

Order Preservation and Positive Correlation for Nonlinear Fokker Planck Equations

Panpan Ren

Department of Mathematics, University of Bonn, Bonn 53115, Germany
RPPZOE@GMAIL.COM

March 15, 2021

Abstract

By investigating McKean-Vlasov SDEs, the order preservation and positive correlation are characterized for nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations. The main results recover the corresponding criteria on these properties established in [3, 5] for diffusion processes or linear Fokker-Planck equations.

AMS subject Classification: 60J60, 58J65.

Keywords: Nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation, Order preservation, Positive correlation.

1 Introduction

Based on [5], complete criteria have been established in [3] for the order preservation and positive correlation for diffusion processes corresponding to linear Fokker-Planck equations, where the order preservation links to comparison theorem in the literature of SDEs, and the positive correlation arises from statistics is known as FKG inequality due to [4]. In the present paper we aim to extend these criteria to nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations associated with McKean-Vlasov SDEs. In the following we first recall the criteria of [3].

Consider the following second order differential operator on \mathbb{R}^d :

$$L = \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i \partial_i,$$

where

$$a = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d, \quad b = (b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$$

are continuous, a is positive definite, such that the martingale problem of L is well-posed, or equivalently, there exists a unique L -diffusion process for any initial distribution. For any $t \geq 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$, the space of all probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the weak topology, let $P_t^* \mu$ be the distribution of the L -diffusion process at time t with initial distribution μ .

We denote $x \leq y$ for $x := (x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$, $y := (y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if $x_i \leq y_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the set of all bounded measurable functions on \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the class of bounded measurable increasing functions:

$$\mathcal{U}_b := \{f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid f(x) \leq f(y) \text{ for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with } x \leq y\},$$

and the family of probability measures of positive correlations:

$$\mathcal{P}_+ := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P} \mid \mu(fg) \geq \mu(f)\mu(g) \quad f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b\},$$

where we call μ satisfies the FKG inequality if $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$. Moreover, we write $\mu \preceq \nu$ for any two probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, if $\mu(f) \leq \nu(f)$ holds for any $f \in \mathcal{U}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that definitions of \mathcal{P}_+ and $\mu \preceq \nu$ does not change if we replace $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, where $C_b^0(\mathbb{R}^d) = C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the set of all bounded continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^d , while when $k \geq 1$ the class $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consists of bounded functions on \mathbb{R}^d having bounded derivatives up to order k .

Now, for the L -diffusion process, we denote $P_t^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ if $P_t^* \mathcal{P}_+ \subset \mathcal{P}_+$. In this case we call P_t^* preserves positive correlations. The following result is implied by [3, Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4].

CW1 **Theorem 1.1** ([3]). $P_t^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for any $t \geq 0$ if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (a) For any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $a_{ij} \geq 0$, and $a_{ij}(x)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .
- (b) For any $1 \leq i \leq d$, $b_i(x)$ is increasing in x_j for $j \neq i$.

Next, let \bar{P}_t^* be associated with the diffusion process generated by another operator \bar{L} satisfying the same assumption on L :

$$\bar{L} = \sum_{i,j=1}^d \bar{a}_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{b}_i \partial_i.$$

We denote $\bar{P}_t^* \preceq P_t^*$ if

$$\bar{P}_t^* \mu \preceq P_t^* \nu, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}, \mu \preceq \nu.$$

In this case we call these two diffusion processes (or \bar{P}_t^* and P_t^*) order-preserving, and when $L = \bar{L}$, we call the L -diffusion process (or P_t^*) monotone. The next result follows from [3, Theorem 1.3].

CW2 **Theorem 1.2** ([3]). $\bar{P}_t^* \preceq P_t^*$ for any $t \geq 0$, if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (a) For any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $\bar{a}_{ij} = a_{ij}$, and $a_{ij}(x)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .
- (b) For any $1 \leq i \leq d$, $\bar{b}_i(x) \leq b_i(y)$ for $x \leq y$ with $x_i = y_i$.

According to Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 with $L = \bar{L}$, we see that $P_t^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ implies the monotonicity.

To conclude this subsection, we recall the link of diffusion processes and linear Fokker-Planck equations. By the definition of martingale problem, we see that $\mu_t := P_t^* \mu$ solves the following linear Fokker-Planck equation on \mathcal{P} :

LFK (1.1)
$$\partial_t \mu_t = L^* \mu_t,$$

in the sense that $\mu \in C([0, \infty); \mathcal{P})$ satisfies

$$\mu_t(f) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu_t = \mu_0(f) + \int_0^t \mu_s(Lf) ds, \quad t \geq 0, f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

On the other hand, according to the superposition principle, see [9, 12], a solution μ_t of (1.1) with

$$\int_0^t \mu_s(\|a\| + |b|) ds < \infty, \quad t \geq 0$$

is given by $\mu_t := P_t^* \mu_0, t \geq 0$. Since the order preservation and positive correlation are distribution properties of diffusion processes, they are indeed properties of solutions to linear Fokker-Planck equations.

As mentioned above, we aim to extend Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations. Consider the Wasserstein space

$$\mathcal{P}_2 = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P} : \mu(|\cdot|^2) < \infty\},$$

which is a Polish space under the Wasserstein distance

$$\mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^2 \pi(dx, dy) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$ is the space of all couplings of μ and ν . Consider the following time-distribution dependent second order differential operators

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t,\mu} &:= \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(t, \cdot, \mu) \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(t, \cdot, \mu) \partial_i, \\ \bar{L}_{t,\mu} &:= \sum_{i,j=1}^d \bar{a}_{ij}(t, \cdot, \mu) \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{b}_i(t, \cdot, \mu) \partial_i, \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq d}, \quad \bar{a} = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq d} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d, \\ b &= (b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}, \quad \bar{b} = (\bar{b}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned}$$

are continuous. The nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations for L and \bar{L} are formulated as

$$\partial_t \mu_t = L_{t,\mu_t} \mu_t, \quad \partial_t \bar{\mu}_t = \bar{L}_{t,\bar{\mu}_t} \bar{\mu}_t, \quad \mu_s = \bar{\mu}_s = \mu, t \geq s. \tag{1.3}$$

We call $(\mu_t, \bar{\mu}_t)_{t \geq s} \in C([s, \infty); \mathcal{P}_2) \times C([s, \infty); \mathcal{P}_2)$ a solution to (1.3), if

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t(f) &= \mu(f) + \int_s^t \mu(L_{r,\mu_r} f) dr, \\ \bar{\mu}_t(f) &= \mu(f) + \int_s^t \bar{\mu}(\bar{L}_{r,\bar{\mu}_r} f) dr, \quad t \geq s, f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{aligned}$$

The nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations can be characterized by distribution dependent SDEs, also called McKean-Vlasov or mean field SDEs. Let W_t be a d -dimensional Brownian motion on a complete filtration probability space $(\Omega, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. Consider the distribution dependent SDEs

DDSDE

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_t &= b(t, X_t, \mathcal{L}_{X_t})dt + \sqrt{2a(t, X_t, \mathcal{L}_{X_t})}dW_t, \\ d\bar{X}_t &= \bar{b}(t, \bar{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_t})dt + \sqrt{2\bar{a}(t, \bar{X}_t, \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_t})}dW_t, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{L}_ξ denotes the distribution of a random variable ξ . We call these SDEs well-posed if for any $s \geq 0$ and any \mathcal{F}_s -measurable random variables X_s and \bar{X}_s with $\mathbb{E}[|X_s|^2 + |\bar{X}_s|^2] < \infty$, they have unique solutions with $(\mathcal{L}_{X_t})_{t \geq s}, (\mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_t})_{t \geq s} \in C([s, \infty); \mathcal{P}_2)$. In this case, we denote

$$P_{s,t}^* \mu := \mathcal{L}_{X_t}, \bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu := \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_t}, \mathcal{L}_{X_s} = \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_s} = \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2, \quad t \geq s.$$

By Itô's formula, $(\mu_t := P_{s,t}^* \mu, \bar{\mu}_t := \bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu)$ solves (1.3). On the other hand, by the superposition principle, see [1], if $(\mu_t, \bar{\mu}_t)$ solves (1.3) with

$$\int_s^t \mu_r (|b(r, \cdot, \mu_r)| + \|a(r, \cdot, \mu_r)\|) dr + \int_s^t \bar{\mu}_r (|\bar{b}(r, \cdot, \bar{\mu}_r)| + \|\bar{a}(r, \cdot, \bar{\mu}_r)\|) dr < \infty, \quad t \geq s,$$

then $\mu_t = P_{s,t}^* \mu$ and $\bar{\mu}_t = \bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu, t \geq 0$. Thus, to investigate the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations (1.3) is equivalent to study the solutions of the distribution dependent SDEs (1.4).

Unlike in the setting of standard Markov processes or linear Fokker-Planck equations, the distribution $\mathcal{L}_{(X_t)_{t \geq s}}$ on the path space is no longer determined by its time-marginals $P_{s,t}^* \mu$, so we will also consider the order preservation and positive correlations for

$$\Lambda_s \mu := \mathcal{L}_{(X_t)_{t \geq s}}, \quad \bar{\Lambda}_s \mu = \mathcal{L}_{(\bar{X}_t)_{t \geq s}}, \quad s \geq 0, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2.$$

In Section 2, we state our main results on the order preservation for $(P_{s,t}^*, \bar{P}_{s,t}^*)$ and $(\Lambda_s, \bar{\Lambda}_s)$, as well as on the positive correlations for Λ_s . To prove these results, In Section 3 we extend Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to the time inhomogeneous setting which are also new in the literature. Finally, the main results are proved in Section 4.

2 Main results

To ensure the well-posedness and to apply the superposition principle, we make the following assumption.

(A) b, \bar{b}, a, \bar{a} are continuous on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_2$, a and \bar{a} are positive definite,

$$\mu (|b(t, \cdot, \mu)| + \|a(t, \cdot, \mu)\|) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|b(t, \cdot, \mu)| + \|a(t, \cdot, \mu)\|) d\mu$$

is locally bounded in $(t, \mu) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{P}_2$, and there exists an increasing function $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $b, \bar{b}, \sigma := \sqrt{2a}$ and $\bar{\sigma} := \sqrt{2\bar{a}}$ satisfy

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ 2 \langle b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \nu), x - y \rangle + \|\sigma(t, x, \mu) - \sigma(t, x, \nu)\|_{HS}^2, \right. \\ & \left. 2 \langle \bar{b}(t, x, \mu) - \bar{b}(t, y, \nu), x - y \rangle + \|\bar{\sigma}(t, x, \mu) - \bar{\sigma}(t, x, \nu)\|_{HS}^2 \right\} \\ & \leq K(t) (|x - y|^2 + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \nu)^2), \quad t \geq 0, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2. \end{aligned}$$

According to [13] and the superposition principle in [1], **(A)** implies the well-posedness of (1.4) and (1.3), and for any $s \geq 0, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2$,

$$\mu_t := P_{s,t}^* \mu, \quad \bar{\mu}_t := \bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu, \quad t \geq s$$

give the unique solution of (1.3).

To state the main results, we first define the order preservation and positive correlations in the present setting. For any

$$\xi, \eta \in C_s := C([s, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d),$$

we denote $\xi \leq \eta$ if $\xi_t \leq \eta_t$ for all $t \geq s$. For any two probability measures Φ_1, Φ_2 on the path space C_s , we denote $\Phi_1 \preceq \Phi_2$ if $\Phi_1(F) \leq \Phi_2(F)$ holds for any bounded increasing function F on C_s . Similarly, let \mathcal{P}_+^s denote the set of probability measures on C_s satisfying the FKG inequality for bounded increasing functions on C_s .

Definition 2.1. Let $t \geq s \geq 0$.

- (1) We write $\bar{P}_{s,t} \preceq P_{s,t}^*$, if $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu \preceq P_{s,t}^* \nu$ holds for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2$ with $\mu \preceq \nu$.
- (2) We write $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$, if $\bar{\Lambda}_s \mu \preceq \Lambda_s \nu$ holds for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2$ with $\mu \preceq \nu$.
- (3) We write $P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ if $P_{s,t}^* \mathcal{P}_+ \subset \mathcal{P}_+$; and $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$ if $\Lambda_s \mu \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$ holds for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$.

Obviously, $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ for all $s \geq 0$ implies $\bar{P}_{s,t} \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for all $t \geq s \geq 0$, but the inverse may not true in the nonlinear setting. Similarly, $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$ implies $P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for any $t \geq s$ but the inverse may not be true.

2.1 Order preservation

The following result provides sufficient conditions for the order preservation.

T1 **Theorem 2.1.** *Assume **(A)** and the following two conditions:*

- (1) For any $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $s \geq 0$, $\bar{b}_i(s, x, \nu) \leq b_i(s, y, \mu)$ holds for $x \preceq y$ with $x_i = y_i$ and $\nu \preceq \mu$;
- (2) $a = \bar{a}$, and for any $1 \leq i, j \leq d, s \geq 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2$, $a_{ij}(s, x, \mu)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .

Then $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ for all $s \geq 0$. Consequently, $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s$.

The next two results include necessary conditions for the order preservation, which are weaker than the sufficient ones given in Theorem 2.1. However, they coincide with the sufficient conditions and hence become sufficient and necessary conditions when $b(t, x, \mu)$ and $a(t, x, \mu)$ do not depend on μ , and hence our first three results recover Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

For any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ and $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$, let

$$\mu_I(A) := \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_I \in A\}), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{\#I})$$

be the marginal distribution of μ with respect to components indexed by I , where $\#I$ denotes the number of elements in I . In particular, we simply denote $\mu_i = \mu_{\{i\}}$

T2 **Theorem 2.2.** *If $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ for all $s \geq 0$, then the following conditions hold:*

- (i) for any $\nu \preceq \mu$ with $\nu_i = \mu_i$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, there exists a coupling $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)$ with $\pi(\{x \leq y\}) = 1$ such that

$$\bar{b}_i(s, x, \nu) \leq b_i(s, y, \mu), \quad s \geq 0, (x, y) \in \text{supp}\pi.$$

Consequently, $\bar{b}_i(s, x, \mu) \leq b_i(s, x, \mu)$ for $s \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2$.

- (ii) for any $\nu \preceq \mu$ with $\nu_{ij} = \mu_{ij}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, there exists a coupling $\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)$ with $\pi(\{x \leq y\}) = 1$ such that

$$\bar{a}_{ij}(s, x, \nu) = a_{ij}(s, y, \mu), \quad s \geq 0, (x, y) \in \text{supp}\pi.$$

Consequently, $a(s, x, \mu) = \bar{a}(s, x, \mu)$ for any $s \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2$.

Since $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ implies $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s$, conditions in the following result are also necessary for $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$.

T3 **Theorem 2.3.** *If $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s \geq 0$, then the following conditions hold:*

- (i) For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, $\nu(\bar{b}_i(s, \cdot, \nu)) \leq \mu(b_i(s, \cdot, \mu))$ holds for $\nu \preceq \mu$ with $\nu_i = \mu_i$.
- (ii) For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $\bar{a}_{ij}(s, x, \delta_x) = a_{ij}(s, x, \delta_x)$ holds and $a_{ij}(x, \delta_x)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .

2.2 Positive correlations

We first present sufficient conditions for the positive correlations.

T4 **Theorem 2.4.** *Assume (A) and suppose further*

- (1) For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, $b_i(s, x, \nu) \leq b_i(s, y, \mu)$, $\nu \preceq \mu, x \leq y$ with $x_i = y_i$.
- (2) For any $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $a_{ij} \geq 0$, and for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$, $a_{ij}(s, x, \mu)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .

Then $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$. Consequently, $P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for any $t \geq s \geq 0$.

Similarly to the above results on the order preservation, necessary conditions for positive correlations presented in the next result are weaker than the above sufficient ones, but they coincide and hence become necessary and sufficient conditions when b and a do not depend on the distribution.

T5 **Theorem 2.5.** *If $\Lambda_s^\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$ for $s \geq 0$ and $\mu = \mu_{\{ij\}} \times \mu_{\{ij\}^c} \in \mathcal{P}_+$, then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) For any $s \geq 0$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $a_{ij}(s, x, \mu)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .
- (2) For any $s \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $f \in \mathcal{U}_b$ independent on x_i ,

$$\mu(b_i(s, \cdot, \mu)f) \geq \mu(f)\mu(b_i(s, \cdot, \mu)).$$

3 Time-inhomogeneous diffusion processes

Consider the time-dependent second order diffusion operators: for $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_t &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(t, x) \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(t, x) \partial_i, \\ \bar{L}_t &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \bar{a}_{ij}(t, x) \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{b}_i(t, x) \partial_i, \end{aligned} \quad \text{OP} \quad (3.1)$$

where $a_{ij}, \bar{a}_{ij}, b_i, \bar{b}_i \in C([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Assume that the martingale problems associated with $(L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\bar{L}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are well-posed so that there exist unique time-inhomogeneous diffusion processes $(X_{s,t})_{t \geq s \geq 0}$ and $(\bar{X}_{s,t})_{t \geq s \geq 0}$ corresponding to $(L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\bar{L}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, respectively. Let $(P_{s,t})_{t \geq s \geq 0}$ and $(\bar{P}_{s,t})_{t \geq s \geq 0}$ be the Markov semigroups generated by $(X_{s,t})_{\{ij\}} \times \mu_{\{ij\}^c}$ and $(\bar{X}_{s,t})_{\{ij\}} \times \mu_{\{ij\}^c}$ with the initial value $X_{s,s} = \bar{X}_{s,s} = x$, respectively, i.e.,

$$\text{semi} \quad (3.2) \quad P_{s,t} f(x) = \mathbb{E} f(X_{s,t}^x), \quad \bar{P}_{s,t} f(x) = \mathbb{E} f(\bar{X}_{s,t}^x), \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

It is well known that for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\text{PP} \quad (3.3) \quad \frac{d}{ds} P_{s,t} f(x) = -P_{s,t} L_s f, \quad \frac{d}{dt} P_{s,t} f(x) = L_t P_{s,t} f, \quad t \geq s \geq 0.$$

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $x \leq y$, $f \in \mathcal{U}_b$ and $t \geq s \geq 0$, if $\bar{P}_{s,t} f(x) \leq P_{s,t} f(y)$, we call $P_{s,t}$ preserving order, written as $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$, where for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$, $P_{s,t}^* \mu, \bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu \in \mathcal{P}$ is given by

$$(P_{s,t}^* \mu)(f) := \mu(P_{s,t} f), \quad (\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu)(f) := \mu(\bar{P}_{s,t} f), \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Moreover, we denote $P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ if $P_{s,t}^* \mathcal{P}_+ \subset \mathcal{P}_+$.

For any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\Lambda_s \mu$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_s \mu$ be the distributions of the processes starting at μ from time s generated by L and \bar{L} respectively. By the standard Markov property we see that $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s \geq 0$ if and only if $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ for $s \geq 0$, while $P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for $t \geq s$ is equivalent to $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$.

3.1 Main results

The following two results extend Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to the present time-inhomogeneous setting.

T1.3 **Theorem 3.1.** *If $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s \geq 0$, equivalently $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ for $s \geq 0$, if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, $\bar{b}_i(s, x) \leq b_i(s, y)$ with $x \leq y$ and $x_i = y_i$.*
- (2) *For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $\bar{a}_{ij} = a_{ij}$ and $a_{ij}(s, x)$ only depends on x_i and x_j .*

T1.6 **Theorem 3.2.** *$P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for $t \geq s$, equivalently $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$ for $s \geq 0$, if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, $b_i(s, x) \leq b_i(s, y)$ with $x \leq y$ and $x_i = y_i$;*
- (2) *For any $s \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, $a_{ij} \geq 0$ and $a_{ij}(s, x) \geq 0$ depends only on x_i and x_j .*

3.2 Proofs

Proof of Theorem 3.1. (a) We first prove the necessity. For any $t \geq s \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let Λ_s^x (resp. $\bar{\Lambda}_s^x$) be the distribution of the L_t -diffusion (resp. \bar{L}_t -diffusion) process on the path space $C_s := C([s, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ starting from x at time s .

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 \leq s_0 \leq s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_n$, let $\Lambda_{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n}^x$ be the marginal distribution of $\Lambda_{s_0}^x$ at the time sequence (s_1, \dots, s_n) , which can be expressed via the Markov property as below

$$\Lambda_{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n}^x(dy_1, dy_2, \dots, dy_n) = P_{s_0, s_1}(x, dy_1)P_{s_1, s_2}(y_1, dy_2) \cdots P_{s_{n-1}, s_n}(y_{n-1}, dy_n).$$

Then, by an inductive argument, together with the Markov property of the associated Markov process, $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ implies $\bar{\Lambda}_s^x \leq \Lambda_s^y$ (i.e., $\bar{\Lambda}_s^x(f) \leq \Lambda_s^y(f)$ for any $f \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_s$). Therefore, there exists a coupling $\mathbb{P}_s^{x,y} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Lambda}_s^x, \Lambda_s^y)$ such that

$$\boxed{\text{D}} \quad (3.4) \quad \mathbb{P}_s^{x,y}((\xi, \eta) \in C_s \times C_s : \eta \leq \xi) = 1.$$

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = (C_s \times C_s, \mathcal{B}(C_s \times C_s), \mathbb{P}_s^{x,y})$ with the natural filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq s}$ induced by the coordinate process $(\xi_t, \eta_t)_{t \geq s}$ solving

$$\boxed{\text{coor}} \quad (3.5) \quad \begin{cases} d\xi_t = b(t, \xi_t)dt + \sigma(t, \xi_t)dB_t^1, & \xi_s = y \\ d\eta_t = \bar{b}(t, \eta_t)dt + \bar{\sigma}(t, \eta_t)dB_t^2, & \eta_s = x \end{cases}$$

for some d -dimensional Brownian motions $(B_t^1)_{t \geq s}$ and $(B_t^2)_{t \geq s}$, and some measurable mappings $\sigma, \bar{\sigma} : [s, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ with $a = \sigma\sigma^*$, $\bar{a} = \bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^*$. Then, from (3.4), we have $\xi_t \geq \eta_t$, $\mathbb{P}_s^{x,y}$ -a.s., for all $t \geq s$.

Let $x \leq y$ with $x_i = y_i$. Since $\xi_t \geq \eta_t$, $\mathbb{P}_s^{x,y}$ -a.s., and $(\xi_s)_i = (\eta_s)_i$ due to $x_i = y_i$, we derive from (3.5) that

$$\int_s^t (b_i(r, \xi_r) - \bar{b}_i(r, \eta_r))dr \geq \int_s^t \langle \bar{\sigma}_i \cdot(r, \xi_r), dB_r^2 \rangle - \int_s^t \langle \sigma_i \cdot(r, \xi_r), dB_r^1 \rangle,$$

where $\sigma_i \cdot$ means the i -th row of σ . Taking conditional expectation $\mathbb{P}_{s_0}^{x,y}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{s_0})$ on both sides yields

$$\int_s^t \mathbb{E}((b_i(r, \xi_r) - \bar{b}_i(r, \eta_r)) | \mathcal{F}_s) dr \geq 0, \quad t \geq s.$$

This implies the assertion (1) by taking the continuity of b_i , \bar{b}_i and (ξ, η) into account.

Let $x \leq y$ with $(x_i, x_j) = (y_i, y_j)$. Then, by using $\xi_t \geq \eta_t$, $\mathbb{P}_{s_0}^{x,y}$ -a.s., again, we have

$$\boxed{\text{coor1}} \quad (3.6) \quad \int_{s_0}^t b_k(s, \xi_s)ds + \int_{s_0}^t \langle \sigma_{k \cdot}(s, \xi_s), dB_s^1 \rangle \geq \int_{s_0}^t \bar{b}_k(s, \eta_s)ds + \int_{s_0}^t \langle \bar{\sigma}_{k \cdot}(s, \eta_s), dB_s^2 \rangle, \quad k = i, j.$$

Note that as $t \downarrow s_0$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t-s_0}} \left(\int_{s_0}^t \langle \sigma_i \cdot(s, \xi_s), dB_s^1 \rangle, \int_{s_0}^t \langle \sigma_j \cdot(s, \xi_s), dB_s^1 \rangle \right) \xrightarrow{\text{weakly}} N \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} a_{ii}(s, y) & a_{ij}(s, y) \\ a_{ji}(s, y) & a_{jj}(s, y) \end{pmatrix} \right) =: \mu,$$

and that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t-s_0}} \left(\int_{s_0}^t \langle \bar{\sigma}_i \cdot(s, \xi_s), dB_s^2 \rangle, \int_{s_0}^t \langle \bar{\sigma}_j \cdot(s, \xi_s), dB_s^2 \rangle \right) \xrightarrow{\text{weakly}} N \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} \bar{a}_{ii}(s, y) & \bar{a}_{ij}(s, y) \\ \bar{a}_{ji}(s, y) & \bar{a}_{jj}(s, y) \end{pmatrix} \right) =: \bar{\mu}.$$

Then (3.6) implies $\bar{\mu} \preceq \mu$. On the other hand, by the symmetry of μ and $\bar{\mu}$ due to the symmetry of a and \bar{a} , then $\bar{\mu} \preceq \mu$ implies $\bar{\mu} \preceq \mu$. Therefore, we have $\mu = \bar{\mu}$ so that $a = \bar{a}$. For the assertion that a_{ij} depends only on x_i and x_j of (2), it can be available by following exactly the arguments of [3, Lemmas 2.1 & Lemma 2.3].

(b) Following exactly the arguments of [3, Lemmas 2.4, 2.5 & Theorem 1.3] by replacing time homogeneous semi-group P_t by time inhomogeneous semi-group $P_{s,t}$, we prove the sufficiency by the following Theorem 3.3 on the monotonicity. \square

T1.4 **Theorem 3.3.** $P_{s,t}^*$ is monotone, i.e., $P_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s \geq 0$, provided the following two conditions hold:

(1') $b_i(s, x) \leq b_i(s, y)$ with $x \preceq y$ and $x_i = y_i$;

(2') $a_{ij}(s, x)$ depends only on x_i and x_j .

Proof. To get $P_{s,t}f \in \mathcal{U}_b$ for $t \geq s$ and $f \in \mathcal{U}_b$, it suffices to show

$$\nabla P_{s,t}f(x) \geq 0, \quad t \geq s, \quad f \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

since $\mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in \mathcal{U}_b . Below, we assume $f \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $u_{s,t} = P_{s,t}f$, $t \geq s$. Then by (3.3), we have

$$\partial_t u_{s,t} = L_t u_{s,t}, \quad t \geq s, \quad u_{s,s} = f.$$

Taking the partial derivative w.r.t. the k -th component (i.e., ∂_k) on both sides yields

$$\text{Ust} \quad (3.7) \quad \partial_t(\partial_k u_{s,t}) = \partial_k \partial_t u_{s,t} = L_t^k(\partial u_{s,t}) + \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_{kj}(t, \cdot) \partial_j u_{s,t},$$

where

$$L_t^k := A_t + \sum_{j=1}^d \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right) \partial_k a_{jk}(t, \cdot) \right] \partial_j + \partial_k b_k(t, \cdot), \quad \alpha_{kj}(t, \cdot) := (\partial_k b_j(t, \cdot)) I_{\{k \neq j\}}.$$

Since L_t^k is a time-inhomogeneous Schrödinger operator, it generates a positivity-preserving semi-group $(T_{s,t}^k)_{t \geq s}$. So, the operator $L_t := (L_t^k)_{1 \leq k \leq d}$ defined on $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ by $L_t V := (L_t^k V_k)_{1 \leq k \leq d}$ generates a positivity preserving semigroup

$$T_{s,t} := (T_{s,t}^k)_{1 \leq k \leq d}, \quad t \geq s.$$

Let $D_r = (\alpha_{kj}(r, \cdot))_{1 \leq k, j \leq d}$ and $V_{s,t} = \nabla P_{s,t}f = \nabla u_{s,t}$. Then (3.7) implies

$$\partial_t V_{s,t} = L_t V_{s,t} + D_t V_{s,t}, \quad t \geq s, \quad V_{s,s} = \nabla f.$$

This, together with Duhamel's formula, gives

$$V_{s,t} = T_{s,t} V_{s,s} + \int_s^t T_{r,t} D_r V_{s,r} dr, \quad t \geq s.$$

Thus, we conclude that $V_{s,t} = \nabla P_{s,t}f \geq 0$ since $V_{s,s} = \nabla f \geq 0$ due to $f \in \mathcal{U}_b$ and $T_{s,t}$, D_r are positivity preserving. \square

Remark 3.4. Different from the proof in [5] for the time-homogeneous setting, we adopt the Duhamel's formula instead of the Trotter product formula which is less explicit in the present setting.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Theorem 3.2 can be proved using the same arguments in [5, Proof of Proposition 4.1] by combining Theorem 3.1 and 3.3. So, we omit the details to save space. \square

4 Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Note that $\bar{P}_{s,t}^*$ and $P_{s,t}^*\mu$ are marginal distribution at time t of $\bar{\Lambda}_s\nu$ and $\Lambda_s\mu$, respectively, we infer that $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$ for $t \geq s$ once $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$ is available. Therefore, to obtain the desired assertion, it is sufficient to show $\bar{\Lambda}_s\nu \preceq \Lambda_s\mu$. Below, we set $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2$ with $\nu \preceq \mu$. For any $T > s$, set

$$\mathcal{P}_{s,T}^{\nu,\mu} := \{(\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}) \in C([s, T]; \mathcal{P}_2 \times \mathcal{P}_2) : \mu_t^{(1)} \preceq \mu_t^{(2)}, t \in [s, T], \mu_s^{(1)} = \nu, \mu_s^{(2)} = \mu\},$$

which is a complete metric space under the metric for $\lambda > 0$,

$$\rho_\lambda((\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}), (\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})) := \sup_{t \in [s, T]} e^{-\lambda t} \{\mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{(1)}) + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^{(2)}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{(2)})\}.$$

For any $(\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{s,T}^{\nu,\mu}$, consider the following time-dependent SDEs:

$$\boxed{\text{ddsde1}} \quad (4.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}} = \bar{b}(t, X_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}}, \mu_t^{(1)})dt + \bar{\sigma}(t, X_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}}, \mu_t^{(1)})dW_t & t \geq s, & X_s^{(1),\mu^{(1)}} = \xi \sim \nu, \\ dX_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}} = b(t, X_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}}, \mu_t^{(2)})dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}}, \mu_t^{(2)})dW_t & t \geq s, & X_s^{(2),\mu^{(2)}} = \eta \sim \mu, \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma = \sqrt{2a}$ and $\bar{\sigma} = \sqrt{2\bar{a}}$, and $\xi \sim \nu$ means $\mathcal{L}_\xi = \nu$. Define the mapping on $\mathcal{P}_{s,T}^{\nu,\mu}$ by

$$\boxed{\text{N1}} \quad (4.2) \quad H((\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}))(t) = \left(\mathcal{L}_{X_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}}}, \mathcal{L}_{X_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}}} \right), \quad t \geq s.$$

Since $\mu_t^{(1)} \preceq \mu_t^{(2)}$, the standard Banach fixed point theorem yields

$$\boxed{\text{N3}} \quad (4.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_{[s,T]}^{(1),\mu^{(1)}}} \preceq \mathcal{L}_{X_{[s,T]}^{(2),\mu^{(2)}}},$$

In the sequel, we aim to prove that H is contractive under the metric ρ_λ for large enough $\lambda > 0$. Let $(\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}), (\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{s,T}^{\nu,\mu}$. By Itô's formula and the assumption **(A)**, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & d(|X_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}} - X_t^{(1),\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}}|^2 + |X_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}} - X_t^{(2),\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}}|^2) \\ (4.4) \quad & \leq K(t) \left(|X_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}} - X_t^{(1),\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}}|^2 \right. \\ & \left. + |X_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}} - X_t^{(2),\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}}|^2 + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{(1)})^2 + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^{(2)}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{(2)})^2 \right) + dM_t \end{aligned}$$

for some martingale M_t . Then, taking expectation on both sides, using Gronwall's inequality and taking $X_s^{(1),\mu^{(1)}} = X_s^{(1),\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}} = \xi$ and $X_s^{(2),\mu^{(2)}} = X_s^{(2),\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}} = \eta$ into consideration, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-2\lambda t} (\mathbb{E}|X_t^{(1),\mu^{(1)}} - X_t^{(1),\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}}|^2 + \mathbb{E}|X_t^{(2),\mu^{(2)}} - X_t^{(2),\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}}|^2) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} K(T) e^{K(T)(T-s)} \sup_{t \in [s, T]} [e^{-2\lambda t} (\mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{(1)})^2 + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^{(2)}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{(2)})^2)]. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\rho_\lambda(H(\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}), H(\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} K(T) e^{K(T)(T-s)} \rho_\lambda((\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}), (\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}, \tilde{\mu}^{(2)})).$$

Hence, for $\lambda > 0$ large enough, H is contractive under the metric ρ_λ . \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $s \geq 0$ and $\nu \preceq \mu$ with $\nu_i = \mu_i$. By $\bar{\Lambda}_s \preceq \Lambda_s$, we have $\bar{\Lambda}_s \nu \preceq \Lambda_s \mu$. According to [8, Theorem 5], there exists $\mathbb{P}_s \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Lambda}_s \nu, \Lambda_s \mu)$ such that

$$\boxed{\text{coup}} \quad (4.5) \quad \mathbb{P}_s(\{(\xi, \eta) \in C_s \times C_s : \xi_t \geq \eta_t, t \geq s\}) = 1.$$

Since $\bar{\Lambda}_s \nu$ and $\Lambda_s \mu$ are solutions to the martingale problems associated with the operators \bar{L} and L in (1.2), respectively, according to the superposition principle (see [12]), we have $\mathcal{L}_{(\xi, \eta)} = \mathbb{P}_s$, where (ξ_t, η_t) solves

$$\boxed{\text{PSDE1}} \quad (4.6) \quad \begin{cases} d\xi_t = \bar{b}(t, \eta_t, \mathcal{L}_{\eta_t}) dt + \bar{\sigma}(t, \eta_t, \mathcal{L}_{\eta_t}) dB_t^1, & t \geq s \\ d\eta_t = b(t, \xi_t, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_t}) dt + \sigma(t, \xi_t, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_t}) dB_t^2, & t \geq s \end{cases}$$

for some $2d$ -dimensional Brownian motions $(B_t^1, B_t^2)_{t \geq s}$ on the probability space $(C_s \times C_s, \mathcal{B}(C_s \times C_s), \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq s}, \mathbb{P}_s)$, where $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq s}$ is the natural filtration induced by the coordinate processes $(\xi_t, \eta_t)_{t \geq s}$.

Since $\mathcal{L}_{(\xi, \eta)} = \mathbb{P}_s$ satisfying (4.5), then we have $\xi_t \geq \eta_t$ for all $t \geq s$. Moreover, note that $\mathcal{L}_{(\xi_s, \eta_s)} \in \mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)$ and $\nu_i = \mu_i$ imply $\xi_s^i = \eta_s^i$. Thus, we find \mathbb{P}_s -a.s.

$$\boxed{\text{NN3}} \quad (4.7) \quad \int_s^t \bar{b}_i(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)}) dr + \int_s^t \bar{\sigma}_i(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)}) dB_t^1 \leq \int_s^t b_i(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)}) + \int_s^t \sigma_i(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)}) dB_t^1, \quad t \geq s.$$

Taking conditional expectation with respect to \mathcal{F}_s , we drive

$$\int_s^t \mathbb{E}(\bar{b}_i(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)}) | \mathcal{F}_s) dr \leq \int_s^t \mathbb{E}(b_i(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)}) | \mathcal{F}_s) dr, \quad t \geq s.$$

By the continuity of \bar{b} and b and $\mu_r^{(1)} \rightarrow \nu, \mu_r^{(2)} \rightarrow \mu$ weakly as $r \downarrow s$, we obtain

$$\bar{b}_i(s, \xi_s, \nu) \leq \bar{b}_i(s, \eta_s, \nu), \quad t \geq s, \quad \mathbb{P}_s - a.s.$$

Consequently, for $\pi := \mathcal{L}_{(\xi_s, \eta_s)} \in \mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)$ with $\pi(\{x \leq y\}) = 1$,

$$\bar{b}_i(s, x, \nu) \leq b_i(s, y, \mu), \quad (x, y) \in \text{supp} \pi.$$

Thus, the first assertion of (i) holds true. Hence, for $\nu = \mu$, $\pi(\{x \leq y\}) = 1$ implies $x = y$, $\pi - a.s.$ Whence, we have

$$\bar{b}_i(s, x, \mu) \leq b_i(s, x, \mu), \quad x \in \text{supp} \mu.$$

In general, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mu_\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon\delta_x$. It is easy to see that $x \in \text{supp} \mu_\varepsilon$. Thus applying (4) with μ_ε replaced by μ yields

$$\bar{b}_i(s, x, \mu_\varepsilon) \leq b_i(s, x, \mu_\varepsilon), \quad s \geq 0, \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

Consequently, the second assertion in (i) follows by taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Below we assume $\nu \preceq \mu$ with $\nu_{ij} = \mu_{ij}$ so that $\nu_i = \mu_i, \nu_j = \mu_j$. Thus, we deduce from (4.7) that for any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_s^t [\varepsilon \bar{b}_i(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)}) + (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{b}_j(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)})] dr + \int_s^t [\varepsilon \bar{\sigma}_i(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)}) + (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{\sigma}_j(r, \xi_r, \mu_r^{(1)})] dB_r^1 \\ & \leq \int_s^t [\varepsilon \bar{b}_i(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)}) + (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{b}_j(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)})] dr + \int_s^t [\varepsilon \bar{\sigma}_i(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)}) + (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{\sigma}_j(r, \eta_r, \mu_r^{(2)})] dB_r^2 \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both side by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t-s}}$ and letting $t \downarrow s$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & N(0, \varepsilon^2 \bar{a}_{ii}(s, \xi_s, \nu) + 2\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) \bar{a}_{ij}(s, \xi_s, \nu) + (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \bar{a}_{jj}(s, \xi_s, \nu)) \\ & \leq N(0, \varepsilon^2 a_{ii}(s, \eta_s, \mu) + 2\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) a_{ij}(s, \eta_s, \mu) + (1 - \varepsilon)^2 a_{jj}(s, \eta_s, \mu)). \end{aligned}$$

By the symmetry of centred normal distribution, this further implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^2 \bar{a}_{ii}(s, \xi_s, \nu) + 2\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) \bar{a}_{ij}(s, \xi_s, \nu) + (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \bar{a}_{jj}(s, \xi_s, \nu) \\ & = \varepsilon^2 a_{ii}(s, \eta_s, \mu) + 2\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) a_{ij}(s, \eta_s, \mu) + (1 - \varepsilon)^2 a_{jj}(s, \eta_s, \mu), \varepsilon \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, dividing by ε^2 on both sides yields

$$\boxed{\text{NN5}} \quad (4.8) \quad \bar{a}_{ij}(s, \xi_s, \nu) = a_{ij}(s, \eta_s, \mu), \quad \mathbb{P}_s - a.s.,$$

which gives for $\pi = \mathcal{L}_{(\xi_s, \eta_s)} \in \mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)$,

$$\bar{a}_{ij}(s, x, \nu) = a_{ij}(s, y, \mu), \quad (x, y) \in \text{supp}\pi, \quad s \geq 0.$$

Thus, by the approximation trick above, we can obtain the second assertion in (ii). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Due to $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \preceq P_{s,t}^*$, we have $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_{s,t}} = \bar{P}_{s,t}^* \nu \preceq P_{s,t}^* \mu = \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,t}}$ for $\nu \preceq \mu$. Therefore, in particular for $f(x) = x_i \in \mathcal{U}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{X}_{s,t})_i \leq \mathbb{E}(X_{s,t})_i.$$

Since $\nu_i(f) = \mu_i(f)$, we then deduce from (4.6) with ξ_t and η_t replaced by $X_{s,t}$ and $\bar{X}_{s,t}$ in (4.1) that

$$\int_s^t \mathbb{E}(\bar{b}_i(s, \bar{X}_{s,r}, \mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}_{s,r}})) dr \leq \int_s^t \mathbb{E}(b_i(s, X_{s,r}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,r}})) dr.$$

Dividing by $t - s$ on both side followed by $t \downarrow s$, we get (i).

Since $\bar{P}_{s,t}^* \mu \leq P_{s,t}^* \mu$, for $f \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have $\mu(\bar{L}_{s,\mu} f) \leq \mu(L_{s,\mu} f)$. In particular, taking $\mu = \delta_x$ yields $\bar{L}_{s,\delta_x} f(x) \leq L_{s,\delta_x} f(x)$. With this at hand, we can get the assertion (ii) by following exactly the argument of [3, Lemma 3.4]. \square

4.1 Proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5

We first present some lemmas.

$\boxed{\text{Lem}}$ **Lemma 4.1.** *Let $\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\mu^{(1)} + \mu^{(2)})$, where $\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)} \in \mathcal{P}_+$ such that $\mu^{(1)} \preceq \mu^{(2)}$. Then, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$.*

Proof. Due to $\mu^{(1)} \preceq \mu^{(2)}$, we have for any $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b$

$$(\mu^{(1)}(f) - \mu^{(2)}(f))(\mu^{(1)}(g) - \mu^{(2)}(g)) \geq 0.$$

The above inequality is equivalent to the following inequality

$$\boxed{\text{E1}} \quad (4.9) \quad 2(\mu^{(1)}(f)\mu^{(1)}(g) + \mu^{(2)}(f)\mu^{(2)}(g)) \geq (\mu^{(1)}(f) + \mu^{(2)}(f))(\mu^{(1)}(g) + \mu^{(2)}(g)).$$

Furthermore, in terms of $\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)} \in \mathcal{P}_+$, we deduce for any $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b$,

$$\mu^{(1)}(fg) \geq \mu^{(1)}(f)\mu^{(1)}(g), \quad \mu^{(2)}(fg) \geq \mu^{(2)}(f)\mu^{(2)}(g).$$

Substituting this (4.9) yields

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mu^{(1)}(fg) + \mu^{(2)}(fg)) \geq \frac{1}{4}(\mu^{(1)}(f) + \mu^{(2)}(f))(\mu^{(1)}(g) + \mu^{(2)}(g))$$

so that $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$. □

lem1 **Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that $(P_{s,t}^*)_{t \geq s}$ preserves positive correlations and let μ be the same as that in Lemma 4.1. Then, for $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\boxed{\text{EE}} \quad (4.10) \quad \mu(fg) = \mu(f)\mu(g),$$

we have

$$\boxed{\text{in1}} \quad (4.11) \quad 2(\mu^{(1)}(L_{s,\mu}(fg)) + \mu^{(2)}(L_{s,\mu}(fg))) \geq (\mu^{(1)}(L_{s,\mu}(f)) + \mu^{(2)}(L_{s,\mu}(f)))(\mu^{(1)}(g) + \mu^{(2)}(g)) \\ + (\mu^{(1)}(L_{s,\mu}(g)) + \mu^{(2)}(L_{s,\mu}(g)))(\mu^{(1)}(f) + \mu^{(2)}(f)).$$

Equivalently,

$$\boxed{\text{in2}} \quad (4.12) \quad 2(\mu^{(1)}(\Gamma_1(f, g)) + \mu^{(2)}(\Gamma_1(f, g))) \geq (\mu^{(2)}(L_{s,\mu}(g)) - \mu^{(1)}(L_{s,\mu}(g)))(\mu^{(1)}(f) - \mu^{(2)}(f)) \\ + (\mu^{(2)}(L_{s,\mu}(f)) + \mu^{(1)}(L_{s,\mu}(f)))(\mu^{(1)}(g) - \mu^{(2)}(g)),$$

where

$$\Gamma_1(f, g)(x) := L_{s,\mu}(fg)(x) - f(x)L_{s,\mu}g(x) - g(x)L_{s,\mu}f(x) = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}(t, x, \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} g(x).$$

Proof. By a direct calculation, we obtain that (4.11) is equivalent to (4.12). Therefore, it is sufficient to show that (4.11) holds true. From Lemma 4.1, we have $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$. Since $(P_{s,t}^*)_{t \geq s}$ preserves positive correlations, we deduce for any $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$(P_{s,t}^*\mu)(fg) \geq (P_{s,t}^*\mu)(f)(P_{s,t}^*\mu)(g), \quad t \geq s.$$

This, together with $\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\mu^{(1)} + \mu^{(2)})$, yields

$$2((P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(1)})(fg) + (P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(2)})(fg)) \geq ((P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(1)})(f) + (P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(2)})(f))((P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(1)})(g) + (P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(2)})(g)).$$

Thus, by taking (4.10) into consideration, we derive that

$$\frac{2}{t-s}((P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(1)})(fg) + (P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(2)})(fg) - (\mu^{(1)})(fg) + (\mu^{(2)})(fg)) \\ \geq \frac{1}{t-s} \{ ((P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(1)})(f) + (P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(2)})(f))((P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(1)})(g) + (P_{s,t}^*\mu^{(2)})(g)) \\ - (\mu^{(1)}(f) + \mu^{(2)}(f))(\mu^{(1)}(g) + \mu^{(2)}(g)) \}.$$

Consequently, the assertion (4.11) follows by taking $t \downarrow s$. □

lem4 **Lemma 4.3.** *If $(P_{s,t}^*)_{t \geq s}$ preserves positive correlation and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$ same as in Lemma 4.1, then $a_{ij}(s, x, \mu) \geq 0$ for any $s \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $B_\varepsilon(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |x - y| \leq \varepsilon\}$, the closed ball centred at the point x with the radius ε . For $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $f_\varepsilon \in [f(x) - \varepsilon, f(x) + \varepsilon]$ and $g_\varepsilon \in [g(x) - \varepsilon, g(x) + \varepsilon]$ on $B_\varepsilon(x)^c$ be the point-wise approximation of $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (i.e., $f_\varepsilon \rightarrow f$ and $g_\varepsilon \rightarrow g$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$). Below we assume that $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$ is given in Lemma 4.1. By Lemma 4.2, we obtain for $f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mu(L_{s,\mu}(f_\varepsilon g_\varepsilon))(x) \geq \mu(f_\varepsilon)\mu(L_{s,\mu}g_\varepsilon)(x) + \mu(g_\varepsilon)\mu(L_{s,\mu}f_\varepsilon)(x), \quad s \geq 0.$$

Then, combining the fact that $f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are constants on $B_\varepsilon(x)^c$, we have

EE2 (4.13)
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (L_{s,\mu}(f_\varepsilon g_\varepsilon))(y) \frac{I_{B_\varepsilon(x)}(y)(dy)}{\mu(B_\varepsilon(x))} \geq \mu(f_\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_{s,\mu}g_\varepsilon(y) \frac{I_{B_\varepsilon(x)}(y)(dy)}{\mu(B_\varepsilon(x))} + \mu(g_\varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_{s,\mu}f_\varepsilon(y) \frac{I_{B_\varepsilon(x)}(y)(dy)}{\mu(B_\varepsilon(x))}.$$

Observe that

$$\mu(f_\varepsilon) = \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} (f_\varepsilon(z) - f(x))\mu(dz) + \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)^c} (f_\varepsilon(z) - f(x))\mu(dz) + f(x) \rightarrow f(x)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, where the first integral goes to zero since f_ε is uniformly continuous on $B_\varepsilon(x)$, and the second integral tends to zero due to $f_\varepsilon \in [f(x) - \varepsilon, f(x) + \varepsilon]$ on $B_\varepsilon(x)^c$. Similarly, we obtain $\mu(g_\varepsilon) \rightarrow g(x)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, note that $\frac{\mu(B_\varepsilon(x) \cap \cdot)}{\mu(B_\varepsilon(x))}$ converges weakly to δ_x as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Thus, taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ on both sides of (4.13) yields

$$L_{s,\mu}(fg)(x) \geq f(x)L_{s,\mu}g(x) + g(x)L_{s,\mu}f(x).$$

Thus, by choosing $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that in a neighbourhood of x

$$f(z) = z_i, \quad g(z) = z_j,$$

we deduce that

$$x_j b_i(s, x, \mu) + x_i b_j(s, x, \mu) + a_{ij}(s, x, \mu) \geq x_j b_i(s, x, \mu) + x_i b_j(s, x, \mu)$$

so that $a_{ij}(t, x, \mu) \geq 0$. □

lem2 **Lemma 4.4.** *Assume $\mu^{(1)} := \mu_i^{(1)} \times \mu_{\{i\}^c}^{(1)}$ and $\mu^{(2)} := \mu_i^{(2)} \times \mu_{\{i\}^c}^{(2)}$ with $\mu_i^{(1)} = \mu_i^{(2)}$, where $\mu_i^{(1)}, \mu_i^{(2)}, \mu_{\{i\}^c}^{(1)}, \mu_{\{i\}^c}^{(2)} \in \mathcal{P}_+$, and suppose further that $(P_{s,t}^*)_{t \geq s}$ preserves positive correlation. Then,*

$$\mu^{(1)}(b_i(t, \cdot, \mu^{(1)})) \leq \mu^{(2)}(b_i(t, \cdot, \mu^{(2)})).$$

Proof. Since $\mu_i^{(1)}, \mu_i^{(2)}, \mu_{\{i\}^c}^{(1)}, \mu_{\{i\}^c}^{(2)} \in \mathcal{P}_+$, we deduce $\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)} \in \mathcal{P}_+$. For given i and $k \neq i$, take $f, g \in \mathcal{U}_b \cap C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that in a neighbourhood of x ,

$$f(z) = z_i - \int_{\mathbb{R}} r \mu_i^{(1)}(dr), \quad g(z) = \frac{\frac{h(z_k)}{1+h(z_k)} - \mu^{(1)}(\frac{h}{1+h})}{\mu^{(2)}(\frac{h}{1+h}) - \mu^{(1)}(\frac{h}{1+h})},$$

where $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}_+)$ is an increasing function. Note that

$$\mu(fg) = \mu(f) = 0, \quad \mu = (\mu^{(1)} + \mu^{(2)})/2.$$

So applying Lemma 4.2 gives

$$\int b_i(t, x, \mu^{(1)}) \mu^{(1)}(dx) \leq \int b_i(t, x, \mu^{(2)}) \mu^{(2)}(dx).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Since $\overline{P}_{s,t}^*$ is the marginal distributions of $\Lambda_s \mu$ at time t , $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+$ implies $P_{s,t}^* \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for $t \geq s$. So, it suffices to prove $\Lambda_s \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$. To this end, we only need to prove that for any $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_+$ and $T > s \geq 0$, the marginal distribution $\Lambda_{s,T} \mu_0$ of $\Lambda_s \mu_0$ on $C_{s,T} := C([s, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies

$$\boxed{*G} \quad (4.14) \quad (\Lambda_{s,T} \mu_0)(FG) \geq (\Lambda_{s,T} \mu_0)(F) \Lambda_{s,T}(G)$$

for any bounded increasing functions F, G on $C_{s,T}$. To achieve this, let

$$\mathcal{D}_+ = \{\nu \in C([s, T]; \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)) : \nu_s = \mu_0, \nu_t \in \mathcal{P}_+, t \in [s, T]\},$$

which is a Polish space under the metric for $\lambda > 0$:

$$\boxed{C2} \quad (4.15) \quad \mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{t \in [s, T]} (e^{-\lambda t} \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t, \nu_t)).$$

For $\nu \in C([s, T]; \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in [s, T]$, let

$$b_t^\nu(x) = b_t(x, \nu_t), \quad \sigma_t^\nu(x) = \sqrt{2a_t(x, \nu_t)}.$$

For $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_+$, consider the following time-dependent SDE

$$\boxed{EQ3} \quad (4.16) \quad dX_t^\nu = b_t^\nu(X_t^\nu) dt + \sigma_t^\nu(X_t^\nu) dW_t, \quad t \in [s, T], \quad X_s^\nu = X_s \sim \mu_0.$$

For $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_+$, we define the mapping $\nu \mapsto \Phi(\nu)$ as below,

$$(\Phi(\nu))_t := \mathcal{L}_{X_t^\nu}, \quad t \in [s, T].$$

Under (1) and (2), by $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_+$ and Theorem 3.2, we have $\mathcal{L}_{X_t^\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_+$ so that $\Phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. Below, we assume that $\nu^1, \nu^2 \in \mathcal{D}$. By Itô's formula and (2.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2 &= \{2\langle X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}, b_t^{\nu^1}(X_t^{\nu^1}) - b_t^{\nu^2}(X_t^{\nu^2}) \rangle + \|\sigma_t^{\nu^1}(X_t^{\nu^1}) - \sigma_t^{\nu^2}(X_t^{\nu^2})\|_{HS}^2\} dt \\ &\quad + 2\langle X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}, (\sigma_t^{\nu^1}(X_t^{\nu^1}) - \sigma_t^{\nu^2}(X_t^{\nu^2})) dW_t \rangle \\ &\leq K(|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2 + \mathbb{W}_2(\nu_t^1, \nu_t^2)^2) dt + 2\langle X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}, (\sigma_t^{\nu^1}(X_t^{\nu^1}) - \sigma_t^{\nu^2}(X_t^{\nu^2})) dW_t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking expectation on both side yields,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|X_s^{\nu^1} - X_s^{\nu^2}|^2 + K(T) \int_s^t (\mathbb{E}|X_r^{\nu^1} - X_r^{\nu^2}|^2 + \mathbb{W}_2(\nu_r^1, \nu_r^2)) dr.$$

Noting that, $X_s^{\nu^1} = X_s^{\nu^2}$, so we have

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2 \leq K(T) \int_s^t \mathbb{W}_2(\nu_r^1, \nu_r^2)^2 dr + K(T) \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|X_r^{\nu^1} - X_r^{\nu^2}|^2 dr.$$

Then Growall's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2 \leq K(T)e^{K(T)T} \int_s^t \mathbb{W}_2(\nu_r^1, \nu_r^2)^2 dr.$$

This implies for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-2\lambda t} \mathbb{E}|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2 &\leq K(T)e^{K(T)T} \int_s^t e^{-2\lambda(t-r)} e^{-2\lambda r} \mathbb{W}_2(\nu_r^1, \nu_r^2)^2 dr \\ \text{EQ5} \quad (4.17) \quad &\leq \frac{K(T)e^{K(T)T}}{2\lambda} \mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}(\nu^1, \nu^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}(\Phi(\nu^1), \Phi(\nu^2)) &= \sup_{t \in [s, T]} (e^{-\lambda t} \mathbb{W}_2(\Phi(\nu^1))_t, (\Phi(\nu^2))_t) \leq \sup_{t \in [s, T]} (e^{-2\lambda t} \mathbb{E}|X_t^{\nu^1} - X_t^{\nu^2}|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{K(T)e^{K(T)T}}{2\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}(\nu^1, \nu^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (4.17). Then, by taking $\lambda = 4K(T)e^{K(T)T}$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}(\Phi(\nu^1), \Phi(\nu^2)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}(\nu^1, \nu^2).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{D}_+ \ni \nu \mapsto \Phi(\nu)$ is contractive under the metric $\mathbb{W}_{2,\lambda}$. Therefore, the Banach fixed point theorem implies that the mapping $\nu \mapsto \Phi(\nu)$ has a unique fixed point, denoted by ν . Consequently, we have

$$(\Phi(\nu))_t = \nu_t = \mathcal{L}_{X_t^\nu} \in \mathcal{P}_+, \quad t \in [s, T],$$

so that $\Lambda_{s,T} := \mathcal{L}_{(X_t^\nu)_{t \in [s, T]}}$. Therefore, by applying Theorem 3.2 to the diffusion process generated by L_t with coefficients (b^ν, a^ν) , we conclude that the present conditions (1) and (2) imply (4.14) as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Consider the decoupled SDE

$$(4.18) \quad dX_{s,t}^{x,\mu} = b(t, X_{s,t}^{x,\mu}, P_{s,t}^* \mu) dt + \sigma(t, X_{s,t}^{x,\mu}, P_{s,t}^* \mu) dW_t, \quad t \geq s, \quad X_{s,s}^{x,\mu} = x,$$

where $P_{s,t}^* \mu$ is the marginal distribution of Λ_s at the time t . For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\Lambda_s^{x,\mu} = \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\infty}^{x,\mu}}$. Then, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\Lambda_s^{\nu,\mu} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_s^{x,\mu} \nu(dx)$$

is the law of $X_{s,\infty}^{\nu,\mu}$ with initial distribution ν . Note that

$$\Lambda_s^\mu = \Lambda_s^{\mu,\mu} = \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\infty}^\mu}.$$

Since $\Lambda_s^\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+^s$, we have

$$\boxed{\text{FKG3}} \quad (4.19) \quad \Lambda_s^\mu(FG) \geq \Lambda_s^\mu(F)\Lambda_s^\mu(G), \quad F, G \in \mathcal{U}(C_s), \mu \in \mathcal{P}_+.$$

For $\gamma \in C_s$, let $F(\gamma) = f(\gamma_s)$ with $0 \leq f \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then (4.19) becomes

$$\Lambda_s^{\nu, \mu}(G) \geq \Lambda_s^{\mu, \mu}(G), \quad G \in \mathcal{U}(C_s),$$

where $\nu(dx) := \frac{f(x)\mu(dx)}{\mu(f)}$. That is, $\Lambda_s^{\nu, \mu} \geq \Lambda_s^{\mu, \mu}$. Then there exist $\pi_s \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda_s^{\nu, \mu}, \Lambda_s^{\mu, \mu})$ and Brownian motions B_t^1 and B_t^2 on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}) := (C_s, \sigma(\gamma_r : r \in [s, t]), \pi_s)$ such that

$$\boxed{\text{PSDE3}} \quad (4.20) \quad \begin{cases} d\xi_t = b(t, \xi_t, P_{s,t}^* \mu) dt + \sigma(t, \xi_t, P_{s,t}^* \mu) dB_t^1, & \mathcal{L}_{\xi_s} = \nu, \quad t \geq s \\ d\eta_t = b(t, \eta_t, P_{s,t}^* \mu) dt + \sigma(t, \eta_t, P_{s,t}^* \mu) dB_t^2, & \mathcal{L}_{\eta_s} = \mu, \quad t \geq s. \end{cases}$$

satisfy $\pi_s(\xi \geq \eta) = 1$.

For any increasing $0 \leq f \in \mathcal{U}_b$, which does not depend on x_i, x_j , we have $\nu := \frac{fd\mu}{\mu(f)}$ with $\mu = \mu_{\{ij\}} \times \mu_{\{ij\}^c}$ such that $\nu_{ij} = \mu_{ij}$. Thus, $\xi_s^i = \eta_s^i$, $\xi_s^j = \eta_s^j$. So,

$$\boxed{\text{PSDE4}} \quad (4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi_t^k - \eta_t^k &= \int_s^t (b_k(r, \xi_r, P_{s,r}^* \mu) - b_k(r, \eta_r, P_{s,r}^* \mu)) dr \\ &+ \int_s^t \langle \sigma_k(\cdot, \eta_r, P_{s,r}^* \mu), dB_t^1 \rangle - \int_s^t \langle \sigma_k(\cdot, \eta_r, P_{s,r}^* \mu), dB_t^2 \rangle \geq 0, \quad k = i, j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by following the argument to derive (4.8), we have

$$a_{ij}(s, \xi_s, \mu) = \sigma_i(s, \xi_s, \mu) \sigma_i(s, \xi_s, \mu) = \sigma_i(s, \eta_s, \mu) \sigma_j(s, \eta_s, \mu) = a_{ij}(s, \eta_s, \mu).$$

This, together with $\nu = \frac{fd\mu}{\mu(f)}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_s} = \nu$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\eta_s} = \mu$, leads to

$$\boxed{\text{PSDE5}} \quad (4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \int f(x) a_{ij}(s, x, \mu) \mu(dx) &= \mu(f) \mathbb{E} a_{ij}(s, \xi_s, \mu) \\ &= \mu(f) \mathbb{E} a_{ij}(s, \eta_s, \mu) = \mu(f) \int a_{ij}(s, x, \mu) \mu(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Let g be a function such that

$$\mu(fg) = \mu(f)\mu(g).$$

Then, for $f(x) = I_A(x_k : k \neq i, j)$ with $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{(d-2)})$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu(I_A g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} I_A(x) g(x) \mu(dx) = \mu(A) \mu(g).$$

Now, by the definition of conditional expectation we get

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu(g | x_k : k \neq i, j) = \mu(g),$$

which obviously implies that g depends only on x_i, x_j . Thus, (4.22) yields the first assertion.

Dividing by $t - s$ on both side of (4.21) and taking $t \rightarrow s$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} b_i(s, \xi_s, \mu) \geq \mathbb{E} b_i(s, \xi_s, \mu).$$

This, together with $\nu = \frac{fd\mu}{\mu(f)}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_s} = \nu$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\eta_s} = \mu$, leads to the second assertion. \square

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Professor Feng-Yu Wang for his helpful comments.

References

- [1] V. Barbu, M. Röckner, *From nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations to solutions of distribution dependent SDE*, Ann. Probab. 48(4), 1902-1920(2020).
- [2] Øksendal, Bernt: *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg(2003).
- [3] M-F. Chen, F-Y. Wang, : *On order-preservation and positive correlations for multidimensional diffusion processes*, Probab Theory Relat. Fields 95, 421-428(1993).
- [4] C.M. Forruin, P.W. Kasteleyn, J. Ginibre, : *Correlation inequality on some partially ordered sets*. Comm. Math. Phys. 22, 89-109(1971).
- [5] Herbst, I., Pitt, L.: *Diffusion equation techniques in stochastic monotonicity and positive correlations*. Probab Theory Relat. Fields 87, 275-312(1991).
- [6] X. Huang, F-Y. Wang: *Distribution dependent SDEs with singular coefficients*. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 129, 4747-4770(2019).
- [7] X. Huang, C. Liu, F-Y. Wang: *Order Preservation for Path-Distribution Dependent SDEs*. Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. , 17, 2125-2133, (2018).
- [8] T. Kamae, U.Krengel, G. L. O'Brien, *Stochastic inequalities on partially ordered spaces*, Ann. Probab. 5, 899–912(1977).
- [9] D. Trevisan: *Well-posedness of multidimensional diffusion processes with weakly differentiable coefficients* Elect. J. Probab. 21, 1-44(2016).
- [10] P. Ren, F.-Y. Wang, *Donsker-Varadhan Large Deviations for Path-Distribution Dependent SPDEs*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 499(1), 125000(2021).
- [11] Yu. S. Mishura, A. Yu. Veretennikov,: *Existence and uniqueness theorems for solutions of McKean-Vlasov stochastic equations*. arXiv:1805.10841.
- [12] D. Strook, S.R.S. Varadhan,: *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*. Springer, 2007.
- [13] F-Y.Wang: *Distribution dependent SDEs for Landau type equations*. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 128, 595-621(2018).