

Hölder Stability and Uniqueness for The Mean Field Games System via Carleman Estimates*

Michael V. Klibanov [†], Jingzhi Li [‡], Hongyu Liu [§]

Abstract

We are concerned with the mathematical study of the Mean Field Games system (MFGS). In the conventional setup, the MFGS is a system of two coupled nonlinear parabolic PDEs of the second order in a backward-forward manner, namely one terminal and one initial conditions are prescribed respectively for the value function and the population density. In this paper, we show that uniqueness of solutions to the MFGS can be guaranteed if, among all four possible terminal and initial conditions, either only two terminal or only two initial conditions are given. In both cases Hölder stability estimates are proven. This means that the accuracies of the solutions are estimated in terms of the given data. Moreover, these estimates readily imply uniqueness of corresponding problems for the MFGS. The main mathematical apparatus to establish those results is two new Carleman estimates, which may find application in other contexts associated with coupled parabolic PDEs.

Key Words: mean field games system, Hölder stability estimates, uniqueness, ill-posed and inverse problems, Carleman estimates

2020 MSC codes: 35R30, 91A16

1 Introduction

The mean field games (MFG) theory was first developed in the seminal works of Lasry and Lions [31, 28, 29] as well as of Huang, Caines and Malhamé [7, 8]. This theory studies the behavior of infinitely many agents, who are trying to optimize their values. There are many applications of this theory in social sciences. Some examples of those applications

***Funding.** The work of J. Li was partially supported by the NSF of China No. 11971221, Guangdong NSF Major Fund No. 2021ZDZX1001, the Shenzhen Sci-Tech Fund No. RCJC20200714114556020, JCYJ20200109115422828 and JCYJ20190809150413261, National Center for Applied Mathematics Shenzhen, and SUSTech International Center for Mathematics. The work of H. Liu was supported by the Hong Kong RGC General Research Funds (projects 12302919, 12301420 and 11300821) and the France-Hong Kong ANR/RGC Joint Research Grant, A-CityU203/19.

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, 28223, USA, mklibanv@uncc.edu

[‡]Department of Mathematics & National Center for Applied Mathematics Shenzhen & SUSTech International Center for Mathematics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, P. R. China, li.jz@sustech.edu.cn

[§]Department of Mathematics, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, P.R. China, hongyliu@cityu.edu.hk

are: finance, economics, pedestrians flocking and interactions of electrical vehicles, see, e.g. [1, 5, 25, 29, 38]. We also mention applications of the MFG theory in the fight with corruption [24], [25, Preface] and the cyber security [23].

The methodology of this publication comes from the theory of Ill-Posed and Inverse Problems. The authors have been heavily involved in this field throughout their careers, see, e.g. [3, 4], [11]-[19], [31, 32]. The apparatus of Carleman estimates was first introduced in the field of coefficient inverse problems in the work of Bukhgeim and Klibanov [4], and it was first introduced in the MFG theory by Klibanov and Averboukh [20], also, see two follow up publications [21, 22].

Accuracy estimates for the solution of the mean field games system (MFGS) with respect to the input data, which the authors also call “stability estimates”, were unknown in the MFG theory prior to [20, 21, 22]. In the meantime such estimates are quite desirable ones since the input data for the MFGS are given with errors. Besides, these estimates imply uniqueness of corresponding problems for the MFGS.

Let $u(x, t)$ be the value function of a mean field game and let $m(x, t)$ be the function, which describes the density of agents [1, 29]. Here $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and t are the spatial variable and the time variable respectively and $t \in (0, T)$. The mean field games system (MFGS) of the second order is a crucial part of the MFG theory. The MFGS is a system of two coupled nonlinear parabolic equations with respect to functions $u(x, t)$ and $m(x, t)$. A substantial complication of the MFGS is that times are running in two different directions in those two PDEs. Therefore, the conventional theory of parabolic PDEs is inapplicable to the MFGS.

The following are four possible terminal and initial conditions for the MFGS:

$$u(x, T), m(x, 0), m(x, T), u(x, 0). \quad (1.1)$$

In the conventional setting the following two out of these four functions are known:

$$u(x, T) \text{ and } m(x, 0). \quad (1.2)$$

In addition, usually functions $u(x, t)$ and $m(x, t)$ are assumed to be periodic with respect to each component of the vector x , see, e.g. [1, 29]. However, uniqueness of the solution of the MFGS is in question then, unless quite restrictive the so-called “monotonicity” conditions are not imposed [2]. On the other hand, if one assumes that either of two vector functions

$$(u(x, T), m(x, 0), m(x, T)), \quad (1.3)$$

$$(u(x, T), m(x, 0), u(x, 0)) \quad (1.4)$$

is known and zero Neumann boundary conditions are imposed on both functions $u(x, t)$ and $m(x, t)$, then the Lipschitz stability estimate for either of cases (1.3) or (1.4) holds along with the uniqueness [20, 21]. In [22] both a Hölder stability estimate and uniqueness are obtained in the case when Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions for functions $u(x, t)$ and $m(x, t)$ are known, whereas all functions in (1.1) are unknown.

Still, three functions are known in either (1.3) or (1.4), which means an over-determination in the data. Hence, the following question is natural one to be posed: *Can only two out of four terminal and initial conditions (1.1) provide both a stability estimate and uniqueness for the MFGS?* The goal of this paper is to address this question positively. More precisely, we demonstrate here that if Neumann boundary conditions are imposed on both

functions $u(x, t)$ and $m(x, t)$, then the replacement of the conventional pair (1.2) with either of two pairs

$$(u(x, T), m(x, T)) \text{ or } (u(x, 0), m(x, 0)) \quad (1.5)$$

leads to both: a Hölder stability estimate and uniqueness. In other word, if the conventional pair (1.2) is replaced by one of two pairs (1.5), then uniqueness of the solution of the MFGS is restored even for the non-overdetermined case, and, in addition, Hölder estimate of the accuracy of the solution is in place.

Assuming that the function $m(x, T)$ is known, we actually assume that we can measure the final distribution of players. Next, solving the MFGS with the terminal data $(u(x, T), m(x, T))$, we provide a retrospective analysis of the process [20]. On the other hand, an approximate knowledge of the initial condition $u(x, 0)$ of the value function can be obtained via polling of players in the beginning of the process about their ideas about their value function [21]. At the same time, since polls are expensive efforts, then it is reasonable to obtain the result of a poll only once, rather than conducting polls at several moments of time.

Results of the current publication as well as of [20, 21, 22] are about a single measurement case. As to the case of infinitely many measurements, we refer to two recent results of [33, 34], which prove uniqueness of the reconstruction of the interaction term of the MFGS.

We rely below on two new Carleman estimates for the MFGS, which were derived in [20, 21]. Carleman estimates are traditionally used for proofs of stability and uniqueness theorems for ill-posed Cauchy problems for various PDEs, although only the case of a single PDE is usually considered, unlike our case of a system of PDEs, see, e.g. see, e.g. [14, 15, 18, 30, 40]. Starting from the originating publication [4], Carleman estimates have been actively used for proofs of global uniqueness and stability results for coefficient inverse problems. Since this paper is not a survey of publications devoted to the method of [4], we refer now only to a few of those and references cited therein [3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 40]. In addition, the idea of [4] was extended to numerical methods for coefficient inverse problems, see, e.g. [16]-[19].

Remark 1.1. *We are not concerned here with the issue of the minimal smoothness. In doing so we follow the tradition of the field of Inverse Problems, see, e.g. [35, 36], [37, Theorem 4.1].*

We work below only with real valued functions. We formulate our two problems in section 2. In section 3 we formulate Carleman estimates of [20, 21]. We prove Hölder stability estimates and uniqueness of our two problems in sections 4 and 5.

2 Two Problems

Below $\beta = \text{const.} > 0$. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the position x of an agent and $t \geq 0$ denotes time. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with the piecewise smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $T > 0$ be a number. Denote

$$Q_T = \Omega \times (0, T), S_T = \partial\Omega \times (0, T).$$

Recall that $u(x, t)$ the value function and $m(x, t)$ is the density of players at the position x and at the moment of time t . The conventional MFGS of the second order

consists of the system of two homogeneous nonlinear parabolic PDEs with times running in two different directions [1, 29]. However, we consider in this paper a more general case of two heterogeneous parabolic PDEs. To do this, we incorporate non-zero terms in the right hand sides to the conventional PDEs forming the MFGS. Hence, this is a generalized MFGS of the form:

$$u_t(x, t) + \beta \Delta u(x, t) - r(x)(\nabla u(x, t))^2/2 + F \left(\int_{\Omega} M(x, y) m(y, t) dy, m(x, t) \right) = G_1(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \quad (2.1)$$

$$m_t(x, t) - \beta \Delta m(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(r(x)m(x, t)\nabla u(x, t)) = G_2(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T. \quad (2.2)$$

Here, the coefficient $r(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is similar with the elasticity of the medium, the function F is the interaction term. We assume zero Neumann boundary conditions, i.e. the full reflection from the boundary

$$\partial_{\nu} u|_{S_T} = \partial_{\nu} m|_{S_T} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\nu = \nu(x)$ is the unit outward looking normal vector at the point $(x, t) \in S_T$. We consider in this paper the following two problems:

Problem 1. *Assuming that functions $u, m \in H^2(Q_T)$ satisfy conditions (2.1)-(2.3), obtain a Hölder stability estimate and uniqueness theorem for the case when the following two functions $u_T(x)$ and $m_T(x)$ are known:*

$$u(x, T) = u_T(x), \quad m(x, T) = m_T(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (2.4)$$

Problem 2. *Assuming that functions $u, m \in H^2(Q_T)$ satisfy conditions (2.1)-(2.3), obtain a Hölder stability estimate and uniqueness theorem for the case when the following two functions $u_0(x)$ and $m_0(x)$ are known:*

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad m(x, 0) = m_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (2.5)$$

Remark 2.1. *The data in the right hand sides of (2.4) and (2.5) are measured with errors, so as the right hand sides of equations (2.1) and (2.2). This is why stability estimates, which are actually accuracy estimates for solutions of the MFGS, are important in Problems 1,2, so as for problems considered in [20, 21, 22].*

3 Carleman Estimates

A Carleman estimate for a partial differential operator is always proven only for the principal part of this operator since it is independent on its lower order terms [18, Lemma 2.1.1]. Therefore we formulate in this section Carleman estimates for principal parts $\partial_t + \beta \Delta$, $\partial_t - \beta \Delta$ of operators of equations (2.1), (2.2). Carleman estimates for Problems 1 and 2 are different. The difference is in the difference of Carleman Weight Functions, i.e. weight functions involved in the resulting integral inequalities. Denote

$$H_0^2(Q_T) = \{u \in H^2(Q_T) : \partial_{\nu} u|_{S_T} = 0\}.$$

3.1 Carleman estimates for Problem 1

Introduce three parameters $b > 0, \lambda > 0$ and $k > 2$. Also, introduce our first Carleman Weight Function

$$\varphi_{\lambda,k}(t) = \exp\left(\lambda(t+b)^k\right), t \in (0, T). \quad (3.1)$$

Theorem 3.1 [20]. *There exists a number $C_1 = C_1(b, T, \beta) > 0$, which depends only on listed parameters, such that the following Carleman estimate is valid:*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T} (u_t + \beta \Delta u)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt &\geq C_1 \int_{Q_T} (u_t^2 + (\Delta u)^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\ &+ C_1 \lambda k \int_{Q_T} (\nabla u)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + C_1 \lambda^2 k^2 \int_{Q_T} u^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt - \\ &- e^{2\lambda(T+b)^k} \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla_x u)^2 + \lambda k (T+b)^k u^2 \right] (x, T) dx, \\ &\forall \lambda > 0, \forall k > 2, \forall u \in H_0^2(Q_T). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 3.2 [20]. *There exist a sufficiently large number $k_0 = k_0(\beta, T, b) > 2$ and a number $C = C(T, b) > 0$ depending only on listed parameters such that the following Carleman estimate holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_T} (u_t - \beta \Delta u)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \geq \\ &\geq C_1 \sqrt{k} \beta \int_{Q_T} (\nabla u)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + C_1 \lambda k^2 \int_{Q_T} u^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt - \\ &- C_1 \lambda k (T+b)^{k-1} e^{2\lambda(T+b)^k} \int_{\Omega} u^2(x, T) dx - C_1 e^{2\lambda b^k} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla u)^2 + \sqrt{\nu} u^2] (x, 0) dx, \\ &\forall \lambda > 0, \forall k \geq k_0(\beta, T, b) > 2, \forall u \in H_0^2(Q_T), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where the number $C_1 = C_1(a, T, \beta) > 0$ depends on the same parameters as ones in Theorem 3.1.

In addition, we formulate a new integral identity, which was proven in [20]. In the past only a similar inequality rather than identity was known [26, Chapter 2, §6].

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that the domain Ω is a rectangular prism. Then the following integral identity holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (\Delta u)^2 dx &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{\Omega} u_{x_i x_j}^2 dx, \\ \forall u &\in \{u \in H^2(\Omega) : \partial_{\nu} u|_{\Omega} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Carleman estimates for Problem 2

Let $c > 2$ be a number. Let $\lambda > 2$ be a sufficiently large parameter. We will choose parameters c and λ later. Introduce the second Carleman Weight Function $\varphi_{\lambda}(t)$,

$$\varphi_{\lambda}(t) = \exp\left((T-t+c)^{\lambda}\right), t \in (0, T). \quad (3.4)$$

Theorem 3.3 [21]. *Choose the number c in (3.4) as: $c > 2$. Define the number λ_0 as:*

$$\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(T, c) = 16(T + c)^2 > 16c^2 > 64. \quad (3.5)$$

Then the following Carleman estimate is valid:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} (u_t + \beta \Delta u)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt \geq \\ & \geq C_2 \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla u)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt + C_2 \lambda^2 c^{\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} u^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt + \\ & - C_2 e^{2c^\lambda} \int_{\Omega} ((\nabla u)^2 + u^2)(x, T) - C_2 \lambda (T + c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)^\lambda} \int_{\Omega} u^2(x, 0) dx, \\ & \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0, \forall u \in H_0^2(Q_T), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where the constant $C_2 = C_2(c, T, \beta) > 0$ depends only on listed parameters.

Theorem 3.4 is not exactly a Carleman estimate but rather a quasi-Carleman estimate. This is because of two test functions u and v are involved in it rather than just a single one.

Theorem 3.4 (a quasi-Carleman estimate) [21]. *Let the numbers c and λ_0 be the same as the ones in Theorem 3.3. Let the function $g \in H^1(Q_T)$ and*

$$\sup_{Q_T} |g|, \sup_{Q_T} |\nabla g| < \infty.$$

Then the following quasi-Carleman estimate holds for any two functions $u, v \in H_0^2(Q_T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} (u_t - \beta \Delta u + g \Delta v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 \geq \\ & \geq C_3 \lambda c^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla u)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt + C_3 \lambda^2 c^{2\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} u^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt - \\ & - C_3 \lambda (T + c)^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla u)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt - \\ & - \lambda (T + c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)^\lambda} \int_{\Omega} u^2(x, 0) dx, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where the number $C_3 = C_3(\beta, c, \|g\|_{C^1(\overline{Q_T})}) > 0$ depends only on listed parameters.

4 Hölder Stability and Uniqueness for Problem 1

For any number $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$ define the domain $Q_{\varepsilon, T}$ as:

$$Q_{\varepsilon, T} = \Omega \times (\varepsilon, T) \subset Q_T. \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $D_1, D_2, D_3, D_4 > 0$ be certain numbers. Let in (2.1), (2.2) functions $G_1, G_2 \in L_2(Q_T)$. Let F be the function in (2.1). Assume that the function $F(y, z) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has derivatives $F_y, F_z \in C(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$\max \left(\sup_{\mathbb{R}^2} |F_y(y, z)|, \sup_{\mathbb{R}^2} |F_z(y, z)| \right) \leq D_1. \quad (4.2)$$

In (2.1), (2.2), let the functions $M(x, y)$ and $r \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be such that

$$\sup_{\Omega \times \Omega} |M(x, y)|, \|r\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})} \leq D_2. \quad (4.3)$$

Define sets of functions $K_3(D_3)$ and $K_4(D_4)$ as

$$K_3(D_3) = \left\{ u \in H_0^2(Q_T) : \sup_{Q_T} |u|, \sup_{Q_T} |\nabla u|, \sup_{Q_T} |\Delta u| \leq D_3 \right\}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$K_4(D_4) = \left\{ u \in H_0^2(Q_T) : \sup_{Q_T} |u|, \sup_{Q_T} |\nabla u| \leq D_4 \right\}. \quad (4.5)$$

Let

$$D = \max(D_1, D_2, D_3, D_4). \quad (4.6)$$

Assume that two pairs of functions (u_1, m_1) and (u_2, m_2) satisfy equations (2.1)-(2.3) with two pairs of functions $(G_{1,1}, G_{2,1})$ and $(G_{1,2}, G_{2,2})$ respectively and are such that

$$(u_1, m_1), (u_2, m_2) \in K_3(D_3) \times K_4(D_4). \quad (4.7)$$

Assume that these two pairs of functions (u_1, m_1) and (u_2, m_2) have the following terminal conditions (see (2.4)):

$$u_1(x, T) = u_T^{(1)}(x), \quad m_1(x, T) = m_T^{(1)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (4.8)$$

$$u_2(x, T) = u_T^{(2)}(x), \quad m_2(x, T) = m_T^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (4.9)$$

Let the number $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$ and let $Q_{\varepsilon, T}$ be the domain defined in (4.1). Then there exists a number $C_4 = C_4(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) > 0$ and a sufficiently small number $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ depending only on listed parameters such that if $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ and

$$\left\| u_T^{(1)} - u_T^{(2)} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \left\| m_T^{(1)} - m_T^{(2)} \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \delta, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\|G_{1,1} - G_{1,2}\|_{L_2(Q_T)}, \|G_{2,1} - G_{2,2}\|_{L_2(Q_T)} \leq \delta, \quad (4.11)$$

then there exists a number $\rho = \rho(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1/6)$ depending only on listed parameters such that the following two Hölder stability estimates are valid:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t u_1 - \partial_t u_2\|_{L_2(Q_{\varepsilon, T})} + \|\Delta u_1 - \Delta u_2\|_{L_2(Q_{\varepsilon, T})} + \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})} \leq \\ & \leq C_4 \left(1 + \|m_1 - m_2\|_{H^2(Q_T)} \right) \delta^\rho, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

$$\|m_1 - m_2\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq C_4 \left(1 + \|m_1 - m_2\|_{H^2(Q_T)}\right) \delta^\rho. \quad (4.13)$$

Furthermore, if the domain Ω is a rectangular prism, then estimate (4.12) can be strengthened as:

$$\|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq C_4 \left(1 + \|m_1 - m_2\|_{H^2(Q_T)}\right) \delta^\rho. \quad (4.14)$$

Furthermore, if in (4.8) and (4.9)

$$u_T^{(1)}(x) \equiv u_T^{(2)}(x), \quad m_T^{(1)}(x) \equiv m_T^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (4.15)$$

$$G_{1,1}(x,t) \equiv G_{1,2}(x,t), \quad G_{2,1}(x,t) \equiv G_{2,2}(x,t), \quad (x,t) \in Q_T, \quad (4.16)$$

then $u_1(x,t) \equiv u_2(x,t)$ and $m_1(x,t) \equiv m_2(x,t)$ in Q_T , which means that Problem 1 has at most one solution $(u, m) \in K_3(D_3) \times K_4(D_4)$.

Remark 4.1: Consider the condition of this theorem that two pairs $(u_1, m_1), (u_2, m_2)$ belong to an a priori chosen bounded set $K_3(D_3) \times K_4(D_4)$. Such conditions are typical ones in the theory of ill-posed problems, see, e.g. [3, 30].

Proof of Theorem 4.1. In this proof $\tilde{C}_4 = \tilde{C}_4(\beta, D, T, \Omega) > 0$ denotes different numbers depending only on β, D, T, Ω and $C_4 = C_4(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) > 0$ denotes different numbers depending not only on parameters β, D, T, Ω but on ε as well. Consider four arbitrary numbers $y_1, z_1, y_2, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\tilde{y} = y_1 - y_2$ and $\tilde{z} = z_1 - z_2$. Hence,

$$y_1 z_1 - y_2 z_2 = \tilde{y} z_1 + \tilde{z} y_2. \quad (4.17)$$

Denote

$$v(x,t) = u_1(x,t) - u_2(x,t), \quad p(x,t) = m_1(x,t) - m_2(x,t), \quad (x,t) \in Q_T, \quad (4.18)$$

$$v_T(x) = u_T^{(1)}(x) - u_T^{(2)}(x), \quad p_T(x) = m_T^{(1)}(x) - m_T^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (4.19)$$

$$\tilde{G}_1(x,t) = (G_{1,1} - G_{1,2})(x,t), \quad \tilde{G}_2(x,t) = (G_{2,1} - G_{2,2})(x,t), \quad (x,t) \in Q_T. \quad (4.20)$$

Using (4.2)-(4.7) and the multidimensional analog of Taylor formula [39], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & F \left(\int_{\Omega} M(x,y) m_1(y,t) dy, m_1(x,t) \right) - \\ & - F \left(\int_{\Omega} M(x,y) m_2(y,t) dy, m_2(x,t) \right) = \\ & = f_1(x,t) \int_{\Omega} M(x,y) p(y,t) + f_2(x,t) p(x,t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

where functions f_1, f_2 are such that

$$|f_1(x,t)|, |f_2(x,t)| \leq D, \quad (x,t) \in Q_T. \quad (4.22)$$

Subtract equations (2.1), (2.2) for the pair (u_2, m_2) from corresponding equations for the pair (u_1, m_1) . Then use (4.7)-(4.9), (4.17)-(4.22) and recall that Carleman estimates

can work with both equations and inequalities [3, 14, 18, 30, 40]. Hence, it is convenient to replace resulting equations with two inequalities:

$$|v_t + \beta \Delta v|(x, t) \leq \tilde{C}_4 \left(|\nabla v| + \int_{\Omega} |p(y, t)| dy + |p| + \left| \tilde{G}_1 \right| \right) (x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \quad (4.23)$$

$$|p_t - \beta \Delta p|(x, t) \leq \tilde{C}_4 \left(|\nabla p| + |p| + |\Delta v| + |\nabla v| + \left| \tilde{G}_2 \right| \right) (x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \quad (4.24)$$

$$\partial_\nu v|_{S_T} = 0, \quad \partial_\nu p|_{S_T} = 0, \quad (4.25)$$

$$v(x, T) = v_T(x), \quad p(x, T) = p_T(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (4.26)$$

Squaring both sides of equation (4.23) and (4.24), applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, multiplying by the CWF $\varphi_{\lambda, k}^2(t)$ defined in (3.1) and integrating over Q_T , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T} (v_t + \beta \Delta v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt &\leq \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt + \\ &+ \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left(p^2 + \int_{\Omega} p^2(y, t) dy + \tilde{G}_1^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T} (p_t - \beta \Delta p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt &\leq \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt + \\ &+ \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left((\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + v^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Note that

$$\int_{Q_T} \left(\int_{\Omega} p^2(y, t) dy \right) \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2(t) dx dt \leq \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2(t) dx dt. \quad (4.29)$$

Set

$$b = 1 \quad (4.30)$$

in the Carleman Weight Function $\varphi_{\lambda, k}(t)$. Apply Carleman estimate (3.2) to the left hand side of (4.27) and use (4.25), (4.26) and (4.29). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left(p^2 + \tilde{G}_1^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt \geq \\ &\geq \int_{Q_T} (v_t^2 + (\Delta v)^2) \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt + \\ &+ \lambda k \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt + \lambda^2 k^2 \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_{\lambda, k}^2 dx dt - \\ &- \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla_x v_T)^2 + \lambda k (T+1)^k v_T^2 \right] dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

$\forall \lambda > 0, \forall k > 2.$

Choosing $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\beta, D, T, \Omega) \geq 1$ so large that

$$\lambda_1 > 2\tilde{C}_4 \quad (4.32)$$

and recalling that $k > 2$, we obtain from (4.31)

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \tilde{G}_1^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \geq \\ & \geq \int_{Q_T} (v_t^2 + (\Delta v)^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\ & + \lambda k \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 k^2 \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt - \\ & - \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla_x v_T)^2 + \lambda k (T+1)^k v_T^2 \right] dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

$$\forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1, \forall k > 2.$$

We now apply Carleman estimate (3.3) to the left hand side of (4.28). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left((\Delta v)^2 + v^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left((\nabla p)^2 + p^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \geq \\ & \geq \sqrt{k} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \lambda k^2 \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt - \\ & - \lambda k (T+b)^{k-1} e^{2\lambda(T+b)^k} \int_{\Omega} p_T^2(x) dx - e^{2\lambda b^k} \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla p)^2 + \sqrt{k} p^2 \right] (x, 0) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

$$\forall \lambda > 0, \forall k \geq k_0 = k_0(\beta, T) > 2.$$

Choose the number $k_0 = k_0(\beta, T)$ so large that

$$k_0 > \max \left(2, 4\tilde{C}_4^2 \right), \quad (4.35)$$

and, until (4.48), set $k = k_0$. Also, let $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$, where the number $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\beta, D, T, \Omega) \geq 1$ is defined in (?). Then (4.34) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left((\Delta v)^2 + v^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \geq \\ & \geq \int_{Q_T} (\nabla p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \lambda \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt - \\ & - \tilde{C}_4 \lambda (T+1)^{k-1} e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} p_T^2(x) dx - \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla p)^2 + p^2 \right] (x, 0) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

$$\forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.$$

In particular, it follows from (4.36) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{1,\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \leq \tilde{C}_4 \lambda^{-1} \int_{Q_T} \left((\Delta v)^2 + v^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\ & + \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} p_T^2(x) dx + \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla p)^2 + p^2 \right] (x, 0) dx, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

Replacing the first term of the first line of (4.33) with the right hand side of inequality (4.37), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{C}_4 \lambda e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} [p_T^2 + (\nabla_x v_T)^2 + v_T^2] (x) dx + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} (\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\
& \quad + \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla p)^2 + p^2] (x, 0) dx + \\
& \quad + \frac{\tilde{C}_4}{\lambda} \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta v)^2 + v^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \geq \\
& \quad \geq \int_{Q_T} (v_t^2 + (\Delta v)^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\
& \quad + \lambda \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

By (4.32) $\tilde{C}_4/\lambda < 1/2$, $\forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1$. Hence, terms in the 4th and 5th lines of (4.38) absorb terms in the 3rd line of (4.38). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{C}_4 \lambda e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} [p_T^2 + (\nabla_x v_T)^2 + v_T^2] (x) dx + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} (\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\
& \quad + \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla p)^2 + p^2] (x, 0) dx \geq \\
& \quad \geq \int_{Q_T} (v_t^2 + (\Delta v)^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\
& \quad + \lambda \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Comparing the last two lines of (4.39) with the first line of (4.36), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{C}_4 \lambda e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} [p_T^2 + (\nabla_x v_T)^2 + v_T^2] (x) dx + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} (\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \\
& \quad + \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla p)^2 + p^2] (x, 0) dx \geq \\
& \quad \geq \int_{Q_T} (\nabla p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt + \lambda \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

Summing up (4.39) and (4.40), we obtain

$$\int_{Q_T} (v_t^2 + (\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + v^2 + (\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dxdt \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \tilde{C}_4 e^{3\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} [p_T^2 + (\nabla_x v_T)^2 + v_T^2] (x) dx \\ &+ \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla p)^2 + p^2] (x, 0) dx + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left(\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dx dt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Since by (4.1) $Q_{\varepsilon,T} \subset Q_T$, then replacing Q_T with $Q_{\varepsilon,T}$ in the first line of (4.41), we strengthen this inequality. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_{\varepsilon,T}} (v_t^2 + (\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + v^2 + (\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_{1,\lambda,k}^2 dx dt \leq \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_4 e^{3\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} [p_T^2 + (\nabla_x v_T)^2 + v_T^2] (x) dx \\ &+ \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla p)^2 + p^2] (x, 0) dx + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left(\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dx dt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

Next, by (3.1), (4.1) and (4.30)

$$\min_{Q_{\varepsilon,T}} \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 (t) = e^{2\lambda(\varepsilon+1)^k}, \quad (4.43)$$

$$\max_{Q_T} \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 (t) = e^{2\lambda(T+1)^k}. \quad (4.44)$$

Also, by (4.10), (4.11), (4.19), (4.20) and (4.44)

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{C}_4 e^{3\lambda(T+1)^k} \int_{\Omega} [p_T^2 + (\nabla_x v_T)^2 + v_T^2] (x) dx + \tilde{C}_4 \int_{Q_T} \left(\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_{\lambda,k}^2 dx dt \leq \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_4 e^{3\lambda(T+1)^k} \delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

By the trace theorem

$$\tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla p)^2 + p^2] (x, 0) dx \leq \tilde{C}_4 e^{2\lambda} \|p\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2. \quad (4.46)$$

Hence, using (4.42), (4.43), (4.45) and (4.46), we replace \tilde{C}_4 with C_4 (see the beginning of this proof) and obtain for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|v_t\|_{L^2(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 + \|\Delta v\|_{L^2(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 + \|v\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 + \|p\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 \leq \\ &\leq C_4 e^{3\lambda(T+1)^k} \delta^2 + C_4 \exp \left[-2\lambda (\varepsilon + 1)^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{(\varepsilon + 1)^k} \right) \right] \|p\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

Recalling (4.35), choose $k_1 = k_1(\beta, T, \varepsilon) \geq k_0(\beta, T)$ so large that

$$\frac{1}{(\varepsilon + 1)^{k_1}} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (4.48)$$

and set $k = k_1$. Then (4.47) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_t\|_{L_2(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 + \|\Delta v\|_{L_2(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 + \|v\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 + \|p\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}^2 \leq \\ & \leq C_4 e^{3\lambda(T+1)^k} \delta^2 + C_4 e^{-\lambda(\varepsilon+1)^k} \|p\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2, \quad \lambda \geq \lambda_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

Choose $\lambda = \lambda(\delta)$ such that

$$e^{3\lambda(\delta)(T+1)^k} \delta^2 = \delta. \quad (4.50)$$

Hence,

$$\lambda(\delta) = \ln \left[\delta^{(3(T+1))^{-1}} \right], \quad (4.51)$$

$$e^{-\lambda(\varepsilon+1)^k} = \delta^{2\rho}, \quad 2\rho = \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\varepsilon+1}{T+1} \right)^k < \frac{1}{3}. \quad (4.52)$$

Choose $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ so small that

$$\lambda(\delta_0) = \ln \left[\delta^{(3(T+1))^{-1}} \right] \geq \lambda_1. \quad (4.53)$$

Then (4.47)-(4.53) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_t\|_{L_2(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|\Delta v\|_{L_2(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|v\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|p\|_{H^{1,0}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq \\ & \leq C_4 \left(1 + \|p\|_{H^2(Q_T)} \right) \delta^\rho, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0), \quad \rho \in (0, 1/6). \end{aligned} \quad (4.54)$$

The rest of the proof of the target Hölder stability estimates (4.12)-(4.14) follows immediately from (4.8), (4.9), (4.18), (4.19), (4.54) and Lemma 3.1.

We now prove uniqueness. Assume that identities (4.15) and (4.16) hold. Then by (4.10) and (4.11) $\delta = 0$. Hence, (4.12) and (4.13) imply that $u_1(x, t) = u_2(x, t)$ and $m_1(x, t) = m_2(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in Q_{\varepsilon,T}$. Setting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $u_1(x, t) = u_2(x, t)$ and $m_1(x, t) = m_2(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in Q_T$. \square

5 Hölder Stability and Uniqueness for Problem 2

Similarly with (4.1), for any number $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$ define the domain $P_{\varepsilon,T}$ as:

$$P_{\varepsilon,T} = \Omega \times (0, T - \varepsilon) \subset Q_T. \quad (5.1)$$

Theorem 5.1. *As in Theorem 4.1, let $D_1, D_2, D_3, D_4 > 0$ be certain numbers. Let functions $G_1, G_2 \in L_2(Q_T)$ be the right hand sides of equations (2.1), (2.2). Let functions F, M, r in (2.1), (2.2) satisfy conditions of Theorem 4.1. Keep notations (4.4)-(4.6) of Theorem 4.1. Assume that two pairs of functions (u_1, m_1) and (u_2, m_2) satisfy equations (2.1)-(2.3) with two pairs of functions $(G_{1,1}, G_{2,1})$ and $(G_{1,2}, G_{2,2})$ respectively and are such that*

$$(u_1, m_1), (u_2, m_2) \in K_3(D_3) \times K_4(D_4). \quad (5.2)$$

Assume that these two pairs of functions (u_1, m_1) and (u_2, m_2) have the following initial conditions (see (2.5)):

$$u_1(x, 0) = u_0^{(1)}(x), \quad m_1(x, 0) = m_0^{(1)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (5.3)$$

$$u_2(x, 0) = u_0^{(2)}(x), \quad m_2(x, 0) = m_0^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (5.4)$$

Let the number $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$ and let $P_{\varepsilon, T}$ be the domain defined in (5.1). Then there exists a number $C_5 = C_5(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) > 0$ and a sufficiently small number $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ depending only on listed parameters such that if $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$,

$$\left\| u_0^{(1)} - u_0^{(2)} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \left\| m_0^{(1)} - m_0^{(2)} \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \delta, \quad (5.5)$$

and also if inequalities (4.11) hold, then there exists a number $\eta = \eta(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1/6)$ depending only on listed parameters such that the following Hölder stability estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon, T})} + \|m_1 - m_2\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon, T})} \leq \\ & \leq C_5 \left(1 + \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^2(Q_T)} + \|m_1 - m_2\|_{H^1(Q_T)} \right) \delta^\eta, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if in (5.3) and (5.4)

$$u_0^{(1)}(x) \equiv u_0^{(2)}(x), \quad m_0^{(1)}(x) \equiv m_0^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

and if (4.16) holds as well, then $u_1(x, t) \equiv u_2(x, t)$ and $m_1(x, t) \equiv m_2(x, t)$ in Q_T , i.e. Problem 2 has at most one solution $(u, m) \in K_3(D_3) \times K_4(D_4)$.

Proof. Similarly with the proof of Theorem 4.1, in this proof $\tilde{C}_5 = \tilde{C}_5(\beta, D, T, \Omega) > 0$ denotes different numbers depending only on β, D, T, Ω and $C_5 = C_5(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) > 0$ denotes different numbers depending not only on parameters β, D, T, Ω but on ε as well. We will choose below the number $c = c(T) > 2$ in (3.4) as:

$$c = c(T) = 2 + \sqrt{T + \frac{1}{4}}. \quad (5.6)$$

We introduce the number $\xi = \xi(T)$,

$$\xi = \xi(T) = \frac{T + c}{c^2} = \frac{T + 2 + \sqrt{T + 1/4}}{\left(2 + \sqrt{T + 1/4}\right)^2} \in (0, 1). \quad (5.7)$$

The reason of the choice of (5.6), (5.7) is explained in this proof below.

Keep notations (4.18) and (4.20) and replace (4.19) with

$$v(x, 0) = v_0(x) = u_0^{(1)}(x) - u_0^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (5.8)$$

$$p(x, 0) = p_0(x) = m_0^{(1)}(x) - m_0^{(2)}(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (5.9)$$

Similarly with (4.23)-(4.26) we obtain two inequalities:

$$|v_t + \beta \Delta v|(x, t) \leq \tilde{C}_5 \left(|\nabla v| + \int_{\Omega} |p(y, t)| dy + |p| + \left| \tilde{G}_1 \right| \right) (x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \quad (5.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & |p_t - \beta \Delta p + r^2(x) m_1 \Delta v|(x, t) \leq \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_5 \left(|\nabla p| + |p| + |\nabla v| + \left| \tilde{G}_2 \right| \right) (x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

$$\partial_\nu v|_{S_T} = 0, \quad \partial_\nu p|_{S_T} = 0, \quad (5.12)$$

$$v(x, 0) = v_0(x), \quad p(x, 0) = p_0(x). \quad (5.13)$$

Note that the difference between (5.11) and (4.24) is that the term with Δv is in the left hand side of (5.11) rather than being in the right hand side of (4.24). This is because the quasi-Carleman estimate of Theorem 3.4, being applied to the left hand side of (5.11), helps us to handle this.

Below the parameter $c = c(T)$ in the Carleman Weight Function $\varphi_\lambda(t)$ in (3.4) is as in (5.6). Applying to (5.10) and (5.11) the same procedure as the one in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we obtain the following analogs of (4.27) and (4.28):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T} (v_t + \beta \Delta v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt &\leq \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt + \\ &+ \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \left(p^2 + \int_\Omega p^2(y, t) dy + \tilde{G}_1^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt, \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T} (p_t - \beta \Delta p + r^2(x) m_1 \Delta v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt &\leq \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt + \\ &+ \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \left((\nabla v)^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

Take $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(T)$ as in (3.5) and apply Carleman estimate (3.6) to the left hand side of (5.14). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_5 e^{2c\lambda} \int_\Omega ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2)(x, T) + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_\Omega v^2(x, 0) dx + \\ + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \left(p^2 + \int_\Omega p^2(y, t) dy + \tilde{G}_1^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt \geq \\ \geq \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 c^{\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Choose $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2(\beta, D, T, \Omega) \geq \lambda_0 > 64$ such that

$$\sqrt{\lambda_2} \geq 2\tilde{C}_5. \quad (5.17)$$

Then the term with $\tilde{C}_5 (\nabla v)^2$ in the left hand side of (5.16) is absorbed by the term with $\sqrt{\lambda} (\nabla v)^2$ in the right hand side of (5.16). Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_5 e^{2c\lambda} \int_\Omega ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2)(x, T) + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_\Omega v^2(x, 0) dx + \\ + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \left(p^2 + \int_\Omega p^2(y, t) dy + \tilde{G}_1^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt \geq \\ \geq \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 c^{\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_\lambda^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Since

$$\int_{Q_T} \left(\int_{\Omega} p^2(y, t) dy \right) \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \leq \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt,$$

then (5.18) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{C}_5 e^{2c\lambda} \int_{\Omega} ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2)(x, T) + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} v^2(x, 0) dx + \\ & \quad + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} (p^2 + \tilde{G}_1^2) \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \geq \\ & \geq \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 c^{\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} v^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Now the question is on how to estimate the integral containing p^2 in the left hand side of (5.19). We will do this via working with (5.15).

Using Carleman estimate (3.7), we estimate the left hand side of (5.15) as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} (p_t - \beta \Delta p + r^2(x) m_1 \Delta v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \geq \\ & \geq \tilde{C}_5 \lambda c^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda^2 c^{2\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt - \\ & \quad - \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt - \\ & \quad - \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x, 0) dx, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this with (5.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x, 0) dx + \\ & \quad + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \\ & \quad + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla v)^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2) \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \geq \\ & \geq \lambda c^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 c^{2\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Since $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_0 > 64$ and $c > 2$ by (5.6), then (5.17) implies

$$\lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} > 2\tilde{C}_5 \text{ and } \lambda c^{\lambda-1} > 2\tilde{C}_5, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_2.$$

Hence, (5.20) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x,0) dx + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \tilde{G}_2^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \\
& \quad + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \geq \\
& \geq \lambda c^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla p)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \lambda^2 c^{2\lambda-2} \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

In particular, (5.21) gives us the following desired estimate for the integral containing p^2 :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \leq \tilde{C}_5 \xi^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt + \\
& + \tilde{C}_5 (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x,0) dx + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \tilde{G}_2^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

where the number $\xi = \xi(T) \in (0,1)$ is defined in (5.7), and this is the reason for our above choice of (5.6), (5.7). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} p^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \geq -\xi^{\lambda-1} \int_{Q_T} (\nabla v)^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt - \\
& -\tilde{C}_5 (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x,0) dx + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} \tilde{G}_2^2 \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Choose $\lambda_3 = \lambda_3(\beta, D, T, \Omega) \geq \lambda_2$ such that

$$\xi^{\lambda-1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_3.$$

Then substitute (5.23) in (5.19). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2) \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt \leq \\
& \leq \tilde{C}_5 e^{2c\lambda} \int_{\Omega} ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2)(x,T) dx + \tilde{C}_5 e^{3(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} v^2(x,0) dx + \\
& + \tilde{C}_5 e^{3(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x,0) dx + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} (\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2) \varphi_{\lambda}^2 dxdt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Hence, the integral with $(\nabla v)^2$ in the left hand side of (5.21) can be estimated via the right hand side of (5.24). This means, in turn that integrals in the right hand side of

(5.21) can also be estimated via the right hand side of (5.24). Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt \leq \\
& \leq \tilde{C}_5 e^{2c\lambda} \int_{\Omega} ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2)(x, T) + \tilde{C}_5 \lambda (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} v^2(x, 0) dx + \\
& + \tilde{C}_5 (T+c)^{\lambda-1} e^{2(T+c)\lambda} \int_{\Omega} p^2(x, 0) dx + \tilde{C}_5 \int_{Q_T} (\tilde{G}_1^2 + \tilde{G}_2^2) \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

We recall now the domain $P_{\varepsilon, T} \subset Q_T$ defined in (5.1). Hence, using (4.11), (5.5), (5.8), (5.9), (5.24), (5.25) and the trace theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{P_{\varepsilon, T}} ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2 + (\nabla p)^2 + p^2) \varphi_\lambda^2 dx dt \leq \\
& \leq \tilde{C}_5 e^{3(T+c)\lambda} \delta^2 + \tilde{C}_5 e^{2c\lambda} \left(\|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|p\|_{H^1(Q_T)}^2 \right), \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

By (3.4) and (5.1)

$$\min_{P_{\varepsilon, T}} \varphi_\lambda(t) = e^{(c+\varepsilon)\lambda}.$$

Hence, using (5.26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|v\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 + \|p\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 \leq C_5 e^{3(T+c)\lambda} \delta^2 + \\
& + C_5 \exp \left[-2(c+\varepsilon)\lambda \left(1 - (c/(c+\varepsilon))^\lambda \right) \right] \left(\|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|p\|_{H^1(Q_T)}^2 \right), \\
& \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

Choose $\lambda_4 = \lambda_4(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \geq \lambda_3$ such that

$$\left(\frac{c}{c+\varepsilon} \right)^\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_4.$$

Then (5.27) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|v\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 + \|p\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 \leq \\
& \leq C_5 e^{3(T+c)\lambda} \delta^2 + C_5 e^{-(c+\varepsilon)\lambda} \left(\|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|p\|_{H^1(Q_T)}^2 \right), \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

Let $\lambda = \lambda(\delta)$ be such that

$$e^{3(T+c)\lambda} \delta^2 = \delta. \tag{5.29}$$

Hence,

$$\lambda(\delta) = \ln \left[\delta^{-(3(T+c)^{-1})} \right]. \tag{5.30}$$

Then

$$e^{-(c+\varepsilon)\lambda} = \delta^\eta, \quad 2\eta = \frac{c+\varepsilon}{3(T+c)} < \frac{1}{3}. \tag{5.31}$$

Choose $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\beta, D, T, \Omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ so small that

$$\ln \left[\delta_0^{-3(T+c)^{-1}} \right] \geq \lambda_4. \quad (5.32)$$

Hence, using (5.28)-(5.32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|p\|_{H^{1,0}(P_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq \\ & \leq C_5 \left(1 + \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)} + \|p\|_{H^1(Q_T)} \right) \delta^\eta, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0). \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is the same as the part of the proof of Theorem 4.1 after (4.54). \square

References

- [1] Y. Achdou, P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, A. Porretta and F. Santambrogio, *Mean Field Games*, Cetraro, Italy 2019, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, C.I.M.E. Foundation Subseries, Volume 2281, Springer, 2019.
- [2] M. Bardi and M. Fischer, On non-uniqueness and uniqueness of solutions in finite-horizon mean field games, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 25 (2019), 44.
- [3] L. Beilina and M.V. Klibanov, *Approximate Global Convergence and Adaptivity for Coefficient Inverse Problems*, Springer, New York, 2012.
- [4] A. Bukhgeim and M. V. Klibanov, Uniqueness in the large of a class of multidimensional inverse problems, *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 17 (1981), 244–247.
- [5] R. Couillet, S.M. Perlaza, H. Tembine, and M. Debbah, Electrical vehicles in the smart grid: a mean field game analysis, *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas of Communications*, 30 (2012), 1086–1096.
- [6] S.-R. Fu and P.-F. Yao, Stability in inverse problem of an elastic plate with a curved middle surface, *Inverse Problems*, 39 (2023), 045003.
- [7] M. Huang, P. E. Caines, and R. P. Malhamé, Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized Nash equilibria, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 52 (2007), 1560–1571.
- [8] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé and P. E. Caines, Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle, *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6 (2006), 221–251.
- [9] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimate for linear viscoelasticity equations and an inverse source problem, *SIAM J. Mathematical Analysis*, 52 (2020), 718–791.
- [10] V. Isakov, *Inverse Problems for Partial Differential Equations*. Second Edition, Springer, New York, 2006.
- [11] M.V. Klibanov, Inverse problems in the ‘large’ and Carleman bounds. *Differential Equations*, 20 (1984), 755–760.

- [12] M. V. Klibanov, Uniqueness in the large of inverse problems for a class of differential equations, *Differential Equations*, 20 (1984), 1947-1953.
- [13] M.V. Klibanov, Inverse problems and Carleman estimates, *Inverse Problems*, 8 (1992), 575–596.
- [14] M.V. Klibanov and A. Timonov, *Carleman Estimates for Coefficient Inverse Problems and Numerical Applications*, VSP, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2004.
- [15] M.V. Klibanov, Carleman estimates for global uniqueness, stability and numerical methods for coefficient inverse problems, *J. of Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems*, 21 (2013), 477-510.
- [16] M.V. Klibanov, Carleman weight functions for solving ill-posed Cauchy problems for quasilinear PDEs, *Inverse Problems*, 31 (2015), 125007.
- [17] M.V. Klibanov, J. Li and W. Zhang, Convexification for an inverse parabolic problem, *Inverse Problems*, 36 (2020), 085008.
- [18] M.V. Klibanov and J. Li, *Inverse Problems and Carleman Estimates: Global Uniqueness, Global Convergence and Experimental Data*, De Gruyter, 2021.
- [19] M.V. Klibanov and A. Timonov, A comparative study of two globally convergent numerical methods for acoustic tomography, *Communications in Analysis and Computation*, 1 (2023), 12-31.
- [20] M.V. Klibanov and Y. Averboukh, Lipschitz stability estimate and uniqueness in the retrospective analysis for the mean field games system via two Carleman estimates, *arXiv: 2302.10709*, 2023.
- [21] M.V. Klibanov, The mean field games system: Carleman estimates, Lipschitz stability and uniqueness, *Journal of Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems*, published online, 2023.
- [22] M.V. Klibanov and J. Li, The mean field games system with the lateral Cauchy data via Carleman estimates, *arXiv: 2303.0758*, 2023.
- [23] V.N. Kolokoltsov and A. Bensoussan, Mean-field-game model of botnet defence in cybersecurity, *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 74 (2015), 669–692.
- [24] V.N. Kolokoltsov, O.A. Malafeyev, Mean field game model of corruption, *Dynamics Games and Applications* 7 (2017), 34–47.
- [25] V.N. Kolokoltsov and O. A. Malafeyev, *Many Agent Games in Socio-economic Systems: Corruption, Inspection, Coalition Building, Network Growth, Security*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG, 2019.
- [26] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, *Boundary Value Problems of Mathematical Physics*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [27] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions, Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343 (2006), 619–625.

- [28] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions, Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343 (2006), 679–684.
- [29] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions, Mean field games, *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2 (2007), 229–260.
- [30] M. M. Lavrentiev, V.G. Romanov and S.P. Shishatskii, *Ill-Posed Problems of Mathematical Physics and Analysis*, AMS, Providence, RI, 1986.
- [31] J. Li and H. Liu, *Numerical Methods for Inverse Scattering Problems*, in press, Springer, 2023.
- [32] Y.-H. Lin, H. Liu, X. Liu and S. Zhang, Simultaneous recoveries for semilinear parabolic systems, *Inverse Problems*, 38 (2022), no. 11, Paper No. 115006, 39 pp.
- [33] H. Liu, C. Mou and S. Zhang, Inverse problems for mean field games, *arXiv*: 2205.11350, 2022.
- [34] H. Liu and S. Zhang, On an inverse boundary problem for mean field games, *arXiv*: 2212.09110, 2022.
- [35] R. G. Novikov, The inverse scattering problem on a fixed energy level for the two-dimensional Schrödinger operator, *J. Functional Analysis*, 103 (1992), 409–463.
- [36] R. G. Novikov, ∂ -bar approach to approximate inverse scattering at fixed energy in three dimensions, *International Math. Research Reports*, 6 (2005), 287–349.
- [37] V. G. Romanov, *Inverse Problems of Mathematical Physics*, VNU Press, Utrecht, 1987.
- [38] N. V. Trusov, Numerical study of the stock market crises based on mean field games approach, *Journal of Inverse and Ill-posed Problems*, 29 (2021), 849–865.
- [39] M. M. Vajnberg, *Variational Method and Method of Monotone Operators in the Theory of Nonlinear Equations*, Israel Program for Scientific Translations, Jerusalem, 1973.
- [40] M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimates for parabolic equations. Topical Review, *Inverse Problems*, 25 (2009), 123013.