

SEQUENTIAL PROPAGATION OF CHAOS

KAI DU, YIFAN JIANG, AND XIAOCHEN LI

ABSTRACT. A new class of particle systems with sequential interaction is proposed to approximate the McKean–Vlasov process that originally arises as the limit of the mean-field interacting particle system. The weighted empirical measure of this particle system is proved to converge to the law of the McKean–Vlasov process as the system grows. Based on the Wasserstein metric, quantitative propagation of chaos results are obtained for two cases: the finite time estimates under the monotonicity condition and the uniform in time estimates under the dissipation and the non-degenerate conditions. Numerical experiments are implemented to demonstrate the theoretical results.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper studies the asymptotic behavior of a particle system with sequential interaction. The major feature of the system is that each particle is influenced only by the particles with smaller ordinal numbers. Specifically, the n -th particle process X^n ($n \geq 2$) is determined recursively by

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t^n = b(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) dW_t^n; \\ \mu_t^n = \mu_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{X_t^n} - \mu_t^{n-1}), \end{cases}$$

with $X_t^1 \equiv X_0^1$ and $\mu_t^1 = \delta_{X_t^1}$. Here, the update rate $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a decreasing positive sequence with $\alpha_1 = 1$, W^n are independent multidimensional Brownian motions, and the initial data $X_0^n \sim \mu_0$ are i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables independent of $\{W^n\}_{n \geq 1}$. Evidently, μ_t^n is a weighted empirical measure of X_t^1, \dots, X_t^n ; if we take $\alpha_n = 1/n$, μ_t^n is the classical empirical measure.

As the interaction is asymmetric and heterogeneous, the model (1.1) is in sharp contrast to the corresponding mean-field interacting system $\{X^{n,N} : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ given by

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t^{n,N} = b(t, X_t^{n,N}, \mu_t^N) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{n,N}, \mu_t^N) dW_t^n, \\ \mu_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{X_t^{n,N}}. \end{cases}$$

It is known from the theory of propagation of chaos (PoC for short, cf. McKean (1967); Sznitman (1991)) that, as N increases, the empirical measure of the system (1.2) may converge to the law of a McKean–Vlasov process described by

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t = b(t, X_t, \mu_t) dt + \sigma(t, X_t, \mu_t) dW_t, \\ \mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t) := \text{Law}(X_t). \end{cases}$$

This paper then obtains a similar property for the system (1.1): as n tends to infinity, the weighted empirical measure μ_t^n as well as the law of X_t^n converges to μ_t defined in (1.3) in a very general setting.

Our primary motivation of introducing the particle system (1.1) is to construct a computational friendly approximation to McKean–Vlasov processes and the associated nonlinear Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations (cf. Frank (2005)). The McKean–Vlasov process

Key words and phrases. propagation of chaos, particle system, sequential interaction, McKean–Vlasov process, convergence rate.

was initially proposed by McKean (1966) to give a probabilistic interpretation for non-linear Vlasov equations, and has found a wide range of applications (see Carmona and Delarue (2018); Chaintron and Diez (2021) and references therein). Although the PoC property is widely applied in computational problems for McKean–Vlasov processes (see Bossy and Talay (1997); Bao et al. (2021); dos Reis et al. (2022), etc.), the system (1.2) itself is fully coupled and N -dependent. To achieve certain numerical accuracy, a sufficiently large N has to be set a priori and the change of N will lead to a recomputation of the whole particle system. On the other hand, thanks to its recursive form, the system (1.1) can be simply computed particle-by-particle (or batch-by-batch), resulting in a great reduction of the computational burden. More significantly, as more and more particles are added (without affecting existing particles), the approximation accuracy is continuously improved until reaching a desired level; in other words, the required number of particles no longer needs to be specified in advance.

Particle systems with heterogeneous interaction have attracted a growing interest in recent years. The classical mean-field framework in which the particles are interacted with each other has been extended to allow interactions described by general networks. In most models, the interactions are encoded in a graph sequence, i.e., two particles are interacting if and only if they are connected in the underlying graph (see Delarue (2017); Bhamidi et al. (2019); Bayraktar et al. (2020); Jabin et al. (2021) and references therein). We remark that, in those models, the degree of each particle (as a node in the graph) tends to infinity as the system size N increases. This is essentially different from our model in which the degree of each particle is fixed and independent of the system size. Some works consider CDF-based or position-based interacting particle systems (see Jourdain and Malrieu (2008); Andreis et al. (2019) etc.), where the interactions are time-varying. To our best knowledge, it seems to be no discussion on particle systems like (1.1) in the literature. Apart from the computational consideration, the model (1.1) and its extensions are expected to have applications in the study of complex networks (cf. Arenas et al. (2008)), which are left to the future work.

The main results of this paper give quantitative PoC estimates for the system (1.1) in two cases: finite time estimates under the monotonicity condition (see Theorem 2.1), and the uniform in time estimates under the dissipation and the non-degenerate conditions (see Theorem 2.2). The difference between measures is quantified by the Wasserstein distance. The proofs make use of coupling arguments: we adopt McKean’s argument of synchronous coupling (cf. McKean (1967); Sznitman (1991)) in the finite time case, and for uniform in time estimates, we apply the technique of reflection coupling that was developed in Eberle et al. (2019); Luo and Wang (2016); Durmus et al. (2020); Liu et al. (2021). The new challenge is caused by the special interaction mechanism of our model. To see this, let x_n denote the quantity to be estimated for the n -th particle. In most existing models (usually an N -particle system), one may obtain a relation of the form $x_n \leq f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$, then with the help of certain structural features like exchangeability or similarity one can derive some upper bound for x_n or some combination of x_1, \dots, x_N . However, the corresponding relation in our model has a recursive form, say, $x_n \leq f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, which cannot be handled analogously. For this, new estimates for recursive inequalities are proved (see Subsection 3.1). Moreover, we derive a new estimate for the convergence rate of weighted empirical measures of an i.i.d. sequence in the Wasserstein distance (see Lemma 3.3). The results for classical empirical measures are rich in the literature, see, for example, Horowitz and Karandikar (1994); Fournier and Guillin (2015); Ambrosio et al. (2019) and references therein.

Although our discussion focuses on (1.1), the results are still valid for some similar models by analogous arguments. For instance, we can consider the model where the n -th

particle process is governed by

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^n = b(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^n) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^n) dW_t^n, \\ \mu_t^n = \mu_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{X_t^n} - \mu_t^{n-1}); \end{cases}$$

comparing with (1.1), the measure μ_t^n takes the place of μ_t^{n-1} in the equation for X^n . Also, one can add the particles batch-by-batch rather than particle-by-particle: the n -th batch $\{X^{i,n} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ can be constructed as

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^{i,n} = b(t, X_t^{i,n}, \mu_t^n) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{i,n}, \mu_t^n) dW_t^{i,n}, \\ \mu_t^n = \mu_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_t^{i,n}} - \mu_t^{n-1} \right). \end{cases}$$

The batch model could be more efficient in numerical computation.

Remarkably, our model exhibits a comparable convergence rate with the classical mean-field system, but with less computation than the latter. This is not just indicated by our theoretical results but also demonstrated by numerical experiments.

Example 1.1 (Curie–Weiss mean-field lattice model). Consider the equation

$$dX_t = [-\beta(X_t^3 - X_t) + \beta K \mathbb{E}X_t] dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad X_0 = 1.$$

We take $\beta = 1$, $K = 1/2$, $T = 3$ and $\sigma = 1$, and numerically compare the performance of the classical PoC method and our sequential PoC method. Figure 1.1 (left) shows the comparison of convergence rates between these two methods. In addition, we draw a reference line with slope $-1/2$ (in the log-log diagram) to indicate the convergence rate. Figure 1.1 (right) shows the approximate density functions simulated by the sequential PoC with different numbers of particles N . As N increases, the approximate density function is gradually updated, and no longer changes drastically when N runs over 10^5 , resulting in a fine approximation to the true density.




FIGURE 1.1. Curie–Weiss mean-field lattice model.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the main results and some remarks. Auxiliary lemmas are proved in Section 3. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the proofs of the main results, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. More numerical examples are given in Section 6. In Appendix A, we discuss the convergence in the Wasserstein distance for empirical measures on the path space.

We end the introduction with some notations. Denote by $|\cdot|$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the Euclidean norm and the inner product, respectively, in the Euclidean spaces, and by $\|\cdot\|$ the Frobenius

norm of a matrix. Let $\mathcal{P}(E)$ be the space of all Borel probability measures on a normed space $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$. The p -Wasserstein distance between $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) := \inf \{ (\mathbb{E}[\|\xi - \eta\|_E^p])^{1/p} : \mathcal{L}(\xi) = \mu, \mathcal{L}(\eta) = \nu \}.$$

Moreover, for an increasing concave function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{W}_f(\mu, \nu) := \inf \{ \mathbb{E}[f(\|\xi - \eta\|_E)] : \mathcal{L}(\xi) = \mu, \mathcal{L}(\eta) = \nu \}.$$

Denote by \mathcal{P}_p the metric space of all probability measures $\mu \in \mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|\mu\|_p := [\int |x|^p \mu(dx)]^{1/p} < \infty$, equipped with the p -Wasserstein distance.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Throughout this paper, we fix a *decreasing* positive sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ with $\alpha_1 = 1$. α_n is the update rate of our weighted empirical measures. We denote

$$\alpha_\infty := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n, \quad \underline{\alpha} := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}}{\alpha_n^2}, \quad \bar{\alpha} := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}}{\alpha_n^2}.$$

In the following, we will frequently encounter the weighted sum s_n recursively given by

$$s_n = s_{n-1} + \alpha_n(x_n - s_{n-1}).$$

This gives

$$s_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i},$$

where $w_1 = 1$ and $w_n = \alpha_n \prod_{i=2}^n (1 - \alpha_i)^{-1}$ for $n \geq 2$. For simplicity, we denote such a weighted sum s_n by $\mathcal{K}_n(x^i)$.

We discuss the sequential PoC (SPoC) in both finite horizon and infinite horizon.

2.1. Finite time SPoC. We fix constants $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$.

Assumption 1 (monotonicity). *There exists a constant $L \geq 0$ such that*

$$2\langle x - y, b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \nu) \rangle + (2p - 1) \|\sigma(t, x, \mu) - \sigma(t, y, \nu)\|^2 \leq L[|x - y|^2 + \mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu)^2],$$

$$|b(t, 0, \mu)|^2 + \|\sigma(t, 0, \mu)\|^2 \leq L[1 + \|\mu\|_2^2]$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2$.

This monotonicity condition ensures the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions of (1.1) and (4.2) (cf. Wang (2018)). Extensive results on strong well-posedness of McKean–Vlasov SDEs can be found in Sznitman (1991); Buckdahn et al. (2017); Bauer et al. (2018); Mishura and Veretennikov (2020); Hammersley et al. (2021); Du et al. (2021) and references therein.

Our first main result is the sequential propagation of chaos in a finite horizon, i.e., the weighted empirical measure as well as the law of X_t^n converges to the law of the corresponding McKean–Vlasov process.

Theorem 2.1. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied, $p \geq 1$, $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_r$ with $r > 2p + (p - 1)d$, and*

$$\gamma := \frac{p}{2 + (1 - 1/p)d}.$$

Let X^n be the solutions of (1.1) and $\mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t)$ given by (1.3) with the initial distribution μ_0 . Then

(1) if $\bar{\alpha} < \gamma^{-1} \wedge (2 - \alpha_\infty)$, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)^{2p} + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)^{2p}] \leq C e^{CT} \alpha_n^\gamma;$$

(2) if $\gamma^{-1} \leq \bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, we have, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}\gamma$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)^{2p} + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)^{2p}] \leq C e^{CT} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta \alpha_i);$$

(3) if $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, we have, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}\gamma \wedge 2\gamma$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)^{2p} + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)^{2p}] \leq C e^{CT} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta \alpha_i).$$

Here, the constant $C > 0$ depends only on $d, p, L, \|\mu_0\|_r$.

Remark 2.1. The case $2 - \alpha_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha} < 2$ never appears because $\bar{\alpha} = 0$ as long as $\alpha_\infty > 0$.

Remark 2.2. The estimate gives an elaborate characterization on how the stepsize affects the asymptotic behavior of the system. The empirical measure μ_t^n converges to μ_t as long as $\alpha_\infty = 0$ and $\sum \alpha_n = \infty$; even if not so, we still give an upper bound for the quantities concerned. The convergence may fail if $\alpha_\infty > 0$ or $\sum \alpha_n < \infty$: intuitively, $\alpha_\infty > 0$ (or $\sum \alpha_n < \infty$) means that the particles with large (or small) ordinals occupy too much weight in μ_t^n . The following example may demonstrate this point: define a sequence of measures μ_n recursively as $\mu_n = \mu_{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{w_n} - \mu_{n-1})$ and $\mu_0 = \delta_0$, where $w_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are i.i.d. The expected limit of μ_n is the standard Gaussian measure (e.g., taking $\alpha = 1/n$); however, for $\xi_n = \int x \mu_n(dx)$, by a simple computation one can see that $\mathbb{E}\xi_n = 0$ but $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|\xi_n|^2 > 0$ whenever $\alpha_\infty > 0$ or $\sum \alpha_n < \infty$; in other words, ξ_n never converges (in L^2) to zero, thus μ_n does not converge to the standard Gaussian measure.

Remark 2.3. A typical choice of stepsize is $\alpha_n \sim n^{-r}$ with some $r \in (0, 1]$. In the case $r < 1$, one has that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)^{2p}] = \mathcal{O}(n^{-2rp/(d+4)}).$$

If $2p > (d+4)/r$, it follows from the Borel–Cantelli lemma that $\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)$ converges to zero almost surely. In contrast, in the case $\alpha_n = 1/n$ (associated with the classical empirical measures), we only have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)^{2p}] = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\varepsilon}) \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon < 1$$

even p is large. So, we cannot conclude the almost sure convergence from estimating a higher moment.

Remark 2.4. Notice that $\mu^n = (\mu_t^n)_{t \leq T}$ and $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \leq T}$ are probability measures on the path space $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. By the sequential PoC and convergence of empirical measures on the path space, one can actually discuss the convergence of measures on the path space. For instance, by taking $\alpha_n = 1/n$, we can show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \mu)^2] \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n}\right),$$

for the Wasserstein distance \mathcal{W}_2 on $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d))$, see Corollary A.1 for details.

Remark 2.5. From the proof of Theorem 2.1, one can see that if additionally assuming

$$\langle x - y, b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \mu) \rangle \leq -L_0|x - y|^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2$$

with a sufficiently large constant $L_0 > 0$, then the estimate can be uniform in time. Of course, the additional condition would be too restrictive in applications, so we discuss the uniform in time PoC under some other conditions in the next subsection.

2.2. Uniform in time SPoC. In this case, the diffusion term is required to be non-degenerate and free of the law. To this end, we modify (1.1) to the following form:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t^n = b(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^n) dW_t^n + dB_t^n, \\ \mu_t^n = \mu_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{X_t^n} - \mu_t^{n-1}), \quad n \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

with $X_t^1 \equiv X_0^1$ and $\mu_t^1 = \delta_{X_t^1}$. Here, $\{W^n\}$ and $\{B^n\}$ are two independent sequences of multidimensional Brownian motions, the initial data $X_0^n \sim \mu_0$ are i.i.d. random variables independent of $\{W^n, B^n\}_{n \geq 1}$. The corresponding McKean–Vlasov process is given by

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t = b(t, X_t, \mu_t) dt + \sigma(t, X_t) dW_t + dB_t, \\ \mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t), \end{cases}$$

where W and B are independent Brownian motions.

Assumption 2 (dissipativity). *There is an increasing function $\kappa : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(r) =: \kappa_\infty > 0$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r \cdot \kappa(r) = 0$ such that*

$$\langle x - y, b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \mu) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y)\|^2 \leq -\kappa(\|x - y\|) \|x - y\|^2$$

for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$.

Define an increasing function $f \in C^2[0, \infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ and the derivative

$$f'(r) = \frac{1}{2} \int_r^{+\infty} s \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_r^s \tau \kappa(\tau) d\tau\right) ds.$$

It is shown in Lemma 5.1 that f is concave. This function has been used in Liu et al. (2021) to study the mean-field particle system.

Assumption 3 (weak interaction). *There exists a constant $0 < \eta < 1/f'(0)$ such that, for any $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_1$, it holds*

$$|b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, x, \nu)| \leq \eta \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \nu).$$

The second main result is the following uniform in time PoC: the law of X_t^n as well as the (weighted) empirical measure μ_t^n converges uniformly in time to $\mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t)$.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. Let (X_t^n, μ_t^n) and (X_t, μ_t) satisfy (2.1) and (2.2), respectively, with a common initial law μ_0 . In addition, we assume that*

$$(2.3) \quad M_p := \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}|X_t|^p < \infty \quad \text{with some } p > d + 2.$$

Then,

(1) if $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_f(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)] \leq C \alpha_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}};$$

(2) if $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, we have, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \frac{\alpha}{d+2} \wedge \frac{2}{d+2}$,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_f(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)] \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta \alpha_i).$$

Remark 2.6. The estimate is still valid with $\mathcal{W}_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ in place of $\mathcal{W}_f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and with a new constant C . Indeed, Lemma 5.1 shows $f(r) \geq r/\kappa_\infty$, so $\mathcal{W}_1(\cdot, \cdot) \leq \kappa_\infty \mathcal{W}_f(\cdot, \cdot)$ if $\kappa_\infty < +\infty$. In the case $\kappa_\infty = +\infty$, one can truncate the function $\kappa(\cdot)$, namely, by defining $\kappa^\lambda(r) := \kappa(r) \wedge \lambda$. This will change the function f and increase $f'(0)$, but by taking λ large enough, one can again ensure $f'(0) < 1/\eta$ so that Assumption 3 is satisfied. Finally, we get the desired estimate by using $\kappa^\lambda(\cdot)$ instead of $\kappa(\cdot)$.

Remark 2.7. The uniform L^p -boundedness (2.3) is used to obtain the convergence rate of empirical measures in the Wasserstein distance. Of course, this condition can be ensured by imposing some growth condition on the coefficients. For example, one can assume additionally that there are constants $K_0 < 2(\kappa_\infty - \eta)/(p - 2)$ and $K_1 \geq 0$ such that $\sup_{t \geq 0} |b(t, 0, \delta_0)| \leq K_1$ and

$$\|\sigma(t, x)\|^2 \leq K_0|x|^2 + K_1, \quad \forall t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Indeed, this along with Assumptions 2 and 3 implies that

$$\langle x, b(t, x, \delta_0) \rangle + \frac{p-1}{2} \|\sigma(t, x)\|^2 \leq -\eta_1|x|^2 + K_2$$

with some $\eta_1 > \eta$ and $K_2 > 0$, and (2.3) can be derived by Itô's formula. Moreover, the index p can be reduced based on further improvement of Lemma 3.3.

Remark 2.8. Under Assumptions 2 and 3, one can actually obtain the exponential contractivity of the McKean–Vlasov process (2.2) by the reflection coupling method. Specifically, for the solutions μ_t, ν_t of (2.2) with the initial distributions μ_0, ν_0 , respectively, one can prove that

$$\mathcal{W}_f(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq e^{-(f'(0)^{-1} - \eta)t} \mathcal{W}_f(\mu_0, \nu_0).$$

See Remark 5.1 for further explanation. Similar results can be found in Liu et al. (2021, Corollary 2.8) where the noise is additive. For time homogeneous processes, this estimate implies the existence and uniqueness of the invariant probability measure.

Example 2.1. Consider the Curie–Weiss mean-field lattice model

$$dX_t = [-\beta(X_t^3 - X_t) + \beta K \mathbb{E}X_t] dt + dW_t.$$

This model is ferromagnetic or anti-ferromagnetic according to $K > 0$ or $K < 0$. By an elementary calculation, Assumption 2 is satisfied by taking $\kappa(r) = \beta(\frac{r^2}{4} - 1)$, and Assumption 3 holds if

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} &> \frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} r \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{2} \int_0^r \frac{s^3 - 4s}{4} ds\right) dr \\ &= \beta e^{\beta/2} \int_{-1}^{+\infty} e^{-\beta x^2/2} dx = \sqrt{2\pi\beta} e^{\beta/2} \Phi(\sqrt{\beta}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi(x)$ is the distribution function of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

3. AUXILIARY LEMMAS

3.1. Estimates for recursive inequalities.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 0}, \{B_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be two decreasing positive sequences and $\varepsilon > 0$. We write*

$$A_n = A_0 \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_i), \quad B_n = B_0 \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \varepsilon \beta_i),$$

where $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in (0, \varepsilon^{-1})$. Let $\{s_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a nonnegative sequence satisfying

$$s_n \leq (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_n) s_{n-1} + \alpha_n B_n.$$

Then, if

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} < 1,$$

there exists $C > 0$ such that $s_n \leq C B_n$; and if

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} > 1,$$

there exists $C > 0$ such that $s_n \leq C A_n$.

Remark 3.1. The estimate will fail when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} = 1$. For example, we take $\alpha_n = \beta_n = n^{-1}$, then by direct calculation $s_n \sim n^{-1} \ln n$. Thus, neither $s_n \leq CA_n$ nor $s_n \leq CB_n$ holds.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$s_n = (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_n) s_{n-1} + \alpha_n B_n.$$

Let $t_n = s_n A_n^{-1}$, and we get

$$t_n = t_{n-1} + \alpha_n A_n^{-1} B_n.$$

Notice that for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^i \alpha_j A_j^{-1} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (A_i^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_{j+1} B_j = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (B_1 - B_i).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} t_n &= t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i \\ &= t_0 + \alpha_1 A_1^{-1} B_1 + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^i \alpha_j A_j^{-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j A_j^{-1} \right) B_i \\ (3.1) \quad &= t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^i \alpha_j A_j^{-1} \right) (B_i - B_{i+1}) + \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j A_j^{-1} B_n \\ &= t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_{i+1} (A_i^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) B_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (A_n^{-1} - A_0^{-1}) B_n \\ &= t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_{i+1} A_i^{-1} B_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (A_n^{-1} B_n - A_0^{-1} B_1). \end{aligned}$$

In the case of $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} < 1$, there exist $N, \delta > 0$ such that $\beta_{i+1} < (1 - \delta) \alpha_i$ for any $i \geq N$. By (3.1), for any n we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i \leq (1 - \delta) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} A_n^{-1} B_n + \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_{i+1} A_i^{-1} B_i,$$

and hence

$$t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i \leq C(1 + A_n^{-1} B_n) \leq C A_n^{-1} B_n.$$

This implies

$$s_n = A_n t_n = A_n \left(t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i \right) \leq C B_n.$$

In the case of $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} > 1$, there exist $N, \delta > 0$ such that $\beta_{i+1} > (1 + \delta) \alpha_i$ for any $i \geq N$. By (3.1), for any n we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i \geq (1 + \delta) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i + \alpha_n A_n^{-1} B_n - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} A_0^{-1} B_1 - \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_{i+1} A_i^{-1} B_i,$$

and hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i A_i^{-1} B_i \leq C.$$

Similarly, we get

$$s_n \leq CA_n.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 3.1. *Let α_n be a decreasing positive sequence with $\alpha_1 = 1$. We write $\alpha_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n$, $\bar{\alpha} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}}{\alpha_n^2}$, and $\underline{\alpha} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}}{\alpha_n^2}$. We set $w_1 = 1$ and define w_n recursively by*

$$\alpha_n = \frac{w_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}.$$

If $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\theta_n := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^2} \leq C\alpha_n;$$

if $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, then for any $0 < \varepsilon < 2 \wedge \underline{\alpha}$ there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\theta_n \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\varepsilon \alpha_n < 1\}}).$$

Proof. We have

$$\theta_n = [1 - (2 - \alpha_n)\alpha_n]\theta_n + \alpha_n^2.$$

First, we assume $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$. Let $\varepsilon \in (\bar{\alpha}, 2 - \alpha_\infty)$ and assume $\varepsilon \alpha_n < 1$ and $\varepsilon < 2 - \alpha_n$ for any $n \geq N$. We define

$$(3.2) \quad s_n = (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_n)s_n + \alpha_n^2, \quad s_N = \theta_N.$$

Then, for any $n \geq N$ we have $\theta_n \leq s_n$. Notice that by setting $B_n = \alpha_n$ we have $\beta_n = \frac{\alpha_{n-1} - \alpha_n}{\varepsilon \alpha_{n-1}}$, and we further derive

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} = \bar{\alpha} < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 we obtain for any $n \geq N$

$$\theta_n \leq s_n \leq CB_n = C\alpha_n.$$

For the case $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, let $0 < \varepsilon < 2 \wedge \underline{\alpha}$. Define s_n as in (3.2). Then similarly we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} = \underline{\alpha} > \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 we obtain for any $n \geq N$

$$\theta_n \leq s_n \leq C \prod_{i=N}^n (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_n).$$

The proof is complete. \square

3.2. Wasserstein convergence of weighted empirical measures. The convergence of (unweighted) empirical measures in the Wasserstein distance has been extensively investigated in the literature (see Horowitz and Karandikar (1994); Fournier and Guillin (2015); Ambrosio et al. (2019) and references therein). Here we prove an estimate for weighted empirical measures, based on the following density coupling lemma that can be proved analogously as Horowitz and Karandikar (1994, Lemma 2.2).

Lemma 3.2. *Let f and g be probability density functions on \mathbb{R}^d such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^r [f(x) + g(x)] dx < \infty, \quad r \geq 1,$$

and define $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$ and $\nu(dx) = g(x) dx$. Then one has

$$\mathcal{W}_r(\mu, \nu)^r \leq C_r \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^r |f(x) - g(x)| dx.$$

Then we have the following convergence result.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $r \in [1, \infty)$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$ and ξ_n be i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables and $m := \mathcal{L}(\xi_1) \in \mathcal{P}_q$ with $q > rp + (p-1)d$, and let*

$$m_n := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \delta_{\xi_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i} \quad \text{with } w_n > 0, n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then there is a constant C depending only on r, p, d and $\|\xi_1\|_{L^q}$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_r(m_n, m)^{rp}] \leq C \theta_n^{\gamma_{r,p,d}}$$

with

$$\theta_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^2}, \quad \gamma_{r,p,d} = \frac{rp}{2r + 2(1-1/p)d}.$$

Remark 3.2. Define α_n as the same way in Corollary 3.1. Then we have if $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_r(m_n, m)^{rp}] \leq C \alpha_n^{\gamma_{r,p,d}};$$

if $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, then for any $0 < \varepsilon < 2 \wedge \underline{\alpha}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_r(m_n, m)^{rp}] \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \varepsilon \alpha_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\varepsilon \alpha_i < 1\}})^{\gamma_{r,p,d}}.$$

Proof. Let ϕ_σ be the p.d.f. of the normal distribution $\Phi_\sigma = N(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$, and define mollified measures

$$m_n^\sigma := \Phi_\sigma * m_n, \quad m^\sigma := \Phi_\sigma * m.$$

Denote the densities of m^σ and μ_n^σ by π^σ and π_n^σ respectively. Then $\pi_n^\sigma(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\pi_n^\sigma(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \phi_\sigma(x - \xi^i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i} =: \mathcal{K}_n(\phi_\sigma(x - \xi^i)).$$

Since $q > rp + (p-1)d$, we notice

$$(1 + |x|)^{r - \frac{q}{p}} \in L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $1/p + 1/p^* = 1$. From Lemma 3.2 and Hölder's inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_r(m_n^\sigma, m^\sigma)^{rp} &\leq \left(C_r \int |x|^r |\pi_n^\sigma(x) - \pi^\sigma(x)| dx \right)^p \\ (3.3) \quad &\leq C_r \|(1 + |x|)^{r - q/p}\|_{L^{p^*}}^p \|(1 + |x|)^{q/p} |\pi_n^\sigma(x) - \pi^\sigma(x)|\|_{L^p}^p \\ &\leq C_{r,p,q,d} \int (1 + |x|)^q |\pi_n^\sigma(x) - \pi^\sigma(x)|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

For any i.i.d. random variables η^i with zero mean, by Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{K}_n(\eta_i)|^p &= \frac{1}{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^p} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \eta_i \right|^p \leq \frac{C_p}{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^p} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 |\eta_i|^2 \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq C_p \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^p} \mathbb{E} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 |\eta_i|^2 \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq C_p \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^p} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 |\eta_i|^p \right] \\ &= C_p \theta_n^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} |\eta_1|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\pi_n^\sigma(x) - \pi^\sigma(x)|^p &= \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{K}_n(\phi_\sigma(x - \xi^i) - \mathbb{E}\phi_\sigma(x - \xi))|^p \\ &\leq C_p \theta_n^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}|\phi_\sigma(x - \xi)|^p. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that $\phi_\sigma^p(x) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{pd}{2}} \sigma^{-pd} e^{-\frac{p|x|^2}{2\sigma^2}} = p^{-\frac{d}{2}} (2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}(1-p)} \sigma^{d(1-p)} \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{p}}(x)$, and we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\phi_\sigma(x - \xi)|^p &= \int \phi_\sigma^p(x - y) m(dy) \\ &= p^{-\frac{d}{2}} (2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}(1-p)} \sigma^{d(1-p)} \int \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{p}}(x - y) m(dy) \\ &= C_{p,d} \sigma^{d(1-p)} \int \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{p}}(x - y) m(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Plug above estimates into (3.3), then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_r(m_n^\sigma, m^\sigma)^{rp}] &\leq C_{r,p,q,d} \int (1 + |x|)^q \mathbb{E}|\pi_n^\sigma(x) - \pi^\sigma(x)|^p dx \\ &\leq C_{r,p,q,d} \sigma^{d(1-p)} \theta_n^{\frac{p}{2}} \iint (1 + |x|)^q \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{p}}(x - y) m(dy) dx \\ &\leq C_{r,p,q,d} \sigma^{d(1-p)} \theta_n^{\frac{p}{2}} \iint (1 + |x| + |y|)^q \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{p}}(x) dx m(dy) \\ &\leq C_{r,p,q,d} \sigma^{d(1-p)} \theta_n^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}(1 + |\xi_1|)^q. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it is easily seen that

$$\mathcal{W}_r(m_n^\sigma, m_n)^{rp} + \mathcal{W}_r(m^\sigma, m)^{rp} \leq C \sigma^{rp}.$$

Noticing

$$\mathcal{W}_r(m_n, m) \leq \mathcal{W}_r(m_n, m_n^\sigma) + \mathcal{W}_r(m_n^\sigma, m^\sigma) + \mathcal{W}_r(m^\sigma, m),$$

we derive

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_r(m_n, m)^{rp}] \leq C(\sigma^{rp} + \sigma^{d(1-p)} \theta_n^{\frac{p}{2}}).$$

We conclude the proof by taking $\sigma = \theta_n^{1/[2r+2(1-p^{-1})d]}$. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

Recall the sequential propagation system

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t^n = b(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) dW_t^n; \\ \mu_t^n = \mu_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n (\delta_{X_t^n} - \mu_t^{n-1}), \end{cases}$$

with $X_t^1 \equiv X_0^1$ and $\mu_t^1 = \delta_{X_t^1}$. To apply the synchronous coupling method, we introduce a sequence of i.i.d. McKean–Vlasov processes Y^n defined by

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} dY_t^n = b(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t) dt + \sigma(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t) dW_t^n, \\ Y_0^n = X_0^n \sim \mu_0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t)$ from (1.3) is also the law of Y_t^n .

Fix a constant $\lambda \geq 0$ that will be specified later. Define the discounted difference

$$\Delta_t^{n,\lambda} = e^{-\lambda t} (X_t^n - Y_t^n).$$

Applying Itô's formula we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& d|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} \\
&= -2p\lambda|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} dt + p e^{-2\lambda t} |\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p-2} \left\{ 2(X_t^n - Y_t^n)^\top [b(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) - b(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t)] \right. \\
&\quad + 2(p-1)|X_t^n - Y_t^n|^{-2} |(X_t^n - Y_t^n)^\top [\sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) - \sigma(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t)]|^2 \\
&\quad \left. + \|\sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) - \sigma(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t)\|^2 \right\} dt \\
&\quad + 2p e^{-\lambda t} |\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p-2} (\Delta_t^{n,\lambda})^\top [\sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) - \sigma(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t)] dW_t^n.
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 1 and Young's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.3) \quad d|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} &\leq [(C - 2p\lambda)|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} + C|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p-2} e^{-2\lambda t} \mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)^2] dt \\
&\quad + 2p e^{-\lambda t} |\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p-2} (\Delta_t^{n,\lambda})^\top [\sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) - \sigma(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t)] dW_t^n \\
&\leq [(C - 2p\lambda)|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} + C e^{-2p\lambda t} \mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^{n-1}, \mu_t)^{2p}] dt \\
&\quad + 2p e^{-\lambda t} |\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p-2} (\Delta_t^{n,\lambda})^\top [\sigma(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) - \sigma(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t)] dW_t^n,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(p, L)$. Taking the expectation and by Gronwall inequality, we have

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} \leq e^{(C-2p\lambda)t} C \int_0^t e^{-2p\lambda s} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_s^{n-1}, \mu_s)^{2p}] ds.$$

We take $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda = \frac{(2-\varepsilon)C}{(1-\varepsilon)2p}$ and further derive

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.5) \quad \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} dt &\leq \frac{C}{2p\lambda - C} \int_0^T e^{-2p\lambda t} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^{n-1}, \mu_t)^{2p}] dt \\
&= (1 - \varepsilon) \int_0^T e^{-2p\lambda t} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^{n-1}, \mu_t)^{2p}] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the property of the Wasserstein distance and Lemma 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^{n-1}, \mu_t)^{2p}] &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{X_t^i}), \mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{Y_t^i}))^{2p}] + C_p \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{Y_t^i}), \mu_t)^{2p}] \\
&\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(|X_t^i - Y_t^i|^{2p})] + C_p \theta_n^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

By s_n we denote $\int_0^T \mathcal{K}_n(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^{i,\lambda}|^{2p}) dt$. Combining the above inequality with (4.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
s_n &= s_{n-1} + \alpha_n \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^{n,\lambda}|^{2p} dt - s_{n-1} \right) \\
&\leq s_{n-1} + \alpha_n (1 - \varepsilon) [(1 + \varepsilon) s_{n-1} + C_p \theta_n^\gamma] - \alpha_n s_{n-1} \\
&\leq (1 - \varepsilon^2 \alpha_n) s_{n-1} + \alpha_n C \theta_n^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $\gamma = p/(2 + (1 - 1/p)d)$.

In the case of $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, we have $\theta_n \leq C\alpha_n$. Set $B_n = \alpha_n^\gamma$, then we have $\beta_n = \frac{\alpha_{n-1}^\gamma - \alpha_n^\gamma}{\varepsilon^2 \alpha_{n-1}^\gamma}$. Thus, if

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n^\gamma - \alpha_{n+1}^\gamma}{\alpha_n^{\gamma+1}} = \gamma \bar{\alpha} < 1,$$

by Lemma 3.1 we have $s_n \leq C\alpha_n^\gamma$. If

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n^\gamma - \alpha_{n+1}^\gamma}{\alpha_n^{\gamma+1}} = \gamma \bar{\alpha} \geq 1,$$

then by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$s_n \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta\alpha_i)$$

for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}\gamma$.

In the case of $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, we have, for any $\eta < 2 \wedge \underline{\alpha}$,

$$\theta_n \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \eta\alpha_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta\alpha_i < 1\}}) \leq C \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - \eta\alpha_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta\alpha_i < 1\}}).$$

Set $B_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - \eta\alpha_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta\alpha_i < 1\}})^\gamma$, then we derive

$$\beta_n = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} [1 - (1 - \eta\alpha_{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta\alpha_{n-1} < 1\}})^\gamma].$$

Thus, we compute

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\alpha_n)^\gamma}{\varepsilon^2 \alpha_n} = \frac{\eta\gamma}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we obtain, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}\gamma \wedge 2\gamma$,

$$s_n \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta\alpha_i).$$

To sum up, we plug above estimates into (4.4) and obtain:

(1) if $\bar{\alpha} < \gamma^{-1} \wedge (2 - \alpha_\infty)$, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)^{2p}] \leq C e^{CT} \alpha_n^\gamma;$$

(2) if $\gamma^{-1} \leq \bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, we have, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}\gamma$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)^{2p}] \leq C e^{CT} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta\alpha_i);$$

(3) if $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, we have, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}\gamma \wedge 2\gamma$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)^{2p}] \leq C e^{CT} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta\alpha_i).$$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

Recall the function $f \in C^2[0, \infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ and

$$f'(r) = \frac{1}{2} \int_r^\infty s \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_r^s \tau \kappa(\tau) d\tau\right) ds,$$

which actually satisfies the ordinary differential equation (ODE):

$$(5.1) \quad 2f''(r) - r\kappa(r)f'(r) = -r.$$

Lemma 5.1. *f is concave; consequently, $\kappa_\infty^{-1} \leq f(r)/r \leq f'(0)$ for all $r > 0$.*

Proof. Since $\kappa_\infty > 0$, there exists $R = \inf\{r > 0 : \kappa(s) > 0, \forall s > r\}$. Then for $r > R$,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(r) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_r^\infty s e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_r^s \tau \kappa(\tau) d\tau} ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\kappa(r)} \int_r^\infty s \kappa(s) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_r^s \tau \kappa(\tau) d\tau} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa(r)} (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_r^\infty \tau \kappa(\tau) d\tau}) \leq \frac{1}{\kappa(r)}, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (5.1) implies $f''(r) \leq 0$; for $r \leq R$, we have $f'(r)\kappa(r) \leq 0$. This implies

$$(5.2) \quad f''(r) = f'(r)\kappa(r)r - r \leq 0.$$

Hence, f is concave. Consequently, $f'(r) \leq f'(0)$. Moreover,

$$f'(r) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_r^{+\infty} s e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_r^s \tau \kappa_\infty d\tau} ds = \frac{1}{\kappa_\infty}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 2.2. Recall that for $n \geq 2$ we recursively define

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^n = b(t, X_t^n, \mu_t^{n-1}) dt + \sigma(t, X_t^n) dW_t^n + dB_t^n, \\ \mu_t^n = \mu_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{X_t^n} - \mu_t^{n-1}), \end{cases}$$

with $X_t^1 \equiv X_0^1$, $\mu_t^1 = \delta_{X_t^1}$, and its corresponding McKean–Vlasov process

$$\begin{cases} dY_t^n = b(t, Y_t^n, \mu_t) dt + \sigma(t, Y_t^n) dW_t^n + dB_t^n, \\ \mu_t = \mathcal{L}(Y_t), \end{cases}$$

with $Y_0^n = X_0^n$. Following the idea of Eberle (2016); Durmus et al. (2020), we take smooth functions $\lambda^n, \pi^n : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$(5.3) \quad |\lambda^n(x)|^2 + |\pi^n(x)|^2 = 1 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \lambda^n(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| \geq \delta_n, \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq \delta_n/2. \end{cases}$$

Here a positive sequence $\{\delta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ will be specified later. Instead of the synchronous coupling (X^n, Y^n) , we define a coupling of reflection $(\widehat{X}^n, \widehat{Y}^n)$ as

$$\begin{cases} d\widehat{X}_t^n = b(t, \widehat{X}_t^n, \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1}) dt + \sigma(t, \widehat{X}_t^n) dW_t^n + \lambda^n(\Delta_t^n) dB_t^n + \pi^n(\Delta_t^n) d\widehat{B}_t^n, \\ \widehat{\mu}_t^n = \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{\widehat{X}_t^n} - \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1}); \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d\widehat{Y}_t^n = b(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n, \mu_t) dt + \sigma(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n) dW_t^n + \lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)(\text{Id} - 2e_t^n(e_t^n)^\top) dB_t^n + \pi^n(\Delta_t^n) d\widehat{B}_t^n, \\ \mu_t = \mathcal{L}(Y_t), \end{cases}$$

where $\{\widehat{B}^n\}$ is an additional sequence of independent Brownian motions which is independent of $\{B^n, W^n, X_0^n\}$, $\Delta_t^n = \widehat{X}_t^n - \widehat{Y}_t^n$, and

$$e_t^n = \begin{cases} \Delta_t^n / |\Delta_t^n| & \text{if } \Delta_t^n \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \Delta_t^n = 0. \end{cases}$$

We set initial data $\widehat{X}_0^n = \widehat{Y}_0^n = X_0^n = Y_0^n$ and $\widehat{\mu}_t^1 = \delta_{\widehat{X}_t^1}$. By Levy's characterization and (5.3), we can show $(\widehat{X}^1, \dots, \widehat{X}^n)$ shares the same joint law with (X^1, \dots, X^n) by induction. Thus, $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{Y}_t^n) = \mathcal{L}(Y_t^n) = \mu_t$ and $\widehat{\mu}_t^n$ have the same law with μ_t^n as random variables on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} d\Delta_t^n &= d(\widehat{X}_t^n - \widehat{Y}_t^n) \\ &= [b(t, \widehat{X}_t^n, \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1}) - b(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n, \mu_t)] dt \\ &\quad + [\sigma(t, \widehat{X}_t^n) - \sigma(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n)] dW_t^n + 2\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)e_t^n(e_t^n)^\top dB_t^n \\ &= [b(t, \widehat{X}_t^n, \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1}) - b(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n, \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1})] dt + [b(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n, \widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1}) - b(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n, \mu_t)] dt \\ &\quad + [\sigma(t, \widehat{X}_t^n) - \sigma(t, \widehat{Y}_t^n)] dW_t^n + 2\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)e_t^n(e_t^n)^\top dB_t^n \\ &:= (\Delta b_t^{n,1} + \Delta b_t^{n,2}) dt + \Delta \sigma_t^n dW_t^n + 2\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)e_t^n(e_t^n)^\top dB_t^n. \end{aligned}$$

By the Itô–Tanaka formula, we have

$$(5.4) \quad d|\Delta_t^n| = \frac{1}{2|\Delta_t^n|} (2\langle \Delta_t^n, \Delta b_t^{n,1} + \Delta b_t^{n,2} \rangle + \|\Delta \sigma_t^n\|^2) dt + \langle e_t^n, \Delta \sigma_t^n \rangle dW_t^n + 2\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)(e_t^n)^\top dB_t^n.$$

By Assumption 2, we obtain

$$\langle \Delta_t^n, \Delta b_t^{n,1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|\Delta \sigma_t^n\|^2 \leq -\kappa(|\Delta_t^n|)|\Delta_t^n|^2.$$

By Lemma 3.3 and Assumption 3, we can further get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta b_t^{n,2}| &\leq \eta \mathcal{W}_1(\widehat{\mu}_t^{n-1}, \mu_t) = \eta \mathcal{W}_1(\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{\widehat{X}_t^i}), \mu_t) \\ &\leq \eta \mathcal{W}_1(\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{\widehat{X}_t^i}), \mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{\widehat{Y}_t^i})) + \eta \mathcal{W}_1(\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\delta_{\widehat{Y}_t^i}), \mu_t) \\ &\leq \eta \mathcal{K}_{n-1}(|\Delta_t^i|) + C\eta\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging above estimates into (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d|\Delta_t^n| &\leq -\kappa(|\Delta_t^n|)|\Delta_t^n| dt + (\eta \mathcal{K}_{n-1}(|\Delta_t^i|) + C\eta\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}) dt \\ &\quad + \langle e_t^n, \Delta \sigma_t^n \rangle dW_t^n + 2\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)(e_t^n)^\top dB_t^n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f'' \leq 0$, by Itô's formula we show

$$\begin{aligned} df(|\Delta_t^n|) &\leq -\kappa(|\Delta_t^n|)|\Delta_t^n|f'(|\Delta_t^n|) dt + 2f''(|\Delta_t^n|)|\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)|^2 dt \\ &\quad + f'(|\Delta_t^n|)(\eta \mathcal{K}_{n-1}(|\Delta_t^i|) + C\eta\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}) dt \\ &\quad + f'(|\Delta_t^n|) \langle e_t^n, \Delta \sigma_t^n \rangle dW_t^n + 2f'(|\Delta_t^n|)\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)(e_t^n)^\top dB_t^n, \end{aligned}$$

where the function f is defined at the beginning of this section. We write

$$\rho(r) = \sup_{x \in [0, r]} x\kappa^-(x),$$

then by (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &-\kappa(|\Delta_t^n|)|\Delta_t^n|f'(|\Delta_t^n|) + 2f''(|\Delta_t^n|)|\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)|^2 \\ &\leq -|\Delta_t^n||\lambda^n(\Delta_t^n)|^2 - \kappa(|\Delta_t^n|)|\Delta_t^n||\pi^n(\Delta_t^n)|^2 \\ &\leq -|\Delta_t^n| + \rho(\delta_n) + \delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from taking the expectation that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}f(|\Delta_t^n|) \leq -\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^n| + \rho(\delta_n) + \delta_n + \eta f'(0)(\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^i|) + C\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}).$$

Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \rho(r) = 0$, we take δ_n such that $\delta_n + \rho(\delta_n) \leq \theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < f'(0)^{-1} - \eta$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}f(|\Delta_t^n|) &\leq -\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^n| + \eta f'(0)\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^i|) + C\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \\ &\leq -\varepsilon \mathbb{E}f(|\Delta_t^n|) - (1 - \varepsilon f'(0))\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^n| + \eta f'(0)\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_t^i|) + C\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$(5.5) \quad 0 \leq \mathbb{E}f(|\Delta_t^n|) \leq e^{-\varepsilon t} \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} [(-1 + \varepsilon f'(0))\mathbb{E}|\Delta_s^n| + \eta f'(0)\mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_s^i|)] ds + C\theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}.$$

This implies

$$\int_0^t e^{s\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}|\Delta_s^n| ds \leq \frac{\eta f'(0)}{1 - \varepsilon f'(0)} \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \mathcal{K}_{n-1}(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_s^i|) ds + C e^{\varepsilon t} \theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}.$$

We denote

$$s_n = \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \mathcal{K}_n(\mathbb{E}|\Delta_s^i|) ds \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = 1 - \frac{\eta f'(0)}{1 - \varepsilon f'(0)} \in (0, 1).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_n &= s_{n-1} + \alpha_n \left(\int_0^t e^s \mathbb{E}|\Delta_s^n| ds - s_{n-1} \right) \\ &\leq (1 - \delta \alpha_{n-1}) s_{n-1} + \alpha_n C e^{\varepsilon t} \theta_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, then by Corollary 3.1 we have $\theta_n \leq C \alpha_n$. We take $B_n = C e^{\varepsilon t} \alpha_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}$, and calculate

$$\beta_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_{n-1}^{1/(d+2)} - \alpha_n^{1/(d+2)}}{\alpha_n^{1/(d+2)}}.$$

Then we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_{n-1}^{1/(d+2)} - \alpha_n^{1/(d+2)}}{\alpha_n^{(d+3)/(d+2)}} = \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{d+2} < 1,$$

and by Lemma 3.1 we derive $s_n \leq C e^{\varepsilon t} \alpha_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}}$.

In the case of $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, for any $0 < \lambda < 2 \wedge \underline{\alpha}$, we have

$$\theta_n \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \lambda \alpha_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda \alpha_i < 1\}}).$$

Set $B_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - \lambda \alpha_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda \alpha_i < 1\}})^{1/(d+2)}$, then we derive

$$\beta_n = \frac{1}{\delta} [1 - (1 - \lambda \alpha_{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda \alpha_{n-1} < 1\}})^{1/(d+2)}].$$

Thus, we compute

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{\alpha_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - (1 - \lambda \alpha_n)^{\frac{1}{d+2}}}{\delta \alpha_n} = \frac{\lambda}{\delta(d+2)}.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we obtain, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \frac{\alpha}{d+2} \wedge \frac{2}{d+2}$,

$$s_n \leq C e^{\varepsilon t} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta \alpha_i).$$

Plugging above estimates into (5.5), we get the uniform estimates of $\mathbb{E}f(|\Delta_t^n|)$ as well as $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)]$. The estimate of $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_f(\mu_t^n, \mu_t)]$ follows from the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_f(\hat{\mu}_t^n, \mu_t) &\leq \mathcal{W}_f(\hat{\mu}_t^n, \mathcal{K}_n(\delta_{\hat{Y}_t^i})) + \mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{K}_n(\delta_{\hat{Y}_t^i}), \mu_t) \\ &\leq \mathcal{K}_n(f(\Delta_t^n)) + f'(0) \mathcal{W}_1(\mathcal{K}_n(\delta_{\hat{Y}_t^i}), \mu_t). \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, we obtain:

(1) if $\bar{\alpha} < 2 - \alpha_\infty$, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_f(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)] \leq C \alpha_n^{\frac{1}{d+2}};$$

(2) if $\bar{\alpha} \geq 2$, we have, for any $\delta < 1 \wedge \frac{\alpha}{d+2} \wedge \frac{2}{d+2}$,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_f(\mu_t^n, \mu_t) + \mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_t^n), \mu_t)] \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta \alpha_i).$$

Remark 5.1. Let X, Y be solutions of (2.2) with different initial data. Then by a similar argument on the reflection coupling $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{Y})$, one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}f(|\widehat{X}_t - \widehat{Y}_t|) &\leq -\mathbb{E}|\widehat{X}_t - \widehat{Y}_t| + c^{-1}\eta\mathcal{W}_1(\mathcal{L}(\widehat{X}_t), \mathcal{L}(\widehat{Y}_t)) \\ &\leq -(1 - c^{-1}\eta)\mathbb{E}|\widehat{X}_t - \widehat{Y}_t| \leq -(c - \eta)\mathbb{E}f(|\widehat{X}_t - \widehat{Y}_t|), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_t), \mathcal{L}(Y_t)) \leq e^{-(c-\eta)t} \mathcal{W}_f(\mathcal{L}(X_0), \mathcal{L}(Y_0)),$$

where $c = 1/f'(0)$.

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we shall illustrate our results of the SPoC algorithm with different numerical examples. We discretize the time interval $[0, T]$ into $\{t_0, \dots, t_M\}$, where $t_m = m\Delta t$ and $\Delta t = T/M$. We give the pseudocode in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Framework of SPoC algorithm

Input: The initial distribution μ_0 , the update rate $\{\alpha_n\}$;

- 1: Initialize $n = 1$, $X_0^1 \sim \mu_0$;
 - 2: **for** $m = 0$ **to** M **do**
 - 3: $\mu_{t_m}^1 = \delta_{X_0^1}$;
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: **repeat**
 - 6: $n = n + 1$;
 - 7: $X_0^n \sim \mu_0$;
 - 8: $\mu_0^n = \mu_0^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{X_0^n} - \mu_0^{n-1})$;
 - 9: **for** $m = 1$ **to** M **do**
 - 10: Generate a path of X^n by
 - 11: $X_{t_m}^n = X_{t_{m-1}}^n + b(t, X_{t_{m-1}}^n, \mu_{t_{m-1}}^{n-1})\Delta t + \sigma(t, X_{t_{m-1}}^n, \mu_{t_{m-1}}^{n-1})\Delta W_t^n$;
 - 12: Update the empirical measure by
 - 13: $\mu_{t_m}^n = \mu_{t_m}^{n-1} + \alpha_n(\delta_{X_{t_m}^n} - \mu_{t_m}^{n-1})$;
 - 14: $m = m + 1$;
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: **until** the end condition.
-

For the SPoC algorithm, the total computational complexity of the first N particles is $\mathcal{O}(N^2M)$. For the n -th particle, it interacts with all the previous particles. At each time step t_m , it takes n calculations to update the empirical measure $\mu_{t_m}^n$. This accounts for a total $\mathcal{O}(nM)$ complexity of the n -th particle. Thus, the total computational complexity of the first N particles is $\mathcal{O}(N^2M)$. In particular, if the interaction is in the form of $b(t, X_t, \mathbb{E}X_t)$, then the complexity reduces to $\mathcal{O}(NM)$. It is because we only need to spend $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time to update $\mathbb{E}X_{t_m}$ for each particle. More generally, we can add the particles batch-by-batch rather than particle-by-particle: we add N_k particles $\{X^{i,k} : i = 1, \dots, N_k\}$ in the k -th batch, and update the empirical measure from the batch. The batch model could be more efficient in practical, see Algorithm 2 for the pseudocode.

We conclude with a comprehensive discussion on the differences between the SPoC algorithm and the classical PoC algorithm. For the classical PoC algorithm, we decide the number of the particles N beforehand and simulate all the paths of N particles $X^{1,N}, \dots, X^{N,N}$ simultaneously.

In order to get the empirical measure corresponding to the terminal time T , we have to calculate the whole system until the last time step. While in the SPoC algorithm,

Algorithm 2 Batch-by-batch SPoC algorithm

Input: The initial distribution μ_0 , the update rate $\{\alpha_n\}$, the bath size $\{N_n\}$;

- 1: Initialize $n = 1$, and the first batch $X_0^{1,1}, \dots, X_0^{N_1,1} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mu_0$;
- 2: **for** $m = 0$ **to** M **do**
- 3: $\mu_{t_m} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \delta_{X_0^{i,1}}$;
- 4: **end for**
- 5: **repeat**
- 6: $n = n + 1$;
- 7: Sample $X_0^{1,n}, \dots, X_0^{N_n,n} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mu_0$;
- 8: **for** $m = 1$ **to** M **do**
- 9: **for** $i = 1$ **to** N_n **do**
- 10: Generate a path of $X^{i,n}$ by
- 11: $X_{t_m}^{i,n} = X_{t_{m-1}}^{i,n} + b(t, X_{t_{m-1}}^{i,n}, \mu_{t_{m-1}}^n) \Delta t + \sigma(t, X_{t_{m-1}}^{i,n}, \mu_{t_{m-1}}^{n-1}) \Delta W_t^{i,n}$;
- 12: **end for**
- 13: Update the empirical measure by
- 14: $\mu_{t_m}^n = \mu_{t_m}^{n-1} + \alpha_n (\frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \delta_{X_{t_m}^{i,n}} - \mu_{t_m}^{n-1})$;
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **until** the end condition.

we simulate the whole path of a single particle at once, and then sequentially increase the number of particles. Given the paths of X^1, \dots, X^{N-1} , we can generate the path of X^N . We have already obtained an approximate distribution $\mu_T^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_T^i}$ at the intermediate step of the calculation. Moreover, as the number of simulated particles increases, the empirical measure converges to the true distribution. While in the classical PoC algorithm, we need to recalculate the whole system to improve the approximation accuracy. In Figure 6.1 we compare the structures of these two algorithms.




FIGURE 6.1. Comparison of the classical PoC (left) and the sequential PoC (right).

In the following we show the performance of the SPoC algorithm with some examples.

Example 1. We consider the mean-field Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process:

$$(6.1) \quad dX_t = (-2X_t - \mathbb{E}X_t) dt + (2 - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|X_t|^2}) dW_t.$$

Both the drift and diffusion terms are distribution dependent. And it is straightforward to check that (6.1) has a unique invariant measure $\mu^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 4/9)$. In our numerical experiments, we take $X_0^n = 1$, $T = 1$ and divide the interval $[0, T]$ uniformly into $M = 30$ parts. We sample 10^6 particles and repeat the simulation independently 100 times. We record the mean and the second moment of the empirical measures. In Figure 6.2, we

compare the convergence of the mean (left) and the second moment (right) of the SPoC and the classical PoC. We plot the 90% confidence interval by the shaded area to show that the SPoC algorithm has almost the same convergence performance as the classical PoC.




FIGURE 6.2. Mean-field Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model.

Example 2. Consider a multidimensional nonlinear system:

$$(6.2) \quad dX_s = \left(-\alpha X_s + \frac{\vec{e}}{\beta + \|X_s - \mathbb{E}X_s\|^2} \right) ds + \sigma dB_s,$$

where $X_s \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\vec{e} = \frac{X_s - \mathbb{E}X_s}{\|X_s - \mathbb{E}X_s\|}$ is a unit vector. We set $\alpha = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1$, $X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, $T = 1$. The damping term $-\alpha X_s$ will drag each particle toward the origin, while the interaction term is a repulsive force pushing each particle away from the mean value. We divide the interval $[0, T]$ uniformly into $M = 20$ parts and sample $N = 10^6$ particles. Figure 6.3 shows the convergence of the mean (left) and the second moment (right) of the SPoC and the classical PoC algorithms.




FIGURE 6.3. Multidimensional nonlinear model.

Example 3. Recall the Curie-Weiss mean-field lattice model

$$dX_t = [-\beta(X_t^3 - X_t) + \beta K \mathbb{E}X_t] dt + \sigma dW_t.$$

We take $\beta = 1.0$, $K = 0.5$, $T = 1$ and $\sigma = 1.0$. Similar to the previous examples, Figure 6.4 shows the convergence of the mean and the second moment. Furthermore, we plot the time evolution of the distribution in Figure 6.5 to demonstrate the asymptotic behavior of the SPoC algorithm. At $T = 0.1, 1, 2, 3, 10$ we plot the approximate densities of the empirical measures with the initial condition $X_0 = 1$ (left) and $X_0 = 0$ (right) and compare them with the density of the invariant measure.




FIGURE 6.4. Curie–Weiss mean-field lattice model.




FIGURE 6.5. Approximate densities of empirical measures and the invariant measure.

APPENDIX A. CONVERGENCE OF EMPIRICAL MEASURES ON THE PATH SPACE

In the appendix we give a rigorous discussion for Remark 2.4. First, we prove an infinite-dimensional version of Lemma 3.3. Let $E = C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the continuous path space equipped with the uniform norm, $\mathcal{P}(E)$ the set of Borel probability measures. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ their Wasserstein distance \mathcal{W}_2 is defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf \left\{ \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |X_t - Y_t|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} : \mathcal{L}(X) = \mu, \mathcal{L}(Y) = \nu \right\}.$$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d))$ be the law of the following Itô diffusion

$$(A.1) \quad X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_s) dW_s.$$

Assumption 4. We assume (A.1) has a unique strong solution X that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{|t-s| \leq k^{-1}} |X_t - X_s|^2 \leq Ck^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{|t-s| \leq k^{-1}} |X_t - X_s|^{dk+5} = 0.$$

Lemma A.1. Suppose Assumption 4 holds. Let $(X^n)_{n \geq 1}$ be i.i.d. copies of the solution X of (A.1), i.e., X^n satisfies

$$X_t^n = X_0^n + \int_0^t b(s, X_s^n) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_s^n) dW_s^n,$$

where W^n are independent Brownian motions and X_0^n are i.i.d. random variables independent of $\{W^n\}_{n \geq 1}$. By μ^n we denote the empirical measure of X^n , i.e.,

$$(A.2) \quad \mu^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X^i},$$

and by μ we denote the law of X^n . Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \mu)^2] \leq C \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n}.$$

Proof. The proof can be split into two steps: we first discretize the continuous path space and estimate the distance between measures on $C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ through their finite marginals; then we apply the classical mollification argument to the finite marginals and obtain a uniform estimate.

For the first step, we define a time partition $\{t_0, \dots, t_k\}$ of $[0, 1]$ where $t_l = l/k$ for $0 \leq l \leq k$. We define a map $T_k : C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $t_l \leq t \leq t_{l+1}$ as

$$T_k(\omega)_t := (t_{l+1} - t)k\omega_{t_l} + (t - t_l)k\omega_{t_{l+1}}.$$

Notice $T_k(\omega)$ is a piecewise linear path and has the same value as ω on $\{t_0, \dots, t_k\}$. We define pushforward measures

$$\mu_k^n = (T_k)_\# \mu^n \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_k = (T_k)_\# \mu.$$

Since X^n are i.i.d., we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \mu_k^n)^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 |X_t^i - T_k(X^i)_t|^2 dt\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1 |X_t - T_k(X)_t|^2 dt\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\sup\{|X(t) - X(s)|^2 : |t - s| \leq k^{-1}\}] \\ &\leq Ck^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \mu_k)^2 \leq Ck^{-1}$. To estimate $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_k^n, \mu_k)^2]$, let ξ and ζ be two random processes with law μ_k^n and μ_k respectively. Since μ_k^n and μ_k concentrate on the piecewise linear paths, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1 |\xi_t - \zeta_t|^2 dt\right] \leq Ck^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^k |\xi(t_l) - \zeta(t_l)|^2\right],$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_k^n, \mu_k)^2] \leq Ck^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\bar{\mu}_k^n, \bar{\mu}_k)^2],$$

where $\bar{\mu}_k^n, \bar{\mu}_k \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times k})$ are the marginals of μ_k^n, μ_k on $\{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$ respectively. To sum up, we derive

$$(A.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_n, \mu)^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \mu_k^n)^2] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_k^n, \mu_k)^2] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_k, \mu)^2] \\ &\leq Ck^{-1} + Ck^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\bar{\mu}_k^n, \bar{\mu}_k)^2]. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed to the mollification step. Let Φ_σ be the law of $(\sigma B_{t_1}, \dots, \sigma B_{t_k})$, where B is a d -dimensional Brownian motion. Then Φ_σ has a density function

$$\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(x_1) \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(x_2 - x_1) \cdots \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(x_k - x_{k-1}),$$

where $\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}$ is the density function of $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 k^{-1} I_d)$. The mollified measures are given by

$$\mu_{k,\sigma}^n = \bar{\mu}_k^n * \Phi_\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{k,\sigma} = \bar{\mu}_k * \Phi_\sigma$$

with density functions

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \mathcal{K}_n(\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(x_1 - X_{l_1}^i)) \cdots \mathcal{K}_n(\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(x_k - x_{k-1} - X_k^i + X_{k-1}^i)),$$

and $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \mathbb{E}[g(x_1, \dots, x_k)]$. It is direct to show that

$$(A.4) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_{k,\sigma}^n, \mu_k^n)^2] \leq C\sigma^2 k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_{k,\sigma}, \mu_k)^2] \leq C\sigma^2 k.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we get

$$(A.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_2(\mu_{k,\sigma}, \mu_{k,\sigma}^n)^2 \\ & \leq Ck \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |x_l|^2 |f(x_1, \dots, x_k) - g(x_1, \dots, x_k)| dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & \leq Ck \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |x_l|^{dk+1})^{-1} dx} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |x_l|^{dk+5}) |f - g|^2 dx} \\ & \leq Ck A_k^{1/2} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |x_l|^{dk+5}) |f(x) - g(x)|^2 dx}, \end{aligned}$$

where A_k is the surface area of $\{x = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} : \sup_l |x_l| = 1\}$ bounded by

$$A_k = \int_{\sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |x_l| = 1} d\sigma \leq C^k.$$

Notice for independent random variables $(\xi_l)_{1 \leq l \leq k}$, we have

$$\text{Var}(\xi_1 \cdots \xi_k) \leq \sum_{l=1}^k \left[\text{Var}(\xi_l) \prod_{m \neq l} \mathbb{E} \xi_m^2 \right].$$

For the simplicity, we write

$$x_1 = y_1, \quad x_2 = y_1 + y_2, \quad \dots, \quad x_k = y_1 + \cdots + y_k,$$

and

$$X_1^i = Y_1^i, \quad X_2^i = Y_1^i + Y_2^i, \quad \dots, \quad X_k^i = Y_1^i + \cdots + Y_k^i.$$

Therefore, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|f(x) - g(x)|^2 = \text{Var}(g) \\ & \leq \sum_{l=1}^k \left[\text{Var}(\mathcal{K}_n(\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l - Y_l^i))) \prod_{m \neq l} \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{K}_n(\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_m - Y_m^i))|^2 \right] \\ & \leq kn^{-1} \prod_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{K}_n(\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l - Y_l^i))|^2 \\ & \leq kn^{-1} \prod_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E} |\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l - Y_l^i)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Plug the above estimate into (A.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_{k,\sigma}, \mu_{k,\sigma}^n)^2] &\leq C^k \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l|^{dk+5}) \mathbb{E}|f(x) - g(x)|^2 dy} \\
 &\leq C^k \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l|^{dk+5}) k n^{-1} \prod_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}|\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l - Y_l)|^2 dy} \\
 &\leq C^k n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l|^{dk+5}) \prod_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}|\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l - Y_l)|^2 dy}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then we calculate the integral inside the square root as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l|^{dk+5}) \prod_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}|\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l - Y_l)|^2 dy \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} (1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l + Y_l|^{dk+5}) \prod_{l=1}^k |\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l)|^2 dy \\
 &\leq 2^{dk+4} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} [1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} (|y_l|^{dk+5} + |Y_l|^{dk+5})] \prod_{l=1}^k |\phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{k}}(y_l)|^2 dy \\
 &= C \pi^{-\frac{dk}{2}} \sigma^{-dk} k^{\frac{dk}{2}} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} [1 + \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} (|y_l|^{dk+5} + |Y_l|^{dk+5})] \prod_{l=1}^k \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{2k}}(y_l) dy \\
 &\leq C \pi^{-\frac{dk}{2}} \sigma^{-dk} k^{\frac{dk}{2}} \left[1 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |Y_l|^{dk+5} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l|^{dk+5} \prod_{l=1}^k \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{2k}}(y_l) dy \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

We take $\sigma^2 = k^{-1}$, and by Assumption 4 we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |Y_l|^{dk+5} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}} \sup_{1 \leq l \leq k} |y_l|^{dk+5} \prod_{l=1}^k \phi_{\sigma/\sqrt{2k}}(y_l) dy \right] = 0.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_{k,\sigma}, \mu_{k,\sigma}^n)^2] \leq (Ck)^{Ck} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Combining this with (A.3) and (A.4), we derive

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \mu^n)^2] \leq C(k^{-1} + (Ck)^{Ck} n^{-1/2}).$$

By taking $k \sim \frac{\ln n}{\ln \ln n}$, we finally derive

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \mu^n)^2] \leq C \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Corollary A.1. *We take $\alpha_n = n^{-1}$. Let (X^n, μ^n) be the solutions of (1.1) and $\mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t)$ given by (1.3) with the initial distribution μ_0 . Under Assumptions 1 and 4, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \mu)^2] \leq C \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n}.$$

Proof. Let Y^n be the associated synchronous coupling. From the proof of Theorem 2.1, we know

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |X_t^i - Y_t^i|^2 dt \leq C n^{-\frac{1}{d+2}}.$$

Let ν^n denote the empirical measure of Y^n , i.e.,

$$\nu^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Y^i}.$$

By Lemma A.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\nu^n, \mu)^2] \leq C \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n}.$$

Combing above two estimates, we derive

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \mu)^2] \leq C\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\mu^n, \nu^n)^2] + C\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}_2(\nu^n, \mu)^2] \leq C \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K. Du was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12222103), and by National Key R&D Program of China (2018YFA0703900). Y. Jiang was supported by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Mathematics of Random Systems: Analysis, Modelling, and Simulation (EP/S023925/1).

REFERENCES

- Luigi Ambrosio, Federico Stra, and Dario Trevisan. A PDE approach to a 2-dimensional matching problem. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173(1):433–477, 2019.
- Luisa Andreis, Amine Asselah, and Paolo Dai Pra. Ergodicity of a system of interacting random walks with asymmetric interaction. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 55(1):590–606, 2019.
- Alex Arenas, Albert Díaz-Guilera, Jurgen Kurths, Yamir Moreno, and Changsong Zhou. Synchronization in complex networks. *Physics reports*, 469(3):93–153, 2008.
- Jianhai Bao, Christoph Reisinger, Panpan Ren, and Wolfgang Stockinger. First-order convergence of Milstein schemes for McKean–Vlasov equations and interacting particle systems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 477(2245):20200258, 2021.
- Martin Bauer, Thilo Meyer-Brandis, and Frank Proske. Strong solutions of mean-field stochastic differential equations with irregular drift. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 23:1–35, 2018.
- Erhan Bayraktar, Suman Chakraborty, and Ruoyu Wu. Graphon mean field systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13180*, 2020.
- Shankar Bhamidi, Amarjit Budhiraja, and Ruoyu Wu. Weakly interacting particle systems on inhomogeneous random graphs. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(6):2174–2206, 2019.
- Mireille Bossy and Denis Talay. A stochastic particle method for the McKean–Vlasov and the Burgers equation. *Mathematics of Computation*, 66(217):157–192, 1997.
- Rainer Buckdahn, Juan Li, Shige Peng, and Catherine Rainer. Mean-field stochastic differential equations and associated PDEs. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(2):824–878, 2017.
- René Carmona and François Delarue. *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I–II*. Springer, 2018.
- Louis-Pierre Chaintron and Antoine Diez. Propagation of chaos: a review of models, methods and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14812*, 2021.
- François Delarue. Mean field games: A toy model on an Erdős–Renyi graph. *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, 60:1–26, 2017.
- Gonçalo dos Reis, Stefan Engelhardt, and Greig Smith. Simulation of McKean–Vlasov SDEs with super-linear growth. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 42(1):874–922, 2022.

- Kai Du, Yifan Jiang, and Jinfeng Li. Empirical approximation to invariant measures for McKean–Vlasov processes: mean-field interaction vs self-interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14112*, 2021.
- Alain Durmus, Andreas Eberle, Arnaud Guillin, and Raphael Zimmer. An elementary approach to uniform in time propagation of chaos. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 148(12):5387–5398, 2020.
- Andreas Eberle. Reflection couplings and contraction rates for diffusions. *Probability theory and related fields*, 166(3):851–886, 2016.
- Andreas Eberle, Arnaud Guillin, and Raphael Zimmer. Quantitative Harris-type theorems for diffusions and McKean–Vlasov processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 371(10):7135–7173, 2019.
- Nicolas Fournier and Arnaud Guillin. On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162(3):707–738, 2015.
- Till Daniel Frank. *Nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations: fundamentals and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- William RP Hammersley, David Šiška, and Łukasz Szpruch. McKean–Vlasov SDEs under measure dependent Lyapunov conditions. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(2):1032–1057, 2021.
- Joseph Horowitz and Rajeeva L. Karandikar. Mean rates of convergence of empirical measures in the Wasserstein metric. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 55(3):261–273, 1994.
- Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin, David Poyato, and Juan Soler. Mean-field limit of non-exchangeable systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.15406*, 2021.
- Benjamin Jourdain and Florent Malrieu. Propagation of chaos and Poincaré inequalities for a system of particles interacting through their CDF. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(5):1706–1736, 2008.
- Wei Liu, Liming Wu, and Chaoen Zhang. Long-time behaviors of mean-field interacting particle systems related to McKean–Vlasov equations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 387(1):179–214, 2021.
- Dejun Luo and Jian Wang. Exponential convergence in L^p -Wasserstein distance for diffusion processes without uniformly dissipative drift. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 289(14-15):1909–1926, 2016.
- Henry P. McKean. A class of Markov processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 56(6):1907–1911, 1966.
- Henry P. McKean. Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations. *Stochastic Differential Equations (Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ., 1967)*, pages 41–57, 1967.
- Yuliya Mishura and Alexander Veretennikov. Existence and uniqueness theorems for solutions of McKean–Vlasov stochastic equations. *Theory of Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 103:59–101, 2020.
- Alain-Sol Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In *Ecole d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX-1989*, pages 165–251. Springer, 1991.
- Feng-Yu Wang. Distribution dependent SDEs for Landau type equations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 128(2):595–621, 2018.

(K. DU) SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, CHINA;
SHANGHAI ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE LABORATORY, 701 YUNJIN ROAD, SHANGHAI, CHINA
Email address: kdu@fudan.edu.cn

(Y. JIANG) MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OXFORD, UK
Email address: yifan.jiang@maths.ox.ac.uk

(X. LI) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, CHINA
Email address: xcli18@fudan.edu.cn