

SELECTION BY VANISHING COMMON NOISE FOR POTENTIAL FINITE STATE MEAN FIELD GAMES

ALEKOS CECCHIN AND FRANÇOIS DELARUE

ABSTRACT. The goal of this paper is to provide a selection principle for potential mean field games on a finite state space and, in this respect, to show that equilibria that do not minimize the corresponding mean field control problem should be ruled out. Our strategy is a tailored-made version of the vanishing viscosity method for partial differential equations. Here, the viscosity has to be understood as the square intensity of a common noise that is inserted in the mean field game or, equivalently, as the diffusivity parameter in the related parabolic version of the master equation. As established in the recent contribution [1], the randomly forced mean field game becomes indeed uniquely solvable for a relevant choice of a Wright-Fisher common noise, the counterpart of which in the master equation is a Kimura operator on the simplex. We here elaborate on [1] to make the mean field game with common noise both uniquely solvable and potential, meaning that its unique solution is in fact equal to the unique minimizer of a suitable stochastic mean field control problem. Taking the limit as the intensity of the common noise vanishes, we obtain a rigorous proof of the aforementioned selection principle. As a byproduct, we get that the classical solution to the viscous master equation associated with the mean field game with common noise converges to the gradient of the value function of the mean field control problem without common noise; we hence select a particular weak solution of the master equation of the original mean field game. Lastly, we establish an intrinsic uniqueness criterion for this solution within a suitable class.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of Mean Field Games (MFG) addresses Nash equilibria within infinite population of rational players subjected to mean field interactions. It has received a lot of attention since the pioneering works of Lasry and Lions [42, 43, 44] and of Huang, Caines and Malhamé [33, 34, 35]. Earlier works in the field were mostly dedicated to proving the existence of such equilibria in a various types of settings, including deterministic or stochastic dynamics, stationary or time-inhomogeneous models, continuous or finite state spaces, local or nonlocal couplings... Many of the proofs in this direction go through the analysis of the so-called MFG system, which is a system of two forward and backward Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) –PDEs reducing to mere ODEs for finite state spaces– describing both the dynamics of an equilibrium and the evolution of the cost to a typical player along this equilibrium, see for instance [7, 29, 44] and [9, Chapter 3] for a tiny example, together with the notes and complements in [13, Chapter 3] for more references. Another and slightly more recent object in the field is the master equation, which is the analogue of the Nash system for games with finitely many players and which hence describes the evolution of the value of the game in the form of a PDE set on the space of probability measures. Informally, the connection between the MFG system and the master equation is pretty simple: The MFG system is nothing but the system of characteristics of the master equation. This picture may be made rigorous when the MFG has a unique equilibrium. Provided that the coefficients of the game are

Date: February 28, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35K65, 35L40, 35Q89, 49L25, 49N80, 60F05, 91A16.

Key words and phrases. Mean field games, finite state space, Wright-Fischer diffusion, Kimura operator, master equation, restoration of uniqueness, vanishing viscosity, selection principle, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman PDE, hyperbolic system of PDEs, semiconcave functions, viscosity solution.

A. Cecchin and F. Delarue acknowledge the financial support of French ANR project ANR-16-CE40-0015-01 on “Mean Field Games”.

smooth enough, the master equation is then expected to have itself a classical solution. In all the instances where this guess can be indeed demonstrated (see for instance [9, 14, 20] in the continuous setting and [2, 18] in the discrete case), the standard assumption that is used –and in fact it is, up to some slight extensions, more or less the only one that exists– for ensuring uniqueness is the so-called Lasry-Lions monotonicity condition, see [42, 43, 44] and [13, Chapter 3] for monotonicity on continuous state spaces and [29] on finite state spaces. In fact, monotonicity has the great advantage of being very robust (meaning that it not only forces uniqueness but also stability of the equilibria) but, at the same time, it has the drawback of being rather restrictive from a practical point of view. Unfortunately, the master equation becomes poorly understood beyond the monotonous case. In particular, the connection between the MFG system and the master equation takes a dramatic turn whenever equilibria are no longer unique: In the latter case, there may be several possible values for the game; accordingly, classical solutions to the master equation cease to exist and almost nothing is then known on the master equation, except maybe in few examples in which the master equation can be reduced to a one-dimensional PDE.

This is precisely the goal of our paper to make one new step forward and to address, in a more systematic way, the following two questions for a suitable class of MFGs without uniqueness:

- (1) Is it possible to select some of the equilibria of the MFG?
- (2) Is it possible to select one specific solution of the master equation?

For sure, those two questions are very challenging in full generality. Subsequently, we cannot hope for a class of MFGs that is too big. In fact, the typical examples for which those two questions have been addressed rigorously in the literature are cases where equilibria can be described through a one-dimensional parameter only, say their mean if the state space is embedded in \mathbb{R} , see for instance [24] that addresses a linear-quadratic 1d MFG with Gaussian equilibria and [3, 16] that address two examples of MFGs on $\{0, 1\}$ and $\{-1, 1\}$ respectively. We here intend to study a generalization of [3, 16] and to consider MFGs on a finite state space of any cardinality. However, even the latter would remain too much: We thus restrict ourselves to so-called potential games, namely to games whose cost coefficients derive from potentials; As explained in Subsection 2.6 below, this still covers the framework of [3, 16] and, interestingly, this provides an example where equilibria cannot be described by a single parameter.

The great interest of potential games is that they are intrinsically associated with a variational problem, usually referred to as a Mean Field Control Problem (MFCP): The MFG indeed reads as a first order condition for the MFCP, meaning that any minimal trajectory of the corresponding MFCP solves the MFG, see for instance [7, 44] and [29, 32] for earlier references on the continuous and discrete settings respectively. In short, the MFCP is here a deterministic control problem with trajectories taking values within the space of probability measures (over the state space supporting the MFG) and the cost functional of which is driven by the potentials of the cost coefficients of the original MFG. Noticeably, this variational interpretation of MFG has been widely used in the analysis of the MFG system, see for example [8, 10, 11]. Here, we want to use it as a way to rule out some of the equilibria of the MFG, namely those that are not minimizers of the MFCP: We provide examples of such equilibria in Subsection 2.6. For sure, we could decide to impose this selection principle arbitrarily but, in the end, this would make little sense. The main purpose of the paper is thus to justify rigorously such a procedure.

Before we say more on the mathematical approaches to this selection principle, it might be worth recalling that, intuitively, MFG are to be thought of as asymptotic versions of games with finitely many players, see for instance [44] for an earlier discussion on this question together with [12, 17, 35] for a generic manner to reconstruct approximate equilibria to the finite game from solutions of the MFG. In this respect, the most convincing strategy for justifying the selection principle would certainly consist in proving that the equilibria of the

corresponding finite player version of the game converge (in some way) to minimizers of the corresponding MFCP. Actually, this is precisely what is done in [3, 16] in a specific case where the state space has exactly two elements. However, this turns out to be a difficult approach since the passage from games with finitely many players to MFGs remains, in general and regardless any question of selection, rather subtle, see for instance [9, 26, 40, 41] and [2, 18] for several contributions on this matter in continuous and discrete settings respectively. Another strategy, already used in [24] in a linear quadratic case, is to pass to the limit in a randomly forced version of the MFG, the limit being taken as the intensity of the random forcing tends to 0. In the MFG folklore, this random forcing is usually referred to as a *common* or *systemic* noise, since it must be understood, in the finite version of the MFG, as a noise that is common to all the players –in contrast to idiosyncratic noises that are independent and specific to each given player–. We refer for instance to [9, 15] for two distinct approaches to continuous state MFGs with a common noise; as for the finite state case, we refer, among others, to [5], the key idea of which is to force the finite-player system to have many simultaneous jumps at some random times prescribed by the common noise. The key fact for us is that, provided that it is rich enough, the common noise may restore uniqueness, see for instance [23, 49] for continuous state MFGs and the recent article [1] for finite state MFGs (noticeably, the latter also involves an additional repulsive forcing at the boundary); in brief, the cornerstone in [1] is to design a form a common noise, which we call Wright-Fisher, so that the corresponding master equation becomes a system of nonlinear PDEs driven by a so-called Kimura operator and hence enjoys the related Schauder like smoothing estimates established in [25]. This paves the way for the following sketch: If we succeed to associate a variational structure to the MFG with a common noise –meaning that the unique equilibrium of the MFG with common noise is also the unique minimizer of some MFCP with common noise– and if we then manage to show that the minimizer of the MFCP with common noise converges –in some suitable sense– to solutions of the original MFCP without common noise, then we are done! Although it is quite clear, this idea is not so simple to implement: In short, the procedure used in [1] to restore uniqueness in finite state MFGs does not preserve the potential structure. Part of our job here is thus to elaborate on [1] in order to cook up a randomly forced version of the MFG that is uniquely solvable and that derives from a potential; equivalently, the corresponding master equation is required to coincide with the derivative of a suitable parabolic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation on the simplex, the analysis of which is here carried out explicitly by means of the properties of the Kimura operator associated with the common noise. Another task is then to take the limit as the intensity of the common noise tends to zero and to show that the solutions that are selected in this way are indeed minimizers of the MFCP without common noise, hence justifying the selection principle that we figured out. The last step in our program is to make the connection between the selection principle and the master equation: As for the potential MFG with a common noise, we show that the master equation has indeed a unique classical solution and that the latter converges almost everywhere to the gradient of the value function of the MFCP without common noise; following an earlier work of Kružkov [38], we are then able to prove that this limit is in fact a weak solution to a conservative form of the master equation and that it is the unique one that satisfies in addition a weak semiconcavity property. We provide a lengthy review of all these results in Section 2 below. The MFCP with common noise is introduced and studied in Section 3. The related MFG with common noise is investigated in Section 4. Selection of the equilibria is addressed in Subsection 5.1 and selection of a solution to the master equation is discussed in Subsection 5.3 by letting the common noise vanish, and in Section 6 in an intrinsic manner.

Notation. Throughout the text, the state space is taken as $\llbracket d \rrbracket := \{1, \dots, d\}$, for an integer $d \geq 2$. We use the generic notation $p = (p_i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ (with i in subscript) for elements of \mathbb{R}^d , while processes are usually denoted by $\mathbf{p} = ((p_t^i)_{i=1, \dots, d})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ (with i in superscript). Also, we let $\mathcal{S}_d := \{(p_1, \dots, p_d) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^d : \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_i = 1\}$ be the $(d-1)$ -dimensional simplex. The

Euclidean norm of $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $|p|$. We can identify \mathcal{S}_d with the convex polyhedron of \mathbb{R}^{d-1} $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d := \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^{d-1} : \sum_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_i \leq 1\}$. In particular, we sometimes write “the interior” of \mathcal{S}_d ; in such a case, we implicitly define the interior of \mathcal{S}_d as the $(d-1)$ -dimensional interior of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$. To make it clear, for some $p \in \mathcal{S}_d$, we write $p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ to say that $p_i > 0$ for any $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. We also write $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ to say that $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, $x_i > 0$ for each $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and $\sum_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_i < 1$.

We use the same convention when speaking about the boundary of \mathcal{S}_d : For some $p \in \mathcal{S}_d$, we may write $p \in \partial \mathcal{S}_d$ to say that $p_i = 0$ for some $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. Finally, $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker symbol, r_+ denotes the positive part of $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and, for two elements $(v_i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ and $(w_i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ of \mathbb{R}^d , we sometimes denote the inner product $\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} v_i w_i$ by $\langle v_\bullet, w_\bullet \rangle$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

In order to state our main results, we first introduce step by step the several forms of MFGs that we handle in the paper. We start with the game without common noise, which is assumed to be potential. Borrowing from the PDE literature –which is justified here since we make a rather systematic use of the master equation–, this game could be called *inviscid*. As we already explained in introduction, it might not be uniquely solvable, which fact is the basic rationale for inserting next a common noise in the dynamics. Following [1], we may indeed cook up a form of noise –together with a repulsive forcing at the boundary– that preserves the structure of the simplex and that forces the MFG to become uniquely solvable. Accordingly, the game with common noise should be called *viscous*. Unfortunately, a striking point in our study is that the common noise, at least in the form postulated in [1], destroys the potential structure of the game. This prompts us to address in the end a new and tailored-made form of MFG that is driven by both a common noise and a potential structure.

2.1. A first form of MFG. The general form of inviscid MFGs that we here consider is given by the following fixed point problem: For some time horizon $T > 0$, find an \mathcal{S}_d -valued continuous trajectory $\mathbf{p} = (p_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ that is an optimal trajectory to the \mathbf{p} -dependent control problem

$$\inf_{\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}} J(\alpha; \mathbf{p}), \quad J(\alpha; \mathbf{p}) = \int_0^T \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^i \left(\mathfrak{L}^i(\alpha_t) + f^i(p_t) \right) dt + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_T^i g^i(p_T), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{q} = (q_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ solves the Fokker-Planck (FP) equation

$$\dot{q}_t^i = \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^j \alpha_t^{j,i}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket, \quad (2.2)$$

subjected to the initial condition $q_0 = p_0$ and to the control $\alpha = ((\alpha_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ satisfying the constraint

$$\alpha_t^{i,j} \geq 0, \quad i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket, \quad i \neq j; \quad \alpha_t^{i,i} = - \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_t^{i,j}, \quad i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket; \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.3)$$

Obviously, the latter constraint says that the trajectory \mathbf{q} may be interpreted as the collection of marginal distributions of a Markov process with rates $((\alpha_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. In the definition of the cost functional (2.1), $(f^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ and $(g^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ are tuples of real valued enough smooth functions, the form of which is specified in the next subsection. As for the cost $(\mathfrak{L}^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$, we take for convenience

$$\mathfrak{L}^i(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} |\alpha^{i,j}|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

The MFG associated with (2.1) and (2.2) has been widely studied. In this respect, it is worth recalling that uniqueness is known to hold true in a few settings only and may actually fail in many cases. The typical condition that is used in practice to ensure uniqueness is a

form of monotonicity of the cost coefficients f and g , but as recalled in Introduction and as shown in the recent paper [1], uniqueness can be also restored –without any further need of monotonicity– by adding to the dynamics of \mathbf{q} a convenient kind of common noise together with a repulsive forcing at the boundary. In the presence of common noise, equilibria become random: In [1], candidates \mathbf{p} for solving the equilibria are then sought as \mathcal{S}_d -valued continuous stochastic processes (on $[0, T]$) that are adapted to the (complete) filtration \mathbb{F} generated by a collection of Brownian motions $((B_t^{i,j})_{0 \leq t \leq T})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : i \neq j}$ –this collection forming the common noise–, constructed on a given (complete) probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$. Accordingly, the FP equation (2.2) for $\mathbf{q} = (q_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ becomes a Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) driven by both the common noise $((B_t^{i,j})_{0 \leq t \leq T})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : i \neq j}$ and the environment \mathbf{p} , the general form of which is

$$dq_t^i = \sum_{j \neq i} \left(q_t^j (\varphi(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j,i}) - q_t^i (\varphi(p_t^j) + \alpha_t^{i,j}) \right) dt + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_t^i}{p_t^i} \sqrt{p_t^i p_t^j} (dB_t^{i,j} - dB_t^{j,i}), \quad (2.5)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $t \in [0, T]$, with $q_0 = p_0$ as initial condition. Forgetting for a while the presence of φ –we comment more on it in the sequel, but, in our claim here, the reader may take it as zero–, a peculiar point with (2.5) is that, generally speaking, the components $(q_t^i)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ are positive but the mass process $(\sum_{i=1}^d q_t^i)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is just equal to 1 in the mean under the expectation \mathbb{E} carrying the common noise. We refer to [1, Prop 2.3] for more details on this subtlety, but also on the solvability of (2.5): Basically, (2.5) is uniquely solvable if α is a bounded process and $\varepsilon^2 \int_0^T (1/p_t^i) dt$ has finite exponential moments of sufficiently high order for any $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. Consistently with the fact that both \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} are random, the control process α is also assumed to be progressively-measurable with respect to \mathbb{F} and, in the resulting MFG with a common noise, the cost (2.1) is averaged out with respect to the expectation \mathbb{E} , namely the cost functional becomes

$$\inf_{\alpha=(\alpha_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}} J^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\alpha; \mathbf{p}), \quad J^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\alpha; \mathbf{p}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^i \left(\mathcal{L}^i(\alpha_t) + f^i(p_t) \right) dt + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_T^i g^i(p_T) \right]. \quad (2.6)$$

The reader must pay attention to the superscript φ right above. Indeed, in addition to the common noise, the intensity of which is denoted by the positive parameter ε in (2.5) (which we take in $(0, 1]$ in the sequel), the other main feature of (2.5) is the additional φ therein: From now on, we may no longer assume it to be zero. As we alluded to, φ is actually intended to induce a repulsive drift that forces equilibria (dynamics of equilibria are obtained by taking $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$ in (2.5)) to stay away from the boundary of the simplex, whenever $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ –we return to this point in the next subsection–, which explains in the end why we are allowed to divide by p_t^i in the right-hand side of (2.5). To achieve this goal and apply the results of [1], it suffices for the moment to assume that φ is a non-increasing smooth function such that

$$\varphi(r) = \begin{cases} \kappa, & \text{if } r \in [0, \theta], \\ \geq 0, & \text{if } r > \theta. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Here, κ and θ are two additional positive parameters that permit to tune the intensity of the drift induced by φ . In this framework, assuming that f and g have suitable Hölder regularity (we return to this point next), the main result of [1] may be summarized as follows: there exists a constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ only depending on $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d , such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\theta > 0$ and $\kappa \geq \kappa_1/\varepsilon^2$, for any initial condition p_0 such that $p_0^i > 0$ for any $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, the MFG associated with the dynamics (2.5) and with the cost functional (2.6) is uniquely solvable.

2.2. Potential structure. As announced in Introduction, our main objective in this paper is to provide a selection criterion for the original MFG (2.1)–(2.2) –so without common noise and outside any monotonicity condition– by letting the intensity ε tend to 0 and the support of φ shrink to the boundary of the simplex in (2.5) and (2.6). This is however a very ambitious program that goes far beyond the single scope of this paper. Indeed, due to the numerous

singularities that may emerge when taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (the fact that (2.1)–(2.2) is not uniquely solvable makes a strong evidence for the existence of such singularities), there are indeed no good stability properties for the solutions to (2.5)–(2.6) when ε is small. To reduce much of the complexity, we here restrict ourselves to the so-called potential case. Following [7, 32, 44], we hence assume that the coefficients f and g derive from smooth potentials F and G . Roughly speaking, this means that

$$f^i(p) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_i}(p), \quad g^i(p) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial p_i}(p), \quad p \in \mathcal{S}_d, \quad (2.8)$$

but this writing is not completely satisfactory: In order to give a meaning to the two derivatives in the right-hand side above, both F and G must be in fact defined on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d containing \mathcal{S}_d —recall that the latter is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional manifold—. In case when F and G are just defined on the simplex, we may use instead the intrinsic derivative on the simplex, which identifies with a $(d-1)$ -dimensional instead of d -dimensional vector. We refer to [1, Subsection 3.2.1] for the definition of intrinsic derivatives, but say to clarify that, whenever F is differentiable on a neighborhood of the simplex in \mathbb{R}^d , the intrinsic gradient $\mathfrak{D}F = (\mathfrak{d}_1 F, \dots, \mathfrak{d}_d F) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of F is simply given by the orthogonal projection of the d -dimensional gradient ∇F onto the orthogonal space to the d -dimensional vector $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$, which is the tangent space to the simplex. Hence we define $\mathfrak{D}F = \nabla F - \frac{1}{d} \langle \nabla F, \mathbf{1} \rangle \mathbf{1}$, and, when F is just defined on the simplex, the intrinsic derivative is defined by the same formula, but rewritten as

$$\mathfrak{d}_i F(p) = \partial_\varepsilon [F(p + \varepsilon(e_i - \bar{e}))]|_{\varepsilon=0}, \quad p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d), i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket.$$

In the above definition, e_i is defined as the i th vector of the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d and \bar{e} as $\bar{e} := (e_1 + \dots + e_d)/d$; in particular, $e_i - \bar{e}$ is a tangent vector to the simplex. From the construction, we have $\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \mathfrak{d}_i F = 0$. Therefore, from now on we assume that, for any $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$,

$$\mathfrak{d}_i F(p) = f^i(p) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} f^j(p), \quad \mathfrak{d}_i G(p) = g^i(p) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} g^j(p). \quad (2.9)$$

Note that this is satisfied in case F is differentiable in a neighbourhood of \mathcal{S}_d in \mathbb{R}^d and (2.8) holds, but (2.9) is slightly more general than (2.8) because, roughly speaking, it involves $d-1$ entries instead of d . In particular, we will see in Subsection 2.6 that any two state mean field game is potential, in the sense that we can always find F and G satisfying (2.9).

A very appealing fact with potential games—without common noise—is that they are naturally associated with a control problem. Actually, this connection is a general fact in game theory and it goes far beyond the single scope of MFGs. In the specific framework of MFGs, the underlying control problem is an MFCEP, as we pointed out in introduction. In our setting—and once again without common noise—the MFCEP takes the form:

$$\inf_{\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}} \mathcal{J}(\alpha), \quad \mathcal{J}(\alpha) = \int_0^T \left(\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^i \mathfrak{L}^i(\alpha_t) + F(q_t) \right) dt + G(q_T), \quad (2.10)$$

where, as in (2.10), $\mathbf{q} = (q_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is a deterministic trajectory solving (2.2) subjected to the initial condition $q_0 = p_0$, for some given $p_0 \in \mathcal{S}_d$, and to the deterministic control $\alpha = ((\alpha_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the constraint (2.3). For convenience, we also assume that admissible controls are bounded, meaning that $\alpha^{i,j} \in L^\infty(0, T)$ (see footnote 9 for more details). The connection between the MFCEP (2.10)–(2.2) and the MFG (2.1)–(2.2) has been widely addressed in the literature, see for instance [7, 44] for continuous state MFGs and [29, 32] for finite state MFGs. Generally speaking, it says that any optimal trajectory $\mathbf{p} = (p_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ to (2.10)–(2.2) that stays away from the boundary of the simplex solves the MFG associated with (2.1)–(2.2). However—and this is the starting point of our paper—, there are known instances of MFG equilibria that are not minimizers of the corresponding MFCEP, see Subsection 2.6 below for a benchmark example. In this regard, our main result here

is precisely to construct a selection procedure that rules out these non-minimal equilibria, meaning that rules out solutions \mathbf{p} to the MFG (2.1)–(2.2) that are not optimal trajectories of (2.10)–(2.2). Using the same terminology as in the previous subsection, our strategy is to associate with the inviscid MFG, which is hence an inviscid potential game, a viscous potential game with the following four features:

- (1) The viscous potential game is associated with a viscous MFCP – that is a MFCP with a common noise of intensity ε –, in the sense that any minimizer –we prove that they do exist– of the viscous MFCP is an equilibrium of the viscous potential game;
- (2) The viscous potential game is uniquely solvable, hence implying that its unique solution, say $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$, is also the unique optimal trajectory of the viscous MFCP;
- (3) The optimal trajectory $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ converges in the weak sense, as the viscosity ε^2 tends to 0, to a probability distribution \mathbb{M} on $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{S}_d)$ that is supported by the set of optimal trajectories of the inviscid MFCP;
- (4) The cost functional of the viscous potential game, which is in the end a variant of $J^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ in (2.6), converges in a suitable sense to the cost functional J in (2.1). In particular, the equilibrium cost of the viscous potential game converges to the mean of the equilibrium costs of the inviscid potential game under the limiting distribution \mathbb{M} .

The combination of the first three items reads as a selection principle since it rules out equilibria of (2.1)–(2.2) that are not optimizers of (2.10)–(2.2), whilst the last item guarantees some consistency in our approach as it says that the cost functional underpinning the approximating viscous potential game is itself a good approximation of the original cost function J in (2.1). Although this strategy looks quite natural, it is in fact rather subtle. The major obstacle is that, as we already said, the pair (2.5)–(2.6) is not a potential game, hence advocating for the search of a version that derives from a potential.

Before we elucidate the form of the viscous potential game, we stress the fact that, at the end of the day, we are not able to address the limit of (2.5)–(2.6) –in its primary non-potential version–. This might seem rather disappointing for the reader, but, once again, this should not come as a surprise: Even though the viscous potential game has, as we clarify below, a structure that is very close to (2.5)–(2.6), the lack of any good stability estimate on (2.5)–(2.6) for ε small, makes really challenging the analysis of the distance between the solutions to (2.5)–(2.6) and the solutions to the viscous potential game defined below.

Our first step in the construction of a suitable viscous potential game is the construction of the viscous MFCP itself. To do so, we elaborate on [1]. Following (2.10), we can indeed associate with the dynamics (2.5) a stochastic control problem, which we precisely call viscous MFCP. It has the following form:

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=(\alpha_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}} \mathcal{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \quad \mathcal{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_t^i \mathcal{L}^i(\alpha_t) + F(p_t) \right) dt + G(p_T) \right], \quad (2.11)$$

where $\mathbf{p} = (p_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ solves the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ -driven SDE

$$dp_t^i = \sum_{j \neq i} \left(p_t^j (\varphi(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j,i}) - p_t^i (\varphi(p_t^j) + \alpha_t^{i,j}) \right) dt + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{p_t^i p_t^j} (dB_t^{i,j} - dB_t^{j,i}), \quad (2.12)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $t \in [0, T]$, with $q_0 = p_0$ as initial condition, and, as before, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is an \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable process satisfying (2.3) except for the fact that, for purely technical reasons, we will rescript ourselves to processes whose off-diagonal coordinates are bounded by a constant M that is explicitly given in terms of f , g and T (even though (2.3) just implies that the diagonal coordinates are bounded by $(d-1)M$, we will say abusively that such processes are bounded by M). The function φ is chosen as in (2.7) and the initial condition p_0 belongs to the interior of the simplex. Such a condition on p_0 will be always assumed in the rest of the paper, the main reason being that it permits to apply results from [1]: By Proposition 2.1 therein, the SDE (2.12) (which is usually called a Wright-Fisher SDE) is

uniquely solvable in the strong sense if $\kappa \geq \varepsilon^2/2$ and the solution remains in the interior of the simplex, and further, by Proposition 2.2 (also in [1]), $\int_0^T (1/p_t^i) dt$ has exponential moments of sufficiently high order, if κ is large enough. We recall that this latter integrability condition is necessary for the well-posedness of (2.5).

In this framework, our first main result has some interest in its own, independently of the aforementioned selection principle. The functional spaces to which F and G are assumed to belong, and to which the value function is proved to belong, are defined in details in the Appendix, by means of local charts. These are called Wright-Fisher, as introduced in [25], and are used in [1] to prove well posedness of the MFG master equation. We just say here that:

- (1) $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ consists of continuous functions on \mathcal{S}_d that are γ -Hölder continuous up to the boundary with respect to the metric associated with the Wright-Fisher noise in (2.12); accordingly, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ consists of continuous functions on \mathcal{S}_d that are continuously differentiable in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, with Hölder continuous derivatives up to the boundary; both spaces are equipped with norms $\|\cdot\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{WF},1,\gamma}$;
- (2) for $k = 0, 1$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{k,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ consists of continuous functions on \mathcal{S}_d that are $2+k$ times continuously differentiable in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, with derivatives satisfying a suitable behaviour at the boundary and a suitable Hölder regularity that depend on the order of the derivative; in particular, the derivatives of order 1 (if $k = 0$) and of order 1 and 2 (if $k = 1$) are Hölder continuous up to the boundary, but the derivative of order $2+k$ (i.e. 2 if $k = 0$ and 3 if $k = 1$) may blow up at the boundary and be only locally Hölder continuous in the interior; both spaces are equipped with norms $\|\cdot\|_{\text{WF},0,2+\gamma}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{WF},1,2+\gamma}$;
- (3) $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{k,2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$ are the parabolic versions of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{k,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$; while the former consists of functions on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$ that are Hölder continuous for a suitable metric, the latter consists of continuous functions on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$ that are continuously differentiable in time $t \in [0, T]$ and that are $2+k$ times continuously differentiable in space in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, with derivatives satisfying a suitable behaviour at the boundary and a suitable Hölder regularity; in particular, the time derivative and the space derivatives up to order $1+k$ are Hölder continuous up to the boundary but the derivative of order $2+k$ may blow up at the boundary; the norms are also denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{WF},k,2+\gamma}$ (below, the norm is understood as being for the parabolic space if the function in argument of the norm is time-space dependent).

Throughout the sequel, the parameter $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is fixed.

Theorem 2.1. *Recall (θ, κ) from (2.7). If $F \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, then there exists a constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ only depending on $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d , such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\theta > 0$ and $\kappa \geq \kappa_1/\varepsilon^2$, and any initial state p_0 in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, the MFCP (2.11)–(2.12) set over \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes α that are bounded by $M = 2(\|g\|_\infty + T\|f\|_\infty)$ has a unique solution. Moreover, there exists $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma]$, possibly depending on ε and κ , such that the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation has a unique solution $\mathcal{V}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$.*

The proof of this result is given in Section 3, see Theorem 3.2. Generally speaking and using the notation $\mathfrak{D} = (\mathfrak{d}_j)_{j \in [d]}$ and $\mathfrak{D}^2 = (\mathfrak{d}_{j,k})_{j,k \in [d]}$ for the first and second order derivatives on the simplex –the second derivative being defined similarly to the first, see Subsection 3.1 for a short account and [1, Subsection 3.2.1] for more details–, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation has the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathcal{V} + \mathcal{H}_M^\varphi(p, \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}) + F(p) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \sum_{j,k \in [d]} (p_j \delta_{j,k} - p_j p_k) \mathfrak{d}_{j,k}^2 \mathcal{V} = 0, \\ \mathcal{V}(T, p) = G(p), \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

for $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, where \mathcal{H}_M^φ is an Hamiltonian term depending explicitly on φ and M , the precise form of which is not so relevant at this early stage of the paper and will be just given in the sequel of the text, see (3.3). In fact, we feel more useful for the reader to be aware of the key fact that, here, this HJB equation is shown to have a unique classical solution. Obviously, this is a strong result that is true because of the presence of the common noise and, in particular, that bypasses any use of convexity on F and G (and hence of monotonicity on f and g). The proof makes use of the smoothing properties obtained in [25] and [1] for so-called *Kimura* diffusions that are second-order diffusion operators on the simplex: In (2.13), the second-order structure manifests through the operator $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \sum_{j,k} (p_j \delta_{j,k} - p_j p_k) \partial_{j,k}^2$, which is –and this is the main difficulty in the analysis– degenerate at the boundary of the simplex. The latter explains why we need the forcing φ to be sufficiently strong –see the condition $\kappa \geq \kappa_1/\varepsilon^2$ in the statement– in order to guarantee for the existence of a classical solution.

Our second main result is to prove that there is a uniquely solvable MFG that derives from the viscous MFCP. Noticeably, this is a non-trivial fact. The reason is that, because of the presence of stochastic terms in (2.12), the standard computations that permit to pass from inviscid MFCPs to inviscid potential games are no longer true. To wit, the result below says that the shape of the cost of the viscous potential game is not the same as the shape of the cost of the original inviscid one.

Theorem 2.2. *Take F , G , and M as in the statement of Theorem 2.1. Then, there exists $\kappa_2 \geq \kappa_1$, only depending on $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d , such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, any $\theta > 0$ and any $\kappa \geq \kappa_2/\varepsilon^2$, we can find a time-dependent coefficient $\vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ that is continuous on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, such that, for any initial condition $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, the optimal trajectory $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ of the MFCP (2.11)–(2.12) is also the unique equilibrium of the MFG with common noise driven by the \mathbf{p} -dependent cost functional*

$$\tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \mathbf{p}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^i \left(\mathcal{L}^i(\alpha_t) + f^i(p_t) + \vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i(t, p_t) \right) dt + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_T^i g^i(p_T) \right], \quad (2.14)$$

defined over pairs $(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ solving (2.5), for \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ that are bounded by M , and over \mathbb{F} -adapted continuous processes \mathbf{p} that take values in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$.

The statement of Theorem 2.2 deserves some explanations. First, we feel useful to specify the definition of an equilibrium in our framework:

Definition 2.3. *With the same notation as in Theorem 2.2 (in particular κ large enough), an \mathbb{F} -adapted continuous process \mathbf{p} with values in \mathcal{S}_d is said to be an equilibrium if the following two properties are satisfied:*

- (i) *There exists an M -bounded and \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable process $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that \mathbf{p} solves the SDE (2.12) –obtained by equalizing \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} in (2.5)–, with p_0 as initial condition;*
- (ii) *For any other M -bounded and \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable process $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ for which (2.5) is uniquely solvable, $\tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{p}) \leq \tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{p})$.*

In particular, from item (i) in the above definition, \mathbf{p} in (2.14) is implicitly required to solve (2.12) for some M -bounded and \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable control process (even though this control is denoted by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ in (2.12), we feel better not to use this notation here in order to distinguish from the control $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ used in (2.14), which stands for the control used in (2.5)). Also, as recalled above, it is proven in [1, Proposition 2.2 and 2.3] that, whatever the choice of the control in (2.12), the solution \mathbf{p} is uniquely defined, provided that κ in (2.7) is greater than some threshold $\kappa_0 \varepsilon^2$, with κ_0 only depending on the dimension; moreover, $\int_0^T (1/p_t^i) dt$ has exponential moments of sufficiently high order so that (2.5) always has a unique solution that is square-integrable, whatever the choice of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ therein (here, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ fits $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ in (2.14)). In particular, under the assumption of Theorem 2.2 (κ large enough), we should not worry for the exponential integrability of $\int_0^T (1/p_t^i) dt$, for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, nor for the well-posedness of (2.5) when \mathbf{p} in (2.14) (and hence $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ itself) is a candidate for solving the MFG.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is given in Section 4, together with the precise definition of the additional cost ϑ ; see Theorem 4.1 and (4.6). As for the latter, it is certainly fair to say that the definition of ϑ is implicit, meaning that it depends on \mathcal{V} itself, which might seem a bit disappointing but looks in the end inevitable. As for the proof itself, it relies on a variant of the argument used in [1], the main point being to take benefit of the smoothness of the solution to the HJB equation (2.13) in order to identify the equilibria. In this regard, a key step in the proof is to expand (as in a verification argument) the intrinsic gradient¹ $V_{\varepsilon,\varphi} = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ of the value function $\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ – solving the HJB equation (2.13) – along any possible equilibrium \mathbf{p} . This allows us to prove that, whatever the equilibrium \mathbf{p} , the optimal solution to $\tilde{J}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}(\cdot; \mathbf{p})$ is in the form

$$(\alpha_t^{\varepsilon,\varphi,\mathbf{p}})^{i,j} = a^* \left(\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t, p_t) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon,\varphi}(t, p_t) \right), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i \neq j, \quad (2.15)$$

where

$$a^*(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r < 0, \\ z & \text{if } r \in [0, M], \\ M & \text{if } r > M. \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

By plugging (2.15) into (2.12), we get that any equilibrium satisfies the same SDE. Thanks to the smoothness properties we have on $\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon,\varphi}$, the latter is uniquely solvable, hence the uniqueness property. See Section 4 for more details.

2.3. Selection. The next step in our program is to address the asymptotic behavior of the equilibria $(\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon,\varphi})_{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ as ε tends to 0 and the support of φ shrinks to the boundary of the simplex. In this regard, one difficulty is that, in the statements of both Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, the function φ is implicitly required to become larger and larger, as ε tends to 0, on the interval $[0, \theta]$. Equivalently, the constant κ therein blows up as ε tends to 0. Obviously, this looks a serious hindrance for passing to the limit. In Section 5 below, we bypass this difficulty by using the fact that, in the limit, the solutions of the Fokker-Planck equation (2.2) without common noise cannot reach the boundary when starting from the interior of the simplex, and in fact the solution stays away from the boundary with an explicit threshold (this advocates once more for taking p_0 in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$). Also, for the subsequent analysis, we introduce a new parameter δ , which is understood below as the half length of the support of φ : In short, θ should be understood as the half length of the interval on which φ blows up as ε tends to 0 (as explained right above) and δ for the half length of the interval on which it is non-zero, see (5.1) for the details. Obviously $\theta \leq \delta$ (in fact, we even require $2\theta \leq \delta$); also, δ is taken small in the sequel. The dependence of the solution $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ on δ , θ and κ is implicitly written as a dependence upon φ . We then get the following result, which holds without any further condition on θ and δ , so that δ can be taken as θ :

Theorem 2.4. *Let the assumptions of both Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 be in force and, with the same notation as in (2.15), let*

$$\alpha_t^{\varepsilon,\varphi} := \alpha_t^{\varepsilon,\varphi,\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then, for any initial condition $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, there is a constant $\delta_0 > 0$ such that the family of laws $(\mathbb{P}_\circ(\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon,\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\varepsilon,\varphi})^{-1})_{\varepsilon \in (0,1], \delta \in (0,\delta_0), 2\theta \leq \delta}$ is tight in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2([0, T]; [-dM, dM]^{d^2}))$, the first factor being equipped with the topology of uniform convergence and the second one with the weak topology. Moreover, any weak limit \mathbb{M} , as ε and δ tend to 0, is supported by pairs $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ that minimize the cost functional \mathcal{J} in (2.10), with $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$ therein, with p_0 as initial condition.

¹Consistently with the notation ϑ in Theorem 2.2, we here put the parameters ε and φ in subscripts as we sometimes write $V_{\varepsilon,\varphi}^i$ for denoting the coordinates of $V_{\varepsilon,\varphi}$; even though $\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon,\varphi}$ is scalar-valued, we feel more consistent to use the same convention for it.

The proof is given in Subsection 5.1, together with the precise definition of the function φ that we use; see Theorem 5.1. It is worth mentioning that the inviscid MFCP may have a unique minimizer even though the MFG has several equilibria. To wit, we provide an example in Subsection 2.6. In such a case, the probability \mathbb{M} in the above statement reduces to one point and the family $(\mathbb{P} \circ (\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\varepsilon, \varphi})^{-1})_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1], \delta \in (0, \delta_0), 2\theta \leq \delta}$ converges to the unique pair $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ minimizing the cost functional \mathcal{J} in (2.10) (with $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}$ therein). As explained in the next subsection, it happens quite often that the minimizer of the inviscid MFCP is unique: For almost every $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, the MFCP (2.11)–(2.2) has a unique solution whenever \mathbf{q} in (2.2) starts from p at time t . These are the points in which the value function of the inviscid MFCP is differentiable, thus they have full measure since the value function can be shown to be Lipschitz in time and space, see Proposition 5.2.

Back to the statement of Theorem 2.2, we get the announced limiting behavior for the equilibria therein. Anyhow, the reader may also wonder about the behavior of the cost functional $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ in (2.14) as ε tends to 0 and the support of φ shrinks to the boundary (and hence δ vanishes). In fact, this asks us to revisit the shape of the coefficient $\vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi}$, which is certainly the most intriguing term therein, see again Section 4. Importantly, we learn from its construction that, in order to control the impact of $\vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ accurately in the cost functional $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$, we cannot play for free with ε , δ and θ at the same time –the three of them popping up in the definition of φ –. The reason is that, even though this may only happen with small probability, the process $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ may visit the neighborhood of the boundary of the simplex where the function φ is non-zero. Even more, φ may become very large when ε tends to 0. Since the geometry of this neighborhood of the boundary of the simplex is determined by δ and θ , this explains why some trade-off between ε , δ and θ is necessary when averaging out the cost functional $\vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ with respect to all the possible trajectories of $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$. In this context, the following result says that we can tune both δ , θ and φ in terms of ε such that, along the equilibrium, the influence of $\vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ vanishes as ε tends to 0:

Proposition 2.5. *Let the assumptions of both Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 be in force. Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, we can choose δ as $\delta = \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ and θ as $\theta = \hat{\theta}(\varepsilon) \leq \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)/2$, for some (strictly) positive-valued functions $\hat{\delta}$ and $\hat{\theta}$, with 0 as limit in 0, and then $\varphi = \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)$ in (2.7), such that all the assumptions required in the statements of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are satisfied together with the following limit:*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^T \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^{i, \varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)} \vartheta_{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}^i(\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}) dt \right| \right] = 0,$$

for any $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $q_0 \in \mathcal{S}_d$, where $\mathbf{q}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}$ solves (2.5) with initial condition q_0 and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}$ therein.

In the statement, it is implicitly understood that $\hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)$ is parametrized by $\hat{\theta}(\varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ (see the discussion above Theorem 2.4 for the meaning of these two parameters). As for the proof, it is given in Subsection 5.3, see Proposition 5.9 and Theorem 5.11. For sure, the above result says that $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}: |\alpha_t| \leq M} |\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}) - \mathbb{E} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)})|$ tends to 0 as ε tends to 0. Since the sequence of laws $(\mathbb{P} \circ (\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)})^{-1})_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1]}$ is tight in the same space as in the statement of Theorem 2.4, we deduce that, along any converging subsequence (still indexing the latter by ε) with \mathbb{M} as weak limit²,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathcal{J}}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}; \mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)}) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{M}}[J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \mathbf{p})], \quad (2.17)$$

where $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{M}}$ denotes the expectation under \mathbb{M} . At this stage, we recall from Theorem 2.4 that, under the probability \mathbb{M} , almost every path $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ – understood as the canonical processes

²It looks like (2.17) could be recast differently, in a fashion closer to Γ -convergence, but this would ask for more materials in the text and we would make little use of it in the end. Instead, our formulation suffices to address the convergence of the solution to the master equation, which is a key point in our paper.

in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2([0, T]; [-dM, dM]^{d^2})$ —forms an equilibrium of the original inviscid MFG (2.1)–(2.2). In particular, $J(\alpha; \mathbf{p})$ is nothing but $J^*(\mathbf{p}) = \inf_{\beta} J(\beta; \mathbf{p})$, the infimum being here taken over all the deterministic processes β , see (2.1). At the end of the day, we may interpret the right-hand side as a mean over the values of the equilibria of the inviscid MFG. Obviously, the argument inside the limit symbol in the left-hand side is also the value of the unique equilibrium of the viscous MFG, hence proving that the limit points of the values of the viscous MFGs are means over the values of the inviscid MFG. Importantly, the probability \mathbb{M} here just charges the minimizers of the inviscid MFCP: In case when the inviscid MFCP has a unique solution, the expectation $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{M}}[J(\alpha; \mathbf{p})]$ then reduces to $\inf_{\alpha} J(\alpha; \mathbf{p})$, where \mathbf{p} is the unique minimal path of the inviscid MFCP.

2.4. Master equation. It is worth recalling that the value of an MFG—at least when the latter is uniquely solvable—has a nice interpretation in terms of the solution of a partial differential equation set on the space of probability measures. This equation, see for instance [30, 31] and [13, Chapter 7] for finite state MFGs and [7, 4, 14, 9, 19] for continuous state MFGs, is usually known as the master equation for the underlying MFG and should be understood as the asymptotic version, as the number of players tends to ∞ , of the Nash system associated with the finite N -player game. Our first main result in this direction concerns the master equation of the viscous MFG: It is here a system of second-order partial differential equations on the simplex, driven by the same Kimura operator as the HJB equation (2.13). It has the following general form:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t U^i + H_M((U^i - U^j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) + \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \varphi(p_j)(U^j - U^i) + (f^i + \vartheta^{i, \varepsilon, \varphi})(t, p) \\ + \sum_{j, k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_k [\varphi(p_j) + (U^k - U^j)_+] (\mathfrak{d}_j U^i - \mathfrak{d}_k U^i) \\ + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_j (\mathfrak{d}_i U^i - \mathfrak{d}_j U^i) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j, k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} (p_j \delta_{j, k} - p_j p_k) \mathfrak{d}_{j, k}^2 U^i = 0, \\ U^i(T, p) = g^i(p), \end{array} \right. \quad (2.18)$$

for $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, where H_M is the Hamiltonian:

$$H_M(w) = \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left\{ -a^*(w_j) w_j + \frac{1}{2} |a^*(w_j)|^2 \right\}, \quad w \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2.19)$$

with a^* as in (2.16). A key fact—which we implicitly use in our text—is that, under the assumption of Theorem 2.2, this master equation has a unique classical solution (with a suitable behaviour at the boundary, see the definition of the so-called Wright-Fischer spaces in Appendix): This result is mostly due to [1]. Given a classical solution $U_{\varepsilon, \varphi} = (U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ to (2.18), the value of the viscous MFG, when initialized from a state $p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ at some time $t \in [0, T)$, is given by $\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_i U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i(t, p)$. In other words, $U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i(t, p)$ is nothing but $\inf_{\alpha} \tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\alpha; \mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi})$ whenever $\mathbf{p}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ is initialized from p at time t and \mathbf{q} in (2.5) is initialized at time t from $(q_t^j = \delta_{i, j})_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$.

Due to the potential structure of the game, there is in fact a strong connection between the HJB equation (2.13) and the master equation (2.18). We can not have directly $U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i(t, p) = \mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon, \varphi}(t, p)$ for any $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, because the intrinsic gradient sum to zero, while the functions $U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i$ do not. This is by the way part of the difficulty in proving Theorem 2.2, see Section 4. What we can show is that

$$U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i(t, p) - U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^j(t, p) = \mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon, \varphi}(t, p) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon, \varphi}(t, p), \quad (2.20)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, $p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, which is reminiscent of [9, Theorem 3.7.1] (in the sense that, heuristically, space derivatives in continuous state space are replaced here by differences). Notably, (2.20) suffices to prove that the MFG and the MFCP have the same solution, because the optimal control is given by (2.15). Interestingly, Proposition 2.5 provides a way to pass to the limit for $U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}$. In case when the inviscid MFCP (2.10)–(2.2) has

a unique minimizer initialized from p at time t , Proposition 2.5 implies that the limit of $U_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i$ (provided that δ is chosen as $\delta = \widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$, θ as $\theta = \widehat{\theta}(\varepsilon)$ and φ as $\varphi = \widehat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)$) is $U^i(t, p)$, where now $U^i(t, p)$ stands for $\inf_{\alpha} J(\alpha; \mathbf{p})$ with \mathbf{p} denoting the unique minimizer of the inviscid MFCP initialized from p at time t and \mathbf{q} in (2.2) being initialized at time t from $(q_t^j = \delta_{i,j})_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$.

Obviously, a natural question is to relate such a limit U with the value function \mathcal{V} of the inviscid MFCP (2.10), where, for $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, $\mathcal{V}(t, p)$ is defined as $\inf_{\alpha} \mathcal{J}(\alpha)$ whenever \mathbf{q} in (2.2) starts from p at time t . We manage to prove (see Theorem 6.2) that \mathcal{V} is the unique Lipschitz viscosity solution of the following HJB equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathcal{V} + \sum_{k, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_k H(\mathfrak{d}_k \mathcal{V} - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}) + F(p) = 0, \\ \mathcal{V}(T, p) = G(p), \end{cases} \quad (t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d, \quad (2.21)$$

where H is the Hamiltonian associated to \mathfrak{L} in (2.4), namely

$$H(u) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} (u_j)_+^2, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2.22)$$

Pay attention that there is no condition on the boundary of the simplex, see Definition 6.1 for the details. Obviously, (2.21) should be regarded as the inviscid version of the equation (2.13) (up to the fact that controls are truncated by M in the latter, but this may be in fact easily handled by using the fact that optimal controls to (2.1) are bounded by M , see Proposition 5.2). Importantly, \mathcal{V} is shown to be Lipschitz continuous in time and space, see if needed Proposition 5.2 in the core of the text. Hence, it is almost everywhere differentiable in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, which plays a crucial role in our analysis: We also prove in Proposition 5.2 that the inviscid MFCP has a unique solution when it is initialized from $p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ at time t such that \mathcal{V} is differentiable in (t, p) –and hence for almost every $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ –, which permits to pass to the limit (as ε tends to 0) in $\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ almost everywhere in time and space in (2.20) (the simplex being equipped with the $(d-1)$ Lebesgue measure). To this end, we need to make the slightly stronger assumption that $F \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, meaning that f is Lipschitz continuous (on \mathcal{S}_d and hence up to the boundary), in order to ensure that \mathcal{V} is semiconcave; see again Proposition 5.2.

We build on this idea to obtain the following:

Theorem 2.6 (Part I). *Under the same assumption and notation as in the statement of Proposition 2.5, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)} = \mathcal{V} \quad \text{locally uniformly in } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d), \quad (2.23)$$

and, moreover, if in addition $F \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)} = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V} \quad \text{a.e. in } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{in } [L_{loc}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d))]^d. \quad (2.24)$$

This is the most technical and demanding result of the paper, and is proved in Subsection 5.3, see Theorem 5.11; notice that, in the end, we can not prove convergence at any points of differentiability of \mathcal{V} , but just almost everywhere. Passing to the limit in (2.20), equations (2.26) and (2.24) provides a strong form of selection for the value of the inviscid MFG. In the above notations, it says that, for almost every $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, the value $U(t, p)$ of the game that is selected is given by the derivative of \mathcal{V} , namely

$$U^i(t, p) - U^j(t, p) = \mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}(t, p) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}(t, p), \quad (2.25)$$

for any $i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. At first sight, it looks like that only finite differences of the vector $(U^1(t, p), \dots, U^d(t, p))$ are hence selected. In fact, we can reconstruct *a posteriori* the full-fledge collection $(U^i(t, p))_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ by observing that each $U^i(t, p)$ should coincide with the optimal cost to (2.1) when \mathbf{p} is the minimizer of the inviscid MFCP (which is unique for almost every initial point (t, p)) and when \mathbf{q} in (2.2) starts from the Dirac point mass in i at time t . Hence we may complement Theorem 2.6 in the following way, which is also proved in Theorem 5.11:

Theorem 2.6 (Part II). *Under the same assumption and notation as in the statement of Proposition 2.5 and provided that $F \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} U_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\varphi}(\varepsilon)} = U \quad \text{a.e. in } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{in } [L_{loc}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d))]^d, \quad (2.26)$$

where, for any initial condition $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ from which the inviscid MFCP has a unique optimal trajectory \mathbf{p} , $U^i(t, p)$ is defined as $\inf_{\alpha} J(\alpha; \mathbf{p})$ in (2.1), the problem being set over the time interval $[t, T]$ and \mathbf{q} in (2.2) starting from $q_t = (q_t^j = \delta_{i,j})_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$.

2.5. Weak solution to the master equation. The last step in our program is hence to provide an intrinsic approach to the relationship (2.25) by addressing directly the master equation of the inviscid MFG. The latter writes (see for instance [28, 29] and [13, Chapter 7]):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U^i + H((U^i - U^j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) + f^i(p) + \sum_{j,k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_k (U^k - U^j)_+ (\mathfrak{d}_j U^i - \mathfrak{d}_k U^i) = 0, \\ U^i(T, p) = g^i(p), \end{cases} \quad (2.27)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, which is informally obtained by taking $\varphi \equiv 0$ and $\varepsilon = 0$ in (2.18). Recasted in terms of the centered value functions $(\dot{U}^i := U^i - \bar{U})_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$, with $\bar{U} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} U^j$, (2.27) becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \dot{U}^i + \dot{H}((\dot{U}^j - \dot{U}^k)_{j,k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) + \dot{f}^i(p) + \sum_{j,k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_k (\dot{U}^k - \dot{U}^j)_+ (\mathfrak{d}_j \dot{U}^i - \mathfrak{d}_k \dot{U}^i) = 0, \\ \dot{U}^i(T, p) = \dot{g}^i(p), \end{cases} \quad (2.28)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, where we have let

$$\dot{H}((u^{j,k})_{j,k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) := H((u^i - u^j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} H((u^j - u^k)_{k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}),$$

and similarly $\dot{f}^i(p) = f^i(p) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} f^j(p)$ and $\dot{g}^i(p) = g^i(p) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} g^j(p)$. As we have already explained, the master equation is typically non-uniquely solvable (see the next subsection for a benchmark example). The question for us is thus to rephrase (2.25) as a uniqueness result for the master equation –or at least for its centered version (2.28)– within a well-chosen class of functions. Loosely speaking, we succeed to obtain such a result in Section 6 below but for the conservative form of (2.28), namely

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \dot{U}^i + \dot{H}((\dot{U}^j - \dot{U}^k)_{j,k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) + \dot{f}^i(p) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_k \mathfrak{d}_i [(\dot{U}^k - \dot{U}^j)_+^2] = 0, \\ \dot{U}^i(T, p) = \dot{g}^i(p), \end{cases} \quad (2.29)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. Clearly, the two equations (2.27) and (2.29) may be identified within the class of differentiable functions \dot{U} that satisfy, for any $i, j, k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{d}_i [(\dot{U}^k - \dot{U}^j)_+^2] = (\dot{U}^k - \dot{U}^j)_+ (\mathfrak{d}_j \dot{U}^i - \mathfrak{d}_k \dot{U}^i),$$

which indeed holds true if, for any $i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$,

$$\mathfrak{d}_i \dot{U}^j = \mathfrak{d}_j \dot{U}^i. \quad (2.30)$$

As we clarify in Section 6, identity (2.30) guarantees that \dot{U} derives –in space– from a potential, meaning that $\dot{U}^i(t, p) = \mathfrak{d}_i \dot{\mathcal{V}}(t, p)$ for some real-valued function $\dot{\mathcal{V}}$ defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$. As a byproduct, it prompts us to regard the conservative formulation (2.29) of the master equation as the derivative system obtained by applying the operator \mathfrak{d}_i , for each $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, to the HJ equation (2.21). In words, (2.29) may be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \dot{U}^i + \mathfrak{d}_i \left(\sum_{k,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_k H(\dot{U}^k - \dot{U}^j) \right) + \mathfrak{d}_i F(p) = 0, \\ \dot{U}^i(T, p) = \mathfrak{d}_i G(p), \end{cases} \quad (2.31)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. Interestingly enough, the formulation (2.31) makes clear the link between the HJ equation (2.21) and the master equation, at least when the latter is understood in its conservative form. For scalar conservation laws, the usual notion of admissibility which is used to restore uniqueness of weak solutions is the one of entropy solution. In space dimension 1, which is the case when $d = 2$ (see next Subsection), the entropy solution to a scalar conservation law is also shown to be the space derivative of the viscosity solution of the corresponding HJB equation; see e.g. [36, 45, 6]. However, for hyperbolic systems of PDEs with multiple space dimension, which is the case here when $d \geq 3$, there might be non-uniqueness of entropy solutions and there are very few results in the literature about such systems. In particular, system (2.31) is hyperbolic in the wide sense, but not strictly hyperbolic. Nevertheless, exploiting the connection with the HJB equation (2.21), borrowing the idea from the paper of Kruřkov [38], it is possible to establish uniqueness in a suitable set of admissible weak solutions. The whole is captured by the following statement³:

Theorem 2.7. *Assume that F and G are in $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$. The conservative form (2.31) of the master equation has a unique weak solution that is bounded and weakly semi-concave in space. This solution is the almost everywhere space derivative of the unique viscosity solution \mathcal{V} of the HJ equation (2.21).*

The proof is given in Section 6, see Theorem 6.6. The notions of weak solution and weak semi-concavity in space are clarified in Definition 6.4 below. In a shell, the proof of the above statement holds in three steps: The first one is to show that any weak solution to the conservative form of the master equation derives from a potential; The second one is to prove that the potential must be an almost everywhere and semi-concave solution of the HJ equation (2.21); The last step is to identify almost everywhere and semi-concave solutions with viscosity solutions of (2.21), which are shown to be unique, despite the lackness of boundary conditions, see Corollary 6.3 below. To put it differently, the striking facts that we use here to restore a form of uniqueness to the master equation are, on the one hand, the existence of a potential and, on the other hand, the semi-concavity assumption. In this regard, it must be fair pointing out that the existence of a potential is somewhat enclosed in the conservative form of (2.31). In other words, the conservative form not only permits to address solutions in a weak sense, but it also permits to reduce the space of solutions to gradient functions. As for the semi-concavity assumption, it plays a crucial role in the selection: The connection between semi-concave solutions of HJ equations and entropy solutions of scalar conservation laws has been widely discussed, see for instance the first chapter in the monograph of Cannarsa and Sinestrari [6] together with the bibliography therein; In the case of hyperbolic systems with a potential structure –like (2.31)–, the role of semi-concavity is exemplified in the earlier paper of Kruřkov [38] from which we borrow part of the proof of Theorem 2.7. For sure, it is also important to say that, in the end, we are not able to define weak solutions for the non-conservative versions (2.27) and (2.28) of the master equation. However, we prove in Proposition 6.5 below that classical solutions to (2.28) are indeed weak solutions to (2.31), the key point being that Schwarz identity (2.30) holds true for classical solutions to (2.28).

2.6. Example. To illustrate our results, we feel useful to revisit the $d = 2$ example addressed in [16] (the reader may also have a look at [3] which shares many features with [16]). Therein, a selection result is proven by addressing directly the large N behavior of the N -player game, both in terms of the value functions for the feedback Nash equilibria and of the optimal trajectories. Although this is certainly a much more satisfactory approach than ours, at least from a modelling point view, making a detour via the finite case remains however much more challenging and difficult. To wit, the selection result established in [16] is partial only, as it leaves open the case when the initial point of the equilibrium is precisely a singular point

³The reader should be aware of the fact that the assumption on G in the statement below is weaker than what we required in the previous statements, see for instance Theorems 2.1 and 2.2.

of the master equation –we go back to this point next–. And most of all, it is by no means clear –at least for us– how the potential structure we use here could help for addressing the convergence of the corresponding finite player game in the case $d \geq 3$. Actually, this informal comparison of the tractability of the two limits over N and ε should not come as a surprise for the reader. Intuitively, it is indeed more difficult to handle the N -player game for a large N than the ε -viscous game for a small intensity ε of the common noise: Even though their solutions are randomized, MFGs with common noise indeed share with standard MFGs the key property that any unilateral deviation from an equilibrium has no influence on the global state of the population; this turns out to be useful when addressing the asymptotic behavior –as ε vanishes– and, obviously, this is false for finite games. Noticeably, this argument in support of the vanishing viscosity approach is exemplified in the paper [24]: Therein, the authors prove a selection result for linear quadratic games with a continuous state space by both methods; In this setting, the vanishing viscosity method is clearly the easiest one.

The case $d = 2$ is very special because any MFG becomes potential. Below, we first provide a general description of two state mean field games and then we specialize our results to the example analyzed in [16]. For the same two sets of coefficients $(f^i)_{i=1,2}$ and $(g^i)_{i=1,2}$ as in (2.1), we can easily reconstruct two potentials F and G such that

$$\mathfrak{d}_1 F(p) = \frac{f^1(p) - f^2(p)}{2} = -\mathfrak{d}_2 F(p), \quad p \in \mathcal{S}_2,$$

by letting

$$F(p_1, 1 - p_1) := \int_0^{p_1} (f^1(q, 1 - q) - f^2(q, 1 - q)) dq, \quad p_1 \in [0, 1],$$

and similarly for G . Interestingly the centered master equation (2.28), which is a system in the general case $d \geq 3$, becomes a mere equation when $d = 2$. Indeed, we then have $\tilde{U}^1 = -\tilde{U}^2$, which implies that (2.28) can be rewritten in terms of the sole $\tilde{U}^1 = (U^1 - U^2)/2$. Accordingly, the conservative version of the master equation takes the form

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{U}^1 + \mathfrak{d}_1(\mathcal{H}(p, \tilde{U}^1)) + \frac{1}{2}(f^1(p_1, 1 - p_1) - f^2(p_1, 1 - p_1)) = 0, \\ \tilde{U}^1(T, p) = \frac{1}{2}(g^1(p_1, 1 - p_1) - g^2(p_1, 1 - p_1)), \end{cases} \quad (2.32)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{H}(p, u) &= 2p_1(u)_+^2 + 2(1 - p_1)(-u)_+^2 = 2p_1\left(\frac{|u| + u}{2}\right)^2 + 2(1 - p_1)\left(\frac{|u| - u}{2}\right)^2 \\ &= u^2 + (2p_1 - 1)u|u|. \end{aligned}$$

The latter expression prompts us to change the variable p_1 into $m = 2p_1 - 1$ (which should be thought of as the mean of (p_1, p_2) if the state space was $\{1, -1\}$ instead of $\{1, 2\}$). Letting $Z(m) := -2\tilde{U}^1(\frac{1+m}{2}, \frac{1-m}{2}) = (U^2 - U^1)(\frac{1+m}{2}, \frac{1-m}{2})$, for $m \in [-1, 1]$, we can rewrite (2.32) in the form

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t Z + \partial_m\left(\frac{mZ|Z|}{2} - \frac{Z^2}{2}\right) = f^2\left(\frac{1+m}{2}, \frac{1-m}{2}\right) - f^1\left(\frac{1+m}{2}, \frac{1-m}{2}\right), \\ Z(T, p) = g^2\left(\frac{1+m}{2}, \frac{1-m}{2}\right) - g^1\left(\frac{1+m}{2}, \frac{1-m}{2}\right), \end{cases} \quad (2.33)$$

for $(t, m) \in [0, T] \times [-1, 1]$.

In [16], the cost coefficients are chosen as

$$F \equiv 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g^1(p) = -(2p_1 - 1), \quad g^{-1}(p) = 2p_1 - 1,$$

so that

$$G(p_1, 1 - p_1) = \int_0^{p_1} -2(2q - 1) dq = -2p_1^2 + 2p_1 = 2p_1 p_2.$$

The reduced master equation in [16], see (3.11) therein, is exactly Equation (2.33) for Z (up to a time reversal). Note also that the potential $\mathcal{G}(p_1, p_2) = -(2p_1 - 1)^2/2$ therein differs from G above by a constant (which is $1/2$), but obviously this does not matter. Importantly, the master equation (2.33) may have multiple weak solutions when T is large enough, hence

the need for a selection argument. The solution selected in (2.33), following the theory for scalar conservation laws, is the entropy solution, which can be shown to be unique in this case despite the lackness of boundary conditions. As explained in the previous subsection, the entropy solution is the space derivative of the viscosity solution to the HJB equation, making this selection consistent with Theorem 2.7. Moreover, in [16], the value functions for the feedback Nash equilibrium of the N -player game are shown to converge to this entropy solution [16, Theorem 8]; this says that the solutions to the master equation that are selected by taking the limit over ε or over N are the same. So, in a shell, our result is fully consistent with [16].

As far as convergence of the optimal trajectories is concerned, the equilibria are shown to be non-unique, provided that the time horizon T is chosen large enough: Whatever the initial condition at time 0, there are three solutions to the MFG if $T > 2$, see [16, Proposition 2]. In this regard, the main result in [16] states that, whenever the initial condition $p_0 = (p_0^1, p_0^2)$ of the population at time 0 satisfies $m_0 := 2p_0^1 - 1 \neq 0$ (i.e., the mean parameter is non-zero), there is a unique equilibrium $(p_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ that is selected by letting N tend to ∞ in the corresponding N -player game; it satisfies the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}m_t = -2m_t|Z(t, m_t)| + 2Z(t, m_t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.34)$$

with $(m_t = p_t^1 - p_t^2)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and Z being the unique entropy solution to (2.33), see [16, (23)]. Notably, this equation is shown to admit a unique solution, when $m_0 \neq 0$; see [16, Prop 6]. Again, this is consistent with our results: [16, Theorem 15] asserts that this equilibrium is also the unique minimizer of the corresponding inviscid MFCP initialized from $(0, m_0)$, see (2.10) plugging $F \equiv 0$ and $G(p) = 2p_1p_2$ therein. While the proof of Theorem [16, Theorem 15] is carried out by explicit computations, our Theorem 2.4 applies directly. Interestingly, we may recover (2.34) explicitly. Indeed, in [16], the function $m \mapsto Z(0, m)$ is shown to be discontinuous at $m = 0$ only (provided that T is large enough; if T is small, $m \mapsto Z(0, m)$ is continuous); Accordingly, the function $m \mapsto \mathcal{V}(0, \frac{1+m}{2})$ in (2.21) is continuously differentiable at m_0 (since m_0 is assumed to be non-zero) which, as we already explained –see also Proposition 5.2–, implies that there is indeed a unique minimizer to the MFCP initialized from $(0, \frac{1+m_0}{2})$. Also, our discussion (see (viii) in Proposition 5.2) says that this unique minimizer, say $(p_t^*)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, solves the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_t^{*,1} = (1 - p_t^{*,1})(\tilde{U}^2(t, p_t^*) - \tilde{U}^1(t, p_t^*))_+ - p_t^{*,1}(\tilde{U}^1(t, p_t^*) - \tilde{U}^2(t, p_t^*))_+,$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Letting $(m_t^* := 2p_t^{*,1} - 1)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, we easily derive that m_t^* solves Equation (2.34), whence we get $m_t = m_t^*$.

Last but not least, the case $m_0 = 0$ is left open in [16]. In that case, the inviscid MFCP is shown to have two non-trivial symmetric minimizers, see again [16, Theorem 15]. It is also claimed in [16], see Section 4 therein, that, numerically, equilibria of the N -player game are tending to converge in law to those two minimizers, with weight 1/2 each; In other words there are numerical evidences for ruling out the third equilibrium (recalling that the MFG has exactly three solutions). Obviously, our Theorem 2.4 sounds as a confirmation of this latter intuition, as it precisely says that the third equilibrium (which is shown to be the constant zero) is indeed excluded by the vanishing viscosity method. The fact that the two remaining ones should be charged with probability 1/2 each comes from an additional symmetry argument, which is similar to the one used in [24]: If $\mathbf{p}^{*,\varepsilon,\varphi} = (p_t^{*,1,\varepsilon,\varphi}, p_t^{*,2,\varepsilon,\varphi})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is an optimal trajectory of the viscous mean field control problem, then, thanks to the symmetric form of G , $(p_t^{*,2,\varepsilon,\varphi}, p_t^{*,1,\varepsilon,\varphi})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is an admissible path with the same cost and hence is also an optimal trajectory but for the common noise $(B_t^{2,1}, B_t^{1,2})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ (instead of $(B_t^{1,2}, B_t^{2,1})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$). By uniqueness in law of the equation characterizing the optimal trajectory, this shows that $(p_t^{*,1,\varepsilon,\varphi}, p_t^{*,2,\varepsilon,\varphi})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and $(p_t^{*,2,\varepsilon,\varphi}, p_t^{*,1,\varepsilon,\varphi})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ have the same distribution. Consequently, under any weak limit \mathbb{M} as in the statement of Theorem 2.4, the marginal law of the first

variable –which must be understood as the law of \mathbf{p} – has to be symmetric. Here, we know that the support of \mathbb{M} is necessarily included in a set of two non-trivial trajectories. Hence, each of them should be charged with probability $1/2$.

Obviously, the thrust of our approach is that it applies to more general coefficients F and G and to any number of states $d \geq 2$; of course, the symmetry argument we have just alluded to only applies under appropriate forms of symmetry.

3. MEAN FIELD CONTROL PROBLEM

The main goal of this section is to prove Theorem 2.1. We feel useful to recall that, for a function φ as in (2.7), we aim at minimizing $\mathcal{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\alpha)$ in (2.11) where $\mathbf{p} = (p_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ therein solves the α -driven SDE (2.12). Importantly, the pair (ε, φ) is kept fixed throughout the section, which prompts us to drop out the superscript (ε, φ) in the subsequent notations. As explained in the previous section, we restrict ourselves to processes α that are bounded by $M = 2(\|g\|_\infty + T\|f\|_\infty)$, in the sense that $|\alpha_t^{i,j}| \leq M$, $dt \otimes \mathbb{P}$ almost everywhere, for any $(i, j) \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ with $i \neq j$. The bound M has the following interpretation in terms of the inviscid MFG (2.1)-(2.2): For a given (deterministic) path $\mathbf{p} = (p_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ with values in \mathcal{S}_d , optimizers of (2.1) are given in terms of the value function $((u_t^i)_{0 \leq t \leq T})_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$, namely $\alpha_t^{i,j} = (u_t^i - u_t^j)_+$, for $t \in [0, T]$ and $i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ with $i \neq j$, see [13, Chapter 7]. Here, u_t^i is defined as the optimal cost when \mathbf{q} starts at time t from the initial condition $q_t^j = \delta_{i,j}$ and hence satisfies $|u_t^i| \leq T\|f\|_\infty + \|g\|_\infty$: the upper bound holds by choosing the zero control, while the lower bound follows from the sign of \mathfrak{L} . With the same meaning for a^* as in (2.16), this allows us to express the corresponding Hamiltonian in the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M(p, w) := \inf_{(\alpha_{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : i \neq j : 0 \leq \alpha_{i,j} \leq M}} \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_M(p, \alpha, w) = \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_i \tilde{H}_M^i(w), \quad (3.1)$$

for $p \in \mathcal{S}_d$ and $w = (w_i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_M(p, \alpha, w) &:= \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_i \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : j \neq i} \left(\alpha_{i,j}(w_j - w_i) + \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_{i,j}|^2 \right) \\ \tilde{H}_M^i(w) &:= \inf_{(\alpha_j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : j \neq i : 0 \leq \alpha_j \leq M}} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left(\alpha_j(w_j - w_i) + \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_j|^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ a^*(w_i - w_j)(w_j - w_i) + \frac{1}{2} |a^*(w_i - w_j)|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

By boundedness of a^* (which in turn follows from our choice to restrict ourselves to controls that are bounded by M), \tilde{H}_M^i is Lipschitz continuous and continuously differentiable with Lipschitz and bounded derivatives (pay attention that it is not \mathcal{C}^2). The Hamiltonian \tilde{H}_M^i is used in the rest of the paper; note however that, in Section 2, see (2.19), we preferred to use the slightly different Hamiltonian H_M , but the two are clearly related by the identity $\tilde{H}_M^i(w) = H_M((w_i - w_j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})$, for $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The HJB equation for the value function is nothing but (2.13), with \mathcal{H}_M^φ therein given by

$$\mathcal{H}_M^\varphi(p, w) := \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_M(p, w) + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \sum_{j \neq i} p_i \varphi(p_j)(w_j - w_i). \quad (3.3)$$

The following is straightforward but useful for us:

$$\partial_{w_i} \mathcal{H}_M^\varphi(p, w) = \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_j \left(\varphi(p_i) + a^*(w_j - w_i) \right) - p_i \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left(\varphi(p_j) + a^*(w_i - w_j) \right). \quad (3.4)$$

3.1. Classical solutions. The well-known verification argument may be easily adapted to the simplex: If there exists a classical solution \mathcal{V} to the HJB equation, then the optimal control is unique (clearly bounded), if the initial condition is in the interior of the simplex, and given in feedback form through the feedback function $\tilde{a}^{*,i,j} := a^*(\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V} - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V})$. The proof proceeds in the same way, by expanding the trajectories along \mathcal{V} , and by using the fact that solutions to (2.12) remain in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ (which makes it possible to use interior smoothness of \mathcal{V} and coercivity of the Hamiltonian on $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$).

Although intrinsic derivatives are the most canonical ones, and will hence be used in the next sections, a key tool to prove the well-posedness of the HJB equation (2.13) is to work with local charts. In this respect, it is worth recalling that any function h defined in the simplex \mathcal{S}_d may be easily regarded as a function defined on the set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$. It suffices to identify h with \hat{h} defined by

$$\hat{h}(x) := h(t, \check{x}), \quad \check{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, 1 - (x_1 + \dots + x_{d-1})), \quad x \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$$

As explained in [1], h is then once or twice differentiable on the (interior of) the simplex if \hat{h} is once or twice differentiable in the usual sense as a function defined on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{d-1} , in which case we have a dictionary to pass from $\mathfrak{D}h$ and \mathfrak{D}^2h to $D_x \hat{h}$ and $D_x^2 \hat{h}$ and conversely. In short, $\partial_{x_i} \hat{h}(t, x) = \mathfrak{d}_i h(t, \check{x}) - \mathfrak{d}_d h(t, \check{x}) = \mathfrak{d}_i h(t, \check{x}) + \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \mathfrak{d}_j h(t, \check{x})$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and $x \in \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, and conversely $\mathfrak{d}_i h(t, p) = (\partial_{x_i} \hat{h} - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \partial_{x_j} \hat{h})(t, p_1, \dots, p_{d-1})$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, and $\mathfrak{d}_d h(t, p) = -\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \partial_{x_j} \hat{h}(t, p_1, \dots, p_{d-1})$, for $p \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$. As for the second order derivatives, $\partial_{x_i x_j} \hat{h}(t, x) = \mathfrak{d}_{ij} h(t, \check{x}) - \mathfrak{d}_{id} h(t, \check{x}) - \mathfrak{d}_{jd} h(t, \check{x}) + \mathfrak{d}_{dd} h(t, \check{x})$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, d-1$. As a byproduct, the HJB has the following writing in local charts (sums being taken over $\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \hat{\mathcal{V}} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_M(x, D_x \hat{\mathcal{V}}) + \hat{F}(x) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 \hat{\mathcal{V}} \\ \quad + \sum_i x_i [\sum_j \varphi(x_j) (\partial_{x_j} \hat{\mathcal{V}} - \partial_{x_i} \hat{\mathcal{V}}) - \varphi(x^{-d}) \partial_{x_i} \hat{\mathcal{V}}] + x^{-d} \sum_j \varphi(x_j) \partial_{x_j} \hat{\mathcal{V}} = 0, \\ \hat{\mathcal{V}}(T, x) = \hat{G}(x), \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, where $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_M(x, z) = \mathcal{H}_M(\check{x}, z) = \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_j \hat{H}_M^j(z) + x^{-d} \hat{H}_M^d(z)$, \hat{H}_M^i , for $i = 1, \dots, d$, is the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_M^i(z) := \tilde{H}_M^i(\Theta(z)), \quad \Theta(z) = \left(z_1 - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} z_j, \dots, z_{d-1} - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} z_j, -\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} z_j \right), \quad (3.6)$$

for $z = (z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and we denote $x^{-d} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} x_j$; we refer to [1] for the derivation of the second order term, see Eq. (2.26) therein. Interestingly enough, the optimal feedback then writes (in local chart) in the form (provided that the HJB equation has a classical solution) $(\hat{a}_{i,j}^*(D_x \hat{\mathcal{V}}))_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : i \neq j}$ with (recall the definition of a^* in (2.16))

$$\hat{a}_{i,j}^*(z) = \begin{cases} a^*(z_i - z_j), & i, j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket, \\ a^*(z_i), & j = d, \\ a^*(-z_j), & i = d. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

We remark that, if the value function is in the Wright-Fischer space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$ (to which we already alluded and which is defined in more detail in the Appendix), then \mathcal{V} solves (2.13) if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ solves (3.5). We choose to express the last coordinate in terms of the first $d-1$ for convenience only, and in fact the choice of the local chart is arbitrary. This is one reason why we expressed the main results in terms of intrinsic derivatives. Anyhow, the local chart is more adapted to the proof of Theorem 3.1 below. Indeed, it is worth emphasizing that, in order to prove the well-posedness of (2.13), it is enough to check that, provided that it belongs to the right space, $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ solves (3.5) in the interior of the simplex for the fixed chart we have chosen. In this regard, the precise choice of the local chart is not of a great importance and expressing any other coordinate than x_d in terms of the other

ones would work as well; to wit, by the same arguments as in [1, Subsection 3.2.1], Equation (3.5) can be equivalently written in terms of another local chart. In fact, the choice of the local chart really matters in the definition of the Wright-Fisher space carrying the solution, in order to describe finely the behaviour of the solution at the boundary. Fortunately, in the sequel, there is no need for returning to the details of the Wright-Fisher space and it is absolutely fine for us to work with the same local chart throughout the analysis. This claim holds also for the derivative systems (3.8) and (3.9) that we introduce below.

3.2. Derivative system. In order to address the HJB equation (2.13), we first study the derivative system. The rationale to do so is that, obviously, the nonlinear term in the derivative system is of order zero only while it is of order one in the HJB equation. As a byproduct, it makes it possible to apply *a priori* estimates proven in [1]. As explained above, we can use both intrinsic derivatives and local charts. Deriving (2.13) (by means of (3.4)), we formally get⁴ the following expression for $V = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}$, applying the Schwarz identity $\mathfrak{d}_i V^j = \mathfrak{d}_j V^i$ (the indices in the sums below belonging to $\llbracket d \rrbracket$),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V^i + \tilde{H}_M^i(V) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \tilde{H}_M^j(V) + \sum_j (\varphi(p_j) - p_j \varphi'(p_i))(V^j - V^i) \\ - \frac{1}{d} \sum_l \sum_j (\varphi(p_j) - p_j \varphi'(p_l))(V^j - V^l) + f^i(p) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_j f^j(p) \\ + \sum_{j,k} p_k (\varphi(p_j) + a^*(V^k - V^j)) (\mathfrak{d}_j V^i - \mathfrak{d}_k V^i) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (p_j \delta_{j,k} - p^j p^k) \mathfrak{d}_{jk}^2 V^i \\ + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 (\mathfrak{d}_i V^i - 2 \sum_j p_j \mathfrak{d}_j V^i - \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathfrak{d}_j V^j) = 0, \\ V^i(T, p) = g^i(p) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_j g^j(p), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where $\tilde{H}_M^i(V)$ is defined by (3.6). Instead, differentiating (3.5) with respect to x (using in the sequel the generic notation Z for $D_x \hat{\mathcal{V}}$) and applying the Schwarz identity $\partial_{x_i} Z^j(t, x) = \partial_{x_j} Z^i(t, x)$, for $i, j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, we then get, at least formally, the following system of equations (all the sums below are taken over $\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Z^i + \hat{H}_M^i(Z) - \hat{H}_M^d(Z) + \hat{f}^i(x) - \hat{f}^d(x) + \sum_j (\hat{b}^j(x, Z) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 x_j) \partial_{x_j} Z^i \\ + \sum_j \hat{c}^{i,j}(x) Z^j + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 Z^i = 0, \\ Z^i(T, x) = \hat{g}^i(x) - \hat{g}^d(x), \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, where, for $j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and $z = (z_k)_{k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c}^{i,j}(x) &= (\varphi'(x_i) - \varphi(x^{-d}) - \sum_{k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \varphi(x_k)) \delta_{i,j} + (\varphi'(x^{-d}) - \varphi'(x_i)) x_j \\ \hat{b}^j(x, z) &= \sum_{k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \left\{ x_k [\varphi(x_j) + a^*(z_k - z_j)] - x_j [\varphi(x_k) + a^*(z_j - z_k)] \right\} \\ &\quad + x^{-d} [\varphi(x_j) + a^*(-z_j)] - x_j [\varphi(x^{-d}) + a^*(z_j)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

The two equations are equivalent, by using the identities $Z^i = \hat{V}^i - \hat{V}^d$, $\hat{V}^i = Z^i - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} Z^j$ and $\hat{V}^d = -\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} Z^j$, given by the aforementioned dictionary to pass from one derivative to another.

Here, we prove well-posedness of (3.9), because it is needed for solving the HJB equation (3.5). Recalling the shape of φ from (2.7), our main solvability result is:

Theorem 3.1. *If $f \in [\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)]^d$ and $g \in [\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)]^d$ for a given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, then there exists a constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ only depending on M, T and d , such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\theta > 0$*

⁴The computations in the derivation of (3.8) and (3.9) are rather tedious; anyhow, there is nothing difficult. We feel it is sufficient to just provide the final results.

and $\kappa \geq \kappa_1/\varepsilon^2$, there exists $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma]$, possibly depending on ε and κ , such that Equation (3.9) admits a unique solution in $[\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)]^{d-1}$.

Proof. The proof of existence is done via Leray-Schauder fixed point theorem. Let $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma]$ to be chosen later. Letting⁵ $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, we consider the map $\Phi : \mathcal{X}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{d-1}$, defined by $\Phi^i(Z) = Y^i$, where Y^i is the solution to the linear equation obtained by freezing the zero order terms in (3.9) (all the sums being taken over $\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Y^i + \sum_j \left(\widehat{b}^j(x, Z) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 x_j \right) \partial_{x_j} Y^i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 Y^i \\ \quad = - \left[\widehat{H}_M^i(Z) - \widehat{H}_M^d(Z) + \widehat{f}^i(x) - \widehat{f}^d(x) + \sum_j \widehat{c}^{i,j}(x) Z^j \right] \\ Y^i(T, x) = \widehat{g}^i(x) - \widehat{g}^d(x). \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

The key remark is that, once Z is given, this is a scalar equation for each Y^i , in the sense that there is no Y^j , $j \neq i$, in the equation. Therefore we are allowed to invoke Theorem 10.0.2 of [25], which states that there exists a unique solution $Y^i \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ to (3.11), for any i , if the right hand side and the drift belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and the terminal condition is in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Such assumptions are satisfied in the present situation because $\widehat{H}_M^i - \widehat{H}_M^d$ and a^* (which shows up in \widehat{b} , see (3.10)) are Lipschitz continuous and φ and φ' are bounded and Lipschitz; thus the map Φ is well-defined. The claim hence follows if Φ admits a fixed point. In order to apply Leray-Schauder fixed point theorem we must show that Φ is continuous and compact and that the set

$$\mathfrak{X} = \left\{ Z \in \mathcal{X}^{d-1} : Z = \lambda \Phi(Z) \text{ for some } \lambda \in (0, 1] \right\}$$

is bounded in \mathcal{X}^{d-1} .

Step 1. We first show that Φ is continuous and compact. To do so, we may restrict ourselves to inputs Z such that $\max_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|Z^j\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma'}$ is less than some arbitrarily fixed real $R > 0$. Then, Theorem 10.0.2 of [25] gives, for any $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$,

$$\|Y^i\|_{\text{WF},0,2+\gamma'} \leq C_R \left(\max_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|Z^j\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma'} + \|f^i - f^d\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma'} + \|g^i - g^d\|_{\text{WF},0,2+\gamma'} \right), \quad (3.12)$$

for some constant $C_R \geq 0$ depending on R through the drift $\widehat{b}(x, Z)$ in (3.11), which yields (up to a new value of C_R)

$$\max_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|Y^i\|_{\text{WF},0,2+\gamma'} \leq C_R. \quad (3.13)$$

The above inequality implies that the map Φ is compact, as $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$ is compactly embedded in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$, see the Appendix. To prove continuity, we consider the analogue of (3.12), but applied to $Y - Y'$ with $(Y, Y') = (\Phi(Z), \Phi(Z'))$, for $(Z, Z') \in (\mathcal{X}^{d-1})^2$. Again, we assume that $\max_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|Z^j\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma'}$ and $\max_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|(Z')^j\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma'}$ are less than R . So, using (3.13) together with the fact that the derivatives of $\widehat{H}_M^i - \widehat{H}_M^d$ are Lipschitz, we have

$$\|\Phi(Z') - \Phi(Z)\|_{\mathcal{X}^{d-1}} \leq \max_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|(Y')^i - Y^i\|_{\text{WF},0,2+\gamma'} \leq C_R \|Z' - Z\|_{\mathcal{X}^{d-1}},$$

which proves continuity.

⁵Our notation for the Wright-Fisher space here is a bit abusive since it is regarded as a space of functions on $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$; as we already explained, there is no difficulty in passing from functions defined on $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ to functions defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, and conversely. And in fact, the construction of the Wright-Fisher spaces, as outlined in Appendix, is based itself on a local description of the functions (that it contains) through a convenient choice of local charts.

Step 2. We now prove an L^∞ bound of \mathfrak{X} . For $Z \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have, for some $\lambda \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Z^i + \sum_j \left(\hat{b}^j(x, Z) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 x_j \right) \partial_{x_j} Z^i + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 Z^i \\ = -\lambda \left[\hat{H}_M^i(Z) - \hat{H}_M^d(Z) + \hat{f}^i(x) - \hat{f}^d(x) + \sum_j \hat{c}^{i,j}(x) Z^j \right] \\ Z^i(T, x) = \lambda (\hat{g}^i(x) - \hat{g}^d(x)). \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

The proof follows from a standard representation of Z along the solution of the SDE that is driven by the second-order differential operator appearing in (3.14). To make it clear, we have, for any $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{S}_d)$,

$$Z^i(t, x) = \lambda \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T \bar{f}^i(X_s^{i,\cdot}, Z(s, X_s^{i,\cdot})) ds + \bar{g}^i(X_T^{i,\cdot}) \right], \quad (3.15)$$

where, for convenience, we have let $Z(s, X_s^{i,\cdot}) := (Z^j(s, X_s^{i,\cdot}))_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket}$ together with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}^i(x) &= \hat{g}^i(x) - \hat{g}^d(x), \\ \bar{f}^i(x, z) &= \hat{H}_M^i(z) - \hat{H}_M^d(z) + \hat{f}^i(x) - \hat{f}^d(x) + \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \hat{c}^{i,j}(x) z_j, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

for $x \in \hat{S}_d$ and z in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . In (3.15), $\mathbf{X}^{i,\cdot} = (\mathbf{X}^{i,j} = (X_t^{i,j})_{t \leq s \leq T})_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket}$ denotes a $(d-1)$ -dimensional process solving the SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dX_s^{i,j} &= \left(\hat{b}^j(X_s^{i,j}, Z(s, X_s^{i,\cdot})) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 X_s^{i,j} \right) ds \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \sqrt{X_s^{i,j} X_s^{i,k}} d(W^{j,k} - W^{k,j}) + \sqrt{X_s^{i,j} X_s^{i,-d}} d(W^{j,d} - W^{d,j}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

for $t \leq s \leq T$, with initial condition $X_t^{i,\cdot} = x$, where we have denoted $X^{i,-d} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} X^{i,j}$.

Representation (3.15) follows from the fact that $Z^i \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{S}_d))$ (which is here the usual space of functions that are once continuously differentiable in time and twice in space) and hence from Itô's formula applied to $(Z^i(s, X_s^{i,\cdot}))_{t \leq s \leq T}$, provided that the solution to (3.17) remains in $\text{Int}(\hat{S}_d)$. Assume for a while that the latter holds true. Then, having (3.15) (together with the notations (3.10) and (3.16)), we exploit the Lipschitz continuity of $(\hat{H}_M^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$, the boundedness of φ and φ' , the fact $\lambda \leq 1$, and the uniform bounds on f and g to obtain

$$|Z^i(t, x)| \leq \|\hat{g}^i - \hat{g}^d\|_\infty + T \|\hat{f}^i - \hat{f}^d\|_\infty + C \int_t^T \max_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \sup_{x' \in \text{Int}(\hat{S}_d)} |Z_\lambda^j(s, x')| ds. \quad (3.18)$$

Taking the supremum over $x \in \text{Int}(\hat{S}_d)$ and the maximum over $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ in the left-hand side and applying Gronwall's lemma, we get a bound for $\max_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{S}_d)} |Z^i(s, x)|$.

By continuity of Z , the L^∞ bound also holds for x in the boundary of \hat{S}_d .

It remains to address the solvability of (3.17). We mostly borrow arguments from [1, Proposition 2.1]. In order to apply the latter, we notice that $\mathbf{X}^{i,-d}$ solves (noticing that the sum over j in the first line in the definition (3.10) of \hat{b}^j is null and similarly for the first term in the second line of (3.17))

$$\begin{aligned} dX_s^{i,-d} &= \left\{ \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} X_s^{i,j} [\varphi(X_s^{i,-d}) + a^*(Z^j(s, X_s^{i,\cdot}))] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - X_s^{i,-d} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} [\varphi(X_s^{i,j}) + a^*(-Z^j(s, X_s^{i,\cdot}))] + \varepsilon^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - X_s^{i,-d} \right) \right\} ds \\ &\quad - \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \sqrt{X_s^{i,j} X_s^{i,-d}} (dW_s^{j,d} - dW_s^{d,j}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

The key fact is then to observe that, whenever $X_s^{i,j}$ is close to zero, $\varphi(X_s^{i,j})$ (which shows up in the definition of the drift, compare (3.10) with (3.17)) is greater than κ , and thus helps for pushing the particle towards the interior of the simplex. This guarantees that, provided that $\kappa \geq \varepsilon^2/2$, the equation is well-posed and that the unique solution stays in $\text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, see [1, Proposition 2.1] for the details.

Step 3. We now provide a (uniform) Hölder estimate for the elements of \mathfrak{X} . Again we borrow the result from [1]. Indeed, (3.14) can be rewritten as a system of $d - 1$ equations on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, using the dictionary to pass from intrinsic derivatives to derivatives in the local chart. Thus we can apply⁶ Theorem 3.6 of [1], which states that there exist κ_1 and γ' as in the statement, and a constant C' , depending on $\varepsilon, \theta, M, d, T$ and the L^∞ norm of the r.h.s. of (3.11) (hence on f, g, φ, φ' , and Z , which is uniformly bounded by step 2) such that $\|Z\|_{\text{WF}, \gamma'} \leq C'$ if $\kappa \geq \kappa_1/\varepsilon^2$. Therefore \mathfrak{X} is bounded, choosing such γ' , and the proof is completed.

Step 4. Uniqueness of classical solutions can be proved by using the so-called four step-scheme, see [22, 46]. Any classical solution Z can be indeed represented in the form of a multi-dimensional forward-backward SDE (which is nothing but a system of stochastic characteristics). In turn, the fact that (3.9) has a classical solution forces the former forward-backward SDE to be uniquely solvable, and hence (3.9) itself to be also uniquely solvable. This argument is in fact explained in detail in [1, Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.4]. The specific subtlety (which is common to [1] and to our case) is that, due to the fact that the Kimura operator driving (3.9) degenerates near the boundary, some exponential integrability is needed for the inverse of the forward component in the forward-backward system of characteristics. In fact, this integrability property is very similar to the integrability property discussed after Definition 2.3. In short, it holds true provided that κ is bigger than (up to a multiplicative constant) ε^2 , which is obviously the case in our setting since κ scales here (at least) like ε^{-2} . This point is discussed with care in the paper [1]. \square

3.3. Solving for the HJB equation. We now turn to the well posedness of (2.13), or equivalently of (3.5), and prove the following refined version of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 3.2. *If $F \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, \gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, for a given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, then there exists a constant $\kappa_1 > 0$ only depending on M, T and d , such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\theta > 0$ and $\kappa \geq \kappa_1/\varepsilon^2$, Equation (2.13) admits a unique solution $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$. The solution \mathcal{V} is the value function of the viscous MFCP and the optimal feedback function is given by*

$$\tilde{\alpha}^{*, i, j}(t, p) = a^*(\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}(t, p) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}(t, p)). \quad (3.20)$$

The latter gives the unique optimal control in the sense that, for any initial state $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and any pair of optimal trajectory \mathbf{p} and optimal control $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (which is an \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable process bounded by M), it holds $\alpha_t = \tilde{\alpha}^(t, p_t)$ for $dt \otimes \mathbb{P}$ a.e. (t, ω) . Moreover, the derivative $\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}$ is the unique solution to (3.8) in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, 2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$.*

Equivalently, with the same assumptions and in the same space (up to a change of coordinate), Equation (3.5) admits a unique solution $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ and its derivative $D_x \hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is the unique solution to (3.9) (denoted by Z in the statement of Theorem 3.1).

Proof. As announced before, we prove well posedness of (3.5). The candidate for being the optimal feedback is (see (3.7)) $\alpha_{i,j}^*(t, x) = \hat{a}_{i,j}^*(Z(t, x))$, $i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, $i \neq j$, for Z given by

⁶In fact, this requires a modicum of care, since the function φ in [1] is assumed to vanish outside $[0, 2\theta]$, see (2.16) therein, with δ replaced by θ , and δ itself (with the same notation as therein) is required to be small enough. The key point is that we can always modify the function φ so that it fits the assumption of [1, Theorem 3.6]: Going back to [1, (3.20)], it is indeed easy to see that the values of φ taken at points that are away from the boundary can be inserted in the function b° therein. Since b° does not enter the definition of the threshold κ_0 in [1, Theorem 3.6], this leaves the conclusion of [1, Theorem 3.6] unchanged.

Theorem 3.1. Using the same notation as in (3.2) and (3.7), we thus consider, on $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, the PDE (sums being taken over $\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathcal{Z} + \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_M(x, Z) + \widehat{F}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 \mathcal{Z} \\ \quad + \sum_k x_k [\sum_j \varphi(x_j) (\partial_{x_j} \mathcal{Z} - \partial_{x_k} \mathcal{Z}) - \varphi(x^{-d}) \partial_{x_k} \mathcal{Z}] + x^{-d} \sum_j \varphi(x_j) \partial_{x_j} \mathcal{Z} = 0, \\ \mathcal{Z}(T, x) = \widehat{G}(x), \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

In particular, we can regard (3.21) as a linear Kimura PDE (the drift coefficient driving the first order term is nothing but $\widehat{b}_j(x, 0)$ and hence points inward the simplex). Since $Z \in [\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)]^{d-1}$, we know from Theorem 10.0.2 of [25] that (3.21) admits a unique solution $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$.

The key fact is to show that $\zeta = Z$ where $\zeta = D_x \mathcal{Z}$. Since the second order operator driving (3.21) is elliptic in the interior of the simplex (and non-degenerate in any ball, see for instance [1, (2.27)]) and the source term is differentiable in space, with time-space Hölder continuous derivatives, we know from interior estimates for parabolic PDEs (see Theorem 8.12.1 in [39]) that ζ is once continuously differentiable in time and twice in space on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ —even though we have no guarantee on the behavior at the boundary—. This suffices to differentiate (3.21). We then get the following variant of (3.9) at any point (t, x) of $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ (the sums below being taken over $j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \zeta^i + \sum_j (\widehat{b}_2^j(x) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 x_j) \partial_{x_j} \zeta^i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 \zeta^i + \sum_j \widehat{c}^{i,j}(x) \zeta^j \\ \quad = -[\widehat{H}_M^i(Z) - \widehat{H}_M^d(Z) + \widehat{f}^i(x) - \widehat{f}^d(x) + \sum_j (\widehat{b}_1^j(x, Z) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 x_j) \partial_{x_j} Z^i], \\ \zeta^i(T, x) = \widehat{g}^i(x) - \widehat{g}^d(x), \end{cases}$$

where, for $j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, x and z (as usual sums below are over $k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$),

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{b}_1^j(x, z) &= \sum_k \{x_k a^*(z_k - z_j) - x_j a^*(z_j - z_k)\} + x^{-d} a^*(-z_j) - x_j a^*(z_j). \\ \widehat{b}_2^j(x) &= \sum_k \{x_k \varphi(x_j) - x_j \varphi(x_k)\} + x^{-d} \varphi(x_j) - x_j \varphi(x^{-d}). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, \widehat{b}_1^j and \widehat{b}_2^j should be compared with \widehat{b}^j in (3.10). In particular, $\widehat{b}^j(x, z)$ is nothing but $\widehat{b}_1^j(x, z) + \widehat{b}_2^j(x)$. This prompts us to make the difference with (3.9), from which we get

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t (\zeta^i - Z^i) + \sum_j (\widehat{b}_2^j(x) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \delta_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 x_j) \partial_{x_j} (\zeta^i - Z^i) \\ \quad + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} (x_j \delta_{j,k} - x_j x_k) \partial_{x_j x_k}^2 (\zeta^i - Z^i) + \sum_j \widehat{c}^{i,j}(x) (\zeta^j - Z^j) = 0, \\ (\zeta^i - Z^i)(T, x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

In order to prove that $\zeta = Z$, we can use Itô's formula as we did in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Indeed, the interior smoothness of ζ^i , for each $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, suffices to apply Itô's formula to $(\sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} R_s^{i,j} (\zeta^j - Z^j)(s, X_s^{i,\cdot}))_{t \leq s \leq T}$ for any given t where $\mathbf{X}^{i,\cdot}$ solves (3.17), but for $\widehat{b}^j(x, z)$ therein replaced by \widehat{b}_2^j , with some $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ as initial condition at time t , and $((R_s^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket})_{t \leq s \leq T}$ solves the SDE $dR_s^{i,j} = \sum_{\ell \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} R_s^{i,\ell} \widehat{c}^{\ell,j}(X_s^{i,\cdot})$, for $s \in [t, T]$ with $(R_t^{i,j} = \delta_{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket}$. Following the standard proof of Feynman-Kac formula, we get that $\zeta^i(t, x) = Z^i(t, x)$. Hence, $\zeta^i(t, \cdot)$ and $Z^i(t, \cdot)$ coincide on $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and then, by continuity, on the entire $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$. In particular, this implies that $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, see the definition of the hybrid spaces in Appendix.

By replacing Z by $D_x \mathcal{Z}$ in (3.21), we deduce that \mathcal{Z} solves (3.5). By a straightforward adaptation of the verification theorem, we deduce that \mathcal{Z} must be the value function of the MFCP and, as by-product, it must be the unique solution of (3.5) in the space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Also, since $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}_M(p, \alpha, w)$ (see (3.2)) is strictly convex with respect to α as long as p is in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and since any controlled trajectory \mathbf{p} in (2.12) stays in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ (see

[1, Proposition 2.1]), we deduce that the optimal control is unique and is in a feedback form. In local coordinates, the optimal feedback function writes

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha}^{i,j}(t, x) &= a^*(\partial_{x_i} \mathcal{Z}(t, x) - \partial_{x_j} \mathcal{Z}(t, x)) \quad \text{if } i, j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket, \\ \hat{\alpha}^{i,d} &= a^*(\partial_{x_i} \mathcal{Z}(t, x)), \quad \hat{\alpha}^{d,i} = a^*(-\partial_{x_i} \mathcal{Z}(t, x)),\end{aligned}$$

and this is equivalent to (3.20) in intrinsic derivatives. Relabelling \mathcal{Z} into $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$, this completes the proof. \square

4. POTENTIAL GAME WITH A COMMON NOISE

The main purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2.2.

4.1. New MFG. Our first step is to introduce an MFG that derives from the MFCP studied in the previous section. Equivalently, we would like the corresponding MFG system to represent the necessary condition for optimality of the MFCP. As we already explained in Section 2, the problem is that, if we use the same dynamics as in (2.5) (which are the basis of the results of [1], on which our paper is built), we can no longer use the cost functional $J^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ (see (2.6)) to get a potential structure. To wit, the master equation associated with (2.6) (which may be computed along the same lines as in [1], see (3.14) therein) does not identify with the derivative system (3.9). In particular, the master equation associated with (2.5)-(2.6) (which is an equation for the value of the game) can not be closed as an equation for the centered value of the game (centered here means that the sum over the states $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ is null), due to the additional drift in the equation given by the common noise: This means that the master equation can not be the intrinsic derivative of a HJB equation. Instead, this holds true for the MFG without common noise and will be exploited in the next sections.

In order to define the new cost of the MFG (see (2.14)), let $V := \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}$ be the classical solution to (3.8) –which is the derivative of the MFCP value function by Theorem 3.2– and consider $(v_t^i = V^i(t, p_t^*))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ where $p^* = (p_t^*)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ solves the SDE driven by the optimal feedback, namely (sums below are over $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{aligned}dp_t^{*,i} &= \left(\sum_j p_t^{*,j} (\varphi(p_t^{*,i}) + a^*(v_t^j - v_t^i)) - \sum_j p_t^{*,i} (\varphi(p_t^{*,j}) + a^*(v_t^i - v_t^j)) \right) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_j \sqrt{p_t^{*,i} p_t^{*,j}} (dB_t^{i,j} - dB_t^{j,i}),\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

see [1, Proposition 2.1] for the unique solvability, the unique solution remaining inside the interior of \mathcal{S}_d . By Itô's formula (the fact that we can apply Itô's formula with intrinsic derivatives can be justified by using the local chart, at least in the interior of the simplex), we get (sums below being over indices in $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{aligned}dv_t^i &= -\left(\tilde{H}_M^i(v_t) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_l \tilde{H}_M^l(v_t) + f^i(p_t^*) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_l f^l(p_t^*) \right) dt + \sum_{j,k} w_t^{i,j,k} dB_t^{j,k} \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_j \left(\varphi(p_t^{*,j}) - p_t^{*,j} \varphi'(p_t^{*,i}) \right) (v_t^j - v_t^i) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j,l} \left(\varphi(p_t^{*,j}) - p_t^{*,j} \varphi'(p_t^{*,l}) \right) (v_t^j - v_t^l) \right) dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \left(\sum_j \sqrt{p_t^{*,j} (p_t^{*,i})^{-1}} (w_t^{i,i,j} + w_t^{j,j,i}) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j,l} \sqrt{p_t^{*,j} (p_t^{*,l})^{-1}} (w_t^{l,l,j} + w_t^{j,j,l}) \right) dt \\ v_T^i &= g^i(p_T^*) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_l g^l(p_T^*),\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

where

$$w_t^{i,j,k} = W^{i,j,k}(t, p_t^*), \quad \text{with} \quad W^{i,j,k}(t, p) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sqrt{p_j p_k} (\mathfrak{d}_j V^i - \mathfrak{d}_k V^i)(t, p).\tag{4.3}$$

Notice in particular that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_j \sqrt{p_t^{*,j} (p_t^{*,i})^{-1}} w_t^{i,i,j} &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_j p_t^{*,j} (\mathfrak{d}_i V^i - \mathfrak{d}_j V^i)(t, p_t^*), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_j \sqrt{p_t^{*,j} (p_t^{*,i})^{-1}} w_t^{j,j,i} &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_j p_t^{*,j} (\mathfrak{d}_j V^j - \mathfrak{d}_i V^j)(t, p_t^*),\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

which permits to recover the penultimate line in (3.8), since $\mathfrak{d}_i V^j = \mathfrak{d}_j V^i$ by Schwarz' Theorem for intrinsic derivatives.

Ideally, we would like to see (4.2) as the stochastic HJB equation associated with our new MFG with common noise (see [1, Lemma 3.1] for its derivation). However, we cannot do so directly because the pair $(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{v})$ in (4.2) takes values in the tangent bundle to the simplex, namely $\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} v_t^i = 0$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. Obviously, the latter is not consistent with our original MFG, whether there is a common noise or not. Indeed, if this were consistent, then, discarding for a while the common noise, we would have to think of v_0^i as the minimum of $J(\cdot; \mathbf{p}^*)$ in (2.1) whenever \mathbf{q} therein starts from the Dirac mass at point i , but, then, there is no reason why the sum of all these costs over $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ should be null. In fact, we here recover the point raised in (2.20): Therein, we can identify the two vectors $(U^{\varepsilon, \varphi, i}(t, p))_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ and $(\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(t, p))_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ up to a constant only. The idea below is thus to reconstruct from scratch the sum of the value functions. To do so, we notice from [25, Theorem 10.0.2] again that we can solve the PDE in the simplex (sums below are over indices in $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathcal{V} + \sum_{j,k} p_j (\varphi(p_k) + a^*(V^j - V^k)) (\mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V} - \mathfrak{d}_k \mathcal{V}) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \sum_{j,k} (p_j \delta_{j,k} - p_j p_k) \mathfrak{d}_{j,k}^2 \mathcal{V} \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} p_j |a^*(V^j - V^k)|^2 + \sum_{j,k} p_j p_k \varphi'(p_j) (V^j - V^k) + \langle p, f^\bullet(p) \rangle = 0, \\ \mathcal{V}(T, p) = \langle p, g^\bullet(p) \rangle, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

where we recall that $\langle p, f^\bullet(p) \rangle$ (and similarly with f replaced by g) here denotes the inner product $\sum_i p_i f^i(p)$.

We are now in the position to elucidate the shape of $\vartheta_{\varepsilon, \varphi}^i$ in (2.14), by letting (we remove the superscripts ε and φ for simplicity)

$$\vartheta^i(t, p) := \sum_j \left[p_j \varphi'(p_i) (V^i - V^j)(t, p) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sqrt{p_j p_i^{-1}} (\widetilde{W}^{j,j,i} - \widetilde{W}^{i,i,j} - 2\Upsilon^{i,j})(t, p) \right], \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}^{i,j,k}(t, p) &= W^{i,j,k}(t, p) - \langle p, W^{\bullet,j,k}(t, p) \rangle \\ \Upsilon^{i,j}(t, p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sqrt{p_i p_j} (\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}(t, p) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}(t, p) - (V^i - V^j)(t, p)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Observe in particular that, despite the factor $\sqrt{p_i^{-1}}$ in (4.6), the function ϑ is bounded and continuous on the entire $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$. Using (4.4), we indeed have

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta^i(t, p) &= \sum_j p_j \varphi'(p_i) (V^i - V^j)(t, p) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \sum_j p_j (\mathfrak{d}_j V^j - \mathfrak{d}_i V^i)(t, p) + \varepsilon^2 \sum_j p_j (\mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V} - \mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V} - (V^j - V^i))(t, p) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j,k} p_j p_k (\mathfrak{d}_i V^k - \mathfrak{d}_j V^k)(t, p). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Now, we recall (2.14) together with Definition 2.3: For an adapted continuous process \mathbf{p} with values in \mathcal{S}_d , such that $\int_0^T (1/p_t^i) dt$ has exponential moments of sufficiently high order (which we recall holds true if \mathbf{p} solves an equation of the same type as (2.12) and κ is large enough independently of \mathbf{p}) for a progressively-measurable process $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = ((\alpha_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket: i \neq j})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ such that $0 \leq \alpha_t^{i,j} \leq M$ and for \mathbf{q} solving (2.5), we let

$$\widetilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \mathbf{p}) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_t^i \left[\mathfrak{L}^i(\alpha_t) + f^i(p_t) + \vartheta^i(t, p_t) \right] dt + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_T^i g^i(p_T) \right]. \quad (4.9)$$

By following [1, Subsection 3.1.1], the Stochastic HJB (SHJB) equation associated with this minimization problem here writes down (sums being taken over $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= -\left(\tilde{H}_M^i(u_t) + \sum_j \varphi(p_t^j)(u_t^j - u_t^i) + f^i(p_t) + \vartheta^i(t, p_t)\right)dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\varepsilon \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}}(\nu_t^{i,i,j} - \nu_t^{i,j,i})dt + \sum_{j \neq k} \nu_t^{i,j,k} dB_t^{j,k}, \\ u_T^i &= g^i(p_T). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Hence, our new MFG (in the sense of Definition 2.3) is characterized by the forward-backward system made of the SHJB equation (4.10) and of the Stochastic FP (SFP) equation (2.12), see again [1, Subsection 3.1.1] for the proof.

Of course, the core of our construction is to show that the optimal trajectory \mathbf{p}^* of the MFCP is the unique possible equilibrium of this new MFG. In this regard, our choice for ϑ is especially designed so that $(v_t^i - \langle p_t^*, v_t^\bullet \rangle + \mathcal{Y}(t, p_t^*))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ solves (4.10) whenever \mathbf{p} is taken as \mathbf{p}^* . In such a case, by equalizing the martingale terms in the expansions of $(u_t^i)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and $(v_t^i - \langle p_t^*, v_t^\bullet \rangle + \mathcal{Y}(t, p_t^*))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, we get from (4.2) and (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_t^{i,j,k} &= w_t^{i,j,k} - \langle p_t^*, w_t^{\bullet,j,k} \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\varepsilon \sqrt{p_t^{*j} p_t^{*,k}} \left(\mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{Y}(t, p_t^*) - \mathfrak{d}_k \mathcal{Y}(t, p_t^*) - (v_t^j - v_t^k) \right) \\ &= \tilde{w}_t^{i,j,k} + \Upsilon^{j,k}(t, p_t^*), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where $\tilde{w}_t^{i,j,k} = w_t^{i,j,k} - \langle p_t^*, w_t^{\bullet,j,k} \rangle$, which explains why Υ appears in (4.6). The details are given in the proof of Theorem 4.1 below.

4.2. Solvability. This is the refined version of Theorem 2.2. Recall that φ satisfies (2.7).

Theorem 4.1. *If $F \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ for a given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, then there exists a constant $\kappa_2 \geq \kappa_1$ (κ_1 and γ' being given by Theorem 3.1) only depending on M , T and d , such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\theta > 0$ and $\kappa \geq \kappa_2/\varepsilon^2$, there exists $\gamma'' \in (0, \gamma']$, possibly depending on ε and κ , such that the new MFG, associated with the dynamics (2.5) and with the cost (4.9), admits a unique solution (\mathbf{p}, α) for any $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$. It is equal to the unique optimizer of the MFCP (2.11)-(2.12). Moreover, the master equation (2.18) associated with the modified MFG admits a unique solution $U \in [\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma''}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)]^d$ and (2.20) holds.*

Proof. We first prove existence of a MFG solution, by using the solution of the MFC problem, and then show uniqueness by invoking the results from [1].

Existence. As announced in the previous subsection, we choose $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^*$ with \mathbf{p}^* as in (4.1) (here, we drop the superscript \star to alleviate the notation) and then let, as a candidate for solving the SHJB equation (4.10):

$$u_t^i := v_t^i - \langle p_t, v_t^\bullet \rangle + \mathcal{Y}(t, p_t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket. \quad (4.12)$$

Importantly, we notice that $u_t^i - u_t^j = v_t^i - v_t^j$ for any $i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ with $i \neq j$. With the same notation as in (4.11), we then get (some explanations are given after the formula; moreover,

the sums below are over $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{aligned}
du_t^i = & - \left(\tilde{H}_M^i(u_t) - \langle p_t, \tilde{H}_M^\bullet(u_t) \rangle + f^i(p_t) - \langle p_t, f^\bullet(p_t) \rangle \right) dt \\
& - \left(\sum_j \varphi(p_t^j)(u_t^j - u_t^i) - \sum_{j,k} p_t^k \varphi(p_t^j)(u_t^j - u_t^k) \right) dt \\
& + \left(\sum_j p_t^j \varphi'(p_t^i)(u_t^j - u_t^i) - \sum_{j,k} p_t^j p_t^k \varphi'(p_t^k)(u_t^j - u_t^k) \right) dt \\
& - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \left(\sum_j \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}} (w_t^{i,i,j} + w_t^{j,j,i}) - \sum_{j,k} \sqrt{p_t^j p_t^k} (w_t^{k,k,j} + w_t^{j,j,k}) \right) dt \\
& - \left(\sum_{j,k} p_t^j (\varphi(p_t^k) + a^\star(u_t^j - u_t^k))(u_t^k - u_t^j) \right) dt - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_{j,k} \sqrt{p_t^j p_t^k} (w_t^{j,j,k} - w_t^{j,k,j}) dt \\
& - \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} p_t^j |a^\star(u_t^j - u_t^k)|^2 + \sum_{j,k} p_t^j p_t^k \varphi'(p_t^j)(u_t^j - u_t^k) + \langle p_t, f^\bullet(p_t) \rangle \right) dt + \sum_{j,k} \nu_t^{j,k} dB_t^{j,k}.
\end{aligned}$$

In short, the term on the first line come from the expansion of $dv_t^i - d\langle p_t, v_t^\bullet \rangle$, see the first line in (4.2). Similarly, the terms on the second and third lines come from the second line in (4.2). And the fourth line derives from the third line in (4.2). The first term on the fifth line comes from $\langle v_t^\bullet, dp_t \rangle$ and the second term on the same line is the bracket in the expansion of the inner product $d\langle v_t^\bullet, p_t \rangle$. The first term on the last line comes from the expansion of $(\mathcal{Y}(t, p_t))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ by means of Itô's formula. The last term is given by (4.11).

We first treat terms that cancel in the above expansion. Obviously, the inner products $\langle p_t, f^\bullet(p_t) \rangle$ on the top and bottom lines cancel. Similarly, the second term on the second line cancel out with half of the first term on the penultimate line, and the second term on the third line cancel out with the second term on the last line. As for the inner product $\langle p_t, \tilde{H}_M^\bullet(u_t) \rangle$ on the first line, it cancels with the second half of the first term on the fifth line and with the first term on the last line. Now, using the fact that $w_t^{j,k,j} = -w_t^{j,j,k}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_{j,k} \sqrt{p_t^j p_t^k} (w_t^{k,k,j} + w_t^{j,j,k}) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_{j,k} \sqrt{p_t^j p_t^k} (w_t^{j,j,k} - w_t^{j,k,j}) = 0,$$

so that the last terms on the fourth and fifth lines also cancel out. Moreover, adding $\vartheta^i(t, p_t)$ (using (4.6)) to the first term on the third line and the first term on the fourth line, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vartheta^i(t, p_t) + \sum_j p_t^j \varphi'(p_t^i)(u_t^j - u_t^i) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_j \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}} (w_t^{i,i,j} + w_t^{j,j,i}) \\
& = \sum_j \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}} (\tilde{w}_t^{j,j,i} - \tilde{w}_t^{i,i,j} - 2\Upsilon^{i,j})(t, p_t) \right] - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sum_j \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}} (w_t^{i,i,j} + w_t^{j,j,i}) \\
& = \sum_j \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}} (-2w_t^{i,i,j} + 2\langle p_t, w_t^{\bullet,i,j} \rangle - 2\Upsilon^{i,j})(t, p_t) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the second and third lines, we used the two equalities $\langle p_t, w_t^{\bullet,i,j} \rangle = -\langle p_t, w_t^{j,i} \rangle$ and $\Upsilon^{i,j}(t, p_t) = -\Upsilon^{j,i}(t, p_t)$.

It remains to see from (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_t^{i,i,j} - \nu_t^{j,j,i} & = w_t^{i,i,j} - w_t^{j,j,i} - \langle p_t, w_t^{\bullet,i,j} \rangle + \langle p_t, w_t^{\bullet,j,i} \rangle + \Upsilon_t^{i,j}(t, p_t) - \Upsilon_t^{j,i}(t, p_t) \\
& = 2w_t^{i,i,j} - 2\langle p_t, w_t^{\bullet,i,j} \rangle + 2\Upsilon_t^{i,j}(t, p_t).
\end{aligned}$$

We hence get that the pair $(p_t, u_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ solves (4.1) (with v_t replaced by u_t therein) and (4.10).

Uniqueness. For κ_2 as in the statement, uniqueness follows from⁷ [1, Theorem 2.9], using the fact that ϑ in (4.8) is Hölder continuous, which in turn follows from the fact that the solution to the linear equation (4.5) belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma'}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$, by [25, Theorem 10.0.2]. The new exponent γ'' , as well as existence and uniqueness of a classical solution to the master equation (2.18), then follow from [1, Theorem 3.8]. Finally, (2.20) follows from (4.12). \square

5. SELECTION BY VANISHING VISCOSITY

5.1. Selection of equilibria. The purpose of this subsection is to prove Theorem 2.4. To do so, we choose $\varphi = \varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ satisfying (in addition to the aforementioned monotonicity and regularity properties)

$$\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(r) = \begin{cases} \kappa_\varepsilon & r \leq \theta \\ \kappa_0 & 2\theta \leq r \leq \delta \\ 0 & r \geq 2\delta, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

for $0 < \delta \leq 1/2$ and $0 < 2\theta < \delta$ and $\kappa_0 > 0$. Above, we choose κ_ε of the form $\kappa_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{-2} \kappa_2$, for κ_2 as in the statement of Theorem 2.2; in particular, κ_2 is fixed once for all and only depends on $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d , and is thus independent of the four remaining parameters θ , δ , ε and κ_0 in (5.1). As for κ_0 , it is a constant whose value is fixed later on; say that, in the end, it must be above some threshold $\bar{\kappa}_0$, only depending on d and κ_2 , see for instance Theorem 5.11. In order for $\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ to be non-increasing, we will impose a smallness condition on ε , namely $\varepsilon^2 \leq \varepsilon_0^2 := \min(\kappa_2/\kappa_0, 1)$; again, we stress the fact that, in this condition, the constant κ_0 will be chosen later on, while κ_2 is fixed. We also assume that

$$\forall r \geq 0, \quad |\varphi'_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(r)| \leq \frac{2\kappa_\varepsilon}{\theta} \mathbb{1}_{[0, 2\theta]}(r) + \frac{2\kappa_0}{\delta} \mathbb{1}_{[0, 2\delta]}(r). \quad (5.2)$$

The rationale for introducing an additional parameter θ in the decomposition (5.1) is the following: Whilst κ_ε blows up with ε , κ_0 does not; Here, κ_ε is used to force uniqueness of the MFG equilibrium (as in [1]), hence the need to have it large when the intensity of the common noise is small; Differently, κ_0 is used below to force the equilibrium to stay sufficiently far away from the boundary, see Proposition 5.4 below. The new decomposition (5.1) is thus a way to disentangle the two issues.

Accordingly, for any initial condition $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we write $(\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}) := (p_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}, \alpha_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ for the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ defined by (2.11) with φ being given by (5.1). When there is no ambiguity on the choice of the initial condition, we merely write $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Importantly, in this notation, the \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable process $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ is given by (2.15) through a feedback function; we feel useful to recall that its off-diagonal entries are bounded by M . In order to state our main result⁸ here, we also let $\mathcal{E} := L^2([0, T]; \mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{A} = \{(a_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\dots,d} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : a_{i,j} \in [0, M], i \neq j ; a_{i,i} = -\sum_{j \neq i} a_{i,j}\}$. We endow \mathcal{E} with the weak topology, which makes it a compact metric (and hence Polish) space and for which the convergence is denoted by \rightharpoonup . We also denote by $\mathcal{V}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ the value function of the

⁷As we already explained in footnote 6, some care is needed to apply the results of [1], since the framework therein is not exactly the same. In footnote 6, we already commented on the shape of the function φ . This observation is still relevant here. Also, it must be stressed that, in [1], the constant κ_0 (with the same notation as therein, κ_0 denoting the threshold for κ in [1] and hence being the analogue of κ_2/ε^2 here) is allowed to depend on $\|f\|_\infty$ and $\|g\|_\infty$. In our analysis, κ_2 is allowed to depend M , which in turn depends on $\|f\|_\infty$ and $\|g\|_\infty$. So, the latter is consistent with the results of [1]. In fact, our framework is easier since the controls are already required to be bounded by M , which is not the case in [1]. This explains why M directly shows up in our statement; in short, it provides an upper bound for the drift in the dynamics of \mathbf{p} .

⁸The attentive reader will observe that the L^2 space we here call \mathcal{E} is slightly different from the L^2 space used in the statement of Theorem 2.4; obviously, \mathcal{E} is here a smaller (closed) subset and the result proven below suffices to derive Theorem 2.4. In fact, we felt better not to introduce the space \mathcal{E} earlier in the text, which explains why Theorem 2.4 and 5.1 are slightly different.

viscous MFCP and by \mathcal{V} the value function of the inviscid MFCP. The following result then subsumes Theorem 2.4:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that $F \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ for a given $\gamma \in (0,1)$. Moreover, fix the value of κ_0 in Definition 5.1 and let $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ stand for the initial condition of (2.12) at time 0. Then there exists δ_0 , depending only on p_0 , M , T and d , such that the family $(\mathbf{p}^{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon})_{0 < 2\theta < \delta \leq \delta_0, 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0}$ is tight in $\mathcal{C}([0,T]; \mathcal{S}_d) \times \mathcal{E}$. The limit in law of any converging subsequence $(\mathbf{p}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n})$, with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (0, 0, 0)$, is a probability \mathbb{M} that satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 2.4. Moreover, for any such converging subsequence,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^{\varepsilon_n, \varphi_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}) = \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{E}} \mathcal{J}(\beta). \quad (5.3)$$

In particular, for any $t_0 \in [0, T]$ and any $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$,

$$\lim_{(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0)} \mathcal{V}_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(t_0, p_0) = \mathcal{V}(t_0, p_0). \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, we use the following notation. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ a bounded deterministic path in \mathcal{E} , we call $\mathbf{p}^\circ(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ the solution of the equation (obviously, the solution exists and is unique as the equation is linear)

$$p_t^i = p_0^i + \int_0^t \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left(p_s^j \alpha_s^{j,i} - p_s^i \alpha_s^{i,j} \right) ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket. \quad (5.5)$$

Step 1. The distributions of the random variables $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ (regarded as taking values within \mathcal{E}) is tight as \mathcal{E} is compact. For any $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ in \mathcal{E} , the corresponding solution $\mathbf{p}^\circ := \mathbf{p}^\circ(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ to (5.5) is such that $p_t^{\circ, i} \geq p_0^i - M(d-1) \int_0^t p_s^{\circ, i} ds$ and thus, by Gronwall's lemma, $p_t^{\circ, i} \geq p_0^i e^{-tM(d-1)}$. This prompts us to define

$$\delta_0 := \frac{1}{4} e^{-TM(d-1)} \min_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_0^i.$$

and let

$$\tau_{\varepsilon, \theta, \delta} := \inf \left\{ 0 \leq t \leq T : \min_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon} \leq 3\delta_0 \right\} \wedge T,$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$, and $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} := (p_{\tau_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} \wedge t}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$.

Notice in particular that, for $\delta < \delta_0$, $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ does not see the function φ in its drift since the support of latter is restricted to $[0, 2\delta]$. By Kolomogorov's criterion, since $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is bounded by M and \mathbf{p} is bounded by 1, it is then standard to show the tightness of the distributions of the processes $(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{0 < 2\theta < \delta \leq \delta_0, 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0}$ in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{S}_d)$.

Step 2. We hence consider a weakly convergent subsequence $(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n})_{n \geq 0}$, with some $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ as weak limit, where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = 0$. To simplify the notations, we let $(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(n)}) := (\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n})$. Applying Skorokhod's representation Theorem, we can assume without any loss generality that the convergence holds almost surely, provided that we allow the Brownian motions $(\mathbf{B}^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket: i \neq j}$ to depend on n . We hence write the latter in the form $\mathbf{B}^{(n)} = (\mathbf{B}^{(n), i, j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket: i \neq j}$. So, we can assume that there exists a full event Ω_0 on which $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\widehat{p}_t^{(n)} - p_t| \rightarrow 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(n)} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

We then write (pay attention that, although we don't mention it explicitly, the last four terms in the right-hand side below depend on i)

$$\widehat{p}_t^{(n), i} := p_0^i + R_t^{(n), 1} + R_t^{(n), 2} + R_t^{(n), 3} + R_t^{(n), 4}, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where (sums being over indices in $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$R_t^{(n), 1} = \int_0^t \sum_j \left(\widehat{p}_s^{(n), j} \alpha_s^{(n), j, i} - \widehat{p}_s^{(n), i} \alpha_s^{(n), i, j} \right) ds - \int_0^t \sum_j \left(p_s^j \alpha_s^{(n), j, i} - p_s^i \alpha_s^{(n), i, j} \right) ds,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_t^{(n),2} &= \int_0^t \sum_j \left(p_s^j \alpha_s^{(n),j,i} - p_s^i \alpha_s^{(n),i,j} \right) ds, \\
R_t^{(n),3} &= \int_0^t \left[(1 - \hat{p}_s^{(n),i}) \varphi_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}(\hat{p}_s^{(n),i}) - \hat{p}_s^{(n),i} \sum_{j \neq i} \varphi_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}(\hat{p}_s^{(n),j}) \right] ds, \\
R_t^{(n),4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon_n \int_0^t \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{\hat{p}_s^{(n),i} \hat{p}_s^{(n),j}} d(B_s^{(n),i,j} - B_s^{(n),j,i}).
\end{aligned}$$

We then work on Ω_0 in order to handle the almost sure convergence of the first three terms. By uniform convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}^{(n)}$ to \mathbf{p} and by uniform boundedness of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(n)}$, $(R_t^{(n),1})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ tends to 0, uniformly in $t \in [0, T]$. By weak convergence of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(n)}$ to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we deduce that, for any $t \in [0, T]$, $R_t^{(n),2}$ tends to $\int_0^t \sum_j (p_s^j \alpha_s^{j,i} - p_s^i \alpha_s^{i,j}) ds$; by Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, the convergence is uniform in $t \in [0, T]$. Since it is implicitly required that $\delta_n < \delta_0$ and hence $\varphi_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}(\hat{p}_t^{(n),j})$ is 0 for all $j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $t \in [0, T]$ (recall that $\hat{\mathbf{p}}^{(n),j}$ is stopped before entering the support of φ), the term $(R_t^{(n),3})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is constantly 0. We hence derive the almost sure limit of the first three terms (the initial condition being excluded) in the expansion of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}^{(n)}$. As for $(R_t^{(n),4})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, we observe by Doob's inequality that, since the second moment of the stochastic integral is uniformly bounded with respect to n , $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |R_t^{(n),4}|$ tends to 0 in probability.

Thus we can conclude that, with probability 1, the limit process $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ solves equation (5.5).

Step 3. We keep the same notation as in the second step (working in particular with the same Skorokhod representation sequence). Since

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{0 \leq t \leq T} \min_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \hat{p}_t^{i, \theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} \leq 3\delta_0 \right) \geq \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} < T)$$

and the limit process satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{0 \leq t \leq T} \min_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_t^i \leq 3\delta_0 \right) = 0,$$

Portmanteau Theorem gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} < T) = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |p_t^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} - p_t| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |p_t^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} - p_t| \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} < T\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\hat{p}_t^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} - p_t| \right] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{P}(\tau_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} < T) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\hat{p}_t^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} - p_t| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right-hand side tends to 0 by (5.6) and the second term by the convergence result proved in the second step (the almost sure convergence also holding true in L^1 since the underlying processes take values in the simplex). Therefore we obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |p_t^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n} - p_t|] = 0$. This in particular implies that the collection of the laws of the random variables $(\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{0 < 2\theta < \delta \leq \delta_0, 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0}$ is tight (on the same space as before).

Step 4. We pass to the limit in the cost. To this end, we use the convenient notations $\mathbf{p}^{(n)} := p^{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\cdot) := \mathcal{J}^{\varepsilon_n, \varphi_{\theta_n, \delta_n, \varepsilon_n}}(\cdot)$, see (2.11). By convexity (splitting $\alpha_t^{i,j}$ into $\alpha_t^{(n),i,j} + (\alpha_t^{i,j} - \alpha_t^{(n),i,j})$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(n)}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} p_t^{(n),i} |\alpha_t^{(n),i,j}|^2 + F(p_t^{(n)}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} p_t^i |\alpha_t^{i,j}|^2 - F(p_t) \right) dt \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + G(p_T^{(n)}) - G(p_T) \Big] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \frac{1}{2} \sum_i (p_t^{(n),i} - p_t^i) \sum_{j \neq i} |\alpha_t^{(n),i,j}|^2 dt \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \sum_i p_t^i \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_t^{i,j} (\alpha_t^{(n),i,j} - \alpha^{i,j}) \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (F(p_t^{(n)}) - F(p_t)) dt + G(p_T^{(n)}) - G(p_T) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |p_t^{(n)} - p_t|] = 0$, the first and third term in the lower bound go to 0 (using the boundedness of $\alpha^{(n)}$ and the regularity of F and G). As for the second term, it can be proved to tend to 0 by combining the convergence $\alpha^{(n)} \rightarrow \alpha$ with Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem. Thus we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{J}(\alpha)] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\alpha^{(n)})$.

In order to complete the proof, consider any deterministic control $\beta \in \mathcal{E}$ (in particular, the off-diagonal components are bounded by M). Then, denote by $\mathbf{p}^{(n),\beta}$ the simplex-valued solution to (2.12) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ therein under the same initial condition $(0, p_0)$ as before but under the deterministic control β (see [1, Proposition 2.1] for a solvability result). Differently from the analysis performed for $\mathbf{p}^{(n)}$, the choice of the noise does not really matter here, meaning that we can work with the original Brownian motions $(\mathbf{B}^{i,j})_{i \neq j}$. Indeed, by the same localization argument as in Steps 2 and 3, it can be proved by a standard stability argument (without any further need of weak compactness) that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |p_t^{(n),\beta} - p_t^\circ(\beta)|]$ tends to 0 as n tends to ∞ . We deduce $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\beta) = \mathcal{J}(\beta)$. Therefore we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{J}(\alpha)] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\alpha^{(n)}) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\alpha^{(n)}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^{(n)}(\beta) = \mathcal{J}(\beta) \tag{5.8}$$

for any $\beta \in \mathcal{E}$. Provided that all the minimizers of \mathcal{J} belong to \mathcal{E} , this implies that α belongs with probability 1 to the set of minimizers of \mathcal{J} over \mathcal{E} and further that (5.3) holds (in particular the limit exists). The fact that optimizers of \mathcal{J} –over L^∞ controls– belong to \mathcal{E} is proved in the next Proposition 5.2, together with other properties of the inviscid MFCEP.

Step 5. As for the proof of (5.4), we can assume without any loss of generality that $t_0 = 0$. Observing that the family $(\mathcal{V}_{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}(0, p_0))_{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}$ is bounded (since F and G themselves are bounded and the control process in (2.11)–(2.12) is bounded by M), (5.4) follows from (5.3) together with a standard compactness argument. \square

5.2. Properties of the inviscid MFCEP. Before we turn to the proof of Theorem 2.6, we address various properties of the value function of the inviscid MFCEP. In this respect, it is useful to work with the system of local coordinates (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) introduced in Subsection 3.1. The dynamics over which the MFCEP (2.10) is defined then have the form (sums are here over $\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$)

$$\dot{x}_t^i = \sum_{j \neq i} \left(x_t^j \alpha_t^{j,i} - x_t^i \alpha_t^{i,j} \right) + x_t^{-d} \alpha_t^{d,i} - x_t^i \alpha_t^{i,d}, \tag{5.9}$$

for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, with the useful notation that $x_t^{-d} = 1 - \sum_{l \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_t^l$. Above, the (deterministic) control $\alpha = ((\alpha_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is as in (2.3); as we already explained, we assume⁹ it to be bounded (but not uniformly bounded by M). Also, the initial condition is taken in the interior of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, which implies in particular that the whole path \mathbf{x} remains in the interior of the simplex. Lastly, following (3.2) and (3.6) (but paying attention that M is formally taken as $+\infty$), the Hamiltonian of the problem is given, for $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, by (sums are here over

⁹ The unbounded case looks more difficult. One issue is that the Lagrangian $\frac{1}{2} \sum_i p_i \sum_{j \neq i} |\alpha^{i,j}|^2$ is not Lipschitz continuous in p , uniformly in α , if α is not in a compact set. Another issue is that the Lagrangian is not uniformly coercive on the simplex: As a result, we can easily cook up instances of unbounded controls that drive the trajectory to the boundary but that remains of a bounded energy; and, in turn, those trajectories precisely fall within the region where the Lagrangian is degenerate, which makes their analysis more difficult.

$\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(x, z) &= \sum_i x_i \widehat{H}^i(z) + x^{-d} \widehat{H}^d(z), \\ \text{with } \widehat{H}^i(z) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} (z_i - z_j)_+^2 + (z_i)_+^2 \right), \quad \widehat{H}^d(z) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_j (-z_j)_+^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

It is important to observe that this Hamiltonian is strictly concave in z , for any $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Indeed, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is the sum of a concave function and of $-\frac{1}{2} \min(\min_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} (x_i), x^{-d}) \sum_i z_i^2$. Moreover, we may also write down the corresponding Pontryagin principle:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_t^i = \sum_{j \neq i} (x_t^j (z_t^j - z_t^i)_+ - x_t^i (z_t^i - z_t^j)_+) + x_t^{-d} (-z_t^i)_+ - x_t^i (z_t^i)_+, \\ \dot{z}_t^i = -(\widehat{H}^i(z_t) - \widehat{H}^d(z_t) + \widehat{f}^i(x_t) - \widehat{f}^d(x_t)), \quad z_T^i = \widehat{g}^i(x_T) - \widehat{g}^d(x_T), \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and for a given initial condition in $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. It is worth noticing that the Pontryagin principle is here stated in local coordinates, or equivalently in dimension $d-1$. For sure, we can also state it in dimension d , in which case the forward-backward system coincides with the standard MFG system (the sum below is over $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{p}_t^i = \sum_{j \neq i} (p_t^j (u_t^j - u_t^i)_+ - p_t^i (u_t^i - u_t^j)_+), \\ \dot{u}_t^i = -\left(H((u_t^i - u_t^j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) + f^i(p_t) \right), \quad u_T^i = g^i(p_T), \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

with H as in (2.22). It is pretty easy to see that the two systems (5.11) and (5.12) are equivalent: Given a solution \mathbf{u} to (5.12), it suffices to let $\mathbf{z} = ((z_t^i := (u_t^i - u_t^d)_+)_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$, where t_0 is the initial time. Conversely, given \mathbf{z} a solution to (5.11), it suffices to solve (5.12) where all the occurrences of $u_t^i - u_t^j$ have been replaced by $z_t^i - z_t^j$ if $j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and by z_t^i if $j = d$.

The fact that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is strictly concave permits to apply to our situation several results from [6, Chapter 7, Section 4], which we collect in the form of a single proposition, although part of the notions are introduced in detail or explicitly used in Section 6. It is worth mentioning that the results of [6] are stated for a dynamics in \mathbb{R}^d , but is it straightforward to see that they apply also to our situation because, when working in local coordinates, any trajectory remains in $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, if starting from $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Assume that F and G are in $\mathcal{C}^1(\mathcal{S}_d)$. Recall that $\mathcal{V} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the value function of the MFCP (2.10), and call $\widehat{\mathcal{V}} : [0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ its formulation in local coordinates, i.e. $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}(t, x) = \mathcal{V}(t, \check{x})$. If the initial condition $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, then*

- (i) *An optimal (bounded) control exists and is bounded by $M = 2(\|g\|_\infty + T\|f\|_\infty)$;*
- (ii) *If α is an optimal control and \mathbf{p} the related optimal trajectory, then there exist \mathbf{u} solving (5.12) and \mathbf{z} solving (5.11), and α is given by $(\alpha_t^{i,j} = (u_t^i - u_t^j)_+)_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$;*
- (iii) *$\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is a viscosity solution of (2.21) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, at least when (2.21) is formulated in local coordinates, see Definition 6.1;*
- (iv) *$\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is (time-space) Lipschitz-continuous on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and thus also on $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$.*

If F and G are in $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, then

- (v) *$\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is semiconcave on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and thus also in $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$;*
- (vi) *\mathcal{V} is differentiable at (t, p_t) , for any $t > t_0$ and any optimal trajectory \mathbf{p} starting from (t_0, p_0) , with $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$;*
- (vii) *If the optimal control for the MFCP starting in (t_0, p_0) is unique (in particular this holds true when (5.12) is uniquely solvable), then \mathcal{V} is differentiable in (t_0, p_0) .*

If we assume in addition that \mathcal{V} is differentiable at (t_0, p_0) , with $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, then

- (viii) *There exists a unique optimal control process α and an optimal trajectory \mathbf{p} for the MFCP starting from (t_0, p_0) , and the optimal control is given in feedback form by*

$$\alpha_t^{i,j} = (\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}(t, p_t) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}(t, p_t))_+, \quad t \in [t_0, T];$$

- (ix) *The adjoint equation in (5.11) is such that $z_t^i = \partial_{x_i} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}(t, x_t)$ for any $t \in [t_0, T]$ and $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$.*

In point (iii), we refer to Definition 6.1 for a reminder on the notion of viscosity solution; In points (v)–(ix), we refer to the assumption of Theorem 2.6 for the meaning of the notation $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$; In point (v), by time-space semiconcavity, we mean that there exists a constant c such that, for any $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, s with $t \pm s \in [0, T]$ and ξ with $x \pm \xi \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$,

$$\frac{v(t+s, x+\xi) - 2v(t, x) + v(t-s, x-\xi)}{|s|^2 + |\xi|^2} \leq c. \quad (5.13)$$

Notice that we also exploit the notion of semiconcavity, but in space only, in the next section, see (6.11). Also, not only in the statement but also throughout the rest of the text, differentiability of \mathcal{V} is understood as time-space differentiability (unless it is stated differently, in which case differentiability is explicitly referred to as space differentiability). Last, we stress that (vii) follows from Theorem 7.4.20 in [6], but the statement therein assumes that the Hamiltonian is strictly convex; in fact, it is clear from the proof that the authors mean strictly convex in z only.

Proof. To prove (i), assume first that controls are bounded by R , for some $R > M$. Then an optimal control α_R exists by [6, Theorem 7.4.5] and, by the Pontryagin principle [6, Theorem 7.4.17], point (ii) holds but with the truncated Hamiltonian $(H_R^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ defined as in (3.2). Thus, α_R induces an equilibrium $\mathbf{p}^\circ(\alpha_R)$ to the MFG (2.1)–(2.2) and (using the coercivity of the Lagrangian on the interior of the simplex) is of the form $((\alpha_{R,t}^{i,j} = (u_t^i - u_t^j)_+), i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket, i \neq j)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, where $\mathbf{u} = ((u_t^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is the value process associated with the optimization problem $J(\cdot; \mathbf{p}^\circ(\alpha_R))$ in (2.1), set over controls that are bounded by R . Choosing 0 as control in (2.1), we observe that \mathbf{u} is upper bounded by $M/2$. In order to prove that $-M/2$ is a lower bound, it suffices to lower bound the quadratic cost by zero in the cost functional $J(\cdot; \mathbf{p}^\circ(\alpha_R))$. Hence, α_R is bounded by M , which is independent of R , implying that an optimal control exists over the set of bounded controls. Therefore, (i) and (ii) are proved and the other points follow now from the results in [6, Section 7.4]. \square

Since \mathcal{V} is almost everywhere differentiable in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, the above result, together with Theorem 5.1, implies that the sequence of optimal trajectories $(\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{0 < 2\theta \leq \delta \leq \delta_0, 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0}$ admits a true limit for almost every initial condition (t_0, p_0) (the convergence hence holding true in probability). Moreover, point (vi) above permits to say more about the convergence also when starting from a point of non-differentiability: The randomness of the limit trajectory is enclosed in the initial time only. We summarize in the following:

Corollary 5.3. *Assume that F is in $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and G in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ for a given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then, if \mathcal{V} is differentiable in (t_0, p_0) , with $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, then, the following holds true in probability (the first one on $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{S}_d)$ and the second one on \mathcal{E}),*

$$\lim_{(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0)} \mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} = \mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]} \quad \lim_{(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0)} \alpha_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} = \alpha_{[t_0, p_0]}, \quad (5.14)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}$ is the unique optimal trajectory and $\alpha_{[t_0, p_0]}$ the unique optimal control process of the limiting MFCP, see the notation in the introduction of Subsection 5.1.

Moreover, if \mathcal{V} is not differentiable in (t_0, p_0) , the limit of any converging subsequence is supported on a set of (optimal) trajectories which do not branch strictly after the initial time.

5.3. Selection for the master equation. Although Corollary 5.3 provides an interesting information about the limiting behavior of the equilibrium $\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ as the parameters $(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon)$ tend to 0, it says nothing about the asymptotic behavior of the related equilibrium cost. We address this question in this subsection; in particular, we prove here Proposition 2.5 and Theorem 2.6. Throughout, we assume that $F \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ for a given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$; at some point, we need to strengthen the condition on F and assume it to belong to $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, see Proposition 5.10 and Theorem 5.11.

Actually, part of the difficulty for passing to the limit in the cost $\tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi}$ defined by (4.9) is to control the distance from the equilibrium to the boundary. Back to the formula (5.1), it is indeed plain to see that φ should become steeper and steeper (and hence $|\varphi'|$ larger and larger) in the neighborhood of 0 as $(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon)$ tends to 0, whence the need for some uniform integrability properties on the inverse of the distance from $\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ to the boundary. We here collect several useful *a priori* bounds in this direction. Proofs of the first three statements are postponed to the end of the section, see Subsection 5.4.

Proposition 5.4. *For $(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\varphi = \varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ as in (5.1), with $\kappa_0 \geq \varepsilon^2/2$ and $\varepsilon_0 := \kappa_2/\kappa_0 \geq \varepsilon^2$, and for any initial condition $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and any $\lambda > 0$ and $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\kappa_0 - \frac{\varepsilon^2 + \lambda}{2} \right) \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq \frac{e^{TC(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda)}}{(p_0^i)^{\lambda/\varepsilon^2}}, \quad (5.15)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \left(\kappa_0 - \frac{\varepsilon^2(1 + \lambda)}{2} \right) \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}) dt \right\} \mathbb{1}_{\{\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon} > 2\theta\}} \right] \leq \frac{e^{TC(\delta, \lambda)}}{(p_0^i)^{\lambda}}, \quad (5.16)$$

with $C(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda) := \varepsilon^{-2}[\lambda(1 + \lambda)/(2\delta) + \lambda d(\kappa_\varepsilon + \kappa_0 + M)]$ and $C(\delta, \lambda) := \lambda(1 + \lambda)/(2\delta) + \lambda d(\kappa_0 + M)$, and where $\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ is here understood as $\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$.

Proposition 5.5. *For any $\lambda \geq 1$, there exists a constant $\bar{\kappa}_0$ (depending on λ and κ_2) such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any compact subset¹⁰ $\mathcal{K} \subset \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we can find (strictly) positive constants \bar{C} , $\bar{\delta}_0$, $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$ and (strictly) positive-valued functions $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$, $\hat{\varepsilon}(\delta)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ converging to 0 in $(0, 0)$, 0 and 0 respectively (all these items only depending on κ_0 , κ_2 , \mathcal{K} , λ , M , T and d), such that*

$$\forall \delta \in (0, \bar{\delta}_0], \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\varepsilon}(\delta)], \forall \theta \in (0, \hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)], \quad \Psi(\lambda, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon, \mathcal{K}) \leq \bar{C}, \quad (5.17)$$

$$\forall \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0], \forall \theta \in (0, \hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)], \quad \Psi(\lambda, \theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon, \mathcal{K}) \leq \bar{C}, \quad (5.18)$$

where

$$\Psi(\lambda, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon, \mathcal{K}) = \max_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \sup_{(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \int_{t_0}^T \left([\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} - \varphi'_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}](p_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}) + \frac{1}{p_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}} \right) dt \right\} \right].$$

With the same notations, it also holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0], \forall \theta \in (0, \hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)], \\ \min_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \inf_{(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} p_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{i, \theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon} \geq \bar{C} \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

In what follows, we prefer to state the convergence result as limits as the viscosity parameter ε^2 tends to 0, instead of limits as δ tends to 0, which explains why, in (5.18) and (5.19), we consider δ as a function of ε , and θ as function of ε and δ . In order to formulate the next statement properly, we need another notation. Similar to $\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$, $\mathbf{q}_{[t_0, p_0, q_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} := (q_{[t_0, p_0, q_0], t}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ denotes the solution to (2.5) with q_0 as initial condition at time t_0 , when $(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ therein is understood as $(\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon})$. In particular, it should be clear for the reader that $\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ and $\mathbf{q}_{[t_0, p_0, p_0], t}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ are the same. When there is no ambiguity on the choice of the initial condition, we merely write \mathbf{q} .

Lemma 5.6. *For $\ell \geq 1$, we can find $\bar{\lambda} := \bar{\lambda}(\ell)$, only depending on ℓ and d and then take $\bar{\kappa}_0$ accordingly in Proposition 5.5 (in terms of λ and κ_2 only) such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, it holds that, for $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$, $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ as in Proposition 5.5,*

¹⁰Here, \mathcal{K} is regarded as a compact subset of \mathcal{S}_d , but, obviously, we could regard it as a $(d-1)$ -dimensional compact subset of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$.

for any state $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and any initial point $(t_0, p_0, q_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{S}_d$, and for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$ and $\theta \in (0, \hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)]$,

$$\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} (p_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{i, \theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon})^{-\ell} \right] \leq C, \quad (5.20)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} (q_{[t_0, p_0, q_0], t}^{i, \theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon})^\ell \right] \leq C, \quad (5.21)$$

where C depends only on κ_0 , κ_2 , \mathcal{K} , ℓ , M , T and d .

Proposition 5.7. *We can find $\bar{\kappa}_0 \geq 0$, only depending on κ_2 and d , such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, there exist constants \bar{C} and $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$, only depending on κ_0 , κ_2 , \mathcal{K} , $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d and functions $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.5 (with λ therein a fixed constant whose value is made explicit in the proof in terms of d only and is, in particular, required to be greater than $\bar{\lambda}(12)$ in Lemma 5.6) such that, for $V_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} = (V_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ denoting the solution to (3.8) with $\varphi = \varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ therein, and for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$ and $\theta \in (0, \hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)]$,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \max_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} |V_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}^i(t, p)| \leq \bar{C}. \quad (5.22)$$

Moreover, if $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$, for the same values of κ_0 , ε and θ (indices in the sums below being taken in $\llbracket d \rrbracket$),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \max_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} |V_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}^i(t, p_t^{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon})|^2 \right] \leq \bar{C}, \quad (5.23)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^T \sum_{i, j, k} |W_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}^{i, j, k}(t, p_t^{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon})|^2 dt \right] \leq \bar{C}, \quad (5.24)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^T \sum_{j, k} |\Upsilon_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}^{j, k}(t, p_t^{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon})|^2 dt \right] \leq \bar{C}, \quad (5.25)$$

where $W_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ is defined by (4.3) and $\Upsilon_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ by (4.7), with $\varphi = \varphi_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.7. For a suitable $\lambda > 1$ that will be fixed in (5.26) below in terms of d only, we consider $\bar{\kappa}_0$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.5 but with λ therein replaced by $2\lambda d$ (the need for changing λ into $2\lambda d$ is made clear in the proof, see again the discussion right after (5.26); in short λ in the statement should be understood as $2\lambda d$ in the sequel of the proof). Then, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and for any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we consider $\bar{\delta}_0$, $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$, $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ also as in the statement of Proposition 5.5. We then fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$, $\theta \in (0, \hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)]$ and $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$ and we write \mathbf{p} for the process $\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon} = (p_t^{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$, φ for $\varphi_{\theta, \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ and $(V^i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ for the corresponding solution to (3.8), and similarly for $(W^{i, j, k})_{i, j, k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$ and $(\Upsilon^{i, j})_{i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$. We then let $(v_t^i := V^i(t, p_t))_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$, for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, and $(w_t^{i, j, k} := W^{i, j, k}(t, p_t))_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$, for $i, j, k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. We know that $(v_t, w_t)_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ satisfy (4.2). We consider then

$$\mathcal{E}_t := \exp \left\{ \lambda \int_{t_0}^t \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) + (p_s^j)^{-1} \right) ds \right\}, \quad t_0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Itô's formula and (4.2) give (indices being taken in $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\begin{aligned} d \left(\mathcal{E}_t |v_t^i|^2 \right) &= 2\mathcal{E}_t v_t^i dv_t^i + \lambda \mathcal{E}_t |v_t^i|^2 \sum_j \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_t^j) + (p_t^j)^{-1} \right) dt + \mathcal{E}_t \sum_{j, k} |w_t^{i, j, k}|^2 dt \\ &= -2\mathcal{E}_t v_t^i \left(\tilde{H}^i(v_t) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_l \tilde{H}^l(v_t) + f^i(p_t) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_l f^l(p_t) \right) dt \\ &\quad - 2\mathcal{E}_t v_t^i \left(\sum_j \left(\varphi(p_t^j) - p_t^j \varphi'(p_t^j) \right) (v_t^j - v_t^i) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j, l} \left(\varphi(p_t^j) - p_t^j \varphi'(p_t^j) \right) (v_t^j - v_t^l) \right) dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sqrt{2\varepsilon} \mathcal{E}_t v_t^i \left(\sum_j \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^i)^{-1}} (w_t^{i,i,j} + w_t^{j,j,i}) - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j,l} \sqrt{p_t^j(p_t^l)^{-1}} (w_t^{l,l,j} + w_t^{j,j,l}) \right) dt \\
& + 2\mathcal{E}_t v_t^i \sum_{j,k} w_t^{i,j,k} dB_t^{j,k} + \lambda \mathcal{E}_t |v_t^i|^2 \sum_j \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_t^j) + (p_t^j)^{-1} \right) dt + \mathcal{E}_t \sum_{j,k} |w_t^{i,j,k}|^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating from $t \geq t_0$ to T and using the Lipschitz continuity of the Hamiltonian and the boundedness of f and g , we deduce that there exists a constant C , which is allowed to vary from line to line as long as it only depends on the same parameters as \bar{C} in the statement, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}_t |v_t^i|^2 + \lambda \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s^i|^2 \sum_j \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) + (p_s^j)^{-1} \right) ds + \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{j,k} |w_s^{i,j,k}|^2 ds \\
& \leq \mathcal{E}_T |g^i(p_T)|^2 + 2 \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s v_s^i \sum_{j,k} w_s^{i,j,k} dB_s^{j,k} + \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s^i| \left\{ C + C|v_s| + c_d |v_s| \sum_j [\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + c_d \varepsilon \sum_{j,l} \sqrt{p_s^j(p_s^l)^{-1}} (|w_s^{l,l,j}| + |w_s^{j,j,l}|) \right\} ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where c_d only depends on d . Hence, by Young's inequality $ab \leq 2\eta a^2 + b^2/2\eta$, which holds true for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}_t |v_t^i|^2 + \lambda \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s^i|^2 \sum_j \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) + (p_s^j)^{-1} \right) ds + \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{j,k} |w_s^{i,j,k}|^2 ds \\
& \leq C\mathcal{E}_T + C \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s (1 + |v_s|^2) ds + c_d \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s|^2 \sum_j [\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) ds \\
& \quad + 8\eta \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{j,l} |w_s^{j,j,l}|^2 ds + \frac{c_d^2}{2\eta} \varepsilon^2 \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s^i|^2 \sum_l (p_s^l)^{-1} ds + 2 \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s v_s^i \sum_{j,k} w_s^{i,j,k} dB_s^{j,k}.
\end{aligned}$$

By summing over $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& |v_t|^2 \mathcal{E}_t + \lambda \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s|^2 \sum_j \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) + (p_s^j)^{-1} \right) ds + \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{i,j,k} |w_s^{i,j,k}|^2 ds \\
& \leq C\mathcal{E}_T + C \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s (1 + |v_s|^2) ds + c_d d \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s|^2 \sum_j [\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) ds \\
& \quad + 8\eta d \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{i,j,k} |w_s^{i,j,k}|^2 ds + \frac{c_d^2}{2\eta} \varepsilon^2 \int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s|^2 \sum_l (p_s^l)^{-1} ds + 2 \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{i,j,k} v_s^i w_s^{i,j,k} dB_s^{j,k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\eta = 1/(16d)$ and $\lambda = \max(\bar{\lambda}(12)/(2d), (32c_d^2 + c_d)d + 1/2)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}_t |v_t|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s |v_s|^2 \sum_j \left([\varphi - \varphi'](p_s^j) + (p_s^j)^{-1} \right) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{i,j,k} |w_s^{i,j,k}|^2 ds \\
& \leq C\mathcal{E}_T + C \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s (1 + |v_s|^2) ds + 2 \int_t^T \mathcal{E}_s \sum_{i,j,k} v_s^i w_s^{i,j,k} dB_s^{j,k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

The stochastic integral is a martingale since $(v_t^i)_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ and $(w_t^{i,j,k})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ are bounded (possibly not uniformly in ε at this stage of the proof). Also, by (5.18) in Proposition 5.5, replacing therein λ by $2\lambda d$ (as we already explained) and then using Hölder's inequality, we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_T^2] \leq C$ for our choices of $\bar{\kappa}_0$ and κ_0 (the latter being greater than $\bar{\kappa}_0$). Therefore, taking expectation in the above inequality and applying Gronwall's lemma, we get

$$\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{E}_t |v_t|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{E}_t \sum_{i,j,k} |w_t^{i,j,k}|^2 dt \right] \leq C. \tag{5.27}$$

In order to pass the supremum inside the expectation in the first term of the left-hand side, we return back to (5.26), take the supremum therein and then apply Burkholder-Davis-Gundy's

inequality to handle the martingale, noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{E}_t^2 \sum_{i,j,k} |v_t^i w_t^{i,j,k}|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{E}_t |v_t|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{E}_t \sum_{i,j,k} |w_t^{i,j,k}|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{E}_t |v_t|^2 \right]^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.27) together with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get the last line. We easily obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{E}_t |v_t|^2 \right] \leq C + C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{E}_t |v_t|^2 \right]^{1/2},$$

which is enough to derive (5.23), recalling that the left-hand side is already known to be finite. Taking $t = t_0$ in (5.23) and then letting (t_0, p_0) vary over the entire $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$, we obtain (5.22).

Inequality (5.24) derives from (5.27). Finally, in order to prove (5.25), we return back to (4.5) and then expand $(\mathcal{V}(t, p_t))_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ by Itô's formula. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t, p_t) &= \langle p_T, g^\bullet(p_T) \rangle + \int_t^T \left[\sum_{j,k} \left(\frac{1}{2} p_s^j |\alpha_s^{j,k}|^2 + p_s^j p_s^k \varphi'(p_s^j) (v_s^j - v_s^k) \right) + \langle p_s, f^\bullet(p_s) \rangle \right] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon \int_t^T \sqrt{p_s^j p_s^k} (\mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}(s, p_s) - \mathfrak{d}_k \mathcal{V}(s, p_s)) dB_s^{j,k}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.5 and by (5.23) (recall also that α is bounded by M), we have a bound for the second order moment of the right-hand side in the first line. Taking $t = t_0$, passing the stochastic integral to the left, squaring the whole equality and then taking expectation, we get the announced result. \square

We now address the (local) uniform convergence of the value function $\mathcal{V}_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ (of the viscous MFCP) towards the value function \mathcal{V} of the inviscid MFCP. Recall that the convergence is already known to hold pointwise, see Theorem 5.1. Recall also that $V_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon} = \mathfrak{D} \mathcal{V}_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ solves (3.8).

Proposition 5.8. *We can find $\bar{\kappa}_0 \geq 0$, only depending on κ_2 and d , such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, for the same two functions $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 (which only depend on κ_0 , κ_2 , \mathcal{K} , $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d), it holds that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{V}_{\hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon} = \mathcal{V}, \quad (5.28)$$

uniformly on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we consider $\bar{\kappa}_0$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 and then, for $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and for two compact subsets \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}' included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ such that the interior of \mathcal{K}' contains \mathcal{K} , we consider $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$, $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 when the compact subset therein is not \mathcal{K} but \mathcal{K}' . For simplicity, we let $\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon := \mathcal{V}_{\hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ and similarly for V_ε , for $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$.

Step 1. The first step is to prove that the functions $(\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon)_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_0}$ are uniformly continuous on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$. In fact, recalling that $V_\varepsilon = \mathfrak{D} \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon$, we already know from (5.22) that the functions $(\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon)_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_0}$ are uniformly Lipschitz continuous in space on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}'$.

In order to prove uniform continuity in time, we fix some $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$ together with an initial condition $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$. Writing \mathbf{p}^ε for $\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ and similarly for α^ε , we define the stopping time $\sigma_\varepsilon := \inf\{t \geq t_0 : p_t^\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{K}'\} \wedge T$. Since $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ tends to 0 with ε , we can change the value of $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$ in such a way that $q_i > 2\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$, $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $q \in \mathcal{K}'$. Since $\varphi_\varepsilon := \varphi_{\hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ is zero outside $[0, 2\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)]$, we deduce that, up to the stopping time σ_ε , \mathbf{p}^ε does not see the function φ_ε in its own dynamics (2.12). Also, since the off-diagonal

entries of the control α^ε in (2.12) are bounded by M , we easily deduce that there exists a constant C , independent of ε and (t_0, p_0) , such that, for any $t \in [t_0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon} |p_s^\varepsilon - p_0|^2 \right] \leq C(t - t_0). \quad (5.29)$$

In particular, denoting by $\text{dist}(\mathcal{K}, (\mathcal{K}')^c)$ the distance from \mathcal{K} to the complementary of \mathcal{K}' and then allowing the value of C to vary from line to line (and to depend on both \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}' but not on ε), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_\varepsilon < t) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t_0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon} |p_s^\varepsilon - p_0| \geq \text{dist}(\mathcal{K}, (\mathcal{K}')^c) \right) \leq C(t - t_0). \quad (5.30)$$

We now apply Itô's formula to $(\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_t))_{t_0 \leq t \leq \sigma_\varepsilon}$. By the HJB equation (2.13) (see also (3.5)), we obtain, for any $t \in [t_0, T]$,

$$\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t_0, p_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^{t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_s^i \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket : j \neq i} |\alpha_s^{\varepsilon, i, j}|^2 + F(p_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds + \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon, p_{t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \right].$$

Subtracting $\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_0)$ to both sides and recalling that the integrand in the right-hand side can be bounded independently of ε , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t_0, p_0) - \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_0)| \\ & \leq C(t - t_0) + \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon, p_{t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_{t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_{t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_0)| \right] \\ & \leq C(t - t_0) + 2\|\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon\|_\infty \mathbb{P}(\sigma_\varepsilon < t) + C\mathbb{E}[|p_{t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - p_0|], \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Lipschitz property of \mathcal{V}_ε in the space variable (at least whenever the latter belongs to \mathcal{K}') to derive the last line. Since the value function \mathcal{V}_ε can be bounded independently of ε (using for instance the fact that controls themselves are required to be bounded), we deduce from (5.29) and (5.30) that

$$|\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t_0, p_0) - \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t, p_0)| \leq C(t - t_0)^{1/2},$$

which shows that the functions $(\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon)_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_0}$ are uniformly continuous in time (and hence in time and space) on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$.

Step 2. Applying Ascoli-Arzelà theorem, we deduce that there exist a subsequence $(\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_n})_{n \geq 0}$ and a function $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\mathcal{K}$, a priori depending on \mathcal{K} , such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_n} = \bar{\mathcal{V}}_\mathcal{K}$ uniformly in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$. Thanks to (5.3), we have pointwise convergence $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon(t_0, p_0) = \mathcal{V}(t_0, p_0)$ for any $t_0 \in [0, T]$ and $p_0 \in \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Hence any subsequence $(\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_n})_{n \geq 0}$ converges uniformly to the same limit which is the value function, and thus we obtain $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{V}$ uniformly in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$. \square

We are now in position to prove a preliminary version Proposition 2.5, but restricted to initial conditions in a compact subset of $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$:

Proposition 5.9. *We can find $\bar{\kappa}_0 \geq 0$, only depending on κ_2 and d , such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, for the same two functions $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 (which only depend on κ_0 , κ_2 , \mathcal{K} , $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d), the additional cost induced by (4.6) tends to 0 with ε :*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Xi_{\hat{\theta}(\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}(t_0, p_0, q_0) = 0, \quad (5.31)$$

uniformly in $t_0 \in [0, T]$, $p_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ and $q_0 \in \mathcal{S}_d$, where

$$\Xi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(t_0, p_0, q_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_{t_0}^T \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} q_{[t_0, p_0, q_0], t}^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon} \vartheta^{i, \varepsilon, \varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}}(t, p_{[t_0, p_0], t}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}) dt \right\| \right].$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, we consider $\bar{\kappa}_0$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 (and implicitly the same value of λ as in its proof, see (5.26) and the discussion below (5.26)) and then, for $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and for a compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we consider $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$, $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$, also as in the statement of Proposition 5.7. For simplicity, we let $\varphi_\varepsilon := \varphi_{\hat{\theta}(\delta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ and $V_\varepsilon := V_{\hat{\theta}(\delta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$. Similarly, we use the abbreviated notations \mathbf{p}^ε and \mathbf{q}^ε for the two processes appearing in (5.31), the underlying initial condition (t_0, p_0, q_0) being fixed in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{S}_d$ (which is licit provided we prove that the convergences below hold uniformly with respect to (t_0, p_0, q_0)). To prove the claim, we have to show (see (4.6)) that (uniformly with respect to the initial condition)

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_0}^T \sum_k q_t^{\varepsilon, k} \sum_j p_t^{\varepsilon, j} \varphi'_\varepsilon(p_t^{\varepsilon, k}) (V_\varepsilon^k(t, p_t^\varepsilon) - V_\varepsilon^j(t, p_t^\varepsilon)) dt \right| \right] = 0, \quad (5.32)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_0}^T \sum_k q_t^{\varepsilon, k} \sum_j \sqrt{p_t^{\varepsilon, j} (p_t^{\varepsilon, k})^{-1}} (\widetilde{W}_\varepsilon^{j, k} - \widetilde{W}_\varepsilon^{k, k, j} - 2\Upsilon_\varepsilon^{k, j})(t, p_t^\varepsilon) dt \right| \right] = 0, \quad (5.33)$$

where $W_\varepsilon = W_{\hat{\theta}(\delta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ and similarly for Υ_ε .

We begin by proving (5.32). We know from (5.19) (all the results from Proposition 5.5 are applied with $2\lambda d$, see again the discussion below (5.26)) that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \min_{k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_t^{\varepsilon, k} \leq \eta) = 0$ for $\eta > 0$ small enough (independently of ε), the convergence being uniform with respect to the initial point $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$. Together with the fact that the support of φ'_ε shrinks with ε , we deduce that the integrand tends to 0 in probability as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, to obtain (5.32), we have to prove uniform integrability, namely it is enough to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_0}^T \sum_k q_t^{\varepsilon, k} \sum_j p_t^{\varepsilon, j} \varphi'_\varepsilon(p_t^{\varepsilon, k}) (V_\varepsilon^k(t, p_t^\varepsilon) - V_\varepsilon^j(t, p_t^\varepsilon)) dt \right|^{3/2} \right] \leq C,$$

for a constant C independent of ε and of (t_0, p_0, q_0) . By (5.23) and by Hölder inequality with exponents 8, 8 and $4/3$, it suffices to prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left[\sum_k \sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} |q_t^{\varepsilon, k}|^{12} \right]^{1/8} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_0}^T \sum_k \varphi'_\varepsilon(p_t^{\varepsilon, k}) dt \right|^{12} \right]^{1/8} \right] \leq C.$$

The first term in the left-hand side is easily bounded by means of Lemma 5.6, recalling that λ in the statement of Proposition 5.7 is required to satisfy $\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}(12)$. As for the second one, it follows from (5.18).

To prove (5.33), we have to show that the expectation is bounded (since there is the additional factor ε in front of it), but this easily follows from Holder's inequality, with $1 = 1/3 + 1/6 + 1/2$, together with (5.20), (5.21), (5.24) and (5.25). \square

We now address the convergence of the master equation. To do so, we denote by $U_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ the solution to the viscous master equation (2.18) (as provided by Theorem 4.1), with $\varphi = \varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ therein. We recall (see Proposition 5.2, (viii)) that there exist a unique optimal control α and optimal trajectory \mathbf{p} for the inviscid MFCEP starting at points $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ where the value function \mathcal{V} is differentiable. For such points, let, as in Section 2 (see Theorem 2.6, part II), $U^i(t_0, p_0) := \inf_{\alpha} J(\alpha; \mathbf{p})$ with \mathbf{q} being initialized at time t_0 from $(q_{t_0}^j = \delta_{i,j})_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}$.

Proposition 5.10. *On top of the assumptions quoted in the beginning of the subsection, assume that F is in $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$. Then, we can find $\bar{\kappa}_0 \geq 0$, only depending on κ_2 and d , such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, for the same two functions $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 (which only depend on κ_0 , κ_2 , \mathcal{K} , $\|f\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty$, T and d), and for any $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$ at which \mathcal{V} is differentiable,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\theta}(\delta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}(t_0, p_0) = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}(t_0, p_0), \quad (5.34)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} U_{\hat{\theta}(\delta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}(t_0, p_0) = U(t_0, p_0), \quad (5.35)$$

Moreover, these convergence hold in $[L_{loc}^r([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d))]^d$, for any $r \geq 1$, where $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ is equipped with the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Step 1. As in the previous proof, we consider $\bar{\kappa}_0$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 (and implicitly the same value of λ as in its proof) and then, for $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and for a compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we consider $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$, $\hat{\theta}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\hat{\delta}(\varepsilon)$, also as in the statement of Proposition 5.7. We also use the same notations φ_ε , V_ε , \mathbf{p}^ε as in the previous proof, and similarly we write α^ε for the corresponding optimal control and U_ε for the solution of the (viscous) master equation. Here, the initial condition of \mathbf{p}^ε is implicitly understood as a point $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$ at which \mathcal{V} is differentiable. By Corollary 5.3 (writing (\mathbf{p}, α) for $(\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}, \alpha_{[t_0, p_0]})$ therein), the convergence of $(\mathbf{p}^\varepsilon, \alpha^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]}$ to (\mathbf{p}, α) holds in probability (for the same topology as in the statement of Theorem 5.1). In fact, by combining (5.7) and (5.8) (with $\beta = \alpha$ therein), we have (indices below are in $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_0}^T \sum_{i \neq j} p_t^i |\alpha_t^{\varepsilon, i, j}|^2 dt = \int_{t_0}^T \sum_{i \neq j} p_t^i |\alpha_t^{i, j}|^2 dt,$$

from which we deduce that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_0}^T \sum_{i \neq j} p_t^i |\alpha_t^{\varepsilon, i, j} - \alpha_t^{i, j}|^2 dt = 0. \quad (5.36)$$

As the limit process \mathbf{p} does not touch the boundary of the simplex, the latter shows that α^ε converges to α in probability but for the strong (instead of weak) topology on \mathcal{E} . We make use of this property later on in the proof.

In order to prove (5.35), it is worth recalling that $U_\varepsilon^i(t_0, p_0)$ is the value function of the cost functional $\tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi_\varepsilon}(\cdot; \mathbf{p}^\varepsilon)$ when the state trajectory \mathbf{q} in (2.5) is initialized from $q_{t_0}^k = \delta_{i, k}$, $k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, and similarly $U^i(t_0, p_0)$ is the value function of the cost functional $J(\cdot; \mathbf{p})$ when the state trajectory in (2.2) is also initialized from $q_{t_0}^k = \delta_{i, k}$, $k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. Recalling (2.14), we have (indices in the sum belonging to $\llbracket d \rrbracket$)

$$\tilde{J}^{\varepsilon, \varphi_\varepsilon}(\alpha^\varepsilon; \mathbf{p}^\varepsilon) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^T \sum_k q_t^{\varepsilon, k} \left(\mathfrak{L}^k(\alpha_t^\varepsilon) + f^k(p_t^\varepsilon) + \vartheta^{\varepsilon, \varphi_\varepsilon, k}(t, p_t^\varepsilon) \right) dt + \sum_k q_T^{\varepsilon, k} g^k(p_T^\varepsilon) \right], \quad (5.37)$$

where $((q_t^{\varepsilon, k})_{k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} dq_t^{\varepsilon, k} &= \sum_{j \neq k} \left(q_t^{\varepsilon, j} (\varphi_\varepsilon(p_t^{\varepsilon, k}) + \alpha_t^{\varepsilon, j, k}) - q_t^{\varepsilon, k} (\varphi_\varepsilon(p_t^{\varepsilon, j}) + \alpha_t^{\varepsilon, k, j}) \right) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{q_t^{\varepsilon, k}}{p_t^{\varepsilon, k}} \sqrt{p_t^{\varepsilon, k} p_t^{\varepsilon, j}} (dB_t^{k, j} - dB_t^{j, k}), \end{aligned}$$

with $q_{t_0}^{\varepsilon, k} = \delta_{i, k}$.

By (5.19), there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \min_{k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} p_t^{\varepsilon, k} \leq \eta) = 0$. This suffices to kill asymptotically the terms φ_ε in the drift right above on the model of the proof of Theorem 5.1. As for the martingale part, we may invoke Lemma 5.6 with $\ell = 4$ (recall that $\bar{\kappa}_0$ is chosen in such a way that Lemma 5.6 applies with $\ell = 12$) to show that its supremum norm converges to 0 in probability. Altogether with (5.36), we easily deduce that

$$q_t^{\varepsilon, k} = \delta_{k, i} + \int_{t_0}^t \sum_{j \neq k} \left(q_s^{\varepsilon, j} \alpha_s^{j, k} - q_s^{\varepsilon, k} \alpha_s^{k, j} \right) ds + r_t^{\varepsilon, k}, \quad t \in [t_0, T],$$

where $\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} |r_t^{\varepsilon, k}|$ tends to 0 in probability with ε , which prompts us to consider the differential equation

$$\dot{q}_t^k = \sum_{j \neq k} (q_t^j \alpha_t^{j, k} - q_t^k \alpha_t^{k, j}), \quad q_{t_0}^k = \delta_{k, i}.$$

Forming the differences $((q_t^{\varepsilon, k} - q_t^k)_{k \in \llbracket d \rrbracket})_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$, we easily deduce that $\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} |q_t^\varepsilon - q_t|$ tends to 0 in probability. By Lemma 5.6 again, the convergence holds in L^2 (recall that

$\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}(12)$). Using (2.14) and (5.36) together with the fact that all the off-diagonal controls are bounded by M , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^T \sum_k q_t^{\varepsilon, k} \left(\mathfrak{L}^k(\alpha_t^\varepsilon) + f^k(p_t^\varepsilon) \right) dt + \sum_k q_T^{\varepsilon, k} g^k(p_T^\varepsilon) \right] \\ &= \int_{t_0}^T \sum_k q_t^k \left(\mathfrak{L}^k(\alpha_t) + f^k(p_t) \right) dt + \sum_k q_T^k g^k(p_T) = J(\alpha; \mathbf{p}) = U^i(t_0, p_0), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.31) that holds for any initial condition, gives (5.35).

Step 2. To prove (5.34), we note that, by item (viii) in Proposition 5.2 again $\alpha_t^{i,j} = (\mathfrak{d}_i \mathcal{V}(t, p_t) - \mathfrak{d}_j \mathcal{V}(t, p_t))_+$ for any $t_0 \leq t \leq T$ (recalling that \mathcal{V} is differentiable at any (t, p_t)), and by item (ix) in Proposition 5.2, the backward equation in (5.11) (in the unknown $\mathbf{z} = (z_t)_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$) represents the gradient of \mathcal{V} , so in particular at the initial time we have $z_{t_0}^i = \partial_{x_i} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}(t_0, x_0)$ with $x_0 = (p_0^1, \dots, p_0^{d-1})$. But $z_{t_0}^i$ is also equal to $U^i(t_0, p_0) - U^d(t_0, p_0)$, which is exactly (5.12). Thus we have $\partial_{x_i} \mathcal{V}(t_0, x_0) = U^i(t_0, p_0) - U^d(t_0, p_0)$. Importantly, we have a similar identity when $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, which is provided by (2.20) proved in Theorem 4.1. Therefore (5.34) now follows from (5.35).

Step 3. The last claim follows from uniform boundedness of $\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon$ and U_ε . The former is given by (5.22), together with the fact that \mathcal{V} is almost everywhere (for the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure) differentiable, while the latter follows easily from the definition (5.37) together with the bounds in Proposition 5.7. \square

At this stage of the proof, the reader must understand that Propositions 5.9 and 5.10 do not provide complete proofs of Proposition 2.5 and Theorem 2.6. The reason is that the functions $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\delta}$ therein depend on the underlying compact set \mathcal{K} . In words, we should write $\widehat{\theta}_\mathcal{K}$ and $\widehat{\delta}_\mathcal{K}$. Now, we would like to choose $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ depending on ε such that, letting

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon := \mathcal{V}_{\widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}, \quad \overline{U}_\varepsilon := U_{\widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}, \quad \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon := \Xi_{\widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}, \quad (5.38)$$

(5.28) and (5.31) hold locally uniformly on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, and (5.34) and (5.35) hold almost everywhere. We mostly argue by an inversion argument very similar to the proof of Proposition 5.5 (which is given below).

Theorem 5.11. *Under the assumptions quoted in the beginning of the subsection, we can find $\bar{\kappa}_0 \geq 0$, only depending on κ_2 and d , such that, for any $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and any $e \in (0, \varepsilon_0 = \sqrt{\kappa_2/\kappa_0}]$, there exist a compact subset \mathcal{K}_e included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, with $\mathcal{K}_e \supset \mathcal{K}_{e'}$ if $e < e'$ and $\bigcup_{e \in (0, \varepsilon_0]} \mathcal{K}_e = \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, together with functions $\widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{K}_e}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_e}(\varepsilon)$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 such that, using the same notations as in (5.38) (and in particular letting $e = \varepsilon$),*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{V} \quad \text{locally uniformly in } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d), \quad (5.39)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\Xi}_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{locally uniformly in } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d) \times \mathcal{S}_d. \quad (5.40)$$

If, in addition F is in $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\overline{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V} \quad \text{a.e. on } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d) \text{ and in } [L_{loc}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d))]^d, \quad (5.41)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{U}_\varepsilon = U \quad \text{a.e. on } [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d) \text{ and in } [L_{loc}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d))]^d, \quad (5.42)$$

where $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ is equipped with the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we consider $\bar{\kappa}_0$ as in the statement of Proposition 5.7 and then, for $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0$ and for a compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we consider $\widehat{\theta}_\mathcal{K}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\widehat{\delta}_\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)$, also as in the statement of Proposition 5.7. Without any loss of generality, the functions $\widehat{\theta}_\mathcal{K}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and $\widehat{\delta}_\mathcal{K}(\varepsilon)$ may be assumed to be defined for all $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0 = \sqrt{\kappa_2/\kappa_0}]$; in fact, only the limits in $(0, 0)$ and 0 matter for our purpose. For any $n \geq 1$, let \mathcal{K}_n be the

compact set $\{x \in \mathcal{S}_d : \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{S}_d) \geq 1/n\}$. Below, we restrict ourselves to the set \mathbb{N}_∂ of large enough integers n such that $\mathcal{K}_n \neq \emptyset$. Obviously, \mathbb{N}_∂ is of the form $\mathbb{N}_\partial = \{n_\partial, n_\partial + 1, \dots\}$ for some integer $n_\partial \geq 1$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_\partial$, we let $\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon}(t, p) := \mathcal{V}_{\hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{K}_n}(\hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_n}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{K}_n}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}(t, p)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_d$; similarly, we introduce $U_{n,\varepsilon}$ and $\Xi_{n,\varepsilon}$ (the latter being defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d \times \mathcal{S}_d$). By Corollary 5.8, for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_\partial$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon} = \mathcal{V}$, uniformly on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_n$, and, by Proposition 5.9, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Xi_{n,\varepsilon} = 0$, uniformly on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}_d$. Further, by Proposition 5.10, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon}(t, p) = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}(t, p)$ for a.e. $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_n$, and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon} = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}$ in $[L^1([0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_n)]^d$, and similarly with $U_{n,\varepsilon}$ and U . Applying Egoroff's theorem for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_\partial$, there exists $E_n \subset [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_n$ with $(d-1)$ -dimensional—since the simplex is equipped with the $(d-1)$ Lebesgue measure—Lebesgue measure $|E_n| \leq 2^{-n}$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon} = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} U_{n,\varepsilon} = U$ uniformly in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{K}_n \setminus E_n$. Therefore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_\partial$, there exists $\varepsilon_n \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ such that, for any $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(t,p) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{K}_n} |(\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{V})(t, p)| + \sup_{(t,p,q) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}_d} |\Xi_{n,\varepsilon}(t, p, q)| \\ & + \sup_{(t,p) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{K}_n \setminus E_n} \left(|(\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon} - \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V})(t, p)| + |(U_{n,\varepsilon} - U)(t, p)| \right) \\ & + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{K}_n} \left(|(\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}_{n,\varepsilon} - \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V})(t, p)| + |(U_{n,\varepsilon} - U)(t, p)| \right) d\varrho(p) dt \leq \frac{1}{n}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

where ϱ is the image of the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure by the map $(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) \mapsto (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, x^{-d})$. Moreover, we can assume that $\varepsilon_{n+1} < \varepsilon_n \leq 1/n$, so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$. We now define n , and thus \mathcal{K}_n , in terms of ε : for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_{n_\partial})$, let n_ε be the unique $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varepsilon_{n+1} < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_n$. Obviously, the function $(0, n_\partial) \ni \varepsilon \mapsto n_\varepsilon$ is decreasing and the supremum, say $N := \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, n_\partial)} n_\varepsilon$ cannot be finite as otherwise we would have $0 < \varepsilon_{N+1} \leq \varepsilon_{n_\varepsilon+1} < \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, which is a contradiction. Hence, choosing $n = n_\varepsilon$ in the right-hand side of (5.43), letting with a slight abuse of notation $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon := \mathcal{K}_{n_\varepsilon}$ (the definition of \mathcal{K}_ε , for $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_{n_\partial}, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$, does not really matter) and then using the same notation as in (5.38), we get, for any compact subset \mathcal{K} included in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$,

$$\sup_{(t,p) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{K}} |\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon(t, p) - \mathcal{V}(t, p)| \leq \sup_{(t,p) \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |\mathcal{V}_{n_\varepsilon, \varepsilon}(t, p) - \mathcal{V}(t, p)| \leq \frac{1}{n_\varepsilon},$$

for ε small enough, which gives (5.39). Obviously, the proof of (5.40) is similar, and in fact the same argument applies for proving the L^1 convergence in (5.41) and (5.42). To prove the a.e. convergence in (5.41) (and similarly in (5.42)), consider again a compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and ε small enough such that $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$. From (5.43) again, we get that

$$|\mathfrak{D}\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon(t, p) - \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}(t, p)| \leq \frac{1}{n_\varepsilon}$$

if $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K} \setminus E_{n_\varepsilon}$. Therefore, the set of points $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ such that $\mathfrak{D}\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon(t, p)$ does not converge to $\mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}(t, p)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, is included in the set of points (t, p) such that $(t, p) \in E_{n_\varepsilon}$ for infinitely many n_ε . The latter is nothing but $\limsup_{n \geq n_\partial} E_n$, which has Lebesgue measure 0 by Borel-Cantelli lemma, since $\sum_{n=1}^\infty |E_n| \leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{-n} < \infty$. Hence $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{D}\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon(t, p) = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}(t, p)$ for a.e. $(t, p) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, from which the a.e. convergence in (5.41) follows. The a.e. convergence in (5.42) is treated in the same way. \square

5.4. Proofs of auxiliary exponential integrability properties.

Proof of Proposition 5.4. We prove (5.15) and (5.16) in a single row, mostly following [1, Proposition 2.2]. Fix $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and, for simplicity, write \mathbf{p}^i for $\mathbf{p}^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$ and take $t_0 = 0$. As in the second step of the proof of [1, Proposition 2.1], we write the equation for \mathbf{p}^i in the form

$$dp_t^i = \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left[p_t^j (\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j,i}) - p_t^i (\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(p_t^j) + \alpha_t^{i,j}) \right] dt + \varepsilon \sqrt{p_t^i (1 - p_t^i)} d\widetilde{W}_t^i, \quad (5.44)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$ and for $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^i = (\widetilde{W}_t^i)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ a $1d$ -Brownian motion. Then, Itô's formula yields (the left-hand side below is well-defined since \mathbf{p}^i does not vanish)

$$\begin{aligned} d\left[\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \ln p_t^i\right] &= \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left[\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{p_t^j}{p_t^i} \left(\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j, i} \right) - \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(p_t^j) + \alpha_t^{i, j} \right) \right] dt - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{1 - p_t^i}{p_t^i} dt \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{1 - p_t^i}{p_t^i}} d\widetilde{W}_t^i, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

We now subtract the quantity $\lambda^2(1 - p_t^i)/(2\varepsilon^2 p_t^i)$ to the drift of (5.45) and then get the following lower bound (using the definition of φ in (5.1) together with the fact that $0 \leq \alpha^{i, j} \leq M$ if $j \neq i$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left[\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{p_t^j}{p_t^i} \left(\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j, i} \right) - \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}(p_t^j) + \alpha_t^{i, j} \right) \right] - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{1 - p_t^i}{p_t^i} - \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \frac{1 - p_t^i}{p_t^i} \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{1}{p_t^i} \kappa_0 \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(p_t^i) - \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left(\kappa_\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[0, 2\theta]}(p_t^j) + \kappa_0 \mathbb{1}_{[0, 2\delta]}(p_t^j) + M \right) - \frac{\lambda}{2\varepsilon^2} (\varepsilon^2 + \lambda) \frac{1}{p_t^i} \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\kappa_0 - \frac{\varepsilon^2 + \lambda}{2} \right) \frac{1}{p_t^i} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(p_t^i) - \frac{\lambda(1 + \lambda)}{2\delta\varepsilon^2} - \frac{\lambda d}{\varepsilon^2} (\kappa_\varepsilon + \kappa_0 + M). \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

Hence, integrating (5.45) from 0 to T , adding and subtracting the compensator $\varepsilon^{-2} \lambda^2 \int_0^T (1 - p_t^i)/(2p_t^i) dt$ and then taking the exponential, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(p_T^i)^{\lambda/\varepsilon^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} \int_0^T \sqrt{\frac{1 - p_t^i}{p_t^i}} d\widetilde{W}_t^i - \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \int_0^T \frac{1 - p_t^i}{p_t^i} dt\right) \\ &\geq (p_0^i)^{\lambda/\varepsilon^2} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\kappa_0 - \frac{\varepsilon^2 + \lambda}{2}\right) \int_0^T \frac{1}{p_t^i} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(p_t^i) dt\right) e^{-TC(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the left-hand side has expectation less than 1, claim (5.15) follows. In order to get (5.16), it suffices to replace λ by $\varepsilon^2 \lambda$, to observe that the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{[0, 2\theta]}$ in (5.46) has zero value if $\inf_{0 \leq t \leq T} p_t^i > 2\theta$, and to integrate from 0 to the first time when \mathbf{p}^i becomes lower than 2θ . \square

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Throughout the proof, the initial condition $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$ is implicitly understood in the notation $\mathbf{p}^{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$. Also, we fix the state $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and the value of $\lambda \geq 1$ and we make explicit the dependence of the various constants upon the two parameters δ and ε . However, we do not indicate the fact that the constants may depend on \mathcal{K} . Below, we use the same notation $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^i$ as in (5.44).

Step 1. a. We first claim that, for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $a_\eta(\delta, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$, such that, for all $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$ and $\theta \in [0, \delta/2]$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon} > a_\eta(\delta, \varepsilon)\right) \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (5.47)$$

The proof is a consequence of (5.45) and of (5.15) (with $\lambda = \varepsilon^2$ and $\kappa_0 > \varepsilon^2$). Indeed, the former, together with Doob's maximal inequality, yield

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} [-\ln(p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon})] \geq -\ln(a_\eta)\right) \leq \frac{c}{|\ln(a_\eta)|} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_0}^T \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_t^{i, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon}}\right) dt.$$

for some c only depending on ε and δ , M , κ_0 and κ_2 . Then, (5.15) gives a bound (depending on δ and ε) for the above right-hand side.

b. Our second step is to prove that, provided that κ_0 satisfies

$$\kappa_0 - 1 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \geq 4\kappa_2, \quad (5.48)$$

there exists $\theta_1(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda) > 0$ such that, for any $\theta \leq \theta_1(\delta, \varepsilon)$ and any $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \int_{t_0}^T -\varphi'_\theta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq 2, \quad (5.49)$$

where we have let for convenience $\varphi'_\theta(r) := -(2\kappa_\varepsilon/\theta)\mathbb{1}_{[0,2\theta]}(r)$.

Obviously, $\int_{t_0}^T \varphi'_\theta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt$ converges to 0 in probability as θ tends to 0, uniformly in $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$ (the other two parameters δ and ε being kept fixed), as the indicator function appearing in the definition of φ'_θ vanishes for θ small enough (it hence suffices to choose $2\theta \leq a_\eta(\delta, \varepsilon)$ for $a_\eta(\delta, \varepsilon)$ as in (5.47), for a given $\eta > 0$ as small as needed). In order to prove (5.49), we then notice that

$$-\varphi'_\theta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) = 2 \frac{\kappa_\varepsilon}{\theta} \mathbb{1}_{[0,2\theta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) \leq 2 \frac{\kappa_\varepsilon}{\theta} \frac{2\theta}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,2\theta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{4\kappa_\varepsilon}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}). \quad (5.50)$$

Recall now that $\kappa_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}\kappa_2$. Hence, if we choose another real λ' that satisfies $\kappa_0 \geq 4\kappa_2 + (1 + \lambda')/2$ (take for instance that $\lambda' = \lambda + 1$ and recall $\kappa_0 \geq 4\kappa_2 + 1 + \lambda/2$), then (5.50) and (5.15) yield

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -\lambda' \int_{t_0}^T \varphi'_\theta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{4\kappa_2\lambda'}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq C_1(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda'),$$

where $C_1(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda')$ is a constant independent of θ and depending on (t_0, p_0) through \mathcal{K} only¹¹. Combining the above upper bound with the fact that $\int_{t_0}^T \varphi'_\theta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt$ tends to 0 in probability (uniformly in $(t_0, p_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{K}$), we easily derive (5.49).

Step 2. The goal of this step is to address a similar result to (5.49) but with φ'_θ replaced by φ'_δ , defined as $\varphi'_\delta(r) := -(2\kappa_0/\delta)\mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}(r)$.

a. The first step is to notice that

$$-\varphi'_\delta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) \leq 2 \frac{\kappa_0}{\delta} \frac{2\delta}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{4\kappa_0}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) + \frac{4\kappa_0}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[\delta,2\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}). \quad (5.51)$$

b. We address the first term in the right-hand side of (5.51). To do so, we need a finer lower bound on the coordinates of $\mathbf{p}^{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}$ and hence we must revisit the proof of Proposition 5.4. As in the first step, we fix some $\eta > 0$ and, for $a_\eta := a_\eta(\delta, \varepsilon)$ as therein, we consider the event $A_\eta^{1,i} := \{\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon} > a_\eta\}$. Obviously, (5.47) says that $\mathbb{P}(A_\eta^{1,i}) \geq 1 - \eta$.

Next, we define the event

$$A^{2,i} = \left\{ \forall t \in [t_0, T], \quad \varepsilon \int_{t_0}^t \sqrt{\frac{1 - p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}}{p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}}} d\widetilde{W}_s^i \geq -1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{1 - p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}}{p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} ds \right\}.$$

We observe that the complementary reads

$$(A^{2,i})^c = \left\{ \exists t \in [t_0, T] : \exp \left(- \int_{t_0}^t \sqrt{\frac{1 - p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}}{p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}}} d\widetilde{W}_s^i - \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{1 - p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}}{p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} ds \right) > \exp(\varepsilon^{-1}) \right\},$$

from which we get by Doob's inequality that $\mathbb{P}(A^{2,i}) \geq 1 - \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1})$.

We now work on $(\cap_{j \in [d]} A_\eta^{1,j}) \cap A^{2,i}$ for $2\theta \leq a_\eta$. By combining (5.45) and (5.46), we get (choosing $\lambda = \varepsilon^2$ therein and noticing that, since we work on $\cap_{j \in [d]} A_\eta^{1,j}$, we can remove the second indicator function in the second line of (5.46)):

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) &\geq \ln(p_0^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) - 1 \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^t (\kappa_0 - \varepsilon) \frac{1}{p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_s^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) ds - \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} + d(\kappa_0 + M) \right) T. \end{aligned}$$

¹¹We do not keep track of the parameters $\kappa_0, \kappa_2, \mathcal{K}, M, T$ and d in the constants.

Hence, for $\kappa_0 \geq \varepsilon$, we can find a constant $C_2 \geq 0$ (only depending on κ_0 , M , T and d) such that, on $(\cap_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} A_\eta^{1,j}) \cap A^{2,i}$, for $2\theta \leq a_\eta \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$, $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $t \in [0, T]$, we have $p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon} \geq \exp(-C_2)$. (Observe indeed that, in (5.47), we can always assume that $a_\eta(\delta, \varepsilon) \leq \min(\varepsilon, \delta)$.)

c. Return back to the first term in the right-hand side of (5.51). By (5.16) (applied with λ replaced by $8\lambda'$ for $\lambda' > \lambda$), if $\kappa_0 \geq \varepsilon^2(1 + 8\lambda')$, which is for instance true if $\kappa_0 \geq 2$ and $8\lambda'\varepsilon^2 \leq 1$ (in turn the latter is true if $8(\lambda + 1)\varepsilon^2 \leq 1$ and $\lambda' - \lambda = 1$), then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ 4\lambda' \kappa_0 \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \mathbb{1}_{\{\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon} > 2\theta\}} \right] \leq C_3(\delta, \lambda'), \quad (5.52)$$

where $C_3(\delta, \lambda')$ is non-increasing with δ . Under the same condition $\kappa_0 \geq 2$ and $16\lambda'\varepsilon^2 \leq 1$, (5.15) (applied with λ replaced by $8\varepsilon^2\lambda'$) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ 4\lambda' \kappa_0 \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \mathbb{1}_{\{\inf_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon} \leq 2\theta\}} \right] \leq C_4(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda') \mathbb{P}((A_\eta^{1,i})^c)^{1/2}.$$

at least whenever $2\theta \leq a_\eta$. Choosing η such that $C_4(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda')\eta^{1/2} \leq C_3(\delta, \lambda')$ and allowing for a new value of $C_3(\delta, \lambda')$, we may remove the second indicator function in (5.52). Then, we can easily change the first indicator function in (5.52) into $\mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}$ by noticing that $r^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}(r) \leq r^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(r) + \delta^{-1}$. For a new value of $C_3(\delta, \lambda')$ (as long as it remains non-increasing with δ), we then have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ 4\lambda' \kappa_0 \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq C_3(\delta, \lambda'). \quad (5.53)$$

Recall C_2 from step 2b and deduce by Hölder's inequality that, for $2\theta \leq a_\eta \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$ and $3\delta \leq \exp(-C_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -\lambda \int_{t_0}^T \varphi'_\delta(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ 4\lambda \kappa_0 \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \\ & = 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ 4\lambda \kappa_0 \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,2\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \mathbb{1}_{((\cap_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} A_\eta^{1,j}) \cap A^{2,i})^c} \right] \\ & \leq 1 + C_3(\delta, \lambda')^{\lambda/\lambda'} (\eta d + \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1}))^{1-\lambda/\lambda'}. \end{aligned}$$

For $3\delta \leq \exp(-C_2)$, we may choose $\varepsilon \leq \widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta) \wedge \delta$ with $C_3(\delta, \lambda')^{\lambda/\lambda'} [2 \exp(-\widehat{\varepsilon}^{-1}(\delta))]^{1-\lambda/\lambda'} = 1$ and then $\eta d \leq \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1})$, with $a_\eta \leq \varepsilon$, and $\theta \leq \min(a_\eta/2, \theta_1(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda))$ (with $\theta_1(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda)$ as in Step 1b). We get that the above right-hand side is less than 2, which is the analogue of (5.49).

d. By collecting (5.2), (5.49) and the above conclusion with $\lambda' = \lambda + 1$ and by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{t_0}^T \varphi'_{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq 2, \quad (5.54)$$

for the following choices: $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_0 := \exp(-C_2)/3$, $\kappa_0 \geq \bar{\kappa}_0 := \max(2, 4\kappa_2 + 1 + \lambda/2)$, $\varepsilon \leq \min(1/\sqrt{16\lambda + 16}, \delta, \sqrt{\kappa_2/\kappa_0}, \widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta))$ and $\theta \leq \min(\theta_1(\delta, \varepsilon, \lambda), a_\eta)$, for $\eta d \leq \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1})$ such that $a_\eta \leq \varepsilon$. We recall that the condition $\varepsilon^2 \leq \sqrt{\kappa_2/\kappa_0}$ is required to ensure that $\varphi_{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}$ is non-increasing. This is one part of the inequality in the definition of the term Ψ showing up in (5.17). In fact, the term with $\varphi_{\theta,\delta}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon})$ in Ψ is bounded in the same way since $\varphi_{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon} \leq -(\varphi'_\theta + \varphi'_\delta)$ for $2\theta \leq \delta \leq 1$, yielding (for the same range of parameters)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{t_0}^T \varphi_{\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq 2. \quad (5.55)$$

Step 3. We now handle the term with $1/p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}$ in (5.17).

a. On the one hand, recalling that $\kappa_0 \geq 2$, using (5.53) and arguing as above, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \leq 2,$$

again for $\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \theta, \delta, \varepsilon$ as in item d of the second step.

b. On the other hand, by following the second step, for $2\theta \leq a_\eta \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[\delta,1]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \right] \\ & \leq \exp(\lambda T e^{C_2}) + \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{[\delta,1]}(p_t^{i,\theta,\delta,\varepsilon}) dt \right\} \mathbb{1}_{((\cap_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} A_\eta^{1,j}) \cap A^{2,i})^c} \right] \\ & \leq \exp(\lambda T e^{C_2}) + \exp\left(\frac{\lambda T}{\delta}\right) (\eta d + \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Following item 2c, we can render the last term in the right-hand side less than 1.

c. We then combine items 3a and 3b by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. And, then by Hölder inequality, we gather all the three cases addressed in item 2d and in this third step to get (5.17), provided we replace λ therein by $\lambda/6$ and then fix the various parameters as in item 2d with the additional constraint that $2 \exp(\lambda T/\delta) \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1}) \leq 1$ (which is equivalent to $\varepsilon \leq (\ln(2) + \lambda T/\delta)^{-1}$).

Step 4. We now want to prove (5.18) and (5.19). Throughout the step, we fix the value of λ .

a. We recall that, for $0 < \delta \leq \bar{\delta}_0$, $\widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta)$ is defined as

$$\widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta) = \min \left(\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\lambda}}, \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_0}}, \delta, \left(\ln(2[C_3(\delta, \lambda + 1)]^\lambda) \right)^{-1}, (\ln(2) + \lambda T/\delta)^{-1} \right),$$

where $C_3(\delta, \lambda + 1)$ is a non-increasing function of δ . (We omit to specify the dependence of $\widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta)$ upon λ and \mathcal{K} .) Clearly, $\widehat{\varepsilon}$ is non-decreasing on $(0, \bar{\delta}_0]$, takes positive values and has 0 as limit in 0. We then define

$$\bar{\varepsilon}(\delta) := \int_0^\delta \widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta') d\delta'.$$

It is straightforward to verify that, for $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta}_0]$, $0 < \bar{\varepsilon}(\delta) \leq \delta \widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta) < \widehat{\varepsilon}(\delta)$ (assume without any loss of generality that $\bar{\delta}_0 \leq 1$). Moreover, $\bar{\varepsilon}$ extends by continuity to $[0, \bar{\delta}_0]$, letting $\bar{\varepsilon}(0) = 0$, and the extension, still denoted by $\bar{\varepsilon}$, is continuous and strictly increasing.

b. We now define $\widehat{\delta} : [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0] \ni \varepsilon \mapsto \widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon) \in [0, \bar{\delta}_0]$ as the converse of the mapping $\bar{\varepsilon} : [0, \bar{\delta}_0] \ni \delta \mapsto \bar{\varepsilon}(\delta) \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$, where $\bar{\varepsilon}_0 = \bar{\varepsilon}(\bar{\delta}_0)$. Conclusion (5.18) hence follows from (5.17), noticing that, for any $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_0]$, $\varepsilon = \bar{\varepsilon}(\widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon)) < \widehat{\varepsilon}(\widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon))$, from which we indeed deduce that $\Psi(\lambda, \theta, \widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon, \mathcal{K}) \leq \bar{C}$, for $\theta \leq \widehat{\theta}(\widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$. As for (5.19), it follows from Step 2b, recalling that, under our choice for η , the probability of $(\cap_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} A_\eta^{1,j}) \cap A^{2,i}$ is less than $2 \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.6. We first prove (5.20). For simplicity, we write \mathbf{p} for $\mathbf{p}_{[t_0, p_0]}^{\theta, \widehat{\delta}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon}$ and φ for $\varphi_{\theta, \delta, \varepsilon}$. Using the same notation as in (5.44) and applying Itô's formula, we expand

$$\begin{aligned} d \frac{1}{(p_t^i)^\ell} &= \left\{ -\ell \frac{1}{(p_t^i)^{\ell+1}} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \left(p_t^j (\varphi(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j,i}) - p_t^i (\varphi(p_t^j) + \alpha_t^{i,j}) \right) + \ell(\ell+1) \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \frac{1 - p_t^i}{(p_t^i)^{\ell+1}} \right\} dt \\ &\quad - \ell \varepsilon \frac{\sqrt{p_t^i(1 - p_t^i)}}{(p_t^i)^{\ell+1}} d\widetilde{W}_t^i. \end{aligned}$$

Letting

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t \left(\ell \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \varphi(p_s^j) + \ell(\ell+1) \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{p_s^i} - 1 \right) \right) ds \right\}, \quad t \in [t_0, T],$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} d \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_t^{-1}}{(p_t^i)^\ell} \right) &= -\ell \frac{\mathcal{E}_t^{-1}}{(p_t^i)^{\ell+1}} \sum_{j \neq i} p_t^j (\varphi(p_t^i) + \alpha_t^{j,i}) dt + \ell \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mathcal{E}_t^{-1}}{(p_t^i)^\ell} \alpha_t^{i,j} dt + dm_t \\ &\leq (d-1) \ell M \frac{\mathcal{E}_t^{-1}}{(p_t^i)^\ell} dt + dm_t, \end{aligned}$$

where m_t is a local martingale. By a standard localization, we deduce that there exists an increasing sequence of (localizing) stopping times $(\sigma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converging to T such that

$$\forall t \in [t_0, T], \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^{-1}}{(p_{t \wedge \sigma_n}^i)^\ell} \right] \leq C + \ell M \int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}_{s \wedge \sigma_n}^{-1}}{(p_{s \wedge \sigma_n}^i)^\ell} \right] ds,$$

for a constant C that is allowed to vary from line to line as long as it only depends on the parameters quoted in the statement of the lemma (in particular, it is independent of n). Thus Gronwall's lemma and then Fatou's lemma (letting n tend to ∞) give

$$\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}_t^{-1}}{(p_t^i)^\ell} \right] \leq C.$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and then the above inequality, with ℓ replaced by 2ℓ , we obtain

$$\sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(p_t^i)^\ell} \right] \leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T \left(2\ell \sum_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \varphi(p_s^j) + \ell(2\ell+1) \frac{1}{p_s^i} \right) ds \right\} \right] \right)^{1/2},$$

which is bounded by a constant thanks to (5.17), choosing λ in terms of ℓ and d .

The proof of (5.21) follows from the same argument and then from Doob's maximal inequality (to pass the supremum inside the expectation), see for instance [1, Proof of Proposition 2.3]. \square

6. UNIQUENESS FOR THE MASTER EQUATION

Here, our aim is to show Theorem 2.7, namely that \mathcal{V} , the value function of the potential game, is the unique viscosity solution of the HJ equation (2.21) and that its derivative $V = \mathfrak{D}\mathcal{V}$ is the unique solution, in a suitable class which we will determine, of the conservative form (2.31) of the master equation of the MFG. In this regard, it is worth emphasizing that we work below with the local coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, x^{-d}) = (p_1, \dots, p_d)$ for $p \in \mathcal{S}_d$ (and thus $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$). We recall that, for any $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, we have $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}(t, x) = \mathcal{V}(t, \check{x})$, where $\check{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, x^{-d})$, and we denote $x^{-d} = 1 - \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_j$. Following (3.5), (2.21) may be indeed rewritten

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widehat{\mathcal{V}} + \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(x, D_x \widehat{\mathcal{V}}) + \widehat{F}(x) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (6.1a)$$

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}(T, x) = \widehat{G}(x), \end{cases} \quad (6.1b)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, and with $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ as in (5.10). Its derivative $Z = D_x \widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ should satisfy (2.31), at least when the latter is formulated in local coordinates, namely

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Z^i + \partial_{x_i} [\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(x, Z) + \widehat{F}(x)] = 0, \\ Z^i(T, x) = \partial_{x_i} \widehat{G}(x), \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

the latter reading as a multidimensional hyperbolic system of PDEs. Let us point out a common difficulty in the study of the above two equations: Both are set in a bounded domain, but there are no boundary conditions in space, which is due to the fact that the dynamics of the forward characteristics of the MFG system do not see the boundary of the simplex when starting from its interior.

Concerning the HJ equation (6.1a), there are no \mathcal{C}^1 solutions in general, which prompts us to consider viscosity solutions. Below, we first handle the HJ equation of the MFCP and then turn to the well-posedness of the conservative form of the master equation. The idea for proving uniqueness of the latter is to construct a correspondence between weak solutions in a suitable class and viscosity solutions of the HJ equation.

6.1. HJ equation for the MFCP. In this subsection, we assume that F and G are just Lipschitz-continuous. As we have just said, the HJ equation (6.1a) is set in a bounded domain but without any boundary conditions in space. We hence define viscosity solutions in the interior of the simplex only:

Definition 6.1. A function $v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$ (hence defined in local coordinates) is said to be:

- (i) a viscosity subsolution of (6.1a) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ if, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$,
- $$-\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) \leq 0, \quad (6.3)$$

at every $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ which is a local maximum of $v - \psi$ on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$;

- (ii) a viscosity supersolution of (6.1a) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ if, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$,

$$-\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) \geq 0, \quad (6.4)$$

at every $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ which is a local minimum of $v - \psi$ on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$;

- (iii) a viscosity solution of (6.1a) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution of (6.1a) in $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$.

In order to prove uniqueness of viscosity solutions, in absence of boundary conditions in space, we must use the fact that the forward characteristics, given by an equation of the type (2.2) with α bounded therein, do not leave the interior of the simplex. The result is the following:

Theorem 6.2 (Comparison Principle). *Let u, v be Lipschitz continuous in $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, u be a viscosity subsolution and v be a viscosity supersolution, respectively, of (6.1a) in $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. If $u(T, x) \leq v(T, x)$ for any $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, then $u(t, x) \leq v(t, x)$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$.*

Before giving the proof, we state an immediate consequence.

Corollary 6.3. *There exists a unique viscosity solution of (6.1a) in $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ that is Lipschitz continuous in $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ and satisfies the terminal condition (6.1b). It is the value function \mathcal{V} of the MFCP.*

Proof. Uniqueness holds in $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ by the above theorem. The fact that the value function is a viscosity solution in $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ is given by Theorem 7.4.14 of [6] (as we already accounted in the statement of Proposition 5.2). \square

Proof of Theorem 6.2. We borrow ideas from the proofs of Theorem 3.8 and Proposition 7.3 in [47]. The idea is to define a supersolution v_h that dominates u at points near the boundary, for any h , and then use the comparison principle and pass to the limit in h . The parameter h is needed to force v_h to be infinity at the boundary of the simplex. Since the simplex has corners, the distance to the boundary is not a smooth function, so the first step is to construct a nice test function that goes to 0 as x approaches the boundary. Roughly speaking, we consider the product of the distances to the faces of the simplex, and then take its logarithm.

Step 1. Let $\rho_i(x)$, for $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, be the distance from x to the hyperplane $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : y_i = 0\}$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, and $\rho_d(x)$ be the distance to $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} y_l = 1\}$. Specifically,

for $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, we have

$$\rho_i(x) = \begin{cases} x_i & i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket, \\ x^{-d}/\sqrt{d-1} & i = d, \end{cases}$$

where we recall that $x^{-d} = 1 - \sum_{l \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_l$. Clearly $\rho_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$.

Since u and v are Lipschitz-continuous, we may let $R := \max\{\|D_x u\|_\infty, \|D_x v\|_\infty\}$, which is licit since the gradients are defined almost everywhere. Hence it is easy to show¹² that u and v are viscosity subsolution and supersolution, respectively, in $\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, of the modified HJB equation

$$\partial_t \widehat{\mathcal{V}} + \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, D_x \widehat{\mathcal{V}}) + \widehat{F}(x) = 0, \quad (6.5)$$

with $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z) = \sum_{k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} x_k \widehat{H}_{2R}^k(z) + x^{-d} \widehat{H}_{2R}^d(z)$, where \widehat{H}_{2R}^i , for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, is given by (3.6), with M replaced by $2R$ therein and also in the definition (2.16) of a^* , which we denote here by a_{2R}^* (see also (3.2) for the way the latter shows up in the Hamiltonian). This modified Hamiltonian has the property that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z) = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(x, z)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ such that $|z| \leq R$, and is further globally Lipschitz continuous in (x, z) and concave in $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, even if not strictly. Now, we show that there exists a constant C_R , depending on R , such that

$$\langle D_z \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z), D\rho_i(x) \rangle \geq -C_R \rho_i(x), \quad (6.6)$$

for any $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Indeed, we have

$$\partial_{x_j} \rho_i(x) = \begin{cases} \delta_{i,j} & i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket, \\ -1/\sqrt{d-1} & i = d. \end{cases}$$

Similar to (3.4), we also have, for $j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$,

$$\partial_{z_j} \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z) = \sum_{k \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} (x_k a_{2R}^*(z_k - z_j) - x_j a_{2R}^*(z_j - z_k)) + x^{-d} a_{2R}^*(-z_j) - x_j a_{2R}^*(z_j).$$

Hence, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$,

$$\langle D_z \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z), D\rho_i(x) \rangle = \partial_{z_i} \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z) \geq -2R(d-1)x_i = -2R(d-1)\rho_i(x),$$

while (noticing that the contribution of the first sum in the expansion of $D_z \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}$ is null in the computation below)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D_z \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(x, z), D\rho_d(x) \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \left(x_j a_{2R}^*(z_j) - x^{-d} a_{2R}^*(-z_j) \right) \\ &\geq -2R \frac{d-1}{\sqrt{d-1}} x^{-d} = -2R(d-1)\rho_d(x), \end{aligned}$$

and thus (6.6) holds with $C_R = 2R(d-1)$.

Step 2. For any $h > 0$, let

$$v_h(t, x) := v(t, x) - h^2 \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \ln(\rho_i(x)) + h(T-t), \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d).$$

We claim that v_h is a viscosity supersolution of (6.5) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Let then $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$, and $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ be a local minimum of $v_h - \psi$ on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Since v is a viscosity supersolution of (6.5) in $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, considering the test function $\psi_h \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$ given by $\psi_h(t, x) = \psi(t, x) + h^2 \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \ln(\rho_i(x)) - h(T-t)$, we get

$$-\partial_t \psi_h(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(\bar{x}, D_x \psi_h(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) \geq 0.$$

¹²In short, the argument is as follows: If ψ is a continuously differentiable function such that $u - \psi$ has a minimum at some point $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, then necessarily $\|D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})\|_\infty \leq R$ and similarly when (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) is a maximum of $v - \psi$.

Using the concavity of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}$ in the second argument, see (3.2), and (6.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq -\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - h - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}\left(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) + h^2 \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \frac{D\rho_i(\bar{x})}{\rho_i(\bar{x})}\right) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) \\ &\leq -\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - h - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) \\ &\quad - \left\langle D_z \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}\left(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) + h^2 \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \frac{D\rho_i(\bar{x})}{\rho_i(\bar{x})}\right), h^2 \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \frac{D\rho_i(\bar{x})}{\rho_i(\bar{x})} \right\rangle \\ &\leq -\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - h - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) + h^2 d C_R, \end{aligned}$$

giving

$$-\partial_t \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2R}(\bar{x}, D_x \psi(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) - \widehat{F}(\bar{x}) \geq h - h^2 d C_R \geq 0 \quad \text{if } h \leq \frac{1}{d C_R},$$

which implies that v_h is a viscosity supersolution of (6.5) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$.

Step 3. As $\rho_i \leq 1$, we have $v_h(t, x) \geq v(t, x)$ for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. In particular, $v_h(T, x) \geq v(T, x) \geq u(T, x)$ for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. We denote $\rho(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d \rho_i(x)$. Since u and v are bounded, we find that for any $h > 0$ there exists $\eta > 0$ (which may depend on h) such that $-h^2 \ln \rho(x) \geq \|u\|_\infty + \|v\|_\infty$ if $\rho(x) \leq \eta$. We denote by $\Gamma^\eta = \{x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d : \rho(x) = \eta\}$, $\mathcal{O}^\eta = \{x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d : \rho(x) \geq \eta\}$, and $\mathcal{O}_c^\eta = \{x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d : \rho(x) \leq \eta\}$; note that \mathcal{O}^η is a smooth domain. Thus $v_h(t, x) \geq u(t, x)$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \mathcal{O}_c^\eta$, in particular for any $x \in \Gamma^\eta$. Therefore we can apply the comparison principle (Theorem 9.1 page 90 in [27]) in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{O}^\eta$, because $u, v_h \in \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times \mathcal{O}^\eta)$: we obtain $u \leq v_h$ on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{O}^\eta$ and hence $u \leq v_h$ on the entire $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, since we already have $u \leq v_h$ on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{O}_c^\eta$. Finally, the conclusion follows by sending h to 0, as $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} v_h(t, x) = v(t, x)$ for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. \square

6.2. Uniqueness of the MFG master equation. We now turn to the analysis of (6.2). Clearly, it has to be understood in the sense of distributions. We assume in this subsection that F and G are in $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathcal{S}_d)$. The multidimensional hyperbolic system (6.2) is known to be ill-posed in general; nevertheless, in this specific potential case, it is possible to prove uniqueness of solutions in a suitable class, thanks to a result of Kruzkov [38]. We remark that the system is hyperbolic in the wide sense, but not strictly hyperbolic. We denote $\mathcal{Q}_T = (0, T) \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_T = [0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, $\mathfrak{f}(x, z) = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(x, z) + \widehat{F}(x)$ and $\mathfrak{g}(x) = D_x \widehat{G}(x)$.

The set of weak solutions in which we prove uniqueness is the following:

Definition 6.4. A function $Z \in [\mathcal{C}([0, T]; (L^\infty(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d), *))^{d-1}]$ (where $*$ denotes the weak star topology $\sigma^*(L^\infty(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d), L^1(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$) is said to be an admissible solution to the Cauchy problem (6.2) if the following three properties hold true:

- (1) For any $\varphi = (\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^{d-1}) \in \mathcal{C}_C^1(\mathcal{Q}_T; \mathbb{R}^{d-1})$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Q}_T} \left[Z^i \partial_t \varphi^i + \mathfrak{f}(x, Z) \partial_{x_i} \varphi^i \right] dx dt = 0; \quad (6.7)$$

- (2) At time $t = T$, $Z(T, \cdot) = \mathfrak{g}$ a.e.; in particular, by time continuity of Z with respect to the weak star topology,

$$Z(t, \cdot) \xrightarrow{*} \mathfrak{g} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow T; \quad (6.8)$$

- (3) There exists a universal constant c such that, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_C^1(\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d); \mathbb{R}_+)$ (where the index C means that ψ is compactly supported) and any nonnegative matrix $A = (A_{i,j})_{i,j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket}$ with $\text{Trace}(A) \leq 1$,

$$\int_{\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)} [\langle D_x \psi, AZ \rangle + c\psi] dx \geq 0. \quad (6.9)$$

By Banach-Steinhaus theorem, note that $Z \in [\mathcal{C}([0, T]; (L^\infty(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d), \sigma^*(L^\infty(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d), L^1(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))))^{d-1}]$ implies $Z \in L^\infty(\mathcal{Q}_T; \mathbb{R}^{d-1})$.

Before we say more about the solvability of (6.2), we feel useful to elucidate the connection between (6.2) and the original form (2.27) of the master equation. For sure, the main difference between the two is that the former is in conservative form while the latter is not, but also the reader must pay attention to the fact that (6.2) is in local coordinates (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) while (2.27) is written in intrinsic coordinates (p_1, \dots, p_d) . Obviously, (2.27) can be easily written in local coordinates, which makes it easier to compare with (6.2). Similar to (3.9), but with $\varphi = \varepsilon = 0$, the version in local coordinates writes (indices in the sums belonging to $\llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widehat{U}^i + H((\widehat{U}^i - \widehat{U}^j)_{j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket}) + \sum_{j,k} (x_k (\widehat{U}^k - \widehat{U}^j)_+ - x_j (\widehat{U}^j - \widehat{U}^k)_+) \partial_{x_j} \widehat{U}^i \\ \quad + \sum_j (x^{-d} (\widehat{U}^d - \widehat{U}^j)_+ - x_j (\widehat{U}^j - \widehat{U}^d)_+) \partial_{x_j} \widehat{U}^i + \widehat{f}^i(x) = 0, \\ \widehat{U}^i(T, x) = \widehat{g}^i(x), \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. As we explained in Subsections 2.4 and 3.2, the key step to pass from one formulation to another is Schwarz identity. The following statement clarifies this fact.

Proposition 6.5. *We have*

- (1) *if $U \in [\mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)]^d$ is a classical solution of the master equation (2.27) and \widehat{U} denotes its version in local coordinates, then Z defined by $Z^i = \widehat{U}^i - \widehat{U}^d$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$, is a weak admissible solution to (6.2); it satisfies $\partial_{x_j} Z^i = \partial_{x_i} Z^j$ for any $i, j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$;*
- (2) *if Z is a weak solution to (6.2), in the sense that it satisfies (6.7), and Z is in $[\mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)]^{d-1}$, then the master equation (2.27) has a (unique) classical solution $U \in [\mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)]^d$; denoting \widehat{U} its version in local coordinates, the latter satisfies $Z^i = \widehat{U}^i - \widehat{U}^d$, for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$.*

The proof of Proposition 6.5 is postponed to the end of the section, as we feel better to focus now on the following statement, which is the refined version of Theorem 2.7. Indeed, the next theorem establishes uniqueness of admissible solutions to (6.2), by determining a correspondence with viscosity solutions to (6.1a–6.1b). The proof is to establish first a connection between admissible solutions to (6.2) and *semiconcave* solutions to (6.1a–6.1b) and then to show that viscosity and semiconcave solutions to (6.1a–6.1b) are equivalent. We recall that, in our case, a function $v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ is called semiconcave (in space) if there exists a constant c such that, for any $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and ξ with $x \pm \xi \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$,

$$\frac{v(t, x + \xi) - 2v(t, x) + v(t, x - \xi)}{|\xi|^2} \leq c. \quad (6.11)$$

We stress that only semiconcavity in space is needed in the analysis below (for simplicity, we just call it semiconcavity), although the value function \mathcal{V} is shown to be semiconcave in time and space in Proposition 5.2 (v), see (5.13). In this framework, condition (6.9) can be referred to as a weak semiconcavity condition, since it reads as the derivative of the above condition. Indeed, assuming for a moment that v is \mathcal{C}^2 , (6.11) can be equivalently formulated by saying that $\sum_{i,j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} A_{i,j} \partial_{x_i, x_j}^2 v \leq c$ for any non-negative matrix A with $\text{Trace}(A) \leq 1$ (write for instance A as the square of a symmetric matrix). Hence, denoting $z = D_x v$ and integrating by parts, we obtain (6.9). We say that v is a semiconcave solution if (6.11) holds, v is Lipschitz-continuous in $[0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, Equation (6.1a) holds almost everywhere and the terminal condition (6.1b) is satisfied (everywhere).

The proof of the following theorem is mostly due to Kruzkov [38], see Theorem 8 therein; for the sake of completeness, we write its adaptation to our framework (as the state variable here belongs to the simplex).

Theorem 6.6. *There exists a unique admissible solution to (6.2). It is given by $D_x \widehat{\mathcal{V}}$, where \mathcal{V} is the value function of the inviscid MFCP and $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is its version in local chart.*

Proof. As we have just explained, we first establish a connection between admissible solutions to (6.2) and semiconcave solutions to (6.1a–6.1b) and, then, we show equivalence between semiconcave and viscosity solutions to (6.1a–6.1b).

Step 1. Let $Z \in [\mathcal{C}([0, T]; (L^\infty(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d), *))^{d-1}]$ be an admissible solution to (6.2). Let $w \in \mathcal{C}_C^2(\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$ and $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_C^\infty((0, T))$, and for fixed $i \neq j$ choose as test functions $\varphi^i(t, x) = \zeta(t)\partial_{x_j}w(x)$, $\varphi^j(t, x) = \zeta(t)\partial_{x_i}w(x)$. Then (6.7) provides

$$\int_0^T \partial_t \zeta(t) \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} [Z^i(t, x)\partial_{x_j}w(x) - Z^j(t, x)\partial_{x_i}w(x)] dx dt = 0,$$

which, by the fundamental lemma of the calculus of variations, implies that the quantity $\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} [Z^i(t, x)\partial_{x_j}w(x) - Z^j(t, x)\partial_{x_i}w(x)] dx$ is a constant for almost every $t \in [0, T]$. Hence (6.8) and the fact that the final condition is a gradient yield

$$\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} [Z^i(t, x)\partial_{x_j}w(x) - Z^j(t, x)\partial_{x_i}w(x)] dx = 0, \quad \text{for all } w \in \mathcal{C}_C^2(\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)), \quad (6.12)$$

which means that $Z(t, \cdot)$ admits a potential, in the weak sense, for almost every t .

Step 2. Fix $(s, y) \in \mathcal{Q}_T$ and choose as test function φ the mollification kernel $\rho_h(t, x) = h^{-d}\rho((s-t)/h, (y-x)/h)$. Then (6.7) gives

$$\partial_t Z_h^i + \partial_{x_i} \mathfrak{f}_h = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q}_T^h, \quad (6.13)$$

where $Z_h^i = \rho_h * Z^i$, $\mathfrak{f}_h = \rho_h * (\mathfrak{f}(\cdot, Z))$ and \mathcal{Q}_T^h is the set of (s, y) in \mathcal{Q}_T with a distance to the (time-space) boundary that is greater than or equal to h . Thanks to (6.12), Z_h derives from a potential for fixed t , and the equation above implies that $(-\mathfrak{f}_h, Z_h^1, \dots, Z_h^d)$ also derives from a potential (but in time and space) for $(t, x) \in \mathcal{Q}_T^h$. Thus there exists a function v_h defined in \mathcal{Q}_T^h such that $\partial_t v_h = -\mathfrak{f}_h$ and $\partial_{x_i} v_h = Z_h^i$; since v_h is defined up to a constant, we fix $v_h(T-h, x^M) = \widehat{G}(x^M)$, where $x^M = (1/d, \dots, 1/d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is the point in the middle of the simplex.

By condition (6.9), substituting again the mollification kernel and integrating over t , we obtain, on \mathcal{Q}_T^h ,

$$\sum_{i,j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} A_{i,j} \partial_{x_i, x_j}^2 v_h \leq c, \quad (6.14)$$

for any nonnegative matrix A with $\text{Trace}(A) \leq 1$, which implies in particular that for any vector ν with $|\nu| = 1$ we have, also on \mathcal{Q}_T^h ,

$$\frac{\partial^2 v_h}{\partial \nu^2} \leq c. \quad (6.15)$$

Step 3. Let $h \rightarrow 0$. We have $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \partial_t v_h = -\mathfrak{f}(x, Z)$ and $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} D_x v_h = Z$ almost everywhere in \mathcal{Q}_T . By Ascoli-Arzelà theorem and by boundedness of \mathfrak{f}_h and Z_h , uniformly in $h > 0$, the sequence $(v_h)_{h>0}$ is precompact in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_T)$ endowed with the topology of uniform convergence, it being understood that we extend v_h outside \mathcal{Q}_T^h as a Lipschitz function. Let v be any limit point. We have necessarily that v is Lipschitz continuous (with a fixed Lipschitz constant) on $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_T$ and has weak derivatives $\partial_t v = -\mathfrak{f}(x, Z)$ and $D_x v = Z$ a.e. in \mathcal{Q}_T , proving that $\partial_t v + \mathfrak{f}(x, D_x v) = 0$ a.e. in \mathcal{Q}_T .

Since $v_h(T-h, x^M) = \widehat{G}(x^M)$, we get $v(T, x^M) = \widehat{G}(x^M)$. Moreover, for any test function $w \in \mathcal{C}_C^2(\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d))$ and any $h > 0$ that is less than the distance $\text{dist}(\text{Supp}(w), \partial \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ from the support of w to the boundary of the simplex, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} v_h(T-h, x) D_x w(x) dx \\ &= - \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} Z_h(T-h, x) w(x) dx \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

$$= - \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} (\rho_h * Z)(T - h, x) w(x) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h(s, y) \left[\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} Z(T - h - s, x) w(x + y) dx \right] ds dy.$$

By (6.8), we know that, for any $|y| \leq \text{dist}(\text{Supp}(w), \partial \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)/2$, $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} [\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} Z(T - h, x) w(x + y) dx] = \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} \mathbf{g}(x) w(x + y) dx$. Since the function in argument of the limit is uniformly continuous with respect to y , the convergence holds uniformly with respect to y . Hence, the right-hand side in (6.16) converges to $-\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} \mathbf{g}(x) w(x) dx$. Since the left-hand side in (6.16) converges to $\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} v(T, x) D_x w(x) dx$, we deduce that $D_x v(T, \cdot) = D_x \widehat{G} = \mathbf{g}$ a.e. and then $v(T, \cdot) = \widehat{G}$ on $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ since both are continuous and coincide in x^M .

Lastly, by inequality (6.15) (writing first the inequality below for v_h and then taking the limit as h tends to 0)

$$v(t, x + \xi) - 2v(t, x) + v(t, x - \xi) \leq c|\xi|^2,$$

for any $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and ξ such that $x \pm \xi \in \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, thus (6.11) holds. Hence, we have proved that v is a semiconcave solution to the Cauchy problem (6.1a–6.1b) and $z = D_x v$ a.e. in \mathcal{Q}_T .

Step 4. On the converse, if v is a semiconcave solution to (6.1a) then, for any $t \in [0, T]$, $v(t, \cdot)$ is a.e. differentiable in x . By integration by parts, it is clear that, for any $w \in \mathcal{C}_C^1(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, the function $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d} D_x v(t, x) w(x) dx$ is continuous. Since $D_x v \in L^\infty(\mathcal{Q}_T)$, the result easily extends to any $w \in L^1(\mathcal{S}_d)$, hence proving that $D_x v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; (L^\infty(\mathcal{S}_d), *))$. Also, v is a.e. differentiable in (t, x) and the (t, x) -derivative clearly satisfies (6.7). Obviously, (6.8) holds true. So we have just to check (6.9). For any $h > 0$, let $v'_h := \rho_h * v$ (it being understood that v can be extended in a Lipschitz fashion outside \mathcal{Q}_T). From (6.11) we derive again inequality (6.15), but with v_h replaced by v'_h , and then (6.14) follows. Multiplying (6.14) by $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_C^1(\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d); \mathbb{R}_+)$ (provided that h is smaller than $\text{dist}(\text{Supp}(\psi), \partial \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$) and integrating by parts we get (for any nonnegative matrix A with a trace lower than or equal to 1)

$$\int_{\text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)} [\langle D_x \psi, A D_x v'_h \rangle + c\psi] dx \geq 0,$$

and letting $h \rightarrow 0$ we obtain (6.9).

Step 5. It remains to show that there is a correspondence between semiconcave and viscosity solutions to (6.1a)–(6.1b). By Corollary 6.3, any viscosity solution \mathcal{V} is in fact the value function of the MFCP. By items (iv) and (v) in Proposition 5.2, the value function is Lipschitz continuous and semiconcave. By Proposition 3.1.7 in [6], \mathcal{V} solves (6.1a) almost everywhere. On the converse, if v is a semiconcave solution then it is also a viscosity solution on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ by Theorem 10.2 in [45]. By Corollary 6.3, it hence coincides with the value function. \square

We now turn:

Proof of Proposition 6.5.

Step 1. We first assume that U is a classical solution of the master equation (2.27) or equivalently that $\widehat{U} \in [\mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)]^d$ is a classical solution to (6.10). Then, $(Z^i = \widehat{U}^i - \widehat{U}^d)_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket}$ is a (classical) solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t Z^i + \widehat{H}^i(Z) - \widehat{H}^d(Z) + \sum_{j,k} (x_k(Z^k - Z^j)_+ - x_j(Z^j - Z^k)_+) \partial_{x_j} Z^i \\ \quad + \sum_j (x^{-d}(-Z^j)_+ - x_j(Z^j)_+) \partial_{x_j} Z^i + \widehat{f}^i(x) - \widehat{f}^d(x) = 0, \\ Z^i(T, x) = \widehat{g}^i(x) - \widehat{g}^d(x), \end{cases} \quad (6.17)$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \text{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$. Obviously, the system of characteristics of (6.17) is nothing but the Pontryagin system (in local coordinates) (5.11), see (ii) in Proposition 5.2. Hence, the fact that Z is a classical solution of (6.17) implies that (5.11) has a unique

solution, for any initial condition (t_0, x_0) of the forward equation in (5.11). The argument is pretty standard: By expanding $(Z^i(t, x_t))_{t_0 \leq t \leq T}$ and then comparing with the backward equation, we prove that any solution (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) of (5.11) must be of the form $z_t^i = Z^i(t, x_t)$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and $t_0 \leq t \leq T$; Conversely, solving the forward equation with $z_t^i = Z^i(t, x_t)$, for $i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$ and $t_0 \leq t \leq T$, we can indeed easily construct a solution. In turn, we deduce that the inviscid MFCP admits a unique optimizer: By (i) in Proposition 5.2, there exists a minimizer; uniqueness follows from the fact the Pontryagin system (5.11) has a unique solution. By Proposition 5.2 (vii), the value function $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ of the MFCP is differentiable in any (t_0, x_0) and, by point (ix) in the same Proposition, $z_{t_0}^i = \partial_{x_i} \hat{\mathcal{V}}(t_0, x_0)$, whenever the forward equation in (5.11) starts from x_0 at time t_0 , but in turn $z_{t_0}^i = Z^i(t_0, x_0)$ hence showing that $Z^i(t, x) = \partial_{x_i} \mathcal{V}(t, x)$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, which implies that, on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is \mathcal{C}^2 and thus $\partial_{x_j} Z^i = \partial_{x_i} Z^j$ for any $i, j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket$. Recalling (5.10), it is plain to see that $\partial_{x_i} \hat{\mathcal{H}}(x, Z)$ coincides with the nonlinear terms in (6.17), which shows that Z is a solution to (6.2) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. It is straightforward to see that it satisfies (6.7) and (6.9), because \mathcal{V} is \mathcal{C}^2 and (obviously) semiconcave.

Step 2. Let $Z \in [\mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)]^{d-1}$ satisfy (6.7). From (6.12) and the fact that $Z \in [\mathcal{C}^1([0, T] \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)]^{d-1}$, we obtain that $\partial_{x_j} Z^i = \partial_{x_i} Z^j$ on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$. Thus Z solves (6.17) on $[0, T] \times \text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, but then it solves the equation also at the boundary, because it is differentiable up to the boundary. It remains to construct a classical solution to the master equation (6.10). To do so, it suffices to solve (6.10) with all the occurrences of $\hat{U}^k - \hat{U}^j$ replaced by $Z^k - Z^j$ and all the occurrences of $\hat{U}^j - \hat{U}^d$ replaced by Z^j . By doing so, we hence solve a linear system of transport equations with a vector field that is \mathcal{C}^1 . Despite the fact that the linear system is set on the simplex, there is no real difficulty for proving that the solution is also \mathcal{C}^1 . \square

APPENDIX A. WRIGHT-FISHER SPACES

We describe the so-called Wright-Fisher spaces used in the paper, as recently introduced in the monograph of Epstein and Mazzeo [25]. We here follow the exposition given in [1]. In short, these Wright-Fisher spaces are Hölder spaces, tailored made to the study of second order operators of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_t h(p) = \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} a_i(t, p) \partial_{p_i} h(p) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i, j \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} (p_i \delta_{i, j} - p_i p_j) \partial_{p_i p_j}^2 h(p), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $p \in \mathcal{S}_d$ and $a_i(p) \geq 0$ if $p_i = 0$. As we already alluded to, such operators are called Kimura operators; we refer to [21, 37, 48] for earlier analyses. Clearly, the second order term in (A.1) is degenerate, which is somehow the price to pay for forcing the corresponding SDE to stay in the simplex; in fact, the latter SDE is nothing but a Wright-Fisher SDE of the same type as (2.12), at least for a relevant choice of a . The key feature is that, under the identification of \mathcal{S}_d with $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ (see the introduction for the notation), we may regard the simplex as a $(d-1)$ -dimensional *manifold with corners*, the corners being obtained by intersecting at most d of the hyperplanes $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : x_1 = 0\}, \dots, \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : x_{d-1} = 0\}, \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : x_1 + \dots + x_{d-1} = 1\}$ with $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ (we then call the codimension of the corner the number of hyperplanes showing up in the intersection). Accordingly, we can rewrite (A.1) as an operator acting on functions from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ to \mathbb{R} , by reformulating (A.1) in terms of the sole $d-1$ first coordinates (p_1, \dots, p_{d-1}) or, more generally, in terms of $(p_i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket \setminus \{l\}}$ for any given coordinate $l \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$. Somehow, choosing the coordinate l amounts to choosing a system of local coordinates and the choice of l is mostly dictated by the position of (p_1, \dots, p_d) inside the simplex. Whenever all the entries of $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d)$ are positive, meaning that (p_1, \dots, p_d) belongs to the interior of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, the choice of l does not really matter and we work, for convenience, with $l = d$ (which is, in fact, what we have done throughout the paper).

In [1, Subsection 2.3.1], it is shown that the operator (A.1) fits the decomposition of [25, Definition 2.2.1], which allows to use the Schauder-like theory developed in the latter reference. We do not repeat the computations here, but we recall the following two facts: Firstly, the operator (A.1) is elliptic non-degenerate in the interior of the simplex, when written in local coordinates in $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ in the form

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_t \widehat{h}(x) = \sum_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \widehat{a}_i(t, x) \partial_{x_i} \widehat{h}(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i, j \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} (x_i \delta_{i, j} - x_i x_j) \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 \widehat{h}(x), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where now $x \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, \widehat{h} is a smooth function on $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ (which must be thought of $\widehat{h}(x) = h(\check{x})$) and $\widehat{a}_i(t, x) = a_i(t, \check{x})$; Secondly, for a point in the relative interior of a corner of codimension ℓ , there exist local coordinates, of the form $(p_i)_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket \setminus \{l\}}$ for a given l depending on the shape of the corner, such that, in the new coordinates, the operator satisfies the normal form required in [25, Definition 2.2.1] (the details of which are however useless here).

Hence, for a point $x^0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ in the relative interior of a corner \mathcal{C} of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ of codimension $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ (if $\ell = 0$, then x^0 is in the interior of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$), we may consider a new system of coordinates (y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}) (obtained as in the second point above) such that $\mathcal{C} = \{y \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d : y_{i_1} = \dots = y_{i_\ell} = 0\}$, for $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_\ell$. Letting $I := \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\}$ and denoting by $(y_1^0, \dots, y_{d-1}^0)$ the coordinates of x^0 in the new system (for sure $y_{i_j}^0 = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$), we may find a $\delta^0 > 0$ such that:

- (1) the closure $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ of $\mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0) := \{y \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^{d-1} : \sup_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} |y_i - y_i^0| < \delta^0\}$ is included in $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$,
- (2) for y in $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$, for $j \notin I$, $y_j > 0$,
- (3) for y in $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$, for $y_1 + \dots + y_{d-1} < 1 - \delta^0$.

A function \widehat{h} defined on $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ is then said to belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0))$, for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, if, in the new system of coordinates, \widehat{h} is Hölder continuous on $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ with respect to the distance

$$d(y, y') := \sum_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} |\sqrt{y_i} - \sqrt{y'_i}|. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We then let

$$\|\widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} := \sup_{y \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)} |\widehat{h}(y)| + \sup_{y, y' \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)} \frac{|\widehat{h}(y) - \widehat{h}(y')|}{d(y, y')^\gamma}.$$

Following [25, Lemma 5.2.5 and Definition 10.1.1], we say that a function \widehat{h} defined on $\mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}(\mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0))$ if, in the new system of coordinates,

- (1) \widehat{h} is continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)$ and \widehat{h} and its derivatives extend continuously to $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ and the resulting extensions belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0))$;
- (2) \widehat{h} is twice continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{U}_+(\delta^0, x^0) = \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0) \cap \{(y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^d : \forall i \in I, y_i > 0\}$. Moreover

$$\lim_{\min(y_i, y_j) \rightarrow 0_+} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \widehat{h}(y) = 0, \quad \lim_{y_i \rightarrow 0_+} \sqrt{y_i} \partial_{y_i y_k}^2 \widehat{h}(y) = 0, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and the functions $y \mapsto \sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \widehat{h}(y)$, $y \mapsto \sqrt{y_i} \partial_{y_i y_k}^2 \widehat{h}(y)$ and $y \mapsto \partial_{y_k y_l}^2 \widehat{h}(y)$ belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0))$ (meaning in particular that they can be extended by continuity to $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$).

We then let

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{h}\|_{2+\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} &:= \|\widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d-1 \rrbracket} \|\partial_{y_i} \widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} + \sum_{i, j \in I} \|\sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k, l \notin I} \|\partial_{y_k y_l}^2 \widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{k \notin I} \|\sqrt{y_i} \partial_{y_i y_k}^2 \widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \hat{h}$ is a shorten notation for $y \mapsto \sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \hat{h}(y)$ (and similarly for the others). For a given finite covering $\cup_{i=1}^K \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i})$ of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, which is then fixed in the rest of the discussion, a function \hat{h} is said to be in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, respectively in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ if \hat{h} belongs to each $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i}))$, respectively each $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}(\mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i}))$. Equivalently, we write $h \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\mathcal{S}_d)$ (respectively $h \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$), for a function h defined on \mathcal{S}_d , if the associated function \hat{h} defined on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ (respectively $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$). We then let

$$\|\hat{h}\|_{\text{WF},\gamma} := \sum_{i=1}^K \|\hat{h}\|_{\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i})}, \quad \|\hat{h}\|_{\text{WF},2+\gamma} := \sum_{i=1}^K \|\hat{h}\|_{2+\gamma; \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i})}.$$

We refer to [25, Chapter 10] and to [1, Subsection 2.3] for more details. Also, we feel useful to notice that, in Subsection 2.2, the spaces $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ are denoted $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0,2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, with a ‘0’ in superscript and without a ‘hat’ on \mathcal{S}_d , and similarly for the two norms $\|\hat{h}\|_{\text{WF},\gamma}$ and $\|\hat{h}\|_{\text{WF},2+\gamma}$, which are written $\|h\|_{\text{WF},0,\gamma}$ and $\|h\|_{\text{WF},0,2+\gamma}$ where $h : \mathcal{S}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is canonically associated with $\hat{h} : \hat{\mathcal{S}}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Our choice for inserting the additional index ‘0’ is made clear below.

Parabolic Wright-Fisher spaces. Similar definitions hold for the spaces $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$. They are respectively spaces of time-space functions that are γ -Hölder continuous functions and spaces of time-space functions that are continuously differentiable in time and twice continuously differentiable in space, with derivatives that are locally γ -Hölder continuous, Hölder continuity being understood in both cases with respect to the time-space distance (in the local system of coordinates)

$$D((t, y), (t', y')) := |t - t'|^{1/2} + d(y, y'). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

To make it clear, a function \hat{h} defined on $[0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ is said to belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0))$, for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, if, in the new system of coordinates, \hat{h} is Hölder continuous on $[0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ with respect to the distance D . We then let

$$\|\hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} := \sup_{(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)} |\hat{h}(t, y)| + \sup_{t, t' \in [0, T], y, y' \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)} \frac{|\hat{h}(t, y) - \hat{h}(t', y')|}{D((t, y), (t', y'))^\gamma}.$$

Following [25, Lemma 5.2.7], we say that a function \hat{h} defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)$ belongs to the space $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0))$ if, in the new system of coordinates,

- (1) \hat{h} is continuously differentiable on $(0, T) \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)$ and \hat{h} and its time and space derivatives extend continuously to $[0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0)$ and the resulting extensions belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0))$;
- (2) \hat{h} is twice continuously differentiable in space on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{U}_+(\delta^0, x^0)$. Moreover, for any $i, j \in I$ and any $k, l \notin I$,

$$\lim_{\min(y_i, y_j) \rightarrow 0_+} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \hat{h}(t, y) = 0, \quad \lim_{y_i \rightarrow 0_+} \sqrt{y_i} \partial_{y_i y_k}^2 \hat{h}(t, y) = 0, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and the functions $(t, y) \mapsto \sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \hat{h}(t, y)$, $(t, y) \mapsto \sqrt{y_i} \partial_{y_i y_k}^2 \hat{h}(t, y)$ and $(t, y) \mapsto \partial_{y_k y_l}^2 \hat{h}(t, y)$ belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \overline{\mathcal{U}}(\delta^0, x^0))$.

We then let

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{h}\|_{2+\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} &:= \|\hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} + \|\partial_t \hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} + \sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_{y_i} \hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} \\ &+ \sum_{i, j \in I} \|\sqrt{y_i y_j} \partial_{y_i y_j}^2 \hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} + \sum_{k, l \notin I} \|\partial_{y_k y_l}^2 \hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)} \\ &+ \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{k \notin I} \|\sqrt{y_i} \partial_{y_i y_k}^2 \hat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^0)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the fixed covering $\cup_{i=1}^K \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i})$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d$, a function \widehat{h} is said to be in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, respectively in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$ (as before, the definition extends equivalently to the associated function h defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$), if \widehat{h} belongs to each $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i}))$, respectively each $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i}))$. We then let

$$\|\widehat{h}\|_{\text{WF}, \gamma} := \sum_{i=1}^K \|\widehat{h}\|_{\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i})}, \quad \|\widehat{h}\|_{\text{WF}, 2+\gamma} := \sum_{i=1}^K \|\widehat{h}\|_{2+\gamma; [0, T] \times \mathcal{U}(\delta^0, x^{0,i})}.$$

As before, we stress the fact that, in the core of the text, we put an additional index ‘0’ and we removed the ‘hat’ in the notations $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^\gamma([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_d)$, $\|\widehat{h}\|_{\text{WF}, \gamma}$ and $\|\widehat{h}\|_{\text{WF}, 2+\gamma}$, hence writing $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, \gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$, $\|h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, \gamma}$ and $\|h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, 2+\gamma}$.

Hybrid spaces. We now introduce hybrid spaces of functions with mixed classical and Wright-Fisher regularity. Again, this notion is directly borrowed from [25, Chapter 5]. More precisely, a function h , defined on \mathcal{S}_d , belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, \gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ (respectively $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$), for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, if it is continuously differentiable on \mathcal{S}_d (meaning that it is continuously differentiable on the interior and the derivatives extend by continuity up to the boundary) and each $\partial_i h$, for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, \gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ (respectively $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, 2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$). For $h \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, \gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we then let

$$\|h\|_{\text{WF}, 1, \gamma} := \|h\|_\infty + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \|\partial_i h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, \gamma},$$

and, for $h \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$, we let

$$\|h\|_{\text{WF}, 1, 2+\gamma} := \|h\|_\infty + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \|\partial_i h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, 2+\gamma}.$$

The parabolic version of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_d)$ (which is the only one we need in the text) is defined in a similar way. A function h , defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d$, belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$, for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, if it belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$ (and is hence differentiable in space) and each $\partial_i h$, for $i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$, belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{0, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$. For $h \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{WF}}^{1, 2+\gamma}([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}_d)$, we then let

$$\|h\|_{\text{WF}, 1, 2+\gamma} := \|h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, \gamma} + \|\partial_t h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, \gamma} + \sum_{i \in \llbracket d \rrbracket} \|\partial_i h\|_{\text{WF}, 0, 2+\gamma}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Bayraktar, A. Cecchin, A. Cohen, and F. Delarue. Finite state mean field games with wright-fisher common noise. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- [2] E. Bayraktar and A. Cohen. Analysis of a finite state many player game using its master equation. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 56(5):3538–3568, 2018.
- [3] E. Bayraktar and X. Zhang. On non-uniqueness in mean field games. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, To appear.
- [4] A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and S. C. P. Yam. The master equation in mean field theory. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 103(6):1441–1474, 2015.
- [5] C. Bertucci, J.-M. Lasry, and P.-L. Lions. Some remarks on mean field games. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 44(3):205–227, 2019.
- [6] P. Cannarsa and C. Sinestrari. *Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, and optimal control*, volume 58 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2004.
- [7] P. Cardaliaguet. Notes on mean field games. <https://www.ceremade.dauphine.fr/~cardalia/MFG20130420.pdf/>, 2013.
- [8] P. Cardaliaguet. Weak solutions for first order mean field games with local coupling. *Analysis and Geometry in Control Theory and its Applications. Springer INdAM Series*, 11:111–158, 2015.
- [9] P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, J.-M. Lasry, and P.-L. Lions. *The master equation and the convergence problem in mean field games*, volume 201 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2019.
- [10] P. Cardaliaguet and J. Graber. Mean field games systems of first order. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 21:690–722, 2015.

- [11] P. Cardaliaguet, J. Graber, A. Porretta, and D. Tonon. Second order mean field games with degenerate diffusion and local coupling. *NoDEA*, 22:1287–1317, 2015.
- [12] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(4):2705–2734, 2013.
- [13] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*, volume 83 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games.
- [14] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. II*, volume 84 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. Mean field games with common noise and master equations.
- [15] R. Carmona, F. Delarue, and D. Lacker. Probabilistic analysis of mean field games with a common noise. *Annals of Probability*, 44:3740–3803, 2016.
- [16] A. Cecchin, P. Dai Pra, M. Fischer, and G. Pelino. On the convergence problem in mean field games: a two state model without uniqueness. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57(4):2443–2466, 2019.
- [17] A. Cecchin and M. Fischer. Probabilistic approach to finite state mean field games. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 2018.
- [18] A. Cecchin and G. Pelino. Convergence, fluctuations and large deviations for finite state mean field games via the master equation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(11):4510 – 4555, 2019.
- [19] J.-F. Chassagneux, D. Crisan, and F. Delarue. Numerical method for FBSDEs of McKean-Vlasov type. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 29(3):1640–1684, 2019.
- [20] J.-F. Chassagneux, D. Crisan, and F. Delarue. A probabilistic approach to classical solutions of the master equation for large population equilibria. *Memoirs of the AMS*, To appear.
- [21] L. Chen and D. W. Stroock. The fundamental solution to the Wright-Fisher equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(2):539–567, 2010.
- [22] F. Delarue. On the existence and uniqueness of solutions to fbsdes in a non-degenerate case. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 99(2):209 – 286, 2002.
- [23] F. Delarue. Restoring uniqueness to mean-field games by randomizing the equilibria. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, Mar 2019.
- [24] F. Delarue and R. Foguen Tchuendom. Selection of equilibria in a linear quadratic mean-field game. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, In press.
- [25] C. L. Epstein and R. Mazzeo. *Degenerate diffusion operators arising in population biology*, volume 185 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2013.
- [26] M. Fischer. On the connection between symmetric n -player games and mean field games. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 127(2):757–810, 2017.
- [27] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner. *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, volume 25 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2006.
- [28] D. A. Gomes, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza. Discrete time, finite state space mean field games. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 93(3):308–328, 2010.
- [29] D. A. Gomes, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza. Continuous time finite state mean field games. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 68(1):99–143, 2013.
- [30] D. A. Gomes, R. M. Velho, and M.-T. Wolfram. Dual two-state mean-field games. In *Decision and Control (CDC), 2014 IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on*, pages 2703–2708. IEEE, 2014.
- [31] D. A. Gomes, R. M. Velho, and M.-T. Wolfram. Socio-economic applications of finite state mean field games. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 372(2028):20130405, 2014.
- [32] O. Guéant. From infinity to one: The reduction of some mean field games to a global control problem. *Cahier de la Chaire Finance et Développement Durable*, 42, 2011.
- [33] M. Huang, P. Caines, and R. Malhamé. Individual and mass behavior in large population stochastic wireless power control problems: centralized and Nash equilibrium solutions. pages 98 – 103, 2003.
- [34] M. Huang, P. E. Caines, and R. P. Malhamé. The Nash certainty equivalence principle and McKean-Vlasov systems: An invariance principle and entry adaptation. In *Decision and Control, 2007 46th IEEE Conference on*, pages 121–126. IEEE, 2007.
- [35] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. E. Caines. Large population stochastic dynamic games: Closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6(3):221–251, 2006.
- [36] K. H. Karlsen and N. H. Risebro. A note on front tracking and equivalence between viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and entropy solutions of scalar conservation laws. *Nonlinear Anal., Ser. A: Theory Methods*:455–469, 2002.
- [37] M. Kimura. Diffusion models in population genetics. *J. Appl. Probability*, 1:177–232, 1964.
- [38] S. N. Kružkov. Generalized solutions of nonlinear equations of the first order with several independent variables. II. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 72 (114):108–134, 1967.
- [39] N. V. Krylov. *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Hölder spaces*, volume 12 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.

- [40] D. Lacker. A general characterization of the mean field limit for stochastic differential games. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 165(3-4):581–648, 2016.
- [41] D. Lacker. On the convergence of closed-loop nash equilibria to the mean field game limit. *Annals Appl. Probability*, To appear.
- [42] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.
- [43] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.
- [44] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [45] P.-L. Lions. *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, volume 69 of *Research Notes in Mathematics*. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass.-London, 1982.
- [46] J. Ma, P. Protter, and J. Yong. Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly — a four step scheme. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 98(3):339–359, Sep 1994.
- [47] A. Porretta and M. Ricciardi. Mean field games under invariance conditions for the state space. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 45(2):146–190, 2020.
- [48] N. Shimakura. Équations différentielles provenant de la génétique des populations. *Tôhoku Math. J.*, 29(2):287–318, 1977.
- [49] R. F. Tchuendom. Uniqueness for linear-quadratic mean field games with common noise. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 8(1):199–210, 2018.

(A. Cecchin and F. Delarue)

UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D’AZUR, CNRS, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES J.A. DIEUDONNÉ,
28 AVENUE VALROSE, 06108 NICE CEDEX 2, FRANCE

E-mail address: `alekos.cecchin@univ-cotedazur.fr`, `francois.delarue@univ-cotedazur.fr`