

**VARIATIONAL STRUCTURES
FOR THE FOKKER–PLANCK EQUATION
WITH GENERAL DIRICHLET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS**

FILIPPO QUATTROCCHI

ABSTRACT. We prove convergence of a modified Jordan–Kinderlehrer–Otto scheme to a solution to the Fokker–Planck equation in $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with spatially nonconstant Dirichlet boundary conditions. We work under mild assumptions on the domain, on the drift, and on the initial datum.

In the special case where Ω is an interval in \mathbb{R}^1 , we prove that such a solution is a gradient flow—curve of maximal slope—within a suitable space of measures, endowed with a modified Wasserstein distance.

Our discrete scheme and modified distance draw inspiration from contributions by A. Figalli and N. Gigli [J. Math. Pures Appl. 94, (2010), pp. 107–130], and J. Morales [J. Math. Pures Appl. 112, (2018), pp. 41–88] on an optimal-transport approach to evolution equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The subject of this paper is the linear Fokker–Planck equation

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = \operatorname{div}(\nabla\rho_t + \rho_t\nabla V)$$

on a bounded Euclidean domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ combined with general, positive and constant in time, Dirichlet boundary conditions. We want to approach this problem applying the theory of *optimal transport*, which, since the seminal works of R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto [14, 18, 19], has proven effective in the study of a number of evolution equations.

Existence, uniqueness, and appropriate estimates are often consequence of a peculiar structure of the problem. Important instances are those PDEs which can be seen as *gradient flows*. In fact, it has been proven that several equations, including Fokker–Planck on \mathbb{R}^d , are gradient flows in a space of probability measures endowed with the 2-Wasserstein distance

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\gamma} \sqrt{\int |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y)},$$

Date: March 13, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49Q20 (Primary), 49Q22, 35A15, 35K20, 35Q84.

Key words and phrases. gradient flows; Jordan–Kinderlehrer–Otto scheme; curves of maximal slope; optimal transport; Dirichlet boundary conditions; Fokker–Planck equation.

The author would like to thank Jan Maas for suggesting this project and for many helpful comments, Lorenzo Dello Schiavo for several fruitful discussions, and Oliver Tse for pointing out the reference [15]. He also gratefully acknowledges support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project 10.55776/F65.

where the infimum is taken among all couplings γ between μ and ν , i.e., measures with marginals $\pi_{\#}^1\gamma = \mu$ and $\pi_{\#}^2\gamma = \nu$. For such PDEs, existence can be deduced from the convergence of the discrete-time approximations given by the Jordan–Kinderlehrer–Otto variational scheme (also known, in a more general metric setting, as De Giorgi’s minimizing movement scheme [10])

$$(1.2) \quad \rho_{(n+1)\tau}^\tau dx \in \arg \min_{\mu} \left(\text{Ent}(\mu) + \frac{W_2^2(\mu, \rho_{n\tau}^\tau dx)}{2\tau} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where Ent is an entropy functional that depends on the equation, and $\tau > 0$ is the time step.

When applied on a bounded Euclidean domain, this approach produces solutions *with Neumann boundary conditions*. This fact is inseparable from the choice of the metric space (probability measures with the distance W_2) in which the flow evolves. Intuitively, Neumann boundary conditions are natural because a curve of probability measures, by definition, conserves the total mass; see also the discussion in [21].

In order to deal with Dirichlet boundary conditions, A. Figalli and N. Gigli defined in [13] a modified Wasserstein distance Wb_2 that gives a special role to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Despite being a distance between nonnegative measures on Ω , the metric Wb_2 is defined as an infimum over measures γ on the product of the topological closures $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$, and only the restrictions of the marginals $\pi_{\#}^1\gamma$ and $\pi_{\#}^2\gamma$ to Ω are prescribed (see the original paper [13] or Section 3.6 below). In this sense, the boundary $\partial\Omega$ can be interpreted as an infinite reservoir, where mass can be taken and deposited freely. The main result in [13] is the convergence of the scheme

$$\rho_{(n+1)\tau}^\tau \in \arg \min_{\rho} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\rho \log \rho - \rho + 1) dx + \frac{Wb_2^2(\rho dx, \rho_{n\tau}^\tau dx)}{2\tau} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

as $\tau \downarrow 0$, to a solution to the heat equation with the *constant* Dirichlet boundary condition $\rho|_{\partial\Omega} = 1$. More generally, it was observed in [13, Section 4] that the same scheme with a suitably modified entropy converges to solutions to the linear Fokker–Planck equation (1.1) with the boundary condition $\rho|_{\partial\Omega} = e^{-V}$. In particular, this theory covers the heat equation with *any constant and strictly positive* Dirichlet boundary condition.

In a more recent contribution, J. Morales [17] proved convergence of a similar discrete scheme for a family of reaction-diffusion equations with drift, subject to rather *general* Dirichlet boundary conditions. In this scheme, the distance between measures is replaced by τ -dependent transportation costs. Morales’ work, together with [13], is the starting point of the present paper.

We conclude this brief literature review by mentioning four further works on this subject. The case of the heat flow with *vanishing* Dirichlet boundary conditions was studied by A. Profeta and K.-T. Sturm in [20]. They defined ‘charged probabilities’ and a suitable distance on them. This metric is built upon the idea that mass can touch the boundary and be reflected, as with the classical Wasserstein distance, but possibly changing the charge (positive to negative or vice versa). One of their results is the *Evolution Variational Inequality* (see [4]) for such a heat flow.

D. Kim, D. Koo, and G. Seo [15] adapted the setting of [13] to porous medium equations with nonnegative *constant* boundary conditions. J.-B. Casteras, L. Monsaingeon, and F. Santambrogio [8] found the Wasserstein gradient-flow structure for the equation arising from the so-called Sticky Brownian Motion, i.e., the Fokker–Planck equation together with boundary conditions of Dirichlet type that also evolve in time subject to diffusion and drift on the boundary. The authors of [15] and [8] further established Energy Dissipation Inequalities for the respective problems. However, they also pointed out that characterizations as *curves of maximal slope* (cf. [4, Definition 1.3.2] and Definition 3.5) are still missing. From [15]: «*Question: Does $\rho(t)$ satisfy the concept of curve of maximal slope? [...] As far as we know, it remains open whether the answer to the question is ‘yes’.*» From [8]: «*It is worth stressing that something is still missing in order to obtain a rigorous metric gradient flow.*» Later in the introduction, we will comment further on this problem.

The author has also been informed of a work by M. Erbar and G. Meglioli [12], in preparation at the same time as this one. The two papers are independent and the results do not overlap. The first part of [12] concerns the description of absolutely continuous curves for the distance Wb_2 , and provides a Benamou–Brenier formulation. The second part contains a characterization of solutions to porous medium equations with constant Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Our contribution. In this work, we present two novel results:

- (1) We prove convergence of a modified Jordan–Kinderlehrer–Otto scheme to a solution to the Fokker–Planck equation with general Dirichlet boundary conditions under mild regularity assumptions. To do this, we adopt a *different point of view* compared to [13, 15, 17]: our scheme is defined on a subset \mathcal{S} of the signed measures *on the closure* $\overline{\Omega}$, rather than on measures on Ω .
- (2) In dimension $d = 1$, we determine that this solution is also a *curve of maximal slope* for an entropy \mathcal{H} in an appropriate metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$.

Let us now explain in detail the extent of these contributions and provide precise statements.

Convergence of a modified JKO scheme. We look at the boundary-value problem

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = \operatorname{div}(\nabla\rho_t + \rho_t\nabla V) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \rho_t|_{\partial\Omega} = e^{\Psi-V} & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \rho_{t=0} = \rho_0. \end{cases}$$

Here, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *bounded* open set and ρ_0, Ψ, V are given functions, with $\rho_0 \geq 0$. The function Ψ can be tuned to obtain the desired boundary condition.

We introduce the set \mathcal{S} of all signed measures on $\overline{\Omega}$ with

$$(1.4) \quad \mu|_{\Omega} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\overline{\Omega}) = 0.$$

We also define

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{E}(\rho) := \int_{\Omega} (\rho \log \rho + (V - 1)\rho + 1) \, dx, \quad \rho \in L^1_+(\Omega),$$

and, for $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}(\rho) + \int \Psi \, d\mu|_{\partial\Omega} & \text{if } \mu|_{\Omega} = \rho \, dx, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In Section 3.7, we will define a transportation-cost functional \mathcal{T} on \mathcal{S} . With it, we can consider the scheme

$$(1.7) \quad \mu_{(n+1)\tau}^{\tau} \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \mu_{n\tau}^{\tau})}{2\tau} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tau > 0,$$

starting from some $\mu_0^{\tau} = \mu_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, independent of τ , such that the restriction $\mu_0|_{\Omega}$ is absolutely continuous with density ρ_0 . These sequences are extended to maps $t \mapsto \mu_t^{\tau}$, constant on the intervals $[n\tau, (n+1)\tau)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \log \rho_0 \, dx < \infty$, that $\Psi: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous, and that¹ $V \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,d^+}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Then:*

- (1) *Well-posedness: The maps $(t \mapsto \mu_t^{\tau})_{\tau}$ resulting from the scheme (1.7) are well-defined and uniquely defined: for every n and τ , there exists a minimum point in (1.7) and it is unique.*
- (2) *Convergence: When $\tau \rightarrow 0$, up to subsequences, the maps $(t \mapsto \mu_t^{\tau}|_{\Omega})_{\tau}$ converge pointwise w.r.t. the Figalli–Gigli distance Wb_2 to a curve of absolutely continuous measures $t \mapsto \rho_t \, dx$. For every $q \in [1, \frac{d}{d-1})$, convergence holds also in $L_{\text{loc}}^1((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$.*
- (3) *Equation: This limit curve is a weak solution to the Fokker–Planck equation (1.1), see Section 3.4 below.*
- (4) *Boundary condition: The function $t \mapsto \left(\sqrt{\rho_t e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \right)$ belongs to the space $L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty); W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$.*

Remark 1.2. We assume that Ψ is defined on the whole set $\overline{\Omega}$ in order to make sense of the inclusion $\sqrt{\rho_t e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ also when $\partial\Omega$ is not smooth enough to have a trace operator. However, if we are given a Lipschitz continuous function $\Psi_0: \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can extend it to a Lipschitz function on $\overline{\Omega}$ via

$$\Psi(x) := \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} \left(\Psi_0(y) + (\text{Lip } \Psi_0)|x - y| \right).$$

Remark 1.3. If V is Lipschitz continuous *only in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$* , then it is possible to find Ψ , Lipschitz as well, in order for $e^{\Psi-V}$ to match *any* uniformly positive and Lipschitz boundary condition.

As mentioned, the conceptual difference between the present work and [13, 15, 17] is that we make use of signed measures on the full closure $\overline{\Omega}$. In this regard, our approach is somewhat similar to that of [8]. The idea is that, due to the boundary condition that we have to match, it is convenient to keep track of the mass at the boundary and to have an entropy functional that can make use of this information.

On a more technical note, although Theorem 1.1 is similar to [17, Theorem 4.1], the latter is not applicable to the Fokker–Planck equation (1.1) without reaction

¹By $V \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,d^+}(\Omega)$ we mean that for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$ open there exists $p = p(\omega) > d$ such that $V \in W^{1,p}(\omega)$, see also Definition 3.1.

term due to Assumptions [17, (C1)-(C9)] (see in particular (C7)). Furthermore, we achieve a significant improvement in the hypotheses:

- The boundary $\partial\Omega$ does not need to have *any* regularity, as opposed to Lipschitz and with the interior ball condition.
- There is no uniform bound on ρ_0 from above or below by positive constants. Only nonnegativity and the integrability of $\rho_0 \log \rho_0$ are assumed.
- The function V is not necessarily Lipschitz continuous. Rather, it is required to have an appropriate local Sobolev regularity.

Curve of maximal slope. Our second main result is a strengthened version of Theorem 1.1 in the case where Ω is an interval in \mathbb{R}^1 and $V \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. In this setting, we are able to define a *true* metric \widetilde{Wb}_2 on \mathcal{S} , construct piecewise constant maps with the scheme

$$(1.8) \quad \mu_{(n+1)\tau}^\tau \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \mu_{n\tau}^\tau)}{2\tau} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tau > 0,$$

$$\mu_0^\tau = \mu_0,$$

for a fixed μ_0 with $\mu_0|_\Omega = \rho_0 dx$, show that they *coincide* with those of Theorem 1.1, and prove that their limit is a *curve of maximal slope* in $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume that $\Omega = (0,1)$, that $\int_0^1 \rho_0 \log \rho_0 dx < \infty$, and that $V \in W^{1,2}(0,1)$. If τ is sufficiently small, then:*

- (1) *The maps $(t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau)_\tau$ resulting from the scheme (1.8) are well-defined, uniquely defined, and coincide with those of Theorem 1.1.*
- (2) *When $\tau \rightarrow 0$, up to subsequences, the maps $(t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau)_\tau$ converge pointwise w.r.t. \widetilde{Wb}_2 to a curve $t \mapsto \mu_t$.*
- (3) *The convergence $\mu^\tau|_\Omega \rightarrow_\tau \mu|_\Omega$ also holds in $L_{\text{loc}}^1((0, \infty); L^q(0,1))$ for every $q \in [1, \infty)$. The curve $t \mapsto \mu_t|_\Omega$ is a weak solution to the Fokker-Planck equation. Denoting by ρ_t be the density of $\mu_t|_\Omega$, the map $t \mapsto (\sqrt{\rho_t} e^V - e^{\Psi/2})$ belongs to $L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty); W_0^{1,2}(0,1))$.*
- (4) *The map $t \mapsto \mu_t$ is a curve of maximal slope for the functional \mathcal{H} in the metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$, see Section 3.5 below.*

Within the general theory of gradient flows in metric spaces developed by L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré in [4] (see [21] for an overview), the ‘curve of maximal slope’ is one of the metric counterparts of the gradient flow in the Euclidean space. To the best of our knowledge, [20] contains the *only* other proof of this metric characterization² in a (Wasserstein-like) space of measures for a PDE with Dirichlet boundary conditions. In the frameworks of [8, 13, 15, 17], as well as ours, the main obstacles to proving that the limit of the scheme is, in fact, a curve of maximal slope are the need for lower semicontinuity of the descending slope of the entropy and the lack of geodesic convexity. Indeed, as observed in the premise to [15, Theorem 1.8], «*it is difficult to find an explicit form of [the slope] and to show its lower semicontinuity [...]. The main technical difficulty is that there is no geodesic convexity for the energy[, which] is a key ingredient to determine the slope*

²To be precise, A. Profeta and K.-T. Sturm prove the Evolution Variational Inequality, which *implies* the formulation as curve of maximal slope, cf. [3, Proposition 3.6].

of an entropy functional in the classical Wasserstein space». Similar considerations were made in [8, Appendix A]: for functionals that are not λ -convex, «the lower semi-continuity of the (relaxed) metric slope [...] is hard to achieve in the absence of any explicit representation».

Nonetheless, in dimension $d = 1$, we are able to find the explicit formula for the descending slope of \mathcal{H} in $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ without resorting to geodesic convexity. As a corollary, we also give an answer, again in dimension $d = 1$, to the problem left open in [13] of identifying the descending slope $|D_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}^- \mathcal{E}|$ of \mathcal{E} with respect to the Figalli–Gigli distance Wb_2 .

Theorem 1.5 (see Corollary 6.5). *Assume that $V \in W^{1,2}(0,1)$. For every $\rho \in L^1_+(0,1)$, we have the formula*

$$(1.9) \quad |D_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}^- \mathcal{E}|^2(\rho) = \begin{cases} 4 \int_0^1 (\partial_x \sqrt{\rho e^V})^2 e^{-V} dx & \text{if } \sqrt{\rho e^V} - 1 \in W_0^{1,2}(0,1), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We believe that the same formula should hold true also in higher dimension. A similar open problem is [8, Conjecture 2].

Plan of the work. In Section 2, we formally derive the objects (entropy and transportation functionals) that appear in the schemes (1.7) and (1.8).

In Section 3, we introduce notation, terminology, and assumptions that are in place throughout the paper, we recall some definitions from the theory of gradient flows in metric spaces, as well as the Figalli–Gigli distance of [13], and we define rigorously the transportation functionals \mathcal{T} and \widetilde{Wb}_2 .

In Section 4, we gather the main properties of these functionals and of the corresponding admissible transport plans. In particular, we show that \widetilde{Wb}_2 is a true metric when Ω is the finite union of one-dimensional intervals.

In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.1.

In Section 6 and Section 7, we focus on the case where $\Omega = (0,1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^1$. In Section 6, we find a formula for the slope of \mathcal{H} in the metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ and prove, as a corollary, Theorem 1.5. In Section 7, making use of Theorem 1.1 and of the slope formula, we prove Theorem 1.4.

Appendix A, contains some additional results on \widetilde{Wb}_2 . Particularly, we prove the lack of geodesic λ -convexity for \mathcal{H} when $\Omega = (0,1)$.

2. FORMAL DERIVATION

Let us work on a completely formal level and postulate that a solution to the Fokker–Planck equation (1.3) is the “Wasserstein-like” gradient flow of some unknown entropy functional Ent. By this we mean the following:

- (1) the motion of ρ_t in Ω is governed by the continuity equation

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \rho_t = -\operatorname{div}(\rho_t \mathbf{v}_t),$$

for some velocity field \mathbf{v}_t ,

- (2) the time-derivative of ρ_t equals the inverse of the Wasserstein gradient of Ent at ρ_t for every t , in the sense that for every sufficiently nice curve $s \mapsto$

f_s of functions on Ω starting at $f_0 = \rho_t$ we have

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{d}{ds} \text{Ent}(f_s dx) \Big|_{s=0} = - \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbf{v}_t, \nabla \psi \rangle \rho_t dx, \quad \text{where } \frac{d}{ds} f_s \Big|_{s=0} = - \text{div}(\rho_t \nabla \psi).$$

We are searching for the right functional Ent and, since we want to retrieve the Fokker–Planck equation, we should try with

$$(2.3) \quad \text{Ent}_0(\rho dx) := \int_{\Omega} (\rho \log \rho + (V - 1)\rho + 1) dx.$$

Then, for a fixed $t \geq 0$ and a curve $s \mapsto f_s$, we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} \text{Ent}_0(f_s dx) = \int_{\Omega} (V + \log f_s) \frac{d}{ds} f_s dx,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \text{Ent}_0(f_s dx) \Big|_{s=0} &= - \int_{\Omega} (V + \log \rho_t) \text{div}(\rho_t \nabla \psi) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \langle (\nabla V + \nabla \log \rho_t), \nabla \psi \rangle \rho_t dx - \int_{\partial\Omega} \Psi \rho_t \langle \nabla \psi, \mathbf{n} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last identity, we used the boundary conditions in (1.3). Let us choose

$$\mathbf{v}_t := -\nabla V - \nabla \log \rho_t,$$

which makes the continuity equation (2.1) true, since ρ_t solves (1.3). Then,

$$\frac{d}{ds} \text{Ent}_0(f_s) \Big|_{s=0} = - \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbf{v}_t, \nabla \psi \rangle \rho_t dx - \int_{\partial\Omega} \Psi \rho_t \langle \nabla \psi, \mathbf{n} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

and we see that Ent_0 is not the right functional, just because of the integral on the boundary. The measure $\langle \nabla \psi, \mathbf{n} \rangle \rho_t d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$ can be seen as the flux of mass (coming from $f_0 = \rho_t$) that is moving away from Ω along the flow $s \mapsto f_s$ at $s = 0$. Thus, if we let this mass settle on the boundary, $\langle \nabla \psi, \mathbf{n} \rangle \rho_t d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$ is the time-derivative of the mass on $\partial\Omega$. For this reason, it makes sense to consider not just measures on Ω , but rather on the closure $\overline{\Omega}$, and to define the entropy as

$$\text{Ent}(\mu) := \text{Ent}_0(\mu|_{\Omega}) + \int \Psi d\mu|_{\partial\Omega}.$$

Our entropy functional \mathcal{H} is defined precisely like this, and, as we will see in Section 3, the transportation functionals \mathcal{T} and \widetilde{Wb}_2 are extensions of Wb_2 to the subset \mathcal{S} of the signed measures on $\overline{\Omega}$, constructed so as to encode the idea that mass leaks from Ω settle on $\partial\Omega$ (and vice versa).

This argument is simple, but we should also emphasize the hidden difficulties:

- we assume low regularity on V and $\partial\Omega$;
- the transportation-cost functionals \widetilde{Wb}_2 and \mathcal{T} will not be, in general, distances. This prevents us from directly applying the theory of metric gradient flows [4];
- the functional \mathcal{H} is not bounded from below on \mathcal{S} (if Ψ is nonconstant), nor it is strictly convex. Indeed, it is linear along lines of the form $\lambda \mapsto \mu + \lambda\eta$ with $\mu, \eta \in \mathcal{S}$ and η concentrated on $\partial\Omega$;
- when $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ is a geodesic metric space, the functional \mathcal{H} is *not* geodesically λ -convex, see [13, Remark 3.4] and Appendix A.3.

3. PRELIMINARIES

3.1. Setting. Throughout the paper, Ω is an open, bounded, and nonempty subset of \mathbb{R}^d . Without loss of generality, we assume that $0 \in \Omega$. No assumption is made on the regularity of its boundary.

Three functions are given: the initial datum $\rho_0: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the potential $V: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the function $\Psi: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that determines the boundary condition. We assume that Ψ is Lipschitz continuous and that the integral $\int_{\Omega} \rho_0 \log \rho_0 \, dx$ is finite. Further, we suppose that V is bounded (i.e., in $L^\infty(\Omega)$) and in the set of locally Sobolev functions $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,d^+}(\Omega)$.

Definition 3.1. We say that $V \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,d^+}(\Omega)$ if, for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$ open, there exists $p = p(\omega) > d$ such that $V \in W^{1,p}(\omega)$.

In particular, $V \in C(\Omega)$.

The set \mathcal{S} is the convex cone of all finite and signed Borel measures μ on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that (1.4) holds.

Proposition 3.2. *The set \mathcal{S} is closed w.r.t. the weak convergence, i.e., in duality with continuous and bounded functions on $\overline{\Omega}$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{S} \ni \mu^n \rightarrow_n \mu$, then $\mu(\overline{\Omega}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^n(\overline{\Omega}) = 0$ and, for every $f: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ continuous and compactly supported in Ω ,

$$\int f \, d\mu_\Omega = \int f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu_\Omega^n \geq 0.$$

The conclusion follows from the Riesz–Markov–Kakutani theorem. \square

The *entropy functionals* $\mathcal{E}: L_+^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $\mathcal{H}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ are defined in (1.5) and (1.6), respectively.

3.2. Convention on constants. The symbol \mathfrak{c} is reserved for strictly positive real constants. The number it represents *may change from formula to formula* and possibly depends on the dimension d , the set Ω , the functions V and Ψ , and the initial datum ρ_0 . We also allow \mathfrak{c} to depend on other quantities, which are, in case, explicitly displayed as a subscript.

3.3. Measures. For every signed Borel measure μ and Borel set A , we write $\mu_A = \mu|_A$ for the restriction of μ to A . Similarly, and following the notation of [13, 17], if γ is a measure on a product space and A, B are Borel, we write $\gamma_A^B = \gamma_{A \times B}$ for the restriction of γ to $A \times B$. We use the notation μ_+, μ_- for the positive and negative parts of a given measure μ , and $\|\mu\|$ for the total-variation norm of μ , i.e., the total mass of $\mu_+ + \mu_-$.

For every Borel function f and signed Borel measure μ , we denote by $\mu(f)$ the integral $\int f \, d\mu$.

On the set of finite signed Borel measures on $\overline{\Omega}$, we also consider the (modified) Kantorovich–Rubinstein norm (see [5, Section 8.10(viii)])

$$(3.1) \quad \|\mu\|_{\widetilde{\text{KR}}} := \left| \mu(\overline{\Omega}) \right| + \sup \left\{ \mu(f) : f: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{Lip}(f) \leq 1 \text{ and } f(0) = 0 \right\}.$$

We write $F\#\mu$ for the push-forward of a (signed) Borel measure μ via a Borel map F . Often, we use as F the projection onto some coordinate: we write π^i for the projection on the i^{th} coordinate (or π^{ij} for the projection on the two coordinates i and j).

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$, we denote by \mathcal{L}^k the k -dimensional Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^k . We also use the notation $|A| := \mathcal{L}^k(A)$ when $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ is a Borel set. We write δ_x for the Dirac delta measure at x .

3.4. Weak solution to the Fokker–Planck equation. We say that a family of nonnegative measures $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on Ω is a weak solution to the Fokker–Planck equation if:

- (1) it is continuous in duality with the space of continuous and compactly supported functions $C_c(\Omega)$;
- (2) for every open set $\omega \Subset \Omega$, both $t \mapsto \mu_t(\omega)$ and $t \mapsto \int |\nabla V| d\mu_t|_\omega$ belong to $L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty))$, i.e., their restrictions to $(0, \bar{t})$ are integrable for every $\bar{t} > 0$;
- (3) for every $\varphi \in C_c^2(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq s \leq t$, the following identity holds:

$$(3.2) \quad \int \varphi d\mu_t - \int \varphi d\mu_s = \int_s^t \int (\Delta\varphi - \langle \nabla\varphi, \nabla V \rangle) d\mu_r dr.$$

3.5. Metric gradient flows. The general theory of gradient flows in metric spaces was developed in [4]; we refer to this book and to the survey [21] for a comprehensive exposition of the topic. We collect here only the definitions we need from this theory.

Let (X, d) be a metric space, let $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto x_t$ be an X -valued map, and let $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a function.

Definition 3.3 (Metric derivative [4, Theorem 1.1.2]). We say that $(x_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ is *locally absolutely continuous* if there exists a function $m \in L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty))$ such that

$$(3.3) \quad d(x_s, x_t) \leq \int_s^t m(r) dr$$

for every $0 \leq s < t$. If $(x_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ is locally absolutely continuous, for $\mathcal{L}^1_{[0, \infty)}$ -a.e. t there exists the limit

$$(3.4) \quad |\dot{x}_t| := \lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{d(x_s, x_t)}{|s - t|},$$

and this function, called *metric derivative*, is the $\mathcal{L}^1_{[0, \infty)}$ -a.e. minimal function m that satisfies (3.3), see [4, Theorem 1.1.2].³

Definition 3.4 (Descending slope [4, Definition 1.2.4]). The *descending slope* of f at $x \in X$ is the number

$$(3.5) \quad |D^- f|(x) = |D_{\text{d}}^- f|(x) := \limsup_{y \xrightarrow{d} x} \frac{(f(x) - f(y))_+}{d(x, y)},$$

where $a_+ := \max\{0, a\}$ is the positive part of $a \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. The slope is conventionally set equal to ∞ if $f(x) = \infty$, and to 0 if x is isolated and $f(x) < \infty$.

Definition 3.5 (Curve of maximal slope [4, Definition 1.3.2]). We say that a locally absolutely continuous X -valued map $(x_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ is a *curve of maximal slope* if $t \mapsto f(x_t)$ is a.e. equal to a nonincreasing map $\phi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.6) \quad \dot{\phi}(t) \leq -\frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}_t|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|D_{\text{d}}^- f|^2(x_t) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1_{[0, \infty)}$$
-a.e. t .

³In [4, Theorem 1.1.2], the completeness of the space is assumed but not necessary, as can be easily checked.

Definition 3.5 is motivated by the observation that, when (X, \mathbf{d}) is a Euclidean space and f is smooth, the inequality (3.6) is equivalent to the gradient-flow equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_t = -\nabla f(x_t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

see for instance [21, Section 2.2]. As noted in [4, Remark 1.3.3],⁴ even in the general metric setting, (3.6) actually implies the identities

$$-\dot{\phi}(t) = |\dot{x}_t|^2 = |\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{d}}^- f|^2(x_t)$$

for a.e. $t \geq 0$.

3.6. The Figalli–Gigli distance. We briefly recall the definition and some properties of the distance Wb_2 introduced in [13].

We denote by $\mathcal{M}_2(\Omega)$ the set of nonnegative Borel measures μ on Ω such that

$$(3.7) \quad \int \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|^2 d\mu(x) < \infty,$$

and, for every nonnegative Borel measure γ on $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$, define the cost functional

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{C}(\gamma) := \int |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y).$$

Definition 3.6 ([13, Problem 1.1]). Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_2(\Omega)$. We say that a nonnegative Borel measure γ on $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ is a *Wb_2 -admissible transport plan* between μ and ν , and write $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{Wb_2}(\mu, \nu)$, if

$$(3.9) \quad (\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma)_{\Omega} = \mu \quad \text{and} \quad (\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma)_{\Omega} = \nu.$$

The distance $Wb_2(\mu, \nu)$ is then defined as

$$(3.10) \quad Wb_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf \left\{ \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)} : \gamma \in \text{Adm}_{Wb_2}(\mu, \nu) \right\}.$$

In [13, Section 2], it was observed that for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_2(\Omega)$ there exists at least one Wb_2 -optimal transport plan, that is, a measure $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{Wb_2}(\mu, \nu)$ that attains the infimum in (3.10).

Later, we will make use of the following consequences of [13, Proposition 2.7]: the convergence w.r.t. the metric Wb_2 implies the convergence in duality with $C_c(\Omega)$, and it is implied by the convergence in duality with $C_b(\Omega)$.

3.7. Transportation functionals/distances. We now define the transportation functionals \mathcal{T} and \widehat{Wb}_2 that appear in the schemes (1.7) and (1.8).

Definition 3.7. For every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\text{Adm}_{\widehat{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$ be the set of all finite nonnegative Borel measures γ on $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ such that

- (1) $(\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma)_{\Omega} = \mu_{\Omega}$,
- (2) $(\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma)_{\Omega} = \nu_{\Omega}$,
- (3) $\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma = \mu - \nu$.

⁴Once again, completeness is not necessary.

We call such measures \widetilde{Wb}_2 -admissible transport plans between μ and ν . We set

$$(3.11) \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf \left\{ \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)} : \gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu) \right\}$$

and write

$$(3.12) \quad \text{Opt}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu) := \arg \min_{\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)} \mathcal{C}(\gamma)$$

for the set of all the \widetilde{Wb}_2 -optimal transport plans between μ and ν .

Remark 3.8. There is some redundancy in the properties (1)-(3), indeed,

$$(1) + (3) \Rightarrow (2) \quad \text{and} \quad (2) + (3) \Rightarrow (1).$$

Definition 3.9. For every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ be the set of all measures $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$ such that, additionally,

$$(4) \quad \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

We define the \mathcal{T} -admissible/optimal transport plans as in (3.11) and (3.12), by replacing \widetilde{Wb}_2 with \mathcal{T} .

Remark 3.10. If $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ for some $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, then

$$(3.13) \quad \|\gamma\| \leq \left\| \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}} \right\| + \left\| \gamma_{\overline{\Omega}}^{\Omega} \right\| = \|\mu_{\Omega}\| + \|\nu_{\Omega}\|.$$

Let us briefly comment about these definitions. Conditions (1) and (2) are precisely the same as (3.9). They are needed to ensure that the mass that departs from (resp. arrives in) Ω is precisely μ_{Ω} (resp. ν_{Ω}). Condition (3) is needed to also keep track of the mass that is exchanged with the boundary. Since μ and ν normally have a negative mass on some subregions of $\partial\Omega$, it does not make sense to naively impose $\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma = \mu$ and $\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma = \nu$. Note that, in Definition 3.9, a \mathcal{T} -admissible transport plan does not move mass from $\partial\Omega$ to $\partial\Omega$. It is shown in Proposition A.1 that this additional condition is needed in dimension $d \geq 2$, because the information about $\mu_{\partial\Omega}$ and $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ may otherwise be lost. This does not happen when Ω is just a finite union of intervals in \mathbb{R}^1 , because points in $\partial\Omega$ are distant from each other. We will see that, in this case, Definition 3.7 defines a distance. This remark reveals part of the difficulties in building cost functionals for signed measures that behave like W_2 . See [16] for further details. However, it seems at least convenient to use signed measures, given that a modified JKO scheme that mimics [13] should allow for a virtually unlimited amount of mass to be taken from points of $\partial\Omega$, step after step.

4. PROPERTIES OF THE TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONALS

We gather some useful properties of \mathcal{T} and \widetilde{Wb}_2 .

4.1. Relation with the Figalli–Gigli distance. For every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, we have the inclusions

$$\text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \text{Adm}_{Wb_2}(\mu_{\Omega}, \nu_{\Omega}).$$

As a consequence,

$$(4.1) \quad Wb_2(\mu_{\Omega}, \nu_{\Omega}) \leq \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu), \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}.$$

In fact, \widetilde{Wb}_2 and \mathcal{T} can be seen as extensions of Wb_2 in the following sense.

Lemma 4.1. *For every pair of finite nonnegative Borel measures μ, ν on Ω , we have the identities*

$$(4.2) \quad Wb_2(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\mu}_\Omega = \mu, \tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu \right\}$$

$$(4.3) \quad = \inf_{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathcal{T}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\mu}_\Omega = \mu, \tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu \right\}$$

$$(4.4) \quad = \sup_{\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu \right\} : \tilde{\mu}_\Omega = \mu \right\}$$

$$(4.5) \quad = \sup_{\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathcal{T}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu \right\} : \tilde{\mu}_\Omega = \mu \right\}.$$

Proof. In light of (4.1), it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathcal{T}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu \right\}, \tilde{\mu}_\Omega = \mu \right\} \leq Wb_2(\mu, \nu).$$

Let $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\tilde{\mu}_\Omega = \mu$ and let $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{Wb_2}(\mu, \nu)$. Define $\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma - \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega}$ and

$$\tilde{\nu} := \tilde{\mu} + \pi_{\#}^2 \tilde{\gamma} - \pi_{\#}^1 \tilde{\gamma}.$$

It is easy to check that $\tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu$, that $\tilde{\gamma} \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu})$, and that $\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma)$. As a consequence,

$$\inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathcal{T}(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\nu}_\Omega = \nu \right\} \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)},$$

and we conclude by arbitrariness of γ and $\tilde{\mu}$. \square

4.2. Relation with the Kantorovich–Rubinstein norm. Interestingly, an inequality relates \widetilde{Wb}_2 and $\|\cdot\|_{\widetilde{\text{KR}}}$.

Lemma 4.2. *For every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, we have*

$$(4.6) \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\mu - \nu\|_{\widetilde{\text{KR}}}.$$

Proof. Define the nonnegative measures

$$\tilde{\mu} := \mu_\Omega + (\mu_{\partial\Omega} - \nu_{\partial\Omega})_+, \quad \tilde{\nu} := \nu_\Omega + (\mu_{\partial\Omega} - \nu_{\partial\Omega})_-,$$

and note that $\tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\nu} = \mu - \nu$. In particular, $\tilde{\mu}(\overline{\Omega}) = \tilde{\nu}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Let γ be a coupling between $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\nu}$, i.e., γ is a nonnegative Borel measure on $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma = \tilde{\mu}$ and $\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma = \tilde{\nu}$. Notice that γ is \widetilde{Wb}_2 -admissible between μ and ν . Therefore,

$$\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma) = \int |x - y|^2 d\gamma \leq \text{diam}(\Omega) \int |x - y| d\gamma.$$

After taking the infimum over γ , the Kantorovich–Rubinstein duality [5, Theorem 8.10.45] implies

$$\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\nu}\|_{\widetilde{\text{KR}}} = \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\mu - \nu\|_{\widetilde{\text{KR}}}. \quad \square$$

4.3. The functional \mathcal{T} is an extended semimetric. The functional \mathcal{T} may take the value infinity and does not satisfy the triangle inequality.

Example 4.3. Consider, for the domain $\Omega := (0, 1)$, the measures

$$\mu_1 := \delta_0 - \delta_1 \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \mu_2 := \delta_{1/2} - \delta_1 \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \mu_3 := 0 \in \mathcal{S}.$$

The transport plans $\gamma_{12} := \delta_{(0,1/2)}$ and $\gamma_{23} := \delta_{(1/2,1)}$ are \mathcal{T} -admissible, between μ_1 and μ_2 , and between μ_2 and μ_3 , respectively. Thus, both $\mathcal{T}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mu_2, \mu_3)$ are bounded above by $1/2$. However, there is no $\gamma_{13} \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu_1, \mu_3)$. Indeed, Conditions (1) and (2) in Definition 3.7 would imply $(\gamma_{13})_{\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}} = (\gamma_{13})_{\Omega}^{\Omega} = 0$. Together with (4) in Definition 3.9, this means that γ_{13} has to equal the zero measure, which contradicts (3) in Definition 3.7.

Nonetheless, we have the following proposition, which we prove together with two useful lemmas.

Proposition 4.4. *The functional \mathcal{T} is an extended semimetric, i.e., it is nonnegative, symmetric, and we have*

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu) = 0 \iff \mu = \nu.$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(\nu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be two sequences in \mathcal{S} , and let $\gamma^n \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^n, \nu^n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Assume that*

- (a) $\mu^n \rightarrow_n \mu$ and $\nu^n \rightarrow_n \nu$ weakly for some μ, ν ,
- (b) $\mu_{\Omega}^n \rightarrow_n \mu_{\Omega}$ and $\nu_{\Omega}^n \rightarrow_n \nu_{\Omega}$ setwise, i.e., on all Borel sets,
- (c) $\gamma^n \rightarrow_n \gamma$ weakly.

Then $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$.

In particular, for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, the set $\text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ is sequentially closed with respect to the weak convergence.

The proof of this lemma is inspired by part of that of [17, Lemma 3.1].

Proof. The total mass of γ^n is bounded and, therefore, the same can be said for the total mass of $(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\Omega}$, $(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\partial\Omega}$, $(\gamma^n)_{\partial\Omega}^{\Omega}$. Hence, up to taking a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\Omega} &\rightarrow_n \sigma_1 \quad \text{in duality with } C(\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}), \\ (\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} &\rightarrow_n \sigma_2 \quad \text{in duality with } C(\overline{\Omega} \times \partial\Omega), \\ (\gamma^n)_{\partial\Omega}^{\Omega} &\rightarrow_n \sigma_3 \quad \text{in duality with } C(\partial\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$. In particular, $\gamma^n \rightarrow_n \gamma := \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3$.

We claim that $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ are concentrated on $\Omega \times \Omega$, $\Omega \times \partial\Omega$, $\partial\Omega \times \Omega$ respectively. If this is true, then Condition (4) in Definition 3.9 for γ is obvious, and those in Definition 3.7 follow by testing them with a function $f \in C_b(\overline{\Omega})$ for every n and passing to the limit. For instance, to prove Condition (1) in Definition 3.7, we have the chain of equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\Omega}(f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\Omega}^n(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f(x) d(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}}(x, y) \\ &= \int f(x) d(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)(x, y) = \int f(x) d\gamma_{\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}}(x, y) = (\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}})(f). \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove the claim. Let $A \subseteq \overline{\Omega}$ be an open set, in the relative topology of $\overline{\Omega}$, that contains $\partial\Omega$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(\partial\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}) &\leq \sigma_1(A \times \overline{\Omega}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega(A \times \overline{\Omega}) \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\gamma^n)_\Omega^{\overline{\Omega}}(A \times \overline{\Omega}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\Omega^n(A) = \mu_\Omega(A), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the semicontinuity of the mass on open sets (in the topology of $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$) and the last equality from the setwise convergence. Since μ_Ω has finite total mass and $\mu_\Omega(\partial\Omega) = 0$, we have $\sigma_1(\partial\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}) = 0$. Analogously, using Condition (2) in place of Condition (1), we obtain $\sigma_1(\overline{\Omega} \times \partial\Omega) = 0$. For σ_2 and σ_3 , the proof is similar. \square

Lemma 4.6. *If $\mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu) < \infty$, then $\text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $\text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ is nonempty and weakly sequentially compact. It is nonempty if $\mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu) < \infty$. It is sequentially compact because

$$\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu) \stackrel{(3.13)}{\implies} \|\gamma\| \leq \|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\|,$$

and thanks to Lemma 4.5. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Only the implication \Rightarrow in (4.7) is not immediate. Let us assume that $\mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu) = 0$ and let $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$. Since $\mathcal{C}(\gamma) = 0$, the measure γ is concentrated on the diagonal of $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$. Thus, the equality $\mu = \nu$ follows from Condition (3) in Definition 3.7. \square

We conclude with a corollary of Lemma 4.5: a semicontinuity property of \mathcal{T} .

Corollary 4.7. *Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(\nu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be two sequences in \mathcal{S} . Assume that*

- (a) $\mu^n \rightarrow_n \mu$ and $\nu^n \rightarrow_n \nu$ weakly for some μ, ν ,
- (b) $\mu_\Omega^n \rightarrow_n \mu_\Omega$ and $\nu_\Omega^n \rightarrow_n \nu_\Omega$ setwise, i.e., on all Borel sets.

Then

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}(\mu^n, \nu^n).$$

Proof. We may assume that the right-hand side in (4.8) exists as a finite limit and that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists $\gamma^n \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}(\gamma^n) \leq \mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \nu^n) + \frac{1}{n}.$$

The total variation of each measure γ^n is bounded by $\|\mu_\Omega^n\| + \|\nu_\Omega^n\|$, which is in turn bounded thanks to the assumption. Therefore, we can extract a subsequence $(\gamma^{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ that converges weakly to a measure γ . We know from Lemma 4.5 that $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$; thus

$$\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}(\gamma^{n_k}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}^2(\mu^{n_k}, \nu^{n_k}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \nu^n). \quad \square$$

4.4. The functional \mathcal{H} is “semicontinuous w.r.t \mathcal{T} ”. Albeit not being a distance, the transportation functional \mathcal{T} makes \mathcal{H} lower semicontinuous, in the following sense.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{S} and suppose that*

$$(4.9) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}(\mu^n, \mu) = 0$$

for some $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$. Then

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}(\mu^n).$$

For the proof we need a lemma, to which we will also often refer later. This lemma, inspired by [17, Lemma 5.8] allows to control $(\mu - \nu)_{\partial\Omega}$ in terms of $\mathcal{T}(\mu, \nu)$ and of the restrictions μ_Ω and ν_Ω . This fact is convenient for two reasons:

- the part of the entropy that depends on μ_Ω is superlinear,
- we will see (Remark 5.15) that *the restrictions to Ω* of the measures produced by the scheme (1.7) have bounded (in time) mass.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\tau > 0$, let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, and let $\Phi: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz continuous. Then,*

$$(4.11) \quad |\mu(\Phi) - \nu(\Phi)| \leq \mathfrak{c}_\Phi \tau (\|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\|) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \nu)}{4\tau}.$$

In particular,

$$(4.12) \quad \mu_{\partial\Omega}(\Phi) - \nu_{\partial\Omega}(\Phi) \leq \nu_\Omega(\Phi) - \mu_\Omega(\Phi) + \mathfrak{c}_\Phi \tau (\|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\|) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \nu)}{4\tau}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$. By Definition 3.7 and Definition 3.9, we have the chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(\Phi) - \nu(\Phi)| &= |(\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma)(\Phi)| = \left| \int (\Phi(x) - \Phi(y)) \, d\gamma(x, y) \right| \\ &\leq \int \sqrt{2\tau} (\text{Lip } \Phi) \cdot \frac{|x - y|}{\sqrt{2\tau}} \, d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\leq \tau (\text{Lip } \Phi)^2 \|\gamma\| + \frac{1}{4\tau} \int |x - y|^2 \, d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\leq \tau (\text{Lip } \Phi)^2 (\|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\|) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \nu)}{4\tau}, \end{aligned}$$

and the conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.8. We may assume that the right-hand side in (4.10) exists as a finite limit and that $\mathcal{H}(\mu^n)$ is finite for every n . In particular, μ_Ω^n is absolutely continuous w.r.t. \mathcal{L}_Ω^d . Denote by ρ^n its density. Owing to Lemma 4.9, for every $\tau > 0$ and n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) &= \mathcal{E}(\rho^n) + \mu_{\partial\Omega}^n(\Psi) \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} (\log \rho^n + V - 1 - \mathfrak{c}\tau - \Psi) \rho^n \, dx + |\Omega| + \mu(\Psi) - \mathfrak{c}\tau \|\mu_\Omega\| - \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \mu)}{4\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the sequence $(\rho^n)_n$ is uniformly integrable; thus, it admits a (not re-labeled) subsequence that converges, weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$, to some function ρ . From (4.1) and [13, Proposition 2.7], we infer that $\mu_\Omega^n \rightarrow \mu_\Omega$ in duality with $C_c(\Omega)$ and, therefore, ρ is precisely the density of μ_Ω . The functional \mathcal{E} is convex and lower semicontinuous on $L^1(\Omega)$ (by Fatou's lemma), hence weakly lower semicontinuous. Thus, we are only left with proving that

$$\mu_{\partial\Omega}(\Psi) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\partial\Omega}^n(\Psi).$$

Once again, we make use of Lemma 4.9 and of the weak convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$ to write, for every $\tau > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mu - \mu^n)_{\partial\Omega}(\Psi) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} c\tau (\|\mu_\Omega^n\| + \|\mu_\Omega\|) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \mu)}{4\tau} \leq c\tau \|\mu_\Omega\| .$$

We conclude by arbitrariness of τ . \square

4.5. The functional $\widetilde{W}b_2$ is a pseudodistance. The functional $\widetilde{W}b_2$ is a pseudodistance on \mathcal{S} , meaning that it fulfills the properties of a distance, except, possibly, $\mu = \nu$ when $\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \nu) = 0$. As before, nonnegativity, symmetry, and the implication

$$\mu = \nu \implies \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \nu) = 0$$

are obvious. To prove finiteness, it suffices to produce a single $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu, \nu)$ for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$. Let us arbitrarily fix a probability measure ζ on $\partial\Omega$ and set

$$\eta := \mu_{\partial\Omega} - \nu_{\partial\Omega} + (\|\mu_\Omega\| - \|\nu_\Omega\|)\zeta .$$

The following is $\widetilde{W}b_2$ -admissible:

$$\gamma := \begin{cases} \mu_\Omega \otimes \zeta + \zeta \otimes \nu_\Omega + \frac{\eta_+ \otimes \eta_-}{\|\eta_+\|} & \text{if } \eta \neq 0, \\ \mu_\Omega \otimes \zeta + \zeta \otimes \nu_\Omega & \text{if } \eta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Only the triangle inequality is still missing.

Proposition 4.10. *The functional $\widetilde{W}b_2$ satisfies the triangle inequality. Hence, it is a pseudodistance.*

Proof. Let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \mathcal{S}$, and let us view them as measures on three different copies of $\overline{\Omega}$, that we denote by $\overline{\Omega}_1, \overline{\Omega}_2, \overline{\Omega}_3$, respectively. We write π^2 for both the projections from $\overline{\Omega}_1 \times \overline{\Omega}_2$ and $\overline{\Omega}_2 \times \overline{\Omega}_3$ onto $\overline{\Omega}_2$.

Choose two transport plans $\gamma_{12} \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and $\gamma_{23} \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu_2, \mu_3)$. Let $\eta := (\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{23} - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{12})_{\partial\Omega}$ and consider

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{12} := \gamma_{12} + (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_{\#} \eta_+, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{23} := \gamma_{23} + (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_{\#} \eta_- .$$

It is easy to check that these are admissible too, i.e., $\tilde{\gamma}_{12} \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{23} \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu_2, \mu_3)$, as well as that $\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{12}) = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma}_{12})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{23}) = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma}_{23})$. Furthermore, $\pi_{\#}^2 \tilde{\gamma}_{12}$ equals $\pi_{\#}^2 \tilde{\gamma}_{23}$. The gluing lemma [4, Lemma 5.3.2] supplies a nonnegative Borel measure $\tilde{\gamma}_{123}$ such that

$$\pi_{\#}^{12} \tilde{\gamma}_{123} = \tilde{\gamma}_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{\#}^{23} \tilde{\gamma}_{123} = \tilde{\gamma}_{23} .$$

The measure $\gamma := \pi_{\#}^{13} \tilde{\gamma}_{123}$ is $\widetilde{W}b_2$ -admissible between μ_1 and μ_2 . By the Minkowski inequality,

$$\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_1, \mu_2) \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma}_{12})} + \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma}_{23})} = \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{12})} + \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{23})} ,$$

from which, by arbitrariness of γ_{12} and γ_{23} , the triangle inequality follows. \square

In general, $\widetilde{W}b_2$ is *not* a true metric on \mathcal{S} . This is proven in Proposition A.1. However, an analogue of Lemma 4.5 holds (proof omitted).

Lemma 4.11. *Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(\nu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be two sequences in \mathcal{S} , and let $\gamma^n \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu^n, \nu^n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Assume that*

$$(a) \quad \mu^n \rightarrow_n \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^n \rightarrow_n \nu \quad \text{weakly for some } \mu, \nu,$$

- (b) $\mu_\Omega^n \rightarrow_n \mu_\Omega$ and $\nu_\Omega^n \rightarrow_n \nu_\Omega$ setwise, i.e., on all Borel sets,
 (c) $\gamma^n \rightarrow_n \gamma$ weakly.

Then $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$.

In particular, for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, the set $\text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$ is sequentially closed with respect to the weak convergence.

4.6. When Ω is a finite union of intervals, \widetilde{Wb}_2 is a distance. When Ω is a finite union of 1-dimensional intervals (equivalently, when $\partial\Omega$ is a finite set) we also have

$$\widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) = 0 \iff \mu = \nu.$$

Proposition 4.12. *If $d = 1$ and Ω is a finite union of intervals, then $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ is a metric space.*

This proposition is an easy consequence of the following remark and lemma, analog to Remark 3.10 and Lemma 4.6, respectively.

Remark 4.13. Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ and pick $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$. If $\partial\Omega$ is finite and the diagonal of $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$ is γ -negligible, then

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\gamma\| &\leq \left\| \gamma_{\overline{\Omega}} \right\| + \left\| \gamma_{\overline{\Omega}} \right\| + \left\| \gamma_{\partial\Omega} \right\| \leq \|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\| + \frac{1}{\min_{\substack{x, y \in \partial\Omega \\ x \neq y}} |x - y|^2} \int |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\leq \|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\| + \mathfrak{c}\mathcal{C}(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.14. *Assume that $d = 1$ and that Ω is a finite union of intervals. Then the set $\text{Opt}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$ is nonempty for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. We already know that $\text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu) \neq \emptyset$. Let us take a minimizing sequence $(\gamma^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$ for the cost functional \mathcal{C} . Let Δ be the diagonal of $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$. It is easy to see that $(\gamma^n - \gamma^n|_\Delta)_n$ is still an admissible and minimizing sequence. Therefore, we can assume that $\gamma^n|_\Delta = 0$. By Remark 4.13, the total variation of γ^n is bounded. Therefore, there exists a subsequence of $(\gamma^n)_n$ that converges weakly to a limit γ and, by Lemma 4.11, $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$. Since the sequence is minimizing, γ is also \widetilde{Wb}_2 -optimal. \square

Two further useful facts about \widetilde{Wb}_2 are the counterparts of Lemma 4.9 and Proposition 4.8 in the case where Ω is a finite union of intervals.

Lemma 4.15. *Assume that $d = 1$ and that Ω is a finite union of intervals. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ and let $\Phi: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz continuous. Then,*

$$(4.14) \quad |\mu(\Phi) - \nu(\Phi)| \leq \mathfrak{c}_\Phi \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) \sqrt{\|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\nu_\Omega\| + \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \nu)}.$$

Proof. By Condition (3) in Definition 3.7, for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ and every $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \nu)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(\Phi) - \nu(\Phi)| &= \left| \int (\Phi(x) - \Phi(y)) d\gamma(x, y) \right| \leq (\text{Lip } \Phi) \int |x - y| d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\leq (\text{Lip } \Phi) \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)} \|\gamma\| = (\text{Lip } \Phi) \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) \sqrt{\|\gamma\|}. \end{aligned}$$

We can assume that the diagonal of $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$ is γ -negligible; hence, we conclude by Remark 4.13. \square

Proposition 4.16. *Assume that $d = 1$ and that Ω is a finite union of intervals. Then \mathcal{H} is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.8, making use of Lemma 4.15 in place of Lemma 4.9. \square

When $\widetilde{W}b_2$ defines a metric, a natural question is whether or not this metric is complete. In general, the answer is *no*; this is proven in Proposition A.2. Of course, we could take the completion of $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{W}b_2)$, but, in fact, completeness will never be necessary. Nonetheless, we prove in Proposition A.3 that the sublevels of the functional \mathcal{H} are, instead, complete for $\widetilde{W}b_2$, which means that we could as well work on a sublevel and forget about any potential issue with completeness.

Another interesting problem is to find a convergence criterion for $\widetilde{W}b_2$. Exploiting Lemma 4.2, we find a simple sufficient condition for convergence in the 1-dimensional setting.

Lemma 4.17. *Assume that $d = 1$ and that Ω is a finite union of intervals. If $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ converges weakly to $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\mu^n \xrightarrow{\widetilde{W}b_2} \mu$.*

Proof. The idea is to use Lemma 4.2 together with the measure theoretic result [5, Theorem 8.3.2]: the metric induced by $\|\cdot\|_{\overline{\text{KR}}}$ metrizes the weak convergence⁵ of nonnegative Borel measures on $\overline{\Omega}$. For every $x \in \partial\Omega$, let $a_x := -\inf_n \mu_n(x)$. Every number a_x is finite because, by the uniform boundedness principle, the total variation of μ^n is bounded. By the considerations above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^n \rightarrow_n \mu \text{ weakly} &\implies \mu^n + \sum_{x \in \partial\Omega} a_x \delta_x \rightarrow_n \mu + \sum_{x \in \partial\Omega} a_x \delta_x \text{ weakly} \\ &\implies \|\mu^n - \mu\|_{\overline{\text{KR}}} \rightarrow_n 0 \stackrel{(4.6)}{\implies} \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu^n, \mu) \rightarrow_n 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.18. The converse of Lemma 4.17 is not true: in the case $\Omega := (0, 1)$, consider the sequence

$$\mu^n := n(\delta_{1/n} - \delta_0), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_1,$$

which converges to $\mu := 0$ w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$.

4.7. Estimate on the directional derivative. The following lemma will be used in Proposition 5.7 to characterize the solutions of the variational problem (1.7). We omit its simple proof, almost identical to that of [13, Proposition 2.11].

Lemma 4.19. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$. Further let $\mathbf{w}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded and Borel vector field with compact support. Let $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_\tau(\mu, \nu)$. For $t > 0$ sufficiently small, define $\mu_t := (\text{Id} + t\mathbf{w})\# \mu$. Then*

$$(4.15) \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu_t, \nu) - \mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \nu)}{t} \leq -2 \int \langle \mathbf{w}(x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y).$$

⁵In [5], two Kantorovich–Rubinstein norms are defined. Here, we implicitly use that they are equivalent on measures on a bounded metric space, see [5, Section 8.10(viii)].

4.8. **Existence of transport maps.** Note the following.

Proposition 4.20. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$, let $A, B \subseteq \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ be Borel sets, and let γ be a nonnegative Borel measure on $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$. If*

- (a) *either $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\overline{Wb_2}}(\mu, \nu)$,*
- (b) *or $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ and $(A \times B) \cap (\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega) = \emptyset$,*

then γ_A^B is optimal for the classical 2-Wasserstein distance between its marginals.

Consequently: under the assumptions of this proposition, if one of the two marginals of γ_A^B is absolutely continuous, we can apply Brenier's theorem [6] and deduce the existence of the optimal transport map. For instance, whenever μ_Ω is absolutely continuous, there exists a Borel map $T: \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\gamma_\Omega^\Omega = (\text{Id}, T)_\# \mu_\Omega$.

Proof of Proposition 4.20. Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be any nonnegative Borel coupling between $\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_A^B$ and $\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_A^B$. In particular, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is concentrated on $A \times B$. Define the nonnegative measure

$$\gamma' := \gamma - \gamma_A^B + \tilde{\gamma}.$$

Note that

$$\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma' = \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma' = \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma,$$

which yields

$$\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\overline{Wb_2}}(\mu, \nu) \implies \gamma' \in \text{Adm}_{\overline{Wb_2}}(\mu, \nu).$$

Furthermore, if $\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = 0$, then $(\gamma')_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = \tilde{\gamma}_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega}$. Thus,

$$[\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu) \text{ and } (A \times B) \cap (\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega) = \emptyset] \implies \gamma' \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu).$$

Hence, if either $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\overline{Wb_2}}(\mu, \nu)$, or $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \nu)$ and $(A \times B) \cap (\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega) = \emptyset$, then, by optimality, $\mathcal{C}(\gamma) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma')$, and we infer that $\mathcal{C}(\gamma_A^B) \leq \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma})$. We conclude by arbitrariness of $\tilde{\gamma}$. \square

In [13, Proposition 2.3] and [17, Proposition 3.2], the authors give more precise characterizations of the optimal plans for their respective transportation functionals in terms of suitable c -cyclical monotonicity of the support, as in the classical optimal transport theory (see, e.g., [2, Lecture 3]). Existence of transport plans is then derived as a consequence. We believe that a similar analysis can be carried out for the transport plans in $\text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\text{Opt}_{\overline{Wb_2}}$, but it is not necessary for the purpose of this work.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Recall the scheme (1.7): we first fix a measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that its restriction to Ω is absolutely continuous (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure) with density equal to ρ_0 . Then, for every $\tau > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we iteratively choose

$$\mu_{(n+1)\tau}^\tau \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \mu_{n\tau}^\tau)}{2\tau} \right).$$

For all $\tau > 0$, these sequences are extended to maps $t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau$, constant on the intervals $[n\tau, (n+1)\tau)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

We are going to prove Theorem 1.1 in seven steps, corresponding to as many (sub)sections:

1. Existence: The scheme is well-posed, in the sense that there exist minimum points for the variational problem (1.7).

2. Boundary condition: The minimizers of (1.7) approximately satisfy the boundary condition $\rho|_{\partial\Omega} = e^{\Psi-V}$.
3. Sobolev regularity: There are minimizers such that their restriction to Ω enjoy some Sobolev regularity, with quantitative estimates, and satisfy a “precursor” of the Fokker–Planck equation.
4. Uniqueness: There is only one minimizer for (1.7) (given $\mu_{n\tau}^r$).
5. Contractivity: Suitably truncated L^q -norms decrease in time along the discrete solutions of the scheme. This result is useful in proving convergence of the scheme, both w.r.t. Wb_2 and in $L^1_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$.
6. Convergence w.r.t. Wb_2 .
7. Fokker–Planck with Dirichlet boundary conditions: The limit solves the Fokker–Planck equation with the required Dirichlet boundary conditions. Moreover, the convergence holds in $L^1_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$ (for appropriate values of q as in the statement of the theorem).

Each (sub)section starts with the precise statement of the corresponding main proposition and ends with its proof. When needed, some preparatory lemmas precede the proof.

5.1. One step of the scheme. In this section, we gather together the subsections corresponding to the first five bullet points of our plan for Theorem 1.1. The reason is that they all involve only one step of the discrete scheme.

Throughout this section, $\bar{\mu}$ is any measure in \mathcal{S} whose restriction to Ω is absolutely continuous and such that, denoting by $\bar{\rho}$ the density of $\bar{\mu}_\Omega$, the quantity $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho})$ is finite. We also fix $\tau > 0$. We aim to find one/all minimum point(s) of

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{H}(\cdot) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\cdot, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

and determine some of its/their properties.

5.1.1. *Existence.*

Proposition 5.1. *There exists at least one minimum point of the function in (5.1). Every minimum point μ satisfies the following:*

- (1) Both $\mathcal{H}(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{T}(\mu, \bar{\mu})$ are finite. In particular, μ_Ω admits a density ρ .
- (2) The total variation of μ and the integral $\int_\Omega \rho \log \rho \, dx$ can be bounded by a constant $\mathfrak{c}_{\tau, \bar{\mu}}$ that depends on V only through $\|V\|_{L^\infty}$.
- (3) The following inequality holds:

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu})}{4\tau} \leq \mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}) - \mathcal{E}(\rho) + \mu_\Omega(\Psi) - \bar{\mu}_\Omega(\Psi) + \mathfrak{c}\tau(\|\mu_\Omega\| + \|\bar{\mu}_\Omega\|).$$

The proof of this proposition, partially inspired by [17, Propositions 4.3 & 5.9], is essentially an application of the *direct method in the calculus of variations*, although some care is needed due to the unboundedness of \mathcal{H} from below.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_1} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a minimizing sequence for (5.1). We may assume that

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \leq \mathcal{H}(\bar{\mu}) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} + \frac{1}{n} = \mathcal{H}(\bar{\mu}) + \frac{1}{n} < \infty, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_1,$$

where the finiteness of $\mathcal{H}(\bar{\mu})$ is consequence of $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}) < \infty$. For every n , let ρ^n be the density of μ^n_Ω and let $\gamma^n \in \text{Opt}_\tau(\mu^n, \bar{\mu})$.

Step 1 (preliminary bounds). Firstly, we shall do some work towards the proof of (5.2) and establish uniform integrability for $\{\rho^n\}_n$. By (5.3) and Lemma 4.9,

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} &\leq \mathcal{H}(\bar{\mu}) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) + \frac{1}{n} = \mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}) - \mathcal{E}(\rho^n) + \bar{\mu}_{\partial\Omega}(\Psi) - \mu_{\partial\Omega}^n(\Psi) + \frac{1}{n} \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}) - \mathcal{E}(\rho^n) + \mu_{\Omega}^n(\Psi) - \bar{\mu}_{\Omega}(\Psi) + \mathfrak{c}\tau(\|\mu_{\Omega}^n\| + \|\bar{\mu}_{\Omega}\|) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \bar{\mu})}{4\tau} + \frac{1}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

from which,

$$(5.5) \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho^n \log \rho^n \leq \int_{\Omega} (\bar{\rho} \log \bar{\rho} + (\|V\|_{L^\infty} + \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty} + 1 + \mathfrak{c}\tau)(\bar{\rho} + \rho^n)) dx + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Since $\lambda \mapsto \lambda \log \lambda$ is superlinear, we have uniform integrability of $\{\rho^n\}_n$. In particular, $\|\mu_{\Omega}^n\|$ is bounded.

Also the total variation $\|\mu^n\|$ is bounded. Indeed,

$$(5.6) \quad \|\mu^n\| \leq 2\|\gamma^n\| + \|\bar{\mu}\| \leq 2\|\mu_{\Omega}^n\| + 3\|\bar{\mu}\|,$$

where the first inequality follows from Condition (3) in Definition 3.7, and the second one from Remark 3.10.

Step 2 (existence). We can extract a (not relabeled) subsequence such that:

- (1) $\mu_{\partial\Omega}^n \rightharpoonup_n \eta$ for some η weakly in duality with $C(\partial\Omega)$,
- (2) $\rho^n \rightharpoonup_n \rho$ for some ρ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$,
- (3) $\mu^n \rightharpoonup_n \mu := \rho dx + \eta$ weakly in duality with $C(\bar{\Omega})$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$.

Since the functional \mathcal{E} is sequentially lower semicontinuous w.r.t. the weak convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$, and sum of lower semicontinuous functions is lower semicontinuous, Corollary 4.7 yields

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu^n) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^n, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \right) = \inf \left(\mathcal{H}(\cdot) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\cdot, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \right).$$

Step 3 (inequalities). If μ is any minimum point for (5.1), the inequality (5.2), and the bounds on $\|\mu\|$ and $\int_{\Omega} \rho \log \rho dx$ directly follow from (5.4), (5.5), and (5.6) by taking the constant sequence equal to μ in place of $(\mu^n)_n$. \square

5.1.2. *Boundary condition.* Pick any minimum point μ for (5.1) and denote by ρ the density of μ_{Ω} . Let $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\tau}(\mu, \bar{\mu})$ and let $S: \Omega \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ be such that $\gamma_{\bar{\Omega}}^{\bar{\Omega}} = (\text{Id}, S)_{\#} \mu_{\Omega}$.

Proposition 5.2. *There exists a \mathcal{L}^d -negligible set $N \subseteq \Omega$ such that:*

- (1) *For all $x \in \Omega \setminus N$ and $y \in \partial\Omega$, the inequalities*

$$(5.7) \quad -\frac{|x-y|^2}{2\tau} \leq \log \rho(x) - \Psi(y) + V(x) \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{|x-y|}{\tau} + \tau \right)$$

hold. The constant \mathfrak{c} can be chosen independent of V .

- (2) *For all $x \in \Omega \setminus N$ such that $S(x) \in \partial\Omega$, we have the inequality*

$$(5.8) \quad \log \rho(x) \leq \Psi(S(x)) - V(x).$$

Remark 5.3. Proposition 5.2 implies in particular that $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and that ρ is bounded from below by a positive constant (depending on τ). Hence, the measure μ_{Ω} is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure on Ω .

Remark 5.4. Define

$$g := \sqrt{\rho e^V} - e^{\Psi/2}, \quad g^{(\kappa)} := (g - \kappa)_+ - (g + \kappa)_-, \quad \kappa > 0.$$

It follows from (5.7) that, when $\kappa \geq c(e^{c\tau} - 1)$, for a suitable constant c independent of V , the function $g^{(\kappa)}$ is compactly supported in Ω (up to changing its value on a Lebesgue-negligible set).

Proposition 5.2 is analog to [13, Proposition 3.7 (27) & (28)] and [17, Proposition 5.2 (5.39) & (5.40)]. Like those, ours is proven by taking suitable variations of the minimizer μ . Two lemmas are also needed. The first one is similar to [17, Proposition A.3 (A.7)], and the second one to [17, Lemma 5.10]. Contrary to the latter, however, our Lemma 5.6 does not require any regularity of the boundary.

Lemma 5.5. *For μ -a.e. point $x \in \Omega$ such that $S(x) \in \partial\Omega$, we have*

$$(5.9) \quad S(x) \in \arg \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} \left(-\Psi(y) + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\tau} \right).$$

Proof. Set

$$(5.10) \quad f(x, y) := -\Psi(y) + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\tau}, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad y \in \partial\Omega.$$

By [1, Theorem 18.19] there exists a Borel function $R: \Omega \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ such that

$$R(x) \in \arg \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} f(x, y)$$

for all $x \in \Omega$. Let $A \subseteq S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$ be a Borel set and consider the measure

$$\tilde{\mu} := \mu + S_{\#}\mu_A - R_{\#}\mu_A,$$

which lies in \mathcal{S} . Further define

$$\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma - (\text{Id}, S)_{\#}\mu_A + (\text{Id}, R)_{\#}\mu_A$$

and notice that $\tilde{\gamma} \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}, \bar{\mu})$. By the minimality property of μ and the optimality of γ , we must have

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{1}{2\tau}\mathcal{C}(\gamma) \leq \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}) + \frac{1}{2\tau}\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma}),$$

which, after rearranging the terms, gives

$$\int f(x, S(x)) \, d\mu_A(x) \leq \int f(x, R(x)) \, d\mu_A(x) = \int \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} f(x, y) \, d\mu_A(x).$$

We conclude the proof by arbitrariness of A . \square

Lemma 5.6. *For μ -a.e. point $x \in \Omega$ such that $S(x) \in \partial\Omega$, we have*

$$(5.11) \quad |x - S(x)| \leq 2\tau \text{Lip } \Psi + \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|.$$

Proof. Fix $x \in S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$ such that (5.9) holds and fix $y \in \partial\Omega$. Let $a := |x - S(x)|$ and $b := |x - y|$. We may assume that $a > 0$. We have

$$-\Psi(S(x)) + \frac{a^2}{2\tau} \stackrel{(5.9)}{\leq} -\Psi(y) + \frac{b^2}{2\tau},$$

whence

$$\frac{a^2 - b^2}{2\tau} \leq (\text{Lip } \Psi)|y - S(x)| \leq (\text{Lip } \Psi)(a + b).$$

We conclude by dividing on both sides by $a + b$, rearranging, taking the minimum over y , and recalling that (5.9) holds for μ -a.e. point in $S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.2. We shall prove the inequalities of the statement for x out of negligible sets N_y that depend on y . This is sufficient because the set $\partial\Omega$ is separable and all the functions in the statement are continuous in y . The actual set N is the union of these negligible sets N_y over all y 's from a countable dense subset of $\partial\Omega$.

Fix $y \in \partial\Omega$.

Step 1 (first inequality in (5.7)). Let $\epsilon > 0$, take a Borel set $A \subseteq \Omega$, and define

$$\tilde{\mu}_1 := \mu + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_A^d - \epsilon |A| \delta_y \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_1 := \gamma + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_A^d \otimes \delta_y \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}_1, \bar{\mu}).$$

By the minimality property of μ and the optimality of γ ,

$$0 \leq \int_A \left(\frac{(\rho + \epsilon) \log(\rho + \epsilon) - \rho \log \rho}{\epsilon} + V - 1 - \Psi(y) + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\tau} \right) dx.$$

Since the function $\lambda \mapsto \lambda \log \lambda$ is convex, we can use the monotone convergence theorem (“downwards”) to find

$$0 \leq \int_A \left(\log \rho + V - \Psi(y) + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\tau} \right) dx.$$

By arbitrariness of A , we have the first inequality in (5.7) for x out of a \mathcal{L}^d -negligible set (possibly dependent on y). In particular, $\rho > 0$.

Step 2 (second inequality in (5.7) on $S^{-1}(\Omega)$). Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, take a Borel set $A \subseteq S^{-1}(\Omega)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_2 &:= \mu + \epsilon \mu(A) \delta_y - \epsilon \mu_A \in \mathcal{S}, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2 &:= \gamma - \epsilon (\text{Id}, S)_{\#} \mu_A + \epsilon \delta_y \otimes S_{\#} \mu_A \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}_2, \bar{\mu}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $A \subseteq S^{-1}(\Omega)$ is needed to ensure that $(\tilde{\gamma}_2)_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = 0$. This time, the minimality property gives

$$0 \leq \int \left(\frac{(1 - \epsilon) \log(1 - \epsilon)}{\epsilon} - \log \rho - V + 1 + \Psi(y) + \frac{\langle y - \text{Id}, y + \text{Id} - 2S \rangle}{2\tau} \right) d\mu_A.$$

We conclude by arbitrariness of A , after letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, that

$$\log \rho(x) + V(x) - \Psi(y) \leq \frac{\langle y - x, y + x - 2S(x) \rangle}{2\tau} \leq \text{diam}(\Omega) \frac{|x - y|}{\tau}$$

for μ -a.e. $x \in S^{-1}(\Omega)$. Since $\rho > 0$, the same thing is true $\mathcal{L}_{S^{-1}(\Omega)}^d$ -a.e.

Step 3 (second inequality in (5.7) on $S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$, and (5.8)). Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, take a Borel set $A \subseteq S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_3 &:= \mu + \epsilon S_{\#} \mu_A - \epsilon \mu_A \in \mathcal{S}, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_3 &:= \gamma - \epsilon (\text{Id}, S)_{\#} \mu_A \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}_3, \bar{\mu}). \end{aligned}$$

By the minimality property,

$$0 \leq \int \left(\frac{(1 - \epsilon) \log(1 - \epsilon)}{\epsilon} - \log \rho - V + 1 + \Psi \circ S - \frac{|\text{Id} - S|^2}{2\tau} \right) d\mu_A,$$

from which, by arbitrariness of ϵ and A , we infer (5.8) $\mathcal{L}_{S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}^d$ -a.e. To deduce the second inequality in (5.7) we make use of the Lipschitz-continuity of Ψ and Lemma 5.6:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \rho(x) - \Psi(y) + V(x) &\stackrel{(5.8)}{\leq} \Psi(S(x)) - \Psi(y) \leq (\text{Lip } \Psi) |S(x) - y| \\ &\leq (\text{Lip } \Psi) (|x - S(x)| + |x - y|) \stackrel{(5.11)}{\leq} 2(\text{Lip } \Psi) (\tau \text{Lip } \Psi + |x - y|). \end{aligned}$$

Eventually, the estimate

$$|x - y| \leq \frac{|x - y|}{2\tau} + \frac{\tau|x - y|}{2} \leq \frac{|x - y|}{2\tau} + \frac{\tau \text{diam}(\Omega)}{2}$$

allows to conclude. \square

5.1.3. Sobolev regularity.

Proposition 5.7. *There exists at least one minimum point μ of (5.1) such that, denoting by ρ the density of μ_Ω , we have:*

- (1) *The function $\sqrt{\rho e^V}$ belongs to $W^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^{2q}(\Omega)$ for every $q \in [1, \infty)$ such that $q(d-2) \leq d$. In particular, $\rho \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$. We have the estimates*

$$(5.12) \quad \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V} \right\|_{L^2} \leq \mathfrak{c} \frac{\mathcal{T}(\mu, \bar{\mu})}{\tau},$$

and

$$(5.13) \quad \|\rho\|_{L^q} \leq \mathfrak{c}_q \left(e^{\epsilon\tau} + \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho\|_{L^1} \right).$$

If $d = 1$, the same is true with $q = \infty$ too.

- (2) *There exists $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_\tau(\mu, \bar{\mu})$ such that, writing $\gamma_\Omega^\bar{\Omega} = (\text{Id}, S)_\# \mu_\Omega$, we have*

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{S - \text{Id}}{\tau} \rho = \nabla \rho + \rho \nabla V = e^{-V} \nabla(\rho e^V) \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. on } \Omega.$$

Remark 5.8. Contrary to Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2, Proposition 5.7 establishes properties only for *some* minimizer of (5.1). However, we will soon prove that the minimizer is unique.

The core idea to prove Proposition 5.7 is to compute the first variation of the functional (5.1) at a minimum point and exploit Lemma 4.19, like in [13, Proposition 3.6]. However, the proof is complicated by the weak assumptions on V and the lack of regularity of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. To manage V , we rely on an approximation argument. The issue with $\partial\Omega$ is that the Rellich–Kondrachev compact embedding theorem and the Sobolev embedding theorem are not available for (sequences of) functions in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Nonetheless, they can still be applied to (sequences of) functions in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. This is why we proved *before* the approximate boundary condition, i.e., Proposition 5.2.

Proof of Proposition 5.7. Since V is essentially bounded, by convolving it with suitable mollifiers, we can construct a sequence of smooth approximating functions $(V_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ that converge to V pointwise almost everywhere and, possibly after rescaling, enjoy the property $\|V_k\|_{L^\infty} = \|V\|_{L^\infty}$ for every k . For each one of these approximating functions, we define \mathcal{E}_k and \mathcal{H}_k by replacing V with V_k

in the definitions of \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{H} . Then, by applying Proposition 5.1, we find μ^k that minimizes

$$\mathcal{H}_k(\cdot) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\cdot, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau}.$$

Let us denote by ρ^k the density of μ_Ω^k and choose a \mathcal{T} -optimal transport plan $\gamma^k \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})$ for every k . Since $\|V_k\|_{L^\infty} = \|V\|_{L^\infty}$ for every k , we know from Proposition 5.1 that the integral $\int_\Omega \rho^k \log \rho^k dx$ and the total variation $\|\mu^k\|$ are bounded. Consequently, there exists a (not relabeled) subsequence such that:

- (1) $\mu_{\partial\Omega}^k \rightarrow_k \eta$ for some η weakly in duality with $C(\partial\Omega)$,
- (2) $\rho^k \rightarrow_k \rho$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$,
- (3) $\mu^k \rightarrow_k \mu = \rho dx + \eta$ weakly in duality with $C(\bar{\Omega})$,
- (4) $\gamma^k \rightarrow_k \gamma$ weakly in duality with $C(\bar{\Omega} \times \bar{\Omega})$ for some γ , and $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \bar{\mu})$, by Lemma 4.5.

As already observed, \mathcal{E} is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. weak L^1 -convergence. Hence,

$$(5.15) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}(\mu^k).$$

We will see in Step 3 that μ is a minimum point of (5.1).

Step 1 (Sobolev bound for the approximants). Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\mathbf{w}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a C^∞ -regular vector field with compact support and, for $\epsilon > 0$, let $R_\epsilon(x) := x + \epsilon \mathbf{w}(x)$. We set $\mu^{k,\epsilon} := (R_\epsilon)_\# \mu^k$ and notice that, if ϵ is sufficiently small, R_ϵ is a diffeomorphism from Ω to itself, and $\mu^{k,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{S}$. The minimality of μ^k implies

$$\int (\log \rho^k - \log(\rho^{k,\epsilon} \circ R_\epsilon) + V_k - V_k \circ R_\epsilon) d\mu_\Omega^k \leq \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^{k,\epsilon}, \bar{\mu}) - \mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau}.$$

It can be easily checked that the density $\rho^{k,\epsilon}$ of $\mu_\Omega^{k,\epsilon}$ satisfies

$$\rho^{k,\epsilon} \circ R_\epsilon = \frac{\rho^k}{\det \nabla R_\epsilon} \quad \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. on } \Omega;$$

hence we have

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\log \det \nabla R_\epsilon + V_k - V_k \circ R_\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho^k dx \leq \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^{k,\epsilon}, \bar{\mu}) - \mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{2\epsilon\tau}.$$

Passing to the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the dominated convergence theorem (V_k is smooth), Lemma 4.19, and Hölder's inequality give

$$(5.16) \quad \int_\Omega (\text{div } \mathbf{w} - \langle \nabla V_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle) \rho^k dx \leq -\frac{1}{\tau} \int \langle \mathbf{w}(x), y - x \rangle d\gamma^k(x, y) \\ \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(\rho^k)} \frac{\mathcal{T}(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{\tau},$$

By the Riesz representation theorem, this means that there exists a vector field $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\rho^k; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$(5.17) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\rho^k)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{T}(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{\tau},$$

and

$$\int_\Omega (\text{div } \mathbf{w} - \langle \nabla V_k, \mathbf{w} \rangle) \rho^k dx = \int_\Omega \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \rho^k dx,$$

for all smooth and compactly supported vector fields \mathbf{w} . In other words, $-\rho^k(\mathbf{u} + \nabla V_k)$ is the distributional gradient of ρ^k . Since $\rho^k \in L^1(\Omega)$, the function V_k is

Lipschitz continuous, and by (5.17), we now know that $\rho^k \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$. Hence, for every smooth \mathbf{w} that is compactly supported,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} \, dx &= \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k} + \epsilon} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} \, dx = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho^k e^{V_k}}{2\sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k} + \epsilon}} \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\rho^k)}}{2} \liminf_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho^k e^{2V_k} |\mathbf{w}|^2}{\rho^k e^{V_k} + \epsilon} \, dx} = \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\rho^k)} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(e^{V_k})}}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where, for the second equality, we used a standard property of composition of Sobolev functions (cf. [7, Proposition 9.5]) and, in the last one, the monotone convergence theorem. With a similar argument as before, we infer that $\sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ with

$$(5.18) \quad \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \right|^2 e^{-V_k} \, dx \leq \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\rho^k)}}{2} \right)^2 \stackrel{(5.17)}{\leq} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{4\tau^2}.$$

The number at the right-hand side of the latter is bounded as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, by minimality of μ^k ,

$$\frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu}) - \mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \leq \mathcal{H}_k(\mu) - \mathcal{H}_k(\mu^k) = \mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^k) + \int_{\Omega} |V - V_k| |\rho - \rho^k| \, dx,$$

from which, owing to (5.15) and the identity $\|V_k\|_{L^\infty} = \|V\|_{L^\infty}$, we find

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu}) &\leq \mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu}) + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2\tau \int_{\Omega} |V - V_k| |\rho - \rho^k| \, dx \\ &\leq \mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu}) + 8\tau \|V\|_{L^\infty} \sup_k \left\| \rho^k \right\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

We infer that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \stackrel{(5.18)}{\leq} \exp(\|V\|_{L^\infty}) \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{4\tau^2} < \infty.$$

In particular, we can extract a further (not relabeled) subsequence such that

$$(5.20) \quad \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \rightharpoonup_k f \quad \text{weakly in } W^{1,2}(\Omega) \text{ with } \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \leq \mathfrak{c} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{\tau}$$

for some function f . In the next Step, we show that $f = \sqrt{\rho e^V}$.

Step 2 (improved convergence). Although $\partial\Omega$ is not regular enough to apply directly Rellich–Kondrachov theorem [7, Theorem 9.16], we claim that the convergence (5.20) is also strong in $L^2(\Omega)$. Firstly, by applying this theorem on a countable covering made of open balls, all contained in Ω , and by a diagonal argument, we extract a (not relabeled) subsequence such that the strong convergence holds in $L^2(\omega)$ for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$. Secondly, let us set

$$g^k := \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} - e^{\Psi/2}, \quad g^{k,(\kappa)} := (g^k - \kappa)_+ - (g^k + \kappa)_-, \quad \kappa > 0$$

(as in Remark 5.4), and fix $\kappa = c(e^{c\tau} - 1)$ for an appropriate constant c (independent of μ^k and V_k), so that each $g^{k,(\kappa)}$ is compactly supported, hence in the space $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Note that $\sup_k \|g^{k,(\kappa)}\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq \sup_k \|g^k\|_{W^{1,2}} < \infty$. Therefore, we can extract a further (not relabeled) subsequence such that $g^{k,(\kappa)} \rightarrow_k g^{(\kappa)}$

weakly in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ for some function $g^{(\kappa)}$. To this sequence, we can apply Rellich-Kondrachov theorem on the whole Ω . Thus, for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k_1, k_2 \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sqrt{\rho^{k_1} e^{V_{k_2}}} - \sqrt{\rho^{k_2} e^{V_{k_1}}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \limsup_{k_1, k_2 \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sqrt{\rho^{k_1} e^{V_{k_2}}} - \sqrt{\rho^{k_1} e^{V_{k_2}}} \right\|_{L^2(\omega)} \\ &\quad + 2 \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega \setminus \omega)} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{c}_\kappa \left(\sqrt{|\Omega \setminus \omega|} + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| g^{k, (\kappa)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega \setminus \omega)} \right) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{c}_\kappa \left(\sqrt{|\Omega \setminus \omega|} + \left\| g^{(\kappa)} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega \setminus \omega)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude, by arbitrariness of ω , that the sequence $(\sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}})_k$ is Cauchy, hence strongly convergent.

Further, we note the following facts:

- The limit $\rho^k \rightarrow_k \rho$ is strong in $L^1(\Omega)$, and f coincides with $\sqrt{\rho e^V}$. To understand why, observe that, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\left\| \rho^k - (f)^2 e^{-V} \right\|_{L^1} \leq \left\| \sqrt{\rho^k} - f e^{-V/2} \right\|_{L^2} \left\| \sqrt{\rho^k} + f e^{-V/2} \right\|_{L^2}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The last norm on the right is bounded, because so is the L^1 -norm of ρ^k . Moreover, since $\left\| f e^{-V/2} - f e^{-V_k/2} \right\|_{L^2} \rightarrow_k 0$ by the dominated convergence theorem, we only need to make the estimate

$$\left\| \sqrt{\rho^k} - f e^{-V_k/2} \right\|_{L^2} \leq \left\| e^{-V_k/2} \left(\sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} - f \right) \right\|_{L^2} \leq \mathfrak{c} \left\| \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} - f \right\|_{L^2},$$

and use that the rightmost term vanishes as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

- The function $g^{(\kappa)}$ is

$$g^{(\kappa)} = (g - \kappa)_+ - (g + \kappa)_-, \quad \text{where } g := f - e^{\Psi/2}.$$

Step 3 (minimality). We have not proven that μ is a minimizer for (5.1) yet. Since the hypotheses of Corollary 4.7 are satisfied,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu^k) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{H}_k(\mu^k) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu^k, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \right) + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |V_k - V| \rho^k dx. \end{aligned}$$

The last limit superior equals 0, because $V_k \rightarrow_k V$ almost everywhere with a L^∞ -bound, and $\rho^k \xrightarrow{L^1} \rho$. Moreover, by minimality of μ^k , every other $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_k(\tilde{\mu}) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu', \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\tilde{\mu}, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |V_k - V| d\tilde{\mu}_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}) < \infty$, then $\tilde{\mu}_\Omega$ is absolutely continuous; thus, by the dominated convergence theorem, $\int |V_k - V| d\tilde{\mu}_\Omega \rightarrow_k 0$. This proves that μ is a minimum point of (5.1).

Step 4 (inequality (5.12)). The inequality (5.12) would follow from (5.20) if

$$(5.21) \quad \mathcal{T}(\mu, \bar{\mu}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}(\mu^k, \bar{\mu}).$$

In turn, the latter is consequence of Corollary 4.7 and (5.19). Indeed, with the same argument of Step 3, we can say that the limit of $\int_{\Omega} |V - V_k| |\rho - \rho^k| dx$ is 0.

Step 5 (higher integrability). The inequality (5.13) would follow from the Sobolev embedding theorem [7, Corollary 9.14] if Ω were a set with regular boundary. Pick q as in the statement, i.e., $1 \leq q < \infty$ with $q(d-2) \leq d$ or, if $d = 1$, $q \in [1, \infty]$. We leverage the fact that $g^{(\kappa)} \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$: after extending $g^{(\kappa)}$ to the whole \mathbb{R}^d (null out of Ω), we can apply [7, Corollary 9.13], which gives $\|g^{(\kappa)}\|_{L^{2q}} \leq \mathbf{c}_q \|g^{(\kappa)}\|_{W^{1,2}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sqrt{\rho e^V} \right\|_{L^{2q}} &\leq \mathbf{c}_q + \|g\|_{L^{2q}} \leq \mathbf{c}_q(1 + \kappa) + \|g^{(\kappa)}\|_{L^{2q}} \leq \mathbf{c}_q \left(1 + \kappa + \|g^{(\kappa)}\|_{W^{1,2}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_q \left(1 + \kappa + \|g\|_{W^{1,2}} \right) \leq \mathbf{c}_q \left(1 + \kappa + \left\| \sqrt{\rho e^V} \right\|_{W^{1,2}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_q \left(1 + \kappa + \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V} \right\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{\|\rho\|_{L^1}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which can be easily transformed into (5.13).

To see that $\rho \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$, observe that, on every $\omega \Subset \Omega$ open, formally,

$$(5.22) \quad \nabla \rho = \nabla \left(\left(\sqrt{\rho e^V} \right)^2 e^{-V} \right) = \underbrace{2e^{-V}}_{\in L^\infty} \underbrace{\sqrt{\rho e^V}}_{L^2} \underbrace{\nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V}}_{L^2} - \underbrace{\rho}_{L^{p'}} \underbrace{\nabla V}_{L^p},$$

where $p = p(\omega)$ is as in Definition 3.1, and p' is its conjugate exponent, which satisfies the condition $p'(d-2) \leq d$.

Step 6 (identity (5.14)) From (5.21), it follows that $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \bar{\mu})$. Indeed,

$$\mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu}) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}(\gamma^k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}(\mu^k, \mu) \stackrel{(5.21)}{=} \mathcal{T}^2(\mu, \bar{\mu}).$$

We shall prove (5.14) for this transport plan γ . Let us fix $\mathbf{w} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ compactly supported and smooth. For every k , we can rewrite (5.16) as

$$-2 \int_{\Omega} e^{-V_k} \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \left\langle \nabla \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}}, \mathbf{w} \right\rangle dx \leq -\frac{1}{\tau} \int \langle \mathbf{w}(x), y - x \rangle d\gamma^k(x, y).$$

Now, recall that

- (1) $\nabla \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \rightharpoonup_k \nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V}$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$,
- (2) $\sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \rightarrow_k \sqrt{\rho e^V}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$,
- (3) $e^{-V_k} \rightarrow e^{-V}$ pointwise and with a L^∞ -bound. Thus, $e^{-V_k} \sqrt{\rho^k e^{V_k}} \mathbf{w} \rightarrow_k e^{-V} \sqrt{\rho e^V} \mathbf{w}$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$,
- (4) $\gamma^k \rightarrow_k \gamma$ weakly.

This is enough to infer that

$$-2 \int_{\Omega} e^{-V} \sqrt{\rho e^V} \left\langle \nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V}, \mathbf{w} \right\rangle dx \leq -\frac{1}{\tau} \int \langle \mathbf{w}, S - \text{Id} \rangle \rho dx$$

when S is such that $\gamma_{\Omega}^{\bar{\Omega}} = (\text{Id}, S)_{\#} \mu_{\Omega}$. By arbitrariness of \mathbf{w} , (5.14) follows. \square

5.1.4. *Uniqueness.* Let us assume that μ and μ' are two minimizers for (5.1) such that their restrictions to Ω are absolutely continuous; let ρ and ρ' be their respective densities. Let $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu, \bar{\mu})$ and $\gamma' \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu', \bar{\mu})$. By Proposition 4.20, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{\bar{\Omega}} &= (\text{Id}, S)_{\#} \mu_{\Omega}, & (\gamma')_{\bar{\Omega}} &= (\text{Id}, S')_{\#} \mu_{\Omega}, \\ \gamma_{\Omega} &= (T, \text{Id})_{\#} \bar{\mu}_{\Omega}, & (\gamma')_{\Omega} &= (T', \text{Id})_{\#} \bar{\mu}_{\Omega},\end{aligned}$$

for some appropriate Borel maps. We suppose that at least one of the two measures, say μ , has the properties in Proposition 5.7, and that S satisfies (5.14). We are going to prove the following.

Proposition 5.9. *The two measures μ and μ' are equal.*

Note that uniqueness is not immediate, given that the functional \mathcal{H} is not strictly convex. This setting is different from that of [17] and [13]: their measures are defined *only on Ω* . Instead, we claim here that the measure μ , on the *whole $\bar{\Omega}$* , is uniquely determined.

The proof of Proposition 5.9 is preceded by three lemmas: the first one concerns the identification of S and S' ; the second one, similar to [17, Proposition A.3 (A.5)], shows that $T|_{T^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}$ and $T'|_{(T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}$ enjoy one same property, inferred from the minimality of μ and μ' ; the third one ensures that this property characterizes uniquely T and T' on $T^{-1}(\partial\Omega) \cap (T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$.

Lemma 5.10. *If $\mu_{\Omega} = \mu'_{\Omega}$, then $S(x) = S'(x)$ for μ_{Ω} -a.e. x .*

Proof. We only have to show that (5.14) is satisfied when S is replaced by S' .

Let $\mathbf{w}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be C^{∞} -regular and with compact support. For every $\epsilon > 0$, let $R_{\epsilon}(x) := x + \epsilon \mathbf{w}(x)$. By repeating the proof at the beginning of Step 1 in Proposition 5.7, and since $\rho = \rho'$, we see that the minimality of μ' implies

$$(5.23) \quad \int_{\Omega} \rho \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} \, dx + \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \frac{V - V \circ R_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \rho \, dx \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbf{w}, \text{Id} - S' \rangle \rho \, dx.$$

We claim that

$$(5.24) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \frac{V \circ R_{\epsilon} - V}{\epsilon} \rho \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla V, \mathbf{w} \rangle \rho \, dx.$$

Let $\omega \Subset \tilde{\omega} \Subset \Omega$ be open sets with \mathbf{w} compactly supported in ω , so that, for every ϵ sufficiently small, R_{ϵ} maps ω to ω and equals the identity on $\Omega \setminus \omega$. Note that, by Definition 3.1 and the supposed regularity of ρ , the function V is in $W^{1,p}(\tilde{\omega})$ and ρ is in $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ for some p and p' conjugate. By Friedrichs' theorem [7, Theorem 9.2], the function $V|_{\omega}$ is limit in $W^{1,p}(\omega)$ of (the restriction to ω) of a sequence of functions $(V_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since (5.24) is true when V is replaced by V_k , it is not difficult to prove it for V by approximation. We omit the details.

Knowing (5.24), the inequality (5.23) becomes

$$- \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla \rho + \rho \nabla V, \mathbf{w} \rangle \, dx \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbf{w}, \text{Id} - S' \rangle \rho \, dx,$$

and we conclude by arbitrariness of \mathbf{w} . \square

Lemma 5.11. *For $\bar{\mu}$ -a.e. point $x \in \Omega$ such that $T(x) \in \partial\Omega$, we have*

$$(5.25) \quad T(x) \in \arg \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} \left(\Psi(y) + \frac{|x - y|^2}{2\tau} \right).$$

An analogous statement holds for T' .

Proof. The proof of this lemma is an easy adaptation of that of Lemma 5.5. \square

Lemma 5.12. *For $\bar{\mu}$ -a.e. point $x \in \Omega$ such that both $T(x) \in \partial\Omega$ and $T'(x) \in \partial\Omega$, we have*

$$T(x) = T'(x).$$

Proof. We can resort to [9, Lemma 1]. Adopting the notation of this lemma, we set

$$Q(t, z) := \Psi(t) + \frac{|z - t|^2}{2\tau}, \quad P := c\bar{\mu}|_{T^{-1}(\partial\Omega) \cap (T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)},$$

for some constant c that makes P a probability distribution. Four assumptions are made therein and need to be checked:

- **Absolute Continuity:** It follows from $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu}) < \infty$ that $\bar{\mu}_\Omega$ is absolutely continuous. Hence, so is the probability P .
- **Continuous Differentiability:** Conditions (a) and (b) are easy to check. Condition (c) is vacuously true by setting $A(t) := \emptyset$ for every t .
- **Generic:** Condition (d) is true and easy to check.
- **Manifold:** This condition is not true if $\partial\Omega$ does not enjoy any kind of regularity. However, one can check that that $\partial\Omega$ does not need to be a union of manifolds if the condition Generic holds with $A(t) := \emptyset$ for every t . The other topological properties, namely second-countability and Hausdorff, are trivially true, since $\partial\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.9. Step 1 (uniqueness of ρ and S). The identity $\rho = \rho'$ follows from the strict convexity of the function $\lambda \mapsto \lambda \log \lambda$. To see why, notice that $\frac{\gamma + \gamma'}{2} \in \text{Adm}_\mathcal{T}(\frac{\mu + \mu'}{2}, \bar{\mu})$; therefore, by minimality,

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{1}{2\tau}\mathcal{C}(\mu) + \mathcal{H}(\mu') + \frac{1}{2\tau}\mathcal{C}(\mu')}{2} \leq \mathcal{H}\left(\frac{\mu + \mu'}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{2\tau}\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{\gamma + \gamma'}{2}\right).$$

Most of the terms simplify by linearity. What remains is

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\rho \log \rho + \rho' \log \rho'}{2} dx \leq \int_\Omega \left(\frac{\rho + \rho'}{2}\right) \log \left(\frac{\rho + \rho'}{2}\right) dx,$$

which implies $\rho(x) = \rho'(x)$ for \mathcal{L}^d -a.e. $x \in \Omega$. The identity $S = S'$ out of a μ_Ω -negligible set follows from Lemma 5.10.

Step 2 (uniqueness of $\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega$). We can write

$$\gamma = \gamma_\Omega^\Omega + \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma' = (\gamma')_\Omega^\Omega + (\gamma')_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega.$$

Because of the uniqueness of μ_Ω and S , however, we have the equality $\gamma_\Omega^\Omega = (\gamma')_\Omega^\Omega$. If we combine this fact with Condition (2) in Definition 3.7, we find

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\pi_\#^2(\gamma - \gamma')\right)_\Omega = \pi_\#^2\left(\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega - (\gamma')_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega\right) \\ &= \pi_\#^2\left((T, \text{Id})_\# \bar{\mu}_{T^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} - (T', \text{Id})_\# \bar{\mu}_{(T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}\right) = \bar{\mu}_{T^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} - \bar{\mu}_{(T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $T^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$ and $(T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$ are $\bar{\mu}$ -essentially equal. Together with Lemma 5.12, this gives

$$\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega = (T, \text{Id})_\# \bar{\mu}_{T^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} = (T', \text{Id})_\# \bar{\mu}_{(T')^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} = (\gamma')_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega.$$

Step 3 (conclusion). We have determined that $\gamma = \gamma'$. Condition (3) in Definition 3.9 gives

$$\mu = \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma + \bar{\mu} = \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma' - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma' + \bar{\mu} = \mu',$$

which is what we wanted to prove. \square

5.1.5. *Contractivity.* In this section, we establish time-monotonicity for some “truncated and weighted” L^q -norm ($q \geq 1$) of the densities ρ_t^τ .

Here too, only one step of the scheme is involved. We let μ be the unique minimum point of (5.1) and ρ be the density of its restriction to Ω .

Proposition 5.13. *Let $q \geq 1$. For every $\vartheta \geq \vartheta_0 := \max_{\partial\Omega} e^\Psi$, the following inequality holds:*

$$(5.26) \quad \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ \rho, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\}^q e^{(q-1)V} dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ \bar{\rho}, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\}^q e^{(q-1)V} dx$$

(possibly with one or both sides being infinite).

Remark 5.14. For a solution to the Fokker-Planck equation (1.3), a monotonicity property like that of Proposition 5.13 is expected. Indeed, *formally*:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ \rho_t, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\}^q e^{(q-1)V} dx &= q \int_{\{\rho_t > \vartheta e^{-V}\}} (\rho_t e^V)^{q-1} \operatorname{div}(\nabla \rho_t + \rho_t \nabla V) dx \\ &= q \int_{\partial\{\rho_t > \vartheta e^{-V}\}} (\rho_t e^V)^{q-1} e^{-V} \langle \nabla(\rho_t e^V), \mathbf{n} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{q(q-1) \int_{\{\rho_t > \vartheta e^{-V}\}} (\rho_t e^V)^{q-2} e^V |\nabla \rho_t + \rho_t \nabla V|^2 dx}_{\leq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\vartheta \geq \vartheta_0$, the boundary condition forces the set $\partial\{\rho_t > \vartheta e^{-V}\} \cap \partial\Omega$ to be negligible. Moreover, on $\partial\{\rho_t > \vartheta e^{-V}\} \cap \Omega$, the scalar product $\langle \nabla(\rho_t e^V), \mathbf{n} \rangle$ is nonpositive. The case $\vartheta = \vartheta_0$ can be deduced by approximation.

Remark 5.15 (Mass bound). Note that Proposition 5.13 implies that the mass of $(\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega$ is bounded by a constant \mathfrak{c} independent of t and τ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \rho_t^\tau dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ \rho_t^\tau, \vartheta_0 e^{-V} \right\} dx \leq \dots \leq \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ \rho_0, \vartheta_0 e^{-V} \right\} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \rho_0 dx + \vartheta_0 \int_{\Omega} e^{-V} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the first Step in Proposition 5.13, i.e., the case $q = 1$, and of the preliminary lemma Lemma 5.16 follow the lines of [13, Proposition 3.7 (24)] and [17, Proposition 5.3]. In all these proofs, the key is to leverage the optimality of μ by constructing small variations. In the proof of Step 2, i.e., the case $q > 1$, instead, our idea is to take the inequality for $q = 1$, multiply it by a suitable power of ϑ , and integrate it w.r.t. the variable ϑ itself. This is the reason why, while Proposition 5.13 will later be used only with $\vartheta = \vartheta_0$, or in the form of Remark 5.15, it is convenient to have it stated and proven (at least for $q = 1$) for a continuum of values of ϑ .

Lemma 5.16. *For μ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$ such that $S(x) \in \Omega$, we have*

$$(5.27) \quad \log \rho(x) + V(x) \leq \log \rho(S(x)) + V(S(x)) - \frac{|x - S(x)|^2}{2\tau}.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $A \subseteq S^{-1}(\Omega)$ be a Borel set. We define

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu} &:= \mu + \epsilon S_{\#} \mu_A - \epsilon \mu_A \in \mathcal{S}, \\ \tilde{\gamma} &:= \gamma - \epsilon(\text{Id}, S)_{\#} \mu_A + \epsilon(S, S)_{\#} \mu_A \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}, \bar{\mu}).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{\rho}$ be the density of $S_{\#} \mu_A$ and note that $\hat{\rho} \leq \bar{\rho}$. By the minimality of μ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \leq \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} \frac{(\rho + \epsilon(\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho)) \log(\rho + \epsilon(\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho)) - \rho \log \rho}{\epsilon} dx}_{:= I_1} \\ + \int \left(V \circ S - V - \frac{|\text{Id} - S|^2}{2\tau} \right) d\mu_A.\end{aligned}$$

We use the convexity of $\lambda \mapsto \lambda \log \lambda$ to write

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &\leq \int_{\Omega} (\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho) \left(1 + \log(\rho + \epsilon(\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho)) \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho) \log(\rho + \epsilon(\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho)) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} \log(\rho + \epsilon(\hat{\rho} - \mathbf{1}_A \rho)) dx - \int_A \rho \log((1 - \epsilon)\rho + \epsilon\hat{\rho}) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} \log(\rho + \epsilon\hat{\rho}) dx - \int_A \rho (\log \rho + \log(1 - \epsilon)) dx.\end{aligned}$$

On the first integral on the last line, we use the monotone convergence theorem (“downwards”): its hypotheses are satisfied because $\hat{\rho} \leq \bar{\rho}$. By passing to the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho} \log \rho dx + \int \left(-\log \rho + V \circ S - V - \frac{|\text{Id} - S|^2}{2\tau} \right) d\mu_A \\ = \int \left(\log \rho \circ S - \log \rho + V \circ S - V - \frac{|\text{Id} - S|^2}{2\tau} \right) d\mu_A,\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude by arbitrariness of A . \square

Proof of Proposition 5.13. Step 1 ($q = 1$). Consider the case $q = 1$. Let

$$(5.28) \quad A := \left\{ x \in \Omega : \rho e^V > \vartheta \right\}.$$

Thanks to (5.8), we know that $A \cap S^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$ is \mathcal{L}^d -negligible. Therefore, we can extract a \mathcal{L}_A^d -full-measure Borel subset \tilde{A} of $A \cap S^{-1}(\Omega)$ where (5.27) holds (recall that $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}^d \ll \mu_{\Omega}$). It is easy to check that $S(\tilde{A}) \subseteq A$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(5.29) \quad \int_A \max \left\{ \rho, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\} dx &\stackrel{(5.28)}{=} \int_A \rho dx = \int_{\tilde{A}} \rho dx \leq \int_{S^{-1}(A)} \rho dx = S_{\#} \mu_{\Omega}(A) \\ &= \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\bar{\Omega}}(A) \stackrel{(A \subseteq \Omega)}{=} \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\Omega}(A) \leq \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\Omega}(A) = \bar{\mu}_{\Omega}(A) \leq \int_A \max \left\{ \bar{\rho}, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\} dx.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$(5.30) \quad \int_{\Omega \setminus A} \max \left\{ \rho, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\} dx \stackrel{(5.28)}{=} \int_{\Omega \setminus A} \vartheta e^{-V} dx \leq \int_{\Omega \setminus A} \max \left\{ \bar{\rho}, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\} dx,$$

and we conclude by taking the sum of (5.29) and (5.30).

Step 2 ($q > 1$) Assume now that $q > 1$. Define

$$f := \max \left\{ \rho, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\}, \quad g := \max \left\{ \bar{\rho}, \vartheta e^{-V} \right\}.$$

Note that the case $q = 1$ implies

$$(5.31) \quad \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ f, \tilde{\vartheta} e^{-V} \right\} dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \max \left\{ g, \tilde{\vartheta} e^{-V} \right\} dx$$

for every $\tilde{\vartheta} > 0$. After multiplying (5.31) by $\tilde{\vartheta}^{q-2}$, integrating w.r.t. $\tilde{\vartheta}$ from 0 to some $\Theta > 0$, and changing the order of integration with Tonelli's theorem, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_0^{\min\{fe^V, \Theta\}} \tilde{\vartheta}^{q-2} d\tilde{\vartheta} \right) f dx + \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{\min\{fe^V, \Theta\}}^{\Theta} \tilde{\vartheta}^{q-1} d\tilde{\vartheta} \right) e^{-V} dx \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_0^{\min\{ge^V, \Theta\}} \tilde{\vartheta}^{q-2} d\tilde{\vartheta} \right) g dx + \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{\min\{ge^V, \Theta\}}^{\Theta} \tilde{\vartheta}^{q-1} d\tilde{\vartheta} \right) e^{-V} dx, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{q-1} \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ fe^V, \Theta \right\}^{q-1} f dx - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ fe^V, \Theta \right\}^q e^{-V} dx \\ & \leq \frac{1}{q-1} \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ ge^V, \Theta \right\}^{q-1} g dx - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ ge^V, \Theta \right\}^q e^{-V} dx. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{1}{q} \right) \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ fe^V, \Theta \right\}^q e^{-V} dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ ge^V, \Theta \right\}^q e^{-V} dx \\ & \leq \frac{1}{q-1} \int_{\Omega} \min \left\{ ge^V, \Theta \right\}^{q-1} g dx. \end{aligned}$$

We now let $\Theta \rightarrow \infty$ and deduce from the monotone convergence theorem that

$$\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{1}{q} \right) \int_{\Omega} f^q e^{(q-1)V} dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} g^q e^{(q-1)V} dx \leq \frac{1}{q-1} \int_{\Omega} g^q e^{(q-1)V} dx.$$

Eventually, we can rearrange, and, noted that $\left(\frac{1}{q-1} - \frac{1}{q} \right) > 0$, simplify to finally obtain (5.26). \square

5.2. Convergence w.r.t Wb_2 . In this section we prove convergence w.r.t. Wb_2 of the measures built with the scheme (1.7). The argument is standard. In fact, we shall give a short proof that relies on the ‘refined version of Ascoli-Arzelà theorem’ [4, Proposition 3.3.1].

Proposition 5.17. *As $\tau \rightarrow 0$, up to subsequences, the maps $(t \mapsto (\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega)_\tau$ converge pointwise w.r.t. Wb_2 to a curve $t \mapsto \rho_t dx$ of absolutely continuous measures, continuous w.r.t. Wb_2 .*

Once again, we first need a lemma.

Lemma 5.18. *Let $t \geq 0$ and $\tau > 0$. Then*

$$(5.32) \quad \tau \int_{\Omega} \rho_i^\tau \log \rho_i^\tau dx + \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} \mathcal{T}^2(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau, \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau) \leq \mathbf{c} \tau (1 + t + \tau).$$

As a consequence,

$$(5.33) \quad Wb_2((\mu_s^\tau)_\Omega, (\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega) \leq \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_s^\tau, \mu_t^\tau) \leq \mathbf{c}\sqrt{(t-s+\tau)(1+t+\tau)}, \quad s \in [0, t].$$

Proof. We use (5.2) to write

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau, \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau)}{4\tau} \leq \mathcal{E}(\rho_0) - \mathcal{E}(\rho_t^\tau) + (\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega(\Psi) - (\mu_0)_\Omega(\Psi) + \mathbf{c}\tau \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor} \|(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau)_\Omega\|,$$

and conclude (5.32) by using Remark 5.15.

The first inequality in (5.33) follows from (4.1). As for the second one, since $\widetilde{W}b_2$ is a pseudometric, and by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and (4.1), we have the chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} Wb_2((\mu_r^\tau)_\Omega, (\mu_s^\tau)_\Omega) &\leq \sum_{i=\lfloor r/\tau \rfloor}^{\lfloor s/\tau \rfloor - 1} Wb_2((\mu_{i\tau}^\tau)_\Omega, (\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau)_\Omega) \leq \sum_{i=\lfloor r/\tau \rfloor}^{\lfloor s/\tau \rfloor - 1} \mathcal{T}(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau, \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{s-r+\tau}{\tau}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=\lfloor r/\tau \rfloor}^{\lfloor s/\tau \rfloor - 1} \mathcal{T}^2(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau, \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau)}. \end{aligned}$$

We combine the latter with (5.32) to infer (5.33). \square

Proof of Proposition 5.17. Fix $t > 0$. We know from Lemma 5.18 that, for every $s \in [0, t]$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$(\mu_s^\tau)_\Omega \in K_t := \left\{ \rho \, dx : \int_\Omega \rho \log \rho \, dx \leq c(2+t) \right\},$$

where c is the constant in (5.32). We claim that K_t is *compact* in $(\mathcal{M}_2(\Omega), Wb_2)$. With an abuse of notation (we do not distinguish an absolutely continuous measure and its density), K_t can be seen as a subset of $L^1(\Omega)$. This set is closed and convex, as well as weakly (sequentially) compact by the Dunford–Pettis theorem. From [13, Proposition 2.7] we know that weak convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$ implies convergence w.r.t. Wb_2 ; hence the claim is true.

Furthermore, for every $r, s \in [0, t]$, we have

$$\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} Wb_2((\mu_r^\tau)_\Omega, (\mu_s^\tau)_\Omega) \stackrel{(5.33)}{\leq} \mathbf{c}\sqrt{|s-r|(1+t)}.$$

All the hypotheses of [4, Proposition 3.3.1] are satisfied, and we can conclude the existence of a subsequence of $(s \mapsto (\mu_s^\tau)_\Omega)_\tau$ that converges, pointwise in $[0, t]$ w.r.t. Wb_2 , to a continuous curve of measures. Each limit measure lies in K_t ; hence it is absolutely continuous. With a diagonal argument, we find a single subsequence that converges pointwise on the whole half-line $[0, \infty)$. \square

5.3. Solution to the Fokker–Planck equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions. We are now going to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1 by showing that the limit curve is, in fact, a solution to the linear Fokker–Planck equation with the desired boundary conditions.

Proposition 5.19. *If the sequence $(t \mapsto (\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega)_\tau$ converges, pointwise w.r.t. Wb_2 as $\tau \rightarrow 0$, to $t \mapsto \rho_t \, dx$, then $\rho^\tau \rightarrow_\tau \rho$ also in $L^1_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$ for every $q \in$*

$[1, \frac{d}{d-1})$. The curve $t \mapsto \rho_t dx$ solves the linear Fokker–Planck equation in the sense of Section 3.4, and the map $t \mapsto \left(\sqrt{\rho_t e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \right)$ belongs to $L^2_{\text{loc}}([0, \infty); W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$.

Like in the proofs of [13, Theorem 3.5] and [17, Theorem 4.1], the key to Proposition 5.19 is to first determine (see Lemma 5.22) that the measures constructed with (1.7) already solve approximately the Fokker–Planck equation. In order to prove that the limit curve has the desired properties and that convergence holds in $L^1_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$ (Lemma 5.24), two other preliminary lemmas turn out to be particularly useful. Both provide quantitative bounds at the discrete level: one (Lemma 5.20) for $\sqrt{\rho^\tau e^V}$ in $L^2_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); W^{1,2}(\Omega))$; the other (Lemma 5.21) for ρ^τ in $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$, for suitable values of q . In turn, these bounds are deduced from Proposition 5.7 and Proposition 5.13.

Lemma 5.20 (Sobolev bound). *If $\tau \leq t$, then,*

$$(5.34) \quad \int_\tau^t \left\| \sqrt{\rho_r^\tau e^V} \right\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 dr \leq \mathfrak{c}(1+t).$$

Proof. Let $r \geq \tau$. By (5.12), we have

$$\left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho_r^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \mathfrak{c} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2 \left(\mu_{\lfloor r/\tau \rfloor \tau}^\tau, \mu_{\lfloor r/\tau \rfloor \tau - \tau}^\tau \right)}{\tau^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_\tau^t \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho_r^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^2}^2 dr \leq \mathfrak{c} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} \frac{\mathcal{T}^2 \left(\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau, \mu_{i\tau}^\tau \right)}{\tau},$$

which, using Lemma 5.18, can be easily reduced to the desired inequality. \square

Lemma 5.21 (Lebesgue bound). *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$ be such that $q(d-2) \leq d$. If $\tau < t$, then*

$$(5.35) \quad \|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^q} \leq \mathfrak{c}_q e^{c\tau} \frac{1+t}{t-\tau}.$$

Proof. For every $r \in [0, t]$, Proposition 5.13 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^q} &\leq \mathfrak{c}_q \left(\int_\Omega \max \left\{ \rho_t^\tau e^V, \vartheta_0 \right\}^q e^{-V} dx \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{c}_q \left(\int_\Omega \max \left\{ \rho_r^\tau e^V, \vartheta_0 \right\}^q e^{-V} dx \right)^{1/q} \leq \mathfrak{c}_q (1 + \|\rho_r^\tau\|_{L^q}), \end{aligned}$$

and if, further, $r \geq \tau$, then (5.13) yields

$$\|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^q} \leq \mathfrak{c}_q \left(e^{c\tau} + \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho_r^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_r^\tau\|_{L^1} \right).$$

After integrating w.r.t. r from τ to t , Lemma 5.20 and Remark 5.15 imply (5.35). \square

Lemma 5.22 (Approximate Fokker–Planck). *Let $\omega \Subset \Omega$ be open, let $\varphi \in C_0^2(\omega)$, and let s, t be such that $0 \leq s \leq t$. Then, $\rho^\tau, \rho^\tau \nabla V \in L_{\text{loc}}^1((\tau, \infty); L^1(\omega))$, and*

$$(5.36) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega} (\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau) \varphi \, dx - \int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau} \int_{\Omega} (\Delta \varphi - \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) \rho_r^\tau \, dx \, dr \right| \leq \mathfrak{c}_\omega \tau (1 + t + \tau) \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)}.$$

Moreover, for $\epsilon > 0$, the inequality

$$(5.37) \quad \|\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau\|_{(C_0^2(\omega))^*} \leq \mathfrak{c}_{\omega, \epsilon} (t - s + \tau)$$

holds whenever $0 < 2\tau \leq \epsilon \leq s \leq t \leq 1/\epsilon$.

Remark 5.23. In (5.37), we identify $\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau$ and the continuous linear functional

$$C_0^2(\omega) \ni \varphi \longrightarrow \int_{\omega} (\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau) \varphi \, dx.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.22. Step 1 (integrability). From Remark 5.15, it follows trivially that $\rho^\tau \in L_{\text{loc}}^1([0, \infty); L^1(\Omega))$. We shall prove that the function $\rho^\tau \nabla V$ belongs to $L_{\text{loc}}^1((\tau, \infty); L^1(\omega))$ for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$ open. Fix $a, b > 0$ with $\tau < a \leq b$. Let p be as in Definition 3.1. Its conjugate exponent p' satisfies $p' \in [1, \infty)$ and $p'(d-2) \leq d$. By Hölder's inequality and Lemma 5.21, we have

$$(5.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_a^b \|\rho_r^\tau \nabla V\|_{L^1} \, dr &\leq \|\nabla V\|_{L^p(\omega)} \int_a^b \|\rho_r^\tau\|_{L^{p'}} \, dr \stackrel{(5.35)}{\leq} \mathfrak{c}_p \|\nabla V\|_{L^p(\omega)} e^{c\tau} \int_a^b \frac{1+r}{r-\tau} \, dr \\ &\leq \mathfrak{c}_p \|\nabla V\|_{L^p(\omega)} e^{c\tau} \frac{1+b}{a-\tau} (b-a) \leq \mathfrak{c}_\omega e^{c\tau} \frac{1+b}{a-\tau} (b-a). \end{aligned}$$

The last passage is due to the fact that both p and $\|\nabla V\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ can be seen as functions of V and ω .

Step 2 (inequality (5.36)). Let $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and choose $\gamma^i \in \text{Opt}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau, \mu_{i\tau}^\tau)$ and $S_i: \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$ as in (5.14). By the triangle inequality and the fact that $\rho_r^\tau = \rho_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau$ when $r \in [(i+1)\tau, (i+2)\tau)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\Omega} (\rho_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau - \rho_{i\tau}^\tau) \varphi \, dx - \int_{(i+1)\tau}^{(i+2)\tau} \int_{\Omega} (\Delta \varphi - \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) \rho_r^\tau \, dx \, dr \right| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\left| \int_{\Omega} (\varphi - \varphi \circ S_i - \tau \Delta \varphi + \tau \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) \rho_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau \, dx \right|}_{=: I_1^i} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\left| \int_{\Omega} ((\varphi \circ S_i) \rho_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau - \varphi \rho_{i\tau}^\tau) \, dx \right|}_{=: I_2^i}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (5.14), we rewrite I_1^i as

$$I_1^i = \left| \int_{\Omega} (\varphi - \varphi \circ S_i + \langle \nabla \varphi, S_i - \text{Id} \rangle) \rho_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau \, dx \right|,$$

and then, thanks to Taylor's theorem with remainder in Lagrange form, we establish the upper bound

$$I_1^i \leq \mathbf{c} \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} \int_{\Omega} |S_i - \text{Id}|^2 \rho_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau dx \leq \mathbf{c} \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} \mathcal{T}^2 \left(\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau, \mu_{i\tau}^\tau \right).$$

On the other hand, using Condition (2) in Definition 3.7 and the fact that φ is supported in the closure of ω , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^i &= \left| \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi(y) d\pi_{\#}^2(\gamma_{\overline{\Omega}}^{\overline{\Omega}} - \gamma_{\overline{\Omega}}^{\Omega}) \right| = \left| \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi(y) d\pi_{\#}^2(\gamma_{\overline{\Omega}}^{\omega} - \gamma_{\overline{\Omega}}^{\Omega}) \right| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \|\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\omega}\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_\omega \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \int_{\partial\Omega \times \omega} |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \leq \mathbf{c}_\omega \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} \mathcal{T}^2 \left(\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau, \mu_{i\tau}^\tau \right), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{c}_ω actually only depends on the (strictly positive) distance of ω from $\partial\Omega$. Taking the sum over i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} (\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau) \varphi dx - \int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau} \int_{\Omega} \rho_r^\tau (\Delta\varphi - \langle \nabla\varphi, \nabla V \rangle) dx dr \right| &\leq \sum_{i=\lfloor s/\tau \rfloor}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} (I_1^i + I_2^i) \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_\omega \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} \mathcal{T}^2 \left(\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau, \mu_{i\tau}^\tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

At this point, (5.36) follows from the previous estimate and Lemma 5.18.

Step 3 (inequality (5.37)). Assume that $2\tau \leq \epsilon \leq s \leq t \leq 1/\epsilon$. From (5.36), we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} (\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau) \varphi dx \right| \leq \mathbf{c}_{\omega, \epsilon} \tau \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} + \underbrace{\int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau} \|\rho_r^\tau (\Delta\varphi - \langle \nabla\varphi, \nabla V \rangle)\|_{L^1} dr}_{=: I_3},$$

and, taking into account Remark 5.15 and the estimate (5.38) of Step 1,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} \int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau} (\|\rho_r^\tau\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_r^\tau \nabla V\|_{L^1}) dr \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_\omega e^{\epsilon\tau} \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} (t - s + \tau) \left(1 + \frac{1 + t + \tau}{\lfloor s/\tau \rfloor \tau} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_{\omega, \epsilon} \|\varphi\|_{C_0^2(\omega)} (t - s + \tau). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (5.37) easily follows. \square

Lemma 5.24 (Improved convergence). *Assume that the sequence $(t \mapsto (\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega)_\tau$ converges pointwise w.r.t. Wb_2 as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ to a limit $t \mapsto \rho_t dx$. Then, for every $q \in [1, \frac{d}{d-1})$, the sequence $(\rho^\tau)_\tau$ converges to ρ in $L_{\text{loc}}^1((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$.*

Proof. Step 1. Fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and an open set $\omega \Subset \Omega$ with C^1 -regular boundary. As a first step, we shall prove strong convergence of $(\rho^\tau)_\tau$ in $L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\omega))$. The idea is to use a variant of Aubin–Lions lemma by M. Dreher and A. Jüngel [11]. Consider the Banach spaces

$$X := W^{1,1}(\omega), \quad B := L^q(\omega), \quad Y := (C_0^2(\omega))^*,$$

and note that the embeddings $X \hookrightarrow B$ and $B \hookrightarrow Y$ are respectively compact (by the Rellich–Kondrachov theorem [7, Theorem 9.16]) and continuous. The inequality (5.37) in Lemma 5.22 provides one of the two bounds needed to apply [11, Theorem 1]. The other one, namely

$$\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \|\rho^\tau\|_{L^1((\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}); W^{1,1}(\omega))} < \infty,$$

can be derived from our previous lemmas. Indeed, Remark 5.15 provides the bound on the $L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^1(\omega))$ -norm, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \rho_t^\tau\|_{L^1(\omega)} &\stackrel{(5.22)}{\leq} \mathfrak{c} \left\| \sqrt{\rho_t^\tau} \nabla \sqrt{\rho_t^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^1(\omega)} + \|\rho_t^\tau \nabla V\|_{L^1(\omega)} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{c} \sqrt{\|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^1}} \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho_t^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^{p'}(\omega)} \|\nabla V\|_{L^p(\omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $p = p(\omega)$ is given by Definition 3.1. When $\tau \leq \epsilon$, Remark 5.15 and Lemma 5.20 yield

$$\int_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \sqrt{\|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^1}} \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho_t^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^2} dt \leq \sqrt{\int_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^1} dt} \sqrt{\int_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \left\| \nabla \sqrt{\rho_t^\tau e^V} \right\|_{L^2}^2 dt} \leq \mathfrak{c}_\epsilon.$$

Moreover, since $p' \in [1, \infty)$ and $p'(d-2) \leq d$, we can apply Lemma 5.21 to bound $\|\rho_t^\tau\|_{L^{p'}(\omega)}$. To be precise, there is still a small obstruction to applying Dreher and Jüngel’s theorem: it requires ρ^τ to be constant on equally sized subintervals of the time-domain, i.e., $(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1})$; instead, here, τ and $(\epsilon^{-1} - \epsilon)$ may even be incommensurable. Nonetheless, it is not difficult to check that the proof in [11] can be adapted.⁶ In the end, we obtain the convergence of $(\rho^\tau)_\tau$, along a subsequence $(\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, to some function $f: (\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}) \times \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Up to extracting a further subsequence, we can also require that convergence holds in $L^q(\omega)$ for $\mathcal{L}_{(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1})}^1$ -a.e. t . For any such t , and for any $\varphi \in C_c(\omega)$, we thus have

$$\int_\omega \varphi f_t dx = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_\omega \varphi \rho_{\tau_k}^\tau dx = \int_\omega \varphi \rho_t dx,$$

where the last identity follows from the convergence w.r.t. Wb_2 and [13, Proposition 2.7]. Therefore, $f_t(x) = \rho_t(x)$ for $\mathcal{L}_{(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}) \times \omega}^{d+1}$ -a.e. (t, x) , and, *a posteriori*, there was no need to take subsequences.

Step 2. Secondly, we prove that, for every $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the sequence $(\rho^\tau)_\tau$ is Cauchy in the complete space $L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\Omega))$. Pick an open subset $\omega \Subset \Omega$ and cover it with a *finite* number of open balls $\{A_i\}_i$, all compactly contained in Ω . Further choose $\beta \in (q, \infty)$ with $\beta(d-2) \leq d$. We have

$$\|\cdot\|_{L(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\Omega))} \leq \sum_i \|\cdot\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(A_i))} + \|\cdot\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\Omega \setminus \omega))},$$

and, by Hölder’s inequality,

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\Omega \setminus \omega))} \leq |\Omega \setminus \omega|^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\beta}} \|\cdot\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^\beta(\Omega))}.$$

⁶The adaptation is the following. In place of [11, Inequality (7)], we write, in our notation:

$$\sum_{i: \epsilon < i\tau < \epsilon^{-1}} \left\| \rho_{i\tau}^\tau - \rho_{(i-1)\tau}^\tau \right\|_Y \stackrel{(5.37)}{\leq} \mathfrak{c}_{\omega, \epsilon, \tau} (\lceil 1/(\epsilon\tau) \rceil - 1 - \lfloor \epsilon/\tau \rfloor) \leq \mathfrak{c}_{\omega, \epsilon} (\epsilon^{-1} - \epsilon + \tau).$$

Hence, by Step 1 and the triangle inequality,

$$\limsup_{\tau_1, \tau_2 \rightarrow 0} \|\rho^{\tau_1} - \rho^{\tau_2}\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\Omega))} \leq 2|\Omega \setminus \omega|^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\beta}} \limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \|\rho^\tau\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^\beta(\Omega))}.$$

Recall Lemma 5.21: we have

$$\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \|\rho^\tau\|_{L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^\beta(\Omega))} \leq \mathfrak{c}_\beta \int_\epsilon^{\epsilon^{-1}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) dt \leq \mathfrak{c}_{\beta, \epsilon}.$$

We conclude, by arbitrariness of ω , the desired Cauchy property.

By Step 1, the limit of $(\rho^\tau)_\tau$ in $L^1(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}; L^q(\Omega))$ must coincide $\mathcal{L}_{(\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}) \times \omega}^{d+1}$ -a.e. with ρ for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$ open; hence, this limit is precisely ρ . \square

Proof of Proposition 5.19. Convergence in $L_{\text{loc}}^1((0, \infty); L^q(\Omega))$ was proven in the previous lemma. Thus, we shall only prove the properties of the limit curve.

Step 1 (continuity). Continuity in duality with $C_c(\Omega)$ follows from Proposition 5.17 and [13, Proposition 2.7].

Step 2 (identity (3.2) for $s > 0$). Let $0 < s \leq t$ and let $\varphi \in C_c^2(\Omega)$. Thanks to the convergences

$$\rho_s^\tau dx \xrightarrow{Wb_2} \rho_s dx \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_t^\tau dx \xrightarrow{Wb_2} \rho_t dx,$$

we have (see [13, Proposition 2.7])

$$\int_\Omega (\rho_t^\tau - \rho_s^\tau) \varphi dx \rightarrow_\tau \int_\Omega (\rho_t - \rho_s) \varphi dx.$$

Moreover, since every p as in Definition 3.1 has a conjugate exponent p' that satisfies $p'(d-1) < d$, Lemma 5.24 yields

$$\int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau} \int_\Omega \rho_r^\tau (\Delta \varphi - \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) dx dr \rightarrow_\tau \int_s^t \int_\Omega \rho_r (\Delta \varphi - \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) dx dr.$$

Thus, (3.2) is true by Lemma 5.22.

Step 3 (Sobolev regularity and boundary condition). In analogy with Remark 5.4, we define

$$g_r^\tau := \sqrt{\rho_r^\tau e^V} - e^{\Psi/2}, \quad g_r^{\tau, (\kappa)} := (g_r^\tau - \kappa)_+ - (g_r^\tau + \kappa)_-, \quad \tau, \kappa > 0, \quad r \geq 0,$$

and

$$g_r := \sqrt{\rho_r e^V} - e^{\Psi/2}, \quad g_r^{(\kappa)} := (g_r - \kappa)_+ - (g_r + \kappa)_-, \quad \kappa > 0, \quad r \geq 0.$$

Recall that, if $\kappa \geq c(e^{c\tau} - 1)$ for an appropriate constant c , and if $r \geq \tau$, then the function $g_r^{\tau, (\kappa)}$ is compactly supported in Ω . Let us fix one such κ and $0 < s < t$. Lemma 5.20 implies that the sequence $(g_r^{\tau, (\kappa)})_\tau$ is eventually norm-bounded in the space $L^2(s, t; W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$. As a consequence, it admits a subsequence $(g_r^{\tau_k, (\kappa)})_k$ (possibly dependent on s, t, κ) that converges weakly in $L^2(s, t; W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$. Using Lemma 5.24 and Mazur's lemma [7, Corollary 3.8 & Exercise 3.4.(1)], one can easily show that this limit indeed coincides with $g^{(\kappa)}$.

By means of the weak semicontinuity of the norm, the definition of $g^{\tau, (\kappa)}$, and Lemma 5.20, we find

$$\int_s^t \left\| g_r^{(\kappa)} \right\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 dr \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^t \left\| g_r^{\tau_k, (\kappa)} \right\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 dr \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^t \|g_r^{\tau_k}\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 dr \leq \mathfrak{c}(1+t),$$

and, by arbitrariness of s ,

$$\int_0^t \left\| g_r^{(\kappa)} \right\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 dr \leq \mathbf{c}(1+t)$$

for every $\kappa, t > 0$. We can thus extract a subsequence $(g^{(\kappa_i)})_k$ (possibly dependent on t) that converges weakly in $L^2(0, t; W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$. As before, one can check that this limit is g , whence $g \in L^2(0, t; W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$.

Step 4 (integrability, and (3.2) for $s = 0$). Fix an open set $\omega \Subset \Omega$ and cover it with a finite number of open balls $\{A_i\}_i$, all contained in Ω . Let $p = p(\omega) > d$ be as in Definition 3.1 and let p' be its conjugate exponent. Knowing that $g \in L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty); W_0^{1,2}(\Omega))$, the Sobolev embedding theorem implies $g \in L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty); L^{2p'}(\Omega))$. Given that $V \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we obtain $\rho \in L_{\text{loc}}^1([0, \infty); L^{p'}(\Omega))$. In particular, $t \mapsto \int_\omega \rho_t dx$ and $t \mapsto \int_\omega |\nabla V| \rho_t dx$ are both locally integrable on $[0, \infty)$. Given $\varphi \in C_c^2(\omega)$, the identity (3.2) for $s = 0$ thus follows from the one with $s > 0$ by taking the limit $s \downarrow 0$: on the one side,

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \int_\Omega \rho_s \varphi dx = \int_\Omega \rho_0 \varphi dx$$

by continuity in duality with $C_c(\Omega)$; on the other,

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \int_s^t \int_\Omega \rho_r (\Delta \varphi - \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) dx dr = \int_0^t \int_\Omega \rho_r (\Delta \varphi - \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla V \rangle) dx dr$$

by the dominated convergence theorem. \square

6. SLOPE FORMULA IN DIMENSION $d = 1$

In this section, we only work in dimension $d = 1$ and we take $\Omega = (0, 1)$. Recall (Proposition 4.12) that, in this setting, $\widetilde{W}b_2$ is a metric on \mathcal{S} . Our purpose is to find an explicit formula for the descending slope $\left| D_{\widetilde{W}b_2}^- \mathcal{H} \right|$ and to derive Theorem 1.5 as a corollary. Specifically, the main result of this section is the following.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume that $V \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Take $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathcal{H}(\mu) < \infty$ and let ρ be the density of μ_Ω . Then,*

$$(6.1) \quad \left| D_{\widetilde{W}b_2}^- \mathcal{H} \right|^2(\mu) = \begin{cases} 4 \int_\Omega (\partial_x \sqrt{\rho e^V})^2 e^{-V} dx & \text{if } \sqrt{\rho e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 6.2. In the current setting, i.e., $\Omega = (0, 1)$ and $V \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, the function V is Hölder continuous; thus it extends to the boundary $\partial\Omega = \{0, 1\}$. When $\sqrt{\rho e^V} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, the function ρ belongs to $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, is continuous, and extends to the boundary as well.

Remark 6.3. The functional

$$W^{1,2}(\Omega) \ni f \longmapsto \begin{cases} 4 \int_\Omega (\partial_x f)^2 e^{-V} dx & \text{if } f - e^{\Psi/2} \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{if } f - e^{\Psi/2} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \setminus W_0^{1,2}(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

is particularly well-behaved: it is convex, strongly continuous, weakly lower semi-continuous, and has weakly compact sublevels.

While the formula (6.1) reminds the classical slope of the relative entropy (i.e., the relative Fisher information), the crucial difference is in the role of the boundary condition: if ρ does not satisfy the correct one, the slope is infinite.

We are going to prove the two opposite inequalities in (6.1) separately. To prove \geq is easier: for the case where $\sqrt{\rho e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \in W_0^{1,2}$, it amounts to taking small variations of μ in an arbitrary direction (as in Proposition 5.7, Step 1); for the other case, it suffices to find appropriate sequences that make the difference quotient tend to infinity. To handle the other inequality, we have to bound $(\mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}))_+$ from above for every sufficiently close measure $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}$. Classical proofs (e.g., [2, Theorem 15.25] or [4, Theorem 10.4.6]) take advantage of geodesic convexity of the functional, which we do not to have, see Appendix A.3. One of the perks of geodesic convexity is that it automatically ensures lower semicontinuity of the descending slope, which in turn allows to make further regularity assumptions on μ and then argue by approximation. To overcome this problem, we combine different ideas on different parts of μ and $\tilde{\mu}$. Away from the boundary $\partial\Omega = \{0, 1\}$, the transport plans move absolutely continuous measures to absolutely continuous measures. The Monge-Ampère equation relates the two densities and makes the computations rather easy. The contribution of the part of μ closest to the boundary (and the corresponding portion of $\tilde{\mu}$) is, instead, *negligible*. The proof of this fact is more technical: we exploit the boundary condition and the Sobolev regularity of the functions ρ , $\log \rho$, and V to obtain appropriate estimates. Note, indeed, that since the boundary condition is positive, also $\log \rho$ has a square-integrable derivative in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$.

To be in dimension $d = 1$ is certainly necessary in order for $\widetilde{W}b_2$ to be a distance, but is also extremely useful because optimal transport maps are monotone. For this reason, it seems difficult (but maybe still possible) to adapt our proof of Proposition 6.1 for an analogue of Theorem 1.5 in higher dimension.

We first provide a variant of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem that is needed for the subsequent proof of Proposition 6.1. We prove Theorem 1.5 at the end of the section.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $(\gamma^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel measures on $\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}(\gamma^n) = 0$. Further assume that $\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma^n$ is absolutely continuous for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with a density that is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, for every $f \in L^2(\Omega)$,*

$$(6.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \left(\int_x^y (f(z) - f(x)) \, dz \right)^2 \, d\gamma^n(x, y) = 0.$$

Proof. Denote by ρ^n the density of $\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma^n$. Let $g: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz continuous. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_n &:= \int \left(\int_x^y (f(z) - f(x)) \, dz \right)^2 \, d\gamma^n \\ &\leq 3 \int \left(\int_x^y (f - g) \, dz \right)^2 \, d\gamma^n + 3 \int \left(\int_x^y g \, dz - g(x) \right)^2 \, d\gamma^n \\ &\quad + 3 \int_{\Omega} (g - f)^2 \rho^n \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function of (the extension to \mathbb{R} of) $f - g$, that is,

$$(f - g)^*(x) := \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{2r} \int_{\max\{x-r,0\}}^{\min\{x+r,1\}} |f - g| \, dz, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By the (strong) Hardy–Littlewood maximal inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left(\int_x^y (f - g) \, dz \right)^2 d\gamma^n &\leq 4 \int ((f - g)^*(x))^2 d\gamma^n = 4 \int_{\Omega} ((f - g)^*)^2 \rho^n \, dx \\ &\leq 4 \sup_n \|\rho^n\|_{L^\infty} \|(f - g)^*\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \mathbf{c} \sup_n \|\rho^n\|_{L^\infty} \|f - g\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The Lipschitz-continuity of g gives

$$\int \left(\int_x^y g \, dz - g(x) \right)^2 d\gamma^n \leq (\text{Lip } g)^2 \int (x - y)^2 d\gamma^n \leq (\text{Lip } g)^2 \mathcal{C}(\gamma^n),$$

and, moreover, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (g - f)^2 \rho^n \, dx \leq \|\rho^n\|_{L^\infty} \|f - g\|_{L^2}^2.$$

In conclusion,

$$I_n \leq \mathbf{c} \sup_n \|\rho^n\|_{L^\infty} \|f - g\|_{L^2}^2 + 3(\text{Lip } g)^2 \mathcal{C}(\gamma^n).$$

After passing to the limit superior in n , we conclude by arbitrariness of g . \square

Proof of Proposition 6.1. We omit the subscript \widetilde{w}_{b_2} in $\left| D_{\widetilde{w}_{b_2}}^- \mathcal{H} \right|$ throughout the proof.

Step 1 (inequality \geq , finite case). Assume that $\sqrt{\rho e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \in W_0^{1,2}$; hence, in particular, $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let $w: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be C^∞ -regular with compact support, and, for $\epsilon > 0$, define $R_\epsilon(x) := x + \epsilon w(x)$. Further set $\mu^\epsilon := (R_\epsilon)_\# \mu$ and $\gamma^\epsilon := (\text{Id}, R_\epsilon)_\# \mu$. When ϵ is sufficiently small, $\mu^\epsilon \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\gamma^\epsilon \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{w}_{b_2}}(\mu, \mu^\epsilon)$. Therefore, arguing as in the proofs of Proposition 5.7 (Step 1) and Lemma 5.10,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^\epsilon)}{\epsilon} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \left(\partial_x w + \frac{V - V \circ R_\epsilon}{\epsilon} \right) \rho \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (\partial_x w - w \partial_x V) \rho \, dx,$$

where the last identity can be proven by approximation of V . Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} (\partial_x w - w \partial_x V) \rho \, dx \leq |D^- \mathcal{H}|(\mu) \liminf_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma^\epsilon)}}{\epsilon} \leq |D^- \mathcal{H}|(\mu) \|w\|_{L^2(\rho)}$$

(interpreting $0 \cdot \infty = 0$), and we conclude that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \sqrt{\rho e^V}|^2 e^{-V} \, dx \leq \frac{1}{4} |D^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\mu).$$

Step 2 (inequality \geq , infinite case). The case $\sqrt{\rho e^V} \notin W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ is trivial. Thus, let us assume now that $\sqrt{\rho e^V} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ with $\text{Tr } \rho \neq \text{Tr } e^{\Psi - V}$. Without loss of generality, we may consider the case where $\rho(0) \neq e^{\Psi(0) - V(0)}$. If $\rho(0) > e^{\Psi(0) - V(0)}$, for $\epsilon > 0$ define

$$\mu^\epsilon := \mu - \epsilon \mu_{(0, \epsilon^2)} + \left(\epsilon \int_0^{\epsilon^2} \rho \, dx \right) \delta_0 \in \mathcal{S},$$

$$\gamma^\epsilon := \epsilon \mu_{(0, \epsilon^2)} \otimes \delta_0 + (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_\# (\mu_\Omega - \epsilon \mu_{(0, \epsilon^2)}) \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{w}_{b_2}}(\mu, \mu^\epsilon).$$

Since all the functions involved are continuous up to the boundary, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^\epsilon) &= \int_0^{\epsilon^2} \left(\rho \log \rho - (1-\epsilon)\rho \log((1-\epsilon)\rho) + \epsilon(V-1-\Psi(0))\rho \right) dx \\ &\sim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \epsilon^3 (\log \rho(0) + V(0) - \Psi(0))\rho(0). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^\epsilon) \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma^\epsilon)} = \sqrt{\epsilon \int_0^{\epsilon^2} x^2 \rho dx} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon^5 \int_0^{\epsilon^2} \rho dx} \sim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \epsilon^{\frac{7}{2}} \sqrt{\rho(0)},$$

from which we find

$$\begin{aligned} |D^- \mathcal{H}|(\mu) &\geq \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^\epsilon)}{\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^\epsilon)} \\ &\geq \underbrace{\sqrt{\rho(0)} (\log \rho(0) + V(0) - \Psi(0))}_{>0} \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

If, instead, $\rho(0) < e^{\Psi(0)-V(0)}$, we consider, for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mu^\epsilon := \mu + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_{(0,\epsilon^2)}^1 - \epsilon^3 \delta_0 \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \gamma^\epsilon := \epsilon \delta_0 \otimes \mathcal{L}_{(0,\epsilon^2)}^1 + (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_{\#} \mu_\Omega \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu, \mu^\epsilon).$$

and conclude with similar computations as before.

Step 3 (preliminaries for \leq). We suppose again that $\sqrt{\rho e^V} - e^{\Psi/2} \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. In particular, there exist $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\epsilon} > 0$ such that

$$\rho|_{[0,\bar{\epsilon}] \cup [1-\bar{\epsilon},1]} > \bar{\lambda}.$$

Let us take a sequence $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ that converges to μ w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$, with $\mu^n \neq \mu$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mu^n) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu)$ for every n . We aim to prove that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{H}(\mu^n) - \mathcal{H}(\mu)}{\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n)} \leq 2 \sqrt{\int_\Omega (\partial_x \sqrt{\rho e^V})^2 e^{-V} dx}.$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we write:

- ρ^n for the density of μ_Ω^n ;
- γ^n for some (arbitrarily chosen) $\widetilde{W}b_2$ -optimal transport plan between μ and μ^n such that the diagonal Δ of $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$ (i.e., the set with the two points $(0,0)$ and $(1,1)$) is γ^n -negligible;
- T_n, S_n for maps such that $(\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega = (\text{Id}, T_n)_{\#} \mu_\Omega$ and $(\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega = (S_n, \text{Id})_{\#} \mu_\Omega^n$. We can and will assume that these two maps are nondecreasing, hence \mathcal{L}_Ω^1 -a.e. differentiable;
- $a_n, b_n \in \overline{\Omega} = [0,1]$ for the infimum and supremum of the set $T_n^{-1}(\Omega)$, respectively. Note that, since T_n is monotone, $T_n^{-1}(\Omega)$ is an interval. Conventionally, we set $a_n = 1$ and $b_n = 0$ if $T_n^{-1}(\Omega) = \emptyset$.

Observe that, since $(0, a_n) \subseteq T_n^{-1}(\{0,1\})$, we have

$$\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu, \mu^n) \geq \int_0^{a_n} \min\{x, 1-x\}^2 \rho dx \geq \bar{\lambda} \int_0^{\min\{a_n, \bar{\epsilon}\}} x^2 dx = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{3} \min\{a_n, \bar{\epsilon}\}^3.$$

In particular,

$$(6.3) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n^3}{\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu, \mu^n)} < \infty \text{ and, similarly, } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1-b_n)^3}{\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu, \mu^n)} < \infty;$$

thus, up to taking subsequences, we may and will assume that $a_n < \bar{\epsilon} < 1 - \bar{\epsilon} < b_n$ for every n . In particular, $(\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{(0,a_n)\cup(b_n,1)}^1 \ll \mu_{(0,a_n)\cup(b_n,1)}$. Furthermore, since γ^n is W_2 -optimal between its marginals (cf. Proposition 4.20), it is concentrated on a monotone set Γ_n . This implies that $\gamma(0, 1)$ and $\gamma(1, 0)$ equal 0 as soon as $\gamma_\Omega^\Omega \neq 0$. Combining this observation with the fact that Δ is γ -negligible, we infer that $\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = 0$. By the same argument, $T|_{(b_n,1)} \equiv 1$ and $T|_{(0,a_n)} \equiv 0$.

Another assumption that we can and will make is

$$(6.4) \quad \rho^n|_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} \leq \Lambda := \left(\sup_{\partial\Omega} e^\Psi \right) \cdot \left(\sup_{\Omega} e^{-V} \right).$$

Indeed, if this is not the case, we can consider the new measures

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}^n &:= \gamma^n - (S_n, \text{Id})_\# \left(\rho^n|_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} - \Lambda \right)_+ \mathcal{L}_\Omega^1, \\ \tilde{\mu}^n &:= \mu - \pi_\#^1(\tilde{\gamma}^n) + \pi_\#^2(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \in \mathcal{S}, \end{aligned}$$

and notice that $\tilde{\gamma}^n \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu, \tilde{\mu}^n)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}^n) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) &= \int_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega) \cap \{\rho^n > \Lambda\}} \Lambda(\log \Lambda + V - 1 - \Psi \circ S_n) \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega) \cap \{\rho^n > \Lambda\}} \rho^n(\log \rho^n + V - 1 - \Psi \circ S_n) \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

and, because of the definition of Λ , the integrated function is nonpositive; therefore, $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}^n) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu^n)$. At the same time, $\widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \tilde{\mu}^n) \leq \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \mu^n)$ because $\tilde{\gamma}^n \leq \gamma^n$. This concludes the proof of the claim that we can assume (6.4).

Step 4 (inequality \leq). Note that $(\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega$ is a W_2 -optimal transport plan between its marginals $\rho \mathcal{L}_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)}^1$ and $\rho^n \mathcal{L}_{S_n^{-1}(\Omega)}^1$, and it is induced by the map T_n . Hence, by the classical theory of optimal transport (cf. [2, Theorem 7.3]), the *Monge-Ampère* equation

$$(6.5) \quad \left(\rho^n|_{S_n^{-1}(\Omega)} \circ T_n \right) \cdot \partial_x T_n = \rho$$

holds $\rho \mathcal{L}_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)}^1$ -a.e. Consequently, we have the chain of identities

$$\begin{aligned} (6.6) \quad \int_{S_n^{-1}(\Omega)} (\log \rho^n + V - 1) \rho^n \, dx &= \int (\log \rho^n + V - 1) \, d\pi_\#^2(\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega \\ &= \int_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)} ((\log \rho^n + V - 1) \circ T_n) \rho \, dx \\ &\stackrel{(6.5)}{=} \int_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)} (\log \rho - \log(\partial_x T_n) + V \circ T_n - 1) \rho \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can decompose the difference $\mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^n)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} (6.7) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) &\stackrel{(6.6)}{=} \int_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)} (\log(\partial_x T_n) + V - V \circ T_n) \rho \, dx + (\mu - \mu^n)_{\partial\Omega}(\Psi) \\ &\quad + \int_{T_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} (\log \rho + V - 1) \rho \, dx - \int_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} (\log \rho^n + V - 1) \rho^n \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let us focus on the integral on $T_n^{-1}(\Omega)$. By making the estimate $\log(\partial_x T_n) \leq \partial_x T_n - 1$ and using the properties of the Riemann–Stieltjes integral, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.8) \quad & \int_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)} \log(\partial_x T_n) \rho \, dx \leq \int_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)} (\partial_x T_n - 1) \rho \, dx = \int_{a_n}^{b_n} (\partial_x T_n) \rho \, dx - \int_{a_n}^{b_n} \rho \, dx \\
 & \leq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{a_n + \epsilon}^{b_n - \epsilon} \rho \, dT_n - b_n \rho(b_n) + a_n \rho(a_n) + \int_{a_n}^{b_n} x \partial_x \rho \, dx \\
 & = (T(b_n^-) - b_n) \rho(b_n) - (T(a_n^+) - a_n) \rho(a_n) - \int_{a_n}^{b_n} (T_n - \text{Id}) \partial_x \rho \, dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we employ the notation $T(a_n^+) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} T(a_n + \epsilon)$, and similarly with $T(b_n^-)$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.9) \quad & \int_{T_n^{-1}(\Omega)} (V - V \circ T_n) \rho \, dx = \int_{a_n}^{b_n} \left(\int_{T_n(x)}^x \partial_x V \, dz \right) \rho \, dx \\
 & = - \int_{a_n}^{b_n} (T_n - \text{Id}) \rho \partial_x V \, dx + \int_{a_n}^{b_n} \left(\int_{T_n(x)}^x ((\partial_x V)(z) - (\partial_x V)(x)) \, dz \right) \rho \, dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

and, by Hölder's inequality and Lemma 6.4 (applied to the restriction $(\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega$), the last double integral is negligible, i.e., it is of the order $o_n(\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n))$.

To handle the rest of (6.7), we exploit the convexity of $\lambda \mapsto \lambda \log \lambda$ and write

$$(6.10) \quad - \int_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} (\log \rho^n + V - 1) \rho^n \, dx \leq - \int_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega)} (\log \rho + V) \rho^n \, dx + \int_{S_n^{-1}(\partial\Omega) \cap \{\rho^n > 0\}} \rho \, dx.$$

Further, by Condition (3) in Definition 3.7 and the boundary condition of ρ ,

$$(6.11) \quad (\mu - \mu^n)_{\partial\Omega}(\Psi) = \int (\log \rho + V) \, d \left(\pi_{\#}^1(\gamma^n)_{\partial\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}} - \pi_{\#}^2(\gamma^n)_{\partial\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}} \right)$$

In summary, recalling that $(\gamma^n)_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = 0$, from (6.7), (6.8), (6.9), (6.10), and (6.11) follows the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.12) \quad & \mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) \leq o_n \left(\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n) \right) - \underbrace{\int_{a_n}^{b_n} (T_n - \text{Id}) (\partial_x \rho + \rho \partial_x V) \, dx}_{=: L_1^n} \\
 & \quad + \underbrace{\int (\log \rho + V) \, d \left(\pi_{\#}^1(\gamma^n - (\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega) - \pi_{\#}^2(\gamma^n - (\gamma^n)_\Omega^\Omega) \right)}_{=: L_2^n} \\
 & \quad + \underbrace{(T(b_n^-) - b_n) \rho(b_n) + \int_{S_n^{-1}(1) \cap \{\rho^n > 0\}} \rho \, dx - \int_{T_n^{-1}(1)} \rho \, dx}_{=: L_3^n} \\
 & \quad - \underbrace{(T(a_n^+) - a_n) \rho(a_n) + \int_{S_n^{-1}(0) \cap \{\rho^n > 0\}} \rho \, dx - \int_{T_n^{-1}(0)} \rho \, dx}_{=: L_4^n}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We claim that the last three lines in (6.12), i.e., L_2^n , L_3^n and L_4^n , are bounded from above by negligible quantities, of the order $o_n(\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n))$. Let us start with L_3^n . Since every left-neighborhood of 1 is *not* μ_Ω -negligible,

$$\sup \{x \in \Omega : (x, T_n(x)) \in \Gamma_n\} = 1,$$

which, together with the monotonicity of Γ_n , implies

$$(6.13) \quad T_n(1^-) \leq \mu_\Omega^n\text{-ess inf } S^{-1}(1).$$

We now distinguish two cases: either $b_n < 1$ or $b_n = 1$. If $b_n < 1$, given that $T_n|_{(b_n, 1)} \equiv 1$, the set $S^{-1}(1)$ is μ_Ω^n -negligible by (6.13). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} L_3^n &\leq \int_{b_n}^1 (\rho(b_n) - \rho(x)) dx = - \int_{b_n}^1 \left(\int_{b_n}^x \partial_x \rho dz \right) dx \\ &\leq \sqrt{\int_{b_n}^1 |x - b_n|^2 dx} \sqrt{\int_{b_n}^1 \left(\int_{b_n}^x \partial_x \rho dz \right)^2 dx} \\ &\stackrel{(6.3)}{=} O_n(\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n)) \sqrt{\int_{b_n}^1 \left(\int_{b_n}^x \partial_x \rho dz \right)^2 dx}. \end{aligned}$$

Knowing that $\rho \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and that $b_n \rightarrow 1$, it can be easily proven with Hardy's inequality that the last square root tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Assume now that $b_n = 1$. This time, the inequality (6.13) yields

$$L_3^n \leq (T_n(1^-) - 1)\rho(1) + \int_{T_n(1^-)}^1 \rho dx = \int_{T_n(1^-)}^1 (\rho(x) - \rho(1)) dx.$$

We conclude as in the case $b_n < 1$, because the computations that led to (6.3) can be easily adapted to show that $(1 - T_n(1^-))^3 = O_n(\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu, \mu^n))$. Indeed, the monotonicity of T_n gives

$$\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu, \mu^n) \geq \int_{T_n(1^-)}^1 (x - T_n(x))^2 \rho(x) dx \geq \bar{\lambda} \int_{\max\{1-\bar{\epsilon}, T_n(1^-)\}}^1 (x - T(1^-))^2 dx.$$

The proof for L_4^n is similar to that for L_3^n .

Let us now deal with the term L_2^n :

$$L_2^n = \int (\log \rho(x) + V(x) - \log \rho(y) - V(y)) d((\gamma^n)_\Omega^{\partial\Omega} + (\gamma^n)_{\partial\Omega}^\Omega).$$

Define the square-integrable function

$$f := \begin{cases} \frac{\partial_x \rho}{\rho} + \partial_x V & \text{on } (0, \bar{\epsilon}) \cup (1 - \bar{\epsilon}, 1), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\gamma_\Omega^{\{1\}}$ is concentrated on $(b_n, 1) \times \{1\}$, and $\gamma_{\{1\}}^\Omega$ is concentrated on $\{1\} \times (T_n(1^-), 1)$, as soon as n is large enough for b_n and $T_n(1^-)$ to be greater than $1 - \bar{\epsilon}$, we have the equality

$$(\log \rho(x) + V(x) - \log \rho(y) - V(y)) = \int_y^x f dz \quad \text{for } ((\gamma^n)_\Omega^{\{1\}} + (\gamma^n)_{\{1\}}^\Omega)\text{-a.e. } (x, y).$$

Moreover,

$$\int \left(\int_y^x f \, dz \right) d(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\{1\}} \leq \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n) \sqrt{\int_{b_n}^1 \left(\int_x^1 f \, dz \right)^2 \underbrace{\rho}_{\leq \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}} \, dx},$$

and

$$\int \left(\int_y^x f \, dz \right) d(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\{1\}} \leq \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n) \sqrt{\int_{T_n(1^-)}^1 \left(\int_x^1 f \, dz \right)^2 \underbrace{\rho^n|_{S_n^{-1}(1)}}_{\leq \Lambda} \, dx}.$$

In both cases, since b_n and $T_n(1^-)$ tend to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, the square roots are infinitesimal. The same argument can be easily applied at 0 (i.e. for the integrals w.r.t. $(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\{0\}}$ and $(\gamma^n)_{\Omega}^{\{0\}}$), and this brings us to the conclusion that L_2^n is negligible.

In the end, (6.12) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mu) - \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) &\leq - \int_{a_n}^{b_n} (T_n - \text{Id})(\partial_x \rho + \rho \partial_x V) \, dx + o_n \left(\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n) \right) \\ &\leq \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu, \mu^n) \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\partial_x \rho}{\sqrt{\rho}} + \sqrt{\rho} \partial_x V \right)^2 \, dx} + o_n(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is precisely the statement that we wanted to prove. \square

Corollary 6.5 (Theorem 1.5). *Assume that $V \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_2(\Omega)$. Then,*

$$(6.14) \quad \left| D_{\widetilde{W}b_2}^- \hat{\mathcal{E}} \right|^2(\mu) = \begin{cases} 4 \int_0^1 \left(\partial_x \sqrt{\rho e^V} \right)^2 e^{-V} \, dx & \text{if } \mu = \rho \, dx \\ \infty & \text{and } \sqrt{\rho e^V} - 1 \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is defined as

$$(6.15) \quad \mathcal{M}_2(\Omega) \ni \mu \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{E}}} \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}(\rho) & \text{if } \mu = \rho \, dx, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We may assume that $\mu = \rho \, dx$ for some $\rho \in L_+^1(\Omega)$, and that $\mathcal{E}(\rho) < \infty$. In particular, μ is finite and we can fix some $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\tilde{\mu}_{\Omega} = \mu$

Step 1 (inequality \leq). Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2(\Omega)$ be such that $Wb_2(\mu^n, \mu) \rightarrow_n 0$. We want to prove that the limit superior

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu) - \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu^n))_+}{Wb_2(\mu, \mu^n)}$$

is bounded from above by the right-hand side of (6.14). To this aim, we may assume that the limit superior is actually a limit and that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu^n) \leq \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu) = \mathcal{E}(\rho)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In particular, each measure μ^n is finite and has a density ρ^n . By Lemma 4.1, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \widetilde{W}b_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}) : \tilde{\nu}_{\Omega} = \mu^n \right\} = Wb_2(\mu, \mu^n),$$

which ensures the existence of $\tilde{\mu}^n \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\tilde{\mu}_\Omega^n = \mu^n$ and

$$(6.16) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^n)}{Wb_2(\mu, \mu^n)} = 1, \quad \text{as well as, consequently, } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^n) = 0.$$

By (6.16) and Proposition 6.1 (with $\Psi \equiv 0$), we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu) - \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu^n))_+}{Wb_2(\mu, \mu^n)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\mathcal{E}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}(\rho^n))_+}{\widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^n)} \leq \text{RHS of (6.14)}.$$

Step 2 (inequality \geq). By Proposition 6.1 (with $\Psi \equiv 0$), we know that there exists a sequence $(\tilde{\mu}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $\widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}^n, \tilde{\mu}) \rightarrow_n 0$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\mu) - \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\tilde{\mu}_\Omega^n))_+}{\widetilde{Wb}_2(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^n)} = \text{RHS of (6.14)}.$$

We conclude by using (4.1). \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

As before, throughout this section we restrict to the case where $\Omega = (0, 1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^1$. Fix $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that its restriction to $(0, 1)$ is absolutely continuous with density equal to ρ_0 . Recall the scheme (1.8): for every $\tau > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we iteratively choose

$$(7.1) \quad \mu_{(n+1)\tau}^\tau \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \mu_{n\tau})}{2\tau} \right).$$

These sequences of measures are extended to maps $t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau$, constant on the intervals $[n\tau, (n+1)\tau)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.4. Observe the following fact: the statement 3 follows directly from the statements 1 and 2. Indeed, given the sequence of maps $(t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau)_\tau$ that converges to $t \mapsto \mu_t$ pointwise w.r.t. \widetilde{Wb}_2 , we infer from (4.1) that $(t \mapsto (\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega)_\tau$ converges to $t \mapsto (\mu_t)_\Omega$ pointwise w.r.t. Wb_2 . Since the approximating maps are precisely the same as those built with (1.7), we can apply Proposition 5.19 to conclude the statement 3. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is thus split into only three sections.

7.1. Equivalence of the schemes. For the purpose of this section, we fix a measure $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that its restriction to $\Omega = (0, 1)$ is absolutely continuous. We denote by $\bar{\rho}$ the density of this restriction, and we assume that $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\rho}) < \infty$.

Proposition 7.1. *If $2\tau|\Psi(1) - \Psi(0)| < 1$, then $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$ is a minimum point of*

$$(7.2) \quad \mathcal{H}(\cdot) + \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\cdot, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$$

if and only if it is a minimum point of

$$(7.3) \quad \mathcal{H}(\cdot) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\cdot, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

In particular, there exists one single such μ , see Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.9.

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be the function in (7.2) and \mathcal{G} be that in (7.3). Recall that $\widetilde{W}b_2 \leq \mathcal{T}$, which implies that $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G}$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu, \bar{\mu})$ be such that the diagonal Δ of $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$ is γ -negligible, and define

$$\tilde{\mu} := \mu - \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} + \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \tilde{\gamma} := \gamma - \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} \in \text{Adm}_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mu}, \bar{\mu}).$$

We have

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\tilde{\mu}) &\leq \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mu}) + \frac{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\gamma})}{2\tau} = \mathcal{F}(\mu) + (\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} - \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega})(\Psi) - \frac{\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega})}{2\tau} \\ &= \mathcal{F}(\mu) + (\Psi(1) - \Psi(0))(\gamma(0, 1) - \gamma(1, 0)) - \frac{\gamma(0, 1) + \gamma(1, 0)}{2\tau} \leq \mathcal{F}(\mu), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last inequality, we used the assumption on τ .

Step 1. It follows from (7.4) that $\inf \mathcal{G} \leq \mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G}$. This is enough to conclude that every minimum point of \mathcal{G} is a minimum point of \mathcal{F} too.

Step 2. Assume now that μ is a minimum point of \mathcal{F} . Again by (7.4),

$$\mathcal{F}(\mu) \leq \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mu}) \leq \mathcal{G}(\tilde{\mu}) \leq \mathcal{F}(\mu).$$

Therefore, it must be true that $\mathcal{F}(\mu) = \mathcal{G}(\tilde{\mu})$ and that all inequalities in (7.4) are equalities. This can only happen if $\gamma_{(\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega) \setminus \Delta} = \gamma_{\partial\Omega}^{\partial\Omega}$ has zero mass, which implies $\mu = \tilde{\mu}$. It is now easy to conclude from $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mu) = \mathcal{G}(\mu)$ that μ is a minimum point of \mathcal{G} . \square

7.2. Convergence.

Proposition 7.2. *As $\tau \rightarrow 0$, up to subsequences, the maps $(t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau)_\tau$ converge pointwise w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$ to a curve $t \mapsto \mu_t$, continuous w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$. The restrictions $(\mu_t)_\Omega$ are absolutely continuous.*

Lemma 7.3. *For every $t \geq 0$ and $\tau > 0$ such that $2\tau|\Psi(1) - \Psi(0)| < 1$, we have the upper bound*

$$(7.5) \quad \|\mu_t^\tau\| \leq \mathbf{c}(1 + t + \tau).$$

Proof. Let $t \geq 0$ be fixed. We already know from Remark 5.15 that $\|(\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega\| \leq \mathbf{c}$. By applying Lemma 4.9 with $\Phi(x) := 1 - x$, we find

$$\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau(0) - \mu_{i\tau}^\tau(0) \leq \int (1 - x) d(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau - \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau)_\Omega + \mathbf{c}\tau + \frac{\mathcal{T}^2(\mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau, \mu_{i\tau}^\tau)}{4\tau},$$

for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By summing over $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, [t/\tau] - 1\}$ and using Lemma 5.18,

$$\mu_t^\tau(0) - \mu_0(0) \leq \int (1 - x) d(\mu_0 - \mu_t^\tau)_\Omega + \mathbf{c}(1 + t + \tau) \leq \mathbf{c}(1 + t + \tau).$$

Thus, the sequence $(\mu_t^\tau(0))_\tau$ is bounded from above as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. By suitably choosing Φ , we can find a similar bound from below and bounds for $\mu_t^\tau(1)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.2. We can assume that $\tau < 1$ and that $2\tau|\Psi(1) - \Psi(0)| < 1$. The proof goes as in Proposition 5.17: for a fixed $t \geq 0$, we need to prove that

$$(7.6) \quad \limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_s^\tau, \mu_t^\tau) \leq \mathbf{c}\sqrt{|r - s|(1 + t)}, \quad r, s \in [0, t],$$

and that

$$\tilde{K}_t := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{S} : \|\mu\| \leq c_1(2 + t), \text{ and } \mu_\Omega = \rho dx \text{ with } \int_\Omega \rho \log \rho dx \leq c_2(2 + t) \right\}$$

is compact in $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$, where the constants c_1 and c_2 are given by Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 5.18, respectively.

The inequality (7.6) follows from (5.33).

If $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a sequence in \widetilde{K}_t , thanks to the bound on the total mass, we can extract a (not relabeled) subsequence that converges weakly to some $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$. Let ρ^n be the density of μ_Ω^n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We exploit the bound on the integral $\int_\Omega \rho^n \log \rho^n$ to extract a further subsequence such that $(\rho^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ converges weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ to some ρ . We have $\mu_\Omega = \rho dx$, as well as $\|\mu\| \leq c_1(2+t)$ and $\int_\Omega \rho \log \rho dx \leq c_2(2+t)$; hence $\mu \in \widetilde{K}_t$. The convergence $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$ holds also w.r.t. \widetilde{Wb}_2 thanks to Lemma 4.17. \square

7.3. Curve of maximal slope.

Proposition 7.4. *Assume that $V \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. If the sequence $(t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau)_\tau$ converges pointwise w.r.t. \widetilde{Wb}_2 to a curve $t \mapsto \mu_t$, then the latter is a curve of maximal slope for the functional \mathcal{H} in the metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$.*

Parts of the proof of this proposition are classical arguments, see for instance [4, Theorem 2.3.3] or [2, Theorem 14.7]. However, we crucially need the slope formula of Proposition 6.1.

It is convenient to work with De Giorgi's variational interpolation

$$(7.7) \quad \tilde{\mu}_t^\tau := \begin{cases} \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mu) + \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \mu_t^\tau)}{2(t - \lfloor t/\tau \rfloor \tau)} \right) & \text{if } t \in [0, \infty) \setminus \tau \mathbb{N}_0, \\ \mu_t^\tau & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Well-posedness (existence and uniqueness of the minimizer) for sufficiently small τ follows from Proposition 7.1. Moreover, after replacing \widetilde{Wb}_2 with \mathcal{T} , (7.7) produces the same map $t \mapsto \tilde{\mu}_t^\tau$.

As usual, we denote by $\rho_t^\tau, \tilde{\rho}_t^\tau, \rho_t$ the densities of $(\mu_t^\tau)_\Omega, (\tilde{\mu}_t^\tau)_\Omega, (\mu_t)_\Omega$, respectively.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\tau > 0$ be such that $16\tau|\Psi(1) - \Psi(0)| < 1$, and let $s, t \in [0, \infty)$ with $s \leq t$. Then there exists a Borel map $G_\tau: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(7.8) \quad \left| D_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}^- \mathcal{H} \right|(\tilde{\mu}_t) \leq G_\tau(t), \quad t \in (0, \infty),$$

and

$$(7.9) \quad \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{i=\lfloor s/\tau \rfloor}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau, \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau)}{\tau^2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau} G_\tau^2(r) dr = \mathcal{H}(\mu_s^\tau) - \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^\tau).$$

Moreover, we have the upper bounds

$$(7.10) \quad \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor - 1} \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_{i\tau}^\tau, \mu_{(i+1)\tau}^\tau)}{\tau^2} \leq c_t \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_r^\tau, \tilde{\mu}_r^\tau) \leq c_t \tau \quad \text{for } r \in [0, t].$$

Proof. It is sufficient to restrict to the subspace $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}} := \{\mu \in \mathcal{S} : \mathcal{H}(\mu) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_0)\}$ and invoke [4, Lemma 3.2.2]. Therein, three assumptions are in place, which in our contest read as follows:

- (1) the metric space $(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ is complete,
- (2) the functional $\mathcal{H}|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ is proper and lower semicontinuous,

(3) if $2\tau|\Psi(1) - \Psi(0)| < 1$ then

$$\mathcal{H}|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\cdot) + \frac{\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\cdot, \bar{\mu})}{2\tau} : \widetilde{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$$

is proper and admits a minimum point for every $\bar{\mu} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$.

The three properties follow from Proposition A.3, Proposition 4.16, and Proposition 7.1, respectively. It can be also checked that completeness is in fact never used in the proof of [4, Lemma 3.2.2], nor in any of the results preparatory to it.

To be precise, [4, Lemma 3.2.2] is stated with the summation and the integral of (7.9) starting from some $i\tau$ with $i \geq 1$. It can be easily verified that, because $\mathcal{H}(\mu_0) < \infty$, (7.9) is true also when they start from 0, i.e., for $s \in [0, \tau)$, cf. [4, Equation (3.1.12)]. \square

Lemma 7.6. *Assume that $(t \mapsto \mu_t^\tau)_\tau$ converges pointwise w.r.t. \widetilde{Wb}_2 to a curve $t \mapsto \mu_t$. Then we can extract a subsequence $(\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ along which we have*

$$(7.11) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^{\tau_k}) = \mathcal{H}(\mu_t) \quad \text{out of a Lebesgue-negligible set } E \subseteq [0, \infty).$$

Proof. We know from Lemma 5.24 that there exists a subsequence $(\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $\rho_t^{\tau_k} \xrightarrow{L^2} \rho_t$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for Lebesgue-a.e. $t \geq 0$.

For every such t , we have to estimate

$$|\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{H}(\mu_t)| = |\mathcal{E}(\mu_t^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{E}(\mu_t) + (\mu_t^{\tau_k} - \mu_t)_{\partial\Omega}(\Psi)|.$$

By Lemma 4.15,

$$|\mu_t^{\tau_k}(\Psi) - \mu_t(\Psi)| \leq c\widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu_t^{\tau_k}, \mu_t) \sqrt{\|(\mu_t^{\tau_k})_\Omega\| + \|(\mu_t)_\Omega\| + \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_t^{\tau_k}, \mu_t)};$$

therefore, thanks to the mass bound of Remark 5.15, we have $\mu_t^{\tau_k}(\Psi) \rightarrow_k \mu_t(\Psi)$. Hence,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{H}(\mu_t)| = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{E}(\mu_t^{\tau_k}) - \mathcal{E}(\mu_t) - (\mu_t^{\tau_k} - \mu_t)_\Omega(\Psi)|,$$

and, as $V, \Psi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, the limit $\mathcal{E}(\mu_t^{\tau_k}) - (\mu_t^{\tau_k})_\Omega(\Psi) \rightarrow_k \mathcal{E}(\mu_t) - (\mu_t)_\Omega(\Psi)$ is an easy consequence of $\rho_t^{\tau_k} \xrightarrow{L^2} \rho_t$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.4. We omit the subscript \widetilde{Wb}_2 in $\left|D_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}^- \mathcal{H}\right|$ throughout the proof.

Step 1. Consider the function

$$D_\tau(t) := \frac{1}{\tau} \widetilde{Wb}_2 \left(\mu_{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor \tau}^\tau, \mu_{\lfloor t/\tau \rfloor \tau + \tau}^\tau \right), \quad t \geq 0,$$

and notice that, by the triangle inequality,

$$(7.12) \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu_a^\tau, \mu_b^\tau) \leq \int_{\lfloor \frac{a}{\tau} \rfloor \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{b}{\tau} \rfloor \tau + \tau} D_\tau(r) dr, \quad 0 \leq a < b.$$

Fix $t > 0$. We know from Lemma 7.5 that

$$\int_0^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau} D_\tau^2(r) dr \leq \mathfrak{c}_t,$$

⁷We only need convergence in some L^q with $q > 1$. We choose $q = 2$ for simplicity.

which implies that, up to subsequences, the sequence $(D_\tau \mathbb{1}_{(0,t-\tau)})_\tau$ converges to some function $D: (0,t) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ weakly in $L^2(0,t)$. By (7.12),

$$\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_a, \mu_b) \leq \int_a^b D(r) dr, \quad 0 \leq a < b < t,$$

which means that $(\mu_r)_{r \in [0,t]}$ is absolutely continuous with $|\dot{\mu}_r| \leq D$. Now consider the subsequence $(\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ (independent of t) provided by Lemma 7.6, and let $E \subseteq [0, \infty)$ be the Lebesgue-negligible set in (7.11). We may assume that $0 \notin E$. For every $s \in [0, t) \setminus E$, Lemma 7.6, Lemma 7.5, the superadditivity of the limit inferior, Fatou's lemma, the semicontinuity of the norm w.r.t. weak convergence, and Proposition 4.16 (semicontinuity of \mathcal{H}) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mu_s) &\stackrel{(7.11)}{=} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}(\mu_s^{\tau_k}) \\ &\stackrel{(7.9)}{\geq} \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\lfloor \frac{s}{\tau} \rfloor \tau}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau} \left(\frac{1}{2} D_\tau^2(r) + \frac{1}{2} G_\tau^2(r) \right) dr + \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^\tau) \right) \\ (7.13) \quad &\geq \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \int_s^{t-\tau} D_\tau^2(r) dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} G_\tau^2(r) dr + \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^\tau) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t |\dot{\mu}_r|^2 dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} G_\tau^2(r) dr + \mathcal{H}(\mu_t). \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. By (7.13), for $\mathcal{L}_{(0,\infty)}^1$ -a.e. r , we have

$$\liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} |\mathcal{D}^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\tilde{\mu}_r^\tau) \leq \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} G_\tau^2(r) < \infty.$$

Let us fix one such $r > 0$. We may take a subsequence $(\tau_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ (possibly depending on r) such that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{D}^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\tilde{\mu}_r^{\tau_l}) = \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} |\mathcal{D}^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\tilde{\mu}_r^\tau).$$

Recall Remark 6.3: we can extract a further (not relabeled) subsequence such that $(\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_r^{\tau_l}} e^V)_l$ converges weakly in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Consequently and by the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem [7, Theorem 8.8], the sequence $(\tilde{\rho}_r^{\tau_l})_l$ converges in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Furthermore, by assumption, (7.10), and (4.1), we have $\tilde{\rho}_r^{\tau_l} dx \xrightarrow{Wb_2} \rho_r dx$. Owing to [13, Proposition 2.7], the two limits coincide, and, making use of the lower semicontinuity observed in Remark 6.3, we can finally write

$$|\mathcal{D}^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\mu_r) = 4 \int_\Omega \left(\partial_x \sqrt{\rho_r e^V} \right)^2 e^{-V} dx \leq \liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} |\mathcal{D}^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\tilde{\mu}_r^\tau).$$

Therefore,

$$(7.14) \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu_s) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t |\dot{\mu}_r|^2 dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t |\mathcal{D}^- \mathcal{H}|^2(\mu_r) dr + \mathcal{H}(\mu_t),$$

$$0 \leq s \leq t \text{ with } s \notin E.$$

At this point, we can define

$$\phi(t) := \sup \{ \mathcal{H}(\mu_r) : r \geq t \text{ and } r \notin E \}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

and check that it fulfills the properties required by Definition 3.5:

- Monotonicity follows directly from the definition.

- If $t \notin E$, by definition, $\phi(t) \geq \mathcal{H}(\mu_t)$. Moreover, for every $r \geq t$, the inequality (7.14) gives $\mathcal{H}(\mu_r) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_t)$; therefore, $\phi(t) = \mathcal{H}(\mu_t)$.
- By monotonicity, $\phi \leq \phi(0)$ and, since $0 \notin E$, we have $\phi(0) = \mathcal{H}(\mu_0) < \infty$. Hence, ϕ is real-valued.
- The inequality (3.6) follows from (7.14) and the Lebesgue differentiation theorem. \square

 APPENDIX A. ADDITIONAL PROPERTIES OF \widetilde{Wb}_2

A.1. \widetilde{Wb}_2 is not a distance when $d \geq 2$. We are going to prove that, when $d \geq 2$, the property

$$\widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) = 0 \implies \mu = \nu$$

in general breaks down. In fact, when applying \widetilde{Wb}_2 to two measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ the information about $\mu_{\partial\Omega}$ and $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ is completely lost, as soon as $\partial\Omega$ is connected and “not too irregular”. A similar result is [16, Theorem 2.2] by E. Mainini.

Proposition A.1. *If $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ be $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -Hölder continuous for some $\epsilon > 0$, then*

$$(A.1) \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2(\delta_{\alpha(0)} - \delta_{\alpha(1)}, 0) = 0.$$

Consequently: Assume that $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{0, \frac{1}{2}+}$ -path-connected, meaning that for every pair of points $x, y \in \partial\Omega$ there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -Hölder curve $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ with $\alpha(0) = x$ and $\alpha(1) = y$; then

$$(A.2) \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu, \nu) = Wb_2(\mu_\Omega, \nu_\Omega)$$

for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. Step 1. Let $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ be $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -Hölder continuous for some $\epsilon > 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$, consider the points

$$x_i := \alpha(i/n), \quad i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\},$$

and the measure

$$\gamma^n := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{(x_i, x_{i+1})}.$$

It is easy to check that $\gamma^n \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\delta_{\alpha(0)} - \delta_{\alpha(1)}, 0)$; moreover,

$$\mathcal{C}(\gamma^n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |x_i - x_{i+1}|^2 \leq \mathbf{c}_\alpha \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} n^{-1-2\epsilon} = \mathbf{c}_\alpha n^{-2\epsilon},$$

where the inequality follows from the Hölder-continuity of α . We conclude (A.1) by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 2. Assume now that $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{0, \frac{1}{2}+}$ -path-connected. Fix a finite signed Borel measure η on $\partial\Omega$ with $\eta(\partial\Omega) = 0$, that is, $\|\eta_+\| = \|\eta_-\| =: \lambda$. We shall prove that $\widetilde{Wb}_2(\eta, 0) = 0$. Fix $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ and let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\} \subseteq \partial\Omega$ be a ϵ_1 -covering for $\partial\Omega$, meaning that there exists a function $P: \partial\Omega \rightarrow X$ such that $|x - P(x)| \leq \epsilon_1$ for every $x \in \partial\Omega$. We pick one such P that is also Borel-measurable (we can by [1, Theorem 18.19]). From the previous step, for every $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, we get $\gamma_{i,j}$ (nonnegative and concentrated on $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$) such that

$$\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{i,j} - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_{i,j} = \delta_{x_i} - \delta_{x_j} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}(\gamma_{i,j}) \leq \epsilon_2.$$

We define

$$\gamma := (\text{Id}, P)_{\#} \eta_+ + (P, \text{Id})_{\#} \eta_- + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \eta_+(P^{-1}(x_i)) \eta_-(P^{-1}(x_j)) \gamma_{i,j}.$$

The \widetilde{Wb}_2 -admissibility of γ , i.e., $\gamma \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\eta, 0)$ is straightforward. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(\gamma) &= \int |\text{Id} - P|^2 d(\eta_+ + \eta_-) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \eta_+(P^{-1}(x_i)) \eta_-(P^{-1}(x_j)) \mathcal{C}(\gamma_{i,j}) \\ &\leq 2\lambda(\epsilon_1)^2 + \lambda\epsilon_2, \end{aligned}$$

which brings us to the conclusion that $\widetilde{Wb}_2(\eta, 0) = 0$ by arbitrariness of ϵ_1, ϵ_2 .

Step 3. Let us assume again that $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{0, \frac{1}{2}+}$ -path-connected, and fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon_3 > 0$. Let γ be an optimal transport plan for Wb_2 between μ_Ω and ν_Ω , and set $\tilde{\mu} := \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma + (\nu - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma)_{\partial\Omega}$. It is easy to check that $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}$ and that $\mu_\Omega = \tilde{\mu}_\Omega$. Therefore, the previous Step is applicable to $\eta := \mu_{\partial\Omega} - \tilde{\mu}_{\partial\Omega}$, and produces γ_η on $\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_\eta - \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma_\eta = \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}(\gamma_\eta) \leq \epsilon_3.$$

The measure $\gamma' := \gamma + \gamma_\eta$ is \widetilde{Wb}_2 -admissible between μ and ν . Therefore,

$$\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma') \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma) + \epsilon_3 = Wb_2^2(\mu_\Omega, \nu_\Omega) + \epsilon_3,$$

which yields one of the two inequalities in (A.2) by arbitrariness of ϵ_3 . The other inequality is (4.1). \square

A.2. Completeness. We prove here two claims from Section 4.6: in the setting where Ω is a finite union of intervals, the metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ is *not* complete, but the sublevels of \mathcal{H} are.

Proposition A.2. *Assume that $d = 1$ and that Ω is a finite union of intervals. Then the metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{Wb}_2)$ is not complete.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(0, 1)$ is a connected component of Ω , i.e., $(0, 1) \subseteq \Omega$ and $\{0, 1\} \subseteq \partial\Omega$.

Consider the sequence

$$\mu^n := \frac{1}{x} \mathcal{L}_{(2^{-n}, 1)}^1 - \delta_0 \int_{2^{-n}}^1 \frac{1}{x} dx \in \mathcal{S}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_1.$$

For every n there exists the admissible transport plan

$$\gamma^n := \delta_0 \otimes \left(\frac{1}{x} \mathcal{L}_{(2^{-n-1}, 2^{-n})}^1 \right) + (\text{Id}, \text{Id})_{\#} \left(\frac{1}{x} \mathcal{L}_{(2^{-n}, 1)}^1 \right) \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu^n, \mu^{n+1}),$$

which yields

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{Wb}_2(\mu^n, \mu^{n+1}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\int_{2^{-n-1}}^{2^{-n}} \frac{x^2}{x} dx} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} 2^{-n} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}};$$

hence $(\mu^n)_n$ is Cauchy.

Now, assume that $\mu^n \xrightarrow{\widetilde{W}b_2} \mu$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$ and, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$, fix $\tilde{\gamma}^n \in \text{Opt}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu^n, \mu)$. Further fix $\epsilon > 0$. We have

$$\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu^n, \mu) = \int |x - y|^2 d\tilde{\gamma}^n(x, y) \geq \epsilon^2 \tilde{\gamma}^n([\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon] \times \{0, 1\}),$$

and, using the properties in Definition 3.7,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_\Omega\| &\geq \tilde{\gamma}^n([\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon] \times (0, 1)) = \mu^n([\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]) - \tilde{\gamma}^n([\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon] \times \{0, 1\}) \\ &\geq \mu^n([\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]) - \frac{\widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu^n, \mu)}{\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we find

$$\|\mu_\Omega\| \geq \int_\epsilon^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1}{x} dx$$

from which, by arbitrariness of ϵ , it follows that the total mass of μ_Ω is infinite, contradicting the finiteness required in Definition 3.7. \square

Proposition A.3. *Assume that $d = 1$ and that Ω is a finite union of intervals. Then the sublevels of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{S} are complete w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$.*

Proof. Take a Cauchy sequence $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ for $\widetilde{W}b_2$ in a sublevel of \mathcal{H} , that is, $\mathcal{H}(\mu^n) \leq M$ for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Thanks to Lemma 4.15, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &\geq \mathcal{H}(\mu^n) \geq \int_\Omega \rho^n \log \rho^n dx - (\|V\|_{L^\infty} + 1) \|\mu_\Omega^n\| + \mu_{\partial\Omega}^n(\Psi) \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \rho^n \log \rho^n dx - (\|V\|_{L^\infty} + 1) \|\mu_\Omega^n\| + \mu^0(\Psi) - \mu_\Omega^n(\Psi) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{c} \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu^n, \mu^0) \sqrt{\|\mu_\Omega^n\| + \|\mu_\Omega^0\| + \widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu^n, \mu^0)}, \end{aligned}$$

and, since $\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu^n, \mu^0)$ is bounded in n , the family $(\rho^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is uniformly integrable. Let $(\rho^{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a subsequence that converges to some ρ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$. For each of the finitely many $\bar{x} \in \partial\Omega$, let $\Phi_{\bar{x}}$ be a Lipschitz continuous function such that

$$\Phi_{\bar{x}}(\bar{x}) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\bar{x}}(x) = 0 \text{ if } x \in \partial\Omega \setminus \{\bar{x}\}.$$

Again by Lemma 4.15, for every $\bar{x} \in \partial\Omega$ and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu^n(\bar{x}) - \mu^m(\bar{x})| &\leq |\mu_\Omega^n(\Phi_{\bar{x}}) - \mu_\Omega^m(\Phi_{\bar{x}})| \\ &\quad + \mathbf{c}_{\Phi_{\bar{x}}} \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu^n, \mu^m) \sqrt{\|\mu_\Omega^n\| + \|\mu_\Omega^m\| + \widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu^n, \mu^m)} \\ &= \left| \int_\Omega \Phi_{\bar{x}} \cdot (\rho^n - \rho^m) dx \right| \\ &\quad + \mathbf{c}_{\Phi_{\bar{x}}} \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu^n, \mu^m) \sqrt{\|\rho^n\|_{L^1} + \|\rho^m\|_{L^1} + \widetilde{W}b_2^2(\mu^n, \mu^m)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $(\mu^{n_k}(\bar{x}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R} , thus convergent to some number $l_{\bar{x}}$. Define

$$\mu := \rho dx + \sum_{\bar{x} \in \partial\Omega} l_{\bar{x}} \delta_{\bar{x}}.$$

It is easy to check that $\mu^{n_k} \rightarrow_k \mu$ weakly; therefore, by Lemma 4.17, also w.r.t. $\widetilde{W}b_2$. The limit μ also lies in the sublevel, i.e., $\mathcal{H}(\mu) \leq M$, by Proposition 4.16. \square

A.3. If Ω is an interval, $\widetilde{W}b_2$ is geodesic, but \mathcal{H} is not geodesically convex.

We prove that $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{W}b_2)$ is geodesic when $\Omega = (0, 1)$, by using the analogous well-known problem of the classical 2-Wasserstein distance. However, as we expect in light of [13, Remark 3.4], \mathcal{H} is *not* geodesically λ -convex for any λ . We give a short proof by adapting the aforementioned remark.

Proposition A.4. *If $\Omega = (0, 1)$, then $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{W}b_2)$ it is a geodesic metric space.*

Proof. We already know from Proposition 4.12 that $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{W}b_2)$ is a metric space.

For any two measures $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{S}$, we need to find a curve $t \mapsto \mu_t$ such that

$$(A.3) \quad \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_s, \mu_t) \leq (t-s)\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1), \quad 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1.$$

The opposite inequality follows from the triangle inequality and (A.3) itself. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1) &\leq \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_s) + \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_s, \mu_t) + \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_t, \mu_1) \\ &\stackrel{(A.3)}{\leq} (s+t-s+1-t)\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1) = \widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1), \end{aligned}$$

and, in order for the inequalities to be equalities, the identity $\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_s, \mu_t) = (t-s)\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ must be true.

Take $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\widetilde{W}b_2}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$. By Proposition 4.20, γ is optimal, between its marginals, for the classical 2-Wasserstein distance. Since the set $\overline{\Omega} = [0, 1]$, endowed with the Euclidean metric, is geodesic, the classical theory of optimal transport (see, e.g., [2, Theorem 10.6]) ensures the existence of a curve (geodesic) $t \mapsto \nu_t$ of nonnegative measures on $\overline{\Omega}$ with constant total mass, such that

$$(A.4) \quad W_2(\nu_s, \nu_t) \leq (t-s)W_2(\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma, \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma) = (t-s)\sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)} = (t-s)\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1)$$

for $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$. After noticing that $\nu_1 - \nu_0 = \mu_1 - \mu_0$ by Condition (3) in Definition 3.7, we define

$$\mu_t := \mu_0 + \nu_t - \nu_0, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

We claim that this is the sought curve. Firstly, since

$$(\mu_t)_\Omega = (\mu_0)_\Omega + (\nu_t)_\Omega - (\nu_0)_\Omega = (\nu_t)_\Omega \geq 0$$

by Condition (1) in Definition 3.7, and since $\nu_0(\overline{\Omega}) = \nu_t(\overline{\Omega})$, we can be sure that $\mu_t \in \mathcal{S}$ for every t . Secondly, every W_2 -optimal transport plan γ_{st} between ν_s and ν_t is $\widetilde{W}b_2$ -admissible between μ_s and μ_t . Hence,

$$\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_s, \mu_t) \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{st})} = W_2(\nu_s, \nu_t) \stackrel{(A.4)}{\leq} (t-s)\widetilde{W}b_2(\mu_0, \mu_1). \quad \square$$

Proposition A.5. *Let $\Omega = (0, 1)$. The functional \mathcal{H} is not geodesically λ -convex on the metric space $(\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{W}b_2)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Consider the curve

$$t \mapsto \mu_t := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t}\mathcal{L}_{(0,t)}^1 - \delta_0 & \text{if } t \in (0, 1] \\ 0 & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\mu_t \in \mathcal{S}$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. We claim that this curve is a geodesic, that $\mathcal{H}(\mu_0) < \infty$, and that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\mu_t) = \infty$, which would conclude the proof.

The second claim, namely $\mathcal{H}(\mu_0) < \infty$, is obvious. The third claim is true because

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu_t) = -\log t + \int_0^t V \, dx - \Psi(0), \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

and, since $V \in L^\infty(0, 1)$, the right-hand side tends to ∞ as $t \rightarrow 0$. To prove the first claim, fix $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$ and define

$$\gamma_{st} := \left(\text{Id}, \frac{s}{t} \text{Id} \right)_{\#} \mu_t \in \text{Adm}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu_t, \mu_s),$$

which gives

$$(A.5) \quad \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_s, \mu_t) \leq \mathcal{C}(\gamma_{st}) = \int \left| x - \frac{s}{t}x \right|^2 \, d\mu_t = \frac{(t-s)^2}{3}.$$

Conversely, for every $\gamma \in \text{Opt}_{\widetilde{Wb}_2}(\mu_1, \mu_0)$, Condition (3) in Definition 3.7 implies

$$\gamma(1, 1) + \gamma(1, 0) + \gamma(\{1\} \times \Omega) = \gamma(1, 1) + \gamma(0, 1) + \gamma(\Omega \times \{1\}),$$

and, since $\gamma(\{1\} \times \Omega) = 0$ by Condition (2) in Definition 3.7, we have $\gamma(1, 0) \geq \gamma(\Omega \times \{1\})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_1, \mu_0) &= \mathcal{C}(\gamma) \geq \mathcal{C}(\gamma_{\Omega}^{\{0\}}) + \int |x-1|^2 \, d\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\{1\}} + \gamma(1, 0) \\ &\geq \mathcal{C}(\gamma_{\Omega}^{\{0\}}) + \int (|x-1|^2 + 1) \, d\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\{1\}} \geq \int x^2 \, d\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\partial\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

By Conditions (1) and (2) in Definition 3.7,

$$\int x^2 \, d\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\partial\Omega} = \int x^2 \, d\pi_{\#}^1 \gamma_{\Omega}^{\overline{\Omega}} = \int_0^1 x^2 \, dx = \frac{1}{3};$$

hence

$$\widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_s, \mu_t) \stackrel{(A.5)}{\leq} \frac{(t-s)^2}{3} \leq (t-s)^2 \widetilde{Wb}_2^2(\mu_1, \mu_0),$$

and this concludes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Charalambos D. Aliprantis and Kim C. Border, *Infinite dimensional analysis*, Third, Springer, Berlin, 2006. A hitchhiker's guide. MR2378491
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Elia Brué, and Daniele Semola, *Lectures on optimal transport*, Unitext, vol. 130, Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021. La Matematica per il 3+2. MR4294651
- [3] Luigi Ambrosio and Nicola Gigli, *A user's guide to optimal transport*, Modelling and optimisation of flows on networks, 2013, pp. 1–155. MR3050280
- [4] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, Second, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2008. MR2401600
- [5] V. I. Bogachev, *Measure theory. Vol. I, II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007. MR2267655
- [6] Yann Brenier, *Décomposition polaire et réarrangement monotone des champs de vecteurs*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **305** (1987), no. 19, 805–808. MR923203
- [7] Haim Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011. MR2759829
- [8] Jean-Baptiste Casteras, Léonard Monsaingeon, and Filippo Santambrogio, *Sticky-reflecting diffusion as a wasserstein gradient flow*, 2024.
- [9] Gregory Cox, *Almost sure uniqueness of a global minimum without convexity*, Ann. Statist. **48** (2020), no. 1, 584–606. MR4065175
- [10] Ennio De Giorgi, *New problems on minimizing movements*, Boundary value problems for partial differential equations and applications, 1993, pp. 81–98. MR1260440

- [11] Michael Dreher and Ansgar Jüngel, *Compact families of piecewise constant functions in $L^p(0, T; B)$* , *Nonlinear Anal.* **75** (2012), no. 6, 3072–3077. MR2890969
- [12] Matthias Erbar and Giulia Meglioli. In preparation.
- [13] Alessio Figalli and Nicola Gigli, *A new transportation distance between non-negative measures, with applications to gradients flows with Dirichlet boundary conditions*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) **94** (2010), no. 2, 107–130. MR2665414
- [14] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto, *The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **29** (1998), no. 1, 1–17. MR1617171
- [15] Dongkwang Kim, Dowan Koo, and Geuntaek Seo, *A gradient flow for the porous medium equations with dirichlet boundary conditions*, 2023.
- [16] E. Mainini, *A description of transport cost for signed measures*, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* **390** (2011), 147–181, 308–309. MR2870233
- [17] Javier Morales, *A new family of transportation costs with applications to reaction-diffusion and parabolic equations with boundary conditions*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) **112** (2018), 41–88. MR3774874
- [18] Felix Otto, *Evolution of microstructure in unstable porous media flow: a relaxational approach*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **52** (1999), no. 7, 873–915. MR1682800
- [19] ———, *The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **26** (2001), no. 1-2, 101–174. MR1842429
- [20] Angelo Profeta and Karl-Theodor Sturm, *Heat flow with Dirichlet boundary conditions via optimal transport and gluing of metric measure spaces*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **59** (2020), no. 4, Paper No. 117, 34. MR4117516
- [21] Filippo Santambrogio, *{Euclidean, metric, and Wasserstein} gradient flows: an overview*, *Bull. Math. Sci.* **7** (2017), no. 1, 87–154. MR3625852

INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AUSTRIA, AM CAMPUS 1, 3400 KLOSTERNEUBURG,
AUSTRIA

Email address: `filippo.quattrocchi@ista.ac.at`