

# VARIATIONAL CONVERGENCE OF EXCHANGE-DRIVEN STOCHASTIC PARTICLE SYSTEMS IN THE THERMODYNAMIC LIMIT

CHUN YIN LAM AND ANDRÉ SCHLICHTING

**ABSTRACT.** We consider the thermodynamic limit of mean-field stochastic particle systems on a complete graph. The evolution of occupation number at each vertex is driven by particle exchange with its rate depending on the population of the starting vertex and the destination vertex, including zero-range and misanthrope process. We show that under a detailed balance condition and suitable growth assumptions on the exchange rate, the evolution equation of the law of the particle density can be seen as a generalised gradient flow equation related to the large deviation rate functional.

We show the variational convergence of the gradient structures based on the energy dissipation principle, which coincides with the large deviation rate function of the finite system. The convergence of the system in this variational sense is established based on compactness of the density and flux and  $\Gamma$ -lower-semicontinuity of the energy dissipation functional along solutions to the continuity equation. The driving free energy  $\Gamma$ -converges in the thermodynamic limit, after taking possible condensation phenomena into account.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The particle system and its thermodynamic limit	2
1.2. Relation to the literature	4
1.3. Assumptions	6
1.4. Detailed balance and equilibria	7
1.5. Gradient structures and variational characterisation of solutions	8
1.6. Main results	11
2. The exchange metric	14
3. The exchange driven growth model as mean field equation	17
3.1. Exchange continuity equation	17
3.2. Gradient flow structure for the exchange driven growth model	18
4. Forward Kolmogorov equation	24
4.1. Finite particle continuity equation	24
4.2. Gradient flow structure for the finite particle system	24
5. Liouville equation	29
5.1. Superposition principle for the infinite particle continuity equation	29
5.2. Gradient flow structure for the Liouville equation	31
6. EDP convergence	33
6.1. Compactness of curves	34
6.2. Compactness of fluxes	37
6.3. Convergence towards the infinite particle continuity equation	41
6.4. Lower semi- and continuity of energy via equivalence of ensembles	42
6.5. Recovery sequence for the energy	48
6.6. Lower semicontinuity of dissipation potentials	51
6.7. Proof of main results from Section 1.6	54
References	56

---

INSTITUTE FOR ANALYSIS AND NUMERICS, UNIVERSITY OF MÜNSTER, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* {c.lam,a.schlichting}@uni-muenster.de.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. The particle system and its thermodynamic limit.

*The finite stochastic particle system.* We consider particle models, in which one particle jumps at a time from a site to another chosen uniformly at random with a rate depending on the number of particle at the departing and arriving sites. More precisely, we consider  $N$  indistinguishable particles on a complete graph with  $L$  sites, which in the present context are also called *boxes*. The system is described by counting the number of particles on

$$\eta \in V^{N,L} := \left\{ \eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^L : \sum_{x=1}^L \eta_x = N \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

The infinitesimal generator of the jump process with state space  $V^{N,L}$ , for any  $f : V^{N,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}^{N,L} f(\eta) := \frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{x,y=1}^L K(\eta_x, \eta_y) (f(\eta^{x,y}) - f(\eta)), \quad (1.2)$$

with  $\eta^{x,y} := \eta - \mathbf{e}_x + \mathbf{e}_y$  is the system after a particle jump from the  $x$ -th box to the  $y$ -th box and  $\mathbf{e}_x \in \mathbb{N}_0^L$  is the  $x$ -th canonical unit vector. We denote the edge set by

$$E^{N,L} := \{(\eta, x, y) \in V^{N,L} \times \{1, \dots, L\} \times \{1, \dots, L\} : \eta^{x,y} \in V^{N,L}\}. \quad (1.3)$$

The kernel  $K : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  in the generator (1.2) determines the jump rate  $K(\eta_x, \eta_y)$  for a particle jumping from a box containing  $\eta_x$  particles to a box contain  $\eta_y$  particles. The overall prefactor  $\frac{1}{L-1}$  is the uniform rate to jump to any of the  $L-1$  neighbours from the given box and shows the mean-field scaling of the equation.

*Cluster size description.* We say the particles in the same box form a cluster and call the number of particles in the box its cluster size. Since the jump rate depends on the cluster size of not only the departing box but also the arriving box, the model is a generalisation of the zero-range process [63] and was introduced under the name *misanthrope processes* in [16].

Thanks to the mean-field setting in (1.2), the kernel does not depend on the label of the box so we can use the vector  $c = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_N) \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{N}_0)^{N+1}$ , where  $c_k$  is the ratio of boxes with  $k$  particles out of the  $L$  boxes to keep track of the dynamics without loss of information. Therefore we will mostly focus on the *cluster size* description. The empirical probability measure for the cluster size distribution for any  $\eta \in V^{N,L}$  is given by

$$C^L[\eta] := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{x=1}^L \delta_{\eta_x}. \quad (1.4)$$

The state space for the cluster size distributions is precisely

$$C^L[V^{N,L}] = \left\{ c \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{N}_0)^{N+1} : \sum_{k=1}^N c_k k = \frac{N}{L} \right\} =: \hat{V}^{N,L} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{N/L}, \quad (1.5)$$

where for any  $\rho \geq 0$ , we denote the probability measure on  $\mathbb{N}_0$  with first moment  $\rho$  by

$$\mathcal{P}_\rho := \left\{ c \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k c_k = \rho \right\}. \quad (1.6)$$

We lift the dynamics induced by the generator (1.2) on particle position to a generator on the cluster size. This is done by the consistency relation  $\mathcal{Q}^{N,L}(G \circ C^L)(\eta) =: \mathcal{Q}^{N,L}G(c)$  for any  $\eta \in V^{N,L}$  such that  $C^L(\eta) = c$  and for any function  $G : \hat{V}^{N,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then the lifted generator is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}^{N,L}G(c) = L \sum_{(k,l):(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \kappa^L[c](k, l-1) \hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L G(c). \quad (1.7)$$

Here,  $\hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L G(c)$  is the discrete gradient obtained by the difference between the resultant state from  $c$  after an exchange labelled by  $(k, l) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  and is given by

$$\hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L G(c) := G(c^{k,l-1}) - G(c) \quad \text{with} \quad c^{k,l-1} := c + L^{-1} \gamma^{k,l-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{k,l-1} := \mathbf{e}_{k-1} + \mathbf{e}_l - \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_{l-1}. \quad (1.8)$$

The edge set  $\hat{E}^{N,L}$  containing all the possible transitions between states is given by

$$\hat{E}^{N,L} := \{(c, k, l) \in \hat{V}^{N,L} \times \{1, \dots, N\} \times \{1, \dots, N\} : \{c, c^{k,l-1}\} \subset \hat{V}^{N,L}\}. \quad (1.9)$$

Finally, the jump rates  $\kappa^L : \hat{V}^{N,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0}$  are given by

$$\kappa^L[c](k, l-1) := \frac{L}{L-1} c_k (c_{l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{k,l-1}) K(k, l-1) \quad \text{for} \quad (c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}. \quad (1.10)$$

The (dual) infinitesimal generator, denoted by  $(\mathcal{Q}^{N,L})^*$ , of the finite Markov jump process determines the evolution of the law of the cluster size distribution  $c$  in the finite system via the *forward Kolmogorov equation (FKE)*

$$\partial_t \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} = (\mathcal{Q}^{N,L})^* \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}.$$

The gradient structure for the variational formulation is based on the decomposition of the forward Kolmogorov equation into a continuity equation

$$\partial_t \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} + L \widehat{\text{div}}^L \hat{\mathbb{J}}_t^{N,L} = 0, \quad (\text{FKE}_N)$$

with the reference net flux  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_t^{N,L} = \hat{\mathbb{J}}_t^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}]$  given by

$$\hat{\mathbb{J}}_t^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}](c, k, l-1) := \frac{1}{2} (\kappa^L[c](k, l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) - \kappa^L[c^{k,l-1}](l, k-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})). \quad (1.11)$$

Hereby, the divergence operator  $\widehat{\text{div}}^L$  is defined as the dual operator of the discrete gradient  $\hat{\nabla}^L$  in (1.8) by

$$\widehat{\text{div}}^L \mathbb{J}^{N,L}(c) = \sum_{(k,l):(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \left( \mathbb{J}^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) - \mathbb{J}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}, l, k-1) \right). \quad (1.12)$$

*Mean field system.* The law of large number result by Grosskinsky and Jatuviyapornchai [32, Theorem 1] in the *thermodynamic limit*, that is along any sequence  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$  as  $N, L \rightarrow \infty$ , states that the empirical process  $(C^L[\eta(t)])_{t \geq 0}$  converges to the solution of a *mean field rate equation (MFE)*.

In the present situation, this is a system of non-linear coupled ordinary differential equations, also called the *exchange-driven growth (EDG) model* [8], given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{c}_k &= \sum_{l \geq 1} K(l, k-1) c_l c_{k-1} - \sum_{l \geq 1} K(k, l-1) c_k c_{l-1} \\ &\quad - \sum_{l \geq 1} K(l, k) c_l c_k + \sum_{l \geq 1} K(k+1, l-1) c_{k+1} c_{l-1}, \end{aligned} \quad \text{for } k \geq 0. \quad (\text{EDG})$$

Note that the deterministic set of equations (EDG) is the reaction rate equation (see e.g. [30]) with mass-action kinetics for the reaction network

$$\{k-1\} + \{l\} \xrightarrow{\frac{K(l, k-1)}{K(k, l-1)}} \{k\} + \{l-1\}, \quad \text{for } k, l \geq 1. \quad (1.13)$$

It describes the time evolution of concentrations of finite-size clusters, i.e. the bulk of the system, on a *mesoscopic scale*. Basic mathematical properties regarding the well-posedness and the long-time behaviour of the system (EDG) are investigated in [23, 61, 24, 18].

The system (EDG) also possesses a continuity equation structure respecting the two conserved quantities: volume and mass, implied from the reaction network (1.13). To keep track of this,

we introduce the exchange gradient  $\bar{\nabla}$  and the exchange divergence  $\bar{\text{div}}$  as the negative dual of the former, for a function  $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a flux  $j \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0)$ ,

$$\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} f := f \cdot \gamma^{k,l-1} = f_{k-1} - f_k + f_l - f_{l-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\text{div}} j := - \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} j_{k,l-1} \gamma^{k,l-1}. \quad (1.14)$$

With this definition, we can rewrite (EDG) as a continuity equation for a reference net flux  $\bar{j}$  via

$$\partial_t c_t + \bar{\text{div}} \bar{j}_t = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{j}_t(k, l-1) := \bar{j}[c_t](k, l-1) := \frac{1}{2}(\kappa[c_t]k, l-1) - \kappa[c_t]l, k-1), \quad (\text{MFE})$$

where the uni-directional flux  $\kappa : \mathcal{P}_{<\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0}$  is given by

$$\kappa[c](k, l-1) := c_k c_{l-1} K(k, l-1). \quad (1.15)$$

If  $\mathbb{C}_t$  denotes the probability distribution for the family of solutions to (MFE) at time  $t$  starting at a random initial state given by  $\mathbb{C}_0$ , then it formally satisfies the Liouville Equation (LiE), which can be also formulated as a continuity equation with reference flux  $\bar{\mathbb{J}}_t = \bar{\mathbb{J}}[\mathbb{C}_t]$  given by

$$\partial_t \mathbb{C}_t + \bar{\text{div}}^\infty \bar{\mathbb{J}}_t = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{\mathbb{J}}_t(\text{dc}, k, l-1) := \bar{j}[c](k, l-1) \mathbb{C}_t(\text{dc}), \quad (\text{LiE})$$

where the lifted exchange divergence operator  $\bar{\text{div}}^\infty$  is defined as the dual operator of the lifted gradient operators  $\bar{\nabla} \nabla^\infty$  defined for a smooth cylindrical test-function  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_{<\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} L \hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L \Phi(c) = (\partial_{c_{k-1}} - \partial_{c_k} + \partial_{c_l} - \partial_{c_{l-1}}) \Phi(c) \quad (1.16)$$

$$\text{with the infinite gradient } \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) := (\partial_{c_k} \Phi(c))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \quad (1.17)$$

and  $\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1}$  the exchange gradient defined in (1.14).

Since (LiE) is the evolution of the law of cluster size distribution in the mean field equation, it is expected to be the limit of (FKE $_N$ ) as  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$ . In contrast to the finite state space  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$ , the relevant spaces in the limit are probability measures with first moment constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\rho &:= \left\{ c \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k c_k = \rho \right\} \subset \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}} := \left\{ c \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k c_k \leq \bar{\rho} \right\} \\ &\subset \mathcal{P}_{<\infty} := \left\{ c \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k c_k < +\infty \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

where  $\bar{\rho} = \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} N/L$ . One crucial tool in our convergence analysis is establishing the rigorous connection between the solution of the Liouville equation (LiE) and the solution of the mean-field equation (MFE) via a *superposition principle* (Theorem 1.9), which is already apparent from the double gradient structure in (1.16).

**1.2. Relation to the literature.** The goal of the present work is to rigorously link suitable variational formulations of the equation (FKE $_N$ ) with (LiE) and (MFE) based on the cosh gradient structure [48, 41, 53, 55] for the Markov jump process under a detailed balance condition.

The ideas to view the evolution equation of jump process as a gradient flow of some functional defined on curves and to show the convergence of finite particle gradient structure to a mean field equation have been well-established in the literature, see for instance: [21, 22] for mean-field limits toward McKean-Vlasov on finite graphs equations, [60] for the macroscopic limit of the related Becker-Dörig model [7], [29] for the hydrodynamic limit of the simple exclusion process and [43] for the thermodynamic limit of finite chemical reacton networks. Those works are based on quadratic/Riemannian-like gradient flow structure for Markov chains under detailed balance condition by Maas [42], Mielke [45], and Chow et. al. [15] following the convergence via variational formulation of gradient flows going back to Sandier and Serfaty [59, 62]. A first approach based on the cosh gradient structure via Hamilton-Jacobi equations is obtained in [37]. In the context of interacting diffusions, the variational approach was recently implemented in [17].

The basic strategy of the proof of the present work follows the blueprint in [21], which consists of the main steps: writing the evolution equation in a continuity equation format, characterising the evolution equation as the global minimiser of a non-negative functional and establishing the lower semicontinuity of the functional. This approach is a refined notion of evolutionary  $\Gamma$ -convergence based on the energy dissipation principle (EDP) (see [46, 41, 47]) of the gradient flows in continuity equation format introduced in [55].

The present contribution provides a significant generalisation: we consider a gradient structure compatible with the expected large-deviation rate functional based on the cosh gradient structure instead of the quadratic gradient structure, see [48] for the connection between large-deviation principle and cosh gradient structures in the setting of finite Markov chains. There is also an intimate connection to flux large deviation principles, also called level 2.5 as established in [57, 10, 51, 3] and its connection to macroscopic fluctuation theory [9]. We expect, that it is possible to extend the EDP convergence statement to a large deviation principle for the system (1.2) along the lines of [2, 1, 28, 44, 36].

We emphasise, that the state space in our setting is an infinite dimensional subspace of probability measures on  $\mathbb{N}_0$  instead of a finite set. Let us stress that in the presence of two conserved quantities (volume and mass) with possible condensation phenomena [33] the generalisation to infinite state spaces becomes a significant challenge, since the choice of topology needs to be suitable for the convergence of the gradient structures.

The rigorous definitions of the energy-dissipation (ED) functionals for the variational formulation of gradient structures for linear jump processes are extensively discussed in [53]. The concrete formulations and estimates in [53] enable us to rigorously define the cosh gradient structure for the forward Kolmogorov equation (FKE $_N$ ). In particular, the chain rule in [53] is almost directly applicable to our situation for the finite system.

However, we need to work on the counterpart for the lifted limit system because in this case the boundedness assumption on the transition rate kernel of the work [53] does not apply and the limiting dynamic has a quadratic nonlinearity typical for non-trivial mean-field limits and is similarly challenging as those for the Boltzmann equation [20] and Landau equation [12].

While we highlighted some differences with some previous works above, it is important to note that the notion of convergence based on the *energy dissipation principle (EDP)* is well-documented [46, 41, 47, 55]. These surveys provide many examples and structural perspectives of this and other variants of variational convergence approach with further discussions on the microscopic origin of the cosh gradient structure. It emerges from diffusions with different time-scales and length scale, such as Kramer’s high activation limit [39, 54, 6] or the thin membrane limit [31, 47]. The stability properties of the cosh gradient structure is investigated for slow-fast systems in [50, 49, 64].

In the main statements in this work, we refer to the definition of EDP convergence from [55, Chapter 2], where the authors separate the continuity equation structure from the kinetic relation encoding the force-flux relationship.

In another recent work [35], the authors prove the EDP convergence for a generalised version of the Bolker–Pacala and Dieckmann-Law (BPDL) model. Similar to their work, we obtain the propagation of chaos for the limit model via a version of the superposition principle to connect the mean field equation to the limit obtained along the finite particle system. Our superposition principle is, like in their case, an extension of [4] to the space  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  equipped with a suitable topology taking the conserved quantities (volume and mass) into account. It turns out, that the metric induces a Polish space that is compatible to the particle exchange in the (EDG) model and that the state space  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  is still not compact under this metric. Due to the non-compactness, we need to show the compactness of the approximating sequence under suitable growth assumptions on the transition kernel in addition to lower semicontinuity of the functionals.

The mean-field limit in form of the exchange driven growth system (EDG) models the distribution of clusters of particles where the clusters interact with each other by exchanging a single particle. From the mathematical perspective, the well-posedness of (EDG) was studied in [23] and is extended with long-time behaviour in [61]. Our assumptions of the transition kernel are within the regime considered in [61]. The long time convergence in that work used first moment weighted  $\ell^1$  norm but we need a weaker metric for the gradient structure convergence. The metric based on the  $\ell^1$  distance of the cluster tail distribution is not explicitly stated but is implicitly used in [61, Theorem 2.12] for the uniqueness of the system (EDG) and also for other cluster growth models like [40].

The convergence of finite stochastic particle system to the mean field equation (MFE) in the Skorohod topology is known from [32]. They show that, even without the detailed balance condition, a weak law of large number of along a sequence of stochastic particle system with exchange transition converges to a solution of the deterministic mean field equation of (EDG). Therefore, the law of large numbers implied by our result is not novel, albeit we do not assume finite second moment for the initial condition. Instead, we replace it by a type of uniform integrability assumption on the initial condition.

The notion of detailed balance and reversibility of the stochastic particle system (1.2) is crucial for the gradient flow description and we emphasise that the stochastic particle system has stationary product measures [16, 27]. On the stochastic side, this knowledge allowed to establish rigorously the condensation transition in the thermodynamic limit for zero-range processes (see e.g. [25, 33, 5]) and for general kernels giving rise to stationary product measures in [26, 14]. The condensation observed is that the stationary measure, playing the role of the bulk cluster distribution for the stochastic particle system, has a maximal first moment in the thermodynamic limit. The consequence is that particles condense in clusters with a diverging number of particles. Nevertheless, even in the presence of those condensation phenomena, an equivalence of ensembles holds, see [14], which is a crucial ingredient for establish a  $\Gamma$ -limit of the driving free energy in the thermodynamic limit, where the condensation phenomena will manifest in the limiting gradient structure.

**1.3. Assumptions.** The global assumptions will be in effect for the all statements to come but otherwise we will state the assumptions needed from Assumption 1.2 for the ease of future reference and refinements.

**Assumption 1.1** (Global assumptions on the kernel). *The kernel  $K : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is assumed to be positive*

$$K(l, 0) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad K(1, l-1) > 0 \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\mathbf{K}_{>0})$$

Moreover, the following limit exists and is positive and finite

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(k, 0)}{K(1, k-1)} = \phi_c \in (0, \infty). \quad (\mathbf{K}_c)$$

The kernel satisfies the Becker-Doering assumption

$$\frac{K(k, l-1)}{K(l, k-1)} = \frac{K(k, 0)K(1, l-1)}{K(l, 0)K(1, k-1)} \quad \text{for } k, l \geq 1. \quad (\mathbf{BDA})$$

**Assumption 1.2** (Local assumptions on the kernel). *The kernel is assumed to have at most linear growth, that is*

$$0 \leq K(k, l-1) \leq C_K kl \quad \text{for } k, l \geq 1. \quad (\mathbf{K}_1)$$

A stronger assumption is a (strict) sublinear growth assumption. For some  $C_K > 0$  there exists  $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $g_k \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$0 \leq K(k, l-1) \leq C_K \frac{kl}{C^*(|g_l - g_k|)} \quad \text{for } k, l \geq 1, \quad (\mathbf{K}_2)$$

where  $C^*(\xi) := 4\left(\cosh \frac{\xi}{2} - 1\right)$ .

Furthermore, the uniqueness of solutions to (EDG) is ensured under the assumption (see [61, Theorem 1.3])

$$|K(l, k) - K(l, k-1)| \leq C_K l \quad \text{and} \quad |K(l+1, k-1) - K(l, k-1)| \leq C_K k \quad \text{for } k, l \geq 1. \quad (\mathbf{K}_u)$$

The stronger technical assumption  $(\mathbf{K}_2)$  is for now needed to ensure the compactness of the approximating sequence.

**1.4. Detailed balance and equilibria.** The characterisation of gradient flows for linear Markov chains in [48] applies to the stochastic particle system (1.2) and a gradient structure only exists under a microscopic detailed balance condition. It turns out that the detailed balance condition on the microscopic level will imply the detailed balance condition for the limit system (EDG), which was independently already used to characterise its longtime behaviour in [61].

*Equilibrium in the stochastic particle system (1.2).* By the non-degeneracy assumption  $(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ , the reversibility of the process with generator  $\mathbf{Q}^{N,L}$  is equivalent to the detailed balance condition which means there exists a measure  $\pi^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(V^{N,L})$  satisfying for all  $\eta \in V^{N,L}$  the identity

$$\pi^{N,L}(\eta) K(\eta_x, \eta_y) = \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,y}) K(\eta_y^{x,y}, \eta_x^{x,y}), \quad \text{for } x, y \in \{1, \dots, L\} : \eta_x \neq 0. \quad (\text{DBC})$$

The detailed balance condition (DBC) leads to a product stationary measure on  $V^{N,L}$  (see e.g. [16, 14, 26, 27]). In our situation, it is given by the following proposition, with the proof provided in Section 4.2 on page 25.

**Proposition 1.3.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *The detailed balance condition (DBC) is satisfied for  $\pi^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(V^{N,L})$  for all  $N, L \in \mathbb{N}$ .*
- (b) *The kernel  $K$  satisfies the Becker-Doering assumption (BDA).*

*In this case the solution of (DBC) is given by the canonical probability measure  $\pi^{N,L}$  on  $V^{N,L}$  for fixed particle number  $N$  and volume  $L$  as product measure by*

$$\pi^{N,L}(\eta) := \frac{1}{Z_{N,L}^{N,L}} \prod_{x=1}^L w(\eta_x) \quad \text{with} \quad Z^{N,L} := \sum_{\tilde{\eta} \in V^{N,L}} \prod_{x=1}^L w(\tilde{\eta}_x), \quad (1.19)$$

where the cluster chemical potentials are defined by

$$w(0) := 1 \quad \text{and} \quad w(n) := \prod_{k=2}^n \frac{K(1, k-1)}{K(k, 0)} \quad \text{if } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.20)$$

By assumption  $(\mathbf{K}_{>0})$ ,  $w(n)$  is well defined for each  $n$ . We note the choice of  $w$  above is not unique because  $(\alpha \phi^n w(n))_n$  also satisfies the detailed balance condition for any positive constants  $\alpha, \phi$ .

If we require  $(\alpha \phi^n w(n))_n$  to be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ , then the constant  $\alpha$  is determined by the normalisation condition  $\alpha^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi^k w(k) < \infty$  which has a radius of convergence  $\phi_c := \sup\{\phi : Z(\phi) < +\infty\} \in [0, \infty]$  such that the sum is finite for  $\phi < \phi_c$ . In this way, we define the *equilibrium cluster distribution*

$$\omega^\phi(n) = \frac{1}{Z(\phi)} \phi^n w(n) \quad \text{with} \quad Z(\phi) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi^n w(n) \quad \text{for any } \phi \in [0, \phi_c). \quad (1.21)$$

The parameter  $\phi$  is called *fugacity* which determines the expected cluster size. The maximal expected cluster size is given by  $\rho_c := \limsup_{\phi \nearrow \phi_c} M_1(\omega^\phi) \in (0, \infty]$ . The system shows a condensation phenomena in the sense of [33] if  $\rho_c < \infty$ . Moreover, provided that  $\rho_c < \infty$ , then also the partition function  $Z(\phi) < \infty$  in (1.21) is finite at the critical value  $\phi_c < \infty$  (see

Lemma 6.14). Since, the first moment map  $\phi \mapsto \rho(\phi) := M_1(\omega^\phi)$  is also monotone, which implies that for  $\rho \in [0, \rho_c]$  there is a unique  $\Phi(\rho) \in [0, \phi_c]$  such that

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} k \omega^{\Phi(\rho)}(k) = \rho \quad \text{and we write} \quad \omega^\rho := \omega^{\Phi(\rho)}. \quad (1.22)$$

In other words, the measure  $\omega^\rho$  is the equilibrium distribution for the cluster sizes in the exchange driven growth model (EDG) with the initial first moment  $\rho$ .

*Equilibrium in the forward Kolomogorov equation (FKE<sub>N</sub>).* The equilibrium in (FKE<sub>N</sub>) can be defined in terms of the canonical measure  $\omega^\rho$  defined in (1.22). Consider the product probability measure on  $\mathbb{N}_0^L$  in the particle position representation and define the product measure

$$\nu_\rho^L(\eta) := \prod_{x=1}^L \omega^\rho(\eta_x). \quad (1.23)$$

It is well-known that this is a stationary measure for the evolution equation in particle-position representation [16, 27]. Since (1.23) gives the distribution of particle-number configurations with fixed fugacity and volume, it is known as the *grand-canonical measure*. Then the canonical and grand canonical measures are related by conditioning on  $V^{N,L}$

$$\nu_\rho^L(\eta | V^{N,L}) = \frac{\nu_\rho^L(\eta)}{\nu_\rho^L(V^{N,L})} = \frac{\prod_{x=1}^L w(\eta_x)}{\sum_{\tilde{\eta} \in V^{N,L}} \prod_{x=1}^L w(\tilde{\eta}_x)} = \frac{\prod_{x=1}^L w(\eta_x)}{\mathcal{Z}^{N,L}} = \pi^{N,L}(\{\eta\}).$$

Therefore, the conditional measure is independent of  $\rho$ . From  $\pi^{N,L}$ , we obtain the equilibrium measure  $\mathbb{P}^{N,L}$  of (FKE<sub>N</sub>) on the cluster-size representation via pushforward of the map  $C^L$  defined in (1.4) and it satisfies the detailed balance condition on  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  (see Proposition 4.4), that is

$$\mathbb{P}^{N,L} := C_{\#}^L \pi^{N,L} \quad \text{satisfies the detailed balance condition} \quad (1.24)$$

$$k_{c,k,l-1}^{N,L} := \mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c) \kappa^L[c](k, l-1) = \mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}) \kappa^L[c^{k,l-1}](l, k-1) \quad \text{for } (c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}.$$

In the proof of convergence of driving free energy of the gradient flow, the *equivalence of ensembles* is a crucial ingredient. Different versions are already established in the literature starting with [33] for zero-range processes and was later generalised to misanthrope processes in [14] and recently also kernels with  $L$ -dependencies are considered in [13].

**Proposition 1.4** (Equivalence of ensembles). *If  $\frac{N}{L} \rightarrow \rho$  as  $N, L \rightarrow \infty$  and let  $\rho \wedge \rho_c := \min(\rho, \rho_c)$ , then*

$$\lim_{\frac{N}{L} \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{H}(\pi^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L) = 0.$$

**1.5. Gradient structures and variational characterisation of solutions.** In general, a gradient structure characterises the evolution equations as the global minimiser of a suitable energy dissipation functional, which is a quantification of the steepest descent. With the help of those energy dissipation functionals, the convergence of gradient structures and evolution equations can be cast into a variational framework.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}^{N,L} \text{ solves (FKE}_N) & \iff & \mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0 \xrightarrow[N/L \rightarrow \rho]{N,L \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0 \iff \mathbb{C} \text{ solves (LiE)} \\ \uparrow \text{The law of the process} & & \text{implies} \\ \text{with generator } \mathcal{Q}^{N,L} \text{ (1.7)} & & \text{via superposition principle} \parallel \mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \int_{AC([0,T]; \mathcal{P}_{< \infty, d_{\text{Ex}}})} \mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\gamma; \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)) \lambda(d\gamma) \\ (c_i) \in (\frac{1}{L} \mathbb{N}_0)^{N+1} & & \lambda\text{-a.e. } \mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(c, j(c)) = 0 \iff c \text{ solves (EDG)}. \end{array}$$

FIGURE 1.1. The different levels of the description of the processes with the associated energy dissipation functionals.

Figure 1.1 depicts the relationships of the evolution equations and energy dissipation functionals in the gradient structures of this work. In the figure,  $(\text{FKE}_N)$  is the evolution equation of the law of the finite particle system and  $(\text{LiE})$  is the evolution equation of a measure on the limit state space, which corresponds to the  $(\text{EDG})$  with random initial data. Using the formulation of generalised gradient flow in the spirit of minimising movement curves, we characterise the solutions of  $(\text{FKE}_N)$ ,  $(\text{LiE})$  and  $(\text{EDG})$  by the zero set of the corresponding energy dissipation functionals denoted by  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$  respectively.

In order to define the energy dissipation functionals giving rise to the variational formulation for the gradient flows, we make use of the continuity equation format for the three evolution equations  $(\text{MFE})$ ,  $(\text{FKE}_N)$  and  $(\text{LiE})$  respectively, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t c_t + \widehat{\text{div}} j_t &= 0 & (\text{ExCE}) \\ \partial_t \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} + \widehat{\text{div}}^L \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} &= 0 & (\text{CE}^N) \\ \partial_t \mathbb{C}_t + \widehat{\text{div}}^\infty \mathbb{J}_t &= 0. & (\text{CE}^\infty) \end{aligned}$$

To illustrate the ideas, we used the strong form of the continuity equation here and will use a weak form in rigorous argument later. We fix a time horizon  $(0, T)$  and use the notation  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  to denote that the pair  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})$  solves (the weak form of) the continuity equation on the time interval  $(0, T)$  and similar for  $\text{ExCE}(0, T)$  and  $\text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ . The solutions to the evolution equations are then given by appropriate choices of the references fluxes  $\bar{j}$  in  $(\text{MFE})$ ,  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}$  in (1.11) for  $(\text{FKE}_N)$  and  $\bar{\mathbb{J}}$  in  $(\text{LiE})$ . For gradient flows, the appropriate fluxes are encoded through a *kinetic relation* for a force driving the system, which in our setting will be free energies of relative entropy type. The kinetic relation itself is encoded through suitable dissipation potentials which is part of the energy dissipation functionals. While the precise definitions will be given later, for the sake of introducing the main theorem, we write down the gradient structures with driving free energies and the corresponding energy dissipation functionals here.

*Finite particle gradient structure*  $(\hat{V}^{N,L}, \hat{E}^{N,L}, \hat{\nabla}^L, \mathcal{E}^{N,L}, \mathcal{R}^{N,L})$ . The continuity equation  $(\text{CE}^N)$  is defined in terms of the vertex set  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  in (1.5), the edge set (1.9) and discrete gradient operator  $\widehat{\text{div}}^L$  from (1.8) giving rise by duality to the divergence operator  $\widehat{\text{div}}^L$  defined in (1.12). The driving free energy  $\mathcal{E}^{N,L}$  is the relative entropy  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \mathbb{I}^{N,L})$  with respect to the invariant measure  $\mathbb{I}^{N,L}$  defined in (1.24), that is

$$\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) := \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \mathbb{I}^{N,L}) = \int \frac{d\mathbb{C}^{N,L}}{d\mathbb{I}^{N,L}} \log \left( \frac{d\mathbb{C}^{N,L}}{d\mathbb{I}^{N,L}} \right) d\mathbb{I}^{N,L}, \quad (1.25)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \mathbb{I}^{N,L}) := +\infty$  if  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \not\ll \mathbb{I}^{N,L}$ . The dissipation potential  $\mathcal{R}^{N,L}$  in (4.2) below and its regularised Legendre dual  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L}$  in (4.3) are based on the cosh gradient structure [48, 53, 55]. Hereby,  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})$  should be thought of as  $\frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L*}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, -\hat{\nabla}^L D\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}))$  which is the Legendre dual of  $\frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L})$ . In fact they coincide when  $-\hat{\nabla}^L D\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})$  is well defined and hence it is omitted in the specification of the gradient structure.

Altogether, the ingredients  $(\hat{V}^{N,L}, \hat{E}^{N,L}, \hat{\nabla}^L, \mathcal{E}^{N,L}, \mathcal{R}^{N,L})$  define the finite particle system gradient structure and the associated energy dissipation functional is explicitly defined for  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  by

$$\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) := L^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \Big|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T \left( L^{-1} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \right) dt,$$

and if  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \notin \text{CE}^N(0, T)$ , we set  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) := +\infty$  (see Definition 4.2).

*The infinite particle gradient structure*  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, E(\mathcal{P}_\rho), \bar{\nabla} \nabla^\infty, \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}, \mathcal{R})$ . The continuity equation structure encoded in  $(\text{CE}^\infty)$  is defined by the vertex set  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$  in (1.6), the edge set

$$E(\mathcal{P}_\rho) := \{(c, k, l) \in \mathcal{P}_\rho \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : c_k > 0, c_{l-1} > 0\}, \quad (1.26)$$

with the emerging exchange gradient  $\bar{\nabla} \nabla^\infty$  from (1.16). The free energy  $\mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$  and dissipation potentials have the common form as an expectation and are given in terms of

$$\mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}) := \int \mathbf{E}^\rho(c) \mathbb{C}(dc), \quad \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) := \int \mathbf{R}\left(c, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(c)\right) \mathbb{C}(dc), \quad \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}) := \int \mathbf{D}(c) \mathbb{C}(dc),$$

where the underlying free energy  $\mathbf{E}^\rho$ , primal  $\mathbf{R}$  and dual dissipation functional  $\mathbf{D}$  are related to the gradient structure for the system (EDG) to be discussed below. Having defined the building blocks  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, E(\mathcal{P}_\rho), \bar{\nabla} \nabla^\infty, \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}, \mathcal{R})$  for the infinite particle gradient structure, we can formulate the energy dissipation functional  $\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$  for  $\rho > 0$  and  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  as

$$\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) := \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_t)|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T (\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t) + \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_t)) dt$$

and set  $\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) := +\infty$ , if  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \notin \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ .

*Exchange gradient structure*  $(\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0, \bar{\nabla}, \mathbf{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}, \mathbf{R})$ . The continuity equation (ExCE) is encoded on the vertex set  $\mathbb{N}_0$  with edges  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0$ , which are connected through the exchange gradient  $\bar{\nabla}$  defined in (1.14). In the equation above, the free energy  $\mathbf{E}^\rho$  is the relative entropy with respect to the invariant measure  $\omega^\rho$ . For  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$ ,  $\mathbf{E}^\rho$  is given by

$$\mathbf{E}^\rho(c) := \mathbf{H}(c|\omega^\rho) = \int \frac{dc}{d\omega^\rho} \log\left(\frac{dc}{d\omega^\rho}\right) d\omega^\rho. \quad (1.27)$$

In the cosh gradient structure, the dissipation potentials are defined in terms of the Legendre pair  $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  which are given by

$$\mathbf{C}(s) := 2s \log \frac{s + \sqrt{s^2 + 4}}{2} - 2\sqrt{s^2 + 4} + 4 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C}^*(\xi) := 4\left(\cosh \frac{\xi}{2} - 1\right). \quad (1.28)$$

Both functions,  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}'$  are smooth, strictly convex, even, and superlinear at infinity, and their derivatives are each other's inverse, that is  $\mathbf{C}'(s) = 2 \operatorname{arsinh} \frac{s}{2}$  and  $(\mathbf{C}^*)'(\xi) = 2 \sinh \frac{\xi}{2}$ . The primal and dual dissipation functions are defined in terms of the functions  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}^*$ , respectively, by

$$\mathbf{R}(c, j) := \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{C}(j_{k, l-1} | \sigma(c, k, l-1)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{R}^*(c, \xi) := \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma(c, k, l-1) \mathbf{C}^*(\xi_{k, l-1}), \quad (1.29)$$

where

$$\sigma_{(c, k, l-1)} := \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa[c](k, l-1) \kappa[c](l, k-1)} \quad (1.30)$$

with  $\kappa$  defined in (1.15). Provided that  $c$  is strictly positive, we have  $\mathbf{D}(c) = \mathbf{R}^*(c, -\bar{\nabla} \log \frac{c}{\omega^\rho})$  (see Definition 3.5 for the general definition). The *perspective* function for  $\mathbf{C}$  above is defined by

$$\mathbf{C}(a|b) := \begin{cases} b\mathbf{C}\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) & \text{if } b > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } b = 0 \text{ and } a = 0, \\ +\infty & \text{if } b = 0 \text{ and } a \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

This provides the building blocks for the exchange gradient structure for (EDG). Accordingly, the energy dissipation functional with respect to (MFE) is given for  $(c, j) \in \mathbf{ExCE}(0, T)$  by

$$\mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(c, j) := \mathbf{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(c(t))|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T (\mathbf{R}(c(t), j(t)) + \mathbf{D}(c(t))) dt$$

and set to  $\mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(c, j) := +\infty$  if  $(c, j) \notin \mathbf{ExCE}(0, T)$  (see Definition 3.5). The rigorous link between the exchange gradient structure and that of infinite particle is established via the *superposition principle* in Theorem 1.9 below stating that the corresponding energy dissipation functionals are related by the identity

$$\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \int_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_{< \infty})} \mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}\left(\gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)\right) \lambda(d\gamma), \quad (1.31)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a path measure concentrated on curves  $\gamma$  such that  $(\gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ .

*Variational characterisation of solutions.* The gradient structures allow us to characterise the solution of the evolution equations via reference net fluxes on the different levels, that is  $\bar{\mathbb{J}}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}$  or  $\mathbb{J}$ . By making the above discussion of the three gradient structures rigorous, we can link those to the corresponding evolution equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T) : \quad & \mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(c, j) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad c \text{ solves (EDG)}; \\ (\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T) : \quad & \mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{C}^{N,L} \text{ solves (FKE}_N\text{)}; \\ (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T) : \quad & \mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{C} \text{ solves (LiE)}. \end{aligned}$$

The above results are contained in Proposition 3.10, Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 5.9, respectively. Hereby, the solution concepts include a suitable energy dissipation balance and for this reason are called *EDP solution* for the respective equation. The results also entail that all three energy dissipation functionals are non-negative. The non-negativity of  $\mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}$  are consequences of suitable chain rules proved in Proposition 3.8 and Proposition 4.5, whereas the non-negativity of  $\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$  follows by the superposition principle from (1.31) and the non-negativity of  $\mathbf{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}$ .

Once we have characterised the evolution equations using these functionals, the goal is to show the evolutionary  $\Gamma$ -convergence following the energy dissipation principle, which we state below.

**1.6. Main results.** We use the concept of EDP convergence for generalised gradient flows in continuity equation format after [55, Definitions 2.8 and 2.10]. The topology on the base space  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  is fixed by choosing the complete separable metric  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  adapted to the jumps in the exchange driven dynamics. This metric turns out to be given by

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(c, \tilde{c}) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} (c_l - \tilde{c}_l) \right| \quad \text{for } c, \tilde{c} \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}.$$

The metric and its properties are discussed in detail in Section 2. The strategy for the functional convergence is establishing suitable compactness and lower semicontinuity statements similar to the direct method of the calculus of variations. Hereby, the choice of the metric  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  is crucial to establish a suitable topology compatible to the compactness implied by the dissipation functionals and at the same time providing a matching lower semicontinuity.

**Definition 1.5** (Convergence of pair measures in vw- $d_{\text{Ex}}$  sense). Let  $N, L \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\frac{N}{L} \rightarrow \rho \in (0, +\infty)$  and set  $\bar{\rho} := \sup \frac{N}{L}$ . A pair  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  converges to  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  in vague-weak- $d_{\text{Ex}}$  sense, denoted by vw- $d_{\text{Ex}}$ , provided that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} &\xrightarrow{*-\text{Ex}} \mathbb{C}_t && \text{in } \sigma(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}), C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})) \text{ for each } t \in [0, T], \\ L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l-1) dt &\rightarrow \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l-1) dt && \text{in } B_b([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})^* \text{ for each } k, l \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hereby,  $B_b(X)$  denotes the space of Borel measurable bounded functions over some topological space  $X$ . In the following, we abbreviate  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}), C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}))$  topology by weak\*-Ex topology.

**Theorem 1.6** (EDP convergence). *Let  $0 < \rho < +\infty$ . The finite particle gradient structure  $(\hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L}, \hat{\mathcal{E}}^{N,L}, \mathcal{E}^{N,L}, \mathcal{R}^{N,L})$  EDP converges to the infinite particle gradient structure  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}), \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}, \mathcal{R})$ , that is*

(a)  $\Gamma$ -convergence of the free energy on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})$  in the topology in duality with  $C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$

$$\Gamma\text{-}\lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} L^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{N,L} = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}.$$

(b)  $\Gamma$ -lim inf of dissipation potentials: Any sequence  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  converging to  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense with

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt < +\infty, \quad (1.32)$$

satisfies

$$\liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int_0^T (L^{-1} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})) dt \geq \int_0^T (\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t) + \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_t)) dt. \quad (1.33)$$

In particular, the limit flux satisfies  $\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1) \ll \mathbb{C}_t$  for each  $k, l-1$  and almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

(c) Under assumption  $(K_2)$ , let  $((\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T))_{\frac{N}{L} \rightarrow \rho}$  with

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{n \geq 1}^k g_n c_k \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}(dc) < +\infty \quad (1.34)$$

and (1.32) holds. Then

(i)  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  converges to  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense along a subsequence.

(ii) For each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{C}_t$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$ .

The concept of EDP convergence is built in such a way, that it implies lower semicontinuity of the full energy dissipation functional, which is the content of

**Theorem 1.7** ( $\Gamma$ -lower semicontinuity of EDF). *For any sequence  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  converges to  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense, assume*

(a) *well-preparedness of initial data:*

$$\lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} L^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}) = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_0^\rho) < +\infty, \quad (1.35)$$

(b) *uniformly bounded energy dissipation functional:*

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) < +\infty,$$

(c) *EDP solution property:*

$$\liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \leq 0.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \leq 0.$$

Recall, that by an EDP solution, we mean a pair of curve and flux such that the associated energy dissipation functional is zero. By the variational characterisation of evolution equations, they are the weak solution of the corresponding evolution equation. As a consequence of the theorem above, we have

**Corollary 1.8** (Convergence of EDP solutions). *Under assumption  $(K_2)$ , consider a sequence  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  in the limit  $\frac{N}{L} \rightarrow \rho \in [0, \infty)$ . Suppose*

(a)  *$(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})$  is an EDP solution of  $(\text{FKE}_N)$  (see Proposition 4.6);*

(b) *the sequence satisfies the uniform bound (1.34);*

(c)  *$\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_0$  in duality with  $C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  and it is well-prepared satisfying (1.35).*

Then

(i) *there exists a convergent subsequence in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense with the limit  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  and it is an EDP solution of (LiE) (see Proposition 5.9);*

- (ii) there exists a path measure  $\lambda$  which is concentrated on EDP solutions to (MFE) (see Proposition 3.10) and  $(e_t)_{\#}\lambda = \mathbb{C}_t$  for each  $t$ ;  
 (iii) the energy converges

$$\lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} L^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_t^\rho) \quad \text{for each } t \in [0, T].$$

Hereby, the connection of the EDP solutions for (LiE) and (MFE) is thanks to the superposition principle proved in Section 5.1.

**Theorem 1.9.** *If  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ ,  $\mathbb{C}(0)$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$  for some  $\rho \in [0, \infty)$  and  $\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1) dt \ll \mathbb{C}_t dt$  for all  $k, l \geq 1$ , then there exists a Borel probability measure  $\lambda$  on  $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  satisfying  $(e_t)_{\#}\lambda = \mathbb{C}_t$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and is concentrated on curves  $\gamma \in \text{AC}([0, T], (\mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}}))$  such that  $(\gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ .*

As a final result, we show that the superposition principle also allows to establish an propagation of chaos result.

**Theorem 1.10** (Propagation of chaos). *Under assumption  $(K_2)$  and  $(K_u)$ , suppose*

- (a)  $c_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  with  $E^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(c_0) < +\infty$ ,  
 (b)  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  is the unique EDP solution of (LiE) with deterministic initial data  $\mathbb{C}_0 = \delta_{c_0}$ ,  
 (c)  $c_t$  is the unique solution to (MFE) with initial data  $c_0$ ,  
 (d)  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})$  satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 1.8.

Then, the limit is deterministic for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , that is

$$\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} \rightarrow \delta_{c_t} \text{ in duality with } C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} L^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_t).$$

**Acknowledgement.** The authors thank Jasper Hoeksema for valuable suggestions and Arтур Stephan for fruitful discussion. This work is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044 -390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics–Geometry–Structure.

### List of notations.

$\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0$	the positive and non-negative integers, respectively	
$\mathbb{C}(\cdot), \mathbb{C}^*(\cdot)$	Legendre pair of cosh-type functions	(1.28)
$\mathcal{M}(Z), \mathcal{M}^+(Z), \mathcal{P}(Z)$	finite signed Borel measure, finite non-negative Borel measure and probability Borel measures on a topological space $Z$ equipped with total variation norm	
$M_1(\cdot)$	The first moment of measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ ,	(2.3)
$\mathcal{P}_\rho$	$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) \cap \{M_1 = \rho\}$	(1.6)
$\mathcal{P}_{\leq \rho}, \mathcal{P}_{< \infty}$	$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) \cap \{M_1 \leq \rho\}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) \cap \{M_1 < \infty\}$	(1.18)
$\mathcal{H}(\cdot \cdot)$	The relative entropy on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{< \infty})$	(1.25)
$\mathbb{H}(\cdot \cdot)$	The relative entropy on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$	(1.27)
$\gamma^{k,l-1}$	Exchange vector defined by $\mathbf{e}_{k-1} + \mathbf{e}_l - \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$	(1.8)
$V^{N,L}$	Vertex set in particle-position representation	(1.1)
	$\{\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^L \mid \sum_{x=1}^L \eta_x = N\}$	
$E^{N,L}$	Edge set in particle-position representation	(1.3)
	$E^{N,L} := \{(\eta, x, y) \in V^{N,L} \times \{1, \dots, L\} \times \{1, \dots, L\} : \eta_x > 0\}$ .	
$\hat{V}^{N,L}$	Vertex set in cluster-size representation	(1.5)
	$\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) \mid \mu = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{x=1}^L \delta_{\eta_x}, \sum_{x=1}^L \eta_x = N\}$	
$\hat{E}^{N,L}$	Edge set in cluster-size representation	(1.9)
	$\{(c, k, l) : (c, c^{k,l-1}) \in \hat{V}^{N,L} \times \hat{V}^{N,L}\} \subset \hat{V}^{N,L} \times \{1, \dots, N\}^2$	
$E(\mathcal{P}_\rho)$	Limit edge set $E(\mathcal{P}_\rho) := \{(c, k, l) \in \mathcal{P}_\rho \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0 : c_k > 0, c_{l-1} > 0\}$ .	(1.26)
$\partial^-$	Discrete left derivative $\partial^- : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ $(\partial^- f)_k := f_k - f_{k-1}$	(2.4)

$$\overline{\nabla} \quad \text{Exchange gradient } \overline{\nabla} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0} : \quad (1.14)$$

$$\overline{\text{div}} \quad \overline{\nabla}_{k,l-1} f = f \cdot \gamma^{k,l-1} = f_{k-1} - f_k + f_l - f_{l-1} \text{ for } k, l \in \mathbb{N} \\ \text{Exchange divergence } \overline{\text{div}} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} : \quad (1.14)$$

$$\widehat{\nabla}^L \quad \widehat{\text{div}} j = - \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} j_{k,l-1} \gamma^{k,l-1} \\ \text{Lifted gradient } \widehat{\nabla}^L : \mathcal{F}(\widehat{V}^{N,L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\widehat{E}^{N,L}) : \quad (1.8)$$

$$\widehat{\text{div}}^L \quad \widehat{\nabla}^L F(c, k, l-1) = F(c^{k,l-1}) - F(c) \text{ where } c^{k,l-1} := c + \frac{1}{L} \gamma^{k,l-1} \\ \text{Lifted divergence } \widehat{\text{div}}^L : \mathcal{F}(\widehat{E}^{N,L}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\widehat{V}^{N,L}) : \quad (1.12)$$

$$\nabla^\infty \quad \widehat{\text{div}}^L \mathbb{J}(c) = \sum_{(k,l-1):(c,k,l) \in \widehat{E}^{N,L}} (\mathbb{J}^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) - \mathbb{J}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}, l, k-1)) \\ \text{The infinite gradient, for } \Phi : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ differentiable coordinate-wise:} \quad (1.17)$$

$$\text{Exchange metric on } \mathcal{P}_{<\infty} : d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} (\mu_l - \nu_l) \right| \quad (2.1)$$

$$\ell^{1,1} \quad \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) := (\partial_{c_k} \Phi(c))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \\ \text{Zeroth-and-first-moment-weighted } \ell^1 \text{ norm on } \mathcal{P}_{<\infty} \quad (6.18)$$

## 2. THE EXCHANGE METRIC

We will work with the topology induced by the following exchange metric for the infinite dimensional state space  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Exchange metric). The *tail distribution*  $\mathbb{T} : \mathcal{P}_{<\infty} \rightarrow \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$  for some  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  is defined by

$$\mathbb{T}(\mu) = (\mathbb{T}_k(\mu))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbb{T}_k(\mu) := \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \mu_n.$$

The *exchange metric* on  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  is defined for  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  via

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mathbb{T}(\mu) - \mathbb{T}(\nu)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{N})}. \quad (2.1)$$

**Proposition 2.2** (Topological properties of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ ).

(1)  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  is weaker than the distance induced by the first-moment-weighted  $\ell^1$  norm:

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k |\mu_k - \nu_k| \leq M_1(\mu) + M_1(\nu). \quad (2.2)$$

for any  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  where

$$M_1(\mu) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \mu_k. \quad (2.3)$$

(2) Characterisation of convergence in  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ : Let  $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\mu$  be a family of positive measures with the same zero and first moments. The following are equivalent:

- (i)  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$  in  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbb{T}(\mu^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(\mu)$  in  $\ell^1$ ;
- (iii)  $\mathbb{T}(\mu^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(\mu)$  pointwise and  $\mathbb{T}(\mu^n)$  is uniformly integrable. i.e. for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $K = K(\varepsilon) \geq 1$  such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \geq K} \mathbb{T}_k(\mu^n) < \varepsilon;$$

- (iv)  $\mathbb{T}(\mu^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(\mu)$  pointwise and there exists a strictly positive increasing divergent sequence  $(g_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  with

$$\sup_n \sum_{k \geq 1} g_k \mathbb{T}_k(\mu^n) < \infty;$$

- (v) In the last two conditions, assume  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$  pointwise instead of  $\mathbb{T}(\mu^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(\mu)$  pointwise.

- (3) Closedness of the first and zeroth moment in  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ : Let  $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{N}_0)$  be a family non-negative measures with the same zero  $m_0 = M_0(\mu^n)$  and first  $m_1 = M_1(\mu^n)$  moment for all  $n \geq 1$ . Moreover, assume that  $T(\mu^n) \rightarrow T$  in  $\ell^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then there exists a positive measure  $\mu$  with  $m_0 = M_0(\mu)$  and  $m_1 = M_1(\mu)$  and  $T(\mu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(\mu^n)$  in  $\ell^1$ .
- (4) Relative compactness: A sequence  $(\mu^n) \subset \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N}_0)$  is relatively compact in  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  if and only if  $T(\mu^n)$  is uniformly integrable.
- (5) Separability: The set  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  equipped with the metric  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  is separable.

*Proof.* (1) By the triangle inequality, we have following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\mu) - T(\nu)\|_{\ell^1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} (\mu_k - \nu_k) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} |\mu_k - \nu_k| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k |\mu_k - \nu_k| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k |\mu_k| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k |\nu_k| = M_1(\mu) + M_1(\nu). \end{aligned}$$

(2) We observe:

- (i)  $\iff$  (ii) by definition.
- (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) Apply the Vitali convergence theorem for the  $\ell^1$  sum of  $(T(\mu^n)_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ .
- (iii)  $\iff$  (iv) Use the de la Vallée-Poussin characterisation of uniform integrability.
- (v)  $\mu_k^n = T_k(\mu^n) - T_{k+1}(\mu^n)$  for  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\mu_0^n = M_0(\mu^n) - T_1(\mu^n)$  so pointwise convergence of  $T_k(\mu^n)$  implies pointwise convergence of  $\mu$ . On the other hand, for each  $T_k(\mu^n) = M_0(\mu^n) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mu_j^n = M_0(\mu) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mu_j^n$  so the pointwise convergence of  $\mu^n$  implies convergence of  $T_k(\mu^n)$  for each  $k$ .
- (3) Let  $\mu_k := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_k(\mu^n) - T_{k+1}(\mu^n)$  for  $k \geq 1$  and  $\mu_0 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_0^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_0(\mu^n) - T_1(\mu^n)$ . Then  $M_0(\mu) = \mu_0 + T_1(\mu) = M_0(\mu^n)$  and  $T(\mu^n)$  converges pointwise to  $T(\mu)$ . By the uniqueness of  $\ell^1$  limit,  $T(\mu)$  is the  $\ell^1$  limit and thus the first moment  $M_1(\mu) = \|T(\mu)\|_{\ell^1}$  is preserved.
- (4) Use the compactness criteria for  $\ell^1$ : bounded, closed and equismall at infinity and the definition of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ .
- (5) Consider the space  $\mathcal{T} := \{(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^1 : t_0 = 1, t_n \geq t_{n+1} \geq 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  equipped with the metric induced by the  $\ell^1$  norm. It is well known that  $\ell^1$  is a separable space and a subset of separable metric space is separable. Therefore  $\mathcal{T}$  is separable.
- Since the spaces  $(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  and  $(\mathcal{T}, \ell^1)$  are isometric isomorphic,  $\mathcal{T}$  is separable implies  $(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  is separable.  $\square$

In the following, we will see the connection of the exchange metric  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  to the particle exchange via the characterisation with functions with bounded exchange gradient, which are crucial for stating continuity properties for the exchange continuity equation (ExCE).

**Definition 2.3** (Dual metric). The set of functions with the exchange gradient bounded by one is

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \sup_{k, l \geq 1} |\bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} f| \leq 1 \right\}$$

and measures summable with respect to the family  $\mathcal{F}$  are

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}} := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) : \sum_{k \geq 0} |f_k| \mu_k < \infty \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

The dual metric on  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is defined as

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \nu) := \|\mu - \nu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^* := \sup \left\{ \left| \sum_{k \geq 0} f_k (\mu_k - \nu_k) \right| : f \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

*Remark 2.4.* (1) By definition,  $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}^*$  if and only if  $\langle f, \mu^n \rangle \rightarrow \langle f, \mu \rangle$  for  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  uniformly.

- (2) Any element  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  gives rise to a linear functional on  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via  $f(\mu) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f_k \mu_k$  is 1- $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  Lipschitz by definition.

**Proposition 2.5** (Connection between  $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ ). *The dual metric  $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  is an extended metric on  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  and a metric precisely on any  $\mathcal{P}_{\rho}$  for  $\rho \in [0, \infty)$ , where it agrees with  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  up to a factor of 1/2, that is if  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$ , then*

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \nu) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{T}(\mu) - \mathbb{T}(\nu)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{N})} & \text{if } M_1(\mu) = M_1(\nu); \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Notice that  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  is equivalent to the variation of  $(\partial_l^- f)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  to be bounded by one where

$$(\partial^- f)_l := f_l - f_{l-1} \quad \text{for } l \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.4)$$

Therefore there exists  $m = m(f) \in [\inf_l \partial_l^- f, \sup_l \partial_l^- f]$  such that

$$m - \frac{1}{2} \leq \inf_l \partial_l^- f \leq m \leq \sup_l \partial_l^- f \leq m + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Define  $\Delta_r f := \partial_r^- f - m = (f_r - f_{r-1}) - m \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ . We observe

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} f_k (\mu_k - \nu_k) \right| = \sup_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0}} \left\{ \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} f_k (\mu_k - \nu_k) \right| : \Delta_r f \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] \text{ for all } r \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

We first consider the case when  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{\rho}$  for some  $\rho \in [0, \infty)$ . We have  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) = 0$  and  $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) = -\sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (\mu_n - \nu_n) \in (-\infty, \infty)$  and  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n(\mu_n - \nu_n) = 0$ . Therefore using the expression  $f_k = f_0 + \sum_{n=1}^k \partial_n^- f$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} f_k (\mu_k - \nu_k) &= f_0 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\mu_n - \nu_n) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \partial_k^- f \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \partial_k^- f \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} m \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_k f \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) \\ &= m \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k (\mu_k - \nu_k) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_k f \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) \\ &= 0 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_k f \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n). \end{aligned}$$

The expression becomes maximal under the constraint  $\Delta_k f \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ , if we choose  $\Delta_k f = +\frac{1}{2}$  whenever  $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) > 0$  and  $\Delta_k f = -\frac{1}{2}$  whenever  $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) < 0$ . Hence, we obtain the identity

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} f_k (\mu_k - \nu_k) \right| \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (\mu_n - \nu_n) \right|,$$

which is the claim when  $M_1(\mu) = \rho = M_1(\nu)$ .

In the case  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  have different first moments, we need to show  $d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \nu) = +\infty$ . Indeed, we take the test function in the definition of  $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  to be  $f_k = \lambda k$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \nu) \geq \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda k (\mu_k - \nu_k) \right| = |\lambda| |M_1(\mu) - M_1(\nu)|,$$

which diverges to  $+\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.6.* It follows from Proposition 2.5 that the metric  $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  is stronger than the metric induced by  $\ell^1$  on  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$ . Indeed, we can take  $f_k = \frac{1}{4} \text{sign}(\mu_k - \nu_k)$  so that  $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{F}$  and thus

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \geq 0} |\mu_k - \nu_k| \leq d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \nu)$$

for  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$ . Therefore, on probability measures with a fixed first moment, the strength of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  is between the metric induced by the pure  $\ell^1$  norm and the first-moment-weighted  $\ell^1$  norm in (2.2).

The connection to the microscopic dynamic induced through the jumps (1.14) becomes apparent through the representation in the next Lemma.

**Lemma 2.7** (Variational form of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  in terms of jumps). *Suppose  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{\rho}$  for some  $\rho \in [0, \infty)$  then*

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = 2 \sup_{f: |\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} f| = 1} \left\{ \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{k,l-1} \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} f \mid \alpha \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0) : \mu = \nu + \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{k,l-1} \gamma^{k,l-1} \right\}.$$

As a consequence, if  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is connected by an exchange jump, that is  $\mu = \nu + m\gamma^{k,l-1}$  for some  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = 2|m|$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.5, we have

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = 2d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \nu) = 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k \geq 0} f_k(\mu_k - \nu_k) \right|.$$

Let  $\alpha \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0)$  be such that  $\mu = \nu + \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{k,l-1} \gamma^{k,l-1}$ . The definition of the exchange gradient (1.14) implies

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n \left[ \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{k,l-1} \gamma_n^{k,l-1} \right] \right| = 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{k,l-1} \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} f \right|.$$

For  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we can apply Fubini theorem to exchange the summation order if  $\sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} |\alpha_{k,l-1}| < +\infty$ . We conclude the proof by noting that  $\mathcal{F}$  is invariant under  $f \mapsto -f$  so we can remove the absolute value.

Now suppose  $\mu - \nu = m\gamma^{k,l-1}$  for some  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , since the unit vectors  $\mathbf{e}_l$  and  $\mathbf{e}_k$  are in  $\mathcal{F}$ . We can choose the former if  $m \geq 0$  and latter otherwise. Then the supremum is attained and  $d_{\text{Ex}} = 2|m|$ .  $\square$

### 3. THE EXCHANGE DRIVEN GROWTH MODEL AS MEAN FIELD EQUATION

For the variational characterisation of the system (EDG) is based on its reformulation as continuity equation (MFE), which we split into a general continuity equation and the specification of the kinetic relation between force and flux.

#### 3.1. Exchange continuity equation.

**Definition 3.1.** A pair  $(c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$  solves the exchange continuity equation provided that

- (1) the curve  $c$  is  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  continuous, that is  $c \in \text{AC}((0, T); (\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}, d_{\text{Ex}}))$ ;
- (2) the Borel measurable family of fluxes  $(j_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0)$  satisfy the bound

$$\int_0^T \sum_{k,l \geq 1} |j_{k,l-1}(t)| dt < \infty;$$

(3) the couple  $(c, j)$  satisfies the exchange continuity equation, that is for any sequence  $\Phi : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\sup_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} |\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \Phi| < \infty$  and for all  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \Phi_k (c_k(t) - c_k(s)) = \int_s^t \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \Phi j_{k,l-1}(r) dr \quad (\text{ExCE})$$

where  $\bar{\nabla}$  is the exchange gradient (1.14).

*Remark 3.2.* If  $(c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ , then besides the zeroth moment, also the first moment is constant in time for  $c$ , that is

$$M_1(c(t)) - M_1(c(s)) = \sum_{k \geq 1} k(c_k(t) - c_k(s)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t, s \in [0, T]$$

because by taking  $\Phi_n = n$ ,  $\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \Phi = 0$  for all  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, if  $c_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  for some  $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$ , then  $c \in \text{AC}((0, T); (\mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}}))$ .

*Remark 3.3* (Variational form of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  in terms of fluxes). With Definition 3.1, the dual metric  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  can also be expressed in terms of fluxes between the two probability measures if they have the same finite first moment, which explains its significance for the setting at hand. Suppose  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  for some  $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$ , then

$$d_{\text{Ex}}(\mu, \nu) = 2 \sup_{f: |\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} f|=1} \left\{ \int_0^1 \langle \bar{\nabla} f, j(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0} dt \mid (c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, 1), c(0) = \mu, c(1) = \nu \right\}.$$

**3.2. Gradient flow structure for the exchange driven growth model.** We introduced the strategy of using a suitable energy functional to characterise (MFE) in Subsection 1.5 where we also mentioned that we will use a regularised Legendre dual instead of the Legendre dual  $R^*(c, -\bar{\nabla} \log \frac{c}{\omega^\rho})$ . It is because the Legendre dual is not well defined if  $c_k = 0$  for some  $k$ . By using the standard conventions to deal with those zeros (see [53, Definition 4.40, Convention 4.41]), we have the following definitions in the cosh setting [53, Example 4.18].

**Notation 3.4.** Since the two energy dissipation functionals  $L^\rho$  and  $L^{\rho,-}$  for the system (EDG) only differ systematically in the part of dissipation potential  $D$  and  $D^-$ , we use the notation  $L^{\rho(-)}$  to define both functionals simultaneously below.

**Definition 3.5** (EDF for (MFE)). In the following definition  $\rho \in [0, \rho_c]$  whenever it appears in the expressions  $E^\rho$  and  $w^\rho$ . We define the EDF

$$L^{\rho(-)}(c, j) := \begin{cases} E^\rho(c(T)) - E^\rho(c(0)) + \int_0^T R(c(t), j(t)) + D^{(-)}(c(t)) dt & \text{if } (c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T), \\ +\infty & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where the free energy is given by the relative entropy  $E^\rho(c) = H(c|\omega^\rho)$  as in (1.27), the dissipation potentials  $R$  and  $R^*$  are defined in (1.29). Moreover, the relaxed dissipation potentials  $D$  and  $D^-$  are defined by

$$D^{(-)}(c) := \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} D_\kappa^{(-)}(c, k, l-1), \quad \text{with } D_\kappa^{(-)}(c, k, l-1) := D^{(-)}(\kappa[c](k, l-1), \kappa[c](l, k-1))$$

where  $\kappa$  is the unidirectional flux defined in (1.15) and

$$D(u, v) := (\sqrt{u} - \sqrt{v})^2, \quad \text{and } D^-(u, v) := \begin{cases} (\sqrt{u} - \sqrt{v})^2 & \text{if } u, v > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } u = 0 \text{ or } v = 0; \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We will use the functional  $D$  for the characterisation, however it is more convenient to prove the non-negativity of  $D$  via the auxiliary functional  $D^-$ . We will see in Remark 3.7, that  $D^-$  is an extension of  $D$  for the cases when  $c_k = 0$  for some  $k$ .

The definition of (3.1) is based on suitable extensions of the log (see Remark 3.7 and also compare with [53, Equation 4.40, 4.42]). To formulate those, we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 3.6.** The function  $A : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is defined by

$$A(u, v) := \begin{cases} \log(v) - \log(u) & \text{if } u, v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus \{(0, 0)\} \\ 0 & \text{if } u = v = 0 \end{cases}$$

and  $B(u, v, w) := A(u, v)w$ .

*Remark 3.7.* The definition of  $D^-$  in (3.1) is due to the extension of the difference of  $\log$  via the function  $A$ . Indeed, it holds

$$D_{\kappa}^-(c, k, l-1) = \sigma_{(c, k, l-1)} \mathbf{C}^*(A(\kappa[c](k, l-1), \kappa[c](l, k-1))).$$

If  $c_k, c_l, c_{l-1}, c_{k-1} > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\kappa}(c, k, l-1) &= D_{\kappa}^-(c, k, l-1) = \sigma_{(c, k, l-1)} \mathbf{C}^*(\log(\kappa[c](l, k-1)) - \log(\kappa[c](k, l-1))) \\ &= \sigma_{(c, k, l-1)} \mathbf{C}^*\left(\bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \log\left(\frac{c}{\omega^{\rho}}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

and when  $c_k > 0$  for all  $k$ , we get agreement of all define dissipation potentials

$$D(c) = \mathbf{R}^*\left(c, -\bar{\nabla} \log \frac{c}{\omega^{\rho}}\right)$$

so we recover the Legendre dual of (1.29) in the non-negative case.

Furthermore, the function  $B(u, v, w)$  gives an extension to the product  $\bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \log\left(\frac{c}{\omega^{\rho}}\right) j_{k, l-1}$  when the argument in the logarithm is zero. This is essential because we will use the Legendre inequality in [53, Lemma 4.19] of the form

$$|B(u, v, j)| \leq \mathbf{C}\left(j \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{uv}\right) + D^-(u, v). \quad (3.2)$$

If all of  $c_k, c_l, c_{k-1}, c_{l-1} > 0$ , then

$$B(\kappa[c](k, l-1), \kappa[c](l, k-1), j_{k, l-1}) = B\left(\frac{c_k c_{l-1}}{\omega_k^{\rho} \omega_{l-1}^{\rho}}, \frac{c_{k-1} c_l}{\omega_{k-1}^{\rho} \omega_l^{\rho}}, j_{k, l-1}\right) = \bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \log\left(\frac{c}{\omega^{\rho}}\right) j_{k, l-1}.$$

We will see  $B$  appears as the limit of an approximation of logarithm so in this sense it is a natural extension. In addition to the Legendre inequality (3.2),  $D^-$  is dominated by  $D$ . So a lower bound for  $D^-$  is also for  $D$ . These properties partly explain the introduction of  $D^-$ .

**Proposition 3.8** (Chain rule). *Under assumption  $(K_1)$ , any curve  $(c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$  starting from  $c(0) \in \mathcal{P}_{< \infty}$ ,  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$  with*

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{R}(c(r), j(r)) dr < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}^{\rho}(c(0)) < +\infty \quad (3.3)$$

*satisfies for all  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$  the chain rule identity*

$$\mathbf{E}^{\rho}(c(t)) - \mathbf{E}^{\rho}(c(s)) = \int_s^t \sum_{k, l \geq 1} B(\kappa[c(r)](k, l-1), \kappa[c(r)](l, k-1), j_{k, l-1}(r)) dr. \quad (3.4)$$

*In particular, the energy dissipation functional is non-negative*

$$\mathbf{L}^{\rho, -}(c, j) \geq 0. \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* We define the  $m$ -truncated logarithm for  $m > 0$  by

$$\log_m(x) := \max\{\min\{\log x, m\}, -m\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Further, we define the  $m$ -Lipschitz entropy density function by

$$\phi_m(x) := \int_1^x \log_m(y) dy.$$

With this, we define the regularised energy

$$\mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c) := \sum_{k \geq 0} \omega_k^\rho \phi_m \left( \frac{c_k}{\omega_k^\rho} \right). \quad (3.7)$$

*Step 1:* We first establish the chain rule for the  $m$ -regularised energy by a time-convolution and passing to the limit as  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ . To do so, it is enough to observe that  $|\log_m(x)| \leq m$  for any  $x \geq 0$  by definition (3.6). Indeed, by Definition 3.1 of  $(c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ , we can choose the test function to be  $\Phi = \mathbf{e}_k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and obtain by linearity of the continuity equation, the strong form of continuity equation for the time regularised pair  $(c^\delta = c * \eta^\delta, j^\delta = j * \eta^\delta)$  by the rescaled standard mollifier  $\eta$ , that is

$$\partial_t c_k^\delta(t) = -(\overline{\text{div}} j^\delta)_k(t) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Next, we define an admissible test function in the continuity equation by additionally truncating the regularised energy in (3.7) for some  $B \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$\mathbf{E}_{m,B}^\rho: \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{E}_{m,B}^\rho(c) := \sum_{k \geq 0}^B \omega_k^\rho \phi_m \left( \frac{c_k}{\omega_k^\rho} \right).$$

Then, we obtain from (3.8) and by the usual chain-rule

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{E}_{m,B}^\rho(c^\delta(t)) = \sum_{k=0}^B \omega_k^\rho \phi'_m \left( \frac{c_k^\delta(t)}{\omega_k^\rho} \right) \frac{\partial_t c_k^\delta(t)}{\omega_k^\rho} = \sum_{k=0}^B \log_m \left( \frac{c_k^\delta(t)}{\omega_k^\rho} \right) (-\overline{\text{div}} j_k^\delta(t)). \quad (3.9)$$

Using the boundedness  $|\log_m(x)| \leq m$  and

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} |(\overline{\text{div}} j^\delta)_k(t)| \leq 4 \sum_{k,l \geq 1} |j_{k,l-1}^\delta(t)| \leq 4 \sum_{k,l \geq 1} |j_{k,l-1}(t)|,$$

together TV bound of  $j$  from  $(c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ , we have the estimate uniform in  $B$  and  $\delta$

$$\int_0^T \sum_{k=0}^B \left| \log_m \left( \frac{c_k^\delta(t)}{\omega_k^\rho} \right) (-\overline{\text{div}} j_k^\delta(t)) \right| dt \leq 4m \int_0^T \sum_{k,l \geq 1} |j_{k,l-1}(t)| dt < \infty. \quad (3.10)$$

So we can take limit  $B \rightarrow \infty$  for the integral of (3.9) in time to obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c^\delta(t)) - \mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c^\delta(0)) = \int_0^t \left\langle \log_m \left( \frac{c^\delta(r)}{\omega^\rho} \right), -\overline{\text{div}} j^\delta(r) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}} dr \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Since the estimate (3.10) is uniform in  $\delta$ , we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \left\langle \log_m \left( \frac{c^\delta(r)}{\omega^\rho} \right), -\overline{\text{div}} j^\delta(r) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}} dr = \int_0^t \left\langle \log_m \left( \frac{c(r)}{\omega^\rho} \right), -\overline{\text{div}} j(r) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}} dr \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

by the pointwise convergence of  $c_k^\delta(t) \rightarrow c_k(t)$  and  $\overline{\text{div}}_k j^\delta(t) \rightarrow \overline{\text{div}}_k j(t)$  on  $[0, T]$  for each  $k \geq 0$  and dominated convergence. On the other hand, by the definition of  $\phi_m$ , we have

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \left| \omega_k^\rho \phi_m \left( \frac{c_k^\delta(t)}{\omega_k^\rho} \right) \right| \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} m c_k^\delta(t) \leq m \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k(t) = m$$

which implies  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c^\delta(t)) = \mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c(t))$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , again by dominated convergence. Therefore, we get the chain rule for the  $m$ -regularised energy

$$\mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c(t)) - \mathbf{E}_m^\rho(c(0)) = \int_0^t \left\langle \log_m \left( \frac{c(r)}{\omega^\rho} \right), -\overline{\text{div}} j(r) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}} dr = \int_0^t \left\langle \nabla \log_m \left( \frac{c(r)}{\omega^\rho} \right), j(r) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0} dr,$$

for which we used that  $\log_m$  is bounded and thus can be used as the test function in the continuity equation (ExCE).

*Step 2: Existence of limit.* We claim that for almost all  $r \in [0, T]$

$$\mathbb{B}\left(\frac{c_k(r)c_{l-1}(r)}{\omega_k^\rho\omega_{l-1}^\rho}, \frac{c_{k-1}(r)c_l(r)}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho\omega_l^\rho}, j_{k,l-1}(r)\right) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left[ -\log_m \frac{c_k(r)c_{l-1}(r)}{\omega_k^\rho\omega_{l-1}^\rho} + \log_m \frac{c_{k-1}(r)c_l(r)}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho\omega_l^\rho} \right] j_{k,l-1}(r). \quad (3.11)$$

Note, by construction of the truncated logarithm (3.6), we get

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a \log_m b = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } a < 0, b = 0 \\ -\infty & \text{if } a > 0, b = 0 \\ a \log b & \text{if } a \neq 0, b > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } a = 0. \end{cases}$$

To see (3.11), we note that the integrability condition (3.3) implies  $\mathbb{R}(c, j)$  is finite for almost all  $r \in [0, T]$ . So we have the following two cases on the limit in  $m$ :

- (1) If all of  $c_k, c_l, c_{l-1}, c_{k-1}$  are non-zero, the limit converges to  $\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \log\left(\frac{c}{\omega^\rho}\right) j_{k,l-1}$
- (2) If  $\mathbb{R}(c, j) = \sum_{k,l-1} \mathbb{C}(j_{k,l-1} | \sigma(c, k, l-1)) < +\infty$ , then when any of  $c_k, c_l, c_{l-1}, c_{k-1}$  is zero, it also forces  $j_{k,l-1} = 0$  by recalling the definition of  $\sigma$  in (1.30). In this case

$$\left( -\log_m \frac{c_k c_{l-1}}{\omega_k^\rho \omega_{l-1}^\rho} + \log_m \frac{c_{k-1} c_l}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho \omega_l^\rho} \right) j_{k,l-1} = 0$$

so the limit is zero.

Comparing with Definition 3.6 we see the equality (3.11) holds for almost all  $r \in [0, T]$ .

*Step 3:* To pass to the limit in  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , we derive a uniform bound via the duality

$$\sum_{k,l \geq 1} \left| \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \log_m \left( \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right) j_{k,l-1} \right| \leq \mathbb{R}(c, j) + \mathbb{R}^*(c, -\bar{\nabla} DE_m^\rho(c)).$$

The first term is bounded by assumption (3.3). To estimate the second term, we recall

$$\mathbb{R}^*(c, -\bar{\nabla} DE_m^\rho(c)) = \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \sigma_{k,l-1}(c) \mathbb{C}^* \left( \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \log_m \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right).$$

By denoting  $u_k := c_k / \omega_k^\rho$  and recalling the definition of  $\sigma$  in (1.30), we have the identity

$$\sigma_{k,l-1}(c) = \omega_k^\rho \omega_{l-1}^\rho K(k, l-1) \sqrt{u_k u_{l-1} u_{k-1} u_l}. \quad (3.12)$$

In particular, only terms for which  $u_k, u_{l-1}, u_{k-1}, u_l > 0$  contribute to the sum.

We estimate for any such  $u_k, u_{l-1}, u_{k-1}, u_l > 0$  by using the construction of the truncation

$$\left| \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \log_m \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right| \leq \left| \partial_k^- \log_m \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right| + \left| \partial_l^- \log_m \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right| \leq \left| \partial_k^- \log \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right| + \left| \partial_l^- \log \frac{c}{\omega^\rho} \right|. \quad (3.13)$$

By the elementary bound

$$\mathbb{C}^*(x) = 2(e^{x/4} - e^{-x/4})^2 \leq 2e^{|x|/2},$$

and (3.13), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}^*(\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \log_m u) &\leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \left| \partial_k^- \log u \right| + \frac{1}{2} \left| \partial_l^- \log u \right|\right) \\ &= 2 \max\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{u_k}{u_{k-1}}}, \sqrt{\frac{u_{k-1}}{u_k}} \right\} \max\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{u_l}{u_{l-1}}}, \sqrt{\frac{u_{l-1}}{u_l}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In combination with the identity (3.12), we find the bound by the assumption  $(K_1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{k,l-1}(c) \mathbb{C}^*(\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \log_m u) &\leq 2\omega_k^\rho \omega_{l-1}^\rho K(k, l-1) \max\{u_k, u_{k-1}\} \max\{u_l, u_{l-1}\} \\ &\leq 2K(k, l-1) \left( c_k + \frac{\omega_k^\rho}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho} c_{k-1} \right) \left( \frac{\omega_{l-1}^\rho}{\omega_l^\rho} c_l + c_{l-1} \right) \\ &\leq 2C_K C_{\omega^\rho} k l (c_k + c_{k-1})(c_l + c_{l-1}) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$C_{\omega^\rho} = \sup_{k \geq 1} \max \left\{ \frac{\omega_k^\rho}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho}, \frac{\omega_{k-1}^\rho}{\omega_k^\rho} \right\} < \infty.$$

Indeed, the finiteness of  $C_{\omega^\rho}$  is thanks to assumption  $(K_c)$  due to

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_k^\rho}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho} = \Phi(\rho) \cdot \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(1, k-1)}{K(k, 0)} < \infty.$$

Altogether, we conclude

$$R^*(c, -\bar{\nabla} DE^m(c)) \leq 2C_K C_{\omega^\rho} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} kl(c_k + c_{k-1})(c_l + c_{l-1}) \leq 8C_K C_{\omega^\rho} (\tilde{\rho} + 1)^2,$$

where  $\tilde{\rho} \in [0, +\infty)$  is the first moment of  $c(0)$ . Thus, we obtained a  $m$ -uniform bound and can conclude the stated chain-rule (3.4) by dominated convergence on  $[0, T]$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Step 4.* To show  $L^{\rho^-}(c, j) \geq 0$ , the idea to use again the duality of  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}^*$  as well as the detailed balance condition to conclude while being cautious about the divergence of  $\log$  at 0. This was taken care of by the properties of the extension  $\mathbf{B}$  from Definition 3.6 in [53, Lemma 4.19]. Therefore, we have the inequality

$$\left| \mathbf{B} \left( \frac{c_k c_{l-1}}{\omega_k^\rho \omega_{l-1}^\rho}, \frac{c_{k-1} c_l}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho \omega_l^\rho}, j_{k, l-1} \right) \right| \leq \mathbf{C}(j_{k, l-1} | \sigma(c, k, l-1)) + \mathbf{D}_\kappa^- [c](k, l-1).$$

In summary, we obtain the chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{E}^\rho(c(T)) - \mathbf{E}^\rho(c(0))| &\leq \int_0^T \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \left| \mathbf{B} \left( \frac{c_k(r) c_{l-1}(r)}{\omega_k^\rho \omega_{l-1}^\rho}, \frac{c_{k-1}(r) c_l(r)}{\omega_{k-1}^\rho \omega_l^\rho}, j_{k, l-1}(r) \right) \right| dr \\ &\leq \int_0^T \left( \sum_{k, l-1} \mathbf{C}(j_{k, l-1}(r) | \sigma(c(r), k, l-1)) + \sum_{k, l-1} \mathbf{D}_\kappa^-(c(r), k, l-1) \right) dr \\ &= \int_0^T (\mathbf{R}(c(r), j(r)) + \mathbf{D}^-(c(r))) dr, \end{aligned}$$

which imply  $\mathbf{E}^\rho(c(T)) - \mathbf{E}^\rho(c(0)) + \int_0^T (\mathbf{R}(c(t), j(t)) + \mathbf{D}^-(c(t))) dt \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9** (Equality conditions). *Let  $u, v \geq 0$ . If  $j \in \mathbb{R}$  is such that*

$$-\mathbf{B}(u, v, j) = \mathbf{C}(j | \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{uv}) + \mathbf{D}(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.14)$$

*then we have either  $\{\sqrt{uv} = 0 \text{ and } (u-v) = 0\}$  or  $\{\sqrt{uv} > 0\}$  and*

$$j = \frac{1}{2}(u-v). \quad (3.15)$$

*In particular, in this case  $\mathbf{D}(u, v) = \mathbf{D}^-(u, v)$ .*

*Conversely, if  $j = \frac{1}{2}(u-v)$ , then*

$$-\mathbf{B}(u, v, j) = \mathbf{C}(j | \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{uv}) + \mathbf{D}(u, v) \in [0, \infty]. \quad (3.16)$$

*Proof.* From the definition (3.1), we observe

$$(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D}^-)(u, v) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} > 0 \text{ or } (u-v) = 0; \\ \max(|u|, |v|), & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} = 0 \text{ and } (u-v) \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore in the cases  $\sqrt{uv} > 0$  or  $(u-v) = 0$  we can apply the [53, Lemma 4.19] to get (3.15).

Next, we show by contradiction that the case  $\sqrt{uv} = 0$  and  $(u-v) \neq 0$  cannot occur. Suppose  $\sqrt{uv} = 0$  and  $(u-v) \neq 0$ , we have

$$-\mathbf{A}(u, v)j = \text{sign}(u-v)\infty \cdot j$$

and

$$\mathsf{C}(j|\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{uv}) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } j \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } j = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{as well as} \quad \mathsf{D}(u, v) = \max(|u|, |v|) > 0.$$

If  $j = 0$ , then by (3.14) we have a contradiction  $0 = \max(|u|, |v|) > 0$  because we use the convention  $0 \cdot \pm\infty = 0$ . If  $j \neq 0$  then both sides of the equality (3.14) are not real. We obtain contradictions for any choice of  $j$  so that this case cannot occur, concluding the proof of the first statement.

By the first statement, we see that  $(\mathsf{D} - \mathsf{D}^-)(u, v) = 0$  in the two possible combinations of  $\sqrt{uv}$  and  $(u - v)$ . This gives the second statement.

Conversely, suppose  $j = \frac{1}{2}(u - v)$ , then we have by expanding all definitions

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathsf{B}(u, v, j) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(u - v)(\log u - \log v) & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} > 0, (u - v) > 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} = 0, (u - v) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } (u - v) = 0; \end{cases} \\ \mathsf{C}(j|\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{uv}) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{uv}\mathsf{C}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}(u-v)}{\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{uv}}\right) & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} > 0, (u - v) > 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} = 0, (u - v) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } (u - v) = 0; \end{cases} \\ \mathsf{D}(u, v) &= \begin{cases} \mathsf{D}^-(u, v) = (\sqrt{u} - \sqrt{v})^2 & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} > 0, (u - v) > 0 \\ \max(|u|, |v|) & \text{if } \sqrt{uv} = 0, (u - v) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } (u - v) = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This shows Equation (3.16) by [53, Lemma 4.19].  $\square$

**Proposition 3.10** (EDP solution for (MFE)). *Under assumption  $(\mathsf{K}_1)$ , let  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$ . Then for any  $c(0) \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  with  $\mathsf{E}^\rho(c(0)) < \infty$ , the following are equivalent*

$$\mathsf{L}^\rho(c, j) = 0 \iff \begin{cases} (c, j) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T) \\ j(t) = \bar{j}[c(t)] \text{ for almost all } t \in [0, T] \\ \mathsf{E}^\rho(c(T)) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}(c(t)) dt \leq \mathsf{E}^\rho(c(0)). \end{cases}$$

Hereby, the total dissipation along the solution is defined as

$$\text{Dis}(c) := - \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathsf{B}\left(\kappa[c](k, l - 1), \kappa[c](l, k - 1), \bar{j}[c](k, l - 1)\right),$$

with  $\bar{j}[c(t)]$  the net flux defined in (MFE).

*Proof.* For  $\mathsf{L}^\rho(c, j) = 0$ , we have for any  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  the bounds

$$\int_0^T [\mathsf{R}(c(r), j(r)) + \mathsf{D}(c(r))] dr < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^T \mathsf{C}(j_{k, l-1}(r)|\sigma(c(r), k, l - 1)) dr < +\infty.$$

By the chain rule in Proposition 3.8, we get

$$\int_0^T \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} -\mathsf{B}(\kappa[c(t)](k, l - 1), \kappa[c(t)](l, k - 1), j_{k, l-1}(t)) dt = \int_0^T \mathsf{R}(c(t), j(t)) + \mathsf{D}(c(t)) dt,$$

which means the equality in the inequality  $|\mathsf{B}(u, v, j)| \leq \mathsf{C}(j|\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{uv}) + (\sqrt{u} - \sqrt{v})^2$  is attained for almost all times  $t \in [0, T]$ . Therefore for each  $k, l - 1$  and for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ , the corresponding Equation (3.14) with  $u = \kappa[c](k, l - 1), v = \kappa[c](l, k - 1)$  is satisfied in  $\mathbb{R}$ . By Lemma 3.9,  $j_{k, l-1}(t) = \bar{j}[c(t)](k, l - 1)$  for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$  or each  $k, l - 1$ . This implies

$$\mathsf{E}^\rho(c(T)) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}(c(t)) dt = \mathsf{E}^\rho(c(0)).$$

Conversely, suppose  $\mathbf{E}^\rho(c(T)) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}(c(t))dt \leq \mathbf{E}^\rho(c(0))$  and  $j_{k,l-1}(t) = \overline{\mathbb{J}}[c(t)](k, l-1)$  for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$  for each  $k, l-1$ . By the converse statement in Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\text{Dis}(c(t)) = \mathbf{R}(c(t), j(t)) + \mathbf{D}(c(t)) \quad \text{for almost all } t \in [0, T].$$

Hence  $\mathbf{L}^\rho(c, j) \leq 0$  and by the non-negativity from (3.5), we have  $\mathbf{L}^\rho(c, j) = 0$ .  $\square$

#### 4. FORWARD KOLMOGOROV EQUATION

**4.1. Finite particle continuity equation.** The graph gradient  $\widehat{\nabla}^L$  defined in (1.8) maps functions on  $\widehat{V}^{N,L}$  defined in (1.5) to functions on  $\widehat{E}^{N,L}$  defined in (1.9) and gives rise to a continuity equation structure typical for Markov jump processes (see e.g. [53, Definition 4.1] or [19, 21, 55]).

**Definition 4.1** (Finite particle continuity equation). Let  $N, L \in \mathbb{N}$ , the pair  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L})_{t \in [0, T]} \subset \mathcal{P}(\widehat{V}^{N,L}) \times \mathcal{M}(\widehat{E}^{N,L})$  is said to satisfy the continuity equation, denoted by  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  provided that:

- (1) the fluxes  $(\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L})_{t \in [0, T]} \subset \mathcal{M}(\widehat{E}^{N,L})$  is a Borel measurable family which maps to finite signed measure on  $\widehat{E}^{N,L}$  satisfying

$$\int_0^T \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \widehat{E}^{N,L}} |L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1)| dt < \infty.$$

- (2)  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})$  satisfies the continuity equation  $\partial_t \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} = -\widehat{\text{div}}^L \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}$  in the sense that for all  $\Phi : \widehat{V}^{N,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and all  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$

$$\sum_{c \in \widehat{V}^{N,L}} (\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) - \mathbb{C}_s^{N,L}(c)) \Phi(c) = \int_s^t \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \widehat{E}^{N,L}} \widehat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L \Phi(c) \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) dr. \quad (\mathbf{CE}^N)$$

Note, that for any given  $N, L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\widehat{V}^{N,L}$  is a finite set and so the sum in  $(\mathbf{CE}^N)$  is always finite. Therefore, the weak form is equivalent with the strong form  $(\mathbf{CE}^N)$ , but it is more convenient for passing to the thermodynamic limit.

**4.2. Gradient flow structure for the finite particle system.** Analogous to energy dissipation function for the limiting mean-field system in Definition 3.5, we have to define the regularised the dual of dissipation potential to avoid the singularity of logarithm at zero.

For the sake of presentation, we use a similar convention as in Notation 3.4, and use the symbol  $(-, -)$  in  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L(-)}$  to define simultaneously the two functionals  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L,-}$ .

**Definition 4.2** (EDF for the particle system  $(\text{FKE}_N)$ ). The energy dissipation function for the finite particle system is defined for any  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  to be given by

$$\mathcal{L}^{N,L(-)}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) := L^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \Big|_{t=0}^T + \int_0^T \left[ L^{-1} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L(-)}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \right] dt \quad (4.1)$$

If  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \notin \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$ , then it takes the value  $+\infty$ . The free energy functional  $\mathcal{E}^{N,L}$  is given as the relative entropy with respect to  $\mathbb{P}^{N,L}$  defined (1.25). The dissipation potential  $\mathcal{R}^{N,L}$  and its relaxed duals  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L(-)}$  (see Remark 4.3) are given by

$$L^{-1} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) := \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \widehat{E}^{N,L}} \mathbf{C} \left( L^{-1} \mathbb{J}^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) \mid \sigma_{(c,k,l-1)}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) \right), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathcal{D}^{N,L(-)}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) := \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \widehat{E}^{N,L}} D_{\kappa}^{N,L(-)}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}; c, k, l-1), \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$D_{\kappa}^{N,L,-}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}; c, k, l-1) := k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L} D^{(-)}(u_t^{N,L}(c), u_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})),$$

$$\sigma_{(c,k,l-1)}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) := \frac{1}{2} k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L} \sqrt{u_t^{N,L}(c) u_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})} \quad \text{with} \quad u_t^{N,L}(c) := \frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c)}{\mathbb{I}^{N,L}(c)}$$

and we recall  $k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L}$  defined in (1.24).

*Remark 4.3.*

(a) *Consistency to  $\mathbb{C}^*$ .* If the arguments of the logarithm is strictly positive, then we get the identity

$$k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L} \left( \sqrt{u_t^{N,L}(c)} - \sqrt{u_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})} \right)^2 = \sigma_{(c,k,l-1)}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^* \left( \log \frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c)}{\mathbb{I}^{N,L}(c)} - \log \frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})}{\mathbb{I}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})} \right)$$

$$= \sigma_{(c,k,l-1)}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^* (-\hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L D\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})(c)).$$

In particular, in this case, we have the identity

$$\mathcal{D}^{N,L,-}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) = \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) = \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_{(c,k,l-1)}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^* (-\hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L D\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L})(c))$$

$$=: \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L*}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, -\hat{\nabla}^L D\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}))$$

which shows the duality structure.

(b) *Explicit formula for  $\mathbb{I}^{N,L}$ .* For  $c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{I}^{N,L}(c) = C^L \# \pi^{N,L}(c) = \frac{\#\{C^L(\cdot) = c\}}{\mathcal{Z}^{N,L}} \prod_{k=0}^N w(k)^{c_k L}.$$

Hereby,  $\#\{C^L(\cdot) = c\} = \frac{L!}{\prod_{k=0}^N (c_k L)!}$  is the cardinality of the configurations  $\eta \in V^{N,L}$

giving rise to the same cluster distribution  $c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$ . Using the explicit expression of  $\mathbb{I}^{N,L} = C^L \# \pi^{N,L}$ , we get the representation of the rates as

$$k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L} = \frac{\#\{C^L(\cdot) = c\}}{\mathcal{Z}^{N,L}} \kappa_{(c,k,l-1)}^L \prod_{j=0}^N w(j)^{c_j L} \quad \text{if } (c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}.$$

We are going to prove that the microscopic detailed balance condition (DBC) is lifted to the cluster level through the push forward map  $C^L$  defined in (1.4), which shows the well-posedness of (1.24). But before that, we first justify the global assumption (BDA) indeed implies that  $\pi^{N,L}$  satisfies the Equation (DBC), which was the content of Proposition 1.3.

*Proof of Proposition 1.3.* Let us suppose that (BDA) holds, then we get for  $N, L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x, y \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ ,  $\eta \in V^{N,L}$ :  $\eta_x > 0$  using the definitions  $\pi^{N,L}$  and  $w$  in (1.19) and (1.20) the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{N,L} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,y}) K(\eta_y^{x,y}, \eta_x^{x,y}) &= \prod_{z=1}^L w(\eta_z^{x,y}) K(\eta_y^{x,y}, \eta_x^{x,y}) \\ &= \prod_{z=1}^L w(\eta_z) \frac{K(\eta_x, 0) K(1, \eta_y)}{K(1, \eta_x - 1) K(\eta_y + 1, 0)} K(\eta_y + 1, \eta_x - 1) \\ &= \prod_{z=1}^L w(\eta_z) \frac{K(\eta_x, \eta_y)}{K(\eta_y + 1, \eta_x - 1)} K(\eta_y + 1, \eta_x - 1) \\ &= \prod_{z=1}^L w(\eta_z) K(\eta_x, \eta_y) = \mathcal{Z}^{N,L} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) K(\eta_x, \eta_y), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (DBC).

Suppose (DBC) holds. Let  $N, L \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed but arbitrary. For  $L = 1$ , (DBC) is an empty condition so we consider  $L \geq 2$ . Let  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k + l - 1 \leq N$ . Choose  $\eta \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$ ,  $x, y, z \in \{1, \dots, L\}$  with  $\eta_x = k$ ,  $\eta_y = l - 1$  and  $\eta_z = 0$ . We have  $\pi^{N,L} > 0$  since  $\pi^{N,L}$  is a probability measure on  $V^{N,L}$  and satisfies (DBC). Applying (DBC) for  $\eta$ ,  $\eta^{x,y}$  and  $\eta^{x,z}$  repeatedly, we have

$$\frac{K(k, l - 1)}{K(l, k - 1)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) = \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,y}) = \frac{K(1, l - 1)}{K(l, 0)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,z}) = \frac{K(1, l - 1)K(k, 0)}{K(l, 0)K(1, k - 1)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta)$$

which implies (BDA) for  $k + l - 1 \leq N$ . Since  $N$  is arbitrary, it holds for all  $k, l \geq 1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4** (Coarse-grained detailed balance condition). *Assume  $\pi^{N,L}$  satisfies (DBC), then the measure  $\mathbb{P}^{N,L} := C^L \# \pi^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{V}^{N,L})$  satisfies the detailed balance condition*

$$\mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c) \kappa^L[c](k, l - 1) = \mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}) \kappa^L[c^{k,l-1}](l, k - 1) \quad \text{for any } \{c, k, l\} \in \hat{E}^{N,L}, \quad (4.4)$$

with the jump rates  $\kappa^L$  are defined in (1.10)

*Proof.* If  $l = k$ , we note that  $c^{k,k-1} = c$  and there is nothing to show. For  $l \neq k$ , we decompose the microscopic edge set  $E^{N,L}$ , defined in (1.3), into

$$F(c, k, l - 1) := \{(\eta, x, y) \in E^{N,L} : C^L(\eta) = c, C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}\}.$$

We observe that by definition

$$\begin{aligned} F(c, k, l - 1) &= \{(\eta, x, y) \in E^{N,L} : C^L(\eta) = c, \eta_x = k, \eta_y = l - 1\} \\ &= \{(\eta, x, y) \in E^{N,L} : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}, \eta_x^{x,y} = k - 1, \eta_y^{x,y} = l\}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that we can describe a transition from  $c$  to  $c^{k,l-1}$  either by the initial distribution with the numbers of particle in the two boxes involved or by the final distribution with the number of particles of the two boxes involved.

We note that we can rewrite equivalently (DBC) in terms of the kernels as

$$\pi^{N,L}(\eta) K(k, l - 1) = \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,y}) K(l, k - 1) \quad \text{for all } (\eta, x, y) \in F(c, k, l - 1). \quad (4.5)$$

By summing over the above equation and after multiplying by  $L^{-2}$  on both sides, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{(\eta, x, y) \in F(c, k, l - 1)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) K(\eta_x, \eta_y) &= \frac{K(k, l - 1)}{L^2} \sum_{(\eta, x, y) \in F(c, k, l - 1)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) \\ &= \frac{K(k, l - 1)}{L^2} \sum_{\eta: C^L(\eta) = c} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) \#\{(x, y) : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The idea behind the last equality is that we can sum over  $F(c, k, l - 1)$  in two steps. First, we fix an  $\eta$  with  $C^L(\eta) = c$  and count how many possible pathways to change from  $C^L(\eta)$  to  $C^L(\eta^{x,y})$  and second sum over  $\{\eta : C^L(\eta) = c\}$ . For a fixed  $\eta$  with  $C^L(\eta) = c$ , we have

$$\#\{(x, y) : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}\} = L^2 c_k (c_{l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{k,l-1}), \quad (4.6)$$

because  $Lc_k$  is the number of boxes with  $k$  particles in  $\eta$  and we only count the jump between different boxes. So we need to reduce the number by 1 if  $k = l - 1$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{K(k, l - 1)}{L^2} \sum_{\eta: C^L(\eta) = c} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) \#\{(x, y) : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}\} \\ &= K(k, l - 1) c_k (c_{l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{k,l-1}) \sum_{\eta: C^L(\eta) = c} \pi^{N,L}(\eta) \\ &= K(k, l - 1) c_k (c_{l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{k,l-1}) C^L \# \pi^{N,L}(c) \\ &= \frac{L - 1}{L} \mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c) \kappa^L_{(c,k,l-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we can modify the summation in analogous way on the other side of the equation (4.5) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{(\eta,x,y) \in F(c,k,l-1)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,y}) K(\eta_y^{x,y}, \eta_x^{x,y}) \\
 &= \frac{K(l, k-1)}{L^2} \sum_{(\eta,x,y) \in F(c,k,l-1)} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{x,y}) \\
 &= \frac{K(l, k-1)}{L^2} \sum_{\substack{\eta: C^L(\eta^{z,z'}) = c^{k,l-1} \\ \text{for some } z, z' \in \{1, \dots, L\}}} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{z,z'}) \#\{(x, y) : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}, C^L(\eta) = c\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we again sum in two steps: we fix  $\eta$  such that it has a transition pathway to  $C^L(\eta^{z,z'}) = c^{k,l-1}$  and then count the number of transition pathways that from  $c^{k,l-1}$  back to  $c$ . We note that by definition of  $\pi^{N,L}$ , it does not depend on the label of the box but the cluster size distribution so we can write  $\pi^{N,L}(\eta^{z,z'})$  independent of  $(x, y)$  in the product form above.

On the set  $\{\eta : C^L(\eta^{z,z'}) = c^{k,l-1} \text{ for some } z, z'\}$ , we get similar to (4.6) the identity

$$\#\{(x, y) : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}, C^L(\eta) = c\} = L^2 c_l^{k,l-1} (c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{l,k-1}).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{K(l, k-1)}{L^2} \sum_{\substack{\eta: C^L(\eta^{z,z'}) = c^{k,l-1} \\ \text{for some } z, z'}} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{z,z'}) \#\{(x, y) : C^L(\eta^{x,y}) = c^{k,l-1}, C^L(\eta) = c\} \\
 &= K(l, k-1) c_l^{k,l-1} (c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{l,k-1}) \sum_{\substack{\eta: C^L(\eta^{z,z'}) = c^{k,l-1} \\ \text{for some } z, z' \in \{1, \dots, L\}}} \pi^{N,L}(\eta^{z,z'}) \\
 &= K(l, k-1) c_l^{k,l-1} (c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} - L^{-1} \delta_{l,k-1}) C_{\#}^L \pi^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}) \\
 &= \frac{L-1}{L} \mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}) \kappa_{(c^{k,l-1}, l, k-1)}^L.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by the detailed balance condition (4.5), we have

$$\mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c) \kappa^L[c](k, l-1) = \mathbb{P}^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1}) \kappa^L[c^{k,l-1}](l, k-1). \quad \square$$

**Proposition 4.5** (Chain rule). *Under assumption  $(K_1)$ , let  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  with*

$$\int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}) < +\infty. \quad (4.7)$$

Then for  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ , the chain rule holds

$$\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) - \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_s^{N,L}) = \int_s^t \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \mathbf{B} \left( \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c), \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c^{k,l-1}), \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) \right) dr \quad (4.8)$$

and the energy dissipation function defined in (4.1) is non-negative

$$\mathcal{L}^{N,L,-}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \geq 0. \quad (4.9)$$

*Proof.* For the first statement, we apply [53, Theorem 4.16] and have to verify the assumptions. The global assumptions in [53, Chapter 3] are satisfied because

( $V\pi\kappa$ ): Since  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  is a finite set,  $(\hat{V}^{N,L}, \tau_{\text{discrete}}, \mathbb{P}^{N,L})$  is a standard Borel measure space with  $\mathbb{P}^{N,L}$  satisfying the detailed balance condition (4.4) on  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  and the bound

$$\sup_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \sum_{k,l=1}^N \kappa[c](k, l-1) < \infty$$

holds trivially.

( $\mathcal{E}\phi$ ): The relative entropy satisfies the assumptions for driving functional [53, Equation (3.8)-(3.9)].

( $\mathcal{R}^*\Psi\alpha$ ): The cosh-structure of  $\mathbb{C}^*$  and  $(u, v) \mapsto \sqrt{uv}$  satisfies the assumptions in [53, Equation (3.11)-(3.13)].

For the local assumptions in [53, Theorem 4.16],

$\mathcal{A}(0, T)$ : Our definition of continuity equation  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{E}^N(0, T)$  is equivalent to the solution  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})$  satisfies the continuity equation in the setting of [53]. By assumption (4.7) it has finite  $\mathcal{R}^{N,L}$  action so  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{E}^N(0, T)$  satisfies the assumption  $\mathcal{A}(0, T)$  as defined in [53, Equation (4.33)].

(4.44): Since the initial relative entropy is bounded, by assumption (4.7), if we can show

$$\int_s^t dr \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \left| \mathbb{B} \left( \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c), \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c^{k,l-1}), \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) \right) \right| < +\infty \quad (4.10)$$

then the assumption [53, Equation (4.44)] is satisfied.

As a result, taking for the moment the bound (4.10) for granted, the result [53, Theorem 4.16] implies (4.8). It remains to show (4.10). Indeed, we estimate using the Legendre duality for  $\mathbb{B}$  in (3.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{L} \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \left| \mathbb{B} \left( \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c), \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c^{k,l-1}), \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) \right) \right| \\ &= \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \left| \mathbb{B} \left( \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c), \frac{\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}}{\mathbb{P}^{N,L}}(c^{k,l-1}), \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L,-}(\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}) \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by the assumption (4.7) and the second term is estimated using the Assumption ( $\mathbb{K}_1$ ) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{N,L,-}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) &\leq \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \leq \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L} (u_t^{N,L}(c) + u_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})) \\ &= 2 \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \kappa^L[c](k, l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{L}{L-1} C_K \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} c_k c_{l-1} kl \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \\ &\leq \frac{2L}{L-1} C_K \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(c) M_1(c) (M_1(c) + 1) \\ &= \frac{2L}{L-1} C_K \frac{N}{L} \left( \frac{N}{L} + 1 \right) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

For the second statement, by the chain rule just proved and the Legendre duality inequality in [53, Lemma 4.19], we immediately get

$$\frac{1}{L}|\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) - \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_s^{N,L})| \leq \int_s^t \frac{1}{L}\mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L,-}(\mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}) \, dr.$$

Therefore, the claim (4.9) is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.6** (EDP solution for (FKE<sub>N</sub>)). *Under the assumption (K<sub>1</sub>), let  $\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{V}^{N,L})$  be given with  $\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}) < \infty$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0 \iff \begin{cases} (\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T), \\ L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} = \hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}] \text{ for almost all } t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) dt \leq \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}), \end{cases}$$

where the reference net flux  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}]$  is defined in (1.11) and the total dissipation is

$$\text{Dis}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) := - \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \text{B}\left(\frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}}{\prod_{N,L}}(c), \frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}}{\prod_{N,L}}(c^{k,l-1}), L \hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}](c, k, l-1)\right).$$

*Proof.* The proof is very similar to Proposition 3.10, so only the key steps are given. For  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0$ , the chain rule in Proposition 4.5 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^T \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \text{B}\left(\frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}}{\prod_{N,L}}(c), \frac{\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}}{\prod_{N,L}}(c^{k,l-1}), \frac{1}{L}\mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(c, k, l-1)\right) dt \\ & = \int_0^T \left(L^{-1}\mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.9, for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ , all  $(c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}$ , we get the identification

$$L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) = \hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}](c, k, l-1).$$

Inserting this expression to  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_T^{N,L}) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) dt = \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}).$$

Conversely, suppose  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$ ,  $L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} = \hat{\mathbb{J}}^{N,L}[\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}]$  for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ , and

$$\mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_T^{N,L}) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) dt \leq \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}) < \infty,$$

then by the converse statement in Lemma 3.9, we have for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\frac{1}{L}\text{Dis}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) = \frac{1}{L}\mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})$$

which implies  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \leq 0$ . Then, by Equation (4.9) in Proposition 4.5, the claim  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0$  follows.  $\square$

## 5. LIOUVILLE EQUATION

**5.1. Superposition principle for the infinite particle continuity equation.** The setting of the exchange continuity equation from Definition 3.1 is now lifted to the infinite particle limit. For doing so, we use a topology adapted to the exchange metric introduced in Section 2, where we now introduce a notion of differentiability.

**Definition 5.1.** A function  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has bounded  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -derivative, denoted by  $C_b^1(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$ , provided that

- (1)  $\Phi$  is coordinate-wise differentiable;

- (2)  $\sup_{c \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}} \sup_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} |\gamma^{k,l-1} \cdot \nabla^\infty \Phi(c)| < \infty$ ;  
(3)  $\sup_{c \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}} \sup_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} |(\Phi(c + L^{-1}\gamma^{k,l-1}) - \Phi(c))L - \gamma^{k,l-1} \cdot \nabla^\infty \Phi(c)| = o(1)_{L \rightarrow \infty}$ .

In this case, also the notation  $\bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c)$  defined in (1.16) is used instead of  $\gamma^{k,l-1} \cdot \nabla^\infty \Phi(c)$ .

**Definition 5.2.** The pair  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  solves the *infinite particle continuity equation*, denoted by  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ , provided that

- (1)  $\mathbb{C} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty})$  is weakly continuous in duality with bounded and continuous functions with respect to  $(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$ ;  
(2)  $(\mathbb{J}_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{P}_{<\infty})$  is a Borel measurable family such that

$$\int_0^T \sum_{k,l \geq 1} |\mathbb{J}_{k,l-1}(t)|(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}) dt < \infty;$$

- (3) for all  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$  and every  $\Phi \in C_b^1(\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  the weak form holds

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}} \Phi(c)(\mathbb{C}_t - \mathbb{C}_s)(dc) = \int_s^t \int_{\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \bar{\nabla}_{k,l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) \mathbb{J}_r(dc, k, l-1) dr. \quad (\text{CE}^\infty)$$

The proof of the superposition principle follows the one established in [4] in the setting of continuity equations on  $\mathbb{R}^\infty$ . We will see that our definition of  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  is compatible with the assumptions in [4, Theorem 7.1]. To see this, we recall the notion of smooth cylindrical test functions on  $\mathbb{R}^\infty$  from [4, Chapter 7].

**Definition 5.3** (Smooth cylindrical function). A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a *smooth cylindrical test function* provided that  $f = \phi \circ p_n$  where  $p_n : \mathbb{R}^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a suitable selection of coordinates and  $\phi \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

*Remark 5.4.* The domain of a smooth cylindrical function is of finite dimension so it is  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -continuous and has bounded  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -derivative.

We state now a version of the superposition principle, which generalises the result from [4] towards our setting.

**Lemma 5.5** (Superposition principle). *Let  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  be such that*

- (a)  $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{C}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  is weakly continuous in duality with smooth cylindrical functions;  
(b) for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{C}(t)$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ ;  
(c)  $\mathbb{C}(0)$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$  for some  $\rho \in [0, \infty)$ ;  
(d) for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , the measure  $\mathbb{J}_{k,l-1}(t) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathbb{C}(t)$  and

$$\overline{\text{div}} \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \quad \text{with} \quad (t, c) \mapsto \overline{\text{div}} \frac{d\mathbb{J}(t)}{d\mathbb{C}(t)}(c) = - \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma^{k,l} \frac{d\mathbb{J}_{k,l-1}(t)}{d\mathbb{C}(t)}(c)$$

is a Borel vector-valued function;

- (e) for every  $F : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  smooth cylindrical and all  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$  the weak form holds

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}} F(c)(\mathbb{C}_t(dc) - \mathbb{C}_s(dc)) = \int_s^t \int_{\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}} \left\langle \nabla^\infty F(c), - \overline{\text{div}} \frac{d\mathbb{J}_r}{d\mathbb{C}_r}(c) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}_0} \mathbb{C}_r(dc) dr;$$

- (f) the flux  $\mathbb{J}$  satisfies the total variation bound

$$\int_0^T \int \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{d\mathbb{J}_{k,l-1}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(c) \right| \mathbb{C}_r(dc) dr < \infty. \quad (5.1)$$

Then there exists a Borel probability measure  $\lambda$  on  $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  such that

- (i)  $(e_t)_\# \lambda = \mathbb{C}_t$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , with  $e_t : C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  the evaluation map given by  $e_t \gamma = \gamma_t$  for  $\gamma \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$ ;
- (ii)  $\lambda$  is concentrated on curves  $\gamma \in \text{AC}([0, T], \mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}})$  such that  $(\gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$  for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $\gamma$ .

*Proof.* Under the assumptions (a)–(f), we can apply the result of [4, Theorem 7.1] to obtain a Borel probability measure  $\lambda$  in  $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  satisfying  $(e_t)_\# \lambda = \mathbb{C}(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . The measure  $\lambda$  is concentrated on  $\gamma \in \text{AC}_w([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  [4, Section 7], which satisfies for all sequences  $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with finitely many non-zero terms, for all  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ , the continuity equation

$$\langle f, (\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)) \rangle_{\mathbb{N}_0} = \int_s^t \left\langle f, -\overline{\text{div}} \left( \frac{d\mathbb{J}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(\gamma(r)) \right) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}_0} dr = \int_s^t \left\langle \nabla f, \frac{d\mathbb{J}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(\gamma(r)) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0} dr. \quad (5.2)$$

We denote the set of curve  $\gamma$  satisfying (5.2) by  $\text{SCE}(\lambda, \mathbb{J})$  so that  $\lambda$  is concentrated on this set. By superposition, we can express the total variation bound (5.1) as

$$\int_{C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})} \int_0^T \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{d\mathbb{J}_{k, l-1}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(\gamma(r)) \right| dr \lambda(d\gamma) < \infty.$$

Hence, we have

$$\int_0^T \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{d\mathbb{J}_{k, l-1}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(\gamma(r)) \right| dr < \infty \quad \text{for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } \gamma \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0}). \quad (5.3)$$

Hence, we can extend for each such  $\gamma$ , the test functions in (5.2) to the set  $\{f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \sup_{k, l-1} |\overline{\nabla}_{k, l-1} f| \leq 1\} = \mathcal{F}$  as given in Definition 2.3 of the dual metric of. Recall that for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{C}(t)$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_{< \infty}$  and so also  $(\gamma(r))_{r \in [0, T]} \subset \mathcal{P}_{< \infty}$ . Moreover  $\mathbb{C}(0)$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$  so that  $\gamma(0) \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$ . By choosing the test function  $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} = (k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{F}$ , we see that  $\gamma(r) \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  for all  $r \in [0, T]$  (see Remark 3.2). This allows us to apply Proposition 2.5 about the dual representation of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  in terms of the set  $\mathcal{F}$ .

The continuity is observed for  $\lambda$ -almost all  $\gamma \in \text{SCE}(\lambda, \mathbb{J})$  by taking the absolute value and supremum on the left of (5.2) and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{Ex}}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) &= \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\|_{\mathcal{F}}^* = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\langle f, \gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{N}_0}| \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \int_s^t \left\langle f, -\overline{\text{div}} \left( \frac{d\mathbb{J}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(\gamma(r)) \right) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{N}_0} dr \right| \leq \int_s^t \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{d\mathbb{J}_{k, l-1}(r)}{d\mathbb{C}(r)}(\gamma(r)) \right| dr. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

By (5.4) and (5.3), we see that if for  $\lambda$  almost all  $\gamma \in \text{SCE}(\lambda, \mathbb{J})$ , then  $\gamma \in \text{AC}([0, T], \mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}})$ . Therefore  $(\gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.9.* We only need to verify the assumptions of Lemma 5.5. Because the set of smooth cylindrical functions is a subset of the functions in  $C_b(\mathcal{P}_{< \infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  and bounded  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  differentiable. Hence the first assumptions on  $\mathbb{C}$  in Lemma 5.5 are satisfied due to the first condition in the definition of  $\text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ .

The assumption on the absolute continuity of  $\mathbb{J}$  with respect to  $\mathbb{C}$  allows us to write the conditions on  $\mathbb{J}$  in  $\text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  of Definition 5.2 in the terms of the Borel density  $\frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}$ .  $\square$

## 5.2. Gradient flow structure for the Liouville equation.

**Definition 5.6** (Energy dissipation function for the Liouville equation). For  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$  the energy dissipation functional for the Liouville equation is given for any

$$\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_T) - \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) + \int_0^T (\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t) + \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_t)) dt & \text{if } (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hereby, the energy and dual dissipation potentials are

$$\mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}) := \int \mathcal{E}^\rho(c) \mathbb{C}(dc) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}) := \int \mathcal{D}(c) \mathbb{C}(dc), \quad (5.5)$$

and the primal dissipation potential is

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) := \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int \mathbb{C} \left( \frac{d\mathbb{J}(\cdot, k, l-1)}{d\Sigma_{k, l-1}}(c) \Big|_{\sigma_{(c, k, l-1)}} \frac{d\mathbb{C}}{d\Sigma_{k, l-1}}(c) \right) \Sigma_{k, l-1}(dc), \quad (5.6)$$

where  $\Sigma_{k, l-1}$  is any common dominating measure for  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{J}(\cdot, k, l-1)$ .

*Remark 5.7.* If  $\int_0^T \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t) dt < \infty$ , then  $\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1) \ll \mathbb{C}_t$  for each  $k, l-1$  for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t) = \int \mathcal{R} \left( c, \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(c) \right) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) \quad \text{for almost all } t \in [0, T].$$

We can apply the superposition principle from Theorem 1.9 to curves with finite energy dissipation functional.

**Corollary 5.8.** *Under assumption  $(K_1)$ , suppose*

- (a)  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ ,
- (b)  $\mathbb{C}_0$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_{\rho_0}$  for some  $\rho_0 \in [0, +\infty)$ ,
- (c)  $\mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) < +\infty$  for some  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$ ,
- (d)  $\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) < +\infty$ .

Then,

- (i) there exists a Borel probability measure  $\lambda$  on  $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$  satisfying  $(e_t)_\# \lambda = \mathbb{C}_t$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\lambda$  is concentrated on curves  $\gamma \in \mathbf{AC}([0, T], (\mathcal{P}_{\rho_0}, d_{\mathbf{Ex}}))$  such that  $(\gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma)) \in \mathbf{ExCE}(0, T)$ ;
- (ii) the energy dissipation functional  $\mathcal{L}^\rho$  has the superposition

$$\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \int \mathcal{L}^\rho \left( \gamma, \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma) \right) \lambda(d\gamma);$$

- (iii) the solution characterisation holds

$$\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0 \iff \lambda \text{ concentrates on solutions of (EDG) (Proposition 3.10).}$$

*Proof.* The assumptions  $\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) < +\infty$  and  $\mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) < +\infty$  imply  $\mathbb{J}_t(k, l-1) \ll \mathbb{C}_t$  for each  $k, l-1$  and almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover,  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  ensures the integrability of  $(t, c) \mapsto \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(c)$  with respect to  $d\mathbb{C}_t dt$ . By Theorem 1.9, the statement (i) follows.

The last two statements on  $\mathcal{L}^\rho$  are the consequence of the existence of path measure  $\lambda$  from the first statement, Definition 5.6 of  $\mathcal{L}^\rho$ , Definition 3.5 of  $\mathcal{L}^\rho$  and Proposition 3.10.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.9** (EDP solution for the Liouville equation). *Under assumption of  $(K_1)$ , let  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$ ,  $\mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) < +\infty$  and assume  $\mathbb{C}_0$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_{\rho_0}$  for some  $\rho_0 \in [0, +\infty)$ , then*

$$\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0 \iff \begin{cases} (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathbf{CE}^\infty(0, T), \\ \mathbb{J}_{k, l-1} \ll \mathbb{C} \text{ for all } k, l \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \frac{d\mathbb{J}}{d\mathbb{C}}(\gamma) = \bar{\mathcal{J}}[\gamma] \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } \gamma, \\ \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_t) + \int_0^T \mathcal{D}is(\mathbb{C}_t) dt \leq \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0), \end{cases}$$

with  $\lambda$  from the superposition principle Theorem 1.9,  $\bar{\mathcal{J}}$  the net flux defined in (MFE), and

$$\mathcal{D}is(\mathbb{C}) := \int \mathcal{D}is(c) \mathbb{C}(dc).$$

*Proof.* The idea is to use Proposition 3.10 and the superposition principle of Lemma 5.5 which makes the representation (1.31) rigorous and gives using the definitions (5.5) and (5.6) the identity

$$\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \int \left[ \mathbb{E}^\rho(\gamma(T)) - \mathbb{E}^\rho(\gamma(0)) + \int_0^T \left[ \mathbb{R}\left(\gamma(t), \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(\gamma(t))\right) + \mathbb{D}(\gamma(t)) \right] dt \right] \lambda(d\gamma).$$

Given  $\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) < +\infty$  and  $\mathbb{C}_0$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_{\rho_0}$  for some  $\rho_0 \in [0, +\infty)$ , Corollary 5.8 implies the assumption of Proposition 3.8 is satisfied pointwise  $\lambda$  almost everywhere. Therefore we have for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $\gamma$  the identities

$$\mathbb{E}^\rho(\gamma(T)) - \mathbb{E}^\rho(\gamma(0)) = \int_0^T \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{B}\left(\kappa[\gamma(t)](k, l-1), \kappa[\gamma(t)](l, k-1), \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(\gamma(t), k, l-1)\right) dt,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \left[ \mathbb{R}\left(\gamma(t), \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(\gamma(t))\right) + \mathbb{D}(\gamma(t)) \right] dt \\ &= - \int_0^T \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{B}\left(\kappa[\gamma(t)](k, l-1), \kappa[\gamma(t)](l, k-1), \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(\gamma(t), k, l-1)\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 3.9 with  $u = \kappa[\gamma(t)](k, l-1)$ ,  $v = \kappa[\gamma(t)](l, k-1)$ , we have

$$\frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(\gamma(t)) = \bar{\mathcal{J}}[\gamma_t] \text{ for Lebesgue almost every } t \text{ and } \lambda \text{ almost every } \gamma.$$

By the disintegration of  $\lambda$  corresponding to the map  $e_t$  from  $(e_t)_\# \lambda = \mathbb{C}_t$ , we conclude

$$0 = \mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_T) - \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}(\mathbb{C}_t) dt.$$

Conversely, if the three conditions hold, then the assumptions of Theorem 1.9 are satisfied so there exists a measure  $\lambda$  with

$$\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_T) - \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) + \int \int_0^T [\mathbb{R}(\gamma(t), \bar{\mathcal{J}}[\gamma_t]) + \mathbb{D}(\gamma(t))] dt \lambda(d\gamma).$$

By the converse statement of Lemma 3.9, we get the identity

$$\int \int_0^T (\mathbb{R}(\gamma(t), \bar{\mathcal{J}}[\gamma_t]) + \mathbb{D}(\gamma(t))) dt \lambda(d\gamma) = \int \int_0^T \text{Dis}(\gamma(t)) dt \lambda(d\gamma).$$

Using the disintegration of  $\lambda$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) &= \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_T) - \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) + \int \int_0^T \text{Dis}(\gamma(t)) dt \lambda(d\gamma) \\ &= \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_t) - \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) + \int_0^T \int \text{Dis}(c) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) dt \\ &= \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_t) - \mathcal{E}^\rho(\mathbb{C}_0) + \int_0^T \text{Dis}(\mathbb{C}_t) dt \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = \int \lambda(d\gamma) \mathcal{L}^\rho(\gamma, \bar{\mathcal{J}}[\gamma]) \leq 0$ , the assumptions of the converse of Proposition 3.10 hold for  $\lambda$ -almost all  $\gamma$ . This implies  $\mathcal{L}^\rho(\gamma, \bar{\mathcal{J}}[\gamma]) = 0$  for  $\lambda$ -almost every  $\gamma$ , so  $\mathcal{L}^\rho(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0$ .  $\square$

## 6. EDP CONVERGENCE

In this section, we fix  $\rho > 0$ . We consider the *thermodynamic limit*, that is any sequence  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$  as  $N, L \rightarrow \infty$  and let  $\bar{\rho} := \sup\{\frac{N}{L}\} < \infty$ . Therefore, each measure in the sequence

$(\mathbb{C}^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  has its support contained in  $\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$ . The compactness and convergence is based on exploiting for the family  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  the uniform bound

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt =: C_{\mathcal{R}} < +\infty. \quad (6.1)$$

For convenience of the reader, we give the overview of the results in each subsection:

- §6.1 We obtain conditions on a sequence  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  so that it is compact in the narrow topology induced by  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  in Proposition 6.2.
- §6.2 We provide conditions under which the flux  $(\mathbb{J}^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  is compact in a suitable  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  induced topology in Proposition 6.5.
- §6.3 In Proposition 6.9, we show the limit we obtained from the sequence  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L} \in \text{CE}^N(0, T))_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  satisfies  $\text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ . Hence the definitions of continuity equation in previous sections are compatible to the notion of compactness.
- §6.4 One main result is the  $\Gamma$ -lower semicontinuity of the energy functions  $((\mathcal{E}^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}, \mathcal{E}^\rho)$  in Proposition 6.13. For this, we need the result of equivalence of ensembles to show lower semicontinuity of relative entropy in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  topology.
- §6.5 This subsection is dedicated to find a recovery sequence in order to obtain the  $\Gamma$ -convergence of the energy function after the  $\Gamma$ -lower semicontinuity result in the preceding Subsection 6.4. The recovery sequence is constructed in Proposition 6.22. The arguments in this subsection are independent of the other subsections.
- §6.6 Finally, we conclude with the  $\Gamma$ -lower semicontinuity of the potential functionals in the energy dissipation functionals in Proposition 6.27. An immediate consequence is the  $\Gamma$ -lower semicontinuity of the respective energy dissipation functionals.

### 6.1. Compactness of curves.

**Lemma 6.1** (Propagation of uniform integrability). *For  $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be any divergent series controlling the growth of the kernel  $K$  from assumption  $(K_2)$ , define*

$$G_n := \sum_{k \geq 1}^n g_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{l}_G(c) := \sum_{k \geq 1} G_k c_k. \quad (6.2)$$

Let  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  satisfy the uniform bound (6.1) and

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}(\mathfrak{l}_G) := \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int_{\hat{V}^{N,L}} \mathfrak{l}_G(c) \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}(dc) < +\infty.$$

Then, the uniform integrability is propagated in time, that is

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(\mathfrak{l}_G) < +\infty. \quad (6.3)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Rewrite using the continuity equation.* By assumption  $(K_2)$ ,  $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies  $g_k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $K(k, l-1) \leq C_K \frac{kl}{\mathfrak{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|)}$  for any  $k, l \geq 1$ . We note that  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L}$  is supported on  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  so we can replace  $\mathfrak{l}_G$  by its truncation  $\mathfrak{l}_G^N(c) := \sum_{k=1}^N G_k c_k$  under the integral of  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L}$ . For each  $N, L$ , by the continuity equation  $(\text{CE}^N)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{C}_T^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L})(\mathfrak{l}_G) &= (\mathbb{C}_T^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L})(\mathfrak{l}_G^N) = \int_{\hat{V}^{N,L}} \mathfrak{l}_G^N(c) (\mathbb{C}_T^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L})(dc) \\ &= \int_0^T \sum_{(c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} (\hat{\nabla}^L \mathfrak{l}_G^N)(c, k, l-1) \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) dt. \end{aligned}$$

For  $(c, k, l-1) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}$ , we have

$$(\hat{\nabla}^L \mathfrak{l}_G^N)(c, k, l-1) = \mathfrak{l}_G^N(c^{k, l-1}) - \mathfrak{l}_G^N(c) = \sum_{p=1}^N G_p \frac{1}{L} \gamma_p^{k, l-1} = \frac{1}{L} \bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} G^N = \frac{1}{L} (g_l - g_k),$$

where  $G^N = (G_k)_{k \leq N} \otimes (0)_{k > N}$ .

*Step 2: Estimate using Legendre duality.* We use the Legendre duality inequality for  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{C}^*$ , that is for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma \geq 0$ , we have the estimate

$$ab \leq \sigma \mathbb{C}^*(a) + \mathbb{C}(b|\sigma).$$

With this, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (\mathbb{C}_T^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L})(\mathbb{1}_G) \right| &= \left| \int_0^T \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \frac{1}{L} (g_l - g_k) \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^T \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \left[ \sigma_{c,k,l-1}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|) + \mathbb{C}(L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) | \sigma_{c,k,l-1}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})) \right] dt \\ &= \int_0^T \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_{c,k,l-1}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|) dt + \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

where the second term is bounded by assumption (6.1).

*Step 3: Apply the growth assumption (K<sub>2</sub>).* Since  $\frac{L}{L-1} \leq 2$ , we use the assumption (K<sub>2</sub>) on  $K$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{(c,k,l-1)}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) &= \frac{1}{2} k_{(c,k,l-1)}^{N,L} \sqrt{u_t^{N,L}(c) u_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{L}{L-1} \sqrt{c_k c_{l-1} c_l^{k,l-1} c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} K(k, l-1) K(l, k-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})} \\ &\leq C_K \frac{kl}{\mathbb{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|)} \sqrt{c_k c_{l-1} c_l^{k,l-1} c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})} \\ &\leq C_K \frac{kl}{\mathbb{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|)} \frac{1}{2} (c_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) + c_l^{k,l-1} c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the first term in upper bound in (6.4) is bounded

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_{c,k,l-1}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|) \\ &\leq \frac{C_K}{2} \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} kl (c_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) + c_l^{k,l-1} c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})) \\ &\leq C_K \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} (M_1(c) + 1) M_1(c) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) = C_K \left( \left( \frac{N}{L} \right)^2 + \frac{N}{L} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hereby, we used that  $\sum_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} kl c_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) = \sum_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} kl c_l^{k,l-1} c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})$ . Indeed, each element  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  is connected to any other element in  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  via edges labelled by some  $(k, l)$  and  $c' = c^{k,l-1} \iff c = c'^{l,k-1}$  so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} kl (c_l^{k,l-1} c_{k-1}^{k,l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})) &= \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} kl \sum_{c' \in \hat{V}^{N,L}; c^{k,l-1}=c'} (c'_l c'_{k-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c')) \\ &= \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \sum_{k,l=1}^N \sum_{c' \in \hat{V}^{N,L}; c^{k,l-1}=c'} kl (c'_l c'_{k-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c')) \\ &= \sum_{(c',l,k) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} kl (c'_l c'_{k-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c')) \\ &= \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} kl (c_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Moreover, we have the estimate

$$\sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} klc_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \leq \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \sum_{k,l=1}^N kl(c_l c_{k-1}) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) = \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} (M_1(c) + 1) M_1(c) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c).$$

Altogether, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \sum_{(c,k,l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_{c,k,l-1}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^*(|g_l - g_k|) dt + \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt \\ & \leq C_K \left( \left( \frac{N}{L} \right)^2 + \frac{N}{L} \right) T + \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt, \end{aligned}$$

from where we conclude

$$\sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(\mathbf{l}_G) \leq \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}(\mathbf{l}_G) + C_K T (\bar{\rho}^2 + \bar{\rho}) + \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt < +\infty. \square$$

**Proposition 6.2.** *Under the assumption of Lemma 6.1, the sequence  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\frac{N}{L}}))_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  is sequentially compact in the weak\*-Ex topology uniformly for  $t \in [0, T]$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.1, the uniform integrability condition (6.3) holds. This condition is sufficient to ensure the compactness in weak\*-Ex topology.

Let  $V_M = \{c \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}} : \mathbf{l}_G(c) \leq M\}$  with  $\mathbf{l}_G$  defined in (6.2). We show that  $V_M$  is  $(\mathcal{P}_{< \infty}, d_{\text{Ex}})$ -compact. For all  $c \in V_M$ , we have the uniform bound

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} g_k \mathbf{T}_k(c) = \sum_{k \geq 1} g_k \sum_{n \geq k} c_n = \sum_{n \geq 1} c_n \sum_{k=1}^n g_k = \sum_{n \geq 1} c_n G_n = \mathbf{l}_G(c) \leq M.$$

Then by the characterisation of relative compactness in  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  in Proposition 2.2(4), we have  $V_M \subset \mathcal{P}_{< \infty}$  is  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  relatively compact and thus  $\overline{V_M}$  with the closure in  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  is compact.

It remains to show tightness of probability measure on  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  with Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. We have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(\overline{V_M}^c) & \leq \sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(V_M^c) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M} \sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \int \mathbf{1}_{V_M^c}(c) \mathbf{l}_G(c) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(dc) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(\mathbf{l}_G) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(\mathbf{l}_G) < +\infty$  by assumption,

$$\sup_{\substack{N/L \rightarrow \rho \\ t \in [0, T]}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(\overline{V_M}^c) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } M \rightarrow \infty$$

and this shows the tightness of  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\frac{N}{L}}))_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  in the weak\*-Ex topology uniformly for  $t \in [0, T]$ .

By the separability of  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  metric on  $\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$  in Proposition 2.2 (5), the Prokhorov's theorem implies  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho, t \in [0, T]}$  is relatively compact in weak\*-Ex topology.  $\square$

*Remark 6.3.* The pointwise compactness in  $t \in [0, T]$  in obtained in Proposition 6.2 is not sufficient to ensure any continuity properties of the limit curve. We strengthen the compactness of the curves  $([0, T] \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  in Lemma 6.12 with the help from the integrability of the flux which will ensure suitable absolute continuity in time (see Section 6.2 below).

**Lemma 6.4.** *If  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \xrightarrow{*-\text{Ex}} \mathbb{C}$ , then*

- (i)  $\liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathbb{I}_G) \geq \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{I}_G)$  and
- (ii) *the probability measure  $\mathbb{C}$  is concentrated on  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$ .*

*Proof.* By Fatou's Lemma  $\mathbb{I}_G$  is  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -lower-semicontinuous. Then the Portmanteau theorem gives the first statement.

For the second statement, for  $0 < \varepsilon < \rho$ , define  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon} := \{c \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq \rho} : \rho - \varepsilon \leq M_1(c) \leq \rho\}$  so that  $\mathcal{P}_\rho = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon}$  contains  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  for a fixed  $\varepsilon$  because  $\frac{N}{L}$  converges to  $\rho$ . The first moment map  $M_1$  is  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  continuous so the set  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon}$  is sequentially  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -closed. We again invoke the Portmanteau theorem to obtain

$$1 = \limsup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon}}) \leq \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon}}).$$

Note that  $\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon} \downarrow \mathcal{P}_\rho$  monotonically as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  so the continuity of measure from above implies

$$\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_\rho}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\rho,\varepsilon}}) \geq 1$$

which gives the second statement.  $\square$

**6.2. Compactness of fluxes.** In this section, we provide a compactness statement for the fluxes in the thermodynamic limit as described in the beginning of Section 6.

**Proposition 6.5** (Setwise compactness of flux). *Under the assumption  $(K_1)$ , suppose there exists  $C_{\mathcal{R}} < \infty$  such that the sequence  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  satisfies the uniform bound (6.1). Let  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  be equipped with the Borel  $\sigma$  algebra. Then along a (common) subsequence of the measures  $\frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l - 1)$  on  $[0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$ , there exists a limit*

$$L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l - 1) dt \rightarrow \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l - 1) dt \quad \text{in } B_b([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})^* \text{ for each } k, l \geq 1$$

and  $(\mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l - 1))_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a Borel measurable family for each  $k, l \geq 1$ .

To prove Proposition 6.5, we first establish a uniform modulus of absolute continuity in time in a suitable set reminiscent of Orlicz space [56] adapted to the function  $\mathbb{C}$  occurring in the primal dissipation functional  $\mathcal{R}$  in (6.1). For doing so, we recall the edge  $E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})$  in (1.26) and define over it the Orlicz-type set

$$L^{\mathbb{C}^*}([0, T]; L^\infty(E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}))) := \left\{ \xi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})} : \int_0^T \mathbb{C}^*(\|\xi(t, \cdot)\|_\infty) dt < +\infty \right\},$$

with  $\|\xi(t, \cdot)\|_\infty := \sup_{e \in E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})} |\xi(t, e)|$ . The proof follows a similar strategy to establish compactness of the fluxes as in [52, Corollary 3.10], where they used similar Orlicz type function sets. We emphasise that the notation  $L^{\mathbb{C}^*}([0, T]; L^\infty(E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})))$  should only be taken as an abbreviation and is in general not a function space.

**Lemma 6.6.** *Under the conditions of Proposition 6.5, the family of fluxes  $\{\mathbb{J}^{N,L}\}$  is equi-integrable in time, that is for any  $\xi \in L^{\mathbb{C}^*}([0, T]; L^\infty(E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})))$  the estimate*

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int_0^T \left| \int_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} \xi(t, e) L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(de) \right| dt \leq C_{\mathcal{R}} + C_{\bar{\rho}, K} \int_0^T \mathbb{C}^*(\|\xi(t, \cdot)\|_\infty) dt < +\infty \quad (6.6)$$

holds, where  $C_{\bar{\rho}, K} = 2C_K \bar{\rho}(\bar{\rho} + 1)$  and  $C_K$  as in  $(K_1)$ .

The equi-integrability in time encoded in the estimated (6.6) is translated to a uniform modulus of absolute continuity in the next Lemma.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Given the estimate (6.6) from Lemma 6.6, there exists a non-decreasing continuous function  $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} w(\sigma) = 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \left\| L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} dt \right\|_{\text{TV}(I \times \hat{E}^{N,L})} \leq w(|I|) \quad \text{for all measurable } I \subseteq [0, T]. \quad (6.7)$$

The last ingredient for the proof of Proposition 6.5 is a disintegration for the limit measure due to the just obtained uniform absolute continuity.

**Lemma 6.8.** *Suppose  $\mu^L := \mu_t^L dt$  converges to  $\mu$  narrowly as measures on  $[0, T] \times M$  for a fixed Borel measurable subset  $M$  of a Polish space where  $dt$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Suppose the family  $\mu^L$  has a uniform modulus of continuity in the first component, that is there exists a non-decreasing continuous function  $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $w(0) = 0$  such that*

$$\sup_L |\mu^L|(I \times M) \leq w(|I|) \quad \text{for any open } I \subset [0, T]. \quad (6.8)$$

*Then the limit has a disintegration  $\mu = \tilde{\mu}_t dt$  with  $\tilde{\mu}_t$  a measure on  $M$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and for each Borel subset  $A \subset M$ ,  $t \mapsto \tilde{\mu}_t(A)$  is  $[0, T]$ -Borel measurable.*

We present first the proof Proposition 6.5 taking the Lemmas 6.7 and 6.8 for granted.

*Proof of Proposition 6.5. Step 1: Convergence of the measure.* Using the modulus of absolute continuity  $w$  constructed in Lemma 6.7, we get for each  $k, l - 1$ ,

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \|L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l - 1) dt\|_{\text{TV}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})} \leq \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \|L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} dt\|_{\text{TV}([0, T] \times \hat{E}^{N,L})} \leq w(T).$$

Identifying measures on a Polish space  $\mathcal{X} := [0, T] \times (\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  as *continuous linear functionals* on bounded Borel functions  $B_b(\mathcal{X})$ , we can apply the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. Hence the uniform boundedness in total variation norm implies the existence of a converging subsequence in the weak\* topology. In our case, this topology is the topology in duality with bounded Borel functions on  $\mathcal{X}$ . There is a  $\mathbb{J}_{(k, l-1)} \in (B_b(\mathcal{X}))^*$  such that

$$\int f L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l - 1) dt \rightarrow \mathbb{J}_{(k, l-1)}(f) \quad \forall f \in B_b(\mathcal{X}).$$

As the limit  $\mathbb{J}_{(k, l-1)}$  determines a  $\sigma$ -additive set function on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra so  $\mathbb{J}_{(k, l-1)}$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{X}$ . By a diagonal argument, we can find a subsequence such that  $(\frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l - 1) dt)_{(k, l) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$  converges to  $(\mathbb{J}_{(k, l-1)}(dc, dt))_{(k, l) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$  in duality with bounded Borel functions on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

*Step 2: Absolute continuity with respect to Lebesgue in time.* By the estimate (6.7) and the fact that the norm of the limit is bounded by the supremum along the limiting sequence, the assumption of Lemma 6.8 is satisfied with  $M = \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$  equipped with the metric and Borel sigma-algebra induced by  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ . Therefore the limit measures are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue in  $[0, T]$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{J}_{(k, l-1)}(dc, dt) = \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l - 1) dt$  and  $t \mapsto \mathbb{J}_t(A, k, l - 1)$  is Borel measurable for any Borel subset  $A \subset M$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 6.6.* For any  $e := (c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}$ , we use the convex duality of  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{C}^*$  to estimate

$$\xi(t, e) L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(de) \leq \mathbb{C}(L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(e) | \sigma_e(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})) + \sigma_e(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbb{C}^*(\xi(t, e)). \quad (6.9)$$

Integrating both sides on  $[0, T] \times \hat{E}^{N,L}$ , we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} \mathbb{C}(L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(e) | \sigma_e(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})) dt = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^T \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) dt < \infty. \quad (6.10)$$

For the second term, we use assumption  $(K_1)$  on the kernel  $K$  and Equation (6.5) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_e(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) &= \sum_{(c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{L}{L-1} \sqrt{c_k c_{l-1} c_l^{k, l-1} c_{k-1}^{k, l-1} K(k, l-1) K(l, k-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k, l-1})} \\ &\leq \sum_{(c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} C_K k l (c_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) + c_l^{k, l-1} c_{k-1}^{k, l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k, l-1})) \\ &= 2C_K \sum_{(c, k, l) \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} k l c_k c_{l-1} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \leq 2C_K \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^N c_k c_{l-1} k l \end{aligned}$$

$$= 2C_K \left( \frac{N}{L} \right) \left( \frac{N}{L} + 1 \right) \leq 2C_K \bar{\rho} (\bar{\rho} + 1).$$

Since  $\mathbf{C}^*$  is non-decreasing in  $[0, \infty)$  and is even, we can commute the supremum and  $\mathbf{C}^*$ , so we have the estimate

$$\sum_{e \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_e(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \mathbf{C}^*(\xi(t, e)) \leq \sup_{e \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \mathbf{C}^*(\xi(t, e)) \sum_{e \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} \sigma_e(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \leq 2C_K \bar{\rho} (\bar{\rho} + 1) \mathbf{C}^*(\|\xi(t, \cdot)\|_\infty). \quad (6.11)$$

By integrating (6.9) over  $[0, T] \times \hat{E}^{N,L}$  and applying (6.10) and (6.11), we have the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 6.7.* We define the function  $w : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  by

$$w(\sigma) := \inf \left\{ \frac{C_{\mathcal{R}} + C_{\bar{\rho}, K}}{\beta} : \beta > 0, \mathbf{C}^*(\beta) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \right\}$$

where  $C_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $C_{\bar{\rho}, K}$  are defined in (6.1) and (6.6).

The function  $\mathbf{C}^*$  is non-decreasing on  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $\mathbf{C}^*(0) = 0$ , is continuously differentiable with  $\mathbf{C}^{*'} > 0$  on  $(0, \infty)$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{C}^*(x) = +\infty$ . Then  $\mathbf{C}^{*-1}$  exists, is increasing, is continuous on  $(0, \infty)$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{C}^{*-1}(x) = +\infty$ . For  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$ , we get

$$w(\sigma) = \frac{C_{\mathcal{R}} + C_{\bar{\rho}, K}}{\sup\{\beta : \beta > 0, \beta \leq \mathbf{C}^{*-1}(\frac{1}{\sigma})\}} = \frac{C_{\mathcal{R}} + C_{\bar{\rho}, K}}{\mathbf{C}^{*-1}(\frac{1}{\sigma})}$$

with  $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} w(\sigma) = 0$ . Hence,  $w$  extends continuously to  $[0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $w(0) = 0$ .

Given a measurable subset  $I$  of  $[0, T]$ , choose  $\beta \in A := \{\bar{\beta} > 0 : \mathbf{C}^*(\bar{\beta}) \leq \frac{1}{|I|}\}$ , and define

$$\xi^{N,L,\beta}(t, e) := \beta \mathbf{1}_I(t) (\mathbf{1}_{E_t^{N,L,+}}(e) - \mathbf{1}_{E_t^{N,L,-}}(e)),$$

where  $E_t^{N,L,+} := \text{supp}(\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L,+})$  and  $E_t^{N,L,-} := \text{supp}(\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L,-})$ . Then

$$\|\xi^{N,L,\beta}(t, \cdot)\|_\infty = \sup_{e \in \hat{E}^{N,L}} |\xi^{N,L,\beta}(t, e)| = \begin{cases} \beta, & \text{for } t \in I \text{ and } \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho, \beta \in A} \int_0^T \mathbf{C}^*(\|\xi^{N,L,\beta}(t, \cdot)\|_\infty) dt \leq 1.$$

With this choice of  $\xi^{N,L,\beta}$ , we get, using (6.6) from Lemma 6.6, the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \|L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} dt\|_{\text{TV}(I \times \hat{E}^{N,L})} &= \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int_I \int_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} L^{-1} |\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}|(de) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta} \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int_I \int_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(de) \xi^{N,L,\beta}(t, e) dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \sup_{\xi \in L^{\mathbf{C}^*}([0, T]; L^\infty(E(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})))} \int_0^T \int_{\hat{E}^{N,L}} \xi(t, e) L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(de) dt \\ &\quad \int_0^T \mathbf{C}^*(\|\xi(t, \cdot)\|_\infty) dt \leq 1 \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\mathcal{R}} + C_{\bar{\rho}, K}}{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\beta \in A$  is arbitrary, by taking the infimum over  $\beta \in A$ , we obtain the inequality in the statement.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 6.8.* For an open subset  $I \subset [0, T]$  by [11, Theorem 8.4.7, Theorem 6.7.7, Definition 7.1.1], we have the weak-lower semicontinuity of the total variation measure

$$|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}(I) = |\mu|(I \times M) \leq \liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} |\mu^L|(I \times M),$$

where the map  $\pi : [0, T] \times M \rightarrow [0, T]$  is the projection to the time coordinate. By Assumption (6.8), we have for all open set  $I \subset [0, T]$

$$|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}(I) \leq w(|I|) \quad (6.12)$$

Then for  $0 < s \leq t < T$  and choosing  $\delta < \min(s, T - t)$ , we can estimate closed intervals from above by open intervals by

$$|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}([a, b]) \leq |\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}((a - \delta, b + \delta)) \leq w(b - a + 2\delta)$$

and similar for half-open intervals  $(a, b]$  as well as  $[a, b)$ . Using the continuity of  $w$  and regularity of Lebesgue measure, we have

$$|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}([a, b]) \leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} w(b - a + \delta) = w(|(a, b]|).$$

If  $a = 0$  or  $b = T$ , the intervals are either open in  $[0, T]$  or can be approximated by open sets in  $[0, T]$  similar to the cases above. Then (6.12) holds for any interval in  $[0, T]$ .

Now we want to use monotone class theorem to argue to extend (6.12) to all Borel-measurable sets. Let

$$G := \{\text{finite union of intervals of } [0, T]\} \cup \{\emptyset\}.$$

$G$  forms an algebra over  $[0, T]$  which means  $G$  is closed under complements, contains the empty set and is closed under binary unions. Any element in  $G$  satisfies the bound (6.12). Consider the set of subsets in  $[0, T]$  given by

$$\text{Mono} := \{A \subset [0, T] : |\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}(A) \leq w(|A|) \text{ holds.}\}.$$

By elementary set theory, if a sequence of monotone sets  $(A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  (i.e.  $A_i \subset A_{i+1}$  or  $A_i \supset A_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ) satisfies (6.12), then monotone set limit  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i$  exists. By continuity of measures from above and below, the set-theoretic limit  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i$  satisfies

$$|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}(\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}(A_i) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} w(|A_i|) = w(\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |A_i|) = w(|\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i|).$$

In other words,  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i \in \text{Mono}$ . Therefore,  $\text{Mono}$  is a monotone class and  $G \subset \text{Mono}$ . By monotone class theorem [11, Theorem 1.9.3(i)], the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $G$  is a subset of  $\text{Mono}$ :  $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) = \sigma(G) \subset \text{Mono}$ . Therefore, (6.12) holds for all Borel-measurable sets.

In particular, this implies the absolute continuity of  $|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem, there exists a Lebesgue density  $f$  of  $|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}$  and is Borel measurable.

By assumption,  $M$  is a Borel measurable subset of a Polish space so we can apply the disintegration of measure theorem with the Borel measurable projection map  $\pi : [0, T] \times M \rightarrow [0, T]$ . There exists a family of regular conditional measures, which are finite Borel measures (c.f. [11, Definition 10.4.2, Corollary 10.4.10]),  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  generated by  $\pi$ . This implies for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(M)$  Borel subsets of  $M$  and  $D \in \mathcal{B}([0, T])$ , that we have

$$\mu(A \times D) = \int_D \int_A \mu_t(dx) |\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}(dt)$$

and  $t \mapsto \mu_t(A)$  is  $[0, T]$ -Borel measurable. Hence using the Lebesgue density  $f$  of  $|\mu| \circ \pi^{-1}$ , we have for  $\tilde{\mu}_t := \mu_t f(t)$

$$\mu(A \times D) = \int_D \tilde{\mu}_t(A) dt$$

and  $t \mapsto \tilde{\mu}_t(A)$  is  $[0, T]$  Borel measurable. □

**6.3. Convergence towards the infinite particle continuity equation.** The goal of this section is to verify the limit measure satisfies the infinite particle continuity equation  $(\text{CE}^\infty)$  in the sense of Definition 5.2. We recall the topology and convergence properties for the curves and fluxes in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense introduced in Definition 1.5. The notion of convergence is implied by the established compactness statements from Proposition 6.2 and Proposition 6.5.

We show that the convergence in  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense is also suitable for passing to the limit from the finite to the infinite particle continuity equation.

**Proposition 6.9.** *If  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  converges to  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  in  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense and the fluxes  $(L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L})_{t \in [0, T]}$  have a uniform modulus of continuity satisfying (6.7), then  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$ .*

*Proof.* The conditions in Definition 5.2 for  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  are verified below, in detail:

- (1) The continuity of  $t \mapsto \mathbb{C}_t$  is obtained in Lemma 6.12 below.
- (2)  $\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1) dt$  is the limit of  $(L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(\cdot, k, l-1) dt)_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  in the weak topology of the Banach space  $(\mathcal{M}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \rho}; \mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}})$  so the limit  $\mathbb{J}_t dt \in \mathcal{M}([0, T] \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \rho}; \mathbb{R})$  has bounded TV-norm by (6.7). The Borel measurability follows from Lemma 6.8.
- (3) In Lemma 6.10 below, we prove that  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  satisfies the infinite particle continuity equation  $(\text{CE}^\infty)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.10.** *If  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  is a limit of  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense, then the limit satisfies the weak form of  $(\text{CE}^\infty)$  in Definition 5.2.*

*Proof.* Let  $s, t$  such that  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ . By the definition of the convergence, we can pass to the limit in the left-hand side

$$\lim_{\substack{N, L \rightarrow \infty \\ N/L \rightarrow \rho}} \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \Phi(c) (\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_s^{N,L})(dc) = \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \Phi(c) (\mathbb{C}_t - \mathbb{C}_s)(dc).$$

On the other hand, we want to pass to the limit in the flux. By the  $\text{d}_{\text{Ex}}$ -differentiability assumption, we have

$$\sup_{c \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sup_{k, l \geq 1} |(\Phi(c + L^{-1}\gamma^{k, l-1}) - \Phi(c))L - \gamma^{k, l-1} \cdot \nabla^\infty \Phi(c)| = o(1)_{L \rightarrow \infty}.$$

Therefore, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_s^t \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} (\Phi(c + L^{-1}\gamma^{k, l-1}) - \Phi(c))L L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(dc, k, l-1) dr \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_s^t \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) \mathbb{J}_r(dc, k, l-1) dr \right| \\ & \leq o(1) \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \|L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} dt\|_{\text{TV}} + \int_s^t \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) (L^{-1}\mathbb{J}_r^{N,L} - \mathbb{J}_r)(dc, k, l-1) dr. \end{aligned}$$

The second term converges to zero because  $\sup_{c \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq \infty}} \sup_{k, l-1} |\bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c)| < \infty$ . In summary, passing to the limit in  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$ , we get for  $\Phi$  satisfying the assumptions

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} (\mathbb{C}_t - \mathbb{C}_s)(dc) \Phi(c) = \int_s^t \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \bar{\nabla}_{k, l-1} \nabla^\infty \Phi(c) \mathbb{J}_r(dc, k, l-1) dr. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 6.11** (Arzela-Ascoli Theorem [58, Chapter 10 Problem 8]). *Let  $X$  be a compact metric space,  $Y$  be a metric space,  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  uniformly equicontinuous sequence of  $Y$ -valued function on  $X$  and for  $x \in X$ ,  $\{f_n(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is relatively compact.*

*Then  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a subsequence converges uniformly on  $X$  to a continuous function  $f$  on  $X$ .*

**Lemma 6.12** (Refinement of compactness and absolute continuity of limit curve). *Given  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \mathbf{CE}^N(0, T)$  with  $(\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L})$  having a uniform modulus of continuity (6.7). Suppose the sequence  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\frac{N}{L}}))_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  is sequentially compact in the weak\*-Ex topology uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$ .*

*Then the measure-valued maps  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}))_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  have a subsequence converging uniformly to a limit  $\mathbb{C} \in \mathbf{AC}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}))$  in a metric space that metricise the weak\*-Ex topology.*

*Proof.* To show  $\mathbb{C} \in \mathbf{AC}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}))$ , we argue  $\mathbb{C}$  is a uniform limit of continuous functions  $(t \mapsto \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  via the Arzela-Ascoli theorem in Lemma 6.11 with  $X := [0, T]$ ,  $Y := \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$ .

First, let us justify that  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  has a metric structure.  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  is separable by Proposition 2.2 (5) so the weak\*-Ex topology is metricised by the Levy-Prokhorov metric  $d_{\text{LP}}$  [11, Theorem 8.3.2]. This allows us to apply the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem for  $Y = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  with the  $d_{\text{LP}}$  metric.

Second, the pointwise in time sequential relative compactness follows from the assumption of  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L_t})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  is relatively compact uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Now we show the uniform equicontinuity. We take  $\Psi$  to be 1- $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -Lipschitz on  $\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$  so that we have  $|\hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L \Psi(c)| = |\Psi(c^{k,l-1}) - \Psi(c)| \leq d_{\text{Ex}}(c^{k,l-1}, c) = \frac{2}{L}$  by Lemma 2.7. We have for any  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$  by using Lemma 6.7 the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \Psi(c) (\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_s^{N,L})(dc) \right| &= \left| \int_s^t dr \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} L \hat{\nabla}_{k,l-1}^L \Psi(c) \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(dc, k, l-1) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \left| \int_s^t dr \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L}(dc, k, l-1) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \|L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_r^{N,L} dr\|_{\text{TV}([s,t] \times \hat{E}^{N,L})} \leq 2w(|t-s|). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

From  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} w(|t|) = 0$  in Lemma 6.7, we conclude

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \sup_{\Psi \in 1\text{-}d_{\text{Ex}}\text{Lipschitz}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \Psi(c) (\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_s^{N,L})(dc) \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow t.$$

Furthermore by [11, Theorem 8.3.2], we have the equivalent metric on  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}), d_{\text{LP}})$  induced by the bounded Lipschitz norm

$$\|\mathbb{C}\|_{\text{BL}} := \sup_{\Psi} \left\{ \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} \Psi(c) \mathbb{C}(dc) \right| : \Psi \text{ is } 1\text{-}d_{\text{Ex}}\text{-Lipschitz and } \|\Psi\|_{\infty} \leq 1 \right\}$$

Therefore, we have the equicontinuity of  $(t \mapsto \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  in  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}), d_{\text{LP}})$ .

Then the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem implies  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L}$  converges uniformly to  $\mathbb{C}$  on  $[0, T]$  along a subsequence and  $t \mapsto \mathbb{C}_t$  is continuous on  $[0, T]$  in the same topology. Hence the estimate (6.13) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{C}_t - \mathbb{C}_s\|_{\text{BL}} &\leq \|\mathbb{C}_t - \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}\|_{\text{BL}} + \|\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_s^{N,L}\|_{\text{BL}} + \|\mathbb{C}_s^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_s\|_{\text{BL}} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\mathbb{C}_r - \mathbb{C}_r^{N,L}\|_{\text{BL}} + \|\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}_s^{N,L}\|_{\text{BL}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the uniform convergence of  $(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  in time, we get the absolute continuity of the map  $t \mapsto \mathbb{C}_t$  on  $[0, T]$  in  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}), d_{\text{LP}})$ .  $\square$

**6.4. Lower semi- and continuity of energy via equivalence of ensembles.** In this subsection, we prove the lower semicontinuity of the free energy, which is of relative entropy form.

**Proposition 6.13** (Lower semicontinuity of relative entropy). *Suppose  $N/L \rightarrow \rho \in (0, +\infty)$ , if  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{V}^{N,L})$  converges to  $\mathbb{C}^\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  in weak\*-Ex topology, then the energy is lower semicontinuous*

$$\liminf_{\substack{N,L \rightarrow \infty \\ N/L \rightarrow \rho}} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) \geq \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}^\rho) = \int \mathbf{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) \mathbb{C}^\rho(\mathrm{d}c).$$

6.4.1. *Properties of the invariant product measures.* The proof of Proposition 6.13 involves breaking down the energy into relative entropies and estimates them separably. This leads to the consideration of the invariant product measures. The relevant definitions for the statements below can be found in Section 1.4.

**Lemma 6.14.** *Let  $\rho(\phi) := \mathbf{M}(\omega^\phi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k \omega^\phi(k)$ , and  $\rho_c := \limsup_{\phi \rightarrow \phi_c} \rho(\phi) \in (0, \infty]$ . Then  $\rho_c < \infty$  implies  $\phi_c < \infty$ ,  $Z(\phi_c) < \infty$ ,  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The first two results were discussed in [61, discussion after Equation 1.14]. The idea is by the observation that the monotonicity of the first moment of the invariant product measure  $\omega^\phi$  with respect to  $\phi$  for  $\phi \in (0, \phi_c)$ , that is  $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\phi} \rho(\phi) > 0$ , which implies  $\phi_c < \infty$  if  $\rho_c < \infty$  by a contradiction argument. Then it follows from the identity of  $Z(\phi)$

$$\log Z(\phi) = \int_0^\phi \rho(\phi) \mathrm{d}\phi$$

that  $Z(\phi_c) \leq e^{\phi_c \rho_c} < \infty$ .

We assume that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) = \alpha. \quad (6.14)$$

The series  $Z(\phi_c) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty (w(k)\phi_c^k)^{1/k}$  is divergent if  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} w(k)^{1/k} \phi_c = e^{-\alpha} > 1$ . Therefore,  $\alpha < 0$  would contradict  $Z(\phi_c) < \infty$ .

Now suppose  $\alpha > 0$ . We show there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $Z(\phi_c + \varepsilon) < \infty$  which contradicts to the definition of  $\phi_c$ . Indeed,  $Z(\phi_c + \varepsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\phi_c})^k w(k)\phi_c^k$ . Equation (6.14) can be written equivalently as

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{w(k)\phi_c^k}{e^{-k\alpha}} = 1.$$

Hence there exists  $M$  large enough such for all  $k \geq M$ , we have  $w(k)\phi_c^k \leq 2e^{-k\alpha}$ . For  $k \geq M$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=M+1}^\infty \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\phi_c}\right)^k w(k)\phi_c^k \leq 2 \sum_{k=M+1}^\infty \left(\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\phi_c}\right)e^{-\alpha}\right)^k.$$

If  $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\phi_c})e^{-\alpha} < 1$ , then the series  $\sum_{k=M+1}^\infty ((1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\phi_c})e^{-\alpha})^k$  converges and

$$\sum_{k=M+1}^\infty \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\phi_c}\right)^k w(k)\phi_c^k < \infty.$$

By choosen  $\varepsilon < \phi_c(e^\alpha - 1)$ , which is possible thanks to  $\alpha > 0$ , we find  $Z(\phi_c + \varepsilon) < \infty$ , which contradicts the maximality of  $\phi_c$ . Altogether, we must have  $\alpha = 0$  which is our claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.15.** *If  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{K(1, k-1)}{K(k, 0)} \geq \phi_c^{-1}$  holds, then  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) \leq 0$ . Therefore, if  $\rho_c < +\infty$  then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* By definition,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \log\left(\phi_c \frac{K(1, l-1)}{K(l, 0)}\right).$$

By assumption, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $M$  such that for all  $l \geq M$ , one has  $\frac{K(1,l-1)}{K(l,0)} \geq \phi_c^{-1}e^{-\varepsilon}$ . Then for  $k > M$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \log\left(\phi_c \frac{K(1,l-1)}{K(l,0)}\right) &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^M \log\left(\phi_c \frac{K(1,l-1)}{K(l,0)}\right) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=M+1}^k \log\left(\phi_c \frac{K(1,l-1)}{K(l,0)}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{M}{k} \inf_{l=1,\dots,M} \log\left(\phi_c \frac{K(1,l-1)}{K(l,0)}\right) + (-\varepsilon) \frac{k-M}{k} \geq \frac{C_M M}{k} - \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} (\varepsilon - \frac{C_M M}{k}) = \varepsilon$ . But  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, then  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log(w(k)\phi_c^k) \leq 0$ .

Now together with Lemma 6.14, we have the second statement.  $\square$

*Proof of Equivalence of ensembles (Proposition 1.4).* The proof in [13, Proposition A.1] carries mainly over, where even the case with system size dependent kernels is investigated. We refer also to the earlier references [33] and [14] proving a similar result. Nevertheless, we check the assumptions in the statement [13, Proposition A.1]. We note that the second moment assumption in there, is only needed to apply [13, Lemma A.2], but the statement of that Lemma is void when the measure is independent of system size and hence not needed.

Therefore, we only have to verify the other assumptions:

- (i) the weights  $w(k)\phi_c^k$  decay sub-exponentially by Lemma 6.15,
- (ii) the assumption on kernel  $(K_{>0})$  implies  $\omega^\phi(n) > 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and all  $\phi \in (0, \phi_c]$ ,
- (iii) In particular  $\sup_n \min\{\omega^{\phi_c}(n), \omega^{\phi_c}(n+1)\} > 0$ .

Therefore the statement of Proposition 1.4 is implied by [13, Proposition A.1].  $\square$

#### 6.4.2. Two counting estimates.

**Lemma 6.16.** *For any  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{V}^{N,L})$ , we have the asymptotics*

$$-\int_{\hat{V}^{N,L}} \log(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) d\mathbb{C}^{N,L} = O(\sqrt{N}).$$

*Proof.* The entropy attains its maximum when  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L}$  is uniformly distributed so

$$-\int_{\hat{V}^{N,L}} \log(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) d\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \leq \log(|\hat{V}^{N,L}|).$$

The size of the set  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  can be considered as the number of distinct ways of representing the natural number  $N$  as a sum of up to  $L$  positive integers. Therefore,  $|\hat{V}^{N,L}|$  is bounded from above by  $P(N)$ , the partition function in number theory, which is the number of distinct ways of representing the natural number  $N$  as a sum of positive integers. This has a well-known asymptotics [34] :  $|\hat{V}^{N,L}| \leq P(N) = O(\frac{1}{N} \exp(\pi\sqrt{\frac{2N}{3}}))$ , which provides the bound  $\log|\hat{V}^{N,L}| = O(\sqrt{N})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.17.** *Any  $c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$  satisfies the asymptotics*

$$\left| \log(L!) - \sum_{k=0}^N \log(c_k L)! + L \sum_{k=0}^N c_k \log(c_k) \right| = O(\sqrt{N} \log L).$$

*Proof.* With  $s(c) := |\{i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\} : c_i > 0\}|$  for  $c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$ , we can estimate

$$\frac{N}{L} = \sum_{i=0}^N c_i i \geq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=0}^N i \geq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=0}^{s(c)-1} i = \frac{1}{2L} (s(c) - 1)(s(c)).$$

Moreover, the function  $s(c)$  satisfies the inequality

$$1 \leq s(c) \leq \sqrt{2N} + \frac{1}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right). \quad (6.15)$$

For  $m \in \{1/L, 2/L, \dots, 1\}$ , define  $\Lambda^L(m) := m \sum_{l=1}^L \log(ml) - \sum_{l=1}^{mL} \log(l)$ . Then, for  $c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$ , we arrive at the bound

$$\left| \log L! - \sum_{i=0}^N \log(c_i L!) + L \sum_{i=0}^N c_i \log(c_i) \right| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^N \Lambda^L(c_i) \mathbf{1}_{c_i > 0} \right| \leq s(c) \sup_{m \in \{1/L, 2/L, \dots, 1\}} |\Lambda^L(m)|. \quad (6.16)$$

We can write

$$\Lambda^L(m) = \int_0^L m \log(m \lceil x \rceil) dx - \int_0^{mL} \log(\lceil x \rceil) dx = m \int_0^L \log\left(\frac{m \lceil x \rceil}{\lceil mx \rceil}\right) dx.$$

By using that  $|m \lceil x \rceil - \lceil mx \rceil| \leq 1$  for any  $m \in (0, 1]$  and  $x > 0$  as well as the bound elementary bound  $\frac{x-1}{x} \leq \log x \leq x-1$  for  $x > 0$ , we have

$$\frac{-1}{m \lceil x \rceil} \leq \frac{m \lceil x \rceil - \lceil mx \rceil}{m \lceil x \rceil} \leq \log \frac{m \lceil x \rceil}{\lceil mx \rceil} \leq \frac{m \lceil x \rceil - \lceil mx \rceil}{\lceil mx \rceil} \leq \frac{1}{\lceil mx \rceil}.$$

Now, we compute the integral of the upper and the lower bound and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L \frac{1}{\lceil mx \rceil} dx &\leq \frac{1}{m} + \int_{1/m}^L \frac{1}{mx} dx = \frac{1}{m} (1 + \log L + \log m), \\ \int_0^L \frac{1}{m \lceil x \rceil} dx &\leq \frac{1}{m} + \int_1^L \frac{1}{mx} dx = \frac{1}{m} (1 + \log L). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $m \in (0, 1]$ , we can estimate

$$\left| \int_0^L \log \frac{m \lceil x \rceil}{\lceil mx \rceil} dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{m} (1 + \log L).$$

Then, we obtain

$$\sup_{m \in \{1/L, 2/L, \dots, 1\}} |\Lambda^L(m)| \leq \sup_{m \in (0, 1]} |\Lambda^L(m)| \leq 1 + \log L. \quad (6.17)$$

The conclusion follows from applying the estimates (6.15) and (6.17) to the equation (6.16).  $\square$

**Lemma 6.18** (Lower semi- and continuity of relative entropy). *Let  $\bar{\rho} \in (0, \infty)$  and  $0 < \rho \leq \rho_c < +\infty$ . The map  $c \mapsto \mathbf{H}(c|\omega^\rho)$  is uniformly bounded,  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  lower semicontinuous and  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  continuous, where the  $\ell^{1,1}$  induced metric is given by*

$$\|c - \tilde{c}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1) |c_k - \tilde{c}_k| \quad \text{for } c, \tilde{c} \in \mathcal{P}_{< \infty}. \quad (6.18)$$

*Proof.* We decompose the relative entropy into an entropy  $\mathbf{S}$  (with respect to the counting measure on  $\mathbb{N}_0$ ) and a potential energy  $\mathbf{P}^\rho$  by writing

$$\mathbf{H}(c|\omega^\rho) = \mathbf{S}(c) + \mathbf{P}^\rho(c) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{S}(c) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \log c_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}^\rho(c) = - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \log \omega_k^\rho,$$

and consider the continuity and boundedness, respectively.

*Step 1: Summability and continuity of the entropy  $\mathbf{S}$ .* The idea of this step follows the proof of [7, Lemma 4.2]. Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  be fixed. Using the fact that  $|\log x| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \max\{x^\varepsilon, x^{-\varepsilon}\}$  and the Hölder inequality, we get for any  $1 \leq m \leq n$  the bound

$$\sum_{k=m}^n c_k^{1-\varepsilon} \leq \left( \sum_{k=m}^n k c_k \right)^{1-\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{k=m}^n k^{1-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \right)^\varepsilon,$$

Hence, we have for any  $c \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}$  the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{S}(c)| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |c_k \log c_k| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (c_k^{1+\varepsilon} + c_k^{1-\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ \max_{k \geq 1} \frac{c_k^\varepsilon}{k} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k k + \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k c_k \right)^{1-\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k^{1-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \right)^\varepsilon \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathbf{M}_1(c) + \mathbf{M}_1(c)^{1-\varepsilon} C_\varepsilon) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $(c_k \log c_k)_k$  is absolutely summable and is uniformly bounded on  $\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$ . Now if  $c^n \rightarrow c$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  or  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , then using the same idea, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq m} c_k^n |\log c_k^n| &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{k \geq m} (c_k^n)^{1+\varepsilon} + \sum_{k \geq m} (c_k^n)^{1-\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{k \geq m} c_k^n \right)^{1+\varepsilon} + \left( \sum_{k \geq m} k c_k^n \right)^{1-\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{k \geq m} k^{1-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \right)^\varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{M}_1(c^n) + \mathbf{M}_1(c^n)^{1-\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{k \geq m} k^{1-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \right)^\varepsilon \right], \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k \geq m} c_k^n \log c_k^n \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{M}_1(c) + (\sum_{k \geq m} k^{1-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}})^\varepsilon \mathbf{M}_1(c)^{1-\varepsilon} \right)$  because both  $d_{\text{Ex}}(c, c^n) \rightarrow 0$  or  $\|c - c^n\|_{\ell^{1,1}} \rightarrow 0$  imply  $\mathbf{M}_1(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{M}_1(c^n)$ . Hence, for all  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $m_\delta$  with  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} m_\delta = +\infty$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k^n \log c_k^n - \sum_{k=0}^{m_\delta} c_k \log c_k \right| &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{m_\delta} |c_k^n \log c_k^n - c_k \log c_k| + \left| \sum_{k=m_\delta+1}^{\infty} c_k^n \log c_k^n \right| \right] \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k=m_\delta+1}^{\infty} c_k^n |\log c_k^n| \leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

In the estimate above, we used that  $d_{\text{Ex}}$  convergence and  $\ell^{1,1}$  convergence implies pointwise convergence and thus the convergence of the finite sum. Hence, we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{S}(c^n) = \mathbf{S}(c)$ .

*Step 2: Uniform boundedness of  $\mathbf{P}^\rho$ .* By Lemma 6.15, we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(w(k) \phi_c^k) = 0$  so that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(w(k) \phi_c^k) = \log \frac{\phi_c}{\phi_c}$ . This implies  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \log \omega^\rho(k) = \log \frac{\phi_c}{\phi} \geq 0$ . In particular this means the sequence  $(-\frac{1}{k} \log \omega^\rho(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded for  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$ . Since  $\omega^\rho(0) = 1$  for all  $\rho \geq 0$ , we get the estimate

$$|\mathbf{P}^\rho(c)| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k |\log \omega^\rho(k)| \leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{k} \log \omega^\rho(k) \right| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k k = \sup_{k \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{k} \log \omega^\rho(k) \right| \mathbf{M}_1(c) < \infty,$$

which shows the absolute summability and the uniform boundedness of  $\mathbf{P}^\rho$  on  $\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$ .

*Step 3: (Lower-semi) continuity of  $\mathbf{P}^\rho$ .* Suppose  $c^n \rightarrow c$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$ . Notice that  $-\log(\omega^\rho) \geq 0$  so by Fatou lemma's we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k (-\log \omega_k^\rho) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k^n (-\log \omega_k^\rho).$$

This shows the  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -lower semicontinuity of  $c \mapsto -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \log(\omega_k^\rho)$  for  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$ .

For the continuity statement, we show the uniform summability of  $((c_k^n \log \omega^\rho(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  when  $c^n \rightarrow c$  in the topology  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  or  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$ . Suppose we have the uniform summability. Then the pointwise convergence of the sequence  $c^n$  and the Vitali convergence theorem yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k^n \log \omega^\rho(k) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \log \omega^\rho(k).$$

This shows the continuity of  $\mathbf{P}^\rho$ .

Now it remains to show the uniform summability in the respective situations.

- (1) In the case  $\rho = \rho_c$ . For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $k_\varepsilon$  such that for all  $k \geq k_\varepsilon$ ,  $|\frac{1}{k} \log \omega^{\rho_c}(k)| \leq \bar{\rho}^{-1}\varepsilon$  because  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} |\frac{1}{k} \log \omega^{\rho_c}(k)| = 0$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \geq k_\varepsilon}^{\infty} c_k^n |\log \omega^\rho(k)| \leq \sup_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} \left| \frac{1}{k} \log \omega^\rho(k) \right| \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \geq k_\varepsilon}^{\infty} c_k^n k \leq \sup_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} \left| \frac{1}{k} \log \omega^\rho(k) \right| \bar{\rho} \leq \varepsilon.$$

This shows the uniform tightness of  $((c_k^n \log \omega^\rho(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and continuity in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$ . Since  $\ell^{1,1}$  is stronger than  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ , this also implies continuity in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$ .

- (2) In the case  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c)$  and thus  $\phi < \phi_c$ . Let  $c^n \rightarrow c$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$ . For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we choose  $k_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough such that

$$0 \leq \sup_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{k} (-\log \omega^\rho(k)) \leq \log \frac{\phi^c}{\phi} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} c_k^n k \leq \frac{1}{\log \frac{\phi^c}{\phi} + 1} \varepsilon.$$

This is possible, because  $k^{-1}(-\log(\omega^\rho(k))) \rightarrow \log \frac{\phi^c}{\phi} > 0$  and  $(c^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\ell^{1,1}$  tight. It follows

$$0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} c_k^n (-\log \omega^\rho(k)) \leq \sup_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{k} (-\log \omega^\rho(k)) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \geq k_\varepsilon} c_k^n k \leq \varepsilon.$$

This shows that  $((c_k^n \log \omega^\rho(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly summable. Therefore,  $\mathbb{P}^\rho(c)$  is  $\ell^{1,1}$  continuous.  $\square$

**Definition 6.19** (Pushforward grand canonical measure). The probability measure  $\nu_\phi^L := C^L \# \nu_\phi^L \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{V}^L)$  is defined as the pushforward with respect to the map  $C^L : \mathbb{N}_0^L \rightarrow \hat{V}^L$  in Equation (1.4) with

$$\hat{V}^L := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0) \mid \mu = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \delta_{x_i} \text{ where } (x_i)_{i=1}^L \in \mathbb{N}_0^L, \sum_{i=1}^L x_i < \infty \right\}.$$

Explicitly,  $\nu_\phi^L$  is characterised for  $c \in \hat{V}^L$  and  $\phi \in (0, \phi_c]$  by

$$\nu_\phi^L(c) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^L : C^L(\eta) = c} \nu_\phi^L(\eta) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^L : C^L(\eta) = c} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (\omega^\phi(k))^{C^L(\eta)_k \cdot L} = \#(C^L)^{-1}(c) \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (\omega^\phi(k))^{c_k L}.$$

where  $\#(C^L)^{-1}(c) = \frac{L!}{\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (c_k L)!}$  is the number of elements in the preimage  $(C^L)^{-1}(c)$ . In the same vein as Equation (1.22), we write  $\nu_\rho^L$  for  $\rho \in (0, \rho_c]$  instead.

*Proof of Proposition 6.13.* We decompose the energy difference with the help of the pushforward of the grand canonical measure from Definition 6.19 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) - \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}^\rho) &= \frac{1}{L} \left( \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \mathbb{I}^{N,L}) - \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L) - \int \mathcal{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(dc) \\ &\quad + \int \mathcal{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) (\mathbb{C}^{N,L} - \mathbb{C}^\rho)(dc). \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

By recalling  $\mathbb{I}^{N,L} = C^L \# \pi^{N,L}$  from (4.4), we have the identity

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L) - \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \mathbb{I}^{N,L}) = \mathcal{H}(\pi^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L).$$

With this, the first term in (6.19) vanishes in the limit  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$  by the equivalence of ensembles from Proposition 1.4. By Definition 6.19 of the measure  $\nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L) - \int \mathbf{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c) &= \int \left[ \frac{1}{L} \log \frac{\mathbb{C}^{N,L}(c)}{\#(\mathbb{C}^L)^{-1}(c)} - \sum_{k=0}^N c_k \log(c_k) \right] \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c) \\ &= \int \left[ \frac{1}{L} \log \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(c) - \frac{1}{L} \left( \log L! - \sum_{k=0}^N \log[(c_k L)!] + L \sum_{k=0}^N c_k \log c_k \right) \right] \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the second term in (6.19) can be estimate by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} | \nu_{\rho \wedge \rho_c}^L) - \int \mathbf{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \left| \int \log \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(c) \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c) \right| + \frac{1}{L} \left| \int \left( \log L! - \sum_{k=0}^N \log(c_k L)! + L \sum_{k=0}^N c_k \log(c_k) \right) \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

So by Lemma 6.16 and Lemma 6.17 the second term in (6.19) vanishes in the limit as  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$ .

For the third term in (6.19), by the lower semicontinuity and boundedness of the map  $c \mapsto \mathbf{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c})$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \rho}, \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{Ex}})$  from Lemma 6.18 and the Portmanteau theorem, we have

$$\liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int \mathbf{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) \mathbb{C}^{N,L}(\mathrm{d}c) \geq \int \mathbf{H}(c | \omega^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}) \mathbb{C}(\mathrm{d}c). \quad \square$$

**6.5. Recovery sequence for the energy.** For the construction of the recovery sequence, we need a suitable discretisation in  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  for a given  $c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$ . We do this via a projection in  $\ell^{1,1}$ , which might be non-unique. Hence, we need to ensure that among the closest point, we find a measurable selection. This measurable map will be used to define a recovery sequence via pushforward.

**Lemma 6.20** (Existence of Borel selection). *Let  $0 < \rho \leq \bar{\rho} < +\infty$ . Consider the complete separable metric space  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$  defined in (6.18), define the set-valued map  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L} : \mathcal{P}_\rho \rightarrow 2^{\hat{V}^{N,L}}$  as*

$$\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) := \arg \min \{ \|c^{N,L} - c\|_{\ell^{1,1}} : c^{N,L} \in \hat{V}^{N,L} \},$$

where  $\hat{V}^{N,L}$  is considered as a finite subset of  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$ .

Then there exists a measurable map  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L} : \mathcal{P}_\rho \rightarrow \hat{V}^{N,L}$  satisfying  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) \in \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$ .

*Proof.* Let us assume for the moment that for any subset  $U \subset \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$ , the set defined by

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{N,L}(U) := \{c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho : \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$$

is closed. In particular,  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{N,L}(U)$  is Borel measurable for any open subset  $U \subset \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}$ . Then by Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem [11, Theorem 6.9.3], there exists a measurable map  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L} : \mathcal{P}_\rho \rightarrow \hat{V}^{N,L}$  and it satisfies  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) \in \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$ .

Hence, it remains to show that  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{N,L}(U)$  is  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$  closed. For  $\hat{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$ , define the associated Voronoi cell in the  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$  metric space by

$$\mathrm{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c}) := \left\{ c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho : \|c - \hat{c}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} = \min_{\tilde{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \|c - \tilde{c}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} \right\}.$$

We note that  $c \mapsto \|c - \tilde{c}\|_{\ell^{1,1}}$  is  $\ell^{1,1}$ -continuous for any fixed  $\tilde{c}$  therefore  $c \mapsto \|c - \hat{c}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} - \min_{\tilde{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \|c - \tilde{c}\|_{\ell^{1,1}}$  is also  $\ell^{1,1}$ -continuous. Since  $\mathrm{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c})$  is the preimage of the closed

subset  $(-\infty, 0] \subset \mathbb{R}$  under a continuous map,  $\text{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c})$  is closed in  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$ . Observe that  $\mathcal{P}_\rho = \bigcup_{\hat{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \text{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c})$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{N,L}(U) &= \bigcup_{\hat{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \{c \in \text{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c}) : \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\hat{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \{c \in \text{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c}) : \{\hat{c}\} \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\hat{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L} \cap U} \text{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c}). \end{aligned}$$

Since, each  $\text{VorCell}^{N,L}(\hat{c})$  for  $\hat{c} \in \hat{V}^{N,L}$  is  $\ell^{1,1}$  closed, we get that  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{N,L}(U)$  is  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$  closed because it is a finite union of closed set.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.21.** *Given two sequences  $(N_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$   $(L_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $N_n, L_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $N_n/L_n \rightarrow \rho \in [0, \infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_\rho \subset \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \hat{V}^{N_n, L_n}}^{\ell^{1,1}}$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\rho = 0$ , there is only one element  $c \in \mathcal{P}_0$  given by  $c_0 = 1$  and  $c_k = 0$  for  $k \geq 1$ . We can use the approximation  $c^n = \frac{L_n-1}{L_n} \delta_0 + \frac{1}{L_n} \delta_{N_n}$ , which provides the approximation in  $\ell^{1,1}$ , since

$$\|c^n - c\|_{\ell^{1,1}} = \frac{1}{L_n} + \frac{N_n + 1}{L_n} \rightarrow \rho = 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, let now  $\rho > 0$ . Fix  $c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$ , define  $\gamma(c) := \sum_{l \geq 1} c_l = 1 - c_0 \in (0, 1]$  and choose  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma \wedge \rho/3)$ . For technical reasons, which will become clear later, we approximate the measure  $c^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}_{\rho-\varepsilon}$  given by

$$c_0^\varepsilon = c_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{c_k}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad c_k^\varepsilon = c_k \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma k}\right) \quad \text{for } k \geq 1. \quad (6.20)$$

Indeed, it holds that  $c_k^\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  so  $c^\varepsilon$  is a probability measure. Also, the first moment of  $c^\varepsilon$  is given by  $\sum_{k \geq 1} k c_k^\varepsilon = \sum_{k \geq 1} k c_k - \gamma^{-1} \varepsilon \sum_{k \geq 1} c_k = \rho - \varepsilon$ .

We can use  $c^\varepsilon$  instead of  $c$  for the approximation, because it satisfies the closeness estimate

$$\|c^\varepsilon - c\|_{\ell^{1,1}} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k \left(1 + \frac{2}{k}\right) \leq 3\varepsilon \frac{1}{\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k = 3\varepsilon.$$

Now, we choose  $\mathbb{N} \ni M_\varepsilon > \rho$  s.t.  $\sum_{k > M_\varepsilon} k c_k^\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon$  or equivalently

$$\sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} k c_k^\varepsilon \geq \rho - 2\varepsilon. \quad (6.21)$$

In particular, we define the truncated measure supported on  $\{0, \dots, M_\varepsilon\}$

$$c^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon}|_{1, \dots, M_\varepsilon} := c^\varepsilon|_{1, \dots, M_\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad c_0^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon} := c_0^\varepsilon + \sum_{k > M_\varepsilon} c_k^\varepsilon, \quad (6.22)$$

which satisfies the bound

$$\|c^\varepsilon - c^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} = \sum_{k > M_\varepsilon} c_k^\varepsilon + \sum_{k > M_\varepsilon} (1+k) c_k^\varepsilon \leq 3\varepsilon.$$

Hence, it is sufficient to approximate  $c^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_{\rho^\varepsilon}$  for some  $\rho^\varepsilon \leq \rho - \varepsilon$ . We note that (6.20) and (6.22) imply that  $c_0^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon} > 0$  possibly depending on  $\varepsilon$ . This allows to choose  $n$  large enough such that

$$\frac{1}{L_n} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} k} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\frac{1}{2} M_\varepsilon (M_\varepsilon + 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{L_n} \leq c_0^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon} \quad (6.23)$$

as well as

$$\left| \frac{N_n}{L_n} - \rho \right| \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad N_n \geq M_\varepsilon.$$

Next, we define the approximating measure supported on  $\{0, \dots, M_\varepsilon\}$  by

$$\hat{c}_k^{\varepsilon,n} := \frac{[L_n c_k^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon}]}{L_n} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq M_\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{c}_0^{\varepsilon,n} := 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} \frac{[L_n c_k^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon}]}{L_n}.$$

Note that  $\hat{c}_0^{\varepsilon,n} \in \frac{\mathbb{N}_0}{L_n}$  since  $\hat{c}_k^{\varepsilon,n} \in \frac{\mathbb{N}_0}{L_n}$  for  $k \geq 1$ . We have the approximation property by our choice of  $L_n$  from the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{c}^{\varepsilon,n} - c^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} &= \sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} (k+2) \frac{L_n c_k - [L_n c_k]}{L_n} \leq \frac{1}{L_n} \sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} (k+2) \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\frac{1}{2} M_\varepsilon (M_\varepsilon + 1)} \frac{1}{2} (M_\varepsilon + 5) M_\varepsilon \leq 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By construction, we obtain  $\hat{c}^{\varepsilon,n} \in \hat{V}^{N^{\varepsilon,n}, L_n}$ , where

$$N^{\varepsilon,n} := \sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} k [L_n c_k^{\varepsilon, M_\varepsilon}].$$

If  $N^{\varepsilon,n} = N_n$ , we constructed  $\hat{c}^{\varepsilon,n} \in \hat{V}^{N_n, L_n} \cap B_{9\varepsilon}(c)$ . If  $N^{\varepsilon,n} \neq N_n$ , we need to correct the number of particles. Together with the properties  $c^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}_{\rho-\varepsilon}$ , the choices of parameters (6.21) and (6.23), we have the chain of inequalities

$$\rho - 3\varepsilon \leq \frac{N^{\varepsilon,n}}{L_n} = \sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} k \hat{c}_k^{\varepsilon,n} - \sum_{k=1}^{M_\varepsilon} k \frac{L_n c_k^{\varepsilon} - [L_n c_k^{\varepsilon}]}{L_n} \leq \rho - \varepsilon \leq \frac{N_n}{L_n} \leq \rho + \varepsilon, \quad (6.24)$$

In particular,  $N_n > N^{\varepsilon,n}$  in this case. Since, we have  $\hat{c}_0^{\varepsilon,n} \geq L_n^{-1}$  by our choice of  $L_n$  in (6.23), we can define

$$\bar{c}^{\varepsilon,n} = \hat{c}^{\varepsilon,n} - \delta_0 L_n^{-1} + \delta_{N_n - N^{\varepsilon,n}} L_n^{-1},$$

which by construction satisfies  $\bar{c}^{\varepsilon,n} \in \hat{V}^{N_n, L_n}$ . The error in  $\ell^{1,1}$  of this construction step is

$$\|\bar{c}^{\varepsilon,n} - \hat{c}^{\varepsilon,n}\|_{\ell^{1,1}} = L_n^{-1} + \frac{N_n - N^{\varepsilon,n} + 1}{L_n} \leq 6\varepsilon,$$

where we used  $\frac{N_n - N^{\varepsilon,n}}{L_n} \leq 4\varepsilon$  from (6.24) and hence we found  $\bar{c}^{\varepsilon,n} \in \hat{V}^{N_n, L_n} \cap B_{15\varepsilon}(c)$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, this shows the claim.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.22** (Recovery sequence). *Let  $0 < \rho \leq \bar{\rho} < +\infty$ . Given  $\mathbb{C}^\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_\rho)$ , there exists a sequence  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{V}^{N,L}))_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  such that  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\rho$  in duality with  $C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$  and*

$$\lim_{\substack{N, L \rightarrow +\infty \\ N/L \rightarrow \rho}} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}^\rho).$$

*In particular,  $\mathbb{C}^{N,L} \xrightarrow{*-\text{Ex}} \mathbb{C}^\rho$ .*

*Proof.* We have both  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}})$  and  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$  are Polish spaces with  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}}) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$ . By a corollary of the Lusin-Souslin Theorem [38, Theorem 15.1, Exercise 15.3], we have  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$  so we do not have to distinguish the Borel measures in  $\mathcal{P}((\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1}))$  and  $\mathcal{P}((\mathcal{P}_\rho, d_{\text{Ex}}))$ .

We obtain a  $\ell^{1,1}$ -measurable map  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L} : \mathcal{P}_\rho \rightarrow \hat{V}^{N,L}$  from Lemma 6.20. This allows us to define the pushforward measure  $\mathcal{D}_\#^{N,L} \mathbb{C}^\rho \in \mathcal{P}(V^{\hat{N}, L})$ .

By the density of  $\bigcup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \hat{V}^{N,L}$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_\rho, \ell^{1,1})$  proven in Lemma 6.21, the sequence  $(\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) \in \hat{V}^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  converges to  $c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  in  $\ell^{1,1}$ .

Let  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c) \rightarrow c$  in  $\ell^{1,1}$  pointwise,  $f(\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c)) \rightarrow f(c)$  as  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$ . By dominated convergence, we have

$$\lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int f(c) \mathcal{D}_\#^{N,L} \mathbb{C}^\rho(\text{dc}) - \int f(c) \mathbb{C}^\rho(\text{dc}) = \lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int (f(\mathcal{D}^{N,L}(c)) - f(c)) \mathbb{C}^\rho(\text{dc}) = 0.$$

This means  $\mathcal{D}_{\#}^{N,L}\mathbb{C}^{\rho} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\rho}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}), C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1}))$ .

Now by Lemma 6.18, we can conclude by the estimate (6.19) that

$$\lim_{\substack{N,L \rightarrow +\infty \\ N/L \rightarrow \rho}} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}) = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}^{\rho}).$$

Since  $C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}}) \subset C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, \ell^{1,1})$ , this implies  $\mathcal{D}_{\#}^{N,L}\mathbb{C}^{\rho} \xrightarrow{*-\text{Ex}} \mathbb{C}^{\rho}$ .  $\square$

**6.6. Lower semicontinuity of dissipation potentials.** This subsection proves the lower semicontinuity of the potentials in Proposition 6.27 which is the second step of showing the lower semicontinuity of the EDF.

The strategy is to apply the lower semicontinuity for convex functional on Polish space from [53, Lemma 2.3 (8)]. To do so, we need to rewrite our measures and functionals in a form making their lower semicontinuity apparent.

**Definition 6.23.** Let  $(V, d)$  be a Polish space and the edge space  $E := V \times V$  with the product metric and the associated Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $\mathbb{F}^1, \mathbb{F}^2, \mathbb{V} \in \mathcal{M}(E)$  be absolutely continuous with respect to a dominating measure  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$ . Define  $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}} : \mathcal{M}(E; \mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{F}^1, \mathbb{F}^2) := \int_E \bar{\mathcal{C}}\left(\frac{d\mathbb{V}}{d\Sigma}, \frac{d\mathbb{F}^1}{d\Sigma}, \frac{d\mathbb{F}^2}{d\Sigma}\right) d\Sigma, \quad (6.25)$$

with  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(y, x_1, x_2) := \mathcal{C}(y|\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{x_1}\sqrt{x_2})$  and  $\mathcal{F}_q : \mathcal{M}(E; \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$

$$\mathcal{F}_q(\mathbb{F}^1, \mathbb{F}^2) := \int_E q\left(\frac{d\mathbb{F}^1}{d\Sigma}, \frac{d\mathbb{F}^2}{d\Sigma}\right) d\Sigma, \quad (6.26)$$

with  $q(x_1, x_2) := (\sqrt{x_1} - \sqrt{x_2})^2$ . Since,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $q$  are positive 1-homogeneous the functionals  $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_q$  are well-defined independent of the choice of the dominating measure  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$  (see [53, Lemma 2.3 (1)]).

*Remark 6.24.* Both  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $q$  are jointly convex, lower semicontinuous and positive 1-homogeneous. The convexity of  $q$  is easy to check directly. For the convexity of  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ , we consider  $\beta : \mathbb{R}^2 \ni x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{x_1}\sqrt{x_2}$  is concave. Using the dual formulation of perspective function,

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}(y, x_1, x_2) = \mathcal{C}(y|\beta(x)) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} (\xi y - \beta(x)\mathcal{C}^*(\xi)).$$

Because  $\mathcal{C}^*$  and  $\beta$  are non-negative, we see that concavity of  $\beta$  implies convexity of  $(y, x_1, x_2) \mapsto (\xi y - \beta(x)\mathcal{C}^*(\xi))$ . Then  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  is convex as the supremum of convex functions.

**Lemma 6.25.** *The maps  $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}} : \mathcal{M}(E; \mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  and  $\mathcal{F}_q : \mathcal{M}(E; \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  are lower semicontinuous in the topology on  $E$  in duality with  $C_b(E)$ .*

*Proof.* As discussed in Remark 6.24,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $q$  are convex, lower semicontinuous and positive 1-homogeneous. Therefore, by [53, Lemma 2.3 (8)], the functionals are lower semicontinuous with respect to the weak convergence.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.26.** *If  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  in vw- $d_{\text{Ex}}$  sense defined in Definition 1.5 then for all  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and Lebesgue almost all  $t \in [0, T]$*

$$(\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2})(t) \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,2})(t) \quad \text{in } \sigma(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}^2; \mathbb{R}^2), C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$$

and

$$(\mathbb{V}^{N,L,k,l-1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2})(t) \rightarrow (\mathbb{V}^{k,l-1}, \mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,2})(t)$$

in  $\sigma(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}^2; \mathbb{R}^3); C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}^2; \mathbb{R}^3))$ , where for the finite particle system the measures are defined by

$$\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}(t, dc, dc') := \delta_{c^{k,l-1}}(dc') \kappa^L[c](k, l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(dc),$$

$$\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2}(t, dc, dc') := \delta_{c^{l,k-1}}(dc) \kappa^L[c'](l, k-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(dc'),$$

$$\mathbb{V}^{N,L,k,l-1}(t, dc, dc') := \delta_{c^{k,l-1}}(dc') L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l-1),$$

and for the limit

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,1}(t, dc, dc') &:= \delta_c(dc') \kappa[c](k, l-1) \mathbb{C}_t(dc), \\ \mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,2}(t, dc, dc') &:= \delta_{c'}(dc) \kappa[c'](l, k-1) \mathbb{C}_t(dc'), \\ \mathbb{V}^{k,l-1}(t, dc, dc') &:= \delta_c(dc') \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l-1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\kappa^L$  and  $\kappa$  are defined in (1.10) and in (1.15), respectively.

*Proof.* The convergence to  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  in  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense implies for given  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and Lebesgue almost everywhere  $t \in [0, T]$  the convergence of the measure

$$L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(dc, k, l-1) \rightarrow \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l-1) \quad \text{in } B_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}})^*.$$

Generally, to establish the weak convergence of product measures  $\mu^n = (\mu_i^n)_{i=1}^d \rightarrow (\mu_i)_{i=1}^d$ , it is equivalent to show the weak convergence of  $\mu_i^n \rightarrow \mu_i$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , that is for each  $f$  bounded and *Lipschitz continuous* on  $(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}^2, \mathbb{R})$  we have the convergence

$$\int f(c, c') \mu_i^n(dc, dc') \rightarrow \int f(c, c') \mu_i(dc, dc').$$

Therefore, it suffices to consider the case when  $\mu^{N,L} = (\mathbb{V}^{N,L,k,l-1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2})(t)$  for fixed  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \in [0, T] \setminus \mathcal{N}$  where  $\mathcal{N}$  is a set of zero measure so that we have the convergence of  $\frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(\cdot, k, l-1) \rightarrow \mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)$ .

*Step 1: Convergence of  $\mathbb{V}^{N,L,k,l-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^{k,l-1}$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(c,c') \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L} \times \hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L}} f(c, c') \delta_{c^{k,l-1}}(c') L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) - \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}} \times \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} f(c, c') \delta_c(dc') \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l-1) \\ &= \sum_{c \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L}} f(c, c^{k,l-1}) L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1) - \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} f(c, c) \mathbb{J}_t(dc, k, l-1) \\ &\leq \sup_{c \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L}} |f(c, c^{k,l-1}) - f(c, c)| \sum_{c \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L}} L^{-1} |\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}|(c, k, l-1) \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} f(c, c) (L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L} - \mathbb{J}_t)(dc, k, l-1) \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

Since  $\frac{1}{L} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(\cdot, k, l-1) \rightarrow \mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)$  in duality with bounded Borel function is equivalent to weak convergence with respect to the total variation norm, we have the total variation norm is bounded

$$\sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} L^{-1} \|\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(\cdot, k, l-1)\|_{\text{TV}(\hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L})} < +\infty.$$

Hence the first term in (6.27) vanishes as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  due to the upper bounded

$$\sup_{c \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}} |f(c, c^{k,l-1}) - f(c, c)| \sum_{c \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L}} L^{-1} |\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}|(c, k, l-1) \leq \frac{2 \text{Lip}(f)}{L} \sup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} L^{-1} \|\mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(\cdot, k, l-1)\|_{\text{TV}(\hat{\mathcal{V}}^{N,L})}.$$

Since  $c$  and  $c^{k,l-1}$  have the same zeroth and first moments, the Lipschitz estimate is obtained by Lemma 2.7. The second term in (6.27) vanishes by weak convergence as  $c \mapsto f(c, c)$  is a bounded Borel function.

*Step 2: Convergence of  $(\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{k,l-1,2})$ .*

The two measures  $(\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2})$  are symmetric under the exchange of  $c \leftrightarrow c^{k,l-1}$  so

we only show the convergence of  $\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}$  in details. By definition, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{c,c' \in \hat{V}^{N,L} \times \hat{V}^{N,L}} f(c,c') \mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,1}(c,c') - \int f(c,c') \mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,1}(dc,dc') \\ &= \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} f(c,c^{k,l-1}) \kappa^L[c](k,l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c) - \int f(c,c) \kappa[c](k,l-1) \mathbb{C}_t(dc). \end{aligned}$$

By adding zeros and the triangle inequality, we estimate

$$|f(c,c^{k,l-1}) - f(c,c)| \kappa^L[c](k,l-1) \leq \frac{2 \text{Lip}(f)}{L} c_k c_{l-1} K(k,l-1) \leq \frac{2 \text{Lip}(f)}{L} K(k,l-1)$$

and similarly

$$|f(c,c)(\kappa^L[c](k,l-1) - \kappa[c](k,l-1))| \leq \frac{|f(c,c)|}{L-1} K(k,l-1) c_k |c_{l-1} - \delta_{k,l-1}| \leq \frac{\|f\|_\infty}{L-1} K(k,l-1).$$

We observe for fixed  $(k,l-1)$ , the map  $\mathbb{R}^{N_0} \ni c \mapsto \kappa[c](k,l-1)$  is continuous coordinatewise which implies it is  $d_{\text{Ex}}$ -continuous. We have  $c \mapsto f(c,c) \kappa[c](k,l-1) \in C_b(\mathcal{P}_{\leq \bar{\rho}}, d_{\text{Ex}})$  and

$$\int f(c,c) \kappa[c](k,l-1) (\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(dc) - \mathbb{C}_t(dc)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N/L \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we conclude

$$\left| \int f(c,c^{k,l-1}) \kappa^L[c](k,l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(dc) - \int f(c,c) \kappa[c](k,l-1) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) \right| \leq \frac{C(f,k,l-1)}{L} + o(1)_{N/L \rightarrow \infty}.$$

The estimate for  $\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2}$  has the same structure to the same estimate for  $\mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}$  up to exchanging  $k \leftrightarrow l$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.27** (Lower semicontinuity of dissipation potentials). *If  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \in \text{CE}^N(0, T)$  satisfies the uniform bound (6.1), then the dissipation potentials are  $\Gamma$ -lower semicontinuous for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$  along any subsequence with  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  in vw- $d_{\text{Ex}}$  sense*

$$\liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \geq \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) \geq \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t)$$

In particular,  $\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1) \ll \mathbb{C}_t$  for all  $(k, l-1)$  for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* First, we rewrite the potential function  $\mathcal{D}^{N,L}$  in terms of  $\mathcal{F}_q$  defined in (6.25) from Definition 6.23 leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) &= \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} q(\kappa^L[c](k,l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c), \kappa^L[c^{k,l-1}](l,k-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})) \\ &= \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{c,c' \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} q(\mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,1}(t,c,c'), \mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,2}(t,c,c')) \\ &= \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_q(\mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,2}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by Fatou's lemma, applying lower semicontinuity of the convex functionals in Lemma 6.25 and Proposition 6.26, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) &\geq \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_q(\mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,2}) \\ &= \sum_{k,l \in \mathbb{N}} \int q\left(\frac{d\mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,1}}{d\Sigma}(c,c'), \frac{d\mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,2}}{d\Sigma}(c,c')\right) d\Sigma(c,c') \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Sigma$  can be any dominating measure and may depend on  $k, l$ . From the structure of the limits, we can choose  $\Sigma(c, c') = \delta_c(c')\mathbb{C}_t(c)$  and get

$$\liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \geq \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int q(\kappa[c](k, l-1), \kappa[c](l, k-1)) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) = \int \mathbb{D}(c) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_t).$$

Similarly, we rewrite  $\mathcal{R}^{N,L}$  in terms of  $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbb{C}}}$  defined in (6.26) from Definition 6.23 providing us with the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) \\ &= \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{c \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \bar{\mathbb{C}}(L^{-1} \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}(c, k, l-1), \kappa^L[c](k, l-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c), \kappa^L[c^{k,l-1}](l, k-1) \mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}(c^{k,l-1})) \\ &= \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{c, c' \in \hat{V}^{N,L}} \bar{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{V}^{N,L,k,l-1}(t, c, c'), \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,1}(t, c, c'), \mathbb{F}^{N,L,k,l-1,2}(t, c, c')) \\ &= \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbb{C}}}(\mathbb{V}_t^{N,L,k,l-1}, \mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}_t^{N,L,k,l-1,2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, with similar arguments as before, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) &\geq \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbb{C}}}(\mathbb{V}_t^{k,l-1}, \mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,1}, \mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,2}) \\ &= \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int \bar{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{d\mathbb{V}_t^{k,l-1}}{d\Sigma}, \frac{d\mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,1}}{d\Sigma}, \frac{d\mathbb{F}_t^{k,l-1,2}}{d\Sigma}\right) d\Sigma(c, c') \\ &= \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\hat{V}} \bar{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{d\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)}{d\Sigma}, \kappa[c](k, l-1) \frac{d\mathbb{C}_t}{d\Sigma}, \kappa[c](l, k-1) \frac{d\mathbb{C}_t}{d\Sigma}\right) d\Sigma(c) \\ &= \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\hat{V}} \mathbb{C}\left(\frac{d\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)}{d\Sigma} \middle| \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa[c](k, l-1) \kappa[c](l, k-1)} \frac{d\mathbb{C}_t}{d\Sigma}\right) d\Sigma(c), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we chose the dominating measure to concentrate on the diagonal without renaming the dominating measure  $\Sigma$ . By assumption (6.1) we have for almost all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\hat{V}} \mathbb{C}\left(\frac{d\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)}{d\Sigma} \middle| \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa[c](k, l-1) \kappa[c](l, k-1)} \frac{d\mathbb{C}_t}{d\Sigma}\right) d\Sigma(c) < +\infty.$$

Therefore Remark 5.7 implies for each  $(k, l-1)$ , we have the absolute continuity of  $\mathbb{J}_t(k, l-1) \ll \mathbb{C}_t$ . By the Radon-Nikodym theorem, we can choose  $\Sigma = \mathbb{C}_t$  and arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) &\geq \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \int \mathbb{C}\left(\frac{d\mathbb{J}_t(\cdot, k, l-1)}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(c) \middle| \sigma(c, k, l-1)\right) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) \\ &= \int \mathbb{R}\left(c, \frac{d\mathbb{J}_t}{d\mathbb{C}_t}(c)\right) \mathbb{C}_t(dc) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**6.7. Proof of main results from Section 1.6.** We can now prove now the main results stated in Section 1.6 using the compactness and the lower semicontinuity results from Section 6 in the *thermodynamic limit*, that is any sequence  $N/L \rightarrow \rho$  as  $N, L \rightarrow \infty$  and set  $\bar{\rho} := \sup\{\frac{N}{L}\} < \infty$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* (a) The finiteness of  $\rho_c$  is by assumption  $\text{K}_c$ . The  $\Gamma$ -convergence is a consequence of Proposition 6.13 and Proposition 6.22.

(b) This follows from Fatou's lemma and Proposition 6.27.

- (c) (i) Under the assumptions, Proposition 6.2 and Lemma 6.7 hold so that we can apply Lemma 6.12 to get each  $\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L} \xrightarrow{*-\text{Ex}} \mathbb{C}_t$  for  $t \in [0, T]$  along a subsequence. Moreover Proposition 6.5 holds so we can extract yet another subsequence so that  $(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})_{N/L \rightarrow \rho}$  converges in the  $\text{vw-d}_{\text{Ex}}$  sense. The limit  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  satisfies the limit continuity equation was proved in Proposition 6.9.
- (ii) Since for each  $t \in [0, T]$   $\mathbb{C}_t$  is a subsequence limit in the weak\*-Ex topology, by Lemma 6.4 we have the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* The proof is a direct application of the lower semicontinuity of the free energy from Proposition 6.13 and the lower semicontinuity of the dissipation potentials of (1.33) in Theorem 1.6.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.8.* This is a consequence of the functional characterisation of solutions of the three equations established in the Sections 3-5.

- (i) As an EDP solution of  $(\text{FKE}_N)$ , we have  $\mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L}) = 0$  and we obtain a subsequence limit  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  by Theorem 1.6. By the result (ii) of Corollary 5.8 and Theorem 1.7,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0$  so the limit is an EDP solution of (LiE).
- (ii) By Theorem 1.6(c ii),  $\mathbb{C}_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$ . Then the existence of the path measure  $\lambda$  is given by Corollary 5.8(i). It also follows from Corollary 5.8(iii) that  $\lambda$  concentrates on EDP solutions of (MFE).
- (iii) By the well-preparedness of the initial data, lower semicontinuity of the functionals and  $\mathcal{L}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) = 0 = \mathcal{L}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}^{N,L})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) &= \lim_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{E}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_0^{N,L}) \\ &\quad - \liminf_{N/L \rightarrow \rho} \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{R}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}, \mathbb{J}_t^{N,L}) + \mathcal{D}^{N,L}(\mathbb{C}_t^{N,L}) \right) dt \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_0) - \int_0^T (\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{C}_t, \mathbb{J}_t) + \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_t)) dt = \mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_t). \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound is given by the lower semicontinuity of the free energy in Proposition 6.13.  $\square$

By [61, Theorem 2.12], if the kernel satisfies assumption  $(K_u)$ , then the solution of (MFE) is unique given an initial data  $c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho$  and defines a semigroup on  $\mathcal{P}_\rho$ , that is

$$S_t^{\text{MFE}} c_0 := c_t \quad \text{with } c_t \text{ the unique solution to (MFE) for } t \in [0, T].$$

This uniqueness is now transferred to the EDP solutions of (LiE) in the next Lemma.

**Lemma 6.28** (Uniqueness of EDP solution of (LiE)). *Under assumptions  $(K_1)$  and  $(K_u)$ , suppose  $\mathbb{C}_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_\rho)$  for some  $\rho \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $\mathcal{E}^{\rho \wedge \rho_c}(\mathbb{C}_0) < +\infty$  and  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J}) \in \text{CE}^\infty(0, T)$  is an EDP solution of (LiE) then there exists a measure  $\lambda$  concentrated on EDP solution of (MFE). Then for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_\rho))$  the set*

$$B|_0 := \{c_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\rho : (S_t^{\text{MFE}} c_0)_{t \in [0, T]} \in B\}$$

*is measurable and gives rise to the representation*

$$\lambda(B) = \int \mathbf{1}_{B|_0}(c) \mathbb{C}_0(dc). \quad (6.28)$$

*In particular, given initial data  $\mathbb{C}_0$ , the EDP solution  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  to (LiE) is unique.*

*Proof.* The existence of  $\lambda$  is given by Corollary 5.8. We only have to argue for the representation (6.28). By the disintegration of measure, [11, Theorem 10.4.12], given a probability measure  $\lambda$  on  $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_\rho)$  there exists a probability kernel  $(\lambda_c)_{c \in \mathcal{P}_\rho}$  generated by the evaluation map  $e_0$  at  $t = 0$  such that for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_\rho))$ ,  $G \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_\rho)$  it holds

$$\lambda(B \cap e_0^{-1}(G)) = \int_G \lambda_{\tilde{c}}(B) (\lambda \circ e_0)(d\tilde{c}) = \int_G \lambda_{\tilde{c}}(B) \mathbb{C}_0(d\tilde{c}). \quad (6.29)$$

Since,  $\lambda$  concentrates on the EDP solution of (MFE) of the form  $(c, \bar{J}[c]) \in \text{ExCE}(0, T)$ , which has also the semigroup representation  $c_t = S_t^{\text{MFE}} c_0$  and we have by uniqueness the identity

$$\lambda_{\tilde{c}} = \delta_{(S_t^{\text{MFE}} \tilde{c})_{t \in [0, T]}}.$$

Hence, we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\tilde{c}}(B) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (c_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in B \text{ and } c_t = S_t^{\text{MFE}} \tilde{c} \text{ for } t \in [0, T]; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{B|_0}(\tilde{c}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tilde{c} \mapsto \lambda_{\tilde{c}}(B)$  is measurable so is  $\tilde{c} \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{B|_0}(\tilde{c})$ . By taking  $G = \mathcal{P}_\rho$  in (6.29), we get the representation of  $\lambda$ . Since  $(e_t)_\# \lambda = \mathbb{C}_t$ , this representation implies the uniqueness of the EDP solution  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$  for (LiE) given  $\mathbb{C}_0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.10.* The assumptions of Corollary 1.8 and Lemma 6.28 are satisfied. Therefore by the uniqueness of EDP solution of (LiE) in Lemma 6.28, every subsequence obtained in Corollary 1.8 must converge to the same limit  $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{J})$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{C}_t^{N, L} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_t$  along the entire sequence. Using the representation in Lemma 6.28 with  $\mathbb{C}_0 = \delta_{c_0}$ , we have  $\mathbb{C}_t = (e_t)_\# \lambda = \delta_{c_t}$ . The proof is complete with the energy limit shown in Corollary 1.8(iii).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Adams, N. Dirr, M. Peletier, and J. Zimmer. Large deviations and gradient flows. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 371(2005):20120341, 17, 2013.
- [2] S. Adams, N. Dirr, M. A. Peletier, and J. Zimmer. From a large-deviations principle to the Wasserstein gradient flow: A new micro-macro passage. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 307(3):791–815, 2011.
- [3] A. Agazzi, L. Andreis, R. I. A. Patterson, and D. R. M. Renger. Large deviations for Markov jump processes with uniformly diminishing rates. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 152:533–559, 2022.
- [4] L. Ambrosio and D. Trevisan. Well-posedness of Lagrangian flows and continuity equations in metric measure spaces. *Anal. PDE*, 7(5):1179–1234, sep 2014.
- [5] I. Armendáriz and M. Loulakis. Thermodynamic limit for the invariant measures in supercritical zero range processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 145:175–188, 2009.
- [6] S. Arnrich, A. Mielke, M. A. Peletier, G. Savaré, and M. Veneroni. Passing to the limit in a Wasserstein gradient flow: From diffusion to reaction. *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.*, 44:419–454, 2012.
- [7] J. M. Ball, J. Carr, and O. Penrose. The Becker-Döring cluster equations: Basic properties and asymptotic behaviour of solutions. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 104(4):657–692, 1986.
- [8] E. Ben-Naim and P. L. Krapivsky. Exchange-driven growth. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68(3):031104, 2003.
- [9] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim. Macroscopic fluctuation theory. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 87(2):593–636, 2015.
- [10] L. Bertini, A. Faggionato, and D. Gabrielli. From level 2.5 to level 2 large deviations for continuous time Markov chains. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 20(3):545–562, 2014.
- [11] V. I. Bogachev and M. A. S. Ruas. *Measure theory*, volume 1. Springer, 2007.
- [12] J. A. Carrillo, M. G. Delgadino, L. Desvillettes, and J. S. H. Wu. The Landau equation as a gradient flow. *Accepted at Anal. PDE, arXiv:2007.08591*, 2022.
- [13] P. Chleboun, S. Gabriel, and S. Grosskinsky. Poisson-Dirichlet asymptotics in condensing particle systems. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 27(none):1 – 35, 2022.
- [14] P. Chleboun and S. Grosskinsky. Condensation in stochastic particle systems with stationary product measures. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 154(1):432–465, 2014.
- [15] S.-N. Chow, W. Huang, Y. Li, and H. Zhou. Fokker-Planck equations for a free energy functional or Markov process on a graph. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 203(3):969–1008, 2012.
- [16] C. Coccozza-Thivent. Processus des misanthropes. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeit.*, 70(4):509–523, 1985.

- [17] M. G. Delgadino, R. S. Gvalani, and G. A. Pavliotis. On the diffusive-mean field limit for weakly interacting diffusions exhibiting phase transitions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 241(1):91–148, Apr. 2021.
- [18] C. Eichenberg and A. Schlichting. Self-similar behavior of the exchange-driven growth model with product kernel. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(3):498–546, 2021.
- [19] M. Erbar. Gradient flows of the entropy for jump processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 50(3):920–945, 2014.
- [20] M. Erbar. A gradient flow approach to the Boltzmann equation. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, June 2023.
- [21] M. Erbar, M. Fathi, V. Laschos, and A. Schlichting. Gradient flow structure for McKean-Vlasov equations on discrete spaces. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 36(12):6799–6833, 2016.
- [22] M. Erbar, M. Fathi, and A. Schlichting. Entropic curvature and convergence to equilibrium for mean-field dynamics on discrete spaces. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 17(1):445–471, 2020.
- [23] E. Esentürk. Mathematical theory of exchange-driven growth. *Nonlinearity*, 31(7):3460, jun 2018.
- [24] E. Esentürk and J. Velazquez. Large time behavior of exchange-driven growth. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 41(2):747–775, 2021.
- [25] M. R. Evans. Phase transitions in one-dimensional nonequilibrium systems. *Braz. J. Phys.*, 30:42–57, 2000.
- [26] M. R. Evans and B. Waclaw. Condensation in models with factorized and pair-factorized stationary states. *J. Stat. Mech: Theory Exp.*, 2015(9):P09005, 2015.
- [27] L. Fajfrová, T. Gobron, and E. Saada. Invariant measures of mass migration processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 21(none):1 – 52, 2016.
- [28] M. Fathi. A gradient flow approach to large deviations for diffusion processes. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 106(5):957–993, 2016.
- [29] M. Fathi and M. Simon. The gradient flow approach to hydrodynamic limits for the simple exclusion process. In P. Gonçalves and A. J. Soares, editors, *From Particle Systems to Partial Differential Equations III*, pages 167–184, Cham, 2016. Springer, Springer International Publishing.
- [30] M. Feinberg. *Foundations of Chemical Reaction Network Theory*. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [31] T. Frenzel and M. Liero. Effective diffusion in thin structures via generalized gradient systems and EDP-convergence. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 14(1):395–425, 2021.
- [32] S. Grosskinsky and W. Jatuviriyapornchai. Derivation of mean-field equations for stochastic particle systems. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 129(4):1455–1475, Apr. 2019.
- [33] S. Großkinsky, G. M. Schütz, and H. Spohn. Condensation in the zero range process: stationary and dynamical properties. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 113:389–410, 2003.
- [34] G. H. Hardy and S. Ramanujan. Asymptotic Formulæ in Combinatory Analysis. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, s2-17(1):75–115, 01 1918.
- [35] J. Hoeksema and O. Tse. Generalized gradient structures for measure-valued population dynamics and their large-population limit. *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.*, 62(5):158, May 2023.
- [36] M. Kaiser, R. L. Jack, and J. Zimmer. Canonical structure and orthogonality of forces and currents in irreversible Markov chains. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 170(6):1019–1050, 2018.
- [37] M. Kaiser, R. L. Jack, and J. Zimmer. A variational structure for interacting particle systems and their hydrodynamic scaling limits. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 17(3):739–780, 2019.
- [38] A. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [39] H. A. Kramers. Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions. *Physica*, 7(4):284–304, 4 1940.
- [40] P. Laurençot and S. Mischler. From the Becker–Döring to the Lifshitz–Slyozov–Wagner Equations. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 106(5/6):957–991, 2002.
- [41] M. Liero, A. Mielke, M. A. Peletier, and D. R. M. Renger. On microscopic origins of generalized gradient structures. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 10(1), 2017.
- [42] J. Maas. Gradient flows of the entropy for finite markov chains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(8):2250–2292, 2011.
- [43] J. Maas and A. Mielke. Modeling of chemical reaction systems with detailed balance using gradient structures. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 181(6):2257–2303, Nov. 2020.
- [44] M. Mariani. A  $\Gamma$ -convergence approach to large deviations. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 18(3):951–976, 2018.
- [45] A. Mielke. Geodesic convexity of the relative entropy in reversible markov chains. *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.*, 48:1–31, 2013.
- [46] A. Mielke. On evolutionary  $\Gamma$ -Convergence for gradient systems. In A. Muntean, J. Rademacher, and A. Zangaris, editors, *Macroscopic and large scale phenomena: Coarse graining, mean field limits and ergodicity*, pages 187–249. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.
- [47] A. Mielke, A. Montefusco, and M. A. Peletier. Exploring families of energy-dissipation landscapes via tilting: three types of EDP convergence. *Continuum Mech. Thermodyn.*, 33(3), 2021.

- [48] A. Mielke, M. A. Peletier, and D. M. Renger. On the relation between gradient flows and the large-deviation principle, with applications to markov chains and diffusion. *Potential Anal.*, 41:1293–1327, 2014.
- [49] A. Mielke, M. A. Peletier, and A. Stephan. EDP-convergence for nonlinear fast-slow reaction systems with detailed balance. *Nonlinearity*, 34(8):5762–5798, 2021.
- [50] A. Mielke and A. Stephan. Coarse-graining via EDP-convergence for linear fast-slow reaction systems. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 30(9):1765–1807, 2020.
- [51] R. I. A. Patterson and D. R. M. Renger. Large deviations of jump process fluxes. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 22(3):Paper No. 21, 32, 2019.
- [52] M. A. Peletier and D. M. Renger. Fast reaction limits via  $\Gamma$ -convergence of the flux rate functional. *J. Dyn. Differ. Equ.*, 35(1):865–906, 2023.
- [53] M. A. Peletier, R. Rossi, G. Savaré, and O. Tse. Jump processes as generalized gradient flows. *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.*, 61(1):1–85, 2022.
- [54] M. A. Peletier, G. Savaré, and M. Veneroni. From Diffusion to Reaction via  $\Gamma$ -Convergence. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 42(4):1805–1825, 1 2010.
- [55] M. A. Peletier and A. Schlichting. Cosh gradient systems and tilting. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 231:113094, 2023. Variational Models for Discrete Systems.
- [56] Z. D. Ren and M. M. Rao. *Applications Of Orlicz Spaces*. Monographs and textbooks in pure and applied mathematics. Taylor & Francis, 2002.
- [57] D. R. M. Renger. Flux large deviations of independent and reacting particle systems, with implications for macroscopic fluctuation theory. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 172(5):1291–1326, 2018.
- [58] H. Royden and P. Fitzpatrick. *Real Analysis*. Prentice Hall, 2010.
- [59] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. Gamma-convergence of gradient flows with applications to Ginzburg-Landau. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 57(12):1627–1672, 2004.
- [60] A. Schlichting. Macroscopic limit of the Becker-Döring equation *via* gradient flows. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 25:Paper No. 22, 36, 2019.
- [61] A. Schlichting. The exchange-driven growth model: basic properties and longtime behavior. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 30(3):793–830, 2020.
- [62] S. Serfaty. Gamma-convergence of gradient flows on Hilbert and metric spaces and applications. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A*, 31(4):1427–1451, 2011.
- [63] F. Spitzer. Interaction of markov processes. *Adv. Math.*, 5(2):246–290, 1970.
- [64] A. Stephan. EDP-convergence for a linear reaction-diffusion system with fast reversible reaction. *Calc. Var. Partial Dif.*, 60(6):Paper No. 226, 35, 2021.