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 3.5. This comes as a by-product of a generic construction, which makes use (in a quite systematic manner) of the notations introduced in Subsection 3.2 (we invite the reader to have a new look at them before she/he enters the details of the proof below). In particular, we recall (27), (28) and the subsequent notation $\mathbb{P}_N = \Gamma_N \circ \mathcal{S}_N^{-1}$. Quite often in the analysis, we also make use of the normalization constant

$$c_N := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\hat{m}^k|^2 \right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\hat{m}^j. \quad (90)$$

(Notice that c_N is different from Z_N in (27).) Moreover, we also introduce a sequence $(\xi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d \setminus \{0\}}$ of independent two-dimensional Gaussian random variables on an auxiliary probability space with \mathbf{P} as probability measure, such that each ξ_k has I_2 as covariance matrix (with I_2 being the identity matrix of dimension 2).

6.1.1. Properties of the sequence $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$. In this paragraph, we obtain a series of lemmas on the properties of the measures $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$. We start with the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *For any two integers $N_0 \leq N$ and for any $[0, 1]$ -valued measurable function φ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$ that is equal to zero outside \mathcal{O}_{N_0} ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ & \leq \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, if φ is null outside the points $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ such that

$$1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x)] \geq \varepsilon, \quad (91)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ & \geq \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \frac{c(\varepsilon, N_0)}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$c(\varepsilon, N_0) := 1 - \frac{C(p)}{\varepsilon N_0^{(p-5/2)d}}, \quad (92)$$

for $C(p)$ a constant only depending on p and d .

Proof. First Step. Using the same notations as in the statement and recalling that φ is zero outside \mathcal{O}_{N_0} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ & = \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+} d\widehat{m}^k \\ & = \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \\ & \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_N}\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \right] \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Obviously, we can bound the indicator function in the last line by 1 and then get c_N/c_{N_0} (see (90) for the definition) as bound for the whole term on the last line. This proves the first inequality in the statement.

Second Step. Take now φ as in the statement and $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ satisfying (91). If we choose another collection $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus F_{N_0}}$ (with the usual requirement that $\widehat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{m}^k}$) such that

$$\sum_{k \in F_N \setminus F_{N_0}} |\widehat{m}^k| < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon,$$

then

$$1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}_k e_{-k}(x) = 1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \Re[\widehat{m}_k e_{-k}(x)] \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon,$$

and accordingly the left hand side can be regarded as a probability measure in \mathcal{P}_N . For instance, so is the case if $|\widehat{m}^k| \leq \kappa_d^{-1} \varepsilon |k|^{-3d/2}$, for $\kappa_d = 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |j|^{-3d/2}$. Therefore, for $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ belongs to the support of φ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{m}^k| < \kappa_d^{-1} \varepsilon |k|^{-3d/2}\}} \exp\left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_N} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \exp\left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \exp\left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Multiplying both sides by c_{N_0}/c_N , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{P} \left(\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|k|^{pd}} |\xi_k| < \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa_d |k|^{3d/2}} \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{c_{N_0}}{c_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_N} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \exp\left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ & \leq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where $(\xi_k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$ is defined right below (90).

By Markov inequality, for $p > 3/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{P} \left(\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|k|^{pd}} |\xi_k| < \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa_d |k|^{3d/2}} \right\} \right) & \geq 1 - \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{P} \left(\left\{ |\xi_k| \geq \sqrt{2} \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa_d} |k|^{(p-3/2)d} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq 1 - C(p) \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon |k|^{(p-3/2)d}} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{C(p)}{\varepsilon N_0^{(p-5/2)d}}, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where the value of the constant $C(p)$ is allowed to change from line to line (as long as it only depends on p and d). The difference on the last line coincides with $c(\varepsilon, N_0)$ in (92).

Back to (95), we deduce

$$c(\varepsilon, N_0) \leq \frac{c_{N_0}}{c_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_N} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \exp\left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j.$$

Back to (93), we get the second inequality in the statement (and this even if $c(\varepsilon, N_0)$ is negative). \square

We get the following lemma:

Lemma 6.2. *With the same notations as above,*

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} - 1 \right| = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{N \geq N_0} \mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+ \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq (2N_0)^{-3d/2} \right\} \right) = 1,$$

with the usual convention that $\widehat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{m}^k}$ for $k \in F_{N_0}^+$.

Proof. First Step. We choose φ in Lemma 6.1 as φ_0 , the indicator function of the set of Fourier coefficients $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ such that

$$1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+ \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) > \varepsilon, \quad (97)$$

for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ as in the statement of Lemma 6.1 and with the same convention as in the statement of Lemma 6.2 that $\widehat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\widehat{m}^k}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi_0 \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}} \varphi_0 \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j. \end{aligned}$$

We then make the change of variable

$$\widehat{y}^k = \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \widehat{m}^k.$$

Then, the condition (97) merely says that $(\widehat{y}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ belongs to \mathcal{O}_{N_0} if $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ belongs to the support of φ_0 . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi_0 \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \exp \left(- (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{y}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{y}^j \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}}. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

By the second inequality in the statement of Lemma 6.1, we deduce that

$$c(\varepsilon, N_0) (1 - \varepsilon)^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \leq 1.$$

Moreover, choosing $\varphi = 1$ in the first inequality in the statement of Lemma 6.1, we also have

$$\frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \geq 1.$$

Second Step. We notice from Proposition 3.1 that $2|F_{N_0}^+| = D_{N_0} \leq 2(2N_0)^d$. So, if we choose $\varepsilon = N_0^{-3d/2}$, then the shape of $c(\varepsilon, N_0)$ in Lemma 6.1 together with the fact that $p \geq 5$ yield

$$c(\varepsilon, N_0) (1 - \varepsilon)^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \geq \left(1 - \frac{C(p)}{N_0^d} \right) \exp \left(2(2N_0)^d \ln(1 - (N_0)^{-3d/2}) \right).$$

Obviously the right-hand side tends to 1 as N_0 tends to ∞ . Combining with the conclusion of the first step, we get

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} - 1 \right| = 0,$$

which is the first claim in the statement.

Third Step. By the second inequality in the statement of Lemma 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi_0 \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &\geq \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \frac{c(\varepsilon, N_0)}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi_0 \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j, \end{aligned}$$

By (98) (with $\varepsilon = N_0^{-3d/2}$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) > N_0^{-3d/2} \right\} \right) &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi_0 \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &\geq c(\varepsilon, N_0) (1 - \varepsilon)^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}}, \end{aligned}$$

By the second step, we get that the infimum over $N \geq N_0$ of the right-hand side tends to 1 as N_0 tends to ∞ . This completes the proof. \square

Here is an application, which is very useful throughout the paper.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $(\psi_{N_0})_{N_0 \geq 1}$ be a sequence of $[-1, 1]$ -valued Borel measurable functions defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with the following two properties:*

- (1) ψ_{N_0} is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra generated by the mappings $(m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+})$;
- (2) ψ_{N_0} is null outside

$$A_{N_0} := \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq (2N_0)^{-3d/2} \right\}.$$

Then, there exists $a_0 > 0$, only depending on d , such that, for any $a \in (0, a_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\widehat{m}^k| < \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \\ \subset \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \left(\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi_{N_0}(m) d\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(m) \right)^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left[\psi_{N_0}(m) \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{m}^k| < a|k|^{-5d/2}\}} \right] d\mathbb{P}_N(m) - 1 \right| \\ = 0, \end{aligned}$$

with the numerator in the first line being necessarily equal 0 when the denominator is 0 and the convention that the ratio is then understood as 1.

Remark 6.4. *In fact, the first claim can be reformulated in the following broader sense. If $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ satisfies, for $N \geq N_0$,*

$$1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq (2N_0)^{-3d/2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{m}^k| < \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}},$$

for $a \in (0, a_0]$, then

$$1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2}.$$

In words, there is no need to assume a priori that $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}$ are the Fourier coefficients of a probability measure. The conditions on the Fourier coefficients suffice to prove it a posteriori.

Proof. We first observe that, for

$$m \in A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ |\widehat{m}^k| < \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\},$$

it holds

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) &\geq (2N_0)^{-3d/2} - \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus F_{N_0}} \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \\ &\geq (2N_0)^{-3d/2} - c_d a (N_0)^{-3d/2}, \end{aligned}$$

for a constant c_d only depending on d . Therefore, for $c_d a \leq 2^{-(3d/2+1)}$,

$$1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2}.$$

We deduce that, for such an a and for ψ_{N_0} as in the statement,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left[\psi_{N_0}(m) \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{m}^k| < a|k|^{-5d/2}\}} \right] d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}} \left[\varphi_{N_0} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{m}^k| < a|k|^{-5d/2}\}} \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \right] \otimes_{j \in F_N^+} d\widehat{m}^j, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_{N_0} = \psi_{N_0} \circ \mathcal{I}_{N_0}$, see the notation in (28). We rewrite the above equality as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left[\psi_{N_0}(m) \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{m}^k| < a|k|^{-5d/2}\}} \right] d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi_{N_0} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{m}^k| < a|k|^{-5d/2}\}} \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \otimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ &= \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi_{N_0}(m) d\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(m) \right) \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{P} \left(\left\{ |\xi_k| \leq \sqrt{2}a|k|^{(p-5/2)d} \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Repeating (96),

$$\prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{P} \left(\left\{ |\xi_k| \leq \sqrt{2}a|k|^{(p-5/2)d} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{C(p)}{aN_0^{(p-7/2)d}},$$

for a constant $C(p)$ only depending on p and d . Therefore, by Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{P} \left(\left\{ |\xi_k| \leq \sqrt{2}a|k|^{(p-5/2)d} \right\} \right) - 1 \right| = 0.$$

Inserting the latter into (99), we get the conclusion. \square

We deduce the following lemma:

Lemma 6.5. *Let $a_0 > 0$ be as in the statement of Lemma 6.3. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $N_1 \geq 1$ such that, for any $N \geq N_0 \geq N_1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ m > 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2} \right\} \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_N \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\widehat{m}^k| < \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \delta, \tag{100}$$

with A_{N_0} being as in Lemma 6.3.

Proof. For δ as in the statement, we know from Lemma 6.3 (with $\psi_{N_0} = \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}$) that we can find $a = a_0 > 0$, only depending on d , such that, for any $N_0 \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \mathbb{P}_N \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ |\hat{m}^k| < \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) - \mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0}) \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

By Lemma 6.3, for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\hat{m}^k| < \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}_N \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\hat{m}^k| < \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0}) - \frac{1}{2}\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

By Lemma 6.2, we know that, for N_0 large enough, $\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0}) \geq 1 - \delta/2$ and, then, the right-hand side is greater than $1 - \delta$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.6. *With the same notations as before,*

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{D_{N_0}} \rightarrow [-1,1]} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P}_N - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) \right| = 0,$$

where, for any $N_0 \geq 1$, φ in the argument of the supremum is required to be measurable, and with the already used notation $D_{N_0} = 2|F_{N_0}^+|$.

Proof. We fix $\delta > 0$. By Lemma 6.5, we can choose a_0 as in Lemma 6.3, N_0 large enough and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that, for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(\{m > \varepsilon\} \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_N \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\hat{m}^k| < \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

For a function φ as in the statement, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \right. \\ & \left. - \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}(m) \prod_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\hat{m}^k| < a_0/|k|^{5d/2}\}} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \right| \leq \delta. \end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

We now apply Lemma 6.3 to the function $m \mapsto \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}(m)$. For N_0 large enough, we get

$$\sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) - \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(m) \right| \leq 3\delta.$$

\square

6.1.2. *Convergence of the sequence* $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$. Using the properties proven in the previous paragraph, we now have all the ingredients to address the limiting points of the sequence $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$.

The following lemma proves the second claim in item (ii) of Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 6.7. *Let \mathbb{P} be a weak limit of $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. For an integer $N_0 \geq 1$, define, on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the (sub-probability) measure \mathbb{Q} by*

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}(m) := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_{N_0}}(m) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}}\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right), \quad m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

Then, the image of \mathbb{Q} by the mapping

$$\pi_{N_0}^{(2)} : m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto \left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$$

is supported by \mathcal{O}_{N_0} (i.e., $\mathbb{Q} \circ (\pi_{N_0}^{(2)})^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{N_0}^c) = 0$) and is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Precisely, for any Borel subset B of $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$ that is included in \mathcal{O}_{N_0} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Q} \circ (\pi_{N_0}^{(2)})^{-1}(B) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \mathbf{1}_B\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}}\right) \frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_B\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall from Lemma 6.2 that the first factor in the above right-hand side is finite.

Proof. Let E be an open subset of \mathcal{O}_{N_0} (equivalently, E is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$ included in \mathcal{O}_{N_0}). We observe that $\{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in E\}$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

Up to a subsequence, we can assume that $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ weakly converges to \mathbb{P} . Then, by Portmanteau theorem,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in E\right\}\right) \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_N\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in E\right\}\right).$$

Now, by Lemma 6.1 (with $\varphi = \mathbf{1}_E$), letting N tend to ∞ therein, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \mathbf{1}_E\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}}\right) \frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_E\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where we recall from Lemma 6.2 that the first factor in the above right-hand side is finite. By definition of \mathbb{Q} , the left-hand side can be rewritten as $\mathbb{Q} \circ (\pi_{N_0}^{(2)})^{-1}(E)$.

Take now a Borel subset B of $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$ that is included in \mathcal{O}_{N_0} . By outer-regularity of the Lebesgue measure, we can find, for any $\delta > 0$, an open subset E of \mathcal{O}_{N_0} , containing B , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_E\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \\ &\leq \frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_B\left(\left(\widehat{m}^k\right)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

By (103),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \mathbf{1}_E \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\ & \leq \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}} \right) \left[\frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_B \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j + \delta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The left-hand side writes $\mathbb{Q} \circ (\pi_{N_0}^{(2)})^{-1}(E)$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Q} \circ (\pi_{N_0}^{(2)})^{-1}(B) \\ & \leq \mathbb{Q} \circ (\pi_{N_0}^{(2)})^{-1}(E) \\ & \leq \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}} \right) \left[\frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_B \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j + \delta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is for any $\delta > 0$, we get the result. \square

Lemma 6.8. *Let \mathbb{P} be a weak limit of $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then*

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(A_{N_0}) = 1,$$

with A_{N_0} being as in Lemma 6.3.

Proof. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.7, A_{N_0} is a closed subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Therefore, by Portmanteau theorem (assuming without any loss of generality that $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ converges to \mathbb{P} in the weak sense),

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{N_0}) \geq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_N(A_{N_0}).$$

The conclusion follows from Lemma 6.5. \square

We now prove item (iii) in the statement of Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 6.9. *Let \mathbb{P} be a weak limit of $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then,*

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{D_{N_0}} \rightarrow [-1,1]} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) \right| = 0,$$

where, for any $N_0 \geq 1$, φ in the argument of the supremum is required to be measurable, and with the already used notation $D_{N_0} = 2|F_{N_0}^+|$.

Proof. First Step. Introduce the sequence

$$\eta_{N_0} := \sup_{\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{D_{N_0}} \rightarrow [-1,1]} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P}_N - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) \right|, \quad N_0 \geq 1.$$

By Lemma 6.6, the sequence $(\eta_{N_0})_{N_0 \geq 1}$ converges to 0.

Take now φ a continuous function from $\mathbb{R}^{D_{N_0}}$ into $[-1, 1]$. Letting N tend to ∞ , we get

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) \right| \leq \eta_{N_0}.$$

Second Step. Assume now that φ is merely measurable and $[-1, 1]$ -valued. Consider also another sequence $(\delta_{N_0})_{N_0 \geq 1}$ converging to 0. Then, by Lusin's theorem, we can find, for each $N_0 \geq 1$, a continuous function $\tilde{\varphi}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{D_{N_0}}$ with values in $[-1, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}} \right) \mathbb{P}_{N_0} \left(\left\{ \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \neq \tilde{\varphi} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right\} \right) \\ & = \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}} \right) \frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi \neq \tilde{\varphi}\}} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \leq \delta_{N_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

By Lemma 6.7,

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi \neq \tilde{\varphi}\}} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \leq \delta_{N_0}. \quad (105)$$

Therefore, by (104) and (105),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) - \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \tilde{\varphi} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varphi - \tilde{\varphi}) \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varphi - \tilde{\varphi}) \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(m) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varphi - \tilde{\varphi}) \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varphi - \tilde{\varphi}) \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}^c}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varphi - \tilde{\varphi}) \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(m) \right| \\ & \leq 4\delta_{N_0} + 2\mathbb{P}(A_{N_0}^c), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the obvious implication $m \in A_{N_0} \Rightarrow (\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathcal{O}_{N_0}$ (see Lemma 6.3). By Lemma 6.8, we can modify our choice of $(\delta_{N_0})_{N_0 \geq 1}$ such that the right-hand side is less than $5\delta_{N_0}$.

Third Step. By the first and second steps, we get

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}_{N_0})(m) \right| \leq \eta_{N_0} + 5\delta_{N_0}.$$

The right-hand side tends to 0 as N_0 tends to ∞ , uniformly with respect to φ . This completes the proof. \square

As a corollary, we deduce

Lemma 6.10. *The sequence $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is weakly converging.*

Proof. Take two weak limits \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}' of the sequence $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$. By Lemma 6.9,

$$\lim_{N_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_{N_0}} \rightarrow [-1,1]} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{P}')(m) \right| = 0, \quad (106)$$

where, for any $N_0 \geq 1$, φ in the argument of the supremum is required to be measurable.

Therefore, \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}' coincide on the σ -algebra generated by the mappings $(m \mapsto \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$, for any $N_0 \geq 1$. By Lemma 3.4 together with a standard monotone class argument, we deduce that \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}' coincide. \square

6.1.3. Completion of the proof of Theorem 3.5. We now prove the first claim in item (ii) of Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 6.11. *Let \mathbb{P} be the weak limit of $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, for any integer $N_0 \geq 1$, the image of \mathbb{P} by the projection mapping*

$$\pi_{N_0}^{(1)} : m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto (\hat{m}^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathcal{O}_{N_0}$$

is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Proof. For $N_0 \geq 1$, we consider a $[0, 1]$ -valued measurable function φ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$ that is equal to 0 outside \mathcal{O}_{N_0} .

Following (93), we get, for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\
&= \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+} d\widehat{m}^k \\
&= \frac{1}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \\
&\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2(|F_N^+| - |F_{N_0}^+|)}} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_N}\left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j \right] \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j.
\end{aligned}$$

And then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^j.
\end{aligned}$$

We make, in the integral on the second line, the following change of variable:

$$\widehat{y}^k = \widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k, \quad k \in F_{N_0}^+.$$

Then, since $|\widehat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq 1$ for each $k \in F_{N_0}^+$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \left(\prod_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{f}_{N_0}^k|\right)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}} \varphi\left((\widehat{y}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \frac{|k|^{2pd} |\widehat{y}^k|^2}{|\widehat{f}_{N_0}^k|^2}\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{y}^j \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \left(\prod_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{f}_{N_0}^k|\right)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}} \varphi\left((\widehat{y}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{y}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{y}^j.
\end{aligned}$$

Since φ is zero outside \mathcal{O}_{N_0} , the above integral reduces to an integral over \mathcal{O}_{N_0} . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_N} \frac{c_N}{c_{N_0}} \left(\prod_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{f}_{N_0}^k|\right)^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi\left((\widehat{y}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd}\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{y}^j.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.6, we can let N tend to ∞ in the left-hand side. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi\left((\widehat{m}^k \widehat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\
&\leq \left(\sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{Z_{N_0} c_N}{Z_N c_{N_0}}\right) \frac{1}{Z_{N_0}} \left(\prod_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |\widehat{f}_{N_0}^k|\right)^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi\left((\widehat{y}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd}\right) \bigotimes_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{y}^j,
\end{aligned}$$

where we recall from Lemma 6.2 that the first factor in the above right-hand side is finite. This completes the proof. \square

We now prove item (i) in the statement of Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 6.12. *Let \mathbb{P} be the weak limit of $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, \mathbb{P} has a full support on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ equipped with the 1-Wasserstein distance.*

Proof. First Step. We consider a measure $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and a real $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We have to prove that $\mathbb{P}(B(m_0, \varepsilon)) > 0$ with $B(m_0, \varepsilon)$ the ball of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of center m_0 and of radius ε for the 1-Wasserstein distance.

By Lemma 3.3, we notice that, for N_0 large enough,

$$m_0 * f_{N_0} = \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}} \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k e_{-k} \in B(m_0, \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon),$$

And then, using the same constant c_0 as in the notation introduced in Section 1, we get

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0} + (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0})m_0 * f_{N_0} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0} + (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}} \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k e_{-k} \in B(m_0, \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon). \quad (107)$$

Recall that there exists a constant c_d , only depending on d , such that, for any $a > 0$,

$$\sum_{k \notin F_{N_0}} \frac{a}{|k|^{5d/2}} \leq \frac{c_d a}{N_0^{3d/2}}.$$

Therefore, for a fixed, for $c_d a / N_0^{3d/2} < \varepsilon / (8c_0)$ and for any collection $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, with $\hat{m}^0 = 1$, $\hat{m}^{-k} = \overline{\hat{m}^k}$ for $k \neq 0$, and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0}, \\ \forall k \notin F_{N_0}, \quad |\hat{m}^k| \leq a |k|^{-5d/2}, \end{array} \right.$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) - \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0} + (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) m_0 * f_{N_0}(x) \right) \right| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0}, \\ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left| m(x) - \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0} + (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) m_0 * f_{N_0}(x) \right) \right| &< \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$m = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}.$$

Therefore, from (107), $m \in B(m_0, \varepsilon)$ and

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left(\sum_{k \in F_{N_0}} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0} + (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m_0 * f_{N_0}(x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} > c_d a N_0^{-3d/2}. \quad (108)$$

From the fact that $m \in B(m_0, \varepsilon)$, we deduce that, in order to complete the proof, it suffices to choose a such that, for some N_0 large enough,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \cap \left\{ \forall k \notin F_{N_0}, |\hat{m}^k| \leq a |k|^{-5d/2} \right\} \right) > 0. \quad (109)$$

Second Step. We claim that in order to prove (109), it suffices to prove that there exists $c > 0$ such that, for some N_0 large enough and for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \cap \left\{ \forall k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+, |\hat{m}^k| \leq a |k|^{-5d/2} \right\} \right) \geq c. \quad (110)$$

Assume indeed that the above holds true. Then, for a given $N_1 \geq N_0$ and for $N \geq N_1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \cap \left\{ \forall k \in F_{N_1}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+, |\hat{m}^k| \leq a |k|^{-5d/2} \right\} \right) \geq c.$$

Then, by Portmanteau theorem, we can easily replace \mathbb{P}_N by \mathbb{P} in the left-hand side. Letting N_1 tend to ∞ , we then get (109).

We now prove (110). To do so, we apply Lemma 6.3. Assuming that a right above is greater than a_0 in the statement of Lemma 6.3, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \cap \left\{ \forall k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+, |\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{1}{2} a_0 |k|^{-5d/2} \right\} \right) \geq c.$$

From (108), we also notice that, for a large enough (the threshold being independent of N_0 and only depending on d),

$$\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \subset A_{N_0},$$

with A_{N_0} as in the statement of Lemma 6.3. Therefore, Lemma 6.3 says that, for some N_0 large enough, for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_N \left(\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \cap \left\{ \forall k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+, |\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{1}{2} a_0 |k|^{-5d/2} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}_{N_0} \left(\left\{ \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{m}^k - (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4c_0}) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8c_0} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $((1 - \varepsilon/(4c_0)) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+ \setminus \{0\}}$ is in \mathcal{O}_{N_0} since $1 + \sum_{k \in F_{N_0} \setminus \{0\}} (1 - \varepsilon/(4c_0)) \hat{m}_0^k \hat{f}_{N_0}^k \geq \varepsilon/(4c_0)$. Therefore, using the fact that the density of Γ_{N_0} in (27) is strictly positive on \mathcal{O}_{N_0} , the last term in the above inequality is strictly positive. \square

It remains to see that

Lemma 6.13. *Let \mathbb{P} be the weak limit of $(\mathbb{P}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, for \mathbb{P} -almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, m has a strictly positive density and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |k| |\hat{m}^k| < \infty$.*

Proof. From Lemma 6.5, we recall that, with a_0 as therein, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, for N_0 large enough and for $N \geq N_1 \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_N \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_{N_1}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where A_{N_0} is as in the statement of Lemma 6.3. By arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.12, we can apply Portmanteau theorem and replace \mathbb{P}_N by \mathbb{P} (with N_1 being fixed in the intersection symbol). Then, letting N_1 tend to ∞ , we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \delta,$$

with $F_\infty^+ := \bigcup_{N \geq 1} F_N^+$. In particular, since δ is arbitrary,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N_0 \geq 1} \left(A_{N_0} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : |\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}} \right\} \right) \right) = 1.$$

Take now m in the event that appears in the left-hand side. We can find $N_0 \geq 1$ such that m belongs to A_{N_0} and, for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$|\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{a_0}{|k|^{5d/2}}.$$

By Lemma 6.3, this implies

$$1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \hat{m}^k e_{-k}(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2}$$

Given the decay of the Fourier modes of m , it is easy to deduce that m has a continuously differentiable density (which we identify with m itself) and that

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) \geq 2^{-(3d/2+1)} N_0^{-3d/2},$$

which completes the proof. \square

6.2. Proof of Theorem 3.10 (Rademacher's theorem on $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \mathbb{P})$).

First part: existence of the derivative. We follow the main lines of the proof given in [13, Theorem 10.6.4] (with the little difference that the latter is given for functionals defined on a Banach space, which makes it slightly easier).

We start with the following definition. For an integer $N \geq 1$, we consider the mapping

$$\mathcal{L}_{N,\infty} : m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \in \ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+) := \{(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} : \widehat{r}^k \in \mathbb{C}\}, \quad (111)$$

with $F_\infty^+ = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \sharp(k) > 0\} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} F_n^+$, and we denote by $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ the image (on $\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+)$) of the measure \mathbb{P} by $\mathcal{L}_{N,\infty}$ and, then by

$$\left(\mathbb{P}_{N|N,\infty}(\cdot | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}) \right)_{(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in \ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+)}}$$

a regular conditional probability distribution of \mathbb{P} given $\mathcal{L}_{N,\infty}$, namely, for any Borel subsets A of $\mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|}$ ($\simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$) and B of $\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in A \text{ and } (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \in B\} \right) \\ &= \int_{\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+)} \left[\mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)} \left(\{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in A\} | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \mathbf{1}_B \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right) \right] d\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

In particular, recalling from Lemma 6.13 that, for \mathbb{P} almost every m , $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\widehat{m}^j| < \infty$, we deduce that, for $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ almost every $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$, $\sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} |\widehat{r}^j| < \infty$.

We now consider the set

$$C_N := \{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : \phi \text{ is differentiable at } m \text{ along the directions } (\mathfrak{P}[e_k])_{k \in F_N^+, \mathfrak{P}=\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{S}}\}.$$

In clear, $m \in C_N$ if, for any $k \in F_N^+$, for $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}$, the limit

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\phi(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) - \phi(m) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)}(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k])$$

exists, which proves that C_N is a Borel subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. We now address, for a given $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$ in $\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+)$, the probability $\mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)}(C_N | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+})$. By definition of a regular conditional probability distribution, we have, for $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ almost every $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)}(C_N | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)} \left(\bigcap_{k \in F_N^+} \bigcap_{\mathfrak{P}=\mathfrak{R},\mathfrak{S}} \left\{ m : \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\phi(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) - \phi(m) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)}(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) \text{ exists} \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \{ \widehat{m}^k = \widehat{r}^k \} | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, on the event $\bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \{\widehat{m}^k = \widehat{r}^k\}$, we have, for any $k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}$ and for $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\phi(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) - \phi(m) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)}(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta} \left\{ \phi \left(1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}] + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}] \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \phi \left(1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}] \right) \right\} \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}] + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}] \right). \end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

For $(\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$ in $\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+)$ such that $\sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} |\widehat{r}^j| < \infty$, we let

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O}_N((\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}) \\ &:= \left\{ (\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|} : \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left[1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}(x)] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}(x)] \right] > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{O}_N((\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+})$ is an open convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$ (regarding the complex coordinates as pairs of reals). Its closure writes

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathcal{O}_N((\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+})} \\ &:= \left\{ (\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|} : \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left[1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}(x)] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}(x)] \right] \geq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can consider p^N the orthogonal projection from $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$ onto $\overline{\mathcal{O}_N((\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+})}$ (for simplicity, we do not specify the dependence upon $(\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$ in the notation p^N). We then let

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi^N \left((\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} | (\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right) \\ &:= \phi \left(1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re \left\{ \left[p^N \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \right) \right]_j e_{-j} \right\} + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, ϕ^N is a Lipschitz function on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$. As such, it is differentiable almost everywhere: we call $\mathcal{D}[\phi^N]$ the set of differentiability points. Back to (113), we have, on the event $\bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \{\widehat{m}^k = \widehat{r}^k\}$, the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\phi(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) - \phi(m) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)}(m + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k]) \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta} \left[\phi^N \left((\widehat{m}^j + \eta z_{\mathfrak{P}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k=j\}})_{j \in F_N^+} | (\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right) - \phi^N \left((\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} | (\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right) \right] \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{m}^j e_{-j}] + \eta \mathfrak{P}[e_k] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\widehat{r}^j e_{-j}] \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $z_{\mathfrak{P}} = 1$ if $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{R}$ and $z_{\mathfrak{P}} = i$ if $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{S}$. In particular, if $(\widehat{m}^j + \eta z_{\mathfrak{P}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k=j\}})_{j \in F_N^+}$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}_N((\widehat{r}^j)_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+})$ and to $\mathcal{D}[\phi^N]$, then the above right-hand side has a limit as η tends to 0. Therefore, for $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ -a.e. $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)}(C_N | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)} \left(\mathcal{D}[\phi^N] \cap \left\{ (\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N \setminus \{0\}} \in \mathcal{O}_N((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}) \right\} \cap \bigcap_{|k| \geq N} \{ \widehat{m}^k = \widehat{r}^k \} | (\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now prove the following two things: for $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ -a.e. $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)}\left(\mathcal{D}[\phi^N] \mid (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}\right) &= 1, \\ \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)}\left(\left\{(\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+})\right\} \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \{\hat{m}^k = \hat{r}^k\} \mid (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}\right) &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

Thanks to (112), this is sufficient to prove $\mathbb{P}(C_N) = 1$

We start with the proof of the first claim in (114). We invoke (ii) in Theorem 3.5. Moreover, we introduce the function $\mathcal{R}^N : (\hat{\varrho}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|} \mapsto (\hat{\varrho}^j \hat{f}_N^j)_{j \in F_N^+}$. Since \hat{f}_N^j is a (strictly) positive real for each $j \in F_N^+$, \mathcal{R}^N can be identified with a linear mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$ into itself with a (strictly) positive determinant. In particular, $(\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}[\phi^N]$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}^N((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}^N(\mathcal{D}[\phi^N])$ and the complementary of the latter has a zero Lebesgue measure. Here now comes Theorem 3.5: for $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $\mathcal{R}^N((\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})$ rewrites $\pi_N^{(1)}(m)$, and the image of the probability measure \mathbb{P} by $\pi_N^{(1)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|}$, from which we deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{m : (\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{D}[\phi^N]\right\}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{m : \pi_N^{(1)}(m) \in \mathcal{R}^N(\mathcal{D}[\phi^N])\right\}\right) = 1.$$

In turn, we get that the first line in (114) holds true for $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ almost every $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$.

We proceed similarly for the second claim in (113). We know that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{m : \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} m(x) > 0\right\}\right) = 1.$$

Therefore, for $\mathbb{P}_{N,\infty}$ almost every $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{N|(N,\infty)}\left(\left\{m : \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \left[1 + \sum_{j \in F_N^+} 2\Re[\hat{m}^j e_{-j}(x)] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} 2\Re[\hat{r}^j e_{-j}(x)]\right] > 0\right\}\right) \\ \cap \bigcap_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} \{\hat{m}^k = \hat{r}^k\} \mid (\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_N^+} &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

from which we easily deduce that the second line in (114) is indeed satisfied.

Notice from (113) that, for any $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and any $N_0 \geq |k_0|$, the partial derivative $\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi(m)$, which exists for \mathbb{P} almost every $m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, coincides with the finite dimensional derivative $\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi(1 + \sum_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} 2\Re[\hat{m}^j e_{-j}] + \sum_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} 2\Re[\hat{r}^j e_{-j}])$ on the event $\bigcap_{j \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \{\hat{m}^j = \hat{r}^j\}$.

Second part: identification of the derivative with a weak limit. We now turn to the proof of (33). Generally speaking, it relies on Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8. It also requires a preliminary result: in order to proceed, we need to identify, for a given integer $N_0 \geq 1$, the conditional measure $\mathbb{P}_{N_0,\infty}$ introduced in the first part, see (111). Here, we do so, but on the set

$$B_{N_0,\infty} := \left\{m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : \forall k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+, |\hat{m}^k| \leq \frac{a_0}{2|k|^{5d/2}}\right\},$$

with a_0 as in the statement of Lemma 6.3. The complete identification is given (and proven) in Lemma 6.14 below. In this second part, we take it for granted and explain how it applies to the current problem.

Following the same notations as in Lemma 5.7, we consider a smooth function $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose support is included in

$$\left\{(\hat{m}^j)_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathbb{C}^{|F_{N_0}^+|} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|} : 1 + 2 \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \sum_{j \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re[\hat{m}^j e_{-j}(x)] \geq \frac{1}{c}\right\},$$

for some $c > 1$. In this framework, Lemma 6.14 says that

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \phi(m) \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \Psi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m), \quad (115)$$

where A_{N_0} is defined as in Lemma 6.3 and has a (strictly) positive probability for N_0 large enough, see Lemma 6.8, and where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(m) &= \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\phi \left(\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + m \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right] d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\phi \left(\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + m \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right] d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + \epsilon_{N_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

where ϵ_{N_0} tends to 0 as N_0 tends to ∞ , uniformly with respect to $\|\phi\|_\infty$ and $\|\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta\|_\infty$. Importantly, this identity requires some care:

(a) First, the notation $\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right)$ is rather abusive since $(\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ may not belong to \mathcal{O}_{N_0} . However, the definition of \mathcal{I}_{N_0} easily extends to the entire $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_{N_0}^+|}$, see (28).

(b) Second, the notation $\mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right)$ is also abusive. Instead, we should write $\mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right)$, but this would be obviously heavier.

(c) Third, we recall that the support of ϑ is included in A_{N_0} (up to the embedding \mathcal{I}_{N_0} and for N_0 large enough).

As a result of the latter observation, we notice that, whenever $(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}$ belongs to the support of ϑ and $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$ satisfies $|\hat{m}^k| \leq (a_0/2)|k|^{-5d/2}$ (which is the case if the $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$'s are the Fourier coefficients of some $m \in B_{N_0, \infty}$), the distribution

$$1 + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{r}^k e_{-k}) + 2 \sum_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{m}^k e_{-k})$$

is a probability measure, see Lemma 6.3 again. Obviously, this probability measure identifies with $\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + m$, which is the argument of ϕ in (116), when the $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$'s are the Fourier coefficients of some $m \in B_{N_0, \infty}$. In particular, the integrand in (116) is always well-defined under the sole assumption that $m \in B_{N_0, \infty}$. Equivalently, we can regard Ψ as a function of $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$ provided that $|\hat{m}^k| \leq (a_0/2)|k|^{-5d/2}$ for any $k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+$. In order to make this clear, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) &:= \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\phi \left(1 + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{r}^k e_{-k}) + 2 \sum_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{m}^k e_{-k}) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right] d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

for $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \in \ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+)$ such that $|\hat{m}^k| \leq (a_0/2)|k|^{-5d/2}$ for any $k \in F_\infty^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+$.

And then, by combining (115), (116) and (117), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \phi(m) \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}(m) \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \Psi(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) + \epsilon_{N_0} \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+)} \tilde{\Psi} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}_{N_0, \infty} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) + \epsilon_{N_0},
\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

where, as before, ϵ_{N_0} tends to 0 as N_0 tends to ∞ , uniformly in $\|\phi\|_{\infty}$ and $\|\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta\|_{\infty}$.

Now, by the first part of the proof, we know that, for $\mathbb{P}_{N_0, \infty}$ -almost every $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \in \ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2(F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+)$, the function

$$(\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \in \mathcal{O}_{N_0} \mapsto \phi \left(1 + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{r}^k e_{-k}) + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{m}^k e_{-k}) \right)$$

is Leb_{N_0} almost everywhere differentiable along any direction $k \in F_{N_0}^+$. Recalling the form of Γ_{N_0} in (27), we can make an integration by parts in (117). We get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Psi} \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) &= - \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi \left(1 + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{r}^k e_{-k}) + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{m}^k e_{-k}) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2|k_0|^{2pd} \hat{m}^{k_0} \phi \left(1 + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{r}^k e_{-k}) + 2 \sum_{k \in F_{\infty}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \Re(\hat{m}^k e_{-k}) \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \vartheta \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we can revert back the computations in (116) and write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(m) &= -\mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi \left(\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + m \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2|k_0|^{2pd} \hat{m}^{k_0} \phi \left(\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + m \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \vartheta \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + \epsilon_{N_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Back to (115) and (118), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \phi(m) \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\
&= - \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left[\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi(m) - 2|k_0|^{2pd} \hat{m}^{k_0} \phi(m) \right] \vartheta \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) + \epsilon_{N_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.5, we have $\mathbb{P}(A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, \infty}) \rightarrow 1$ as $N_0 \rightarrow \infty$, from which we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \phi(m) \partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) \\
&= - \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left[\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi(m) - 2|k_0|^{2pd} \hat{m}^{k_0} \phi(m) \right] \vartheta \left((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\mathbb{P}(m) + \epsilon_{N_0},
\end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

where, as before, ϵ_{N_0} tends to 0 as N_0 tends to ∞ , uniformly in $\|\phi\|_{\infty}$, $\|\vartheta\|_{\infty}$, $\|\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi\|_{\infty}$ and $\|\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \vartheta\|_{\infty}$.

For each $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we now call $\hat{\Phi}^{k_0}(m)$ a weak limit of the sequence $(\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi(m * f_N))_{N > |k_0|}$ with $\partial_{\hat{m}^{k_0}} \phi$ being here understood, for each $N > |k_0|$, as the almost everywhere (for the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{P}_N) derivative of ϕ on \mathcal{P}_N . Then, by combining Lemma 5.7 and (119), we reach the same conclusion as (89) in the proof of Lemma 5.8, but with $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_1^{k_0}(m)$ therein being replaced by

$\widehat{\Phi}^{k_0}(m)$ and with $\widehat{W}_2^{k_0}(m)$ being replaced by $\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}}\phi(m)$ (as given by the conclusion of the first part). We hence conclude that, almost everywhere under \mathbb{P} , $\widehat{\Phi}^{k_0}$ and $\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}}\phi$ are equal, which proves that $(\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}}\phi(m * f_N))_{N > |k_0|}$ converges (in the weak sense) to $\partial_{\widehat{m}^{k_0}}\phi$. \square

Third part: auxiliary statement. It now remains to prove the following lemma, which we invoked in the derivation of the above second part.

Lemma 6.14. *For any bounded measurable function $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m),$$

with A_{N_0} in the first line being as in Lemma 6.3 and with

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(m) = \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, \infty}}(m) \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\varphi \left(\mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) - \mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) + m \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right] \\ \times d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and with the same notation as in (28) for the map \mathcal{I}_{N_0} .

Proof. Throughout the proof, we use the same abuse of notations as in the proof of Theorem 3.10: We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\widehat{r}^k - \widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) \quad \text{for} \quad \mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) - \mathcal{I}_{N_0} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right), \\ \vartheta \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \quad \text{for} \quad \vartheta \circ \mathcal{I}_N \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right), \end{aligned}$$

when ϑ is defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $(\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \in \mathcal{O}_N$.

First Step. We start with the following observation, very similar to an argument used in the proof of Theorem 3.10. If, for $N \geq N_0$ being fixed, we set

$$B_{N_0, N} := \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) : \forall k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+, |\widehat{m}^k| \leq \frac{a_0}{2|k|^{5d/2}} \right\},$$

then, for any bounded measurable function $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \tag{120} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}_N} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, N}} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) d\Gamma_N \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \\ &= \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+|}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) \right] \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, N}} \left((0)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\widehat{m}^k|^2 \right) \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\widehat{m}^k, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 6.3 in order to derive the last equality together with the fact that $\mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, N}} \left((\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+} \right) = \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, N}} \left((0)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right)$ only depends on $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$.

In particular, if we let

$$\psi(m) := \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \varphi \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right) d\Gamma_{N_0} \left((\widehat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+} \right), \tag{121}$$

for $m \in B_{N_0, N}$ and $\psi(m) := 0$ otherwise, then, by Fubini's theorem, ψ is measurable with respect to the sigma-field generated by the mappings $(m \mapsto (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+})$ and (120) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0, N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &= \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+|}} \left[\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0, N}} \right) \left((0)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}, (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right] \tag{122} \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\hat{m}^k|^2\right) \Big] \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\hat{m}^k.$$

Notice that the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0,N}}$ in the product $\psi \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0,N}}$ is redundant with the definition of ψ , but we keep it for clarity.

Now, the equality (120), with φ being replaced by ψ , leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) \\ &= \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+|}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}) d\Gamma_{N_0}((\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}) \right] \\ & \quad \times \left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0,N}} \right) \left((0)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}, (\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\hat{m}^k|^2\right) \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\hat{m}^k \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0}) \frac{Z_{N_0}}{Z_N} \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+|}} \left[\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_0,N}} \right) \left((0)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}, (\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \exp\left(-\sum_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} |k|^{2pd} |\hat{m}^k|^2\right) \right] \bigotimes_{k \in F_N^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+} d\hat{m}^k, \end{aligned}$$

and then, (122) becomes

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}_N(m) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}_N(m), \quad (123)$$

where we recall from Lemma 6.5, that for N_0 large enough, $\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0}) > 0$.

Second Step. We now send $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (123). In order to do so, we first assume that φ is measurable with respect to $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_1}^+}$ for $N_1 \geq N_0$. Then, for $N \geq N_1$, ψ in (121) only depends, on the set $B_{N_0,N}$, on m through $(\hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_1}^+ \setminus F_{N_0}^+}$ and is independent of N . Next, by using Lemma 6.9, we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,N}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) + \varepsilon_N,$$

where $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_N = 0$. It then remains to observe that the subsets $(B_{N_0,N})_{N \geq N_0}$ are non-increasing and their intersection is precisely $B_{N_0,\infty}$. Then, splitting φ into the difference $\varphi_+ - \varphi_-$, we can easily let N tend to ∞ by regarding the left-hand side and the first term in the right-hand side as the masses of $B_{N_0,N}$ under finite positive measures. We get

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \varphi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,\infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_{N_0}(A_{N_0})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)} \psi(m) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0} \cap B_{N_0,\infty}}(m) d\mathbb{P}(m),$$

where, on the set $B_{N_0,\infty}$, we have

$$\psi(m) = \int_{\mathcal{O}_{N_0}} \left[\varphi\left(\mathcal{I}_{N_0}((\hat{r}^k - \hat{m}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}) + m\right) \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_0}}((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}) \right] d\Gamma_{N_0}((\hat{r}^k)_{k \in F_{N_0}^+}).$$

By monotone class theorem (together with Lemma 3.4), we easily extend the result to bounded and measurable functions φ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. □

6.3. Mollification of McKean-Vlasov equations. The following statement plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 4.12.

Theorem 6.15. *Let W_1 and W_2 be two Lipschitz continuous functions on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, with $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ being equipped with d_{-2} . Then, for a constant $c > 1$, we can find an integer N_c such*

that, for $N \geq N_c$, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and ρ as in Definition 3.12, the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t m_t(x) - \operatorname{div} \left(D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x) (m_t * f_N)(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta m_t(x) = 0, \quad (124)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, with

$$\begin{aligned} D\mathcal{H}_\lambda^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) &:= \partial_p H \left(x, \lambda \partial_\mu W_1^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) + (1 - \lambda) \partial_\mu W_2^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) \right), \\ D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) &:= \int_0^1 D\mathcal{H}_\lambda^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x) d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and with $m_0 \in B_N(c)$ as initial condition, has a (unique) smooth solution with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. It satisfies

$$m_t \geq 1/c', \quad \|\nabla m_t\|_\infty \leq c', \quad t \in [0, T],$$

for $c' > 1$ independent of N .

Proof. We first recall that the function $(t, m, x) \mapsto D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m)(x)$ is smooth. It depends on m through $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N}$. We can extend the mapping to inputs m which are general distributions. It suffices to project the Fourier coefficients on the closure of \mathcal{O}_N . In short, we call Π_N the mapping that maps $m = (\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ onto $\Pi_N(m)$ defined by

$$\widehat{\Pi_N(m)}^k = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \pi_N((\widehat{m}^j)_{j \in F_N^+})^k & \text{if } k \in F_N^+ \\ \overline{\widehat{\Pi_N(m)}^k} & \text{if } -k \in F_N^+ \\ 0 & \text{if } k \notin F_N \end{cases},$$

where π_N is the orthogonal projection from $\mathbb{R}^{2|F_N^+|} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{|F_N^+|}$ onto the closure of \mathcal{O}_N . We then consider $(t, m, x) \mapsto D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, \Pi_N(m))(x)$. It is Lipschitz with respect to the Fourier coefficients $(\widehat{m}^k)_{k \in F_N \setminus \{0\}}$. There is no difficulty for proving that the solution is classical. However, the solution to the hence extended version of (124) may not take values in \mathcal{O}_N .

We now consider the local Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{m}_t(x) - \operatorname{div} \left(D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x) \tilde{m}_t(x) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_t(x) = 0, \quad (125)$$

with $\tilde{m}_0 = m_0 \in B_N(c)$ as initial condition. It is important to notice that, in the non-linear dependence, the argument is m_t and not \tilde{m}_t . Since W_1 and W_2 are d_{-2} -Lipschitz continuous in the measure argument, the field $x \mapsto D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(t, m_t)(x)$ is bounded and Lipschitz continuous, with a bound and a Lipschitz constant that are independent of N, ε, ρ : it suffices to combine Corollary 3.16 and the second claim in Proposition 4.10. In turn, the solution to the Fokker-Planck equation satisfies

$$\tilde{m}_t \geq 1/c', \quad \|\nabla_x \tilde{m}_t\|_\infty, \quad \|\|\nabla_x \tilde{m}_t\|\|_\gamma \leq c', \quad t \in [0, T],$$

for a constant c' that depends on c but that is independent of N, ε and ρ , and for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ that is also independent of N, ε and ρ .

We then compare m and \tilde{m} . Denoting by $p(t, x)$ the standard heat kernel on the torus, we have

$$m_t(x) - \tilde{m}_t(x) = - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla_x p(t-s, x-y) D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(s, m_s)(y) (f_N * m(s, y) - \tilde{m}(s, y)) dy ds,$$

from which we deduce that

$$\|m_t - \tilde{m}_t\|_\infty \leq C \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\|m_s - \tilde{m}_s\|_\infty}{\sqrt{t-s}} ds + \eta_N, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

for a sequence $(\eta_N)_{N \geq 1}$ that tends to 0 as N tends to ∞ and that only depends on m_0 through the value of c . It is standard to deduce that

$$\|m_t - \tilde{m}_t\|_\infty \leq C \eta_N,$$

which proves that m_t is positive for N large enough. Since $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} m_t(x) dx = 1$, it is a probability measure.

Using the regularity in y of $D\mathcal{H}^{N,\varepsilon,\rho}(s, y)$ together with the Hölder continuity of $\nabla_x \tilde{m}_t$, we can proceed in the same way for $\|\nabla_x m_t - \nabla_x \tilde{m}_t\|_\infty$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Ahuja. Wellposedness of mean field games with common noise under a weak monotonicity condition. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 54(1):30–48, 2016.
- [2] S. A. Alimov, R. R. Ashurov, and A. K. Pulatov. Multiple Fourier series and Fourier integrals [MR1027847 (91b:42022)]. In *Commutative harmonic analysis, IV*, volume 42 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 1–95. Springer, Berlin, 1992.
- [3] D. M. Ambrose and A. R. Mészáros. Well-posedness of mean field games master equations involving non-separable local hamiltonians. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.03926>, 2021.
- [4] L. Ambrosio and W. Gangbo. Hamiltonian ODEs in the Wasserstein space of probability measures. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(1):18–53, 2008.
- [5] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.
- [6] E. Bandini, A. Cosso, M. Fuhrman, and H. Pham. Randomized filtering and Bellman equation in Wasserstein space for partial observation control problem. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 129(2):674–711, 2019.
- [7] E. Bayraktar, A. Cosso, and H. Pham. Randomized dynamic programming principle and feynman-kac representation for optimal control of mckean-vlasov dynamics. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 370(3):2115–2160, 2018.
- [8] E. Bayraktar and X. Zhang. On non-uniqueness in mean field games. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148(9):4091–4106, 2020.
- [9] E. Bayraktar and X. Zhang. Corrigendum to “On non-uniqueness in mean field games”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 149(3):1359–1360, 2021.
- [10] A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and S. C. P. Yam. The master equation in mean field theory. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 103(6):1441–1474, 2015.
- [11] C. Bertucci. Monotone solutions for mean field games master equations : continuous state space and common noise. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.09531>, 2021.
- [12] C. Bertucci. Monotone solutions for mean field games master equations: finite state space and optimal stopping. *J. Éc. polytech. Math.*, 8:1099–1132, 2021.
- [13] V. I. Bogachev. *Differentiable measures and the Malliavin calculus*, volume 164 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [14] A. Briani and P. Cardaliaguet. Stable solutions in potential mean field game systems. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 25(1):Paper No. 1, 26, 2018.
- [15] M. Burzoni, V. Ignazio, A. M. Reppen, and H. M. Soner. Viscosity solutions for controlled McKean-Vlasov jump-diffusions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 58(3):1676–1699, 2020.
- [16] P. Cannarsa and C. Sinestrari. *Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, and optimal control*, volume 58 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2004.
- [17] P. Cardaliaguet, M. Cirant, and A. Porretta. Splitting methods and short time existence for the master equations in mean field games. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.10406>, 2020.
- [18] P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, J.-M. Lasry, and P.-L. Lions. *The master equation and the convergence problem in mean field games*, volume 201 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2019.
- [19] P. Cardaliaguet, J. Graber, A. Porretta, and D. Tonon. Second order mean field games with degenerate diffusion and local coupling. *NoDEA*, 22:1287–1317, 2015.
- [20] P. Cardaliaguet and A. Porretta. An introduction to mean field game theory. In *Mean Field Games, chapter 1, Cetraro, Italy 2019, Cardaliaguet, Pierre, Porretta, Alessio (Eds.)*, LNM 2281, pages 203–248. Springer, 2021.
- [21] P. Cardaliaguet and M. Quincampoix. Deterministic differential games under probability knowledge of initial condition. *International Game Theory Review*, 10(1).
- [22] P. Cardaliaguet and P. Souganidis. On first order mean field game systems with a common noise. *To appear on Annals of applied probability*, 2020.
- [23] P. Cardaliaguet and P. Souganidis. Weak solutions of the master equation for mean field games with no idiosyncratic noise. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.14911>, 2021.
- [24] P. Cardaliaguet and P. Souganidis. Regularity of the value function and quantitative propagation of chaos for mean field control problems. 2022.
- [25] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*, volume 83 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games.

- [26] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. II*, volume 84 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field games with common noise and master equations.
- [27] A. Cecchin, P. Dai Pra, M. Fischer, and G. Pelino. On the convergence problem in mean field games: a two state model without uniqueness. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57(4):2443–2466, 2019.
- [28] A. Cecchin and F. Delarue. Selection by vanishing common noise for potential finite state mean field games. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 47(1):89–168, 2022.
- [29] J.-F. Chassagneux, D. Crisan, and F. Delarue. A probabilistic approach to classical solutions of the master equation for large population equilibria. *Memoirs of the AMS*, To appear.
- [30] G. Conforti, R. Kraaij, and D. Tonon. Hamilton–jacobi equations for controlled gradient flows: the comparison principle. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.13258>, 2021.
- [31] A. Cosso, F. Gozzi, I. Kharroubi, H. Pham, and M. Rosestolato. Master bellman equation in the wasserstein space: Uniqueness of viscosity solutions. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.10535>, 2021.
- [32] A. Cosso and H. Pham. Zero-sum stochastic differential games of generalized McKean-Vlasov type. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 129:180–212, 2019.
- [33] F. Delarue and R. Foguen Tchoumou. Selection of equilibria in a linear quadratic mean field game. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130(2):1000–1040, 2020.
- [34] F. Delarue and A. Tse. Uniform in time weak propagation of chaos on the torus. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.14973>, 2021.
- [35] L. Dello Schiavo. A Rademacher-type theorem on L^2 -Wasserstein spaces over closed Riemannian manifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 278(6):108397, 57, 2020.
- [36] M. F. Djete, D. Possamai, and X. Tan. Mckean-vlasov optimal control: the dynamic programming principle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08860*, 2019.
- [37] A. Douglis. The continuous dependence of generalized solutions of non-linear partial differential equations upon initial data. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 14:267–284, 1961.
- [38] W. Gangbo and A. R. Mészáros. Global well-posedness of master equations for deterministic displacement convex potential mean field games. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.01660>, 2020.
- [39] W. Gangbo, A. R. Mészáros, C. Mou, and J. Zhang. Mean field games master equations with non-separable hamiltonians and displacement monotonicity. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.12362>, 2021.
- [40] W. Gangbo and A. Świech. Existence of a solution to an equation arising from the theory of mean field games. *J. Differential Equations*, 259(11):6573–6643, 2015.
- [41] W. Gangbo and A. Tudorascu. On differentiability in the Wasserstein space and well-posedness for Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 125:119–174, 2019.
- [42] B. I. Golubov. Multiple series and Fourier integrals. In *Mathematical analysis, Vol. 19*, pages 3–54, 232. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Informatsii, Moscow, 1982.
- [43] D. A. Gomes and J. a. Saúde. Mean field games models—a brief survey. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 4(2):110–154, 2014.
- [44] M. Huang, P. Caines, and R. Malhamé. Individual and mass behavior in large population stochastic wireless power control problems: centralized and Nash equilibrium solutions. pages 98 – 103, 2003.
- [45] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. E. Caines. Large population stochastic dynamic games: Closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6(3):221–251, 2006.
- [46] M. Iseri and J. Zhang. Set values for mean field games. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.01661>, 2021.
- [47] F. Jean, O. Jerhaoui, and H. Zidani. Deterministic optimal control on Riemannian manifolds under probability knowledge of the initial condition. *HAL*, <https://hal-ensta-paris.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03564787>, Feb. 2022. working paper or preprint.
- [48] A. Q. M. Jimenez, Chloé; Marigonda. Optimal control of multiagent systems in the Wasserstein space. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 59(2).
- [49] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- [50] S. N. Kružkov. The Cauchy problem in the large for certain non-linear first order differential equations. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 1:474–477, 1960.
- [51] S. N. Kružkov. Generalized solutions of nonlinear equations of the first order with several independent variables. II. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 72 (114):108–134, 1967.
- [52] D. Lacker. Limit theory for controlled mckean-vlasov dynamics. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 55:1641–1672, 2017.
- [53] D. Lacker, M. Shkolnikov, and J. Zhang. Superposition and mimicking theorems for conditional McKean-Vlasov equations. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.00099>, 2020.
- [54] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.
- [55] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.
- [56] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.

- [57] M. Laurière and O. Pironneau. Dynamic programming for mean-field type control. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 169(3):902–924, 2016.
- [58] P.-L. Lions. Cours au collège de france, equations aux dérivées partielles et applications. <https://www.college-de-france.fr/site/pierre-louis-lions/course-2010-2011.htm>, 2010-11.
- [59] P.-L. Lions. Estimées nouvelles pour les équations quasilineaires. Seminar in Applied Mathematics at the Collège de France. <http://www.college-de-france.fr/site/pierre-louis-lions/seminar-2014-11-14-11h15.htm>, 2014.
- [60] P.-L. Lions. *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, volume 69 of *Research Notes in Mathematics*. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass.-London, 1982.
- [61] C. Mou and J. Zhang. Wellposedness of second order master equations for mean field games with nonsmooth data. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.09907>, 2019.
- [62] C. Mou and J. Zhang. Mean field game master equations with anti-monotonicity conditions. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.10762>, 2022.
- [63] A. R. Mészáros and C. Mou. Mean field games systems under displacement monotonicity. *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06687>, 2021.
- [64] H. Pham and X. Wei. Bellman equation and viscosity solutions for mean-field stochastic control problem. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 24(1):437–461, 2018.
- [65] A. Wiśniewski. The structure of measurable mappings on metric spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 122(1):147–150, 1994.
- [66] C. Wu and J. Zhang. Viscosity solutions to parabolic master equations and McKean-Vlasov SDEs with closed-loop controls. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30(2):936–986, 2020.
- [67] L. Zhizhiashvili. *Trigonometric Fourier series and their conjugates*, volume 372 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1996. Revised and updated translation of Some problems of the theory of trigonometric Fourier series and their conjugate series (Russian) [Tbilis. Gos. Univ., Tbilisi, 1993], Translated from the Russian by George Kvinikadze.
- [68] C. Zălinescu. On uniformly convex functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 95(2):344–374, 1983.

(A. Cecchin)

UNIVERSITY OF PADOVA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS “TULLIO LEVI CIVITA”,
VIA TRIESTE 63, 35121 PADOVA, ITALY
Email address: alekos.cecchin@unipd.it

(F. Delarue)

UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D’AZUR, CNRS, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES J.A. DIEUDONNÉ,
28 AVENUE VALROSE, 06108 NICE CEDEX 2, FRANCE
Email address: francois.delarue@univ-cotedazur.fr