

AN EXPLICIT EULER METHOD FOR SOBOLEV VECTOR FIELDS WITH APPLICATIONS TO THE CONTINUITY EQUATION ON NON CARTESIAN GRIDS

Tommaso Cortopassi^a

^a*Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza Dei Cavalieri 7, Pisa, 56126, Italy*

Abstract

We prove a novel stability estimate in $L_t^\infty(L_x^p)$ between the regular Lagrangian flow of a Sobolev vector field and a piecewise affine approximation of such flow. This approximation of the flow is obtained by a (sort of) explicit Euler method, and it is the crucial tool to prove approximation results for the solution of the continuity equation by using the representation of the solution as the push-forward via the regular Lagrangian flow of the initial datum. We approximate the solution in two ways, using different approximations for both the flow and the initial datum. In the first case we give an estimate, which however holds only in probability, of the Wasserstein distance between the solution of the continuity equation and a discrete approximation of such solution. The approximate solution is defined as the push forward of weighted Dirac deltas (whose centers are chosen in a probabilistic way). In the second case we give a deterministic estimate of the Wasserstein distance using a slightly different approximation of the regular Lagrangian flow and requiring more regularity on the velocity field u than in the previous case. An advantage of both approximations is that they provide an algorithm which is easily parallelizable and does not rely on any particular structure of the mesh with which we discretize (only in space) the domain. We also compare our estimates to similar ones previously obtained in [27], and we show how under certain hypotheses our method provides better convergence rates.

Keywords: Continuity equation, regular Lagrangian flow, Sobolev velocity field, forward Euler method

1. Introduction

One of the most important results in classical analysis is the Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem:

Theorem 1.1. (Cauchy-Lipschitz)¹

Let $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, continuous in t and Lipschitz in x , uniformly in time. Then, for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for every $T > 0$, the solution of the Cauchy problem

Email address: tommaso.cortopassi@sns.it (Tommaso Cortopassi)

¹There exist many different versions of this theorem. The boundedness of u is not usually required, but we assume it since in the following the velocity u that we consider will always be bounded.

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}y(t) = u(t, y(t)) \\ y(0) = x_0 \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

exists for all $t \in [0, T]$ and it is unique.

The Cauchy problem (1.1) is strictly connected with the following initial value problem for the continuity equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}_x(u\rho) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

The link between (1.1) and (1.2) in the classical setting (namely when the velocity field u satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1) is provided by the method of characteristics, a well-known tool for first order linear PDEs which shows that the solution ρ of (1.2) can be represented as

$$\rho(t, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \cdot)_\# \rho_0,$$

where Φ is the flow of u , i.e. $\Phi(\cdot, x)$ satisfies for every x :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi(t, x) = u(t, \Phi(t, x)) & \text{if } t > 0 \\ \Phi(0, x) = x & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

It is well-known that in (1.1) the assumption that u is continuous in time can be removed asking for example only summability, but it is also important for several applications to significantly weaken also the Lipschitz regularity condition in the space variable. Indeed (1.2) is often part of many equations coming from physics (a very important example is fluid dynamics, where the continuity equation is part of the inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations) which encodes the ‘‘conservation of mass’’, i.e. the quantity $\|\rho(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ is constant in time, and in this setting the velocity does not have Lipschitz regularity in general. The first breakthrough in this direction² was obtained in [11], where the authors proved well-posedness for solutions of (1.2) in the class $L^\infty(0, T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with a velocity field $u \in [L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d))]^d$ with $1/p + 1/q = 1$ and such that $\operatorname{div}(u) \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ (see [11] for the details). Well-posedness was later extended in [1] to velocity fields $u \in [L^1(0, T; BV(\mathbb{R}^d))]^d$ with the negative part of the divergence (denoted in the following as $\operatorname{div}(u)^-$) in $L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Moreover, in [1] the author introduced the following notion of ‘‘regular Lagrangian flow’’ which generalizes the classical notion of flow.

Definition 1.1. (Regular Lagrangian Flow, [1])

We say that Φ is a regular Lagrangian flow associated to the vector field u if:

- For \mathcal{L}^d a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \mapsto \Phi(t, x)$ is an absolutely continuous solution of $\partial_t \Phi(t, x) = u(t, \Phi(t, x))$ with $\Phi(0, x) = x$;

²Some progress had in fact already been made, proving well-posedness for (1.1) also for functions u satisfying the Osgood condition [26] or a uniform one-sided Lipschitz condition.

- Let \mathcal{L}^d be the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure. There exists a constant $L = L(T) > 0$ such that $\Phi(t, \cdot)_\# \mathcal{L}^d \leq L \mathcal{L}^d$ for every $t \in [0, T]$.

The constant L is often called in the literature “compressibility constant” and it can be proved that this constant is essentially controlled by $\text{div}(u)^-$ (in fluid dynamics a common condition on velocity fields is the incompressibility, namely $\text{div}(u) = 0$, which in turn implies $L = 1$). Even though the authors proved the well-posedness, both in [11] and in [1] they did not exhibit any kind of quantitative stability, since their proofs rely on the method of renormalized solutions, which is not well suited for quantitative estimates. The first quantitative result was obtained in [9], where the authors prove stability estimates on regular Lagrangian flows for $u \in [L^1(0, T; (W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)))^d$ with $p > 1$ ³. More recently in [29, 30] the author used tools from optimal transport theory and the results from [9] to give stability estimates in a suitable logarithmic Wasserstein distance for the solution ρ of (1.2).

In recent years the topic of approximating ρ in presence of non Lipschitz velocity fields with numerical methods has also been investigated. To the best of our knowledge, the first works in this direction have been [34] and [5], where using a discontinuous Galerkin method and a finite volume scheme respectively they prove strong convergence of approximate solution, although without explicit rates of convergence. However, it is worth mentioning that in [5] they conjecture a rate of $1/2$ based on numerical simulations, which matches the rate for smoother vector fields⁴. The rate was proved to be optimal, although only for Lipschitz velocity field, in [22, 23]. The first quantitative estimate of the error in presence of a vector field with Sobolev regularity (although only in a weak sense, i.e. the logarithmic Wasserstein distance introduced in this context in [29]) was obtained in [27], where the authors consider an *explicit* finite volume upwind scheme and whose proof requires (for technical reasons) the use of cartesian meshes⁵ to discretize the spatial domain. Such results have been extended to more general meshes in [28] by using an *implicit* method, and recently they have been adapted to include diffusion in [24, 25]. Recent developments concerning the numerical approximation of (1.2) have been obtained in [4] and [17]. In [4] in particular they obtain strong convergence (i.e. in L^p norm) of approximate solutions of non linear continuity equations of the form $\partial_t \rho + \text{div}(uf(\rho)) = 0$ with different approximations schemes: for example their results prove strong convergence of the Lax-Friedrichs ([19, 20, 21]) and of the upwind scheme. Their argument relies on bounding the semi-norms of the approximate solutions on a precise logarithmic Sobolev space (see also [3]) which embeds compactly in L^p . We refer the interested reader to [4, Theorem 8] pointing out that, while not explicitly derived, the results obtained in [4] allow to get a quantitative rate of convergence (see [4, Corollary 11] and the discussion after that). However, as in [27], the main restriction is that the estimates are only valid in a cartesian mesh. The issue has been partially solved in [17], where the authors obtain similar results for the continuity equation on non

³The key estimate in their paper relies on the $L^p - L^p$ strong boundedness of the maximal function, which only holds if $p > 1$.

⁴The method is actually of first order, but the rate of convergence falls to $1/2$ if the initial datum is not regular, see [18, 10, 5].

⁵I.e. a mesh whose elements are isometric axis-parallel rectangular boxes.

cartesian meshes with some additional hypotheses (they require some periodicity condition). Moreover, in [17] they manage to treat a system of equations where the density solving (1.2) and the velocity are coupled in a non linear way (see [17, Theorem 1.7]). We stress that, since the continuity equation is often part of many different physical models, studying the coupling of (1.2) with other equations is crucial in many different parts of physics and biology. A non exhaustive list comprehend [14, 15] for compressible Navier-Stokes, [2, 12, 13] for compressible Stokes, [32] for swarming and [6] for chemotaxis, see also [17] and the references therein. To the best of our knowledge, so far every approximation scheme has used an Eulerian point of view of (1.2). We will instead use a Lagrangian one, managing to prove quantitative estimates, although only in a weak sense, for non cartesian meshes without *any* regularity assumptions, requiring only a bound on the diameter of the cells. This seems to be the first *explicit* method which gives quantitative estimates on a non cartesian mesh (we recall that in [28] they used an *implicit* scheme). Another useful feature of our method, from the point of view of numerics, is that it is parallelizable in a straightforward way.

The main result of this paper, i.e. Theorem 2.1, is a stability estimate in the spirit of [9], which we use as a tool to prove approximation results for the solution of the continuity equation. In particular we consider the following initial value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}_x(u\rho) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d \\ \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^d. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Remark 1. *Our results are stated on the d -dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^d for simplicity. However, with some care, they can be extended to more general ambient spaces.*

We will work with functions belonging to the following class:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_0 \in L^q(\mathbb{T}^d) \\ u \in [L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d)]^d & \text{with } 1/p + 1/q = 1, \quad p > 1 \\ \operatorname{div}(u)^- \in L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d) & \text{if } 1 < p \leq d \\ \operatorname{div}(u)^- \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)) & \text{if } p > d. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

Notice that when $1 < p \leq d$ we are asking a little more than what is asked in [1] for having well-posedness. Namely, we are not asking that $\operatorname{div}(u)^- \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d))$, but rather $\operatorname{div}(u)^- \in L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d)$. This stronger assumption will be crucial in our proof of Lemma 2.2. The idea is to use Lagrangian estimates to get estimates at the Eulerian level (i.e. for the solution ρ of (1.3)). The key observation is that in the DiPerna-Lions setting it still holds that the solution ρ of (1.3) can be represented as

$$\rho(t, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \cdot)_\# \rho_0,$$

with ρ_0 the initial datum and Φ the regular Lagrangian flow associated to the velocity u , as defined in Definition 1.1. Then we approximate the solution ρ with

$$\rho_E(t, \cdot) = \Phi_E(t, \cdot)_\# \mu,$$

where Φ_E is an approximation of Φ and μ is an approximation of ρ_0 . This method is in principle quite flexible, in the sense that any “good” approximation of Φ and ρ_0 should give a “good” approximation of ρ which we will specify more precisely later on. In particular we will approximate ρ in two ways, using different approximations for both Φ and ρ_0 . In the first one we consider a mesh of the domain with some mild assumptions on the sets $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of the mesh, and for every set Q_i we choose (according to a uniform probability distribution) a point $x_i \in Q_i$ and a weight $M_i > 0$ so that $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^M M_i \delta_{x_i}$ approximates the initial datum ρ_0 . As for the approximation of the regular Lagrangian flow Φ we construct, for every point $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, a piecewise affine map $\Phi_E(\cdot, x)$ obtained by a (sort of) explicit Euler method applied to the velocity field u . The precise definition of Φ_E will be given in Definition 2.1. The approximation ρ_E will therefore be a weighted sum of Dirac deltas whose positions evolve in time in a piecewise linear fashion. We prove that ρ_E approximates in Wasserstein distance the solution ρ of (1.3), although only in probability (see Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.1 for the precise statements). We do not know if, at least in some cases, similar estimates hold for *every* choice of the initial positions of the Dirac deltas, i.e. in a deterministic sense (see Remark 8). We also consider a different approximation $\bar{\Phi}_E$ of the flow (see Definition 4.1) which, if $p > d$ and considering an approximation of the initial datum in the strong L^1 norm, provides a deterministic approximation of ρ in Wasserstein distance (see Theorem 4.1). The novelty is that this an *explicit* method which can be performed on unstructured meshes, it provides an easily parallelizable algorithm and it uses the Lagrangian formulation of the problem, whereas in previous works the Eulerian point of view was always employed.

Let us now discuss briefly the organisation of the paper. Section 2 is dedicated to proving Theorem 2.1, where we give a novel $L_t^\infty(L_x^p)$ stability estimate for the difference of the regular Lagrangian flow Φ of a velocity field u satisfying (1.4) and an approximation Φ_E of such flow, whereas previously known stability estimates considered the difference of two regular Lagrangian flows (see [9]). In Section 3 we use such a stability estimate to approximate, in Wasserstein distance, the solution ρ of the continuity equation (1.3) via the push-forward through Φ_E of suitably chosen Dirac deltas. The estimates are proved both in 1-Wasserstein distance and logarithmic Wasserstein distance. In the latter case in particular we show that in expected value the rate of convergence is of order $1/2$ if $1 < p \leq d$, as the rate obtained in [27], and it is better than that if $p > d$ (see Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3 for the details). We believe that the logarithmic rates we obtain are optimal for the range $1 < p \leq d$ (as suggested also in [27]), but the case $p > d$ does not give any precise rate. In Section 4 we consider, for reasons explained in Remark 11, only velocity fields $u \in [L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d))]^d$ such that $p > d$ and we assume to approximate the initial datum strongly in L^1 . Under these stronger assumptions, using a slightly different approximation $\bar{\Phi}_E$ of the regular Lagrangian flow, we are able to prove estimates similar to the ones of Section 3, but which hold deterministically. In this case, moreover, we prove a convergence of order 1 of the method with respect to the logarithmic Wasserstein distance. We refer the reader to Theorem 4.1 for the details. In Section 5 we sum up the results obtained and highlight some open questions and future research perspectives. As a final note, we remark that in [8] we are also considering an approximation via a θ -method of the regular Lagrangian flow, with which we can

approximate the solution of (1.3) with a divergence free vector field which, even outside the range of DiPerna-Lions theory, is able to select the unique Lagrangian solution of (1.3), i.e. the unique solution which is representable as a push-forward of the initial datum via the regular Lagrangian flow of the velocity field.

2. Stability estimates

Let us immediately state the main result of the paper, i.e. a stability estimate between the regular Lagrangian flow Φ and an approximation Φ_E of such flow, which will be introduced shortly after the statement.

Theorem 2.1. (*L^p stability estimate between Φ and Φ_E*)

Let u satisfy assumptions (1.4). Then if Φ is the regular Lagrangian flow of u and Φ_E is defined as in Definition 2.1 with $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$ if $1 < p \leq d$, we have

$$\|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1},$$

where $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, if $p > d$ the same estimate holds even if $\operatorname{div}(u) \in L^1(0, T; L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))$.

We point out here that we will make extensive use of the notation $X \lesssim Y$, which means $X \leq CY$ for some positive constant $C > 0$ that we omit explicitly writing both to keep the notation lighter and because C is uniformly bounded. Crucially relying on Theorem 2.1 we will be able to prove two approximation results for the solution ρ of (1.3) in different Wasserstein distances: Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3. In section 4 we will also introduce another approximation $\bar{\Phi}_E$ of Φ (see Definition 4.1) and we will prove a result analogous to Theorem 2.1, i.e. Proposition 4.1, with which we will get another approximation of the density ρ : see Theorem 4.1.

The vector field Φ_E is explicitly constructed by a sort of forward Euler method, and we now give its precise definition.

Definition 2.1. (*Euler approximation of a regular Lagrangian flow*)

Let u satisfy conditions (1.4) with $1 < p \leq d$, and let

$$u_\delta(t, \cdot) := \eta_\delta * u(t, \cdot) \tag{2.1}$$

for some $\delta > 0$, where η is a standard mollifier in \mathbb{R}^d , $\eta_\delta(x) := \delta^{-d} \eta(x/\delta)$ and the convolution is in space only. We denote as Φ_E (where “E” stands for “Euler”) the so called Euler approximation of the regular Lagrangian flow Φ of u , with time step Δt and regularisation parameter δ . For $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1})$ we define:

$$\Phi_E(t, x) := \Phi_E(t_n, x) + (t - t_n) \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} u_\delta(s, \Phi_E(t_n, x)) ds, \tag{2.2}$$

where $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_M = T$ is a partition of $[0, T]$ with $t_{i+1} - t_i = \Delta t$ and $\Phi_E(0, x) = x \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d$. If $p > d$, we define Φ_E directly with the u as

$$\Phi_E(t, x) := \Phi_E(t_n, x) + (t - t_n) \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} u(s, \Phi_E(t_n, x)) ds. \tag{2.3}$$

We remark that in order to keep the notation as light as possible, we omit explicitly writing the dependence of Φ_E on Δt and (eventually) δ .

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we need some preliminary estimates. We now give a Lemma which estimates the intrinsic error in considering u_δ instead of u if $1 < p \leq d$. Notice that this is a L^p extension of an equivalent L^1 estimate obtained in [9, Theorem 2.9] which may be of independent interest. To highlight this link, we have decided to keep the notation of [9], denoting as b and \tilde{b} the vector fields and as X and \tilde{X} their regular Lagrangian flows.

Proposition 2.1. (L^p stability estimate for regular Lagrangian flows)

Let b and \tilde{b} be bounded vector fields belonging to $L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for some $p > 1$. Let X and \tilde{X} be regular Lagrangian flows of b and \tilde{b} respectively and denote by L and \tilde{L} their compressibility constants. Then, for every time $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\|X(t, \cdot) - \tilde{X}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(B_r(0))} \leq C_t \left| \log(\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(B_R(0)))}) \right|^{-1},$$

where $R = r + T\|\tilde{b}\|_\infty$ and the constant C_t only depends on $t, r, \|b\|_\infty, \|\tilde{b}\|_\infty, L, \tilde{L}$ and $\|D_x b\|_{L^1(L^p)}$. Moreover, $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Let $\delta := \sqrt{\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(B_R(0)))}}$ with $R = r + T\|\tilde{b}\|_\infty$ and let

$$g(t) := \left[\int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)|}{\delta} \right)^p dx \right]^{1/p}.$$

For simplicity of notation, we will omit explicitly writing the dependence on t and x when this will not be necessary. So we will often write X and \tilde{X} in place of $X(t, x)$ and $\tilde{X}(t, x)$. Differentiating in time:

$$\frac{d}{dt}g(t) = \frac{1}{p}g(t)^{1-p} \int_{B_r(0)} p \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta + |X - \tilde{X}|} \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{X - \tilde{X}}{|X - \tilde{X}|} \left(\frac{d}{dt}X - \frac{d}{dt}\tilde{X} \right) dx \quad (2.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{g(t)^{1-p}}{\delta} \int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} \frac{1}{1 + |X - \tilde{X}|/\delta} |b(t, X) - \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{X})| dx \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{g(t)^{1-p}}{\delta} \int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} \frac{1}{1 + |X - \tilde{X}|/\delta} |b(t, X) - b(t, \tilde{X})| dx}_{\textcircled{1}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{g(t)^{1-p}}{\delta} \int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} \frac{1}{1 + |X - \tilde{X}|/\delta} |b(t, \tilde{X}) - \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{X})| dx}_{\textcircled{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Considering $\textcircled{1}$ we have, thanks to Lemma 6.1:

$$|b(t, X(t, x)) - b(t, \tilde{X}(t, x))| \leq c_n |X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)| [M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, X(t, x)) + M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, \tilde{X}(t, x))], \quad (2.5)$$

for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ and (at fixed t) for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\tilde{R} = T(\|b\|_\infty + \|\tilde{b}\|_\infty)$.

Remark 2. Notice that the compressibility constraint in the definition of regular Lagrangian flow is crucial for (2.5) to hold almost everywhere. Indeed, for almost every t we have that $b_t(x) := b(t, x) \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then (2.5) holds only if $X(t, x), \tilde{X}(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus N_t$, with N_t a null set. Then inequality (2.5) holds for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ since

$$\mathcal{L}^d(X(t, \cdot)^{-1}(N_t)) \leq L\mathcal{L}^d(N_t) = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{L}^d(\tilde{X}(t, \cdot)^{-1}(N_t)) \leq \tilde{L}\mathcal{L}^d(N_t) = 0.$$

Using (2.5):

$$\begin{aligned} \textcircled{1} &\leq c_n g(t)^{1-p} \int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|/\delta}{1 + |X - \tilde{X}|/\delta} [M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, X(t, x)) \\ &\quad + M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, \tilde{X}(t, x))] dx \\ &\leq c_n g(t)^{1-p} \int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} [M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, X(t, x)) + M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, \tilde{X}(t, x))] dx \\ &= c_n g(t)^{1-p} \underbrace{\int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, X(t, x)) dx}_{\textcircled{3}} \\ &\quad + c_n g(t)^{1-p} \underbrace{\int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} M_{\tilde{R}}(|Db|)(t, \tilde{X}(t, x)) dx}_{\textcircled{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\textcircled{3}$, applying Hölder's inequality with exponents p and $p/(p-1)$ yields

$$\textcircled{3} \leq c_n g(t)^{1-p} g(t)^{p-1} \left(\int_{B_r(0)} [M_{\tilde{R}} Db(t, X(t, x))]^p dx \right)^{1/p},$$

and changing variables setting $y = X(t, x)$ gives

$$\textcircled{3} \leq c_n L^{1/p} \left(\int_{B_{r+T\|b\|_\infty}(0)} [M_{\tilde{R}} Db(t, y)]^p dy \right)^{1/p} \leq c_n c_{p,n} L^{1/p} \|Db(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(B_{R'}(0))},$$

with $R' = r + 3T \max\{\|b\|_\infty, \|\tilde{b}\|_\infty\}$, thanks to the continuity of the local maximal function on L^p ([9, Lemma A.2]). With this choice of R' , it is easy to see that with the same argument we get

$$\textcircled{4} \leq c_n c_{p,n} \tilde{L}^{1/p} \|Db(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(B_{R'}(0))}.$$

As for $\textcircled{2}$, we clearly have:

$$\textcircled{2} \leq \frac{g(t)^{1-p}}{\delta} \int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X - \tilde{X}|}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} |b(t, \tilde{X}(t, x)) - \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{X}(t, x))| dx.$$

First using Hölder's inequality and then changing variables as before:

$$\textcircled{2} \leq \frac{\tilde{L}^{1/p}}{\delta} \|b(t, \cdot) - \tilde{b}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(B_{R'}(0))},$$

where we recall that $R = r + T\|\tilde{b}\|_\infty$. Inequality (2.4) now reads:

$$\frac{d}{dt}g(t) \leq c_n c_{p,n} (L^{1/p} + \tilde{L}^{1/p}) \|Db(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(B_{R'}(0))} + \frac{\tilde{L}^{1/p}}{\delta} \|b(t, \cdot) - \tilde{b}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(B_{R'}(0))}.$$

Thanks to the choice of δ , integrating in time from 0 to $t \in [0, T]$ we get:

$$g(t) \leq C_t \text{ for all } t \in [0, T],$$

with C_t being a constant depending on $t, r, L, \tilde{L}, \|D_x b\|_{L^1(L^p(B_{R'}(0)))}, \|b\|_\infty, \|\tilde{b}\|_\infty$ and p , and it can be easily seen that $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. This means that, for every $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\int_{B_r(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)|}{\delta} \right)^p dx \leq C_t^p. \quad (2.6)$$

By Chebychev inequality, for every $\eta > 0$ there exists a set K such that $|B_r \setminus K| \leq \eta$ and

$$\log \left(\frac{|X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)|}{\delta} + 1 \right)^p \leq \frac{C_t^p}{\eta} \text{ on } K.$$

Then, on K :

$$|X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)|^p \leq \delta^p \exp \left(\frac{C_t^p}{\eta^{1/p}} \right).$$

Integrating over B_r :

$$\int_{B_r(0)} |X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)|^p dx \leq \eta (\|X\|_\infty + \|\tilde{X}\|_\infty)^p + \omega_d r^d \delta^p \exp \left(\frac{C_t^p}{\eta^{1/p}} \right), \quad (2.7)$$

with $\omega_d := |B_1(0)|$. Choosing $\eta = 2^p C_t^p |\log \delta|^{-p}$ we get

$$\exp \left(\frac{C_t^p}{\eta^{1/p}} \right) = \exp \left(\frac{p}{2|\log(\delta)|^{-1}} \right) = \exp \left(-\frac{p}{2} \log(\delta) \right) = \exp(\log(\delta^{-p/2})) = \delta^{-p/2},$$

so (2.7) reads as:

$$\int_{B_r(0)} |X(t, x) - \tilde{X}(t, x)|^p dx \leq 2^p C_t^p (\|X\|_\infty + \|\tilde{X}\|_\infty)^p |\log \delta|^{-p} + \omega_d r^d \delta^{p/2}. \quad (2.8)$$

Taking the p -th root, and assuming that $\delta = \sqrt{\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(B_R(0)))}}$ is small enough so that $|\log(\delta)|^{-1} \gg \sqrt{\delta}$, we conclude. \square

Remark 3 (The choice of δ). *In the previous Proposition we assumed $\delta := \sqrt{\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(B_R(0)))}}$ in order to bound $g(t)$ with a constant $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. If instead we had chosen $\delta = \|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(B_R(0)))}$ the proof would have still worked, with $g(t) \leq C$. In particular, it holds:*

$$\left\| \log \left(1 + \frac{|X(t, \cdot) - \tilde{X}(t, \cdot)|}{\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(B_R(0)))}} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C.$$

Thanks to Proposition 2.1 we easily obtain:

Corollary 2.1. (Error of regularisation)

Consider Φ the regular Lagrangian flow of a vector field u satisfying (1.4), and let Φ_δ be the (classical) flow of u_δ defined in (2.1). Then for every $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t |\log(\|u - u_\delta\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))})|^{-1} \leq C_t |\log(\delta)|^{-1},$$

with $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. For the first inequality, use the L^p estimate between regular Lagrangian flows in Proposition 2.1. For the second one notice that denoting with B_1 the ball centered in 0 and of unitary radius, using Lemma 6.1:

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t, x) - u_\delta(t, x)| &= \left| u(t, x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \eta_\delta(z) u(t, x + z) dz \right| \\ &= \left| u(t, x) - \int_{B_1} \eta(y) u(t, x + \delta y) dy \right| \leq \int_{B_1} \eta(y) |u(t, x) - u(t, x + \delta y)| dy \\ &\lesssim \delta \int_{B_1} \eta(y) [M(|Du|)(t, x) + M(|Du|)(t, x + \delta y)] dy \\ &= \delta M(|Du|)(t, x) + \delta [\eta_\delta * M(|Du|)](t, x). \end{aligned}$$

Take the L^p norm on both sides and conclude using the Young convolution inequality and the boundedness of the maximal operator, and finally integrating in time we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_\delta\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))} \lesssim \delta &\implies \log(\|u - u_\delta\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))}) \lesssim \log(\delta) \\ \implies |\log(\|u - u_\delta\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))})| &\gtrsim |\log(\delta)| \\ \implies |\log(\|u - u_\delta\|_{L^1(0,t;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))})|^{-1} &\lesssim |\log(\delta)|^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

We now need to estimate $\|\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ uniformly in t , but since Φ_E is not properly a flow we cannot use the stability estimate in Proposition 2.1. We need the following Propositions as a key tool to treat the case $1 < p \leq d$. As we will see later, this will not be needed if $p > d$.

Proposition 2.2. (Compressibility estimate for Φ_E)

Consider Φ_E defined as in (2.2) with $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$. Then $\exists c > 0$ not dependent on Δt such that $\det(\nabla_x \Phi_E(t, x)) > c$ for every $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$.

Proof. Define $\Phi_n(t, x)$ in $[0, \Delta t] \times \mathbb{T}^d$ as

$$\Phi_n(t, x) := x + t \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} u_\delta(s, x) ds.$$

Notice that Φ_E can be seen as a composition of such Φ_n 's, i.e. if $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$:

$$\Phi_E(t, x) = \Phi_n(t - t_n, \Phi_{n-1}(\Delta t, \Phi_{n-2}(\dots, \Phi_0(\Delta t, x)))) \dots.$$

Differentiating in space:

$$\nabla_x \Phi_E(t, x) = \nabla_x \Phi_n(t - t_n, \dots) \nabla_x \Phi_{n-1}(\Delta t, \dots) \dots \nabla_x \Phi_0(\Delta t, x),$$

and by Binet:

$$\det[\nabla_x \Phi_E(t, x)] = \underbrace{\det[\nabla_x \Phi_n(t - t_n, \dots)] \det[\nabla_x \Phi_{n-1}(\Delta t, \dots)] \dots \det[\nabla_x \Phi_0(\Delta t, x)]}_{\approx 1/\Delta t \text{ times}}.$$

We will uniformly bound $\det[\nabla_x \Phi_0]$ from below, but the argument is the same for every Φ_j (the only difference in the definition is the time interval). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\nabla_x \Phi_0(\Delta t, x)) &= \det\left(I + \Delta t \int_0^{\Delta t} \nabla_x u_\delta(s, x) ds\right) \\ &= \det(I + \Delta t A), \quad \text{where } A := \int_0^{\Delta t} \nabla_x u_\delta(s, x) ds. \end{aligned}$$

It is known (see [16, Chapitre I, section 3, equations (4) and (6)]) that

$$\det(I + \Delta t A) = 1 + \Delta t[\text{tr}(A)] + \sum_{j=2}^d (\Delta t)^j \sigma_j(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d),$$

where σ_j are symmetric polynomials of degree j and λ_i are the eigenvalues of A . By our definition each entry of the matrix A is bounded by $\approx 1/\sqrt{\Delta t}$ since u_δ is $1/\sqrt{\Delta t}$ -Lipschitz, and thus $|\lambda_i| \lesssim 1/\sqrt{\Delta t}$ for every i . Then, $|\sigma_j(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)| \lesssim (\Delta t)^{-j/2}$. Since we also have that $\text{tr}(A)^- = \text{div}(u_\delta)^- \in L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T}^d)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\det(I + \Delta t A) \geq 1 - \Delta t[\text{div}(u)^-] - \sum_{j=2}^d (\Delta t)^j (\Delta t)^{-j/2} \geq 1 - C \Delta t. \quad (2.9)$$

Multiplying $\approx 1/\Delta t$ times such determinants we can estimate $\det(\nabla_x \Phi_E)$ uniformly from below, and the proof is complete. \square

Remark 4. In the following we will always assume $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$. In view of the proof of Proposition 2.2 it is clear that other choices are possible. However, as we will see in Theorem 3.3, the choice of $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$ will be crucial for obtaining a $O(\sqrt{\Delta t})$ rate of convergence if we consider a logarithmic Wasserstein distance, assuming that the space discretization scale Δx is equal to Δt .

Proposition 2.3. (Injectivity and Lipschitzianity of Φ_E)

Let Φ_E be defined as in (2.2) and let $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$. Then $\exists C_{\Delta t, T} > 0$ such that

$$C_{\Delta t, T}^{-1}|x - y| \leq |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, y)| \leq C_{\Delta t, T}|x - y| \text{ for all } t \in [0, T].$$

In particular, $\Phi_E(t, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous and injective.

Proof. Consider two points $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d$, with $|x - y| = \ell$. At the first step in the definition of Φ_E (i.e. up to time $t = \Delta t$) we have, since u_δ is $1/\sqrt{\Delta t}$ -Lipschitz:

$$|\Phi_E(\Delta t, x) - \Phi_E(\Delta t, y)| \leq |x - y| + \int_0^{\Delta t} |u_\delta(s, x) - u_\delta(s, y)| ds \lesssim \ell(1 + \sqrt{\Delta t}),$$

Iterating $T/\Delta t$ times we get a Lipschitz constant $C_{\Delta t, T} = \exp(T/\sqrt{\Delta t})$, and with the same argument we get an estimate from below with $C_{\Delta t, T}^{-1} = \exp(-T/\sqrt{\Delta t})$. \square

We are now ready to prove the following Proposition, whose proof is strongly inspired by the proof of [28, Lemma 6]:

Proposition 2.4. (L^p stability estimate for Φ_δ and Φ_E)

Let Φ_E be defined as in (2.2) with u satisfying assumptions (1.4), and let $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$. Then:

$$\|\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} \text{ for every } t \in [0, T],$$

where $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and Φ_δ is the flow of u_δ . If $u \in L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ with $p > d$, then

$$\|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} \text{ for every } t \in [0, T],$$

where $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and Φ_E is defined as in (2.3). Moreover, if $p > d$ the conclusion holds even if we only require $\operatorname{div}(u)^- \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d))$.

Proof. In the first part of the proof we will work without loss of generality with Φ_δ with the assumption $1 < p \leq d$, since the argument is identical if $p > d$. The difference will appear only at the end of the proof, where we differentiate the two cases. We want to prove that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)|}{\Delta t} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C_t, \quad (2.10)$$

with a constant C_t not dependent on Δt such that $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. Once we prove that, the conclusion follows as in Proposition 2.1. Notice that, by the concavity of the

logarithm and by the fact that $\log(1+x)$ is an increasing monotone function, for every $a, b \geq 0$ it holds

$$\log(1+b) - \log(1+a) \leq \frac{d}{dx} \left[\log(1+x) \right]_{x=a} |b-a| = \frac{|b-a|}{1+a}.$$

In particular, let $t = t_n$ for simplicity. We have (since the estimate is pointwise we omit the dependence on x to keep the notation as light as possible):

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t_n) - \Phi_E(t_n)|}{\Delta t} \right) - \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t_{n-1}) - \Phi_E(t_{n-1})|}{\Delta t} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\Delta t}{|\Phi_\delta(t_{n-1}) - \Phi_E(t_{n-1})| + \Delta t} \frac{||\Phi_\delta(t_n) - \Phi_E(t_n)| - |\Phi_\delta(t_{n-1}) - \Phi_E(t_{n-1})||}{\Delta t} \\ & \leq \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t_n) - \Phi_\delta(t_{n-1}) - (\Phi_E(t_n) - \Phi_E(t_{n-1}))|}{|\Phi_\delta(t_{n-1}) - \Phi_E(t_{n-1})| + \Delta t} = \frac{|\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_E(t_{n-1})) ds|}{|\Phi_\delta(t_{n-1}) - \Phi_E(t_{n-1})| + \Delta t}. \end{aligned}$$

Iterating the estimate above up to $t_0 = 0$ we get by telescopic summing:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t_n) - \Phi_E(t_n)|}{\Delta t} \right) & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{|\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_E(t_j)) ds|}{|\Phi_\delta(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t} \quad (2.11) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{|\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) ds| + |\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_E(t_j)) ds|}{|\Phi_\delta(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t} \\ & \leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))| ds}{|\Phi_\delta(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t}}_{= \textcircled{1}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_E(t_j))| ds}{|\Phi_\delta(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t}}_{= \textcircled{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, notice that by Lemma 6.1:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))| ds \\ & \lesssim \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |\Phi_\delta(s) - \Phi_\delta(t_j)| [M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) + M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))] ds \\ & = \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left| \int_{t_j}^s u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) ds \right| [M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) + M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))] ds \\ & \leq \|u_\delta\|_\infty \Delta t \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} [M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) + M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $\Delta t / (|\Phi_\delta(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t) \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\textcircled{1} &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} [M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) + M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))] ds \\
&= \int_0^T M(|Du|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) ds + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Considering the L^p norm:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \int_0^T M(|Du|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s)) ds + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) ds \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \quad (2.12) \\
&\leq \int_0^T \|M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(s))\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \|M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j))\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} ds \\
&\lesssim \|M(Du_\delta)\|_{L^1(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))} \lesssim \|Du\|_{L^1(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{T}^d))},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequalities we used the L^∞ bound on the compressibility to change variables in each addendum, the boundedness of the maximal operator and Young's convolution inequality. As for $\textcircled{2}$, we need to differentiate the case $1 < p \leq d$ and $p > d$.

- If $1 < p \leq d$, we repeat the argument above. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |u_\delta(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) - u_\delta(s, \Phi_E(t_j))| ds \\
&\lesssim |\Phi_h(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} [M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) + M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_E(t_j))] ds,
\end{aligned}$$

and we can estimate $|\Phi_h(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| / (|\Phi_h(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t) \leq 1$. Then, after summing over j :

$$\textcircled{2} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} [M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_\delta(t_j)) + M(|Du_\delta|)(s, \Phi_E(t_j))] ds.$$

After considering the L^p norm the estimate goes as in (2.12). For the second addendum, notice that by Proposition 2.3 the map Φ_E is Lipschitz and injective (so we are allowed to change variables in the usual way) and by Proposition 2.2 the compressibility is controlled, thus the change of variables does not cause any problem as in (2.12) when we were dealing with Φ_δ , and we can conclude.

- If $p > d$, recall that we work directly with Φ , and not with Φ_δ . In this case we use Lemma 6.2 with $\tilde{p} \in (d, p)$ to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |u(s, \Phi(t_j)) - u(s, \Phi_E(t_j))| ds}{|\Phi(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t} &\lesssim \frac{|\Phi(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} f(s, \Phi(t_j)) ds}{|\Phi(t_j) - \Phi_E(t_j)| + \Delta t} \\
&\leq \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} f(s, \Phi(t_j)) ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$f(s, x) := [M(|Du|^{\tilde{p}})(s, x)]^{1/\tilde{p}} \in L^1(0, T; L^{\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d)). \tag{2.14}$$

To conclude we just need to sum over j , consider the L^p norm and use the compressibility estimate on Φ to change variables. Notice that $\tilde{p} \in (d, p)$ is needed to have $|Du_{\delta}(s, \cdot)| \in L^{p/\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $p/\tilde{p} > 1$ in order to have boundedness of the maximal operator. Notice also that in this case we do not need any compressibility estimate for Φ_E since the argument of f is $\Phi(t_j)$, whose compressibility is controlled by the hypothesis on the divergence even assuming only $\operatorname{div}(u)^- \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d))$, as we assumed in (1.4).

At this point, we can conclude the proof by arguing as in Proposition 2.1 with Δt in place of δ . \square

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.1, whose proof is now trivial:

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Combine Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.4 if $1 < p \leq d$. If $p > d$, we already proved this result in Proposition 2.4. \square

3. Singular probabilistic approximation of ρ

The goal of this section is to use the results from Section 2 to approximate, in a suitable sense that we will specify shortly, the solution ρ of (1.3). Let us state a standard result, whose proof we put in the Appendix for the sake of completeness, which will be crucial in order to exploit Theorem 2.1 for approximating ρ .

Lemma 3.1.

Consider a vector field u and an initial density ρ_0 satisfying (1.4). Let Φ be the regular Lagrangian flow of u . Then

$$\rho(t, \cdot) := \Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#} \rho_0$$

is the solution of (1.3).

As we mentioned in the introduction the idea is to exploit the Lagrangian representation $\rho(t, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#} \rho_0$ of the solution of (1.3) by constructing a vector field Φ_E and a measure μ which approximate Φ and ρ_0 respectively, so that $\rho_E(t) := \Phi_E(t, \cdot)_{\#} \mu$ approximates ρ in some sense. Before stating the main result of this section, let us give the definition of Wasserstein distance. For the sake of simplicity we state this definition and some other results in the metric space (\mathbb{R}^d, d) rather than (\mathbb{T}^d, d) , but analogous results hold also in the latter case.

Definition 3.1. (Wasserstein distance)

Consider μ, ν two positive measures in (\mathbb{R}^d, d) , with d a distance, such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}^d) = \nu(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We define the Wasserstein distance between μ and ν as

$$W(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d(x, y) d\pi(x, y) \quad (3.1)$$

where Γ is the set of measures on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ whose marginals are μ and ν . If in particular $d(x, y) = |x - y|$, we denote with W_1 the so called 1-Wasserstein distance:

$$W_1(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - y| d\pi(x, y). \quad (3.2)$$

We also define a logarithmic Wasserstein distance with respect to the distance

$$d_\alpha(x, y) := \log \left(1 + \frac{|x - y|}{h^\alpha} \right) \quad \text{for some } \alpha \in [0, 1] \text{ and } h > 0, \quad (3.3)$$

which we will denote as \tilde{W}_α . We will never explicitly write the dependence of d_α and \tilde{W}_α on h in order to have a lighter notation.

We will not use the above definition, but its dual formulation given by the Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality theorem:

Theorem 3.1. (Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality theorem, [33])

Let μ, ν be positive measures with compact support on the metric space (\mathbb{R}^d, d) and with the same mass. Then, it holds that

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d(x, y) d\pi(x, y) = \sup_{\text{Lip}(f) \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d(\mu - \nu)(x),$$

where f is 1-Lipschitz with respect to the distance d .

We can now state the two main results of this section, which we decided to present in two separate Theorems: one for the 1-Wasserstein distance and the other for the logarithmic one. The reason is that a single statement would have been too long, and while the proofs of both theorems are very similar we believe both of them deserve to be presented in detail. Indeed while on the one hand the 1-Wasserstein distance is far more commonly used than the logarithmic one, on the other hand the latter is more suited to precisely capture the rate of convergence of the method, as we will see. We recall that the first time such a logarithmic distance was used (at least in the context of the continuity equation in the DiPerna-Lions setting) is in [29] and that in [27, 28] the authors use such a logarithmic Wasserstein distance to evaluate the rate of convergence of their approximation method, so we decided to use the same distance to have a clearer comparison. We also remark that, for the sake of simplicity, in this section we will restrict ourselves to the case $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and non negative. The non negativity assumption is clearly not a problem: we can always split the initial datum as in its positive and negative parts. We will explain how to deal with the unbounded case in Remark 9. As a final note, we point out that we are forced to distinguish between bounded and unbounded initial densities due to our choice of a uniform probability \bar{P} , which will play a crucial role in Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3. With a different choice of \bar{P} this issue can be fixed and one does not need to distinguish the two cases. We refer to Remark 10 for a more detailed discussion on the matter. Let us now state the two main results of this section:

Theorem 3.2. (Singular probabilistic approximation of ρ in 1-Wasserstein distance)

Assume that u satisfies (1.4) and $\rho_0 \geq 0$ and bounded, and let ρ be the solution of (1.3). Assume also that the domain \mathbb{T}^d is partitioned into sets $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ such that $\text{diam}(Q_i) \leq \Delta x \ \forall i = 1, \dots, N$ for some space discretization scale $\Delta x > 0$. Choose, for every set Q_i , a random starting point $x_0^i \in Q_i$ according to a uniform probability distribution on Q_i , and define $M_i := \int_{Q_i} \rho_0 dx$. For $t \in [0, T]$ consider the measure given by:

$$\rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0) := \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0^i)} = \Phi_E(t, \cdot)_{\#} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N M_i \delta_{x_0^i} \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where $\bar{x}_0 = (x_0^1, x_0^2, \dots, x_0^N)$ and Φ_E is defined as in (2.2) with a time step $\Delta t > 0$ and with $\delta = \sqrt{\Delta t}$ if $1 < p \leq d$ or as in (2.3) otherwise. Denoting with W_1 the 1-Wasserstein distance defined in (3.2) it holds that, in expected value, for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[W_1(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} + (\Delta x)^{1-\alpha} + t\alpha^{-p} |\log(\Delta x)|^{-p}, \quad (3.5)$$

with $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. We can also estimate the variance of $W_1(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))$ if $N \lesssim (\Delta x)^{-d}$. In this case:

$$\text{Var}[W_1(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim C_t^2 |\log(\Delta t)|^{-2} + (\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} + tC_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} + t^2 \alpha^{-p} |\log(\Delta x)|^{-p}. \quad (3.6)$$

Theorem 3.3. (Singular probabilistic approximation of ρ in logarithmic Wasserstein distance)

Consider the same setting of Theorem 3.2. It holds that, given the Wasserstein distance \tilde{W}_α defined in Definition 3.1 with $h := \max\{\Delta t, \Delta x\}$ and assuming $\alpha = 1/2$, if $1 < p \leq d$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim 1 \quad (3.7)$$

and if $N \lesssim (\Delta x)^{-d}$, we also can estimate the variance as

$$\text{Var}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim |\log(h)|. \quad (3.8)$$

If $p > d$, it holds that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1-\alpha}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim 1 + \frac{|\log(h)|^{1-p}}{\alpha^p} \quad (3.9)$$

and if $N \lesssim (\Delta x)^{-d}$:

$$\text{Var}[\tilde{W}_{1-\alpha}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim |\log(h)| + \frac{|\log(h)|^{2-p}}{\alpha^p}. \quad (3.10)$$

If moreover $p \geq 2$, we have that:

$$\text{Var}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim 1 \quad (3.11)$$

if $1 < p \leq d$, and

$$\text{Var}[\tilde{W}_{1-\alpha}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \lesssim 1 + \frac{|\log(h)|^{2-p}}{\alpha^p} \quad (3.12)$$

if $p > d$.

Before proving Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3, we will need the following:

Lemma 3.2.

Let μ, ν be two positive measures with compact support on \mathbb{R}^d and such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}^d) = \nu(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let μ_i, ν_i with $i = 1, \dots, N$ be positive measures such that

$$\mu = \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i, \quad \nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \nu_i \quad \text{and} \quad M_i = \mu_i(\mathbb{R}^d) = \nu_i(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ for every } i.$$

Define also the probability measures

$$\bar{\mu}_i := \mu_i / M_i \text{ and } \bar{\nu}_i := \nu_i / M_i.$$

Then

$$W(\mu, \nu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N W(\mu_i, \nu_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N M_i W(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i). \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. First of all let us prove that for every i it holds

$$W(\mu_i, \nu_i) = M_i W_1(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i).$$

By definition:

$$W(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i) = \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} d(x, y) d\pi(x, y)$$

and given a sequence of measures π_n realising the infimum in (3.2) with marginals $\bar{\mu}_i$ and $\bar{\nu}_i$, $M_i \pi_n$ will realise the infimum in (3.2) with marginals μ_i, ν_i , so

$$W_1(\mu_i, \nu_i) = M_i W_1(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i).$$

For every i and every $\varepsilon > 0$ we consider π_i a transport plan between $\bar{\mu}_i$ and $\bar{\nu}_i$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} d(x, y) d\pi_i(x, y) \leq W(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i) + \varepsilon / N.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\pi^\varepsilon := \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \pi_i \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)$, since for every A, B Borel:

$$\pi^\varepsilon(A \times \mathbb{R}^d) = \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \pi_i(A \times \mathbb{R}^d) = \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \bar{\mu}_i(A) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i(A) = \mu(A),$$

and similarly we see that $\pi^\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^d \times B) = \nu(B)$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
W(\mu, \nu) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} d(x, y) d\pi^\varepsilon(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} d(x, y) d\pi_i(x, y) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^N M_i W(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i) + \varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^N W(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude since ε is arbitrarily small. \square

Remark 5. *The above lemma has an heuristic obvious “proof”. What we are doing is simply to impose that the mass of μ_i is sent to ν_i for every i , and we minimize this cost for every $i = 1, \dots, N$. Of course by doing this we are putting more constraints on $\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)$, so the inequality is just a consequence of the fact that we are considering the infimum in (3.1) on a smaller set than $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$.*

We are now ready to prove the theorems.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. First of all, we notice that in order to prove (3.5) we can work without loss of generality with Φ_δ instead of Φ if $1 < p \leq d$. By Proposition 2.1, using Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_\# \rho_0, \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_\# \rho_0) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) |\Phi(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \quad (3.14) \\
&\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^q} \|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p} \lesssim C_t |\log(\delta)|^{-1} \approx C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

At time t fixed, consider $\bar{x}_0 = (x_0^1, \dots, x_0^N)$ as a random variable in $((\mathbb{T}^d)^N, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}^d)^N, \bar{P})$, with $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the Borel sigma algebra on \mathbb{T}^d ,

$$\bar{P} = P_1 \otimes P_2 \cdots \otimes P_N, \text{ with } P_i \text{ being a uniform distribution over } Q_i. \quad (3.15)$$

We also define $\rho_0^i := \rho_0 \llcorner Q_i$ and $\bar{\rho}_0^i := (\rho_0 \llcorner Q_i) / M_i$ if $M_i > 0$, otherwise $M_i = \bar{\rho}_0^i = 0$, where $\mu \llcorner A$ denotes the restriction of a measure μ to the set A . In the following, each time we consider an expected value $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ or a variance $\text{Var}[\cdot]$ it will be with respect to the probability \bar{P} . We consider

$$\mu_i := \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_\# (\rho_0 \llcorner Q_i) \text{ and } \nu_i := M_i \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0^i)} = \Phi_E(t, \cdot)_\# (M_i \delta_{x_0^i}),$$

which have the same mass, so we can apply Lemma 3.2. For the moment we will work in a fixed set $Q = Q_i$ of the partition such that $M_i \neq 0$, so in order to keep the notation lighter we will drop the subscript and in the following we will implicitly assume that the measures are restricted to Q and normalized, also we will write x_0 instead of x_0^i . Since $\rho(t, \cdot) = \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_\# \bar{\rho}_0$, we need to estimate $\mathbb{E}[W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_\# \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})]$. By triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_\# \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_\# \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)})] \quad (3.16) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[W_1(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})].
\end{aligned}$$

For the first addendum in (3.16), recalling that $\int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) dx = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \# \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}) \\ &= \sup_{\text{Lip}(h) \leq 1} \left(\int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) h(\Phi_\delta(t, x)) dx - \int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) h(\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)) dx \right) \\ &\leq \int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) |\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)| dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Using Lemma 6.3 we can consider a set $K \subset \mathbb{T}^d$ with $|K^c| = \alpha^{-p} c_d^p A_p(R, \Phi_\delta)^p |\log(\Delta x)|^{-p}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\text{Lip}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \llcorner K) \leq (\Delta x)^{-\alpha}$ for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. Notice that $A_p(R, \Phi_\delta)$ does not depend on the mollification scale δ , since $\|D_x u_\delta\|_{L^1(L^p)} \leq \|D_x u\|_{L^1(L^p)}$ for every $\delta > 0$ by Young's inequality. Then using that $|x - x_0| \leq \text{diam}(Q) \leq \Delta x$ and (3.17):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \# \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)})] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \left[\int_{Q \cap K} \left(\int_{Q \cap K} \bar{\rho}_0(x) |\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)| dx \right) dx_0 \right. \\ &\quad + \int_{Q \cap K} \left(\int_{Q \cap K^c} \bar{\rho}_0(x) |\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)| dx \right) dx_0 \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{Q \cap K^c} \left(\int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) |\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)| dx \right) dx_0 \right] \\ &\lesssim (\Delta x)^{1-\alpha} \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K)} + (\Delta x + 2t \|u\|_\infty) \left(\|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K^c)} + \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q \cap K^c)}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where we used that

$$|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)| \leq \Delta x + 2t \|u\|_\infty \text{ and that } \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q)} = 1 \text{ by construction.}$$

As for the other addendum in (3.16), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)}) &= \sup_{\text{Lip}(h)=1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) d\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)} - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h(x) d\delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)} \right) \\ &\leq |\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

So, considering the expected value:

$$\mathbb{E}[W_1(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})] \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q |\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)| dx_0. \quad (3.20)$$

Then using Lemma 3.2:

$$\mathbb{E}[W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \# \rho_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N M_i W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \# \bar{\rho}_0^i, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x)}) \right] \quad (3.21)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \mathbb{E} \left[W_1 \left(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0^i, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x)} \right) \right] \\
&\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \left((\Delta x)^{1-\alpha} \|\bar{\rho}_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K)} + (\Delta x + 2t\|u\|_\infty) \|\bar{\rho}_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K^c)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\Delta x + 2t\|u\|_\infty) \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q \cap K^c)}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i)} \int_{Q_i} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \left((\Delta x)^{1-\alpha} \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K)} + (\Delta x + 2t\|u\|_\infty) \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K^c)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\rho_0\|_\infty (\Delta x + 2t\|u\|_\infty) \mathcal{L}^d(Q_i \cap K^c) + \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{Q_i} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right) \\
&\lesssim (\Delta x)^{1-\alpha} \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + t \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(K^c)} + t \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c) + \|\rho_0\|_\infty \|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \\
&\lesssim (\Delta x)^{1-\alpha} + \|\rho_0\|_\infty \left(t \frac{|\log(\Delta x)|^{-p}}{\alpha^p} + C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(K^c)} \leq \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c)$ with $\mathcal{L}^d(K^c) \approx \alpha^{-p} |\log(\Delta x)|^{-p}$. We also have

$$\|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} \quad (3.22)$$

by Hölder inequality and Proposition 2.4, and thus we have proved (3.5). We now estimate the variance. By definition

$$\text{Var}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] - \mathbb{E}[X]^2.$$

We will simply estimate $\text{Var}(X)$ from above with $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$. First of all we verify that, in order to prove (3.6), if $1 < p \leq d$ we can work without loss of generality with Φ_δ instead of Φ . Indeed:

$$W_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))^2 \leq 2 W_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0)^2 + 2 W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))^2, \quad (3.23)$$

and by (3.14) we have

$$W_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0)^2 \lesssim C_t^2 |\log(\Delta t)|^{-2}. \quad (3.24)$$

We now restrict to working in a fixed set Q_i . As we did before, we omit writing the index i and we will denote $(\rho_0 \llcorner Q_i)/M_i$ and x_0^i as $\bar{\rho}_0$ and x_0 . It holds:

$$W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})^2 \leq 2 W_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)})^2 + 2 W_1(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})^2. \quad (3.25)$$

For the first addendum in the right hand side of (3.25), using (3.17), the same choice of K , the decomposition in (3.18) and the elementary inequality $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 4a^2 + 4b^2 + 4c^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{W}_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)})^2] &\lesssim (\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K)}^2 + (\Delta x + 2\|u\|_\infty t)^2 \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K^c)}^2 \\ &\quad + (\Delta x + 2\|u\|_\infty t)^2 \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q \cap K^c)^2}{\mathcal{L}(Q)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

For the second addendum in (3.25), using (3.19) in expected value:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{W}_1(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})^2] &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q |\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|^2 dx_0 \\ &\leq \frac{\|\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)\|_\infty}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q |\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)| dx_0 \\ &\leq \frac{2\|u\|_\infty t}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q |\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)| dx_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

The conclusion follows as in (3.13), using (3.26), (3.27) and that by Cauchy-Schwartz:

$$\mathbb{W}_1(\mu, \nu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \mathbb{W}_1(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i) \implies \mathbb{W}_1(\mu, \nu)^2 \leq N \sum_{i=1}^N M_i^2 \mathbb{W}_1(\bar{\mu}_i, \bar{\nu}_i)^2.$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{W}_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))^2] &\leq N \sum_{i=1}^N M_i^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{W}_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0^i, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x)})^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim N \sum_{i=1}^N M_i^2 \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\bar{\rho}_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K)}^2 + (\Delta x + t)^2 \|\bar{\rho}_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K^c)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\Delta x + t)^2 \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i \cap K^c)^2}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i)^2} + \frac{t}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i)} \int_{Q_i} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right) \\ &\leq N \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i)} + (2(\Delta x)^2 + 2t^2) \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K^c)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2(\Delta x)^2 + 2t^2) \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}(K^c \cap Q_i) + t \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{Q_i} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right). \\ &\leq N \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i)} + (4(\Delta x)^2 + 4t^2) \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}(K^c \cap Q_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + t \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{Q_i} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

By the assumption on $\text{diam}(Q_i)$ we have $M_i \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_\infty (\Delta x)^d$ for every i , and also by assumption $N \lesssim (\Delta x)^{-d}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{W}_1(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))^2] \\
& \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^N \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i)} + t^2 \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c \cap Q_i) + t \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \int_{Q_i} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right) \\
& = \|\rho_0\|_\infty \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + t^2 \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c) + t \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right) \\
& \leq \|\rho_0\|_\infty \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + t^2 \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c) + t \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Phi_E(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)| dx \right) \\
& \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_\infty \left((\Delta x)^{2-2\alpha} \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + t^2 \|\rho_0\|_\infty \alpha^{-p} |\log(\Delta x)|^{-p} + t C_t \|\rho_0\|_\infty |\log(\Delta t)|^{-1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and together with (3.23) and (3.24) we can conclude and get (3.6). \square

Remark 6. A simple sufficient condition to impose in order to have that $N \gtrsim (\Delta x)^{-d}$ is a lower bound on the volume of the cells, i.e. $|Q_i| \geq c(\Delta x)^d$ for some $c > 0$ for every i .

Remark 7 (The role of α). We will try to give an heuristic explanation of the role of α . It essentially takes into account the fact that one cannot estimate $\rho(t, \cdot)$ better than a certain threshold even for small times, since we have a discretization of the initial datum at scale Δx . We can check that if $t = 0$, we can consider $\alpha = 1$ and estimate $\mathbb{W}_1\left(\rho_0, \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_0^i}\right)$ deterministically. Indeed, let $\bar{\rho}_0^i$ be the probability distribution in Q_i defined in the statement of Theorem 3.2. By Kantorovich-Rubinstein:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{W}_1(\bar{\rho}_0^i, \delta_{x_0^i}) &= \sup_{\text{Lip}(f) \leq 1} \left(\int_{Q_i} f(x) \bar{\rho}_0^i(x) dx - \int_{Q_i} f(x_0) \bar{\rho}_0^i(x) dx \right) \\
&= \int_{Q_i} \bar{\rho}_0^i(x) |f(x) - f(x_0)| dx \leq \Delta x \int_{Q_i} \bar{\rho}_0^i(x) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and we can easily conclude applying Lemma 3.2.

Remark 8 (The role of the expected value). If we did not consider any expected value in Theorem 3.2, instead of (3.20) we would have had to estimate pointwise differences between Φ_δ and Φ_E , which we are unable to control. Indeed, while it is certainly possible to control in a pointwise sense the difference if we allow either Δt or Δx to be much smaller than the other, in the more interesting case where $\Delta t = \Delta x = h$ for some $h > 0$, it is not clear if a pointwise estimate holds as $h \rightarrow 0$.

Before proving Theorem 3.3, let us remark once again why it is more precise than Theorem 3.2. While before we had for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ essentially the same logarithmic rate, in this case defining $h := \max\{\Delta t, \Delta x\}$ the optimal rate h^α for which we will be able to estimate both the expected value and the variance will be $1/2$ for $1 \leq p \leq d$, while for $p > d$ we get better estimates. Namely, if $p > d$ we can estimate the $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_{1-\alpha}$ -distance, but with constants that diverge to $+\infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. We thus do not have a sharp rate for this case. We notice that the convergence rate of $1/2$ is likely sharp if $1 < p \leq d$ (as shown in [27] for the upwind scheme).

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Since the relevant quantity will be h in the following, we can assume without loss of generality that $h = \Delta t = \Delta x$. If $1 < p \leq d$, we first need to estimate $\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0)$ since we want to work with Φ_δ in lieu of Φ with $\delta = \sqrt{h}$. Notice that this will not be necessary if $p > d$. By Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \quad (3.29) \\ &\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left\| \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the estimate of Remark 3, since $\|u - u_\delta\|_{L^1(L^p)} \lesssim \sqrt{h}$, because $\delta = \sqrt{h}$. Arguing as in Theorem 3.2 we restrict to working in a fixed set Q_i and we will omit the index for the moment to lighten the notation, in particular $\bar{\rho}_0$, x_0 and Q will denote $(\rho_0 \llcorner Q_i)/M_i$, x_0^i and Q_i respectively. By triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)}) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}) \right] \quad (3.30) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the first addendum in the right hand side of (3.30) it holds the analogous of (3.17), i.e.

$$\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}) \leq \int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx.$$

By Lemma 6.3 we can choose $K \subset \mathbb{T}^d$ such that $|\mathbb{T}^d \setminus K| = 2^p c_d^p A_p(R, \Phi_\delta)^p |\log(h)|^{-p}$ and $\text{Lip}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \llcorner K) \leq 1/\sqrt{h}$ for every t . Notice that $A_p(R, \Phi_\delta)$ does not depend on the mollification scale δ , since $\|D_x u_\delta\|_{L^1(L^p)} \leq \|D_x u\|_{L^1(L^p)}$ for every $\delta > 0$. Then it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)})] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \left[\int_{Q \cap K} \left(\int_{Q \cap K} \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right) dx_0 \right. \\ &\quad + \int_{Q \cap K^c} \left(\int_{Q \cap K^c} \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right) dx_0 \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{Q \cap K^c} \left(\int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right) dx_0 \right] \\ &\lesssim \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K)} + |\log(h)| \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K^c)} + |\log(h)| \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q \cap K^c)}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first addendum we used the Lipschitz estimate on $\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \llcorner K$, while for the second and third addenda we simply estimated the logarithm as $|\log(h)|$ and used that $\|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q)} = 1$. For the second addendum in (3.30), using the analogous of (3.19):

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\delta_{\Phi(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})] \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx_0.$$

So, estimating as in (3.21):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \rho_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N M_i \tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0^i, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x)}) \right] \quad (3.31) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0^i, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x)}) \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N M_i \left(\|\bar{\rho}_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K)} + |\log(h)| \|\bar{\rho}_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K^c)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\log(h)| \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i \cap K)}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i)} \int_{Q_i} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, x)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\|\rho_0^i\|_{L^1(Q_i \cap K)} + |\log(h)| \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(Q_i \cap K^c) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\log(h)| \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(Q_i \cap K^c) + \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{Q_i} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, x)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right) \\ &\lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + |\log(h)| \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c) + \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_E(t, x)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \\ &\lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + \|\rho_0\|_\infty (|\log(h)|^{1-p} + 1) \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.29) and (3.31) we get (3.7). With the same estimates used in Theorem 3.2, we can also recover the estimate for the variance. First of all, let us see that if $1 < p \leq d$ we can work without loss of generality with Φ_δ in lieu of Φ . Indeed we can use (3.23) and (3.29) with $\tilde{W}_{1/2}$ to get $\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0)^2 \leq C$. We are left to estimate $\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \rho_0, \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))$ and by (3.25) we first estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot)_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0, \delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)})^2] \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \left[\int_{Q \cap K} \left(\int_{Q \cap K} \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right)^2 dx_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{Q \cap K^c} \left(\int_{Q \cap K^c} \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right)^2 dx_0 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{Q \cap K^c} \left(\int_Q \bar{\rho}_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x) - \Phi_\delta(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx \right)^2 dx_0 \Big] \\
& \lesssim \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K)} + |\log(h)|^2 \|\bar{\rho}_0\|_{L^1(Q \cap K^c)} + |\log(h)|^2 \frac{\mathcal{L}^d(Q \cap K^c)}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first addendum we used the Lipschitz estimate on $\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) \llcorner K$ and in the last two addenda we simply estimated the logarithm as $|\log(h)|$. The other relevant estimate is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\delta_{\Phi_\delta(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})^2 \right] & \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right)^2 dx_0 \\
& \lesssim \frac{|\log(h)|}{\mathcal{L}^d(Q)} \int_Q \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Summing over j as in (3.28) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] & \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_\infty \left(\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + |\log(h)|^2 \|\rho_0\|_\infty \mathcal{L}^d(K^c) \right) \\
& + |\log(h)| \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx_0 \\
& \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_\infty (\|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + \|\rho_0\|_\infty |\log(h)|^{2-p} + \|\rho_0\|_\infty |\log(h)|) \\
& \lesssim |\log(h)|,
\end{aligned}$$

so we have proved (3.8). The stronger rate for $p > d$ can be proved by noticing that we do not need to first estimate (3.29) and by defining K such that

$$|\mathbb{T}^d \setminus K| \leq \alpha^{-p} c_d^p A_p(\mathbf{R}, \Phi)^p |\log(h)|^{-p} \text{ and } \text{Lip}(\Phi(t, \cdot) \llcorner K) \leq h^{-\alpha} \text{ for every } t.$$

Every estimate works the same way, but keeping track of the dependence on α gives us (3.9) and (3.10). Finally, if we also assume $p \geq 2$ we can keep the square in the integrand on the first line of (3.32), and with the same estimates as above we can conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E(t, \bar{x}_0))] & \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} + \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} |\log(h)|^{2-p} \\
& + \|\rho_0\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right)^2 dx_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $p \geq 2$ we can use estimate the last integral using Hölder inequality and (2.10), and we have proved (3.11). The estimate (3.12) can be proved similarly, keeping track of the dependence of α on $\mathcal{L}^d(K^c)$. \square

Remark 9 (The case $\rho_0 \notin L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$). As already said, for the sake of simplicity we assumed ρ_0 to be bounded. In the general case, one can simply estimate ρ_0 with $\rho_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_0 \leq K\}}$, with $\mathbb{1}_A$ denoting the indicator function of the set A . After this first approximation one should keep track of the dependence of the estimates on K .

Remark 10 (A possible alternative choice for \bar{P}). If the choice of the point x_0^i in the cell Q_i is not made according to a uniform distribution, but according to the probability density function $(\rho_0 \llcorner Q_i)/M_i$, one can verify that both Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3 hold without the need to distinguish between the bounded and the unbounded cases. In particular, we point out that the crucial technical advantage here lies in the fact that if x_0 is picked according to the ad hoc probability just defined, it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} M_i \mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{1/2}(\delta_{\Phi(t, x_0)}, \delta_{\Phi_E(t, x_0)})] &= M_i \int_{Q_i} \bar{\rho}_0(x_0) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx_0 \\ &= \int_{Q_i} \rho_0(x_0) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx_0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

while using a uniform distribution we needed to use that $M_i/\mathcal{L}^d(Q_i) \leq \|\rho_0\|_\infty$, crucially relying on the boundedness of ρ_0 . There are two reasons why we preferred to give the proofs using a uniform probability distribution even though it produces less sharp results. The first one is that a uniform probability distribution is simpler, and the second reason is that, in many practical cases, the initial distribution is bounded and the issue is given by the low regularity of the velocity field. We also notice that while using a bounded density we essentially only used L^1 stability estimates for the flow, if we had used the probability distribution just defined we would have really needed the full L^p stability estimate on the flows. Indeed after summing the terms like (3.33) for every i we would have needed to use an estimate like:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x_0) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, x_0) - \Phi_E(t, x_0)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) dx_0 \leq \\ &\|\rho_0\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left\| \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi_\delta(t, \cdot) - \Phi_E(t, \cdot)|}{\sqrt{h}} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \end{aligned}$$

to conclude.

Thanks to the above results we can now easily prove the following, which in a certain sense is a Monte Carlo-like method. For the sake of simplicity and since the arguments would be identical, we give the result for a specific choice of Δt , Δx , α and only with respect to the 1-Wasserstein distance.

Proposition 3.1.

Let u , ρ_0 and $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.2. Moreover, assume for simplicity $\alpha = 1/2$, $\Delta t = \Delta x = h$ for some $h > 0$ and that $C_i |\log(h)|^{-1} \gg \sqrt{h}$. Then, defining

$$S_n(t) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_E^i(t)$$

the mean of n realizations of ρ_E (we omit to explicitly write in every ρ_E^i the dependence on \bar{x}_0) it holds that for every $k > 1$

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}} \left(|W_1(S_n(t), \rho(t, \cdot)) - \mathbb{E}[S_n(t)]| > k \sqrt{\frac{C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}}{n}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{k^2},$$

where $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[W_1(S_n(t), \rho(t, \cdot))] \leq C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}$.

Proof. Let $X_i := W_1(\rho(t, \cdot), \rho_E^i(t))$ be a random variable with respect to the probability $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ defined in (3.15). By Lemma 3.2:

$$W_1(S_n(t), \rho(t, \cdot)) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_1(\rho_E^i(t), \rho(t, \cdot))$$

so by (3.5)

$$\mathbb{E}[W_1(S_n(t), \rho(t, \cdot))] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_1(\rho_E^i(t), \rho(t, \cdot))] \lesssim C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}, \quad (3.34)$$

and we proved the upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[W_1(S_n(t), \rho(t, \cdot))]$. By construction the random variables X_i 's are independent and identically distributed, so by (3.6)

$$\text{Var}[S_n(t)] = \frac{\text{Var}[X_1]}{n} \leq \frac{C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}}{n}. \quad (3.35)$$

Finally by Chebychev inequality and (3.35):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{P}} \left(|S_n(t) - \mathbb{E}[S_n(t)]| > k \sqrt{\frac{C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}}{n}} \right) &\leq \bar{\mathbb{P}} \left(|S_n(t) - \mathbb{E}[S_n(t)]| > k \sqrt{\text{Var}[S_n(t)]} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

4. Diffuse deterministic approximation of ρ

In the previous section we showed how, in expected value, an approximation of the initial datum by a sum of Dirac deltas, each advected by the vector field Φ_E , led to an approximation (in expected value) of the density $\rho(t, \cdot)$ which solves (1.3). The point was to prove that the analogue of the explicit Euler method applied to one of the simplest (weak) approximation of the initial datum (i.e. a sum of Dirac deltas) works also in this low regularity setting. Such an approximation however is not well suited for many applications where one really wants a diffuse approximation of the density rather than a singular one (for instance when there is a coupling between the continuity equation and another equation). Moreover, we want to also present an approximation scheme

which works deterministically. We thus consider a variation of the previous results to cover also this important case, showing how allowing for a stronger approximation of the initial datum and a suitable approximation of the regular Lagrangian flow Φ we can give a simple estimate both of the 1-Wasserstein distance and of the logarithmic one. As already noted there are two major problems with the method presented in Section 3:

1. The approximation of ρ is a singular measure. Often one would like a diffuse approximation of a diffuse initial datum;
2. The estimates are valid in expected value only, and this essentially is due to the high sensitivity (at least a priori, see Remark 8) of the choice of the points $x_0^i \in Q_i$.

A way to fix the above issues is to approximate the flow Φ by performing an additional averaging in space and to consider a strong (in L^1 norm) approximation of the initial datum. In this way, estimates for both the 1-Wasserstein distance and for the logarithmic Wasserstein distance introduced in the previous section will follow easily, as we will see in Theorem 4.1. Let us now make these ideas rigorous.

Definition 4.1. (Definition of $\bar{\Phi}_E$)

Assume the domain \mathbb{T}^d is partitioned in sets $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Let u satisfy conditions (1.4) with $p > d$. For every Q_i fix a point $x_0^i \in Q_i$. Given $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1})$ and $x \in Q_i$, we define:

$$\bar{\Phi}_E(t, x) := \bar{\Phi}_E(t_n, x) + (t - t_n) \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{Q_i} u(s, \bar{\Phi}_E(t_n, x_0^i) + y - x_0^i) dy ds, \quad (4.1)$$

where $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_M = T$ is a partition of $[0, T]$ with $t_{i+1} - t_i = h$ for some $h > 0$ and $\Phi_E(0, x) = x \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d$. In order to keep the notation as light as possible, we omit explicitly writing the dependence of $\bar{\Phi}_E$ on h .

Before proving the stability estimate between Φ and $\bar{\Phi}_E$, we believe it is convenient to explicitly explain what the idea behind the definition of $\bar{\Phi}_E$ is and what approximation of ρ it can yield. Since the argument does not depend on the particular element of the partition, we drop the subscripts. Consider a point $x \in Q$. In the time interval $[0, h]$, such a point is transported by $\bar{\Phi}_E$ to

$$\bar{\Phi}_E(h, x) = x + \int_0^h \int_Q u(s, y) dy ds = x + v.$$

This translation by v is applied to every point in Q , so in the first time step we are just translating Q by the vector $v = \int_0^h \int_Q u(s, y) dy ds$. Let $\tilde{Q} := Q + v$. In the second time step, we have defined $\bar{\Phi}_E$ so that it is constant on \tilde{Q} and it acts on \tilde{Q} by translating it by $\int_h^{2h} \int_{\tilde{Q}} u(s, y) dy ds$. Indeed, consider $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{Q}$. There exists $x \in Q$ such that $\tilde{x} = \bar{\Phi}_E(h, x) = x + v \in \tilde{Q}$. Then for every $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{Q}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}_E(2h, x) &= \bar{\Phi}_E(h, x) + \int_h^{2h} \int_Q u(s, \bar{\Phi}_E(h, x) + y - x) dy ds \\ &= \tilde{x} + \int_h^{2h} \int_Q u(s, y + v) dy ds = \tilde{x} + \int_h^{2h} \int_{\tilde{Q}} u(s, z) dz ds = \tilde{x} + w \end{aligned}$$

with w not dependent on \tilde{x} . This is, in a sense, the same thing we have done when defining Φ_E . The difference is that while with Φ_E we were only integrating u in time (when $p > d$) and we kept the space variable fixed, here we also average over some translation of Q . To sum up, if we partition the initial datum as:

$$\rho_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_0 \llcorner Q_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_0^i,$$

the proposed approximation of $\rho(t, \cdot)$ via $\bar{\Phi}_E$ will simply be:

$$[\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#} \rho_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#} \rho_0^i = \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_0^i(x - \bar{\Phi}_E(t, x_0^i)).$$

We now prove the stability estimate between Φ and $\bar{\Phi}_E$.

Proposition 4.1.

Consider $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ a partition of \mathbb{T}^d such that $\text{diam}(Q_i) \leq h$ for every i , for some $h > 0$. Let u be a vector field satisfying (1.4) with $p > d$ and let $\bar{\Phi}_E$ be defined as in Definition 4.1. Then it holds that:

$$\|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p} \lesssim C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}$$

with $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. We mimic the proof of Proposition 2.4 with $\bar{\Phi}_E$ in place of Φ_E . We recall that the following is a pointwise inequality, which holds for every $x, x_0 \in Q$ with $Q \in \{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and for this reason we write $\Phi(t), \bar{\Phi}_E(t)$ in place of $\Phi(t, x), \bar{\Phi}_E(t, x)$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t_n) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_n)|}{h} \right) - \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t_{n-1}) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1})|}{h} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{h}{|\Phi(t_{n-1}) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1})| + h} \frac{||\Phi(t_n) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_n)| - |\Phi(t_{n-1}) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1})||}{h} \\ & \leq \frac{|\Phi(t_n) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1}) - (\bar{\Phi}_E(t_n) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1}))|}{|\Phi(t_{n-1}) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1})| + h} \\ & = \frac{\left| \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} u(s, \Phi(s)) - \left(\int_Q u(s, \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1}, x_0) + y - x_0) dy \right) ds \right|}{|\Phi(t_{n-1}) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_{n-1})| + h}. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of readability, we denote:

$$h_j(y) := \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j, x_0) + y - x_0.$$

By telescopic summing, just like in Proposition 2.4, we end up having:

$$\log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t_n) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_n)|}{h} \right) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\left| \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} u(s, \Phi(s)) - \left(\int_Q u(s, h_j(y)) dy \right) ds \right|}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h} \quad (4.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\left| \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} u(s, \Phi(s)) - u(s, \Phi(t_j)) ds + \left| \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} u(s, \Phi(t_j)) - \left(f_Q u(s, h_j(y)) dy \right) ds \right| \right|}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} |u(s, \Phi(s)) - u(s, \Phi(t_j))| ds}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h}}_{= \textcircled{1}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left| u(s, \Phi(t_j)) - \left(f_Q u(s, h_j(y)) dy \right) \right| ds}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h}}_{= \textcircled{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

As we will see, we will get estimates which are independent of the specific Q . The term $\textcircled{1}$ can be estimated exactly as in Proposition 2.4. As for $\textcircled{2}$, we use that $\text{diam}(Q) \leq h$, so arguing as in (2.13):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\left| u(s, \Phi(t_j)) - f_Q u(s, h_j(y)) dy \right|}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h} \leq \frac{f_Q \left| u(s, \Phi(t_j)) - u(s, h_j(y)) dy \right|}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h} \quad (4.3) \\
&\lesssim \frac{f_Q |\Phi(t_j) - h_j(y)| dy}{|\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h} f(s, \Phi(t_j)) \leq f(s, \Phi(t_j)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the anisotropic estimate of Lemma 6.2, f defined as in (2.14) and for the last inequality the fact that for every $y \in Q$:

$$|\Phi(t_j) - h_j(y)| \leq |\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + |y - x_0| \leq |\Phi(t_j) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t_j)| + h. \quad (4.4)$$

We conclude that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \log \left(1 + \frac{|\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot) - \Phi(t, \cdot)|}{h} \right) \right\|_{L^p} \leq C_t,$$

with $C_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ arguing as in Proposition 2.4, and given this bound on the L^p norm we can conclude as in Proposition 2.1. \square

Remark 11 (The restriction $p > d$). *The anisotropic estimate of Lemma 6.2 is crucial for our proof of Proposition 4.1, and that is the reason why we only considered the case $p > d$. If $1 < p \leq d$ we do not have such an estimate, and we cannot estimate $\textcircled{2}$ using Lemma 6.1. Indeed, contrary to what we could do with Φ_E , we cannot change variables when using $\bar{\Phi}_E$, since it is clearly not injective. A more refined argument may solve the issue for $1 < p \leq d$, but this will need further investigations.*

We can now prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. (Diffuse deterministic approximation of ρ)

Consider a partition $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of \mathbb{T}^d , an initial density ρ_0 and a vector field u such that $\text{diam}(Q_i) \leq h$ for every i and u satisfies (1.4) with $p > d$. Then, given $\bar{\Phi}_E$ as in Definition 4.1 and a function $\bar{\rho}_0$ such that $\|\bar{\rho}_0 - \rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, it holds that

$$W_1(\rho(t, \cdot), [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#} \bar{\rho}_0) \lesssim \max\{C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}, \varepsilon\}.$$

Consider \tilde{W}_1 the Wasserstein distance defined in Definition 3.1 with $\alpha = 1$. It holds that

$$\tilde{W}_1(\rho(t, \cdot), (\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot))_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0) \lesssim \max\{C_t, |\log(h)|\varepsilon\}.$$

Proof. By triangle inequality we have

$$W_1(\rho(t, \cdot), [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0) \leq W_1(\overbrace{(\Phi(t, \cdot))_{\#}\rho_0}^{=\rho(t, \cdot)}, [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\rho_0) + W_1([\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\rho_0, [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0). \quad (4.5)$$

We can estimate the second term with $\|\bar{\rho}_0 - \rho_0\|_{L^1} \leq \varepsilon$ and the first one with

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0 |\Phi - \bar{\Phi}_E| dx \leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)} \|\Phi - \bar{\Phi}_E\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t |\log(h)|^{-1}$$

by Proposition 4.1. As for the estimate for \tilde{W}_1 , it follows in the exact same way. We just notice that 1-Lipschitz functions on \mathbb{T}^d with respect to the distance d_1 , defined in (3.3) with $\alpha = 1$, are uniformly bounded by $\approx |\log(h)|$ so we estimate the second addendum in (4.5) (with \tilde{W}_1 in place of W_1) with $|\log(h)|\varepsilon$, implicitly using Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality. In the same way we can estimate the first addendum with:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}_1(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\rho_0) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t, x) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t, x)|}{h} \right) dx \\ &\leq \|\rho_0\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left\| \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)|}{h} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim C_t \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 4.1, and the proof is complete. \square

We remark that the method presented above is very easily implemented numerically and parallelizable. Moreover, it provides a better rate of convergence for the logarithmic Wasserstein distance than the one proved in [27], having h in the denominator in the logarithm rather than \sqrt{h} . We finally remark that such an improvement in the case $p > d$ is in accordance with what we proved in Theorem 3.3.

Remark 12 (A CFL condition). *In Section 3 we worked essentially in a mesh-less setting, and the partition $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ had the only role of providing an approximation of the initial datum by selecting a Dirac mass with suitable weight inside each Q_i . We had either a situation where both the time step Δt and the space discretization scale Δx contributed to the total error separately (Theorem 3.2) or a situation where we gave estimates with respect to the maximum of the two (Theorem 3.3). In particular, we never had to assume any particular relation between Δt and Δx . In Theorem 4.1 instead we need a CFL condition in order to have a stability estimate for $\bar{\Phi}_E$. Indeed, compare the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and of Proposition 4.1. In Theorem 2.1 the Δt in the denominator was used to estimate (1) in (2.11). In Proposition 4.1 the same quantity in the denominator is needed in the estimate of (2) in (4.3) via the use of (4.4). In this situation, it is clear from (4.4) that considering a spatial discretization of order Δx we can assume $h = \Delta x$. But at the same time we estimate (1) in (4.2) the same way we did in (2.1), and for this reason we need $\Delta t/\Delta x \lesssim 1$.*

Remark 13 (Weak vs. strong approximations of ρ_0). *In Section 3 we worked with a sum of Dirac deltas which approximated, in a weak sense, the initial datum ρ_0 . Choosing such a measure was very natural, since we wanted a “true” approximation method, in the sense that it is truly implementable in a computer. Indeed in Section 3 we used Φ_E which is not locally constant in the space variable, so the only possibility was to use measures concentrated on points. In section 4, working with $\bar{\Phi}_E$ which is locally constant in space, we are more free to choose the initial datum, and actually we can compute the push-forward of every initial datum $\bar{\rho}_0$ as we explained after Definition 4.1. In Theorem 4.1 we imposed that $\bar{\rho}_0$ approximated ρ_0 in a strong L^1 sense, so it is natural to wonder if the same result holds only assuming $\bar{\rho}_0$ to be a measure approximating ρ_0 in a weak sense (for instance, one could consider $\bar{\rho}_0$ to be a sum of Dirac deltas just like in Section 3). Given W the Wasserstein distance with respect to some distance d , in order to estimate $W(\rho(t, \cdot), [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0) = W(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0)$ we crucially rely on the triangle inequality. Namely, we need to estimate either $W(\Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\rho_0, \Phi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0)$ or $W([\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\rho_0, [\bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)]_{\#}\bar{\rho}_0)$. The problem is that, to the best of our knowledge, in general such distances can only be estimated with the L^1 norm of the difference between ρ_0 and $\bar{\rho}_0$. If f is a Lipschitz function it actually holds that $W(f_{\#}\mu, f_{\#}\nu) \leq \text{Lip}(f) W(\mu, \nu)$, however neither Φ nor $\bar{\Phi}_E$ are Lipschitz. And even if we previously approximated u with some Lipschitz function \tilde{u} , the Lipschitz constant of the flow of \tilde{u} would depend exponentially on both $\text{Lip}(\tilde{u})$ and on the time t , which is clearly not ideal.*

5. Final discussion, questions and future perspectives

We conclude by briefly summing up the results obtained, pointing out some questions and future possible research directions. In our paper, we proved a novel stability estimate between the regular Lagrangian flow of a vector field u with Sobolev regularity in space and an approximation of such flow via a (sort of) explicit Euler method. We gave two approximations of the flow, i.e. Φ_E and $\bar{\Phi}_E$, for which the same stability estimate holds. We used that the solution ρ of the continuity equation (1.3) is representable as a push-forward of the initial datum ρ_0 via the regular Lagrangian flow Φ of u to approximate it using our approximations Φ_E and $\bar{\Phi}_E$ of Φ and different approximations of the initial datum ρ_0 . In section 3 we used Φ_E to approximate Φ and a sum of Dirac deltas to approximate ρ_0 . In this setting, we proved that the Dirac deltas, advected by Φ_E , approximate ρ in suitable Wasserstein distances. However such an approximation holds only in expected value, since a priori it strongly depends on the choice of the Dirac deltas.

Question 1. *Is the estimate truly valid in expected value only, or it can be made deterministic if $h = \Delta t = \Delta x$ is small enough?*

In section 4, we used a different approximation $\bar{\Phi}_E$ of Φ and a strong approximation $\bar{\rho}_0$ of ρ_0 in L^1 norm to prove a deterministic estimate. However, due to technical reasons in our proof of Proposition 4.1, we can prove that the crucial estimate on $\|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ holds only assuming $p > d$.

Question 2. *Does the stability estimate on $\|\Phi(t, \cdot) - \bar{\Phi}_E(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ also hold for $1 < p \leq d$?*

Moreover, as already said in Remark 13, we do not know if a strong approximation of ρ_0 is truly needed in Theorem 4.1:

Question 3. *Does Theorem 4.1 hold even assuming to have as an initial datum a measure $\bar{\rho}_0$ approximating ρ_0 in a weak sense (for example in some Wasserstein distance)?*

Of course, it is totally possible that a better *explicit* approximation of Φ , that has nothing to do with either Φ_E or $\bar{\Phi}_E$ and for which there are no issues like the ones we just described above, exists. For example, in [8] we are considering an approximation of Φ based on the θ -method, which however for $\theta \neq 0$ is *implicit*. To conclude, we highlight possible future research directions. While numerical approximation methods for the continuity equation (see [4, 5, 17, 27, 28, 34]) and recently advection diffusion equation ([24]) have received some attention, more general situations where there is a non linear coupling between the density and the velocity field seem less studied. In this direction we cite [17], whose results can be applied also to some non linear systems. However, a limitation of the available methods is a certain “rigidity” with respect to the mesh which seems somehow unavoidable (see [17, Example 1.1]) when using an *explicit* finite volume scheme (we recall [28], where they do not need a cartesian mesh, but using an *implicit* upwind finite volume method). For this reason the mesh needs to be either cartesian (as in [27]) or at least satisfy some additional conditions (as in [17]), which may be problematic in some situations. Our method does not need any assumption on the mesh other than an upper bound on their diameter and, eventually, a lower bound on their volume. Moreover it is easily parallelizable, but it only provides weak stability estimates in Wasserstein distance.

Future challenges could be the approximation of the solution of coupled systems without relying on any particular structure of the mesh, or developing methods based on the Lagrangian point of view of (1.3) that approximate the solution ρ in a stronger topology, and for this reason we think that our point of view could be useful in such a task.

6. Appendix

We list here some results used in the above sections. We point out that the following results are stated in \mathbb{R}^d , while we have worked in \mathbb{T}^d . This is not a substantial problem since the estimates are of local nature.

Lemma 6.1. *([31])*

Let $f \in BV(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists a negligible set $N \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a constant $c_n > 0$ such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq c_n |x - y| (M_\lambda Df(x) + M_\lambda Df(y)) \text{ for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus N \text{ with } |x - y| \leq \lambda.$$

Lemma 6.2. *([7, Lemma 5.1])*

Let $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p > d$. Then

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq c_{d,p} |x - y| [M(|Df|^p)(x)]^{1/p} \text{ for every } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Lemma 6.3. *([9, Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.3])*

Let b be a bounded vector field belonging to $L^1(0, T; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for some $p > 1$ and with $\operatorname{div}(b)^- \in L^1(0, T; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Let $X : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a regular Lagrangian flow

for b . Let L be the compressibility of the flow as defined in Definition 1.1. Define the quantity:

$$A_p(\mathbf{R}, X) := \left[\int_{B_{\mathbf{R}}(0)} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{0 < r < 2\mathbf{R}} \int_{B_r(x)} \log \left(1 + \frac{|X(t, x) - X(t, y)|}{r} \right) dy \right)^p dx \right]^{1/p}.$$

It holds that $A_p(\mathbf{R}, X) \leq C(\mathbf{R}, L, \|D_x b\|_{L^1(L^p)})$. Moreover for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $\mathbf{R} > 0$ we can find a set $K \subset B_{\mathbf{R}}(0)$ such that $|B_{\mathbf{R}}(0) \setminus K| \leq \varepsilon$ and for every $t \in [0, T]$ it holds

$$\text{Lip}(X(t, \cdot) \llcorner K) \leq \exp \left(\frac{c_d A_p(\mathbf{R}, X)}{\varepsilon^{1/p}} \right),$$

where $c_d > 0$ is a dimensional constant.

We finally report the proof of Lemma 3.1:

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We give for granted both the uniqueness of the solution of (1.3) and the existence of Φ (see [11], [9]), so we need only to verify that ρ satisfies (1.3), i.e.

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(\partial_t \xi + u \cdot \nabla_x \xi) dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) \xi(0, x) dx = 0 \text{ for every } \xi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{T}^d).$$

Indeed by definition, denoting with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality pairing:

$$\langle \partial_t \rho + \text{div}_x(u\rho), \xi \rangle = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \langle \partial_t \rho, \xi \rangle + \langle \text{div}(u\rho), \xi \rangle dx dt.$$

Now:

$$\int_0^T \langle \partial_t \rho, \xi \rangle dt = [\rho \xi]_0^T - \int_0^T \rho \partial_t \xi dt = -\rho_0(x) \xi(0, x) - \int_0^T \rho \partial_t \xi dt$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \text{div}(u\rho) \xi dx = - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho u \cdot \nabla_x \xi dx.$$

So ρ solves (1.3) if

$$0 = \langle \partial_t \rho + \text{div}_x(u\rho), \xi \rangle = - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0 \xi(0, x) dx - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho(\partial_t \xi + u \cdot \nabla_x \xi) dx dt.$$

Applying the push forward formula in the second integral, since $\rho(t, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \cdot)_\# \rho_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho [\partial_t \xi + (\nabla_x \xi \cdot u)] dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0 [\partial_t \xi(t, \Phi(t, x)) + \nabla_x \xi(t, \Phi(t, x)) \cdot u(t, \Phi(t, x))] dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) \frac{d}{dt} (\xi(t, \Phi(t, x))) dx dt = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) \left(\int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} (\xi(t, \Phi(t, x))) dt \right) dx \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0(x) \xi(0, x) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude. □

7. Acknowledgments

The author is a member of the INdAM group GNAMPA. We wish to thank prof. Giovanni Alberti and prof. André Schlichting for the precious help and the suggestions offered in writing this article.

References

- [1] Luigi Ambrosio. Transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields. *Invent. Math.*, 158(2):227–260, 2004.
- [2] L. Batteux, T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, J. C. Latché, and P. Pouillet. Convergence of the MAC scheme for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with variable density and viscosity. *Math. Comp.*, 92(342):1595–1631, 2023.
- [3] Fethi Ben Belgacem and Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin. Compactness for nonlinear continuity equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264(1):139–168, 2013.
- [4] F. Ben Belgacem and P.-E. Jabin. Convergence of numerical approximations to non-linear continuity equations with rough force fields. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 234(2):509–547, 2019.
- [5] Franck Boyer. Analysis of the upwind finite volume method for general initial- and boundary-value transport problems. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 32(4):1404–1439, 2012.
- [6] Martin Burger, Yasmin Dolak-Struss, and Christian Schmeiser. Asymptotic analysis of an advection-dominated chemotaxis model in multiple spatial dimensions. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 6(1):1–28, 2008.
- [7] Laura Caravenna and Gianluca Crippa. A directional Lipschitz extension lemma, with applications to uniqueness and Lagrangianity for the continuity equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(8):1488–1520, 2021.
- [8] Gennaro Ciampa, Tommaso Cortopassi, Gianluca Crippa, Raffaele D’Ambrosio, and Stefano Spirito. A-posteriori estimates for the θ -method for odes with non smooth velocity fields. (*in preparation*).

- [9] Gianluca Crippa and Camillo De Lellis. Estimates and regularity results for the DiPerna-Lions flow. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 616:15–46, 2008.
- [10] Bruno Despres. Lax theorem and finite volume schemes. *Math. Comp.*, 73(247):1203–1234, 2004.
- [11] R. J. DiPerna and P.-L. Lions. Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 98(3):511–547, 1989.
- [12] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, and J. C. Latché. A convergent finite element-finite volume scheme for the compressible Stokes problem. II. The isentropic case. *Math. Comp.*, 79(270):649–675, 2010.
- [13] T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, and J.-C. Latché. A convergent finite element-finite volume scheme for the compressible Stokes problem. I. The isothermal case. *Math. Comp.*, 78(267):1333–1352, 2009.
- [14] T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, and J.-C. Latché. Kinetic energy control in explicit finite volume discretizations of the incompressible and compressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Int. J. Finite Vol.*, 7(2):6, 2010.
- [15] Thierry Gallouët, Laura Gastaldo, Raphael Herbin, and Jean-Claude Latché. An unconditionally stable pressure correction scheme for the compressible barotropic Navier-Stokes equations. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 42(2):303–331, 2008.
- [16] A. Grothendieck. La théorie de Fredholm. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 84:319–384, 1956.
- [17] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin and Datong Zhou. Discretizing advection equations with rough velocity fields on non-Cartesian grids. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 82(2):229–303, 2024.
- [18] N. N. Kuznecov. The accuracy of certain approximate methods for the computation of weak solutions of a first order quasilinear equation. *Ž. Vyčisl. Mat i Mat. Fiz.*, 16(6):1489–1502, 1627, 1976.
- [19] Peter D. Lax. Weak solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic equations and their numerical computation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 7:159–193, 1954.
- [20] Randall J. LeVeque. *Numerical methods for conservation laws*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 1992.
- [21] Randall J. LeVeque. *Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [22] Benoit Merlet. L^∞ - and L^2 -error estimates for a finite volume approximation of linear advection. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(1):124–150, 2007/08.
- [23] Benoît Merlet and Julien Vovelle. Error estimate for finite volume scheme. *Numer. Math.*, 106(1):129–155, 2007.

- [24] Víctor Navarro-Fernández and André Schlichting. Error estimates for a finite volume scheme for advection-diffusion equations with rough coefficients. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 57(4):2131–2158, 2023.
- [25] Víctor Navarro-Fernández, André Schlichting, and Christian Seis. Optimal stability estimates and a new uniqueness result for advection-diffusion equations. *Pure Appl. Anal.*, 4(3):571–596, 2022.
- [26] W. F. Osgood. Beweis der Existenz einer Lösung der Differentialgleichung $\frac{dy}{dx} = f(x, y)$ ohne Hinzunahme der Cauchy-Lipschitz’schen Bedingung. *Monatsh. Math. Phys.*, 9(1):331–345, 1898.
- [27] André Schlichting and Christian Seis. Convergence rates for upwind schemes with rough coefficients. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 55(2):812–840, 2017.
- [28] André Schlichting and Christian Seis. Analysis of the implicit upwind finite volume scheme with rough coefficients. *Numer. Math.*, 139(1):155–186, 2018.
- [29] Christian Seis. A quantitative theory for the continuity equation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 34(7):1837–1850, 2017.
- [30] Christian Seis. Optimal stability estimates for continuity equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 148(6):1279–1296, 2018.
- [31] Elias M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, volume No. 30 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- [32] Chad M. Topaz and Andrea L. Bertozzi. Swarming patterns in a two-dimensional kinematic model for biological groups. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 65(1):152–174, 2004.
- [33] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [34] Noel J. Walkington. Convergence of the discontinuous Galerkin method for discontinuous solutions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 42(5):1801–1817, 2005.