

ENVIRONMENTAL AVERAGING

ROMAN SHVYDKOY

ABSTRACT. Many classical examples of models of self-organized dynamics, including the Cucker-Smale, Motsch-Tadmor, multi-species, and several others, include an alignment force that is based upon density-weighted averaging protocol. Those protocols can be viewed as special cases of ‘environmental averaging’. In this paper we formalize this concept and introduce a unified framework for systematic analysis of alignment models.

A series of studies are presented including the mean-field limit in deterministic and stochastic settings, hydrodynamic limits in the monokinetic and Maxwellian regimes, global hypocoercivity and relaxation for dissipative kinetic models, several general alignment results based on chain connectivity and spectral gap analysis. Each study is structured as follows – first, we identify a set of natural regularity conditions on the averaging protocol that imply the most general result, and second, we provide a scrutiny of more deliberate computations going to specific models. Numerous applications are revealed. This includes applications to well-posedness and long time behavior of kinetic Vlasov-alignment and Fokker-Planck-alignment models. In particular, we prove that solutions to the Fokker-Planck model based on a smooth environmental averaging gain Gaussian tails uniformly in time and, consequently, relax unconditionally to the global Maxwellian. In the context of the original Cucker-Smale model this presents a substantial improvement over previously known perturbative results.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Basic concept and examples	8
2.1. Examples	8
3. Classes of models and their properties	12
3.1. Mapping properties. Jensen inequality	12
3.2. Reproducing kernel	13
3.3. Conservative models	15
3.4. Symmetric models	16
3.5. Galilean invariance	16
3.6. Ball-positivity	17
4. Flocking	18
4.1. Cucker-Smale Theorem	18
4.2. Chain connectivity. The $\frac{1}{t^{1/4}}$ and $\frac{1}{t^{1/2}}$ results	21
4.3. Alignment in the energy sense. Spectral gaps	24
4.4. Spectral gap of a ball-positive model. Low energy method	28
5. Deterministic mean-field limit	32
5.1. Examples and Applications	36
6. Stochastic mean-field limit	37
6.1. Assumptions	39
6.2. Main result	40
6.3. Applications	43
7. Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation	45

Date: August 4, 2023.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q84, 35Q35, 92D25, 92D50.

Key words and phrases. collective behavior, emergence, alignment, Cucker-Smale system, Motsch-Tadmor system, Fokker-Planck equation, hypocoercivity, mean-field limit, hydrodynamic limit.

Acknowledgment. This work was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-2107956. The author thanks E. Tadmor and C. Imbert for fruitful discussions, and acknowledges hospitality of Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences during the preparation of this paper.

7.1. Local well-posedness	46
7.2. Spread of positivity	50
7.3. Global well-posedness	58
8. Relaxation and global hypocoercivity	60
8.1. Applications	67
9. Hydrodynamic limits	67
9.1. Monokinetic regime	68
9.2. Maxwellian regime	74
9.3. Remarks on the pressureless Euler Alignment System	79
10. Appendix I: averagings on finite sets and proof of Proposition 3.9	80
11. Appendix II: on spectral gaps	82
12. Appendix III: categorial considerations	83
References	84

1. INTRODUCTION

Many mathematical models of swarming behavior reflect the tendency of every agent to align its velocity to an averaged direction of motion of the crowd around. Although the rules that describe the average may not be given explicitly, most adhere to a few basic principles. First, agents react more to the closest neighbors, and second, the density of the swarm plays constructive role in defining a particular communication protocol. Such rules, in a broad sense, give rise to what is called *environmental averaging*.

Early computer simulations that incorporated an alignment mechanism along with other interaction forces produced first realistic visualizations of flocks and schools, see [Aok82, Rey87]. A wide variety of applications ranging from swarming behavior of animals to technological implementations, see these sources [ABF⁺19, Axe97, BN05, Jac08, EK01, VZ12, MT14, MP18, Shv21, Tad21] and references therein, has ignited mathematical inquiries into theoretical foundation of alignment dynamics.

A prototypical example of a static averaging model arises in opinion dynamics, where each agent labeled by index $i \in [1, N]$ has a set of other agents \mathcal{N}_i to which it is connected. The opinion vector \mathbf{p}_i aligns to the opinions of connected agents via

$$(1) \quad \dot{\mathbf{p}}_i = \lambda \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}(t)(\mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{p}_i) + \mathbf{F}_i, \quad \sum_j a_{ij}(t) = 1.$$

Here, \mathbf{F}_i incorporate all other forces such as adherence to convictions or random noise. If the graph of players is connected then the system naturally reaches the total consensus $\mathbf{p}_i \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{p}}$. Forces may lead to non-trivial limiting states, such as Nash equilibria, see [MT14, DeG74, Olf06, LRS21].

In swarming dynamics the pioneering work of Vicsek et al [VCBJ⁺95] introduced a discrete model of self-propelled particles with local interactions

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_i(k+1) = v_0 \frac{\sum_{j: |x_j - x_i| < r_0} \mathbf{v}_j}{\left| \sum_{j: |x_j - x_i| < r_0} \mathbf{v}_j \right|} + \sigma \xi_n, \\ \mathbf{x}_i(k+1) = \mathbf{x}_i(k) + \mathbf{v}_i(k+1). \end{cases}$$

where ξ_n are random variables and $\sigma > 0$ is the noise intensity. The Vicsek averaging is spatially local and includes normalization to reflect the tendency of agents to adhere to a fixed characteristic speed. The model produces a number of emergent phenomena developing into global patterns such as mills or periodically rotating chains. Solutions undergo phase transitions from ordered to disordered states depending on the noise level, see [VZ12] for discussion.

A growing number of studies of flocking behavior in recent years are based on the Cucker-Smale system introduced in [CS07a, CS07b],

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{v}_i, \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}}_i = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi(x_i - x_j)(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i), \end{cases} \quad (x_i, \mathbf{v}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Here, ϕ is a smooth radially symmetric and decreasing kernel, originally $\phi(r) = \frac{\lambda}{(1+r^2)^{\beta/2}}$. The model provides a well-defined mathematical framework which admits justifiable kinetic and macroscopic descriptions, see [HT08, HL09, CFRT10, BCnC11, FK19, Shv21, TT14]. It appeared, in part, in response to the need for a model whose long time behavior is not associated with perpetual connectivity assumptions on the flock as in prior studies. In fact, a simple criterion for alignment can be stated solely based on rate of decay of the kernel.

Theorem 1.1 ([CS07a, CS07b]). *If $\beta \leq 1$, all solutions to (3) align exponentially fast to the mean velocity $\bar{v} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j} \sum_{j=1}^N m_j v_j$, while flock remains bounded*

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, N} |v_i - \bar{v}| \leq C e^{-\delta t}, \quad \max_{i, j=1, \dots, N} |x_i - x_j| \leq \bar{D}.$$

If $\beta > 1$ there are solutions that do not align.

Since its inception the Cucker-Smale system has seen numerous applications. A remarkable implementation to satellite navigation was proposed in [PEG09], where value of $\beta = 0.4$ was found to be most optimal for the purposes of the mission. Adaptations to control problems are addressed in [BFK15, CFPT15, CKPP19]. Interacting agents immersed in an incompressible fluid lead to hybrid systems with Cucker-Smale component modeling the alignment force, [HKK14]. Multi-scale and multi-species flocks have been studied in [HT20, ST21]. An important modification of the system with thermodynamic features was proposed in [HR17], see also [ABF⁺19]. Flocking analysis can be extended to nonlinear alignment protocols as well [Tad22, JJ15, HHK10, Mar18]. A comprehensive review of various other features of the Cucker-Smale dynamics based on hierarchy, angle of vision, and emergence of leaders can be found in [CFTV10]. In the context of alignment dynamics which includes potential attraction/repulsion or Rayleigh frictions forces, the emergent behavior has not yet been fully understood, although it is clear from these studies [CDM⁺07, ST20a, ST19, ST21, LRS21], that the effect of such forces on collective outcomes could be dramatic. In particular, the quadratic confinement potential drives the system to an aggregated harmonic oscillator state, [ST20a]. Some general N -dependent results in this direction can be achieved for the 3Zone model of Reynolds [Rey87] with the use of the corrector method introduced in [DS19], see [Shv21]. Lastly, we mention that the alignment criterion itself stated in Theorem 1.1 does not require the kernel to have any explicit form and has seen numerous extensions to include general fat-tail kernels and kernels with degenerate communication in short range, see [DS19, HL09] and Section 4.1 below.

It is insightful to rewrite the the Cucker-Smale system as follows

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= v_i, & x_i &\in \Omega, \\ \dot{v}_i &= s_i([v]_i - v_i), & v_i &\in \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned} \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

where Ω is an environment (for the most part of our discussion either \mathbb{T}^n or \mathbb{R}^n), $[v]_i$ is an averaging protocol of the i th agent, $v = (v_1, \dots, v_N)$, and s_i is a specific communication strength. Here,

$$(5) \quad s_i = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi(x_i - x_j), \quad [v]_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi(x_i - x_j) v_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi(x_i - x_j)}.$$

This form allows us to isolate two separate structural components – the averaging and communication strength. Varying these two components helps to adapt the system to a particular modeling scenario. For example, it is argued in [MT11, MT14] that if a flock consists of clusters with unbalanced sizes it is more realistic to incorporate a static strength parameter $s_i = \lambda > 0$, leading to what is called the Motsch-Tadmor variant of the system

$$(6) \quad \dot{v}_i = \lambda([v]_i - v_i),$$

with the same averaging rule $[\cdot]_i$ as in (5). Analysis of the Motsch-Tadmor model presents many challenges related to the lack of symmetry and momentum conservation. However, the analogue of (1.1) still holds, [MT14]. A modification that restores symmetries in the model was proposed in [Shv21],

$$(7) \quad s_i = 1, \quad [v]_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(x_i - \xi) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi(\xi - x_j) v_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi(\xi - x_j)} d\xi.$$

This particular averaging appears instrumental in several other studies in flocking such as hydrodynamic limits [Shv21], relaxation and hypocoercivity in kinetic dynamics [Shv22], see also Sections 8 and 9. Its continuous variant emerged in the analysis of non-homogeneous turbulence in [LS16].

Another interesting example of environmental averaging is given by a class of segregation models. Let $\{g_l\}_{l=1}^L$ be a smooth partition of unity $\sum_{l=1}^L g_l = 1$ subordinated to an open cover $\cup_{l=1}^L \Omega_l = \mathbb{R}^n$. Let

$$(8) \quad s_i = 1, \quad [v]_i = \sum_{l=1}^L g_l(x_i) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j v_j g_l(x_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j g_l(x_j)}.$$

Here, the agents communicate predominantly in their own communities and exchange of information is facilitated through the borders. The consensus can be reached provided the border communication is sustained at all times, see Section 4 for rigorous interpretations. Many more examples are discussed in Section 2.

In the large crowd limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ the averaging / strength couples take macroscopic forms, making them in fact more concise and more illuminating to study. For example, denoting $f_\phi = f * \phi$ for a distribution f , we can see that the Cucker-Smale model is defined by

$$s_\rho = \rho_\phi, \quad [u]_\rho = \frac{(u\rho)\phi}{\rho_\phi}.$$

This averaging rule is also known as the Favre filtration, [Fav83], which appears in simulations of turbulent flows. In the same manner, the averaging of (7) is given by the over-mollified Favre filtration

$$(9) \quad [u]_\rho = \left(\frac{(u\rho)\phi}{\rho_\phi} \right)_\phi,$$

and the averaging of (8) becomes

$$(10) \quad [u]_\rho(x) = \sum_{l=1}^L g_l(x) \frac{\int_\Omega g_l \rho \, dx}{\int_\Omega u g_l \rho \, dy},$$

and so on. All the operations above make mathematical sense for any probability measure $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and any bounded field $u \in L^\infty(d\rho)$. In particular, we can go back to the discrete analogues by evaluating the averages on the empirical pair

$$(11) \quad \rho = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad u = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \mathbb{1}_{x_i},$$

$$(12) \quad [v]_i := [u^N]_{\rho^N}(x_i), \quad s_i := s_{\rho^N}(x_i).$$

It is therefore more inclusive to define averaging rules via macroscopic prescriptions.

Physical features of the system (4) are intimately connected to analytical properties of the pair $(s_\rho, [\cdot]_\rho)$. In fact, in many situations it is more natural to consider the strength measure given by $d\kappa_\rho = s_\rho d\rho$. Thus, the invariance of the κ -momentum

$$\int_\Omega [u]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega u \, d\kappa_\rho,$$

implies conservation of the physical momentum of the system, $\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega u \, d\rho = 0$. Symmetry

$$\int_\Omega v \cdot [u]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega [v]_\rho \cdot u \, d\kappa_\rho,$$

implies the natural energy dissipation law

$$(13) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega |u|^2 \, d\rho(x) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_\rho(x, y) |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \, d\rho(x) \, d\rho(y),$$

where ϕ_ρ is a communication kernel representing given averaging, see Section 3.2. The central issue of the long time behavior is related to coercivity and positive-definiteness of the averaging, see Section 4.

In order to get more insight into such connections, it is useful to disassociate the averaging/strength pair $(\kappa_\rho, [\cdot]_\rho)$ from any particular differential law they may be involved in, and take a ‘birds eye’ look on its

kinematic properties. For this purpose, we will delegate the concept of an *environmental averaging model* to a family of pairs

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(\kappa_\rho, [\cdot]_\rho) : \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)\},$$

parametrized by probability measures $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, and satisfying a list of continuity assumptions stated below in Section 2. Through the study of such models it appears possible to build a unified framework for many flocking and regularity results that have been treated separately before, and to find substantially new ones that, otherwise, are obscured by specificity of a particular model. This will be the main objective of the present work. So, let us give a brief overview of the studies we undertake here.

(I) First, we develop basic functional framework of the averaging models by viewing them as a category of objects. We isolate a class of physical properties that play significant role in the dynamics of a particular law they are involved in. Those include representability (existence of a communication kernel), invariances, symmetry, and most importantly a quantitative version of positive definiteness – ball positivity, see Section 3.

(II) For models with representing kernels one can adapt the Ha-Liu Lyapunov function approach to address the flocking behavior in the classical sense of Theorem 1.1. This question is possible to treat on the most general level of kinetic model in the general context of measure-valued solutions:

$$(14) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v (s_\rho(v - [u]_\rho) f).$$

Here ρ and $u\rho$ are the macroscopic density and momentum, respectively. It includes, as a particular case, the microscopic system (4) if applied to empirical measures $f = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i} \otimes \delta_{v_i}$, and the pressureless hydrodynamic case if applied to mono-kinetic solutions $f = \rho(x, t) \delta_0(v - u(x, t))$.

In the case of local communication all alignment criteria can be sorted into two types – ones that rely on a chain-connectivity of the flock, and ones that make use of the spectral gap condition. The former approach is dynamic in spirit. It is based on the idea that connected misaligned components of the flock burn energy through the law (13) until full alignment is achieved. For the classical Cucker-Smale and topological singular models this was addressed in [ST20b, MPT19]. Here we will present a new result that converts chain-connectivity and thickness conditions into one criterion, namely: $\rho_- := \min \rho \gtrsim \frac{1}{t^{1/4}}$ is sufficient for flocking in open space case, and $\rho_- \gtrsim \frac{1}{t^{1/2}}$ is sufficient on the torus, see Section 4.2. No control on the upper bound is necessary.

The spectral gap approach is kinematic in nature, and it relies on finding effective bounds on the spectral gap of the averaging operator set in a proper functional space. In fact finding spectral gap is relevant to the flocking behavior in several contexts including relaxation problem for the Fokker-Planck alignment model. So, it will be our primary focus in Section 4.4. A criterion proved in [Tad21] states that a symmetric model aligns provided $\int_0^\infty \lambda(t) dt = \infty$, where

$$(15) \quad \lambda = \inf_{u \in L^2_0(\rho)} \frac{(u, \mathcal{L}_\rho u)_\rho}{(u, u)_\rho}, \quad \mathcal{L}_\rho u = s_\rho(u - [u]_\rho).$$

In Proposition 4.9 we present an extension of this result to the non-symmetric case. For the Cucker-Smale model the bound $\lambda \gtrsim \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+}$ was proved in the same work [Tad21], see also Remark 4.11. This result is consistent with the chain-connectivity criterion stated above provided ρ_+ remains bounded. For systems with a singular kernel a similar result was established in [ST20b]. With a view towards applying spectral gaps to the relaxation problem, where reliance on ρ_+ is prohibitive, except for some special cases, see [ST17b, ST20b, Cho16, DFT10], we aim at finding estimates independent of ρ_+ .

To this end we propose a somewhat different methodology – one that focuses directly on the averaging $[\cdot]_\rho$ in the framework of κ_ρ -weighted spaces:

$$(16) \quad (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)}^2.$$

We introduce the *low energy method* tailored to finding estimates on ε solely in terms of ρ_- . The method applies to a special, but quite broad class of so called *ball-positive models*, see Section 4.4. These include the segregation (8), the overmollified Motsch-Tadmor variant (7), and most notably the classical Cucker-Smale model (5) provided the latter is defined by a Bochner-positive communication kernel: $\phi = \psi * \psi$ for some $\psi \geq 0$. In particular, if applied to the Cucker-Smale model the method gives the following bound, see Example 4.18,

$$(17) \quad \varepsilon \gtrsim \rho_-^3.$$

Many other examples of such estimates are presented in Section 4.4.

(III) As the number of agents grows $N \rightarrow \infty$, the microscopic system settles in the mean-field limit to a solution to the kinetic *Vlasov-Alignment* equation (14)

$$\mu^N = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i} \otimes \delta_{v_i} \rightarrow f.$$

So far the limit has been rigorously justified for the Cucker-Smale and (7)-models, [HT08, HL09, Shv21]. In Section 5 we establish a much broader result which relies on mild regularity conditions on \mathcal{M} and applies to a wide variety of models, including Motsch-Tadmor and segregation models.

When system (4) is supplemented with density-weighted stochastic forces

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= v_i, \\ \dot{v}_i &= s_i([v]_i - v_i) + \sqrt{2\sigma s_i} dB_i, \end{aligned} \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

where B_i 's are independent Brownian motions in \mathbb{R}^n , the limit ‘in law’ settles to a solution of the *Fokker-Planck-Alignment* equation

$$(19) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \sigma s_\rho \Delta_v f + \nabla_v (s_\rho (v - [u]_\rho) f).$$

For the additive noise and general convolution-type models the result was proved in [BCnC11]. The non-homogeneous diffusion requires a separate treatment, which we present in Section 6. The kinetic model (19) will be instrumental in the study of relaxation.

(IV) Reading off the evolution of macroscopic quantities from (14) we obtain the hydrodynamic *Euler-alignment* system (EAS)

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) &= 0, \\ \partial_t(\rho u) + \nabla \cdot (\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla \cdot \mathcal{R} &= ([u]_\rho - u) d\kappa_\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{R} is the Reynolds stress given by

$$\mathcal{R} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v - u) \otimes (v - u) f dv.$$

Here, we encounter the classical closure problem. One can achieve a specific form of \mathcal{R} by introducing various scaling regimes. This has been addressed in two situations. The monokinetic regime $f \rightarrow \rho(x, t) \delta_0(v - u(x, t))$ results in the pressureless EAS, $\mathcal{R} = 0$, and the analysis of this limit for the classical Cucker-Smale model goes back to [MV08, KV15, FK19] see also [Shv21]. The convergence was established quantitatively in Wasserstein-1 metric. In Section 9.1 we produce a general result and upgrade the convergence to Wasserstein-2 under mild continuity assumptions on \mathcal{M} . It applies, in particular, to all the models listed here.

By incorporating a strong penalization force of Fokker-Planck type one can achieve another regime where f settles to a Maxwellian. This results in the Euler-alignment system with isothermal pressure tensor $\mathcal{R} = \rho \text{Id}$. The Cucker-Smale model was analyzed in [KMT13, KMT14, KMT15], and (7) was analyzed in [Shv22], see also [CK23] for a new development in the mildly singular case. Section 9.2 presents a general result.

We note that kinetic closure is not the only way to model flocking on the macroscopic level. A general class of systems with entropic pressure introduced in [Tad22], which includes kinetic ones as a particular example, is amenable to flocking analysis as well.

(V) The most comprehensive study in this present work is related to well-posedness and relaxation of the Fokker-Planck-Alignment model (19) on the periodic environment $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$. The motivation for this study is rooted in the original question of *emergence* – formation of collective outcome from purely local interactions. On the periodic domain, if the communication kernel ϕ has a short reach, $\text{supp } \phi \subset [0, r_0]$, then there exists a family of unaligned solutions where agents rotate along parallel geodesics with various velocities (or even perpendicular geodesics with mutually rational velocities). These are called *locked states*. Such solutions form a measure-zero set in the ensemble of initial data $(x_1, \dots, x_N, v_1, \dots, v_N)$. No deterministic approach to establishing alignment based on generic data that avoids locked states has been explored yet, except for 1D case [DS19]. It is natural, however, to look into this problem in stochastic settings of (18), where locked states are being disrupted instantly. One can expect a collective outcome in two limiting steps: first $t \rightarrow \infty$,

then $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. For large crowd distributions governed by (19) this can be viewed as a relaxation problem: on the first step we obtain convergence to Maxwellian

$$(21) \quad f \rightarrow \mu_{\sigma, \bar{u}} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|(2\pi\sigma)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|v-\bar{u}|^2}{2\sigma}},$$

which in turn aggregates on the monokinetic state $\delta_0(v - \bar{u}) \otimes dx$ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. The latter represents a perfectly aligned configuration.

This program has seen some success in the past. The relaxation itself for the linear problem is a classical and well-understood subject, see [Vil09] and references therein. With the nonlinear alignment force the works [DFT10, Cho16] establish relaxation for perturbative solutions near equilibrium in the case of the Cucker-Smale and purely local models, respectively. The first global result was proved in [Shv22] in the context of the (7)-model, where linear technique was adapted to the nonlinear problem enabled by special cancelations in the alignment forcing.

In Section 8 we push this technique further and prove a much more general result that pertains to a wide variety of models, see Theorem 8.1, including non-symmetric ones such as Motsch-Tadmor. We mention that remarks in [Cho16, DFT10] referred to a possibility of such result for perturbative solutions, although no written account was provided.

The main application of the relaxation Theorem 8.1 comes in conjunction with the well-posedness theory for the Fokker-Planck-Alignment equations developed in Section 7 and spectral gap conditions such as (17) that rely only on the lower bound of the density. We prove local, and for some models including Cucker-Smale, global well-posedness in specially designed weighted Sobolev spaces $H_t^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. In order to make use of (17) we establish spread of positivity of solutions, expressed by the instant gain of Gaussian tails

$$(22) \quad f(t, x, v) \geq b e^{-a|v|^2}.$$

The spread of positivity is a well-known effect in many kinetic equations, see [AZ21, GIMV19, AZ21, HST20, Mou05, IMS20] and references therein. The novel additional aspect of our result stated in Proposition 7.4 is that the constants a, b depend only on the entropy and L^∞ -bound on the drift $s_\rho[u]_\rho$. Since the latter two can be controlled by initial condition for some models, including Cucker-Smale, we obtain uniform control on ρ_- and hence, the spectral gap through (17), which makes it possible to prove unconditional relaxation.

Let us summarize the result specifically for the original Cucker-Smale model, which is a representative of a model that unconditionally fulfills the assumptions of all the pieces involved.

Theorem 1.2. *Any classical solution $f \in H_t^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ to (19) based on the Cucker-Smale model with Bochner-positive kernel ϕ relaxes exponentially fast to the global Maxwellian (21).*

Previously this type of result was established in perturbative regime only by Duan et al [DFT10]. We refer to Corollary 8.7 and Theorem 8.1 for more detailed statements and application to other models.

The proof of the spread (22) starts with a special construction on the initial plateau with characteristic parameters depending only on the entropy and drift. We then establish a one-step spread result that heavily relies on the recent weak-Harnack inequality for super-solutions of (19) proved in [GI21]. We then stretch positivity to remote regions in v -space using the classical construction of Harnack chains adopted to the kinetic scaling, see [AS67a, AS67b] and more recently [AZ21].

Finally, let us comment on what is not included in our study and what would be highly desirable to address in the near future. First, we include no forces, focusing mainly on the core alignment mechanism. Potential forces, such as confinement, attraction/repulsion etc, have a great impact on collective outcomes and play major role in applications, [ST20a, ST19, CCP17, CFTV10, CDM⁺07]. Second, we treat only linear couplings in the alignment force. Several recent studies [Tad22, JJ15, HHK10, Mar18] highlight the importance of non-linear couplings as well. In our general framework nonlinearity Γ can be incorporated by considering the system

$$\dot{v}_i = s_i [\Gamma(v - v_i)]_i.$$

Developing regularity and relaxation theory, say, for the kinetic counterpart would be crucial to understanding more intricate nonlinear phenomena of self-organization. Third, our framework does not presume communication to be singular, either mildly or strongly. Such models were introduced in [Pes15, ST17a, ST17b, ST18, DKRT18, ST20b] to analyze the effects of enhanced local communication and its role in emergent dynamics, see the survey [MP18]. Finally, we leave the analysis of hydrodynamic models

in our general framework to future research as it shifts the focus far from the thread of this study, see [TT14, CCTT16, Shv21, LS19a, MT14, HT17] and the literature therein. However, we will share a new prospective on modeling macroscopic alignment in Section 9.3.

2. BASIC CONCEPT AND EXAMPLES

Let Ω denote an n -dimensional *environment*. We mostly focus on the cases when Ω is either the open space \mathbb{R}^n , periodic domain \mathbb{T}^n , a finite set of points, or Cartesian products of the above. Denote by $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ the set of probability measures on Ω . An *environmental averaging model* is a family of pairs

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(\kappa_\rho, [\cdot]_\rho) : \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)\}$$

satisfying the following functional requirements:

(ev1) For every $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, κ_ρ is a finite positive measure on Ω . We call it communication strength.

(ev2) $[\cdot]_\rho$ is a linear bounded operator on the weighted space $L^2(\Omega, d\kappa_\rho) := L^2(\kappa_\rho)$.

(ev3) $[\cdot]_\rho$ is a linear bounded operator on $L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$, with the properties (κ_ρ -a.e.)

$$(23) \quad [u]_\rho \geq 0 \text{ for all } u \geq 0, \text{ and } [1]_\rho = 1.$$

If $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ is a vector field (where m may be unrelated to the dimension n) we assume that the operator $[u]_\rho$ is acting on each coordinate:

$$(24) \quad [u]_\rho = ([u_1]_\rho, \dots, [u_m]_\rho).$$

Although the averaging models are generally assumed to be defined over all densities $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, to fulfill all of the assumptions (ev1)-(ev3) or to achieve specific results, sometimes it is necessary to restrict the probabilities ρ to a narrower admissible class $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{P}$. The most encountered examples include non-vacuous flocks $\rho > 0$, or uniformly thick flocks $\rho * \phi > 0$, where ϕ is some communication kernel.

Many natural models are *material* - a property of adherence to the support of the flock. Namely, we say that the model \mathcal{M} is material if

(ev4) there exists bounded family of non-negative functions $s_\rho \in L^{\infty}_+(\Omega)$ with $\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)} \|s_\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \bar{S}$ such that $\kappa_\rho = \rho s_\rho$. We also call s_ρ a (specific) strength function.

(ev5) $[u]_\rho = 0$ provided $u_\rho = 0$.

On the microscopic level one considers discretely distributed density and velocity fields associated to a set of N agents $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$

$$(25) \quad \rho^N = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad u^N = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \mathbb{1}_{x_i}.$$

Assuming that the model is material we can unambiguously compute the values of the average and strength at the agents' locations

$$(26) \quad [v]_i := [u^N]_{\rho^N}(x_i), \quad s_i := s_{\rho^N}(x_i).$$

The agent-based system (4) is stated precisely in terms of these discrete components.

2.1. Examples. Let us list several classical examples, and some new ones, and show how they fit into the definition of environmental averaging.

Example 2.1. The most obvious example is the global averaging

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{glob}}) \quad s_\rho = 1, \quad [u]_\rho = \int_{\Omega} u \rho \, dx.$$

and the system (4) in this case expresses alignment with all-to-all communication

$$\dot{v}_i = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j (v_j - v_i).$$

The extreme opposite is the pure identity model

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{I}}) \quad s_\rho = 1, \quad [u]_\rho = u \mathbb{1}_{\text{supp } \rho}.$$

The agent-based version obviously leads to a stalled system. However, the utility of this model in the kinetic formulation will present itself in the study of hydrodynamic limits, see Section 9.

Example 2.2. The classical Cucker-Smale system has been discussed in detail in the introduction. Let us recall that in this case the pair is given by

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}) \quad s_\rho = \rho_\phi, \quad [u]_\rho = \frac{(u\rho)_\phi}{\rho_\phi}.$$

Here and throughout we denote for short $f_\phi = f * \phi$. In this case the averaging $[u]_\rho = u_{\text{F}}$ is also known as the Favre filtration used in large eddy simulations of compressible turbulence, [Fav83]. Its remarkable property comes from the fact that if ρ satisfies the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) = 0,$$

then the filtered density ρ_ϕ satisfies the continuity equation relative to the Favre-filtered velocity field

$$\partial_t \rho_\phi + \nabla \cdot (u_{\text{F}} \rho_\phi) = 0.$$

Example 2.3. If we set $s_\rho = 1$, the example above becomes what is called the Motsch-Tadmor model [MT11, MT14]:

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{MT}}) \quad s_\rho = 1, \quad [u]_\rho = \frac{(u\rho)_\phi}{\rho_\phi}.$$

The model was introduced to fix the unrealistic scenario occurring under \mathcal{M}_{CS} -protocol, where a large and distant flock hijacks the dynamics of a smaller flock, see also [ST21, Shv21] for more discussion.

Example 2.4. We can interpolate between \mathcal{M}_{CS} and \mathcal{M}_{MT} and consider a general power law for the specific strength function:

$$(\mathcal{M}_\beta) \quad s_\rho = \rho_\phi^\beta, \quad [u]_\rho = \frac{(u\rho)_\phi}{\rho_\phi}, \quad \beta \geq 0.$$

All these models satisfy the requirements (ev1) and (ev3) obviously, however (ev2) holds only for special subclasses of densities (except for the Cucker-Smale $\beta = 1$ case where it holds unconditionally). For example, it holds for uniformly thick flocks: $\mathcal{D} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{P} : \inf \rho_\phi > 0\}$.

Example 2.5. More suitable for local kernels ϕ , namely mollifiers $\phi \in L^1_+(\Omega)$ with $\int \phi \, dx = 1$, a symmetric version of the Motsch-Tadmor model can be defined by applying extra convolution to the Favre filtration:

$$(\mathcal{M}_\phi) \quad s_\rho = 1, \quad [u]_\rho = \left(\frac{(u\rho)_\phi}{\rho_\phi} \right)_\phi.$$

This gives rise to the discrete averaging given by (7).

The model was introduced in [Shv22, Shv21] and played various roles. It was proved to define a globally hypocoercive kinetic dynamics, and was also used to extend Figalli and Kang's hydrodynamic limit in the monokinetic regime [FK19] to flocks with compact support, see Section 9.

More versions of \mathcal{M}_ϕ can be obtained by looking into different strengths by analogy with the \mathcal{M}_β -model, or by replacing ρ with a more general barotropic pressure law:

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\phi,p}) \quad \kappa_\rho = p(\rho), \quad [u]_\rho = \left(\frac{(u\rho)_\phi}{p_\phi} \right)_\phi,$$

where $p \geq 0$ is a function of ρ . Here, the support of the strength function may not coincide with ρ , or s_ρ may be unbounded, which makes it a non-material model. Also the class of admissible densities \mathcal{D} may be restricted depending on the pressure law $p(\rho)$. For example, in the ideal gas case $p = \rho^\gamma$ we naturally assume $\mathcal{D} = L^\gamma(\Omega)$.

One interesting case is obtained when $p = 1$, resulting in

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\phi\phi}) \quad \kappa_\rho = 1, \quad [u]_\rho = u_{\phi*\phi}.$$

In this case the average and the strength do not depend on the density at all, and consequently define a non-material model.

Example 2.6 (Topological models). A new way of modeling interactions which implement topological, rather than Euclidean measure of distance, has long been advocated by many empirical studies [SB14, NMG14, BCC+08, CCG+12]. The first symmetric topological model was introduced in [ST20b], see also [LRS22, RS20, MMP20], although it incorporated singular communication. Its smooth variant fits within our framework of environmental averaging.

To define such a model let us consider a basic symmetric domain $\mathcal{O}_0 = \mathcal{O}(-\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_1)$ connecting two points $-\mathbf{e}_1$ and \mathbf{e}_1 , and for any pair (x, y) , let $\mathcal{O}(x, y)$ be the domain connecting x and y obtained by rotation and dialation of \mathcal{O}_0 . Let $\chi_{\mathcal{O}(x,y)}$ be some mollification of the characteristic function $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}(x,y)}$. We introduce the topological “distance” given by

$$(27) \quad d_\rho(x, y) = \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\mathcal{O}(x,y)}(\zeta) \rho(\zeta) d\zeta$$

Now let $\phi(d, z) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth non-negative kernel, radial in z . We define

$$(28) \quad \phi_\rho(x, y) = \phi(d_\rho(x, y), x - y).$$

The kernel incorporates both metric and topological distances. Note that due to the symmetry of the domain $\mathcal{O}(x, y)$, the kernel is also symmetric.

Let us define

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^{\text{topo}}) \quad s_\rho(x) = \int_{\Omega} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho(y) dy, \quad [u]_\rho = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \phi_\rho(x, y) u(y) \rho(y) dy}{\int_{\Omega} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho(y) dy}.$$

This is the full topological variant of \mathcal{M}_{CS} . As these models bare relevance to biological applications it makes most sense to assume inverse dependence on the topological distance. For example,

$$(29) \quad \phi(d, z) = \frac{\psi(z)}{(\varepsilon + d^2)^{\alpha/2}}, \alpha \geq 0,$$

where ψ is a smooth kernel and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a parameter ($\varepsilon = 0$ would correspond to the fully singular case).

By analogy we can also define a topological version of \mathcal{M}_{MT} :

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{MT}}^{\text{topo}}) \quad s_\rho(x) = 1, \quad [u]_\rho = \text{same},$$

or the β -model

$$(\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{topo}}) \quad s_\rho(x) = \left(\int_{\Omega} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho(y) dy \right)^\beta, \quad [u]_\rho = \text{same}.$$

There is no reasonable topological counterpart of the mollified model \mathcal{M}_ϕ , since there is no way to guarantee that ϕ_ρ integrates to 1 at all times.

Example 2.7 (Models with strict Segregation). A family of examples with segregated alignment protocol can be built by setting $s_\rho = 1$, fixing a σ -algebra \mathcal{F} of Borel subsets of Ω and considering the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_\rho(f|\mathcal{F})$ relative to $d\rho$. Define

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{cond}}) \quad [u]_{\rho, \mathcal{F}} = \mathbb{E}_\rho(u|\mathcal{F}).$$

For a given filtration $\{\Omega, \emptyset\} \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ we can define a martingale chain of averages

$$[u]_{\rho, n} = \mathbb{E}_\rho(u|\mathcal{F}_n)$$

which naturally connects the global averaging model with the purely local one, as $[u]_{\rho, n} \rightarrow u$ in any $L^p(\rho)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Such an averaging operation models strict segregation between disjoint subalgebras of \mathcal{F} , so-called “neighborhoods”. Let us consider one specific example. Suppose \mathcal{F} is the algebra spanned by a partitioning of Ω into subsets A_1, \dots, A_L . Then

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}) \quad [u]_{\rho, \mathcal{F}} = \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{\mathbb{1}_{A_l}}{\rho(A_l)} \int_{A_l} u \rho dx.$$

If $u_0 = u_0^l$ within each cube A_l , and initial density ρ_0 is stays away from the borders ∂A_l , then for a short period of time the solution satisfies a pure transport equation

$$\rho_t + u_0^l \cdot \nabla_x \rho = 0$$

on each A_l . So, the flock will travel with constant velocity within each neighborhood and will remain segregated until one piece reaches the boundary of its neighborhood and starts communicating with others.

Example 2.8 (Smooth Segregation). Since in practice there is always a gradual transition between neighborhoods, it makes sense to consider a smooth version of the model above, which is also more amenable to analysis. It can be constructed from any smooth partition of unity $g_l \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, $g_l \geq 0$, and $\sum_{l=1}^L g_l = 1$. Most naturally, such a partition can be obtained by subordinating it to an open cover $\{\mathcal{O}_l\}_{l=1}^L$ of Ω , so that $\text{supp } g_l \subset \mathcal{O}_l$. We define the model by setting all $s_\rho = 1$, and

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\text{seg}}) \quad [u]_\rho(x) = \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{g_l(x)}{\rho(g_l)} \int_\Omega u g_l \rho \, dy, \quad \rho(g_l) = \int_\Omega g_l \rho \, dx.$$

In this model the boundaries are not sharp as in the previous version, and there is some exchange of information that occurs across the contiguous neighborhoods.

There are ways to combine several averaging models into one that describe evolution of a multi-flock. Here “multi” may mean several things – either multiple subflocks with their own communication rules combine into a mega-flock with some global communication between subflocks, or it could mean the use of several communication rules within and between subgroups which we call ‘species’. Both of these variants were studied in [HT20, ST21].

Example 2.9 (Multi-species). When a big flock contains groups of agents with distinct characteristics, communication between different groups may be facilitated by different rules, or communication kernels $\phi^{\alpha\beta}$. A model that accommodates such various communication rules was introduced in [HT20] :

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i^\alpha &= v_i^\alpha, \quad i = 1, \dots, N^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, A, \\ \dot{v}_i^\alpha &= \sum_{\beta=1}^A \sum_{j=1}^{N^\beta} m_j^\beta \phi^{\alpha\beta}(x_j^\beta - x_i^\alpha)(v_j^\beta - v_i^\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Here, each communication protocol is of Cucker-Smale type.

Such multi-species models can be generalized and fit into the framework of environmental averaging we discuss here. To do that, suppose we have an array of A^2 material models $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, A$ defined over the same environment Ω . We can combine them into a new multi-model on the product space $\Omega \times A$. To account for possible variations of masses of sub-flocks, we fix a set of masses $\{M^\alpha\}_\alpha$ with the total mass being $M = \sum_\alpha M^\alpha$, and incode them into the set of admissible densities \mathcal{D}^A over $\Omega \times A$. Namely, we say that $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^A$ is admissible if

$$\rho = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^A M^\alpha \rho^\alpha \otimes \delta_\alpha,$$

where $\rho^\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$. We define a cumulative strength function by

$$s_\rho(x, \alpha) = \sum_{\beta=1}^A M^\beta s_{\rho^\beta}^{\alpha\beta}(x).$$

The corresponding averaging of a function $u = \{u^\alpha\}_\alpha$ is given by

$$(31) \quad [u]_\rho(x, \alpha) = \frac{1}{s_\rho(x, \alpha)} \sum_{\beta=1}^A M^\beta s_{\rho^\beta}^{\alpha\beta}(x) [u^\beta]_{\rho^\beta}^{\alpha\beta}(x).$$

In terms of this average one can see directly, that the model (30) takes the canonical form

$$\dot{v} = s_\rho([v]_\rho - v).$$

Example 2.10 (Multi-flocks). Let us recall the multi-flock model introduced in [ST21]

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i^\alpha &= v_i^\alpha, \\ \dot{v}_i^\alpha &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_\alpha} m_j^\alpha \phi^\alpha(x_i^\alpha - x_j^\alpha)(v_j^\alpha - v_i^\alpha) + \varepsilon \sum_{\substack{\beta=1 \\ \beta \neq \alpha}}^A M^\beta \psi(X^\alpha, X^\beta)(V^\beta - v_i^\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

The model represents A groups of agents evolving according to their own communication, Cucker-Smale type in this particular case, while communication between groups is facilitated through another protocol which involves a kernel ψ and alignment to macroscopic parameters of each subflock, namely their center of masses

$$X^\alpha = \frac{1}{M^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N_\alpha} m_i^\alpha x_i^\alpha, \quad M^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{N_\alpha} m_i^\alpha,$$

and momenta

$$V^\alpha = \frac{1}{M^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N_\alpha} m_i^\alpha v_i^\alpha.$$

This idea can be made more formal via an asymptotic analysis detailed in [ST21].

In general, let $\{\mathcal{M}^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ be a family of material models defined over the same environment Ω . We define the admissible set of densities \mathcal{D}^A as in the previous example. For any $\rho = \{\rho^\alpha\}_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^A$ we define the strength function by

$$s_\rho(x, \alpha) = M^\alpha s_{\rho^\alpha}^\alpha(x),$$

and for $u = \{u^\alpha\}_\alpha$ the average is given by

$$[u]_\rho(x, \alpha) = [u^\alpha]_{\rho^\alpha}^\alpha(x).$$

So far this model incorporates only internal flock communications. To combine these into an interactive multi-flock we assume that the communication between sub-flocks is facilitated through another averaging model $(s_\rho^{\text{ext}}, [u]_\rho^{\text{ext}})$. The multiflock model (32) can be written as a system over $\Omega \times A$:

$$\dot{v} = s_\rho([v]_\rho - v) + \varepsilon s_{\rho^A}^{\text{ext}}([V]_{\rho^A}^{\text{ext}} - v),$$

where $\rho^A = \sum_{\alpha=1}^A M^\alpha \delta_{X^\alpha}$, and $V = \sum_{\alpha=1}^A \mathbb{1}_{V^\alpha}$.

Example 2.11 (Models on finite sets). The last but not least example on our list is the family of models on finite environments $\Omega = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$. These will be an essential tool to prove results about continuous models, see Appendix 10. Finite models illustrate a situation when all the agents are planted in their places and simply play the role of labels. They do not give rise to any inertial systems of type (4). However, they do give rise to families of first order linear systems for $v_i = v(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\dot{v}_i = s_i([v]_i - v_i),$$

for each distribution of masses $\rho = (m_1, \dots, m_N)$. Since the averages act coordinatewise, (24), the systems for each coordinate decouple and we can assume that v_i are scalars. In this case the properties of the model can be reduced to the properties of the corresponding reproducing matrix associated with the average:

$$A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N, \quad a_{ij} = [\mathbb{1}_{x_j}]_{x_i}.$$

Property (ev3) implies that A has non-negative entries, and $A\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$, i.e. A is right-stochastic.

3. CLASSES OF MODELS AND THEIR PROPERTIES

In this section we will examine kinematic properties of environmental averaging models without association with any dynamical law. We introduce several important classes based on their operator-theoretical classification, which will be used extensively in subsequent studies.

3.1. Mapping properties. Jensen inequality. Let us discuss functional basics of environmental averages, and direct consequences of mapping properties stated in (ev2) and (ev3).

First of all, order preserving maps (23) obey the maximum principle

$$(33) \quad \min f \leq [f]_\rho \leq \max f,$$

and consequently are contractive on $L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$:

$$(34) \quad \|[f]_\rho\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty.$$

Next, let us look into L^∞ -adjoint operator $[\cdot]^*$. Technically it maps $(L^\infty)^* \rightarrow (L^\infty)^*$ and if restricted to $L^1(\kappa_\rho)$ it still lands into $(L^\infty(\kappa_\rho))^*$ from this general perspective.

Lemma 3.1. *The operator $[\cdot]_\rho^*$ has the following properties:*

- (1) $[\cdot]_\rho^* : L^1(\kappa_\rho) \rightarrow L^1(\kappa_\rho)$, and hence, $[\cdot]_\rho$ is weak*-continuous on $L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$;
- (2) $[\cdot]_\rho^*$ is order preserving;
- (3) $[\cdot]_\rho^* : L_+^1(\kappa_\rho) \rightarrow L_+^1(\kappa_\rho)$ is an isometry.

Proof. Let us fix $f \in L^1(\kappa_\rho)$ and for every measurable set A define

$$\nu_f(A) = \int_\Omega f [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho.$$

This defines finite σ -additive measure. Indeed, if $A = \cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i$, a disjoint union, then $\mathbb{1}_{\cup_{i=1}^N A_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i}$ in $L^2(\kappa_\rho)$. By (ii), we then also have $[\mathbb{1}_{\cup_{i=1}^N A_i}]_\rho \rightarrow [\mathbb{1}_{\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i}]_\rho$ in $L^2(\kappa_\rho)$. Then up to a subsequence, the same convergence holds κ_ρ -a.e. By the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we obtain $\nu_f(\mathbb{1}_{\cup_{i=1}^N A_i}) \rightarrow \nu_f(\mathbb{1}_{\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i})$.

Furthermore, if $\kappa_\rho(A) = 0$, then $[\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho = 0$ a.e. by (ii), and hence $\nu_f(A) = 0$. This implies that ν_f is absolutely continuous with respect to κ_ρ . Hence, there exists a function $g \in L^1(\kappa_\rho)$ such that $\int_\Omega f [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega g \mathbb{1}_A \, d\kappa_\rho$. By approximation and continuity (34) we obtain the same relation $\int_\Omega f [h]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega gh \, d\kappa_\rho$, for any $h \in L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$. This means that $[f]_\rho^* = g \in L^1(\kappa_\rho)$. We have proved (1).

Preservation of order (2) follows directly from (iii) since if $f \in L_+^1(\kappa_\rho)$, then $\int [f]_\rho^* g \, d\kappa_\rho = \int f [g]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho \geq 0$ for all $g \in L_+^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$. Hence, $[f]_\rho^* \geq 0$. Moreover, $\int [f]_\rho^* \, d\kappa_\rho = \int f [\mathbb{1}]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int f \, d\kappa_\rho$, which proves (3). \square

As a consequence, we obtain the following pointwise Jensen inequality for averagings.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $u \in L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$ the following Jensen inequality holds κ_ρ -a.e.,*

$$(35) \quad \psi([u]_\rho(x)) \leq [\psi(u)]_\rho(x),$$

where ψ is a continuous convex even and monotonely increasing on \mathbb{R}^+ function.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, for every $A \subset \Omega$, there exists $f_A \in L_+^1(\kappa_\rho)$, $\|f_A\|_1 = 1$, such that

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(A)} \int_A [u]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega u f_A \, d\kappa_\rho.$$

Then by the classical Jensen inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(A)} \int_A [u]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho\right) &= \psi\left(\left|\int_\Omega u f_A \, d\kappa_\rho\right|\right) \leq \psi\left(\int_\Omega |u| f_A \, d\kappa_\rho\right) \\ &\leq \int_\Omega \psi(|u|) f_A \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega \psi(u) f_A \, d\kappa_\rho = \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(A)} \int_A [\psi(u)]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any A , by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem and continuity of ψ , as $A \rightarrow \{x\}$ for a.e. x we obtain (35), as desired. \square

Applying Jensen's inequality to $\psi(x) = |x|^p$, $p \geq 1$ it is tempting to conclude that any average is automatically bounded on $L^p(\kappa_\rho)$. This, however, requires one last step to ensure that $\int_\Omega [f]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega f \, d\kappa_\rho$, which is not guaranteed to hold, as for example for \mathcal{M}_{MT} . This and other special properties of models will be discussed in Section 3 systematically.

3.2. Reproducing kernel. For material models we often deal with the weighted averaging $s_\rho[u]_\rho$ rather than the bare averaging $[u]_\rho$. In most models considered so far this operator has a very specific integral form represented via some kernel $\phi_\rho(x, y)$:

$$(36) \quad s_\rho[u]_\rho = \int_\Omega \phi_\rho(x, y) u(y) \, d\rho(y).$$

Let us list some examples discussed earlier.

MODEL	ϕ_ρ
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{glob}}$	1
\mathcal{M}_{CS}	$\phi(x - y)$
\mathcal{M}_{MT}	$\frac{\phi(x-y)}{\rho_\phi(x)}$
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^{\text{topo}}$	$\phi(\text{d}_\rho(x, y), x - y)$
\mathcal{M}_ϕ	$\int_\Omega \frac{\phi(x-z)\phi(y-z)}{\rho_\phi(z)} dz$
\mathcal{M}_{seg}	$\sum_{l=1}^L \frac{g_l(x)g_l(y)}{\rho(g_l)}$
$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$	$\sum_{l=1}^L \frac{\mathbb{1}_{A_l} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_l}}{\rho(A_l)}$

Generally, such a kernel can be recovered from the reproducing kernel of the average itself

$$(37) \quad [u]_\rho = \int_\Omega \Phi_\rho(x, y) u(y) d\kappa_\rho(y)$$

via the correspondence

$$(38) \quad \phi_\rho(x, y) = s_\rho(x) \Phi_\rho(x, y) s_\rho(y).$$

Reproducing kernels are useful for many reasons. Not only do they provide more specific structure to the averaging operator, many properties of the averaging that we will introduce later can be restated in terms of functional properties of the kernel itself. The alignment forces that appear on all levels of description take more conventional form:

$$(39a) \quad s_i([v]_i - v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \phi_{\rho^N}(x_i, x_j) (v_j - v_i),$$

$$(39b) \quad s_\rho([u]_\rho - v) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\rho(x, y) (w - v) f(y, w) dw dy$$

$$(39c) \quad s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) = \int_\Omega \phi_\rho(x, y) (u(y) - u(x)) d\rho(y).$$

Even though a reproducing kernel exists for a variety of models including rough models such as $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$, we can generally establish existence for models that show some minimal regularization properties. Specifically we will need the average to ‘smooth out’ bounded function by analogy with the *strong Feller* properties of Markov processes:

$$(40) \quad [\cdot]_\rho : L^\infty(\kappa_\rho) \rightarrow C_b(\Omega), \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega).$$

Here $C_b(\Omega)$ denotes the space of continuous bounded functions on Ω .

Lemma 3.3. *Any strong Feller model possesses a non-negative right-stochastic integrable reproducing kernel $\Phi_\rho \in L^1_+(\kappa_\rho \otimes \kappa_\rho)$,*

$$\int_\Omega \Phi_\rho(x, y) d\kappa_\rho(y) = \mathbf{1}(x), \quad \kappa_\rho\text{-a.e.}$$

such that (37) holds for all $u \in L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$.

Proof. Indeed, by (34) and Feller property, for every $x \in \Omega$, $[\cdot]_\rho(x)$ defines a bounded linear functional on $C_0(\Omega)$ – the space continuous functions vanishing at infinity. Hence, there exists a positive measure μ_x , $\mu_x(\Omega) = 1$, such that

$$[u]_\rho(x) = \int_\Omega u(y) d\mu_x(y).$$

If $\kappa_\rho(A) = 0$, then $\mathbf{1}_A = 0$ as an element of $L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$. This means $[\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho = 0$, in $C_b(\Omega)$ by the strong Feller. Then $[\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho(x) = \mu_x(\mathbf{1}_A) = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$. So, the measures μ_x are absolutely continuous with respect to κ_ρ . There exists $\Phi_\rho(x, \cdot) \in L^1_+$ such that $\mu_x = \Phi_\rho(x, \cdot) d\kappa_\rho$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Moreover, $\int_\Omega \Phi_\rho(x, y) d\kappa_\rho(y) = \mu_x(\Omega) = 1$. So, the kernel is stochastic. Tonelli’s theorem also implies that $\Phi_\rho \in L^1(\kappa_\rho \otimes \kappa_\rho)$. \square

All models based on mollification are strong Feller provided the kernel ϕ is all-to-all so that $\rho_\phi > c_0$ throughout. However, \mathcal{M}_ϕ is strong Feller for any kernel. The segregation model \mathcal{M}_{seg} is strong Feller also. If the kernel ψ is not bounded from below, then any model based on the Favre filtration is not strong Feller, including the Cucker-Smale model. Although obviously it has a reproducing kernel $\phi_\rho = \phi$. To include these cases one can restate Lemma 3.3 for material models specifically that have regularizing weighted averaging:

$$(41) \quad s_\rho [\cdot]_\rho : L^\infty(\rho) \rightarrow C_b(\Omega), \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega).$$

Lemma 3.4. *Any model with property (41) has a non-negative integrable reproducing kernel $\phi_\rho \in L^1_+(\rho \otimes \rho)$, such that*

$$\int_\Omega \phi_\rho(x, y) d\rho(y) = s_\rho(x), \quad \rho\text{-a.e.}$$

and so that (36) holds for all $u \in L^\infty(\rho)$.

The proof is exactly the same as that of Lemma 3.3 where the starting point is the functional $s_\rho(x) [\cdot]_\rho(x)$.

Note that the reproducing kernels may exist even for models not covered by the above lemmas. For example the averaging based on expectation $\mathcal{M}_{\text{cond}}$ is not strong Feller, yet for its finite-dimensional version $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ the kernel exist as listed in the table above. The identity model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{I}}$ has a degenerate kernel which is purely Dirac: $\Phi_\rho(x, y) = \delta(x - y)$.

3.3. Conservative models. Recall that due to (33) every alignment system that is based on an environmental averaging has a maximum/minimum principle and therefore tends to align. If one can quantify the rate of change of the amplitude of u based on properties of the couple $(\kappa_\rho, [\cdot]_\rho)$ one can potentially obtain an alignment $u \rightarrow \bar{u}$ to some constant velocity vector \bar{u} . However, not every model has a predetermined \bar{u} . Typically \bar{u} is uniquely defined by the initial condition if the system preserves the momentum. This property is insured if the underlying model is conservative.

Definition 3.5. We say that the model \mathcal{M} is *conservative* if for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$, $u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho)$

$$(42) \quad \int_\Omega u d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega [u]_\rho d\kappa_\rho.$$

In operator terms being conservative simply means that the adjoint average $[\cdot]_\rho^*$ also preserves constants

$$(43) \quad [\mathbf{1}]_\rho^* = \mathbf{1}.$$

This in turn implies that the space of mean-zero fields

$$L_0^2(\kappa_\rho) = \left\{ u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho) : \int_\Omega u d\kappa_\rho = 0 \right\}$$

is invariant for both $[\cdot]_\rho$ and $[\cdot]_\rho^*$.

The most important consequence of being conservative when it comes to a particular system the model is involved in is the conservation of momentum,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \bar{u} = 0, \quad \bar{u} = \int_\Omega \rho u dx.$$

This holds on all levels of description (4), (61), (20). Together with mass conservation, and here we assume that all masses are 1, this determines the limiting velocity, if achieved, from initial condition $\bar{u} = \int_\Omega \rho u dx$. Non-conservative models such as \mathcal{M}_{MT} may also align, see Section 4.1 below. However, the limiting velocity emerges from the dynamics and is not determined by the initial condition.

Together with the positivity proved in Lemma 3.1, (43) implies that $[\cdot]_\rho^* : L^\infty(\kappa_\rho) \rightarrow L^\infty(\kappa_\rho)$, and so the adjoint model \mathcal{M}^* consisting of pairs $(\kappa_\rho, [\cdot]_\rho^*)$ fulfills all the requirements of environmental averaging.

Lemma 3.6. *If \mathcal{M} is conservative, then \mathcal{M}^* also defines a conservative model. If \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are conservative and defined over the same set of densities and strength functions, then $\mathcal{M}_2 \circ \mathcal{M}_1$ is also conservative.*

For a model that possesses a reproducing kernel, Φ_ρ , being conservative is equivalent to Φ_ρ being doubly stochastic:

$$\int_\Omega \Phi_\rho(y, x) d\kappa_\rho(y) = \int_\Omega \Phi_\rho(x, y) d\kappa_\rho(y) = \mathbf{1}(x).$$

Lemma 3.7. *Every conservative model is L^p -contractive, i.e. $\|[\cdot]_\rho\|_p \leq 1$, for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.*

Proof. The case $p = \infty$ is clear from the definition. For $p < \infty$, by the Jensen inequality (35), we have

$$|[u]_\rho(x)|^p \leq [|u|^p]_\rho(x),$$

κ_ρ -almost everywhere. Hence, by conservation,

$$\int_\Omega |[u]_\rho|^p d\kappa_\rho \leq \int_\Omega [|u|^p]_\rho d\kappa_\rho = \int_\Omega |u|^p d\kappa_\rho = \|u\|_p^p.$$

This proves the lemma. \square

Contractivity also implies that the alignment force is dissipative. For example, for the pressureless Euler-Alignment system, see (257) below, we obtain

$$(44) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho |u|^2 dx = \int_\Omega [u \cdot [u]_\rho - |u|^2] d\kappa_\rho \leq 0.$$

This form of energy law is useful for studying flocking from the perspective of spectral properties of the averaging, see Section 4.3. The diffusion term takes more a more explicit form for symmetric models which we discuss next.

3.4. Symmetric models. Most of the models on our list are in fact *symmetric*: for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$, $u', u'' \in L^2(\kappa_\rho)$

$$(45) \quad (u', [u'']_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} = ([u']_\rho, u'')_{\kappa_\rho},$$

where we generally adopt the following notation for an inner-product relative to a measure κ :

$$(46) \quad (f, g)_\kappa = \int_\Omega fg d\kappa.$$

In other words, $[\cdot]_\rho^* = [\cdot]_\rho$. In terms of reproducing kernel, if one is available, symmetry is equivalent to Φ_ρ being symmetric. Setting $u'' = \mathbb{1}$ we can see that every symmetric model is conservative. However, not every conservative model is automatically symmetric. Plenty of examples are provided by defining the averages with non-symmetric doubly stochastic reproducing kernels.

For symmetric models the energy law (44) takes a more explicit form

$$(47) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \rho |u|^2 dx = - \int_\Omega \phi_\rho(x, y) |u(x) - u(y)|^2 d\rho(x) d\rho(y).$$

We can see that the dissipation burns energy for as long as communicating agents of the flock are not yet aligned. This creates a mechanism for flocking behavior to be discussed in more detail in Section 4.

3.5. Galilean invariance. We say that the model \mathcal{M} is Galilean invariant if for all $x \in \Omega$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$(48) \quad \kappa_{\rho(\cdot+v)}(x) = \kappa_\rho(x+v),$$

$$(49) \quad [u(\cdot+v)]_{\rho(\cdot+v)}(x) = [u]_\rho(x+v).$$

In terms of reproducing kernel, if one is available, the Galilean invariance is equivalent to (48) combined with translation invariance of the kernel:

$$(50) \quad \Phi_{\rho(\cdot+v)}(x, y) = \Phi_\rho(x+v, y+v).$$

For material models, this can be expressed in terms of specific quantities

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} s_{\rho(\cdot+v)}(x) &= s_\rho(x+v), \\ \phi_{\rho(\cdot+v)}(x, y) &= \phi_\rho(x+v, y+v). \end{aligned}$$

For a particular differential system \mathcal{M} is involved in, this property implies the conventional Galilean invariance with respect to transformation

$$(52) \quad x \rightarrow x + tV, \quad v \rightarrow v + V, \quad u \rightarrow u + V.$$

All the models considered above except for segregation and conditional expectation ones are Galilean invariant. The segregation protocols are planted into a given geography of the map and therefore any Galilean shift should be felt by the model.

3.6. Ball-positivity. If an operator T on a (real in our case) Hilbert space $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ is positive semi-definite, i.e.

$$(53) \quad (Tu, u) \geq 0,$$

geometrically this means that Tu and u lie on the same side of the hyperplane u^{\perp} . If Tu lies in an even more restricted location, namely, in the ball $\frac{1}{2}B_{\|u\|}(u)$, i.e.

$$(54) \quad \left\| Tu - \frac{1}{2}u \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|,$$

then we call T *ball-positive*. A more useful definition of ball-positivity can be stated equivalently as follows

$$(55) \quad (Tu, u) \geq \|Tu\|^2, \quad \forall u \in H_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

In other words, it is positivity (53) that comes with a more coercive flavor.

In the context of environmental averaging models, where $H_{\mathbb{R}} = L^2(\kappa_{\rho})$, and $T = [\cdot]_{\rho}$, the ball-positivity is stated as follows

$$(56) \quad (u, [u]_{\rho})_{\kappa_{\rho}} \geq \| [u]_{\rho} \|_{L^2(\kappa_{\rho})}^2, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\kappa_{\rho}).$$

This property has profound implications to flocking behavior of the system as we will see later in Section 4.4.

Let us identify ball-positive models amongst those on our list.

First, an obvious example is provided by $\mathcal{M}_{\text{cond}}$. Indeed, the conditional expectation is simply an orthogonal projection onto the space of \mathcal{F} -measurable functions in $L^2(\rho)$. Here, ball-positivity is exact

$$(57) \quad \int_{\Omega} u \cdot [u]_{\mathcal{F}} \, d\rho = \int_{\Omega} [u]_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \, d\rho.$$

A less trivial family of examples are provided by all the $\mathcal{M}_{\phi, p}$ -models. Indeed, we have a pointwise estimate

$$[u]_{\rho}^2 \leq \left(\frac{(up)_{\phi}^2}{p_{\phi}^2} \right)_{\phi}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} [u]_{\rho}^2 \, d\kappa_{\rho} &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{(up)_{\phi}^2}{p_{\phi}^2} \right)_{\phi} p \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{(up)_{\phi}^2}{p_{\phi}^2} p_{\phi} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{(up)_{\phi}^2}{p_{\phi}} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{(up)_{\phi}}{p_{\phi}} (up)_{\phi} \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{(up)_{\phi}}{p_{\phi}} \right)_{\phi} up \, dx = (u, [u]_{\rho})_{\kappa_{\rho}}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Note that this model is positive semi-definite and symmetric. A simple argument proves that all such models are automatically ball-positive.

Lemma 3.8. *If an environmental averaging model \mathcal{M} is symmetric, then \mathcal{M} is ball-positive if and only if it is positive semi-definite.*

Proof. The forward implication is trivial. Conversely, if \mathcal{M} is non-negative and symmetric, then $(u, v)_T = (Tu, v)$ defines a (possibly degenerate) inner product on the real Hilbert space $H_{\mathbb{R}} = L^2(\kappa_{\rho})$. Hence, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality applies

$$(58) \quad |(Tu, v)| \leq \sqrt{(Tu, u)} \sqrt{(Tv, v)}.$$

Taking supremum over all unit v and using the contractivity of T , we obtain the result. \square

Examples of symmetric non-negative definite models are \mathcal{M}_{seg} ,

$$(59) \quad (u, [u]_{\rho})_{\rho} = \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{\rho(ug_l)^2}{\rho(g_l)} \geq 0.$$

Most notable example is the classical Cucker-Smale \mathcal{M}_{CS} , provided the kernel ϕ is Bochner-positive, i.e. $\phi = \psi * \psi$, for some smooth $\psi \geq 0$. We have

$$(60) \quad (u, [u]_{\rho})_{\kappa_{\rho}} = \int_{\Omega} (u\rho) \cdot (u\rho)_{\phi} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (u\rho)_{\psi}^2 \, dx \geq 0.$$

Among symmetric but not necessarily ball-positive is the topological model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^{\text{topo}}$. Here, the kernel is not Bochner-positive to imply sign definiteness of the averaging.

Direct implications of ball-positivity in general include, of course, positivity and contractivity. What is less trivial to establish is that in fact all ball-positive models are conservative.

Proposition 3.9. *Every ball-positive model is conservative.*

We include the proof in Appendix 10 which requires a more delicate analysis of models on finite sets. We also show that ball-positivity does not imply symmetry, i.e. the next stronger property is not guaranteed.

Let us summarize the list of properties, relations between them, and examples.

$$\text{ball-positive} \iff \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{symmetric} \implies \text{conservative} \implies \text{contractive} \\ \text{positive semi-definite} \iff \text{ball-positive} \end{array} \right.$$

MODEL	conservative	symmetric	ball-positive	Galilean invariant
$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{I}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{glob}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓
\mathcal{M}_{CS}	✓	✓	✓ if $\phi = \psi * \psi$	✓
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^{\text{topo}}$	✓	✓	×	✓
\mathcal{M}_{MT}	×	×	×	✓
\mathcal{M}_{ϕ}	✓	✓	✓	✓
\mathcal{M}_{seg}	✓	✓	✓	×

The most important applications of ball-positivity will be seen in the context of flocking and spectral gap calculations. Such calculations will comprise a new low energy method to be discussed in Section 4.4.

4. FLOCKING

4.1. Cucker-Smale Theorem. We start with an extension of the classical Cucker-Smale Theorem that originally appeared in [CS07a] for the \mathcal{M}_{CS} -model. The result declares how strong the long-range communication must be in order to ensure alignment from any initial condition. The discrete, kinetic, and hydrodynamic analogues of this result are proved in exact same way, due to essentially the same structure of the characteristic equations taking one of the forms (39), see [Shv21] for a detailed account. We adhere to the context of kinetic Vlasov-alignment model

$$(61) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v \cdot (s_\rho(v - [u]_\rho) f), \quad \text{diam}(\text{supp } f_0) < \infty.$$

It incorporates the agent based dynamics as a special case of a weak solution, and does not require any particular closure assumption, for more on this see [Tad21, Tad22]. The pressureless Euler-alignment system allows the same treatment if written in Lagrangian coordinates, see Theorem 4.2 below. The main idea conveyed here is that the result does not require any special properties of the model and can be extended to any general material environmental averaging that has a reproducing kernel ϕ_ρ .

We consider Ω to be an arbitrary environment, although the unbounded ones, such as \mathbb{R}^n , is where the result is most meaningful. If we have a measure-valued solution to (61) starting from a compactly supported initial condition f_0 , then at any point of time t the solution f_t is given as a push-forward of f_0 along the characteristic flow-map given by (see also Section 5)

$$(62) \quad \frac{d}{dt} X(t, x, v) = V(t, x, v), \quad X(0, x, v) = x,$$

$$(63) \quad \frac{d}{dt} V(t, x, v) = s_\rho(X)([u]_\rho(X) - V), \quad V(0, x, v) = v.$$

We abbreviate $\omega = (x, v)$ for short. The representation formula (39b) gives the V -equation a more specific form (using the characteristics change of coordinates)

$$(64) \quad \frac{d}{dt} V(t, \omega) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\rho(X(t, \omega), X(t, \omega')) (V(t, \omega') - V(t, \omega)) df_0(\omega').$$

It is clear from this equation that if initially $V(0, \omega)$ belong to a convex set $\Sigma = \cap_{\ell \in F \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \{v : \ell(v) \leq c_\ell\}$, for $\omega \in \text{supp } f_0$ then they will remain there for all times. Indeed, for any $\ell \in F$ computing at a point of maximum ω we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \ell(V(t, \omega)) = \int_{\omega' \in \text{supp } f_0} \phi_\rho(X(t, \omega), X(t, \omega')) (\ell(V(t, \omega')) - \ell(V(t, \omega))) df_0(\omega') \leq 0.$$

So, $\ell(V(t, \omega)) \leq c_\ell$, and hence $V(t, \omega) \in \Sigma$. We call it the maximum principle for characteristics.

Theorem 4.1 (Kinetic Cucker-Smale). *Suppose there exists $\phi(r)$, a positive, non-decreasing kernel with fat tail, $\int_0^\infty \phi(r) dr = \infty$, such that*

$$(65) \quad \phi_\rho(x, y) \geq \phi(x - y), \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Then any measure-valued solution to (61) starting from a compactly supported initial condition f_0 aligns and flocks exponentially fast

$$(66) \quad D(t) = \max_{\omega', \omega'' \in \text{supp } f_0} |X(t, \omega') - X(t, \omega'')| < C, \quad \forall t > 0$$

$$(67) \quad A(t) = \max_{\omega', \omega'' \in \text{supp } f_0} |V(t, \omega') - V(t, \omega'')| \leq C e^{-\delta t},$$

where $C, \delta > 0$ depend on the initial condition and the parameters of the model. Moreover, there exists $u_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$(68) \quad \max_{\omega \in \text{supp } f_0} |V(t, \omega) - u_\infty| \leq C e^{-\delta t}.$$

If the model \mathcal{M} is conservative then $u_\infty = \bar{u} = \int_\Omega u \rho dx$, the total conserved momentum.

Proof. Following characteristics let us fix at any point of time a label $\omega_\pm \in \text{supp } f_0$ where V^i achieves its maximum and minimum, respectively, V_\pm^i . So, by the Rademacher lemma, we have distributionally,

$$(69) \quad \frac{d}{dt} V_\pm^i = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\rho(X(t, \omega_\pm), X(t, \omega')) (V^i(t, \omega') - V_\pm^i) df_0(\omega').$$

In view of (65),

$$\frac{d}{dt} V_+^i \leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi(X(t, \omega_+) - X(t, \omega')) (V^i(t, \omega') - V_+^i) df_0(\omega') \leq \phi(D) \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (V^i(t, \omega') - V_+^i) df_0(\omega').$$

And similarly,

$$\frac{d}{dt} V_-^i \geq \phi(D) \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (V^i(t, \omega') - V_-^i) df_0(\omega').$$

Subtracting the two, we obtain for the amplitude $A^i = V_+^i - V_-^i$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} A^i \leq -\phi(D) A^i.$$

Taking the Euclidean amplitude $A = \sqrt{(A^1)^2 + \dots + (A^n)^2}$, we obtain the system

$$\frac{d}{dt} D \leq A, \quad \frac{d}{dt} A \leq -\phi(D) A.$$

Following [HL09] we form the Lyapunov function

$$L = A + \int_0^D \phi(r) dr,$$

which remains bounded. Hence, in view of the fat-tail condition, D remains bounded, and going back to the A -equation we obtain exponential decay on the amplitudes.

To conclude (68) let us notice that as a consequence of (67), we have

$$\max_{\omega \in \text{supp } f_0} |\dot{V}| \leq C e^{-\delta t}.$$

So, every characteristic $V(\omega, t)$ will converge exponentially fast to a limit $u_\infty(\omega)$. In view of (67), u_∞ must be a constant vector. \square

The alignment of characteristics stated in Theorem 4.1 implies corresponding behavior of the distribution f itself by transport. First, we can see that its v -marginal $f^v = \int_{\Omega} f(t, x, v) dx$ converges weakly to Dirac,

$$f^v \rightarrow \delta_0(v - u_{\infty}).$$

Moreover, since f is a push-forward of f_0 along (62) - (63), the v -support of f will belong to an exponentially shrinking ball around u_{∞} . This implies uniform convergence of the macroscopic velocity

$$u(x, t) - u_{\infty} = \frac{\int_{|v - u_{\infty}| \leq C e^{-\delta t}} (v - u_{\infty}) f(x, v, t) dv}{\int_{|v - u_{\infty}| \leq C e^{-\delta t}} f(x, v, t) dv},$$

so,

$$(70) \quad \sup_{x \in \text{supp } \rho} |u(x, t) - u_{\infty}| \leq C e^{-\delta t}.$$

And it also implies exponential alignment in the energy sense, to be discussed in greater detail in Section 4.3:

$$(71) \quad \bar{u} = \int_{\Omega} u \rho dx,$$

$$(72) \quad \delta \mathcal{E} := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - \bar{u}|^2 f dv dx \leq C e^{-\delta t}.$$

Unfortunately the result doesn't seem to provide much insight into behavior of the macroscopic density ρ . See, however, [ST17b] for a convergence result to a traveling wave in 1D case.

The exact same result can be stated for the hydrodynamic alignment model without pressure, so called pressureless Euler-Alignment system (see Section 9.1 for derivation)

$$(73) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_t + \nabla \cdot (u \rho) &= 0, \\ u_t + u \cdot \nabla u &= s_{\rho}([u]_{\rho} - u). \end{aligned}$$

If passed to Lagrangian coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(\alpha, t) &= v(\alpha, t) := u(x(\alpha, t), t), \quad \alpha \in \Omega, \\ \dot{v}(\alpha, t) &= \int_{\Omega} \phi_{\rho}(x(t, \alpha), x(t, \alpha')) (v(t, \alpha') - v(t, \alpha)) d\rho_0(\alpha'). \end{aligned}$$

the system is structurally similar to (62) - (63). So, the proof goes through exactly as before.

Theorem 4.2 (Hydrodynamic Cucker-Smale). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, any classical solution to the pressureless Euler-alignment system (73) with compactly supported initial ρ_0 , and $\rho_t \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $t \geq 0$, aligns and flocks exponentially fast*

$$(74) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} (\text{diam}(\text{supp } \rho)) < \infty, \quad \sup_{x \in \text{supp } \rho} |u(t, x) - u_{\infty}| \leq C_0 e^{-\delta t}.$$

For the \mathcal{M}_{CS} -model where $\phi_{\rho}(x, y) = \phi(x - y)$ the statements above are classical. The kinetic and hydrodynamics versions appeared in [CFRT10] and [TT14], respectively.

In the Motsch-Tadmor case, we can apply the same fat-tail condition on the defining kernel ϕ due to

$$(75) \quad \phi_{\rho}(x, y) = \frac{\phi(x - y)}{\rho_{\phi}(x)} \geq \frac{1}{\|\phi\|_{\infty}} \phi(x - y).$$

However, the limiting velocity u_{∞} is not determined by the initial condition and emerges dynamically.

The theorem does not apply to either the over-mollified model \mathcal{M}_{ϕ} or the segregation model \mathcal{M}_{seg} as those are inherently local, which brings us to the next main question – what conditions guarantee emergent behavior when communication is strictly local?

4.2. Chain connectivity. The $\frac{1}{t^{1/4}}$ and $\frac{1}{t^{1/2}}$ results. Let us assume that the underlying averaging model \mathcal{M} is symmetric and material, and the kernel supports short range communication

$$(76) \quad \phi_\rho(x, y) \geq c_0 \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| < r_0}, \text{ for some } r_0 > 0.$$

Many models in our list satisfy this condition automatically. For the classical Cucker-Smale, it simply means that $\phi > 0$ near the origin. The Motsch-Tadmor model fulfills the same via (75). Similarly, for the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model, we have, since $\rho_\phi(z) \leq c$,

$$\phi_\rho(x, y) \geq c^{-1} \phi * \phi(x - y) \geq c_0 \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| < r_0}$$

as long as ϕ itself is local.

As to the segregation model \mathcal{M}_{seg} , since $\sum_{l=1}^L g_l(x) = 1$, for every x there exists l such that $g_l(x) \geq 1/L$. Using continuity and compactness, there exists a $r_0 > 0$ such that for any $|x - y| < r_0$ we have $g_l(y) > 1/2L$. Then, since $\rho(g_l) \leq 1$,

$$\phi_\rho(x, y) = \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{g_l(x)g_l(y)}{\rho(g_l)} \geq \frac{1}{2L^2} = c_0, \quad \forall x, y : |x - y| < r_0.$$

Thus, (76) is satisfied.

It is obvious that locality (76) itself is insufficient for unconditional alignment of the system. In the open space \mathbb{R}^n one can simply direct two agents away from each other starting at a distance larger than communication range. On \mathbb{T}^n one can launch two agents with misaligned velocities along two parallel geodesics at a distance larger than communication range. So, it is clear that some kind of connectivity is necessary to obtain alignment. In this section we explore how to achieve this through connectivity and thickness assumptions on the flock.

First, we set proper definitions, see also [MPT19].

Definition 4.3. We say that the flock (u, ρ) is *chain connected at scale r* if for any two points $x', x'' \in \text{supp } \rho$ there exists a chain

$$x' = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K = x''$$

such that $x_i \in \text{supp } \rho$ and $|x_i - x_j| < r$.

Definition 4.4. Thickness of the flock ρ at scale $r > 0$ is defined by

$$(77) \quad \text{Th}_r(\rho) = \inf_{x \in \text{supp } \rho} \rho(B_r(x)).$$

Our main result states under connectivity in some sub-communication scale and proper thickness assumptions the alignment is achieved for velocity characteristics although at a much slower rate than in the classical case.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, and \mathcal{M} is symmetric and material. Suppose the kernel satisfies (76). If the flock remains chain connected at the scale $r = r_0/8$ for all time and has thickness satisfying $\text{Th}_r(\rho) \geq \frac{c}{t^{1/4}}$, then the flock aligns*

$$(78) \quad \sup_{\omega, \omega' \in \text{supp } f_0} |V(t, \omega) - V(t, \omega')| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln t}}.$$

On the torus $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$ the result holds under weaker condition $\text{Th}_r(\rho) \geq \frac{c}{t^{1/2}}$.

In the case of the torus we can consider a non-vacuous flock with positive lower bound on the density

$$\rho_- = \min_{\mathbb{T}^n} \rho > 0.$$

Such a flock remains trivially connected at any scale and one has $\text{Th}_r(\rho) \gtrsim \rho_-$. So, one important consequence of the above theorem is a statement in terms of quantitative no-vacuum condition.

Corollary 4.6. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$, \mathcal{M} is symmetric and material, and the kernel satisfies (76). If $\rho_- \geq \frac{c}{t^{1/2}}$, then the flock aligns (78).*

Before we get to the proof we first explore how one can reduce the number of links in a chain.

Lemma 4.7. *If the flock is chain connected at scale r , then it is also chain connected at scale $3r$. Moreover, between any pair of points there is a $3r$ -chain with the number of links limited to $K \leq \frac{2}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)}$.*

If the diameter of the flock is bounded, then K can be chosen independent of thickness but dependent on the diameter, $K \leq C(\text{diam}(\text{supp } \rho))$.

Proof. Suppose we have a chain $x' = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K = x''$ with the properties listed in the definition. We now choose a subchain in the following manner. Let $x_{i_1} = x_1$. Then let us pick $i_2 - 1$ to be the largest index $> i_1$ for which $|x_{i_1} - x_{i_2-1}| < 2r$. So, all subsequent elements will stay at a distance at least $2r$ from x_{i_1} . In particular $|x_{i_1} - x_{i_2}| \geq 2r$, and yet since $|x_{i_2-1} - x_{i_2}| < r$, we have $|x_{i_1} - x_{i_2}| < 3r$. Pick i_3 similarly to i_2 , etc. Eventually x_K will be selected last unconditionally.

According to construction we have a new chain $y_j = x_{i_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, such that $|y_j - y_{j+1}| < 3r$ and $|y_j - y_k| \geq 2r$ for any $j \neq k < J$. Hence, the chain is connected at scale $3r$. At the same time, by disjointness

$$\text{Th}_r(\rho)(J-1) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \rho(B_r(y_j)) = \rho\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{J-1} B_r(y_j)\right) \leq 1.$$

Hence, $J \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)} \leq \frac{2}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)}$.

Alternatively, if the flock is bounded, and the balls around y_j 's are disjoint, J is limited by volume to $c_n \text{diam}(\text{supp } \rho)^n / r^n$. This proves the lemma. \square

The primary technical use of this lemma will be in construction of chains with thick links. Specifically, if the flock is r -connected then we find it also $3r$ -connected by chains of size $K \leq \frac{2}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)}$, and since any ball $B_{4r}(x_i)$ contains the balls $B_r(x_{i-1}) \cup B_r(x_{i+1})$, then

$$(79) \quad \rho(B_{4r}(x_i) \cap B_{4r}(x_{i+1})) \geq \text{Th}_r(\rho).$$

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Let us assume for now that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$.

By symmetry of the model we have the following energy law

$$(80) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\rho(x - x') |v - v'|^2 f(t, \omega') f(t, \omega) d\omega' d\omega.$$

Hence, in view of (76),

$$(81) \quad \int_0^\infty \int_{\{|x-x'| < r_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - v'|^2 f(t, \omega') f(t, \omega) d\omega' d\omega dt < \infty.$$

Consider the averages over balls of radius $4r$:

$$\bar{v}(x) = \frac{1}{\rho(B_{4r}(x))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x)} w f(t, y, w) dy dw.$$

The quadratic deviations from the averages are all subordinated to the dissipation rate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} |v - \bar{v}(x^*)|^2 f(t, x, v) dx dv \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} \left| \frac{1}{\rho(B_{4r}(x^*))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} (v - w) f(t, y, w) dy dw \right|^2 f(t, x, v) dx dv \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} \frac{1}{\rho(B_{4r}(x^*))} \int_{B_{4r}(x^*)} |v - w|^2 f(t, y, w) f(t, x, v) dy dw dx dv \end{aligned}$$

using that $|x - y| < 8r = r_0$,

$$\leq \frac{1}{\rho(B_{4r}(x^*))} \int_{\{|x-x'| < r_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - v'|^2 f(t, \omega') f(t, \omega) d\omega' d\omega.$$

Thus, in view of (87), and the fact that $\text{Th}_r(\rho) \leq \rho(B_{4r}(x^*))$,

$$(82) \quad \int_0^\infty \sup_{x^* \in \Omega} \text{Th}_r(\rho) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} |v - \bar{v}(x^*)|^2 f(t, x, v) dx dv dt < \infty.$$

Let us now estimate the flattening near extremes. Let us fix one coordinate of v $\text{supp } f$, say v^i and denote by $v_+^i = V^i(t, \omega_+) = \max_{\omega \in \text{supp } f_0} V^i(t, \omega)$, and $x_+ = X(t, \omega_+)$. We drop superindex i for shortness of notation. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} v_+ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\rho(x_+, y)(w - v_+)f(t, y, w) dy dw \leq c_0 \int_{B_{4r}(x_+)} (w - v_+)f(t, y, w) dy dw \\ &= c_0 \rho(B_{4r}(x_+))(\bar{v}(x_+) - v_+) \leq c_0 \text{Th}_r(\rho)(\bar{v}(x_+) - v_+). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{d}{dt} v_- \geq c_0 \text{Th}_r(\rho)(\bar{v}(x_-) - v_-).$$

Consequently,

$$(83) \quad \int_0^\infty \text{Th}_r(\rho)[(\bar{v}(x_-) - v_-) + (v_+ - \bar{v}(x_+))] dt < \infty.$$

Combining (82) and (83), and fixing an $T' > 0$ large enough we can ensure that for any $T > 0$ there is a time $t \in [T, T + T']$ such that

$$(84) \quad (\bar{v}(x_-) - v_-) + (v_+ - \bar{v}(x_+)) + \sup_{x^* \in \Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} |v - \bar{v}(x^*)|^2 f(t, x, v) dx dv < \infty < \frac{1}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)t \ln t}.$$

In particular, the extreme values are close to the averages around them. Let us now show that all the averages are close to each other, and this will finish the proof.

We have for any $x^* \in \Omega$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} |v - \bar{v}(x^*)|^2 f(t, x, v) dx dv \leq \frac{1}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)t \ln t}.$$

Denote $\delta = \frac{2}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)\sqrt{t \ln t}}$. Then by the Chebyshev inequality,

$$(85) \quad f(\{|v - \bar{v}(x^*)| > \delta\} \times B_{4r}(x^*)) \leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times B_{4r}(x^*)} |v - \bar{v}(x^*)|^2 f(t, x, v) dx dv \leq \frac{1}{4} \text{Th}_r(\rho).$$

Let us now consider a $3r$ -chain x_1, \dots, x_K with $K < C/\text{Th}_r(\rho)$, which connects two points x_- and x_+ . According to (79), $\rho(B_{4r}(x_i) \cap B_{4r}(x_{i+1})) \geq \text{Th}_r(\rho)$. Thus, $f(\mathbb{R}^n \times (B_{4r}(x_i) \cap B_{4r}(x_{i+1}))) \geq \text{Th}_r(\rho)$. Yet according to (85),

$$f(\{(|v - \bar{v}(x_i)| > \delta\} \times B_{4r}(x_i)) \cup (\{|v - \bar{v}(x_{i+1})| > \delta\} \times B_{4r}(x_{i+1}))\}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Th}_r(\rho).$$

Consequently,

$$B_\delta(\bar{v}(x_i)) \times B_{4r}(x_i) \cap B_\delta(\bar{v}(x_{i+1})) \times B_{4r}(x_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Hence,

$$|\bar{v}(x_i) - \bar{v}(x_{i+1})| \leq 2\delta.$$

Summing up over all i , we obtain

$$(86) \quad |\bar{v}(x_+) - \bar{v}(x_-)| \leq 2\delta K \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)^2 \sqrt{t \ln t}} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln t}}.$$

Combining with (84) we have

$$v_+ - v_- \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln t}}.$$

Since this holds at time $t < T + T'$, it must hold at time $T + T'$ by the maximum principle. But since $t > T$, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln t}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln T}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln(T+T')}}$. Since T is arbitrary, this finishes the proof in the open space.

On the torus the diameter of the flock is uniformly bounded, and consequently, by Lemma 4.7, K remains uniformly bounded. In this case the estimate (86) gets improved to the following

$$|\bar{v}(x_+) - \bar{v}(x_-)| \leq 2\delta K \lesssim \frac{1}{\text{Th}_r(\rho)\sqrt{t \ln t}} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln t}},$$

provided $\text{Th}_r(\rho) \gtrsim \frac{1}{t^{1/2}}$. The rest of the proof is the same. \square

Remark 4.8. The exact same result holds for solutions of the pressureless Euler-Alignment System (73), thanks to the fact that it has a similar form of the energy dissipation

$$(87) \quad \int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi_\rho(x, y) |u(x, t) - u(y, t)|^2 d\rho(y) d\rho(y) dt < \infty.$$

4.3. Alignment in the energy sense. Spectral gaps. The alignment of characteristics stated in Theorem 4.5 implies alignment in the energy sense. Recalling that $\bar{u} = \int_\Omega u \rho dx$, we have

$$\delta\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - \bar{u}|^2 f dv dx \leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |V - V'|^2 f_0 f'_0 d\omega d\omega' \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln t}}.$$

In this section we explore alignment in this weaker sense

$$(88) \quad \delta\mathcal{E} \rightarrow 0,$$

by appealing to the most basic energy law of the Vlasov-alignment equation (61).

We will not make any special assumptions on the underlying model \mathcal{M} except that \mathcal{M} is material just to make sense of the strength function in equation (61). In particular, the momentum \bar{u} may not be conserved.

In order to write the equation for $\delta\mathcal{E}$, let us note the identity

$$\mathcal{E} := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f dv dx = \delta\mathcal{E} + \frac{1}{2} |\bar{u}|^2.$$

The momentum satisfies

$$(89) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} |\bar{u}|^2 = (\bar{u}, [u]_\rho - u)_{\kappa_\rho},$$

and the equation for total energy is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v|^2 f dv dx + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Subtracting the two we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \delta\mathcal{E} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v|^2 f dv dx + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} - (\bar{u}, [u]_\rho - u)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Let us further notice the identity

$$\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v|^2 f dv dx = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - \bar{u}|^2 f dv dx + 2(u, \bar{u})_{\kappa_\rho} - (\bar{u}, \bar{u})_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Collecting the macroscopic terms together we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \delta\mathcal{E} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - \bar{u}|^2 f dv dx + (\delta u, [\delta u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}, \quad \delta u = u - \bar{u}.$$

Next, let us decompose the energy on the right hand side into the internal and macroscopic part,

$$\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - \bar{u}|^2 f dv dx = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - u|^2 f dv dx + (\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

We obtain the energy law

$$(90) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \delta\mathcal{E} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - u|^2 f dv dx + (\delta u, [\delta u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} - (\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Naturally, we will seek to relate the right hand side back to the energy. This comes from two assumptions. First, we require that the averaging operator has a numerical range separated from 1, i.e. at any time there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(91) \quad \sup \left\{ (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} : u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \bar{u} = 0, \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)} = 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

This in turn implies

$$(92) \quad (\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho} - (\delta u, [\delta u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} \geq \varepsilon (\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Second, we require the strength function to have a positive lower bound

$$(93) \quad s_\rho(x, t) \geq s(t), \quad \forall x \in \text{supp } \rho.$$

Plugging these back into (90) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(94) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \delta \mathcal{E} &\leq - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - u|^2 f \, dv \, dx - \varepsilon (\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho} \\
&\leq -\varepsilon \left(\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - u|^2 f \, dv \, dx + (\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho} \right) \\
&= -\varepsilon \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - \bar{u}|^2 f \, dv \, dx \leq -\varepsilon s \delta \mathcal{E}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies a general sufficient condition for alignment.

Proposition 4.9. *Let \mathcal{M} be a material model on an arbitrary environment Ω . The kinetic model (61) aligns in the energy sense provide the following condition holds*

$$(95) \quad \int_0^\infty \varepsilon(t) s(t) \, dt = \infty.$$

A few remarks are in order.

Remark 4.10. Let us note that for symmetric models with $s_\rho \equiv 1$, the space of vanishing momentum $L_0^2(\rho)$ is invariant under $[\cdot]_\rho$, and the numerical range determines the range of the spectrum. So, condition (91) is equivalent to a spectral gap between the trivial eigenvalue 1 and the rest of the spectrum to the left

$$(96) \quad \text{spec}\{[\cdot]_\rho; L_0^2(\rho)\} \subset (-\infty, 1 - \varepsilon],$$

where

$$L_0^2(\rho) = \left\{ u \in L^2(\rho) : \int_\Omega u \, d\rho = 0 \right\}.$$

For this reason, although in general (91) is not a spectral property, we still refer to it as a *spectral gap*.

In general, however, conservative models leave the null-space

$$L_0^2(\kappa_\rho) = \left\{ u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho) : \int_\Omega u \, d\kappa_\rho = 0 \right\}$$

invariant. In this case it is possible to relate ε to the actual spectral gap of $[\cdot]_\rho$ on $L_0^2(\kappa_\rho)$ if s_ρ is bounded from below. Details are provided in Appendix 11.

Remark 4.11. Proposition 4.9 can be viewed as a generalization of Tadmor's [Tad21] to the non-symmetric case. The argument there is slightly different in the interpretation of the spectral gap condition (92). As opposed to (92) where all the inner products are related to the common κ_ρ -weight, one can make a more direct relation to the physical macroscopic energy, i.e. the ρ -weighted product:

$$(\delta u, \delta u)_{\kappa_\rho} - (\delta u, [\delta u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} \geq \lambda (\delta u, \delta u)_\rho.$$

The corresponding alignment statement in terms of λ reads

$$(97) \quad \int_0^\infty \min\{s(t), \lambda(t)\} \, dt = \infty.$$

Such λ can be expressed in variational form as the second (approximate) eigenvalue of the alignment operator

$$(98) \quad \mathcal{L}_\rho u = s_\rho (u - [u]_\rho).$$

We have

$$(99) \quad \lambda = \inf_{u \in L_0^2(\rho)} \frac{(u, \mathcal{L}_\rho u)_\rho}{(u, u)_\rho}.$$

The advantage of this approach consists in the fact that for symmetric models represented by a kernel the formulation (99) takes a more explicit form:

$$(100) \quad \lambda = \inf_{u \in L_0^2(\rho), \|u\|_2=1} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \phi_\rho(x, y) \, d\rho(y) \, d\rho(x).$$

Theorem 2 of [Tad21] gives a kinematic estimate in terms of lower and upper bounds on the density, $\rho_- = \min \rho$, $\rho_+ = \max \rho$, in case when $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$. Namely,

$$(101) \quad \lambda \gtrsim \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+}.$$

The result is proved under condition (102) below, however it can be recast for physically local kernels (76) as well. Let us reproduce the argument as it will be used later in Example 4.14.

Proof of (101). We obtain

$$(u, \mathcal{L}_\rho u)_\rho \geq c_0 \rho_-^2 \int_{|x-y| < r_0} |u(x) - u(y)|^2 dx dy.$$

As shown in [LS19b, Lemma 2.1] this can be further estimated from below by

$$\geq c_0 c_1 \rho_-^2 \frac{c_0}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} |u(x) - \text{Ave}(u)|^2 dx,$$

where $c_1 = c_1(r_0)$, and $\text{Ave}(u) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\Omega} u(x) dx$. Recalling that u has momentum zero, we finish with

$$\gtrsim \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} |u(x) - \text{Ave}(u)|^2 d\rho(x) \geq \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+} (u, u)_\rho.$$

□

Estimate (101) shows that under global control on ρ_+ one obtains alignment under the root-assumption $\rho_- \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{t}$, the same result as proved in Corollary 4.6 under no assumption on ρ_+ . The difference between the two approaches is fundamental – dynamic vs kinematic. It appears that the dynamic approach is not sensitive to the density growth and gives a better result for symmetric models. However, as we will see later in Section 4.4 in some cases the kinematic approach can give estimates on the spectral gap independent of ρ_+ too, and in some cases can even beat the root-result, as for instance in the case of the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model, see Example 4.16. This will prove to be a crucial ingredient in the study of relaxation for kinetic Fokker-Planck models in Section 8.

Let us present two applications of Proposition 4.9 that are distinctly different from the root-result. In both cases we work on the torus $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$.

Example 4.12 (\mathcal{M}_{CS} -model). Let us assume that ϕ is a mollification kernel, $\phi \geq 0$, $\int_{\Omega} \phi dx = 1$, local or not. Then its non-zero Fourier modes will necessarily be smaller than unit:

$$(102) \quad c_0 = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{\phi}(k)| < 1.$$

Let us compute the spectral gap as defined by (91). Using that $\int u \rho dx = 0$ by the Plancherel identity,

$$(u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} = \int_{\Omega} u \rho (u \rho)_\phi dx = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} |\widehat{u \rho}(k)|^2 \text{Re}(\hat{\phi}(k)) \leq c_0 \int_{\Omega} |u \rho|^2 dx.$$

We now relate it back to the $L^2(\kappa_\rho)$ -norm:

$$(u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} \leq c_0 \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 \rho \phi \frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} dx \leq c_0 \left\| \frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} \right\|_\infty \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)}^2.$$

Suppose now that $\left\| \frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} \right\|_\infty < \frac{1}{c_0}$. We define

$$(103) \quad \varepsilon = 1 - c_0 \left\| \frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} \right\|_\infty.$$

Naturally, $\varepsilon < 1 - c_0$ since at the point of maximum of ρ we have $\rho \geq \rho_\phi$, and so the L^∞ -norm is at least 1. Also, note that if ρ is convex in a ball $B_r(x)$, where r is the range of the communication kernel, then $\rho(x) \leq \rho_\phi(x)$, and (103) holds if restricted to that ball. So, the spectral gap (103) essentially quantifies flatness of the density ρ in those regions where it is not convex.

Also, note that for $\varepsilon = 1 - c_0$, the only flock that satisfies (103) is the uniformly distributed one. So, the smaller the ε the more room there is for variations in distribution. However, (103) still ensures sufficient spread of the support across the domain (for otherwise the geodesic counterexample applies).

Now, a lower bound on s_ρ can be interpreted as a measure of thickness of the flock (a more precise definition will be given in Section 4.2):

$$(104) \quad \inf_{x \in \text{supp } \rho} \rho_\phi(x, t) = s(t)$$

Collecting the computations above and applying Proposition 4.9 we obtain the following alignment result.

Corollary 4.13. *For the Cucker-Smale model \mathcal{M}_{CS} a sufficient condition for alignment in the energy sense is the flatness (103) and thickness (104) to satisfy $\int_0^\infty \varepsilon(t)s(t) dt = \infty$.*

Example 4.14 (\mathcal{M}_{MT} -model). For the Motsch-Tadmor non-symmetric model \mathcal{M}_{MT} computation of the gap is more technical and require heavier assumptions on the density.

Let us assume that the defining kernel ϕ is local, (76). We have

$$(u, u)_\rho - (u, [u]_\rho)_\rho = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} u(x) \cdot (u(x) - u(y)) \rho(x) \rho(y) \frac{\phi(x-y)}{\rho_\phi(x)} dy dx,$$

symmetrizing in x and y

$$(105) \quad \begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) \frac{\phi(x-y)}{\rho_\phi(x)} dy dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} u(y) \cdot (u(x) - u(y)) \rho(x) \rho(y) \left(\frac{1}{\rho_\phi(x)} - \frac{1}{\rho_\phi(y)} \right) \phi(x-y) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using that $\rho_\phi(x) \leq \|\phi\|_\infty$ we bound the first term from below by a multiple of $(u, \mathcal{L}_\rho u)_\rho$, which by (101) is bounded from below by $c \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+} \|u\|_2^2$. As to the second term, note that the component with the dot-product $u(y) \cdot u(x)$ vanishes by symmetry, and hence we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |u(y)|^2 \rho(y) \rho(x) \left(\frac{1}{\rho_\phi(x)} - \frac{1}{\rho_\phi(y)} \right) \phi(x-y) dy dx &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |u(y)|^2 \rho(y) \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} \right)_\phi(y) dy + \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |u(y)|^2 \rho(y) \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} \right)_\phi(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

We now impose the following condition on the smallness of variation

$$(106) \quad \rho_+ - \rho_- \leq c \frac{\rho_-^3}{\rho_+}.$$

Then

$$\left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi} \right)_\phi(y) \leq \frac{\rho_+ - \rho_-}{\rho_-} \leq c \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+}.$$

Consequently, this term becomes less than half of the main dissipation term (105),

$$(u, u)_\rho - (u, [u]_\rho)_\rho \geq \frac{c}{2} \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+} (u, u)_\rho.$$

So, similar to the symmetric case under the flatness assumption (106), the size of the spectral gap is still estimated at $\lambda = \varepsilon \gtrsim \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+}$.

Corollary 4.15. *There exists a $c > 0$ which depends only on the parameters of the model such that any solution to the kinetic equation (61) on \mathbb{T}^n governed by the Motsch-Tadmor averaging aligns in the energy sense, provided*

$$\rho_+ - \rho_- \leq c \frac{\rho_-^3}{\rho_+}, \quad \int_0^\infty \frac{\rho_-^2}{\rho_+} ds = \infty.$$

4.4. Spectral gap of a ball-positive model. Low energy method. Finding the spectral gap (91) plays a central role in the study of relaxation result for solutions of the Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation, and sometimes allows to even relax the root-condition of Corollary 4.6. In fact, to apply relaxation results later in Section 8 it will be essential to have an estimate on the spectral gap stated only in terms of ρ_- , since the lower bound can be gained by instantaneous spread of positivity, see Section 7.2. It turns out that for ball-positive models such ρ_+ -independent estimates can be found with the use of a new *low energy method*.

To describe the method let us first discuss energetics of ball-positive models. Since $\|[\cdot]_\rho\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)} \leq 1$, we obtain a streak of three inequalities,

$$(107) \quad (u, u)_{\kappa_\rho} \geq (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} \geq ([u]_\rho, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

This defines the hierarchy of three κ -energies (not to be confused with the physical ρ -energies)

$$(108) \quad \mathcal{E}_0 = (u, u)_{\kappa_\rho}, \quad \mathcal{E}_1 = (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}, \quad \mathcal{E}_2 = ([u]_\rho, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

As seen from (44) the difference between the first two energies $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{E}_0 - \mathcal{E}_1$ controls the rate of alignment in collective systems. The next difference $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{E}_1 - \mathcal{E}_2$ is also non-negative by the very definition of ball-positivity, and in fact by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality one has the relation

$$\mathcal{A}_0 \geq \mathcal{A}_1.$$

So, it is clear that the strength of ball-positivity measured by \mathcal{A}_1 bears direct relevance to alignment.

To adopt it for spectral gap calculations, we note that the spectral gap condition (91) can be expressed directly in terms of top tier energies

$$(109) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 \geq \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_0, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \bar{u} = 0.$$

The lower energy method seeks to achieve (109) through comparison between the two terms down in the hierarchy (low energies)

$$(110) \quad \mathcal{A}_1 \geq \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_1, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \bar{u} = 0.$$

Indeed, let us observe that (110) is equivalent to

$$(111) \quad (1 - \varepsilon)(u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} \geq ([u]_\rho, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \bar{u} = 0,$$

and hence

$$\| [u]_\rho \|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)} \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \| u \|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)}, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \bar{u} = 0,$$

which implies (91)~(109).

One can see from (111) that the method is necessarily restricted to the class of ball-positive models. It turns out that estimating the low energy gap (110) sometimes gives substantial improvements over the direct approach (109) in the sense of giving a bound independent of ρ_+ . Let us present several examples from our list of ball-positive models.

Throughout we assume that the kernel in question is local (76), and the environment is periodic $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$. Let us give a table summary of estimates to be obtained below:

MODEL	\mathcal{M}_{CS}	\mathcal{M}_ϕ	\mathcal{M}_{seg}
$\varepsilon \gtrsim$	ρ_-^3	ρ_-	ρ_-^{2L}

The lower bound ρ_- all these estimates above can in fact be replaced with a more refined quantity given by uniform thickness

$$(112) \quad \text{UTh}_r(\rho) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} \rho(B_r(x)), \quad r < r_0.$$

This version, however, is not essential for what follows.

Example 4.16 (\mathcal{M}_ϕ -model). For the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model the following formula was proved in [Shv22]:

$$(113) \quad \mathcal{A}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho_{\phi\phi}(x, y) |u_F(x) - u_F(y)|^2 dx dy,$$

$$\rho_{\phi\phi}(x, y) = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x - \xi) \phi(y - \xi) \rho(\xi) d\xi,$$

where u_F is the Favre-filtration given by \mathcal{M}_{MT} . The proof goes as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_1 &= \int_{\Omega} (\rho_{\phi} |u_F|^2 - \rho |(u_F)_{\phi}|^2) dx = \int_{\Omega} (\rho_{\phi} u_F \cdot u_F - \rho (u_F)_{\phi} \cdot (u_F)_{\phi}) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} (\rho_{\phi} u_F - (\rho (u_F)_{\phi})_{\phi}) \cdot u_F dx = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \phi(x - \xi) \rho(\xi) (u_F(x) - (u_F)_{\phi}(\xi)) \cdot u_F(x) d\xi dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega \times \Omega \times \Omega} \phi(x - \xi) \phi(y - \xi) \rho(\xi) (u_F(x) - u_F(y)) \cdot u_F(x) d\xi dx dy \\
&= \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho_{\phi\phi}(x, y) (u_F(x) - u_F(y)) \cdot u_F(x) dx dy = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \rho_{\phi\phi}(x, y) |u_F(x) - u_F(y)|^2 dx dy,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we performed symmetrization in x, y .

We now estimate $\rho_{\phi\phi}$ from below: let $|x - y| < r_0/2$, then

$$\rho_{\phi\phi}(x, y) = \int_{\Omega} \phi(x - y + \xi) \phi(\xi) \rho(y - \xi) d\xi \geq \rho_- \int_{|\xi| < r_0/2} \phi(x - y + \xi) \phi(\xi) d\xi \geq \rho_- c_0^2 c(n, r_0).$$

Thus,

$$(114) \quad \rho_{\phi\phi}(x, y) \geq c_1 \rho_- \mathbb{1}_{|x-y| < r_0/2}.$$

With this at hand we have

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \geq c_0 \rho_- \int_{|x-y| < r_0/2} |u_F(x) - u_F(y)|^2 dx dy$$

by [LS19b, Lemma 2.1],

$$\geq c_1 \rho_- \int_{\Omega} |u_F - \text{Ave}(u_F)|^2 dx \geq c_2 \rho_- \int_{\Omega} \rho_{\phi} |u_F - \text{Ave}(u_F)|^2 dx.$$

Using the vanishing momentum, $\text{Ave}((u\rho)_{\phi}) = 0$, we continue

$$= c_2 c \int_{\Omega} \rho_{\phi} |u_F|^2 dx - \underbrace{2 \text{Ave}(u_F) \cdot \text{Ave}((u\rho)_{\phi})}_{=0} + (2\pi)^n |\text{Ave}(u_F)|^2.$$

Noting that $\int_{\Omega} \rho_{\phi} |u_F|^2 dx = \mathcal{E}_1$, we conclude

$$\geq c_2 \rho_- \mathcal{E}_1.$$

So, we have a bound

$$(115) \quad \varepsilon \geq c \rho_-,$$

for some $c > 0$ depending only on the parameters of the model.

We obtain the following improvement over the general root-result of Corollary 4.6.

Corollary 4.17. *Under the \mathcal{M}_{ϕ} -averaging protocol a solution to the kinetic equation (61) aligns if $\rho_- \gtrsim \frac{1}{t}$.*

Let us note that under this weak assumption on the density the only known alignment result was established in [ST20b] for singular topological models. And in 1D it was proved to hold automatically for any non-vacuous solutions to the Euler-Alignment system (257) based on the metric or topological Cucker-Smale averaging protocol. For the system based on the \mathcal{M}_{ϕ} -model such a bound is unknown a priori.

Example 4.18 (\mathcal{M}_{CS} -model). We assume that, $\phi = \psi * \psi$, where ψ is a non-negative smooth kernel satisfying

$$(116) \quad \psi(x) \geq c_0 \mathbb{1}_{|x| \leq r_0}.$$

Then the Cucker-Smale model becomes ball-positive according to (60). Let us apply the low energy method. We aim to prove the following bound:

$$(117) \quad \varepsilon \gtrsim \rho_-^3.$$

Let us note that if used in conjunction with Proposition 4.9 and the fact that $s \geq \rho_-$, this gives a weaker result, $\rho_- \gtrsim 1/t^{1/4}$ on the torus, where we already know the better root-result of Corollary 4.6. The purpose of (117) will be primarily in the application to relaxation, where a ρ_+ -independent estimate is crucial.

To prove (117) we will quantify the alignment term \mathcal{A}_1 in a way similar to the previous example. To achieve this we notice that for the Bochner-positive ϕ the \mathcal{M}_{CS} -averaging is nothing but a nested application of two distinct Favre filtrations. Indeed, let us denote

$$(118) \quad v = \frac{(u\rho)_\psi}{\rho_\psi}, \quad \varrho = \rho_\psi.$$

Then denoting $v_{\text{F}} = \frac{(v\varrho)_\psi}{\varrho_\psi}$, the filtration of v relative to ψ, ϱ , we obtain

$$(119) \quad [u]_\rho = \frac{(u\rho)_\phi}{\rho_\phi} = \frac{((u\rho)_\psi)_\psi}{\varrho_\psi} = \frac{\left(\frac{(u\rho)_\psi}{\rho_\psi} \rho_\psi\right)_\psi}{\varrho_\psi} = v_{\text{F}}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \int_{\Omega} (u\rho)_\psi^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} |[u]_\rho|^2 \rho \rho_\phi dx = \int_{\Omega} |v|^2 \varrho \rho_\psi dx - \int_{\Omega} |v_{\text{F}}|^2 \rho \varrho_\psi dx.$$

Let us examine the second term now: $|v_{\text{F}}|^2 \rho \varrho_\psi$. We use the fact that the Favre-filtration with respect to ψ, ϱ is a symmetric operation relative to the measure $\varrho \varrho_\psi$. So, we can write

$$\int_{\Omega} |v_{\text{F}}|^2 \rho \varrho_\psi dx = \int_{\Omega} v_{\text{F}} \cdot \left(v_{\text{F}} \frac{\rho}{\varrho}\right) \varrho \varrho_\psi dx = \int_{\Omega} v \cdot \left(v_{\text{F}} \frac{\rho}{\varrho}\right)_{\text{F}} \varrho \varrho_\psi dx = \int_{\Omega} v \cdot (v_{\text{F}} \rho)_\psi \varrho dx.$$

Now let us factor out the common $v \varrho$ term:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \int_{\Omega} \varrho v \cdot (\rho_\psi v - (v_{\text{F}} \rho)_\psi) dx = \int_{\Omega^2} \varrho(x) \rho(y) v(x) \cdot (v(x) - v_{\text{F}}(y)) \psi(x-y) dy dx$$

expanding further in $v_{\text{F}}(y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\Omega^2} \frac{\varrho(x) \rho(y)}{\varrho_\psi(y)} v(x) \cdot (v(x) \varrho_\psi(y) - (v \varrho)_\psi(y)) \psi(x-y) dy dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega^3} \frac{\varrho(x) \rho(y) \varrho(z)}{\varrho_\psi(y)} v(x) \cdot (v(x) - v(z)) \psi(z-y) \psi(x-y) dz dy dx \end{aligned}$$

symmetrizing in x, z ,

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^3} \frac{\varrho(x) \rho(y) \varrho(z)}{\varrho_\psi(y)} |v(x) - v(z)|^2 \psi(z-y) \psi(x-y) dz dy dx.$$

Notice that the integral in y represents the application of the variable doubling convolution to ρ/ρ_ϕ as in (113) using kernel ψ . So we obtain the following exact formula for \mathcal{A}_1 :

$$(120) \quad \mathcal{A}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^2} \varrho(x) \varrho(z) \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi}\right)_{\psi\psi}(x, z) |v(x) - v(z)|^2 dz dx.$$

Since $\rho_\phi \leq c_1$ pointwise, we have $\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_\phi}\right)_{\psi\psi} \geq c_1 \rho_\psi$, and the latter is estimated via (114) by $c_1 \rho_- \mathbb{1}_{|x-z| < r_0/2}$. So,

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \gtrsim \rho_- \int_{|x-z| < r_0/2} \varrho(x) \varrho(z) |v(x) - v(z)|^2 dz dx \gtrsim \rho_-^3 \int_{|x-z| < r_0/2} |v(x) - v(z)|^2 dz dx$$

proceeding as in Example 4.16,

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \rho_-^3 \int_{\Omega} |v(x) - \text{Ave}(v)|^2 dx \gtrsim \rho_-^3 \int_{\Omega} \varrho |v(x) - \text{Ave}(v)|^2 dx \\ &\geq \rho_-^3 \int_{\Omega} \varrho |v(x)|^2 dx = \rho_-^3 \int_{\Omega} \frac{(u\rho)_\psi^2}{\rho_\psi} dx \gtrsim \rho_-^3 \int_{\Omega} (u\rho)_\psi^2 dx = \rho_-^3 \mathcal{E}_1. \end{aligned}$$

We arrive at the desired (117).

Example 4.19 (\mathcal{M}_{seg} -model). Since this model is symmetric and non-negative definite it is automatically ball-positive by Lemma 3.8. So, it is natural to apply the low-energy approach. Our goal is to prove the following bound

$$(121) \quad \varepsilon \gtrsim \rho_-^{2L}.$$

We start with the analogue (113) which in this case reads

$$(122) \quad \mathcal{A}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l,l'} \rho(g_l g_{l'}) \left| \frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} - \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\rho(g_{l'})} \right|^2.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= \sum_l \frac{(\rho(ug_l))^2}{\rho(g_l)} - \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_l g_l \frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} \right)^2 \rho \, dx \\ &= \sum_l \frac{(\rho(ug_l))^2}{\rho(g_l)} - \sum_{l,l'} \rho(g_l g_{l'}) \frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\rho(g_{l'})} \\ &= \sum_l \rho(ug_l) \left(\frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} - \sum_{l'} \frac{\rho(g_l g_{l'})}{\rho(g_l)} \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\rho(g_{l'})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

noting that the coefficients $\frac{\rho(g_l g_{l'})}{\rho(g_l)}$ add up to 1 over l' ,

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_l \rho(ug_l) \sum_{l'} \frac{\rho(g_l g_{l'})}{\rho(g_l)} \left(\frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} - \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\rho(g_{l'})} \right) \\ &= \sum_{l,l'} \rho(g_l g_{l'}) \frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} \left(\frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} - \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\rho(g_{l'})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

symmetrizing over l, l' ,

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l,l'} \rho(g_l g_{l'}) \left| \frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\rho(g_l)} - \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\rho(g_{l'})} \right|^2.$$

The formula indicates that the energy keeps dissipating as long as discrepancies remain between local averages in adjacent and connected neighborhoods, $\rho(g_l g_{l'}) > 0$. To extract a working criterion out of it, we rewrite \mathcal{A}_1 in a different way:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \sum_l \frac{(\rho(ug_l))^2}{\rho(g_l)} - \sum_{l,l'} G_{ll'} \frac{\rho(ug_l)}{\sqrt{\rho(g_l)}} \frac{\rho(ug_{l'})}{\sqrt{\rho(g_{l'})}},$$

where

$$G_{ll'} = \frac{\rho(g_l g_{l'})}{\sqrt{\rho(g_l) \rho(g_{l'})}}.$$

Considering those as entries of the symmetric matrix $G = \{G_{ll'}\}_{l,l'=1}^L$ and denoting the vector

$$X = \left(\frac{\rho(ug_1)}{\sqrt{\rho(g_1)}}, \dots, \frac{\rho(ug_L)}{\sqrt{\rho(g_L)}} \right),$$

the above expression can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = |X|^2 - \langle GX, X \rangle.$$

The vanishing momentum condition means that the vector X belongs to the hyperplane orthogonal to the vector of roots $Y = (\sqrt{\rho(g_1)}, \dots, \sqrt{\rho(g_L)})$, denoted Y^\perp . Such plane remains invariant under the action of G , while $GY = Y$. So, the low-energy bound (110) becomes equivalent to the spectral gap condition on G :

$$(123) \quad \text{spec}\{G; Y^\perp\} \leq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

It is not easy, however, to compute the spectrum of G exactly. A more practical approach to (123) would be to find a condition on the entries of G that implies a bound like (123). To this end, let us assume that non-zero entries are uniformly bounded from below, i.e. the neighborhoods have ‘populated intersections’:

$$(124) \quad \rho(g_l g_{l'}) \geq \delta \sqrt{\rho(g_l) \rho(g_{l'})}, \quad \forall l, l' : \text{supp } g_l \cap \text{supp } g_{l'} \neq \emptyset,$$

for some $\delta > 0$.

Under this condition let us consider the eigenvalue problem

$$(1 - \varepsilon)X = GX, \quad X \cdot Y = 0.$$

Renormalizing $X = (X_1, \dots, X_L)$ via $x_l = \frac{X_l}{\sqrt{\rho(g_l)}}$ we obtain the system

$$(125) \quad (1 - \varepsilon)x_l = \sum_{l' : \text{supp } g_{l'} \cap \text{supp } g_l \neq \emptyset} \frac{\rho(g_{l'} g_l)}{\rho(g_l)} x_{l'}.$$

Note that the sum on the right represents a convex combination of coordinates.

Denote $x^+ = x_{l^+}$ the positive maximal and $x^- = x_{l^-}$ the negative minimal values. Since $X \in Y^\perp$, those must be strictly signed. Since g 's form a partition of unity, there is a sequence of indexes $l^+ = l_0, l_1, \dots, l_p = l^-$ with $p \leq L$ such that $\text{supp } g_{l_i} \cap \text{supp } g_{l_{i+1}} \neq \emptyset$. Let us start with (125) at $l = l_0$. Then l_1 is one of the neighbors. We can assume without loss of generality that $x_{l_1} < x^+$ for otherwise, we relabel and start with the first index l_1 having this property.

We leave the l_1 -term unchanged, and estimate rest of x 's by x^+ to obtain

$$(1 - \varepsilon)x^+ \leq \left(1 - \frac{\rho(g_{l_0} g_{l_1})}{\rho(g_{l_0})}\right) x^+ + \frac{\rho(g_{l_0} g_{l_1})}{\rho(g_{l_0})} x_{l_1}.$$

Solving for x_{l_1} we obtain

$$x_{l_1} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\frac{\rho(g_{l_0} g_{l_1})}{\rho(g_{l_0})}}\right) x^+.$$

Since $x_{l_1} < x^+$ it implies in particular that $\varepsilon > 0$. It also follows from (124) that $\frac{\rho(g_{l_0} g_{l_1})}{\rho(g_{l_0})} \geq \delta^2$ and hence,

$$x_{l_1} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2}\right) x^+.$$

By the same computation centered this time at x_{l_1} and with ε reset to $\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^2}$ we obtain

$$x_{l_2} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^4}\right) x^+.$$

Continuing the process to the last term we obtain

$$x^- \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^{2p}}\right) x^+ \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta^{2L}}\right) x^+.$$

Recalling that $x^- < 0$, it implies $\varepsilon \geq \delta^{2L}$. Thus, the spectral gap is estimated to be at least

$$(126) \quad \varepsilon = \delta^{2L}.$$

It remains to observe that $\delta \gtrsim \rho_-$. Indeed, if the supports of g_l and $g_{l'}$ overlap, we have using that $\rho(g_l) \leq 1$,

$$\frac{\rho(g_l g_{l'})}{\sqrt{\rho(g_l) \rho(g_{l'})}} \geq |\text{supp}(g_l) \cap \text{supp}(g_{l'})| \rho_- \geq c \rho_-.$$

5. DETERMINISTIC MEAN-FIELD LIMIT

In this section we consider either the periodic or open environments $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}^n$.

$$(127) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_i = v_i \\ \dot{v}_i = s_i([v]_i - v_i) \end{cases} \quad i = 1 \dots N.$$

The well-posedness of the system is ensured by local Lipschitzness of the right hand side. This can be achieved under the following general regularity assumptions on the kinematic strength and the weighted average:

$$(locLip1) \quad |s_{\rho'}(x') - s_{\rho''}(x'')| \leq c_1 W_1(\rho', \rho'') + c_2 |x' - x''|,$$

$$(locLip2) \quad |s_{\rho'}(x') [u']_{\rho'}(x') - s_{\rho''}(x'') [u'']_{\rho''}(x'')| \leq c_3 W_1(\rho', \rho'') + c_4 W_1(u' \rho', u'' \rho'') + c_5 |x' - x''|,$$

for all $\|u'\|_\infty, \|u''\|_\infty \leq A$, $|x'|, |x''| \leq D$, and $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ with $\text{supp } \rho' \cup \text{supp } \rho'' \subset B_D(0)$, and where all c_1, \dots, c_5 depend only on A, D . Here and throughout W_1 denotes the classical Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric

$$(128) \quad W_1(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\text{Lip}(g) \leq 1} \left| \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(\omega) d\mu(\omega) - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(\omega) d\nu(\omega) \right|.$$

In view of (locLip1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &= s_i(x_1, \dots, x_N) = s_{\sum_j m_j \delta_{x_j}}(x_i), \\ |s_i(x'_1, \dots, x'_N) - s_i(x''_1, \dots, x''_N)| &= \left| s_{\sum_j m_j \delta_{x'_j}}(x'_i) - s_{\sum_j m_j \delta_{x''_j}}(x''_i) \right| \\ &\leq c_1 W_1 \left(\sum_j m_j \delta_{x'_j}, \sum_j m_j \delta_{x''_j} \right) + c_2 |x'_i - x''_i| \\ &\leq c_1 \sum_j m_j |x'_j - x''_j| + c_2 |x'_i - x''_i| \leq c \max_j |x'_j - x''_j|. \end{aligned}$$

And for

$$s_i[v]_i = s_{\sum_j m_j \delta_{x_j}}(x_i) \left[\sum_j v_j \mathbb{1}_{x_j} \right]_{\sum_j m_j \delta_{x_j}}(x_i) := g_i(x_1, \dots, x_N, v_1, \dots, v_N),$$

we have by (locLip2)

$$\begin{aligned} &|g_i(x'_1, \dots, x'_N, v'_1, \dots, v'_N) - g_i(x''_1, \dots, x''_N, v''_1, \dots, v''_N)| \\ &\leq c_3 W_1 \left(\sum_j m_j \delta_{x'_j}, \sum_j m_j \delta_{x''_j} \right) + c_4 W_1 \left(\sum_j v'_j m_j \delta_{x'_j}, \sum_j v''_j m_j \delta_{x''_j} \right) + c_5 |x'_i - x''_i| \\ &\lesssim \sum_j m_j |x'_j - x''_j| + \sum_j m_j |v'_j - v''_j| + |x'_i - x''_i| \lesssim \max_j (|v'_j - v''_j| + |x'_j - x''_j|). \end{aligned}$$

Then by a priori bound $A(t) := \max_i |v_i(t)| \leq A(0)$, and $|x_i| \leq c_0 + tA(0)$. The standard Picard iteration ensures global well-posedness of (127).

Let us now consider the Vlasov-Alignment equation

$$(129) \quad f_t + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \nabla_v (s_\rho(v - [u]_\rho) f),$$

where

$$\rho(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v) dv, \quad u\rho(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v f(x, v) dv.$$

We will focus for a moment on the measure-valued solutions with bounded support. The latter is not necessary but certainly sufficient for all our future discussion and it simplifies some of the technical issues considerably.

Definition 5.1. Suppose (locLip1), (locLip2) hold. We say that $\{\mu_t\}_{0 \leq t < T} \in C_{w^*}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(B_R))$ is a measure-valued solution to (129) with initial condition μ_0 if for any test-function $g \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ one has, for all $0 < t < T$,

$$(130) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(t, x, v) d\mu_t(x, v) &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(0, x, v) d\mu_0(x, v) \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\partial_s g + v \cdot \nabla_x g + s_{\rho_s}([u_s]_{\rho_s} - v) \cdot \nabla_v g) d\mu_s(x, v) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that both $s_{\rho_s}(x)$ and $[u_s]_{\rho_s}(x)$ are bounded and continuous functions in (s, x) under the standing assumptions. So, the above space-time integral makes sense.

The crucial and elementary observation is of course that the empirical measure

$$(131) \quad \mu_t^N = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i(t)} \otimes \delta_{v_i(t)},$$

satisfies (130) if and only if $\{(x_i, v_i)\}_i$ satisfy (127). So, we have a wealth of solutions to work with automatically. Now the question becomes do they converge at any time t to a smooth solution of (129) if they do so initially.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is a material model satisfying (locLip1), (locLip2). Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ be any measure with compact support. Then for any $T > 0$ there exists a unique measure-valued solution $\{\mu_t\}_{0 \leq t < T} \in C_w^*([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(B_R(T)))$ to (129) which can be reconstructed from solutions to (127) as follows. Let all $(x_i^0, v_i^0) \in \mathcal{O}$, where \mathcal{O} is some fixed neighborhood of $\text{supp } \mu_0$ and such that $\mu_0^N \rightarrow \mu_0$ weakly. Then $\mu_t^N \rightarrow \mu_t$ weakly uniformly on $[0, T]$.*

The theorem will be proved via a Lagrangian approach using the transport structure of (129). To this end, we introduce the characteristic flow

$$(132) \quad \frac{d}{dt} X(t, s, x, v) = V(t, s, x, v), \quad X(s, s, x, v) = x,$$

$$(133) \quad \frac{d}{dt} V(t, s, x, v) = s_{\rho}(X)([u]_{\rho}(X) - V), \quad V(s, s, x, v) = v.$$

We also denote $X(t, 0, x, v) = X(t, x, v)$, $V(t, 0, x, v) = V(t, x, v)$, and $(x, v) = \omega$. Note that the right hand side of (133) is Lipschitz in (X, V) , so the flow is well-defined on $[0, T]$. Define the test-function $g(s, \omega) = h(X(t, s, \omega), V(t, s, \omega))$ for some $h \in C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, for which we have

$$\partial_s g + v \cdot \nabla_x g + s_{\rho}([u]_{\rho} - v) \cdot \nabla_v g = 0.$$

So, plugging it into (130) we obtain

$$(134) \quad \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(\omega) d\mu_t(\omega) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(X(t, \omega), V(t, \omega)) d\mu_0(\omega).$$

This means that μ_t is a *push-forward* of the initial measure μ_0 along the flow-map (X, V) , $\mu_t = (X, V)\# \mu_0$.

The proof of the mean-field limit consists of two steps: establishing control over the deformation $(\nabla X, \nabla V)$ on a given time interval, and proving Lipschitzness of the push-forward map in the W_1 -metric.

So, let us assume that on a time interval $[0, T]$ we have a solution $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(B_R)$, i.e. the supports of μ_t are all restricted to a ball of radius R . Let us observe that $\|u(t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\text{supp } \rho(t))} \leq \|V(t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\text{supp } \mu_0)}$, and hence, since the model is material, $\|[u]_{\rho}\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq \|V(t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\text{supp } \mu_0)}$. Therefore the maximum principle applies to v -characteristics: for any compact domain \mathcal{O} such that $\text{supp } \mu_0 \subset \mathcal{O}$, one has

$$(135) \quad \|V(t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} \leq \max_{(x,v) \in \mathcal{O}} |v| \leq \text{diam } \mathcal{O}.$$

Let us fix a compact domain \mathcal{O} with $\text{supp } \mu_0 \subset \mathcal{O}$. Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla X\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} \leq \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})}.$$

Next,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \nabla V \leq \nabla X^{\top} \nabla (s_{\rho} [u]_{\rho})(X) + \nabla X^{\top} \nabla s_{\rho}(X) V + s_{\rho}(X) \nabla V,$$

so, in view of (ev4), (135), and (locLip1), (locLip2), we obtain the inequality up to a constant depending only on $R, m, \mathcal{O}, \bar{S}$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} \leq \|\nabla X\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})}.$$

We thus conclude that

$$(136) \quad \sup_{[0, T]} \|\nabla X\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathcal{O})} \leq C(R, m, \mathcal{O}, T).$$

Let us now proceed to continuity estimates. Let us fix two measures $\mu'_t, \mu''_t \in \mathcal{P}(B_R)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. We also fix a common initial domain \mathcal{O} , $\text{supp } \mu'_0 \cup \text{supp } \mu''_0 \subset \mathcal{O}$. Clearly,

$$(137) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} \leq \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}.$$

For velocities we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} (V' - V'') = s_{\rho'}(X') [u']_{\rho'}(X') - s_{\rho''}(X'') [u'']_{\rho''}(X'') + s_{\rho''}(X'') V'' - s_{\rho'}(X') V'.$$

So,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} \lesssim W_1(\rho', \rho'') + W_1(u' \rho', u'' \rho'') + \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

But for any $\|g\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} g(x) (d\rho'_t - d\rho''_t) &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(x) (d\mu'_t - d\mu''_t) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(X') d\mu'_0 - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(X'') d\mu''_0 \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(X') (d\mu'_0 - d\mu''_0) + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (g(X') - g(X'')) d\mu'_0 \\ &\leq \|\nabla X'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0) + \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

In view of (136) we conclude that

$$(138) \quad W_1(\rho'_t, \rho''_t) \lesssim W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0) + \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Similarly, for any $\|g\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} g(x) (d(u' \rho'_t) - d(u'' \rho''_t)) &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(x) v (d\mu'_t - d\mu''_t) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(X') V' d\mu'_0 - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(X'') V'' d\mu''_0 \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g(X') V' (d\mu'_0 - d\mu''_0) + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (g(X') V' - g(X'') V'') d\mu'_0 \\ &\leq (\text{diam } \mathcal{O} \|\nabla X'\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \|\nabla V'\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}) W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0) \\ &\quad + m \text{diam } \mathcal{O} \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (136) we conclude that

$$(139) \quad W_1(u' \rho', u'' \rho'') \lesssim W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0) + \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} \lesssim W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0) + \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}.$$

Combining with (137) we conclude that

$$(140) \quad \|X' - X''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|V' - V''\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} \leq C(R, T) W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0).$$

Let us now fix a function h with $\text{Lip}(h) \leq 1$, and use the transport identity (134):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(\omega) d\mu'_t - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(\omega) d\mu''_t &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(X', V') d\mu'_0 - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(X'', V'') d\mu''_0 \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(X', V') (d\mu'_0 - d\mu''_0) + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} [h(X', V') - h(X'', V'')] d\mu'_0 \\ &\leq \text{Lip}_{\mathcal{O}}(h(X', V')) W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0) + \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that

$$\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{O}}(h(X', V')) \leq \|\nabla V'\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} + \|\nabla X'\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})},$$

and applying (136), (140) we conclude the following bounds

$$(141) \quad W_1(\mu'_t, \mu''_t) \leq C(R, \mathcal{O}, T) W_1(\mu'_0, \mu''_0).$$

This immediately implies uniqueness of measure-valued solutions.

So, we start now with an arbitrary measure μ_0 , and approximate it weakly with a sequence of empirical measures

$$(142) \quad \mu_0^N = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i} \otimes \delta_{v_i},$$

with all $(x_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{O}$, where \mathcal{O} is some fixed neighborhood of $\text{supp } \mu_0$. Then let us run the agent-based alignment model alignment (127). For any time T , we have $\text{supp } \mu_t^N \subset B_{|\mathcal{O}|+TA_0} \times B_{A_0}$, $t < T$. Thus, according to (141), μ_t^N is weakly Cauchy, and hence $\mu_t^N \rightarrow \mu_t$ for some μ_t . To finish the proof Theorem 5.2 we now prove a short lemma showing that the limit solves the Vlasov-alignment equation weakly.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose a sequence of solutions $\mu^N \in C_{w^*}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(B_R))$ converges weakly pointwise, i.e. $\mu_t^N \rightarrow \mu_t$ for all $0 \leq t < T$. Then $\mu \in C_{w^*}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(B_R))$ is a weak solution to (129).*

Proof. The weak*-continuity of the limit will follow immediately from (130) once it is established. Clearly, all the linear terms in (130) converge to their natural limits. As to the force let us note for any $s < T$, we have (by computations done above)

$$W_1(\rho_s^N, \rho_s^M) + W_1(u_s^N \rho_s^N, u_s^M \rho_s^M) \leq CW_1(\mu_s^N, \mu_s^M) \leq CW_1(\mu_0^N, \mu_0^M),$$

since both are solutions to the Vlasov-alignment equation. Sending $M \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain

$$W_1(\rho_s^N, \rho_s) + W_1(u_s^N \rho_s^N, u_s \rho_s) \leq CW_1(\mu_0^N, \mu_0),$$

which by continuity (locLip1), (locLip2) implies that

$$\|s_{\rho_s^N}([u_s^N]_{\rho_s^N} - v) - s_{\rho_s}([u_s]_{\rho_s} - v)\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly in s . Together with the weak convergence assumed for μ_s^N we obtain

$$\int_0^t \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (s_{\rho_s^N}([u_s^N]_{\rho_s^N} - v)) d\mu_s^N(x, v) ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (s_{\rho_s}([u_s]_{\rho_s} - v)) d\mu_s(x, v) ds.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Remark 5.4. Finally, let us take a note on the implementation of Theorem 5.2 to global well-posedness of smooth solutions. Since all solutions are transported according to (134) regularity of a solution will depend on the regularity of initial data and the parameters of the model. First, let us notice that the Jacobian of the characteristic map, by the Liouville formula, is given by

$$\det \nabla_\omega(X, V)(t, \omega) = \exp \left\{ -n \int_0^t s_\rho(X(s, \omega)) ds \right\}.$$

Then if $\mu_0 = f_0 d\omega$, with $f_0 \in \text{Lip}$ and compactly supported, then for any $t > 0$,

$$(143) \quad f(t, X(t, \omega), V(t, \omega)) = f_0(\omega) \exp \left\{ n \int_0^t s_\rho(X(s, \omega)) ds \right\}.$$

Inverting the flow and noting that (X, V) and s_ρ are Lipschitz implies $f \in \text{Lip}$ at all times.

By the same token, any higher regularity of the model \mathcal{M} and f_0 implies the same for f at any later time.

5.1. Examples and Applications. Let us discuss how the mean-field limit applies to some of our models in the list.

Condition (locLip1) essentially contains two requirements – Lipschitzness and W_1 -continuity with respect to ρ . In those case when $s_\rho = 1$ or $= \rho_\phi$, its verification is trivial and holds unconditionally for all smooth kernels ϕ . For the \mathcal{M}_β -model we have $s_\rho = \rho_\phi^\beta$, and so the Lipschitzness holds if

$$\nabla s_\rho = \frac{\rho \nabla \phi}{\rho_\phi^{1-\beta}}$$

is bounded, i.e. $\rho_\phi > c$. This is not possible for all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ unless ϕ is not a local kernel:

$$(144) \quad \phi(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

In this case the W_1 -continuity also follows: for any $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{P}(B_D(0))$ we have

$$|s_{\rho'}(x) - s_{\rho''}(x)| = |\rho'_\phi(x) - \rho''_\phi(x)|c,$$

where $c \in [(\rho'_\phi(x))^{\beta-1}, (\rho''_\phi(x))^{\beta-1}]$. In view of (144) the latter is a bounded interval, and the W_1 -continuity follows.

If a model possesses a reproducing kernel ϕ_ρ , then (locLip2) reduces to verifying the following regularity conditions

$$(145) \quad \|\nabla_{x,y}\phi_\rho\|_\infty \leq c_1, \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{P}(B_D(0)),$$

$$(146) \quad \|\phi_{\rho'} - \phi_{\rho''}\|_\infty \leq c_2 W_1(\rho', \rho''), \quad \forall \rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{P}(B_D(0)).$$

Indeed, the first one implies Lipschitzness directly. Using the second we obtain

$$(147) \quad \begin{aligned} |s_{\rho'}(x)[u']_{\rho'}(x) - s_{\rho''}(x)[u'']_{\rho''}(x)| &= \left| \int_\Omega \phi_{\rho'}(x,y)u''(y) d\rho'(y) - \int_\Omega \phi_{\rho''}(x,y)u''(y) d\rho''(y) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_\Omega \phi_{\rho'}(x,y)u'(y) d\rho'(y) - \int_\Omega \phi_{\rho'}(x,y)u''(y) d\rho''(y) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_\Omega \phi_{\rho'}(x,y)u''(y) d\rho''(y) - \int_\Omega \phi_{\rho''}(x,y)u''(y) d\rho''(y) \right| \\ &\leq c_1 W_1(u', u'') + c_2 W_1(\rho', \rho'') \|u''\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider specific examples.

For \mathcal{M}_{CS} , (145) and (146) are trivial as well as (locLip1). The Motsch-Tadmor model \mathcal{M}_{MT} and \mathcal{M}_β require (144) to fulfill (145) - (146). The mollified \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model verifies Lipschitzness directly

$$|\nabla[u]_\rho| = \left| \left(\frac{(u\rho)\phi}{\rho\phi} \right)_{\nabla\phi} \right| \leq \|\nabla\phi\|_\infty \|u\|_\infty.$$

However, the W_1 -continuity requires a lower support $\rho_\phi > c$. So, the non-degeneracy (144) is still necessary.

As for the segregation model \mathcal{M}_{seg} the Lipschitzness follows directly as well from the smoothness of the partition functions g_l . The W_1 -continuity requires $\rho(g_l) > c$ for all l and $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^n)$. This puts restriction on the partition itself. In fact, we need spreadout neighborhoods

$$(148) \quad \text{supp } g_l = \mathbb{T}^n, \quad l = 1, \dots, L.$$

Technically this makes the model not localized, however this can be mitigated by putting most of the weights of g_l 's on particular neighborhoods they are supposed to represent.

Let us summarize.

Corollary 5.5. *The \mathcal{M}_{CS} -model fulfills the mean-field limit requirements unconditionally. The \mathcal{M}_{MT} , \mathcal{M}_β , and \mathcal{M}_ϕ -models require non-degeneracy of communication (144). The \mathcal{M}_{seg} -model requires (148).*

6. STOCHASTIC MEAN-FIELD LIMIT

As discussed in Section 4.1 one of the main obstacles for alignment on the torus \mathbb{T}^n is existence of ‘‘locked states’’: solutions with agents locked on periodic orbits that stay at a positive distance greater than the communication length scale r_0 . One way to disrupt such solutions is to introduce a stochastic noise

$$(149) \quad \begin{aligned} dx_i &= v_i dt \\ dv_i &= s_i([v]_i - v_i) dt + \sqrt{2\sigma s_i} dB_i, \end{aligned}$$

where B_i 's are independent Brownian motions in \mathbb{R}^n . Note that the noise here is assumed to be ‘material’, i.e. it places stochasticity only within the influence of the flock. As $N \rightarrow \infty$ and assuming that the agents are indistinguishable, i.e. $m_1 = \dots = m_N = \frac{1}{N}$, the system comes in natural correspondence with what we call the *Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation*

$$(150) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \sigma s_\rho \Delta_v f + \nabla_v \cdot (s_\rho (v - [u]_\rho) f).$$

A major advantage of using material noise is that the kinetic model (150) possesses a family of thermodynamic equilibria

$$(151) \quad \mu_{\sigma, \bar{u}} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|(2\pi\sigma)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|v-\bar{u}|^2}{2\sigma}}.$$

If the underlying model \mathcal{M} is conservative every solution is centered around the constant averaged momentum \bar{u} , which predetermines the corresponding equilibrium and opens a possibility for potential relaxation towards that distribution. The collective behavior interpretation of this result would say that, as expected, the noise disrupts the locked states and redistributes initial velocities symmetrically around the mean value \bar{u} . Alignment is then restored in the sense of the vanishing noise limit:

$$(152) \quad \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f^\sigma(t) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \delta_{v=\bar{u}} \otimes dx.$$

The problem of relaxation and hypocoercivity will be discussed in Section 8. In this section we provide a rigorous derivation of equation (150) as a mean-field limit of solutions to the stochastic system (149).

Let us consider a classical smooth solution f to (150) on a time interval $[0, T]$ with initial distribution f_0 . This solution can be reconstructed as a mean-field limit of the corresponding solutions to the agent-based stochastic system (149) as follows. Consider N independent identically distributed random variables (x_i^0, v_i^0) , $i \leq N$, with $f_0 = \text{law}(x_i^0, v_i^0)$. Form the empirical measure-valued random variables

$$\mu_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i(t)} \otimes \delta_{v_i(t)}.$$

Then for all $t \leq T$, we have $\mu_t^N \rightarrow f_t$ in law, i.e. for any Lipschitz function h on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(153) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(x_i(t), v_i(t)) - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(x, v) f(t, x, v) dx dv \right|^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $f dx dv$ in this context is considered as a constant random measure.

In general, the convergence (153) is equivalent to propagation of chaos, see Sznitman [Szn91]: if f^N denotes the joint probability distribution of the process $(x_1, v_1, \dots, x_N, v_N)$ solving (149), then for any $k \geq 1$, the k -th marginal $f^{(k)}$ converges weakly to the product of k copies of f , $f^{\otimes k}$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(154) \quad \langle f^N, \varphi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi_k \otimes 1 \otimes \dots \otimes 1 \rangle \rightarrow \prod_{j=1}^k \langle f, \varphi_j \rangle, \quad \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^{2nk}).$$

The strategy of proving (153) is based on the classical coupling method. Note that if (x_i, v_i) 's were independent and identically distributed by f , then (153) would have been nothing but the Law of Large Numbers. So, to achieve the limit we couple (149) with another system of separate N copies of the characteristic processes for (150):

$$(155) \quad \begin{aligned} d\bar{x}_i &= \bar{v}_i dt \\ d\bar{v}_i &= s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)([u]_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - \bar{v}_i) dt + \sqrt{2\sigma s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)} dB_i, \end{aligned}$$

with initial condition (x_i^0, v_i^0) . Here, ρ and u are the macroscopic values of f . Note that because the equations are decoupled, the pairs (x_i, v_i) remain independent and identically distributed. By the Itô formula, f is their common law.

To establish (153) one can add and subtract the intermediate average of h with $\bar{x}_i(t), \bar{v}_i(t)$ pairs:

$$(156) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(x_i(t), v_i(t)) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} h(x, v) f(t, x, v) dx dv \right|^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(x_i(t), v_i(t)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(\bar{x}_i(t), \bar{v}_i(t)) \right|^2 \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(\bar{x}_i(t), \bar{v}_i(t)) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} h(x, v) f(t, x, v) dx dv \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second term goes to zero by the Law of Large Numbers, while the first can be estimated using symmetry by

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(x_i(t), v_i(t)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(\bar{x}_i(t), \bar{v}_i(t)) \right|^2 \leq \|\nabla h\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[|x_1 - \bar{x}_1|^2 + |v_1 - \bar{v}_1|^2].$$

So the proof of (153) reduces to obtaining control over separation of characteristics:

$$(157) \quad E(t) = \mathbb{E}[|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 + |v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2] \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

This approach was carried out by Bolley, et al., [BCnC11] in the case of convolution-type alignment systems and with additive noise (no strength s_ρ prefactor). We now provide a proper extension that includes general environmental averaging models and material noise as stated.

Let us also note, following [BCnC11], that a bound on (157) entails a bound on the rate of decorrelation $f^{(k)} \rightarrow f^{\otimes k}$. Indeed,

$$W_2^2(f^{(k)}, f^{\otimes k}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^k |x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 + |v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2 \right] = kE(t) \rightarrow 0.$$

where W_2 is the Wasserstein-2 distance.

6.1. Assumptions. Let us list a few assumptions on the model \mathcal{M} itself that will be needed to carry out the proof. The first three assumptions are a somewhat stronger versions of (locLip1), (locLip2). In the stochastic case, solutions to (149) or (155) are inherently unbounded, so we no longer can rely on the maximum principle and local regularity. For the strength function s_ρ itself we assume the same regularity: $\forall \rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$,

$$(Lip1) \quad |s_{\rho'}(x') - s_{\rho''}(x'')| \leq c_1 W_1(\rho', \rho'') + c_2 |x' - x''|,$$

but with absolute c_1, c_2 . For the alignment we make two separate regularity assumptions with explicit dependance on u . First, we assume that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ there exists a probability measure dP_ρ absolutely continuous with respect to $d\rho$ such that for any bounded u

$$(Lip2) \quad |s_\rho(x') [u]_\rho(x') - s_\rho(x'') [u]_\rho(x'')| \leq c_3 (|x' - x''| \wedge 1) \int_\Omega |u| dP_\rho.$$

Here and thereafter \wedge denotes minimum while \vee denotes maximum. Second, we assume a somewhat more stringent condition on continuity in ρ, u : for any $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, $u' \in L^2_{\rho'}$, $u'' \in L^2_{\rho''}$,

$$(Lip3) \quad \|s_{\rho'} [u']_{\rho'} - s_{\rho''} [u'']_{\rho''}\|_\infty \leq c_4 (\|u'\|_{L^2_{\rho'}} \vee 1) BL(\rho', \rho'') + c_5 BL(u' \rho', u'' \rho'').$$

Here BL stands for the Bounded Lipschitz distance,

$$BL(\mu', \mu'') = \sup_{\|g\|_\infty \leq 1, \|g\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} \left| \int_\Omega g d\mu' - \int_\Omega g d\mu'' \right|.$$

The next two assumptions essentially state that the strength function and the averaging operator of our model \mathcal{M} is compatible with the law of large numbers (153). Namely, we assume

$$(LLN1) \quad \alpha_N = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}} \int_{\Omega^N} |s_{\rho^N}(y_i) - s_\rho(y_i)|^2 d\rho(y_1) \dots d\rho(y_N) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\rho^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{y_j}$. Note that α_N is independent of i by symmetry. Lastly, for any class of distributions with bounded energy

$$(158) \quad \mathcal{P}_E^2 = \{f \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n) : \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 df \leq E\},$$

we assume that for any $E > 0$,

$$(LLN2) \quad \beta_N = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{P}_E^2: \rho \in \mathcal{D}} \int_{\Omega^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN}} \left| s_{\rho^N}(y_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N v_j \mathbb{1}_{\{y_j\}} \right] (y_i) - s_\rho(y_i) [u]_\rho(y_i) \right|^2 df(y_1, v_1) \dots df(y_N, v_N) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where ρ^N is as before and ρ, u are the macroscopic density and velocity of f .

6.2. Main result. As discussed earlier we now focus on obtaining an estimate on separations of characteristics to achieve (157). The result holds on a finite time interval $[0, T]$ where f is a smooth solution to (150) by which we mean existence of sufficiently many derivatives in weighted Sobolev spaces to sufficient to understand (150) classically, see Section 7.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is a material model. Let f be a classical solution to (150) on a time interval $[0, T]$ with $\rho(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, where \mathcal{D} is a class of admissible densities for which all the regularity assumptions (Lip1), (Lip2), (Lip3), (LLN1), (LLN2) hold, and*

$$(159) \quad s_\rho(x) \geq c_6, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Next we assume either one of the following two alternative conditions

(AL1) *all the measures in (Lip2) $dP_\rho = P_\rho d\rho$ have uniformly bounded densities $\|P_\rho\|_{L^\infty(\rho)} \leq c_7$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and*

$$(160) \quad \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{a|v|^2} f(x, v, t) dx dv \leq c_8, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

(AL2) *Ω is a compact domain and the solution is non-vacuous and sub-Gaussian*

$$(161) \quad \rho(x, t) \geq c_9, \quad f(x, v, t) \leq c_{10} e^{-a|v|^2}, \quad \forall (x, v, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T].$$

Then for any solution to the particle system (149) and (155) on the time interval $[0, T]$ with i.i.d. initial datum (x_i^0, v_i^0) distributed according to the law f_0 one has the following estimate

$$(162) \quad \mathbb{E}[|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 + |v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2] \leq C_1(\alpha_N + \beta_N) e^{-C_2 t},$$

for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending on T and all the constants involved in the assumptions above.

Proof. We set $\sigma = 1$ for simplicity. First, we notice that the solution has a uniformly bounded energy on $[0, T]$ and thus (Lip3) (with $u' = u$) and (LLN2) apply uniformly on $[0, T]$.

Let us denote $E = E_x + E_v$, where

$$(163) \quad E_x(t) = \mathbb{E}[|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2], \quad E_v(t) = \mathbb{E}[|v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2].$$

Taking the derivative of the x -component we obviously obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_x = 2\mathbb{E}[(x_i - \bar{x}_i) \cdot (v_i - \bar{v}_i)] \leq E.$$

For the velocity component we use the Itô formula,

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_v = \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot (s_i([v]_i - v_i) - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)([u]_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - \bar{v}_i))] + \mathbb{E}\left|\sqrt{2s_i} - \sqrt{2s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)}\right|^2.$$

Let us start with the noise term using (159),

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\sqrt{2s_i} - \sqrt{2s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)}\right|^2 = 2\mathbb{E}\left|\frac{s_i - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)}{\sqrt{s_i} + \sqrt{s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)}}\right|^2 \leq C \mathbb{E}|s_i - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)|^2.$$

Recalling that $s_i = s_{\rho^N}(x_i)$, where $\rho^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{x_j}$ and denoting $\bar{\rho}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\bar{x}_j}$, we add and subtract intermediate terms

$$(164) \quad \mathbb{E}|s_i - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}|s_{\rho^N}(x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i)|^2 + \mathbb{E}|s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)|^2$$

For the first term we use the hypothesis (Lip1) and symmetry to estimate

$$\mathbb{E}|s_{\rho^N}(x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i)|^2 \lesssim E_x + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |x_j - \bar{x}_j|^2\right] = CE_x.$$

The second term is bounded by α_N as defined in (LLN1), since ρ is the law of \bar{x}_i and the latter are independent,

$$\mathbb{E}|s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)|^2 = \int_{\Omega^N} |s_{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{y_j}}(y_i) - s_\rho(y_i)|^2 d\rho(y_1) \dots d\rho(y_N) \leq \alpha_N.$$

In conclusion, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{2s_i} - \sqrt{2s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)} \right|^2 \leq CE(t) + \alpha_N.$$

Let us now turn to the alignment term. By adding and subtracting several intermediate terms we expand it as follows

$$(165) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot (s_i([v]_i - v_i) - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)([u]_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - \bar{v}_i))] = -\mathbb{E}[s_i|v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2] \\ & + \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot (s_i[v]_i - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)[u]_\rho(\bar{x}_i))] + \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot \bar{v}_i(s_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - s_i)]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is non-positive, so we simply drop it. Let us estimate the last term. We fix an $R > 0$ to be determined later and split the integrand as follows

$$(166) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot \bar{v}_i(s_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - s_i)] &= \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot \bar{v}_i \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| < R}(s_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - s_i)] + \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot \bar{v}_i \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| \geq R}(s_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - s_i)] \\ &\leq R^2 \mathbb{E}|v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2 + \mathbb{E}|s_i - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)|^2 + C \mathbb{E}|v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2 + C \mathbb{E}[|\bar{v}_i|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| \geq R}], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last term we simply used the global boundedness of the strength functions. For the second term we use the same estimate as before (164), hence continuing

$$\leq (R^2 + C)E(t) + \alpha_N + C \mathbb{E}[|\bar{v}_i|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| \geq R}].$$

Now,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\bar{v}_i|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| \geq R}] \leq \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[|\bar{v}_i|^4] \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[\mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| \geq R}].$$

Here the first term is bounded by the fourth moment of f which is clearly bounded from the assumptions. And using (160) we estimate the last term by

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_i| \geq R}] = \int_{\Omega} \int_{|v| \geq R} f_t(x, v) \, dv \, dx \leq \frac{c_4}{e^{aR^2}}.$$

The latter remains bounded on the interval $[0, T]$ by a constant by assumption. We thus obtained

$$(167) \quad \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot \bar{v}_i(s_\rho(\bar{x}_i) - s_i)] \leq (R^2 + C)E(t) + \alpha_N + c_4 e^{-aR^2/2}.$$

Lastly, let us estimate the second term on the right hand side of (166). We have

$$(168) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(v_i - \bar{v}_i) \cdot (s_i[v]_i - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)[u]_\rho(\bar{x}_i))] \leq E \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left| s_{\rho^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N v_j \mathbf{1}_{\{x_j\}} \right]_{\rho^N} (x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N} (x_i) \right|^2 \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left| s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N} (x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N} (\bar{x}_i) \right|^2 \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left| s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N} (\bar{x}_i) - s_\rho(\bar{x}_i)[u]_\rho(\bar{x}_i) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last term here is bounded by β_N , see (LLN2). The elements in the first term are evaluated at the same point x_i . So, (Lip3) applies to show

$$(169) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| s_{\rho^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N v_j \mathbf{1}_{\{x_j\}} \right]_{\rho^N} (x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N} (x_i) \right|^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\bar{v}_j|^2 \vee 1 \right) BL^2(\rho^N, \bar{\rho}^N) \right] + \mathbb{E} BL^2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N v_j \delta_{x_j}, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \delta_{\bar{x}_j} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(|\bar{v}_j|^2 \vee 1)(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1)] + \mathbb{E}[|\bar{v}_i|^2 (|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Each term here will be estimated by the same splitting method as before:

$$(170) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(|\bar{v}_j|^2 \vee 1)(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1)] &= \mathbb{E}[(|\bar{v}_j|^2 \vee 1) \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| < R} (|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1)] + \mathbb{E}[|\bar{v}_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| \geq R} (|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1)] \\ &\leq R^2 E_x + \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[|\bar{v}_j|^4] \mathbb{E}^{1/2}[\mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| \geq R}] \leq R^2 E + C e^{-aR^2/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(169) \leq R^2 E + C e^{-aR^2/2}.$$

It remains to estimate the middle term in (168). Here we invoke the Lipschitzness (Lip2) and obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left| s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) \right|^2 \leq c \mathbb{E} \left[(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\bar{v}_j|^2 P_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_j) \right],$$

where $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N P_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_j) = 1$.

Let us continue under the (AL1). Then

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1) |\bar{v}_j|^2].$$

Each term in this sum is estimated in exact same way as in (170), and hence $\lesssim R^2 E + C e^{-aR^2/2}$.

Proceeding under the (AL2), let us denote for simplicity $\lambda_j = \frac{1}{N} P_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_j)$. So, each λ_j is a random variable and $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$ pointwise. Continuing, we obtain

$$(171) \quad \begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1) |\bar{v}_j|^2 \lambda_j] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1) |\bar{v}_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| \leq R} \lambda_j] + \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [(|x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \wedge 1) |\bar{v}_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| > R} \lambda_j] \\ &\leq R^2 E + \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [|\bar{v}_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| > R} \lambda_j]. \end{aligned}$$

Examining the latter terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|\bar{v}_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{v}_j| > R} \lambda_j] &= \int_{\Omega^{N-1}} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|v_j| > R} \lambda_j f(x_j, v_j) dx_j dv_j d\rho(x_1) \dots d\rho(x_{j-1}) d\rho(x_{j+1}) \dots d\rho(x_N) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Omega^{N-1}} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v_j|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|v_j| > R} \lambda_j e^{-a|v_j|^2} dx_j dv_j d\rho(x_1) \dots d\rho(x_{j-1}) d\rho(x_{j+1}) \dots d\rho(x_N) \\ &\lesssim e^{-aR^2/2} \int_{\Omega^N} \lambda_j d\rho(x_1) \dots d\rho(x_{j-1}) dx_j d\rho(x_{j+1}) \dots d\rho(x_N). \end{aligned}$$

Using the lower bound on the density we reinsert it inside the j th integral,

$$\lesssim e^{-aR^2/2} \int_{\Omega^N} \lambda_j d\rho(x_1) \dots d\rho(x_{j-1}) d\rho(x_j) d\rho(x_{j+1}) \dots d\rho(x_N).$$

Now the integration is performed over a common probability space. So adding up over j and using that λ_j 's partition the unity, we obtain the bound $\leq e^{-aR^2/2}$.

Under any alternative, we have obtained

$$\mathbb{E} \left| s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N}(x_i) - s_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) \left[\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{v}_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{x}_j\}} \right]_{\bar{\rho}^N}(\bar{x}_i) \right|^2 \leq R^2 E + e^{-aR^2/2}.$$

Putting the above estimates together and denoting $r = aR^2/2$ and $\gamma_N = \alpha_N + \beta_N$, we arrive at

$$(172) \quad \frac{d}{dt} E \leq C_1(r+1)E + C_2\gamma_N + C_3e^{-r}.$$

Inequality (172) is exactly the one that appeared in [BCnC11]. Let us recap the conclusion for completeness. First, by choosing $r = 1$ we see that E remains uniformly bounded on $[0, T]$, $E \leq E_0$. Thus, $-\ln(E/eE_0) \geq 1$. Denoting $v = E/eE_0$ and picking $r = -\ln v$ we obtain

$$v' \leq -c_1 v \ln v + c_2 \gamma_N \leq -cv \ln v + c\gamma_N,$$

where $c = \max\{c_1, c_2\}$. Rescaling time $u(t) = v(t/c)$ we further obtain

$$u' \leq -u \ln u + \gamma_N.$$

Letting $w = u\gamma_N^{-e^{-t}}$ we conclude

$$w' \leq -w \ln w + 1 \leq e^{-1} + 1.$$

Thus, $w \leq T(e^{-1} + 1) = C_T$ and hence unwrapping the notation, $E \leq C_1 \gamma_N^{e^{-C_2 t}}$ as claimed. \square

6.3. Applications. We note that the Gaussian tail hypotheses are naturally satisfied for solutions in the $L^2(\mu)$ -framework, or for perturbative solutions as demonstrated in many various situations, see [DFT10, Cho16, BCnC11, AZ21, GIMV19, IM21]. Well-posedness for the stochastic processes (149) and (155) is discussed in detail in [BCnC11] for convolution-type Cucker-Smale systems, and a similar analysis can be done in the more general case, which we defer to a separate study.

In this section we will focus solely on the properties of the averaging models themselves, and in particular on finding the admissible classes \mathcal{D} which support the assumptions (Lip1), (Lip2), (Lip3), (LLN1), (LLN2) as well as (AL1).

Let us start by noting that the regularity conditions (Lip1), (Lip2), (Lip3) are more stringent than those listed in Section 5, so we will focus on them only. Also, for most of the material models either $s_\rho = 1$ or $= \rho_\phi$. This makes (Lip1) trivial.

Verification of (LLN1), (LLN2) reduces to the standard Law of Large Numbers. Let us recall the following estimates: for any $h \in C_b(\Omega)$ and $f \in \mathcal{P}_E^2$,

$$(173) \quad \int_{\Omega^N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N h(y_j) - \int_{\Omega} h(z) d\rho(z) \right|^2 d\rho(y_1) \dots d\rho(y_N) \leq \frac{C \|h\|_\infty}{N},$$

$$(174) \quad \int_{\Omega^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N v_j h(y_j) - \int_{\Omega} h(z) u(z) d\rho(z) \right|^2 df(y_1, v_1) \dots df(y_N, v_N) \leq \frac{CE \|h\|_\infty}{N}.$$

Example 6.2 (\mathcal{M}_{CS} -model). For the classical Cucker-Smale $s_\rho[u]_\rho = (u\rho)_\phi$. So, (Lip1) and (Lip3) are trivial because ϕ is bounded and Lipschitz. For (Lip2) we can rely on a general principle that if the kernel ϕ_ρ is uniformly Lipschitz, then (Lip2) holds with $dP_\rho = d\rho$, indeed, using the representation (36),

$$(175) \quad \|\nabla(s_\rho[u]_\rho)\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla_x \phi_\rho\| \int_{\Omega} |u| d\rho.$$

In the \mathcal{M}_{CS} case $\phi_\rho = \phi$ and the estimate follows. This also fits under assumption (AL1) of Theorem 6.1

To verify (LLN1), we have

$$(176) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(y_1 - y_j) - \int_{\Omega} \phi(y_1 - z) d\rho(z) \right|^2 d\rho(y_1) \dots d\rho(y_N) \\ & \leq \frac{C}{N} + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega^{N-1}} \left| \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j=2}^N \phi(y_1 - y_j) - \int_{\Omega} \phi(y_1 - z) d\rho(z) \right|^2 d\rho(y_2) \dots d\rho(y_N) d\rho(y_1). \end{aligned}$$

For each fixed y_1 the inner integral falls under (173) for $h(\cdot) = \phi(y_1 - \cdot)$, which it is bounded by C/N uniformly over all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$. Thus, $\alpha_N \lesssim \frac{1}{N}$.

As to (LLN2),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N v_j \phi(y_1 - y_j) - \int_{\Omega} \phi(y_1 - z) u(z) d\rho(z) \right|^2 df(y_1, v_1) \dots df(y_N, v_N) \\ & \leq \frac{CE}{N} + \int_{\Omega^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN}} \left| \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j=2}^N v_j \phi(y_1 - y_j) - \int_{\Omega} \phi(y_1 - z) u(z) d\rho(z) \right|^2 df(y_1, v_1) \dots df(y_N, v_N). \end{aligned}$$

Again the latter integral falls under (174) for the same h . Thus, $\lesssim E/N$.

The only restrictive assumption for this model comes from the uniform thickness (159), which translates into $\rho_\phi \geq c_6$. Local existence of such solutions can be shown similar to [Shv22]. Global existence near equilibrium which satisfies the thickness automatically was established in [DFT10].

Example 6.3 (\mathcal{M}_{MT} -model). Here, $s_\rho = 1$, so (Lip1), (LLN1) are trivial. As to (Lip2), we estimate the gradient of the kernel $\phi_\rho(x, y) = \frac{\phi(x-y)}{\rho_\phi(x)}$:

$$|\nabla_x \phi_\rho| \leq \frac{\|\nabla \phi\|_\infty}{\rho_\phi(x)} + \frac{\phi(x-y)}{\rho_\phi^2(x)} \rho_{|\nabla \phi|}(x) \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho_\phi(x)} + \frac{1}{\rho_\phi^2(x)}.$$

The only way to guarantee that this yields a probability measure P_ρ is to require it to be bounded for all probability measures $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. This translates into the same uniform thickness condition $\rho_\phi \geq c$ uniformly for all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$. This is only possible for an all-to-all kernel $\phi \geq c$. Under this assumption we can also extend the admissibility class \mathcal{D} to all of $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{P}$.

To verify (Lip3), we have

$$(177) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{(u'\rho')_\phi}{\rho'_\phi} - \frac{(u''\rho'')_\phi}{\rho''_\phi} &= \frac{(u'\rho')_\phi - (u''\rho'')_\phi}{\rho''_\phi} + \frac{(u'\rho')_\phi(\rho''_\phi - \rho'_\phi)}{\rho'_\phi \rho''_\phi} \\ &\lesssim BL(u'\rho', u''\rho'') + \|u\|_2 W_1(\rho', \rho''), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

To verify (LLN2) we start out as in (177) and notice that under the standing assumption the first term falls under the same computation at the \mathcal{M}_{CS} -model. In the second term arranging for $u' = u$, $\rho' = \rho$ we simply bound $(u'\rho')_\phi$ by the energy, while $\rho''_\phi - \rho_\phi$ again falls under the (LLN1) computation of \mathcal{M}_{CS} .

Example 6.4 (\mathcal{M}_ϕ -model). Here, as in the previous example, $s_\rho = 1$, so (Lip1), (LLN1) are trivial. As to (Lip2), we refer to the integral representation (36). In this case $\phi_\rho(x, y) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi(x-z)\phi(y-z)}{\rho_\phi(z)} dz$, so for any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$, we obtain

$$|\nabla_x \phi_\rho| \leq \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi(y-z)}{\rho_\phi(z)} dz.$$

In this case $P_\rho(y) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi(y-z)}{\rho_\phi(z)} dz$, which is clearly a probability density relative to ρ . We cannot guarantee a uniform bound on it for all ρ unless ϕ is all-to-all like in the previous example. This assumption is necessary for (Lip3) as well so adopt it along with compactness of Ω to ensure that $\phi \in L^1(\Omega)$. This implies that P_ρ is uniformly bounded and (AL1) applies.

As to (LLN2), the extra mollification does not offer any advantage, and so, the argument provided for the \mathcal{M}_{MT} -model applies under the global communication.

Example 6.5 (\mathcal{M}_{seg}). For the non-convolution type segregation model we have

$$\nabla_x \phi_\rho(x, y) \leq C \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{g_l(y)}{\rho(g_l)}.$$

So, here $P_\rho = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{g_l(y)}{\rho(g_l)}$ is a perfectly well-defined probability density relative to ρ . However, as in the \mathcal{M}_ϕ case we have no uniform control over its L^∞ -norm for all $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$. So, we resort to (AL2) in this case also.

To verify (Lip3), we obtain

$$[u']_{\rho'} - [u'']_{\rho''} = \sum_l g_l(x) \frac{\int_{\Omega} [u' \rho'(y) - u'' \rho''(y)] g_l(y) dy}{\rho''(g_l)} + \sum_l g_l(x) \int_{\Omega} u' \rho'(y) g_l(y) dy \frac{\rho''(g_l) - \rho'(g_l)}{\rho'(g_l) \rho''(g_l)}.$$

One can see that this is estimated similar to (177) provided $\text{supp } g_l = \Omega$ for all $l = 1, \dots, L$. This is the segregation analogue of the all-to-all communication condition. Condition (LLN2) is verified similarly.

7. FOKKER-PLANCK-ALIGNMENT EQUATION

In this section we develop a well-posedness theory of classical solutions to Fokker-Planck-Alignment equations (150) that is suitable for applications to flocking. This means that in addition to the standard regularity questions we will pay close attention to the connectivity as related to the spectral gap computations discussed in Section 4.

We will restrict ourselves to the periodic domain $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$ as motivated by the flocking applications and to avoid technical issues associated with the leaking to spacial infinity. This can in principle be mitigated by inclusion of confinement forces, see [Vil09], and we will address this in a separate study. We also set $\sigma = 1$ as it plays no role in the analysis and consider

$$(178) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = s_{\rho} \Delta_v f + \nabla_v (s_{\rho} (v - [u]_{\rho}) f).$$

Classical solutions to (178) are defined to be solutions that belong to a high regularity weighted Sobolev class. For reasons that will be clarified later it is essential to distribute velocity weights in the manner defined as follows

$$(179) \quad H_l^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n) = \left\{ f : \sum_{k' \leq k} \sum_{|\mathbf{k}|=k'} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l+2(k-k')} |\partial_{x,v}^{\mathbf{k}} f|^2 dv dx < \infty \right\},$$

where $\langle v \rangle = (1 + |v|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Some remarks are in order to elaborate on this choice. First, we note that the alignment term in (150) prevents the persistence of a subgaussian bound $f \leq C\mu$ if it holds initially. So, setting the problem traditionally in subgaussian Hölder classes, c.f. [IM21, AZ21], is not natural for the FPA equations. One exception is the class of perturbative solutions developed for particular models in [Cho16, DFT10]. Inclusion of the weights in (179) is necessary to achieve uniqueness primarily due to, again, the presence of alignment components, see however [Vil09] for the classical much weaker result. The use of progressively increasing weights for lower order terms is required to control terms coming from the inhomogeneity in front of the Fokker-Planck operator, which prevents closing a priori estimates for any single-weight choice. Single weight spaces, however, would have been sufficient for models with $s_{\rho} = 1$.

Let us discuss regularity conditions on the model \mathcal{M} itself. Roughly, the models can be sorted into three tiers according to their reliance on the uniform thickness condition $\text{UTh}_r(\rho) = \rho_- > 0$ at some scale: rough ones where all C^k -norms of the components s_{ρ} and $s_{\rho} [u]_{\rho}$ depend quantitatively on ρ_- ; mild ones where at least L^{∞} -norms are independent of ρ_- ; and smooth ones that are mild and contractive. We will develop only local well-posedness theory for the rough models, but those are very general and include virtually all of the models on our list; global well-posedness only for the mild ones; and global well-posedness with uniform estimate on ρ_- for the smooth ones.

We start with the rough models as those will be the primary focus in the next section where we establish the most general local well-posedness result. So, let us assume that for all models in question there is a radial kernel $\phi \geq 0$, $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\Omega)$, satisfying

$$(180) \quad \phi(r) \geq c_0 \mathbf{1}_{r < r_0},$$

such that

$$(181) \quad s_{\rho} \geq s(\rho_{\phi}),$$

where $s : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a monotonely increasing continuous function with $s(0) = 0$. Next, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ with

$$(182) \quad \rho_{\phi} \geq \rho_- > 0,$$

and for every $k = 0, 1, \dots$ we assume that there exists a constant $C_k(\rho_-)$ which is decreasing in ρ_- such that for all $u \in L^2(\rho)$

$$(183) \quad \|\partial^k s_\rho\|_\infty \leq C_k(\rho_-); \quad \|\partial^k (s_\rho [u]_\rho)\|_\infty \leq C_k(\rho_-) \|u\rho\|_1.$$

If the weighted average $s_\rho [u]_\rho$ is represented by a kernel $\phi_\rho(x, y)$, then the latter condition can be extracted from regularity of the kernel itself

$$\|\partial_x^k \phi_\rho(x, y)\|_\infty \leq C_k(\rho_-).$$

We also need to assume continuity relative to the data: for any two pairs (ρ', u') , (ρ'', u'') both satisfying (182) and $u' \in L^2(\rho')$, $u'' \in L^2(\rho'')$,

$$(184) \quad \begin{aligned} \|s_{\rho'} - s_{\rho''}\|_\infty &\leq C_0(\rho_-) \|\rho' - \rho''\|_1 \\ \|s_{\rho'} [u']_{\rho'} - s_{\rho''} [u'']_{\rho''}\|_\infty &\leq C_0(\rho_-) \|\rho' u' - \rho'' u''\|_1 + C_0(\rho_-) \|u' \rho'\|_1 \|\rho' - \rho''\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Example 7.1. For most of our convolution-based models ϕ is the same as the defining kernel. For $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{topo}}$ with kernel given by (29) we have $\phi = h$ because $d_\rho \leq 1$. For \mathcal{M}_{seg} , ϕ could be any local kernel supported on a ball of radius $r_0 > 0$ such that for any $l \leq L$ there is a ball $B_{r_0}(x_l)$ which lies in the interior of $\text{supp } g_l$. So, all but $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ models fulfill the regularity assumptions (181) - (184).

7.1. Local well-posedness.

Theorem 7.2. *Suppose the model \mathcal{M} satisfies (181) - (184). Let $f_0 \in H_l^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, $k, l \geq n + 3$, be an initial condition such that $\rho_\phi(0) \geq \rho_- > 0$. Then there exists a unique local solution to (187) on a time interval $[0, T)$, where $T > 0$ depends only on \mathcal{E}_0 and ρ_- , in the regularity class*

$$(185) \quad f \in C_w([0, T); H_l^k), \quad \nabla_v f \in L^2([0, T]; H_l^k), \quad \inf_{[0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^n} \rho_\phi > 0.$$

Moreover, if $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, T); H_l^k)$ is a given solution such that

$$(186) \quad \inf_{[0, T) \times \mathbb{T}} \rho_\phi > 0,$$

then f can be extended to an interval $[0, T + \varepsilon)$ in the same class.

We can view the right hand side of (178) as a sum of a weighted Fokker-Planck operator and a smooth drift

$$(187) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = s_\rho \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} f + w_\rho \cdot \nabla_v f,$$

where

$$(188) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} f = \nabla_v \cdot (\nabla_v f + v f), \quad w_\rho = -s_\rho [u]_\rho.$$

Let us first disassociate the weights s_ρ and w_ρ from the solution and consider the linear problem

$$(189) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = s(x, t) \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} f + w(x, t) \cdot \nabla_v f,$$

where s, w is a given smooth set of data on an interval $[0, T]$ such that

$$s \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times [0, T].$$

Lemma 7.3. *Under the assumptions above for any initial condition $f_0 \in H_l^k$ there exists a unique solution to (189) on the time interval $[0, T]$, $f \in C_w([0, T]; H_l^k)$, $\nabla_v f \in L^2([0, T]; H_l^k)$, and moreover,*

$$\|f\|_{H_l^k} \leq \|f_0\|_{H_l^k} e^{Ct},$$

where C depends only on c_0 and C^k -norms of s, w .

Proof. To construct a solution to (189) from initial data $f_0 \in H_l^k$ one first considers a fully viscous regularization

$$(190) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = s \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} f + w \cdot \nabla_v f + \varepsilon \Delta_{x, v} f.$$

A local solution to (190) on a time interval $[0, T_\varepsilon]$ is obtained via the standard fixed point argument, see [Kry96]. In order to extend it to all of $[0, T]$ we provide a priori estimates for (189) which automatically apply to (190) independently of ε . As a result we obtain a bound on $\|f\|_{H_l^k}$ which depends only on its initial value, on c_0 and C^k -norms of s and w . So, we have a family of solutions f^ε uniformly in $C([0, T]; H_l^k)$, and

clearly also in $f_t^\varepsilon \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^2)$. By the Aubin-Lions compactness lemma we can pass to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in any $H_v^{k'}$ for $k' < k$, $l' < l$ and weakly in H_t^k extracting a subsequence converging to a solution to (189). Weak continuity in H_t^k also follows classically.

Thus, the problem reduced to obtaining proper a priori bounds for solutions to (189).

Let us estimate the top v -derivative $\partial_v^k f$ first (here and further on we use a less formal notation for the partials, only keeping track of the order)

$$\partial_t \partial_v^k f + v \cdot \nabla_x \partial_v^k f + \partial_v^{k-1} \partial_x f = s \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} \partial_v^k f + s \partial_v^{k+1} f + w \cdot \nabla_v \partial_v^k f.$$

Testing with $\langle v \rangle^l \partial_v^k f$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^k f|^2 dv dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l v \cdot \nabla_x |\partial_v^k f|^2 dv dx + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l \partial_v^{k-1} \partial_x f \partial_v^k f dv dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{k+1} f|^2 dv dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \Delta_v (\langle v \rangle^l) |\partial_v^k f|^2 dv dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \partial_v (\langle v \rangle^l v) |\partial_v^k f|^2 dv dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} w \cdot \nabla_v (\langle v \rangle^l) |\partial_v^k f|^2 dv dx \end{aligned}$$

While the first integral on the left hand side vanishes, the second is bounded by $\|f\|_{H_t^k}^2$. All the terms on the right hand side, using that $\partial_v \langle v \rangle^p \lesssim \langle v \rangle^{p-1}$, are also bounded by $\|f\|_{H_t^k}^2$ except for the dissipation which is negative and can be dropped. Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^k f|^2 dv dx \leq C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 - c_0 \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{k+1} f|^2 dv dx,$$

where C is a constant depending on all the L^∞ -norms of s, w .

Let us now estimate the rest of the other top derivatives $\partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'} f$, $\mathbf{k}' > \mathbf{0}$. Sparing the tedious details, most of terms are all bounded by $C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2$, where C is an upper bound for the C^k -norms of s, w . The rest is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'} f|^2 dv dx \lesssim C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 - c_0 \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{k-k'+1} \partial_x^{k'} f|^2 dv dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l \partial_x s \Delta_v \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'-1} f \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'} f dv dx + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \partial_x s \langle v \rangle^l v \cdot \nabla_v \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'-1} f \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'} f dv dx. \end{aligned}$$

For the penultimate term we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l \partial_x s \Delta_v \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'-1} f \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'} f dv dx &\leq - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l \partial_x s \nabla_v \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'-1} f \cdot \nabla_v \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'} f dv dx \\ &\quad + C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 \\ &= - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l \partial_x s \partial_x |\nabla_v \partial_v^{k-k'} \partial_x^{k'-1} f|^2 dv dx + C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l \partial_x^2 s |\partial_v^{k-k'+1} \partial_x^{k'-1} f|^2 dv dx + C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the remaining term we take advantage of the dissipation and the higher weight assigned to the lower order derivatives. Integrating by parts in v we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \partial_x s \langle v \rangle^l v \cdot \nabla_v \partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'-1} f \partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f \, dv \, dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \partial_x s \nabla_v \cdot (\langle v \rangle^l v) \partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'-1} f \partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f \, dv \, dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \partial_x s \langle v \rangle^l \partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'-1} f v \cdot \nabla_v \partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f \, dv \, dx \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 + \frac{c_0}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'+1} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f|^2 \, dv \, dx + C \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l+2} |\partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'-1} f|^2 \, dv \, dx \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 + \frac{c_0}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'+1} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f|^2 \, dv \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f|^2 \, dv \, dx \leq C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 - \frac{c_0}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^l |\partial_v^{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'+1} \partial_x^{\mathbf{k}'} f|^2 \, dv \, dx.$$

The same argument works to estimate any positive order derivatives, each time taking advantage of the higher weight put on one order below. It remains to estimate the zeroth-order term,

$$\begin{aligned}
(191) \quad & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l+k} |f|^2 \, dv \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \Delta_v \langle v \rangle^{l+k} f^2 \, dv \, dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \langle v \rangle^{l+k} |\nabla_v f|^2 \, dv \, dx \\
& - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \nabla_v \langle v \rangle^{l+k} \cdot v f^2 \, dv \, dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s \nabla_v \cdot (\langle v \rangle^{l+k} v) f^2 \, dv \, dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (w \cdot \nabla_v \langle v \rangle^{l+k}) f^2 \, dv \, dx \\
& \leq C \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l+k} |f|^2 \, dv \, dx - c_0 \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l+k} |\nabla_v f|^2 \, dv \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

So, the estimate on the 0-th term closes on itself.

We obtained

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 \leq C \|f\|_{H_t^k}^2 - \frac{c_0}{2} \|\nabla_v f\|_{H_t^k}^2,$$

and the estimate stated in the lemma follows. It also proves uniqueness since the equation is linear. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. We now focus on the fully non-linear problem (187). We obtain solutions as a limit to an iteration scheme. Using Lemma 7.3 a sequence of solutions obtained iteratively solving

$$(192) \quad \partial_t f^{m+1} + v \cdot \nabla_x f^{m+1} = s^m \nabla_v \cdot (\nabla_v f^{m+1} + v f^{m+1}) + w^m \cdot \nabla_v f^{m+1}, \quad s^m = s_{\rho^m}, \quad w^m = w_{\rho^m},$$

where $m = 0, 1, \dots, f^n(0) = f_0$, and $s^0 = s_{\rho^0}$, $w^0 = -s_{\rho^0} [u^0]_{\rho^0}$. In order to pass to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we need to ensure that f^m remain uniformly bounded in H_t^k on the given time interval $[0, T]$. According to Lemma 7.3 a bound on f^{m+1} depends on smoothness of s^m and w^m and a lower bound on s^m . Thanks to our assumptions (181) - (183) these can be controlled by the energies

$$\mathcal{E}^m = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f^m \, dv \, dx,$$

and thicknesses

$$\min \rho_\phi^m = \rho_-^m.$$

Let us show that there exists a common time interval $[0, T]$ on which the energies are all uniformly bounded from above and the densities ρ_-^m are uniformly bounded from below.

Starting with the energy, testing (192) with $\frac{1}{2}|v|^2$ we can see that the Fokker-Planck component yields a bound $\|s^m\|_\infty \mathcal{E}^{m+1}$, where $\|s^m\|_\infty$ is bounded by a universal constant \bar{S} according to our basic hypothesis (ev4). Thus, taking into account the bound

$$\|s_\rho [u]_\rho\|_\infty \leq C_0(\rho_-) \sqrt{\mathcal{E}},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}^{m+1} &\leq nC - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} w^n \cdot v f^{m+1} dv dx \\
&= nC + \int_{\Omega} s^m [u^m]_{\rho^m} \cdot u^{m+1} \rho^{m+1} dx \\
&\leq nC + C_0(\rho_-^m) \sqrt{E^m} \int_{\Omega} |u^{m+1}| \rho^{m+1} dx \leq nC + C_0(\rho_-^m) \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^m \mathcal{E}^{m+1}} \\
&\leq nC + C_0(\rho_-^m) \max\{\mathcal{E}^m, \mathcal{E}^{m+1}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, denoting $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^m = \max\{\mathcal{E}^0, \mathcal{E}^1, \dots, \mathcal{E}^m\}$, then from the above

$$(193) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{m+1} \leq nC + C_0(\rho_-^m) \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{m+1}.$$

We can assume w.l.o.g. that $C_0(r)$ is decreasing and $C_0(r) \geq 1$.

At the same time, we have

$$(194) \quad \partial_t \rho_{\phi}^{m+1} = -\nabla_x \cdot (u^{m+1} \rho^{m+1})_{\phi} = -(u^{m+1} \rho^{m+1})_{\nabla \phi} \geq -C_1 \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{m+1}} \geq -C_1 \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{m+1}},$$

where C_1 depends only on ϕ .

Let us argue by induction. The initial interval of existence for $m = 0$ is $T_0 = \infty$. On that interval $\rho_{\phi}^0 \geq \rho_-$. Then from (193) we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}^1 \leq \mathcal{E}_0 e^{C_0(\rho_-^0)t} + nC e^{C_0(\rho_-^0)t} \leq \mathcal{E}_0 e^{C(\rho_-/2)t} + nC e^{C_0(\rho_-^0/2)t}.$$

So, for $t \leq \frac{\ln 2}{C(\rho_-/2)}$ we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}^1(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC.$$

Using (194) we conclude on the same time interval

$$\rho_-^1 \geq \rho_- - tC_1 \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC}.$$

Consequently, for $t < \frac{\rho_-}{2C_1 \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC}}$ we have

$$\rho_-^1(t) \geq \rho_-/2.$$

Setting $T = \min\{\frac{\ln 2}{C(\rho_-/2)}, \frac{\rho_-}{2C_1 \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC}}\}$ we obtain exact same estimates for the next elements in the sequence:

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_0 e^{C(\rho_-/2)t} + nC e^{C_0(\rho_-^0/2)t} \Rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}^2(t) \leq 2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC, \quad t < T$$

and

$$\rho_-^2 \geq \rho_- - tC_1 \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC} \Rightarrow \rho_-^2(t) \geq \rho_-/2, \quad t < T.$$

Continuing in the same manner it follows that $\mathcal{E}^m \leq 2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2nC$ and $\rho_{\phi}^m \geq \rho_-/2$ on the same time interval $[0, T]$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 7.3 implies that each solution in the sequence f^m will exist and be uniformly bounded in class $C_w([0, T]; H_l^k)$.

As in Lemma 7.3 we conclude that there exists a converging subsequence in any lower regularity class, which by continuity properties of the model (184) insures that the limit solves the equation (187) classically.

From the above we see that the local time of existence T depends only on \mathcal{E}_0 and ρ_- . With this observation let us assume that we are given a solution on an interval $[0, T')$ in the Sobolev class H_l^k and such that (182) holds for all $t < T'$. Then the estimate analogous to (193) shows that the energy $\mathcal{E}(t)$ remains bounded on $[0, T')$ by a constant depending only on ρ_- and \mathcal{E}_0 . Starting from $T' - \varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon > 0$ is small we construct a solution on a time interval $[T' - \varepsilon, T' - \varepsilon + T)$ where T depends only on ρ_- and E_0 and not on ε . This extends the solution beyond T' by uniqueness, which we address next.

Let us have two solutions f and \tilde{f} in class (185) starting from the same initial condition f_0 . Denote $g = f - \tilde{f}$. We will estimate evolution of this difference in the weighted class $L_l^2 = H_l^0$ and show that estimates close if l is large enough. Note that according to definition of H_l^k for k large as assumed, we have $\nabla_v f, \nabla_v \tilde{f}, \mathcal{L}_{FP} f, \mathcal{L}_{FP} \tilde{f} \in L_l^2$ uniformly.

Let us take the difference

$$\partial_t g + v \cdot \nabla_x g = s_{\rho} \mathcal{L}_{FP} g + (s_{\rho} - s_{\tilde{\rho}}) \mathcal{L}_{FP} \tilde{f} + w_{\rho} \cdot \nabla_v g + (w_{\rho} - w_{\tilde{\rho}}) \cdot \nabla_v \tilde{f}.$$

Testing with $\langle v \rangle^l g$ and integrating the x -transport term drops out. The rest of the terms are estimated using continuity assumptions (184) and the usual energy estimates

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|g\|_{L_t^2}^2 \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2}^2 + \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_1 \|\mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} \tilde{f}\|_{L_t^2} \|g\|_{L_t^2} + \|\rho u - \tilde{\rho} \tilde{u}\|_1 \|\nabla_v \tilde{f}\|_{L_t^2} \|g\|_{L_t^2}$$

The \tilde{f} components are uniformly bounded as noted above. So, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|g\|_{L_t^2}^2 \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2}^2 + \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_1 \|g\|_{L_t^2} + \|\rho u - \tilde{\rho} \tilde{u}\|_1 \|g\|_{L_t^2}$$

Now,

$$(195) \quad \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_1 \leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |g| \, dv \, dx = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l/2} |g| \langle v \rangle^{-l/2} \, dv \, dx \leq \|g\|_{L_t^2},$$

provided $l > n$. Similarly,

$$(196) \quad \|\rho u - \tilde{\rho} \tilde{u}\|_1 \leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v| |g| \, dv \, dx = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \rangle^{l/2} |g| \langle v \rangle^{-l/2+1} \, dv \, dx \leq \|g\|_{L_t^2},$$

provided $l > n + 2$.

So, we arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|g\|_{L_t^2}^2 \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2}^2,$$

and uniqueness follows. \square

7.2. Spread of positivity. Solutions to many kinetic equations tend to develop instantaneous spread of positivity across the domain, in the sense of lower bound by a Gaussian

$$(197) \quad f(t, x, v) \geq b e^{-a|v|^2},$$

see [AZ21, Kol34, H67, DFP06, GIMV19, AZ21, DV00, HST20, Mou05, IMS20]. The constants a, b , however, depend on either the regularity of the solution on a given time interval or bounds on macroscopic quantities such as the mass-density, energy-density and entropy-density. Such bounds may deteriorate in time which puts constants a, b in dependence on time as well. With a view towards application to flocking, the primary purpose of a bound like (197) would be to obtain the lower bound on the density $\rho \geq \rho_-$ controlled in time or even preferably independent of time in order to establish global regularity and relaxation results.

Our main result states that the Gaussian bound (197) holds and parameters that depend only on the global entropy/energy of the solution and uniform bound on the drift.

Proposition 7.4. *For a given classical solution $f \in C_w([0, T]; H_t^k(\mathbb{T}^n))$ of (178) on a time interval $[0, T]$ there exists $a, b > 0$ which depend only on the parameters of the model \mathcal{M} , time T , and*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W} &= \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|s_\rho[u]_\rho\|_\infty, \\ \overline{H} &= \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f \, dv \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} f |\log f| \, dv \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(198) \quad f(t, x, v) \geq b e^{-a|v|^2}, \quad \forall (t, x, v) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [T/2, T].$$

Corollary 7.5. *For a given classical solution $f \in C_w([0, T]; H_t^k(\mathbb{T}^n))$ of (178) on a time interval $[0, T]$ there exists ρ_- which depends only on the parameters of the model \mathcal{M} , time T , and $\overline{W}, \overline{H}$ such that*

$$\rho(t, x) \geq \rho_-, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [T/2, T] \times \mathbb{T}^n.$$

Central to our proof will be the Weak Harnack inequality proved in [GI21]. To state it we need to introduce some notation.

We will be looking at solutions on kinetic cylinders defined by, for $z_0 = (t_0, x_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$Q_r(z_0) = \{z : -r^2 < t - t_0 \leq 0, |x - x_0 - (t - t_0)v_0| < r^3, |v - v_0| < r\}.$$

One can define the Lie-group action on triplets z by

$$z_0 \circ z = (t_0 + t, x_0 + x + tv_0, v_0 + v).$$

Then

$$z^{-1} = (-t, -x + tv, -v).$$

And we define the kinetic multiplication by a scalar as

$$rz = (r^2t, r^3x, rv).$$

The cylinders $Q_r(z_0)$ can then be considered as the shift and rescaling of the 0-centered cylinder $Q_r = Q_r(0)$

$$Q_r(z_0) = z_0 \circ Q_r.$$

And by scaling, $rQ_1 = Q_r$.

We consider super-solutions to the following general Fokker-Planck equation

$$(199) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f \geq \nabla_v (A \nabla_v f) + B \cdot \nabla_v f.$$

The equation has natural scaling invariance. If

$$f_{r,z_0}(z) = f(z_0 \circ rz),$$

then f_{r,z_0} satisfies

$$(200) \quad \partial_t f_{r,z_0} + v \cdot \nabla_x f_{r,z_0} \geq \nabla_v (A_{r,z_0} \nabla_v f_{r,z_0}) + B_{r,z_0} \cdot \nabla_v f_{r,z_0},$$

where

$$(201) \quad A_{r,z_0}(z) = A(z_0 \circ rz), \quad B_{r,z_0}(z) = rB(z_0 \circ rz).$$

Thus, the following rule applies:

Claim 7.6. If f solves (199) on $Q_{r'}(z')$, then f_{r,z_0} solves the rescaled equation (200) on $Q_{r'/r}((z_0^{-1} \circ z')/r)$. Furthermore, if A, B satisfy

$$(202) \quad \lambda \mathbb{I} \leq A \leq \Lambda \mathbb{I}, \quad |B| \leq \Lambda, \quad z \in Q_{r'}(z'),$$

for some $\lambda, \Lambda > 0$, then the new coefficients A_{r,z_0}, B_{r,z_0} satisfy the same bounds on $Q_{r'/r}((z_0^{-1} \circ z')/r)$, provided $r < 1$.

For $\omega > 0$ small let us introduce the following two non-overlapping cylinders

$$Q_\omega^+ = Q_\omega(1, 0, 0), \quad Q_\omega^- = Q_\omega(\omega^2, 0, 0).$$

That is, Q_ω^+ is attached to the top of the basic cylinder $Q_1(1, 0, 0)$, and Q_ω^- is lying on the bottom.

Theorem 7.7 (Weak Harnack inequality, [GI21]). *There are constants $R_0, \omega_0, p, C_0 > 0$ which depend only on λ, L, n satisfying the following property. If f is a super-solution to (199), in the cylinder $Q^{R_0} = [0, 1] \times \{|x| < R_0\} \times \{|v| < R_0\}$ with A, B satisfying (202), then whenever*

$$\left(\int_{Q_\omega^-} f^p dz \right)^{1/p} \leq C_0 \inf_{Q_\omega^+} f.$$

We now turn to proving Proposition 7.4. The proof goes in several steps. First, we rewrite the FPA (187) as follows

$$(203) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = s_\rho \Delta_v f + (s_\rho v + w_\rho) \cdot \nabla_v f + ns_\rho f.$$

Since the last term is non-negative, f is a super-solution to the truncated equation

$$(204) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f \geq s_\rho \Delta_v f + (s_\rho v + w_\rho) \cdot \nabla_v f,$$

which has the structure of (199). We will be mindful of the fact, however, that $B = s_\rho v + w_\rho$ is unbounded in v , and this will be taken into account in due course.

In the subsequent course of the proof the various constants denoted

$$c_0, c_1, \dots, \omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, T_0, T_1, \dots, r_0, r_1, \dots, R_0, R_1, \dots$$

depend only on the parameters of the model, T , and $\overline{W}, \overline{H}$. We call such constants *admissible*.

STEP 1: CHOOSING DOMAIN OF ELLIPTICITY. Since \mathbb{T}^n has finite volume by a covering argument, there exists a constant c_1 depending on n , and there exists $x' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ such that

$$(205) \quad \rho(0, B_{r_0/4}(x')) \geq c_1 |B_{r_0/4}(x')|,$$

where r_0 is the local range of ϕ declared in (180) Consequently,

$$\rho_\phi(0, x) \geq c_2, \quad \forall x \in B_{r_0/2}(x').$$

Next, let us notice that ρ_ϕ satisfies the following equation

$$\partial_t \rho_\phi = -\nabla_x(u\rho)_\phi = -(u\rho)_{\nabla\phi} \geq -c_3\|u\|_{L^2(\rho)} \geq -c_3\overline{H}.$$

So, for any $t > 0$, and any $x \in B_{r_0/2}(x')$, we have

$$\rho_\phi(t, x) \geq c_2 - tc_3\overline{H}.$$

This implies that on the time interval $t \in [0, T_1]$, where $T_1 = \left(\frac{c_2}{2c_3\overline{H}}\right) \wedge T$, we have

$$\rho_\phi(t, x) \geq c_2/2, \quad \forall x \in B_{r_0/2}(x'),$$

and in view of (181),

$$s_\rho(t, x) \geq s(c_2/2) = \lambda, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T_1] \times B_{r_0/2}(x').$$

Let us come back to (205) and extract a thick subdomain for f not too far in v -direction. We have

$$\begin{aligned} c_1|B_{r_0/4}(x')| &\leq \int_{B_{r_0/4}(x')} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx \\ &= \int_{B_{r_0/4}(x')} \int_{|v| < R} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx + \int_{B_{r_0/4}(x')} \int_{|v| \geq R} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{B_{r_0/4}(x')} \int_{|v| < R} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx + \frac{\overline{H}}{R^2}. \end{aligned}$$

So, for $R = R_1 = 1 \vee \sqrt{\frac{2\overline{H}}{c_1|B_{r_0/4}(x')|}}$ we have

$$\int_{B_{r_0/4}(x')} \int_{|v| < R_1} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx \geq \frac{c_1}{2}|B_{r_0/4}(x')| =: c_3.$$

Let define our ambient domain of ellipticity $\overline{\Omega} = [0, T_1] \times B_{r_0/2}(x') \times B_{2R_1}(0)$, where

$$(206) \quad \lambda \leq s_\rho \leq \Lambda, \quad |s_\rho v| + |w_\rho| \leq \Lambda,$$

where $\Lambda = \max\{\overline{S}, 2\overline{S}R_1 + \overline{W}\}$, and \overline{S} is the common bound on the strength function by (ev4). The constants λ, Λ determine $R_0, \omega_0, p, C_0 > 0$ from Theorem 7.7, which depend only on λ, Λ, n , so they are admissible.

STEP 2: FINDING THE INITIAL PLATEAU.

We want to find a center of inflation $(0, x_0, v_0)$ in such a way that the point (x_0, v_0) lies within the interior subdomain $B_{r_0/4}(x') \times B_{R_1}(0)$ and a small ω -cylinder around it has a substantial presence of f . That cylinder will be blown into $Q_{\omega_0}^-$ resulting in f having a substantial L^p -mass in it. At the same time the domain of ellipticity $\overline{\Omega}$ will be blown to engulf the needed wide cylinder Q^{R_0} to fulfill the assumptions of Theorem 7.7. The theorem then applies to obtain an admissible lower bound on f at a later time.

Since

$$\int_{B_{r_0/4}(x') \times B_{R_1}(0)} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx \geq c_3,$$

by the standard covering argument, for any small ω one can find a point $(x_0, v_0) \in B_{r_0/4}(x') \times B_{R_1}(0)$ such that

$$(207) \quad \int_{B_{\omega^3}(x_0) \times B_\omega(v_0)} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx \geq c_3 c_4 |B_{\omega^3}(x_0) \times B_\omega(v_0)| = c_5 \omega^{4n},$$

We will choose ω later. Let us prove now that the initial weight of f in a cylinder as in (207) stretches in time on the natural scale ω^2 .

Lemma 7.8. *Suppose initially*

$$\int_{B_{\omega^3}(x_0) \times B_\omega(v_0)} f(0, x, v) \, dv \, dx \geq c_5 \omega^{4n}.$$

Then

$$(208) \quad \int_{Q_{2\omega}(4\omega^2, x_0, v_0)} f(z) dz \geq c_6 \omega^{8n+2}.$$

Proof. Let us fix a smooth cut-off function $h(r) = \mathbb{1}_{r < 1}$ and $h(r) = 0$ for $r \geq 2$, bounded by 1. Let

$$h_\omega(x, v) = h(x/\omega^3)h(v/\omega).$$

Define the kinetic convolution

$$g(t) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f(t, x_0 + x + tv_0, v + v_0) h_\omega(x, v) dv dx$$

Then initially, $g(0) \geq c_5 \omega^{4n}$. Let us compute the derivative

$$\frac{d}{dt} g = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\partial_t f + v_0 \cdot \nabla_x f) h_\omega dv dx = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\partial_t f + (v_0 + v) \cdot \nabla_x f) h_\omega dv dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} v \cdot \nabla_x f h_\omega dv dx.$$

Note that

$$\left| \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} v \cdot \nabla_x f h_\omega dv dx \right| = \left| \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f v \cdot \nabla_x h_\omega dv dx \right| \leq c \|\nabla h\|_\infty \omega^{-2}.$$

So,

$$(209) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} g &\geq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} [s_\rho \Delta_v f + (s_\rho(v + v_0) + w_\rho) \cdot \nabla_v f] h_\omega dv dx - c \omega^{-2} \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f [s_\rho \Delta_v h_\omega - n s_\rho h_\omega - (s_\rho(v + v_0) + w_\rho) \cdot \nabla_v h_\omega] dv dx - c \omega^{-2} \\ &\geq -\Lambda \omega^{-2} - n \Lambda - (\Lambda 2R_1 + \overline{W}) \omega^{-1} - c \omega^{-2} \geq -c_7 \omega^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$g(t) \geq c_5 \omega^{4n} - c_7 \omega^{-2} t.$$

Integrating again we obtain

$$\int_0^t g(s) ds \geq c_5 \omega^{4n} t - c_7 \omega^{-2} \frac{t^2}{2}$$

Setting $t = c_5 \omega^{4n+2} c_7 \ll \omega^2$ we obtain

$$\int_0^{\omega^2} g(s) ds \geq c_6 \omega^{8n+2}.$$

Noting that h_ω is supported on $B_{8\omega^3} \times B_{2\omega}$ and bounded by 1, we obtain the desired result. \square

We now make a transformation

$$(210) \quad z \rightarrow z_0 \circ r z, \quad z_0 = (0, x_0, v_0), \quad r = \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_0}, \quad \omega_1 = 2\omega.$$

This insures that, whatever ω is, the box $Q_{\omega_0}^-$ gets transformed into our $Q_{2\omega}(4\omega^2, x_0, v_0)$. We now choose ω such that the ambient domain Q^{R_0} transforms inside our the lower half of the domain of ellipticity. Given that x_0 is within $B_{r_0/4}(x')$ and $v_0 \in B_{R_1}(0)$ it suffices to choose

$$\omega_1 = \omega_0 \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{T_1}{4}}, \sqrt{\frac{r_0}{16R_1}}, \frac{R_1}{2R_0} \right\}.$$

Under so defined rescaling the we have

$$Q_{\omega_0}^- \rightarrow Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0), \quad Q_{\omega_0}^+ \rightarrow Q_{\omega_1}((\omega_1/\omega_0)^2, x_0 + v_0(\omega_1/\omega_0)^2, v_0),$$

and moreover $2Q^{R_0} = [0, 2] \times B_{2R_0} \times B_{2R_0}$ gets transformed inside the domain of ellipticity

$$2Q^{R_0} \hookrightarrow [0, T/2] \times B_{r_0/2}(x') \times B_{2R_1}(0) \subset \overline{\Omega}.$$

At the same time, the ellipticity bounds (206) remain the same (and in fact improve on the drift). Observe also that all the parameters involved so far are admissible.

In order to apply the weak Harnack inequality, we need to essentially interpolate the L^1 -information on f expressed by (208) between L^p and $L \log L$ in order to extract information on the L^p level.

Since $\omega_1 = 2\omega$ has been picked already and it is dependent only on the parameters of the model, and $T, \overline{W}, \overline{H}$, let us write (208) as follows

$$(211) \quad \int_{Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)} f(z) \, dz \geq c_8.$$

We have

$$\int_{Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)} f |\log f| \, dz \leq \omega_1^2 \overline{H}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_0^\infty |\{f \geq \alpha\} \cap Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| (|\log \alpha| + \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha - 1)) \, d\alpha \leq \omega_1^2 \overline{H}.$$

Consequently, for $\alpha_0 > 1$,

$$\int_{\alpha_0}^\infty |\{f \geq \alpha\} \cap Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| \, d\alpha \leq \frac{1}{\log \alpha_0} \omega_1^2 \overline{H}.$$

Choosing $\alpha_0 = \exp\{\frac{4\omega_1^2 \overline{H}}{c_8}\}$ we have

$$\int_{\alpha_0}^\infty |\{f \geq \alpha\} \cap Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| \, d\alpha \leq \frac{c_8}{4}.$$

At the same time for $\alpha_1 = \frac{c_8}{4\omega_1^{2+4n}}$ we have

$$\int_0^{\alpha_1} |\{f \geq \alpha\} \cap Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| \, d\alpha \leq \alpha_1 |Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| = \alpha_1 \omega_1^{2+4n} = \frac{c_8}{4}.$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_0} |\{f \geq \alpha\} \cap Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| \, d\alpha \geq \frac{c_8}{4}.$$

This implies that

$$|\{f \geq \alpha_1\} \cap Q_{\omega_1}(\omega_1^2, x_0, v_0)| \geq \frac{c_8}{4(\alpha_0 - \alpha_1)} := c_9.$$

Note again that all the constants depend only on the parameters of the model, and $T, \overline{W}, \overline{H}$.

Using transformation (210) which has Jacobian $(\omega_1/\omega_0)^{4n+2}$ we obtain

$$|\{f_{r,z_0} \geq \alpha_1\} \cap Q_{\omega_0}^-| \geq (\omega_1/\omega_0)^{4n+2} c_9 := c_{10}.$$

Hence, by the Chebychev inequality,

$$\left(\int_{Q_{\omega_0}^-} f_{r,z_0}^p \, dz \right)^{1/p} \geq (\alpha_1^p |\{f_{r,z_0} \geq \alpha_1\} \cap Q_{\omega_0}^-|)^{1/p} \geq \alpha_1 c_{10}^{1/p} := c_{11}.$$

Theorem 7.7 applies to show that

$$\inf_{Q_{\omega_0}^+} f_{r,z_0} \geq c_{12},$$

or in terms of the original function f ,

$$\inf_{Q_{\omega_1}((\omega_1/\omega_0)^2, x_0 + v_0(\omega_1/\omega_0)^2, v_0)} f \geq c_{12}.$$

STEP 3: HARNACK CHAINS. It will be more efficient, in terms of notation, to remain in the new system of coordinates defined by (210). Since the transformation involves only admissible parameters, any bound on f obtained in the new system will translate into an admissible bound in the old system.

So, in the new coordinates, f satisfies

$$(212) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f \geq s(t, x) \Delta_v f + (b(t, x)v + w(t, x)) \cdot \nabla_v f.$$

We make another time-shift to make notation even simpler $z \rightarrow (1, 0, 0) \circ z$. Thus, we have

$$(213) \quad \lambda \leq s \leq \Lambda, \quad |bv| + |w| \leq \Lambda,$$

on the new wide domain of ellipticity

$$\overline{\Omega} = [-1, 1] \times B_{2R_0} \times B_{2R_0}.$$

Notice that the new quantities $\overline{W}, \overline{H}$ turn into another pair of admissible constants.

On the previous step we established a bound, which in the new coordinate frame reads

$$(214) \quad \inf_{Q_{\omega_0}} f \geq c_0,$$

where c_0 is admissible. The goal now is to show that by the time $t = 1$ the solution spreads across the entire torus Ω .

It will also be more accommodating to use Theorem 7.7 where $Q_{\omega_0}^-$ is replaced by Q_{ω_0} . This is clearly achievable by a slight rescaling and a shift which is allowed by our enlarged ellipticity domain $\overline{\Omega}$. Also, notice that by rescaling the theorem also applies to the cylinders $Q_{\omega_0/2}^\pm$ with C_0 being replaced with an absolute multiple of C_0 , also admissible.

Now let us proceed with the construction of Harnack chains. The construction will be similar in spirit to [AZ21], although quite different in two technical aspects. First, we produce a chain that reaches the targeted velocity field in fewer steps, thus achieving the exact Gaussian tail on the first run. And second, the estimates along the chain will take into account the loss of information that comes with the use of a weaker version of the Harnack inequality.

Lemma 7.9. *Let (214) hold. There exist admissible constants $a, b > 0$ such that*

$$(215) \quad f(t, x, v) \geq be^{-a|v|^2},$$

for all $(\omega_0/4)^2 \leq t \leq (\omega_0/2)^2$, $|x| \leq (\omega_0/2)^3$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. Let us fix an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ to be determined later, and let $r = \frac{2|v|}{\omega_0 N}$. Denote $\hat{v} = \frac{v}{|v|}$. Let us define the sequence of points

$$z_0 = 0, \quad z_{l+1} = z_l \circ r(1, 0, \frac{\omega_0}{2}\hat{v}), \quad l = 0, \dots, N-1.$$

In other words,

$$z_l = (lr^2, lr^3 \frac{\omega_0}{2} \hat{v}, lr \frac{\omega_0}{2} \hat{v}) := (t_l, x_l, v_l).$$

Notice that the end-point

$$z_N = (\frac{4|v|^2}{N\omega_0^2}, \frac{4|v|^3}{N^2\omega_0^2} \hat{v}, v)$$

reaches the target velocity vector v by cost of a small shift in time-space variable.

Also notice the following embeddings of cylinders

$$(216) \quad z_1 \circ rQ_{\omega_0/2} \subset rQ_{\omega_0}(1, 0, 0),$$

which follows by direct verification. Applying $z_l \circ$ from the left we obtain

$$(217) \quad z_{l+1} \circ rQ_{\omega_0/2} \subset z_l \circ rQ_{\omega_0}(1, 0, 0).$$

We will be looking at the rescalings

$$f_l(z) = f(z_l \circ rz).$$

All these functions can be thought as defined on the same domain $\overline{\Omega}$ with the same ellipticity constants. Indeed, if $z = (s, y, w) \in \overline{\Omega}$, then

$$z_l \circ rz = (t_l + r^2s, x_l + r^3y + r^2sv_l, rw + v_l).$$

We have

$$|t_l + r^2s| \leq \frac{4|v|^2}{\omega_0^2 N} + \frac{4|v|^2}{\omega_0^2 N^2} \leq \frac{8|v|^2}{\omega_0^2 N} < 1$$

provided $N \geq \frac{8|v|^2}{\omega_0^2}$. Next,

$$|x_l + r^3y + r^2sv_l| \leq \frac{4|v|^3}{\omega_0^2 N^2} + 2R_0 \frac{8|v|^3}{\omega_0^3 N^3} + \frac{4|v|^3}{\omega_0^2 N^2} \leq (2R_0 + 1) \frac{16|v|^3}{\omega_0^3 N^2} \leq 2R_0,$$

provided $N^2 \geq \frac{2R_0+1}{2R_0} \frac{16|v|^3}{\omega_0^3}$. This puts the (t, x) pair into the box $[-1, 1] \times B_{2R_0}$, and so, the ellipticity for $s(z_l \circ rz)$ enjoys the same bounds (213). As to the drift term which gets rescaled to

$$B_l = b(t_l + r^2s, x_l + r^3y + r^2sv_l)r(rw + v_l) + rw(t_l + r^2s, x_l + r^3y + r^2sv_l)$$

notice that

$$|rw + v_l| \leq 2R_0r + |v|$$

so,

$$|B_l| \leq \Lambda r(2R_0r + |v|) + r\Lambda < \Lambda,$$

provided $N \geq c_1|v|^2$, where c_1 is admissible.

The conclusion is that all functions f_l if considered defined on $\bar{\Omega}$ satisfy the equation with the same ellipticity constants provided

$$N \geq c_2 \langle v \rangle^2,$$

where c_2 is admissible.

Let us now start iteration of the weak-Harnack inequality. We have for $f_0(z) = f(rz)$ from the assumption (214), and since $rQ_{\omega_0} \subset Q_{\omega_0}$,

$$\left(\int_{Q_{\omega_0}} f_0^p(z) dz \right)^{1/p} \geq c_0 \omega_0^{\frac{4n+2}{p}}.$$

According to Theorem 7.7,

$$\inf_{Q_{\omega_0}(1,0,0)} f_0 \geq C_0^{-1} c_0 (\omega_0/2)^{\frac{4n+2}{p}},$$

(we artificially divided ω_0 by 2 in order to fit with the general pattern later). According to (216) we have in particular

$$\inf_{Q_{\omega_0/2}} f_1 \geq C_0^{-1} c_0 (\omega_0/2)^{\frac{4n+2}{p}}.$$

Then by restricting to the cylinder $Q_{\omega_0/2}$,

$$\left(\int_{Q_{\omega_0}} f_1^p(z) dz \right)^{1/p} \geq C_0^{-1} c_0 (\omega_0/2)^{2\frac{4n+2}{p}}.$$

According to Theorem 7.7,

$$\inf_{Q_{\omega_0}(1,0,0)} f_1 \geq C_0^{-2} c_0 (\omega_0/2)^{2\frac{4n+2}{p}}.$$

We proceed in the same manner using (217) and applying repeatedly Theorem 7.7.

On the last step we achieve the following bound

$$\inf_{Q_{\omega_0/2}} f_N \geq c_0 [(\omega_0/2)^{\frac{4n+2}{p}} C_0^{-1}]^N = c_0 c_3^N.$$

In particular at the origin we obtain

$$f_N(0, 0, 0) = f(z_N) = f(t_N, x_N, v) \geq c_0 c_3^N.$$

Let us now fix a pair (t, x) such that $(\omega_0/4)^2 \leq t \leq (\omega_0/2)^2$, $|x| \leq (\omega_0/2)^3$ and consider the function

$$g(z) = f((t - t_N, x - x_N, 0) \circ z).$$

This function satisfies the equation on the slightly shrunk domain of ellipticity $[-0.9, 0.9] \times B_{1.9R_0} \times B_{1.9R_0}$. At the same time

$$\inf_{(t_N-t, x_N-x, 0) \circ Q_{\omega_0}} g \geq c_0$$

The same holds on the subcylinder $Q_{\omega_0/2} \subset (t_N-t, x_N-x, 0) \circ Q_{\omega_0}$ (the inclusion follows from the assumptions on (t, x)). Applying the above proof to the new function g , we obtain

$$g(t_N, x_N, v) = f(t, x, v) \geq c_0 c_4^N.$$

Picking the minimal N under which the above holds we find $N = c_5 \langle v \rangle^2$. Hence,

$$f(t, x, v) \geq c_0 e^{N \ln c_4} = c_0 e^{-c_5 |\ln c_4| \langle v \rangle^2},$$

and the proof is over. \square

STEP 4: SPREAD OF POSITIVITY IN x . Let us fix any point of time $(\omega_0/4)^2 \leq t \leq (\omega_0/2)^2$ and reset it to 0. So, at the moment, we have

$$(218) \quad f(0, x, v) \geq be^{-a|v|^2},$$

for all $|x| \leq (\omega_0/2)^3 := r_1$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that r_1 is admissible.

The next goal is to establish spread of positivity across the entire periodic domain. Recall that after the rescaling (210) our distribution f is defined on $L_0\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, where L_0 is an admissible new period. Also, recall that since the scaling parameter $r < 1$, we still have global bounds on the coefficients

$$(219) \quad |s| \leq \bar{S}, \quad |b| \leq \bar{S}, \quad |w| \leq \bar{W}.$$

First, let us adopt a barrier construction from [AZ21] to our situation.

Lemma 7.10. *Suppose*

$$f(0, x, v) \geq \delta \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| < r, |v| < R\}}.$$

Then for any $\tau > 0$ we have

$$f(t, x, v) \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x-tv| < r/2, |v| < R/2\}}.$$

for

$$(220) \quad t \leq t_1 := \min \left\{ 1, \tau, \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{n\bar{S}(\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{R^2}) + (\bar{S}R + \bar{W})(\frac{\tau}{r} + \frac{1}{R})} \right\}.$$

Proof. Let us fix $A > 0$ to be determined later and consider the barrier function

$$\chi = -At + \delta \left(1 - \frac{|x-tv|^2}{r^2} - \frac{|v|^2}{R^2} \right)$$

Note that $f(0, x, v) \geq \chi(0, x, v)$, and also for all $t > 0$, $f(t, x, v) \geq \chi(t, x, v) = 0$, on the boundary $1 = \frac{|x-tv|^2}{r^2} + \frac{|v|^2}{R^2}$. So, we have $f \geq \chi$ on the parabolic boundary in question. We now need to show that χ is a sub-solution inside the ellipsoid $1 \geq \frac{|x-tv|^2}{r^2} + \frac{|v|^2}{R^2}$. By the classical comparison principle it implies $f \geq \chi$ on the same region.

So, differentiating we obtain

$$(221) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi_t + v \cdot \nabla_x \chi &= -A, \\ |s\Delta_v \chi| &= s\delta \left| \frac{2t^2 n}{r^2} + \frac{2n}{R^2} \right| \leq 2n\delta\bar{S} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{R^2} \right), \\ |(bv + w) \cdot \nabla_v \chi| &\leq \delta(\bar{S}R + \bar{W}) \left(2t \frac{|x-tv|}{r^2} + \frac{2|v|}{R^2} \right) \leq \delta(\bar{S}R + \bar{W}) \left(\frac{2\tau}{r} + \frac{2}{R} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$A = 2n\delta\bar{S} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{R^2} \right) + \delta(\bar{S}R + \bar{W}) \left(\frac{2\tau}{r} + \frac{2}{R} \right).$$

In view of the bounds above this implies that χ is a sub-solution.

It remains to observe that as long as $t \leq \frac{\delta}{4A}$ and $|x-tv| < r/2$, $|v| < R/2$, we have $\chi \geq \frac{\delta}{4}$. \square

We will be applying Lemma 7.10 for $r = r_1$. Let us pick τ and R now. Our aim is to make sure that the time limitation giving by the bound (220) is long enough that every corner of the torus $L_0\mathbb{T}^n$ is reachable in that time with velocities from the ball $|v| \leq R/4$. In other words, we ask for $t_1 R \geq 4L_0$, or

$$(222) \quad \tau R \geq 4L_0, \quad R \geq 4L_0$$

$$(223) \quad R \geq 32L_0 \left[n\bar{S} \left(\frac{1}{r_1^2} + \frac{1}{R^2} \right) + (\bar{S}R + \bar{W}) \left(\frac{\tau}{r_1} + \frac{1}{R} \right) \right].$$

So, first we fix $\tau = \frac{r_1}{2\bar{S}}$. This ensures that the leading order term in (223) has coefficient $\frac{1}{2}$. Next we fix the minimal $R = R_1$ satisfying both (222) and (223). Note that R_1 is admissible.

Setting $\delta = be^{-aR_1^2}$, which is also admissible, in view of (218) we have

$$f(0, x, v) \geq \delta \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| < r_1, |v| < R_1\}}.$$

Then

$$f(t, x, v) \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-tv| < r_1/2, |v| < R_1/2\}}, \quad t \leq t_1.$$

Fix any $x_0 \in L_0\mathbb{T}^n$. Then at time t_1 there exists $|v_0| < R_1/4$ such that $t_1 v_0 = x_0$. Notice that if

$$|x - x_0| < r_1/4, \quad |v - v_0| < r_1/4,$$

then $|x - t_1 v| = |x - x_0 + t_1(v_0 - v)| < r_1/2$, and certainly, $|v| < R_1/2$. So,

$$f(t_1, x, v) \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-x_0| < r_1/4, |v-v_0| < r_1/4\}}.$$

Let us recall that we have started from any point of time $(\omega_0/4)^2 \leq t \leq (\omega_0/2)^2$, and obtained a time t_1 independent of t . So, we found that for any $x_0 \in L_0\mathbb{T}^n$ there exists a v_0 , $|v_0| < R_1/4$, which depends only on x_0 such that

$$(224) \quad f(t, x, v) \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \mathbb{1}_{\{(\omega_0/4)^2 < t-t_1 < (\omega_0/2)^2, |x-x_0| < r_1/4, |v-v_0| < r_1/4\}}.$$

In particular,

$$\rho(t, x_0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(t, x_0, v) dv \geq \int_{|v-v_0| < r_1/4} f(t, x_0, v) dv \geq \lambda_1,$$

where λ_1 is admissible, and $(\omega_0/4)^2 \leq t - t_1 \leq (\omega_0/2)^2$. So, for all such times, the density has a uniform lower bound λ_1 . At the same time there exists an admissible Λ_1 such that

$$s(t, x) + |b(t, x)v + w(t, x)| \leq \Lambda_1,$$

for all $(t, x, v) \in [(\omega_0/4)^2 + t_1, (\omega_0/2)^2 + t_1] \times L_0\mathbb{T}^n \times B_{4R_1} = \overline{\Omega}_1$.

This implies that we another initial plateau (224), but now around an arbitrary point $x_0 \in L_0\mathbb{T}^n$, and inside a large domain of ellipticity $\overline{\Omega}_1$. Applying Lemma 7.9 to shifted and if necessary rescaled solution f , we find a time $t_2 < (\omega_0/2)^2 + t_1$ and admissible $\omega_1, a_1, b_1 > 0$ such that

$$f(t_2, x, v) \geq b_1 e^{-a_1|v|^2} \mathbb{1}_{|x-x_0| < \omega_1}.$$

The obtained admissible constants are independent of x_0 by virtue of the argument on Step 3. Thus,

$$(225) \quad f(t_2, x, v) \geq b_1 e^{-a_1|v|^2}.$$

Now, let us go back to Step 1 and recall that we started with time 0 and found an admissible time $0 < t_2 < \frac{1}{2}$ such that (225) holds. Starting at any other initial time $1 - t_2 > t > 0$, we find that (225) holds at $t + t_2$. This finishes the proof.

7.3. Global well-posedness. The main implication of the Proposition 7.4 expressed in Corollary 7.5 is that whenever we control \overline{W} and \overline{H} , we have a control over the low bound on the density, which by Theorem 7.2 implies global extension. For a special class of our models, which we termed ‘mild’ in the beginning discussion of this section, the control over \overline{W} and \overline{H} can indeed be given a priori in terms of energy. This class of models is distinguished by the fact that the 0-order bound in (183) is independent of the density, i.e. \mathcal{M} satisfies for the following condition: for all $u \in L^2(\rho)$

$$(226) \quad \|s_\rho [u]_\rho\|_\infty \leq C_0 \|u\|_{L^2(\rho)}, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\rho), \forall \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega).$$

Such models include all \mathcal{M}_β and $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{topo}}$ for $\beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and in particular, the classical Cucker-Smale model \mathcal{M}_{CS} . Indeed,

$$\rho_\phi^\beta \frac{|(u\rho)_\phi|}{\rho_\phi} \leq C \rho_\phi^\beta \frac{\|u\|_{L^2(\rho)} \rho_\phi^{1/2}}{\rho_\phi} = C \rho_\phi^{\beta-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{L^2(\rho)} \leq C_0 \|u\|_{L^2(\rho)}.$$

In order to obtain an a priori bound on the macroscopic energy let us consider the following entropy (see also Section 8)

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f dv dx + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f \log f dv dx.$$

We have directly from the equation

$$(227) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho \left[\frac{|\nabla_v f|^2}{f} + 2(v - [u]_\rho) \cdot \nabla_v f + v \cdot (v - [u]_\rho) f \right] dv dx.$$

Using the identities

$$\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v f \, dx \, dv = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho v \cdot [u]_\rho f \, dx \, dv = (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho},$$

we obtain

$$(228) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho \frac{|\nabla_v f + v f|^2}{f} \, dv \, dx + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq \int_{\Omega} u \cdot [u]_\rho s_\rho \, d\rho \leq \|s_\rho [u]_\rho\|_\infty \|u\|_{L^2(\rho)} \leq C_0 \|u\|_{L^2(\rho)}^2 \leq C_0 \mathcal{E}.$$

Now, as shown in [Lio94, GJV04] there is an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(229) \quad \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |f \log f| \, dv \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f \log f \, dv \, dx + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f \, dv \, dx + C \leq \mathcal{H} + C.$$

So,

$$(230) \quad \mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{H} - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f \log f \, dv \, dx \leq \mathcal{H} + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |f \log f| \, dv \, dx \leq 2\mathcal{H} + C.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq C_1 \mathcal{H} + C_2.$$

This implies that H is bounded uniformly on $[0, T)$ and hence so is the energy \mathcal{E} , and in view of (229) the quantity \overline{H} .

Thus, we have uniform bounds on \overline{W} and \overline{H} on any time interval $[0, T]$.

Theorem 7.11. *Suppose the model \mathcal{M} satisfies (181) - (184) as well as (226). Then any local solution f to the Fokker-Planck-alignment equation (187) in class $H_l^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ extends globally in time. Consequently, (187) is globally well-posed for solutions with uniformly thick initial data*

$$f_0 \in H_l^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n), \quad k, l \geq n + 3, \quad \inf \rho_\phi(0) > 0.$$

In particular, \mathcal{M}_{CS} , $\mathcal{M}_{CS}^{\text{topo}}$, and all \mathcal{M}_β , $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{\text{topo}}$, for $\beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$, satisfy the conclusions above.

For yet a narrower class of models, namely contractive ones, the entropy \mathcal{H} is in fact a decaying quantity. To see that let us go back to (227) and replace $[u]_\rho$ with u in the second term and compute the third as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho v \cdot (v - [u]_\rho) f \, dv \, dx &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho v \cdot (v - u) f \, dv \, dx + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho v \cdot (u - [u]_\rho) f \, dv \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho |v - u|^2 f \, dv \, dx + \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)}^2 - (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$(231) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho \frac{|\nabla_v f + (v - u) f|^2}{f} \, dv \, dx - \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)}^2 + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

For contractive models the last two terms add up to a nonnegative value. Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq 0.$$

This establishes uniform bound over \overline{H} on any time interval and in view of (226) also on \overline{W} . Applying Corollary 7.5 on time intervals $[n, n + 1]$ we obtain a uniform lower bound on the density starting from time $t = 1$.

Theorem 7.12. *Suppose the model \mathcal{M} is contractive and satisfies (181) - (184), (226). Then, in addition to the conclusions of Theorem 7.11, for any classical solution f there exists a $\rho_- > 0$ depending only on the initial entropy \mathcal{H}_0 and the parameters of the model, such that*

$$(232) \quad \rho(t, x) \geq \rho_-, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [1, \infty) \times \mathbb{T}^n.$$

In particular, models \mathcal{M}_{CS} , $\mathcal{M}_{CS}^{\text{topo}}$ satisfy the statement above.

A simple rescaling argument shows that in fact for any time $t_0 > 0$ there exists $\rho_- > 0$ depending on the initial entropy \mathcal{H}_0 , t_0 , and the parameters of the model such that

$$(233) \quad \rho(t, x) \geq \rho_-, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [t_0, \infty) \times \mathbb{T}^n.$$

So, vacuum disappears instantaneously.

As discussed in Section 4, the size of the spectral gap is directly related to the lower bound (232). Just like in the noiseless case, having a uniform lower bound on the density has profound implications to flocking. This will be discussed next in the study of relaxation.

8. RELAXATION AND GLOBAL HYPOCOERCIVITY

The discussion in this section will be taking place on the compact domain $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$. This technical rather than essential assumption can be avoided if we embed the equation (150) in the field of a confining force, see [Vil09] for necessary modifications.

Let us recall that the Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation

$$(234) \quad \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f = \sigma s_\rho \Delta_v f + \nabla_v (s_\rho (v - [u]_\rho) f),$$

has an obvious equilibrium

$$(235) \quad \mu_{\sigma, \bar{u}} = \frac{1}{|\Omega| (2\pi\sigma)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|v - \bar{u}|^2}{2\sigma}}.$$

Let us state our main result.

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is a material model. Let $f \in H_t^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a classical solution to (150) with $\rho(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $t \geq 0$, where \mathcal{D} is a class of admissible densities satisfying the following three conditions*

- (i) *there exist constants $c_0, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $c_0 \leq s_\rho \leq c_1$ and $\|\nabla s_\rho\|_\infty \leq c_2$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$;*
- (ii) *there exists a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(236) \quad \sup \left\{ (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} : u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \bar{u} = 0, \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)} = 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \varepsilon_0.$$

- (iii) $\nabla_x (s_\rho [\cdot]_\rho) : L^2(\rho) \rightarrow L^2(\rho)$ *uniformly for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$.*

Then f relaxes to the corresponding Maxwellian exponentially fast,

$$(237) \quad \|f(t) - \mu_{\sigma, \bar{u}(t)}\|_{L^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c_3 \sqrt{\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}(f_0)} e^{-c_4 \sigma t},$$

where $c_3, c_4 > 0$ depend only on the stated parameters of the model \mathcal{M} and $\mathcal{I}(f_0)$ is the Fisher information defined in (246).

Proof of Theorem 8.1. We seek to estimate the relative entropy defined by

$$(238) \quad \mathcal{H} = \sigma \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f \log \frac{f}{\mu_{\sigma, \bar{u}}} dv dx.$$

By the Csiszár-Kullback inequality, we have

$$c\sigma \|f - \mu_{\sigma, \bar{u}}\|_1^2 \leq \mathcal{H},$$

for some absolute c . So, an exponential decay of the entropy would imply the desired result.

Since the model at hand is not assumed to be Galilean invariant or conservative the mean velocity \bar{u} is time dependent and generally may not be assumed 0 without changing the equation. It will, however, be beneficial to pass to the reference frame centered at \bar{u} . So, we consider the change of variables

$$\tilde{f}(x, v, t) = f(x, v + \bar{u}, t), \quad \tilde{u} = u - \bar{u}, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \rho.$$

In the new variables the equation reads (dropping tildas)

$$(239) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t f + (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x f &= \bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v f + \sigma s_\rho \Delta_v f + \nabla_v (s_\rho (v - [u]_\rho) f) \\ \int_{\Omega} u \rho dx &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We also denote $\mu_\sigma = \mu_{\sigma, 0}$. Again, let us note that the extra transport term $\bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v f$ appears because we do not assume that our model is conservative. The equation for \bar{u}_t is not important. We only keep in mind that \bar{u}_t is independent of x at any point of time.

The starting point in the proof is the two forms of the entropy law given by (228) and (231) (note that the extra transport term $\bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v f$ has no effect here).

Let us consider (228) first. Rescaled by σ , the law takes form

$$(240) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho \frac{|\sigma \nabla_v f + v f|^2}{f} dv dx + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Although this form is not dissipative, it gives access to the partial Fisher information

$$\mathcal{I}_{vv} = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\sigma \nabla_v f + v f|^2}{f} dv dx.$$

Indeed, in view of (i), we have

$$(241) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq -c_0 \mathcal{I}_{vv} + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

To control the residual energy $(u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}$ we use the dissipative form of the entropy law (231), after σ -rescaling

$$(242) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} = - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_\rho \frac{|\sigma \nabla_v f + (v - u) f|^2}{f} dv dx - \|u\|_{L^2(\kappa_\rho)}^2 + (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Using the spectral gap assumption (ii) we conclude

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq -\varepsilon_0 \|u\|_2^2.$$

Combining with the previous form (241) we obtain

$$(1 + 2/\varepsilon_0) \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq -c_0 \mathcal{I}_{vv} - \|u\|_2^2,$$

or, dividing by $(1 + 2/\varepsilon_0)$,

$$(243) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H} \leq -c \mathcal{I}_{vv} - c \|u\|_2^2.$$

The next stage of the proof consists of showing that the classical hypocoercivity of the linear Fokker-Planck equation extends to the fully non-linear alignment model. In contrast to the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model analyzed in [Shv22] the general system (239) requires special attention in many steps. This is due to inhomogeneity of diffusion, shift in the transport term, and absence of explicitly given integral representation of the averaging (recall that we are not even assuming that the model has a reproducing kernel). These differences result in the slower exponential rate σ , as opposed to $\sigma^{1/2}$ for the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model.

Let us write the equation for the new distribution

$$h = \frac{f}{\mu_\sigma},$$

$$(244) \quad h_t + (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h = \bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v h - \frac{v}{\sigma} \cdot \bar{u}_t h + s_\rho (\sigma \Delta_v h - v \cdot \nabla_v h) + s_\rho (\sigma^{-1} ([u]_\rho \cdot v) h - [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v h).$$

The Fokker-Planck part of the equation (244) has the traditional structure of an evolution semigroup. Denoting

$$B = (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x, \quad A = \nabla_v, \quad A^* = \frac{v}{\sigma} - \nabla_v,$$

where A^* is understood relative to the inner product of the weighted space $L^2(\mu_\sigma)$, we can write

$$(245) \quad h_t = -\sigma s_\rho A^* A h - B h + s_\rho A^* ([u]_\rho h) - A^* (h \bar{u}_t).$$

We consider Fisher information functionals

$$\mathcal{I}_{vv}(h) = \sigma^2 \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla_v h|^2}{h} d\mu_\sigma, \quad \mathcal{I}_{xv}(h) = \sigma^{3/2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\nabla_x h \cdot \nabla_v h}{h} d\mu_\sigma, \quad \mathcal{I}_{xx}(h) = \sigma \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla_x h|^2}{h} d\mu_\sigma,$$

where $d\mu_\sigma = \mu_\sigma dv dx$. The full Fisher information defined by

$$(246) \quad \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{vv} + \mathcal{I}_{xx}$$

dominates the relative entropy by the classical log-Sobolev inequality

$$\mathcal{I}_{vv} + \mathcal{I}_{xx} \geq \lambda \mathcal{H}.$$

We now differentiate each of these functionals and obtain estimates on the obtained equations. The coercivity will be restored by putting them together in a proper linear combination along with the entropy law (243).

We will use the following notation: $(g)_\mu = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} g \, d\mu_\sigma$.

Lemma 8.2. *We have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{vv}(h) \leq -2\sigma^3 \mathcal{D}_{vv} - 2c_0 \mathcal{I}_{vv} - 2\sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{I}_{xv} + 2\|u\|_2^2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{vv} = (s_\rho h |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu, \quad \bar{h} = \log h.$$

Proof. Let us write $\mathcal{I}_{vv} = (\nabla_v h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu$. Computing the derivative we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{vv} = 2(\nabla_v h_t \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - (|\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 h_t)_\mu = J_A + J_B + J_u + J_{\bar{u}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_A &= -2\sigma(s_\rho \nabla_v A^* A h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + \sigma(s_\rho |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 A^* A h)_\mu \\ J_B &= -2(\nabla_v B h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + (|\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 B h)_\mu \\ J_u &= 2(s_\rho \nabla_v A^* ([u]_\rho h) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - (s_\rho |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 A^* ([u]_\rho h))_\mu \\ J_{\bar{u}} &= -2(\nabla_v A^* (h \bar{u}_t) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + (\nabla_v |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \bar{u}_t h)_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Let us start with the most straightforward transport term B . We have

$$J_B = -2(\nabla_x h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - 2((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h_{v_i} \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + (|\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu =: J_B^1 + J_B^2 + J_B^3.$$

Observe that

$$J_B^1 = -2\sigma^{-3/2} \mathcal{I}_{xv}.$$

Next, as to the second term:

$$\begin{aligned} J_B^2 &= -2((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h_{v_i} h_{v_i} h^{-1})_\mu = -((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x |h_{v_i}|^2 h^{-1})_\mu \\ &= -(|h_{v_i}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h h^{-2})_\mu = -(|\bar{h}_{v_i}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu = -J_B^3 \end{aligned}$$

and so the two cancel. We obtain

$$J_B = -2\sigma^{-3/2} \mathcal{I}_{xv}.$$

Let us turn to the dissipation term J_A . Using the identity

$$\partial_{v_i} (A^* A h) = A^* A h_{v_i} + \sigma^{-1} h_{v_i},$$

we have

$$J_A = -2\sigma(s_\rho A^* A h_{v_i} \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - 2(s_\rho \nabla_v h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + \sigma(s_\rho |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 A^* A h)_\mu.$$

Note that the term in the middle is bounded above by $-2c_0 \sigma^{-2} \mathcal{I}_{vv}$ in view of (i). In the other two we switch A^* to the opposite side,

$$\begin{aligned} J_A &\leq -2\sigma(s_\rho A h_{v_i} \cdot A \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - 2c_0 \sigma^{-2} \mathcal{I}_{vv} + \sigma(s_\rho A |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 \cdot A h)_\mu \\ &= -2\sigma(s_\rho h A \bar{h}_{v_i} \cdot A \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - 2\sigma(s_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i} A h \cdot A \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - 2c_0 \sigma^{-2} \mathcal{I}_{vv} + 2\sigma(s_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i} A \bar{h}_{v_i} \cdot A h)_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

The second and last terms cancel, while the first is exactly $-2\sigma \mathcal{D}_{vv}$:

$$J_A \leq -2\sigma \mathcal{D}_{vv} - 2c_0 \sigma^{-2} \mathcal{I}_{vv}.$$

For the alignment term we obtain the following the exact identity

$$(247) \quad J_u = 2\sigma^{-2} ([u]_\rho \cdot u)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

We note, however, that there is no advantage of keeping the low energy here as the full energy will emerge later in the proof. So, we replace it with the full energy

$$(248) \quad J_u \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon_0) \sigma^{-2} \|u\|_2^2 \leq 2\sigma^{-2} \|u\|_2^2.$$

To prove (247) we manipulate with the formula for J_u as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
J_u &= 2(s_\rho \nabla_v A^*([u]_\rho h) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - (s_\rho |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 A^*([u]_\rho h))_\mu \\
&= 2(s_\rho \nabla_v (\sigma^{-1} v \cdot [u]_\rho h - [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v h) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - (s_\rho \nabla_v |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 \cdot [u]_\rho h)_\mu \\
&= 2\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho [u]_\rho h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + 2\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho (v \cdot [u]_\rho) \nabla_v h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - 2(s_\rho \nabla_v^2 h [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - 2(s_\rho \nabla_v^2 \bar{h} (\nabla_v \bar{h}) \cdot [u]_\rho h)_\mu \\
&=: J_u^1 + J_u^2 + J_u^3 + J_u^4,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla_v^2 h$ is the Hessian matrix of h .

Observe that the first term is exactly the lower energy

$$J_u^1 = 2\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu = 2\sigma^{-2} (s_\rho [u]_\rho \cdot v h)_\mu = 2\sigma^{-2} ([u]_\rho \cdot u)_{\kappa_\rho}.$$

Now comes the crucial observation that the remaining terms that cannot be controlled cancel altogether

$$J_u^2 + J_u^3 + J_u^4 = 0.$$

Indeed, using

$$(249) \quad h_{v_i v_j} = \bar{h} \bar{h}_{v_i v_j} + \frac{1}{h} h_{v_i} h_{v_j}$$

let us compute J_u^3 ,

$$J_u^3 = -2(s_\rho h_{v_i v_j} [u_j]_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu = -2(s_\rho h \bar{h}_{v_i v_j} [u_j]_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - 2(s_\rho \frac{1}{h} h_{v_i} h_{v_j} [u_j]_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu = J_u^4 - 2(s_\rho \nabla_v h \cdot [u]_\rho |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu$$

Also note that

$$J_u^2 = 2\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho (v \cdot [u]_\rho h) |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu.$$

Then we have

$$J_u^2 + J_u^3 = J_u^4 + 2\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho (v \cdot [u]_\rho h) |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu - 2(s_\rho \nabla_v h \cdot [u]_\rho |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu = J_u^4 + 2(s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h) |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu.$$

Switching A^* in the last term we obtain

$$2(s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h) |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu = 2(s_\rho h [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2)_\mu = -2J_u^4.$$

The obtained terms sum up to zero.

Finally, we show that the momentum term vanishes $J_{\bar{u}} = 0$. Let us expand

$$J_{\bar{u}} = 2(\nabla_v^2 h \nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \bar{u}_t)_\mu - 2 \left(\frac{v \cdot \bar{u}_t}{\sigma} \frac{|\nabla_v h|^2}{h} \right)_\mu + (\nabla_v |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \bar{u}_t h)_\mu =: J_{\bar{u}}^1 + J_{\bar{u}}^2 + J_{\bar{u}}^3.$$

Let us look into the first term,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\bar{u}}^1 &= \left(\frac{\nabla_v |\nabla_v h|^2}{h} \cdot \bar{u}_t \right)_\mu = \left(A \left(\frac{|\nabla_v h|^2}{h} \right) \cdot \bar{u}_t \right)_\mu + \left(\frac{|\nabla_v h|^2}{h^2} \nabla_v h \cdot \bar{u}_t \right)_\mu \\
&= \left(\frac{|\nabla_v h|^2}{h} \frac{v \cdot \bar{u}_t}{\sigma} \right)_\mu + (|\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 \nabla_v h \cdot \bar{u}_t)_\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

So,

$$J_{\bar{u}}^1 + J_{\bar{u}}^2 = - \left(\frac{|\nabla_v h|^2}{h} \frac{v \cdot \bar{u}_t}{\sigma} \right)_\mu + (|\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 \nabla_v h \cdot \bar{u}_t)_\mu = -(|\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 A^*(h \bar{u}_t))_\mu = -(\nabla_v |\nabla_v \bar{h}|^2 h \bar{u}_t)_\mu = -J_{\bar{u}}^3.$$

Thus, $J_{\bar{u}}^1 + J_{\bar{u}}^2 + J_{\bar{u}}^3 = 0$. □

Lemma 8.3. *We have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{xv}(h) \leq -\frac{1}{4} \sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{I}_{xx} + c(\sigma^{-1/2} + 1) \mathcal{I}_{vv} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^3 \mathcal{D}_{vv} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \mathcal{D}_{xv} + c(\sigma^{-1/2} + 1) \|u\|_2^2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{xv} = (s_\rho h |\nabla_v \nabla_x \bar{h}|^2)_\mu.$$

Proof. Let us write

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^{3/2}} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{xv}(h) = (\nabla_x h_t \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + (\nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_v h_t)_\mu - (h_t \nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu := J_A + J_B + J_u + J_{\bar{u}},$$

where as before $J_A, J_B, J_u, J_{\bar{u}}$ collect contributions from A, B , and alignment components, respectively.

For the B -term we have

$$J_B = -(\nabla_x((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - (\nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_v((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h))_\mu + (((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h) \nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu := J_B^1 + J_B^2 + J_B^3.$$

For the middle term we expand

$$J_B^2 = -(\nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu - (\bar{h}_{x_i}(v_j + \bar{u}_j)h_{x_j v_i})_\mu.$$

The first term is exactly $-\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx}$ and in the second integrating by parts in x_j , we obtain

$$= -\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx} + (\bar{h}_{x_i x_j}(v_j + \bar{u}_j)h_{v_i})_\mu$$

using that $\bar{h}_{x_i x_j} = h^{-1} h_{x_i x_j} - \bar{h}_{x_i} \bar{h}_{x_j}$,

$$= -\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx} + (h_{x_i x_j}(v_j + \bar{u}_j)\bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - (\bar{h}_{x_i} \bar{h}_{x_j}(v_j + \bar{u}_j)h_{v_i})_\mu = -\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx} - J_B^1 - J_B^3.$$

Hence,

$$(250) \quad J_B = -\sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx}.$$

Let us look into the J_A -term:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma} J_A = -(\nabla_x(s_\rho A^* A h) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu - (s_\rho \nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_v A^* A h)_\mu + (s_\rho A^* A h \nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu = J_A^1 + J_A^2 + J_A^3.$$

For J_A^1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_A^1 &= -(s_\rho A^* A h_{x_i} \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - ((s_\rho)_{x_i} A^* A h \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu = -(s_\rho \nabla_v h_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - ((s_\rho)_{x_i} \nabla_v h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu \\ &= -(s_\rho h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - (s_\rho \bar{h}_{x_i} \nabla_v h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - \left(\frac{(s_\rho)_{x_i}}{s_\rho^{1/2}} \frac{\nabla_v h}{h^{1/2}} \cdot s_\rho^{1/2} h^{1/2} \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i} \right)_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

In view of assumption (i),

$$J_A^1 \leq -(s_\rho h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - (s_\rho \bar{h}_{x_i} \nabla_v h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + c\sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{vv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}}.$$

For J_A^2 we obtain

$$J_A^2 = -\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho \nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu - (s_\rho \bar{h}_{x_i} A^* A h_{v_i})_\mu = -\sigma^{-1} (s_\rho \nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu - (s_\rho h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - (s_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i} \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu.$$

The two add up to

$$\begin{aligned} J_A^1 + J_A^2 &= -\sigma^{-1} \left(s_\rho \frac{\nabla_x h}{h^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{\nabla_v h}{h^{1/2}} \right)_\mu - 2(s_\rho h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu - (s_\rho A h \cdot A(\nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h}))_\mu + c\sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{vv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}} \\ &\leq -c_0 \sigma^{-5/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{xx} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} + \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}} + c\sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{vv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}} - J_A^3. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$J_A \leq c_0 \sigma^{-3/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{xx} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} + \sigma \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}} + c \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{vv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}}.$$

Let us examine the alignment term now,

$$\begin{aligned} J_u &= (\nabla_x(s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h)) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h})_\mu + (\nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_v(s_\rho A^*([u] h)))_\mu - (s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h) \nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu \\ &= ((s_\rho)_{x_i} A^*([u]_\rho h) \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + (s A^*([u]_\rho)_{x_i} h) \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + (s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h_{x_i}) \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu \\ &\quad + (s_\rho \bar{h}_{x_i} A^*([u]_\rho h_{v_i}))_\mu + \sigma^{-1} (s_\rho h \nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot [u]_\rho)_\mu - (s_\rho h [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v(\nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h}))_\mu \\ &= (h(s_\rho [u]_\rho)_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + (s_\rho h [u]_\rho \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu \\ &\quad + (s_\rho h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot [u]_\rho \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + \sigma^{-1} (s_\rho h \nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot [u]_\rho)_\mu - (s_\rho h [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v(\nabla_v \bar{h} \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h}))_\mu \end{aligned}$$

We can see that the 2rd, 3th, and 5th terms cancel, and we arrive at

$$J_u = (h(s_\rho [u]_\rho)_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{v_i})_\mu + \sigma^{-1} (s_\rho h \nabla_x \bar{h} \cdot [u]_\rho)_\mu = J_u^1 + J_u^2.$$

We estimate J_u^1 using the assumption (iii),

$$J_u^1 \leq c \|u\|_2 \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{vv}}$$

And finally,

$$J_u^2 \leq \sigma^{-3/2} \|u\|_2 \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{xx}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx} + \sigma^{-2} \|u\|_2^2.$$

Noticing that $\frac{1}{2} \sigma^{-1} \mathcal{I}_{xx}$ is absorbed into (250) and summing up all the terms we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{xv}(h) &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{I}_{xx} + c_0 \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{xx} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} + c \sigma^{3/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{vv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}} + \sigma^{5/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{D}_{vv}} + c \sigma^{3/2} \|u\|_2 \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{vv}} + \sigma^{-1/2} \|u\|_2^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{4} \sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{I}_{xx} + c(\sigma^{-1/2} + 1) \mathcal{I}_{vv} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^3 \mathcal{D}_{vv} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \mathcal{D}_{xv} + c(\sigma^{-1/2} + 1) \|u\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let us look at the momentum term

$$J_{\bar{u}} = -(A^*(\bar{u}_t \partial_{x_i} h) \partial_{v_i} \bar{h})_\mu - (\partial_{x_i} \bar{h} \partial_{v_i} A^*(\bar{u}_t h))_\mu + (A^*(\bar{u}_t h) \partial_{v_i} \bar{h} \partial_{x_i} \bar{h})_\mu := J_{\bar{u}}^1 + J_{\bar{u}}^2 + J_{\bar{u}}^3.$$

Let us note the identity

$$\partial_{v_i} A^* = A^* \partial_{v_i} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \text{Id},$$

and expand on $J_{\bar{u}}^2$

$$J_{\bar{u}}^2 = -(\partial_{x_i} \bar{h} A^*(\bar{u}_t \partial_{v_i} h))_\mu - \sigma^{-1} (\partial_{x_i} h \bar{u}_t)_\mu.$$

The last term vanishes since \bar{u}_t is a constant vector. Thus,

$$J_{\bar{u}}^2 = -(\nabla_v \partial_{x_i} \bar{h} \cdot \bar{u}_t \partial_{v_i} h)_\mu$$

In the other two terms we switch A^* as well

$$J_{\bar{u}}^1 = -(\partial_{x_i} h \bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v \partial_{v_i} \bar{h})_\mu$$

$$J_{\bar{u}}^3 = (h \bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v (\partial_{v_i} \bar{h} \partial_{x_i} \bar{h}))_\mu$$

The sum of the three is clearly zero by the product rule. So,

$$J_{\bar{u}} = 0.$$

□

Lemma 8.4. *We have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{xx}(h) \leq c \mathcal{I}_{vv} - \sigma^2 \mathcal{D}_{xv} + c \|u\|_2^2.$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_{xx}(h) = 2(\nabla_x h_t \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu - (|\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 h_t)_\mu := J_A + J_B + J_u + J_{\bar{u}}.$$

The B -term cancels entirely,

$$\begin{aligned} J_B &= -2(\nabla_x((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h) \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu + (|\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu \\ &= -2(((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h_{x_i}) h_{x_i} h^{-1})_\mu + (|\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu \\ &= -(((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x |\nabla_x h|^2 h^{-1})_\mu + (|\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu \\ &= -((v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h |\nabla_x h|^2 h^{-2})_\mu + (|\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 (v + \bar{u}) \cdot \nabla_x h)_\mu = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So is $J_{\bar{u}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\bar{u}} &= -2(\nabla_x A^*(\bar{u}_t h) \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu + (|\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 A^*(\bar{u}_t h))_\mu \\ &= -2(\partial_{x_i} h \bar{u}_t \cdot \nabla_v \partial_{x_i} \bar{h})_\mu + (\nabla_v |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \bar{u}_t h)_\mu = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The A -term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} J_A &= -2(\nabla_x (s_\rho A^* Ah) \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu + (s_\rho |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 A^* Ah)_\mu \\ &= -2((s_\rho)_{x_i} Ah \cdot A \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu - 2(s_\rho Ah_{x_i} \cdot A \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu + (s_\rho A |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 \cdot Ah)_\mu \\ &\leq c \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} - 2(s_\rho \nabla_v (h \bar{h}_{x_i}) \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu + (s_\rho \nabla_v |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu \\ &= c \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} - 2(s_\rho h \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu - 2(s_\rho \bar{h}_{x_i} \nabla_v h \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu + (s_\rho \nabla_v |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu \\ &= c \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} - 2\mathcal{D}_{xv} - (s_\rho \nabla_v |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu + (s_\rho \nabla_v |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 \cdot \nabla_v h)_\mu \\ &= c \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv} \mathcal{I}_{vv}} - 2\mathcal{D}_{xv}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$J_A \leq c\sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv}\mathcal{I}_{vv}} - 2\sigma\mathcal{D}_{xv}.$$

Finally, the alignment term is given by

$$J_u = 2(\nabla_x(s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h)) \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu - (s_\rho |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 A^*([u]_\rho h))_\mu.$$

In the second term we switch the operator A^* :

$$(251) \quad -(s_\rho |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 A^*([u]_\rho h))_\mu = -(s_\rho \nabla_v |\nabla_x \bar{h}|^2 [u]_\rho h)_\mu.$$

For the first term we obtain

$$2(\nabla_x(s_\rho A^*([u]_\rho h)) \cdot \nabla_x \bar{h})_\mu = 2(h(s_\rho [u]_\rho)_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu + 2(s_\rho h \bar{h}_{x_i} [u]_\rho \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu.$$

We can see that the last term cancels with (251). We thus obtain, using assumption (iii),

$$J_u = 2(h(s_\rho [u]_\rho)_{x_i} \cdot \nabla_v \bar{h}_{x_i})_\mu \leq c\|u\|_2\sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv}}.$$

Putting together the obtained bounds we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{I}_{xx}(h) \leq c\sigma\sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv}\mathcal{I}_{vv}} - 2\sigma^2\mathcal{D}_{xv} + c\sigma\|u\|_2\sqrt{\mathcal{D}_{xv}} \leq c\mathcal{I}_{vv} - \sigma^2\mathcal{D}_{xv} + c\|u\|_2^2.$$

□

To conclude the proof, let us combine together all the Fisher functionals in the following format

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{I}_{vv} + \delta\sigma^{1/2}\mathcal{I}_{xv} + \frac{c_0}{c}\mathcal{I}_{xx},$$

where $\delta > 0$ is small but dependent only on the parameters of the assumptions (i), (ii), (iii). Since $\sigma < 1$, for δ small enough we have $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} \sim \mathcal{I}$. Then,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\mathcal{I}} \leq -c_0\mathcal{I}_{vv} - c_1\sigma\mathcal{I}_{xx} + C\|u\|_2^2.$$

Invoking the entropy inequality (243), we obtain with a properly chosen constant $C > 0$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{\mathcal{I}} + C\mathcal{H}) \leq -c_0\mathcal{I}_{vv} - c_1\sigma\mathcal{I}_{xx} \leq -c_2\sigma(\mathcal{I}_{vv} + \mathcal{I}_{xx}) \sim -\sigma(\tilde{\mathcal{I}} + C\mathcal{H}).$$

Hence,

$$(252) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{I}} + C\mathcal{H} \leq c_3\mathcal{I}(f_0)e^{-c_2\sigma t},$$

and the result follows. □

The result provides a general relaxation result for initial data close to the Maxwellian in the sense of information. Indeed, let us suppose that the averaging model admits all densities close to uniform, i.e.

(U): there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying $\|\rho - 1\|_{L^1} \leq \delta_0$ belongs to the admissibility class \mathcal{D} of Theorem 8.1.

Corollary 8.5. *Suppose (U) holds. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that if*

$$(253) \quad \mathcal{I}(f_0) \leq \sigma\delta,$$

then the solution relaxes to the Maxwellian exponentially fast.

Proof. If (253) holds, for some δ to be determined later, then by the Csiszár-Kullback inequality $\|\rho_0 - 1\|_{L^1} \leq c\delta$. Assuming that $c\delta < \delta_0/2$, we will have a solution that satisfies $\|\rho - 1\|_{L^1} \leq \delta_0$ on a time interval $[0, T)$. Let us suppose that T is the maximal such time. Then the proof of Theorem 8.1 applies on $[0, T]$, and hence (252) holds at time $t = T$. Consequently, $\|\rho(T) - 1\|_{L^1} \leq c_1\delta$. Again, choosing δ small we can ensure that $c_1\delta < \delta_0$, and hence T cannot be finite. This proves the result. □

8.1. Applications. Let us explore various applications of Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 7.12 combined with the spectral gap formulas obtained in Section 4.4.

Example 8.6 (\mathcal{M}_{CS} -model). The most striking application of the obtained results goes for the classical Cucker-Smale model. \mathcal{M}_{CS} fulfills all the assumptions of Theorem 7.12. In addition, according to (117), the spectral gap satisfies $\varepsilon \gtrsim \rho_-^3$, provided the kernel ϕ is Bochner-positive, $\phi = \psi * \psi$ for some smooth $\psi \geq 0$. Consequently, the gap remains uniformly bounded from below from time $t = 1$. All the assumptions of Theorem 8.1 are therefore satisfied starting from time $t = 1$.

Corollary 8.7. *Any classical solution $f \in H_t^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ to (150) based on the Cucker-Smale model \mathcal{M}_{CS} with Bochner-positive kernel ϕ will relax exponentially fast as stated in Theorem 8.1.*

Combined with Theorem 7.2 and Theorem 7.11 we obtain global existence and relaxation of any solution with initially thick data, $\rho_\phi(0) > 0$. This extends the result of [DFT10] to non-perturbative settings.

Example 8.8 (\mathcal{M}_{MT} , \mathcal{M}_ϕ , and \mathcal{M}_{seg} -models). For these models $s_\rho \equiv 1$, however, no uniform gain of positivity can be shown as \overline{W} may not remain uniformly bounded for all time. So, one way to satisfy the requirements of Theorem 8.1 is to enforce a conditional uniform thickness: in the case of \mathcal{M}_ϕ ,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{P} : \rho_- \geq c_0\}, \quad c_0 > 0;$$

in the case of \mathcal{M}_{MT} ,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{P} : \rho_+ \leq c_1, \rho_- \geq c_2, \rho_+ - \rho_- \leq c \frac{\rho_-^3}{\rho_+}\}$$

where c is defined in Corollary 4.15; and

$$(254) \quad \mathcal{D} = \{G_{l'l} \geq \delta, \quad \forall l, l' = 1, \dots, L\}$$

in the case of \mathcal{M}_{seg} -model. We refer to Example 4.16, Example 4.14, and Example 4.19, respectively.

Another way to achieve the assumptions of Theorem 8.1 for \mathcal{M}_ϕ and \mathcal{M}_{seg} -models is to enforce the macroscopic velocity u to be bounded

$$(255) \quad \|u(t)\|_\infty \leq C, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Indeed, the averaging becomes uniformly bounded. So, \overline{W} remains uniformly bounded, and so is \overline{H} by the contractivity. According to Proposition 7.4, ρ becomes bounded from below for all $t > 1$.

Corollary 8.9. *Let $f \in H_t^k(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a classical solution to (150) based on the averaging model \mathcal{M}_ϕ or \mathcal{M}_{seg} . Then provided the macroscopic velocity u remains uniformly bounded for all times, the distribution f relaxes to the global Maxwellian according to (237).*

It is remarkable that even under the assumption of admissibility \mathcal{D} the Motsch-Tadmor model still may not settle on a fixed mean velocity, i.e. we don't have means of proving that $\bar{u} \rightarrow u_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for some $u_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^n$. So, the relaxation occurs towards a moving Maxwellian.

9. HYDRODYNAMIC LIMITS

Supplementing the Vlasov equation (61) with a strong penalization force

$$(256) \quad \partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon = \nabla_v \cdot (s_\rho(v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} F(f^\varepsilon),$$

one can achieve regimes in which the distribution f asymptotically takes a special form explicitly expressible in terms of the macroscopic quantities u, ρ . This allows to resolve the closure problem for the Euler-alignment system (20) whereby the Reynolds stress tensor turns into a pressure term. Two regimes in which this was done are the monokinetic and Maxwellian ones.

In the former case, F is given by the local alignment to the macroscopic field $F = \nabla_v \cdot ((v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon)$ which forces f^ε to aggregate on the monokinetic distribution $f = \rho(x, t) \delta_{u(x, t)}(v)$, where ρ, u solve the pressureless EAS

$$(257) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u \rho) &= 0, \\ \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u &= s_\rho([u]_\rho - u). \end{aligned}$$

The history of the former approach goes back to [MV08, KV15] where the alignment term in (61) is considered centered around zero velocity. In the settings of the classical Cucker-Smale model the hydrodynamic limit

was studied in [FK19]. In both studies the force $F = \nabla_v[(v - u^\varepsilon)f^\varepsilon]$ includes the rough macroscopic field u^ε causing issues with uniqueness of characteristics of (256) and subsequently the transport of f^ε . These issues have been dealt with in [FK19] by imposing no vacuum condition $\rho > 0$ and restricting analysis to the periodic domain. A more recent remake of Figalli-Kang's argument done in [Shv21] avoids all these issues by replacing u^ε with a mollified version if it, u_δ^ε , based on the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -protocol. Such a change allows to extend the limit to vacuum and compactly supported flocks on either \mathbb{T}^n or \mathbb{R}^n .

In the context of the general environmental averaging models this result can be broadly extended to include all material models \mathcal{M} which have a representing kernel ϕ_ρ satisfying two natural continuity assumptions, see (R1)-(R2) below. Moreover, in contrast to the previous studies where the convergence $f^\varepsilon \rightarrow f$ is shown in Wasserstein-1 metric, we implement a new approach based on probabilistic definition of Wasserstein-2 and show convergence in this stronger metric instead, see Theorem 9.2.

In the Maxwellian regime the force F incorporates diffusion, $F = \Delta_v f^\varepsilon + \nabla_v((v - u^\varepsilon)f^\varepsilon)$. The local thermodynamic equilibrium becomes the Maxwellian

$$f = \frac{\rho(x, t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|v - u(x, t)|^2}{2}},$$

and so the macroscopic closure model turns into EAS with isothermal pressure

$$(258) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) &= 0, \\ \partial_t(\rho u) + \nabla \cdot (\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla \rho &= \rho s_\rho([u]_\rho - u). \end{aligned}$$

In the Cucker-Smale settings, this limit was justified in [KMT15] via the relative entropy method. Again, because of the roughness of u^ε the result had to be cast in the settings of a special class of weak solutions established in [KMT13], see also [KMT14] for the justification of a local alignment limit. The work [Shv22] implemented similar method to prove hydrodynamic limit in the context of the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model.

Now, we can cast the Maxwellian limit in the framework of general environmental averaging models with the additional implementation of the mollified local alignment field u_δ^ε – the same methodology we have been using in the monokinetic regime. This allows to work in the class of classical solutions as stated in Theorem 7.2 and Theorem 7.11. The requirements imposed on the model \mathcal{M} are only being contractive and material, and the strength s_ρ along with the weighted average $s_\rho[u]_\rho$ need to satisfy mild continuity conditions stated in (R3)-(R4) below. Theorem 9.5 shows convergence $f^\varepsilon \rightarrow f$ in the relative entropy sense, and hence, in L^1 by the Csiszár-Kullback inequality.

9.1. Monokinetic regime. In this section we discuss hydrodynamic limit in the monokinetic regime which penalizes deviation of the density f from the monokinetic distribution around a properly averaged mean velocity. The analysis will be carried out on any environment Ω , compact or not, and for a material model \mathcal{M} that possesses a reproducing kernel ϕ_ρ , see (38). The latter is necessary to give the weighted averages $s_\rho[u]_\rho$ a more specific integral representation (36).

Let us consider solutions to the following Vlasov model with forced local alignment

$$(259) \quad \partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon = \nabla_v (s_{\rho^\varepsilon} (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_v ((v - u_\delta^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon),$$

where subscript δ designates a special mollification. To define it let us fix a smooth mollifier $\psi_\delta(x) = \frac{1}{\delta^n} \psi(x/\delta)$. Then let u_δ be the average of u based on the $\mathcal{M}_{\psi_\delta}$ -protocol,

$$(260) \quad u_\delta = \left(\frac{(u\rho)\psi_\delta}{\rho\psi_\delta} \right)_{\psi_\delta}.$$

Notice that if f has a bounded support in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$ (which is always be the case), we have

$$\left| \frac{(u\rho)\psi_\delta}{\rho\psi_\delta}(x) \right| = \left| \frac{\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \psi_\delta(x - y) w f(y, w) \, dw \, dy}{\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \psi_\delta(x - y) f(y, w) \, dw \, dy} \right| \leq \text{diam}(\text{supp } f).$$

So, the overmollified u_δ defines a C^∞ field. As a result, the additional force in the Vlasov model (259) does not interfere with the well-posedness theory established in Section 5. In particular, if the parameters of the model \mathcal{M} satisfy (locLip1), (locLip2), then for any Lipschitz initial data there exists a global Lipschitz solution, see Remark 5.4. This regularity will be sufficient for the analysis of this section.

Going back to the defined mollification we note another remarkable approximation property – if u is a smooth field, then u_δ approximates u with a quantitative bound *independent* of any regularity of ρ ! This allows us to use it in the situations where the only information known on ρ is its mass. The following is a generalization of such approximation property presented in [Shv21, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 9.1. *For any $u \in \text{Lip}$ and for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ one has*

$$(261) \quad \|u_\delta - u\|_{L^p(\rho)} \leq C\delta \|u\|_{\text{Lip}},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on the kernel ψ and p . The estimate also holds for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ with C independent of p if ψ is compactly supported.

Proof. Let us fix a test-function $f \in L^q(\rho)$, where $q^{-1} + p^{-1} = 1$. Then, let us split

$$\int_{\Omega} f(u_\delta - u)\rho \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f(u_\delta - u_{\psi_\delta})\rho \, dx + \int_{\Omega} f(u_{\psi_\delta} - u)\rho \, dx := I_1 + I_2.$$

For I_2 we simply use the standard approximation property of mollification

$$I_2 \leq \delta \|u\|_{\text{Lip}} \|f\|_{L^1(\rho)} \leq \delta \|u\|_{\text{Lip}} \|f\|_{L^q(\rho)}.$$

For I_1 we have, using Minkowskii and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{\Omega} (f\rho)_{\psi_\delta} \frac{(u\rho)_{\psi_\delta}}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} (f\rho)_{\psi_\delta} \frac{u\rho_{\psi_\delta}}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}} \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{(f\rho)_{\psi_\delta} ((u\rho)_{\psi_\delta} - u\rho_{\psi_\delta})}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{(f\rho)_{\psi_\delta}}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^{1/p}} \frac{(u\rho)_{\psi_\delta} - u\rho_{\psi_\delta}}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^{1/q}} \, dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|(f\rho)_{\psi_\delta}|^q}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^{q/p}} \, dx \right)^{1/q} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|(u\rho)_{\psi_\delta} - u\rho_{\psi_\delta}|^p}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^{p/q}} \, dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |(|f|^q \rho)_{\psi_\delta} \, dx \right)^{1/q} \left(\int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |u(y) - u(x)|^p \rho(y) \psi_\delta(x-y) \, dy \, dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{L^q_\rho} \|u\|_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |x-y|^p \rho(y) \psi_\delta(x-y) \, dy \, dx \right)^{1/p} = \delta \|f\|_{L^q_\rho} \|u\|_{\text{Lip}} C_{p,\psi}^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{p,\psi} = \int_{\Omega} |x|^p \psi(x) \, dx$. This implies (261) for all $p < \infty$. If however ψ is compactly supported, then $C_{p,\psi} \leq (\text{diam supp } \psi)^p$, and so the estimate holds also in the limit as $p \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Characteristics of the equation (259) satisfy the usual maximum principle for the kinetic variable V^ε , which can be seen even more directly using the integral representation formula

$$\dot{V}^\varepsilon = \int_{\Omega} \left[\phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(X^\varepsilon, X^{\varepsilon'}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon, \delta}(X^\varepsilon, X^{\varepsilon'}) \right] (V^{\varepsilon'} - V^\varepsilon) f_0^\varepsilon(\omega') \, d\omega',$$

where $\omega = (x, v)$, and $\phi_{\rho,\delta}$ stands for the kernel of (260). Hence $|X^\varepsilon(t)| \leq R + t$. Thus, on any time interval $[0, T]$, the support of the solution f^ε will be confined to a bounded region uniformly in ε if initially so. This in turn implies that all u^ε 's are uniformly bounded and hence u_δ^ε define a uniformly smooth family of fields.

By a classical solution to (257) we understand a solution in a higher regularity class,

$$(u, \rho) \in C_w([0, T]; H^m \times (H^k \cap L^1_+)) \cap \text{Lip}([0, T]; H^{m-1} \times (H^{k-1} \cap L^1_+)),$$

for $m \geq k + 1 > \frac{n}{2} + 2$. Existence of such solutions locally in time can be established for a variety of models and data, see [Shv21] for a detailed survey.

Let us discuss two regularity assumptions on the kernel that will be required to run the argument. First is the assumption of weak-continuity in the density itself.

(R1) we assume that for any $\rho' \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\rho'' \in \mathcal{D}$, the latter being in the admissible class, we have

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega} \int_{\Omega} |\phi_{\rho'}(x, y) - \phi_{\rho''}(x, y)| \, d\rho'(y) \leq CW_1(\rho', \rho'').$$

(R2) for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$|\nabla_y \phi_\rho(x, y)| \leq C.$$

The result will be stated in terms of convergence in Wasserstein-2 metric. Let us recall the definition

$$W_2^2(f_1, f_2) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(f_1, f_2)} \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\omega_1 - \omega_2|^2 d\gamma(\omega_1, \omega_2),$$

where $\Pi(f_1, f_2)$ is the set of probability measures with marginals f_1 and f_2 , respectively.

Theorem 9.2. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is a material model with reproducing kernel satisfying (R1) – (R2). Let (ρ, u) be a classical solution to (257) on the time interval $[0, T]$ with $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$ and let $f = \rho(x, t)\delta_{u(x, t)}(v)$. Suppose $f_0^\varepsilon \in \text{Lip}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a family of initial conditions for satisfying*

- (i) $\text{supp } f_0^\varepsilon \subset \{|w| < R_0\}$;
- (ii) $W_2(f_0^\varepsilon, f_0) \leq \varepsilon$.

Then there exists a constant C such that for all $t < T$ one has

$$(262) \quad W_2(f_t^\varepsilon, f_t) \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}}.$$

Remark 9.3. Let us note that the scaling regime $\delta = \varepsilon^2$ appears to be the most optimal: if $\delta \ll \varepsilon^2$, the model becomes over-resolved without improvement on convergence rate of solutions, if $\delta \gg \varepsilon^2$, the model is under-resolved and the convergence rate slows down. We obtain in this case the optimal rate of $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$:

$$(263) \quad W_2(f^\varepsilon, f) \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Remark 9.4. Note that $W_2(f^\varepsilon, f) \rightarrow 0$ also implies convergence of densities, simply because ρ 's are marginals of f 's: $W_2(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho) \leq W_2(f^\varepsilon, f)$. Similarly, since all distributions are confined to a bounded set, we also have $W_1(u^\varepsilon \rho^\varepsilon, u\rho) \leq CW_1(f^\varepsilon, f) \leq CW_2(f^\varepsilon, f)$. So, this also implies the convergence of momenta.

Denoting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon(x, v) dx dv, \\ \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) |w - v|^2 f^\varepsilon(y, w, t) f^\varepsilon(x, v, t) dw dy dv dx \end{aligned}$$

we have the following energy balance relation for solutions of (259):

$$(264) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon = -\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)_{\psi_\delta}|^2}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^\varepsilon} dx - \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon.$$

Obviously the last two terms store a lot of dissipative information. The crucial observation is that they control internal energies of f^ε both the native one relative to the local field u^ε and relative to the filtered field u_δ^ε . To see that let us note the following two identities

$$\begin{aligned} e(f^\varepsilon | u^\varepsilon) &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon dv dx = \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|^2 dx, \\ e(f^\varepsilon | u_\delta^\varepsilon) &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u_\delta^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon dv dx = \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)_{\psi_\delta}|^2}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^\varepsilon} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u_\delta^\varepsilon|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up we obtain

$$e(f^\varepsilon | u^\varepsilon) + e(f^\varepsilon | u_\delta^\varepsilon) = 2\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)_{\psi_\delta}|^2}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^\varepsilon} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon |u_\delta^\varepsilon|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|^2 dx,$$

and since the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model is contractive, the last two terms add up to a non-positive value. Thus,

$$2\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)_{\psi_\delta}|^2}{\rho_{\psi_\delta}^\varepsilon} dx \geq e(f^\varepsilon | u^\varepsilon) + e(f^\varepsilon | u_\delta^\varepsilon).$$

Consequently, plugging this pack into (264) we obtain

$$(265) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon \leq -\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} [e(f^\varepsilon | u^\varepsilon) + e(f^\varepsilon | u_\delta^\varepsilon)].$$

The energy inequality (265) already shows that the solution concentrates to a monokinetic form near its own macroscopic field. However, the quantity that controls how far that concentration is from u , is the internal energy relative to u :

$$e(f^\varepsilon|u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u|^2 f^\varepsilon \, dv \, dx.$$

This quantity will play a key role in the argument.

According to (ii) we can fix an initial $\gamma_0 \in \Pi(f_0^\varepsilon, f_0)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\omega_1 - \omega_2|^2 \, d\gamma_0(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leq 2\varepsilon^2.$$

Let us now propagate γ_0 along the direct product of characteristic maps of (259) and (61), i.e. let γ_t be the measure-valued solution to the transport equation

$$\partial_t \gamma + v_1 \cdot \nabla_{x_1} \gamma + v_2 \cdot \nabla_{x_2} \gamma + \nabla_{v_1} [\gamma s_{\rho^\varepsilon}(v_1 - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(v_1 - u_\delta^\varepsilon)] + \nabla_{v_2} [\gamma s_\rho(v_2 - [u]_\rho)] = 0.$$

Integrating upon pairs (x_1, v_1) and (x_2, v_2) we can see that the marginals of γ satisfy the same transport equations as f and f^ε , respectively. Consequently, by uniqueness, $\gamma_t \in \Pi(f_t^\varepsilon, f_t)$ for all time. This means that the cost of γ_t dominates the W_2 -distance at any time,

$$W := \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\omega_1 - \omega_2|^2 \, d\gamma_t(\omega_1, \omega_2) \geq W_2^2(f^\varepsilon, f).$$

Let us split W into potential and kinetic components

$$W = \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |v_1 - v_2|^2 \, d\gamma + \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |x_1 - x_2|^2 \, d\gamma := W_v + W_x.$$

Evolution of the potential component is easily estimated using the transport of γ

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} W_x &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |X^\varepsilon(\omega_1, t) - X(\omega_2, t)|^2 \, d\gamma_0 \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} (X^\varepsilon(\omega_1, t) - X(\omega_2, t)) \cdot (V^\varepsilon(\omega_1, t) - V(\omega_2, t)) \, d\gamma_0 \leq W_x + W_v. \end{aligned}$$

Instead of writing the evolution equation for W_v we subordinate it to the internal energy, and trace its evolution. Let us make the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} W_v &\leq \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |v_1 - u(x_1)|^2 \, d\gamma + \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x_1) - u(x_2)|^2 \, d\gamma + \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x_2) - v_2|^2 \, d\gamma \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u(x)|^2 f^\varepsilon(x, v) \, dv \, dx + C \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}} |x_1 - x_2|^2 \, d\gamma + 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last term canceled thanks to the monokinetic nature of f ,

$$= e(f^\varepsilon|u) + CW_x.$$

We have obtained so far

$$(266) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} W_x &\leq e(f^\varepsilon|u) + c_1 W_x, \\ W_v &\leq e(f^\varepsilon|u) + c_2 W_x. \end{aligned}$$

To complete this system we now investigate evolution of the internal energy itself.

Before we write the equation for $e(f^\varepsilon|u)$, let us recall that we are dealing with smooth solutions to both so all the computations are legitimate. From (259) we can read off the macroscopic system for the ε -density and momentum

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t^\varepsilon + \nabla \cdot (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) = 0, \\ (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)_t + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon + \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \, dy + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon), \end{cases}$$

where the Reynolds stress is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v - u^\varepsilon) \otimes (v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon(x, v, t) \, dv.$$

Let us expand $e(f^\varepsilon|u)$ into three parts

$$e(f^\varepsilon|u) = \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon |u|^2 \, dx.$$

From the energy inequality (265) we will only retain the main alignment dissipation component to be used later and the amplified native internal energy

$$(267) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon \leq -\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e(f^\varepsilon|u^\varepsilon).$$

Let us workout evolution of the next two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_t(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) \cdot u \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot \partial_t u \, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon + \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon) : \nabla u \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(y) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \cdot (u(x) - u(y)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u : \nabla u \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho(y) u^\varepsilon(x) \cdot (u(y) - u(x)) \, dy \, dx. \\ \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u|^2 \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u \cdot \partial_t u \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \partial_t \rho^\varepsilon |u|^2 \, dx \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u \otimes u : \nabla u \, dx + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho(y) u(x) \cdot (u(y) - u(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u \otimes u^\varepsilon : \nabla u \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Putting the two equations together and collecting all the inertia terms we obtain

$$- \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon - u) \otimes (u^\varepsilon - u) : \nabla u \, dx \leq \|\nabla u\|_\infty \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 \, dx.$$

On the right hand side we can see the macroscopic relative entropy which can be estimated by the internal relative energy

$$(268) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} (|u^\varepsilon|^2 \rho^\varepsilon - 2u^\varepsilon \cdot u \rho^\varepsilon + |u|^2 \rho^\varepsilon) \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} (|v|^2 f^\varepsilon - 2u \cdot v f^\varepsilon + |u|^2 f^\varepsilon) \, dx \, dv = e(f^\varepsilon|u). \end{aligned}$$

The Reynolds stress is estimated similarly

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon : \nabla u \, dx \leq \|\nabla u\|_\infty \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u^\varepsilon(x, t)|^2 f^\varepsilon(x, v, t) \, dx \, dv = ce(f^\varepsilon|u^\varepsilon).$$

As to the local alignment term, we use the symmetry and approximation property of the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model stated in Lemma 9.1, say with $p = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u_\delta^\varepsilon \cdot u \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u_\delta \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot (u_\delta - u) \, dx \leq C \|u^\varepsilon\|_\infty \delta \|\nabla u\|_\infty \lesssim \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we crucially used the fact the the approximation property of the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -model does not rely on any regularity of ρ^ε which of course deteriorates as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. So,

$$(269) \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u \, dx \lesssim \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}.$$

It remains to make estimates on the global alignment terms which is most involved. What helps to control these terms is in part the dissipation \mathcal{D}_ε available through (267). To make it readily accessible on the macroscopic level let us make the following observation

$$(270) \quad \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \, dy \, dx.$$

Indeed, expanding the $|w - v|^2$ term we obtain

$$\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon = \int_{\Omega^2 \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon(x, v) \rho^\varepsilon(y) \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \, dy \, dx \, dv - \int_{\Omega^2} \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) u^\varepsilon(x) u^\varepsilon(y) \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \, dx \, dy.$$

However, the total energy density dominates the macroscopic one:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon(x, v) \, dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v - u^\varepsilon(x)|^2 f^\varepsilon(x, v) \, dv + \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u^\varepsilon(x)|^2 \geq \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u^\varepsilon(x)|^2.$$

This proves (270).

First, let us collect all the alignment terms:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x))(u(y) - u(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y))(u(x) - u(y)) \, dy \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term is partially absorbed into dissipation

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y))(u(x) - u(y)) \, dy \, dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) |u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y)|^2 \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x) - u(y) + u^\varepsilon(y)) \, dy \, dx \end{aligned}$$

where we can see that the first term is bounded by (270) and the second one, by the symmetry in x and y , turns into the double of the term containing $u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)$ only,

$$\leq \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx.$$

So, the alignment can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} A &\leq \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x))(u(y) - u(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u^\varepsilon(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &= \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x) + u(y) - u^\varepsilon(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_{\rho^\varepsilon}(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u(x) - u(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u(x) - u(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

The second term here is non-positive and can be dismissed while the last two depend on reproducing kernels with different densities. So, we add and subtract cross-terms,

$$\begin{aligned} A &\leq \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon + \int_{\Omega^2} [\phi_{\rho^\varepsilon} - \phi_\rho] \rho^\varepsilon(x) \rho^\varepsilon(y) (u(x) - u(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega^2} \phi_\rho(x, y) \rho^\varepsilon(x) [\rho^\varepsilon(y) - \rho(y)] (u(x) - u(y))(u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)) \, dy \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the regularity properties of the kernel (R1), (R2), as well as the regularity u , the last two integrals are bounded by the same quantity $CW_1(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho) \int_\Omega \rho^\varepsilon(x) |u(x) - u^\varepsilon(x)| dx$. Using (268) we can further bound the latter integral by $\sqrt{e(f^\varepsilon|u)}$. We obtain

$$A \leq \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon + CW_1(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho) \sqrt{e(f^\varepsilon|u)}.$$

Collecting all the estimates together we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} e(f^\varepsilon|u) \lesssim e(f^\varepsilon|u) + e(f^\varepsilon|u^\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e(f^\varepsilon|u^\varepsilon) + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} + W_1^2(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho).$$

Obviously, for small ε the native energy is absorbed. Finally, we observe also that $W_1^2(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho) \leq W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho)$, and since the (x_1, x_2) -marginal of γ belongs to $\Pi(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho)$ we further find $W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon, \rho) \leq W_x$.

So, we have obtained the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} W_x &\leq e(f^\varepsilon|u) + c_1 W_x, \\ \frac{d}{dt} e(f^\varepsilon|u) &\leq c_2 e(f^\varepsilon|u) + c_3 W_x + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the initial value of $e(f^\varepsilon|u) + W_x$ is bounded by a constant multiple of ε in view of the choice of γ_0 for W_x (even ε^2 in this case), and

$$e(f_0^\varepsilon|u_0) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u_0|^2 df_0^\varepsilon = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} |v - u_0|^2 [df_0^\varepsilon - df_0] \leq CW_1(f_0^\varepsilon, f_0) \leq CW_2(f_0^\varepsilon, f_0) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Grönwall's Lemma implies $e(f^\varepsilon|u) + W_x \lesssim \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$, and thanks to (266),

$$W_v \leq \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}.$$

We thus arrive at (262).

9.2. Maxwellian regime. In this section we provide a derivation of the Euler-alignment system with isothermal pressure for contractive material models on the torus $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^n$,

$$(271) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_t + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) &= 0 \\ (\rho u)_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla \rho &= \rho s_\rho([u]_\rho - u). \end{aligned}$$

As outlined in the beginning of this section our strategy will be to consider the equation with strong Fokker-Planck penalization force

$$(272) \quad \partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} [\Delta_v f^\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot ((v - u_\delta^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon)] + \nabla_v \cdot (s_{\rho^\varepsilon}(v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon),$$

where u^ε is the macroscopic velocity field associated with f^ε , and u_δ^ε is the same mollification as defined in the previous monokinetic study. We assume that we have a family of smooth solutions to (272) defined on a common interval $[0, T)$ – the same interval of existence of a local solution to (271). If, for example, $\text{supp } \psi = \Omega$ – the mollifier used in defining u_δ – then u_δ^ε remains globally smooth for any ε and $\delta > 0$. As such it does not interfere with the existence results already stated in Theorem 7.2 and Theorem 7.11. The focus of this section will be to establish convergence of the hydrodynamic limit for a given family of solutions.

Let us write out the corresponding macroscopic system

$$(273) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho^\varepsilon_t + \nabla \cdot (u^\varepsilon \rho^\varepsilon) &= 0 \\ (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) + \nabla \rho^\varepsilon + \nabla_x \cdot \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon &= \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}([u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon} - u^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \\ \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ((v - u^\varepsilon) \otimes (v - u^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{I}) f^\varepsilon dv. \end{aligned}$$

Here, \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix.

We measure the distance between pairs $(u^\varepsilon, \rho^\varepsilon)$ and (u, ρ) by using the relative entropy between the corresponding local Maxwellians:

$$(274) \quad \mu = \frac{\rho(x, t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|v - u(x, t)|^2}{2}}, \quad \mu^\varepsilon = \frac{\rho^\varepsilon(x, t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|v - u^\varepsilon(x, t)|^2}{2}}.$$

In fact such entropy is encoded into the total kinetic relative entropy between f^ε and μ :

$$\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} f^\varepsilon \log \frac{f^\varepsilon}{\mu} \, dv \, dx.$$

Indeed, the following identity holds,

$$(275) \quad \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) = \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{H}(\mu^\varepsilon|\mu),$$

$$(276) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu^\varepsilon|\mu) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon \log(\rho^\varepsilon/\rho) \, dx.$$

So, if $\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) \rightarrow 0$, then also $\mathcal{H}(\mu^\varepsilon|\mu) \rightarrow 0$. Recall that by the classical Csiszár-Kullback inequality, the relative entropy controls L^1 -distance between the probability densities,

$$\mathcal{H}(f|g) \geq c \|f - g\|_{L^1}^2.$$

So, vanishing of the relative entropy $\mathcal{H}(\mu^\varepsilon|\mu) \rightarrow 0$ implies strong limits

$$(277) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho^\varepsilon &\rightarrow \rho, \\ \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon &\rightarrow \rho u, \\ \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|^2 &\rightarrow \rho |u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

in $L^1(\Omega^n)$.

In order to proceed with the result let us state the needed regularity assumptions on the model:

(R3) we suppose that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{P}$ one has

$$(278) \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho'' |s_{\rho'} - s_{\rho''}|^2 \, dx \leq C \|\rho' - \rho''\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

Note that here L^1 is understood with respect to the volume measure.

(R4) there exist $C, c > 0$ such that for any $\rho' \in \mathcal{D} \cap L^1(\Omega)$, $\rho'' \in L^1(\Omega)$, and $u \in C(\Omega)$ one has

$$(279) \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho'' |s_{\rho'}[u]_{\rho'} - s_{\rho''}[u]_{\rho''}|^2 \, dx \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \|\rho' - \rho''\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

Theorem 9.5. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is a material contractive model satisfying (R3)-(R4). Let (u, ρ) be a smooth non-vacuous solution to (271) on a time interval $[0, T)$ with $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$. Suppose that initial distributions f_0^ε converge to μ_0 in the sense of entropies as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$:*

$$\mathcal{H}(f_0^\varepsilon|\mu_0) \rightarrow 0,$$

then as long as $\delta = o(\varepsilon)$, for any $t \in [0, T)$, we have

$$(280) \quad \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Let us break down the relative entropy into kinetic and macroscopic parts:

$$(281) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) &= \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \\ \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(f^\varepsilon \log f^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon \right) \, dv \, dx + \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) \\ \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho^\varepsilon |u|^2 - \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u - \rho^\varepsilon \log \rho \right) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let us state the energy bounds for each component. In the sequel we denote for short $\kappa^\varepsilon = \kappa_{\rho^\varepsilon}$.

Lemma 9.6. *There are constants c_1, c_2, c_3 that depend only on the model such that we have the following entropy inequalities:*

$$(282) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon \leq c_1;$$

$$(283) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon \leq -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon + c_2 \varepsilon e(f^\varepsilon|u^\varepsilon) - \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon},$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon + (1 + \varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}/2)(v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} \, dv \, dx.$$

Proof. Differentiating,

$$\begin{aligned}
(284) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left[\frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} + 2\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - u_\delta^\varepsilon) + |v - u_\delta^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon \right] dv dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} [(u_\delta^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)_{\rho^\varepsilon} - (u_\delta^\varepsilon, u_\delta^\varepsilon)_{\rho^\varepsilon}] \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} [\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) + v \cdot (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon] dv dx.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove (282) we simply dismiss the first information term, and recall that the δ -mollification constitutes the \mathcal{M}_ϕ -averaging which is ball-positive. So, the second term, according to (56) is also non-negative and we dismiss it too. We estimate the third term as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} [\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) + v \cdot (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon] dv dx \\
&= n \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} f^\varepsilon dv dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon dv dx + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon} \leq C - \int_{\Omega} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|^2 dx + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon} \\
&= c_1 - \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon} \leq c_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last two terms add up to a non-positive value due to the contractivity of the model. This proves (282).

To show (283) we replace all the macroscopic velocities in (284) with the native one u^ε . Indeed, in the information term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left[\frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} + 2\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - u_\delta^\varepsilon) + |v - u_\delta^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon \right] dv dx \\
&= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left[\frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} + 2\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - u^\varepsilon) + |v - u^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon + |u^\varepsilon - u_\delta^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon \right] dv dx \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left[\frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} + 2\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - u^\varepsilon) + |v - u^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon \right] dv dx \\
&= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon + (v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} dv dx.
\end{aligned}$$

For the alignment term we obtain similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} [\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) + v \cdot (v - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon] dv dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} \nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - u^\varepsilon) dv dx - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} [v \cdot (v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon + v \cdot (u^\varepsilon - [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) f^\varepsilon] dv dx \\
&= - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} (\nabla_v f^\varepsilon \cdot (v - u^\varepsilon) + |v - u^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon) dv dx - \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combing the two expressions and completing the squares

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon &\leq -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla_v f^\varepsilon + (1 + \varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}/2)(v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon|^2}{f^\varepsilon} dv dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n} s_{\rho^\varepsilon} |v - u^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon dv dx \\
&\quad - \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon} \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon + c\varepsilon e(f^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon|) - \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 + (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

We have obtained (283). \square

The main consequence of (282) is that the entropy \mathcal{H}_ε remains bounded on the time interval $[0, T]$ uniformly in ε . This implies uniform boundedness of the total energy \mathcal{E}_ε according to (230),

$$(285) \quad \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon \leq C,$$

with C independent of ε .

Lemma 9.7. *We have the following inequality*

$$(286) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \leq C \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon | \mu) + C \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} + C\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} + \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 - (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon},$$

where C is independent of ε .

Proof. Let us compute the derivative of each component of \mathcal{G}_ε

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u|^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon - u) \cdot \nabla u \cdot u - \rho^\varepsilon u \cdot \nabla \log \rho + \rho^\varepsilon s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) \cdot u] dx \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega^n} \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot u dx &= \int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon - u) \cdot \nabla u \cdot u^\varepsilon + \rho^\varepsilon \nabla \cdot u - \rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \log \rho - \nabla u : \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}([u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon} - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u + \rho^\varepsilon s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) \cdot u^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u] dx \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega^n} \rho^\varepsilon \log \rho dx &= \int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \log \rho - \rho^\varepsilon u \cdot \nabla \log \rho - \rho^\varepsilon \nabla \cdot u] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = \int_{\Omega} [\nabla u : \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon - \rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon - u) \cdot \nabla u \cdot (u^\varepsilon - u)] dx + A,$$

where A is the alignment component,

$$A = \int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) \cdot u - \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}([u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon} - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u - \rho^\varepsilon s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) \cdot u^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u] dx.$$

Given that u is smooth we have

$$(287) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon| dx + C \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 dx + A.$$

Note that the relative entropy term in the middle is dominated by the total relative entropy $\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon | \mu)$, see (275), (276).

As far as the Reynolds stress, we will use a well-known estimate from [MV08] that establishes a bound in terms of information and energy. Let us rerun this argument to account for the ε -correction. We simply note that

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [2 \nabla_v \sqrt{f^\varepsilon} + (v - u^\varepsilon) \sqrt{f^\varepsilon}] \otimes [(v - u^\varepsilon) \sqrt{f^\varepsilon}] dv.$$

then we reinsert the ε -correction to obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [2 \nabla_v \sqrt{f^\varepsilon} + (1 + \varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}/2)(v - u^\varepsilon) \sqrt{f^\varepsilon}] \otimes [(v - u^\varepsilon) \sqrt{f^\varepsilon}] dv - \varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}/2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v - u^\varepsilon) \otimes (v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon dv.$$

So,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon| dx \lesssim \sqrt{e(f^\varepsilon | u^\varepsilon) \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon e(f^\varepsilon | u^\varepsilon) \lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} + \varepsilon.$$

Finally, let us examine the alignment term. Notice that the amplified component, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho^\varepsilon (u_\delta^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon) \cdot u$, can be estimated as in (269), except here we apply Lemma 9.1 with $p = 2$ and use the uniform bound on the energy \mathcal{E}^ε available to us through (285). So, this part is bounded by δ/ε .

Let us proceed with the alignment term by rewriting it as follows

$$\int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon) - \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}([u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon} - u^\varepsilon) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon)] dx + \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 - (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon}.$$

It remains to analyze the integral term

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon s_\rho([u]_\rho - u) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon) - \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}([u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon} - u^\varepsilon) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon)] dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} [\rho^\varepsilon (s_\rho[u]_\rho - s_{\rho^\varepsilon}[u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon) - \rho^\varepsilon (s_{\rho^\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon - s_\rho u) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon)] dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon (s_\rho[u]_\rho - s_{\rho^\varepsilon}[u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}) \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon) dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon}[u - u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon} \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon) dx \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon s_{\rho^\varepsilon} |u - u^\varepsilon|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon (s_{\rho^\varepsilon} - s_\rho) u \cdot (u - u^\varepsilon) dx \\
&=: I + II + III + IV.
\end{aligned}$$

For I we use (R4)

$$I \leq \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |s_\rho[u]_\rho - s_{\rho^\varepsilon}[u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u - u^\varepsilon|^2 dx \lesssim \|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^1}^2 + \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) \leq C\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu).$$

Terms II and III add up to a non-positive value due to contractivity of the model:

$$II + III = ([u - u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon}, u - u^\varepsilon)_{\kappa^\varepsilon} - \|u - u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 \leq 0.$$

To estimate IV we use (R3), boundedness of the strength functions and the solution u ,

$$IV \leq \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |s_{\rho^\varepsilon} - s_\rho|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\varepsilon |u - u^\varepsilon|^2 dx \leq C\|\rho^\varepsilon - \rho\|_{L^1}^2 + \mathcal{H}(\mu^\varepsilon|\mu) \leq C\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu).$$

Thus,

$$(288) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon \leq C \int_{\Omega^n} |\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon| dx + C\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) + \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\kappa^\varepsilon)}^2 - (u^\varepsilon, [u^\varepsilon]_{\rho^\varepsilon})_{\kappa^\varepsilon}.$$

and the lemma is proved. \square

Combining the equations on \mathcal{H}_ε and \mathcal{G}_ε , (283), (286), we see that the residual energy terms cancel out and we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) \lesssim \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} \leq \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \lesssim \mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) + \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}.$$

By the Grönwall's Lemma we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) \leq \mathcal{H}(f_0^\varepsilon|\mu_0) e^{CT} + C(\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}) e^{CT}, \quad \forall t \leq T,$$

where C depends only on the parameters of the model and the regularity of (u, ρ) . This finishes the proof. \square

Remark 9.8. The same observation can be made here as in the monokinetic case. If we quantify the initial entropy

$$\mathcal{H}(f_0^\varepsilon|\mu_0) \leq \varepsilon,$$

then the proof produces the bound

$$\mathcal{H}(f^\varepsilon|\mu) \leq \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}.$$

So, again, the optimal convergence is achieved when $\delta \sim \varepsilon^2$. However, unlike in the monokinetic case, here we do not loose on the magnitude of the entropy at positive times.

9.3. Remarks on the pressureless Euler Alignment System. We will leave discussion of the well-posedness of macroscopic systems that arise from general models \mathcal{M} to a future research, see [TT14, CCTT16, Shv21, LS19a, MT14, HT17] for the literature on this problem specifically for smooth communication models. The most clear-cut result obtained in [CCTT16] pertains to the regularity of the 1D pressureless EAS based on the Cucker-Smale protocol

$$\partial_t u + uu_x = \rho_\phi u - (u\rho)_\phi.$$

Here, one finds an additional conserved quantity

$$e = u_x + \rho_\phi$$

which controls u_x and hence regularity of the system. In fact, e satisfies

$$\partial_t e + \partial_x(ue) = 0$$

or in Lagrangian coordinates associated with u ,

$$\frac{d}{dt}e = e\rho_\phi - e^2 = e(\rho_\phi - e),$$

which is a non-homogeneous logistic ODE. The critical threshold for regularity becomes $e_0 \geq 0$.

In multi-D, the law of e is given by

$$(289) \quad \begin{aligned} e &= \operatorname{div} u + \rho_\phi, \\ \partial_t e + \nabla \cdot (ue) &= (\nabla \cdot u)^2 - \operatorname{Tr}[(\nabla u)^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Although the right hand side in this case involves ∇u , in some cases this still allows to obtain partial regularity results in multi-D, for example for small data or for unidirectional flocks, see [TT14, HT17, LS19a]. The latter are solutions of the form

$$u = (u(x_1, \dots, x_n), 0, \dots, 0).$$

For these the right hand side of (289) vanishes.

While the existence of e is attributed to the particular commutator structure of the alignment forcing of the Cucker-Smale model, in general, it can be seen as a consequence of another property of the model – transport of the specific strength function s_ρ itself. Indeed, let us notice that in the \mathcal{M}_{CS} -case we have

$$(290) \quad \partial_t s_\rho + \nabla \cdot (s_\rho [u]_\rho) = 0,$$

simply because ρ_ϕ is transported by the Favre-filtration $u_F = (u\rho)_\phi/\rho_\phi$. This turns out to be the general reason for the conservation of e .

Lemma 9.9. *If for any solution of the pressureless EAS (257) the strength function satisfies (290), then $e = \operatorname{div} u + s_\rho$ satisfies (289). In particular, e is conserved for all solutions in 1D and unidirectional solutions in multi-D.*

Proof. By direct verification. □

The above observation motivates to consider a system where the strength is not fixed but rather evolves according to the ‘natural law’ (290), whereby the strength itself becomes another unknown. This leads to the following system

$$(291) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (u\rho) &= 0, \\ \partial_t s + \nabla \cdot (s [u]_\rho) &= 0, \\ \partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u &= s([u]_\rho - u). \end{aligned}$$

All such systems will satisfy the e -law by design, where $e = \operatorname{div} u + s$.

For example, if we start from the initial Favre-based model, $[u]_\rho = u_F$ and set $s_0 = 1$, like for instance in the \mathcal{M}_{MT} -model, the future value of strength will be determined by the transport along the averaged velocity $[u]_\rho$, rather than being forcefully set at $s = 1$ for all times. Given that both s and ρ_ϕ solve the same continuity equation in this case, we also have transport of the ratio

$$\partial_t \frac{s}{\rho_\phi} + u_F \cdot \nabla_x \frac{s}{\rho_\phi} = 0.$$

This implies

$$c_1 \rho_\phi \leq s \leq c_2 \rho_\phi, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega,$$

if initially so. In particular s remains uniformly bounded regardless of the regularity of u_F (!).

We will leave the study of (291) to future research.

10. APPENDIX I: AVERAGINGS ON FINITE SETS AND PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.9

In this section we will prove Proposition 3.9.

To achieve it we first study properties of models on finite sets – to which as we will see the result is reduced. We will use the notation of Example 2.11 below.

For models on finite sets being conservative is equivalent to

$$A^\top \kappa = \kappa, \quad \kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_N).$$

Denoting $K = \text{diag}\{\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_N\}$ one can see that being symmetric is equivalent to the matrix KA being symmetric,

$$(KA)^\top = KA.$$

Similarly, the ball-positivity is equivalent to the matrix A being ball-coercive relative to the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_K = (K\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$(Au, u)_K \geq (Au, Au)_K.$$

Lemma 10.1. *If \mathcal{M} is ball-positive on a 2-point set, then \mathcal{M} is symmetric.*

Proof. The result reduces to showing that $\kappa_1 a_{12} = \kappa_2 a_{21}$ for any ball-coercive model. Coercivity is equivalent to

$$\kappa_1 a_{11} u_1^2 + (\kappa_1 a_{12} + \kappa_2 a_{21}) u_1 u_2 + \kappa_2 a_{22} u_2^2 \geq \kappa_1 (a_{11} u_1 + a_{12} u_2)^2 + \kappa_2 (a_{21} u_1 + a_{22} u_2)^2.$$

Collecting coefficients in front of each monomial we obtain

$$\alpha u_1^2 + \beta u_1 u_2 + \gamma u_2^2 \geq 0,$$

where

$$\alpha = \kappa_1 a_{11} - \kappa_1 a_{11}^2 - \kappa_2 a_{21}^2, \quad \beta = \kappa_1 a_{12} + \kappa_2 a_{21} - 2\kappa_1 a_{11} a_{12} - 2\kappa_2 a_{21} a_{22}, \quad \gamma = \kappa_2 a_{22} - \kappa_1 a_{12}^2 - \kappa_2 a_{22}^2.$$

This means that the determinant of the quadratic form is non-negative

$$4\alpha\gamma \geq \beta^2.$$

Using stochasticity of A and after a long but elementary computation, the above condition reduces to

$$(\kappa_1 a_{12} - \kappa_2 a_{21})^2 \leq 0,$$

which proves the result. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.9. Since the averages act coordinatewise it is sufficient to prove the result for scalar fields u .

Let us fix ρ . Let us pick any partitioning of Ω into two sets A, B and assume that $\nu(A), \nu(B) > 0$. Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} a_{11} &= \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(A)} \int_A [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho, & a_{12} &= \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(A)} \int_A [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho; \\ a_{21} &= \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(B)} \int_B [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho, & a_{22} &= \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(B)} \int_B [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^2$ is right stochastic. Denoting $\kappa_1 = \kappa_\rho(A)$, $\kappa_2 = \kappa_\rho(B)$ and verifying coercivity on functions of the form $u = u_1 \mathbf{1}_A + u_2 \mathbf{1}_B$ we obtain

$$\kappa_1 a_{11} u_1^2 + (\kappa_1 a_{12} + \kappa_2 a_{21}) u_1 u_2 + \kappa_2 a_{22} u_2^2 \geq \int_\Omega |u_1 [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho + u_2 [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho|^2 \, d\kappa_\rho.$$

Breaking down the integral and using the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |u_1 [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho + u_2 [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho|^2 \, d\kappa_\rho &= \int_A |u_1 [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho + u_2 [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho|^2 \, d\kappa_\rho + \int_B |u_1 [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho + u_2 [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho|^2 \, d\kappa_\rho \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(A)} \left| \int_A (u_1 [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho + u_2 [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho) \, d\kappa_\rho \right|^2 + \frac{1}{\kappa_\rho(B)} \left| \int_B (u_1 [\mathbf{1}_A]_\rho + u_2 [\mathbf{1}_B]_\rho) \, d\kappa_\rho \right|^2 \\ &= \kappa_1 (a_{11} u_1 + a_{12} u_2)^2 + \kappa_2 (a_{21} u_1 + a_{22} u_2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the 2-point model with A and κ defined above is ball-positive. The previous lemma implies that

$$(292) \quad \int_A [\mathbb{1}_B]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_B [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho.$$

We further conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho &= \int_A [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho + \int_B [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho \\ &= \int_A [\mathbb{1}_A]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho + \int_A [\mathbb{1}_B]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \int_A [\mathbb{1}_\Omega]_\rho \, d\kappa_\rho = \kappa_\rho(A). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the conservative property holds for all characteristic functions. Since it is also linear and the average, by our assumption, is a bounded operator on $L^2(\kappa_\rho)$ we obtain the result by the standard approximation. \square

It would seem like (292) is suggestive of symmetry as it holds for any pair of partitioning sets. However, to prove general symmetry one would have to make the same conclusion for any pair of disjoint sets not necessarily partitioning Ω , or for any triple of partitioning sets. The above argument fails to do it, and in fact the implication

$$\text{ball-positive} \Rightarrow \text{symmetric},$$

is generally not true. A finite dimensional example can be found via a 3-point construction.

Example 10.2. Let us assume for simplicity that $\kappa = \mathbb{1} = (1, 1, 1)$. Then we are looking for a matrix that is non-symmetric yet doubly stochastic, $A\mathbb{1} = A^\top \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$, and ball-positive.

Thanks to stochasticity, A leaves the space $X = \mathbb{1}^\perp$ invariant, and so it is enough to properly define A on the 2-dimensional space X only. Let us fix a non-orthogonal basis in X : $e_1 = (1, -1, 0)$, $e_2 = (1, 0, -1)$, and complement it to $e_3 = \mathbb{1}$. We define

$$Ae_1 = \lambda_1 e_1, \quad Ae_2 = \lambda_2 e_2,$$

where $1 > \lambda_i > 0$ and $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$. This choice guarantees that the matrix A is not symmetric. Now, we need to make sure that A is ball-positive. Again, by stochasticity, ball-positivity reduces to that of the restriction $A|_X$. The latter is equivalent to the condition

$$(e_1 + te_2) \cdot (\lambda_1 e_1 + t\lambda_2 e_2) \geq |\lambda_1 e_1 + t\lambda_2 e_2|^2,$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Expanding we obtain

$$(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2)t^2 + \left[\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) - \lambda_1 \lambda_2\right]t + \lambda_1 - \lambda_1^2 \geq 0.$$

This is equivalent to

$$(293) \quad (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 2\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^2 \leq 16(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_1^2).$$

In addition we need to ensure that all the entries of the matrix A in the original system of coordinates are non-negative. We can write down these entries explicitly:

$$A = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 & 1 + \lambda_2 - 2\lambda_1 & 1 + \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2 \\ 1 - \lambda_1 & 1 + 2\lambda_1 & 1 - \lambda_1 \\ 1 - \lambda_2 & 1 - \lambda_2 & 1 + 2\lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So the only conditions to guarantee are

$$(294) \quad 1 + \lambda_2 - 2\lambda_1 \geq 0, \quad 1 + \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2 \geq 0.$$

There are plenty of choices to fulfill both (293) and (294). For example, $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{3}$. This concludes the construction.

11. APPENDIX II: ON SPECTRAL GAPS

With regard to the discussion of Remark ??, we prove a lemma that establishes equivalence of numerical ranges on the space of zero-momenta and the mean-zero functions.

Lemma 11.1. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is conservative and satisfies the following*

$$(295) \quad c_0 \leq s_\rho(x) \leq c_1, \quad \forall x \in \text{supp } \rho,$$

$$(296) \quad \sup \left\{ (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} : u \in L_0^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \|u\|_2 = 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Then

$$(297) \quad \sup \left\{ (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} : u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \bar{u} = 0, \quad \|u\|_2 = 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \varepsilon \frac{c_0}{c_0 + c_1}.$$

Conversely, if

$$(298) \quad \sup \left\{ (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} : u \in L^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \bar{u} = 0, \quad \|u\|_2 = 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \delta,$$

then

$$(299) \quad \sup \left\{ (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} : u \in L_0^2(\kappa_\rho), \quad \|u\|_2 = 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \delta \frac{c_0}{c_0 + c_1}.$$

Proof. First let us observe that the bounds on s_ρ , (295), imply bounds on κ_ρ -masses

$$(300) \quad c_0 \leq \kappa_\rho(\Omega) \leq c_1.$$

Let us denote $\mathbb{P} : L^2(\kappa_\rho) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ the orthogonal projection onto the space of constant fields. We have for all u with $\bar{u} = 0$,

$$\left| \int_\Omega (u - \mathbb{P}u) \rho \, dx \right| = |\mathbb{P}u| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_\rho(\Omega)}} \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2.$$

On the other hand, by (i),

$$\left| \int_\Omega (u - \mathbb{P}u) \rho \, dx \right| = \left| \int_\Omega (u - \mathbb{P}u) \frac{1}{s_\rho} \, d\kappa_\rho \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_\rho(\Omega)}}{c_0} \|u - \mathbb{P}u\|_2.$$

Using compatibility of masses (300),

$$\|u - \mathbb{P}u\|_2 \geq \frac{c_0}{c_1} \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2.$$

Hence,

$$\|u\|_2^2 = \|u - \mathbb{P}u\|_2^2 + \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2^2 \geq \left(1 + \frac{c_0}{c_1}\right) \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2^2,$$

or

$$(301) \quad \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2^2 \leq \frac{c_1}{c_0 + c_1} \|u\|_2^2.$$

Now, let us compute the numerical range, noting that $[\mathbb{P}u]_\rho = \mathbb{P}u$,

$$(u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} = (u - \mathbb{P}u, [u - \mathbb{P}u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} + (u - \mathbb{P}u, \mathbb{P}u)_{\kappa_\rho} + (\mathbb{P}u, [u - \mathbb{P}u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} + \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2^2.$$

The second term vanishes due to orthogonality. For the third term we observe that due to the conservative property of the average integrating against a constant field produces the same result as integrating without the average. So,

$$(\mathbb{P}u, [u - \mathbb{P}u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} = (\mathbb{P}u, u - \mathbb{P}u)_{\kappa_\rho} = 0.$$

Using the spectral gap condition for the first term and (301) for the last one, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (u, [u]_\rho)_{\kappa_\rho} &\leq (1 - \varepsilon_0) \|u - \mathbb{P}u\|_2^2 + \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2^2 = (1 - \varepsilon_0) \|u\|_2^2 + \varepsilon_0 \|\mathbb{P}u\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon_0 \frac{c_1}{c_0 + c_1}\right) \|u\|_2^2 = \left(1 - \varepsilon_0 \frac{c_0}{c_0 + c_1}\right) \|u\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the converse statement, apply the same argument replacing the roles of ρ and κ_ρ , and note that $1/c_1 \leq 1/s_\rho \leq 1/c_0$. \square

12. APPENDIX III: CATEGORIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Environmental averagings form an 'ecosystem' of models. On a more formal level they can be thought of as a category of objects and we can discuss relationships between them.

For a couple of models \mathcal{M}' , \mathcal{M}'' defined over Ω' and Ω'' , respectively, a morphism $\mathcal{M}' \rightarrow \mathcal{M}''$ is defined by a volume preserving homeomorphism $\tau : \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega''$ such that if $\rho'' \circ \tau = \rho'$ and $u'' \circ \tau = u'$, then

$$[u'']_{\rho''}'' \circ \tau = [u']_{\rho'}',$$

and there exist two constants $c, C > 0$ such that

$$c \, d\kappa'_{\rho'} \leq d\kappa''_{\rho''} \circ \tau \leq C \, d\kappa'_{\rho'}.$$

For material models, the latter can be restated in terms of specific strengths

$$c s'_{\rho'} \leq s''_{\rho''} \circ \tau \leq C s'_{\rho'}.$$

We have tacitly employed this concept in Appendix 10 when discussing models on finite sets.

On a given environment Ω all models can be partially ordered in several ways. The most straightforward definition of $\mathcal{M}' \preceq \mathcal{M}''$ is

$$\left[[u]_{\rho}' \right]_{\rho}'' = \left[[u]_{\rho}'' \right]_{\rho}' = [u]_{\rho}', \quad \forall u \in L^{\infty}(\Omega).$$

For example, among rough segregation models we have $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}'} \preceq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}''}$ provided $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}''$. The identity model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{I}}$ is the finest of all material ones (although if we defined it to be $[u] = u$ irrelevant of the $\text{supp } \rho$, then it would have become the finest of all). At the same time $\mathcal{M}_{\text{glob}}$ is the coarsest among all conservative ones with $s_{\rho} = 1$.

A more refined definition of order can be given on classes of equivalence where we say $\mathcal{M}' \sim \mathcal{M}''$ if there exist intermediate averagings $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n$ such that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ there exist $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\left[\dots \left[[u]_{\rho_1}'' \right]_{\rho_1}^1 \dots \right]_{\rho_n}^n = [u]_{\rho}', \quad \forall u \in L^{\infty}(\Omega),$$

and there exist intermediate averagings $\mathcal{M}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{n+m}$ such that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ there exist $\rho_{n+1}, \dots, \rho_{n+m} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\left[\dots \left[[u]_{\rho_{n+1}}' \right]_{\rho_{n+1}}^{n+1} \dots \right]_{\rho_{n+m}}^{n+m} = [u]_{\rho}'', \quad \forall u \in L^{\infty}(\Omega).$$

Then for a pair of models representing their equivalence classes we say $\mathcal{M}' \preceq \mathcal{M}''$ if only one half of the definition above holds, namely, there exist intermediate averagings $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n$ such that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ there exist $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\left[\dots \left[[u]_{\rho_1}'' \right]_{\rho_1}^1 \dots \right]_{\rho_n}^n = [u]_{\rho}', \quad \forall u \in L^{\infty}(\Omega).$$

Under this partial ordering, more subtle examples emerge. For instance, for Cucker-Smale models with Bochner-positive kernels, it can be seen from the identity (119) that if $\phi = \psi * \psi$, and assuming that $\int \psi = 1$, then the \mathcal{M}_{CS} -model based on ψ is finer than that based on ϕ , $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^{\phi} \preceq \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^{\psi}$. The same applies for \mathcal{M}_{MT} -models as those are based on the same averaging.

One can build new averaging models from old ones by superimposing averages as long as they are defined over the same strength measures. So, if

$$\mathcal{M}_i = \{(\kappa_{\rho}, [\cdot]_{\rho}^i) : \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)\}, \quad i = 1, 2$$

are two averaging models, then

$$(302) \quad \mathcal{M}_2 \circ \mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{ (\kappa_{\rho}, \left[\left[[\cdot]_{\rho}^1 \right]_{\rho}^2 \right]_{\rho}) : \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \right\}$$

defines another averaging model.

Certain compositions preserve special properties. For example, if \mathcal{M}_i are ball-positive and symmetric the conjugation $(\kappa_{\rho}, \left[\left[[\cdot]_{\rho}^1 \right]_{\rho}^2 \right]_{\rho}^1)$ is also ball-positive and symmetric.

REFERENCES

- [ABF⁺19] G. Albi, N. Bellomo, L. Fermo, S.-Y. Ha, J. Kim, L. Pareschi, D. Poyato, and J. Soler. Vehicular traffic, crowds, and swarms: From kinetic theory and multiscale methods to applications and research perspectives. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 29(10):1901–2005, 2019.
- [Aok82] I. Aoki. A simulation study on the schooling mechanism in fish. *Bull. Japanese Society of Scientific Fisheries*, 48(8):1081–1088, 1982.
- [AS67a] D. G. Aronson and James Serrin. Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 25:81–122, 1967.
- [AS67b] D. G. Aronson and James Serrin. A maximum principle for nonlinear parabolic equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 21:291–305, 1967.
- [Axe97] Robert Axelrod. *The Complexity of Cooperation: Agent-Based Models of Competition and Collaboration*. Princeton University Press, 1997.
- [AZ21] Francesca Anceschi and Yuzhe Zhu. On a spatially inhomogeneous nonlinear fokker-planck equation: Cauchy problem and diffusion asymptotics, 2021.
- [BCC⁺08] M. Ballerini, N. Cabibbo, R. Candelier, A. Cavagna, E. Cisbani, I. Giardina, V. Lecomte, A. Orlandi, G. Parisi, A. Procaccini, M. Viale, and V. Zdravkovic. Interaction ruling animal collective behavior depends on topological rather than metric distance: evidence from a field study. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 105:1232–1237, 2008.
- [BCnC11] François Bolley, José A. Cañizo, and José A. Carrillo. Stochastic mean-field limit: non-Lipschitz forces and swarming. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 21(11):2179–2210, 2011.
- [BFK15] M. Bongini, M. Fornasier, and D. Kalise. (Un)conditional consensus emergence under perturbed and decentralized feedback controls. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - A*, 35:4071, 2015.
- [BN05] E. Ben-Naim. Opinion dynamics: Rise and fall of political parties. *Europhys. Lett.*, 69:671–677, 2005.
- [CCG⁺12] M. Camperi, A. Cavagna, I. Giardina, G. Parisi, and E. Silvestri. Spatially balanced topological interaction grants optimal cohesion in flocking models. *Interface Focus*, 2:715–725, 2012.
- [CCP17] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and S. P. Perez. A review on attractive-repulsive hydrodynamics for consensus in collective behavior. In *Active particles. Vol. 1. Advances in theory, models, and applications*, Model. Simul. Sci. Eng. Technol., pages 259–298. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [CCTT16] J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, E. Tadmor, and C. Tan. Critical thresholds in 1D Euler equations with non-local forces. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 26(1):185–206, 2016.
- [CDM⁺07] Yao-li Chuang, Maria R. D’Orsogna, Daniel Marthaler, Andrea L. Bertozzi, and Lincoln S. Chayes. State transitions and the continuum limit for a 2D interacting, self-propelled particle system. *Phys. D*, 232(1):33–47, 2007.
- [CFPT15] M. Caponigro, M. Fornasier, B. Piccoli, and E. Trélat. Sparse stabilization and control of alignment models. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25(3):521–564, 2015.
- [CFRT10] J. A. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, J. Rosado, and G. Toscani. Asymptotic flocking dynamics for the kinetic Cucker-Smale model. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(1):218–236, 2010.
- [CFTV10] J. A. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, G. Toscani, and F. Vecil. Particle, kinetic, and hydrodynamic models of swarming. In *Mathematical modeling of collective behavior in socio-economic and life sciences*, Model. Simul. Sci. Eng. Technol., pages 297–336. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2010.
- [Cho16] Young-Pil Choi. Global classical solutions of the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation with local alignment forces. *Nonlinearity*, 29(7):1887–1916, 2016.
- [CK23] Young-Pil Choi and Jeongho Kim. Rigorous derivation of the Euler-alignment model with singular communication weights from a kinetic Fokker-Planck-alignment model. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 33(1):31–65, 2023.
- [CKPP19] Y.-P. Choi, D. Kalise, J. Peszek, and A. A. Peters. A collisionless singular Cucker-Smale model with decentralized formation control. *SIAM J. Appl. Syst.*, 18(4):1954–1981, 2019.
- [CS07a] F. Cucker and S. Smale. Emergent behavior in flocks. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 52(5):852–862, 2007.
- [CS07b] F. Cucker and S. Smale. On the mathematics of emergence. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):197–227, 2007.
- [DeG74] M. H. DeGroot. Reaching a consensus. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 69:118–121, 1974.
- [DFP06] Marco Di Francesco and Sergio Polidoro. Schauder estimates, Harnack inequality and Gaussian lower bound for Kolmogorov-type operators in non-divergence form. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 11(11):1261–1320, 2006.
- [DFT10] Renjun Duan, Massimo Fornasier, and Giuseppe Toscani. A kinetic flocking model with diffusion. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 300(1):95–145, 2010.
- [DKRT18] Tam Do, Alexander Kiselev, Lenya Ryzhik, and Changhui Tan. Global regularity for the fractional Euler alignment system. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 228(1):1–37, 2018.
- [DS19] H. Dietert and R. Shvydkoy. On Cucker-Smale dynamical systems with degenerate communication. *Anal. Appl. (Singap.)*, 19(4):551–573, 2019.
- [DV00] Laurent Desvillettes and Cédric Villani. On the spatially homogeneous Landau equation for hard potentials. I. Existence, uniqueness and smoothness. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(1-2):179–259, 2000.
- [EK01] Leah Edelstein-Keshet. *Mathematical models of swarming and social aggregation*. 2001.
- [Fav83] A. Favre. Turbulence: Space-time statistical properties and behavior in supersonic flows. *The Physics of Fluids*, 26(10):2851–2863, 1983.
- [FK19] A. Figalli and M.-J. Kang. A rigorous derivation from the kinetic Cucker-Smale model to the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal alignment. *Anal. PDE*, 12(3):843–866, 2019.
- [GI21] Jessica Guerand and Cyril Imbert. Log-transform and the weak harnack inequality for kinetic fokker-planck equations. 2021.

- [GIMV19] François Golse, Cyril Imbert, Clément Mouhot, and Alexis F. Vasseur. Harnack inequality for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with rough coefficients and application to the Landau equation. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (5), 19(1):253–295, 2019.
- [GJV04] Thierry Goudon, Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin, and Alexis Vasseur. Hydrodynamic limit for the Vlasov-Navier-Stokes equations. I. Light particles regime. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 53(6):1495–1515, 2004.
- [Hö67] Lars Hörmander. Hypocoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Math.*, 119:147–171, 1967.
- [HHK10] S.-Y. Ha, T. Ha, and J.-H. Kim. Emergent behavior of a cucker-smale type particle model with nonlinear velocity couplings. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 55(7), 2010.
- [HKK14] S.-Y. Ha, M.-J. Kang, and B. Kwon. A hydrodynamic model for the interaction of Cucker-Smale particles and incompressible fluid. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 24(11):2311–2359, 2014.
- [HL09] S.-Y. Ha and J.-G. Liu. A simple proof of the Cucker-Smale flocking dynamics and mean-field limit. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 7(2):297–325, 2009.
- [HR17] S.-Y. Ha and T. Ruggeri. Emergent dynamics of a thermodynamically consistent particle model. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 223(3):1397–1425, 2017.
- [HST20] Christopher Henderson, Stanley Snelson, and Andrei Tarfulea. Self-generating lower bounds and continuation for the Boltzmann equation. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 59(6):Paper No. 191, 13, 2020.
- [HT08] S.-Y. Ha and E. Tadmor. From particle to kinetic and hydrodynamic descriptions of flocking. *Kinet. Relat. Models*, 1(3):415–435, 2008.
- [HT17] S. He and E. Tadmor. Global regularity of two-dimensional flocking hydrodynamics. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 355(7):795–805, 2017.
- [HT20] S. He and E. Tadmor. A game of alignment: collective behavior of multi-species. 2020.
- [IM21] Cyril Imbert and Clément Mouhot. The Schauder estimate in kinetic theory with application to a toy nonlinear model. *Ann. H. Lebesgue*, 4:369–405, 2021.
- [IMS20] Cyril Imbert, Clément Mouhot, and Luis Silvestre. Gaussian lower bounds for the Boltzmann equation without cutoff. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(3):2930–2944, 2020.
- [Jac08] Matthew O. Jackson. Social and economic networks. 2008.
- [JJ15] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin and Stéphane Junca. A continuous model for ratings. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 75(2):420–442, 2015.
- [KMT13] T. K. Karper, A. Mellet, and K. Trivisa. Existence of weak solutions to kinetic flocking models. *SIAM. J. Math. Anal.*, 45:215–243, 2013.
- [KMT14] T. K. Karper, A. Mellet, and K. Trivisa. On strong local alignment in the kinetic Cucker-Smale model. In *Hyperbolic conservation laws and related analysis with applications*, volume 49 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 227–242. Springer, Heidelberg, 2014.
- [KMT15] T. K. Karper, A. Mellet, and K. Trivisa. Hydrodynamic limit of the kinetic Cucker-Smale flocking model. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 25(1):131–163, 2015.
- [Kol34] A. Kolmogoroff. Zufällige Bewegungen (zur Theorie der Brownschen Bewegung). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 35(1):116–117, 1934.
- [Kry96] N. V. Krylov. *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Hölder spaces*, volume 12 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [KV15] M.-J. Kang and A. Vasseur. Asymptotic analysis of Vlasov-type equations under strong local alignment regime. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25(11):2153–2173, 2015.
- [Lio94] P.-L. Lions. Compactness in Boltzmann’s equation via Fourier integral operators and applications. I, II. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 34(2):391–427, 429–461, 1994.
- [LRS21] Daniel Lear, David N. Reynolds, and Roman Shvydkoy. Grassmannian reduction of cucker-smale systems and dynamical opinion games. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 41(12):5765–, 2021.
- [LRS22] Daniel Lear, David N. Reynolds, and Roman Shvydkoy. Global solutions to multi-dimensional topological Euler alignment systems. *Ann. PDE*, 8(1):Paper No. 1, 43, 2022.
- [LS16] T. M. Leslie and R. Shvydkoy. The energy balance relation for weak solutions of the density-dependent Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 261(6):3719–3733, 2016.
- [LS19a] D. Lear and R. Shvydkoy. Existence and stability of unidirectional flocks in hydrodynamic Euler Alignment systems. *Anal. PDE*, 15(1):175–196, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.10661>.
- [LS19b] T. M. Leslie and R. Shvydkoy. On the structure of limiting flocks in hydrodynamic Euler Alignment models. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 29(13):2419–2431, 2019.
- [Mar18] I. Markou. Collision-avoiding in the singular Cucker-Smale model with nonlinear velocity couplings. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 38(10):5245–5260, 2018.
- [MMP20] Piotr Minakowski, Piotr B. Mucha, and Jan Peszek. Density-induced consensus protocol. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 30(12):2389–2415, 2020.
- [Mou05] Clément Mouhot. Quantitative lower bounds for the full Boltzmann equation. I. Periodic boundary conditions. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 30(4-6):881–917, 2005.
- [MP18] P. B. Mucha and J. Peszek. The Cucker-Smale equation: singular communication weight, measure-valued solutions and weak-atomic uniqueness. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 227(1):273–308, 2018.
- [MPT19] J. Morales, J. Peszek, and E. Tadmor. Flocking with short-range interactions. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 176(2):382–397, 2019.
- [MT11] S. Motsch and E. Tadmor. A new model for self-organized dynamics and its flocking behavior. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 144(5):923–947, 2011.
- [MT14] S. Motsch and E. Tadmor. Heterophilous dynamics enhances consensus. *SIAM Rev.*, 56(4):577–621, 2014.

- [MV08] A. Mellet and A. Vasseur. Asymptotic analysis for a Vlasov-Fokker-Planck/compressible Navier-Stokes system of equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 281(3):573–596, 2008.
- [NMG14] Takayuki Niizato, Hisashi Murakami, and Yukio-Pegio Gunji. Emergence of the scale-invariant proportion in a flock from the metric-topological interaction. *Biosystems*, 119:62 – 68, 2014.
- [Olf06] R. Olfati-Saber. Flocking for multi-agent dynamic systems: algorithms and theory. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51(3):401–420, 2006.
- [PEG09] L. Perea, P. Elosegui, and G. Gomez. Extension of the Cucker-Smale control law to space flight formations. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, 32:526 – 536, 2009.
- [Pes15] J. Peszek. Discrete Cucker-Smale flocking model with a weakly singular weight. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 47(5):3671–3686, 2015.
- [Rey87] C. W. Reynolds. Flocks, herds and schools: A distributed behavioral model. *ACM SIGGRAPH Computer Graphics*, 21:25–34, 1987.
- [RS20] D. N. Reynolds and R. Shvydkoy. Local well-posedness of the topological Euler alignment models of collective behavior. *Nonlinearity*, 33(10):5176–5215, 2020.
- [SB14] Yilun Shang and Roland Bouffanais. Consensus reaching in swarms ruled by a hybrid metric-topological distance. *The European Physical Journal B*, 87(12):294, Dec 2014.
- [Shv21] Roman Shvydkoy. *Dynamics and analysis of alignment models of collective behavior*. Nečas Center Series. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021.
- [Shv22] Roman Shvydkoy. Global hypocoercivity of kinetic Fokker-Planck-Alignment equations. *Kinet. Relat. Models*, 15(2):213–237, 2022.
- [ST17a] Roman Shvydkoy and Eitan Tadmor. Eulerian dynamics with a commutator forcing. *Trans. Math. Appl.*, 1(1):26, 2017.
- [ST17b] Roman Shvydkoy and Eitan Tadmor. Eulerian dynamics with a commutator forcing II: Flocking. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 37(11):5503–5520, 2017.
- [ST18] Roman Shvydkoy and Eitan Tadmor. Eulerian dynamics with a commutator forcing III. Fractional diffusion of order $0 < \alpha < 1$. *Phys. D*, 376/377:131–137, 2018.
- [ST19] R. Shu and E. Tadmor. Anticipation breeds alignment. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 240(1):203–241, 2019.
- [ST20a] R. Shu and E. Tadmor. Flocking hydrodynamics with external potentials. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 238(1):347–381, 2020.
- [ST20b] Roman Shvydkoy and Eitan Tadmor. Topologically based fractional diffusion and emergent dynamics with short-range interactions. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(6):5792–5839, 2020.
- [ST21] Roman Shvydkoy and Eitan Tadmor. Multiflocks: emergent dynamics in systems with multiscale collective behavior. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 19(2):1115–1141, 2021.
- [Szn91] Alain-Sol Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, volume 1464 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 165–251. Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [Tad21] Eitan Tadmor. On the mathematics of swarming: emergent behavior in alignment dynamics. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 68(4):493–503, 2021.
- [Tad22] Eitan Tadmor. Swarming: hydrodynamic alignment with pressure. 2022.
- [TT14] E. Tadmor and C. Tan. Critical thresholds in flocking hydrodynamics with non-local alignment. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 372(2028):20130401, 22, 2014.
- [VCBJ⁺95] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet. Novel type of phase transition in a system of self-driven particles. *Physical Review Letters*, 75(6):1226–1229, 1995.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. Hypocoercivity. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 202(950):iv+141, 2009.
- [VZ12] T. Vicsek and A. Zefeiris. Collective motion. *Physics Reprints*, 517:71–140, 2012.

851 S MORGAN ST, M/C 249, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL 60607

Email address: shvydkoy@uic.edu