

SIMULTANEOUSLY RECOVERING RUNNING COST AND HAMILTONIAN IN MEAN FIELD GAMES SYSTEM

HONGYU LIU AND SHEN ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We propose and study several inverse problems for the mean field games (MFG) system in a bounded domain. Our focus is on simultaneously recovering the running cost and the Hamiltonian within the MFG system by the associated boundary observation. There are several technical novelties that make our study highly intriguing and challenging. First, the MFG system couples two nonlinear parabolic PDEs within one moving forward and the other one moving backward in time. Second, there is a probability measure constraint on the population distribution of the agents. Third, the simultaneous recovery of two coupling factors within the MFG system is far from being trivial. We present two different techniques that can ensure the probability constraint as well as effectively tackle the inverse problems, which are respectively termed as high-order variation and successive linearisation. In particular, the high-order variation method is new to the literature, which demonstrates a novel concept to examine the inverse problems by positive inputs only. Both cases when the running cost depends on the measure locally and non-locally are investigated.

Keywords: mean field games, inverse boundary problem, running cost, Hamiltonian, simultaneous recovery, high-order variation, probability measure

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 49N80, 91A16, 35R30, 65H30

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Problem setup and background	1
1.2. Technical developments and discussion	3
2. Preliminaries and statement of main results	5
2.1. Notations and basic setting	5
2.2. Admissible class	5
2.3. Main unique identifiability results	6
3. Local well-posedness of the forward problems	6
4. Analysis of the linearized systems in two different scenarios	10
4.1. Higher-order linearization	10
4.2. High-order variation	11
5. Proof of Theorem 2.1, 2.2	12
Acknowledgements	19
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Problem setup and background. Mean Field Games (MFGs) are non-atomic differential games in which the goal is to study the behaviors of a large population of symmetric agents as the number of agents grows to infinity. They offer quantitative modeling of the macroscopic behaviors of agents seeking to minimize a specific cost. Caines-Huang-Malhame

and Lasry-Lions independently pioneered the theory of MFGs in 2006, and it has since received significant attention and increasing studies in the literature. For further discussion, we refer to the books and lecture notes, as well as the references cited therein. One of the main characteristics of an MFG is the existence of an adversarial regime, and the Nash equilibrium exists and is unique in this so-called monotone regime. Let \mathbb{R}^n be the Euclidean space with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The state spaces are represented by a family of disjoint bounded Lipschitz domains $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n (i = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$. In a specific domain Ω , let $x \in \Omega$ be the state variable and $t \in [0, \infty)$ be the time variable. Let \mathcal{P} stand for the set of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^n , and $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ stand for the set of Borel probability measures on Ω . Let $m \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ denote the population distribution of the agents and $u(x, t) : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ denote the value function of each player. Let $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ signifies the terminal time. We consider the following MFG system:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(x, t) - \Delta u(x, t) + \frac{1}{2} \kappa(x) |\nabla u(x, t)|^2 = F(x, m) & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m(x, t) - \Delta m(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(m(x, t) \kappa(x) \nabla u(x, t)) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = \partial_\nu m(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x), \quad m(x, 0) = m_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where Δ and div are the Laplacian and divergent operators with respect to the x -variable, respectively; and $\Sigma := \partial\Omega \times [0, T]$, $Q := \overline{\Omega} \times [0, T]$ and ν is the exterior unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. In (1.1), $F(x, m)$ represents the running cost function which signifies the interaction between the agents and the population; m_0 denotes the initial population distribution and $\psi(x)$ represents the terminal cost; and $\kappa(x)$ is a real function defined on Ω . In this paper, we consider the case where ψ is unrelated to m . In general and in many physical models, we assume $\kappa(x)$ is positive, but our results do not depend on this condition.

We can define

$$\mathcal{O}_a := \{m : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty) \mid \int_{\Omega} m dx = a \leq 1\}. \quad (1.2)$$

In other words, if $m \in \mathcal{O}$, then it is the restriction of a density of a distribution in \mathbb{R}^n . It can directly verified from (1.1) that if the initial distribution $m_0 \in \mathcal{O}_a$, then $m(\cdot; t) \in \mathcal{O}_a$ for any subsequent time t . The physical meaning of this fact is that agents cannot leave this domain in this game. It is important to note that, because we think of a family of domains Ω_i , the measure m in each domain might be 0 as long as it still represents a distribution in $\cup_i \Omega_i$.

Next, we introduce the measurement we used in this paper. Define

$$\mathcal{N}_{\kappa, F}(m_0, \psi) := (u(x, t) \Big|_{\Sigma}, u(x, 0)), \quad (1.3)$$

where (u, m) is the (unique) pair of solutions to the MFG system (1.1) associated with the initial population distribution $m(x, 0) = m_0(x)$ and the total cost $\psi(x)$. The following is a formulation of the inverse problem that we aim to investigate:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\kappa, F}(m_0, \psi) \rightarrow (F, \kappa), \quad (1.4)$$

for many pairs of m_0 and ψ , which shall be more detailed in what follows. We consider two different types of running costs: F belongs to an analytic class (locally dependent case), and F is given in the form of an integral with an unidentified kernel (non-locally dependent case). More details about this aspect will be given in Section 2.2. Here, we provide a global view of our study of the MFG inverse problems.

1.2. Technical developments and discussion. In many contexts, the well-posedness of the MFG system (1.1) is well understood. The initial outcomes are from Lasry and Lions' original works and have been presented in Lions [26]; additionally, see Caines-Huang-Malhame [21]. Since then, significant advancements have been made. The MFG system (1.1) is known to be well-posed in Cardaliaguet [12], Cardaliaguet-Porretta [15], Carmona-Delarue [9], and Meszaros-Mou [31] in the nonlocal case; and Ambrose [1, 2], Cardaliaguet [14], Cardaliaguet-Graber [6], Cardaliaguet-Graber-Porretta-Tonon [7], Cardaliague-Porretta [15], Cirant-Gianni-Mannucci [10], Cirant-Goffi [11], Ferreira-Gomez [18], Ferreira-Gomez-Tada [19], Gomez-Pimentel-Sanchez Morgado [3, 4], Porretta [32] in the case that F is locally dependent on the measure variable m . However, we would like to emphasize that in order to fully understand our inverse problem research, additional results for the forward MFG system (1.1) are required. These new results shall focus on the regularity of the solutions and the high-order variation of the system around a fixed pair of solutions.

On the other hand, the inverse problems for MFGs are far less studied in the literature. To our best knowledge, there are only several numerical results available in [13, 16]. In [27], the authors derived unique identifiability results for an MFG system with unknown running cost and total cost. However, we would like to point out that in [27], the probability constraint on m was not treated and hence the results therein are purely of mathematical interest. In fact, the technical constraint (1.2) significantly increases the difficulty of the inverse problem study, since one would need to construct suitable "probing modes" which fulfil this constraint. In [28], to overcome this difficulty, the authors proposed an effective method for dealing with the inverse problem, which takes into account the high-order variation in the probability space around a nontrivial uniform distribution. Moreover, this method can be expanded to the situation where the running cost varies on t by the construction of certain so-called CGO (Complex-Geometric-Optics) solutions. However, the method in [28] cannot be extended to dealing with the case of recovering more unknowns within the MFG system, say e.g. both the running cost and the Hamiltonian considered in the current article. In Table 1, we provide a rough comparison of different studies in the literature on MFG inverse problems. We would also like to mention some interesting results in two recent papers [22, 23]

TABLE 1. Comparisons of different studies in the literature on MFG inverse problems

Literature	Unknowns for recovery	Features of the unknowns	Technical Restriction
[27]	The running cost F and the total cost	Unknowns belong to certain analytic classes	The probability measure constraint was not treated
[28]	The running cost F	F belongs to an analytic class	It is difficult to recover more than one unknowns with the MFG system
[16]	The running cost F and Hamiltonian	F is in the form of an integral	Numerical result
The current paper	The running cost F and the Hamiltonian	F is in an analytic class or in the form of an integral	F depends only on x and m , but not t explicitly.

where quantitative estimates were derived to bounded the MFG solutions in terms of its (space-time) boundary data. The results may inspire some inverse problem study.

In this paper, we develop a novel approach to ensure the probability measure constraint on m while effectively tackle the MFG inverse problems, especially when the running cost depends only on the state-space variable x and the measure m . We term this approach as high-order variation in combination with successive linearisation. Moreover, this approach provides more flexibilities of extensions to inverse problems associated with different PDE systems than the one in [28]. Indeed, there are abundant of significant and challenging issues to be resolved for this emerging field of research on inverse problems for MFGs. In what follows, we list a few of them from our perspective, which are actually the motivational sources for the technical developments in the present paper. Can we find a better way to describe the probability measure constraint on m ? Is it possible that we can understand the space spanned by positive solutions (probability measure is non-negative at least) of a specific PDE system? Can the Hamiltonian of the MFG system be recovered in a more conventional configuration, such as the Hamiltonian with the form $H(x, \nabla u)$? Can the total cost or the operational cost of an MFG system be recovered using partial boundary observation? As shall be seen in our subsequent discussion, the novel approach can effectively tackle some of the issues mentioned above and actually pave the way for many potential developments. We believe that this field of research on inverse problems for MFGs will be dynamic.

Next, we briefly explain the benefits of this strategy here because this is the first theoretical article to recover non-local dependence running costs, and because we create a new method to get around the probability measure constraint. In recent research, inverse problems for nonlinear PDEs have been studied using higher order linearization; see, for example, [24, 25]. The study of the first order linearization system is crucial to the evidence in order to apply this strategy. This topic is challenging since we can only take into account positive solutions of linearization system due to the probability measure limitation. For the issues in the non-local scenario, we create a novel high-frequency linearization approach (see section 4). This approach allows us to primarily concentrate on the second order linearization system but not the first order system. Moreover, the initial value of the first order linearization system is still forced to be positive but the initial value of the second order linearization system is arbitrary. This is the reason why we can overcome the probability measure constraint. On the other hand, this method allows us to consider the linearization system of MFG system near a trivial solution. In this case, the linearization systems are much simpler than considering the linearization system of MFG system near a non-trivial solution as in [28]. Due to this fact, one can apply this method in other PDE system with positive constraint. Although this is a correlated PDE system, another unexpected aspect of our result is that we do not require the measure information in the boundary.

Finally, we would like to remark that there has recently been a lot of interest in the literature about the mathematical study of inverse problems related to nonlinear PDEs; for examples, see [24, 25, 29, 30] and the references listed therein. Even in this setting, there is another crucial aspect of our study that need to be emphasized. The two nonlinear PDEs are coupled in a backward-forward fashion with regard to time by the MFG system (1.1). We are confident that the mathematical techniques described in this work can be used to address more inverse problems connected to coupled nonlinear PDEs in various contexts.

The remainder of the essay is structured as follows. The basic outcome of the inverse problem is stated in Section 2, along with a few notations that have been fixed. The examination of the forward problem is covered in Section 3. In Section 4, we discuss and compare two different linearization methods and the proof of the major results are covered in Sections 5.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Notations and basic setting. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$, the Hölder space $C^{k+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ is defined as the subspace of $C^k(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\phi \in C^{k+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ if and only if $D^l \phi$ exist and are Hölder continuous with exponent α for all $l = (l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $|l| \leq k$, where $D^l := \partial_{x_1}^{l_1} \partial_{x_2}^{l_2} \cdots \partial_{x_n}^{l_n}$ for $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. The norm is defined as

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{k+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} := \sum_{|l| \leq k} \|D^l \phi\|_{\infty} + \sum_{|l|=k} \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|D^l \phi(x) - D^l \phi(y)|}{|x - y|^{\alpha}}. \quad (2.1)$$

If the function ϕ depends on both the time and space variables, we define $\phi \in C^{k+\alpha, \frac{k+\alpha}{2}}(Q)$ if $D^l D_t^j \phi$ exist and are Hölder continuous with exponent α in x and $\frac{k+\alpha}{2}$ in t for all $l \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|l| + 2j \leq k$. The norm is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{C^{k+\alpha, \frac{k+\alpha}{2}}(Q)} &:= \sum_{|l|+2j \leq k} \|D^l D_t^j \phi\|_{\infty} + \sum_{|l|+2j=k} \sup_{t, x \neq y} \frac{|\phi(x, t) - \phi(y, t)|}{|x - y|^{\alpha}} \\ &+ \sum_{|l|+2j=k} \sup_{t \neq t', x} \frac{|\phi(x, t) - \phi(x, t')|}{|t - t'|^{\alpha/2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

2.2. Admissible class. Now we introduce the admissible classes of the running cost of F in two different cases. The first one is closed to the conditions in [27]. For the completeness of this paper, we list it here.

Definition 2.1. We say $U(x, z) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is admissible, denoted by $U \in \mathcal{A}$, if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) The map $z \mapsto U(\cdot, z)$ is holomorphic with value in $C^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.
- (ii) $U(x, 0) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Clearly, if (1) and (2) are fulfilled, then U can be expanded into a power series as follows:

$$U(x, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U^{(k)}(x) \frac{(z)^k}{k!}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $U^{(k)}(x) = \frac{\partial^k U}{\partial z^k}(x, 1) \in C^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Clearly, if $F(x, m) \in \mathcal{A}$ and m is the density of the measure, then F depends on the measure locally.

Next, we consider the non-local case.

Definition 2.2. Let $m(x, t)$ be the density of a given distribution. We say

$$F(x, m) = \int_{\Omega} K(x, y) m(y, t) dy$$

belongs to \mathcal{B} if

- (i) $K(x, y)$ is smooth in $\Omega \times \Omega$.
- (ii) $\int_{\Omega} K(x, y) dy = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$.

Remark 2.3. In fact, the condition (ii) in the Definition 2.2 is quit natural. If $m_0(x) = 1$ and $\psi(x)$ be a constant c , the solution of MFG game system should be $(u, m) = (c, 0)$. This is because mean Field Games are non-atomic differential games. In other words, if $m_0(x)$ is the uniform distribution and $\psi(x)$ is constant, this is already a equilibrium of this system, then $m(x, t)$ should keep to be 1. This is a common nature of MFG system that the uniform distribution is a stable state.

2.3. Main unique identifiability results. We are able to articulate the primary conclusions for the inverse problems, which show that one can recover the running cost and Hamiltonian from the measurement map $\mathcal{N}_{F,\kappa}$.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $F_j(x, m) \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{N}_{F_j, \kappa_j}$ be the measurement map associated to the following system:*

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(x, t) - \Delta u(x, t) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_j |\nabla u(x, t)|^2 = F_j(x, m), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m(x, t) - \Delta m(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(m(x, t)\kappa_j \nabla u(x, t)) = 0, & \text{in } Q', \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = \partial_\nu m(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m(x, 0) = m_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

If for any $(m_0, \psi) \in [C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{O}_a] \times C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)$, where \mathcal{O}_a is defined in (1.2), one has

$$\mathcal{N}_{F_1, \kappa_1}(m_0, \psi) = \mathcal{N}_{F_2, \kappa_2}(m_0, \psi),$$

then it holds that

$$\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and

$$F_1(x, z) = F_2(x, z) \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that*

$$F_j(x, m) = \int_{\Omega} K_j(x, y)m(y, t)dy \in \mathcal{B}$$

. Let $\mathcal{N}_{F_j, \kappa_j}$ be the measurement map associated to the following system:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u(x, t) - \Delta u(x, t) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_j |\nabla u(x, t)|^2 = \int_{\Omega'} K_j(x, y)m(y, t)dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m(x, t) - \Delta m(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(m(x, t)\kappa_j \nabla u(x, t)) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = \partial_\nu m(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m(x, 0) = m_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

If for any $(m_0, \psi) \in [C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{O}_a] \times C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)$, where \mathcal{O}_a is defined in (1.2), one has

$$\mathcal{N}_{F_1, \kappa_1}(m_0, \psi) = \mathcal{N}_{F_2, \kappa_2}(m_0, \psi),$$

then it holds that

$$\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and

$$K_1(x, y) = K_2(x, y) \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \Omega.$$

3. LOCAL WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE FORWARD PROBLEMS

We obtain numerous auxiliary conclusions on the forward problem of the MFG system (1.1) in this section. One of the most significant insights is the infinite differentiability of the system with respect to small variations around given input $m_0(x)$ or $\psi(x)$. This is the foundation to apply the linearization methods.

For the well-posedness of system (1.1) with respect to $m_0(x)$. A similar result is proved in [27], so we just state this theorem here without proof. To make this paper complete, we give the proof of the well-posedness of system (1.1) with respect to $\psi(x)$, which is similar to the proof of the following system.

Theorem 3.1. *Given $\psi(x) = 0$. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{A}$. The following results holds:*

(a) *There exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any*

$$m_0 \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) := \{m_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) : \|m_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq \delta\},$$

the MFG system (1.1) has a solution $(u, m) \in [C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)]^2$ which satisfies

$$\|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} := \|u\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} + \|m\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\|m_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)}. \quad (3.1)$$

Furthermore, the solution (u, m) is unique within the class

$$\{(u, m) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) : \|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\delta\}. \quad (3.2)$$

(b) *Define a function*

$$S : B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) \rightarrow C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \text{ by } S(m_0) := (u, v).$$

where (u, v) is the unique solution to the MFG system (1.1). Then for any $m_0 \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega))$, S is holomorphic.

A similiary result is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Given $m_0(x) = 0$. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{A}$. The following results holds:*

(a) *There exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any*

$$\psi(x) \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) := \{\psi \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) : \|\psi(x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq \delta\},$$

the MFG system (1.1) has a solution $(u, m) \in [C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)]^2$ which satisfies

$$\|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} := \|u\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} + \|m\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\|\psi(x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Furthermore, the solution (u, m) is unique within the class

$$\{(u, m) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) : \|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\delta\}. \quad (3.4)$$

(b) *Define a function*

$$S : B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) \rightarrow C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \text{ by } S(\psi(x)) := (u, v).$$

where (u, v) is the unique solution to the MFG system (1.1). Then for any $\psi(x) \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega))$, S is holomorphic.

The proof of Thoerem 3.2. Let

$$Y_1 := \{m \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) : \partial_\nu m = 0\},$$

$$Y_2 := \{(u, m) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) : \partial_\nu m = \partial_\nu u = 0 \text{ in } \Sigma\},$$

$$Y_3 := Y_1 \times Y_1 \times C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q),$$

and we define a map $\mathcal{K} : Y_1 \times Y_2 \rightarrow Y_3$ by that for any $(\psi, \tilde{u}, \tilde{m}) \in Y_1 \times Y_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{K}(\psi, \tilde{u}, \tilde{m})(x, t) \\ & := (\tilde{u}(x, T) - \psi(x), \tilde{m}(x, 0), -\partial_t \tilde{u}(x, t) - \Delta \tilde{u}(x, t) \\ & \quad + \frac{\kappa(x)|\nabla \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2}{2} - F(x, \tilde{m}(x, t)), \partial_t \tilde{m}(x, t) - \Delta \tilde{m}(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(\tilde{m}(x, t)\kappa(x)\nabla \tilde{u}(x, t))). \end{aligned}$$

We begin by demonstrating that \mathcal{K} is well-defined. As a result of the fact that the Hölder space is an algebra under point-wise multiplication, we have $\kappa(x)|\nabla u|^2, \operatorname{div}(m(x, t)\kappa(x)\nabla u(x, t)) \in C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$. By the Cauchy integral formula,

$$F^{(k)} \leq \frac{k!}{R^k} \sup_{|z|=R} \|F(\cdot, z)\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)}, \quad R > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Then there is $L > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\| \frac{F^{(k)}}{k!} m^k \right\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq \frac{L^k}{R^k} \|m\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)}^k \sup_{|z|=R} \|F(\cdot, z)\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)}. \quad (3.6)$$

By choosing $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ large enough and by virtue of (3.5) and (3.6), it can be seen that the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x) \frac{z^k}{k!}$ converges in $C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$ and therefore $F(x, m(x, t)) \in C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$. This implies that \mathcal{K} is well-defined.

Let us show that \mathcal{K} is holomorphic. Verifying that \mathcal{K} is weakly holomorphic is sufficient because it is evidently locally confined. That is we aim to show the map

$$\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mapsto \mathcal{K}((m_0, \tilde{u}, \tilde{m}) + \lambda(\bar{m}_0, \bar{u}, \bar{m})) \in Y_3, \quad \text{for any } (\bar{m}_0, \bar{u}, \bar{m}) \in Y_1 \times Y_2$$

is holomorphic. In fact, this follows from the fact that the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x) \frac{z^k}{k!}$ converges in $C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$.

Note that $\mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0) = 0$. Let us compute $\nabla_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{m})} \mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0)$:

$$\nabla_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{m})} \mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0)(u, m) = (0, 0, -\partial_t u(x, t) - \Delta u(x, t) - F^{(1)} m, \partial_t m(x, t) - \Delta m(x, t)). \quad (3.7)$$

Then If $\nabla_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{m})} \mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0) = 0$, we have $\bar{m} = 0$ and then $\bar{u} = 0$. Therefore, the map is injective.

On the other hand, letting $(r(x), s(x, t)) \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) \times C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$, there exists $a(x, t) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t a(x, t) - \Delta a(x, t) = s(x, t) & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu a = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ a(x, 0) = r(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then letting $(r'(x), s'(x, t)) \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) \times C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$, one can show that there exists $b(x, t) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t b(x, t) - \Delta b(x, t) - F^{(1)}(x)a = s'(x, t) & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu b = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ b(x, T) = r'(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

This shows that $\nabla_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{m})} \mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0)$ is also surjective. Therefore, $\nabla_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{m})} \mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0)$ is a linear isomorphism between Y_2 and Y_3 . Hence, by the implicit function theorem, there exist $\delta > 0$ and a unique holomorphic function $S : B_\delta(\Omega) \rightarrow Y_2$ such that $\mathcal{K}(\psi, S(m_0)) = 0$ for all $m_0 \in B_\delta(\Omega)$.

By letting $(u, m) = S(\psi(x))$, we obtain the unique solution of the MFG system (1.1). Let $(u_0, v_0) = S(0)$. Since S is Lipschitz, we know that there exist constants $C, C' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)^2} \\ & \leq C' \|\psi(x)\|_{B_\delta(\Omega)} + \|u_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} + \|v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \\ & \leq C \|\psi\|_{B_\delta(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Notice that we still need to show the local well-posedness in the case that the running cost F in the form of inegration. It is stated in the following theorems.

Theorem 3.3. *Given $\psi(x) = 0$. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{B}$. The following results holds:*

(a) *There exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any*

$$m_0 \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) := \{m_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) : \|m_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq \delta\},$$

the MFG system (1.1) has a solution $(u, m) \in [C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)]^2$ which satisfies

$$\|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} := \|u\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} + \|m\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\|m_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)}. \quad (3.8)$$

Furthermore, the solution (u, m) is unique within the class

$$\{(u, m) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) : \|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\delta\}. \quad (3.9)$$

(b) *Define a function*

$$S : B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) \rightarrow C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \text{ by } S(m_0) := (u, v).$$

where (u, v) is the unique solution to the MFG system (1.1). Then for any $m_0 \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega))$, S is holomorphic.

Similarly, we have

Theorem 3.4. *Given $m_0(x) = 0$. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{A}$. The following results holds:*

(a) *There exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any*

$$\psi(x) \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) := \{\psi \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) : \|\psi(x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq \delta\},$$

the MFG system (1.1) has a solution $(u, m) \in [C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)]^2$ which satisfies

$$\|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} := \|u\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} + \|m\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\|\psi(x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Furthermore, the solution (u, m) is unique within the class

$$\{(u, m) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) : \|(u, m)\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q)} \leq C\delta\}. \quad (3.11)$$

(b) *Define a function*

$$S : B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega)) \rightarrow C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \text{ by } S(\psi(x)) := (u, v).$$

where (u, v) is the unique solution to the MFG system (1.1). Then for any $\psi(x) \in B_\delta(C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega))$, S is holomorphic.

For these two theorems, we give the proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let

$$Z_1 := \{m \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega) : \partial_\nu m = 0\},$$

$$Z_2 := \{(u, m) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) : \partial_\nu m = \partial_\nu u = 0 \text{ in } \Sigma\},$$

$$Z_3 := Z_1 \times Z_1 \times C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q) \times C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(Q),$$

and we define a map $\mathcal{K} : Z_1 \times Z_2 \rightarrow Z_3$ by that for any $(m_0(x), \tilde{u}, \tilde{m}) \in Y_1 \times Y_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{K}(m_0(x), \tilde{u}, \tilde{m})(x, t) \\ & := (0, \tilde{m}(x, 0), -\partial_t \tilde{u}(x, t) - \Delta \tilde{u}(x, t) \\ & \quad + \frac{\kappa(x)|\nabla \tilde{u}(x, t)|^2}{2} - F(x, \tilde{m}(x, t)), \partial_t \tilde{m}(x, t) - \Delta \tilde{m}(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(\tilde{m}(x, t)\kappa(x)\nabla \tilde{u}(x, t))). \end{aligned}$$

We shall use the same arguemnt in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Since $F \in \mathcal{B}$ and then $K(x, y)$ is smooth. It is clear that \mathcal{K} is well-defined. To complete this proof, we only need to show

$$\nabla_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{m})} \mathcal{K}(0, 0, 0)(u, m) = (0, 0, -\partial_t u - \Delta u - \int_\Omega K(x, y)m(y, t)dy, \partial_t m - \Delta m). \quad (3.12)$$

is a linear isomorphism between Z_2 and Z_3 . This also follows by the fact $K(x, y)$ is smooth and a similarly argument in Theorem 3.1. \square

4. ANALYSIS OF THE LINEARIZED SYSTEMS IN TWO DIFFERENT SCENARIOS

4.1. Higher-order linearization. We next develop a high-order linearization scheme of the MFG system (1.1) with respect to $\psi(x)$ in the case that $F(x, m) \in \mathcal{B}$. By Theorem 3.2, given $m_0(x)$, the MFG system (1.1) is infinite differentiable with respect to a input $\psi(x)$.

We introduce the basic setting of this higher order linearization method. Consider the system (1.1). Let

$$\psi(x; \varepsilon) = \varepsilon_1 f_1 + \varepsilon_2 f_2,$$

where

$$f_l \in C^{2+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|\varepsilon| = |\varepsilon_1| + |\varepsilon_2|$ small enough.

By Theorem 3.2, there exists a unique solution $(u(x, t; \varepsilon), m(x, t; \varepsilon))$ of (1.1). If $\varepsilon = 0$ and $m_0(x) = 0$ by our assumption, we have $(u(x, t; 0), m(x, t; 0)) = (0, 0)$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(1)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} u|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x, t; \varepsilon) - u(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_1}, \\ m^{(1)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} m|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(x, t; \varepsilon) - m(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can construct a new system with unknowns $(u^{(1)}, m^{(1)})$. In other words, we have $(u_j^{(1)}, m_j^{(1)})$ satisfies the following system:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(1)} - \Delta u^{(1)} = \int_{\Omega} K(x, y) m^{(1)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m^{(1)}(x, t) - \Delta m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_{\nu} u^{(1)}(x, t) = \partial_{\nu} m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1)}(x, T) = f_1, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(1)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Then we can define

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(2)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_2} u|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x, t; \varepsilon) - u(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_2}, \\ m^{(2)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_2} m|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(x, t; \varepsilon) - m(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and obtain a similar system.

Next, we consider

$$u^{(1,2)} := \partial_{\varepsilon_1} \partial_{\varepsilon_2} u|_{\varepsilon=0}, m^{(1,2)} := \partial_{\varepsilon_1} \partial_{\varepsilon_2} m|_{\varepsilon=0}. \quad (4.2)$$

We have the second-order linearization as follows:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(1,2)} - \Delta u^{(1,2)}(x, t) + \kappa(x) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} \\ \quad = \int_{\Omega} K(x, y) m^{(1,2)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t m^{(1,2)} - \Delta m^{(1,2)} = \operatorname{div}(m^{(1)} \kappa(x) \nabla u^{(2)}) + \operatorname{div}(m^{(2)} \kappa(x) \nabla u^{(1)}), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_{\nu} u^{(1,2)}(x, t) = \partial_{\nu} m^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1,2)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(1,2)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Notice that the non-linear terms of the system (4.3) depend on the first-order linearised system (4.1). We will use this to recover $\kappa(x)$ in the proof of Theorem 2.2. In fact, we get three systems by this method and intinial values of the first two systems, say f_1, f_2 are arbitrary functions. Hence, we will focus on the solutions of first two systems.

By a similar approach, we can define the high-order linearization scheme of the MFG system (1.1) in the case that $F(x, m) \in \mathcal{A}$. For detials, see [27, 28]. We just show the main equations here.

The first order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(1)} - \Delta u^{(1)} = F^{(1)}(x)m^{(1)}(x, t), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m^{(1)}(x, t) - \Delta m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1)}(x, T) = f_1, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(1)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

The second order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(1,2)} - \Delta u^{(1,2)}(x, t) + \kappa(x)\nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} \\ \quad = F^{(1)}m^{(1,2)}(x, t) + F^{(2)}m^{(1)}(x, t)m^{(2)}(x, t), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t m^{(1,2)} - \Delta m^{(1,2)} = \operatorname{div}(m^{(1)}\kappa(x)\nabla u^{(2)}) + \operatorname{div}(m^{(2)}\kappa(x)\nabla u^{(1)}), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1,2)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1,2)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(1,2)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

Similarly, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(1,2,\dots,N)} &= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} \partial_{\varepsilon_2} \dots \partial_{\varepsilon_N} u|_{\varepsilon=0}, \\ m^{(1,2,\dots,N)} &= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} \partial_{\varepsilon_2} \dots \partial_{\varepsilon_N} m|_{\varepsilon=0}. \end{aligned}$$

We are able to produce a series of parabolic systems that will be used once more to determine the higher order Taylor coefficients of the unknowns F . The most imporment ingredient is that the non-linear terms in higher order systems only depend on the solutions of lower order terms. Therefore, we can apply mathematical induction in the proof of Thoerem 2.1.

4.2. High-order variation. We now take into account another linearization technique. We are the first to suggest and use this approach to address an inverse problem. If we simply take into consideration positive solutions, which is quite common in physics issues, it is significantly better than the first type of linearization method. If the running cost is dependent on m non-locally in this MFG system, it also gains supremacy.

Consider the system (1.1). Let

$$m_0(x; \varepsilon) = \varepsilon g_1 + \varepsilon^2 g_2,$$

where

$$g_1, g_2 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad , \quad g_1 \geq 0,$$

and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then we have $m_0 \geq 0$ in Ω' if ε tends to 0. By Theorem 3.3, there exists a unique solution $(u(x, t; \varepsilon), m(x, t; \varepsilon))$ of (1.1). If $\varepsilon = 0$ and $\psi(x) = 0$, we have $(u(x, t; 0), m(x, t; 0)) = (0, 0)$.

Let

$$u^{(I)} := \partial_\varepsilon u|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x, t; \varepsilon) - u(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon},$$

$$m^{(I)} := \partial_\varepsilon m|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(x, t; \varepsilon) - m(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon}.$$

We get the first order linearization

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(I)} - \Delta u^{(I)} = \int_{\Omega'} K(x, y) m^{(I)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m^{(I)}(x, t) - \Delta m^{(I)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(I)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m^{(I)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(I)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(I)}(x, 0) = g_1, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

It is the same as the first method until now and the main difference is that we will focus on the second order linearization system in this method but not the first order system. Since in this case, g_2 is arbitrary, it helps us to surmount difficulties in inverse problem.

Let

$$u^{(II)} := \partial_\varepsilon^2 u|_{\varepsilon=0}, \quad m^{(II)} := \partial_\varepsilon^2 m|_{\varepsilon=0}.$$

Then the second order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(II)} - \Delta u^{(II)} + \kappa(x) |\nabla u^{(I)}|^2 = \int_{\Omega} K(x, y) m^{(II)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m^{(II)}(x, t) - \Delta m^{(II)}(x, t) = 2 \operatorname{div}(m^{(I)} \kappa \nabla u^{(I)}), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(II)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m^{(II)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(II)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(II)}(x, 0) = 2g_2, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

Similarly, the non-linear terms only depend on the solution of the first order linearization system. Notice that we only get two systems by this method, but the initial value of $m_j^{(II)}(x, 0)$ is still free to choose as an arbitrary function. We will use this fact to recover $K(x, y)$ in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Remark 4.1. *In fact, we can also use the high-order variation method in the proof of Theorem 2.1. But the higher-order linearization method does not work in the proof of Theorem 2.2. This fact shows its advantage.*

We list the higher-order linearization method here because this is a common method in recent literature and it still gains supremacy in some local-dependence cases.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1, 2.2

We start from a useful Lemma. It is the key part of the main proofs.

Lemma 5.1. *Consider*

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u - \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } Q \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

There exist a sequence of solution $u(x, t)$ of system (5.1) such that

- (1) $u(x, t) = e^{\lambda t} g(x; \lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g(x; \lambda) \in C^2(\Omega')$.
- (2) *There does not exist an open subset U of Ω such that $\nabla g(x; \lambda) = 0$ in U .*

Proof. Let λ be an eigenvalue of Neumann-Laplacian operator and $g(x; \lambda)$ be a corresponding eigenfunction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta g(x; \lambda) = \lambda g(x; \lambda) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu g(x; \lambda) = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

Then it is obviously that $u(x, t) = e^{\lambda t} g(x; \lambda)$ is a solution of (5.1). This implies that $\lambda = 0$. It is a contradiction.

Futhermore, suppose there is an open subset U of Ω such that $\nabla g = 0$ in U , then g is a constant in U . This implies that $\lambda = 0$. It is a contradiction.

This completes the proof. \square

With all the preparations, we are in a position to present the proof of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 .

Proof of Theorem 2.1 . For $j = 1, 2$, let us consider

$$\begin{cases} -u_t - \Delta u + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_j|\nabla u|^2 = F_j(x, m) & \text{in } Q, \\ m_t - \Delta m - \operatorname{div}(m\kappa_j\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = \partial_\nu m(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m(x, 0) = m_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

Next, we divide our proof into several steps.

Step I. We show $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ first.

Let $\psi(x) = \varepsilon_1 f_1 + \varepsilon_2 f_2$, $m_0 = 0$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(1)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} u|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x, t; \varepsilon) - u(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_1}, \\ m^{(1)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} m|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(x, t; \varepsilon) - m(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1)} - \Delta u_j^{(1)} = F_j^{(1)}(x) m^{(1)}(x, t), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(1)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(1)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u_j^{(1)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m_j^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j^{(1)}(x, T) = f_1, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m_j^{(1)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

This implies that $m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0$. We define $m^{(2)}(x, t)$ in the same way (see section 4). Similarly, we have $m^{(2)}(x, t) = 0$. Therefore, $u_j^{(1)}(x, t)$ are independent of j . Let $u_1^{(1)}(x, t) = u_2^{(1)}(x, t) = u^{(1)}(x, t)$, then it satisfies the following system

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(1)}(x, t) - \Delta u^{(1)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1)}(x, T) = f_1, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

Similarly, $u_1^{(2)}(x, t) = u_2^{(2)}(x, t) = u^{(2)}(x, t)$ also satisfy (5.5). Notice that $m^{(1)}(x, t) = m^{(2)}(x, t) = 0$, we have the second order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1,2)} - \Delta u_j^{(1,2)} + \kappa_j(x) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} = F_j^{(1)} m^{(1,2)}(x, t), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1,2)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(1,2)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

Note that $m^{(1,2)}(x, t)$ must be 0 and hence,

$$-\partial_t u^{(1,2)} - \Delta u^{(1,2)} + \kappa_j(x) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

holds if $u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}$ are solution of (5.24). Let $\bar{u}(x, t) = u_1^{(1,2)}(x, t) - u_2^{(1,2)}(x, t)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa_1, F_1} = \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_2, F_2}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \bar{u} - \Delta \bar{u} + (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu \bar{u}(x, t) = \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{u}(x, T) = \bar{u}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Let ω be a solution of the following system

$$\partial_t \omega - \Delta \omega = 0 \text{ in } Q, \quad (5.9)$$

then we multiply ω on the both side of (5.8) and then integration by part implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} \omega dx dt = 0. \quad (5.10)$$

By Lemma 5.1, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g(x) \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $e^{\lambda t} g(x)$ satisfies (5.5). Let $f_1 = e^{\lambda T} g(x)$, then by the uniqueness of the solution of heat equation, we have

$$u^{(1)}(x, t) = e^{\lambda t} g(x).$$

Then we have

$$\int_{Q'} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) e^{2\lambda t} |\nabla g(x)|^2 \omega dx dt = 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Consider $\omega = e^{-|\xi|^2 t - ix \cdot \xi}$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It follows that

$$\int_0^T e^{2\lambda t} e^{-|\xi|^2 t} \int_{\Omega} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) |\nabla g(x)|^2 e^{-ix \cdot \xi} = 0.$$

i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) |\nabla g(x)|^2 e^{-ix \cdot \xi} = 0.$$

Therefore, we have $(\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) |\nabla g(x)|^2 = 0$ in Ω . By the construction in Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x) = 0.$$

Step II. Let $\kappa = \kappa_1 = \kappa_2$. Next, we aim to show $F_1 = F_2$. Consider the following systems

$$\begin{cases} -u_t - \Delta u + \frac{1}{2} \kappa(x) |\nabla u|^2 = F_j(x, m) & \text{in } Q, \\ m_t - \Delta m - \operatorname{div}(m \kappa(x) \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = \partial_\nu m(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m(x, 0) = m_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

Let $\psi(x) = 0$ and

$$m_0(x; \varepsilon) = \sum_{l=1}^N \varepsilon_l f_l,$$

where

$$f_l \in C^{2+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad f_l \geq 0,$$

and $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_N) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ with $|\varepsilon| = \sum_{l=1}^N |\varepsilon_l|$ small enough. First, we do the first order linearization to the MFG system (5.12) in Q and can derive:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1)} - \Delta u_j^{(1)} = F_j^{(1)}(x) m_j^{(1)} & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(1)} - \Delta m_j^{(1)} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1)}(x, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m_j^{(1)}(x, 0) = f_1(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

We just choose $f_1(x) = 1$, then we have $m_1^{(1)}(x, t) = m_2^{(1)}(x, t) = 1$. Hence, we have $u_j^{(1)}(x, t)$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1)} - \Delta u_j^{(1)} = F_j^{(1)}(x) & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1)}(x, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.14)$$

Let $\bar{u}(x, t) = u_1^{(1)}(x, t) - u_2^{(1)}(x, t)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa_1, F_1} = \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_2, F_2}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \bar{u}(x, t) - \Delta \bar{u}(x, t) = F_1^{(1)}(x) - F_2^{(1)}(x), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu \bar{u}(x, t) = \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{u}(x, T) = \bar{u}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

Let ω be a solution of the following system

$$\partial_t \omega - \Delta \omega = 0 \text{ in } Q, \quad (5.16)$$

then we multiply ω on the both side of (5.15) and then integration by part implies that

$$\int_Q (F_1^{(1)}(x) - F_2^{(1)}(x)) \omega(x, t) dx dt = 0. \quad (5.17)$$

Consider $\omega = e^{-|\xi|^2 t - ix \cdot \xi}$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Similarly to the proof of part (I), we have

$$\int_\Omega (F_1^{(1)}(x) - F_2^{(1)}(x)) e^{i\xi \cdot x} dx = 0, \quad (5.18)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, we have $F_1^{(1)}(x) = F_2^{(1)}(x)$.

Step III. We proceed to consider the second linearization to the MFG system (5.12) in Q and can obtain for $j = 1, 2$:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1,2)} - \Delta u_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) + \kappa(x) \nabla u_j^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u_j^{(2)} \\ \quad = F_j^{(1)}(x) m_j^{(1,2)} + F_j^{(2)}(x) m_j^{(1)} m_j^{(2)} & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t m_j^{(1,2)} - \Delta m_j^{(1,2)} = \operatorname{div}(m_j^{(1)} \kappa(x) \nabla u_j^{(2)}) + \operatorname{div}(m_j^{(2)} \kappa(x) \nabla u_j^{(1)}), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T) \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1,2)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j^{(1,2)}(x, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m_j^{(1,2)}(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.19)$$

Now we may choose $f_1(x) = f_2(x) = 1$, then we have

$$m_j^{(1)}(x, t) = m_j^{(2)}(x, t) = 1.$$

Notice that we have shown that $F_1^{(1)}(x) = F_2^{(1)}(x)$ in Ω and this implies that

$$m^{(1,2)}(x, t) = m_1^{(1,2)}(x, t) = m_2^{(1,2)}(x, t).$$

Let $\hat{u}(x, t) = u_1^{(1,2)}(x, t) - u_2^{(1,2)}(x, t)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa_1, F_1} = \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_2, F_2}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \hat{u}(x, t) - \Delta \hat{u}(x, t) = (F_1^{(2)}(x) - F_2^{(2)}(x)), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu \hat{u}(x, t) = \hat{u}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \hat{u}(x, T) = \hat{u}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

Let ω be a solution of the following system

$$\partial_t \omega - \Delta \omega = 0 \text{ in } Q, \quad (5.21)$$

then we multiply ω on the both side of (5.20) and then integration by part implies that

$$\int_Q (F_1^{(2)}(x) - F_2^{(2)}(x)) \omega(x, t) dx dt = 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Similarly to the proof of part (II), we have

$$F_1^{(2)}(x) - F_2^{(2)}(x).$$

Step IV. Finally, using mathematical induction and reiterating similar arguments as in Steps II and III, one can show that

$$F_1^{(k)}(x) - F_2^{(k)}(x) = 0,$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$F_1(x, z) = F_2(x, z)$$

in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. The proof is now complete. \square

Next we show the Theorem 2.2. Recall that in this case, we have

$$F(x, m) = \int_\Omega K(x, y) m(y, t) dy.$$

By comparing the proof of Theorem 2.1 with the proof of Theorem 2.2, we claim that High-frequency method is much better in the non-local case.

Proof of Theorem 2.2 . For $j = 1, 2$, let us consider

$$\begin{cases} -u_t - \Delta u + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_j |\nabla u|^2 = \int_\Omega K_j(x, y) m(y, t) dy & \text{in } Q, \\ m_t - \Delta m - \operatorname{div}(m \kappa_j \nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = \partial_\nu m(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m(x, 0) = m_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.23)$$

Next, we divide our proof into several steps.

Step I. We show $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ first.

Let $\psi(x) = \varepsilon_1 f_1 + \varepsilon_2 f_2$, $m_0 = 0$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(1)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} u|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x, t; \varepsilon) - u(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_1}, \\ m^{(1)} &:= \partial_{\varepsilon_1} m|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(x, t; \varepsilon) - m(x, t; 0)}{\varepsilon_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1)} - \Delta u_j^{(1)} = \int_{\Omega'} K_j(x, y) m^{(1)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(1)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(1)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u_j^{(1)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m_j^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma', \\ u_j^{(1)}(x, T) = f_1, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m_j^{(1)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.24)$$

This implies that $m^{(1)}(x, t) = 0$. We define $m^{(2)}(x, t)$ in the same way (see section 4). Similarly, we have $m^{(2)}(x, t) = 0$. Therefore, $u_j^{(1)}(x, t)$ are independent of j . Let $u_1^{(1)}(x, t) = u_2^{(1)}(x, t) = u^{(1)}(x, t)$, then it satisfies the following system

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u^{(1)}(x, t) - \Delta u^{(1)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u^{(1)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1)}(x, T) = f_1, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.25)$$

Then the second order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(1,2)} - \Delta u_j^{(1,2)} + \kappa_j(x) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} = \int_{\Omega} K_j(x, y) m^{(1,2)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu u_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) = \partial_\nu m_j^{(1,2)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u^{(1,2)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m^{(1,2)}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.26)$$

Note that $m^{(1,2)}(x, t)$ must be 0 and hence,

$$-\partial_t u^{(1,2)} - \Delta u^{(1,2)} + \kappa_j(x) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} = 0, \quad (5.27)$$

holds if $u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}$ are solution of (5.24). Let $\bar{u} = u_1^{(1,2)}(x, t) - u_2^{(1,2)}(x, t)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa_1, F_1} = \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_2, F_2}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t \bar{u} - \Delta \bar{u} + (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu \bar{u}(x, t) = \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{u}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.28)$$

Let ω be a solution of the following system

$$\partial_t \omega - \Delta \omega = 0, \text{ in } Q, \quad (5.29)$$

then we multiply ω on the both side of (5.28) and then integration by part implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) \nabla u^{(1)} \cdot \nabla u^{(2)} \omega dx dt = 0. \quad (5.30)$$

By Lemma 5.1, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g(x) \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $e^{\lambda t} g(x)$ satisfies (5.25). Let $f_1 = e^{\lambda T} g(x)$, then by the uniqueness of the solution of heat equation, we have

$$u^{(1)}(x, t) = e^{\lambda t} g(x).$$

Consider $\omega = e^{-|\xi|^2 t - ix \cdot \xi}$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By the same argument in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\int_0^T e^{2\lambda t} e^{-|\xi|^2 t} \int_{\Omega} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) |\nabla g(x)|^2 e^{-ix \cdot \xi} = 0.$$

i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega} (\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) |\nabla g(x)|^2 e^{-ix \cdot \xi} = 0.$$

Therefore, we have $(\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x)) |\nabla g(x)|^2 = 0$ in Ω . By the construction in Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\kappa_1(x) - \kappa_2(x) = 0.$$

Step II. Let $\kappa = \kappa_1 = \kappa_2$. Next, we aim to show $K_1(x, y) = K_2(x, y)$.

Consider another type of linearization method, let $m_0 = \varepsilon g_1 + \varepsilon^2 g_2$, where $g_1 > 0, \varepsilon > 0$. Let $\psi(x) = 0$. Then the first order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(I)} - \Delta u_j^{(I)} = \int_{\Omega} K_j(x, y) m^{(I)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(I)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(I)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_{\nu} u_j^{(I)}(x, t) = \partial_{\nu} m_j^{(I)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j^{(I)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m_j^{(I)}(x, 0) = g_1, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.31)$$

Let $g_1(x) = 1$. Since $\int_{\Omega} K_j(x, y) dy = 0$ for $j = 1, 2$, we have $u_j^{(I)}(x, t) = 0, m_j^{(I)}(x, t) = 1$. Then the second order linearization system is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t u_j^{(II)} - \Delta u_j^{(II)} + \kappa(x) |\nabla u^{(I)}|^2 = \int_{\Omega} K_j(x, y) m^{(II)}(y, t) dy, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_t m_j^{(II)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(II)}(x, t) = 2 \operatorname{div}(m^{(I)} \kappa \nabla u^{(I)}), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_{\nu} u_j^{(II)}(x, t) = \partial_{\nu} m_j^{(II)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j^{(II)}(x, T) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ m_j^{(II)}(x, 0) = 2g_2, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.32)$$

Define $\hat{K} = K_1 - K_2$. Let ω be a solution of (5.29), by a similar argument, we have

$$\int_Q \left[\int_{\Omega} \hat{K}(x, y) m^{(2)}(y, t) dy \right] \omega(x, t) dx dt = 0, \quad (5.33)$$

for all $m^{(II)}(y, t)$ such that it is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t m_j^{(II)}(x, t) - \Delta m_j^{(II)}(x, t) = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_{\nu} m_j^{(II)}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ m_j^{(II)}(x, 0) = 2g_2, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.34)$$

Similarly, by Lemma 5.1, we may choose $m^{(II)}(x, t) = e^{\lambda t} g(x; \lambda)$. Then by the same argument, we have

$$\int_0^T e^{\lambda t} e^{-|\xi|^2 t} dt \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_{\Omega} \hat{K}(x, y) g(y; \lambda) dy \right] e^{-ix \cdot \xi} dx = 0, \quad (5.35)$$

Then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \hat{K}(x, y) g(y; \lambda) dy = 0,$$

for all $g(y; \lambda)$. Note that $g(y; \lambda)$ can be all Neumann eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$ and these functions are complete in $L^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, we have

$$K_1(x, y) = K_2(x, y)$$

in Ω . The proof is now complete. \square

Remark 5.2. *By the proof of this two Theorem, we show that we do not need the full information of $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa, F}(m_0, \psi)$. One can only use $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa, F}(m_0, 0)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\kappa, F}(0, \psi)$ to recover F and $\kappa(x)$.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work of was supported by the Hong Kong RGC General Research Funds (projects 12302919, 12301420 and 11300821), the NSFC/RGC Joint Research Fund (project N_CityU 101/21), and the France-Hong Kong ANR/RGC Joint Research Grant, A-CityU203/19.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. M. AMBROSE, Strong solutions for time-dependent mean field games with non-separable Hamiltonians, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 113 (2018), 141–154.
- [2] D. M. AMBROSE, Existence theory for non-separable mean field games in Sobolev spaces, *Indiana U. Math. J.* to appear, arXiv 1807.02223.
- [3] D. A. GOMES, E. A. PIMENTEL AND H. SÁNCHEZ-MORGADO, Time-dependent mean-field games in the subquadratic case, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 40 (2015), no. 1, 40–76.
- [4] D. A. GOMES, E. A. PIMENTEL AND H. SÁNCHEZ-MORGADO, Time-dependent mean-field games in the superquadratic case, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 22 (2016), no. 2, 562–580.
- [5] P. CARDALIAGUET, Weak solutions for first order mean field games with local coupling, in *Analysis and geometry in control theory and its applications*, 111–158, Springer INdAM Ser., 11, Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [6] P. CARDALIAGUET AND P. J. GRABER, Mean field games systems of first order, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 21 (2015), no. 3, 690–722.
- [7] P. CARDALIAGUET, P.J. GRABER, A. PORRETTA AND D. TONON, Second order mean field games with degenerate diffusion and local coupling, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 22 (2015), no. 5, 1287–1317.
- [8] P. CARDALIAGUET AND A. PORRETTA, An introduction to mean field game theory, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 2281 (2020), pages 1–158.
- [9] R. CARMONA AND F. DELARUE, Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games., *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*, 83. Springer, Cham, 2018. *xrv+713 pp.*
- [10] M. CIRANT, R. GIANNI AND P. MANNUCCI, Short-time existence for a general backward-forward parabolic system arising from mean-field games, *Dyn. Games Appl.* 10 (2020), no. 1, 100–119.
- [11] M. CIRANT AND A. GOFFI, Maximal L^q -regularity for parabolic Hamilton-Jacobi equations and applications to Mean Field Games, *Ann. PDE* 7 (2021), 19.
- [12] P. CARDALIAGUET, Notes on Mean-Field Games, *based on the lectures by P.L. Lions at Collège de France*, (2012).
- [13] Y.T. CHOW, S.W. FUNG, S.T. LIU, L. NURBEKYAN AND S. OSHER, A Numerical algorithm for inverse problem from partial boundary measurement arising from mean field game problem. [arXiv:2204.04851](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04851).
- [14] P. CARDALIAGUET, Weak solutions for first order mean field games with local coupling, in *Analysis and geometry in control theory and its applications*, 111–158, Springer INdAM Ser., 11, Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [15] P. CARDALIAGUET AND A. PORRETTA, An introduction to mean field game theory, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 2281 (2020), pages 1–158.
- [16] L. DING, W. LI, S. OSHER AND W. YIN, A mean field game inverse problem, *J. Sci. Comput.* to appear, [arXiv:2007.11551](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.11551).
- [17] R. FERREIRA, D. GOMES AND T. TADA, Existence of weak solutions to time-dependent mean-field games, *Nonlinear Anal.* 212 (2021), Paper No. 112470, 31 pp.
- [18] R. FERREIRA AND D. GOMES, Existence of weak solutions to stationary mean-field games through variational inequalities, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 50 (2018), no. 6, 5969–6006.

- [19] R. FERREIRA, D. GOMES AND T. TADA, Existence of weak solutions to time-dependent mean-field games, *Nonlinear Anal.* 212 (2021), Paper No. 112470, 31 pp.
- [20] M. HUANG, P. E. CAINES AND R. P. MALHAMÉ, Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle, *Commun. Inf. Syst.* 6 (2006), no. 3, 221–251.
- [21] M. HUANG, P. E. CAINES AND R. P. MALHAMÉ, Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle, *Commun. Inf. Syst.* 6 (2006), no. 3, 221–251.
- [22] MICHAEL V. KLIBANOV The Mean Field Games System: Carleman Estimates, Lipschitz Stability and Uniqueness, [arXiv:2303.03928](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.03928)
- [23] MICHAEL V. KLIBANOV, JINGZHI LI he Mean Field Games System With the Lateral Cauchy Data via Carleman Estimates, [arXiv:2303.07556](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.07556)
- [24] Y. KURYLEV, M. LASSAS AND G. UHLMANN, Inverse problems for Lorentzian manifolds and non-linear hyperbolic equations, *Invent. Math.* 212 (2018), no. 3, 781–857.
- [25] Y.-H. LIN, H. LIU, X. LIU AND S. ZHANG, Simultaneous recoveries for semilinear parabolic systems, *Inverse Problems*, 38 (2022), no. 11, Paper No. 115006
- [26] P.-L. LIONS, *Cours au Collège de France*, 2007–2013.
- [27] H. LIU, C. MOU AND S. ZHANG, Inverse problems for mean field games, [arXiv:2205.11350](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.11350)
- [28] HONGYU LIU, S.ZHANG, On an inverse problem for Mean Field Games. [arXiv:2212.09110](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.09110)
- [29] M. LASSAS, T. LIIMATAINEN, Y.-H. LIN AND M. SALO, Inverse problems for elliptic equations with power type nonlinearities, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 145 (2021), 44–82.
- [30] M. LASSAS, MATTI, T. LIIMATAINEN, Y.-H., LIN AND M. SALO, Partial data inverse problems and simultaneous recovery of boundary and coefficients for semilinear elliptic equations, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 37 (2021), no. 4, 1553–1580.
- [31] A. MESZAROS AND C. MOU, Mean field games system under displacement monotonicity, to appear, [arXiv:2109.06687](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06687).
- [32] A. PORRETTA, Weak solutions to Fokker-Planck equations and mean field games, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 216 (2015), no. 1, 1–62.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, KOWLOON, HONG KONG SAR, CHINA

Email address: hongyu.liuip@gmail.com, hongyliu@cityu.edu.hk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, KOWLOON, HONG KONG SAR, CHINA

Email address: szhang347-c@my.cityu.edu.hk