

SINGULAR PERTURBATION PROBLEM OF MEAN FIELD GAME OF ACCELERATION

CRISTIAN MENDICO

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to the singular perturbation problem for mean field game systems with control on the acceleration. This correspond to a model in which the acceleration cost vanishes. So, we are interested in analyzing the behavior of solutions to the mean field game systems arising from such a problem as the acceleration cost goes to zero. In this case the Hamiltonian fails to be strictly convex and superlinear w.r.t. the momentum variable and this creates new issues in the analysis of the problem. We obtain that the limit problem is the classical mean field game system.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we address the singular perturbation problem for mean field game (MFG) systems with control on the acceleration. MFG systems with control on the acceleration have been introduced first in [9, 1] and the one we consider here reads as follows

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |D_v u^\varepsilon|^2 - \langle D_x u^\varepsilon, v \rangle - L_0(x, v, m_t^\varepsilon) = 0, & (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \\ \partial_t \mu_t^\varepsilon - \langle D_x \mu_t^\varepsilon, v \rangle - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_v (\mu_t^\varepsilon D_v u^\varepsilon) = 0, & (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \\ \mu_0^\varepsilon = \mu_0, \quad u^\varepsilon(T, x, v) = g(x, m_T^\varepsilon), & (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \end{cases}$$

where $u^\varepsilon : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the value function, $\mu \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$ is the joint distribution of position and velocity of a typical agent and $m_t^\varepsilon = \pi_1 \# \mu_t^\varepsilon$, with $\pi_1 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ the projection map onto the first variable, is the distribution of positions. MFG systems with control on the acceleration describes in general models in which the interacting agents controls their acceleration. Here, the systems we are interested in are those in which the acceleration cost vanishes, the ε in (1.1) being a small parameter.

The Lagrangian L_0 appearing in the system is assumed to be smooth in space and velocity variable and to have Tonelli type dependence on v . Assumption **(M3)**, below, concerns the dependence of L_0 on the measure variable. One can immediately recognise that the underlying minimisation problem associated with the above PDEs systems has the following form

$$\inf_{\substack{\gamma(t)=x \\ \dot{\gamma}(t)=v}} \left\{ \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\dot{\gamma}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds + g(\gamma(T), m_T^\varepsilon) \right\}$$

for any initial position and velocity $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Date: November 5, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35B25, 35B40, 35F21, 91A13.

Key words and phrases. Mean Field Games; Singular Limit;

Acknowledgement: Cristian Mendico was partly supported by Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (GNAMPA 2020 Research Projects) and University Italo Francese (Vinci Project 2020) n. C2-794. The author would like to thanks Pierre Cardaliaguet for his fruitful comments and his careful reading of the manuscript.

We recall that MFG were introduced in [18, 19, 20, 17, 16] in order to describe the behaviour of Nash equilibria in problems with infinitely many infinitesimal rational agents (we refer to [10] and references therein for more details). Since these pioneering works the MFG theory has grown very fast: see for instance the survey papers and the monographs [15, 6, 13] and the references therein. In system (1.1) the pair $(u^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon)$ can be interpreted as follows: u^ε is the value function of a typical small player for an optimal control problem depending on acceleration in which the cost depends on the time-dependent family of probability measures (m_t^ε) ; on the other hand, μ_t^ε is, for each time t , the joint distribution of position and velocity of a small player and it evolves in time according to the continuity equation driven by the optimal feedback. In particular, analyzing such singular perturbation problem we will describe the natural relation which holds between the MFG system with acceleration and the classical MFG system.

The singular perturbation problem has been widely studied for control problems and, more recently, for differential games. For an overview on the subject, which is far from being complete, we refer the reader to [4, 2, 5], and references therein. For these kind of problems, the general structure is to consider a classical controlled dynamic on \mathbb{R}^d coupled with one, on \mathbb{R}^d also, that depends on a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the limit system turns out to be defined only on \mathbb{R}^d . Some type of perturbation problems in MFG have been studied, recently, in [11, 7, 8, 12] where the authors study the long time-average behaviour of solutions to first order MFG system and in [14, 21] where the authors study the homogenisation problem for second order MFG system. Note that, in homogenisation the structure of the MFG system might be lost in the limit (as proved in [14, 21]) which is not the case here, as we will show in [Theorem 3.2](#).

Indeed, going back to the MFG system (1.1) we prove that $(u^\varepsilon, m^\varepsilon)$, where we recall that m_t^ε is the space marginal of the solution μ_t^ε for any $t \in [0, T]$, converges (up to subsequence) to a solution (u^0, m^0) to the classical MFG system

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & -\partial_t u^0(t, x) + H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ (ii) & \partial_t m_t^0 - \operatorname{div} \left(m_t^0 D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0) \right) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ & m_0^0 = \pi_1 \# \mu_0, \quad u^0(T, x) = g(x, m_T^0), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d \end{cases}$$

where $H_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Hamiltonian associated the Lagrangian L_0 . As observed so far, we can see from (1.2) that the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ leads to the elimination of the velocity as state variable, whose dynamics was controlled via the perturbation ε . At this point, we again want to put the attention to the fact that the Lagrangian L_0 in (1.1) depends only on the space marginal of the measure μ^ε . First, this comes from the elimination of the velocity as state variable and so, also for in the analysis of the measure μ^ε , the limit does not see the behavior of the second marginal. Moreover, we are interested in connecting the MFG system of acceleration with the classical one which we know depends only on a flow of probability measures in space which describes the motion of the agents.

Let us briefly explain the method of proof. We first show that u^ε is equibounded and m^ε is tight (see [Lemma 4.1](#) and [Theorem 4.4](#)). Thus, as a first consequence we get that, up to a subsequence, there exists $m^0 \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $m^\varepsilon \rightarrow m^0$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then, we proceed with the analysis of the value function u^ε : we show that $u^\varepsilon(t, \cdot, v)$ is equi-Lipschitz continuous, $u^\varepsilon(\cdot, x, v)$ is equicontinuous and $u^\varepsilon(t, x, \cdot)$ has decreasing oscillation w.r.t. ε (see [Lemma 4.6](#) and [Proposition 4.7](#)). We finally address the locally uniform convergence of u^ε , showing that there exists a subsequence $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$ such that $(u^{\varepsilon_k}, m^{\varepsilon_k})$ converges to a solution

(u^0, m^0) of (1.2) (see Theorem 4.9, Proposition 4.10 and Corollary 4.12). The main issues in proving the above results are due to the lack of strict convexity and the lack of superlinearity of the Hamiltonian in system (1.1). In particular, these and the fact that Lagrangian L_0 is non-autonomous motivated us to use a variational approach instead of a PDEs approach since the latter creates series difficulties in estimating uniformly the gradient of u^ε w.r.t. velocity variable. We recall that such gradient plays a key role in understanding the limit state space since it capture the behaviour of the velocity as state variable in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we fix the notation that will be used throughout the paper and we recall the main definitions and results from measure theory. In Section 3 we introduce the MFG system associated with the singular perturbation problem, we give the standing assumptions on the data and finally we state the main result of this paper (Theorem 3.2). In Section 4 is devoted to the proofs.

2. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. We write below a list of symbols used throughout this paper.

- Denote by \mathbb{N} the set of positive integers, by \mathbb{R}^d the d -dimensional real Euclidean space, by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the Euclidean scalar product, by $|\cdot|$ the usual norm in \mathbb{R}^d , and by B_R the open ball with center 0 and radius R .
- For a Lebesgue-measurable subset A of \mathbb{R}^d , we let $\mathcal{L}^d(A)$ be the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure of A and $\mathbf{1}_A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the characteristic function of A , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{1}_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A, \\ 0 & x \notin A. \end{cases}$$

We denote by $L^p(A)$ (for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$) the space of Lebesgue-measurable functions f with $\|f\|_{p,A} < \infty$, where

$$\|f\|_{\infty,A} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in A} |f(x)|,$$

$$\|f\|_{p,A} := \left(\int_A |f|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty.$$

For brevity, $\|f\|_\infty$ and $\|f\|_p$ stand for $\|f\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}$ and $\|f\|_{p, \mathbb{R}^d}$ respectively.

- $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ stands for the function space of bounded uniformly continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^d . $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ stands for the space of bounded functions on \mathbb{R}^d with bounded uniformly continuous first and second derivatives. $C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) stands for the function space of k -times continuously differentiable functions on \mathbb{R}^d , and $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) := \bigcap_{k=0}^\infty C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$. $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ stands for the space of functions in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with compact support. Let $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$. $AC([a, b]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the space of absolutely continuous maps $[a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.
- For $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the gradient of f is denoted by $Df = (D_{x_1}f, \dots, D_{x_n}f)$, where $D_{x_i}f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Let k be a nonnegative integer and let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ be a multiindex of order k , i.e., $k = |\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_d$, where each component α_i is a nonnegative integer. For $f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define $D^\alpha f := D_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots D_{x_d}^{\alpha_d} f$.

2.2. On the Wasserstein distance. We recall here the notations and definitions of Wasserstein spaces and Wasserstein distance, for more details we refer to [22, 3].

Let (X, d) be a metric space (in the paper, we use $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ or $X = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$). Denote by $\mathcal{B}(X)$ the Borel σ -algebra on X and by $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the space of Borel probability measures on X . The support of a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, denoted by $\text{spt}(\mu)$, is the closed set defined by

$$\text{spt}(\mu) := \left\{ x \in X : \mu(V_x) > 0 \text{ for each open neighborhood } V_x \text{ of } x \right\}.$$

We say that a sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$ is weakly- $*$ convergent to $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, denoted by $\mu_k \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu$, if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f(x) d\mu_n(x) = \int_X f(x) d\mu(x), \quad \forall f \in C_b(X).$$

For $p \in [1, +\infty)$, the Wasserstein space of order p is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_p(X) := \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \int_X d(x_0, x)^p dm(x) < +\infty \right\},$$

for some (and thus all) $x_0 \in X$. Given any two measures m and m' in $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$, define

$$(2.1) \quad \Pi(m, m') := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X) : \lambda(A \times X) = m(A), \lambda(X \times A) = m'(A), \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(X) \right\}.$$

The Wasserstein distance of order p between m and m' is defined by

$$d_p(m, m') = \inf_{\lambda \in \Pi(m, m')} \left(\int_{X \times X} d(x, y)^p d\lambda(x, y) \right)^{1/p}.$$

The distance d_1 is also commonly called the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance and can be characterized by a useful duality formula (see, for instance, [22]) as follows

$$(2.2) \quad d_1(m, m') = \sup \left\{ \int_X f(x) dm(x) - \int_X f(x) dm'(x) \mid f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is 1-Lipschitz} \right\},$$

for all $m, m' \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)$.

Let X_1, X_2 be metric spaces, let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X_1)$ and let $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ be a μ measurable map. Then, we denote by $f\#\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X_2)$ the push-forward of μ through f defined by

$$f\#\mu(B) := \mu(f^{-1}(B)), \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(X_2).$$

More generally, in integral form, it reads as

$$\int_{X_1} \varphi(f(x)) \mu(dx) = \int_{X_2} \varphi(y) f\#\mu(dy).$$

3. ASSUMPTIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

We now list the main assumptions on the Lagrangian $L_0 : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

(M1) L_0 is continuous w.r.t. all variables and for any $m \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the map $(x, v) \mapsto L_0(x, v, m)$ belongs to $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(M2) There exists $M_0 \geq 0$ such that for any $(x, v, m) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{M_0}|v|^2 - M_0 \leq L_0(x, v, m) \leq M_0(1 + |v|^2),$$

$$(3.2) \quad |D_x L_0(x, v, m)| \leq M_0(1 + |v|^2),$$

$$(3.3) \quad |D_v L_0(x, v, m)| \leq M_0(1 + |v|),$$

and, without loss of generality, $L_0(x, v, m) \geq 0$ for any $(x, v, m) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(M3) There exists two moduli $\theta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\omega_0 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$|L_0(x, v, m_1) - L_0(x, v, m_2)| \leq \theta(|x|)\omega_0(d_1(m_1, m_2)),$$

for any $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Let $H_0 : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Hamiltonian associated with L_0 , i.e.,

$$H_0(x, p, m) = \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ -\langle p, v \rangle - L_0(x, v, m) \}.$$

We consider the following MFG system

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}|D_v u^\varepsilon|^2 - \langle D_x u^\varepsilon, v \rangle - L_0(x, v, m_t^\varepsilon) = 0, & (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \\ \partial_t \mu_t^\varepsilon - \langle D_x \mu_t^\varepsilon, v \rangle - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div}_v (\mu_t^\varepsilon D_v u^\varepsilon) = 0, & (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \\ \mu_0^\varepsilon = \mu_0, \quad u^\varepsilon(T, x, v) = g(x, m_T^\varepsilon), & (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \end{cases}$$

where $m_t^\varepsilon = \pi_1 \# \mu_t^\varepsilon$ and $\pi_1 : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the projection onto the first factor, i.e., $\pi_1(x, v) = x$. We assume the following on the boundary data of the system:

- (BC1)** $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, we still denote by μ_0 its density, and it has compact support. Recall also that $m_0 := \pi_1 \# \mu_0$.
- (BC2)** $g(\cdot, m)$ belongs to $C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $M_0 \geq \max\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\|Dg(\cdot, m)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}\}$ and $g(x, \cdot)$ uniformly continuous w.r.t. space.

Let Γ be the set of C^1 curves $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, endowed with the local uniform convergence of the curve and its derivative, and given $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ let $\Gamma_t(x, v)$ be the subset of Γ such that $\gamma(t) = x, \dot{\gamma}(t) = v$. Similarly, let $\Gamma_t(x)$ be the subset of Γ such that $\gamma(t) = x$. Define the functional $J_{t,T}^\varepsilon : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$J_{t,T}^\varepsilon(\gamma) = \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\dot{\gamma}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds + g(\gamma(T), m_T^\varepsilon), \quad \text{if } \gamma \in H^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$$

and set $J_{t,T}^\varepsilon(\gamma) = +\infty$ if $\gamma \notin H^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, from [9, 1] we know that there exist a solution $(u^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon) \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$ to system (3.4) such that

$$(3.5) \quad u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t(x, v)} J_{t,T}^\varepsilon(\gamma)$$

and for any $t \in [0, T]$ the probability measure μ_t^ε is the image of μ_0 under the flow

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\gamma}(t) = v(t) \\ \dot{v}(t) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} D_v u^\varepsilon(t, \gamma(t), v(t)). \end{cases}$$

That is, u^ε solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation in the viscosity sense and μ^ε solves the continuity equation in the sense of distributions.

Remark 3.1. Note that for a.e. $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ there exists a unique solution to system (3.6), which we will denote by $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon$, such that $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(0) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(0) = v$. Moreover, such a curve $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is optimal for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$ satisfying $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(t) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(t) = v$ as initial condition.

Theorem 3.2 (Main result). Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Let $(u^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon)$ be a solution to (3.4) and let $m_t^\varepsilon = \pi_{1\#} \mu_t^\varepsilon$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. That is, there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, a function $u^0 \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and a flow of probability measures $\{m_t^0\}_{t \in [0, T]} \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that for any $R \geq 0$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) = u^0(t, x), \quad \text{uniformly on } [0, T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m^{\varepsilon_k} = m^0, \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

Moreover, the following holds.

(i) $(u^0, m^0) \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a solution of

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u^0(t, x) + H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ \partial_t m_t^0 - \operatorname{div} \left(m_t^0 D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0) \right) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ m_0^0 = m_0, \quad u^0(T, x) = g(x, m_T^0), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

that is, u^0 solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation in the viscosity sense and m^0 is a solution of the continuity equation in the sense of distributions.

(ii) For any $t \in [0, T]$ the probability measure m_t^0 is the image of m_0 under the Euler flow associated with L_0 .

Remark 3.3. Let $(u^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon)$ be a solution to (3.4). Assume that H_0 is of separated form, i.e., there exists a coupling function $F : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$H_0(x, p, m) = H(x, p) - F(x, m), \quad \forall (x, p, m) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Moreover, assume that F is continuous w.r.t. all variables, that the map $x \mapsto F(x, m)$ belongs to $C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and that the functions F, g are monotone in the sense of Lasry-Lions, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (F(x, m_1) - F(x, m_2)) (m_1(dx) - m_2(dx)) &\geq 0, \quad \forall m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (g(x, m_1) - g(x, m_2)) (m_1(dx) - m_2(dx)) &\geq 0, \quad \forall m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{aligned}$$

Then, from [1, 9] we know that there exists a unique solution $(u^0, m^0) \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ of (3.7) and thus as $(u^\varepsilon, m^\varepsilon)$ is relatively compact then convergence of $(u^\varepsilon, m^\varepsilon)$ holds for the whole sequence.

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In order to prove the main result we proceed by steps analyzing the behavior of the value function u^ε and of the flow of probability measures m^ε separately. First, we show that u^ε is equibounded and we prove that, up to a subsequence, m^ε converges to a flow of probability measure in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then, we address the convergence of the value function, up to

a subsequence, to a solution of a suitable Hamilton-Jacobi equation and we study the limit of its minimizing trajectories. Finally, we are able to characterize the limit flow of measures as solution of a suitable continuity equation which coupled with the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, previously found, define the MFG system (3.7).

Lemma 4.1. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Then we have that*

$$-TM_0 - \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} \leq u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \leq M_0T(1 + |v|^2) + \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d},$$

for any $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. First, since u^ε satisfy (3.5), from (3.1) and (BC) follows that for any $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ there holds

$$u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \geq -C_0T - \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}.$$

On the other hand, the function

$$\zeta(t, x, v) = g(x, m_T^\varepsilon) + C(1 + |v|^2)(T - t), \quad (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$$

is a supersolution to the equation satisfied by u^ε for a suitable choice of the real constant $C \geq 0$. Indeed, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_t \zeta(t, x, v) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |D_v \zeta(t, x, v)|^2 - \langle D_x \zeta(t, x, v), v \rangle - L_0(x, v) \\ & \geq C(1 + |v|^2) + 2 \frac{(T-t)^2 C^2}{\varepsilon} |v|^2 - \langle D_x g(x, m_T^\varepsilon), v \rangle - M_0(1 + |v|^2) \\ & \geq C(1 + |v|^2) - \frac{1}{2} \|Dg(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} - \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 - M_0(1 + |v|^2) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Young's inequality. Thus, taking $C = 2M_0$ by (BC) we obtain

$$M_0(1 + |v|^2) - \frac{1}{2} \|Dg(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} - \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 \geq 0. \quad \square$$

Corollary 4.2. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Let $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and let γ^ε be a minimizer for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$. Then, there exists a constant $Q_1 \geq 0$ such that*

$$\int_t^T |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 ds \leq Q_1(1 + |v|^2), \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

where Q_1 is independent of ε, t, x and v .

Proof. On the one hand, from Lemma 4.1 we know that

$$u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \leq M_0T(1 + |v|^2) + \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}, \quad \forall (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

On the other hand, let $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and let γ^ε be a minimizer for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$. Then, by (3.1) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) &= \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) \\ &\geq \int_t^T L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s), m_s^\varepsilon) ds - \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} \\ &\geq \int_t^T \left(\frac{1}{M_0} |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 - M_0 \right) ds - \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining the above inequalities we get

$$\int_t^T |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 ds \leq 2M_0(\|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} + M_0T(1 + |v|^2)) =: Q_1(1 + |v|^2)$$

where Q_1 depends only on M_0 , T and $\|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}$ which is bounded uniformly in m_T^ε . \square

Corollary 4.3. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Then, there exists a constant $Q_2 \geq 0$ such that for any $s_1, s_2 \in [0, T]$ with $s_1 \leq s_2$ there holds*

$$d_1(m_{s_2}^\varepsilon, m_{s_1}^\varepsilon) \leq Q_2 |s_1 - s_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

where Q_2 is independent of ε .

Proof. We first recall that for any $t \in [0, T]$ we know that $m_t^\varepsilon = \pi_1 \# \mu_t^\varepsilon$ where μ_t^ε is the image of μ_0 under the flow (3.6) whose space marginal we denote by $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon$ for $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Let $s_1, s_2 \in [0, T]$ be such that $s_1 \leq s_2$. Then, by (2.2) we have that

$$d_1(m_{s_1}^\varepsilon, m_{s_2}^\varepsilon) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(s_1) - \gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(s_2)| \mu_0(dx, dv)$$

and thus, appealing to Corollary 4.2 and the Hölder inequality we obtain

$$d_1(m_{s_1}^\varepsilon, m_{s_2}^\varepsilon) \leq |s_1 - s_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} Q_1(1 + |v|^2) \mu_0(dx, dv) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

So, since μ_0 has compact support we get the result setting

$$Q_2 = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} Q_1(1 + |v|^2) \mu_0(dx, dv) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad \square$$

We are now ready to prove that the flow of probability measures m^ε converges in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$, up to a subsequence. First, we recall that for any $t \in [0, T]$ the measure m_t^ε is the space marginal of μ_t^ε which is given by the push-forward of the initial distribution μ_0 under the optimal flow (3.6), that is

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\gamma}_{(x,v)}(t) = v(t), & \gamma_{(x,v)}(0) = x \\ \dot{v}(t) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} D_v u^\varepsilon(t, \gamma_{(x,v)}(t), v(t)), & v(0) = v. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 4.4. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Then, the flow of measures $\{m_t^\varepsilon\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is tight and there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that m^{ε_k} converges to some probability measure m^0 in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$.*

Proof. Since $m_t^\varepsilon = \pi_1 \# \mu_t^\varepsilon$, for any $t \in [0, T]$, where μ_t^ε is given by push-forward of μ_0 under the flow (3.6), we know that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 m_t^\varepsilon(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(t)|^2 \mu_0(dx, dv).$$

So, we are interested in estimating the curve $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon$ for any (x, v) , uniformly in $\varepsilon > 0$. In order to get it, from Corollary 4.2 we immediately deduce that

$$|\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(s)| \leq |x| + \sqrt{T} \sqrt{Q_1(1 + |v|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \forall s \in [0, T].$$

Hence, for any $t \geq 0$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 m_t^\varepsilon(dx) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(t)|^2 \mu_0(dx, dv) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} C_0(|x|^2 + TQ_1(1 + |v|^2)) \mu_0(dx, dv) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_0 \geq 0$. Thus, since μ_0 has compact support we deduce that $\{m_t^\varepsilon\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ has bounded second-order momentum, uniformly in $\varepsilon > 0$ and, consequently, $\{m_t^\varepsilon\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is tight. Therefore, by Prokhorov Theorem and Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and measure $m^0 \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $m^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow m^0$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$. \square

Next, we turn to the convergence of u^ε . Before proving it, we need preliminary estimates on the oscillation of the value function w.r.t. velocity variable and then w.r.t. time and space variable. In particular, we will show that the function $u^\varepsilon(t, x, \cdot)$ has uniformly decreasing oscillation which will allowed us to conclude that the limit function does not depend on v .

Lemma 4.5. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Let $R \geq 0$ and let $(x, v_0), (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{B}_R$. Then, there exists $C_R \geq 0$ and a parametric curve $\sigma : [0, \sqrt{\varepsilon}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$\sigma(0) = \sigma(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) = x, \quad \dot{\sigma}(0) = v_0, \quad \dot{\sigma}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) = v$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\sigma}(s)|^2 + L_0(\sigma(s), \dot{\sigma}(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds \leq C_R$$

where C_R is independent of ε, x, v and v_0 .

Proof. Let $R \geq 0$ and let $(x, v_0), (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{B}_R$. Define the curve $\sigma : [0, \sqrt{\varepsilon}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\sigma(t) = x + v_0 t + B t^2 + A t^3$$

with $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following conditions

$$\sigma(0) = \sigma(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) = x, \quad \dot{\sigma}(0) = v_0, \quad \dot{\sigma}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) = v.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} B = -(2v_0 + v) \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ A = (v + v_0) \varepsilon^{-1}. \end{cases}$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\sigma}(s)|^2 + L_0(\sigma(s), \dot{\sigma}(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\ \leq \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |2B + 6At|^2 + M_0(1 + |v + 2tB + 3t^2A|^2) \right) ds \leq \widehat{C} \sqrt{\varepsilon} R^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant \widehat{C} and the proof is thus complete. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Assume (M1), (M2) and (BC). Let $R \geq 0$, let $T > 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, there exists $\widehat{C}_R(\varepsilon) \geq 0$ such that for any $t \in [0, T]$, any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and any v, w in \overline{B}_R there holds*

$$|u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) - u^\varepsilon(t, x, w)| \leq \widehat{C}_R(\varepsilon)$$

and $\widehat{C}_R(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Proof. Fix $R \geq 0$ and take $(x, v), (x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{B}_R$. Let γ^ε be a minimizer for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$ and define the curve

$$\widehat{\gamma}(s) = \begin{cases} \sigma(s-t), & s \in [t, t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}] \\ \gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), & s \in [t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}, T] \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma : [0, \sqrt{\varepsilon}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ connects, in the sense of [Lemma 4.5](#), (x, w) with (x, v) . Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(t, x, w) - u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) &\leq \int_t^{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\sigma}(s-t)|^2 + L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\ &+ \int_{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon})|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\ &+ g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_T^\varepsilon) - u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \\ &= \int_t^{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\sigma}(s-t)|^2 + L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_{s-t}^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\ &+ \int_{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon})|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_{s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\ &+ g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_T^\varepsilon) - g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) - u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \\ &+ \int_t^{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_s^\varepsilon) - L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_{s-t}^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\ &+ \int_{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^T \left(L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_s^\varepsilon) - L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_{s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon) \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from [Lemma 4.5](#) we know that

$$(4.1) \quad \int_t^{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\sigma}(s-t)|^2 + L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_{s-t}^\varepsilon) \right) ds \leq C_R \sqrt{\varepsilon},$$

and, moreover, from the optimality of γ^ε we get

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon})|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_{s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon) \right) ds - u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \\ &\leq - \int_{T-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, as observed before from [Corollary 4.2](#) we obtain that

$$|\gamma^\varepsilon(s)| \leq |x| + \sqrt{T} \sqrt{Q_1} (1 + |v|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall s \in [0, T]$$

and we also know that the curve σ is bounded. Hence, by **(M3)** and [Corollary 4.3](#) we deduce that there exists $P(\varepsilon) \geq 0$, with $P(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, such that

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_t^{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} (L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_s^\varepsilon) - L_0(\sigma(s-t), \dot{\sigma}(s-t), m_{s-t}^\varepsilon)) ds \\ & + \int_{t+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^T (L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_s^\varepsilon) - L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_{s-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon)) ds \\ & + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T-\sqrt{\varepsilon}), m_T^\varepsilon) - g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) \leq P(\varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that the modulus θ in **(M3)** is bounded from the boundedness of γ^ε and σ . Therefore, combining [\(4.1\)](#), [\(4.2\)](#) and [\(4.3\)](#) we get the result. \square

Proposition 4.7. *Assume **(M1)** – **(M3)** and **(BC)**. Then, for any $R \geq 0$ there exists a modulus $\omega_R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a constant $C_1 \geq 0$, independent of R , such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the following holds:*

$$(4.4) \quad |u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) - u^\varepsilon(s, x, v)| \leq \omega_R(|t - s|), \quad \forall (t, s, x, v) \in [0, T] \times [0, T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R$$

$$(4.5) \quad |D_x u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)| \leq C_1 T(1 + |v|^2), \quad a.e. (t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. We begin by proving [\(4.5\)](#). Let $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and let γ^ε be a minimizer for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$. Then, from [\(3.2\)](#) we get

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(t, x + h, v) & \leq \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s) + h, \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T) + h, m_T^\varepsilon) \\ & = u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) + \int_t^T (L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s) + h, \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s), m_s^\varepsilon) - L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s), m_s^\varepsilon)) ds \\ & \quad + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T) + h, m_T^\varepsilon) - g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) \\ & \leq u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) + \int_t^T M_0 |h| (1 + |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2) ds + \|Dg(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} |h|. \end{aligned}$$

By [\(3.1\)](#) and by [Lemma 4.1](#) we obtain

$$\int_t^T \left(\frac{1}{M_0} |\dot{\gamma}^*(s)|^2 - M_0 \right) ds \leq u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \leq M_0 T(1 + |v|^2) + \|g(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d}$$

which, in turns, yields to the conclusion.

Next, we proceed to show (4.4). Let $R \geq 0$ and take $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R$. Let γ^ε be a minimizer for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$ and let $h \in [0, T - t]$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& u^\varepsilon(t + h, x, v) \\
& \leq \int_{t+h}^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-h)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-h), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-h), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds + g(\gamma(T-h), m_T^\varepsilon) \\
& = \int_{t+h}^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-h)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-h), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-h), m_{s-h}^\varepsilon) \right) ds + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) \\
& + \int_{t+h}^T \left(L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-h), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-h), m_s^\varepsilon) - L_0(\gamma^\varepsilon(s-h), \dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s-h), m_{s-h}^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\
& + g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T-h), m_T^\varepsilon) - g(\gamma^\varepsilon(T), m_T^\varepsilon) \\
& \leq u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) + \int_{t+h}^T \theta(|\gamma^\varepsilon(s-h)|) \omega_0(d_1(m_s^\varepsilon, m_{s-h}^\varepsilon)) ds + \|Dg(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} |h|
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by **(M3)**. Hence, from [Corollary 4.2](#) we know that

$$|\gamma^\varepsilon(s)| \leq |x| + \sqrt{T} \sqrt{Q_1} (1 + |v|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall s \in [0, T]$$

and thus $\theta(\cdot)$ turns out to be bounded. Therefore, appealing to [Corollary 4.3](#) we obtain

$$(4.6) \quad u^\varepsilon(t + h, x, v) - u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) \leq T\theta(R)\omega_0(|h|^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \|Dg(\cdot, m_T^\varepsilon)\|_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d} |h|.$$

On the other hand, let $R \geq 0$ and let $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R$. For $h \in [0, T - t]$, define the curve $\gamma : [t, t + h] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\gamma(s) = x + (s - t)v$. Then, by [Dynamic Programming Principle](#) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.7) \quad u^\varepsilon(t, x, v) & \leq \int_t^{t+h} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\dot{\gamma}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), m_s^\varepsilon) \right) ds \\
& + u^\varepsilon(t + h, \gamma(t + h), \dot{\gamma}(t + h)) \\
& = \int_t^{t+h} L_0(x + (s - t)v, v, m_s^\varepsilon) ds + u^\varepsilon(t + h, x + hv, v) \\
& \leq M_0(1 + R^2)|h| + u^\varepsilon(t + h, x, v) + C_1 T(1 + R^2)|h|
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied (3.1) and (4.5) to get the last inequality. Therefore, combining (4.6) and (4.7) the proof is complete. \square

Remark 4.8. Next, we study the behavior of the value function u^ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and before doing that we recall the following argument needed to get uniform convergence from point-wise convergence.

Assume that there exists a nonnegative function $\Theta(\delta_0, \varepsilon_0, R_0)$ such that

$$\Theta(\delta_0, \varepsilon_0, R_0) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_0, \delta_0 \downarrow 0,$$

and assume that for any $|t_1 - t_2| + |x_1 - x_2| \leq \delta_0$, any $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and any $|x_i|, |v_i| \leq R_0$ ($i = 1, 2$) there holds

$$|u^\varepsilon(t_1, x_1, v_1) - u^\varepsilon(t_2, x_2, v_2)| \leq \Theta(\delta_0, \varepsilon_0, R_0).$$

Then: if u^ε converge point-wise then u^ε converges locally uniformly and the limit function does not depend on v . \square

Let $m^0 \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be the flow of measures obtained in [Theorem 4.4](#) as limit of the flow m^{ε_k} in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for some subsequence $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$. Define the function $u^0 : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(4.8) \quad u^0(t, x) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t(x)} \left\{ \int_t^T L_0(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), m_s^0) ds + g(\gamma(T), m_T^0) \right\}.$$

We will prove now that for the subsequence ε_k the sequence of value functions u^{ε_k} locally uniformly converge to u^0 .

Theorem 4.9. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Then, there exists a subsequence $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$ such that u^{ε_k} locally uniformly converges to u^0 .*

Proof. We proceed to show first the point-wise convergence of u^{ε_k} to u^0 , for some subsequence $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, and then, using [Remark 4.8](#), i.e., constructing such a modulus Θ , we deduce that the convergence is locally uniform.

From [Theorem 4.4](#), let ε_k be the subsequence such that $m^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow m^0$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Let $R \geq 0$, let $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{B}_R$ and let γ^{ε_k} be a minimizer for $u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v)$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) \\ &= \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) \right) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}) \\ &\geq \int_t^T L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}) \\ &\geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t(x)} \left\{ \int_t^T L_0(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), m_s^0) ds + g(\gamma(T), m_T^0) \right\} \\ &\quad + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}) - g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^0) \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \left(L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) - L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^0) \right) ds \geq u^0(t, x) - o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by **(M1)** and the convergence of m^{ε_k} in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

On the other hand, let $R \geq 0$ and take $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{B}_R$. Let $\gamma^0 \in \Gamma_t(x)$ be a solution of

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t(x)} \left\{ \int_t^T L_0(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), m_s^0) ds + g(\gamma(T), m_T^0) \right\}.$$

Next, we distinguish two cases: first, when $\dot{\gamma}^0(t) = v$ and then when $\dot{\gamma}^0(t) \neq v$. Indeed, if $\dot{\gamma}^0(t) = v$, by the Euler equation and the C^2 -regularity of L_0 we have that $\gamma \in C^2([0, T])$.

Hence, we can use γ^0 as a competitor for $u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v)$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.9) \quad u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) &\leq \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^0(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^0(s), \dot{\gamma}^0(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) \right) ds + g(\gamma^0(T), m^{\varepsilon_k}(T)) \\
&\leq \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} |\ddot{\gamma}^0(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^0(s), \dot{\gamma}^0(s), m_s^0) \right) ds + g(\gamma^0(T), m^0(T)) \\
&\quad + \int_t^T \left(L_0(\gamma^0(s), \dot{\gamma}^0(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) - L_0(\gamma^0(s), \dot{\gamma}^0(s), m_s^0) \right) ds \\
&\quad + g(\gamma^0(T), m^{\varepsilon_k}(T)) - g(\gamma^0(T), m^0(T)) \\
&\leq u^0(t, x) + o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality again follows from the convergence of m^{ε_k} in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$. If this is not the case, i.e., $\dot{\gamma}^0(t) \neq v$, from [Lemma 4.6](#) we deduce that

$$u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) = u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) - u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, \dot{\gamma}^0(t)) + u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, \dot{\gamma}^0(t)) \leq o(1) + u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, \dot{\gamma}^0(t)).$$

Thus, in order to conclude it is enough to estimate $u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, \dot{\gamma}^0(t))$ as in [\(4.9\)](#). Therefore, we obtain

$$u^0(t, x) - o(1) \leq u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) \leq u^0(t, x) + o(1)$$

which implies that u^{ε_k} point-wise converges to u^0 .

Finally, in order to conclude we need to show that the convergence is locally uniform. From [\(4.4\)](#), [\(4.5\)](#) and [Lemma 4.6](#) we have that for any $R \geq 0$ and any $(t_1, x_1, v_1), (t_2, x_2, v_2) \in [0, T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&|u^\varepsilon(t_1, x_1, v_1) - u^\varepsilon(t_2, x_2, v_2)| \\
&\leq \omega_R(|t_1 - t_2|) + C_1|x_1 - x_2| + C_R\sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, setting

$$\Theta(\delta_0, \varepsilon_0, R_0) = \omega_{R_0}(\delta_0) + C_1\delta_0 + C_{R_0}\sqrt{\varepsilon_0}$$

by [Remark 4.8](#) we deduce that the convergence is locally uniform and the proof is thus complete. \square

After proving the convergence of u^ε , we go back to the analysis of the flow of measures and in particular we will characterize it in terms of the limit function u^0 . In order to do so, we study the convergence of minimizers for u^ε and appealing to such a result we will show that $m^0 \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ solves a continuity equation with vector field $D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0)$, in the sense of distribution.

Proposition 4.10. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Let $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be such that u^0 is differentiable at (t, x) and let γ^ε be a minimizer for $u^\varepsilon(t, x, v)$. Then, γ^ε uniformly converges to a curve $\gamma^0 \in AC([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and γ^0 is the unique minimizer for $u^0(t, x)$ in [\(4.8\)](#).*

Proof. Let us start by proving that γ^ε uniformly converges, up to a subsequence. By [Corollary 4.2](#) we know that

$$\int_t^T |\dot{\gamma}^\varepsilon(s)|^2 ds \leq Q_1(1 + |v|^2).$$

Thus, for any $s \in [t, T]$, by Hölder inequality we have that

$$|\gamma^\varepsilon(s)| \leq |x| + \sqrt{T} \sqrt{Q_1} (1 + |v|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, γ^ε is bounded in $H^1(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ which implies that by Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a curve $\gamma^0 \in \text{AC}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that γ^{ε_k} converges uniformly to γ^0 .

We show now that such a limit γ^0 is a minimizer for $u^0(t, x)$. First, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) \right) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}) \right] \\ & \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_t^T L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, as observed at the beginning of this proof γ^ε is uniformly bounded in $H^1(0, T)$. So by lower-semicontinuity of L and [Theorem 4.4](#) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.10) \quad & \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_t^T L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s)) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}) \right] \\ & \geq \int_t^T L_0(\gamma^0(s), \dot{\gamma}^0(s), m_s^0) ds + g(\gamma^0(T), m_T^0). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $R \geq 0$ taking $(t, x, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{B}_R$, from [Theorem 4.9](#) we obtain

$$u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) \leq u^0(t, x) + o(1)$$

and we recall that

$$u^{\varepsilon_k}(t, x, v) = \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) \right) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}).$$

Hence, we get

$$o(1) + u^0(t, x) \geq \int_t^T \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{2} |\dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s)|^2 + L_0(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(s), \dot{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_k}(s), m_s^{\varepsilon_k}) \right) ds + g(\gamma^{\varepsilon_k}(T), m_T^{\varepsilon_k}).$$

Therefore, passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ from [\(4.10\)](#) we obtain

$$u^0(t, x) \geq \int_t^T L_0(\gamma^0(s), \dot{\gamma}^0(s), m_s^0) ds + g(\gamma^0(T), m_T^0)$$

which proves that γ^0 is a minimizer for $u^0(t, x)$. Since u^0 is differentiable at $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists a unique minimizing trajectory and thus we have that the uniform convergence of γ^ε holds for the whole sequence. \square

Remark 4.11. Since u^0 is locally Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. time and Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. space, we have that [Proposition 4.10](#) holds for a.e. $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let u^0 be as in [\(4.8\)](#) and let $\gamma_t^0(\cdot)$ be the flow associated with the vector field

$$x \mapsto D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0),$$

that is,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\gamma}_t^0(x) = D_p H_0(\gamma_t^0(x), D_x u^0(t, \gamma_t^0(x)), m_t^0), & t \in [0, T] \\ \gamma_0(x) = x. \end{cases}$$

Note that such a flow exists since the vector field $x \mapsto D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0)$ is Lipschitz continuous by the Lipschitz continuity of the value function u^0 and by the regularity of the Hamiltonian H_0 . We also recall that the measure μ^ε is the image of μ_0 under the flow (3.6), which is optimal as observed in Remark 3.1 for $u^\varepsilon(0, x, v)$ for a.e. $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, and thus, for any function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the measure m_t^ε is given by

$$(4.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^\varepsilon(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi(\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon(t)) \mu_0(dx, dv).$$

We finally recall that by assumption μ_0 is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure.

Corollary 4.12. *Assume (M1) – (M3) and (BC). Then, we have that*

$$(4.12) \quad m_t^0 = \gamma_t^0(\cdot) \# m_0, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Moreover, $m^0 \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t m_t^0 - \operatorname{div} \left(m_t^0 D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0) \right) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ m_0^0 = m_0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

in the sense of distributions.

Proof. From Theorem 4.4 let $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$ be such that $m^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow m^0$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then, since μ_0 is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure by Proposition 4.10 we have that

$$\gamma_{(x,v)}^{\varepsilon_k}(t) \rightarrow \gamma_t^0(x), \quad \mu_0\text{-a.e. } (x, v), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Therefore, from (4.11), for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) m_t^0(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\gamma_t^0(x)) m_0(dx), \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

which proves (4.12). Moreover, again by Proposition 4.10 we have that γ_t^0 is a minimiser for $u^0(0, x)$ since it is the limit of $\gamma_{(x,v)}^\varepsilon$ which is optimal $u^\varepsilon(0, x, v)$ and we are taking (x, v) in a subset of full measure w.r.t. μ_0 . Therefore, from the optimality of γ^0 we get

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\gamma}_t^0(x) = D_p H_0(\gamma_t^0(x), D_x u^0(t, \gamma_t^0(x)), m_t^0), & t \in (0, T] \\ \gamma_0^0(x) = x. \end{cases}$$

Hence, for any $\psi \in C_c^\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(t, x) m_t^0(dx) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(t, \gamma_t^0(x)) m_0(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\partial_t \psi(t, \gamma_t^0(x)) + \langle D_x \psi(t, \gamma_t^0(x)), D_p H_0(\gamma_t^0(x), D_x \psi(t, \gamma_t^0(x)), m_t^0) \rangle \right) m_0(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\partial_t \psi(t, x) + \langle D_x \psi(t, x), D_p H_0(x, D_x \psi(t, x), m_t^0) \rangle \right) m_t^0(dx) \end{aligned}$$

and integrating, in time, over $[0, T]$ we get the result. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that $m^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow m^0$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $u^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow u^0$ locally uniformly on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Then, appealing to Theorem 4.9 and Corollary 4.12 we deduce that (u^0, m^0) is a solution to the MFG system

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^0(t, x) + H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ \partial_t m_t^0 - \operatorname{div}(m_t^0 D_p H_0(x, D_x u^0(t, x), m_t^0)) = 0, & (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ m_0^0 = m_0, \quad u^0(T, x) = g(x, m_T^0) & x \in \mathbb{R}^d \end{cases}$$

which completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Achdou, P. Mannucci, C. Marchi, and N. Tchou. Deterministic mean field games with control on the acceleration. *NoDEA, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, 27(3):32, 2020. Id/No 33.
- [2] O. Alvarez and M. Bardi. *Ergodicity, stabilization, and singular perturbations for Bellman-Isaacs equations*, volume 960. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2010.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savare. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2005.
- [4] Z. Artstein and V. Gaitsgory. The value function of singularly perturbed control systems. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 41(3):425–445, 2000.
- [5] Z. Artstein and A. Vigodner. Singularly perturbed ordinary differential equations with dynamic limits. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb., Sect. A, Math.*, 126(3):541–569, 1996.
- [6] A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and P. Yam. *Mean field games and mean field type control theory*. New York, NY: Springer, 2013.
- [7] P. Cannarsa, W. Cheng, C. Mendico, and W. K. Long-time behavior of first-order mean field games on Euclidean space. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 10(2):361–390, 2020.
- [8] P. Cannarsa, W. Cheng, C. Mendico, and W. K. Weak kam approach to first-order mean field games with state constraints. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations (accepted)*, 2021.
- [9] P. Cannarsa and C. Mendico. Mild and weak solutions of mean field game problems for linear control systems. *Minimax Theory Appl.*, 5(2):221–250, 2020.
- [10] P. Cardaliaguet. Notes on mean field games from p. -l. lions lectures at collège de france. *Unpublished*, 2012.
- [11] P. Cardaliaguet. Long time average of first order mean field games and weak KAM theory. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 3(4):473–488, 2013.
- [12] P. Cardaliaguet and C. Mendico. Ergodic behavior of control and mean field games problems depending on acceleration. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A, Theory Methods*, 203:41, 2021. Id/No 112185.
- [13] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications I. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games*, volume 83. Cham: Springer, 2018.
- [14] A. Cesaroni, N. Dirr, and C. Marchi. Homogenization of a mean field game system in the small noise limit. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48(4):2701–2729, 2016.
- [15] D. A. Gomes, E. A. Pimentel, and V. Voskanyan. *Regularity theory for mean-field game systems*. Cham: Springer; Rio de Janeiro: Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática Aplicada e Computacional (SBMAC), 2016.
- [16] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. E. Caines. Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6(3):221–252, 2006.
- [17] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. E. Caines. Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized ε -Nash equilibria. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 52(9):1560–1571, 2007.
- [18] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I: Le cas stationnaire. *C. R., Math., Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.
- [19] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II: Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R., Math., Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.

- [20] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.* (3), 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [21] P.-L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Homogenization of the backward-forward mean field games systems in periodic enviromets. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei, Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat., IX. Ser., Rend. Lincei, Mat. Appl.*, 31(4):733–755, 2020.
- [22] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2003.

GSSI-GRAN SASSO SCIENCE INSTITUTE, VIALE F. CRISPI 7, 67100 L' AQUILA AND CEREMADE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-DAUPHINE, PLACE DU MARÉCHAL DE LATTRE DE TASSIGNY - 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16
Email address: cristian.mendico@gssi.it