

DIFFERENTIAL AND VARIATIONAL APPROACH TO FIRST ORDER MEAN FIELD GAMES IN A GENERALIZED FORM.

ANTONIO SICONOLFI

ABSTRACT. We investigate time-dependent, first-order Mean Field Games on the torus \mathbb{T}^N comparing, in a broad and general framework, the classical differential formulation — given by a Hamilton–Jacobi equation coupled with a continuity equation — with a variational approach based on fixed points of a multivalued map acting on probability measures over trajectories.

We prove existence of fixed points for very general Hamiltonians. When the Hamiltonian is differentiable with respect to the momentum, we show that the evaluation curve of any such fixed point solves a continuity equation driven by a vector field W_{g_0} , associated with the final condition g_0 .

This field is defined without requiring additional regularity conditions on the value function solving the Hamilton–Jacobi equation. The field coincides with the classical vector field of Mean Field Systems at space-differentiability points of the value function lying in the space-time regions where optimal trajectories concentrate.

Our analysis therefore provides a unified framework that bridges the differential and variational viewpoints in Mean Field Games, showing how aggregate optimality conditions naturally lead to continuity-equation descriptions under the sole assumption of differentiability of H in p .

1. INTRODUCTION

We study a time-dependent first order Mean Field Game (MFG) model posed on the N -dimensional flat torus \mathbb{T}^N over a finite time horizon T . The Hamiltonian

$$H(x, \mu, p) \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^N, \mu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N), p \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ is the space of Borel probability measures in \mathbb{T}^N , is considered in a rather general form. As the title suggests, our main purpose is to compare — within the broadest possible setting — two approaches to the problem, which we refer to as the *differential* and the *variational* formulation.

The first one, classical in the MFG literature, consists in determining solutions — precisely defined later — of a system comprising a backward Hamilton–Jacobi (HJ) equation coupled with a forward continuity equation.

In the HJ equation the Hamiltonian appears as $H(x, \xi(t), Dv)$, thus depending on time through a curve of measures $\xi(t)$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ defined in $[0, T]$. This curve is, in turn, the unknown of the continuity equation, driven by the vector field

$$H_p(x, \xi(t), -Dv(x, t)),$$

where H_p denotes the derivative of the Hamiltonian with respect to the momentum variable, and Dv is the spatial gradient of the value function v , given by Lax–Oleinik (LO) formula, solving the HJ equation.

As a matter of fact, the term $H_p(x, \xi(t), -Dv(x, t))$ is elusive, since the existence of Dv is not in general guaranteed.

The second method relies on the observation that the above system represents the same optimization problem at two different scales: that of the typical agent (the HJ equation) and that of the global population (the continuity equation). This viewpoint shifts the focus from the differential system to a direct variational characterization of the optimal objects — curves and measures — yielding a simple and direct formulation.

The problem ultimately reduces to finding fixed points of a suitable multivalued map defined in a space of probability measures supported on curves of \mathbb{T}^N . In this framework, the system formulation becomes less central, since no explicit knowledge of the value function solving the HJ equation is required.

In the differential approach one works with curves of measures in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, while in the variational framework the relevant fixed points lie in the space $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ of probability measures on Γ , where Γ denotes the space of continuous curves $[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$. To each $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ one associates a canonical curve of measures

$$\xi(t) = \text{ev}_t \# \xi \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \text{ev}_t : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N,$$

where $\#$ stands for the push-forward. We call $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ the *evaluation curve* associated to ξ .

Under basic assumptions — continuity of H in all arguments plus convexity and superlinearity in p ((H1)–(H3)) — we establish existence of such fixed points.

Under the additional assumption of differentiability of H in p ((H4)), we prove that the evaluation curve of any fixed point in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ solves a continuity equation. Strengthening the superlinearity condition ((H5)) yields that the evaluation curve is absolutely continuous with a suitable exponent.

In the results above we replace the classical driving field

$$H_p(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$$

whose definition requires differentiability of the value function — an assumption not generally available without imposing restrictive conditions on H . This motivates the expression *in a generalized form* in the title.

The replacement vector field is well defined on the whole $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ under (H1)–(H4), without any further regularity of the value function. It coincides with $H_p(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$, wherever the spatial gradient of v does exist, in the space–time region occupied by optimal trajectories — an issue to which we return later.

The differential MFG framework was introduced in the mathematical community in 2006 in the seminal works of Lasry and Lions [21, 20, 22] and, simultaneously, by Huang, Caines and Malhamé [19, 17, 18]. Since then it has generated a substantial body of literature —

both qualitative and quantitative — drawing from viscosity solutions, optimal transport, Wasserstein spaces, optimal control, game theory, probability, and Fokker–Planck equations.

The differential MFG system captures the behavior of a large population of indistinguishable and negligible agents. The HJ equation represents the optimal control problem of a typical agent. The convexity of H , though arising in a game-theoretic model, stems from the negligibility of individual players, which rules out direct interactions; other agents affect the equation only through an aggregate density representing a conjectured evolution of the total state.

On the other hand, the decisions of each agent induce a global motion of the system, represented by a curve of measures solving the continuity equation. The coupling arises because optimal individual trajectories are integral curves of the same vector field driving the continuity equation.

The equilibrium state in fact is reached when the conjectured aggregate evolution matches the one actually induced by the optimal strategies. Mathematically, this corresponds to a pair $(v, \xi(t))$ of an individual value function solution to the HJ equation (in viscosity sense) and a curve of measures solving the continuity equation (in distributional sense).

A nontrivial conceptual shift occurs when moving from the differential to the variational approach: one passes from curves of measures to measures on curves, among which the fixed points must be found. Several works develop this point of view [24, 10, 6, 9, 23].

We organize our analysis along two complementary lines:

- the derivation of aggregate optimality conditions and their differential counterpart, namely the continuity equation;
- the fixed-point problem for the multivalued map that relates aggregate decision rules to optimal collective behavior.

For the first line of investigation, we do not yet impose any dependence of the Hamiltonian on an aggregate evolution. We therefore work with an *abstract* Hamiltonian $H_0(x, t, p)$. Given a continuous final condition g_0 in the Hamilton–Jacobi equation, we select—among the curves of minimal action for the corresponding Lagrangian L_0 —a distinguished family of trajectories, called g_0 -optimal.

We therefore consider the Borel probability measures on the space of curves supported on g_0 -optimal paths. We call them g_0 -optimal as well. Although the definition is elementary, these measures exhibit strong variational features: using an appropriate version of Kantorovich duality, we show that they minimize the lifted action functional (Proposition 4.13), under assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)**.

When the Hamiltonian is differentiable in p (**(H4)**), a continuity equation emerges as a necessary differential condition for any g_0 -optimal measure. In this framework, the value function automatically admits distinguished directional derivatives on a set

$$\mathcal{A}_{g_0} \subset \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T],$$

which determines a Borel vector field W_{g_0} . The set \mathcal{A}_{g_0} is large in the sense that, for every g_0 -optimal curve ζ , the points $(\zeta(t), t)$ belong to a subset of \mathcal{A}_{g_0} for almost every t .

Moreover, whenever the value function is differentiable in space at such a point,

$$W_{g_0}(x, t) = H_p(x, t, -Dv(x, t)).$$

We prove that each g_0 -optimal trajectory is an integral curve of W_{g_0} . Consequently, the evaluation curve of any g_0 -optimal measure solves the continuity equation driven by W_{g_0} .

For the second line of investigation, we return to Hamiltonians of the form $H(x, \xi(t), p)$, under assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)**. Employing the locally convex variant of Kakutani’s fixed point theorem (see [9, 23]), together with topological arguments, a suitable perturbation of the Lagrangian, and the variational characterization of g_0 -optimal measures, we establish the existence of fixed points.

Since each fixed point is itself g_0 -optimal, the previous analysis applies: the evaluation curve $\xi^*(t)$ of any fixed point ξ^* satisfies the continuity equation driven by W_{g_0} , where W_{g_0} is constructed from the value function solving the Hamilton–Jacobi equation with Hamiltonian depending on $\xi^*(t)$.

We believe that the most significant outputs of this work are the following:

For the abstract Hamiltonian $H_0(x, t, p)$:

- Under assumptions **(H1)**–**(H4)**, the fact that the evaluation curve solves the continuity equation driven by W_{g_0} is a necessary differential condition for g_0 -optimality of a measure in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ (Theorem 6.3).

For the Hamiltonian $H(x, \mu, p)$ of the MFG model:

- Existence under the sole assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)** of a fixed point of the multivalued map $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{P}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ defined in (55) (Theorem 8.1).
- Under assumptions **(H1)**–**(H4)**, any fixed point ξ^* , coupled with the solution of the HJ equation with Hamiltonian $H(x, \xi^*(t), p)$ given by LO formula, solves the differential MFG system with driving vector field $W_{g(\cdot, \xi^*(T))}$ (Theorem 9.2).

1.1. Outline of the paper. Section 2 introduces notations, basic measure–theoretic results used throughout the paper, and the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)** on the Hamiltonian. Section 3 discusses properties of the action functional and the LO formula providing the relevant solution to the time–dependent HJ equation coupled with final datum g_0 . The key notion of g_0 -optimal curve (Definition 3.11) is derived, along with a compactness result (Proposition 3.13).

Section 4 proves that g_0 -optimal measures exist for any initial distribution. Their intrinsic variational properties are given in Proposition 4.13, and the compactness result for optimal curves is extended to measures (Proposition 4.14). Section 5 is devoted to the construction of the vector field W_{g_0} , which is then related to $H_p^0(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$ in Section 7.

Section 6 contains the main Theorem 6.3 on g_0 -optimality and continuity equation. A preliminary step is the proof that any g_0 -optimal curve is an integral curve of W_{g_0} .

In the final sections we return to the Hamiltonian $H(x, \mu, p)$, and establish the fixed point result (Theorem 8.1, Section 8). Finally, Section 9 deals with the differential MFG result in a generalized form (Theorem 9.2).

The four appendices contain a summary on disintegration theory, an analysis on the function given by LO formula, topological facts on the strict topology in the non-local compactness setting, and results on a perturbed Lagrangian used in the fixed point theorem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations and basic results. We denote by \mathbb{T}^N the N -dimensional flat *torus*. Given x, y in \mathbb{T}^N , we write $|x - y|$ for their Euclidean distance. By a *curve* in \mathbb{T}^N we mean, unless otherwise specified, an absolutely continuous (AC) curve.

In a space of measures, the term *curve* will instead refer to any map from a real interval to the space.

For any set E , χ_E denotes the characteristic function.

We use the abbreviation lsc (resp. usc) for lower (resp. upper) semicontinuous.

For a measure μ , we denote by $\text{spt } \mu$ its *support*.

For $r \geq 1$, we denote by $L^r([0, T])$ the space of functions defined in $[0, T]$ which are r -summable with respect to the 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure.

If X is a metric space, $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, we denote by $B(x, r)$ the ball centered at x with radius r .

Given a continuous function u , we call *subtangent* (resp. *supertangent*) to u at a point a viscosity test function from below (resp. from above). Unless otherwise specified, the function u and the subtangent (resp. supertangent) coincide at the test point. If they coincide *only* at such a point, we say that the subtangent (resp. supertangent) is *strict*.

We recall two standard results that will be used throughout the paper:

Proposition 2.1. *Let X be a Polish space, let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a lsc function, and let $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ narrowly. Then*

$$\liminf_n \int f d\mu_n \geq \int f d\mu.$$

Proof. See [3, Section 5.1.1]. □

Proposition 2.2. *Let X, Y be Polish spaces, μ a measure on X . We consider a Borel map $G : X \rightarrow Y$ and a Borel function $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded from below. Then*

$$(1) \quad \int \varphi(G(x)) d\mu = \int \varphi(y) dG\#\mu,$$

where $G\#\mu$ is the push-forward of μ to Y through G .

Proof. See [2, Proposition 8.1]. □

2.2. The measure-theoretic framework. Given $T > 0$, we denote by Γ the space of continuous curves $[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$, endowed with the uniform topology. For any $\zeta \in \Gamma$ we denote by $\|\zeta\|$ its uniform norm.

We denote by $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ the spaces of Borel probability measures in \mathbb{T}^N and Γ , respectively, both endowed with the narrow topology.

Remark 2.3. All Wasserstein distances metrize the narrow topology on both $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$, making them Polish spaces. This follows from the compactness of \mathbb{T}^N and the boundedness of $(\Gamma, \|\cdot\|)$.

Notation 2.4. We denote by d_W the first Wasserstein distance both on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$.

Notation 2.5. For $\mu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and f integrable with respect to μ , we set

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle = \int f d\mu.$$

Definition 2.6. For $\zeta \in \Gamma$, we define the *space-time occupation measure* μ_ζ on $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ by

$$\mu_\zeta(B) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \chi_{\{t | (\zeta(t), t) \in B\}} dt$$

for any Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$. Thus $\mu_\zeta(B)$ gives the fraction of time that $(\zeta(t), t)$ spends in B .

For sets of the form $E \times I$, with $E \subset \mathbb{T}^N$ and I an interval contained in $[0, T]$,

$$\mu_\zeta(E \times I) = \frac{1}{T} \int_I \chi_{\{t | \zeta(t) \in E\}} dt.$$

The first marginal of μ_ζ is the usual (*space*) *occupation measure*

$$\mu_\zeta(A \times [0, T]) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \chi_{\{t | \zeta(t) \in A\}} dt \quad \text{for } A \subset \mathbb{T}^N \text{ Borel.}$$

For $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$, we define the *evaluation curve*

$$\xi(t) = \text{ev}_t \# \xi \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T],$$

where $\#$ indicates the push-forward, and

$$\text{ev}_t(\zeta) = \zeta(t) \quad \text{for } \zeta \in \Gamma.$$

We also refer to $\xi(0)$ and $\xi(T)$ as the *initial* and *final distribution* of ξ .

Lemma 2.7. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$. Then the evaluation curve $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ is continuous from $[0, T]$ with the natural topology to $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ with the narrow topology.

Proof. Given a sequence t_n in $[0, T]$ converging to some t_0 , we aim at showing that

$$\int f d\xi(t_n) \rightarrow \int f d\xi(t_0) \quad \text{for any continuous function } f : \mathbb{T}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

By the change of variable formula in Proposition 2.2 with $X = \Gamma$, $Y = \mathbb{T}^N$, $\mu = \xi$, $G = \text{ev}_{t_n}/\text{ev}_t$, $\varphi = f$, we get

$$\int f d\xi(t_n) = \int f(\zeta(t_n)) d\xi(\zeta) \quad \text{and} \quad \int f d\xi(t_0) = \int f(\zeta(t_0)) d\xi(\zeta).$$

Since

$$f(\zeta(t_n)) \rightarrow f(\zeta(t_0)) \quad \text{for any } \zeta \in \Gamma,$$

we get by dominated convergence theorem

$$\int f(\zeta(t_n)) d\xi \rightarrow \int f(\zeta(t_0)) d\xi,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\xi_n, \xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ with $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$, then*

$$\xi_n(t) \rightarrow \xi(t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N), \text{ uniformly in } [0, T], \text{ with respect to } d_W.$$

Proof. We derive from the assumptions and Remark 2.3 that ξ_n converges to ξ with respect to d_W . There consequently exists a sequence of measures γ_n in $\Gamma \times \Gamma$ with marginals ξ_n and ξ satisfying

$$(2) \quad \int \|\eta_n - \eta\| d\gamma_n(\eta_n, \eta) \rightarrow 0.$$

We define, for $t \in [0, T]$, a map $\pi_t : \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{T}^N$ as

$$\pi_t(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)).$$

Since for any n , t , and any Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{T}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t \# \gamma_n(E \times \mathbb{T}^N) &= \gamma_n(\{(\zeta, \eta) \mid \zeta(t) \in E, \eta(t) \in \mathbb{T}^N\}) \\ &= \xi_n(\{\zeta \mid \zeta(t) \in E\}) = \xi_n(E), \end{aligned}$$

we derive that the first marginals of the $\pi_t \# \gamma_n$'s are $\xi_n(t)$, and a similar computation yields that all the second marginals coincide with $\xi(t)$.

We therefore get by change of variable formula (2.2)

$$(3) \quad \int |x - y| d(\pi_t \# \gamma_n) = \int |\eta_n(t) - \eta(t)| d\gamma_n(\eta_n, \eta) \leq \int \|\eta_n - \eta\| d\gamma_n,$$

which gives, in force of (2), the claimed uniform convergence of $\xi_n(t)$ to $\xi(t)$. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, and let f_n be continuous functions in \mathbb{T}^N converging uniformly to f . Then*

$$\langle \mu_n, f_n \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mu, f \rangle.$$

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain for n large enough

$$\int f_n d\mu_n \geq \int f d\mu_n - \varepsilon,$$

which implies

$$\liminf_n \int f_n d\mu_n \geq \int f d\mu - \varepsilon.$$

The same argument, with obvious adaptations, gives a converse inequality for the lim sup. The constant ε being arbitrary, the assertion follows. \square

2.3. Assumptions on the Hamiltonians. In Sections 3–7, we work with a non-autonomous Hamiltonian

$$H_0 : \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

in Section 8 (the fixed point argument), and Section 9 (the generalized MFG system) time-dependence will be mediated by a curve of probability measures on \mathbb{T}^N .

We assume that H_0 satisfies:

- (H1) continuity in all arguments;
- (H2) convexity in p ;
- (H3) uniformly superlinearity in p for (x, t) varying in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$;

These conditions will remain in force throughout the paper.

We denote by $L_0(x, t, q)$ the Lagrangian associated to H_0 via Fenchel transform. Under (H1), (H2), (H3) L_0 is continuous, convex in the velocity variable q , and superlinear, uniformly for (x, t) varying in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.

The superlinearity is equivalent to the existence of a function $\theta : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ with

$$(4) \quad L_0(x, t, q) \geq \theta(|q|) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\theta(s)}{s} = +\infty.$$

By the Corollary in [12, Proposition 2.2.6] these assumptions imply that the H_0 and L_0 are locally Lipschitz continuous in p and q uniformly in (x, t) .

Notation 2.10. *We set*

$$M_0 = \max\{|L_0(x, t, 0)| \mid (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]\}, \quad m_{L_0} = \min\{L_0(x, t, q) \mid (x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N\}.$$

3. MINIMAL ACTION AND LAX–OLEINIK FORMULA

3.1. Minimal action.

Definition 3.1. Let $[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T]$, and let ζ be a curve in \mathbb{T}^N defined on $[t_1, t_2]$, we define its *action* as

$$(5) \quad \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt.$$

If ζ is continuous, but not absolutely continuous, its action is set to $+\infty$.

To simplify notations, we write

$$(6) \quad A_{L_0}(\zeta) = \int_0^T L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt.$$

Proposition 3.2. *For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the set*

$$C = \{\zeta \in \Gamma \mid A_{L_0}(\zeta) \leq a\}$$

is compact in the uniform topology.

Proof. By (4) the curves in C are equiabsolutely continuous, see [8, Theorem 2.12]. Since they take values in the compact set \mathbb{T}^N , they are also equibounded. The result follows by Ascoli–Arzelà theorem. \square

Proposition 3.3. *The functional*

$$\zeta \mapsto A_{L_0}(\zeta)$$

is lsc (possibly $+\infty$) in Γ with respect to the uniform topology.

Proof. This follows from [8, Theorem 3.6], using the continuity of L_0 and its convexity in the velocity variable. \square

Since any curve in Γ with finite action is AC, the Lebesgue differentiation yields:

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\zeta \in \Gamma$ with $A_{L_0}(\zeta) < +\infty$, then the set*

$$C = \{(x, t) \mid x = \zeta(t) \text{ with } t \text{ diffe. point of } \zeta \text{ and Lebesgue point of } L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta})\}$$

satisfies $\mu_\zeta(C) = 1$.

Definition 3.5. A curve $\eta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ is said of *minimal action* in $[0, T]$ if

$$A_{L_0}(\eta) = \min\{A_{L_0}(\zeta) \mid \zeta(0) = \eta(0), \zeta(T) = \eta(T)\}.$$

As a consequence of Propositions 3.2, 3.3, we have:

Proposition 3.6. *For any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{T}^N$, there exist curves of minimal action η in $[0, T]$ with $\eta(0) = x$, $\eta(T) = y$.*

Given x, y in \mathbb{T}^N , we define

$$(7) \quad S_T(x, y) = \min\{A_{L_0}(\zeta) \mid \zeta \text{ with } \zeta(0) = x, \zeta(T) = y\}.$$

Proposition 3.7. *The function*

$$(x, y) \mapsto S_T(x, y)$$

is bounded and lsc.

Proof. Fix (x_0, y_0) in $\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{T}^N$. Joining x_0 to y_0 by a geodesic defined in $[0, T]$, we find

$$S_T(x_0, y_0) \leq \frac{|x_0 - y_0|}{T} \max\{|L_0(x, t, q)| \mid |q| = 1\}.$$

From Notation 2.10 we also have

$$S_T(x_0, y_0) \geq m_{L_0} T.$$

Thus $S_T(\cdot, \cdot)$ is bounded.

Now let $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0)$, and let ζ_n be minimizers realizing $S_T(x_n, y_n)$. The corresponding actions $A_{L_0}(\zeta_n)$ are uniformly bounded, hence by Propositions 3.2, 3.3 the ζ_n 's converge, up to subsequences, uniformly to ζ joining x_0 to y_0 . Then

$$\liminf S_T(x_n, y_n) = \liminf A_{L_0}(\zeta_n) \geq A_{L_0}(\zeta) \geq S_T(x_0, y_0).$$

This proves lower semicontinuity. \square

3.2. HJ equation. We consider the time-dependent Hamilton–Jacobi (HJ) equation

$$(HJ) \quad -u_t + H_0(x, t, -Du) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T),$$

where solutions are understood in the viscosity sense.

A continuous solution to (HJ) with final condition g_0 is given by the Lax–Oleinik (LO) formula, see Appendix B:

$$(8) \quad v(x, t) = \min_{\zeta(t)=x} \left\{ g_0(\zeta(T)) + \int_t^T L_0(\zeta, s, \dot{\zeta}) ds \right\} \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T].$$

The minimum exists by Propositions 3.2, 3.3 and the continuity of g_0 .

Remark 3.8. Under assumptions **(H1)–(H3)** equation (HJ) does not admit a unique continuous solution in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$, even with a continuous final datum g_0 . Uniqueness may be enforced, for instance, by requiring

$$|H_0(x, t, p) - H_0(y, t, p)| \leq \omega_0((1 + |p|)|x - y|)$$

for some modulus $\omega_0 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and all x, y in \mathbb{T}^N , $t \in [0, T]$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^N$, see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.1].

Uniqueness is not needed here: we will work exclusively with the Lax–Oleinik solution (8), which represents the value function of the associated optimal control problem.

Notation 3.9. We denote by v the LO solution defined in (8).

Lemma 3.10. For any x, y in \mathbb{T}^N , $t_2 > t_1 \in [0, T]$, and any curve ζ in $[t_1, t_2]$ linking x to y ,

$$v(x, t_1) - v(y, t_2) \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt.$$

The choice of continuous final datum g_0 induces a natural decomposition of the minimal action curves into (possibly overlapping) families.

Definition 3.11. For a continuous function g_0 on \mathbb{T}^N , a curve $\zeta_0 : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ is called g_0 -optimal if

$$g_0(\zeta_0(T)) + A_{L_0}(\zeta_0) = \min\{g_0(\zeta(T)) + A_{L_0}(\zeta) \mid \zeta \in \Gamma \text{ with } \zeta(0) = \zeta_0(0)\}.$$

Equivalently

$$A_{L_0}(\zeta_0) = v(\zeta_0(0), 0) - g_0(\zeta_0(T)).$$

Existence of such curves comes from Propositions 3.2, 3.3 and the continuity of g_0 .

Remark 3.12. If ζ_0 is g_0 -optimal then for all $t \in [0, T]$

$$v(\zeta_0(t), t) = g_0(\zeta_0(T)) + \int_t^T L_0(\zeta_0, s, \dot{\zeta}_0) ds \quad .$$

Proposition 3.13. Let $M > 0$ and let ω be a modulus. Then the set of curves $[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ that are g_0 -optimal for some continuous function g_0 with

$$(9) \quad \max_{\mathbb{T}^N} |g_0(x)| \leq M, \quad |g_0(x_1) - g_0(x_2)| \leq \omega(|x_1 - x_2|) \quad \text{for any } x_1, x_2 \text{ in } \mathbb{T}^N$$

is compact in Γ .

Proof. Let ζ_n be g_n^0 -optimal curves for final data g_n^0 satisfying (9). We have

$$(10) \quad v_n(\zeta_n(0), 0) = g_n^0(\zeta_n(T)) + A_{L_0}(\zeta_n),$$

where v_n is the LO solution to (HJ) agreeing with g_n^0 at $t = T$. By (9) the sequence g_n^0 uniformly converges in \mathbb{T}^N , up to a subsequence, to a continuous function g_0 still satisfying (9). Consequently, by Proposition B.7, the solutions v_n uniformly converge in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$, up to subsequences, to the LO solution v of (HJ) with final datum g_0 .

Up to extracting a subsequence, we therefore have that the v_n 's are equibounded in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$. This implies by (10) that the actions $A_{L_0}(\zeta_n)$ are equibounded as well. We can therefore extract, by Proposition 3.2, a subsequence uniformly converging in $[0, T]$ to a limit curve ζ_0 . Passing to the limit, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, in (10) and taking into account Proposition 3.3 we get

$$v(\zeta_0(0), 0) - g_0(\zeta_0(T)) \geq A_{L_0}(\zeta_0),$$

which implies by Lemma 3.10 that ζ_0 is g_0 -optimal. This concludes the argument. \square

4. OPTIMAL MEASURES

We introduce a notion parallel to Definition 3.11 for measures in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$:

Definition 4.1. Given a continuous function g_0 in \mathbb{T}^N , a measure $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is called *g_0 -optimal* if it is supported on g_0 -optimal curves.

4.1. Existence of g_0 -optimal measures.

Proposition 4.2. *For any continuous function g_0 and $\mu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, there exist g_0 -optimal measures with initial distribution μ .*

This existence result follows from measurable selection principles for multivalued maps together with the disintegration Theorem (Appendix A).

We begin by defining the multivalued map $\mathcal{G}_{g_0} : \mathbb{T}^N \rightarrow \Gamma$ as

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{G}_{g_0}(x) = \{g_0\text{-optimal curves starting at } x\}.$$

By disintegration theory any g_0 -optimal measure — if it exists — is, roughly speaking, parametrized by the measurable families $\{\eta_x\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ with $\text{spt}(\eta_x) \subset \mathcal{G}_{g_0}(x)$, for each $x \in \mathbb{T}^N$. See Definition A.1 for terminology.

More precisely:

Proposition 4.3. *Given any continuous function g_0 , the existence of a g_0 -optimal measure, for any initial distribution μ , is equivalent to the existence of a measurable family $\{\eta_x\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ such that*

$$\text{spt } \eta_x \subset \mathcal{G}_{g_0}(x) \quad \text{for } x \text{ varying in } \mathbb{T}^N.$$

Proof. Assume that such a family $\{\eta_x\}$ exists, and define

$$\xi(B) = \int \eta_x(B) d\mu(x) \quad \text{for any Borel subset } B \text{ in } \Gamma,$$

then ξ is a probability measure on Γ with $\xi(0) = \mu$ by Proposition A.2, and

$$\text{spt } \xi \subset \overline{\bigcup_x \text{spt } \eta_x},$$

so ξ is supported on g_0 -optimal curves.

Conversely, if ξ is a measure as in the statement, its disintegration via ev_0 (Theorem A.3) yields the required family. \square

To construct such families $\{\eta_x\}$, we need some preliminary material.

Definition 4.4. Let X, Y be Polish spaces and $\mathcal{G} : X \rightarrow Y$ a multivalued map. We say that it is *measurable* if

- it has closed values;

– for any closed subset E of Y , the set

$$\mathcal{G}^-(E) := \{x \in X \mid \mathcal{G}(x) \cap E \neq \emptyset\}$$

is Borel.

Proposition 4.5. *Every measurable multivalued map $\mathcal{G} : X \rightarrow Y$ admits a measurable selection, namely a measurable function $h : X \rightarrow Y$ with*

$$h(x) \in \mathcal{G}(x) \quad \text{for any } x.$$

Proof. See [11, Theorem 3.6]. □

Lemma 4.6. *The multivalued map \mathcal{G}_{g_0} , defined in (11), is measurable for any continuous final datum g_0 .*

Proof. It is clear that \mathcal{G}_{g_0} is closed valued.

Given a closed subset $E \subset \Gamma$, let x_n be a sequence in $\mathcal{G}_{g_0}^-(E)$ converging to $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}^N$, and let $\zeta_n \in \mathcal{G}_{g_0}(x_n) \cap E$. The curves ζ_n then satisfy

$$(12) \quad v(x_n, 0) = g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + A_{L_0}(\zeta_n).$$

Since the action of the ζ_n 's is bounded, they uniformly converge, up to a subsequence, by Proposition 3.2 to a curve linking x_0 to some y_0 , which is optimal by Proposition 3.3. Passing to the limit, as n goes to infinity, in (12) we get that $\mathcal{G}_g^-(E)$ is closed, which yields the assertion. □

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Using Proposition 4.3 it suffices to show the existence of a family of measures $\{\eta_x\}$ in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ as in the statement of Proposition 4.3.

By Lemma 4.6 and Proposition 4.5 there exists a measurable selection $h(x) \in \mathcal{G}_{g_0}(x)$. Define

$$\eta_x = \delta_{h(x)} \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma),$$

where δ stands for the Dirac measure. This family is measurable (Definition A.1) because h is so. Since h is a selection of \mathcal{G}_{g_0} , each η_x is supported by g_0 -optimal curves starting at x . □

4.2. Intrinsic characterization of g_0 -optimal measures. We now provide intrinsic characterizations of g_0 -optimal measures by lifting both the action functional to $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ and the cost S_T to $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{T}^N)$.

Some preliminary notions are needed:

Definition 4.7. Given μ, ν in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, we call *transport plan* between them any Borel probability measure in $\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{T}^N$ with first marginal μ and second marginal ν .

We define

$$S_T(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\gamma} \int S_T(x, y) d\gamma \quad \mu, \nu \text{ in } \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N),$$

where the infimum is taken over all the transport plans γ between μ and ν .

Proposition 4.8. *For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ there exist transport plans achieving the infimum in the definition of $S_T(\mu, \nu)$.*

Proof. Since the cost S_T is lsc (Proposition 3.7), the functional

$$\gamma \mapsto \int S_T(x, y) d\gamma$$

is lsc in the narrow topology by Proposition 2.1. Since the family of transport plans between μ and ν is compact, minimizers exist. \square

We derive from Lemma 3.10

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, and let v be the LO solution of (HJ) with final datum g_0 . Then*

$$S_T(\mu, \nu) \geq \langle \mu, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \nu, g_0 \rangle.$$

Proof. Let γ be a transport plan between μ and ν . By Lemma 3.10

$$\int S_T(x, y) d\gamma \geq \int [v(x, 0) - g_0(y)] d\gamma = \langle \mu, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \nu, g_0 \rangle.$$

Hence the claim. \square

By Proposition 3.3 and the coercivity of L_0 , we have:

Proposition 4.10. *The action functional*

$$\zeta \mapsto A_{L_0}(\zeta) \quad \zeta \in \Gamma$$

is integrable (with possibly infinite integral) against any measure in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$.

Thus, for $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$, we may define its action as

$$\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi(\zeta).$$

Next, we relate transport plans and the action of measures in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$:

Proposition 4.11. *For any $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$*

$$\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi \geq S_T(\xi(0), \xi(T)).$$

Proof. Let $\eta_{(x,y)}$ be the disintegration of ξ with respect to

$$(13) \quad \text{ev}_{(0,T)} : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{T}^N, \quad \text{ev}_{(0,T)}(\zeta) = (\zeta(0), \zeta(T)).$$

Then $\text{ev}_{(0,T)}\#\xi$ is a transport plan between $\xi(0)$ and $\xi(T)$, and

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi &= \int \left(\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\eta_{(x,y)} \right) d(\text{ev}_{(0,T)}\#\xi)(x, y) \\ &\geq \int S_T(x, y) d(\text{ev}_{(0,T)}\#\xi)(x, y) \geq S_T(\xi(0), \xi(T)), \end{aligned}$$

where the leftmost equality is obtained by the very definition of disintegration. \square

We need Kantorovitch Theorem in the following form:

Theorem 4.12. *Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, there exists a continuous function $g_0 : \mathbb{T}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the LO solution v of (HJ), with final datum g_0 , satisfies*

$$S_T(\mu, \nu) = \langle \mu, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \nu, g_0 \rangle.$$

Proof. We adapt the strategy of [27, Theorem 1.1], where the cost is assumed continuous. In our setting S_T is only lsc (Proposition 3.7). Thus, we approximate it monotonically from below by continuous costs, according to [29, Theorem 1.3].

Following [27, Theorem 1.1], the result is first proved under the assumption that μ, ν are finite convex combinations of Dirac masses. In that case the continuity of the approximating costs allows constructing the appropriate final datum g_0 ([27, Proposition 6.1]). The conclusion is then obtained by a finite-dimensional argument based on Hahn–Banach Theorem applied to a suitable space of measures.

One passes to general measures by exploiting the density of the convex hull of Dirac measures in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ with respect to the narrow topology, and the stability properties of LO solutions (Proposition B.7). \square

Proposition 4.13. *For a measure $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) ξ is g_0 -optimal for some continuous function g_0 ;
- (ii) $\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi = \langle \xi(0), v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi(T), g_0 \rangle$.

Proof. Assume ξ satisfies (i), and let v be the LO solution of (HJ) with final datum g_0 . By disintegration of ξ with respect to $\text{ev}_{(0,T)}$, denoted by $\eta_{(x,y)}$, we get

$$(15) \quad \int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi = \int \left(\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\eta_{(x,y)} \right) d(\text{ev}_{(0,T)}\#\xi)(x, y).$$

Since ξ is g_0 -optimal, all curves ζ in its support are g_0 -optimal, hence for $(x, y) = (\zeta(0), \zeta(T))$ we have

$$A_{L_0}(\zeta) = v(x, 0) - g_0(y).$$

Therefore by (15)

$$\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi(\zeta) = \int [v(x, 0) - g_0(y)] d(\text{ev}_{(0,T)} \# \xi)(x, y) = \langle \xi(0), v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi(T), g_0 \rangle.$$

Conversely, Kantorovitch duality Theorem (Theorem 4.12) yields

$$(16) \quad S_T(\xi(0), \xi(T)) = \langle \xi(0), v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi(T), g_0 \rangle$$

for some continuous function g_0 and the LO solution v of (HJ) with final condition g_0 .

Assume that ξ does not satisfy (i) for this g_0 , then there exists a set of curves with nonvanishing ξ -measure on which the inequality in Lemma 3.10 is strict. Equivalently the open set

$$E = \{\zeta \in \Gamma \mid A_{L_0}(\zeta) > v(\zeta(0), 0) - g_0(\zeta(T))\}$$

has positive ξ -measure. By integrating, we get

$$\int A_{L_0}(\zeta) d\xi > \langle \xi(0), v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi(T), g_0 \rangle$$

which contradicts (ii). \square

The following result directly comes from Proposition 3.13. It will be used in the proof of the fixed point theorem of Section 8.

Proposition 4.14. *Let $M > 0$ and ω be a modulus. The set of g_0 -optimal measures in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$, where g_0 ranges over continuous functions with*

$$(17) \quad \max_{\mathbb{T}^N} |g_0(x)| \leq M, \quad |g_0(x_1) - g_0(x_2)| \leq \omega(|x_2 - x_1|) \quad \text{for any } x_1, x_2 \text{ in } \mathbb{T}^N$$

is a compact subset in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.13 all such measures are supported on a compact subset of Γ . Compactness then follows from Prohorov's theorem. \square

5. A DISTINGUISHED BOREL VECTOR FIELD

We introduce the following additional assumption on H_0 :

(H4) the function $p \mapsto H_0(x, t, p)$ is differentiable in \mathbb{R}^N ,

which is equivalent to the strict convexity of the Lagrangian:

$$(18) \quad q \mapsto L_0(x, t, q) \text{ is strictly convex.}$$

Notation 5.1. We denote by H_p^0 the derivative of H_0 with respect to p .

We fix a continuous final datum g_0 and denote by v the LO solution to (HJ) with final datum g_0 . In accordance with the title, we construct in this section, under assumptions **(H1)**–**(H4)**, a Borel vector field in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$, depending on g_0 and v , which will be linked to g_0 -optimal trajectories in Section 6 and employed in a generalized formulation of MFG systems in Section 9.

Notation 5.2. For $(x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T)$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by

$$D_{(q,1)}v(x, t)$$

the directional derivative of v at (x, t) in the space-time direction $(q, 1)$, whenever it exists, namely

$$D_{(q,1)}v(x, t) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h}.$$

Lemma 5.3. For any $(x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$(19) \quad \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h} \geq -L_0(x, t, q).$$

Proof. For $h < 0$, Lemma 3.10 yields

$$v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t) \leq \int_{t+h}^t L_0(x + (\tau - t)q, \tau, q) d\tau,$$

which gives

$$(20) \quad \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h} \geq -\frac{1}{h} \int_{t+h}^t -L_0(x + (\tau - t)q, \tau, q) d\tau.$$

For $h > 0$, a similar argument gives

$$v(x, t) - v(x + hq, t + h) \leq \int_t^{t+h} L_0(x + (\tau - t)q, \tau, q) d\tau,$$

and

$$(21) \quad \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h} \geq \frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} -L_0(x + (\tau - t)q, \tau, q) d\tau.$$

The claim follows by combining (20) and (21). \square

We define the multivalued (possibly empty-valued) map $\mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$

$$(22) \quad \mathcal{W}_{g_0}(x, t) = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid D_{(q,1)}v(x, t) = -L_0(x, t, q)\}.$$

We then set

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{A}_{g_0} = \{(x, t) \mid \mathcal{W}_{g_0}(x, t) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Remark 5.4. Since the LO solution $v(x, t)$ is, in general, only continuous, the set \mathcal{A}_{g_0} might a priori be small. However, we shall prove in Proposition 7.1 that \mathcal{A}_{g_0} contains a full measure set (with respect to μ_ζ) for any g_0 -optimal $\zeta \in \Gamma$. In particular, for every optimal curve ζ , $(\zeta(t), t) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0}$ for almost all times.

Proposition 5.5. *For any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T)$, the set $\mathcal{W}_{g_0}(x, t)$ contains at most one element.*

Proof. By (18) $L_0(x, t, \cdot)$ is strictly convex. Assume by contradiction that $q_1 \neq q_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{g_0}(x, t)$.

Let $h > 0$, then by definition

$$\begin{aligned} v(x + hq_1, t + h) &= v(x, t) - hL_0(x, t, q_1) + o(h), \\ v(x - hq_2, t - h) &= v(x, t) + hL_0(x, t, q_2) + o(h), \end{aligned}$$

where $o(h)$ denotes the Landau symbol. Subtracting yields

$$v(x - hq_2, t - h) - v(x + hq_1, t + h) = 2h \left(\frac{L_0(x, t, q_2)}{2} + \frac{L_0(x, t, q_1)}{2} \right) + o(h),$$

$$(24) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} (v(x - hq_2, t - h) - v(x + hq_1, t + h)) = \frac{L_0(x, t, q_2)}{2} + \frac{L_0(x, t, q_1)}{2}.$$

We define in $[t - h, t + h]$ the curves

$$\zeta_h(t) = y_h + t \left(\frac{q_1}{2} + \frac{q_2}{2} \right),$$

with

$$y_h = x + hq_1 - (t + h) \left(\frac{q_1}{2} + \frac{q_2}{2} \right).$$

We have

$$\zeta_h(t - h) = x - hq_2, \quad \zeta_h(t + h) = x + hq_1.$$

Lemma 3.10 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2h} (v(x - hq_2, t - h) - v(x + hq_1, t + h)) &\leq \frac{1}{2h} \int_{t-h}^{t+h} L_0(\zeta_h, \tau, \dot{\zeta}_h) d\tau \\ &= L_0\left(\zeta_h(\tau_h), \tau_h, \frac{q_1}{2} + \frac{q_2}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for a suitable $\tau_h \in [t - h, t + h]$.

Since

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \zeta_h(\tau_h) = x, \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \tau_h = t,$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} (v(x - hq_2, t - h) - v(x + hq_1, t + h)) \leq L_0\left(x, t, \frac{q_1}{2} + \frac{q_2}{2}\right).$$

Comparing with (24), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} L_0(x, t, q_1) + \frac{1}{2} L_0(x, t, q_2) \leq L_0\left(x, t, \frac{q_1}{2} + \frac{q_2}{2}\right),$$

contradicting the strict convexity of L_0 . \square

Notation 5.6. We denote by W_{g_0} the map which associates to any $(x, t) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0}$ the unique vector in $\mathcal{W}_{g_0}(x, t)$.

We next set

$$G(x, t, q) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h}, \quad (x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By Lemma 5.3 we obtain:

Corollary 5.7. A triple (x, t, q) satisfies

$$G(x, t, q) \leq -L_0(x, t, q)$$

if and only if $(x, t) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0}$ and $q = W_{g_0}(x, t)$.

Lemma 5.8. The function $G : \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel.

Proof. Let $J \subset (-1, 1)$ be a countable dense subset not containing 0.

Since the function

$$h \mapsto \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h}$$

is continuous for $h \neq 0$, we have

$$(25) \quad G(x, t, q) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup \left\{ \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h} \mid |h| < \frac{1}{n}, h \in J \right\}.$$

The map

$$(x, t, q) \mapsto \sup \left\{ \frac{v(x + hq, t + h) - v(x, t)}{h} \mid |h| < \frac{1}{n}, h \in J \right\}$$

is Borel, being the supremum of countably many continuous functions. Thus G is the infimum of a countable family of Borel functions, hence Borel. \square

We recall classical notions (see [28]). In what follows, X and Y denote arbitrary Polish spaces.

Definition 5.9. A subset $A \subset X$ is called *analytic* if it is the projection of a Borel set $B \subset X \times Y$ for some Y . Any Borel subset of X is analytic, but the converse is not true.

Definition 5.10. Given any subset $C \subset X$, a set $E \subset C$ is called Borel in C if

$$E = B \cap C$$

for some Borel subset B of X .

A map $f : C \rightarrow Y$ is called *Borel* if for any Borel set B_0 of Y there exists a Borel set $B \subset X$ such that

$$f^{-1}(B_0) = B \cap C.$$

We give the following results in a form adapted to our setting.

Theorem 5.11 (Graph Theorem). *Let $A \subset \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ be analytic. A map $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is Borel if and only if its graph is a Borel subset of $A \times \mathbb{R}^N$.*

Proof. See [28, Theorem 4.5.2]. □

Theorem 5.12 (Extension Theorem). *Any Borel map $f : C \rightarrow Y$, with $C \subset X$, extends to a Borel map defined on all of X .*

Proof. See [28, Theorem 3.2.3]. □

Lemma 5.13. *The set $\mathcal{A}_{g_0} \subset \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T)$ is analytic, and W_{g_0} is a Borel map in the sense of Definition 5.10.*

Proof. From Corollary 5.7 we have

$$\text{graph } W_{g_0} = \{(x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \mid G(x, t, q) + L_0(x, t, q) \leq 0\}.$$

Since G and L_0 are Borel, the graph is Borel in $\mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus \mathcal{A}_{g_0} , its projection, is analytic. The claim follows from Theorem 5.11. □

We directly derive from Lemma 5.13 and Theorem 5.12:

Proposition 5.14. *The map $W_{g_0} : \mathcal{A}_{g_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ can be extended to a Borel map defined on all of $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.*

Notation 5.15. *We continue to denote the extended map by W_{g_0} .*

If the LO solution v is differentiable in space and time, we straightforwardly get:

Proposition 5.16. *If v is differentiable in space and time at (x_0, t_0) then $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0}$ and*

$$H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)) = W_{g_0}(x_0, t_0).$$

Proof. It is immediate that $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0}$.

We have

$$L_0(x_0, t_0, H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0))) = -Dv(x_0, t_0) \cdot H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)) - v_t(x_0, t_0),$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)), 1)} v(x_0, t_0) &= v_t(x_0, t_0) + Dv(x_0, t_0) \cdot H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)) \\ &= -L_0(x_0, t_0, H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0))), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the assertion. \square

If v is differentiable only in space, the analysis requires more care and will be carried out in Section 7.

6. g_0 -OPTIMALITY AND CONTINUITY EQUATION

We introduce a strengthened superlinearity assumption;

(H5) There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{H_0(x, t, p)}{|p|^{1+\varepsilon_0}} = +\infty$$

uniformly for (x, t) varying in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.

This is equivalent to

$$\lim_{|q| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{L_0(x, t, q)}{|q|^{(1+\varepsilon_0)^*}} = +\infty \quad \text{uniformly for } (x, t) \text{ varying in } \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T],$$

where $(1 + \varepsilon_0)^*$ is the conjugate exponent of $1 + \varepsilon_0$. In particular, this implies

$$(26) \quad L_0(x, t, q) \geq a + b|q|^{(1+\varepsilon_0)^*}$$

for suitable positive constants a, b , and all $(x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N$.

We recall two notions.

Definition 6.1. We say that a curve of measures $\mu(t)$, $\mu : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, is $(1 + \varepsilon_0)^*$ -*absolutely continuous* if

$$d_W(\mu(t_1), \mu(t_2)) \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \varphi(t) dt$$

for a function $\varphi \in L^{(1+\varepsilon_0)^*}([0, T])$ and any $t_1 < t_2 \in [0, T]$.

Definition 6.2. A narrowly continuous curve of measures $\mu(\cdot) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ is a solution to the *continuity equation* driven by W_{g_0} in $[0, T]$

$$(27) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mu(t) + \nabla \cdot (\mu(t) W_{g_0}(x, t)) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$$

if the following chain rule holds

$$(28) \quad \int_0^T \langle \mu(t), \varphi_t(\cdot, t) + D\varphi(\cdot, t) \cdot W_{g_0}(\cdot, t) \rangle dt = \langle \mu(T), \varphi(\cdot, T) \rangle - \langle \mu(0), \varphi(\cdot, 0) \rangle$$

for every function $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^1 .

In this section we prove:

Theorem 6.3. Let g_0 be a continuous final datum, under the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H4)** any g_0 -optimal measure $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ satisfies:

(i) the evaluation curve $\xi(t)$ is a solution of the continuity equation driven by W_{g_0} .

If in addition **(H5)** holds, then

(ii) $\xi(t)$ is $(1 + \varepsilon_0)^*$ -absolutely continuous.

We start with some preliminaries:

Lemma 6.4. Let ζ, h_n be a curve defined in $[0, T]$ and an infinitesimal negative sequence, respectively. Assume that ζ is differentiable at some $t_0 \in (0, T)$, then there exists $\rho_n > 0$ with $\lim_n \frac{\rho_n}{h_n} = 0$ and

$$\frac{|\zeta(t_0) + (h_n - \rho_n)\dot{\zeta}(t_0) - \zeta(t_0 + h_n - \rho_n)|}{\rho_n} \leq 1$$

for all n sufficiently large .

If instead h_n is infinitesimal and positive, then there exists $\rho_n > 0$ with $\lim_n \frac{\rho_n}{h_n} = 0$ and

$$\frac{|\zeta(t_0) + (h_n + \rho_n)\dot{\zeta}(t_0) - \zeta(t_0 + h_n + \rho_n)|}{\rho_n} \leq 1$$

for all n sufficiently large.

Proof. We only treat the case $h_n < 0$, the other one being analogous. For each n , define

$$f_n : \rho \mapsto \frac{|\zeta(t_0) + (h_n - \rho)\dot{\zeta}(t_0) - \zeta(t_0 + h_n - \rho)|}{\rho}$$

in the interval $(0, |h_n|]$. Since ζ is differentiable at t_0 , one has $\lim_n f_n(|h_n|) = 0$, hence

$$(29) \quad f_n(|h_n|) < 1 \quad \text{for all large } n .$$

For such an n , either

$$(30) \quad \sup_{(0, |h_n|]} f_n > 1$$

in which case, by continuity, there exists ρ_n with $f_n(\rho_n) = 1$, or else

$$(31) \quad \sup_{(0, |h_n|]} f_n \leq 1,$$

in which case we simply take $\rho_n = h_n^2$. If for a subsequence n_k (31) holds then the stated inequality is proved for ρ_{n_k} . If instead there exists a subsequence n_k satisfying (30), then by the differentiability of ζ at t_0 we have

$$\lim_{n_k} \frac{\rho_{n_k}}{h_{n_k} - \rho_{n_k}} = \lim_{n_k} \frac{|\zeta(t_0) + (h_{n_k} - \rho_{n_k})\dot{\zeta}(t_0) - \zeta(t_0 + h_{n_k} - \rho_{n_k})|}{h_{n_k} - \rho_{n_k}} = 0$$

and consequently

$$\lim_{n_k} \frac{h_{n_k}}{\rho_{n_k}} = \lim_{n_k} \frac{h_{n_k} - \rho_{n_k}}{\rho_{n_k}} + \lim_{n_k} \frac{\rho_{n_k}}{\rho_{n_k}} = -\infty,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\zeta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ be a g_0 -optimal curve, and assume that $t_0 \in (0, T)$ is a differentiability point of both ζ and of the function $t \mapsto v(\zeta(t), t)$, with*

$$\frac{d}{dt}v(\zeta(t_0), t_0) = -L_0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, \dot{\zeta}(t_0)).$$

Then

$$(\zeta(t_0), t_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\zeta}(t_0) = W_{g_0}(\zeta(t_0), t_0).$$

Proof. According to Corollary 5.7, it is enough to show that

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(\zeta(t_0) + h\dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h) - v(\zeta(t_0), t_0)}{h} &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(\zeta(t_0 + h), t_0 + h) - v(\zeta(t_0), t_0)}{h} \\ &= -L_0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, \dot{\zeta}(t_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Let (h_n) be any infinitesimal sequence such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n\dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) - v(\zeta(t_0), t_0)}{h_n} = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(\zeta(t_0) + h\dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h) - v(\zeta(t_0), t_0)}{h}.$$

Up to subsequences, we may assume that either all $h_n < 0$ or all $h_n > 0$.

Case 1: $h_n < 0$

Assume first that all $h_n < 0$. If (32) fails, then there exists $a > 0$ such that for n large,

$$(33) \quad v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n\dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) \leq v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n), t_0 + h_n) + ah_n.$$

Let (ρ_n) be the positive sequence associated with (h_n) by Lemma 6.4. Since ζ is g_0 -optimal,

$$v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n - \rho_n), t_0 + h_n - \rho_n) - v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n), t_0 + h_n) = \int_{t_0 + h_n - \rho_n}^{t_0 + h_n} L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt \geq m_{L_0} \rho_n.$$

Thus by (33),

$$(34) \quad v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) \leq v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n - \rho_n), t_0 + h_n - \rho_n) + ah_n - m_{L_0} \rho_n.$$

For n large, let $I_n = [t_0 + h_n - \rho_n, t_0 + h_n]$, and define the linear interpolation

$$\zeta_n(t) = \left(1 - \frac{t - (t_0 + h_n - \rho_n)}{\rho_n}\right) \zeta(t_0 + h_n - \rho_n) + \frac{t - (t_0 + h_n - \rho_n)}{\rho_n} (\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0)), \quad t \in I_n.$$

Lemma 6.4 gives

$$|\dot{\zeta}_n(t)| \leq |\dot{\zeta}(t_0)| + 1 \quad \text{for all } t \in I_n, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence

$$(35) \quad v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n - \rho_n), t_0 + h_n - \rho_n) - v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) \leq \int_{I_n} L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt \leq b\rho_n$$

for some constant $b > 0$.

Combining (34) and (35), we obtain

$$-ah_n + m_{L_0} \rho_n \leq b\rho_n,$$

which is impossible because $h_n < 0$ and $\rho_n/h_n \rightarrow 0$. Thus (32) holds when $h_n < 0$.

Case 2: $h_n > 0$

The argument is analogous. If (32) fails, then for some $a > 0$ and n large,

$$v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) \geq v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n), t_0 + h_n) + ah_n.$$

Let $\rho_n > 0$ be the sequence given by Lemma 6.4 for $h_n > 0$. Since ζ is g_0 -optimal,

$$v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n), t_0 + h_n) - v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n + \rho_n), t_0 + h_n + \rho_n) = \int_{t_0 + h_n}^{t_0 + h_n + \rho_n} L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt \geq m_{L_0} \rho_n.$$

Hence

$$(36) \quad v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) \geq v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n + \rho_n), t_0 + h_n + \rho_n) + ah_n + m_{L_0} \rho_n.$$

Let $I_n = [t_0 + h_n, t_0 + h_n + \rho_n]$, and define the linear interpolation

$$\zeta_n(t) = \left(1 - \frac{t - (t_0 + h_n)}{\rho_n}\right) (\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0)) + \frac{t - (t_0 + h_n)}{\rho_n} \zeta(t_0 + h_n + \rho_n), \quad t \in I_n.$$

As before,

$$|\dot{\zeta}_n(t)| \leq |\dot{\zeta}(t_0)| + 1, \quad t \in I_n,$$

and therefore,

$$(37) \quad v(\zeta(t_0) + h_n \dot{\zeta}(t_0), t_0 + h_n) - v(\zeta(t_0 + h_n + \rho_n), t_0 + h_n + \rho_n) \leq \int_{I_n} L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt \leq b\rho_n.$$

Combining (36) and (37) yields

$$ah_n + m_{L_0} \rho_n \leq b\rho_n,$$

which is impossible since $h_n > 0$ and $\rho_n/h_n \rightarrow 0$.

Thus in both cases (32) holds, and the lemma follows. \square

The next propositions shows, among other things, that for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}^N$ the vector field W_{g_0} has an integral curve ζ with $\zeta(0) = x_0$.

Proposition 6.6. *Any g_0 -optimal curve ζ is an integral curve of W_{g_0} with*

$$(38) \quad (\zeta(t), t) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0} \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. By the dynamical programming principle, see Remark 3.12, for any $t \in (0, T)$, h small in modulus

$$(39) \quad v(\zeta(t), t) = v(\zeta(t+h), t+h) + \int_t^{t+h} L_0(\zeta(\tau), \tau, \dot{\zeta}(\tau)) d\tau \quad \text{if } h > 0,$$

$$(40) \quad v(\zeta(t+h), t+h) = v(\zeta(t), t) + \int_{t+h}^t L_0(\zeta(\tau), \tau, \dot{\zeta}(\tau)) d\tau \quad \text{if } h < 0.$$

Let E_ζ be the set of the differentiability times of ζ , which are also Lebesgue points of $t \mapsto L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t))$. Since ζ is AC and $t \mapsto L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t))$ summable, E_ζ has full measure in $[0, T]$.

For $t \in E_\zeta$, we derive from (39), (40)

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{v(\zeta(t+h), t+h) - v(\zeta(t), t)}{h} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} -\frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} L_0(\zeta(\tau), \tau, \dot{\zeta}(\tau)) d\tau = -L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t)) \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{v(\zeta(t+h), t+h) - v(\zeta(t), t)}{h} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{1}{h} \int_{t+h}^t L_0(\zeta(\tau), \tau, \dot{\zeta}(\tau)) d\tau = -L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence ζ is differentiable at t and

$$\frac{d}{dt} v(\zeta(t), t) = -L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t)).$$

The claim then follows from Lemma 6.5. \square

Corollary 6.7. *Let ζ be a g_0 -optimal curve and $t_0 \in (0, T)$ a differentiability point of ζ and a Lebesgue point of $t \mapsto L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t))$. Then*

$$(\zeta(t_0), t_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\zeta}(t_0) = W_{g_0}(\zeta(t_0), t_0).$$

We derive from Proposition 6.6 and the definition of g_0 -optimal measure:

Corollary 6.8. *Any g_0 -optimal measure in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is supported by integral curves of W_{g_0} .*

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Let φ be a C^1 function defined in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$. By the change of variable formula in Proposition 2.2, for each $t \in [0, T]$

$$(41) \quad \begin{aligned} \int [\varphi_t(x, t) + D\varphi(x, t) \cdot W_{g_0}(x, t)] d\xi(t) = \\ \int [\varphi_t(\zeta(t), t) + D\varphi(\zeta(t), t) \cdot W_{g_0}(\zeta(t), t)] d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

The functions

$$(\zeta, t) \mapsto \zeta(t), \quad (\zeta, t) \mapsto \varphi_t(\zeta(t), t), \quad (\zeta, t) \mapsto D\varphi(\zeta(t), t)$$

are continuous and

$$(x, t) \mapsto W_{g_0}(x, t)$$

is Borel, hence the integrand on the right-side of (41) is Borel. By Fubini's Theorem and (41)

$$(42) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \xi(t), \varphi_t(\cdot, t) + D\varphi(\cdot, t) \cdot W_{g_0}(\cdot, t) \rangle dt = \\ \int \left[\int_0^T [\varphi_t(\zeta(t), t) + D\varphi(\zeta(t), t) \cdot W_{g_0}(\zeta(t), t)] dt \right] d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Since ξ is supported on integral curves of W_{g_0} (Corollary 6.8), the rightmost term in the above formula is equal to

$$(43) \quad \int [\varphi(\zeta(T), T) - \varphi(\zeta(0), 0)] d\xi,$$

and by the change of variable formula

$$(44) \quad \int \varphi(\zeta(T), T) d\xi = \langle \xi(T), \varphi(\cdot, T) \rangle$$

$$(45) \quad \int \varphi(\zeta(0), 0) d\xi = \langle \xi(0), \varphi(\cdot, 0) \rangle$$

By combining (42), (43), (44), (45), we finally obtain

$$\int_0^T \langle \xi(t), \varphi_t(\cdot, t) + D\varphi(\cdot, t) \cdot W_{g_0}(\cdot, t) \rangle dt = \langle \xi(T), \varphi(\cdot, T) \rangle - \langle \xi(0), \varphi(\cdot, 0) \rangle$$

which yields (i). We pass to item (ii). By [3, Theorem 8.3.1] it is enough to show that

$$t \mapsto \langle \xi(t), |W_{g_0}(t, \cdot)|^{(1+\varepsilon_0)^*} \rangle$$

belongs to $L^1([0, T])$. Using Fubini's Theorem, the g_0 -optimality of ξ and the growth bound (26), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \xi(t), |W_{g_0}(t, \cdot)|^{(1+\varepsilon_0)*} \rangle dt &\leq \int_0^T \langle \xi(t), c + c_0 L_0(x, t, W_{g_0}(x, t)) \rangle dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^T (c + c_0 L_0(\zeta(t), t, W_{g_0}(\zeta(t), t))) dt d\xi \\ &\leq cT + c_0 \text{osc}(v), \end{aligned}$$

for suitable positive constants c, c_0 , where osc stands for oscillation and v is the LO solution with final datum g_0 . This shows that the function above is integrable, and the claim follows. \square

7. COMPARISON BETWEEN W_{g_0} AND $H_p^0(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$

Exploiting some results from the previous section, we now establish a connection between W_{g_0} and $H_p^0(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$, just assuming space-differentiability of v (see also Proposition 5.16). The main result of the section is:

Proposition 7.1. *There exists $B \subset \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ which contains a subset of μ_ζ -full measure, for any g_0 -optimal curve ζ , such that*

$$\mathcal{A}_{g_0} \supset B \quad \text{and} \quad W_{g_0}(x, t) = H_p^0(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$$

for all $(x, t) \in B$ where v is differentiable in space.

We first prove a lemma on the extrema of functions of the form

$$(46) \quad F_h^\varphi(x) = \varphi(x) - h L_0 \left(\zeta(t_0), t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x}{h} \right),$$

where $h \in \mathbb{R}$ has sufficiently small modulus, ζ is a g_0 -optimal curve, t_0 a fixed time in $(0, T)$, and φ is a C^1 function on \mathbb{T}^N . This lemma will be used in the proof of Proposition 7.1, and in a corollary, taking as φ a C^1 subgradient/supergradient of $v(\cdot, t_0)$ at a space-differentiability point (x_0, t_0) . Recall that a function differentiable at a point admits both a C^1 subgradient and a C^1 supergradient at that point (see [4, Lemma 1.8]).

Lemma 7.2. *Let ζ, t_0, φ, h be as above, and let F_h^φ be defined by (46). If x_h is an extremal point of F_h^φ in \mathbb{T}^N (i.e., a local/global maximizer/minimizer), for any h , then*

- (i) $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} = H_p^0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, -D\varphi(\zeta(t_0)))$;
- (ii) $-D\varphi(\zeta(t_0)) \in \frac{\partial}{\partial q} L_0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, H_p^0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, -D\varphi(\zeta(t_0))))$, where $\frac{\partial}{\partial q} L_0$ denotes the subdifferential of L_0 with respect to the velocity variable.

Proof. Since F_h^φ is continuous, it admits extremal points over \mathbb{T}^N and at any such point x_h the first-order optimality condition yields

$$(47) \quad D\varphi(x_h) + \frac{\partial}{\partial q} L_0 \left(\zeta(t_0), t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} \right) \ni 0.$$

Because $D\varphi(x)$ is bounded and L_0 is superlinear in q , it follows that

$$\frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h}$$

is bounded, hence $x_h \rightarrow \zeta(t_0)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Passing to the limit in (47) and using closedness of the graph of the subdifferential, we obtain

$$(48) \quad D\varphi(\zeta(t_0)) + \frac{\partial}{\partial q} L_0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, q_0) \ni 0,$$

for any limit point q_0 of $\frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h}$. Since $L_0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, \cdot)$ is strictly convex, its subdifferential is strictly monotone, hence all such limit points must coincide, and

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h}$$

exists. By duality it equals

$$H_p^0(\zeta(t_0), t_0, -D\varphi(\zeta(t_0))),$$

which proves (i). Item (ii) follows directly from (48). \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Fix a g_0 -optimal curve ζ . Assume that v is differentiable in space at a point $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T)$ with $x_0 = \zeta(t_0)$. Assume further that ζ is differentiable at t_0 and that t_0 is a Lebesgue point for

$$t \mapsto L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t)).$$

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 subgradient to $v(\cdot, t_0)$ at $\zeta(t_0)$ and, for each $h > 0$, let x_h be a maximizer of the function F_h^φ defined in (46). The gist of the proof is to show that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{x_h - x_0}{h} = 0.$$

From Lemma 7.2 (i) $\frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h}$ stays bounded for $h \rightarrow 0$ and $x_h \rightarrow x_0$. Moreover, ζ is differentiable at t_0 , and t_0 is a Lebesgue point for $L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t))$. Using these facts, we can find a modulus ω with

$$(49) \quad \left| L_0 \left(x_0, t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} \right) - L_0 \left(x_h + (t - t_0) \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h}, t, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} \right) \right| < \omega(h)$$

for $t \in [t_0, t_0 + h]$, and moreover

$$(50) \quad \left| L_0 \left(x_0, t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_0}{h} \right) - L_0(x_0, t_0, \dot{\zeta}(t_0)) \right| < \omega(h),$$

$$(51) \quad \left| \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt - L_0(x_0, t_0, \dot{\zeta}(t_0)) \right| < \omega(h).$$

Define

$$\eta_h(t) = x_h + (t - t_0) \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h},$$

which is a curve joining x_h to $\zeta(t_0 + h)$ for t varying in $[t_0, t_0 + h]$. Using (49), and the fact that φ is subtangent to $v(\cdot, t_0)$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} F_h^\varphi(x_h) &\leq v(x_h, t_0) - \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} L_0(\eta_h, t, \dot{\eta}_h) dt + h\omega(h) \\ &\leq v(\zeta(t_0 + h), t_0 + h) + h\omega(h). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (50) and (51),

$$\begin{aligned} F_h^\varphi(x_0) &\geq v(x_0, t_0) - hL_0(x_0, t_0, \dot{\zeta}(t_0)) - h\omega(h) \\ &\geq v(x_0, t_0) - h \left[\frac{1}{h} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt + \omega(h) \right] - h\omega(h) \\ &= v(\zeta(t_0 + h), t_0 + h) - 2h\omega(h). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq F_h^\varphi(x_h) - F_h^\varphi(x_0) \\ &\leq v(\zeta(t_0 + h), t_0 + h) + h\omega(h) - v(\zeta(t_0 + h), t_0 + h) + 2h\omega(h) \\ &\leq 3h\omega(h). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by h and expanding F_h^φ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} (52) \quad 0 &\leq \frac{1}{h} \left[\varphi(x_h) - \varphi(x_0) + h \left(L_0 \left(x_0, t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_0}{h} \right) - L_0 \left(x_0, t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} \right) \right) \right] \\ &= Dv(x_0, t_0) \cdot \frac{x_h - x_0}{h} + \frac{o(|x_h - x_0|)}{h} \\ &\quad + \left[L_0 \left(x_0, t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_0}{h} \right) - L_0 \left(x_0, t_0, \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} \right) \right] \\ &\leq 3\omega(h). \end{aligned}$$

We have by Lemma 7.2 (i)

$$\lim_h \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} = H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0))$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_h \frac{x_h - x_0}{h} &= -\lim_h \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - x_h}{h} + \lim_h \frac{\zeta(t_0 + h) - \zeta(t_0)}{h} \\ &= \dot{\zeta}(t_0) - H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in (52), we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_0(x_0, t_0, \dot{\zeta}(t_0)) - L_0(x_0, t_0, H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0))) \\ = (-Dv(x_0, t_0)) \cdot (\dot{\zeta}(t_0) - H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0))), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(53) \quad \dot{\zeta}(t_0) = H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0))$$

because $-Dv(x_0, t_0) \in \frac{\partial}{\partial q} L_0(x_0, t_0, H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)))$ by Lemma 7.2 (ii) and L_0 is strictly convex in q . Since t_0 is a differentiability point of ζ and a Lebesgue point of L_0 , we get from (53) and Corollary 6.7

$$(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{g_0} \quad \text{and} \quad W_{g_0}(x_0, t_0) = H_p^0(x_0, t_0, -Dv(x_0, t_0)).$$

The assertion is then a consequence of Proposition 3.4. \square

The argument of Proposition 7.1 plus Lemma 7.2 actually proves the following more general statement:

Corollary 7.3. *There exists $B \subset \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ containing a subset of μ_ζ -full measure, for any g_0 -optimal curve ζ , such that $\mathcal{A}_{g_0} \supset B$, and*

$$W_{g_0}(x, t) = H_p^0(x, t, -D\varphi(x))$$

for any $(x, t) \in B$ where $v(\cdot, t)$ admits a C^1 super- or sub-tangent φ .

8. A FIXED POINT RESULT

Here we consider a Hamiltonian

$$H : \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

satisfying the structural assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)**, up to straightforward adaptations.

We are specifically interested in the case where a measure $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is fixed and H depends on time only through its evaluation curve $\xi(t)$. In other words, the Hamiltonians we focus on in this section have the form

$$H(x, \xi(t), p) \quad \text{for } \xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma).$$

By Lemma 2.7, the above Hamiltonians inherit the structural conditions **(H1)**–**(H3)**. Therefore all results established in the first part of the paper for the *abstract* Hamiltonian H_0 apply to them for any given ξ .

We also consider a continuous function

$$g : \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

and the HJ equation

$$(HJ^*) \quad -u_t + H(x, \xi(t), -Du) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T).$$

coupled with the final datum $g(\cdot, \xi(T))$ at $t = T$.

Since both \mathbb{T}^N and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ are compact, the continuity of g implies the existence of a constant M_g and a modulus ω_g with

$$(54) \quad \max_{\mathbb{T}^N} |g(x, \mu)| \leq M_g, \quad |g(x_1, \mu) - g(x_2, \mu)| \leq \omega_g(|x_2 - x_1|)$$

for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{T}^N$, $\mu \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$.

Given an *initial measure* μ_0 , we define the multivalued map $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{P}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ by

$$(55) \quad \mathcal{T}(\xi) = \{g(\cdot, \xi(T))\text{-optimal measures } \xi^* \text{ with } \xi^*(0) = \mu_0\}.$$

The main result of the section is:

Theorem 8.1. *Under the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)** the multivalued map \mathcal{T} possesses a fixed point, that is, there exists $\xi^* \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ satisfying*

$$\xi^* \in \mathcal{T}(\xi^*).$$

For the proof we will rely on the following version of the Kakutani–Glicksberg–Fan fixed point Theorem (see e.g. [1]):

Theorem 8.2. *Let S be a nonempty, compact and convex subset of a locally convex Hausdorff space. Let Φ be a multivalued map on S with nonempty convex values and closed graph. Then the set of fixed points of Φ is nonempty and compact.*

We now introduce some preliminary material. Set

$$\mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma) = \overline{\text{co}}\{\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma) \text{ with } \xi(0) = \mu_0, \text{ optimal for } g(\cdot, \xi_0(T)), \text{ for some } \xi_0 \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)\},$$

where $\overline{\text{co}}$ stands for the closed convex hull. Note that

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)) \subset \mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma).$$

We will prove the existence of a fixed point for the restriction of \mathcal{T} to $\mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$. This relies on a crucial compactness property. For its proof we need the following preliminary lemma, where we exploit the topological properties discussed in Section C.

Lemma 8.3. *The closed convex hull of a compact subset of $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is compact.*

The property above does not hold in a general Polish space. To prove it in our setting, we must use the specific structure of $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$. A general result states that the closed convex hull of a compact set in a locally convex space is precompact, in the sense that its completion, with respect to the canonical uniformity induced by the seminorms, is compact, see [25, Chapter II, Section 4.3].

To prove Lemma 8.3, we accordingly introduce some local convexity in the picture. We exploit the fact that the space $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ of signed Borel measures with bounded variation on Γ is locally convex with the family of seminorms induced by duality from the space $C_b(\Gamma)$ of bounded continuous functions endowed with the strict topology. The corresponding topology on $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ is the narrow one. See Section C for details, including all relevant definitions and terminology.

Proof of Lemma 8.3. Let \mathbb{A} be a compact subset of $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$, and let \mathbb{B} denote its closed convex hull. Since $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ it is enough to show, in view of [25, Chapter II, Section 4.3], that \mathbb{B} is complete with respect to the uniformity induced by the dual seminorms.

In this context the terms *compact* and *closed* are unambiguous since both refer to the narrow topology, which is related to the family of dual seminorms in $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$, see (84), and is also equivalent to the topology associated with Wasserstein distance in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$. Regarding completeness, however, we must specify that it is meant with respect to the uniformity generated by the dual seminorms: completeness depends on the uniformity, not only on the topology.

There are, in fact, two different uniformities at play: that related to the seminorms in $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$, and that induced by d_W .

If we can show that any Cauchy net in \mathbb{B} with respect to the dual seminorms is also Cauchy for d_W then the claim follows immediately from the fact that $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is closed, and $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is complete with respect to d_W on $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$.

The proof therefore boils down to showing this implication, which is a consequence of the Kantorovich–Rubinstein Theorem.

Let in fact K be a compact subset of Γ for the uniform topology. Define

$$\Theta_0 = \{f \in C_b(\Gamma) \mid f \text{ is 1-Lipschitz and } \min_K f = 0\},$$

where Lipschitz continuity is understood with respect to the uniform norm on Γ . We can choose $a > 0$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\psi_0} \leq 1 \quad \text{for any } f \in \Theta_0,$$

where $\psi_0 = a \chi_K$, and $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_0}$ is an admissible seminorm for the strict topology (see Section C). By (84), we therefore get

$$(56) \quad \|\mu\|_{\psi_0}^* \geq \sup\{(\mu, f) \mid f \in \Theta_0\} \quad \text{for any } \mu \in \mathbb{M}(\Gamma),$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the duality pairing between $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ and $C_b(\Gamma)$. Let μ_α be a Cauchy net, with respect to the dual seminorms, contained in \mathbb{B} . According to Definition C.2, there

exists, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, an index α_0 with

$$\|\mu_\alpha - \mu_\beta\|_{\psi_0} < \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } \alpha, \beta \succ \alpha_0.$$

By (56) this implies

$$|\langle \mu_\alpha, f \rangle - \langle \mu_\beta, f \rangle| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } f \in \Theta_0.$$

The inequality remains valid if we add to f a constant, since such a constant cancels out under subtraction of the two integrals. Hence

$$|\langle \mu_\alpha, f \rangle - \langle \mu_\beta, f \rangle| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } f \in C_b(\Gamma) \text{ 1-Lipschitz.}$$

Applying the Kantorovich–Rubinstein Theorem to the Polish space Γ ([29, Theorem 1.14]) we deduce

$$d_W(\mu_\alpha, \mu_\beta) < \varepsilon,$$

so that μ_α is Cauchy with respect to the first Wasserstein distance. This concludes the argument. \square

Proposition 8.4. *The set $\mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$ is compact in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. We first prove that

$$(57) \quad \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma) \text{ with } \xi(0) = \mu_0, \text{ optimal for } g(\cdot, \xi_0(T)), \text{ for some } \xi_0 \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma) \right\}$$

is compact. Indeed, the measures in (57) are supported on the same set of curves as in Proposition 3.13, with M_g, ω_g from (54) in place of M, ω , respectively, which is compact in Γ by virtue of Proposition 4.14. This shows the claim.

Since $\mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$ is the closed convex hull of the compact set in (57), the assertion follows from Lemma 8.3. \square

We next introduce some perturbations of the Lagrangian L which will be used in the proof of Theorem 8.1 to compensate for the lack of uniform continuity of L on $\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N$. Choose β_0 such that

$$(58) \quad \beta_0 > \max\{L(x, \mu, 0) \mid (x, \mu) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)\},$$

and for each $\beta > 0$ define

$$(59) \quad L_\beta(x, \mu, q) = L(x, \mu, q) \wedge (\beta |q| + \beta_0) \quad \text{for any } (x, \mu, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. Let $L_\beta^* : \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be its conjugate function

$$L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p) = \sup_q (p \cdot q - L_\beta(x, \mu, q)),$$

and let $L_\beta^{**} : \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the biconjugate

$$L_\beta^{**}(x, \mu, q) = \sup_p (p \cdot q - L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p)).$$

See Section D for basic facts on the above conjugate and biconjugate functions. We recall that

$$(60) \quad q \mapsto L_\beta^{**}(x, \mu, q) \text{ is the convex hull of } q \mapsto L_\beta(x, \mu, q) \text{ for any } (x, \mu),$$

see [15, Chapter E, Theorem 1.3.5], i.e., the largest convex function in q dominated by L_β .

Lemma 8.5. *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\beta > 0$, β_0 as in (58), and a sequence ξ_n in $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ narrowly converging to a measure ξ , there exists n_ε such that*

$$(61) \quad L(x, \xi_n(t), q) \geq L_\beta(x, \xi(t), q) - \varepsilon$$

for all $(x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N$ and all $n > n_\varepsilon$.

Proof. By uniform superlinearity of the Lagrangian L , we can choose a closed ball B in \mathbb{R}^N with

$$(62) \quad L(x, \mu, q) > \beta |q| + \beta_0 = L_\beta(x, \mu, q) \quad \text{for } (x, \mu, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B).$$

By Lemma 2.8 and the uniform continuity of L in $\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times B$, we can ensure that, for n sufficiently large,

$$(63) \quad L(x, \xi_n(t), q) \geq L(x, \xi(t), q) - \varepsilon \geq L_\beta(x, \xi(t), q) - \varepsilon$$

for $(x, t, q) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \times B$. Inequalities (62), (63) yield the assertion. \square

Next statement is pictorially evident; we provide nevertheless a formal proof.

Proposition 8.6. *We have*

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} L_\beta^{**}(x, \mu, q) = L(x, \mu, q) \quad \text{pointwise in } \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. Fix $\beta > 0$, $(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N$, and consider an affine subgradient

$$\phi(q) = L(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) + p_0 \cdot (q - q_0) \quad \text{for some } p_0 \in \partial_q L(x_0, \mu_0, q_0)$$

to $q \mapsto L(x_0, \mu_0, q)$ at q_0 , where $\partial_q L(x_0, \mu_0, q_0)$ is the subdifferential of $q \mapsto L(x_0, \mu_0, q)$ at q_0 . By (58) we have

$$(64) \quad \beta_0 > L(x_0, \mu_0, 0) \geq L(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) - p_0 \cdot q_0.$$

If $L_\beta(x_0, \mu_0, \cdot)$ does not dominate ϕ on all of \mathbb{R}^N , there exists q_1 in the closure of

$$\{q \mid L_\beta(x_0, \mu_0, q) < \phi(q)\}$$

with

$$L(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) + p_0 \cdot (q_1 - q_0) = \beta_0 + \beta |q_1| = L_\beta(x_0, \mu_0, q_1),$$

and from (64) we deduce

$$\beta |q_1| < p_0 \cdot q_1 \leq |p_0| |q_1|,$$

so that

$$(65) \quad |p_0| > \beta.$$

On the other hand, $q \mapsto L(x, \mu, q)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, uniformly with respect to (x, μ) , and superlinear, hence there exists a compact set $K_\beta \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with

$$\partial_q L(x_0, \mu_0, q) \subset B(0, \beta) \quad \text{and} \quad L(x_0, \mu_0, q) = L_\beta(x_0, \mu_0, q) \quad \text{for any } q \in K_\beta.$$

Combining (65), (60) and the characterization of the convex hull as the pointwise supremum of all the affine functions dominated by the given function, we get

$$L(x_0, \mu_0, q) = L_\beta(x_0, \mu_0, q) = L_\beta^{**}(x_0, \mu_0, q) \quad \text{for } q \in K_\beta.$$

The family K_β , for β varying in \mathbb{R}^+ , is increasing with respect to inclusion and satisfies

$$\mathbb{R}^N = \bigcup_{\beta > 0} K_\beta.$$

This implies the claim. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Taking into account Proposition 8.4, the fact that $\mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ where the narrow topology is induced by a family of seminorms, and the Kakutani–Glicksberg–Fan Theorem 8.2, the existence of a fixed point in $\mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$ is a consequence of the following statement:

- The multivalued map $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$ has nonempty convex values and closed graph.

We now prove it. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{P}_0(\Gamma)$. By Proposition 4.2, there exist $g(\cdot, \xi(T))$ –optimal measures associated to (HJ) with $H(x, \xi(t), q)$ in place of $H_0(x, t, q)$, and with initial distribution μ_0 . Such measures belong to $\mathcal{T}(\xi)$, which is then nonempty. An element ξ^* in $\mathcal{T}(\xi)$ is characterized, by Proposition 4.13 (ii) and Theorem 4.12, by the identity

$$(66) \quad \int_0^T \int L(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi^*(\zeta) = \langle \mu_0, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi^*(T), g(\cdot, \xi(T)) \rangle,$$

where v is the LO solution to (HJ*) with final datum $g(x, \xi(T))$. A direct computation shows that if (66) holds for measures ξ_1^*, ξ_2^* , then it also holds for any convex combination of them. Thus $\mathcal{T}(\xi)$ is convex.

It remains to show that the graph of \mathcal{T} is closed. Consider a sequence (ξ_n, ξ_n^*) in the graph of \mathcal{T} with

$$(\xi_n, \xi_n^*) \rightarrow (\xi, \xi^*).$$

We must prove that $\xi^* \in \mathcal{T}(\xi)$.

Let v_n, v be the LO solutions to (HJ*) with Hamiltonians $H(x, \xi_n(t), p), H(x, \xi(t), p)$ and final data $g(x, \xi_n(T)), g(x, \xi(T))$, respectively. By Lemma 2.8 we have $\xi_n(t) \rightarrow \xi(t)$ and $g(x, \xi_n(T)) \rightarrow g(x, \xi(T))$ uniformly in $[0, T]$ and \mathbb{T}^N , respectively. In addition, by

Proposition B.7 $v_n(\cdot, 0) \rightarrow v(\cdot, 0)$ uniformly in \mathbb{T}^N . Using optimality of ξ_n^* and the fact that $\xi_n^*(0) = \mu_0$ for any n , we deduce from Proposition 4.13 (ii) that

$$(67) \quad \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi_n(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi_n^*(\zeta) = \langle \mu_0, v_n(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi_n^*(T), g(\cdot, \xi_n(T)) \rangle,$$

for any n . By Lemma 2.9 and the convergences above,

$$\langle \mu_0, v_n(\cdot, 0) \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mu_0, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle, \quad \langle \xi_n^*(T), g(\cdot, \xi_n(T)) \rangle \rightarrow \langle \xi^*(T), g(\cdot, \xi(T)) \rangle.$$

Passing to the limit in (67), we obtain

$$(68) \quad \lim_n \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi_n(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi_n^*(\zeta) = \langle \mu_0, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi^*(T), g(\cdot, \xi(T)) \rangle.$$

Fix $\beta > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Since L_β^{**} is convex in q , and continuous in all arguments (Proposition D.1), the functional

$$\zeta \mapsto \int_0^T L_\beta^{**}(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt$$

is lsc in Γ by [8, Theorem 3.6] for any measure ξ . Using Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 8.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_n \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi_n(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi_n^* &\geq \lim_n \inf \int_0^T \int_0^T [L_\beta(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) - \varepsilon] dt d\xi_n^* \\ &\geq \lim_n \inf \int_0^T \int_0^T [L_\beta^{**}(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) - \varepsilon] dt d\xi_n^* \\ &\geq \int_0^T \int_0^T [L_\beta^{**}(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) - \varepsilon] dt d\xi^*. \end{aligned}$$

Letting first $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and then $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$, and using Proposition 8.6 together with the monotone convergence theorem, we get

$$\int_0^T L_\beta^{**}(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt \rightarrow \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt \quad \text{for any } \zeta \in \Gamma,$$

which implies, again using the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int_0^T \int_0^T L_\beta^{**}(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi^* \rightarrow \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi^*.$$

We finally derive

$$(69) \quad \lim_n \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi_n(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi_n^* \geq \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi^*.$$

By combining (68), (69) and exploiting Proposition 4.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_0^T L(\zeta, \xi(t), \dot{\zeta}) dt d\xi^* &\leq \langle \mu_0, v(\cdot, 0) \rangle - \langle \xi^*(T), g(\cdot, \xi(T)) \rangle \\ &\leq S_T(\mu_0, \xi^*(T)). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.11 equality must prevail in the above formula. This yields that $\xi^* \in \mathcal{T}(\xi)$ by Proposition 4.13 (ii), and concludes the argument. \square

9. MFG SYSTEMS IN A GENERALIZED FORM

In this section we assume, in addition to **(H1)**–**(H3)**, the additional condition **(H4)** on $H(x, \mu, p)$. By the results of Section 5, these hypotheses guarantee that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ and any continuous function

$$g : \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

there exists a Borel vector field

$$W_{g(\cdot, \xi(T))} : \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$$

enjoying all the properties established in Sections 5 and 6.

Given $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$, we consider the system

$$(MFG) \quad \begin{cases} -u_t + H(x, \xi(t), -Du) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T], \\ u(x, T) = g(x, \xi(T)) & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{T}^N, \\ \xi_t(t) + \nabla \cdot (\xi(t) W_{g(\cdot, \xi(T))}(x, t)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T], \\ \xi(0) = \mu_0 \end{cases}$$

This is not the classical MFG system, since the vector field driving the continuity equation is

$$W_{g(\cdot, \xi(T))}(x, t)$$

instead of the usual $H_p(x, t, -Dv(x, t))$.

Definition 9.1. A pair $(v, \xi^*) \in C(\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]) \times \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ is said to be a *solution* of (MFG) if

- v is the LO solution of the HJ equation with final datum $g(\cdot, \xi^*(T))$;
- the evaluation curve of ξ^* is a solution to the continuity equation with initial datum μ_0 .

Recall the multivalued map $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{P}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{T}(\xi) = \{g(\cdot, \xi(T))\text{-optimal measures } \xi_0 \text{ with } \xi_0(0) = \mu_0\}.$$

Theorem 9.2. *Assume (H1)–(H4). For every $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)$ and $g \in C(\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N))$, any fixed point ξ^* of \mathcal{T} , together with the LO solution v of the corresponding HJ equation with final datum $g(\cdot, \xi^*(T))$, provides a solution of (MFG). If, in addition, (H5) holds then the curve $\xi^*(t)$ is $(1 + \varepsilon_0)^*$ -absolutely continuous.*

Proof. By Theorem 8.1, there exists a fixed point $\xi^* \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ of \mathcal{T} . By Theorem 6.3 $\xi^*(t)$ then solves the continuity equation

$$\xi_t^*(t) + \nabla \cdot (\xi^*(t) W_{g(\cdot, \xi^*(T))}(x, t)) = 0.$$

This yields the first part of the assertion. If (H5) holds the absolute continuity of $\xi^*(t)$ with exponent $(1 + \varepsilon_0)^*$ follows from Theorem 6.3. \square

APPENDIX A. DISINTEGRATION THEORY

We briefly recall some standard facts on the disintegration of measures (see, e.g., [14]).

Definition A.1. Let X, Y be Polish spaces. A family η_y , with y varying in Y , of probability measures on X is said *measurable* if

$$(70) \quad y \mapsto \eta_y(B) \quad \text{is Borel for any Borel subset } B \text{ of } X.$$

Given such a family, and a Borel probability measure ν on Y , we define a probability measure μ on X by the *pull-back* formula

$$(71) \quad \mu(B) = \int \eta_y(B) d\nu.$$

We next consider a Borel map $\Phi : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfying

$$(72) \quad \text{spt}(\eta_y) \subset \Phi^{-1}(y) \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-almost all } y \in Y.$$

Proposition A.2. *Assume (72) holds and define μ by (71). Then μ is a probability measure on X and*

$$\nu = \Phi \# \mu.$$

Proof. Since (71) defines a probability measure, it remains to check that

$$\mu(\Phi^{-1}(E)) = \nu(E)$$

for any Borel set E in Y . Using (72), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Phi^{-1}(E)) &= \int \eta_y(\Phi^{-1}(E)) d\nu = \int \eta_y(\Phi^{-1}(E) \cap \Phi^{-1}(y)) d\nu \\ &= \int_E \eta_y(\Phi^{-1}(E) \cap \Phi^{-1}(y)) d\nu = \int_E \eta_y(\Phi^{-1}(y)) d\nu \\ &= \int_E \eta_y(X) d\nu = \nu(E). \end{aligned}$$

\square

The disintegration theorem allows a more precise construction. Given a probability measure μ on X and defining $\nu = \Phi\#\mu$, a disintegration of μ with respect to Φ consists in a measurable family of probability measures η_y with $y \in Y$ supported on $\Phi^{-1}(y)$ for ν -almost all y , such that

$$(73) \quad \int g \, d\mu = \int \left[\int g \, d\eta_y \right] d\nu$$

for any μ -integrable function g .

The disintegration theorem reads:

Theorem A.3. *Let X and Y be Polish spaces and $\Phi : X \rightarrow Y$ a Borel map. Then any Borel probability measure μ on X admits a disintegration with respect to Φ .*

APPENDIX B. THE LO SOLUTION

The aim of this appendix is to prove the following.

Theorem B.1. *Let g_0 be a continuous function on \mathbb{T}^N . Under assumptions (H1)–(H3) the function v given by the Lax–Oleinik formula (8) is a continuous solution of (HJ) agreeing with g_0 at $t = T$.*

We first collect some auxiliary results.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} M_{g_0} &= \max_{\mathbb{T}^N} g_0, \\ m_{g_0} &= \min_{\mathbb{T}^N} g_0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.2. *The function v given by the Lax–Oleinik formula is bounded on $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} v(x_0, t_0) &\leq g_0(x_0) + \int_{t_0}^T L_0(x_0, t, 0) \, dt \leq M_0 T + M_{g_0}, \\ v(x_0, t_0) &\geq m_{g_0} + m_{L_0} T \end{aligned}$$

for any $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$, where M_0, m_{L_0} are the constants appearing in Notation 2.10. \square

Lemma B.3. *Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}^N$ and $t_1 < t_2$. Then*

$$v(x_0, t_1) \leq v(x_0, t_2) + M_0 (t_2 - t_1).$$

Proof. Let $\zeta : [t_2, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ be a curve with

$$v(x_0, t_2) = g_0(\zeta(T)) + \int_{t_2}^T L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt.$$

Define $\bar{\zeta}$ by

$$\bar{\zeta}(t) = \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{in } [t_1, t_2], \\ \zeta(t) & \text{in } [t_2, T]. \end{cases}$$

Using the Lax–Oleinik formula with $\bar{\zeta}$ as competitor, we get

$$v(x_0, t_1) \leq g_0(\bar{\zeta}(T)) + \int_{t_1}^T L_0(\bar{\zeta}, t, \dot{\bar{\zeta}}) dt \leq v(x_0, t_2) + M_0(t_2 - t_1).$$

□

Lemma B.4. *For every $t_0 \in [0, T]$, the function $x \mapsto v(x, t_0)$ is lsc on \mathbb{T}^N .*

Proof. For $t_0 = T$ the claim is trivial since $v(\cdot, T) = g_0$ is continuous. Assume $t_0 < T$ and fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}^N$. Let x_n be a sequence converging to x_0 . For each n , let ζ_n be a curve with

$$v(x_n, t_0) = g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt.$$

By Lemma B.2, the integrals in the right-hand side of the above formula are equibounded, hence by Proposition 3.2 the curves ζ_n uniformly converge in $[t_0, T]$, up to a subsequence, to a curve ζ with $\zeta(t_0) = x_0$. By Proposition 3.3

$$\liminf_n \left(g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt \right) \geq g_0(\zeta(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt \geq v(x_0, t_0),$$

which eventually yields

$$\liminf_n v(x_n, t_0) \geq v(x_0, t_0).$$

□

Proposition B.5. *The function v given by the Lax–Oleinik formula is lsc in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.*

Proof. Fix $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$. Let (x_n, t_n) be a sequence converging to (x_0, t_0) . Fix ε with $t_0 + \varepsilon < T$, and take n large enough so that $t_n < t_0 + \varepsilon$. Denote by $\zeta_n : [t_n, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ a sequence of curves with

$$(74) \quad v(x_n, t_n) = g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_n}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt.$$

Set

$$y_n = \zeta_n(t_0 + \varepsilon)$$

so that

$$v(y_n, t_0 + \varepsilon) = g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_0 + \varepsilon}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt.$$

Thus

$$(75) \quad v(x_n, t_n) = v(y_n, t_0 + \varepsilon) + \int_{t_n}^{t_0 + \varepsilon} L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt \geq v(y_n, t_0 + \varepsilon) + m_{L_0}(t_0 + \varepsilon - t_n).$$

Extend each ζ_n to $[0, T]$ by setting

$$\zeta_n(t) = \zeta_n(t_n) = x_n \quad \text{in } [0, t_n].$$

By Lemma B.2 and Proposition 3.2, the extended curves converge uniformly in $[0, T]$, up to subsequences, to a curve ζ . In particular

$$(76) \quad x_0 = \lim_n x_n = \lim_n \zeta_n(t_n) = \zeta(t_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_n y_n = \lim_n \zeta_n(t_0 + \varepsilon) = \zeta(t_0 + \varepsilon).$$

From (75), (76) and Lemmata B.3, B.4 we get

$$(77) \quad \begin{aligned} \liminf_n v(x_n, t_n) &\geq \liminf_n v(y_n, t_0 + \varepsilon) + m_{L_0}(t_0 + \varepsilon - t_n) \\ &\geq v(\zeta(t_0 + \varepsilon), t_0 + \varepsilon) + m_{L_0} \varepsilon \geq v(\zeta(t_0 + \varepsilon), t_0) + (m_{L_0} - M_0)\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and using again Lemma B.4 and (76) we deduce

$$\liminf_n v(x_n, t_n) \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (v(\zeta(t_0 + \varepsilon), t_0) + (m_{L_0} - M_0)\varepsilon) \geq v(x_0, t_0),$$

which shows the claimed lower semicontinuity in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.

We now consider the case of a point (x_0, T) . Let (x_n, t_n) be a sequence in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ converging to (x_0, T) , and let ζ_n be a sequence of curves satisfying (74). Then

$$(78) \quad v(x_n, t_n) \geq g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + m_{L_0}(T - t_n).$$

Extending the curves ζ_n as before, they are equicontinuous and uniformly convergent, up to a subsequence, to a curve ζ . Let ω be a common modulus of continuity, then

$$|x_0 - \zeta_n(T)| \leq |x_0 - x_n| + |\zeta_n(t_n) - \zeta_n(T)| \leq |x_0 - x_n| + \omega(T - t_n),$$

hence

$$\lim_n \zeta_n(T) = x_0.$$

From (78), we obtain

$$\liminf_n v(x_n, t_n) \geq \lim_n (g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + m_{L_0}(T - t_n)) = g_0(x_0).$$

This concludes the argument. \square

Proposition B.6. *The function v given by the Lax-Oleinik formula is usc on $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$.*

Proof. Fix $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ and let (x_n, t_n) be a sequence converging to (x_0, t_0) . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. Let $\zeta : [t_0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ be a curve with

$$v(x_0, t_0) = g_0(\zeta(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt.$$

For n with $t_0 > t_n - \varepsilon$ and $\frac{|x_0 - x_n|}{t_0 - t_n + \varepsilon} < 1$, we define

$$\zeta_n(t) = \begin{cases} \eta_n(t) & \text{in } [t_n - \varepsilon, t_0] \\ \zeta(t) & \text{in } [t_0, T] \end{cases},$$

where $\eta_n : [t_n - \varepsilon, t_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ is the geodesic joining x_n to x_0 . In particular

$$|\dot{\eta}_n(t)| = \frac{|x_0 - x_n|}{t_0 - t_n + \varepsilon} < 1.$$

By definition of v

$$\begin{aligned} v(x_n, t_n - \varepsilon) &\leq g_0(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_n - \varepsilon}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt \leq \int_{t_n - \varepsilon}^{t_0} L_0(\eta_n, t, \dot{\eta}_n) dt + v(x_0, t_0) \\ &\leq M_1 (t_0 - t_n + \varepsilon) + v(x_0, t_0), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_1 = \max\{|L_0(x, t, q)| \mid |q| \leq 1\}.$$

Fix n and let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Using the lower semicontinuity of v proved in Proposition B.5, we get from the above inequality

$$v(x_n, t_n) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v(x_n, t_n - \varepsilon) \leq v(x_0, t_0) + M_1 (t_0 - t_n) \quad \text{for } n \text{ large enough.}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$, this yields

$$\limsup_n v(x_n, t_n) \leq v(x_0, t_0),$$

hence the claimed upper semicontinuity. \square

Proof of Theorem B.1. By Propositions B.5 and B.6, v is continuous in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$, and, by its very definition, it coincides with g_0 at $t = T$.

We now prove that it is a viscosity supersolution of (HJ). Let ψ be a C^1 strict subgradient to v at some $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T)$. Let $\zeta : [t_0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ be an optimal curve for $v(x_0, t_0)$, and choose a sequence $t_n \in [t_0, T]$ converging to t_0 . By the subtangency of ψ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0}^{t_n} (\psi_t(\zeta(t), t) + D\psi(\zeta(t)) \cdot \dot{\zeta}(t)) dt \\ &= \psi(\zeta(t_n), t_n) - \psi(x_0, t_0) \leq v(\zeta(t_n), t_n) - v(x_0, t_0) \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t_n} -L_0(\zeta(t), t, \dot{\zeta}(t)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a sequence of differentiability times $s_n \in [t_0, t_n]$ for ζ with

$$(79) \quad -\psi_t(\zeta(s_n), s_n) - D\psi(\zeta(s_n)) \cdot \dot{\zeta}(s_n) \geq L_0(\zeta(s_n), s_n, \dot{\zeta}(s_n))$$

for any n . Let U be a closed neighborhood of (x_0, t_0) containing the points $(\zeta(s_n), s_n)$ for n large. Set

$$M = \max_U |D\psi(x, t)|.$$

From (79),

$$M|\dot{\zeta}(s_n)| \geq -D\psi(\zeta(s_n)) \cdot \dot{\zeta}(s_n) \geq L_0(\zeta(s_n), s_n, \dot{\zeta}(s_n)) + \psi_t(\zeta(s_n), s_n).$$

Since L_0 is superlinear in q , the sequence $\dot{\zeta}(s_n)$ must be bounded, hence converges, up to a subsequence, to some $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in (79),

$$-\psi_t(x_0, t_0) - D\psi(x_0, t_0) \cdot q \geq L_0(x_0, t_0, q),$$

and consequently

$$(80) \quad -\psi_t(x_0, t_0) + H(x_0, t_0, -D\psi(x_0, t_0)) \geq 0,$$

which shows that v is a supersolution in $\mathbb{T}^N \times (0, T)$. The supersolution property at $t = 0$ follows by standard extension arguments for time-dependent Hamilton–Jacobi equations.

Next we prove that v is a subsolution to (HJ). Let φ be a C^1 strict supertangent to v at a point $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T)$. Then, for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and all $h > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\frac{\varphi(x_0, t_0) - \varphi(x_0 + hq, t_0 + h)}{h} \leq \frac{v(x_0, t_0) - v(x_0 + hq, t_0 + h)}{h}.$$

Since the argument is local, we may regard \mathbb{T}^N as \mathbb{R}^N in a chart around x_0 . We get

$$\frac{\varphi(x_0, t_0) - \varphi(x_0 + hq, t_0 + h)}{h} \leq \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} L_0(x_0 + (t - t_0)q, t, q) dt.$$

Letting $h \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$-\varphi_t(x_0, t_0) - D\varphi(x_0, t_0) \cdot q \leq L_0(x_0, t_0, q).$$

Since $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is arbitrary, this inequality implies

$$-\varphi_t(x_0, t_0) + H(x_0, t_0, -D\varphi(x_0, t_0)) \leq 0.$$

This ends the proof. \square

We close the section with a stability result.

Proposition B.7. *Let g_n be a sequence of continuous functions on \mathbb{T}^N converging uniformly to a function g_0 . The LO solutions v_n of (HJ) with final datum g_n converge uniformly in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T]$ to the LO solution v of (HJ) with final datum g_0 .*

Proof. Fix (x_0, t_0) in $\mathbb{T}^N \times [0, T)$, an approximating sequence (x_n, t_n) and $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume

$$v_n(x_n, t_n) = g_n(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_n}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt$$

for some curves ζ_n with $\zeta_n(t_n) = x_n$. For n large, we have $t_n \geq t_0 - \varepsilon$. Extend each ζ_n to $[t_0 - \varepsilon, T]$ by setting

$$(81) \quad \zeta_n(t) = x_n \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0 - \varepsilon, t_n].$$

Then

$$v_n(x_n, t_n) = g_n(\zeta_n(T)) + \int_{t_0 - \varepsilon}^T L_0(\zeta_n, t, \dot{\zeta}_n) dt - \int_{t_0 - \varepsilon}^{t_n} L_0(x_n, t, 0) dt.$$

By the definition of LO solution and (81), the actions of the curves ζ_n are bounded in $[t_0 - \varepsilon, T]$, so by Proposition 3.2 they converge uniformly, up to subsequences, to a curve ζ on $[t_0 - \varepsilon, T]$. Moreover, since the action is lsc with respect to the uniform convergence by Proposition 3.3 and

$$\int_{t_0 - \varepsilon}^{t_n} L_0(x_n, t, 0) dt \leq M_0(t_n - t_0 + \varepsilon),$$

we get

$$\liminf_n v_n(x_n, t_n) \geq g_0(\zeta(T)) + \int_{t_0 - \varepsilon}^T L_0(\zeta, t, \dot{\zeta}) dt - M_0 \varepsilon \geq v(x_0, t_0 - \varepsilon) - M_0(t_n - t_0 + \varepsilon).$$

Since ε is arbitrary and v is continuous,

$$(82) \quad \liminf_n v_n(x_n, t_n) \geq v(x_0, t_0).$$

Now let n be so large that

$$\|g_n - g_0\|_\infty < \varepsilon.$$

For such n and a suitable choice of curves $\eta_n : [t_n, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^N$ with $\eta_n(t_n) = x_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} v(x_n, t_n) &= g_0(\eta_n(T)) + \int_{t_n}^T L_0(\eta_n, t, \dot{\eta}_n) dt \\ &\geq g_n(\eta_n(T)) - \varepsilon + \int_{t_n}^T L_0(\eta_n, t, \dot{\eta}_n) dt \\ &\geq v_n(x_n, t_n) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as n goes to infinity, we get

$$v(x_0, t_0) = \lim_n v(x_n, t_n) \geq \limsup_n v_n(x_n, t_n) - \varepsilon.$$

The constant ε being arbitrary, we derive

$$(83) \quad \limsup_n v_n(x_n, t_n) \leq v(x_0, t_0).$$

Inequalities (82), (83) imply the assertion. \square

APPENDIX C. STRICT TOPOLOGY

We recall the notion of *strict topology* on $C_b(\Gamma)$ (see [16]), the space of bounded continuous functions on Γ . It is defined through the family of seminorms

$$\{\|\cdot\|_\psi \mid \psi \in B_0(\Gamma)\},$$

where $B_0(\Gamma)$ is the space of bounded Borel functions on Γ *vanishing at infinity* and

$$\|f\|_\psi = \|\psi f\|_\infty \quad \text{for any } f \in C_b(\Gamma).$$

A function ψ is said to vanish at infinity if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact subset K of Γ with

$$|\psi(x)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Gamma \setminus K.$$

A basis of neighborhoods of a fixed f_0 is then given by the sets

$$\{f \in C_b(\Gamma) \mid \|f - f_0\|_{\psi_i} < \varepsilon\} \quad \varepsilon > 0, M \in \mathbb{N}, \psi_i \in B_0(\Gamma), i = 1, \dots, M.$$

The space $C_b(\Gamma)$ endowed with the strict topology is therefore locally convex, Hausdorff and, moreover, complete with respect to the uniformity induced by these seminorms, see [16, Theorem 1].

Remark C.1. The classical definition of strict topology (see [7], [13]) is formulated for bounded functions defined on locally compact spaces and involves seminorms $\|\cdot\|_\psi$ with ψ continuous and vanishing at infinity. In our setting Γ is an infinite dimensional Banach space, and the only continuous function vanishing at infinity is the zero function. Therefore, to extend the theory to non-locally compact spaces, the continuity assumption on ψ must be removed.

The key feature of the strict topology on $C_b(\Gamma)$ is that its topological dual is precisely the space of signed Borel measures with bounded variation on Γ , denoted by $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$; see [16, Theorem 2]. In particular, the normalized positive elements of $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ are exactly the probability measures $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$. We denote by (\cdot, \cdot) the corresponding duality pairing. Note that

$$(\mu, f) = \langle \mu, f \rangle \quad \text{for any } f \in C_b(\Gamma), \mu \in \mathbb{P}(\Gamma),$$

see Notation 2.5.

The weak-star topology on the dual space $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$, i.e., pointwise convergence on $C_b(\Gamma)$, coincides with the narrow topology, and is induced by the family of dual seminorms

$$(84) \quad \|\mu\|_\psi^* = \sup\{|\langle \mu, f \rangle| \mid f \in C_b(\Gamma), \|f\|_\psi \leq 1\}$$

for ψ varying in $B_0(\Gamma)$. Thus $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ is locally convex and in addition Hausdorff, see [26, Chapter 28.15].

Narrow convergence of a net $\mu_\alpha \rightarrow \mu$ can be equivalently described by

$$\|\mu_\alpha - \mu\|_\psi^* \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for any } \psi \in B_0(\Gamma).$$

Unsurprisingly, we say that a subset \mathbb{A} of $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ is *complete* if every Cauchy net contained in \mathbb{A} converges to an element of \mathbb{A} .

Definition C.2. A net μ_α contained in $\mathbb{M}(\Gamma)$ is said *Cauchy* (with respect to the seminorms $\|\cdot\|_\psi^*$) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\psi \in B_0(\Gamma)$ there exists α_0 such that

$$\alpha, \beta \succ \alpha_0 \Rightarrow \|\mu_\alpha - \mu_\beta\|_\psi^* < \varepsilon.$$

APPENDIX D. CONJUGATE AND BICONJUGATE OF THE PERTURBED LAGRANGIAN L_β

We consider the Lagrangian

$$L : \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

introduced in Section 8, and its perturbation L_β , defined in (59). For convenience, we recall that

$$L_\beta(x, \mu, q) = L(x, \mu, q) \wedge (\beta |q| + \beta_0),$$

with $\beta > 0$, and β_0 satisfying

$$(85) \quad \beta_0 > \max\{L(x, \mu, 0) \mid (x, \mu) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N)\}.$$

We further denote by $\overline{B(0, \beta)}$ the closed ball of radius β centered at 0 in \mathbb{R}^N .

The conjugate of L_β is given by

$$(x, \mu, p) \mapsto L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^N} (p \cdot q - L_\beta(x, \mu, q)),$$

and the biconjugate L_β^{**} in the usual way.

Our aim is to prove:

Proposition D.1. *The function $(x, \mu, q) \mapsto L_\beta^{**}(x, \mu, q)$ is continuous.*

We begin with two preliminary lemmata.

Lemma D.2. *We have $L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p) = +\infty$ if and only if $|p| > \beta$.*

Proof. Take p with $|p| > \beta$. Then

$$L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p) \geq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} (\lambda |p| - L_\beta(x, \mu, \lambda p/|p|)) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} (\lambda |p| - \beta \lambda - \beta_0) = +\infty.$$

Conversely, assume $L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p) = +\infty$. Then there exists a sequence q_n with $|q_n| \rightarrow +\infty$ such that

$$+\infty = \lim_n (p \cdot q_n - L_\beta(x, \mu, q_n)) = \lim_n (p \cdot q_n - \beta |q_n| - \beta_0) \leq \lim_n (|p| |q_n| - \beta |q_n| - \beta_0),$$

which implies $|p| > \beta$. \square

Lemma D.3. *The function L_β^* is continuous on $\mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \overline{B(0, \beta)}$.*

Proof. Fix $(x, \mu, p) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \overline{B(0, \beta)}$ and a sequence (x_n, μ_n, p_n) with $(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) \rightarrow (x, \mu, p)$.

By Lemma D.2, since $|p| \leq \beta$, the supremum in the definition of $L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p)$ is attained at some q_0 , and since L_β is continuous in all arguments, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p) &= p \cdot q_0 - L_\beta(x, \mu, q_0) \\ &= \lim_n (p_n \cdot q_0 - L_\beta(x_n, \mu_n, q_0)) \\ &\leq \liminf_n L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n), \end{aligned}$$

which yields lower semicontinuity at (x, μ, p) .

Again by Lemma D.2, for each n there exists q_n with

$$L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) = p_n \cdot q_n - L_\beta(x_n, \mu_n, q_n) \quad \text{for any } n.$$

Assume by contradiction that $|q_n| \rightarrow +\infty$, up to subsequences. Then for n large enough,

$$L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) = p_n \cdot q_n - \beta |q_n| - \beta_0,$$

hence q_n satisfies

$$\frac{q_n}{|q_n|} = \frac{p_n}{|p_n|},$$

since with such a choice the first term in the right-hand side of the above formula is maximized and the other ones are not affected. Then

$$L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) = |q_n| |p_n| - \beta |q_n| - \beta_0,$$

which yields

$$L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) \leq -\beta_0.$$

By (85),

$$L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) < -L(x_n, \mu_n, 0) = -L_\beta(x_n, \mu_n, 0),$$

which contradicts the definition of L_β^* .

We conclude that the sequence q_n is bounded, hence, up to subsequences, $q_n \rightarrow q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^N$. By continuity of L_β ,

$$\lim_n L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) = \lim_n (p_n \cdot q_n - L_\beta(x_n, \mu_n, q_n)) = p \cdot q_1 - L_\beta(x, \mu, q_1) \leq L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p).$$

Combining upper and lower semicontinuity, we deduce the claimed continuity. \square

As a consequence of the above lemmata, we have

$$(86) \quad L_\beta^{**}(x, \mu, q) = \max_{p \in B(0, \beta)} (p \cdot q - L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p)) \quad \text{for any } (x, \mu, q).$$

Proof of Proposition D.1. Let $(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) \in \mathbb{T}^N \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}^N) \times \mathbb{R}^N$ and let (x_n, μ_n, q_n) be a sequence converging to (x_0, μ_0, q_0) . By (86) and the continuity of

$$p \mapsto p \cdot q - L_\beta^*(x, \mu, p),$$

there exist, by Lemma D.3, p_0, p_n in $\overline{B(0, \beta)}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} L_\beta^{**}(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) &= p_0 \cdot q_0 - L_\beta^*(x_0, \mu_0, p_0), \\ L_\beta^{**}(x_n, \mu_n, q_n) &= p_n \cdot q_n - L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n) \quad \text{for any } n. \end{aligned}$$

We derive

$$\begin{aligned} L_\beta^{**}(x_0, \mu_0, q_0) &= p_0 \cdot q_0 - L_\beta^*(x_0, \mu_0, p_0) \\ &= \lim_n (p_0 \cdot q_n - L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_0)) \\ &\leq \liminf_n L_\beta^{**}(x_n, \mu_n, q_n), \end{aligned}$$

since p_n converges, up to subsequences, to some $p_1 \in \overline{B(0, \beta)}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_n L_\beta^{**}(x_n, \mu_n, q_n) &= \lim_n (p_n \cdot q_n - L_\beta^*(x_n, \mu_n, p_n)) \\ &= p_1 \cdot q_0 - L_\beta^*(x_0, \mu_0, p_1) \\ &\leq L_\beta^{**}(x_0, \mu_0, q_0). \end{aligned}$$

The two above inequalities prove the assertion. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. D. ALIPRANTIS AND K. C. BORDER, *Infinite dimensional analysis*, Springer, Berlin, third ed., 2006. A hitchhiker's guide.
- [2] L. AMBROSIO, G. DA PRATO, AND A. MENNUCCI, *Introduction to measure theory and integration*, vol. 10 of Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie) [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)], Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2011.
- [3] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, AND G. SAVARÉ, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second ed., 2008.
- [4] M. BARDI AND I. CAPUZZO-DOLCETTA, *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*, Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1997. With appendices by Maurizio Falcone and Pierpaolo Soravia.
- [5] G. BARLES, *An introduction to the theory of viscosity solutions for first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations and applications*, in *Hamilton-Jacobi equations: approximations, numerical analysis and applications*, vol. 2074 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 49–109.
- [6] J.-D. BENAMOU, G. CARLIER, AND F. SANTAMBROGIO, *Variational mean field games*, in *Active particles. Vol. 1. Advances in theory, models, and applications*, Model. Simul. Sci. Eng. Technol., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 141–171.
- [7] R. C. BUCK, *Bounded continuous functions on a locally compact space*, Michigan Math. J., 5 (1958), pp. 95–104.

- [8] G. BUTTAZZO, M. GIAQUINTA, AND S. HILDEBRANDT, *One-dimensional variational problems*, vol. 15 of Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.
- [9] P. CANNARSA AND R. CAPUANI, *Existence and uniqueness for mean field games with state constraints*, in PDE models for multi-agent phenomena, vol. 28 of Springer INdAM Ser., Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 49–71.
- [10] P. CARDALIAGUET, A. R. MÉSZÁROS, AND F. SANTAMBROGIO, *First order mean field games with density constraints: pressure equals price*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 54 (2016), pp. 2672–2709.
- [11] C. CASTAING AND M. VALADIER, *Convex analysis and measurable multifunctions*, vol. Vol. 580 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.
- [12] F. H. CLARKE, *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*, vol. 5 of Classics in Applied Mathematics, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second ed., 1990.
- [13] J. B. CONWAY, *The strict topology and compactness in the space of measures. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 126 (1967), pp. 474–486.
- [14] C. DELLACHERIE AND P.-A. MEYER, *Probabilities and potential*, vol. 29 of North-Holland Mathematics Studies, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [15] J.-B. HIRIART-URRUTY AND C. LEMARÉCHAL, *Fundamentals of convex analysis*, Grundlehren Text Editions, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Abridged version of *Convex analysis and minimization algorithms. I* [Springer, Berlin, 1993; MR1261420 (95m:90001)] and *II* [ibid.; MR1295240 (95m:90002)].
- [16] J. HOFFMANN-JØRGENSEN, *A generalization of the strict topology*, Math. Scand., 30 (1972), pp. 313–323.
- [17] M. HUANG, P. E. CAINES, AND R. P. MALHAMÉ, *An invariance principle in large population stochastic dynamic games*, J. Syst. Sci. Complex., 20 (2007), pp. 162–172.
- [18] ———, *An invariance principle in large population stochastic dynamic games*, J. Syst. Sci. Complex., 20 (2007), pp. 162–172.
- [19] M. HUANG, R. P. MALHAMÉ, AND P. E. CAINES, *Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle*, Commun. Inf. Syst., 6 (2006), pp. 221–251.
- [20] J.-M. LASRY AND P.-L. LIONS, *Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 343 (2006), pp. 619–625.
- [21] ———, *Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 343 (2006), pp. 679–684.
- [22] ———, *Mean field games*, Jpn. J. Math., 2 (2007), pp. 229–260.
- [23] G. MAZANTI AND F. SANTAMBROGIO, *Minimal-time mean field games*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 29 (2019), pp. 1413–1464.
- [24] F. SANTAMBROGIO, *Lecture notes on variational mean field games*, in Mean field games, vol. 2281 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020, pp. 159–201.
- [25] H. H. SCHAEFER AND M. P. WOLFF, *Topological vector spaces*, vol. 3 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1999.
- [26] E. SCHECHTER, *Handbook of analysis and its foundations*, Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 1997.
- [27] A. SICONOLFI, *Minimal action on the space of measures and Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Minimax Theory Appl., 8 (2023), pp. 213–234.
- [28] S. M. SRIVASTAVA, *A course on Borel sets*, vol. 180 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [29] C. VILLANI, *Topics in optimal transportation*, vol. 58 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, ITALY.
Email address: `siconolf@mat.uniroma1.it`