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Abstract

In this paper, utilizing Wang’s Harnack inequality with power and the Banach fixed point theorem, the weak well-posedness for distribution dependent SDEs with integrable drift is investigated. In addition, using a trick of decoupled method, some regularity such as relative entropy and Sobolev’s estimate of invariant probability measure are proved. Furthermore, by comparing two stationary Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations, the existence and uniqueness of invariant probability measure for McKean-Vlasov SDEs are obtained by log-Sobolev’s inequality and Banach’s fixed theorem. Finally, some examples are presented.
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1 Introduction

Invariant probability measure is the equilibrium state in physics. There are plentiful results on the invariant probability measure for linear semigroup \(P_t\) associated to classical
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SDEs. The existence of invariant probability measure can be ensured by investigating the tightness of
\[
\frac{1}{n} \int_0^n P_t^* \delta_x dt
\]
with respect to \( n \), see [15]. Moreover, Lyapunov’s condition is an useful sufficient condition to obtain the existence of invariant probability measure, i.e. there exists a function \( V \) with \( \lim_{|x| \to \infty} V(x) = \infty \) and constants \( C, R > 0 \) such that
\[
LV \leq -C, \quad |x| \geq R,
\]
see, for instance [9]. For the uniqueness, the classical principle is strong Feller property together with irreducibility, see [15, Theorem 4.2.1]. By Wang’s Harnack inequality [30, Theorem 1.4.1], the uniqueness can also be ensured. Furthermore, using couplings or generalized couplings, [29] proved the uniqueness of the invariant measures. Recently, in [32], the existence and uniqueness as well as the regularity such as relative entropy and Sobolev’s estimate are investigated.

However, all the above method are unavailable in distribution dependent SDEs, where the associated semigroup \( P_t^* \) is nonlinear. In [31], Wang obtained the existence and uniqueness of invariant probability measure by Cauchy sequence method, see [20] for the path-distribution dependent case. One can also refer to [24] for the McKean-Vlasov SDEs with Lévy noise. Quite recently, [35] investigated the existence of invariant probability measure by Schauder’s fixed point theorem, see also [4] for the existence of invariant probability measure of functional McKean-Vlasov SDEs by Kakutani’s fixed point theorem. [34] proved the existence and uniqueness of invariant probability measure for (reflecting) McKean-Vlasov SDEs by exponential ergodicity and Banach’s fixed point theorem. For more results, one can see [16, 18, 19] and references therein. Moreover, by using log-Sobolev’s inequality or Poisson equations, [7, 8] investigated the existence and uniqueness of the solution to stationary nonlinear and non-degenerate Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations.

In this paper, we will extend the results in [7] to the degenerate case, where the diffusion coefficients may be not invertible. More precisely, we will give the estimate of information entropy between two invariant probability measures of two different SDEs and then the existence and uniqueness of invariant probability measure for McKean-Vlasov SDEs are proved by log-Sobolev’s inequality and Banach’s fixed point theorem. Moreover, the regularity of invariant probability measure with integrable drift is also obtained by decoupled technique and the existed results in [32].

Let \( \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) be the space of all probability measures on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) equipped with the weak topology. Consider the following distribution dependent SDE on \( \mathbb{R}^d \):
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
dX_t &= Z_0(X_t) + \sigma(X_t)Z(X_t, \mathcal{L}X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t,
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
where \( (W_t)_{t \geq 0} \) is an \( n \)-dimensional Brownian motion on a complete filtration probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})\), \( \mathcal{L}X_t \) is the law of \( X_t \),
\[
Z : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}^n, \quad Z_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^n
\]
are measurable. Compared with [32], \( Z \) can depend on the distribution of the solution, see \((A_6)\) below for the condition of \( Z \) on the measure component. When a different probability measure \( \mathbb{P} \) is concerned, we use \( \mathcal{L}_\xi|\mathbb{P} \) to denote the law of a random variable \( \xi \) under the probability \( \mathbb{P} \), and use \( \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P} \) to stand for the expectation under \( \mathbb{P} \).

**Definition 1.1.** (1) An adapted continuous process \((X_t)_{t\geq 0}\) on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is called a solution of (1.1), if 
\[
\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \{ |Z_0(X_t)| + |\sigma(X_t)Z(X_t, \mathcal{L}_X_t)| + ||\sigma(X_t)||^2 \} dt < \infty, \; T > 0,
\]
and \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.s.
\[
X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t Z_0(X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)Z(X_s, \mathcal{L}_X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)dW_s, \; t \geq 0.
\]

(2) For any \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), \( \{\tilde{X}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, \{\tilde{W}_t\}_{t\geq 0}\) is called a weak solution to (1.1) starting at \( \mu_0 \), if \( \tilde{W}_t \) is an \( n \)-dimensional Brownian motion under a complete filtration probability space \((\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})\), \( \tilde{X}_t \) is a continuous \( \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t \)-adapted process on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{X}_0}|\tilde{\mathbb{P}} = \mu_0 \) and \( \tilde{X}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0 \), and (1.2)-(1.3) hold for \((X, \tilde{W}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}})\) replacing \((X, W, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{E})\).

(3) We call (1.1) weakly well-posed for an initial distribution \( \mu_0 \), if it has a weak solution starting at \( \mu_0 \) and any weak solution with the same initial distribution is equal in law.

For the well-posedness of distribution dependent SDEs with singular drifts, one can refer to [5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 36] and references within.

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we investigate the weak well-posedness of (1.1) under integrable condition. In Section 3, the regularity of invariant probability measure for McKean-Vlasov SDEs with integrable drift is presented. The existence and uniqueness of invariant probability measure are stated in Section 4.

## 2 Weak Well-posedness

For any \( \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), the total variation distance between \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) is defined as
\[
\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = 2 \sup_{A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| = \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\mu(f) - \nu(f)|.
\]

To obtain the weak well-posedness of (1.1), we make the following assumptions, see [32] for more details.
(A) The reference SDE

\[ \text{d}X_t = Z_0(X_t)\text{d}t + \sigma(X_t)\text{d}W_t \]

is strongly well-posed and has a unique invariant probability measure \( \mu^0 \).

\((A_b)\) There exist constants \( \varepsilon > 0, K_b > 0 \) such that

\[ \mu^0(e^{\varepsilon|Z|} \cdot \mu^0)^2) < \infty, \]

and

\[ |Z(x, \gamma) - Z(x, \tilde{\gamma})| \leq K_b \| \gamma - \tilde{\gamma} \|_{TV}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d). \]

For any \( t \geq 0 \), let \( \pi(t) \) be the projection map from \( C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d) \) to \( \mathbb{R}^d \), i.e.

\[ \pi(t)(w) = w(t), \ w \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d). \]

For any \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), we will prove that (1.1) has a unique weak solution with initial distribution \( \gamma \) and the distribution of the solution \( \mathbb{P}^\gamma \) satisfying

\[ \mathbb{P}^\gamma \left( w \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d), \int_0^t |Z(w_s, \mathbb{P}^\gamma \circ \pi^{-1}_s)|^2 \text{d}s < \infty, \ t \geq 0 \right) = 1. \]

Firstly, repeating the proof of [32, Theorem 2.1], we can easily extend it to the time dependent case below. Consider

\[ \text{d}X_t = Z_0(X_t) + \sigma(X_t)\tilde{Z}_t(X_t)\text{d}t + \sigma(X_t)\text{d}W_t, \]

where \( \tilde{Z} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is measurable.

**Theorem 2.1.** Assume (A) and that the semigroup \( P_0^t \) associated to (2.1) satisfies the Harnack inequality, i.e. there exists \( p > 1 \) such that

\[ (P_0^t |f|^p(z)) \leq (P_0^t |f|^p)(\tilde{z})e^{\Phi_p(t, z, \tilde{z})}, \ f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d), z, \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d, t > 0 \]

with

\[ \int_0^t \left\{ \mu^0(e^{-\Phi_p(s,z)}) \right\}^{-\frac{1}{p}} \text{d}s < \infty, \ t > 0, z \in \mathbb{R}^d. \]

If in addition, there exists a constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[ \|e^{\varepsilon|Z|^2}\|_{L^\infty([0,t]; L^1(\mu^0))} < \infty, \ t > 0, \]

then for any \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), (2.5) has a unique weak solution \( \tilde{X}_t^\gamma \) with initial distribution \( \gamma \) and satisfying (2.4).
Proof. Since the proof can be completely the same with that of [32, Theorem 2.1], we omit it here. \qed

The main result in this section is the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.2.** Assume (A), (A_b), and that \( P^0_t \) satisfies (2.6) and (2.7), then for any \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), (1.1) has a unique weak solution with initial distribution \( \gamma \) and satisfying (2.4).

To prove Theorem 2.2, it is sufficient to prove that for any \( T > 0 \), (1.1) is weakly well-posed on \([0, T]\). So, we fix \( T > 0 \) in the following. For any \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), \( \mu \in \mathcal{B}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \), consider

\[
(2.8) \quad dX_t = Z_0(X_t) + \sigma(X_t)Z(X_t, \mu_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t
\]

with initial distribution \( \gamma \).

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** Note that (A_b) implies

\[
\|e^{\frac{1}{2} e^{\|Z(\cdot, \mu)\|^2}}\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; L^1(\mu))} \leq \mu^0(e^{\|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)\|^2 + 4e^{K^2}}) = \mu^0(e^{\|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)\|^2}) e^{4eK^2} < \infty, \quad t \geq 0.
\]

So, under the assumption of Theorem 2.2, Theorem 2.1 implies that for any \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), (2.8) has a unique weak solution \((X^\mu_t, W^\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}\) on \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})\) with \( \mathcal{L}_{X^\mu_0}\mid \mathbb{P} = \gamma \) for some probability measure \( \mathbb{P}^\mu \). Moreover, we denote \( \Phi^\gamma_t(\mu) = \mathcal{L}_{X^\mu_t}\mid \mathbb{P}^\mu \). For \( \nu \in \mathcal{B}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \), we rewrite (2.8) as

\[
(2.9) \quad dX^\mu_t = Z_0(X^\mu_t) + \sigma(X^\mu_t)Z(X^\mu_t, \nu_t)dt + \sigma(X^\mu_t)d\bar{W}_t,
\]

where

\[
\bar{W}_t = W^\mu_t + \int_0^t \xi_s ds, \quad \xi_s := Z(X^\mu_s, \nu_s) - Z(X^\mu_s, \nu_s), \quad s, t \in [0, T].
\]

By (A_b), it is not difficult to see that

\[
(2.10) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^\mu}[e^{\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\xi_s|^2 ds}] \leq e^{\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T K^2 \|\nu_s - \nu_s\|_{L^2} ds} \leq e^{2TK^2} < \infty.
\]

Set

\[
R_t := e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \langle \xi_s, dW^\mu_s \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\xi_s|^2 ds}, \quad t \in [0, T].
\]

According to the Girsanov theorem, we see that \( R_T \) is a probability density with respect to \( \mathbb{P}^\mu \), and \((\bar{W}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}\) is an \( n \)-dimensional Brownian motion under the probability \( \mathbb{Q} := R_T \mathbb{P}^\mu \).

From the weak uniqueness of (2.8) and \( \mathcal{L}_{X^\mu_0}\mid \mathbb{Q} = \mathcal{L}_{X^\mu_0}\mid \mathbb{P}^\mu = \gamma \), we conclude that

\[
\Phi^\gamma_t(\nu) = \mathcal{L}_{X^\mu_t}\mid \mathbb{Q}, \quad t \in [0, T].
\]
Combining this with \((A_b)\) and applying Pinsker’s inequality [14, 27], we obtain
\[
\|\Phi^*_t(\nu) - \Phi^*_t(\mu)\|_{TV}^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\nu}[R_t \log R_t] = \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \int_0^t |\xi_s|^2 \, ds
\]
(2.11)
\[
= \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \int_0^t |Z(X_s^\mu, \mu_s) - Z(X_s^\mu, \nu_s)|^2 \, ds.
\]
This together with \((A_b)\) implies
(2.12)
\[
\|\Phi^*_t(\nu) - \Phi^*_t(\mu)\|_{TV}^2 \leq \int_0^t K_b^2 \|\mu_s - \nu_s\|_{TV}^2 \, ds.
\]
Take \(\lambda = K_b^2\) and consider the space \(E_T := \{\mu \in \mathcal{B}([0, T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) : \mu_0 = \gamma\}\) equipped with the complete metric
\[
\rho(\nu, \mu) := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} e^{-\lambda t} \|\nu_t - \mu_t\|_{TV}.
\]
It follows from (2.11) that
\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} e^{-2\lambda t} \|\Phi^*_t(\nu) - \Phi^*_t(\mu)\|_{TV}^2 \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t K_b^2 e^{-2\lambda(t-s)} e^{-2\lambda s} \|\mu_s - \nu_s\|_{TV}^2 \, ds
\]
(2.13)
\[
\leq \sup_{s \in [0, T]} e^{-2\lambda s} \|\mu_s - \nu_s\|_{TV}^2 \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t K_b^2 e^{-2\lambda(t-s)} \, ds
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} e^{-2\lambda s} \|\mu_s - \nu_s\|_{TV}^2.
\]
Then \(\Phi^\gamma\) is a strictly contractive map on \(E_T\), so that the equation
\[
(2.14) \quad \Phi^\gamma_t(\mu) = \mu_t, \quad t \in [0, T]
\]
has a unique solution \(\mu \in E_T\). The proof is completed. \(\square\)

3 Regularity of Invariant Probability Measure

In this section, we consider the regularity of invariant probability measure of (1.1) and a general result for the regularity will be presented. Assume that \(\mu^Z\) is an invariant probability measure of (1.1) with density \(\rho\) with respect to \(\mu^0\), i.e. \(\mu^Z = \rho \mu^0\). It is clear that \(\mu^Z\) is also an invariant probability measure of the following distribution independent SDE:
\[
(3.1) \quad dX_t = Z_0(X_t) + \sigma(X_t)Z(X_t, \mu^Z) \, dt + \sigma(X_t) \, dW_t.
\]
Theorem 3.1. Assume (A), (2.3) and

\begin{equation}
\|P_0^0\|_{L^2(\mu^0) \rightarrow L^{2p_0}(\mu^0)} < \infty
\end{equation}

for some \(t_0 > 0\) and \(p_0 > 1\). If in addition, \(\mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) < \infty\) for some \(\lambda > \frac{t_0(3p_0 - 1)}{p_0 - 1}\) and

\[\frac{\lambda K_b^2 t_0 (3p_0 - 1)}{p_0 - 1} < \lambda(p_0 - 1) - t_0(3p_0 - 1),\]

then it holds

\[\mu^0(\rho \log \rho) \leq \frac{t_0(3p_0 - 1)}{2(p_0 - 1)} \log \mu^0(e^{\frac{t_0}{2}|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) + 2\lambda p_0 \log \|P_0^0\|_{L^2(\mu^0) \rightarrow L^{2p_0}(\mu^0)} + \frac{\lambda K_b^2 t_0 (3p_0 - 1)}{p_0 - 1}.
\]

Proof. According to [32, Theorem 3.1, Theorem 4.1], \(\mu_Z\) is the unique invariant probability measure of (3.1). Since

\begin{equation}
\mu^0(e^{\frac{t_0}{2}|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) \leq \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) e^{\lambda K_b^2 \|\mu^0 - \mu^0\|^2_{TV}} < \infty
\end{equation}

for some \(\lambda\) satisfying \(\lambda > \frac{t_0(3p_0 - 1)}{2(p_0 - 1)}\) due to (2.3), [32, Theorem 4.1] holds with \(\lambda\) replaced by \(\frac{\lambda}{2}\), i.e.

\begin{equation}
\mu^0(\rho \log \rho) \leq \frac{t_0(3p_0 - 1)}{2(p_0 - 1)} \log \mu^0(e^{\frac{t_0}{2}|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) + 2\lambda p_0 \log \|P_0^0\|_{L^2(\mu^0) \rightarrow L^{2p_0}(\mu^0)} + \frac{\lambda K_b^2 t_0 (3p_0 - 1)}{p_0 - 1}.
\end{equation}

Pinsker’s inequality yields

\[\log \mu^0(e^{\frac{t_0}{2}|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) \leq \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) + \lambda K_b^2 \|\mu-Z - \mu^0\|^2_{TV} = \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) + 2\lambda K_b^2 \mu^0(\rho \log \rho).
\]

Substituting this into (3.4) and noting that

\[\frac{\lambda K_b^2 t_0 (3p_0 - 1)}{p_0 - 1} < \lambda(p_0 - 1) - t_0(3p_0 - 1),\]

we arrive at

\[\mu^0(\rho \log \rho) \leq \frac{t_0(3p_0 - 1)}{2(p_0 - 1)} \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot)^0|^2}) + 2\lambda p_0 \log \|P_0^0\|_{L^2(\mu^0) \rightarrow L^{2p_0}(\mu^0)} + \frac{\lambda K_b^2 t_0 (3p_0 - 1)}{p_0 - 1}.
\]
To obtain the Sobolev estimate by log-Sobolev’s inequality of the reference SDE (2.1), let
\[ Z_0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \{ \partial_j (\sigma \sigma^*)_{ij} - (\sigma \sigma^*)_{ij} \partial_j V \} e_i \]
for some \( V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \). Define
\[ \mathcal{E}_0(f, g) = \mu^0(|f|^2 + |\sigma \nabla f|^2) \]
Let \( H^{1,2}_\sigma(\mu^0) \) be the completion of \( C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \) under the norm
\[ \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1(f, f)} := \mu^0(|f|^2 + |\sigma \nabla f|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]
Then \( (\mathcal{E}_0, H^{1,2}_\sigma(\mu^0)) \) is a symmetric Dirichlet form on \( L^2(\mu^0) \).
Moreover, we shall introduce the condition \( (H) \) in [32]:

(\( H \)) Assume that \( \mu^0(dx) = e^{-V}dx \) is a probability measure. There exists \( k \geq 2 \) such that \( \sigma \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^n) \) and vector fields
\[ U_i = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sigma_{ji} \partial_j, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \]
satisfy the Hörmander condition up to the \( k \)-th order of Lie brackets. Moreover, 1 \( \in H^{1,2}_\sigma(\mu^0) \) with \( \mathcal{E}_0(1, 1) = 0 \), and defective log-Sobolev inequality
\[ \mu^0(f^2 \log f^2) \leq \kappa \mu^0(|\sigma \nabla f|^2) + \beta, \quad f \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu^0(f^2) = 1 \]
holds for some \( \kappa > 0 \) and \( \beta \geq 0 \).

**Theorem 3.2.** Assume \( (H) \), (2.3) and \( \mu^0(e^{\lambda |Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) < \infty \) for some \( \lambda > \frac{2c}{1 - 4\kappa K_b^2} \) with \( 4\kappa K_b^2 < 1 \). Then for any \( p \in (1, \frac{4\kappa}{\sqrt{4\kappa - 1}}) \), there exists a constant \( C_{\lambda, p} \geq 1 \) such that \( \rho \) has a strictly positive continuous version satisfying \( \log \rho, \rho^\frac{p}{2} \in H^{1,2}_\sigma(\mu^0) \) and
\[ \mu^0(|\sigma \nabla \sqrt{\rho}|^2) \leq \frac{2}{\lambda - 2\kappa - 4\lambda K_b^2 \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda |Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) + \beta \left( 1 + 2\lambda K_b^2 \right) \right), \]
\[ \mu^0(|\sigma \nabla \log \rho|^2) \leq 8\mu^0(|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2) \]
\[ + 8K_b^2 \left\{ \frac{4K}{\lambda - 2\kappa - 4\lambda K_b^2 \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda |Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) + \beta \left( 1 + 2\lambda K_b^2 \right) \right) + 2\beta \right\} \wedge 4 \}, \]
\[ \mu^0(|\sigma \nabla \rho^\frac{p}{2}|^2) \leq e^{4K^2 \lambda C_\rho \lambda} C_{\rho, \lambda}(\mu^0(e^{\lambda |Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2})) \]

**Proof.** Noting that (3.3) holds for \( \frac{\lambda}{2} > \kappa \) since \( \lambda > \frac{2\kappa}{1 - 4\kappa K_b^2} \) with \( 4\kappa K_b^2 < 1 \), it is sufficient to prove the three estimates above due to [32, Theorem 5.1(2), Theorem 5.2]. By [32,
Theorem 5.1(2), Theorem 5.2, for any $p \in (1, \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2\kappa}})$, there exists a constant $C_{\lambda,p} \geq 1$ such that

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \sqrt{\rho})^2 \leq \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda}{2} - \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}Z(\cdot, \mu^0)^2}) + \beta \right),
$$

(3.6)

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \log \sqrt{\rho}) \leq 4\mu^0(|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2),
$$

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \rho^\frac{\kappa}{2})^2 \leq C_{p,\lambda} \mu^0(\mu^0(e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}Z(\cdot, \mu^0)^2})) C_{p,\lambda}.
$$

(3.7)

It follows from (2.3) that

$$
|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2 \leq 2|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2 + 2K_b^2 \|\mu^0\|_{TV}^2.
$$

(3.8)

So, this together with the third inequality in (3.6) yields

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \rho^\frac{\kappa}{2})^2 \leq C_{p,\lambda} \mu^0(\mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)^2|+\lambda K_b^2 \|\mu^0\|_{TV}^2})) C_{p,\lambda} \leq e^{4K_b^2 \lambda} C_{p,\lambda} \mu^0(\mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)^2|})) C_{p,\lambda}.
$$

Moreover, applying the log-Sobolev inequality (3.5) for $\mathcal{f} = \sqrt{\rho}$, we get

$$
\mu^0(\rho \log \rho) \leq \kappa \mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \sqrt{\rho})^2 + \beta.
$$

(3.9)

Combining this with the first inequality in (3.6), (3.7) and Pinker’s inequality, we conclude that

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \sqrt{\rho})^2 \leq \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda}{2} - \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)^2|}) + \beta \right)
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda}{2} - \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) + 2\lambda K_b^2 \mu^0(\rho \log \rho) + \beta \right)
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda}{2} - \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) + 2\lambda K_b^2 \kappa \mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \sqrt{\rho})^2 + \beta (1 + 2\lambda K_b^2) \right).
$$

Noting that $4\lambda K_b^2 \kappa < \lambda - 2\kappa$ due to $\lambda > \frac{2\kappa}{1 - 4\kappa K_b^2}$ and $4\kappa K_b^2 < 1$, we have

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \sqrt{\rho})^2 \leq \frac{2}{\lambda - 2\kappa - 4\lambda K_b^2 \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) + \beta (1 + 2\lambda K_b^2) \right).
$$

(3.9)

By the second inequality in (3.6) and (3.7), it holds

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \log \sqrt{\rho})^2
$$

$$
\leq 8\mu^0(|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2) + 8K_b^2 \|\mu^Z - \mu^0\|_{TV}^2
$$

$$
\leq 8\mu^0(|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2) + 8K_b^2 \left( 2\mu^0(\rho \log \rho) \wedge 4 \right).
$$

Combining this with Pinker’s inequality, (3.8) and (3.9), we arrive at

$$
\mu^0(\sigma^* \nabla \log \sqrt{\rho})^2 \leq 8\mu^0(|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2)
$$

$$
+ 8K_b^2 \left\{ \frac{4\kappa}{\lambda - 2\kappa - 4\lambda K_b^2 \kappa} \left( \log \mu^0(e^{\lambda|Z(\cdot, \mu^0)|^2}) + \beta (1 + 2\lambda K_b^2) \right) + 2\beta \right\} \wedge 4 \right\).
$$

\[\square\]
4 Existence and Uniqueness of Invariant Probability Measure

4.1 Invariant Probability Measure by Log-Sobolev's inequality

Consider the stationary nonlinear Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equation:

\[ L^* \mu = 0, \]

here,

\[ L_\mu f = \langle Z_0, \nabla f \rangle + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla f \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^* \nabla^2 f), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \]

and

\[ (L^*_\mu \gamma)(f) = \gamma(L_\mu f), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu, \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d). \]

When (1.1) is weakly well-posed, the invariant probability measure of (1.1) is a solution to (4.1) in the sense

\[ \mu(L_\mu f) = 0, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \]

Note that

\[ \mu^0(e^{\varepsilon |Z|} |Z|^2) \leq \mu^0(e^{\varepsilon |Z|} |Z|^2 e^{\varepsilon |Z(\cdot, \cdot)|^2}), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d). \]

Then according to [32, Theorem 5.2], under (H) and (A_b) with \( \varepsilon > 2\kappa \), for any \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), there exists a unique probability measure \( \Gamma(\mu) \) such that

\[ (4.2) \quad L^*_\mu(\Gamma(\mu)) = 0. \]

Thus, \( \Gamma \) construct a map from \( \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) to \( \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \). Next, we prove that \( \Gamma \) has a unique fixed point. We first give a result characterizing the Fisher information of \( \Gamma(\mu) \) and \( \Gamma(\nu) \) for \( \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \).

By [32, Theorem 5.2], under (H) and (A_b) with \( \varepsilon > 2\kappa \), for any \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), \( \Gamma(\mu) \) has a strictly positive and continuous density with respect to \( \mu^0 \). We denote \( \rho_\mu = \frac{d\Gamma(\mu)}{d\mu^0} \) and \( \rho_{\nu, \mu} = \frac{d\Gamma(\nu)}{d\mu^0} \), \( \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \). Then it is clear that \( \rho_\nu = \rho_{\nu, \mu} \rho_\mu \). Moreover, \( \log \rho_\mu, \rho_{\nu, \mu}^2 \) \( H_{\sigma}^{1, 2}(\mu^0) \) for \( p \in (1, \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2\kappa}}) \). Next, we prove a useful result on the information entropy between \( \Gamma(\mu) \) and \( \Gamma(\nu) \). The proof is modified from [8, Theorem 2.1], where \( \sigma \sigma^* \) is assumed to be invertible.

**Theorem 4.1.** Assume (H) and (A_b) with \( \varepsilon > 2\kappa \). If

\[ (4.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{|\sigma \sigma^*(x)|}{(1 + |x|)^2} + \frac{|Z_0(x) + \sigma Z(x, \mu)|}{1 + |x|} \right) \Gamma(\mu)(dx) < \infty, \]

then it holds

\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu, \mu}|^2}{\rho_{\nu, \mu}} d\Gamma(\mu) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)|^2 d\Gamma(\nu). \]
Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}^0 := \langle Z_0, \nabla \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma^* \nabla^2)$. Then under (H), $(\mathcal{L}^0, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}^0))$ is a symmetric operator in $L^2(\mu^0)$. It follows from integration by parts formula that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla f \rangle e^{-V(x)} dx
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \left[ - \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu) g) + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle g \right] \mu^0(\cdot) dx, \quad f, g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).
$$

So, we conclude that the adjoint operator of $\mathcal{L}_\mu$ on $L^2(\mu^0)$ is defined as

$$
\mathcal{L}_\mu^* g = \mathcal{L}^0 g - \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle g, \quad g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).
$$

For any $u, v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$
\mathcal{L}_\mu^*[uv] = \mathcal{L}^0[u v] - \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu)[uv]) + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle[u v]
= v \langle Z_0, \nabla u \rangle + u \langle Z_0, \nabla v \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma^* (v \nabla^2 u + u \nabla^2 v + 2 \nabla u \otimes \nabla v))
- u \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla v \rangle - v \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla u \rangle - \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu))[uv] + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle[u v]
= u \mathcal{L}_\mu^* v + v \mathcal{L}_\mu^* u + \text{Tr}(\sigma^* \nabla u, \nabla v) + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle[u v] - \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle[u v]
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{L}_\mu^*[f(u)] = \mathcal{L}^0[f(u)] - \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu)[f(u)]) + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle[f(u)]
= f'(u) \langle Z_0, \nabla u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma^* (f''(u) \nabla u \otimes \nabla u + f'(u) \nabla^2 u))
- f(u) \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu)) - f'(u) \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla u \rangle + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle f(u)
= f'(u) \mathcal{L}_\mu^* u + \frac{1}{2} f''(u) \langle \sigma^* \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle
+ (uf'(u) - f(u)) \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu)) + \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle (f(u) - uf'(u)).
$$

From the definition of $\rho_\mu$ and $\rho_\nu$, we arrive at

$$
\mathcal{L}_\mu^* \rho_\mu = \mathcal{L}_\nu^* \rho_\nu = 0
$$

in the sense that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}_\mu(\phi) \rho_\mu d\mu^0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}_\nu(\phi) \rho_\nu d\mu^0 = 0, \quad \phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).
$$

So, for $f \in C^2((0, \infty))$ with $f'' \geq 0$, we have

$$
\mathcal{L}_\mu^*[f(\rho_{\nu, \mu}) \rho_\mu] = \rho_\mu \mathcal{L}_\mu^* f(\rho_{\nu, \mu}) + f'(\rho_{\nu, \mu}) \text{Tr}(\sigma^* \nabla \rho_{\nu, \mu}, \nabla \rho_\mu)
+ \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu))[f(\rho_{\nu, \mu}) \rho_\mu] - \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle[f(\rho_{\nu, \mu}) \rho_\mu].
$$
Replacing \( u \) by \( \rho_{\nu,\mu} \) and multiplying \( \rho_{\mu} \) on both sides of (4.4), we get from (4.5) that

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\mu}^*[f(\rho_{\nu,\mu})\rho_{\mu}] = \frac{1}{2} f''(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \langle \sigma \sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu}, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle + f'(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \left[ \rho_{\mu} \mathcal{L}_{\mu}^* \rho_{\nu,\mu} + \rho_{\mu} \rho_{\nu,\mu} \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \mu)) \right] + \text{Tr} \langle \sigma \sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu}, \nabla \rho_{\mu} \rangle \langle \sigma \nabla Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle [\rho_{\mu} \rho_{\nu,\mu}] .
\]

Noting that

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\mu}^*[\rho_{\nu} \rho_{\nu} \mu] = (\mathcal{L}_{\mu}^* - \mathcal{L}_{\nu}^*) \rho_{\nu} = \text{div}(\sigma(Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)) \rho_{\nu}) + \langle \sigma(Z(\cdot, \mu) - Z(\cdot, \nu)), \nabla V \rangle \rho_{\nu},
\]

we know

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\nu}^*[\rho_{\mu} \rho_{\nu,\mu}] = \rho_{\mu} \mathcal{L}_{\nu}^* \rho_{\nu,\mu} + \text{Tr} \langle \sigma \sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu}, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle + \text{div}(\sigma Z(\cdot, \nu)) \rho_{\mu} \rho_{\nu,\mu} - \langle \sigma Z(\cdot, \mu), \nabla V \rangle [\rho_{\mu} \rho_{\nu,\mu}] = \text{div}(\sigma(Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)) \rho_{\nu}) + \langle \sigma(Z(\cdot, \mu) - Z(\cdot, \nu)), \nabla V \rangle \rho_{\nu}.
\]

This implies that

\[
\rho_{\mu} \frac{1}{2} f''(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \langle \sigma \sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu}, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle = \mathcal{L}_{\mu}^*[f(\rho_{\nu,\mu})\rho_{\mu}] - f'(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \left[ \text{div}(\sigma(Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)) \rho_{\nu}) + \langle \sigma(Z(\cdot, \mu) - Z(\cdot, \nu)), \nabla V \rangle \rho_{\nu} \right].
\]

Let \( \Phi = \sigma(Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)) \). It yields that for any \( \psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \),

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\mu} \frac{1}{2} f''(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \langle \sigma \sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu}, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle \psi \mu^0(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [f(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \rho_{\mu}] \mathcal{L}_{\nu}^* \psi \mu^0(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f'(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \text{div}(\Phi \rho_{\nu}) \psi \mu^0(dx)
\]

\[
+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \Phi, \nabla \nabla \rangle f'(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \rho_{\nu} \psi \mu^0(dx)
\]

(4.6)

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [f(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \rho_{\mu}] \mathcal{L}_{\nu}^* \psi \mu^0(dx)
\]

\[
+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \Phi, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle f''(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \psi \mu^0(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \Phi, \nabla \psi \rangle f'(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \rho_{\nu} \mu^0(dx).
\]

Similarly to [7, Proof of Theorem 1] or [8, Proof of Theorem 2.1], there exists a sequence of \( \{\psi_N\}_{N \geq 1} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that \( \psi_N \to 1 \), \( |\nabla \psi_N| \to 0 \) and \( \mathcal{L}_{\nu}^* \psi_N \to 0 \) as \( N \) goes to infinity. Therefore, replacing \( \psi \) with \( \psi_N \) in (4.6) and letting \( N \to \infty \), (4.3) implies that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\mu} \frac{1}{2} f''(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \langle \sigma \sigma \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu}, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle \mu^0(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \Phi, \nabla \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rangle \rho_{\nu,\mu} \rho_{\mu} f''(\rho_{\nu,\mu}) \mu^0(dx).
\]
Recall $\Phi = \sigma(Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu))$. By the elemental inequality
\[
\langle \Phi, \nabla \rho_{\nu, \mu} \rangle_{\rho_{\nu, \mu}} \leq \frac{1}{2} |\sigma^* \nabla \rho_{\nu, \mu}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)|^2 \rho_{\nu, \mu}^2,
\]
we have
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho''_{\nu, \mu} |\sigma^* \nabla \rho_{\nu, \mu}|^2 \rho_{\nu, \mu}^0 \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)|^2 \rho_{\nu, \mu}^2 \rho''_{\nu, \mu} \rho_{\nu, \mu}^0 \, dx.
\]
Finally, the proof is finished by taking $f(x) = x \log x$ and noting that $f''(x) = \frac{1}{x}$.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let the assumptions in Theorem 4.1 hold. If in addition, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the log-Sobolev inequality holds, i.e.
\[
\Gamma(\mu)(f^2 \log f^2) \leq \tilde{\kappa} \Gamma(\mu)(|\sigma^* \nabla f|^2), \quad f \in H^{1,2}_{\sigma}(\mu^0), \Gamma(\mu)(f^2) = 1
\]
with $\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}K_b < 1$, then $\mathcal{L}_x \mu = 0$ has a unique solution.

**Proof.** Taking $f = \sqrt{\rho_{\nu, \mu}}$, we have
\[
\Gamma(\mu)(\rho_{\nu, \mu} \log \rho_{\nu, \mu}) \leq \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{4} \Gamma(\mu) \left( |\sigma^* \nabla \rho_{\nu, \mu}|^2 \right).
\]
This together with Theorem 4.1 implies that
\[
\Gamma(\mu)(\rho_{\nu, \mu} \log \rho_{\nu, \mu}) \leq \frac{\tilde{K}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Z(\cdot, \nu) - Z(\cdot, \mu)|^2 d\Gamma(\nu).
\]
Applying Pinsker’s inequality, we have
\[
\|\Gamma(\mu) - \Gamma(\nu)\|_{TV}^2 \leq \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Z(x, \nu) - Z(x, \mu)|^2 d\Gamma(\nu) \leq \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{2} \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}^2.
\]
When $\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}}K_b < 1$, we finish the proof due to the fixed point theorem.

**Remark 4.3.** We should remark that it is difficult to prove the log-Sobolev inequality (4.7) when $Z$ only satisfies $(A_0)$ although (3.5) holds with $\kappa > 0$ and $\beta = 0$. One can refer to [1, 2, 3, 13, 33] for more results on the log-Sobolev inequality.

The next corollary provides the existence and uniqueness of invariant probability measure with bounded perturbation $Z$.

**Corollary 4.4.** Assume that $\sigma = I_{d \times d}$ and $Z(\cdot, \mu^0)$ is bounded. If $(H)$ with $\beta = 0$ and (2.3) with $\sqrt{\frac{\kappa^2 \|Z\|_{\infty}}{2}} K_b < 1$ and
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{Z_0(x)}{1 + |x|} \right)^p \mu^0(\, dx) < \infty
\]
for some $p > 1$, then there exists a unique solution to (4.1).
Proof. Since $Z(\cdot, \mu^0)$ is bounded, (2.3) implies that $Z$ is bounded. Then $(A_b)$ holds with $\epsilon > 2\kappa(\frac{1}{p-1})^2$. So, by [17, Remark 1.20] and (H) with $\beta = 0$, (4.7) holds with $\tilde{k} = \kappa e^{2\|Z\|_{\infty}}$. Moreover, noting that $\sigma = I_{d \times d}$ and $Z$ is bounded, (4.10), the fact that $\rho_{\mu^0}^{p-1} \in H^1_\sigma(\mu^0)$ due to $\frac{\rho_{\mu^0}}{p-1} \in (1, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}})$ and Hölder’s inequality yield (4.3). Therefore, we complete the proof according to Theorem 4.2.

4.2 Some Other Examples

In the section, we give some examples where the log-Sobolev inequality (4.7) is not required and the cost is that the drift is assumed to be of special form.

Example 4.5. Assume (H). $Z(x, \mu) = \nabla F(x, \mu) + \nabla \bar{F}(x), \sigma = \sqrt{2}I_{d \times d}$. Assume that there exist constants $\epsilon > 0, C > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \log 2)$ such that

$$\mu^0(e^{F(\cdot, \mu^0)} + \bar{F}) + \mu^0(e^{\nabla F(\cdot, \mu^0) + \nabla \bar{F}}) < \infty,$$

$$|\nabla F(x, \mu) - \nabla F(x, \nu)| \leq C \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and

$$|F(x, \mu) - F(x, \nu)| \leq \delta \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then (1.1) has a unique invariant probability measure.

Proof. It is clear that

$$\frac{d\Gamma(\mu)}{d\mu^0} = \frac{e^{F(\cdot, \mu^0)} + \bar{F}}{\mu^0(e^{F(\cdot, \mu) + \bar{F})}}.$$

By Taylor’s expansion, we arrive at

$$|e^{F(x, \mu)} - e^{F(x, \nu)}| \leq e^{F(x, \mu)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|F(x, \mu) - F(x, \nu)|^k}{k!}$$

$$\leq e^{F(x, \nu)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta^k \|\mu - \nu\|^k_{TV}$$

$$\leq e^{F(x, \nu)} \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^k 2^{k-1}}{k!}$$

$$= e^{F(x, \nu)} \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \frac{e^{2\delta} - 1}{2}.$$

As a result, it holds

$$\|\Gamma(\mu) - \Gamma(\nu)\|_{TV}$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{e^{F(\cdot, \mu) + \bar{F}}}{\mu^0(e^{F(\cdot, \mu) + \bar{F})}} - \frac{e^{F(\cdot, \nu) + \bar{F}}}{\mu^0(e^{F(\cdot, \nu) + \bar{F})}} \right| \mu^0(dx)$$
By Banach’s fixed point theorem and $\delta \in (0, \frac{\log 2}{2})$, we finish the proof.

The next example concentrates on the stochastic Hamiltonian system.

Example 4.6. Let $Z_0(x, y) = (y, -x - y), x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma = \sqrt{2}I_{d \times d}$. Consider

\begin{equation}
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{d}X_t = Y_t \\
\mathrm{d}Y_t = -X_t - Y_t - \nabla H(\cdot, \mathcal{L}(x_t, y_t))(X_t) \mathrm{d}t - \nabla \bar{H}(X_t) \mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2}dW_t,
\end{array} \right.
\end{equation}

where $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \to \mathbb{R}, \bar{H} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. $Z(x, \mu) = -\nabla H(\cdot, \mu)(x) - \nabla \bar{H}(x)$. Then

\[\mu^0(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) = \exp \left\{-\frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{y^2}{2}\right\} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y.\]

Assume that there exist constants $\varepsilon > 0, C > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \frac{\log 2}{2})$ such that

\[\mu^0(e^{H(\cdot, \mu^0) + \bar{H}}) + \mu^0(e^{\varepsilon|\nabla H(\cdot, \mu^0) + \nabla \bar{H}|^2}) < \infty,
\]

\[|\nabla H(x, \mu) - \nabla H(x, \nu)| \leq C\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}), x \in \mathbb{R}^d,
\]

and

\[|H(x, \mu) - H(x, \nu)| \leq \delta\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}), x \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

Then (1.1) has a unique invariant probability measure.

Proof. It is easy to see that

\[\frac{\mathrm{d}\Gamma(\mu)}{\mathrm{d}\mu^0} = \frac{e^{H(\cdot, \mu) + \bar{H}}}{\mu^0(e^{H(\cdot, \mu) + \bar{H}})}\]

In fact, the infinitesimal generator of (4.11) is

\[Lf(x, y) = y\nabla_x f + (-x - y - \nabla H(x, \mu) - \nabla \bar{H})\nabla_y f + \nabla_y^2 f, \quad f \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^{2d}),\]

which yields

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Lf(x, y) \exp \left\{-\frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{y^2}{2} - \bar{H}(x, \mu) - H(x)\right\} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y \\
= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left\langle \nabla_x f, \nabla_y \exp \left\{-\frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{y^2}{2} - \bar{H}(x, \mu) - H(x)\right\} \right\rangle \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y \\
+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left\langle \nabla_y f, \nabla_x \exp \left\{-\frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{y^2}{2} - \bar{H}(x, \mu) - H(x)\right\} \right\rangle \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y = 0.
\]

Then repeating the proof of Example 4.5, we complete the proof.
In the one-dimensional case, since the invariant probability measure has explicit representation, the drift term $Z$ can be more general.

**Example 4.7.** $d = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $Z(y, \mu) = b(y, \mu) + \bar{b}(y)$. Assume that there exist constants $\varepsilon > 0, c_0 \in \mathbb{R}, C > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \log \frac{2}{2})$ such that

$$
\mu^0\left(e^{\int_{c_0}^{x} b(y, \mu^0) dy + \int_{c_0}^{x} \bar{b}(y) dy}\right) > 0, \\
\mu^0\left(e^{\int_{c_0}^{x} b(y, \mu^0) dy + \int_{c_0}^{x} \bar{b}(y) dy}\right) < \infty,
$$

$$
|b(x, \mu) - b(x, \nu)| \leq C \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}), x \in \mathbb{R}^d,
$$

and

$$
\left|\int_{c_0}^{x} b(y, \mu) dy - \int_{c_0}^{x} b(y, \nu) dy\right| \leq \delta \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}, \quad \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}), x \in \mathbb{R}.
$$

Then (1.1) has a unique invariant probability measure.

**Proof.** It is clear that

$$
\frac{d\Gamma(\mu)}{d\mu^0} = \frac{e^{\int_{c_0}^{x} b(y, \mu^0) dy + \int_{c_0}^{x} \bar{b}(y) dy}}{\mu^0\left(e^{\int_{c_0}^{x} b(y, \mu^0) dy + \int_{c_0}^{x} \bar{b}(y) dy}\right)}.
$$

Again the remaining is just repeating the proof of Example 4.5. \(\square\)
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