

# Intrinsic regularization by noise for $1d$ mean field games

François Delarue\*      Youssef Ouknine †

## Abstract

The purpose of this article is to show that an intrinsic noise with values in the space  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  of  $1d$  probability measures may force uniqueness to first order mean field games. The structure of the noise is inspired from the earlier work [DHa]. It reads as a coloured Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with reflection on the boundary of quantile functions on the  $1d$  torus, with the elements of the latter playing the role of indices for the continuum of players underpinning the game. In [DHa], the semi-group generated by the noise is shown to enjoy smoothing properties that become key in the study carried out here. Although the analysis is limited to the  $1d$  setting, this is the first example of uniqueness forcing for generic mean field games set over an infinite dimensional set of probability measures and this may be one step forward towards a more systematic regularization by noise theory for mean field games.

**Keywords:** Mean field games; Common Noise; Measure-valued Diffusions; Wasserstein Diffusions; Reflected SPDE; Rearrangement Inequalities.

**MSC2020 subject classifications:** 49N80, 91A16, 60H15, 60G57.

## 1 Introduction

Mean field game theory was introduced in concomitant works by Lasry and Lions and by Huang, Caines and Malhamé, see [HMC03, HMC07, LL06a, LL06b, LL07]. Its purpose is to describe asymptotic versions of dynamic games with many weakly interacting agents. In this approach, equilibria (in the sense of Nash) are described by means of a time-dependent path with values in the space of probability measures. Those probability measures describe the successive states (as time goes by) of the population of players when all of them form a Nash equilibrium.

Solutions (or equilibria) to mean field games are known to be characterized through a forward-backward system of two Partial Differential Equations (PDEs): the forward equation is a Fokker-Planck equation describing the evolution of the in-equilibrium population whilst the backward equation is a Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the value function to one reference player within the population, see [CDLL19, CP21, Lio]. Alternatively, equilibria can be described through a forward-backward system of two (possibly stochastic) differential equations, the forward one being for the state of one typical player inside the in-equilibrium population and the backward one being either for the optimal cost or the optimal strategy to the same reference player, see [CD18a].

One main difficulty with mean field games is that uniqueness is rare. Conditions are known under which uniqueness is indeed satisfied, but there are rather demanding. The most famous ones are the so-called monotonicity conditions, either stated in the sense of

---

\*Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, Nice, France E-mail: [francois.delarue@univ-cotedazur.fr](mailto:francois.delarue@univ-cotedazur.fr)

†Cadi Ayyad University & Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Morocco.  
E-mail: [ouknine@uca.ac.ma](mailto:ouknine@uca.ac.ma)

Lasry and Lions (or equivalently in the space of signed measures) or in the displacement monotone sense (or equivalently in the space of random variables lying above the space of probability measures), see the additional references [GM22, GMMZ22] for the latter.

The key objective of this article is to show that one can guarantee uniqueness by forcing the dynamics of the population randomly. This fact was already observed in previous contributions, but in some limited cases when the equilibria are known to live in a finite-dimensional space (for instance, when equilibria are Gaussian, see [Tch18], or when the mean field game is set over a finite state space, see [BCCD21]). When the framework is truly infinite dimensional, uniqueness has been shown to hold in [Del19], but in presence of an infinite dimensional noise that destroys the mean field structure of the solutions. In contrast to the latter one, the main result here is to show that we can indeed force uniqueness and (at the same time) preserve the mean field structure of the solutions with a suitable form of common noise.

The form of our common noise is taken from the previous work [DHa]. Therein, the authors study the construction of a diffusion process with values in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  (the space of probability measures over  $\mathbb{R}$ ). The key point in this approach is to identify elements of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  with quantile functions defined on the  $1d$  torus and then to consider, as dynamics, a coloured stochastic heat equation with reflection on the boundary of the set of quantile functions. Importantly, the semi-group of the resulting process (acting on real-valued functions defined on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ ) is shown to have a strong smoothing effect, mapping bounded onto Lipschitz functions, with a time integrable singularity in small time. The core of our approach is to subject the players of the game to this form of noise and then to use the smoothing properties established for the latter one in [DHa] in order to decouple the two forward and backward equations characterizing the equilibrium. In particular, the limitation of the analysis to the  $1d$  setting directly stems from the approach introduced in [DHa]. If we could extend [DHa] to the higher dimensional setting, we could consider in turn games with  $d$ -dimensional players.

Similar to solutions to standard mean field games, the equilibrium that is constructed is shown to be distributed, meaning that the equilibrium strategy of a reference player in the population is a feedback function of the private state of the reference player and of the statistical state of the population. As such, the feedback function does not depend on the index of the reference player in the continuum of players. Based on this observation, we say that the regularization phenomenon enforcing uniqueness is *intrinsic*. In fact, this feedback function is expected to be, at least formally, the solution of a second order analogue of the master equation for mean field games (see [CDLL19]). At this stage, the understanding of the Kolomogorov equation associated with the reflected stochastic heat equation constructed in [DHa] remains however too limited to make this guess rigorous. We hope to come back to this question in a future work.

Our article is organized as follows. The form of the game together with the main results are presented in Section 2 (see in particular Theorem 2.7). The forward-backward system characterizing the equilibria is shown to be uniquely solvable in Section 3. In Section 4, we prove that the equilibrium feedback has a distributed structure. Finally, we establish in Appendix some auxiliary results related to the noise itself.

**Notations.** We let  $\mathbb{S} := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , which we equip with the Lebesgue measure  $\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}}$ . We call  $(e_0 := 1, (e_k := \sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi k \cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}})$  the standard cosinus functions on  $\mathbb{S}$ . For an exponent  $\lambda \in (1/2, 1)$  (which is fixed throughout the note), we let  $Q$  be the operator mapping  $e_k$  onto  $k^{-\lambda} e_k$ , for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Also, we call  $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$  an  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ -valued  $Q$ -Brownian motion defined on some usual filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , with the following expansion:

$$W_t(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (Qe_k)(x) B_t^k, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

for a collection  $(B^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of independent  $\mathbb{F}$ -Brownian motions. For purposes that are clarified

below, we assume  $\mathbb{F}$  to be generated by  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and the family  $(B^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We say that a 1-periodic function from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $[-\infty, +\infty]$  is non-decreasing if it is symmetric with respect 0 and non-increasing on  $[-1/2, 0]$ . Identifying 1-periodic functions with functions defined on  $\mathbb{S}$ , we call  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  the class of those non-decreasing functions that are also square-integrable (with respect to  $\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}}$ ). Importantly (see for instance<sup>1</sup> [DHa, Proposition 2.1]), any element of  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  has a unique version in  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$  that is right-continuous in 0 and left-continuous on  $(0, 1/2]$  (by symmetry such a version is in fact continuous in 0). We say that this version is ‘canonical’. Also, the mapping

$$(x, h) \in \mathbb{S} \times U^2(\mathbb{S}) \mapsto \begin{cases} \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{x-\delta}^x h(r) dr & x \in (0, 1/2] + \mathbb{Z} \\ \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \int_x^{x+\delta} h(r) dr & x \in [-1/2, 0] + \mathbb{Z} \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

that maps an element  $h \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$  onto the evaluation of the canonical version of  $h$  at  $x$  is jointly measurable in  $(x, h)$ .

Without any further comment, we will always consider this version. In the same spirit, we denote by  $H_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{S})$  the set of symmetric 1-periodic functions that belong to the standard Sobolev space  $H^2(\mathbb{S})$  (i.e., the second-order derivatives are in  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ ). The dual of  $H_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{S})$  is denoted  $H_{\text{sym}}^{-2}(\mathbb{S})$ .

Moreover, we call  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  the space of probability measures over  $\mathbb{R}$  with a finite second moment. We equip it with the 2-Wasserstein distance  $W_2$ , see [CD18a, Chapter 5]. We recall in particular from [DHa] that  $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}), W_2)$  and  $(U^2(\mathbb{S}), \|\cdot\|_2)$  (where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is the  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ -norm) are isometric. In words, elements of  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  should be regarded as ‘periodic’ quantile functions and are canonically identified with probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Indeed, for a probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  with  $F_\mu$  as cumulative distribution function and with

$$F_\mu^{-1}(x) := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} : F_\mu(t) \geq x\}, \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

as generalized inverse of the cumulative distribution function, the periodic function given by

$$x \mapsto \begin{cases} F_\mu^{-1}(2x), & x \in [0, 1/2], \\ F_\mu^{-1}(-2x), & x \in [-1/2, 0], \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

is the representative of  $\mu$  in  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ . With a slight abuse of notation, we still denote this representative by  $F_\mu^{-1}$ .

Lastly, we also recall that the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  is generated by the mappings  $A \mapsto \mu(A)$ , for  $A$  running in the Borel  $\sigma$ -field over  $\mathbb{R}$ . And, for any metric space  $\mathcal{X}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

## 2 Mean field game with common noise and main result

### 2.1 Candidate for being an equilibrium: reflected SDE

Following [BCCD21] (which addresses mean field games over a finite state space), the challenge is to define a suitable class of probability-measure-valued dynamics on the top of which the mean field game will be eventually constructed. We thus introduce the following prototype of reflected SDEs, the driftless version of which is taken from [DHa]:

$$dX_t(x) = -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})dt + \Delta X_t(x)dt + dW_t(x) + d\eta_t(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}$  is a measurable mapping from  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . We assume the latter to satisfy the following properties:

---

<sup>1</sup>In fact, in [DHa], elements of  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  are non-increasing on  $[0, 1/2]$  and non-decreasing on  $[-1/2, 0]$ . We may easily pass from one choice to the other by means of the change of variable  $x \mapsto x + 1/2$ .

**Definition 2.1.** We denote by  $\mathcal{C}$  the class of measurable functions  $\mathcal{V} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that, for a certain constant  $C \geq 0$ ,

1. The function  $\mathcal{V}$  is bounded by  $C$ ;
2. For any  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , the function  $x \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto \mathcal{V}(t, x, \mu)$  belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ ;
3. The function  $\mathcal{V} : (t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{S})$  is  $C$ -Lipschitz, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{V}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{V}(t, x, \nu)|^2 dx \leq C \mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu, \nu).$$

In Equation (2.1), the process  $(\eta_t(x))_{0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{S}}$  is a reflection term that forces the solution to stay in the cone  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  of square-integrable mappings from  $\mathbb{S}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . The definition is as follows:

**Definition 2.2.** On  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  equipped with the  $Q$ -Brownian motion  $(W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  and with a deterministic initial condition  $X_0$  with values in  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , a process  $(X_t, \eta_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  solves the rearranged SHE (2.1) if

1.  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is a continuous  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process with values in  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ ;
2.  $(\eta_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is a continuous  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process with values in  $H_{\text{sym}}^{-2}(\mathbb{S})$ , starting from 0 at 0, such that, with probability 1, for any  $u \in H_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{S}) \cap U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , the path  $(\langle \eta_t, u \rangle)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is non-decreasing;
3. with probability 1, for any  $u \in H_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{S})$  and for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\langle X_t - X_0, u \rangle = - \int_0^t \langle \mathcal{V}(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}), u \rangle dr + \int_0^t \langle X_r, \Delta u \rangle dr + \langle W_t, u \rangle + \langle \eta_t, u \rangle.$$

4. for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon \Delta} X_r \cdot d\eta_r \right] = 0.$$

One key technical result in our work is to show that, for a fixed choice of  $\mathcal{V}$ , Equation (2.1) has a unique strong solution. This is an improvement of the results studied in [DH<sub>a</sub>], in which  $\mathcal{V}$  is just 0.

**Theorem 2.3.** Given  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$  and a deterministic initial condition  $X_0 \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , there exists a unique solution  $(X_t, \eta_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  to the rearranged SHE (2.1) that satisfies Definition 2.2. Moreover, there exist constants  $C, \varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla X_t\|_2^2 \right] &\leq C + C \min \left( \frac{1}{t} \|X_0\|_2^2, \|\nabla X_0\|_2^2 \right), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \varepsilon \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t\|_2^2 \right) \right] &\leq C. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

We just provide the proof of uniqueness at this stage of the paper, because the argument is repeatedly used in the paper. Existence, which is much more difficult to address, is treated in Appendix (Section 5).

*Proof.* The proof of uniqueness is just a variant of the proof of [DH<sub>a</sub>, Proposition 4.14]. For this reason, we just present a sketch of it, the details being left to the reader. Intuitively, for any two solutions  $(X_t(x), \eta_t(x))_{t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{S}}$  and  $(X'_t(x), \eta'_t(x))_{t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{S}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_t \|X_t - X'_t\|_2^2 &= -2 \langle X_t - X'_t, \mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) - \mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_t)^{-1}) \rangle_2 dt \\ &\quad - \|\nabla(X_t - X'_t)\|_2^2 dt + 2 \langle X_t - X'_t, d\eta_t - d\eta'_t \rangle_2, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

with the bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$  standing for the inner product in  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ . Rigorously, this argument is false, as the last integral with respect to  $d\eta_t - d\eta'_t$  is properly defined only when the integrand takes values in  $H^2_{\text{sym}}(\mathbb{S})$ . The proof performed in [DHa, Proposition 4.14] consists in mollifying  $X_t - X'_t$  by  $e^{\varepsilon\Delta}$  and then in letting  $\varepsilon$  tend 0. In this way, we can do as if the term in the right-hand side were well-defined. The next step is to invoke items (2) and (4) in Definition 2.2: altogether, they guarantee that the contribution of  $\langle X_t - X'_t, d\eta_t - d\eta'_t \rangle_2$  is negative. The proof is then easily completed by using the Lipschitz property of  $\mathcal{V}$  (item (3) in Definition 2.1), which says that  $\|\mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) - \mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_t)^{-1})\|_2 \leq C\|X_t - X'_t\|_2$ , together with Gronwall's lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** *By (1.1), we can easily change the version of  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  in Definition 1.1 in such a way that it still satisfies all the items of the definition and, for any  $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$ , the function  $x \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto X_t(x)$  is left-continuous on  $(0, 1/2]$ , right-continuous on  $[-1/2, 0)$  and continuous in 0.*

*In fact, more can be said from Theorem 2.3. Indeed, we know that, for any  $t > 0$  and with probability 1,  $\|\nabla X_t\|_2 < \infty$ , from which we deduce that, for any  $t > 0$  and with probability 1, the mapping  $x \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto X_t(x)$  is continuous. In particular, for any bounded and continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the mapping  $x \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t(x))]$  is continuous.*

**Remark 2.5.** *Below, we often denote by  $(X_t^0)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  the solution to (2.1) when  $\mathcal{V} \equiv 0$ . Obviously, it can be defined in arbitrary time (even for  $t > T$ ). Also, it induces the following semi-group, acting on bounded measurable functions  $\varphi : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :*

$$\mathcal{P}_t^0 \varphi : \mu \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})], \quad t \geq 0.$$

## 2.2 Definition of the mean field game

With a given  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$ , we associate the following deterministic control problem (in the random environment formed by the solution  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  to (2.1)):

$$\inf J\left((\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\right),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J\left((\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\right) &:= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \left[ g(\Gamma_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^T \left( f(\Gamma_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) + \frac{1}{2} |\gamma_t(x)|^2 \right) dt \right] dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $f$  and  $g$  are (measurable) real-valued function functions over  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , at most of linear growth with respect to the spatial variable and to the root of the second-order moment of the measure argument, i.e.,  $|f(x, \mu)|, |g(x, \mu)| \leq C(1 + |x|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^2 d\mu(x))^{1/2}$ , and the infimum is taken over pairs of  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively-measurable random fields  $\Gamma, \gamma$  from  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{S}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , with  $\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\gamma(x)|^2 ds dx < \infty$ , that solve the dynamics

$$d\Gamma_t(x) = dX_t(x) + \left( \gamma_t(x) + \mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) \right) dt, \quad t \in [0, T]; \quad \Gamma_0(x) = X_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (2.5)$$

The key idea in this formula is very simple: without the forcing term  $\Delta X_t(x)dt + dW_t(x)$ , the equation for  $(X_t(x))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  just becomes

$$dX_t(x) = -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})dt + d\eta_t(x).$$

Still, if the drift can be written in feedback form, i.e.,  $\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) = \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})$  as is shown below in the main statement (Theorem 2.7) for the mean field game under

study, then the reflection term should be forgotten because the ordinary differential equation is expected to preserve monotonicity of the initial condition. In other words, the solution to the non-reflected equation

$$dX_t(x) = -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})dt$$

is then expected to live in  $\mathcal{C}$  when  $X_0$  itself is in  $\mathcal{C}$ , even when there is no reflection in the dynamics. This says that, in absence of random forcing equation (2.5) boils down to a mere controlled curve  $\dot{\Gamma}_t(x) = \gamma_t(x)$ , the label  $x$  here parametrizing the state of the initial condition. This explains intuitively the connection with standard mean field games, all these explanations being addressed in a more rigorous manner in Proposition 4.4.

For the time being, we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 2.6.** *We say that a field  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$  forms a mean field equilibrium if the problem control (2.4)–(2.5) admits as optimal trajectory the curve*

$$(\Gamma_t(x), \gamma_t(x)) = (X_t(x), -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Here is then our main statement:

**Theorem 2.7.** *Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are  $x$ -differentiable and that  $\partial_x f$  and  $\partial_x g$  are bounded over  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , non-decreasing in the argument  $x$  and jointly Lipschitz continuous in  $(x, \mu)$  (with  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  being equipped with  $\mathbb{W}_2$ ). Then, for any initial condition  $X_0 \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , there exists a unique mean field equilibrium  $(X_t(x))_{0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{S}}$  in the sense of Definition 2.6 and there exists a certain  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}$  such that, for any initial condition  $X_0 \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , the unique equilibrium is driven by  $\mathcal{U}$ .*

*Moreover, there exists a measurable function  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (only depending on  $\mathcal{U}$ ) such that, for any mean field equilibrium  $(X_t(x))_{0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{S}}$  as above, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  almost surely,*

$$\mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}.$$

The following comments are in order:

1. Here, the functions  $f$  and  $g$  are convex in  $x$  because the derivatives are non-decreasing in the argument  $x$ . This is substantially different from assuming that  $f$  and  $g$  have any form of monotonicity in the measure argument. In particular, our functions  $f$  and  $g$  here do NOT satisfy the Lasry-Lions monotonicity condition. Our statement should be thus regarded as a regularization by noise result.

Actually, the need to assume  $f$  and  $g$  to be convex in  $x$  comes from the fact there is no idiosyncratic noise in our model. In turn, there is no smoothing effect in the  $x$ -variable and we must rely on standard convexity properties in  $x$  to prevent the emergence of singularities (and thus lack of uniqueness). Obviously, this is part of our project to extend our results to models with an idiosyncratic noise, but this would require first to address the analogue of [DHa] for models with an idiosyncratic noise.

2. The existence of a function  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  is a crucial point in our approach. It says that the equilibrium feedback in the game with common noise can be computed in terms of the sole states of the agent (which is here encoded through  $X_t(x)$ ) and of the distribution (which is here encoded through  $\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}$ ). The specific value of the label  $x$  does not need to be known. In this sense, the equilibrium has the same distributed form as in standard mean field games with common noise. This is an important feature.

Furthermore, we insist on the fact that the two mappings  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  are independent of the initial condition. This is a form of Markov property that is very connected to

the notion of master equation in mean field games. Would the forcing be absent, the reader who is aware of the theory would indeed easily identify  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  with the derivative in  $x$  of the solution to the master equation (see [CDLL19]). In presence of the forcing  $\Delta X_t(x)dt + dW_t(x)$ , which plays the role of a common noise, we are still lacking a similar sharp correspondance, but we conjecture that it holds true. In fact, the form of the master equation could be inferred from the Itô rule established in the parallel work [DHB], but a rigorous analysis of the associated Kolmogorov equation is still missing at this stage. This is our plan to come back to this point in the future.

3. The result is just stated for a cost functional with a linear control and a quadratic Lagrangian. We have indeed chosen to limit the presentation to this simpler framework. The reason is that almost all the technical aspects due to the random forcing are already present in the current framework. In particular, our result should be considered as a proof of concept. However, it would make perfect sense, for practical purposes, to extend the analysis to more general convex Hamiltonians  $H$ , depending on both the state variable  $x$  and the momentum  $p$  (as in the usual formulation of mean field games). Typically, one would then require  $H$  to be convex in  $(x, p)$ , with strictly positive second order derivatives in  $p$  (uniformly in  $x$ ) and bounded derivatives in  $x$  (uniformly in  $p$ ). Subsequently, the term  $-\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})$  in (2.1) would be replaced by  $-\partial_p H(X_t(x), \mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}))$ . This would make slightly more difficult the analysis of the equation (2.1) (in particular, one should adapt the arguments given in Section 5), but the spirit of the analysis would remain very much the same. As for the representation of  $\mathcal{V}$  (see Proposition 2.8 below), this would yield an additional term  $-\partial_x H(X_s(x), \mathcal{V}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}))$  in the integral appearing in the right-hand side of (2.6), but the principles underpinning the main smoothing result (see Lemma 3.6) would also remain the same.

Throughout the analysis below, the assumption of Theorem 2.7 is in force.

### 2.3 Characterization of mean field equilibria

The following result is an adaptation of the stochastic Pontryagin principle and is key in our proof of Theorem 2.7:

**Proposition 2.8.** *A field  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$  forms a mean field equilibrium if and only if, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely, for all  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

with  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  being the solution of (2.1).

We recall from Remark 2.4 that the mapping  $(s, \omega, x) \mapsto X_s(x)$  is measurable, which guarantees that the term appearing inside the conditional expectation in the right-hand side of (2.6) is indeed a random variable.

Also, the reader should regard Proposition 2.8 as a fixed point condition on the mapping  $\mathcal{V}$ . This condition is reminiscent of the fixed point condition in standard mean field games.

*Proof.* We start with the necessary condition, assuming that  $\mathcal{V}$  forms a mean field equilibrium. Solving (2.1), with  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  as solution, we then consider the control problem (2.4)–(2.5).

We know that, for any pair control  $(\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} J \left( (-\mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) + \varepsilon \gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \right) = 0.$$

Above,  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  does not depend on  $(\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  because it is the equilibrium. By (2.5), the controlled curve associated with  $(-\mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) + \varepsilon \gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is  $(X_t + \varepsilon \Gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  (pay attention that the controlled curve is not  $(\Gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  as one may think from (2.5)), where

$$\Gamma_t(x) = \int_0^t \gamma_s(x) ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S},$$

from which we get (by differentiating w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$ ) that, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) \Gamma_T(x) \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^T \left( \partial_x f(X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) \Gamma_t(x) - \mathcal{V}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) \gamma_t(x) \right) dt \right] dx = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

which may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \right. \\ & \left. - \mathcal{V}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) \right] \gamma_t(x) dx dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$  almost surely, for almost every  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ , (2.6) is satisfied. By one-sided continuity in  $x$  of the two left-hand sides, we deduce that (2.6) holds true for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$  almost surely, for any  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ .

We now study the converse, assuming that (2.6) is satisfied. Reverting back the computations, we easily obtain (2.7). Using the convexity of  $f$  and  $g$  in  $x$ , we easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & J \left( (-\mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) + \gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \right) \\ & \geq J \left( (-\mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}))_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) \Gamma_T(x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^T \left( \partial_x f(X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) \Gamma_t(x) - \mathcal{V}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) \gamma_t(x) \right) dt \right] dx \\ & = J \left( (-\mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}))_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \right), \end{aligned}$$

with the last line following from (2.7). This holds for any choice of  $(\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ . By linearity of the set of controls, we get the result.  $\square$

The next statement elaborates on the previous one. The proof is deferred to the next section.

**Proposition 2.9.** *There exists a unique mean field equilibrium for any initial condition  $X_0 \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$  if there exists a unique field  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$  satisfying, for any  $(t, x, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,*

$$\mathcal{V}(t, x, \mu) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \right], \quad (2.8)$$

whenever  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  solves the equation (2.1) driven by  $\mathcal{V}$  but with  $X_t \sim \mu$  as initial condition.

Identity (2.8) should be regarded as a forward-backward fixed point problem since  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  depends on  $\mathcal{V}$ .



### 3 Analysis of the forward-backward fixed point problem

The purpose of this section is to kill two birds with one stone: not only we prove that the fixed point problem (2.8) has a unique solution but we also establish Proposition 2.9. Throughout the section, we thus consider the following map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C} \\ \mapsto \left( \mathcal{U} : (t, x, \mu) \mapsto \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  in the right-hand side solves the equation (2.1) with  $X_t \sim \mu$  as initial condition.

#### 3.1 Short time analysis

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}$ , the function  $\mathcal{U} = \Phi(\mathcal{V})$  is well-defined and for any  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , the function  $x \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu)$  is bounded and continuous and belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ . Moreover, there exists  $c > 0$  such that, for  $T \leq c$ , we can find a constant  $C_c$  with the following property: if  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $C_c$ -Lipschitz in  $\mu$  (when regarded as an  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ -valued function), then  $\Phi(\mathcal{V})$  is also  $C_c$ -Lipschitz continuous (also when it is regarded as an  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ -valued function).*

*Proof.* The fact that  $\Phi(\mathcal{V})$  is well-defined follows from Remark 2.4 (which implies joint measurability of the function  $(s, \omega, x) \mapsto X_s(x)$ ). The same remark guarantees that, for any initial condition  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , for any  $s \in (t, T]$  and any bounded and continuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the function  $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_s(x))]$  is continuous. We here apply this observation with  $\varphi = \partial_x g$  and  $\varphi = \partial_x f$  respectively. We deduce that  $\Phi(\mathcal{V})(t, \cdot, \mu)$  is also continuous (when  $t < T$ ). Since  $\partial_x f$  and  $\partial_x g$  are non-decreasing and each  $X_s$  has values in  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , we also deduce, by composition, that  $\Phi(\mathcal{V})(t, \cdot, \mu)$  belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ . At time  $t = T$ ,  $\Phi(\mathcal{V})(T, x, \mu) = \partial_x g(F_\mu^{-1}(x), \mu)$  and satisfies the same prescription of one-sided continuity as in Remark 2.4.

Item (3) in Definition 2.1 may be seen as a consequence of the proof of the second part of the statement, which may be proved as follows. For  $(t, \mu, \nu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, \nu)|^2 dx \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) - \partial_x g(X'_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_T)^{-1})|^2 dx \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) - \partial_x f(X'_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_s)^{-1})|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

where  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  stands for the solution initialized from  $(t, \mu)$  and  $(X'_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  for the solution initialized from  $(t, \nu)$ . By the Lipschitz properties of  $\partial_x f$  and  $\partial_x g$  (in both variables), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, \nu)|^2 dx & \leq C_g \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |X_T(x) - X'_T(x)|^2 dx \\ & \quad + C_f \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} |X_s(x) - X'_s(x)|^2 dx ds \\ & \leq C_{f,g} (1 + T) \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \mathbb{E} [\|X_s - X'_s\|_2^2], \end{aligned}$$

for a constant  $C_{f,g}$  only depending on  $f$  and  $g$ .

Next, by proceeding as in (2.3), we obtain (for  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$  denoting the square Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{V}$ )

$$\sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \|X_s - X'_s\|_2^2 \leq \|X_t - X'_t\|_2^2 + 2C_{\mathcal{V}}T \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \|X_s - X'_s\|_2^2,$$

and then, choosing  $TC_{\mathcal{V}} \leq 1/4$ , we obtain  $\sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \|X_s - X'_s\|_2^2 \leq 2\|X_t - X'_t\|_2^2$ , so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, \nu)|^2 dx \leq 2C_{f,g}(1+T)\|X_t - X'_t\|_2^2.$$

Since  $X_t$  and  $X'_t$  are quantile functions, we have  $\|X_t - X'_t\|_2^2 = \mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu, \nu)$ , see [DHa, Subsection 2.2]. Therefore, for  $TC_{\mathcal{V}} \leq 1/4$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, \nu)|^2 dx \leq 2C_{f,g}(1+T)\mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu, \nu).$$

Assuming  $C_{\mathcal{V}} \leq 2C_{f,g}(1+T)$  and then  $2TC_{f,g}(1+T) \leq 1/4$ , we complete the proof with  $c := 1/(8(C_{f,g}(1+T)))$  and  $C_c := \sqrt{2C_{f,g}(1+T)}$ .  $\square$

In the sequel, we denote by  $\mathcal{C}_c$  the subclass of  $\mathcal{C}$  containing fields  $\mathcal{V}$  which are  $C_c$ -Lipschitz continuous in  $\mu$  (when regarded as being  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ -valued). It now remains to prove that

**Proposition 3.2.** *With the same notation as in the statement of Lemma 3.1, the function  $\Phi$  is a (strict) contraction from  $\mathcal{C}_c$  into itself when  $T \leq \min(c, \ln(2)/(1+2C_c^2))$  and  $\mathcal{C}_c$  is equipped with the distance*

$$d(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}') := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \|\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \mu) - \mathcal{V}'(s, \cdot, \mu)\|_2.$$

*In particular, the mapping  $\Phi$  has a fixed point in small time.*

*Proof.* We proceed as in the proof of Lemma 3.1. For two fields  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{V}'$  in  $\mathcal{C}_c$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$  the respective images by  $\Phi$ . For a given  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , we call  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  and  $(X'_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  the two solutions to (2.1), driven by  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{V}'$  respectively, with  $(t, \mu)$  as initial condition. Following the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}'(t, x, \mu)|^2 dx \leq C_{f,g}(1+T) \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\|X_s - X'_s\|_2^2].$$

By (2.3), for any  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-s}\|X_s - X'_s\|_2^2 &\leq \int_t^s e^{-r} \|\mathcal{V}(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) - \mathcal{V}'(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_r)^{-1})\|_2^2 dr \\ &\leq 2 \int_t^s e^{-r} \|\mathcal{V}(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) - \mathcal{V}'(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1})\|_2^2 dr \\ &\quad + 2C_c^2 \int_t^s e^{-r} \|X_r - X'_r\|_2^2 dr \\ &\leq 2e^{2C_c^2 T} \int_t^s e^{-r} \|\mathcal{V}(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) - \mathcal{V}'(r, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1})\|_2^2 dr \end{aligned}$$

with the last line following from Gronwall's lemma. And then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}'(t, x, \mu)|^2 dx \\ &\leq 2C_{f,g}(1+T)e^{(1+2C_c^2)T} \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \|\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) - \mathcal{V}'(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})\|_2^2 ds. \\ &\leq \frac{T}{4c} e^{(1+2C_c^2)T} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \|\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \nu) - \mathcal{V}'(s, \cdot, \nu)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $c = 1/(8(C_{f,g}(1+T)))$ .

By assumption,  $T \leq \min(c, \ln(2)/(1+2C_c^2))$  and then  $Te^{(1+2C_c^2)T} \leq 2c$ . We can easily complete the proof.  $\square$

### 3.2 Martingale representation

We now provide further properties of the mapping  $\Phi$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{U} := \Phi(\mathcal{V})$ . For a given initial condition  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  to (2.1), call  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  the corresponding solution (driven by  $\mathcal{V}$ ). Then, for any  $s \in [t, T]$ , with probability 1 under  $\mathbb{P}$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{U}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_s^T \partial_x f(X_r(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) dr \mid \mathcal{F}_s \right].$$

*Proof.* The proof relies on a variation of the Markov property for (2.1). Without any loss of generality, we can assume that we are working on the canonical space  $\Omega = \mathcal{C}([0, T], L^2(\mathbb{S}))$  (space of continuous functions from  $[0, T]$  to  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ ) equipped with the  $Q$ -Brownian motion law. Then, we can consider a regular conditional probability  $(\mathbb{P}_{s,\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of  $\mathbb{P}$  given the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\sigma(W_r(\cdot); r \leq s)$  (with  $W$  being understood as the canonical process).

Then,  $\omega$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely, under  $\mathbb{P}_{s,\omega}$ ,  $(X_r)_{s \leq r \leq T}$  can be regarded as the unique solution of (2.1) initialized from  $(s, X_s(\omega))$ . By uniqueness in law of the solution (which follows from pathwise uniqueness), it must hold, for any  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s(\omega))^{-1}) &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_x g(X_T(\omega')(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_T(\omega'))^{-1}) d\mathbb{P}_{s,\omega}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} \left[ \int_s^T \partial_x f(X_r(\omega')(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_r(\omega'))^{-1}) dr \right] d\mathbb{P}_{s,\omega}(\omega'), \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the claim.  $\square$

We notice by martingale representation theorem in infinite dimension (see [FT02, Proposition 4.1]) that, within the framework of Lemma 3.3, there exists a collection of progressively-measurable processes  $(Z^{t,\mu,k}(x))_{k \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{S}}$  (with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \\ &= \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^T Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x) dB_s^k, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

with

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \int_t^T |Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x)|^2 ds < \infty.$$

By boundedness and  $\omega$ -wise continuity in  $x$  of the left-hand side (see Remark 2.4) and of the first term in the right-hand side, we notice that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad \lim_{x' \rightarrow x} \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^T |Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x) - Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x')|^2 ds = 0,$$

from which we can easily find a version of each  $Z^{t,\mu,k}(x)$  such that the field  $(s, x) \mapsto Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x)$  is  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable for each  $k$  (i.e., the mapping  $(s, x, \omega) \in [0, t] \times \mathbb{S} \times \Omega \mapsto Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x, \omega)$  is  $\mathcal{B}([0, t]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{S}) \otimes \mathcal{F}_t/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  measurable for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ). Details are left to the reader because a stronger version of this result is given in Lemma 3.4 below.

The following statement is indeed a standard but crucial result in BSDE theory. It clarifies the structure of the martingale representation term  $(Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x))_{t \leq s \leq T}$  in (3.1). Intuitively, it is a way to access the derivatives of  $\mathcal{U}$  with respect to the measure argument, but without any preliminary study of the differentiability properties of  $\mathcal{U}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *With the same notation as in (3.1), there exists a collection of measurable functions*

$$\psi^k : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

such that, for any initial condition  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , the process  $(Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x))_{k \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{S}}$  in (3.1) satisfies

$$\int_t^T \mathbb{P} \left( \left\{ Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x) \neq \psi^k(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) \right\} \right) ds = 0.$$

*Proof.* Although the result is standard in the finite-dimensional setting, proving it in the infinite-dimensional case is more delicate. The main idea is borrowed from [IRR12] and relies on Theorem 6.27 in [cJPS80]. There is here an additional (little) difficulty, which comes from the fact that the martingale representative term  $Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x)$  depends on the extra variable  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ . For that reason, we feel more appropriate to give a sketch of the proof, based on the ideas of [cJPS80].

*First Step.* We start with several notations. Throughout the proof, we call  $D_n$  the collection of dyadic numbers  $\{j/2^n, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Moreover, for any  $(t, x, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , we call  $\mathbb{P}^{t,x,\mu}$  the probability measure on  $\Omega = \mathcal{C}([0, T], [0, T]) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], U^2(\mathbb{S})) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], L^2(\mathbb{S}))$  equipped with the law of the concatenated paths  $(t, F_\mu^{-1}, 0)_{0 \leq r \leq t}$  and  $(s, X_s, W_s - W_t)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ , where  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  solves (2.1) with  $F_\mu^{-1}$  as initial condition at time  $t$ .

We think that there is no ambiguity in denoting the canonical process on the space  $\Omega$  by  $(\tau_s, X_s, W_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ . It is very important to notice that, although  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  is equipped with an  $L^2$  norm, we can impose the process  $(X_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$  evaluated at  $x$ , namely  $(X_s(x))_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ , to be jointly measurable in  $s, x$  and  $\omega$  (the latter denoting here the generic element of the canonical space). This follows from Remark 2.4. In particular, this allows us to define the following functional:

$$Y_s(x) = \mathcal{U}(\tau_s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_{\tau_s}^{-1}) + \int_{\tau_0}^{s \vee \tau_0} \partial_x f(X_r(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) dr, \quad s \in [0, T].$$

Lastly, with a slight abuse of notation, we do as in (3.1) and we call  $((Z_s^{t,\mu,k}(x))_{t \leq s \leq T})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  the processes obtained by representing the left-hand side in (3.1) as a sum of stochastic integrals under  $\mathbb{P}^{t,x,\mu}$ .

*Second Step.* For  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ , for any two integers  $k, n \geq 1$  and any two reals  $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq T$ , we let

$$C_{s_1, s_2}^{k, n}(x) := \sum_{r_i \in D_n, s_1 \leq r_i < r_{i+1} < s_2} (Y_{r_{i+1}}(x) - Y_{r_i}(x)) (B_{r_{i+1}}^k - B_{r_i}^k),$$

Following the proof of Lemma 3.28 in [cJPS80], we can construct an increasing sequence of integers  $(n_p(t, x, \mu))_{p \geq 1}$ , measurable w.r.t.  $(t, x, \mu)$ , such that, under each  $\mathbb{P}^{t,x,\mu}$ , the limit

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} C_{s_1, s_2}^{k, n_p(t, x, \mu)}(x) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} C_{s_1, s_2}^{k, n_p}(\tau_0, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_0^{-1})(x), \quad 0 \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq T,$$

exists (pointwise) almost surely and then coincides with the quadratic co-variation between  $(Y_s(x))_{0 \leq s \leq T}$  and  $(B_s^k)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ . We then define, for  $s_1, s_2 \in [0, T]$ ,

$$A_{s_1, s_2}^k(x) := \limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} C_{s_1, s_2}^{k, n_p}(\tau_0, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_0^{-1})(x),$$

and

$$Z_s^k(x) := \liminf_{h \searrow 0, h \in \mathbb{Q}} \frac{1}{h} A_{s, s+h}^k(x), \quad s \in [0, T],$$

with the limit existing in  $[-\infty, \infty]$ . With probability 1 under  $\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}$ ,

$$A_{s_1, s_2}^k(x) = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} Z_r^k(x) dr, \quad t \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq T.$$

In particular, with probability 1 under  $\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}$ ,

$$\int_t^T |Z_r^k(x) - Z_r^{t, \mu, k}(x)| dr = 0.$$

*Third Step.* We observe that  $Z_t^k(x)$  is  $\cap_{s>t} \sigma((\tau_r, X_r, W_r), 0 \leq r \leq s)$ -measurable. Blumenthal 0-1 law says that, under  $\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}$ ,  $Z_t^k(x)$  is almost surely constant. And then

$$\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu} \left( \{ |Z_t^k(x)| = \mathbb{E}^{t, x, \mu}(|Z_t^k(x)|) \} \right) = 1.$$

Letting

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^k(t, x, \mu) &:= \mathbb{E}^{t, x, \mu}(|Z_t^k(x)|), \\ \psi^k(t, x, \mu) &:= \mathbb{E}^{t, x, \mu}(Z_t^k(x)) \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi^k(t, x, \mu) < \infty\}}, \end{aligned}$$

this yields

$$\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu} \left( \{ Z_t^k(x) = \psi^k(t, x, \mu) \} \right) = 1,$$

when  $\varphi^k(t, x, \mu) < \infty$ . Assume for a while that the functions  $\varphi^k$  and  $\psi^k$  are jointly measurable (in  $(t, x, \mu)$ ). Then, for any  $s \in [t, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}$  almost surely,

$$\mathbb{P}^{s, x, \text{Lebs} \circ X_s^{-1}} \left( \{ Z_s^k(x) = \psi^k(s, x, \text{Lebs} \circ X_s^{-1}) \} \right) = 1,$$

when  $\mathbb{E}^{s, x, \text{Lebs} \circ X_s^{-1}}(|Z_s^k(x)|) < \infty$ .

By the conclusion of the second step, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{t, x, \mu} \int_t^T \mathbb{E}^{s, x, \text{Lebs} \circ X_s^{-1}}(|Z_s^k(x)|) ds = \mathbb{E}^{t, x, \mu} \int_t^T |Z_s^k(x)| ds < \infty.$$

And then, this implies that the condition  $\mathbb{E}^{s, x, \text{Lebs} \circ X_s^{-1}}(|Z_s^k(x)|) < \infty$  is satisfied almost everywhere under  $ds \otimes d\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}$ . This implies the claim (notice that it suffices to identify the integrand  $Z^k(x)$  when the problem is set on the canonical space).

It remains to check that the functions  $\varphi^k$  and  $\psi^k$  are measurable. This follows from a monotone class argument. Indeed, we observe that, for any subset  $A$  in the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  and any  $B$  in the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $\Omega$ , the mapping

$$(t, x, \mu) \mapsto \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_A(t, x, \mu) \mathbf{1}_B(\omega) d\mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}(\omega) = \mathbf{1}_A(t, x, \mu) \mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}(B)$$

is measurable. In particular, if we call  $\mathcal{L}$  the collection of Borel subsets  $C$  of  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \Omega$  such that

$$(t, x, \mu) \mapsto \mathbb{P}^{t, x, \mu}(C)$$

is measurable,  $\mathcal{L}$  contains the Cartesian product of the two Borel  $\sigma$ -fields on the two spaces  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\Omega$ . Now, it is clear that  $\mathcal{L}$  is stable by monotone limits. This shows that  $\mathcal{L}$  is equal to the tensorial product of the two Borel  $\sigma$ -fields on the two spaces  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\Omega$ . Measurability of  $\varphi^k$  and  $\psi^k$  easily follows.  $\square$

The purpose of the next lemma is to estimate the functions  $(\psi^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in Lemma 3.4.

**Lemma 3.5.** *With the same notation as in (3.1) and Lemma 3.3, we have, for every initial condition  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  to (2.1), and every function  $\theta \in L^2(\mathbb{S})$ ,*

$$\left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left( (1 \vee k)^{2\lambda} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \psi^k(t, x, \mu) dx \right|^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \leq \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right],$$

where

$$\text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right] := \sup_{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) : \mu \neq \nu} \mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \nu)^{-1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) (\mathcal{U}(s, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}(s, x, \nu)) dx \right|.$$

By item (3) in Definition 2.1, we observe that the right-hand side in the last display of the statement is less than  $C \|\theta\|_2$ .

*Proof.* Throughout the proof, the initial condition  $(t, \mu)$  is fixed. Recalling (3.1), we merely write  $(Z^j(x))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  for  $(Z^{t, \mu; j}(x))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

*First Step.* For given  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and an infinite collection  $(\ell_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , with  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k^2 = 1$  and with  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k^2 k^{2\lambda} < \infty$ , and for  $h \in [0, T - t]$ , we consider the probability measure

$$\mathbb{Q}^\beta := \exp \left( -\beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda (B_{t+h}^k - B_t^k) - \frac{\beta^2}{2} h \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k^2 (1 \vee k)^{2\lambda} \right) \cdot \mathbb{P}.$$

We know that, under  $\mathbb{Q}^\beta$ , the collection of processes

$$\left( \tilde{B}_s^k := B_s^k + \beta \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda (s \wedge (t+h) - t)_{t \leq s \leq T} \right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$$

are independent Brownian motions.

Fix  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ . Recalling that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) &= \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \int_t^s \partial_x f(X_r(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) dr \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^s Z_r^k(x) dB_r^k, \quad s \in [t, T], \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) &= \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \int_t^s \partial_x f(X_r(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) dr \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \beta \int_t^s \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k(x) dr + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^s Z_r^k(x) d\tilde{B}_r^k, \quad s \in [t, t+h]. \end{aligned}$$

And then, choosing  $s = t + h$  and taking expectation under  $\mathbb{Q}^\beta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\beta} \left[ \mathcal{U}(t+h, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_{t+h}^{-1}) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\beta} \int_t^{t+h} \partial_x f(X_r(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) dr - \beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\beta} \int_t^{t+h} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k(x) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Next, we observe that, under  $\mathbb{Q}^\beta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dX_s(x) &= -\mathcal{V}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds + \Delta X_s(x) ds - \beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k e_k(x) ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 \vee k)^\lambda} e_k(x) d\tilde{B}_s^k + d\eta_s(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad s \in [t, t+h]. \end{aligned}$$

The law of  $(X_s(\cdot))_{t \leq s \leq t+h}$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^\beta$  is the same as the law of  $(X_s^\beta(\cdot))_{t \leq s \leq t+h}$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} dX_s^\beta(x) &= -\mathcal{V}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^\beta)^{-1}) ds + \Delta X_s^\beta(x) ds - \beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k e_k(x) ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 \vee k)^\lambda} e_k(x) dB_s^k + d\eta_s^\beta(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad s \in [t, t+h], \end{aligned}$$

with  $X_t^\beta = X_t$  as initial condition (uniqueness to the above equation can be shown as in (2.3)). Therefore, by (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{U}(t+h, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t+h}^\beta)^{-1}) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+h} \partial_x f(X_r^\beta(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_r^\beta)^{-1}) dr - \beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\beta} \int_t^{t+h} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k(x) dr. \end{aligned}$$

By the property (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{U}(t+h, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t+h}^\beta)^{-1}) - \mathcal{U}(t+h, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t+h})^{-1}) \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+h} \left[ \partial_x f(X_r^\beta(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_r^\beta)^{-1}) - \partial_x f(X_r(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_r^{-1}) \right] dr \\ &\quad - \beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\beta} \int_t^{t+h} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k(x) dr. \end{aligned}$$

*Second Step.* Reproducing the stability analysis carried out in (2.3) and in Lemma 3.1, we can get an estimate for  $\|X_{t+h}^\beta - X_{t+h}\|_2^2$  and then deduce by integrating in  $x$  the above identity that, for any smooth function  $\theta : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\beta} \int_t^{t+h} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) Z_r^k(x) dx \right) dr \right| &\leq \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(t+h, x, \cdot) dx \right] e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} |\beta| h \\ &\quad + C_{\mathcal{V}} |\beta| \|\theta\|_2 h^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$  depends on the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{V}$ . The key point to get the above formula is to repeat (2.3), with  $X'$  replaced by  $X^\beta$  and to use the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_s - X_s^\beta\|_2^2 &\leq C_{\mathcal{V}} \int_t^s \|X_r - X_r^\beta\|_2^2 dr + 2\beta \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^s \ell_k \langle X_r - X_r^\beta, e_k \rangle_2 dr \\ &\leq 2|\beta| e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} \int_t^s \|X_r - X_r^\beta\|_2 dr, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k^2 = 1$ . We easily deduce that  $\|X_s - X_s^\beta\|_2 \leq e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} |\beta| h$  for  $s \in [t, t+h]$ . Dividing by  $\beta$  on both sides in (3.4) and then letting  $\beta$  tend to 0, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \int_t^{t+h} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) Z_r^k(x) dx \right) dr \right| &\leq \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(t+h, x, \cdot) dx \right] e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} h \\ &\quad + C_{\mathcal{V}} \|\theta\|_2 h^2. \end{aligned}$$

We then argue as in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Assuming that we are working on the canonical space  $\Omega = \mathcal{C}([0, T], L^2(\mathbb{S}))$  equipped with the law  $\mathbb{P}$  of a  $Q$ -Brownian motion, we consider a regular conditional probability  $(\mathbb{P}_{s,\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of  $\mathbb{P}$  given the  $\sigma$ -field generated by

$\sigma(W(r, \cdot); r \leq s)$  ( $W$  here standing for the canonical process). Then,  $\omega$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely,

$$\left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{s, \omega}} \int_s^{s+h} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) Z_r^k(x) dx \right) dr \right| \leq \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s+h, x, \cdot) dx \right] e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} h + C_{\mathcal{V}} \|\theta\|_2 h^2.$$

*Third Step.* Consider now a mesh  $\{t = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T\}$  of  $[t, T]$  of step  $h$  together with a simple process  $H : [t, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$H_s = H_{t_i}, \quad s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}),$$

and  $H_{t_i} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bounded and  $\mathcal{F}_{t_i}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable. Then, the conclusion of the third step yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{t_i, \omega}} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left[ H_{t_i} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) Z_r^k(x) dx \right) \right] dr \right| \\ & \leq |H_{t_i}| \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s+h, x, \cdot) dx \right] e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} h + C_{\mathcal{V}} \|\theta\|_2 h^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and then summing over  $i$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left[ H_r \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) Z_r^k(x) dx \right) \right] dr \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right] e^{C_{\mathcal{V}} h} \mathbb{E} \int_t^T |H_r| dr + C_{\mathcal{V}} \|\theta\|_2 T h. \end{aligned}$$

By a standard result of approximation of progressively measurable processes, the above remains true for any  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable process  $(H_r)_{t \leq r \leq T}$  satisfying

$$\mathbb{E} \int_t^T |H_r|^2 dr < \infty,$$

where we used implicitly the fact that (see (3.1))

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} |Z_r^k(x)|^2 dx \right) dr < \infty.$$

Letting  $h$  tend to 0, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left[ H_r \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k(x) \right\} dx \right) \right] dr \right| \\ & = \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \left[ H_r \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) Z_r^k(x) dx \right) \right] dr \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right] \mathbb{E} \int_t^T |H_r| dr. \end{aligned}$$

Writing the integral over  $\mathbb{S}$  in the left-hand side as the inner product  $\langle \theta, \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k \rangle_2$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ , we deduce that

$$\int_t^T \mathbb{P} \left( \left\{ \left| \langle \theta, \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda Z_r^k \rangle_2 \right| > R(\theta) \right\} \right) dr = 0,$$



with

$$R(\theta) := \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right].$$

Back to Lemma 3.4, this says that we can replace  $\psi^k(t, x, \mu)$  by

$$\psi^k(t, x, \mu) \prod_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \prod_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1} \left\{ \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_j^{(p)} (1 \vee j)^\lambda \langle \psi^j(t, \cdot, \mu), \theta^{(q)} \rangle_2 \right| \leq R(\theta^{(q)}) \right\},$$

for countably many  $(\theta^{(q)})_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ 's and countably many sequences  $(\ell^{(p)})_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ 's. By a separability argument, we then have

$$\left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k (1 \vee k)^\lambda \langle \psi^k(t, \cdot, \mu), \theta \rangle_2 \right| \leq R(\theta),$$

for all  $\theta \in L^2(\mathbb{S})$  and all  $(\ell_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_k^2 = 1$  and  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (1 \vee k)^{2\lambda} \ell_k^2 < \infty$ . By a new approximation argument, the last condition can be dropped. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.3 Analysis over an arbitrary fixed time duration

In order to extend existence and uniqueness from small to arbitrary time durations, one needs to provide an *a priori* bound for fixed points of  $\Phi$ . In order to clarify the analysis, we denote, for any  $t \in (0, T)$ , by  $\mathcal{C}_t$  the space of functions  $\mathcal{V} : [t, T] \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfy Definition 2.1 but on the time interval  $[t, T]$ . With a slight abuse of notation, we then write  $\Phi(\mathcal{V})$  for the image of  $\mathcal{V}$  by the restriction of the mapping  $\Phi$  to the interval  $[t, T]$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $t \in (0, T)$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  be an element of  $\mathcal{C}_t$  satisfying*

$$\|\nabla_x \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1})\|_2^2 \leq C + \frac{C}{T-s} \|X\|_2^2, \quad X \in U^2(\mathbb{S}), \quad s \in [t, T],$$

for some constant  $C \geq 0$ .

Then, for any  $\theta \in L^2(\mathbb{S})$ , the function  $(t, \mu) \mapsto \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \mu) \rangle_2$ , with  $\mathcal{U} := \Phi(\mathcal{V})$ , can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \mu) \rangle_2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x g \left( X_T^0(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_T^0)^{-1} \right) dx \right. \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x f \left( X_s^0(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^0)^{-1} \right) dx \right) ds \\ &\quad \left. + \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathcal{V}(s, y, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^0)^{-1}) \Psi^\theta(s, y, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^0)^{-1}) dy ds \right], \quad (t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}), \end{aligned}$$

for a measurable function  $\Psi^\theta : [t, T] \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \left| \Psi^\theta(s, y, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) \right|^2 dy \leq \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right]^2, \quad (s, X) \in [t, T] \times U^2(\mathbb{S}).$$

We recall that, above,  $(X_s^0)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  is the solution to (2.1) with 0-drift and  $(t, \mu)$  as initial condition and that  $\text{Lip}$  is as in the statement of Lemma 3.5.

*Proof. First Step.* Back to (2.1) (with  $(t, \mu)$  as initial condition), we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds + dW_s(x) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{e_k(x)}{(1 \vee k)^\lambda} \left( (1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds + dB_s^k \right) \\ &=: \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} e_k(x) d\widetilde{B}_s^k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \mu)$  is the Fourier coefficient number  $k$  of  $\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \mu)$ . This Fourier coefficient can be estimated in two ways:

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \mu)| &\leq \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ |\widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \mu)| &\leq \frac{1}{k} |\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{V}}^k(s, \mu)|, \quad k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

And then, we can find a constant  $C$  (possibly different from the one in the statement) such that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 \leq C + C \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{k^{2\lambda}}{k^{1+\delta}} |\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^{1+\delta},$$

where  $\delta$  is a parameter in  $(0, 1)$  whose value is fixed next. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 \\ &\leq C + C \left( \sum_{k \geq 1} \left[ \frac{k^{2\lambda}}{k^{1+\delta}} \right]^{2/(1-\delta)} \right)^{(1-\delta)/2} \left( \sum_{k \geq 1} |\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 \right)^{(1+\delta)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that  $2\lambda < 2$  and then we can choose  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  such that  $1 + \delta > 2\lambda$ . This says that  $2\lambda - (1 + \delta) < 0$ . Since  $2/(1 - \delta)$  tends to  $\infty$  as  $\delta$  tends to 1, we can increase the value of  $\delta$  (still in  $(0, 1)$ ) so that  $2[2\lambda - (1 + \delta)]/(1 - \delta) < -1$ . We obtain (for a new value of  $C$  depending on  $\delta$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 ds &\leq C + C \left( \sum_{k \geq 1} |\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 \right)^{(1+\delta)/2} \\ &= C + C \|\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{V}}(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})\|_2^{1+\delta} \\ &\leq C + \frac{\|X_s\|_2^{1+\delta}}{(T-s)^{(1+\delta)/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

with the last line following from the assumption in the statement (of Lemma 3.6). And then,

$$\int_0^T \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 ds \leq C \left( 1 + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \|X_s\|_2^{1+\delta} \right). \quad (3.5)$$

By (2.2), the right-hand has finite exponential moments of any order, from which we deduce that Novikov criterion is satisfied. Hence, we can consider the new probability measure

$$\mathbb{Q} := \exp \left( - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) dB_s^k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1})|^2 ds \right) \cdot \mathbb{P}.$$

Under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the law of  $(X_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T}$  is the same as the law of  $X^0$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ , see [DPZ92, Theorem 10.14].

*Second Step.* We now observe that, under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , (3.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \\ &= \mathcal{U}(t, x, \mu) - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^T Z_s^k(x) (1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^T Z_s^k(x) d\widetilde{B}_s^k. \end{aligned}$$

(The second term on the right-hand side is well-defined thanks to (3.5)) Here, we make use of Lemma 3.4. Taking inner product with a function  $\theta \in L^2(\mathbb{S})$  and then expectation on both sides (under  $\mathbb{Q}$ ), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \mu) \rangle_2 &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) dx \right. \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) dx \right) ds \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^T \langle \theta, \psi^k(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) \rangle_2 (1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

And then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \mu) \rangle_2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x g(X_T^0(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_T^0)^{-1}) dx \right. \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x f(X_s^0(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^0)^{-1}) dx \right) ds \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_t^T \langle \theta, \psi^k(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^0)^{-1}) \rangle_2 (1 \vee k)^\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^k(s, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s^0)^{-1}) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We justify that the last term is well-defined. By Lemma 3.5, we indeed have, for any  $X \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (1 \vee k)^{2\lambda} \langle \theta, \psi^k(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) \rangle_2^2 &\leq \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right]^2 \\ &\leq C \|\theta\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

with the last line following from the fact that  $\mathcal{U}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ . This allows us to let

$$\Psi^\theta(s, y, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (1 \vee k)^\lambda \langle \theta, \psi^k(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) \rangle_2 e_k(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{S}.$$

As a function of  $y$ , it belongs to  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ . Moreover,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\Psi^\theta(s, y, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1})|^2 dy \leq \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \mathcal{U}(s, x, \cdot) dx \right]^2.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We now turn to the proof of the main statement.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 2.7, there exists a unique field  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}$  solving the fixed point  $\mathcal{U} = \Phi(\mathcal{U})$ .*

*Proof.* The principle of the construction is well known, see [Del02]. The point is to start from the terminal time  $T$  and to construct  $\mathcal{U}$  on the interval  $[T - \delta, T]$ , for some  $\delta > 0$ , by means of Proposition 3.2 and then to iterate.

The challenge is to control the length  $\delta$  along the iteration. As made clear in the statement of Proposition 3.2, this is the same as controlling the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{U}$  (in the variable  $\mu$ , with the function  $\mathcal{U}$  being seen as a mapping from  $[0, T] \times U^2(\mathbb{S})$  into  $U^2(\mathbb{S}) \subset L^2(\mathbb{S})$ ) along the induction. Assuming that  $\mathcal{U}$  solves the fixed point on some interval  $[t, T]$ , for  $t \in (0, T)$ , we then need to prove an *a priori* bound for the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{U}$  in  $\mu$  that

is uniform with respect to the time argument in  $[t, T]$ . For the sake of clarity, notice that the Lipschitz constant that needs to be controlled is

$$\text{Lip}_{L^2(\mathbb{S})}\mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) := \sup_{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}); \mu \neq \nu} \mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \nu)^{-1} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{U}(s, x, \mu) - \mathcal{U}(s, x, \nu)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}, \quad (3.6)$$

which is indeed the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot)$ , seen as a function from  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  into  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ .

To proceed, we indeed apply Lemma 3.6 and we use the regularization property proven in [DHa] for the dynamics without drift  $X^0$  (see the paragraph ‘‘Notations’’ in Introduction). Also, we make use of the notation introduced in the beginning of Subsection 3.3. Whenever  $\mathcal{U}$  is a fixed point of the mapping  $\Phi$  (with the latter being restricted to the time interval  $[t, T]$  in an obvious manner), we then observe from Theorem 2.3 that  $\mathcal{U}$  satisfies the main condition in the statement of Lemma 3.6. To do so, it suffices to combine the representation of  $\mathcal{U} = \Phi(\mathcal{U})$  with the first bound in Theorem 2.3 (written with  $(s, X)$  instead of  $(0, X_0)$  as initial condition). We get, for  $s \in [t, T]$  and  $X \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1})\|_2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla X_T\|_2 + \int_s^T \|\nabla X_r\|_2 dr \right] \\ &\leq C + \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-s}} \|X\|_2 + \int_s^T \frac{C}{\sqrt{r-s}} \|X\|_2 dr \leq C + \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-s}} \|X\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

with  $C$  depending on  $T$  and  $\mathcal{V}$ . By the way, we also notice that we have a bound for  $\|\mathcal{U}\|_{\infty}$  (in terms of known parameters), thanks to (2.8).

Invoking Lemma 3.6 and recalling that  $(\mathcal{P}_s^0)_{s \geq 0}$  denotes the semi-group generated by  $X^0$ , we obtain, for any function  $\theta \in L^2(\mathbb{S})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \mu) \rangle_2 &= \mathcal{P}_{T-t}^0(\mathcal{G}^\theta(\cdot)) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{s-t}^0(\mathcal{F}^\theta(\cdot, \mu)) ds \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{s-t}^0 \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathcal{U}(s, y, \cdot) \Psi^\theta(s, y, \cdot) dy \right) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

with the notation

$$\mathcal{F}^\theta(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x f(F_\mu^{-1}(x), \mu) dx, \quad \mathcal{G}^\theta(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \theta(x) \partial_x g(F_\mu^{-1}(x), \mu) dx.$$

We then apply Theorem 5.11 in [DHa], which says that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that, for any bounded measurable function  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any  $t \in (0, T]$ ,

$$\text{Lip}(\mathcal{P}_t^0 \Phi) \leq \frac{C}{t^{(1+\lambda)/2}} \|\Phi\|_{\infty}, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\text{Lip}$  is used to denote the Lipschitz constant of  $\Phi$  (as usual  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  is equipped with  $\mathbb{W}_2$ ). Then, inserting (3.8) into (3.7), we obtain (for a constant  $C$  only depending on known parameters)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] &\leq C \|\theta\|_1 + \frac{C \|\theta\|_1}{(T-t)^{(1+\lambda)/2}} \\ &\quad + C \int_t^T \frac{1}{(s-t)^{(1+\lambda)/2}} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \left( \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathcal{U}(s, y, \mu) \Psi^\theta(s, y, \mu) dy \right| \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Above,  $\text{Lip}[\langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2]$  denotes the Lipschitz constant of  $\mu \mapsto \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \mu) \rangle_2$ , seen as a function from  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Using Lemma 3.6 to get a bound for  $y \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\Psi^\theta(s, y, \mu)|^2 dy$ , we obtain (the value of the constant  $C$  being allowed to vary from line to line)

$$\text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] \leq \frac{C \|\theta\|_1}{(T-t)^{(1+\lambda)/2}} + C \int_t^T \frac{1}{(s-t)^{(1+\lambda)/2}} \sup_{s \leq r \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(r, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] ds.$$

And then, for any  $S$  fixed  $(t, T)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] &\leq \frac{C \|\theta\|_1}{(T-t)^{(1+\lambda)/2}} + C(S-t)^{(1-\lambda)/2} \sup_{t \leq s \leq S} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] \\ &\quad + C \sup_{s \leq s \leq T} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Importantly,  $C$  is independent of  $t$  and  $\theta$ .

Next, we recall (3.6) and we notice that

$$\text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] \leq \|\theta\|_2 \text{Lip}_{L^2(\mathbb{S})} \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot). \quad (3.10)$$

We then choose  $\delta$  such that  $C\delta^{(1-\lambda)/2} \leq 1/2$ . Assume also that we have a bound  $C_\ell$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$ , for  $\sup_{T-\ell\delta \leq s \leq T} [\text{Lip}_{L^2(\mathbb{S})} \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot)]$ . By Lemma 3.1 and by (3.10), we already have a bound for  $C_1$  that only depends on the properties of  $f$  and  $g$ , provided  $\delta$  is small enough. If  $\ell\delta < T-t$ , then, for any  $s \in [T-(\ell+1)\delta, T-\ell\delta]$ ,  $s \geq t$ , (3.9) yields

$$\sup_{\|\theta\|_2 \leq 1} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{(1+\lambda)/2}} + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{s \leq r \leq T-\ell\delta} \sup_{\|\theta\|_2 \leq 1} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(r, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] + CC_\ell.$$

Taking the supremum over  $s \in [t \vee (T-(\ell+1)\delta), T-\ell\delta]$ , we get a bound  $C_{\ell+1}$  for

$$\sup_{t \vee (T-(\ell+1)\delta) \leq s \leq T} \sup_{\|\theta\|_2 \leq 1} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right].$$

Now, it is standard to prove that

$$\sup_{\|\theta\|_2 \leq 1} \text{Lip} \left[ \langle \theta, \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot) \rangle_2 \right] = \text{Lip}_{L^2(\mathbb{S})} \mathcal{U}(s, \cdot, \cdot).$$

In this way, we get an *a priori* bound for the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{U}$ , seen as a function from  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  into  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$ , along its iterative backward construction.  $\square$

### 3.4 Existence and uniqueness of a mean field equilibrium (first part of Theorem 2.7)

Since we already have proven Theorem 3.7, it remains to establish Proposition 2.9 in order to prove the existence and uniqueness part in Theorem 2.7.

*Proof of Proposition 2.9.* The fact that a fixed point to  $\Phi$  induces a mean field equilibrium is a consequence of Lemma 3.3 and then Proposition 2.8.

We then need to prove that uniqueness of a fixed point to  $\Phi$  implies uniqueness of the mean field equilibrium. In addition to a fixed point  $\mathcal{U}$ , we consider another equilibrium  $\mathcal{U}'$  (as in Definition 2.1). We call  $(X'_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  the solution to (2.1) driven by  $\mathcal{U}'$ . By Proposition 2.8, we know that, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely, for all  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}'(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_t)^{-1}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g \left( X'_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_T)^{-1} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_t^T \partial_x f \left( X'_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_s)^{-1} \right) ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Considering as before a regular conditional probability  $(\mathbb{P}_{t,\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of  $\mathbb{P}$  given the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\sigma(W_r; r \leq t, x \in \mathbb{S})$ , we have that,  $\omega$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely, under  $\mathbb{P}_{t,\omega}$ ,  $(X'_r)_{s \leq r \leq T}$  can be regarded as the unique solution of (2.1) driven by  $\mathcal{U}'$  and initialized from  $(t, X'_t(\omega))$ . By expressing the above conditional expectation through the regular conditional probability, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}'(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_t(\omega))^{-1}) &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_x g \left( X'_T(\omega')(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_T(\omega'))^{-1} \right) d\mathbb{P}_{t,\omega}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \int_{\Omega} \partial_x f \left( X'_s(\omega')(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_s(\omega'))^{-1} \right) d\mathbb{P}_{t,\omega}(\omega') ds. \end{aligned}$$

Under the same probability measure, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X'_t(\omega))^{-1}) &= \int_{\Omega} \partial_x g(X_T(\omega')(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_T(\omega'))^{-1}) d\mathbb{P}_{t,\omega}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \int_{\Omega} \partial_x f(X_s(\omega')(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_s(\omega'))^{-1}) d\mathbb{P}_{t,\omega}(\omega') ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(X_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$  is the solution to (2.1) driven by  $\mathcal{U}$  and initialized from  $(t, X'_t(\omega))$ . Repeating the proof of Lemma 3.1, we obtain that, for  $T - t \leq C_{\mathcal{U}}/2$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\mathcal{U}'(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  should coincide. Restarting the analysis from time  $T - C_{\mathcal{U}}/2$ , with  $\mathcal{U}(T - C_{\mathcal{U}}/2, x, \mu)$  playing the role of  $\partial_x g(X(x), \mu)$  for  $X \sim \mu$ , we obtain the identification of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$  on  $[T - 2 \times C_{\mathcal{U}}/2, T]$ . Arguing inductively, we can identify  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$  on the interval  $[0, T]$ , which proves that there is a unique mean field equilibrium, given by  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Representation of $\mathcal{U}$

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be given by Theorem 3.7 (equivalently, by the first part of Theorem 2.7). Solve (2.1) with 0 as initial time (and with some initial state  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ).

The purpose of this section is to show the second part in Theorem 2.7: along the path  $(X_t(\cdot))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  (which takes values in  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ ), the field  $\mathcal{U}$  can be represented in a mean-field form, namely, for almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$  and almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1})$  can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}), \quad (4.1)$$

for a measurable mapping  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

### 4.1 Formula when $X$ is invertible

The proof of (4.1) relies on the following generic principle.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $X \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$  be a continuous non-decreasing mapping such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X(x)=X(y)\}} dx dy = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

*Then, the function  $X : [0, 1/2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is one-to-one from  $[0, 1/2]$  on its image  $X(\mathbb{S})$ . Denoting by  $X^{-1}$  the inverse (which is measurable), it holds, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}),$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, y, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{U}(t, X^{-1}(y), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) & y \in X(\mathbb{R}) \\ \mathcal{U}(t, 0, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) & y < X(0) \\ \mathcal{U}(t, 1/2, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) & y > X(1/2) \end{cases}.$$

*Proof.* We know that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a non-decreasing continuous function on  $[0, 1/2]$ . Assume that it is not strictly decreasing, meaning that there exist  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in  $[0, 1/2]$ , with  $x_1 < x_2$ , such that  $\mathcal{U}(x_1) = \mathcal{U}(x_2)$ . Then, for all  $z \in [x_1, x_2]$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(z) = \mathcal{U}(x_1) = \mathcal{U}(x_2)$ . Letting  $I = [x_1, x_2]$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X(x)=X(y)\}} dx dy \geq \int_I \int_I \mathbf{1}_{\{X(x)=X(y)\}} dx dy = |I|^2 > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $X$  is continuous one-to-one from  $[0, 1/2]$  onto its image. This makes it possible to define  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  as in the statement.

Now, for  $x \in [0, 1/2]$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) = \mathcal{U}(t, X^{-1}(X(x)), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) = \mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}).$$

When  $x \in [-1/2, 0]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) &= \mathcal{U}(t, -x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X(-x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We recall from (1.2) that the function  $x \in [0, 1] \mapsto X(x/2)$  is the quantile function of the probability measure  $\mu := \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}$ . With  $X^{-1}$  defined as in the previous lemma, we get

$$(2X^{-1}) \circ X\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) = x, \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

which shows that the function  $2X^{-1}$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $\mu$ , which we denote by  $F_{\mu}$ . Therefore,  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, y, \mu) = \mathcal{U}\left(t, \frac{F_{\mu}(y)}{2}, \mu\right) \quad y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.3)$$

We can prove that the function

$$(t, y, \mu) \mapsto \left(t, \frac{F_{\mu}(y)}{2}, \mu\right)$$

is measurable. This shows that  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  is measurable. Indeed, we notice that, for any  $a \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(\mu, y) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R} : F_{\mu}(y) \geq a\} \\ &= \{(\mu, y) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{S}) \times \mathbb{R} : \mu((-\infty, y]) \geq a\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{Q}} \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) : \mu((-\infty, z]) \geq a\} \times \{y \in \mathbb{R} : z - \frac{1}{n} \leq y \leq z\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the set on the last line above belongs to the product of the two  $\sigma$ -fields on  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  respectively. Importantly, we notice that the definition of  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  in (4.3) always makes sense, even if the assumption of Lemma 4.1 is not satisfied. This plays a key role in the sequel.

Notice also that, whenever  $\mu$  has no atoms,  $F_{\mu}$  is continuous so that  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  is continuous in  $y$ . Observe that so is the case for  $\mu = \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X^{-1}$  when  $X$  satisfies (4.2).

#### 4.2 Almost sure invertibility of the solution

Here is now the second step in the construction of a mean field representative of the process  $(\mathcal{U}(s, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}))_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be given by Theorem 3.7. Solve (2.1) with 0 as initial time (and with some initial state  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ). Then, for almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$  and for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_t(x) = X_t(y)\}} dx dy = 0.$$

*Proof.* By the same Girsanov transformation as in Lemma 3.6, we can in fact prove the result for the driftless equation (2.1). Then, for a given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , consider a smooth positive function  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{|y| \leq \varepsilon\}} \leq \psi(y) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{|y| \leq 2\varepsilon\}}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Obviously, we can choose  $\psi$  to be even. Also, we can find a function  $\Psi$  such that  $\Psi'' = \psi$ . Choosing  $\Psi(0) = \Psi'(0) = 0$ , we have  $|\Psi'(x)| \leq 2\varepsilon$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and then  $|\Psi(x)| \leq 2\varepsilon|x|$ . Clearly,  $\Psi$  is even.

Next, we consider the following functional on  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\Xi(\mu) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Psi(x-y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}).$$

Since  $\Psi$  is smooth,  $\Xi$  has continuous first and second-order derivatives (with respect to  $\mu$ ). They are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\mu} \Xi(\mu)(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Psi'(x-y) d\mu(y), \\ \partial_x \partial_{\mu} \Xi(\mu)(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x-y) d\mu(y), \\ \partial_{\mu}^2 \Xi(\mu)(x, y) &= -\psi(x-y). \end{aligned}$$

We believe that those notations are by now standard. We refer to Chapter 5 in the book [CD18a].

By Itô's formula proven in [DHb], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \Xi(\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) - \Xi(\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_0^{-1}) \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \psi(X_s(x) - X_s(y)) [\nabla X_s(x)]^2 dx dy ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \psi(X_s(x) - X_s(y)) e_k^2(x) dx dy ds \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \psi(X_s(x) - X_s(y)) e_k(x) e_k(y) dx dy ds, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s(x)=X_s(y)\}} |e_k(x) - e_k(y)|^2 dx dy ds \\ & \leq C\varepsilon + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s(x)-X_s(y)| \leq 2\varepsilon\}} [\nabla X_s(x)]^2 dx dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\varepsilon$  tend to 0, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s(x)=X_s(y)\}} |e_k(x) - e_k(y)|^2 dx dy ds \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s(x)=X_s(y)\}} [\nabla X_s(x)]^2 dx dy ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

We claim that the last line on the right-hand side is equal to 0. Take indeed  $y \in \mathbb{S}$  and consider, for an element  $h \in H^1(\mathbb{S}) \cap U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{h(x)=h(y)\}} [\nabla h(x)]^2 dx.$$

We claim that it is zero. Without any loss of generality, we can assume (by symmetry and periodicity) that  $y \in [0, 1/2]$ . Then, the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{S} : h(x) = h(y)\}$  must be made of one or two intervals since  $h$  is non-decreasing on  $[0, 1/2]$  and non-increasing on  $[-1/2, 0]$ . When there are two intervals, they are obtained one from each other by means of the mapping  $x \mapsto -x$ . We then call  $I$  the interval containing at least one non-negative real. If the length



of  $I$  is zero, then the proof of the claim is done, i.e. the above integral is indeed zero. If not, we write

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{h(x)=h(y)\}} [\nabla h(x)]^2 dx \leq \int_I \mathbf{1}_{\{h(x)=h(y)\}} [\nabla h(x)]^2 dx + \int_{-I} \mathbf{1}_{\{h(x)=h(y)\}} [\nabla h(x)]^2 dx,$$

but we observe that, on the interior of  $I$ ,  $\nabla h$  must be zero (and similarly on  $-I$ ). This completes the proof the claim. Back to (4.4), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s(x)=X_s(y)\}} |e_k(x) - e_k(y)|^2 dx dy ds = 0.$$

Recalling that  $e_k(x) = \sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi kx)$ , this may be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s(x)-X_s(y)|=0\}} \sin^2(2\pi k(x-y)) \sin^2(2\pi k(x+y)) dx dy ds = 0.$$

So,  $\mathbb{P}$  almost surely, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$  and almost every  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ ,

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} k^{-2\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s(x)-X_s(y)|=0\}} \sin^2(2\pi k(x-y)) \sin^2(2\pi k(x+y)) dy = 0.$$

For a given  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , the function  $y \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto \sin^2(2\pi k(x-y)) \sin^2(2\pi k(x+y))$  can only have  $x$  as a zero on a small interval around  $x$  (since the function is a trigonometric polynomial and has a finite number of zeros on the circle). This means that we can find  $\delta > 0$  (random, depending on  $t$  and  $x$ ) such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s(x)-X_s(y)|=0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{d_{\mathbb{S}}(x,y) < \delta\}} dy = 0,$$

where  $d_{\mathbb{S}}$  is the distance on  $\mathbb{S}$ .

Using again the fact that the collection of points  $y$  such that  $X_s(y) = X_s(x)$  is an interval containing  $x$ , we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_s(x)-X_s(y)|=0\}} dy = 0.$$

The above holds true  $\mathbb{P}$  almost-surely, for almost every  $t$  and for almost every  $x$ . The result easily follows.  $\square$

### 4.3 Main statement

By combining the last two subsections, we get

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be given by Theorem 3.7 and call*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, y, \mu) = \mathcal{U}\left(t, \frac{F_{\mu}(y)}{2}, \mu\right) \quad y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

*Also, solve (2.1) with 0 as initial time (and with some initial state  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ) and call the solution  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ . Then,  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  solves*

$$dX_t(x) = -\tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) dt + \Delta X_t(x) dt + dW_t(x) + d\eta_t(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (4.5)$$

*where, for almost every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely,*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(t, X_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_T^{-1}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_t^T \partial_x f(X_s(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_s^{-1}) ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{S}. \end{aligned}$$

#### 4.4 Connection with standard mean field games

The reader may wonder about the connection between our construction and the one that is usually followed in standard mean field games without common noise. Intuitively, the field  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  identified in the statement of Theorem 4.3 should be regarded as  $(t, x, \mu) \mapsto \partial_x \mathcal{V}(t, x, \mu)$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the solution of the so-called master equation in mean field games, see for instance [CDLL19, CD18a, CD18b]. In the absence of common noise, the construction of the field  $\mathcal{V}$  is just restricted to cases satisfying certain monotonicity properties (like Lasry-Lions monotonicity either or displacement monotonicity). Because the displacement monotonicity condition is more in line with the Pontryagin principle, which we invoked in the proof of Proposition 2.8, we here assume (in this paragraph only and in order to fix the setting)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( X - X' \right) \left( \partial_x f(X, \mathcal{L}(X)) - \partial_x f(X', \mathcal{L}(X')) \right) \right] \geq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

and similarly for  $g$ , for any two random variables  $X$  and  $X'$  that are constructed on an arbitrary probability space, with respective laws  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(X')$ .

We then consider the same mean field game as the one described in Subsection 2.2, but without the additional forcing  $\Delta X_t dt + dW_t$  in the equation (2.1). Instead, we just postulate that

$$dX_t(x) = -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) dt + d\eta_t(x), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (4.7)$$

where, as before,  $(\eta_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is a reflection term with values in  $L^2(\mathbb{S})$  such that, for any  $u \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ , the path  $(\langle \eta_t, u \rangle)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is non-decreasing. As far as  $\mathcal{V}$  is concerned, we assume it to belong to the class  $\mathcal{C}$  introduced in Definition 2.1. Following Brenier's original work [Bre09], one can show that (4.7) has a unique solution  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  with a continuous path from  $[0, T]$  into  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ . It is obtained as the limit of the following discrete scheme

$$\frac{d}{dt} X_t^{(h)}(x) = -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_n}^{(h)})^{-1}), \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}, \quad (4.8)$$

for a time mesh  $(t_n)_{n=0, \dots, N}$  of the interval  $[0, T]$  with uniform step size  $h$ . At time  $t_{n+1}$ ,  $X_{t_{n+1}}^{(h)}$  is obtained by rearrangement:

$$X_{t_{n+1}}^{(h)} = \left( X_{t_{n+1}-}^{(h)} \right)^\star, \quad (4.9)$$

with the symbol  $-$  in the above time index denoting the left-limit at point  $t_{n+1}$  (which obviously exists here) and the symbol  $\star$  is the rearrangement operation. Intuitively, we rearrange any function on  $\mathbb{S}$  in the form of a function, which has the same distribution under the Lebesgue measure, but which belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ . Details may be found in [Bre09, DHa].

Here is the main result of this subsection. It shows that, in absence of common noise, our notion of mean field game coincides with the usual one:

**Proposition 4.4.** *On the top of the assumptions used in Theorem 2.7, assume that (4.6) is in force. Then, the mean field game, as defined in Definition 2.2 but with  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  satisfying equation (4.8), has a unique solution  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}$ . This solution coincides with the unique mean field game equilibrium that is understood in the usual sense.*

*In clear, the flow of distributions  $(\mu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  defined by*

$$\mu_t := \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1},$$

*when  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is driven by  $\mathcal{U}$ , is the unique continuous flow  $(\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  from  $[0, T]$  to  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , with  $\nu_0 = \mu_0$ , such that the optimal trajectory of the minimization problem*

$$\inf \tilde{J} \left( (\varphi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \right),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}\left((\varphi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\right) &:= \int_{\mathbb{S}} g(\Phi_T(x), \nu_T) dx \\ &+ \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} \left( f(\Phi_t(x), \nu_t) + \frac{1}{2} |\varphi_t(x)|^2 \right) dt dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

has exactly  $(\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  as marginal laws. Above, the minimization is performed over measurable mappings  $\varphi : (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{S} \mapsto \varphi_t(x) \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\varphi_t(x)|^2 dt dx < \infty$  and  $(\Phi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t(x) = \varphi_t(x), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S},$$

where  $\Phi_0$  is any measurable mapping from  $\mathbb{S}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ \Phi_0^{-1} = \mu_0$ . The flow of marginal laws of any trajectory is then given by  $(\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ \Phi_t^{-1})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ .

*Proof.*

*First Step.* By [CD18a, Theorem 3.32], there exists a unique mean field equilibrium (in the standard sense) under the standing assumption. Moreover, it admits a decoupling field, in the sense that there exists a mapping

$$\mathcal{W} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

which is Lipschitz continuous in the second and third arguments, uniformly in time, such that the equilibrium  $(\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  of the mean field game (which has not been yet identified with  $(\mu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ ) is the solution of the (first-order) Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t \nu_t - \text{div}_x (\mathcal{W}(t, \cdot, \nu_t) \nu_t) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

with  $\nu_0 = \mu_0$  as initial condition. In fact, one can show (this is a consequence of the analysis carried out in [CD18a, Theorem 3.32]) that  $\mathcal{W}$  is non-decreasing in the argument  $x$ . In short, this is a consequence of the fact that  $\mathcal{W}$  has the same monotonicity structure as  $\partial_x f$  and  $\partial_x g$ .

Alternatively,  $(\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  can be regarded as the flow of marginal laws of the solution to the McKean-Vlasov equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} Y_t(x) = -\mathcal{W}(t, Y_t(x), \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ Y_t^{-1}), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S},$$

with any initial condition  $Y_0 : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mu_0$  as distribution.

*Second Step.* In particular, one can choose  $Y_0(x) = F_{\mu_0}^{-1}(x)$ , for  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ , so that  $Y_0 \in U^2(\mathbb{S})$ . We claim that, under this choice,  $Y_t$  belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  for any  $t \in [0, T]$ . The proof is twofold. First, we observe that  $Y_t(x) = Y_t(-x)$ , by uniqueness of the solution to the ODE

$$\dot{y}_t = -\mathcal{W}(t, y_t, \nu_t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

with  $y_0 = Y_0(x) = Y_0(-x)$  as initial condition. Second, we notice that, for any  $x, x' \in (0, 1/2)$ , with  $x < x'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{Y_t(x') - Y_t(x)}{x' - x} \right) &= -\frac{\mathcal{W}(t, Y_t(x'), \nu_t) - \mathcal{W}(t, Y_t(x), \nu_t)}{x' - x} \\ &= -Z_t(x, x') \left( \frac{Y_t(x') - Y_t(x)}{x' - x} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

with

$$Z_t(x, x') := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{W}(t, Y_t(x'), \nu_t) - \mathcal{W}(t, Y_t(x), \nu_t)}{Y_t(x') - Y_t(x)} & \text{if } Y_t(x') \neq Y_t(x), \\ 0 & \text{if } Y_t(x') = Y_t(x). \end{cases}$$

By the Lipschitz property of  $\mathcal{W}$ , we have  $|Z_t(x, x')| \leq C$ , for some constant  $C \geq 0$  related with the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{W}$ . And then we deduce from the ‘linear’ ODE (4.11) that  $Y_t(x') - Y_t(x)$  has the same sign as  $Y_0(x') - Y_0(x)$  and is thus non-negative. Moreover,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t(x') - Y_t(x)| \leq \exp(CT) |Y_0(x') - Y_0(x)|,$$

which shows that each  $Y_t$  is right-continuous in 0 and left-continuous on  $(0, 1/2]$ , because  $Y_0$  is also right-continuous in 0 and left-continuous on  $(0, 1/2]$ . This completes the proof that  $Y_t$  belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , that is  $Y_t(x) = F_{\nu_t}^{-1}(x)$  for any  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{S}$ . We thus rewrite the equation for  $(Y_t(x))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  in the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} Y_t(x) = -\mathcal{W}(t, F_{\nu_t}^{-1}(x), \nu_t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (4.12)$$

This prompts us to let:

$$\widetilde{W}(t, x, \mu) = \mathcal{W}(t, F_{\mu}^{-1}(x), \mu), \quad (t, x, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}).$$

Next, (4.12) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} Y_t(x) &= -\widetilde{W}(t, x, \nu_t) \\ &= -\widetilde{W}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ Y_t^{-1}), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

*Third Step.* The point is to regard (4.13) as a reflected equation of the form (4.7). We first observe that, for any two  $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\widetilde{W}(t, x, \mu) - \widetilde{W}(t, x, \mu')|^2 dx &= \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\mathcal{W}(t, F_{\mu}^{-1}(x), \mu) - \mathcal{W}(t, F_{\mu'}^{-1}(x), \mu')|^2 dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{S}} |F_{\mu}^{-1}(x) - F_{\mu'}^{-1}(x)|^2 dx + C \mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu, \mu') \\ &\leq C \mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu, \mu'), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where the constant  $C$  is related with the Lipschitz constant of  $\mathcal{W}$ . The third line follows from the solution of the  $\mathbb{W}_2$ -optimal transport problem in dimension 1, see [Vil09].

It remains to notice that, by composition of  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $F_{\mu}^{-1}$ , the function  $x \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto \widetilde{W}(t, x, \mu)$  belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$ . Moreover, by [CD18a, Eq. (3.46)] and by boundedness of  $\partial_x f$  and  $\partial_x g$ , the function  $\mathcal{W}$  is bounded. This shows that  $\widetilde{W}$  is in the class  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Finally, since  $Y_t$  belongs to  $U^2(\mathbb{S})$  for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , we can write

$$dY_t(x) = -\widetilde{W}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ Y_t^{-1}) + d\widetilde{\eta}_t(x), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{S},$$

with  $(\widetilde{\eta}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \equiv 0$ .

*Fourth Step.* We now show that the function  $\widetilde{W}$  satisfies Definition 2.6. Using the same notation as in (2.4) and (2.5), we consider the cost

$$J\left((\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (Y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\right)$$

which (implicitly) requires to associate with the control  $(\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  the dynamics

$$d\Gamma_t(x) = dY_t(x) + \left(\gamma_t(x) + \widetilde{W}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ Y_t^{-1})\right) dt, \quad t \in [0, T]; \quad \Gamma_0(x) = Y_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}.$$

By (4.13), we get

$$d\Gamma_t(x) = \gamma_t(x) dt, \quad t \in [0, T]; \quad \Gamma_0(x) = Y_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}.$$

Back to (4.10), we deduce that

$$J\left((\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (Y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\right) = \tilde{J}\left((\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}; (\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\right).$$

Since  $(\nu_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is a mean field equilibrium (in the classical sense), we deduce that, under the initial condition  $F_{\mu_0}^{-1}$ , the optimal trajectory to the functional in the right-hand side (which is unique under the standing convexity properties of  $f$  and  $g$  in  $x$ ) is exactly  $(Y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ . The optimal control is

$$\gamma_t(x) = -\mathcal{W}(t, Y_t(x), \mu) = -\mathcal{W}(t, F_{\mu}^{-1}(x), \mu) = -\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}(t, x, \mu), \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{S}.$$

This proves that the optimal control to the left-hand side is  $(t, x) \mapsto -\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ Y_t^{-1})$ , hence proving that  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  satisfies Definition 2.6.

*Fifth Step.* It remains to notice that there exists a unique solution to the mean field game defined in Definition 2.2. The proof is very similar to that of Proposition 2.9. Indeed, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is a solution and because  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  is also a solution, we know from Proposition 3.2 that it must coincide with  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  on  $[T - \delta, T]$ , for some  $\delta > 0$  depending on the Lipschitz constants of coefficients  $f$  and  $g$ . In this way, we have a representation formula for  $\mathcal{U}(T - \delta, \cdot, \cdot)$ . Thanks to (4.14), we have a Lipschitz property (in the measure argument) for this new boundary condition at time  $T - \delta$ . This allows us to iterate the proof and then to identify  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$  on the whole domain.  $\square$

## 5 Appendix: proof of Theorem 2.3

The goal of this section is prove that equation (2.1) has a solution when  $\mathcal{V}$  in the class  $\mathcal{C}$  (see Definition 2.1).

### 5.1 Approximation scheme for proving existence

The proof of existence achieved in [DHa, Proposition 4.14] when  $\mathcal{V} = 0$  relies on a discretization scheme. We follow the same lines below, but we pay a special care in explaining the additional difficulties due to the presence of  $\mathcal{V}$ . Notice that another strategy based on Girsanov theorem would be conceivable, see for instance the forthcoming work [DHb].

Following [DHa], we consider the following approximation, along a uniform time mesh  $(t_n)_{n=0, \dots, N}$  of the interval  $[0, T]$ . We call  $h \in (0, T)$  the step size of the mesh.

Iterating on the value of  $n$ , we then define:

$$dX_t^{(h)}(x) = -\mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_n}^{(h)})^{-1})dt + \Delta X_t^{(h)}(x)dt + dW_t(x), \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}),$$

the value of  $X_{t_n}^{(h)}$  being given by the previous iteration of the scheme and the next value  $X_{t_{n+1}}^{(h)}$  being given by rearrangement:

$$X_{t_{n+1}}^{(h)} = (X_{t_{n+1}-}^{(h)})^*.$$

We recall that the symbol  $-$  in the above time index denotes the left-limit at point  $t_{n+1}$ . Moreover, the symbol  $\star$  is the rearrangement operation, see (4.9).

One of the very key point in the proof is the analogue of Lemma 3.4 in [DHa].

**Lemma 5.1.** *There exists a constant  $C_T$ , independent of  $h$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla X_{t_n}^{(h)}\|_2^2 \right] \leq C_T \left[ 1 + \min \left( \frac{1}{nh} \|X_0\|_2^2, \|\nabla X_0\|_2^2 \right) \right].$$

*Proof.* We follow the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [DHa]. We consider an additional random variable  $U$ , uniformly distributed on  $(0, 1)$  and independent of  $W$ . By Lemma 3.3 in [DHa],

we get the first line below, which holds true for any  $r \geq 0$ . The second line below is standard algebra.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{rU\Delta} X_{t_n}^{(h)} \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(rU+h)\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(rU+t_n-s)\Delta} \left[ -\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) ds + dW_s \right] \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
 & \leq (1+h) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(rU+h)\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(rU+t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{h}\right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(rU+t_n-s)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] ds \right) \right\|_2^2 \right]. \tag{5.1}
 \end{aligned}$$

And then, by orthogonality of the stochastic integral with the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}$  and by Jensen inequality, we obtain the first inequality below.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{rU\Delta} X_{t_n}^{(h)} \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
 & \leq (1+h) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(rU+h)\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] + (1+h) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \nabla e^{(rU+t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + (1+h) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(rU+t_n-s)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_2^2 ds \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

We then replace  $t_n$  by  $t_m$  and we choose  $r = (n-m)h$ , which makes it possible to iterate. We obtain, for  $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla X_{t_n}^{(h)} \right\|_2^2 \right] & \leq (1+h)^{n-m+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(n-m+1)hU\Delta} X_{t_{m-1}}^{(h)} \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
 & \quad + \sum_{k=m}^n (1+h)^{n-k+1} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \nabla e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2 \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_2^2 ds \right] \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The sum on the second line is handled as in Lemma 3.4 in [DHa]. Choosing  $m = 1$ , we deduce that, for  $\delta \in (0, \lambda - 1/2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla X_{t_n}^{(h)} \right\|_2^2 \right] & \leq (1+h)^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla \left( e^{nhU\Delta} X_0 \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] + c_{\delta, \lambda} (hn)^\delta \\
 & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^n (1+h)^{n-k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_2^2 ds \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The really new term is the sum on the second line above. We proceed as follows.

$$\left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{c \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty}{\sqrt{t_k - s + (n-k)hU}},$$

and

$$\left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_1 \leq c \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\text{TV}},$$

with  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$  denoting the total variation norm. Since  $\mathcal{V}$  is non-decreasing on  $(0, 1/2)$  and symmetric with respect to 0, we have  $\|\mathcal{V}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 4\|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty$ . And, by Hölder inequality,

$$\left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{c \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty^2}{\sqrt{t_k - s + (n-k)hU}}. \tag{5.2}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} [\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1})] \right) \right\|_2^2 ds \\
 & \leq \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \frac{c \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{t_k-s+(n-k)hU}} ds = \sqrt{h} \int_0^1 \frac{c \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{r+(n-k)U}} dr \\
 & \leq \frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{U}} \int_0^1 \frac{c \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{r+n-k}} dr = 2c \frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{U}} \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty} [\sqrt{1+n-k} - \sqrt{n-k}].
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Eventually,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(t_k-s+(n-k)hU)\Delta} [\mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)})^{-1})] \right) \right\|_2^2 ds \\
 & \leq C \sqrt{h} \sum_{k=1}^n [\sqrt{1+n-k} - \sqrt{n-k}] = 2c \sqrt{hn}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In order to complete the proof, it remains to see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \nabla (e^{nhU\Delta} X_0) \right\|_2^2 \right] \leq C_T \min \left( \frac{1}{nh} \|X_0\|_2^2, \|\nabla X_0\|_2^2 \right),$$

see the end of the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [DHa].  $\square$

## 5.2 Tightness

The next step is to verify the various ingredients for proving tightness, as developed in [DHa, Subsection 3.3]:

**Proposition 5.2.** *Denoting by  $(\tilde{X}_t^{(h)})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  the linear interpolation of  $(X_{t_n}^{(h)})_{n=0, \dots, N}$ , the family  $\{\tilde{X}^{(h)}\}_{h \in (0,1)}$  induces a tight family of probability measures on the space  $\mathcal{C}([0, T], L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{S}))$  of continuous functions from  $[0, T]$  into  $L_{\text{sym}}^2(\mathbb{S})$ .*

*Proof.* The key is to adapt Proposition 3.7 in [DHa]. We follow, line by line, the computations therein. We start with

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| X_{t_n}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0 \right\|_2^2 & \leq \left\| e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) ds + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in the derivation of (5.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| X_{t_n}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0 \right\|_2^2 & \leq (1+h) \left\| e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0 + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{h}\right) \left\| \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) ds \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq (1+h) \left\| e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0 + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2 + Ch,
 \end{aligned}$$

for a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$ . We expand the above in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| X_{t_n}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0 \right\|_2^2 & \leq (1+h) \left\| X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(n-1)h\Delta} X_0 \right\|_2^2 + (1+h) \left\| \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + 2(1+h) \left\langle e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0, \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\rangle_2 + Ch.
 \end{aligned}$$

By iterating, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{t_n}^{(h)} - e^{nh\Delta} X_0\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n (1+h)^{n-k+1} \left[ \left\| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} e^{(t_k-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \left\langle e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)} - e^{kh\Delta} X_0, \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} e^{(t_k-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\rangle_2 + Ch \right], \end{aligned}$$

which decomposition is very similar to [DHa, (3.31)]. Following [DHa, (3.32)], we then let, for  $n \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor T/h \rfloor\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^1 &:= \sum_{k=1}^n (1+h)^{n-k+1} \left\| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} e^{(t_k-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\|_2^2, \\ T_n^2 &:= 2 \sum_{k=1}^n (1+h)^{n-k+1} \left\langle e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{k-1}}^{(h)} - e^{kh\Delta} X_0, \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} e^{(t_k-s)\Delta} dW_s \right\rangle_2, \end{aligned}$$

And then, by the same computations as in [DHa], we have, for any exponent  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |T_n^1 - T_m^1|^p \right] \leq C_p (h(n-m))^p, \quad m, n \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor T/h \rfloor\},$$

with the constant  $C_p$  being allowed to depend on  $p$ . Moreover, with an obvious adaptation of Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.5 in [DHa] and with the same computations as in [DHa, (3.33)], we also have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |T_n^2 - T_m^2|^p \right] \leq C_p (h(n-m))^{p/2}, \quad m, n \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor T/h \rfloor\}.$$

Then it is easy to follow displays (3.34) to (3.39) in [DHa]. We deduce

$$\|\tilde{X}_t^{(h)} - X_0\|_2 \leq \Xi^{(h)} t^{\alpha/2} + w(t),$$

where  $(\tilde{X}_t^{(h)})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is the piecewise-linear interpolation of  $(X_{t_n})_{n=0, \dots, N}$ . Here,  $\Xi^{(h)}$  is a random variable with moments of any order  $p \geq 1$  that are bounded independently of  $h$  and  $t \mapsto w(t)$  is random function that is bounded and that tends almost surely to 0 as  $t$  tends to 0.

The next step is to study the analogue of (3.43) in [DHa]. Proceeding as before, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| X_{t_n}^{(h)} - e^{(n-m)h\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2p} &\leq \left\| e^{h\Delta} X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_S \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{(t_n-s)\Delta} dW_s - e^{(n-m)h\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2p}, \end{aligned}$$

which prompts us to let

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}_s^{(h), n-1} &:= e^{s\Delta} \left[ X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(t_{n-1}-t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right] \\ &\quad - \int_0^s e^{(s-r)\Delta} \mathcal{V}(r + t_{n-1}, \cdot, \text{Leb}_S \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) dr + \int_0^s e^{(s-r)\Delta} d[W_{t_{n-1}+r} - W_{t_{n-1}}]. \end{aligned}$$



By Theorem 6 in [SZ16], we obtain, for  $t_n \geq t_m \geq t_N$  for some integer  $N \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| X_{t_n}^{(h)} - e^{(t_n - t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2p} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_N} \right] \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(t_{n-1} - t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2p} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_N} \right] \\
 & \quad + Ch \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(t_{n-1} - t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2p-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_N} \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(t_{n-1} - t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2(p-1)} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_N} \right] + h^{p-1} \right) \\
 & \leq (1+h) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(t_{n-1} - t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2p} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_N} \right] \\
 & \quad + Ch \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)} - e^{(t_{n-1} - t_m)\Delta} X_{t_m}^{(h)} \right\|_2^{2(p-1)} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_N} \right] + h^{p-1} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

the second line following from Hölder and Young inequalities. Up to the pre-factor  $(1+h)$  on the penultimate line, we recover the main inequality coming after (3.43) in [DHa]. This makes it possible to reproduce the computations therein and eventually to obtain the analogue of [DHa, (3.44)]. We then get [DHa, (3.45)].

Lastly, we need to readapt the third step in the proof of [DHa, Proposition 3.7]. By returning to the proof of Lemma 5.1, see in particular (5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \nabla (e^{(n-m)hU\Delta} X_{t_m}) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq (1+h) \left\| \nabla \left( e^{[(n-m)hU+h]\Delta} X_{t_{m-1}} + \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + \left(1 + \frac{1}{h}\right) \left\| \nabla \left( \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{n-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] ds \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq (1+h) \left\| \nabla \left( e^{[(n-m)hU+h]\Delta} X_{t_{m-1}} + \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + (1+h) \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \left\| \nabla \left( e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} \left[ \mathcal{V}(s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_{m-1}}^{(h)})^{-1}) \right] \right) \right\|_2^2 ds,
 \end{aligned}$$

and then, by (5.2) and (5.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \nabla (e^{(n-m)hU\Delta} X_{t_m}) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq (1+h) \left\| \nabla \left( e^{[(n-m)hU+h]\Delta} X_{t_{m-1}} + \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + (1+h) \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \frac{C}{\sqrt{t_m - s + (n-m)hU}} ds \\
 & \leq (1+h) \left\| \nabla \left( e^{[(n-(m-1)]hU\Delta} X_{t_{m-1}} \right) \right\|_2^2 + (1+h) \left\| \nabla \left( \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + 2(1+h) \left\langle \nabla \left( e^{[(n-m)hU+h]\Delta} X_{t_{m-1}} \right), \left( \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} e^{[(n-m)hU+t_m-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\rangle_2 \\
 & \quad + C(1+h) \frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{U}} [\sqrt{1+n-m} - \sqrt{n-m}].
 \end{aligned}$$

And then, by induction,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \nabla \left( e^{(n-m)hU\Delta} X_{t_m} \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq (1+h)^\ell \left\| \nabla \left( e^{[n-(m-\ell)]hU\Delta} X_{t_{m-\ell}} \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + \sum_{k=m-\ell+1}^m (1+h)^{m+1-k} \left\| \nabla \left( \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} e^{[(n-k)hU+t_k-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
 & \quad + 2 \sum_{k=m-\ell+1}^m (1+h)^{m+1-k} \left\langle \nabla \left( e^{[(n-k)hU+h]\Delta} X_{t_{k-1}} \right), \left( \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} e^{[(n-k)hU+t_k-s]\Delta} dW_s \right) \right\rangle_2 \\
 & \quad + C \sum_{k=m-\ell+1}^m (1+h)^{m+1-k} \frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{U}} [\sqrt{1+n-k} - \sqrt{n-k}].
 \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $n = m$  and  $m - \ell = N$ , for some integer  $N \geq 1$  (with  $N \leq \lfloor T/h \rfloor$ ), performing the change of variable  $j = m + 1 - k$ , integrating with respect to  $U$ , taking the power  $p \geq 1$  and then taking the conditional expectation given  $\mathcal{F}_{t_N}$ , the second and third terms right above lead to similar quantities as  $R^1$  and  $R^2$  in the proof of [DHa, Proposition 3.7]. It then remains to observe that the last term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left( \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=N+1}^m (1+h)^{m+1-k} \frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{U}} [\sqrt{1+m-k} - \sqrt{m-k}] \right)^p \\
 & = \left( \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^{m-N} (1+h)^j \frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{U}} [\sqrt{j} - \sqrt{j-1}] \right)^p \\
 & = c_p h^{p/2} \left( (1+h)^{m-N} \sqrt{m-N} + \sum_{j=1}^{m-N-1} \sqrt{j} [(1+h)^j - (1+h)^{j+1}] \right)^p \\
 & = c_p h^{p/2} \left( (1+h)^{m-N} \sqrt{m-N} - h \sum_{j=1}^{m-N-1} \sqrt{j} (1+h)^j \right)^p \\
 & \leq C_{p,T} [h(m-N)]^{p/2},
 \end{aligned}$$

which bound does not change the argument developed in the proof of [DHa, Proposition 3.7].  $\square$

### 5.3 Existence of a solution and proof of (2.2)

Following [DHa], existence is proven by extracting a convergent subsequence of the family  $((\tilde{X}_t^{(T/p)})_{0 \leq t \leq T})_{p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}}$ . Very briefly, we decompose  $X_{t_n}$  into  $X_{t_n} := Y_{t_n} + V_{t_n}$ , where

$$V_{t_{n+1}} = e^{\Delta h} V_{t_n} - \int_0^h e^{\Delta(h-s)} \mathcal{V}(t_n + s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_n})^{-1}) ds + \int_0^h e^{\Delta(h-s)} dW_{t_n+s}.$$

Then, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_{t_{n+1}} & = \left( e^{\Delta h} X_{t_n} - \int_0^h e^{\Delta(h-s)} \mathcal{V}(t_n + s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_n})^{-1}) ds + \int_0^h e^{\Delta(h-s)} dW_{t_n+s} \right)^* \\
 & = \left( e^{\Delta h} V_{t_n} - \int_0^h e^{\Delta(h-s)} \mathcal{V}(t_n + s, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ (X_{t_n})^{-1}) ds \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \int_0^h e^{\Delta(h-s)} dW_{t_n+s} + e^{h\Delta} (X_{t_n} - V_{t_n}) \right)^* \\
 & = \left( V_{t_{n+1}} + e^{h\Delta} Y_{t_n} \right)^*,
 \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$Y_{t_{n+1}} = \left( V_{t_{n+1}} + e^{h\Delta} Y_{t_n} \right)^* - V_{t_{n+1}},$$

which is the analogue of (4.6) in [DHa]. We then proceed as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [DHa]: roughly speaking, the process  $(Y_{t_n})_{0 \leq n \leq \lfloor T/h \rfloor}$  induces the reflection term and the process  $(V_{t_n})_{0 \leq n \leq \lfloor T/h \rfloor}$  generates the non-reflected part of the dynamics.

To prove the first inequality in (2.2), we notice that, by Lemma 5.1,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla(e^{\varepsilon\Delta} X_{t_n}^{(h)})\|_2^2 \right] \leq C_T \left[ 1 + \min\left(\frac{1}{t_n} \|X_0\|_2^2, \|\nabla X_0\|_2^2\right) \right].$$

Letting  $h$  tend to 0, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla(e^{\varepsilon\Delta} X_t)\|_2^2 \right] \leq C_T \left[ 1 + \min\left(\frac{1}{t} \|X_0\|_2^2, \|\nabla X_0\|_2^2\right) \right].$$

Letting  $\varepsilon$  to 0, we get the result.

As for the second inequality in (2.2), its proof is similar to the one in [DHb]. We give it for the sake of completeness. It can be checked that the mean (over  $\mathbb{S}$ ) satisfies

$$d \int_{\mathbb{S}} X_t(x) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathcal{V}(t, x, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) dx dt + dB_t^0.$$

Since  $\mathcal{V}$  is bounded, the result is straightforward for the sole mean, which we denote by  $(\bar{X}_t := \int_{\mathbb{S}} X_t(x) dx)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ . Next, we expand

$$\begin{aligned} d\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2 &= -2\langle X_t - \bar{X}_t, \mathcal{V}(t, \cdot, \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}} \circ X_t^{-1}) \rangle_2 dt - \|\nabla X_t\|_2^2 dt + 2\langle X_t - \bar{X}_t, dW_t \rangle_2 + c_\lambda dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using Poincaré inequality, one can prove that, for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d[\exp(\varepsilon\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2)] &\leq C_\varepsilon \exp(\varepsilon\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2) (1 + \varepsilon^2\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2 - c\varepsilon\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2) dt \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon \exp(\varepsilon\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2) \langle X_t - \bar{X}_t, dW_t \rangle_2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c$  denotes the constant in Poincaré inequality over  $\mathbb{S}$ . Above,  $C_\varepsilon$  may depend on  $\varepsilon$ . Choosing  $\varepsilon$  small enough, we deduce that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\varepsilon\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_2^2)] < \infty,$$

for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we complete the proof (with a possibly smaller value of  $\varepsilon$ ).

## References

- [BCCD21] Erhan Bayraktar, Alekos Cecchin, Asaf Cohen, and François Delarue. Finite state mean field games with Wright-Fisher common noise. J. Math. Pures Appl., 147:98–162, 2021.
- [Bre09] Yann Brenier.  $L^2$  formulation of multidimensional scalar conservation laws. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 193(1):1–19, 2009.
- [CD18a] René Carmona and François Delarue. Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I, volume 83 of Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games.
- [CD18b] René Carmona and François Delarue. Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. II, volume 84 of Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field games with common noise and master equations.

- [CDLL19] P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, J.M. Lasry, and P.L. Lions. The Master Equation and the Convergence Problem in Mean Field Games: (AMS-201). Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [cJPS80] E. Çinlar, J. Jacod, P. Protter, and M. J. Sharpe. Semimartingales and Markov processes. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete, 54(2):161–219, 1980.
- [CP21] Pierre Cardaliaguet and Alessio Porretta. An introduction to mean field game theory. In Mean Field Games, chapter 1, Cetraro, Italy 2019, Cardaliaguet, Pierre, Porretta, Alessio (Eds.), LNM 2281, pages 203–248. Springer, 2021.
- [Del02] François Delarue. On the existence and uniqueness of solutions to fbsdes in a non-degenerate case. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 99(2):209 – 286, 2002. Cited by: 136.
- [Del19] François Delarue. Restoring Uniqueness to Mean-Field Games by Randomizing the Equilibria. Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations, 2019.
- [DHa] François Delarue and William R. P. Hammersley. Rearranged stochastic heat equation. arXiv:2210.01239.
- [DHb] François Delarue and William R. P. Hammersley. Rearranged stochastic heat equation: ergodicity and related gradient descent on the space of probability measures. In preparation.
- [DPZ92] Giuseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk. Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions, volume 44 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [FT02] Marco Fuhrman and Gianmario Tessitore. Nonlinear Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensional spaces: the backward stochastic differential equations approach and applications to optimal control. Ann. Probab., 30(3):1397–1465, 2002.
- [GM22] Wilfrid Gangbo and Alpár R. Mészáros. Global well-posedness of master equations for deterministic displacement convex potential mean field games. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 75(12):2685–2801, 2022.
- [GMMZ22] Wilfrid Gangbo, Alpár R. Mészáros, Chenchen Mou, and Jianfeng Zhang. Mean field games master equations with nonseparable Hamiltonians and displacement monotonicity. Ann. Probab., 50(6):2178–2217, 2022.
- [HMC03] Minyi Huang, Roland P. Malhamé, and Peter E. Caines. Individual and mass behavior in large population stochastic wireless power control problems: centralized and Nash equilibrium solutions. pages 98 – 103, 2003.
- [HMC07] Minyi Huang, Roland P. Malhamé, and Peter E. Caines. The nash certainty equivalence principle and mckean-vlasov systems: An invariance principle and entry adaptation. In 2007 46th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pages 121–126, Dec 2007.
- [IRR12] Peter Imkeller, Anthony Réveillac, and Anja Richter. Differentiability of quadratic BSDEs generated by continuous martingales. Ann. Appl. Probab., 22(1):285–336, 2012.
- [Lio] Pierre-Louis Lions. Cours au collège de france, equations aux dérivées partielles et applications. <https://www.college-de-france.fr/site/pierre-louis-lions/course-2010-2011.htm>, 2010-11.
- [LL06a] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. i – le cas stationnaire. Comptes Rendus Mathématique, 343(9):619 – 625, 2006.
- [LL06b] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. ii – horizon fini et contrôle optimal. Comptes Rendus Mathématique, 343(10):679 – 684, 2006.
- [LL07] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field games. Japanese Journal of Mathematics, 2(1):229–260, Mar 2007.
- [SZ16] Erfan Salavati and Bijan Z. Zangeneh. A maximal inequality for  $p$ th power of stochastic convolution integrals. Journal of Inequalities and Applications, 2016.
- [Tch18] Rinel Foguen Tchuendom. Uniqueness for linear-quadratic mean field games with common noise. Dyn. Games Appl., 8(1):199–210, 2018.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. Optimal Transport: Old and New. Springer, 2009.

**Acknowledgments.** Youssef Ouknine thanks UniCA for having hosted him during the preparation of this work. His stay was supported by Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS, Call ‘postes rouges’). François Delarue acknowledges the financial support of the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (AdG ELISA project, Grant agreement No. 101054746).