

MEAN-FIELD LIMITS OF DETERMINISTIC AND STOCHASTIC FLOCKING MODELS WITH NONLINEAR VELOCITY ALIGNMENT

VINH NGUYEN*, ROMAN SHVYDKOY†, AND CHANGHUI TAN‡

ABSTRACT. We study the mean-field limit for a class of agent-based models describing flocking with nonlinear velocity alignment. Each agent interacts through a communication protocol ϕ and a non-linear coupling of velocities given by the power law $A(\mathbf{v}) = |\mathbf{v}|^{p-2}\mathbf{v}$, $p > 2$. The mean-field limit is proved in two settings – deterministic and stochastic. We then provide quantitative estimates on propagation of chaos for deterministic case in the case of the classical fat-tailed kernels, showing an improved convergence rate of the k -particle marginals to a solution of the corresponding Vlasov equation. The stochastic version is addressed with multiplicative noise depending on the local interaction intensity, which leads to the associated Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation.

Our results extend the classical Cucker-Smale theory to the nonlinear framework which has received considerable attention in the literature recently.

1. INTRODUCTION

The mathematical modeling of collective behavior, such as flocking of birds, schooling of fish, or swarming of bacteria, has been a fertile ground for interaction between mathematical analysis, probability theory, and statistical physics, see these comprehensive surveys of the subject [1, 4, 28, 20, 21, 24]. A cornerstone in this field is the Cucker-Smale model [11], a second-order particle system where agents align their velocities based on a weighted average of their neighbors' relative velocities. This model and its numerous variants have been shown to exhibit remarkable emergent properties, most notably flocking: the convergence of agents to a common velocity while maintaining a bounded spatial profile.

A fundamental question in the study of such interacting particle systems is their behavior as the number of particles N tends to infinity. The formal limit is described by a kinetic equation, in which the probability distribution is transported along a force field generated by the distribution itself. The rigorous justification of this limit under the mean-field scaling and the associated propagation of chaos, which is the phenomenon in which particles become asymptotically independent as $N \rightarrow \infty$, are central problems in the mathematical physics and modeling, see [14, 18, 26].

There is a large and growing literature on mean-field limits and propagation of chaos for flocking models of Cucker-Smale type. For the classical Cucker-Smale system, a formal derivation of the associated kinetic equation via the BBGKY hierarchy was presented by Ha and Tadmor [17], while a rigorous justification through the mean-field limit was later established by Ha and Liu [16]. The quantitative propagation of chaos for systems with fat-tailed communication protocols was subsequently investigated by Nguyen and Shvydkoy [23], where explicit convergence rates in the Wasserstein-2 distance for finite marginals were obtained. Other works, including Natalini and Paul [22] and related references therein, have also treated mean-field limits for the linear model under various kernel assumptions and interaction structures.

Date: January 1, 2026.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 92D25, 35Q35.

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear velocity alignment, Collective behavior, Cucker-Smale, stochastic mean-field limit, propagation of chaos.

Acknowledgment. The work of R. Shvydkoy was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-2405326 and the Simons Foundation. The work of C. Tan was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-2238219.

While most classical results concern linear alignment, that is, interactions of the form $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i$ weighted by a communication protocol, recent interest has shifted toward models with more singular or nonlinear interactions. These present significant mathematical challenges, but are often more biologically realistic or exhibit richer dynamics.

In this paper, we consider the following deterministic agent-based flocking model:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{v}_i, & \mathbf{x}_i(0) = \mathbf{x}_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i), & \mathbf{v}_i(0) = \mathbf{v}_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here ϕ is the *communication protocol*, which measures the strength of the alignment interaction. We assume that ϕ is radially symmetric and non-increasing in the radial variable. A typical family of communication protocols we consider takes the form

$$\phi(r) = (1 + r)^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1], \quad (1.2)$$

where ϕ is bounded, Lipschitz, and has a *fat tail*, that is, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{r_0}^{\infty} \phi(r) dr = \infty.$$

The mapping $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ encodes the velocity coupling. For the linear choice $A(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}$, (1.1) reduces to the Cucker-Smale system. In this work we focus on the nonlinear mapping

$$A(\mathbf{v}) = |\mathbf{v}|^{p-2} \mathbf{v}, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (1.3)$$

Such nonlinear velocity couplings were first introduced by Ha, Ha, and Kim [15]. Subsequent works [29, 19, 5] demonstrate that the choice of the nonlinear mapping has a decisive influence on the asymptotic flocking and alignment behavior, notably on the resulting convergence rates. In particular, Black and Tan [5] obtained quantitative bounds in which the rates depend explicitly on the parameters p and α . See Theorem 2.2 for a detailed description.

The mean-field limit of (1.1) as $N \rightarrow \infty$ is given by the following Vlasov-type kinetic equation (see Definition 2.5):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mu + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mu + \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \cdot (\mu F(\mu)) = 0, & \mu(0) = \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}), \\ F(\mu)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}) d\mu(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}). \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

The well-posedness theory for (1.4) was established by Carrillo, Choi and Hauray [8]. By formal hydrodynamic limits, one may further derive the macroscopic *p*-alignment system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, & \rho(0) = \rho_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t (\rho \mathbf{u}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})) \rho(\mathbf{x}) \rho(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

We refer to the work of Tadmor [27] and references therein for formal derivations and analysis of the *p*-alignment system. Remarkably, the systems (1.1), (1.4), and (1.5) exhibit the same asymptotic flocking and alignment behavior (see also [5]).

The well-posedness theory of (1.5) and the rigorous derivation of the hydrodynamic limit were recently established by Black and Tan [6]. We also highlight the work of Choi, Fabisiak, and Peszek [9], who treated singular communication protocols of the form $\phi(r) = r^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \geq d$, establishing well-posedness and micro-to-macro mean-field limits.

Our primary interest is the mean-field limit from the agent-based system (1.1) to the kinetic equation (1.4). Under the assumptions of smooth ϕ and the nonlinear mapping (1.3), we derive a

stability estimate analogous to the classical Dobrushin estimate [12]: perturbations in the initial data, measured in the Wasserstein-1 distance, grow at most exponentially in time; see (2.9).

The kinetic equation (1.4) inherits the same flocking and alignment estimates as the agent-based model (1.1). Leveraging these estimates, we obtain enhanced stability bounds in which the growth is sub-exponential in time. As a consequence, we establish a rigorous mean-field limit for (1.1) and obtain enhanced quantitative propagation-of-chaos estimates in the Wasserstein-2 metric. Theorems 2.6–2.8 present the detailed results. Our conclusions extend and generalize the quantitative estimates obtained in [23] for the Cucker-Smale system with linear velocity coupling ($p = 2$).

The kinetic equation (1.4) enjoys the same flocking and alignment estimates as the agent-based model (1.1). Using these estimates, we establish enhanced stability estimates where the growth is sub-exponential in time. Consequently, we establish a rigorous mean-field limit for agent-based system (1.1), and derive enhanced quantitative propagation of chaos control, under Wasserstein-2 metric. See Theorems 2.6–2.8 for detail descriptions, and Table 1 for explicit rates. Our results broaden the quantitative framework developed in [23] for the Cucker-Smale system with linear velocity coupling ($p = 2$), extending it to the nonlinear regime.

In the stochastic setting, a number of works addressed the classical linear alignment force with multiplicative or additive noise. The first result in this direction belongs to Bolley, Cañizo, and Carrillo [7], in the case of constant noise and linear alignment force. Strength-dependent noise was treated in [25]. Choi and Salem [10] analyzed stochastic particle systems with multiplicative noise depending on velocity, deriving stochastic mean-field limits and phase transition phenomena. Friesen and Kutoviy [13] considered jump-type stochastic interactions and proved the propagation of chaos through McKean-Vlasov formulations. Those studies treat additive or velocity-dependent noise.

We consider the following stochastic agent-based flocking model:

$$d\mathbf{v}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) dt + \sqrt{2h(s_i)} dW_i,$$

incorporating multiplicative noise whose amplitude depends on the local interaction strength s_i . We develop an analogous mean-field theory in this stochastic setting and prove convergence of the empirical measure to the associated Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation (2.13).

Overall, our results significantly broaden the scope of existing work, which has largely been confined to linear velocity couplings or simpler noise structures. They provide a unified quantitative framework for both deterministic and stochastic flocking models with nonlinear velocity alignment.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces notation, recalls the flocking estimates for the agent-based system, presents key auxiliary lemmas, and states the main results. In Section 3, we study the deterministic flocking model with nonlinear alignment and establish global well-posedness together with the mean-field limit. Section 4 is devoted to quantitative propagation-of-chaos estimates, where explicit Wasserstein-2 convergence rates are derived for systems with fat-tailed communication protocols. In Section 5, we extend the analysis to the stochastic model with locally dependent multiplicative noise and prove convergence of the empirical measure to the corresponding Fokker-Planck-Alignment equation. Finally, Section 6 contains the proofs of the key auxiliary lemmas used throughout the analysis.

Notations. We use C to denote a positive constant whose value may change from line to line. When two distinct constants appear in the same expression, we write C and \bar{C} . We often employ the Japanese bracket $\langle t \rangle := \sqrt{1 + t^2}$. The functions $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ will serve as auxiliary quantities. The notation $A \lesssim B$ means that there exists a positive constant C such that $A \leq CB$.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

In this section we collect preliminary material and state the main results of the paper. We first introduce notation and recall basic properties of the Wasserstein distance, which will serve as the principal metric throughout the analysis. We then review the flocking and alignment estimates for the agent-based model with nonlinear velocity alignment under fat-tailed communication protocols. Next, we present a set of auxiliary lemmas for systems of differential inequalities, which provide the quantitative bounds needed in the subsequent stability and propagation-of-chaos arguments. The section concludes with the statements of the main results, including the Dobrushin-type stability estimate for the kinetic equation, the deterministic mean-field limit, quantitative propagation-of-chaos estimates, and the stochastic mean-field limit.

2.1. Wasserstein distance. We first recall the definition and key properties of the Wasserstein distance (see [2, 14]), a central metric for measuring the proximity of probability measures in our analysis.

Throughout, denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ the space of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^{2d} , and for $m > 0$ set

$$\mathcal{P}_m(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\mathbf{v}|^m d\mu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) < \infty \right\}.$$

Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_m(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we write $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ for the set of couplings between μ and ν ; in other words, $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ consists of all Borel probability measures π on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ whose first and second marginals are μ and ν , respectively. Equivalently, a measure $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ belongs to $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ if and only if

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \psi(\mathbf{y})) d\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(\mathbf{y}) d\nu(\mathbf{y})$$

for every pair of functions $\varphi, \psi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with at most polynomial growth, i.e., $\varphi(\mathbf{z}), \psi(\mathbf{z}) = O(|\mathbf{z}|^m)$ as $|\mathbf{z}| \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 2.1. For $m \geq 1$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_m(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the Wasserstein- m distance (also known as the Monge–Kantorovich distance) between μ and ν , denoted by $\mathcal{W}_m(\mu, \nu)$, is defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_m(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^m d\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right)^{1/m}.$$

For a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Lipschitz constant of φ , denoted by $\text{Lip}(\varphi)$, is defined by

$$\text{Lip}(\varphi) := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\varphi(\mathbf{x}) - \varphi(\mathbf{y})|}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|}.$$

The set of Lipschitz functions on \mathbb{R}^d , denoted by $\text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, consists all functions whose Lipschitz constant is finite.

The Wasserstein-1 distance has the following dual formulation:

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ \text{Lip}(\varphi) \leq 1}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{z}) d\nu(\mathbf{z}) \right|. \quad (2.1)$$

2.2. Flocking and alignment with fat-tailed communication protocol. Let us recall the flocking and alignment properties of the agent-based model (1.1). For $t \geq 0$, define the spatial and velocity diameters

$$\mathcal{D}(t) = \max_{i,j=1,\dots,N} |\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)|, \quad \mathcal{V}(t) = \max_{i,j=1,\dots,N} |\mathbf{v}_i(t) - \mathbf{v}_j(t)|.$$

The flocking and alignment behaviors can be interpreted by

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{D}(t) < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}(t) = 0,$$

respectively.

For the nonlinear alignment model (1.1), the evolution of $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{V})$ is known to satisfy the following closed system of differential inequalities [15]:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}'(t) \leq \mathcal{V}(t), \\ \mathcal{V}'(t) \leq -c_p \phi(\mathcal{D}(t)) \mathcal{V}(t)^{p-1}, \quad c_p = 2^{2-p}. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Further analysis of the paired inequalities show flocking and alignment phenomena, provided that the communication protocol ϕ is fat-tailed, satisfying (2.3).

In [5], quantitative bounds were obtained for the family of communication protocols in (1.2), or more generally, ϕ is bounded, Lipschitz, and there exist $\lambda, \Lambda > 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\lambda r^{-\alpha} \leq \phi(r) \leq \Lambda r^{-\alpha}, \quad \forall r > r_0. \quad (2.3)$$

Sharp asymptotic bounds for $\mathcal{D}(t)$ and $\mathcal{V}(t)$ were derived. These rates depend explicitly on the nonlinear exponent p and the tail parameter α . We summarize the result below.

Theorem 2.2 (Flocking and alignment estimates [5]). *Suppose $(\mathcal{D}(t), \mathcal{V}(t))$ satisfy the paired inequality (2.2) with bounded initial data $(\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{V}_0)$, and the communication protocol ϕ satisfies (2.3). Then, for any $t \geq 0$, we have the following bounds:*

(i). *if $p \in (2, 3)$, then there exists $D < \infty$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{D}(t) = D, \quad \mathcal{V}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{p-2}};$$

(ii). *if $p > 3$, then*

$$\mathcal{D}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{p-\alpha-2}}, \quad \mathcal{V}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{p-\alpha-2}}.$$

(iii). *if $p = 3$, then*

$$\mathcal{D}(t) \lesssim (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad \mathcal{V}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}};$$

In contrast to the linear velocity coupling case ($p = 2$), where $\mathcal{V}(t)$ decays exponentially fast, the nonlinear regime $p > 2$ yields only polynomial decay. Moreover, flocking (i.e., bounded $\mathcal{D}(t)$) holds for all $p < 3$, while for $p \geq 3$ the spatial diameter may grow in time, though only at a sublinear rate.

2.3. Key auxiliary lemmas. We shall require a collection of technical estimates for certain closed systems of differential inequalities sharing the same structural form as (2.2). These systems admit quantitative bounds analogous to those in Theorem 2.2. The resulting estimates will be used repeatedly in the sequel, in particular for deriving quantitative stability and propagation-of-chaos bounds. Proofs of the auxiliary lemmas stated below are deferred to Section 6.

Lemma 2.3. *Given $\beta \in [0, +\infty)$, suppose that $(a(t), b(t))$ is a nonnegative solution to the system:*

$$\begin{cases} a'(t) \leq b(t), & a(0) = a_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ b'(t) \leq C \langle t \rangle^{-\beta} a(t) + g(t), & b(0) = b_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad t \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant, and $g(t)$ is a given nonnegative source term. Then the following holds:

(i). if $\beta > 2$, letting

$$\mathcal{G}_1(t) := \int_0^t g(s) ds,$$

then there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$a(t) \leq a_0 + C_1 t + C_2 \int_0^t \mathcal{G}_1(s) ds, \quad b(t) \leq C_1 + C_2 \mathcal{G}_1(t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.5)$$

(ii). if $\beta \in [0, 2)$, letting $\gamma := 1 - \frac{\beta}{2}$, $\bar{C} := \frac{1-\gamma+\sqrt{(1-\gamma)^2+4C}}{2\gamma}$, and

$$\mathcal{G}_2(t) := \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{1-\gamma} e^{-\bar{C} \langle s \rangle^\gamma} g(s) ds,$$

then there exist positive constants C_3 and C_4 such that

$$a(t) \leq (C_1 + C^{-1} \bar{C}^\gamma \mathcal{G}_2(t)) e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma}, \quad b(t) \leq (C_2 + \mathcal{G}_2(t)) \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.6)$$

(iii). If $\beta = 2$, letting $\zeta := (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4C})/2$ and

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t) := \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{-(\zeta-1)} g(s) ds,$$

then there exist positive constants C_5 and C_6 such that

$$a(t) \leq (C_5 + C^{-1} \zeta \mathcal{G}_3(t)) \langle t \rangle^\zeta, \quad b(t) \leq (C_6 + \mathcal{G}_3(t)) \langle t \rangle^{\zeta-1}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

We briefly comment on the behavior of (2.4) in the absence of a source term, i.e., when $g(t) \equiv 0$. For $\beta = 0$, part (ii) recovers the classical exponential growth bound

$$a(t) \leq C_1 e^{\bar{C} t}, \quad b(t) \leq C_2 e^{\bar{C} t}.$$

When $\beta \in (0, 2)$, the solution exhibits sub-exponential but super-polynomial growth. The case $\beta = 2$ is critical and leads to polynomial bounds. Finally, for $\beta > 2$, the growth of $a(t)$ is at most linear, while $b(t)$ remains uniformly bounded.

In Theorem 2.2(iii), corresponding to the critical case $p = 3$, the flocking and alignment estimates involve a logarithmic correction. Accordingly, in the critical regime $\beta = 2$, we require a variant of (2.4) that incorporates an additional logarithmic factor. The corresponding estimate is given next.

Lemma 2.4. *Given $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, suppose that $(a(t), b(t))$ is a nonnegative solution to the system:*

$$\begin{cases} a'(t) \leq b(t), & a(0) = a_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ b'(t) \leq C \langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} a(t) + g(t), & b(0) = b_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad t \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant, and $g(t)$ is a given nonnegative source term. Letting $\theta := \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, $\bar{C} := \frac{1+\sqrt{1+4C}}{2\theta}$, and

$$\mathcal{G}_4(t) := \int_0^t \langle s \rangle (\log \langle s \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C} (\log \langle s \rangle)^\theta} g(s) ds,$$

then there exist positive constants C_7 and C_8 such that

$$a(t) \leq (C_7 + C^{-1} \bar{C} \theta \mathcal{G}_4(t)) e^{\bar{C} (\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta}, \quad b(t) \leq (C_8 + \mathcal{G}_4(t)) \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} e^{\bar{C} (\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Lemma 2.4 provides the refined estimates required to treat the critical case, including the corresponding sharp rate. We note that the presence of the logarithmic factor $(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$ in (2.7) leads to a bound that is no longer polynomial in time, in contrast to Lemma 2.3(iii), except in the special case $\alpha = 0$.

2.4. Statement of main results. In this subsection, we state our main results together with several accompanying remarks.

We first establish a Dobrushin-type stability estimate for the nonlinear kinetic equation (1.4), which forms the backbone of the subsequent mean-field and propagation-of-chaos analysis.

Definition 2.5. A map $\mu : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, $t \mapsto \mu_t$, is called a *measure-valued solution* to (1.4) with initial data μ_0 if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i). μ is weakly* continuous,
- (ii). For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $0 < t < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(0, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} [\partial_s \varphi + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi + F(\mu_s) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi] d\mu_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.6 (Stability). *Let μ and ν be two measure-valued solutions of (1.4) on a common time interval of existence $[0, T)$, corresponding to initial data μ_0 and ν_0 , respectively. Assume that the initial measures have compact supports contained in a common compact subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, that is,*

$$\text{supp } \mu_0 \cup \text{supp } \nu_0 \subseteq \Omega.$$

Then there exist constants $C, \bar{C} > 0$, depending only on Ω and ϕ , such that

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq C e^{\bar{C}t} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \forall t \in [0, T). \quad (2.9)$$

Moreover, if the communication protocol ϕ satisfies the fat-tailed condition (2.3), we have:

- (i). *if $p \in (2, 3)$, then*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq C \langle t \rangle \log \langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0);$$

- (ii). *if $p > 3$, then*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq C \langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}}} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0);$$

- (iii). *if $p = 3$, then*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq C (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0),$$

where C, \bar{C} are positive constants which depend only on initial support, ϕ and p .

Building on this stability estimate, we establish well-posedness of the kinetic equation (1.4) and provide a rigorous justification of the mean-field limit from the agent-based model (1.1).

Theorem 2.7 (Mean-field limit). *Given any measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ with compact support, there exists a unique measure-valued solution to (1.4) with the initial condition μ_0 . More specifically, this solution is the weak limit of the empirical measure built on the solution to the agent-based system (1.1).*

Our next main result is the quantitative propagation-of-chaos estimate under fat-tailed communication. We start with introducing the notations.

Suppose the initial measure μ_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure,

$$d\mu_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = f_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v},$$

where $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a density function, then the solution of (1.4) is of the form $d\mu_t = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v}$ with density f satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f + \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \cdot (f F(f)) = 0, & f(0) = f_0, \\ F(f)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Denote by $f^N : \mathbb{R}^{2dN} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ the N -particle density function, which solves the Liouville equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f^N + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f^N + \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_i} \cdot (f^N F_i^N) = 0, & f^N(0) = f_0^{\otimes N}, \\ F_i^N(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i). \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

Due to the symmetries of the initial data and the forces, the solution will remain symmetric with respect to permutations of pairs $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i)$ for all time. We further define the k -th marginal by

$$f_t^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d(N-k)}} f^N(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{v}_N, t) d\mathbf{x}_{k+1} d\mathbf{v}_{k+1} \dots d\mathbf{x}_N d\mathbf{v}_N.$$

Theorem 2.8 (Propagation of chaos). *Suppose ϕ satisfies the fat-tailed condition (2.3) and $f_0 \in C_0^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ is a compactly supported initial distribution. Let f, f^N be the solutions to (2.10) and (2.11), respectively. Then for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < N$, and $t \geq 0$,*

(i). *if $p \in (2, 3)$ then*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq C\sqrt{k} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{t}{\sqrt{N}} \right\};$$

(ii). *if $p > 3$ then*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq C\sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}}};$$

(iii). *if $p = 3$ then*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq C\sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}},$$

where constants C, \bar{C} depend only on p , $\text{diam}(\text{supp } f_0)$ and ϕ .

TABLE 1. Quantitative estimates on flocking models with nonlinear velocity alignment

	$p = 2$	$2 < p < 3$	$p = 3$	$p > 3$
Flocking: $\mathcal{D}(t)$	D	D	$(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$	$\langle t \rangle^{1-\frac{1-\alpha}{p-\alpha-2}}$
Alignment: $\mathcal{V}(t)$	$e^{-\kappa t}$	$\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{p-2}}$	$\langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$	$\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{p-\alpha-2}}$
Stability: $\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t)$	$\langle t \rangle \log \langle t \rangle$	$(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}$	$(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}$	$\langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}}}$
PoC: $\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k})$	$\sqrt{k} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{t}{\sqrt{N}} \right\}$	$\sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}}}$

Table 1 summarizes the quantitative bounds on stability and the corresponding propagation-of-chaos (PoC) estimates. We remark that in the regime $p \in (2, 3)$, the flocking property is sufficient to recover the same rate for the PoC bound as in the classical Cucker-Smale model with linear velocity coupling ($p = 2$), despite the lack of exponential alignment. For $p > 3$, the resulting bounds grow super-polynomially but remain sub-exponential in time. In the borderline case $p = 3$, the estimates contain an additional logarithmic correction.

Our final result focus on the stochastic model with strength-dependent noise

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{v}_i dt, & (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i) \in \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ d\mathbf{v}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) dt + \sqrt{2h(s_i)} dW_i, \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

where W_i 's are independent Brownian motions in \mathbb{R}^d . The function s_i is called the *strength function*, defined by

$$s_i := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j),$$

and the mapping $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz and copositive, which means $h(r) > 0$ if $r > 0$. Denote by \mathbb{T}^d the d -dimensional torus. We consider the following stochastic system:

We will show that the stochastic mean field limit for this system is

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f = h(s_\rho) \Delta_v f - \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \cdot (f F(f)), \quad (2.13)$$

where $F(f)$ given by

$$F(f)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

For stochastic setting, the following result will be proved in Section 5.

Theorem 2.9. *Suppose that $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ is a solution to (2.12) with joint distribution law f^N such that $f_0^N = f_0^{\otimes N}$. Let f solve (2.13) on $[0, T]$ with initial data f_0 . If f satisfies*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \phi * \rho(\mathbf{x}) \geq \underline{\rho} > 0, \quad (2.14)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} e^{c_0 |\mathbf{v}|^{p-1}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} < \infty \text{ for some } c_0 > 0. \quad (2.15)$$

then we have the following mean-field approximation of f in law: for any $\varphi \in \text{Lip}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t)) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N e^{-Ct}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

and propagation of chaos

$$W_2^2(f^{(k)}, f^{\otimes k}) \leq \frac{Ck}{N e^{-Ct}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

3. MEAN-FIELD LIMIT FOR DETERMINISTIC MODEL

This section is dedicated to establishing the mean-field limit for the deterministic flocking model with nonlinear velocity alignment (1.1). We begin by formally associating the Vlasov-type kinetic equation (1.4) with (1.1) via characteristic paths. We then analyze the kinetic equation (1.4), showing that it inherits the same flocking and alignment behavior as the agent-based model (1.1).

The core of the section is the derivation of a Dobrushin-type stability estimate in the Wasserstein-1 distance, demonstrating that the flow generated by (1.4) is Lipschitz continuous with respect to its initial data. We then combine this estimate with the flocking and alignment control to obtain an enhanced stability bound. This stability result serves as the key ingredient in the rigorous mean-field analysis, allowing us to show that the empirical measure of the agent-based system converges to the solution of the kinetic equation as the number of agents tends to infinity.

3.1. Flocking and alignment estimates. Suppose that $\mu : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ is a measure-valued solution to (1.4) with initial data μ_0 . It is known from the optimal transport theory that μ is a push-forward of μ_0 along the characteristics (X_μ, V_μ) :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} X_\mu(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = V_\mu(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}), & X_\mu(0, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{x}, \\ \frac{d}{dt} V_\mu(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(X'_\mu - X_\mu) A(V'_\mu - V_\mu) d\mu_0(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{v}'), & V_\mu(0, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Here and in the following, we write $X'_\mu = X_\mu(t, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{v}')$ and $V'_\mu = V_\mu(t, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{v}')$. For simplicity, we also denote $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{z}' = (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{v}')$. If we assume that the support of the initial measure μ_0 is contained in a compact set Ω , then we define

$$\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t) = \max_{\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'' \in \Omega} |X_\mu(t, \mathbf{z}') - X_\mu(t, \mathbf{z}'')|, \quad \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) = \max_{\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'' \in \Omega} |V_\mu(t, \mathbf{z}') - V_\mu(t, \mathbf{z}'')|. \quad (3.2)$$

The following proposition shows that $(\mathcal{D}_\Omega, \mathcal{V}_\Omega)$ satisfies the differential inequalities (2.2). The proof is analogous to that in [15, 5].

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose (X_μ, V_μ) satisfies (3.1). Then, $(\mathcal{D}_\Omega, \mathcal{V}_\Omega)$ defined in (3.2) satisfies the differential inequalities (2.2), that is, for almost all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}'_\Omega(t) \leq \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) \\ \mathcal{V}'_\Omega(t) \leq -c_p \phi(\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t)) \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t)^{p-1}, \quad c_p = 2^{2-p}. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. From (3.1)₁ and Rademacher's lemma, we immediately get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{D}_\Omega(t) \leq \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t).$$

For the second inequality in (3.3), we fix a time t and take $\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'' \in \Omega$ to be the maximizing points, such that

$$\mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) = |V_\mu(t, \mathbf{z}') - V_\mu(t, \mathbf{z}'')|.$$

We remark that the selections \mathbf{z}' and \mathbf{z}'' depend on time, and are in general neither unique nor continuous with respect to time. From (3.1)₂ and Rademacher's lemma we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{V}_\Omega^2(t) &= (V'_\mu - V''_\mu) \cdot \frac{d}{dt} (V'_\mu - V''_\mu) \\ &\leq \phi(\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t)) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (V'_\mu - V''_\mu) \cdot \left[|V_\mu - V'_\mu|^{p-2} (V_\mu - V'_\mu) - |V_\mu - V''_\mu|^{p-2} (V_\mu - V''_\mu) \right] d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}) \\ &\leq -c_p \phi(\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t)) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V'_\mu - V''_\mu|^p d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}) = -c_p \phi(\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t)) \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t)^p, \end{aligned}$$

where in the penultimate step, we have used an elementary inequality

$$(V'_\mu - V''_\mu) \cdot \left[|V_\mu - V'_\mu|^{p-2} (V_\mu - V'_\mu) - |V_\mu - V''_\mu|^{p-2} (V_\mu - V''_\mu) \right] \leq -2^{2-p} |V'_\mu - V''_\mu|^p,$$

which can be justified by applying Lemma 3.2 below with $\mathbf{a} = V'_\mu$, $\mathbf{b} = V''_\mu$, and $\mathbf{c} = V_\mu$.

Collecting the estimates above, we conclude with the desired inequalities (3.3). \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p \geq 2$. Then for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) \cdot (|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{c}|^{p-2} (\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{c}) - |\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}|^{p-2} (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c})) \geq 2^{2-p} |\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}|^p, \quad (3.4)$$

where the equality is attained when $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$ or $\mathbf{c} = \frac{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}}{2}$.

Proof. When $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$, it is obvious that (3.4) holds with an equality. Now, assume $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}$. By rotation, translation, and scaling invariance, the inequality (3.4) holds for $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ if and only if it holds for $(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\mathbf{c}})$ with

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{2}{|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}|} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}} \left(\mathbf{a} - \frac{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}}{2} \right) = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}} = \frac{2}{|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}|} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}} \left(\mathbf{b} - \frac{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}}{2} \right) = -\mathbf{e}_1, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \frac{2}{|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}|} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}} \left(\mathbf{c} - \frac{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}}{2} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}}$ denotes the rotation transformation such that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) = |\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}| \mathbf{e}_1$. Therefore, it suffices to show that for any $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$2\mathbf{e}_1 \cdot (|\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}}|^{p-2} (\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}}) - |-\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}}|^{p-2} (-\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}})) \geq 2^{2-p} \cdot 2^p = 4.$$

Express $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = (\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{c}}_r)$, where \tilde{c}_1 is the first component of $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ consists the remaining components. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{e}_1 \cdot (|\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}}|^{p-2}(\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}}) - |-\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}}|^{p-2}(-\mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{c}})) \\ &= ((1 - \tilde{c}_1)^2 + |\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_r|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}(1 - \tilde{c}_1) + ((1 + \tilde{c}_1)^2 + |\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_r|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}(1 + \tilde{c}_1) \\ &\geq |1 - \tilde{c}_1|^{p-2}(1 - \tilde{c}_1) + |1 + \tilde{c}_1|^{p-2}(1 + \tilde{c}_1) \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

where the two inequalities attain equality when $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_r = \mathbf{0}$ and $\tilde{c}_1 = 0$, respectively. We conclude with the inequality (3.4), where the equality is attained when $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{0}$, or equivalently $\mathbf{c} = \frac{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}}{2}$. \square

We remark that taking $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}$, we deduce from (3.4) the following interesting inequality:

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot (|\mathbf{x}|^{p-2}\mathbf{x} - |\mathbf{y}|^{p-2}\mathbf{y}) \geq 2^{2-p}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^p \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.5)$$

From (3.3)₂, we have $\mathcal{V}'_\Omega(t) \leq 0$, which yields a maximum principle for the velocity diameter:

$$\mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) \leq \mathcal{V}_\Omega(0) \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Substituting this bound into (3.3)₁ leads to a linear growth estimate for the spatial diameter:

$$\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t) \leq C(1 + t) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where C is a constant depending only on the $\mathcal{D}_\Omega(0)$ and $\mathcal{V}_\Omega(0)$.

Since the system (3.3) has the same structural form as (2.2), the enhanced flocking and alignment estimates follow directly from Theorem 2.2 under the assumption that the communication protocol is fat-tailed. We summarize the resulting bounds below.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that the communication protocol ϕ satisfies the fat-tailed condition (2.3). Suppose that $\mu \in C_{w*}(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$ is a measure-valued solution to (1.4) with compactly supported initial data μ_0 , and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be a compact set with $\text{supp } \mu_0 \subseteq \Omega$. Then the following holds for all $t \geq 0$:*

(i). *if $p \in (2, 3)$ then*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{D}_\Omega(t) = D < \infty, \quad \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{p-2}};$$

(ii). *if $p > 3$, then*

$$\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{p-\alpha-2}}, \quad \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{p-\alpha-2}}.$$

(iii). *if $p = 3$, then*

$$\mathcal{D}_\Omega(t) \lesssim (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad \mathcal{V}_\Omega(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}};$$

3.2. Stability. Based upon the flocking and alignment estimates, we now prove our first main result, Theorem 2.6.

Denote by (X_μ, V_μ) and (X_ν, V_ν) the characteristic flows associated with μ and ν , respectively. Then, by the dual formulation of the Wasserstein-1 distance (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) &= \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \\ \text{Lip}(\varphi) \leq 1}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(\mathbf{z}) \, d\mu_t(\mathbf{z}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(\mathbf{z}) \, d\nu_t(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\
&= \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \\ \text{Lip}(\varphi) \leq 1}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(X_\mu, V_\mu) \, d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(X_\nu, V_\nu) \, d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \\ \text{Lip}(\varphi) \leq 1}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(X_\mu, V_\mu) \, d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(X_\mu, V_\mu) \, d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\
&\quad + \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \\ \text{Lip}(\varphi) \leq 1}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} [\varphi(X_\mu, V_\mu) - \varphi(X_\nu, V_\nu)] \, d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\
&\leq (\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty + \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty) \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |(X_\mu, V_\mu) - (X_\nu, V_\nu)| \, d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}) \\
&\leq (\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty + \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty) \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) + \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty. \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

The next step is to estimate the quantities $\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty + \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty$ and $\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty$. From equation (3.1)₁, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \nabla X_\mu = \nabla V_\mu.$$

By evaluating this equality at points where $\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty$ and $\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty$ are achieved, and invoking Rademacher's lemma, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \leq \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Next, by differentiating (3.1)₂ we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \nabla V_\mu &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \nabla \phi(X'_\mu - X_\mu) (\nabla^T X_\mu) \otimes A(V'_\mu - V_\mu) \, d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}') \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(X'_\mu - X_\mu) \left[|V'_\mu - V_\mu|^{p-2} \mathbf{I} + (p-2) |V'_\mu - V_\mu|^{p-4} (V'_\mu - V_\mu) \otimes (V'_\mu - V_\mu) \right] \nabla V_\mu \, d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}'),
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{I} denotes the d -by- d identity matrix. Since the matrix inside the bracket of the second integral is positive definite, we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1}(t). \tag{3.9}$$

Then, for a general communication protocol ϕ , using (3.6) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \leq C \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty,$$

where C is a positive constant depending on ϕ and initial data. Combining this with the first inequality in (3.8) and applying Grönwall's inequality yields, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty + \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \leq C e^{Ct}. \tag{3.10}$$

If ϕ satisfies fat-tailed condition (2.3), then combining (3.9) and the estimates in Theorem 3.3 we obtain for all $t \in [0, T]$:

(i). if $p \in (2, 3)$ then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \leq C \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{p-1}{p-2}}.$$

(ii). if $p > 3$ then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \leq C \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{(1-\alpha)(p-1)}{p-\alpha-2}}.$$

(iii). if $p = 3$ then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \leq C \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}}.$$

Here $C > 0$ denoting a general constant depending only on ϕ , p and the initial data, it is different for each case of p . Set

$$a(t) := \|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty, \quad b(t) := \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty.$$

Then, the dynamics of (a, b) satisfies the paired inequalities in (2.4) with $g(t) \equiv 0$, and the parameter

$$\beta := \begin{cases} \frac{p-1}{p-2} > 2 & \text{for } p \in (2, 3), \\ \frac{(1-\alpha)(p-1)}{p-\alpha-2} \in (0, 2) & \text{for } p > 3. \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

For the borderline case $p = 3$, the dynamics satisfies (2.7) with $g(t) \equiv 0$. Applying the key Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, we arrive at the following estimates.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $t \in [0, T)$, we have*

(i). if $p \in (2, 3)$ then

$$\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \lesssim \langle t \rangle, \quad \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \lesssim 1;$$

(ii). if $p > 3$ then

$$\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \lesssim e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma}, \quad \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma},$$

$$\text{where } \gamma = 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} = \frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)};$$

(iii). if $p = 3$ then

$$\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \lesssim e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}, \quad \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}.$$

We now estimate the time derivative of $\|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty$. Evaluating at a maximizing point \mathbf{z} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty^2 &\leq (V_\mu - V_\nu) \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(X'_\mu - X_\mu) A(V'_\mu - V_\mu) d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}') \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(X'_\nu - X_\nu) A(V'_\nu - V_\nu) d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}') \right) \\ &\leq (V_\mu - V_\nu) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(X'_\mu - X_\mu) A(V'_\mu - V_\mu) (d\mu_0(\mathbf{z}') - d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}')) \\ &\quad + (V_\mu - V_\nu) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (\phi(X'_\mu - X_\mu) - \phi(X'_\nu - X_\nu)) A(V'_\mu - V_\mu) d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}') \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(X'_\nu - X_\nu) (V_\mu - V_\nu) \cdot (A(V'_\mu - V_\mu) - A(V'_\nu - V_\nu)) d\nu_0(\mathbf{z}'). \end{aligned}$$

The last term is negative due to Lemma 3.2. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty &\leq C \|\phi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \left(\|\nabla X_\mu\|_\infty \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1} + \|\nabla V_\mu\|_\infty \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-2} \right) \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \\ &\quad + C \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Hence, for general ϕ we use the bounds from (3.6) and (3.10) to have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty \leq C e^{Ct} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) + C \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty.$$

Combining this inequality with the second estimate in (3.8), we arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty) \leq C(\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty) + Ce^{Ct}\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0).$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality yields

$$\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty \leq Ce^{Ct}\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (3.13)$$

where $C > 0$ depend on the initial data and the interaction potential ϕ . Substituting (3.13) and (3.10) into (3.7), we obtain the exponential growth stability estimate for a general kernel ϕ :

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq Ce^{Ct}\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (3.14)$$

which is the conclusion (2.9).

In the case ϕ satisfies the fat-tailed condition (2.3), utilizing the estimates in Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, from (3.12) we obtain:

(i). if $p \in (2, 3)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty &\leq C(\langle t \rangle \cdot \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{p-1}{p-2}} + 1 \cdot \langle t \rangle^{-1}) \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) + C\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \\ &\leq C\langle t \rangle^{-\beta} \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + C\langle t \rangle^{-1} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact $1 - \frac{p-1}{p-2} < -1$ and the definition of β in (3.11);

(ii). if $p > 3$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty &\leq C(e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \cdot \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{(1-\alpha)(p-1)}{p-\alpha-2}} + \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \cdot \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{(1-\alpha)(p-2)}{p-\alpha-2}}) \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \\ &\quad + C\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{(1-\alpha)(p-1)}{p-\alpha-2}} \\ &\leq C\langle t \rangle^{-\beta} \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + C\langle t \rangle^{-\beta} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0); \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact $-\frac{(1-\alpha)(p-1)}{p-\alpha-2} > -(1-\gamma) - \frac{(1-\alpha)(p-2)}{p-\alpha-2}$ and the definition of β ;

(iii). if $p = 3$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty &\leq C\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + C(e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \cdot \langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \\ &\quad + \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \cdot \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}) \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \\ &\leq C\langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty + C\langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0). \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$a(t) := \|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty, \quad b(t) := \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty.$$

Then, the dynamics of (a, b) satisfies the paired inequalities (2.4) (or (2.7) for the borderline case) with $a_0 = 0, b_0 = 0$, and with source term $g(t)$. Applying the key Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, we obtain the following bounds.

Lemma 3.5. *For all $t \in [0, T]$,*

(i). *if $p \in (2, 3)$ then*

$$\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \lesssim t \log \langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty \lesssim \log \langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0);$$

(ii). *if $p > 3$ then*

$$\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \lesssim \langle t \rangle^\gamma e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{2\gamma-1} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0),$$

where $\gamma = \frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}$;

(iii). if $p = 3$ then

$$\|X_\mu - X_\nu\|_\infty \lesssim (\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \|V_\mu - V_\nu\|_\infty \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{2\theta-1} e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0),$$

where $\theta = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$.

Proof. For (i), we have $g(t) = C\langle t \rangle^{-1} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0)$. Compute

$$\mathcal{G}_1(t) = C\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{-1} ds = C \log\langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0).$$

Then we deduce from (2.5) that

$$a(t) \lesssim \int_0^t \mathcal{G}_1(s) ds \lesssim t \log\langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad b(t) \lesssim \mathcal{G}_1(t) \lesssim \log\langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0).$$

For (ii), we have $g(t) = C\langle t \rangle^{-\beta} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0)$. Compute

$$\mathcal{G}_2(t) = C\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{\gamma-1} ds \leq C\gamma^{-1} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \langle t \rangle^\gamma.$$

Then, we deduce from (2.6) that

$$a(t) \lesssim \mathcal{G}_2(t) e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \lesssim \langle t \rangle^\gamma e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad b(t) \lesssim \mathcal{G}_2(t) \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{2\gamma-1} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0).$$

For (iii), we have $g(t) = C\langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0)$. Compute

$$\mathcal{G}_4(t) = C\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0) \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle s \rangle)^{\theta-1} ds = C\theta^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0).$$

Then, we deduce from (2.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &\lesssim \mathcal{G}_4(t) e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \lesssim (\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \\ b(t) &\lesssim \mathcal{G}_4(t) \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{2\theta-1} e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0). \end{aligned}$$

□

Substituting the bounds from Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 into (3.7), we obtain the following stability estimates for the fat-tailed ϕ :

(i). if $p \in (2, 3)$ then

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle \log\langle t \rangle \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0);$$

(ii). if $p > 3$ then

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^\gamma e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \gamma = \frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)};$$

(iii). if $p = 3$, then there exist constants C, \bar{C} satisfying

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \lesssim (\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta e^{\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0, \nu_0), \quad \theta = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}.$$

Together with (3.14), we conclude the proof of Theorem 2.6.

3.3. Mean-field Limit. With the stability of the mean-field dynamics established, we now prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the kinetic equation (1.4) by taking the limit of the particle system. The strategy is to consider a sequence of empirical measures μ_t^N corresponding to the particle system (1.1) and apply the Dobrushin stability estimate. This estimate implies that the sequence is Cauchy in the Wasserstein-1 distance, ensuring its convergence to a limit μ_t . We then verify that this limit satisfies the weak formulation of the Vlasov equation, thus constituting the desired mean-field solution.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $(\mathbf{x}_k^0, \mathbf{v}_k^0) \in \text{supp } \mu_0$, $k = 1, \dots, N$ such that

$$\mu_0^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_{\mathbf{x}_k^0} \otimes \delta_{\mathbf{v}_k^0} \xrightarrow{*} \mu_0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Define the empirical measures

$$\mu_t^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_{\mathbf{x}_k(t)} \otimes \delta_{\mathbf{v}_k(t)},$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_k(t), \mathbf{v}_k(t))$ is the solution to (1.1). Testing with $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$, we have that μ^N is a measure-valued solution to (1.4) with initial data μ_0^N . Thus, applying Theorem 2.6 there exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t^N, \mu_t^M) \leq C e^{cT} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0^N, \mu_0^M), \quad \text{for } N, M > 0, t \leq T.$$

Hence $\{\mu_t^N\}_N$ is weakly*-Cauchy in the Banach space $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d}), \mathcal{W}_1)$, and hence converges to a limit $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_t^N, \mu_t) \leq C_T \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_0^N, \mu_0), \quad \text{for } N > 0, t \leq T.$$

Next we will prove that the map $t \rightarrow \mu_t$ is weak*-continuous. Firstly, we note that for $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ the sequence $\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_t^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})\}_N$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous on $[0, T]$. Indeed, for $t \in [0, T)$ and $\Delta t > 0$ with $t + \Delta t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_{t+\Delta t}^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_t^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \right| \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\psi(X_{\mu^N}(t + \Delta t), V_{\mu^N}(t + \Delta t)) - \psi(X_{\mu^N}(t), V_{\mu^N}(t))| d\mu_0^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \\ & \leq |\nabla \psi|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (|X_{\mu^N}(t + \Delta t) - X_{\mu^N}(t)| + |V_{\mu^N}(t + \Delta t) - V_{\mu^N}(t)|) d\mu_0^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \\ & \leq C \Delta t. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used the uniform Lipschitzness of $\{X_{\mu^N}\}_N, \{V_{\mu^N}\}_N$ on $[0, T]$. Then, letting $N \rightarrow +\infty$ we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_{t+\Delta t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \right| \leq C \Delta t,$$

which implies the weak*-continuity of the map $t \rightarrow \mu_t$.

We will show that this μ is a measure-valued solution to (1.4) with the given initial μ_0 . Because μ^N is a measure-valued solution, for any test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_t^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(0, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_0^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} [\partial_s \varphi + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi + F(\mu_s^N) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi] d\mu_s^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

All linear terms weakly converge to the natural limits. For the nonlinear term, we note that for all $t \in [0, T)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $R_T > 0$ such that $\text{supp } \mu_t^N \subseteq B_{R_T}(0)$, a ball in \mathbb{R}^{2d} with radius R_T . The family of functions $\{\phi(\mathbf{x} - \cdot)A(\cdot - \mathbf{v})\}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \in B_{R_T}(0)}$ indexing by $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \in B_{R_T}(0)$ is uniformly Lipschitz on $B_{R_T}(0)$ with the common Lipschitz constant denoted by L_{R_T} . Thus, it is precompact in $C(B_{R_T}(0))$. Therefore, $F(\mu_t^N)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \rightarrow F(\mu_t)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ uniformly on $B_{R_T}(0)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F(\mu_s^N)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_s^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F(\mu_s)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F(\mu_s^N)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) (d\mu_s^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) - d\mu_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})) ds \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (F(\mu_s^N)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) - F(\mu_s)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^t L_{R_T} |\nabla \varphi|_{\infty} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_s^N, \mu_s) ds + |\nabla \varphi|_{\infty} \int_0^t \|F(\mu_s^N) - F(\mu_s)\|_{L^{\infty}(B_{R_T}(0))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} d\mu_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, which implies that

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F(\mu_s^N)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_s^N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F(\mu_s)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mu_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) ds$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that μ satisfies Definition 2.5. Uniqueness is a direct consequence of the stability (2.9), which concludes the theorem.

Note that in the case ϕ is fat-tailed and $p \in (2, 3)$, $\text{supp } \mu_t^N \subseteq B_R(0)$ with R independent of T . Thus, in this case there exists a global solution μ_t with $\text{supp } \mu_t$ is uniformly bounded for all times. \square

4. PROPAGATION OF CHAOS FOR DETERMINISTIC MODEL WITH FAT-TAILED KERNELS

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.8: the propagation-of-chaos estimate for the deterministic model (2.10):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f + \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \cdot (f F(f)) = 0, & f(0) = f_0, \\ F(f)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Here, we assume without loss of generality that $f_0 = f_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ is a probability distribution.

Recall the Liouville equation (2.11):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f^N + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} f^N + \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_i} \cdot (f^N F_i^N) = 0, & f^N(0) = f_0^{\otimes N}, \\ F_i^N(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i). \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Due to the symmetries of the forces F_i^N , the solution f^N will remain symmetric with respect to permutations of pairs $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i)$ for all time. We denote by

$$\Phi_t^N = (X_t, V_t) = (\mathbf{x}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{x}_N(t), \mathbf{v}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{v}_N(t)) : \mathbb{R}^{2dN} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2dN}$$

the flow-map of (4.2), in other words, these are solutions to the agent-based system (1.1). Then, f_t^N at any time $t > 0$ is a push-forward of the initial distribution by Φ_t^N ,

$$f_t^N = \Phi_t^N \# f_0^{\otimes N}.$$

Now, denote by

$$\bar{\Phi}_t = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \bar{\mathbf{v}}(t)) : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$$

the flow-map of the Vlasov equation (4.1), i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} = \bar{\mathbf{v}}, \\ \dot{\bar{\mathbf{v}}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}, \end{cases}$$

and by

$$\bar{\Phi}_t^{\otimes N} = (\bar{X}_t, \bar{V}_t) = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1(t), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_N(t), \bar{\mathbf{v}}_1(t), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_N(t)) : \mathbb{R}^{2dN} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2dN}$$

the direct product of N copies of $\bar{\Phi}_t$'s. Thus,

$$f_t = \bar{\Phi}_t \# f_0, \quad f_t^{\otimes N} = \bar{\Phi}_t^{\otimes N} \# f_0^{\otimes N}.$$

Denote Σ_N^k the set of all different ordered subsets of size k of $\{1, \dots, N\}$. Then, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_N^k$,

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^k |(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)}, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma(i)}) - (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\sigma(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\sigma(i)})|^2 f_0^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0) dX_0 dV_0.$$

Summing up over all $\sigma \in \Sigma_N^k$,

$$\binom{N}{k} \mathcal{W}_2^2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_N^k} \sum_{i=1}^k |(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)}, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma(i)}) - (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\sigma(i)}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\sigma(i)})|^2 f_0^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0) dX_0 dV_0.$$

Note that each coordinate is repeated $\binom{N-1}{k-1}$ times on the right hand side of the above inequality. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_2^2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) &\leq \frac{k}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^N |(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i) - (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)|^2 f_0^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0) dX_0 dV_0 \\ &= \frac{k}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} |\Phi_t^N(X_0, V_0) - \bar{\Phi}_t^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0)|^2 f_0^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0) dX_0 dV_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, the proof of Theorem 2.8 amounts to establishing the following estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} |\Phi_t^N(X_0, V_0) - \bar{\Phi}_t^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0)|^2 f_0^{\otimes N}(X_0, V_0) dX_0 dV_0.$$

Let us break the expression under the integral into potential and kinetic parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} |X_t - \bar{X}_t|^2 f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0, \\ \mathcal{K}(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} |V_t - \bar{V}_t|^2 f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0. \end{aligned}$$

By the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\mathcal{P}'(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} (X_t - \bar{X}_t) \cdot (V_t - \bar{V}_t) f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0 \leq 2\sqrt{\mathcal{P}(t)}\sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)}. \quad (4.4)$$

For the kinetic part, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}'(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right) f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0 \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i,j=1}^N [\phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) - \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)] (\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0, \\
I_2 &= \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) (\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot [A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0, \\
I_3 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right) f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0.
\end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , we apply the mean value theorem and the smoothness of ϕ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty [|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i| + |\mathbf{x}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j|] |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| |\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j|^{p-1} f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0, \\
&\leq C \max_{i,j=1,\dots,N} |\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j|^{p-1} \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)} \left(2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^N |\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i|^2 f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1}(t) \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}(t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, for I_2 , since ϕ is even, and A is odd, symmetrizing i and j yields

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) [(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - (\mathbf{v}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)] \cdot [A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0 \leq 0,$$

where we have used (3.5) with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i$. Finally, for I_3 , applying the Hölder inequality we have

$$I_3 \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^N |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2 f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} J^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)} \sqrt{J},$$

where we further estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
J &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right|^2 f_0^{\otimes N} dX_0 dV_0 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2dN}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right|^2 f_t^{\otimes N} d\bar{X}_t d\bar{V}_t \\
&\leq N \left(\frac{4}{N} \sup_{(\bar{\mathbf{x}}', \bar{\mathbf{v}}'), (\bar{\mathbf{x}}'', \bar{\mathbf{v}}'') \in \text{supp } f_t} |\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}' - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'') A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}' - \bar{\mathbf{v}}'')|^2 \right) \leq 4 \|\phi\|_\infty^2 \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{2(p-1)}(t).
\end{aligned}$$

For the penultimate inequality, we have used the estimate in [22, Lemma 3.3] to control each integrand. Therefore, we obtain

$$I_3 \leq C \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1}(t) \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)}.$$

Summing up the above estimates for I_1, I_2 and I_3 , we deduce that

$$\mathcal{K}'(t) \leq C \mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1}(t) \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)} (1 + \sqrt{\mathcal{P}(t)}). \quad (4.5)$$

Set

$$a(t) := 1 + \sqrt{\mathcal{P}(t)}, \quad b(t) := \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(t)}.$$

Then, we deduce from (4.4) and (4.5) that the dynamics of (a, b) satisfies the paired inequalities

$$\begin{cases} a'(t) \leq b(t), & a(0) = 1, \\ b'(t) \leq C\mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1}(t) a(t), & b(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

The term $\mathcal{V}_\Omega^{p-1}(t)$ can be further estimated by Theorem 3.3. Hence, the system (4.6) has the form (2.4) with $g(t) \equiv 0$ (or (2.7) for the borderline case when $p = 3$). We apply Lemma 2.3 (and Lemma 2.4 for $p = 3$) and obtain the bounds analogous to those in Lemma 3.4:

(i). if $p \in (2, 3)$ then

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^2, \quad \mathcal{K}(t) \lesssim 1;$$

(ii). if $p > 3$ then

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \lesssim e^{2\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma}, \quad \mathcal{K}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-2(1-\gamma)} e^{2\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^\gamma}, \quad \gamma = \frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)};$$

(iii). if $p = 3$ then

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \lesssim e^{2\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}, \quad \mathcal{K}(t) \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-2} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{2\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}.$$

Note that in the case of $p \in (2, 3)$, thanks to the flocking estimate in Theorem 3.3 (i), we also have $\mathcal{P}(t) \leq CN$. Thus, in this case

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \lesssim \min\{N, t^2\}.$$

Plugging all the bounds above into (4.3), we conclude with the propagation-of-chaos estimates:

(i). if $p \in (2, 3)$ then

$$\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \lesssim \sqrt{k} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{t}{\sqrt{N}} \right\};$$

(ii). if $p > 3$ then

$$\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq C \sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} e^{\bar{C}\langle t \rangle^{\frac{(1+\alpha)(p-3)}{2(p-\alpha-2)}}};$$

(iii). if $p = 3$ then

$$\mathcal{W}_2(f_t^{(k)}, f_t^{\otimes k}) \leq C \sqrt{\frac{k}{N}} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.8.

5. MEAN-FIELD LIMIT FOR STOCHASTIC MODEL

In this section we establish similar results in the stochastic setting and prove Theorem 2.9.

Let $(\mathbf{x}_i^0, \mathbf{v}_i^0)$ be N independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables corresponding to law f_0 , and let $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i)$ be the solution to (2.12). Both conclusions of the theorem come from a single source – comparing solutions of (2.12) with N identically distributed and independent versions of the stochastic characteristics of the Fokker-Planck equation (2.13). So, let $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i), i = 1, \dots, N$ solve:

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i dt, \\ d\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right) dt + \sqrt{2h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i))} dW_i, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) := \phi * \rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i), \quad \rho(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v},$$

and W_i are independent Brownian motions. We also let initial conditions $(\mathbf{x}_i^0, \mathbf{v}_i^0)$ have a common law f_0 and be independent. As a result, $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)$ are i.i.d.'s with the common law f .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t)) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i(t)) \right|^2 \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i(t)) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \right|^2}_{=: J}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting

$$\mu_\varphi(t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v}$$

and $\varphi_i := \varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i(t))$. Then φ_i 's are i.i.d. with mean $\mu_\varphi(t)$, and

$$J = \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i - \mu_\varphi(t) \right|^2.$$

Expanding the square and using independence,

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\varphi_i - \mu_\varphi(t))^2 + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i \neq j} (\varphi_i - \mu_\varphi(t))(\varphi_j - \mu_\varphi(t)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\varphi_i - \mu_\varphi(t))^2] + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}[\varphi_i - \mu_\varphi(t)] \mathbb{E}[\varphi_j - \mu_\varphi(t)] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Var}_f(\varphi), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{Var}_f(\varphi) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})^2 f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \right)^2.$$

By the symmetry, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i(t)) \right|^2 \leq \text{Lip}(\varphi)^2 \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2].$$

At the same time, following [3],

$$W_2^2(f^{(k)}, f^{\otimes k}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^k |x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 + |v_i - \bar{v}_i|^2 \right] = k \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2].$$

Note that in the the above the right hand sides are independent of particular i .

Thus, denoting

$$\mathcal{E}(t) := \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2] =: \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) + \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{v}}(t).$$

the proof of the theorem reduces to establishing the bound on expected divergence of characteristics

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq \frac{C}{N e^{-Ct}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Compute the time derivative of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = 2 \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] \leq \mathcal{E}(t). \quad (5.2)$$

By Itô's formula and systems (2.12), (5.1), the time derivative of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{v}}(t)$ is computed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}'_{\mathbf{v}}(t) &= \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \sqrt{2}(\sqrt{h(s_i)} - \sqrt{h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i))}) dW_i\right] + d\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sqrt{h(s_i)} - \sqrt{h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i))}\right)^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\phi(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \left(\phi(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) - \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \sqrt{2}(\sqrt{h(s_i)} - \sqrt{h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i))}) dW_i\right] \\
&\quad + d\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sqrt{h(s_i)} - \sqrt{h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i))}\right)^2\right] \\
&:= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 + J_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Because agents are independent and identically distributed, ϕ is even (radial), and A is odd, J_1 can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\phi(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)((\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - (\mathbf{v}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)) \cdot \left(A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)\right)\right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\phi(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)((\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - (\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)) \cdot \left(A(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i) - A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)\right)\right] \leq 0. \quad (5.3)
\end{aligned}$$

For J_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{p-2} (\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \left(\phi(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) - \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)\right)\right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E}\left[|\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{p-1} \min\{1, |(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) - (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|\}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

since ϕ is bounded above and smooth. Let us fix a pair (i, j) and define the random variable

$$\mathbf{z} := |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{p-1} \min\{1, |(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) - (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|\}.$$

For any given positive constant R , letting

$$\mathcal{R} := \{|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| \leq R, |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j| \leq R\}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{z}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c} \mathbf{z}].$$

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{z}] &\lesssim R^{p-1} \mathbb{E}\left[|\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| |(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) - (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|\right] \\
&\lesssim R^{p-1} \mathcal{E}(t) \quad (\text{by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality, the second term is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c \mathbf{z}}] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c} |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c} |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{2(p-1)}] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2] + (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c}])^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}[|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{4(p-1)}] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{E}(t) + \left(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| > R\}}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j| > R\}}] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}[|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{4(p-1)}] \right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

By Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| > R\}}] \leq \mathbb{P}(e^{c_0|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|} > e^{c_0 R^{p-1}}) \leq \frac{1}{e^{c_0 R^{p-1}}} \mathbb{E}[e^{c_0|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|}].$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[e^{c_0|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|}] < +\infty$, one has

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| > R\}}] \lesssim e^{-c_0 R^{p-1}}, \quad \mathbb{E}[|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{4(p-1)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{c_0|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|}] < +\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}^c \mathbf{z}}] \lesssim \mathcal{E}(t) + e^{-\frac{c_0 R^{p-1}}{2}}.$$

Therefore,

$$J_2 \lesssim (1 + R^{p-1})\mathcal{E}(t) + e^{-\frac{c_0 R^{p-1}}{2}}. \quad (5.4)$$

For J_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_3 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right] := J_{31} + J_{32}.\end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$J_{32} \leq \frac{1}{N} \left(\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right]^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}(t)}}{N}. \quad (5.5)$$

Here we use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right] \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) A(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_\infty \int_{(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} |\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}|^{p-1} f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \\ &\lesssim \int_{(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} (|\mathbf{w}|^{p-1} + |\mathbf{v}|^{p-1}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{v}|^{p-1} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{v} < +\infty \quad (\text{due to (2.15)}).\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider J_{31} . For each $j \neq i$, define

$$\xi_j := \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

Then,

$$J_{31} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \cdot \left(\sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right) \right].$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{31} &\leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i| \left| \sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right| \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} (\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2])^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_v(t)}}{N} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

We now examine the variance

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right|^2 \right] = \sum_{j \neq i}^N \mathbb{E}[|\xi_j|^2] + \sum_{\substack{j, k \neq i \\ j \neq k}} \mathbb{E}[\xi_j \cdot \xi_k].$$

Since $\{(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)\}_{j \neq i}$ are i.i.d. with law f , and ξ_j depends on $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)$, we have for $j \neq k$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \cdot \xi_k] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \cdot \xi_k \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] \right].$$

Conditional on $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)$, ξ_j and ξ_k are independent for $j \neq k$ and have zero mean

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \cdot \xi_k \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_j \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\xi_k \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] = 0.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\xi_j \cdot \xi_k] = 0$ for $j \neq k$. Thus, the cross-terms vanish, and we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right|^2 \right] = \sum_{j \neq i}^N \mathbb{E}[|\xi_j|^2].$$

By exchangeability, $\mathbb{E}[|\xi_j|^2]$ is the same for all $j \neq i$. Fix $j_0 \neq i$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j \neq i}^N \xi_j \right|^2 \right] = (N-1) \mathbb{E}[|\xi_{j_0}|^2]. \tag{5.7}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{j_0} \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)] = 0$, one has

$$\mathbb{E}[|\xi_{j_0}|^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left(\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \right) \right].$$

Using the boundedness of ϕ and the growth of A , one gets

$$|\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)| \leq \|\phi\|_\infty |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{p-1} \lesssim (|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0}|^{p-1} + |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{p-1}).$$

Therefore, the conditional variance is bounded by the conditional second moment

$$\text{Var} \left(\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)|^2 \mid (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i) \right].$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\xi_{j_0}|^2] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) A(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)|^2 \right] \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[(|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_0}|^{p-1} + |\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^{p-1})^2 \right] < +\infty.$$

Combining this inequality with (5.6) and (5.7), we have

$$J_{31} \leq \frac{C\sqrt{N-1}\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_v(t)}}{N} \leq \frac{C\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_v(t)}}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \mathcal{E}_v(t) + \frac{C}{N}.$$

This inequality and (5.5) imply that

$$J_3 \leq \mathcal{E}(t) + \frac{C}{N}. \quad (5.8)$$

Because

$$M_t := \int_0^t (\mathbf{v}_i(\tau) - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i(\tau)) \cdot \sqrt{2} \left(\sqrt{h(s_i(\tau))} - \sqrt{h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(\tau)))} \right) dW_i(\tau)$$

is a martingale, so $\mathbb{E}[M_t] = \mathbb{E}[M_0] = 0$. Thus,

$$J_4 = 0. \quad (5.9)$$

For J_5 , since h is Lipschitz and due to (2.14) we have

$$J_5 = d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{h(s_i) - h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i))}{\sqrt{h(s_i)} + \sqrt{h(s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i))}} \right|^2 \right] \leq d \text{Lip}(h)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[|s_i - s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|^2 \right]$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |s_i - s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)| &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\phi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) - \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j)) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|s_i - s_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|^2 \right] &\leq 2 \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) - (\mathbf{x}_j - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \right|^2 \right] \\ &=: J_{51} + J_{52}. \end{aligned}$$

We get

$$J_{51} \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i|^2 \right] \leq C \mathcal{E}_x(t) \quad (\text{due to i.i.d. property}). \quad (5.10)$$

For J_{52} , let us define for each $j \neq i$,

$$\zeta_j := \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_j) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, t) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w},$$

then

$$J_{52} \leq \frac{2 \|\phi\|_\infty}{N^2} + \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E} [|\zeta_j|^2] + \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{j, k \neq i \\ j \neq k}} \mathbb{E} [\zeta_j \cdot \zeta_k] \quad (5.11)$$

Since $\{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_j\}_{j \neq i}$ are i.i.d. with law f , and ζ_j depends on $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$, for $j \neq k$,

$$\mathbb{E} [\zeta_j \cdot \zeta_k] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [\zeta_j \cdot \zeta_k \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i] \right].$$

Conditional on $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$, ζ_j and ζ_k are independent for $j \neq k$ and have zero mean, hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [\zeta_j \cdot \zeta_k \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [\zeta_j \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i] \mathbb{E} [\zeta_k \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i] \right] = 0,$$

By exchangeability, fix $j_0 \neq i$, we have

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E} [|\zeta_j|^2] = (N-1) \mathbb{E} [|\zeta_{j_0}|^2]. \quad (5.12)$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_{j_0} \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i] = 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\xi_{j_0}|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[|\xi_{j_0}|^2 \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i]] = \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)].$$

As ϕ is bounded,

$$|\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)| \leq \|\phi\|_\infty.$$

Therefore, the conditional variance is bounded by the conditional second moment

$$\text{Var}(\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \leq \mathbb{E}[|\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|^2 \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i].$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\zeta_{j_0}|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\phi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{j_0} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)|^2] < +\infty.$$

This inequality together with (5.11) and (5.12) implies

$$J_{52} \leq \frac{C}{N}.$$

Combining this with (5.10), we yield

$$J_5 \leq \frac{C}{N} + C\mathcal{E}_x(t). \quad (5.13)$$

By estimates (5.2), (5.3), (5.4), (5.8), (5.9), and (5.13) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(t) \leq C(1 + R^{p-1})\mathcal{E}(t) + e^{-\frac{c_0 R^{p-1}}{2}} + \frac{C}{N} \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

It implies that for any $r > 0$, there exists constant C_0 such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(t) \leq C_0(1 + r)\mathcal{E}(t) + e^{-r} + \frac{C_0}{N} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.14)$$

By Grönwall's lemma,

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq \mathcal{E}(0)e^{C_0(1+r)t} + \int_0^t e^{C_0(1+r)(t-s)} \left(e^{-r} + \frac{C_0}{N} \right) ds \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Thus, for all $N \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq (e^{-r} + C_0)(e^{C_0(1+r)T} - 1) := C_1 \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

We now define

$$a(t) := \frac{\mathcal{E}(t)}{eC_1},$$

which ensures that $a(t) \leq e^{-1}$. This bound implies the useful inequality

$$1 - \ln a(t) \leq -2 \ln a(t).$$

For any t with $a(t) > 0$, we choose $r = -\ln a(t) > 0$. Substituting this into (5.14) yields

$$a'(t) \leq C_0(1 - \ln a(t)) a(t) + \frac{eC_0C_1}{N} \leq -C_2 a(t) \ln a(t) + \frac{C_2}{N}, \quad (5.15)$$

with $C_2 = \max\{2C_0, eC_0C_1\}$. The same inequality holds trivially when $a(t) = 0$ by the standard convention $0 \ln 0 = 0$. Thus, (5.15) is valid for all $t \in [0, T]$. To simplify the analysis, we rescale time by defining

$$u(t) := a(C_2t).$$

Then $u(0) = 0$, and (5.15) becomes

$$u'(t) \leq -u(t) \ln u(t) + \frac{1}{N}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T/C_2].$$

We now introduce a time-dependent scaling factor to absorb the $1/N$ term. Let $b(t)$ be a function to be determined and define

$$v(t) := u(t) N^{b(t)}.$$

A computation shows that $v(t)$ satisfies $v(0) = 0$ and

$$v'(t) \leq -v(t) \ln v(t) + N^{b(t)-1} + v(t) \ln N \cdot (b'(t) + b(t)).$$

The optimal choice is $b(t) = e^{-t}$, which is bounded by 1. With this selection, the inequality reduces to

$$v'(t) \leq -v(t) \ln v(t) + 1 \leq 1 + e^{-1},$$

where the last bound follows from maximizing $-z \ln z$ for $z > 0$. Integrating this differential inequality from 0 to t gives

$$v(t) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{e}\right) t \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{e}\right) \frac{T}{C_2} \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T/C_2].$$

Reverting to the original variables, we conclude that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \mathbb{E} [|\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i|^2 + |\mathbf{v}_i - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|^2] \leq C_3 N^{-e^{-C_4 t}},$$

with $C_3 = (1 + \frac{1}{e}) \frac{T}{C_2}$ and $C_4 = 1/C_2$. □

6. PROOF OF KEY AUXILLARY LEMMAS

In this section, we provide proofs of the key technical lemmas stated in Section 2. We design Lyapunov functionals via appropriate scalings to obtain bounds from the paired inequalities.

6.1. Proof of Lemma 2.3. Recall the paired inequalities (2.4):

$$\begin{cases} a'(t) \leq b(t), & a(0) = a_0, \\ b'(t) \leq C \langle t \rangle^{-\beta} a(t) + g(t), & b(0) = b_0. \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

We consider the three cases on different choices of β separately.

(i). $\beta > 2$. We define a Lyapunov functional

$$\mathcal{L}_1(t) := \frac{C}{\beta - 1} \langle t \rangle^{-\beta+1} a(t) + b(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

By (6.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1'(t) &\leq \frac{C}{\beta - 1} \langle t \rangle^{-\beta+1} a'(t) - C \langle t \rangle^{-\beta} a(t) + b'(t) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\beta - 1} \langle t \rangle^{-\beta+1} b(t) - C \langle t \rangle^{-\beta} a(t) + C \langle t \rangle^{-\beta} a(t) + g(t) \leq \frac{C}{\beta - 1} \langle t \rangle^{-\beta+1} \mathcal{L}_1(t) + g(t). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1(t) &\leq \left(\mathcal{L}_1(0) + \int_0^t g(s) ds \right) \exp \left(\frac{C}{\beta - 1} \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{-\beta+1} ds \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C}{\beta - 1} a_0 + b_0 + \int_0^t g(s) ds \right) \exp \left(\frac{C}{(\beta - 1)(\beta - 2)} \right) =: C_1 + C_2 \int_0^t g(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for any $t \geq 0$

$$b(t) \leq \mathcal{L}_1(t) \leq C_1 + C_2 \mathcal{G}_1(t), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{G}_1(t) := \int_0^t g(s) ds.$$

Substituting this bound into (6.1)₁ gives

$$a(t) \leq a_0 + C_1 t + C_2 \int_0^t \mathcal{G}_1(s) ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

which yields the desired bounds in (i).

(ii). $\beta \in [0, 2]$. We define the rescaled quantities

$$\tilde{a}(t) := \bar{C} \gamma e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} a(t), \quad \tilde{b}(t) := \langle t \rangle^{1-\gamma} e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} b(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where the parameters $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $\bar{C} > 0$ will be chosen later in (6.2).

We first consider the case when there is no source term, namely $g(t) \equiv 0$. By (6.1) we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{a}(t) \leq -(\bar{C} \gamma)^2 \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} a(t) + \bar{C} \gamma e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} b(t) = -\bar{C} \gamma \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} (\tilde{a}(t) - \tilde{b}(t)); \quad \text{and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{b}(t) &\leq ((1-\gamma) \langle t \rangle^{-\gamma} - \bar{C} \gamma) e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} b(t) + \langle t \rangle^{1-\gamma} e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} C \langle t \rangle^{-\beta} a(t) \\ &\leq (1-\gamma - \bar{C} \gamma) \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} \tilde{b}(t) + \frac{C}{\bar{C} \gamma} \langle t \rangle^{1-\gamma-\beta} \tilde{a}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we have used the fact that $\langle t \rangle^{-\gamma} \leq 1$. Now we choose γ and \bar{C} such that $-(1-\gamma - \bar{C} \gamma) = \frac{C}{\bar{C} \gamma}$ and $-(1-\gamma) = 1-\gamma-\beta$, namely:

$$\gamma := 1 - \frac{\beta}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{C} := \frac{1-\gamma + \sqrt{(1-\gamma)^2 + 4C}}{2\gamma}. \quad (6.2)$$

Then we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{b}(t) \leq \frac{C}{\bar{C} \gamma} \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} (\tilde{a}(t) - \tilde{b}(t)).$$

Define an Lyapunov functional

$$\mathcal{L}_2(t) := C \tilde{a}(t) + (\bar{C} \gamma)^2 \tilde{b}(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Then we have the monotone property

$$\mathcal{L}_2'(t) \leq -C \bar{C} \gamma \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} (\tilde{a}(t) - \tilde{b}(t)) + C \bar{C} \gamma \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} (\tilde{a}(t) - \tilde{b}(t)) = 0.$$

It yields that $\mathcal{L}_2(t) \leq \mathcal{L}_2(0) = C \bar{C} \gamma e^{-\bar{C}} a_0 + (\bar{C} \gamma)^2 e^{-\bar{C}} b_0$, and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= (\bar{C} \gamma)^{-1} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} \tilde{a}(t) \leq (\bar{C} \gamma)^{-1} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} C^{-1} \mathcal{L}_2(0) = (a_0 + C^{-1} \bar{C} \gamma b_0) e^{\bar{C} (\langle t \rangle^\gamma - 1)}; \quad \text{and} \\ b(t) &= \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} \tilde{b}(t) \leq \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} (\bar{C} \gamma)^{-2} \mathcal{L}_2(0) = (C \bar{C}^{-1} \gamma^{-1} a_0 + b_0) \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C} (\langle t \rangle^\gamma - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we take into the consideration of the source term $g(t)$. For the Lyapunov functional \mathcal{L}_2 , we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_2'(t) \leq (\bar{C} \gamma)^2 \langle t \rangle^{1-\gamma} e^{-\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma} g(t).$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{L}_2(t) \leq \mathcal{L}_2(0) + (\bar{C} \gamma)^2 \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{1-\gamma} e^{-\bar{C} \langle s \rangle^\gamma} g(s) ds = C \bar{C} e^{-\bar{C}} \gamma a_0 + (\bar{C} \gamma)^2 (e^{-\bar{C}} b_0 + \mathcal{G}_2(t)),$$

where we denote the integrand by $\mathcal{G}_2(t)$. We conclude with our desired bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &\leq (e^{-\bar{C}} a_0 + C^{-1} \bar{C} \gamma (e^{-\bar{C}} b_0 + \mathcal{G}_2(t))) e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma}; \quad \text{and} \\ b(t) &\leq (C \bar{C}^{-1} e^{-\bar{C}} \gamma^{-1} a_0 + e^{-\bar{C}} b_0 + \mathcal{G}_2(t)) \langle t \rangle^{-(1-\gamma)} e^{\bar{C} \langle t \rangle^\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_3 := (a_0 + C^{-1}\bar{C}\gamma b_0)e^{-\bar{C}}$ and $C_4 := (C\bar{C}^{-1}\gamma^{-1}a_0 + b_0)e^{-\bar{C}}$.

(iii). $\beta = 2$. This case can be treated similar to the proof of (ii). We define the rescaled quantities

$$\tilde{a}(t) := \langle t \rangle^{-\zeta} a(t), \quad \tilde{b}(t) := \zeta^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-(\zeta-1)} b(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

By (6.1), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{a}(t) &\leq -\zeta \langle t \rangle^{-\zeta-1} a(t) + \langle t \rangle^{-\zeta} b(t) = \zeta \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\tilde{b}(t) - \tilde{a}(t)); \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{b}(t) &\leq -\zeta^{-1}(\zeta-1) \langle t \rangle^{-\zeta} b(t) + C\zeta^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-(\zeta+1)} a(t) + \zeta^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-(\zeta-1)} g(t) \\ &= C\zeta^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\tilde{a}(t) - \tilde{b}(t)) + C\zeta^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-(\zeta+1)} a(t) + \zeta^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-(\zeta-1)} g(t). \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality, we have used $\zeta(\zeta-1) = C$ with our choice of $\zeta = (1 + \sqrt{1+4C})/2$.

Define the Lyapunov functional $\mathcal{L}_3(t) := C\tilde{a}(t) + \zeta^2 \tilde{b}(t)$ so that $\mathcal{L}'_3(t) \leq \zeta \langle t \rangle^{-(\zeta-1)} g(t)$, and hence

$$\mathcal{L}_3(t) \leq \mathcal{L}_3(0) + \zeta \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{-(\zeta-1)} g(s) ds = Ca_0 + \zeta(b_0 + \mathcal{G}_3(t)), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{G}_3(t) := \int_0^t \langle s \rangle^{1-\gamma} g(s) ds.$$

It then yields

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= \langle t \rangle^\zeta \tilde{a}(t) \leq (a_0 + C^{-1}\zeta(b_0 + \mathcal{G}_3(t))) \langle t \rangle^\zeta; \quad \text{and} \\ b(t) &= \zeta \langle t \rangle^{\zeta-1} \tilde{b}(t) \leq (C\zeta^{-1}a_0 + b_0 + \mathcal{G}_3(t)) \langle t \rangle^{\zeta-1}, \end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof of (iii) with $C_5 = a_0 + C^{-1}\zeta b_0$ and $C_6 = C\zeta^{-1}a_0 + b_0$.

6.2. Proof of Lemma 2.4. Recall the paired inequalities (2.7)

$$\begin{cases} a'(t) \leq b(t), & a(0) = a_0, \\ b'(t) \leq C\langle t \rangle^{-2}(\log\langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} a(t) + g(t), & b(0) = b_0. \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

When $\alpha = 0$, the system reduces to (6.1) with $\beta = 2$. The result follows from Lemma 2.3 (iii). We focus on the proof of the case when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Due to the additional logarithmic term in (6.3)₂, we define a new set of rescaled quantities

$$\tilde{a}(t) = \bar{C}\theta e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} a(t), \quad \tilde{b}(t) = \langle t \rangle(\log\langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} b(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where the parameters $\theta > 1$ and $\bar{C} > 0$ will be chosen later in (6.4). By (6.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{a}(t) &\leq \bar{C}\theta e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} b(t) - \bar{C}\theta \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} a(t) \\ &\leq \bar{C}\theta \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} (\tilde{b}(t) - \tilde{a}(t)), \\ \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{b}(t) &\leq \left((\log\langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} - (\theta-1)(\log\langle t \rangle)^{-\theta} - \bar{C}\theta \right) e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} b(t) \\ &\quad + \langle t \rangle(\log\langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} \left(C\langle t \rangle^{-2}(\log\langle t \rangle)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} a(t) + g(t) \right) \\ &\leq (1 - \bar{C}\theta) \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} \tilde{b}(t) + \frac{C}{\bar{C}\theta} \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log\langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)+\frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \tilde{a}(t) \\ &\quad + \langle t \rangle(\log\langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C}(\log\langle t \rangle)^\theta} g(t). \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose θ and \bar{C} such that $\theta-1 = -(\theta-1) + \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}$ and $\bar{C}\theta-1 = \frac{C}{\bar{C}\theta}$, namely:

$$\theta := \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{C} := \frac{1 + \sqrt{1+4C}}{2\theta}. \quad (6.4)$$

Then we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{b}(t) \leq C(\bar{C}\theta)^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} (\tilde{a}(t) - \tilde{b}(t)) + \langle t \rangle (\log \langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta} g(t).$$

Define a Lyapunov functional

$$\mathcal{L}_4(t) := C\tilde{a}(t) + (\bar{C}\theta)^2 \tilde{b}(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Then adding these above inequalities we get

$$\mathcal{L}'_4(t) \leq (\bar{C}\theta)^2 \langle t \rangle (\log \langle t \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta} g(t),$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{L}_4(t) \leq \mathcal{L}_4(0) + (\bar{C}\theta)^2 \int_0^t \langle s \rangle (\log \langle s \rangle)^{-(\theta-1)} e^{-\bar{C}(\log \langle s \rangle)^\theta} g(s) ds = C\bar{C}\theta e^{-\bar{C}} a_0 + (\bar{C}\theta)^2 (e^{-\bar{C}} b_0 + \mathcal{G}_4(t)),$$

where the integrand is denoted by \mathcal{G}_4 . It then yields

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= (\bar{C}\theta)^{-1} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta} \tilde{a}(t) \leq (e^{-\bar{C}} a_0 + C^{-1} \bar{C} \theta (e^{-\bar{C}} b_0 + \mathcal{G}_4(t))) e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta}; \quad \text{and} \\ b(t) &= \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta} \tilde{b}(t) \\ &\leq (C\bar{C}^{-1} \theta^{-1} e^{-\bar{C}} a_0 + e^{-\bar{C}} b_0 + \mathcal{G}_3(t)) \langle t \rangle^{-1} (\log \langle t \rangle)^{\theta-1} e^{\bar{C}(\log \langle t \rangle)^\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof with $C_7 = (a_0 + C^{-1} \bar{C} \theta b_0) e^{-\bar{C}}$ and $C_8 = (C\bar{C}^{-1} \theta^{-1} a_0 + b_0) e^{-\bar{C}}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Giacomo Albi, Nicola Bellomo, Luisa Fermo, S-Y Ha, Jeongho Kim, Lorenzo Pareschi, David Poyato, and Juan Soler. Vehicular traffic, crowds, and swarms: From kinetic theory and multiscale methods to applications and research perspectives. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 29(10):1901–2005, 2019.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Elia Brué, Daniele Semola, et al. *Lectures on optimal transport*, volume 130. Springer, 2021.
- [3] Hajer Bahouri, Jean-Yves Chemin, and Raphaël Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 343. Springer, 2011.
- [4] Eli Ben-Naim. Opinion dynamics: rise and fall of political parties. *Europhysics Letters*, 69(5):671, 2005.
- [5] McKenzie Black and Changhui Tan. Asymptotic behaviors for the compressible Euler system with nonlinear velocity alignment. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 380:198–227, 2024.
- [6] McKenzie Black and Changhui Tan. Hydrodynamic limit of a kinetic flocking model with nonlinear velocity alignment. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 18(4):609–632, 2025.
- [7] François Bolley, José A Canizo, and José A Carrillo. Stochastic mean-field limit: non-Lipschitz forces and swarming. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 21(11):2179–2210, 2011.
- [8] José A Carrillo, Young-Pil Choi, and Maxime Hauray. Local well-posedness of the generalized Cucker-Smale model with singular kernels. *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, 47:17–35, 2014.
- [9] Young-Pil Choi, Michal Fabisiak, and Jan Peszek. Alignment with nonlinear velocity couplings: Collision avoidance and micro-to-macro mean-field limits. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 57(5):5791–5820, 2025.
- [10] Young-Pil Choi and Samir Salem. Cucker-Smale flocking particles with multiplicative noises: Stochastic mean-field limit and phase transition. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 12(3):573–592, 2019.
- [11] Felipe Cucker and Steve Smale. Emergent behavior in flocks. *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, 52(5):852–862, 2007.
- [12] Roland L’vovich Dobrushin. Vlasov equations. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 13(2):115–123, 1979.
- [13] Martin Friesen and Oleksandr Kutoviy. Stochastic Cucker-Smale flocking dynamics of jump-type. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 13(2):211–247, 2020.
- [14] François Golse. On the dynamics of large particle systems in the mean field limit. In *Macroscopic and large scale phenomena: coarse graining, mean field limits and ergodicity*, pages 1–144. Springer, 2016.
- [15] Seung-Yeal Ha, Taeyoung Ha, and Jong-Ho Kim. Emergent behavior of a Cucker-Smale type particle model with nonlinear velocity couplings. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(7):1679–1683, 2010.
- [16] Seung-Yeal Ha and Jian-Guo Liu. A simple proof of the cucker-smale flocking dynamics and mean-field limit. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 7(2):297–325, 2009.
- [17] Seung-Yeal Ha and Eitan Tadmor. From particle to kinetic and hydrodynamic descriptions of flocking. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 1(3):415–435, 2008.

- [18] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin. A review of the mean field limits for Vlasov equations. *Kinetic and Related models*, 7(4):661–711, 2014.
- [19] Jong-Ho Kim and Jea-Hyun Park. Complete characterization of flocking versus nonflocking of Cucker–Smale model with nonlinear velocity couplings. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, 134:109714, 2020.
- [20] Sebastien Motsch and Eitan Tadmor. Heterophilous dynamics enhances consensus. *SIAM review*, 56(4):577–621, 2014.
- [21] Piotr B Mucha and Jan Peszek. The Cucker–Smale equation: singular communication weight, measure-valued solutions and weak-atomic uniqueness. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 227:273–308, 2018.
- [22] Roberto Natalini and Thierry Paul. On the mean field limit for Cucker-Smale models. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B*, 2021.
- [23] Vinh Nguyen and Roman Shvydkoy. Propagation of chaos for the Cucker-Smale systems under heavy tail communication. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 47(9):1883–1906, 2022.
- [24] Roman Shvydkoy. *Dynamics and analysis of alignment models of collective behavior*. Springer, 2021.
- [25] Roman Shvydkoy. Environmental averaging. *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences*, 11(2):277–413, 2024.
- [26] Alain-Sol Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In *Ecole d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, pages 165–251. Springer, 2006.
- [27] Eitan Tadmor. Swarming: hydrodynamic alignment with pressure. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 60(3):285–325, 2023.
- [28] Tamás Vicsek and Anna Zafeiris. Collective motion. *Physics reports*, 517(3-4):71–140, 2012.
- [29] Guanghui Wen, Zhisheng Duan, Zhongkui Li, and Guanrong Chen. Flocking of multi-agent dynamical systems with intermittent nonlinear velocity measurements. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 22(16):1790–1805, 2012.

*MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EAST LANSING, MI 48824, USA
Email address: `nguy1685@msu.edu`

†UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, CHICAGO, IL 60607, USA
Email address: `shvydkoy@uic.edu`

‡UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA, SC 29208, USA
Email address: `tan@math.sc.edu`