

# A LIMIT THEORY FOR CONTROLLED MCKEAN–VLASOV SPDES

DAVID CRIENS

ABSTRACT. We develop a limit theory for controlled mean field stochastic partial differential equations in a variational framework. More precisely, we prove existence results for mean field limits and particle approximations, and we establish a set-valued propagation of chaos result which shows that sets of empirical distributions converge to sets of mean field limits in the Hausdorff metric topology. Further, we discuss limit theorems related to stochastic optimal control theory. To illustrate our findings, we apply them to a controlled interacting particle system of stochastic porous media equations.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The area of controlled McKean–Vlasov dynamics, also known as mean field control, has rapidly developed in the past years, see, e.g., the monograph [6] and the references therein. There is also increasing interest in infinite dimensional systems such as controlled McKean–Vlasov stochastic PDEs (mean field SPDEs). For controlled mean field SPDEs within the semigroup approach of Da Prato and Zabczyk [10], well-posedness of the state equation, the dynamic programming principle and a Bellman equation were recently proved in the paper [8]. We also refer to this paper for extensive comments on related literature.

Mean field dynamics are typically motivated by particle approximations (related to propagation of chaos), see, for instance, Sznitman’s seminal monograph [40]. It is an important task to make this motivation rigorous. For finite dimensional controlled systems, a general limit theory was developed in the paper [29] and extended in [12] to a setup with common noise. The purpose of the present paper is to establish a limit theory for controlled interacting infinite dimensional SPDEs in the variational framework initiated by Pardoux [35] and Krylov–Rozovskii [27], see also the more recent monographs [32, 36].

To explain our contributions in more detail, consider a particle system  $Y = (Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  of the form

$$dY_t^k = \int b(f, t, Y_t^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_t)) \mathbf{m}^k(t, df) dt + \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}^k(t, \cdot), t, Y_t^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_t)) dW_t^k,$$

with initial values  $Y_0^k = x$ , where

$$\mathcal{X}_n(Y_t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Y_t^i}$$

denotes the empirical distribution of the particles, and  $\bar{\sigma}$  is such that

$$\bar{\sigma} \bar{\sigma}^*(\mathbf{m}^k(t, \cdot), t, Y_t^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_t)) = \int \sigma \sigma^*(f, t, Y_t^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_t)) \mathbf{m}^k(t, df)$$

---

*Date:* December 29, 2023.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q35 – 35R60 – 49N80 – 60F17 – 60H15 – 60K35 – 82C22 – 93E20.

*Key words and phrases.* mean field control; propagation of chaos; McKean–Vlasov limits; stochastic PDEs; variational approach; interacting diffusions; stochastic optimal control; relaxed controls; martingale solutions; stochastic porous media equations.

for a volatility coefficient  $\sigma$ . Here,  $\mathbf{m}^1, \dots, \mathbf{m}^n$  are probability kernel that model the control variables, and  $W^1, \dots, W^n$  are independent cylindrical Brownian motions. This corresponds to a relaxed control framework in the spirit of [13, 15]. Let  $\mathcal{R}^n(x)$  be the set of joint empirical distributions of particles and controls (latter are captured via  $\mathbf{m}^k(t, df)dt$  in a suitable space of Radon measures). The associated set of mean field limits is denoted by  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$ . It consists of probability measures supported on the set of laws of  $(Y, \mathbf{m}(t, df)dt)$ , where  $Y$  solves a controlled McKean–Vlasov equation of the form

$$dY_t = \int b(f, t, Y_t, P_t^Y) \mathbf{m}(t, df)dt + \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(t, \cdot), t, Y_t, P_t^Y) dW_t, \quad Y_0 = x,$$

with  $P_t^Y = \mathcal{L}aw(Y_t)$ .

Conceptually, our main results are divided into two groups. The first one is probabilistic and deals with the convergence of controlled particle systems, while the second one sheds light on mean field limits from a stochastic optimal control perspective.

On the probabilistic page, we show that  $\mathcal{R}^n(x)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$  are nonempty and compact in a suitable Wasserstein space, and that the maps  $x \mapsto \mathcal{R}^n(x)$  converge to  $x \mapsto \mathcal{R}^0(x)$  uniformly on compacts in the Hausdorff metric topology. This result can be seen as set-valued propagation of chaos. Indeed, when  $\mathcal{R}^n(x)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$  are singletons, we recover a classical formulation of the propagation of chaos property. To the best of our knowledge, the concept and formulation of set-valued propagation of chaos is new. The observation that  $\mathcal{R}^0(x) \neq \emptyset$  provides existence for McKean–Vlasov SPDEs in a variational framework. In particular, it entails an existence result for classical (uncontrolled) McKean–Vlasov SPDEs in the spirit of a very recent result from [20]. Our proof for  $\mathcal{R}^0(x) \neq \emptyset$  is based on a particle approximation. In the absence of controls, the particle approximation can be compared to a recent propagation of chaos result for stochastic 2D Navier–Stokes equations that was established in [20].

As second main contribution, we investigate approximation properties of optimal control problems. Namely, if  $\psi$  is a continuous input function of suitable growth, we prove that the value functions associated to the particle approximation

$$x \mapsto \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi]$$

converge uniformly on compacts to the value function of the mean field limit

$$x \mapsto \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi].$$

We also derive ramification of this statement for upper and lower semicontinuous input functions  $\psi$  of suitable growth. These results allow us to deduce limit theorems in the spirit of the seminal work [29]. Namely, we show that all accumulation points of sequences of  $n$ -state nearly optimal controls maximize the mean field value function, and that any optimal mean field control can be approximated by a sequence of  $n$ -state nearly optimal controls.

Let us now comment on the assumptions on the coefficients  $b$  and  $\sigma$ . The main condition has two layers, each formulated with the help of a Gelfand triple. On the first, we impose continuity, coercivity and growth assumptions that can be compared to mild existence conditions from [19]. These assumptions suffice to obtain that  $\mathcal{R}^n(x)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$  are nonempty and compact, as well as the particle approximation. As explained in [19], such conditions can be verified for stochastic porous media and Navier–Stokes equations.

The second Gelfand triple is used to formulate growth and weak monotonicity conditions, which we employ to establish set-valued propagation of chaos and the limit theory for stochastic control problems. These assumptions can be verified for stochastic porous media equations, but they fail for stochastic Navier–Stokes equations that lack weak monotonicity properties (see [32]). It is an interesting open problem to replace the weak monotonicity conditions in our work by

local monotonicity conditions ([31]) to cover for instance stochastic 2D Navier–Stokes systems. Such a strengthening appears to be challenging due to the non-local structure of McKean–Vlasov equations. We leave this question for future research.

To illustrate our theory, we verify our assumptions for a slow diffusion framework where the controlled particle system is of the form

$$dY_t^k = \left[ \Delta(|Y_t^k|^{q-2}Y_t^k) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_t^k - Y_t^i) + \int c(f) \mathbf{m}^k(t, df) \right] dt + \sigma dW_t^k,$$

with  $q \geq 2$  and  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . It is worth mentioning that our results apply to the classical finite dimensional framework.

We now comment on related literature and proofs. Our work is heavily inspired by the paper [29], which develops a limit theory for mean field control within a finite dimensional framework. Similar to [29], parts of our proofs rely on compactification and martingale problem methods that were established in [13]. In contrast to [13, 29], we deal with an infinite dimensional setting that is technically different. Let us also mention that our work covers some new finite dimensional cases. In the following, we highlight some important points that lead to technical difficulties. Due to multiple state spaces (recall that we work with two Gelfand triples), we have to keep track of several topologies that influence convergence and continuity properties. Under our assumptions on the coefficients, we have no a priori moment estimates, which we therefore have to built into our setting. Furthermore, we avoid conditions that yield strong existence and uniqueness properties for equations with random coefficients. To overcome this obstacle, we prove new weak existence results that keep track of the driving noise, adapting a method from [25], and we apply a change of topology, where we work with the second Gelfand triple. Finally, compared to the finite dimensional case, we also require different tightness methods, which are influenced by [19, 28].

The paper is structured as follows. Our framework and the main results are explained in Section 2. The slow diffusion example is discussed in Section 3 and the proof of our main theorem is given in Section 4.

**Remark on Notation.** In this paper,  $C$  denotes a generic positive constant that might change from line to line. In case the constant depends on important quantities, this is mentioned specifically.

## 2. A LIMIT THEORY FOR CONTROLLED SPDES IN A VARIATIONAL FRAMEWORK

**2.1. The Setting and Notation.** Let  $\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}$  and  $\mathbb{V}$  be separable Hilbert spaces and let  $\mathbb{Y}$  be a separable reflexive Banach space (whose topological duals are denoted by  $\mathbb{H}^*, \mathbb{X}^*, \mathbb{V}^*$  and  $\mathbb{Y}^*$ , respectively). We assume that

$$\mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$$

continuously and densely. For any Banach space  $\mathbb{E}$ , we denote its norm by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{E}}$  and the dualization between  $\mathbb{E}$  and  $\mathbb{E}^*$  by  ${}_{\mathbb{E}}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{E}^*}$ , i.e.,

$${}_{\mathbb{E}}\langle e, e^* \rangle_{\mathbb{E}^*} := e^*(e), \quad e^* \in \mathbb{E}^*, e \in \mathbb{E}.$$

In general, we endow all Banach spaces with their norm topologies.

Below, we will work with two Gelfand triples

$$\mathbb{V}^* \subset \mathbb{H}^* \cong \mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{V}, \quad \mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{X} \cong \mathbb{X}^* \subset \mathbb{Y}^*.$$

In particular, for  $x \in \mathbb{H}, y \in \mathbb{V}^*$  and  $z \in \mathbb{X}, v \in \mathbb{Y}$ , we have

$${}_{\mathbb{V}}\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} = \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad {}_{\mathbb{Y}^*}\langle z, v \rangle_{\mathbb{Y}} = \langle z, v \rangle_{\mathbb{X}},$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{X}}$  are the scalar products of  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{X}$ , respectively.

Throughout this paper, we extend scalar functions from a smaller to a larger Banach space by setting them  $\infty$  outside its original domain. For instance, we set  $\|x\|_{\mathbb{Y}} := \infty$  for  $x \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \mathbb{Y}$ . In this way,  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{Y}}$  becomes a lower semicontinuous map from  $\mathbb{V}$  into  $[0, \infty]$  ([32, Exercice 4.2.3]).

Before we proceed, let us give an overview on all parametric constants that we use in this paper:

$$T, \lambda, \alpha, \gamma, \beta, \eta, \varrho \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

We impose the following restrictions:

$$(2.1) \quad T, \lambda > 0, \quad \alpha, \gamma > 1, \quad \beta \geq 2 \vee \gamma, \quad \eta \geq \frac{\beta}{2} \vee \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad \eta > 2, \quad \alpha > \varrho \geq 1.$$

Define

$$\Omega := \left\{ \omega \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{V}) : \int_0^T \|\omega(s)\|_{\mathbb{Y}}^\alpha ds < \infty \right\}.$$

We endow  $\Omega$  with the topology induced by the metric

$$d(\omega, \alpha) := \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{V}} + \left( \int_0^T \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{Y}}^\alpha ds \right)^{1/\alpha}, \quad \omega, \alpha \in \Omega,$$

which turns it into a Polish space. Further, denote  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ . The coordinate map  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  on  $\Omega$  is defined by  $X_t(\omega) = \omega(t)$  for  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and the corresponding filtration is defined by  $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  with  $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(X_s, s \in [0, t])$ .

Take another separable Hilbert space  $\mathbb{U}$ , which we use as state space for the randomness that drives our systems. The space of Hilbert–Schmidt operators from  $\mathbb{U}$  into  $\mathbb{H}$  is denoted by  $L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})$  and the Hilbert–Schmidt norm is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}$ .

For any metric space  $(E, m)$ , let  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  be the set of Borel probability measures on  $E$  and endow this space with the weak topology, i.e., the topology of convergence in distribution. It is well-known that  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  is a Polish space once  $E$  has the same property ([11, Theorem III.60, p. 73]). For  $r \geq 1$  and an arbitrary reference point  $e_0 \in E$ , we set (with abuse of notation)

$$\|\mu\|_{r, E} := \left( \int m(e, e_0)^r \mu(de) \right)^{1/r}, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E),$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}^r(E) := \{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E) : \|\mu\|_{r, E} < \infty \}.$$

Further, let  $w_r^E$  be the  $r$ -Wasserstein metric<sup>1</sup> on  $\mathcal{P}^r(E)$ , i.e.,

$$w_r^E(\mu, \nu) := \left( \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int m(x, y)^r \pi(dx, dy) \right)^{1/r}, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}^r(E),$$

where  $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$  is the set of couplings of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , i.e., the set of all Borel probability measures  $\pi$  on  $E^2$  such that  $\pi(dx \times E) = \mu$  and  $\pi(E \times dy) = \nu$ . It is well-known ([41, Theorem 6.18]) that  $(\mathcal{P}^r(E), w_r^E)$  is a complete separable metric space once  $(E, m)$  has the same property. If not mentioned otherwise, we endow  $\mathcal{P}^r(E)$  with the topology induced by  $w_r^E$ . In case  $E$  is a (separable) Banach space, we take  $e_0 = 0$  by convention.

We fix a function  $\mathcal{N}: \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  with the following properties: it is lower semicontinuous,  $\mathcal{N}(x) = 0$  implies  $x = 0$ , and

$$\mathcal{N}(cy) \leq c^\alpha \mathcal{N}(y), \quad \forall c \geq 0, y \in \mathbb{Y},$$

and

$$\{y \in \mathbb{Y} : \mathcal{N}(y) \leq 1\} \text{ is relatively compact in } \mathbb{Y}.$$

Moreover, we set

$$\mathcal{N}_p(y) := \|y\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{N}(y), \quad p \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \mathbb{Y}.$$

<sup>1</sup>In fact, it is a metric once  $(E, m)$  is separable, see [7].

To model the control variable, we fix an action space  $F$  that is assumed to be a compact metrizable space. Let  $\mathbb{M}([0, T] \times F)$  be the set of all Radon measures on  $[0, T] \times F$  and define  $\mathbb{M}$  as its subset of all measures in  $\mathbb{M}([0, T] \times F)$  whose projections on  $[0, T]$  coincide with the Lebesgue measure. We endow  $\mathbb{M}$  with the vague topology, which turns it into a compact metrizable space ([14, Theorem 2.2]). The Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $\mathbb{M}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{M}$  and the identity map on  $\mathbb{M}$  is denoted by  $M$ . Further, we define the  $\sigma$ -fields

$$\mathcal{M}_t := \sigma(M(C) : C \in \mathcal{B}([0, t] \times F)), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

In the following, we consider the product space  $\Theta := \Omega \times \mathbb{M}$ . Let  $r$  be a metric on  $\mathbb{M}$  that induces its topology. Then, we endow  $\Theta$  with the metric  $d + r$ , which induces the product topology. We also set  $\mathcal{O} := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ . The product filtration  $\mathbf{O} := (\mathcal{O}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is given by  $\mathcal{O}_t := \mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{M}_t$ . With little abuse of notation, we denote the coordinate map on  $\Theta$  by  $(X, M)$ .

Let  $\varkappa : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a continuous function that is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\mathbb{H}$  and such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa(x) \geq & \exp\{6\lambda\eta T(1 + 18\eta)\}(1 + 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta}) + \frac{1}{2}[\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + 3\lambda T(1 + 3\exp\{114\lambda T\})(1 + 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2)] \\ & + \frac{1}{\beta+2}[\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{\beta+2} + \lambda(\frac{\beta}{2} + 1)T(\beta + 3)(1 + 3\exp\{6\lambda(\frac{\beta}{2} + 1)T(9\beta + 19)\})(1 + 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{\beta+2})]. \end{aligned}$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ , define

$$\mathcal{G} := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta) : E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} + \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(X_s) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(X_s)] ds \right] < \infty \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}(x) := \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta)) : \int E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} + \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(X_s) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(X_s)] ds \right] Q(d\mu) \leq \varkappa(x) \right\}.$$

By [5, Theorem 8.10.61],  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{J}(x)$  are Borel subsets of  $\mathcal{P}(\Theta)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta))$ , respectively.

We write  $\mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  for the space  $\mathcal{P}^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  endowed with the topology induced by  $w_\rho^\vee$ , i.e., the subspace topology coming from  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathbb{V})$ .

**2.2. The Coefficients.** Next, we introduce the coefficients for the equations under consideration. We take two coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} b : F \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{V}, \\ \sigma : F \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H}) &\rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H}) \end{aligned}$$

that are supposed to be Borel measurable. Further, we presume that

$$\sup_{f \in F} \|\sigma(f, t, y, \mu)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})} < \infty$$

for all  $(t, y, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}$ . Finally, let

$$\bar{\sigma} : \mathcal{P}(F) \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})$$

be a Borel map such that

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^*(\nu, t, y, \mu) = \int \sigma\sigma^*(f, t, y, \mu)\nu(df)$$

for all  $(\nu, t, y, \mu) \in \mathcal{P}(F) \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ . We emphasize that  $\bar{\sigma}$  always exists. For example, one can take the nonnegative operator root ([32, Proposition 2.3.4] or [37, Theorem VI.9]) of the right hand side in (2.2). As the root map  $A \mapsto A^{1/2}$  is continuous in the norm and strong operator topology ([37, Problem 14, p. 217]), notice that it does not only preserve measurability but also continuity properties.

Our main result has two layers that require different assumptions. The first layer is given by the following condition.

**Condition 2.1.** (i)  $\mathbb{V}^* \subset \mathbb{Y}$  (continuously and) compactly.

(ii) For every  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ , the maps

$$F \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H}) \ni (f, y, \mu) \mapsto \mathbb{v}\langle b(f, t, y, \mu), v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$F \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H}) \ni (f, y, \mu) \mapsto \sigma^*(f, t, y, \mu)v \in \mathbb{U},$$

$$\mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H}) \ni (y, \mu) \mapsto \bar{\sigma}^*(\nu, t, y, \mu)v \in \mathbb{U}$$

are continuous. Further, for every  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$  and all compact sets  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ , the maps  $\mathbb{v}\langle b, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}v$  are bounded on  $F \times [0, T] \times \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{P}(F) \times [0, T] \times \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$ , respectively.

(iii) For the constant  $\lambda > 0$  as in (2.1), it holds that

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{v}\langle b(f, s, w, \mu), w \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \leq \lambda(1 + \|w\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \|\mu\|_{2, \mathbb{H}}^2) - \mathcal{N}(w),$$

$$(2.4) \quad \|\sigma(f, s, v, \mu)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^{2\gamma} + \|b(f, s, v, \mu)\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\gamma \leq \lambda((1 + \mathcal{N}(v))(1 + \|v\|_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta) + \|\mu\|_{\beta, \mathbb{H}}^\beta),$$

$$(2.5) \quad \|\bar{\sigma}(\nu, s, v, \mu)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq \lambda(1 + \|v\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \|\mu\|_{2, \mathbb{H}}^2),$$

for all  $f \in F$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ ,  $s \in [0, T]$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,  $v \in \mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ .

The following is our second main condition.

**Condition 2.2.** (i)  $b(F \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})) \subset \mathbb{Y}^*$ .

(ii) There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$(2.6) \quad \|b(f, s, y, \mu)\|_{\mathbb{Y}^*}^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \leq C((1 + \mathcal{N}(y))(1 + \|y\|_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta) + \|\mu\|_{\beta, \mathbb{H}}^\beta),$$

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbb{Y}^* \langle b(f, s, y, \mu) - b(f, s, v, \mu^*), y - v \rangle_{\mathbb{Y}} \leq C(\|y - v\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mu, \mu^*)),$$

$$(2.8) \quad \|\bar{\sigma}(\nu, s, y, \mu) - \bar{\sigma}(\nu, s, v, \mu^*)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{X})}^2 \leq C(\|y - v\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mu, \mu^*))$$

for all  $f \in F$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ ,  $s \in [0, T]$  and  $y, v \in \mathbb{Y}$ ,  $\mu, \mu^* \in \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ .

We are in the position to introduce the particle systems of interest and its proposed mean field limits.

**2.3. Controlled Particles Systems and Mean Field Limits.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\mathcal{S}_n: \Theta^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Theta), \quad \mathcal{S}_n(\theta^1, \dots, \theta^n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\theta^k},$$

$$\mathcal{X}_n: \Omega^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \quad \mathcal{X}_n(\omega^1, \dots, \omega^n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\omega^k}.$$

It is known ([28, Lemma 3.2]) that there exists a predictable probability kernel  $\mathbf{m}$  from  $[0, T] \times \Theta$  into  $F$  such that

$$M(dt, df) = \mathbf{m}(t, M, df)dt.$$

In the following we will also write  $\mathbf{m}(t, M)$  for the measure  $\mathbf{m}(t, M, dy)$ .

The following are the particles systems of interest.

**Definition 2.3.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ , let  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$  be the set of all  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta^n)$  with the following properties:

(i)  $Q \circ \mathcal{S}_n^{-1} \in \mathcal{I}(x)$ ;

- (ii) possibly on a standard extension of  $(\Theta^n, \mathcal{O}^n, \mathbf{O}^n, Q)$ , there exist independent cylindrical standard Brownian motions  $W^1, \dots, W^n$  such that a.s., for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X_t^k, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^t \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) dW_s^k, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, it is implicit that the integrals are well-defined.

Further, we define

$$\mathcal{R}^n(x) := \{Q \circ \mathcal{S}_n^{-1} : Q \in \mathcal{C}^n(x)\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta)).$$

The next definition introduces their proposed mean field limits.

**Definition 2.4.** For  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ , we define  $\mathcal{C}^0(x)$  to be the set of all measures  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$  with the following properties:

- (i)  $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ ;  
(ii) possibly on a standard extension of  $(\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \mathbf{O}, Q)$ , there exists a cylindrical standard Brownian motion  $W$  such that a.s., for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X_t, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^t \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) dW_s, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, it is implicit that the integrals are well-defined.

Further, we set

$$\mathcal{R}^0(x) := \{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta)) : P(\mathcal{C}^0(x)) = 1\} \cap \mathcal{I}(x).$$

The Definitions 2.3 and 2.4 are in the spirit of the variational framework for SPDEs as studied by Pardoux [35] and Krylov–Rozovskii [27], see also [32, 36]. In Section 4.1 below, we establish characterizations via controlled martingale problems as studied in [14, 15].

**2.4. Main Result.** The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 2.5.** Assume that Condition 2.1 holds and take a sequence  $(x^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  such that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  (in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ ). Then, the following hold:

- (i) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the sets  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  are nonempty and compact in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ .  
(ii) Every sequence  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $Q^n \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$  and every of its accumulation points is in the set  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ .  
(iii) For every upper semicontinuous function  $\psi : \mathcal{P}^e(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , such that

$$(2.9) \quad \exists C > 0: \quad |\psi(\nu)| \leq C[1 + \|\nu\|_{\alpha, \mathcal{P}^e(\Theta)}^\alpha] \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}^e(\Theta),$$

it holds that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q[\psi] \leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} E^Q[\psi].$$

Assume that Condition 2.2 holds additionally.

- (iv) For every  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  and every subsequence  $(x^{M_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  of  $(x^n)_{n=1}^\infty$ , there exists a further subsequence  $(x^{N_n})_{n=1}^\infty \subset (x^{M_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  and measures  $Q^{N_n} \in \mathcal{R}^{N_n}(x^{N_n})$  such that  $Q^{N_n} \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ .

- (v) For every lower semicontinuous function  $\psi: \mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the property (2.9), it holds that

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} E^Q[\psi] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q[\psi].$$

- (vi) For every compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{H}$  and every continuous function  $\psi: \mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the property (2.9), it holds that

$$(2.10) \quad \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \left| \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi] - \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi] \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the map

$$\mathbb{H} \ni x \mapsto \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi]$$

is continuous.

- (vii) For every compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{H}$ , it holds that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} h(\mathcal{R}^n(x), \mathcal{R}^0(x)) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $h$  denotes the Hausdorff metric<sup>2</sup> on  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ .<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the map  $x \mapsto \mathcal{R}^0(x)$  is continuous in the Hausdorff metric topology.

**Remark 2.6.** (i) Part (i) of Theorem 2.5 (actually this follows from part (ii)) includes an existence result for certain mean field controlled stochastic PDEs. In particular, taking  $F$  as singleton, this includes an existence result for usual (in the sense of uncontrolled) McKean–Vlasov equations. In this regard, the theorem contains an existence result comparable to some from the recent paper [20].

- (ii) Part (ii) of Theorem 2.5 provides a particle approximation for controlled equations. In this regard, the result is comparable to a propagation of chaos result from [20] for uncontrolled stochastic 2D Navier–Stokes equations (that are covered by our result, see part (iv) of this remark).

- (iii) The items (iii), (v) and (vi) from Theorem 2.5 are related to stochastic optimal control theory, as they provide some understanding of mean field control problems and their approximations. We will discuss more details in Corollary 2.7 below.

The flavor of part (vii) from Theorem 2.5 is probabilistic. It can be viewed as *set-valued propagation of chaos*. To the best of our knowledge, such a result and the concept itself are new in the literature on mean field control.

- (iv) Let us also comment on our main assumptions. Condition 2.1 is rather mild and heavily inspired by (C1) – (C3) from [19]. It is satisfied for stochastic porous media equations ([19, Section 5]) and Navier–Stokes equations on bounded domains ([19, Section 6]).

Condition 2.2 is a type of growth and weak monotonicity condition that appears frequently in the literature ([27, 32, 36]). For example, it can be verified for stochastic porous media equations ([32, Example 4.1.11]). However, it fails for stochastic Navier–Stokes equations which lack weak monotonicity ([32, Section 5.1.3]). It is an interesting open problem to establish (iv) – (vii) under, say, a local monotonicity condition (as derived in [31] for SPDEs without control and measure dependence) that covers stochastic 2D Navier–Stokes frameworks.

In Section 3 below, we show that both Conditions 2.1 and 2.2 hold for certain controlled slow diffusion equations.

<sup>2</sup>Definition 3.70 in [2]

<sup>3</sup>Recall that the sets  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  are nonempty and compact in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$  thanks to part (i).



In finite dimensional cases, Condition 2.1 and 2.2 correspond to classical growth and monotonicity conditions. In fact, as monotonicity conditions are weaker than their Lipschitz counterparts, Theorem 2.5 covers some new cases even for finite dimensional frameworks (cf. [29, Assumption B]).

The next corollary is related to [29, Theorems 2.11, 2.12], which are limit theorems in the context of stochastic optimal control. The first part shows that accumulation points of  $n$ -state nearly optimal controls are optimal for the McKean–Vlasov system, while the second part explains that every optimal McKean–Vlasov control can be obtained as limit of  $n$ -state nearly optimal controls.

**Corollary 2.7.** *Suppose that the Conditions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, take a continuous function*

$$\psi: \mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

with the property (2.9) and an initial value  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ .

- (i) Let  $(\varepsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  be a sequence such that  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , suppose that  $Q^n \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)$  is such that

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi] - \varepsilon^n \leq E^{Q^n}[\psi].$$

In other words,  $Q^n$  is a so-called  $n$ -state  $\varepsilon_n$ -optimal control. Then, the sequence  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  and every accumulation point  $Q^0$  is in  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$  and optimal in the sense that

$$(2.11) \quad E^{Q^0}[\psi] = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi].$$

- (ii) Take a measure  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)$  that is optimal (i.e., it satisfies (2.11)). Then, there are sequences  $(\varepsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  such that  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ , each  $Q^n$  is an  $n$ -state  $\varepsilon_n$ -optimal control and  $Q^n \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$ .

*Proof.* (i). By Theorem 2.5 (vi), we have

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi] \leftarrow \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi] - \varepsilon^n \leq E^{Q^n}[\psi] \leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi] \rightarrow \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi],$$

which shows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^n}[\psi] = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi].$$

By part (ii) of Theorem 2.5,  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  and every accumulation point  $Q^0$  is in  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$ . Thus, by virtue of [41, Definition 6.8], we get that

$$E^{Q^0}[\psi] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^n}[\psi] = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)} E^Q[\psi].$$

This is the claim.

(ii). By Theorem 2.5 (iv), there exists a sequence  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  such that  $Q^n \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)$  and  $Q^n \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$ . Using that  $Q^0$  is optimal, Theorem 2.5 (vi) and [41, Definition 6.8], we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi] = E^{Q^0}[\psi] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^n}[\psi].$$

Consequently,

$$0 \leq \varepsilon^n := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)} E^Q[\psi] - E^{Q^n}[\psi] \rightarrow 0,$$

which shows that  $Q^n$  is an  $n$ -state  $\varepsilon^n$ -optimal control. The claim is proved.  $\square$

### 3. EXAMPLE: MEAN FIELD CONTROL FOR POROUS MEDIA MODELS

In this section we verify the Conditions 2.1 and 2.2 for interacting controlled stochastic porous media systems of the form

$$dY_t^k = \left[ \Delta(|Y_t^k|^{q-2}Y_t^k) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_t^k - Y_t^i) + \int c(f) \mathbf{m}(t, M^k, df) \right] dt + \sigma dW_t^k,$$

where  $q \geq 2$  and  $k = 1, \dots, N$ . For  $q = 2$  this equation corresponds to the stochastic heat equation. The cases  $q > 2$  are typically called *slow diffusion models*. More specifically, in the classical uncontrolled cases without interaction,  $q = 3$  describes the flow of an ideal gas in a porous medium. There are also other interesting situations, e.g., thermal propagation in plasma ( $q = 7$ ), or plasma radiation ( $q = 5$ ). We refer to the monograph [3] for more information about (stochastic) porous media equations.

We now introduce a precise setting for this system. Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be a fixed dimension and let  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded open set with smooth boundary. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p > 1$ , let  $W_0^{k,p}(\mathcal{O})$  be the usual Sobolev space on  $\mathcal{O}$  with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The dual space of  $W_0^{k,p}(\mathcal{O})$  can be identified with  $W^{-k,p'}(\mathcal{O})$ , where  $p' = p/(p-1)$  ([1, Theorem 3.12] or [27, Section III.1]). In this way, the dualization between  $W_0^{k,p}(\mathcal{O})$  and  $W^{-k,p'}(\mathcal{O})$  is defined by means of the usual scalar product in  $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ . In the following, we take some  $q \geq 2$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y} &:= L^q(\mathcal{O}), & \mathbb{H} &:= L^2(\mathcal{O}), & \mathbb{X} &:= W^{-1,2}(\mathcal{O}), \\ \mathbb{V} &:= W^{-d-2,2}(\mathcal{O}), & \mathbb{V}^* &:= W_0^{d+2,2}(\mathcal{O}). \end{aligned}$$

Further, we set

$$\mathcal{N}(y) := \begin{cases} \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla(|y(u)|^{q/2-1}y(u))|^2 du, & \text{if } |y|^{q/2-1}y \in W_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}), \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thanks to [19, Lemma 5.1], for  $\alpha := q$ , the function  $\mathcal{N}$  is as in the previous section, i.e., it has all presumed properties. The action space  $F$  is still assumed to be a compact metrizable space.

Next, we introduce the coefficients  $b$  and  $\sigma$ . We set

$$b(f, s, x, \mu) \equiv b(f, x, \mu)(\cdot) := \Delta(|x(\cdot)|^{q-2}x(\cdot)) + \int (x(\cdot) - z(\cdot))\mu(dz) + c(f)(\cdot),$$

where  $F \times \mathbb{R} \ni (f, u) \mapsto c(f)(u)$  is a bounded continuous function. Further, for some separable Hilbert space  $\mathbb{U}$ , let  $\sigma \in L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})$  be a constant Hilbert–Schmidt coefficient.

**Lemma 3.1.** *In the above setting, Condition 2.1 holds for  $\gamma = q/(q-1)$ , large enough  $\lambda$  and all  $\beta, \eta$  that satisfy (2.1).*

*Proof.* We have  $\mathbb{V}^* \subset \mathbb{Y}$  compactly by [1, Theorem 6.3], i.e., (i) holds. Moreover, except for the measure dependent component  $-\int z\mu(dz)$ , (ii) and (iii) from Condition 2.1 follow from [19, Lemma 5.2]. In the following, we comment on the measure component.

Take  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$  and a sequence  $(\mu^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}_\varrho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  such that  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}_\varrho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ . By the continuity of the map  $z \mapsto \langle z, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}$  from  $\mathbb{V}$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ , and the fact that  $|\langle z, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}| \leq \|z\|_{\mathbb{V}} \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}^*}$ , we deduce from  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}_\varrho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  that

$$\left\langle \int z\mu^n(dz) - \int z\mu^0(dz), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} = \int \langle z, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} (\mu^n(dz) - \mu^0(dz)) \rightarrow 0.$$

We conclude that Condition 2.1 (ii) holds.

Next, we discuss Condition 2.1 (iii). Take  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ . First, notice that

$$-\left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} z\mu(dz), w \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} = -\int \langle z, w \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} \mu(dz) \leq \|w\|_{\mathbb{H}} \|\mu\|_{1, \mathbb{H}} \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|w\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \|\mu\|_{2, \mathbb{H}}^2).$$

We conclude that (2.3) holds (where the term  $-\mathcal{N}$  comes from the non-measure dependent part of the coefficient  $b$ , cf. [19, Lemma 5.2]). Finally, notice that

$$\left\| \int z\mu(dz) \right\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\gamma \leq \left( \int \|z\|_{\mathbb{V}} \mu(dz) \right)^\gamma \leq \|\mu\|_{1, \mathbb{H}}^\gamma \leq \|\mu\|_{2, \mathbb{H}}^\gamma,$$

i.e., we conclude (2.4). This completes the proof.  $\square$

Next, we also discuss Condition 2.2. In the following, we consider the Gelfand triple

$$\mathbb{Y} = L^q(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathbb{X} = W^{-1,2}(\mathcal{O}) \cong \mathbb{X}^* = W_0^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathbb{Y}^* = (L^q(\mathcal{O}))^*,$$

where we understand  $\cong$  via the Riesz map  $\mathcal{R} := (-\Delta)^{-1}$  as discussed in [32, Lemma 4.1.12]. We also recall the well-known fact ([32, Lemma 4.1.13]) that  $\Delta$  extends to a linear isometry from  $L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathcal{O})$  into  $\mathbb{Y}^*$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *In the above setting, Condition 2.2 holds.*

*Proof.* Notice that

$$x \in \mathbb{Y} = L^q(\mathcal{O}) \implies |x|^{q-2}x \in L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathcal{O}).$$

Hence,  $\Delta(|x|^{q-2}x) \in \mathbb{Y}^*$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Y}$ . This implies that Condition 2.2 (i) holds.

Next, we discuss Condition 2.2 (ii). Take  $x \in \mathbb{Y}$  and recall that  $\alpha = q$ . Thanks to [19, Lemma C.1], we obtain

$$\|\Delta(|x|^{q-2}x)\|_{\mathbb{Y}^*}^{q/(q-1)} = \int_{\mathcal{O}} |x(u)|^q du = \|x\|_{\mathbb{Y}}^q \leq C(\mathcal{N}(x) + \|x\|_{\mathbb{V}}^q) \leq C(\mathcal{N}(x) + \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^q).$$

Further, using that  $\mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{Y}^*$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| x - \int z\mu(dz) + c(f) \right\|_{\mathbb{Y}^*}^{q/(q-1)} &\leq C \left\| x - \int z\mu(dz) + c(f) \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{q/(q-1)} \\ &\leq C (\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{q/(q-1)} + \|\mu\|_{2, \mathbb{H}}^{q/(q-1)} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (2.6) holds.

It is easy to check that

$$\forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}: \quad (|t|^{p-2}t - |s|^{p-2}s)(t - s) \geq 0.$$

Hence, for  $y, v \in \mathbb{Y}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}^* \langle \Delta(|y|^{p-2}y) - \Delta(|v|^{p-2}v), y - v \rangle_{\mathbb{Y}} &= - \int_{\mathcal{O}} (|y(u)|^{p-2}y(u) - |v(u)|^{p-2}v(u))(y(u) - v(u)) du \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Take  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  and recall that the Wasserstein metric can be realized by some optimal coupling ([6, part I, p. 353]), i.e., there exists a coupling  $\pi$  of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  such that

$$\mathbf{w}_1^{\mathbb{X}}(\mu, \nu) = \int \|z - w\|_{\mathbb{X}} \pi(dz, dw).$$

Consequently, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int z\mu(dz) - \int z\nu(dz) \right\|_{\mathbb{X}} &= \left\| \iint z\pi(dz, dw) - \iint w\pi(dz, dw) \right\|_{\mathbb{X}} \\ &\leq \iint \|z - w\|_{\mathbb{X}} \pi(dz, dw) = \mathbf{w}_1^{\mathbb{X}}(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Using this observation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle y - v + \int z\mu(dz) - \int z\nu(dz), y - v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{Y}^*} &= \left\langle y - v + \int z\mu(dz) - \int z\nu(dz), y - v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{X}} \\
&\leq \left\| y - v + \int z\mu(dz) - \int z\nu(dz) \right\|_{\mathbb{X}} \|y - v\|_{\mathbb{X}} \\
&\leq \|y - v\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \|y - v\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_1^{\mathbb{X}}(\mu, \nu)^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \|y - v\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mu, \nu)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

All together, we conclude that (2.7) holds.

Finally, as  $\sigma$  is constant, (2.8) holds trivially and the proof is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5

In this section we prove our main Theorem 2.5. Let us shortly comment on the structure of this section. In Section 4.1, we start with a martingale problem characterizations for the sets  $\mathcal{C}^0$  and  $\mathcal{C}^n$ . Thereafter, in Section 4.2, we investigate compactness properties. In Section 4.3, we provide a general existence result for stochastic PDEs with certain random coefficients. In the remaining sections, we proceed with the proof of Theorem 2.5 in a chronological order.

**4.1. Martingale Problem Characterizations of  $\mathcal{C}^0$  and  $\mathcal{C}^n$ .** Let  $\mathcal{B} := \{e_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{V}^*$  be a countable dense set. Furthermore, suppose that  $\mathcal{C}_c^2$  is a countable subset of  $C_c^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$  that is dense for the norm  $\|f\|_{\infty} + \|f'\|_{\infty} + \|f''\|_{\infty}$ . Finally, for  $s \in [0, T]$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_s \subset C_b(\Theta; \mathbb{R})$  be a countable separating class for  $\mathcal{O}_s$ . The existence of such a class follows as in the proof of [29, Lemma A.1].

We also need the following notation to define relaxed control rules. For  $g \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{V}^*$  and  $(f, t, v, \mu) \in F \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$ , we set

$$\mathcal{L}_{g,y}(f, t, v, \mu) := g'(\mathbb{V}\langle v, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) \mathbb{V}\langle b(f, t, v, \mu), y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \frac{1}{2} g''(\mathbb{V}\langle v, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) \|\sigma^*(f, t, v, \mu)y\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2.$$

Finally, for  $g \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ ,  $f \in F$ ,  $y^1, \dots, y^n \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,  $v^1, \dots, v^n \in \mathbb{Y}$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_\rho^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{g,y^1, \dots, y^n}^i(f, t, v^1, \dots, v^n, \mu) \\
:= g' \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{V}\langle v^k, y^k \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \right) \mathbb{V}\langle b(f, t, v^i, \mu), y^i \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \frac{1}{2} g'' \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{V}\langle v^k, y^k \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \right) \|\sigma^*(f, t, v^i, \mu)y^i\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We are in the position to provide a martingale characterization of the sets  $\mathcal{C}^0$  and  $\mathcal{C}^n$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Suppose that Condition 2.1 (iii) holds. Let  $x \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $Q \in \mathcal{C}^0(x)$ .
- (ii) *The following properties hold:*
  - (a)  $Q(X_0 = x) = 1$ ;
  - (b)  $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ ;
  - (c) *for all  $y \in \mathbb{V}^*$  and  $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ , the process*

$$\mathbf{M}^{g,y} := g(\mathbb{V}\langle X, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - \int_0^\cdot \int \mathcal{L}_{g,y}(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) M(ds, df)$$

*is a (square integrable)  $Q$ - $\mathbf{O}$ -martingale.*

- (iii) *The following properties hold:*
  - (a)  $Q(X_0 = x) = 1$ ;

- (b)  $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ ;  
(c) for all  $y \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{C}_c^2$ ,  $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \cap [0, T]$ ,  $s < t$  and all  $\psi \in \mathcal{T}_s$ ,

$$E^Q[(M_t^{g,y} - M_s^{g,y})\psi] = 0.$$

*Proof.* We will prove the following implications:

$$(i) \Rightarrow (ii), \quad (ii) \Rightarrow (i), \quad (iii) \Rightarrow (ii).$$

As (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) is trivial, these complete the proof.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Notice that (a) and (b) hold. We now work on a standard extension of  $(\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \mathbf{O}, Q)$  and we use the notation from Definition 2.4, i.e., a.s., for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X_t, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^t \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) dW_s, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, fix  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ . The classical Itô formula for real-valued semimartingales yields that a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} M^{g,y} &= g(\mathbb{V}\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) + \int_0^\cdot \left( g'(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), y \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{g''(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*})}{2} \left\langle \int \sigma \sigma^*(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df) y, y \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}} \right) ds \\ &= g(\mathbb{V}\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) + \int_0^\cdot \left( g'(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), y \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{g''(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*})}{2} \|\bar{\sigma}^*(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) y\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2 \right) ds \\ &= g(\mathbb{V}\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) + \int_0^\cdot g'(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) \langle \bar{\sigma}^*(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) v, dW_s \rangle_{\mathbb{U}}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting by  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  the quadratic variation process, we obtain that a.s.

$$[M^{g,y}, M^{g,y}]_T = \int_0^T (g'(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}))^2 \|\bar{\sigma}^*(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) v\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2 ds.$$

Using the growth bound (2.5) and that  $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ , we obtain that

$$E^Q[[M^{g,y}, M^{g,y}]_T] < \infty.$$

We conclude that  $M^{g,y}$  is a (square integrable)  $Q$ - $\mathbf{O}$ -martingale, i.e., (i) follows.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Take  $h \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$  and let  $g^n \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$  be such that  $h = g^n$  on  $[-2n, 2n]$ . With

$$T_n := \inf\{t \in [0, T] : |\mathbb{V}\langle X_t, y \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}| \geq n\},$$

the hypothesis of (ii) yields that the process  $M_{\cdot \wedge T_n}^{h,y} = M_{\cdot \wedge T_n}^{g^n,y}$  is a  $Q$ - $\mathbf{O}$ -martingale. Consequently, because  $T_n \nearrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the process  $M^{h,y}$  is a local  $Q$ - $\mathbf{O}$ -martingale. Hence, it follows from [26, Theorem II.2.42] that, for every  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ , the process

$$\mathbb{V}\langle X, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} - \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} - \int_0^\cdot \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds$$

is a continuous local  $Q$ - $\mathbf{O}$ -martingale with quadratic variation process

$$\int_0^\cdot \|\bar{\sigma}^*(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) v\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2 ds.$$

The growth condition (2.5) and  $Q \in \mathcal{G}$  imply that  $Q$ -a.s.

$$\int_0^T \|\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^2 ds < \infty.$$

As  $\mathbb{V}^* \subset \mathbb{H}^*$  densely, we deduce from [34, Corollary 6] that, possibly on a standard extension of  $(\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \mathbf{O}, Q)$ , there exists a cylindrical Brownian motion  $W$  such that, for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} - \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} - \int_0^\cdot \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, Q_s^X) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ = \left\langle \int_0^\cdot \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, Q_s^X) dW_s, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that part (ii) from Definition 2.4 holds. Consequently,  $Q \in \mathcal{C}^0(x)$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): This implication follows readily by a density argument.  $\square$

A similar result can also be proved for the set  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that Condition 2.1 (iii) holds. Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta^n)$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $Q \in \mathcal{C}^n(x)$ .
- (ii) *The following hold:*
  - (a)  $Q(X_0^k = x, k = 1, \dots, n) = 1$ ;
  - (b)  $Q \circ \mathcal{L}_n^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$ ;
  - (c) *for all  $v^1, \dots, v^n \in \mathbb{V}^*$  and  $g \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ , the process*

$$g\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{V}\langle X^k, v^k \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}\right) - \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^\cdot \int \mathcal{L}_{g, v^1, \dots, v^n}^k(f, s, X_s, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) M^k(ds, df)$$

*is a (square integrable)  $Q$ - $\mathbf{O}$ -martingale.*

*Proof.* The lemma follows similar to the proof of (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii) from Lemma 4.1. We omit the details for brevity.  $\square$

The following observation follows directly from Lemma 4.2.

**Corollary 4.3.** *Suppose that Condition 2.1 (iii) holds. For every  $x \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$  is convex.*

**4.2. Compactness properties.** In this section we investigate (relative) compactness of the sets  $\mathcal{R}^n$  and  $\mathcal{R}^0$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that Condition 2.1 (i) and (iii) hold. For every nonempty bounded set  $B \subset \mathbb{H}$ , the set*

$$\mathcal{R}(B) := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{x \in B} \mathcal{R}^n(x)$$

*is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^q(\mathcal{P}^q(\Theta))$ .*

*Proof. Step 1: Tightness in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta))$ .* We define the map  $I: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  by

$$(4.1) \quad I(Q)(G) := \int m(G \times \mathbb{M})Q(dm), \quad G \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega).$$

In the following we prove tightness of the family

$$\mathcal{I} := \{I(Q): Q \in \mathcal{R}(B)\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega).$$

By virtue of [19, Lemma 4.3], Condition 2.1 (i) and the definition of  $\mathcal{J}(x)$ , it suffices to prove that there exists a constant  $l > 0$  such that

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}(B)} E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{\|X_s - X_t\|_{\mathbb{V}}}{|t - s|^l} \right] < \infty.$$

Take  $Q = P \circ \mathcal{S}_n^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^n(x)$ . Then,

$$E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{\|X_s - X_t\|_{\mathbb{V}}}{|t - s|^l} \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E^P \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{\|X_s^k - X_t^k\|_{\mathbb{V}}}{|t - s|^l} \right].$$

By definition of  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$ , have  $P$ -a.s., for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V} \langle X_t^k, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V} \langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^t \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) dW_s^k, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

for independent cylindrical Brownian motions  $W^1, \dots, W^n$ . This means that  $P$ -a.s.

$$X^k = x + \int_0^\cdot \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df) ds + \int_0^\cdot \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) dW_s^k,$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , where the equality is meant to be in  $\mathbb{V}$ . Consequently,  $P$ -a.s., for  $s < t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{V}} &\leq \|x\|_{\mathbb{V}} + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{V}} \|b(f, r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))\|_{\mathbb{V}} \mathbf{m}(r, M^k, df) dr \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(r, M^k), r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r)) dW_r^k \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's and Jensen's inequality and (2.4), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{V}} \|b(f, r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))\|_{\mathbb{V}} \mathbf{m}(r, M^k, df) dr \\ &\leq |t - s|^{1-1/\gamma} \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{V}} \|b(f, r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\gamma \mathbf{m}(r, M^k, df) dr \\ &\leq |t - s|^{1-1/\gamma} \int_0^T \lambda \left( (1 + \mathcal{N}(X_r^k))(1 + \|X_r^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_r^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta \right) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, as  $Q \circ \mathcal{S}_n^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$ , we get that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E^P \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{V}} \|b(f, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))\|_{\mathbb{V}} \mathbf{m}(r, M^k, df) dr / |t - s|^{1-1/\gamma} \right] \leq C,$$

where the constant only depends on the boundedness of  $B$  and the function  $\varkappa$  that appears in the definition of  $\mathcal{J}(x)$ . By Burkholder's inequality and (2.5), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &E^P \left[ \left\| \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(r, M^k), r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r)) dW_s^k \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} \right] \\ &\leq E^P \left[ \left( \int_s^t \|\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(r, M^k), r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^2 dr \right)^\eta \right] \\ &\leq E^P \left[ \left( \int_s^t \lambda \left( 1 + \|X_r^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_r^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right) dr \right)^\eta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using that  $Q \circ \mathcal{S}_n^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , with the same dependencies as above, such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E^P \left[ \left\| \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(r, M^k), r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r)) dW_s^k \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} \right] \leq C |t - s|^\eta.$$

The Besov–Hölder embedding ([18, Corollary A.2]) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E^P \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \left\| \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(r, M^k), r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r)) dW_r^k \right\|_{\mathbb{H}} / |t - s|^{(\eta-2)/2\eta} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E^P \left[ \int_0^T \int_0^T \left\| \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(r, M^k), r, X_r^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r)) dW_r^k \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} / |t - s|^\eta dt ds \right] \leq CT^2. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that (4.2) holds with  $l = (1 - 1/\gamma) \wedge (\eta - 2)/2\eta$ .

*Step 2: Relative compactness in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$ .* First of all, recall that  $\varrho < \alpha$ . Moreover, using the definition of  $\mathcal{J}$  and [19, Lemma C.1], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}(B)} E^{I(Q)} [d(X, 0)^\alpha] & \leq C \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}(B)} E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha + \int_0^T \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha ds \right] \\ & \leq C \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}(B)} E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha + \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(X_s) + \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha] ds \right] \\ & \leq C \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}(B)} E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha + \int_0^T \mathcal{N}(X_s) ds \right] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by [28, Corollary B.2], the compactness of  $\mathbb{M}$  and Step 1, we conclude that  $\mathcal{R}(B)$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $(x^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  be such that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ . Furthermore, let  $(Q^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta))$  be such that  $Q^n \in \mathcal{J}(x^n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $Q^n \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta))$ . Then,  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}(x^0)$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that  $(t, \omega) \mapsto \omega(t)$  is continuous from  $[0, T] \times \Omega$  into  $\mathbb{V}$  by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem. Hence,  $(t, \omega) \mapsto \|\omega(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}}$  is lower semicontinuous from  $[0, T] \times \Omega$  into  $[0, \infty]$  (as  $x \mapsto \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}$  is lower semicontinuous from  $\mathbb{V}$  into  $[0, \infty]$ ; recall our convention that  $\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}} = \infty$  for  $x \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ ). By Berge’s maximum theorem (see [21, Proposition 1.3.1] for a suitable version), the same is true for the map  $(t, \omega) \mapsto \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\omega(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ . Also notice that

$$\omega \mapsto \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(\omega(s)) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(\omega(s))] ds$$

is lower semicontinuous from  $\Omega$  into  $[0, \infty]$  (by Fatou’s lemma). Now, using again Fatou’s lemma ([17, Theorem 2.4]), we obtain that the map

$$\mu \mapsto E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} + \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(X_s) - \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(X_s)] ds \right]$$

is lower semicontinuous. Consequently, once again by Fatou’s lemma, the assumption that  $Q^n \in \mathcal{J}(x^n)$ , and the continuity of  $x \mapsto \varkappa(x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} + \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(X_s) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(X_s)] ds \right] Q^0(d\mu) \\ & \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} + \int_0^T [\mathcal{N}(X_s) + \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(X_s)] ds \right] Q^n(d\mu) \end{aligned}$$



$$\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varkappa(x^n) = \varkappa(x^0).$$

We conclude that  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}(x^0)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *Assume that Condition 2.1 holds. For every compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{H}$ , the set*

$$\mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{K}) := \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{R}^0(x)$$

*is compact in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ .*

*Proof. Step 1.* We first show that  $\mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{K})$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ . Here, we argue along the lines of the proof for Lemma 4.4. Recall the definition of the map  $I$  from (4.1). First, we prove tightness of  $\mathcal{J} := \{I(Q) : Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{K})\}$ . Take  $Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x)$  with  $x \in \mathcal{K}$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{R}^0(x)$ , for  $Q$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}^0(x)$ . Now, we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}}{|t - s|^{(1-1/\gamma) \wedge (\eta-2)/2\eta}} \right] \\ = \int E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathbb{V}}}{|t - s|^{(1-1/\gamma) \wedge (\eta-2)/2\eta}} \right] Q(d\mu) \\ \leq C \left( 1 + \int E^\mu \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2\eta} + \int_0^T \mathcal{N}(X_s) ds + \int_0^T \mathcal{N}_{\beta/2+1}(X_s) ds \right] Q(d\mu) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $\mathcal{J}$ , the properties of  $\varkappa$  and the boundedness of  $\mathcal{K}$ , there exists a constant independent of  $Q$  such that

$$E^{I(Q)} \left[ \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{\|X_s - X_t\|_{\mathbb{V}}}{|t - s|^{(1-1/\gamma) \wedge (\eta-2)/2\eta}} \right] \leq C.$$

Using the same facts again, it follows from Condition 2.1 (i) and [19, Lemma 4.3] that  $\mathcal{J}$  is tight in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Finally, relative compactness in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$  follows from [28, Corollary B.2], [19, Lemma C.1] and, once again, the definition of  $\mathcal{J}$ .

*Step 2.* In this step, we prove that  $\mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{K})$  is closed, where we use the martingale problem characterization of  $\mathcal{C}^0$  as given by Lemma 4.1. Take a sequence  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{K})$  such that  $Q^n \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{K})$ , there exists a sequence  $(x^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\mu \circ X_0^{-1} = \delta_{x^n}$  for  $Q^n$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ . By the compactness of  $\mathcal{K}$ , possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0 \in \mathcal{K}$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ .

Take  $\varepsilon > 0$  and set  $G = G(\varepsilon) := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta) : \mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{V}}(Q \circ X_0^{-1}, \delta_{x^0}) \leq \varepsilon\}$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{V}}$  denotes some metric on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})$  that induces the weak topology. As the map  $Q \mapsto \mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{V}}(Q \circ X_0^{-1}, \delta_{x^0})$  is continuous from  $\mathcal{P}(\Theta)$  into  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , the set  $G$  is closed in  $\mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ . Hence, by the Portmanteau theorem,

$$Q^0(G) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q^n(G) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{V}}(\delta_{x^n}, \delta_{x^0}) \leq \varepsilon\} = 1.$$

As  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, it follows that

$$Q^0(\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta) : \mu \circ X_0^{-1} = \delta_{x^0}\}) = 1,$$

that is almost all realizations of  $Q^0$  satisfy (a.i) from Lemma 4.1 with initial value  $x^0$ .

We deduce from Lemma 4.5 that  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}(x^0)$ . In particular, this implies that  $Q^0(\mathcal{G}) = 1$ , i.e., (a.ii) from Lemma 4.1 holds for  $Q^0$ -a.a. realizations.

It remains to show that  $Q^0$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$  satisfy (a.iii) from Lemma 4.1. Take  $g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ . For  $k > 0$  and  $r \in [0, T]$ , we define a map  $M_r^k : \Theta \times \mathcal{P}(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$M_r^k(\omega, m, \mu) := g(\mathbb{V}\langle \omega(r), v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - \int_0^r \int \left[ (-k) \vee \mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, s, \omega(s), \mu_s) \wedge k \right] m(ds, df),$$

where  $\mu_s := \mu \circ X_s^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *Suppose that the Condition 2.1 (ii) holds. For every  $k > 0$  and  $r \in [0, T]$ , the map  $M_r^k$  is continuous from  $\Theta \times \mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ , where we endow  $\mathcal{G}$  with the subspace topology coming from the Wasserstein space  $\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta)$ .*

*Proof.* Take a sequence  $(\omega^n, m^n, \mu^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \Theta \times \mathcal{G}$  with  $(\omega^n, m^n, \mu^n) \rightarrow (\omega^0, m^0, \mu^0)$  and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & |M_r^k(\omega^n, m^n, \mu^n) - M_r^k(\omega^0, m^0, \mu^0)| \\ & \leq |g(\mathbb{V}\langle \omega^n(r), v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - g(\mathbb{V}\langle \omega^0(r), v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*})| \\ & \quad + \int_0^r \sup_{f \in F} |(-k) \vee \mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, s, \omega^n(s), \mu_s^n) \wedge k - (-k) \vee \mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, s, \omega^0(s), \mu_s^0) \wedge k| ds \\ & \quad + \left| \int_0^r \int (-k) \vee \mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, s, \omega^0(s), \mu_s^0) \wedge k (m^n(ds, df) - m^0(ds, df)) \right| \\ & =: I_n + II_n + III_n. \end{aligned}$$

First, as  $\omega^n \rightarrow \omega^0$  in  $\Omega$ , we have  $\omega^n(r) \rightarrow \omega^0(r)$  in  $\mathbb{V}$ , which immediately implies that  $I_n \rightarrow 0$ .

Next,  $\omega^n \rightarrow \omega^0$  in  $\Omega$  also implies that  $\|\omega^n - \omega^0\|_{\mathbb{V}} \rightarrow 0$  in Lebesgue measure. By the continuity of  $[0, T] \times \Omega \ni (s, \omega) \mapsto \omega(s) \in \mathbb{V}$ , it follows that  $\mu_s^n \rightarrow \mu_s^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}_e^{2\eta}(\mathbb{H})$  for each  $s \in [0, T]$ . Using Condition 2.1 (ii) and Berge's maximum theorem ([2, Theorem 17.31]), we obtain that the integrand in  $II_n$  converges to zero in Lebesgue measure. As it is bounded (by  $2k$ ), the dominated convergence theorem yields that  $II_n \rightarrow 0$ .

Finally, notice that the integrand in  $III_n$  is continuous in the  $F$ -variable for each fixed time point. Consequently,  $III_n \rightarrow 0$  follows from [24, Corollary 2.9]. The proof is complete.  $\square$

Take  $0 \leq s < t \leq T$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{T}_s$ . For  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ , define

$$Z^k(\mu) := \iint [M_t^k(\omega, m, \mu) - M_s^k(\omega, m, \mu)] \mathfrak{t}(\omega, m) \mu(d\omega, dm),$$

and

$$Z(\mu) := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z^k(\mu).$$

By virtue of [5, Theorem 8.10.61],  $Z^k$  and  $Z$  are Borel maps. Thanks to (2.4), we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad |\mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, s, v, \mu_s)|^\gamma \leq C \left( (1 + \mathcal{N}(v))(1 + \|v\|_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta) + E^\mu [\|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^\beta] \right).$$

As  $Q^n \in \mathcal{J}(x^n)$  and  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}(x^0)$ , we obtain, for  $Q^n$ -a.a. and  $Q^0$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ ,

$$(4.4) \quad Z(\mu) = E^\mu \left[ \left( g(\mathbb{V}\langle X_t, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - g(\mathbb{V}\langle X_s, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - \int_s^t \int \mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, r, X_r, \mu_r) M(dr, df) \right) \mathfrak{t} \right].$$

In the following, we prove that

$$E^{Q^0} [Z] = 0.$$

As  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_c^2$  and  $\mathcal{T}_s$  are countable, this implies that  $Q^0$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$  satisfy (a.iii) from Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof.

Notice that  $Q^n$ -a.s.  $Z = 0$ , as  $Q^n(\mathcal{C}^0(x^n)) = 1$ . Thus, by the triangle inequality, we observe that

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} E^{Q^0} [Z] & \leq E^{Q^n} [Z^k - Z] + |E^{Q^n} [Z^k] - E^{Q^0} [Z^k]| + |E^{Q^0} [Z^k] - E^{Q^0} [Z]| \\ & =: I_{n,k} + II_{n,k} + III_k. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of [5, Theorem 8.10.61] and Lemma 4.7,  $II_{n,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $k > 0$ . Using (4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,k} &\leq \int E^\mu \left[ \int_0^T \int |\mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f,r,X_r,\mu_r)| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f,r,X_r,\mu_r)| > k\}} M(ds,df) \right] Q^n(d\mu) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{k^{\gamma-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C > 0$  depends on  $\varkappa$  from  $\mathcal{J}$  but is independent of  $n$ . Similarly, we obtain that

$$III_k \leq \frac{C}{k^{\gamma-1}}.$$

Hence,  $I_{n,k} + III_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $n$ . Thus, choosing first a large  $k$  and taking then  $n \rightarrow \infty$  shows that  $I_{n,k} + II_{n,k} + III_k$  can be made arbitrarily small, which entails that  $Q^0$ -a.s.  $Z = 0$ . In summary,  $Q^0$ -a.a. realizations satisfy (iii) from Lemma 4.1 and consequently,  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0) \subset \mathcal{R}^0(\mathcal{X})$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

We record another observation.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds. For every  $x \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the sets  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^n(x)$  are compact in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta^n)$  and  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ , respectively.*

*Proof.* Similar to Lemma 4.4, one proves that the set  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta^n)$ . Further, a martingale problem argument (related to Lemma 4.2, see also the proof of Lemma 4.6) shows that  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$  is closed in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta^n)$ . We omit the details for brevity. In summary,  $\mathcal{C}^n(x)$  is compact. These claims transfer directly to  $\mathcal{R}^n(x)$  by the continuity of  $P \mapsto P \circ \mathcal{S}_n^{-1}$  from  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta^n)$  into  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ , cf. [28, Proposition A.1].  $\square$

**4.3. An existence result.** Fix an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a filtered probability space  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \in [0,T]}, P)$  that supports independent cylindrical Brownian motions  $W^1, \dots, W^N$  and predictable kernel  $\mathfrak{q}^1, \dots, \mathfrak{q}^N$  from  $[0, T] \times \Sigma$  into  $F$ . We define the product setup

$$\Psi := \Sigma \times \Omega^N, \quad \mathcal{G} := \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}^N, \quad \mathcal{G}_t := \bigcap_{s>t} \mathcal{A}_s \otimes \mathcal{F}_s^N.$$

With little abuse of notation, let  $X = (X^1, \dots, X^N)$  be the projection to the second coordinate, and extend  $W^1, \dots, W^N$  in the obvious manner to the product setup. The following can be seen as an extension of [19, Theorem 4.6] to a setting with random coefficients. The result is very much in the spirit of the seminal paper [25] whose ideas we also adapt.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Assume that Condition 2.1 holds and fix  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ . Then, there exists a probability measure  $Q$  on  $(\Psi, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in [0,T]})$  such that  $W^1, \dots, W^N$  are independent cylindrical Brownian motions under  $Q$  and  $Q$ -a.s., for all  $k = 1, \dots, N, t \in [0, T]$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_t^k, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^t \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_N(X_s)) \mathfrak{q}_s^k(df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathfrak{q}_s^k, s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_N(X_s)) dW_s^k, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover,  $Q \circ \mathcal{S}_N(X, K)^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$  (where we take  $K := (\delta_{\mathfrak{q}_t^1} dt, \dots, \delta_{\mathfrak{q}_t^N} dt)$ ) and there exists a probability transition kernel  $\mathcal{Q}$  such that

$$Q(dz, d\omega) = \mathcal{Q}(z, d\omega) P(dz) \tag{4.7}$$

and  $\mathcal{Q}(\cdot, G)$  is  $P$ -a.s.  $\mathcal{A}_t$ -measurable for every  $G \in \mathcal{F}_t^N$ .

*Proof.* The proof of this proposition is based on ideas from [19, Theorem 4.6] and [25, Theorem 1.8].

*Step 0:* Before we can start the proof, we shortly recall the concept of *weak-strong convergence* as, for instance, studied in [24]. We say that a sequence  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of probability measures on  $(\Psi, \mathcal{G})$  converges in the *weak-strong sense* to a probability measure  $Q^0$  on  $(\Psi, \mathcal{G})$  if

$$E^{Q^n}[g] \rightarrow E^{Q^0}[g]$$

for all bounded Carathéodory functions from  $\Psi$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ , i.e., all bounded functions  $\Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable in the  $\Sigma$ -variable and continuous in the  $\Omega^N$ -variable. We refer also to [9, Section 2] for some discussion (and a collection of useful results) on weak-strong convergence.

*Step 1:* Let  $\{\ell_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{V}^*$  be an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{H}$  such that

$$\|\Pi_n x\|_{\mathbb{V}} \leq C \|x\|_{\mathbb{V}}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{V},$$

where

$$\Pi_n x := \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{V} \langle x, \ell_k \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} \ell_k, \quad x \in \mathbb{V}.$$

Such an orthonormal basis exists thanks to [19, Lemma 4.4]. Furthermore, let  $\{g_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{U}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{U}$ . Now, set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_n &:= \text{span} \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n\} \subset \mathbb{V}^* \subset \mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{V}, \\ \mathbb{U}_n &:= \text{span} \{g_1, \dots, g_n\} \subset \mathbb{U}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the coefficients  $b_n^k : \Sigma \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{H}_n^N \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_n$  and  $\sigma_n^k : \Sigma \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{H}_n^N \rightarrow L(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} b_n^k(w, t, x_1, \dots, x_N) &:= \Pi_n \int b(f, t, x_k, \mathcal{X}_N(x)) \mathfrak{q}_t^k(df)(w), \\ \sigma_n^k(w, t, x_1, \dots, x_N) &:= \Pi_n \bar{\sigma}(\mathfrak{q}_t^k(w), t, x_k, \mathcal{X}_N(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{H}_n^N$ . Let us summarize some properties of  $b_n^k$  and  $\sigma_n^k$ . First, for every  $(w, t) \in \Sigma \times [0, T]$ , the maps

$$x \mapsto b_n^k(w, t, x), \quad x \mapsto \sigma_n^k(w, t, x)$$

are continuous by Condition 2.1 (ii). Moreover, thanks to Condition 2.1 (iii), we also have

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle b_n^k(w, t, x), x_k \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n} &\leq \lambda \left( 1 + \|x_k\|_{\mathbb{H}_n}^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_i\|_{\mathbb{H}_n}^2 \right) - \mathcal{N}(x_k), \\ \|\sigma_n^k(w, t, x)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)}^2 &\leq \lambda \left( 1 + \|x_k\|_{\mathbb{H}_n}^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_i\|_{\mathbb{H}_n}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

For  $m > 0$ , let  $\phi_m \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$  be a cutoff function such that

$$\phi_m(y) = \begin{cases} 1, & |y| \leq m, \\ 0, & |y| \geq 2m. \end{cases}$$

We also set

$$b_{n,m}^k(w, t, x) := \phi_m(\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}_n^N}) b_n^k(w, t, x), \quad \sigma_{n,m}^k(w, t, x) := \phi_m(\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}_n^N}) \sigma_n^k(w, t, x),$$

where  $\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}_n^N} = \sum_{i=1}^N \|x_i\|_{\mathbb{H}_n}$ . Notice that  $b_{n,m}^k$  and  $\sigma_{n,m}^k$  have the same continuity properties as  $b_n^k$  and  $\sigma_n^k$ . Furthermore,  $b_{n,m}^k$  and  $\sigma_{n,m}^k$  are bounded, which follows from Condition 2.1 (ii).

*Step 2:* We deduce from [25, Theorem 1.8] that there exists a probability measure  $Q^{n,m}$  on the product space  $(\Psi, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in [0, T]})$  such that  $Q^{n,m}$  admits a decomposition of the type (4.7),<sup>4</sup>  $W^1, \dots, W^N$  are independent cylindrical Brownian motions under  $Q^{n,m}$  (which follows from the kernel decomposition, cf. [25, Lemma 2.17]) and  $Q^{n,m}$ -a.s., for all  $k = 1, \dots, N$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$X_t^k = \Pi_n x + \int_0^t b_{n,m}^k(s, X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma_{n,m}^k(s, X_s) dW_s^{k,n},$$

where

$$W^{k,n} := \sum_{i=1}^n \langle W^k, g_i \rangle_{\mathbb{U}} g_i.$$

In particular, each  $X^k$  is  $Q^n$ -a.s.  $\mathbb{H}_n$ -valued (in particular, finite dimensional).

*Step 3:* Thanks to (4.8), one may follow the proof of [19, Theorem C.3] to conclude that the family  $\{Q^{n,m} \circ X^{-1} : m \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega^N)$  is tight. Consequently, as the  $\Sigma$ -marginal of each measure from  $(Q^{n,m})_{m=1}^\infty$  coincides with  $P$ , we deduce from [9, Theorem 2.5] that there exists a subsequence  $(Q^{n, N_m})_{m=1}^\infty$  that converges in the weak-strong sense to a probability measure  $Q^n$ . As explained in the proof of [25, (3.25), p. 190], the limit  $Q^n$  also admits a decomposition of the type (4.7), and  $W^1, \dots, W^N$  remain independent cylindrical Brownian motions under  $Q^n$ , cf. [25, Lemma 2.17].

*Step 4:* For  $g \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{U}_n$  and  $h \in \mathbb{H}_n$ , we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{K}_{n,m}^k(w, \omega, t) &:= g(\langle W_t^{k,n}(w), u \rangle_{\mathbb{U}_n} + \langle X_t^k(\omega), h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n}) - g(\langle W_0^{k,n}(w), u \rangle_{\mathbb{U}_n} + \langle X_0^k(\omega), h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n}) \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \left( g'(\langle W_s^{k,n}(w), u \rangle_{\mathbb{U}_n} + \langle X_s^k(\omega), h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n}) \langle b_{n,m}^k(w, s, X_s(\omega)), h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} g''(\langle W_s^{k,n}(w), u \rangle_{\mathbb{U}_n} + \langle X_s^k(\omega), h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n}) \|u + (\sigma_{n,m}^k)^*(w, s, X_s(\omega))h\|_{\mathbb{U}_n}^2 \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , the map  $(w, \omega) \mapsto \mathbb{K}_{n,\infty}^k(w, \omega, t)$  is a Carathéodory function. Furthermore, whenever  $(\omega^m)_{m=1}^\infty \subset C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}_n^N)$  is a sequence that converges uniformly, it also follows that

$$|\mathbb{K}_{n,m}^k(w, \omega^m, t) - \mathbb{K}_{n,\infty}^k(w, \omega^m, t)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty,$$

where we can apply the dominated convergence theorem thanks to the continuity of  $b_n^k$  and  $\sigma_n^k$ . Using (4.8), it follows from a standard Gronwall argument (see, e.g., [19, pp. 1762 – 1763]) that there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , independent of  $n, m$ , such that

$$(4.9) \quad E^{Q^{n,m}} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}_n^N}^2 \right] \leq C.$$

Notice also that, by Itô's formula,

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{K}_{n,m}^k = \int_0^\cdot g'(\langle W_s^{k,n}, u \rangle_{\mathbb{U}_n} + \langle X_s^k, h \rangle_{\mathbb{H}_n}) \langle u + (\sigma_{n,m}^k)^*(s, X_s)h, dW_s^{k,n} \rangle_{\mathbb{U}_n}.$$

Hence, taking (4.9), (4.10) and the second line from (4.8) into consideration, we may conclude that (for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) the family  $\{Q^{n,m} \circ \mathbb{K}_{n,m}^k(\cdot, \cdot, s)^{-1} : s \in [0, T], m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is uniformly integrable.

---

<sup>4</sup>By this we also mean that the kernel has the measurability property explained below (4.7). In [25, Theorem 1.8] this kernel decomposition follows from the fact that solution measure is *very good*, see [25, Corollary 2.20].

In summary, we deduce from [9, Theorem 3.20] that each  $K_{n,\infty}^k$  is a  $Q^n$ -martingale, and [26, Theorem II.2.42] and a representation result for local martingales (e.g., [34, Corollary 6]) show that, under  $Q^n$ ,

$$X^k = \Pi_n x + \int_0^\cdot b_n^k(s, X_s) ds + \int_0^\cdot \sigma_n^k(s, X_s) dW_s^{k,n},$$

cf. also [23, Theorem 6.3].

*Step 5:* Next, we show that  $Q^n \circ \mathcal{S}_N(X, K)^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$ . Fix some  $p \geq 1$ . By Itô's formula, (4.8) and Young's inequality, we obtain that

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|X_t^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} &= \|\Pi_n x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + 2p \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \langle b_n^k(s, X_s), X_s^k \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\ &\quad + p \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \|\sigma_n^k(s, X_s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2p(p-1) \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-2)} \|(\sigma_n^k)^*(s, X_s) X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2p \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \langle X_s^k, \sigma_n^k(s, X_s) dW_s^{k,n} \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} \\ &\leq \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \left[ 3p\lambda \left( 1 + \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right) - 2p\mathcal{N}(X_s^k) \right] ds \\ &\quad + 2p(p-1) \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \lambda \left( 1 + \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right) ds \\ &\quad + 2p \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \langle X_s^k, \sigma_n^k(s, X_s) dW_s^{k,n} \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} \\ &\leq \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \int_0^t \left[ \lambda p(2p+1) \left( 1 + \left( 2 + \frac{1}{p} \right) \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \frac{p-1}{Np} \sum_{i=1}^N \|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right) - 2p\mathcal{N}_p(X_s^k) \right] ds \\ &\quad + 2p \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \langle X_s^k, \sigma_n^k(s, X_s) dW_s^{k,n} \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using Burkholder's inequality ([27, Theorem 2.5]), we obtain that

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right] &\leq \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \int_0^t \lambda p(2p+1) \left( 1 + \frac{3}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right) ds \\ &\quad + \frac{6p}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^P \left[ \left( \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{4p-2} \|\sigma_n^k(s, X_s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using again (4.8) and Young's inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E^{Q^n} \left[ \left( \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{4p-2} \|\sigma_n^k(s, X_s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ \leq E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X_r^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^p \left( \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \|\sigma_n^k(s, X_s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{12p} E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X_r^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right] + 3p E^{Q^n} \left[ \int_0^t \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2(p-1)} \|\sigma_n^k(s, X_s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}_n; \mathbb{H}_n)}^2 ds \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{12p} E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X_r^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right] + 3p E^{Q^n} \left[ \int_0^t \lambda \left( 1 + \left( 2 + \frac{1}{p} \right) \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \frac{p-1}{Np} \sum_{i=1}^N \|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right) ds \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.12), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right] &\leq 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \int_0^t 2\lambda(p(2p+1) + 16p^2) \left( 1 + \frac{3}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E^{Q^n} [\|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p}] \right) ds \\
&\leq 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \int_0^t 6\lambda p(1 + 18p) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|X_r^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right] \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we deduce from Gronwall's lemma<sup>5</sup> that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} \right] \leq (1 + 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p}) \exp \{ 6\lambda p T (1 + 18p) \}.$$

Finally, taking expectation in (4.11), and using the martingale property of the Itô integral, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^{Q^n} [\|X_T^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p}] &\leq \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \int_0^T \lambda p(2p+1) \left( 1 + \frac{3}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E^{Q^n} [\|X_s^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p}] \right) ds \\
&\quad - \frac{2p}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^{Q^n} \left[ \int_0^T \mathcal{N}_p(X_s^k) ds \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N E^{Q^n} \left[ \int_0^T \mathcal{N}_p(X_s^k) ds \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2p} \left[ \|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p} + \lambda p T (2p+1) (1 + 3(1 + 2\|x\|_{\mathbb{H}}^{2p}) \exp \{ 6\lambda p T (1 + 18p) \}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, putting these estimates together, it follows that  $Q^n \circ \mathcal{S}_N(X, K)^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$ .

*Step 6:* We are in the position to sketch the final step of the proof. First of all, it follows similar to Step 1 of the proof for Lemma 4.4 that the family  $\{Q^n \circ X^{-1} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is tight in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega^N)$ . Thus, as in Step 3 of this proof, there exists a subsequence  $(Q^{M_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  that converges to a probability measure  $Q$  in the weak-strong sense. As before, the measure  $Q$  admits the decomposition (4.7) and  $W^1, \dots, W^N$  remain independent cylindrical Brownian motions under  $Q$  (see again [25, p. 190]). Now, by virtue of Lemma 4.2, we can use a martingale problem argument as in Step 4 above (see also Step 3 from the proof of [19, Theorem 4.5]) to conclude that (4.6) holds under  $Q$ . We omit the details for brevity. Finally,  $Q \circ \mathcal{S}_N(X, K)^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x)$  follows Lemma 4.5 and Step 5.  $\square$

The following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.9.

**Corollary 4.10.** *If Condition 2.1 holds, then  $\mathcal{C}^n(x) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{H}$ .*

<sup>5</sup>Of course, Gronwall's lemma requires that the involved function is integrable. In our case, it is well-known that the expectations are finite (see, e.g., [19] or [32, Lemma 5.1.5]). Alternatively, it would also be possible to work with stopping times. At this point, our main interest is an explicit upper bound to relate  $Q^n$  to the set  $\mathcal{J}(x)$ .

4.4. **Proof of Theorem 2.5 (i).** First of all,  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  is nonempty by Corollary 4.10 and compact by Lemma 4.4. The compactness of  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  follows from Lemma 4.6. Finally, anticipating the following section, the claim  $\mathcal{R}^0(x) \neq \emptyset$  follows from Theorem 2.5 (ii).  $\square$

4.5. **Proof of Theorem 2.5 (ii).** Take a sequence  $(x^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  such that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$  and let  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be such that  $Q^n \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$ . By Lemma 4.4, the set  $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{R}^n(x^n) \subset \bigcup_{n,m=1}^\infty \mathcal{R}^n(x^m) = \mathcal{R}(\{x^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ . Consequently,  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ . It remains to prove that every of its accumulation points is in  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ . To lighten our presentation, we prove that  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  whenever  $Q^n \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^e(\mathcal{P}^e(\Theta))$ . The argument is based on Lemma 4.1.

First of all,

$$Q^0(\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta) : \mu \circ X_0^{-1} = \delta_{x^0}\}) = 1$$

follows as in the proof for Lemma 4.6, i.e., (iii.a) from Lemma 4.1 holds for  $Q^0$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ .

Lemma 4.5 yields that  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}(x^0)$ . In particular, (iii.b) from Lemma 4.1 holds for  $Q^0$ -a.a.  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Theta)$ .

It remains to investigate part (iii.c) from Lemma 4.1. Take  $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \cap [0, T]$ ,  $s < t$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{C}_c^2$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{T}_s$ . We define  $Z^k$  and  $Z$  as in the proof of Lemma 4.6. In particular, recall (4.4). We now prove that  $Q^0$ -a.s.  $Z = 0$ . As  $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}_c^2$  and  $\mathcal{T}_s$  are countable, this implies that almost all realizations of  $Q^0$  satisfy (iii.c) from Lemma 4.1. In summary, we then can conclude that  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ .

The proof of  $Q^0$ -a.s.  $Z = 0$  uses a strategy we learned from [4]. It is divided into two steps. First, we prove that

$$(4.13) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^n} [|Z|] = E^{Q^0} [|Z|],$$

and afterwards, we show that

$$(4.14) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^n} [|Z|^2] = 0.$$

Obviously, (4.13) and (4.14) yield that  $E^{Q^0} [|Z|] = 0$ , which proves  $Q^0$ -a.s.  $Z = 0$ .

*Step 1: Proof of (4.13).* By the triangle inequality, we observe that

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} |E^{Q^n} [|Z|] - E^{Q^0} [|Z|]| &\leq |E^{Q^n} [|Z|] - E^{Q^n} [|Z^k|]| \\ &\quad + |E^{Q^n} [|Z^k|] - E^{Q^0} [|Z^k|]| \\ &\quad + |E^{Q^0} [|Z^k|] - E^{Q^0} [|Z|]| \\ &=: I_{n,k} + II_{n,k} + III_k. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of [5, Theorem 8.10.61] and Lemma 4.7, we have  $II_{n,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $k > 0$ . Next, we discuss the term  $I_{n,k}$ . With  $Q^n = P^n \circ \mathcal{L}_n^{-1}$ ,  $Q^n \in \mathcal{J}(x^n)$  and (4.3), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,k} &\leq \frac{C}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ \int_0^T \int |\mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, r, X_r^i, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))| \mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, r, X_r^i, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))| > k\}} M^i(ds, df) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k^{\gamma-1}} \frac{C}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ \int_0^T \int |\mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, r, X_r^i, \mathcal{X}_n(X_r))|^\gamma M^i(ds, df) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{k^{\gamma-1}}, \end{aligned}$$



where we emphasize that the constant  $C > 0$  is independent of  $n$ . Similarly, using that  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{J}(x^0)$  and (4.3), we obtain that

$$III_k \leq \frac{C}{k^{\gamma-1}}.$$

In summary,  $I_{n,k} + III_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $n$ . Thus, choosing first a large  $k$  and taking then  $n \rightarrow \infty$  shows that  $I_{n,k} + II_{n,k} + III_k$  can be made arbitrarily small, which entails that (4.13) holds.

*Step 2: Proof of (4.14).* For  $r \in [0, T]$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we set

$$K_r^{i,n} := g(\mathbb{V}\langle X_r^i, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - g(\mathbb{V}\langle X_0^i, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) - \int_0^r \int \mathcal{L}_{g,v}(f, u, X_u^i, \mathcal{X}_n(X_u)) M^i(du, df).$$

Notice that

$$E^{Q^n}[Z^2] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ (K_t^{i,n} - K_s^{i,n})(K_t^{j,n} - K_s^{j,n}) \mathfrak{t}(X^i, M^i) \mathfrak{t}(X^j, M^j) \right].$$

Recall from Definition 2.3 that there are independent cylindrical Brownian motions  $W^1, \dots, W^n$  such that  $P^n$ -a.s., for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X_t^k, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x^n, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^t \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) \mathfrak{m}(s, M^k, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(\mathfrak{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(X_s)) dW_s^k, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Itô's formula, we obtain that  $P^n$ -a.s.

$$K^{i,n} = \int_0^{\cdot} g''(\mathbb{V}\langle X_u^i, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*}) \langle \bar{\sigma}^*(\mathfrak{m}(u, M^i), u, X_u^i, \mathcal{X}_n(X_u)) v, dW_u^i \rangle_{\mathbb{U}}.$$

Take  $i \neq j$ . By the independence of  $W^i$  and  $W^j$ , the quadratic variation of  $K^{i,n}$  and  $K^{j,n}$  vanishes. As  $K^{i,n}$  and  $K^{j,n}$  are square integrable  $P^n$ -martingales (see Lemma 4.2), this means that the product  $K^{i,n}K^{j,n}$  is also a  $P^n$ -martingale. Consequently, using that  $K^{i,n}, K^{j,n}$  and  $K^{i,n}K^{j,n}$  are  $P^n$ -martingales (recall that  $\mathfrak{t}$  is  $\mathcal{O}_s$ -measurable), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E^{P^n} \left[ (K_t^{i,n} - K_s^{i,n})(K_t^{j,n} - K_s^{j,n}) \mathfrak{t}(X^i, M^i) \mathfrak{t}(X^j, M^j) \right] \\ &= E^{P^n} \left[ (K_t^{i,n}K_t^{j,n} - K_t^{i,n}K_s^{j,n} - K_s^{i,n}K_t^{j,n} + K_s^{i,n}K_s^{j,n}) \mathfrak{t}(X^i, M^i) \mathfrak{t}(X^j, M^j) \right] \\ &= E^{P^n} \left[ (K_s^{i,n}K_s^{j,n} - K_s^{i,n}K_s^{j,n} - K_s^{i,n}K_s^{j,n} + K_s^{i,n}K_s^{j,n}) \mathfrak{t}(X^i, M^i) \mathfrak{t}(X^j, M^j) \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Burkholder's inequality,  $Q^n \in \mathcal{J}(x^n)$  and (2.5), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} E^{Q^n}[Z^2] &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ (K_t^{i,n} - K_s^{i,n})^2 \mathfrak{t}(X^i, M^i)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ (K_t^{i,n} - K_s^{i,n})^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ \int_s^t \|\bar{\sigma}^*(\mathfrak{m}(u, M^i), u, X_u^i, \mathcal{X}_n(X_u))\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^2 du \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ \int_0^T \lambda \left( 1 + \|X_u^i\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right) du \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{C}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E^{P^n} \left[ \sup_{u \in [0, T]} \|X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

This bound proves (4.14). The proof of Theorem 2.5 (ii) is complete.  $\square$

**4.6. Proof of Theorem 2.5 (iii).** We start with an elementary fact that appears to be well-known ([29, p. 1657]) but we did not find a reference.

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $(E, \mathbf{e})$  be a complete separable metric space and let  $\mathcal{P}^\ell(E)$  be the corresponding  $\ell$ -Wasserstein space for  $\ell \geq 1$ . Assume that  $g: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an upper semicontinuous function such that*

$$\exists x_0 \in E: \quad \mathbf{c} := \sup \left\{ \frac{|g(x)|}{1 + \mathbf{e}(x, x_0)^\ell} : x \in E \right\} < \infty.$$

Let  $(\mu^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}^\ell(E)$  be a sequence such that  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\ell(E)$ . Then,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{\mu^n} [g] \leq E^{\mu^0} [g].$$

*Proof.* By Skorokhod's coupling theorem, on some probability space (whose expectation we denote by  $E$ ), there are random variables  $X^0, X^1, \dots$  with laws  $\mu^0, \mu^1, \dots$  such that a.s.  $X^n \rightarrow X^0$ . Notice that

$$Y^n := \mathbf{c} [1 + \mathbf{e}(X^n, x_0)^\ell] - g(X^n) \geq 0.$$

Hence, Fatou's lemma yields that

$$E \left[ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y^n \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[Y^n].$$

As  $g$  is presumed to be upper semicontinuous, we have a.s.

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y^n = \mathbf{c} [1 + \mathbf{e}(X^0, x_0)^\ell] - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(X^n) \geq \mathbf{c} [1 + \mathbf{e}(X^0, x_0)^\ell] - g(X^0),$$

which implies

$$\mathbf{c} E [1 + \mathbf{e}(X^0, x_0)^\ell] - E[g(X^0)] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[Y^n].$$

As  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\ell(E)$ , we get

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[Y^n] = \mathbf{c} E [1 + \mathbf{e}(X^0, x_0)^\ell] - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[g(X^n)],$$

and finally,

$$-E[g(X^0)] \leq -\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[g(X^n)].$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.5 (iii).* We use the notation from Theorem 2.5 (iii). Using the compactness of  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$ , which is due to Theorem 2.5 (i), and standard properties of the limes superior, there exists a subsequence  $(N_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of  $1, 2, \dots$  and measure  $Q^{N_n} \in \mathcal{R}^{N_n}(x^{N_n})$  such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q [\psi] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^{N_n}} [\psi].$$

By Theorem 2.5 (ii), there is a subsequence of  $(Q^{N_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  that converges in  $\mathcal{P}^\ell(\mathcal{P}^\ell(\Theta))$  to a measure  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ . Recalling that  $\psi$  is upper semicontinuous from  $\mathcal{P}^\ell(\Theta)$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  and that it satisfies the growth condition (2.9), we get from Lemma 4.11 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^{N_n}} [\psi] \leq E^{Q^0} [\psi] \leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} E^Q [\psi].$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.7. Proof of Theorem 2.5 (iv).** The following strategy is inspired by the proof for [29, Theorem 2.12]. In particular, we learned the idea to use the Krein–Milman theorem from that proof. Let us start with an auxiliary result whose proof is postponed to the end of this section.

**Lemma 4.12.** *Assume that the Conditions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Let  $(x^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  be a sequence such that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$  and take  $P \in \mathcal{C}^0(x^0)$ . Then, there exists a sequence  $(Q^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $Q^n \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  such that  $Q^n \rightarrow \delta_P$  in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ .*

With this lemma at hand, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.5 (iv). Let  $(x^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  be such that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$  and take  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ . Furthermore, let  $(x^{M_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  be a subsequence of  $(x^n)_{n=1}^\infty$ . Recall from Theorem 2.5 (i) that the set  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  is nonempty and compact in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ . Furthermore, it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  is convex. We denote its extreme points by  $\text{ex}(\mathcal{R}^0(x^0))$ . Thanks to the Krein–Milman theorem ([2, Theorem 7.68]), we have

$$\mathcal{U}^0(x^0) = \overline{\text{co}}[\text{ex}(\mathcal{R}^0(x^0))],$$

where  $\overline{\text{co}}[\cdot]$  denotes the closure (in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ ) of the convex hull. Let

$$\Delta(\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}^0(x^0)) : \mu = \sum_{k=1}^2 \lambda^k \delta_{\mu^k}, \lambda^k \geq 0, \lambda^1 + \lambda^2 = 1, \mu^k \in \mathcal{C}^0(x^0) \right\}.$$

Thanks to [42, Theorem 2.1, Examples 2.1 (a)], we have

$$\text{ex}(\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) \subset \Delta(\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)).$$

Hence, there exists a sequence

$$(R^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{co}[\{\delta_P : P \in \mathcal{C}^0(x^0)\}]$$

such that  $R^n \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ . We write

$$R^n = \sum_{k=1}^{p_n} a_k^n \delta_{P_{n,k}}, \quad \text{with } p^n \in \mathbb{N}, a_k^n \geq 0, \sum_{k=1}^{p_n} a_k^n = 1, P_{n,k} \in \mathcal{C}^0(x^0).$$

By Lemma 4.12, there are sequences  $(Q_{n,k}^m)_{m=1}^\infty$  such that  $Q_{n,k}^m \in \mathcal{R}^m(x^m)$  and  $Q_{n,k}^m \rightarrow \delta_{P_{n,k}}$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ . Now, set

$$R^{n,m} := \sum_{k=1}^{p_n} a_k^n Q_{n,k}^m.$$

Recall from Corollary 4.3 that  $\mathcal{C}^{M_m}(x^{M_m})$  is convex. Hence,  $\mathcal{R}^{M_m}(x^{M_m})$  is also convex and  $R^{n,m} \in \mathcal{R}^{M_m}(x^{M_m})$ . Furthermore, it is clear that  $R^{n,m} \rightarrow R^n$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  in  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ . To keep our notation simple, let  $w$  be the  $\varrho$ -Wasserstein metric on  $\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\mathcal{P}^{\varrho}(\Theta))$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists an  $N_n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $w(R^{n,N_n}, R^n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$ . Hence,

$$w(R^{n,N_n}, Q^0) \leq w(R^{n,N_n}, R^n) + w(R^n, Q^0) \leq \frac{1}{n} + w(R^n, Q^0) \rightarrow 0.$$

Consequently, as  $R^{n,N_n} \in \mathcal{R}^{M_{N_n}}(x^{M_{N_n}})$ , the sequence  $(R^{n,N_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  has the claimed properties. The proof of Theorem 2.5 (iv) is complete.  $\square$

It is left to prove Lemma 4.12.

*Proof of Lemma 4.12.* Let  $(x^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  be a sequence such that  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$  and take  $R \in \mathcal{C}^0(x^0)$ . By definition, there exists a standard extension  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \in [0,T]}, P)$  of  $(\Theta, \mathcal{O}, \mathbf{O}, R)$ , supporting a standard cylindrical Brownian motion  $W$ , such that  $P$ -a.s., for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^\cdot \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{V}} b(f, s, X_s, R_s) \mathbf{m}(s, M, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^\cdot \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M), s, X_s, R_s) dW_s, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $R_s = R \circ X_s^{-1} = P \circ X_s^{-1}$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , consider the  $n$ -fold product  $(\Sigma^n, \mathcal{A}^n, (\mathcal{A}_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}, P^n)$ , where

$$\mathcal{A}_t^n := \bigcap_{s > t} \bigotimes_{k=1}^n \mathcal{A}_s, \quad P^n := \bigotimes_{k=1}^n P.$$

With obvious notation, we have  $P^n$ -a.s., for  $k = 1, \dots, n$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle X^k, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^\cdot \left\langle \int b(f, s, X_s^k, R_s) \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^\cdot \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, R_s) dW_s^k, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

where, by construction,  $W^1, \dots, W^n$  are independent cylindrical Brownian motions. Finally, we set

$$\Psi := \Sigma^n \times \Omega^n, \quad \mathcal{G}_t := \mathcal{A}^n \otimes \mathcal{F}^n, \quad \mathcal{G}_t := \bigcap_{s > t} \mathcal{A}_s^n \otimes \mathcal{F}_s^n.$$

We denote the coordinate process on the second coordinate by  $(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$ . By Proposition 4.9, there exists a probability measure  $Q^n$  on  $(\Psi, \mathcal{A})$  such that  $Q^n \circ \mathcal{S}_n(Y, M)^{-1} \in \mathcal{J}(x^n)$ , where  $M := (M^1, \dots, M^n)$ , and  $Q^n$ -a.s., for all  $k = 1, \dots, n$  and  $v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\langle Y^k, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} &= \mathbb{V}\langle x^n, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} + \int_0^\cdot \left\langle \int b(f, s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s)) \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df), v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{V}^*} ds \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^\cdot \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s)) dW_s^k, v \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,  $Q^n$  has a decomposition of the type (4.7), which entails that the dynamics of  $X^1, \dots, X^n$  are still valid under  $Q^n$ , see [22, Proposition 10.46].

We notice that  $R^n := Q^n \circ \mathcal{S}_n(Y, M)^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$ . In the following, we prove that  $R^n \rightarrow \delta_R$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$ . This finishes the proof. We split the remainder into two steps.

*Step 1.* Notice that  $\{R^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  by Lemma 4.4. Therefore,  $R^n \rightarrow \delta_R$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  follows once we prove that all accumulation points of  $(R^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  coincide with  $\delta_R$ . Let us explain our argument for this in detail. First of all, we prove that  $\delta_R, R^n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$ , where

$$\Upsilon := \left\{ \omega \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{X}) : \int_0^T \|\omega(s)\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha ds < \infty \right\} \times \mathbb{M},$$

which we endow (for a moment) with the metric  $\mathbf{d} + r$ . At this point, recall that

$$\mathbf{d}(\omega, \alpha) = \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{V}} + \left( \int_0^T \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{V}}^\alpha ds \right)^{1/\alpha},$$

and that  $r$  is a metric on  $\mathbb{M}$  that induces its topology. We notice that  $\Upsilon \in \mathcal{B}(\Theta)$  (and consequently, also  $\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta))$ ) by [39, Theorem 5, p. 101] (using that  $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ ). If we have a sequence  $(\mu^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$ , then  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Theta))$  if and only if  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$ , cf. [16, Corollary 3.3.2]. Consequently, provided  $\delta_R, R^n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$ , it suffices to prove that all accumulation points of  $(R^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$  coincide with  $\delta_R$ .

Now, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}'(\omega, \alpha) &:= \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{V}}, \\ \mathbf{d}^*(\omega, \alpha) &:= \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{X}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the space  $\Upsilon$ , the topologies generated either by  $\mathbf{d} + r$  or  $\mathbf{d}^* + r$  are both stronger than those generated by  $\mathbf{d}' + r$  (using that  $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ ). Furthermore, we notice that the Borel  $\sigma$ -fields on  $\Upsilon$  (and

also on  $\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon)$  coincide for all these topologies (when  $\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon)$  is endowed with the weak topology corresponding to one of these topologies), see [39, Corollary 2, p. 101].<sup>6</sup>

Take a sequence  $(\mu^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$  such that  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$  when  $\Upsilon$  is endowed with the topology generated by  $\mathbf{d} + r$  and  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^*$  when  $\Upsilon$  is endowed with the topology generated by  $\mathbf{d}^* + r$ . Then, we also have  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$  and  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^*$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$  when  $\Upsilon$  is endowed with the topology generated by  $\mathbf{d}' + r$ . By the uniqueness of the limit, we get that  $\mu = \mu^*$ .

Consequently, to complete our proof, it suffices to prove that  $R^n \rightarrow \delta_R$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$  when  $\Upsilon$  is endowed with  $\mathbf{d}^* + r$ , and that these measures are really supported on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$ , of course. This is program of our second (and final) step.

*Step 2.* In the following, we tailor a coupling idea as outlined in [30, 33] to our setting. Notice that  $Q^n$ -a.s.  $X^k, Y^k \in L^\alpha([0, T]; \Upsilon)$ . By virtue of Condition 2.1 (i) and 2.2, we also observe that the dynamics of  $X^k$  and  $Y^k$  hold in  $\Upsilon^*$  up to a  $dt \otimes Q^n$  null set. Moreover, by the integrability properties of  $X^k$  and  $Y^k$ , and Condition 2.2 (ii), we obtain that  $Q^n$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int \|b(f, s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s))\|_{\Upsilon^*}^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)} \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df) ds < \infty, \\ \int_0^T \int \|b(f, s, X_s^k, R_s)\|_{\Upsilon^*}^{\alpha/(1-\alpha)} \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df) ds < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recalling that  $\mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{X}$ , we observe that the Itô integrals within the dynamics of  $X^k$  and  $Y^k$  are  $\mathbb{X}$ -valued (local) martingales.

In summary, we deduce from the Krylov–Rozovskii Itô formula ([27, Theorem I.3.1]) that  $(X^k, M^k)$  and  $(Y^k, M^k)$  have  $Q^n$ -a.s. paths in  $\Upsilon$  and, together with Condition 2.2 (ii), that  $Q^n$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Y_t^k - X_t^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 - \|x^n - x^0\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \\ &= \int_0^t 2 \langle Y_s^n - X_s^k, (\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s)) - \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, R_s)) dW_s^k \rangle_{\mathbb{X}} \\ & \quad + \int_0^t 2 \left\langle \int_{\Upsilon^*} (b(f, s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s)) - b(f, s, X_s^k, R_s)) \mathbf{m}(s, M^k, df), Y_s^k - X_s^k \right\rangle_{\Upsilon} ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \|\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s)) - \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, R_s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{X})}^2 ds \\ & \leq \int_0^t 2 \langle Y_s^k - X_s^k, (\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, Y_s^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_s)) - \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(s, M^k), s, X_s^k, R_s)) dW_s^k \rangle_{\mathbb{X}} \\ & \quad + \int_0^t C \left( \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_s), R_s)^2 \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using Burkholder's inequality, again Condition 2.2 and Young's inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left| \int_0^s 2 \langle Y_u^k - X_u^k, (\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(u, M^k), u, Y_u^k, \mathcal{X}_n(Y_u)) - \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}(u, M^k), u, X_u^k, R_u)) dW_u^k \rangle_{\mathbb{X}} \right| \right] \\ & \leq CE^{Q^n} \left[ \left( \int_0^t \|Y_u^k - X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 [\|Y_u^k - X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_u), R_u)^2] du \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ & \leq CE^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}} \left( \int_0^t [\|Y_u^k - X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_u), R_u)^2] du \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ & \leq E^{Q^n} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \frac{C}{2} \int_0^t [\|Y_u^k - X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_u), R_u)^2] du \right]. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>6</sup>Notice that  $\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon)$  is really the same space irrespective of the topology of  $\Upsilon$ , as their Borel  $\sigma$ -fields coincide.

In summary, we conclude that

$$E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \right] \leq 2\|x^n - x^0\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + CE^{Q^n} \left[ \int_0^t [\|Y_u^k - X_u^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_u), R_u)^2] du \right].$$

Gronwall's lemma yields that

$$(4.16) \quad E^{Q^n} \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \right] \leq C \left( \|x^n - x^0\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \int_0^t E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_s), R_s)^2 \right] ds \right).$$

For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , define

$$\mathbf{w}_t(\mu, \nu)^2 := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \iint \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\omega(s) - \alpha(s)\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \pi(d\omega, d\alpha),$$

where  $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$  denotes the set of all couplings of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . Using the coupling  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{(Y^k, X^k)}$ , we observe that

$$(4.17) \quad \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(Y), \mathcal{X}_n(X))^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2.$$

Hence, using the triangle inequality, (4.16) and (4.17), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(Y), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(Y), \mathcal{X}_n(X))^2 \right] + 2E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(X), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2E^{Q^n} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|Y_s^k - X_s^k\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \right] + 2E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(X), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \\ & \leq C \left( \|x^n - x^0\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \int_0^t E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_2^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{X}_n(Y_s), R_s)^2 \right] ds + E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(X), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \right) \\ & \leq C \left( \|x^n - x^0\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + \int_0^t E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_s(\mathcal{X}_n(Y), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] ds + E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_t(\mathcal{X}_n(X), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall's lemma once again, we get that

$$(4.18) \quad E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_T(\mathcal{X}_n(Y), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \leq C \left( \|x^n - x^0\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 + E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_T(\mathcal{X}_n(X), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \right).$$

Under  $Q^n$ , the processes  $X^1, X^2, \dots, X^n$  are independent with law  $R \circ X^{-1}$ . Hence, as also

$$E^R \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{X}}^2 \right] \leq CE^R \left[ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|X_s\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right] < \infty,$$

by the definition of  $\mathcal{G}$ , it follows from [30, Corollary 2.14] that

$$E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_T(\mathcal{X}_n(X), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In summary, we conclude from (4.18) that

$$E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_T(\mathcal{X}_n(Y), R \circ X^{-1})^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Endowing  $\Upsilon$  with the metric  $\mathbf{d}^* + \mathbf{r}$ , using the triangle inequality, and once again [30, Corollary 2.14], we conclude that

$$E^{Q^n} \left[ \mathbf{w}_2^{\Upsilon}(\mathcal{S}_n(Y, M), R)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let  $\Xi := C([0, T]; \mathbb{X}) \times \mathbb{M}$ , and endow this space with the topology induced by  $\mathbf{d}^* + \mathbf{r}$  (which turns it into a Polish space). Then, we proved that  $R^n \rightarrow \delta_R$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Xi))$  (as on this space Wasserstein convergence implies weak convergence, see [41, Theorem 6.9]). Finally, it follows (again) from

[16, Corollary 3.3.2] that  $R^n \rightarrow \delta_R$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Upsilon))$  (where  $\Upsilon$  is endowed with  $\mathbf{d}^* + r$ ). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.8. Proof of Theorem 2.5 (v).** We use the notation from Theorem 2.5 (v). First, there exists a subsequence  $(N_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of  $1, 2, \dots$  such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q[\psi] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^{N_n}(x^{N_n})} E^Q[\psi].$$

Take an arbitrary measure  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ . Then, by Theorem 2.5 (iv), there exists a subsequence  $(M_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of the subsequence  $(N_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  and measures  $Q^{M_n} \in \mathcal{R}^{M_n}(x^{M_n})$  such that  $Q^{M_n} \rightarrow Q^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Omega))$ . By the assumptions on  $\psi$ , and Lemma 4.11,

$$\begin{aligned} E^{Q^0}[\psi] &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{Q^{M_n}}[\psi] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^{M_n}(x^{M_n})} E^Q[\psi] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^{N_n}(x^{N_n})} E^Q[\psi] \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q[\psi]. \end{aligned}$$

As  $Q^0$  was arbitrary, we get

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} E^Q[\psi] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q[\psi].$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

**4.9. Proof of Theorem 2.5 (vi).** By Theorem 2.5 (iii) and (v), for every sequence  $(x^n)_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}$  with  $x^n \rightarrow x^0$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ , we get

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} E^Q[\psi] \rightarrow \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} E^Q[\psi], \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now, it follows from [38, Theorem on pp. 98–99] that  $x \mapsto \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} E^Q[\psi]$  is continuous and that (2.10) holds. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**4.10. Proof of Theorem 2.5 (vii).** To keep our notation simple, we write  $w := w_e^{\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta)}$ . By virtue of [38, Theorem on pp. 98–99], it suffices to prove that

$$h(\mathcal{R}^n(x^n), \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) = \max \left\{ \max_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} w(Q, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)), \max_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} w(Q, \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)) \right\} \rightarrow 0.$$

Notice that the maxima are attained by the compactness of the sets  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ .

We start investigating the first term. By the compactness of  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a measure  $Q^n \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)$  such that

$$\max_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} w(Q, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) = w(Q^n, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)).$$

By Theorem 2.5 (ii), every subsequence of  $1, 2, \dots$  has a further subsequence  $(N_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  such that  $(Q^{N_n})_{n=1}^\infty$  converges in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  to a measure  $Q^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ . Now, by the continuity of the distance function, we have

$$w(Q^{N_n}, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) \rightarrow w(Q^0, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) = 0.$$

We conclude that

$$\max_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)} w(Q, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) = w(Q^n, \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We turn to the second term. By the compactness of  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a measure  $R^n \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  such that

$$\max_{Q \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)} w(Q, \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)) = w(R^n, \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)).$$

Let  $(N_1^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be an arbitrary subsequence of  $1, 2, \dots$ . Again by compactness of  $\mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ , there exists a subsequence  $(N_2^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (N_1^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  such that  $(R^{N_2^n})_{n=1}^\infty$  converges in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$  to a measure  $R^0 \in \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$ . By Theorem 2.5 (iv), there exists another subsequence  $(N_3^n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset (N_2^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  and measures  $(Q^{N_3^n})_{n=1}^\infty$  such that  $Q^{N_3^n} \in \mathcal{R}^{N_3^n}(x^{N_3^n})$  and  $Q^{N_3^n} \rightarrow R^0$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\mathcal{P}^\varrho(\Theta))$ . Finally,

$$w(R^{N_3^n}, \mathcal{R}^{N_3^n}(x^{N_3^n})) \leq w(R^{N_3^n}, Q^{N_3^n}) \leq w(R^{N_3^n}, R^0) + w(R^0, Q^{N_3^n}) \rightarrow 0.$$

As  $(N_1^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  was arbitrary, this proves that

$$w(R^n, \mathcal{R}^n(x^n)) \rightarrow 0.$$

In summary,  $\mathcal{R}^n(x^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^0(x^0)$  in the Hausdorff metric topology. The proof is complete.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams. *Sobolev Spaces*. Academic Press, 2nd ed., 2003.
- [2] C. D. Aliprantis and K. B. Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 3rd ed., 2006.
- [3] V. Barbu, G. Da Prato and M. Röckner. *Stochastic Porous Media Equations*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2016.
- [4] A. G. Bhatt, G. Kallianpur, R. L. Karandikar and J. Xiong. On interacting systems of Hilber-space-valued diffusions. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 37:151–188, 1998.
- [5] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [6] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I, II*. Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [7] P. Clement and W. Desch. An elementary proof for the triangle inequality for the Wasserstein metric. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 136(1):333–339, 2008.
- [8] A. Cosso, F. Gozzi, I. Kharroubi, H. Pham and M. Rosetolati. Optimal control of path-dependent McKean-Vlasov SDEs in infinite dimension. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(4): 2863–2918, 2023.
- [9] D. Crien, P. Pfaffelhuber and T. Schmidt. The martingale problem method revisited. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28(19):1–46, 2023.
- [10] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [11] C. Dellacherie and P. A. Meyer. *Probability and Potential*. North-Holland Publishing Company - Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1978.
- [12] M. F. Djete, D. Possamai and X. Tan. McKean–Vlasov optimal control: limit theory and equivalence between different formulations. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(4):2891–2930, 2022.
- [13] N. El Karoui, D. Nguyen and M. Jeanblanc-Picqué. Compactification methods in the control of degenerate diffusions: existence of an optimal control. *Stochastics*, 20(3):169–219, 1987.
- [14] N. El Karoui, D. Nguyen and M. Jeanblanc-Picqué. Existence of an optimal Markovian filter for the control under partial observations. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, 26(5):1025–1061, 1988.
- [15] N. El Karoui and X. Tan. Capacities, measurable selection and dynamic programming part II: application in stochastic control problems. arXiv:1310.3364v2, 2015.
- [16] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, 2005.



- [17] E. A. Feinberg, P. O. Kasyanov and Y. Liang. Fatou’s lemma for weakly converging measures under the uniform integrability condition. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 64(4):615–630, 2020.
- [18] P. K. Fritz and N. B. Victor. *Multidimensional Stochastic Processes as Rough Paths*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [19] B. Goldys, M. Röckner and X. Zhang. Martingale solutions and Markov selections for stochastic partial differential equations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 119:1725–1764, 2009.
- [20] W. Hong, S. Li and W. Liu. McKean-Vlasov stochastic partial differential equations: existence, uniqueness and propagation of chaos. arXiv:2306.15508, 2023.
- [21] S. Hu and N. S. Papageorgiou. *Handbook of Multivalued Analysis*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- [22] J. Jacod. *Calcul stochastique et problèmes de martingales*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1979.
- [23] J. Jacod. Weak and strong solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Stochastics*, 3:171–191, 1980.
- [24] J. Jacod and J. Mémin. Sur un type de convergence intermédiaire entre la convergence en loi et la convergence en probabilité. *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg*, 15:529–546, 1981.
- [25] J. Jacod and J. Mémin. Weak and strong solutions of stochastic differential equations: Existence and stability. In D. Williams, editor, *Stochastic Integrals*, volume 851 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 169–212. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1981.
- [26] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2nd ed., 2003.
- [27] N. V. Krylov and B. L. Rozovskii. Stochastic evolution equations. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 16:1233–1277, 1981.
- [28] D. Lacker. Mean field games via controlled martingale problems: Existence of Markovian equilibria. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125:2856–2894, 2015.
- [29] D. Lacker. Limit theory for controlled McKean–Vlasov dynamics. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, 55(3):1641–1672, 2017.
- [30] D. Lacker. Mean field games and interacting particle systems. Lecture notes, Columbia University, 2018.
- [31] W. Liu and M. Röckner. SPDE in Hilbert spaces with locally monotone coefficients. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 259:2902–2922, 2010.
- [32] W. Liu and M. Röckner. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: An Introduction*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2015.
- [33] S. Méléard. *Asymptotic behaviour of some interacting particle systems; McKean-Vlasov and Boltzmann models* D. Talay, L. Tubaro (eds.), Probabilistic models for nonlinear partial differential equations, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 42–96, 1996.
- [34] M. Ondreját. Brownian representations of cylindrical local martingales, martingale problem and strong Markov property of weak solutions of SPDEs in Banach spaces. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 55:1003–1039, 2005.
- [35] É. Pardoux. *Equations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques monotones*. Thèse, University Paris-Sud, 1975.
- [36] É. Pardoux. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: An Introduction*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2021.
- [37] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis*. Academic Press, revised and enlarged edition, 1980.
- [38] R. Remmert. *Theory of Complex Functions*. Springer Science+Business Media New York, 1991.

- [39] L. Schwartz. *Radon Measures on Arbitrary Topological Spaces and Cylindrical Measures*. Oxford University Press, 1973.
- [40] A.-S. Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In P.-L. Hennequin, editor, *Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX — 1989*, 165–251, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991.
- [41] C. Villani. *Optimal Transport: Old and New*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [42] G. Winkler. Extreme points of moment sets. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 13(4):581–587, 1988.

ALBERT-LUDWIGS UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG, ERNST-ZERMELO-STR. 1, 79104 FREIBURG, GERMANY  
Email address: david.criens@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de