

# A Mean-Field Games Laboratory for Generative Modeling

**Benjamin J. Zhang**

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics  
University of Massachusetts Amherst  
Amherst, MA 01003-9305, USA*

BJZHANG@UMASS.EDU

**Markos A. Katsoulakis**

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics  
University of Massachusetts Amherst  
Amherst, MA 01003-9305, USA*

MARKOS@UMASS.EDU

## Abstract

We demonstrate the versatility of mean-field games (MFGs) as a mathematical framework for explaining, enhancing, and designing generative models. In generative flows, a Lagrangian formulation is used where each particle (generated sample) aims to minimize a loss function over its simulated path. The loss, however, is dependent on the paths of other particles, which leads to a competition among the population of particles. The asymptotic behavior of this competition yields a mean-field game. We establish connections between MFGs and major classes of generative flows and diffusions including continuous-time normalizing flows, score-based generative models (SGM), and Wasserstein gradient flows. Furthermore, we study the mathematical properties of each generative model by studying their associated MFG's optimality condition, which is a set of coupled forward-backward nonlinear partial differential equations. The mathematical structure described by the MFG optimality conditions identifies the inductive biases of generative flows. We investigate the well-posedness and structure of normalizing flows, unravel the mathematical structure of SGMs, and derive a MFG formulation of Wasserstein gradient flows. From an algorithmic perspective, the optimality conditions yields Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) regularizers for enhanced training of generative models. In particular, we propose and demonstrate an HJB-regularized SGM with improved performance over standard SGMs. We present this framework as an MFG laboratory which serves as a platform for revealing new avenues of experimentation and invention of generative models.

**Keywords:** Generative modeling, mean-field games, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, normalizing flows, score-based generative models, Wasserstein gradient flow, inductive bias

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	A preview of results . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Background on mean-field games</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	Optimality conditions . . . . .	9

2.2	Potential formulation of MFGs . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Continuous normalizing flows as solutions to MFGs</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Continuous normalizing flows . . . . .	11
3.2	Well-posedness and structure of canonical continuous normalizing flows . .	14
3.3	Variants of normalizing flows via MFGs . . . . .	16
3.3.1	Optimal-transport normalizing flow . . . . .	16
3.3.2	Boltzmann generators as MFGs . . . . .	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Score-based generative models as solutions to MFGs</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1	Deriving SGM from an MFG . . . . .	19
4.2	Score-matching objective through duality . . . . .	22
4.3	MFGs unravel the curious mathematical serendipity of score-based generative modeling . . . . .	25
4.4	Score-based probability flows as solutions of MFGs . . . . .	27
4.5	Schrödinger bridges . . . . .	30
4.5.1	MFGs, Schrödinger bridges, and a system of forward-backward heat equations . . . . .	30
<b>5</b>	<b>Generative models based on Wasserstein gradient flows as solutions to MFGs</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Wasserstein gradient flows as solutions to MFG . . . . .	32
5.2	Mean-field games with relaxation . . . . .	34
5.3	Applications to generative modeling . . . . .	35
<b>6</b>	<b>Enhancing generative models with MFGs: HJB regularizers</b>	<b>36</b>
6.1	Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman regularizers . . . . .	36
6.2	HJB regularizers for normalizing flows . . . . .	36
6.2.1	Optimal-transport normalizing flows . . . . .	36
6.2.2	Normalizing flows with bounded velocities . . . . .	37
6.3	HJB regularizers for score-based generative modeling and beyond . . . . .	37
6.4	A numerical demonstration: HJB-regularized SGM . . . . .	39
6.5	Score-matching via PINNs . . . . .	41
<b>7</b>	<b>Inventing generative models using MFGs</b>	<b>42</b>
7.1	Optimal transport BG: a corrected Boltzmann generator . . . . .	42
7.2	Stochastic normalizing flows via MFGs . . . . .	43
7.3	SGM and the cross-entropy regularization of optimal transport . . . . .	43
7.4	Interpolating between MFGs: from Wasserstein gradient flows to normalizing flows and Wasserstein geodesics . . . . .	44
<b>8</b>	<b>A modular mean-field games framework for generative modeling</b>	<b>46</b>

## 1 Introduction

Generative models are powerful unsupervised learning tools that approximate a target probability distribution via samples. These constructed models are often used to generate new but approximate samples that statistically reproduce and augment the original dataset. Generative models have recently found extraordinary success in applications such as image generation, image processing, audio generation, natural language processing, molecular modeling, and more. Their success has led to a surge of research activity related to formulating, parametrizing, and training new deep generative models. Three of the most successful classes of generative models of the last decade are generative adversarial nets (GANs) Goodfellow et al. (2020), denoising diffusion probability models Ho et al. (2020), including score-based generative models (SGM) Song et al. (2021b), and normalizing flows (NFs) Rezende and Mohamed (2015); Chen et al. (2018); Grathwohl et al. (2018). These three classes of models have spawned numerous competing variants in the pursuit of inexpensive, high-quality generative models.

We focus on two groups of generative modeling techniques: continuous-time generative models, and implicit generative models. Continuous normalizing flows Chen et al. (2018) and score-based generative models Song et al. (2021b) are examples of *continuous-time* generative models, in which the model is expressed as an ordinary or stochastic differential equation. The velocity field is learned via data, such that the associated ODE or SDE transports samples of a normal distribution to samples of the target distribution. In contrast, *implicit* generative models, based on Wasserstein gradient flows, are less well-known particle system-based approaches for generative modeling and sampling Arbel et al. (2019); Wang et al. (2021b); Gu et al. (2022). Here, rather than learning an explicit map that generates samples from the target distribution, new samples are instead generated through the Wasserstein gradient flow of an empirical distribution toward the target distribution. The Wasserstein gradient flow Santambrogio (2017) has also been used to study the training of GANs Arbel et al. (2019); Mroueh et al. (2019). There is a pervasive sense that flow and diffusion-based generative models have some common fundamental structure and interconnections, and there have been several attempts to connect these two classes of models together Albergo et al. (2023); Zhang and Chen (2021). We will show that mean-field games provide a natural framework for describing flow and diffusion-based generative models.

Mean-field game (MFG) theory is a mathematical field that studies the dynamics and decision-making of individual agents in a large population Lasry and Lions (2007); Guéant (2012). This emerging field has applications in many disciplines including control theory, economics, finance, epidemiology, and more. In this paper, we present a unifying mathematical framework based on mean-field games for explaining, enhancing, and inventing generative models. While the foundational formulations of the generative models we study

in this paper have different origins, we will demonstrate that these generative models can be derived through a unifying mean-field games formalism.

Our primary observation in this paper is that mean-field games naturally encode the characteristics of generative modeling with continuous-time models. A mean-field game involves an objective function that models the action, interaction, and terminal costs of an individual agent in relation to a population of other agents. The solution to the MFG describes the action each agent should take throughout space and time, while describing the evolution of the population distribution over time. The optimality conditions of MFGs are a pair of coupled PDEs: a Fokker-Planck (or continuity) equation, which describes the evolution of the density, and a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, which describes the optimal velocity field.

Meanwhile, continuous-time generative models have a common set of ingredients. Given samples from some target distribution, an optimal velocity field that evolves a simple reference distribution to the target distribution in finite time is learned. An optimization problem over the space of probability distributions is solved to learn the optimal velocity field. The evolution of the density is determined by a transport PDE (the continuity equation or Fokker-Planck equation), which is intractable to solve beyond low dimensional settings. Instead, the Lagrangian formulation is considered so that the generative modeling task becomes an optimization problem where each individual particle (generated sample) evolves according to its location while minimizing some objective function over the path it takes. This optimization problem appears to be an optimal control problem; it is, however, a mean-field game since the objective function depends on other generated samples (particles). In the language of mean-field games, the Fokker-Planck describes the family of generative models, while the solution of the HJB characterizes the optimal generative model.

We will derive the major classes of generative models with the MFG formalism and culminate in a sort of laboratory (see Table 3) in which researchers can experiment with existing and new generative modeling approaches. We also create several new examples of generative models as demonstration of the potential uses of the MFG laboratory.

**Our contributions:** We present a unifying mean-field games framework for explaining, enhancing, and inventing generative models. By *explaining* how generative models can be derived from mean-field games, we bring attention to the richness of the MFG for designing and analyzing generative models.

- **Explaining generative models:** Formulating generative flows as MFGs reveals a *common mathematical structure* through their optimality conditions, i.e., a backwards HJB and a forward Fokker-Planck equation (FPE). This backward–forward structure was already observed as a key feature in denoising diffusion models. Our MFG formulation shows that it is shared by *all* flow and diffusion–based generative models, and delineates the *generative* and *discriminative* features required to describe the flows. That is, the FPE describes the generative model while the HJB

identifies the optimal velocity field. The mathematical structure described by the mean-field game identifies the inductive bias of generative flows. In particular, we formulate normalizing flow (Theorem 2), score-based generative models (Theorem 7), and Wasserstein gradient flows (Theorem 14) in terms of MFGs. Another key result is that the MFG optimality conditions characterize the well-posedness of optimization problems used to train generative models. For example, in Section 3.2, we study the ill-posedness of the canonical normalizing flows framework using the theory of HJB PDEs, and ways to make the method well-posed.

- **Enhancing generative models:** MFGs inform structure of generative flows that may be used to accelerate their training. The optimality conditions explicitly relate the optimal velocities to the gradient of the solution of the HJB. Therefore, even without solving the HJB explicitly, we know that we can *restrict* the generative vector fields to just gradients of a scalar function. Moreover, in Section 6 we construct regularization functionals that can be derived from the optimality conditions which may further accelerate learning of the optimal generative model.
- **Inventing generative models:** This unifying approach establishes a platform for systematically building new generative models. In Section 7 we give examples of new generative modeling formulations using MFGs.

Our work culminates to Table 3 in Section 8, which not only classifies major generative models, but also provides a laboratory for the experimentation, investigation, and invention of new generative models. We emphasize, however, that not all models developed using the laboratory will necessarily have good practical performance. This framework allows one to formulate generative models with well-defined optimization problems and inform their associated structure, however one must still proceed with numerical and algorithmic investigation to make their implementation practical.

**Related work:** The connections between mean-field games and machine learning have been previously investigated. The use of generative modeling tools, such as normalizing flows, to solve mean-field games has been well-explored Ruthotto et al. (2020); Huang et al. (2022). Moreover, connections between reinforcement learning and mean-field games have been explored as well Guo et al. (2022). Studying score-based generative models with stochastic optimal control tools is discussed in Berner et al. (2022). The use of partial differential equations to enhance the training of score-based generative models was applied in Lai et al. (2023). Recently, Albergo and Vanden-Eijnden (2022); Albergo et al. (2023) have also unified normalizing flows with diffusion models and the Schrödinger bridge through *stochastic interpolants*. To our knowledge, however, there has not been a comprehensive unifying approach of using the MFG formalism to describe several classes of generative models.

### 1.1 A preview of results

We preview the main results of this paper. In Section 2, we provide a more thorough exposition of mean-field games, but we provide a simplified presentation here to discuss the main ideas of our paper.

Let  $X$  be a  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random variable with unknown data distribution  $\pi$  and density  $\pi(x)$ . Denote  $\rho_0$  be a standard normal distribution with density  $\rho_0(x)$ . We suppose we have only samples  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$  from  $\pi$ . The generative modeling problem is the task of producing more samples from  $\pi(x)$ .

The potential formulation of mean-field games (MFG) is an infinite dimensional optimization problem over velocity fields  $v \in \mathcal{C}^2$ ,  $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , and densities  $\rho(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with finite second moments for some finite time interval  $t \in [0, T]$ . Broadly speaking, the objective function is decomposed into a sum of three types of cost functions,  $L$  to model action costs,  $\mathcal{I}$  to model interaction costs, and  $\mathcal{M}$  to model terminal costs. The continuity equation constraint models the dynamics of the density of the agents under a particular velocity field. There is a correspondence between the continuity equation and the particle dynamics, which depend on whether the dynamics are deterministic or stochastic. The MFG is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{M}(\rho(\cdot, T)) + \int_0^T \mathcal{I}(\rho(\cdot, t)) dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(x, v(x, t)) \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad (1) \\ \text{s.t. } & \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

The optimality conditions for the MFG are given by a coupled system of a continuity (Fokker-Planck) equation for  $\rho$  which corresponds to the optimal generative model, and a (backward) Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation which yields the optimal velocity field  $v^*$ .

We will derive canonical formulations of generative models using the potential formulation of mean-field games. Depending on how cost functions  $L, \mathcal{I}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ , are chosen, the solutions of the corresponding MFGs will be different classes of generative models. Aspects of the derivations and connections have been noted in the literature for particular cases, such as the optimal transport regularized normalizing flow Onken et al. (2021); Ruthotto et al. (2020); Huang et al. (2022), and the stochastic optimal control perspective of score-based generative modeling Berner et al. (2022). Here, we provide a comprehensive unifying approach, using the full MFG formalism to describe several classes of fundamental generative models. In Tables 1 and 2, we overview the main contribution of this paper for three well-studied classes of generative models. Eventually, we will build to Table 3, by demonstrating how numerous generative modeling variants can be described via the MFG framework. In Figure 1, we show a schematic illustrating how the mean-field games perspective relates and provides insight to the current understanding of generative models.

Generative model	$\mathcal{M}(\rho)$	$\mathcal{I}(\rho)$	$L(x, v)$
Normalizing flow	$\mathbb{E}_\rho [\log \rho - \log \rho_{ref}]$	0	0
Score-based	$-\mathbb{E}_\rho \log \pi$	0	$\frac{1}{2} v ^2 - \nabla \cdot f$
Wasserstein Gradient Flows ( $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ )	$\mathcal{F}(\rho)e^{-T/\epsilon}$	$\frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \mathcal{F}(\rho)$	$\frac{1}{2} v ^2 e^{-t/\epsilon}$

Table 1: Generative models and corresponding mean-field game cost functions. See a more complete version in Table 3.

Generative model	Dynamics	$H(x, p)$	Optimal $v^*$
Normalizing flow	$dx = v dt$	$\sup_{v \in K \subset \mathbb{R}^d} -p^\top v$	$-\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)$
Score-based	$dx = [f + \sigma v] dt + \sigma dW_t$	$-f^\top p + \frac{ \sigma p ^2}{2} + \nabla \cdot f$	$\sigma \nabla \log \eta_t$
Wasserstein GF ( $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ )	$dx = v dt$	$\frac{1}{2} e^{t/\epsilon}  p ^2$	$-\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}$

Table 2: Generative models, their corresponding dynamics, Hamiltonians, and optimal velocity fields.




Figure 1: Flow chart describing how mean-field games are related to and provide new insights for flow-based generative modeling. Blue boxes denote the current understanding of flow-based generative models. Green boxes are the new perspective provided by mean-field games.

## 2 Background on mean-field games

We review formulations of mean-field games and their optimality conditions. This section is based on Lasry and Lions (2007); Bensoussan et al. (2013). Mean-field games model the dynamics of individual rational agents whose actions depend on the dynamics of a large population of other agents. When the trajectories and actions take values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the MFG is a differential game, whose solution determines the optimal action of each individual agent. The optimality conditions are a system of partial differential equations, the Fokker-Planck (continuity) and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equations, which characterize the solution of the MFG. The solution of the optimality conditions is often referred to as a *Nash equilibrium*.

Denote  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to be the space of probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with finite second moment, and suppose the evolution of an agent  $x(s) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  over the time interval  $s \in [0, T]$  is given by the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} dx(s) &= v(x(s), s) ds + \sigma(x(s), s) dW(s) \\ x(0) &= x_0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a vector field that models the action of the agent at time  $s$  and position  $x(s)$ ,  $\sigma(x(s), s)$  is the diffusion coefficient, and  $W(s)$  is a standard Brownian motion on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The velocity field (action) at  $(x, t)$  is determined by minimizing the objective function  $J : \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$J_{x,t}(v, \rho) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T L(x(s), v(x(s), s)) + I(x(s), \rho(x(s), s)) ds + M(x(T), \rho(x(T), T)) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $L : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the running cost incurred by the agent by performing action  $v(x(s), s)$ ,  $I : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the running cost due to interaction with the density of all the agents  $\rho(\cdot, s) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $M : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the terminal cost which depends on the final position of the agent and the population density. The expectation is taken over the path-space measure of (2) with initial condition  $(x, t)$  and over time interval  $s \in [t, T]$ . Note that the running costs may explicitly depend on time, but for simplicity of notation, we omit the time argument. We consider a time-dependent example in Section 5. Let  $\mathbf{D}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}\sigma(x, t)\sigma(x, t)^\top$ . Given a velocity field  $v = v(x, t)$ , the evolution of the population density is given by the continuity (Fokker-Planck) equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) &= \nabla^2 : \mathbf{D}\rho \\ \rho(x, 0) &= \rho_0(x) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{A} : \mathbf{B} = \sum_{ij} \mathbf{A}_{ij}\mathbf{B}_{ij}$ , and  $(\nabla^2)_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ . This formulation also holds when the agent dynamics in (2) are deterministic, i.e., when  $\sigma := 0$ .



## 2.1 Optimality conditions

The solution of a mean-field game is a pair  $(v^*(\cdot, t), \rho^*(\cdot, t))$ , referred to as a Nash equilibrium, such that for all  $v$ ,

$$J_{x,t}(v^*, \rho^*) \leq J_{x,t}(v, \rho^*). \quad (5)$$

The optimality conditions characterizing this pair is found by considering the value function

$$U(x, t) = \inf_{v, \rho} J_{x,t}(v, \rho), \quad (6)$$

which solves a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation that is coupled to the continuity equation. The optimality conditions are

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + H(x, \nabla U) - \mathbf{D} : \nabla^2 U = I(x, \rho(x, t)) \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)) = \nabla^2 : \mathbf{D} \rho \\ U(x, T) = M(x, \rho(x, T)) \\ \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Here, the Hamiltonian is defined as

$$H(x, p) = \sup_v \left[ -p^\top v - L(x, v) \right], \quad (8)$$

and the optimal control,  $v^*(x, t)$ , is given by the maximizer, and in this case is equal to

$$v^*(x, t) = -\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U(t, x)). \quad (9)$$

Since this relation holds at optimality, it is common to replace  $v$  with  $v^*$  in (4) to explicitly couple the continuity and HJB equations. Note that the HJB equation is solved *backwards* in time while the continuity equation is solved *forwards* time as the latter has a terminal condition, and the former has an initial condition. Moreover, it is important to note that this is not a standard optimal control problem as the HJB equation cannot be solved by itself since it is coupled with the continuity equation. For details about the derivation of the optimality conditions, see Lasry and Lions (2007) and the references therein.

## 2.2 Potential formulation of MFGs

Solving the coupled system of PDEs in (7) via traditional numerical methods for PDEs is intractable beyond low dimensional settings. Meanwhile, solving the MFG directly as presented in (2) and (3) is still quite computationally taxing as it requires solving an infinite dimensional optimization problem for each point in time and space. In the celebrated paper

Lasry and Lions (2007), an alternative *potential formulation* is devised for a certain class of MFGs so that the optimal controls and densities can be determined simultaneously for all  $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ .

Suppose there exist functionals  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$I(x, \rho) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{I}(\rho)}{\delta \rho}(x), \quad M(x, \rho) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}(\rho)}{\delta \rho}(x). \quad (10)$$

For a test function  $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and some density function  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , recall that the variational derivative of functional  $\mathcal{F}$  is given by

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{F}(\rho + h\phi) - \mathcal{F}(\rho)}{h} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \phi(x) dx.$$

The potential formulation of the MFG (3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{v, \rho} \mathcal{J}(v, \rho) = \inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{M}(\rho(\cdot, T)) + \int_0^T \mathcal{I}(\rho(\cdot, t)) dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(x, v(x, t)) \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad (11) \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) = \nabla^2 : \mathbf{D}\rho, \quad \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding optimality conditions (7) are,

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + H(x, \nabla U) - \mathbf{D} : \nabla^2 U = I(x, \rho) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{I}(\rho)}{\delta \rho}(x) \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)\rho) = \nabla^2 : \mathbf{D}\rho \\ U(x, T) = M(x, \rho) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}(\rho(\cdot, T))}{\delta \rho}(x) \\ \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

The optimization problem given in this formulation is often *implicitly* considered in many machine learning tasks, such as density estimation and generative modeling. We will demonstrate the connections between the potential MFG and generative models clearly. In the following sections, we will use the potential MFG formulation (11) to establish for a unified perspective of normalizing flows, score-based generative modeling, Wasserstein gradient flows, and their variants. It will also provide a framework for extending and enhancing these classes of generative models.

### 3 Continuous normalizing flows as solutions to MFGs

A normalizing flow (NF) is an *invertible* transport map  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  that transforms target distribution  $\pi$  to a standard normal  $\rho_{ref}$  Rezende and Mohamed (2015); Tabak and

Vanden-Eijnden (2010); Tabak and Turner (2013). By learning such a map  $f$  through samples of  $\pi$ , one can then produce more realizations from the target distribution by inverting the map on sample points of the normal distribution. We say reference distribution  $\rho_{ref}$  is the *pushforward* distribution of  $\pi$  under map  $f$ , and their densities  $\pi(x)$ , and  $\rho_{ref}(x)$  are related by a change of variables formula

$$\log \pi(x) = \log \rho_{ref}(f(x)) + \log \det \mathbf{J}_f(x) \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathbf{J}_f(x)$  denotes the Jacobian of  $f$ . For generative modeling, the map is typically learned by maximizing the log-likelihood of the pullback distribution defined by the approximate map  $f_\theta$  with respect to the data distribution over a parametrized space of functions, i.e., by solving the variational problem

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\log \pi_{\theta}(x)] = \max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\log \rho_{ref}(f_{\theta}(x)) + \log \det \mathbf{J}_{f_{\theta}}(x)] \quad (14)$$

for parameters  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

The map  $f_\theta$  is often parameterized as a composition of simple invertible functions, which makes the map amenable to approximation via neural networks. Each layer of the neural network represents one of the composed functions. In practice, the simple invertible functions are chosen depending on the particular application and so that the determinant Jacobian can be computed quickly. There is a rich body of literature outlining different function choices. See Papamakarios et al. (2021); Kobyzev et al. (2020) and the references therein for a review of parametrization choices.

### 3.1 Continuous normalizing flows

A *continuous normalizing flow* (CNF) is a particular type of normalizing flow that can be conceptualized as a standard NF as the number of layers in the neural network tends to infinity Chen et al. (2018). The transport map is described as the solution of a differential equation, and the velocity field of the differential equation is learned from data rather than the entire flow map. The goal then is to learn a  $v_\theta(x, t)$  such that we have an ODE model  $\frac{dx}{dt} = v_\theta(x(t), t)$ ,  $x(0) \sim \pi$ , and  $x(T) \sim \rho(\cdot, T) = \rho_{ref}$ , where  $\rho(x, t)$  satisfies the continuity equation (4). Running the normalizing flow reverse in time then produces a generative model that flows samples from  $\rho_{ref}$  to new samples from  $\pi$ .

A computable change of variable formula also exists for continuous normalizing flows. Assuming that  $v$  is uniformly Lipschitz in  $x$  and continuous in  $t$ . The change in log probability along a trajectory  $x(t)$  is given by the instantaneous change of variables formula Chen et al. (2018)

$$\frac{D \log \rho(x(t), t)}{Dt} = -\nabla \cdot v(x, t) := -\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_i}. \quad (15)$$

The likelihood can be estimated by simply integrating (15) along with  $dx/dt = v(x(t), t)$  simultaneously. A proof of this formula is given in Chen et al. (2018); however it is a direct consequence of the definition of *material derivative* and the continuity equation, as we discuss in Remark 1.

**Remark 1** (Instantaneous change of variables and the material derivative). *The instantaneous change of variables formula Chen et al. (2018) is a direct consequence of a standard result from fluid mechanics. In the Lagrangian description of fluid mechanics, the material derivative describes the rate of change of a quantity along a single flow trajectory Munson et al. (2013). For a scalar quantity  $\phi(x, t)$  and flow velocity  $v(x, t)$ , the material derivative is defined as*

$$\frac{D\phi}{Dt} := \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} + v \cdot \nabla\phi. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, the change of variables formula is simply the material derivative applied to the log-density of the normalizing flow. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D}{Dt} \log \rho(x(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\rho(x, t)} \frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{v(x, t)}{\rho(x, t)} \cdot \nabla \rho(x, t) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \cdot (v\rho) + \frac{v \cdot \nabla \rho}{\rho} \\ &= -\nabla \cdot v. \end{aligned}$$

Normalizing flows easily fit into the mean-field games framework. Our first result is a general normalizing flows formulation in terms of mean-field games, and is given in Theorem 2. Given a reference distribution  $\rho_{ref}$ , some running cost  $L(x, v)$ ,  $\mathcal{I}(\rho) := 0$ , and  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \parallel \rho_{ref})$ , with the initial density being the target data distribution  $\pi(x)$ , many variants of normalizing flows can be derived. Here  $\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \parallel \rho') = \mathbb{E}_{\rho'} \left[ \log \frac{\rho}{\rho'} \right]$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\pi$  be the target distribution. Generative models based on normalizing flows are solutions to the mean-field game*

$$\min_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho(\cdot, T) \parallel \rho_{ref}) + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(x, v) \rho(x, t) dx dt : \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) = 0, \rho(x, 0) = \pi(x) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

with dynamics

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = v(x(s), s). \quad (18)$$

Moreover, for sets  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , the solution of the mean-field game satisfies the optimality conditions for  $H(x, p) = \sup_{v \in K} [-p^\top v - L(x, v)]$ ,

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + H(x, \nabla U) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x, T)}{\rho_{ref}(x)}, \rho(x, 0) = \pi(x), \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where the optimal velocity field of the continuous normalizing flow has the representation formula

$$v^*(x, t) = \arg \sup_v \left\{ -p^\top v - L(x, v) \right\} = -\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U). \quad (20)$$

Choosing the running costs to be identically zero,  $L = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{I} = 0$ , and the terminal cost to be the KL divergence from the density  $\rho(\cdot, T)$  to the reference distribution,  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \| \rho_{ref})$ , we will recover the standard normalizing flows objective in Chen et al. (2018); Grathwohl et al. (2018). This is the standard KL divergence minimization problem, and its relationship to maximum likelihood estimation is very well-noted and understood.

**Proof** We perform the following computations, while always implicitly assuming sufficient smoothness of all functions. First note that by a change of variables, the terminal conditions can be re-expressed as follows

$$\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho(x, T) \| \rho_{ref}(x)) = \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi(x) \| \tilde{\rho}(x, 0)), \quad (21)$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}(x, 0)$  is the density of the inverse flow at time  $t = 0$  given that  $\tilde{\rho}(x, T) = \rho_{ref}(x)$ . Next observe that

$$\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi(x) \| \tilde{\rho}(x, 0)) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [\log \pi(x)] - \mathbb{E}_\pi [\log \tilde{\rho}(x, 0)].$$

Furthermore,  $\log \tilde{\rho}(x, 0)$  can be expressed in terms of the reference density  $\rho_{ref}(x)$  through the continuity equation and the definition of the material derivative. Integrating along a trajectory  $x(t)$ , we have that for  $x(T) \sim \pi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \tilde{\rho}(x(0), 0) &= \log \rho_{ref}(x(T)) - \int_T^0 \nabla \cdot v(x(s), s) \, ds \\ x(0) &= x(T) + \int_T^0 v(x(s), s) \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Note that for  $L(x, v) = 0$ , the resulting objective function is precisely the normalizing flows objective as described in Chen et al. (2018); Grathwohl et al. (2018). Observe that (17) is now equivalent to

$$\min_v \left\{ -\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \log \rho_{ref}(x) - \int_T^0 \nabla \cdot v(x(s), s) ds \right] : x(s) = x + \int_T^s v(x(s'), s') ds', x \sim \pi \right\}. \quad (23)$$

As for the optimality conditions, observe that for test function  $\chi(x)$  where  $\int \chi(x) dx = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}}{\delta \rho} \chi(x) dx &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int \left( \log \frac{\rho(x) + \epsilon \chi(x)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right) (\rho(x) + \epsilon \chi(x)) - \left( \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right) \rho(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int \left( \log \left[ \frac{\rho(x) + \epsilon \chi(x)}{\rho(x)} \right] \rho(x) + \epsilon \log \left[ \frac{\rho(x) + \epsilon \chi(x)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right] \chi(x) \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \left( \rho(x) \frac{\log(\rho(x) + \epsilon \chi(x)) - \log \rho(x)}{\epsilon} + \log \left[ \frac{\rho(x) + \epsilon \chi(x)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right] \chi(x) \right) dx \\ &= \int \left( 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right) \chi(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

so  $M(x, \rho) = 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\rho_{ref}(x)}$ . Lastly the Hamiltonian and optimality conditions are clear from the potential formulation of MFG in (12), see also Lasry and Lions (2007).  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 3.** *Even though there is no running cost function due to interaction,  $\mathcal{I}(x, \rho)$ , (17) is still not an optimal control problem since the continuity and HJB equations are coupled by the terminal condition. This implies that normalizing flows are necessarily solutions of mean-field games.*

### 3.2 Well-posedness and structure of canonical continuous normalizing flows

In this section we focus on the original formulation of continuous normalizing flows as discussed in Chen et al. (2018); Grathwohl et al. (2018). While, in practice, training a normalizing flow does not require the MFG perspective, there is, however, significant insight that can be gained by studying this objective function in the context of MFGs. In particular, we can study the optimality conditions of the corresponding HJB equation to understand the *well-posedness* of the optimization problem and the *structure* of the optimal velocity field  $v^*(x, t)$ .

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $L = 0$ , and  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact convex set. Then the optimizer of  $\sup_{v \in K} -p^\top v$  is attained on the boundary of  $K$ . Moreover, when  $K$  is a ball of radius  $c$ , then the optimal velocity field is*

$$v^*(x, t) = -c \frac{\nabla U(x, t)}{|\nabla U(x, t)|}, \quad (24)$$

where  $U(x, t)$  solves the level-set equation Osher and Fedkiw (2001); Sethian (1999) in the system of PDEs

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - c|\nabla U| = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot \left( c\rho \frac{\nabla U}{|\nabla U|} \right) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x, T)}{\rho_{ref}(x, T)}, \rho(x, 0) = \pi(x). \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

**Proof** Following the notation of Theorem 2, the Hamiltonian of the system is  $H(x, p) = \sup_{v \in K} -p^\top v$ . Since  $p^\top v$  is a convex function in  $v$  and  $K$  is convex and compact, by basic convex analysis, the optimizer must lie on the boundary Boyd et al. (2004). Therefore, if  $K$  is ball of radius  $c$ , then the optimizer is  $v = -cp/|p|$  so  $H(x, p) = c|p|$ , and by (7), we obtain the desired optimality conditions with

$$v^*(x, t) = -c \frac{\nabla U(x, t)}{|\nabla U(x, t)|}. \quad (26)$$

■

Corollary 4 shows that for the standard continuous normalizing flow (CNF) formulation Chen et al. (2018); Grathwohl et al. (2018), the Hamiltonian cannot be defined properly without additional assumptions on the set of feasible velocity fields  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Specifically,  $K$  is necessarily a bounded set for the Hamiltonian to be finite and for the normalizing flows optimization problem to be well-posed. Furthermore, if  $K$  is a convex set, the optimal control must lie on the boundary  $\partial K$ . We can interpret this as a form of *bang-bang* control, in which the optimal control always lies on the boundary of the feasible set Evans (2005).

**Remark 5.** *The typical assumption when learning CNFs is that the velocity fields only need to be Lipschitz continuous so that the resulting ODE has a solution. We argue that our result here shows that the velocity field must come from a bounded set of feasible controls and that successful implementations of CNFs implicitly enforce this constraint. In fact, Verine et al. (2021) states that in practice, most normalizing flows are bi-Lipschitz, meaning that both the map and its inverse are Lipschitz. Corollary 4 describes the precise mathematical justification for this observation.*

**Remark 6** (Well-posedness of normalizing flows through MFG). *Learning neural ODEs through empirical risk minimization is an ill-posed problem Ott et al. (2020). We argue that the MFG formalism may be one approach to study the well-posedness of normalizing flow. Indeed, taking advantage of the MFG optimality conditions, the normalizing flow variational problem is well-posed only if its corresponding MFG PDE system is well-posed Lasry and Lions (2007); Bensoussan et al. (2013). Moreover, we may even study the well-posedness of certain GANs formulations based on normalizing flows, such as the Flow-GAN*

*Grover et al. (2018). If the generator of a GAN is a continuous normalizing flow, then we may study them as an MFG with different choices of terminal cost.*

### 3.3 Variants of normalizing flows via MFGs

With the MFG framework for normalizing flows at hand in Theorem 2, we are able to derive known variants of normalizing flows, re-write them as MFG, and analyze them based on their optimality conditions and corresponding PDEs.

#### 3.3.1 OPTIMAL-TRANSPORT NORMALIZING FLOW

A special MFG that is well-studied is the case when the running cost is a term that can be interpreted as kinetic energy  $L(x, v) = \frac{1}{2}|v|^2$ . This yields a Hamiltonian that is quadratic in the co-state as  $H(x, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ , which together with Theorem 2 implies that the optimal control is simply the gradient of the value function:  $v^*(t, x) = -\nabla U(t, x)$ . Not only does this special case simplify and provide additional structure to the problem, it also reveals connections to optimal transport and other classes of generative models. In particular, quadratic running cost functions can be used to regularize the training of normalizing flows Onken et al. (2021); Huang et al. (2022). The addition of a nonzero running cost to the normalizing flow MFG is also another approach to make the normalizing flow optimization problem well-posed.

In Onken et al. (2021), the authors introduce the optimal transport flow (OT-flow), which trains normalizing flows with the additional quadratic running cost. They presented their method as combining optimal transport with normalizing flows. Through numerical examples, they found improved regularity of the normalizing flow models in that the resulting trajectories have straighter solutions, which are easier to integrate over time. The OT-flow is the following potential MFG:

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho(\cdot, T) \parallel \rho_{ref}) + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt : \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v \rho) = 0, \rho(x, 0) = \pi(x) \right\}. \quad (27)$$

The Hamiltonian is  $H(x, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ , so by Theorem 2,  $v(x, t) = -\nabla U(x, t)$  with optimality conditions

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla U|^2 = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x, T)}{\rho_{ref}(x)}, \rho(x, 0) = \pi(x). \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

The main takeaway is that the addition of the quadratic running cost function produces a generative model that appears to be a time-dependent gradient flow due to the structure



of the continuity equation for  $\rho$ . Moreover, Onken et al. (2021) found that OT-flow models are easier and faster to train as it required fewer parameters. This is likely due to the fact that only a scalar potential function needs to be learned rather than every component of a possibly high-dimensional vector field. Moreover, by explicitly constructing a model informed by the inductive bias of the generative flow, the velocity field can train faster. This formulation was also explored in Huang et al. (2022) for discrete normalizing flows, in which the flow map of a continuous normalizing flow is learned rather than the velocity field.

For completeness, the following optimization problem can be derived from (27), the log-likelihood formula (22), and the change of variables (21), and is exactly the OT-flow problem. The objective function can be computed via training samples from  $\pi$ :

$$\inf_U \left\{ \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ -\log \rho_{ref}(x(T)) - \int_T^0 \Delta U(x(s), s) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\nabla U(x(s), s)|^2 ds \right] \right\} \quad (29)$$

$$x(s) = x + \int_T^s \nabla U(x(t), t) dt, x \sim \pi.$$

### 3.3.2 BOLTZMANN GENERATORS AS MFGS

Boltzmann generators are normalizing flows that have been successfully used for enhancing sampling from complex distributions that arise in computational chemistry. Sampling Boltzmann distributions  $\pi(x) \propto \exp(-V(x))$  is challenging as the energy function  $V(x)$ , while known up to a normalizing constant, may be highly multimodal. The task is often challenging with traditional sampling methods such as Markov chain Monte Carlo or molecular dynamics methods. Boltzmann generators use a combination of generative modeling and sampling methods to more efficiently explore the energy landscape Noé et al. (2019); Köhler et al. (2020). Using actual samples from the distribution  $\pi(x)$  produced by some traditional sampling method, a normalizing flow is constructed, which is then used to construct an importance sampling distribution to produce more samples of the target distribution.

The optimization problem that is solved to train the importance sampling distribution can also be cast as a potential MFG, see Section 2.2, as we demonstrate next. As both the evaluation of target density and samples from it are accessible, the terminal cost is a convex combination of the forward and reverse KL divergences. That is, we select

$$\mathcal{M}(x, \rho) = \lambda \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi || \rho) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho || \pi) \quad (30)$$

for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . In Noé et al. (2019); Köhler et al. (2020), Boltzmann generators, which are variants of continuous normalizing flows, are introduced and they correspond to the following MFG, where  $L(x, v) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = 0$ ,

$$\min_{v, \rho} \left\{ \lambda \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi || \rho) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho || \pi) : \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) = 0, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_{ref}(x) \right\}. \quad (31)$$

The optimality conditions are the same as (25) except for the terminal condition

$$U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}}{\delta \rho}(x) = -\lambda \frac{\pi(x)}{\rho(x)} + (1 - \lambda) \left( 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\pi(x)} \right) \quad (32)$$

Without constraining the feasible velocity fields, the Boltzmann generator as presented in Noé et al. (2019) is ill-posed in a way identical to the canonical normalizing flows objective, which we discussed in Section 3.2. In Köhler et al. (2020), they instead parameterize the normalizing flow velocity field as the gradient of the potential function, similar to the OT-flow. However, based on the MFG optimality conditions in (25), we already know that the velocity field is not of that form, and should instead have a normalized gradient structure (24). Furthermore, we also know that a gradient structure for the velocity field is optimal only if there is a quadratic running cost function as shown in (28). Therefore, to remedy the theoretical inconsistency in Köhler et al. (2020), we can simply introduce a quadratic running cost. Based on this MFG-based framework, we will present a corrected version of Boltzmann generators in Section 7.

#### 4 Score-based generative models as solutions to MFGs

We derive the score-based generative modeling (SGM) with stochastic differential equations framework as presented in Song et al. (2021b) through mean-field games. We first present an overview of SGM with notation that will be consistent with the subsequent MFG formulation.

Let  $\pi$  be the target data distribution and let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a time-evolving vector field, and  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a positive function. Let  $Y(t)$  be the diffusion process over  $s \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dY(s) &= -f(Y(s), T - s) dt + \sigma(T - s) dW(s) \\ Y(0) &\sim \pi \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

which evolves  $\eta(\cdot, 0) = \pi$  to  $\eta(\cdot, T)$ . Score-based generative modeling aims to find a process  $X(t) \sim \rho(\cdot, t)$  that reverses the evolution of  $Y(t)$ , i.e.,  $\rho(x, t) = \eta(x, T - t)$ . Remarkably, the reverse process can be expressed in terms of the score function,  $\nabla \log \eta(y, s)$  of the diffusion process  $Y(s)$  Anderson (1982). For  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $X(t)$  evolves according to

$$\begin{aligned} dX(t) &= [f(X(t), t) + \sigma(t)^2 \nabla \log \eta(x, T - t)] dt + \sigma(t) dW(t) \\ X(0) &\sim \eta(\cdot, T). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In other words, the reverse process evolves samples from  $\rho(\cdot, 0) = \eta(\cdot, T)$  to samples of  $\rho(\cdot, T) = \eta(\cdot, 0) = \pi(\cdot)$ . In practice, the forward process is constructed such that  $\eta(y, T)$  is close to a normal distribution. For example, if  $f(y, t) := y$  and  $\sigma(t) := \sqrt{2}$  then for sufficiently large  $T$ ,  $\eta(\cdot, T)$  will be approximately normal. New approximate samples from

$\pi$  can then be generated by evolving samples from the normal distribution through the reverse process.

For generative modeling, we only require learning the score function and then simulating the reverse SDE. The score function is modeled by some neural network  $\mathbf{s}_\theta(y, t)$ , which is trained through a score-matching objective. In essence,  $\mathbf{s}_\theta(y, t)$  minimizes a least-squares loss function with respect to the true score function. The explicit score-matching objective

$$C_{ESM}(\theta) := \int_0^T \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\eta(y,s)} [\sigma(T-s)^2 |\mathbf{s}_\theta(y, s) - \nabla \log \eta(y, s)|^2] ds \quad (35)$$

is not computable since  $\nabla \log \eta(y, t)$  is not accessible. Instead, the implicit score-matching objective Song et al. (2020)

$$C_{ISM}(\theta) := \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{\eta(y,s)} \left[ \sigma(T-s)^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{s}_\theta(y, s)|^2 + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{s}_\theta(y, s) \right) \right] ds \quad (36)$$

and the denoising score-matching objective Vincent (2011); Song and Ermon (2019), which we omit here, are used. These objective functions avoid the need to evaluate  $\eta(y, s)$  or its derivatives.

#### 4.1 Deriving SGM from an MFG

We show that SGM can be derived from a potential MFG (11) with  $L(x, v) = \frac{1}{2}|v|^2 - \nabla \cdot f$ ,  $\mathcal{I} = 0$ , and  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = -\mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \pi]$ .

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $\pi$  be the target distribution. Score-based generative models are solutions to the mean-field game*

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \log \pi(x) \rho(x, T) dx + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 - \nabla \cdot f(x, t) \right) \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad (37) \\ & \text{s.t. } \frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [(f(x, t) + \sigma(t)v(x, t))\rho(x, t)] = \frac{1}{2} \sigma(t)^2 \Delta \rho(x, t) \\ & \rho_0(x) = \eta(x, T) \end{aligned}$$

with controlled dynamics

$$dx(t) = [f(x(t), t) + \sigma(t)v(x(t), t)] dt + \sigma(t) dW(t). \quad (38)$$

The solution of the mean-field game satisfies the optimality conditions

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - f^\top \nabla U + \frac{1}{2} |\sigma \nabla U|^2 + \nabla \cdot f = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta U \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot ((f - \sigma^2 \nabla U)\rho) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho \\ U(x, T) = -\log \pi(x), \rho(x, 0) = \eta(x, T). \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

where the optimal velocity field has the representation formula

$$v^*(x, t) = -\sigma(t)\nabla U(x, t). \quad (40)$$

Moreover, the solution to the HJB equation solves a time-reversed Fokker-Planck equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} &= \nabla \cdot (f(y, T-s)\eta(y, s)) + \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ \eta(y, 0) &= \pi(y). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where

$$U(x, t) = -\log \eta(x, T-t), \quad (42)$$

and  $\rho^*(x, t) = \eta(x, T-t)$ . Note that (41) corresponds with the uncontrolled forward SDE arising in SGM (33), namely

$$\begin{aligned} dy(s) &= -f(y(s), T-s) ds + \sigma(T-s) dW_s \\ y(0) &\sim \eta(\cdot, 0) = \pi(\cdot). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Finally, the continuity equation in the MFG optimality conditions (39) is the Fokker-Planck equation corresponding with the reverse SGM dynamics in (34), i.e. the generative part of the SGM.

Here, the running cost function is a kinetic energy-like term minus the divergence of  $f$ , and the terminal cost is the *cross-entropy* of target distribution  $\pi$  relative to  $\rho(\cdot, T)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = -\mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \pi]$ . The cross-entropy can also be interpreted as the sum of the entropy of  $\rho(\cdot, T)$  and the KL divergence from  $\pi$  to  $\rho(\cdot, T)$ , i.e., observe that  $-\mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \pi] = -\mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \rho] + \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho||\pi)$ . In the proof of this theorem, we will show that the forward-reverse SDE pair is *naturally* induced via the optimality conditions of the MFG.

**Proof** First note that the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, p) &= \sup_v -p^\top (f + \sigma v) - \frac{1}{2}|v|^2 + \nabla \cdot f \\ &= -f^\top p + \frac{1}{2}|\sigma p|^2 + \nabla \cdot f, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where the optimizer is  $v^* = -\sigma p$ . The variational derivative of the cross entropy is

$$M(x, \rho) = -\frac{\delta}{\delta \rho} \mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \pi] = -\log \pi(x). \quad (45)$$

This implies that the optimal velocity field is  $v^* = -\sigma \nabla U$ , where  $U(x, t)$  solves the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - f^\top \nabla U + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} |\nabla U|^2 + \nabla \cdot f &= \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta U \\ U(x, T) &= -\log \pi(x). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Applying the logarithmic transformation  $U(x, t) = -\log \eta(x, T - t)$  Fleming and Soner (2006), also known as the Cole-Hopf transform Evans (1998); Berner et al. (2022), to (46), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + \frac{f^\top}{\eta} \nabla \eta + \frac{\sigma^2}{2\eta^2} |\nabla \eta|^2 + \nabla \cdot f &= -\frac{\sigma^2(\eta \Delta \eta - |\nabla \eta|^2)}{2\eta^2} \\ \implies \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + f^\top \nabla \eta + \frac{\sigma^2}{2\eta} |\nabla \eta|^2 + \eta \nabla \cdot f &= -\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \eta + \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \eta|^2}{2\eta} \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to the following linear PDE

$$\frac{\partial \eta(x, T - t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (f(x, t) \eta(x, T - t)) + \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(x, T - t) = 0, \eta(x, T - T) = \pi(x).$$

If we then reparametrize time to be  $s = T - t$ , the linear PDE is equivalent to the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta(x, s)}{\partial s} &= -\nabla \cdot (-f(x, T - s) \eta(x, s)) + \frac{\sigma(T - s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta \\ \eta(x, 0) &= \pi(x). \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

This implies that the optimal velocity  $v^*(x, t) = \sigma(t) \nabla \log \eta(x, T - t)$  is related to the solution of the Fokker-Planck of the uncontrolled SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dy(s) &= -f(y(s), T - s) ds + \sigma(T - s) dW(s) \\ y(0) &\sim \pi. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\rho^*(x, t) = \eta(x, T - t)$$

is the solution to the Fokker-Planck of the controlled diffusion process in Theorem 7 for  $v^*(x, t) = \sigma(t) \nabla \log \eta(x, T - t)$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho^*(x, t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [(f(x, t) + \sigma(t) v^*(x, t)) \rho^*(x, t)] &= -\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot [(f + \sigma^2 \nabla \log \eta) \eta] \\ &= -\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot [f \eta + \sigma^2 \nabla \eta] \\ &= -\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \eta + \sigma^2 \Delta \eta \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho^*. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, notice that the initial condition is determined by the solution of the Fokker-Planck  $x(0) \sim \eta(\cdot, T)$ . ■

In Berner et al. (2022), it is shown that the reverse SDE can be derived by considering a stochastic optimal control problem. However, they pre-supposed the existence of the forward-reverse SDE pair to derive the optimal control problem. Through the MFG framework, we show that the forward-reverse SDE pair is *induced* through the HJB equation of the MFG optimality condition, which in this particular setup, is equivalent to the Fokker-Planck equation for  $\eta$  in Theorem 7 via a logarithmic transformation.

**Remark 8** (Natural boundary conditions of the SGM MFG). *Notice that the initial condition in (37) are implicitly determined by the optimality conditions of the MFG. This is an example of a natural boundary condition since the initial density  $\rho_0(x)$  is not imposed explicitly in the MFG formulation.*

## 4.2 Score-matching objective through duality

We relate the implicit score-matching objective (36) to the mean-field game formulation we study in Theorem 7. It is unclear that (37) can be related to (36) directly, mainly due to the fact that in the former, the velocity field and densities must be optimized simultaneously, while the latter problem has the density and the velocity field decoupled. To make the connection to score-matching, we first need to discuss an inherent duality in the SGM MFG.

The proof of Theorem 7 demonstrates that there is a dual nature of the MFG formulation since the optimality conditions reduce to a pair of Fokker-Planck equations — one corresponding to the controlled SDE, the other corresponding to an uncontrolled SDE. The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, which comes from the optimal control problem of the controlled SDE, *induces* the existence of the uncontrolled SDE. The duality allows us to *exchange the roles of the controlled and uncontrolled* systems through a reparametrization. The stochastic optimal control objective derived in Berner et al. (2022) makes the connection to the score-matching objectives through a reparametrization of the optimal control problem. The discussion we have here will properly justify that reparametrization considered in Berner et al. (2022); Huang et al. (2021) using our MFG framework. We first prove a lemma that states the duality of the MFG and its optimality conditions.

**Lemma 9.** *(Duality and reparametrization) At optimality, the roles of the Fokker-Planck and HJB equations in Theorem 7 can be exchanged through a reparametrization. That is, the following two systems are equivalent*

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U(x, t)}{\partial t} - f(x, t)^\top \nabla U(x, t) + \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} |\nabla U(x, t)|^2 + \nabla \cdot f(x, t) = \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} \Delta U(x, t) \\ \frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot ((f(x, t) - \sigma(t)^2 \nabla U(x, t)) \rho(x, t)) = \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} \Delta \rho(x, t) \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot ((-g(y, s) - \sigma(T-s)^2 \nabla V(y, s)) \eta(y, s)) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ -\frac{\partial V(y, s)}{\partial s} + g(y, s)^\top \nabla V(y, s) - \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} |\nabla V(y, s)|^2 - \nabla \cdot g(y, s) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta V(y, s), \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

where

$$g(y, s) = f(y, T-s) + \sigma(T-s)v^*(y, T-s) = f(y, T-s) - \sigma(T-s)^2 \nabla U(y, T-s). \quad (50)$$

Moreover,  $U(x, t) = -\log \eta(x, T-t)$ ,  $V(y, s) = -\log \rho(y, T-s)$ , and  $\rho(\cdot, t) = \eta(\cdot, T-t)$ . **Proof** Since the logarithmic transformation converts the HJB into a time-reversed Fokker-Planck equation, we can also apply the logarithmic transformation to the Fokker-Planck equation to produce a HJB equation. From Theorem 7, if we let  $U(x, t) = -\log \eta(x, T-t)$ , then the optimality conditions yield a pair of Fokker-Planck equations,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot ((-f(y, T-s)) \eta(y, s)) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ \frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot ((f(x, t) - \sigma(t)^2 \nabla U(x, t)) \rho(x, t)) = \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} \Delta \rho. \end{cases}$$

To exchange the roles of the uncontrolled FP with the controlled one, define  $g(y, s) = f(y, T-s) - \sigma(T-s)^2 \nabla U(y, T-s)$ , and  $V(y, s) = U(y, T-s)$ . We then have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot ((-g(y, s) - \sigma(T-s)^2 \nabla V(y, s)) \eta(y, s)) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ \frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (g(x, T-t) \rho(x, t)) = \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} \Delta \rho. \end{cases}$$

Lastly, perform a second logarithmic transformation  $V(y, s) = -\log \rho(y, T-s)$ , so that we derive

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot ((-g(y, s) - \sigma(T-s)^2 \nabla V(y, s)) \eta(y, s)) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ -\frac{\partial V(y, s)}{\partial s} + g(y, s)^\top \nabla V(y, s) + \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} |\nabla V(y, s)|^2 - \nabla \cdot g(y, s) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta V(y, s). \end{cases}$$

■

Lemma 9 shows two sets of optimal conditions have the same solution through a reparametrization at the optimum. Therefore, there is a second MFG that corresponds to the second set of optimality conditions in the lemma which has the same optimizer as (37). Furthermore, we can show that this second MFG is equivalent to score-matching.

**Theorem 10.** *Mean-field games (37) and (51)*

$$\inf_{v, \eta} \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \log \rho(y, 0) \eta(y, T) dy + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{1}{2} |v(y, T-s)|^2 + \nabla \cdot g(y, s) \right) \eta(y, t) dy dt \right\} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s.t. } & \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot [(-g(y, s) + \sigma(T-s)v(y, T-s))\eta(y, s)] = \frac{1}{2} \sigma(T-s)^2 \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ & \eta(y, 0) = \pi(y), \end{aligned}$$

with  $g = g(y, s)$  defined in Lemma 9, and the implicit score-matching problem (52) with  $\eta = \eta(y, s)$  given by (41),

$$\inf_{\mathbf{s}} \left\{ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(T-s)^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{s}(y, s)|^2 + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{s}(y, s) \right) \eta(y, s) dy ds \right\} \quad (52)$$

have the same minimizers. Note that the latter functional (52) is identical to (36).

**Proof** The optimality conditions of mean-field games (37) and (51) were shown to be equivalent in Lemma 9. To show equivalence of MFG (51) to the score-matching objective, recall from Lemma 9 that at optimality,  $g(y, s) = f(y, T-s) + \sigma(T-s)v^*(y, T-s)$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \log \rho(y, 0) \eta^*(y, T) dy + \\ & \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{1}{2} |v^*(y, T-s)|^2 + \nabla \cdot (f(y, T-s) + \sigma(T-s)v^*(y, T-s)) \right) \eta^*(y, s) dy ds \\ & = \inf_v \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \log \rho(y, 0) \eta^*(y, T) + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 + \nabla \cdot (f + \sigma v) \right) \eta^*(y, s) dy ds \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta^*(y, s)$  is the optimal density evolution. By Theorem 7 and Lemma 9, (and by some abuse of notation), we know that  $\eta^*(y, s) = \eta(y, s)$  given by (41). Defining  $\sigma(T-s)\mathbf{s}(y, s) = v(y, T-s)$ , and ignoring terms that are independent of  $v$ , the above problem is equivalent to

$$\inf_{\mathbf{s}} \left\{ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(T-s)^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{s}(y, s)|^2 + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{s} \right) \eta(y, s) dy ds \right\},$$

which is precisely implicit score-matching. ■



For connections between the score-matching objectives, (35) and (36), and the evidence lower bound (ELBO), see Huang et al. (2021); Song et al. (2021a). The equivalence of implicit score matching and the frequently used denoising score-matching can be found in Berner et al. (2022); Vincent (2011).

### 4.3 MFGs unravel the curious mathematical serendipity of score-based generative modeling

We take a broader perspective on the curious mathematical structure of the mean-field game associated with score-based generative modeling. The optimality conditions of any MFG (11) are two coupled PDEs (12)— a continuity equation that is solved forwards in time, which determines the evolution of the density, and a HJB equation that is solved backwards in time, which determines the optimal control. In general, it is quite difficult to find structure that simplifies the coupled set of PDEs. It is intriguing, however, that for the MFG associated with SGM (37), a series of curious mathematical coincidences conspire to create a mean-field game that not only decouples the pair of PDEs (39), but also yields two stochastic differential equations – one controlled (38), one uncontrolled (43), where the optimal control of the controlled SDE (46) is determined by the density evolution (47) of the uncontrolled SDE. Furthermore, the duality of the optimality conditions (Lemma 9) shows that there is, in fact, a pair of MFGs, (37) and (51), that share the same solution, one of which (51) can be related to implicit score-matching (36).

We emphasize three key characteristics of the MFG formulation of SGM that makes the structure described above possible:

- The logarithmic transformation that converts the HJB equation (46) into a Fokker-Planck (47) is only possible if **the controlled dynamical system (38) is a stochastic differential equation**. The presence of the Laplacian operator on the right hand side of (46) is crucial for the logarithmic transformation to convert the nonlinear Hamilton-Jacobi equation into a linear PDE.
- Both terms in the running cost  $L(x, v) = |v|^2/2 - \nabla \cdot f$  are important. **The quadratic cost function yields a gradient structure** for the velocity field, which we later find is a score function. **The divergence term  $\nabla \cdot f$**  is needed so that after a logarithmic transformation is applied to the HJB, **the advection term of a Fokker-Planck equation (47) appears**.
- **The terminal cost is the cross-entropy of  $\pi$  with respect to the terminal density  $\rho(\cdot, T)$** . This yields a terminal condition in the HJB equations (46) that is independent of the terminal density of the Fokker-Planck. Therefore, the mean-field game (37) is, in fact, a stochastic optimal control problem, *cf.* the terminal conditions of the normalizing flow optimality conditions in (19). The cross-entropy

cost also results in the solution to the HJB to be the logarithm of a density function. Further connections between the score-matching objective and the cross-entropy is discussed in Vahdat et al. (2021).

The first two features imply that the HJB can be transformed into a time-reversed Fokker-Planck equation. These two characteristics alone do not necessarily imply that the HJB corresponds to the density evolution of an uncontrolled SDE. The third point regarding the cross-entropy is crucial since it determines that the terminal condition of the time-reversed Fokker-Planck equation is, indeed, a density function. Altogether, these three characteristics imply that the solution to the HJB (46) is related to the solution of an uncontrolled SDE. Without the cross-entropy terminal cost in SGM, the pair of SDEs still exists, except that both of them are controlled SDEs. In fact, the problem is the Schrödinger bridge problem, which we discuss in Section 4.5.

A fourth fact allows us to relate the MFG objective function to the implicit score-matching objective:

- The dual nature of the pair of Fokker-Planck equations imply that there are two equivalent mean-field games with the same solution (Lemma 9). That is, there is no requirement that one of the processes must be controlled or uncontrolled. A simple reparametrization (50) can swap the roles of the two SDEs.

**Remark 11** (A shooting method analogy). *Score-based generative modeling has been found to be superior to normalizing flows Song et al. (2021b), and the MFG perspective can give some intuitive insight into why this may be. One can interpret generative modeling as finding the trajectory on the space of measures that connects an initial distribution  $\rho_0$  to the target distribution  $\pi$ . The MFG analysis of SGM shows that because the pair of PDEs yields a pair of SDEs, (38) and (43), that invert each other, the trajectory on the space of measures is prescribed a priori. Therefore, score-matching is simply finding a least squares approximation (35) to that trajectory.*

*In contrast, normalizing flows based on minimizing the KL divergence (17) is necessarily a mean-field game, and so the velocity and density have to be optimized simultaneously. Unlike SGM, there is no elegant relation between the density and the optimal velocity field. Intuitively, and in practice, the CNF problem can be thought of as a shooting problem on the space of probability measures. We first guess a velocity field, which results in an approximate density to  $\pi$ . Based on the discrepancy between the approximate and target distribution, the velocity field is updated so that the approximate density is closer to  $\pi$ . Reasoning by analogy, two point boundary value problems for ODEs on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are generally numerically difficult to solve with the shooting method. Therefore, we argue by analogy that normalizing flows are more difficult to train than SGMs.*

**Remark 12** (Score-based generative models as normalizing flows). *By comparing Theorem 2 with Theorem 7, we can interpret score-based generative models as a normalizing flow*

with initial distribution  $\eta(x, T)$  defined in (41). Specifically, SGMs are a normalizing flow with stochastic dynamics, a quadratic running cost, and the cross-entropy as the terminal cost.

#### 4.4 Score-based probability flows as solutions of MFGs

The probability flow ODE presented in Maoutsa et al. (2020); Song et al. (2021b) defines a system of interacting particles with deterministic dynamics that approximates the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation. It also provides a connection between normalizing flows and score-based generative models. We present a theorem where we show that the probability flow can be derived via a mean-field game without appealing to its relation to score-based models.

We show that the probability flow ODE can be derived from a potential MFG with  $L(x, v) = \frac{1}{2}|v|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\nabla \cdot f$ ,  $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ \frac{\sigma^2}{8} |\nabla \log \rho|^2 \right]$ , and  $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = -\mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \pi]$ .

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $\pi$  be the target distribution. The score-based probability flow ODE is the solution of the mean-field game*

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(x, T)} [\log \pi(x)] + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{\rho(x, t)} \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{8} |\nabla \log \rho(x, t)|^2 + \frac{|v(x, t)|^2 - \nabla \cdot f(x, t)}{2} \right) \right] dt \right\} \quad (53)$$

$$s.t. \quad \frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [(f(x, t) + \sigma(t)v(x, t))\rho(x, t)] = 0$$

$$\rho_0(x) = \eta(x, T)$$

with deterministic dynamics

$$dx(t) = [f(x(t), t) + \sigma(t)v(x(t), t)] dt. \quad (54)$$

The solution of the mean-field game satisfies the optimality conditions

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - f^\top \nabla U + \frac{1}{2} |\sigma \nabla U|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot f = \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \rho|^2}{8\rho^2} - \frac{\sigma^2 \Delta \rho}{4\rho} \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot ((f - \sigma^2 \nabla U)\rho) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \pi(x), \rho(x, 0) = \eta(x, T). \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

where the optimal velocity field has the representation formula

$$v^*(x, t) = -\sigma(t) \nabla U(x, t). \quad (56)$$

Moreover, the solution to the HJB equation solves a time-reversed Fokker-Planck equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta(y, s)}{\partial s} &= \nabla \cdot (f(y, T-s)\eta(y, s)) + \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(y, s) \\ \eta(y, 0) &= \pi(y). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where

$$U(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \eta(x, T-t), \quad (58)$$

and  $\rho^*(x, t) = \eta(x, T-t)$ . Again, (57) corresponds with the uncontrolled SDE:

$$\begin{aligned} dy(s) &= -f(y(s), T-s) ds + \sigma(T-s) dW_s \\ y(0) &\sim \eta(\cdot, 0) = \pi(\cdot). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

**Proof** First note that the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, p) &= \sup_v -p^\top (f + \sigma v) - \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot f \\ &= -p^\top f + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} |p|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot f, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

with the optimizer being  $v^* = -\sigma p$ . Next, notice that the interaction cost functional is

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\sigma^2}{8} |\nabla \log \rho(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx. \quad (61)$$

We compute the variational derivative; for some test function  $\chi$ , such that  $\int \chi dx = 0$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{I}(\rho + \epsilon \chi) - \mathcal{I}(\rho)}{\epsilon} &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma^2}{8\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla(\rho + \epsilon \chi)|^2}{\rho + \epsilon \chi} - \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho} dx \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma^2}{8\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\rho |\nabla \rho|^2 + 2\rho \epsilon \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla \chi + \epsilon^2 \rho |\nabla \chi|^2 - \rho |\nabla \rho|^2 - \epsilon \chi |\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho(\rho + \epsilon \chi)} dx \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma^2}{8} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{2\rho \nabla \rho \cdot \nabla \chi + \epsilon \rho |\nabla \chi|^2 - \chi |\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho(\rho + \epsilon \chi)} dx \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{8} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 2\nabla \log \rho \cdot \nabla \chi - \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho^2} \chi dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( -\frac{\sigma^2}{4} \Delta \log \rho - \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \rho|^2}{8\rho^2} \right) \chi dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( -\frac{\sigma^2 \Delta \rho}{4\rho} + \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \rho|^2}{4\rho^2} - \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \rho|^2}{8\rho^2} \right) \chi dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( -\frac{\sigma^2 \Delta \rho}{4\rho} + \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \rho|^2}{8\rho^2} \right) \chi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the HJB-FP system of PDEs is

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - f^\top \nabla U + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 |\nabla U|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot f = \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \rho|^2}{8\rho^2} - \frac{\sigma^2 \Delta \rho}{4\rho} \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho(f - \sigma^2 \nabla U)) = 0 \\ \rho(x, 0) = \eta(x, T), U(x, T) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \pi(x), \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

and by the derivation of the Hamiltonian, the optimal velocity is  $v^*(x, t) = -\sigma(t) \nabla U(x, t)$ . We claim that the solution of the HJB-FP system is of the form  $U(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \eta(x, T-t)$  and  $\rho(x, t) = \eta(x, T-t)$ , and that  $\eta$  solves a Fokker-Planck equation. To see that the optimal  $U$  and  $\rho$  can be expressed in terms of the density of an uncontrolled SDE, note the following computations. Define  $s = T - t$ , and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2\eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} f^\top \nabla \log \eta + \frac{\sigma^2}{8} |\nabla \log \eta|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot f = \frac{\sigma^2 |\nabla \eta|^2}{8\eta^2} - \frac{\sigma^2 \Delta \eta}{4\eta} \\ \implies & \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial s} - f^\top \nabla \eta - \frac{\sigma^2}{4} \eta |\nabla \log \eta|^2 - \eta \nabla \cdot f = \frac{\sigma^2 \Delta \eta}{2} - \frac{\sigma^2}{4} \eta |\nabla \log \eta|^2 \\ \implies & \frac{\partial \eta(x, s)}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot (-f(x, T-s) \eta(x, s)) = \frac{\sigma(T-s)^2}{2} \Delta \eta(x, s). \end{aligned}$$

With the time and logarithmic transformation, the terminal condition becomes an initial condition, where  $\eta(x, 0) = \pi(x)$ . The HJB, once again, becomes the Fokker-Planck of an uncontrolled SDE.

Lastly, we check that  $\rho(x, t) = \eta(x, T-t)$  is the solution of the controlled SDE with the optimal control  $v^*(x, t) = -\sigma(t) \nabla U(x, t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho(f - \sigma^2 \nabla U)) &= -\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot \left[ \eta \left( f + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log \eta \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial s} + \nabla \cdot (f\eta) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \eta \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

The interaction term here is the Fisher information functional of  $\rho$ . The MFG corresponding to the score probability flow in Equation (53) can also be interpreted as a regularization of the Benamou-Brenier problem. See Chen et al. (2021); Pavon et al. (2021) for further discussion about the Fisher information functional, Schrödinger bridges, and the Benamou-Brenier formula.

#### 4.5 Schrödinger bridges

We discuss connections between the Schrödinger bridge problem (SBP), score-based generative modeling, and mean-field games. While there are many formulations and variations of the SBP, see Chen et al. (2021); Pavon et al. (2021); Léonard (2014), we focus on the optimal control version. Let  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_T = \pi$  be two distributions. The Schrödinger bridge problem aims to find a stochastic process whose  $t = 0$  and  $t = T$  marginals are  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_T$  respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_v \left\{ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \right\} \\ & \text{s.t. } dx(t) = \sigma v(x(t), t) \, dt + \sigma \, dW(t) \\ & \quad x(0) \sim \rho_0, x(T) \sim \rho_T = \pi. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Here  $\sigma > 0$  is a constant. From Léonard (2014); Pavon et al. (2021), it is shown that the solution to the SBP is the control

$$v^*(x, t) = \sigma \nabla \log \phi(x, t) \quad (64)$$

where  $\phi(x, t)$  is the solution of the so-called Schrödinger system Chen et al. (2021)

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \phi = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \hat{\phi}}{\partial t} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \hat{\phi} = 0 \\ \phi(x, 0) \hat{\phi}(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \phi(x, T) \hat{\phi}(x, T) = \pi(x). \end{cases} \quad (65)$$

The above stochastic optimal control problem (63) has a form that is quite similar to a mean-field game. The main difference is that the terminal cost is instead a terminal constraint  $\rho_T = \pi$ . It is possible to derive the Schrödinger system (65) by interpreting the SBP as a mean-field game. To do so, we first consider a more general MFG.

##### 4.5.1 MFGs, SCHRÖDINGER BRIDGES, AND A SYSTEM OF FORWARD-BACKWARD HEAT EQUATIONS

Consider the mean-field game with a quadratic running cost  $L(x, v) = \frac{1}{2} |v|^2$  and arbitrary interaction and terminal cost functionals  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\sigma$  be constant. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{M}(\rho(\cdot, T)) + \int_0^T \mathcal{I}(\rho(\cdot, t)) \, dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \right\} \\ & \text{s.t. } \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v \rho) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

This particular mean-field game has been previously studied due to the structure of the resulting optimality conditions Guéant (2012). One can easily check that the Hamiltonian is quadratic in the co-state  $H(x, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ , and the optimality conditions are

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla U|^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\Delta U = I(x, \rho) \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\Delta U = 0 \\ \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), U(x, T) = M(x, \rho(x, T)) \end{cases} \quad (67)$$

In Guéant (2012), a variable transformation, which can be interpreted as a generalized logarithmic transformation, is used to reduce (67) into a system of two inhomogeneous heat equations with related source terms. Define  $\psi(x, t) = \exp\left(-\frac{U(x, t)}{\sigma^2}\right)$  and  $\widehat{\psi}(x, t) = \rho(x, t) \exp\left(\frac{U(x, t)}{\sigma^2}\right)$ . The optimality conditions (67) reduce to

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\Delta \psi = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}I(x, \psi \widehat{\psi})\psi \\ \frac{\partial \widehat{\psi}}{\partial t} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\Delta \widehat{\psi} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}I(x, \psi \widehat{\psi})\widehat{\psi} \\ \psi(x, T) = \exp\left(-\frac{M(x, \rho(x, T))}{\sigma^2}\right) \\ \widehat{\psi}(x, 0) = \frac{\rho(x, 0)}{\psi(x, 0)}. \end{cases} \quad (68)$$

With the variable transformation, it is simple to see that this system closely matches the Schrödinger system (65). The main differences are that there is no interaction term  $I$ , and that the terminal condition is not a strict terminal constraint. Replacing a terminal constraint that is difficult to enforce with a penalty is sometimes considered to relax the optimization problem Genevay et al. (2017).

The link between the SBP and mean-field games has attracted recent attention. For example, Liu et al. (2022) argued the connection via the MFG objective, as we do here, and they further generalize the SBP by introducing an interaction cost function, which naturally arises in the MFG formulation, by choosing  $I$  to be nonzero. Moreover, using solutions of the SBP for generative modeling has also been an active area of research. For example, Wang et al. (2021a); De Bortoli et al. (2021); Shi et al. (2023) have trained generative models based on solutions of the Schrödinger bridge problem. Moreover, Chen et al. (2022) learns Schrödinger bridge-based generative models using forward-backward SDE theory.

## 5 Generative models based on Wasserstein gradient flows as solutions to MFGs

In this section we discuss how the Wasserstein gradient flow can be derived with mean-field games. Specifically, we construct a sequence of mean-field games whose limit is the Wasserstein gradient flow. This connection will allow us to introduce relaxations to the Wasserstein gradient flows and may lead to future computational investigations.

### 5.1 Wasserstein gradient flows as solutions to MFG

We now formulate the Wasserstein gradient flow as the solution of an MFG. The key results that allow us to connect these two concepts come from the study of general metric gradient flows through variational principles. The main idea here is that a variational principle appears by combining gradient flows with elliptic regularization. It was shown in Rossi et al. (2011); Segatti (2013); Rossi et al. (2019); Mielke and Stefanelli (2011) that gradient flows on metric spaces can be described as minimizers of a so-called weighted energy dissipation (WED) functional. For Wasserstein space, this minimization problem can be related to the mean-field game described in (69). Let  $\mathcal{F}(\nu)$  be a geodesically convex energy functional on  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ .<sup>1</sup> The following theorem establishes the connection between Wasserstein gradient flows and MFGs:

**Theorem 14.** *For any  $\epsilon > 0$  and geodesically convex functional  $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ , the MFG*

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\rho(\cdot, T))e^{-T/\epsilon} + \int_0^T \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \mathcal{F}(\rho(\cdot, t)) dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad (69)$$

$$s.t. \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) = 0$$

$$\rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x)$$

with dynamics

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = v(x(t), t) \quad (70)$$

satisfies the optimality conditions

$$\begin{cases} -\epsilon \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + U + \frac{\epsilon}{2} |\nabla U|^2 = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T)), \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \end{cases} \quad (71)$$

---

1. A constant speed geodesic between two measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  is defined as  $\mu_t = ((1-t)\text{Id} + t\mathcal{T})\# \mu$ , where  $\mathcal{T}\# \mu = \nu$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$  is the optimal map, and  $t \in [0, 1]$ . A functional  $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$  is  $\lambda$ -geodesically convex if  $\mathcal{F}(\mu_t) \leq (1-t)\mathcal{F}(\mu) + t\mathcal{F}(\nu)$ .



with optimal velocity field  $v^*(x, t) = -\nabla U(x, t)$ . In particular, as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the solution is the Wasserstein gradient flow, in which

$$\begin{cases} U = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left( \rho \nabla \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right) \\ \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

**Proof**

To derive the optimality conditions, note that the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, p, t) &= \sup_v \left[ -p^\top v - \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{2} |v|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{e^{t/\epsilon}}{2} |p|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where the maximum is attained when  $v^* = -e^{t/\epsilon} p$ . Therefore, the optimality conditions are

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial U_\epsilon}{\partial t} + \frac{e^{t/\epsilon}}{2} |\nabla U_\epsilon|^2 = \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot \left( \rho e^{t/\epsilon} \nabla U_\epsilon \right) = 0 \\ U_\epsilon(x, T) = e^{-T/\epsilon} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T)), \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

We may simplify the optimality conditions further. Let  $U^\epsilon(x, t) = U(x, t)e^{-t/\epsilon}$ , then the HJB equation is

$$-\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} e^{-t/\epsilon} + \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} U + \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{2} |\nabla U|^2 = \frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho},$$

which after simplifying, we get the desired result

$$\begin{cases} -\epsilon \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + U + \frac{\epsilon}{2} |\nabla U|^2 = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U) = 0. \\ U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T)), \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

Moreover, sending  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and assuming smoothness of solutions, we obtain the Wasserstein gradient flow. This limit is well-defined based on the results in Rossi et al. (2011, 2019). ■

**Remark 15** (Regularized Wasserstein gradient flow). *Alternatively, we may rewrite the continuity equation in (75) as a regularized Wasserstein gradient flow:*

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left( \rho \nabla \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right) + \epsilon \nabla \cdot \left( \rho \nabla \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla U|^2 \right) \right) \quad (76)$$

*Again, we observe that if  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we recover the Wasserstein gradient flow.*

Finally, we note that in the  $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$  limit, the MFG (69) converges to a regularized optimal transport problem, as discussed in detail in Section 7.4. As a result, we can interpret different choices of  $\epsilon$  as *interpolating* between Wasserstein gradient flows ( $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) and (regularized) optimal transport ( $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ ).

## 5.2 Mean-field games with relaxation

An alternative asymptotic analysis for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  can be carried out by rewriting the MFG system (75) in *relaxation form*, Jin and Xin (1995), namely as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla U|^2 = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left( U - \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right) \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T)), \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

We refer to (77) as an MFG with relaxation due to the relaxation term  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left( U - \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right)$  in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. We note the resemblance in structure to the relaxation approximations for hyperbolic conservation laws introduced in Jin and Xin (1995). In the latter work, an asymptotic analysis based on a Chapman-Enskog expansion demonstrates that the relaxation approximations converge as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  to the (physically correct) entropy solutions of multi-dimensional hyperbolic conservation laws. Here the Chapman-Enskog expansion of (77) is due to the relaxation term  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left( U - \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right)$  which in the  $\epsilon \ll 1$  regime, enforces a local equilibrium — hence a Chapman-Enskog expansion — which takes the form

$$U(x, t) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} + \epsilon v(x, t). \quad (78)$$

We can substitute this in (77) to obtain

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla U|^2 = v \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left( \rho \nabla \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right) + \epsilon \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla v) \\ U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T)), \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (79)$$

As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  the continuity equation yields the Wasserstein gradient flow

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left( \rho \nabla \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho} \right), \quad \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \quad (80)$$

In the derivations of Jin and Xin (1995) the authors also had to resolve the next order term  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$  to ensure the entropy condition is satisfied for the hyperbolic conservation laws. In our case, the zeroth order term in the continuity equation in (79) is the Wasserstein gradient flow which is always well-posed. Therefore, resolving the next order term  $\epsilon \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla v)$ , while feasible, appears to be less essential.

**Remark 16** (Well-posedness and boundary layers). *An important use of the relaxation formulation (77) is related to the well-posedness of the MFG formulation. Indeed, the corresponding Chapman-Enskog expansion (78) allows us to justify the choice of the terminal condition  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}$  in the potential MFG in Theorem 14, as follows. In principle, the choice of any  $\mathcal{M}$  instead of  $\mathcal{F}$  in (69), may appear to be possible or even user-defined. However in Theorem 14 we pick  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}$  to avoid the boundary layer in the Hamilton Jacobi equation at  $t = T$  and thus facilitate the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit, by ensuring that  $U = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}$  at  $t = T$ . By a boundary layer we mean that a choice  $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{F}$  would imply a mismatch between the terminal condition in (77), which in this case would be  $U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{M}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T))$ , and the Chapman-Enskog expansion (78), as  $\epsilon \ll 1$ . In this sense, the Chapman-Enskog expansion (78) of the relaxation MFG (77) demonstrates that the choice  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}$  constitutes a “natural” boundary condition for the MFG (69).*

### 5.3 Applications to generative modeling

Wasserstein gradient flows have applications in many problems in machine learning, including generative modeling and sampling. A classic example of a Wasserstein gradient flow is the overdamped Langevin dynamics, where the interaction functional is the KL divergence. This celebrated result was first noted in Jordan et al. (1998). Using this gradient flow structure for sampling and inference has been explored in Maoutsa et al. (2020); Garbuno-Inigo et al. (2020); Wang and Li (2022); Wang et al. (2021b); Liu and Wang (2016); Nüsken (2023). Particle-based, non-parametric implicit generative models based on gradient flows is an active area of research. For example, the use of the kernelized maximum mean discrepancy for generative modeling was explored in Arbel et al. (2019). Moreover, discretizations of the gradient flows have been used to construct implicit generative models Arbel et al. (2019); Glaser et al. (2021); Gu et al. (2022); Liutkus et al. (2019); Ansari et al. (2020). A broader class of interaction functionals based on the generalization of  $f$ -divergences and integral probability metrics for implicit generative models in the small data regime was presented in Gu et al. (2022).

There has also been some investigation into the training of generative adversarial nets (GANs) using the tools of Wasserstein gradient flows. The training of a GAN can be interpreted as a gradient flow on Wasserstein space, and implicit generative models can be

interpreted as particles moving according to the gradient of a learned discriminator of a GAN. Studying the convergence of a restricted class of GANs as a Wasserstein gradient flow was explored in Mroueh et al. (2019).

## 6 Enhancing generative models with MFGs: HJB regularizers

Characterizing generative flows in terms of MFGs provide formulations of generative models as solutions to partial differential equations. In particular, the optimal velocity field that is typically trained by solving an optimization problem is the solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. The use of HJB equations for accelerating training of generative models has been studied previously in specific flows Onken et al. (2021); Yang and Karniadakis (2020). The MFG formulation of generative modeling in this paper allows us to incorporate HJB regularizers to *any* generative model that can be written as a MFG, such as score-based generative models, in a systematic fashion. Using HJB regularizers is a way to explicitly encode the inductive biases of generative flows during their training.

After reviewing HJB regularizers for normalizing flows in Section 6.2, we formulate an HJB regularizer for score-based generative models in Section 6.3 and report the related numerical experiments in Section 6.4.

### 6.1 Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman regularizers

Notice that the following penalty term can be added to the potential MFG objective function,  $\mathcal{J}(v, \rho)$  in (11), or any of its equivalent forms, without changing the true minimizer,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(U, \rho) = & \alpha_1 \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - H(x, \nabla U) \right| \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \\ & + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U(x, T) - M(x, \rho(\cdot, T))| \rho(x, T) \, dx, \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ . Recall that  $v$  is related to  $U$  through  $v = -\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)$ , so we may also minimize the MFG objective in (11) over  $U$ . Notice that the first term enforces the solution of the HJB over  $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$ , while the second term enforces the terminal condition. In essence, since we know any minimizer of the potential MFG necessarily satisfies the HJB equation, the addition of the HJB regularizer penalizes solutions that violate the optimality conditions and may help find the minimizer faster.

### 6.2 HJB regularizers for normalizing flows

#### 6.2.1 OPTIMAL-TRANSPORT NORMALIZING FLOWS

In addition to introducing the optimal transport cost to the normalizing flow, Onken et al. (2021) empirically found that incorporating the HJB optimality conditions as an additional regularizer to the optimization objective improved training performance. They also

found that the solutions to be more regular, in the sense that particle trajectories were “straighter.” To be precise, the optimality conditions (28) defines the regularization functional to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(U, \rho) = & \alpha_1 \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla U|^2 \right| \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \\ & + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| U(x, T) - \left( 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x, T)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right) \right| \rho(x, T) \, dx, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

for some  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 0$ . This regularizer does not change the true minimizer of the MFG (27) as they share the same minimizer. In Onken et al. (2021), they do not enforce the terminal condition, i.e.,  $\alpha_2 = 0$ , as it requires the ability to evaluate the data distribution  $\pi(x)$ . This regularizer can be cheaply evaluated since  $U$  is exactly the potential function that is learned, and so only derivatives of  $U$  are needed to evaluate the functional.

The idea of using the HJB as a regularizer has been introduced previously in Ruthotto et al. (2020); Yang and Karniadakis (2020). In Ruthotto et al. (2020), the authors solved a mean-field game with the tools of normalizing flows, and chose to include HJB regularizer to improve stability when solving the optimization problem. In Yang and Karniadakis (2020), GANs and flow-based generative models are learned with the regularization functional. This regularizer is a weak constraint since it is integrated over space and time rather than being enforced pointwise. The inclusion of a partial differential equation in a loss function in this weak sense is similar to the objective function for training physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) Raissi et al. (2019).

### 6.2.2 NORMALIZING FLOWS WITH BOUNDED VELOCITIES

We can use the results of Corollary 4 to formulate an HJB regularizer for the canonical formulation of normalizing flows with bounded velocities. The primary difference is the form of the HJB equation; the terminal condition is the same as for the OT-flow in (82)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(U, \rho) = & \alpha_1 \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} - c |\nabla U| \right| \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \\ & + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| U(x, T) - \left( 1 + \log \frac{\rho(x, T)}{\rho_{ref}(x)} \right) \right| \rho(x, T) \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

### 6.3 HJB regularizers for score-based generative modeling and beyond

The use of an HJB regularizer during the training of a generative model is not limited to the normalizing flows. Here we devise an HJB regularizer, discussed in Section 6.1, for score-based generative models. Recall that for SGMs, the score function  $s(y, s) = \nabla \log \eta(y, s)$  is learned via score-matching. Furthermore, the score function is equal to the negative

gradient of solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (39) which comes from the SGM MFG (37) optimality conditions. We cannot use the HJB equation as a regularizer directly here since, in practice, each component of the score function is learned individually and so the approximate score function will not exactly be the gradient of a scalar function. However, by taking the gradient of the HJB, it is possible to derive a regularizer for the score function directly:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{s}) &= \alpha_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^T \left| \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial s} - \nabla(f^\top \nabla \mathbf{s}) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla |\mathbf{s}|^2 - \nabla(\nabla \cdot f) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{s}) \right|^p \eta(y, s) \, ds \, dy \\ &\quad + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{s}(y, 0) - \nabla \log \pi(y)|^2 \eta(y, 0) \, dy, \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

where  $\eta(y, s)$  is given by (47) and  $p \geq 1$ . Recall that by reparametrizing time, the terminal condition is instead an initial condition. Moreover, observe that enforcing the terminal condition amounts to adding an explicit score-matching objective for the data distribution Song and Ermon (2019)! In particular, if the norm is chosen to be the Euclidean norm, then the terminal condition can be enforced by adding an additional implicit score-matching objective for the initial distribution  $\eta(\cdot, 0) = \pi$ . In particular, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{s}) &= \alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^T \left| \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}^{(i)}}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial f^\top}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{s} - f^\top \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial x_i} - \sigma^2 \mathbf{s}^\top \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial x_i} - \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \mathbf{s}^{(i)} \right|^p \eta(y, s) \, ds \, dy \\ &\quad + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\mathbf{s}(y, 0)|^2 + 2\nabla \cdot \mathbf{s}(y, 0)) \pi(y) \, dy, \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where  $\mathbf{s}^{(i)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th component of the score function. In Section 6.4, we will demonstrate the effect of this particular regularizer on a simple example.

Alternatively, if we implement a version of SGM that learns the log-density instead of the score function, we can use the HJB regularizer directly like in the OT-Flow in Section 6.2. In this case, a scalar function  $\varphi(y, s)$  is learned using the score matching objective, where  $\mathbf{s}(y, s) = \nabla \varphi(y, s)$ , and  $U(y, s) = -\varphi(y, s)$ . Moreover, since the terminal constraint cannot be imposed directly, as we do not have access to evaluations of  $\pi(y)$ , we can again use the score-matching objective:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_2(\varphi) &= \alpha_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^T \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial s} - f \cdot \nabla \varphi - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \nabla \cdot f - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \varphi \right| \eta(y, s) \, ds \, dy \\ &\quad + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla \varphi(y, 0)|^2 + 2\Delta \varphi(y, 0)) \pi(y) \, dy. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

In contrast, for the OT-flow discussed in Section 6.2, the terminal constraint cannot be applied as it requires evaluations of the target log-density. Learning such a scalar function via score-matching has been studied previously Song and Kingma (2021).

A similar PDE-based regularizer for SGM was studied in Lai et al. (2023) where the uncontrolled Fokker-Planck equation is used to derive a PDE for the score function. A crucial difference is that the regularizer presented in Lai et al. (2023) does not enforce the terminal condition associated with the PDE problem. In our paper, we can impose the terminal condition with little additional computational cost by score-matching. In Section 6.4 we show that the inclusion of the terminal cost can dramatically affect the quality of the generative model.

**Remark 17.** *In this paper, we have focused on the training of score-based generative models by solving a mean-field game. On the other hand, we may also study mean-field games that can be solved through score-matching. Similar to how Ruthotto et al. (2020); Huang et al. (2022) use tools for training normalizing flows to solve mean-field games, we may also study how score-matching can solve certain mean-field games and its associated high-dimensional PDEs. For example, the use of entropy-based regularizers for solving mean-field games have also been recently explored Guo et al. (2022). In particular, one could solve certain high-dimensional HJB equation with only samples of the terminal data using score-based generative modeling methods.*

#### 6.4 A numerical demonstration: HJB-regularized SGM

We demonstrate the effects of the HJB regularizer for score-based generative modeling discussed in Section 6.4. We will highlight numerical and algorithmic aspects one could explore in the future. The results here constitute only a preliminary investigation of the potential computational contributions of MFG-based generative modeling.

In this example, we choose  $f(x, t) = \frac{x}{2}$  and  $\sigma(t) = 1$ , so that the induced noising process is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process. Recall from Section 6.3 that the regularizer for this example is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{s}) = & \alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^T \left| \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}^{(i)}}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial f^\top}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{s} - f^\top \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial x_i} - \mathbf{s}^\top \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial x_i} - \frac{1}{2} \Delta \mathbf{s}^{(i)} \right|^p \eta(y, s) \, ds \, dy \quad (87) \\ & + \alpha_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\mathbf{s}(y, 0)|^2 + 2\nabla \cdot \mathbf{s}(y, 0)) \pi(y) \, dy, \end{aligned}$$

where for some  $p \geq 1$ . In this example, we choose  $p = 1$  or  $p = 2$ . The regularized implicit score-matching problem is then

$$\min_{\theta} \alpha_0 \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{s}_\theta(y, s)|^2 + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{s}_\theta(y, s) \right) \eta(y, s) \, dy \, ds + \mathcal{R}_1(\mathbf{s}_\theta). \quad (88)$$

The data distribution  $\pi(y)$  is the checkerboard distribution, see Figure 2a. The checkerboard distribution presents particular challenges to score-based generative models, mainly in that the distribution has disconnected support and the density is discontinuous.

We informally investigate and observe the impact of different choices of the HJB regularization parameters,  $\alpha_0$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$ , and  $p$ . For all examples, the total simulation time is  $T = 3$ , and the reverse SDE is simulated with an Euler-Maruyama scheme with  $\Delta t = 0.001$ . The forward SDE is an OU process and can be simulated exactly. For all experiments, the score function  $s_\theta : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is a neural network with two hidden layers, with 32 nodes per hidden layer. We use the Gaussian error linear unit (GeLU) activation function, and train the network over  $10^5$  batches of 64 samples, with learning rate 0.001. The derivatives are computed using the DeepXDE package Lu et al. (2021).




Figure 2: Effects of different choices of HJB regularization on score-based generative modeling. In these examples,  $\alpha_0 = 1$  in (88).

We can clearly see that the HJB regularizer has a nontrivial effect on the generative properties of the score-based generative modeling. Cases where the terminal constraint is enforced such as Figures 2e and 2f, yields sharper boundaries. However, they also seem to exhibit Gibbs phenomenon Strauss (2007), in which more samples lie on boundaries



of the checkerboard density. In Figure 2h, we see that reducing the constant  $\alpha_2$  for the terminal constraint can help make the boundaries sharper, without exhibiting as much Gibbs phenomenon. Comparing Figures 2f and 2g, we find different behavior when choosing different values of  $p$ . Figure 2h shows that the parameters can be tuned to produce an improved generative model. On the other hand, if only the HJB equation is enforced as presented in Lai et al. (2023), then the regularizers may produce worse results than if no regularizer was present. This is likely due the fact that without the terminal constraint, the function  $f(x, t) = 0$  minimizes the regularizer. Therefore, the use of the HJB regularizer alone skews the learned score function towards zero.

These simple examples clearly show that HJB regularization has the potential to provide improvements to score-based methods. They also demonstrate that a more extensive numerical and algorithmic investigation on the effects of HJB regularization strategies in MFG-based generative modeling are warranted for future research.

**Remark 18.** *We note that we are not restricted to use the distribution  $\eta(y, s)$  when evaluating the HJB regularizer (87). Using  $\eta(y, s)$  as the measure the HJB equations are integrated with respect to is a natural choice since it is already used in the implicit score-matching objective. The choice of measure here is, however, arbitrary; for example, Lu et al. (2021) chooses a uniform distribution over space and time. The effects of the choice of measure can also be another direction for future research.*

## 6.5 Score-matching via PINNs

The HJB regularizer provides an alternate way for implementing score-based generative modeling. Since the terminal conditions (46) can be imposed directly, we can recover results similar to standard score-based generative modeling by *only* minimizing the HJB regularizer, i.e.,  $\alpha_0 = 0$  in (88). In Section 4, we established that score-based generative modeling is based on solving a pair of partial differential equations. We can therefore obtain approximate solutions of the optimality conditions by minimizing the regularizers directly, which we can then use with the reverse SDE (34) to generate new samples. Minimizing the HJB regularizer directly is the same task as training a physics-informed neural network (PINN) Raissi et al. (2019); Lu et al. (2021).

In Figure 3 we show results of score-based generative modeling by only minimizing the HJB regularizer. We see different performance depending on the choice of parameter values. Comparing Figure 3a with 3b, we see that when the terminal constraint has a larger constant than the HJB equation, the generated distribution has sharper edges. When  $p = 1$ , we see many particles end up on the edges, which is indicative of a Gibbs phenomenon. We hope the results in this section may spawn further research regarding the use of HJB regularizers for generative modeling.




Figure 3: Score-based generative modeling via PINNs. Here  $\alpha_0 = 0$  in (88). Compare these figures with standard SGM in Figure 2a.

## 7 Inventing generative models using MFGs

We provide some examples of how the MFG framework can easily lead to new variants of generative models, as well as enhancements of existing ones in a coherent and motivated fashion. The richness of potential generative modeling formulations via the MFG framework is partly captured in Table 3 but it is primarily a topic for future research. The examples we discuss here are by no means exhaustive. We once again emphasize that while one can conjure the following generative models with Table 3, further numerical and algorithmic investigation is needed to evaluate their practical utility.

### 7.1 Optimal transport BG: a corrected Boltzmann generator

As we discussed in Section 3.3.2, Boltzmann generators build generative models using normalizing flows that help when sampling from probability distributions that arise in computational chemistry Noé et al. (2019). The normalizing flow formulation in (31) is, however, ill-posed without additional constraints or structure as described in Section 3.2. One (of many) possible fixes is to introduce a quadratic running cost like in the OT-flow in Section 3.3.1. We introduce the optimal transport Boltzmann generator MFG,

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \lambda \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi \| \rho(\cdot, T)) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho(\cdot, T) \| \pi) + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad (89)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v \rho) = 0, \quad \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x)$$

for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . In this setting, the Hamiltonian will be quadratic, so the optimal velocity field will be the gradient of a scalar function. Therefore, like in the OT-flow, we may optimize for a single scalar function, rather than for each component of a vector-valued

velocity function. Moreover, in Köhler et al. (2020), the normalizing flow velocity field was parametrized as the gradient of a scalar function, even though the optimization problem did not include a quadratic running cost. Adding such a running cost will mathematically justify the approach taken in Köhler et al. (2020), and as a result, likely facilitate the algorithm to learn a normalizing flow with *gradient* structure. Furthermore, like in Section 6.3, we may introduce an HJB regularizer to enhance training of the Boltzmann generator.

## 7.2 Stochastic normalizing flows via MFGs

Since the introduction of continuous normalizing flows based on deterministic dynamics, there have been several attempts to extend it to stochastic differential equations Wu et al. (2020); Hodgkinson et al. (2020); Zhang and Chen (2021). While each devises their own computational approaches to and implementation of a stochastic normalizing flow, it is unclear if their mathematical formulations are well-posed. With the MFG formulation, it is simple to devise well-posed stochastic normalizing flows. For example, consider the MFG

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi \| \rho(\cdot, T)) + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad (90)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v \rho) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x).$$

We have already studied the well-posedness of this mean-field game: it has the same optimality conditions as score-based generative models (39), except that the terminal condition is based on the KL divergence instead of cross-entropy, i.e.,

$$U(x, T) = -\frac{\pi(x)}{\rho(x, T)}. \quad (91)$$

One can then devise computational schemes for solving this MFG and be assured that there exist consistent discretizations since the optimization problem is well-defined. To further belabor the point about the HJB regularizer, we may, again consider using the HJB regularizer for this newly introduced generative model as well.

Moreover, as we have discussed in Remark 12, score-based generative models can be considered to be a stochastic normalizing flow. In particular, if the terminal cost  $\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi \| \rho)$  is replaced with the cross-entropy  $-\mathbb{E}_\rho[\log \pi]$ , (90) is identical to the SGM MFG (37) for  $f := 0$ , and  $\rho_0(x) = \eta(x, T)$  defined by (41).

## 7.3 SGM and the cross-entropy regularization of optimal transport

The Schrödinger bridge problem in Section 4.5 is often studied as an entropically regularized version of the optimal transport problem Chen et al. (2021). In fact, if we replace the stochastic dynamics in (63) by the Fokker-Planck equation, we obtain a potential formu-

lation (11) of the SBP. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be compact, and consider the MFG

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx dt : \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x), \rho(x, T) = \pi(x) \right\}. \quad (92)$$

When  $\sigma = 0$ , this MFG is the Benamou-Brenier formula, which is the dynamic formulation of the optimal transport problem Villani et al. (2009); Santambrogio (2015). This is the problem of transporting a distribution  $\rho_0$  to  $\pi$  with minimal cost Santambrogio (2015). When  $\sigma > 0$ , it is a regularization of the optimal transport problem Santambrogio (2015); Chen et al. (2021).

Since the terminal constraint is difficult to enforce pointwise, it is common to relax it by introducing a penalty term Genevay et al. (2017). If we replace the terminal constraint with a cross-entropy loss function  $-\mathbb{E}_{\rho}[\log \pi]$ , we can interpret the resulting MFG as a *cross-entropy regularized* entropic dynamic optimal transport problem:

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \left\{ - \int_{\Omega} \rho(x, T) \log \pi(x) dx + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |v(x, t)|^2 dx dt : \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x) \right\}. \quad (93)$$

Notice, however, this is exactly equivalent to the SGM MFG (37) in Theorem 7 for  $f := 0$ . With this observation, we may approximate solutions to a certain class of optimal transport problems with computational tools of score-based generative modeling, which have proved to be extremely efficient in high-dimensions.

#### 7.4 Interpolating between MFGs: from Wasserstein gradient flows to normalizing flows and Wasserstein geodesics

We refer back to the connection between Wasserstein gradient flows and mean-field games described by Theorem 14. In Section 5, we studied the MFG (69) in the asymptotic regime where  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Notice, however, there is another interesting regime when  $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ , in which the MFG (69) converges to a regularized optimal transport problem:

$$\min_{v, \rho} \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\rho(\cdot, T)) + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx dt \right\} \quad s.t. \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (v\rho) = 0, \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \quad (94)$$

Since the functional  $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$  is typically some divergence from  $\rho$  to target  $\pi$ , for example,  $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho||\pi)$ , this problem is a generalization of the OT normalizing flow in Section 3.3.1. Recall, however, that (94) is the limiting case of (69) where  $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies that for  $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$  we have MFGs that *interpolate* the Wasserstein gradient flow, and the OT-flow. Following the same steps as in Section 3.3.1, the optimality conditions

of the MFG (94) are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla U|^2 = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla U) = 0 \\ U(x, T) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}(\rho(\cdot, T)), \rho(x, 0) = \rho_0(x). \end{array} \right. \quad (95)$$

Moreover, recall from Section 7.3 that  $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$  in the terminal cost can be interpreted as a relaxation of a terminal constraint  $\rho(x, T) = \pi(x)$ . Therefore, (94) is a relaxation of the Benamou-Brenier dynamic formulation of optimal transport. Since solutions of the optimal transport problem are geodesics connecting  $\rho_0$  and  $\pi$  in Wasserstein space Villani et al. (2009); Santambrogio (2015), solutions of the MFG (69) for  $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$  can be interpreted as interpolating between Wasserstein gradient flows ( $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) and Wasserstein geodesics ( $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ ).

## 8 A modular mean-field games framework for generative modeling

Model	Mean-field game (11)				$H(x, p)$	Optimal $v^*$	HJB Reg?	Refs
	$\mathcal{M}(\rho)$	$\mathcal{I}(\rho)$	$L(x, v)$	Dynamics				
Continuous normalizing flow	$\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \parallel \rho_{ref})$	0	0	$dx = v dt$	$\sup_{v \in K} -p^\top v$	$-\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)$	<b>X</b>	1
Score-based generative modeling	$-\mathbb{E}_\rho [\log \pi]$	0	$\frac{ v ^2}{2} - \nabla \cdot f$	$dx = (f + \sigma v) dt + \sigma dW_t$	$-f \cdot p + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}  p ^2 + \nabla \cdot f$	$\sigma \nabla \log \eta_{T-t}$	<b>X</b>	2
Score-based probability flow	$-\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\rho [\log \pi]$	$\mathbb{E}_\rho \left[ \frac{ \sigma \nabla \log \rho ^2}{8} \right]$	$\frac{ v ^2}{2} - \frac{\nabla \cdot f}{2}$	$dx = (f + \sigma v) dt$	$-f \cdot p + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}  p ^2 + \nabla \cdot f$	$\frac{\sigma}{2} \nabla \log \eta_{T-t}$	<b>X</b>	3
Wasserstein gradient flow (WGF) ( $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ )	$\mathcal{F}(\rho) e^{-T/\epsilon}$	$\frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \mathcal{F}(\rho)$	$\frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = v dt$	$\frac{1}{2} e^{t/\epsilon}  p ^2$	$-\nabla \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho}$	<b>X</b>	4
OT-Flow	$\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \parallel \rho_{ref})$	0	$\frac{1}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = v dt$	$\frac{1}{2}  p ^2$	$-\nabla U$	<b>✓</b>	5
Boltzmann generator	$\lambda \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi \parallel \rho) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \parallel \pi)$	0	0	$dx = v dt$	$\sup_{v \in K} -p^\top v$	$-\nabla_p H(x, \nabla U)$	<b>X</b>	6
Schrödinger bridge	$\rho = \pi$	0	$\frac{1}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = \sigma v dt + \sigma dW_t$	$\frac{1}{2}  p ^2$	$-\sigma \nabla U$	<b>X</b>	7
Generalized Schrödinger bridge	$\rho = \pi$	$\mathcal{I}(x, \rho)$	$\frac{1}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = \sigma v dt + \sigma dW_t$	$\frac{1}{2}  p ^2$	$-\sigma \nabla U$	<b>X</b>	8
HJB-regularized SGM	$-\mathbb{E}_\rho [\log \pi]$	0	$\frac{ v ^2}{2} - \nabla \cdot f$	$dx = (f + \sigma v) dt + \sigma dW_t$	$-f \cdot p + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}  p ^2 + \nabla \cdot f$	$\sigma \nabla \log \eta_{T-t}$	<b>✓</b>	9
Stochastic OT normalizing flow	$\mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi \parallel \rho)$	0	$\frac{1}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = \sigma v dt + \sigma dW_t$	$\frac{1}{2}  p ^2$	$-\sigma \nabla U$	<b>(✓)</b>	10
OT-Boltzmann generator	$\lambda \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\pi \parallel \rho) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{D}_{KL}(\rho \parallel \pi)$	0	$\frac{1}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = v dt$	$\frac{1}{2}  p ^2$	$-\nabla U$	<b>(✓)</b>	11
Generalized OT-Flow (Relaxed WGF $\epsilon > 0$ )	$\mathcal{F}(\rho) e^{-T/\epsilon}$	$\frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \mathcal{F}(\rho)$	$\frac{e^{-t/\epsilon}}{2}  v ^2$	$dx = v dt$	$\frac{1}{2} e^{t/\epsilon}  p ^2$	$-\nabla U$	<b>(✓)</b>	12
Build your own generative model	Choose your	own cost	functions and	dynamics here	?	?	?	?

Table 3: Summary of generative modeling and related topics as mean-field games.

1. Chen et al. (2018); Grathwohl et al. (2018) & Sec. 3.2
2. Song et al. (2021b); De Bortoli et al. (2021) & Sec. 4
3. Maoutsa et al. (2020); Song et al. (2021b) Sec. 4.4
4. Santambrogio (2015); Rossi et al. (2011); Arbel et al. (2019); Gu et al. (2022) & Sec. 5.1
5. Onken et al. (2021); Huang et al. (2022) & Sec. 3.3.1
6. Noé et al. (2019); Köhler et al. (2020) & Sec. 3.3.2
7. Pavon et al. (2021); Chen et al. (2021) & Sec. 4.5
8. Liu et al. (2022) & Sec. 4.5
9. New & Sec. 6.3, Sec. 6.4, 10. New & Sec. 7.2
11. New & Sec. 7.1, 12. New & Sec. 7.4

## 9 Discussion and outlook

In this paper, we showed that mean-field games provide a natural framework for studying continuous-time generative models. Given samples from a target distribution, continuous-time generative models aim to approximate the target by building a dynamical system that evolves samples from a reference distribution to those of the target. Depending on the choice of the continuous-time model, the dynamics of each particle may depend on the evolution of other particles or on the final state of the density of particles. The mean-field games framework can be readily used as an organizational principle for understanding the generative modeling task.

We showed how normalizing flows, score-based generative models, and Wasserstein gradient flows can be derived from different MFGs. Moreover, we demonstrated how MFGs can explain and enhance generative models by revealing and exploiting their mathematical structure, yielding new computational tools, and provide a system for inventing new generative models. We summarize our main contributions here:

- **Explaining and categorizing generative models:** We showed that the potential formulation of MFG in Section 2.2 describes major classes of generative models. We showed how with different choices cost function, mean-field games correspond to different generative models. Each generative model can be defined by four ingredients: the terminal, interaction, and running cost functions, and the form of the dynamical system. The MFG optimality conditions uncover the common mathematical structure of all flow and diffusion-based generative models. While the Fokker-Planck equation is clearly the generative portion of the model, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation can be interpreted as the ‘discriminative’ part, which determines the optimal velocity field of the generative model. The optimality conditions describe the mathematical structure that identifies the inductive bias of generative flows. Overall, the MFG perspective yields a simple way of organizing the vast collection of flow and diffusion-based generative models. We exhibit some of these methods in Table 3. The table also provides a way to understand generative models in relation to each other.

Furthermore, the MFG formulation provides insight into the *well-posedness* of a generative model. In particular, well-posedness of a generative model can be studied in terms of the well-posedness of the optimality conditions, which are a set of partial differential equations. In Section 3.2 we used the optimality conditions of MFGs to show that the canonical formulation of normalizing flows is ill-posed because the Hamiltonian, and therefore the associated HJB equation, is not well-defined without additional constraints to the problem. The MFG formulation then provides various options to make the problem well-posed. In Section 5.1, we showed that the finite-time relaxations of the Wasserstein gradient flow require the terminal and interaction costs to be related so that the flow avoids boundary layers at terminal time.

- **Enhancing generative models:** Studying generative models within the MFG framework provides access to optimality conditions which describe the solution to the generative modeling problem. These HJB regularizers, while first developed for optimal transport flows, can be applied to any generative model described by the MFG framework presented here. In Sections 6.3 and 6.4 we demonstrated how these HJB regularizers may be applied to improve score-based generative modeling. The HJB regularizers provides one approach for enforcing the inductive bias of generative models, which may accelerate their training.

Moreover, the MFG perspective provides ideas for better relaxations of problems in optimal transport. For example, in Section 7.3 we remarked that the entropy-regularized Benamou-Brenier dynamic formulation of optimal transport, where the terminal constraint is substituted with a terminal cross-entropy cost function, is equivalent to score-based generative modeling. Thus, the MFG perspective provides insight into how to choose relaxations that are more easily solved via machine learning techniques.

- **Inventing generative models:** The MFG framework provides a systematic way for inventing new generative models. In Section 7 we proposed three new generative models that either extend existing approaches (Sections 6.3 and 7.2) or amend ill-posed approaches (Section 7.1).

Our contributions here have only discussed a fraction of the potential insights of each of the above three categories. The main goal of this paper has been to illustrate the richness of studying generative models through the mean-field game perspective. For future work, we provide a decidedly non-exhaustive list of possible future research directions. Table 3, however, beckons for further future investigations and contributions to generative modeling and mean field games, well-beyond what is discussed in this paper.

- **The role of stochasticity:** We can study further the well-posedness of generative models by using the theory of MFGs and partial differential equations. These aspects are important for machine learning applications as they may lead to consistent discretizations of generative models, and more stable algorithms for training such models. MFG optimality conditions may provide insight into the role of stochasticity in generative models. For stochastic dynamics (e.g., diffusion-based methods), gradients of the HJB are always smooth. Therefore learning the optimal velocity is always well-defined. This is not the case for deterministic dynamics such as normalizing flows where gradients of the corresponding first-order HJB and hence optimal velocities may have jumps, creating ambiguities in the optimal velocities that the generative algorithm will need to somehow resolve. In this sense, *stochastic* generative algorithms have theoretical and possibly practical advantages, that need to be explored further using PDE and MFG regularity theory.



- **Finite sample analysis:** Mean-field games are asymptotic dynamics of a large population of interacting agents. Studying MFGs in the nonasymptotic regime may provide insight into improving the performance of generative models. In particular, similar questions have been studied in seminal papers in mean-field games by Huang et al. (2006); Lasry and Lions (2007). Since then, there has been extensive literature in MFGs for discrete state spaces and approximations of MFGs.
- **Finding and exploiting structure:** As we have seen for normalizing flows and its variants in Sections 3.2, the resulting structure of the MFG and its associated PDEs may inform neural network parametrizations. In this paper we highlighted generative models that are the gradient of a scalar function. Furthermore, Ruthotto et al. (2020) encodes linear and quadratic functions into the approximating class of neural networks which arises from the knowledge of the underlying MFG’s structure.
- **Creating even more generative models:** Table 3 provides a systematic way of creating new generative models by simply playing with different cost functions and dynamics. It also shows us capabilities of MFGs that are under-explored in generative modeling. For example, we see that the interaction term  $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$  is not often used in generative modeling. We can also choose dynamical systems beyond ODEs and SDEs. For example, if we formulate generative modeling via discrete-time mean-field games, the dynamics can be jump processes and nonlocal diffusions Liu et al. (2021).

One particularly interesting class of models that merit further computational investigation are relaxations of Wasserstein gradient flows we introduced in Section 5.2. As we mentioned in Section 7.4, solutions to the Wasserstein MFG for  $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$  seem to be interpolations between Wasserstein geodesics and Wasserstein gradient flows. The properties and value of computing these curves could be a rich area of investigation.

- **ML tools for MFGs:** While adapting ML tools, such as normalizing flows, to solve MFGs has been considered previously Ruthotto et al. (2020); Huang et al. (2022), our MFGs for generative modeling framework provides multiple bridges between the two fields. That is, any ML method devised to perform generative modeling based on the MFG framework can be adapted to solve mean-field games instead. For example, one idea is to adapt score-based generative modeling for solving some class of MFGs and HJB equations. Training generative models may result in new classes of computationally tractable mean-field games.

Finally, we mention, once again, that while the MFG laboratory may lead to many new generative models, it is not a formula that yields useful algorithms on its own. The MFG formulation establishes generative models with well-posed optimization properties and is a first, but necessary step, towards a systematic approach for building novel generative

models. However, numerical and algorithmic aspects must be subsequently developed for the practical implementation of new generative models.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

The research of B.Z. and M.K. was partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) under the grant FA9550-21-1-0354. The research of M.K. was partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under the grant TRIPODS CISE-1934846.

## References

- Michael S Albergo and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Building normalizing flows with stochastic interpolants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15571*, 2022.
- Michael S Albergo, Nicholas M Boffi, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Stochastic interpolants: A unifying framework for flows and diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08797*, 2023.
- Brian DO Anderson. Reverse-time diffusion equation models. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 12(3):313–326, 1982.
- Abdul Fatir Ansari, Ming Liang Ang, and Harold Soh. Refining deep generative models via discriminator gradient flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00780*, 2020.
- Michael Arbel, Anna Korba, Adil Salim, and Arthur Gretton. Maximum mean discrepancy gradient flow. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Alain Bensoussan, Jens Frehse, Phillip Yam, et al. *Mean field games and mean field type control theory*, volume 101. Springer, 2013.
- Julius Berner, Lorenz Richter, and Karen Ullrich. An optimal control perspective on diffusion-based generative modeling. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Score-Based Methods*, 2022.
- Stephen Boyd, Stephen P Boyd, and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- Ricky T. Q. Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/file/69386f6bb1dfed68692a24c8686939b9-Paper.pdf>.
- Tianrong Chen, Guan-Horng Liu, and Evangelos Theodorou. Likelihood training of Schrödinger bridge using forward-backward sdes theory. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

- Yongxin Chen, Tryphon T Georgiou, and Michele Pavon. Stochastic control liaisons: Richard Sinkhorn meets Gaspard Monge on a Schrödinger bridge. *Siam Review*, 63(2):249–313, 2021.
- Valentin De Bortoli, James Thornton, Jeremy Heng, and Arnaud Doucet. Diffusion Schrödinger bridge with applications to score-based generative modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:17695–17709, 2021.
- Lawrence C Evans. An introduction to mathematical optimal control theory. *Lecture Notes, University of California, Department of Mathematics, Berkeley*, 3:15–40, 2005.
- L.C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.
- Wendell H Fleming and Halil Mete Soner. *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, volume 25. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- Alfredo Garbuno-Inigo, Franca Hoffmann, Wuchen Li, and Andrew M Stuart. Interacting Langevin diffusions: Gradient structure and ensemble kalman sampler. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 19(1):412–441, 2020.
- Aude Genevay, Gabriel Peyré, and Marco Cuturi. GAN and VAE from an optimal transport point of view, 2017.
- Pierre Glaser, Michael Arbel, and Arthur Gretton. KALE flow: A relaxed KL gradient flow for probabilities with disjoint support. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8018–8031, 2021.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144, 2020.
- Will Grathwohl, Ricky TQ Chen, Jesse Bettencourt, Ilya Sutskever, and David Duvenaud. FFJORD: Free-form continuous dynamics for scalable reversible generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01367*, 2018.
- Aditya Grover, Manik Dhar, and Stefano Ermon. Flow-GAN: Combining maximum likelihood and adversarial learning in generative models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Hyemin Gu, Panagiota Birmpa, Yiannis Pantazis, Luc Rey-Bellet, and Markos A Katsoulakis. Lipschitz regularized gradient flows and latent generative particles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17230*, 2022.
- Olivier Guéant. Mean field games equations with quadratic Hamiltonian: a specific approach. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 22(09):1250022, 2012.

- Xin Guo, Renyuan Xu, and Thaleia Zariphopoulou. Entropy regularization for mean field games with learning. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(4):3239–3260, 2022.
- Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- Liam Hodgkinson, Chris van der Heide, Fred Roosta, and Michael W Mahoney. Stochastic normalizing flows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09547*, 2020.
- Chin-Wei Huang, Jae Hyun Lim, and Aaron C Courville. A variational perspective on diffusion-based generative models and score matching. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22863–22876, 2021.
- Han Huang, Jiajia Yu, Jie Chen, and Rongjie Lai. Bridging mean-field games and normalizing flows with trajectory regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14990*, 2022.
- Minyi Huang, Roland P Malhamé, and Peter E Caines. Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop mckean-vlasov systems and the nash certainty equivalence principle. 2006.
- Shi Jin and Zhouping Xin. The relaxation schemes for systems of conservation laws in arbitrary space dimensions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 48(3):235–276, 1995.
- Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker–Planck equation. *SIAM Journal on mathematical analysis*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- Ivan Kobyzev, Simon JD Prince, and Marcus A Brubaker. Normalizing flows: An introduction and review of current methods. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 43(11):3964–3979, 2020.
- Jonas Köhler, Leon Klein, and Frank Noé. Equivariant flows: exact likelihood generative learning for symmetric densities. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5361–5370. PMLR, 2020.
- Chieh-Hsin Lai, Yuhta Takida, Naoki Murata, Toshimitsu Uesaka, Yuki Mitsufuji, and Stefano Ermon. Fp-diffusion: Improving score-based diffusion models by enforcing the underlying score Fokker-Planck equation. 2023.
- Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field games. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- Christian Léonard. A survey of the Schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 34(4):1533, 2014.

- Guan-Horng Liu, Tianrong Chen, Oswin So, and Evangelos Theodorou. Deep generalized Schrödinger bridge. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Qiang Liu and Dilin Wang. Stein variational gradient descent: A general purpose Bayesian inference algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Siting Liu, Matthew Jacobs, Wuchen Li, Levon Nurbekyan, and Stanley J Osher. Computational methods for first-order nonlocal mean field games with applications. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 59(5):2639–2668, 2021.
- Antoine Liutkus, Umut Simsekli, Szymon Majewski, Alain Durmus, and Fabian-Robert Stöter. Sliced-Wasserstein flows: Nonparametric generative modeling via optimal transport and diffusions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4104–4113. PMLR, 2019.
- Lu Lu, Xuhui Meng, Zhiping Mao, and George Em Karniadakis. DeepXDE: A deep learning library for solving differential equations. *SIAM Review*, 63(1):208–228, 2021. doi: 10.1137/19M1274067.
- Dimitra Maoutsa, Sebastian Reich, and Manfred Opper. Interacting particle solutions of Fokker–Planck equations through gradient–log–density estimation. *Entropy*, 22(8):802, 2020.
- Alexander Mielke and Ulisse Stefanelli. Weighted energy-dissipation functionals for gradient flows. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 17(1):52–85, 2011.
- Youssef Mroueh, Tom Sercu, and Anant Raj. Sobolev descent. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2976–2985. PMLR, 2019.
- Bruce Roy Munson, Theodore Hisao Okiishi, Wade W Huebsch, and Alric P Rothmayer. *Fluid mechanics*. Wiley Singapore, 2013.
- Frank Noé, Simon Olsson, Jonas Köhler, and Hao Wu. Boltzmann generators: Sampling equilibrium states of many-body systems with deep learning. *Science*, 365(6457):eaaw1147, 2019.
- N Nüsken. On the geometry of Stein variational gradient descent. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24:1–39, 2023.
- Derek Onken, Samy Wu Fung, Xingjian Li, and Lars Ruthotto. OT-flow: Fast and accurate continuous normalizing flows via optimal transport. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 9223–9232, 2021.
- Stanley Osher and Ronald P Fedkiw. Level set methods: an overview and some recent results. *Journal of Computational physics*, 169(2):463–502, 2001.

- Katharina Ott, Prateek Katiyar, Philipp Hennig, and Michael Tiemann. When are neural ODE solutions proper ODEs? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.15386*, 2020.
- George Papamakarios, Eric Nalisnick, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):2617–2680, 2021.
- Michele Pavon, Giulio Trigila, and Esteban G Tabak. The data-driven Schrödinger bridge. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 74(7):1545–1573, 2021.
- Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.
- Danilo Rezende and Shakir Mohamed. Variational inference with normalizing flows. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1530–1538. PMLR, 2015.
- Riccarda Rossi, Giuseppe Savaré, Antonio Segatti, and Ulisse Stefanelli. A variational principle for gradient flows in metric spaces. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 349(23-24):1225–1228, 2011.
- Riccarda Rossi, Giuseppe Savaré, Antonio Segatti, and Ulisse Stefanelli. Weighted energy-dissipation principle for gradient flows in metric spaces. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 127:1–66, 2019.
- Lars Ruthotto, Stanley J Osher, Wuchen Li, Levon Nurbekyan, and Samy Wu Fung. A machine learning framework for solving high-dimensional mean field game and mean field control problems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(17):9183–9193, 2020.
- Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*. Springer, 2015.
- Filippo Santambrogio. {Euclidean, metric, and Wasserstein} gradient flows: an overview. *Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences*, 7:87–154, 2017.
- Antonio Segatti. A variational approach to gradient flows in metric spaces. *Bollettino dell’Unione Matematica Italiana*, 6(3):765–780, 2013.
- James Albert Sethian. *Level set methods and fast marching methods: evolving interfaces in computational geometry, fluid mechanics, computer vision, and materials science*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 1999.
- Yuyang Shi, Valentin De Bortoli, Andrew Campbell, and Arnaud Doucet. Diffusion Schrödinger bridge matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16852*, 2023.

- Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Yang Song and Diederik P Kingma. How to train your energy-based models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03288*, 2021.
- Yang Song, Sahaj Garg, Jiaxin Shi, and Stefano Ermon. Sliced score matching: A scalable approach to density and score estimation. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 574–584. PMLR, 2020.
- Yang Song, Conor Durkan, Iain Murray, and Stefano Ermon. Maximum likelihood training of score-based diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 1415–1428, 2021a.
- Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021b.
- Walter A Strauss. *Partial differential equations: An introduction*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- Esteban G Tabak and Cristina V Turner. A family of nonparametric density estimation algorithms. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 66(2):145–164, 2013.
- Esteban G Tabak and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Density estimation by dual ascent of the log-likelihood. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 8(1):217–233, 2010.
- Arash Vahdat, Karsten Kreis, and Jan Kautz. Score-based generative modeling in latent space. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11287–11302, 2021.
- Alexandre Verine, Yann Chevalyere, Fabrice Rossi, et al. On the expressivity of bi-Lipschitz normalizing flows. In *ICML Workshop on Invertible Neural Networks, Normalizing Flows, and Explicit Likelihood Models*, 2021.
- Cédric Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- Pascal Vincent. A connection between score matching and denoising autoencoders. *Neural computation*, 23(7):1661–1674, 2011.
- Gefei Wang, Yuling Jiao, Qian Xu, Yang Wang, and Can Yang. Deep generative learning via Schrödinger bridge. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10794–10804. PMLR, 2021a.
- Yifei Wang and Wuchen Li. Accelerated information gradient flow. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 90:1–47, 2022.



Yiwei Wang, Jiu hai Chen, Chun Liu, and Lulu Kang. Particle-based energetic variational inference. *Statistics and Computing*, 31:1–17, 2021b.

Hao Wu, Jonas Köhler, and Frank Noé. Stochastic normalizing flows. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:5933–5944, 2020.

Liu Yang and George Em Karniadakis. Potential flow generator with  $L_2$  optimal transport regularity for generative models. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 33(2):528–538, 2020.

Qinsheng Zhang and Yongxin Chen. Diffusion normalizing flow. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:16280–16291, 2021.