

Continuous-time mean field games: a primal-dual characterization

Xin Guo ^{*} Anran Hu [†] Jiacheng Zhang [‡] Yufei Zhang [§]

Abstract

This paper establishes a primal-dual formulation for continuous-time mean field games (MFGs) and provides a complete analytical characterization of the set of all Nash equilibria (NEs). We first show that for any given mean field flow, the representative player’s control problem with *measurable coefficients* is equivalent to a linear program over the space of occupation measures. We then establish the dual formulation of this linear program as a maximization problem over smooth subsolutions of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, which plays a fundamental role in characterizing NEs of MFGs. Finally, a complete characterization of *all NEs for MFGs* is established by the strong duality between the linear program and its dual problem. This strong duality is obtained by studying the solvability of the dual problem, and in particular through analyzing the regularity of the associated HJB equation.

Compared with existing approaches for MFGs, the primal-dual formulation and its NE characterization do not require the convexity of the associated Hamiltonian or the uniqueness of its optimizer, and remain applicable when the HJB equation lacks classical or even continuous solutions.

Key words. Mean field game, Nash equilibrium, primal-dual characterization, occupation measure, controlled martingale, superposition principle, strong duality, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, Fokker–Planck equation

AMS subject classifications. 91A16, 90C46, 49L12

1 Introduction

Stochastic control and linear programming. The connection between stochastic control problems and infinite-dimensional linear programming was initially envisioned anecdotally by E. Dynkin and later rigorously established in various forms of control problems, including controlled martingale problems [38, 6, 31], singular controls [39, 30], and control problems with constraints [18, 32].

The primary purpose of the linear programming formulation for a control problem is to establish the *existence* of an optimal control (see, e.g., [31]). Since proving existence generally requires identifying just one optimal control for the value function, the question of multiple optimal controls, particularly their characterization through the dual formulation of the linear program, has remained largely unexplored in the stochastic control literature (See Remark 4.1 for further discussion).

^{*}University of California, Berkeley, Department of IEOR, email: xinguo@berkeley.edu

[†]Columbia University, Department of IEOR, email: ah4277@columbia.edu

[‡]The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Department of Statistics, email: jiachengzhang@cuhk.edu.hk

[§]Imperial College London, Department of Mathematics, email: yufei.zhang@imperial.ac.uk

MFGs and NE. The theory of mean field games (MFGs) was pioneered in the seminal works of [25] and [33]. Its ingenious idea of assuming a population of homogeneous players with weak interactions has reduced the analysis of nonzero-sum game to finding the optimal strategy of a single representative player. Moreover, the Nash equilibrium (NE) of the MFG has been shown to serve as an ϵ -NE for the corresponding finite-player game. As such, MFG theory provides an innovative framework for approximating NEs in finite-player dynamic games that would otherwise be intractable.

In MFGs, an NE is defined by two key components as the result of the homogeneity assumption: the first is the optimality condition for the representative player, which ensures that the chosen strategy is optimal given the mean field distribution of the entire population; the second is the consistency condition, which requires that the state dynamics induced by the representative player’s strategy match the distribution of the population state.

To characterize NEs of MFGs, there are three main analytical approaches: the first is through the coupled HJB-FP equations, consisting of a backward Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation that determines the optimal value function of the representative player given the population distribution, and a forward Fokker-Planck (FP) equation that describes the evolution of the population distribution under the optimal feedback control derived from the HJB equation (see, e.g., [25, 33, 3]). The second approach replaces the HJB equation with a backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE) [8, 13, 17], offering a probabilistic approach to characterize the optimal control of a representative player. The third approach is the master equation approach, which involves deriving and analyzing a partial differential equation (PDE) on the space of probability measures based on the coupled forward-backward system [5, 10, 4].

In all these approaches, one typical assumption is that the Hamiltonian associated with the control problem admits a unique optimizer. This guarantees that the representative player has a unique optimal control given the population distribution (see e.g., [11, 25, 12, 3, 10]). The only exception is [27], which studies a continuous-time MFG with two states and two actions and introduces a set-valued ordinary differential equation system to characterize the NEs.

MFGs and linear programming. Linear programming formulation was introduced in mean field control and stopping games in [7, 19, 20] to characterize the optimality condition for NEs and to establish the existence of NEs with mixed strategies. Recently, a primal-dual formulation has been developed in [22] for discrete-time MFGs using the complementarity condition in linear program. By introducing dual variables, this approach successfully characterizes the set of all NEs for *discrete-time* MFGs. As a consequence, [22] also proposes an efficient optimization algorithm for finding multiple NEs with performance guarantees.

These recent advancements in linear programming formulations for MFGs, and in particular the primal-dual analysis highlight the potential of a new approach for analyzing MFGs. However, several challenges must be addressed before this optimization approach becomes a viable computational and analytical tool for MFGs. First and foremost, a primal-dual formulation for general *continuous-time* MFGs must be established for the theoretical development of this optimization approach. Additionally, while the linear programming formulation plays a well-recognized role in analyzing stochastic control problems, the significance and necessity of its dual formulation in MFGs remain less well understood, beyond its demonstrated computational advantages in [22]. Indeed, developing a primal-dual formulation for continuous-time MFGs would be critical for an analytical comparison between this optimization-based approach and existing methods.

Our work. This paper focuses on establishing a primal-dual formulation for general continuous-time MFGs and providing a complete analytical characterization of the set of all NEs, *without*

assuming the convexity of the Hamiltonian or the uniqueness of its optimizer.

The first result is to show that for any given mean field flow, the representative player's control problem with *measurable coefficients* is equivalent to a linear program over the space of occupation measures (Theorem 3.5). In contrast to existing works that assume *continuous coefficients*, this generalization is crucial for characterizing NEs of an MFG, where the optimal policy of the representative player is only measurable in the state variable. This equivalence is established via an equivalent auxiliary controlled martingale problem. The main technical effort in the analysis is to show that, using the so-called superposition principle (Proposition 3.4), any appropriate admissible occupation measure for the linear program induces a weak solution of the controlled state process.

The second result is to establish the dual formulation of this linear program as a maximization problem over smooth subsolutions of the associated HJB equation (Proposition 4.2). The solution to the dual problem plays a fundamental role in characterizing NEs of MFGs, analogous to the role of adjoint variables in identifying all optimal controls in classical control problems. Specifically, for any given admissible occupation measure of the linear program, if there exists a solution to the dual problem that achieves the same value, then the occupation measure corresponds to an NE of the MFG (Theorem 4.5). This is valid even when the associated HJB equation may not admit a continuous solution; see Example 6.2.

Finally, a complete characterization of *all NEs for MFGs* is established by the strong duality between the linear program and its dual problem (Theorem 5.1). This strong duality is obtained by studying the solvability of the dual problem, and in particular through analyzing the regularity of the associated HJB equation. In the case of the uncontrolled diffusion coefficient, the analysis involves studying a class of semilinear PDEs with general mean field dependence, where the coefficients are Hölder continuous in the Wasserstein metric (See Remark 5.2).

Primal-dual vs. existing approaches for MFGs. To compare the primal-dual formulation established in this paper with existing methods, recall that NEs in MFGs are determined by both the *optimality* and the *consistency* conditions. In the HJB-FP approach, the consistency condition is captured by the FP equation, which analyzes the consistency of the dynamics of the population distribution under the optimal feedback control for the associated HJB equation. In the primal-dual approach, the dual problem is introduced so that the consistency condition of the NE can be verified when the value of the primal solution equals to that of the dual formulation, with the existence of the optimal dual variable, i.e., the solvability of the dual problem. Notably, in an MFG setting, the linear programming formulation for the optimal control problem *alone* is not sufficient to characterize the MFG, especially the set of NEs. Instead, the combination of the linear program and its dual problem provides a complete characterization of the set of all NEs for the MFGs.

Furthermore, it is evident from our analysis that in order to find an NE, the constructed dual variable only needs to coincide with the solution of the associated HJB equation on the support of the mean field flow; see Remark 4.2. This is reminiscent of the maximum principle in stochastic control problems, where it suffices to define the (decoupling fields of) adjoint processes along the optimal state trajectory.

Finally, compared with existing approaches for MFGs, the primal-dual formulation and its NE characterization do not require convexity of the associated Hamiltonian or the uniqueness of its optimizer, making the approach applicable even when traditional methods fail. Indeed, in general MFGs, the Hamiltonian may admit multiple optimizers, and the optimal feedback control may exhibit jump discontinuities. Moreover, we show that when the equilibrium flow does not have full support, a solution to the dual problem is not required to satisfy the HJB equation for all

states, hence ensuring the applicability of the primal-dual approach in characterizing NEs even when the HJB equation does not admit a classical or even a continuous solution. See Examples 6.1 and 6.2.

Our techniques and most related works. The most related work is [22], which establishes a primal-dual formulation for discrete-time MFGs with finite states and actions, where the solvability of the dual problem follows directly from the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions. In contrast, this paper develops a primal-dual formulation for general continuous-time MFGs, requiring entirely different techniques: The equivalence between the linear programming formulation and control problem is established through an auxiliary controlled martingale problem by exploiting the superposition principle of diffusions, which mimics a narrowly continuous weak solution of an associated FP equation. Moreover, the dual problem is formulated as a maximization problem over smooth subsolutions of the associated HJB equation, and its solvability is derived by analyzing the regularity of the HJB solution.

The first result (Theorem 3.5) differs in formulation from those in [19, 20, 14], which replace the representative player’s control problem with a linear program over measures (analogous to the primal problem (LP)). However, as emphasized earlier, the linear programming formulation *alone* for the representative player’s control problem is insufficient to characterize MFGs, in particular the complete set of all NEs. The strong duality established in this paper plays a crucial role in addressing this gap.

Notation. For any topological space X , we equip X with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(X)$. We denote by $B_b(X)$ the space of bounded measurable functions on X , and $C_b(X)$ the space of bounded continuous functions on X . We denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the space of finite signed measures on X , $\mathcal{M}_+(X)$ the positive cone of finite (nonnegative) measures on X , and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the space of probability measures on X . We endow $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with the topology of weak convergence. For any Polish spaces X and Y , we denote by $\mathcal{P}(Y|X)$ the space of probability kernels $\gamma : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y)$. We denote by $C_b^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of continuous and bounded functions $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\partial_t u$, $\partial_x u$, and $\partial_{xx} u$ exist, and are continuous and bounded. We denote by $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of time-independent functions in $C_b^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Throughout the paper, proofs of main results are deferred to Section 7.

2 Mathematical setup of MFGs

This section presents a mathematical formulation of a continuous-time MFG. In this game, there are a continuum of homogeneous rational players. Each player controls a continuous-time diffusion process, where both the drift and diffusion coefficients are controlled and depend on a given mean field state distribution. The players optimize a given criterion over a finite time horizon $T < \infty$. An NE in this game is achieved when the distribution of the optimal controlled state process coincides with the given mean field distribution.

Representative player’s problem. Let $\mathbb{T} = [0, T]$ with $T > 0$ be the time horizon, A be a metric space representing the player’s action space, $b : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the state dynamics’ coefficients, and $f : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the cost functions, satisfying the following conditions.

H.1. A is a Polish space (i.e., complete separable metric space), $b : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $f : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are bounded and measurable.

Given the coefficients b and σ , the state dynamics of the representative player follows a diffusion process with a given initial distribution, is controlled by a relaxed policy, and evolves depending on the mean field distribution of the population's state. More precisely, let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T})$ be a given mean field distribution of the population's state, $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the distribution of the initial state, and $\mathcal{P}(A | \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the collection of the representative player's policies. Given an \mathbb{R}^d -valued process $\mathbf{X} = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ on some filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$, and a policy $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A | \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, we call (\mathbf{X}, γ) a closed-loop state-policy pair if $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{P}}(X_0) = \rho$ and \mathbf{X} is a weak solution to the dynamics

$$dX_t = b^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, X_t)dt + \sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, X_t)dW_t, \quad (2.1)$$

where W is a d -dimensional \mathbb{F} -Brownian motion on the probability space, and $b^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are measurable functions such that

$$b^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, x) := \int_A b(t, x, a, \mu_t) \gamma(da | t, x), \quad \sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, x) := \sqrt{\int_A (\sigma \sigma^\top)(t, x, a, \mu_t) \gamma(da | t, x)} \quad (2.2)$$

with \sqrt{M} being the principal square root of a positive semidefinite matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ the set of all closed-loop state-policy pairs (\mathbf{X}, γ) , with the given mean field flow $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Observe that the set $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ may be empty, as (H.1) only requires the functions b and σ to be measurable in the state variable. If the coefficients are more regular or the diffusion coefficient is non-degenerate, then $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is non-empty; see (H.2) in Section 5.

Given the set $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ of closed-loop state-policy pairs, the representative player considers the following minimization problem:

$$\inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})} J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma), \quad (\text{CL})$$

where $J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma)$ is defined by

$$J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_A f(t, X_t, a, \mu_t) \gamma(da | t, X_t) dt + g(X_T, \mu_T) \right] \quad (2.3)$$

for any state-policy pair (\mathbf{X}, γ) on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Under Condition (H.1), $\inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})} J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) < \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \neq \emptyset$.

MFG and its NE. In this MFG, the representative player optimizes (2.3) by considering the mean field flow $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T})$ as given. An NE of the MFG is then achieved when the state process of an optimal state-policy pair for (2.3) has the distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T})$ and $(\mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$ be a state-policy pair on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We say the tuple $(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*)$ is an NE for the MFG if

- (1) (\mathbf{X}^*, γ^*) is optimal when $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ is the given mean field flow, i.e., $J_{\text{cl}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}^*}(\mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*) \leq J_{\text{cl}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}^*}(\mathbf{X}, \gamma)$ for all $(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$.
- (2) $(\boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*)$ satisfies the consistency condition, i.e., $\mu_t^* = \mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{P}}(X_t^*)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$.

Definition 2.1 concerns the closed-loop NE for the MFG, in the sense that for a given $\boldsymbol{\mu}^*$, the representative player optimizes the cost functional (2.3) over all Markov policies $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A|\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. One can define analogously an NE for an open-loop MFG, where the representative player optimizes an open-loop controlled martingale problem (see Remark 3.1).

Under Condition (H.1), the MFG may have no NE or multiple NEs. The focus of our analysis is to characterize the set of NEs in Definition 2.1. It is achieved by characterizing the representative player's optimal controls via a primal-dual approach, where the primal problem is a minimization problem over the space of measures on $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A$, and the dual problem is a maximization problem over suitable functions.

3 Primal formulation of representative player's problem

To derive the primal-dual formulation of the MFG in Section 2, the first step is to show that for any given mean field flow $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$, the representative player's control problem (CL) is equivalent to a linear program (LP) over the space of measures. This is established by showing their equivalence to an auxiliary martingale problem. Such a linear program will be referred to as the primal problem.

The LP. Given the control problem of the representative player, consider two variables $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+ := \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$, where $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ represents the distribution of the state at the terminal time T , and ξ is the occupation measure associated with the stochastic control problem (see e.g., [38, 31]), with $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$ representing the state-action distribution over the time horizon \mathbb{T} .

A pair of measures (ν, ξ) is in the admissible set $\mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ of the linear program if the state-time marginal measure of ξ coincides with the law of a controlled state process, and also is consistent with ν at the terminal time. Specifically, define the following linear constraint for $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \nu(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) \xi(dt, dx, da), \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W} := C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where the operator \mathbb{L}^μ is given by

$$(\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\sigma \sigma^\top)(t, x, a, \mu_t) (\text{Hess}_x \psi)(t, x)) + b(t, x, a, \mu_t)^\top (\nabla_x \psi)(t, x). \quad (3.2)$$

Then the admissible set $\mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \subset \mathcal{X}_+$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu}) := \{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+ \mid (\nu, \xi) \text{ satisfies (3.1)}\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Given the set $\mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ in (3.3), the representative player considers the following LP:

$$\inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi), \quad (\text{LP})$$

where for all $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+$,

$$J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi) := \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} f(t, x, a, \mu_t) \xi(dt, dx, da) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x, \mu_T) \nu(dx), \quad (3.4)$$

with the same cost functions f and g as in (CL).

Note that the (LP) is over measures $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$. This is different from the linear programming formulation in [20], which replaces ξ by a flow of finite measures $t \mapsto m_t(dx, da)$ that is integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure over \mathbb{T} . The formulation (LP) has the advantage that its dual problem is easier to characterize, which subsequently allows for characterizing the set of NEs for the MFG. This will be clear from our subsequent analysis.

Equivalence between (CL) and (LP). In order to establish the equivalence of two problems (CL) and (LP), we first connect the feasible sets $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $\mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ through an auxiliary controlled martingale problem.

The following proposition establishes one direction of the claim: an admissible state-policy pair (\mathbf{X}, γ) in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ induces an admissible occupation measure ξ . Given (\mathbf{X}, γ) , ξ describes the amount of time the joint state and control process spends in each region of the state and control space over the time horizon \mathbb{T} .

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose (H.1) holds. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$ and let $(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ be defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Define $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$ such that for all $F_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$,*

$$\nu(F_1) := \mathbb{P}(X_T \in F_1), \quad \xi(F_2) := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T} \times A} \mathbf{1}_{\{(t, X_t, a) \in F_2\}} \gamma(da|t, X_t) dt \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

Then $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $J_{\text{cl}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) = J_P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\nu, \xi)$.

The converse direction that an admissible occupation measure ξ induces a weak solution of the controlled diffusion process is more involved. Our main technical tool is the superposition principle for diffusion processes [40]. It allows for lifting a measure-valued solution of the FP equation for a given diffusion process to a solution of its corresponding martingale problem, and simultaneously preserving the time-marginals of this measure-valued process.

To this end, we first connect an occupation measure ξ with a Markov policy γ using the following disintegration theorem (see [2, Theorem 14.D.10]).

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X, \mathcal{X}) and (Y, \mathcal{Y}) be two measurable spaces, and assume (Y, \mathcal{Y}) is Polish. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(X \times Y)$ and μ^X be the marginal measure of μ on (X, \mathcal{X}) defined by $\xi^X(F) = \xi(F \times Y)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a unique ξ^X -almost everywhere $\kappa \in \mathcal{P}(Y|X)$ such that for all $F \in \mathcal{X}$ and $E \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\mu(F \times E) = \int_F \kappa(E|x) \xi^X(dx)$. The kernel κ is called the disintegration (probability) kernel of μ with respect to μ^X .*

Using Lemma 3.2, any $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$ can be represented as

$$\xi(dt, dx, da) = \gamma(da|t, x) \xi^{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d}(dt, dx) = \gamma(da|t, x) m^X(dx|t) \xi^{\mathbb{T}}(dt), \quad (3.6)$$

with $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A|\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $m^X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$. We will write $m_t^X(dx) = m^X(dx|t)$ interchangeably. Given the decomposition (3.6), we then identify (a version of) the curve $m^X = (m_t^X)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as a narrowly continuous weak solution of the following equation:

$$\partial_t m_t^X = (\mathbb{L}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma})^\dagger m_t^X, \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d; \quad m_0^X = \rho, \quad (3.7)$$

where the operator $\mathbb{L}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}$ is defined by

$$(\mathbb{L}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma} \psi)(t, x) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left((\sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma} (\sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma})^\top)(t, x) (\text{Hess}_x \psi)(t, x) \right) + b^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, x)^\top (\nabla_x \psi)(t, x) \quad (3.8)$$

with the policy γ in (3.6) and functions $b^{\mu,\gamma}$ and $\sigma^{\mu,\gamma}$ given in (2.2), and $(\mathbb{L}^{\mu,\gamma})^\dagger$ is the adjoint operator of $\mathbb{L}^{\mu,\gamma}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose (H.1) holds. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$ and $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)$.*

- (1) *The time marginal measure $\xi^\mathbb{T}$ of ξ is the Borel measure on \mathbb{T} , i.e., it is the restriction of the Lebesgue measure to the σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$.*
- (2) *Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A|\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the disintegration of ξ with respect to $\xi^{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d}$, and $m^X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$ be the disintegration of $\xi^{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d}$ with respect to $\xi^\mathbb{T}$. Then $m^X = (m_t^X)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a weak solution of (3.7), in the sense that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \nu(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\mu,\gamma} \psi)(t, x) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) m_t^X(dx) dt. \quad (3.9)$$

- (3) *There exists a version of m^X that is narrowly continuous, in the sense that for all $\phi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) m_t^X(dx)$ is continuous. Moreover, $m_0^X = \rho$ and $m_T^X = \nu$.*

We finally apply the superposition principle in [40, Theorem 2.5] to link the narrowly continuous curve m^X in Proposition 3.3 to a solution of the martingale problem associated with the generator $\mathbb{L}^{\mu,\gamma}$, and further to a weak solution to the controlled SDE (2.1).

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose (H.1) holds. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$ and $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)$. Let m^X be the narrowly continuous weak solution of (3.7) constructed in Proposition 3.3. Then there exists a probability measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d))$ such that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$, the process*

$$t \mapsto M_t^\psi := \psi(t, \omega(t)) - \int_0^t \left((\mathbb{L}^{\mu,\gamma} \psi)(s, \omega(s)) + (\partial_t \psi)(s, \omega(s)) \right) ds$$

is a martingale with respect to the natural filtration on $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$, with $t \mapsto \omega(t)$ being the canonical process, and $\mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(\omega(t)) = m_t^X$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Consequently, there exists a process \mathbf{X} , defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, such that $(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\mu)$, and $J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) = J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi)$.

Remark 3.1. By setting $\mathbf{\Lambda}_t = \gamma(da|t, X_t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$, Proposition 3.4 implies that given $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)$, there exists an $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(A)$ -valued process $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Lambda}) = (X_t, \Lambda_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(X_0) = \rho$, $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Lambda})$ is \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable and for all $\psi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the process

$$M_t^\psi := \psi(X_t) - \psi(X_0) - \int_0^t \int_A (\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(s, X_s, a) \Lambda_s(da) ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad (3.10)$$

is an \mathbb{F} -martingale on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, with \mathbb{L}^μ defined in (3.2), and

$$J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi) = J_{\text{op}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Lambda}) := \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_A f(t, X_t, a, \mu_t) \Lambda_t(da) dt + g(X_T, \mu_T) \right].$$

In fact, one can show minimizing $J_{\text{op}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Lambda})$ over all pairs $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Lambda})$ satisfying (3.10) yields the same value as $\inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi)$. This establishes the equivalence between a controlled martingale problem and an LP formulation for the control problem with measurable coefficients, without requiring the continuity of system coefficients as assumed in [38, 31, 19].

Combining Propositions 3.1 and 3.4 shows that two formulations (CL) and (LP) of the representative player's control problem are equivalent.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose (H.1) holds, and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$. Then the formulations (CL) and (LP) have the same value:*

$$\inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\mu)} J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) = \inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi). \quad (3.11)$$

Remark 3.2. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 3.5 is the first result establishing an equivalent LP for a continuous-time control problem, whose state coefficients are only *measurable* in time and state variables. All prior results on such equivalence assume that the system coefficients are *continuous* (see, e.g., [38, 31]) or even *Lipschitz continuous* in the state variables (see [19]).

Removing the continuity assumption in Theorem 3.5 is crucial for our subsequent analysis for dual formulation of the LP, and in particular solvability of the dual problem and characterization of the NEs set in the MFG. This is because the optimal policy of the representative player's problem is only measurable in the state variable, which implies that the state process under an optimal policy is measurable in the state variable and not necessarily continuous.

4 Dual formulation and verification of NEs

This section introduces a dual formulation of the representative player's primal problem. This dual problem is formulated as a maximization problem over smooth subsolutions of the associated HJB equation. As we will demonstrate, the combination of the primal and dual solutions provides a novel verification theorem for NEs of the MFG.

Derivation of the dual problem. To derive the dual formulation of (LP) we first rewrite the primal problem (LP) using dual pairs of (infinite-dimensional) topological vector spaces.

Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$, $\mathcal{Y} = B_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \times B_b(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$, $\mathcal{W} = C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ as defined in Section 3, and $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{W}^\#$ be the algebraic dual space of \mathcal{W} containing all linear functionals from \mathcal{W} to \mathbb{R} . And we equip the spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} with weak topologies induced by the dual pairings between $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}$, respectively. More precisely, let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ be the bilinear form on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that for all $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $(u, \phi) \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\langle (\nu, \xi), (u, \phi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x) \nu(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \phi(t, x, a) \xi(dt, dx, da).$$

We also endow \mathcal{X} the weak topology $\sigma(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ (called σ -topology on \mathcal{X}) induced by the dual pair $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, i.e., the coarsest topology under which for all $(u, \phi) \in \mathcal{Y}$, the linear map $(\nu, \xi) \mapsto \langle (\nu, \xi), (u, \phi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ is continuous. Similarly, we define the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$ on $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}$ such that $\langle \eta, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}} := \eta(\psi)$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{Z}$. We endow \mathcal{Z} the weak topology $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{W})$ (called σ -topology on \mathcal{Z}) induced by the dual pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$.

Using the dual pair $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, the primal problem (LP) can be rewritten equivalently as

$$\inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi), \quad \text{with } J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi) := \left\langle (\nu, \xi), (g(\cdot, \mu_T), f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}, \quad (\text{LP}^*)$$

with $\mathcal{D}_P(\mu) = \{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+ \mid \mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi) = h\}$, where $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is a linear map and $h \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi)(\psi) := \left\langle (\nu, \xi), (\psi(T, \cdot), -(\partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}, \quad h(\psi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx). \quad (4.1)$$

The map \mathcal{L} is continuous with respect to the σ -topology as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose (H.1) holds and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$. For each $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$, let $\mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi)(\psi)$ be defined as in (4.1). Then $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is a well-defined, $\sigma(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ - $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{W})$ -continuous linear map.*

We next derive the dual problem of (LP*) by applying the abstract duality theory in Section 3.3 of [1]. By Lemma 4.1 and [1, Proposition 4, p.37], the adjoint $\mathcal{L}^* : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ of \mathcal{L} is a well-defined linear map satisfying

$$\langle \mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi), \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}} = \langle (\nu, \xi), \mathcal{L}^*(\psi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, (\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}.$$

The dual formulation for (LP*) is then defined as

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}^*}(\mu)} \langle b, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}, \quad (\text{Dual}^*)$$

with the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}^*}(\mu) := \{\psi \in \mathcal{W} \mid (g(\cdot, \mu_T), f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) - \mathcal{L}^*(\psi) \in \mathcal{X}_+^\#\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathcal{X}_+^\#$ is the dual cone of \mathcal{X}_+ in \mathcal{Y} defined by

$$\mathcal{X}_+^\# := \{(u, \phi) \in \mathcal{Y} \mid \langle (\nu, \xi), (u, \phi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+\}.$$

Hereafter, we call $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$ a dual variable and $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}^*}(\mu)$ a feasible/admissible dual variable.

The following proposition presents an explicit formulation of the dual problem (Dual*).

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose (H.1) holds, and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$. The dual problem (Dual*) can be written in the following form:*

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}^*}(\mu)} J_{\mathcal{P}^*}^\mu(\psi), \quad \text{with } J_{\mathcal{P}^*}^\mu(\psi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx), \quad (\text{Dual})$$

and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}^*}(\mu) \subset \mathcal{W}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}^*}(\mu) := \left\{ \psi \in \mathcal{W} \mid \begin{array}{l} g(x, \mu_T) \geq \psi(T, x), \quad \partial_t \psi(t, x) + (\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t) \geq 0 \\ \text{for all } (t, x, a) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A. \end{array} \right\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Remark 4.1. Observe that the dual problem (Dual) can be interpreted as the supremum over all smooth subsolutions of the following HJB equation: for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\partial_t V(t, x) + \inf_{a \in A} ((\mathbb{L}^\mu V)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t)) = 0, \quad V(T, x) = g(x, \mu_T).$$

Similar observations have been made for control problems with Lipschitz coefficients in [34, 21, 9, 37], where the dual problem serves as an intermediate step in connecting the value function to viscosity solutions of the HJB equation.

Here we extend the dual formulation to control problems with measurable coefficients. As will be shown in Theorems 4.5 and 5.1, a solution to this dual problem plays an essential role in characterizing NEs of the MFG.

Verification theorem of NEs. To characterize the NE, we first observe that the value of the dual problem provides a lower bound for the value of the primal problem, as shown in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.3 (Weak duality). *Suppose (H.1) holds and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$. Then*

$$\inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi) \geq \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)} J_{P^*}^\mu(\psi).$$

Proposition 4.3 implies the following verification theorem for an optimality control of the representative player's problem.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose (H.1) holds and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(A|\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. If $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\psi}) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A) \times C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies the following linear equations:*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x, \mu_T) \bar{\nu}(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} f(t, x, a, \mu_t) \bar{\xi}(dt, dx, da) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{\psi}(0, x) \rho(dx), \end{array} \right. \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \bar{\nu}(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ = \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) \bar{\xi}(dt, dx, da), \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, \end{array} \right. \quad (4.4b)$$

$$g(x, \mu_T) \geq \bar{\psi}(T, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (4.4c)$$

$$\partial_t \bar{\psi}(t, x) + (\mathbb{L}^\mu \bar{\psi})(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t) \geq 0, \quad \forall (t, x, a) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A, \quad (4.4d)$$

then $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}) \in \arg \min_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi)$ and $\bar{\psi} \in \arg \max_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)} J_{P^*}^\mu(\psi)$.

Proposition 4.4 follows directly from Proposition 4.3: Condition (4.4b) ensures that $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi})$ is a feasible solution to the primal problem, Conditions (4.4c) and (4.4d) guarantee that $\bar{\psi}$ is a feasible solution to the dual problem, and Condition (4.4a) implies $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi})$ and $\bar{\psi}$ yield the same value, which ensures the optimality of $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\psi})$ due to the weak duality property.

To provide a verification theorem for the NEs of the MFG, observe that the consistency condition in Definition 2.1 can be enforced by replacing μ in Proposition 4.4 with the state marginal law of $\bar{\xi}$. Consequently, we can obtain a verification theorem for an NE of the MFG through solutions of a primal-dual system.

Theorem 4.5 (Primal-dual formulation of MFG). *Suppose (H.1) holds. Let $\mu^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d|\mathbb{T})$ be narrowly continuous, $\xi^* \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$, and $\psi^* \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. If (μ^*, ξ^*, ψ^*) satisfies the following primal-dual system:*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x, \mu_T^*) \mu_T^*(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} f(t, x, a, \mu_t^*) \xi^*(dt, dx, da) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi^*(0, x) \rho(dx), \end{array} \right. \quad (4.5a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \mu_T^*(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ = \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\mu^*} \psi)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) \xi^*(dt, dx, da), \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, \end{array} \right. \quad (4.5b)$$

$$g(x, \mu_T^*) \geq \psi^*(T, x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (4.5c)$$

$$\partial_t \psi^*(t, x) + (\mathbb{L}^{\mu^*} \psi^*)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall (t, x, a) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A, \quad (4.5d)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d} \psi(t, x) \mu_t^*(dx) dt = \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \psi(t, x) \xi^*(dt, dx, da), \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, \end{array} \right. \quad (4.5e)$$

then $\psi^* \in \arg \max_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)} J_{P^*}^{\mu^*}(\psi)$, and there exists a process \mathbf{X}^* such that $(\mu^*, \mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T}) \times \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\mu^*)$ is an NE, with $\gamma^* \in \mathcal{P}(A | \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ being the disintegration kernel of ξ^* in Lemma 3.2.

Remark 4.2. Condition (4.5b) ensures that ξ^* is an admissible occupation measure of the representative player's primal problem given the mean field flow μ^* , and Conditions (4.5c) and (4.5d) ensures that ψ^* is a feasible solution of the representative player's dual problem given the mean field flow μ^* . Condition (4.4a) ensures simultaneously that ξ^* and ψ^* are optimal solutions for the primal and dual formulations, respectively. Finally, Condition (4.5e) ensures that the time-space marginal of ξ^* is consistent with the given mean field flow μ^* .

Corollary 4.6. Under Conditions (4.5b), (4.5c) and (4.5d), Condition (4.5a) is equivalent to the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (g(x, \mu_T^*) - \psi^*(T, x)) \mu_T^*(dx) &= 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left(\partial_t \psi^*(t, x) + (\mathbb{L}^{\mu^*} \psi^*)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t^*) \right) \xi^*(dt, dx, da) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Consequently, Theorem 4.5 holds when (4.5a) is replaced by (4.6).

Note that Condition (4.6) suggests the dual variable ψ^* to satisfy $\psi^*(T, \cdot) = g(\cdot, \mu_T^*)$ on the support of μ_T^* , and $\min_{a \in A} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\mu^*} \psi^*)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi^*)(t, x) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t^*) \right) = 0$ on the support of the mean field flow μ_t^* . This is a key distinction between the primal-dual approach and the existing PDE approach, as will be discussed in detail in Remark 6.1 and Example 6.2.

5 Strong duality and characterization of all NEs

Theorem 4.5 allows for verifying a given tuple (μ^*, ξ^*, ψ^*) as an NE of the MFG through a primal-dual system. In this section, we will show that this primal-dual system in fact characterizes all NEs, provided that the equilibrium flow ensures strong duality between the primal problem (LP) and the dual problem (Dual).

Here, strong duality means that given the flow μ , both the representative player's primal problem (LP) and the dual problem (Dual) attain their optimal solutions, and yield the same optimal values. More precisely

Definition 5.1. We say a given flow $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T})$ ensures strong duality if there exists $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)$ and $\bar{\psi} \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)$ such that

$$J_{P^*}^{\mu}(\bar{\psi}) = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)} J_{P^*}^{\mu}(\psi) = \inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^{\mu}(\nu, \xi) = J_P^{\mu}(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}).$$

The following theorem shows that, with the primal-dual system (4.5), strong duality characterizes all NEs of the MFG.

Theorem 5.1. Suppose (H.1) holds. Assume $(\mu^*, \mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T}) \times \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\mu^*)$ is an NE and μ^* ensures strong duality. Define $\xi^* \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$ such that $\xi^*(F) := \int_F \gamma^*(da | t, x) \mu_t^*(dx) dt$ for all $F \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$. Then $\arg \max_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)} J_{P^*}^{\mu^*}(\psi)$ is nonempty, and for any $\psi^* \in \arg \max_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)} J_{P^*}^{\mu^*}(\psi)$, the triple (μ^*, ξ^*, ψ^*) satisfies the primal-dual system (4.5).

In order to guarantee the strong duality, it is critical to identify conditions that ensure the dual problem to attain its maximizer. This is also known as the solvability of the dual problem.

Recall that for any given flow μ , the dual problem involves taking the supremum over all smooth subsolutions of the following HJB equation (see Remark 4.1):

$$\partial_t V(t, x) + \inf_{a \in A} ((\mathbb{L}^\mu V)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t)) = 0, \quad V(T, x) = g(x, \mu_T). \quad (5.1)$$

Since the pointwise maximum of subsolutions is known to be a viscosity solution [15, Theorem 4.1], a natural sufficient condition for the solvability of the dual problem is ensuring that the HJB equation (5.1) admits a smooth viscosity solution, or equivalently a classical solution.

To this end, observe that the regularity of the solution to (5.1) depends crucially on the regularity of (b, σ, f) with respect to the measure component, and the regularity of the given mean field flow $t \mapsto \mu_t$. In the sequel, we focus on flows $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ of the form:

$$\mu_t = \mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(X_t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad \text{with } \mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(X_0) = \rho \text{ and } X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \bar{b}_s ds + \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}_s dW_s, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\bar{b} : \mathbb{T} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\bar{\sigma} : \mathbb{T} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are bounded \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and W is a d -dimensional \mathbb{F} -Brownian motion on Ω . Define the space \mathcal{U}_ρ of admissible flows by

$$\mathcal{U}_\rho := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T}) \mid \mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \text{ satisfies (5.2)}\}. \quad (5.3)$$

The class \mathcal{U}_ρ contains all mean field state distributions induced by a given policy (cf. (2.1)), and is sufficient to characterize all NEs of the MFG.

We now show a flow in \mathcal{U}_ρ ensures strong duality under the following conditions.

H.2. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\rho$,

- (1) There exists $V \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying the HJB equation (5.1), and a measurable function $\phi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow A$ such that $\phi(t, x) \in \arg \min_{a \in A} ((\mathbb{L}^\mu V)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t))$ for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.
- (2) Define $(t, x) \mapsto \gamma(da|t, x) := \delta_{\phi(t, x)}(da)$ with ϕ given in (H.2(1)). Then the SDE (2.1) with the policy γ admits a weak solution.

Theorem 5.2. Suppose (H.1) and (H.2) hold. Then any $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\rho$ ensures strong duality between (LP) and (Dual) (cf. Definition 5.1). In particular, Theorem 5.1 provides a necessary condition for all NEs of the MFG.

Remark 5.1. Theorem 5.2 establishes two crucial aspects of the representative player's control problem. First, it proves that the optimal value of the primal problem (LP) is equal to that of the dual problem (Dual). Second, it ensures that both problems admit optimal solutions.

While the first aspect has been previously studied for continuous-time control problems (see e.g., [21, 23, 39, 9, 37]), the solvability of the associated dual problem, to the best of our knowledge, has not been established before. We fill this gap through analyzing the regularity of solutions to the associated HJB equation, as indicated in Assumption (H.2). As demonstrated in Theorem 5.1, a solution to the dual problem plays a crucial role in characterizing the set of NEs in MFGs. Specifically, the dual solution acts as an adjoint variable in characterizing the representative player's optimal control, further enforcing the consistency condition between the mean field flow and the optimal state distribution.

We conclude this section by providing explicit conditions on the system coefficients that ensure the validity of (H.2). For a given MFG, (H.2) can be verified through parabolic regularity results under additional regularity properties of the system coefficients, depending on whether the diffusion coefficient is controlled or not.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose (H.1) holds. Then Condition (H.2) is satisfied if one further assumes the following conditions:*

- (1) *There exists $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $(t, x, a, \mu) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $v^\top \sigma(t, x, a, \mu)v \geq \lambda|v|^2$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*
- (2) *A is compact and for all $(t, x, \mu) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $a \mapsto (b(t, x, a, \mu), \sigma(t, x, a, \mu))$ is continuous and $a \mapsto f(t, x, a, \mu)$ is lower-semicontinuous.*
- (3) *For all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $x \mapsto g(x, \mu)$ is in $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with Hölder continuous second-order derivatives.*
- (4) *One of the following statements holds:*

- (a) *The function σ is independent of the control a , and there exists $C \geq 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and $p \geq 1$ such that $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for all $t, t' \in \mathbb{T}$, $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $a \in A$ and $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & |b(t, x, a, \mu) - b(t', x', a, \mu')| + |\sigma(t, x, \mu) - \sigma(t', x', \mu')| + |f(t, x, a, \mu) - f(t', x', a, \mu')| \\ & \leq C \left(|t - t'|^{\alpha/2} + |x - x'|^\alpha + W_p(\mu, \mu')^\alpha \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the space of probability measures of order p , equipped with the p -Wasserstein metric W_p .

- (b) *The functions b , σ and f are of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} b(t, x, a, \mu) &= \bar{b} \left(t, x, a, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{b}(t, y) \mu(dy) \right), \quad \sigma(t, x, a, \mu) = \bar{\sigma} \left(t, x, a, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{\sigma}(t, y) \mu(dy) \right), \\ f(t, x, a, \mu) &= \bar{f} \left(t, x, a, \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{f}(t, y) \mu(dy) \right), \end{aligned}$$

with bounded measurable functions $\bar{b} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\bar{\sigma} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\bar{f} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{b} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\hat{\sigma} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\hat{f} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists $C \geq 0$ such that for all $t, t' \in \mathbb{T}$, $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $a \in A$ and $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{b}(t, x, a, y) - \bar{b}(t', x', a, y')| + |\bar{\sigma}(t, x, a, y) - \bar{\sigma}(t', x', a, y')| + |\bar{f}(t, x, a, y) - \bar{f}(t', x', a, y')| \\ & \leq C (|t - t'| + |x - x'| + |y - y'|), \end{aligned}$$

and each component of \hat{b} , $\hat{\sigma}$ and \hat{f} is in $C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Remark 5.2. Proposition 5.3 establishes the solvability of (5.1) in $C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ using different approaches, depending on whether the diffusion coefficient is controlled or not.

When the diffusion coefficient is uncontrolled, the HJB equation becomes semilinear. In this case, its solution regularity can be analyzed using Schauder estimates for linear parabolic PDEs, along with interpolation inequalities over Hölder spaces (see Proposition 7.1). This approach enables the consideration of coefficients with general mean field dependence, which are Hölder continuous in the Wasserstein metric.

When the diffusion coefficient is controlled, the HJB equation is fully nonlinear, and the Evans-Krylov theorem (see [28, Theorem 6.4.3, pp. 301]) is applied to ensure the existence of a classical solution. The Evans-Krylov theorem requires all coefficients to be Lipschitz continuous in both time and space variables, which imposes restrictions on the coefficients in terms of their mean field dependence, as the flow $\mathbb{T} \ni t \mapsto \mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is only 1/2-Hölder continuous. These structural conditions may be relaxed if more refined regularity results are employed to verify (H.2(1)).

6 Comparison with existing approaches for MFGs

Having established the equivalence between the set of NEs and solutions to the primal-dual system, we compare in this section the primal-dual characterization with existing approaches for MFGs, in particular the coupled HJB-FB (see e.g., [25, 33]) and the BSDE approaches (for instance, [11, 10]).

We first show that when the associated Hamiltonian has a unique optimizer and the equilibrium flow has full support, the primal-dual system (4.5) is consistent with the HJB-FP approach. We then present two examples without these restrictions, where this primal-dual approach remains applicable and the HJB-FP and the BSDE approaches fail, as the latter two rely on the uniqueness of the optimizer for the Hamiltonian. Moreover, when the equilibrium flow does not have full support, an admissible dual variable is not required to satisfy the HJB equation for all states, hence ensures the applicability of the primal-dual approach in characterizing NEs even when the HJB equation does not admit a classical or even a continuous solution.

Specifically, recall that the HJB-FP approach assumes the existence of a *unique* function $\pi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow A$ satisfying

$$\pi(t, x, y, z, \mu) = \arg \min_{a \in A} H(t, x, y, z, a, \mu), \quad (6.1)$$

where $H : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times A \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Hamiltonian defined by

$$H(t, x, y, z, a, \mu) := \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left((\sigma \sigma^\top)(t, x, a, \mu) z \right) + b(t, x, a, \mu)^\top y + f(t, x, a, \mu);$$

see [25, (H.5)], [10, Equation (13)], and [3, Assumption 3.1.(b)]. Given π , consider the following coupled HJB-FP system: for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t V(t, x) + \min_{a \in A} H(t, x, (\nabla_x V)(t, x), (\operatorname{Hess}_x V)(t, x), a, \mu_t) = 0, \quad V(T, x) = g(x, \mu_T), \quad (6.2a) \\ \partial_t \mu_t = -\operatorname{div}[b(t, \cdot, \phi(t, \cdot), \mu_t) \mu_t] + \operatorname{tr} [\operatorname{Hess}_x ((\sigma \sigma^\top)(t, \cdot, \phi(t, \cdot), \mu_t) \mu_t)], \quad \mu_0 = \rho, \quad (6.2b) \\ \phi(t, x) = \pi(t, x, (\nabla_x V)(t, x), (\operatorname{Hess}_x V)(t, x), \mu_t). \quad (6.2c) \end{array} \right.$$

When π is sufficiently regular, (6.2) admits a classical solution, which corresponds to an NE of the MFG. Note that in this HJB-FP approach, the FP equation (6.2b) depends on the unique choice of π satisfying (6.1).

The following theorem shows that when the Hamiltonian has a unique optimizer and the equilibrium flow has full support, the primal-dual system (4.5) coincides with a weak formulation of the HJB-FP system (6.2).

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose (H.1) holds. Let $\mu^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d | \mathbb{T})$ be narrowly continuous and $\psi^* \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Assume that there exists a unique measurable function $\phi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow A$ such that*

$$\phi(t, x) = \arg \min_{a \in A} H(t, x, (\nabla_x \psi^*)(t, x), (\operatorname{Hess}_x \psi^*)(t, x), a, \mu_t^*), \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (6.3)$$

the functions $x \mapsto g(x, \mu_T^*)$ and $(t, x) \mapsto \min_{a \in A} H(t, x, (\nabla_x \psi^*)(t, x), (\text{Hess}_x \psi^*)(t, x), a, \mu_t^*)$ are continuous, and

$$\text{supp}(\mu_t^*) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \mu_t^*(\mathbb{B}_r(x)) > 0, \forall r > 0\} = \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \forall t \in (0, T], \quad (6.4)$$

where $\mathbb{B}_r(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |y - x| < r\}$. Then for any $\xi^* \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$, the triple (μ^*, ξ^*, ψ^*) satisfies the primal-dual system (4.5) if and only if $\xi^*(dt, dx, da) = \delta_{\phi(t, x)}(da) \mu_t^*(dx) dt$ and (μ^*, ψ^*) satisfies the following system:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \mu_T^*(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ \quad = \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\mu^*} \psi)(t, x, \phi(t, x)) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) \mu_t^*(dx) dt, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, \\ \partial_t \psi^*(t, x) + \min_{a \in A} H(t, x, (\nabla_x \psi^*)(t, x), (\text{Hess}_x \psi^*)(t, x), a, \mu_t^*) = 0, \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d. \\ \psi^*(T, x) = g(x, \mu_T^*), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{array} \right. \quad (6.5a)$$

Remark 6.1. Note that the equivalence between the primal-dual system and the HJB-FP system, as established in Theorem 6.1, relies crucially on Condition (6.3) regarding the uniqueness of the Hamiltonian's optimizer, as well as the full support condition (6.4) on the equilibrium flow μ^* . Indeed, Condition (6.3) ensures that for any $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the Markov policy derived from ξ^* is concentrated on the unique optimizer $\phi(t, x)$ of the Hamiltonian, which yields the optimal strict policy. The full support condition (6.4) and Corollary 4.6 ensure that the dual variable ψ^* satisfies the HJB equation *everywhere*. Equation (6.5a) then indicates that $\mu^* = (\mu_t^*)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ is a weak solution to the FP equation (6.2b) for the controlled state process, whose coefficients involve the optimal policy ϕ and the equilibrium flow $(\mu_t^*)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$.

To ensure the Hamiltonian has a unique optimizer, existing works assume that $A \ni a \mapsto H(t, x, y, z, a, \mu)$ is strictly convex, which necessitates the convexity of the action set A , the linearity of b and $\sigma \sigma^\top$ in a , and the strict convexity of the running cost function f .

Unfortunately, when the Hamiltonian is nonconvex, such is the case when A is finite, (6.1) may have multiple optimizers. In this case, one may define the coupled system (6.2) by selecting a specific feedback map π . Consequently, (6.2) provides only *sufficient* conditions for a particular NE and for a given choice of π . However, with an inappropriate choice of π , (6.2) may fail to admit any solution, even when the MFG has an NE [27]. Similarly, the BSDE approach also assumes the convexity of the Hamiltonian to characterize the optimal control of the representative player ([11, Lemma 2.1], [12, Assumption (A4), p. 156]).

In contrast, our primal-dual approach characterizes the set of *all* NEs for general MFGs without assuming the uniqueness of the feedback map π : it avoids the prior selection of π by including the policy ϕ as part of the solution.

The advantage of the primal-dual approach over the HJB-FP approach when (6.1) has multiple optimizers is demonstrated by the following example.

Example 6.1. Consider a degenerate MFG (CL) with $f = g = 0$. Due to the constant cost functions, any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A \mid \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and the corresponding controlled state process constitute an NE of the MFG. Moreover, the primal-dual system (4.5) characterizes all equilibria, since each NE corresponds to a solution to (4.5) with $\psi^* \equiv 0$.

However, the coupled system (6.2) does not characterize all NEs. Indeed, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \mid \mathbb{T})$, (6.2a) has a unique solution $V \equiv 0$. But the solution to (6.2b) depends on the map $(t, x, \mu) \mapsto \pi(t, x, 0, 0, \mu)$, which can be chosen as any measurable function from $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to A . If

choosing $\pi \equiv a$ for a given $a \in A$, (6.2) only retrieves one NE of the MFG. Moreover, if choosing a discontinuous map $\mu \mapsto \pi(t, x, 0, 0, \mu)$ may result in (6.2b) not admitting a solution, and thus (6.2) may fail to retrieve any NE.

Moreover, when the equilibrium flow μ^* does not have full support, the dual variable ψ^* in (4.5) is not required to satisfy the HJB equation (6.2a) for all states. This distinctive feature of the primal-dual approach ensures its applicability in characterizing NEs even when the HJB equation does not admit a classical or even a continuous solution. This distinction is reflected by (4.6) and further illustrated in the following example.

Example 6.2. Consider an MFG (CL) with an action space $A = \{-1, 1\}$, a one-dimensional (deterministic) state process with $b(t, x, a, \mu) = a$, $\sigma = 0$ and $\rho = \delta_{x_0}$ for some $x_0 > 0$, and cost functions $f(t, x, a, \mu) = 1 + (x_0 + t - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \mu(dy))^2$ and $g(x, \mu) = -|x|$.¹ It is easy to verify that the mean field flow $\mu_t^* = \delta_{x_0+t}$ and the optimal control $a_t^* = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$ is an NE of the MFG.

However, the HJB-FP approach fails to capture this NE, as the HJB equation (6.2a) does not admit a classical solution. Indeed, at the equilibrium, (6.2a) takes the form:

$$\partial_t V(t, x) - |(\partial_x V)(t, x)| + 1 = 0, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}; \quad V(T, x) = -|x|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6.6)$$

The unique viscosity solution to (6.6) is given by $V(t, x) = -|x|$ for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$, which is not differentiable at 0. In fact, (6.6) does not admit any C^1 solution.

In contrast, the proposed primal-dual system (4.5) retrieves the NE by taking $\mu_t^* = \delta_{x_0+t}$, $\xi^*(dt, dx, da) = dt \delta_{x_0+t}(dx) \delta_1(da)$, and any $\psi^* \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \psi^*(0, x_0) = -x_0, & \psi^*(T, x) \leq -|x|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \partial_t \psi^*(t, x) + a(\partial_x \psi^*)(t, x) + 1 \geq 0, & \forall (t, x, a) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \{-1, 1\}. \end{cases} \quad (6.7)$$

There are infinitely many feasible dual variables ψ^* satisfying (6.7). For instance, one can choose any $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\phi(x_0) = -1; \quad -1 < \phi(x) < 0, \quad \forall x \leq 0; \quad 0 < \phi(x) < 1, \quad \forall x > 0,$$

and define the dual variable by

$$\psi^*(t, x) = \begin{cases} -x_0 + \int_{x_0}^x \phi(y) dy, & \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times (-\infty, x_0), \\ -x, & \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times [x_0, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

It is worth noting that the dual variables (6.8) coincide with the solution V to (6.6) only on $\mathbb{T} \times [x_0, \infty)$, a set containing the support of the mean field flow μ^* .

Note that the above observation extends to any (possibly discontinuous) terminal cost g satisfying $g(x, \mu) \geq -|x|$ for all $x < x_0$. In such cases, the associated HJB equation may not even admit a *continuous* solution, and hence the HJB-FP approach fails. However, the primal-dual framework remains applicable and can still characterize the NE.

¹To simplify the presentation, we consider an MFG with unbounded cost functions, which, strictly speaking, does not satisfy (H.1). However, since the system is deterministic, the cost functions can be truncated outside a sufficiently large domain without altering the NE.

7 Proofs of main results

7.1 Proofs of Propositions 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ be defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Observe that ν, ξ are two well-defined nonnegative finite measures on \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A$ respectively. Specifically, ν is defined as the law of X_T , the countable additivity of ξ follows from the dominated convergence theorem, and the nonnegativeness and finiteness of ξ follows from the fact that γ is a probability kernel and \mathbb{T} is a finite interval. Hence it remains to verify that (ν, ξ) satisfies (3.1). To this end, fix $\psi \in \mathcal{W} = C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. As $(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, using Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(T, X_T) - \psi(0, X_0) &= \int_0^T (\nabla_x \psi)^\top(t, X_t) \sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, X_t) dW_t + \int_0^T \partial_t \psi(t, X_t) dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left((\sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma} (\sigma^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma})^\top)(t, X_t) (\text{Hess}_x \psi)(t, X_t) \right) + b^{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \gamma}(t, X_t)^\top (\nabla_x \psi)(t, X_t) \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation on both sides and using (2.2) and the boundedness of ψ and σ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(T, X_T) - \psi(0, X_0) - \int_0^T \int_A \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left((\sigma \sigma^\top)(t, X_t, a, \mu_t) (\text{Hess}_x \psi)(t, X_t) \right) \gamma(da|t, X_t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \partial_t \psi(t, X_t) + b(t, X_t, a, \mu_t)^\top (\nabla_x \psi)(t, X_t) \gamma(da|t, X_t) \right) dt \right] \quad (7.1) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(T, X_T) - \psi(0, X_0) - \int_0^T \int_A \left((\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, X_t, a) + \partial_t \psi(t, X_t) \right) \gamma(da|t, X_t) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of ν and $\mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(X_0) = \rho$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi(T, X_T)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \nu(dx), \quad \mathbb{E}[\psi(0, X_0)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx).$$

By to the definition of ξ , for all bounded measurable function $\varphi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T} \times A} \varphi(t, x, a) \xi(dt, dx, da) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_A \varphi(t, X_t, a) \gamma(da|t, X_t) dt \right]. \quad (7.2)$$

Substituting them back into (7.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \nu(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) \xi(dt, dx, da), \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies (3.1). The fact that $J_{\text{cl}}^\mu(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) = J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi)$ follows from the definition of ν and ξ . \square

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We first prove Item (1). Fix $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. For each $0 < a < T$, and $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1/a, \infty)$, let $\varphi^{(n)} \in C_b^1(\mathbb{T})$ be such that $\varphi^{(n)}(t) = a - t$ for all $t \in [0, a - 1/n]$, $\varphi^{(n)}(t) = 0$ for all $t \in (a, T]$ and $-2 \leq (\varphi^{(n)})'(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Let $\psi^{(n)} \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the natural

extension of $\varphi^{(n)}$ onto $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\psi^{(n)}(t, x) = \varphi^{(n)}(t)$ for all (t, x) . Setting $\psi = \psi^{(n)}$ in (3.1) and noting that $\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi^{(n)} = 0$ since ψ does not depend on x yield

$$\begin{aligned} 0 - a\rho(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \int_0^T (\varphi^{(n)})'(t) \xi^\mathbb{T}(dt) = \int_0^{a-\frac{1}{n}} (-1) \xi^\mathbb{T}(dt) + \int_{a-\frac{1}{n}}^a (\varphi^{(n)})'(t) \xi^\mathbb{T}(dt) \\ &= -\xi^\mathbb{T}\left(\left(0, a - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right) + \int_{a-\frac{1}{n}}^a (\varphi^{(n)})'(t) \xi^\mathbb{T}(dt). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a-\frac{1}{n}}^a (\varphi^{(n)})'(t) \xi^\mathbb{T}(dt) = 0$, due to the bound $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in [0, T]} |(\varphi^{(n)})'(t)| \leq 2$, and the dominated convergence theorem. This implies that $a = \xi^\mathbb{T}((0, a))$ for all $a \in (0, T)$, and hence $\xi^\mathbb{T}$ is the Borel measure on \mathbb{T} .

To prove Item (2), by Item (1) and the definition of a disintegration kernel, we have for any bounded measurable function $\varphi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \varphi(t, x, a) \xi(dt, dx, da) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_A \varphi(t, x, a) \gamma(da|x, t) m_t^X(dx) dt. \quad (7.3)$$

Combining (7.3) and (3.1) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(T, x) \nu(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) \right) \gamma(da|x, t) m_t^X(dx) dt, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to (3.9) using the definition (2.2) of $b^{\mu, \gamma}$ and $\sigma^{\mu, \gamma}$. This proves Item (2).

It remains to prove Item (3). We first follow a similar argument as in [36, Lemma 2.3] to select a narrowly continuous version of m^X . Taking $\psi(t, x) = f(t)\varphi(x)$ with $f \in C_c^1((0, T))$, $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in (3.9) gives

$$\int_0^T f'(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx) \right) dt = - \int_0^T f(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi(t, x) m_t^X(dx) \right) dt. \quad (7.4)$$

Since $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi(t, x) m_t^X(dx)$ is bounded, the map $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx)$ belongs to Sobolev space $W^{1,1}((0, T))$ with weak derivative $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi)(t, x) m_t^X(dx) dt$ -a.s. Then, we can choose a countable set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ dense in $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and a real-valued map $(\varphi, t) \mapsto F(\varphi, t)$ on $\mathcal{F} \times [0, T]$ such that for each $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$, $t \mapsto F(\varphi, t)$ is an absolutely continuous version of $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx)$. That is, there exists a $\mathcal{T} \in [0, T]$ with $\text{Leb}(\mathcal{T}^c) = 0$, and

$$F(\varphi, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx), \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{T}, \varphi \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Taking $\varphi(x) = 1$ in (7.4) shows that $t \mapsto m_t^X(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a weak derivative of 0, which implies that it is constant dt-a.e., and hence we can set $m_t(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a constant for $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Setting $\psi(t, x) = (T-t)$ in (3.9) yields $m_t^X(\mathbb{R}^d) = \rho(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Fix $t \in \mathbb{T}$, let $(t_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{T}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = t$. For all $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$, since $F(\varphi, \cdot)$ is absolute continuous, we have

$$F(\varphi, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\varphi, t_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_{t_n}^X(dx).$$

Therefore, for all $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$|F(\varphi, t) - F(\varphi', t)| = \left| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\varphi(x) - \varphi'(x)) m_{t_n}^X(dx) \right| \leq \|\varphi' - \varphi\|_\infty.$$

Hence, for fixed $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we can uniquely extend $F(\cdot, t)$ to a continuous linear mapping on all of $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (again denoted by $F(\cdot, t)$). By the Riesz Representation Theorem, $F(\cdot, t) = \tilde{m}_t^X(dx)$ for some measure $\tilde{m}_t^X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, that is $F(\varphi, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \tilde{m}_t^X(dx)$ for all $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and by the uniqueness of the representation, we know that $\tilde{m}_t^X = m_t^X$ when $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Therefore, \tilde{m}_t^X is a version of m_t^X and for all $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \tilde{m}_t^X(dx) = F(\varphi, t)$ is continuous, which implies that \tilde{m}_t^X is vaguely continuous. Further, since \tilde{m}_t^X are all probability measures, vaguely continuous is equivalent to narrowly continuous, we conclude the first part of the proof.

Denote by $m_t^X(dx)$ the narrowly continuous version of the state marginal law. To prove the desired result, we show that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_0^X(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \rho(dx)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_T^X(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \nu(dx)$ for all $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Fix $\varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and set $\psi^{(n)}(t, x) = f^{(n)}(t)\varphi(x)$ where $n \geq 1/T$, $f^{(n)} \in C_b^1([0, T])$ such that $f^{(n)}(0) = 1$, $f^{(n)}(t) = 0$ for $t \in [1/n, T]$, $-2n \leq (f^{(n)})'(t) \leq 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Plugging $\psi^{(n)}$ into (3.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \rho(dx) &= \int_0^{1/n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(f^{(n)}(t) (\mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi)(t, x) + (f^{(n)})'(t) \varphi(x) \right) m_t^X(dx) dt \\ &= \int_0^{1/n} f^{(n)}(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi)(t, x) m_t^X(dx) \right) dt + \int_0^{1/n} (f^{(n)})'(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_0^X(dx) \right) dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^{1/n} (f^{(n)})'(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_0^X(dx) \right) dt \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

Recall that $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx)$ has a weak derivative $t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi)(t, x) m_t^X(dx)$, with

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi)(t, x) m_t^X(dx) \right| \leq (\|b\|_\infty + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2) \|\varphi\|_{C_b^2}.$$

Since $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |f^{(n)}(t)| \leq 1$, for all $t \in [0, 1/n]$,

$$\left| f^{(n)}(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}^{\mu, \gamma} \varphi)(t, x) m_t^X(dx) \right) \right| \leq (\|b\|_\infty + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2) \|\varphi\|_{C_b^2},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (f^{(n)})'(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^X(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_0^X(dx) \right) \right| &\leq 2n \times 1/n (\|b\|_\infty + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2) \|\varphi\|_{C_b^2} \\ &= 2(\|b\|_\infty + \|\sigma\|_\infty^2) \|\varphi\|_{C_b^2}, \end{aligned}$$

Further notice that $\int_0^{1/n} (f^{(n)})'(t) dt = -1$, by using the dominated convergence theorem and taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (7.5), we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \rho(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_0^X(dx),$$

which proves $m_0^X = \rho$. The proof for the identity of $m_T^X = \nu$ follows a similar argument using $f^{(n)}$ with $f^{(n)}(T) = 1$ and $f^{(n)}(t) = 0$ for $t \in [0, T - 1/n]$, whose details are omitted. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. The existence of a probability measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d))$ such that M^ψ is a martingale is guaranteed by the superposition principle [40, Theorem 2.5]. This along with [26, Proposition 4.11, Chapter 5] implies that there exists a weak solution \mathbf{X} , defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, to the following SDE

$$dX_t = b^{\mu, \gamma}(t, X_t) dt + \sigma^{\mu, \gamma}(t, X_t) dW_t,$$

and satisfies $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{P}}(X_t) = m_t^X$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$. Thus by Proposition 3.3 Item (3), $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{P}}(X_T) = m_T^X = \nu$. Moreover, by (7.3), for all bounded measurable function $\varphi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \varphi(t, x, a) \xi(dt, dx, da) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_A \varphi(t, x, a) \gamma(da|x, t) m_t^X(dx) dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_A \varphi(t, x, a) \gamma(da|x, t) \mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{P}}(X_t)(dx) dt = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T} \times A} \varphi(t, X_t, a) \gamma(da|t, X_t) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $J_{\text{cl}}^{\mu}(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) = J_P^{\mu}(\nu, \xi)$ and completes the proof. \square

7.2 Proofs of Lemma 4.1, Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, and Corollary 4.6

Proof of Lemma 4.1. By (H.1) and the definition of \mathcal{W} , $(\psi(T, \cdot), -(\partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi)) \in \mathcal{Y}$, and hence $\mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi)(\psi)$ is a well-defined real number. It is easy to see the map $\mathcal{W} \ni \psi \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi)(\psi) \in \mathbb{R}$ is linear, and hence $\mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{Z}$. The map $\mathcal{X} \ni (\nu, \xi) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{Z}$ is linear by the bilinearity of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$.

To show the continuity of \mathcal{L} , let $(\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ be a net indexed by a directed set Γ which converges to some $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}$ in the σ -topology on \mathcal{X} . We claim that the net $(\mathcal{L}(\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha))_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ converges to $\mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi)$ in the σ -topology on \mathcal{Z} . To see it, observe that \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{W} are the continuous dual spaces of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} in the σ -topology, respectively; see [1, Proposition 1, p. 37]. Hence the convergence of $((\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha))_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \in \mathcal{X}$ in the σ -topology on \mathcal{X} implies for all $(u, \phi) \in \mathcal{Y}$, the net $(\langle (\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha), (u, \phi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ converges to $\langle (\nu, \xi), (u, \phi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ in \mathbb{R} . Moreover, to show the desired convergence of $(\mathcal{L}(\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha))_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ in \mathcal{Z} , it suffices to prove that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$, the net $(\langle \mathcal{L}(\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha), \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}})_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ converges to $\langle \mathcal{L}(\nu, \xi), \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$ in \mathbb{R} , which is equivalent to show the convergence of $(\langle (\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha), (\psi(T, \cdot), -(\partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ to $\langle (\nu, \xi), (\psi(T, \cdot), -(\partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, due to the definitions of the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$ and the map \mathcal{L} . Note that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$, by (H.1), $(\psi(T, \cdot), -(\partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi)) \in \mathcal{Y}$, and hence the desired convergence follows from the convergence of $(\nu^\alpha, \xi^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ in the σ -topology on \mathcal{X} . \square

Proof of Proposition 4.2. It suffices to prove that the definitions (4.2) and (4.3) of $\mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)$ are equivalent. That is, for each $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$, ψ satisfies (4.2) if and only if ψ satisfies (4.3).

Fix $\psi \in \mathcal{W}$. For all $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+$, by the definition of \mathcal{L}^* and \mathcal{L} ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle (\nu, \xi), ((g(\cdot, \mu_T), f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) - \mathcal{L}^*(\psi)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \\ &= \langle (\nu, \xi), (g(\cdot, \mu_T), f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} - \langle (\nu, \xi), \mathcal{L}^*(\psi) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \\ &= \langle (\nu, \xi), (g(\cdot, \mu_T) - \psi(T, \cdot), \partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi + f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Suppose that ψ satisfies (4.3). By (7.6), it holds for all $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle (\nu, \xi), ((g(\cdot, \mu_T), f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) - \mathcal{L}^*(\psi)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \\ &= \langle (\nu, \xi), (g(\cdot, \mu_T) - \psi(T, \cdot), \partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi + f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used $g(\cdot, \mu_T) \geq \psi(T, \cdot)$ and $\partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi + f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu) \geq 0$ since ψ satisfies (4.3). This proves ψ satisfies (4.2).

Now suppose that ψ satisfies (4.2). From (7.6), it holds for all $(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{X}_+$ that

$$\langle (\nu, \xi), (g(\cdot, \mu_T) - \psi(T, \cdot), \partial_t \psi + \mathbb{L}^{\mu} \psi + f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \mu)) \rangle_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \geq 0.$$

This implies that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $g(x, \mu_T) \geq \psi(T, x)$ and for all $\xi \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T} \times A} h(t, x, a) \xi(dt, dx, da) \geq 0, \quad \text{with } h(t, x, a) := \partial_t \psi(t) + (\mathbb{L}^\mu \psi)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t). \quad (7.7)$$

Suppose that there exists $(t_0, x_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A$ such that $h(t_0, x_0, a_0) < 0$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} h(t, x, a) \delta_{(t_0, x_0, a_0)}(dt, dx, da) = h(t_0, x_0, a_0) < 0,$$

which contradicts to (7.7). Consequently, $h(t, x, a) \geq 0$ for all $(t, x, a) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A$. This shows that ψ satisfies (4.3) and finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Note that if $\mathcal{D}_P(\mu) = \emptyset$, then $\inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi) = \infty$, and if $D_{P^*}(\mu) = \emptyset$, then $\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)} J_{P^*}^\mu(\psi) = -\infty$. Hence without loss of generality, we can assume both $D_{P^*}(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{D}_P(\mu)$ are non-empty. In this case, the desired inequality $\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu)} J_{P^*}^\mu(\psi) \leq \inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)} J_P^\mu(\nu, \xi)$ follows from the weak duality result for general infinite-dimensional LP problems [1, Theorem 3.1, p. 39]. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.6. To show the equivalence between (4.5a) and (4.6), observe that using $\psi^* \in \mathcal{W}$ and (4.5b), (4.5a) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (g(x, \mu_T^*) - \psi(T, x)) \mu_T^*(dx) \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\mu^*} \psi)(t, x, a) + (\partial_t \psi)(t, x) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t^*) \right) \xi^*(dt, dx, da) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to (4.6) under Conditions (4.5c) and (4.5d). \square

7.3 Proofs of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Since $(\mu^*, \mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*)$ is an NE, $J_{\text{cl}}^{\mu^*}(\mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*) = \inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\mu^*)} J_{\text{cl}}^{\mu^*}(\mathbf{X}, \gamma)$ and $\mu_T^* = \mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{P}}(X_T^*)$. By Proposition 3.1, we have $(\mu_T^*, \xi^*) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu^*)$ and hence Condition (4.5b) holds. Moreover,

$$J_P^{\mu^*}(\mu_T^*, \xi^*) = J_{\text{cl}}^{\mu^*}(\mathbf{X}^*, \gamma^*) = \inf_{(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\mu^*)} J_{\text{cl}}^{\mu^*}(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) = \inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu^*)} J_P^{\mu^*}(\nu, \xi),$$

where the last equality holds due to Theorem 3.5.

Since μ^* ensures strong duality, $\arg \max_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)} J_{P^*}^{\mu^*}(\psi)$ is nonempty and for any $\psi^* \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)$

$$J_{P^*}^{\mu^*}(\psi^*) = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)} J_{P^*}^{\mu^*}(\psi) = \inf_{(\nu, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu^*)} J_P^{\mu^*}(\nu, \xi) = J_P^{\mu^*}(\mu_T^*, \xi^*),$$

which verifies Condition (4.5a). Finally, Conditions (4.5c) and (4.5d) are guaranteed by the feasibility condition $\psi^* \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}(\mu^*)$, and Condition (4.5e) is ensured by the definition of ξ^* . \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. We prove that there exists $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\mu)$ such that $J_{P^*}^\mu(V) = J_P^\mu(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi})$. By Assumption (H.2(1)), there exists $\phi(t, x)$ such that

$$\phi(t, x) \in \arg \min_{a \in A} \left((\mathbb{L}^\mu V)(t, x, a) + f(t, x, a, \mu_t) \right).$$

Define $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A|\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ by $\gamma(da|t, x) := \delta_{\phi(t, x)}(da)$. By Assumption (H.2(2)), there exists $(\mathbf{X}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cl}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ defined on some filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Define $\bar{\nu} \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$ such that for all $F_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $F_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\nu}(F_1) &:= \mathbb{P}(X_T \in F_1), \\ \bar{\xi}(F_2) &:= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T} \times A} \mathbf{1}_{\{(t, X_t, a) \in F_2\}} \gamma(da|t, X_t) dt \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbf{1}_{\{(t, X_t, \phi(t, X_t)) \in F_2\}} dt \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

By Proposition 3.1, $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}) \in \mathcal{D}_P(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{P^*}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(V) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(0, x) \rho(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(T, x) \bar{\nu}(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} V)(t, x, a) + \partial_t V(t, x) \right) \bar{\xi}(dt, dx, da) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x, \mu_T) \bar{\nu}(dx) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} \left((\mathbb{L}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} V)(t, X_t, \phi(t, X_t)) + \partial_t V(t, X_t) \right) dt \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x, \mu_T) \bar{\nu}(dx) - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(t, X_t, \phi(t, X_t), \mu_t) dt \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x, \mu_T) \bar{\nu}(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} f(t, x, a, \mu_t) \bar{\xi}(dt, dx, da) = J_P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by (Dual), the second equality holds by (3.1), the third equality holds by Assumption (H.2(1)) and (7.8), the fourth equality holds by Assumption (H.2(1)), the fifth equality holds by (7.8) and the last one holds by (3.4). This along with the weak duality implies that $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{\xi})$ and V are the optimal solutions to (LP) and (Dual), respectively, and therefore proves the desired strong duality result. \square

7.4 Proof of Proposition 5.3

We first establish a regularity result for semilinear PDEs in Hölder spaces. The result generalizes existing regularity results for PDEs with smooth/Lipschitz continuous coefficients (see e.g., [35, 16]) to PDEs with Hölder continuous coefficients. In the sequel, for each non-integer $\ell > 0$, we denote by $C^{\ell/2, \ell}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ the parabolic Hölder space equipped with the Hölder norm $|\cdot|_{\ell/2, \ell}$ as introduced in [29, Section 8.5], and by $C^{\ell}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the usual Hölder space of time-independent functions as in [29, Section 3.1].

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\kappa > 0$, and $a^{ij} \in C^{\delta, \delta/2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, be such that $a^{ij} = a^{ji}$ for all i, j , and $\sum_{i, j=1}^d a^{ij}(t, x) v_i v_j \geq \kappa |v|^2$ for all $v = (v_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $C_H \geq 0$, $H : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that for all $(t, x, p), (t', x', p') \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $|H(t, x, 0)| \leq C_H$, and*

$$|H(t, x, p) - H(t', x', p')| \leq C_H (|t - t'|^{\delta/2} + |x - x'|^{\delta})(1 + \max\{|p|, |p'|\}) + |p - p'|, \quad (7.9)$$

and let $g \in C^{2+\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there exists a unique $V \in C^{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\partial_t V(t, x) + \sum_{i, j=1}^d a^{ij}(t, x) (\partial_{x_i x_j} V)(t, x) + H(t, x, (\nabla_x V)(t, x)) = 0, \quad V(T, x) = g(x). \quad (7.10)$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the existence of a classical solution to (7.10), as the uniqueness of solutions follows directly from the maximum principle for linear parabolic PDEs [29, Theorem 8.1.4]. We now construct a solution to (7.10) by considering a sequence of PDEs with mollified coefficients. Fix $\lambda > 0$, and define $H^\lambda : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $H^\lambda(t, x, p) := H(t, x, e^{\lambda(T-t)}p)$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\eta_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a mollifier given by $\eta_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \eta\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$, where $\eta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a smooth function satisfying $\eta(x) = 0$ for all $|x| \geq 1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta(x) dx = 1$, and for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, define $a_\varepsilon^{ij} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $a_\varepsilon^{ij}(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon(y) a^{ij}(t, x - y) dy$. Similarly, let $(\rho_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ be a sequence of mollifiers on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and define $H_\varepsilon^\lambda : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $H_\varepsilon^\lambda(t, x, p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \eta_\varepsilon(y, q) H^\lambda(t, x - y, p - q) dy dq$. Note that both H^λ and H_ε^λ satisfy the estimate (7.9). To simplify the notation, we denote by $C \geq 0$ a generic constant, which is independent of ε and may take a different value at each occurrence.

Now for each $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the following PDE: for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V(t, x) + \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_\varepsilon^{ij}(t, x) (\partial_{x_i x_j} V)(t, x) - \lambda V(t, x) + H_\varepsilon^\lambda(t, x, (\nabla_x V)(t, x)) &= 0, \\ V(t, x) &= g(x), \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

which admits a unique solution $V_\varepsilon \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, due to standard regularity results for parabolic PDEs with smooth coefficients (see e.g., [35, Proposition 3.3]). We now show that $(V_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is uniformly bounded in the norm $|\cdot|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}$. Observe that $\sum_{i,j=1}^d a_\varepsilon^{ij}(t, x) v_i v_j \geq \kappa |v|^2$ for all $v = (v_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and there exists $C \geq 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $|a_\varepsilon^{ij}|_{\delta/2, \delta} \leq C$, $|H_\varepsilon^\lambda(\cdot, \cdot, p)|_{\delta/2, \delta} \leq C(1 + |p|)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $|\partial_p H_\varepsilon^\lambda|_0 \leq C$, where $|\cdot|_0$ denotes the sup-norm. This along the interpolation inequality given in [29, Exercise 8.8.2]. implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |H_\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, (\nabla_x V_\varepsilon)(\cdot, \cdot))|_{\delta/2, \delta} &\leq C(1 + |\nabla_x V_\varepsilon|_0 + |\nabla_x V_\varepsilon|_{\delta/2, \delta}) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} |V_\varepsilon|_0^{\frac{1+\delta}{2+\delta}} + |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}^{\frac{1+\delta}{2+\delta}} |V_\varepsilon|_0^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the a-priori estimate of linear parabolic PDE [29, Theorem 9.2.3],

$$\begin{aligned} |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta} &\leq C (|H_\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, (\nabla_x V_\varepsilon)(\cdot, \cdot))|_{\delta/2, \delta} + |g|_{2+\delta}) \\ &\leq C \left(1 + |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} |V_\varepsilon|_0^{\frac{1+\delta}{2+\delta}} + |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}^{\frac{1+\delta}{2+\delta}} |V_\varepsilon|_0^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which along with Young's inequality shows that for all $\tau > 0$,

$$|V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta} \leq C \left(1 + \tau |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta} + \tau^{-\frac{2+\delta}{1+\delta}} |V_\varepsilon|_0 + \tau |V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta} + \tau^{-(1+\delta)} |V_\varepsilon|_0 \right).$$

Taking a sufficiently small τ yields $|V_\varepsilon|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta} \leq C(1 + |V_\varepsilon|_0) \leq C$, where the last inequality follows from $|V_\varepsilon|_0 \leq C$ due to the maximum principle [29, Theorem 8.1.4]. This proves the uniform boundedness of $(V_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ in the norm $|\cdot|_{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}$.

By the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem and a diagonalization argument, there exists $\bar{V} \in C^{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and a subsequence of $(V_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ (denoted by $(V_{\varepsilon_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$) such that for any given compact subset of $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $(V_{\varepsilon_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and all their derivatives converge to \bar{V} and its derivatives uniformly. Moreover, due to the Hölder continuity of a_{ij} and H^λ , $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |a_{\varepsilon_n}^{ij} - a^{ij}|_0 = 0$ and $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |H_{\varepsilon_n} - H|_0 = 0$. Using (7.11) and passing $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ imply that \bar{V} satisfies for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\partial_t \bar{V}(t, x) + \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(t, x) (\partial_{x_i x_j} \bar{V})(t, x) - \lambda \bar{V}(t, x) + H^\lambda(t, x, (\nabla_x \bar{V})(t, x)) = 0, \quad \bar{V}(t, x) = g(x).$$

Then by the definition of H^λ , one can verify that the function $(t, x) \mapsto V(t, x) := e^{\lambda(T-t)}\bar{V}(t, x)$ is in $C^{1+\delta/2, 2+\delta}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and satisfies (7.10). This proves the desired result. \square

The following lemma proves the time regularity of a flow in the class \mathcal{U}_ρ defined in (5.3).

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\rho$. For all $\phi \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists $C \geq 0$ such that $|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(t, y)\mu_t - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(s, y)\mu_s| \leq C|t-s|$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$. Assume further that $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $p \geq 1$. Then there exists $C \geq 0$ such that $W_p(\mu_t, \mu_s) \leq C|t-s|^{1/2}$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$.*

Proof. By (5.2), $\mu_t = \mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(X_t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$, where $\mathcal{L}^\mathbb{P}(X_0) = \rho$ and $X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \bar{b}_s ds + \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}_s dW_s$ for some bounded processes \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$ on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. For any given $\phi \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, by Itô's formula, there exists $C \geq 0$ such that for all $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(t, y)\mu_t - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(s, y)\mu_s \right| = \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[\phi(t, X_t) - \phi(s, X_s)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P} \left[\int_s^t \left(\partial_t \phi(r, X_r) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\sigma}_r \bar{\sigma}_r^\top (\text{Hess}_x \phi)(r, X_r) \right) + \bar{b}_r^\top (\nabla_x \phi)(r, X_r) \right) dr \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P} \left[\int_s^t (\nabla_x \phi)^\top(r, X_r) \bar{\sigma}_r dW_r \right] \leq C|t-s|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used the uniform boundedness of \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$, and the derivatives of ϕ .

Assume further that $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By the boundedness of \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$, $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$. For all $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$, using the definition of the Wasserstein metric W_p ,

$$\begin{aligned} W_p(\mu_t, \mu_s)^p &\leq \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[|X_t - X_s|^p] = \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \int_s^t \bar{b}_r dr + \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}_r dW_r \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \int_s^t \bar{b}_r dr \right|^p + \left| \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}_r dW_r \right|^p \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the boundedness of \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$, and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, there exists $C \geq 0$ such that $W_p(\mu_t, \mu_s)^p \leq C|t-s|^{p/2}$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$. This finishes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 5.3.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. It suffices to prove the existence of a classical solution $V \in C_b^{1,2}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ to (5.1), since once such a V is obtained, the measurable selection theorem [24, D.5 Proposition] ensures the existence of a measurable pointwise minimizer ϕ under Condition (H.2(2)). Throughout this proof, fix $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\rho$, and define $b^\mu : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by $b^\mu(t, x, a) := b(t, x, a, \mu_t)$, $\sigma^\mu : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ by $\sigma^\mu(t, x, a) := \sigma(t, x, a, \mu_t)$, $f^\mu : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f^\mu(t, x, a) := f(t, x, a, \mu_t)$, and $g^\mu : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $g^\mu(x) := g(x, \mu_T)$. Write $\Sigma^\mu = \sigma^\mu(\sigma^\mu)^\top$.

We first verify (H.2(1)) under Condition (a). Since σ is independence of a , the HJB equation (5.1) is of the following semilinear form:

$$\partial_t V(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^\mu(t, x)(\text{Hess}_x V)(t, x)) + H(t, x, (\nabla_x V)(t, x)) = 0, \quad V(T, x) = g^\mu(x),$$

where $H(t, x, p) := \inf_{a \in A} (p^\top b^\mu(t, x, a) + f^\mu(t, x, a))$. By Lemma 7.2 and the Hölder regularity of b , σ and f , for all $a \in A$, the components of $b^\mu(\cdot, a)$, $\Sigma^\mu(\cdot, a)$ and $f^\mu(\cdot, a)$ are in $C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, and the $|\cdot|_{\alpha/2, \alpha}$ -norms are uniformly bounded with respect to $a \in A$. Moreover, using the inequality $|\inf_{a \in A} f_a - \inf_{a \in A} g_a| \leq C \sup_{a \in A} |f_a - g_a|$ for any $(f_a)_{a \in A}, (g_a)_{a \in A} \subset \mathbb{R}$, one can show that H

satisfies the condition (7.9)(with $\delta = \alpha$). Hence by Proposition 7.1, the HJB equation (5.1) admits a classical solution V .

We then verify (H.2(1)) under Condition (b). In this case, the HJB equation (5.1) is fully nonlinear. By Lemma 7.2 and the structural properties of b , σ and f in Condition (b), the coefficients b^μ , Σ^μ and f^μ are bounded and Lipschitz continuous in $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, uniformly with respect to $a \in A$. Then by the well-known Evans-Krylov theorem (see Example 6.1.8 on page 279 and Theorem 6.4.3 on page 301 in [28]) and standard regularization procedures of the coefficients, the HJB equation (5.1) admits a classical solution V .

Finally, Condition (H.2(2)) holds under the nondegeneracy condition Item (1) and [41, Theorem 6.13, p. 46]. This completes the proof of this proposition. \square

7.5 Proof of Theorem 6.1

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Observe from Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.6 that for any (μ^*, ψ^*) satisfying (6.5), by setting $\xi^*(dt, dx, da) = \delta_{\phi(t,x)}(da)\mu_t^*(dx)dt$, the triple (μ^*, ξ^*, ψ^*) satisfies (4.5). Hence it suffices to prove that any solution (μ^*, ξ^*, ψ^*) to (4.5) satisfies the HJB-FP system.

We first show that ψ^* satisfies the HJB equation (6.5b). That is, for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $\psi^*(T, x) = g(x, \mu_T^*)$ and $\min_{a \in A} F(t, x, a) = 0$ with

$$F(t, x, a) := \partial_t \psi^*(t, x) + H(t, x, (\nabla_x \psi^*)(t, x), (\text{Hess}_x \psi^*)(t, x), a, \mu_t^*).$$

Since $F(t, x, a) \geq 0$ by (4.5c), suppose $\min_{a \in A} F(t_0, x_0, a) = \delta > 0$ for some $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. By the continuity of $\min_{a \in A} F(t, x, a)$, there exist neighborhood $U(t_0)$ of t_0 and neighborhood $\mathbb{B}_r(x_0)$ of x_0 such that $\min_{a \in A} F(t, x, a) \geq \delta/2$ for any $(t, x) \in U(t_0) \times \mathbb{B}_r(x_0)$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A} F(t, x, a) \xi^*(dt, dx, da) \geq \int_{U(t_0) \times \mathbb{B}_r(x_0) \times A} \frac{\delta}{2} \xi^*(dt, dx, da) = \frac{\delta}{2} \int_{U(t_0)} \mu_t^*(\mathbb{B}_r(x_0)) dt > 0,$$

where the second equality holds due to (4.5e). This contradicts with (4.6), and implies that $\min_{a \in A} F(t, x, a) = 0$ for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Similar argument shows $\psi^*(T, x) = g(x, \mu_T^*)$.

We then prove that μ^* satisfies the FP equation (6.5a). By Proposition 3.3 and (4.5e), there exists a $\mu_t^*(dx)dt$ -a.e. unique $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(A|\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\xi^*(dt, dx, da) = \gamma(da|t, x)\mu_t^*(dx)dt$. We claim that $\gamma(da|t, x) = \delta_{\phi(t,x)}(da)$ for $\mu_t^*(dx)dt$ -a.e. $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Indeed, Conditions (4.5d) and (4.6) imply that $\int_A F(t, x, a)\gamma(da|t, x) = 0$ for $\mu_t^*(dx)dt$ -a.e. $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix such a $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Since $\phi(t, x)$ is the unique minimizer of $H(t, x, a)$, and $\min_{a \in A} F(t, x, a) = 0$, it holds that $F(t, x, a) > 0$ for any $a \neq \phi(t, x)$. This implies that $\gamma(\{a \neq \phi(t, x)\}|t, x) = 0$, since otherwise $\int_A F(t, x, a)\gamma(da|t, x) \geq \int_{\{a \neq \phi(t, x)\}} F(t, x, a)\gamma(da|t, x) > 0$. This implies that $\gamma(da|t, x) = \delta_{\phi(t,x)}(da)$ for $\mu_t^*(dx)dt$ -a.e. and hence $\xi^*(dt, dx, da) = \delta_{\phi(t,x)}(da)\mu_t^*(dx)dt$. Substituting this form of ξ^* into (4.5b) yields (6.5a). This finishes the proof. \square

References

- [1] E. J. ANDERSON AND P. NASH, *Linear Programming in Infinite-Dimensional Spaces: Theory and Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, 1987.
- [2] F. BACCELLI, B. BLASZCZYSZYN, AND M. KARRAY, *Random Measures, Point Processes, and Stochastic Geometry*, Inria, July 2024.
- [3] E. BAYRAKTAR, A. BUDHIRAJA, AND A. COHEN, *Rate control under heavy traffic with strategic servers*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 29 (2019), pp. 1–35.

- [4] E. BAYRAKTAR AND A. COHEN, *Analysis of a finite state many player game using its master equation*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 56 (2018), pp. 3538–3568.
- [5] A. BENSOUSSAN, J. FREHSE, AND S. C. P. YAM, *The master equation in mean field theory*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 103 (2015), pp. 1441–1474.
- [6] A. G. BHATT AND V. S. BORKAR, *Occupation measures for controlled markov processes: Characterization and optimality*, The Annals of Probability, (1996), pp. 1531–1562.
- [7] G. BOUVERET, R. DUMITRESCU, AND P. TANKOV, *Mean-field games of optimal stopping: A relaxed solution approach*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 58 (2020), pp. 1795–1821.
- [8] R. BUCKDAHN, B. DJEHICHE, J. LI, AND S. PENG, *Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations: A limit approach*, The Annals of Probability, 37 (2009), pp. 1524–1565.
- [9] R. BUCKDAHN, D. GOREAC, AND M. QUINCAMPOIX, *Stochastic optimal control and linear programming approach*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, 63 (2011), pp. 257–276.
- [10] P. CARDALIAGUET, F. DELARUE, J.-M. LASRY, AND P.-L. LIONS, *The Master Equation and the Convergence Problem in Mean Field Games*, Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [11] R. CARMONA AND F. DELARUE, *Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51 (2013), pp. 2705–2734.
- [12] R. CARMONA AND F. DELARUE, *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I Mean Field FBSDEs, Control, and Games*, Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling, Springer Nature, United States, 2018, pp. 1–695.
- [13] R. CARMONA AND P. WANG, *A probabilistic approach to extended finite state mean field games*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 46 (2021), pp. 471–502.
- [14] A. COHEN AND C. SUN, *Existence of optimal stationary singular controls and mean field game equilibria*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07945, (2024).
- [15] M. G. CRANDALL, H. ISHII, AND P.-L. LIONS, *User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bulletin of the American mathematical society, 27 (1992), pp. 1–67.
- [16] F. DELARUE AND S. MENOZZI, *A forward-backward stochastic algorithm for quasi-linear PDEs*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 16 (2006), pp. 140 – 184.
- [17] J. DIANETTI, G. FERRARI, M. FISCHER, AND M. NENDEL, *Submodular mean field games: Existence and approximation of solutions*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 31 (2021), pp. 2538–2566.
- [18] F. DUFOUR AND R. H. STOCKBRIDGE, *On the existence of strict optimal controls for constrained, controlled markov processes in continuous time*, Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 84 (2012), pp. 55–78.
- [19] R. DUMITRESCU, M. LEUTSCHER, AND P. TANKOV, *Control and optimal stopping mean field games: a linear programming approach*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 26 (2021), pp. 1–49.

- [20] ———, *Linear programming fictitious play algorithm for mean field games with optimal stopping and absorption*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 57 (2023), pp. 953–990.
- [21] W. H. FLEMING AND D. VERMES, *Convex duality approach to the optimal control of diffusions*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 27 (1989), pp. 1136–1155.
- [22] X. GUO, A. HU, AND J. ZHANG, *MF-OMO: An optimization formulation of mean-field games*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 62 (2024), pp. 243–270.
- [23] D. HERNÁNDEZ-HERNÁNDEZ, O. HERNÁNDEZ-LERMA, AND M. TAKSAR, *The linear programming approach to deterministic optimal control problems*, Applicationes Mathematicae, 24 (1996), pp. 17–33.
- [24] O. HERNÁNDEZ-LERMA AND J. B. LASSERRE, *Discrete-time Markov Control Processes: Basic Optimality Criteria*, vol. 30, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [25] M. HUANG, R. P. MALHAMÉ, AND P. E. CAINES, *Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop mckean-vaslov systems and the nash certainty equivalence principle*, (2006).
- [26] I. KARATZAS AND S. SHREVE, *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, vol. 113, Springer Science & Business Media, 1991.
- [27] C. KNOCHENHAUER AND B. A. NEUMANN, *Long-run behavior and convergence of dynamic mean field equilibria*. <https://stochasticcontrol.org/preprints/2023-12-12-DynamicConsumerChoice.pdf>, 2023.
- [28] N. V. KRYLOV, *Nonlinear Elliptic and Parabolic Equations of the Second Order*, Springer, 1987.
- [29] ———, *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Hölder spaces*, vol. 12 of Grad. Stud. Math., Providence, RI: AMS, American Mathematical Society, 1996.
- [30] T. KURTZ AND R. STOCKBRIDGE, *Stationary solutions and forward equations for controlled and singular martingale problems*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 6 (2001), pp. 1–52.
- [31] T. G. KURTZ AND R. H. STOCKBRIDGE, *Existence of markov controls and characterization of optimal markov controls*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 36 (1998), pp. 609–653.
- [32] ———, *Linear programming formulations of singular stochastic control problems: time-homogeneous problems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09209, (2017).
- [33] J.-M. LASRY AND P.-L. LIONS, *Mean field games*, Japanese Journal of Mathematics, 2 (2007), pp. 229–260.
- [34] P.-L. LIONS, *On the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*, Acta Applicandae Mathematica, 1 (1983), pp. 17–41.
- [35] J. MA, P. PROTTER, AND J. YONG, *Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly—a four step scheme*, Probability theory and related fields, 98 (1994), pp. 339–359.

- [36] M. REHMEIER, *Flow selections for (nonlinear) Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations*, Journal of Differential Equations, 328 (2022), pp. 105–132.
- [37] R. SERRANO, *On the LP formulation in measure spaces of optimal control problems for jump-diffusions*, Systems & Control Letters, 85 (2015), pp. 33–36.
- [38] R. H. STOCKBRIDGE, *Time-average control of martingale problems: A linear programming formulation*, The Annals of Probability, (1990), pp. 206–217.
- [39] M. I. TAKSAR, *Infinite-dimensional linear programming approach to singular stochastic control*, SIAM journal on control and optimization, 35 (1997), pp. 604–625.
- [40] D. TREVISAN, *Well-posedness of multidimensional diffusion processes with weakly differentiable coefficients*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 21 (2016), pp. 1–41.
- [41] J. YONG AND X. Y. ZHOU, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, vol. 43, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.