STRONG CONVERGENCE OF PROPAGATION OF CHAOS FOR MCKEAN-VLASOV SDES WITH SINGULAR INTERACTIONS

ZIMO HAO, MICHAEL RÖCKNER, XICHENG ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this work we show the strong convergence of propagation of chaos for the particle approximation of McKean-Vlasov SDEs with singular $L^p$-interactions as well as the moderate interaction particle system in the level of particle trajectories. One of the main obstacles is to establish the strong well-posedness of particle system with singular interaction. In particular, we develop the theory of strong well-posedness of Krylov and Röckner [25] in the case of mixed $L^p$-drifts, where the heat kernel estimates play a crucial role. Moreover, when the interaction kernel is bounded measurable, we also obtain the optimal rate of strong convergence, which is partially based on Jabin and Wang’s entropy method [19] and Zvonkin’s transformation.
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1. Introduction

Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^m$, $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel measurable functions. For a (sub)-probability measure $\mu$ over $\mathbb{R}^d$, we define
\[ b(t, x, \mu) := F(t, x, (\phi_t \otimes \mu)(x)), \]
where
\[ (\phi_t \otimes \mu)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_t(x, y)\mu(dy). \]

Consider the following interaction system of $N$-particles in $\mathbb{R}^d$,
\[ dX_t^{N,i} = b(t, X_t^{N,i}, \eta_{X_t^{N}})dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{N,i})dW_t^i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{1.1} \]
where $\eta_{X_t^{N}}$ stands for the empirical distribution measure of $N$-particles $X_t^{N} := (X_t^{N,1}, \cdots, X_t^{N,N})$,
\[ \eta_{X_t^{N}}(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta_{X_t^{N,j}}(dy), \]
and $\{W_t^i, i \in N\}$ is a sequence of independent standard Brownian motions on some stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0})$. The infinitesimal generator of the above system is given by
\[ \mathcal{L}_t^N \varphi(x) = \text{tr}(a(t, x^i) \cdot \nabla^2 \varphi(x)) + F(t, x^i, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \phi_t(x^i, x^j)) \cdot \nabla_{x^i} \varphi(x), \]
where $x = (x^1, \cdots, x^N) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$ and $a = \frac{1}{2} \sigma \sigma^*$. Here and below we use the usual Einstein’s convention for summation: A repeated index in a product will be summed automatically.

In this paper we are mainly concerned with the weak and strong convergences of the above particle system with general $L^p$-singular interaction $\phi_t(x, y)$ to the following distribution-dependent or McKean-Vlasov SDE when $N \to \infty$:
\[ dX_t = b(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t})dt + \sigma(t, X_t)dW_t^1, \tag{1.2} \]
where $\mu_{X_t}$ stands for the distribution of $X_t$. In particular, $\mu := (\mu_{X_t})_{t \geq 0}$ solves the following nonlinear and nonlocal Fokker-Planck equation in distributional sense:
\[ \partial_t \mu = \partial_i \partial_j (a_{ij} \mu) + \text{div}(b(\mu) \mu), \]
Moreover, we are also interesting in the so-called moderately interacting kernel
\[ \phi_t(x, y) = \phi_{\varepsilon_N}(x - y) = \varepsilon_N^{-d} \phi((x - y)/\varepsilon_N), \]
where $\varepsilon_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ and $\phi$ is a probability density function with compact support. In this case, the interacting particle system
\[ dX_t^{N,i} = F(t, X_t^{N,i}, (\phi_{\varepsilon_N} \otimes \eta_{X_t^{N}})(X_t^{N,i}))dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{N,i})dW_t^i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{1.3} \]
shall converge to the following density-dependent SDE (see [35, 23]):
\[ dX_t = F(t, X_t, \rho_{X_t}(X_t))dt + \sigma(t, X_t)dW_t, \tag{1.4} \]
where $\rho_{X_t}$ stands for the density of $X_t$. Here $\rho := (\rho_{X_t})_{t \geq 0}$ solves the following nonlinear and local Fokker-Planck equation:
\[ \partial_t \rho = \partial_i \partial_j (a_{ij} \rho) + \text{div}(F(\rho) \rho). \tag{1.5} \]
It should be kept in mind that for $d = 1$ and $F(\rho) = \rho$, this is the typical Burgers equation.
For the motion of a single particle, when \( \phi \in L^2(\mathbb{L}^p) \) with \( \frac{2}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < 1 \), Krylov and Röckner [25] showed the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to the following SDE by Girsanov’s transformation:

\[
\text{d}X_t = \phi_t(X_t) \text{d}t + \text{d}W_t.
\]

Later, Zhang [49] extended their result to the multiplicative noise by Zvonkin’s transformation in [55] (see also [52, 46]). However, for \( N \)-particle system (1.1) with \( F(t, x, r) = r \) and \( \phi_t(x, y) = \phi_t(x - y) \), where \( \phi \) is as above, one can not use the well-known results to derive the well-posedness by considering (1.1) as an SDE in \( \mathbb{R}^{Nd} \). For instance, when \( N = 2 \), we consider the following SDE in \( \mathbb{R}^{2d} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d}X^1_t &= \phi(X^1_t, X^2_t) \text{d}t + \text{d}W^1_t, \\
\text{d}X^2_t &= \phi(X^2_t, X^1_t) \text{d}t + \text{d}W^2_t,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( |\phi(x, y)| \leq h(x - y) \) and \( h \in L^p \) with \( p > d \). As a function of \( (x, y) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^{2d} \), one only has

\( \phi \in L^\infty_y(\mathbb{L}^p_x) \cap L^\infty_x(\mathbb{L}^p_y) \).

In this case, Krylov and Röckner’s result is not applicable to show the strong well-posedness for the above SDE with singular interactions. So our first task is to extend [25, 49] to the case of mixed \( L^p \)-spaces. We must mention that although Ling and Xie [29] has already considered the singular SDEs in mixed \( L^p \)-spaces, their result can not be applied to the above equation due to the new feature that we need to consider the order of integrability in \( x, y \) as well as the different integrability indices. Note that in [37], the last two authors of the present paper have already shown the weak and strong well-posedness for DDSDE (1.2) when \( b(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \phi_t(x, y) \mu(\text{d}y) \) (see also [28] and [34] for bounded measurable interaction kernel \( \phi \)). About the density-dependent SDE (1.4), it was studied in [2] by Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov’s equation and the superposition principle, and in [15] by directly using Euler’s scheme. Recently, Wang [44] studied the weak and strong well-posedness for more general density-distribution dependent SDEs with singular coefficients by fixed point argument, but not mixed \( L^p \)-drifts. In [16] and [51], we also studied the well-posedness of second order McKean-Vlasov SDEs with singular drifts. Nowadays, there are vast literatures about the McKean-Vlasov or mean-field SDEs. We do not intend to list all the works here. The interesting readers can found more in the above references.

1.1. Propagation of chaos. In this subsection we recall some notions and well-known results about the propagation of chaos.

Kac’s chaos: Let \( E \) be a Polish space and \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E) \) a probability measure. Let \( (\mu^N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence of symmetric probability measures on the product space \( E^N \), where the symmetry means that for any permutation \( (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_N}) \) of \( (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \),

\[
\mu^N(\text{d}x_{i_1}, \ldots, \text{d}x_{i_N}) = \mu^N(\text{d}x_1, \ldots, \text{d}x_N).
\]

In particular, \( \mu^N \) has the common \( 1 \)-marginal distribution. One says that \( (\mu^N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \) is \( \mu \)-chaotic if for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) (see [24]),

\[
\mu^{N,k} \text{ weakly converges to } \mu^{\otimes k} \text{ as } k \leq N \to \infty,
\]

where \( \mu^{N,k}(\text{d}x_1, \ldots, \text{d}x_k) = \mu^N(\text{d}x_1, \ldots, \text{d}x_k, E, \ldots, E) \) is the \( k \)-fold marginal distribution of \( \mu^N \). It is well known that (1.6) holds if and only if (1.6) holds for only \( k = 2 \) (see [42, (i) of Proposition 2.2]). In the language of random variables, Kac’s chaos can be restated as follows: Let \( \xi^N := (\xi^{N,1}, \ldots, \xi^{N,N}) \) be a family of \( E \)-valued random variables. If the law of \( \xi^N \) is symmetric...
and $\mu$-chaotic, one says that $\xi^N$ is $\mu$-chaotic. It is also equivalent to (see [42, (ii) of Proposition 2.2])

$$\text{the empirical measure } \eta_{\xi^N}(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta_{\xi^{N,j}}(dy) \in \mathcal{P}(E) \text{ converges to } \mu \text{ in law.} \quad (1.7)$$

Note that $\xi^N$ can be regarded as $N$-random particles in state space $E$. In this viewpoint, Kac’s chaos means that if one observes the distribution of any $k$-particles, then they become statistically independent as $N$ goes to infinity. Indeed, (1.7) is a law of large numbers, i.e., for any $\varphi \in C_b(E)$,

$$\eta_{\xi^N}(\varphi) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \varphi(\xi^{N,j}) \rightarrow \mu(\varphi) := \int_E \varphi(x)\mu(dx), \quad \text{in law.}$$

In Hauray and Mischler’s work [17], various quantitative and qualitative estimates related to the chaos are obtained for different notions such as Kac’s chaos, entropy chaos and Fisher information chaos. More references about Kac’s chaos can be also found in [17].

**Propagation of chaos**: If one considers Kac’s chaos as a static version of chaos, then propagation of chaos is usually understood as a dynamical version of Kac’s chaos. More precisely, let $(\xi^N_t)_{t \geq 0} := (\xi^{N,1}_t, \ldots, \xi^{N,N}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a family of $E^N$-valued continuous stochastic processes, which can be thought as the evolution of $N$-particles. Let $(\xi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a limit $E$-valued continuous stochastic process defined on the same probability space. Let $\mu^N_t$ be the law of $\xi^N_t$ in $E^N$ and $\mu_t$ be the law of $\xi_t$ in $E$. Suppose that $\mu^N_0$ is $\mu_0$-chaotic at time 0. One says that *propagation of chaos* holds if for any time $t > 0$, $\mu^N_t$ is $\mu_t$-chaotic. Usually, as the evolution of particle distributions, the probability measures $\mu^N_t$ and $\mu_t$ satisfy some Fokker-Planck equation in the weak sense. Therefore, it can be studied by purely PDE’s method. However, as stochastic processes, one would like to ask the following stronger convergence in probabilistic sense: for each $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}|\xi^{N,1}_0 - \xi_t| = 0,$$

or in the functional path sense

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0,t]} |\xi^{N,1}_s - \xi_s| \right) = 0. \quad (1.8)$$

In fact, when $F$, $\phi$ and $\sigma$ are globally Lipschitz continuous in $x$, $r$ and uniformly in $t$, McKean [31] firstly established the following result for (1.1) and (1.2): for any $T > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0,T]} |X^{N,1}_s - X_s|^2 \right) \leq \frac{C(b,\sigma,T)}{N}, \quad (1.9)$$

where the constant $C(b, \sigma, T) > 0$ can be estimated explicitly. Note that the power of convergence rate $N$ is sharp. The above estimate is also reproven by Sznitman [42] by more direct and popular synchronous coupling method. Since then, propagation of chaos has received great development in mathematical kinetic theory (see [14, 33, 17, 20]). Moreover, propagation of chaos also appears in many other disciplines including data science [11], mean-field games [6, 7] and the training of neural networks [38], etc. In a recent paper [8], Chaintron and Diez reviews various models, methods as well as the applications for propagation of chaos.

Obviously, Lipschitz assumptions on $F, \phi$ and $\sigma$ are too strong in practice. In fact, most of the interesting physical models have bounded measurable or even singular interaction kernels. For examples, the rank-based interaction diffusion studied in [40, 26] has a discontinuous interaction kernel (see (1.18) below), and the Biot-Savart law appearing in the vortex description of 2d incompressible Navier-Stokes equations has a singular kernel like $x^\perp / |x|^2$. For this type of singular
kernels, Osada [36] firstly showed the propagation of chaos for the point vortices associated with 2d Navier-Stokes equation with large viscosity. Recently, in [13], Fournier, Hauray, and Mischler dropped the assumption of large viscosity by the classical martingale method. More recently, Jabin and Wang [20] obtained a first quantitative convergence rate about the relative entropy between the law of particle system and the tensorized limit law, where the key point is to estimate the entropy and a large deviation type exponential functional. In fact, the results in [20] can be applied to a large class of singular kernels $K$ in $W^{-1,\infty}$ with $K(x) = -K(-x)$, as well as the bounded measurable interaction kernel (see Section 5.2). It is noticed that the proof in [20] strongly depends on the symmetry of the kernel $K(x)$, not valid for general $L^p$-singular kernel. We also mention that the long time behaviors and the Gaussian fluctuation for interacting particle systems with singular kernels are studied in [30] by coupling and in [45] by relative entropy, respectively.

For the general $L^p$-singular interaction kernels, in [43], Tomašević uses the partial Girsanov transform as in [21] to derive the propagation of chaos under extra assumption that the set of discontinuous points of interaction kernel has Lebesgue measure zero. In [18], Hoeksema, Holding, Maurelli and Tse showed a large deviation result for the particle system with $L^p$-singular interaction kernels. As a byproduct, they also obtained a result of propagation of chaos (see also [26]). However, in [43] and [18], both of them assume the initial distributions of the particle system are i.i.d, that is, the initial distributions are not really chaotic. This assumption is crucial for them to construct a weak solution for interaction particle system by Girsanov’s transform. In the present paper we overcome this difficulty by showing the existence of strong solutions for particle system (see Lemma 2.1 below), and then obtain the strong convergence as in (1.8) for singular interaction kernels and quantitative convergence (1.9) for bounded measurable kernels by Zvonkin’s transformation. Note that Bao and Huang [1] has already used the Zvonkin transformation to obtain the propagation of chaos for Hölder interaction kernels with non-optimal rate $N^{-\frac{1}{4}}$.

1.2. Main results. Before stating our main assumptions, we introduce the following index sets:

$$\mathcal{F}^o := \{(q, p) \in (2, \infty)^{1+d} : \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < 1\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{X} := \{x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) : \text{any permutation of } (x_1, \ldots, x_d)\}.$$

Now we make the following main assumptions:

$(\text{H}^\circ)$ There are $\kappa_0 \geq 1$ and $\gamma_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $t \geq 0$ and $x, x', \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\kappa_0^{-1}|\xi| \leq |\sigma(t, x)\xi| \leq \kappa_0|\xi|, \quad \|\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, x')\|_{HS} \leq \kappa_0|x - x'|^{\gamma_0},$$

(1.11)

where $\|\cdot\|_{HS}$ is the usual Hilbert-Schmidt norm of a matrix. Moreover, for some $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{F}^o$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $T > 0$,

$$\|\nabla \sigma\|_{L^q_{\mathbb{R}^d}([0, T]^n)} \leq \kappa_0,$$

(1.12)

where the localized space $L^q_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ is defined in Subsection 2.1 below.

$(\text{H}^b)$ Suppose that $\phi_t(x, x) = 0$ and for some measurable $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa_1 > 0$,

$$|F(t, x, r)| \leq h(t, x + \kappa_1|r|, \quad |F(t, x, r) - F(t, x, r')| \leq \kappa_1|r - r'|,$$

(1.13)

and for some $(q, p) \in \mathcal{F}^o$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and for any $T > 0$,

$$\|h\|_{L^q_{\mathbb{R}^d}([0, T])} + \left[\int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\|\phi_t(\cdot, y)\|_{L^q_{\mathbb{R}^d}} + \|\phi_t(y, \cdot)\|_{L^q_{\mathbb{R}^d}}\right) dt\right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \kappa_1.$$

(1.14)

Example 1. We provide two examples to illustrate condition (1.14).
Let $d \geq 2$ and $\phi_t(x, y) = c_t(x, y)/|x - y|^\alpha$, where $c_t(x, y)$ is bounded measurable and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. It is easy to see that (1.14) holds for $q$ close to $\infty$ and $p \in (d, \frac{d}{\alpha})$ with $\frac{d}{p} + \frac{\alpha}{q} < 1$.

Let $d \geq 1$ and $\phi_t(x, y) = c_t(x, y)/\Pi_{i=1}^d|x_i - y_i|^\alpha$, where $\alpha_i \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ satisfies $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_d < 1$ and $c_t(x, y)$ is bounded measurable. Note that one can choose $q$ close to $\infty$ and $p_i > 2$ close to $1/\alpha_i$ so that $\frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{\alpha_i}{q} < 1$ and (1.14) holds. In this case, the singularity of the kernel could be along each axis.

Throughout this paper we use $\Theta$ to denote the set of parameters that a constant may depend, which may have different parameters in different occasions and should be clear from the context, e.g.,

$$\Theta = (m, d, \gamma_0, \kappa_0, q_0, q_0, q, p, \cdots).$$

The aim of this paper is to show the following strong convergence of particle approximation.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $T > 0$. Under $(\mathbf{H}^s)$ and $(\mathbf{H}^d)$, for any initial values $X_0^N$ and $X_0$, there are unique strong solutions $X_t^N$ and $X_t$ to particle system (1.1) and DDSDE (1.2), respectively. Moreover, letting $\mu_t^N$ be the law of $X_t^N$ in $\mathbb{R}^{dN}$ and $\mu_t$ the law of $X_t$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we have the following strong convergence results:

(i) **(Singular kernel)** Suppose that $\mu_0^N$ is symmetric and $\mu_0$-chaotic, and

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}|X_{t}^{N,1} - X_0|^2 = 0,$$

then for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |X_{t}^{N,1} - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) = 0. \tag{1.15}$$

(ii) **(Bounded kernel)** If $h$ and $\phi$ in $(\mathbf{H}^b)$ are bounded measurable and

$$\kappa_2 := \sup_N \mathcal{H}(\mu_0^N | \mu_0^{\otimes N}) < \infty, \tag{1.16}$$

where $\mu_0^{\otimes N} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{dN})$ is the $N$-tensor of $\mu_0$ and $\mathcal{H}$ stands for the relative entropy, then for any $\delta > 2$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, there are constants $C_1 = C_1(T, \gamma, \delta, \Theta) > 0$, $i = 1, 2$ independent of $\phi$ and $\kappa_2$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |X_{t}^{N,1} - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) \leq C_1 e^{C_2 \|\phi\|_\infty^\delta} \left( \mathbb{E}|X_{0}^{N,1} - X_0|^2 + \frac{\kappa_2 \gamma}{N} \right)^\gamma. \tag{1.17}$$

**Remark 1.2.** If $\sup_N \mathbb{E}|X_{0}^{N,1}|^p < \infty$ for some $p > 2$, then by interpolation one in fact has

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |X_{t}^{N,1} - X_t|^{p\gamma} \right) = 0, \quad \gamma \in (0, 1).$$

The Euler approximation for particle system (1.1) with bounded interaction kernel was studied in [50], which combining with (1.17) could give fully discretization approximation for DDSDE (1.2).

**Example 2.** Let $d = 1$. Consider the following rank-based interaction:

$$b(t, x, \mu) = F(t, x, \mu(-\infty, x]). \tag{1.18}$$

In this case, the interaction kernel $\phi(x, y) = 1_{(-\infty, x]}(y) = 1_{x-y \geq 0}$, which is bounded and discontinuous. Thus, by (1.17) we have the strong convergence rate of the particle approximation. In
particular, if we let $V(x) := \mu((\infty, x)]$, $\sigma(t, x) = \sqrt{2}$ and $F(t, x, r) = g(r)$, then $V$ solves the following Burgers type equation:

$$\partial_t V = \Delta V + \left( \int_0^V g(r) dr \right)' .$$

For $g(r) = r$, this is the classical Burgers equation. In this way, the above Burgers type equation has been studied in [5, 22, 26]. In the following Example 3, we have another way to simulate Burgers equation via moderate interaction particle system.

Next we turn to the moderate interaction system (1.3) and have the following result.

**Theorem 1.3.** Let $T > 0$. Suppose that (H$^\circ$) holds, and

$$|F(t, x, r)| \leq \kappa_1, \quad |F(t, x, r) - F(t, x, r')| \leq \kappa_1 |r - r'| , \quad (1.19)$$

and

$$\phi(t, x, y) = \phi_{x,N}(x - y) = \varepsilon^{-d} \phi((x - y)/\varepsilon_N),$$

where $\phi$ is a bounded probability density function in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with support in the unit ball. Then for any initial value $X_0$ with bounded density $\rho_0$, there is a unique strong solution $X$ to density-dependent SDE (1.4) such that for each $t > 0$, $X_t$ admits a density $\rho_t$ with

$$\|\rho_t\|_{\infty} \leq C(T, \Theta)\|\rho_0\|_{\infty}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (1.20)$$

Moreover, under (1.16), for any $T > 0$, $\beta \in (0, \gamma_0)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta > 2$, there are constants $C_i = C_i(T, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \Theta) > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ such that for all $N \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N,1} - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) \leq C_1 e^{C_2 \varepsilon_N^{1/d}} \left( \mathbb{E} |X_0^{N,1} - X_0|^2 + \frac{\kappa_2}{N} \right)^{\gamma} + C_3 \varepsilon_N^{2\gamma}. \quad (1.21)$$

**Remark 1.4.** Suppose that for some $C > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} |X_0^{N,1} - X_0|^2 \leq C/N.$$

If one chooses $\varepsilon_N = C_4/(\ln N)^{1/(\delta d)}$ with $C_4$ being large enough, then by (1.21), for some $C > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N,1} - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) \leq \frac{C}{(\ln N)^{(2\beta \gamma)/(\delta d)}} .$$

In [23], under smooth assumptions on $F$, $\phi$ and the initial density $\rho_0$, Jourdain and Méléard [23, Theorem 2.7] have proven the similar estimate (1.21). Note that the concept of moderately interacting particles is introduced by Oelschläger in [35]. Therein, $\varepsilon_N = N^{-\beta/d}$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$. For $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = 1$, they are called weak and strong interactions since they correspond to the scaling order $1/N$ and 1, respectively. While, the moderate interaction is usually referred to any choice of $\varepsilon_N$ with that $\varepsilon_N \to 0$ and $\varepsilon_N^{-d}/N = o(1)$.

Although we assume $F$ is bounded in (1.19), once we can establish the existence of bounded solutions to Fokker-Planck equation (1.5) under linear growth assumption of $F$ on $r$, then the boundedness of $F$ in (1.19) is no longer a restriction. We illustrate this by the following example.

**Example 3.** Consider the following special case:

$$\partial_t \rho = \Delta \rho + \text{div}(F(\rho) \rho),$$

where $F: \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^d |F_i'(r)| \leq \kappa_1$. Since the above equation can be written as the following transport form:

$$\partial_t \rho = \Delta \rho + (F(\rho) + F'(\rho) \rho) \cdot \nabla \rho,$$
it is easy to see that by the maximum principle,
\[ \| \rho_t \|_\infty \leq \| \rho_0 \|_\infty. \]
This can be established priorily and rigorously by considering the truncated \( F \) as \( F^n(r) = (-n) \lor F(r) \land n \) (for example, see [54]). In particular, the above example covers the one dimensional Burgers equation, i.e., \( F(r) = r \). In this case, if one takes \( \phi(x) = 1_{[-1,1]}(x)/2 \) in (1.3), then
\[
(\phi_{\epsilon N} \otimes \eta_{X_N})(X_{i,N}^j) = \frac{1}{2N\epsilon N} \sum_{j=1}^N 1_{|X_{i,N}^j - X_{i,N}^j| \leq \epsilon N},
\]
which is easily calculated in a computer. We believe that this is useful for numerical experiment.

1.3. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we first introduce the localized mixed \( L^p \)-spaces and its basic properties used in this paper. Then we study the second order parabolic PDEs with mixed \( L^p \)-drifts and show the unique solvability of strong solutions. Since each component of the drift lies in different mixed \( L^p \)-space, the new point here is that the second order derivative of the solution shall stay in a direct sum space (see Theorem 2.9).

In Section 3, we show the weak and strong well-posedness for stochastic differential equations with mixed \( L^p \)-drifts. As usual, we need to prove the a priori Krylov estimate based on the PDE estimates obtained in Section 2 and then show the Zvonkin transformation. Since Zvonkin’s transformation is a \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism and reduces the original singular SDE into an equivalent regular SDE, one can use the well-known results such as the heat kernel estimates to derive some priori estimates for the original SDE, and then show our main results. We emphasize that the mixed \( L^p \)-space is not invariant under \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism transformation. Thus one can not obtain the Krylov estimate directly through the transformed equation. Instead of that, we use the heat kernel estimates to show the Krylov estimate for the indices \( (q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_2 \).

In Section 4, by Picard’s iteration, we show the weak and strong well-posedness for density-distribution dependent SDEs with mixed \( L^p \)-drifts, where we use the entropy formula, Pinsker’s inequality and Fokker-Planck equation to show that the Picard iteration of the density is a Cauchy sequence in \( L^1 \cap L^\infty \).

In Section 5, by the classical martingale method we show the propagation of chaos for system (1.1) with singular kernels holds in the weak sense, where the key point is to use the partial Girsanov transform used in [21, 43] to derive some uniform estimate for the exponential functional. In particular, the strong solution is used to treat the chaos of the initial distributions. Moreover, we also provide a detailed proof for Jabin and Wang’s quantitative result [20] for bounded interaction kernel. This is not new and only for readers’ convenience.

In Sections 6 and 7, we give the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, and show how to use Zvonkin’s transformation again to derive the strong convergence from the weak convergence obtained in Section 5, where the key point is Lemma 6.1.

We conclude this introduction by introducing the following convention: Throughout this paper, we use \( C \) with or without subscripts to denote an unimportant constant, whose value may change
in different occasions. We also use := as a way of definition and \( a^+ := 0 \lor a \). By \( A \preceq_C B \) and \( A \preceq B \) or simply \( A \preceq B \) and \( A \preceq B \), we mean that for some unimportant constant \( C \geq 1 \),
\[
A \preceq CB, \quad C^{-1}B \preceq A \preceq CB.
\]

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Mixed \( L^p \)-spaces. In this section we recall the definition of localized mixed \( L^p \)-spaces, which is originally introduced in [3]. As we have seen in the introduction, it is very suitable for singular
interacting particle system (see also [18]). Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. For multi-index $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_d) \in (0, \infty)^d$ and any permutation $x \in \mathcal{P}$, the mixed $L^p_x$-space is defined by

$$
\|f\|_{L^p_x} := \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \cdots \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x_1, \ldots, x_d)|^{p_d} \, dx_d \right)^{\frac{1}{p_d}} \cdots dx_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \, dx_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. 
$$

When $p = (p, \ldots, p) \in (0, \infty)^d$, the mixed $L^p_{x}$-space is the usual $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$-space and simply denoted by $L^p$. Note that for general $x \neq x'$ and $p \neq p'$,

$$
L^p_{x'} \neq L^p_{x} \neq L^p_{x'}. 
$$
For multi-indices $p, q \in (0, \infty)^d$, we shall use the following notations:

$$
\frac{1}{p} := \left( \frac{1}{p_1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{p_d} \right), \quad p \cdot q := \sum_{i=1}^{d} p_i q_i, \quad \frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{p_i},
$$
and

$$
p > q \quad (\text{resp. } p \geq q; \ p = q) \iff p_i > q_i \quad (\text{resp. } p_i \geq q_i; \ p_i = q_i) \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, d.
$$
Moreover, we use bold number to denote constant vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$, for example,

$$
1 = (1, \ldots, 1), \quad 2 = (2, \ldots, 2).
$$
For any multi-indices $p, q, r \in (0, \infty)^d$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{q}$, the following Hölder’s inequality holds

$$
\|fg\|_{L^q_x} \leq \|f\|_{L^p_x} \|g\|_{L^r_x}. 
$$
For any multi-indices $p, q, r \in [1, \infty)^d$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r} = 1 + \frac{1}{q}$, the following Young’s inequality holds

$$
\|fg\|_{L^q_x} \leq \|f\|_{L^p_x} \|g\|_{L^r_x}. 
$$
For any $r > 0$, let $B^r_z$ be the ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with radius $r$ and center $z$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, 1]$ be a smooth cutoff function with $\chi|_{B^r_z} = 1$ and $\chi|_{B^r_z} = 0$. For fixed $r > 0$, we set

$$
\chi^r_z(x) := \chi((x - z)/r), \quad x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d. 
$$
For $p \in [1, \infty)^d$, we introduce the following localized $L^p_x$-space (see [53]):

$$
\tilde{L}^p_{x,r} := \left\{ f \in L^1_{x,loc}(\mathbb{R}^d), \|f\|_{\tilde{L}^p_{x,r}} := \sup_z \|\chi^r_z f\|_{L^p_x} < \infty \right\},
$$
and for a finite time interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$,

$$
\tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r}) := \left\{ f \in L^1_{I,loc}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d), \|f\|_{\tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r})} := \sup_z \|\chi^r_z f\|_{L^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r})} < \infty \right\},
$$
where for a Banach space $B$,

$$
L^q(T) := L^q(T; B).
$$
By a finitely covering technique, it is easy to see that the definitions of $\tilde{L}^p_{x,r}$ and $\tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r})$ do not depend on the choice of $r$ (see [53]), and for any $1 \leq q_2 < q_1 < \infty$ and $1 \leq p_2 \leq p_1 < \infty$,

$$
\tilde{L}^p_{x,r} \subset \tilde{L}^p_{x}, \quad \tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r}) \subset \tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x}).
$$
This property is the main advantage of using the localized spaces. Since the supremum $z$ in the definition of $\tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r})$ is taken outside of the time integral, we obviously have

$$
\tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x}) \subset \tilde{L}^q_{I}(\tilde{L}^p_{x,r}).
Moreover, for \( \alpha \geq 0 \), let \( C^\alpha \) be the usual Hölder space defined by the norm:

\[
\|f\|_{C^\alpha} := \sum_{j=0}^{[\alpha]} \|\nabla^j f\|_\infty + \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla^{[\alpha]} f(x) - \nabla^{[\alpha]} f(y)|}{|x - y|^{[\alpha] - [\alpha]}},
\]

where \( \nabla^j \) stands for the \( j \)-order gradient and \([\alpha]\) stands for the integer part of \( \alpha \). For simplicity we write

\[
\tilde{L}_T^q(\tilde{L}_x^p) := L_{[0,T]}^q(L_{\infty}^p), \quad L_T^p := L_{[0,T]}^p(\mathbb{L}^p), \quad \tilde{L}_T^\infty(C^\alpha) := L_{[0,T]}^\infty(C^\alpha).
\]

**Example.** For \( i = 1, \cdots, d \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), let \( f_i(x) = b(x)|x_i|^{-\alpha} \), where \( b(x) \) is a bounded measurable function. It is easy to see that \( f_i \in \tilde{L}_T^p \), where \( x_i = (x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_d, x_i) \) and \( p = (\infty, \cdots, \infty, p) \) with \( p \in (1, \frac{1}{\alpha}) \). From this example, one sees that for a \( C^1 \)-diffeomorphism \( \Phi \) from \( \mathbb{R}^d \) to \( \mathbb{R}^d \), say \( \Phi(x) = (x_1, x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_d) \), it may happen

\[
f_i \circ \Phi \notin \tilde{L}_T^p.
\]

Throughout this paper, we shall use the same notation \( \Gamma_\varepsilon \) to denote the mollifiers in different dimensions \( N \), i.e.,

\[
\Gamma_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-N} \Gamma(x/\varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1),
\]

where \( \Gamma \) is a nonnegative smooth density function in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) with compact support in the unit ball. For a function \( f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N) \), the mollifying approximation of \( f \) is defined by

\[
f_\varepsilon(x) := f * \Gamma_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x-y) \Gamma_\varepsilon(y) dy.
\]

The dimension \( N \) takes different values in different occasions. It should be clear from the context.

The following lemma is direct by definition. We omit the details.

**Lemma 2.1.** For any \( f \in \tilde{L}_x^p \), there is a constant \( C = C(p) > 0 \) such that for all \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \),

\[
\|f_\varepsilon\|_{\tilde{L}_x^p} \leq C \|f\|_{\tilde{L}_x^p},
\]

and for any \( R > 0 \),

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \|f_\varepsilon - f\|_{\chi_0^R} = 0.
\]

The local Hardy-Littlewood maximal function in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is defined by

\[
\mathcal{M} f(x) := \sup_{r \in (0, 1)} \frac{1}{B_0^d} \int_{B_0^d} f(x+y) dy.
\]

The following result is taken from Lemma 2.1 in [46].

**Lemma 2.2.** (i) There is a constant \( C = C(d) > 0 \), such that for any \( f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) with \( \nabla f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and for Lebesgue-almost all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \),

\[
|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C|x - y| (\mathcal{M} |\nabla f|(x) + \mathcal{M} |\nabla f|(y) + \|f\|_\infty).
\]

(ii) For any \((q, p) \in (1, \infty)^{1+d}\), there is a constant \( C = C(d, p, q) > 0 \) such that for all \( f \in \tilde{L}_T^q(\tilde{L}_x^p) \),

\[
\|\mathcal{M} f\|_{\tilde{L}_T^q(\tilde{L}_x^p)} \leq C \|f\|_{\tilde{L}_T^q(\tilde{L}_x^p)}.
\]
2.2. A study of PDE with mixed $L^p$-drifts. In this section we show the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions in PDE’s sense to second order parabolic PDEs with drifts in the mixed $L^p$-spaces. For $t > 0$, let $P_t f(x) = E f(x + W_t)$ be the Gaussian heat semigroup, i.e.,

$$P_t f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t(x-y) f(y) dy,$$

where

$$g_t(x) := (2\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2t}}.$$ 

First of all, we establish the following easy estimates about $P_t$.

**Lemma 2.3.** (i) For any $p \in (1, \infty)^d$, $T > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(T, p, \beta, d) > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^p_T$ and $t \in (0, T]$,

$$\|P_t f\|_{C^\beta} \leq C t^{-\frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p_T}. \tag{2.12}$$

(ii) For any $q \geq p$, there is a constant $C = C(q, p, d) > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$\|\nabla P_t f\|_{L^q_T} \leq C t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \|f\|_{L^p_T}. \tag{2.13}$$

**Proof.** (i) Note that for $m = 0, 1, \ldots$,

$$\nabla^m P_t f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla^m g_t(x-y) f(y) dy.$$

For $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$, by H"older’s inequality (2.2) and the scaling, we have

$$\|\nabla^m P_t f\|_q \leq \|\nabla^m g_t\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^p_T} = t^{-\frac{m}{2} + \frac{1}{p}} \|\nabla^m g_t\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{L^p_T},$$

where $\|\nabla^m g_t\|_{L^2} < \infty$. The estimate (2.12) follows by the interpolation theorem for H"older spaces.

(ii) For $r \in [1, \infty]^d$ with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 + \frac{1}{d}$, by Young’s inequality (2.3), we have

$$\|\nabla P_t f\|_{L^q_T} \leq \|\nabla g_t\|_{L^r} \|f\|_{L^p_T} = t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \|\nabla g_t\|_{L^r} \|f\|_{L^p_T}.$$

The estimate (2.13) now follows by $\|\nabla g_t\|_{L^r_T} < \infty$. \hfill $\square$

We introduce the following index sets for later use:

$$\mathcal{F}_m := \left\{(q, p) \in (1, \infty)^{1+d} : \left|\frac{1}{p}\right| + \frac{2}{q} < m \right\}, \; m = 1, 2. \tag{2.14}$$

**Remark 2.4.** $\mathcal{F}^\circ \subset \mathcal{F}_1$, where $\mathcal{F}^\circ$ is defined by (1.10). For $(q, p) \in \mathcal{F}^\circ$, it holds that $(\frac{q}{p}, \frac{p}{q}) \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

For $\lambda \geq 0$ and $f \in L^p_T(L^q_T)$, we define

$$u(t, x) := \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} P_{t-s} f(s, x) ds, \; t > 0,$$

which solves the following non-homeogenous heat equation

$$\partial_t u = \frac{1}{2} \Delta u - \lambda u + f, \; u(0) = 0.$$

**Lemma 2.5.** (i) For any $T > 0$, $(q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\beta \in [0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q})$, there is a constant $C = C(T, d, q, p, \beta) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$(1 + \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2} \left(2 - \beta - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}\right)} \|u\|_{L^q_T(C^\beta)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p_T(L^q_T)}. \tag{2.15}$$

(ii) For any $T > 0$, $(q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and $(q', p') \geq (q, p)$ with $\left|\frac{1}{p'}\right| + \frac{2}{q'} < \left|\frac{1}{p}\right| + \frac{2}{q} + 1$, there is a constant $C = C(T, d, q, p, q', p') > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$(1 + \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{q'} \right)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p_T(L^q'_T)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p_T(L^q'_T)}. \tag{2.16}$$
(iii) For any $T > 0$, $(q, p) \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, there is a constant $C = C(\lambda, T, d, q, p) > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T$,

$$
\|u(t_1) - u(t_0)\|_\infty \leq C(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}.
$$

(2.17)

**Proof.** (i) For $\beta \in [0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q})$, by (2.12) and Hölder’s inequality for time variable, we have

$$
\|u(t)\|_{C^\beta} \lesssim \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)}(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\beta+1-\frac{3}{p})} \|f(s)\|_{L^p} ds
\leq \left(\int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} \left( t-s \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{3}{p})} \|f(s)\|_{L^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}
\lesssim (1 + \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}(2-\beta-\frac{2}{q})} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}.
$$

(ii) For $(q', p') \geq (q, p)$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < \frac{1}{p'} + \frac{2}{q'} + 1$, by (2.13) we have

$$
\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^p(I_t^q)} \lesssim \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)}(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{1}{q'})} \|f(s)\|_{L^q} ds.
$$

Let $r \geq 1$ be defined by $\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{q'} + 1 - \frac{1}{q}$. By Young’s inequality we further have

$$
\|\nabla u\|_{L^p(I_t^q)} \lesssim \left(\int_0^T e^{-\lambda s} \left( t-s \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{1}{q'})} \|f(s)\|_{L^q} ds \right)^{1/r} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}
\lesssim (1 + \lambda)^{-\frac{3}{4}(1+\frac{1}{q'})} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}.
$$

(iii) For $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T$, by definition we have

$$
u(t_1) - u(t_0) = \int_0^{t_0} e^{-\lambda(t_1-s)}(P_{t_1-s} - P_{t_0-s})f(s, x)ds
+ (e^{-\lambda(t_1-t_0)} - 1) \int_0^{t_0} e^{-\lambda(t_0-s)}P_{t_0-s}f(s, x)ds
+ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{-\lambda(t_1-s)}P_{t_1-s}f(s, x)ds
=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
$$

For $I_1$, noting that

$$
\|P_t f - f\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|\Delta P_s f\|_\infty ds \lesssim \left(\int_0^t s^{-\frac{3}{2}} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_\infty \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_\infty,
$$

by (2.12) and Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$
\|I_1\|_\infty \lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{t_0} \|\nabla P_{t_0-s} f(s)\|_\infty ds
\lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{t_0} (t_0 - s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1+\frac{1}{q'}) \|f(s)\|_{L^q} ds
\lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}
$$

and by $1 - e^{-\lambda(t_1-t_0)} \leq \lambda(t_1 - t_0)$,

$$
\|I_2\|_\infty \lesssim \lambda(t_1 - t_0) \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}.
$$

For $I_3$, noting that

$$
\|P_t f - f\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|\Delta P_s f\|_\infty ds \lesssim \left(\int_0^t s^{-\frac{3}{2}} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_\infty \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_\infty,
$$

by (2.12) and Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$
\|I_3\|_\infty \lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{t_1} \|\nabla P_{t_1-s} f(s)\|_\infty ds
\lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1+\frac{1}{q'}) \|f(s)\|_{L^q} ds
\lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}
$$

and by $1 - e^{-\lambda(t_1-t_0)} \leq \lambda(t_1 - t_0)$,

$$
\|I_3\|_\infty \lesssim \lambda(t_1 - t_0) \|f\|_{L^\infty_T(I_p^q)}.
$$
For $I_3$, as above, by (2.12) and Hölder’s inequality, we have
\[ \|I_3\|_\infty \lesssim (\int_0^{t_1-t_0} (e^{-\lambda s} s^{-\frac{1}{2}|p|}) \frac{ds}{s} \|f\|_{L^p_t(L^q_x)}^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \|f\|_{L^p_t(L^q_x)} \].
Combining the above estimates and by $\frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{p} < 1$, we obtain (2.17).

Now we turn to the study of the following second order parabolic PDE in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$:
\[ \partial_t u = \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla u) + b \cdot \nabla u - \lambda u + f, \quad u(0) = 0, \tag{2.18} \]
where $\lambda \geq 0$ and $a := \sigma \sigma^* / 2$, $\sigma$ satisfies (1.11) and
\[ b, f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d). \]
We introduce the following notion of the solutions to PDE (2.18).

**Definition 2.6.** Let $T > 0$ and $\mathcal{U}_T \subset L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be some subclass of locally integrable functions. We call $u \in \mathcal{U}_T$ a solution of PDE (2.18) if for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$,
\[ \langle u(t), \varphi \rangle = \int_0^t \langle \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla u) + b \cdot \nabla u + f, \varphi \rangle ds - \lambda \int_0^t \langle u, \varphi \rangle ds + \int_0^t \langle f(s), \varphi \rangle ds, \]
where we have implicitly assumed that $\nabla^2 u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$ and $\nabla u \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}$ so that the above right hand sides are well defined. Here $\mathcal{U}_T$ will be specified below in different cases.

We first show the following result for bounded drift $b$ (see [29, Theorem 2.1]).

**Theorem 2.7.** Let $T > 0$ and $(q, p) \in (1, \infty)^{1+d}$. Suppose that (1.11) holds and $b$ is bounded measurable. Then for any $f \in L^q_t(L^p_x)$ and $\beta \in [0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}]$, there exists a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{U}_T$ in the sense of Definition 2.6, where $\mathcal{U}_T$ consists of all $u$ with
\[ (1 \lor \lambda)^{\beta - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{q}} \|u\|_{L^\infty_t(L^p_x)} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p_t(L^q_x)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q_t(L^p_x)}. \tag{2.19} \]
Here and below, the constant $C = C(T, \kappa_0, d, p, q, \beta, \|b\|_{L^p_x}) > 0$ is independent of $\lambda$. Moreover, for any $(q', p') \geq (q, p)$ with $\frac{1}{p'} + \frac{1}{q'} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{q} + 1$, we also have
\[ (1 \lor \lambda)^{\beta - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{q}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{q'}_t(L^{p'}_x)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q_t(L^p_x)}. \tag{2.20} \]
and for all $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 < T$,
\[ \|u(t_1) - u(t_0)\|_\infty \leq C(\lambda)(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^q_t(L^p_x)}. \tag{2.21} \]

**Proof.** We only prove the a priori estimates (2.19), (2.20) and (2.21). The existence is standard by mollifying the coefficients and a compact argument. Fix $r > 0$. Let $\chi^r_\epsilon$ be the cutoff function in (2.4) and $w := u \chi^r_\epsilon$. It is easy to see that
\[ \partial_t w = \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla^2 w) - \lambda w + g, \quad w(0) = 0, \tag{2.22} \]
where
\[ g := \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla^2 u) \chi^r_\epsilon - \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla^2 w) + (b \cdot \nabla u) \chi^r_\epsilon + f \chi^r. \]
Let $(q, p) \in (1, \infty)^{1+d}$. By [29, Theorem 2.1], there is a constant $C = C(T, \kappa_0, d, p, q) > 0$ such that
\[ \|w\|_{L^q_t(L^p_x)} + \|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^p_t(L^q_x)} \lesssim C \|g\|_{L^q_t(L^p_x)}. \tag{2.23} \]
On the other hand, we can write (2.22) as
\[ \partial_t w = \Delta w - \lambda w + \text{tr}((a - I) \cdot \nabla^2 w) + g, \quad w(0) = 0, \]
and by Duhamel’s formula,
\[ w_z(t, x) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} P_{t-s}(\text{tr}((a - \mathbb{I}) \cdot \nabla^2 w_z) + g_z)(s, x)ds. \]

Note that by (2.23),
\[ \|\text{tr}((a - \mathbb{I}) \cdot \nabla^2 w_z) + g_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \lesssim \|g_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \tag{2.24} \]

For \( \beta \in [0, 2 - |\frac{1}{p}| - \frac{2}{q}) \), by (2.15) and (2.24) we have
\[ (1 \lor \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}(2 - \beta - |\frac{1}{p}| - \frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{q})} \|w_z\|_{L^p_x(L^q_z(C^2))} \lesssim \|g_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \tag{2.25} \]

For \((q', p') \succeq (q, p)\) with \( |\frac{1}{p}| + \frac{2}{q} < |\frac{1}{p'}| + \frac{2}{q'} + 1\), by (2.16) and (2.24) we have
\[ (1 \lor \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}(1 + |\frac{1}{p'}| + \frac{2}{q'} - |\frac{1}{p}| - \frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{q'})} \|\nabla w_z\|_{L^{q'}_x(L^p_z)} \lesssim \|g_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \tag{2.26} \]

For \( 0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T \), by (2.17) and (2.24) we have
\[ \|w_z(t_1) - w_z(t_0)\|_\infty \lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^\frac{1}{2} \|g_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \tag{2.27} \]

Since \( \chi^{2r}_z \nabla^j \chi^{2r}_z = \nabla^j \chi^{2r}_z \) for \( j = 0, 1, 2 \), we have
\[ \|g_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \leq \|\nabla u \chi^{2r}_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|u \nabla^2 \chi^{2r}_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla \chi^{2r}_z\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \]

Substituting this into (2.23), (2.25), (2.26) and (2.27) and taking supremum in \( z \in \mathbb{R}^d \), we obtain
\[ \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}, \tag{2.28} \]

and for \( \beta \in [0, 2 - |\frac{1}{p}| - \frac{2}{q}) \),
\[ (1 \lor \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}(2 - \beta - |\frac{1}{p}| - \frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{q})} \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^q_z(C^2))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \tag{2.29} \]

and for \((q', p') \succeq (q, p)\) with \( |\frac{1}{p}| + \frac{2}{q} < |\frac{1}{p'}| + \frac{2}{q'} + 1\),
\[ (1 \lor \lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}(1 + |\frac{1}{p'}| + \frac{2}{q'} - |\frac{1}{p}| - \frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{q'})} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{q'}_x(L^p_z)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \tag{2.30} \]

and for all \( 0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T \),
\[ \|u(t_1) - u(t_0)\|_\infty \lesssim (t_1 - t_0)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \|f\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \right). \tag{2.31} \]

Note that by the interpolation inequality, for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \),
\[ \|\nabla u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}. \]

Substituting this into (2.28) and choosing \( \varepsilon \) small enough, we derive that for any \( t \in [0, T] \),
\[ \|u(t)\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \left( \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}^q ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \]

By Gronwall’s inequality, we get
\[ \|u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p_x(L^p_z)}, \]

which together with (2.29), (2.30) and (2.31) yields (2.19), (2.20) and (2.21). \( \square \)
Remark 2.8. For any $T, \gamma > 0$ and $(q,p) \in \mathcal{F}_2$, there is a $C = C(T, \gamma, d, q, p) > 0$ such that
\[
\sup_x \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T g(s, x + W_{\gamma s}) ds \right) \leq C \|g\|_{L^q_x}.
\] (2.32)

Indeed, let $\lambda = \sqrt{\gamma/2}$, $b = 0$, $\lambda = 0$ and $f(s, x) = g(t - s, x)$ in PDE (2.18). By (2.19) we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T g(s, x + W_{\gamma s}) ds \right) = \int_0^T P_{\gamma(T-s)} f(s, x) ds = u(T, x) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q_x} = \|g\|_{L^q_x}.
\]

In particular, once we have the Gaussian type density estimate for SDEs, then by (2.32), we immediately have the Krylov estimate as we can see in Theorem 2.9. Below we consider the drift $b$ being in the mixed $L^p$-space, where each component $b_i$ lies in different mixed $L^p$-spaces. Thus the second order generalized derivative of $u$ stays in a direct sum space of mixed $L^p$-spaces. The following result seems to be new and is the cornerstone of studying SDEs with singular mixed $L^p$-coefficients.

Theorem 2.9. Let $T > 0$. Suppose (1.11) and for some $(q_i, p_i) \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $i = 1, \ldots, d$,
\[
\|b_1\|_{L^p_x(p_{x_1}^{q_1})} + \cdots + \|b_d\|_{L^p_x(p_{x_d}^{q_d})} \leq \kappa_1 < \infty.
\] (2.33)

Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{F}_1$. Define
\[
\vartheta := 1 - \max_{i=0, \ldots, d} \left( \frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{2}{q_i} \right).
\] (2.34)

For any $f \in \mathcal{L}^{q_0}_T(p_{x_0}^{q_0})$ and $\beta \in [0, \vartheta)$, there is a constant $C_0 = C_0(T, \kappa_0, d, p_i, q_i, \beta) \geq 1$ so that for all $\lambda \geq C_0 \kappa_1^{1/\beta}$, there exists a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{U}_T$ to PDE (2.18) in the sense of Definition 2.6, where $\mathcal{U}_T$ consists of all $u = u_0 + u_1 + \cdots + u_d$ with
\[
\lambda^{\frac{\beta}{2}(\theta - \beta)} \|u\|_{L^p_x(C^{1+\beta})} + \sum_{i=0}^d \|\nabla^2 u_i\|_{L^p_x(p_{x_i}^{q_i})} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L^{q_0}_T(p_{x_0}^{q_0})},
\] (2.35)

where $C_1 = C_1(T, \kappa_0, d, p_i, q_i, \beta) > 0$ is independent of $C$ and $\kappa_1$. Moreover, for all $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 < T$,
\[
\|u(t_1) - u(t_0)\|_{\infty} \leq C(\lambda)(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|f\|_{L^{q_0}_T(p_{x_0}^{q_0})}.
\] (2.36)

Proof. Still we only show the a priori estimate (2.35) since the existence can be shown by a compact method. Let $u = u_0 + u_1 + \cdots + u_d$, where $u_0$ solves the following PDE:
\[
\partial_t u_0 = (a \cdot \nabla^2 u_0) - \lambda u_0 + f, \quad u_0(0) = 0,
\]
and for each $i = 1, \ldots, d$, $u_i$ solves
\[
\partial_t u_i = (a \cdot \nabla^2 u_i) + b_i \cdot \partial_i u - \lambda u_i, \quad u_i(0) = 0.
\]

Let $\lambda \geq 1$ and $\beta \in [0, \vartheta)$ with $\vartheta$ being defined by (2.34). By Theorem 2.7 with $b = 0$, we have
\[
\lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2}} \|u_0\|_{L^p_x(C^{1+\beta})} + \|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^p_x(p_{x_0}^{q_0})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q_0}_T(p_{x_0}^{q_0})},
\]
and
\[
\|u_0(t_1) - u_0(t_0)\|_{\infty} \leq C(\lambda)(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|f\|_{L^{q_0}_T(p_{x_0}^{q_0})},
\]
and for each $i = 1, \ldots, d$,
\[
\lambda^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2}} \|u_i\|_{L^p_x(C^{1+\beta})} + \|\nabla^2 u_i\|_{L^p_x(p_{x_i}^{q_i})} \lesssim \|b_i \cdot \partial_i u\|_{L^p_x(p_{x_i}^{q_i})} \lesssim \|b_i \|_{L^p_x(p_{x_i}^{q_i})} \|\partial_i u\|_{L^p_x},
\]
Definition 3.1. Let \( \mathcal{F} := (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}) \) be a stochastic basis, and \( \xi_t \) be a given \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued measurable \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-adapted process with \( \int_0^t |\xi_s| ds < \infty \) a.s. for each \( t > 0 \), and \( (X, W) \) be two continuous \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-adapted processes. Let \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \). We call \( (X, W, \mathcal{U}) \) a solution of SDE (3.1) with initial distribution \( \mu_0 \) if

(i) \( \mu_0 = \mathbb{P} \circ X_0^{-1} \) and \( W \) is a standard Brownian motion.

(ii) For all \( t \geq 0 \), it holds that

\[
\int_0^t |b(s, X_s)| ds + \int_0^t |\sigma(s, X_s)|^2 ds < \infty, \text{ a.s.}
\]

and

\[
X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t [\xi_s + b(s, X_s)] ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_s) dW_s, \text{ a.s.}
\]

By Theorem 2.7, we can establish the following a priori Krylov estimate (see [47]).

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that (1.11) and (2.33) hold. Then for any \( (q, p) \in \mathcal{F}, x \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( T > 0 \), there is a constant \( C_{T, \delta} = C_{T, \delta}(\Theta) > 0 \) such that for all \( f \in L^q_T(\mathbb{P}^x) \) and any solution \( X \) of SDE (3.1) in the sense of Definition 3.1,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T f(s, X_s) ds \right) \leq \|f\|_{L^q_T(\mathbb{P}^x)} \left[ C_{T, \delta} + \delta \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |\xi_s| ds \right) \right].
\]
Proof. By Theorem 2.7 and as in [47, Lemma 5.5], for any \((q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_1\), \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) and \(T, \delta > 0\), there is a constant \(C_{T, \delta} > 0\) such that for any stopping time \(\tau \leq T\) and \(f \in \overline{L^2}_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbb{L}^p)\),
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^\tau f(s, X_s)ds \right) \leq \|f\|_{L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbb{L}^p)} \left[ C_{T, \delta} + \delta \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^\tau (|\xi_s| + |b(s, X_s)|)ds \right) \right]. \tag{3.3}
\]
Now for \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), define a stopping time
\[
\tau_n := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \int_0^t |b(s, X_s)|ds \geq n \right\} \wedge T.
\]
Since \((q_i, p_i) \in \mathcal{F}_1\), by applying (3.3) with \(f(s, x) = b_i(s, x)\), we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{\tau_n} |b_i(s, X_s)|ds \right) \leq \|b_i\|_{L^p_{\mathbb{F}}} \left[ C_{T, \delta} + \delta \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{\tau_n} (|\xi_s| + |b(s, X_s)|)ds \right) \right].
\]
Summing up the above inequalities for \(i\) from 1 to \(d\), we get
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{\tau_n} |b(s, X_s)|ds \right) \leq \kappa_1 \left[ C_{T, \delta} + \delta \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{\tau_n} (|\xi_s| + |b(s, X_s)|)ds \right) \right].
\]
Letting \(\delta = 1/(2\kappa_1)\) and \(n \to \infty\), we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |b(s, X_s)|ds \right) \leq \kappa_1 C_{T, 1/(2\kappa_1)} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T (|\xi_s| + |b(s, X_s)|)ds \right),
\]
which implies
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |b(s, X_s)|ds \right) \leq 2\kappa_1 C_{T, 1/(2\kappa_1)} + \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |\xi_s|ds \right).
\]
Substituting this into (3.3) with \(\tau = T\), we complete the proof. \(\square\)

In the above lemma, the requirement of \((q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_1\) is too strong for applications. We need to improve it to \((q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_2\). Firstly, we use Theorem 2.9 and the above a priori Krylov estimate to construct the Zvonkin transformation. For each \(i = 1, \ldots, d\), consider the following backward PDE:
\[
\partial_t u_i + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\sigma \sigma^*) \cdot \nabla^2 u_i) + b \cdot \nabla u_i - \lambda u_i + b_i = 0, \quad u_i(T) = 0. \tag{3.4}
\]
By reversing the time variable and Theorem 2.9, there is a unique solution \(u_i\) with the following estimates: for any \(\beta \in (0, \vartheta)\), where \(\vartheta\) is defined by (2.34), there are \(C_0, C_1 \geq 1\) such that for all \(\lambda \geq C_0 \kappa_1^{2/\vartheta}\),
\[
\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta - \beta)} \|u_i\|_{L^\infty_{\mathbb{F}}(C^{1+\beta})} + \sum_{j=0}^d \|\nabla^2 u_{ij}\|_{L^2_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq C_1 \kappa_1, \tag{3.5}
\]
and for all \(0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T\),
\[
\|u_i(t_1) - u_i(t_0)\|_{\infty} \leq C(\lambda)|t_1 - t_0|^{1/2}, \tag{3.6}
\]
where
\[
u_i = u_{i0} + u_{i1} + u_{i2} + \cdots + u_{id}, \tag{3.7}
\]
and
\[
q_{i0} = q_i, \quad p_{i0} = p_i, \quad x_{i0} = x_i, \quad q_{ij} = q_j, \quad p_{ij} = p_j, \quad x_{ij} = x_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d.
\]
Below we define
\[
u = (u_1, \ldots, u_d).
By \((3.5)\), for any \(\beta \in (0, \vartheta)\), we can choose \(\lambda\) large enough so that
\[
\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(C^{1+\beta})} \leq \frac{1}{2}.
\]
Once \(\lambda\) is chosen, it shall be fixed below without further declaration. Now if we define
\[
\Phi(t, x) := x + u(t, x),
\]
then for each \(t\),
\[
x \mapsto \Phi(t, x)
\]
is a \(C^1\)-diffeomorphism, and
\[
\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \Phi^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2,
\]
and by \((3.6)\), for all \(0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T\),
\[
\|\Phi(t_1) - \Phi(t_0)\|_\infty \leq C(\lambda)(t_1 - t_0)^{1/2}.
\]
We have the following important result (see \cite[Theorem 3.10]{47}).

**Lemma 3.3** (Zvonkin’s transformation). Under \((1.11)\) and \((2.33)\), \(Y_t := \Phi(t, X_t)\) solves the following SDE
\[
Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t \xi_s \cdot \nabla \Phi(s, \Phi^{-1}(s, Y_s))ds + \int_0^t \tilde{b}(s, Y_s)ds + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}(s, Y_s)dW_s,
\]
where \(Y_0 := \Phi(0, X_0)\) and
\[
\tilde{b}(s, y) := \lambda u(s, \Phi^{-1}(s, y)), \quad \tilde{\sigma}(s, y) := (\sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi)(s, \Phi^{-1}(s, y)).
\]
Moreover, for any \(\beta \in (0, \vartheta \wedge \gamma_0)\), where \(\vartheta\) is defined by \((2.34)\),
\[
\tilde{b}, \quad \nabla \tilde{b} \in L^\infty_T, \quad \tilde{\sigma} \in L^\infty_T(C^\beta),
\]
and for some \(\tilde{\kappa}_0 \geq 1\),
\[
\tilde{\kappa}_0^{-1} |\eta|^2 \leq |\tilde{\sigma}(s, y)\eta|^2 \leq \tilde{\kappa}_0|\eta|^2, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\]
Vice versa, i.e., if \(Y_t\) solves SDE \((3.10)\), then \(X_t := \Phi^{-1}(t, Y_t)\) solves SDE \((3.1)\).

**Proof.** For each \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), define
\[
u^n(t, x) := (u(t, \cdot) * I_{1/n})(x), \quad \Phi^n(t, x) := x + u^n(t, x).
\]
By Itô’s formula, we have
\[
\Phi^n(t, X_t) = \Phi^n(0, X_0) + \int_0^t [\xi_s \cdot \nabla \Phi^n + \mathcal{L} \Phi^n](s, X_s)ds + \int_0^t (\sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi^n)(s, X_s)dW_s,
\]
where
\[
\mathcal{L} := \partial_s + \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla^2) + b \cdot \nabla, \quad a := (\sigma\sigma^*)/2.
\]
Since \(x \mapsto u(t, x)\) is \(C^{1+\beta}\)-continuous, it is easy to see that for each \(t, x\),
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \nabla^j \Phi^n(t, x) = \nabla^j \Phi(t, x), \quad j = 0, 1.
\]
Therefore, to show \((3.10)\), it suffices to show that as \(n \to \infty\),
\[
\int_0^t |\mathcal{L} \Phi^n - \lambda u|(s, X_s)ds \to 0, \quad \text{a.s.}
\]
For \(m \in \mathbb{N}\), we define a stopping time
\[
\tau_m := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : |X_t| + \int_0^t |\xi_s|ds \geq m \right\}.
\]
Since $\tau_m \to \infty$ as $m \to \infty$, it suffices to show that for each fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$,
\begin{equation}
E \left( \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} |\mathcal{L} \Phi^n - \lambda u|(s, X_s) ds \right) = 0. \tag{3.13}
\end{equation}

Note that by definition,
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L} \Phi^n - \lambda u = \partial_t u^n + \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla^2 u^n) + b \cdot \nabla u^n + b - \lambda u
= \left[ \text{tr}(a \cdot (\nabla^2 u) \ast \Gamma_1/n) - \text{tr}(a \cdot \nabla^2 u) \ast \Gamma_1/n \right]
+ [b \cdot (u \ast \Gamma_1/n) - b \cdot \nabla u] + \lambda (u \ast \Gamma_1/n - u). \tag{3.14}
\end{equation}

For each $i, j$, since $(q_{ij}, p_{ij}) \in \mathcal{J}_1$, by Krylov’s estimate (3.2) and (3.5), we have
\begin{equation}
E \left( \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} |\nabla^2 u^n_{ij} - \nabla^2 u_{ij}|(s, X_s) ds \right) \leq C_m \|\nabla^2 (u^n_{ij} - u_{ij})\|_{L^2_m(\mathcal{F}_t^{p_{ij}})} \to 0.
\end{equation}

From this and by (3.7) and (3.14), it is easy to see that (3.13) holds. Moreover, (3.11) and (3.12) are direct by their definitions and (3.5). On the other hand, if $Y_t$ solves SDE (3.10), then by similar but tedious calculations, $X_t := \Phi^{-1}(t, Y_t)$ solves SDE (3.1). We omit the details. □

**Remark 3.4.** Consider SDE (3.1) with $\xi \equiv 0$ and assume (1.11) and (2.33). An immediate consequence of Zvonkin’s transformation together with (3.8) and (3.9) is that for any $p \geq 1$ and $T > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(p, T, \Theta) > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
E|X_t - X_s|^{2p} \leq C|t - s|^p, \quad t, s \in [0, T]. \tag{3.15}
\end{equation}

Now we show the following main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.5.** Suppose that (1.11) and (2.33) hold. For any $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there is a unique weak solution to SDE (3.1) with $\xi \equiv 0$ and initial distribution $\mu_0$ in the sense of Definition 3.1. Moreover, we have the following conclusions:

(i) For each $t > 0$, $X_t$ admits a density $\rho^{X}_t(y)$ with the following two-sides estimate: for any $T > 0$, there are $\delta_1, C_1 \geq 1$ such that for all $t \in (0, T]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,
\begin{equation}
\frac{C_1^{-1}}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{d|x-y|^2}{2}} \mu_0(dx) \leq \rho^{X}_t(y) \leq \frac{C_1}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{d|x-y|^2}{4}} \mu_0(dx). \tag{3.16}
\end{equation}

(ii) Let $\vartheta$ be defined by (2.34). For any $\beta \in (0, \vartheta \wedge \gamma_0)$ and $T > 0$, there are $\delta_2, C_2 \geq 1$ such that for all $t \in (0, T]$ and $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^d$,
\begin{equation}
\frac{d\rho^{X}(y) - \rho^{X}(y')}{d^{\beta}} \leq C_2 \theta^{d+\beta} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{d|x-y|^2}{2\theta^2}} \mu_0(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{d|x-y'|^2}{2\theta^2}} \mu_0(dx) \right]. \tag{3.17}
\end{equation}

(iii) For any $(q, p) \in \mathcal{J}_2$ and $T > 0$, there is a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for any $f \in L^q_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$,
\begin{equation}
E \left( \int_0^T f(s, X_s) ds \right) \leq C_0 \|f\|_{L^q_p(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{3.18}
\end{equation}

**Proof.** By (3.11) and (3.12), it is well known that SDE (3.10) with $\xi \equiv 0$ admits a unique weak solution (cf. [41]). The existence and uniqueness of weak solutions for original SDE follow from Lemma 3.3. Next we devote to proving (3.16), (3.17) and (3.18).

(i) Let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ be the generator of SDE (3.10), i.e.,
\begin{equation}
\tilde{\mathcal{L}} := \text{tr}((\tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma}^*) \cdot \nabla^2)/2 + b \cdot \nabla.
\end{equation}
By (3.11), (3.12) and Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 2.3 of [9], there is a fundamental solution \( p(s, x, t, y) \) associated with \( \hat{\mathcal{L}} \), which enjoys the following estimates: for all \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \) and \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \),
\[
\frac{C_0^{-1}}{(t-s)^{d/2}} e^{-\frac{|y-s|}{\sqrt{t-s}}} \leq p(s, x, t, y) \leq \frac{C_0}{(t-s)^{d/2}} e^{-\frac{|y-s|^2}{C_0(t-s)}} ,
\]
and for any \( \beta \in (0, \Theta \wedge \gamma_0) \), and for all \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \) and \( x, y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^d \),
\[
|p(s, x, t, y) - p(s, x, t, y')| \leq C_0 |y - y'|^\beta (t-s)^{-d/2} \left[ e^{-\frac{|y-s|^2}{C_0(t-s)}} + e^{-\frac{|y'-s|^2}{C_0(t-s)}} \right],
\]
where \( \delta_0, C_0 \geq 1 \) only depend on \( \Theta \) and the bounds of \( \tilde{b} \) and \( \tilde{\sigma} \). In particular, \( p(0, x, t, y) \) is just the density of the solution of SDE (3.1) starting from \( x \) at time zero. Note that the density \( \rho_t^Y(y) \) of \( Y_t \) starting from initial distribution \( \tilde{\mu}_0 = \mu_0 \circ \Phi(\cdot)^{-1} \) is given by
\[
\rho_t^Y(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(0, x, t, y) \tilde{\mu}_0(dx) .
\]
This can be shown by considering the smooth approximation and taking weak limits (see [32, Section 5.1] for more details). We thus have that for any \( t \in (0, T] \) and all \( y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^d \),
\[
\frac{C_0^{-1}}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{\delta_0 |y-s|^2}{t}} \tilde{\mu}_0(dx) \leq \rho_t^Y(y) \leq \frac{C_0}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{|y-s|^2}{\delta_0 t}} \tilde{\mu}_0(dx)
\]
and
\[
|\rho_t^Y(y) - \rho_t^Y(y')| \leq C_0 |y - y'|^\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ e^{-\frac{|y-s|^2}{\delta_0 t}} + e^{-\frac{|y'-s|^2}{\delta_0 t}} \right] \tilde{\mu}_0(dx) .
\]
On the other hand, by the change of variables, we have
\[
\rho_t^X(y) = \rho_t^Y(\Phi(t, y)) \det(\nabla \Phi(t, y)) ,
\]
and for some \( \tilde{C}_0 \geq 1 \),
\[
\frac{\tilde{C}_0^{-1}}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{\delta_0 |(\Phi(0, x) - \Phi(t, y))|^2}{t}} \mu_0(dx) \leq \rho_t^X(y) \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_0^{-1}}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{|(\Phi(0, x) - \Phi(t, y))|^2}{\delta_0 t}} \mu_0(dx) ,
\]
which together with the following two estimates yields (3.16),
\[
|\Phi(0, x) - \Phi(t, y)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} |\Phi(t, x) - \Phi(t, y)|^2 - |\Phi(0, x) - \Phi(t, x)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{8} |x - y|^2 - Ct,
\]
and
\[
|\Phi(0, x) - \Phi(t, y)|^2 \leq 2 |\Phi(t, x) - \Phi(t, y)|^2 + 2 |\Phi(0, x) - \Phi(t, x)|^2 \leq 8 |x - y|^2 - Ct .
\]
(ii) By (3.20) and (3.19), we have
\[
|\rho_t^X(y) - \rho_t^X(y')| \leq |\rho_t^Y(\Phi(t, y)) - \rho_t^Y(\Phi(t, y'))| \det(\nabla \Phi(t, y)) \left[ \rho_t^Y(\Phi(t, y)) \right] \det(\nabla \Phi(t, y)) \left[ \rho_t^Y(\Phi(t, y')) \right] \det(\nabla \Phi(t, y')) |\nabla \Phi(t, y) - \nabla \Phi(t, y')|,
\]
which in turn implies (3.17) by (3.5).
(iii) For nonnegative \( f \in \overline{L}_2^p(L_2^q) \) with \((q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_2\), by (3.16) and (2.32), we get
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T f(s, X_s)ds \right) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(s, y) \rho_s^X(y)dyds 
\leq \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(s, y) \left( \frac{C_2}{q s^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2|\sigma|^2}} \mu_0(dx) \right)dyds
\]
\[
= C_2 (2\pi \delta_1)^{d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_0^T \mathbb{E}f(s, x - W_{\delta_s})ds \right) \mu_0(dx) \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L_2^p(L_2^q)}.
\]
The proof is complete. \( \Box \)

As a corollary, we have the following important exponential integrability of singular functionals.

**Corollary 3.6. (Khasminskii’s estimate) Let \( X \) be the unique solution of SDE (3.1) in Theorem 3.5. For any \( T, \lambda > 0 \), \((q, p) \in \mathcal{F}_2\) and \( \beta \in (0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}) \), there is a constant \( C_1 \) depending only on \( T, \lambda, d, \beta, \kappa_0, \kappa_1, q_i, p_i, q, p \) such that for all \( f \in \overline{L}_2^p(L_2^q) \),
\[
\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \lambda \int_0^T f(s, X_s)ds \right\} \leq e^{C_1 \|f\|_{L_2^p(L_2^q)}^2}. \quad (3.21)
\]
Moreover, if \( b \) is bounded measurable, then for some \( C_2 = C_2(T, \lambda, d, \beta, \kappa_0, q, p) > 0 \),
\[
\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \lambda \int_0^T f(s, X_s)ds \right\} \leq e^{C_2 \|f\|_{L_2^p(L_2^q)}^2}. \quad (3.22)
\]

**Proof.** Let \( \beta \in (0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}) \). For (3.21), by [47, Lemma 3.5], it suffices to show that for any \( 0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T \),
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_{t_0}^{t_1} f(s, X_s)ds \right|_{\mathcal{F}_{t_0}} \right) \leq C_0(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|f\|_{L_2^p(L_2^q)}. \quad (3.23)
\]
Let \( \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{\beta}{2} \). Since \( \beta \in (0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}) \), we have \((q', p) \in \mathcal{F}_2\). By (3.18) and Hölder’s inequality,
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_{t_0}^{t_1} f(s, X_s)ds \right) \leq C_0 \|f\|_{L_2^{q', q}_{t_1 - t_0}} \leq C_0(t_1 - t_0)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|f\|_{L_2^p(L_2^q)}.
\]
By the Markov property of \( X_t \), we get (3.23). For (3.22), it follows by Girsanov’s theorem. \( \Box \)

**Theorem 3.7. (Strong well-posedness)** In addition to the assumptions in Theorem 3.5, we also assume (1.12) and \((q_i, p_i) \in \mathcal{F}^o\) in (2.33). Then there is a unique strong solution to SDE (3.1) with \( \xi \equiv 0 \).

**Proof.** By Yamada-Watanabe’s theorem, it suffices to show the pathwise uniqueness. It follows by Zvonkin’s transformation (see Lemma 3.3), Lemma 2.2 and (3.21) (see [47, Theorem 3.9] for more details). \( \Box \)

4. WELL-POSEDNESS OF DDSDEs WITH MIXED \( L^p \)-DRIFFTS

We consider the following density-distribution dependent SDE (abbreviated as DDSDE):
\[
dX_t = b(t, X_t, \rho_t(X_t), \mu_{X_t})dt + \sigma(t, X_t)dW_t,
\]
where \( \rho_t(x) \) is the density of \( X_t \) and \( b(t, x, r, \mu) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}^d \) is a measurable function. As in Definition 3.1, we introduce the following notion of solutions to the above SDE.
Definition 4.1. Let $\Omega := (\Omega, F, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0})$ be a stochastic basis and $(X, W)$ be two continuous $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted processes. Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We call $(X, W, \Omega)$ a solution of DDSDE (4.1) with initial distribution $\mu_0$ if

(i) $\mu_0 = \mathbb{P} \circ X_0^{-1}$ and $W$ is a standard Brownian motion.

(ii) For each $t > 0$, the distribution $\mu_{X_t}$ of $X_t$ admits a density $\rho_t$, and it holds that

$$\int_0^t |b(s, X_s, \rho_s(X_s), \mu_{X_s})|ds + \int_0^t |\sigma(s, X_s)|^2ds < \infty, \text{ a.s.},$$

and

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_s, \rho_s(X_s), \mu_{X_s})ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_s)dW_s, \text{ a.s.}$$

Let $T > 0$ and $C_T$ be the space of all continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$. We use $\omega$ to denote a path in $C_T$ and by $w_t(\omega) = \omega_t$ to denote the coordinate process. Let $\mathcal{B}_t := \sigma\{w_s, s \leq t\}$ be the natural filtration. We also introduce the following notion of martingale solutions to DDSDE (4.1).

Definition 4.2. Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. A probability measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(C_T)$ is called a martingale solution of DDSDE (4.1) with initial distribution $\mu_0$ if $\mathbb{P} \circ w_0^{-1} = \mu_0$ and for any $f \in C^2_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the process

$$M_t^f(\omega) := f(w_t) - f(w_0) - \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\sigma^*)(s, w_s) \cdot \nabla^2) + b(s, w_s, \rho_s(w_s), \mu_s) \cdot \nabla \right) f(w_s)ds$$

(4.2)

is a $\mathcal{B}_t$-martingale, where $\mu_s := \mathbb{P} \circ w_s^{-1}$ has a density $\rho_s(x)$. We shall use $\mathcal{M}^{\sigma, b}_{\mu_0}$ to denote the set of all martingale solutions of DDSDE (4.1) associated with $\sigma, b$ and initial distribution $\mu_0$.

Remark 4.3. It is well known that weak solutions are equivalent to the martingale solutions (see [41]). When we consider the linearized SDE, i.e., $b$ only depends on $(t, x)$, if for each starting point $(s, x)$, there is a unique martingale solution starting from $(s, x)$, then as usual, we say the martingale problem is well-posed.

4.1. Relative entropy. In this subsection we recall the notion and some basic facts about the relative entropy. Let $E$ be a Polish space and $\mu, \nu$ be two probability measures over $E$. The relative entropy $\mathcal{H}(\mu|\nu)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu|\nu) := \begin{cases} \int_E \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\nu, & \mu \ll \nu, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Since $x \mapsto x \log x$ is convex on $[0, \infty)$, by Jensen’s inequality, we have $\mathcal{H}(\mu|\nu) \geq 0$.

The following results are the main tools used below (see [4, Theorem 2.1(ii)], [12, Lemma 1.4.3(a)] and [10, Lemma 3.9]).

Theorem 4.4. (i) (Pinsker’s inequality) For any two probability measures $\mu, \nu$, it holds that

$$||\mu - \nu||^2_{\text{var}} \leq 2\mathcal{H}(\mu|\nu). \quad (4.3)$$

(ii) (The weighted Pinsker inequality) For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and Borel measurable function $f$, it holds that

$$|\langle \mu - \nu, f \rangle|^2 \leq 2 \left( 1 + \log \int_E e^{f(x)^2} \nu(dx) \right) \mathcal{H}(\mu|\nu). \quad (4.4)$$

(iii) (Variational representation of the relative entropy) For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu|\nu) = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)} \left( \int_E \psi d\mu - \log \int_E e^\psi d\nu \right), \quad (4.5)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_b(E)$ is the set of all bounded Borel measurable functions.
(iv) (Dimensional bounds on entropy) Let \( \mu^N \) be a symmetric probability measure on \( E^N \) and \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E) \). Then for any \( k \leq N \),

\[
\mathcal{H}(\mu^{N,k} | \mu^k) \leq \frac{2k}{N} \mathcal{H}(\mu^N | \mu^N),
\]

where \( \mu^{N,k} \) is the marginal distribution of the first \( k \)-component of \( \mu^N \).

We recall the following entropy formula for the martingale solutions of linearized SDEs, which is a consequence of Girsanov’s theorem (see [27, Lemma 4.4 and Remark 4.5] for the most general form).

**Lemma 4.5.** For \( i = 1, 2 \), let \( b^i : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) be two measurable functions. Suppose that the martingale problem associated with \( (\sigma, b^2) \) is well-posed (see Remark 4.3). Let \( \mu^0_1, \mu^0_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) be two initial distributions. For any two martingale solutions \( \mathbb{P}_i \in \mathcal{M}^{\sigma, b^i}_\mu \), \( i = 1, 2 \), and any \( t \geq 0 \), if we let \( \mu^t_i := \mathbb{P}_i \circ w^{-1}_t \) be the marginal distribution, then

\[
\mathcal{H}(\mu^t_1 | \mu^t_2) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu^0_1 | \mu^0_2) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_2} z \left( \int_0^t |\sigma^{-1}(s, w_s)(b^1(s, w_s) - b^2(s, w_s))|^2 ds \right).
\]

### 4.2. Stability of density

In this section we prepare a stability result about the density of linearized SDEs. Our starting point is the associated Fokker-Planck equation. Fix \( z \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Let

\[
A^z_{s,t} := \int_s^t A(r, z) dr \text{ with } A(r, z) = (a_{ij}(r, z)) = ((\sigma \sigma^*)_{ij}(r, z))/2.
\]

Let \( P^z_{s,t} f(x) \) be the Gaussian heat kernel associated with \( A^z_{s,t} \), i.e.,

\[
P^z_{s,t} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_{A^z_{s,t}}(x - y)f(y)dy,
\]

where for a symmetric positive definite matrix \( A \),

\[
h_A(x) := \frac{e^{-(A^{-1}x, x)/2}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d \det(A)}}.
\]

**Lemma 4.6.** Let \( \beta \in [0, 1] \), \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( p \in [1, \infty]^d \) and \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). Under (1.11), for any \( T > 0 \), there is a constant \( C = C(T, d, \beta, k, p, \kappa_0) > 0 \) such that for all \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \) and \( 0 \leq f \in L^p_\mathcal{X} \),

\[
|\nabla^k P^z_{s,t}(|\cdot|^{\beta} f)(0)| \leq C(t - s)^{\frac{d(\beta - k)}{2}} \| f \|_{L^p_\mathcal{X}}.
\]

**Proof.** First of all, by definition and (1.11), it is easy to see that for some \( \lambda > 0 \),

\[
|\nabla^k h_{A^z_{s,t}}(x)| \leq (t - s)^{-\frac{k+d}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(t - s)}} = (t - s)^{-\frac{k}{2}} (2\pi \lambda)^{\frac{d}{2}} g_{\lambda(t-s)}(x),
\]

and for some \( \lambda' > \lambda \),

\[
|\nabla^k P^z_{s,t}(|\cdot|^{\beta} f)(0)| \leq (t - s)^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{\lambda(t-s)}(y)|y|^{\beta} f(y)dy
\]

\[
\leq (t - s)^{-\frac{k}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{\lambda(t-s)}(y)f(y)dy.
\]

Let \( p' \in (1, \infty)^d \) be defined by \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1 \). Fix \( r > 0 \). By Hölder’s inequality we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{\lambda(t-s)}(y)f(y)dy \leq \frac{1}{|B_0^r|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{\lambda(t-s)}(y)1_{B_r^x}(y)f(y)dydz
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{|B_0^r|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|1_{B_r^x}g_{\lambda(t-s)}\|_{L^{p'}_\mathcal{X}} \| f \|_{L^p_\mathcal{X}} dz
\]
C = \int

Hence,

\begin{proof}

First of all, by the heat kernel estimate (4.7c) \footnote{Note that \( \lambda \leq 0 \).} we have

\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \| B_t^r \|_{L^p} \, dz &= (2\pi \lambda t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \| B_t^r \|_{L^p} \, dz \\
&\leq t^{-\frac{d}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_{|z_i| \leq r} \left( \int_{|y_i| \leq r} e^{-\frac{|y_i|^2}{4a}} \, dy_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \, dz_i + \int_{|z_i| > r} \left( \int_{|y_i| \leq r} e^{-\frac{|y_i|^2}{4a}} \, dy_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \, dz_i \right) \\
&\leq t^{-\frac{d}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_{z_i \leq r} \left( \int e^{-\frac{|y_i|^2}{4a}} \, dy_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \, dz_i + \int_{z_i > r} \left( \int e^{-\frac{|y_i|^2}{4a}} \, dy_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \, dz_i \right) \\
&\leq \left( \int e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{4a}} \, dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \int e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{4a}} \, dy \ \text{d}z \ \text{d}y \ \leq t^{\frac{1}{2p}} + t^2 \ \text{d}z \ \text{d}y \ \leq t^{\frac{1}{2p}} = t^{\frac{1}{2p}} = t^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{align*}

Hence,

\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \| B_t^r \|_{L^p} \, dz &\leq t^{-\frac{d}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left( \left( t^{1/2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \right) = t^{-\frac{d}{2}}.
\end{align*}

Combining the above estimates, we obtain the desired estimate. \qed

The following stability result shall be used to show the existence and uniqueness in the following.

\begin{lemma}

Let \( b_0, b_1 \) be two Borel measurable functions satisfying (2.33) and for \( k = 0, 1 \), \( \mu_k(dx) = \rho_k^* (x) \, dx \) with \( \rho_k^* \in L^\infty \). Let \( P_k \in \mathcal{M}^{a,b_k} \) be the unique martingale solution and \( \rho_k(t,x) \) be the density of the coordinated process \( w_t \) under \( \mathbb{P}_k \). Then for any \( T > 0 \), there is a constant \( C = C(T, \Theta) > 0 \) such that for all \( t \in [0,T] \),

\begin{align*}
\| \rho_0(t) - \rho_1(t) \|_{L^\infty} &\leq C \| \rho_0^* - \rho_1^* \|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}\left( 1 + \frac{1}{p_i} \right)} \| b_0^i(s) - b_1^i(s) \|_{L^p} \, ds.
\end{align*}

\end{lemma}

\begin{proof}

First of all, by the heat kernel estimate (3.16), we have for all \( t, y \),

\begin{align*}
\rho_k(t,y) &\leq C_1 \frac{1}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4\sigma^2}} \rho_k^*(x) \, dx \leq \| \rho_k^* \|_{L^\infty}, k = 0, 1.
\end{align*}

Note that \( \rho_k \) solves the following Fokker-Planck equation in distributional sense:

\begin{align*}
\partial_t \rho_k = \partial_i \partial_j (a_{ij} \partial_i \rho_k) + \text{div} (b_k \rho_k),
\end{align*}

where \( a = \sigma \sigma^* / 2 \) and we used the Einstein convention for summation. Below we use the freezing technique to show our result. Fix \( z \in \mathbb{R}^d \). For a function \( f(z) \), we write

\begin{align*}
\tau_z f(x) := f(x+z), \quad \ell(t,x) := \rho_0(t,x) - \rho_1(t,x).
\end{align*}

By the invariance of shifting the spatial variable \( y \), we have

\begin{align*}
\partial_t \tau_z \ell &= \partial_i \partial_j (\tau_z a_{ij} \tau_z \ell) + \text{div} (\tau_z b_0 \tau_z \ell) + \text{div} (\tau_z (b_0 - b_1) \tau_z \rho_1) \\
&= a_{ij}(t,z) \partial_i \partial_j \tau_z \ell + \partial_i (\text{div} \left( \tau_z (b_0 - b_1) \partial_j \ell \right) + \text{div} (\tau_z b_0 \tau_z \ell) + \text{div} (\tau_z (b_0 - b_1) \tau_z \rho_1).
\end{align*}

\end{proof}
By Duhamel’s formula we have
\[
\tau_z(t, x) = P^z_{0,t} \tau_z(0, x) + \int_0^t P^z_{s,t} (\partial_i \partial_j ((\tau_z a_{ij} - a_{ij}(s, z))\tau_z))(s, x)ds \\
+ \int_0^t P^z_{s,t} \text{div}(\tau_z b_{0}\tau_z)(s, x)ds + \int_0^t P^z_{s,t} \text{div}(\tau_z (b_0 - b_1)\tau_z\rho_1)(s, x)ds.
\]
By (1.11) and Lemma 4.6 we have
\[
|\tau_z(t, 0)| \lesssim |P^z_{0,t} \tau_z(0, 0)| + \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}+1} \|\tau_z\|_{L^\infty}ds \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}+1} \|\tau_z b_0 \tau_z\|_{L^p_{x_i}}ds \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}+1} \|\tau_z (b_0^i - b_1^i)\tau_z\rho_1\|_{L^p_{x_i}}ds.
\]
Noting that
\[
\|\tau_z b_0 \tau_z\|_{L^p_{x_i}} \leq \|\tau_z\|_{L^\infty} \|\tau_z\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \kappa_1 \|\ell\|_{L^\infty},
\]
and by (4.9),
\[
\|\tau_z (b_0^i - b_1^i)\tau_z\rho_1\|_{L^p_{x_i}} \leq \|\tau_z (b_0^i - b_1^i)\|_{L^p_{x_i}} \|\tau_z\rho_1\|_{L^\infty} \\
= \|b_0^i - b_1^i\|_{L^p_{x_i}} \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|b_0^i - b_1^i\|_{L^p_{x_i}} \|\rho_0^i\|_{L^\infty},
\]
we further have
\[
\|\ell(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \sup_z |\tau_z(t, 0)| \lesssim \|\ell(0)\|_{L^\infty} + \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} \|\ell(s)\|_{L^\infty}ds \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}+1} \|\ell(s)\|_{L^\infty}ds \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{d}{2}+1} \|b_0^i - b_1^i\|_{L^p_{x_i}}ds.
\]
By Gronwall’s inequality of Volterra’s type (see [48, Lemma 2.2]), we obtain the desired estimate.

\[
\square
\]

4.3. Well-posedness of DDSDEs. Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.8. (Weak well-posedness) Suppose that (1.11) holds and for any $T > 0$ and $i = 1, \cdots, d$, there are indices $(q_i, p_i) \in \mathcal{S}^\circ$ and $x_i \in \mathcal{X}^-$ such that
\[
\sup_{\mu \in C([0,T]; \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \|b^i(\cdot, \cdot, r, \mu)\|_{L^1_t(\mathcal{P}_{x_i})} \leq \kappa_1,
\]
and for some $h_i \in L^1_t(\mathcal{P}_{x_i})$ and for all $t, x \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $r, r' \geq 0$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,
\[
|b^i(t, x, r, \mu) - b^i(t, x, r', \nu)| \leq h_i(t, x)(|r - r'| + \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{var}}).
\]
Then for any probability measure $\mu_0(dx) = \rho_0(x)dx$ with $\rho_0 \in L^\infty$, there is a unique weak solution $(X, W, \mu)$, or equivalently, a martingale solution to DDSDE (4.1) with initial distribution $\mu_0$. 


Proof. We divide the proof into three steps.

(Step 1). Let $\mu^n_t \equiv \mu_0$ for any $t \geq 0$. We consider the following Picard iteration: for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
\begin{equation}
\text{d}X^n_t = b_n(t, X^n_t)\text{d}t + \sigma(t, X^n_t)\text{d}W_t, \quad X^n_0 \overset{(d)}{=} \mu_0,
\end{equation}
where
\[ b_n(t, x) := b(t, x, \mu^{n-1}_t(x), \mu^{n-1}_t), \]
and
\[ \mu^{n-1}_t \text{ is the marginal distribution of } X^{n-1}_t, \text{ which has a density } \rho^{n-1}_t. \]
By (4.10), one sees that for each $i = 1, \cdots, d$,
\begin{equation}
\sup_n \| b^n_i \|_{L^2(E \mu^n)} \lesssim \kappa_1.
\end{equation}
Thus, by Theorem 3.5, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a unique weak solution $(X^n, W^n, \mu^n)$ to SDE (4.12), where
\[ \mu^n := (\Omega^n, \mathcal{F}^n, (\mathbb{P}^n(t))_{t \geq 0}), \]
and for each $t > 0$, $X^n_t$ admits a density $\rho^n_t$ with the following estimate: for all $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$,
\begin{equation}
\rho^n_t(y) \leq \frac{C_1}{t^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}} \rho_0(x)\text{d}x \lesssim \|\rho_0\|_{\infty}.
\end{equation}
Moreover, for any $T > 0$, by (3.15), there is a constant $C > 0$ such that
\[ \sup_n \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^n}[|X^n_t - X^n_s|^2] \leq C|t-s|^2, \quad s, t \in [0, T], \]
and by (3.18), for any $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{J}_2$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathbb{L}^q_{T}^{\infty}((\mathbb{P}^0))$,
\begin{equation}
\sup_n \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^n} \left( \int_0^T f(s, X^n_s)\text{d}s \right) \leq C\|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^q_{T}^{\infty}((\mathbb{P}^0))}.
\end{equation}
In particular, by Kolomogorv’s criterion,
\[ \text{the law } \mathbb{P}_n \text{ of } X^n \text{ in } \mathcal{C}_T \text{ is tight}. \]

(Step 2). For simplicity of notations, we write
\[ \Gamma_{n,m}(t) := \|\rho^n_t - \rho^m_t\|_{\infty} + \|\rho^n_t - \rho^m_t\|_{L^1}. \]
Noting that by (4.11) and (4.13),
\[ |b^n_i(s, x) - b^m_i(s, x)| \leq h_i(s, x)(|\rho^{n-1}_s(x) - \rho^{m-1}_s(x)| + \|\mu^{n-1}_s - \mu^{m-1}_s\|_{\text{var}}) \leq h_i(s, x)\Gamma_{n-1,m-1}(s), \]
we have
\begin{equation}
\|b^n_i(s) - b^m_i(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(P_i)} \leq h_i(s)\|\rho^n_s - \rho^m_s\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(P_i)} \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}(s) =: \ell_i(s)\Gamma_{n-1,m-1}(s). \end{equation}
Since $(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_T) \in \mathcal{J}_2$, by Lemma 4.5 and (4.16), (4.18), we have
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H}(\mu^n_t | \mu^m_t) & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_m} \left( \int_0^t |\sigma^{-1}(s, w_s)(b_n(s, w_s) - b_m(s, w_s))|^2\text{d}s \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\|\sigma^{-1}\|_{L^2}^2}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_m} \left( \int_0^t \|b_n(s, w_s) - b_m(s, w_s)\|^2\text{d}s \right) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^d \left( \int_0^t \|b^n_i(s) - b^m_i(s)\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^{p_i}/2}\text{d}s \right)^{\frac{2}{p_i}}.
\end{align*}
which together with (4.3), we get
\[
\|\mu_t^1 - \mu_t^m\|_{L^1} = \|\mu_t^1 - \mu_t^m\|_{\text{var}} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_0^t \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_i}}. \tag{4.19}
\]

On the other hand, by (4.8), (4.18) and Hölder’s inequality, for \( q' = \frac{q_i}{q_i - 1} \), we have
\[
\|\rho_t^1 - \rho_t^m\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{q'}{2} (1 + |s|^{\frac{1}{\gamma_i}})} \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds
\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{q'}{2} (1 + |s|^{\frac{1}{\gamma_i}})} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left( \int_0^t \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}}
\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_0^t \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} ,
\]
which together with (4.19) yields
\[
\Gamma_{n,m}(t) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_0^t \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} .
\]

Let \( q = q_1 \lor \cdots \lor q_d \). By Hölder’s inequality with respect to \( \ell_i^q(s) ds \), we get
\[
\Gamma_{n,m}^q(t) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \int_0^t \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds \right) \left( \int_0^t \ell_i^q(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q'} - 1} 
\lesssim \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^{d} \ell_i^q(s) \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds.
\]

Therefore, by (4.15) and Fatou’s lemma,
\[
\lim_{n,m \to \infty} \Gamma_{n,m}^q(t) \lesssim \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^{d} \ell_i^q(s) \lim_{n,m \to \infty} \Gamma_{n-1,m-1}^q(s) ds,
\]
which implies by Gronwall’s inequality that for each \( t \in [0,T] \),
\[
\lim_{n,m \to \infty} \left( \|\mu_t^1 - \mu_t^m\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mu_t^1 - \mu_t^m\|_{L^1} \right) = \lim_{n,m \to \infty} \Gamma_{n,m}(t) = 0. \tag{4.20}
\]

Now by (4.17), there is a subsequence \( n_k \) such that as \( k \to \infty \),
\[
\mathbb{P}_{n_k} \text{ weakly converges to some } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(C_T),
\]
and by (4.20), \( \mathbb{P} \circ w_t^{-1}(dx) = \mu_t(dx) = \rho_t(x)dx \) and for each \( t \in (0,T] \),
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \|\rho_t^1 - \rho_t\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho_t^1 - \rho_t\|_{L^1} \right) = 0. \tag{4.21}
\]
(Step 3). In this step we show \( \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\sigma,b}_{0} \). More precisely, we want to show that for fixed \( f \in C^{2}_{c}(\mathbb{R}^{d}) \), the process \( M^{f}_{t} \) defined by (4.2) is a \( \mathcal{B}_{t} \)-martingale under \( \mathbb{P} \), that is, for any \( t_{0} < t_{1} \) and bounded \( \mathcal{B}_{t_{0}} \)-measurable continuous functional \( \eta \),

\[
\mathbb{E}((M^{f}_{t_{1}} - M^{f}_{t_{0}})\eta) = 0. \tag{4.22}
\]

Note that for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), by SDE (4.12) and Itô’s formula,

\[
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}}((M^{f}_{t_{1}} - M^{f}_{t_{0}})\eta) = 0,
\]

where

\[
M^{f}_{k} := f(w_{t}) - f(w_{0}) - \int_{t_{0}}^{t} \left( \text{tr}(a_{n_{k}} \cdot \nabla^{2}f) + b_{n_{k}} \cdot \nabla f \right) (s, w_{s}) ds.
\]

Since \( x \mapsto a_{n_{k}}(s, x) \) is continuous, to show (4.22), the key point is to prove the following limit:

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}} (\eta \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} b_{n_{k}}(s, w_{s}) \cdot \nabla f(s, w_{s}) ds) = \mathbb{E} (\eta \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} b(s, w_{s}, \rho_{s}(w_{s}), \mu_{s}) \cdot \nabla f(s, w_{s}) ds),
\]

which follows by the following two limits:

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{k} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}} \left( \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} \left| b_{n_{m}}(s, w_{s}) - b(s, w_{s}, \rho_{s}(w_{s}), \mu_{s}) \right| ds \right) = 0, \tag{4.23}
\]

and for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \),

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}} (\eta \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} b_{n_{m}}(s, w_{s}) \cdot \nabla f(s, w_{s}) ds) = \mathbb{E} (\eta \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} b(s, w_{s}) \cdot \nabla f(w_{s}) ds). \tag{4.24}
\]

The first limit (4.23) follows by Krylov’s estimate (4.16), (4.11) and (4.21). For the second one, let

\[
b_{n_{m}}(s, x) := b_{n_{m}}(s, \cdot) \ast \Gamma_{\varepsilon}(x), \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1),
\]

where \( \Gamma_{\varepsilon} \) is the mollifiers in (2.7). For each \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \), since \( x \mapsto b_{n_{m}}(s, x) \) is bounded continuous, by the weak convergence of \( \mathbb{P}_{n_{k}} \), we have

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}} (\eta \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} b_{n_{m}}^{\varepsilon}(s, w_{s}) \cdot \nabla f(w_{s}) ds) = \mathbb{E} (\eta \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} b^{\varepsilon}(s, w_{s}) \cdot \nabla f(w_{s}) ds). \tag{4.25}
\]

Moreover, for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( R > 0 \), by Krylov’s estimate (4.16), we also have

\[
\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}} \left( \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} \left| b_{n_{m}}^{\varepsilon} - b_{n_{m}}(s, w_{s}) \right| \mathbbm{1}_{|w_{s}| \leq R} ds \right) \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left\| (b_{n_{m}}^{\varepsilon} - b_{n_{m}}(s, w_{s}))^{i} \mathbbm{1}_{R^{d}} \right\|_{L_{\mathbb{P}}^{1}} = 0, \tag{4.26}
\]

and

\[
\lim_{R \to \infty} \sup_{k, \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{n_{k}}} \left( \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} \left| b_{n_{m}}^{\varepsilon} - b_{n_{m}}(s, w_{s}) \right| \mathbbm{1}_{|w_{s}| \geq R} ds \right) = 0. \tag{4.27}
\]

Combining (4.25), (4.26) and (4.27), we obtain (4.24). Thus we complete the proof of existence. On the other hand, by the same calculations as in (4.20), one can show that any two weak solutions have the same marginal distribution. Then by Theorem 3.5, we get the weak uniqueness. \( \square \)
**Remark 4.9.** If \( b \) does not depend on the density variable \( r \), then we can drop the assumption \( \mu_0(dx) = \rho_0(x)dx \). In this case, we can only use (4.19) to show that \( \mu_0^k \) is a Cauchy sequence. It is noticed that a similar result has been shown in [44]. However, even in the non-mixed norm case, the results in [44] do not cover our case since we are using the total variational norm in (4.11). Moreover, our proofs are based on the Fokker-Planck equation, and Wang’s proofs are based on the backward Kolmogorov equation.

**Theorem 4.10. (Strong well-posedness)** In addition to the assumptions in Theorem 4.8, we also assume (1.12). Then there is a unique strong solution.

**Proof.** It is a direct consequence of Theorems 4.8 and 3.7. \( \square \)

5. Weak convergence of propagation of chaos

Throughout this section we assume (H\( ^\sigma \)) and (H\( ^0 \)). Let

\[
X_t^N := (X_t^{N,1}, \ldots, X_t^{N,N}), \quad W_t^N := (W^1, \ldots, W^N),
\]

and for \( x = (x^1, \ldots, x^N) \), define

\[
B(t, x) := \left( F(t, x^1, 1/N \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_j(x^1, x^j)), \ldots, F(t, x^N, 1/N \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_j(x^N, x^j)) \right),
\]

and a \((dN) \times (dN)\)-matrix \( \sigma \) by

\[
\sigma(t, x) = \text{diag}_N(\sigma(t, x^1), \ldots, \sigma(t, x^N)).
\]

Then the particle system (1.1) can be written as an SDE in \( \mathbb{R}^{dN} \):

\[
dX_t^N = B(t, X_t^N)dt + \sigma(t, X_t^N)dW_t^N.
\]

Noting that by (H\( ^0 \)),

\[
|B_i(t, x)| \leq h(t, x^i) + \frac{K_1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\phi_j(x^i, x^j)|,
\]

we have for \( \bar{p} = (\infty, \ldots, \infty, p) \in [1, \infty]^{dN} \) and \( x_i = (\cdot, x^{i-1}, x^{i+1}, \ldots, x^N, x^i) \),

\[
\|B_i\|_{L_p^t(L_{\bar{p}}^q)} \leq \|h\|_{L_p^t(L_{\bar{p}}^q)} + \kappa_1 \left[ \int_0^T \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\phi_i(\cdot, y)\|_{L_{\bar{p}}^q}^p dt \right]^{1/p} < \infty.
\]

Thus, by Theorem 3.7, for any initial value \( X_0^N \), there is a unique strong solution to the above SDE. In particular, there is a measurable functional \( \Phi : \mathbb{R}^{dN} \times \mathcal{C}_T^N \to \mathcal{C}_T^N \) such that

\[
X_t^N = \Phi(X_0^N, W^N)(t), \quad t \in [0, T].
\]

5.1. Martingale approach. In this section we use the classical martingale approach to show the following qualitative result of weak convergence.

**Theorem 5.1.** For any \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( \xi^1_N, \ldots, \xi^N_N \) be \( N \)-random variables and \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \). Suppose that the law of \((\xi^1_N, \ldots, \xi^N_N)\) is invariant under any permutation of \( \{1, \ldots, N\} \), and for any \( k \leq N \),

\[
\mathbb{P} \circ (\xi^1_N, \ldots, \xi^N_N)^{-1} \rightarrow \mu_0^{\otimes k}, \quad N \to \infty.
\]

Then for any \( k \leq N \) and \( T > 0 \),

\[
\mathbb{P} \circ (X_{[0,T]}^{N,1}, \ldots, X_{[0,T]}^{N,k})^{-1} \rightarrow \mu_{[0,T]}^{\otimes k}, \quad N \to \infty,
\]

where \( \mu_{[0,T]} \) is the law of the unique solution of DDSDE (1.2) with initial distribution \( \mu_0 \) on \( \mathcal{C}_T \).
First of all, we use the partial Girsanov transform as used in [21, 43] to show some uniform Krylov estimate for particle system (1.1). Let \( \{ \tilde{W}_t^i, i \in \mathbb{N} \} \) be a sequence of independent \( d \)-dimensional standard Brownian motions. For each \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), let \( Z_t(x) \) be the unique strong solution of the following SDE starting from \( x \):
\[
\mathrm{d}Z_t = \sigma(t, Z_t) \mathrm{d}\tilde{W}_t,
\]
\( Z_0 = x. \)

For each \( z = (z^2, \ldots, z^N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1)d} \), let \( Z^N_t(z) := Z^N_t := (Z^N_t, 2, \ldots, Z^N_t) \) be the unique strong solution of the following SDE starting from \( z \):
\[
\mathrm{d}Z^N_t = b(t, Z^N_t, \eta Z^N_t) \mathrm{d}t + \sigma(t, Z^N_t) \mathrm{d}\tilde{W}_t,
\]
where \( k = 2, \ldots, N \) and
\[
\eta_z(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=2}^{N} \delta_{z,j}(dy).
\]

In particular, as Brownian functionals of \( \tilde{W}^1 \) and \( (\tilde{W}^2, \ldots, \tilde{W}^N) \), \( Z(\cdot) \) is independent of \( Z^N(\cdot) \), \( \eta_z(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=2}^{N} \delta_{z,j}(dy) \)

by the notion of strong solution of SDEs (see (5.3)),
\[
\tilde{X}^1_t := Z_t(\xi^1_t), \quad (\tilde{X}^N_1, \ldots, \tilde{X}^N_N) := Z^N_t(\xi^N_1, \ldots, \xi^N_N) =: \tilde{Y}^N_t,
\]
solves the following SDE:
\[
\begin{cases}
\mathrm{d}\tilde{X}^N_1 = \sigma(t, \tilde{X}^N_1) \mathrm{d}\tilde{W}^1_t, & \tilde{X}^N_0 = \xi^N_1, \\
\text{and for each } k = 2, \ldots, N, \\
\mathrm{d}\tilde{X}^N_k = b(t, \tilde{X}^N_k, \eta_{\tilde{Y}^N_t}) \mathrm{d}t + \sigma(t, \tilde{X}^N_k) \mathrm{d}\tilde{W}^1_t, & \tilde{X}^N_0 = \xi^N_k,
\end{cases}
\]
where
\[
\eta_{\tilde{Y}^N_t}(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=2}^{N} \delta_{\tilde{Y}^N_t,j}(dy).
\]

Now let us define
\[
\eta_{\tilde{X}^N_t}(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta_{\tilde{X}^N_t,j}(dy), \quad H^{N,1}_t := \sigma(t, \tilde{X}^N_1)^{-1} b(t, \tilde{X}^N_1, \eta_{\tilde{X}^N_t}),
\]
and for \( k = 2, \ldots, N, \)
\[
H^{N,k}_t := \sigma(t, \tilde{X}^N_k)^{-1} \left[ b(t, \tilde{X}^N_k, \eta_{\tilde{X}^N_t}) - b(t, \tilde{X}^N_k, \eta_{\tilde{Y}^N_t}) \right].
\]

By the above definition, we clearly have for each \( i = 1, \ldots, N, \)
\[
\mathrm{d}\tilde{X}^{N,i}_t = b(t, \tilde{X}^{N,i}_t, \eta_{\tilde{X}^N_t}) \mathrm{d}t + \sigma(t, \tilde{X}^{N,i}_t) (\mathrm{d}\tilde{W}^1_t - H^{N,i}_t \mathrm{d}t),
\]
(5.9)

The following uniform estimate is the key step for performing the Girsanov transform to derive the Krylov estimate for particle system, whose proof strongly depends on the independence in (5.6) and the strong uniqueness used in (5.7).

**Lemma 5.2.** For any \( \gamma, T > 0 \), it holds that
\[
\sup_N \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_0^T |H^{N,i}_t|^2 \mathrm{d}t \right\} < \infty.
\]
(5.10)
Proof. For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( y = (y^2, \ldots, y^N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1)d} \), let us write \( \eta_y := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=2}^{N} \delta_y^j \) and define
\[
\Gamma_1(t, x, y) := \sigma(t, x)^{-1} b \left( t, x, \frac{\delta_x}{N} + \eta_y \right),
\]
and for \( k = 2, \ldots, N \),
\[
\Gamma_k(t, x, y) := \sigma(t, y^k)^{-1} \left[ b \left( t, y^k, \frac{\delta_y}{N} + \eta_y \right) - b \left( t, y^k, \eta_y \right) \right].
\]
From the very definition, one sees that for each \( i = 1, \ldots, N \),
\[
H^{N,i}_s = \Gamma_i(s, \bar{X}^{N,1}_s, \bar{Y}^{N}_s),
\]
and by (5.7) and (5.6),
\[
\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_0^T |H^{N,i}_s|^2 ds \right\} = \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\Gamma_i(s, Z_s, Y^N_s)|^2 ds \right\}
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E} \left( \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\Gamma_i(s, Z_s, Y^N_s)|^2 ds \right\} \right) \left|_{(x, y) = (\xi^N, Y^N)} \right.
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{x, y} \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\Gamma_i(s, Z_s, Y^N_s)|^2 ds \right\}
\]
\[
= \sup_{x, y} \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T f_y(s, Z_s(x)) ds \right\},
\]
where for \( y = (y_s)_{s \in [0, T]} \),
\[
f_y(s, x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\Gamma_i(s, x, y_s)|^2.
\]
Note that by (1.13) and \( \phi_t(x, x) = 0 \),
\[
|\Gamma_1(t, x, y)| = \left| \sigma(t, x)^{-1} F \left( t, x, \frac{1}{N} \left( \phi_t(x, x) + \sum_{j=2}^{N} |\phi_t(x, y^j)| \right) \right) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \|\sigma^{-1}\|_{\infty} \left( h(t, x) + \frac{k_1}{N} \sum_{j=2}^{N} \phi_t(x, y^j) \right),
\]
and
\[
|\Gamma_k(t, x, y)| \leq \frac{k_1 \|\sigma^{-1}\|_{\infty}}{N} |\phi_t(y^k, x)|,
\]
and by (1.14),
\[
\left( \int_0^T \sup_y \|\Gamma_1(t, \cdot, y)\|_{L^p}^q dt \right)^{1/q} \leq \|\sigma^{-1}\|_{\infty} (\kappa_1 + \kappa_1^2)
\]
and
\[
\left( \int_0^T \sup_y \|\Gamma_k(t, \cdot, y)\|_{L^p}^q dt \right)^{1/q} \leq \frac{\kappa_1^2 \|\sigma^{-1}\|_{\infty}}{N - 1}.
\]
From these two estimates, by Minkowskii’s inequality, we derive that
\[
\left( \int_0^T \sup_y \| f_y (s, \cdot) \|_{L^q_T}^{q/2} \, dt \right)^{2/q} \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \int_0^T \sup_y \| \Gamma_i(t, \cdot, y) \|_{L^q_T}^{q/2} \, dt \right)^{2/q} \\
= \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \int_0^T \sup_y \| \Gamma_i(t, \cdot, y) \|_{L^q_T}^{q} \, dt \right)^{2/q} \leq \| \sigma^{-1} \|_\infty^2 (\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_4^2/N) .
\]
Thus, due to (5.21) we have
\[
\sup_{x,y} \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T f_y (s, Z_s(x)) \, ds \right\} \leq C,
\]
which together with (5.11) yields (5.10).

Now if we define
\[
\mathcal{E}^N_t := \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t H_{ni}^N \, d\tilde{W}_i^N - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t |H_s^N i|^2 \, ds \right\},
\]
then by (5.10) and Novikov’s criterion, \( t \mapsto Z_t \) is an exponential martingale and
\[
\mathcal{E}^N_t = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t H_{ni}^N \, d\tilde{W}_i^N .
\]
Thus, by Girsanov’s theorem, \( (\tilde{W}_i - \int_0^t H_{ni}^N \, ds)_{t \in [0,T]} \) are \( N \)-independent standard Brownian motions under the new probability measure
\[
\mathbb{Q} := \mathcal{E}^N_T \mathbb{P} .
\]
Moreover, by (5.9) and the weak uniqueness for SDE (1.1), we have
\[
\mathbb{Q} \circ (X^N_{N,0,T})^{-1} = \mathbb{P} \circ (X^N_{0,T})^{-1} ,
\]
and for any \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \), by (5.10) it is standard to derive that
\[
\sup_N \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |\mathcal{E}^N_t|^\gamma \right) < \infty .
\]
From these, we can derive the following crucial Krylov’s estimate for the particle system.

**Lemma 5.3.**  
(i) The law of \( (X^N_{N,1})_{t \in [0,T]} \) in \( C_T \) is tight in \( N \in \mathbb{N} \).  
(ii) For any \( T > 0 \), \( (q, p) \in \mathcal{J}_2 \) and \( x \in \mathcal{Y} \), there is a constant \( C_1 = C_1(T, \Theta) > 0 \) such that for any \( f \in L^p_T \mathcal{L}_q^R \),
\[
\sup_N \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T f(t, X^N_{N,1}) \, dt \right) \leq C_1 \| f \|_{L^p_T \mathcal{L}_q^R} ,
\]
and for any \( \lambda > 0 \) and \( \beta \in (0, 2 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}) \), there is a \( C_2 = C_2(T, \Theta, \lambda, \beta) > 0 \) such that for any \( f \in L^q_T \mathcal{L}_p^\beta \),
\[
\sup_N \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \lambda \int_0^T f(t, X^N_{N,1}) \, dt \right\} \leq e^{C_2 \| f \|_{L^q_T \mathcal{L}_p^\beta}^2} .
\]
(iii) Let \( p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)^d \) and \( q \in (1, \infty) \) satisfy \( \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{2}{q} < 2 \) and \( x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X} \). Then for any \( T > 0 \), it holds that for some \( C_3 = C_3(T, \Theta) > 0 \),
\[
\sup_N \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T f(t, X_t^{N,1}, X_t^{N,2})dt \right) \leq C_3 \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{E}_T(\mathbb{P}^{\mu}_X))},
\]
where \( \mathbb{E}_T(\mathbb{P}^{\mu}_X) \) is the localization of \( L^q(\mathbb{P}^{\mu}_X) \) as in (2.5).

**Proof.** (i) By (5.12), Hölder’s inequality, (5.13) and (5.8), there is a constant \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \) and \( N \in \mathbb{N} \),
\[
\mathbb{E}[X_t^{N,1} - X_s^{N,1}]^4 = \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{E}_T^N)^{N,1} - (\mathcal{E}_T^N)^{N,1}]^4 \leq \left( \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{E}_T^N)^{N,1}]^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{E}[|X_t^{N,1} - X_s^{N,1}|] \right)^2 \leq C|t - s|^2,
\]
which, together with (5.4), implies the tightness by Kolmogorov’s criterion.

(ii) Let \( \gamma > 1 \) be such that \( \left( \frac{q}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \in \mathcal{F}_2 \). By (5.12), Hölder’s inequality, (5.13) and (3.2), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T f(t, X_t^{N,1})dt \right) = \mathbb{E} \left( \mathcal{E}_T^N \int_0^T f(t, \mathcal{E}_T^N)dt \right) \leq \left[ \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_T^N)^{N,1} \right]^{1-1/\gamma} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |f(t, \mathcal{E}_T^N)|^\gamma dt \right) \right]^{1/\gamma} \leq C\|f\|_{L^q(\mathcal{E}_T)}.\]

As for (5.15), it follows by the same method and (3.21).

(iii) Let \( \gamma \in (1, \min_i(p_i, q_i) \land q) \) be such that \( \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{2}{q_i} < 2 \). By (5.12), Hölder’s inequality and (5.13), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T f(t, X_t^{N,1}, X_t^{N,2})dt \right) \leq \left[ \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_T^N)^{N,1} \right]^{2-1/\gamma} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |f(t, \mathcal{E}_T^N)|^\gamma dt \right) \right]^{1/\gamma} \leq \sup_x \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |f(t, Z_t(x), \mathcal{E}_T^N)|^\gamma dt \right) \right]^{1/\gamma}.
\]
By \( \frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{2}{q_i} < 2 \), one can choose \( q_1, q_2 > \gamma \) so that \( \frac{1}{q_1/\gamma} + \frac{1}{q_2/\gamma} = 1 + \frac{1}{q_1/\gamma} \) and \( \left( q_i/\gamma, p_i/\gamma \right) \in \mathcal{F}_2, i = 1, 2 \). Since \( Z_t(x) \) and \( \mathcal{E}_T^{N,2} \) are independent by (5.6) and (5.7), and satisfy the Krylov estimate (see (5.14)), the desired estimate now follows by using [37, Lemma 2.6].

In the following, in order to take weak limits, we need to mollify the coefficients. For \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), we define
\[
b_{\varepsilon, k}(t, x, \mu) := F_{\varepsilon}(t, x, (\phi_k \mu))(x),
\]
where
\[
F_{\varepsilon}(t, x, r) := (-\varepsilon^{-1}) \vee \left( (\mathcal{F}(t, r; \gamma) \ast \Gamma_{\varepsilon})(x) \right) \wedge \varepsilon^{-1}
\]
and
\[
\phi_k(x, y) := (-k) \vee \left( (\phi \ast \Gamma_{1/k})(x, y) \right) \wedge k.
\]
We have the following properties about the above approximation.

**Lemma 5.4.** (i) \( b_{\varepsilon,k} \in L_0^\infty(C_b(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))) \) and
\[
|b_{\varepsilon,k}(t, x, \mu)| \leq h_t * \Gamma_\varepsilon(x) + \kappa_0(\phi^k_t \otimes \mu) * \Gamma_\varepsilon(x)
\]
and
\[
|b - b_{\varepsilon,k}||t, x, \mu| \leq \sup_{|r| \leq k} |F \varepsilon - F|(t, x, r) + \kappa_0(|\phi^k_t - \phi_t| \otimes \mu)(x).
\]
(ii) For any \( T > 0 \), it holds that
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |b - b_{\varepsilon,k}||s, X^N_s, \eta_{X_N}|ds \right) = 0.
\]

**Proof.** (i) is obvious by definition and the assumptions. We show (ii). Note that
\[
|b - b_{\varepsilon,k}||s, X^N_s, \eta_{X_N}| \leq \sup_{|r| \leq k} |F \varepsilon - F|(s, X^N_s, r) + \frac{\kappa_0}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\phi^k_s - \phi_s|(|X^N_s, X^N_s, j|).
\]
We first show that for fixed \( r \in \mathbb{R}^m \),
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{N} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |F \varepsilon - F|(s, X^N_s, r)ds \right) = 0.
\]
Let \( R > 0 \). Since \((\frac{\xi}{2}, \frac{\xi}{2}) \in \mathscr{J}_2 \) and \( \|F|, r\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)} < \infty \) by (1.13) and (1.14), by Hölder’s inequality and (5.14), (2.8), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |F \varepsilon - F|(s, X^N_s, r) \|_{X^N_s} > R \right) ds \right) \leq \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |F \varepsilon - F|(s, X^N_s, r) ds \right) \right]^{1/2} \left[ \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(\|X^N_s\| > R)^{1/2} ds \right]^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \|F \varepsilon - F\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)}^{1/2} \left[ \int_0^T \left( \mathbb{P}(\|X^N_s - X^N_0\| > R) + \mathbb{P}(\|X^N_0\| > \frac{R}{2}) \right) ds \right]^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \|F|, r\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)}^{1/2} \left[ \int_0^T \left( \frac{C}{R} + \mathbb{P}(\|\xi^N_1\| > \frac{R}{2}) \right) ds \right]^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \|F|, r\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)}^{1/2} \left[ \frac{C}{R} \right]^{1/2} \rightarrow 0, \ R \to \infty.
\]
On the other hand, for each \( R > 0 \), by (5.14) again, we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |F \varepsilon - F|(s, X^N_s, r) \|_{X^N_s} \leq R \right) ds \right) \leq \|F \varepsilon - F\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^2)} \to 0, \ \varepsilon \to 0,
\]
which together with (5.21) yields (5.20).

Since \(|F \varepsilon(t, x, r) - F \varepsilon(t, x, r')| \leq \kappa_0|\varepsilon - r'| \), by (5.20) and a finitely covering technique, for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), we further have
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{N} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \sup_{|r| \leq k} |F \varepsilon - F|(s, X^N_s, r)ds \right) = 0.
\]
Indeed, for any given \( \delta > 0 \), one can find \( M \)-balls in \( \mathbb{R}^m \) with centers in \( \{ r_i, i = 1, \ldots, M \} \) and radius \( \delta \) such that
\[
\{ r : |r| \leq k \} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{M} B_{\delta}(r_i).
\]
Thus,
\[
E \left( \int_0^T \sup_{|r| \leq k} |F_z - F|(s, X_s^{N,1}, r) ds \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} E \left( \int_0^T |F_z - F|(s, X_s^{N,1}, r_i) ds \right) + \kappa_0 \delta.
\]
By (5.20) and firstly letting \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) and then \( \delta \to 0 \), we get (5.22).
Moreover, for \( j \neq 1 \), since
\[
E \left( \int_0^T |\phi_s^k - \phi_s|(X_s^{N,1}, X_s^{N,j}) ds \right) = E \left( \int_0^T |\phi_s^k - \phi_s|(X_s^{N,1}, X_s^{N,2}) ds \right),
\]
as in proving (5.20) and by (1.14) and (5.16), we also have
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup_N E \left( \int_0^T |\phi_s^k - \phi_s|(X_s^{N,1}, X_s^{N,j}) ds \right) = 0,
\]
and by \( \phi_s(x, x) = 0 \) and (5.14),
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup_N E \left( \int_0^T |\phi_s^k|(X_s^{N,1}, X_s^{N,1}) ds \right) = 0.
\]
Hence,
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup_N \sup_{j=1,\ldots,N} E \left( \int_0^T |\phi_s^k - \phi_s|(X_s^{N,1}, X_s^{N,j}) ds \right) = 0,
\]
which together with (5.22) and (5.19) yields (5.18).

Now we are ready to give

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** Consider the following random measure with values in \( \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T) \),
\[
\omega \to \Pi_N(\omega, dw) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{X_{n,i}(\omega)}(dw).
\]
By (i) of Lemma 5.3 and [42, (ii) of Proposition 2.2], the law of \( \Pi_N \) in \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T)) \) is tight. Without loss of generality, we assume that the law of \( \Pi_N \) weakly converges to some \( \Pi_\infty \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T)) \). By (5.14) and (5.16), it is standard to derive that for any \( (q, p) \in \mathcal{J}_2 \) and \( f \in \tilde{L}_q^2(\tilde{L}_p^q) \) (see [47, Remark 3.4]),
\[
\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T)} \int_{\mathbb{C}_T} \left( \int_0^T f(s, w_s) ds \right) \nu(dw) \Pi_\infty(d\nu) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{\tilde{L}_q^2(\tilde{L}_p^q)}, \tag{5.23}
\]
and for any \( p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)^d \) and \( q \in (1, \infty) \) with \( \sum_{i=1}^{d} \nu_i(p_i) + \frac{2}{q} < 2 \), and \( x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X} \), \( f \in \tilde{L}_q^2(\tilde{L}_p^q(\tilde{L}_{p_1}^{p_2}(\tilde{L}_{p_2}^q))) \),
\[
\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T)} \int_{\mathbb{C}_T} \int_{\mathbb{C}_T} \left( \int_0^T f(s, w_s, w'_s) ds \right) \nu(dw) \nu(dw') \Pi_\infty(d\nu) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{\tilde{L}_q^2(\tilde{L}_p^q(\tilde{L}_{p_1}^{p_2}(\tilde{L}_{p_2}^q)))}, \tag{5.24}
\]
Our aim below is to show that \( \Pi_\infty \) is a Dirac measure, i.e.,
\[
\Pi_\infty(d\nu) = \delta_\mu(d\nu), \quad \Pi_\infty - a.s.,
\]
where \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu_0}^{\sigma,b} \) is the unique martingale solution of DDSDE with initial distribution \( \mu_0 \).
We divide the proofs into two steps.

**Step 1** For given \( f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T) \), we define a functional on \( \mathcal{C}_T \) by

\[
M_{f,\nu}(t, w) := f(w_t) - f(w_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\sigma,b}_w f(s, w_s)ds, \quad t \in [0, T],
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{L}^{\sigma,b}_w f(s, x) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^* \cdot \nabla^2 f)(s, x) + b(s, x, \nu_s) \cdot \nabla f(x),
\]

and

\[
\nu_s := \nu \circ w_s^{-1} \quad \text{is the marginal distribution of } \nu \text{ at time } s.
\]

Fix \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). For given \( f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^{nd}) \) and \( 0 \leq s_1 < \cdots < s_n \leq s \), we also introduce a functional \( \Xi_f^\nu \) over \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T) \) by

\[
\Xi_f^\nu := \int_{\mathcal{C}_T} \left( M_{f,\nu}^\sigma(t, w) - M_{f,\nu}^\sigma(s, w) \right) g(w_{s_1}, \cdots, w_{s_n})\nu(dw).
\]

In particular,

\[
\Xi_f^\nu(\Pi_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( M_{f,\Pi_N}^\sigma(t, X^{N,i}_t) - M_{f,\Pi_N}^\sigma(s, X^{N,i}_s) \right) g(X^{N,i}_{s_1}, \cdots, X^{N,i}_{s_n})
\]

(5.25) and

\[
\Pi_N \circ w_s^{-1} = \eta^{X_N}_s.
\]

Noting that by Itô's formula,

\[
M_{f,\Pi_N}^\sigma(t, X^{N,i}_t) = f(X^{N,i}_t) - f(X^{N,i}_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\sigma,b}_{\Pi_N} f(s, X^{N,i}_s)ds = \int_0^t (\sigma^* \cdot \nabla f)(s, X^{N,i}_s)dW_s^i,
\]

by (5.25) and the isometry of stochastic integrals, we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[\Xi_f^\nu(\Pi_N)]^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \int_t^s (\sigma^* \cdot \nabla f)(r, X^{N,i}_r)g(X^{N,i}_{s_1}, \cdots, X^{N,i}_{s_n})dW_s^i \right]^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \mathbb{E}(\sigma^* \cdot \nabla f)(r, X^{N,i}_r)g(X^{N,i}_{s_1}, \cdots, X^{N,i}_{s_n})^2 dr
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{N} (t-s) \|\sigma^* \cdot \nabla f\|_{\infty}^2 \|g\|_{\infty}^2.
\]

(5.26)

Suppose that we have proven

\[
\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Xi_f^\nu(\Pi_N)] = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T)} |\Xi_f^\nu(\nu)| \Pi_\infty(d\nu).
\]

(5.27)

Then by (5.26) and (5.27), for each \( f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( g \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^{nd}) \),

\[
\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T)} |\Xi_f^\nu(\nu)| \Pi_\infty(d\nu) = 0 \Rightarrow \Xi_f^\nu(\nu) = 0 \quad \text{for } \Pi_\infty\text{-a.s. } \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T).
\]

Since \( C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( C_0(\mathbb{R}^{nd}) \) are separable, one can find a common \( \Pi_\infty\)-null set \( \mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T) \) such that for all \( \nu \notin \mathcal{N} \) and for all \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \), \( f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( g \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^{nd}) \),

\[
\Xi_f^\nu(\nu) = \int_{\mathcal{C}_T} \left( M_{f,\nu}^\sigma(t, w) - M_{f,\nu}^\sigma(s, w) \right) g(w_{s_1}, \cdots, w_{s_n})\nu(dw) = 0.
\]

Moreover, by (5.4) and (1.7), we also have

\[
\Pi_\infty \{ \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_T) : \nu_0 = \mu_0 \} = 1.
\]
Hence, for $\Pi_\infty$-almost all $\nu$,

$$\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu_0}^{\sigma,b}.$$ 

Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mu_0}^{\sigma,b}$ only contains one point by uniqueness (see Theorem 4.8), all the points $\nu \notin \mathcal{N}$ are the same. Hence, $\Pi_N$ weakly converges to one-point measure. By [42, (ii) of Proposition 2.2], we conclude (5.5). Thus it remains to show (5.27).

**(Step 2)** Let $b_{\varepsilon,k}$ be defined by (5.17) and define

$$\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\nu) := \int_{C_T} (M_{f,\nu}^{\sigma,b_{\varepsilon,k}}(t,w) - M_{f,\nu}^{\sigma,b_{\varepsilon,k}}(s,w)) g(w_{s_1}, \ldots, w_{s_n}) \nu(dw).$$

By $b_{\varepsilon,k} \in L_T^\infty(C_b(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)))$, we have

$$\Xi_{\varepsilon,k} \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(C_T)), \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad \tag{5.28}$$

Indeed, note that

$$\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\nu) = \int_{C_T} \left( f(w_t) - f(w_s) + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^* \cdot \nabla^2 f)(r,w_r)dr \right) g(w_{s_1}, \ldots, w_{s_n}) \nu(dw) + \int_{C_T} \left( b_{\varepsilon,k} \cdot \nabla f(r,w_r,\nu_r)dr \right) g(w_{s_1}, \ldots, w_{s_n}) \nu(dw) =: \Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(1)}(\nu) + \Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(2)}(\nu).$$

Since $f \in C_b^2$ and $\sigma,g$ are bounded continuous, we have $\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(1)}(\nu) \in C_b(\mathcal{P}(C_T))$. For $\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(2)}$, since it is a non-linear functional of $\nu$, we have to take some care for the continuity of $\nu \mapsto \Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(2)}(\nu)$. Suppose that $\nu_m \in \mathcal{P}(C_T)$ weakly converges to $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(C_T)$. By definition, we have

$$|\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(2)}(\nu_m) - \Xi_{\varepsilon,k}^{(2)}(\nu)| \leq \int_{C_T} \left( \int_s^t (b_{\varepsilon,k} \cdot \nabla f)(r,w_r,\nu_r)dr \right) g(w_{s_1}, \ldots, w_{s_n}) (\nu_m - \nu)(dw)$$

$$+ \kappa_0 \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|g\|_\infty \int_{C_T} \left( \int_s^t |\phi^k_r \otimes (\nu_m - \nu)_r| |(w_r)dr \right) \nu_m(dw) =: I_m^{(1)} + I_m^{(2)},$$

where we have used that

$$|F_\varepsilon(r,x,s_1) - F_\varepsilon(r,x,s_2)| \leq \kappa_0 |s_1 - s_2|.$$ 

For $I_m^{(1)}$, we clearly have

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} I_m^{(1)} = 0.$$ 

For $I_m^{(2)}$, by the dominated convergence theorem, it suffices to show that for each $r \in [s,t]$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \int_{C_T} |\phi^k_r \otimes (\nu_m - \nu)_r|(w_r) \nu_m(dw) = 0,$$

which follows by noting that (see the proof of (5.22))

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} |\phi^k_r \otimes (\nu_m - \nu)_r|(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and

$$\sup_{|x - y| \to 0} m \|\phi^k_r \otimes (\nu_m)_r(x) - (\phi^k_r \otimes (\nu_m)_r)(y)\| = 0.$$ 

Thus we get (5.28), and so,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} E[\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\Pi_N)] = \int_{\mathcal{P}(C_T)} |\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\nu)| \Pi_\infty(d\nu).$$
On the other hand, note that
\[ \Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\nu) - \Xi_f^\varepsilon(\nu) = \int_{\mathbb{C}_T} \left( \int_s^t (b - b_{\varepsilon,k})(r, w_r, \nu_r) \cdot \nabla f(w_r) \, dr \right) g(w_s, \ldots, w_n) \nu(dw), \]
and
\[ \Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\Pi_N) - \Xi_f^\varepsilon(\Pi_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \int_s^t (b - b_{\varepsilon,k}) \cdot \nabla f(r, X^{N,i}_r, \eta_{X^{N,i}_r}) \, dr \right) g(X^{N,i}_s, \ldots, X^{N,i}_n). \]
By (5.18), we have
\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sup_N \mathbb{E}|\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\Pi_N) - \Xi_f^\varepsilon(\Pi_N)| \leq \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|g\|_\infty \lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sup_N \mathbb{E}\left( \int_s^t |b - b_{\varepsilon,k}|(r, X^{N,1}_r, \eta_{X^{N,i}_r}) \, dr \right) = 0, \]
and by (5.23) and (5.24), as in showing (5.18),
\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T)} |\Xi_{\varepsilon,k}(\nu) - \Xi_f^\varepsilon(\nu)|\Pi(\nu) \, d\nu \leq \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|g\|_\infty \lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{C}_T)} \int_{\mathbb{C}_T} \left( \int_0^T |b - b_{\varepsilon,k}|(s, w_s, \nu_s) \, ds \right) \nu(dw) \Pi(\nu) \, d\nu = 0. \]
Thus we obtain (5.27) and the proof is complete. \(\square\)

5.2. Entropy method. In this section we recall the entropy method used in [20] to show a quantitative result for weak convergence when the interaction kernel is bounded measurable, which is essentially contained in [20]. For the completeness of the paper, we provide a detailed proof. We first prepare the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. Let \(\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}\) be a bounded measurable function with \(\phi(x, x) = 0\) and \(\xi := (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_N)\) be a sequence of independent identical distribution random variables. Write \(\bar{\phi}(x, y) := \phi(x, y) - (\phi \otimes \mu)(x)\).

For any \(\lambda \leq \frac{1}{10c^2\|\phi\|_{L^\infty}^2}\), it holds that
\[ \mathbb{E}e^{\lambda N}(\bar{\phi} \otimes \eta_\xi)(\xi_1)^2 \leq 6, \]
where \(\eta_\xi(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\xi_i}(dy)\).

Proof. Note that by Taylor’s expansion,
\[ e^{\lambda N}(\bar{\phi} \otimes \eta_\xi)(\xi_1)^2 = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\lambda^m N^m}{m!} |(\bar{\phi} \otimes \eta_\xi)(\xi_1)|^{2m} = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\lambda^m}{m! N^m} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_j) \right|^{2m} \]
\[ \leq \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\lambda^m}{m! N^m} 2^{2m} \left( |\bar{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_1)|^{2m} + \sum_{j=2}^N |\bar{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_j)|^{2m} \right) \]
\[ \leq \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{(4\lambda)^m}{m! N^m} \left( |\bar{\phi}|_{L^\infty}^{2m} + \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_{2m} = 2}^N |\bar{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_{j_1}) \cdots \bar{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_{j_{2m}})| \right). \]
Let \(J\) be the set of all indices \((j_1, \ldots, j_{2m}) \in \{2, \ldots, N\}^{2m}\) with that there is at least one index \(j_k\) different from others. Since for \(j \in \{2, \ldots, N\}\) and \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\),
\[ \mathbb{E}\bar{\phi}(x, \xi_j) = 0, \]
by the independence of $\xi$, we have for any $(j_1, \ldots, j_{2m}) \in J$,
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \tilde{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_{j_1}) \cdots \tilde{\phi}(\xi_1, \xi_{j_{2m}}) \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[ \mathbb{E}\left[ \tilde{\phi}(x, \xi_{j_1}) \cdots \tilde{\phi}(x, \xi_{j_{2m}}) \right] | x = \xi_1 \right] = 0.
\]
Hence,
\[
\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda N}|(\tilde{\phi} \circ \eta^N_\varepsilon)(\xi_1)|^2 \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(4\lambda)^m}{m!N^m} \| \tilde{\phi} \|^2_{2m} (1 + \sharp \mathcal{J}^c),
\]
where $\sharp \mathcal{J}^c$ stands for the cardinality of the complement set $\mathcal{J}^c$.

Suppose $2m \leq N$. It is easy to see that $(j_1, \ldots, j_{2m}) \in \mathcal{J}^c$ if and only if each of $j_k$ appears at least twice and there are at most $m$-distinct $j_k$. Thus one has
\[
\mathcal{J}^c = \cup_{n=1}^m \mathcal{J}_n,
\]
where $\mathcal{J}_n$ is the set of $(j_1, \ldots, j_{2m})$ that each $j_k$ appears at least twice and exactly $n$-integers appear. Clearly, by Stirling’s formula $n^n \leq e^n n! \leq e^{2n} n^n$, we have
\[
\sharp \mathcal{J}_n \leq \left( \frac{N-1}{n} \right)^{2mn} \leq \frac{(N-1)^n}{n!} n^{2m} \leq \frac{e^n(N-1)^n}{n^n} n^{2m} \leq (Ne)^n n^m.
\]
Thus, for $2m \leq N$,
\[
\sharp \mathcal{J}^c \leq \sum_{n=1}^{m} (Ne)^n n^m \leq 2(Ne)^m m^m \leq 2(2e)^m m^m.
\]
Moreover, for $2m > N$, we obviously have
\[
\sharp \mathcal{J}^c \leq N^{2m} \leq N^m (2m)^m \leq N^m (2e)^{m} m^m.
\]
So, for $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{16c+\|\phi\|_{\infty}}$,
\[
\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda N}|(\tilde{\phi} \circ \eta^N_\varepsilon)(\xi_1)|^2 \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (4\lambda)^m \| \tilde{\phi} \|^2_{2m} \left( \frac{1}{m!N^m} + (2e)^m \right) \leq 2 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{-m} = 6.
\]
The proof is complete. \hfill $\Box$

Now we can use the entropy formula in Lemma 4.5 to show the following result.

**Theorem 5.6.** Suppose that $(H^c)$ and $(H^d)$ hold and $\phi$ is bounded measurable. Let $\mu_t^N$ be the law of $X_t^N$ in $\mathbb{R}^{dN}$ and $\mu_t$ be the law of $X_t$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then there is a constant $C = C(\kappa_0, \kappa_1) > 0$ independent of $\phi$ such that for any $t > 0$,
\[
\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^N | \mu_t) \leq e^{C \| \phi \|_{\infty}^2 t} \left( \mathcal{H}(\mu_0^N | \mu_0) + C \| \phi \|_{\infty}^2 t \right).
\]

**Proof.** Let $\eta_{w_s} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{w_s}$ and $B, \sigma$ be defined by (5.1) and (5.2), respectively. By Lemma 4.5 and (1.13), we have
\[
\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^N | \mu_t) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_0^N | \mu_0) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t^N} |\sigma(s, w_s)\sigma(s, w_s)^{-1}(B(s, w_s, \mu_s) - B(s, w_s, \eta_{w_s}))|^2 ds
\]
\[
\leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_0^N | \mu_0) + \frac{\kappa_0}{2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t^N} |B(s, w_s, \mu_s) - B(s, w_s, \eta_{w_s})|^2 ds
\]
\[
\leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_0^N | \mu_0) + \frac{\kappa_0 \kappa_1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t^N} |(\phi_s \circ \mu_s)(w_s^i) - (\phi_s \circ \eta_w)(w_s^i)|^2 ds
\]
\[
= \mathcal{H}(\mu_0^N | \mu_0) + \frac{\kappa_0 \kappa_1}{2} \int_0^t N \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t^N} |(\phi_s \circ \eta_{w_s})(w_s^i)|^2 ds.
\]
Now by the variational representation (4.5) and Lemma 5.5 with \( \lambda = \frac{1}{\log\|\phi\|_{\infty}} \), we further have

\[
\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^N | \mu_t^0)^{\otimes N} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^N | \mu_t^0)^{\otimes N} + \frac{\kappa_0 \kappa_1}{2\lambda} \int_0^t \left[ \mathcal{H}(\mu_s^N | \mu_s^0)^{\otimes N} + \ln \mathbb{E}^{\mu_t^N}_{\otimes N} e^{\lambda N(\varphi_s, \eta_{w_t}) \langle w_t \rangle^2} \right] ds
\]

\[
\leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^0 | \mu_t^0)^{\otimes N} + C\|\phi\|_{\infty}^2 \int_0^t \left[ \mathcal{H}(\mu_s^N | \mu_s^0)^{\otimes N} + \ln 6 \right] ds,
\]

which yields the desired estimate by Gronwall’s inequality. \( \square \)

**Remark 5.7.** By the Pinsker inequality (4.3) and (4.6), we have for any \( k \leq N \),

\[
\|\mu_t^{N,k} - \mu_t^{\otimes k}\|_{\text{var}} \leq \sqrt{2\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^{N,k} | \mu_t^{\otimes k})} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\|\phi\|_{\infty}^2 e^{C\|\phi\|_{\infty}^2 t}}{N} \left( \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^0 | \mu_t^0)^{\otimes N} + C\|\phi\|_{\infty}^2 t \right)}.
\]

Note that when \( F(t, x, r) = r \) is linear and \( \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^{N,k} | \mu_t^{\otimes k}) \leq C_0 k^2 / N \), by a delicate analysis of BBGKY hierarchy, the following sharp estimate is obtained by Lacker (see Theorem 2.10):

\[
\|\mu_t^{N,k} - \mu_t^{\otimes k}\|_{\text{var}} \leq \sqrt{2\mathcal{H}(\mu_t^{N,k} | \mu_t^{\otimes k})} \leq Ck / N.
\]

6. **From weak convergence to strong convergence: Proof of Theorem 1.1**

In this section we show how to use the previous weak convergence result to derive the strong convergence of particle system. The following lemma is the key point.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let \( \phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) be a measurable function. Write

\[
\tilde{\phi}_t(x, y) := \phi_t(x, y) - (\phi_t \otimes \mu_X)(x).
\]

(i) If \( \phi \) is bounded measurable, then there is a constant \( C = C(\kappa_0, \kappa_1) > 0 \) such that for all \( t > 0 \),

\[
\mathbb{E}|(\tilde{\phi}_t \otimes \eta_{X_t})(X_t^{N,1})|^2 \leq C\|\phi\|_{\infty}^2 e^{C\|\phi\|_{\infty}^2 t} \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^N | \mu_t^{\otimes N}) + 1)/N.
\]  

(6.1)

(ii) If \( \phi \) satisfies (1.14), then for any \( T > 0 \),

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |(\tilde{\phi}_t \otimes \eta_{X_t})(X_t^{N,1})|^2 dt \right) = 0.
\]  

(6.2)

**Proof.** (i) By the variational representation (4.5), for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), we have

\[
\varepsilon \mathbb{N} \mathbb{E}|(\tilde{\phi}_t \otimes \eta_{X_t})(X_t^{N,1})|^2 = \varepsilon \mathbb{N} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\phi}_t(w_t, \eta_{w_t})|^2 \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu_t^N | \mu_t^{\otimes N}) + \log \mathbb{E}^{\mu_t^N}_{\otimes N} e^{\varepsilon N|\tilde{\phi}_t(w_t, \eta_{w_t})|^2},
\]

which in turn implies (6.1) by Lemma 5.5 with \( \varepsilon = \frac{1}{\log\|\phi\|_{\infty}} \) and Theorem 5.6.

(ii) By definition we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |(\tilde{\phi}_t \otimes \eta_{X_t})(X_t^{N,1})|^2 dt \right) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \Gamma_t(X_t^{N,1}, X_t^{N,j}, X_t^{N,k}) dt \right),
\]  

(6.3)

where

\[
\Gamma_t(x, y, z) := \tilde{\phi}_t(x, y) \tilde{\phi}_t(x, z).
\]

Let \( \phi_t^\varepsilon(x, y) := (\phi_t * \Gamma^\varepsilon)(x, y) \) be the mollifying approximation of \( \phi_t \) and

\[
\tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon(x, y) := \phi_t^\varepsilon(x, y) - (\phi_t^\varepsilon \otimes \mu_X)(x),
\]

and

\[
\Gamma_t^\varepsilon(x, y, z) := \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon(x, y) \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon(x, z).
\]

Noting that

\[
(\Gamma_t - \Gamma_t^\varepsilon)(x, y, z) = (\tilde{\phi}_t - \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon)(x, y) \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon(x, z) + \phi_t(x, y)(\tilde{\phi}_t - \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon)(x, z),
\]
Thus by \( \text{H"older's inequality, we have} \)
\[
I_{j,k}^N(\varepsilon) : = \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T (\Gamma_t - \Gamma_t^\varepsilon)(X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}, X_{t}^{N,k}) \, dt \right) \\
\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\tilde{\phi}_t - \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon)^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \tilde{\phi}_t \right)^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2} \\
+ \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}_t (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}) \, dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\tilde{\phi}_t - \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon)^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2}.
\]

Using Krylov's estimate (5.16) and as in showing (5.20), we have
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sup_{N,j,k} I_{j,k}^N(\varepsilon) = 0. \tag{6.4}
\]

On the other hand, for fixed \( \varepsilon \), by (5.5) we have
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup_{N \neq j \neq k} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \Gamma_t^\varepsilon (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}, X_{t}^{N,k}) \, dt \right) \\
= \lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \Gamma_t^\varepsilon (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,2}, X_{t}^{N,3}) \, dt \right) \\
= \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \Gamma_t^\varepsilon (X_{t}^{1}, X_{t}^{2}, X_{t}^{3}) \, dt \right) = 0, \tag{6.5}
\]

where the last step is due to that
\[
\mathbb{E} \Gamma_t^\varepsilon (X_{t}^{1}, X_{t}^{2}, X_{t}^{3}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon (x, X_{t}^{1}) \mathbb{E} \tilde{\phi}_t^\varepsilon (x, X_{t}^{2}) ; x = X_{t}^{1} \right] = 0.
\]

Thus by (6.4) and (6.5),
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup_{N \neq j \neq k} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \Gamma_t (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}, X_{t}^{N,k}) \, dt \right) = 0. \tag{6.6}
\]

Moreover, by Krylov’s estimate (5.16) we also have
\[
\sup_{j,k} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \Gamma_t (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}, X_{t}^{N,k}) \, dt \right) \\
\leq \sup_{j,k} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}_t (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}) \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}_t (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,k}) \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
= \sup_j \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}_t (X_{t}^{N,1}, X_{t}^{N,j}) \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty. \tag{6.7}
\]

By (6.3), (6.6) and (6.7), we obtain (6.2). \( \square \)

Now we can give

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let \( X_t \) be the unique strong solution of DDSDE (1.2) starting from \( X_0 \) (see Theorem 4.8). Define
\[
\bar{b}(t,x):=b(t,x,\mu_{X_t})=F(t,x,(\phi_t \circ \mu_{X_t})(x)).
\]
By \((H^0)\), it is easy to see that
\[
b := \|b\|_{L^2_T(\mathbb{H}^n)} < \infty.
\]
Consider the following backward PDE
\[
\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^* \cdot \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}) + b \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \lambda \mathbf{u} + \tilde{b} = 0, \quad \mathbf{u}(T) = 0.
\]
By reversing the time variable and Theorem 2.9, there is a unique solution \(\mathbf{u}\) with the following estimate: for any \(\beta \in (0, \vartheta)\), where \(\vartheta := 1 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q}\), there is a \(C_0 = C_0(T, \kappa_0, d, p, q, \beta) \geq 1\) such that for all \(\lambda \geq C_0 b^{2/\beta}\),
\[
\lambda^{\frac{2}{\beta}(\vartheta - \beta)} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^p_T(C^{1+\beta})} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^q_T(\mathbb{H}^n)} \leq C_0 b.
\]
(6.8)
In particular, one can choose \(\lambda = (2C_0 b)^{2/\beta}\) so that
\[
\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^p_T} \leq \frac{1}{2}.
\]
(6.9)
Now if we define
\[
\Phi(t, x) := x + \mathbf{u}(t, x),
\]
then for each \(t\),
\[
x \mapsto \Phi(t, x) \text{ is a } C^1\text{-diffeomorphism in } \mathbb{R}^d,
\]
and
\[
\|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^p_T} + \|\nabla \Phi^{-1}\|_{L^p_T} \leq 2.
\]
(6.10)
Define
\[
Y_t := \Phi(t, X_t), \quad Y_t^{N,1} := \Phi(t, X_t^{N,1}).
\]
By Itô’s formula (see the proof in Lemma 3.3), we have
\[
dY_t = \lambda \mathbf{u}(t, X_t)dt + \sigma(t, X_t)dW_t^1
\]
and
\[
dY_t^{N,1} = \lambda \mathbf{u}(t, X_t^{N,1})dt + (B \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u})(t, X_t^{N,1})dt + \tilde{\sigma}(t, X_t^{N,1})dW_t^1,
\]
where \(\tilde{\sigma} := \sigma^* \nabla \Phi\) and
\[
B(t, x) := b(t, x, \eta_{X_t^N}) - b(t, x, \mu_{X_t}).
\]
In particular, we have
\[
Y_t^{N,1} - Y_t = \Phi(0, X_0^{N,1}) - \Phi(0, X_0) + \lambda \int_0^t \left[ \mathbf{u}(s, X_s^{N,1}) - \mathbf{u}(s, X_s) \right] ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t (B \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u})(s, X_s^{N,1}) ds + \int_0^t \left[ \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s^{N,1}) - \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s) \right] dW_s.
\]
By Itô’s formula and (6.9), (6.10), we further have
\[
|Y_t^{N,1} - Y_t| \leq 4|X_0^{N,1} - X_0|^2 + \int_0^t |Y_s^{N,1} - Y_s| (\lambda|X_s^{N,1} - X_s| + |B(s, X_s^{N,1})|) ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t |\tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s^{N,1}) - \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s)|^2 ds + M_t,
\]
where \(M_t\) is a continuous local martingale. Note that by (2.10),
\[
|\tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s^{N,1}) - \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s)|^2 \leq 2\ell_{N,0}(s)|X_s^{N,1} - X_s|^2,
\]
where
\[
\ell_{N,0}(s) := \mathcal{M}|\nabla \tilde{\sigma}(s, \cdot)|^2(X_s^{N,1}) + \mathcal{M}|\nabla \tilde{\sigma}(s, \cdot)|^2(X_s) + \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_{\infty}^2 + \lambda + 1.
\]
Thus, by (6.11) and (6.10) we have
\[
|X_t^{N,1} - X_t|^2 \leq C \left( |X_0^{N,1} - X_0|^2 + \int_0^t \ell_{N,\lambda}(s)|X_s^{N,1} - X_s|^2 ds \right. \\
\left. + \int_0^t |B(s, X_s^{N,1})|^2 ds \right) + M_t,
\]
(6.12)
where \( C > 0 \) is an absolute constant. By the chain rule, we have
\[
\mathcal{M}(|\nabla \sigma|^2) \leq 4\mathcal{M}(|\nabla \sigma|^2) + \|\sigma\|^2_{\infty}\mathcal{M}(|\nabla^2 u|^2).
\]
By (2.11) and (1.12), we have
\[
\|\mathcal{M}(|\nabla \sigma|^2)\|_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\nabla \sigma\|^2_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\nabla \sigma\|^2_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \kappa_0,
\]
and by (6.8),
\[
\|\mathcal{M}(|\nabla^2 u|^2)\|_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\nabla^2 u\|^2_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq (C_0)^2.
\]
Since \( (\frac{2}{p}, \frac{2}{q}) \), \((\frac{2}{p}, \frac{2}{p'}) \in \mathcal{C}_2 \), by (5.15) and (3.21), we have for any \( \gamma > 0 \),
\[
A_{\gamma} := \sup_N \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T \ell_{N,\lambda}(s) ds \right\} < \infty.
\]
Thus by (6.12) and stochastic Gronwall's inequality (cf. [39] or [47, Lemma 3.7]), we get for any \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \),
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |X_t^{N,1} - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) \leq C_{\gamma} A_{\gamma + \frac{1}{\gamma}} \left( \mathbb{E} |X_0^{N,1} - X_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |B(s, X_s^{N,1})|^2 ds \right)^{\gamma}. 
\]
(6.13)
Noting that by (1.13),
\[
|B(t, x)| \leq \kappa_1 |(\phi \circ \eta_{X_N})(x) - (\phi \circ \mu_{X_N})(x)| = \kappa_1 |(\tilde{\phi} \circ \eta_{X_N})(x)|,
\]
where
\[
\tilde{\phi}(x, y) := \phi_t(x, y) - (\phi \circ \mu_{X_N})(x),
\]
we further have for any \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \),
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |X_t^{N,1} - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) \leq C_{\gamma} A_{\gamma + \frac{1}{\gamma}} \left( \mathbb{E} |X_0^{N,1} - X_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |(\tilde{\phi} \circ \eta_{X_N})(X_s^{N,1})|^2 ds \right)^{\gamma}.
\]
(i) It follows by (6.2) and the above estimate.
(ii) When \( h \) and \( \phi \) are bounded, by (1.13) one has
\[
|\tilde{b}(t, x)| \leq \|\tilde{h}\|_{\infty} + \kappa_1 \|\phi\|_{\infty}.
\]
Thus for any \( \delta > 2 \), one can choose \( q, p \) in (6.8) close to \( \infty \) so that \( \theta = \frac{2}{q} = 1 - \frac{2}{q} = \frac{1}{p} \) and
\[
\bar{b} := \|\tilde{b}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(1 + \|\phi\|_{\infty}).
\]
By (5.15), (3.22) and \( \lambda = (2C_{\phi})^{2/\delta} \), we have
\[
A_{\gamma} := \sup_N \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \gamma \int_0^T \ell_{N,\lambda}(s) ds \right\} \leq C e^{C_{\phi} e^{2/\delta}} \leq C e^{C \|\phi\|_{\infty}^d}.
\]
Estimate (1.17) now follows by the above estimates and (6.1).
7. Moderate interaction particle system: Proof of Theorem 1.3

We consider the following McKean-Vlasov type approximation for density-dependent SDE (1.4):
\[
dX^\varepsilon_t = F(t, X^\varepsilon_t, (\phi_\varepsilon \ast \rho^\varepsilon_t)(X^\varepsilon_t))dt + \sigma(t, X^\varepsilon_t)dW^1_t, \quad X^\varepsilon_0 = X_0,
\]
where \(\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-d}\phi(x/\varepsilon)\), and \(\phi\) is a bounded probability density function with support in the unit ball, \(F\) is bounded measurable and \(\rho^\varepsilon_t\) is the density of \(X^\varepsilon_t\).

We first show the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.1.** For any \(T > 0\), \(\beta \in (0, \gamma_0)\) and \(\gamma \in (0, 1)\), there is a constant \(C = C(T, \beta, \gamma, \Theta) > 0\) such that for all \(\varepsilon \in (0, 1)\),
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X^\varepsilon_t - X_t|^{2\gamma} \right) \leq C\varepsilon^{2\beta\gamma}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \(X_t\) be the unique strong solution of DDSDE (1.4) starting from \(X_0\). Define \(\bar{b}(t, x) := F(t, x, \rho_t(x))\).

Consider the following backward PDE
\[
\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^* \cdot \nabla^2 u) + \bar{b} \cdot \nabla u - \lambda u + \bar{b} = 0, \quad u(T) = 0.
\]
As in the proof of Theorem 1.1 we construct a \(C^1\)-diffeomorphism
\[
\Phi(t, x) := x + u(t, x),
\]
and define
\[
Y^\varepsilon_t := \Phi(t, X^\varepsilon_t), \quad Y_t := \Phi(t, X_t).
\]
By generalized Itô’s formula, we have
\[
dY_t = \lambda u(t, X_t)dt + \tilde{\sigma}(t, X_t)dW^1_t
\]
and
\[
dY^\varepsilon_t = \lambda u(t, X^\varepsilon_t)dt + (B_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u)(t, X^\varepsilon_t)dt + \tilde{\sigma}(t, X^\varepsilon_t)dW^1_t,
\]
where \(\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma^* \nabla \Phi\) and
\[
B_\varepsilon(t, x) := F(t, x, (\phi_\varepsilon \ast \rho^\varepsilon_t)(x)) - F(t, x, \rho_t(x)).
\]
In particular, we have
\[
Y^\varepsilon_t - Y_t = \lambda \int_0^t [u(s, X^\varepsilon_s) - u(s, X_s)]ds + \int_0^t (B_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u)(s, X^\varepsilon_s)ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t \left[ \tilde{\sigma}(s, X^\varepsilon_s) - \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s) \right]dW^1_s.
\]
By Itô’s formula and (6.9), we further have
\[
|Y^\varepsilon_t - Y_t|^2 \leq \int_0^t |Y^\varepsilon_s - Y_s| (\lambda |X^\varepsilon_s - X_s| + |B_\varepsilon(s, X^\varepsilon_s)|)ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t |\tilde{\sigma}(s, X^\varepsilon_s) - \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s)|^2 ds + M_t,
\]
(7.1)
where $M_t$ is a continuous local martingale. It is completely same as in (6.13), we have
\[
\mathbb{E}|X_t^{N,1} - X_t|^2 \lesssim \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |B_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 ds \right)^\gamma.
\] (7.2)

On the other hand, for any $p > d$, by Lemma 4.7 we have
\[
\|\rho_t^\varepsilon - \rho_t\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim C \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{d}{p})} \|B_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^p} ds.
\]

By the Lipschitz assumption of $F$ in $r$, we have
\[
\|B_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^p} \leq \|B_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\phi_\varepsilon \* \rho_s^\varepsilon - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\rho_s^\varepsilon - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty} + \|\phi_\varepsilon \* \rho_s - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty}.
\]

For any $\beta \in (0, \gamma_0)$, noting that by (3.17),
\[
\|\rho_s(\cdot + y) - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} |y|^\beta s^{-\beta/2},
\]
we have
\[
\|\phi_\varepsilon \* \rho_s - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\rho_s(\cdot + y) - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty} \cdot |\phi_\varepsilon(y)| dy \\
\lesssim s^{-\beta/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^\beta \cdot |\phi_\varepsilon(y)| dy \lesssim s^{-\beta/2} \|\phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim s^{-\beta/2} \epsilon^\beta.
\] (7.3)

Hence,
\[
\|\rho_t^\varepsilon - \rho_t\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim C \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{d}{p})} (\|\rho_s^\varepsilon - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty} + s^{-\beta/2} \epsilon^\beta) ds.
\]

By Gronwall’s inequality of Volterra’s type, we have
\[
\|\rho_t^\varepsilon - \rho_t\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim C \epsilon^\beta.
\] (7.4)

Note that by (1.13), (7.3) and (7.4),
\[
\mathbb{E}|B_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 \leq \kappa_1^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi_\varepsilon \* \rho_s^\varepsilon(x) - \rho_s(x)|^2 \rho_s^\varepsilon(x) dx \\
\leq \kappa_1^2 \|\phi_\varepsilon \* \rho_s^\varepsilon - \rho_s\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq C \epsilon^{2\beta}(1 + s^{-\beta}).
\]

Substituting this into (7.2), we obtain the desired estimate. \hfill \Box

Now we can give

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** It is a direct combination of Lemma 7.1 and (ii) of Theorem 1.1. \hfill \Box
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