

Existence and uniqueness results for strongly degenerate McKean-Vlasov equations with rough coefficients

Andrea Pascucci* Alessio Rondelli† Alexander Yu Veretennikov‡

This version: September 24, 2024

Abstract

We present existence results for weak solutions to a broad class of degenerate McKean-Vlasov equations with rough coefficients, expanding upon and refining the techniques recently introduced by the third author. Under certain structural conditions, we also establish results concerning both weak and strong well-posedness.

1 Introduction

We consider the McKean-Vlasov (MKV) equation in \mathbb{R}^N

$$dX_t = B(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t})dt + \Sigma(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t})dW_t \quad (1.1)$$

where μ_{X_t} denotes the law of X_t and W_t is a d -dimensional Brownian motion on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We assume $0 \leq d \leq N$, meaning the equation can be degenerate, even *completely*. The coefficients may have linear growth and minimal regularity properties: as a key example, our framework encompasses the following MKV-Langevin equation with *measurable* coefficients

$$\begin{cases} dX_{0,t} = X_{1,t}dt, \\ dX_{1,t} = B_1(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t})dt + \Sigma_1(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t})dW_t. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

The classical Langevin model [20] is a specific instance of (1.2): the solution is a $2d$ -dimensional process $X_t = (X_{0,t}, X_{1,t})$ describing the dynamics in the phase space of a system of d particles with position $X_{0,t}$ and velocity $X_{1,t}$ at time t . The interest in measurable coefficients is primarily driven by applications in control problems. In finance, SDEs of the form (1.2) describe path-dependent contingent claims, such as Asian options or some local stochastic volatility model (see, for instance, [28]).

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy. **e-mail:** andrea.pascucci@unibo.it

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy. **e-mail:** alessio.rondelli@studio.unibo.it

‡Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Moscow, Russian Federation. **e-mail:** ayv@iitp.ru

Stochastic differential equations dependent on distributions have been extensively researched since McKean's seminal paper [23], building upon Kac's foundation of kinetic theory [14]. Genuinely degenerate MKV equations have recently sparked considerable interest: they are studied in [1] as alternative approaches to Navier-Stokes equations turbulent flows, using the results in [9]. The martingale problem for nonlinear kinetic distribution-dependent SDEs with singular drifts is studied in [13], [21] and [41], which also contain numerous additional references. Recent results for stable driven MKV equations are proved in [5], [6] and [11]. Applications in the calibration of local stochastic volatility models in finance and nonlinear filtering problems are discussed in [7], [19] and [30], while recent work on degenerate quantile-dependent SDEs can be found in [15] and [12]. Rather general existence results for the martingale problem for (1.1) were proved in [10] assuming the continuity of the coefficients and the existence of Lyapunov functions.

In order to state our main results, we introduce the assumptions and notations we will adopt throughout the paper. The subsequent assumptions can be significantly loosened, and expansions to coefficients of wider generality are outlined in Remark 1.7.

Assumption 1.1 (Structural assumptions). The coefficients of (1.1) are of the form

$$B(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(t, x, y) \mu(dy), \quad \Sigma(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sigma(t, x, y) \mu(dy), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.3)$$

where b is a \mathbb{R}^N -valued Borel measurable function and σ is a $\mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ -valued Borel measurable function of the form

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sigma_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.4)$$

In (1.4), 0 is a null $(N - d) \times d$ -block, while the block σ_1 is uniformly positive definite, that is

$$\langle \sigma_1 \xi, \xi \rangle \geq \lambda |\xi|^2, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.5)$$

for some positive constant λ .

Later it will be convenient to rewrite (1.1) in a more explicit form, separating the degenerate from the diffusive part of the SDE as in (1.2).

Notation 1.2. We set $x = (x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-d} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and call x_0 and x_1 the *degenerate* and *non-degenerate* components of $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, respectively.

Setting $X_t = (X_{0,t}, X_{1,t})$, equation (1.1) reads

$$\begin{cases} dX_{0,t} = B_0(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t}) dt, \\ dX_{1,t} = B_1(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t}) dt + \Sigma_1(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t}) dW_t. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

As per Notation 1.2, we say that B_0 is the *degenerate* drift coefficient and B_1, Σ_1 are the *non-degenerate* drift and diffusion coefficients respectively, which are defined according to (1.3):

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(t, x, \mu_{X_t}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b_i(t, x, y) \mu_{X_t}(dy) = \mathbf{E}[b_i(t, x, X_t)], \quad i = 0, 1, \\ \Sigma_1(t, x, \mu_{X_t}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sigma_1(t, x, y) \mu_{X_t}(dy) = \mathbf{E}[\sigma_1(t, x, X_t)], \quad t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

with σ_1 as in (1.4).

Assumption 1.3. The coefficients $b = (b_0, b_1)$ and σ_1 satisfy the linear growth condition

$$|b(t, x, y)| + |\sigma_1(t, x, y)| \leq \mathbf{c}(1 + |x| + |y|), \quad t \in [0, T], x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.8)$$

for some positive constant \mathbf{c} . Moreover, $b = b(t, x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1)$ and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(t, x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1)$ are continuous functions of the degenerate variables $x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N-d}$, uniformly in $t \in [0, T]$ and $x_1, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 1.3 imposes the continuity of the coefficients solely with respect to the *degenerate* variables x_0, y_0 . This encompasses both ends of the spectrum: from deterministic equations with *continuous* coefficients (as per the classic Cauchy-Peano existence theorem, but see also [8]), to non-degenerate stochastic equations with *measurable* coefficients (as per the well-known results by Krylov [16] and [18], Chap.2 Sec.6).

Definition 1.4 (Weak solution). A weak solution on $[0, T]$ to the MKV equation with coefficients b and σ_1 , is a pair $(X_t, W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ of stochastic processes, defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]})$, such that:

- i) W is a d -dimensional Brownian motion;
- ii) X is a continuous and adapted process such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{E}[|X_t|^2] dt < \infty; \quad (1.9)$$

- iii) almost surely we have

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(s, X_s, y) \mu_{X_s}(dy) \right) ds + \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sigma_1(s, X_s, y) \mu_{X_s}(dy) \right) dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (1.10)$$

Remark 1.5. Under Assumption 1.3, condition (1.9) ensures that the stochastic integral in (1.10) is well-defined. In fact, we have

$$\int_0^T \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sigma_1(t, X_t, y) \mu_{X_t}(dy) \right|^2 dt \leq \mathbf{c}^2 \int_0^T (1 + |X_t| + \mathbf{E}[|X_t|])^2 dt$$

which is finite almost surely, by (1.9) and since X is continuous. Notice that for non-MKV equations condition (1.9) is redundant since it follows from standard a priori L^p estimates for solutions of SDEs (cf., for instance, [29], Theor. 14.5.2).

Our first result is the following

Theorem 1.6 (Existence). *Let μ_0 be a distribution on \mathbb{R}^N with finite fourth moment and $T > 0$. Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.3, a weak solution (X, W) on $[0, T]$ to the MKV equation with coefficients b, σ_1 and with initial distribution $\mu_{X_0} = \mu_0$, exists and verifies*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t|^4 \right] \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E} [|X_0|^4]), \quad \sup_{\substack{0 \leq t, s \leq T \\ |t-s| \leq h}} \mathbb{E} [|X_t - X_s|^4] \leq Ch^2,$$

for some positive constant C .

Existence results were recently established by the third author of this paper in [40] under stronger conditions, specifically requiring the coefficients to be bounded (excluding the prototype MKV-Langevin equation (1.2)), the coefficient b_0 to be continuous with respect to all variables except t , and the diffusion matrix to be symmetric. The main tools used in the proof are Krylov's bounds [18], Skorokhod's technique of weak convergence [33], and Nisio's approach to SDEs in [26] and [39]. In addition to extending the original arguments of [40], in Proposition 2.5 we clarify certain technical aspects of the construction of the so-called ε -net, a crucial tool in the proof of Theorem 1.6: see, in particular, Remark 2.6.

Remark 1.7. The techniques employed in the proof of Theorem 1.6 are quite likely to be applicable even in the case of coefficients of the form

$$\bar{B}(t, x, \mu) = \Phi(t, x, B(t, x, \mu)), \quad \bar{\Sigma}_1(t, x, \mu) = \Psi(t, x, \Sigma_1(t, x, \mu)), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where B, Σ_1 in (1.3)-(1.7) satisfy Assumptions 1.1-1.3, and

$$\Phi : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \Psi : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

are measurable functions, locally Lipschitz continuous in the second and third argument, uniformly in $t \in [0, T]$, and $\bar{\Sigma}_1$ satisfies the non-degeneracy condition (2.25). Also the assumption regarding the finiteness of the fourth moment of the initial distribution μ_0 can be relaxed: the proof remains valid without modification as long as μ_0 has a finite $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -moment, for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

In the second part of the paper, we establish the well-posedness of the MKV equation (1.6) under the specific condition that the coefficients B_0 and Σ_1 are independent of the law. We consider the MKV equation

$$\begin{cases} dX_{0,t} = B_0(t, X_t)dt, \\ dX_{1,t} = B_1(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t})dt + \Sigma_1(t, X_t)dW_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

with initial datum η . We also consider the standard (i.e. non-MKV) equation

$$\begin{cases} d\hat{X}_{0,t} = B_0(t, \hat{X}_t)dt, \\ d\hat{X}_{1,t} = B_1(t, \hat{X}_t, \mu_t)dt + \Sigma_1(t, \hat{X}_t)dW_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

where $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the flow of marginals of a given continuous, adapted process. Equation (1.12) is a linearized version of (1.11).

Theorem 1.8 (Uniqueness). *Suppose the structural Assumption 1.1 holds and the coefficients are Borel measurable functions of the form*

$$b = (b_0(t, x), b_1(t, x, y)), \quad \sigma_1 = \sigma_1(t, x), \quad t \in [0, T], x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Assume also that:

i) b satisfies the linear growth condition

$$|b(t, x, y)| \leq \mathbf{c}(1 + |x|), \quad t \in [0, T], x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N; \quad (1.13)$$

ii) the matrix σ_1 is bounded and uniformly positive definite, that is

$$\lambda^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq \langle \sigma_1(t, x)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \lambda|\xi|^2, \quad t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some positive constant λ ;

iii) the initial datum satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{r|\eta|^2} \right] < \infty \quad (1.14)$$

for some positive constant r .

If, for any fixed flow μ the solution of (1.12), with initial datum η , is weakly (resp. strongly) unique, then also the solution of (1.11) is weakly (resp. strongly) unique.

Remark 1.9. In Theorem 1.8, when b_1 is bounded, a less restrictive condition than (1.14) is sufficient, such as $\mathbb{E} [|\eta|^2] < \infty$.

Notice that Theorem 1.8 does not require any regularity conditions for the coefficients, which may be merely measurable. On the other hand, one of the most stringent assumptions is the weak (or strong) well-posedness of the non-MKV equation (1.12). To illustrate the potential range of applications of the theorem, we provide a far from complete list of known results on well-posedness for (1.12). We distinguish between the *non-degenerate* case (i.e., when $d = N$) and the *degenerate* case (i.e., when $d < N$):

- [33], [34], [16, 17] prove weak well-posedness for non-degenerate SDE with bounded and measurable coefficients (see also Sect. 2.6 in [18] and Theorems 6.1.7 and 7.2.1 in [34]). In [42], [37] strong well-posedness is established if the drift is bounded and Hölder continuous, and the diffusion coefficient is bounded and Lipschitz continuous;

- several results for degenerate Langevin-type SDEs are available in the literature: for SDEs with Hölder continuous coefficients, weak well-posedness is studied in [24] and is a straightforward consequence of the results in [22] and [9] where an optimal notion of intrinsic Hölder continuity is considered. Well-posedness of the martingale problem for SDEs with measurable diffusion coefficients is established in [41]. Strong well-posedness is achieved when the coefficients are bounded and Hölder continuous, provided the Hölder exponents meet certain thresholds, as proved in [3] and [4]. For instance, in the case $B_0(t, X_{0,t}, X_{1,t}) = X_{1,t}$ the drift B_1 must be at least $2/3$ -Hölder continuous w.r.t. the degenerate component; it is currently not known if this threshold is indeed optimal. The author of [38] establishes sufficient conditions for the strong well-posedness of SDEs with nonsmooth drift under conditions of possible degeneracy of the diffusion with respect to some of the variables.

Due to the technique employed, which relies on Girsanov's theorem, in this paper we prove well-posedness only for MKV equations whose diffusion coefficient is independent of the law. In future research, we plan to revisit the study of well-posedness under more general assumptions. One approach we are considering involves combining techniques from [15] and [3] for non-degenerate equations with the parametrix method used in [9] and [22] for the linear case. This combined approach could allow us to exploit the non-Euclidean intrinsic geometric structures induced by degenerate kinetic equations, as detailed in [27].

The paper is organized into two sections, which respectively contain the proofs of the existence and uniqueness theorems. Throughout the paper, C denotes a positive constant that may vary from line to line.

2 Existence: proof of Theorem 1.6

2.1 Step 1: regularization

We approximate the coefficients through a sequence of functions b^n, σ^n that are bounded, Lipschitz continuous and satisfy Assumptions 1.1 and 1.3. Specifically, they satisfy the non-degeneracy condition (1.5) and the linear growth condition (1.8) with the constants λ, c independent of n . This can be achieved by taking, for $f = b, \sigma$, the convolution $f^n := f_n * \psi_n$ where $\psi_n = \psi_n(t, x, y)$ is a standard mollifier supported in the ball of radius $\frac{1}{n}$, and

$$f_n(t, x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1) := f(t, \chi_n(x_0), \chi_n(x_1), \chi_n(y_0), \chi_n(y_1))$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, we set

$$\chi_n(\xi) = \begin{cases} \xi & \text{if } |\xi| \leq n, \\ n \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

both for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{N-d}$. Clearly, $f_n \equiv f$ on $[0, T] \times Q_n$ where

$$Q_n := \{(x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} \mid \max\{|x_0|, |x_1|, |y_0|, |y_1|\} \leq n\}. \quad (2.1)$$

To ensure the convolution is well-defined, we extend the domains of b and σ to include $t < 0$. We define $b(t, \cdot) = 0$ and $\sigma(t, \cdot) = I_n$ for $t < 0$. The extension of σ in this manner is designed to maintain its positive definiteness. We denote by B^n, Σ^n the integrals corresponding to b^n, σ^n , as defined in (1.3).

The equation with regularized coefficients is strongly well-posed. More precisely, let W^x be a d -dimensional Brownian motion defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}_t)$. A fixed point argument (see, for instance, [35] or [2], Theor. 4.21) shows that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta_x \in L^p(\Omega, m\mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$ with $p \geq 2$, the MKV equation

$$dX_t^n = B^n(t, X_t^n, \mu_{X_t^n})dt + \Sigma^n(t, X_t^n, \mu_{X_t^n})dW_t^x, \quad X_0^n = \eta_x, \quad (2.2)$$

admits a unique solution in the space \mathbb{S}^p of continuous processes, adapted to the augmented filtration $\mathcal{F}^{\eta_x, W^x}$ generated by η_x and W^x , and such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t^n|^p \right] < \infty. \quad (2.3)$$

Next, as a consequence of the linear growth condition (1.8), we derive some estimates that are uniform in n . Although the proof is quite standard, the authors were unable to locate an appropriate reference; therefore we provide a sketch of the proof for completeness.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\eta_x \in L^p(\Omega, m\mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$ with $p \geq 2$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the solution $X^n \in \mathbb{S}^p$ of (2.2) satisfies the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X_t^n|^p \right] \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}[|\eta_x|^p]), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{0 \leq t, s \leq T \\ |t-s| \leq h}} \mathbb{E}[|X_t^n - X_s^n|^p] \leq Ch^{p/2}. \quad (2.5)$$

where the constant C depends on T, N and p , but not on n .

Proof. We prove that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$v_n(t_1) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_1} |X_t^n|^p \right] \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}[|\eta_x|^p]) \left(1 + \int_0^{t_1} v_n(s) ds \right), \quad 0 \leq t_1 \leq T, \quad (2.6)$$

where C is a constant that depends only on p, N, T and \mathbf{c} in (1.8): in particular, C is independent of n . Since $v_n(T)$ is finite by (2.3), we can directly apply Grönwall's lemma to deduce (2.4) from (2.6).

In order to prove (2.6), we notice that by (1.8) we have

$$|B^n(t, X_t^n, \mu_{X_t^n})| + |\Sigma^n(t, X_t^n, \mu_{X_t^n})| \leq \mathbf{c} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (1 + |X_t^n| + |x|) \mu_{X_t^n}(dx) = \mathbf{c}(1 + |X_t^n| + \mathbb{E}[|X_t^n|]). \quad (2.7)$$

Applying Hölder and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities to (2.2), for some constant c_0 dependent only on p and N , we get

$$v_n(t_1) \leq 3^{p-1} \left(\mathbb{E}[|\eta_x|^p] + t_1^{p-1} \int_0^{t_1} \mathbb{E}[|B^n(s, X_s^n, \mu_{X_s^n})|^p] ds + c_0 t_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \int_0^{t_1} \mathbb{E}[|\Sigma^n(s, X_s^n, \mu_{X_s^n})|^p] ds \right) \leq$$

(by (2.7), for some constant c_1 dependent only on p, N, T and \mathbf{c})

$$\leq c_1 \left(\mathbb{E}[|\eta_x|^p] + \int_0^{t_1} \mathbb{E}[1 + |X_s^n|^p + \mathbb{E}[|X_s^n|^p]] ds \right)$$

which yields (2.6). The proof of (2.5) is based on similar arguments and is omitted. \square

2.2 Step 2: linearization

By possibly enlarging the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, we may assume the existence of a second Brownian motion W^y , independent of W^x , and a random variable η_y equal in law to η_x and independent of η_x . We consider the sequence $(Y^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of strong solutions of the SDE (2.2) where W^y substitutes W^x and η_y replaces η_x . By uniqueness, Y^n is equal in law to X^n and, being adapted to $\mathcal{F}^{\eta_y, W^y}$, is independent of W^x (hence, also independent of X^m for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$).

Notice that X^n solves the standard (i.e. non-MKV) SDE

$$dX_t^n = B^n(t, X_t^n, \mu_{X_t^n})dt + \Sigma^n(t, X_t^n, \mu_{X_t^n})dW_t^x, \quad X_0^n = \eta_x. \quad (2.8)$$

Clearly, in equation (2.8) we can swap the roles of X^n and Y^n : thus, we have

$$dY_t^n = B^n(t, Y_t^n, \mu_{Y_t^n})dt + \Sigma^n(t, Y_t^n, \mu_{Y_t^n})dW_t^y, \quad Y_0^n = \eta_y,$$

and Y^n satisfies estimates (2.4)-(2.5) as well.

2.3 Step 3: limiting process

For convenience, we introduce the compact notations $Z = (X, Y)$ and $W = (W^x, W^y)$. By virtue of estimates (2.4)-(2.5) and Skorokhod's lemma, there exists a probability space supporting a sequence of stochastic processes $(\tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{W}^n)$ that are equal in law to (Z^n, W) and such that, up to a subsequence, converge in probability

$$(\tilde{Z}_t^n, \tilde{W}_t^n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} (\tilde{Z}_t^\infty, \tilde{W}_t^\infty) \quad (2.9)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Remark 2.2. The fact that (2.9) holds for any $t \in [0, T]$ implies the weak convergence of finite-dimensional distributions of the processes $(\tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{W}^n)$.

Lemma 2.3. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, the process \tilde{Z}^n satisfies estimates (2.4)-(2.5) with the constant C independent of n :*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{Z}_t^n|^4 \right] \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E} [|\eta_x|^4]), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{0 \leq t, s \leq T \\ |t-s| \leq h}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{Z}_t^n - \tilde{Z}_s^n|^4 \right] \leq Ch^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Moreover, \tilde{Z}^n admits a continuous modification and \tilde{W}^n is a 2d-dimensional Brownian motion with respect to the filtration $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$ generated by $(\tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{W}^n)$.

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the thesis follows from (2.4)-(2.5) and the equivalence in law of Z^n and \tilde{Z}^n . If $n = \infty$, by Fatou's lemma¹ we have

$$\sup_{\substack{0 \leq t, s \leq T \\ |t-s| \leq h}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{Z}_t^\infty - \tilde{Z}_s^\infty|^4 \right] \leq \sup_{\substack{0 \leq t, s \leq T \\ |t-s| \leq h}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{Z}_t^n - \tilde{Z}_s^n|^4 \right] \leq Ch^2$$

which proves (2.11). By Kolmogorov's continuity theorem, \tilde{Z}^n admits a continuous modification for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Next, we prove (2.10) with $n = \infty$. Let \mathcal{D}_m denote the m -th dyadic set of $[0, T]$. Since $(\tilde{Z}_t^n)_{t \in \mathcal{D}_m}$ converges in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to $(\tilde{Z}_t^\infty)_{t \in \mathcal{D}_m}$, we also have a.s. convergence up to a subsequence of $\max_{t \in \mathcal{D}_m} |\tilde{Z}_t^n|^4$ to $\max_{t \in \mathcal{D}_m} |\tilde{Z}_t^\infty|^4$: thus, by Fatou lemma and (2.4) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{t \in \mathcal{D}_m} |\tilde{Z}_t^\infty|^4 \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{t \in \mathcal{D}_m} |\tilde{Z}_t^n|^4 \right] \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E} [|\eta_x|^4]). \quad (2.12)$$

By Beppo-Levi we can pass in the limit in (2.12) as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence (2.10) follows from the continuity of \tilde{Z}^∞ .

Now, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$: since $(\tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{W}^n)$ is equal in law to (Z^n, W^n) , then $\tilde{W}_t^n - \tilde{W}_s^n$ is independent of $(\tilde{Z}_r^n, \tilde{W}_r^n)_{r \in [0, s]}$ (and therefore, of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_s^n$). Using also that \tilde{W}^n is a Gaussian process (because it is equal in law to W), this suffices to prove that \tilde{W}^n is a Brownian motion with respect to the filtration $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$. This result extends to $n = \infty$ by virtue of Remark 2.2. \square

2.4 Step 4: SDE for \tilde{X}_t^n with $n \in \mathbb{N}$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, \tilde{Z}^n is continuous and adapted to $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$, and therefore progressively measurable: by (1.7) and Fubini's theorem, also the processes $\Sigma^n(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_t^n})$ are progressively measurable and therefore the stochastic integrals

$$\int_0^t \Sigma^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x, n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\},$$

¹Up to sub-sequences, we have a.s. convergence of \tilde{X}_t^n to \tilde{X}_t^∞ for any t .

are well-defined.

Lemma 2.4. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{W}^{x,n})$ solves the SDE

$$d\tilde{X}_t^n = B^n(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_t^n})dt + \Sigma^n(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_t^n})d\tilde{W}_t^{x,n}. \quad (2.13)$$

An analogous result is valid for $(\tilde{Y}^n, \tilde{W}^{y,n})$.

The proof of Lemma 2.4 derives from a standard approximation argument (cf. [18], p.89) and is postponed to Section 2.6.

2.5 Step 5: SDE for \tilde{X}_t^∞

A key step in the proof is the following proposition which states that we can pass in the limit in (2.13). Here we rely on the compactness argument used in [40] that allows to “freeze” the degenerate component $\tilde{X}_{0,t}^n$ in order to apply *Krylov’s estimates* to the non-degenerate component $\tilde{X}_{1,t}^n$. Since the coefficients have linear growth at infinity, we employ the broader form of Krylov’s bounds provided by Lemma 3 of [25].

Proposition 2.5. The process \tilde{X}_t^∞ in (2.9) solves the SDE

$$\tilde{X}_t^\infty = \tilde{X}_0^\infty + \int_0^t B(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty})ds + \int_0^t \Sigma(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty})d\tilde{W}_s^{x,\infty}.$$

Proof. We split the proof in three steps. We prove the L^1 -convergence of the drift and the convergence in probability of the diffusive part as we take the limit in (2.13) as n tends to infinity.

Step I: the ε -net.

Let ε and α be two fixed positive constants. By Ascoli-Arzelà’s theorem, for any $h \in \mathbb{N}$ the space

$$C_h^\alpha := \{\varphi \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{N-d}) \mid |\varphi(t)| \leq h, |\varphi(t) - \varphi(s)| \leq h|t - s|^\alpha, t, s \in [0, T]\} \quad (2.14)$$

is totally bounded. Hence, there exists a finite collection of functions $\varphi_1^{(h)}, \dots, \varphi_{\kappa_\varepsilon}^{(h)} \in C_h^\alpha$, which we call an ε -net, such that

$$C_h^\alpha = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\kappa_\varepsilon} Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_j^{(h)}), \quad Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_j^{(h)}) := \{\varphi \in C_h^\alpha \mid \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\varphi(t) - \varphi_j^{(h)}(t)| < \varepsilon\}. \quad (2.15)$$

Here $\kappa_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ depends only on ε , α , T , the dimension $N - d$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, assume $\alpha < 1/2$: by (2.11) and Kolmogorov’s continuity theorem, $\tilde{Z}^n(\omega) \in C^\alpha([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{2N})$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by (2.10)-(2.11) and Markov inequality, there exists $h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left(\tilde{X}_{0,\cdot}^n \in C_h^\alpha\right) \cap \left(\tilde{Y}_{0,\cdot}^n \in C_h^\alpha\right)\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\},$$

with h dependent on ε but not on $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Thus, we also have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_{n,\varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \mathcal{B}_{n,\varepsilon} := \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{\kappa_\varepsilon} \left(\tilde{X}_{0,\cdot}^n \in Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_i^{(h)})\right) \cap \left(\tilde{Y}_{0,\cdot}^n \in Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_j^{(h)})\right) \quad (2.16)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Again, notice that κ_ε depends on ε , α , T and the dimension $N - d$, but not on n .

By estimate (2.10), which is uniform in n , for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $M_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$P(\mathcal{D}_{n,\varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{n,\varepsilon} := \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{Z}_t^n| < M_\varepsilon \right) \cap \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\tilde{Z}_t^\infty| < M_\varepsilon \right) \quad (2.17)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. In conclusion, setting

$$\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon} := \mathcal{B}_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \mathcal{D}_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad (2.18)$$

by (2.16) and (2.17) we have

$$P(\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad \mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon} = \bigcup_{i,j=1}^{\kappa_\varepsilon} \mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j} := \left(\tilde{X}_{0,\cdot}^n \in Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_i^{(h)}) \right) \cap \left(\tilde{Y}_{0,\cdot}^n \in Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_j^{(h)}) \right) \cap \mathcal{D}_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon, \quad (2.19)$$

with $Q_{\varepsilon,h}(\varphi_i^{(h)})$ as in (2.15). Notice that, without loss of generality, we can modify the sets $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}$ to be mutually disjoint.

Remark 2.6. By the uniform estimates (2.10)-(2.11) and the total boundedness of C_h^α in (2.14), the number κ_ε of elements of the ε -net is independent of n . We explicitly indicate the dependence of κ_ε on ε due to the delicate estimates such as (2.24) where κ_ε appears as the upper limit in the summation (see [40], page 13 for comparison).

Step II: L^1 -convergence of the drift.

We prove that, for any arbitrary $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \left| B^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - B(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) \right| ds \right] \leq \delta.$$

Let us fix $\delta > 0$ and notice that, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ which depends on δ and will be chosen appropriately later, we have

$$\int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\left| B^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - B(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) \right| \right] ds \leq \mathbf{E}_1^{n,m} + \mathbf{E}_2^{n,m} + \mathbf{E}_3^m \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}_1^{n,m} := \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\left| B^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - B^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) \right| \right] ds, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_2^{n,m} := \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\left| B^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - B^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) \right| \right] ds,$$

$$\mathbf{E}_3^m := \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\left| B^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) - B(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) \right| \right] ds. \quad (2.22)$$

◇ **The term $\mathbf{E}_1^{n,m}$.**

We consider $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}$ in (2.18): the value of ε will be selected later depending on δ . We have

$$\mathbf{E}_1^{n,m} \leq \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{E} \left[\left| b^n(s, x, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, x, \tilde{Y}_s^n) \right| \right]_{x=\tilde{X}_s^n} \right] ds =$$

(by the freezing lemma, being \tilde{X}_s^n independent of \tilde{Y}_s^n)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\left| b^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{Y}_s^n) \right| \right] ds \leq \\ &\leq \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}}) \left| b^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{Y}_s^n) \right| \right] ds \leq \end{aligned}$$

(by the linear growth of b uniformly in n , the fact that $\mathbf{P}(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}) \leq \varepsilon$ and (2.10))

$$\leq \varepsilon CT(1 + \mathbf{E} [|\eta_x|^4]) + I^{n,m} \quad (2.23)$$

where, by (2.19),

$$\begin{aligned} I^{n,m} &:= \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon} \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}} \left| b^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \tilde{Y}_s^n) \right| \right] ds \\ &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon} (I_1^{n,m,i,j} + I_2^{n,m,i,j} + I_3^{n,m,i,j}) \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}$ as in (2.19) and

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^{n,m,i,j} &= \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}} \left| b^n(s, \tilde{X}_{0,s}^n, \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \tilde{Y}_{0,s}^n, \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) - b^n(s, \varphi_i(s), \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \varphi_j(s), \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) \right| \right] ds, \\ I_2^{n,m,i,j} &= \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}} \left| b^n(s, \varphi_i(s), \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \varphi_j(s), \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) - b^m(s, \varphi_i(s), \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \varphi_j(s), \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) \right| \right] ds, \\ I_3^{n,m,i,j} &= \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}} \left| b^m(s, \varphi_i(s), \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \varphi_j(s), \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) - b^m(s, \tilde{X}_{0,s}^n, \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \tilde{Y}_{0,s}^n, \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) \right| \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 1.3, $b^n(s, \cdot, \cdot)$ and $b^m(s, \cdot, \cdot)$ are uniformly continuous on Q_{M_ε} in (2.1), with respect to the degenerate variables x_0, y_0 , uniformly in s, n and m ; thus, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon} (I_1^{n,m,i,j} + I_3^{n,m,i,j}) \leq \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon} \frac{\delta}{3} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}) \leq \frac{\delta}{3} \quad (2.24)$$

since $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon$, are pairwise disjoint.

Remark 2.7. Clearly, $\Sigma_1 \Sigma_1^*$ is a symmetric $d \times d$ matrix that satisfies the non-degeneracy condition

$$\langle \Sigma_1 \Sigma_1^* \xi, \xi \rangle = |\Sigma_1^* \xi|^2 \geq \lambda^2 |\xi|^2, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2.25)$$

since, by (1.5),

$$\lambda |\xi|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \sigma_1(t, x, y) \xi, \xi \rangle \mu(dy) = \langle \xi, \Sigma_1^*(t, x, \mu) \xi \rangle \leq |\xi| |\Sigma_1^*(t, x, \mu) \xi|.$$

To estimate $I_2^{n,m,i,j}$ we use the Krylov's bounds for the process $(\tilde{X}_{1,t}^n, \tilde{Y}_{1,t}^n)$ which, by Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.7, solves a non-degenerate SDE. Setting

$$g_{ij}^n(t, x_1, y_1) := b^n(t, \varphi_i(t), x_1, \varphi_j(t), y_1), \quad t \in [0, T], x_1, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

we have

$$I_2^{n,m,i,j} \leq \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}} \left| b^n(s, \varphi_i(s), \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \varphi_j(s), \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) - b^m(s, \varphi_i(s), \tilde{X}_{1,s}^n, \varphi_j(s), \tilde{Y}_{1,s}^n) \right| \right] ds \leq$$

(by the Krylov's bounds of Lemma 3 in [25])

$$\leq C \|g_{ij}^n - g_{ij}^m\|_{L^{2d+1}([0,T] \times D_{M_\varepsilon} \times D_{M_\varepsilon})} \quad (2.26)$$

where $D_{M_\varepsilon} = \{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |x_1| < M_\varepsilon\}$ with M_ε defined in (2.17) and the positive constant C depends only on d, M_ε , the linear growth coefficient \mathbf{c} and the ellipticity constant λ . From (2.26) it follows that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon} I_2^{n,m,i,j} \leq \frac{\delta}{3} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq \kappa_\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}^{i,j}) \leq \frac{\delta}{3} \quad (2.27)$$

if m, n are suitably large.

Combining (2.23), (2.24) and (2.27), for $\varepsilon > 0$ suitably small and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ suitably large, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_1^{n,m} \leq \delta. \quad (2.28)$$

◇ **The term \mathbf{E}_3^m .**

The term \mathbf{E}_3^m can be estimated exactly like $\mathbf{E}_1^{n,m}$ after extending Krylov's bounds to the limiting process $\tilde{Z}_{1,t}^\infty := (\tilde{X}_{1,t}^\infty, \tilde{Y}_{1,t}^\infty)$. Thus, we want to prove that for every bounded, non-negative and Borel measurable function g with support in $[0, T] \times D_M \times D_M$ we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[g(t, \tilde{Z}_{1,t}^\infty) \right] dt \leq C \|g\|_{L^{2d+1}([0,T] \times D_M \times D_M)} \quad (2.29)$$

with C dependent only on d, M, \mathbf{c} and λ . The bound is pretty direct for continuous functions, indeed if g is also continuous then by weak convergence we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[g(t, \tilde{Z}_{1,t}^\infty) \right] dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[g(t, \tilde{Z}_{1,t}^n) \right] dt \leq C \|g\|_{L^{2d+1}([0,T] \times D_M \times D_M)}. \quad (2.30)$$

Next, we prove (2.29) for $g = \mathbb{1}_K$ where K is a compact subset of $[0, T] \times D_M \times D_M$: by Urysohn's lemma, there exists a sequence of continuous functions, with values in $[0, 1]$, such that $g_n \searrow \mathbb{1}_K$. By Lebesgue's theorem, we have

$$\nu(K) := \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_K(t, \tilde{Z}_{1,t}^\infty) \right] dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[g_n(t, \tilde{Z}_{1,t}^\infty) \right] dt \leq \quad (2.31)$$

(by (2.30))

$$\leq C \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_n\|_{L^{2d+1}([0,T] \times D_M \times D_M)} = C \|g\|_{L^{2d+1}([0,T] \times D_M \times D_M)}.$$

Now, ν in (2.31), as any finite measure on Borel sets, is regular²: thus, estimate (2.29)

² $\nu(D) = \sup\{\nu(K) \mid K \subseteq D, K \text{ compact}\}$ for any Borel set D .

extends to $g = \mathbf{1}_D$ where D is any Borel subset of $[0, T] \times D_M \times D_M$. As a final step, for any non-negative and Borel measurable function g there exists an increasing sequence g_n of simple functions (i.e. linear combinations of indicator functions of Borel sets) such that $g_n(t, z) \nearrow g(t, z)$ for any (t, z) : an easy application of Beppo Levi's theorem allows to conclude the proof of (2.29).

◇ **The term $\mathbf{E}_2^{n,m}$.**

Let ε and m be fixed as previously, ensuring that (2.28) and an analogous estimate for \mathbf{E}_3^m hold. Just as for (2.23), we also have

$$\mathbf{E}_2^{n,m} \leq \varepsilon CT(1 + \mathbf{E}[|\eta_x|^4]) + I^{n,m}$$

where

$$I^{n,m} := \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} \left| b^m(s, \xi, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, x, \tilde{Y}_s^\infty) \right| \right] \Big|_{\xi=\tilde{X}_s^n, x=\tilde{X}_s^\infty} \right] ds$$

with $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}$ as in (2.18). Now, $b^m(s, \cdot, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous on Q_{M_ε} in (2.1), uniformly in $s \in [0, T]$. Thus, we have $I^{n,m} \leq I_1^{n,m} + I_2^{n,m}$ where

$$I_1^{n,m} := \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} \left| b^m(s, \xi, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, x, \tilde{Y}_s^\infty) \right| \right] \Big|_{\xi=\tilde{X}_s^n, x=\tilde{X}_s^\infty} \right] ds \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by weak convergence of \tilde{X}_s^n to \tilde{X}_s^∞ for any fixed $s \in [0, t]$, and by dominated convergence in the time-integral. Similarly, we have

$$I_2^{n,m} = \int_0^t \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{n,\varepsilon}} \left| b^m(s, x, \tilde{Y}_s^n) - b^m(s, x, \tilde{Y}_s^\infty) \right| \right] \Big|_{x=\tilde{X}_s^\infty} \right] ds \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by weak convergence of \tilde{Y}_s^n to \tilde{Y}_s^∞ .

Step III: convergence in probability of stochastic integrals.

We show convergence in probability

$$\mathbf{I}^n := \int_0^t \Sigma_1^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,n} - \int_0^t \Sigma_1^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,\infty} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbf{P}} 0$$

by proving that, for any positive constants c and δ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|\mathbf{I}^n| > c) \leq \delta.$$

As in Step II (cf. (2.20)), for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $\mathbf{I}^n = \mathbf{I}_1^{n,m} + \mathbf{I}_2^{n,m} + \mathbf{I}_3^m$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_1^{n,m} &:= \int_0^t \left(\Sigma_1^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - \Sigma_1^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) \right) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,n}, \\ \mathbf{I}_2^{n,m} &:= \int_0^t \Sigma_1^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,n} - \int_0^t \Sigma_1^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{I}_3^m := \int_0^t \left(\Sigma_1^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) - \Sigma_1(s, \tilde{X}_s^\infty, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^\infty}) \right) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,\infty}.$$

By Markov inequality and Itô's isometry, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(|\mathbf{I}_1^{n,m}| > c) \leq \frac{1}{c^2} \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^t \left| \Sigma_1^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - \Sigma_1^m(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) \right|^2 ds \right].$$

Then, proceeding as in the proof of estimate (2.28) for $\mathbf{E}_1^{n,m}$ in (2.21), we can show that for any $c, \delta > 0$ there exists a suitably large $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|\mathbf{I}_1^{n,m}| > c) \leq \delta.$$

Similarly, the term \mathbf{I}_3^m can be treated as \mathbf{E}_3^m in (2.22).

Let us assume that m is fixed as stated above. We are left with the term $\mathbf{I}_2^{n,m}$, which sets itself apart from the other two due to the stochastic integrals being associated with distinct Brownian motions. To deal with this term, we rely on the following lemma, that is a specific instance of the results in Chapter 2, Section 3 of [33].

Lemma 2.8 (Skorokhod). *On a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, let W^n be a sequence of Brownian motions and f^n be a sequence of stochastic processes such that (f_t^n, W_t^n) converges in probability to (f_t^∞, W_t^∞) for any $t \in [0, T]$, where W^∞ is a Brownian motion. Suppose that:*

a) *the stochastic integrals*

$$\int_0^t f_s^n dW_s^n, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

are well-defined for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$;

b) *f^n are uniformly bounded, i.e. $|f_t^n(\omega)| \leq C$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [0, T]$ and $\omega \in \Omega$;*

c) *for any $c > 0$*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{0 \leq t, s \leq T \\ |t-s| \leq h}} \mathbf{P}(|f_t^n - f_s^n| > c) = 0.$$

Then

$$\int_0^t f_s^n dW_s^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbf{P}} \int_0^t f_s^\infty dW_s^\infty, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

We apply Lemma 2.8 with $f_t^n = \Sigma_1^m(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_t^n})$ and $W_t^n = \tilde{W}_t^{x,n}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Conditions a), b) and c) are readily verified since $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed and it is clear that f^n are uniformly bounded and uniformly continuous in virtue of the boundedness and smoothness of Σ_1^m , and estimate (2.11). Moreover, we already observed in Step 4 that the stochastic integrals are well-defined and $\tilde{W}_t^{x,n}$ converges in probability to $\tilde{W}_t^{x,\infty}$ for any $t \in [0, T]$, by (2.9). To conclude, we show convergence in probability (actually, even in $L^1(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$) of f_t^n to f_t^∞ for any $t \in [0, T]$. We have

$$\mathbf{E}[|f_t^n - f_t^\infty|] \leq \mathbf{E}_1^n + \mathbf{E}_2^n + \mathbf{E}_3^n$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}_1^n := \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sigma_1^m(t, x, \tilde{Y}_t^n) - \sigma_1^m(t, x, \tilde{Y}_t^\infty) \right| \Big|_{x=\tilde{X}_t^\infty} \right] \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by weak convergence of \tilde{Y}_t^n to \tilde{Y}_t^∞ in the inner expectation and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem in the outer expectation; for any fixed but arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathbf{E}_2^n := \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{|\tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_t^\infty| \leq \varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \sigma_1^m(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, y) - \sigma_1^m(t, \tilde{X}_t^\infty, y) \right| \mu_{\tilde{Y}_t^n}(dy) \right] \leq C_m \varepsilon$$

where C_m is the Lipschitz constant of σ_1^m , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_3^n &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{|\tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_t^\infty| > \varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \sigma_1^m(t, \tilde{X}_t^n, y) - \sigma_1^m(t, \tilde{X}_t^\infty, y) \right| \mu_{\tilde{Y}_t^n}(dy) \right] \\ &\leq 2 \|\sigma_1^m\|_\infty \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_t^\infty \right| > \varepsilon \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \end{aligned}$$

by convergence in probability of \tilde{X}_t^n to \tilde{X}_t^∞ (cf. (2.9)). □

2.6 Proof of Lemma 2.4

We prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_0^n - \int_0^t B^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) ds - \int_0^t \Sigma^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x, n} \right| \right] = 0.$$

For simplicity, we consider here only the case $B^n \equiv 0$, the general case being completely analogous.

Let $[t]_m := \frac{[2^m t]}{2^m}$ be the dyadic approximation of t ; we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_0^n - \int_0^t \Sigma^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x, n} \right|^2 \right] \leq E_1^m + E_2^m$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^m &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_0^n - \int_0^t \Sigma^n([s]_m, \tilde{X}_{[s]_m}^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_{[s]_m}^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x, n} \right|^2 \right], \\ E_2^m &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \left(\Sigma^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) - \Sigma^n([s]_m, \tilde{X}_{[s]_m}^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_{[s]_m}^n}) \right) d\tilde{W}_s^{x, n} \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^m &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_0^n - \int_0^t \Sigma^n([s]_m, \tilde{X}_{[s]_m}^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_{[s]_m}^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x, n} \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{X}_t^n - \tilde{X}_0^n - \sum_{k2^{-m} \leq t} \Sigma^n(k2^{-m}, \tilde{X}_{k2^{-m}}^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_{k2^{-m}}^n}) \left(\tilde{W}_{(k+1)2^{-m}}^{x, n} - \tilde{W}_{k2^{-m}}^{x, n} \right) \right|^2 \right] = \end{aligned}$$

(by the equivalence of $(\tilde{Z}^n, \tilde{W}^{x,n})$ and (Z^n, W))

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X_t^n - \eta - \sum_{k2^{-m} \leq t} \Sigma^n(k2^{-m}, X_{k2^{-m}}^n, \mu_{Y_{k2^{-m}}^n}) (W_{(k+1)2^{-m}}^n - W_{k2^{-m}}^n) \right|^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X_t^n - \eta - \sum_{k2^{-m} \leq t} \left(\int_{\Omega} \sigma^n(t, x, Y_{k2^{-m}}^n) d\mathbb{P} \right) \Big|_{x=X_{k2^{-m}}^n} (W_{(k+1)2^{-m}} - W_{k2^{-m}}) \right|^2 \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since (Z^n, W) solves (2.2) (with $B^n \equiv 0$, by assumption) and by the continuity and boundedness of σ^n . We also have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_2^m = 0$$

by standard approximation of a stochastic integral with bounded and continuous coefficient. This proves that the processes \tilde{X}_t^n and

$$\tilde{X}_0^n + \int_0^t \Sigma^n(s, \tilde{X}_s^n, \mu_{\tilde{Y}_s^n}) d\tilde{W}_s^{x,n}$$

are modifications, but since they are continuous this suffices to conclude.

3 Uniqueness: proof of Theorem 1.8

Let $(X_t^i, W_t^i)_{t \in [0, T]}$, for $i = 1, 2$, be two weak solutions of the MKV equation (1.11) with flows $\mu^i = (\mu_t^i)_{t \in [0, T]}$ respectively. If we show that $\mu^1 = \mu^2$ then weak/strong uniqueness will follow from weak/strong uniqueness of the non-MKV equation (1.12).

Let us first consider the case where B_1 is bounded. Up to transferring the two solutions to the canonical space (cf., for instance, [32] p.152 or [31], Theorem IX.1.7.), we can assume that X^1, X^2 are defined on the same filtered probability space and are solutions w.r.t. the same Brownian motion W , that is for $i = 1, 2$ we have

$$\begin{cases} dX_{0,t}^i = B_0(t, X_t^i) dt, \\ dX_{1,t}^i = B_1(t, X_t^i, \mu_t^i) dt + \Sigma_1(t, X_t^i) dW_t. \end{cases}$$

Since B_0 and Σ_1 are independent of μ , by Girsanov's theorem we can "pass" from one solution to the other: precisely, let

$$\lambda_t^1 = \Sigma_1^{-1}(t, X_t^1) (B_1(t, X_t^1, \mu_t^1) - B_1(t, X_t^1, \mu_t^2)), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\gamma_t^1 = \exp \left(- \int_0^t \lambda_s^1 dW_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |\lambda_s^1|^2 ds \right), \quad (3.2)$$

$$W_t^1 = W_t + \int_0^t \lambda_s^1 ds. \quad (3.3)$$

Since B_1 (and consequently λ^1) is a bounded process, then γ^1 is a martingale and, by Girsanov's theorem, W^1 is a Brownian motion under the probability measure P^1 defined by $\frac{dP^1}{dP}|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \gamma_t^1$. Therefore, we have

$$dX_{1,t}^1 = B_1(t, X_t^1, \mu_t^2)dt + \Sigma_1(t, X_t^1)dW_t^1,$$

and, under the probability P^1 , X^1 is a solution to the same SDE as X^2 . Due to the weak uniqueness hypothesis, X^1 under P^1 has the same law as X^2 under P , and in particular for any Borel set $H \in \mathcal{B}_N$ we have

$$\mu_t^2(H) = P(X_t^2 \in H) = P^1(X_t^1 \in H).$$

Thus, we can estimate the total variation distance between μ_t^1 and μ_t^2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_t^1 - \mu_t^2\|_{\text{TV}} &:= 2 \sup_{H \in \mathcal{B}_N} |\mu_t^1(H) - \mu_t^2(H)| \\ &= 2 \sup_{H \in \mathcal{B}_N} |P(X_t^1 \in H) - P^1(X_t^1 \in H)| \\ &\leq \|P|_{\mathcal{F}_t} - P^1|_{\mathcal{F}_t}\|_{\text{TV}} = \end{aligned}$$

(by Scheffé's theorem (see, for instance, [36] Sect.2.2.4), since γ_t^1 is the density of P^1 with respect to P on \mathcal{F}_t)

$$= 2\mathbb{E}[1 - \gamma_t^1 \wedge 1] \leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\gamma_t^1)^2] - 1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Now, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\gamma_T^1)^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-2\int_0^T \lambda_t^1 dW_t - \int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-2\int_0^T \lambda_t^1 dW_t - 4\int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)\exp\left(3\int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)\right] \leq \end{aligned}$$

(by Cauchy-Bouniakowsky-Schwarz inequality)

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-4\int_0^T \lambda_t^1 dW_t - 8\int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)\right]}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(6\int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)\right]} \leq$$

(since $\exp\left(-4\int_0^T \lambda_t^1 dW_t - 8\int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)$ is positive local martingale, and therefore a super-martingale)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(6\int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt\right)\right]} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(6\int_0^T \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Sigma_1^{-1}(t, X_t^1)b_1(t, X_t^1, y)(\mu_t^1(dy) - \mu_t^2(dy))\right|^2 dt\right)\right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(6\|\Sigma_1^{-1}b_1\|_\infty^2 \int_0^T \|\mu_t^1 - \mu_t^2\|_{\text{TV}}^2 dt\right)\right]}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Notice that, since the last value is non-random, we may drop the expectation: thus, plugging (3.5) into (3.4) and setting $v(t) := \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mu_s^1 - \mu_s^2\|_{TV}$, we obtain

$$v(T) \leq 2\sqrt{\exp(CTv^2(T)) - 1},$$

with $C := 3\|\Sigma_1^{-1}b_1\|_\infty^2$. Let $\alpha_0 > 0$ be such that $e^\alpha \leq 2\alpha + 1$ for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_0$: then, since $v(T) \leq 2$ by definition, for $T \leq \frac{\alpha_0}{4C}$ we have

$$v(T) \leq 2\sqrt{2CT}v(T)$$

which implies $v(T) = 0$, at least if $2\sqrt{2CT} < 1$.

To establish the result for any $T > 0$, we proceed via a straightforward inductive argument. Let us fix some $T > 0$ such that $v(T) = 0$. We then prove that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the condition $v(kT) = 0$ implies $v((k+1)T) = 0$. Indeed, let

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_t^{(k)} &:= \exp\left(-\int_{kT}^t \lambda_s^1 dW_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_{kT}^t |\lambda_s^1|^2 ds\right), \\ W_t^{(k)} &:= W_t + \int_{kT}^t \lambda_s^1 ds, \quad t \in [kT, (k+1)T]. \end{aligned}$$

By Girsanov's theorem $(W_t^{(k)})_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]}$ is a Brownian motion starting at W_{kT} under the probability measure with density $\gamma_{(k+1)T}^{(k)}$ relative to P . Repeating the calculations leading to (3.4) and (3.5), we obtain

$$v((k+1)T) \leq 2\sqrt{\exp(CTv^2((k+1)T)) - 1}$$

with $C = 3\|\Sigma_1^{-1}B_1\|_\infty^2$. As earlier, the conditions $2\sqrt{2CT} < 1$ and $T < \frac{\alpha_0}{4C}$ guarantee that $v((k+1)T) = 0$ as required. This completes the induction.

We now prove the thesis under the linear growth condition (1.13). We have the following preliminary estimate. Let X be a weak solution of (1.11) on $[0, T]$: there exists a positive constant $\delta = \delta(r, \mathbf{c}, \lambda, T)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\delta|\bar{X}_T|^2}\right] < \infty, \quad \bar{X}_T := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t|. \quad (3.6)$$

Indeed, by (1.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t| &\leq |\eta| + \mathbf{c} \int_0^t (1 + |X_s|) ds + \left| \int_0^t \Sigma_1(s, X_s) dW_s \right| \\ &\leq |\eta| + \mathbf{c}T + J_T + \mathbf{c} \int_0^t |X_s| ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_T := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \Sigma_1(s, X_s) dW_s \right|,$$

and Grönwall's lemma yields

$$\bar{X}_T \leq (|\eta| + \mathbf{c}T + J_T) e^{\mathbf{c}T}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\delta |\bar{X}_T|^2} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{3e^{2\mathbf{c}T} \delta (|\eta|^2 + \mathbf{c}^2 T^2 + J_T^2)} \right],$$

which is finite if $\delta > 0$ is suitably small, thanks to assumption (1.14) on the initial datum and to standard exponential estimates for stochastic integrals, given that Σ_1 is bounded (cf., instance, Prop. 13.2.4 in [29]). This proves (3.6). Clearly, if (3.6) holds for some $T > 0$ then it holds also for any $t \in [0, T]$ with the same δ .

Now, let λ^1 be as in (3.1): by (1.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\lambda_t^1|^2 dt \right) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\mathbf{c} \|\Sigma_1^{-1}\|_\infty^2 \int_0^T (1 + |X_t^1|^2) dt \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\mathbf{c} \|\Sigma_1^{-1}\|_\infty^2 T (1 + |\bar{X}_T^1|^2) \right) \right] < \infty \end{aligned}$$

if $T > 0$ is suitably small, thanks to (3.6). Thus Novikov's condition is satisfied, γ^1 in (3.2) is a martingale and, by Girsanov's theorem, W^1 in (3.3) is a Brownian motion under the probability measure P^1 defined by $\frac{dP^1}{dP} |_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \gamma_t^1$.

Next, we can retrace the proof given in the case of bounded b : using the linear growth condition (1.13) and setting $c_1 = 12\mathbf{c}^2 \|\Sigma_1^{-1}\|_\infty^2$, estimate (3.5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [(\gamma_T^1)^2] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{c_1 (1 + |\bar{X}_T^1|^2) T v^2(T)} \right]} \\ &\leq e^{\frac{c_1}{2} T v^2(T)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{c_1 T v^2(T) |\bar{X}_T^1|^2} \right]}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Now, recalling that $v(T) \leq 2$, as before we have

$$e^{\frac{c_1}{2} T v^2(T)} \leq 1 + c_1 T v^2(T) \tag{3.8}$$

if T is suitably small. On the other hand, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{c_1 T v^2(T) |\bar{X}_T^1|^2} \right] = 1 + \int_0^{+\infty} 2c_1 T v^2(T) x e^{c_1 T v^2(T) x^2} P(\bar{X}_T^1 \geq x) dx \leq$$

(with $\delta > 0$ as in (3.6) and using again $v(T) \leq 2$)

$$\leq 1 + \frac{c_1 T v^2(T)}{\delta} \int_0^{+\infty} 2\delta x e^{(4c_1 T - \delta) x^2} e^{\delta x^2} P(\bar{X}_T^1 \geq x) dx \leq$$

(if T is sufficiently small so that $4c_1 T - \delta < 0$)

$$\leq 1 + \frac{c_1 \mathbb{E}[e^{\delta |\bar{X}_T^1|^2}]}{\delta} T v^2(T)$$

and by the elementary inequality $\sqrt{1+x} \leq 1 + \frac{x}{2}$ valid for $x \geq -1$, we have

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{c_1 T v^2(T) |\bar{X}_T^1|^2} \right]} \leq 1 + \frac{c_1 \mathbb{E} [e^{\delta |\bar{X}_T^1|^2}]}{2\delta} T v^2(T). \quad (3.9)$$

To sum up, as in (3.4) we have

$$v(T) \leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(\gamma_t^1)^2] - 1} \leq$$

(by (3.7),(3.8) and (3.9), for some positive constant C)

$$\leq \sqrt{CT} v(T)$$

which implies the existence of $T > 0$ such that $v(T) = 0$. The proof is completed by reiterating the preceding inductive argument.

References

- [1] Mireille Bossy, Jean-Francois Jabir, and Denis Talay. On conditional McKean Lagrangian stochastic models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 151(1-2):319–351, 2011.
- [2] René Carmona and Francois Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*, volume 83 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games.
- [3] P. E. Chaudru de Raynal. Strong well posedness of McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations with Hölder drift. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(1):79–107, 2020.
- [4] Paul-Éric Chaudru de Raynal, Igor Honoré, and Stéphane Menozzi. Strong regularization by Brownian noise propagating through a weak Hörmander structure. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 184(1-2):1–83, 2022.
- [5] Paul-Éric Chaudru de Raynal, J. F. Jabir, and S. Menozzi. Multidimensional stable driven McKean-Vlasov SDEs with distributional interaction kernel: a regularization by noise perspective. *Preprint arXiv:2205.11866*, 2024.
- [6] Paul-Éric Chaudru de Raynal, J. F. Jabir, and S. Menozzi. Multidimensional stable driven McKean-Vlasov SDEs with distributional interaction kernel: Critical thresholds and related models. *Preprint arXiv:2302.09900*, 2024.
- [7] Dan Crisan, Thomas G. Kurtz, and Yoonjung Lee. Conditional distributions, exchangeable particle systems, and stochastic partial differential equations. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 50(3):946–974, 2014.
- [8] Camillo De Lellis. Ordinary differential equations with rough coefficients and the renormalization theorem of Ambrosio [after Ambrosio, DiPerna, Lions]. Number 317, pages Exp. No. 972, viii, 175–203. 2008. Séminaire Bourbaki. Vol. 2006/2007.
- [9] Marco Di Francesco and Andrea Pascucci. On a class of degenerate parabolic equations of Kolmogorov type. *AMRX Appl. Math. Res. Express*, (3):77–116, 2005.
- [10] Tadahisa Funaki. A certain class of diffusion processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equations. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 67(3):331–348, 1984.
- [11] Zimo Hao, Xicheng Zhang, Rongchan Zhu, and Xiangchan Zhu. Singular kinetic equations and applications. *Preprint arXiv:2108.05042*, 2021.
- [12] Yaozhong Hu, Michael A. Kouritzin, and Jiayu Zheng. Nonlinear McKean-Vlasov diffusions under the weak Hörmander condition with quantile-dependent coefficients. *Potential Anal.*, 60(3):1093–1119, 2024.

- [13] Elena Issoglio, Stefano Pagliarani, Francesco Russo, and Davide Trevisani. Degenerate McKean-Vlasov equations with drift in anisotropic negative Besov spaces. *Preprint arXiv:2401.09165*, 2024.
- [14] M. Kac. Foundations of kinetic theory. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. III*, pages 171–197. Univ. California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles, Calif., 1956.
- [15] Vassili N. Kolokoltsov. Nonlinear diffusions and stable-like processes with coefficients depending on the median or VaR. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 68(1):85–98, 2013.
- [16] N. V. Krylov. On Itô’s stochastic integral equations. *Theory Prob. Appl.*, 14(2):330–336 (English translation), 1969.
- [17] N. V. Krylov. Correction to the paper “Itô’s stochastic integral equations” (Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen. **14** (1969), 340–348). *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 17:392–393, 1972.
- [18] N. V. Krylov. *Controlled diffusion processes*, volume 14 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Translated from the 1977 Russian original by A. B. Aries, Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [19] Daniel Lacker, Mykhaylo Shkolnikov, and Jiacheng Zhang. Inverting the Markovian projection, with an application to local stochastic volatility models. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(5):2189–2211, 2020.
- [20] P. Langevin. Sur la théorie du mouvement brownien. *Compt. Rendus*, (146):530–533, 1908.
- [21] Anh-Dung Le. Well-posedness of McKean-Vlasov SDEs with density-dependent drift. *Preprint arXiv:2404.19499v1*, 2024.
- [22] Giacomo Lucertini, Stefano Pagliarani, and Andrea Pascucci. Optimal regularity for degenerate Kolmogorov equations in non-divergence form with rough-in-time coefficients. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 23(4):Paper No. 69, 37, 2023.
- [23] H. P. McKean, Jr. A class of Markov processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equations. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 56:1907–1911, 1966.
- [24] Stéphane Menozzi. Martingale problems for some degenerate Kolmogorov equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 128(3):756–802, 2018.
- [25] Y. Mishura and A. Yu. Veretennikov. Existence and uniqueness theorems for solutions of McKean-Vlasov stochastic equations. *Theory Probab. Math. Statist.*, (103):59–101, 2020.
- [26] Makiko Nisio. On the existence of solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Osaka Math. J.*, 10:185–208, 1973.
- [27] Stefano Pagliarani, Andrea Pascucci, and Michele Pignotti. Intrinsic Taylor formula for Kolmogorov-type homogeneous groups. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 435(2):1054–1087, 2016.
- [28] Andrea Pascucci. *PDE and martingale methods in option pricing*, volume 2 of *Bocconi & Springer Series*. Springer, Milan; Bocconi University Press, Milan, 2011.
- [29] Andrea Pascucci. *Probability Theory II – Stochastic Calculus*, volume 166 of *UNITEXT*. Springer Cham, 2024.
- [30] Andrea Pascucci and Antonello Pesce. Backward and forward filtering under the weak Hörmander condition. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 11(1):177–210, 2023.
- [31] Daniel Revuz and Marc Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1999.
- [32] L. C. G. Rogers and David Williams. *Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 2*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. Itô calculus, Reprint of the second (1994) edition.

- [33] A. V. Skorokhod. *Studies in the theory of random processes*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, MA, 1965. Translated from the Russian by Scripta Technica, Inc.
- [34] Daniel W. Stroock and S. R. Srinivasa Varadhan. *Multidimensional diffusion processes*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. Reprint of the 1997 edition.
- [35] Alain-Sol Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, volume 1464 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 165–251. Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [36] Alexandre B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2009. Revised and extended from the 2004 French original, Translated by Vladimir Zaiats.
- [37] A. Yu. Veretennikov. Strong solutions and explicit formulas for solutions of stochastic integral equations. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 111(153)(3):434–452, 480, 1980.
- [38] A. Yu. Veretennikov. Stochastic equations with diffusion that degenerates with respect to part of the variables. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 47(1):189–196, 1983.
- [39] A. Yu. Veretennikov. On weak solutions of strongly degenerate SDEs. *Avtomat. i Telemekh.*, (3):28–43, 2020.
- [40] A. Yu. Veretennikov. On weak existence of solutions of degenerate McKean–Vlasov equations. *to appear in Stochastics and Dynamics*, doi.org/10.1142/S0219493724500321, 2024.
- [41] Xicheng Zhang. Second order McKean-Vlasov SDEs and kinetic Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations. *Preprint arXiv:2109.01273v2*.
- [42] A. K. Zvonkin. A transformation of the phase space of a diffusion process that will remove the drift. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 93(135):129–149, 152, 1974.