

Operator-splitting schemes for degenerate conservative-dissipative systems

Daniel Adams^{a,*}
d.t.s.adams@sms.ed.ac.uk

H. Duong^b
h.duong@bham.ac.uk

Gonalo dos Reis^{c,d,†}
G.dosReis@ed.ac.uk

^a Maxwell Institute for Mathematical Sciences School of Mathematics University of Edinburgh Edinburgh UK EH9 3FD

^b School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

^c School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, The King's Buildings, Edinburgh, UK

^d Centro de Matemática e Aplicaões (CMA), FCT, UNL, Portugal

20th July, 2022 (21h49)

Abstract

The theory of Wasserstein gradient flows in the space of probability measures provides a powerful framework to study dissipative partial differential equations (PDE). It can be used to prove well-posedness, regularity, stability and quantitative convergence to the equilibrium. However, many PDE are not gradient flows, and hence the theory is not immediately applicable.

In this work we develop a straightforward entropy regularised splitting scheme for degenerate non-local non-gradient systems. The approach is composed of two main stages: first we split the dynamics into the conservative and dissipative forces, secondly we perturb the problem so that the diffusion is no longer singular and perform a weighted Wasserstein “JKO type” descent step. Entropic regularisation of optimal transport problems opens the way for efficient numerical methods for solving these gradient flows. We illustrate the generality of our work by providing a number of examples, including the Regularized Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck equation, to which our results applicable.

Keywords: Wasserstein gradient flows; degenerate diffusions; variational principle; splitting; non-local drift; optimal transport; entropic regularisation.

2020 AMS subject classifications:

Primary: 35K15, 35K55, Secondary: 65K05, 90C25

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The Main Result	5
2.1	Notation	5
2.2	Framework	6

^{*}D.A was supported by The Maxwell Institute Graduate School in Analysis and its Applications, a Centre for Doctoral Training funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (grant EP/L016508/01), the Scottish Funding Council, Heriot-Watt University and the University of Edinburgh.

[†]G.d.R. acknowledges support from the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology) through the project UIDB/00297/2020 (Centro de Matemática e Aplicaões CMA/FCT/UNL).

3	Proof of the Main Result	7
3.1	Preliminary results and well-posedness	7
3.2	Discrete Euler-Lagrange Equations	9
3.3	A priori estimates	9
3.4	Convergence	12
4	Entropy Regularised Scheme	15
5	Examples	17
5.1	Vlasov-Fokker-Planck Equation (VFPE)	17
5.2	Linear Wigner FPE	19
5.3	A degenerate diffusion equation of Kolmogorov-type	19
5.4	A generalised Vlasov-Langevin equation	19
A	Appendix	20
A.1	Well-Posedness	21

1 Introduction

The seminal work of Jordan, Otto and Kinderlehrer [JKO98] it was shown that the linear Fokker-Planck equation (FPE) can be regarded as a gradient flow on the space of probability measures. The authors did this by proving that the solution of the FPE, over some fixed time interval $[0, T]$, can be approximated by the following variational scheme: fix a time-step $h > 0$ and an initial distribution $\rho_h^0 = \rho_0$, then for $n \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{T}{h} \rfloor\}$, define the n -th iterate ρ_h^n , as the unique minimiser of

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2h} W_2^2(\rho_h^{n-1}, \rho) + \mathcal{F}_{\text{fpe}}(\rho) \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the space of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d with finite second moments. The minimisation problem (1.1) is comprises two terms: the free energy \mathcal{F}_{fpe} , and the Wasserstein metric W_2 which we implicitly mean to lift the Euclidean distance. Loosely speaking the free energy determines “in what direction one moves”, and the Wasserstein term tells “how far one moves”. The procedure of (1.1) has been coined a “JKO scheme”, and serves as an analog to the implicit Euler method (on \mathbb{R}^d). Indeed, as the time-step tends to zero the scheme converges to a continuous time gradient flow on the space of probability measures, see [AGS08] for an exposition on the subject of gradient flows on metric spaces, with special attention devoted to $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), W_2)$. Upon a re-weighting of the Wasserstein metric, and a re-formulation of the free energy, similar schemes have been identified for a number of dissipative Partial Differential Equations. These include (but are not limited to) such fundamental PDE as: the porous medium equation [Ott01], the non-linear (and weighted non-linear) diffusion [CDPS17, Lis09], the fourth-order quantum drift-diffusion equation and related models [GST09, MMS09]. In the above works the optimal transport problem driving the scheme is the Wasserstein metric (or a weighted version thereof), this is significant both theoretically and computationally.

The theory of Wasserstein gradient flows connects different areas of mathematics, such as: partial differential equations, differential geometry, optimal transport, and statistical mechanics. This discussion is explored in Villani’s book [Vil08]. The theory serves as a framework to study dissipative PDEs, providing the means to prove their well-posedness, regularity, stability and quantitative convergence to equilibrium [Vil08, AGS08, San15]. Moreover, it has been shown that the Wasserstein gradient flow structure arises naturally from large deviation principles of the microscopic stochastic dynamics [ADPZ13, DLR13, DPZ13, EMR15], and hence such gradient flows have been described to “capture the fluctuation behaviour” (of Brownian particles) [ADPZ11]. Furthermore, the theory has been extended to discrete state space structures [Maa11, Mie13], in which (under strong geometrical assumptions) the discrete optimal transport costs have been shown to converge to the Wasserstein metric [GKMP20].

There is a great deal of interest in developing structure-preserving numerical methods for evolutionary PDE. In this respect JKO schemes do the job since they preserve mass and positivity and, moreover, guarantee the monotonic decrease of the corresponding energy functional. We refer the reader to [BFS12, CCP19, CCWW21] and the references therein. From a computational point of view, a major challenge in implementing the JKO scheme is to efficiently approximate the optimal transport cost. When this cost is the Wasserstein metric this reduces to solving a linear programming problem. The of entropic regularisation of such linear programming problems has been studied as early as the 1930s [Sch31, Léo13]. This technique, recently popularised in [Cut13, PC19] transforms the transport problem into a strictly convex problem that can be solved efficiently via Sinkhorn’s matrix scaling algorithm [KS67]. Replacing the Wasserstein distance in the JKO scheme (1.1) by its entropy smoothed variant, and proving the convergence of the regularised scheme, was first done in [CDPS17].

The above theory is well-established for PDE which are Wasserstein gradient flows. However, many fundamental PDEs are not of this type, but however they still possess a dissipative component. Hence, a natural question is if one can develop variational schemes akin to (1.1) for non-gradient systems. A famous example is the kinetic Fokker-Planck (Kramer's equation), which is a PDE on phase space, i.e., it describes the density evolution of the position and velocity of a particle [Kra40, Ris89]. Kramer's equation models a mix of conservative and dissipative dynamics, and is a degenerate diffusion in the sense that the Laplacian operator acts only on the velocity variable. The difficulty in constructing "JKO type" schemes for these types of PDE is in identifying a suitable cost function for the dissipation mechanism. Methods do exist for finding the appropriate cost functions. They are based on the fundamental solution to the equation [DT18], or leveraging the the underlying Lagrangian structure [FGY11], or the Freidlin-Wentzell large deviation rate functional [DPZ14, Hua00, HJ00]. However the cost functions adopted in these works are often non-homogeneous, time-step dependent and do not induce a metric.

A different approach when considering a mix of conservative and dissipative forces is to perform a splitting of the dynamics. Of course, operator splitting approaches are well established in the theory of PDE and SDE [HKL10, GO16], and it is no wonder these techniques have found success in the field of JKO schemes. See [MS20, CG04] for the splitting approach applied to degenerate diffusions and [CL17] for non-local non-linear equations. In short, these works approximate the solution to the PDE (of mixed forces) by following the trajectory of the Hamiltonian dynamics and separately treating dissipative dynamics as a Wasserstein gradient flow. It is worth noting that the works [Ber18] and [BA15, DL18] even display a split between the transport and diffusion terms in the FPE and fractional FPE respectively, although this is not considered in our work.

Motivated by the works discussed in the above paragraphs, we propose a simple splitting scheme for a general class of non-gradient degenerate systems.

The set-up. Consider a general evolution equation of the form

$$\partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho b[\rho]) = \operatorname{div}(A(\nabla \rho + \rho \nabla f)), \quad \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0(\cdot), \quad (1.2)$$

where the unknown ρ is a time dependent probability distribution on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a semi-positive definite (symmetric) matrix, $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a given energy potential, $b : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ a divergence free non-local vector field, and the probability density $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the initial condition. Here, and throughout we denote $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d , $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ those with finite second moment, and $\mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as those which are additionally absolutely continuous (with respect to the Lebesgue measure). Equation (1.2) can be viewed as the forward Kolmogorov equation describing the time evolution of the distribution ρ associated to the stochastic process X satisfying the following SDE of McKean type

$$\begin{aligned} dX(t) &= b[\rho_t](X(t))dt - A \nabla f(X(t))dt + \sigma dW(t), \\ \rho_t &= \operatorname{Law}(X_t), \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

for a constant diffusion matrix σ , with $\sigma \sigma^T = A$. This serves as a general model for the dynamic limit of interacting particles, evolving via a conservative, possibly non-local, term $b[\rho]$, and a potential drift ∇f , whilst being perturbed by noise $W(t)$.

The class of (1.2) is rich and includes many cases of interest: the linear and kinetic Fokker-Planck [Ris89], the Vlasov Poisson Fokker-Planck [HJ13], the linear Wigner Fokker-Planck [AGG⁺12], and higher-order degenerate diffusions approximating the generalised Langevin and generalised Vlasov equations [OP11, Duo15]. We emphasize that because σ is (possibly) degenerate our framework is well suited to study the dynamics of particles in phase space when random forcing is only felt in the velocity components. In its generality PDE (1.2) is a non-reversible/non-gradient flow system. When $b = 0$ and A is non-singular, (1.2) is a (weighted) Wasserstein gradient flow [Lis09]. This intuitively leads one along the following path. Firstly, we perturb (1.3) by adding a small amount of noise into each component of X , that is, we consider (1.2) with A replaced by the positive-definite matrix $A_h := A + hI$, with I being the $d \times d$ identity matrix and h a positive constant. Secondly, we consider a splitting of the dynamics. That is, over small time intervals we let the evolution alternate between the Hamiltonian dynamics driven by b , and dissipative dynamics governed by the energy potential ∇f and the random forcing. From this perspective we can study the evolution equation (1.2) by alternating between solving an ODE (induced by the Hamiltonian dynamics) and performing a "JKO type" weighted Wasserstein gradient descent step. We now detail this proposed scheme.

The Scheme. Take (1.2). Denote the free energy $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the sum of the potential energy and the entropy

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) := F(\rho) + H(\rho),$$

where

$$F(\rho) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho f dx, \quad \text{and} \quad H(\rho) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \log(\rho) dx.$$

Consider the following two-step splitting scheme. Let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be given, with $\mathcal{F}(\rho_0) < \infty$. Let $h > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $hN = T$, and let $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. Set $\rho_h^0 = \tilde{\rho}_h^0 = \rho_0$. Given ρ_h^n we find ρ_h^{n+1} through the following procedure. First we introduce the push forward by the Hamiltonian flow as

$$\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1} = X_h^n(h, \cdot)_{\#} \rho_h^n, \quad (1.4)$$

where $X_h^n : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ solves the ODE

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t X_h^n = b[\rho_h^n] \circ X_h^n, \\ X_h^n(0, \cdot) = \text{id}. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

Next, define ρ_h^{n+1} as the minimiser of the classical “JKO type” descent step

$$\rho_h^{n+1} = \underset{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho) + \mathcal{F}(\rho) \right\}, \quad (1.6)$$

where W_{c_h} is the optimal transport problem, defined for $h > 0$ as

$$W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int c_h(x, y) d\gamma(x, y), \quad (1.7)$$

with the cost function $c_h : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$c_h(x, y) := A_h^{-1} \langle x - y, x - y \rangle, \quad (1.8)$$

for the matrix $A_h \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ defined as

$$A_h := A + hI. \quad (1.9)$$

Note that the addition of hI to A means that A_h is a positive-definite matrix (see Lemma 3.3) which means that c_h is well defined for all $h > 0$ and $\sqrt{c_h}$ defines a metric on \mathbb{R}^d , which in-turn means $W_{c_h}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ defines a metric on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. One can take (1.9) and induce a perturbation of (1.3) by noise. We mention that if the matrix A is invertible then there is no need to perform the perturbation. Instead we can adopt the scheme with $c_h(x, y) = c(x, y) := A^{-1} \langle x - y, x - y \rangle$ and the all results would remain true. This is the case for the Linear Wigner Fokker-Planck, see Section 5.2.

For each $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ we denote $\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n,c}, \tilde{\gamma}_h^n \in \Pi(\tilde{\rho}_h^n, \rho_h^n)$, as the following optimal couplings (respectively)

$$W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^n, \rho_h^n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} c_h(x, y) \tilde{\gamma}_h^{n,c}(x, y), \quad W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_h^n, \rho_h^n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} c_h(x, y) \tilde{\gamma}_h^n(x, y), \quad (1.10)$$

and for $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ we define $\gamma_h^n \in \Pi(\rho_h^n, \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1})$ as the optimal coupling

$$W_2^2(\rho_h^n, \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} c_h(x, y) \gamma_h^n(x, y). \quad (1.11)$$

The optimal couplings in (1.10) and (1.11) are all well defined, see Lemma A.3. Throughout this work we will adopt the notation that $t_n = nh$ for $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$. Consider the following piece-wise constant interpolations of $\{\rho_h^n\}_{n=0}^N$

$$\rho_h(t, \cdot) := \rho_h^{n+1} \text{ for } t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}), \quad (1.12)$$

and of $\{\tilde{\rho}_h^n\}_{n=0}^N$

$$\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot) := \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1} \text{ for } t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}), \quad (1.13)$$

and the continuous interpolation of $\{\tilde{\rho}_h^n\}_{n=0}^N$

$$\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot) := (X_h^n(t - t_n, \cdot))_{\#} \rho_h^n \text{ for } t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}), \quad (1.14)$$

so that ρ_h^\dagger is the solution over $t \in (0, h)$ of the continuity equation (see Lemma 3.1)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mu(t, \cdot) + \operatorname{div}(\mu(t, \cdot) b[\rho_h^n]) = 0 \\ \mu(t, \cdot)|_{t=0} = \rho_h^n. \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

The proof of convergence of the above scheme is straightforward for two reasons. Firstly, since b is divergence free the change in the free energy under the Hamiltonian dynamics is easily controlled. Secondly, since A_h is positive-definite, performing the “JKO type” descent step (1.6) can be done following the well-established strategy [JKO98].

In scope of existing work, and as already alluded, this construction can be re-cast under entropic regularisation. Indeed, this aspect is also part of our operator-splitting program but we choose to postpone this to Section 4 as to not distract from the simplicity of the technique.

Contribution of our work. This work builds on conservative-dissipative operator-splitting methods in relation to JKO schemes by extending the existing results to degenerate systems via a novel perturbation by noise approach. The main Theorem 2.4 (and its entropy regularized version, Theorem 4.2) states the convergence of the 2-step scheme (regularised 2-scheme resp.) for a general class of degenerate non-local non-gradient evolution PDE. This class of PDE include general models of phase space particle dynamics, which previously have been intractable via these methods. In turn, this provides existence of weak solutions to such PDE. Notably, because of the splitting (and the nature of the JKO scheme), the physical structure of the dynamics is preserved. This is of great significance, according to Ottinger [Ött18] “an important challenge for the future is how the structure of thermodynamically admissible evolution equations can be preserved under time-discretization, which is a key to successful numerical calculations”. Lastly, the regularisation of the optimal transport problem opens the way to efficient numerical implementation.

Comparison to existing literature. The proof of the main theorem, Theorem 2.4, follows the well-established procedure of [JKO98]. However, to deal with such general PDE as (1.2) we use a splitting procedure inspired by [CDPS17], in combination with a novel perturbation by noise approach. The work [CDPS17] considered non-linear diffusions which we do not, however, we see no reason why our approach cannot be extended to that case. As an attempt to construct schemes for degenerate PDE our work can be compared to [CG04, MS20], however these works do not perform a perturbation by noise and can only deal with linear conservative dynamics. Lastly, in comparison with the 1-step schemes found in [ADdR21], the method of this paper preserves the physical structure of the system and hence the dissipation mechanism in the form of the (weighted) Wasserstein metric is explicit.

Future work. From a modelling perspective the non-local term b captures the weak interactions between a large ensemble of particles. In this case, it takes the form of a convolution between the measure and a certain Kernel, and under our assumptions we require the kernel to be Lipschitz. However, many fundamental models of interacting particle systems compose of a singular interaction kernel, for example the Coulomb potential [Ser20]. Our work makes a second restrictive assumption on the non-local term, being that it is divergence free. Of course, one could perform a Helmholtz decomposition of this term (see [CL17]) but it is presently unclear how one would then incorporate the conservative vector field into the dissipation term (because of the diffusion matrix A). These themes are left for future work.

Organisation of the paper. In Section 2 we present our notation, the main assumptions, and the result of this paper. Section 3.1 contains the well posedness of the scheme, and some preliminary results on the continuity equation. The proof of the main result is given in Section 3. In Section 4 we outline how the scheme can regularised. We finish with Section 5 which provides some explicit examples to which our work can be applied.

2 The Main Result

In this section, we first introduce the notation that will be used throughout the paper, then we give the main assumptions that we work under, and finally we present the main result, Theorem 2.4.

2.1 Notation

Throughout $d \in \mathbb{N}$ will be the dimension of the space. A fixed $T > 0$ denotes the length of the time interval we consider. Throughout, C denotes a constant whose value may change without indication and depends on the problem’s involved constants, but, critically, it is independent of key parameters of this work, namely the time step $h > 0$ and number of iterates $N \in \mathbb{N}$ of the scheme introduced in Section 1. The Euclidean inner product between two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will be written as $x \cdot y$ or sometimes $\langle x, y \rangle$. We write $\|\cdot\|$ as the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d , and $|\cdot|$ when $d = 1$. The symbol $\|\cdot\|$ is also used as the 2-norm on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. For a matrix A let A^T be its transpose.

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. The space of Lebesgue m -integrable functions on Ω is denoted by $L^m(\Omega)$. The Sobolev space of functions in $L^1(\Omega)$ with first weak derivatives also in $L^1(\Omega)$ is denoted $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$. We say that $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ for any compact $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We define the space $f \in W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ similarly. The supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \Omega}$ of a vector field $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, or a function $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is used to denote $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \|\phi(x)\|$, $\sup_{x \in \Omega} |\phi(x)|$ respectively, when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ we just write $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$. We use the Landau “big-O” notation $\phi(h) = O(\varphi(h))$, for functions $\phi, \varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to mean that there exists $C, h_0 > 0$ such that $|\phi(h)| \leq C\varphi(h)$ for all $h < h_0$ and we say a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is $O(h)$ if $\max_{i,j} |B_{i,j}| \leq Ch$.

Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, define $C^k(A; B)$ as the k -times continuously differentiable functions from A to B with continuous k^{th} derivative. Define $C_c^\infty(A; B)$ as the set of infinitely differentiable functions from A to B with compact support. Let $\nabla \phi$, $\Delta \phi$, and $\nabla^2 \phi$ be the gradient, Laplacian, and Hessian respectively, of a sufficiently smooth function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a sufficiently smooth vector field $\eta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ let $\text{div}(\eta)$, and $D\eta$ be its divergence and Jacobian respectively. We call id the identity map on any space.

Denote the space of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d as $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The second moment M of a measure $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is

defined as

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \rho \mapsto M(\rho) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\|^2 \rho(dx). \quad (2.1)$$

The set of probability measures with finite second moments is denoted $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : M(\rho) < \infty\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Define $\mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as those $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which are absolutely continuous. Throughout, when a measure is said to be ‘absolutely continuous’ we implicitly mean with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We will use the same symbol ρ to denote a measure $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as well as its associated density. Define H to be the negative of Boltzmann entropy,

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \rho \mapsto H(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \log \rho, & \text{if } \rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (2.3)$$

which throughout we will just refer to as the entropy. Also define the positive part of the entropy as

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \rho \mapsto H_+(\rho) := \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \max\{\rho \log \rho, 0\}, & \text{if } \rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (2.4)$$

The set of transport plans between given measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is denoted by $\Pi(\mu, \nu) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. That is, for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ if $\gamma(\mathcal{B} \times \mathbb{R}^d) = \mu(\mathcal{B})$ and $\gamma(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{B}) = \nu(\mathcal{B})$ for all Borel sets $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\Pi^r(\mu, \nu)$ be those $\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ which are absolutely continuous. We denote a sequence of probability measures indexed by $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as $\{\mu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ which we relax to $\{\mu_k\}$. We use the symbol \rightarrow to mean the weak convergence of measures. For any two subsets $P, Q \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote $\Pi(P, Q)$ as the set of transport plans whose marginals lie in P and Q respectively. For a vector field $\eta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we write $(\eta)_\# \mu$ as the push-forward of μ by η . For any probability measure γ and function c on \mathbb{R}^{2d} we write

$$(c, \gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} c(x, y) \gamma(dx, dy).$$

We use the symbol $*$ to denote the convolution, that is for a vector field $K : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and a measure $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d_2})$, $K * \rho : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ is defined as

$$K * \rho(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_2}} K(x - x') \rho(x', z) dx' dz, \quad (2.5)$$

where $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2-d_1}$. Lastly, the 2-Wasserstein distance on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is denoted by W_2 .

2.2 Framework

We now make clear the assumption that this paper makes on the potential f , non-local vector field b , and matrix A . Under the following assumption we have well-posedness of the splitting scheme, and the convergence of the interpolations (1.12)-(1.14) to the weak solution of (1.2).

Assumption 2.1. The potential energy $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is assumed to be non-negative $f(x) \geq 0$, and uniformly Lipschitz, that is there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C \|x - y\|. \quad (2.6)$$

We assume for the non-local drift $b : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\|b[\mu](x)\| \leq C(1 + \|x\|), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad b[\mu] \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \text{div}(b[\mu]) = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, we assume there exists $C > 0$ for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|b[\nu](x) - b[\mu](x)\|^2 d\nu(x) \leq C W_2^2(\nu, \mu). \quad (2.8)$$

Lastly assume A is a semi-positive definite (symmetric), constant matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

Remark 2.2. The assumption on f is standard, and so is the assumption on A if we envision it originating from a diffusion matrix. In terms of the assumptions on the non-local vector field b , (2.7) ensures well-posedness of the problem via DiPerna-Lions theory [DL89]. Moreover, imposing (2.8) allows us to apply our results when b takes the form of a convolution, which is exactly the case for the examples motivating us, see Section 5 and Remark 5.1 in particular.

Definition 2.3 (Weak solution). The curve $\rho : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t \mapsto \rho(t, \cdot)$, is called a weak solution to the general evolution equation (1.2) if for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(t, x) \left(\partial_t \varphi(t, x) + (b[\rho(t, \cdot)](x) + A \nabla f(x)) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) + \operatorname{div}(A \nabla \varphi(t, x)) \right) dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^0(x) \varphi(0, x) dx = 0 \quad (2.9)$$

The main (abstract) result of this work, under Assumption 2.1, is the following theorem which gives the existence of weak solutions of the evolution equation (1.2). Uniqueness is not discussed here, but can likely be obtained via displacement convexity arguments and an exponential in time contraction on the W_2 distance between two solutions started from different initial data, cf. [Lab17].

Theorem 2.4. Let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy $\mathcal{F}(\rho_0) < \infty$. Let $h > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $hN = T$, and take $\{\rho_h^n\}_{n=0}^N, \{\tilde{\rho}_h^n\}_{n=0}^N$ to be the solution of the scheme (1.4)-(1.6). Define the piecewise constant interpolations $\rho_h, \tilde{\rho}_h$ by (1.12)-(1.13) and the continuous interpolation ρ_h^\dagger by (1.14). Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds.

Then,

(i) as $h \rightarrow 0$ ($N \rightarrow \infty$ abiding by $hN = T$) we have

$$\rho_h, \tilde{\rho}_h, \rho_h^\dagger \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} \rho \quad \text{in } L^1((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (2.10)$$

(ii) Moreover, there exists a map $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \rho(t, \cdot)$ in $\mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \max \left\{ W_2(\rho_h(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)), W_2(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)), W_2(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)) \right\} = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

The ρ maps appearing in the above limits are weak solutions of the evolution equation (1.2) in the sense of Definition 2.3.

Remark 2.5. If one were to instead consider the evolution equation, for a non-linear function p ,

$$\partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho b[\rho]) = \operatorname{div} \left(A(\nabla p(\rho) + \rho \nabla f) \right),$$

then following the strategy in [CL17], to deal with the non-linear term, we expect one could construct a similar scheme to the one detailed above by adjusting the free energy term \mathcal{F} . We leave this for now to not over complicate the presentation, and also since our framework already covers a large range of PDE.

3 Proof of the Main Result

The objective of this section is to prove the main result, Theorem 2.4. This will be done following the celebrated strategy of [JKO98]: firstly we prove the well-posedness of the scheme, then the discrete Euler-Lagrange equations for the minimisers of (1.6) are established, next we derive necessary a priori estimates, and finally we prove the convergence of the scheme by stitching together the discrete Euler-Lagrange equations and using the compactness provided by the a priori estimates.

Recall from Section 1 the definitions of the sequences $\rho_h^n, \tilde{\rho}_h^n$, interpolations $\rho_h, \tilde{\rho}_h, \rho_h^\dagger$, and optimal couplings $\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n,c}, \tilde{\gamma}_h^n, \gamma_h^n$. Also recall that the constant $C \geq 0$ that appears will be independent of h and $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, but may depend on the final time T . The following results hold under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, and for all $0 < h < 1$, note that we are ultimately interested in the case where $h \rightarrow 0$.

3.1 Preliminary results and well-posedness

The main result here is that the scheme proposed in Section 1 is well-posed. We also make some preliminary observations on the matrix A_h , and on solutions to the continuity equation which will be useful later on.

3.1.1 The Hamiltonian step

By our assumptions on b , we can use DiPerna Lions theory [DL89] to conclude that there exists a solution to the ODE (1.5), which when pushing forward the initial density solves the continuity equation (1.15). Moreover, we note that the Hamiltonian dynamics preserves the entropy.

Lemma 3.1. The following results hold for any $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. Let $\rho_h^n \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,

- (i) there exists a unique $X_h^n : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, such that $X_h^n(0, \cdot) = \text{id}$, and for a.e $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the map $t \mapsto X_h^n(t, x)$ solves (1.5),

$$X_h^n(t, x) = x + \int_0^t b[\rho_h^n] \circ X_h^n(s, x) ds.$$

Moreover $\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \rightarrow X(\cdot, x) \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d; C(\mathbb{R}))$, and for a.e $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the map $\mathbb{R}^+ \ni t \rightarrow X_h^n(t, x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.

- (ii) For $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$, $\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)$ solves the continuity equation (1.15) over the interval $[0, h)$.
- (iii) We have the following entropy preservation identities

$$H(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)) = H(\rho_h^n) \quad \forall t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}), \quad H(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) = H(\rho_h^n). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Since $b[\rho_h^n]$ satisfies Assumption 2.1, point (i) and (ii) follow by [DL89, Theorem III.1]. In regard to point (iii), note that for all $t \geq 0$ the map $X_h^n(t, \cdot)$ preserves the Lebesgue measure since b is a divergence free vector field. The result is thus immediate. \square

The following lemma bounds the change of the distribution under the Hamiltonian dynamics over the interval $(0, h)$ by its 2nd moments.

Lemma 3.2. The following result holds for any $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. Let $\rho_h^n \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let μ be the solution of (1.15) over the interval $[0, h)$ and let $0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq h$. Then

$$W_2^2(\mu(s_1, \cdot), \mu(s_2, \cdot)) \leq Ch \int_{s_1}^{s_2} (1 + M(\mu(s, \cdot))) ds. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, for any $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$, $M(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)), M(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot)) < C(M(\rho_h^n) + 1)$.

Proof. Recall the Benamou-Brenier formula [AGS08, Chapter 8]. Let μ solve (1.15). For any $0 \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq h$ we have by (2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} W_2^2(\mu(s_1, \cdot), \mu(s_2, \cdot)) &\leq (s_2 - s_1) \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|b[\rho_h^n](x)\|^2 \mu(s, x) dx ds \\ &\leq (s_2 - s_1) C \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|x\|^2) \mu(s, x) dx ds \leq hC \int_{s_1}^{s_2} (1 + M(\mu(s, \cdot))) ds, \end{aligned}$$

which is (3.2). Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t M(\mu(t, \cdot)) &= \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|X_h^n(t, x)\|^2 \rho_h^n(x) dx = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} X_h^n(t, x) \cdot \partial_t X_h^n(t, x) \rho_h^n(x) dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} X_h^n(t, x) \cdot b[\rho_h^n] \circ X_h^n(t, x) \rho_h^n(x) dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|X_h^n(t, x)\|^2) \rho_h^n(x) dx \\ &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \|x\|^2) (X_h^n(t, \cdot))_{\#} \rho_h^n(x) dx = C(1 + M(\mu(t, \cdot))). \end{aligned}$$

Employing Grönwall's inequality, we have

$$M(\mu(t, \cdot)) \leq C(M(\mu(0, \cdot)) + 1) = C(M(\rho_h^n) + 1). \quad (3.3)$$

For $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$, let $\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)$ solve (1.15) over the interval $[0, h)$. Hence for any $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$, by (3.3),

$$M(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)) \leq C(M(\rho_h^n) + 1).$$

Moreover, for all $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$ we have $\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot) = \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1} = \mu(h, \cdot)$, where again μ solves (1.15), and hence by (3.3)

$$M(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot)) = M(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) = M(\mu(h, \cdot)) \leq C(M(\rho_h^n) + 1),$$

for any $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$. This completes the proof. \square

3.1.2 The JKO step

In this section we discuss the well-posedness of the JKO descent step, (1.6). It is natural to achieve well-posedness of the scheme through finiteness, lower semi-continuity, and convexity of the functionals which appear in it. First observe that A_h is indeed positive.

Lemma 3.3 (The cost function). The matrix A_h defined in (1.9) is positive definite (i.e., invertible), which implies

$$\|x - y\|^2 \leq C c_h(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. This is well-known [ADdR21, Appendix B.1]. □

The next result addresses the existence of unique minimisers to (1.6). This type of result is classical, for completeness the details of the proof can be found in Appendix A.1.

Proposition 3.4. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\mathcal{F}(\mu) < \infty$. Then, there exists a unique $\nu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\nu^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) + \mathcal{F}(\nu) \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

3.2 Discrete Euler-Lagrange Equations

The following results are quite classical so are stated without proof. For Lemma 3.5 see [JKO98, Proposition 4.1], and for Lemma 3.6 see [ADdR21, Lemma 4.2].

The works of Peletier and others, cf [ADPZ13], have shown that solutions to Wasserstein gradient flows (1.6) can be viewed as minimisers of a large deviation rate functional. We can therefore regard the Euler-Lagrange equations (3.9), as the discrete analogue of (2.9).

Lemma 3.5. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and let Φ be its flow

$$\partial_s \Phi_s = \eta(\Phi_s), \quad \Phi_0 = \operatorname{id}. \quad (3.6)$$

For any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\delta \mathcal{F}(\nu, \eta) := \frac{d}{ds} \mathcal{F}((\Phi_s)_\# \nu) \Big|_{s=0} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nu(y) \eta(y) \cdot \nabla f(y) dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nu(y) \operatorname{div}(\eta(y)) dy. \quad (3.7)$$

Lemma 3.6. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let ν be the optimal choice in (3.5), and let γ be the corresponding optimal plan in $W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu)$. Then, for any $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$0 = \frac{1}{2h} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \left\langle \eta(y), \nabla_y c_h(x, y) \right\rangle d\gamma(x, y) + \delta \mathcal{F}(\nu, \eta). \quad (3.8)$$

In particular, for η of the form $\eta(x) = A_h \nabla \varphi(x)$ (for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$), and $\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1, c}$ defined in (1.10),

$$0 = \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \left\langle y - x, \nabla \varphi(x) \right\rangle d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1, c}(x, y) + \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi). \quad (3.9)$$

3.3 A priori estimates

In this section we use (1.6) to establish a number of results which will allow us to deduce the desired convergence in Section 3.4. The introduction of the Hamiltonian step does not bring much added difficulty. Indeed, if we can show the uniformly bounded 2nd moments and free energies of the JKO iterates (1.6), then these results are preserved under the Hamiltonian dynamics. This is explained in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.7. Let $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$. If there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$, independent of h and n , such that $M(\rho_h^n), \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^n) < C_1$, then $\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}$ obtained from (1.4) satisfies

$$M(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}), \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) < C.$$

Proof. The bound for the moments clearly hold by Lemma 3.2. For the free energy we have $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) = F(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) + H(\rho_h^n)$ by the conservation of entropy in Lemma 3.2. Therefore, since f is Lipschitz

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) &= \int f(x) \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x) dx + H(\rho_h^n) \leq \int (\|x\| + f(0)) \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x) dx + H(\rho_h^n) \\ &\leq M(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) + C + H(\rho_h^n) \leq M(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) + C + \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^n) \leq C.\end{aligned}$$

□

The next Lemma provides uniform bounds in n and h for the moments, free energy, and positive part of the entropy of each element the scheme (1.4) - (1.6).

Lemma 3.8 (Bounded energy, moments and the positive part of the entropy). For all $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, we have

$$M(\rho_h^n), \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^n), H_+(\rho_h^n) \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad M(\tilde{\rho}_h^n), \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^n), H_+(\tilde{\rho}_h^n) \leq C.$$

Proof. The proof is carried out via an inductive argument over n . Recall that $M(\rho^0), \mathcal{F}(\rho^0) \leq C$. For the induction assumption assume $M(\rho_h^n), \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^n) \leq C$, and note therefore that Lemma 3.7 implies that $M(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}), \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) \leq C$. Since ρ_h^{n+1} is optimal we compare it against $\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}$ in (1.6), this yields

$$W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq 2h(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1})), \quad (3.10)$$

so that using Inequality (A.2) we have

$$M(\rho_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1})) + CM(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}).$$

Now using that f is positive and (A.3) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}M(\rho_h^{n+1}) &\leq Ch(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) - H(\rho_h^{n+1})) + CM(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) \\ &\leq Ch(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) + (M(\rho_h^{n+1}) + 1)^\alpha) + CM(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}).\end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

By the inductive assumption and Lemma 3.7 we know $M(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}), \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) \leq C$. Thus, (3.11) implies, for $h < 1$,

$$M(\rho_h^{n+1}) \leq (M(\rho_h^{n+1}) + 1)^\alpha + C.$$

Since $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we can use that $(x + 1)^\alpha \leq 1 + \alpha x$ to conclude from the above that $M(\rho_h^{n+1}) \leq C$. Returning to (3.10), the non-negativity of $W_{c_h}(\cdot, \cdot)$ gives

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) \leq C,$$

where we have again used the inductive assumption. Therefore by induction we have the bounds $M(\rho_h^n), \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^n) \leq C$ for any n . It then immediately follows (as established in Lemma 3.7) that $M(\tilde{\rho}_h^n), \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^n) < C$. The bounds for H_+ also follow immediately from Lemma A.2 and the bounded moments just obtained. □

Lemma 3.8 states the uniform bounds for the discrete elements of our schemes. The following Lemma induces those bounds for the interpolations (1.12), (1.13) and (1.14).

Lemma 3.9 (A priori estimates for the interpolations). For all $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, the moments, free-energies and the positive part of the entropies are uniformly bounded (in n, h, t), namely,

$$M(\rho_h(t, \cdot)), M(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot)), M(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)), \mathcal{F}(\rho_h(t, \cdot)), \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot)), \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)), H_+(\rho_h(t, \cdot)), H_+(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot)), H_+(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)) \leq C.$$

Proof. These results for the interpolations follow easily from Lemma 3.8. Indeed, it is immediate from their definitions how this is inferred for the interpolations $\rho_h(t, \cdot), \tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot)$. For $\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)$, just notice from Lemma 3.2 that we have $M(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)) \leq C$. This uniform moment bound gives us the other two bounds for $\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)$: for the free energy one follows the argument in Lemma 3.7 (using the bounded energy of ρ_h^n), and for the positive entropy one uses Lemma (A.3). □

The uniform bounds established in Lemma 3.8 allow us to control the transport cost (w.r.t to both cost functions $c_h, \|\cdot\|^2$) of the JKO step.

Lemma 3.10 (The cost of dissipation). We have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch. \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. Let $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$. Since ρ_h^{n+1} attains the infimum in (1.6) we can compare it against $\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}$. This gives

$$\frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}).$$

Using Lemma 3.2 for the entropy, the above is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq F(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) - F(\rho_h^{n+1}) + H(\rho_h^n) - H(\rho_h^{n+1}). \quad (3.13)$$

Recall now that $(c_h, \tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1,c}) = W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1})$. Using that f is Lipschitz and Young's inequality with $\sqrt{\sigma}$ for some $\sigma > 0$, we can see

$$\begin{aligned} F(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) - F(\rho_h^{n+1}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (f(x) - f(y)) d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1,c}(x, y) \leq C \int \|x - y\| d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1,c}(x, y) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2\sigma} \int \|x - y\|^2 d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1,c}(x, y) + \frac{C\sigma}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2\sigma} \int c_h(x, y) d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1,c}(x, y) + \frac{C\sigma}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used (3.4). Substituting this into (3.13) yields

$$\frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq \frac{C}{2\sigma} \int c_h(x, y) d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1,c}(x, y) + \frac{C\sigma}{2} + H(\rho_h^n) - H(\rho_h^{n+1}).$$

Choosing $\sigma = 2Ch$ leads to

$$\frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq \frac{1}{4h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) + Ch + H(\rho_h^n) - H(\rho_h^{n+1}).$$

After rearranging we finally conclude

$$W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq C(h^2 + h(H(\rho_h^n) - H(\rho_h^{n+1}))). \quad (3.14)$$

The sum of (3.14) over $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ contains a telescopic component which allows for the simplified expression

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch(1 + H(\rho^0) - H(\rho_h^N)),$$

where we have used that $Nh = T$. To deal with the terms in the right hand side of the above expression, we employ Lemma (A.3) to deal with $H(\rho_h^N)$, while for $H(\rho^0)$ we just use the positivity of f . This leads to

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch(1 + \mathcal{F}(\rho^0) + (M(\rho_h^N) + 1)^\alpha),$$

which by the uniform bounds of Lemma 3.8 gives the first result of (3.12). The second result is immediate from the first and (3.4), since

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch.$$

□

The uniform moment bounds for the interpolation ρ_h^\dagger established in Lemma 3.9 (in conjunction with the preliminary observation of Lemma 3.2) allow us to control the Wasserstein cost of the Hamiltonian step.

Lemma 3.11 (The cost of the Hamiltonian dynamics). We have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\rho_h^n, \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) \leq Ch. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. To show this result we just need (3.2) of Lemma 3.2 which gives

$$W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^n) \leq Ch \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} (1 + M(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot))) dt.$$

The uniform bounded moments result of Lemma 3.9 ensures the right hand side is $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ and hence summing over n gives the result. □

3.4 Convergence

With the previously obtained a priori estimates we can have enough compactness to prove the convergence of Theorem 2.4. Because of the non-local term b we will require a uniform in time W_2 convergence of our sequences, this is established in Lemma 3.12 via an Arzela-Ascoli argument.

Note that, since the positive entropy H_+ is superlinear, the bounds of Lemma 3.9 imply the sequences are equi-integrable and hence the Dunford-Pettis Theorem [San15, Box 8.2 (p301)] yields the $L^1((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ convergence along a sub-sequence of $\rho_h, \tilde{\rho}_h, \rho_h^\dagger$ (in h) to some respective limits. The following Lemma shows that these limits are equal almost everywhere to some curve $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \rho(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and moreover, the sequences $\rho_h(t, \cdot), \tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot), \rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)$ converge in W_2 to ρ , uniformly in time.

Lemma 3.12. [Convergence] There exists a curve $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \rho(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \max \left\{ W_2(\rho_h(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)), W_2(\tilde{\rho}_h(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)), W_2(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)) \right\} = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. We provide the argument for ρ_h only, the approach for $\tilde{\rho}_h, \rho_h^\dagger$ is similar.

To obtain the uniform convergence we set up an Arzela-Ascoli argument. Since the paths ρ_h are not continuous we introduce the continuous concatenation of $\{\rho_h^n\}_n$ by geodesics. Let $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. Fix any $s, t \in [0, T]$, define the path $\nu_h : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by concatenating ρ_h^n and ρ_h^{n+1} on $[t_{n-1}, t_n]$ by a constant speed geodesic. Then for $t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n]$

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\rho_h(t), \nu_h(t)) &= W_2(\rho_h^n, \nu_h(t)) = W_2(\nu_h(t_{n-1}), \nu_h(t)) \\ &\leq W_2(\rho_h^n, \rho_h^{n+1})(t - t_{n-1}) \leq W_2(\rho_h^n, \rho_h^{n+1})h \leq Ch, \end{aligned}$$

by the bounded moments of Lemma 3.9. Let $t < s, t \in [ih, (i+1)h], s \in [jh, (j+1)h]$, for some $i, j \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\nu_h(t), \nu_h(s)) &\leq W_2(\nu_h(t), \rho_h^{i+1}) + W_2(\rho_h^{i+1}, \rho_h^{j+1}) + W_2(\rho_h^{j+1}, \nu_h(s)) \\ &\leq hW_2(\rho_h^{i+2}, \rho_h^{i+1}) + W_2(\rho_h^{i+1}, \rho_h^{j+1}) + hW_2(\rho_h^{j+1}, \rho_h^{j+2}) \\ &\leq Ch + W_2(\rho_h^{i+1}, \rho_h^{j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle property and then the Cauchy Schwartz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\rho_h^{i+1}, \rho_h^{j+1}) &\leq \sum_{n=i+1}^j W_2(\rho_h^n, \rho_h^{n+1}) \leq \sqrt{(j-i)h} \sqrt{\frac{1}{h} \sum_{n=i+1}^j W_2^2(\rho_h^n, \rho_h^{n+1})} \leq \sqrt{(j-i)h} \sqrt{\frac{1}{h} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\rho_h^n, \rho_h^{n+1})} \\ &\leq \sqrt{(j-i)h} \sqrt{\frac{2}{h} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\rho_h^n, \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) + W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1})} \leq C\sqrt{(j-i)h} \leq C\sqrt{h}\sqrt{(j-i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the family ν_h is uniformly equicontinuous, [AGS08, Proposition 3.3.1]. This implies that for all $t \in [0, T]$ $\{\nu_h(t, \cdot)\}_{h>0} \subset (\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), W_2)$ is precompact, and hence we can use Arzela-Ascoli [BS18, Theorem 1.1.11] to obtain uniform convergence (taking sub-sequences if necessary) in W_2 (over $[0, T]$ as $h \rightarrow 0$) of the paths ν_h to a limit, which we call ρ . We are then able to deduce the uniform convergence of ρ_h to ρ from that of ν_h , namely

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_2(\rho_h(t), \rho(t)) &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(W_2(\rho_h(t), \nu_h(t)) + W_2(\nu_h(t), \rho(t)) \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left(Ch + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_2(\nu_h(t), \rho(t)) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the limit $\rho(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the uniform bounds on the entropy (see Lemma 3.9). By an almost identical procedure (this time concatenating geodesics between $\{\tilde{\rho}_h^n\}_n$, and using (3.2) for ρ_h^\dagger) we get the same convergence of $\tilde{\rho}_h, \rho_h^\dagger$ to some limit $\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It remains only to show that $\rho = \tilde{\rho}$ a.e. Since W_2 induces a stronger topology than that of weak convergence in measure we have, for instance (using the Dominated Convergence theorem) letting $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}(t, x) - \rho(t, x)) \varphi(t, x) dx dt &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}_h(t, x) - \rho_h(t, x)) \varphi(t, x) dx dt \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x) - \rho_h^{n+1}(x)) \varphi(t, x) dx dt \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (\varphi(t, x) - \varphi(t, y)) \gamma^{n+1}(dx, dy) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall $\tilde{\gamma}^{n+1}$ is the optimal coupling between ρ^{n+1} and $\tilde{\rho}^{n+1}$ in W_2 . By Taylor's theorem, Jensen inequality and then Cauchy Schwartz, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}(t, x) - \rho(t, x)) \varphi(t, x) dx dt &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sup \|\nabla \varphi\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|x - y\| \gamma^{n+1}(dx, dy) \\
&\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sup \|\nabla \varphi\| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) \\
&\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \sqrt{N} \sup \|\nabla \varphi\| \sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1})} \\
&\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} Ch \sqrt{T} \sup \|\nabla \varphi\| = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used Lemma 3.10. We are then able to conclude that $\tilde{\rho}$ and ρ are equal a.e. \square

In essence, the following lemma says that the change of our distribution over the interval $[0, T]$ is captured by a sum of the change of the dissipative and conservative parts.

Lemma 3.13. For any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x) - \rho_h^{n+1}(x)) \varphi(t_{n+1}, x) dx &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) (\partial_t \varphi(t, x) + b[\rho_h(t - h)](x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x)) dx dt \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^0(x) \varphi(0, x) dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. Let $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. First notice that for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$ by the chain rule

$$\partial_t (\varphi(t, X_h^n(t - t_n, x))) = (\partial_t \varphi + b[\rho_h^n] \cdot \nabla \varphi)(t, X_h^n(t - t_n, x)). \tag{3.18}$$

Next consider

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x) - \rho_h^{n+1}(x)) \varphi(t_{n+1}, x) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^0(x) \varphi(0, x) dx \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x) \varphi(t_{n+1}, x) - \rho_h^n(x) \varphi(t_n, x)) dx
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^n(x) (\varphi(t_{n+1}, X_h^n(t_{n+1}, x)) - \varphi(t_n, x)) dx \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^n(x) \partial_t (\varphi(t, X_h^n(t - t_n, x))) dx dt \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^n(x) (\partial_t \varphi + b[\rho_h^n] \cdot \nabla \varphi)(t, X_h^n(t - t_n, x)) dx dt
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

$$= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) (\partial_t \varphi + b[\rho_h(t - h, \cdot)] \cdot \nabla \varphi)(t, x) dx dt, \tag{3.21}$$

where in (3.19) follows since φ has compact support, in (3.20) we have applied (3.18), and in (3.21) we have used the definitions of the interpolations ρ_h, ρ_h^\dagger . \square

Now following the classical procedure we can interpolate across the discrete Euler-Lagrange equations (3.9).

Lemma 3.14. For any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) (\partial_t \varphi(t, x) + b[\rho(t - h, \cdot)](x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x)) dx dt \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^0(x) \varphi(0, x) dx - h \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, \cdot)) + O(h).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Proof. Let $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. By Taylor's Theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho_h^{n+1}(x) - \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x)) \varphi(t_n, x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (\varphi(t_n, y) - \varphi(t_n, x)) d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1, c}(x, y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \langle y - x, \nabla \varphi(t_n, y) \rangle d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1, c}(x, y) + \kappa_n(t_n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

By Lemma 3.3 we can bound the remainder term κ_n , namely,

$$|\kappa_n(t)| \leq C \|\nabla \varphi\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \|x - y\|^2 d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1, c}(x, y) \leq C \|\nabla \varphi\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} c_h(x, y) d\tilde{\gamma}_h^{n+1, c}(x, y). \quad (3.24)$$

Using (3.23) in combination with the Euler-Lagrange equation (3.9) yields the identity

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho_h^{n+1}(x) - \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x)) \varphi(t_n, x) dx = \kappa_n(t_n) - h \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, \cdot)).$$

Summing the previous expression over $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ gives

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho_h^{n+1}(x) - \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}(x)) \varphi(t_n, x) dx = O(h) - h \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, \cdot)), \quad (3.25)$$

where we have combined (3.24) with Lemma 3.10 to conclude $|\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \kappa_n(t_n)| \leq Ch$. Finally, using (3.17) on the left hand side of (3.25) deliver the sought result. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Recall the convergence result of Lemma 3.12. To prove Theorem 2.4 we need only to argue that the limit $h \rightarrow 0$, $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.22) can be taken. Clearly the error term $O(h)$ in (3.22) goes to zero (as $h \rightarrow 0$), and for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) \partial_t \varphi(t, x) dx dt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(t, x) \partial_t \varphi(t, x) dx dt.$$

We now address the remaining terms of (3.22): the free energy and the divergence free part. We start with the free energy term $\delta \mathcal{F}$. Note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} h \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, \cdot)) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^{n+1}(x) (A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, x) \cdot \nabla f(x)) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^{n+1}(x) \operatorname{div}(A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, x)) dx \right) dt \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h(t, x) (A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, x) \cdot \nabla f(x)) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h(t, x) \operatorname{div}(A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, x)) dx \right) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Consider the first term on the right hand side of (3.26) (the second term can be dealt with in a similar manner). Adding and subtracting $A_h \nabla \varphi(t, x)$ and $A \nabla \varphi(t, x)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^{n+1} (A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, x) \cdot \nabla f(x)) dx dt \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\rho_h (A \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla f)(t, x) + \rho_h ((A_h - A) \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla f)(t, x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \rho_h(t) (A_h (\nabla \varphi(t_n) - \nabla \varphi(t)) \cdot \nabla f)(x) \right) dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

Then, as $h \rightarrow 0$, the first term tends to $\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho (A \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla f)(t, x) dx dt$ by the weak convergence of Lemma 3.12, the second term tends to zero by Cauchy Schwartz and the fact that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|A_h - A\| = 0$ and again the weak convergence. The third term in (3.27) also tends to zero, since

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h(t) (A_h (\nabla \varphi(t_n) - \nabla \varphi(t)) \cdot \nabla f)(x) dx dt \\ &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} C \|A_h\| \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla f(x)\| \sup_{[u_h, r_h] \subset [0, T], |u_h - r_h| \leq h} \sup_{s \in [u_h, r_h], x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla \varphi(u_h, x) - \nabla \varphi(s, x)\| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h(t, x) dx dt = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\|A_h\|, \sup \|\nabla f\| \leq C$, the weak convergence of ρ_h , and that $\nabla \varphi$ is uniformly continuous. Lastly, we address the divergence free term in (3.22). Adding and subtracting $\rho_h^\dagger b[\rho_h^\dagger] \cdot \nabla \varphi$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) b[\rho_h(t-h, \cdot)](x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) \left(b[\rho_h(t-h, \cdot)](x) - b[\rho_h^\dagger](x) \right) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) b[\rho_h^\dagger] \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

The first term in (3.28) converges to zero as $h \rightarrow 0$ since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) \left(b[\rho_h(t-h, \cdot)](x) - b[\rho_h^\dagger](x) \right) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt \right| \\ & \leq C \int_0^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) \|b[\rho_h(t-h, \cdot)](x) - b[\rho_h^\dagger](x)\|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

$$\leq C \int_0^T W_2(\rho_h(t-h, \cdot), \rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)) dt \quad (3.30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= C \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} W_2(\rho_h^n, \rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)) dt \\ &\leq CTh, \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

where in (3.29) we have used the Cauchy Schwartz and Jensen's inequality, in (3.30) we have used Assumption (2.8), and in (3.31) we have used (3.2) and the bounded moments result of Lemma 3.9. The second term on the right hand side of (3.28) has already the desired convergence, indeed consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\rho_h^\dagger(t, x) b[\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)](x) - \rho(t, x) b[\rho(t, \cdot)](x) \right) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt \right| \\ & \leq C \int_0^T \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h^\dagger(t, x) \|b[\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot)](x) - b[\rho(t, \cdot)](x)\|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho(t, x) - \rho_h^\dagger(t, x)) b[\rho(t, \cdot)](x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt \right| \\ & \leq CT \sup_{t \in [0, T]} W_2(\rho_h^\dagger(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)) + \left| \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\rho(t, x) - \rho_h^\dagger(t, x)) b[\rho(t, \cdot)](x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x) dx dt \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

where in (3.32) we have added and subtracted $\rho_h^\dagger b[\rho]$, used Cauchy Schwartz and Jensen's inequality, and in (3.33) we used again Assumption (2.8). To conclude, notice that the two terms in (3.33) go to zero from the convergence of ρ_h^\dagger in Lemma 3.12 and that $b[\rho(t, \cdot)] \cdot \nabla \varphi \in L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. \square

4 Entropy Regularised Scheme

Recently, the field of entropic regularisation has enjoyed a revival of interest due to the success it enjoys in the field of computational optimal transport [PC19]. In particular, the entropic regularisation of the Wasserstein distance transforms the convex problem into a uniformly convex problem. The seminal work [Cut13] showed that an entropic smoothing of the classical optimal transport problem leads to more efficient computations via the Sinkhorn matrix scaling algorithm [SK67].

In this section we provide an entropy regularised version of the scheme introduced in Section 1. The regularised scheme, presented below, differs only in that we have penalised the weighted Wasserstein by an entropy term. The convergence of this new scheme is stated in Theorem 4.2, the proof of which is sketched since it only differs slightly to that of Theorem 2.4. The results and techniques of this section are similar to those appearing in [CDPS17, ADdR21]. The following assumption introduces a theoretical constraint on the scaling of the time step and strength of entropic regularisation. It ensures that the error made by the regularisation goes to zero sufficiently fast.

Assumption 4.1 (The regularisation's scaling parameters). Take three sequences $\{N_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$, $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, which, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, abide by the following scaling

$$h_k N_k = T, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \varepsilon_k \leq \varepsilon_k |\log \varepsilon_k| \leq Ch_k^2, \quad (4.1)$$

and are such that $h_k, \varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ and $N_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

The regularised two-step scheme:

Let the sequences $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, \{N_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, satisfy Assumption 4.1. Let $\mathcal{F}(\rho_0) < \infty$, and set $\rho_k^0 = \tilde{\rho}_k^0 = \rho^0$. Let $n \in \{0, \dots, N_k - 1\}$. Given ρ_k^n we find ρ_k^{n+1} as follows, first introduce the push forward of ρ_k^n by the Hamiltonian flow as

$$\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1} = X_k^n(h_k, \cdot) \# \rho_k^n, \quad (4.2)$$

where X_k^n solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t X_k^n = b[\rho_k^n] \circ X_k^n, \\ X_k^n(0, \cdot) = \text{id}. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Next define ρ_k^{n+1} as the minimiser of the classical JKO type descent step

$$\rho_k^{n+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2h_k} W_{c_h, \varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}, \rho) + \mathcal{F}(\rho) \right\}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $W_{c_h, \varepsilon}$ is the regularised weighted Wasserstein

$$W_{c_h, \varepsilon}(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} c_{h_k}(x, y) \gamma(dx, dy) + \varepsilon_k H(\gamma) \right\}, \quad (4.5)$$

for the same cost function defined in (1.8). Let $(c_{h_k}, \tilde{\gamma}_k^{n, c}) = W_{c_{h_k}, \varepsilon_k}(\tilde{\rho}_k^n, \rho_k^n)$, and define the optimal couplings $\tilde{\gamma}_k^n, \gamma_k^n$ and interpolations $\rho_k, \tilde{\rho}_k, \rho_k^\dagger$ analogously to the un-regularised case but now with respect to the new sequences $\{\rho_k^n\}_{n=0}^{N_k}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_k^n\}_{n=0}^{N_k}$.

The convergence of the regularised two-step scheme is established in the next result.

Theorem 4.2. Assume that f, b and A satisfy Assumption 2.1, and let the sequences $\{h_k\}, \{\varepsilon_k\}, \{N_k\}$ satisfy Assumption 4.1. Let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy $\mathcal{F}(\rho_0) < \infty$. Let $\{\rho_k^n\}_{n=0}^{N_k}, \{\tilde{\rho}_k^n\}_{n=0}^{N_k}$ to be the solution of the regularised scheme (4.2)-(4.4), with interpolations $\rho_k, \tilde{\rho}_k, \rho_k^\dagger$ as defined above.

Then

(i)

$$\rho_k, \tilde{\rho}_k, \rho_k^\dagger \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} \rho \quad \text{in } L^1((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (4.6)$$

(ii) Moreover, there exists a map $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \rho(t, \cdot)$ in $\mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \max \left\{ W_2(\rho_k(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)), W_2(\tilde{\rho}_k(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)), W_2(\rho_k^\dagger(t, \cdot), \rho(t, \cdot)) \right\} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} 0, \quad (4.7)$$

where the limits ρ appearing above are weak solutions of the evolution equation (1.2) in the sense of Definition 2.3.

The proof does not change much from that of Theorem 2.4, so we provide only a sketch, highlighting the parts that are different.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Throughout the proof, for the sake of notational clarity, we will suppress the dependence of ε, h and N on k . Let $n \in \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$.

The well-posedness. The well-posedness of the regularised scheme relies on the well-posedness of the minimisation problem (4.5), the proof of which can be found in [ADdR21, Section 3].

A priori estimates. In the proof of Theorem 2.4 we compare the quantity $\frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1}) + \mathcal{F}(\rho_h^{n+1})$ against $\frac{1}{2h} W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}) + \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1})$. The term $W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1})$ is zero, and hence we end up with a control of $W_{c_h}(\tilde{\rho}_h^{n+1}, \rho_h^{n+1})$ in terms of the free energy. However, since $W_{c_h, \varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}, \rho_k^{n+1}) \neq 0$, we need to select a new distribution to compare the performance of ρ_k^{n+1} against. We judiciously choose a distribution as to make the cost c_h of transporting mass free (zero). We construct such a candidate distribution ρ_ε in the following way, let $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a probability density, such that $M(G) = 1$ and $H(G) < \infty$. Define $G_\varepsilon(\cdot) := \varepsilon^{-2d} G(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})$, and

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(x, y) := \tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}(x) G_\varepsilon(y - x),$$

as the joint distribution with first marginal $\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}$, and second marginal $\rho_\varepsilon(y) := \int \gamma_\varepsilon(x, y) dx$.

One can then calculate/express $H(\gamma_\varepsilon), \mathcal{F}(\gamma_\varepsilon), (c_h, \gamma_\varepsilon)$ in terms of $\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}$ (see [ADdR21, Lemma 4.3]). Comparing the performance of ρ_k^{n+1} against ρ_ε in (4.4) we get, making use of the scaling (4.1) and that $H(\tilde{\gamma}_k^{n+1, c}) \geq H(\rho_k^{n+1}) + H(\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1})$, the following inequality

$$(c_h, \tilde{\gamma}_k^{n+1, c}) \leq Ch^2 \left(M(\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}) + 1 \right) - \varepsilon H(\rho_k^{n+1}) + 2h \left(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}) - \mathcal{F}(\rho_k^{n+1}) \right). \quad (4.8)$$

From (4.8) we are able to obtain bounded 2nd moments, energy, and entropy estimates in an almost identical fashion as to Lemma 3.8. Moreover, summing (4.8) and using such estimates yields the bound

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (c_h, \tilde{\gamma}_k^{n+1,c}) \leq Ch. \quad (4.9)$$

It is easy to conclude that we also have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}, \rho_k^{n+1}) \leq Ch \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} W_2^2(\rho_k^n, \tilde{\rho}_k^{n+1}) \leq Ch. \quad (4.10)$$

The Discrete Euler-Lagrange Equation and concluding the convergence. Since ρ_k^{n+1} solves the minimisation problem (4.4), the associated discrete Euler-Lagrange equation reads, for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$0 = \frac{1}{h} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \langle x - y, \nabla \varphi(y) \rangle d\tilde{\gamma}^{n+1,c}(x, y) + \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_k^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi) - \frac{\varepsilon}{h} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_k^{n+1}(y) \operatorname{div}(A_h \nabla \varphi(y)) dy. \quad (4.11)$$

Therefore, the analogous result to Lemma 3.14 is

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_k^\dagger(t, x) (\partial_t \varphi(t, x) + b[\rho(t, \cdot)](x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(t, x)) dx dt \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^0(x) \varphi(0, x) dx - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(h \delta \mathcal{F}(\rho_k^{n+1}, A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, \cdot)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{h} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_k^{n+1}(y) \operatorname{div}(A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, y)) dy \right) + O(h). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

The convergence claimed in (4.6) and (4.7) follows by a priori estimates identical to those of Lemma 3.12. Hence to complete the proof of Theorem 4.2 we need only to deal with the term appearing from the regularisation

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{\varepsilon}{h} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_k^{n+1}(y) \operatorname{div}(A_h \nabla \varphi(t_n, y)) dy,$$

and show it goes to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This is clear by a similar argument to that in the end of the proof of Section 3.4: using the convergence (4.6) of ρ_k and the scaling (4.1) which implies that $\frac{\varepsilon}{h} \rightarrow 0$. \square

5 Examples

The purpose of this section is to show the breadth of our framework. We present four PDE examples which can all be written in the general form (1.2): the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck Equation (5.2), a degenerate non-linear diffusion equation of Kolmogorov-type (5.9), the linear Wigner FPE (5.7), and a generalised Vlasov-Langevin equation (5.11). In each case, assuming the coefficients are such that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied, the application of Theorem 2.4 and/or of Theorem 4.2 provides novel results.

Remark 5.1 (The components of the divergence free vector field). Let us remark that the non-local terms we will consider are convolutions $K * \rho$ (for some kernel $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$) which always satisfy (2.8) as long as the vector field K is Lipschitz. Moreover, we also consider external potentials of the form ∇g (for some $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) which can be made to satisfy (2.7) under relatively mild assumptions on the Hessian.

5.1 Vlasov-Fokker-Planck Equation (VFPE)

In this example, let the dimension be $2d$, and coordinates be $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, where $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the following vector field, diffusion matrix, and potential energy

$$b[\rho](x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ -(\nabla g(x) + K * \rho(x)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad f(x, v) = f(v), \quad (5.1)$$

for a given $g, f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and where in the matrix A each entry stands for a $d \times d$ -matrix times that entry. Substituting (5.1) into PDE (1.2), yields the linear kinetic Fokker-Planck for $t \geq 0$

$$\partial_t \rho = -\operatorname{div}_x(\rho v) + \operatorname{div}_v(\rho(\nabla g + K * \rho)) + \operatorname{div}_v(\rho \nabla f) + \Delta_v \rho. \quad (5.2)$$

For this equation, $\rho(t, x, v)dx dv$ describes the probability of finding a particle, at time t , with position x and velocity v . As an alternative interpretation, (5.2) is the forward Kolmogorov equation of the associated SDE for $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = V_t dt \\ dV_t = -(K * \rho_t(X_t) + \nabla g(X_t))dt - \nabla f(V_t)dt + \sqrt{2}dW_t \\ \rho_t = \text{Law}(X_t, V_t). \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

The particle interacts with its environment through the non-local term $K * \rho$ whilst being confined by an external potential g , experiencing a frictional force f and a diffusive force W_t . We have just presented a statistical physics interpretation of (5.3), however, more recently there has been a resurgence of interest in such equations among those in the machine learning community who want to rigorously prove trainability of neural networks, see [KRTY20] and references therein.

In (5.2) the frictional and diffusion terms are of a dissipative nature, and the vector field b comprises of the conservative forces in (5.3). Because of the mixed dynamics and the degeneracy of the diffusion, (5.2) is not a classical gradient flow. One-step schemes have been developed for the linear kinetic Fokker-Planck [DPZ14, Hua00], and for the non-linear kinetic Fokker-Planck [ADdR21]. Our main criticism of these works is that the cost function c_h that appears does not give rise to a metric and thus the optimal transport problem that drives the scheme is not a metric on the space of probability measures. In the scope of our construction (Theorem 2.4 and 4.2), we use a weighted Wasserstein metric and hence our work is easily implementable using the Sinkhorn algorithm [PC19]. It is also worth mentioning that, by Remark 5.1, the assumptions required for g are less restrictive than those assumed in the above works.

Splitting schemes have already been developed for (5.2), see [CG04, MS20], there the authors fix the spacial variable and perform the gradient descent step only in the velocity component. However, it is not immediately clear how to extend this strategy to non-linear non-local drifts – which is the setting we address – greatly reducing the number of systems to which their work can be applied.

5.1.1 Regularized Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck equation

A particular case of (5.2) is the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \rho = -\text{div}_x(\rho v) + \text{div}_v(\rho(\nabla g(x) + E[\rho](x))) - \beta \text{div}_v(\rho v) + \sigma \Delta_v \rho. \quad (5.4)$$

where the constants σ, β are positive, and E solves the Poisson equation

$$\Delta E[\rho](x) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x, v) dv,$$

the solution of which is

$$E[\rho](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(x - y) \rho(y, v) dy dv, \quad (5.5)$$

for the Kernel Γ defined as

$$\Gamma(r) := \begin{cases} \frac{\omega_d}{\|r\|^{d-2}} & \text{for } d > 2 \\ \omega_2 \log \|r\| & \text{for } d = 2 \end{cases},$$

where ω_d is the surface area of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . This equation is of great importance in plasma physics, as it models a cloud of charged particles influencing each other through a Coulomb interaction, whilst subject to deterministic and random forcing, and friction. Since Γ is singular our methods can not be directly applied where it is easy to check that (2.7) fails to hold. However, if we consider E^ϵ defined analogously to (5.5) but with Γ replaced by

$$\Gamma^\epsilon(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{\omega_d}{(\|r\|^2 + \epsilon)^{d-2/2}} & \text{for } d \neq 2 \\ \frac{\omega_d}{2} \log(\|r\|^2 + \epsilon) & \text{for } d = 2 \end{cases},$$

then we arrive at the regularised Vlasov-Poisson Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \rho^\epsilon = -\text{div}_x(\rho^\epsilon v) + \text{div}_v(\rho^\epsilon(\nabla g(x) + E^\epsilon[\rho^\epsilon](x))) - \beta \text{div}_v(\rho^\epsilon v) + \sigma \Delta_v \rho^\epsilon. \quad (5.6)$$

Here we have regularised the Kernel appearing in the convolution (this is different from the regularisation discussed in Section 4). The solutions ρ^ϵ to (5.6) have been shown to converge (as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) to the solution of the original system (5.4) [CS95]. For any $\epsilon > 0$, Γ^ϵ is non-singular and hence our theory applies to (5.6) (note this is just a specific case of the systems discussed in the previous Section 5.1). One-step variational schemes (in the space of probability measures) have already been proposed for (5.6), see [HJ00]. The cost function used in [HJ00] is essentially the same as that used for Kramers' equation in [Hua00]. Therefore their work lends itself to similar criticisms as before: the cost function is not a metric, the free energy depends on the time step and contains a mix of conservative and dissipative terms. Our scheme does not suffer from any of these theoretical and practical drawbacks.

5.2 Linear Wigner FPE

The Wigner Fokker-Planck equation is the quantum mechanical analogue to the classical VFPE discussed in Section 5.1. The solutions of the Wigner FPE (Wigner functions [Wig97]) are valuable in the modelling of semiconductor devices, see [MRS90] and references therein. The full equation includes a pseudo-differential operator acting on a non-local term coupled to the Poisson equation. At this time it is not clear how to apply our theory to the full equation, however, such is possible if one considers only the linear terms in the equation.

Let the dimension be $2d$, and coordinates be $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ for $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the following vector field b , diffusion matrix A , and potential energy f ,

$$b(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} -(\frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma} + 1)v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \lambda \\ \lambda & \sigma \end{pmatrix}, \quad f(x, v) = f(v) = \frac{\beta}{\sigma} \|v\|^2,$$

where $\beta > 0$ is the friction parameter and $\sigma, \alpha, \lambda > 0$ form the diffusion matrix of the system. Again each entry of A stands for a $d \times d$ identity matrix times that entry.

Of course in the KFPE of classical mechanics $\alpha = \lambda = 0$. Under this framework (1.2) reduces to the linearized Wigner Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \rho = -\operatorname{div}_x(\rho v) + \beta \operatorname{div}_v(v \rho) + \sigma \Delta_v \rho + \alpha \Delta_x \rho + 2\lambda \operatorname{div}_v(\nabla_x \rho). \quad (5.7)$$

This example differs from the main perspective of our work in the sense that (5.7) is local and non-degenerate. We mention (5.7) since it is relevant in the physics literature [ADM07] and acts as a standard example of a non-diagonal diffusion matrix fitting our framework.

5.3 A degenerate diffusion equation of Kolmogorov-type

In this example, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and set the dimension to be nd . Denote the coordinates as $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)^T$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Consider the following divergence free vector field, diffusion matrix, and potential energy

$$b(\mathbf{x}) = (x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n, 0)^T, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = f(x_n), \quad (5.8)$$

where, in the matrix A , I is the $d \times d$ -dimensional identity matrix and 0 stands for a $d(n-1) \times d(n-1)$ -matrix of zeros. Then (1.2) reduces to the following non-linear degenerate equation of Kolmogorov type

$$\partial_t \rho = -\sum_{i=2}^n \operatorname{div}_{x_{i-1}}(x_i \rho) + \operatorname{div}_{x_n}(\nabla f(x_n) \rho) + \Delta_{x_n} \rho. \quad (5.9)$$

Equation (5.9) is the forward Kolmogorov equation of the associated stochastic differential equations

$$\begin{cases} dX_1 = X_2 dt \\ dX_2 = X_3 dt \\ \vdots \\ dX_{n-1} = X_n dt \\ dX_n = -\nabla f(X_n) dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t, \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

where W_t is a d -dimensional Wiener process. System (5.10) describes the motion of n coupled oscillators connected to their nearest neighbours with the last oscillator additionally forced by a random noise which propagates through the system. The simplest cases of $n = 1, n = 2$ correspond to the heat equation and Kramers' equation (with no background potential) respectively. When $n > 2$ this type of equations arise as models of simplified finite Markovian approximations of generalised Langevin dynamics [OP11], or harmonic oscillator chains [BL08, DM10]. Recent works [DT17, ADdR21] have constructed a one-step scheme for (5.9), however, the cost function used there (the mean squared derivative cost function [DT18] [(11)]), although explicit, does not take a simple form.

5.4 A generalised Vlasov-Langevin equation

In this example, set the dimension as $2d + md$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Set the coordinates of the domain to be $(q, p, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+md}$, with $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{md}$. Consider the following divergence free vector field, diffusion matrix, and potential

energy

$$b[\rho](q, p, z) = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{A}(q) - K * \rho(q) + \sum_{j=1}^m \Lambda^j z^j \\ -\Lambda^1 p \\ \vdots \\ -\Lambda^m p \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad f(q, p, z) = f(z) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \|z\|^2,$$

where $\mathcal{A}, K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \Lambda^j, \alpha^j \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are diagonal matrices, $\alpha = \text{diag}(\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^m)$, and I is the $md \times md$ identity matrix. Then (1.2) reduces to an approximation of the generalised Vlasov-Langevin dynamics [OP11, Duo15]

$$\partial_t \rho = -p \cdot \nabla_q \rho + (\mathcal{A}(q) + K * \rho(q) - \sum_{j=1}^m \Lambda^j z^j) \cdot \nabla_p \rho + \text{div}_z[(\lambda p + \alpha z) \rho] + \Delta_z \rho. \quad (5.11)$$

Equation (5.11) is the forward Kolmogorov equation of the SDE system

$$\begin{cases} dQ_t = P_t dt, \\ dP_t = -\mathcal{A}(Q_t) dt - K * \rho_t(Q_t) dt + \sum_{j=1}^m \Lambda^j Z_t^j dt, \\ dZ_t^j = -\Lambda^j P_t dt - \alpha^j Z_t^j dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, m. \\ \rho_t = \text{Law}(Q_t, P_t, Z_t^1, \dots, Z_t^m), \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

where W_t^j are independent d -dimensional Brownian motions. When \mathcal{A} is the gradient of a potential and no Kernel is present, $K = 0$, then (5.12) can be viewed as the coupling of a deterministic Hamiltonian system (Q_t, P_t) to a heat bath Z_t , the literature on this subject is vast. In this setup, for large m the Markovian system (5.12) approximates the Generalised Langevin equation (GLE). The GLE serves as a standard model in non-Markovian non-equilibrium statistical mechanics, where the Hamiltonian system is in contact with one or more heat baths. The heat baths are modeled by the linear wave equation and are initialised according to Gibbs distribution, see [Kup04, OP11, RB06] and references therein.

When $K \neq 0$, the mean field term $K * \rho$ models the particle interactions in the underlying deterministic system (via the positions Q_t). In this case, (5.12) is the McKean-Vlasov limit of a system of weakly interacting particles [Duo15].

A Appendix

Lemma A.1. For any $h > 0$, and any μ and ν in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it is true that

$$M(\nu) \leq 2(W_2^2(\mu, \nu) + M(\mu)) \quad (A.1)$$

and

$$M(\nu) \leq C(W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) + M(\mu)). \quad (A.2)$$

Proof. The result (A.1) for W_2 is obvious. For (A.2) just use (A.1) in conjunction with (3.4). \square

Lemma A.2. [JKO98, Proposition 4.1] There exists a $C > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that

$$H(\mu) \geq -C(M(\mu) + 1)^\alpha, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{and} \quad H_+(\mu) \leq C(M(\mu) + 1)^\alpha, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (A.3)$$

Moreover, H is weakly lower semi-continuous under bounded moments, i.e., if $\{\mu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\mu_k \rightarrow \mu$, and there exists $C > 0$ such that $M(\mu_k), M(\mu) < C$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$H(\mu) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} H(\mu_k). \quad (A.4)$$

Lemma A.3. Let $h > 0$. Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ there exists $\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ such that

$$W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) = (c_h, \gamma).$$

Moreover, the map $\gamma \mapsto (c_h, \gamma)$ is weakly lower semi-continuous.

Proof. See [Vil08, Theorem 4.1]. \square

Lemma A.4 (Lower Semi-Continuity of the functionals). Let $\{\nu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with $\nu_k \rightharpoonup \nu$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Assume that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the probability measures ν_k, μ, ν have uniformly bounded entropy and second moments. Then

$$\mathcal{F}(\nu) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\nu_k) \quad \text{and} \quad W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu_k). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Proof. Let $\{\nu_k\}, \mu, \nu$ be as assumed above, and $\{\gamma_k\}$ be the associated optimal plans in $W_{c_h, \varepsilon}(\mu, \nu_k)$. Note $\{\gamma_k\} \subset \Pi(\mu, \{\nu_k\})$ (see notations Section 2.1). Since $\{\nu_k\}$ is weakly convergent then it is tight, and [Vil08, Lemma 4.4] implies that $\Pi(\mu, \{\nu_k\})$ is so too. Extracting (and relabelling) a sub-sequence $\{\gamma_k\}$, we know that (as $k \rightarrow \infty$) $\gamma_k \rightharpoonup \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. In fact $\gamma \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ since the weak convergence of γ_k implies the weak convergence of its marginals (and we know $\nu_k \rightharpoonup \nu$). Now, the lower semi-continuity established in Lemma A.3 implies that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu_k) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2h}(c_h, \gamma_k) \geq \frac{1}{2h}(c_h, \gamma) \geq W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu).$$

The proof for \mathcal{F} is identical to [AddR21, Lemma 3.8]. \square

A.1 Well-Posedness

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $0 < h < 1$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Define $J_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) := \frac{1}{2h}W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) + \mathcal{F}(\nu)$, then we have

$$J_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2h}W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) + M(\mu) + \mathcal{F}(\nu) - M(\mu) \geq W_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) + M(\mu) + \mathcal{F}(\nu) - M(\mu) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\geq C_1 M(\nu) + H(\nu) - M(\mu) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$= C_1 M(\nu) - C_2(1 + M(\nu))^\alpha + C_\mu, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where in (A.6) we have used that $h < 1$, in (A.7) we used Lemma A.1 and the non-negativity of f , and in (A.8) we used Lemma A.2. We emphasize that the constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are independent of μ, ν and $C_\mu > 0$ is independent of ν . Inequality (A.8) implies that $\nu \mapsto J(\mu, \nu)$ is bounded from below. Note that there exists a $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $J_{c_h}(\mu, \nu) < \infty$, for example, take $\nu = \mu$ (and the product plan).

Let $\{\mu_k\}$ be a minimising sequence and note that this implies $M(\nu_k), H(\nu_k)$ are uniformly bounded. The uniform boundedness of $M(\nu_k)$ implies tightness of $\{\nu_k\}$, and hence extracting a sub sequence we have $\nu_k \rightharpoonup \nu^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, $\nu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ since uniformly bounded 2nd moments and weak convergence of $\{\nu_k\}$ implies that the limit has a bounded 2nd moment as well. Additionally, $\nu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the lower semi-continuity of H , see Lemma A.2. That ν^* is indeed the minimiser of (3.5) follows from the lower semi-continuity in Lemma A.4. Finally, the uniqueness follows by linearity of $F(\cdot)$, convexity of $W_2(\mu, \cdot)$, and the strict convexity of $H(\cdot)$. \square

References

- [AddR21] D. Adams, M. H. Duong, and G. dos Reis, *Entropic regularisation of non-gradient systems*, 2021. arXiv:2104.04372.
- [ADM07] A. Arnold, E. Dhamo, and C. Manzini, *Le système de Wigner-Poisson-Fokker-Planck: solutions globales en temps et effets dispersifs*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **24** (2007), no. 4, 645–676. MR2334997
- [ADPZ11] S. Adams, N. Dirr, M. A. Peletier, and J. Zimmer, *From a large-deviations principle to the Wasserstein gradient flow: a new micro-macro passage*, Comm. Math. Phys. **307** (2011), no. 3, 791–815. MR2842966
- [ADPZ13] S. Adams, N. Dirr, M. Peletier, and J. Zimmer, *Large deviations and gradient flows*, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. **371** (2013), no. 2005, 20120341, 17. MR3150638
- [AGG⁺12] A. Arnold, I. M. Gamba, M. P. Gualdani, S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, and C. Sparber, *The Wigner-Fokker-Planck equation: stationary states and large time behavior*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **22** (2012), no. 11, 1250034, 31. MR2974172
- [AGS08] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré, *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [BA15] M. Bowles and M. Agueh, *Weak solutions to a fractional Fokker-Planck equation via splitting and Wasserstein gradient flow*, Appl. Math. Lett. **42** (2015), 30–35. MR3294365
- [Ber18] E. Bernton, *Langevin Monte Carlo and JKO splitting*, Conference on learning theory, 2018, pp. 1777–1798.
- [BFS12] M. Burger, M. Franek, and C.-B. Schönlieb, *Regularized regression and density estimation based on optimal transport*, Applied Mathematics Research eXpress **2012** (2012), no. 2, 209–253.

- [BL08] T. Bodineau and R. Lefevre, *Large deviations of lattice Hamiltonian dynamics coupled to stochastic thermostats*, J. Stat. Phys. **133** (2008), no. 1, 1–27. MR2438895
- [BS18] T. Bühler and D. A. Salamon, *Functional analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 191, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018. MR3823238
- [CCP19] J. A. Carrillo, K. Craig, and F. S. Patacchini, *A blob method for diffusion*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations **58** (2019), no. 2, 1–53.
- [CCWW21] J. A. Carrillo, K. Craig, L. Wang, and C. Wei, *Primal dual methods for wasserstein gradient flows*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics (2021), 1–55.
- [CDPS17] G. Carlier, V. Duval, G. Peyré, and B. Schmitzer, *Convergence of entropic schemes for optimal transport and gradient flows*, SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis **49** (2017), no. 2, 1385–1418.
- [CG04] E. A. Carlen and W. Gangbo, *Solution of a model Boltzmann equation via steepest descent in the 2-Wasserstein metric*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **172** (2004), no. 1, 21–64. MR2048566
- [CL17] G. Carlier and M. Laborde, *A splitting method for nonlinear diffusions with nonlocal, nonpotential drifts*, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications **150** (2017), 1–18.
- [CS95] J. A. Carrillo and J. Soler, *On the initial value problem for the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system with initial data in L^p spaces*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **18** (1995), no. 10, 825–839. MR1343393
- [Cut13] M. Cuturi, *Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport*, Advances in neural information processing systems **26** (2013), 2292–2300.
- [DL18] M. H. Duong and Y. Lu, *An operator splitting scheme for the fractional kinetic Fokker-Planck equation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.06127 (2018).
- [DL89] R. J. DiPerna and P.-L. Lions, *Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces*, Invent. Math. **98** (1989), no. 3, 511–547. MR1022305
- [DLR13] M. H. Duong, V. Laschos, and M. Renger, *Wasserstein gradient flows from large deviations of many-particle limits*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations **19** (2013), no. 4, 1166–1188.
- [DM10] F. Delarue and S. Menozzi, *Density estimates for a random noise propagating through a chain of differential equations*, Journal of functional analysis **259** (2010), no. 6, 1577–1630.
- [DPZ13] M. H. Duong, M. A. Peletier, and J. Zimmer, *GENERIC formalism of a Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation and connection to large-deviation principles*, Nonlinearity **26** (2013), no. 11, 2951–2971. MR3129075
- [DPZ14] M. H. Duong, M. A. Peletier, and J. Zimmer, *Conservative-dissipative approximation schemes for a generalized Kramers equation*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **37** (2014), no. 16, 2517–2540. MR3271101
- [DT17] M. H. Duong and H. M. Tran, *Analysis of the mean squared derivative cost function*, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences **40** (2017), no. 14, 5222–5240, available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/mma.4382>.
- [DT18] M. H. Duong and H. M. Tran, *On the fundamental solution and a variational formulation for a degenerate diffusion of Kolmogorov type*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **38** (2018), no. 7, 3407–3438. MR3809088
- [Duo15] M. H. Duong, *Long time behaviour and particle approximation of a generalised Vlasov dynamic*, Nonlinear Anal. **127** (2015), 1–16. MR3392354
- [EMR15] M. Erbar, J. Maas, and D. R. M. Renger, *From large deviations to Wasserstein gradient flows in multiple dimensions*, Electron. Commun. Probab. **20** (2015), no. 89, 12. MR3434206
- [FGY11] A. Figalli, W. Gangbo, and T. Yolcu, *A variational method for a class of parabolic PDEs*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **10** (2011), no. 1, 207–252. MR2829314
- [GKMP20] P. Gladbach, E. Kopfer, J. Maas, and L. Portinale, *Homogenisation of one-dimensional discrete optimal transport*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées **139** (2020), 204–234.
- [GO16] R. Glowinski and S. J. Osher (eds.), *Splitting methods in communication, imaging, science, and engineering*, Scientific Computation, Springer, Cham, 2016. MR3587821
- [GST09] U. Gianazza, G. Savaré, and G. Toscani, *The Wasserstein gradient flow of the Fisher information and the quantum drift-diffusion equation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **194** (2009), no. 1, 133–220. MR2533926
- [HJ00] C. Huang and R. Jordan, *Variational formulations for Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck systems*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **23** (2000), no. 9, 803–843. MR1763126
- [HJ13] H. J. Hwang and J. Jang, *On the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck equation near Maxwellian*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **18** (2013), no. 3, 681–691. MR3007749

- [HKL10] H. Holden, K. H. Karlsen, and K.-A. Lie, *Splitting methods for partial differential equations with rough solutions: Analysis and matlab programs*, Vol. 11, European Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [Hua00] C. Huang, *A variational principle for the Kramers equation with unbounded external forces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **250** (2000), no. 1, 333–367. MR1893894
- [JKO98] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto, *The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **29** (1998), no. 1, 1–17. MR1617171
- [Kra40] H. A. Kramers, *Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions*, Physica **7** (1940), 284–304. MR0002962 (2,140d)
- [KRTY20] A. Kazeykina, Z. Ren, X. Tan, and J. Yang, *Ergodicity of the underdamped mean-field Langevin dynamics*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14660 (2020).
- [KS67] P. Knopp and R. Sinkhorn, *Concerning nonnegative matrices and doubly stochastic matrices.*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **21** (1967), no. 2, 343–348.
- [Kup04] R. Kupferman, *Fractional kinetics in Kac-Zwanzig heat bath models*, J. Statist. Phys. **114** (2004), no. 1-2, 291–326. MR2032133
- [Lab17] M. Laborde, *On some nonlinear evolution systems which are perturbations of Wasserstein gradient flows*, Topological optimization and optimal transport, 2017, pp. 304–332. MR3729381
- [Léo13] C. Léonard, *A survey of the schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.0215 (2013).
- [Lis09] S. Lisini, *Nonlinear diffusion equations with variable coefficients as gradient flows in Wasserstein spaces*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **15** (2009), no. 3, 712–740. MR2542579
- [Maa11] J. Maas, *Gradient flows of the entropy for finite markov chains*, Journal of Functional Analysis **261** (2011), no. 8, 2250–2292.
- [Mie13] A. Mielke, *Geodesic convexity of the relative entropy in reversible markov chains*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations **48** (2013Sep), no. 1, 1–31.
- [MMS09] D. Matthes, R. J. McCann, and G. Savaré, *A family of nonlinear fourth order equations of gradient flow type*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **34** (2009), no. 11, 1352–1397.
- [MRS90] P. A. Markowich, C. A. Ringhofer, and C. Schmeiser, *Semiconductor equations*, Springer-Verlag, Vienna, 1990. MR1063852
- [MS20] A. Marcos and A. Soglo, *Solutions of a class of degenerate kinetic equations using steepest descent in wasserstein space*, Journal of Mathematics **2020** (2020).
- [OP11] M. Ottobre and G. A. Pavliotis, *Asymptotic analysis for the generalized Langevin equation*, Nonlinearity **24** (2011), no. 5, 1629–1653. MR2793823
- [Ott01] F. Otto, *The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **26** (2001), no. 1-2, 101–174. MR1842429
- [Ött18] H. C. Öttinger, *Generic: Review of successful applications and a challenge for the future*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08470 (2018).
- [PC19] G. Peyré and M. Cuturi, *Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science*, Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning **11** (2019), no. 5-6, 355–607.
- [RB06] L. Rey-Bellet, *Open classical systems*, Open quantum systems. II, 2006, pp. 41–78. MR2248987
- [Ris89] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck equation*, Second, Springer Series in Synergetics, vol. 18, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989. Methods of solution and applications. MR987631
- [San15] F. Santambrogio, *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, Birkhäuser, NY **55** (2015), no. 58-63, 94.
- [Sch31] E. Schrödinger, *Über die umkehrung der naturgesetze*, Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Kommission bei Walter De Gruyter u . . ., 1931.
- [Ser20] S. Serfaty, *Mean field limit for Coulomb-type flows*, Duke Math. J. **169** (2020), no. 15, 2887–2935. With an appendix by Mitia Duerinckx and Serfaty. MR4158670
- [SK67] R. Sinkhorn and P. Knopp, *Concerning nonnegative matrices and doubly stochastic matrices*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **21** (1967), no. 2, 343–348.
- [Vil08] C. Villani, *Optimal transport: old and new*, Vol. 338, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [Wig97] E. P. Wigner, *On the quantum correction for thermodynamic equilibrium*, Part I: Physical chemistry. Part II: Solid state physics, 1997, pp. 110–120.