

# A bifurcation analysis of some McKean-Vlasov equations

Quentin Cormier

*Princeton University*

January 28, 2022

## Abstract

We study the long time behavior of a family of McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations. We give conditions ensuring the local stability of an invariant probability measure. Our criterion involves the location of the roots of an explicit holomorphic function associated to the dynamics. When all the roots lie on the left-half plane, local stability holds and we prove convergence in Wasserstein norms. We also provide the optimal rate of convergence. Our probabilistic proof makes use of Lions derivatives and relies on a new “integrated sensibility” formula.

**Keywords** McKean-Vlasov SDE · Long time behavior · Mean-field interaction · Lions derivative

**Mathematics Subject Classification** Primary: 60H10. Secondary 60K35 · 45D05 · 37A30

## 1 Introduction

We are interested in the long time behavior of the solutions of some McKean-Vlasov SDE, of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^\nu &= \mathcal{V}(X_t^\nu, \mu_t)dt + dW_t. \\ \mu_t &= \mathcal{L}(X_t^\nu), \quad \mu_0 = \nu. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In this equation,  $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a standard  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued Brownian motion and  $\nu$  is the law of the initial condition  $X_0^\nu$ , assumed to be independent of  $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . McKean-Vlasov equations appear naturally as the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  of the following particle system  $(X_t^{i,N})_{t \geq 0}$ , solution of

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad dX_t^{i,N} = \mathcal{V}(X_t^{i,N}, \mu_t^N)dt + dW_t^{i,N}, \tag{2}$$

where  $\mu_t^N$  is the empirical measure  $\mu_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{X_t^{j,N}}$  and  $(W_t^{i,N})_{t \geq 0}$  are  $N$  independent standard Brownian motions. We refer to [Szn91] for an introduction to this topic. Such particle systems and their mean-field counterparts are used in a wide range of applications such as plasma physics [Dob79; HJ07], fluid mechanics [FHM14], astrophysics (particles are stars or galaxies [Wol99]), bio-sciences (to understand the collective behavior of animals [BCC11]), neuroscience (to model assemblies of neurons, such as integrate and fire neurons [DIRT15; FL16] or FitzHugh–Nagumo neurons [LP21]), opinion dynamics [DFL15] and economics [CD18].

In these applications, one important question concerns the long time behavior of the solutions. As such, the ergodic properties of McKean-Vlasov equations (1) have been studied in many different contexts and with many different approaches.

Two different families of assumptions are known to ensure that (1) admits an unique, globally attractive invariant probability measure. The first type of assumptions deals with kernels of the form  $\mathcal{V}(x, \mu) = -\nabla V(x) - \nabla W * \mu(x)$ , where  $W$  is symmetric and  $V, W$  have suitable convexity properties. The first results in this direction were obtained in [BRTV98; BRV98] in dimension one. In larger dimensions, [Mal03; Ver06] proved the convergence uniformly in time of a suitable particle

system towards the mean-field equation. As such, they obtained the ergodicity of the McKean-Vlasov equation from the ergodicity of the particle system. These uniformly in time propagation of chaos arguments have been used wisely, see for instance [DT19; GM21] for recent results in this direction. This type of results has also been obtained by functional inequalities [BCCP98; CMV03]: the idea is to define a measured valued functional (known as the entropy or free energy) which only decreases along the trajectories of the solution of (1). The second kind of assumptions involves weak enough interactions. When the dependence of  $\mathcal{V}$  with respect to the measure is sufficiently weak, one expects global stability, because this situation can be seen as a perturbation of the case without interactions. As such, it is possible to extend techniques from ergodic Markov processes to the case of weak interactions. This includes for instance coupling techniques [Gan08; But14; EGZ19] or Picard iterations in suitable spaces [CTV20].

It is also well-known that in general, such global stability results cannot hold, because (1) may have multiple invariant probability measures and periodic solutions [Sch85; HT10]. This motivates the current question of the paper, namely the study of the local stability of a given invariant probability measure of (1). That is, being given  $\nu_\infty$  an invariant probability measure of (1), we want to answer the following question:

Is there exists an open neighborhood of  $\nu_\infty$  such that for all initial conditions  $\nu$  within this neighborhood, the law of  $X_t^\nu$  converges to  $\nu_\infty$ , as  $t$  goes to infinity? If so, in which metric does the convergence hold and what is the rate of convergence?

Such local stability results can be obtained via PDE techniques, using that the marginals of the non-linear process solve a non-linear PDE (the Fokker-Planck equation). The strategy is to linearize the non-linear PDE around  $\nu_\infty$ , to study the existence of a spectral gap for the linear equation in appropriate Banach spaces and to use perturbation techniques to obtain the convergence for the non-linear PDE. We refer to [Hen81; MW05] for an overview of these techniques. When the non-linear PDE admits a gradient flow structure, it is also possible to study the local stability of an invariant probability measure using functional inequalities, see [Tug13; CGPS20].

Our approach differs from these two methods on several points. We do not rely on the non-linear Fokker-Planck PDE, but use instead the stochastic version (1). Our main idea is to derive the interaction kernel with respect to the initial probability measure, in the neighborhood of  $\nu_\infty$ . There are several notions of derivation with respect to probability measures (see [CD18]) and we use here the Lions derivatives. We denote by  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the set of probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  having a second moment. For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $t \geq 0$ , we consider the function

$$\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \nu \mapsto \mathcal{V}(x, \mathcal{L}(X_t^\nu)) =: v_t^x(\nu) \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $X_t^\nu$  is the solution of (1) starting with  $\nu$  at time 0. We prove that under suitable assumptions, this function is Lions differentiable at  $\nu_\infty$ , meaning that for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{V}(x, \mu_t) = \mathcal{V}(x, \nu_\infty) + \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu v_t^x(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot (X - X_0) + o((\mathbb{E} |X - X_0|^2)^{1/2}).$$

In this equation,  $X, X_0$  are any random variables with laws respectively equal to  $\nu$  and  $\nu_\infty$ , defined on the same probability space. We write  $\mathbb{E}(X - X_0 | X_0) = k(X_0)$ , where  $k$  is a deterministic function from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Because  $\mathbb{E} |X - X_0|^2$  is finite, it follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that  $\mathbb{E} |k(X_0)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} |X - X_0|^2 < \infty$ , that is  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ . As such we can define the following linear operator  $\Omega_t(k) : L^2(\nu_\infty) \rightarrow L^2(\nu_\infty)$

$$\Omega_t(k) := x \mapsto \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu v_t^x(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot k(X_0),$$

such that

$$\mathcal{V}(x, \mu_t) = \mathcal{V}(x, \nu_\infty) + \Omega_t(k)(x) + o((\mathbb{E} |X - X_0|^2)^{1/2}).$$

Our spectral conditions under which we prove that  $\nu_\infty$  is locally stable can be stated in terms of the decay of the function  $t \mapsto \Omega_t$ , as  $t$  goes to infinity. We prove that the integrability of this function on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  implies the stability of  $\nu_\infty$ . In addition, the decay of  $t \mapsto \Omega_t$  as  $t$  goes to infinity gives precisely the rate of convergence of  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\nu)$  towards  $\nu_\infty$ , in Wasserstein metrics. Crucial to

our analysis, we provide an explicit integral equation to compute this function  $\Omega_t$ . To do so, we consider the linear process  $(Y_t^\nu)_{t \geq 0}$  associated to (1) and  $\nu_\infty$ , defined as the solution of

$$dY_t^\nu = \mathcal{V}(Y_t^\nu, \nu_\infty)dt + dW_t,$$

starting from  $\mathcal{L}(Y_0^\nu) = \nu$ . We define similarly for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $t \geq 0$  the function  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \nu \mapsto u_t^x(\nu) := \mathcal{V}(x, \mathcal{L}(Y_t^\nu))$ . Under our assumptions,  $u_t^x$  is Lions differentiable at  $\nu_\infty$ , and we can define

$$\forall k \in L^2(\nu_\infty), \quad \Theta_t(k) := x \mapsto \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^x(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot k(X_0).$$

We prove the following key relation between  $\Theta_t$  and  $\Omega_t$

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \Omega_t(k) = \Theta_t(k) + \int_0^t \Theta_{t-s}(\Omega_s(k))ds.$$

That is,  $\Omega$  is a solution of a Volterra integral equation whose kernel is given by  $\Theta$ : in the language of integral equations,  $\Omega$  is the resolvent of  $\Theta$ . This relation is useful because it is easier to get estimates on  $u_t^x$ , which involves a linear Markov process, rather than getting estimates on  $v_t^x$ , which involves the solution of the McKean-Vlasov equation (1). In particular, this relation allows deducing the decay properties of  $\Omega$  from properties of  $\Theta$ . A pleasant feature of our approach is that it does not require any regularity assumption on the initial datum (for instance we do not need to assume that the initial datum has a density). To avoid technical issues, we assume that the drift is separable (see Section 2) but we believe that the method is more broadly applicable.

We provide examples in Section 6 showing how to check in practice the assumptions. These examples show that the stability criterion we obtain is optimal: it captures correctly the bifurcations from stable to unstable invariant probability measures and gives the optimal rate of convergence. As such, this criterion can be used to study the bifurcations of (1). The strategy presented in this work also applies to mean-field models of noisy integrate-and-fire neurons. In an unpublished preliminary version of this work [Cor21], we study the stability of the stationary solutions of such mean-field model of noisy neurons. In addition, the existence of periodic solutions via Hopf bifurcations is studied in [CTV21]. For the sake of clarity, we restrict here ourselves to a diffusive setting.

Finally, we mention an important open problem concerning the long time behavior of the particle system (2). On one hand, general conditions are known to ensure that the particle system is ergodic. On the other hand, numerical studies show that this particle system can have a metastable behavior in the sense that the convergence of the empirical measure  $\mu_t^N$  towards its invariant state can be very slow when  $N$  is large. The locally stable invariant probability measures of the non-linear equation (1) are good candidates to be metastable states of the particle system (2). Characterizing those metastable states in quantitative terms is a challenging mathematical question. Recent partial results have been obtained in this direction [AD20; LM21; DT21] and we hope to make progress on this question in future works.

**Structure of the paper.** The main result is given in Section 2. In Section 3, we explain why Lions derivatives are a natural tool to study the stability of McKean-Vlasov equations. In Section 3.1, we consider the flow of measures associated to the linear process and study its derivative in the sense of Lions with respect to the initial datum. In Section 3.3, we study similarly the derivative of the flow of measures of the non-linear process (1) and show that the two Lions derivatives are connected through a Volterra integral equation. This connection is made possible by the introduction of an “integrated sensibility formula”, developed in Section 3.2. Finally in Section 3.4 we discuss our spectral assumption. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of our main result, Theorem 2. The key idea is to apply the implicit function theorem to a well-chosen functional. The main arguments of the proof are explained in Section 4.1 and Sections 4.2 and 4.3 provide required technical estimates. In Section 5 we give some insights on the static bifurcations. Finally, in Section 6, we provide two simple examples to illustrate the applicability and the sharpness of the results.

**Acknowledgments.** The author would like to express his gratitude to Etienne Tanré for many suggestions at every step of this work, as well as hearty encouragements. He also thanks Romain Veltz and René Carmona for their valuable advice. This research has received funding from the

European Union's Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation under the Specific Grant Agreement No. 945539 (Human Brain Project SGA3) and was supported by AFOSR FA9550-19-1-0291.

## 2 Main result

We assume that the drift is of the form

$$\mathcal{V}(x, \mu) = -\nabla V(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu(f_i) e_i,$$

where  $m \leq d$ ,  $(e_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$  are  $m$  independent (deterministic) vectors of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $V, (f_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$  are functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . We used here the notation

$$\mu(f_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_i(y) \mu(dy).$$

**Assumptions 1.** *We assume that*

1. *The function  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{C}^2$ ,  $\|\nabla^2 V\|_\infty < \infty$  and  $\nabla^2 V$  is Lipschitz continuous. In addition, we assume that  $V$  is uniformly strongly convex:*

$$\exists \kappa_* > 0 : \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \nabla^2 V(x) \geq \kappa_* I_d.$$

2. *The functions  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are  $\mathcal{C}^2$  with  $\|\nabla f_i\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 f_i\|_\infty < \infty$ .*

Let  $\nu_\infty$  be an invariant probability measure of (1). Denote by  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$  the interaction term under  $\nu_\infty$

$$\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_\infty(f_i) e_i. \quad (3)$$

Each invariant probability measure of (1) is characterized by its associated vector  $\alpha$  and we sometimes denote by  $\nu_\infty^\alpha$  such invariant probability measure to emphasize the dependence on  $\alpha$ . We give a sufficient condition ensuring that  $\nu_\infty$  is locally stable for the McKean-Vlasov dynamics (1). Consider  $(Y_t^\alpha)_{t \geq 0}$  the solution of the linear SDE

$$dY_t^\alpha = -\nabla V(Y_t^\alpha) dt + \alpha dt + dW_t. \quad (4)$$

Note that  $\nu_\infty = \nu_\infty^\alpha$  is also an invariant probability measure of this linear SDE. Key to our analysis is the following family of matrices  $\Theta_t := (\Theta_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$  defined for all  $t \geq 0$  by:

$$\Theta_t^{i,j} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_t^\alpha) \cdot e_j \nu_\infty(dy). \quad (5)$$

The notation  $\mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_t^\alpha)$  means that the initial condition of  $(Y_t^\alpha)$  is set to be  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  (that is  $Y_0^\alpha = y$ ). In addition,  $\nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_t^\alpha)$  is the gradient of the function  $\mathbb{R}^d \ni y \mapsto \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_t^\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $I_m$  be the  $m \times m$  identity matrix and let  $\widehat{\Theta}(z)$  be the Laplace transform of  $\Theta_t$ , defined by

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } \Re(z) > -\kappa_*, \quad \widehat{\Theta}(z) := \int_0^\infty e^{-zt} \Theta_t dt.$$

Our main result is

**Theorem 2.** *Consider  $\nu_\infty$  an invariant probability measure of (1). Assume Assumption 1 holds and let  $\alpha$  be given by (3). Define the “abscissa” of the rightmost zeros of  $\det(I_d - \widehat{\Theta}(z))$ :*

$$-\lambda' := \sup\{\Re(z) \mid z \in \mathbb{C}, \det(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z)) = 0\}. \quad (6)$$

*Assume that  $\lambda' > 0$ . Then  $\nu_\infty$  is locally stable: for all  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda')$  there exists  $C, \rho > 0$  such that for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) \leq \rho$ , it holds that*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad W_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^\nu), \nu_\infty) \leq C W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) e^{-\lambda t}.$$

**Remark 3.** *Few comments are in order:*

1. *The fact that the Laplace transform of  $\Theta$  is well-defined (and holomorphic) on  $\Re(z) > -\kappa_*$  follows from Lemma 4 below. In addition, the function  $z \mapsto \det(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z))$  is holomorphic on the half-plane  $\Re(z) > \kappa_*$ , and so its zeros are isolated.*
2. *(Case of weak interactions) Assume that  $\int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t\|_1 dt < 1$ , where  $\|A\|_1 := \max_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^m |A_{ij}|$  is the standard  $L^1$  norm of matrices. Then  $\lambda' > 0$  and so  $\nu_\infty$  is locally stable.*
3. *There is some freedom in the choice of the distance between probability measures. The same result still holds if we replace  $W_2$  by  $W_p$  with any  $p \geq 1$ , or by some weighted total variation norms. See Remark 25.*
4. *The existence of an invariant probability measure of (1) does not follow directly from our assumptions. Consider for instance  $d = 1$ ,  $-\nabla V(x) = -x$ ,  $m = 1$  and  $f_1(x) = \kappa x$  for some  $\kappa > 1$ . This satisfies all our assumptions and (1) does not have any invariant probability measure because for all  $\nu$ ,  $\mathbb{E} X_t^\nu = e^{(\kappa-1)t} \mathbb{E} X_0^\nu \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*
5. *If however all the  $f_i$  are bounded ( $\sup_{i=1}^m \|f_i\|_\infty < \infty$ ) then there exists at least one invariant probability measure. This follows from the Brouwer fixed point theorem, see Corollary 27.*
6. *The uniqueness of the invariant probability measure of (1) does not hold in general. See for instance the example of Section 6.1. This example also shows that the condition  $\lambda' > 0$  is required.*

## Notations and preliminaries

We introduce here some notations used all along. We denote by  $L^2(\nu_\infty)$  the space of measurable functions  $k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)}^2 := \int |k(x)|^2 \nu_\infty(dx) < \infty$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the following  $m$ -dimensional subspace of constant functions

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m h_i e_i, \quad h_i \in \mathbb{R} \right\} = \text{Span}((e_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}).$$

For  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , we write  $|h|_{\mathcal{H}} := \|h\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)}$ . Given  $I$  a closed interval of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{C}(I; \mathcal{H})$  the space of continuous functions from  $I$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ . Consider  $Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu}$  the solution of the following linear non-homogeneous  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued SDE:

$$dY_{t,s}^{a,\nu} = -\nabla V(Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu}) dt + a_t dt + dW_t, \quad (7)$$

where at time  $s$ , the initial condition of  $Y$  has law  $\nu$ . Note that  $Y_{t,0}^{a,\nu}$  is a solution of (1) provided that  $a$  satisfies the following closure equation:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad a_t = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_{t,0}^{a,\nu}) e_i. \quad (8)$$

When the initial condition is taken at  $s = 0$ , we write  $Y_t^{a,\nu} := Y_{t,0}^{a,\nu}$  to simplify the notation. When  $a \equiv \alpha$  is constant in time, the SDE is time-homogeneous and so it holds that  $Y_{t,s}^{\alpha,\nu} = Y_{t-s}^{\alpha,\nu}$ . Finally, for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we sometimes write  $\mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a) := \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y})$ . We have

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty < \infty$ . For all  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$  and for all  $t \geq s \geq 0$ , the function  $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a)$  is  $\mathcal{C}^1$  and*

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad |\nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a)| \leq \|\nabla g\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-s)}.$$

*If in addition  $g$  is  $\mathcal{C}^2$  with  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 g\|_\infty < \infty$ , we also have*

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad |\nabla_x \mathbb{E}_x g(Y_{t,s}^a) - \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a)| \leq C e^{-\kappa_*(t-s)} |x - y|,$$

*for some constant  $C$  only depending on the Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla^2 V$ ,  $\kappa_*$ ,  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty$  and  $\|\nabla^2 g\|_\infty$ .*

*Proof.* Because the functions  $g$  and  $-\nabla V$  are  $\mathcal{C}^1$  with bounded derivatives, [GT13, Th. 7.18] applies and  $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a)$  is differentiable everywhere with

$$\nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a) = \mathbb{E} \nabla g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y}) \nabla_y (Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y}). \quad (9)$$

In this equation, the matrix  $\nabla_y (Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y}) = (\partial_{y_i} Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y})_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$  is obtained by solving the linear ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt} \partial_{y_i} Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y} = -\nabla^2 V(Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y}) \cdot \partial_{y_i} Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y}.$$

The stated bounds follow from the fact that  $V$  is strictly uniformly convex and (for the second inequality) from the fact that  $\nabla^2 V$  is Lipschitz.  $\square$

### 3 Main tool: Lions derivatives and the integrated sensibility formula

#### 3.1 Lions derivative with respect to the linear process

Let  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ . Define for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ :

$$u_{t,s}^{i,a}(\nu) := \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu}).$$

Note that by the Markov property, we have

$$u_{t,s}^{i,a}(\nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,s}^a) \nu(dy),$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,s}^a) := \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_{t,s}^{a,\delta_y})$ . So the function  $\nu \mapsto u_{t,s}^{i,a}(\nu)$  is linear with respect to  $\nu$ . By Lemma 4,  $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,s}^a)$  is differentiable with a bounded derivative. It follows from [CD18, Section 5.2.2] that the function  $\nu \mapsto u_{t,s}^{i,a}(\nu)$  is continuously Lions differentiable, with

$$\partial_\nu u_{t,s}^{i,a}(\nu)(y) := \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,s}^a). \quad (10)$$

So, the function  $\nu \mapsto u_{t,s}^a(\nu) := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu}) e_i$  is Lions differentiable. To alleviate the notations, when  $a \equiv \alpha$ , we write  $u_t^\alpha(\nu) := u_{t,0}^\alpha(\nu)$ . The Lions differentiability of  $\nu \mapsto u_t^\alpha(\nu)$  at  $\nu_\infty$  means that for  $X_0 \sim \nu_\infty$  and  $K$  two random variables defined on a same probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\|K\|_2^2 := \mathbb{E} |K|^2 < \infty$ , we have for  $\nu = \mathcal{L}(X_0 + K)$ :

$$u_t^\alpha(\nu) = \alpha + \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^\alpha(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot K + o_t(\|K\|_2).$$

We used here that  $u_t^\alpha(\nu_\infty) = \alpha$  and wrote  $o_t(\cdot)$  to emphasize that the error depends a priori on  $t$ . For such  $K \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a deterministic measurable function  $k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(d\omega) \text{ p.s.}, \quad \mathbb{E}(K|X_0) = k(X_0).$$

It follows from  $\mathbb{E} |K|^2 < \infty$  and from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ . With this notation, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^\alpha(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot K = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_\nu u_t^\alpha(\nu_\infty)(y) \cdot k(y) \nu_\infty(dy) =: \Theta_t(k). \quad (11)$$

This serves us as the definition of  $k \mapsto \Theta_t(k)$ , viewed as a linear operator from  $L^2(\nu_\infty)$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ . In particular, we have

$$\forall k \in L^2(\nu_\infty), \quad \Theta_t(k) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u_t^\alpha(\mathcal{L}(X_0 + \epsilon k(X_0))) - \alpha}{\epsilon}.$$

**Remark 5.** Because  $\nu_\infty$  has a density, Brenier's theorem applies [CD18, Th. 5.20]: for any  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , there exists a  $(-\infty, \infty]$ -valued lower semi-continuous proper convex function  $\varphi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that is almost everywhere differentiable and such that

$$W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty)^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla\varphi(y) - y|^2 \nu_\infty(dy).$$

So an optimal coupling between  $\nu$  and  $\nu_\infty$  is obtained by setting

$$X_0 \sim \nu_\infty, \quad X = X_0 + k(X_0), \quad \text{with} \quad k(y) = \nabla\varphi(y) - y.$$

In addition, it holds that  $W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) = \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)}$ .

We now explain why (11) is compatible with (5). First, we have for all  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ ,

$$\Theta_t(k) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^{i,\alpha}(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot k(X_0) \right) e_i. \quad (12)$$

and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality  $\left| \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^{i,\alpha}(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot k(X_0) \right| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| \partial_\nu u_t^{i,\alpha}(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \right|^2} \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)}$ .

So  $\Theta_t$  is a bounded linear operator from  $L^2(\nu_\infty)$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ . For  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , we write  $h$  in the canonical basis  $(e_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$ , such that  $h = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i e_i$  is represented by a vector of size  $m$ :  $h = [h_1, \dots, h_m]^t$ . In this basis, one easily check that the restriction of  $\Theta_t$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  is given by the matrix-vector product

$$\Theta_t(h) = \Theta_t \cdot h,$$

where  $\Theta_t = (\Theta_t^{i,j})_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$  is the matrix defined by  $\Theta_t^{i,j} := \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^i(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot e_j$ . We recover our definition of  $\Theta_t$  given by (5): in other words (5) is an embedding of (11) on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

### 3.2 Integrated sensibility formula

The goal of this section is to prove the following ‘‘integrated sensibility’’ formula:

**Proposition 6.** Let  $a, h \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $g \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 g\|_\infty < \infty$ . It holds that for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a, \nu}) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,\theta}^a) \cdot h_\theta \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+h, \nu})(dy) d\theta.$$

#### Proof of Proposition 6

Let  $u_{t,s}^{g,a}(\nu) := \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu})$ . We want to prove that

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a, \nu}) = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta}^{g,a}(\mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+h, \nu}))(Y_\theta^{a+h, \nu}) \cdot h_\theta d\theta.$$

Given  $h \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ , we write for all  $u \geq 0$ :

$$h_{\lfloor \theta \rfloor}(u) := \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq \theta\}} h_u.$$

The proof of Proposition 6 follows from

**Lemma 7.** The function  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h_{\lfloor \theta \rfloor}, \nu})$  is differentiable for all  $\theta \in (0, t)$  and

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h_{\lfloor \theta \rfloor}, \nu}) = \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta}^{g,a}(\mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+h, \nu}))(Y_\theta^{a+h, \nu}) \cdot h_\theta. \quad (13)$$




Figure 1

*Proof.* Fix  $\theta \in (0, t)$  and  $\delta > 0$  small enough such that  $\theta + \delta \in (0, t)$ . We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\theta &:= \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+h,\nu}), & \mu_{\theta+\delta}^1 &:= \mathcal{L}(Y_{\theta+\delta}^{a+h[\theta],\nu}), & \mu_{\theta+\delta}^2 &:= \mathcal{L}(Y_{\theta+\delta}^{a+h,\nu}), \\ Y_\theta &:= Y_\theta^{a+h,\nu}, & Y_{\theta+\delta}^1 &:= Y_{\theta+\delta}^{a+h[\theta],\nu}, & Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 &:= Y_{\theta+\delta}^{a+h,\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

The notations are illustrated on Figure 1. We have by the Markov property satisfied by  $Y$  at time  $\theta + \delta$

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h[\theta+\delta],\nu}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h[\theta],\nu}) = \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,\theta+\delta}^{a,\mu_{\theta+\delta}^2}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,\theta+\delta}^{a,\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1}).$$

By definition of the Lions derivative at the point  $\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1$  we have

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,\theta+\delta}^{a,\mu_{\theta+\delta}^2}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,\theta+\delta}^{a,\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1}) = \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta+\delta}^{g,a}(\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1)(Y_{\theta+\delta}^1) \cdot (Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 - Y_{\theta+\delta}^1) + o(\|Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 - Y_{\theta+\delta}^1\|_2). \quad (14)$$

By Lemma 8(a) below, it holds that  $o(\|Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 - Y_{\theta+\delta}^1\|_2) = o(\delta)$  as  $\delta$  goes to zero. We now approximate  $Y_{\theta+\delta}^1$  and  $Y_{\theta+\delta}^2$  by a one step Euler scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\theta+\delta}^1 &\approx \tilde{Y}_{\theta+\delta}^1 := Y_\theta + (b(Y_\theta) + a_\theta)\delta + (W_{\theta+\delta} - W_\theta) \\ Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 &\approx \tilde{Y}_{\theta+\delta}^2 := Y_\theta + (b(Y_\theta) + a_\theta + h_\theta)\delta + (W_{\theta+\delta} - W_\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Note that  $\tilde{Y}_{\theta+\delta}^2 - \tilde{Y}_{\theta+\delta}^1 = h_\theta \delta$ . Lemma 8(b) below give an estimate of the error of this Euler approximation. With (14) this gives

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,\theta+\delta}^{a,\mu_{\theta+\delta}^2}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,\theta+\delta}^{a,\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1}) = \delta \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta+\delta}^{g,a}(\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1)(Y_{\theta+\delta}^1) \cdot h_\theta + o(\delta).$$

Finally, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta+\delta}^{g,a}(\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1)(Y_{\theta+\delta}^1) \cdot h_\theta - \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta}^{g,a}(\mu_\theta)(Y_\theta) \cdot h_\theta \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta+\delta}^{g,a}(\mu_{\theta+\delta}^1)(Y_{\theta+\delta}^1) \cdot h_\theta - \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta+\delta}^{g,a}(\mu_\theta)(Y_\theta) \cdot h_\theta \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta+\delta}^{g,a}(\mu_\theta)(Y_\theta) \cdot h_\theta - \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta}^{g,a}(\mu_\theta)(Y_\theta) \cdot h_\theta \right| =: A_1 + A_2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9(a) gives

$$A_1 \leq \sqrt{C(T, a) \mathbb{E} |Y_{\theta+\delta}^1 - Y_\theta|^2 |h_\theta|} \stackrel{\text{Lem. 8(c)}}{\leq} C\sqrt{\delta} \sup_{\theta \in [0, t]} |h_\theta| \varkappa.$$



Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be fixed. Lemma 9(b) yields for  $\delta$  small enough:

$$A_2 \leq \epsilon \sup_{\theta \in [0, t]} |h_\theta|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Altogether, we find that

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h_{[\theta+\delta], \nu}}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a+h_{[\theta], \nu}}) = \delta \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t, \theta}^{g, a}(\mu_\theta)(Y_\theta) \cdot h_\theta + o(\delta).$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

We used the following classical estimates:

**Lemma 8.** *We have, with the notations introduced in the proof of Lemma 7,*

$$8(a) \text{ it holds that } \mathbb{E} |Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 - Y_{\theta+\delta}^1|^2 \leq C(T, a) \sup_{\theta \in [0, t]} |h_\theta|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \delta^2.$$

$$8(b) \text{ the Euler scheme (15) satisfies } \mathbb{E} |Y_{\theta+\delta}^1 - \tilde{Y}_{\theta+\delta}^1|^2 + \mathbb{E} |Y_{\theta+\delta}^2 - \tilde{Y}_{\theta+\delta}^2|^2 = o(\delta^2), \text{ as } \delta \text{ goes to zero.}$$

$$8(c) \text{ it holds that } \mathbb{E} |Y_{\theta+\delta}^1 - Y_\theta|^2 \leq C(a, T) \delta.$$

We also used the following regularity results on  $\partial_\nu u_{t, s}^{g, a}(\nu)(y) = \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t, s}^a)$ , for which the proof easily follows from Lemma 4.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $T > 0$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{H})$  be fixed. It holds that*

9(a) *the Lions derivative is Lipschitz continuous: there exists a constant  $C(T, a)$  such that any square-integrable variables  $Z, Z'$ ,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} |\partial_\nu u_{t, s}^{g, a}(\mathcal{L}(Z))(Z) - \partial_\nu u_{t, s}^{g, a}(\mathcal{L}(Z'))(Z')|^2 \leq C(T, a) \mathbb{E} |Z - Z'|^2.$$

9(b) *the function  $s \mapsto \partial_\nu u_{t, s}^{g, a}(\mathcal{L}(Z))(Z)$  is continuous: for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that*

$$\forall s, s' \in [0, t], \quad |s - s'| \leq \delta \implies \mathbb{E} \left| \partial_\nu u_{t, s}^{g, a}(\mathcal{L}(Z))(Z) - \partial_\nu u_{t, s'}^{g, a}(\mathcal{L}(Z))(Z) \right|^2 < \epsilon.$$

As a first application of Proposition 6, we have

**Corollary 10.** *Let  $T > 0$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{H})$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ . The application*

$$\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{H}) \ni a \mapsto u_{t, s}^a(\nu) := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_{t, s}^{a, \nu}) e_i$$

*is Fréchet differentiable with  $D_h u_{t, s}^a(\nu) \cdot h = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \int_s^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t, \theta}^{i, a}(\mathcal{L}(Y_{\theta, s}^{a, \nu})) (Y_{\theta, s}^{a, \nu}) \cdot h_\theta d\theta \right] e_i$ .*

Applying this result with  $a = \alpha$ ,  $s = 0$  and  $\nu = \nu_\infty$ , we find that for  $X_0 \sim \nu_\infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_h u_t^\alpha(\nu) \cdot h &= \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t-\theta}^\alpha(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot h_\theta d\theta \\ &= \int_0^t \Theta_{t-\theta}(h_\theta) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the Fréchet derivative of  $h \mapsto u_t^{\alpha+h}(\nu_\infty)$  at  $h = 0$  is given by a convolution with respect to  $\Theta$ .

*Proof of Corollary 10.* Using Proposition 6, we have

$$u_{t,s}^{a+h}(\nu) - u_{t,s}^a(\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \int_s^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t,\theta}^{i,a}(\mathcal{L}(Y_{\theta,s}^{a+h,\nu})) (Y_{\theta,s}^{a+h,\nu}) \cdot h_\theta d\theta \right] e_i. \quad (16)$$

So the fact that  $a \mapsto u_{t,s}^a(\nu)$  is Fréchet differentiable with the stated derivative easily follows from Lemma 9(a) and the fact that there exists a constant  $C(T, a)$  such that for all  $\theta, s \in [0, T]$  with  $\theta \geq s$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| Y_{\theta,s}^{a+h,\nu} - Y_{\theta,s}^{a,\nu} \right|^2 \leq C(T, a) \sup_{\theta \in [0, T]} |h_\theta|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 11.** *It is also possible to prove Proposition 6 without using Lions derivatives. Fix  $t > 0$  and define for  $s \in (0, t)$*

$$(s, y) \mapsto \phi(s, y) := \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a).$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}_t^a \psi := (-\nabla V + a_t) \cdot \nabla \psi + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi$  be the infinitesimal generator associated to  $Y^a$ . It holds that  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  with

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \phi(s, y) = -\mathcal{L}_s^a \phi(s, y).$$

So, by Itô's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \phi(s, Y_s^{a+h,\nu}) &= \mathbb{E} \phi(0, Y_0^{a+h,\nu}) - \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_\theta^a \phi(\theta, Y_\theta^{a+h,\nu}) d\theta + \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_\theta^{a+h} \phi(\theta, Y_\theta^{a+h,\nu}) d\theta \\ &= \mathbb{E} \phi(0, Y_0^{a+h,\nu}) + \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \nabla_y \phi(\theta, Y_\theta^{a+h,\nu}) \cdot h_\theta d\theta \end{aligned}$$

We used that  $\mathcal{L}_\theta^{a+h} \psi - \mathcal{L}_\theta^a \psi = \nabla \psi \cdot h_\theta$ . Using the definition of  $\phi$ , we find:

$$\mathbb{E} \phi(s, Y_s^{a+h,\nu}) = \mathbb{E} g(Y_t^{a,\nu}) + \int_0^s \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,\theta}^a) \cdot h_\theta \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+h,\nu})(dy) d\theta.$$

Finally, we let  $s$  converges to  $t$  and find the stated formula.

### 3.3 Lions derivative of the non-linear process

Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0$  be fixed. Consider now  $v_t : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\nu \mapsto v_t(\nu) := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f_i(X_t^\nu) e_i,$$

where  $(X_t^\nu)$  denotes the solution of the non-linear SDE (1) starting at  $t = 0$  with law  $\nu$ . We define the linear operator  $\Omega_t$  from  $L^2(\nu_\infty)$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  by taking the following Dyson-Phillips series

$$\Omega_t(k) := \sum_{i \geq 1} \Theta_t^{\otimes i}(k), \quad (17)$$

where the linear operators  $\Theta_t^{\otimes i}$  are defined recursively by

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \Theta_t^{\otimes(i+1)}(k) = \int_0^t \Theta_{t-s}(\Theta_s^{\otimes i}(k)) ds, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_t^{\otimes 1}(k) = \Theta_t(k).$$

So the operators  $\Omega_t$  and  $\Theta_t$  satisfy the following Volterra integral equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in L^2(\nu_\infty), \quad \Omega_t(k) &= \Theta_t(k) + \int_0^t \Theta_{t-s}(\Omega_s(k)) ds \\ &= \Theta_t(k) + \int_0^t \Omega_{t-s}(\Theta_s(k)) ds \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The series (17) converges uniformly on any compact  $[0, T]$  for  $T > 0$ . Note that  $\alpha \stackrel{(3)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_\infty(f_i) e_i = v_t(\nu_\infty)$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ . We have

**Proposition 12.** *Let  $X_0, K$  be two square-integrable random variables defined on the same probability space such that  $\mathcal{L}(X_0) = \nu_\infty$ . Let  $\nu = \mathcal{L}(X_0 + K)$  and write  $\mathbb{E}(K|X_0) = k(X_0)$  for some  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ . It holds that for all  $t \geq 0$ :*

$$v_t(\nu) = \alpha + \Omega_t(k) + o_t(\|K\|_2),$$

as  $\|K\|_2$  goes to zero.

**Remark 13.** *In other words, the function  $v_t$  is Lions differentiable at the point  $\nu_\infty$  and its derivative is given by  $\Omega_t$ . As a direct consequence, it holds that*

$$\forall k \in L^2(\nu_\infty), \quad \Omega_t(k) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{v_t(\mathcal{L}(X_0 + \epsilon k(X_0))) - \alpha}{\epsilon}.$$

Again, the restriction of  $\Omega_t$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  can be represented by a  $m \times m$  matrix (that we also denote by  $\Omega_t$ ). From (18), we deduce that the  $m \times m$  matrices  $\Theta_t$  and  $\Omega_t$  are linked by the following convolution Volterra Integral equation (the dots represent a matrix/matrix product)

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \Omega_t = \Theta_t + \int_0^t \Theta_{t-s} \cdot \Omega_s ds = \Theta_t + \int_0^t \Omega_{t-s} \cdot \Theta_s ds.$$

*Proof of Proposition 12.* Let  $T > 0$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be fixed. Let  $X_0, K$  be random variables such that

$$\mathcal{L}(X_0) = \nu_\infty, \quad \mathcal{L}(X_0 + K) = \nu.$$

We write  $\mathbb{E}(K|X_0) = k(X_0)$  for some  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ . It holds that  $W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) \leq \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|K|^2}$ . We define for all  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$h_t^* := v_t(\nu) - \alpha.$$

Note that  $h_t^* \in \mathcal{H}$  is a function of the initial condition  $\nu$ . The closure equation (8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} h_t^* &= \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{\alpha+h^*, \nu}) e_i - \alpha \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha+h^*, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}) \right) e_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}) - \alpha_i \right) e_i \\ &=: A_1 + A_2. \end{aligned}$$

First, by definition of  $\Theta_t$  and  $k$ , we have

$$A_2 = \Theta_t(k) + o_T(\|K\|_2).$$

Using Eq. (16), it holds that

$$A_1 = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t-\theta}^\alpha(\mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+h^*, \nu}))(Y_\theta^{\alpha+h^*, \nu}) \cdot h_\theta^* d\theta.$$

Lemma 14 below yields

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |h_t^*|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C_T W_1(\nu, \nu_\infty) \leq C_T W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty).$$

So, using Lemma 9, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t-\theta}^\alpha(\mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha, \nu}))(Y_\theta^{\alpha, \nu}) \cdot h_\theta^* d\theta + o_T\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |h_t^*|_{\mathcal{H}}\right) \\ &= \int_0^t \Theta_{t-\theta}(h_\theta^*) d\theta + o_T\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |h_t^*|_{\mathcal{H}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using again that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |h_t^*|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C_T W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) \leq C_T \|K\|_2$ , we find that

$$h_t^* = \Theta_t(k) + \int_0^t \Theta_{t-\theta}(h_\theta^*) d\theta + o_T(\|K\|_2).$$

That is, there exists a function  $\epsilon_T : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\lim_{y \downarrow 0} \epsilon_T(y)/y = 0$  such that

$$\left| h_t^* - \Theta_t(k) - \int_0^t \Theta_{t-\theta}(h_\theta^*) d\theta \right|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \epsilon_T(\|K\|_2).$$

To end the proof, it suffices to iterate this estimate: by induction, it holds that for all  $n \geq 1$ :

$$\left| h_t^* - \sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_t^{\otimes n}(k) - \int_0^t \Theta_{t-\theta}^{\otimes n}(h_\theta^*) d\theta \right|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{t^j \left[ \sup_{u \in [0, T]} |\Theta_u|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]^j}{j!} \epsilon_T(\|K\|_2).$$

The series on the right-hand side is converging. In addition, we have

$$\left| \int_0^t \Theta_{t-\theta}^{\otimes n}(h_\theta^*) d\theta \right|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{t^n \left[ \sup_{u \in [0, T]} |\Theta_u|_{\mathcal{H}} \sup_{u \in [0, T]} |h_u^*| \right]^n}{n!}.$$

So, letting  $n$  goes to infinity, we find that there exists a constant  $C_T$  such that

$$|h_t^* - \Omega_t(k)|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C_T \epsilon_T(\|K\|_2).$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $T > 0$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  be fixed. The function  $v_t^i(\nu) := \mathbb{E} f_i(X_t^\nu)$  is Lipschitz: there exists a constant  $L_T$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and all  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$|v_t^i(\mu_1) - v_t^i(\mu_2)| \leq L_T W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

*Proof.* Consider  $(X_t^{\mu_1}, X_t^{\mu_2})$  the solutions of (1) coupled with the same Brownian motion. The initial conditions  $(X_0^{\mu_1}, X_0^{\mu_2})$  are chosen such that

$$\mathbb{E} |X_0^{\mu_1} - X_0^{\mu_2}| = W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Let  $\mu_t^1 := \mathcal{L}(X_t^{\mu_1})$  and  $\mu_t^2 := \mathcal{L}(X_t^{\mu_2})$ . From (1) and Assumption 1, we have

$$|X_t^{\mu_1} - X_t^{\mu_2}| \leq |X_0^{\mu_1} - X_0^{\mu_2}| + \int_0^t |\nabla V(X_s^{\mu_1}) - \nabla V(X_s^{\mu_2})| ds + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_0^t |\mu_s^1(f_i) e_i - \mu_s^2(f_i) e_i| ds.$$

The functions  $f_i$  are Lipschitz so there exists a constant  $L$  such that  $|\mu_s^1(f_i) - \mu_s^2(f_i)| \leq L W_1(\mu_s^1, \mu_s^2)$ . In addition,  $\nabla V$  is Lipschitz so there exists another constant  $L$  such that

$$|X_t^{\mu_1} - X_t^{\mu_2}| \leq |X_0^{\mu_1} - X_0^{\mu_2}| + L \int_0^t |X_s^{\mu_1} - X_s^{\mu_2}| ds + L \int_0^t W_1(\mu_s^1, \mu_s^2) ds.$$

Because  $(X_t^{\mu_1}, X_t^{\mu_2})$  is a coupling between  $\mu_t^1$  and  $\mu_t^2$ , we have  $W_1(\mu_t^1, \mu_t^2) \leq \mathbb{E} |X_t^{\mu_1} - X_t^{\mu_2}|$ . So Grönwall's lemma gives  $W_1(\mu_t^1, \mu_t^2) \leq \mathbb{E} |X_t^{\mu_1} - X_t^{\mu_2}| \leq e^{2Lt} W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ . Using that the functions  $f_i$  is Lipschitz ends the proof.  $\square$

### 3.4 Spectral assumption

We now comment on the spectral assumption (6) involving the Laplace transform of  $\Theta$ . In view of Proposition 12, if  $\nu_\infty$  is locally stable, one expects  $\Omega_t$  to decay to zero at  $t$  goes to infinity. In addition, if the convergence to  $\nu_\infty$  occurs at an exponential rate, we expect that  $\Omega_t$  also converges to zero at the same exponential rate. We prove here that our spectral condition  $\lambda' > 0$  is indeed equivalent to the decay of  $\Omega_t$  at rate  $e^{-\lambda't}$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{L}$  be the set of bounded linear maps from  $L^2(\nu_\infty)$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ , equipped with the operator norm

$$G \in \mathfrak{L}, \quad \|G\| := \sup_{\|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)} \leq 1} |G(k)|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

For  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L})$  the following  $L^1$  weighted space

$$L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L}) := \{\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}, \quad \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \|\kappa_t\| dt < \infty\}.$$

We equip  $L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L})$  with  $\|\kappa\|_\lambda := \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \|\kappa_t\| dt$ . We define similarly the space  $L_\lambda^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$  as the  $L^\infty$  space weighted by  $e^{\lambda t}$  and denote by  $\|\kappa\|_\lambda^\infty$  its associated (weighted) sup norm.

**Proposition 15.** *Under Assumption 1, we have*

15(a) *For all  $\lambda < \kappa_*$ , it holds that  $\Theta \in L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L}) \cap L_\lambda^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$ .*

15(b) *For  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\Re(z) > -\kappa_*$ , let  $\widehat{\Theta}(z) := \int_0^\infty e^{-zt} \Theta_t dt \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  be the Laplace transform of the matrices  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , given by (5). Consider the abscissa of the first zero of  $z \mapsto \det(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z))$*

$$\lambda' := -\sup\{\Re(z) \mid \Re(z) > -\lambda^* \text{ and } \det(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z)) = 0\}.$$

*Then for all  $\lambda < \lambda'$ , it holds that  $\Omega \in L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L}) \cap L_\lambda^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$ .*

15(c) *Conversely, assume that there exists  $\lambda$  such that  $\Omega \in L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L})$ . Then  $\lambda' \geq \lambda$ .*

*Proof.* First, for  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ , provided that  $\mathcal{L}(X_0) = \nu_\infty$ , one has

$$\Theta_t(k) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^{i,\alpha}(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot k(X_0) e_i.$$

Using (10) and Lemma 4 with  $g = f_i$ , we deduce that from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_t^{i,\alpha}(\nu_\infty)(X_0) \cdot k(X_0) \right| \leq \|\nabla f_i\|_\infty \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)} e^{-\kappa_* t}.$$

This proves 15(a). Second, let  $\lambda < \kappa_*$ . We apply [GLS90, Ch. 2, Th. 4.1] with the matrices  $r(t) = e^{\lambda t} \Omega_t$  and  $k(t) = -e^{\lambda t} \Theta_t$ . By assumption, we have  $\det(I_m + \widehat{k}(z)) \neq 0$  for  $\Re(z) \geq 0$ , and so  $r \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})$ . This shows that  $t \mapsto e^{\lambda t} \Omega_t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})$ . Let  $k \in L^2(\nu_\infty)$ . There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\Theta_t(k) \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad |\Theta_t(k)|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C e^{-\kappa_* t} \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)}.$$

Using that  $\Theta_s(h) \in \mathcal{H}$  and (18), we find that

$$|\Omega_t(k)|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C e^{-\kappa_* t} \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)} + C \|k\|_{L^2(\nu_\infty)} \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_* s} |\Omega_{t-s}| ds.$$

Finally, Fubini yields  $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_* s} |\Omega_{t-s}| ds dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-(\kappa_* - \lambda)s} \int_0^\infty |\Omega_u| e^{\lambda u} du ds < \infty$ . So,  $\Omega \in L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L})$ . Similarly,  $\Omega \in L_\lambda^\infty(\mathfrak{L})$ . This shows 15(b).

Reciprocally, assume that  $t \mapsto \Omega_t e^{\lambda t} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\Re(z) > -\lambda$ . From (18), we have

$$e^{-zt} \Omega_t = e^{-zt} \Theta_t + \int_0^t e^{-z(t-s)} \Theta_{t-s} \cdot e^{-zs} \Omega_s ds.$$

Integrating from  $t = 0$  to  $\infty$ , we find  $\widehat{\Omega}(z) = \widehat{\Theta}(z) + \widehat{\Theta}(z) \cdot \widehat{\Omega}(z)$ . That is, we have

$$(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z))(I_m + \widehat{\Omega}(z)) = I_m,$$

and so  $\det(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z)) \det(I_m + \widehat{\Omega}(z)) = 1$ . We deduce that

$$\Re(z) > -\lambda \implies \det(I_m - \widehat{\Theta}(z)) \neq 0.$$

So  $\lambda' \geq \lambda$ : this ends the proof of 15(c).  $\square$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 2

### 4.1 Structure of the proof

Given  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ , we define

$$\|g\|_\lambda^\infty = \sup_{t \geq 0} e^{\lambda t} |g_t|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  be the Banach space consisting of all continuous functions from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  with finite norm  $\|\cdot\|_\lambda^\infty$ . Let  $\lambda \in (0, \kappa_*)$ . For  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $h \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$ , define

$$\Phi(\nu, h)(t) := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha+h, \nu}) e_i - (\alpha + h_t). \quad (19)$$

By Lemma 20 and 23 below, it holds that

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), \forall h \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}), \quad \Phi(\nu, h) \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}).$$

We apply the implicit function theorem to  $\Phi$  at the point  $(\nu_\infty, 0)$ . Indeed, we have

$$\Phi(\nu_\infty, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_\infty(f_i) e_i - \alpha \stackrel{(3)}{=} 0.$$

To proceed, we have first to verify that  $\Phi$  is sufficiently smooth with respect to  $\nu$  and  $h$ . We have

**Proposition 16.** *Fix  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The function  $\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}) \ni h \mapsto \Phi(\nu, h) \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  is  $\mathcal{C}^1$  Fréchet differentiable, with a derivative given by*

$$[D_h \Phi(\nu, h) \cdot c](t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,\theta}^{\alpha+h}) \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+h, \nu})(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta - c_t.$$

In addition,  $(\nu, h) \mapsto \Phi(\nu, h)$  and  $(\nu, h) \mapsto D_h \Phi(\nu, h)$  are Lipschitz continuous functions.

The proof of this result is postponed in Section 4.3. In particular, for  $h = 0$  and  $\nu = \nu_\infty$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0) \cdot c(t) &= -c_t + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t-\theta}^\alpha) \nu_\infty(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta \\ &= -c_t + \Theta_t(c). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, to apply the implicit function theorem, we have to check that  $D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)$  is an invertible linear map, with a continuous inverse. We have

**Lemma 17.** Let  $(\Omega_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the given by (17). Let  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda')$  (so  $\Omega \in L_\lambda^1(\mathfrak{L})$ ). The linear operator  $D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}); \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}))$  is invertible, with a continuous inverse given by

$$\begin{aligned} [D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)]^{-1} : \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}) \\ c &\mapsto \left[ -c_t - \int_0^t \Omega_{t-s}(c_s) ds \right]_{t \geq 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* Consider  $c \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$ . The eq.  $D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0) \cdot h = c$  writes

$$c_t = -h_t + \int_0^t \Theta_{t-s}(h_s) ds.$$

Because  $\Omega$  solves (18), we have

$$h_t = -c_t - \int_0^t \Omega_{t-s}(c_s) ds.$$

It follows that  $h \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  ( $h$  is continuous because  $c$  and  $\Omega$  are continuous). Moreover if  $c = 0$ , then  $h = 0$ . Overall  $\Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)$  is invertible, with inverse given by (20). This ends the proof.  $\square$

Consequently, we can define the following iteration scheme:

$$h^0 := 0, \quad h^{n+1} = h^n - [D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)]^{-1} \cdot \Phi(\nu, h^n). \quad (21)$$

**Remark 18.** Define  $\Psi_t^\nu(a) := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{a, \nu}) e_i$ . Setting  $a_t^n := h_t^n + \alpha$  one has

$$a_t^{n+1} = \Psi_t^\nu(a^n) + \int_0^t \Omega_{t-s}(\Psi_s^\nu(a^n) - a_s^n) ds.$$

So, the scheme (21) is actually a refinement of the ‘‘standard’’ Picard scheme defined by  $a^{n+1}(t) = \Psi_t^\nu(a^n)$ . Note that (21) is an approximation of the following Newton scheme:

$$h^0 := 0, \quad h^{n+1} := h^n - [D_h \Phi(\nu, h^n)]^{-1} \cdot \Phi(\nu, h^n).$$

We prefer to use (21) for simplicity (by doing so we lose with the speed of convergence of the scheme, but it does not matter here).

We now prove that the scheme (21) converges to some  $\mathbf{h}(\nu) \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  and that  $\Phi(\nu, \mathbf{h}(\nu)) = 0$ . This gives the proof of Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda')$ . We have  $h^{n+1} = T_\nu(h^n)$ , with:

$$\begin{aligned} T_\nu : \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}) \\ h &\mapsto h - [D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)]^{-1} \cdot \Phi(\nu, h) \end{aligned}$$

For  $\rho > 0$ , let  $B_\lambda^\infty(0, \rho) := \{h \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H}) \mid \|h\|_\lambda^\infty < \rho\}$ .

**Claim.** We can find small enough  $\rho, \rho' > 0$  such that  $W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) < \rho$  implies

$$T_\nu(\overline{B_\lambda^\infty(0, \rho')}) \subset \overline{B_\lambda^\infty(0, \rho')}.$$

Indeed we have

$$D_h T_\nu(h) = I - [D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)]^{-1} D_h \Phi(\nu, h),$$

which is close to zero because  $(\nu, h) \mapsto D_h \Phi(\nu, h)$  is continuous at  $(\nu_\infty, 0)$ . It follows that for  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  small enough, we have

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), \forall h \in B_\lambda^\infty(0, \rho'), \quad W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) < \rho \implies \|D_h T_\nu(\mathbf{h})\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (22)$$

Moreover, for  $\rho$  small enough

$$\|T_\nu(0)\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \|[D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)]^{-1}\|_\lambda^\infty \|\Phi(\nu, 0)\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \frac{\rho'}{2}.$$

It follows that  $W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) < \rho$  and  $\|h\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \rho'$  implies that

$$\|T_\nu(h)\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \|T_\nu(h) - T_\nu(0)\|_\lambda^\infty + \|T_\nu(0)\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}\|h\|_\lambda^\infty + \frac{\rho'}{2} \leq \rho'.$$

We used that  $\overline{B_\lambda^\infty(0, \rho')} \ni h \mapsto T_\nu(h)$  is  $\frac{1}{2}$ -Lipschitz (this is a consequence of (22)). We deduce that  $T_\nu$  has a unique fixed point  $h^*(\nu) \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\|h^*(\nu)\|_\lambda^\infty \leq \rho'$  and we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n - h^*(\nu)\|_\lambda^\infty = 0.$$

This fixed point satisfies  $[D_h \Phi(\nu_\infty, 0)]^{-1} \cdot \Phi(\nu, h^*(\nu)) = 0$  and so, by Proposition 17,  $\Phi(\nu, h^*(\nu)) = 0$ . Consequently,  $\alpha + h^*(\nu)$  solves the closure equation (8).

Note that this construction follows precisely the standard proof of the implicit function theorem. At any step  $n$ , the Picard iteration  $h_{n+1} = T_\nu(h_n)$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $\nu$  and so the fixed point  $h^*(\nu)$  is itself Lipschitz continuous in  $\nu$ . In particular, there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) < \rho \implies \|h^*(\nu)\|_\lambda^\infty \leq CW_2(\nu, \nu_\infty).$$

To end the proof of Theorem 2, we use the following coupling argument. Let  $(X_t^\nu)$ ,  $(X_t^{\nu_\infty})$  be the solutions of (1), driven by the same Brownian motion  $W$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t^\nu - X_t^{\nu_\infty}|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|Y_t^{\alpha+h^*(\nu), \nu} - Y_t^{\alpha, \nu_\infty}|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{\alpha+h^*(\nu), \nu} - Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{\alpha, \nu} - Y_t^{\alpha, \nu_\infty}|^2 = 2A^2 + 2B^2. \end{aligned}$$

We have  $B \leq e^{-\kappa_* t} W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty)$  and by Lemma 19 below, there exists a constant  $C_\lambda$  such that  $A \leq C_\lambda W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) e^{-\lambda t}$ . Altogether, we have proved the existence of another constant  $C_\lambda$  such that

$$W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) < \rho \implies W_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^\nu), \nu_\infty) \leq C_\lambda W_2(\nu, \nu_\infty) e^{-\lambda t}.$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $\lambda \in (0, \kappa_*)$ . There exists a constant  $C_\lambda$  such that for all  $h \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  and for all  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{\alpha+h, \nu} - Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}|^2 \leq (C_\lambda \|h\|_\lambda^\infty)^2 e^{-2\lambda t}.$$

*Proof.* Write  $Z_t = Y_t^{\alpha+h, \nu} - Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}$ . Itô's lemma and Assumption 1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} d|Z_t|^2 &\leq -2\kappa_* |Z_t|^2 dt + 2Z_t \cdot h_t dt \\ &= -2\kappa_* |Z_t|^2 + 2(\epsilon |Z_t|) \frac{C}{\epsilon} |h_t|_{\mathcal{H}} dt \\ &= (-2\kappa_* + \epsilon^2) |Z_t|^2 dt + \frac{C^2}{\epsilon^2} |h_t|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

We used the inequality  $2AB \leq A^2 + B^2$  with  $A = \epsilon |Z_t|$ , for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . By Grönwall's lemma, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}|Z_t|^2 \leq \frac{C^2}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t e^{-(2\kappa_* - \epsilon^2)(t-s)} |h_s|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds.$$

Choosing  $\epsilon$  such that  $2\kappa_* - \epsilon^2 > \lambda$  ends the proof.  $\square$

## 4.2 Estimates for the linear process

**Estimates using the representation formula (16)**

**Lemma 20.** *Let  $\lambda < \kappa_*$  and  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ . For all  $c \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  and for all  $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty < \infty$ , it holds that*

$$\forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \left| \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a+c, \nu}) - \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a, \nu}) \right| \leq \frac{\|\nabla g\|_\infty}{\kappa_* - \lambda} \|c\|_\lambda^\infty e^{-\lambda t}.$$



*Proof.* By (16), we have

$$\mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a+c,\nu}) - \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a,\nu}) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,\theta}^a) \cdot c_\theta \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+c,\nu})(dy) d\theta.$$

Using that  $|\nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,\theta}^a)| \leq \|\nabla g\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-\theta)}$  and that  $|c_\theta| \leq \|c\|_\infty^\lambda e^{-\lambda\theta}$ , the result follows.  $\square$

### $L^\infty$ estimate via Girsanov's theorem

**Lemma 21.** *Let  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Let  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}g^2(Y_t^{a,\nu}) < \infty$ . Consider  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$  such that  $\int_0^\infty \|c_s\|^2 ds < 1$ . Then, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a+c,\nu}) - \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a,\nu})| \leq \left[ (e-1) \mathbb{E}g^2(Y_t^{a,\nu}) \int_0^t \|c_s\|^2 ds \right]^{1/2}.$$

**Remark 22.** *This estimate does not require any regularity for  $g$  but is not as sharp as Lemma 20, because the right-hand side does not converge to zero as  $t$  goes to infinity.*

*Proof.* Under  $\mathbb{P}$ , consider  $(Y_t)$  the solution of the linear SDE (7) with current  $a$ , that is

$$dY_t = (-\nabla V(Y_t) + a_t)dt + dW_t.$$

Define  $L_t^c := \int_0^t c_s \cdot dW_s$  and let  $\mathcal{E}(L^c)_t := \exp\left(\int_0^t c_s \cdot dW_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|c_s\|^2 ds\right)$  be the exponential martingale associated to  $(L_t^c)$ . Let  $T > 0$  be fixed. On  $\mathbb{Q} := \mathcal{E}(L^c)_T \mathbb{P}$ , it holds that  $\tilde{W}_t := W_t - \int_0^t c_s ds$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion. We have  $dY_t = (-\nabla V(Y_t) + a_t)dt + c_t dt + d\tilde{W}_t$ , so on  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $(Y_t)$  is a solution of (7) with current  $a+c$ . It follows that on  $[0, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}g(Y_t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}g(Y_t) \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}g(Y_t)\mathcal{E}(L^c)_t$ . The constant  $T > 0$  can be chosen arbitrarily large, so

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a+c,\nu}) = \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a,\nu}) \exp\left(\int_0^t c_s \cdot dW_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|c_s\|^2 ds\right). \quad (23)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds that  $|\mathbb{E}g(Y_t^{a+c}) - \mathbb{E}g(Y_t^a)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}g^2(Y_t^a) \mathbb{E}(1 - \mathcal{E}(L^c)_t)^2$ . Using that  $\mathcal{E}(L^c)_t$  and  $\mathcal{E}(L^{2c})_t$  are two martingales, one has for all  $t \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E}(1 - \mathcal{E}(L^c)_t)^2 = -1 + \exp\left(\int_0^t \|c_s\|^2 ds\right).$$

By assumption we have  $\int_0^t \|c_s\|^2 ds < 1$ . So the inequality  $e^x - 1 \leq (e-1)x$ , valid for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , ensures that  $\mathbb{E}(1 - \mathcal{E}(L^c)_t)^2 \leq (e-1) \int_0^t \|c_s\|^2 ds$ . This ends the proof.  $\square$

### $W_1$ estimates for the linear process

**Lemma 23.** *Let  $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty < \infty$ . Let  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{H})$ . For all  $t \geq s \geq 0$ , it holds that*

$$|\mathbb{E}g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu}) - \mathbb{E}g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\mu})| \leq \|\nabla g\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-s)} W_1(\nu, \mu).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\pi(dx, dy)$  be an optimal coupling between  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  for the Kantorovich  $W_1$  distance. We have

$$\mathbb{E}g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\nu}) - \mathbb{E}g(Y_{t,s}^{a,\mu}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{E}_x g(Y_{t,s}^a) - \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a)) \pi(dx, dy).$$

By Lemma 4, we have  $|\mathbb{E}_x g(Y_{t,s}^a) - \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{t,s}^a)| \leq \|\nabla g\|_\infty |x - y| e^{-\kappa_*(t-s)}$  and so the result follows.  $\square$

### 4.3 Regularity of $\Phi$

As a consequence of the  $L^\infty$  and the gradient estimates of Section 4.2, we have for  $f \in \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ :

**Lemma 24.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ ,  $\lambda < \kappa_*$  and  $c \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  with  $\int_0^\infty |c_s|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds < 1$ . Let  $C_\lambda := \frac{\sqrt{e-1} \|\nabla f\|_\infty}{\kappa_* - \lambda}$ . Then we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{a+c, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{a, \nu}) - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f(Y_{t, \theta}^a) \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a, \nu})(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta \right| \leq C_\lambda \left[ \int_0^\infty \|c_s\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds \right]^{1/2} \|c\|_\lambda^\infty e^{-\lambda t}.$$

*Proof.* By (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{a+c, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{a, \nu}) &= \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \partial_\nu u_{t, \theta}^a(\mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+c, \nu}))(Y_\theta^{a+c, \nu}) \cdot c_\theta d\theta \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f(Y_{t, \theta}^a) \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a+c, \nu})(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta \\ &= \int_0^t \mathbb{E} G_{t, \theta}(Y_\theta^{a+c, \nu}) \cdot c_\theta d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where the function  $G_{t, \theta}$  is defined by  $G_{t, \theta}(y) := \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f(Y_{t, \theta}^a)$ . We have

$$|G_{t, \theta}(y)| \leq \|\nabla f\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-\theta)}.$$

So Lemma 21 yields

$$|\mathbb{E} G_{t, \theta}(Y_\theta^{a+c, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} G_{t, \theta}(Y_\theta^{a, \nu})| \leq \sqrt{e-1} \|\nabla f\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-\theta)} \left( \int_0^\infty \|c_u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 du \right)^{1/2}. \quad (24)$$

Finally using that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{a+c, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} f(Y_t^{a, \nu}) - \int_0^t \mathbb{E} G_{t, \theta}(Y_\theta^{a, \nu}) \cdot c_\theta d\theta \right| \leq \int_0^t |\mathbb{E} G_{t, \theta}(Y_\theta^{a+c, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} G_{t, \theta}(Y_\theta^{a, \nu})| |c_\theta| d\theta,$$

we deduce the stated inequality.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 16.* We write  $\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^m (\Phi^{1,i} + \Phi^{2,i}) e_i$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{1,i}(\nu, h)(t) &:= \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha+h, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}) \\ \Phi^{2,i}(\nu, h)(t) &:= \mathbb{E} f_i(Y_t^{\alpha, \nu}) - (\alpha^i + h_t^i). \end{aligned}$$

The fact that  $\Phi^{1,i}$  is Fréchet differentiable with respect to  $h$  follows from Lemma 24 and from

$$\left[ \int_0^\infty |c_s|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds \right]^{1/2} \leq \frac{\|c\|_\lambda^\infty}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}.$$

We deduce that  $\Phi$  is Fréchet differentiable with respect to  $h$ . We now prove that  $D_h \Phi(\nu, h)$  is continuous with respect to  $h$ . Let  $h, \tilde{h}, c \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} (D_h \Phi^{1,i}(\nu, h) - D_h \Phi^{1,i}(\nu, \tilde{h})) \cdot c(t) &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t, \theta}^{\alpha+h}) - \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t, \theta}^{\alpha+\tilde{h}}) \right] \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+h, \nu})(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t, \theta}^{\alpha+\tilde{h}}) \left[ \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+h, \nu})(dy) - \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+\tilde{h}, \nu})(dy) \right] \cdot c_\theta d\theta \\ &=: A + B. \end{aligned}$$

We use now (23) with  $a = \alpha + \tilde{h}$ ,  $c = h - \tilde{h}$  and  $\nu = \delta_y$ . Together with eq. (9), this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,\theta}^{\alpha+\tilde{h}}) - \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,\theta}^{\alpha+\tilde{h}}) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \nabla f_i(Y_{t,\theta}^{\alpha+\tilde{h},\delta_y}) \nabla_y(Y_{t,\theta}^{\alpha+\tilde{h},\delta_y}) (\mathcal{E}(L^{h-\tilde{h}})_t - 1) \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{e-1} \|\nabla f_i\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-\theta)} \left[ \int_0^\infty \|h_s - \tilde{h}_s\|^2 ds \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

So,  $A \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{2\lambda(\kappa_*-\lambda)}} \|\nabla f_i\|_\infty \|h - \tilde{h}\|_\lambda^\infty \|c\|_\lambda^\infty e^{-\lambda t}$  for some constant  $C > 0$ . The same estimate holds for  $B$  using (24) (with  $a = \alpha + \tilde{h}$  and  $c = h - \tilde{h}$ ). This proves that  $\Phi^1$  (and thus  $\Phi$ ) is  $\mathcal{C}^1$  Fréchet differentiable with respect to  $h$ . The Lipschitz continuity of  $\Phi$  with respect to  $\nu$  follows immediately from Lemma 23. It remains to prove that  $D_h \Phi^1(\nu, h)$  is Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $\nu$ . Fix  $h, c \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathcal{H})$  and let  $a := \alpha + h$ . We have

$$D_h \Phi^{1,i}(\nu, h) \cdot c(t) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,\theta}^a) \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{a,\nu})(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} G_{t,\theta}(Y_\theta^{a,\nu}) \cdot c_\theta d\theta,$$

where  $G_{t,\theta}(y) := \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_{t,\theta}^a)$ . By the Markov property at time 0, it holds that

$$D_h \Phi^{1,i}(\nu, h) \cdot c = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}_y G_{t,\theta}(Y_\theta^a) \nu(dy) \cdot c_\theta d\theta.$$

By Lemma 4, the function  $G_{t,\theta}$  is  $\|\nabla f_i\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(t-\theta)}$  Lipschitz. So, we have  $|\mathbb{E}_y G_{t,\theta}(Y_\theta^a) - \mathbb{E}_x G_{t,\theta}(Y_\theta^a)| \leq \|\nabla f_i\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_* t} |y - x|$ . Altogether, this gives:

$$\left| D_h \Phi^{1,i}(\nu, h) \cdot c - D_h \Phi^{1,i}(\mu, h) \cdot c \right|(t) \leq \frac{\|\nabla f_i\|_\infty}{\kappa_* - \lambda} \|c\|_\lambda^\infty W_1(\nu, \mu) e^{-\lambda t}.$$

It ends the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 25.** *Inspecting carefully the proof of the regularity of  $\Phi$  with respect to  $\nu$ , we see that the distance  $W_2$  in Theorem 2 can be replaced by  $W_p$  for any  $p \geq 1$ . Another possible choice is to use some weighted total variation distance, such as:*

$$d_p^{TV}(\nu, \mu) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|^p) |\nu - \mu|(dx),$$

for some  $p \geq 1$ .

## 5 Bifurcation analysis

Our result also provides some insights on the analysis of the invariant probability measures of (1). For  $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$ , we denote by  $\nu_\infty^\alpha$  the unique invariant probability measure of  $(Y_t^\alpha)$ , solution of (4).

**Proposition 26.** *The function  $\mathcal{H} \ni \alpha \mapsto \nu_\infty^\alpha \in (\mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d), W_1)$  is globally Lipschitz. In addition, the function  $\alpha \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_\infty^\alpha(f_i) e_i$  is  $\mathcal{C}^1$  with*

$$\nabla_\alpha \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_\infty^\alpha(f_i) e_i \right) = \int_0^\infty \Theta_\alpha(t) dt = \widehat{\Theta}_\alpha(0),$$

where  $\Theta_\alpha$  is given by (5).

*Proof.* Let  $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|\nabla g\|_\infty < \infty$ . We have for all  $T \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\infty^{\alpha+\epsilon}(g) - \nu_\infty^\alpha(g) &= \left[ \mathbb{E} g(Y_T^{\alpha+\epsilon, \nu_\infty^{\alpha+\epsilon}}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_T^{\alpha+\epsilon, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) \right] + \left[ \mathbb{E} g(Y_T^{\alpha+\epsilon, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_T^{\alpha, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) \right] \\ &=: A + B. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 23, we have

$$|A| \leq \|\nabla g\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_* T} W_1(\nu_\infty^{\alpha+\epsilon}, \nu_\infty^\alpha).$$

This term can be made arbitrarily small by choosing  $T$  sufficiently large. In addition, using Proposition 6, we have

$$B = \epsilon \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y g(Y_{T-\theta}^\alpha) \mathcal{L}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+\epsilon, \nu_\infty^\alpha})(dy) d\theta.$$

Using Lemma 4, it follows that  $|B| \leq \frac{|\epsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}}{\kappa_*} \|\nabla g\|_\infty$ . Letting  $T \rightarrow \infty$  (and using the Kantorovich–Rubinstein theorem), we find that  $\alpha \mapsto \nu_\infty^\alpha$  is globally Lipschitz, with a Lipschitz constant equals to  $1/\kappa_*$ . Assume now that  $g = f_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . A refinement of the previous argument shows that the function  $\alpha \mapsto \nu_\infty^\alpha(f_i)$  is  $\mathcal{C}^1$ . To see this, define  $G_t(y) := \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_t^\alpha)$ . Mimicking the proof of Lemma 24, in particular (24), we have  $B = \int_0^T \mathbb{E} G_{T-\theta}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+\epsilon, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) \cdot \epsilon d\theta$  and

$$\left| \mathbb{E} G_{T-\theta}(Y_\theta^{\alpha+\epsilon, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) - \mathbb{E} G_{T-\theta}(Y_\theta^{\alpha, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) \right| \leq \|\nabla f_i\|_\infty e^{-\kappa_*(T-\theta)} |\epsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Overall there exists a constant  $C$  such that for all  $T$ ,

$$\left| \nu_\infty^{\alpha+\epsilon}(f_i) - \nu_\infty^\alpha(f_i) - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y \mathbb{E}_y f_i(Y_u^\alpha) \cdot \epsilon \nu_\infty^\alpha(dy) du \right| \leq C[e^{-\kappa_* T} + |\epsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 T].$$

We choose  $T = |\epsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}^{1/2}$  and let  $|\epsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}$  goes to zero. This proves that  $\alpha \mapsto \nu_\infty^\alpha(f_i)$  is differentiable. The continuity of the derivative follows from its explicit expression and from Assumption 1.  $\square$

**Corollary 27.** *Assume all the  $f_i$  are bounded:  $\sup_{i=1}^m \|f_i\|_\infty < \infty$ . Then there exists at least one invariant probability measure of (1).*

*Proof.* Let  $K := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}, |\alpha_i| \leq \|f_i\|_\infty\}$  and consider the function

$$F : K \ni \alpha \mapsto (\nu_\infty^\alpha(f_1), \dots, \nu_\infty^\alpha(f_K)) \in K.$$

By Proposition 26,  $\Psi$  is continuous. So the Brouwer fixed point theorem implies the existence of an  $\alpha \in K$  such that (3) holds with  $\nu_\infty = \nu_\infty^\alpha$ . So  $\nu_\infty^\alpha$  is an invariant probability measure of (1).  $\square$

## 6 Examples and applications

### 6.1 Example 1

As an illustration, consider for  $J \in \mathbb{R}^*$  the following McKean–Vlasov SDE on  $\mathbb{R}$ :

$$dX_t = -X_t dt + J \mathbb{E} \cos(X_t) dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t. \quad (25)$$

The associated linear process is  $Y_t^\alpha$ , solution of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck SDE:

$$dY_t^\alpha = -Y_t^\alpha dt + \alpha dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t.$$

This process admits a unique invariant probability measure given by

$$\nu_\infty^\alpha = \mathcal{N}(\alpha, 1),$$

such that, if  $G$  is a standard Gaussian random variable,  $\mathbb{E} \cos(Y_t^{\alpha, \nu_\infty^\alpha}) = \mathbb{E} \cos(\alpha + G) = \frac{\cos(\alpha)}{\sqrt{e}}$ . We deduce that the invariant probability measures of (25) are  $\{\mathcal{N}(\alpha, 1) \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \frac{\sqrt{e}}{J} \alpha = \cos(\alpha)\}$ . Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\frac{\sqrt{e}}{J} \alpha = \cos(\alpha)$ . The law of  $Y_t^{\alpha, \delta_y}$  is  $\mathcal{N}(ye^{-t} + \alpha(1 - e^{-t}), 1 - e^{-2t})$ , so we find:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \Theta_t = J \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d}{dy} \mathbb{E}_y f(Y_t^\alpha) \nu_\infty^\alpha(dy) = -\frac{J}{\sqrt{e}} e^{-t} \sin(\alpha).$$

So, for  $\Re(z) > -1$ ,  $\widehat{\Theta}(z) = -\frac{J}{z+1}e^{-1/2}\sin(\alpha)$  and the equation  $\widehat{\Theta}(z) = 1$  has a unique solution

$$z = -Je^{-1/2}\sin(\alpha) - 1.$$

This root is strictly negative if and only if

$$J\sin(\alpha) > -\sqrt{e}.$$

We deduce by Theorem 2 that  $\nu_\infty^\alpha$  is locally stable provided that  $J\sin(\alpha) > -\sqrt{e}$ . Recall that  $\alpha\sqrt{e} = J\cos(\alpha)$ . So among all the invariant probability measures of (25), the (locally) stable ones are the  $\mathcal{N}(\alpha, 1)$  with

$$\alpha \tan(\alpha) > -1.$$

## 6.2 Example 2: the Kuramoto model

Consider now on the circle  $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ , for some  $\kappa, \sigma > 0$ :

$$dX_t = \kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sin(y - X_t) \mu_t(dy) + \sigma dW_t. \quad (26)$$

This equation is known as the Kuramoto model [ABPRS05; BGP10; LP17]. We refer to [CGPS20] for an in depth study of the long time behavior of McKean-Vlasov SDE in the torus using PDE techniques. Here we propose a simple proof, using the methods introduced in this paper, of a well-known result: the local stability of the uniform invariant probability measure.

We assume that  $X_0$  admits a density  $p_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ . We denote by  $p_t$  the density of  $X_t$ . It holds that  $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ , the uniform measure on the circle, is an invariant probability measure of (26) and:

**Theorem 28.** *Assume  $\kappa < \sigma^2$ . Then for all  $\lambda < \frac{\sigma^2 - \kappa}{2}$ , there exists a constant  $C, \rho > 0$  such that for all initial condition  $X_0$  with density  $p_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$  satisfying  $\|p_0 - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|_2 < \rho$ , it holds that*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|p_t - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|_2 \leq Ce^{-\lambda t} \|p_0 - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|_2.$$

Note that (26) does not perfectly fit in the framework of Theorem 2, but the proof can be easily adapted.

*Sketch of the proof.* Step 1. Assume first that  $\kappa = 0$  (no interaction). Then  $p_t$ , the density of  $X_t$ , can be given in term of the Fourier coefficients of  $p_0$ : write  $p_0(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k e^{ikx}$ , it holds that

$$p_t(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{c}_k e^{-\frac{k^2 \sigma^2}{2} t} e^{ikx}.$$

This shows that

$$\|p_t - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|_2^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^*} |c_k|^2 e^{-k^2 \sigma^2 t} \leq e^{-\sigma^2 t} \|p_0 - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|_2^2.$$

Step 2. Assume now  $\kappa \neq 0$ . Note that the interactions satisfy:

$$\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sin(y - X_t) \mu_t(dy) = \kappa \cos(X_t) \mathbb{E} \sin(X_t) - \kappa \sin(X_t) \mathbb{E} \cos(X_t).$$

This suggests to consider for  $h = (h^1, h^2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+)^2$  the following linear non-homogeneous SDE:

$$dY_{t,s}^{h,\nu} = h_t^1 \cos(Y_{t,s}^{h,\nu}) dt + h_t^2 \sin(Y_{t,s}^{h,\nu}) dt + \sigma dB_t,$$

where at time  $s$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(Y_{t,s}^{h,\nu}) = \nu$ . The Integrated sensibility formula of Proposition 6 becomes

$$\mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,0}^{h,\nu}) - \mathbb{E} g(Y_{t,0}^{0,\nu}) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d}{dy} \mathbb{E} g(y + \sigma B_{t-\theta}) [h_\theta^1 \cos(y) + h_\theta^2 \sin(y)] \mathcal{L}(Y_{\theta,0}^{h,\nu})(dy) d\theta. \quad (27)$$

Step 3. Let  $\lambda \in (0, \sigma^2/2)$ . We define for  $\nu \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$  and  $h \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+) \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+)$ :

$$\Phi(\nu, h) = -h + \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E} \sin(Y_t^{h, \nu}) \\ -\mathbb{E} \cos(Y_t^{h, \nu}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The zeros of  $\Phi$  provide solutions of (26). Note that when  $\psi \in \{\sin, \cos\}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \psi(y + \sigma B_{t-\theta}) = \psi(y) e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(t-\theta)},$$

and so (27) gives:

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \psi(Y_{t,0}^{h, \nu}) - \mathbb{E} \psi(Y_{t,0}^{0, \nu}) \right| \leq (\|h^1\|_\lambda^\infty + \|h^2\|_\lambda^\infty) \int_0^t e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(t-\theta)} e^{-\lambda\theta} d\theta \leq \frac{\|h^1\|_\lambda^\infty + \|h^2\|_\lambda^\infty}{\sigma^2/2 - \lambda} e^{-\lambda t}.$$

This shows that  $\Phi(\nu, h) \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+) \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+)$ .

Step 4. We show that  $\Phi(\nu, \cdot)$  is  $\mathcal{C}^1$  Fréchet differentiable. In addition, we prove that  $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \ni \nu \mapsto \Phi(\nu, h) \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+) \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and  $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \ni \nu \mapsto D_h \Phi(\nu, h)$  are continuous. Details are left to the reader. We use the same strategy as in Section 4.3.

Step 5. Because of (27), we have

$$D_h \Phi\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}, 0\right) \cdot h = -h + \kappa \begin{bmatrix} K * h^1 \\ K * h^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$(K * h^1)(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(t-s)} h_s^1 ds.$$

The linear operator  $h^1 \mapsto -h^1 + \kappa K * h^1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+); \mathcal{C}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+))$  is invertible with continuous inverse if and only if

$$\lambda' = \sigma^2/2 - \kappa/2 > 0$$

and  $\lambda < \lambda'$ . This is easily seen using Laplace transform and mimicking the arguments of Proposition 15. Applying the implicit function theorem to  $\Phi$  ends the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [ABPRS05] J. A. Acebrón, L. L. Bonilla, C. J. Pérez Vicente, F. Ritort, and R. Spigler. “The Kuramoto model: A simple paradigm for synchronization phenomena”. In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 77 (2005), pp. 137–185. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.77.137.
- [AD20] M. Arnaudon and P. Del Moral. “A second order analysis of McKean-Vlasov semi-groups”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 30 (6) (2020), pp. 2613–2664. DOI: 10.1214/20-AAP1568.
- [BCC11] F. Bolley, J. A. Cañizo, and J. A. Carrillo. “Stochastic mean-field limit: non-Lipschitz forces and swarming”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 21 (11) (2011), pp. 2179–2210. DOI: 10.1142/S0218202511005702.
- [BCCP98] D. Benedetto, E. Caglioti, J. A. Carrillo, and M. Pulvirenti. “A non-Maxwellian steady distribution for one-dimensional granular media”. In: *J. Statist. Phys.* 91 (5-6) (1998), pp. 979–990. DOI: 10.1023/A:1023032000560.
- [BGP10] L. Bertini, G. Giacomin, and K. Pakdaman. “Dynamical aspects of mean field plane rotators and the Kuramoto model”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 138 (1-3) (2010), pp. 270–290. DOI: 10.1007/s10955-009-9908-9.

- [BRTV98] S. Benachour, B. Roynette, D. Talay, and P. Vallois. “Nonlinear self-stabilizing processes. I. Existence, invariant probability, propagation of chaos”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 75 (2) (1998), pp. 173–201. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-4149(98)00018-0.
- [BRV98] S. Benachour, B. Roynette, and P. Vallois. “Nonlinear self-stabilizing processes. II. Convergence to invariant probability”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 75 (2) (1998), pp. 203–224. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-4149(98)00019-2.
- [But14] O. A. Butkovsky. “On ergodic properties of nonlinear Markov chains and stochastic McKean-Vlasov equations”. In: *Theory Probab. Appl.* 58 (4) (2014), pp. 661–674. DOI: 10.1137/S0040585X97986825.
- [CD18] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*. Vol. 83. Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games. Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. xxv+713.
- [CGPS20] J. A. Carrillo, R. S. Gvalani, G. A. Pavliotis, and A. Schlichting. “Long-time behaviour and phase transitions for the McKean-Vlasov equation on the torus”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 235 (1) (2020), pp. 635–690. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-019-01430-4.
- [CMV03] J. A. Carrillo, R. J. McCann, and C. Villani. “Kinetic equilibration rates for granular media and related equations: entropy dissipation and mass transportation estimates”. In: *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* 19 (3) (2003), pp. 971–1018. DOI: 10.4171/RMI/376.
- [Cor21] Q. Cormier. *A mean-field model of Integrate-and-Fire neurons: non-linear stability of the stationary solutions*. Tech. rep. 2021. arXiv: 2002.08649 [math.PR].
- [CTV20] Q. Cormier, E. Tanré, and R. Veltz. “Long time behavior of a mean-field model of interacting neurons”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 130 (5) (2020), pp. 2553–2595. DOI: 10.1016/j.spa.2019.07.010.
- [CTV21] Q. Cormier, E. Tanré, and R. Veltz. “Hopf bifurcation in a mean-field model of spiking neurons”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 26 (2021), Paper No. 121, 40. DOI: 10.1214/21-ejp688.
- [DFL15] P. Degond, A. Frouvelle, and J.-G. Liu. “Phase transitions, hysteresis, and hyperbolicity for self-organized alignment dynamics”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 216 (1) (2015), pp. 63–115. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-014-0800-7.
- [DIRT15] F. Delarue, J. Inglis, S. Rubenthaler, and E. Tanré. “Global solvability of a networked integrate-and-fire model of McKean-Vlasov type”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 25 (4) (2015), pp. 2096–2133. DOI: 10.1214/14-AAP1044.
- [Dob79] R. L. Dobrušin. “Vlasov equations”. In: *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 13 (2) (1979), pp. 48–58, 96.
- [DT19] P. Del Moral and J. Tugaut. “Uniform propagation of chaos and creation of chaos for a class of nonlinear diffusions”. In: *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 37 (6) (2019), pp. 909–935. DOI: 10.1080/07362994.2019.1622426.
- [DT21] F. Delarue and A. Tse. *Uniform in time weak propagation of chaos on the torus*. 2021. arXiv: 2104.14973 [math.AP].
- [EGZ19] A. Eberle, A. Guillin, and R. Zimmer. “Quantitative Harris-type theorems for diffusions and McKean-Vlasov processes”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 371 (10) (2019), pp. 7135–7173. DOI: 10.1090/tran/7576.
- [FHM14] N. Fournier, M. Hauray, and S. Mischler. “Propagation of chaos for the 2D viscous vortex model”. In: *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 16 (7) (2014), pp. 1423–1466. DOI: 10.4171/JEMS/465.
- [FL16] N. Fournier and E. Löcherbach. “On a toy model of interacting neurons”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 52 (4) (2016), pp. 1844–1876. DOI: 10.1214/15-AIHP701.
- [Gan08] A. Ganz Bustos. “Approximations des distributions d’équilibre de certains systèmes stochastiques avec interactions McKean-Vlasov”. PhD thesis. 2008.

- [GLS90] G. Gripenberg, S.-O. Londen, and O. Staffans. *Volterra integral and functional equations*. Vol. 34. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp. xxii+701. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511662805.
- [GM21] A. Guillin and P. Monmarché. “Uniform long-time and propagation of chaos estimates for mean field kinetic particles in non-convex landscapes”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 185 (2) (2021), Paper No. 15, 20. DOI: 10.1007/s10955-021-02839-6.
- [GT13] C. Graham and D. Talay. *Stochastic simulation and Monte Carlo methods*. Vol. 68. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Mathematical foundations of stochastic simulation. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013, pp. xvi+260. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-39363-1.
- [Hen81] D. Henry. *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*. Vol. 840. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981, pp. iv+348.
- [HJ07] M. Hauray and P.-E. Jabin. “ $N$ -particles approximation of the Vlasov equations with singular potential”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 183 (3) (2007), pp. 489–524. DOI: 10.1007/s00205-006-0021-9.
- [HT10] S. Herrmann and J. Tugaut. “Non-uniqueness of stationary measures for self-stabilizing processes”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 120 (7) (2010), pp. 1215–1246. DOI: 10.1016/j.spa.2010.03.009.
- [LM21] E. Löcherbach and P. Monmarché. “Metastability for systems of interacting neurons”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* (2021). (to appear). arXiv: 2004.13353 [math.PR].
- [LP17] E. Luçon and C. Poquet. “Long time dynamics and disorder-induced traveling waves in the stochastic Kuramoto model”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 53 (3) (2017), pp. 1196–1240. DOI: 10.1214/16-AIHP753.
- [LP21] E. Luçon and C. Poquet. “Periodicity induced by noise and interaction in the kinetic mean-field FitzHugh-Nagumo model”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 31 (2) (2021), pp. 561–593. DOI: 10.1214/20-aap1598.
- [Mal03] F. Malrieu. “Convergence to equilibrium for granular media equations and their Euler schemes”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 13 (2) (2003), pp. 540–560. DOI: 10.1214/aoap/1050689593.
- [MW05] T. Ma and S. Wang. *Bifurcation theory and applications*. Vol. 53. World Scientific Series on Nonlinear Science. Series A: Monographs and Treatises. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2005, pp. xiv+375. DOI: 10.1142/9789812701152.
- [Sch85] M. Scheutzow. “Some examples of nonlinear diffusion processes having a time-periodic law”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 13 (2) (1985), pp. 379–384.
- [Szn91] A.-S. Sznitman. “Topics in propagation of chaos”. In: *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*. Vol. 1464. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 1991, pp. 165–251. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0085169.
- [Tug13] J. Tugaut. “Convergence to the equilibria for self-stabilizing processes in double-well landscape”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 41 (3A) (2013), pp. 1427–1460. DOI: 10.1214/12-AOP749.
- [Ver06] A. Y. Veretennikov. “On ergodic measures for McKean-Vlasov stochastic equations”. In: *Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods 2004*. Springer, Berlin, 2006, pp. 471–486. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-31186-6\\_29.
- [Wol99] G. Wolansky. “On nonlinear stability of polytropic galaxies”. In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 16 (1) (1999), pp. 15–48. DOI: 10.1016/S0294-1449(99)80007-9.