# Convergence of a discrete selection-mutation model with exponentially decaying mutation kernel to a Hamilton-Jacobi equation

Anouar Jeddi\*

\*CMAP, École polytechnique, Institut polytechnique de Paris, anouar.jeddi@polytechnique.edu

December 10, 2024

#### Abstract

In this paper we derive a Hamilton-Jacobi equation with obstacle from a discrete linear integro-differential model in population dynamics, with exponentially decaying mutation kernel. The fact that the kernel has exponential decay leads to a modification of the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation obtained previously from continuous models in [3]. We consider a population parameterized by a scaling parameter K and composed of individuals characterized by a quantitative trait, subject to selection and mutation. In the regime of large population  $K \rightarrow +\infty$ , small mutations and large time we prove that the WKB transformation of the density converges to the unique viscosity solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi equation with obstacle.

**Keywords:** Integro-differential equation, Hamilton-Jacobi equation, viscosity solution, population dynamics.

### 1 Introduction

The study of eco-evolutionary dynamics of populations structured by quatitative traits and subject to selection and mutation, has been extensively developed in several works. Two approaches have emerged: deterministic models represented by partial differential equations (PDEs) (see [11, 3, 15, 12]), and stochastic individual-based models (see [7, 8, 10]). A classical deterministic model, given by a non-local integro-differential equation introduced in [3], assumes that in a population structured by quantitative trait x, the phenotypic density n(t, x), at time t satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n(t,x) = R(x,I(t))n(t,x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(y,I(t))G(y-x)n(t,y)dy, \ \forall (t,x) \in (0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ I(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} n(t,y)dy \quad \forall t > 0, \\ n(0,.) = n^0(.), \end{cases}$$
(1)

where *R* and *p* are respectively the growth rate and mutation rate, which depend on traits and the total size *I*(*t*), and *G* is a probability kernel of mutation effects. A well-know approach to study these models is to perform an asymptotic analysis of the problem in the regime of small mutation steps (see, for instance, [3, 15]). In the regime of small mutation variance of order  $\varepsilon^2$  where  $\varepsilon$  is a small parameter, *G*(.) is replaced by  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}G(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$  to account of small mutations. Moreover, the large time scale is rescaled as  $t \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ . Then, the above model, without competition satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n_{\varepsilon}(t,x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} R(x) n_{\varepsilon}(t,x) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(y) \frac{1}{\varepsilon} G\left(\frac{y-x}{\varepsilon}\right) n(t,y) dy, \quad \forall (t,x) \in (0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ n_{\varepsilon}(0,.) = n_{\varepsilon}^0(.) \end{cases}$$
(2)

The Hopf-cole transformation  $u_{\varepsilon}(t, x) = \varepsilon \log n_{\varepsilon}(t, x)$ , yields in the limit  $\varepsilon \to 0$ , a dynamic described by the following Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t,x) = R(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(y) e^{\nabla u(t,x) \cdot y} dy, \quad (t,x) \in (0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0,.) = u^0(.). \end{cases}$$
(3)

The analysis of [3] is conducted under a mutation kernel with finite exponential moments for any order. Similar results have been obtained in models where mutations are modeled by a diffusion term (see [3, 15]). However, when we consider a kernel which does not decay faster than exponential, Equation (3) may not be well-defined. Biologically it is interesting to consider a kernel with slow decay, since it allows to take into account large mutation jumps with a high rate. Few works have studied kernels with slow decay, for example fractional diffusion in [14, 13], or a fat-tailed kernel in [5].

In this work, we study a discrete linear version of (2) with vanishing discretization step and with an exponentially decaying mutation kernel. Our main goal is to prove that in a limit combining small mutations and discretization step, we obtain the convergence of the discrete model to a Hamilton-Jacobi equation with obstacle. In this work, we focus on the non-finite nature of the Hamiltonian and the discrete aspect. To treat the case where the growth rate may depend on the total population size I, one has to deal with further technical difficulties. In particular the limit of I is not necessarily continuous but only of bounded variation. One then has to deal with the notion of viscosity solutions for discontinuous Hamilton-Jacobi equations (see [13]).

The main difficulty in this work is that the Hamiltonian

$$H(x,p) = -R(x) - p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{p \cdot y} dy, \qquad (4)$$

can be infinite. Another difficulty arises from the limited knowledge of the equation only on a grid. To prove the convergence of the WKB transformation of the density, we combine the method of semi-relaxed limits (see [1, 4]) with Lipschitz estimates in space. The methods based on semi-relaxed limits and Lipschitz estimates are often used alternatively and in classical works one of the methods is usually sufficient. Here we combine the two methods. We use the semi-relaxed limits to overcome the difficulty coming from the Hamiltonian with infinite values, and the Lipschitz estimates in *x* to deal with the discrete aspect of the problem. The method used here is closely related to the works [13, 6].

Here, we explain the motivation to consider a discrete model. The derivation of Hamilton-Jacobi equations from individual-based models is generally carried out in two steps: the first one is to derive deterministic integro-differential equations from individual-based models in the limit of a large population [7, 8], the second is to derive Hamilton-Jacobi equations from integro-differential models in the regime of a small mutation variance [3, 15]. Recently, a direct derivation of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation from an individual-based model has been obtained in the limit of large population in [9] from a model on a discrete gride. Our motivation is the same as in this reference, so we use a similar scaling and descritization.

Thus, this work can be considered as a first step towards deriving a Hamilton-Jacobi equation with obstacle from an individual-based model.

In section 2, we describe the discrete model, the parameter scaling, and we state our main result. The remaining of this paper is dedicated to the proof of this result, we refer to the end of section 2 for a detailed plan of the proof.

### 2 Model and main result

#### 2.1 The model

We consider a population parameterized by a carrying capacity  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ , consisting of individuals characterized by a trait which belongs to  $\mathbb{R}$ , subject to selection and mutation. We consider a parameter  $\delta_K \to 0$  as  $K \to +\infty$ . The trait space with  $\delta_K$  discretization is given by:  $\mathcal{X}_K := \{i\delta_K, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . We consider a discrete version in  $\mathcal{X}_K$  of the selection-mutation model (2) without scalings,  $(n_i^K(t))_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$  where  $n_i^K(t)$  is the population density at time t and trait  $i\delta_K$ , such that

$$\frac{d}{dt}n_i^K(t) = R(i\delta_K)n_i^K(t) + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} p(j\delta_K)\delta_K G((j-i)\delta_K)n_j^K(t).$$
(5)

The growth rate of individuals with trait  $i\delta_K$  is denoted by  $R(i\delta_K)$  and is assumed to depend only on trait. The term with the sum models mutations: an individual with trait  $j\delta_K$  mutates at a rate  $p(j\delta_K)$ , and the probability of mutation to trait  $i\delta_K$  is  $\delta_K G((j-i)\delta_K)$ , where  $G(\cdot)$  is a probability density function representing mutation effects.

Our purpose is to perform an asymptotic analysis of (5). We discuss now our choice of scalings applied to (5). To consider small mutation effects, we assume that the standard deviation of mutations is of the order  $\frac{1}{\log K}$ . To take into account this assumption, we investigate a rescaling introduced in [9], where we reduce the magnitude of mutations. To this end we replace G(.) by  $\log KG(.\log K)$ . We shall introduce also a change of variable in time, given by  $t \mapsto t \log K$ , which accelerates the dynamics and allows us to observe the effects of the accumulation of small mutations. We assume that

$$\delta_K \ll \frac{1}{\log K},$$

so that the trait discretization step allows to observe mutations with sizes of the order of  $\frac{1}{\log K}$ . Then  $h_K := \delta_K \log K \to 0$  as  $K \to +\infty$ . We obtain the following rescaled problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{\log K} \frac{d}{dt} n_i^K(t \log K) = R(i\delta_K) n_i^K(t \log K) + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_K) h_K G(lh_K) n_{l+i}^K(t \log K), \ \forall (t,i) \in (0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{Z} \\ n_i^K(0) = n^{K,0}(i\delta_K), \end{cases}$$

(6)

where  $n^{K,0}$  is the initial density.

Following earlier works [3, 15, 9], we perform the classical Hopf-Cole transformation on

a logarithmic scale

$$u_i^K(t) = \frac{\log\left(n_i^K(t\log K)\right)}{\log K}.$$

It is easier to study the asymptotic behaviour of  $u^K$  instead of  $n^K$ . Therefore the density of the subpopulation characterized by trait  $i\delta_K$  can be expressed as follows:

$$n_i^K(t\log K) = K^{u_i^K(t)}$$

We obtain the following system of ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u_i^K(t) = R(i\delta_K) + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K)e^{\log K(u_{l+i}^K(t) - u_i^K(t))}, \ \forall (t,i) \in (0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{Z} \\ u_i^K(0) = u^{K,0}(i\delta_K). \end{cases}$$
(7)

#### 2.2 Assumptions

1. We assume that *R* and *p* are Lipschitz continuous functions with Lipschitz norms  $||R||_{\text{Lip}}$  and  $||p||_{\text{Lip}}$ , and that there exist two constants  $\overline{R}$  and  $\underline{R}$ , and two positive constants  $\overline{p}$  and *p* such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\underline{R} \le R(x) \le \overline{R} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 
(8)$$

2. The kernel *G* has exponential decay, i.e.,  $G(x) = f(x)e^{-|x|}$ , such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)dy = 1$ , *G* is a positive continuous function in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ 

$$0 < \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) \le f(x) \le \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) < \infty,$$
(9)

which implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)e^{ay}dy < +\infty \ \forall |a| < 1, \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)e^{ay}dy = +\infty \ \forall |a| \ge 1.$$
(10)

An example of Kernel *G* satisfying Assumption 2 is given by the exponential kernel  $G(x) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-|x|}$ .

3. There exist positive constants *A* and *B*<sub>1</sub> such that, for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $K \ge 1$ 

$$u^{K,0}(i\delta_K) \le -A|i\delta_K| + B_1. \tag{11}$$

4. There exists a positive constant L < 1 such that, for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $K \ge 1$ 

$$\left|\frac{u^{K,0}((i+1)\delta_K) - u^{K,0}(i\delta_K)}{\delta_K}\right| \le L,\tag{12}$$

i.e. for any  $K \ge 1$ ,  $u^{K,0}$  is *L*-Lipschitz continous in the discrete trait space  $\mathcal{X}_K$ .

5. The linear interpolation  $\tilde{u}^{K,0}$  of  $u^{K,0}$ , defined as follows: for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  be such that  $x \in [i\delta_K, (i+1)\delta_K)$ ,

$$\widetilde{u}^{K,0}(x) = u^{K,0}(i\delta_K)(1 - \frac{x}{\delta_K} + i) + u^{K,0}((i+1)\delta_K)(\frac{x}{\delta_K} - i),$$

converges locally uniformly to a continuous function  $u^0$ , as  $K \to +\infty$ .

From Assumption 1 the growth rate is bounded and the mutation rate is bounded from below by a positive value, ensuring that every individual has a positive probability of mutating. Moreover, from Assumption 2, we conclude that the sum  $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_K G(lh_K)$ , converges to 1, as  $K \to +\infty$  (see Lemma 3.1 for a proof), Assumption 3 implies that the initial population size  $I^K(0) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta_K n_i^K(0)$  is bounded by  $2\delta_K K^{B_1}/(1-e^{-Ah_K})$ . Finally, Assumptions 4 and 5 imply that  $u^0$  is *L*-Lipschitz continuous.

#### 2.3 Main result

For selection-mutation models, it has been shown in [3, 15, 11] that in the limit, the dynamics are characterized by a viscosity solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi equation. In this context, one expects that in the limit  $K \to +\infty$ , a continuous dynamics in a continuous trait space described by a Hamilton-Jacobi equation is obtained. For this purpose, we introduce the following affine, continuous interpolation of  $u_i^K$ , on the non-discretized trait space  $\mathbb{R}$ . For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  be such that  $x \in [i\delta_K, (i+1)\delta_K)$ , we define

$$\widetilde{u}^{K}(t,x) = u_{i}^{K}(t)\left(1 - \frac{x}{\delta_{K}} + i\right) + u_{i+1}^{K}(t)\left(\frac{x}{\delta_{K}} - i\right).$$
(13)

**Theorem 2.1.** Under Assumptions 1-5, let  $u^K = (u_i^K)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be the solution of (7) and  $\tilde{u}^K$  as in (13). Then, as  $K \to +\infty$ ,  $\tilde{u}^K$  converges locally uniformly to the function  $u \in C([0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ , unique continuous viscosity solution to the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \min(\partial_t u(t,x) - R(x) - p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u(t,x) \cdot y} dy, 1 - |\nabla u(t,x)|) = 0, \quad \forall (t,x) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \\ u(0,.) = u^0(.). \end{cases}$$
(14)

This theorem characterizes, in the limit of large population and small mutation variance, a dynamics described by a Hamilton-Jacobi equation in the viscosity sense. This equation differs from the equations obtained in previous work (see for example, [3, 9]), as it includes an additional term due to the fact that the Hamiltonian (4) takes infinite values when  $|p| \ge 1$ , stemming from the exponential decay of the mutation kernel. Equation (14) has the form of the classical equation

$$\partial_t u(t,x) - R(x) - p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u(t,x) \cdot y} dy = 0,$$

for subsolution when  $|\nabla u| < 1$ . For the supersolution, since the Hamiltonian takes infinite values when  $|\nabla u| \ge 1$ , this enforces *u* to satisfy  $|\nabla u| \le 1$ .

The remaining of this paper is dedicated to the proof of this result: In Section 3, we present results regarding the existence, uniqueness, and comparison principle for the equation (6). In Section 4, we establish the local bound and Lipschitz estimates of the solutions (7), which are crucial ingredients in proving convergence. Sections 5 and 6 are dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2.1.

### **3** Preliminary results

**Lemma 3.1.** For any  $a \in (-1, 1)$ , the sum  $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_K G(h_K l) e^{ah_K |l|}$  converges to  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{a|y|} dy$  as  $K \to +\infty$ , and there exists a finite constant  $\alpha(a)$  such that

$$\sup_{K \ge 1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_K G(h_K l) e^{ah_K |l|} =: \alpha(a).$$
(15)

**PROOF.** Let  $a \in (-1, 1)$ . Let M > 0, by continuity of G the Riemann sum  $\sum_{|lh_K| \le M} h_K G(lh_K) e^{ah_K |l|}$  converges to  $\int_{|x| \le M} G(x) e^{a|x|} dx$ . Moreover, by Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{|lh_{K}|>M} h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{ah_{K}|l|} &\leq C \sum_{|lh_{K}|>M} h_{K}e^{-|lh_{K}|}e^{ah_{K}|l|} \\ &\leq C \int_{|y|\geq M} e^{-(1-a)|y|+o(1)}dy \end{split}$$

Then

$$\limsup_{K \to +\infty} \sum_{|lh_K| > M} h_K G(lh_K) e^{ah_K |l|} \le C \int_{|y| \ge M} e^{-(1-a)|y|} dy.$$

We let *M* tend to infinity, we deduce the convergence of the entire sum  $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_K G(lh_K) e^{ah_K |l|}$ to  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{a|y|} dy$ , as  $K \to +\infty$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** Under Assumptions 1-3, for all  $K \ge 1$ , there exists a unique solution  $n^K \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+, \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}))$  to equation (6) which satisfies, for all  $t \ge 0$ ,

$$\|n^{K}(t)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})} \le C(t)\|n^{K}(0)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})},$$
(16)

where  $C(t) = 1 + e^{(\overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(0))t \log K}$ .

The proof of this theorem is given in appendix A.

**Proposition 3.3.** Equation (6) satisfies the comparison principle for the class of bounded functions in space with the the natural norm  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ . By this we mean that, if v is a bounded subsolution in space of (6), and w is a bounded supersolution in space of (6) such that  $v(0,.) \le w(0,.)$ , then we have

$$v(t,.) \le w(t,.) \quad \forall t \ge 0.$$

**PROOF.** In this proof, we omit the fixed index K, and we consider Equation (6) at time  $t/\log(K)$ .

Since Equation (6) is linear, it suffices to show that for any bounded subsolution in space v of the equation (6) satisfying  $v(0, \cdot) \le 0$ , then  $v(t, \cdot) \le 0$   $\forall t \ge 0$ .

Let *v* be a bounded subsolution in space of Equation (6) satisfying  $v(0, \cdot) \leq 0$ .

Define, for  $(t,i) \in [0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{Z}$  and for *D* to be chosen later  $\widetilde{v}_i(t) := v_i(t)e^{-\frac{1}{2}|i|h_K}e^{-Dt}$ . The function  $\widetilde{v}$  satisfies the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{\log(K)}\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde{v_i}(t) \le (-D + R(i\delta_K))\widetilde{v_i}(t) + e^{-\frac{1}{2}|i|h_K} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((i+l)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K)e^{\frac{1}{2}|l+i|h_K}\widetilde{v_{l+i}}(t).$$
(17)

Let T > 0, we show that  $\tilde{v}_i(t) \le 0$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, T]$ . Let us assume by contradiction that

$$M = \sup_{(t,i)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{Z}}\widetilde{\nu}_i(t) > 0.$$

Since v is bounded in space, we deduce that  $\tilde{v}$  vanishes when  $|i| \to +\infty$ . Thus, the supremum is attained at some point  $(t_0, i_0)$ . Since  $\tilde{v}(0, .) \leq 0$ , we conclude that  $t_0 > 0$ . Conse-

quently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\log\left(K\right)} \frac{d}{dt} \widetilde{v}_{i_0}(t_0) &\leq (-D + R(i_0 \delta_K))M + M \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p(((i_0 + l)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K)e^{\frac{1}{2}|l|h_K} \\ &\leq (-D + \overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(1/2))M. \end{aligned}$$

We choose *D* sufficiently large such that  $-D + \overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(1/2) < 0$ . This is in contradiction with  $t_0 > 0$ .

### 4 Regularity estimates

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $K \ge 1$ . Under Assumptions 1-4, we have for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $t \ge 0$ 

$$-L|i\delta_K| + B_2 + C_2t \le u^{K,0}(i\delta_K) + C_2t \le u^K_i(t) \le u^{K,0}(i\delta_K) + C_1t \le -A|i\delta_K| + B_1 + C_1t, \quad (18)$$

where  $C_2$ ,  $B_2$  and  $C_1$  are real constants.

**PROOF.** The proof of the upper bound is a direct application of the comparison principle proved in Proposition 3.3. Let us show that  $\phi_i(t) := u^{K,0}(i\delta_K) + C_1 t$ , is a supersolution of the equation (7). Indeed, we have

$$\phi'_i(t) = C_1$$
 and  $\phi_{l+i}(t) - \phi_i(t) \le L |l\delta_K|.$ 

We can choose  $C_1 = \overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(L)$ . Then  $(t, i) \mapsto e^{\log K\phi_i(t)}$  is a bounded supersolution in space of (6). By comparison principle, we deduce that

$$n_i^K(t) \le e^{\log K\phi_i(t)}, \quad \forall t \ge 0$$

Then from (11) we conclude that

$$u_i^K(t) \le \phi_i(t) := u^{K,0}(i\delta_K) + C_1 t \le -A|i\delta_K| + B_1 + C_1 t, \quad \forall t \ge 0.$$

Let us now show the lower bound. From (7), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}u_i^K(t) \ge \underline{R}$$

Then, by (12), we deduce that

$$u_i^K(t) \ge \underline{R}t + u^{K,0}(i\delta_K) \ge \underline{R}t + \inf_{K \ge 1} u^{K,0}(0) - L|i\delta_K|.$$

**Proposition 4.2.** Let T > 0, and  $N \ge 0$ . Under Assumptions 1-3, there exists a constant C which may depend on T and N such that for any  $K \ge 1$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $i\delta_K \in [-N, N]$ , we have

$$|\Delta_K u_i^K(t)| \le C. \tag{19}$$

where  $\Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(t) = \frac{u_{i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i}^{K}(t)}{\delta_{K}}$ .

**PROOF**. The calculations in this proof are an adaptation of those in [9, 3]. In this proof, *C* is a constant that may change from line to line. Let T > 0. For any  $t \in [0, T]$ , and  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Delta_{K}u_{i}^{K}(t) = \frac{R((i+1)\delta_{K}) - R(i\delta_{K})}{\delta_{K}} + \frac{1}{\delta_{K}} \left[ \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i+1)\delta_{K})h_{K} - G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} - \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i}^{K}(t) - u_{i}^{K}(t))} \right].$$

Moreover, we have

$$p((l+i+1)\delta_K) - p((l+i)\delta_K) \le \|p\|_{Lip}\delta_K \le \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}}\delta_K p((l+i)\delta_K).$$
(20)

Then

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{\delta_{K}} & \left[ \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i+1)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} - \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i}^{K}(t)-u_{i}^{K}(t))} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\delta_{K}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K}) \left[e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} - e^{\log K(u_{l+i}^{K}(t)-u_{i}^{K}(t))}\right] \\ & \leq \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ & \quad + \log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \left(\Delta_{K}u_{l+i}^{K}(t) - \Delta_{K}u_{i}^{K}(t)\right). \end{split}$$

In the last line we have used the inequality  $e^x - e^y \le e^x(x - y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We obtain that

$$\begin{split} \frac{d}{dt} \Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(t) &\leq \|R\|_{Lip} + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ &+ \log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \Big(\Delta_{K}u_{l+i}^{K}(t) - \Delta_{K}u_{i}^{K}(t)\Big) \\ &\leq \|R\|_{Lip} + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ &\quad \times \Big(1 - \log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))\Big) \\ &+ \log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ &\quad \times \Big(\Delta_{K}u_{l+i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}}u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - \Big(\Delta_{K}u_{i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}}u_{i+1}^{K}(t)\Big)\Big). \end{split}$$

On the other hand, from (20) we obtain for *K* sufficiently large

$$p((i+l+1)\delta_K) \le 2p((l+i)\delta_K).$$

We deduce from (7) that for *K* large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}u_{i+1}^{K}(t) &\leq \overline{R} + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i+1)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ &\leq \overline{R} + 2\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t)-u_{i+1}^{K}(t))}. \end{aligned}$$

From these inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{split} \frac{d}{dt} \bigg( \Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{i+1}^{K}(t) \bigg) \\ &\leq C + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \times \left(3 - \log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))\right) \\ &+ \log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i)\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ &\times \left(\Delta_{K}u_{l+i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}}u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - \left(\Delta_{K}u_{i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}}u_{i+1}^{K}(t)\right)\right), \end{split}$$

where *C* is a constant independent of *K*. Since  $e^x(3-x) \le e^2$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{i+1}^{K}(t) \right) &\leq C + \overline{p} \log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K} G(lh_{K}) e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))} \\ & \times \left( \Delta_{K} u_{l+i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - \left( \Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{i+1}^{K}(t) \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C is independent of K. Let us define

$$g_i^K(t) := \Delta_K u_i^K(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{i+1}^K(t) - 2Ct.$$

We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}g_{i}^{K}(t) \leq -C + \overline{p}\log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t))}(g_{l+i}^{K}(t) - g_{i}^{K}(t)).$$
(21)

Note that from Lemma 4.1 and Assumption (4), we deduce that

$$u_{l+i+1}^{K}(t) - u_{i+1}^{K}(t) \le L|l\delta_{K}| + (C_{1} - C_{2})t \text{ and } g_{i}^{K}(t) \le L + \frac{(C_{1} - C_{2})t}{\delta_{K}} + C(T)$$

Moreover for  $\alpha > 0$ , we have  $g_i^K - \alpha |i\delta_K| \to -\infty$  as  $|i| \to +\infty$ . Let  $(t_{\alpha,K}, i_{\alpha,K})$  a maximum point of  $g_i^K - \alpha |i\delta_K|$  on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{Z}$ . By contradiction we assume that  $t_{\alpha,K} > 0$ , then

$$\begin{split} \frac{d}{dt}g_{i_{\alpha,K}}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K}) &\leq -C + \overline{p}\log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i_{\alpha,K}+1}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K}) - u_{i_{\alpha,K}+1}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K}))}(g_{l+i_{\alpha,K}}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K}) - g_{i_{\alpha,K}}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K})) \\ &\leq -C + \alpha \overline{p}\log K \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i_{\alpha,K}+1}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K}) - u_{i_{\alpha,K}+1}^{K}(t_{\alpha,K}))}(|(l+i_{\alpha,K})\delta_{K})| - |i_{\alpha,K}\delta_{K}|) \\ &\leq -C + \alpha \overline{p} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K}G(lh_{K})|l|h_{K}e^{L|l|h_{K}+|C_{1}-C_{2}|T\log K}. \end{split}$$

Therefore, for  $\alpha$  small enough we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}g_{i_{\alpha,K}}^K(t_{\alpha,K}) < 0.$$

This contradicts the fact that  $g_i^K - \alpha |i\delta_K|$  is maximal at  $(t_{\alpha,K}, i_{\alpha,K})$ . We deduce that

$$\Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(t) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{i+1}^{K}(t) - 2Ct - \alpha |i\delta_{K}| \le \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \Delta_{K} u_{i}^{K}(0) + \frac{\|p\|_{Lip}}{\underline{p}} u_{i+1}^{K}(0) \right).$$
(22)

Letting  $\alpha$  go to zero, and using Lemma 4.1, we conclude that  $\Delta_K u_i^K$  is locally uniformly bounded above by a constant independent of K, which lay depend on the trait  $i\delta_K$ , but which grows at most linearly in  $i\delta_K$ . In a similar manner, we show that  $-\Delta_K u_i^K$  is bounded above by a constant independent of K which grows at most linearly in  $i\delta_K$ .

# 5 Convergence to a viscosity solution

We introduce the following semi-relaxed limits (see [1]): for all  $t \ge 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\overline{u}(t,x) := \limsup_{\substack{K \to +\infty \\ (s,y) \to (t,x)}} \widetilde{u}^{K}(s,y) \text{ and } \underline{u}(t,x) := \liminf_{\substack{K \to +\infty \\ (s,y) \to (t,x)}} \widetilde{u}^{K}(s,y)$$

Note that we can define such quantities, as  $\tilde{u}^{K}$  is locally uniformly bounded, by Lemma 4.1.

#### 5.1 Viscosity supersolution

**Proposition 5.1.** Under Assumptions 1-5, the function  $\underline{u}$  is a viscosity supersolution for the equation (14).

#### **PROOF.** Step 1: <u>u</u> is a viscosity supersolution of (14) in $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ .

Let  $\phi \in C^{\infty}((0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ , and  $(t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$  a strict global minimum of  $\underline{u} - \phi$  on  $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then (see [1], Lemma 4.2) there exist a subsequence of *K*, by abuse of notation still denoted *K*, and a sequence  $(t_K, x_K)$  such that for *K* large enough,  $\tilde{u}^K - \phi$  has a global minimum at  $(t_K, x_K)$  and  $(t_K, x_K) \to (t, x)$ , as  $K \to +\infty$  and  $\tilde{u}^K(t_K, x_K) \to \underline{u}(t, x)$ . On the one hand, since  $(t_K, x_K)$  is a global minimum of  $\tilde{u}^K - \phi$ , we have

$$\partial_t \phi(t_K, x_K) \ge \partial_t \widetilde{u}^K(t_K, x_K). \tag{23}$$

Moreover, by (13) we deduce that

$$\partial_t \phi(t_K, x_K) \ge \frac{d}{dt} u_{i_K}^K(t_K) (1 - \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} + i_K) + \frac{d}{dt} u_{i_K+1}^K(t_K) (\frac{x_K}{\delta_K} - i_K),$$
(24)

where  $i_K = \lfloor \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} \rfloor$ . Since the function *R* is Lipschitz continuous, we have

$$R(i_K\delta_K) \ge R(x) - ||R||_{Lip}|x - i_K\delta_K|.$$

We deduce that when  $K \to +\infty$ 

$$(1 - \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} + i_K)R((i_K + 1)\delta_K) + (\frac{x_K}{\delta_K} - i_K)R(i_K\delta_K) \ge R(x) + o(1).$$

$$(25)$$

Moreover for any  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$u_{l+i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K}) - u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K}) = u_{l+i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K}) - \widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, x_{K}) + \widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, x_{K}) - u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K})$$
  

$$\geq \phi(t_{K}, (l+i_{K})\delta_{K})) - \phi(t_{K}, x_{K}) + \widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, x_{K}) - u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K})$$
  

$$\geq \phi(t_{K}, (l+i_{K})\delta_{K})) - \phi(t_{K}, x_{K}) - C(x)\delta_{K},$$

where C(x) is the space Lipschitz constant of  $u^K$  in [x - 1, x + 1] given by Proposition 4.2. Let M > 0. For K large enough, and for any  $|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor$ , there exists a point  $\xi_{K,l} \in [x - 1, x + 1]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(t_K, (l+i_K)\delta_K) - \phi(t_K, x_K) &= ((l+i_K)\delta_K - x_K)\partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + \frac{1}{2}((l+i_K)\delta_K - x_K)^2 \partial_{xx} \phi(t_K, \xi_{K,l}) \\ &\geq l\delta_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) - C|x_K - i_K \delta_K| - C'(l\delta_K)^2 \\ &\geq l\delta_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) - C\delta_K - C' \frac{M^2}{\log^2 K}, \end{aligned}$$

where C and C' are constants independent of K. Therefore

$$\log K(u_{l+i_K}^K(t_K) - u_{i_K}^K(t_K)) \ge lh_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + o(1).$$

Using similar arguments replacing l by l + 1 in the above inequality and using the Lipschitz estimates, we have

$$\log K(u_{l+i_{K}+1}^{K}(t_{K}) - u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K})) \ge lh_{K}\partial_{x}\phi(t_{K}, x_{K}) + o(1).$$

We take the minimum of the o(1) terms in the above inequalities, and using (24)- (25), and we bound the remainder of the above sum by zero, to obtain

$$\partial_t \phi(t_K, x_K) \ge R(x) + o(1) + \sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor} \left( (1 - \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} + i_K) p((l + i_K + 1)\delta_K) + (\frac{x_K}{\delta_K} - i_K) p((l + i_K)\delta_K) \right) + h_K G(lh_K) e^{lh_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + o(1)}.$$

Moreover, since p is Lipschitz continuous, we have

$$(1 - \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} + i_K)p((l + i_K + 1)\delta_K) + (\frac{x_K}{\delta_K} - i_K)p((l + i_K)\delta_K) \ge p(x) - \|p\|_{Lip}(|l| + 1)\delta_K.$$

We deduce that

$$\partial_t \phi(t_K, x_K) \ge R(x) + o(1) + \sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor} (p(x) - ||p||_{Lip}(|l| + 1)\delta_K) h_K G(lh_K) e^{lh_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + o(1)}.$$

Let us now show that

$$\lim_{K \to +\infty} \sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor} (|l|+1) \delta_K h_K G(lh_K) e^{lh_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + o(1)} = 0,$$
(26)

and that

$$\liminf_{K \to +\infty} \sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor} h_K G(lh_K) e^{lh_K \partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + o(1)} \ge \int_{|y| \le M} G(y) e^{\nabla \phi(t, x) \cdot y} dy.$$
(27)

We start by proving (26). Since  $(t_K, x_K)$  converges, there exists b > 0, such that  $|\partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K)| \le b$ . We have

$$\sum_{|l|\leq \lfloor \frac{M}{h_k} \rfloor} (l+1)\delta_K h_K G(h_K l) e^{bh_K |l|+o(1)} = \frac{1}{\log K} \sum_{|l|\leq \lfloor \frac{M}{h_k} \rfloor} (lh_K + h_K) h_K G(lh_K) e^{bh_K |l|+o(1)}.$$

Since o(1) does not depend on l, the Riemann sum  $\sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_k} \rfloor} (lh_K + h_K) h_K G(lh_K) e^{bh_K |l| + o(1)}$ converges to  $\int_{|y| \le M} y G(y) e^{b|y|} dy$ . Thus  $\frac{1}{\log K} \sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_k} \rfloor} (lh_K + h_K) h_K G(lh_K) e^{bh_K |l| + o(1)}$  converges to zero. Hence (26) is proved.

We now show (27). Since  $\phi$  is a  $C^{\infty}$  function, then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and sufficiently large *K*, we have

$$|\partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) - \partial_x \phi(t, x)| \le \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor} h_K G(lh_K) e^{h_K l\partial_x \phi(t_K, x_K) + o(1)} \ge \sum_{|l| \le \lfloor \frac{M}{h_K} \rfloor} h_K G(lh_K) e^{h_K l\partial_x \phi(t, x) - \varepsilon M + o(1)}$$

This is a Riemann sum which converges to  $\int_{|y| \le M} G(y) e^{\partial_x \phi(t,x)y - \varepsilon M} dy$ . By dominated convergence, we let  $\varepsilon$  tend to zero and we deduce (27). From (26) and (27), and letting M

tend to infinity, we conclude that

$$\partial_t \phi(t, x) \ge R(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\partial_x \phi(t, x) y} dy.$$

We now prove that  $1 - |\nabla \phi(t, x)| \ge 0$ . To do so, we require the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.2.** For any  $(t, x, y) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$\underline{u}(t, x+y) - \underline{u}(t, x) \le |y|. \tag{28}$$

*i.e* <u>*u*</u> *is* 1-Lipschitz continuous in space, uniformly in time.

The proof of this lemma will be given after the end of the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Since  $\underline{u} - \phi$  is minimal at (t, x), by Lemma 5.2 we have for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ 

$$\phi(t, x+y) - \phi(t, x) \le \underline{u}(t, x+y) - \underline{u}(t, x) \le |y|,$$

we conclude that

$$|\nabla \phi(t, x)| \le 1.$$

Therefore, we have proved that  $\underline{u}$  is a viscosity supersolution of (14) in  $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ .

**Step 2: Initial condition.** By Lemma 4.1 and the uniform convergence of  $u^{K,0}$  we deduce that  $\underline{u}(0,x) = u^0(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . That concludes the proof.

#### Proof of Lemma 5.2.

By contradiction, we assume that there exist  $(t, x, y_0) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$\underline{u}(t, x + y_0) - \underline{u}(t, x) \ge |y_0| + \alpha.$$

Since <u>u</u> is lower semi-continuous, then there exists  $\gamma > 0$  such that

$$\underline{u}(t, x+y) \ge \underline{u}(t, x+y_0) - \alpha/4 \quad \forall y \in (y_0 - \gamma, y_0 + \gamma).$$

We deduce that

$$\underline{u}(t, x + y) - \underline{u}(t, x) \ge |y| + 5/8\alpha, \ \forall y \in \mathcal{A}_0 := (y_0 - \min(\gamma, \alpha/8), y_0 + \min(\gamma, \alpha/8)).$$
(29)

Let  $\phi \in C^1((0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R})$  be such that (t, x) is a strict global minimum of  $\underline{u} - \phi$  on  $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then, there exists a sequence  $(t_K, x_K)$  such that  $(t_K, x_K)$  is a global minimum of  $\widetilde{u}^K - \phi$  and  $(t_K, x_K) \to (t, x)$ , and  $\widetilde{u}^K(t_K, x_K) \to \underline{u}(t, x)$ , as  $K \to +\infty$ . Therefore, by definition of  $\underline{u}$ , we have for any  $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  and K sufficiently large

$$\widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, i_{K}\delta_{K} + y) \ge \underline{u}(t, x + y) - \alpha/4, \quad \text{and} \quad -\widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, x_{K}) \ge -\underline{u}(t, x) - \alpha/4, \tag{30}$$

where  $i_K = \lfloor \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} \rfloor$ . By (29)-(30) and the Lipschitz estimates of  $u^K$ , we obtain

$$\widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, i_{K}\delta_{K} + y) - u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K}) \ge |y| + \alpha/8 - C(x)\delta_{K}, \ \forall y \in \mathcal{A}_{0},$$
(31)

where C(x) is the Lipschitz constant of  $u^{K}$  in [x-1, x+1]. Using Assumption (2) we deduce that

$$\begin{split} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i_K)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K) e^{\log K(u_{l+i_K}^K(t_K) - u_{i_K}^K(t_K))} &\geq \underline{p} \sum_{\{l \in \mathbb{Z}/|l\delta_K \in \mathcal{A}_0\}} h_K G(lh_K) e^{h_K|l| + \alpha/8 \log K + O(h_K)} \\ &\geq \underline{p} \sum_{\{l \in \mathbb{Z}/|l\delta_K \in \mathcal{A}_0\}} h_K f(h_K l) e^{\alpha/8 \log K + O(h_K)} \\ &\geq \underline{p} h_K \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) \Big( \lfloor \frac{y_0 + \min(\gamma, \alpha/8))}{\delta_K} \rfloor - (\lfloor \frac{y_0 - \min(\gamma, \alpha/8)}{\delta_K} \rfloor + 1) \Big) e^{\alpha/8 \log K + O(h_K)} \\ &\geq 2\underline{p} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) (\min(\gamma, \alpha/8) + O(h_K)) \log K e^{\alpha/8 \log K + O(h_K)}. \end{split}$$

Proceeding similarly using (31) and the Lipschitz estimates of  $u^K$ , we obtain the same bound with  $i_K + 1$  instead  $i_K$ . Since  $\tilde{u}^K - \phi$  has a minimum at  $(t_K, x_K)$  with  $t_K > 0$ , we deduce that

$$\partial_t \phi(t_K, x_K) \ge \partial_t \widetilde{u}^K(t_K, x_K) \ge \underline{R} + 2\underline{p} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x)(\min(\gamma, \alpha/8) + O(h_K))e^{\alpha/8\log K + O(h_K)},$$

wich converges to  $+\infty$  when  $K \to +\infty$ . This is a contradiction with the fact that the sequence  $(t_K, x_K)_K$  converges to (t, x).

#### 5.2 Viscosity subsolution

**Proposition 5.3.** Under Assumptions 1-5, we have  $\overline{u} = \underline{u}$ , and that the function  $\overline{u}$  is a viscosity subsolution for the equation (14).

The classical method of semi-relaxed limits consists of proving that  $\overline{u}$  is a subsolution and concluding, using a comparison principle, that  $\overline{u} = \underline{u}$  (see [4, 1]). But, as the Hamiltonian (4) can take infinite values, this method cannot be used in the classical way. Here we use an alternative method used in [13, 6]. The strategy of this method is to first show the equality between  $\underline{u}$  and  $\overline{u}$ , then to use the properties of  $\underline{u}$  to show that  $\overline{u}$  is a subsolution.

**Proposition 5.4.** We have for any  $t \ge 0$   $\overline{u}(t,.) = \underline{u}(t,.)$ . In addition  $\overline{u}(0,.) = \underline{u}(0,.) = u^0(.)$ .

This result provides the convergence of  $\tilde{u}^{K}$  to a continuous function. To prove this result, we first regularize the supersolution and modify it to satisfy certain required properties. Then, we use it as a test function that we compare with  $\overline{u}$ .

**PROOF.** For some technical reason we replace R by  $\widetilde{R}$  with  $\widetilde{R}(x) = R(x) - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})$ . Then  $\underline{u} - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t$  is a supersolution of

$$\begin{cases} \min(\partial_t u(t,x) - \widetilde{R}(x) - p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u(t,x) \cdot y}, 1 - |\nabla u(t,x)|) = 0, \quad \forall (t,x) \in (0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \\ u(0,.) = u^0(.). \end{cases}$$
(32)

We start by modifying  $\underline{u} - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t$  at the initial time in the following way: for any  $(t, x) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ 

$$\underline{u}_{\circ}(t,x) = \begin{cases} \underline{u}(t,x) - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t & t > 0\\ \liminf_{\substack{s \to 0 \\ s > 0}} \underline{u}(s,x) & t = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that from Proposition 5.1 and the lower semi-continuity of  $\underline{u}$ , we obtain

$$u^{0}(x) = \underline{u}(0, x) \le \underline{u}_{\circ}(0, x).$$

Then,  $\underline{u}_{\circ}$  is a viscosity supersolution of (32) also in t = 0.

We will regularise  $\underline{u}_{\circ}$  in several steps.

7

**Step 1: Lipschitz continuity in time:** We perform an inf-convolution to make it also Lipschitz continuous in time: for  $\gamma > 0$ , we define

$$\underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma}(t,x) = \inf_{s \in \mathbb{R}^+} \{ \underline{u}_{\circ}(s,x) + \frac{|t-s|^2}{\gamma^2} \}.$$
(33)

Note that from the lower bound in (18),  $\underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma}$  is well-defined. We show that this infimum is attained. For fixed  $(t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\gamma > 0$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $s_{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$\underline{u}_{o,\gamma}(t,x) \geq \underline{u}_{o}(s_{\varepsilon},x) + \frac{|t-s_{\varepsilon}|^{2}}{\gamma^{2}} - \varepsilon.$$

By (18) and the definition of  $\underline{u}_{o,\nu}$  there exists a constant C(t) such that

$$\frac{|t-s_{\varepsilon}|^2}{\gamma^2} - \varepsilon \le C(t).$$

We deduce that  $(s_{\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon}$  is bounded. Then along subsequences, it converges to  $s_0 \ge 0$ . Moreover, by lower semi continuity of  $\underline{u}_{\circ}$ , we deduce

$$\underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma}(t,x) \ge \underline{u}_{\circ}(s_0,x) + \frac{|t-s_0|^2}{\gamma^2}.$$

Hence the infimum in (33) is attained. Moreover, by the above inequality we deduce that  $s_0$  tends to t when  $\gamma$  tends to zero. Therefore, by the lower semi continuity of  $\underline{u}_{\circ}$  and (33), we conclude that  $\underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma}$  converges to  $\underline{u}_{\circ}$  as  $\gamma \to 0$ .

We now prove that  $\underline{u}_{o,\gamma}$  is a supersolution of (32). Let  $\phi \in C^1((0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R})$  and let  $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$  a minimum of  $\underline{u}_{o,\gamma} - \phi$ . Since the infimum in (33) is attained, there exists  $s_0 \ge 0$  such that  $(t_0, s_0, x_0)$  is a minimum of the following function

$$(t,s,x)\mapsto \underline{u}_{\circ}(s,x)+\frac{|t-s|^2}{\gamma^2}-\phi(t,x).$$

Since  $\underline{u}_{\circ}$  is a supersolution of (32) on  $[0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ , we deduce that

$$\frac{2(t_0-s_0)}{\gamma^2}-\widetilde{R}(x_0)-p(x_0)\int_{\mathbb{R}}G(y)e^{\nabla\phi(t_0,x_0).y}dy\geq 0.$$

Moreover, since  $t_0$  is a minimum point of  $t \mapsto \underline{u}_o(s_0, x_0) + \frac{|t-s_0|^2}{\gamma^2} - \phi(t, x_0)$ , we deduce that  $\partial_t \phi(t_0, x_0) = \frac{2(t_0-s_0)}{\gamma^2}$ . Then

$$\partial_t \phi(t_0, x_0) - \widetilde{R}(x_0) - p(x_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \phi(t_0, x_0) \cdot y} dy \ge 0.$$

Moreover,  $\underline{u}_{o,\gamma}$  is also 1-Lipschitz in space, we conclude that it is a supersolution of the equation (32) in  $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ .

**Step 2: Regularisation to be in the domain of the Hamiltonian:** Let us show the  $\mu$ -Lipschitz continuous function  $\mu \underline{u}_{o,\gamma}$  for  $\mu \in (0,1)$ , is a viscosity supersolution for a perturbed equation of (32). By concavity of the Hamiltonian (4) in variable p and the nonpositivity of  $\widetilde{R}$ , we deduce that the function  $\mu \underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma}$  satisfies in the viscosity sense

$$\begin{split} \partial_t u(t,x) &\geq \mu \widetilde{R}(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u.y} dy - (1-\mu) p(x) \\ &\geq \widetilde{R}(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u.y} dy - (1-\mu) \overline{p}. \end{split}$$

We deduce that the function  $\mu \underline{u}_{o,\nu}$  satisfies in the viscosity sense the equation

$$\min(\partial_t u - \widetilde{R}(x) - p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u \cdot y} dy + (1 - \mu) \overline{p}, \mu - |\nabla u|) \ge 0 \text{ in } (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}.$$
(34)

**Step 3: Lower bound:** Since the Hamiltonian is concave with respect to the gradient variable and  $\mu \underline{u}_{o,\gamma}$  is a supersolution to (34), and since any constant is a supersolution to (34), we deduce that for any constant *B*, the function  $\underline{u}_{o,\gamma,\mu}^B = \max(-B, \mu \underline{u}_{o,\gamma})$  is a supersolution of (34) (see Appendix B for the proof). Moreover,  $\underline{u}_{o,\gamma,\mu}^B$  is Lipschitz in time and space, then it is differentiable almost everywhere, and satisfies almost everywhere (34).

**Step 4:**  $C^1$  **regularity:** Let  $\rho : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^+$  be a smooth function with support in the unit ball such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}} \rho(t, x) dt dx = 1$ . We define  $\rho_{\varepsilon}(.,.) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \rho(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$ . Let us define  $\underline{\widetilde{\mu}}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}$ , for any  $(t, x) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ , by

$$\underline{\widetilde{u}}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) = \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu} * \rho_{\varepsilon}(t,x).$$

By (34) we have

$$\partial_{t} \underline{\widetilde{u}}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) \geq \widetilde{R} * \rho_{\varepsilon}(t,x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{+} \times \mathbb{R}} \rho_{\varepsilon}(t-s,x-z)p(z) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu}(s,z).y} dy ds dz - \overline{p}(1-\mu).$$

Since *R* and *p* are Lipschitz continuous functions, and  $\rho_{\varepsilon}$  has support in the ball centred in 0 with radius  $\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t} \widetilde{\underline{u}}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) &\geq \widetilde{R}(x) - \|R\|_{Lip}\varepsilon + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{+} \times \mathbb{R}} \rho_{\varepsilon}(t-s,x-z) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu}(s,z).y} dy ds dz \\ &- \|p\|_{Lip}\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^{+} \times \mathbb{R}} \rho_{\varepsilon}(t-s,x-z) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu}(s,z).y} dy ds dz - \overline{p}(1-\mu). \end{aligned}$$

By Jensen inequality we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}} \rho_{\varepsilon}(t-s,x-z) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu}(s,z)\cdot y} dy ds dz \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{\widetilde{u}}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x)\cdot y} dy.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}} \rho_{\varepsilon}(t-s,x-z) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu}(s,z).y} dy ds dz \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\mu|y|} dy =: C_{\mu}.$$

We deduce from these inequalities

$$\partial_t \underline{\widetilde{u}}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) \ge \widetilde{R}(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{\widetilde{u}}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x)\cdot y} dy - (||R||_{Lip} + C_{\mu} ||p||_{Lip})\varepsilon - \overline{p}(1-\mu).$$

Since  $|\nabla \underline{\widetilde{u}}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}^B| \le \mu$ , then by the dominated convergence theorem and letting *t* go to zero, the above equation is satisfied up to t = 0.

**Step 5: Strictly supersolution:** Let us define  $\underline{\mu}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}$  for a constant *C* to be chosen later, for any  $(t, x) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ .

$$\underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) = \underline{\widetilde{u}}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) + C(1-\mu)t.$$

We choose  $C, \mu$  and  $\varepsilon$  such that  $-(||R||_{Lip} + C_{\mu}||p||_{Lip})\varepsilon + (C - \overline{p})(1 - \mu) > 0$ . We obtain

$$\partial_{t}\underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) > \widetilde{R}(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x).y} dy \quad \forall (t,x) \in [0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R},$$
(35)

and

$$|\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}| \le \mu. \tag{36}$$

We now prove that

 $\overline{u} \leq \underline{u}.$ 

Let T > 0. We want to prove that the supremum of  $\overline{u} - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t - \underline{u}_{\circ}^{B}$  on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$  is non positive, where  $\underline{u}_{\circ}^{B} = \max(-B, \underline{u}_{\circ})$ . By contradiction we assume that

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}}\overline{u}(t,x) - (\overline{R}+\overline{p})t - \underline{u}_{\circ}^{B}(t,x) = a > 0.$$
(37)

According to the upper bound in (18) and the fact that  $\underline{u}_{\circ}^{B} \ge -B$ , we deduce that the supremum is attained at some point  $(t_{0}, x_{0}) \in [0, T] \times F$  with F a compact set. For  $\gamma, \varepsilon$  and  $\mu$  small enough,  $\overline{u} - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t - \underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}^{B}$  takes a positive maximum greater than a/2 at some point  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times F$ , we can take a larger compact set F if necessary. Then (see [1]), there exists a subsequence of K and a sequence  $(t_{K}, x_{K})$  such that  $\widetilde{u}^{K} - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t - \underline{u}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}^{B}$  is maximal at  $(t_{K}, x_{K})$  and  $\widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, x_{K})$  converges to  $\overline{u}(t, x)$  and  $(t_{K}, x_{K})$  converges to (t, x), as  $K \to +\infty$ .

**Case 1:** t > 0. Then, for *K* sufficiently large, we have  $t_K > 0$ , and we obtain that

$$\partial_t \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K, x_K) + \overline{R} + \overline{p} \le \partial_t \widetilde{u}^K(t_K, x_K) = (1 - \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} + i_K) \frac{d}{dt} u^K_{i_K}(t_K) + (\frac{x_K}{\delta_K} - i_K) \frac{d}{dt} u^K_{i_K+1}(t_K),$$

where  $i_K = \lfloor \frac{x_K}{\delta_K} \rfloor$ . However, we have when  $K \to +\infty$ 

$$\frac{d}{dt}u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K}) = R(i_{K}\delta_{K}) + \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}p((l+i_{K})\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(u_{l+i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K})-u_{i_{K}}^{K}(t_{K}))}$$
$$\leq R(x) + o(1) + \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}p((l+i_{K})\delta_{K})h_{K}G(lh_{K})e^{\log K(\underline{u}_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}^{B}(t_{K},(l+i_{K})\delta_{K})-\underline{u}_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}^{B}(t_{K},i_{K}\delta_{K}))+o(1)}.$$

Let M > 0, we have

$$\sum_{|lh_K| \le M} p((l+i_K)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K)e^{\log K(\underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,(l+i_K)\delta_K)-\underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,i_K\delta_K))+o(1)}$$
$$\le (p(x)+o(1))\sum_{|lh_K| \le M} h_K G(lh_K)e^{h_K l\nabla \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,x_K)+o(1)}.$$

On the one hand for all  $\eta > 0$ , we have for *K* sufficiently large

$$|\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_{K},x_{K})-\nabla \underline{u}^{B}_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x)|\leq \eta.$$

On the other hand,  $\sum_{|lh_K| \le M} h_K G(lh_K) e^{h_K l \nabla \underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) + \eta h_K |l| + o(1)}$  is a Riemann sum that converges to  $\int_{|y| \le M} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) \cdot y + \eta |y|} dy$ . Moreover, by Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{|lh_K|>M} p(l+i)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K) e^{h_K l\nabla \underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,x_K)+o(1)} &\leq C\overline{p} \sum_{|lh_K|>M} e^{-(1-\mu)|lh_K|+o(1)} dy \\ &\leq C\overline{p} \int_{|y|\geq M} e^{-(1-\mu)|y|+o(1)} dy. \end{split}$$

Since  $|\nabla \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x)| \le \mu$ , by the dominated convergence theorem, as  $\eta$  tends to zero, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{K \to +\infty} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i_K)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K) e^{\log K(\underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,(l+i_K)\delta_K)-\underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,i_K\delta_K))+o(1)}$$
  
$$\leq p(x) \int_{|y| \leq M} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^B_{o,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x).y} dy + C\overline{p} \int_{|y| \geq M} e^{-(1-\mu)|y|} dy.$$

We let M go to infinity, we obtain

$$\limsup_{K \to +\infty} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p((l+i_K)\delta_K)h_K G(lh_K) e^{\log K(\underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,(l+i_K)\delta_K)-\underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t_K,i_K\delta_K))+o(1)} \le p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x).y} dy.$$

In the same way, we show the same bound on  $i_K + 1$  instead of  $i_K$ . We deduce that

$$\partial_t \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) \le \widetilde{R}(x) + p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(t,x) \cdot y} dy.$$

It is a contradiction with (35).

**Case 2** t = 0. If there exists a subsequence of  $t_K$  such that for large enough K,  $t_K = 0$ , then

$$\widetilde{u}^{K}(t_{K}, x_{K}) = u^{K,0}(i_{K}\delta_{K})(1 - \frac{x_{K}}{\delta_{K}} + i_{K}) + u^{K,0}((i_{K}+1)\delta_{K})(\frac{x_{K}}{\delta_{K}} - i_{K}).$$

Thus  $\overline{u}(0, x) = u^0(x) \le \underline{u}^B_{\circ}(0, x)$ , and then for  $\gamma, \varepsilon$  and  $\mu$  small enough we have

$$\overline{u}(0,x) - \underline{u}^B_{\circ,\gamma,\mu,\varepsilon}(0,x) < a/2,$$

this is in contradiction with (37). We can assume  $t_K > 0$ , and treat this case in the same way of Case 1.

Therefore, we conclude that  $\overline{u}(t,.) - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t \le \underline{u}_{\circ}^{B}(t,.)$  for all  $t \ge 0$ . We let *B* go to infinity we obtain  $\overline{u}(t,.) - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t \le \underline{u}_{\circ}(t,.)$  for all  $t \ge 0$ , where

$$\underline{u}_{\circ}(t,.) = \begin{cases} \underline{u}(t,.) - (\overline{R} + \overline{p})t & t > 0, \\ \liminf_{\substack{s \to 0 \\ s > 0}} \underline{u}(s,.) & t = 0. \end{cases}$$

We deduce that  $\overline{u}(t,.) = \underline{u}(t,.)$  for all t > 0. All that remains is to verify the inequality at zero. We use the second and third inequalities in (18) of Lemma 4.1 and the uniform convergence of  $u^{K,0}$ , we deduce that

$$\overline{u}(0,x) = \underline{u}(0,x) = u^0(x).$$

#### 5.2.1 **Proof of Proposition 5.3**

Let  $\phi \in C^1((0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ , and let  $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$  a maximum point of  $\overline{u} - \phi$ . If  $1 - |\nabla \phi(t_0, x_0)| \le 0$ , we deduce that  $\overline{u}$  is a viscosity subsolution of (14) in  $(t_0, x_0)$ . We assume here  $|\nabla \phi(t_0, x_0)| < 1$ . Since  $\overline{u}$  is 1-Lipschitz, without loss of generality we can assume that  $|\nabla \phi(t_0, x)| < 1$ , for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . In a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 5.4, we show that

$$\partial_t \phi(t_0, x_0) \le R(x_0) + p(x_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla \phi(t_0, x_0) \cdot y} dy.$$

We conclude that  $\overline{u}$  is a viscosity subsolution of (14) in  $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ . By Lemma 5.4 we deduce that  $\overline{u}$  is a viscosity subsolution of (14) in  $[0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ .

### 6 Uniqueness of the Hamilton-Jacobi limit equation

**Theorem 6.1.** Under Assumptions 1-2, the equation (14) has a unique continuous viscosity solution.

**PROOF.** To prove this result, we prove a comparison principle using a doubling variables technique (see [1]). A similar uniqueness result for this type of Hamilton-Jacobi equation with obstacle has been provided in a bounded domain in [6]. Here we give a proof of the comparison principle for the class of bounded functions. For a general proof see [2].

Informal motivation, as discussed in [6], is that if u is a subsolution and v is a supersolution, then at a maximum point  $(t_0, x_0)$  of  $u - \mu v$ , we have  $Du(t_0, x_0) = \mu Dv(t_0, x_0)$ . If  $|Du(t_0, x_0)| \ge 1$ , we have  $|Dv(t_0, x_0)|| = \frac{1}{\mu}|Du(t_0, x_0)| \ge \frac{1}{\mu} > 1$ , which is in contradiction with the fact that v is a supersolution. Thus,  $\max(|Du(t_0, x_0)|, |Dv(t_0, x_0)|) < 1$ , so this problem reduces to a classical problem. Let us now present a complete proof.

Let *u* be a bounded continuous viscosity subsolution and *v* be a bounded continuous viscosity supersolution, such that  $u(0,.) \le v(0,.)$ . We prove that

$$u(t,.) \le v(t,.), \ \forall t \ge 0.$$

Let T > 0. By contradiction, we assume that

$$M := \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} u(t,x) - v(t,x) > 0.$$
(38)

Let  $\mu \in (0,1)$  and  $\eta, \alpha > 0$ , we consider the following function defined on  $[0, T]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$  by

$$\psi_{\mu,\eta,\alpha}(t,s,x,y) = u(t,x) - \mu v(s,y) - \frac{|x-y|^2}{\eta^2} - \frac{|t-s|^2}{\eta^2} - C(1-\mu)t - \alpha(|x|^2 + |y|^2) - \frac{\alpha}{T-t},$$

where *C* is a positive constant to be chosen later. We omit the fixed index  $\mu$  and we denote by  $(t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha})$  a maximum point of  $\psi_{\mu,\eta,\alpha}$ . Such a maximum exists because *u* and *v* are continuous and bounded.

Lemma 6.2. We have the following points:

- 1.  $|x_{\eta,\alpha} y_{\eta,\alpha}| + |t_{\eta,\alpha} s_{\eta,\alpha}| \to 0$  when  $(\eta, \alpha) \to (0, 0)$ .
- 2. There exists a positive constant  $C_0$  such that  $\max(\alpha |x_{\eta,\alpha}|, \alpha |y_{\eta,\alpha}|) \le C_0 \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .
- 3. For  $\eta$ ,  $\alpha$  sufficiently small, we have  $0 < t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha} < T$ .

The proof of this lemma is given at the end of the proof of the Theorem 6.1.

The point  $(t_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha})$  is a maximum point of the function

$$(t,x)\mapsto\psi_{\eta,\alpha}(t,s_{\eta,\alpha},x,y_{\eta,\alpha})=u(t,x)-\phi_1(t,s_{\eta,\alpha},x,y_{\eta,\alpha}),$$

where

$$\phi_1(t, s_{\eta,\alpha}, x, y_{\eta,\alpha}) = \mu v(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}) + \frac{|x - y_{\eta,\alpha}|^2}{\eta^2} + \frac{|t - s_{\eta,\alpha}|^2}{\eta^2} + C(1 - \mu)t + \alpha(|x|^2 + |y_{\eta,\alpha}|^2) + \frac{\alpha}{T - t}$$

Since u is a viscosity subsolution of (14) we have

$$\min(\partial_t \phi_1(t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}) - R(x_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(x_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla_x \phi_1(t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}) \cdot y} dy$$

$$(39)$$

$$= \min(C(1-\mu) + \frac{\alpha}{(T-t_{\eta,\alpha})^2} + h_{\eta,\alpha} - R(x_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(x_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}+2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}) \cdot y} dy$$

$$(1-|q_{\eta,\alpha}+2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}|) \le 0,$$

where  $h_{\eta,\alpha} = \frac{2(t_{\eta,\alpha} - s_{\eta,\alpha})}{\eta^2}$  and  $q_{\eta,\alpha} = \frac{2(x_{\eta,\alpha} - y_{\eta,\alpha})}{\eta^2}$ . Moreover  $(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha})$  is a minimum point of the function

$$(s,y)\mapsto -\psi_{\eta,\alpha}(t_{\eta,\alpha},s,x_{\eta,\alpha},y)=\mu v(s,x)-\phi_2(t_{\eta,\alpha},s,x_{\eta,\alpha},y),$$

where

$$\phi_2(t_{\eta,\alpha}, s, x_{\eta,\alpha}, y) = u(t_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}) - \frac{|x_{\eta,\alpha} - y|^2}{\eta^2} - \frac{|t_{\eta,\alpha} - s|^2}{\eta^2} - C(1-\mu)t_{\eta,\alpha} - \alpha(|x_{\eta,\alpha}|^2 + |y|^2) - \frac{\alpha}{T - t_{\eta,\alpha}}$$

Since the Hamiltonian (4) is concave, then  $\mu v$  is a supersolution of the equation

$$\min(\partial_t u - \mu R(x) - p(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{\nabla u \cdot y} dy + (1 - \mu)\overline{p}, \mu - |\nabla u|) \ge 0,$$

we have

$$\min(\partial_{t}\phi_{2}(t_{\eta,\alpha},s_{\eta,\alpha},x_{\eta,\alpha},y_{\eta,\alpha}) - \mu R(y_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(y_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)e^{\nabla_{y}\phi_{2}(t_{\eta,\alpha},s_{\eta,\alpha},x_{\eta,\alpha},y_{\eta,\alpha})\cdot y} dy + (1-\mu)\overline{p}$$

$$,\mu - |\nabla_{y}\phi_{2}(t_{\eta,\alpha},s_{\eta,\alpha},x_{\eta,\alpha},y_{\eta,\alpha})|)$$

$$= \min(h_{\eta,\alpha} - \mu R(y_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(y_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}-2\alpha y_{\eta,\alpha})\cdot y} dy + (1-\mu)\overline{p}, \mu - |q_{\eta,\alpha}-2\alpha y_{\eta,\alpha}|) \ge 0.$$

$$(40)$$

We deduce from (40) and point 2 of Lemma 6.2 that

$$\left|q_{\eta,\alpha} + 2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}\right| \le \left|q_{\eta,\alpha} - 2\alpha y_{\eta,\alpha}\right| + 2\alpha |x_{\eta,\alpha} + y_{\eta,\alpha}| \le \mu + 2C_0 \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, for  $\alpha$  small enough, we have for some  $\alpha_0 > 0$  depending on  $\mu$ 

$$\left|q_{\eta,\alpha} + 2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}\right| \le \mu + \alpha_0 < 1.$$
(41)

Therefore, from (39)-(40) and (41), we deduce that

$$C(1-\mu) + h_{\eta,\alpha} - R(x_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(x_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha} + 2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}) \cdot y} dy \le 0,$$

$$(42)$$

and

$$h_{\eta,\alpha} - \mu R(y_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(y_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha} - 2\alpha y_{\eta,\alpha}) \cdot y} dy + (1-\mu)\overline{p} \ge 0.$$
(43)

Thus

$$\begin{split} (C-\overline{p}-\overline{R})(1-\mu) &\leq R(x_{\eta,\alpha}) - R(y_{\eta,\alpha}) + (p(x_{\eta,\alpha}) - p(y_{\eta,\alpha})) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}+2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}).y} dy \\ &+ p(y_{\eta,\alpha}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) (e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}+2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}).y} - e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}-2\alpha y_{\eta,\alpha}).y}) dy \\ &\leq ||R||_{Lip} |x_{\eta,\alpha} - y_{\eta,\alpha}| + ||p||_{Lip} |x_{\eta,\alpha} - y_{\eta,\alpha}| \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}+2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}).y} dy \\ &+ 2\alpha \overline{p} |x_{\eta,\alpha} - y_{\eta,\alpha}| \int_{\mathbb{R}} |y| G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha}+2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}).y} dy. \end{split}$$

Moreover, from (41) we can find  $\alpha_1$  depending on  $\mu$  and a positif constant D such that  $\mu + \alpha_1 < 1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |y| G(y) e^{(q_{\eta,\alpha} + 2\alpha x_{\eta,\alpha}) \cdot y} \le D \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y) e^{(\mu + \alpha_1)|y|} dy$ . We conclude that

$$(C-\overline{p}-\overline{R})(1-\mu) \leq (||R||_{Lip} + ||p||_{Lip} \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)e^{(\mu+\alpha_0)|y|}dy + 2\alpha\overline{p}D \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(y)e^{(\mu+\alpha_1)|y|}dy)|x_{\eta,\alpha} - y_{\eta,\alpha}|.$$

We let  $(\eta, \alpha)$  go to zero, and we deduce that  $(C - \overline{p} - \overline{R})(1 - \mu) \le 0$ . This is a contradiction for  $C > \overline{p} + \overline{R}$ .

#### Proof of Lemma 6.2.

We have

$$\psi_{\mu,\eta,\alpha}(t_{\eta,\alpha},s_{\eta,\alpha},x_{\eta,\alpha},y_{\eta,\alpha}) \geq \psi_{\mu,\eta,\alpha}(0,0,0,0).$$

Then

$$\alpha(|x_{\eta,\alpha}|^2 + |y_{\eta,\alpha}|^2) + \frac{|x_{\eta,\alpha} - y_{\eta,\alpha}|^2}{\eta^2} + \frac{|t_{\eta,\alpha} - s_{\eta,\alpha}|^2}{\eta^2} \le 4H,$$
(44)

where  $H = \max(||u||_{\infty}, ||v||_{\infty})$ . Hence, we obtain the points 1 and 2. By definition of  $(t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha})$  we deduce that for  $\eta, \alpha$  small enough  $t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha} < T$ . We prove now that  $t_{\eta,\alpha}, s_{\eta,\alpha} > 0$  for  $\eta, \alpha$  small enough. In fact that, we have for any  $(t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$ 

$$u(t,x) - \mu v(t,x) - C(1-\mu)t - 2\alpha |x|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{T-t} \le \psi_{\mu,\eta,\alpha}(t_{\eta,\alpha},s_{\eta,\alpha},x_{\eta,\alpha},y_{\eta,\alpha}).$$

Therefore,

$$u(t,x) - \mu v(t,x) - C(1-\mu)t \leq \liminf_{\alpha \to 0} \liminf_{\eta \to 0} u(t_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}) - \mu v(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}).$$

By continuity of u and v, we take the supremum in the above inequality, and obtain

$$M - (H + CT)(1 - \mu) \le \liminf_{\alpha \to 0} \liminf_{\eta \to 0} u(t_{\eta,\alpha}, x_{\eta,\alpha}) - v(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}) + H(1 - \mu),$$

with *M* defined in (38). If there exists a subsequence of  $(\eta, \alpha)$  such that  $t_{\eta,\alpha} = 0$ , and since we have  $u(0, .) \le v(0, .)$ . Then

$$u(0, x_{\eta,\alpha}) - v(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}) \le v(0, x_{\eta,\alpha}) - v(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}).$$

Moreover, from Point 2, for fixed  $\alpha$  the sequences  $(x_{\eta,\alpha})_{\eta}$  and  $(y_{\eta,\alpha})_{\eta}$  have along subsequence of  $\eta$ , limits denoted  $x_{\alpha}$  and  $y_{\alpha}$ . By (44), we have  $x_{\alpha} = y_{\alpha}$  and  $s_{\eta,\alpha}$  converges to zero when  $\eta$  goes to zero, and by continuity of v, we deduce that

$$\liminf_{\eta\to 0} v(0, x_{\eta,\alpha}) - v(s_{\eta,\alpha}, y_{\eta,\alpha}) \le 0.$$

We conclude that

$$M \le (2H + CT)(1 - \mu).$$

This is a contradiction for  $\mu$  very close to 1. The case when  $s_{\eta,\alpha} = 0$  can be treated in the same way.

# 7 Proof of Theorem 2.1

From Proposition 5.1,5.3 and Theorem 6.1, we conclude  $\tilde{u}^K$  converges to a continuous function  $u = \overline{u} = \underline{u}$ , which is the unique continuous viscosity solution of the equation (14).

## Appendix A

**Proof of Theorem 3.2.** We define  $A^K = (a_{i,j}^K)_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}}$  the double infinite real matrix where  $a_{i,j}^K = p(j\delta_K)h_KG((j-i)h_K)$ ,  $D^K$  the double infinite diagonal matrix whose diagonal element  $d_i^K$  is given by  $d_i^K = R(i\delta_K)$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and we define the infinite vector  $n^K = (n_i^K)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ . We rewrite the equation (6) at time  $t/\log K$  as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\log K} \frac{d}{dt} n^{K}(t) = (D^{K} + A^{K}) n^{K}(t).$$
(45)

Let T > 0. We consider the following subset of  $C([0, T], \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}))$ :

$$\mathcal{A} := \{ n \in C([0, T], \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})), \ \|n(t)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})} \le C(t) \|n^K(0)\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})}, \ \forall t \in [0, T] \}.$$

The space  $C([0, T], \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}))$  is a Banach space for the norm

$$||n||_{L^{\infty}([0,T],\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z}))} := \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |n_{i}(t)|.$$

Moreover  $\mathcal{A}$  is a closed subset of  $C([0, T], \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}))$ . We define the following mapping:

$$\Phi: \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{A}$$
$$n \mapsto \Phi(n)$$

where  $\Phi(n)$  is the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{\log K} \frac{d}{dt} \Phi(n)(t) = (D^K + A^K)n(t)\\ \Phi(n)(0) = n^K(0). \end{cases}$$

We prove that  $\Phi$  has a unique fixed point in A. Let us show that  $\Phi$  is a mapping from A to A. Indeed, let  $n \in A$ . Then, we have for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ 

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\log K} (\Phi(n)(t))_i &= \frac{1}{\log K} n_i^K(0) + \int_0^t (D^K + A^K) n(s))_i ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\log K} n_i^K(0) + \int_0^t \left( R(i\delta_K) n_i(s) + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} p(j\delta_K) h_K G((j-i)h_K) n_j(s) \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{split} \|\Phi(n)(t)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})} &\leq \|n^{K}(0)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})} + \log K \int_{0}^{t} \left(\overline{R}\|n(s)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})} + \overline{p} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K} G((j-i)h_{K})n_{j}(s)\right) ds \\ &\leq (1 + (\overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(0))C(t)t\log K)\|n^{K}(0)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})}, \end{split}$$

Therefore, for *T* small enough, we have  $1 + (\overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(0))C(t)t\log K \le C(t)$ . This yields

$$\|\Phi(n)(t)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})} \leq C(T)\|n^{K}(0)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})}.$$

Let us now show that  $\Phi$  is a contraction.

Let  $n, m \in A$ , we have for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $t \in [0, T]$ 

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{\log K} \|\Phi(n)(t) - \Phi(m)(t)\|_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})} &\leq \int_{0}^{t} \left(\overline{R} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |n_{i}(s) - m_{i}(s)| + \overline{p} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{K} G((j-i)h_{K}) \right. \\ & \left. \left. \left| n_{j}(s) - m_{j}(s) \right| \right) ds \\ & \leq (\overline{R} + \overline{p}\alpha(0))T \|n - m\|_{L^{\infty}([0,T],\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z}))}. \end{split}$$

So for *T* small enough,  $\Phi$  is a contraction in *A*. Consequently  $\Phi$  has a unique fixed point which is a maximal solution for the equation (6). Moreover

$$||n^{K}||_{L^{\infty}([0,T],\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z}))} \leq C(T)||n^{K}(0)||_{\ell^{1}(\mathbb{Z})}.$$

By iteration in time, we can deduce that the solution exists globally.

### Appendix B

**Lemma 7.1.** Let  $\Omega$  be an open convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and let  $H : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous Hamiltonian that is uniformly Lipschitz-continuous in space and concave with respect to the gradient variable. Let  $u_1$  and  $u_1$  be two Lipschitz-continuous in time and space viscosity supersolutions of the problem

$$\partial_t u + H(x, Du) = 0, \tag{46}$$

such that almost everywhere  $Du^i \in \Omega$ , for i = 1, 2. Then, the function  $v = \max(u_1, u_2)$  is also a viscosity supersolution of (46).

**PROOF.** Let  $u_1$  and  $u_1$  be two viscosity supersolutions of (46). We prove that  $v = \max(u_1, u_2)$  is also a viscosity supersolution of (46). Using similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma

5.4, we regularize these solutions using a convolution approximation. We denote by  $u_1^{\varepsilon}$  and  $u_2^{\varepsilon}$  the regularised functions. By the uniform Lipschitz continuity and concavity of the Hamiltonian, we obtain for i = 1, 2 and for all  $(t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ 

$$\partial_t u_i^{\varepsilon} + H(x, Du_i^{\varepsilon}) \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}} \rho_{\varepsilon}(t - s, x - y) (H(x, Du^i(s, y)) - H(y, Du^i(s, y))) ds dy \ge o(1), \quad (47)$$

where  $\rho_{\varepsilon}$  a regularized function defined in Step 4 in the proof of Proposition 5.4 and o(1) is a negligible constant of  $\varepsilon$  and independent of *i*. Let us prove show that  $v^{\varepsilon} = \max(u_1^{\varepsilon}, u_2^{\varepsilon})$  is a viscosity supersolution.

Let  $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $(p, q) \in D_v^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0)$ , where  $D_v^{\varepsilon}$  is the subdifferential of  $v^{\varepsilon}$  (see [1]). Then, there exists  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$(p,q) = (\alpha \partial_t u_1^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + (1-\alpha) \partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0), \alpha D u_1^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + (1-\alpha) D u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0)),$$

The proof of this property is given after this proof. Then, by the concavity of the Hamiltonian, we obtain

$$p + H(x_0, q) \ge \alpha(\partial_t u_1^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_1^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \ge o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \le o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \le o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + H(x_0, Du_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \le o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))) \le o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0)) \le o(1) + (1 - \alpha)(\partial_t u_2^{\varepsilon}(t_0, x_0))$$

Thus,  $v^{\varepsilon}$  is a viscosity supersolution. Therefore, by the stability of viscosity solutions, we deduce that v is a viscosity supersolution of (46).

We now prove that for  $f = \max(f_1, f_2)$ , where  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are differentiable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , the subdifferential of f satisfies at any point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ 

$$D_{-}f(x) = \text{Co}(Df_{1}(x), Df_{2}(x)),$$
(48)

where  $Co(Df_1(x), Df_2(x))$  is the convex hull of  $Df_1(x)$  and  $Df_2(x)$ .

Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . The case where the maximum is defined by  $f_1$  only or  $f_2$  only is obvious, because if for example  $f_1(x) > f_2(x)$ , we have  $D_-f(x) = \{Df_1(x)\}$ .

Let now assume that  $f_1(x) = f_2(x)$ . By contradiction we assume that there exists  $p \in D_-f(x)$ such that  $p \notin Co(Df_1(x), Df_2(x))$ . Moreover,  $Co(Df_1(x), Df_2(x))$  is a convex compact set. Then, by the Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$  such that

$$\langle p,\xi \rangle > \langle y,\xi \rangle, \quad \forall y \in \operatorname{Co}(Df_1(x), Df_2(x)).$$
 (49)

Let  $\lambda > 0$ , we consider  $z = x + \lambda \xi$ . Since  $p \in D_{-}f(x)$ , we have for  $\lambda$  small enough

$$f(z) - f(x) \ge \langle p, z - x \rangle + o(||z - x||).$$

We use the Taylor expansion at  $x + \lambda \xi$  of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  and let  $\lambda$  tend to zero and the fact that  $f(x) = f_1(x) = f_2(x)$ , we obtain

$$\max(\langle Df_1(x),\xi\rangle,\langle Df_2(x),\xi\rangle) \ge \langle p,\xi\rangle.$$

This is in contradiction with (49).

Acknowledgements: The author is very grateful to Sepideh Mirrahimi for valuable discussions and continuous support in this work, to Nicolas Champagnat and Sylvie Méléard for their fruitful discussions and comments on drafting this paper, and to Charles Bertucci for fruitful discussions on maximum principle. This work is funded by the European Union (ERC, SINGER, 101054787). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This work has also been supported by the Chair "Modélisation Mathématique et Biodiversité" of Veolia Environnement-École Polytechnique-Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle-Fondation X.

### References

- [1] G. Barles. *Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1994.
- [2] G. Barles and C. Lambert. Second-order elliptic integro-differential equations: viscosity solutions' theory revisited. Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire, 25(3):567–585, 2008.
- [3] G. Barles, S. Mirrahimi, and B. Perthame. Concentration in Lotka-Volterra parabolic or integral equations: a general convergence result. *Methods and Applications of Analysis*, 16(3):321–340, 2009.
- [4] G. Barles and B. Perthame. Exit time problems in optimal control and vanishing viscosity method. *SIAM*, 26(5), 1998.
- [5] E. Bouin, J. Garnier, C. Henderson, and P. Patout. Thin front limit of an integro-differential FISHER-KPP equation with fat-tailed kernels. *SIAM J. Math. Anal*, 50:3365–3394, 2018.
- [6] C. Brändle and E. Chasseigne. Large deviations estimates for some non-local equations. general bounds and applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc*, 365(7):3437–3476, 2009.
- [7] N. Champagnat, R. Ferrière, and S. Méléard. Unifying evolutionary dynamics: from individual stochastic processes to macroscopic models. *Theoretical Population Biol*ogy, 69(3):297–321, 2006.
- [8] N. Champagnat, R. Ferrière, and S. Méléard. From individual stochastic processes to macroscopic models in adaptive evolution. *Stochastic Models*, 24:2–44, 2008.
- [9] N. Champagnat, S. Méléard, S. Mirrahimi, and V. Chi Tran. Filling the gap between individual-based evolutionary models and Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Journal de l'École polytechnique — Mathématiques*, Tome 10:1247–1275, 2023.
- [10] N. Champagnat, S. Méléard, and V.C Tran. Stochastic analysis of emergence of evolutionary cyclic behavior in population dynamics with transfer. *Ann. Appl. Probab*, 31:1820–1867, 2021.
- [11] O. Diekmann, P-E. Jabin, S. Mischler, and B. Perthame. The dynamics of adaptation: An illuminating example and a Hamilton–Jacobi approach. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 67:257–271, 2005.

- [12] A. Lorz, S. Mirrahimi, and B. Perthame. Dirac mass dynamics in multidimensionalnonlocal parabolic equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 36(6):1071–1098, 2011.
- [13] S. Mirrahimi. Singular limits for models of selection and mutations with heavy-tailed mutation distribution. *J. Math. Pures Appl*, 134:191–203, 2020.
- [14] S. Méléard and S. Mirrahimi. Singular limits for reaction-diffusion equations with fractional laplacian and local or nonlocal nonlinearity. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 40:957–993, 2015.
- [15] B. Perthame and G. Barles. Dirac concentrations in Lotka-Volterra parabolic PDEs. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 57:3275–3301, 2008.