

# Generalized Wasserstein Barycenters

Francesco Tornabene, Marco Veneroni, Giuseppe Savaré

November 12, 2024

## Abstract

We propose a generalization, where negative weights are allowed, of the Wasserstein barycenter of  $n$  probability measures. The barycenter is found, as usual, as a minimum of a functional. In this paper, we prove existence of a minimizer for probability measures on a separable Hilbert space and uniqueness in the case of one positive coefficient and  $n - 1$  negative ones. In the one-dimensional case, we characterize the quantile function of the unique minimum as the orthogonal projection of the  $L^2$ -barycenter of the quantiles on the cone of nonincreasing functions in  $L^2(0, 1)$ . Further, we provide a stability estimate in dimension one and a counterexample to uniqueness in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

**Keywords:** optimal transport, Wasserstein distance, barycenter, extrapolation

**MSC Classification:** 49J27, 49J45, 49Q22

## 1 Introduction and main results

In this paper, we introduce an extension of the barycenter problem studied by Agueh and Carlier [1] in the Wasserstein space  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . Throughout the article,  $X$  will denote a separable Hilbert space. Let  $n \geq 2$  be a given integer and for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  let  $\nu_i$  be given probability measures on  $X$  with finite second moments and let  $\lambda_i$  be real numbers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0$ . Denoting  $W_2^2$  the squared 2-Wasserstein distance, we study the following minimization problem:

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\nu_i, \mu), \quad (1.1)$$

which we call the *generalized* barycenter problem of the measures  $\nu_i$  with weights  $\lambda_i$ . In the usual barycenter problem, the weights  $\lambda_i$  satisfy  $0 < \lambda_i < 1$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ , while here we allow for negative  $\lambda_i$ 's, as long as the total sum is positive. This condition is necessary since, for  $x_i \in X$ , if  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i < 0$ , then

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x - x_i|^2 = -\infty.$$

We prove the existence of a solution of problem (1.1) and, in the particular case of one positive weight and  $n - 1$  negative ones, we are able to show uniqueness of the solution.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $X$  be a separable Hilbert space and let  $n \geq 2$  be a given integer. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  be given and let  $\lambda_i$  be real numbers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0$ . Define  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by*

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\nu_i, \mu).$$

*Then: (i) There exists a solution  $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  of the problem*

$$\min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{E}(\mu).$$

*(ii) If, in particular,  $\lambda_1 > 0$  and  $\lambda_i < 0$  for  $i = 2, \dots, n$ , then there exists a unique minimizer  $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  of  $\mathcal{E}$ .*

It should be noticed that uniqueness is false, in general, in the classical barycenter problem with positive weights in  $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Moreover, in the case  $X = \mathbb{R}$ , we provide an explicit characterization of the minimizer. Indeed, in the 1-dimensional case any probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  can be represented by its quantile function (see, e.g., [13, Theorem 2.18]), i.e., the pseudo-inverse  $X_\mu$  of its distribution function  $F_\mu$ :

$$\begin{aligned} F_\mu(x) &:= \mu((-\infty, x]), & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ X_\mu(w) &:= \inf\{x : F_\mu(x) > w\}, & \forall w \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

The map  $\mu \mapsto X_\mu$  is an isometry between  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , endowed with the 2-Wasserstein distance, and the convex cone  $\mathcal{K}$  of nondecreasing functions in the Hilbert space  $L^2(0, 1)$ . We denote by  $P_{\mathcal{K}}$  the orthogonal projection operator,  $P_{\mathcal{K}} : L^2(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ . Our main result, in the 1-dimensional case, is the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be a given integer. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  be given and let  $\lambda_i$  be real numbers such that  $m = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0$ . Then there exists a unique solution  $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  of*

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\nu_i, \mu),$$

and it is characterized by

$$X_{\bar{\mu}} = P_{\mathcal{K}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i}{m} X_{\nu_i} \right), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $X_{\nu_i} \in \mathcal{K}$  is the pseudo-inverse function of (the distribution function of)  $\nu_i$ .

## 1.1 Literature review and related problems

### Wasserstein barycenters

The barycenter of two probability measures, with positive weights adding to 1, is well-known as McCann's interpolation [8], while a complete study of the Wasserstein barycenters of  $n$  measures in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  was done in [1], where, in particular, it was shown the existence of a minimizer and the uniqueness, in the case where one of the  $\nu_i$ 's vanishes on small sets. In the present paper we do not require the absolute continuity of one of the measures, but in order to obtain uniqueness we need  $n - 1$  negative coefficients. In the one-dimensional case, if all weights  $\lambda_i$  are positive and all measures  $\nu_i$  are nonatomic, our characterization (1.2) reduces to the one-dimensional formula in [1, Section 6.1].

### Metric extrapolation

The barycenter of two measures, with weights  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\beta = 1 - \alpha < 0$ , was studied in [7] and [6] in the context of metric extrapolation for the Backward Differentiation Formula of order 2 (BDF2). This connection requires some explanation. Given a metric space  $(X, d)$  and a functional  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , the gradient flow of  $\Phi$  with respect to the metric  $d$  is formally given by the solutions  $u : [0, T] \rightarrow X$  of

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t) = -\nabla\Phi(u(t)),$$

or by its time-discrete equivalent  $(u_\tau^k) \in X$

$$\frac{u_\tau^k - u_\tau^{k-1}}{\tau} = -\nabla\Phi(u_\tau^k), \quad (1.3)$$

for a small time-step  $\tau > 0$ . A rigorous metric framework for the derivatives that appear in these equations was established in [2]. The minimizing movement scheme (also referred to as Implicit Euler method or Jordan-Kinderlehrer-Otto (JKO) stepping) provides, under suitable assumptions, a discrete approximation of the gradient flow equation, by solving a sequence of minimization problems defined by

$$u^k = \arg \min_{w \in X} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tau} d^2(u_\tau^{k-1}, w) + \Phi(w) \right\}.$$

The BDF2 scheme is a second-order discretization scheme, well-known for ODEs in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  since the 1950's (see, e.g., [5]), which was recently proposed to approximate gradient flows in metric spaces [7]. In the Euclidean setting, the time-discrete approximation (1.3) is substituted by

$$\frac{3u_\tau^k - 4u_\tau^{k-1} + u_\tau^{k-2}}{2\tau} = -\nabla\Phi(u_\tau^k),$$

which leads, in a JKO step, to the minimization of

$$\Psi(\tau, u_\tau^{k-2}, u_\tau^{k-1}; w) := \frac{1}{\tau} d^2(u_\tau^{k-1}, w) - \frac{1}{4\tau} d^2(u_\tau^{k-2}, w) + \Phi(w).$$

In [7] several examples of metric spaces  $(X, d)$  are given, such that a sequence of piecewise-constant interpolations of the discrete solutions  $(u_\tau^k)$  converges, locally uniformly in time, to a solution  $u \in \text{AC}^2([0, \infty), X)$  of the gradient flow of  $\Phi$ , in the sense of the following Evolutionary Variational Inequality (EVI)

$$\frac{1}{2} d^2(u(t), w) - \frac{1}{2} d^2(u(s), w) \leq \int_s^t \left[ \Phi(w) - \Phi(u(r)) - \frac{\lambda}{2} d^2(u(r), w) \right] dr,$$

for all  $0 \leq s < t$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is the  $\lambda$ -convexity modulus of  $\Psi$  ([7, Theorem 5.1]). In the case  $(X, d) = (\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), W_2)$ , minimizing the distance part of the JKO functional  $\Psi$  is a Wasserstein barycenter problem like (1.1), with two assigned measures (corresponding to  $u_\tau^{k-2}$  and  $u_\tau^{k-1}$ ) and real coefficients. It should be remarked that the negative sign of one of the weights is crucial for the  $\lambda$ -convexity of  $\Psi$  and thus for the existence and uniqueness of a minimizer. Indeed, we are going to exploit exactly [7, Theorem 3.4] for the uniqueness part of our Theorem 1.1.

## Sticky particles

In [6, Remarks 4.6 and 4.13], an interesting connection was pointed out, between metric extrapolation and the one-dimensional pressureless Euler system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \partial_x(\rho v) = 0 \\ \partial_t(\rho v) + \partial_x(\rho v^2) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

in  $\mathbb{R} \times (0, +\infty)$ , with initial density and velocity conditions  $\rho|_{t=0} = \rho_0$ ,  $v|_{t=0} = v_0$ , for the evolution of a system of particles that share their trajectories after a collision (also called “*sticky particle system*” (SPS)) (see also [3]). Here, we exploit the characterization of the solutions to the (SPS) given in [10], in order to show a direct connection with the minimizer of a generalized Wasserstein barycenter functional. Let  $(\rho_t, \rho_t v_t)$  be the solution of the (SPS) at time  $t > 0$ , corresponding to a discrete initial datum

$$\rho_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad \rho_0 v_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i v_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad m_i > 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^N m_i = 1, \quad x_i, v_i \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Denoting  $X_0$  (resp.  $X_t$ ) the pseudo-inverse function of  $\rho_0$  (resp.  $\rho_t$ ), by [10, Theorem 2.6 - II] it holds

$$X_t = P_{\mathcal{K}}(X_0 + tV_0), \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$ , as above, is the convex cone of nondecreasing functions in  $L^2(0, 1)$ ,  $P_{\mathcal{K}}$  is the orthogonal projection operator on  $\mathcal{K}$ , and  $V_0$  is the piecewise-constant function such that  $V_0(x) = v_i$  if  $X_0(x) = x_i$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  be the first collision time of the evolution, then, for all  $0 < s \leq \delta$

$$X_s = P_{\mathcal{K}}(X_0 + sV_0) = X_0 + sV_0,$$

and owing to (1.5), for all  $t > s$

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= P_{\mathcal{K}}(X_0 + tV_0) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{K}}\left(X_0 + t \frac{X_s - X_0}{s}\right) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{K}}\left(\left(1 - \frac{t}{s}\right) X_0 + \frac{t}{s} X_s\right). \end{aligned}$$

By (1.2), we immediately see that the solution  $\rho_t = (X_t)_{\#} \mathcal{L}^1_{\perp(0,1)}$  of the sticky particle system (1.4) at time  $t$  is also the minimizer of the generalized barycenter functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \left(1 - \frac{t}{s}\right) W_2^2(\rho_0, \rho) + \frac{t}{s} W_2^2(\rho_s, \rho),$$

where the fixed measures are the initial density  $\rho_0$  of the (SPS), with negative weight  $1 - t/s$  and the solution of the system at time  $s$ , that is,  $\rho_s$ , with positive weight  $t/s$ .

## 1.2 Plan of the paper

In Section 2 we study the one-dimensional case. After recalling the main definitions and notation, we state and prove the result concerning existence, uniqueness, and characterization of generalized barycenters between  $n$  probability measures on the real line. In Subsection 2.3, we provide a stability result and in Subsection 2.4 an example where the generalized barycenter between one-dimensional Gaussian distributions is not a Gaussian. In Section 3 we prove the existence part of Theorem 1.1, for measures on a separable Hilbert space, while in Section 4 we prove uniqueness, in the case of one positive and  $n - 1$  negative weights. Finally, in Subsection 4.3, we provide an example of non-uniqueness.

# 2 The one-dimensional case

## 2.1 Setting and notation

We collect here the minimal definitions needed to state our problem. For an in-depth treatise on optimal transport and Wasserstein distances we refer to the textbooks [2], [14].

### Wasserstein distance

We denote by  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  the space of Borel probability measures  $\mu$  on  $X$  with finite second moments:

$$\int_X |x|^2 d\mu(x) < +\infty.$$

For a general Borel map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and a Borel measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , the push-forward measure of  $\mu$  through  $f$  is defined as

$$f_{\#}\mu(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A)), \quad \text{for every Borel set } A \subseteq Y.$$

For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $\pi^i : X \times X \rightarrow X$  denote the projection operator on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  variable,  $\pi^i(x_1, x_2) = x_i$ . Given two measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the set of admissible transport plans between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is

$$\Gamma(\mu, \nu) = \{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X) : \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma = \mu, \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma = \nu \}.$$

The Wasserstein-Rubinstein-Kantorovich distance of order 2 between two measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is defined as

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) = \min \left\{ \left( \int_{X \times X} |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} : \gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu) \right\}.$$

We denote by  $\Gamma_o(\mu, \nu)$  the set of *optimal transport plans* between  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . That is, if  $\gamma \in \Gamma_o(\mu, \nu)$ , then  $\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)$  and

$$W_2^2(\mu, \nu) = \int_{X \times X} |x - y|^2 d\gamma(x, y).$$

### Isometry between $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{K}$

We restrict to the one-dimensional setting because in this case there is a standard isometry between  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  and the subset  $\mathcal{K}$  of (essentially) nondecreasing functions in the Hilbert space of square-integrable functions  $L^2(0, 1)$ . This relation allows us to exploit the properties of scalar products and projections in Hilbert spaces, which are crucial in our proof. We denote by  $\|\cdot\|$  the standard norm in  $L^2(0, 1)$ :

$$\|f\| = \left( \int_0^1 f^2(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , the cumulative distribution function of  $\mu$  is the function  $F_\mu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$

$$F_\mu(x) := \mu((-\infty, x]) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Its pseudo-inverse (also called: ‘monotone rearrangement’ or ‘quantile function’) is the nondecreasing function  $X_\mu : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$X_\mu(w) := \inf \{x : F_\mu(x) > w\} \quad \forall w \in (0, 1).$$

Observe that  $X_\mu(F_\mu(x)) \geq x$  and that, if  $m > F_\mu(x)$ , then  $X_\mu(m) > x$ . Therefore, denoting by  $\lambda$  the Lebesgue measure on  $(0, 1)$ :

$$(X_\mu)_\# \lambda((-\infty, x]) = \lambda(X_\mu^{-1}((-\infty, x])) = \lambda((0, F_\mu(x))) = F_\mu(x).$$

In other words,  $(X_\mu)_\# \lambda = \mu$ .

Moreover, given two measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\gamma = (X_\mu, X_\nu)_\# \lambda$  is the unique monotone transport in  $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ ; it follows that  $\gamma \in \Gamma_o(\mu, \nu)$  ([12, Theorem 2.9]). Therefore

$$W_2^2(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x - y|^2 d(X_\mu, X_\nu)_\# \lambda = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |X_\mu(x) - X_\nu(x)|^2 d\lambda = \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|^2. \quad (2.6)$$

We have shown that the mapping  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(0, 1)$ ,  $\phi(\mu) = X_\mu$  satisfies the following properties (see also the *Hoeffding-Fréchet* characterization of distributions with given marginals [11, Sec. 3.1]):

- (i) for all  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$   $\|\phi(\mu) - \phi(\nu)\| = W_2(\mu, \nu)$ ,
- (ii) for all  $f \in \mathcal{K}$  the measure  $\mu = f_{\#}\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  satisfies  $\phi(\mu) = f$ .

Therefore, the metric spaces  $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}), W_2)$  and  $(\mathcal{K}, \|\cdot\|)$  are isometric. We recall that the orthogonal projection operator  $P_{\mathcal{K}} : L^2(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  can be characterized by the following property ([4], Theorem 5.2): for all  $x \in L^2(0, 1)$ ,  $P_{\mathcal{K}}(x)$  is the unique element in  $\mathcal{K}$  such that

$$\|P_{\mathcal{K}}(x) - x\| \leq \|z - x\|, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (2.7)$$

We can therefore give the following equivalent statement of Theorem 1.2, where, without loss of generality, we can rescale by a positive quantity and assume that the weights sum is 1.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be a given integer. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $x_i \in \mathcal{K}$  be given and let  $\lambda_i$  be real numbers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ . Then, there exists a unique minimizer  $x^* \in \mathcal{K}$  of the functional*

$$E : L^2(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad E(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \|x - x_i\|^2$$

and it is characterized by

$$x^* = P_{\mathcal{K}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right).$$

The solution of Theorem 1.2 in the Wasserstein space can then be recovered by

$$\mu^* = \phi^{-1}(x^*) = x_{\#}^* \lambda.$$

**Remark 2.2.** Since the proof of Theorem 2.1 only relies on the Hilbert structure of the space  $L^2(0, 1)$  and on the closedness and convexity properties of  $\mathcal{K}$ , the same characterization of the solution holds in a more general setting. Precisely: let  $(X, |\cdot|_X)$  be a real Hilbert space and let  $\mathcal{H} \subset X$  be a closed and convex subset. Let  $x_i \in X$  be given for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and let  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ . Then there exists a unique minimizer  $x^* \in \mathcal{H}$  of the functional

$$F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x - x_i|_X^2$$



and it is characterized by

$$x^* = P_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right).$$

**Remark 2.3.** Theorem 3.1 in [10] gives a useful characterization of the orthogonal projection  $P_{\mathcal{K}} : L^2(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ , which may be employed for explicit computations: given  $f \in L^2(0, 1)$ , let  $F(t) = \int_0^t f(s) ds$  be its integral function; let  $F^{**}$  be the lower semi-continuous convex envelope of  $F$ , i.e., the greatest lower semi-continuous convex function which is lower or equal to  $F$ .  $F^{**}$  may also be defined by

$$F^{**}(t) = \sup\{at + b : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, as + b \leq F(s) \text{ for a.e. } s \in (0, 1)\}.$$

Being convex, in every point  $F^{**}$  admits a left derivative  $\frac{d^-}{dt} F^{**}$  and a right derivative  $\frac{d^+}{dt} F^{**}$ . The projection may then be characterized by

$$P_{\mathcal{K}}(f)(t) = \frac{d^+}{dt} F^{**}(t).$$

## 2.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

We state the intermediate computations on a general real Hilbert space  $X$ , endowed with the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and norm  $|u| = \sqrt{u \cdot u}$ . In the present Section, for an integer  $n \geq 2$ , we are given a collection of elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  and weights  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ . The proof of Theorem 2.1 relies on the following two elementary computations.

**Lemma 2.4.** *It holds*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 - \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right|^2 = \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j |x_i - x_j|^2. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 - \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j x_i \cdot x_j \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j (x_i \cdot (x_j - x_i) + x_i \cdot x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i \lambda_j x_i \cdot (x_j - x_i) \\
&= - \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j (x_i - x_j) \cdot (x_j - x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j |x_i - x_j|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$ . Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x - x_i|^2 = |x - \bar{x}|^2 + \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j |x_i - x_j|^2. \quad (2.9)$$

*Proof.* Using  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$  and (2.8) we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x - x_i|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (|x|^2 - 2x \cdot x_i + |x_i|^2) \\
&= |x|^2 - 2x \cdot \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 \\
&= |x|^2 - 2x \cdot \bar{x} + |\bar{x}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 - |\bar{x}|^2 \\
&= |x - \bar{x}|^2 + \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j |x_i - x_j|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

By Lemma 2.5, using equivalence (2.9), the projection property (2.7), and exploiting the independence of the right-hand side summation from  $P_{\mathcal{K}}(\bar{x})$ ,

for all  $z \in \mathcal{K}$

$$\begin{aligned}
E(P_{\mathcal{K}}(\bar{x})) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |P_{\mathcal{K}}(\bar{x}) - x_i|^2 \\
&= |P_{\mathcal{K}}(\bar{x}) - \bar{x}|^2 + \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\leq |z - \bar{x}|^2 + \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \lambda_j |x_i - x_j|^2 = E(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $P_{\mathcal{K}}(\bar{x})$  is the unique minimum of  $E$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ .

### 2.3 Stability

The explicit characterization of the Wasserstein barycenter entails a stability result, with respect to perturbations of the fixed measures:

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\nu}_n$  be probability measures in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ; let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  be weights such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$  and consider the barycenters  $\mu, \tilde{\mu}$  with respect to the measures  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\nu}_n$ , with weights  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ . Then*

$$W_2^2(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^2 \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n W_2^2(\nu_i, \tilde{\nu}_i) \right).$$

*Proof.* For  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , let  $X_\rho$  be its monotone rearrangement. Then, using (2.6), the last statement in [10, Theorem 3.1] and the elementary inequality  $(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i b_i|)^2 \leq (\sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2)(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
W_2^2(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) &= \int_{(0,1)} \left| P_{\mathcal{K}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i X_{\nu_i} \right) - P_{\mathcal{K}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i X_{\tilde{\nu}_i} \right) \right|^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{(0,1)} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (X_{\nu_i} - X_{\tilde{\nu}_i}) \right|^2 dx \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^2 \right) \int_{(0,1)} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_{\nu_i} - X_{\tilde{\nu}_i}|^2 dx \\
&= \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^2 \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n W_2^2(\nu_i, \tilde{\nu}_i) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 2.7.** Since discrete measures comprised of a finite number of atoms are dense in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  with respect to the Wasserstein distance, we may approximate any barycenter by a barycenter of finite atomic measures with an arbitrary error.

## 2.4 An example in the case of two Gaussian measures

While the (standard) barycenter of two Gaussian measures is always a Gaussian, it is possible to choose the parameters of the measures and a negative weight so that the generalized barycenter of two Gaussians is a Dirac delta.

**Remark 2.8.** If  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3$  are three probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu_2$  is the barycenter of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_3$  with parameters  $0 < \lambda < 1$  and  $1 - \lambda$ , then  $\mu_3$  is the generalized barycenter for  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  with parameters  $(\lambda - 1)/\lambda, 1/\lambda$  (and, likewise,  $\mu_1$  is a generalized barycenter for  $\mu_2, \mu_3$  with parameters  $1/(1 - \lambda)$  and  $-\lambda/(1 - \lambda)$ ). This remark follows directly from the equation

$$X_{\mu_2} = (1 - \lambda)X_{\mu_1} + \lambda X_{\mu_3}$$

since then

$$X_{\mu_3} = \frac{1}{\lambda}X_{\mu_2} + \frac{\lambda - 1}{\lambda}X_{\mu_1}$$

and no projection on  $\mathcal{K}$  is needed (even if  $(\lambda - 1)/\lambda < 0$ ).

Let  $\mu_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(m_1, \sigma_1^2)$ ,  $\mu_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(m_2, \sigma_2^2)$  be two Gaussian measures, and suppose that  $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2$ : then it is possible to choose  $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu_2$  is the barycenter between  $\mu_1$  and the Dirac delta  $\delta_{\bar{z}}$ . Owing to Remark 2.8,  $\delta_{\bar{z}}$  is then the generalized barycenter between the Gaussians  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . In order to choose  $\bar{z}$ , we proceed as follows. For  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ , the monotone rearrangement of the Wasserstein barycenter  $\bar{\mu}$  between  $\mu_1$  and an atomic measure  $\delta_z$  satisfies

$$X_{\bar{\mu}} = (1 - \lambda)X_{\mu_1} + \lambda z.$$

Using the relation  $(aX + b)^{-1}(x) = X^{-1}((x - b)/a)$ , valid for all invertible functions  $X : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and all  $a, b$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $a \neq 0$ , we obtain

$$F_{\bar{\mu}}(x) = F_{\mu_1}((x - \lambda z)/(1 - \lambda)),$$

so that the density of  $\bar{\mu}$  is given by

$$F'_{\bar{\mu}} = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} f_{\mu_1}((x - \lambda z)/(1 - \lambda)) = K \exp\left(-\frac{(x - ((1 - \lambda)m_1 + \lambda z))^2}{2((1 - \lambda)\sigma_1)^2}\right)$$

where  $K$  doesn't depend on  $x$ , so  $\bar{\mu} \sim \mathcal{N}((1-\lambda)m_1 + \lambda z, ((1-\lambda)\sigma_1)^2)$ . Now we look for particular values  $\bar{\lambda}$  and  $\bar{z}$  for which  $\bar{\mu} = \mu_2$ : setting

$$\begin{cases} (1 - \bar{\lambda})m_1 + \bar{\lambda}\bar{z} = m_2, \\ (1 - \bar{\lambda})\sigma_1 = \sigma_2, \end{cases}$$

yields

$$\bar{\lambda} = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_2}{\sigma_1}, \quad \bar{z} = \frac{\sigma_1 m_2 - \sigma_2 m_1}{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)}.$$

With this choice of parameters, we have

$$X_{\mu_2} = (1 - \bar{\lambda})X_{\mu_1} + \bar{\lambda}\bar{z},$$

and therefore, owing to Remark 2.8, the Dirac measure  $\delta_{\bar{z}}$  is the generalized barycenter of the Gaussian measures  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ , with weights  $1/\bar{\lambda} > 0$  and  $(\bar{\lambda} - 1)/\bar{\lambda} < 0$ .

### 3 Existence in Hilbert spaces

In this section, we prove the existence part of Theorem 1.1.

#### 3.1 Setting and notation

We collect here a few results needed for the proof of the existence of a minimizer. For general statements with proofs and in-depth discussion, we refer again to the textbooks [2] and [14].

Here  $n \geq 1$  is a fixed integer,  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$  are given probability measures with finite second moments on the separable Hilbert space  $X$ , and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  are real numbers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ . The scalar product in  $X$  is denoted by ' $\cdot$ ' and the norm by  $|x| = \sqrt{x \cdot x}$ .

**Definition 3.1** (Narrow convergence). We say that a sequence  $(\mu_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  is narrowly convergent to  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  if

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X f(x) d\mu_j(x) = \int_X f(x) d\mu(x) \quad \forall f \in C_b(X).$$

#### Gluing Lemma

([2], Lemma 5.3.2) Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and  $\gamma^{0i} \in \Gamma(\nu, \nu_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then there exists  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X^{n+1})$  such that

$$(\pi^0, \pi^i)_\# \gamma = \gamma^{0i}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . An example of such a  $\gamma$  is given by the measure whose disintegration with respect to  $\nu$  is

$$\gamma = \int_X (\gamma_\nu^{01} \times \dots \times \gamma_\nu^{0n}) d\nu,$$

where  $\gamma^{0i} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_\nu^{0i} d\nu$  are the disintegrations of the transport plans  $\gamma^{0i}$  with respect to  $\nu$ .

**Definition 3.2.** As a consequence of the Gluing Lemma, the following sets are not empty.

- (i)  $\Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  is the set of probability measures  $\gamma$  on  $X \times X^n$  such that  $\pi_{\#}^i \gamma = \nu_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , while the first marginal (corresponding to the variable  $x_0$ ) is not fixed;
- (ii)  $\tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  is the subset of  $\Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  such that  $(\pi^0, \pi^i)_{\#} \gamma \in \Gamma_o(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma, \nu_i)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

We consider the multimarginal functional  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P}(X^{n+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$

$$\mathcal{F}(\gamma) = \int_{X^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_0 - x_i|^2 d\gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n).$$

The relation between the functionals  $\mathcal{F}$  and

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\nu_i, \mu)$$

is made clear by the following computation.

**Lemma 3.3.**

$$\inf \{ \mathcal{E}(\mu), \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \} = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\gamma), \gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ , by optimality of the transport plans between the first and the  $i^{\text{th}}$  marginal

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\gamma) &= \int_{X^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_0 - x_i|^2 d\gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma, \pi_{\#}^i \gamma) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma, \nu_i) = \mathcal{E}(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\inf \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\gamma), \gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \right\} \geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{E}(\mu).$$

On the other hand, for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , by the gluing Lemma there exists  $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  such that  $\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma = \mu$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i W_2^2(\mu, \nu_i) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \inf \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\gamma), \gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n), \pi_{\#}^0 \gamma = \mu \right\} \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ \mathcal{F}(\gamma), \gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1-(i)

We are going to split the proof of Theorem 1.1 into several steps, corresponding to the usual boundedness, compactness, and lower-semicontinuity of the direct method of the calculus of variations. We first show that, on the set  $\Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ , the functional  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded from below and that its sublevel sets have bounded first marginal  $\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *There exists a constant  $M \in \mathbb{R}$ , depending on  $\{\nu_i\}$  and  $\{\lambda_i\}$  only, such that,  $\forall \gamma \in \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$*

$$(i) \quad \mathcal{F}(\gamma) \geq M$$

and

$$(ii) \quad \mathcal{F}(\gamma) - M \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_X |x_0|^2 d(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma).$$

The explicit expression of  $M$  is

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ (\lambda_i - 2n\lambda_i^2) \int_X |x_i|^2 d\nu_i \right].$$

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$ . By Young's inequality

$$x_0 \cdot \bar{x} \leq \frac{|x_0|^2}{4} + |\bar{x}|^2 \leq \frac{|x_0|^2}{4} + n \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i x_i|^2,$$

and thus  $\forall \gamma \in \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(\gamma) &= \int_{X^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_0 - x_i|^2 d\gamma \\
&= \int_{X^{n+1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (|x_0|^2 - 2x_0 \cdot x_i + |x_i|^2) d\gamma \\
&= \int_{X^{n+1}} \left( |x_0|^2 - 2x_0 \cdot \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 \right) d\gamma \\
&\geq \int_{X^{n+1}} \left( \frac{|x_0|^2}{2} - 2n \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 \right) d\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  marginal of  $\gamma$  is the assigned measure  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(\gamma) &\geq \int_{X^{n+1}} \frac{|x_0|^2}{2} d\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_X |x_i|^2 (-2n\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_i) d\nu_i \\
&\geq \int_X \frac{|x_0|^2}{2} d\pi_{\sharp}^0 \gamma(x_0) + M,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $M$  only depends on  $\lambda_i$  and on the fixed quantities  $\int_X |x_i|^2 d\nu_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .  $\square$

Next, we address the compactness of sublevel sets in  $\Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ . We recall the following useful criteria.

### Tightness criteria

([2], Lemma 5.2.2 and Remark 5.1.5)

- (i) Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{P}(X^{n+1})$  be such that  $\mathcal{K}_i := \pi_{\sharp}^i(\mathcal{K})$  is tight in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ , then also  $\mathcal{K}$  is tight in  $\mathcal{P}(X^{n+1})$ .
- (ii) A subset  $\mathcal{K}_i \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  is tight if and only if there exists a function  $\varphi : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ , with compact sublevels, such that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}_i} \int_X \varphi(x) d\mu(x) \leq C < +\infty.$$



**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $(\gamma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  be such that  $\mathcal{F}(\gamma_j) \leq C$ , for some  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, there exists a subsequence  $(\gamma_{j_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  and a measure  $\gamma \in \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  such that*

$$\gamma_{j_k} \rightharpoonup \gamma \quad \text{narrowly in } \mathcal{P}(X^{n+1}).$$

Moreover, if  $\gamma_j \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  for all  $j$ , then  $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.4

$$\sup_j \int_X |x_0|^2 d\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma_j \leq 2(\mathcal{F}(\gamma_j) - M) \leq 2(C - M) < +\infty,$$

and therefore, by the second tightness criterion,  $(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma_j)$  is tight in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . Since all other marginals are fixed, i.e.,

$$\sup_j \int_X |x_i|^2 d\pi_{\#}^i \gamma_j = \int_X |x_i|^2 d\nu_i < +\infty$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , by the first tightness criterion we deduce that  $(\gamma_j)$  is tight in  $\mathcal{P}(X^{n+1})$ , and by Prokhorov's Theorem we conclude that there exists a subsequence  $(\gamma_{j_k})$  and a measure  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X^{n+1})$  such that  $\gamma_{j_k} \rightharpoonup \gamma$ . In particular, for all  $f \in C_b(X)$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X^{n+1}} f(x_i) d\gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{X^{n+1}} f(x_i) d\gamma_{j_k}(x_0, \dots, x_n) \\ &= \int_X f(x_i) d\nu_i(x_i), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $\gamma \in \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ . Finally, we recall that the condition of optimality of transport plans is stable with respect to narrow convergence ([2], Proposition 7.1.3). Precisely, if  $(\pi^0, \pi^i)_{\#} \gamma_j \in \Gamma_o(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma_j, \nu_i)$  and  $\gamma_j$  converges narrowly to  $\gamma$ , then also  $(\pi^0, \pi^i)_{\#} \gamma \in \Gamma_o(\pi_{\#}^0 \gamma, \nu_i)$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  (and, thus,  $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ ).  $\square$

The next step regards the lower-semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{F}$ , where we are going to use the framework of the strong-weak topology on measures in product spaces described in [9]. In order to highlight the role of the different topologies, as is done in [9], we slightly change the notation with respect to the rest of the section. Since the base space for the multimarginal functional is  $X^{n+1}$ , here we let  $Y = X$  be the Hilbert space corresponding to the first  $X$  in the product and to the free marginal in  $\Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  and we denote  $\mathbf{X} = X^n$

for the  $n$  spaces with fixed marginals  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$ ; we equip  $Y$  with the weak topology and  $\mathbf{X}$  with the strong topology. Let  $Z = Y \times \mathbf{X}$  and

$$\mathcal{P}_2(Z) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \int_Z (|y|^2 + |\mathbf{x}|^2) d\boldsymbol{\mu}(y, \mathbf{x}) < +\infty \right\}.$$

We consider the space  $C_2^{sw}(Z)$  of test functions  $\zeta : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that:

- $\zeta$  is sequentially continuous with respect to the weak-strong product topology on  $Z$ ;
- $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists A_\varepsilon \geq 0 : |\zeta(y, \mathbf{x})| \leq A_\varepsilon (1 + |\mathbf{x}|^2) + \varepsilon |y|^2$ .

We endow  $C_2^{sw}(Z)$  with the norm

$$\|\zeta\|_{C_2^{sw}(Z)} := \sup_{(y, \mathbf{x})} \frac{|\zeta(y, \mathbf{x})|}{1 + |\mathbf{x}|^2 + |y|^2}.$$

**Definition 3.6.** We endow  $\mathcal{P}_2(Z)$  with the initial topology induced by the functions

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} \mapsto \int_Z \zeta(y, \mathbf{x}) d\boldsymbol{\mu}(y, \mathbf{x}), \quad \zeta \in C_2^{sw}(Z);$$

we call  $\mathcal{P}_2^{sw}(Z)$  the topological space  $(\mathcal{P}_2(Z), \sigma(\mathcal{P}_2(Z), C_2^{sw}(Z)))$ .

**Proposition 3.7** ([9], Proposition 3.4). *A sequence  $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_2^{sw}(Z)$  and a measure  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_2^{sw}(Z)$  satisfy*

- (i)  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}$  narrowly in  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ ;
- (ii)  $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Z |\mathbf{x}|^2 d\boldsymbol{\mu}_j \rightarrow \int_Z |\mathbf{x}|^2 d\boldsymbol{\mu}$ ;
- (iii)  $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_Z |y|^2 d\boldsymbol{\mu}_j < +\infty$ ,

if and only if

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_j \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{P}_2^{sw}(Z).$$

We can now address the lower-semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $(\gamma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  be such that  $\mathcal{F}(\gamma_j) \leq C$ , for some  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ , and*

$$\gamma_j \rightarrow \gamma \quad \text{narrowly in } \mathcal{P}(Z).$$

Then

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\gamma_j) \geq \mathcal{F}(\gamma).$$

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 3.7, we notice that hypothesis (ii) is verified because the  $i^{\text{th}}$  marginals of  $\gamma_j$  are fixed, for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and hypothesis (iii) is satisfied by Lemma 3.4-(ii). Denoting  $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$ , we observe that the function

$$\zeta : Y \times \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \zeta(y, \mathbf{x}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i y \cdot x^i = -2y \cdot \bar{x}$$

belongs to  $C_2^{sw}(Z)$ : by Young's inequality, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$|\zeta(y, \mathbf{x})| \leq \varepsilon |y|^2 + \frac{4}{\varepsilon} |\bar{x}|^2 \leq \varepsilon |y|^2 + A_\varepsilon |\mathbf{x}|^2,$$

where  $A_\varepsilon = 4n \max\{|\lambda_i|^2\}/\varepsilon$ ; moreover, given sequences

$$y_j \rightarrow y \text{ in } Y, \quad \mathbf{x}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \text{ in } \mathbf{X},$$

setting  $\bar{x}_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_j^i$ , we have  $\bar{x}_j \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} |y_j \cdot \bar{x}_j - y \cdot \bar{x}| &= |y_j \cdot (\bar{x}_j - \bar{x}) + (y_j - y) \cdot \bar{x}| \\ &\leq |y_j| |\bar{x}_j - \bar{x}| + |(y_j - y) \cdot \bar{x}|; \end{aligned}$$

since  $\sup_j |y_j| < +\infty$ ,  $|\bar{x}_j - \bar{x}| \rightarrow 0$  and  $(y_j - y) \cdot \bar{x} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\zeta$  is sequentially continuous. Therefore

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Z \zeta(y, \mathbf{x}) d\gamma_j(y, \mathbf{x}) = \int_Z \zeta(y, \mathbf{x}) d\gamma(y, \mathbf{x}). \quad (3.10)$$

Finally, by the standard lower-semicontinuity of second moments ([2], Lemma 5.1.7), with respect to narrow convergence of measures, we know that

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Z |y|^2 d\gamma_j(y, \mathbf{x}) \geq \int_Z |y|^2 d\gamma(y, \mathbf{x}). \quad (3.11)$$

In conclusion, by (3.10) and (3.11), taking into account that the last  $n$  marginals are fixed, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\gamma_j) &= \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Z \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |y - x_i|^2 \right) d\gamma_j(y, \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Z \left( |y|^2 - 2y \cdot \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 \right) d\gamma_j(y, \mathbf{x}) \\ &\geq \int_Z \left( |y|^2 - 2y \cdot \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |x_i|^2 \right) d\gamma(y, \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \mathcal{F}(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

□

We have now all the elements to prove existence of a minimizer for  $\mathcal{E}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Since  $\tilde{\Gamma} := \tilde{\Gamma}(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \subset \Gamma := \Gamma(*, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ , by Lemma 3.4

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} := \inf_{\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}} \mathcal{F}(\gamma) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathcal{F}(\gamma) \geq M > -\infty.$$

Now, let  $(\gamma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$  be a minimizing sequence, that is

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\gamma_j) = \underline{\mathcal{F}}.$$

Owing to Lemma 3.5, there exists a subsequence  $(\gamma_{j_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$  such that  $\gamma_{j_k} \rightharpoonup \gamma$  narrowly in  $\mathcal{P}(X^{n+1})$ . By Lemma 3.8

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} = \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}(\gamma_{j_k}) \geq \mathcal{F}(\gamma)$$

and, therefore,  $\gamma$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}(\gamma) = \min_{\mu \in \tilde{\Gamma}} \mathcal{F}(\mu).$$

Finally, by Lemma 3.4-(ii) and Lemma 3.3, the first marginal of  $\gamma$ , that is,  $\bar{\mu} := \pi_{\sharp}^0 \gamma$  satisfies

$$\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu}) = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{E}(\mu).$$

□

## 4 Uniqueness in Hilbert spaces for one positive coefficient

In this section we specialize to the case where there is only one positive coefficient and  $k$  negative ones. In this case, uniqueness of the solution holds, even in contrast to the case of regular barycenters.  $X$  will, again, denote a separable Hilbert space.

In order to highlight the different role of the positive and negative weights, we use the following notation. Fix  $k+1$  measures  $\nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_k$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , and  $k+1$  weights  $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k > 0$ , such that

$$\lambda_0 - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = 1.$$

We study

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathcal{E}(\mu) = \lambda_0 W_2^2(\mu, \nu_0) - \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i W_2^2(\mu, \nu_i). \quad (4.12)$$

## 4.1 $\lambda$ -convexity

We will use the concept of  $\lambda$ -convexity along geodesics, as defined in [2, Definition 9.2.4]; the argument, which we briefly expose below, is essentially the same as [7, Theorem 4.1]: we adapt it to our functional. Let  $(M, d)$  be a complete metric space, and suppose we have an appropriate concept of connecting curve  $\gamma(s) = \gamma_s : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  between two points  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1$  in  $M$ , that we call *generalized geodesic*. We say that a functional  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is  $\lambda$ -convex along generalized geodesics (with  $\lambda > 0$ ) if for every  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1$  in  $M$ , for every generalized geodesic  $\gamma_s$  connecting  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_1$ , and for every  $s$  in  $[0, 1]$ , the inequality

$$F(\gamma_s) \leq (1-s)F(\gamma_0) + sF(\gamma_1) - \lambda s(1-s)d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)$$

holds. If  $F$  is  $\lambda$ -convex for some  $\lambda > 0$  and some class of generalized geodesics, if it is bounded from below, and it is lower-semicontinuous with respect to the metric topology of  $M$ , then  $F$  admits a minimum in  $M$ . This is true because, taken a minimizing sequence  $(\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $M$ , we have

$$d^2(\mu_m, \mu_n) \leq 4/\lambda \left[ \frac{1}{2}(F(\mu_m) + F(\mu_n)) - F(\gamma_{1/2}) \right]$$

where  $\gamma_s$  is a generalized geodesic connecting  $\mu_m$  and  $\mu_n$  and we have taken  $s = 1/2$ . Since the right-hand side term tends to 0 as  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ , the sequence is Cauchy; by completeness of  $M$  and lower semi-continuity of  $F$  we conclude that  $\lim \mu_n$  is a minimum point for  $F$ .

Note that  $\lambda$ -convexity is stronger than strict convexity: if we have a minimum for  $F$ , it must also be unique.

If we specialize to the case  $(M, d) = (\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$ , the right concept of generalized geodesic has been introduced in [2, Definition 9.2.2]: we report here the definition and the basic properties.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  be in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . Choose optimal transports  $\gamma_{02}$  in  $\Gamma_o(\gamma_0, \gamma_2)$  and  $\gamma_{12}$  in  $\Gamma_o(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ . By the Gluing Lemma, we can glue  $\gamma_{02}$  and  $\gamma_{12}$  along the common marginal  $\gamma_2$ , obtaining a measure  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X^3)$  such that  $(\pi^{0,2})_{\#}\gamma = \gamma_{02}$  and  $(\pi^{1,2})_{\#}\gamma = \gamma_{12}$ . For  $t \in (0, 1)$ , denote by  $\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1}$  the interpolating projection  $(1-t)\pi^0 + t\pi^1 : X^3 \rightarrow X$ . A generalized geodesic  $\gamma_t$  connecting  $\gamma_0$  to  $\gamma_1$ , with basepoint  $\gamma_2$ , is the curve  $t \mapsto (\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1})_{\#}\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  (see Fig. 1).




Figure 1: Generalized geodesic with basepoint  $\gamma_2$  (dotted). The continuous lines denote regular geodesics induced by the optimal transports  $(\pi^{0,2})_{\#}\gamma = \gamma_{02}$ ,  $(\pi^{1,2})_{\#}\gamma = \gamma_{12}$ , and an optimal transport between  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_1$ ; the dotted line is the curve induced by the (not necessarily optimal) transport  $(\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1})_{\#}\gamma$ . In our case, we are going to choose  $\gamma_2$  to be the only fixed measure associated with a positive coefficient.

Notation: Following [2], we set

$$\pi_t^{i \rightarrow j} := (1-t)\pi^i + t\pi^j, \quad \gamma_t^{i \rightarrow j} := (\pi_t^{i \rightarrow j})_{\#}\gamma.$$

We will show that, when there's only one positive coefficient  $\lambda_0$ , the functional  $\mathcal{E}$  is 1-convex; from this fact it will follow immediately that  $\mathcal{E}$  has exactly one minimizer in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . Our proof is just an iteration of the  $\lambda$ -convexity proof given in [7, Theorem 3.4] in the case of metric extrapolation, i.e., with one positive and one negative coefficient. Nonetheless, it should be noted that extending that theorem to a higher number of measures should be done carefully, since there are precise constraints on the conditions that can be imposed on the marginals, in order for a common product measure to exist (see also Remark 4.4 below).

We need the following lemma, where we adapt the notation to our case (see Fig. 2).

**Lemma 4.2** (Curve extension lemma; [2], Proposition 7.3.1). *Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_2(X^2)$ ,  $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , there exists  $\nu_t \in \mathcal{P}_2(X^3)$  such that  $(\pi^{0,1})_{\#}\nu_t = \alpha$  and  $(\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1}, \pi^2)_{\#}\nu_t \in \Gamma_o((\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1})_{\#}\alpha, \beta)$ .*




Figure 2: Here's how we will use the lemma: with the same notation we used to define the generalized geodesic  $\gamma_t$ ,  $\alpha$  will be  $(\pi^{0,1})_{\#}\gamma$ , the base point  $\gamma_2$  will be  $\nu_0$ , i.e., the fixed measure associated with the positive coefficient  $\lambda_0$ ,  $\beta$  will be one of the fixed measures  $\nu_j$  associated with a negative coefficient and  $t$  will be a fixed time in  $(0, 1)$ . This lemma yields a measure  $\nu_t^j$  in  $\mathcal{P}(X^3)$  such that  $(\pi^{0,1})_{\#}\nu_t^j = (\pi^{0,1})_{\#}\gamma$  and  $(\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1}, \pi^2)_{\#}\nu_t^j \in \Gamma_o(\gamma_t, \nu_j)$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** For  $j = 0, \dots, k$ , let  $\nu_j \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  be fixed and let  $\lambda_j > 0$  be such that  $\lambda_0 - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = 1$ . Then the functional  $\mathcal{E}$  defined in (4.12) is 1-convex along generalized geodesics with basepoint  $\nu_0$ .

*Proof.* We need the inequality, valid in Hilbert spaces:

$$|(1-t)x_0 + tx_1 - x_2|^2 = (1-t)|x_0 - x_2|^2 + t|x_1 - x_2|^2 - t(1-t)|x_0 - x_1|^2. \quad (4.13)$$

Let  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1$  be in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and  $\gamma_2 := \nu_0$ ; let  $\gamma_{02}$  be in  $\Gamma_o(\gamma_0, \gamma_2)$  and  $\gamma_{12}$  be in  $\Gamma_o(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ . Let  $\gamma$  be a measure in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X^3)$  obtained by gluing the optimal transports along the common marginal  $\gamma_2$  and let  $\gamma_t = (\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1})_{\#}\gamma$  be the associated generalized geodesic. Using (4.13) and the optimality of the marginals of  $\gamma$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_2^2(\gamma_t, \gamma_2) &\leq \int_{X^2} |y_1 - y_2|^2 d(\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1}, \pi^2)_{\#}\gamma(y_1, y_2) \\ &= \int_{X^3} |(1-t)x_0 + tx_1 - x_2|^2 d\gamma(x_0, x_1, x_2) \\ &= (1-t)W_2^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_2) + tW_2^2(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \\ &\quad - (1-t)t \int_{X^3} |x_0 - x_1|^2 d\gamma(x_0, x_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $1 \leq j \leq k$  and let  $t \in [0, 1]$ . The curve extension lemma yields a measure  $\nu_t^j$  such that  $(\pi^{0,1})_{\#}\nu_t^j = (\pi^{0,1})_{\#}\gamma$  and  $(\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1}, \pi^2)_{\#}\nu_t^j \in \Gamma_o((\pi_t^{0 \rightarrow 1})_{\#}\gamma, \nu_j)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} W_2^2(\gamma_t, \nu_j) &= \int_{X^3} |(1-t)x_0 + tx_1 - x_2|^2 d\nu_t^j(x_0, x_1, x_2) \\ &= (1-t) \int_{X^3} |x_0 - x_2|^2 d\nu_t^j \\ &\quad + t \int_{X^3} |x_1 - x_2|^2 d\nu_t^j - t(1-t) \int_{X^3} |x_0 - x_1|^2 d\gamma \\ &\geq (1-t)W_2^2(\gamma_0, \nu_j) + tW_2^2(\gamma_1, \nu_j) - t(1-t) \int_{X^3} |x_0 - x_1|^2 d\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Using the two inequalities and the fact that the coefficients  $\lambda_0$  and  $-\lambda_j$  sum to 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\gamma_t) &\leq (1-t)\mathcal{E}(\gamma_0) + t\mathcal{E}(\gamma_1) - t(1-t) \int_{X^3} |x_0 - x_1|^2 d\gamma \\ &\leq (1-t)\mathcal{E}(\gamma_0) + t\mathcal{E}(\gamma_1) - t(1-t)W_2^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)\end{aligned}$$

which proves that  $\mathcal{E}$  is 1-convex along generalized geodesics with basepoint  $\nu_0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** Note that having only one positive weight is crucial: if we were to try to generalize the argument to  $n \geq 2$  positive weights, we would have to construct  $n$  different generalized geodesics  $\gamma_t$  with basepoints equal to the different measures associated with the positive weights.

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1-(ii)

Now we repeat the informal argument presented above to show that  $\mathcal{E}$  admits a unique minimizer.

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $(\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a minimizing sequence for  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then it is Cauchy with respect to  $W_2$ .*

*Proof.* We have already shown that  $\inf \mathcal{E} > -\infty$ . Let  $l = \inf \mathcal{E}$  so that  $\mathcal{E}(\mu_i) \rightarrow l$ . Pick  $\mu_m, \mu_n$  and let  $\gamma_s$  be a generalized geodesic connecting them. For  $s = \frac{1}{2}$  we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(\gamma_{1/2}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}(\mu_m) + \mathcal{E}(\mu_n)) - \frac{1}{4}W_2^2(\mu_m, \mu_n)$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{4}W_2^2(\mu_m, \mu_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}(\mu_m) + \mathcal{E}(\mu_n)) - \mathcal{E}(\gamma_{1/2}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}(\mu_m) + \mathcal{E}(\mu_n)) - l$$

and, since the right-hand term tends to 0 as  $m, n \rightarrow +\infty$ , it follows that  $(\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy.  $\square$

Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is continuous with respect to the metric  $W_2$ , we finally obtain the desired result:

**Theorem 4.6.** *For  $j = 0, \dots, k$ , let  $\nu_j \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  be fixed and let  $\lambda_j > 0$  be such that  $\lambda_0 - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = 1$ . Then the functional  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \lambda_0 W_2^2(\mu, \nu_0) - \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i W_2^2(\mu, \nu_i).$$

*admits exactly one minimizer in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .*



*Proof.* Pick a minimizing sequence  $(\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ : by Corollary 4.5, it is a Cauchy sequence with respect to the metric  $W_2$ ; since  $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$  is a complete metric space, there is a limit  $\mu$ . Then, by continuity of  $\mathcal{E}$ ,

$$\inf \mathcal{E} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\mu_i) = \mathcal{E}(\mu).$$

Now suppose that there are two minimum points  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  for  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let  $\gamma_s$  be a generalized geodesic with basepoint  $\nu_0$ . Then, for  $s = 1/2$ ,

$$\frac{1}{4}W_2^2(\eta_1, \eta_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}(\eta_1) + \mathcal{E}(\eta_2)) - \mathcal{E}(\gamma_{1/2}) \leq 0$$

so that  $W_2(\eta_1, \eta_2) = 0$ : therefore  $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ .  $\square$

### 4.3 Counterexample to uniqueness in the case of two positive weights

We look at a particular example in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ : let

$$\nu_0 = \delta_{(0,0)}, \quad \nu_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{(-1,-1)} + \delta_{(1,1)}), \quad \nu_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{(1,-1)} + \delta_{(-1,1)}),$$

and consider the functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = -W_2^2(\mu, \nu_0) + W_2^2(\mu, \nu_1) + W_2^2(\mu, \nu_2).$$

Owing to Theorem 1.1,  $\mathcal{E}$  admits a minimizer in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ ; we are going to prove that uniqueness does not hold.

The argument will employ the symmetry of the problem; for convenience, we define the matrix

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the subsets

$$V = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |y| > |x|\} \quad \text{and} \quad U = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| > |y|\}.$$




Figure 3: The fixed measured  $\nu_0, \nu_1$ , and  $\nu_2$  (left); the subdivision of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  using  $U$  and  $V$  (right).

Consider the functions  $S, T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$S = -R\mathbb{1}_V + \mathbb{1}_{V^c}, \quad \text{and} \quad T = R\mathbb{1}_U + \mathbb{1}_{U^c},$$

where, for  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\mathbb{1}_A$  is the characteristic function of the set  $A$  and  $A^c = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus A$ . Let  $\mu$  be a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}$ ; we assume that  $\mu$  is unique and argue by contradiction. Owing to the symmetry of  $\nu_0, \nu_1$ , and  $\nu_2$ , (see Fig. 3), it can be easily checked that

$$\mathcal{E}(S_{\#}\mu) = \mathcal{E}(\mu) = \mathcal{E}(T_{\#}\mu).$$

By the uniqueness of  $\mu$ , we infer that  $S_{\#}\mu = \mu$ , and therefore

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = \text{supp}(S_{\#}\mu) \subset V^c.$$

Similarly  $T_{\#}\mu = \mu$ , and therefore  $\text{supp}(\mu) = \text{supp}(T_{\#}\mu) \subset U^c$ . In conclusion,

$$\text{supp}(\mu) \subset V^c \cap U^c = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| = |y|\}.$$

For all points  $p$  in  $\{|x| = |y|\}$  let us consider the function

$$f(p) = \min \{|p - (-1, 1)|^2, |p - (1, -1)|^2\} \\ + \min \{|p - (-1, -1)|^2, |p - (1, 1)|^2\} - |p|^2.$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(p) d\mu \leq \mathcal{E}(\mu).$$

Assume that  $p$  has the form  $p = (x, x)$ , then

$$|p - (-1, 1)|^2 = |p|^2 + 2 = |p - (1, -1)|^2.$$

The same computation, with respect to the support of  $\nu_1$ , holds if  $p$  lies on  $y = -x$ . Therefore, for all measures  $\mu$  concentrated on  $\{|x| = |y|\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|p|^2 + 2 - |p|^2) d\mu(p) = 2.$$

On the other hand, if we take  $\eta = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(0,1)} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(0,-1)}$ , we have  $\mathcal{E}(\eta) = 1$ , which contradicts the assumption of  $\mu$  being the minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}$ . We conclude that  $\mathcal{E}$  does not admit a unique minimizer.

**Acknowledgements.** M.V. would like to thank Alessandro Spelta and Stefano Gualandi for many stimulating and insightful discussions on the applicative and computational aspects of Wasserstein barycenters.

## References

- [1] Martial Agueh and Guillaume Carlier. Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(2):904–924, 2011.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [3] Yann Brenier and Emmanuel Grenier. Sticky particles and scalar conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(6):2317–2328, 1998.
- [4] Haim Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [5] Germund Dahlquist. Convergence and stability in the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations. *Math. Scand.*, 4:33–53, 1956.
- [6] Thomas O. Gallouët, Andrea Natale, and Gabriele Todeschi. From geodesic extrapolation to a variational BDF2 scheme for Wasserstein gradient flows. *Math. Comp.*, 93(350):2769–2810, 2024.
- [7] Daniel Matthes and Simon Plazotta. A variational formulation of the BDF2 method for metric gradient flows. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 53(1):145–172, 2019.
- [8] Robert J. McCann. A convexity principle for interacting gases. *Adv. Math.*, 128(1):153–179, 1997.
- [9] Emanuele Naldi and Giuseppe Savaré. Weak topology and Opial property in Wasserstein spaces, with applications to gradient flows and proximal point algorithms of geodesically convex functionals. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 32(4):725–750, 2021.
- [10] Luca Natile and Giuseppe Savaré. A Wasserstein approach to the one-dimensional sticky particle system. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 41(4):1340–1365, 2009.
- [11] Svetlozar T. Rachev and Ludger Rüschendorf. *Mass transportation problems. Vol. I : Theory*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [12] Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians : Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling*, volume 87 of

*Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications.*  
Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015.

- [13] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2003.
- [14] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport : Old and new*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.

### **Funding**

M.V. has been supported by the MIUR-PRIN Grant 2020F3NCPX Mathematics for industry 4.0 (Math4I4). G.S. has also been supported by IMATI-CNR, Pavia, by the MIUR-PRIN 202244A7YL project Gradient Flows and Non-Smooth Geometric Structures with Applications to Optimization and Machine Learning, and by the INDAM project E53C23001740001.

### **Contacts**

Francesco Tornabene: Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila.

Marco Veneroni: Department of Mathematics, University of Pavia, Pavia.  
*Email address:* marco.veneroni@unipv.it

Giuseppe Savaré: Department of Decision Sciences, Bocconi University, Milano.