

# Ergodic distribution dependent BSDE and application to long-time behavior of finite horizon distribution dependent BSDE

Kaplan Desbouis<sup>1</sup> and Adrien Richou<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, INRIA, Bordeaux INP, IMB, UMR 5251, F-33400 Talence, France*

December 1, 2025

## Abstract

After proving existence and uniqueness of ergodic distribution dependent Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (BSDEs) under strong and weak dissipativity regimes for the underlying McKean–Vlasov SDE, we are able to leverage this new framework to investigate the long-time behavior of distribution-dependent BSDEs on a finite-time horizon. Finally, we apply our results to solve an ergodic McKean–Vlasov stochastic control problem and study the long-time behavior of the value function of a finite-horizon McKean–Vlasov stochastic control problem.

**Keywords:** McKean–Vlasov SDE, Ergodic BSDE, Ergodic optimal control problem

**AMS 2010 subject classification:** 60H10, 60H30, 93E20.

**Acknowledgment:** The authors acknowledge funding from the ANR project ReLISCoP (ANR-21-CE40-0001).

## 1 Introduction

We study in this paper the following distribution dependent ergodic backward stochastic differential equation (EBSDE for short) in infinite horizon

$$Y_t^{[\theta]} = Y_T^{[\theta]} + \int_t^T \left( f(X_s^{[\theta]}, \mathcal{L}(X_s^{[\theta]}), Z_s^{[\theta]}) - \lambda \right) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{[\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T < \infty, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $(Y^{[\theta]}, Z^{[\theta]}, \lambda)$  is the unknown with,

- $Y, Z$  are progressively measurable processes, respectively,  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued and  $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$ -valued,
- $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$

and the given data are

- $W$  an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued Brownian motion defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  a filtered probability space,
- $\theta$  is an  $L^2(\Omega)$  random variable independent with  $W$ ,
- $X^{[\theta]}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process starting from  $\theta$  and solving for all  $t \geq 0$  the following McKean–Vlasov’s type SDE (MV-SDE for short)

$$dX_t^{[\theta]} = b(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dt + \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dW_t, \quad (1.2)$$

where, for a given r.v.  $X$ ,  $[X]$  denotes the distribution of  $X$ ,

- $f$  a deterministic measurable function.

This type of BSDE was first introduced in the non-distribution dependent framework by Fuhrman, Hu and Tessitore in [14] in order to solve some ergodic stochastic control problem. In their paper, they assumed that  $\sigma$  is constant and  $b$  has a strong dissipativity assumption, that is to say,

$$\exists \eta > 0, \forall x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \langle x - x', b(x) - b(x') \rangle \leq -\eta |x - x'|^2,$$

which allows to get an exponential confluence of trajectories. The strong dissipative assumption was later dropped by Debussche, Hu and Tessitore in [9] for a weakly dissipative one: In other words,  $b$  can be written as a sum of a bounded function and a strongly dissipative one. Equivalently, it can be seen as being dissipative at a sufficiently large range. Since the confluence of trajectories no longer holds, this paper is heavily built around the so-called *basic coupling estimate* and a gradient estimate based on the Bismut-Elworthy-Li formula for BSDE; see, e.g. [13]. Later on, Hu, Madec and Richou in [16] make a link between EBSDE and the long time behaviour of finite horizon BSDE given, for  $T > 0$  fixed, by

$$Y_t^{T,x} = g(X_T^x) + \int_t^T f(X_s^x, Z_s^{T,x}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{T,x} dW_s, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (1.3)$$

where  $X$  is the solution to an infinite dimension SDE and  $g$  is a given function. Namely, they proved that there exist some constants  $L \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$|Y_0^{T,x} - \lambda T - Y_0^x - L| \leq C e^{-\eta T}, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $(Y^x, Z^x, \lambda)$  is the solution to the following (non-distribution dependent) EBSDE

$$Y_t^x = Y_T^x + \int_t^T (f(X_s^x, Z_s^x) - \lambda) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^x dW_s, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T. \quad (1.5)$$

It is well known that BSDEs give a probabilistic representation of semi-linear parabolic PDEs, so (1.5) also gives the long time behavior of the solution to the following HJB equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^T(t, x) + \mathcal{L}u^T(t, x) + f((x, \nabla_x u^T(t, x)\sigma(x))) = 0 & t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u^T(T, \cdot) = g, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the infinitesimal generator of the semi-group associated to the SDE  $X$ . A few years later, Hu and Lemmonier in [15] extended the previous results for the weak dissipative assumption in finite dimension, assuming now that  $\sigma$  is no longer constant.

The novelty of the present work comes from the fact that we now assume a distribution dependency for the generator  $f$  and  $X$  is now the solution to a MV-SDE. This difference leads to additional difficulties. In particular, due to the distribution dependency,  $X$  is no longer Markovian but the couple  $(X, [X])$  is. Taking into account this, we start by decoupling the MV-SDE (1.2) as follows: for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta$  an  $L^2(\Omega)$  r.v., we consider

$$dX_t^{x, [\theta]} = b(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dt + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dW_t, \quad X_0^{x, [\theta]} = x,$$

where  $X^{[\theta]}$  solves (1.2) with starting point  $\theta$ . We stress that this new equation is not a McKean-Vlasov SDE but is close to it since  $X^{\theta, [\theta]}$  gives a solution to (1.2). Consequently, instead of (1.1) we will study the following equation:

$$Y_t^{x, [\theta]} = Y_T^{x, [\theta]} + \int_t^T (f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{x, [\theta]}) - \lambda) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{x, [\theta]} dW_s. \quad (1.6)$$

The first aim of the paper is to establish some existence and uniqueness results for (1.6) under two different sets of assumptions: a strong dissipativity assumption on one side and a weak dissipativity assumption with a distribution free  $\sigma$  on the other side (see  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE}1)$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE}2)$ ). Then we are able to use this EBSDE in order to study the long time behavior of (1.3) in our new framework, that is to say,

$$Y_t^{T,x, [\theta]} = g(X_T^{T,x, [\theta]}) + \int_t^T f(X_s^{T,x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,x, [\theta]}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{T,x, [\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (1.7)$$

In particular, we obtain an exponential convergence of  $Y_0^{T,x, [\theta]} - \lambda T - Y_0^{x, [\theta]}$  toward a constant as in (1.4). In an equivalent way, this result allows to obtain the long-time behavior of the solution of a McKean-Vlasov HJB equation given by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^T(t, x, [\theta]) + \mathcal{L}u^T(t, x, [\theta]) + f(x, [\theta], \nabla_x u^T(t, x, [\theta])\sigma(x, [\theta])) + \mathcal{I}(u^T(t, x, [\theta])) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0, \theta \in L^2(\Omega) \\ u^T(T, x, [\theta]) = g(x, [\theta]), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^2(\Omega) \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}(u^T(t, x, [\theta])) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_\mu u^T(t, x, [\theta])(y) + \partial_y \partial_\mu u^T(t, x, [\theta])(y) \mu(dy)), \quad \mu = [\theta]$$

and  $\partial_\mu \phi(\mu)$  denotes the Lions' derivative of a function  $\phi$  with respect to its distribution valued variable, see e.g. [10, Section 5.2] for further details.

The EBSDE (1.6) can also be used to solve an ergodic optimal control problem where we optimize an ergodic reward with a controlled MV-SDE,

$$dX_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}} = \left( b(X_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], 0}]) + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], 0}])Ra_t \right) dt + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], 0}])dW_t \quad (1.8)$$

over a set of admissible controls  $\mathbf{a} = (a_s)_{s \geq 0}$  taking values in a bounded subset of some  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . This stochastic control problem is also linked to the following ergodic McKean-Vlasov Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (HJB for short) given by:

$$\mathcal{L}u(x, [\theta]) + f(x, [\theta], \nabla_x u(x, [\theta])) + \mathbb{E}_{U \sim [\theta]} [\partial_{[\theta]} u(t, x, [\theta])(U)] + \mathbb{E}_{U \sim [\theta]} [\partial_u \partial_{[\theta]} u(t, x, [\theta])(U)] = \lambda, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0, \theta \in L^2(\Omega),$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the infinitesimal generator defined by

$$\mathcal{L}\phi(x, [\theta]) := b(x, [\theta])\nabla_x \phi(x, [\theta]) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top(x, [\theta]) \nabla_x^2 \phi(x, [\theta]) \right),$$

and  $f$  is the Hamiltonian associated to the control problem. We stress the fact that the problem considered do not allow to control the law in the decoupled equation (1.8). Consequently, the studied framework is not the classical McKean-Vlasov ergodic control problem and it explains why we will talk about a *partial* McKean-Vlasov ergodic control problem. If we see a McKean-Vlasov SDE as the limit of an interacting particle system, we consider a problem where we control only one particle, which explains why this control will have no impact on the distribution, whereas the classical McKean-Vlasov ergodic control problem is looking for an optimal control identically applied to all particles at the same time.

**Comparison with other works.** Up to our knowledge, there is no work dealing with distribution dependent ergodic BSDEs. However several papers investigate some questions related to close models, as mean field games (MFG for short) or McKean-Vlasov control problems, by using other tools. Let us detail here some of them.

A recent paper of Fuhrman and Rudà, see [12], obtain result on ergodic control problem on the Wasserstein space by using a control approach for strongly dissipative and controlled McKean-Vlasov's SDE. Namely, the following SDE,

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

Their main result is the existence and (partial) uniqueness of a viscosity solution to an ergodic McKean-Vlasov HJB equation on the Wasserstein space. They link it with an optimal ergodic McKean-Vlasov control problem and show that  $\lambda$  (the constant that is part of the solution of the ergodic PDE) gives the first order term when we look at the long time behavior of a finite horizon McKean-Vlasov control problem, as in Theorem 4.1. Nevertheless, compared to our work, they only consider a strong dissipativity condition, and ask their generator  $f$  to be bounded and Lipschitz with respect to  $x$  where we have instead a polynomial growth and a locally Hölder condition. Moreover, they do not have the precise exponential convergence (1.4). Same kind of results, under some close assumptions, were also obtained by Bao and Tang in [1].

Bayraktar and Jian [2] developed ergodicity and turnpike properties, i.e. exponential convergence toward an ergodic problem, for linear-quadratic Mean Field control problems. Apart from the linear-quadratic framework, the main difference on the MV-SDE is that theirs only depend on the law through the expectation.

Cecchin, Conforti, Durmus and Eichinger in [7] establish several turnpike properties, under different smoothness assumptions and weak dissipativity assumption, of the long time behavior of solutions of mean field PDE systems related to MFG. These results generalize some previous papers [4, 5, 6] restricted to compact domains of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and assuming a Lasry-Lions monotonicity assumption.

**Organization.** The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state some useful estimates on McKean-Vlasov SDEs under two different sets of assumptions (see  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$ ). Section 3 is devoted to the proof of an existence and uniqueness result for the EBSDE (1.6) given by Theorem 3.4. In Section 4, we study the long time behavior of the finite horizon distribution dependent BSDE (1.7) thanks to our EBSDE solution: see Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.5. In Section 5, we apply results of Sections 3 and 4 to a partial McKean-Vlasov ergodic control problem and the long-time behavior of a partial McKean-Vlasov control problem. The remaining of the introduction is devoted to notations.

**Notations.** Let a given filtered complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathbb{F} := (\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}, \mathbb{P})$  which supports a  $d$ -Brownian motion denoted  $W$ . Let also, see [23],  $\mathcal{G}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{G}$  is generated by  $U \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1])$  and is independent of  $W$ . Consequently, we define the filtration  $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  by  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\mathcal{G} \cup \mathbb{F}_t)$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ . We also set the following:

1. Spaces: For all  $p \geq 1$ , we set:

(a)  $L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$  the set of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random variable admitting finite moment of order  $p$  endowed with the norm

$$\|\theta\|_p^p := \|\theta\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)}^p = \mathbb{E}[|\theta|^p].$$

(b)  $L^2_{\mathcal{P}}(\Omega; L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d))$  the set of predictable processes  $X$  on  $[0, T]$  such that

$$\|X\|_{L^2}^2 := \|X\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{P}}([0, T]; E)}^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |X_s|^2 ds \right].$$

(c)  $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d))$  the set of predictable processes  $X \in L^2_{\mathcal{P}}(\Omega; L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d))$  for any  $T > 0$ .

(d)  $\mathcal{S}_T^2$  the set of continuous,  $\mathcal{F}$ -adapted processes  $X$  on  $[0, T]$  with value in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  satisfying

$$\|X\|_{\mathcal{S}_T^2} := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_s|^2 \right]^{1/2} < \infty.$$

(e)  $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be the set of probabilities measures having finite  $p$ -th moment over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  endowed with the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance defined by: for  $\nu, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\nu, \mu) = \inf_{\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_{\nu, \mu}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^p \Pi(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p},$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{\nu, \mu}$  is the set of all couplings of probability distributions  $\nu$  and  $\mu$ , i.e. the set of all probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  with marginals  $\nu, \mu$ .

(f)  $\mathcal{C}^{k, m}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d); \mathbb{R})$  be the set of  $k$  times continuously differentiable w.r.t the first variable and  $m$  times differentiable w.r.t to the second one.

We also denote  $\nabla_x f$  the gradient of  $f$  w.r.t  $x$  which will be seen as an element of  $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$

2. Norms: We naturally endow  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with the Euclidean norm denoted  $|\cdot|$  and for a  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  we denote  $\|\sigma\|$  the Frobenius norm. Namely,  $\|\sigma\|^2 := \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top)$
3. Constants: For  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \mapsto H$  a Lipschitz function w.r.t both variables and  $H$  an Hilbert space, we set, up to transformations,  $K_x^\varphi$  (resp.  $K_\varphi^\varphi$ ) the Lipschitz constant for the space variable (resp. for the distribution variable). The constants  $C$  will be denoted with a index  $k$  to enlighten the dependency w.r.t  $k$ . The constants  $C$  might change from one line to another.

## 2 The forward McKean-Vlasov SDE

In this section, we establish several exponential convergence results for McKean-Vlasov SDEs under two different sets of assumptions ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE1}$ ) and ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE2}$ ). Let us consider the following McKean-Vlasov SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^{s, [\theta]} = b(t, X_t^{s, [\theta]}, [X_t^{s, [\theta]}]) dt + \sigma(X_t^{s, [\theta]}, [X_t^{s, [\theta]}]) dW_t, & t \geq s, \\ X_s^{s, [\theta]} = \theta \in L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ is } \mathcal{G}\text{-measurable,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{MV-SDE})$$

where  $p \geq 2$ ,  $b$  and  $\sigma$  satisfy the following assumptions.

**Assumption 1.**  $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are two measurable functions such that

1. for all  $t \geq 0$   $b(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  is uniformly Lipschitz,
2. for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p$ ,  $t \mapsto b(t, x, \mu)$  is bounded,
3.  $\sigma$  is Lipschitz.

We emphasize that *Assumption 1* is only here for the well-posedness of (MV-SDE) and this set of assumptions is supposed to be fulfilled throughout the article. If we consider a r.v.  $\theta' \in L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$  that is not  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable, then we can construct a  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable r.v.  $\theta_\mu$  that only depends on  $\mu := [\theta']$  and such that  $[\theta] = \mu = [\theta']$  since the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$  is atomless: see e.g. [10, Page 352]. In this case, we define it by a slight abuse of the notation  $X^{s, [\theta']} := X^{s, [\theta_\mu]}$ . Moreover, we can remark that if  $\theta'$  is  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable but not  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable, then  $X^{s, [\theta']}$  is not equal to the solution of (MV-SDE) starting from  $\theta'$  at time  $s$  but these two processes are equal in distribution.

For the latter use, we also introduce the *decoupled* McKean-Vlasov SDE as

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^{s,x,[\theta]} = b(t, X_t^{s,x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{s,[\theta]}])dt + \sigma(X_t^{s,x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{s,[\theta]}])dW_t, & t \geq s, \\ X_s^{s,x,[\theta]} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (\text{Decoupled SDE})$$

where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , for  $p \geq 2$  and  $X^{s,[\theta]}$  is the solution to (MV-SDE). Let us remark that (Decoupled SDE) is not a McKean-Vlasov SDE but we can easily return to (MV-SDE) by evaluating the function  $X^{s,\cdot,[\theta]}$  in  $\theta$ , i.e.  $X^{s,\theta,[\theta]}$  is solution to (MV-SDE). Finally, we set  $X^{[\theta]} := X^{0,[\theta]}$  and  $X^{x,[\theta]} := X^{0,x,[\theta]}$  to simplify the notation.

Under *Assumption 1* the following result holds: See [12, Proposition 2.1], with  $\alpha = 0$  in the cited reference, for the first point; while the second point is a consequence of standard results for classical SDEs.

**Theorem 2.1.** 1. For all  $s \geq 0$  and  $\theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a unique solution  $(X_t^{s,[\theta]})_{t \geq s}$  to (MV-SDE) such that  $(X_t^{s,[\theta]})_{t \in [s,T]} \in \mathcal{S}_T^p$  for all  $T \geq s$ .

2. For all  $s \geq 0, \theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a unique solution  $(X_t^{s,x,[\theta]})_{t \geq s}$  to (MV-SDE) such that  $(X_t^{s,x,[\theta]})_{t \in [s,T]} \in \mathcal{S}_T^p$  for all  $T \geq s$ .

We also recall in the next proposition a flow property for McKean-Vlasov SDEs that will be useful throughout the paper: see for instance [8, Proposition 2.1] and [22, Lemma 3.1].

**Proposition 2.2.** For all  $p \geq 2, 0 \leq s \leq t, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\left( X_t^{0,x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{0,[\theta]}] \right) = \left( X_t^{s,X_s^{x,[\theta]},[X_s^{[\theta]}]}, [X_t^{s,[X_s^{[\theta]}]}] \right), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

We also define, for all  $t \geq 0$ , the non-linear and non-homogeneous semigroup, see again [8, Proposition 2.1] and [22, Lemma 3.1], associated to  $X^{x,[\theta]}, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}_t[\phi](x, [\theta]) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \right]. \quad (2.1)$$

## 2.1 The strong dissipative framework

In this subsection, we prove some exponential convergence results for (MV-SDE) and (Decoupled SDE) under the following strong dissipative assumptions on  $b$  and  $\sigma$ .

**Assumption** ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE1}$ ). Let  $p \geq 2$ .

1.  $b$  is  $\nu$ -L-dissipative. Namely, there exists  $\nu > 0$  such that for all  $U, U' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle U - U', b(t, U, [U]) - b(t, U', [U']) \rangle] \leq -\nu \mathbb{E}[|U - U'|^2],$$

2.  $b$  is  $\eta$ -dissipative w.r.t  $x$  and is  $K_{\mathcal{L}}^b$ -Lipschitz w.r.t the distribution. Namely, there exists  $\eta > 0$  and  $K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \geq 0$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, \theta' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\langle x - x', b(t, x, [\theta]) - b(t, x', [\theta]) \rangle \leq -\eta |x - x'|^2,$$

$$|b(t, x, [\theta]) - b(t, x, [\theta'])| \leq K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta']).$$

3.  $\sigma$  is bounded and there exists  $K_x^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma > 0$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, \theta' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d), t \geq 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\sigma(x, [\theta]) - \sigma(x', [\theta'])\|^2 \leq K_x^\sigma |x - x'|^2 + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^2,$$

4.  $\nu > K_x^\sigma + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma$  and  $\eta \geq \nu$ .

**Remark 2.3.** 1. ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE1}$ )-1. depends upon the choice of the probability space only through its atomless property. Indeed, when a probability space is atomless, we know that for any joint distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  there exists  $(U, U') \sim \pi$ , see e.g. [10, Page 352]. Additionally, the formulation 'L-dissipative' is here to echo with the L-monotonicity, see, for instance, [10, Definition 3.31], and the classical dissipativity notion.

2.  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -3. implies that  $\sigma$  is  $\sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}$ -Lipschitz w.r.t.  $x$  and  $\sqrt{2K_\mathcal{L}^\sigma}$ -Lipschitz w.r.t. the distribution.
3. There are some entanglements between the assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -1. and  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -2. Indeed, by doing same computations as in Example 2.4, it is easy to see that, if  $\eta > K_\mathcal{L}^b$  then  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -2. implies  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -1. with  $\nu := \eta - K_\mathcal{L}^b$ . Nevertheless, this upper-bound could be really rough. In order to illustrate the difference between these two assumptions, we give two examples below.

*Example 2.4.* Let  $X^{[\theta]}$  be the solution to the following Ornstein-Uhlenbeck MV-SDE

$$dX_t^{[\theta]} = b(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dt + dW_t := -\eta X_t^{[\theta]}dt + K_\mathcal{L}^b \mathbb{E}[X_t^{[\theta]}]dt + dW_t.$$

We can compute that, for all  $U, U' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle U - U', b(U, [U]) - b(U', [U']) \rangle &= -\eta |U - U'|^2 + K_\mathcal{L}^b \langle U - U', \mathbb{E}[U - U'] \rangle, \\ \mathbb{E}[\langle U - U', b(U, [U]) - b(U', [U']) \rangle] &= -\eta \mathbb{E}[|U - U'|^2] + K_\mathcal{L}^b |\mathbb{E}[U - U']|^2 \leq -(\eta - K_\mathcal{L}^b) \mathbb{E}[|U - U'|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

So,  $b$  is  $(\eta - K_\mathcal{L}^b)$ -L-dissipative as soon as  $\eta > K_\mathcal{L}^b$ . Now let us consider  $X'^{[\theta]}$  the solution to the following Ornstein-Uhlenbeck MV SDE

$$dX_t'^{[\theta]} = b(X_t'^{[\theta]}, [X_t'^{[\theta]}])dt + dW_t := -\eta X_t'^{[\theta]}dt - K_\mathcal{L}^b \mathbb{E}[X_t'^{[\theta]}]dt + dW_t.$$

Doing same computations as before leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle U - U', b(U, [U]) - b(U', [U']) \rangle] = -\eta \mathbb{E}[|U - U'|^2] - K_\mathcal{L}^b |\mathbb{E}[U - U']|^2 \leq -\eta \mathbb{E}[|U - U'|^2], \quad (2.3)$$

and so,  $b$  is always  $\eta$ -L-dissipative. If we compare these two cases, we can see that it is not restrictive to assume that  $\eta \geq \nu$  and we do not penalize the dissipativity constant  $\eta$  if  $K_\mathcal{L}^b$  has a minus in front, whereas if we only use the Lipschitz property, we lose the fact that the distribution term could 'helps'.

*Example 2.5.* Let now  $X^{[\theta]}$  be the solution to the following MV-SDE

$$dX_t^{[\theta]} = b(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dt + dW_t,$$

where  $b$  is defined for any  $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_2$  as  $b(x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_1(x - y)d\mu(y) + h_2(x) = \mathbb{E}[h_1(x - X)] + h_2(x)$  with  $h_1 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $h_2 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $X \sim \mu$ . We assume that  $h_1$  is 0-dissipative (i.e.  $-h_1$  is monotone),  $K_\mathcal{L}^b$ -Lipschitz and  $h_2$  is  $\eta$ -dissipative (with  $\eta > 0$ ). These assumptions on  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  imply, by some direct computations, that  $b$  is  $\eta$ -dissipative and  $K_\mathcal{L}^b$ -Lipschitz. Thus, if  $\eta > K_\mathcal{L}^b$  we can obtain that  $b$  is  $(\eta - K_\mathcal{L}^b)$ -L-dissipative. Nevertheless, it is also possible to show that  $b$  is  $\eta$ -L-dissipative by assuming that  $h_1$  is odd. Indeed we have, for  $X \sim \mu$ ,  $X' \sim \mu'$  and  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}')$  an independent copy of  $(X, X')$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', b(X, \mu) - b(X', \mu') \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle] + \mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', h_2(X) - h_2(X') \rangle].$$

Then, the  $\eta$ -dissipativity of  $h_2$  gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', h_2(X) - h_2(X') \rangle] \leq -\eta \mathbb{E}[|X - X'|^2].$$

Moreover, since  $h_1$  is odd and  $(X, X', \tilde{X}, \tilde{X}')$  has the same law as  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}', X, X')$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{X} - \tilde{X}', h_1(\tilde{X} - X) - h_1(\tilde{X}' - X') \rangle] = -\mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{X} - \tilde{X}', h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle]$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle] &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbb{E}[\langle X - X', h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{X} - \tilde{X}', h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\langle X - \tilde{X} - (X' - \tilde{X}'), h_1(X - \tilde{X}) - h_1(X' - \tilde{X}') \rangle] \leq \mathbb{E}[|X - \tilde{X} - X' + \tilde{X}'|^2] \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by using the 0-dissipativity of  $h_1$ .

Before giving the exponential convergence results, we recall some useful uniform bounds on moments of solutions to (MV-SDE) and (Decoupled SDE).

**Proposition 2.6.** Under  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ , for all  $p \geq 2$ , there exists  $C = C(p, \nu, K_x^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, \sigma(0, \delta_0), \|\sigma\|_\infty \mathbf{1}_{p>2}, \sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)|)$  such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C(1 + \|\theta\|_p^p), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + \|\theta\|_p^p). \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof.* By classical results on MV-SDEs, see for instance [8, Proposition 2.1] we know that, there exists  $C_t \geq 0$  that might depend on time (in an increasing way) such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C_t(1 + |x|^p + \|\theta\|_p^p). \quad (2.6)$$

So it remains to prove that this upper bound is uniform in time. Let us prove first (2.4). We start by proving it for  $p = 2$ . By applying Itô's formula to  $\left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^2$  and Young's inequality we have, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^2 &= 2 \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) \right\rangle dt + \left\| \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) \right\|^2 dt + 2 \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) dW_t \right\rangle \\ &\leq 2 \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) - b(t, 0, \delta_0) \right\rangle dt + (1 + \varepsilon) \left\| \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) - \sigma(0, \delta_0) \right\|^2 dt \\ &\quad + 2 \sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)| \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right| dt + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \left\| \sigma(0, \delta_0) \right\|^2 dt + 2 \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) dW_t \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -4, we can set  $0 < \varepsilon < (\nu - (K_x^\sigma + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma))(1 + K_x^\sigma + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma)^{-1}$  and  $0 < \lambda < \nu - (\varepsilon + (K_x^\sigma + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma)(1 + \varepsilon))$ . Thus, by Young's inequality we get,

$$\begin{aligned} de^{2\lambda t} \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^2 &\leq \left( 2(\lambda + \varepsilon) \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^2 + 2 \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) - b(t, 0, \delta_0) \right\rangle dt + (1 + \varepsilon) \left\| \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) - \sigma(0, \delta_0) \right\|^2 \right) e^{2\lambda t} dt \\ &\quad + (\varepsilon^{-1} \sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)|^2 + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \left\| \sigma(0, \delta_0) \right\|^2) e^{2\lambda t} dt + 2e^{2\lambda t} \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) dW_t \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Due to (2.6), the last term of the previous inequality is a martingale, we finally obtain by  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -1-2 and the definition of  $\lambda$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\lambda t} \mathbb{E} \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^2 &\leq \|\theta\|_2^2 + 2(\lambda - \nu + (1 + \varepsilon)K_x^\sigma + \varepsilon) \int_0^t e^{2\lambda s} \mathbb{E} \left| X_s^{[\theta]} \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2(1 + \varepsilon)K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma \int_0^t e^{2\lambda s} \mathcal{W}_2(\left[ X_s^{[\theta]} \right], \delta_0)^2 ds + \frac{C}{2\lambda} (e^{2\lambda t} - 1) \\ &\leq \|\theta\|_2^2 - 2(\nu - ((1 + \varepsilon)(K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma + K_x^\sigma) + \varepsilon) - \lambda) \int_0^t e^{2\lambda s} \mathbb{E} \left| X_s^{[\theta]} \right|^2 ds + \frac{C}{2\lambda} e^{2\lambda t} \leq \|\theta\|_2^2 + \frac{C}{2\lambda} e^{2\lambda t}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives us (2.4). Let us now prove it for any  $p \geq 2$ . By applying Itô's formula to  $\left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p$ , we obtain

$$d \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p = p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-2} \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) \right\rangle dt + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-2} \left\| \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) \right\|^2 dt + \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-2} \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) dW_t \right\rangle.$$

We set  $dM_t := \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-2} \left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right]) dW_t \right\rangle$  which is a martingale due to (2.6). Thus, by using  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  and the estimate for  $p = 2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p &\leq -\eta p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p dt + p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-1} |b(t, 0, \delta_0)| dt + p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-1} K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \mathcal{W}_2(\left[ X_t^{[\theta]} \right], \delta_0) + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-2} \left\| \sigma \right\|_\infty^2 dt + dM_t \\ &\leq -\eta p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p dt + p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-1} |b(t, 0, \delta_0)| dt + p \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-1} K_{\mathcal{L}}^b C(1 + \|\theta\|_2) dt + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^{p-2} \left\| \sigma \right\|_\infty^2 dt + dM_t. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using Young's inequality with  $0 < \varepsilon < p\eta/3$ , gives

$$d \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p \leq (-p\eta + 3\varepsilon) \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p dt + \left( \varepsilon^{-(p-1)} (p|b(t, 0, \delta_0)|)^p + \varepsilon^{-(p-1)} (pK_{\mathcal{L}}^b C(1 + \|\theta\|_2))^p + \varepsilon^{-\frac{p-2}{2}} \left( \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \left\| \sigma \right\|_\infty^2 \right)^{p/2} \right) dt + dM_t$$

If we set  $0 < \lambda = \eta - \frac{3\varepsilon}{p}$ , then applying Itô's formula to  $de^{p\lambda t}|X^{[\theta]}|^p$  gives, by taking the expectation

$$e^{p\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left[|X_t^{[\theta]}|^p\right] \leq \|\theta\|_p^p + \int_0^t C(1 + \|\theta\|_p^p)e^{\lambda s}ds,$$

which gives the wanted result. We prove (2.5) by using same computations and (2.4).  $\square$

Now we give the first exponential convergence result for the solution to (MV-SDE).

**Theorem 2.7.** *Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  is fulfilled. Then, for all  $p \geq 2$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $t \geq 0$  and for  $\Lambda := \nu - (K_x^\sigma + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma) > 0$ ,*

$$\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}]) \leq \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])e^{-\Lambda t}. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\theta, \theta' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . By applying Itô's formula to  $e^{2\Lambda t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2$ , where  $\tilde{X} = X^{[\theta]} - X^{[\theta']}$ , we obtain due to  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -3,

$$\begin{aligned} de^{2\Lambda t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2 &\leq 2(\Lambda + K_x^\sigma)e^{2\Lambda t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + 2\left\langle X_t^{[\theta]} - X_t^{[\theta']}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(t, X_t^{[\theta']}, [X_t^{[\theta']}]) \right\rangle dt \\ &\quad + 2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma \mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])^2 e^{2\Lambda t} dt + 2e^{2\Lambda t} \langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - \sigma(X_t^{[\theta']}, [X_t^{[\theta']}])) dW_t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Proposition 2.6, the stochastic integral in the previous estimate is a martingale. Thus, taking the expectation gives by  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -1 and the definition of  $\Lambda$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\Lambda t}\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{X}_t|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}'|^2] - 2(\nu - (\Lambda + K_x^\sigma)) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{X}_s|^2]e^{2\Lambda s}ds + 2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma \int_0^t \mathcal{W}_2([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^2 e^{2\Lambda s}ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}'|^2], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}'$  are  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable r.v. such that  $[\theta] = [\bar{\theta}]$  and  $[\theta'] = [\bar{\theta}']$ . Then we obtain the wanted result by taking an optimal coupling of  $([\theta], [\theta'])$  for the  $\mathcal{W}_2$ -Wasserstein distance.  $\square$

**Remark 2.8.** Thanks to Remark 2.3, this result still holds if we assume that  $\eta > K_{\mathcal{L}}^b$  and we drop the L-dissipative assumption. This case is already known in the literature, see for instance [12, Proposition 3.1] by replacing, in the cited reference,  $\gamma$  by  $\eta - K_x^\sigma$  and by considering our slightly different assumption on the Lipschitz constants of  $\sigma$ .

**Corollary 2.9.** *Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  is fulfilled. Let  $(\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a bounded progressively measurable process such that, by Girsanov's theorem,  $W^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} := W - \int_0^\cdot \beta_s ds$  is a  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$ -Brownian motion for  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  the associated Girsanov's probability. Let us assume that  $\nu > K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty$  and set  $\varepsilon, \gamma$  such that  $0 < \varepsilon < \nu - K_x^\sigma - \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty$ ,  $0 < \gamma < \nu - K_x^\sigma - \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty - \varepsilon$  and  $\gamma < \nu - (K_x^\sigma + K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma)$ . Then, there exists  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}\left[\left|X_t^{x, [\theta]} - X_t^{x', [\theta']}\right|^2\right]^{1/2} \leq C(|x - x'| + \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta']))e^{-\gamma t}. \quad (2.9)$$

*Proof.* We write the equation satisfied by  $X^{x, [\theta]}$  under  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  as

$$dX_t^{x, [\theta]} = b(t, X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dt + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])\beta_t dt + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dW_t^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}.$$

Then, by applying Itô's formula to  $e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2$ , with  $\tilde{X} = X^{x, [\theta]} - X^{x', [\theta']}$ , we have by using  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$ -2, Young's inequality, the



fact that  $\nu \leq \eta$  and Theorem 2.7,

$$\begin{aligned}
d\left(e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2\right) &\leq 2\left\langle X_t^{x,[\theta]} - X_t^{x',[\theta']}, b(t, X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(t, X_t^{x',[\theta']}, [X_t^{[\theta']}]) \right\rangle e^{2\gamma t} dt + 2(K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty + \gamma)e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt \\
&\quad + 2|\beta|_\infty\sqrt{2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma}e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])dt + 2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma e^{2\gamma t}\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])^2 dt \\
&\quad + 2e^{2\gamma t}\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{x,[\theta]}]) - \sigma(X_t^{x',[\theta']}, [X_t^{x',[\theta']}]))dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \rangle \\
&\leq -2\left(\eta - \left(K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty + \gamma\right)\right)e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + 2(|\beta|_\infty\sqrt{2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma} + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b)e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])dt \\
&\quad + 2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma e^{2\gamma t}\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])^2 dt + 2e^{2\gamma t}\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{x,[\theta]}]) - \sigma(X_t^{x',[\theta']}, [X_t^{x',[\theta']}]))dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \rangle \\
&\leq -2\left(\eta - \left(K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty + \gamma + \varepsilon\right)\right)e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + \left((|\beta|_\infty\sqrt{2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma} + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b)^2(2\varepsilon)^{-1} + 2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma\right)\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])^2 e^{2\gamma t} dt \\
&\quad + 2e^{2\gamma t}\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{x,[\theta]}]) - \sigma(X_t^{x',[\theta']}, [X_t^{x',[\theta']}]))dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \rangle \\
&\leq -2\left(\nu - \left(K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty + \gamma + \varepsilon\right)\right)e^{2\gamma t}|\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + C\mathcal{W}_2([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])^2 e^{2\gamma t} dt \\
&\quad + 2e^{2\gamma t}\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{x,[\theta]}]) - \sigma(X_t^{x',[\theta']}, [X_t^{x',[\theta']}]))dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \rangle \\
&\leq C\mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^2 e^{2(\gamma-\Lambda)t} dt + 2e^{2\gamma t}\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{x,[\theta]}]) - \sigma(X_t^{x',[\theta']}, [X_t^{x',[\theta']}]))dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 2.10, the stochastic integral is a martingale. Hence, by taking the expectation w.r.t  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  and recalling that  $\gamma < \Lambda$ , we have

$$e^{2\gamma t}\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}\left[|\tilde{X}_t|^2\right] \leq |x - x'|^2 + C\mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^2,$$

which gives the desired result.  $\square$

The next result extend Proposition 2.6 under the new probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$ .

**Proposition 2.10.** *Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  is fulfilled. Let  $\beta$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  be defined as in Corollary 2.9 and let us assume that  $\nu > K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty$ . Then, for all  $p \geq 2$ , there exists  $C = C(p, \nu, K_x^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, \sigma(0, \delta_0), \|\sigma\|_\infty \mathbf{1}_{p>2}, \sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)|)$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}\left[|X_t^{[\theta]}|^p\right] \leq C(1 + \|\theta\|_p^p), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}\left[|X_t^{x,[\theta]}|^p\right] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + \|\theta\|_p^p). \quad (2.11)$$

*Proof.* This is a straight forward adaptation of the proof of Proposition 2.6 where we replace (2.7) by the following inequality, for  $\varepsilon$  small enough and  $0 < \gamma < \nu - (1 + \varepsilon)K_x^\sigma - \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty - \varepsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
de^{2\gamma t}|X_t^{[\theta]}|^2 &\leq \left(2(\gamma + \varepsilon + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty)|X_t^{[\theta]}|^2 + 2\left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(t, 0, \delta_0) \right\rangle\right)e^{2\gamma t} dt \\
&\quad + (1 + \varepsilon)\left\|\sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - \sigma(0, \delta_0)\right\|^2 e^{2\gamma t} dt + (\varepsilon^{-1}\sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)|^2 + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\|\sigma(0, \delta_0)\|^2)e^{2\gamma t} dt \\
&\quad + 2e^{2\gamma t}\left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \right\rangle. \\
&\leq \left(2(\gamma + \varepsilon + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}|\beta|_\infty + (1 + \varepsilon)K_x^\sigma)|X_t^{[\theta]}|^2 + 2\left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, b(t, X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(t, 0, \delta_0) \right\rangle\right)e^{2\gamma t} dt \\
&\quad + \left(2K_{\mathcal{L}}^\sigma(1 + \varepsilon)C(1 + \|\theta\|_2^2) + \varepsilon^{-1}\sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)|^2 + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})\|\sigma(0, \delta_0)\|^2\right)e^{2\gamma t} dt \\
&\quad + 2e^{2\gamma t}\left\langle X_t^{[\theta]}, \sigma(X_t^{[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dW_t^{\tilde{Q}} \right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

applying (2.4) in the last inequality. From here, the remaining of the proof is the same as for Proposition 2.6.  $\square$

## 2.2 The weak dissipative framework

In this subsection, we consider the equation (MV-SDE) in a simpler framework where  $\sigma$  does not depend on the distribution, namely:

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t, [X_t])dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.12)$$

It should be possible to extend some results of this subsection when  $\sigma$  also depend on the distribution but at the cost of additional strong constraints on the Lipschitz and monotonicity constants of  $b$  and  $\sigma$ , see *Remark 2.17*.

The aim of this subsection is to relax the strong dissipativity assumption on  $b$  into a weak one: Generally speaking,  $b$  is now allowed to be dissipative only outside a ball. In order to obtain the same results as Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 2.9 in this new framework, we use a classical approach based on a reflection coupling as in [7] and [18], themselves based on the seminal paper [11].

**Assumption** ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE2}$ ).

1. There exists  $R, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, K_x^b, \eta > 0$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, x', \mu')| &\leq K_x^b |x - x'| + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \mu'), \\ \langle x - x', b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, x', \mu') \rangle &\leq -\eta |x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| > R} + K_x^b |x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| \leq R}, \end{aligned}$$

2.  $\sigma$  is bounded and uniformly elliptic, i.e. there exists  $\sigma_0 > 0$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ :  $\sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top \geq \sigma_0^2 I_d$ ,

3. there exists  $K_x^\sigma > 0$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ :  $\|\sigma(x) - \sigma(x')\| \leq \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma} |x - x'|$ ,

4.  $K_{\mathcal{L}}^b < (\eta - K_x^\sigma) e^{-\frac{\eta + 2K_x^b}{2\sigma_0^2} R^2}$ .

We start by giving some uniform estimates on the moments of solutions of (MV-SDE) and (Decoupled SDE).

**Proposition 2.11.** Assume that ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE2}$ ) holds. For all  $p \geq 2$ , there exists  $C = C(p, \eta, K_x^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, R, \sigma(0), \|\sigma\|_\infty \mathbf{1}_{p>2}, \sup_t |b(t, 0, \delta_0)|)$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C(1 + \|\theta\|_p^p), \quad (2.13)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + \|\theta\|_p^p). \quad (2.14)$$

*Proof.* The proof follows same computations as for Proposition 2.6 using the fact that  $K_{\mathcal{L}}^b < \eta - K_x^\sigma$ .  $\square$

We can now obtain the first exponential convergence result for (MV-SDE).

**Theorem 2.12.** Assume that ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE2}$ ) holds and let  $p \geq 2$ . Then, there exists  $C = C(\eta, \sigma_0, K_x^b, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, K_x^\sigma, R) > 0$  and  $\tilde{\eta} = \tilde{\eta}(\eta, \sigma_0, K_x^b, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, K_x^\sigma, R) > 0$  such that, for all  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2p-1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}]) \leq C \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta']) e^{-\tilde{\eta}t}, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_p([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}]) \leq C(1 + \|\theta\|_{2p-1}^{1-\frac{1}{2p}} + \|\theta'\|_{2p-1}^{1-\frac{1}{2p}}) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{1/p} e^{-\tilde{\eta}t/p}. \quad (2.16)$$

*Proof.* Firstly, we prove (2.15) by using Theorem A.2. By setting  $\mathbf{b}(t, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot, [X^{[\theta]}])$ ,  $\mathbf{b}'(t, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot, [X^{[\theta']}])$  and  $(X_0, X'_0) = (\theta, \theta')$ , we have that  $(X, X')$  is a coupling of  $(X^{[\theta]}, X^{[\theta']})$ . Moreover, we have  $M_{\mathbf{b}} = K_x^b R$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_t \leq K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \mathbb{E}[|X_t - X'_t|]$  and we can take  $\mathbf{c} = K_{\mathcal{L}}^b$  since (A.4) is satisfied due to ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE2}$ )-4. Hence, by Theorem A.2, (2.15) holds. In order to obtain the results for  $p > 1$ , we use the following suitable Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality. Let  $(X, X')$  be an optimal coupling of  $(X^{[\theta]}, X^{[\theta']})$  for the  $\mathcal{W}_1$ -distance. By using, Proposition 2.11 with  $2p - 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}]) &= \mathcal{W}_p([X_t], [X'_t]) \leq \mathbb{E}[|X_t - X'_t|^p]^{1/p} = \mathbb{E}[|X_t - X'_t|^{p-1/2} |X_t - X'_t|^{1/2}]^{1/p} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|X_t - X'_t|^{2p-1}]^{1/2p} \mathbb{E}[|X_t - X'_t|]^{1/p} \\ &\leq C \left( \mathbb{E}[|X_t|^{2p-1}]^{1/2p} + \mathbb{E}[|X'_t|^{2p-1}]^{1/2p} \right) \mathbb{E}[|X_t - X'_t|]^{1/p} \\ &\leq C(1 + \|\theta\|_{2p-1}^{1-\frac{1}{2p}} + \|\theta'\|_{2p-1}^{1-\frac{1}{2p}}) \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof concludes by using (2.15).  $\square$

The next theorem concerns some exponential convergence results for (Decoupled SDE).

**Theorem 2.13.** *Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE}2)$  holds and let  $p \geq 2$ . Then, there exists  $C = C(\eta, \sigma_0, K_x^\sigma, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, K_x^b, R) > 0$  and  $\hat{\eta} = \hat{\eta}(\eta, \sigma_0, K_x^b, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, K_x^\sigma, R) > 0$  such that, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2p-1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]) \leq C(|x - x'| + \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])) e^{-\hat{\eta}t} \quad (2.17)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_p([X_t^{x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]) \leq C(1 + |x|^{1-\frac{1}{2p}} + |x'|^{1-\frac{1}{2p}} + \|\theta\|_{2p-1}^{1-\frac{1}{2p}} + \|\theta'\|_{2p-1}^{1-\frac{1}{2p}}) (|x - x'|^{1/p} + \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{1/p}) e^{-\hat{\eta}t/p}, \quad (2.18)$$

*Proof.* First, due to triangular inequality, one has

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta]}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x', [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]).$$

For the first term on the right-hand side, we apply Theorem A.2 by setting  $\mathbf{b}(t, \cdot) = \mathbf{b}'(t, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot, [X_t^{[\theta]}])$  and  $(X_0, X'_0) = (x, x')$  which ensures that  $(X, X')$  is a coupling of  $(X^{x, [\theta]}, X^{x', [\theta]})$ . Moreover we have  $M_b = K_x^b R$  and  $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathbf{c} = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta]}]) \leq C|x - x'|e^{-\hat{\eta}t}.$$

For the second term, we set  $\mathbf{b}(t, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot, [X_t^{[\theta]}])$ ,  $\mathbf{b}'(t, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot, [X_t^{[\theta']}])$  with  $M_b = K_x^b R$  and  $X_0 = X'_0 = x'$  which ensures that  $(X, X')$  is a coupling of  $(X^{x', [\theta]}, X^{x', [\theta']})$ . Then, Theorem A.2 gives us

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x', [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]) = \mathcal{W}_1([X_t], [X'_t]) \leq C\mathcal{W}_1([X_0], [X'_0])e^{-\hat{\eta}t} + Ce^{-\hat{\eta}t} \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_s e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds = Ce^{-\hat{\eta}t} \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_s e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds.$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}_t \leq C\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}])$ , we obtain by using (2.15) that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x', [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]) \leq Ce^{-\hat{\eta}t} \int_0^t e^{(\hat{\eta}-\hat{\eta})s} ds.$$

Moreover, by using the following trivial fact: for all  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$e^{-c_1 t} \int_0^t e^{(c_1 - c_2)s} ds \leq C_{c_1, c_2} e^{-\frac{\min(c_1, c_2)}{2} t}, \quad (2.19)$$

we can conclude that there exists  $\hat{\eta} < \min(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\eta})$  such that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x', [\theta]}], [X_t^{x', [\theta']}]) \leq C\mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])e^{-\hat{\eta}t}.$$

Finally, the proof of (2.18) follows with the same Cauchy-Schwarz's trick used in Theorem 2.12.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.14.** *Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE}2)$  is fulfilled. Let  $(\tilde{\beta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a bounded progressively measurable process such that, by Girsanov's theorem,  $W^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} := W - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{\beta}_s ds$  is a  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$ -Brownian motion for  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  the associated Girsanov's probability. for all  $p \geq 2$ , there exists  $C = C(p, \eta, K_x^\sigma, K_x^b, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, R, \|\tilde{\beta}\|_\infty, \|\sigma\|_\infty) > 0$  such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \left| X_t^{[\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C(1 + \|\theta\|_p^p), \quad (2.20)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \left| X_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^p \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^p + \|\theta\|_p^p). \quad (2.21)$$

*Proof.* The proof is the same as the one did for Proposition 2.10.  $\square$

Now, let us consider a bounded function  $\beta : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz uniformly with respect to  $t$  and let us denote  $\mathcal{P}^\beta$  the semi group associated to the family of SDEs, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$dX_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]} = b(t, X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) + \sigma(X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]})\beta(t, X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])dt + \sigma(X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]})dW_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad X_0^{\beta, x, [\theta]} = x. \quad (2.22)$$

Let us emphasize that (2.22) is not a decoupled McKean-Vlasov's SDE since the law dependence in  $b$  and  $\beta$  corresponds to the original McKean-Vlasov's SDE, i.e. the SDE where  $\beta = 0$ .

**Theorem 2.15.** Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$  is fulfilled and let us consider a bounded function  $\beta : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , for  $q \geq 0$ , such that  $\beta(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz uniformly with respect to  $t$ . Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and let us consider a measurable function  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$|\psi(x, \mu) - \psi(x', \mu')| \leq c(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}(0, \mu)^q + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}(0, \mu')^q) (|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \mu')^\epsilon). \quad (2.23)$$

Then, there exists  $C = C(q, \eta, \sigma_0, K_x^\sigma, K_x^b, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, R, |\beta|_\infty, \|\sigma\|_\infty) > 0$  and  $\hat{\eta} = \hat{\eta}(\eta, \sigma_0, K_x^b, K_{\mathcal{L}}^b, K_x^\sigma, R, |\beta|_\infty, \|\sigma\|_\infty) > 0$  such that, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x', [\theta]) \right| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon t/2} |x - x'|^\frac{\epsilon}{2}. \quad (2.24)$$

*Proof.* Let us prove (2.24). We set  $(\mathcal{U}_t, \mathcal{U}'_t)$  an optimal coupling of  $(X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}, X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]})$  for the  $\mathcal{W}_1$ -distance. By using the locally Hölder property of  $\psi$  and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x', [\theta]) \right| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathcal{U}_t, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - \psi(\mathcal{U}'_t, [X_t^{[\theta]}])] \right| \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 + |\mathcal{U}_t|^q + |\mathcal{U}'_t|^q + \|X_t^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^q \right) |\mathcal{U}_t - \mathcal{U}'_t|^\epsilon \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 + |\mathcal{U}_t|^{q+\epsilon/2} + |\mathcal{U}'_t|^{q+\epsilon/2} + \|X_t^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+\epsilon/2} \right) |\mathcal{U}_t - \mathcal{U}'_t|^{\epsilon/2} \right] \\ &\leq C \left( 1 + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_t|^{2q+\epsilon}]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}'_t|^{2q+\epsilon}]^{1/2} + \|X_t^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+\epsilon/2} \right) \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_t - \mathcal{U}'_t|^{\epsilon/2}] \\ &= C \left( 1 + \mathbb{E}[|X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}|^{2q+\epsilon}]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}[|X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]}|^{2q+\epsilon}]^{1/2} + \|X_t^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+\epsilon/2} \right) \mathcal{W}_1(X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}, X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]})^{\epsilon/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

Since  $\beta$  is bounded, we can set  $\tilde{\beta}_t := \beta(t, X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) dt$  and remark that

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}|^{2q+\epsilon}]^{1/2} = \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}[|X_t^{x, [\theta]}|^{2q+\epsilon}]^{1/2},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  is defined in Proposition 2.14. Then, by using (2.13), with  $p = 2q + \epsilon \geq 2$  if  $q \geq 1$  and with  $p = 2$  and Jensen's inequality otherwise, (2.21), Jensen's and Young's inequalities we obtain

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x', [\theta]) \right| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1(X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}, X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]})^{\epsilon/2}. \quad (2.26)$$

Finally, we deal with the term  $\mathcal{W}_1(X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}, X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]})^{\epsilon/2}$  by using Theorem A.2. We set  $\mathbf{b}(t, \cdot) = \mathbf{b}'(t, \cdot) := b(t, \cdot, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) + \sigma(\cdot)\beta(t, \cdot, [X_t^{[\theta]}])$  and we check that it satisfies (A.2). By using  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$  we have, for all  $R' \geq R$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle x - x', b(t, x, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(t, x', [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \rangle + \sigma(x)\beta(t, x, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - \sigma(x')\beta(t, x', [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \\ &\leq -\eta|x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x-x'| > R'} + K_x^b|x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x-x'| \leq R'} + 2|\beta|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty |x - x'| \\ &\leq -\left(\eta - \frac{2|\beta|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty}{R'}\right) |x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x-x'| > R'} + (K_x^b R' + 2|\beta|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty) |x - x'| \mathbf{1}_{|x-x'| \leq R'}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by taking  $R'$  large enough,  $\mathbf{b}$  satisfies (A.2) with  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \eta - \frac{2|\beta|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty}{R'} > K_x^\sigma$  and  $M_{\mathbf{b}} = K_x^b R' + 2|\beta|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty$ . Hence, we can apply Theorem A.2 with  $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathbf{c} = 0$ , in order to obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]}]) \leq C|x - x'| e^{-\hat{\eta}t}. \quad (2.27)$$

It just remains to plug the previous estimate into (2.26) in order to get (2.24).  $\square$

**Remark 2.16.** If  $\psi$  is globally  $\epsilon$ -Hölder, i.e.  $q = 0$  in (2.23), then (2.25) can be replaced by the better estimate

$$|\mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x', [\theta])| \leq C \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_t - \mathcal{U}'_t|^\epsilon] \leq C \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_t - \mathcal{U}'_t|]^\epsilon = C \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{\beta, x, [\theta]}], [X_t^{\beta, x', [\theta]}])^\epsilon.$$

So, (2.24) can be improved in order to obtain

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x', [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_t^\beta[\psi](x, [\theta]) \right| \leq C|x - x'|^\epsilon e^{-\hat{\eta}t}.$$

**Remark 2.17.**

1. If  $b$  is strongly dissipative, i.e.  $R \rightarrow 0$ , then  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$ -4 corresponds to the assumption  $K_{\mathcal{L}}^b < \eta - K_x^\sigma$  which is the usual constraint needed in the strong dissipative framework: see for instance [19, Assumption (E)] or subsection 2.1.
2. Under  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$ , we no longer asked  $b$  to be Lipschitz under the  $\mathcal{W}_2$ -Wasserstein distance, but under the  $\mathcal{W}_1$  one, which is a stronger assumption than the one used in the strong dissipativity framework.
3. It is possible to add a distribution dependency on  $\sigma$  by using same computations as in the proof of [17, Theorem 3.1]. However, these computations need a stronger complicated assumption where Lipschitz constants appear in a strong intricate way: see assumptions appearing in [17, Theorem 2.1]. In order to ensure the readability of this article, we decided to consider a simpler framework, i.e.  $\sigma$  that does not depend on the distribution. Nevertheless assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  in the previous subsection allows a distribution dependency of  $\sigma$ .

### 3 The Ergodic Distribution Dependent BSDE

The aim of this section is to prove, under the two different sets of assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$ , a result of existence and uniqueness of the following distribution dependent ergodic BSDE

$$Y_t^{[\theta]} = Y_T^{[\theta]} + \int_t^T \left( f(X_s^{[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{[\theta]}) - \lambda \right) ds - \int_0^T Z_s^{[\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{EBSDE})$$

where the unknown is the triple  $(Y^{[\theta]}, Z^{[\theta]}, \lambda)$  and with  $X^{[\theta]}$  the solution to (MV-SDE) with  $s = 0$  and  $b, f$  satisfying following assumptions.

**Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_0)$ .** There exists  $q \geq 0$  such that

1.  $f : (x, \mu, z) \ni \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is uniformly  $K_z^f$ -Lipschitz w.r.t  $z$ ,
2. (a) there exists  $C > 0$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|f(x, [\theta], 0)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+1}^{q+1}),$$

- (b) there exists  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $C > 0$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and all  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|f(x, [\theta], z) - f(x', [\theta'], z)| \leq C(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (\mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta']))^{\epsilon} + |x - x'|^{\epsilon}. \quad (3.1)$$

3. for  $b$  defined in (MV-SDE),  $b$  no longer depends on time.

**Remark 3.1.** We could work in the larger space  $\mathcal{P}_{(2q+\epsilon)\vee 2}$  instead of  $\mathcal{P}_{2q+2}$  but, for readability reasons, we decided to stay in  $\mathcal{P}_{2q+2}$ , underlying the fact that the restriction is very weak.

In order to prove the existence of a solution  $(Y, Z, \lambda)$  to (EBSDE), we will work with the associated decoupled EBSDE given by

$$Y_t^{x, [\theta]} = Y_T^{x, [\theta]} + \int_t^T \left( f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{x, [\theta]}) - \lambda \right) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{x, [\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (\text{Decoupled EBSDE})$$

and we will follow the classical proof that introduce a discounted approximation of (Decoupled EBSDE), see for instance [9],[15],[16]: Let  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$Y_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} = Y_T^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} + \int_t^T \left( f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}) - \alpha Y_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} \right) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} dW_s. \quad (\alpha\text{-BSDE})$$

Let us remark once again that (Decoupled EBSDE) becomes (EBSDE) when we replace  $x$  by a  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable r.v.  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Let us now give the two different sets of assumptions we are going to use to prove the main result:

**Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ .**

1.  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_0)$  hold,

2.  $\nu > K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma K_z^f}$ ,
3.  $\sigma$  is invertible.

**Assumption** ( $\mathcal{H}_2$ ).

1. ( $\mathcal{H}_{SDE2}$ ) and ( $\mathcal{H}_0$ ) hold.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let us assume that ( $\mathcal{H}_1$ ) or ( $\mathcal{H}_2$ ) hold. Then, for all  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}$ , there exists a unique solution  $(Y^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}, Z^{\alpha,x,[\theta]})$  to  $(\alpha\text{-BSDE})$  such that  $Z^{\alpha,x,[\theta]} \in L_{loc}^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d))$  and there exists  $C$  that does not depend on  $\alpha$ , such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ :*

$$|Y_0^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}| \leq \frac{C}{\alpha} \left(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, there exists a measurable function  $\zeta^\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $Z_t^{\alpha,x,[\theta]} = \zeta^\alpha(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])$  a.s. for a.e.  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}$ .

*Proof.* If we consider a solution  $(Y^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}, Z^{\alpha,x,[\theta]})$  to  $(\alpha\text{-BSDE})$  such that  $Z^{\alpha,x,[\theta]} \in L_{loc}^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d))$  and  $Y^{\alpha,x,[\theta]} \in \bigcup_{T>0} \mathcal{S}_T^2$ , then we have the *a priori* estimate

$$|Y_0^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}| \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\alpha} \left[ \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\alpha s} \left| f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], 0) \right| ds \right] \leq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\alpha s} C(1 + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\alpha} [|X_s^{x,[\theta]}|^{q+\varepsilon}] + \|X_s^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+\varepsilon}) ds,$$

where  $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha$  is the Girsanov's probability associated to the bounded process  $\beta^\alpha$  defined for all  $s \geq 0$  as

$$\beta^\alpha := \frac{f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], 0)}{|Z_s^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}|^2} (Z_s^{\alpha,x,[\theta]})^\top \mathbf{1}_{Z_s^{\alpha,x,[\theta]} \neq 0}. \quad (3.3)$$

Let us remark that  $|\beta^\alpha|_\infty \leq K_z^f$  uniformly in  $\alpha$ . Then, we can apply Proposition 2.10 under ( $\mathcal{H}_1$ ) or Proposition 2.14 under ( $\mathcal{H}_2$ ), Jensen's and Young's inequalities to get that there exists  $C > 0$  that does not depend on  $\alpha$ , such that

$$\sup_{s \geq 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^\alpha} [|X_s^{x,[\theta]}|^{q+\varepsilon}] \leq C \left(1 + |x|^{q+\varepsilon} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+\varepsilon}\right) \leq C \left(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}\right) \quad (3.4)$$

and then

$$|Y_0^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}| \leq \frac{C}{\alpha} \left(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}\right).$$

Thanks to this *a priori* estimate, we can directly adapt the proof of [3, Lemma 3.1] which is restricted to the bounded framework in order to get the existence and uniqueness result. Finally, the Markovian representation of  $Z^{\alpha,x,[\theta]}$  is classical, see e.g. the 4th step in the proof of [15, Theorem 18]. □

Let us recall the following flow property, see [10, Lemma 4.25 and Remark 4.26], that will be useful later.

**Proposition 3.3.** *For  $X^{[\theta]}$  the solution to (MV-SDE) starting from  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $X^x$  the solution to (Decoupled SDE) starting from  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have*

$$Y_t^{\alpha,x,[\theta]} = Y_0^{\alpha,X_t^{x,[\theta]},[X_t^{[\theta]}]}.$$

The main goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Under ( $\mathcal{H}_1$ ) or ( $\mathcal{H}_2$ ) the following holds: there exists a deterministic function  $\bar{u} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying that there exists  $C > 0$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  we have*

1.  $\bar{u}(0, \mu^*) = 0$  where  $\mu^*$  is the unique invariant measure of (MV-SDE),
2.  $|\bar{u}(x, [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ ,

3. depending on the set of assumption,  $\bar{u}$  satisfies

(a) for  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ ,

$$|\bar{u}(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}(x', [\theta'])| \leq C(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon),$$

(b) for  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ ,

$$|\bar{u}(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}(x', [\theta'])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) (|x - x'|^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2}).$$

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we set  $Y_t = \bar{u}(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])$ . Then there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $Z \in L_{loc}^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d))$  such that  $(Y, Z, \lambda)$  is a solution to (Decoupled EBSDE). Moreover, there exists a measurable function  $\bar{\zeta} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $Z_t = \bar{\zeta}(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}])$  a.s. for a.e.  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

Finally  $\lambda$  is unique in the class of Markovian solutions  $(Y, Z, \lambda)$  such that  $Y = u(X^{x, [\theta]}, [X^{[\theta]}])$  where  $u$  satisfies 2.,  $Z \in L_{loc}^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d))$  and  $Z = \zeta((X^{x, [\theta]}, [X^{[\theta]}])$ . Moreover, if  $\sigma$  is uniformly elliptic, which is already satisfied under  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ , then  $(Y, Z)$  is unique in this class if we also add that  $u$  satisfies 1. and 3.

**Remark 3.5.** The existence and uniqueness of  $\mu^*$  is a direct consequence of [24, Theorem 3.1] and Theorem 2.7 or Theorem 2.12.

**Remark 3.6.** We obtain an existence and uniqueness result for (EBSDE) by evaluating  $(Y^{\cdot, [\theta]}, Z^{\cdot, [\theta]})$  at  $\theta$  in Theorem 3.4.

The remainder of this section consists of proving Theorem 3.4 separately for each set of assumptions.

### 3.1 Under the assumptions $\mathcal{H}_1$

Let us assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  holds.

*Proof of Theorem 3.4. **Existence:*** Let us define  $u^\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , as  $u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) = Y_0^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and let us prove that it satisfies an equicontinuous estimate. Let  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . As in [9, Lemma 2.6], we apply Itô's formula to  $e^{-\alpha t}(Y_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Y_t^{\alpha, x', [\theta']})$ , in order to get

$$\begin{aligned} u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - u^\alpha(x', [\theta']) &:= Y_0^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Y_0^{\alpha, x', [\theta']} = e^{-\alpha T}(Y_T^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Y_T^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s}(Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']})dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s}(f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}))ds \\ &\leq e^{-\alpha T}(Y_T^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Y_T^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - \int_0^T Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']} (dW_s - \beta_s^\alpha ds) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} (f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']})) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta_s^\alpha$  is a bounded progressively measurable process given by, for  $s \geq 0$ ,

$$\beta_s^\alpha := \frac{f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']})}{|Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}|^2} (Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']})^\top \mathbf{1}_{Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} \neq Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Let us set  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^\alpha$  the Girsanov's probability associated to  $\beta^\alpha$ . Then, by taking the expectation under  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^\alpha$ , by using Proposition 3.2,  $(\mathcal{H}_0)$ , Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and Proposition 2.10 with  $2q$  if  $q \geq 1$  or with 2 and Jensen's inequality if  $0 \leq q < 1$ , the

fact that  $\mathcal{W}_1 \leq \mathcal{W}_2$ , Jensen's inequalities and Young's inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
|u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - u^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| &\leq e^{-\alpha T} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^\alpha \left[ \left| Y_T^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Y_T^{\alpha, x', [\theta']} \right| \right] \\
&\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^\alpha \left[ \left| f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) \right| \right] ds \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\alpha} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\alpha T} \\
&\quad + C \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^\alpha \left[ \left( 1 + \left| X_s^{x, [\theta]} \right|^q + \left| X_s^{x', [\theta']} \right|^q + \left\| X_s^{[\theta]} \right\|_{2q+2}^q + \left\| X_s^{[\theta']} \right\|_{2q+2}^q \right) \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \left( \left| X_s^{x, [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']} \right|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) \right] ds \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\alpha} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\alpha T} \\
&\quad + C (1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^\alpha \left[ \left| X_s^{x, [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']} \right|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_2([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  does not depend on  $\alpha$ . Then, we just have to apply Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 2.9 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - u^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| &\leq \frac{C}{\alpha} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\alpha T} \\
&\quad + C (1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon) \int_0^T e^{-\tilde{\lambda}s} ds
\end{aligned}$$

and, by taking  $T \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$|u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - u^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq C (1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon).$$

Therefore,  $\bar{u}^\alpha := u^\alpha - u^\alpha(0, \mu^*)$  satisfies also, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq C (1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon) \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x, [\theta])| \leq C (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}). \quad (3.7)$$

Consequently, by using a diagonal procedure, there exists a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_n \searrow_0$  and  $\bar{u}$  such that  $\bar{u}^{\alpha_n} \rightarrow \bar{u}$  on a countable dense subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (which exists since both are separable, see e.g. the paragraph after [10, Corollary 5.6]). We can extend this convergence on the whole space due to the equicontinuous estimate. It is easy to see that  $\bar{u}$  satisfies 1., 2. and 3. thanks to estimates (3.6)-(3.7). We set  $\bar{Y}^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} := \bar{u}^{\alpha_n}(X^{x, [\theta]}, [X^{[\theta]}])$  and  $\bar{Y}^{x, [\theta]} := \bar{u}(X^{x, [\theta]}, [X^{[\theta]}])$ . Furthermore, since  $|\alpha u^\alpha(0, \mu^*)| \leq C$  due to (3.2), we have that there exists  $\lambda$  such that  $(\alpha_n u^{\alpha_n}(0, \mu^*))_n$  tends to  $\lambda$  up to a subsequence that, by a slight abuse of notation, we still denote  $(\alpha_n)_n$ . Then, due to (3.7) and classical estimates on SDEs, we know that, for any  $T > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \sup_{\alpha > 0} \left| \bar{Y}_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} \right|^2 \right] \leq C \left( 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left| X_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^{2q+2} \right] + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q \right) < +\infty.$$

Hence, by dominated convergence theorem, we get, for all  $T > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left| \bar{Y}_t^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} - \bar{Y}_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^2 dt \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \bar{Y}_T^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} - \bar{Y}_T^{x, [\theta]} \right|^2 \longrightarrow 0.$$

By applying Itô's formula to  $|\tilde{Y}_t|^2$  where  $\tilde{Y} := \bar{Y}^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} - \bar{Y}^{\alpha_m, x, [\theta]}$  and  $\tilde{Z} := Z^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} - Z^{\alpha_m, x, [\theta]}$ , for  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , one could get that  $(Z^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]})_n$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^d))$  and thus that there exists  $\bar{Z}^{x, [\theta]} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^d))$  such that, for all  $T > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left| \bar{Z}_t^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} - \bar{Z}_t^{x, [\theta]} \right|^2 dt \longrightarrow 0.$$



By applying same arguments as in [14], we can also prove the existence of a measurable function  $\bar{\zeta} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\bar{Z}^{x, [\theta]} = \bar{\zeta}(X^x, [X^{[\theta]}])$ . Finally, we can pass to the limit in the BSDE

$$\bar{Y}_0^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} = \bar{Y}_T^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} + \int_0^T \left( f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]}) - \alpha_n \bar{Y}_s^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} - \alpha_n u^{\alpha_n}(0, \mu^*) \right) ds - \int_0^T \bar{Z}_s^{\alpha_n, x, [\theta]} dW_s,$$

in order to show that  $(\bar{Y}^{x, [\theta]}, \bar{Z}^{x, [\theta]}, \lambda)$  is a solution to (Decoupled EBSDE).

**Uniqueness:** Let  $(Y^{x, [\theta]}, Z^{x, [\theta]}, \lambda)$  and  $(Y'^{x, [\theta]}, Z'^{x, [\theta]}, \lambda')$  be solutions to (Decoupled EBSDE) with  $(u, \zeta)$  and  $(u', \zeta')$  respectively associated to  $(Y, Z)$  and  $(Y', Z')$  with same property as  $\bar{u}$  defined above. Denoting  $\tilde{Y} := Y^{x, [\theta]} - Y'^{x, [\theta]}$  and  $\tilde{Z} := Z^{x, [\theta]} - Z'^{x, [\theta]}$ , we have

$$-d\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Z}_t \beta_t dt - (\lambda - \lambda') dt - \tilde{Z}_t dW_t = -(\lambda - \lambda') dt - \tilde{Z}_t dW_t^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\beta$  is the progressively measurable process given by

$$\beta_t := \frac{f(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}], Z_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}) - f(X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}], Z_t'^{\alpha, x, [\theta]})}{\left| Z_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Z_t'^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} \right|^2} (Z_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} - Z_t'^{\alpha, x, [\theta]})^\top \mathbf{1}_{Z_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} \neq Z_t'^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}} \quad (3.9)$$

and  $dW_t^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} := dW_t - \beta_t dt$ . Thus, by taking the expectation w.r.t. the new Girsanov's probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$  associated to  $\beta$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\tilde{Y}_0 - \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}}[\tilde{Y}_T]}{T} = \lambda - \lambda'.$$

Then, due to the polynomial growth of  $u, u'$  and Proposition 2.10, we obtain

$$|\lambda - \lambda'| \leq \frac{C}{T} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ 1 + |X_T^{x, [\theta]}|^{q+1} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+1}^{q+1} + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+1}^{q+1} \right] \leq \frac{C}{T} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|^{q+1}). \quad (3.10)$$

Thus, by taking  $T \rightarrow +\infty$ , we obtain that  $\lambda$  is unique.

Let us show now that  $u = u'$ . We can remark that  $(u(X^{x, \mu^*}, \mu^*), \zeta(X^{x, \mu^*}, \mu^*), \lambda)$  and  $(u'(X^{x, \mu^*}, \mu^*), \zeta'(X^{x, \mu^*}, \mu^*), \lambda)$  are solutions to the same classical, ergodic BSDE, i.e. a non-distribution dependent one. Since we assume that  $\sigma$  is invertible, we can apply [15, Theorem 20] in order to get that  $u(\cdot, \mu^*) = u'(\cdot, \mu^*)$ . Hence, since for all  $T > 0$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, \mu^*) = u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, \mu^*)$ , we have, due to (3.7), the locally Lipschitz property of  $u, u'$ , Corollary 2.9 and (2.11),

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x, \theta) - u'(x, \theta)| &= \left| \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, \mu^*) + u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, \mu^*) - u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, \mu^*) \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, \mu^*) - u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{\mu^*}]) \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{\mu^*}]) - u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \left| u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{\mu^*}]) \right| \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \left| u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{\mu^*}]) - u'(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right| \right] \\ &\leq C \left( 1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}^q(\mu^*, 0) \right) \mathcal{W}_2(X_T^{[\theta]}, [X_T^{\mu^*}])^\epsilon \\ &\leq C \left( 1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}^q(\mu^*, 0) \right) \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], \mu^*)^\epsilon e^{-\gamma \epsilon T} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Uniqueness of  $Z$  is a direct consequence of Itô's formula applied to (3.8). □

### 3.2 Under the assumption $\mathcal{H}_2$

Let us assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$  holds.

*Proof of Theorem 3.4. **Existence:*** As in the proof of Section 3.1 we will prove that  $u^\alpha$ , defined for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  as  $u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) := Y_0^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}$ , satisfies an equicontinuous estimate, firstly with respect to  $x$  and then with respect to  $[\theta]$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . We have, by applying Itô's formula to  $e^{-\alpha t} Y_t^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} u^\alpha(x, [\theta]) &= Y_0^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} = e^{-\alpha T} Y_T^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]}) ds - \int_0^T Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} dW_s \\ &= e^{-\alpha T} Y_T^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], 0) ds + \int_0^T Z_s^{\alpha, x, [\theta]} (dW_s - \beta_0^\alpha(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}]) ds), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

with

$$\beta_0^\alpha(x, \mu) := \frac{f(x, \mu, \zeta^\alpha(x, \mu)) - f(x, \mu, 0)}{|\zeta^\alpha(x, \mu)|^2} \zeta^\alpha(x, \mu)^\top \mathbf{1}_{\zeta^\alpha(x, \mu) \neq 0}, \quad \forall (x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}. \quad (3.12)$$

We already know that  $\beta_0^\alpha$  is bounded by  $K_z^f$ , so we can apply Girsanov's theorem. However,  $\beta_0^\alpha$  is not necessarily Lipschitz but we can approximate it thanks to the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.7.** *There exists a uniformly bounded sequence of Lipschitz function  $(\beta_{0,n}^\alpha)_n$  such that,  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\beta_{0,n}^\alpha\|_\infty < +\infty$ ,*

$$|\beta_{0,n}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - \beta_{0,n}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq C_n |x - x'| + C_n \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta']), \quad \forall (x, \theta), (x', \theta') \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d),$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \beta_{0,n}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) = \beta_0^\alpha(x, [\theta]), \quad \forall (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

*Proof.* By lifting  $[\theta]$  on the Hilbert space  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \supset L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  we get a function  $\check{\beta}^\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that for all  $\check{\theta} \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \sim [\theta]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\check{\beta}^\alpha(x, \check{\theta}) = \beta^\alpha(x, [\theta])$ . Then, we can apply [9, Lemma 3.5] in order to get the existence of a uniformly bounded sequence of Lipschitz lifted functions  $(\check{\beta}_{0,n}^\alpha)_n$  such that  $\check{\beta}_{0,n}^\alpha(x, \check{\theta}) \rightarrow \check{\beta}^\alpha(x, \check{\theta})$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , which implies that

$$\beta_{0,n}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) := \check{\beta}_{0,n}^\alpha(x, \check{\theta}) \rightarrow \check{\beta}^\alpha(x, \check{\theta}) = \beta^\alpha(x, [\theta]), \quad \forall (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Moreover, for all  $(x, \check{\theta}), (x', \check{\theta}') \in \mathbb{R}^d \times L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $[\check{\theta}] = [\theta]$  and  $[\check{\theta}'] = [\theta']$ , we have

$$|\beta_{0,n}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - \beta_{0,n}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| = |\check{\beta}_{0,n}^\alpha(x, \check{\theta}) - \check{\beta}_{0,n}^\alpha(x', \check{\theta}')| \leq C_n |x - x'| + C_n \mathbb{E}[|\check{\theta} - \check{\theta}'|^2]^{1/2}.$$

Then, it just remains to take for  $(\check{\theta}, \check{\theta}')$  an optimal coupling of  $([\theta], [\theta'])$  for the  $\mathcal{W}_2$ -Wasserstein distance in order to conclude.  $\square$

Let us denote  $(Y^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]}, Z^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]})$  the solution of the infinite horizon BSDE (3.11) where  $\beta_0^\alpha$  is replaced by  $\beta_{0,n}^\alpha$  and  $u^{\alpha, n}(x, [\theta]) := Y_0^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]}$ . Then using Girsanov's theorem we get that there exists  $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}^\alpha$  for which  $W_t^{\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}^\alpha} = W_t - \int_0^t \beta_{0,n}^\alpha(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}]) ds$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}^\alpha$ -Brownian motion and we obtain, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\alpha, n}(x, [\theta]) &= e^{-\alpha T} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}^\alpha} \left[ u^{\alpha, n}(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}^\alpha} \left[ f(X_s^{x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], 0) \right] ds \\ &= e^{-\alpha T} \mathcal{P}_T^{\alpha, n} [u^{\alpha, n}](x, [\theta]) + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathcal{P}_s^{\alpha, n} [f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)](x, [\theta]) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where  $(\mathcal{P}_t^{\alpha, n})_{t \geq 0}$  is the semigroup associated to the following family of SDEs

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]} &= b(X_t^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) dt + \sigma(X_t^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]}) \beta_{0,n}^\alpha(X_s^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}]) dt + \sigma(X_t^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]}) dW_t, \quad t \geq 0, \\ X_0^{\alpha, n, x, [\theta]} &= x. \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

Let us set  $\bar{u}^{\alpha, n} := u^{\alpha, n} - u^{\alpha, n}(0, \mu^*)$ . Then, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , (3.13) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^{\alpha, n}(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}^{\alpha, n}(x', [\theta]) &= e^{-\alpha T} (\mathcal{P}_T^{\alpha, n} [u^{\alpha, n}](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_T^{\alpha, n} [u^{\alpha, n}](x', [\theta])) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} (\mathcal{P}_s^{\alpha, n} [f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_s^{\alpha, n} [f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)](x', [\theta])) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

By using Proposition 3.2, Proposition 2.11 and Theorem 2.15 in (3.15), we obtain that there exists  $C$  that does not depend on  $n$  and  $\alpha$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{u}^{\alpha,n}(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}^{\alpha,n}(x', [\theta])| &\leq e^{-\alpha T} \frac{C}{\alpha} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) \\ &\quad + C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) |x - x'|^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \int_0^T e^{-(\alpha + \frac{\eta\epsilon}{2})s} ds \\ &\xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) |x - x'|^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Then, the same diagonal argument as in the second step of the proof of [15, Proposition 16] gives us that  $\bar{u}^{\alpha,n} \rightarrow \bar{u}^\alpha := u^\alpha - u^\alpha(0, \mu^*)$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , up to a subsequence. It easily implies, thanks to (3.16), that, there exists  $C$  that does not depend on  $\alpha$  such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) |x - x'|^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}. \quad (3.17)$$

It remains to deal with  $\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])$ , for all  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ . To that end, we will not use the same probability change as above. Indeed, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta']) &= e^{-\alpha T} (Y_T^{\alpha, x', [\theta]} - Y_T^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - \int_0^T (Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta]} - Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) (dW_s - \beta_s^\alpha ds) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \left( f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) \right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\beta_s^\alpha$  given in (3.5) where  $x$  is replaced by  $x'$ . We have, due to the boundedness of  $\beta^\alpha$  and Girsanov's theorem, that there exists  $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha$  under which  $dW^{\mathbb{Q}^\alpha} := dW_s - \beta_s^\alpha ds$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha$ -Brownian motion. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta']) &= e^{-\alpha T} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \bar{u}^\alpha(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \left( f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) \right) ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Thanks to (3.18), let us prove now by induction that  $\bar{u}^\alpha$  satisfies, for all  $n \geq 0, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| &\leq A_n(1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2} \\ &\quad + C_\alpha (C e^{-\alpha T})^n (1 + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (HR_n)$$

with  $(A_n)_n$  that satisfies the following induction relation:

$$A_{n+1} = C_T + A_n C e^{-\frac{\eta\epsilon}{2}T}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad A_0 = 0, \quad (3.19)$$

where  $C_\alpha, C_T, C$  do not depend on  $n$ ,  $C_\alpha$  and  $C$  do not depend on  $T$ ,  $C_T$  and  $C$  do not depend on  $\alpha$ . First, due to Proposition 3.2, we have

$$|u^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - u^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq \frac{C}{\alpha} (1 + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}),$$

which proves the initial case. Let us now move on to the inductive step. First, due to the Cauchy-Schwarz's and Jensen's inequalities,  $(HR_n)$  and (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \\
& \leq e^{-\alpha T} \left( \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| \bar{u}^\alpha(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) \right| \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| \bar{u}^\alpha(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right| \right] \right) \\
& \quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) \right| \right] ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{\alpha, x', [\theta']}) \right| \right] ds \\
& \leq C e^{-\alpha T} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left( 1 + |X_T^{x', [\theta]}|^{2q+1} + |X_T^{x', [\theta']}|^{2q+1} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{2q+1} \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |X_T^{x', [\theta]} - X_T^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/4} \right. \\
& \quad + e^{-\alpha T} A_n \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left( 1 + |X_T^{x', [\theta]}|^{q+1/2} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|X_T^{[\theta']}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} \right) \mathcal{W}_1([X_T^{[\theta]}], [X_T^{[\theta']}])^{\epsilon/2} \right. \\
& \quad + e^{-\alpha T} C_\alpha (C e^{-\alpha T})^n \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left( 1 + |X_T^{x', [\theta]}|^{q+1} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|X_T^{[\theta']}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} \right) \right. \\
& \quad + C \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left( 1 + |X_s^{x', [\theta]}|^{2q+1} + |X_s^{x', [\theta']}|^{2q+1} + \|X_s^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{2q+1} \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |X_s^{x', [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/4} ds \\
& \quad \left. \left. + C \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left( 1 + |X_s^{x', [\theta]}|^q + \|X_s^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^q + \|X_s^{[\theta']}\|_{2q+2}^q \right) \mathcal{W}_1([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon ds \right] \right] \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by using Proposition 2.14 with  $p = 2q+1$  or  $2q$  if  $q \geq 1$  and, using Cauchy-Schwarz's and Jensen's inequality, with  $p = 2$  otherwise, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| & \leq C e^{-\alpha T} (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |X_T^{x', [\theta]} - X_T^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/4} \\
& \quad + C e^{-\alpha T} (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) A_n \mathcal{W}_1([X_T^{[\theta]}], [X_T^{[\theta']}])^{\epsilon/2} \\
& \quad + C_\alpha (C e^{-\alpha T})^{n+1} \left( 1 + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} \right) \\
& \quad + C (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |X_s^{x', [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/4} ds \\
& \quad + C (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \mathcal{W}_1([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^{\epsilon/2} ds. \tag{3.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we want to obtain a suitable bound on  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |X_t^{x', [\theta]} - X_t^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ . By applying Itô's formula to  $|X_t^{x', [\theta]} - X_t^{x', [\theta']}|^2$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha$ , we get by the Lipschitz property of  $b$  and  $\sigma$ , and the boundedness of  $\beta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
d|\tilde{X}_t|^2 & := d|X_t^{x', [\theta]} - X_t^{x', [\theta']}|^2 = 2 \left\langle \tilde{X}_t, b(X_t^{x', [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(X_t^{x', [\theta']}, [X_t^{[\theta']}]) \right\rangle dt + 2 \left\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta]}) - \sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta']})) \beta_t^\alpha \right\rangle dt \\
& \quad + \left\| \sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta]}) - \sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta']}) \right\|^2 dt + 2 \left\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta]}) - \sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta']})) dW_t^{\mathbb{Q}^\alpha} \right\rangle \\
& \leq 2K_x^b |\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + 2K_{\mathcal{L}}^b |\tilde{X}_t| \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{[\theta]}], [X_t^{[\theta']}]) dt + 2\sqrt{2K_x^\sigma} |\beta^\alpha|_\infty |\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + 2K_x^\sigma |\tilde{X}_t|^2 dt + dM_t,
\end{aligned}$$

with the martingale  $dM_t = 2 \left\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta]}) - \sigma(X_t^{x', [\theta']})) dW_t^{\mathbb{Q}^\alpha} \right\rangle$ . Hence, by using Young's inequality, Theorem 2.12 and Grönwall's lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |\tilde{X}_t|^2 \right] & \leq \left( 2K_x^b + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b + 2K_x^\sigma + 2\sqrt{2K_x^\sigma} |\beta^\alpha|_\infty \right) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |\tilde{X}_s|^2 \right] ds + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \int_0^t \mathcal{W}_1([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^2 ds \\
& \leq \left( 2K_x^b + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b + 2K_x^\sigma + 2\sqrt{2K_x^\sigma} |\beta^\alpha|_\infty \right) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |\tilde{X}_s|^2 \right] ds + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b \int_0^t e^{-2\tilde{\eta}s} \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^2 ds \\
& \leq \frac{K_{\mathcal{L}}^b}{2\tilde{\eta}} \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^2 e^{(2K_x^b + K_{\mathcal{L}}^b + 2K_x^\sigma + 2\sqrt{2K_x^\sigma} |\beta^\alpha|_\infty)t} =: C_t \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^2. \tag{3.21}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using (3.21), Theorem 2.12, Theorem 2.13 and the fact that  $e^{-\alpha T} \leq 1$  in (3.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| &\leq (Ce^{-\frac{\eta\epsilon}{2}T} A_n + C_T)(1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2} \\ &\quad + C_\alpha (Ce^{-\alpha T})^{n+1} \left(1 + |x'|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives that  $(HR_n)$  holds for all  $n \geq 0$ . Now, for a given  $\alpha > 0$  we set  $T_\alpha$  large enough in order to have  $Ce^{-\alpha T_\alpha} < 1$  and  $Ce^{-\frac{\eta\epsilon}{2}T_\alpha} < 1$  in  $(HR_n)$ . Thus  $(A_n)_n$  is a contractive sequence and hence admits a limit  $A_\infty$  that depends on  $\alpha$ . By taking  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $(HR_n)$  gives us

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq A_\infty (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2}.$$

But, by doing the same computations as for proving  $(HR_n)$ , we also get

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq \tilde{A}_n (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2}, \quad (HR'_n)$$

with  $(\tilde{A}_n)_n$  that satisfies the following induction relation:

$$\tilde{A}_{n+1} = C_T + \tilde{A}_n Ce^{-\frac{\eta\epsilon}{2}T}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \tilde{A}_0 = A_\infty, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $C_T$  and  $C$  do not depend on  $n$  and  $\alpha$ ,  $C$  does not depend on  $T$ . Now we can set  $T$  (independently of  $\alpha$ ) such that  $Ce^{-\frac{\eta\epsilon}{2}T} < 1$ , which gives us that  $(\tilde{A}_n)_n$  is a contractive sequence and hence admits a limit  $\tilde{A}_\infty$  that does not depend on  $\alpha$ . Thus, letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the previous inequality gives the following estimate, uniformly in  $\alpha$ ,

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq \tilde{A}_\infty (1 + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2}. \quad (3.23)$$

Then, combining it with (3.17) gives us, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \left( \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2} + |x - x'|^{\epsilon/2} \right),$$

which is the wanted equicontinuous estimate. Then we just have to follow the end of the proof of Section 3.1 in order to prove the existence of a solution to (Decoupled EBSDE).

**Uniqueness:** The proof of the uniqueness is the same as in Section 3.1, up to the  $\mathcal{W}_2$ -Wasserstein distance that is replaced by the  $\mathcal{W}_1$  one. □

**Remark 3.8.** If  $f$  is globally  $\epsilon$ -Hölder, i.e.  $q = 0$  in (3.1), then  $\bar{u}$  is globally  $\epsilon$ -Hölder too. Namely,

$$|\bar{u}(x, [\theta]) - \bar{u}(x', [\theta'])| \leq C(|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon).$$

Indeed, for the  $x$  part, it follows from (3.15) and *Remark 2.16*. For the distribution part, we instead prove, by using the same computation and the new globally  $\epsilon$ -Hölder estimate w.r.t  $x$ , the following inductive relation

$$|\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| \leq A_n \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon + C_\alpha (Ce^{-\alpha T})^n (1 + |x'| + \|\theta\|_2 + \|\theta'\|_2).$$

Hence, by following computations, up to Cauchy-Schwarz's inequalities, leading to (3.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta]) - \bar{u}^\alpha(x', [\theta'])| &\leq Ce^{-\alpha T} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| X_T^{x', [\theta]} - X_T^{x', [\theta']} \right| \right]^\epsilon + Ce^{-\alpha T} A_n \mathcal{W}_1 \left( \left[ X_T^{[\theta]} \right], \left[ X_T^{[\theta']} \right] \right)^\epsilon \\ &\quad + C_\alpha (Ce^{-\alpha T})^{n+1} (1 + |x'| + \|\theta\|_2 + \|\theta'\|_2) \\ &\quad + C \int_0^T e^{-\alpha s} \left( \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| X_s^{x', [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']} \right| \right]^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_1 \left( \left[ X_s^{[\theta]} \right], \left[ X_s^{[\theta']} \right] \right)^\epsilon \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

and we bound  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| X^{x', [\theta]} - X^{x', [\theta']} \right| \right]^\epsilon \leq \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| X^{x', [\theta]} - X^{x', [\theta']} \right|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2}$  as before. It is then sufficient to apply the same arguments to reach a conclusion.

## 4 Long-time behaviour of McKean-Vlasov BSDEs

The main goal of this section is to establish long-time behaviour of the solution of the (decoupled) finite horizon BSDE towards the solution to the (decoupled) McKean-Vlasov infinite horizon EBSDE. Let us denote  $(Y^{T,x,[\theta]}, Z^{T,x,[\theta]})$  the solution of the decoupled McKean-Vlasov finite horizon BSDE,  $(Y^{T,[\theta]}, Z^{T,[\theta]})$  the solution of the coupled finite horizon BSDE and  $(Y^{x,[\theta]}, Z^{x,[\theta]}, \lambda)$  the solution to the decoupled EBSDE. Namely, we set:

$$Y_t^{T,x,[\theta]} = g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) + \int_t^T f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (\text{Decoupled BSDE})$$

$$Y_t^{x,[\theta]} = Y_T^{x,[\theta]} + \int_t^T \left( f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{x,[\theta]}) - \lambda \right) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{x,[\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T < \infty, \quad (\text{Decoupled EBSDE})$$

where we recall that  $X^{x,[\theta]}$  and  $X^{[\theta]}$  are, respectively, the solutions of (Decoupled SDE) and (MV-SDE) and for  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  being such that

**Assumption** ( $\mathcal{H}_g$ ). There exist  $q \geq 0$ ,  $c > 0$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  such that, for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

1.  $|g(x, [\theta])| \leq c(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ ,
2.  $|g(x, [\theta]) - g(x', [\theta'])| \leq c(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q)(|x - x'|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon)$ .

Without loss of generality, we can take the same  $q$  in  $(\mathcal{H}_g)$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_0)$ . We will assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  or that  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$  hold: Thus, we can apply Theorem 3.4 in order to get the existence of a triplet  $(u, \zeta, \lambda)$  such that  $(u(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]), \zeta(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]), \lambda)$  is a solution to (Decoupled EBSDE) and  $u$  has growth and smoothness properties specified in Theorem 3.4. In the remaining of this section, we will always consider this solution of (Decoupled EBSDE). We will now establish three different long-time behaviour for (Decoupled BSDE).

**Theorem 4.1** (LTB 1). Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ -( $\mathcal{H}_g$ ) or that  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ -( $\mathcal{H}_g$ ) hold. Then, there exists  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and all  $T > 0$ ,

$$\left| \frac{Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]}}{T} - \lambda \right| \leq C \frac{1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}}{T}. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $T > 0$ . We have

$$\left| \frac{Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]}}{T} - \lambda \right| \leq \left| \frac{Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - Y_0^{x,[\theta]} - \lambda T}{T} \right| + \left| \frac{Y_0^{x,[\theta]}}{T} \right|.$$

First, by the growth property of  $u$ ,  $|Y_0^{x,[\theta]}| = |u(x, [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ . Furthermore, we have, for  $\tilde{Z} = Z^{T,x,[\theta]} - Z^{x,[\theta]}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - Y_0^{x,[\theta]} - \lambda T &= g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) + \int_0^T f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{x,[\theta]}) ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \tilde{Z}_s dW_s \\ &= g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - \int_0^T \tilde{Z}_s (dW_s - \beta_s^T ds), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_s^T = \frac{f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{x,[\theta]})}{|\tilde{Z}_s|^2} \tilde{Z}_s^\top \mathbf{1}_{Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]} \neq Z_s^{x,[\theta]}}.$$

By assumptions on  $f$ ,  $\beta^T$  is bounded, thus by Girsanov's theorem, there exists  $\mathbb{Q}_T$  s.t  $W_t^T = W_t - \int_0^t \beta_s^T ds$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}_T$ -Brownian motion. Then, we get from the polynomial growth of  $u$  and the assumption on  $g$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - Y_0^{x,[\theta]} - \lambda T \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_T} \left[ g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_T} \left[ \left| g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right| \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_T} \left[ \left| u(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right| \right] \\ &\leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_T} \left[ \left| X_T^{x,[\theta]} \right|^{q+1} \right] + \left\| X_T^{[\theta]} \right\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Using Jensen's inequality and Proposition 2.10 or Proposition 2.14 (depending on the assumptions set), we get

$$\left| Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - Y_0^{x,[\theta]} - \lambda T \right| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}), \quad (4.3)$$

which gives the wanted result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** This previous results would still holds if we drop the Markovian assumption on the terminal condition as long as it satisfies the suitable growth condition. Namely, it is enough to consider a terminal condition  $\xi^T$  such that  $|\xi^T| \leq C(1 + |X_T^{x,[\theta]}|^{q+1} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ , see for instance [15, Theorem 21] in the non-McKean-Vlasov framework. Moreover, it should also be possible to deal with an unbounded path-dependent terminal condition by adapting the proof of [16, Theorem 4.1].

**Theorem 4.3** (LTB 2). *Assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ -( $\mathcal{H}_g$ ) or that  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ -( $\mathcal{H}_g$ ) hold. Let us also enrich  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  by assuming that  $\sigma$  is uniformly elliptic. Then, there exists  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$  such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $T > 0$ , we have*

$$\left| Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - \lambda T - Y_0^{x,[\theta]} - \ell \right| \leq C \left( 1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} \right) e^{-\eta T}. \quad (4.4)$$

*Proof.* The idea of the proof follows the same as the one in [16, Theorem 4.4]. For all  $T > 0$ , we introduce  $w^T : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  as  $w^T(t, x, [\theta]) := u^T(t, x, [\theta]) - \lambda(T - t) - u(x, [\theta])$ . The equicontinuous property of  $u$  allows us to obtain the following equicontinuous property on  $w^T$  for all  $T > 0$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Assume that assumptions of Theorem 4.3 hold. There exists  $C > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$  such that, for all  $T > 0$ ,  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

1. *for  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} |w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - w^T(0, x', [\theta'])| &\leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) |x - x'|^{\epsilon/2} e^{-\eta T} \\ &\quad + C(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

2. *for  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ ,*

$$|w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - w^T(0, x', [\theta'])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \left( |x - x'|^{\epsilon/2} e^{-\eta T} + \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^{\epsilon/2} \right). \quad (4.6)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* 1. We start by proving the result under  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ .

1.1. First, let us fix  $\theta$  and look only for the estimate w.r.t  $x$ , that is to say  $|w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - w^T(0, x', [\theta])|$ . Let  $\beta^T$  be given, for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , by

$$\beta^T(s, x) = \frac{f(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}], \zeta^T(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}])) - f(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}], \zeta(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}]))}{\left| (\zeta^T - \zeta)(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}]) \right|^2} ((\zeta^T - \zeta)(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}]))^\top \mathbf{1}_{(\zeta^T - \zeta)(x, [X_s^{[\theta]}]) \neq 0}.$$

Due to the Lipschitz property of  $f$  w.r.t  $z$ ,  $\beta^T$  is bounded by  $K_z^f$ . Consequently, let us set  $\mathbb{Q}^T$  the Girsanov's probability associated to  $\beta^T$  under which  $dW^T := dW_t - \beta^T(s, x)ds$  is a Brownian motion. Then,  $w^T(0, x, [\theta])$  writes under  $\mathbb{Q}^T$

$$w^T(0, x, [\theta]) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right].$$

By using Lemma 3.7, we denote  $(\beta_n^T)$  a sequence of Lipschitz functions, uniformly bounded with respect to  $n$ , approximating  $\beta_\theta^T$ ,  $(\mathbb{Q}_n^T)$  the associated probabilities coming from Girsanov's Theorem, and, for all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_n^T} \left[ g(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right].$$

Then, for all  $n \geq 0$ , we can introduce  $\mathcal{P}^n$  the semi-group associated to the following standard SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]} = \left( b(X_t^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) + \beta_n^T(t, X_t^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}) \sigma(X_t^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \right) dt + \sigma(X_t^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) dW_t, & t \in [0, T], \\ X_0^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]} = x. \end{cases}$$

Hence, we can write  $w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) = \mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x, [\theta])$  and we obtain

$$|w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) - w^{T,n}(0, x', [\theta])| = |\mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x', [\theta])|. \quad (4.7)$$

Let us prove that

$$|\mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x', [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2})e^{-\gamma\epsilon T/2}|x - x'|^{\epsilon/2}.$$

Let  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}')$  be an optimal coupling of  $(X^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, X^{\beta_n^T, x', [\theta]})$  w.r.t the  $\mathcal{W}_1$ -Wasserstein distance. By using the locally Hölder property of  $g$  and  $u$ , Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and Proposition 2.10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x, [\theta]) - \mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x', [\theta])| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ g(X_T^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ g(X_T^{\beta_n^T, x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{\beta_n^T, x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ g(\mathcal{U}_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(\mathcal{U}_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ g(\mathcal{U}'_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(\mathcal{U}'_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| g(\mathcal{U}_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - g(\mathcal{U}'_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| u(\mathcal{U}_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(\mathcal{U}'_T, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) \right| \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ (1 + |\mathcal{U}_T|^q + |\mathcal{U}'_T|^q + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^q) |\mathcal{U}_T - \mathcal{U}'_T|^\epsilon \right] \\ &\leq (1 + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_T|^{2q+1}]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}'_T|^{2q+1}]^{1/2} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_T - \mathcal{U}'_T|]^\epsilon \\ &\leq (1 + \mathbb{E}^{Q_n^T} \left[ |X_T^{x, [\theta]}|^{2q+1} \right]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}^{Q_n^T} \left[ |X_T^{x', [\theta]}|^{2q+1} \right]^{1/2} + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1(X_T^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, X_T^{\beta_n^T, x', [\theta]})^\epsilon \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) \mathcal{W}_1(X_T^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, X_T^{\beta_n^T, x', [\theta]})^\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Now, we want to use Theorem A.2 with  $\mathbf{b}(t, \cdot) = \mathbf{b}'(t, \cdot) = b(\cdot, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) + \sigma(\cdot, [X_t^{[\theta]}])\beta_n^T(t, \cdot)$ . Firstly, we can check that  $\mathbf{b}$  satisfies (A.2) uniformly in  $n$ : for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $R' > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle x - x', b(x, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) - b(x', [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \right\rangle + \left\langle x - x', \sigma(x, [X_t^{[\theta]}])\beta_n^T(t, x) - \sigma(x', [X_t^{[\theta]}])\beta_n^T(t, x) \right\rangle \\ &\leq -\eta|x - x'|^2 + 2\|\sigma\|_\infty \|\beta_n^T\|_\infty |x - x'| \\ &\leq -\eta|x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| > 2} + 2\|\sigma\|_\infty K_z^f |x - x'| (\mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| > 2} + \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| \leq 2}) \\ &\leq -(\eta - \frac{\|\sigma\|_\infty K_z^f}{R'}) |x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| > R'} + 2\|\sigma\|_\infty K_z^f \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| \leq R'}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{b}$  satisfies *Assumption 3* with  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \eta - \frac{\|\sigma\|_\infty K_z^f}{R'} > K_x^\sigma$  considering  $R'$  to be large enough. Consequently, we can apply Theorem A.2 with  $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathbf{c} = 0$  to obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_1 \left( \left[ X_t^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]} \right], \left[ X_t^{\beta_n^T, x', [\theta]} \right] \right) \leq C e^{-\hat{\eta}t} |x - x'| \quad (4.9)$$

and we get, uniformly in  $n$ ,

$$|w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) - w^{T,n}(0, x', [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2}) |x - x'|^{\epsilon/2} e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon T/2}. \quad (4.10)$$

Now we want to take  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  in order to conclude this first step. Let us remark that  $(w^T(t, X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]), \delta Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , where  $\delta Z_t := Z_t^{T, x, [\theta]} - Z_t^{x, [\theta]}$ , is solution of the following BSDE

$$w^T(t, X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) = g(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) + \int_t^T \delta Z_s \beta_n^T(s, X_s^{x, [\theta]}) ds - \int_t^T \delta Z_s dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Moreover, by the existence and uniqueness of Lipschitz driven BSDE result, see [21], there exists a progressively measurable process  $\delta Z^n$  such that  $(w^{T,n}(t, X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]), \delta Z_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is solution of the following BSDE

$$w^{T,n}(t, X_t^{x, [\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) = g(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - u(X_T^{x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) + \int_t^T \delta Z_s^n \beta_n^T(s, X_s^{x, [\theta]}) ds - \int_t^T \delta Z_s^n dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$



Then a classical  $L^2$ -stability result for Lipschitz BSDEs gives us

$$|w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta])|^2 \leq C \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[|\beta^T(s, X_s^{x, [\theta]}) - \beta_n^T(s, X_s^{x, [\theta]})|^2] ds$$

and, applying Lebesgue's convergence theorem, we obtain  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) = w^T(0, x, [\theta])$ . Thus, (4.10) allows to get

$$|w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - w^T(0, x', [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + |x'|^{q+1/2} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2})|x - x'|^{\epsilon/2} e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon T/2},$$

which is the wanted estimate.

1.2. For the  $\theta$  part, let us fix  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We recall that, for all  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$w^T(0, x', [\theta]) - w^T(0, x', [\theta']) = u^T(0, x', [\theta]) - u^T(0, x', [\theta']) - (u(x', [\theta]) - u(x', [\theta'])). \quad (4.11)$$

Since  $u$  is  $\epsilon$ -locally Hölder w.r.t  $[\theta]$ , see Theorem 3.4, it suffices to prove that  $u^T$  is too. By introducing  $\beta'^T$  given by

$$\beta'_s{}^T = \frac{f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']})}{|Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]} - Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']}|^2} \left( Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]} - Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']} \right)^\top \mathbf{1}_{Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]} \neq Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']}}, \quad (4.12)$$

and  $\mathbb{Q}^T$  the associated probability coming from Girsanov's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u^T(0, x', [\theta]) - u^T(0, x', [\theta']) &= g(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - g(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \left( f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']}) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \left( Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]} - Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']} \right) dW_s \\ &= g(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - g(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \left( f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']}) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \left( Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]} - Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']} \right) (dW_s - \beta'_s{}^T ds) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ g(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - g(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ \int_0^T \left( f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']}) \right) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using the locally Hölder property of  $g$  and  $f$ , Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, Proposition 2.10, Theorem 2.7 and

Corollary 2.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u^T(0, x', [\theta]) - u^T(0, x', [\theta'])| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ \left| g(X_T^{x', [\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) - g(X_T^{x', [\theta']}, [X_T^{[\theta']}]) \right| \right] \\
& \quad + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ \left| f(X_s^{x', [\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x', [\theta']}, [X_s^{[\theta']}], Z_s^{T, x', [\theta']}) \right| \right] ds \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ C(1 + |X_T^{x', [\theta]}|^q + |X_T^{x', [\theta']}|^q + \|X_T^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^q + \|X_T^{[\theta']}\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( |X_T^{x', [\theta]} - X_T^{x', [\theta']}|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([X_T^{[\theta]}], [X_T^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ C(1 + |X_s^{x', [\theta]}|^q + |X_s^{x', [\theta']}|^q + \|X_s^{[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^q + \|X_s^{[\theta']}\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( |X_s^{x', [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']}|^\epsilon + \mathcal{W}_2([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) \right] ds \\
& \leq C(1 + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ |X_T^{x', [\theta]} - X_T^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_2([X_T^{[\theta]}], [X_T^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) \\
& \quad + C(1 + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \int_0^T \left( \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^T} \left[ |X_s^{x', [\theta]} - X_s^{x', [\theta']}|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_2([X_s^{[\theta]}], [X_s^{[\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) ds \\
& \leq C(1 + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (e^{-\gamma \epsilon T} + e^{-\Lambda \epsilon T}) \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta']) \\
& \quad + C(1 + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \int_0^T (e^{-\gamma \epsilon s} + e^{-\Lambda \epsilon s}) \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta']) ds \\
& \leq C(1 + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 4.4 under  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ .

2. Under  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ , the local regularity of  $w^T$  w.r.t.  $x$ , that is to say (4.6) when  $\theta = \theta'$ , follows by applying (2.24) to (4.7). It remains to prove the local regularity of  $w^T$  w.r.t.  $[\theta]$ . Using once again the decomposition (4.11) and since  $u$  is  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -locally Hölder w.r.t.  $[\theta]$ , see Theorem 3.4, it suffices to prove that  $u^T$  is too. To that end, we will prove the result using a recursive argument. Let us consider  $\tilde{T} > 0$  whose value will be precised later and  $N := \lfloor T/\tilde{T} \rfloor$ . By denoting  $(Y^{T, s, x, [\theta]}, Z^{T, s, x, [\theta]})$  the solution to the finite horizon BSDE (Decoupled BSDE) where  $(X^{x, [\theta]}, [X^{[\theta]}])$  is replaced by  $(X^{s, x, [\theta]}, [X^{s, [\theta]}])$ . We have, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$u^T(N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]) = g(X_T^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}]) + \int_{N\tilde{T}}^T f(X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}) ds - \int_{N\tilde{T}}^T Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} dW_s.$$

Let us show that  $u^T(N\tilde{T}, x, \cdot)$  satisfies a locally Hölder estimate: we are looking for  $A_0 \geq 0$  that does not depend on  $N$  and  $T$  such that

$$|u^T(N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]) - u^T(N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta'])| \leq A_0(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon.$$

First, by a Girsanov's argument with  $\mathbb{Q}^{N\tilde{T}}$  the probability associated to  $\beta_s^{N\tilde{T}}$  given by

$$\beta_s^{N\tilde{T}} = \frac{f(X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']}, [X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta']}], Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']})}{|Z_s^{T, x, [\theta]} - Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']}|^2} \left( Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} - Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']} \right)^\top \mathbf{1}_{Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} \neq Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']},$$

and by using the locally  $\epsilon$ -Hölder property of  $g$  and  $f$ , (3.21), Theorem 2.13 on  $[N\tilde{T}, T]$  and the facts that  $T - N\tilde{T} \leq \tilde{T}$  and that  $C_t$  in (3.21) is increasing in  $t$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| u^T \left( N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta] \right) - u^T \left( N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta'] \right) \right| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N\tilde{T}}} \left[ \left| g(X_T^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_T^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}]) - g(X_T^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']}, [X_T^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta']}]) \right| \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{N\tilde{T}}^T \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N\tilde{T}}} \left[ \left| f(X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}) - f(X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']}, [X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta']}], Z_s^{T, N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}) \right| \right] ds \\
& \leq C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N\tilde{T}}} \left[ \left| X_T^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} - X_T^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']} \right|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_1([X_T^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], [X_T^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) \\
& + C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \int_{N\tilde{T}}^T \left( \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N\tilde{T}}} \left[ \left| X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} - X_s^{N\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']} \right|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_1([X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], [X_s^{N\tilde{T}, [\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) ds \\
& \leq C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( C_{T-N\tilde{T}} + C e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon(T-N\tilde{T})} + C_{T-N\tilde{T}}(T-N\tilde{T}) + C \right) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon \\
& \leq C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) (C_{\tilde{T}} + C) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon \\
& = A_0(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Now we want to prove by induction the following estimate: for all  $k \in \llbracket 0, N \rrbracket$ ,

$$\left| u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta] \right) - u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta'] \right) \right| \leq A_k(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon, \tag{4.15}$$

where  $A_k$  satisfies, for  $C, C_{\tilde{T}} > 0$  that do not depends on  $T$  nor  $N$ ,

$$A_k = C_{\tilde{T}} + C e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon\tilde{T}} A_{k-1}, \quad k \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket, \quad A_0 = C_{\tilde{T}}.$$

If  $N = 0$ , we already have the desired result. Let us now look at the case  $N \geq 1$ . It has already been proven the initial case  $k = 0$  and we just have to look at the inductive step: for all  $k \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta] \right) &= u^T \left( (N+1-k)\tilde{T}, X_{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, [\theta]}] \right) + \int_{(N-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}} f(X_s^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]}, [X_s^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], Z_s^{T, x, [\theta]}) ds \\
&\quad - \int_{(N-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}} Z_s^{T, x, [\theta]} dW_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, replacing  $g$  by  $u^T((N+1-k)\tilde{T}, \cdot, \cdot)$  in previous computations, (4.14) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta] \right) - u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta'] \right) \right| \\
& \leq C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}}} \left[ \left| X_{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} - X_{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']} \right|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} \\
& + A_{k-1} \left( 1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q \right) \mathcal{W}_1([X_{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], [X_{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, [\theta']}])^\epsilon \\
& + C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \\
& \times \int_{(N-k)\tilde{T}}^{(N+1-k)\tilde{T}} \left( \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{(N-k)\tilde{T}}} \left[ \left| X_s^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta]} - X_s^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta']} \right|^2 \right]^{\epsilon/2} + \mathcal{W}_1([X_s^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, [\theta]}], [X_s^{(N-k)\tilde{T}, [\theta']}])^\epsilon \right) ds \\
& \leq C(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( C_{\tilde{T}} + C e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon\tilde{T}} A_{k-1} \right) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon \\
& := A_k(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.14) and (2.21). Moreover, for  $\tilde{T}$  such that  $C e^{-\hat{\eta}\epsilon\tilde{T}} \leq 1$ ,  $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is a contractive sequence and hence has a unique fixed point  $A_\infty$  which does not depend on  $N$  nor  $T$ . Hence, by setting  $A^* = \max(A_0, A_\infty)$  which does not depend on  $N$  nor  $T$ , we have for all  $k \in \llbracket 0, N \rrbracket$ ,

$$\left| u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta] \right) - u^T \left( (N-k)\tilde{T}, x, [\theta'] \right) \right| \leq A^*(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon.$$

In particular,

$$|u^T(0, x, [\theta]) - u^T(0, x, [\theta'])| \leq A^*(1 + |x|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \mathcal{W}_1([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon,$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

As soon as Lemma 4.4 holds, the proof of Theorem 4.3 is the same under  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$  or  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ , up to the differences implied by the equicontinuous terms and the polynomial growth w.r.t  $x$  and  $\theta$  in (4.5)-(4.6). Thus, we will only do the proof in the strong dissipative framework. Firstly, let us remark that setting  $[\theta] = \mu^*$ , with  $\mu^*$  the unique invariant measure of the solution to (MV-SDE), transposes the MKV's framework to a standard one since  $[X_t^{\mu^*}] = \mu^*$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Nevertheless, we cannot apply [15, Theorem 22] to get the result for  $\theta \sim \mu^*$  since our assumptions do not fit perfectly the ones requested in [15]. Using Lemma 4.4 and a diagonal procedure, there exist  $w$  and an increasing sequence  $(T_i)_i \rightarrow +\infty$  such that for all  $(x, [\theta]) \in \mathbb{D}$  a dense and countable subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} w^{T_i}(0, x, [\theta]) = w(0, x, [\theta]),$$

which can be extended on the whole product space due to the equicontinuous estimate (4.5). Moreover, by replacing  $T$  by  $T_i$  in (4.5), we get that  $w$  does not depend on  $x$ , i.e. there exists  $\bar{w}$ , such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} w^{T_i}(0, x, [\theta]) = \bar{w}([\theta]).$$

Using the same notation as in part 1.1. of the proof of Lemma 4.4, we have, for all  $T \geq 0$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$w^T(0, x, [\theta]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) \quad \text{and} \quad w^{T,n}(0, x, [\theta]) = \mathcal{P}_T^n[g - u](x, [\theta]), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thanks to the semigroup property of  $\mathcal{P}^n$  and Lemma 4.4 one could get for all  $T \leq S$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} |w^{T,n}(0, x, \mu^*) - w^{S,n}(0, x, [\theta])| &= |w^{T,n}(0, x, \mu^*) - \mathcal{P}_{S-T}^n[w^{T,n}(0, \cdot, \cdot)](x, [\theta])| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| w^{T,n}(0, x, \mu^*) - w^{T,n}(0, X_{S-T}^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_{S-T}^{[\theta]}]) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| w^{T,n}(0, x, [X_{S-T}^{\mu^*}]) - w^{T,n}(0, X_{S-T}^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]}, [X_{S-T}^{[\theta]}]) \right| \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 + |x|^{q+1/2} + \left| X_{S-T}^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]} \right|^{q+1/2} + \left\| X_{S-T}^{\mu^*} \right\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} + \left\| X_{S-T}^{[\theta]} \right\|_{2q+2}^{q+1/2} \right) \left| x - X_{S-T}^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]} \right|^{\epsilon/2} \right] e^{-\eta T} \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 + |x|^q + \left| X_{S-T}^{\beta_n^T, x, [\theta]} \right|^q + \left\| X_{S-T}^{\mu^*} \right\|_{2q+2}^q + \left\| X_{S-T}^{[\theta]} \right\|_{2q+2}^q \right) \right] \mathcal{W}_2([X_{S-T}^{\mu^*}], [X_{S-T}^{[\theta]}])^\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since the right hand side of the inequality does not depend on  $n$ , we can take  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then, by using Theorem 2.7, Proposition 2.6 and Proposition 2.10, we get, for all  $T \leq S$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , that

$$|w^T(0, x, \mu^*) - w^S(0, x, [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}(\mu^*, 0)^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})(e^{-\eta T} + \mathcal{W}_2(\mu^*, [\theta])e^{-\Lambda \epsilon(S-T)}). \quad (4.16)$$

We apply (4.16) with  $\theta \sim \mu^*$ ,  $S = T_i$  and we take  $i \rightarrow +\infty$  to get

$$|w^T(0, x, \mu^*) - \bar{w}(\mu^*)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}(\mu^*, 0)^{q+1})e^{-\eta T}, \quad (4.17)$$

which implies  $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} w^T(0, x, \mu^*) = \bar{w}(\mu^*)$ . Returning to (4.16), we take,  $S = T_i$ ,  $i \rightarrow +\infty$  and then  $T \rightarrow +\infty$  to obtain  $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} w^{T_i}(0, x, [\theta]) = \bar{w}(\mu^*)$ . Since  $(w^T(0, x, [\theta]))_T$  is bounded and has a unique accumulation point, we conclude that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} w^T(0, x, [\theta]) = \bar{w}(\mu^*)$ . Finally, by using (4.16) and (4.17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - \bar{w}(\mu^*)| &\leq \left| w^T(0, x, [\theta]) - w^{T/2}(0, x, \mu^*) \right| + \left| w^{T/2}(0, x, \mu^*) - \bar{w}(\mu^*) \right| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}(\mu^*, 0)^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})(e^{-\eta T/2} + \mathcal{W}_2(\mu^*, [\theta])e^{-\Lambda \epsilon T/2}) \\ &\quad + C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \mathcal{W}_{2q+2}(\mu^*, 0)^{q+1})e^{-\eta T/2} \end{aligned}$$

which gives us the result by setting  $\ell = \bar{w}(\mu^*)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.5** (LTB 3). *Let  $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ - $(\mathcal{H}_g)$  or  $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ - $(\mathcal{H}_g)$  be fulfilled. If we assume that  $b, \sigma$  are  $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$  with globally Lipschitz derivative w.r.t.  $x$ , then  $x \mapsto u^T(t, x, [\theta])$  and  $x \mapsto u(x, [\theta])$  are  $\mathcal{C}^1$  for all  $T > 0$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . Moreover, for all  $T \geq 1$ , there exists  $C > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$ , such that, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , the following holds*

$$|\nabla_x u^T(0, x, [\theta]) - \nabla_x u(x, [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})e^{-\eta T}. \quad (4.18)$$

and there exists a continuous version of  $Z^{T,x,[\theta]}$  and  $Z^{x,[\theta]}$  satisfying

$$|Z_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - Z_0^{x,[\theta]}| \leq C\|\sigma\|_\infty(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})e^{-\eta T}. \quad (4.19)$$

*Proof.* First of all, [13, Theorem 4.2] applied to BSDEs (Decoupled EBSDE), seen as a finite horizon BSDE on  $[0, T]$ , and (Decoupled BSDE) gives us the  $\mathcal{C}^1$  regularity of  $u^T(t, \cdot, [\theta])$  and  $u(\cdot, [\theta])$ . Moreover we have the following gradient representation of  $Z$  and  $Z^T$ , for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$Z_t^{x,[\theta]} = \nabla_x Y_t^{x,[\theta]} \sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) = \nabla_x u(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \quad (4.20)$$

$$Z_t^{T,x,[\theta]} = \nabla_x Y_t^{T,x,[\theta]} \sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) = \nabla_x u^T(t, X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) \quad (4.21)$$

that gives us some continuous version of  $Z^{x,[\theta]}$  and  $Z^{T,x,[\theta]}$ .

Let us set  $\bar{w}^T := w^T - \ell$  with  $\ell$  given in Theorem 4.3. By definition  $\bar{w}^T$  solves the following finite horizon BSDE on  $[0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}^T(t, X_t^{x,[\theta]}, [X_t^{[\theta]}]) &= \bar{w}^T(T, X_T^{x,[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) + \int_t^T \left( f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{x,[\theta]}) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T \left( Z_s^{T,x,[\theta]} - Z_s^{x,[\theta]} \right) dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting the previous BSDE on  $[0, \delta]$  for some  $\delta \in (0, T)$  and using the Markov property gives that  $\bar{w}^T$  solves, for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}^T(t, x, [\theta]) &= \bar{w}^T(\delta, X_\delta^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_\delta^{t,[\theta]}]) + \int_t^\delta \left( f(X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}], Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]}) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^\delta \left( Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]} - Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]} \right) dW_s \\ &= \bar{w}^{T-\delta}(0, X_\delta^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_\delta^{t,[\theta]}]) + \int_t^\delta \left( f(X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}], Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]}) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^\delta \left( Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]} - Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]} \right) dW_s. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

We want to obtain a suitable bound on  $\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(0, x, [\theta])$  by applying [13, Theorem 4.2 - (4.6)]. In particular, we want to track precisely the constant that appears in this estimate. By checking carefully the proof of [13, Theorem 4.2 - (4.6)], this bound follows from a standard regularization step and the application of [13, Theorem 3.10 and Corollary 3.11]. In particular, we can assume that  $f$  has the asked regularity by [13, Theorem 3.10] in order to apply it. Due to [8, Proposition 3.2], the regularity assumption on  $b, \sigma$  w.r.t  $x$  ensures that  $X^{\cdot,[\theta]}$  is differentiable for all  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega)$ . Then, let us set

$$U(t, s) := \frac{1}{s-t} \int_s^t \left\langle \sigma(X_r^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_r^{t,[\theta]}])^{-1} \nabla_x X_r^{t,x,[\theta]}, dW_r \right\rangle, \quad s \in (t, \delta].$$

A direct application of Itô's isometry and the classical estimate  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \nabla_x X_s^{t,x,[\theta]} \right|^2 \right] \leq e^{2c\delta}$  give us, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and all  $s \in (t, \delta]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[|U(t, s)|^2]^{1/2} \leq \frac{\|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty e^{c\delta}}{\sqrt{s-t}}.$$

We apply [13, Theorem 3.10] to (4.22). Hence, we obtain by using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and Theorem 4.3

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x \bar{w}^T(t, x, [\theta]) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \bar{w}^{T-\delta}(0, X_\delta^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_\delta^{t,[\theta]}]) U(t, \delta) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^\delta \left( f(X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]}) - f(X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}], Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]}) \right) U(t, s) ds \right], \\ |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(t, x, [\theta])| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ C \left( 1 + \left| X_\delta^{t,x,[\theta]} \right|^{q+1} + \left\| X_\delta^{t,[\theta]} \right\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} \right) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} |U(t, \delta)| \right] + K_z^f \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^\delta \left| Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]} - Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]} \right| |U(t, s)| ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Consequently, due to (4.20)-(4.21), the Markov property and the boundedness of  $\sigma$ ,

$$\left| Z_s^{T,t,x,[\theta]} - Z_s^{t,x,[\theta]} \right| \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty \left| \nabla_x \bar{w}^T(s, X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}]) \right|.$$

Then, (4.23) writes,

$$|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(t, x, [\theta])| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ C \left( 1 + |X_\delta^{t,x,[\theta]}|^{q+1} + \|X_\delta^{t,[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} \right) |U(t, \delta)| \right] e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} + K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^\delta |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(s, X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}])| |U(t, s)| ds \right].$$

Hence, by mimicking the proof of [13, Corollary 3.11], and following their notations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(t, x, [\theta]) &= I_2(t, x, [\theta]) = 0, \\ I_3(t, x, [\theta]) &= K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^\delta |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(s, X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}])| |U(t, s)| ds \right], \\ I_4(t, x, [\theta]) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ C \left( 1 + |X_\delta^{t,x,[\theta]}|^{q+1} + \|X_\delta^{t,[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1} \right) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} |U(t, \delta)| \right], \\ \|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T\| &:= \sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \frac{\sqrt{\delta-t}}{(1+|x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} e^{c\delta}} |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(t, x, [\theta])| \end{aligned}$$

we obtain, for  $\|I_4\|$  defined the same way, due to Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and Proposition 2.6 or Proposition 2.11

$$\begin{aligned} I_4(t, x, [\theta]) &\leq C \|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty \frac{e^{c\delta}}{\sqrt{\delta-t}} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)}, \\ \|I_4\| &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Using again Cauchy-Schwarz and Proposition 2.6 or Proposition 2.11, we also get

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(t, x, [\theta]) &\leq K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \int_t^\delta \mathbb{E} \left[ |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(s, X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}, [X_s^{t,[\theta]}])|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [|U(t, s)|^2]^{1/2} ds \\ &\leq K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T\| \int_t^\delta (1 + \mathbb{E} [|X_s^{t,x,[\theta]}|^{2q+2}]^{1/2} + \|X_s^{t,[\theta]}\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) \frac{e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} e^{c\delta}}{\sqrt{\delta-s}} \mathbb{E} [|U(t, s)|^2]^{1/2} ds \\ &\leq K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} \|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T\| \int_t^\delta \frac{\|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty e^{2c\delta}}{\sqrt{\delta-s} \sqrt{s}} ds \\ &= \pi K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty e^{2c\delta} (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} \|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T\|, \\ \|I_3\| &\leq \pi K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty \sqrt{\delta} e^{c\delta} \|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by taking  $\delta$  small enough such that  $\pi K_z^f \|\sigma\|_\infty \|\sigma^{-1}\|_\infty \sqrt{\delta} e^{c\delta} < 1$ , we obtain,  $\|\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(0, x, [\theta])\| \leq C$ . Thus, we have for the well-chosen  $\delta$

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(0, x, [\theta])| &\leq C (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\eta(T-\delta)} \frac{e^{c\delta}}{\sqrt{\delta}} \\ &\leq C (1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1}) e^{-\eta T}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of (4.18). For (4.19), we use again the gradient representations (4.20) and (4.21) to obtain, due to the boundedness of  $\sigma$ ,

$$\left| Z_0^{T,x,[\theta]} - Z_0^{x,[\theta]} \right| \leq |\nabla_x u^T(0, x, [\theta]) \sigma(x, [\theta]) - \nabla_x u(x, [\theta]) \sigma(x, [\theta])| \leq \|\sigma\|_\infty |\nabla_x \bar{w}^T(0, x, [\theta])|,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** One could remark that the above results holds for  $(Y^{T,\theta,[\theta]}, Z^{T,\theta,[\theta]}) =: (Y^{T,[\theta]}, Z^{T,[\theta]})$  the solution to the following finite-horizon *coupled* BSDE

$$Y_t^{T,[\theta]} = g(X_T^{[\theta]}, [X_T^{[\theta]}]) + \int_t^T f(X_s^{[\theta]}, [X_s^{[\theta]}], Z_s^{T,[\theta]}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{T,[\theta]} dW_s, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \theta \in L^2(\Omega)$$

towards  $(Y^{[\theta]}, Z^{[\theta]})$  part of the solution to (EBSDE).

## 5 Application to Optimal ergodic control problem

We introduce in this Section a partial McKean-Vlasov optimal ergodic control problem. Let us explain a little bit the denomination *partial*. If we see our McKean-Vlasov dynamic as the limit of a particle system where the number of particles tends to infinity, we are considering a problem where we want to control in an optimal way only one particle of this system. Then the limiting McKean-Vlasov dynamic is not impacted by the control (which differs from the mean-field game framework). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed, bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and let us define an admissible control  $\mathbf{a} : (\omega, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \ni a_s$  as an  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -progressively measurable process. We make the following assumptions throughout the section.

**Assumption 2.** Let  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$  and  $L, g$  be satisfying the following:

1.  $L : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and there exists  $q \geq 0$ ,  $C, K_x^L, K_{\mathcal{L}}^L > 0$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ , such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,
  - (a)  $|L(x, [\theta], a) - L(x', [\theta'], a)| \leq C(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( K_x^L |x - x'|^\epsilon + K_{\mathcal{L}}^L \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon \right)$ ,
  - (b)  $|L(x, [\theta], a)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ ,
2.  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and there exists  $q \geq 0$ ,  $C, K_x^g, K_{\mathcal{L}}^g > 0$ , such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,
  - (a)  $|g(x, [\theta]) - g(x', [\theta'])| \leq C(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( K_x^g |x - x'|^\epsilon + K_{\mathcal{L}}^g \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon \right)$ ,
  - (b)  $|g(x, [\theta])| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ .

Without restriction we can take same constants  $q$  and  $C$  for  $L$  and  $g$ .

Let us set, for any admissible control  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $T > 0$  the following Girsanov's change of probability

$$\rho_T^{\mathbf{a}} = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |Ra_t|^2 ds + \int_0^T (Ra_t)^\top dW_t \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_T^{\mathbf{a}} = \rho_T^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbb{P}.$$

Thanks to our assumptions,  $W_t^{\mathbf{a}} := W_t - \int_0^t Ra_s ds$  is a  $\mathbb{P}_T^{\mathbf{a}}$ -Brownian motion and so, we can write  $X^{[\theta]}$  and  $X^{x, [\theta]}$  the respective solutions to (MV-SDE) and (Decoupled SDE) w.r.t to that new Brownian motion without control on the distribution. Namely,

$$dX_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}} = \left( b(X_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}}]) + \sigma(X_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}}]) Ra_t \right) dt + \sigma(X_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], \mathbf{a}}]) dW_t^{\mathbf{a}}, \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$dX_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}} = \left( b(X_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], 0}]) + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], 0}]) Ra_t \right) dt + \sigma(X_t^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_t^{[\theta], 0}]) dW_t^{\mathbf{a}}, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $X^{\cdot, 0}$  satisfies (5.1) without control, i.e.  $a_t = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

**Remark 5.1.** We stress the fact that (5.2) is no longer of McKean-Vlasov's type but still have a distribution dependency w.r.t a McKean-Vlasov SDE.

Let us set the finite horizon cost as

$$J^T(x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{E}_T^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \int_0^T L(X_s^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_s^{[\theta], 0}], a_s) ds \right] + \mathbb{E}_T^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ g(X_T^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_T^{[\theta], 0}]) \right]$$

and the associated optimal control problem as the minimization of  $J^T$  over all admissible control  $\mathbf{a}$ . We can also define the ergodic cost as

$$J(x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}) = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_T^{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \int_0^T L(X_s^{x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}}, [X_s^{[\theta], 0}], a_s) ds \right]$$

and the associated optimal control problem as the minimization of  $J$  over all admissible control  $\mathbf{a}$ . As usual, we introduce the associated Hamiltonian function as

$$f(x, [\theta], z) := \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{L(x, [\theta], a) + zRa\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Using Filippov's theorem (see [20, Theorem 4]), if the infimum is attained, there exists  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_{2q+2} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  measurable s.t.

$$f(x, [\theta], z) = L(x, [\theta], \varphi(x, [\theta], z)) + zR(\varphi(x, [\theta], z)).$$

Following lemmas are direct applications of the definitions and assumptions given above.

**Lemma 5.2.** Assume that Assumption 2 holds. Then the function  $f$  given by (5.3) satisfies that

1. for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and all  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}$ ,  $|f(x, [\theta], 0)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})$ ,
2. for all  $x, x', z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and all  $\theta, \theta' \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|f(x, [\theta], z) - f(x', [\theta'], z')| \leq C(1 + |x|^q + |x'|^q + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^q + \|\theta'\|_{2q+2}^q) \left( K_x^L |x - x'|^\epsilon + K_{\mathcal{L}}^L \mathcal{W}_2([\theta], [\theta'])^\epsilon \right) + |R\mathcal{A}|_\infty |z - z'|.$$

where  $|R\mathcal{A}|_\infty = \sup \{|Ra|, a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . In particular  $f$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{H}_0)$  with  $K_z^f = |R\mathcal{A}|_\infty$ .

*Proof.* 1. is a direct consequence of (5.3) and Assumption 2-1., 2. is a consequence of [13, Lemma 5.2].  $\square$

**Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_{OCP})$ .** Assume that Assumption 2 holds and that one of the following is fulfilled

1.  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE1})$  holds,  $\sigma$  is uniformly elliptic and  $\nu > K_x^\sigma + \sqrt{2K_x^\sigma} |R\mathcal{A}|_\infty$ .
2.  $(\mathcal{H}_{SDE2})$  holds.

**Lemma 5.3.** We assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{OCP})$  holds. For  $(Y^{T,x,[\theta]}, Z^{T,x,[\theta]})$  the solution to (Decoupled BSDE), we have that, for all admissible control  $\mathbf{a}$ ,

$$J^T(x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}) \geq Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]}.$$

Moreover, if the infimum is attained for every  $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in (5.3), there exists  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}^T$  an admissible control s.t.  $J^T(x, [\theta], \bar{\mathbf{a}}^T) = Y_0^{T,x,[\theta]}$  where

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}_t^T := \varphi \left( X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}^T}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right], Z_t^{T,x,[\theta]} \right) = \varphi \left( X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}^T}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right], \nabla_x u^T(t, X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}^T}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right]) \sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}^T}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right]) \right).$$

**Lemma 5.4.** We assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{OCP})$  holds. For  $(Y^{x,[\theta]}, Z^{x,[\theta]}, \lambda)$  the solution to (Decoupled EBSDE), we have that, for all admissible control  $\mathbf{a}$ ,

$$J(x, [\theta], \mathbf{a}) \geq \lambda.$$

Moreover, if the infimum is attained for every  $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in (5.3), there exists  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$  an admissible control s.t.  $J(x, [\theta], \bar{\mathbf{a}}) = \lambda$ , where

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}_t = \varphi(X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right], Z_t^{x,[\theta]}) = \varphi(X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right], \nabla_x u^T(t, X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right]) \sigma(X_t^{x,[\theta],\bar{\mathbf{a}}}, \left[ X_t^{[\theta],0} \right])).$$

*Proofs of Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4.* The proofs follow from the definition of  $f$ , see for instance [14, Theorem 7.1] in the strong dissipative and non-McKean-Vlasov's framework  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** We assume that  $(\mathcal{H}_{OCP})$  holds. For every control  $\mathbf{a}$ , we have:

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J^T(x, [\theta], \mathbf{a})}{T} \geq \lambda. \quad (5.4)$$

Furthermore, if the infimum is attained for every  $x, [\theta], z$  in (5.3), we have that there exists  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C > 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$  such that:

$$\left| J^T(x, [\theta], \bar{\mathbf{a}}^T) - J(x, [\theta], \bar{\mathbf{a}})T - Y_0^{x,[\theta]} - \ell \right| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})e^{-\eta T} \quad (5.5)$$

*Proof.* Thanks to Lemma 5.2,  $f$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{H}_0)$ . Then, (5.4) is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 4.1 while (5.5) is a consequence of Theorem 4.3.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.6.** If we additionally assume that  $b, \sigma$  are  $\mathcal{C}^{1,0}$  with gradient globally Lipschitz w.r.t  $x$ , that  $\mathcal{A}$  is convex and that  $L$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex, then, the infimum is attained in Theorem 5.5 and there exists  $C$  that depends on  $\mu$  such that, for all  $T \geq 1$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\theta \in L^{2q+2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_0^T - \bar{\mathbf{a}}_0| \leq C(1 + |x|^{q+1} + \|\theta\|_{2q+2}^{q+1})e^{-\eta T}. \quad (5.6)$$

*Proof.* Due to the additional  $\mu$ -strongly convex of  $L$  and convexity of  $\mathcal{A}$  assumptions,  $(\mathcal{H}_{OCP})$  satisfies the assumptions of [10, Lemma 3.3] which gives that the infimum is attained. Consequently,  $\phi$  (which is the same for  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}^T$ ) exists and is globally Lipschitz w.r.t  $z$  with the constant depending on  $\mu$ . Hence, by applying Theorem 4.5 we obtain the wanted result.  $\square$



## A Appendix

Let us consider the following non-homogeneous forward SDE,

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{b}(t, \mathbf{X}_t)dt + \sigma(t, \mathbf{X}_t)dW_t, \quad \mathbf{X}_0 \in L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d), \quad p \geq 2, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 3.**

1.  $\mathbf{b} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  is measurable w.r.t time,  $K_x^b$ -Lipchitz w.r.t  $x$  and satisfies that there exists  $\eta, R, M_b > 0$ , such that for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ,
$$\langle x - x', \mathbf{b}(t, x) - \mathbf{b}(t, x') \rangle \leq -\eta |x - x'|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| > R} + M_b |x - x'| \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| \leq R}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$
2.  $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is  $\sqrt{2K_x^\sigma}$ -Lipschitz and uniformly elliptic uniformly in time, i.e. there exists  $\sigma_0 > 0$ , such that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\sigma \sigma^\top(t, x) \geq \sigma_0^2 I_d$ .
3.  $\eta > K_x^\sigma$ .

**Remark A.1.** One could remark that it is possible to rewrite (A.2) using the Lipschitz property of  $\mathbf{b}$  as

$$\langle x - x', \mathbf{b}(t, x) - \mathbf{b}(t, x') \rangle \leq -\eta |x - x'|^2 + \left( (M_b \wedge K_x^b |x - x'|) + \eta |x - x'| \right) |x - x'| \mathbf{1}_{|x - x'| \leq R}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

**Theorem A.2.** Let us set  $\mathbf{X}'$  be the solution to (A.1) with drift  $\mathbf{b}'$  that satisfies the suitable assumptions ensuring that  $\mathbf{X}'$  exists. We set, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_t := \|\mathbf{b}(t, \cdot) - \mathbf{b}'(t, \cdot)\|_\infty$ . Then, by considering  $c > 0$  that satisfies

$$c < (\eta - K_x^\sigma) \exp\left(-\frac{\eta + \frac{2M_b}{R}}{2\sigma_0^2} R^2\right), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

there exists  $\hat{\eta} = (\eta, M_b, R, K_x^\sigma, c, \sigma_0) > 0$  and  $C = C(\eta, R, M_b, K_x^\sigma, c, \sigma_0) > 0$  such that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t], [X'_t]) \leq C \mathcal{W}_1([X_0], [X'_0]) e^{-\hat{\eta}t} + C e^{-\hat{\eta}t} \int_0^t (\mathcal{E}_s - c \mathbb{E}[|X_s - X'_s|]) e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

**Remark A.3.**  $\mathbf{b}$  is assumed to be Lipschitz with respect to the second variable in order to ensure the existence and the uniqueness of a strong solution to (A.1) but, importantly, (A.4) and (A.5) do not depend on  $K_x^b$ .

*Proof.* We want to adapt the proof of [18, Theorem 3.2] to our framework, namely we assume, in their notations,  $r_0 = 0$  since we are not path dependent in our case. However, we propose a slightly more general framework with two different drifts. For  $W^1, W^2, W^3$  three independent Brownian motions and for  $R > \delta > 0$ ,  $\pi_\delta^1$  and  $\pi_\delta^2 : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$  two Lipschitz functions such that

$$[0, 1] \ni \pi_\delta^1(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \geq \delta \\ 0 & \text{if } r \leq \delta/2 \end{cases}, \quad \pi_\delta^1(r)^2 + \pi_\delta^2(r)^2 = 1, \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

we define the coupling  $(X, X')$  of  $(X, X')$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t &= \mathbf{b}(t, X_t)dt + \sigma_0 \pi_\delta^1(r_t) dW_t^1 + \sigma_0 \pi_\delta^2(r_t) dW_t^3 + \bar{\sigma}(t, X_t) dW_t^2, \\ dX'_t &= \mathbf{b}'(t, X'_t)dt + \sigma_0 \pi_\delta^1(r_t) (I_d - 2e_t e_t^\top) dW_t^1 + \sigma_0 \pi_\delta^2(r_t) dW_t^3 + \bar{\sigma}(t, X'_t) dW_t^2 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where, we define, for  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\tilde{X}_t := X_t - X'_t, \quad r_t := |\tilde{X}_t|, \quad e_t := \frac{\tilde{X}_t}{r_t} \mathbf{1}_{r_t \neq 0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma \sigma^\top = \sigma_0^2 I_{d \times d} + \bar{\sigma} \bar{\sigma}^\top.$$

Let us set, for all  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(r) &:= \sup_{t \geq 0, |x - x'| = r} \left\{ \frac{\langle x - x', \mathbf{b}(t, x) - \mathbf{b}(t, x') \rangle}{|x - x'|} + \frac{\|\bar{\sigma}(t, x) - \bar{\sigma}(t, x')\|^2}{2|x - x'|} \right\}, \\ \kappa^*(r) &= (M_b \wedge K_x^b r) \mathbf{1}_{r \leq R} + \eta r \mathbf{1}_{r \leq R} - (\eta - K_x^\sigma) r \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Phi(r) := \int_0^r \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^2} \int_0^s \kappa^*(v) dv\right) \left( \int_s^\infty u \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\sigma_0^2} \int_0^u \kappa^*(v) dv\right) du \right) ds. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

By using (A.3), we get  $\kappa \leq \kappa^*$ . Moreover,  $\Phi$  satisfies

**Lemma A.4.** For all  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\Phi$  satisfies

1.  $2\sigma_0^2\Phi''(r) + \kappa(r)\Phi'(r) \leq -2\sigma_0^2r$ ,
2.  $\Phi'(r) \geq 0$  and  $\Phi''(r) \leq 0$ ,
3.  $\frac{2\sigma_0^2}{\eta - K_x^\sigma}r \leq \Phi(r) \leq \Phi'(0)r$

and  $\Phi'(0)$  satisfies

$$\Phi'(0) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\eta + \frac{2M_b}{R}R^2}{4\sigma_0^2}\right) \frac{2\sigma_0^2}{\eta - K_x^\sigma}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

*Proof.* The proof is a straight forward adaptation of computations in [18, Theorem 3.2's proof], namely equations [18, (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13)] where  $\Phi$  and  $\kappa^*$  respectively correspond to  $f$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}$  in the cited reference, and the fact that  $\kappa^* \geq \kappa$ .  $\square$

First, by applying Itô-Tanaka's formula to  $r_t := \sqrt{r_t^2}$ , we obtain,

$$dr_t = \frac{\langle X_t - X'_t, \mathbf{b}(t, X_t) - \mathbf{b}'(t, X'_t) \rangle}{r_t} dt + \frac{1}{2r_t} \|\sigma(t, X_t) - \sigma(t, X'_t)\|^2 dt + \frac{\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\bar{\sigma}(t, X_t) - \bar{\sigma}(t, X'_t)) dW_t^2 \rangle}{r_t} + 2\sigma_0\pi_\delta^1(r_t)e_t^\top dW_t^1.$$

Consequently, by applying again Itô's formula to  $\Phi(r_t)$ , one could get

$$\begin{aligned} d\Phi(r_t) &= \left[ \Phi'(r_t) \left( \frac{\langle X_t - X'_t, \mathbf{b}(t, X_t) - \mathbf{b}'(t, X'_t) \rangle}{r_t} + \frac{1}{2r_t} \|\sigma(t, X_t) - \sigma(t, X'_t)\|^2 \right) + 2\sigma_0^2\Phi''(r_t)\pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2 \right] dt \\ &\quad + \Phi'(r_t) \left( \frac{\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\bar{\sigma}(t, X_t) - \bar{\sigma}(t, X'_t)) dW_t^2 \rangle}{r_t} + 2\sigma_0\pi_\delta^1(r_t)e_t^\top dW_t^1 \right) \\ &= \left[ \Phi'(r_t) \left( \frac{\langle X_t - X'_t, \mathbf{b}(t, X_t) - \mathbf{b}'(t, X'_t) \rangle}{r_t} + \frac{1}{2r_t} \|\sigma(t, X_t) - \sigma(t, X'_t)\|^2 \right) + 2\sigma_0^2\Phi''(r_t)\pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2 \right] dt \\ &\quad + \Phi'(r_t) \frac{\langle X_t - X'_t, \mathbf{b}(t, X_t) - \mathbf{b}'(t, X'_t) \rangle}{r_t} dt + \Phi'(r_t) \left( \frac{\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\bar{\sigma}(t, X_t) - \bar{\sigma}(t, X'_t)) dW_t^2 \rangle}{r_t} + 2\sigma_0\pi_\delta^1(r_t)e_t^\top dW_t^1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We set,

$$dM_t := \Phi'(r_t) \left( \frac{\langle \tilde{X}_t, (\bar{\sigma}(t, X_t) - \bar{\sigma}(t, X'_t)) dW_t^2 \rangle}{r_t} + 2\sigma_0\pi_\delta^1(r_t)e_t^\top dW_t^1 \right).$$

Hence, by using Lemma A.4, (A.3), the facts that  $\kappa \leq \kappa^*$  and  $\kappa^*$  is increasing on  $[0, R]$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\Phi(r_t) &\leq [\Phi'(r_t)\kappa(r_t) + 2\sigma_0^2\Phi''(r_t)\pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2] dt + \Phi'(0)\mathcal{E}_t dt + dM_t \\ &\leq [\Phi'(r_t)\kappa(r_t) + 2\sigma_0^2\Phi''(r_t)]\pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2 dt + \Phi'(r_t)\kappa(r_t)(1 - \pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2) dt + \Phi'(0)\mathcal{E}_t dt + dM_t \\ &\leq -2\sigma_0^2r_t\pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2 dt + \Phi'(0)\kappa^*(\delta) dt + \Phi'(0)\mathcal{E}_t dt + dM_t \\ &= -2\sigma_0^2r_t dt + 2\sigma_0^2r_t(1 - \pi_\delta^1(r_t)^2) dt + \Phi'(0)\kappa^*(\delta) dt + \Phi'(0)\mathcal{E}_t dt + dM_t \\ &\leq -2\sigma_0^2r_t dt + \left( 2\sigma_0^2\delta + \Phi'(0)\kappa^*(\delta) \right) dt + \Phi'(0)\mathcal{E}_t dt + dM_t \\ &\leq -\frac{2\sigma_0^2}{\Phi'(0)}\Phi(r_t) dt + \ell(\delta) dt + \Phi'(0)\mathcal{E}_t dt + dM_t, \end{aligned}$$

where we set  $\ell(\delta) := 2\sigma_0^2\delta + \Phi'(0)\kappa^*(\delta) \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0$ . Due to the non-increasing property of  $\Phi$  and the Lipschitz property of  $\bar{\sigma}$ , we have that the stochastic integral  $dM_t$  is a martingale. Thus, by (A.4) and (A.8), we can set  $\hat{\eta} := \frac{2\sigma_0^2}{\Phi'(0)} - \frac{\mathbf{c}\Phi'(0)(\eta - K_x^\sigma)}{2\sigma_0^2} > 0$ . Thus, applying Itô's formula to  $e^{\hat{\eta}t}\Phi(r_t)$  and taking the expectation lead to,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\hat{\eta}t}\mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_t)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_0)] + \frac{\ell(\delta)}{\hat{\eta}}e^{\hat{\eta}t} + \Phi'(0) \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_s e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds - \frac{\mathbf{c}\Phi'(0)(\eta - K_x^\sigma)}{2\sigma_0^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_s)] e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds \\ &\xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_0)] + \Phi'(0) \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_s e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds - \frac{\mathbf{c}\Phi'(0)(\eta - K_x^\sigma)}{2\sigma_0^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_s)] e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by using Lemma A.4-3. and taking  $(X_0, X'_0)$  an optimal coupling for  $\mathcal{W}_1$ -distance, last inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_1([X_t], [X'_t]) &\leq \mathbb{E}[r_t] \leq \frac{\eta - K_x^\sigma}{2\sigma_0^2} e^{-\hat{\eta}t} \left( \mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_0)] + \Phi'(0) \int_0^t \left( \mathcal{E}_s - c \frac{\eta - K_x^\sigma}{2\sigma_0^2} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(r_s)] \right) e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\eta - K_x^\sigma}{2\sigma_0^2} \Phi'(0) \mathbb{E}[|X_0 - X'_0|] e^{-\hat{\eta}t} + e^{-\hat{\eta}t} \Phi'(0) \int_0^t (\mathcal{E}_s - c \mathbb{E}[r_s]) e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds \\
&= C \mathcal{W}_1([X_0], [X'_0]) e^{-\hat{\eta}t} + \Phi'(0) e^{-\hat{\eta}t} \int_0^t (\mathcal{E}_s - c \mathbb{E}[r_s]) e^{\hat{\eta}s} ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

□

## References

- [1] X. Bao and S. Tang. Ergodic control of McKean-Vlasov SDEs and associated Bellman equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 527(1):Paper No. 127404, 28, 2023.
- [2] E. Bayraktar and J. Jian. Ergodicity and turnpike properties of linear-quadratic mean field control problems, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.08935>.
- [3] P. Briand and Y. Hu. Stability of BSDEs with random terminal time and homogenization of semilinear elliptic PDEs. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 155, 455-494, 1998.
- [4] P. Cardaliaguet, J.-M. Lasry, P.-L. Lions, and A. Porretta. Long time average of mean field games. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 7(2):279-301, 2012.
- [5] P. Cardaliaguet, J.-M. Lasry, P.-L. Lions, and A. Porretta. Long time average of mean field games with a nonlocal coupling. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(5):3558-3591, 2013.
- [6] P. Cardaliaguet and A. Porretta. Long time behavior of the master equation in mean field game theory. *Anal. PDE*, 12(6):1397-1453, 2019.
- [7] A. Cecchin, G. Conforti, A. Durmus, and K. Eichinger. The exponential turnpike phenomenon for mean field game systems: weakly monotone drifts and small interactions, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.09193>.
- [8] D. Crisan and E. McMurray. Smoothing properties of McKean-Vlasov SDEs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 171, pp.97-148, 2018.
- [9] A. Debussche, Y. Hu, and G. Tessitore. Ergodic BSDEs under weak dissipative assumptions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 121, 3, pp. 407-426, 2011.
- [10] F. Delarue and R. Carmona. *Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I Mean Field FBSDEs, Control, and Games*. Springer, 2018.
- [11] A. Eberle, A. Guillin, and R. Zimmer. Quantitative Harris type theorems for diffusions and mckean-vlasov processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 371, 06 2016.
- [12] M. Fuhrman and S. Rudà. Ergodic control of McKean-Vlasov systems on the Wasserstein space, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.17958>.
- [13] M. Fuhrman and G. Tessitore. The Bismut-Elworthy formula for backward SDE's and applications to nonlinear Kolmogorov equations and control in infinite dimensional spaces. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 74:1-2, pp. 429-464, 2002.
- [14] M. Fuhrman, G. Tessitore, and Y. Hu. Ergodic BSDEs and optimal ergodic control in Banach spaces. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol.48, No.3, pp.1542-1566, 2009.
- [15] Y. Hu and F. Lemonnier. Ergodic BSDE with an unbounded and multiplicative underlying diffusion and application to large time behavior of viscosity solution of HJB equation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(10):4009-4050, 2019.

- [16] Y. Hu, P.-Y. Madec, and A. Richou. A probabilistic approach to large time behavior of mild solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations in infinite dimension. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 53(1):378–398, 2015. <https://hal.science/hal-01006336>.
- [17] X. Huang, H. Li, and L. Mu. Exponential ergodicity in  $\mathcal{W}_1$  for SDEs with distribution dependent noise and partially dissipative drifts, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.14090>.
- [18] X. Huang and X. Ma. Coupling methods and applications on the exponential contractivity for path dependent McKean-Vlasov SDEs, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.03104>.
- [19] X. Huang and F.-Y. Wang. Regularities and exponential ergodicity in entropy for SDEs driven by distribution dependent noise. *Bernoulli*, 30(3):3303 – 3323, 2023.
- [20] E. J. McShane and R. B. Warfield. On Filippov’s implicit functions lemma. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 18(1):41–47, 1967.
- [21] E. Pardoux and S. Peng. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 14(1):55–61, 1990.
- [22] H. Pham and X. Wei. Dynamic programming for optimal control of stochastic McKean-Vlasov dynamics. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 55(2):1069–1101, 2017.
- [23] S. Rudà. Infinite time horizon optimal control of McKean-Vlasov SDEs, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.20572>.
- [24] F.-Y. Wang. Distribution dependent SDEs for Landau type equations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications Volume 128, Issue 2*, 2018.