

Well-posedness of McKean-Vlasov kinetic equations by inversion

Andrea Pascucci*

Alessio Rondelli†

This version: January 22, 2025

Abstract

We consider the McKean-Vlasov equation

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t, [X_t])dt + \sigma(t, X_t, [X_t])dW_t$$

where $[X_t]$ is the law of X_t . We focus specifically on the “kinetic” case, where the equation is degenerate in the sense that the dimension of the Brownian motion W can be strictly less than the dimension of the solution X . Assuming Hölder continuous coefficients and a hypoellipticity condition, we prove the well-posedness of the equation. This result complements the existing literature by addressing the case where the diffusion coefficient σ depends on the law $[X_t]$, which have been previously unexplored. Our proof employs a novel technique that offers a simplified and direct argument, eliminating the need for PDEs involving derivatives with respect to the measure argument and exploiting the sub-Riemannian metric structure induced by the corresponding Fokker-Planck operator.

Acknowledgements: The authors are members of INDAM-GNAMPA.

1 Introduction

Let $T > 0$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ denote the space of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^N . For $t \in [0, T]$, we consider the McKean-Vlasov (MKV) system

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^0 = (B^0 X_t + b(t, X_t, [X_t])) dt + \Sigma(t, X_t, [X_t])dW_t, \\ dX_t^1 = B^1 X_t dt, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where W is a d -dimensional Brownian motion ($1 \leq d \leq N$) defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}_t)$, and $[X_t]$ denotes the law of $X_t = (X_t^0, X_t^1)$. In (1.1), B^0, B^1 are constant matrices of dimension $d \times N$ and $(N - d) \times N$ respectively, and the coefficients are measurable functions

$$b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \Sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}. \quad (1.2)$$

The kinetic Langevin [15] MKV stochastic differential equation (SDE) is a specific instance of (1.1), with $N = 2d$:

$$\begin{cases} dV_t = b(t, P_t, V_t, [(P_t, V_t)])dt + \Sigma(t, P_t, V_t, [(P_t, V_t)])dW_t, \\ dP_t = V_t dt. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

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

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy. **e-mail:** alessio.rondelli2@unibo.it

Its solution is a $2d$ -dimensional process (P_t, V_t) describing the dynamics in the phase space of a system of d particles with position P_t and velocity V_t at time t . Conditional MKV systems of the form (1.3) were first studied in [2] as Lagrangian stochastic models for the simulation of turbulent flows, offering an alternative to the Navier-Stokes equations. In [2], the associated nonlinear martingale problem is solved, and propagation of chaos for the corresponding interacting particle system is established. As in the present paper, a key ingredient in [2] is the use of estimates on fundamental solutions of ultraparabolic PDEs, as proved by Di Francesco and the first author in [8]. In finance, SDEs of the form (1.3) describe path-dependent contingent claims, such as Asian options, and have been recently considered in the analysis of local stochastic volatility models (see, e.g., [20] and [13]).

Genuinely degenerate (i.e., with $d < N$) MKV equations have recently attracted considerable interest. Significant progress has been made in establishing their well-posedness, as shown in [11], [12], and [24]. However, these contributions share the significant limitation that the diffusion coefficient Σ is independent of the measure argument. The objective of this article is to remove the restriction on Σ and extend the previous results to a more general setting. A significant motivation for lifting this restriction is that such dependence on the distribution is frequently observed in practical applications. For example, this dependence appears in [7] to model grazing collisions of particles, and similar considerations motivate the models in [9].

Recently, in [23], we developed a novel approach, based on the so-called Inversion Lemma, which provides a simplified and direct proof of the well-posedness of MKV SDEs, under the assumption of uniform non-degeneracy. In this note we illustrate how this approach can be applied in the framework of MKV kinetic equations by exploiting the sub-Riemannian metric structure induced by the corresponding Fokker-Planck operator.

1.1 Assumptions and main results

Since (1.1) is a non-linear SDE, later it will be useful to linearize it by taking a fixed flow of distributions $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and considering the related linear SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^0 = (B^0 X_t + b(t, X_t, \mu_t)) dt + \Sigma(t, X_t, \mu_t) dW_t, \\ dX_t^1 = B^1 X_t dt. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

Setting

$$b^\mu(t, x) := b(t, x, \mu_t), \quad \Sigma^\mu(t, x) := \Sigma(t, x, \mu_t), \quad \mathcal{C}^\mu := \Sigma^\mu (\Sigma^\mu)^*, \quad B := \begin{pmatrix} B^0 \\ B^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.5)$$

the characteristic operator of (1.4) is $\mathcal{A}_{t,x}^\mu + Y$ where

$$\mathcal{A}_{t,x}^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \mathcal{C}_{ij}^\mu(t, x) \partial_{x_i x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i^\mu(t, x) \partial_{x_i} \quad (\text{diffusion}) \quad (1.6)$$

$$Y = \partial_t + \langle Bx, \nabla \rangle = \partial_t + \sum_{i,j=1}^N B_{ij} x_j \partial_{x_i}. \quad (\text{drift}) \quad (1.7)$$

We now introduce the main structural conditions.

Assumption 1.1 (Coercitivity in \mathbb{R}^d). The $d \times d$ matrix $\mathcal{C} := \Sigma \Sigma^*$ is uniformly positive definite, that is

$$\langle \mathcal{C}(t, x, \mu) \eta, \eta \rangle \geq \lambda |\eta|^2, \quad (t, x, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some positive constant λ .

Note that Assumption 1.1 is a non-degeneracy condition in \mathbb{R}^d , while the system's dimension N can be strictly greater than d . Propagation of diffusion is ensured by the following hypoellipticity condition.

Assumption 1.2 (Hörmander's condition). The vector fields $\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_d}$ and Y satisfy the Hörmander's condition

$$\text{rank Lie}(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_d}, Y) = N + 1.$$

In Section 1.2, we recall that Assumption 1.2 induces a natural *anisotropic* distance on \mathbb{R}^N associated with problem (1.1). The specific regularity assumptions on the coefficients b and Σ , formulated within the framework of anisotropic Hölder spaces, are detailed in Assumption 1.7.

Our main result is the following

Theorem 1.3 (Weak well-posedness). *Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.7 there exists a unique weak solution of (1.1) with initial distribution $[X_0] = \bar{\mu}_0$. The solution is a strong Markov and Feller process, and admits a transition density p satisfying the two-sided Gaussian estimate*

$$C_- \Gamma^{\lambda-}(t, x; s, y) \leq p(t, x; s, y) \leq C_+ \Gamma^{\lambda+}(t, x; s, y), \quad 0 \leq t < s \leq T, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

for some positive constants C_{\pm}, λ_{\pm} , where Γ^{λ} is the Gaussian kernel in (2.2).

A direct consequence of Theorem 1.3 is the following

Corollary 1.4 (Strong well-posedness). *Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.7, if $\Sigma = \Sigma(t, x, \mu)$ is also Lipschitz continuous in x uniformly in $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ then (1.1) admits a unique strong solution.*

1.2 Anisotropic Hölder spaces

According to [14], Assumption 1.2 is equivalent to B^1 having the form

$$B^1 = \begin{pmatrix} B_1^1 & * & \cdots & * & * \\ 0 & B_2^1 & \cdots & * & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B_q^1 & * \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.8)$$

where the $*$ -blocks are arbitrary and B_j^1 is a $(d_{j-1} \times d_j)$ -matrix of rank d_j with

$$d = d_0 \geq d_1 \geq \cdots \geq d_q \geq 1, \quad \sum_{i=0}^q d_i = N.$$

For example, in the Langevin equation (1.3), we simply have $B^1 = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ where I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix.

The structure of B^1 in (1.8) induces a natural definition of anisotropic norm on \mathbb{R}^N , along with related notions of moments and Hölder continuity. Within this framework, basic results such as the intrinsic Taylor formula and Sobolev embedding theorems were recently established in [19] and [22].

Definition 1.5 (Anisotropic norm). For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ let

$$|x|_B = \sum_{j=0}^q \sum_{i=\bar{d}_{j-1}+1}^{\bar{d}_j} |x_i|^{\frac{1}{2j+1}}, \quad \bar{d}_j = \sum_{k=0}^j d_k.$$

Definition 1.6 (Anisotropic spaces). Let $\alpha \in]0, 1[$:

i) for functions $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the semi-norms

$$[f]_{C_B^\alpha} := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|_B^\alpha}, \quad \|f\|_{bC_B^\alpha} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} |f(x)| + [f]_{C_B^\alpha};$$

ii) $\mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)$ denotes the space of distributions $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$[\mu]_{\mathcal{P}_B^\alpha} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |x|_B^\alpha \mu(dx) < \infty.$$

We now introduce our last main assumption.

Assumption 1.7 (Coefficients and initial datum). The coefficients b, Σ in (1.2) are bounded, measurable functions and one of the two following conditions is satisfied for some $\alpha > 0$:

i) the initial law $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and there is a positive constant C such that

$$|b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \nu)| + |\Sigma(t, x, \mu) - \Sigma(t, y, \nu)| \leq C (|x - y|_B^\alpha + \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, B}^0(\mu, \nu)), \quad (1.9)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where

$$\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, B}^0(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{\|f\|_{bC_B^\alpha} \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) (\mu - \nu) (dx);$$

ii) the initial law $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and there is a positive constant C such that

$$|b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \nu)| + |\Sigma(t, x, \mu) - \Sigma(t, y, \nu)| \leq C (|x - y|_B^\alpha + \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, B}^1(\mu, \nu)),$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where

$$\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, B}^1(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{[f]_{C_B^\alpha} \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) (\mu - \nu) (dx).$$

Remark 1.8. In the study of the propagation of chaos phenomenon for interacting particle systems (see [27]), MKV equations of the form (1.1) emerge, with the coefficients in (1.2) taking on the normal form

$$b(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta(t, x, y) \mu(dy), \quad \Sigma(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sigma(t, x, y) \mu(dy).$$

In this case, condition (1.9) is satisfied if $\beta, \sigma \in L^\infty([0, T]; bC_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N))$.

As in the Appendix of [23], the following result can be proved using an analogous argument.

Proposition 1.9. *Setting*

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu, \nu) := \max_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu_t, \nu_t), \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (1.10)$$

for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, $(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^0)$ and $(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^1)$ are complete metric spaces.

To motivate the use of the metrics $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha,B}^i$ we recall a nice example by Zhao [29] which shows that having bounded and Lipschitz coefficients with respect to the *total variation distance* is not enough to ensure weak uniqueness even under the hypothesis of uniformly elliptic diffusion: in fact, a stricter metric is needed. On the other hand, our approach suggests exploring weaker moduli of continuity than Hölder, a direction left for future research (see for example [1] and [30] where Gaussian estimates have been proven for Dini continuous coefficients).

Example 1.10 ([29], Example 1). Let W be a real Brownian motion, I be the interval $[-2, 2]$ and consider the positive constants

$$c_1 := [W_1](I) = \mathcal{N}_{0,1}(I), \quad c_2 := [2W_1](I) = \mathcal{N}_{0,4}(I),$$

and λ_1, λ_2 defined as the solutions to the linear system

$$\begin{cases} c_1 \lambda_1 + (1 - c_1) \lambda_2 = 1, \\ c_2 \lambda_1 + (1 - c_2) \lambda_2 = 2. \end{cases}$$

Now, the coefficient

$$\Sigma(t, \mu) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(t, y) \mu(dy), \quad \text{where } \sigma(t, y) := \lambda_1 \mathbf{1}_I \left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{t}} \right) + \lambda_2 \mathbf{1}_{I^c} \left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{t}} \right),$$

is bounded, uniformly positive and Lipschitz continuous with respect to the total variation distance. However, both W_t and $2W_t$ are strong solutions to the MKV equation

$$dX_t = \Sigma(t, [X_t]) dW_t,$$

with initial value $X_0 = 0$, since

$$\Sigma(t, [W_t]) = \lambda_1 [W_1](I) + \lambda_2 [W_1](I^c) = 1, \quad \Sigma(t, [2W_t]) = \lambda_1 [2W_1](I) + \lambda_2 [2W_1](I^c) = 2.$$

We conclude this section by providing another example with kinetic motivations, where a step-2 Lie algebra structure arises.

Example 1.11. Adding the acceleration component to the Langevin model (1.3), we get the following MKV equation in \mathbb{R}^3 driven by a real Brownian motion W : the solution $Z_t = (X_t, V_t, A_t)$ verifies

$$\begin{cases} dA_t = \sigma(t, Z_t, [Z_t]) dW_t, \\ dV_t = A_t dt, \\ dX_t = V_t dt, \end{cases}$$

and the backward Kolmogorov operator

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{aa} + a \partial_v + v \partial_x + \partial_t$$

satisfies the Hörmander condition (1.2) because ∂_a and $Y := a \partial_v + v \partial_x + \partial_t$, together with their commutators

$$[\partial_a, Y] = \partial_v, \quad [[\partial_a, Y], Y] = \partial_x,$$

span \mathbb{R}^4 . In this case,

$$B^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

induces the anisotropic metric

$$|(a, v, x)|_B = |a| + |v|^{\frac{1}{3}} + |x|^{\frac{1}{5}}.$$

1.3 Motivations and related literature

McKean-Vlasov equations significantly extend the scope of classical SDEs by incorporating the effects of interactions between particles or agents subject to the same dynamics. The initial formulations of MKV equations are attributed to McKean [17], in the context of nonlinear PDEs, and independently to Vlasov [28], in the study of plasma dynamics. The central idea is that in a multi-agent system of many interacting particles, the effect of the other particles on any single particle can be averaged out in favor of a mean field; this process has subsequently been termed propagation of chaos.

MKV equations have garnered significant attention across various fields of applied mathematics, including mathematical finance, demography, statistical mechanics, and mean-field games (see, e.g., [3]). More specifically, MKV equations offer a natural framework for explaining how aggregative phenomena emerge from microscopic descriptions. Notable examples include their application in fluid dynamics, biology and population dynamics (see [4], [27]).

A substantial body of literature addresses the well-posedness problem for *non-degenerate* MKV equations (i.e., with $N = d$). Funaki [10] studied the martingale problem under Lyapunov-type conditions and global Lipschitz assumptions. Subsequently, Shiga and Tanaka [26] proved that strong well-posedness holds when the diffusion is the identity matrix and the coefficients are bounded and Lipschitz continuous with respect to the total variation norm. More recently, Mishura and Veretennikov [18] established weak existence under relatively minimal hypotheses and strong well-posedness under more restrictive assumptions using Girsanov's theorem (which requires independence of the diffusion with respect to the law of the solution). Independently, Chaudru de Raynal [5] and we [23] proved well-posedness for MKV equations with Hölder coefficients. Röckner and Zhang [25] (for a measure-independent diffusion coefficient) and Zhao [29] (for the general case) obtained remarkably comprehensive well-posedness results, even in the presence of a singular drift term.

As mentioned previously, in the degenerate case, weak existence and strong well-posedness have been investigated in [11], [12], and [24], even for measurable coefficients and/or singular drift, but only under the assumption that the diffusion coefficient is measure-independent.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we prove the crucial Inversion Lemma, which expresses the push-forward operator in terms of pull-back operators and allows us to formulate a fixed-point problem in the space of continuous flows of marginals. Section 3 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2 Inversion Lemma

The following notations for integrals will be used interchangeably throughout this section:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f d\nu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x)\nu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nu(dx)f(x).$$

For a fixed flow of marginals $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ and an initial distribution $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we consider the linear SDE (1.4) with $[X_0] = \bar{\mu}_0$ and the corresponding characteristic operator $\mathcal{A}_{t,x}^\mu + Y$ in (1.6)-(1.7). Since in degenerate problems there are some directions that are more natural than others to consider and most importantly Euclidean derivatives only exist in some special directions, we need to properly define the notion of solution to

$$\mathcal{A}_{t,x}^\mu u + Y u = f.$$

Let us note that the integral curve, starting from (t, x) , of the drift Y is the map $s \rightarrow (s, e^{(s-t)B}x)$.

Definition 2.1 (Strong Lie solution). We say that $u :]0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a.e. differentiable along Y if there exists $F \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(]0, T[, bC(\mathbb{R}^N))$ such that

$$u(s, e^{(s-t)B}x) = u(t, x) + \int_t^s F(r, e^{(r-t)B}x) dr, \quad (t, x) \in]0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N, \quad s \in]0, T[. \quad (2.1)$$

In this case, we set¹ $Yu = F$ and say that F is a Lie derivative of u along Y . A solution to equation

$$\mathcal{A}^\mu_{t,x} u + Yu = f$$

on $]0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N$, is a continuous function u such that $\partial_{x_i} u, \partial_{x_i x_j} u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(]0, T[, bC(\mathbb{R}^N))$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ and $f - \mathcal{A}^\mu_{t,x} u$ is a Lie derivative of u along Y on $]0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N$.

The following result was proven in [16].

Theorem 2.2. *Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.7, the operator $\mathcal{A}^\mu_{t,x} + Y$ has a fundamental solution $p^\mu = p^\mu(t, x; s, y)$ verifying the following Gaussian estimates*

$$C_- \Gamma^{\lambda_-}(t, x; s, y) \leq p^\mu(t, x; s, y) \leq C_+ \Gamma^{\lambda_+}(t, x; s, y), \quad 0 \leq t < s \leq T, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where C_\pm, λ_\pm are positive constants which only depend on $N, d, T, B, \lambda, \alpha, \|b\|_{bC_B^\alpha}$ and $\|C\|_{bC_B^\alpha}$; moreover, Γ^λ is the fundamental solution of $\frac{\lambda}{2}\Delta + Y$, that is

$$\Gamma^\lambda(t, x; s, y) := G\left(\lambda \mathbf{C}_{s-t}, y - e^{(s-t)B}x\right), \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$G(\mathbf{C}, x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^N \det \mathbf{C}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(C^{-1}x, x)}, \quad \mathbf{C}_s := \int_0^s e^{(s-t)B} \begin{pmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} e^{(s-t)B^*} dt.$$

Assuming that the coefficients are also continuous with respect to the time variable², the results in [16] guarantee that the fundamental solution p^μ is a strong Lie solution of the backward Kolmogorov PDE

$$(\mathcal{A}^\mu_{t,x} + Y)p^\mu(t, x; s, y) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in]0, s[\times \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (2.3)$$

and, for any $(t, x) \in [0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N$, $p^\mu(t, x; \cdot, \cdot)$ is a distributional solution of the forward Kolmogorov PDE $(Y^* + \mathcal{A}^{\mu,*}_{s,y})p^\mu(t, x; s, y) = 0$ on $]t, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N$, that is

$$\int_t^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy p^\mu(t, x; s, y) (Y + \mathcal{A}^\mu_{s,y}) \varphi(s, y) = 0,$$

for any test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(]t, T[\times \mathbb{R}^N)$. As a byproduct, p^μ provides a solution to the martingale problem for the linear SDE (1.4) which then admits a unique weak solution, denoted by X^μ (with transition density p^μ).

The *push-forward* and the *pull-back* operators acting on the distribution $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are defined as

$$\vec{P}^\mu_{t,s} \eta(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} p^\mu(t, x; s, y) \eta(dx), \quad \bar{P}^\mu_{t,s} \eta(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} p^\mu(t, x; s, y) \eta(dy),$$

for $0 \leq t < s \leq T$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Notice that $\vec{P}^\mu_{0,s} \bar{\mu}_0$ is the density of the marginal law $[X_s^\mu]$.

¹Note that, for F continuous, (2.1) amounts to saying that $F(t, x) = Yu(t, x)$ as a classical directional derivative.

²This assumption simplifies the presentation without imposing significant restrictions. Even if the coefficients are merely measurable in t , $p^\mu(\cdot, x; s, y)$ remains absolutely continuous, and the proof proceeds in a similar manner.

Notation 2.3. Let $\mu, \nu \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ and $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$. For any $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, suitable measurable function, we set³

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}(\eta, f) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) (\bar{P}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu} - \bar{P}_{t_1, t_2}^{\nu}) \eta(y), \\ \bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}(\eta, f) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta(dx) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \bar{P}_{t_1, t}^{\mu} (\mathcal{A}_{t, x}^{\mu} - \mathcal{A}_{t, x}^{\nu}) \bar{P}_{t, t_2}^{\nu} f(x).\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

To fix ideas, $\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}$ and $\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}$ may be interpreted as forward and backward estimators of the distance between the two flows of distributions μ and ν .

A crucial tool in our analysis is the following Inversion Lemma which establishes a link between the forward and backward estimators $\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}$ and $\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}$.

Lemma 2.4 (Inversion). *For any $\mu, \nu \in C([0, T], \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N))$, $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$, $f \in bC_B^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (respectively, $f \in C_B^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$) and $\bar{\mu}_0, \eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (respectively, $\bar{\mu}_0, \eta \in \mathcal{P}_B^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$), we have*

$$\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}(\eta, f) = \bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}(\eta, f).$$

Proof. We have

$$\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}(\eta, f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) (p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t_2, y) - p^{\nu}(t_1, x; t_2, y)) =$$

(by Fubini's theorem and the Gaussian estimates for p^{μ} and p^{ν} , see Theorem 1.1 in [16])

$$\begin{aligned}&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) (p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t_2, y) - p^{\nu}(t_1, x; t_2, y)) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz (\det e^{tB}) p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, e^{tB}z) p^{\nu}(t, e^{tB}z; t_2, y) =\end{aligned}$$

(by the potential estimates in [16], Appendix B, the fact that $\det e^{tB} = e^{t \operatorname{tr}(B)}$, and the definition of Lie derivative along Y ; we write $Y_{t, z}$ to indicate that Y acts on the variables (t, z))

$$\begin{aligned}&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz \operatorname{tr}(B) e^{t \operatorname{tr}(B)} p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, e^{tB}z) p^{\nu}(t, e^{tB}z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz e^{t \operatorname{tr}(B)} (Y_{t, z} p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, e^{tB}z)) p^{\nu}(t, e^{tB}z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz e^{t \operatorname{tr}(B)} p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, e^{tB}z) Y_{t, z} p^{\nu}(t, e^{tB}z; t_2, y) =\end{aligned}$$

(by a change of variable)

$$\begin{aligned}&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz \operatorname{tr}(B) p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, z) p^{\nu}(t, z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz (Y_{t, z} p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, z)) p^{\nu}(t, z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^{\mu}(t_1, x; t, z) Y_{t, z} p^{\nu}(t, z; t_2, y) =\end{aligned}$$

³ $\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}$ and $\bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}$ depend also on $\bar{\mu}_0$ since the push-forward and pull-back operators do. For conciseness, this dependence is implied throughout the remainder of the paper.

(by Lemma 2.5)

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) (\mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\mu - \mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\nu) p^\nu(t, z, t_2, y) =$$

(using again the potential estimates)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) (\mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\mu - \mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\nu) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dy f(y) p^\nu(t, z, t_2, y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta(dx) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \bar{P}_{t_1, t}^\mu (\mathcal{A}_{t, \cdot}^\mu - \mathcal{A}_{t, \cdot}^\nu) \bar{P}_{t, t_2}^\nu f(x) = \bar{I}_{t_1, t_2}^{\mu, \nu}(\eta, f). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.5. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 2.4, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz [(Y_{t,z} p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z)) p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y) + p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) Y_{t,z} p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y)] = \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) (\mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\mu - \mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\nu) p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad - \text{tr}(B) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. The left-hand side of (2.5) is equal to $J_1 + J_2$ where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &:= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz (Y_{t,z} p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z)) p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y), \\ J_2 &:= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) Y_{t,z} p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $Y = -Y^* - \text{tr}(B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz [(Y_{t,z}^* + \text{tr}(B)) p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z)] p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y) \\ &= - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) Y_{t,z} p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad - \text{tr}(B) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y) = \end{aligned}$$

(by the forward Kolmogorov equation)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) \mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\mu p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y) \\ &\quad - \text{tr}(B) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y). \end{aligned}$$

on the other hand, we have

$$J_2 = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) Y_{t,z} p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y)$$

(by the backward Kolmogorov equation)

$$= - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} dz p^\mu(t_1, x; t, z) \mathcal{A}_{t,z}^\nu p^\nu(t, z; t_2, y).$$

which concludes the proof. □

Remark 2.6. The Inversion Lemma appears to be highly robust to modifications of the problem. For instance, if $Y = \partial_t + \langle F(t, x), \nabla \rangle$, where $F : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, and Gaussian as well as potential estimates still hold (as in [6]), then, due to the structure of the integral curves, the forward and backward estimators remain equal, and the proof remains effectively unchanged.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Depending on the specific version of Assumption 1.7, the proof of Theorem 1.3 is based either on the contraction mapping principle in the space $(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^0)$ or in the space $(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^1)$ of continuous flows of distributions $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ where $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i$, for $i = 0, 1$, is as in (1.10). More precisely, denoting X^μ the solution of (1.4), we claim that the map

$$\mu \longmapsto [X_t^\mu]_{t \in [0, T]}$$

is a contraction on $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ (or $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N))$), at least for $T > 0$ suitably small. The thesis will readily follow from this assertion. Indeed, by Proposition 1.9, $(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^0)$ and $(C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^1)$ are complete metric spaces and therefore there would exist a unique fixed point $\bar{\mu} \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ (or $\bar{\mu} \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_B^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N))$), such that $\bar{\mu} = [X^\mu]$. Thus, $X^{\bar{\mu}}$ is the unique weak (or strong, under the assumption of Corollary 1.4) solution of the MKV equation (1.1).

Recalling the notation (1.5) for the coefficients of the characteristic operator, by Assumption 1.7 we have

$$\|\mathcal{C}^\mu - \mathcal{C}^\nu\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N)} + \|b^\mu - b^\nu\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N)} \leq c \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu, \nu), \quad (3.1)$$

for some positive constant c . Note that

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^0([X^\mu], [X^\nu]) = \max_{s \in [0, T]} \sup_{\|f\|_{bC_B^\alpha} \leq 1} \bar{I}_{0, s}^{\mu, \nu}(\bar{\mu}_0, f), \quad \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^1([X^\mu], [X^\nu]) = \max_{s \in [0, T]} \sup_{\|f\|_{C_B^\alpha} \leq 1} \bar{I}_{0, s}^{\mu, \nu}(\bar{\mu}_0, f) \quad (3.2)$$

with $\bar{I}_{0, s}^{\mu, \nu}(\bar{\mu}_0, f)$ as in (2.4). Now, $\bar{I}_{0, s}^{\mu, \nu}(\bar{\mu}_0, f)$ can be estimated by means of the Inversion Lemma 2.4: indeed, if $\|f\|_{C_B^\alpha} \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{I}_{0, s}^{\mu, \nu}(\bar{\mu}_0, f) \right| &\stackrel{2.4}{=} \left| \bar{I}_{0, s}^{\mu, \nu}(\bar{\mu}_0, f) \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^s \|\bar{P}_{0, t}^\mu(\mathcal{A}_{t, \cdot}^\mu - \mathcal{A}_{t, \cdot}^\nu) \bar{P}_{t, s}^\nu f\|_{L^\infty} dt \\ &\leq \int_0^s \|(\mathcal{A}_{t, \cdot}^\mu - \mathcal{A}_{t, \cdot}^\nu) \bar{P}_{t, s}^\nu f\|_{L^\infty} dt \leq \end{aligned}$$

(by (3.1))

$$\leq c \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu, \nu) \int_0^s \max_{1 \leq k, j \leq d} \left(\|\partial_{x_k x_j} \bar{P}_{t, s}^\nu f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_{x_k} \bar{P}_{t, s}^\nu f\|_{L^\infty} \right) dt \leq$$

(by the potential estimates for p^ν , adjusting the constant c as needed, which depends solely on $T, \|b\|_{bC_B^\alpha}, \|\mathcal{C}\|_{bC_B^\alpha}$)

$$\leq c \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu, \nu) \int_0^s \frac{1}{(s-t)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} dt \leq c s^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu, \nu).$$

Thus, by (3.2), we have

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i([X^\mu], [X^\nu]) \leq c T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha, B}^i(\mu, \nu)$$

which shows the contraction property up to small values of T . Using a classical argument, we can extend the result for any finite T .

To prove the second part of Theorem 1.3 we consider a weak solution (X, W) of (1.1) defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}_t)$. The law $\mu \equiv \mu^X$ of X is uniquely determined, and therefore X solves the (standard, non-MKV) SDE (1.4) with backward Kolmogorov operator (2.3); by⁴ Theorem 2.2, X has transition density p^μ .

Let $\varphi \in bC(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$u^\mu(t, x) := \tilde{P}_{t,s}^\mu(\varphi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} p^\mu(t, x; s, y) \varphi(y) dy$$

be the classical solution of the backward Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} (Y + \mathcal{A}_t^\mu)u^\mu(t, x) = 0, & (t, x) \in]0, s[\times \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u^\mu(s, x) = \varphi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases}$$

The Gaussian estimates for p^μ imply that u^μ is a bounded function (also uniformly w.r.t. μ). By Itô's formula, $u^\mu(t, X_t)$ is a local martingale and a bounded process: therefore, $u^\mu(t, X_t)$ is a true martingale and we have

$$\varphi(X_s) = u^\mu(t, X_t) + \int_t^s \nabla_x u^\mu(r, X_r) \Sigma^\mu(r, X_r) dW_r. \quad (3.3)$$

Thus, conditioning (3.3) on \mathcal{F}_t , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_s) \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = u^\mu(t, X_t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p^\mu(t, X_t; s, y) \varphi(y) dy.$$

Given the arbitrariness of φ , it follows that X is a Markov process with transition density p^μ : it also follows that X is a Feller process and thus also enjoys the strong Markov property (see, for instance, Section 18.2 in [21]).

References

- [1] BADERKO, E. A., AND SEMENOV, K. V. Regular fundamental solution to parabolic equation with Dini continuous coefficients in many spatial variables. *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* 274, 4 (2023), 441–459.
- [2] BOSSY, M., JABIR, J.-F., AND TALAY, D. On conditional McKean Lagrangian stochastic models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 151, 1-2 (2011), 319–351.
- [3] CARMONA, R., AND DELARUE, F. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*, vol. 83 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games.
- [4] CHAINTRON, L.-P., AND DIEZ, A. Propagation of chaos: a review of models, methods and applications. I. Models and methods. *Kinet. Relat. Models* 15, 6 (2022), 895–1015.
- [5] CHAUDRU DE RAYNAL, P. E. Strong well posedness of McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations with Hölder drift. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 130, 1 (2020), 79–107.

⁴Here we use the fact that the measure argument enters the infinitesimal generator only through the dependence on t , which is merely measurable, and the results and the bounds in [8] are *uniform in μ* .

- [6] CHAUDRU DE RAYNAL, P.-E., HONORÉ, I., AND MENOZZI, S. Strong regularization by Brownian noise propagating through a weak Hörmander structure. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 184, 1-2 (2022), 1–83.
- [7] DESVILLETES, L., AND VILLANI, C. On the spatially homogeneous Landau equation for hard potentials. I. Existence, uniqueness and smoothness. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 25, 1-2 (2000), 179–259.
- [8] DI FRANCESCO, M., AND PASCUCCI, A. On a class of degenerate parabolic equations of Kolmogorov type. *AMRX Appl. Math. Res. Express*, 3 (2005), 77–116.
- [9] FOURNIER, N., AND GUILLIN, A. From a Kac-like particle system to the Landau equation for hard potentials and Maxwell molecules. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* 50, 1 (2017), 157–199.
- [10] FUNAKI, T. A certain class of diffusion processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equations. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* 67, 3 (1984), 331–348.
- [11] HAO, Z., RÖCKNER, M., AND ZHANG, X. Strong convergence of propagation of chaos for McKean-Vlasov SDEs with singular interactions. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 56, 2 (2024), 2661–2713.
- [12] ISSOGLIO, E., PAGLIARANI, S., RUSSO, F., AND TREVISANI, D. Degenerate McKean-Vlasov equations with drift in anisotropic negative Besov spaces. *Preprint arXiv:2401.09165* (2024).
- [13] LACKER, D., SHKOLNIKOV, M., AND ZHANG, J. Inverting the Markovian projection, with an application to local stochastic volatility models. *Ann. Probab.* 48, 5 (2020), 2189–2211.
- [14] LANCONELLI, E., AND POLIDORO, S. On a class of hypoelliptic evolution operators. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino* 52, 1 (1994), 29–63. Partial differential equations, II (Turin, 1993).
- [15] LANGEVIN, P. Sur la théorie du mouvement brownien. *Compt. Rendus*, 146 (1908), 530–533.
- [16] LUCERTINI, G., PAGLIARANI, S., AND PASCUCCI, A. Optimal regularity for degenerate Kolmogorov equations in non-divergence form with rough-in-time coefficients. *J. Evol. Equ.* 23, 4 (2023), Paper No. 69, 37.
- [17] MCKEAN, JR., H. P. Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations. In *Stochastic Differential Equations (Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ., 1967)*, Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7. Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Office of Aerospace Research, United States Air Force, Arlington, VA, 1967, pp. 41–57.
- [18] MISHURA, Y., AND VERETENNIKOV, A. Y. Existence and uniqueness theorems for solutions of McKean-Vlasov stochastic equations. *Theory Probab. Math. Statist.*, 103 (2020), 59–101.
- [19] PAGLIARANI, S., PASCUCCI, A., AND PIGNOTTI, M. Intrinsic Taylor formula for Kolmogorov-type homogeneous groups. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 435, 2 (2016), 1054–1087.
- [20] PASCUCCI, A. *PDE and martingale methods in option pricing*, vol. 2 of *Bocconi & Springer Series*. Springer, Milan; Bocconi University Press, Milan, 2011.

- [21] PASCUCCI, A. *Probability Theory II – Stochastic Calculus*, vol. 166 of *UNITEXT*. Springer Cham, 2024.
- [22] PASCUCCI, A., AND PESCE, A. Sobolev embeddings for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations. *J. Funct. Anal.* *286*, 7 (2024), Paper No. 110344, 40.
- [23] PASCUCCI, A., AND RONDELLI, A. McKean-Vlasov stochastic equations with Hölder coefficients. *To appear in Stochastic Process. Appl.* (2024).
- [24] PASCUCCI, A., RONDELLI, A., AND VERETENNIKOV, A. Y. Existence and uniqueness results for strongly degenerate McKean-Vlasov equations with rough coefficients. *Preprint arXiv: 2409.14451* (2024).
- [25] RÖCKNER, M., AND ZHANG, X. Well-posedness of distribution dependent SDEs with singular drifts. *Bernoulli* *27*, 2 (2021), 1131–1158.
- [26] SHIGA, T., AND TANAKA, H. Central limit theorem for a system of Markovian particles with mean field interactions. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* *69*, 3 (1985), 439–459.
- [27] SZNITMAN, A.-S. Topics in propagation of chaos. In *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, vol. 1464 of *Lecture Notes in Math*. Springer, Berlin, 1991, pp. 165–251.
- [28] VLASOV, A. A. The vibrational properties of an electron gas. *Phys. Usp.* *10*, 6 (1968), 721–733.
- [29] ZHAO, G. Existence and uniqueness for McKean-Vlasov equations with singular interactions. *Potential Anal.* (2024).
- [30] ZHENYAKOVA, I. V., AND CHEREPOVA, M. F. The Cauchy problem for a multi-dimensional parabolic equation with Dini-continuous coefficients. *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* *264*, 5 (2022), 581–602.