

## DISINTEGRATED OPTIMAL TRANSPORT FOR METRIC FIBER BUNDLES

JUN KITAGAWA AND ASUKA TAKATSU

ABSTRACT. We define a new two-parameter family of metrics on a subspace of Borel probability measures on a metric fiber bundle, called the *disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics*. We then prove the disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics are complete, separable (except an endpoint case), geodesic spaces, with a dual representation. Additionally, we prove existence and duality for an associated barycenter problem, and provide conditions for uniqueness of a barycenter. These results on barycenter problems for the disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics also yield the corresponding existence, duality, and uniqueness results for classical Monge–Kantorovich barycenters in a wide variety of spaces, including a uniqueness result on any connected, complete Riemannian manifold, with or without boundary, with no restriction on the geometry of any kind.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Motivation and existing literature	6
1.2. Outline of paper	8
1.3. Notation	8
2. Disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics	8
2.1. Complete, separable, metric	13
2.2. Existence of geodesics	18
2.3. Duality	23
2.4. Further properties of disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics	34
3. Disintegrated barycenters	39
3.1. Existence of disintegrated barycenters	39
3.2. Duality for $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ - barycenters	41
3.3. Uniqueness of disintegrated barycenters	46
References	64

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a complete, separable metric space  $(X, d_X)$ , let  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  denote the space of Borel probability measures on  $X$ . For  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , also let  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  denote the set of elements in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  with finite  $p$ th moment. For  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and a Borel map  $T$  from  $X$  to a measurable space  $Y$ , the *pushforward measure*  $T_{\#}\mu \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$  is defined for a Borel set  $A \subset Y$  by

$$T_{\#}\mu(A) := \mu(T^{-1}(A)).$$

---

*Date:* July 3, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49Q22, 30L05, 28A50.

*Key words and phrases.* optimal transport, duality, barycenters, fiber bundles, disintegration of measures.

Then  $\text{MK}_p^X$  will denote the well-known  $p$ -Monge–Kantorovich metric on  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , from optimal transport theory. To be precise, let  $\pi_i : X \times X \rightarrow X$  be the projection onto the  $i$ th coordinate for  $i = 1, 2$ . For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , we define

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi(\mu, \nu) &:= \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X) \mid \pi_{1\#}\gamma = \mu, \pi_{2\#}\gamma = \nu\}, \\ \text{MK}_p^X(\mu, \nu) &:= \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \|\text{d}_X\|_{L^p(\gamma)} = \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \left( \int_{X \times X} \text{d}_X(x, y)^p d\gamma(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

The infimum above is always attained (see [35, Theorem 4.1], for instance) and a minimizer is called a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ .

It is well-known that  $\text{MK}_p^X$  is a metric on  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  and provides a rich geometric structure, laying the groundwork to name a few examples, for the theory of synthetic Ricci curvature, PDEs on singular spaces, and a wide variety of applications (see, for example, [35, Parts II and III], [32, Chapters 4, 7, and 8], and [13]).

We now introduce a two parameter family of metrics on subsets of Borel probability measures on *metric fiber bundles*, which encapsulate transportation along individual fibers. We begin by recalling some basic definitions.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $G$  be a group.

- A left action of  $G$  on a set  $Y$  is called *effective* if  $gy = y$  for all  $y \in Y$  implies that  $g$  is the identity element in  $G$ .
- A left action of  $G$  on a metric space  $(Y, \text{d}_Y)$  is *isometric* if  $\text{d}_Y(gy_1, gy_2) = \text{d}_Y(y_1, y_2)$  for  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$  and  $g \in G$ .
- $G$  is called a *topological group* if  $G$  is also endowed with a topological structure such that the map  $G \times G \rightarrow G$  defined by  $(g_1, g_2) \mapsto g_1g_2^{-1}$  is continuous.
- A topological group  $G$  *acts continuously* on a metric space  $(Y, \text{d}_Y)$  if the map  $G \times Y \rightarrow Y$  defined by  $(g, y) \mapsto gy$  is continuous.

**Definition 1.2.** A *metric fiber bundle* is a triple of metric spaces  $(E, \text{d}_E)$ ,  $(\Omega, \text{d}_\Omega)$ , and  $(Y, \text{d}_Y)$ , along with a continuous, surjective map  $\pi : E \rightarrow \Omega$ , and a topological group  $G$  acting effectively, continuously, and isometrically on  $Y$  such that the following properties hold. There exists an open cover  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  of  $\Omega$  and corresponding maps  $\Xi_j : U_j \times Y \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(U_j)$  (called *local trivializations*) such that for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ,

- (1)  $\Xi_j$  is an isometry from  $U_j \times Y$  (endowed with the product metric) to  $\pi^{-1}(U_j)$  with the restriction of  $\text{d}_E$ .
- (2)  $\pi(\Xi_j(\omega, y)) = \omega$  for all  $(\omega, y) \in U_j \times Y$ .
- (3) Write  $\Xi_{j, \omega}(y) := \Xi_j(\omega, y)$  for  $\omega \in U_j$ . Then for any  $j' \in \mathcal{J}$  with  $U_j \cap U_{j'} \neq \emptyset$ , there exists a continuous map  $g_j^{j'} : U_j \cap U_{j'} \rightarrow G$  (which is well-defined since  $G$  is effective) such that

$$\Xi_{j', \omega}^{-1}(\Xi_{j, \omega}(y)) = g_j^{j'}(\omega)y \quad \text{for } (\omega, y) \in (U_j \cap U_{j'}) \times Y.$$

As an example, we suggest the reader keep in mind the case when  $E = \Omega \times Y$  is a trivial bundle (i.e.,  $G$  is the trivial group, and there is only one local trivialization map with a cover of  $\Omega$  by only one set).

Note for any  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and any subset  $\tilde{U}_j \subset U_j$ , the restriction of  $\Xi_j$  is an isometry between  $\pi^{-1}(\tilde{U}_j)$  and  $\tilde{U}_j \times Y$ . In particular, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the space  $(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}), \text{d}_E)$  is isometric to  $(Y, \text{d}_Y)$ . For brevity, we will denote a metric fiber bundle by  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$ .

Throughout the paper, we fix a metric fiber bundle  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  where  $(E, d_E)$  and  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  are metric spaces, with  $E$  complete and separable, and  $\Omega$  complete.<sup>1</sup> Then  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  is a Lindlöf space by its separability, and is paracompact since it is metric, hence there is a countable, locally finite subcover  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ , with the associated local trivializations  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Additionally, we can find a (continuous) partition of unity  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  subordinate to  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Furthermore, we make the assumption that

$$(1.2) \quad \text{for each } y \in Y, \text{ the orbit } \{gy \mid g \in G\} \text{ is a bounded subset of } Y.$$

Examples satisfying this assumption include trivial bundles ( $E = \Omega \times Y$  with  $G$  the trivial group), the tangent bundle of any  $n$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold ( $G = O(n)$ ), and any bundle where  $Y$  has bounded diameter or  $G$  is compact. We also fix a Borel probability measure  $\sigma$  on  $\Omega$ , and define

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E) := \{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}(E) \mid \pi_\# \mathbf{m} = \sigma\}.$$

Next recall a form of disintegration of measures which can be found, for example, in [9, Chapter III-70 and 72].

**Disintegration Theorem.** *Let  $X, \Omega$  be complete, separable metric spaces,  $\pi : X \rightarrow \Omega$  a Borel map, and fix a probability measure  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then there exists a map  $\mathbf{m}^\bullet : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ , uniquely defined  $\pi_\# \mathbf{m}$ -a.e., such that if  $A \subset X$  is Borel, the real valued function on  $\Omega$  defined by*

$$\omega \mapsto \mathbf{m}^\omega(A)$$

is Borel, and

$$\mathbf{m}(A) = \int_\Omega \mathbf{m}^\omega(A) d\pi_\# \mathbf{m}(\omega).$$

Moreover, for  $\pi_\# \mathbf{m}$ -a.e.  $\omega$ ,

$$\mathbf{m}^\omega(X \setminus \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})) = 0.$$

We refer to this as the disintegration of  $\mathbf{m}$  with respect to  $\pi$  and by an abuse of notation, write  $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes (\pi_\# \mathbf{m})$ .

Then we define for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E) := \{\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E) \mid \mathbf{m}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})) \text{ for } \sigma\text{-a.e. } \omega\},$$

where the disintegration is taken with respect to the map  $\pi$ .

We are now ready to define our second family of metrics. Fix some  $y_0 \in Y$  and for any Borel  $A \subset E$ , define

$$(1.5) \quad (\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma)(A) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j, \omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y(A) d\sigma(\omega).$$

If we define  $\delta_{E, y_0}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}(E)$  by

$$(1.6) \quad \delta_{E, y_0}^\omega := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j, \omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y,$$

from Lemma 2.5 below we find (1.5) is an element of  $\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$  whose disintegration with respect to  $\pi$  is actually given by  $\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma$ .

---

<sup>1</sup> $(Y, d_Y)$  inherits separability and completeness, while  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  inherits separability from  $(E, d_E)$ .

We also define the function on  $\Omega \times E$  by

$$(1.7) \quad d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) d_E(\Xi_{j,\omega}(y_0), u)^p \quad \text{for } (\omega, u) \in \Omega \times E.$$

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ . Given  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ , we define

$$(1.8) \quad \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) := \|\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)},$$

and call  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  the *disintegrated*  $(p, q)$ -Monge–Kantorovich metric. We set

$$(1.9) \quad \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E) := \left\{ \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E) \mid \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}) < \infty \right\}.$$

A few comments are in order. First by [3, Lemma 12.4.7], for  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$  the function  $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)$  is Borel, hence  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  as above is well-defined. Second, the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  actually does not depend on the choice of  $y_0 \in Y$ , nor on the choices of the countable family  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , associated local trivializations  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and subordinate partition of unity  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ; the proofs of these claims will be postponed to Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 respectively.

Recall also:

**Definition 1.4.** For a locally compact Hausdorff space  $X$ , a real valued function  $\phi$  on  $X$  is said to *vanish at infinity* if

$$\{x \in X \mid |\phi(x)| \geq \varepsilon\}$$

is compact for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We let  $C_0(X)$  and  $C_b(X)$  stand for the space of continuous functions on  $X$  vanishing at infinity and the space of bounded continuous functions on  $X$  respectively, both equipped with the supremum norm.

To state the properties of  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ , we fix  $y_0 \in Y$  and define

$$(1.10) \quad \mathcal{X}_p := \left\{ \xi \in C(E) \mid \frac{\xi}{1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi, \cdot)} \in C_0(E) \right\}, \quad \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} := \sup_{u \in E} \frac{|\xi(u)|}{1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(u), u)},$$

$$(1.11) \quad \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma} := \left\{ (\Phi, \Psi) \in C_b(E) \times C_b(E) \mid \begin{array}{l} -\Phi(u) - \Psi(v) \leq d_E(u, v)^p \\ \text{for all } u, v \in E \text{ such that } \pi(u) = \pi(v) \end{array} \right\},$$

$$(1.12) \quad \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} := \left\{ \zeta \in C_b(\Omega) \mid \|\zeta\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \leq 1, \zeta > 0 \right\}, \quad r' \in [1, \infty];$$

again the space  $\mathcal{X}_p$  will not depend on the specific choices of  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $y_0 \in Y$ , which we will show below in Lemma 2.15. Additionally, for  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$  and  $\xi \in \mathcal{X}_p$ , we denote by  $S_{\lambda,p}\xi : E \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ ,

$$(1.13) \quad S_{\lambda,p}\xi(u) := \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p - \xi(v)) \quad \text{for } u \in E;$$

in the case  $\lambda = 1$  we will simply write  $S_p\xi$  for  $S_{\lambda,p}\xi$ . As a supremum of continuous functions, we see  $S_{\lambda,p}\xi$  is Borel on  $E$  for any  $\xi \in \mathcal{X}_p$ .

We also recall the following definitions.

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a metric space. A curve  $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  is called a *minimal geodesic* if

$$(1.14) \quad d_X(\rho(\tau_1), \rho(\tau_2)) \leq |\tau_1 - \tau_2| d_X(\rho(0), \rho(1))$$

for any  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, 1]$ .

We say a metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is *geodesic* if any two points in  $X$  can be joined by a minimal geodesic.

We also say a geodesic space  $(X, d_X)$  is *ball convex with respect to a point*  $x_0 \in X$  if for any minimal geodesic  $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  and  $\tau \in [0, 1]$

$$d_X(\rho(\tau), x_0) \leq \max\{d_X(\rho(0), x_0), d_X(\rho(1), x_0)\}.$$

Due to the triangle inequality, equality holds in (1.14) for a minimal geodesic.

Our main results on disintegrated metrics are as follows.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ . Let  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  be a metric fiber bundle satisfying (1.2), with  $(E, d_E)$  complete and separable, and  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  complete, and let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Then:*

- (1)  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$  is a complete metric space. It is also separable when  $q < \infty$ .
- (2) If  $(Y, d_Y)$  is a geodesic space that is ball convex with respect to some point in  $Y$ , then  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$  is geodesic.
- (3) Let  $p \leq q$ , set  $r := q/p$ , and denote by  $r'$  the Hölder conjugate of  $r$ . Then if  $(Y, d_Y)$  is locally compact, for  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$  we have

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p = \sup \left\{ - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Phi d\mathbf{m} - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Psi d\mathbf{n} \mid (\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}, \zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \right\}$$

If  $(E, d_E)$  is locally compact, we also have

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p = \sup \left\{ - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) (S_p \Psi) d\mathbf{m} - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Psi d\mathbf{n} \mid \Psi \in \mathcal{X}_p \cap C_b(E), \zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \right\}.$$

In the second portion of this paper, we consider barycenter problems related to the disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics. First we define some notation and terminology.

**Definition 1.7.** Fix  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $K \geq 2$  and write

$$\Lambda_K := \left\{ \Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K) \in (0, 1)^K \mid \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k = 1 \right\}.$$

Take  $\Lambda \in \Lambda_K$  and  $\kappa \geq 0$ . For a complete, separable metric space  $(X, d_X)$ , also fix a collection  $M = (x_k)_{k=1}^K$  in  $X$ . We define  $\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{\text{d}_X, \kappa} : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{\text{d}_X, \kappa}(x) := \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k d_X(x_k, x)^\kappa,$$

with the convention  $0^0 := 0$ .

We call any minimizer of  $\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{\text{d}_X, \kappa}$  on  $X$  a  $d_X$ -*barycenter*. For simplicity, we write

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p, \kappa} := \mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{\text{MK}_p^Y, \kappa}, \quad \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p, q, \kappa} := \mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{\text{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma, \kappa},$$

where  $Y$  and  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  will be understood.

We now state our main results on  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenters.

**Theorem 1.8.** Fix any  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $K \geq 2$ ,  $\Lambda \in \Lambda_K$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , and  $p \leq q \leq \infty$ . Also let  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  be a metric fiber bundle satisfying (1.2), with  $(E, d_E)$  complete and separable, and  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  complete, and let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Furthermore, suppose that  $(E, d_E)$  is locally compact. Let  $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathbf{m}_k)_{k=1}^K \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)^K$ .

- (1) If  $(Y, d_Y)$  has the Heine–Borel property, then for  $\kappa \geq 0$ , there exists a minimizer of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ .
- (2) It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}(\mathbf{n}) \\ &= \sup \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_k(\omega) \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega d\sigma(\omega) \mid (\zeta_k, \xi_k) \in \mathcal{Z}_{r', \sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p, \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \xi_k \equiv 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (3) Suppose  $p > 1$ ,  $q < \infty$ , and let  $Y$  be a complete, connected Riemannian manifold, possibly with boundary.

Also suppose for some index  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$  there exists  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\omega \in U_j$  such that the measure  $(\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Riemannian volume measure on  $Y$ . Then minimizers of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  are unique, if they exist.

*Remark 1.9.* It can be seen that when  $p = q$  (i.e.  $r' = \infty$ ),  $\zeta \equiv 1$  attains the maximum in the duality result Theorem 1.6 (3), hence the supremum over  $\zeta$  is not actually needed in this case. Since the proof of Theorem 1.8 (2) is based on Theorem 1.6 (3) through Proposition 3.4, the supremums over  $\zeta_k$  are also not needed there when  $p = q$ .

Finally, we can use Theorem 1.8 to obtain results for classical  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Y$ -barycenters in a wide variety of spaces. In particular, we can extend the duality result of [1, Proposition 2.2] to any locally compact metric space, and the uniqueness result to *all* complete, connected Riemannian manifolds with or without boundary, with *no restriction on geometry* (for example, regarding injectivity radius or curvature bounds).

**Corollary 1.10.** Fix  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Lambda \in \Lambda_K$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $(Y, d_Y)$  be a complete, separable metric space and fix  $M = (\mu_k)_{k=1}^K$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ .

- (1) If  $(Y, d_Y)$  satisfies the Heine–Borel property, for any  $\kappa \geq 0$  there exists a minimizer of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p,\kappa}(\nu)$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ .
- (2) If  $(Y, d_Y)$  is locally compact,

$$\inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p,p}(\nu) = \sup \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_Y \phi_k^{\lambda_k} d_Y^p d\mu_k \mid \frac{|\phi_k|}{1 + d_Y(y_0, \cdot)^p} \in C_0(Y), \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_k \equiv 0 \right\}.$$

- (3) If  $p > 1$  and  $Y$  is a complete, connected Riemannian manifold, possibly with boundary, and  $\mu_k$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Riemannian volume measure on  $Y$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , then there is a unique minimizer of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p,p}(\nu)$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ .

**1.1. Motivation and existing literature.** Our disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics are the first such construction on truly general fiber bundles. In [30], the authors introduce the *fibered quadratic Wasserstein distance*, which corresponds to our  $\mathcal{MK}_{2,2}^\sigma$  on the trivial bundle  $E = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . When  $E = \Omega \times Y$  is a trivial bundle, it is possible to view  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(\Omega \times Y), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$  as the metric space valued  $L^q$  space on  $(\Omega, \sigma)$  where the range is  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Y), \mathbf{MK}_p^Y)$  (i.e., elements are of the form  $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{m}^\omega$ ). Properties such as completeness for such spaces are claimed in various works, but do

not appear to come with proofs in the literature except when the range is a Banach space (i.e., for Bochner–Lebesgue spaces), which is not the case here. No such identification with a metric space valued  $L^q$  space is available when  $E$  is a general metric fiber bundle, hence the jump from product structure to general fiber bundle is highly nontrivial, and in particular the methods of [30] cannot be extended to the general case. However, already in their greatly simplified setting on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , there are a multitude of applications to analysis of gradient flows with heterogeneous structure, such as the Kuramoto–Sakaguchi equation and the multi-species Patlak–Keller–Segel model. Our metric will open up the possibility of considering such evolutions on manifolds, or more singular metric spaces.

When  $E = \Omega \times \Omega$  where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a suitable set,  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Omega)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $n$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure, and  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}$  are  $p$ -optimal couplings between  $\sigma$  and measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Omega)$  respectively, it can be seen that  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,p}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$  coincides with (an extension from the case  $p = 2$  of) the *linearized optimal transport metric* introduced in [36] between the right marginals of  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$ . This can be used to obtain properties of the linearized optimal transport metric, for example, Proposition 2.27 below yields that the linearized optimal transport metric is complete. This claim is nontrivial, as it shows that the subset of optimal mappings from  $\sigma$  is closed in  $L^p(\sigma)$ . We also note there is a somewhat similar notion of layerwise Wasserstein distance introduced in [23].

Aside from pure mathematical interest, we also note that our metrics  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  are related to a notion of *measure differential equation* introduced by Piccoli in [31]. There, a notion of flows generated by probability measure fields (as opposed to vector fields) is introduced and analyzed in a systematic way; among other applications, they are raised as natural candidates for mean-field limits in the setting of multi-particle systems. A quantity  $\mathcal{W}(V_1, V_2)$  between probability measures  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  on the tangent bundle of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is defined in [31, Definition 4.1]. Piccoli notes that  $\mathcal{W}$  is in general *not* a metric, but in the special case when  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  have the same marginal when projected onto the base space,  $\mathcal{W}$  exactly equals our  $\mathcal{MK}_{1,1}^\sigma$ , hence does give a metric. In particular,  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  can be used as a pointwise metric between probability measure fields as defined in [31, Definition 2.1], hence could be of use in the analysis of the stability of families of measure differential equations.

Regarding the results in Theorem 1.8 on barycenters, the instability of disintegration of measures under weak convergence means we are unable to prove existence of  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenters by direct compactness methods, thus we have taken the route of using duality in the disintegrated metric setting to prove existence of barycenters. The uniqueness result relies on extracting an appropriate limit of a maximizing sequence in the dual problem, which is by far the most involved proof of the paper. The proof relies on a novel assortment of techniques, which we hope can be of use in other variational problems. Finally, Corollary 1.10 comes from a quick application of the corresponding results in Theorem 1.8 where  $\Omega$  is a one point space. We note that the requirement that  $Y$  be a Riemannian manifold in Theorem 1.8 (3) and Corollary 1.10 is only really necessary to obtain Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8, the remainder of the proof is possible if  $Y$  is a space where there is a distinguished class of measures for which all  $p$ -optimal couplings with left marginals from this class are supported on the graph of an a.e. single valued mapping that can be uniquely determined from a dual potential. Some existing results on barycenters in similar settings include the results in [19, 21, 22, 28]. We note existing results in the non-manifold setting involve other geometric restrictions (such as Aleksandrov curvature bounds), whereas our result, although restricted to the smooth setting, do not.



**1.2. Outline of paper.** We present the proofs of Theorems 1.6 in Section 2, and Theorem 1.8 and Corollary 1.10 in Section 3 respectively, with the proofs further broken down into subsections. We also present some supplementary results on the disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics that do not directly fall under Theorem 1.6 in subsection 2.4.

**1.3. Notation.** We close this section by summarizing some notation.

Notation	Meaning	Definition
$\mathcal{P}(X)$	Borel probability measures on $X$	
$\mathcal{P}_p(X)$	Borel probability measures on $X$ with finite $p$ th moment	
$\Pi(\mu, \nu)$	Couplings between $\mu$ and $\nu$	(1.1)
$\text{MK}_p^X(\mu, \nu)$	$p$ -Monge–Kantorovich distance between $\mu$ and $\nu$	(1.1)
$C_b(X)$	Bounded continuous functions on $X$	
$C_0(X)$	Bounded continuous functions on $X$ vanishing at infinity	Definition 1.4
$\phi^{d_X^p}$	$d_X^p$ -transform of $\phi$	Definition 2.17
$\mathcal{G}(X)$	Minimal geodesics on $X$ defined on $[0, 1]$	Definition 2.9
$d_{\mathcal{G}(X)}$	Supremum metric on $\mathcal{G}(X)$	Definition 2.9
$e^\tau$	Evaluation map on $\mathcal{G}(Y)$ sending $\rho$ to $\rho(\tau)$	Definition 2.9
$\mathcal{H}^i$	$i$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure	
$(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$	Complete separable metric fiber bundle	Definition 1.2
$\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$	Locally finite open cover of $\Omega$	p.3
$\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$	the associated local trivializations with $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$	p.3
$\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$	Partition of unity $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ subordinate to $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$	p.3
$\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$	Mutually disjoint cover of $\Omega$	(2.1)
$d_{E, y_0}^p$	Auxiliary function on $\Omega \times E$	(1.7)
$\delta_{E, y_0}^\omega$	Auxiliary Borel probability measure on $E$	(1.6)
$d_{y_0}(t)$	Distance between $y_0$ and $t$ , i.e., $d_Y(y_0, t)$	
$\sigma$	Fixed Borel probability measure on $\Omega$	
$\sigma_j$	Restriction of $\sigma$ to $U_j$	
$\mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$	Borel probability measures on $E$ with $\pi$ -pushforward $\sigma$	(1.3)
$\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$	$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ s.t. $\mathbf{m}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}))$ for $\sigma$ -a.e. $\omega$	(1.4)
$\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$	$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ with $\text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \in L^q(\sigma)$	(1.9)
$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$	Disintegrated $(p, q)$ -Monge–Kantorovich distance of $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}$	
$\mathcal{X}_p$	$\phi \in C(E)$ with $\phi/(1 + d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi, \cdot)) \in C_0(E)$	(1.10)
$\mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$	$(\Phi, \Psi) \in C_b(E) \times C_b(E)$ s.t. $-\Phi - \Psi \leq d_E^p$ fiberwise	(1.11)
$\mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$	$\zeta \in C_b(\Omega)$ with $\zeta > 0$ and $\ \zeta\ _{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \leq 1$	(1.12)
$\mathcal{Y}_p$	$\phi \in C(Y)$ with $\phi/(1 + d_{y_0}^p) \in C_0(Y)$	(2.12)
$\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p,\kappa}$	$\text{MK}_p^Y$ -barycenter on $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$	Definition 1.7
$\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p,q,\kappa}$	$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenter on $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(\Omega \times Y)$	Definition 1.7
$S_{\lambda,p}^\xi$	Fiberwise $\lambda d_E^p$ -transform of $\xi$	(1.13)

## 2. DISINTEGRATED MONGE–KANTOROVICH METRICS

In this section, we prove various properties of the disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics as claimed in Theorem 1.6. For the remainder of the paper  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  is a metric fiber bundle



where  $(E, d_E)$  is a complete, separable metric space,  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  a complete metric space,  $G$  satisfies assumption (1.2), and  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , with other conditions added as necessary.

First, we recall here the following properties of the usual Monge–Kantorovich metrics for later use. If  $(X, d_X)$  is a metric space we will write  $B_r^X(x)$  for the open ball centered at  $x \in X$  of radius  $r > 0$  with respect to  $d_X$ .

**Theorem 2.1** ([35, Theorem 6.9, Theorem 6.18]). *Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete, separable metric space and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then  $(\mathcal{P}_p(X), \text{MK}_p^X)$  is also a complete, separable metric space.*

*For a sequence  $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , the following four conditions are equivalent to each other.*

- $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{MK}_p^X(\mu_\ell, \mu) = 0$ .
- $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to  $\mu$  and

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_X d_X(x_0, x)^p d\mu_\ell(x) = \int_X d_X(x_0, x)^p d\mu(x)$$

*holds for some (hence all)  $x_0 \in X$ .*

- $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to  $\mu$  and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X \setminus B_r^X(x_0)} d_X(x_0, x)^p d\mu_\ell(x) = 0.$$

- For any  $\phi \in C(X)$  with  $|\phi| \leq C(1 + d_X(x_0, \cdot)^p)$  for some  $C \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x_0 \in X$ ,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \phi(x) d\mu_\ell(x) = \int_X \phi(x) d\mu(x).$$

Next, some notation and conventions. Throughout this paper, we will take  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  unless stated otherwise. We also denote by  $\mathbb{1}_A$  the characteristic function of a set  $A$ . Finally, we will write  $\delta_y^Y$  to denote the delta measure at the point  $y$  on a space  $Y$ .

Recall that for  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ , we write

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma$$

where  $\mathbf{m}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}))$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , following from [Disintegration Theorem](#), and we have fixed some countable, locally finite open cover  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\Omega$ , with associated local trivializations  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , along with a partition of unity  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  subordinate to  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ; using these and some fixed point  $y_0 \in Y$ , we define  $\delta_{E, y_0}^\omega$  by (1.5). We also define the cover  $\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\Omega$  consisting of mutually disjoint sets by

$$(2.1) \quad V_1 := U_1, \quad V_j := U_j \setminus \bigcup_{j'=1}^{j-1} V_{j'}, \quad j \geq 2.$$

For ease of notation we will write  $d_{y_0}(t) := d_Y(y_0, t)$  for  $t \in Y$ . Finally, if  $\mu$  is any Borel measure on a topological space  $X$ , we will denote by  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  the completion of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $X$  with respect to  $\mu$ .

We begin with some measure theoretical preliminaries. First recall the following definitions.

**Definition 2.2.** If  $X$  is any space, we say a map  $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$  is *simple* if there are finite collections  $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^I \subset \mathcal{B}_\sigma$  and  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^I \subset X$ , such that the  $\Omega_i$  form a partition of  $\Omega$  and

$$f(\omega) = x_i \text{ whenever } \omega \in \Omega_i.$$

We will denote such a function by

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^I \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_i} x_i.$$

If  $(X, d_X)$  is a metric space, a map  $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly measurable if there exists a sequence of simple functions that converges  $\sigma$ -a.e. pointwise to  $f$ .

Also if  $Z$  is any measurable space with a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_Z$ , we will say a map  $f : Z \rightarrow X$  is  $\mathcal{F}_Z$ -measurable if  $f^{-1}(O) \in \mathcal{F}_Z$  for any open set  $O \subset X$ . If  $Z$  is equipped with a topology and  $\mathcal{F}_Z$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $Z$ , then we simply say  $f$  is *Borel*.

We will write  $L^0(\sigma; X)$  for the collection of maps from  $\Omega$  to  $X$  which are strongly  $\sigma$ -measurable. Note the above definitions do not actually require any vector space structure on the range  $X$ , since the sets  $\Omega_i$  in the definition of simple are assumed mutually disjoint.

*Remark 2.3.* By [34, Theorem 1] if  $(X, d_X)$  is separable, a  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable map  $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$  is  $\sigma$ -strongly measurable. In the converse direction, since the inverse image of any set under a simple function is a finite union of elements of  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ , a  $\sigma$ -strongly measurable map is always  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable (regardless of separability of the range).

Now by [2, Proposition 2.26]<sup>2</sup>, if a map  $\mu_\bullet : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_p(X)$  for some metric space  $(X, d_X)$  satisfies that  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega(A)$  is a Borel function for any *open*  $A \subset X$ , this property is satisfied for any *Borel*  $A \subset X$ . Since each  $\mu_\omega$  is a probability measure, it is clearly also equivalent to have the above condition hold for any *closed*  $A \subset X$  as well. Then by the proof of [3, Theorem 12.4.7],  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega$  is Borel as a map from  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  to  $(\mathcal{P}_p(X), \text{MK}_p^X)$ . Since  $(\mathcal{P}_p(X), \text{MK}_p^X)$  is separable by Theorem 2.1, the map is also  $\sigma$ -strongly measurable. On the other hand, it is easy to see that a  $\sigma$ -strongly measurable map into  $(\mathcal{P}_p(X), \text{MK}_p^X)$  satisfies that  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega(A)$  is Borel for all open (and closed) sets  $A$ , thus the above are equivalent characterizations of measurability.

Additionally, if  $\mu_\bullet$  is a map satisfying any of the equivalent characterizations of measurability in the previous paragraph, we can define the function

$$\mu(A) := \int_{\Omega} \mu_\omega(A) d\sigma(\omega)$$

for any Borel  $A \subset X$ . Then for any disjoint collection  $\{A_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  of Borel sets in  $X$ , we have

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} A_\ell\right) = \int_{\Omega} \mu_\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} A_\ell\right) d\sigma(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_\omega(A_\ell) d\sigma(\omega) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_\ell)$$

by monotone convergence. Clearly  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\mu(X) = 1$ , with  $\mu(A) \geq 0$  for any Borel set  $A \subset X$ , hence we see  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . These facts will be used freely throughout the remainder of the paper.

*Remark 2.4.* Note that if  $\gamma_i \in \Pi(\mu_i, \nu_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , then

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \gamma_i \in \Pi\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mu_i, \sum_{i'=1}^N \lambda_{i'} \nu_{i'}\right) \quad \text{for } \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = 1 \text{ with } \lambda_i > 0.$$

<sup>2</sup>Although this proposition is stated for measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , it is easy to see the proof holds in general metric spaces.

Thus for any metric space  $(X, d_X)$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , we have

$$\mathbf{MK}_p^X \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mu_i, \sum_{i'=1}^N \lambda_{i'} \nu_{i'} \right)^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{MK}_p^X (\mu_i, \nu_i)^p.$$

Also since each map  $\Xi_{j,\omega}$  is an isometry, for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ , we have

$$\mathbf{MK}_p^Y (\mu, \nu) = \mathbf{MK}_p^E ((\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \mu, (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu) \quad \text{for } \omega \in \Omega.$$

We will freely use these properties in the sequel.

First we show a lemma on measurability.

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  for some  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , the functions on the Borel sets of  $E$  defined by*

$$(2.2) \quad A \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \mu(A) d\sigma(\omega)$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad A \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \mu(A) d\sigma(\omega)$$

are elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(E)$  for any  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , with disintegrations

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \mu \otimes \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \mu \otimes \sigma$$

respectively, with respect to  $\pi$ .

*Proof.* Fix any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  and open set  $A \subset E$ . Then by Fatou's lemma the function

$$\omega \mapsto \int_Y \mathbb{1}_A(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) d\mu(t)$$

is lower semi-continuous, in particular Borel, on  $U_j$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus we immediately see

$$\omega \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \mu(A) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \int_Y \mathbb{1}_A(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) d\mu(t)$$

is Borel for any open set  $A \subset E$ , hence for any Borel set. Thus (2.2) is well-defined for any Borel  $A \subset E$ , and by Remark 2.3,

$$\mathbf{m} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \mu \otimes \sigma$$

is a nonnegative probability measure, which we easily see belongs to  $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma}(E)$ . Also, if  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $u_0 \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  are fixed,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E d_E(u_0, u)^p d\mathbf{m}(u) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \int_E d_E(u_0, u)^p d(\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \mu(u) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \int_Y d_E(u_0, \Xi_{j,\omega}(t))^p d\mu(t) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \int_Y d_Y(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1}(u_0), t)^p d\mu(t) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the finiteness follows since  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ , and the sum above is finite from disjointness of the sets  $V_j$ , thus  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ . The same proof holds replacing each  $\mathbb{1}_{V_j}$  with  $\chi_j$ , the local finiteness taking the place of disjointness of the sets  $V_j$ , hence the expression in (2.3) also defines an element of  $\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ ; in particular, taking  $\mu = \delta_{y_0}^Y$  we also see  $\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma$  defined by (1.5) belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ .

Next, fix  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then using the local finiteness property of the partition of unity  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and recalling Remark 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega)^p &= \mathrm{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_{j'}}(\omega) (\Xi_{j',\omega})_\# \mu \right)^p \\ &\leq \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \mathbb{1}_{V_{j'}}(\omega) \mathrm{MK}_p^E \left( (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, (\Xi_{j',\omega})_\# \mu \right)^p \\ &= \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \mathbb{1}_{V_{j'}}(\omega) \mathrm{MK}_p^Y \left( g_j^{j'}(\omega) \delta_{y_0}^Y, \mu \right)^p \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \mathbb{1}_{V_{j'}}(\omega) \left( \mathrm{MK}_p^Y \left( \delta_{y_0}^Y, \mu \right)^p + \mathrm{MK}_p^Y \left( \delta_{y_0}^Y, g_j^{j'}(\omega) \delta_{y_0}^Y \right)^p \right) \\ &= 2^{p-1} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \mathbb{1}_{V_{j'}}(\omega) \left( \mathrm{MK}_p^Y \left( \delta_{y_0}^Y, \mu \right)^p + d_Y(y_0, g_j^{j'}(\omega) y_0)^p \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$  since  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  and by (1.2). Thus  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ ; an analogous proof applies for (2.3) and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

Next we show that the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  does not depend on the choices of cover, local trivializations, partition of unity, nor choice of point in  $Y$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  be a metric fiber bundle with open cover  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  of  $\Omega$  and associated local trivializations  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ . Then, the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  is independent of the choices of subcover  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , partition of unity  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $y_0$ .*

*Proof.* To see this, suppose  $\{\tilde{U}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\tilde{\Xi}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\tilde{\chi}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  are another choice of open subcover, associated local trivializations, and partition of unity, take some other point  $\tilde{y}_0 \in Y$ , and let  $\delta_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma$  denote the construction (1.5) made with these choices. Then, for each  $\omega \in U_j \cap U_{j'}$  with  $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\gamma_j^{j'}(\omega) \in G$  such that  $\tilde{\Xi}_{j',\omega}^{-1}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(y)) = \gamma_j^{j'}(\omega)y$  for  $y \in Y$ . By the triangle inequality from Theorem 1.6 (1) below, (which does not rely on this lemma) it is sufficient to show  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \delta_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma) < \infty$ . To this end, fix  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \delta_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^\omega)^p &= \mathrm{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{\chi}_{j'}(\omega) (\tilde{\Xi}_{j',\omega})_\# \delta_{\tilde{y}_0}^Y \right)^p \\ &\leq \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \tilde{\chi}_{j'}(\omega) \mathrm{MK}_p^E \left( (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, (\tilde{\Xi}_{j',\omega})_\# \delta_{\tilde{y}_0}^Y \right)^p \\ &= \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \tilde{\chi}_{j'}(\omega) d_Y(\gamma_j^{j'}(\omega) y_0, \tilde{y}_0)^p, \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$  due to assumption (1.2) and since  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a partition of unity.

Thus we see that  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  is well-defined.  $\square$

Finally, we make a quick calculation that will be of use later. By (1.2),

$$\tilde{C} := \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) d\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega(u) = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\omega) \chi_j(\omega) d_Y(y_0, g_j^{j'}(\omega) y_0)^p < \infty.$$

Now for  $\omega \in \Omega$  fixed, suppose  $\mathbf{m}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}))$  and  $\gamma_\omega \in \Pi(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\omega)$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling (with respect to  $d_E$ ). Then we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, v) d\mathbf{m}^\omega(v) &= \int_{E^2} d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, v) d\gamma_\omega(u, v) \\ (2.4) \quad &\leq 2^{p-1} \int_{E^2} (d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) + d_E(u, v)^p) d\gamma_\omega(u, v) \\ &= 2^{p-1} \left( \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) d\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega(u) + \int_{E^2} d_E(u, v)^p d\gamma_\omega(u, v) \right) \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} (\tilde{C} + \text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega)^p). \end{aligned}$$

**2.1. Complete, separable, metric.** We are now ready to prove that  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$  is a complete metric space, and separable when  $q < \infty$ . It is easy to show  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  is a metric, however completeness and separability will be more involved proofs, as there is no direct comparison between  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  and the usual Monge–Kantorovich metrics (however, note Proposition 2.26 below). Additionally, since our setting is on fiber bundles,  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$  can not be identified with a metric space valued  $L^q$  space, hence all proofs must be done “by hand.”

Our proof of separability when  $q < \infty$ , is inspired by the arguments in [34, Theorem 1] and [18, Remark 1.2.20].

*Remark 2.7.* We note that  $\mathcal{P}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(E)$  is *not* separable with respect to  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,\infty}^\sigma$  for any  $p$  if  $Y$  is not a single point and  $\sigma$  is such that there exists an uncountable family  $\{\Omega_a\}_{a \in A} \subset \Omega$  of Borel sets in  $\Omega$  such that  $\sigma(\Omega_{a_1} \setminus \Omega_{a_2}) > 0$  for all distinct  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ . Indeed, fix two distinct points  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$  and let

$$\mathbf{m}_a := \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_a}(\Xi_j, \bullet)_\# \delta_{y_1}^Y + \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_a}(\Xi_j, \bullet)_\# \delta_{y_2}^Y) \right) \otimes \sigma.$$

Then  $\{\mathbf{m}_a\}_{a \in A}$  is uncountable but

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{a_1}, \mathbf{m}_{a_2}) \geq d_Y(y_1, y_2) > 0$$

whenever  $a_1 \neq a_2$ . As an example, if  $E$  is a metric bundle whose base space  $\Omega$  is a Riemannian manifold and  $\sigma$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Riemannian volume, then for the sets  $\Omega_a$  one can take geodesic balls of sufficiently small radius, centered at an uncountable collection of points.

*Remark 2.8.* As a consequence of the triangle inequality for  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  that we will show below, we see if  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,1}^\sigma(E)$ , we have

$$\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega) \in [0, \infty) \quad \text{for } \sigma\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

Also a simple application of Hölder’s inequality shows that

$$p \leq p', q \leq q' \Rightarrow \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma \leq \mathcal{MK}_{p',q'}^\sigma, \quad \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E) \subset \mathcal{P}_{p',q'}^\sigma(E).$$

We are now ready to prove the claims in Theorem 1.6 (1).

*Proof of Theorem 1.6 (1).*

**(Metric):** Let  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . From the definition, it is immediate that

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = \|\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \geq 0,$$

and equality holds if and only if  $\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet) = 0$ ,  $\sigma$ -a.e. Since  $\mathbf{MK}_p^E$  is a metric when restricted to  $\mathcal{P}_p(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}))$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we see  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = 0$  if and only if  $\mathbf{m}^\omega = \mathbf{n}^\omega$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ , that is,  $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n}$  by [Disintegration Theorem](#). Using the triangle inequality for  $\mathbf{MK}_p^E$  together with Minkowski's inequality, we have for  $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3 \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_3) &= \|\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_1^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_3^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_1^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_2^\bullet) + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_2^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_3^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_1^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_2^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} + \|\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_2^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_3^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\ &= \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3). \end{aligned}$$

By the above triangle inequality, we also see

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leq \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n}) < \infty$$

for all  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ .

**(Separability):** Assume  $q < \infty$ . Let  $\{\nu_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Y$ -dense subset in  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  (recall that  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Y), \mathbf{MK}_p^Y)$  is separable, see [Theorem 2.1](#)). Since  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  is separable, there exists a countable algebra  $\mathcal{Q} \subset 2^\Omega$  of mutually disjoint sets which generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega$ . Now given  $I \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite collection  $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^I \subset \mathcal{Q}$ , by [Lemma 2.5](#) if we define

$$(\mathbf{n}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^I}^\bullet \otimes \sigma)(A) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \left( \sum_{i=1}^I \mathbb{1}_{Q_i}(\omega) \nu_i + \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^I Q_i}(\omega) \delta_{y_0}^Y \right) (A) d\sigma(\omega),$$

we see that  $\mathbf{n}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^I}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . Now we claim that

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ \mathbf{n}_{\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^I}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \mid \{Q_i\}_{i=1}^I \subset \mathcal{Q} \text{ for } I \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -dense in  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is countable this will prove separability.

To this end, for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , define

$$\mathbf{n}_m^\omega := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu_m \in \mathcal{P}_p(E),$$

supported on  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$ , by [Lemma 2.5](#), for a fixed Borel  $A \subset E$  the map  $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{n}_m^\omega(A)$  is Borel. Now fix  $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , then we can define a function  $f_m : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f_m(\omega) := \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{n}_m^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega),$$

which is then Borel for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  by [[3](#), Lemma 12.4.7]; note that if  $\omega \in V_j$  for some  $j$ , then  $f_m(\omega) = \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\nu_m, (\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega)$ . For  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the Borel set

$$\Omega_{\ell,m} := f_m^{-1}([0, \ell^{-1})) \cap \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{m-1} f_i^{-1}([\ell^{-1}, \infty)) \right),$$

note  $\{\Omega_{\ell,m}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a cover of  $\Omega$  consisting of mutually disjoint sets for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let us also write

$$\tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y,$$

again by Lemma 2.5 the measure (whose disintegration with respect to  $\pi$  is given by)  $\tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega \otimes \sigma$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . For each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , since

$$\left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \leq \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}) < \infty,$$

there exists  $I_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(2.5) \quad \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \Omega_{\ell,i}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} < \ell^{-1}.$$

Now for  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the measures  $\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega \in \mathcal{P}(E)$  by

$$\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \left( \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\ell,i}}(\omega) \nu_m \right) + \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \Omega_{\ell,i}}(\omega) \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega.$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have  $\mathbf{m}_\ell := \mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , and for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq I_\ell$ , we have  $\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega = \mathbf{n}_i^\omega$  whenever  $\omega \in \Omega_{\ell,i}$ . Then using (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_\ell, \mathbf{m}) &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_i^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\ell,i}} + \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \Omega_{\ell,i}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{n}_i^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\ell,i}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} + \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \Omega_{\ell,i}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\ &< \left\| \ell^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\ell,i}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} + \ell^{-1} \\ &\leq 2\ell^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and let  $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}, \mathbf{m}) < \varepsilon.$$

We now construct an element of  $\mathcal{D}$  approximating  $\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}$ . Let

$$M := \max_{1 \leq i, i' \leq I_{\ell_0}} \left\{ \max \left\{ \text{MK}_p^Y(\nu_i, \nu_{i'})^q, \text{MK}_p^Y(\delta_{y_0}^Y, \nu_{i'})^q \right\} \right\}.$$

By [18, Lemma A.1.2], for each  $1 \leq i \leq I_{\ell_0}$  there exists a set  $\tilde{Q}_i \in \mathcal{Q}$  with the property that  $\sigma(\tilde{Q}_i \Delta \Omega_{\ell_0,i}) < \varepsilon^q / (MI_{\ell_0})$ , using these define

$$Q_1 := \tilde{Q}_1, \quad Q_i := \tilde{Q}_i \setminus \bigcup_{i'=1}^{i-1} Q_{i'} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq I_{\ell_0}.$$



We observe from Remark 2.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu_i \right) &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \delta_{y_0}^Y, (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \mathbf{MK}_p^Y \left( \delta_{y_0}^Y, \nu_i \right) = \mathbf{MK}_p^Y \left( \delta_{y_0}^Y, \nu_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for each  $1 \leq i' \leq I_{\ell_0}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu_{i'}, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu_i \right) \leq \mathbf{MK}_p^Y \left( \nu_{i'}, \nu_i \right).$$

Together, these imply that for each  $1 \leq i \leq I_{\ell_0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_i} \mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\bullet, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \nu_i \right)^q d\sigma \\ &= \sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \int_{Q_i \cap \Omega_{\ell_0, i'}} \mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \nu_{i'}, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \nu_i \right)^q d\sigma \\ (2.7) \quad &+ \int_{Q_i \setminus \bigcup_{i'=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \Omega_{\ell_0, i'}} \mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \nu_i \right)^q d\sigma \\ &\leq \sum_{i' \neq i, 1 \leq i' \leq I_{\ell_0}} \int_{Q_i \cap \Omega_{\ell_0, i'}} \mathbf{MK}_p^Y \left( \nu_{i'}, \nu_i \right)^q d\sigma + \int_{Q_i \setminus \bigcup_{i'=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \Omega_{\ell_0, i'}} \mathbf{MK}_p^Y \left( \delta_{y_0}^Y, \nu_i \right)^q d\sigma \\ &\leq M \cdot \sigma(Q_i \setminus \Omega_{\ell_0, i}) \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon^q}{I_{\ell_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, setting

$$\Omega' := \left[ \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} (\tilde{Q}_i \cup \Omega_{\ell_0, i}) \right],$$

we can see that

$$\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} Q_i = \Omega' \cup \left[ \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \Omega_{\ell_0, i} \right) \setminus \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \tilde{Q}_i \right) \right] \subset \Omega' \cup \left[ \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} (\Omega_{\ell_0, i} \setminus \tilde{Q}_i) \right].$$

Since  $\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\omega = \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega$  for  $\omega \in \Omega'$  we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} Q_i} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\omega, \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega)^q d\sigma(\omega) \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega'} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\omega, \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega)^q d\sigma(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \int_{\Omega_{\ell_0,i} \setminus \tilde{Q}_i} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\omega, \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega)^q d\sigma(\omega) \\
(2.8) \quad & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \int_{\Omega_{\ell_0,i} \setminus \tilde{Q}_i} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \mathbf{MK}_p^E((\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \nu_i, (\Xi_{j,\omega})_{\#} \delta_{y_0}^Y) \right)^q d\sigma(\omega) \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\nu_i, \delta_{y_0}^Y)^q \cdot \sigma(\Omega_{\ell_0,i} \setminus \tilde{Q}_i) \\
& \leq M \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \sigma(\Omega_{\ell_0,i} \Delta \tilde{Q}_i) < \varepsilon^q.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus if we take

$$\mathbf{n}^\bullet := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \left( \sum_{i=1}^I \mathbf{1}_{Q_i} \nu_i + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^I Q_i} \delta_{y_0}^Y \right) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j} \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} \mathbf{1}_{Q_i}(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_{\#} \nu_i + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\ell_0}} Q_i} \tilde{\delta}_{E,y_0}^\omega,$$

we find for  $\mathbf{n} := \mathbf{n}^\bullet \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{D}$ , using (2.6), (2.7), and (2.8) that

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}) \leq \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}, \mathbf{m}) < \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}}\right) \varepsilon,$$

finishing the proof of separability.

**(Completeness):** Let  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$ . Then there exists  $\Omega_{p,q} \subset \Omega$  such that  $\sigma(\Omega_{p,q}) = 1$  and  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in  $\mathbf{MK}_p^E$  for any  $\omega \in \Omega_{p,q}$ . Indeed, if  $q = \infty$ , then the claim is trivial. In the case  $q < \infty$ , for any  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ , there exists some  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  such that whenever  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \geq L$ , we have  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{m}_{\ell_2}) < \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2$ . It follows from Chebyshev's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_1}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_{\ell_2}^\omega) \geq \varepsilon_1\}) & \leq \varepsilon_1^{-q} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_1}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_{\ell_2}^\omega)^q d\sigma_{n-1}(\omega) \\
& = \varepsilon_1^{-q} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{m}_{\ell_2})^q \\
& < \varepsilon_2^q,
\end{aligned}$$

for  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \geq L$ . Now we can take a subsequence of  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  (not relabeled) such that for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\sigma(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega, \mathbf{m}_{\ell+1}^\omega) \geq 2^{-\ell}\}) \leq 2^{-\ell}.$$

Setting

$$\Omega_{p,q} := \Omega \setminus \left( \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\ell=m}^{\infty} \{\omega \in \Omega \mid \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_m^\omega, \mathbf{m}_{m+1}^\omega) \geq 2^{-\ell}\} \right),$$

we have

$$\sigma(\Omega_{p,q}) = 1 - \sigma\left(\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\ell=m}^{\infty} \{\omega \in \Omega \mid \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_m^\omega, \mathbf{m}_{m+1}^\omega) \geq 2^{-\ell}\}\right) = 1$$

by the Borel–Cantelli lemma, and we can see that the sequence  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in  $\text{MK}_p^E$  whenever  $\omega \in \Omega_{p,q}$ .

Since  $\text{MK}_p^E$  is complete on  $\mathcal{P}_p(E)$ , for every  $\omega \in \Omega_{p,q}$ , there exists  $\mathbf{m}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(E)$  such that

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega) = 0.$$

Then, for  $\phi \in C_b(E)$ , it follows from Theorem 2.1 that

$$\int_E \phi(u) d\mathbf{m}^\omega(u) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \phi(u) d\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega(u),$$

which is a  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable function in  $\omega$  by [Disintegration Theorem](#). For any open set  $A \subset E$ , the sequence  $\{\min\{1, m d_E(\cdot, E \setminus A)\}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_b(E)$  of nonnegative functions monotonically increases pointwise everywhere to  $\mathbf{1}_A$ , hence by monotone convergence we see the map

$$\omega \mapsto \mathbf{m}^\omega(A)$$

is Borel for all open  $A \subset E$ . Thus if we define the function  $\mathbf{m}$  on Borel sets  $A \subset E$  by

$$\mathbf{m}(A) := \int_\Omega \mathbf{m}^\omega(A) d\sigma(\omega),$$

using Remark 2.3 we see  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ . Also for  $\phi \in C_b(E)$  since each  $\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega$  and  $\sigma$  are probability measures, the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\int_E \phi d\mathbf{m} = \int_\Omega \int_E \phi(u) d\mathbf{m}^\omega(u) d\sigma(\omega) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega \int_E \phi(u) d\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega(u) d\sigma(\omega),$$

thus  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ ; the uniqueness in [Disintegration Theorem](#) implies that  $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma$ .

Now fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then there exists  $\ell_0$  such that for all  $\ell, m \geq \ell_0$  we have  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_m, \mathbf{m}_\ell) < \varepsilon$ . Then using Fatou's lemma when  $q < \infty$  and directly by definition for  $q = \infty$ , and recalling (2.9),

$$(2.10) \quad \|\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} = \left\| \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_m^\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_m^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} < \varepsilon,$$

which ensures  $\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet) \in L^q(\sigma)$ . Since we have

$$\text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega) \leq \text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\omega) + \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega) \quad \text{for } \omega \in \Omega_{p,q},$$

$\sigma(\Omega_{p,q}) = 1$ , and  $\mathbf{m}_{\ell_0} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , we conclude  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . It also follows from (2.10) that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_\ell, \mathbf{m}) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\bullet, \mathbf{m}^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} = 0$$

for the particular chosen subsequence. Since the original sequence is Cauchy, the full sequence also converges in  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  to  $\mathbf{m}$ . This proves completeness.  $\square$

**2.2. Existence of geodesics.** We now prove that  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma)$  is a geodesic space.

When  $p > 1$  on a more general space  $Y$ , a minimal geodesic in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Y), \text{MK}_p^Y)$  can be obtained as a family of pushforwards of what is known as a *dynamic optimal coupling*. More specifically, we start by recalling the following space (which will also be used in the proof of Theorem 1.6 (2)).

**Definition 2.9.** Suppose  $(Z, d_Z)$  is complete, separable, and a geodesic space. We let  $\mathcal{G}(Z)$  denote the space of minimal geodesics  $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow Z$  with respect to  $d_Z$ , and define the metric  $d_{\mathcal{G}(Z)}$  on  $\mathcal{G}(Z)$  by

$$d_{\mathcal{G}(Z)}(\rho_1, \rho_2) := \sup_{\tau \in [0, 1]} d_Z(\rho_1(\tau), \rho_2(\tau)).$$

Also for  $\tau \in [0, 1]$  the evaluation map  $e^\tau : \mathcal{G}(Z) \rightarrow Z$  is defined by  $e^\tau(\rho) := \rho(\tau)$ .

We can see that  $(\mathcal{G}(Z), d_{\mathcal{G}(Z)})$  is complete and separable since it is a closed subset of  $C([0, 1]; Z)$  with the same metric  $d_{\mathcal{G}(Z)}$ , which is also separable by [33, Theorem 2.4.3]. Then it is known that  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Z$  minimal geodesics have the following description.

**Proposition 2.10** ([35, Corollaries 7.22, 7.23, and Theorem 7.30(i)]). *Let  $(Z, d_Z)$  be a complete, separable geodesic space and  $p > 1$ . Then, for  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_p(Z)$ , there exists  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(Z))$  such that  $(e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma$  is an  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , and*

$$e_\#^\bullet \Gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z)$$

*is a minimal geodesic from  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Z), \mathbf{MK}_p^Z)$ . Moreover, for  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, 1]$  the measure  $(e^{\tau_1} \times e^{\tau_2})_\# \Gamma \in \Pi(e_\#^{\tau_1} \Gamma, e_\#^{\tau_2} \Gamma)$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling. Conversely, for any  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(Z))$  such that  $(e^0 \times e^0)_\# \Gamma$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $e_\#^0 \Gamma$  and  $e_\#^1 \Gamma$ ,*

$$e_\#^\bullet \Gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z)$$

*is a minimal geodesic from  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Z), \mathbf{MK}_p^Z)$ .*

We will take  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Y$  minimal geodesics connecting each pair  $\mathbf{m}_1^\omega$  and  $\mathbf{m}_2^\omega$ , then use these to construct a minimal geodesic for  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ . However, in order to do so we must make sure the dependence on  $\omega$  is  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable, hence we will have to use the Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem which we will now recall.

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{F}_X)$  be a measurable space and  $(Z, d_Z)$  be a metric space. A set-valued function  $F$  from  $X$  to  $2^Z$  is said to be  $\mathcal{F}_X$ -weakly measurable if

$$\{x \in X \mid F(x) \cap O \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{F}_X$$

for any open  $O \subset Z$ .

*Remark 2.12.* By [26, Corollary 1] it is equivalent to replace ‘‘open’’ by ‘‘closed’’ in the above definition; it is then clear that if  $Z$  is  $\sigma$ -compact then it is also equivalent to replace ‘‘open’’ by ‘‘compact.’’

**Theorem 2.13** ([26, Main Theorem]). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{F}_X, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $(Z, d_Z)$  a complete, separable metric space. For a map  $F : X \rightarrow 2^Z$ , if  $F(x)$  is nonempty and closed for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ , and  $F$  is  $\mathcal{F}_X$ -weakly measurable, then there exists an  $\mathcal{F}_X$ -measurable map  $f_\bullet : X \rightarrow Z$  such that  $f_x \in F(x)$  for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ . Such a map is called a measurable selection of  $F$ .*

We now show a preliminary lemma on convergence of dynamic optimal couplings and their pushforwards.

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $(Z, d_Z)$  be a complete, separable, and geodesic space. Then for any fixed  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ , the map  $e_\#^\tau : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(Z)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z)$  is both weakly and  $\mathbf{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Z)}$ -to- $\mathbf{MK}_p^Z$  continuous. In particular, if  $(\Gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $\mathbf{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Z)}$ , the sequence  $(e_\#^\tau \Gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $e_\#^\tau \Gamma$  with respect to  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Z$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\Gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a weakly convergent sequence in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(Z))$  with limit  $\Gamma$ . For  $\phi \in C_b(Z)$ , we have  $\phi \circ e^\tau \in C_b(\mathcal{G}(Z))$  and

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_Z \phi(t) de_\#^\tau \Gamma_\ell(t) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{G}(Z)} \phi(e^\tau(\rho)) d\Gamma_\ell(\rho) = \int_{\mathcal{G}(Z)} \phi(e^\tau(\rho)) d\Gamma(\rho) = \int_Z \phi(t) de_\#^\tau \Gamma(t),$$

which shows weak continuity of  $e_{\#}^{\tau}$ . Now if  $(\Gamma_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $\Gamma$  in  $\text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Z)}$ , the above implies  $(e_{\#}^{\tau} \Gamma_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to  $e_{\#}^{\tau} \Gamma$ . Then if  $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{G}(Z)$  is identically  $z_0 \in Z$ , by Theorem 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Z \setminus B_r^Z(z_0)} d_Z(z_0, z)^p d e_{\#}^{\tau} \Gamma_{\ell}(z) &= \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{G}(Z)} d_Z(z_0, \rho(\tau))^p \mathbb{1}_{Z \setminus B_r^Z(z_0)}(\rho(\tau)) d \Gamma_{\ell}(\rho) \\ &\leq \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{G}(Z) \setminus B_r^{\mathcal{G}(Z)}(\rho_0)} d_{\mathcal{G}(Z)}(\rho_0, \rho)^p d \Gamma_{\ell}(\rho) \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence by another application of Theorem 2.1 we see  $(e_{\#}^{\tau} \Gamma_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $e_{\#}^{\tau} \Gamma$  in  $\text{MK}_p^Z$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.6 (2).

*Proof of Theorem 1.6 (2).* Recall we assume that  $(Y, d_Y)$  is a geodesic space that is ball convex with respect to some  $y_0 \in Y$ . If  $p = 1$ , it is easy to see that  $((1 - \tau)\mathbf{m}_0 + \tau\mathbf{m}_1)_{\tau \in [0,1]}$  is a minimal geodesic with respect to  $\mathcal{MK}_{1,q}^{\sigma}$  for any  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  (see for example [24, Lemma 2.10]<sup>3</sup>) thus we assume  $p > 1$ .

As previously mentioned,  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Y^2), \text{MK}_p^{Y^2})$  is a complete, separable metric space. For  $t, s \in Y$ , since we have

$$d_Y(t, s)^p = (d_Y(t, s)^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq 2^{\frac{p}{2}} (d_{y_0}(t)^2 + d_{y_0}(s)^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} = 2^{\frac{p}{2}} d_{Y^2}((y_0, y_0), (t, s))^p,$$

Theorem 2.1 yields that the function on  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y^2)$  defined by

$$\mathcal{C}(\gamma) := \|d_Y^p\|_{L^1(\gamma)}$$

is continuous with respect to  $\text{MK}_p^{Y^2}$ .

Now there exists a set  $\Omega' \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}$  with full  $\sigma$  measure such that  $\mathbf{m}_0^{\omega}, \mathbf{m}_1^{\omega} \in \mathcal{P}_p(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}))$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . For  $i = 1, 2$ , let us write

$$\mu_i^{\omega} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}_i^{\omega}$$

which belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . Now define  $F : \Omega \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y))}$  by

$$F(\omega) := \left\{ \Gamma \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y)) \mid e_{\#}^{\bullet} \Gamma \text{ is an } \text{MK}_p^Y \text{ minimal geodesic from } \mu_0^{\omega} \text{ to } \mu_1^{\omega} \right\};$$

note that if  $\Gamma \in F(\omega)$  then  $(e^0 \times e^1)_{\#} \Gamma \in \Pi(\mu_0^{\omega}, \mu_1^{\omega})$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling by [35, Corollary 7.22].

We now show that  $F$  satisfies the hypotheses of the Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski selection theorem, Theorem 2.13.

**Claim 1.**  $F(\omega)$  is nonempty and closed for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* By Proposition 2.10, for any  $\omega \in \Omega'$  there is a  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(Y))$  such that  $e_{\#}^{\bullet} \Gamma$  is a minimal geodesic from  $\mu_0^{\omega}$  to  $\mu_1^{\omega}$ . Additionally, if  $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$  is identically equal to  $y_0$ , since

<sup>3</sup>The result there is on  $\mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , but the exact same proof holds for general  $Y$ .

Proposition 2.10 also yields that  $(e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu_0^\omega$  and  $\mu_1^\omega$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{G}(Y)} d_{\mathcal{G}(Y)}(\rho, \rho_0)^p d\Gamma(\rho) &= \int_{\mathcal{G}(Y)} \left( \sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} d_Y(\rho(\tau), \rho_0(\tau)) \right)^p d\Gamma(\rho) \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} \int_{\mathcal{G}(Y)} \sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} (d_Y(\rho(0), y_0)^p + d_Y(\rho(0), \rho(\tau))^p) d\Gamma(\rho) \\
&= 2^{p-1} \int_{\mathcal{G}(Y)} \sup_{\tau \in [0,1]} (d_{y_0}(\rho(0))^p + \tau^p d_Y(\rho(0), \rho(1))^p) d\Gamma(\rho) \\
&= 2^{p-1} \int_Y d_{y_0}(t)^p d e_\#^0 \Gamma(t) + 2^{p-1} \int_{Y^2} d_Y(t, s)^p d(e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma(t, s) \\
&= 2^{p-1} \int_Y d_{y_0}(t)^p d\mu_0^\omega(t) + 2^{p-1} \text{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0^\omega, \mu_1^\omega) < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

hence  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y))$ , thus we have  $F(\omega) \neq \emptyset$ . Now given  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , if  $(\Gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset F(\omega)$  converges in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y)), \text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)})$ , by Lemma 2.14 the sequence  $(e_\#^\tau \Gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $e_\#^\tau \Gamma$  in  $\text{MK}_p^Y$  for each  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ . Thus for  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, 1]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{MK}_p^Y(e_\#^{\tau_1} \Gamma, e_\#^{\tau_2} \Gamma) &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{MK}_p^Y(e_\#^{\tau_1} \Gamma_\ell, e_\#^{\tau_2} \Gamma_\ell) \\
&= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \text{MK}_p^Y(e_\#^0 \Gamma_\ell, e_\#^1 \Gamma_\ell) \\
&= |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \text{MK}_p^Y(e_\#^0 \Gamma, e_\#^1 \Gamma),
\end{aligned}$$

hence  $\Gamma \in F(\omega)$ ; in other words  $F(\omega)$  is closed in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y)), \text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)})$ .  $\diamond$

**Claim 2.**  $F$  is  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -weakly measurable.

*Proof of Claim 2.* For  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y))$ , define  $\Phi_\Gamma : \Omega' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  by

$$\Phi_\Gamma(\omega) := (\text{MK}_p^Y(e_\#^0 \Gamma, \mu_0^\omega)^p, \text{MK}_p^Y(e_\#^1 \Gamma, \mu_1^\omega)^p, |\mathcal{C}((e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma) - \text{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0^\omega, \mu_1^\omega)^p|).$$

We see  $\Phi_\Gamma$  is  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable by combining Lemma 2.5 and [3, Lemma 12.4.7]. Since  $(\mathcal{G}(Y), d_{\mathcal{G}(Y)})$  is complete and separable, the space  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y)), \text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)})$  is complete and separable. Fix a closed set  $K$  in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y)), \text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)})$ , then there exists a countable set  $\{\Gamma_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  that is  $\text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)}$ -dense in  $K$ . Set

$$B := \bigcap_{\tilde{m}=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \Phi_{\Gamma_\ell}^{-1} \left( [0, \tilde{m}^{-1}]^3 \right), \quad \Omega_K := \{\omega \in \Omega' \mid F(\omega) \cap K \neq \emptyset\},$$

by the  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurability of each  $\Phi_{\Gamma_\ell}$ , we find  $B \in \mathcal{B}_\sigma$ . We will now show that  $\Omega_K = B$ .

If  $\omega \in \Omega_K$ , there exists  $\Gamma \in F(\omega) \cap K$ , and a sequence  $(\Gamma_{\ell_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  taken from  $(\Gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  that converges to  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $\text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)}$ . Then by Lemma 2.14, the sequence  $(e_\#^i \Gamma_{\ell_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges in  $\text{MK}_p^Y$  to  $\mu_i^\omega = e_\#^i \Gamma$ , for  $i = 0, 1$ . Similarly, the convergence of  $(\Gamma_{\ell_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  to  $\Gamma$  in  $\text{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)}$  implies convergence of  $((e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma_{\ell_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  to  $(e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma$  in  $\text{MK}_p^{Y^2}$ , hence the continuity of  $\mathcal{C}$  implies that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{C}((e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma_{\ell_m}) - \text{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0^\omega, \mu_1^\omega)^p| = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{C}((e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma_{\ell_m}) - \mathcal{C}((e^0 \times e^1)_\# \Gamma)| = 0.$$

Thus for any  $\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $m$  is sufficiently large, we have  $\Phi_{\Gamma_{\ell_m}}(\omega) \in [0, \tilde{m}^{-1}]^3$  which yields  $\omega \in B$ .

Now assume  $\omega \in B$ . For each  $\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is  $\ell(\tilde{m}) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\Phi_{\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}}(\omega) \in [0, \tilde{m}^{-1}]^3$ , that is,

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(e_{\#}^0 \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}, \mu_0^\omega)^p &< \tilde{m}^{-1}, & \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(e_{\#}^1 \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}, \mu_1^\omega)^p &< \tilde{m}^{-1}, \\ |\mathcal{C}((e^0 \times e^1)_{\#} \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}) - \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0^\omega, \mu_1^\omega)^p| &< \tilde{m}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\{e_{\#}^0 \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}\}_{\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{\mu_0^\omega\}$  and  $\{e_{\#}^1 \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}\}_{\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{\mu_1^\omega\}$  are compact in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(Y), \mathbf{MK}_p^Y)$ , by [35, Corollary 7.22] there exists a subsequence of  $(\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})})_{\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}}$  (not relabeled) that converges weakly to some  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(Y))$ . Since  $(Y, d_Y)$  is ball convex with respect to  $y_0$ , recalling that  $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{G}(Y)$  is identically  $y_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{G}(Y) \setminus B_r^{\mathcal{G}(Y)}(\rho_0)} d_{\mathcal{G}(Y)}(\rho, \rho_0)^p d\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}(\rho) \\ & \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\rho \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \mid \max\{d_{y_0}(\rho(0)), d_{y_0}(\rho(1))\} \geq r\}} \max\{d_{y_0}(\rho(0)), d_{y_0}(\rho(1))\}^p d\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}(\rho) \\ & \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\rho \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \mid d_{y_0}(\rho(0)) \geq r\}} d_{y_0}(\rho(0))^p d\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}(\rho) \\ & \quad + \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\rho \in \mathcal{G}(Y) \mid d_{y_0}(\rho(1)) \geq r\}} d_{y_0}(\rho(1))^p d\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}(\rho) \\ & = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Y \setminus B_r^Y(y_0)} d_{y_0}(t)^p de_{\#}^0 \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}(t) + \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Y \setminus B_r^Y(y_0)} d_{y_0}(t)^p de_{\#}^1 \Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})}(t) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (2.11) and Theorem 2.1, hence  $\Gamma_{\ell(\tilde{m})} \rightarrow \Gamma$  in  $\mathbf{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)}$  as  $\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $K$  is  $\mathbf{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)}$ -closed, this implies  $\Gamma \in K$ . From (2.11) we see  $(e^0 \times e^1)_{\#} \Gamma$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu_0^\omega$  and  $\mu_1^\omega$ , hence from Proposition 2.10 we have that  $\Gamma \in F(\omega)$ . Thus  $\omega \in \Omega_K$ , proving  $\Omega_K = B \in \mathcal{B}_\sigma$ , and in particular  $F$  is  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -weakly measurable.  $\diamond$

As mentioned previously  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y)), \mathbf{MK}_p^{\mathcal{G}(Y)})$  is complete and separable, hence we can apply Theorem 2.13, to find a  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable selection  $\Gamma_\bullet : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{G}(Y))$  of  $F$ , defined  $\sigma$ -a.e. By Lemma 2.14, as the composition of a continuous map  $e_{\#}^\tau$  with an  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable map  $\Gamma_\bullet$ , the map  $e_{\#}^\tau \Gamma_\bullet : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  is  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable for each  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ .

Thus we can argue again as in Remark 2.3 to see the linear functional

$$\mathbf{m}_\tau(A) := \int_{\Omega} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) (\Xi_{j, \omega})_{\#} e_{\#}^\tau \Gamma_\omega(A) \right) d\sigma(\omega)$$

is a nonnegative probability measure on  $E$ , and whose disintegration satisfies  $\sigma$ -a.e.,

$$\mathbf{m}_\tau^\bullet = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\Xi_{j, \bullet})_{\#} e_{\#}^\tau \Gamma_\bullet.$$



Now fix  $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq 1$ . By the construction of  $\Gamma_\bullet$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\tau_1}, \mathbf{m}_{\tau_2}) &= \left\| \text{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\Xi_{j,\bullet})_\# e_{\#}^{\tau_1} \Gamma_\bullet, \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\Xi_{j',\bullet})_\# e_{\#}^{\tau_2} \Gamma_\bullet \right) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\
&\leq \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j \text{MK}_p^E((\Xi_{j,\bullet})_\# e_{\#}^{\tau_1} \Gamma_\bullet, (\Xi_{j,\bullet})_\# e_{\#}^{\tau_2} \Gamma_\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\
&= \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j \text{MK}_p^Y(e_{\#}^{\tau_1} \Gamma_\bullet, e_{\#}^{\tau_2} \Gamma_\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\
&= |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \left\| \text{MK}_p^Y \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}_0^\bullet, \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\Xi_{j',\bullet}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}_1^\bullet \right) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\
&\leq |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j \text{MK}_p^Y((\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}_0^\bullet, (\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}_1^\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\
&= |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_0^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_1^\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} = |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{m}_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from this we see for any  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_\tau) &\leq \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_0) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{m}_\tau) \\
&\leq \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_0) + \tau \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{m}_1) < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

hence  $\mathbf{m}_\tau \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . Thus  $\tau \mapsto \mathbf{m}_\tau$  is a minimal geodesic with respect to  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ .  $\square$

**2.3. Duality.** We now work toward a duality result for disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics.

We begin by showing the space  $\mathcal{X}_p$  in (1.10) is well-defined.

**Lemma 2.15.** *The space  $\mathcal{X}_p$  is a Banach space, independent of the choices of  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\Xi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $y_0 \in Y$ , and the associated norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}_p}$  will be bi-Lipschitz equivalent under a different choice of the above.*

*Proof.* Again let  $\{\tilde{U}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\tilde{\Xi}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\tilde{\chi}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\tilde{y}_0 \in Y$ ,  $d_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^p$  be alternate choices of the relevant objects. For each  $\omega \in U_j \cap U_{j'}$  with  $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\gamma_j^{j'}(\omega) \in G$  such that  $\tilde{\Xi}_{j',\omega}^{-1}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(y)) = \gamma_j^{j'}(\omega)y$  for  $y \in Y$ . Then for any  $u \in E$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^p(\omega, u) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) d_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^p(\omega, u) \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) (d_{E,\tilde{y}_0}^p(\omega, \Xi_{j,\omega}(y_0)) + d_E(\Xi_{j,\omega}(y_0), u))^p \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{\chi}_j(\omega) \chi_{j'}(\omega) d_E(\tilde{\Xi}_{j',\omega}(\tilde{y}_0), \Xi_{j,\omega}(y_0))^p + 2^{p-1} d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{\chi}_j(\omega) \chi_{j'}(\omega) d_Y(\tilde{y}_0, \gamma_j^{j'}(\omega)y_0)^p + 2^{p-1} d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u)
\end{aligned}$$

The first term above is bounded independent of  $u$  and  $\omega$  (depending only on  $y_0$  and  $\tilde{y}_0$ ) by (1.2), hence there is some constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$1 + d_{E, \tilde{y}_0}^p(\pi(u), u) \leq C(1 + d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u)),$$

for all  $u \in E$ , which proves the lemma.  $\square$

Next we define a subspace of  $C(Y)$  assuming  $(Y, d_Y)$  is locally compact, by

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{Y}_p := \left\{ \phi \in C(Y) \mid \frac{\phi(t)}{1 + d_Y(y_0, t)^p} \in C_0(Y) \text{ for some (hence all) } y_0 \in Y \right\}$$

equipped with the norm defined by

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p, y_0} := \sup_{t \in Y} \left| \frac{\phi(t)}{1 + d_Y(y_0, t)^p} \right| \quad \text{for } \phi \in C(Y).$$

Since all  $(\mathcal{Y}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p, y_0})$  for  $y_0 \in Y$  are equivalent to each other, we simply denote this normed space by  $\mathcal{Y}_p$  and write the norm as  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$  with the convention that we have fixed some  $y_0 \in Y$ , when there is no possibility of confusion. It is easy to see that  $(\mathcal{Y}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p})$  is a Banach space.

We now recall the classical duality for  $\mathbf{MK}_p^X$  on a metric space  $(X, d_X)$ , also known as *Kantorovich duality*, which will be the basis of a duality theory for  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ .

**Theorem 2.16** ([35, Theorem 5.10]). *Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete, separable metric space, and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , then for  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{MK}_p^X(\mu, \nu)^p &= \sup \left\{ - \int_X \phi d\mu - \int_X \psi d\nu \mid \begin{array}{l} (\phi, \psi) \in C_b(X)^2, \\ -\phi(t) - \psi(s) \leq d_X(t, s)^p \text{ for } (t, s) \in X^2 \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ - \int_X \psi^{d_X^p} d\mu - \int_X \psi d\nu \mid \phi \in C_b(X) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also recall the following definition.

**Definition 2.17.** For a function  $\phi$  on a metric space  $(X, d_X)$  and  $s \in X$ , the  $d_X^p$ -transform of  $\phi$  is defined by

$$\phi^{d_X^p}(s) := \sup_{t \in X} (-d_X(t, s)^p - \phi(t)) \in (-\infty, \infty].$$

Next we show a few lemmas on the  $d_Y^p$ -transform of a function in  $\mathcal{Y}_p$ . The continuity below is an analogue of [14, Appendix C], but in spaces other than  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and for functions in the restricted class  $\mathcal{Y}_p$ .

**Lemma 2.18.** *If  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p$ , then  $\phi^{d_Y^p}$  is locally bounded and continuous on  $Y$ , and belongs to  $L^1(\mu)$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ .*

*Proof.* We first show local boundedness. Note by definition,

$$\phi^{d_Y^p}(s) \geq -d_Y(s, s)^p - \phi(s) = -\phi(s) > -\infty$$

for all  $s \in Y$ . To see local boundedness from above, fix  $y_0, s \in Y$ . Since compact sets are bounded and  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p$ , there exists an  $R > 0$  such that if  $d_{y_0}(t) > R$ , then

$$\frac{|\phi(t)|}{1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p} \leq 2^{-p},$$

we calculate for such  $t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.13) \quad -d_Y(t, s)^p - \phi(t) &\leq -d_Y(t, s)^p + 2^{-p} (1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p) \\
&\leq -d_Y(t, s)^p + 2^{-p} [1 + 2^{p-1} (d_Y(t, s)^p + d_{y_0}(s)^p)] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} d_Y(t, s)^p + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s)^p \leq \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\phi^{d_Y^p}(s) \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s)^p, \sup_{t \in B_R^Y(y_0)} (-d_Y(t, s)^p - \phi(t)) \right\},$$

since  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  implies  $\phi$  is bounded on bounded, open balls, the expression on the right is locally bounded in  $s$ , hence we see  $\phi^{d_Y^p}$  is locally bounded. Since  $\mu$  has finite  $p$ th moment, the above bounds give  $\phi^{d_Y^p} \in L^1(\mu)$ .

To see continuity, fix a convergent sequence  $(s_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $Y$  with limit  $s_0$  and fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then since  $\phi^{d_Y^p}$  is locally bounded from above, there exists  $t_0 \in Y$  such that  $\phi^{d_Y^p}(s_0) \leq -d_Y(t_0, s_0)^p - \phi(t_0) + \varepsilon$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.14) \quad \phi^{d_Y^p}(s_0) - \phi^{d_Y^p}(s_\ell) &\leq -d_Y(t_0, s_0)^p + d_Y(t_0, s_\ell)^p + \varepsilon \\
&\leq p \cdot \max\{d_Y(t_0, s_\ell)^{p-1}, d_Y(t_0, s_0)^{p-1}\} |d_Y(t_0, s_\ell) - d_Y(t_0, s_0)| + \varepsilon \\
&\leq p \cdot \max\{d_Y(t_0, s_\ell)^{p-1}, d_Y(t_0, s_0)^{p-1}\} d_Y(s_\ell, s_0) + \varepsilon \\
&< 2\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

if  $\ell$  is sufficiently large. Similarly, for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$(2.15) \quad \phi^{d_Y^p}(s_\ell) - \phi^{d_Y^p}(s_0) \leq p \max\{d_Y(t_\ell, s_\ell)^{p-1}, d_Y(t_\ell, s_0)^{p-1}\} d_Y(s_\ell, s_0) + \varepsilon,$$

where  $t_\ell \in Y$  satisfies  $\phi^{d_Y^p}(s_\ell) \leq -d_Y(t_\ell, s_\ell)^p - \phi(t_\ell) + \varepsilon$ . Now suppose by contradiction that (after passing to some subsequence)  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} d_{y_0}(t_\ell) = \infty$ , then since  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p$ , for all  $\ell$  sufficiently large we can apply (2.13) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
-\phi^{d_Y^p}(s_\ell) &\leq -d_Y(t_\ell, s_\ell)^p - \phi(t_\ell) + \varepsilon \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2} d_Y(t_\ell, s_\ell)^p + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s_\ell)^p + \varepsilon \xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty} -\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

as  $(s_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded. This contradicts that  $\phi^{d_Y^p}$  is locally bounded, since  $s_\ell \rightarrow s_0$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus for  $\ell$  sufficiently large,

$$\phi^{d_Y^p}(s_\ell) - \phi^{d_Y^p}(s_0) \leq p \max\{d_Y(t_\ell, s_\ell)^{p-1}, d_Y(t_\ell, s_0)^{p-1}\} d_Y(s_\ell, s_0) + \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon,$$

and we see  $\phi^{d_Y^p}$  is continuous at  $s_0$ . □

Next we prove stability of  $d_Y^p$ -transforms under the norm of  $\mathcal{Y}_p$ . Note we do not claim that  $\tilde{\phi}^{d_Y^p}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{Y}_p$  in (2) below.

**Lemma 2.19.** *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ . Then:*

(1)  $\phi \in L^1(\mu)$  and

$$\int_Y |\phi| d\mu \leq \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} \int_Y (1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p) d\mu(t).$$

(2) Let  $R_\phi > 0$  be such that if  $d_{y_0}(t) > R_\phi$ , then

$$\frac{|\phi(t)|}{1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p} \leq 2^{-p-1}.$$

Then for all  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  with  $\|\phi - \tilde{\phi}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} < 2^{-p-1}$  and  $s \in Y$ ,

$$|\tilde{\phi}^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) - \phi^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s)| \leq \left\| \phi - \tilde{\phi} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} \left( 1 + \max\{R_\phi^p, 2^{p+1}(1 + \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p})(1 + d_{y_0}(s)^p)\} \right).$$

*Proof.* Assertion (1) follows from the inequality

$$|\phi(t)| \leq \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} (1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p) \quad \text{for all } t \in Y.$$

Assertion (2) is more involved. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then if  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  by Lemma 2.18,  $\tilde{\phi}^{\text{d}_Y^p}$  is finite on all of  $Y$ . Thus for any  $s \in Y$ , there exists  $t_{\tilde{\phi}} \in Y$  such that

$$\tilde{\phi}^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) \leq -d_Y(t_{\tilde{\phi}}, s)^p - \phi(t_{\tilde{\phi}}) + \varepsilon.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) - \phi^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) &\leq -d_Y(t_{\tilde{\phi}}, s)^p - \tilde{\phi}(t_{\tilde{\phi}}) + d_Y(t_{\tilde{\phi}}, s)^p + \phi(t_{\tilde{\phi}}) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \left\| \phi - \tilde{\phi} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} (1 + d_{y_0}(t_{\tilde{\phi}})^p) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and switching the roles of  $\phi, \tilde{\phi}$  yields

$$(2.16) \quad |\tilde{\phi}^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) - \phi^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s)| \leq \left\| \phi - \tilde{\phi} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} (1 + \max\{d_{y_0}(t_\phi)^p, d_{y_0}(t_{\tilde{\phi}})^p\}) + \varepsilon.$$

Now suppose  $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  with  $\|\phi - \tilde{\phi}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} < 2^{-p-1}$ , then if  $d_{y_0}(t) > R_\phi$ ,

$$\frac{|\tilde{\phi}(t)|}{1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p} \leq \|\phi - \tilde{\phi}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} + \frac{|\phi(t)|}{1 + d_{y_0}(t)^p} < 2^{-p}.$$

If  $s, t \in Y$  satisfy  $d_{y_0}(t) \geq \max\{R_\phi, 2d_{y_0}(s)\}$ , by the triangle inequality,

$$d_Y(t, s) \geq |d_{y_0}(t) - d_{y_0}(s)| = d_{y_0}(t) - d_{y_0}(s) \geq \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(t),$$

then from (2.13) we obtain that

$$-d_Y(t, s)^p - \tilde{\phi}(t) \leq -\frac{1}{2} d_Y(t, s)^p + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s)^p \leq -\frac{1}{2^{p+1}} d_{y_0}(t)^p + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s)^p,$$

Thus if  $s \in Y$  is such that  $d_{y_0}(t_{\tilde{\phi}}) \geq \max\{R_\phi, 2d_{y_0}(s)\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\left\| \tilde{\phi} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} (1 + d_{y_0}(s)^p) &\leq -\tilde{\phi}(s) \leq \tilde{\phi}^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) \leq -d_Y(t_{\tilde{\phi}}, s)^p - \tilde{\phi}(t_{\tilde{\phi}}) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2^{p+1}} d_{y_0}(t_{\tilde{\phi}})^p + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2} d_{y_0}(s)^p + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

or rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{y_0}(t_{\tilde{\phi}})^p &\leq 2^{p+1} \left\| \tilde{\phi} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} (1 + d_{y_0}(s)^p) + 2 + 2^p d_{y_0}(s)^p + 2^{p+1} \varepsilon \\ &\leq 2^{p+1} (2^{-p-1} + \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}) (1 + d_{y_0}(s)^p) + 2 + 2^p d_{y_0}(s)^p + 2^{p+1} \varepsilon \\ &\leq 2^{p+1} \left[ (1 + \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}) (1 + d_{y_0}(s)^p) + \varepsilon \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in all cases, we have

$$d_{y_0}(t_{\tilde{\phi}})^p \leq \max \left\{ R_{\tilde{\phi}}^p, 2^{p+1} \left[ (1 + \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p})(1 + d_{y_0}(s)^p) + \varepsilon \right] \right\}.$$

We can obtain the above estimate when  $\tilde{\phi} = \phi$  as well, hence combining with (2.16) and taking  $\varepsilon$  to 0 finishes the proof.  $\square$

Our approach will be to apply the classic Kantorovich duality for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and appeal to the Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem (Theorem 2.13) to obtain the necessary measurability. However, care must be taken to utilize this measurability since we are not in the trivial bundle case. To this end, given  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we define a set-valued function  $\overline{F}_{j,\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}$  from  $U_j$  to  $2^{\mathcal{Y}_p}$  by

$$\overline{F}_{j,\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}(\omega) := \overline{\left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p \mid - \int_Y \phi d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_Y \phi^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^\omega > \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p - \varepsilon \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}},$$

where  $\overline{A}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}}$  denotes the closure of  $A \subset \mathcal{Y}_p$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$ .

For the remainder of the section, for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote

$$\sigma_j := \sigma|_{U_j}.$$

**Lemma 2.20.** *Assume  $(Y, d_Y)$  is locally compact and let  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ . Then for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we find  $\overline{F}_{j,\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}$  is  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -weakly measurable and  $\overline{F}_{j,\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}(\omega)$  is closed and nonempty for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega \in U_j$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$  are fixed, we write  $\overline{F}$  in place of  $\overline{F}_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}$ . We first show  $\overline{F}(\omega) \neq \emptyset$  for  $\sigma_j$ -a.e.  $\omega \in U_j$ . Since  $(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega, (\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  for  $\sigma_j$ -a.e.  $\omega$ , for such  $\omega$  we have

$$\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega) = \text{MK}_p^Y((\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega, (\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^\omega) < \infty$$

and by the classical Kantorovich duality Theorem 2.16 for  $\text{MK}_p^Y$ , there exists  $\phi_\varepsilon \in C_b(Y) \subset \mathcal{Y}_p$  such that

$$\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p - \varepsilon < - \int_Y \phi_\varepsilon^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_Y \phi_\varepsilon d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^\omega,$$

thus  $\phi_\varepsilon \in \overline{F}(\omega) \neq \emptyset$ . By definition,  $\overline{F}(\omega)$  is closed.

Next, we prove the  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -weak measurability of  $\overline{F}$ . Define

$$F(\omega) := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p \mid - \int_Y \phi^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_Y \phi d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^\omega > \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p - \varepsilon \right\}.$$

First, for any open set  $O \subset \mathcal{Y}_p$  and any set  $A \subset \mathcal{Y}_p$ , it is clear that  $\overline{A}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}} \cap O \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $A \cap O \neq \emptyset$ , thus it is sufficient to prove that  $F$  is  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -weakly measurable. To this end, fix  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  and define the function  $G_\phi : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$  by

$$G_\phi(\omega) := - \int_Y \phi^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_Y \phi d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^\omega - \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p,$$

then  $\phi \in F(\omega)$  if and only if  $G_\phi(\omega) > -\varepsilon$ , hence

$$(2.17) \quad \{\omega \in \Omega \mid F(\omega) \cap O \neq \emptyset\} = \bigcup_{\phi \in O} G_\phi^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)).$$

Since  $(Y, d_Y)$  is locally compact and separable, by combining [20, (5.3) Theorem ii) and iv)], and [8, Chapter V.5, Exercise 2(c)] we find  $C_0(Y)$  is separable, hence there exists a countable set  $\{\tilde{\phi}_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_0(Y)$ , dense in the supremum norm, then

$$\{\phi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} := \{(1 + d_{y_0}^p)\tilde{\phi}_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Y}_p$$

is dense in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$ ; we may throw out some elements to assume  $\{\phi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset O$  while remaining dense in  $O$ . We now claim that

$$(2.18) \quad \bigcup_{\phi \in O} G_\phi^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)) = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} G_{\phi_\ell}^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)).$$

Since  $\{\phi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset O$ , it is clear that

$$\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} G_{\phi_\ell}^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)) \subset \bigcup_{\phi \in O} G_\phi^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)).$$

On the other hand, suppose  $\omega \in G_\phi^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty))$  for some  $\phi \in O$ . From Lemma 2.19 combined with the fact that  $(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ , and the density of  $\{\phi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{Y}_p$ , for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\ell_\delta \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$G_\phi(\omega) - G_{\phi_{\ell_\delta}}(\omega) = - \int_Y (\phi^{d_Y^p} - \phi_{\ell_\delta}^{d_Y^p}) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_Y (\phi - \phi_{\ell_\delta}) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega < \delta,$$

thus taking  $\delta = G_\phi(\omega) + \varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$G_\phi(\omega) - G_{\phi_{\ell_\delta}}(\omega) < G_\phi(\omega) + \varepsilon,$$

consequently  $G_{\phi_{\ell_\delta}}(\omega) > -\varepsilon$ . Thus  $\omega \in G_{\phi_{\ell_\delta}}^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty))$  and the opposite inclusion is proved.

By [3, Lemma 12.4.7] and Disintegration Theorem, we see  $G_{\phi_\ell}^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)) \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$  for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence

$$\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} G_{\phi_\ell}^{-1}((-\varepsilon, \infty)) \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}.$$

Thus combining (2.17) and (2.18), this shows  $F$  is  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -weakly measurable.  $\square$

We now prove some auxiliary lemmas.

**Lemma 2.21.** *For  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $f \in L^0(\sigma_j; \mathcal{Y}_p)$ , then for  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ , the functions defined by*

$$(2.19) \quad \omega \mapsto \int_Y f_\omega^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega, \quad \omega \mapsto \int_Y f_\omega d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega$$

are  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -measurable on  $U_j$ .

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is  $\sigma_j$ -strongly measurable, for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $I_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\{\phi_{i,\ell}\}_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \subset \mathcal{Y}_p$ , and a partition  $\{A_{i,\ell}\}_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \subset \mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$  of  $U_j$  such that for  $\sigma_j$ -a.e.  $\omega$ , the sequence

$$f_\omega^\ell := \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \mathbf{1}_{A_{i,\ell}}(\omega) \phi_{i,\ell}$$

converges to  $f_\omega$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$ . The probability measures  $(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\bullet$  and  $(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\bullet$  have finite  $p$ th moment  $\sigma$ -a.e., fix  $\omega$  such that this holds. For each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $\{A_{i,\ell}\}_{i=1}^{I_\ell}$  is a disjoint collection there exists a unique  $1 \leq i_\ell \leq I_\ell$  such that  $\omega \in A_{i_\ell,\ell}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y f_\omega^\ell d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega &= \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \mathbb{1}_{A_{i,\ell}}(\omega) \int_Y \phi_{i,\ell}(t) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega(t), \\ \int_Y (f_\omega^\ell)^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega &= \int_Y \left[ \sup_{t \in Y} \left( -d_Y(t, s)^p - \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \mathbb{1}_{A_{i,\ell}}(\omega) \phi_{i,\ell}(t) \right) \right] d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega(s) \\ &= \int_Y \left[ \sup_{t \in Y} (-d_Y(t, s)^p - \phi_{i_\ell,\ell}(t)) \right] d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega(s) \\ &= \int_Y \phi_{i_\ell,\ell}^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega = \sum_{i=1}^{I_\ell} \mathbb{1}_{A_{i,\ell}}(\omega) \int_Y \phi_{i,\ell}^{d_Y^p} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}^\omega, \end{aligned}$$

which are  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -measurable functions of  $\omega \in U_j$  by [Disintegration Theorem](#). Thus from [Lemma 2.19](#), we observe each of the functions in [\(2.19\)](#) is a  $\sigma$ -a.e. pointwise limit of  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -measurable functions, hence is  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -measurable itself.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.22.** *If  $f \in L^0(\sigma_j; \mathcal{Y}_p)$ , there is a sequence  $(f_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_b(U_j; \mathcal{Y}_p)$  which converges pointwise  $\sigma_j$ -a.e. to  $f$ .*

*Proof.* By [Remark 2.3](#),  $f$  is a  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -measurable map. Then since  $\mathcal{Y}_p$  is complete and separable, for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we may apply [[4](#), [Theorem 7.1.13](#)], where  $\mathcal{B}_\mu(X)$  in the reference is our  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ , to  $f$  to find a compact set  $K_\ell \subset U_j$  such that  $\sigma_j(U_j \setminus K_\ell) < 2^{-\ell}$  and  $f$  restricted to  $K_\ell$  is continuous; we may also assume  $K_\ell \subset K_{\ell+1}$  for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\mathcal{Y}_p$  is a normed space it is locally convex, hence the Tietze extension theorem [[10](#), [Theorem 4.1](#)] applies and there is a continuous function  $f_\ell : U_j \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_p$  such that  $f_\ell = f$  on  $K_\ell$ . Moreover since  $K_\ell$  is compact and  $f$  restricted to it is continuous, the image  $f(K_\ell)$  is also compact, hence bounded in  $\mathcal{Y}_p$ . Then [[10](#), [Theorem 4.1](#)] also ensures that the image  $f_\ell(U_j)$  is contained in the convex hull of  $f(K_\ell)$ , consequently  $f_\ell$  is bounded. Since  $\sigma_j(K_\ell) \rightarrow \sigma_j(U_j)$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , it is clear that  $f_\ell$  converges pointwise  $\sigma_j$ -a.e. to  $f$ , finishing the proof.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the duality result. Note carefully that we do not require  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  to belong to  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , but only to  $\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ . This will be relevant for [Corollary 2.24](#) below.

*Proof of [Theorem 1.6 \(3\)](#).* Recall  $r = p/q$ ,  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ , and we first assume  $(Y, d_Y)$  is locally compact. Let  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$ . Since  $\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\}))$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ , by the Kantorovich duality [Theorem 2.16](#) for  $\text{MK}_p^E$  restricted to  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$ , and the dual representation for the  $L^r$  norm again ([[12](#), [Proposition 6.13](#)]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_\Omega \zeta(\omega) \left( \int_E \Phi(u) d\mathbf{m}^\omega(u) + \int_E \Psi(v) d\mathbf{n}^\omega(v) \right) d\sigma(\omega) &\leq \int_\Omega \zeta(\omega) \text{MK}_p^Y(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p d\sigma(\omega) \\ &\leq \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} \\ &= \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)}^p = \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p. \end{aligned}$$

To show the reverse inequality, fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $\Omega'$  be the set of  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that both of  $\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega$  have finite  $p$ th moment. By [Lemma 2.20](#), for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  the set-valued mapping  $\overline{F}_{j,\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}$  on  $U_j$  is nonempty and closed valued  $\sigma$ -a.e., and  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -weakly measurable. Since  $\mathcal{Y}_p$  is separable, by



Theorem 2.13 we can find maps  $f_{\bullet}^j : U_j \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_p$  that are  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_j}$ -measurable such that  $f_{\omega}^j \in \overline{F}_{j,\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}}(\omega)$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega \in U_j$ , and by Remark 2.3, this implies  $f_{\bullet}^j \in L^0(\sigma_j; \mathcal{Y}_p)$ . By Lemma 2.19 for  $\omega \in \Omega' \cap U_j$

$$-\int_Y (f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\omega}(t) - \int_Y f_{\omega}^j(s) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\omega}(s) \geq \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^{\omega}, \mathbf{n}^{\omega})^p - \varepsilon.$$

If  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) < \infty$ , it is easy to see there exists  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega} \zeta(\omega) \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^{\omega}, \mathbf{n}^{\omega})^p d\sigma(\omega) > \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - \varepsilon;$$

thus combining with the inequality above and using the properties of a partition of unity we obtain

$$(2.20) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \chi_j(\omega) \zeta(\omega) \left( -\int_Y (f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\omega}(t) - \int_Y f_{\omega}^j(s) d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\omega}(s) \right) d\sigma(\omega) > \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - 2\varepsilon;$$

in the case  $p = q$  we may take  $\zeta \equiv 1$ .

Now for  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ , let

$$T_{\ell}(z) := \max\{\min\{z, \ell\}, -\ell\} := \begin{cases} \min\{z, \ell\}, & \text{if } z \geq 0, \\ \max\{z, -\ell\}, & \text{if } z < 0. \end{cases}$$

A simple calculation yields that for each  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , the sequence  $(T_{\ell}(z_1) + T_{\ell}(z_2))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is non-negative and non-decreasing if  $z_1 + z_2 \geq 0$ , and non-positive and non-increasing if  $z_1 + z_2 \leq 0$  with limit  $z_1 + z_2$ , and in particular

$$(2.21) \quad \left( T_{\ell}(-(f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t)) + T_{\ell}(-f_{\omega}^j(s)) \right) \leq \text{d}_Y(t, s)^p$$

for each  $t, s \in Y$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\omega \in U_j$ . For each  $\omega \in U_j$  define the sets

$$E_{\pm}^j(\omega) := \left\{ (t, s) \mid \pm \left( (f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t) + (f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(s) \right) \leq 0 \right\}$$

then we can see

$$\left( \pm \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \int_{E_{\pm}^j(\omega)} \left( T_{\ell}(-(f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t)) + T_{\ell}(-f_{\omega}^j(s)) \right) d((\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\omega} \otimes (\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\omega})(t, s) \right)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$$

are non-negative, non-decreasing sequences for each  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . Thus integrating against  $\zeta \sigma$  and using monotone convergence (and using  $T_{\ell}(-(f_{\omega}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t)) + T_{\ell}(-f_{\omega}^j(s)) = 0$  on  $E_{+}^j(\omega) \cap E_{-}^j(\omega)$ ), by (2.20) if  $\ell_0$  is large enough we obtain

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \chi_j \zeta \left( \int_Y [-T_{\ell_0}(-f_{\bullet}^j)]^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t) d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(t) + \int_Y [-T_{\ell_0}(-f_{\bullet}^j(s))] d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\bullet}(s) \right) d\sigma \\ & \geq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \chi_j \zeta \left( \int_Y T_{\ell_0}(-(f_{\bullet}^j)^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t)) d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(t) + \int_Y T_{\ell_0}(-f_{\bullet}^j(s)) d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\bullet}(s) \right) d\sigma \\ & > \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in the second line follows from (2.21), and the integration against  $\sigma$  is justified by the measurability from by Lemma 2.21. Let us fix such a  $\ell_0$ .

By Lemma 2.22, for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a sequence  $(\Psi_{j,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_b(U_j; \mathcal{Y}_p)$  converging pointwise  $\sigma_j$ -a.e. to  $-T_{\ell_0} \circ (-f_{\bullet}^j)$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$ ; we may truncate to assume  $\|(\Psi_{j,m})_{\omega}\|_{C_b(Y)} \leq 2\ell_0$ , for all  $\omega \in U_j$ , and by [24, Lemma 2.14], the sequence  $(\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  also satisfies the same bound. Thus

$$(2.23) \quad - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \zeta(\omega) \left( \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{\omega} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\omega} + \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m})_{\omega} d(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\omega} \right) \geq -4\ell_0 \zeta(\omega),$$

for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Also by Lemma 2.19 and the local finiteness of the  $\chi_j$ , we have that

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j \zeta \left( \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{\bullet} d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet} + \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m})_{\bullet} d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\bullet} \right) \\ & = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j \zeta \left( \int_Y [-T_{\ell_0}(-f_{\bullet}^j)]^{\text{d}_Y^p}(t) d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(t) + \int_Y [-T_{\ell_0}(-f_{\bullet}^j(s))] d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\bullet}(s) \right), \end{aligned}$$

holds  $\sigma$ -a.e. Since  $C_b(\Omega; \mathcal{Y}_p) \subset L^0(\sigma; \mathcal{Y}_p)$  by Remark 2.3, all functions involved can be integrated against  $\sigma$  again by Lemma 2.21; by (2.23) and since  $\zeta \in L^{r'}(\sigma) \subset L^1(\sigma)$  we may apply Fatou's lemma, thus combining with (2.22) and (2.24) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left[ - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \chi_j \zeta \left( \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{\bullet} d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet} - \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m})_{\bullet} d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma \right] \\ & \geq - \int_{\Omega} \zeta \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_E \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j (\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{\bullet} \circ \Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1} d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet} + \int_E \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j (\Psi_{j,m})_{\bullet} \circ \Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1} d\mathbf{n}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma \\ & > \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi(u) & := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\pi(u)) \cdot (\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{\pi(u)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(u)}^{-1}(u)), \\ \Psi(v) & := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\pi(v)) \cdot (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v)}^{-1}(v)), \end{aligned}$$

for an  $m$  sufficiently large, then since  $\mathbf{m}^{\omega}, \mathbf{n}^{\omega}$  are supported in  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \left( \int_E \zeta \Phi d\mathbf{m} + \int_E \zeta \Psi d\mathbf{n} \right) \\ & = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\Omega} \chi_j \zeta \left( \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_{\bullet} d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet} - \int_Y (\Psi_{j,m})_{\bullet} d(\Xi_{j,\bullet}^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{n}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma \\ & > \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we will obtain the first equality in Theorem 1.6 (3) when  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) < \infty$ , if we can verify that  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$ . First, let  $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $E$  converging to some  $v_{\infty} \in E$ . Then by the local finiteness of  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , there is a finite set  $J \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\{\pi(v_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{\pi(v_{\infty})\} \subset \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi(v_n) - \Psi(v_\infty)| &\leq \sum_{j \in J} \left( |\chi_j(\pi(v_n)) - \chi_j(\pi(v_\infty))| \cdot \left| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_n)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n)) \right| \right. \\
&\quad + |\chi_j(\pi(v_\infty))| \cdot \left| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_n)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n)) - (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n)) \right| \\
&\quad + |\chi_j(\pi(v_\infty))| \cdot \left| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n)) - (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_n)) \right| \\
&\quad \left. + |\chi_j(\pi(v_\infty))| \cdot \left| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_n)) - (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_\infty)) \right| \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in J} (I_{j,n} + II_{j,n} + III_{j,n} + IV_{j,n}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{j,n} &:= 2\ell_0 |\chi_j(\pi(v_n)) - \chi_j(\pi(v_\infty))|, \\
II_{j,n} &:= \left\| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_n)} - (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)} \right\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} (1 + d_{y_0}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n))^p), \\
III_{j,n} &:= \left| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n)) - (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_n)) \right|, \\
IV_{j,n} &:= \left| (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_n)) - (\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_\infty)) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

By continuity of the  $\chi_j$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}$ , and  $(\Psi_{j,m})_{\pi(v_\infty)}$ , we see

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (I_{j,n} + IV_{j,n}) = 0$$

for each  $j \in J$ . Since  $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a convergent sequence,

$$d_{y_0}(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n)) = d_E(\Xi_j(\pi(v_n), y_0), v_n)$$

is bounded uniformly in  $n$  by the continuity of the  $\Xi_j$  and  $\pi$ , then combining with the fact that  $(\Psi_{j,m})_\bullet \in C_b(\Omega; \mathcal{Y}_p)$  we see

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} II_{j,n} = 0$$

for each  $j \in J$ . Also,

$$d_Y(\Xi_{j,\pi(v_n)}^{-1}(v_n), \Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_n)) = d_E(v_n, \Xi_j(\pi(v_n), \Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}(v_n))) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by the continuity of  $\pi$ ,  $\Xi_j$ , and  $\Xi_{j,\pi(v_\infty)}^{-1}$ , hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} III_{j,n} = 0.$$

Again by the local finiteness of  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , the sum in the bound for  $|\Psi(v_n) - \Psi(v_\infty)|$  is actually finite, hence we see  $\Psi \in C(E)$ . Since Lemma 2.19 (2) implies  $(\Psi_j^{\text{d}_Y^p})_\bullet$  is continuous with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$ , a similar argument shows  $\Phi \in C(E)$ , and the uniform boundedness of the  $(\Psi_{j,m})_\bullet$  implies  $\Phi, \Psi \in C_b(E)$ . Finally, if  $\omega := \pi(u) = \pi(v)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
-\Phi(u) - \Psi(v) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \left( -(\Psi_{j,m}^{\text{d}_Y^p})_\omega \circ \Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1}(u) - (\Psi_{j,m})_\omega \circ \Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1}(v) \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) d_Y(\Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1}(u), \Xi_{j,\omega}^{-1}(v))^p \\
&= d_E(u, v)^p,
\end{aligned}$$

thus  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$  as desired.

If  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = \infty$ , we can replace  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$  in the above proof starting at (2.20) by an arbitrary positive number to obtain that the supremum in the first equality of Theorem 1.6 (3) takes the value  $\infty$ .

Now let us assume that  $(E, d_E)$  is locally compact. To show the second equality in Theorem 1.6 (3), fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and take  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$  defined by (2.25), satisfying (2.26) as above. By definition of  $S_p$  and since  $\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega$  are supported on  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  we see that for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ ,

$$-\int_E \Phi d\mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^\omega \leq -\int_E S_p \Psi d\mathbf{m}^\omega - \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^\omega \leq \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_\Omega \zeta(\omega) \left( \int_E S_p \Psi d\mathbf{m}^\omega + \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^\omega \right) d\sigma(\omega) &= -\int_E \zeta S_p \Psi d\mathbf{m} - \int_E \zeta \Psi d\mathbf{n} \\ &\in (\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - 3\varepsilon, \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are uniformly bounded from below, we can view

$$-\zeta \left( \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^\bullet + \int_E S_p \Psi d\mathbf{m}^\bullet \right) \sigma$$

as a (signed) Borel measure with finite total variation on  $\Omega$ , then from [4, Theorem 7.1.7] we can find a compact set  $K'_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$  such that

$$(2.27) \quad \left| -\int_{\Omega \setminus K'_\varepsilon} \zeta \left( \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^\bullet + \int_E S_p \Psi d\mathbf{m}^\bullet \right) d\sigma \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Since  $\Omega$  is locally compact, we may cover  $K'_\varepsilon$  with a finite number of open sets whose closures are compact. Writing  $K_\varepsilon$  for the union of the closures of these neighborhoods, we see  $K_\varepsilon$  is also compact and (2.27) holds with  $K'_\varepsilon$  replaced by  $K_\varepsilon^\circ$ . Now define for  $\delta > 0$

$$\psi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega) := \min\{1, \delta^{-1} d_\Omega(\omega, \Omega \setminus K_\varepsilon)\}, \quad \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(v) := \psi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\pi(v))\Psi(v).$$

Since  $\Psi$  is bounded on  $E$  by  $2\ell_0$ , so is  $S_p\Psi$ , hence for any  $u \in E$  and  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$  there exists  $v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})$  such that  $S_p\Psi(u) \leq -d_E(u, v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}})^p - \Psi(v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + \tilde{\varepsilon}$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} S_p\Psi(u) - S_p\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(u) &\leq -d_E(u, v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}})^p - \Psi(v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + \tilde{\varepsilon} + \inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (d_E(u, v)^p + \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(v)) \\ &\leq \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) - \Psi(v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + \tilde{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq 2\ell_0(\psi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\pi(v_{\tilde{\varepsilon}})) - 1) + \tilde{\varepsilon} \\ &= 2\ell_0(\psi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\pi(u)) - 1) + \tilde{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  and by an analogous argument reversing the roles of  $\Psi$  and  $\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{K_\varepsilon^\circ} \zeta \left( \int_E S_p \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} d\mathbf{m}^\bullet - \int_E S_p \Psi d\mathbf{m}^\bullet \right) d\sigma \right| &\leq 2\ell_0 \left| \int_{K_\varepsilon^\circ} \zeta |1 - \psi_{\delta,\varepsilon}| d\sigma \right| \\ &\leq 2\ell_0 \left\| \zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega \in K_\varepsilon^\circ \mid 0 \leq d_\Omega(\omega, \Omega \setminus K_\varepsilon) < \delta\}} \right\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)}. \end{aligned}$$

We also find

$$\left| \int_{K_\varepsilon^\circ} \zeta \left( \int_E \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} d\mathbf{n}^\bullet - \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma \right| \leq 2\ell_0 \left\| \zeta \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega \in K_\varepsilon^\circ \mid 0 \leq d_\Omega(\omega, \Omega \setminus K_\varepsilon) < \delta\}} \right\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)},$$

thus if  $\delta > 0$  is sufficiently small, combining with (2.27) and using the definition of  $S_p$  implies that

$$-\int_{\Omega} \zeta \left( \int_E \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} d\mathbf{n}^{\bullet} + \int_E S_p \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma \in (\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p - 4\varepsilon, \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p].$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, we need only verify that  $\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ ; note it is clear that  $\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in C_b(E)$ .

Now since  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is locally finite, the compact set  $K_{\varepsilon}$  can only intersect a finite number of sets  $\{U_{j_i}\}_{i=1}^{J_I}$ . Thus for any fixed  $\hat{\varepsilon} > 0$ , using that  $\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} \equiv 0$  outside of  $\pi^{-1}(K_{\varepsilon})$ ,

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\{ v \in E \mid \frac{|\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(v)|}{1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v)} \geq \hat{\varepsilon} \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ v \in \pi^{-1}(K_{\varepsilon}) \mid \sum_{i=1}^I \chi_{j_i}(\pi(v)) \cdot \frac{\psi_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\pi(v)) \left| (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\pi(v)}(\Xi_{j_i,\pi(v)}^{-1}(v)) \right|}{1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v)} \geq \hat{\varepsilon} \right\} \\ & \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^I A_i, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_i := \left\{ v \in \pi^{-1}(K_{\varepsilon}) \mid \chi_{j_i}(\pi(v)) \cdot \frac{\left| (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\pi(v)}(\Xi_{j_i,\pi(v)}^{-1}(v)) \right|}{1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v)} \geq \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{I} \right\}.$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq I$  fixed, let  $(v_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $A_i$ . Then if  $\omega_{\ell} := \pi(v_{\ell})$ , by compactness of  $K_{\varepsilon}$  there exists a subsequence such that  $\omega_{\ell}$  converges to some  $\omega_{\infty} \in K_{\varepsilon}$ . Also since  $\chi_{j_i}(\pi(v_{\ell})) > 0$  we have  $\omega_{\ell} \in U_{j_i}$ , hence we may define  $y_{\ell} := \Xi_{j_i,\omega_{\ell}}^{-1}(v_{\ell})$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{j_i}(\omega_{\ell}) \left| (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\ell}}(y_{\ell}) \right| & \geq \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{I} (1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega_{\ell}, v_{\ell})) \\ & > \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{I} (\chi_{j_i}(\omega_{\ell}) + \chi_{j_i}(\omega_{\ell}) d_{y_0}(y_{\ell})^p), \end{aligned}$$

since we must have  $\chi_{j_i}(\omega_{\ell}) > 0$ , this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left| (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\infty}}(y_{\ell}) \right|}{1 + d_{y_0}(y_{\ell})^p} & \geq \frac{\left| (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\ell}}(y_{\ell}) \right|}{1 + d_{y_0}(y_{\ell})^p} - \frac{\left| (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\ell}}(y_{\ell}) - (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\infty}}(y_{\ell}) \right|}{1 + d_{y_0}(y_{\ell})^p} \\ & \geq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{I} - \|(\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\ell}} - (\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\infty}}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_p} \\ & \geq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2I} \end{aligned}$$

if  $\ell$  is large enough. Since  $(\Psi_{j_i,m})_{\omega_{\infty}} \in \mathcal{Y}_p$  there exists a subsequence of  $y_{\ell}$  converging to some  $y_{\infty} \in Y$ . Thus by continuity of  $\Xi_{j_i}$ , we see (the corresponding subsequence of)  $v_{\ell}$  converges to  $v_{\infty} := \Xi_{j_i}(\omega_{\infty}, y_{\infty})$  which we easily see belongs to  $A_i$ . Thus as a closed subset of a finite union of compact sets, the first set in (2.28) is compact, in particular we see  $\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ , finishing the proof.  $\square$

**2.4. Further properties of disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics.** In this subsection, we prove some further properties of the metrics  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}$ .

First, we prove that convergence in  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}$  implies weak convergence.

**Proposition 2.23.** *For any  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , if  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  converges in  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  to some  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , then the sequence converges weakly.*

*Proof.* Any subsequence of  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a further subsequence (not relabeled) such that the sequence  $(\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega, \mathbf{m}^\omega))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to zero for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ . Then for any  $\phi \in C_b(E)$ , by Theorem 2.1 we have

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \phi d\mathbf{m}_\ell^\omega = \int_E \phi d\mathbf{m}^\omega,$$

then by dominated convergence,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \phi d\mathbf{m}_\ell = \int_E \phi d\mathbf{m}.$$

Since this holds for arbitrary subsequences, we have weak convergence of the whole original sequence to  $\mathbf{m}$ .  $\square$

Next, duality will yield that  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  is lower-semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence on  $\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ , at least when  $E$  is locally compact.

**Corollary 2.24.** *If  $(E, d_E)$  is locally compact,  $p \leq q$ , and  $(\mathbf{m}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\mathbf{n}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  are sequences in  $\mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$  that weakly converge to  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$  respectively, then*

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leq \liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  and  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$ , then since  $(\zeta \circ \pi)\Phi, (\zeta \circ \pi)\Psi \in C_b(E)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi)\Phi d\mathbf{m} - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi)\Psi d\mathbf{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \left( - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi)\Phi d\mathbf{m}_\ell - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi)\Psi d\mathbf{n}_\ell \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Theorem 1.6 (3) in the last line. Taking a supremum over  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  and  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$  and using Theorem 1.6 (3) again yields the desired lower-semicontinuity.  $\square$

Now we show that  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,p}^\sigma$  can be recognized as coming from a certain optimal transport problem on  $E^2$ .

**Definition 2.25.** For  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , define  $\mathbf{c}_p : E^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by

$$\mathbf{c}_p(u, v) := \begin{cases} d_E(u, v)^p, & \text{if } \pi(u) = \pi(v), \\ \infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

For  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_p^\sigma(E)$ , set

$$\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) := \inf_{\Gamma \in \Pi(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})} \|\mathbf{c}_p\|_{L^p(\Gamma)} \in [0, \infty].$$

**Proposition 2.26.** *For  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,p}^\sigma(E)$ ,  $\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$  is finite and*

$$\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = \mathcal{MK}_{p,p}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,p}^\sigma(E)$ . For any  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$ , by definition we have  $\Phi, \Psi \in C_b(E)$  and

$$-\Phi(u) - \Psi(v) \leq \mathbf{c}_p(u, v).$$

Since  $(E, d_E)$  is a complete, separable metric space, the Kantorovich duality Theorem 2.16<sup>4</sup> yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) &= \sup_{(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p, E, \sigma}} \left( - \int_E \Phi d\mathbf{m} - \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n} \right) \\ &= \sup_{(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p, E, \sigma}} \int_{\Omega} \left( - \int_E \Phi d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet} - \int_E \Psi d\mathbf{n}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^{\omega}, \mathbf{n}^{\omega})^p d\sigma(\omega) = \mathcal{MK}_{p, p}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$  is finite and  $\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leq \mathcal{MK}_{p, p}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p$ .

On the other hand, since  $\mathfrak{c}_p$  is lower semi-continuous and non-negative, by [35, Theorem 4.1] there exists  $\gamma \in \Pi(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$  such that

$$\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = \int_{E^2} \mathfrak{c}_p d\gamma,$$

since  $\mathfrak{C}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) < \infty$  by above, we find that

$$\gamma(\{(u, v) \mid \pi(u) \neq \pi(v)\}) = 0.$$

Let  $\pi^2 : E^2 \rightarrow \Omega^2$  be defined by  $\pi^2(u, v) := (\pi(u), \pi(v))$ , then by the above, for  $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma}$ -measurable sets  $A, A' \subset \Omega$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma(A \times A') &= \gamma(\{(u, v) \mid \pi(u) \in A, \pi(v) \in A', \pi(u) = \pi(v)\}) \\ &= \gamma(\{(u, v) \mid \pi(u), \pi(v) \in A \cap A'\}) \\ &= \gamma(\pi^{-1}(A \cap A') \times E) \\ &= \mathbf{m}(\pi^{-1}(A \cap A')) = \sigma(A \cap A') = (\text{Id}_{\Omega} \times \text{Id}_{\Omega})_{\#} \sigma(A \times A'), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma = (\text{Id}_{\Omega} \times \text{Id}_{\Omega})_{\#} \sigma$ . Consider the disintegration of  $\gamma$  with respect to  $\pi^2$  given by

$$\gamma = \gamma^{(\bullet, \ast)} \otimes \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma = \gamma^{(\bullet, \ast)} \otimes (\text{Id}_{\Omega} \times \text{Id}_{\Omega})_{\#} \sigma.$$

For  $\phi \in C_b(E^2)$ , the function on  $\Omega^2$  (resp.  $\Omega$ ) defined by

$$(\omega, \omega') \mapsto \int_{E^2} \phi d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega')} \quad \left( \text{resp. } \omega \mapsto \int_{E^2} \phi d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)} \right)$$

is Borel by [Disintegration Theorem](#), and

$$(2.29) \quad \int_{\Omega^2} \int_{E^2} \phi d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega')} d\pi_{\#}^2 \gamma(\omega, \omega') = \int_{\Omega} \int_{E^2} \phi d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)} d\sigma(\omega).$$

Now for any Borel set  $E' \subset E$  and  $\Omega' \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma}$ , since  $\gamma \in \Pi(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega'} \mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(E') d\sigma &= \int_{\Omega} \int_E \mathbf{1}_{\Omega'}(\pi(u)) \mathbf{1}_{E'}(u) d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(u) d\sigma = \int_E \mathbf{1}_{\Omega'}(\pi(u)) \mathbf{1}_{E'}(u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \\ &= \int_{E^2} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega'}(\pi(u)) \mathbf{1}_{E'}(u) d\gamma(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{E^2} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega'}(\pi(u)) \mathbf{1}_{E'}(u) d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)}(u, v) d\sigma(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega'} \int_{E^2} \mathbf{1}_{E' \times E}(u, v) d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)}(u, v) d\sigma(\omega) = \int_{\Omega'} \gamma^{(\omega, \omega)}(E' \times E) d\sigma(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

<sup>4</sup>We have stated Theorem 2.16 only for cost functions of the form  $d_Y^p$ , however the same result holds for any lower-semicontinuous cost function bounded from below, hence for  $\mathfrak{c}_p$ , see [35, Theorem 5.10].



Since  $E'$  and  $\Omega'$  are arbitrary (and using a similar argument for  $\mathbf{n}$ ) this implies that for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have  $\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)} \in \Pi(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)$ .

Finally, using this claim with the disintegration (2.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{MK}_{p,p}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p d\sigma(\omega) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{E^2} d_E(u, v)^p d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)}(u, v) d\sigma(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{E^2} \mathbf{c}_p(u, v) d\gamma^{(\omega, \omega)}(u, v) d\sigma(\omega) \\ &= \int_{E^2} \mathbf{c}_p(u, v) d\gamma(u, v) = \mathbf{c}_p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We also show that in the case of a trivial bundle where the fiber equals the base space, the set of  $p$ -optimal couplings is closed in  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  for  $p \leq q$ .

**Proposition 2.27.** *Suppose  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  is a complete, separable metric space, we have the trivial bundle  $E = \Omega \times \Omega$ . Fix  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and some  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Omega)$ , and let us denote by  $\Pi_{\text{opt}}(\sigma)$  the set of all  $p$ -optimal couplings between  $\sigma$  and any other measure in  $\mathcal{P}_p(\Omega)$ . Then if  $p \leq q \leq \infty$ , the set  $\Pi_{\text{opt}}(\sigma)$  is closed with respect to  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(\Omega \times \Omega)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_p(\Omega)$  and suppose  $\gamma_\ell$  is a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu_\ell$  and  $\sigma$ , note that  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ . In the calculations below we will consider each  $\gamma_\ell^\bullet$  as a measure on  $\Omega$ . Since  $p \leq q < \infty$ , for some  $\omega_0 \in \Omega$  we can calculate using Jensen's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E, \omega_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \gamma_\ell) &= \|\mathbf{MK}_p^\Omega(\delta_{\omega_0}^\Omega, \gamma_\ell^\bullet)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} = \left\| \left( \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega)^p d\gamma_\ell^\bullet(\omega) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega)^p d\gamma_\ell^{\omega'}(\omega) d\sigma(\omega') \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left( \int_{\Omega^2} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega)^p d\gamma_\ell(\omega', \omega) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left( \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega)^p d\mu_\ell(\omega) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $q \rightarrow \infty$  also yields that  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(\delta_{E, \omega_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \gamma_\ell) < \infty$ . Now suppose  $(\gamma_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges in  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$  to some  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(\Omega \times \Omega)$ . Again since  $p \leq q$ , by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega^2} d_\Omega(\omega', \omega)^p d\gamma_\ell(\omega', \omega) &\leq 2^{p-1} \left( \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega')^p d\sigma(\omega') + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega)^p d\gamma_\ell^{\omega'}(\omega) d\sigma(\omega') \right) \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left( \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega')^p d\sigma(\omega') + \left\| \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega)^p d\gamma_\ell^\bullet(\omega) \right\|_{L^{q/p}(\sigma)} \right) \\ &= 2^{p-1} \left( \int_{\Omega} d_\Omega(\omega_0, \omega')^p d\sigma(\omega') + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E, \omega_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \gamma_\ell)^p \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded uniformly in  $\ell$ . By Proposition 2.23 the sequence converges weakly, hence by [35, Theorem 5.20] we see  $\gamma \in \Pi_{\text{opt}}(\sigma)$  as well.  $\square$

Finally, we note there is also a relationship between the sliced Monge–Kantorovich metrics which we defined in our previous work [24], and our disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics.

**Definition 2.28** ([24, Definition 1.1]). For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\sigma_{n-1}$  be the standard Riemannian volume measure on  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , normalized to have unit mass, and for  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  define the map  $R^\omega : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $R^\omega(x) := \langle x, \omega \rangle$ . Then for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the *sliced*  $(p, q)$ -Monge–Kantorovich metric is defined by

$$\text{MK}_{p,q}(\mu, \nu) := \left\| \text{MK}_p^{\mathbb{R}}(R_\#^\bullet \mu, R_\#^\bullet \nu) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma_{n-1})}.$$

Recall these include the well-known *sliced Wasserstein* ( $p = q$ ) and *max-sliced Wasserstein* ( $q = \infty$ ) metrics. As shown in [24, Main Theorem], each  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n), \text{MK}_{p,q})$  is a complete, separable metric space, but is *not* geodesic (when  $p > 1$ ). The relationship between the sliced and disintegrated Monge–Kantorovich metrics is as follows.

**Proposition 2.29.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $(E, \Omega, \pi, Y, G)$  is taken to be the trivial bundle  $E = \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ , then there exists an isometric embedding of  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n), \text{MK}_{p,q})$  into  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}}(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}})$  defined by sending  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  to the element of the form  $R_\#^\bullet \mu \otimes \sigma_{n-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . For  $\phi \in C_b(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R})$ , by dominated convergence the function on  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  defined by

$$\omega \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(\omega, t) dR_\#^\omega \mu(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(\omega, \langle x, \omega \rangle) d\mu(x)$$

is continuous, and

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu(\phi) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(\omega, t) dR_\#^\omega \mu(t) d\sigma_{n-1}(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(\omega, \langle x, \omega \rangle) d\mu(x) d\sigma_{n-1}(\omega)$$

is well-defined. Since  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$  is locally compact, by [4, Theorem 7.11.3] we can identify  $\mathcal{L}_\mu$  with a Borel probability measure  $\mathbf{m}_\mu \in \mathcal{P}^{\sigma_{n-1}}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathbf{m}_\mu^\bullet = R_\#^\bullet \mu$ .

Noting that for the choice  $y_0 = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have  $\delta_{E, y_0}^\omega = \delta_0^{\mathbb{R}}$  for all  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , for  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  a direct calculation combined with [24, Lemma 2.3] gives

$$\left\| \text{MK}_p^{\mathbb{R}}(\delta_0^{\mathbb{R}}, R_\#^\bullet \mu) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma_{n-1})} = \text{MK}_{p,q}(\delta_0^{\mathbb{R}^n}, \mu) \leq M_{\max\{p,q\}, n} \text{MK}_p^{\mathbb{R}^n}(\delta_0^{\mathbb{R}^n}, \mu) < \infty,$$

hence  $\mathbf{m}_\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R})$ . Finally, for  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_\mu, \mathbf{m}_\nu) = \left\| \text{MK}_p^{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{m}_\mu^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_\nu^\bullet) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma_{n-1})} = \left\| \text{MK}_p^{\mathbb{R}}(R_\#^\bullet \mu, R_\#^\bullet \nu) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma_{n-1})} = \text{MK}_{p,q}(\mu, \nu),$$

showing that the map  $\mu \mapsto \mathbf{m}_\mu$  is an isometry.  $\square$

*Remark 2.30.* By the completeness from [24, Main Theorem], the image of  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n), \text{MK}_{p,q})$  under  $\mu \mapsto \mathbf{m}_\mu$  is closed in  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}})$ . However, also by [24, Main Theorem] the embedded image is *not* geodesically convex in  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}})$  when  $n \geq 2$  and  $p > 1$ .

This shows that  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n), \text{MK}_{p,q})$  can be viewed as a sort of “submanifold” embedded into the geodesic space  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma_{n-1}})$ , but  $\text{MK}_{p,q}$  is in actuality utilizing the ambient metric from the larger space rather than the intrinsic metric generated from itself. In fact, it is proved in [7, Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.8] that the intrinsic metric on  $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  induced by  $\text{MK}_{p,p}$  between discrete measures with compact supports is  $\text{MK}_p^{\mathbb{R}^n}$ .

*Remark 2.31.* Recall that  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  can be viewed as the quotient space of  $L^2([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^n)$  under the equivalence relation  $\sim$ , where  $S \sim T$  if and only if  $T_{\#}\mathcal{H}^1|_{[0,1]} = S_{\#}\mathcal{H}^1|_{[0,1]}$ . In particular, if  $p = 2$ , the map from  $L^2([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^n)$  to  $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n), \mathbf{MK}_2^{\mathbb{R}^n})$  sending  $T$  to  $T_{\#}\mathcal{H}^1|_{[0,1]}$  formally becomes a ‘‘Riemannian submersion’’ (for instance, see [29, Section 4]). This Riemannian interpolation is recovered for a complete, separable, geodesic space by the use of absolutely continuous curves ([3, Chapter 8], for instance). This enables one to discuss the notion of differentiability on  $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n), \mathbf{MK}_2^{\mathbb{R}^n})$ , see also [16] for various notions of differentiability. It may be possible to apply such an approach to the spaces  $(\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(E), \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma})$  in certain settings, which is left for a future work.

### 3. DISINTEGRATED BARYCENTERS

In this section, we prove our various claims regarding  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}$ -barycenters.

**3.1. Existence of disintegrated barycenters.** Next we prove Theorem 1.8 (1), that is, the existence of  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}$ -barycenters. Compared to the case of  $\mathbf{MK}_{p,q}$ -barycenters, we lack the continuity need to apply the direct method, hence we must appeal to the dual problem for  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}$  to show existence. We will require the fiber  $(Y, d_Y)$  to be locally compact to apply the duality result Theorem 1.6 (3), but will actually need the stronger Heine–Borel property on  $(Y, d_Y)$ . Note that the Heine–Borel property is strictly stronger than local compactness on a complete, separable metric space: the metric space  $(\mathbb{R}, \min\{1, |x - y|\})$  has the same topology as the usual Euclidean one on  $\mathbb{R}$  and is complete and locally compact, but the ball of radius 2 is all of  $\mathbb{R}$  and hence not compact.

*Proof of Theorem 1.8 (1).* If  $\kappa = 0$ , we see  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}$  is constant on  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(E)$  and the claim holds trivially, thus assume  $\kappa \neq 0$ . Since each  $\mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(E)$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}$  is nonnegative, it has a finite infimum and we may take a minimizing sequence  $(\mathbf{n}_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ , that is

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} B(\mathbf{n}_{\ell}) = \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}_{\ell})$$

and  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}_{\ell})$  is uniformly bounded in  $\ell$ . Since we have

$$\lambda_1 \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{n}_{\ell}, \mathbf{m}_1)^{\kappa} \leq \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}_{\ell})$$

and  $\lambda_1 > 0$ , we have

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\delta_{E, y_0}^{\bullet} \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n}_{\ell})^{\kappa} &\leq 2^{\kappa} \left( \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\delta_{E, y_0}^{\bullet} \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_1)^{\kappa} + \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{n}_{\ell}, \mathbf{m}_1)^{\kappa} \right) \\ &\leq 2^{\kappa} \left( \lambda_1^{-1} \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}_{\ell}) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\delta_{E, y_0}^{\bullet} \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_1)^{\kappa} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now show that  $(\mathbf{n}_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is tight. Fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , since  $\sigma$  is a Borel measure, there exists a compact set  $K_{\Omega} \subset \Omega$  such that  $\sigma(\Omega \setminus K_{\Omega}) < \varepsilon/2$ . If  $q < \infty$ , using Jensen’s inequality in the second

line below, by (2.4) and (3.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.2) \quad \left( \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) d\mathbf{n}_\ell(v) \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{p}} &= \left[ \int_\Omega \left( \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) d\mathbf{n}_\ell^\bullet(v) \right) d\sigma \right]^{\frac{q}{p} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{q}} \\
&\leq \left\| \left( \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) d\mathbf{n}_\ell^\bullet(v) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)}^\kappa \\
&= \left\| 2^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left( \tilde{C}^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}_\ell^\bullet) \right) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)}^\kappa \\
&\leq 2^{\frac{(p-1)\kappa}{p}} \left( \tilde{C}^{\frac{\kappa}{p}} + \mathcal{MK}_p^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n}_\ell^\bullet)^\kappa \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which has a finite upper bound, uniform in  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  by (3.1). If  $q = \infty$ , then we can use the trivial inequality

$$\left( \int_\Omega \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) d\mathbf{n}_\ell^\bullet(v) d\sigma \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{p}} \leq \left\| \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) d\mathbf{n}_\ell^\bullet(v) \right\|_{L^\infty(\sigma)}^{\frac{\kappa}{p}}$$

in place of Jensen to obtain a uniform upper bound. Thus in all cases, by Chebyshev's inequality, for  $R > 0$  large enough we have

$$\mathbf{n}_\ell(\{v \in E \mid d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) > R\}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

hence we find that defining

$$K_E := \{v \in \pi^{-1}(K_\Omega) \mid d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v), v) \leq R\},$$

we have

$$\sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{n}_\ell(E \setminus K_E) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{n}_\ell(\pi^{-1}(\Omega \setminus K_\Omega)) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \sigma(\Omega \setminus K_\Omega) < \varepsilon.$$

We now show that  $K_E$  is a compact subset of  $E$ . Let  $(v_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  be any sequence in  $K_E$  and write  $\omega_\ell := \pi(v_\ell)$ . By compactness of  $K_\Omega$ , we may pass to a convergent subsequence  $(\omega_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  (not relabeled) with limit  $\omega_\infty \in K_\Omega$ . By local finiteness of  $\{U_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and passing to another subsequence, we may assume all  $\omega_\ell$  belong to an open neighborhood of  $\omega_\infty$  that only meets a finite number of the sets  $\{U_{j_i}\}_{i=1}^I$ . Passing to another subsequence (and possibly increasing  $I$ ), we may also assume that all  $\omega_\ell$  belong to a common set  $U_{j_{i_0}}$  for some  $1 \leq i_0 \leq I$  and  $\chi_{j_{i_0}}(\omega_\ell) \geq I^{-1}$ . Then we have for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{I} d_Y(y_0, \Xi_{j_{i_0}, \omega_\ell}^{-1}(v_\ell))^p &= \frac{1}{I} d_E(\Xi_{j_{i_0}}(\omega_\ell, y_0), v_\ell)^p \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega_\ell) d_E(\Xi_j(\omega_\ell, y_0), v_\ell)^p \\
&= d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(v_\ell), v_\ell) \leq R,
\end{aligned}$$

thus  $(\Xi_{j_{i_0}, \omega_\ell}^{-1}(v_\ell))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a bounded sequence in  $Y$ . Since  $Y$  satisfies the Heine–Borel property, we may pass to one final subsequence to assume  $\Xi_{j_{i_0}, \omega_\ell}^{-1}(v_\ell)$  converges to some point in  $Y$ . Thus by continuity of  $\Xi_{j_{i_0}}$  we see  $v_\ell$  converges to some point in  $E$ , which again by continuity lies in  $K_E$ . Hence we see  $K_E$  is compact.

Now by Prokhorov's theorem we may pass to a subsequence and assume  $(\mathbf{n}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to some  $\mathbf{n}$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ . Since  $Y$  is locally compact, we may apply Theorem 1.6 (3) to obtain

for any  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  and  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Phi d(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma) - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Psi d\mathbf{n} &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \left( - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Phi d(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma) - \int_E (\zeta \circ \pi) \Psi d\mathbf{n}_\ell \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n}_\ell)^p, \end{aligned}$$

where the last term is uniformly bounded in  $\zeta$  by (3.1). Thus taking a supremum over  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  and  $(\Phi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{p,E,\sigma}$  and using Theorem 1.6 (3) again, we see  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n}) < \infty$ , hence  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ .

Finally, we can apply Corollary 2.24 to obtain

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}) \leq \liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}_\ell),$$

that is,  $\mathbf{n}$  minimizes  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,\kappa}$ .  $\square$

**3.2. Duality for  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ - barycenters.** We now work toward duality for disintegrated barycenters, in the spirit of [1, Proposition 2.2] in the classical Monge–Kantorovich case with  $p = 2$ .

For  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$  and  $\xi \in \mathcal{X}_p$ , recall that we denote by  $S_{\lambda,p}\xi : E \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ ,

$$S_{\lambda,p}\xi(u) := \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p - \xi(v)) \quad \text{for } u \in E.$$

*Remark 3.1.* It is well-known (see [12, Theorem 7.17]) that if  $X$  is a locally compact Hausdorff space, elements of the dual of  $C_0(X)$  equipped with the supremum norm can be identified with integration against elements of  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ , the space of (signed) Radon measures on  $X$ , moreover the total variation norm is equal to the operator norm. Then we can see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_p^* &= \{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}(E) \mid (1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi, \cdot))\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}(E)\}, \\ \mathcal{Y}_p^* &= \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Y) \mid (1 + d_{y_0}^p)\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which are normed spaces.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$  with  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , and  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ . Recalling that  $r = p/q$  and  $r'$  is its Hölder conjugate, for  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p$  we define

$$H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}(\eta) := \inf \left\{ \int_\Omega \zeta \left( \int_E S_{\lambda,p}\xi d\mathbf{m}^\bullet \right) d\sigma \mid (\zeta, \xi) \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p, \eta = (\zeta \circ \pi)\xi \right\}.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , and  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ , for any  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,1}^\sigma(E)$  the function  $H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}$  is proper and convex on  $\mathcal{X}_p$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove that  $H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}$  is proper. Since

$$(3.3) \quad H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}(0) \leq 0$$

we see  $H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}$  is not identically  $\infty$ . Also, for any  $\xi \in \mathcal{X}_p$  and  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  we have  $\eta = (\zeta \circ \pi)\xi \in \mathcal{X}_p$  and using (2.4) in the third line below,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \zeta \int_E S_{\lambda,p}\xi(u) d\mathbf{m}^\bullet(u) d\sigma &\geq \int_\Omega \zeta \int_E (-\xi(u)) d\mathbf{m}^\bullet(u) d\sigma = - \int_E \eta d\mathbf{m} \\ &\geq - \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} \int_E (1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(u), u)) d\mathbf{m}(u) \\ &= -2^{p-1} \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} (\tilde{C} + \mathcal{MK}_{p,1}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m})) > -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

hence  $H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}$  is proper.

Next we show  $H_{\lambda,p,q,m}$  is convex. Fix  $\eta_0, \eta_1 \in \mathcal{X}_p$ , and for  $i = 0, 1$ , let  $(\zeta_i, \xi_i) \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p$  satisfy  $\eta_i = (\zeta_i \circ \pi)\xi_i$ . For  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ , let

$$\zeta := (1 - \tau)\zeta_0 + \tau\zeta_1, \quad \xi := \frac{1}{(\zeta \circ \pi)} \cdot [(1 - \tau)(\zeta_0 \circ \pi)\xi_0 + \tau(\zeta_1 \circ \pi)\xi_1],$$

then  $(1 - \tau)\eta_0 + \tau\eta_1 = (\zeta \circ \pi)\xi$ . Moreover, it is clear that  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma}$  and  $\xi \in C(E)$ . Since

$$|\xi| = \left| \frac{(1 - \tau)(\zeta_0 \circ \pi)\xi_0 + \tau(\zeta_1 \circ \pi)\xi_1}{(1 - \tau)(\zeta_0 \circ \pi) + \tau(\zeta_1 \circ \pi)} \right| \leq \max\{|\xi_0|, |\xi_1|\}$$

we have  $\xi \in \mathcal{X}_p$  as well. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & H_{\lambda,p,q,m}((1 - \tau)\eta_0 + \tau\eta_1) \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} \zeta \left( \int_E S_{\lambda,p}\xi d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma \\ & = \int_{\Omega} \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p (\zeta \circ \pi) - \xi(v)(\zeta \circ \pi)) d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(u) d\sigma \\ & = \int_{\Omega} \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \{-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p [(1 - \tau)(\zeta_0 \circ \pi) + \tau(\zeta_1 \circ \pi)] \\ & \quad - [(1 - \tau)(\zeta_0 \circ \pi)\xi_0(v) + \tau(\zeta_1 \circ \pi)\xi_1(v)]\} d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(u) d\sigma \\ & \leq (1 - \tau) \int_{\Omega} \zeta_0 \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p - \xi_0(v)) d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(u) d\sigma \\ & \quad + \tau \int_{\Omega} \zeta_1 \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p - \xi_1(v)) d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet}(u) d\sigma \\ & = (1 - \tau) \int_{\Omega} \zeta_0 \left( \int_E S_{\lambda,p}\xi_0 d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma + \tau \int_{\Omega} \zeta_1 \left( \int_E S_{\lambda,p}\xi_1 d\mathbf{m}^{\bullet} \right) d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Taking an infimum over admissible  $\zeta_i, \xi_i$  proves the convexity of  $H_{\lambda,p,q,m}$ .  $\square$

For  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*$ , recall the *Legendre–Fenchel transform* of  $H_{\lambda,p,q,m}$  is defined by

$$H_{\lambda,p,q,m}^*(\mathbf{n}) := \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p} \left( \int_E \eta d\mathbf{n} - H_{\lambda,p,q,m}(\eta) \right).$$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(E)$  with  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ , and  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ . If  $(E, d_E)$  is locally compact, for  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*$ , we have*

$$H_{\lambda,p,q,m}^*(-\mathbf{n}) := \begin{cases} \lambda \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p, & \text{if } \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^{\sigma}(E), \\ \infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* First suppose  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ , then by Theorem 1.6 (3),

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}^*(-\mathbf{n}) &= \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p} \left( - \int_E \eta d\mathbf{n} - H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}(\eta) \right) \\
&= \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p} \sup_{\substack{(\zeta,\xi) \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p \\ \eta = (\zeta \circ \pi)\xi}} \int_{\Omega} \left( - \int_E \eta(v) d\mathbf{n}^\bullet(v) - \zeta \int_E S_{\lambda,p} \xi(u) d\mathbf{m}^\bullet(u) \right) d\sigma \\
&= \sup_{\substack{(\zeta,\xi) \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p \\ \eta = (\zeta \circ \pi)\xi}} \left[ - \int_{\Omega} \zeta \left( \int_E \xi(v) d\mathbf{n}^\bullet(v) + \int_E S_{\lambda,p} \xi(u) d\mathbf{m}^\bullet(u) \right) d\sigma \right] \\
&= \lambda \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})^p,
\end{aligned}$$

note that since  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , we have  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = \infty$  if  $\mathbf{n} \notin \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ .

We now handle the case of  $\mathbf{n} \notin \mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$ . First suppose  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*$  and  $\pi_{\#}\mathbf{n} \neq \sigma$ . In this case, there exists some  $\phi \in C_b(\Omega)$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \phi d\sigma \neq \int_E \phi(\pi(v)) d\mathbf{n}(v).$$

For  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ , define  $\eta_{C\phi} \in \mathcal{X}_p$  by  $\eta_{C\phi}(u) := -C\phi(\pi(u))$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\lambda,p} \eta_{C\phi}(u) &= \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p + C\phi(\pi(v))) \\
&= \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (-\lambda d_E(u, v)^p + C\phi(\pi(u))) = C\phi(\pi(u)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since we can decompose  $\eta_{C\phi} = (\zeta \circ \pi)\xi$  where  $\zeta \equiv 1$  and  $\xi = \eta_{C\phi}$ , we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\lambda,r,\mathbf{m}}^*(-\mathbf{n}) &\geq \sup_{C \in \mathbb{R}} \left( - \int_E \eta_{C\phi} d\mathbf{n} - \int_{\Omega} \int_E S_{\lambda,p} \eta_{C\phi} d\mathbf{m}^\omega d\sigma(\omega) \right) \\
&= \sup_{C \in \mathbb{R}} C \left( \int_E \phi(\pi(v)) d\mathbf{n}(v) - \int_E \phi(\pi(u)) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\
&= \sup_{C \in \mathbb{R}} C \left( \int_E \phi(\pi(v)) d\mathbf{n}(v) - \int_{\Omega} \phi d\sigma \right) = \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Now suppose  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*$  is not nonnegative. Here,  $\mathbf{n}$  is said to be nonnegative if  $\mathbf{n}(E') \geq 0$  for any measurable set  $E' \subset E$ , hence there exists some  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p$  such that  $\eta \geq 0$  everywhere and

$$- \int_E \eta d\mathbf{n} > 0.$$

Then it is clear from the definition that  $-S_{\lambda,p}(C\eta) \geq 0$  on  $E$  for any constant  $C > 0$ , hence we can again calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\lambda,p,q,\mathbf{m}}^*(-\mathbf{n}) &\geq \sup_{C > 0} \left( - \int_E C\eta d\mathbf{n} - \int_{\Omega} \int_E S_{\lambda,p}(C\eta) d\mathbf{m}^\omega d\sigma(\omega) \right) \\
&\geq \sup_{C > 0} \left( -C \int_E \eta d\mathbf{n} \right) = \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove our duality result for  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenters.

*Proof of Theorem 1.8 (2).* Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  and  $(\eta_k)_{k=1}^K$  a collection in  $\mathcal{X}_p$  such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k \equiv 0.$$

For each  $k$  fix  $(\zeta_k, \xi_k) \in \mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p$  such that  $\eta_k = (\zeta_k \circ \pi)\xi_k$  (which is always possible, for example by taking  $\zeta_k \equiv 1$ ,  $\xi_k \equiv \eta_k$ ). Since  $\mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega) < \infty$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ , for all  $k$ , using (2.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_E \xi_k(u) d\mathbf{n}^\omega(u) \right| &\leq \|\xi_k\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} \int_E (1 + d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(u), u)^p) d\mathbf{n}^\omega(u) \\ &\leq \|\xi_k\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} (1 + 2^{p-1}(\tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p)) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then for such  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , we can first integrate the inequality

$$\lambda_k d_E(u, v)^p \geq -S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k(u) - \xi_k(v)$$

which holds for any  $u, v \in E$  such that  $\pi(u) = \pi(v)$ , against a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  and  $\mathbf{n}^\omega$ , then multiply by  $\zeta_k(\omega)$  and integrate in  $\omega$  against  $\sigma$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n})^p &\geq \lambda_k \int_\Omega \zeta_k(\omega) \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p d\sigma(\omega) \\ &\geq - \int_\Omega \zeta_k(\omega) \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega d\sigma(\omega) - \int_\Omega \zeta_k(\omega) \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\omega d\sigma(\omega) \\ &= - \int_\Omega \zeta_k(\omega) \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega d\sigma(\omega) - \int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k \equiv 0$ , taking a supremum over all such pairs  $(\zeta_k, \xi_k)$ , then summing over  $1 \leq k \leq K$  in the above inequality gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n})^p \geq - \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}(\eta_k) - \int_E \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k d\mathbf{n} = - \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}(\eta_k).$$

Thus it follows that

$$(3.5) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p, q, p}(\mathbf{n}) \geq \sup \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}(\eta_k) \mid \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k \equiv 0, \eta_k \in \mathcal{X}_p \right\}.$$

Let us now show the reverse inequality. It follows from Proposition 3.4 that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p, q, p}(\mathbf{n}) = \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n})^p = \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}^*(-\mathbf{n}).$$

Define the function  $H$  on  $\mathcal{X}_p$  as the infimal convolution of  $\{H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}\}_{k=1}^K$ , that is, defined for  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p$  by

$$H(\eta) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}(\eta_k) \mid \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k \equiv \eta, \eta_k \in \mathcal{X}_p \right\}.$$

Then (3.5) implies

$$(3.6) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p, q, p}(\mathbf{n}) \geq -H(0).$$



Note that  $H$  is convex since each of  $\{H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}\}_{k=1}^K$  is proper and convex by Lemma 3.3, and then by [5, Lemma 4.4.15] the Legendre–Fenchel transform of  $H$  satisfies

$$(3.7) \quad H^*(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}^*(\mathbf{n}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*.$$

Let  $\mathcal{X}_p^{**}$  be the dual of  $\mathcal{X}_p^*$  and regard  $\mathcal{X}_p$  as a subset of  $\mathcal{X}_p^{**}$  under the natural isometric embedding. For  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{X}_p^{**}$ , the Legendre–Fenchel transform of  $H^*$  on  $\mathcal{X}_p^{**}$  is given by

$$H^{**}(\mathbf{f}) := \sup_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{n}) - H^*(\mathbf{n})).$$

Then we observe from Proposition 3.4 and (3.7) that

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} -H^{**}(0) &= \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*} H^*(-\mathbf{n}) = \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{X}_p^*} \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}^*(-\mathbf{n}) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p, q}^\sigma(E)} \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \mathcal{M}_{p, q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n})^p = \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p, q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p, q, p}(\mathbf{n}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (3.6) and (3.8) it is enough to show  $H^{**}(0) = H(0)$ .

To this end, first note by Proposition 3.4 combined with (3.7) we see

$$H^*(-\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma) = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \mathcal{M}_{p, q}^\sigma(\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_k) < \infty.$$

Thus since its Legendre–Fenchel transform is not identically  $\infty$ , we see  $H$  never takes the value  $-\infty$ . At the same time using (3.3),

$$H(0) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}(0) \leq 0,$$

hence  $H$  is not identically  $\infty$ , in particular it is proper.

Recall each  $\lambda_k$  is strictly positive by assumption. Suppose  $\eta \in \mathcal{X}_p$  with

$$\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} \leq 2^{1-p} \cdot K \cdot \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \lambda_k.$$

Then, using that

$$2^{1-p} d_{E, y_0}^p(\omega, v) - d_E(u, v)^p \leq d_{E, y_0}^p(\omega, u),$$

followed by (2.4) in the calculation below,

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\eta) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K H_{\lambda_k, p, q, \mathbf{m}_k}(K^{-1}\eta) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p}(K^{-1}\eta) d\mathbf{m}_k^{\omega} d\sigma(\omega) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \left( -\lambda_k d_E(u, v)^p + K^{-1} \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{X}_p} (1 + d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(v), v)) \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^{\omega}(u) d\sigma(\omega) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \left( -d_E(u, v)^p + 2^{1-p} (1 + d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(v), v)) \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^{\omega}(u) d\sigma(\omega) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \int_E \sup_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \left( 2^{1-p} + d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(v), u) \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^{\omega}(u) d\sigma(\omega) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \left[ 2^{1-p} + 2^{p-1} \left( \tilde{C} + \mathcal{M}_{p, q}^{\sigma}(\delta_{E, y_0}^{\bullet} \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_k)^p \right) \right] < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

proving that  $H$  is bounded from above in a neighborhood of 0. Thus by [5, Proposition 4.1.4 and Proposition 4.4.2 (a)], we obtain  $H^{**}(0) = H(0)$ , finishing the proof.  $\square$

**3.3. Uniqueness of disintegrated barycenters.** In this final subsection, we prove  $\mathcal{M}_{p, q}^{\sigma}$ -barycenters are unique under some absolute continuity conditions, when  $p > 1$  and  $q < \infty$ .

We start by noting that in the case  $q = \infty$ , it is possible to construct many examples where  $\mathcal{M}_{p, \infty}^{\sigma}$ -barycenters are not unique; the next examples includes all cases when  $\sigma$  is not a delta measure and the fiber  $Y$  is a connected, complete Riemannian manifolds of any kind (with or without boundary).

**Example 3.5.** Let  $1 < p < \infty$  (the case  $p = 1$  may have nonuniqueness for other reasons, see Example 3.6 below), make the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.8 (1), and also assume  $(Y, d_Y)$  is any geodesic space. Also take two distinct elements  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ , and assume there exists a measurable  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$  with  $0 < \sigma(\Omega') < 1$ , and define for any Borel  $A \subset E$ ,

$$(\mathbf{m}_k^{\bullet} \otimes \sigma)(A) := \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{V_j} (\Xi_{j, \bullet})_{\#} \mu_0(A) d\sigma, & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq K-1, \\ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \int_{V_j \cap \Omega'} (\Xi_{j, \bullet})_{\#} \mu_0(A) d\sigma + \int_{V_j \setminus \Omega'} (\Xi_{j, \bullet})_{\#} \mu_1(A) d\sigma \right), & \text{if } k = K, \end{cases}$$

where we recall that  $\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined by (2.1). By Lemma 2.5, each of these are elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{p, \infty}^{\sigma}(E)$ , with disintegrations with respect to  $\pi$  given by  $\mathbf{m}_k = \mathbf{m}_k^{\bullet} \otimes \sigma$  where

$$\mathbf{m}_k^{\omega} := \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j, \omega})_{\#} \mu_0, & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq K-1, \\ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j, \omega})_{\#} (\mathbf{1}_{\Omega'}(\omega) \mu_0 + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \Omega'}(\omega) \mu_1), & \text{if } k = K. \end{cases}$$

For  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(E)$ , and any  $\kappa = 0$  we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,\infty,\kappa}(\mathbf{n}) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \mathcal{MK}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n})^\kappa \\ &= (1 - \lambda_K) \mathcal{MK}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{n})^\kappa + \lambda_K \mathcal{MK}_{p,\infty}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_K, \mathbf{n})^\kappa \\ &\geq (1 - \lambda_K) \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\omega \notin \Omega'} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_1^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^\kappa + \lambda_K \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\omega \notin \Omega'} \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_K^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^\kappa \end{aligned}$$

for  $\Lambda \in \Lambda_K$  and  $\mathfrak{M} := (\mathbf{m}_k)_{k=1}^K$ .

Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  be a minimizer of  $\mathcal{B}_{(1-\lambda_K, \lambda_K), (\mu_0, \mu_1)}^{p,\kappa}$ , then for each  $\omega \notin \Omega'$ , if  $j_0$  is the unique index such that  $\omega \in V_{j_0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - \lambda_K) \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_1^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^\kappa + \lambda_K \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_K^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^\kappa \\ &= (1 - \lambda_K) \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0, (\Xi_{j_0, \omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega)^\kappa + \lambda_K \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_1, (\Xi_{j_0, \omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega)^\kappa \\ &\geq (1 - \lambda_K) \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0, \nu)^\kappa + \lambda_K \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_1, \nu)^\kappa \end{aligned}$$

hence if  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  satisfies

$$\mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0, \mu)^\kappa \leq (1 - \lambda_K) \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_0, \nu)^\kappa + \lambda_K \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_1, \nu)^\kappa,$$

the measure

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j, \bullet})_\# (\mathbf{1}_{\Omega'} \mu + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \Omega'} \nu) \otimes \sigma,$$

(which belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  by Lemma 2.5) is a minimizer of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,\infty,\kappa}$ . Thus since  $\lambda_K \neq 0, 1$ , this yields infinitely many possible minimizers.

Also, we can see that  $\mathcal{MK}_{1,q}^\sigma$ -barycenters may not be unique due to nonuniqueness of  $\mathbf{MK}_1^Y$ -barycenters.

**Example 3.6.** Let  $M = (\mu_k)_{k=1}^K$  in  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  to be determined and define  $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathbf{m}_k)_{k=1}^K$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  by

$$\mathbf{m}_k := \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j, \bullet})_\# \mu_k \right) \otimes \sigma.$$

For  $\Lambda \in \Lambda_K$ , by convexity of the  $L^q(\sigma)$  norm, for any  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$  we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n}) \geq \left\| \lambda_k \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j, \bullet})_\# \mu_k, \mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) \right\|_{L^q(\sigma)}.$$

For any measure of the form  $\mathbf{n} := (\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j, \bullet})_\# \nu_0) \otimes \sigma$  where  $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$ , if  $j_0$  is the unique index such that  $\omega \in V_{j_0}$  we have

$$\mathbf{MK}_p^E \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\Xi_{j, \omega})_\# \mu_k, \mathbf{n}^\omega \right) = \mathbf{MK}_p^E((\Xi_{j_0, \bullet})_\# \mu_k, (\Xi_{j_0, \bullet})_\# \nu_0) = \mathbf{MK}_p^Y(\mu_k, \nu_0).$$

Hence if  $\nu_0$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda, M}^{p,p}$  (i.e., an  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Y$ -barycenter), we see  $\mathbf{n}$  will be a  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenter, thus if  $(\mu_k)_{k=1}^K$  can be chosen in a way that there exist nonunique  $\mathbf{MK}_p^Y$ -barycenters, this will lead to nonuniqueness of  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenters as well.

For  $p = 1$ , it is strongly suspected that such configurations yielding nonunique barycenters exist for various  $\Lambda$ , we give such an example in the case of  $Y = \mathbb{R}$  with the measures  $\mu_k$  absolutely

continuous, and  $\lambda_k \equiv K^{-1}$  where  $K$  is even, which incidentally, relies on our duality result Corollary 1.10. Define

$$\nu_0 := \mathcal{H}^1|_{[-2,-1]}, \quad \nu_1 := \mathcal{H}^1|_{[1,2]}, \quad \mu_k := \begin{cases} \nu_0, & \text{if } k \text{ even,} \\ \nu_1, & \text{if } k \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

Then we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{1,q,1}(\nu_0 \otimes \sigma) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{MK}_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\mu_k, \nu_0) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \text{ odd}} \int_1^2 |t - (t-3)| dt = \frac{3}{2}, \\ \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{1,q,1}(\nu_1 \otimes \sigma) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{MK}_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\mu_k, \nu_1) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k \text{ even}} \int_{-2}^{-1} |t - (t+3)| dt = \frac{3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now define  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi(t) := \begin{cases} -4 - t, & \text{if } -4 \leq t < -2, \\ t, & \text{if } -2 \leq t < 2, \\ 4 - t, & \text{if } 2 \leq t \leq 4, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $\phi$  is 1-Lipschitz, it is classical that  $\phi^{\text{d}\mathbb{R}} = -\phi$ , then if we define

$$\phi_k(t) := \begin{cases} -\frac{\phi(t)}{K}, & \text{if } k \text{ even,} \\ \frac{\phi(t)}{K}, & \text{if } k \text{ odd,} \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_k &\equiv 0, \\ -\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_k^{\lambda_k \text{ d}\mathbb{R}} d\mu_k &= -\sum_{k \text{ even}} \int_{-2}^{-1} \frac{\phi(t)}{K} dt + \sum_{k \text{ odd}} \int_1^2 \frac{\phi(t)}{K} dt = \frac{1}{2} \left( \int_1^2 t dt - \int_{-2}^{-1} t dt \right) = \frac{3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 1.10 (2) we see that both  $\nu_0$  and  $\nu_1$  are  $\text{MK}_1^{\mathbb{R}}$ -barycenters.

For the remainder of the section  $Y$  will be a complete, connected Riemannian manifold, possibly with boundary, and  $d_Y$  (resp.  $\text{Vol}_Y$ ) will be the Riemannian distance function (resp. volume measure). We will also write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{inj}_1(y) &:= \min\{1, \sup\{r > 0 \mid \exp_y \text{ is a diffeomorphism on } B_r^{T_y(Y \setminus \partial Y)}(0)\}\} \quad \text{for } y \in Y \setminus \partial Y, \\ \text{inj}(A) &:= \inf_{y \in A} \text{inj}_1(y) \quad \text{for any } A \subset Y \setminus \partial Y, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\overline{B}_r^Y(y)$  for the *closed* ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $y$ . Although  $Y \setminus \partial Y$  may not be complete, by [6, Lemmas 10.90 and 10.91], we have  $\text{inj}(K) > 0$  for any compact  $K \subset Y \setminus \partial Y$ .

First we show a very simple lemma on covering boundaries of geodesic balls.

**Lemma 3.7.** *For any compact set  $K \subset Y \setminus \partial Y$  and  $0 < r < \text{inj}(K)/2$ , there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $K$  and  $r$  such that for any  $y \in K$ , there exists a set of points  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \overline{B}_{5r/4}^Y(y) \setminus B_{3r/4}^Y(y)$  such that  $\{B_{r/2}^Y(y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  is a cover of  $\partial B_r^Y(y)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose the lemma does not hold, then there is a sequence  $(\tilde{y}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset K$  such that no collection of  $\ell$  or fewer open balls of radius  $r/2$  with centers in  $\overline{B}_{5r/4}^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell) \setminus B_{3r/4}^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell)$  is a cover of  $\partial B_r^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell)$ . By compactness of  $K$ , we may pass to a convergent subsequence  $(\tilde{y}_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  (not relabeled) with limit  $\tilde{y}_\infty \in K$ . Now, also by compactness, for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a cover  $\{B_{r/2}^Y(y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  of  $\overline{B}_{9r/8}^Y(\tilde{y}_\infty) \setminus B_{7r/8}^Y(\tilde{y}_\infty)$  with  $y_i \in \overline{B}_{9r/8}^Y(\tilde{y}_\infty) \setminus B_{7r/8}^Y(\tilde{y}_\infty)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . Since  $r < \text{inj}(K)/2$  and  $\tilde{y}_\ell \in K$ , we see that  $y \in \partial B_r^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell)$  implies  $d_Y(\tilde{y}_\ell, y) = r$ . Then by the triangle inequality, for  $\ell > N$  satisfying  $d_Y(\tilde{y}_\ell, \tilde{y}_\infty) < r/8$ , we have  $\partial B_r^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell) \subset \overline{B}_{9r/8}^Y(\tilde{y}_\infty) \setminus B_{7r/8}^Y(\tilde{y}_\infty)$  while each  $y_i \in \overline{B}_{5r/4}^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell) \setminus B_{3r/4}^Y(\tilde{y}_\ell)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

It is well known that local boundedness for a  $\lambda d_Y^p$ -convex function translates to a Lipschitz bound. To show convergence of a maximizing sequence in the disintegrated barycenter dual problem from Theorem 1.8 (2), we will need to consider sequences of *averages* constructed from the maximizing sequence. When  $p = 2$ , the average of  $d_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2$ -transforms is also a  $d_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2$ -transform, but this does not hold for  $p \neq 2$  or on more general manifolds  $Y$ . Thus in the next lemma, we will prove that under certain conditions, local Lipschitzness of the average of  $d_Y^p$ -transforms also follows from boundedness. The following lemma is stated in more generality than will be needed later.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Fix  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ ,  $R > 0$ , and suppose  $(g_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence such that the functions  $f_m := g_m^{\lambda d_Y^p}$  are bounded uniformly in  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  on  $\overline{B}_R^Y(y_0)$ . If there exists an increasing sequence  $(M_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\lambda_{\ell, m} \geq 0$  for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq m \leq M_\ell$ , and  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell, m} \leq C_1, \quad \sup_{t \in \overline{B}_R^Y(y_0)} \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell, m} |f_m(t)| \leq C_2,$$

then the sequence

$$\left( \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell, m} f_m \right)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is uniformly Lipschitz on  $\{y \in \overline{B}_{R/2}^Y(y_0) \mid d_Y(y, \partial Y) \geq 2R^{-1}\}$ .

*Proof.* We can assume that  $\lambda = 1$  as

$$g_m^{\lambda d_Y^p} = \lambda(\lambda^{-1} g_m)^{d_Y^p}.$$

Since the result follows from [32, Proposition 3.1] when  $p = 1$ , assume  $1 < p < \infty$ . Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be from applying Lemma 3.7 with the choice of the set

$$K := \{y \in \overline{B}_R^Y(y_0) \mid d_Y(y, \partial Y) \geq 2R^{-1}\},$$

compact in  $Y \setminus \partial Y$ , and  $r := \min\{\text{inj}(K), R\}/2$ . Now let us write

$$\overline{B}_{R/2} := \{y \in \overline{B}_{R/2}^Y(y_0) \mid d_Y(y, \partial Y) \geq 2R^{-1}\}.$$

Fix  $t \in \overline{B}_{R/2}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then since each  $f_m$  is finite on  $\overline{B}_R^Y(y_0)$ , for each  $m$  there exists  $s_{m,t} \in Y$  such that

$$f_m(t) \leq -d_Y(t, s_{m,t})^p - g_m(s_{m,t}) + \varepsilon.$$

Then for any  $t' \in Y$ , we have

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} f_m(t') + \varepsilon &\geq -d_Y(t', s_{m,t})^p - g_m(s_{m,t}) + \varepsilon \\ &\geq -d_Y(t', s_{m,t})^p + d_Y(t, s_{m,t})^p + f_m(t) \\ &\geq p d_Y(t', s_{m,t})^{p-1} (d_Y(t, s_{m,t}) - d_Y(t', s_{m,t})) + f_m(t). \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $\{B_{r/2}^Y(y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  be a cover of  $\partial B_r^Y(t)$  where each  $y_i \in \overline{B}_{5r/4}^Y(t) \setminus B_{3r/4}^Y(t)$ , which exists from the application of Lemma 3.7 above. By completeness and connectedness, there is at least one minimal, unit speed geodesic  $\gamma_{m,t}$  from  $t$  to  $s_{m,t}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , define

$$B_i := \begin{cases} B_{r/2}^Y(y_1), & \text{if } i = 1, \\ B_{r/2}^Y(y_i) \setminus \bigcup_{i'=1}^{i-1} B_{r/2}^Y(y_{i'}), & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq N, \end{cases}$$

$$I_i := \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid \gamma_{m,t}(r) \in B_i \text{ and } s_{m,t} \notin B_{2r}^Y(t)\}.$$

Then for  $m \in I_i$ , using that  $r < \text{inj}(K)/2$  and  $t \in K$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(t, s_{m,t}) - d_Y(y_i, s_{m,t}) &\geq d_Y(t, s_{m,t}) - d_Y(\gamma_{m,t}(r), s_{m,t}) - d_Y(\gamma_{m,t}(r), y_i) \\ &\geq d_Y(t, \gamma_{m,t}(r)) - \frac{r}{2} = \frac{r}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this we can calculate for each  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , by taking  $t' = y_i$  in (3.9) and noting that each  $y_i \in \overline{B}_R^Y(y_0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 + \varepsilon &\geq \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell,m} |f_m(y_i)| + \varepsilon \\ &\geq \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq M_\ell, \\ m \in I_i}} \lambda_{\ell,m} [p d_Y(y_i, s_{m,t})^{p-1} (d_Y(t, s_{m,t}) - d_Y(y_i, s_{m,t})) + f_m(t)] \\ &\geq \frac{pr}{2M_\ell} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq M_\ell, \\ m \in I_i}} \lambda_{\ell,m} d_Y(y_i, s_{m,t})^{p-1} - \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell,m} |f_m(t)| \\ &\geq \frac{pr}{2M_\ell} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq M_\ell, \\ m \in I_i}} \lambda_{\ell,m} [2^{-p+1} d_Y(t'', s_{m,t})^{p-1} - d_Y(t'', y_i)^{p-1}] - C_2 \\ &\geq \frac{pr}{2M_\ell} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq M_\ell, \\ m \in I_i}} \lambda_{\ell,m} [2^{-p+1} d_Y(t'', s_{m,t})^{p-1} - (2R)^{p-1}] - C_2 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $t'' \in \overline{B}_{R/2}$ . Hence, for  $t_1, t_2 \in \overline{B}_{R/2}$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell,m} f_m(t_1) - \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell,m} f_m(t_2) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell,m} (\mathrm{d}_Y(t_2, s_{m,t_1})^p - \mathrm{d}_Y(t_1, s_{m,t_1})^p + \varepsilon) \\
& \leq \frac{p}{M_\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{M_\ell} \lambda_{\ell,m} \max\{\mathrm{d}_Y(t_1, s_{m,t_1})^{p-1}, \mathrm{d}_Y(t_2, s_{m,t_1})^{p-1}\} |\mathrm{d}_Y(t_2, s_{m,t_1}) - \mathrm{d}_Y(t_1, s_{m,t_1})| + \varepsilon C_1 \\
& \leq \frac{2^p}{r} (2C_2 + \varepsilon + 2^{p-2} p r R^{p-1} C_1) \mathrm{d}_Y(t_1, t_2) + \varepsilon C_1,
\end{aligned}$$

thus taking  $\varepsilon$  to 0 and then reversing the roles of  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  yields the uniform Lipschitz bound on  $\overline{B}_{R/2}$ .  $\square$

The above lemma also immediately gives an analogue of [14, Corollary C.5] which we will have use for later.

**Corollary 3.9.** *Fix  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$  and suppose  $R > 0$ . For a function  $g$  on  $Y$ , if  $f := g^{\lambda \mathrm{d}_Y}$  is bounded on  $\overline{B}_R^Y(y_0)$ , then it is uniformly Lipschitz on  $\{y \in \overline{B}_{R/2}^Y(y_0) \mid \mathrm{d}_Y(y, \partial Y) \geq 2R^{-1}\}$ .*

*Proof.* Simply apply Lemma 3.8 with  $f_m \equiv f$  and  $\lambda_{\ell,m} \equiv 1$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove uniqueness of  $\mathcal{MC}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenters under appropriate conditions.

*Proof of Theorem 1.8 (3).* By Theorem 1.8 (2), for  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can take  $(\zeta_{k,m}, \hat{\xi}_{k,m})_{k=1}^K \in (\mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p)^K$  which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) \hat{\xi}_{k,m} = 0, \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m} \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \hat{\xi}_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet \right) d\sigma \leq - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m+1} \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \hat{\xi}_{k,m+1} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet \right) d\sigma \\
& \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}(\mathbf{n}),
\end{aligned}$$

where this limit is also the value of the supremum for the dual problem in Theorem 1.8 (2). Define

$$\tilde{\xi}_{k,m} := \begin{cases} S_{\lambda_k, p}(S_{\lambda_k, p} \hat{\xi}_{k,m}), & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq K-1, \\ -\frac{1}{(\zeta_{K,m} \circ \pi)} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} (\zeta_{i,m} \circ \pi) \tilde{\xi}_{i,m}, & \text{if } k = K, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\sum_{k=1}^K (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) \tilde{\xi}_{k,m} \equiv 0.$$

For  $1 \leq k \leq K-1$ , it is classical that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad & S_{\lambda_k, p} \tilde{\xi}_{k,m} = S_{\lambda_k, p}(S_{\lambda_k, p}(S_{\lambda_k, p} \hat{\xi}_{k,m})) = S_{\lambda_k, p} \hat{\xi}_{k,m}, \\
& \hat{\xi}_{k,m} \geq \tilde{\xi}_{k,m} \geq -S_{\lambda_k, p} \hat{\xi}_{k,m}.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\tilde{\xi}_{K,m} = -\frac{1}{(\zeta_{K,m} \circ \pi)} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) \tilde{\xi}_{k,m} \geq -\frac{1}{(\zeta_{K,m} \circ \pi)} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) \hat{\xi}_{k,m} = \hat{\xi}_{K,m},$$

hence  $-S_{\lambda_K,p} \tilde{\xi}_{K,m} \geq -S_{\lambda_K,p} \hat{\xi}_{K,m}$ . For  $1 \leq k \leq K-1$ , since (3.10) holds and  $\hat{\xi}_{k,m} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ , by Lemma 2.18 we see  $\tilde{\xi}_{k,m}$  is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  when  $\omega \in \Omega$  is fixed. Thus composing with  $\Xi_{j,\omega}$  for some appropriate  $j$ , by Corollary 3.9, we have that  $\tilde{\xi}_{k,m}|_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})}$  is continuous for all  $1 \leq k \leq K-1$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , this also implies  $\tilde{\xi}_{K,m}|_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})}$  is also continuous. Finally, for  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $v \in E$ , define

$$\xi_{k,m}(v) := \tilde{\xi}_{k,m}(v) - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\pi(v)) \tilde{\xi}_{k,m}(\Xi_j(\pi(v), y_0)), \quad \eta_{k,m}(v) := \zeta_{k,m}(\pi(v)) \xi_{k,m}(v),$$

then

$$(3.11) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \xi_{k,m}(\Xi_j(\omega, y_0)) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_j(\omega, y_0)) = 0$$

for all  $k, m$ , and  $\omega \in \Omega$  and we can calculate

$$S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m}(u) = S_{\lambda_k,p} \tilde{\xi}_{k,m}(u) + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\pi(u)) \tilde{\xi}_{k,m}(\Xi_j(\pi(u), y_0)),$$

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_{k,m} \equiv 0,$$

for all  $m$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} -\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m} \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}^\bullet \right) d\sigma &= -\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m} \int_E \left( S_{\lambda_k,p} \tilde{\xi}_{k,m} + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j \tilde{\xi}_{k,m}(\Xi_j(\cdot, y_0)) \right) d\mathbf{m}^\bullet d\sigma \\ &= -\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m} \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \tilde{\xi}_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}^\bullet d\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

we see that

$$(3.13) \quad \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m} \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet \right) d\sigma \right) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}.$$

If  $p < q$ , then we have  $1 < r' < \infty$  hence  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$  is reflexive. Since  $(\zeta_{k,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$  for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , we can pass to a subsequence which can be assumed to converge weakly in  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$  to some  $\zeta_k$ . If  $p = q$ , then by Remark 1.9 we may assume that each  $\zeta_{k,m} \equiv 1$ , hence we still have weak convergence, this time to  $\zeta_k \equiv 1$ .

**Claim 1.** There exists a Borel set  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$  with  $\sigma(\Omega') = 1$ , and for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , subsequences of  $(\eta_{k,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(\zeta_{k,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  (not relabeled), such that there is a Borel function  $\eta_k : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  whose restriction to  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  is continuous for all  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , and writing

$$\eta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(v) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \eta_{k,m}(v) \quad \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \zeta_{k,m}(\omega),$$



we have

$$(3.14) \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(v) = \eta_k(v), \quad \text{for all } v \in \pi^{-1}(\Omega'),$$

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) = \zeta_k(\omega), \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega'.$$

Moreover, the convergence of  $\eta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}$  to  $\eta_k$  is uniform on the sets

$$\overline{B}_{\omega,\ell} := \{\Xi_j(\omega, y) \mid y \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0), d_Y(y, \partial Y) \geq 2\ell^{-1}\},$$

for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , where  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  is the unique index such that  $\omega \in V_j$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k \equiv 0,$$

and  $\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}$  converges to  $\zeta_k$  in  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$  for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* For any  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and fixed  $u \in E$ , using (3.11) we have

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} -S_{\lambda_k,p}\xi_{k,m}(u) &= \inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (\lambda_k d_E(u, v)^p + \xi_{k,m}(v)) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\pi(u)) (\lambda_k d_E(u, \Xi_{j,\pi(u)}(y_0))^p + \xi_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\pi(u)}(y_0))) \\ &= \lambda_k d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(u), u). \end{aligned}$$

Also by (3.13) we may pass to a subsequence to assume

$$\inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left( -\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p}\xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega d\sigma(\omega) \right) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p} - 1,$$

thus for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ,

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\int_{\Omega} \zeta_{k,m} \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p}\xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}^\bullet d\sigma \\ & \geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p} - 1 - \sum_{i \neq k} \left( -\int_{\Omega} \zeta_{i,m} \int_E S_{\lambda_i,p}\xi_{i,m} d\mathbf{m}_i^\bullet d\sigma \right) \\ & \geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p} - 1 - \sum_{i \neq k} \lambda_i \left( \int_{\Omega} \zeta_{i,m} \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\cdot, u) d\mathbf{m}_i^\bullet(u) d\sigma \right) \\ & \geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p} - 1 - \sum_{i \neq k} \lambda_i \|\zeta_{i,m}\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \left\| 2^{p-1}(\tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_i^\bullet)^p) \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} \\ & \geq C, \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$C := \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p} - 1 - 2^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i (\tilde{C} + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_i^\bullet)^p) > -\infty$$

and used  $\|\zeta_{i,m}\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \leq 1$  for all  $i$  and (2.4) in the last line.

Now for a fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $u, v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  we can integrate the inequality

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta_{k,m}(v) &\geq -\zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p}\xi_{k,m}(u) - \lambda_k \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) d_E(u, v)^p \\ &\geq -\zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p}\xi_{k,m}(u) - 2^{p-1} \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) (d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) + d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, v)) \end{aligned}$$

with respect to  $\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \otimes \mathbf{n}^\omega(u, v)$  for any  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , then integrate against  $\sigma$  with respect to  $\omega$ , and using that each  $\mathbf{n}^\omega$  is nonnegative and has total mass one along with (2.4) and (3.18) we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E \eta_{k,m} d\mathbf{n} &\geq - \int_\Omega \zeta_{k,m} \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\ &\quad - 2^{p-1} \left( \int_\Omega \zeta_{k,m} \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\cdot, u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u) d\sigma + \int_\Omega \zeta_{k,m} \int_E d_{E,y_0}^p(\cdot, v) d\mathbf{n}^\bullet(v) d\sigma \right) \\ &\geq C - 2^{2p-2} \|\zeta_{k,m}\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \left\| 2\tilde{C} + \text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_k^\bullet)^p + \text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} \\ &\geq C - 2^{2p-2} \left( 2\tilde{C} + \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_i) + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n})^p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (3.12), there exists a constant  $C_{p,q,K}(\mathfrak{M})$  depending on  $p, q, K$ , and  $\mathfrak{M}$  such that

$$(3.20) \quad \left| \int_E \eta_{k,m} d\mathbf{n} \right| \leq C_{p,q,K}(\mathfrak{M}) + 2^{2p-2}(K-1) \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n})^p.$$

Now recall the partition  $\{V_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\Omega$  into Borel sets defined by (2.1), and define for  $\delta > 0$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $j, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega} \\ &:= \left\{ t \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0) \mid \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) \geq \sup_{t' \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t')) - \delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$t \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t))$$

is continuous on  $Y$  for any fixed  $\omega$ , we must have  $\text{Vol}_Y(I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega}) > 0$ , so we can define

$$\mu_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega := \frac{\mathbf{1}_{I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega}}}{\text{Vol}_Y(I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega})} \text{Vol}_Y \in \mathcal{P}(Y).$$

By the continuity of each  $\Xi_j$  and  $\eta_{k,m}$ , we can see the set  $\{(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times Y \mid t \in I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega}\}$  is a Borel subset of  $\Omega \times Y$ . Thus the function

$$(\omega, t) \mapsto \mathbf{1}_{I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega}}(t)$$

is Borel on  $\Omega \times Y$ , and by Tonelli's theorem the function  $\omega \mapsto \text{Vol}_Y(I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega})$  is Borel on  $\Omega$ . Now fix any Borel  $A \subset E$ , then as a composition of a Borel function  $\mathbf{1}_A$  with a continuous map  $\Xi_j$ ,  $(\omega, t) \mapsto \mathbf{1}_A(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t))$  is Borel on  $U_j \times Y$  (endowed with the subspace metric), then the function

$$(\omega, t) \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega}}(t) \mathbf{1}_A(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t))$$

is Borel on  $\Omega \times Y$ . Thus combining the above, if we define

$$\mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \mu_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega$$

again by Tonelli's theorem we see  $\omega \mapsto \mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega(A)$  is Borel on  $\Omega$  for any Borel  $A \subset E$ , hence  $\mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,j,\ell,m} := \mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,j,\ell,m}^\bullet \otimes \sigma$  is well-defined and belongs to  $\mathcal{P}^\sigma(E)$  by Remark 2.12. Also if  $\omega \in V_j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega)^p \\
& \leq \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\omega) \text{MK}_p^E((\Xi_{j',\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \mu_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega)^p \\
(3.21) \quad & \leq 2^{p-1} \left( \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\omega) \text{MK}_p^E((\Xi_{j',\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y)^p + \text{MK}_p^E((\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \delta_{y_0}^Y, (\Xi_{j,\omega})_\# \mu_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega)^p \right) \\
& = 2^{p-1} \left( \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\omega) d_Y(y_0, g_j^{j'}(\omega) y_0)^p + \text{Vol}_Y(I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega})^{-1} \int_{I_{m,k,\ell}^{\delta,\omega}} d_{y_0}(t)^p d \text{Vol}_Y(t) \right) \\
& \leq 2^{p-1} \left( \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{j'}(\omega) d_Y(y_0, g_j^{j'}(\omega) y_0)^p + \ell^p \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded independent of  $\omega$  and  $j$  by (1.2), hence  $\mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,\ell,m} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . Then we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_\Omega \sup_{t \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) \right) d\sigma(\omega) - \delta \\
& \leq \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\text{Vol}_Y(I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega})} \int_{I_{k,\ell,m}^{\delta,\omega}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) d \text{Vol}_Y(t) d\sigma(\omega) \\
& = \int_\Omega \int_E \eta_{k,m} d\mathbf{n}_{\delta,k,\ell,m}^\omega d\sigma(\omega) \\
& \leq C'
\end{aligned}$$

for some  $C' > 0$  independent of  $k$ ,  $m$ , and  $\delta$  by (3.20) and (3.21). We may replace max with min and sup with inf, then change the direction of the inequality in the definition of  $I_{k,m,\ell}^{\delta,\omega}$  to obtain the analogous inequality

$$\int_\Omega \inf_{t \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) \right) d\sigma(\omega) + \delta \geq -C'.$$

Taking  $\delta$  to 0 in the two resulting inequalities above and using Hölder's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.22) \quad & \int_\Omega \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\eta_{k,m} \circ \Xi_{j,\omega}) \right\|_{L^2(\overline{B}_j^Y(y_0))} d\sigma(\omega) \\
& \leq \text{Vol}_Y(\overline{B}_j^Y(y_0))^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_\Omega \sup_{t \in \overline{B}_j^Y(y_0)} \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) \right| d\sigma(\omega) \\
& \leq C' \text{Vol}_Y(\overline{B}_j^Y(y_0))^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the reference measure on  $L^2(\overline{B}_j^Y(y_0))$  is  $\text{Vol}_Y$ . This implies that for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , the sequence  $(\omega \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{V_j}(\omega) (\eta_{k,m} \circ \Xi_{j,\omega}))_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in the Bochner–Lebesgue space  $L^1(\sigma; L^2(\overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)))$ . Since  $L^2(\overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0))$  is a Hilbert space, we may repeatedly apply [17, Theorem

3.1] along with a diagonalization argument to obtain a subsequence of  $(\omega \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega)(\eta_{k,m} \circ \Xi_{j,\omega}))_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  (which we do not relabel) with property that: there exists a function

$$\tilde{\eta}_k : \Omega \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{with} \quad \omega \mapsto \tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, \cdot)|_{\overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)} \in L^1(\sigma; L^2(\overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)))$$

for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for any further (not relabeled) subsequence there is a  $\sigma$ -null Borel set  $\mathcal{N}_1 \subset \Omega$  such that for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega \setminus \mathcal{N}_1$ ,

$$(3.23) \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \tilde{\eta}_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, \cdot) - \tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0))} = 0,$$

where

$$\tilde{\eta}_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, t) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)).$$

By (3.22) and since

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|\zeta_{k,m}\|_{L^1(\sigma)} \leq \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|\zeta_{k,m}\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \leq 1$$

we can apply the real valued Komlós' theorem (see [25, Theorem 1a]) for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  to the sequences  $(\omega \mapsto \sup_{t' \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)} \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t')) \right|)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\zeta_{k,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and make yet another diagonalization argument to assume there exists a  $\sigma$ -null Borel set  $\mathcal{N}_2$  such that for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , and  $\omega \in \mathcal{N}_2$ ,

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sup_{t' \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0)} \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\omega) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t')) \right| \text{ converges,}$$

and (3.15) holds. If  $p < q$ , by the Banach–Saks theorem we may pass to another subsequence of  $(\zeta_{k,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  to assume that  $\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}$  also converges in  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$ , necessarily to  $\zeta_k$ , while if  $p = q$  we already have  $\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \equiv 1$  for all  $M$ .

With this setup, fix an arbitrary increasing sequence  $(M_{\ell'})_{\ell' \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega' := \Omega \setminus (\mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2)$ , which is Borel. By (3.23) we may pass to yet another subsequence to assume for some Vol $_Y$ -null set  $\mathcal{N}(\omega) \subset Y$ ,

$$\lim_{\ell' \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\eta}_{k,M_{\ell'}}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, t) = \tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, t), \quad \text{for all } t \in Y \setminus \mathcal{N}(\omega).$$

If  $j_0$  is the unique index such that  $\omega \in V_{j_0}$  and we define the set

$$\overline{B}_\ell := \{y \in \overline{B}_\ell^Y(y_0) \mid d_Y(y, \partial Y) \geq 2\ell^{-1}\},$$

we can then apply Lemma 3.8 with  $f_m = \xi_{k,m}(\Xi_{j_0}(\omega, \cdot))$  and  $\lambda_{\ell,m'} = \zeta_{k,m}(\omega)$  independent of  $\ell' \in \mathbb{N}$  (since the sequence  $(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega))_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges, it is also uniformly bounded) for  $1 \leq k \leq K - 1$  to obtain that  $(\tilde{\eta}_{k,M_{\ell'}}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, \cdot))_{\ell' \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Lipschitz on  $\overline{B}_\ell$  for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\tilde{\eta}_{k,M_{\ell'}}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, y_0) = 0$  for all  $k$  we see this sequence is also bounded on  $\overline{B}_\ell$ , thus we may apply the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem to see a subsequence of  $\tilde{\eta}_{k,M_{\ell'}}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, \cdot)$  converges uniformly on  $\overline{B}_\ell$ , necessarily to  $\tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, \cdot)$ . By another diagonalization argument, this implies there is a continuous extension of  $\tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, \cdot)$  to all of  $Y$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ; we continue to denote this extension by  $\tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, \cdot)$ . Since we had started with an arbitrary increasing sequence  $(M_{\ell'})_{\ell' \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we conclude that (for the full original sequence)  $\tilde{\eta}_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega, t)$

converges to  $\tilde{\eta}_k(\omega, t)$  for any fixed  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , and this convergence is uniform in  $t$  when restricted to  $\overline{B}_\ell$  for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . By (3.12),

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{\eta}_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \equiv 0,$$

hence we see the same limiting claim holds for  $k = K$  as well. Finally by disjointness of the  $V_j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\pi(v)) \tilde{\eta}_{k,m}^{\text{avg}}(\Xi_j^{-1}(v)) &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\pi(v)) \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_{j'}}(\pi(v)) \eta_{k,m}(\Xi_{j'}^{-1}(v)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\pi(v)) \eta_{k,m}(v) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \eta_{k,m}(v), \end{aligned}$$

hence defining

$$\eta_k(v) := \mathbb{1}_{\pi^{-1}(\Omega')}(v) \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{V_j}(\pi(v)) \tilde{\eta}_k(\Xi_j^{-1}(v))$$

yields the claim.  $\diamond$

Now, for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , we define

$$\Omega_k := \{\omega \in \Omega' \mid \zeta_k(\omega) \neq 0\}, \quad \xi_k(v) := \frac{\eta_k(v)}{\zeta_k(\pi(v))} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_k}(\pi(v)) \quad \text{for } v \in E.$$

**Claim 2.** For any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \sigma(\Omega_k))$  there exists a Borel set  $\Omega_{k,\varepsilon} \subset \Omega \setminus \Omega_k$  with  $\sigma(\Omega_{k,\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$  such that  $\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}$  converges uniformly to zero on  $\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,\varepsilon})$ , and for any  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , the functions defined on  $\Omega$  by

$$(3.24) \quad \omega \mapsto -\mathbb{1}_{\Omega'}(\omega) \int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\omega,$$

$$(3.25) \quad \omega \mapsto \left[ -\zeta_k(\omega) \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_k}(\omega) \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega + \mathbb{1}_{\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,\varepsilon})}(\omega) \inf_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})} \eta_k \right] \mathbb{1}_{\Omega'}(\omega)$$

are  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable.

*Proof of Claim 2.* Fix  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , by Egorov's theorem there is a Borel set  $\Omega_{k,\varepsilon} \subset \Omega \setminus \Omega_k$  with  $\sigma(\Omega_{k,\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$  such that  $\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}$  converges uniformly to zero on  $\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,\varepsilon})$ .

We begin with the measurability of (3.24). Since  $\eta_k$  is Borel, the integral of its positive and negative parts respectively against  $\mathbf{n}^\omega$  are Borel in  $\omega$ , by [Disintegration Theorem](#). Thus to obtain measurability of (3.24), it is sufficient to show the integral is finite from below for  $\sigma$ -a.e. To this end, for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , we observe from (3.19) that for any  $u, v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_k(v) &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \eta_{k,m}(v) \\ &\geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left[ -\zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m}(u) - 2^{p-1} \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) (d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) + d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, v)) \right] \\ &\geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m}(u) \right) - 2^{p-1} \zeta_k(\omega) (d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, u) + d_{E,y_0}^p(\omega, v)). \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  and  $\mathbf{n}^\omega$  are supported on  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$ , integrating against  $(\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \otimes \mathbf{n}^\omega)(u, v)$  and using (2.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\omega &\geq \int_E \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \\
&\quad - 2^{2p-2} \zeta_k(\omega) \left( 2\tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_k^\omega)^p + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p \right) \\
(3.26) \quad &\geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \\
&\quad - 2^{2p-2} \zeta_k(\omega) \left( 2\tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_k^\omega)^p + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p \right);
\end{aligned}$$

here we are able to apply Fatou's lemma to obtain the final inequality due to the fact that by (3.17), we have

$$-\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m}(u) \leq \left( \sup_{M' \in \mathbb{N}} \zeta_{k,M'}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) \right) \cdot \lambda_k d_{E,y_0}^p(\pi(u), u),$$

where the expression on the right belongs to  $L^1(\mathbf{m}_k^\omega)$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$  by (2.4) combined with  $\mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . Also using (2.4),

$$\int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \zeta_{k,m}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \leq 2^{p-1} \lambda_k \left( \sup_{M' \in \mathbb{N}} \zeta_{k,M'}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) \right) \left( \tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_k^\omega)^p \right)$$

and the expression on the right belongs to  $L^1(\sigma)$ , again due to the fact that  $\mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ , thus we may integrate the last expression in (3.26) against  $\sigma$  and apply Fatou's lemma and Hölder's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \left[ \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \right] \\
&\quad - 2^{2p-2} \int_\Omega \left[ \zeta_k \cdot \left( 2\tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_k^\bullet)^p + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \right) \right] d\sigma \\
(3.27) \quad &\geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \int_\Omega \zeta_{k,m} \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \right) \\
&\quad - 2^{2p-2} \|\zeta_k\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \left( 2\tilde{C} + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_k^\omega)^p + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E,y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p \right) \\
&> -\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the finiteness is from (3.18) with the fact that  $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)$ . Hence

$$\int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet$$

has a finite lower bound for  $\sigma$ -a.e. for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , yielding the  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurability of (3.24).

Next we show the measurability of (3.25). Since  $Y$  is separable and  $\eta_k \circ \Xi_{j,\omega}$  is continuous on  $Y$  for each  $\omega \in U_j$ , there exists a countable subset  $D$  of  $Y$  (independent of  $\omega$ ) such that

$$\inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})} \eta_k(v) = \inf_{t \in Y} \eta_k(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)) = \inf_{t \in D} \eta_k(\Xi_{j,\omega}(t)),$$

hence the function

$$\omega \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{\Omega'}(\omega) \inf_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})} \eta_k$$

is  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurable in  $\omega$ . Again since  $S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k$  is Borel, it suffices by [Disintegration Theorem](#) this time to show that

$$- \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega < \infty \quad \text{for } \sigma\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

This follows as by a calculation analogous to (3.17) applied to  $\xi_k$  in place of  $\xi_{k, m}$ , followed by (2.4), we have

$$- \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \leq \lambda_k \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega(u) \leq \lambda_k 2^{p-1} (\tilde{C} + \mathbf{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E, y_0}^\omega, \mathbf{m}_k^\omega)^p),$$

and the last expression is finite for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$  as  $\mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{P}_{p, q}^\sigma(E)$ . Thus we have the  $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ -measurability of (3.25) for  $1 \leq k \leq K$  as claimed.  $\diamond$

Now suppose  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{P}_{p, q}^\sigma(E)$  is a minimizer of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p, q, p}$ , and for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\Omega_{k, j}$  be the set obtained from Claim 2 with  $\varepsilon = j^{-1} \sigma(\Omega_k)$  if  $\sigma(\Omega_k) > 0$ , and the empty set otherwise. If we denote

$$\xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}} := \frac{\eta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}}{(\zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi)},$$

then since  $\xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(v) \rightarrow \xi_k(v)$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$  whenever  $\pi(v) \in \Omega_k$ , for all  $\omega \in \Omega_k$  and  $u \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} (-\zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(u)) &= \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) \inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} (\lambda_k d_E(u, v)^p + \xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(v)) \right] \\ (3.28) \quad &\leq \inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} [\zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) (\lambda_k d_E(u, v)^p + \xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(v))] \\ &= -\zeta_k(\omega) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k(u), \end{aligned}$$

where we use that

$$\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} (a_\ell b_\ell) = \left( \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} a_\ell \right) \left( \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} b_\ell \right)$$

for any sequences  $(a_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(b_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $(a_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a positive number. Meanwhile for  $\omega \in \Omega' \setminus \Omega_k$  and  $u \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} (-\zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(u)) &\leq \inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_k \zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) d_E(u, v)^p + \eta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(v)) \\ (3.29) \quad &= \inf_{v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(u)\})} \eta_k(v). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}$  converges  $\sigma$ -a.e., it is bounded  $\sigma$ -a.e, and by (3.17),

$$-\zeta_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k, M}^{\text{avg}}(u) \leq \left( \sup_{M' \in \mathbb{N}} \zeta_{k, M'}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) \right) \cdot \lambda_k d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u)$$

for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ . Again since  $\mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{P}_{p, q}^\sigma(E)$ , by (2.4) we have

$$(3.30) \quad \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u) \in L^r(\sigma) \subset L^1(\sigma),$$

hence we may use Fatou's lemma to obtain

$$(3.31) \quad \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_E (-\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \leq \int_E \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} (-\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(\omega) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega$$

for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ . Since  $\sigma$  has finite total measure,  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$ -convergence of the  $\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}$  implies the restricted sequence  $(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k})_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges in  $L^1(\sigma)$ , necessarily to  $\zeta_k \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} = \zeta_k$ .

Next suppose  $\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)} > 0$ , then we have  $\|\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\sigma)} > 0$  for all  $M$  sufficiently large, and

$$\|\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\sigma)}^{-1} \int_{\Omega'} \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} d\sigma \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} \|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}^{-1} \int_{\Omega'} \zeta_k d\sigma$$

for any  $\Omega' \in \mathcal{B}_\sigma$ . Thus we can view  $(\|\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\sigma)}^{-1} \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \sigma)_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$  as a sequence in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  that converges setwise to the probability measure  $\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}^{-1} \zeta_k \sigma$ . Thus by (3.30), and using (2.4), the  $L^1(\sigma)$ - and  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$ -convergence of  $(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k})_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$  to  $\zeta_k$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_k} \frac{\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}}{\|\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u) d\sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u) d\sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u) d\sigma \\ &\leq \frac{2^{p-1}}{\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \int_{\Omega} \zeta_k \left( \tilde{C} + \text{MK}_p^E(\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet, \mathbf{m}_k^\bullet)^p \right) d\sigma \\ &\leq \frac{2^{p-1} \|\zeta_k\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)}}{\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \cdot \left( \tilde{C} + \mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma(\delta_{E, y_0}^\bullet \otimes \sigma, \mathbf{m}_k^\bullet)^p \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$- \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega \leq \lambda_k \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega(u)$$

we may apply Fatou's lemma for sequences of probability measures, [11, Theorem 4.1], with the choices

$$\mu_n = \frac{\zeta_{k,n}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \sigma}{\|\zeta_{k,n}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\sigma)}}, \quad g_n = -\lambda_k \int_E d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u), \quad f_n = \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,n}^{\text{avg}} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet$$

in the reference which yields

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_k} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_E (-\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\ &= \|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)} \int_{\Omega_k} \frac{\zeta_k}{\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( - \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet \right) d\sigma \\ &\geq \|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( - \int_{\Omega_k} \frac{\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}}{\|\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\sigma)}} \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \right) \\ &= \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( - \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \right); \end{aligned}$$



above we have used that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} > 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega_k.$$

If  $\|\zeta_k\|_{L^1(\sigma)} = 0$ , we would have  $\sigma(\Omega_k) = 0$  and the same inequality (3.32) holds. By a calculation analogous to (3.4), for any  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$(3.33) \quad -(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \geq -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,m},$$

thus combining the above with (3.31) and (3.32) we see

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_k} \int_E \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\ & \geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_{k,m} \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $\{\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}\}_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges uniformly to 0 on  $\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})$ , for all  $M$  sufficiently large we have

$$-(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}(u) \leq \lambda_k d_{E, y_0}^p(\pi(u), u) \quad \text{for } u \in \pi^{-1}(\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})).$$

Since the expression on the right-hand side has finite integral with respect to  $\mathbf{m}_k$ , by Fatou's lemma and (3.33) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})} \int_E \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\ & \geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,m} d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \right), \end{aligned}$$

thus combining with (3.34) we have

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( -(\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\ & \geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

By the  $L^{r'}(\sigma)$ -convergence of  $\{\zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}}\}_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$  to 0 on  $\Omega_{k,j}$  and (3.30), we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\ & \leq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \zeta_{k,M}^{\text{avg}} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{k,j}} \right\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \cdot \left\| \int_E \lambda_k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_j(\pi(u)) d_E(\Xi_{j, \pi(u)}(y_0), u)^p d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet(u) \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\
& \geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\
& \quad - \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\
& \geq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \int_E \left( -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (\zeta_{k,m} \circ \pi) S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_{k,m} \right) d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma \\
& \geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}_{p,q}^\sigma(E)} \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p} = \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}(\mathbf{n}),
\end{aligned}$$

by (3.13). Combining this with (3.28), (3.29), and (3.35) and since  $\Omega_k$  is disjoint with  $\Omega_{k,j}$ , we obtain

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}(\mathbf{n}) \leq - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k(\omega) \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega d\sigma(\omega) + \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})} \inf_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})} \eta_k d\sigma(\omega).$$

Although the elements do not necessarily belong to  $(\mathcal{Z}_{r',\sigma} \times \mathcal{X}_p)^K$ , we do have  $\zeta_k \in L^{r'}(\sigma)$  with  $\|\zeta_k\|_{L^{r'}(\sigma)} \leq 1$ , and  $\xi_k$  continuous on  $\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$ . By (3.16) and the measurability of (3.24) and (3.25), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p,q,p}(\mathbf{n}) \\
& \leq - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet d\sigma + \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})} \inf_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})} \eta_k d\sigma(\sigma) - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega} \int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet d\sigma \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \left( -\zeta_k \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet - \int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet d\sigma \\
(3.36) \quad & + \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega \setminus (\Omega_k \cup \Omega_{k,j})} \int_E \left( -\eta_k + \inf_{\pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})} \eta_k \right) d\mathbf{n}^\bullet d\sigma(\omega) \\
& \leq - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_{k,j}} \int_E \eta_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet d\sigma \\
& \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma,
\end{aligned}$$

where the final limit follows because  $\sigma(\Omega_{k,j}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and (3.16) combined with the estimates (3.26) and (3.27) implies each  $\eta_k \in L^1(\mathbf{n})$ . Since

$$(3.37) \quad -\zeta_k(\omega)(S_{\lambda_k,p} \xi_k(u) + \xi_k(v)) \leq \lambda_k \zeta_k(\omega) d_E(u, v)^p$$

for all  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $u, v \in \pi^{-1}(\{\omega\})$ , (3.36) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma \\
& \geq \mathfrak{B}_{\Lambda, \mathfrak{M}}^{p, q, p}(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_k} \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} + \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} \\
& \geq \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} \\
& \geq - \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma,
\end{aligned}$$

hence for any  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_k$ , we have  $\text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega) = 0$ , in particular  $\mathbf{m}_k^\omega = \mathbf{n}^\omega$ .

Now the above also implies

$$- \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)},$$

then by (3.37), each term in the sum on the left of the inequality above is less than or equal to each term in the sum on the right, in particular we have termwise equality for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$ .

Let  $k$  be the distinguished index in our hypothesis. Then again using the dual characterization of the  $L^r(\sigma)$  norm ([12, Proposition 6.13]),

$$\begin{aligned}
- \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma &= \lambda_k \left\| \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \right\|_{L^r(\sigma)} \\
&\geq \lambda_k \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet, \mathbf{n}^\bullet)^p d\sigma \\
&\geq - \int_{\Omega_k} \zeta_k \left( \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\bullet + \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\bullet \right) d\sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega_k$  we must have

$$- \int_E S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k d\mathbf{m}_k^\omega - \int_E \xi_k d\mathbf{n}^\omega = \lambda_k \text{MK}_p^E(\mathbf{m}_k^\omega, \mathbf{n}^\omega)^p.$$

Fix  $\omega \in \Omega_k$  where this equality holds, with  $\omega \in U_j$  for some  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  where the measure  $(\Xi_{j, \omega})_\# \mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\text{Vol}_Y$ . Suppose  $j_0$  is the unique index such that  $\omega \in V_{j_0}$ , then if we define  $\phi_\omega, \psi_\omega : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu_\omega, \nu_\omega \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  by

$$\psi_\omega(s) := ((S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k) \circ \Xi_{j_0, \omega})^{\lambda_k} d_Y^p(s), \quad \phi_\omega(t) := \psi_\omega^{\lambda_k} d_Y^p(t), \quad \mu_\omega := (\Xi_{j_0, \omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}_k^\omega, \quad \nu_\omega := (\Xi_{j_0, \omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{n}^\omega,$$

the above implies

$$- \int_Y \phi_\omega d\mu_\omega - \int_Y \psi_\omega d\nu_\omega = \lambda_k \text{MK}_p^Y(\mu_\omega, \nu_\omega)^p.$$

Since  $\mu_\omega = g_j^{j_0}(\omega)_\# (\Xi_{j, \omega}^{-1})_\# \mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  and  $g_j^{j_0}(\omega)$  is an isometry of  $Y$ , we also see  $\mu_\omega$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\text{Vol}_Y$ . Let  $\gamma^\omega \in \Pi(\mu_\omega, \nu_\omega)$  be a  $p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu_\omega$  and  $\nu_\omega$ . Then we

obtain

$$(3.38) \quad -\phi_\omega(t) - \psi_\omega(s) = \lambda_k d_Y(t, s)^p, \quad \gamma^\omega\text{-a.e. } (t, s).$$

Since

$$-\lambda_k d_Y(y_0, t)^p - \psi_\omega(y_0) \leq \phi_\omega(t) \leq S_{\lambda_k, p} \xi_k(\Xi_{j_0, \omega}(t)),$$

we see  $\phi_\omega$  is bounded on any compact subset of  $Y$ , and since it is a  $\lambda_k d_Y^p$ -transform of some function, by Corollary 3.9  $\phi_\omega$  is uniformly Lipschitz on any compact subset of  $Y \setminus \partial Y$ . Thus by Rademacher's theorem  $\phi_\omega$  is differentiable  $\text{Vol}_Y$ -a.e. on  $Y$ . Let  $t \in Y \setminus \partial Y$  be a point of differentiability for  $\phi_\omega$  such that there exists  $s_t \in Y$  satisfying (3.38); as  $\mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\text{Vol}_Y$ , the set of such  $t$  has full  $\mathbf{m}_k^\omega$  measure. Let us denote by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y$  the Riemannian metric on  $Y$ , and write  $|\cdot|_Y = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y^{1/2}$ . If a function  $f$  on  $Y$  is differentiable at  $t \in Y \setminus \partial Y$ , then

$$f(\exp_t^Y(\varepsilon V)) = f(t) + \varepsilon \langle V, \nabla_Y f(t) \rangle_Y + o(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

for any unit tangent vector  $V$  to  $Y$  at  $t$ , where  $\exp_t^Y$  is the exponential map of  $Y$  and  $\nabla_Y f$  is the gradient of  $f$ . This with the choice  $f = \phi_\omega$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(\exp_t^Y(\varepsilon V), s_t)^p &\geq -\phi_\omega(\exp_t^Y(\varepsilon V)) - \psi_\omega(s_t) \\ &= -\varepsilon \langle V, \nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t) \rangle_Y - \phi_\omega(t) - \psi_\omega(s_t) + o(\varepsilon) \\ &= -\varepsilon \langle V, \nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t) \rangle_Y + d_Y(t, s_t)^p + o(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the above shows  $t' \mapsto d_Y(t', s_t)^p$  is subdifferentiable at  $t' = t$ , while since  $d_Y^p = (d_Y^2)^{p/2}$  we see that [27, Proposition 6] implies superdifferentiability when  $s_t \neq t$ , hence  $t' \mapsto d_Y(t', s_t)^p$  is differentiable at  $t' = t$  if  $s_t \neq t$ . Since  $p > 1$ , when  $s_t \neq t$  by taking the derivative of (3.38) with respect to  $t$ , after some tedious but routine calculation we obtain that  $\nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t) \neq 0$  and

$$s_t = \exp_t^Y \left( \left| \frac{\nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t)}{p \lambda_k} \right|_Y^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \frac{\nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t)}{|\nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t)|_Y} \right),$$

and if either  $\nabla_Y \phi_\omega(t) = 0$  or  $\phi_\omega$  is not superdifferentiable at  $t$ , we have  $s_t = t$ . This shows that there is a  $\mu_\omega$ -a.e. single valued map  $T^\omega$  on  $Y$  such that the pair  $(t, T^\omega(t))$  satisfy the equality in (3.38). Combining with [15, Lemma 2.4] necessarily we have that  $\gamma^\omega = (\text{Id} \times T^\omega)_\# \mu_\omega$ . The map  $T^\omega$  is entirely determined by  $\xi_k$ , hence so is the right marginal  $\nu_\omega$  for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega_k$ . All together this implies  $\mathbf{n}^\omega$  is determined for  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\omega$  by  $\zeta_k$  or  $\xi_k$ , thus we see the  $\mathcal{MK}_{p,q}^\sigma$ -barycenter is unique.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.10.* We can apply Theorem 1.8 (1), (2), and (3) with any value of  $q$  and  $\Omega$  a one-point space, and  $\sigma$  the associated delta measure and the claims follow immediately. Regarding the duality result, also recall Remark 1.9.  $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** The authors would like to thank Guillaume Carlier, Wilfrid Gangbo, Quentin Mériçot, and Brendan Pass for fruitful discussions.

JK was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant DMS-2246606.

AT was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19K03494.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Agueh and G. Carlier, *Barycenters in the Wasserstein space*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **43** (2011), no. 2, 904–924.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara, *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

- [3] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, Second, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2008.
- [4] V. I. Bogachev, *Measure theory. Vol. I, II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.
- [5] J. M. Borwein and J. D. Vanderwerff, *Convex functions: constructions, characterizations and counterexamples*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 109, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [6] N. Boumal, *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023.
- [7] J. Candau-Tilh, *Wasserstein and sliced Wasserstein distances*, Masters thesis (2020). [https://julescandautilh.files.wordpress.com/2022/06/master\\_thesis\\_jct.pdf](https://julescandautilh.files.wordpress.com/2022/06/master_thesis_jct.pdf).
- [8] J. B. Conway, *A course in functional analysis*, Second, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 96, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990.
- [9] C. Dellacherie and P.-A. Meyer, *Probabilities and potential*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, vol. 29, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [10] J. Dugundji, *An extension of Tietze's theorem*, Pacific J. Math. **1** (1951), 353–367.
- [11] E. A. Feinberg, P. O. Kasyanov, and N. V. Zadoianchuk, *Fatou's lemma for weakly converging probabilities*, Theory Probab. Appl. **58** (2014), no. 4, 683–689.
- [12] G. B. Folland, *Real analysis*, Second, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999. Modern techniques and their applications, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [13] A. Galichon, *Optimal transport methods in economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2016.
- [14] W. Gangbo and R. J. McCann, *The geometry of optimal transportation*, Acta Math. **177** (1996), no. 2, 113–161.
- [15] ———, *Shape recognition via Wasserstein distance*, Quart. Appl. Math. **58** (2000), no. 4, 705–737.
- [16] W. Gangbo and A. Tudorascu, *On differentiability in the Wasserstein space and well-posedness for Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **125** (2019), 119–174.
- [17] M. Guessous, *An elementary proof of Komlós-Révész theorem in Hilbert spaces*, J. Convex Anal. **4** (1997), no. 2, 321–332.
- [18] T. Hytönen, J. van Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis, *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. I. Martingales and Littlewood-Paley theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 63, Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [19] Y. Jiang, *Absolute continuity of Wasserstein barycenters over Alexandrov spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **69** (2017), no. 5, 1087–1108.
- [20] A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 156, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [21] Y.-H. Kim and B. Pass, *Wasserstein barycenters over Riemannian manifolds*, Adv. Math. **307** (2017), 640–683.
- [22] ———, *A canonical barycenter via Wasserstein regularization*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **50** (2018), no. 2, 1817–1828.
- [23] Y.-H. Kim, B. Pass, and D. J. Schneider, *Optimal transport and barycenters for dendritic measures*, Pure Appl. Anal. **2** (2020), no. 3, 581–601.
- [24] J. Kitagawa and A. Takatsu, *Sliced optimal transport: is it a suitable replacement?* (2024), available at [arXiv:2311.15874](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.15874).
- [25] J. Komlós, *A generalization of a problem of Steinhaus*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **18** (1967), 217–229.
- [26] K. Kuratowski and C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *A general theorem on selectors*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. **13** (1965), 397–403.
- [27] R. J. McCann, *Polar factorization of maps on Riemannian manifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **11** (2001), no. 3, 589–608.
- [28] S.-i. Ohta, *Barycenters in Alexandrov spaces of curvature bounded below*, Adv. Geom. **12** (2012), no. 4, 571–587.
- [29] F. Otto, *The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **26** (2001), no. 1-2, 101–174.
- [30] J. Peszek and D. Poyato, *Heterogeneous gradient flows in the topology of fibered optimal transport*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **62** (2023), no. 9, Paper No. 258, 72.
- [31] B. Piccoli, *Measure differential equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **233** (2019), no. 3, 1289–1317.

- [32] F. Santambrogio, *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 87, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling.
- [33] S. M. Srivastava, *A course on Borel sets*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 180, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [34] V. S. Varadarajan, *On the convergence of sample probability distributions*, Sankhyā **19** (1958), 23–26.
- [35] C. Villani, *Optimal transport: Old and new*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 338, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
- [36] W. Wang, D. Slepčev, S. Basu, J. A. Ozolek, and G. K. Rohde, *A linear optimal transportation framework for quantifying and visualizing variations in sets of images*, Int. J. Comput. Vis. **101** (2013), no. 2, 254–269.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MI 48824  
*Email address:* `kitagawa@math.msu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TOKYO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY, TOKYO 192-0397, JAPAN  
& RIKEN CENTER FOR ADVANCED INTELLIGENCE PROJECT (AIP), TOKYO JAPAN.  
*Email address:* `asuka@tmu.ac.jp`