

Doctoral thesis

Doctoral theses at NTNU 2021:399

Olav Ersland

Analysis and discretization of fractional Mean Field Games

NTNU
Norwegian University of Science and
Technology Thesis for the Degree of
Philosophiae Doctor
Faculty of Information Technology and
Electrical Engineering
Department of Mathematical Sciences



Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Olav Ersland

Analysis and discretization of fractional Mean Field Games

Thesis for the Degree of Philosophiae Doctor

Trondheim, December 2021

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering
Department of Mathematical Sciences

NTNU

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Thesis for the Degree of Philosophiae Doctor

Faculty of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering
Department of Mathematical Sciences

© Olav Ersland

ISBN 978-82-326-6274-6 (printed ver.)
ISBN 978-82-326-6298-2 (electronic ver.)
ISSN 1503-8181 (printed ver.)
ISSN 2703-8084 (online ver.)

Doctoral theses at NTNU, 2021:399

Printed by NTNU Grafisk senter

Preface

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD) at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway.

This thesis have been funded by the project Waves and nonlinear phenomena, sponsored by the Research Council of Norway. I am grateful for the excellent working conditions provided by the Department of Mathematical Sciences, both professionally and socially during the years of my research work.

First of all, I would like to thank my main advisor Espen Robstad Jakobsen for his excellent guidance through these years of thesis work. Without you this thesis would have been non-existent. I am very grateful for the time and resources you have spent, the fruitful mathematical discussions, and the patience you has shown during these years.

I also want to thank my co-advisor Indranil Chowdhury, for the close cooperation, interesting discussions, and nice travels together. I really value our friendship. Also thanks to my co-supervisor Katrin Grunert for excellent coaching through these years.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Alessio Porretta for inviting me to come to Rome for a semester, although the stay was a bit shortened by the global pandemic. I am very grateful for the interesting conversations and discussions upon mathematical subjects.

For the stay in Rome I would also like to thank Norges Forskningsråd for providing me with funding and support during the rather turbulent stay.

I want to thank Annalisa Cesaroni, Fabio Camilli, and Olivier Ley for a careful reading of my manuscript.

Finally, I want to express my thanks to my colleagues, family and friends. You are all very important to me. As the saying goes: "Maybe the real treasure was the friends we made along the way."

Olav Erstrand

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Olav Erstrand', written in a cursive style.

Bergen, 04.11.2021

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Preface | iii |
| Contents | v |
| | |
| I Introduction | 1 |
| | |
| 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 Fractional Mean Field Games | 3 |
| 1.2 Non-local diffusion operators | 4 |
| 1.3 Background | 5 |
| 1.4 Our main contributions | 6 |
| 1.5 Framework | 7 |
| 1.6 Outline of thesis | 9 |
| 1.7 Concluding remarks and further work | 11 |
| 1.8 Bibliography | 12 |
| | |
| II Research Papers | 17 |

Part I

Introduction

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Fractional Mean Field Games

All of the papers in this thesis are connected to the fractional Mean Field Games (MFG) system,

$$(fMFG) \quad \begin{cases} -u_t - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, Du) = F(x, m(t)), \\ m_t - \mathcal{L}^*m - \operatorname{div}(mD_pH(x, Du)) = 0, \\ m(0, x) = m_0(x), \quad u(T, x) = G(x, m(T)), \end{cases}$$

posed on $Q_T := (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, with

$$(L) \quad \mathcal{L}\phi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x+z) - \phi(x) - D\phi(x) \cdot z 1_{|z|<1} d\mu(z),$$

where μ is a non-negative Radon measure satisfying the Lévy condition $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1 \wedge |z|^2 d\mu(z) < +\infty$. The adjoint \mathcal{L}^* is defined similarly, but with measure $\mu^*(A) := \mu(-A)$ for all Borel sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and it is the L^2 -adjoint of \mathcal{L} .

The equation (fMFG) consists of a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation solved backwards in time, and a Fokker-Planck (FP) equation solved forwards in time. The operators \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* are non-local diffusion operators, H is the so-called Hamiltonian, $m \mapsto F(x, m)$, $m \mapsto G(x, m)$ are functions over the space of probability measures, and represents running-cost and terminal cost, respectively. Finally, m_0 is an initial condition.

In this thesis we study well-posedness and numerical discretizations of (fMFG). We do so under very general assumptions on the non-local operators \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* .

The original purpose of MFG is to model N -player differential games, where the number of players $N \rightarrow \infty$ [29]. Each player is small and has a negligible influence on the system

as a whole. She only cares about the probability distribution of the other players, in order to determine her response. More specifically, each generic player controls a stochastic differential equation (SDE) driven by a Levy process L_t [4]

$$(SDE) \quad dX_t = \alpha_t dt + dL_t,$$

and wants to minimize the functional

$$J(x, \alpha) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T [L(X_s, \alpha_s) + F(X_s, m(s))] ds + G(X_T, m(T)) \right].$$

Here $L(x, q)$ is the Fenchel conjugate of H ,

$$L(x, q) := \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{p \cdot q - H(x, p)\},$$

and describes the cost of performing the control $q = \alpha_t(x)$, at the position $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In the case that L is convex in q , the players pay more for big controls $|q|$. The function F is the so-called running cost, and is a function of the position X_s of the player, and the distribution $m(s)$ of the other players at time s . Finally, G describes the terminal cost at time T , and m_0 the initial distribution of players. Note that the cost each player pays then depend on her position X_s , her choice of control α_s , and the probability distribution of the other players $m(s)$.

A formal computation shows that the optimal control is given by $\alpha_t^*(x) = -D_p H(x, Du)$. If every player reasons in the same way, we end up with the system (fMFG), with two equations that is to be solved simultaneously. Here $u(t, x)$ represents the optimal cost at (t, x) , and $m(t)$ is the distribution of the optimally controlled process X_t^* , and is an evolution of probability measures, describing the positions of all the players at time $t \in [0, T]$.

1.2 Non-local diffusion operators

An example of a local second order diffusion operator is the Laplace operator,

$$\Delta u = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} u,$$

where $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. To compute Δu at the point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we only need information on u on a arbitrarily small neighbourhood of x , $B(x, \epsilon)$, where we can send $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In contrast, to compute $\mathcal{L}u(x)$ defined in (L), we need to take into consideration all of the information on u on \mathbb{R}^d , which then makes the operator non-local.

Coming back to (SDE), and without being too precise, the operator \mathcal{L} in (L) is generated from the term

$$dL_t := \int_{|z|<1} z \tilde{N}(dz, dt) + \int_{|z|\geq 1} z N(dz, dt),$$

where N is a Poisson random measure with intensity $\mu(dz)dt$, and $\tilde{N} = N(dz, dt) - \mu(dz)dt$ is the compensated Poisson measure. Loosely speaking, L_t is a pure jump process, with infinitely many "small" jumps, and finitely many big jumps. That is, a realization of the process $L_t(\omega)$ can appear continuous on some time interval, for example hovering around $L_t(\omega) \approx 5$, and then suddenly at time $t = t_1$, it jumps to a value $L_{t_1}(\omega) = 20$. This kind of behaviour is often observed in the stock market, where sudden crashes and surges happens quite regularly. The jumps of the process L_t leads to the non-local nature of the operator \mathcal{L} . In contrast, the Brownian motion process B_t , which is almost surely everywhere continuous (no jumps), is associated to the Laplace operator Δ , which is a local diffusion operator.

In view of this discussion, we find it quite natural to study MFG with non-local diffusion operators. As an example, we mention the one-dimensional CGMY process from Finance [21], where $d\mu(z)$ in (L) is given by

$$d\mu(z) = \frac{C}{|z|^{1+Y}} e^{-Gz^+ - Mz^-} dz,$$

where $C, G, M > 0$ and $Y \in (0, 2)$.

1.3 Background

MFG was first introduced around 2006 by Lasry and Lions in a series of papers [32, 33, 36, 34], and independently, at the same time, by Huang, Caines and Malhamé [29, 30, 31]. Since then the field have seen an exponential growth its literature, with a wide and thorough analysis, and a large number of applications and use cases. A quick search for published papers with "Mean Field Games" in the title, gives us over 400 results, and it is far out of this thesis' scope to mention something about all of them.

MFG have numerous applications in finance, biology, crowd control, and network engineering. We mention an economic analysis of electric vehicles, where each vehicle can buy and sell electricity on the smart grid energy market, and wants to optimize its costs [22]. It is also used to analyse cryptocurrency mining [35, 6], where so called 'miners' are competing to solve a hash-based puzzle, in order to earn cryptocurrencies. It has also been used to

model the competition between oil producers [28]. We refer to [26, 15, 7, 25] for further MFG models and applications.

By now, the analysis of MFG is thorough. For MFG with local or no diffusion, we refer again to the articles [32, 33, 36, 34], where they give existence and uniqueness of classical solutions under quite general conditions on the data H , F , G , and m_0 .

For numerical analysis, we mention the finite difference methods by Achdou et al. [2, 1], where they discretize MFG equations with local, uniformly elliptic diffusion (e.g. $\nu\Delta$, where $\nu > 0$). Closer to our setting is the semi-Lagrangian schemes by Carlini and Silva [13, 14], developed for MFG equations with local/no diffusion. A survey on the present numerical methods in MFG is given in [3].

Finally, some words about fractional MFG. Well-posedness of MFG with a fractional Laplace operator $\mathcal{L} = -(-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}$, where $\sigma \in (0, 2)$, has been studied in [16, 19]. One paper is in the parabolic setting, and the other in the ergodic stationary setting. In the parabolic setting, thanks to convexity and coercivity assumptions, they get uniform in time semiconcavity and Lipschitz bounds on u , the solution of the HJB equation, which gives them results for the case $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. In [27] they study nonlocal Bertrand and Cournot MFGs in one dimension, which have a more complicated structure of the MFG system than what we deal with. Here, the regularity comes from a local second order diffusion term, while the non-local diffusion terms are of lower order. Finally, in [38, 8] they study well-posedness of time-fractional MFG, that is, MFG systems with fractional time derivatives.

1.4 Our main contributions

For the well-posedness of fractional MFG, we extend the current literature, by allowing for very general Lévy processes, which include α -stable processes, tempered α -stable processes, and the CGMY process often used in Finance [21, 4]. We deal with uniformly elliptic operators \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L}^* of order $\sigma \in (1, 2)$ (we will soon come back to what this means). We allow for general assumptions on H, F, G , where for example H can be noncoercive and nonconvex, and F and G are local or non-local couplings. Our analysis is performed on the whole space \mathbb{R}^d , which gives compactness issues which are not present in analysis on the torus \mathbb{T}^d .

For numerics, as in in [13, 14], we use a Semi-Lagrangian approach to discretize a MFG system. However, we do it for the system (fMFG), with non-local diffusion operators. Our work is an extension of the methods developed for fractional HJB equations in [9]. A chal-

lenging aspect of non-local operators is the singular parts of the operators, which we truncate and approximate by a local diffusion. The scheme we develop is valid for MFGs with very general non-local operators, now including the case $\sigma \in (0, 2)$. In addition to solving for general operators \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* , we also provide a clear derivation of the dual scheme for the FP equation. We prove convergence of subsequences in dimension $d = 1$ in the case of degenerate operators \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L}^* , and in \mathbb{R}^d for non-degenerate operators \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L}^* , in both cases towards a viscosity-very weak solution of the MFG system. If the MFG system has a pair of unique classical solutions, we get full convergence.

For a more in-depth discussion of both literature and our contributions, we refer to the introductions of Paper I and Paper II.

1.5 Framework

We describe the common framework in the papers here, as they share some similarities. We let $P(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the space of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d , which is equipped with the metric

$$d_0(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{\phi \in \text{Lip}_{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) d(\mu - \nu),$$

where $\text{Lip}_{1,1} := \{f : f \text{ Lipschitz with } \|f\|_\infty, \|Df\|_\infty \leq 1\}$. This is known as the Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance, and convergence in d_0 is equivalent to weak convergence in measures.

We mostly work with nonlocal operators $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^*$ that are uniformly elliptic. A typical ellipticity condition is to assume that the measure $d\mu$ is bounded from above and below by a fractional Laplacian on the unit ball. We say that the operator \mathcal{L} is uniformly elliptic with order $\sigma \in (0, 2)$, if there are constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$, such that

$$C_1 |z|^{-d-\sigma} dz \leq d\mu(z) \leq C_2 |z|^{-d-\sigma} dz \quad \text{for } |z| \leq 1.$$

However, there are more general conditions than this, for example a condition directly on the corresponding heat kernel of the operator \mathcal{L} and the integrability of μ (see condition (L2) in Paper I). Namely, \mathcal{L} is uniformly elliptic with order $\sigma \in (0, 2)$, if there is a constant $c > 0$ independent of r , such that

$$r^\sigma \int_{|z| < 1} \frac{|z|^2}{r^2} \wedge 1 d\mu(z) \leq c \quad \text{for } r \in (0, 1),$$

and the heat kernel K corresponding to \mathcal{L} satisfies

$$\|D_x^\beta K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \mathcal{K} t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T),$$

and any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and multi-index $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, where $\mathcal{K} > 0$ is a constant independent of β and t .

The similarities of the different conditions is that the operator \mathcal{L} has smoothing properties. For a more general introduction to non-local operators, we refer to [24, 4].

It is time to talk about the single equations appearing in (fMFG). Given a drift $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the fractional Fokker-Planck equation is given by

$$(FP) \quad \begin{cases} m_t - \mathcal{L}^* m - \operatorname{div}(mb) = 0, \\ m(0, x) = m_0(x), \end{cases}$$

and multiplying with a smooth test function and integrating, we get

$$(w-FP) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m\phi(x, t)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m\phi(x, s)dx + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(\phi_t + \mathcal{L}\phi - b \cdot D\phi)(x, r)dxdr.$$

A very weak solution of (FP) is then a function $m \in L^1(0, T; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$, such that (w-FP) holds for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\bar{Q}_T)$. This, with a couple of variations, is how we define weak solutions of the FP equation in all of our papers. The conditions that we put on b varies, so we do not specify them on this point. Often we assume that b is continuous and bounded.

Three crucial estimates we get from the weak formulation of FP, are preservation of mass and positivity, tightness and equicontinuity. To be more precise, we say that a subset $\mathcal{C} \subset C([0, T]; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is tight, if there exists a monotone radial function $\Psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, with $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(r) = +\infty$, such that for all $m \in \mathcal{C}$ and all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(x) dm(t, x) \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of m and t . Tightness of \mathcal{C} implies compactness of $\{m(s) : m \in \mathcal{C}\} \subset P(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the Prokhorov theorem. The set $\mathcal{C} \subset C([0, T]; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is equicontinuous, if for all $m \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$d_0(m(s), m(t)) \leq \omega(|t - s|),$$

where $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a modulus of continuity independent of m . The combination of tightness and equicontinuity is sufficient to have compactness of \mathcal{C} in $C([0, T], P(\mathbb{R}^d))$, using the Prokhorov and Arzela-Ascoli theorems.

We follow up with the fractional HJB equation,

$$(HJB) \quad \begin{cases} u_t - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, Du) = f(t, x), \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \end{cases}$$

where the solution concept is given through the notion of viscosity solutions, originally introduced by Crandall and Lions [23] for first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations. For the non-local case, denoting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\phi(x) &= \left(\int_{|z|\leq r} + \int_{|z|>r} \right) \phi(x+z) - \phi(x) - D\phi(x) \cdot z 1_{|z|<1} d\mu(z) \\ &:= \mathcal{L}_r(x, \phi, D\phi) + \mathcal{L}^r(x, \phi, D\phi), \quad \text{for all } r > 0, \end{aligned}$$

a function $u \in USC(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (upper-semicontinuous function on \mathbb{R}^d) is a viscosity subsolution (cf. [5]) if for every $\phi \in C^2((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a maximum point in (t_0, x_0) , then

$$\partial_t \phi(t_0, x_0) - \mathcal{L}_r(x, \phi, D\phi) - \mathcal{L}^r(x, u, D\phi) + H(x, D\phi) \leq f(t, x).$$

Viscosity supersolutions $v \in LSC(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (lower-semicontinuous functions on \mathbb{R}^d) are defined analogously. A function $u \in C(Q_T)$ is a viscosity solution if it is both a subsolution and a supersolution.

The notion of viscosity solutions provides us with strong uniqueness properties, stability, and existence results for the HJB equation. More precisely, we have the comparison principle, which states that if u is a viscosity subsolution, v is a viscosity supersolution, and $u_0 \leq v_0$, then

$$u \leq v \quad \text{in } Q_T,$$

which implies uniqueness of viscosity solutions. Existence of solutions is through Perron's method, where we only need to find a subsolution w and a supersolution v of the HJB equation, with initial data $w_0 \leq u_0 \leq v_0$.

Finally, for both the FP and HJB equation, we use a concept that we call classical solutions. For HJB, a function u is a classical solution, if $\partial_t u, Du, \mathcal{L}u \in C((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, and (HJB) holds pointwise. Similarly, m is a classical solution of the FP equation if $\partial_t m, Dm, \mathcal{L}^*m \in C((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, and (FP) holds pointwise.

1.6 Outline of thesis

This thesis consist of two papers. We give a short summary.

Paper I

We show well-posedness for the fractional MFG system (fMFG), where we consider a large class of non-degenerate Lévy operators \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L}^* of order $\sigma \in (1, 2)$, and nonlocal and local couplings F and G . A large part of the paper is devoted to regularity results for the HJB and FP equation. Using results on the fractional heat kernel, defined as the fundamental solution of

$$\rho_t - \mathcal{L}\rho = 0,$$

we prove existence of classical solutions of the HJB and FP equation, by a Duhamel formula and a fixed point argument. Furthermore, for the FP equation we prove L^1 -, L^∞ -, equicontinuity-, and tightness results, based purely on pde methods.

Finally, through Schauder fixed point theorem [35], we get existence of classical solutions of the fractional MFG system (fMFG), in the case of non-local coupling F and G . We also provide existence for a MFG system with local coupling, through an approximation of MFG systems with non-local coupling. Uniqueness of solutions are also proved in both cases, using monotonicity assumptions on F and G .

Paper II

In the second paper, we construct a numerical scheme for fractional MFG. The schemes are based on a semi-Lagrangian approximations of the underlying control problem, corresponding to the HJB equation, along with a dual approximation for the FP equation.

In both approximations, we follow [9], and truncate the singularities of the non-local operators, replacing them with (vanishing) Laplace operators. We discretize the corresponding SDE, which consists of a drift part, a Brownian motion part, and a part consisting of long jumps. Based on this discretization, we are able to develop the schemes for both the HJB and the FP equation.

The methods are monotone, stable, and consistent, and we prove convergence along subsequences for (i) degenerate equations in one space dimension and (ii) nondegenerate equations in arbitrary dimensions. Note that degenerate equations means that the Lévy operator has no smoothing effect. We also give results on full convergence and convergence to classical solutions. Numerical tests are implemented for a wide range of different nonlocal diffusions.

1.7 Concluding remarks and further work

The previous pages and the introductions of Paper I and Paper II have showed what our contributions to the theory of MFG are. One of the main contributions is to allow for the SDEs to be driven by quite general Lévy processes. However, there are still open questions. In Paper I we consider uniformly elliptic operators of order $\sigma \in (1, 2)$, but a natural question is what would happen for the case $\sigma \in [0, 1)$, where you do not get smoothness from \mathcal{L} . As in [19], one probably needs to look for a pair (u, m) of viscosity solution u of HJB and weak solution m of FP. However, much the framework and assumptions are left to decide. For Paper II about numerics, the next natural step would be to consider fractional MFG with local coupling $f(x, m(t, x))$. Also it would be interesting to use a finite difference approach as in [2] with entailing convergence analysis. At last, we mention that convergence of numerical approximation of MFG in dimension d for degenerate diffusion would be interesting to prove.

Further, looking at the underlying SDE

$$dX_t = \alpha_t dt + dL_t,$$

it is clear that the term dL_t can be changed to something else. One extension is to allow for different processes, for example Lévy flights and subdiffusions. We could also, like in [18], put the control α_t inside the diffusion process. In this case the player controls the diffusion, and this creates a different kind of MFG model. To summarize, there are many further questions left to explore.

I would also like to mention, that in the last period of this thesis, I have worked on a project with Alessio Porretta and my supervisor Espen R. Jakobsen. However, in the end there were not enough time to complete it, so this will have to be a future work. The project is about the long-time behaviour/turnpike property of MFG [11, 10, 12, 20, 37]. In the literature, most results assumes a local uniformly elliptic diffusion operator and the domain $\mathbb{T}^d := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}^d$. We study it for the case of fractional diffusion operators and posed in the whole space \mathbb{R}^d , which are two novelties.

To be more precise, we study the long time behaviour of a fractional MFG system posed on $Q_T := (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(CMFG) \quad \begin{cases} -u_t - \mathcal{L}u + b(x) \cdot Du + H(x, Du) = F(x, m(t)), \\ m_t - \mathcal{L}^*m - \operatorname{div}(m(b(x) + D_p H(x, Du))) = 0, \\ m(0, x) = m_0(x), \quad u(T, x) = G(x, m(T)), \end{cases}$$

where $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a so-called Ornstein-Uhlenbeck drift, satisfying

$$(b(x) - b(y), x - y) \geq \alpha|x - y|^2,$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a constant. The drift b has confining properties, leading to uniform in time bound on $\|Du\|_\infty$, following a similar argument as in [17]. It also confines the underlying stochastic process

$$dX_t = -b(x)dt - D_p H(x, Du)dt + dL_t.$$

For these types of equations, we will show that when $T > 0$ is big solution of the parabolic problem (CMFG) stabilizes around the solution of the ergodic MFG system

$$\begin{cases} \lambda - \mathcal{L}\bar{u} + b(x) \cdot D\bar{u} + H(x, D\bar{u}) = F(x, \bar{m}(t)), \\ -\mathcal{L}^* \bar{m} - \operatorname{div}(\bar{m}(b(x) + D_p H(x, D\bar{u}))) = 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{m} = 1, \quad u(0) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is the ergodic constant. We show this in the form of an exponential estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \|m(t) - \bar{m}\| + \|Du(t) - D\bar{u}\| \\ \leq C e^{-\omega t - \omega(T-t)} (\|m_0 - \bar{m}\| + \|DG(x, m(T)) - D\bar{u}\|), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ are appropriate norms. This work is far from completed, so we did not include it in this thesis. We still struggle with well-posedness of (CMFG) and for the corresponding ergodic stationary system, but we have partial results. One of the challenges is that $b(x)$ is unbounded in x , which is a generality not covered in the first paper. There we assume that $|H(x, p)|$ is uniformly bounded in x , which clearly does not hold for $\tilde{H}(x, p) := b(x) \cdot p + H(x, p)$, since $b(x)$ is unbounded.

This is one of the next extensions of fractional Mean Field Games.

1.8 Bibliography

- [1] Yves Achdou, Fabio Camilli, and Italo Capuzzo-Dolcetta. Mean field games: numerical methods for the planning problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(1):77–109, 2012.
- [2] Yves Achdou and Italo Capuzzo-Dolcetta. Mean field games: numerical methods. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 48(3):1136–1162, 2010.

-
- [3] Yves Achdou and Mathieu Laurière. Mean field games and applications: numerical aspects. In *Mean field games*, volume 2281 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 249–307. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020.
- [4] David Applebaum. *Lévy processes and stochastic calculus*, volume 116 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2009.
- [5] Guy Barles and Cyril Imbert. Second-order elliptic integro-differential equations: viscosity solutions’ theory revisited. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(3):567–585, 2008.
- [6] Charles Bertucci, Louis Bertucci, Jean-Michel Lasry, and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field game approach to bitcoin mining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08167*, 2020.
- [7] Peter E Caines, Minyi Huang, and Roland P Malhamé. Mean field games., 2015.
- [8] Fabio Camilli and Raul De Maio. A time-fractional mean field game. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 24(9-10):531–554, 2019.
- [9] Fabio Camilli and Espen R. Jakobsen. A finite element like scheme for integro-partial differential Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 47(4):2407–2431, 2009.
- [10] P. Cardaliaguet, J.-M. Lasry, P.-L. Lions, and A. Porretta. Long time average of mean field games with a nonlocal coupling. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(5):3558–3591, 2013.
- [11] Pierre Cardaliaguet, Jean-Michel Lasry, Pierre-Louis Lions, and Alessio Porretta. Long time average of mean field games. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 7(2):279–301, 2012.
- [12] Pierre Cardaliaguet and Alessio Porretta. Long time behavior of the master equation in mean field game theory. *Anal. PDE*, 12(6):1397–1453, 2019.
- [13] E. Carlini and F. J. Silva. A fully discrete semi-Lagrangian scheme for a first order mean field game problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52(1):45–67, 2014.
- [14] Elisabetta Carlini and Francisco J. Silva. A semi-Lagrangian scheme for a degenerate second order mean field game system. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(9):4269–4292, 2015.

-
- [15] Rene Carmona. Applications of mean field games in financial engineering and economic theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05237*, 2020.
- [16] Annalisa Cesaroni, Marco Cirant, Serena Dipierro, Matteo Novaga, and Enrico Valdinoci. On stationary fractional mean field games. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 122:1–22, 2019.
- [17] Emmanuel Chasseigne, Olivier Ley, and Thi Tuyen Nguyen. A priori Lipschitz estimates for solutions of local and nonlocal Hamilton-Jacobi equations with Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 35(5):1415–1449, 2019.
- [18] Indranil Chowdhury, Espen R Jakobsen, and Miłosz Krupski. On fully nonlinear parabolic mean field games with examples of nonlocal and local diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.06985*, 2021.
- [19] Marco Cirant and Alessandro Goffi. On the existence and uniqueness of solutions to time-dependent fractional MFG. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51(2):913–954, 2019.
- [20] Marco Cirant and Alessio Porretta. Long time behaviour and turnpike solutions in mildly non-monotone mean field games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.09965*, 2021.
- [21] Rama Cont and Peter Tankov. *Financial modelling with jump processes*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Financial Mathematics Series. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004.
- [22] Romain Couillet, Samir Medina Perlaza, Hamidou Tembine, and Mérouane Debbah. A mean field game analysis of electric vehicles in the smart grid. In *2012 Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM Workshops*, pages 79–84. IEEE, 2012.
- [23] Michael G. Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions. Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 277(1):1–42, 1983.
- [24] Maria Giovanna Garroni and Jose Luis Menaldi. *Second order elliptic integro-differential problems*, volume 430 of *Chapman & Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.
- [25] Diogo A. Gomes, Levon Nurbekyan, and Edgard A. Pimentel. *Economic models and mean-field games theory*. Publicações Matemáticas do IMPA. [IMPA Mathematical Publications].

-
- [26] Diogo A. Gomes and João Saúde. Mean field games models—a brief survey. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 4(2):110–154, 2014.
- [27] P. Jameson Graber, Vincenzo Ignazio, and Ariel Neufeld. Nonlocal Bertrand and Cournot mean field games with general nonlinear demand schedule. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 148:150–198, 2021.
- [28] Olivier Guéant, Jean-Michel Lasry, and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field games and applications. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2010*, volume 2003 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 205–266. Springer, Berlin, 2011.
- [29] Minyi Huang, Peter E. Caines, and Roland P. Malhamé. An invariance principle in large population stochastic dynamic games. *J. Syst. Sci. Complex.*, 20(2):162–172, 2007.
- [30] Minyi Huang, Peter E. Caines, and Roland P. Malhamé. Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized ϵ -Nash equilibria. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 52(9):1560–1571, 2007.
- [31] Minyi Huang, Roland P. Malhamé, and Peter E. Caines. Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6(3):221–251, 2006.
- [32] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.
- [33] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.
- [34] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [35] Zongxi Li, A Max Reppen, and Ronnie Sircar. A mean field games model for cryptocurrency mining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01952*, 2019.
- [36] Pierre-Louis Lions and Jean-Michel Lasry. Large investor trading impacts on volatility. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 24(2):311–323, 2007.
- [37] Alessio Porretta. On the turnpike property for mean field games. *Minimax Theory Appl.*, 3(2):285–312, 2018.

- [38] Qing Tang and Fabio Camilli. Variational time-fractional mean field games. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 10(2):573–588, 2020.

Part II

Research Papers

Paper 1

**On fractional and nonlocal parabolic Mean Field
Games in the whole space**

Olav Erslund and Espen R. Jakobsen

Published in *Journal of Differential Equations*

ON FRACTIONAL AND NONLOCAL PARABOLIC MEAN FIELD GAMES IN THE WHOLE SPACE

OLAV ERSLAND AND ESPEN R. JAKOBSEN

ABSTRACT. We study Mean Field Games (MFGs) driven by a large class of nonlocal, fractional and anomalous diffusions in the whole space. These non-Gaussian diffusions are pure jump Lévy processes with some σ -stable like behaviour. Included are σ -stable processes and fractional Laplace diffusion operators $(-\Delta)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$, tempered nonsymmetric processes in Finance, spectrally one-sided processes, and sums of subelliptic operators of different orders. Our main results are existence and uniqueness of classical solutions of MFG systems with nondegenerate diffusion operators of order $\sigma \in (1, 2)$. We consider parabolic equations in the whole space with both local and nonlocal couplings. Our proofs uses pure PDE-methods and build on ideas of Lions et al. The new ingredients are fractional heat kernel estimates, regularity results for fractional Bellman, Fokker-Planck and coupled Mean Field Game equations, and a priori bounds and compactness of (very) weak solutions of fractional Fokker-Planck equations in the whole space. Our techniques requires no moment assumptions and uses a weaker topology than Wasserstein.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 2 |
| 2. Preliminaries | 7 |
| 3. Existence and uniqueness for fractional MFG systems | 10 |
| 4. Fractional heat kernel estimates | 14 |
| 5. Fractional Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations | 19 |
| 6. Fractional Fokker-Planck equations | 28 |
| 7. Existence for MFGs with nonlocal coupling – Proof of Theorem 3.4 | 36 |
| 8. Existence for MFGs with local coupling – Proof of Theorem 3.7 | 38 |
| Appendix A. Uniqueness of solutions of MFGs – Proof of Theorem 3.5 | 40 |
| Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 5.11 | 41 |
| References | 44 |

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q89, 47G20, 35A01, 35A09, 35Q84, 49L12, 45K05, 35S10, 35K61, 35K08.

Key words and phrases. Mean Field Games, fractional diffusion, nonlocal PDE, fractional PDE, anomalous diffusion, regularity, existence, uniqueness, compactness, classical solutions, local coupling, nonlocal coupling. Both authors were supported by the Toppforsk (research excellence) project Waves and Nonlinear Phenomena (WaNP), grant no. 250070 from the Research Council of Norway.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study parabolic Mean Field Games (MFGs) driven by a large class of nonlocal, fractional and anomalous diffusions in the whole space:

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, u, Du) = F(x, m(t)) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^*m - \operatorname{div}(m D_p H(x, u, Du)) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ m(0, x) = m_0(x), \quad u(x, T) = G(x, m(T)), \end{cases}$$

where H is a (nonlinear) Hamiltonian, F and G are source term and terminal condition, and m_0 an initial condition. Furthermore, \mathcal{L} and its adjoint \mathcal{L}^* , are non-degenerate fractional diffusion operators of order $\sigma \in (1, 2)$ of the form

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{L}u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x+z) - u(x) - Du(x) \cdot z 1_{|z|<1} d\mu(z),$$

where μ is a nonnegative Radon measure satisfying the Lévy-condition $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1 \wedge |z|^2 d\mu(z) < \infty$, see (L1) and (L2) below for precise assumptions. When $\sigma \in (1, 2)$, the operator \mathcal{L} has smoothing properties in our setting (this assumption is used e.g. in Proposition 5.8). The system is uniformly parabolic and consists of a backward in time fractional Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation coupled with a forward in time fractional Fokker-Planck (FP) equation.

Background. MFGs is an emerging field of mathematics with a wide and increasing range of applications in e.g. economy, network engineering, biology, crowd and swarm control, and statistical learning [26, 22]. It was introduced more or less at the same time by Lasry and Lions [31, 32] and Caines, Huang and Malhamé [27]. Today there is a large and rapidly expanding literature addressing a range of mathematical questions concerning MFGs. We refer to the books and lecture notes [1, 12, 10, 23, 7] and references therein for an overview of the theory and the current state of the art. Heuristically a large number of identical players want to minimize some cost depending on their own state and the distribution of the states of the other players, and the mean field game system arise as a characterisation of Nash equilibria when the number of players tends to infinity under certain symmetry assumptions. The optimal MFG feedback control is almost optimal also for finite player games with moderate to large numbers of players, and often provides the only practical way of solving also such games.

In this paper the generic player controls a stochastic differential equation (SDE) driven by a pure jump Lévy process L_t with characteristic triplet $(0, 0, \mu)$ [3],

$$(3) \quad dX_t = \alpha_t dt + dL_t,$$

with the aim of minimizing the cost functional

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left[L(X_s, \alpha_s) + F(X_s, m(s)) \right] ds + G(X_T, m(T)) \right]$$

with respect to the control α_s . Here L is the Legendre transform of H with respect to the second variable, F and G are running and terminal costs, and m the distribution of the states of the other players. If u is the value function of the generic player, then formally the optimal feedback control is $\alpha_t^* = -D_2 H(x, Du)$ and u satisfies the HJB equation in (1). The probability distribution of the optimally controlled process X_t^* then satisfies the FP equation in (1). Since the players are identical, the distribution m of all players will satisfy the same FP equation, now starting from the initial distribution of players m_0 . This is a heuristic explanation for (1).

What differs from the standard MFG formulation is the type of noise used in the model. In many real world applications, jump processes or anomalous diffusions will better model the observed noise than Gaussian processes [34, 18, 38, 3]. One example is symmetric σ -stable noise which correspond to fractional Laplacian operators $\mathcal{L} = (-\Delta)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ for $\sigma \in (0, 2)$. In Finance the observed jump processes are not symmetric and σ -stable but rather non-symmetric and tempered. An example is the one-dimensional CGMY process [18] where $\frac{d\mu}{dz}(z) = \frac{C}{|z|^{1+Y}} e^{-Gz^+ - Mz^-}$ for $C, G, M > 0$ and $Y \in (0, 2)$. Our assumptions cover a large class of uniformly elliptic operators (they satisfy (L2)) \mathcal{L} that includes fractional Laplacians, generators of processes used in Finance, anisotropic operators with different orders σ in different directions, Riesz-Feller operators, and operators with Lévy measures that non-absolutely continuous, spectrally one-sided, have no fractional moments, and a general behaviour at infinity. We refer to Section 4 for a discussion, results, and examples. We also analyse the system in the whole space, while many other papers focus on the compact torus. For control problems and games, the whole space case is usually more natural, but also more technical.

Main results. Under structure and regularity assumptions on $\mathcal{L}, H, F, G, m_0$, we show:

- (i) *Existence of bounded smooth solutions of (1) with nonlocal and local coupling, see Theorems 3.4 and 3.7.*

- (ii) *Uniqueness of bounded smooth solutions of (1) with nonlocal and local coupling*, see Theorems 3.5 and 3.8.

Our assumptions on H, F, G are fairly standard [33, 9, 1] (except maybe that the problem is posed on the whole space). For the existence results, we note that the Hamiltonian H (assumptions (A3)–(A5)) can be both nonconvex and noncoercive. Since we consider nondegenerate parabolic problems, the order of the equations have to be greater than one and we do not need or impose semiconcavity assumptions. The proofs of the main results follow from an adaptation of the PDE-approach of Lions [33, 9, 1], and existence is much more involved than uniqueness. Existence for MFGs with nonlocal coupling is proved using a Schauder fixed point argument and well-posedness, regularity, stability and compactness results for individual fractional HJB and fractional FP equations of the form:

$$\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, u, Du) = f(t, x),$$

$$\partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^*m + \operatorname{div}(b(t, x)m) = 0.$$

Existence for MFGs with local coupling follows from an approximation argument, the results for nonlocal coupling, and regularity and compactness results, in this case directly for the coupled MFG system.

Secondary results:

- (iii) *Fractional heat kernel estimates*, see Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.9.
- (iv) *Fractional HJB equations*: Regularity, existence, and space-time compactness of derivatives of classical solutions in Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 5.6.
- (v) *Fractional FP equations*: Well-posedness, space-time compactness of derivatives, $C(0, T; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ compactness, and global L^∞ bounds of smooth solutions in Theorem 6.8 (a), Theorem 6.8 (b) and (c), Proposition 6.6, and Lemma 6.7.

For both equations we show new high order regularity results of independent interest. These results are obtained from a Banach fixed point argument using semigroup/Duhamel representation of the solutions and bootstrapping in the spirit of [19, 20, 28]. Key ingredients are very general fractional heat kernel estimates and global in time Lipschitz bounds for u and L^∞ bounds for m . The heat kernel estimates are based on [25], and we give some extensions, e.g. to operators with general Lévy measures at infinity and sums of subelliptic operators. To show space-time compactness of derivatives, we prove that they are space-time equi-continuous, combining uniform Hölder estimates in space with new time and mixed

regularity estimates for the Duhamel representations of the solutions (see Section 5). In the local coupling case, the HJB and FP equations have less regular data, and regularity can no longer be obtained through separate treatment of the equations. Instead we need to work directly on the coupled MFG system and apply a more refined bootstrapping argument based on fractional derivatives. These estimates also require better global in time Lipschitz and L^∞ estimates the HJB and FP equations respectively. Here we use a variant of the Lipschitz bound of [5] and provide a new L^∞ -estimate for the FP equation.

For the Schauder fixed point argument to work and give existence for the MFG system, compactness in measure is needed for a family of solutions of the FP-equation. We prove such compactness essentially through an analysis of very weak solutions of this equation: We prove preservation of positivity, mass, and L^1 -norms, equicontinuity in time, and tightness. Our proof of equicontinuity is simple and direct, without probabilistic SDE-arguments as in e.g. [9, 1]. The tightness estimates are new in the fractional MFG setting and more challenging than in the local case.

This paper is the first to consider fractional MFGs in the whole space. To have compactness in measure on non-compact domains, a new ingredient is needed: tightness. Typically tightness is obtained through some moment condition on the family of measures. Such moment bounds depend both on the initial distribution and the generator of the process. In the local case when L_t in (3) is a Brownian motion, then the process X_t and FP solution m have moments of any order, only limited by the number of moments of X_0 and m_0 . In the nonlocal/fractional case, X_t and m may have only limited (as for σ -stable processes) or even no fractional power moments at all, even when X_0 and m_0 have moments of all orders. We refer to Section 2.3 for more examples, details, and discussion. Nonetheless it turns out that some generalized moment exists, and tightness and compactness can then be obtained. This relies on Proposition 6.5 (taken from [15]), which gives the existence of a nice ‘‘Lyapunov’’ function that can be integrated against m_0 and $\mu 1_{|z|\geq 1}$.

In this paper we prove tightness and compactness without any explicit moment conditions on the underlying processes X_t or solutions of the FP equations m . This seems to be new for MFGs even in the classical local case. Furthermore, m is typically set in the Wasserstein-1 space \mathcal{W}_1 of measures with first moments, and compactness then requires more than one moment to be uniformly bounded. Since our Lévy processes and FP solutions may not have first moments, we can not work in this setting. Rather we work in a weaker setting using a weaker Rubinstein-Kantorovich metric d_0 (defined below) which is equivalent to weak

convergence in measure (without moments). This is reflected both in the compactness and stability arguments we use as well as our assumptions on the nonlocal couplings.

Literature. In the case of Gaussian noise and local MGF systems, this type of MFG problems with nonlocal or local coupling have been studied from the start [31, 32, 33, 9] and today there is an extensive literature summarized e.g. in [1, 23, 7] and references therein. For local MFGs with local couplings, there are also results on weak solutions [32, 35, 11, 1], a topic we do not consider in this paper. Duhamel formulas have been used e.g. to prove short-time existence and uniqueness in [17].

In the case of non-Gaussian noise and nonlocal MFGs or MFGs with fractional diffusions, there is already some work. In [13] the authors analyze a stationary MFG system on the torus with fractional Laplace diffusions and both non-local and local couplings. Well-posedness of time-fractional MFG systems, i.e. systems with fractional time-derivatives, are studied in [8]. Fractional parabolic Bertrand and Carnot MFGs are studied in the recent paper [24]. These problems are posed in one space dimension, they have a different and more complicated structure than ours, and the principal terms are the (local) second derivative terms. The nonlocal terms act as lower order perturbations. Moreover, during the rather long preparation of this paper we learned that M. Cirant and A. Goffi were working on somewhat similar problems. Their results have now been published in [16]. They consider time-dependent MFG systems on the torus with fractional Laplace diffusions and nonlocal couplings. Since they assume additional convexity and coercivity assumptions to ensure global in time semiconcavity and Lipschitz bounds on solutions, they consider also fractional Laplacians of the full range of orders $\sigma \in (0, 2)$. Regularity results are given in terms of Bessel potential and Hölder spaces, weak energy solutions are employed when $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, and existence is obtained from the vanishing viscosity method. Our setup is different in many ways, and more general in some (a large class of diffusion operators, less smoothness on the data, problems posed in the whole space, no moment conditions, fixed point arguments), and most of our proofs and arguments are quite different from those in [16]. We also give results for local couplings, which in view of the discussion above is a non-trivial extension.

Outline of paper. This paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we introduce notation, spaces, and give some preliminary assumptions and results for the nonlocal operators. We state assumptions and give existence and uniqueness results for MFG systems with nonlocal and local coupling in Section 3. To prove these results, we first establish fractional heat kernel estimates in Section 4. Using these estimates and Duhamel representation formulas, we prove regularity results for fractional Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Section 5. In Section

6 we establish results for fractional Fokker-Planck equations, both regularity of classical solutions and $C([0, T], P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ compactness. In Sections 7 and 8 we prove the existence result for nonlocal and local couplings respectively, while uniqueness for nonlocal couplings is proved in Appendix A. Finally we prove a technical space-time regularity lemma in Appendix B.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation and spaces. By C, K we mean various constants which may change from line to line. The Euclidean norm on any \mathbb{R}^d -type space is denoted by $|\cdot|$. For any subset $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and for any bounded, possibly vector valued, function on Q , we define the L^∞ norms by $\|w\|_{L^\infty(Q)} := \text{ess sup}_{y \in Q} |w(y)|$. Whenever $Q = \mathbb{R}^d$ or $Q = [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(Q)} := \|\cdot\|_\infty$. Similarly, the norm in L^p space is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(Q)}$ or simply $\|\cdot\|_p$. We use $C_b(Q)$ and $UC(Q)$ to denote the spaces of bounded continuous and uniformly continuous real valued functions on Q , often we denote the norm $\|\cdot\|_{C_b}$ simply by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Furthermore, $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ or $C_b^{l,m}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ are subspaces of C_b with k bounded derivatives or m bounded space and l bounded time derivatives.

By $P(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the set of Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d . The Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance $d_0(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ on the space $P(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined as

$$(4) \quad d_0(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(x) \right\},$$

where $\text{Lip}_{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \left\{ f : f \text{ is Lipschitz continuous and } \|f\|_\infty, \|Df\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}$. Convergence in d_0 is equivalent to weak convergence of measures (convergence in $(C_b)^*$), and hence tight subsets of (P, d_0) are precompact by Prokhorov's theorem. We let the space $C([0, T]; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be the set of $P(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued functions on $[0, T]$. It is a metric space with the metric $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_0(\mu(t), \nu(t))$, and tight equicontinuous subsets are precompact by the Arzela-Ascoli and Prokhorov theorems.

2.2. Nonlocal operators. Under the Lévy condition

$$(\mathbf{L1}): \mu \geq 0 \text{ is a Radon measure satisfying } \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1 \wedge |z|^2 d\mu(z) < \infty,$$

the operators \mathcal{L} defined in (2) are in one to one correspondence with the generators of pure jump Lévy processes [3]. One example is the symmetric σ -stable processes and the fractional Laplacians,

$$-(-\Delta)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \phi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[\phi(x+z) - \phi(x) - z \cdot D\phi(x) 1_{|z| < 1} \right] \frac{c_{d,\sigma} dz}{|z|^{d+\sigma}}, \quad \sigma \in (0, 2).$$

They are well-defined pointwise e.g. on functions in $C_b \cap C^2$ by Taylor's theorem and Fubini:

$$|\mathcal{L}\phi(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|D^2\phi\|_{C_b(B(x,1))} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^2 d\mu(z) + 2\|\phi\|_{C_b} \int_{|z|\geq 1} d\mu(z) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let $\sigma \in [1, 2)$. With more precise upper bounds on the integrals of μ near the origin:

$$(5) \quad \text{There is } c > 0 \text{ such that } r^\sigma \int_{|z|<1} \frac{|z|^2}{r^2} \wedge 1 d\mu(z) \leq c \quad \text{for } r \in (0, 1),$$

or equivalently, $r^{-2+\sigma} \int_{|z|<r} |z|^2 d\mu(z) + r^{-1+\sigma} \int_{r<|z|<1} |z| d\mu(z) + r^\sigma \int_{r<|z|<1} d\mu(z) \leq c$ for $r \in (0, 1)$, we can have interpolation estimates for the operators \mathcal{L} in L^p .

Lemma 2.1. (*L^p -bounds*). *Assume (L1), (5) with $\sigma \in [1, 2)$, and $u \in C_b^2$. Then for all $p \in [1, \infty]$, and $r \in (0, 1]$,*

$$(6) \quad \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \left(\|D^2u\|_{L^p} r^{2-\sigma} + \|Du\|_{L^p} \Gamma(\sigma, r) + \|u\|_{L^p} \mu(B_1^c) \right)$$

where

$$\Gamma(\sigma, r) = \begin{cases} |\ln r|, & \sigma = 1, \\ r^{1-\sigma} - 1, & 1 < \sigma < 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $p \in [1, \infty)$ we split $\mathcal{L}u$ into three parts, $L_1 = \int_{B_r} u(x+z) - u(x) - Du(x) \cdot z d\mu(z)$, $L_2 = \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} u(x+z) - u(x) - Du(x) \cdot z d\mu(z)$, and $L_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_1} u(x+z) - u(x) d\mu(z)$. Using Taylor expansions, Minkowski's integral inequality, and (5),

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_1\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |D^2u(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \int_{B_r} |z|^2 d\mu(z) \leq C \|D^2u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} r^{2-\sigma}, \\ \|L_2\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Du(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} |z| d\mu(z) \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \Gamma(\sigma, r), \\ \|L_3\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_1} d\mu(z) \right) \leq 2 \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \mu(B_1^c). \end{aligned}$$

Summing these estimates we obtain (2.1). The case $p = \infty$ is similar, so we omit it. \square

Similar estimates are given e.g. in Section 2.5 in [21]. Note that assumption (5) holds for $-(-\Delta)^{\beta/2}$ for any $\beta \in (0, \sigma] \setminus \{1\}$ and is related to the order of \mathcal{L} .

Remark 2.2. (a) When μ is symmetric, $\int_{B_1 \setminus B_r} Du(x) \cdot z d\mu(z) = 0$,

$$\|L_2\|_{L^p} \leq 2 \|u\|_p \int_{r<|z|<1} d\mu(z) \leq C \|u\|_p r^{-\sigma},$$

and $\|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(\|D^2u\|_{L^p}r^{2-\sigma} + \|u\|_{L^p}r^{-\sigma})$. Minimizing w.r.t. r then yields

$$\|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^p} \leq C\|D^2u\|_p^{\sigma/2}\|u\|_p^{1-\sigma/2}.$$

This results holds for the fractional Laplacian $\mathcal{L} = (-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}$ when $\sigma \in (1, 2)$.

(b) When $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, a similar argument shows that

$$\|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|Du\|_{L^p}r^{1-\sigma} + \|u\|_{L^p}r^{-\sigma}),$$

and we find that $\|(-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C\|Du\|_p^\sigma\|u\|_p^{1-\sigma}$ for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$.

We define the adjoint of \mathcal{L} in the usual way.

Definition 2.3. (Adjoint). The adjoint of \mathcal{L} is the operator \mathcal{L}^* such that

$$\langle \mathcal{L}f, g \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \langle f, \mathcal{L}^*g \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \quad \text{for all } f, g \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

The \mathcal{L}^* operator has the same form as \mathcal{L} , with the ‘‘antipodal’’ Lévy measure μ^* :

Lemma 2.4. *Assume (L1) holds. The adjoint operator \mathcal{L}^* is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}^*u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x+z) - u(x) - Du(x) \cdot z1_{|z|<1} d\mu^*(z),$$

where $\mu^*(B) = \mu(-B)$ for all Borel sets $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

This result is classical (see e.g. Section 2.4 in [21]). Hence all assumptions and results in this paper for μ and \mathcal{L} automatically also holds for μ^* and \mathcal{L}^* (and vice versa).

2.3. Moments of Lévy-measures, processes and FP equations. Consider the solution X_t of the SDE (3) (e.g. with $X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$) and the corresponding FP equation for its probability distribution m , $m_t + \text{div}(\alpha m) - \mathcal{L}^*m = 0$. If $\alpha \in L^\infty$ and (L1) holds, then it follows that X_t (and m) has $s > 0$ moments if and only if $\mu_{1_{|z|>1}}$ has s moments [3]:

$$E|X_t|^s = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^s m(dx, t) < \infty \iff \int_{|z|>1} |z|^s d\mu(z) < \infty.$$

The symmetric σ -stable processes have finite s -moments for any $s \in (0, \sigma)$. It is well-known that smoothing properties of \mathcal{L} only depend on the (moment) properties of $\mu_{1_{|z|<1}}$, and hence is completely independent of the number of moments of $\mu_{1_{|z|>1}}$, X_t and $m(t)$. This fact is reflected in the ellipticity assumption (L2') in the next section, and follows e.g. from simple heat kernel considerations in section 4, see Remark 4.8.

In this paper we will be as general as possible and assume no explicit moment assumptions on $\mu_{1_{|z|>1}}$, X_t , and $m(t)$. The only condition we impose on $\mu_{1_{|z|>1}}$ is (L1).

Note however, that we will still always have some sort of generalized moments, but maybe not of power type, and these “moments” will be important for tightness and compactness for the FP equations. We refer to section 6 and Proposition 6.5 for more details.

3. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS FOR FRACTIONAL MFG SYSTEMS

Here we state our assumptions and the existence and uniqueness results for classical solutions of the system (1) both with nonlocal and local couplings.

3.1. Assumptions on the fractional operator \mathcal{L} in (2). We assume (L1) and

(L2’): (Uniform ellipticity) There are constants $\sigma \in (1, 2)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C} \frac{1}{|z|^{d+\sigma}} \leq \frac{d\mu}{dz} \leq C \frac{1}{|z|^{d+\sigma}} \quad \text{for } |z| \leq 1.$$

These assumptions are satisfied by generators \mathcal{L} of pure jump processes whose infinite activity part is close to α -stable. But scale invariance is not required nor any restrictions on the tail of μ except for (L1). Some examples are α -stable processes, tempered α -stable processes, and the nonsymmetric CGMY process in Finance [18, 3]. Note that the upper bound on $\frac{d\mu}{dz}$ implies that (5) holds. A much more general condition than (L2’) is:

(L2): There is $\sigma \in (1, 2)$, such that

(i) μ satisfies the upper bound (5).

(ii) There is $\mathcal{K} > 0$ such that the heat kernels K_σ and K_σ^* of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* satisfy for $K = K_\sigma, K_\sigma^* : K \geq 0, \|K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$, and

$$\|D^\beta K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \mathcal{K} t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T)$$

and any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and multi-index $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ where D is the gradient in \mathbb{R}^d .

The heat kernel is a transition probability/fundamental solution. Under (L2) Lévy measures need not be absolutely continuous, e.g. $\mathcal{L} = -\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2}\right)^{\sigma_1/2} - \dots - \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_d^2}\right)^{\sigma_d/2}$ for $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d \in (1, 2)$ satisfies (L2) with $\sigma = \min_i \sigma_i$ and $d\mu(z) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{dz_i}{|z_i|^{1+\sigma_i}} \prod_{j \neq i} \delta_0(dz_j)$. See Section 4 for precise definitions, a proof that (L2’) implies (L2), more examples and extensions.

In the local coupling case, we need in addition to (L2) also the following assumption:

(L3): Let the cone $\mathcal{C}_{\eta,r}(a) := \{z \in B_r : (1 - \eta)|z||a| \leq |\langle a, z \rangle|\}$. There is $\beta \in (0, 2)$ such that for every $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $0 < \eta < 1$ and $C_\nu > 0$, and for all $r > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}_{\eta,r}(a)} |z|^2 \nu(dz) \geq C_\nu \eta^{\frac{d-1}{2}} r^{2-\beta}.$$

This assumption is introduced in [5] to prove Lipschitz bounds for fractional HJB equations. It holds e.g. for fractional Laplacians [5, Example 1] and then also if the inequalities of (L2') holds for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Since the assumption is in integral form, it also holds for non-absolutely continuous Lévy measures, spectrally one-sided processes, sums of operators etc.

3.2. Fractional MFGs with nonlocal coupling. We consider the MFG system

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, u, Du) = F(x, m(t)) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^*m - \operatorname{div}(mD_p H(x, u, Du)) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ m(x, 0) = m_0(x), \quad u(x, T) = G(x, m(T)) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

where the functions $F, G : \mathbb{R}^d \times P(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are non-local coupling functions, and $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Hamiltonian. We impose fairly standard assumptions on the data and nonlinearities [33, 9, 1] (but note we use the metric d_0 and not Wasserstein-1):

(A1): There exists a $C_0 > 0$ such that for all $(x_1, m_1), (x_2, m_2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times P(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$|F(x_1, m_1) - F(x_2, m_2)| + |G(x_1, m_1) - G(x_2, m_2)| \leq C_0(|x_1 - x_2| + d_0(m_1, m_2)).$$

(A2): There exist constants $C_F, C_G > 0$, such that

$$\sup_{m \in P(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|F(\cdot, m)\|_{C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_F \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{m \in P(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|G(\cdot, m)\|_{W^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_G.$$

(A3): $H \in C^3$ and for every $R > 0$ there is $C_R > 0$ such that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, u \in [-R, R], p \in B_R, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, |\alpha| \leq 3$,

$$|D^\alpha H(x, u, p)| \leq C_R.$$

(A4): For every $R > 0$ there is $C_R > 0$ such that for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, u \in [-R, R], p \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$|H(x, u, p) - H(y, u, p)| \leq C_R(|p| + 1)|x - y|.$$

(A5): There exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, u, v \in \mathbb{R}, u \leq v, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$H(x, v, p) - H(x, u, p) \geq \gamma(v - u).$$

(A6): $m_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap P(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Note that convexity or coercivity of H is not assumed at this point and that we identify probability measures and their density functions (see (A6)).

¹We define $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$

Example 3.1. Given $h(x) \in C_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $L(p) \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then

$$H(x, p) = h(x) + L(p), \quad H(x, p) = h(x)L(p), \quad H(x, u, p) = h(x)u + L(p),$$

satisfy the assumptions (A3)–(A5).

Example 3.2. We want to point out that the Hamiltonians $H(x, p) = x + \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ and $H(x, p) = x \cdot p$ are not covered by our assumptions, since these functions are unbounded in x .

Definition 3.3. (Classical solution) A classical solution of (7) is a pair (u, m) such that (i) $u, m \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$, (ii) $m \in C([0, T]; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$, (iii) $Du, D^2u, \mathcal{L}u, u_t, Dm, \mathcal{L}^*m, m_t \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T))$, and (iv) (u, m) solves (7) at every point.

Theorem 3.4. (*Existence of classical solutions*) Assume (L1), (L2), (A1)–(A6). Then there exists a classical solution (u, m) of (7) such that $u \in C_b^{1,3}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $m \in C_b^{1,2}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap C([0, T]; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

The proof will given in Section 7. It is an adaptation of the fixed point argument of P.-L. Lions [33, 9, 1] and requires a series of a priori, regularity, and compactness estimates for fractional HJB and fractional FP equations given in Sections 5 and 6.

For uniqueness, we add the following assumptions:

(A7): F and G satisfy monotonicity conditions:

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

(A8): The Hamiltonian $H = H(x, p)$ and is uniformly convex with respect to p :

$$\exists C > 0, \quad \frac{1}{C}I_d \leq D_{pp}^2 H(x, p) \leq CI_d.$$

Theorem 3.5. Assume (L1), (A1)–(A8). Then there is at most one classical solution of the MFG system (7).

Since \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* are adjoint operators, the proof of uniqueness is essentially the same as the proof in the College de France lectures of P.-L. Lions [33, 9, 1]. For the readers convenience we give the proof in Appendix A.

Example 3.6. (a) $F(x, m) = (\rho * m)(x)$ satisfies (A1) and (A2) if $\rho \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(b) $F(x, m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi(z, (\rho * m)(z))\rho(x - z)dz$ satisfies (A1) and (A2) if $\rho \in C_b^2$ and $\Phi \in C^1$.

(c) Both functions satisfy (A7) if $\rho \geq 0$ and Φ is nondecreasing in its second argument.

3.3. Fractional MFG with Local Coupling. We consider the MFG system

$$(8) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, Du) = f(x, m(t, x)) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ \partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^*m - \operatorname{div}(m D_p H(x, Du)) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ m(0) = m_0, u(x, T) = g(x), \end{cases}$$

where the coupling term f are local and only depend on the value of m at (x, t) . Again we impose fairly standard assumptions on f , g and H [33, 9]:

(A2'): (Regularity) $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, +\infty))$ with $\|f(\cdot, k)\|_{C_k^2} \leq C_k$ for any $k \in (0, +\infty)$, and $g \in C_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(A2''): (Uniform bound f) $\|f\|_{C_b} \leq K_f$ for $K_f > 0$.

(A3'): (Lipschitz bound H) $\|D_p H\|_\infty \leq L_H$ for $L_H > 0$.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume (L1)–(L3), (A3)–(A6), (A2'), and either (A2'') or (A3'). Then there exists a classical solution (u, m) of (8) such that $u \in C_b^{1,3}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $m \in C_b^{1,2}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap C([0, T]; P(\mathbb{R}^d))$.*

The proof of this result is given in Section 8. The idea is to approximate by a MFG system with nonlocal coupling and use the compactness and stability results to pass to the limit. These results rely on new regularity results. As opposed to the case of nonlocal coupling, it not enough to consider the HJB and FP equations separately, in this local coupling case, regularity has to be obtained directly for the coupled system. This requires the use of fractional regularity and bootstrap arguments.

For uniqueness we follow [33, 9] and look at the more general MFG system

$$(9) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, Du, m) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T) \\ \partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^*m - \operatorname{div}(m D_p H(x, Du(t, x), m)) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T) \\ m(0) = m_0, u(x, T) = G(x), \end{cases}$$

where $H = H(x, p, m)$ is convex in p and

$$(A10): \quad \begin{bmatrix} m D_{pp}^2 H & \frac{1}{2} m D_{pm}^2 H \\ \frac{1}{2} m (D_{pm}^2 H)^T & -D_m H \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad \text{for all } (x, p, m) \text{ with } m > 0.$$

This allows for analyzing uniqueness for MFG systems with i.e. $H(x, p, m) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{|p|^2}{m^\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ (cf. [9]). These types of Hamiltonians are not included by the assumptions in Theorem 3.7. Note that when $H(x, p, m) = \tilde{H}(x, p) - f(x, m)$, then (A10) is equivalent to

assuming (A8) and $D_m f(x, m) > 0$, where $D_m f(x, m) > 0$ implies assumption (A7) for the function f .

Theorem 3.8. *Assume (L1), (A10), and $H = H(x, p, m) \in C^2$. Then (8) has at most one classical solution.*

We skip the proof which in view of adjointness of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* is the same as in [33, 9]. The minor adaptations needed can be extracted from the uniqueness proof for nonlocal couplings given in Appendix A.

4. FRACTIONAL HEAT KERNEL ESTIMATES

Here we introduce fractional heat kernels and prove L^1 -estimates of their spatial derivatives. These estimates are used for the regularity results of Sections 5, 6, and 8. The heat kernel of an elliptic operator \mathcal{A} is the fundamental solution of $\partial_t u - \mathcal{A}u = 0$, or $u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{A}}})$, where $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is the Fourier multiplier defined by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}u) = \hat{\mathcal{A}}\hat{u}$. Taking the Fourier transform of (2), a direct calculation (see [3]) shows that

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{L}u) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\xi)\hat{u}(\xi),$$

where

$$(10) \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{ix \cdot \xi} - 1 - i\xi \cdot z 1_{|z| < 1}) d\mu(z).$$

We can split $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ into a singular and a non-singular part,

$$(11) \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\xi) = \left(\int_{|z| < 1} + \int_{|z| \geq 1} \right) (e^{ix \cdot \xi} - 1 - i\xi \cdot z 1_{|z| < 1}) d\mu(z) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_s(\xi) + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_n(\xi).$$

Note that since $\mu \geq 0$, $\text{Re } \hat{\mathcal{L}} = \int (\cos(z \cdot \xi) - 1) d\mu \leq 0$.

We will need the heat kernels K_σ and \tilde{K}_σ of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_s :

$$(12) \quad K_\sigma(t, x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{K}_\sigma(t, x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_s(\cdot)}).$$

By the Lévy-Kinchine theorem (Theorem 1.2.14 in [3]), K_σ and \tilde{K}_σ are probability measures for $t > 0$:

$$K_\sigma, \tilde{K}_\sigma \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_\sigma(x, t) dx = 1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{K}_\sigma(x, t) dx.$$

When (L2') holds, $\operatorname{Re} \hat{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\operatorname{Re} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_s \leq -c|\xi|^\sigma$ for $|\xi| \geq 1$, and K_σ and \tilde{K}_σ are absolutely continuous since $|e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\cdot)}|$ decays exponentially at infinity. An immediate consequence of assumption (L2) is existence for the corresponding fractional heat equation.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume (L1), (L2), $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and let $u(t, x) = K_\sigma(t, \cdot) * u_0(x)$. Then $u \in C^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and u is a classical solution of*

$$\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T), \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We first show that sums of operators \mathcal{L}_i satisfying (L1) and (L2) also satisfy (L1) and (L2). Let

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \cdots + \mathcal{L}_N \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{L}_i u(x) = \int_{Z_i} u(x+z) - u(x) - Du(x) \cdot z 1_{|z|<1} d\mu_i(z),$$

Z_i is a d_i -dimensional subspace, $\bigoplus_{i=1}^N Z_i = \mathbb{R}^d$, and \mathcal{L}_i satisfy (L1) and (L2) in Z_i :

(L1''): (i) $Z_i \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ is a subspace for $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^M Z_i = \mathbb{R}^d$ for $M \leq N$.

(ii) $\mu_i \geq 0$ is a Radon measure on Z_i satisfying $\int_{Z_i} 1 \wedge |z|^2 d\mu_i(z) < \infty$.

(L2''): (i) μ_i satisfy the upper bound (5) with $\sigma = \min_i \sigma_i$.

(ii) There are $\sigma_i \in (1, 2)$ and $c_i > 0$ such that the heat kernels K_i and K_i^* of \mathcal{L}_i and \mathcal{L}_i^* satisfy for $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, M$, and $t \in (0, T)$,

$$\|D_{z_i}^\beta K_i(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(Z_i)} + \|D_{z_i}^\beta K_i^*(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(Z_i)} \leq c_i t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma_i}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)}.$$

First observe that here $\mu = \sum_i \mu_i \delta_{0, Z_i^\perp}$ where δ_{0, Z_i^\perp} is the delta-measure in Z_i^\perp centered at 0. It immediately follows that (L1'') and (L2'') imply (L1) and (L2) (i).

Theorem 4.2. *Assume (L1''), (L2'') (ii), and \mathcal{L} is defined in (13). Then the heat kernel K and K^* of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* belongs to C^∞ and satisfy (L2) (ii) with $\sigma = \min_i \sigma_i$, i.e.*

$$\|D_x^\beta K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|D_x^\beta K^*(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c_{\beta, T} t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T), \quad \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d.$$

Proof. First note that in this case $K(t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_1} \cdots e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_N}) = \mathcal{K}_1(t) * \cdots * \mathcal{K}_N(t)$ where

$$\mathcal{K}_i(t) := \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i}) = K_i(t) \delta_{0, Z_i^\perp}, \quad K_i(t) = \mathcal{F}_{Z_i}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i}).$$

For $t \in (0, T)$, (L2'') (ii) implies that

$$\|D_{z_i}^\beta \mathcal{K}_i(t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|D_{z_i}^\beta K_i(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(Z_i)} \leq c_i t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma_i}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \leq c_T t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \quad (\sigma \leq \sigma_i)$$

for some constant $c_T > 0$. Since K_i is a probability measure by the Lévy-Kinchine theorem [3, Thm 1.2.14], $\|\mathcal{K}_j(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|K_j(t)\|_{L^1(Z_j)} = 1$. By properties of mollifiers and Young's inequality for convolutions it then follows that

$$\|D_{z_i}^\beta K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p} = \|\mathcal{K}_1 * \dots * D_{z_i}^\beta \mathcal{K}_i * \dots * \mathcal{K}_N\|_{L^p} \leq 1 \cdot \|D_{z_i}^\beta K_i\|_{L^p(Z_i)} \leq c_T t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)}.$$

Since $i = 1, \dots, M$ was arbitrary and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^M Z_i = \mathbb{R}^d$, the proof for K is complete. The proof for K^* is similar. \square

It is easy to check that (L2') implies (L2)(i). We then check that (L2') implies (L2)(ii).

Theorem 4.3. *Assume (L1), (L2'), and \mathcal{L} is defined in (2). Then the heat kernels K and K^* of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* belong to C^∞ and satisfies (L2)(ii): For $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$,*

$$\|D_x^\beta K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|D_x^\beta K^*(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c_{\beta, T} t^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T).$$

Example 4.4. In view of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, assumption (L2) is satisfied by e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= -(-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^d})^{\sigma_1/2} - (-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^d})^{\sigma_2/2}, \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= -\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2}\right)^{\sigma_1/2} - \dots - \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_d^2}\right)^{\sigma_d/2}, \\ \mathcal{L}_3 u(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(x+z) - u(x) - u'(x)z 1_{|z|<1} \frac{C e^{-Mz^+ - Gz^-}}{|z|^{1+Y}}, \\ &\quad \text{where } C, G, M > 0, Y \in (0, 2), \quad [\text{CGMY model in Finance}] \\ \mathcal{L}_4 &= \mathcal{L} + L \quad \text{where } \mathcal{L} \text{ satisfy (L2) and } L \text{ is any other Lévy operator.} \end{aligned}$$

We can even take L to be any local Lévy operator (e.g. Δ) if we relax the definition of \mathcal{L}_i to $\mathcal{L}_i u(x) = \text{tr}[a_i D^2 u] + b_i \cdot Du + \int_{Z_i} u(x+z) - u(x) - Du(x) \cdot z 1_{|z|<1} d\mu_i(s)$ for $a_i \geq 0$.

Remark 4.5. (a) (L2) holds also for very non-symmetric operators where μ has support in a cone in \mathbb{R}^d . Examples are Riesz-Feller operators like

$$\mathcal{L}_3 u(x) = \int_{z>0} u(x+z) - u(x) - u'(x)z 1_{z<1} \frac{dz}{z^{1+\alpha}}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 2).$$

We refer to [2] for results and discussion, see e.g. Lemma 2.1 (G7) and Proposition 2.3.

(b) More general conditions implying (L2) can be derived from the very general results on derivatives of heat semigroups in [36] and heat kernels in [25]. Such conditions could include more non absolutely continuous and non-symmetric Lévy measures.

We will now prove Theorem 4.3 and start by proving the result for \tilde{K}_σ , the kernel of \mathcal{L}_σ .

Lemma 4.6. *Assume (L1) and (L2'). Then $\tilde{K}_\sigma \in C^\infty$, and for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_o^d$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$, there is $c > 0$ such that*

$$\|D_x^\beta \tilde{K}_\sigma(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq ct^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1 - \frac{1}{p})d)} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Remark 4.7. (a) When $p = 1$, the bound simplifies to $\|D_x^\beta \tilde{K}_\sigma(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq ct^{-\frac{|\beta|}{\sigma}}$.

(b) When $|\beta| = 1$, the bound is locally integrable in t when $1 \leq p < p_0 := \frac{d}{1+d-\sigma}$. Note that $p_0 > 1$.

Proof. We verify the conditions of Theorem 5.6 of [25]. By (L2'), assumption (5.5) in [25] holds with

$$\nu_0(|x|) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|x|^{d+\sigma}}, & |x| < 1, \\ 0, & |x| \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Then we compute the integral h_0 ,

$$h_0(r) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1 \wedge \frac{|x|^2}{r^2} \nu_0(|x|) dx = \begin{cases} c_d \left(\frac{1}{2-\sigma} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \right) r^{-\sigma} - \frac{c_d}{\sigma}, & r < 1, \\ c_d \frac{1}{2-\sigma} r^{-2}, & r \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where c_d is the area of the unit sphere. Note that h_0 is positive, strictly decreasing, and that $h_0(r) \leq \lambda^\sigma h_0(\lambda r)$ for $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ and every $r > 0$. Hence the scaling condition (5.6) in [25] holds with $C_{h_0} = 1$ for any $\theta_{h_0} > 0$. The inverse is given by

$$h_0^{-1}(\rho) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{(2-\sigma)\rho}{c_d} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \rho \leq \frac{c_d}{2-\sigma}, \\ \left(\frac{\rho}{c_d} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}} \left(\frac{\sigma(2-\sigma)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}}, & \rho \geq \frac{c_d}{2-\sigma}. \end{cases}$$

In both cases $t \leq (2-\sigma)/c_d$ and $t \geq (2-\sigma)/c_d$, we then find that $h_0^{-1}(1/t) \leq (\tilde{c}t)^{1/\sigma}$, where \tilde{c} only depends on σ and d .

At this point we can use Theorem 5.6 in [25] to get the following heat kernel bound:

$$|\partial_x^\beta p(t, x + tb_{[h_0^{-1}(1/t)]})| \leq C_0 [h_0^{-1}(1/t)]^{-|\beta|} Y_t(x) = C_{0,\sigma} t^{-\frac{|\beta|}{\sigma}} Y_t(x),$$

for any $t > 0$, where b_r does not depend on x ,

$$Y_t(x) = [h_0^{-1}(1/t)]^{-d} \wedge \frac{tK_0(|x|)}{|x|^d},$$

and

$$K_0(r) := r^{-2} \int_{|x|<r} |x|^2 \nu_0(|x|) dx = \frac{c_d}{2-\sigma} \cdot \begin{cases} r^{-\sigma}, & r < 1 \\ r^{-2}, & r \geq 1 \end{cases} \leq \frac{c_d}{2-\sigma} r^{-\sigma}.$$

An integration in x then yields for $p \in [1, \infty)$,

$$(14) \quad \|\partial_x^\beta p(t, \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^p \leq C_{0,\sigma}^p \tilde{c}^p t^{-\frac{p|\beta|}{\sigma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Y_t(x)^p dx.$$

We compute $\|Y_t\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. Since $h_0^{-1}(1/t) \leq \tilde{c}t^{1/\sigma}$ and $K_0(r) \leq \frac{c_d}{2-\sigma} r^{-\sigma}$, we can compute the minimum to find a constant $c_{\sigma,d} > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq Y_t(x) \leq \begin{cases} (\tilde{c}t)^{-d/\sigma}, & \text{for } |x| < c_{\sigma,d}t^{1/\sigma} \\ \frac{c_d}{2-\sigma} \frac{t}{|x|^{d+\sigma}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A direct computation then shows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Y_t(x)^p dx \leq c_{d,\sigma,p} t^{-\frac{(p-1)d}{\sigma}},$$

where $c_{d,\sigma,p} > 0$ is a constant not depending on t . Combining this estimate with (14) concludes the proof of the Lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. result for K_σ follows by Lemma 4.6 and a simple computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_x^\beta K_\sigma\|_{L^p} &= \|D_x^\beta \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_s} e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n})\|_{L^p} = \|(D_x^\beta \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_s})) * \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n})\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq \|D_x^\beta \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_s})\|_{L^p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n}) \leq ct^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}(|\beta| + (1-\frac{1}{p})d)} \cdot 1. \end{aligned}$$

The last integral is 1 since $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{t\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n})$ is a probability by e.g. Theorem 1.2.14 in [3]. Since \mathcal{L}^* is an operator of the same type as \mathcal{L} with a Lévy measure μ^* also satisfying (L1) and (L2') (cf. Lemma 2.4), the computations above show that K_σ^* also satisfy the same bound as K_σ . \square

Remark 4.8. From this proof it follows that the smoothing properties of \mathcal{L} and K_σ are independent of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n$ and then also $\mu 1_{|z|>1}$.

By interpolation we obtain estimates for fractional derivatives of the heat kernel.

Proposition 4.9. *Assume (L1), (L2), $t \in [0, T]$, $s, \sigma \in (0, 2)$, and $|D|^s := (-\Delta)^{s/2}$. Then*

$$\||D|^s K_\sigma(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq ct^{-\frac{s}{\sigma}},$$

and if $s \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\| |D|^s \partial_x K_\sigma(t) \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq ct^{-\frac{s+1}{\sigma}}.$$

Proof. By Remark 2.2 (a) with $p = 1$ and (L2), we find that

$$\int \| |D|^s K^\sigma(t) \| dx \leq c \| D^2 K^\sigma(t) \|_{L^1}^{\frac{s}{2}} \| K^\sigma \|_{L^1}^{1-\frac{s}{2}} \leq (ct^{-\frac{2}{\sigma}})^{s/2} 1^{1-s/2} \leq ct^{-\frac{s}{\sigma}}.$$

The proof of the second part follows in a similar way from Remark 2.2 (b). \square

5. FRACTIONAL HAMILTON-JACOBI-BELLMAN EQUATIONS

Here we prove regularity and well-posedness for solutions of the fractional Hamilton-Jacobi equation. In our proof we use heat kernel estimates (Section 4), a Duhamel formula, and a fixed point argument as in [28, 19]. The fractional Hamilton-Jacobi equation is given by

$$(15) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, u, Du) = f(t, x) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

where f is the source term and u_0 initial condition. We assume

(B1): $u_0 \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in C_b([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$.

(B2): There is an $L > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|f(t, x) - f(t, y)| + |u_0(x) - u_0(y)| \leq L|x - y|.$$

Assumptions (L1), (A3)–(A5), (B1)–(B2) implies that there exists a bounded x -Lipschitz continuous viscosity solution u of (15) (cf. e.g [29, 30, 6, 28]).

Theorem 5.1 (Comparison principle). *Assume (L1), (A3)–(A5), (B1)–(B2) and u, v are bounded viscosity sub- and supersolutions of (15) with bounded continuous initial data u_0, v_0 . If $u_0 \leq v_0$ in \mathbb{R}^d , then $u \leq v$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T)$.*

Outline of proof. If u and v are uniformly continuous, then the proof is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 2 in [28]. When u and v are not uniformly continuous, the limit (13) in [28] no longer holds because (in the notation of [28]) $\frac{|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^2}{\varepsilon} \not\rightarrow 0$. However, this can be fixed under our assumptions, loosely speaking because we can remove all $O(\frac{|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^2}{\varepsilon})$ -terms before taking limits by modifying the test function. The modification consists in introducing an exponential factor in the quadratic term: $\frac{e^{Ct}}{\varepsilon} |x - y|^2$ for C large enough. \square

Remark 5.2. We drop a complete proof here for two reasons: (i) it is long and rather standard, and (ii) we only apply the result in cases where u and v are uniformly continuous and an argument like in [28] is sufficient.

Theorem 5.3 (Well-posedness). *Assume (L1), (A3)–(A5), and (B1)–(B2).*

(a) *There exists a (unique) bounded continuous viscosity solution u of (15) in $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $u(0, x) = u_0(x)$.*

(b) $\|u\|_\infty \leq \|u_0\|_\infty + C_0 T$ where $C_0 := \|H(\cdot, 0, 0)\|_\infty + \|f\|_\infty$ is finite by (A3) and (B1).

(c) *If also $u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then*

$$\|Du(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq M_T,$$

where $M_T = e^{2C_R T} \left(\frac{1}{2}C_R + T^2\|D_x f\|_\infty^2 + \|Du_0\|_\infty^2\right)^{1/2}$, with C_R from (A4) and $R = \|u\|_\infty$.

Proof. The proof of (a) is quite standard and almost identical to the proof of Theorem 3 in [28]. Part (b) follows from comparison, Theorem 5.1, and the proof of part (c) is similar to the proof of Lemma 2 in [28]. \square

Using parabolic regularity (in the form of (L3) [5]) and the method of Ishii-Lions, it is possible to obtain Lipschitz bounds that only depend on the C_b -norm of f :

Theorem 5.4. *Assume (L1), (L3), (A3)–(A5), $f \in C_b([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the viscosity solution u of (15) is Lipschitz continuous in x and there is a constant $M > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\|Du(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq M,$$

where M depends on $\|u\|_\infty$, $\|f\|_\infty$, d , and the quantities in (A3)–(A5).

Proof. In the periodic case this result is a direct consequence of Corollary 7 in [5]. The original proof is for a right-hand side f not depending on t . For continuous $f = f(x, t)$, the proof is exactly the same. The result also holds in the whole space case, and this is explained in section 5.1 in [5] (see Theorem 6 in section 5.1 in [5] for the stationary case). \square

Similar parabolic results for the whole space are also given in [14]. To have classical solutions we make further regularity assumptions on the data:

(B3): $\|f(t, \cdot)\|_{C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

(B4): $u_0 \in C_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Note that f needs less spatial regularity than H in (A3).

Theorem 5.5 (Classical solutions). *Assume (L1)–(L2), (A3)–(A5), and (B1)–(B4). Then (15) has a unique classical solution u (see Definition 3.3) such that $\partial_t u, u, Du, D^2u, D^3u \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ with*

$$\|\partial_t u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \|Du\|_{L^\infty} + \|D^2u\|_{L^\infty} + \|D^3u\|_{L^\infty} \leq c,$$

where c is a constant depending only on σ, T, d , and quantities from (L1)–(B4).

To have space-time uniform continuity (and compactness) of derivatives, we assume:

(B5): There is a modulus of continuity ω_f such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, t, s \in [0, T]$,

$$|f(s, x) - f(t, y)| \leq \omega_f(|s - t| + |x - y|).$$

Theorem 5.6 (Uniform continuity). *Assume (L1)–(L2), (A3)–(A5), and (B1)–(B5). Then the unique classical solution u of (15) also satisfies*

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} & |u(t, x) - u(s, y)| + |Du(t, x) - Du(s, y)| + |D^2u(t, x) - D^2u(s, y)| \\ & + |\partial_t u(t, x) - \partial_t u(s, y)| + |\mathcal{L}u(t, x) - \mathcal{L}u(s, y)| \leq \omega(|t - s| + |x - y|), \end{aligned}$$

where ω only depends on σ, T, d , and quantities from (L1)–(B5).

Remark 5.7. Imbert shows in [28] that when $\mathcal{L} = -(-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}$, $f \equiv 0$, and $u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a classical solution u such that $\|u\|_{C_b} + \|Du\|_{C_b} + \|t^{1/\sigma} D^2u\|_{C_b} \leq c$. He goes on to show that when $H = H(p) \in C^\infty$, then $u \in C^\infty$. In this paper we prove results for a much larger class of equations and nonlocal operators. Our results are also more precise: We need and prove time-space uniform continuity of all derivatives appearing in the equation, see Theorem 5.6. To do we need a finer analysis of the regularity in time. A final difference is that our estimates do not blow up as $t \rightarrow 0^+$, since u_0 belongs to C_b^3 in our case. Note that it is easy to adapt our proofs and obtain even higher order regularity, e.g. treat the case $H = H(x, u, p) \in C^\infty$.

To prove Theorem 5.5 and 5.6, we first restrict ourselves to a short time interval.

5.1. Short time regularity by a Duhamel formula. Let K be the fractional heat kernel defined in (12). A solution v of (15) is formally given by the Duhamel formula

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} v(t, x) &= \psi(v)(t, x) \\ &:= K(t, \cdot) * v_0(\cdot)(x) - \int_0^t K(t-s, \cdot) * (H(s, \cdot, v(s, \cdot), Dv(s, \cdot)) - f(s, \cdot))(x) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $*$ is convolution in \mathbb{R}^d . Note that solutions of this equation are fixed points of ψ .

Proposition 5.8 (Spatial regularity). *Assume (L1)–(L2), (A3)–(A5), (B1)–(B3), and $k \in \{2, 3\}$. For $R_0 \geq 0$, let $R_1 = (1 + \mathcal{K})R_0 + 1$ with \mathcal{K} defined in (L2).*

(a) *If $v_0 \in W^{k-1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|v_0\|_{W^{k-1, \infty}} \leq R_0$, then there is $T_0 \in (0, T)$ such that ψ in (17) has a unique fixed point $v \in C_b^{k-1}([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $t^{1/\sigma} D^k v \in C_b([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty} + \cdots + \|D^{k-1}v\|_{L^\infty} + \|t^{1/\sigma} D^k v\|_{L^\infty} \leq R_1.$$

(b) *If $v_0 \in W^{k, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|v_0\|_{W^{k, \infty}} \leq R_0$, then there is $T_0 \in (0, T)$ such that ψ in (17) has a unique fixed point $v \in C_b^k([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty} + \cdots + \|D^k v\|_{L^\infty} \leq R_1.$$

In both cases T_0 only depends on σ and the quantities in (L1)–(B3).

Proof. (a) We will use the Banach fixed point theorem in the Banach (sub) space

$$X = \{v : v, \dots, D^{k-1}v, t^{1/\sigma} D^k v \in C_b([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } \|v\|_k \leq R_1\},$$

where $\|v\|_k = \|v\|_{k-1} + \sum_{|\beta|=k} \|t^{1/\sigma} D_x^\beta v\|_\infty$ and $\|v\|_k = \sum_{0 \leq |\beta| \leq k} \|D_x^\beta v\|_\infty$.

Let $v \in X$. For $i = 1, \dots, d$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$, $|\beta| \leq k-2$,

$$(18) \quad \partial_x^\beta \partial_{x_i} \psi(v) = K(t) * \partial_x^\beta \partial_{x_i} v_0(x) - \int_0^t \partial_{x_i} K(t-s) * \partial_x^\beta (H(\cdot, \cdot, v, Dv) - f)(s, x) ds,$$

while for $|\beta| = k-1$,

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} t^{1/\sigma} \partial_x^\beta \partial_{x_i} \psi(v) &= t^{1/\sigma} \partial_{x_i} K(t) * \partial_x^\beta v_0(x) \\ &\quad - t^{1/\sigma} \int_0^t \partial_{x_i} K(t-s) * \partial_x^\beta (H(\cdot, \cdot, v, Dv) - f)(s, x) ds. \end{aligned}$$

If w and F are bounded functions, then $K(t, \cdot) * w$ and $\int_0^t \partial_x K(t-s, \cdot) * F(s, \cdot) ds$ are well-defined, bounded and continuous by (L2) and an argument like in the proof of [19, Proposition 3.1]. It follows by (A3) and (B3), that the derivatives of $\psi(v)$ in (18) and (19)

are well-defined, bounded, and continuous. In particular by (L2), for $t \in (0, T)$,

$$\|t^{1/\sigma} \partial_{x_i} K(t) * \partial_x^\beta v_0\|_{C_b} \leq \mathcal{K} \|\partial_x^\beta v_0\|_{C_b}.$$

Let $u, v \in X$ and $t \in [0, T_0]$. By (A3) and (B3) there is a constant $C_{R_1} > 0$, such that

$$(20) \quad \left| \partial_x^\beta [H(s, x, u(s, x), Du(s, x))] \right| + \left| \partial_x^\beta f(s, x) \right| \leq \begin{cases} C_{R_1}, & 0 \leq |\beta| \leq k-2, \\ C_{R_1} \left(1 + s^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}}\right), & |\beta| = k-1, \end{cases}$$

$$(21) \quad \left| \partial_x^\beta [H(s, x, u, Du)] - \partial_x^\beta [H(s, x, v, Dv)] \right| \leq \begin{cases} C_{R_1} \|u - v\|_{|\beta|+1}, & 0 \leq |\beta| \leq k-2, \\ C_{R_1} \left(1 + s^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}}\right) \|u - v\|_3, & |\beta| = k-1. \end{cases}$$

By (L2) $\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |K(t-s, x)| dx ds \leq T_0$, $\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\partial_{x_i} K(t-s, x)| dx ds \leq k(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma}$, and

$$\int_0^t s^{-1/\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\partial_{x_i} K(t-s, x)| dx ds \leq \gamma(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma},$$

where $k(\sigma) = \mathcal{K} \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}$ and $\gamma(\sigma) = \mathcal{K} \int_0^1 (1-\tau)^{-1/\sigma} \tau^{-1/\sigma} d\tau$. From these considerations and Young's inequality for convolutions on (18) and (19), we compute the norm in X ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\psi(v)\|_\infty + \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\|\partial_i \psi(v)\|_\infty + \sum_{1 \leq |\beta|=k-2} \|\partial_x^\beta \partial_i \psi(v)\|_\infty + \sum_{|\beta|=k-1} \|t^{1/\sigma} \partial_x^\beta \partial_i \psi(v)\|_\infty \right) \\ & \leq (1 + \mathcal{K}) R_0 \\ & + C_{R_1} \underbrace{\left(T_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d \left(k(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} + \sum_{1 \leq |\beta|=k-2} k(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} + \sum_{|\beta|=k-1} k(\sigma) T_0 + \gamma(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} \right) \right)}_{=: c(T_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $T_0 \in (0, T)$ such that $c(T_0) \leq 1/2$, ψ maps X into itself: By the definition of R_1 ,

$$\|\|\psi(v)\|\|_k \leq (1 + \mathcal{K}) R_0 + \frac{1}{2} \leq R_1.$$

It is also a contraction on X . By (21) and $\|u\|_1 \leq \|u\|_{k-1} \leq \|u\|_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\|\psi(u) - \psi(v)\|\|_k \\ & \leq C_{R_1} \left(T_0 \|u - v\|_1 + \sum_{i=1}^d \left(k(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} \|u - v\|_1 + \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq k-2} k(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} \|u - v\|_{|\beta|+1} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{|\beta|=k-1} (k(\sigma) T_0 + \gamma(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma}) \|u - v\|_{|\beta|+1} \right) \right) \\ & \leq c(T_0) \|\|u - v\|\|_k \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\|u - v\|\|_k. \end{aligned}$$

An application of Banach's fixed point theorem in X now concludes the proof of part (a).

(b) We define the Banach (sub) space

$$X = \{v : v, Dv, \dots, D^k v \in C_b((0, T_0) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } \|v\|_k \leq R_1\},$$

where $\|v\|_k = \sum_{0 \leq |\beta| \leq k} \|D_x^\beta v\|_\infty$. We use (18) with $|\beta| \leq k - 1$, and only the first parts of (20) and (21). The rest of the proof is then similar to the proof of part (a). \square

We proceed to prove time and mixed time-space regularity results. As a consequence, the solution of (17) is a classical solution of (15).

Proposition 5.9. *Assume $T_0 > 0$, (L1)–(L2), (A3)–(A5), (B1)–(B3), v satisfies (17), and $v, Dv, D^2v \in C_b([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then*

- (a) $\partial_t v \in C_b([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\|\partial_t v\|_\infty \leq c$, where c depends only on σ, T_0, d , the quantities in assumptions (L1)–(B3), and $\|D^k v\|_\infty$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$.

Assume in addition $D^3v \in C_b([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$.

- (b) $v, Dv, \mathcal{L}v, D^2v \in UC([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ with modulus $\omega(t - s, x - y) = C(|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |x - y|)$, where $C > 0$ only depends on σ, T_0, d , the quantities in assumptions (L1)–(B3), and $\|D^k v\|_\infty$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

- (c) If also (B5), then $\partial_t v \in UC((0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, where the modulus only depends on T_0, σ, T_0, d , the quantities in assumptions (L1)–(B5), and the moduli of $v, Dv, \mathcal{L}v, D^2v$.

Corollary 5.10. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 5.9 (a), v is a classical solution of (15) on $(0, T_0) \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Follows by differentiating formula (17). To prove Proposition 5.9 we use the Duhamel formula

$$(22) \quad v(t, x) = K(t, \cdot) * v_0(\cdot)(x) - \int_0^t K(t - s, \cdot) * g(s, \cdot)(x) ds,$$

corresponding to the equation

$$(23) \quad \partial_t v(t, x) - \mathcal{L}v(t, x) + g(t, x) = 0.$$

The following technical lemma is proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 5.11. *Assume (L1)–(L2), $g, \nabla g \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, and let*

$$\Phi(g)(t, x) = \int_0^t K(t - s, \cdot) * g(s, \cdot)(x) ds.$$

(a) $\Phi(g)(t, x)$ is C^1 w.r.t. $t \in (0, T)$ and $\partial_t \Phi(g)(t, x) = g(t, x) + \mathcal{L}[\Phi(g)](t, x)$.

(b) If $\beta \in (\sigma - 1, 1)$ and $g \in UC((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_t \Phi(g)(t, x) - \partial_t \Phi(g)(s, y)| + |\mathcal{L}\Phi(g)(t, x) - \mathcal{L}\Phi(g)(s, y)| \\ & \leq 2(1+c) \|g\|_{C_{b,t} C_{b,x}^1} |x-y|^{1-\beta} \\ & \quad + 2(1+c) \|g\|_{C_{b,t} C_{b,x}^1}^\beta \omega_g(|t-s|)^{1-\beta} + \tilde{c} \|g\|_{C_b} |t-s|^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} T^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \mathcal{K} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^{1+\beta} d\mu(z) + 4T \int_{|z|\geq 1} d\mu(z)$,

$$\tilde{c} = 2 \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \mathcal{K} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^{1+\beta} d\mu(z) K + 2T^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \int_{|z|\geq 1} d\mu(z),$$

and $K = \max_{s,t \in [0,T]} |t^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} - s^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}| / |t-s|^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}$.

Note that c , \tilde{c} , and K are finite. We have the following results for (22) and (23).

Lemma 5.12. Assume (L1)–(L2), v satisfies (22), and $v, \nabla v, D^2 v, g, \nabla g \in C_b([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$.

(a) $\partial_t v \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, and v solves equation (23) pointwise.

(b) If in addition $g \in UC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\partial_t v$ and $\mathcal{L}v$ are uniformly continuous and for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t, s \in [0, T]$, $k = 0, 1, 2$,

$$(24) \quad |\partial_t v(t, x) - \partial_t v(s, y)| + |\mathcal{L}v(t, x) - \mathcal{L}v(s, y)| \leq \omega(|t-s| + |x-y|),$$

where ω only depends on ω_g , $\|g\|_\infty$, $\|g\|_{C_{b,t} C_{b,x}^1}$, $\|Dv_0\|_\infty$, $\|D^2 v_0\|_\infty$, σ , T , and μ .

Proof. (a) By the assumptions and Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 5.11 (a), we can differentiate the right hand side of (22). Differentiating and using the two results then leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v &= \partial_t (K(t) * v_0) - \partial_t \int_0^t K(t-s) * g(s) ds \\ &= \mathcal{L}(K(t) * v_0) - g(t) - \mathcal{L} \int_0^t K(t-s) * g(s) ds \\ &= -g(t) + \mathcal{L} \left(K(t) * v_0 - \int_0^t K(t-s) * g(s) ds \right) \\ &= -g(t) + \mathcal{L}v(t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we end up with (23) and the proof of (a) is complete.

(b) By (22), v is the sum of two convolution integrals. The regularity of the second integral follows from Lemma 5.11 (b). The regularity of the first integral follows by similar but much simpler arguments, this time with no derivatives on the kernel K (and hence two derivatives on v_0). We omit the details. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.9. (a) In view of the assumptions, the result follows from Lemma 5.12(a) with $g(t, x) = H(x, v(t, x), Dv(t, x)) - f(t, x)$.

(b) By (a) and Corollary 5.10, v solve (15). We show that $D^2v \in UC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $w = \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 v$ and $w^\epsilon = w * \rho_\epsilon$ for a standard mollifier ρ_ϵ . Convolving (15) with ρ_ϵ and then differentiating twice ($\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j}$), we find that

$$\partial_t w^\epsilon - \mathcal{L}w^\epsilon + \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 (H(t, x, v, Dv) * \rho_\epsilon) = \partial_{x_i x_j} f * \rho_\epsilon.$$

By Lemma 2.1 $\|\mathcal{L}w^\epsilon\|_\infty \leq c\|w^\epsilon\|_{C_b^2}$, and then by properties of convolutions,

$$\|\mathcal{L}w^\epsilon\|_\infty \leq c \sum_{k=2}^4 \|D^k v^\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \frac{c}{\epsilon} \|D\rho\|_{L^1} \|D^3 v\|_\infty + c(\|D^3 v\|_\infty + \|D^2 v\|_\infty).$$

It follows that $|\partial_t w^\epsilon| \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{\epsilon} + K$, where $\tilde{c} = c\|D\rho\|_{L^1} \|D^3 v\|_\infty$ and $K > 0$ is a constant only depending on $\|v\|_\infty, \|Dv\|_\infty, \|D^2 v\|_\infty, \|D^3 v\|_\infty, \|D^2 f\|_\infty$ and $C_R > 0$ from (A3), with $R = \max(\|v\|_\infty, \|Dv\|_\infty)$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w(t) - w(s)\|_\infty &\leq \|w^\epsilon(t) - w(t)\|_\infty + \|w^\epsilon(t) - w^\epsilon(s)\|_\infty + \|w^\epsilon(s) - w(s)\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2\|Dw\|_\infty \cdot \epsilon + \|\partial_t w^\epsilon\|_\infty |t - s| \leq 2\|D^3 v\|_\infty \cdot \epsilon + \left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{\epsilon} + K\right) |t - s| \leq C|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2}} + K|t - s|, \end{aligned}$$

where we took $\epsilon = |t - s|^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Since w is bounded, this implies Hölder 1/2 regularity in time. The spatial continuity follows from $|w(t, x) - w(t, y)| \leq \|D^3 v\|_\infty |x - y|$. In total, we get (recalling that $w = \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} v$),

$$|D^2 v(s, x) - D^2 v(t, y)| \leq C(|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |x - y|),$$

where $C > 0$ is only dependent on T_0, σ, T, d , the quantities in (L1)–(B3), and $\|D^k v\|_\infty$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The results for v and Dv follow by simpler similar arguments. Since v, Dv and $D^2 v$ are uniformly continuous, by Taylor's theorem (as in the proof Lemma 2.1) $\mathcal{L}v$ is uniformly continuous with a modulus only depending on the moduli of v, Dv and $D^2 v$.

(c) By (B5) and the results from (b), $\partial_t v \in UC((0, T_0) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ by the equation (15). \square

Global regularity and proofs of Theorem 5.5 and 5.6. From the local in time estimates, we construct a classical solution u of (15) on the whole interval $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. By Theorem 5.3, there is a unique viscosity solution u of (15) on $(0, T)$. To show that this solution is smooth, we proceed in steps.

1) By Proposition 5.8 (b) we find a $T_0 > 0$ and a unique solution v of (17) satisfying

$$v, Dv, D^2v, D^3v \in C_b([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } v(0) = u_0,$$

and by Corollary 5.10, v is a classical solution of (15) on $(0, T_0)$. Since classical solutions are viscosity solutions, v coincides with the unique viscosity solution u on $(0, T_0)$.

2) Fix $t_0 \in [0, T)$ and take the value of the viscosity solution u of (15) as initial condition for (17) at $t = t_0$. Then $v(t_0, x) = u(t_0, x)$ and by Theorem 5.3, we have the uniform in time in $[0, T]$ Lipschitz estimate for the viscosity solution,

$$(25) \quad \|v(t_0, \cdot)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq M_T.$$

This estimate is crucial for the rest of this step. We apply Proposition 5.8 (a) with $k = 2$ (translate time $t \rightarrow t - t_0$, apply the theorem, and translate back) to obtain a $T_1 > 0$, independent of t_0 , such that on

$$(t_0, t_0 + T_1),$$

we have a unique solution v of (17) satisfying $v, \nabla v, (t - t_0)^{1/\sigma} D^2v \in C_b$. Then

$$v, \nabla v, D^2v \in C_b((t_0 + \delta_1, t_0 + T_1) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$$

for any $\delta_1 \in (0, T_1)$. Let $\delta_1 \leq \frac{1}{4} \min(T_0, T_1)$, and take $v(t_0 + \delta_1, \cdot)$ as initial condition. By Proposition 5.8 (a) again we find a $T_2 > 0$ such that on the interval

$$(t_0 + \delta_1, t_0 + \delta_1 + T_2)$$

there exists a unique solution v of (17) such that for any $\delta_2 \in (0, T_2)$,

$$v, \nabla v, D^2v, t^{1/\sigma} D^3v \in C_b((t_0 + \delta_1 + \delta_2, t_0 + \delta_1 + T_2)).$$

We define $\tilde{T} := \min(T_0, T_1, T_2)$, and let $\delta_2 \leq \frac{1}{8}\tilde{T}$. Defining $\delta := \delta_1 + \delta_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\tilde{T}$, we find that

$$v, Dv, \dots, D^3v \in C_b((t_0 + \delta, t_0 + \delta + \tilde{T}) \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

By Proposition 5.9, $\partial_t v \in C_b$, and v is a classical solution of (15) on $(t_0 + \delta, t_0 + \delta + \tilde{T})$, therefore coinciding with u on this time interval. Note that $\tilde{T} > 0$ can be chosen independently of t_0 by (A3), (B3), (B4), and (25).

3) We cover all of $(0, T)$ by intervals from step 1) and 2), repeatedly taking $t_0 = 0, \frac{1}{2}\tilde{T}, \tilde{T}, \frac{3}{2}\tilde{T}, \dots, \frac{N-1}{2}\tilde{T}$ with $\frac{N}{2}\tilde{T} \geq T$. We then find that the viscosity solution u is a classical solution with bounded derivatives on $(0, T)$ and the proof of Theorem 5.5 is complete.

4) Theorem 5.6 follows from Theorem 5.5 and Proposition 5.9.

6. FRACTIONAL FOKKER-PLANCK EQUATIONS

Here we prove the existence of smooth solutions of the fractional Fokker-Planck equation, along with C_b, L^1 , tightness, and time equicontinuity in L^1 a priori estimates. The equation is given by

$$(26) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^* m + \operatorname{div}(b(t, x)m) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ m(0, x) = m_0(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

where $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and \mathcal{L} (and hence also \mathcal{L}^*) satisfies (L1),(L2).

We first show preservation of positivity and a first C_b -bound for bounded solutions.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume (L1) and $b, Db \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and m is a bounded classical solution of (26).*

(a) *If $m_0 \geq 0$, then $m(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

(b) *If $m_0 \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\|m(t, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq e^{\|(\operatorname{div} b)^+\|_\infty t} \|m_0\|_\infty$.*

In fact this result also holds for bounded viscosity solutions, but this is not needed here. The result is an immediate consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *Assume (L1) and $b, Db \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and m is a bounded classical subsolution of (26). Then for $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$(27) \quad \|m(t, \cdot)^+\|_\infty \leq e^{\|(\operatorname{div} b)^+\|_\infty t} \|m_0^+\|_\infty$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1. (a) Apply Lemma 6.2 on $-m$ (which still is a solution) and note that $(-m_0)^+ = 0$. (b) Apply Lemma 6.2 on m and $-m$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.2. In non-divergence form we get (the linear!) inequality

$$\partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^* m + b \cdot Dm + (\operatorname{div} b) m \leq 0,$$

with C_b coefficients by the assumptions. The proof is then completely standard and we only sketch the case that $\operatorname{div} b < 0$. Let

$$a = \sup_{(x,t) \in Q_T} m(x,t)^+ - \|m_0^+\|_\infty,$$

$\chi_R(x) = \chi(\frac{x}{R})$ where $0 \leq \chi \in C_c^2$ such that $\chi = 1$ in B_1 and $= 0$ in B_2^c , and

$$\Psi(x,t) = m(x,t) - \|m^+\|_\infty - at - \|m^+\|_\infty \chi_R(x).$$

We must show that $a \leq 0$. Assume by contradiction that $a > 0$. Then there exists a max point (\bar{x}, \bar{t}) of Ψ such that $\bar{t} > 0$. At this max point $m > 0$ (since $a > 0$) and

$$m_t \geq a, \quad Dm = D\chi_R, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}^* m \leq \mathcal{L}^* \chi_R.$$

Hence using the subsolution inequality at this point and $\operatorname{div} b < 0$, we find that

$$a \leq m_t \leq \mathcal{L}^* m + b \cdot Dm + (\operatorname{div} b) m \leq \|m^+\|_\infty \left(\mathcal{L}^* \chi_R + b \cdot D\chi_R \right).$$

An easy computation shows that that all χ_R -terms converge to zero as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Hence we pass to the limit and find that $a \leq 0$, a contradiction to $a > 0$. The result follows. \square

The Fokker-Planck equation (26) is mass and positivity preserving (it preserves probability density functions) and therefore may preserve the L^1 -norm in time. We will now prove a sequence of a priori estimates for L^1 solutions of (26), using a “very weak formulation” of the equation.

Lemma 6.3. *Assume (L1), $m_0 \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$, $b, Db \in C_b$, and m is a classical solution of (26) such that $m, Dm, D^2m \in C_b$. Then for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(Q_T)$, $0 \leq s < t \leq T$,*

$$(28) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m\phi(x,t) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m\phi(x,s) dx + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(\phi_t + \mathcal{L}\phi - b \cdot D\phi)(x,r) dx dr.$$

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{L}\phi \in C([0,T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ by Lemma 2.1 with $p = 1$. Multiply (26) by ϕ , integrate in time and space, and integrate by parts. The proof is completely standard, after noting that $\int \mathcal{L}^* m \phi dx = \int m \mathcal{L}\phi dx$ in view of the assumptions of the Lemma. \square

Remark 6.4. If in addition $m \in C([0,T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$, then a density argument shows that (28) holds for any $\phi \in C_b^\infty$.

Next we prove mass preservation, time-equicontinuity, and tightness for positive solutions in L^1 . For tightness we need the following result:

Proposition 6.5. *Assume (L1) and $m_0 \in P(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists a function $0 \leq \psi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|D\psi\|_\infty, \|D^2\psi\|_\infty < \infty$, and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \psi(x) = \infty$, such that*

$$(29) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(x) m_0(dx) < \infty, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_1} \Psi(x) \mu(dx) < \infty$$

Proof. We let $\mu_0 = \frac{\mu(dx)\mathbf{1}_{|x| \geq 1}}{\int_{B_1^c} \mu(dx)}$ and $\Pi = \{m_0, \mu_0\}$ and apply [15, Proposition 3.8]. \square

Proposition 6.6. *Assume (L1), $m_0 \in C_b$, $b, Db \in C_b$, and m is a classical solution of (26) such that $m, Dm, D^2m \in C_b$. We also assume $m \in C([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^1))$, $m_0 \geq 0$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0 dx = 1$.*

(a) $m \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) dx = 1$ for $t \in [0, T]$.

(b) There exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$d_0(m(t), m(s)) \leq c_0(1 + \|b\|_\infty)|t - s|^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T].$$

(c) For ψ defined in Proposition 6.5 there is $c > 0$ such that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(30) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t)\psi(|x|) dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0\psi(|x|) dx + 2\|\psi'\|_{C_b} + cT\|\psi'\|_{C_b} \left(\|b\|_{C_b} + \int_{|z| < 1} |z|^2 d\mu(z) \right) + T \int_{|z| > 1} \psi(|z|) d\mu(z).$$

Proof. (a) By Proposition 6.1, $m \geq 0$. Let $R > 1$ and $\chi_R(x) = \chi(\frac{x}{R})$ for $\chi \in C_c^\infty$ such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and $\chi = 1$ in B_1 and $= 0$ in B_2^c . We will apply Lemma 6.3 with $\phi = \chi_R$ and $s = 0$ and pass to the limit as $R \rightarrow \infty$. To do that, we write $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}^1 = \int_{|z| < 1} \cdots + \int_{|z| > 1} \cdots$, and note that by Lemma 2.1 with $p = \infty$ and $\mu(B_1^c) = 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_1 \chi_R\|_{C_b} \leq C \inf_{r \in (0, 1)} \left(r^{2-\sigma} \frac{1}{R^2} \|D^2 \chi\|_{C_b} + (r^{1-\sigma} - 1) \frac{1}{R} \|D \chi\|_{C_b} \right) \leq C \frac{1}{R^2} \|\chi\|_{C_b^2},$$

and then

$$\|\partial_t \chi_R + \mathcal{L}_1 \chi_R - b \cdot D \chi_R\|_{C_b} \leq \frac{1}{R} \left(\|\chi\|_{C_b^2} + \|b\|_{C_b} \|D \chi\|_{C_b} \right) \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Also note that $\|\mathcal{L}^1 \phi_R\|_{C_b} \leq 2\mu(B_1^c)$ and $\mathcal{L}^1 \phi_R(x) \rightarrow 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Since $m \in C([0, T]; L^1)$ by assumption, it follows by the dominated convergence theorem that,

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m \mathcal{L}^1 \chi_R dx dr \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Now we apply Lemma 6.3 with $\phi = \chi_R$ and $s = 0$ and pass to the limit in (28) as $R \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) \chi_R(x) dx = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0 \chi_R(x) dx + 0.$$

The result now follows from the dominated convergence theorem since $\chi_R \rightarrow 1$ pointwise and $\int m_0 dx = 1$.

(b) Fix a $\text{Lip}_{1,1}$ function $\phi(x)$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $\phi_\epsilon \in C_b^\infty$ be an approximation (e.g. by mollification) such that

$$(31) \quad \|\phi - \phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} \leq \epsilon \|D\phi\|_{C_b} \quad \text{and} \quad \|D^k \phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} \leq c \epsilon^{(k-1)^+} \|\phi\|_{C_b^1}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Applying Lemma 6.3 and Remark 6.4 with $\phi = \phi_\epsilon(x)$, then leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (m(x, t) - m(x, s)) \phi_\epsilon(x) dx = \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(0 + \mathcal{L}\phi_\epsilon - b \cdot D\phi_\epsilon)(x, r) dx dr.$$

By Lemma 2.1 with $p = \infty$ and (31),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}\phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} &\leq c \inf_{r \in (0,1)} \left(r^{2-\sigma} \|D^2\phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} + r^{1-\sigma} \|D\phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} + \|\phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} \right) \\ &\leq c \inf_{r \in (0,1)} \left(r^{2-\sigma} \frac{1}{\epsilon} + r^{1-\sigma} + 1 \right) \|\phi\|_{C_b^1} \leq C \epsilon^{1-\sigma} \|\phi\|_{C_b^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (m(x, t) - m(x, s)) \phi_\epsilon(x) dx \leq C |t - s| \epsilon^{1-\sigma} (1 + \|b\|_{C_b}) \|\phi\|_{C_b^1} \|m\|_{C(0,T;L^1)}.$$

Then by adding and subtracting $(m(x, t) - m(x, s)) \phi_\epsilon(x)$ terms, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (m(x, t) - m(x, s)) \phi(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (m(x, t) - m(x, s)) \phi_\epsilon(x) dx + 2 \|m\|_{C(0,T;L^1)} \|\phi - \phi_\epsilon\|_{C_b} \\ &\leq C (|t - s| \epsilon^{1-\sigma} + \epsilon) (1 + \|b\|_{C_b}) \|\phi\|_{C_b^1} \|m\|_{C(0,T;L^1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|m\|_{C(0,T;L^1)} = 1$ by part (a), and $\|\phi\|_{C_b^1} \leq 2$ for $\text{Lip}_{1,1}$ -functions, the result follows from the definition of the d_0 distance in (4) after a minimization in ϵ .

(c) Let $\psi_R(r) = \rho_1 * (\psi \wedge R)(r)$ for $r \geq 1$, where $0 \leq \rho_1 \in C_c^\infty((-1, 1))$ is symmetric and has $\int \rho_1 dx = 1$ (a mollifier). We note that $\rho_1 * \psi \leq \psi$ and that $\psi \wedge R$ is nondecreasing, concave, and $\nearrow \psi$. Standard arguments then show that $\psi_R \in C_b^\infty([1, \infty))$,

$$(32) \quad 0 \leq \psi_R \leq R, \quad 0 \leq \psi'_R \leq \psi', \quad \psi''_R \leq 0, \quad \|\psi''_R\|_{C_b} \leq \|\rho'_1\|_{L^1} \|\psi'\|_{C_b},$$

$$(33) \quad \psi_R \nearrow \rho_1 * \psi (\leq \psi) \quad \text{as} \quad R \rightarrow \infty.$$

The convergence as $R \rightarrow \infty$ is pointwise. We apply Lemma 6.3 and remark 6.4 with

$$\phi(x, t) = \phi_R(x) := \psi_R(\sqrt{1 + |x|^2}).$$

Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}^1$ as in the proof of part (a), and note that (using also (32) and Lemma 2.1 with $r = 1$),

$$\|D\phi_R\|_{C_b} \leq c\|\psi'\|_{C_b}, \quad \|D^2\phi_R\|_{C_b} \leq c\|\rho'_1\|_{L^1}\|\psi'\|_{C_b}, \quad \|\mathcal{L}_1\phi_R\| \leq c\|\rho'_1\|_{L^1}\|\psi'\|_{C_b} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^2 d\mu.$$

Next since ψ_R is nonnegative, nondecreasing, and subadditive², we observe that

$$|\psi_R(r) - \psi_R(s)| \leq \psi_R(r - s) \quad \text{for all } r, s \geq 0.$$

Hence we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}^1\phi_R(x)| &\leq \int_{|z|>1} \left| \psi_R(\sqrt{1 + |x + z|^2}) - \psi_R(\sqrt{1 + |x|^2}) \right| d\mu(z) \\ &\leq \int_{|z|>1} \psi_R(|z|) d\mu(z) \leq \int_{|z|>1} \psi(|z|) d\mu(z). \end{aligned}$$

From the estimates above we conclude that

$$\left| \partial_t \phi_R + \mathcal{L}\phi_R - b \cdot D\phi_R \right| \leq c\|\psi'\|_{C_b} \left(\|b\|_{C_b} + \|\rho'_1\|_{C_b} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^2 d\mu \right) + \int_{|z|>1} \psi(|z|) d\mu.$$

Inserting this estimate into (28) with $\phi = \phi_R$, along with $m \geq 0$, $\int m(x, t) dx = 1$ (by part (a)), and $\phi_R(x) \leq \psi(\sqrt{1 + |x|^2})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) \phi_R(x) dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0(x) \psi(\sqrt{1 + |x|^2}) dx \\ &\quad + Tc\|\psi'\|_{C_b} \left(\|b\|_{C_b} + \|\rho'_1\|_{C_b} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^2 d\mu \right) + T \int_{|z|>1} \psi(|z|) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

By the monotone convergence theorem and (33),

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) \phi_R(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) \rho_1 * \psi(\sqrt{1 + |x|^2}) dx.$$

To conclude that (30) holds, we note that $\rho_1 * \psi \geq \psi - \|\psi'\|_{C_b}$ and

$$\psi(|x|) \leq \psi(\sqrt{1 + |x|^2}) \leq \psi(|x|) + \|\psi'\|_{C_b}.$$

The proof of (c) is complete. □

Solutions in L^1 also have a better C_b bound than the one in Proposition 6.1. This bound is needed in the local coupling case – see Section 8.

Lemma 6.7. *Assume (L1), (L2) (ii), $b \in C_b$, $0 \leq m_0 \in C_b$, and $0 \leq m \in C_b(Q_T)$ is a classical solution of (26). If $m \in C(0, T; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$, then there exist a constant $C > 0$ only*

²Nonnegative concave functions h on $[0, \infty)$ are subadditive: $h(a + b) \leq h(a) + h(b)$ for $a, b \geq 0$.

dependent on d, q, σ, T , such that for any $1 < p < p_0 := \frac{d}{d+1-\sigma}$,

$$\|m\|_{C_b} \leq 1 \vee \left[\|m_0\|_{C_b} + CT^{\frac{d-p(1+d-\sigma)}{p\sigma}} \|b\|_{C_b} \right]^{\frac{p}{p-1}}.$$

Proof. (Inspired by [4, Proposition 2.2]) For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\phi(s, x) = K(t-s, y-x)$ where K is the heat kernel of Section 4. Then $\phi \geq 0$ is smooth, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x, s) dx = 1$, and ϕ solves the backward heat equation

$$(34) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t \phi - \mathcal{L}\phi = 0, & s < t, \\ \phi(x, t) = \delta_y(x), \end{cases}$$

where the δ -measure δ_y has support in y . Multiply (26) by ϕ , integrate in time and space, and integrate by parts to get

$$\int m\phi(x, t) dx - \int m\phi(x-y, 0) dx = \int_0^t \int m(x, s) [\phi_t + \mathcal{L}\phi - b \cdot D\phi](x-y, s) dx ds$$

or

$$m(y, t) = m * K(\cdot, t)(y) + \int_0^t \int (bm)(\cdot, s) * DK(\cdot, t-s) dx ds.$$

Then by the heat kernel estimates of (L2) (ii), $\|DK(s, \cdot)\|_{L^p} \leq Cs^{\frac{d-p(1+d)}{p\sigma}}$, the Hölder and Young's inequalities, the properties of K , and $\|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^q}^q \leq \|m\|_{C_b}^{q-1} \|m(\cdot, t)\|_{L^1} = \|m\|_{C_b}^{q-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |m(y, t)| &\leq \|m_0\|_{C_b} + \|b\|_{C_b} \int_0^t \|DK(\cdot, t-s)\|_{L^p} \|m(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{p'}} dt \\ &\leq \|m_0\|_{\infty} + Ct^{\frac{d-p(1+d)+p\sigma}{p\sigma}} \|b\|_{C_b} \|m\|_{C_b}^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq p \leq \frac{d}{1+d-\sigma}$ where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. Since y is arbitrary, we get after taking the supremum and dividing both sides by $\|m\|_{C_b}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ that

$$\|m\|_{C_b} \leq 1 \vee \left[\|m_0\|_{C_b} + CT^{\frac{d-p(1+d-\sigma)}{p\sigma}} \|b\|_{C_b} \right]^{p'}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Finally, we state the main result of this section, the existence of classical solutions of (26) that are positive and mass-preserving.

Proposition 6.8. *Assume (L1), (L2), $b, Db, D^2b \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $0 \leq m_0 \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0 dx = 1$.*

(a) *There exists a unique classical solution m of (26) satisfying $m \geq 0$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) dx = 1$ for $t \in [0, T]$, and*

$$\|m\|_{L^\infty} + \|Dm\|_{L^\infty} + \|D^2m\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_t m\|_{L^\infty} \leq c,$$

where c is a constant depending only on σ , T , d , and $\|D^k b\|_\infty$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$.

(b) *There exists a modulus $\tilde{\omega}$ only depending on $\|D^k m\|_\infty$, $\|D^k b\|_\infty$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, and (L1), such that for $s, t \in [0, T]$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|m(t, x) - m(s, y)| + |Dm(t, x) - Dm(s, y)| \leq \tilde{\omega}(|t - s| + |x - y|).$$

(c) *If in addition $b, Db \in UC((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, then there exists a modulus ω only depending on $\tilde{\omega}$, ω_b , ω_{Db} , $\|Db\|_\infty$, m_0 , T , σ , and d , such that for $s, t \in [0, T]$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|\mathcal{L}^* m(x, t) - \mathcal{L}^* m(s, y)| + |\partial_t m(x, t) - \partial_t m(s, y)| \leq \omega(|s - t| + |x - y|).$$

Proof. (a) The proof uses a Banach fixed point argument based on the Duhamel formula

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} m(t, x) &= \tilde{\psi}(m)(t, x) \\ &:= K^*(t, \cdot) * m_0(\cdot)(x) - \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \partial_{x_i} K^*(t - s, \cdot) * (b_i m)(s, \cdot) ds, \end{aligned}$$

and is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.5. Here K^* is the heat kernel of \mathcal{L}^* . It is essentially a corollary to Proposition 5.1 in [19] (but in our case the we have more regular initial condition and hence no blowup of norms when $t \rightarrow 0^+$).

Similar to the corresponding proof for the HJB equation, we first show short-time C^1 -regularity using the Duhamel formula. Let $R_0 = 1 + \|m_0\|_\infty$, $R_1 = (2 + dK)R_0 + 1$, and the Banach (sub) space

$$(36) \quad X = \{m : m, t^{1/\sigma} Dm \in C_b((0, T_0) \times \mathbb{R}^d), m \in C([0, T]; L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)), \text{ and } \|m\| \leq R_1\},$$

where $\|m\| = \|m\|_{C([0, T]; L^1)} + \|m\|_\infty + \sum_{i=1}^d \|t^{1/\sigma} \partial_{x_i} m\|_\infty$. Then if $k(\sigma)$ and $\gamma(\sigma)$ are defined in the proof of Proposition 5.8 (a), we find from (35) that for $p \in \{1, \infty\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\psi}(m)(t, x)\|_{L^p} &\leq \|K^*\|_{L^1} \|m_0\|_p + \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \|\partial_{x_i} K^*(t - s, \cdot)\|_{L^1} \|b_i\|_\infty \|m(s)\|_p ds \\ &\leq R_0 + dk(\sigma) T_0^{1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}} \|b\|_\infty R_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |t^{1/\sigma} \partial_{x_j} \tilde{\psi}(m)(t, x)| \\
 & \leq t^{1/\sigma} \|\partial_{x_j} K^*\|_{L^1} \|m_0\|_\infty + \sum_{i=1}^d t^{1/\sigma} \int_0^t \|\partial_{x_i} K^*(t-s, \cdot)\|_{L^1} \|(m \partial_j b_i + b_i \partial_j m)\|_\infty ds \\
 & \leq \mathcal{K} R_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d t^{1/\sigma} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t-s)^{-1/\sigma} \left[\|m\|_\infty \|\partial_j b_i\|_\infty + s^{-1/\sigma} \|b_i\|_\infty \|s^{1/\sigma} \partial_j m\|_\infty \right] ds \\
 & \leq \mathcal{K} R_0 + \left[k(\sigma) T_0 \|Db\|_\infty + \gamma(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} \|b\|_\infty \right] d R_1,
 \end{aligned}$$

Computing the full norm, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\tilde{\psi}(m)\| \\
 & \leq (2 + d\mathcal{K}) R_0 + \underbrace{\left[2dk(\sigma) T_0^{1-\frac{1}{\sigma}} \|b\|_\infty + d^2 \left[k(\sigma) T_0 \|Db\|_\infty + \gamma(\sigma) T_0^{1-1/\sigma} \|b\|_\infty \right] \right]}_{:=c(T_0)} R_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

We take $T_0 > 0$ so small that $c(T_0) \leq 1/2$. Then it follows that $\tilde{\psi}$ maps X into itself by the definition of R_1 . It is also a contraction since for $m_1, m_2 \in X$, it easily follows that

$$\|\tilde{\psi}(m_1) - \tilde{\psi}(m_2)\| \leq c(T_0) \|m_1 - m_2\|.$$

An application of Banach's fixed point theorem in X then concludes the proof. Note that we only needed $m_0 \in C_b$ and $b, Db \in C_b$ to obtain the result.

We can now repeatedly differentiate the Duhamel formula (17) and use similar contraction arguments to conclude that if $b, Db, \dots, D^k b \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, then there exists a solution $m \in X$ such that

$$D^2 m, \dots, D^{k-1} m, t^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} D^k m \in C_b((0, T_0) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{for } T_0 > 0 \text{ sufficiently small.}$$

In a similar way as in Proposition 5.9 (a) and Corollary 5.10 for the HJB-equation, it now follows that m is a classical solution to (26). By Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.6 (a), we then have global in time bounds m in $C_b \cap C([0, T]; L^1)$. We can therefore extend the local existence and the derivative estimates to all of $[0, T]$. The argument is very similar to the proof in Section 5.9 and we omit it. Finally, by Lemma 6.6 (a) again, we get that $m \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) dx = 1$.

(b) Part (b) follows in a similar way as part (b) in Theorem 5.9. We omit the details.

(c) From part (a), (b), and the assumptions, the function $g(t, x) = \operatorname{div}(mb)$ satisfies $g, \nabla g \in C_b((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in UC((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Lemma 5.11 (b) (with K^* instead of K) then gives that $\partial_t \Phi(g), \mathcal{L}^* \Phi(g) \in UC((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ with modulus ω only dependent on $\sigma, T, d, \|g\|_\infty, \|\nabla g\|_\infty$ and ω_g . A similar, but simpler argument shows that $\partial_t K_t^* * m_0 = \mathcal{L}^* K_t^* * m_0 \in UC((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $m = K_t^* * m_0 - \Phi(g)$, this concludes the proof. \square

7. EXISTENCE FOR MFGS WITH NONLOCAL COUPLING – PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4

We adapt [33, 9, 1] and use the Schauder fixed point theorem. We work in $C([0, T], P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with metric $d(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} d_0(\mu(t), \nu(t))$ and the subset

$$(37) \quad \mathcal{C} := \left\{ \mu \in C([0, T], P(\mathbb{R}^d)) : \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(|x|) \mu(dx, t) \leq C_1, \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{d_0(\mu(s), \mu(t))}{|s - t|^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}} \leq C_2 \right\},$$

where ψ is defined in Proposition 6.5 and the constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are to be determined. For $\mu \in \mathcal{C}$, define $S(\mu) := m$ where m is the classical solution of the fractional FPK equation

$$(38) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t m - \mathcal{L}^* m - \operatorname{div}(D_p H(x, u, Du)m) = 0, \\ m(0, \cdot) = m_0(\cdot), \end{cases}$$

and u is the classical solution of the fractional HJB equation

$$(39) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u + H(x, u, Du) = F(x, \mu), \\ u(x, T) = G(x, \mu(T)). \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{U} := \{u : u \text{ solves (39) for } \mu \in \mathcal{C}\}$ and $\mathcal{M} := \{m : m \text{ solves (38) for } u \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

1. (\mathcal{C} convex, closed, compact). The subset \mathcal{C} is convex and closed in $C([0, T], P(\mathbb{R}^d))$ by standard arguments. It is compact by the Prokhorov and Arzèla-Ascoli theorems.

2. ($S : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is well-defined). By (L1), (L2), (A1)–(A6), Theorem 5.5 and 5.6, there is a unique solution u of (39) with

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_\infty, \|Du\|_\infty, \dots, \|D^3 u\|_\infty, \|\partial_t u\|_\infty &\leq U_1, \\ \partial_t u, u, Du, D^2 u, \mathcal{L}u &\text{ equicontinuous with modulus } \omega, \end{aligned}$$

where U_1 depends on d, σ and the spatial regularity of F, G and H . The modulus ω depends in addition on C_2 in (37). By the uniform bound in (A2), U_1 is independent of μ . By

Proposition 6.8 part (a)–(c), for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$ there is a unique m solving (38) such that

$$(41) \quad \begin{aligned} \|m\|_\infty, \|Dm\|_\infty, \|D^2m\|_\infty, \|\partial_t m\|_\infty &\leq M_1, \\ \partial_t m, m, Dm, \mathcal{L}^*m &\text{ are equicontinuous with modulus } \bar{\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where M_1 depends on U_1 and the local regularity of H but not on μ . The modulus $\bar{\omega}$ depends in addition on ω . By Lemma 6.6 (b)–(c),

$$\begin{aligned} d_0(m(s), m(t)) &\leq c_0(1 + \|D_p H(\cdot, Du)\|_\infty) |s - t|^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m(x, t) \psi(|x|) dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0 \psi(|x|) dx \\ &\quad + 2\|\psi'\|_{C_b} + cT\|\psi'\|_{C_b} \left(\|D_p H(\cdot, Du)\|_{C_b} + \int_{|z|<1} |z|^2 d\mu(z) \right) + T \int_{|z|>1} \psi(|z|) d\mu(z). \end{aligned}$$

By (40) and (A3), $\|D_p H(x, Du)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{C}$, where \tilde{C} is independent of μ . Hence, we take $C_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m_0 \psi(|x|) dx + 2\|\psi'\|_{C_b} + cT\|\psi'\|_{C_b} \tilde{C} + \int_{|z|<1} |z|^2 d\mu(z)$ and $C_2 = c_0(1 + \tilde{C})$ and get that S maps \mathcal{C} into itself.

3. (S is continuous). We use the well-known result:

Lemma 7.1. *Let (X, d) a metric space, $K \subset\subset X$ a compact subset and $(x_n) \subset K$ a sequence such that all convergent subsequences have the same limit $x^* \in K$. Then $x_n \rightarrow x^*$.*

Define $X_1 := \{f : f, Df, D^2f, \partial_t f, \mathcal{L}f \in C_b\}$ and $X_2 := \{f : f, Df, \partial_t f, \mathcal{L}^*f \in C_b\}$, equipped with the metric of local uniform convergence, taken at all the derivatives. Then X_1 and X_2 are complete metric spaces. By (40), (41), Arzela-Ascoli, and a diagonal (covering) argument \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{M} are compact in X_1 and X_2 , respectively.

Let $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu \in \mathcal{C}$, and let (u_n, m_n) be the corresponding solutions of (39) and (38). Take a convergent subsequence $(u_n) \supset u_{n_k} \rightarrow \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ and let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}^1 = \left(\int_{|z|<1} + \int_{|z|\geq 1} \right) (\dots)$. By uniform convergence $\mathcal{L}_1 u_{n_k}(t, x) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_1 \tilde{u}(t, x)$, and by dominated convergence $\mathcal{L}^1 u_{n_k}(t, x) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^1 \tilde{u}(t, x)$. By (A1), (A3) and for any $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| -\partial_t \tilde{u}(t, x) - \mathcal{L} \tilde{u}(t, x) + H(x, D\tilde{u}(t, x)) - F(x, \mu) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \partial_t u_{n_k}(t, x) - \partial_t \tilde{u}(t, x) \right| + \left| \mathcal{L} u_{n_k}(t, x) - \mathcal{L} \tilde{u}(t, x) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| H(x, Du_{n_k}) - H(x, D\tilde{u}) \right| + \left| F(x, \mu_{n_k}(t)) - F(x, \mu(t)) \right| \\ & \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

and $|\tilde{u}(T, x) - G(x, \mu(T))| \leq |\tilde{u}(T, x) - u_{n_k}(T, x)| + |G(x, \mu_{n_k}(T)) - G(x, \mu(T))| \rightarrow 0$. This shows that \tilde{u} solves (39) with μ as input. By uniqueness of the HJB equation, compactness of \mathcal{U} in X_1 , and Lemma 7.1, we conclude that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in X_1 .

A similar argument shows that $m_n \rightarrow m \in X_2$. By compactness of \mathcal{C} in part 2, uniqueness of solutions, and Lemma 7.1, we also find that $m_n \rightarrow m$ in $C([0, T], P(\mathbb{R}^d))$. The map $S : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is therefore continuous.

4. (Fixed point). By Schauder fixed point theorem there then exists a fixed point $S(m) = m$, and this fixed point is a classical solution of (7) and the proof of Theorem 3.4 is complete.

8. EXISTENCE FOR MFGs WITH LOCAL COUPLING – PROOF OF THEOREM 3.7

1. (Approximation) We follow Lions [33, 9], approximating by a system with non-local coupling and passing to the limit. Let $\epsilon > 0$, $0 \leq \phi \in C_c^\infty$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi = 1$, $\phi_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon^d} \phi(x/\epsilon)$, and for $\mu \in P(\mathbb{R}^d)$ let $F_\epsilon(x, \mu) := f(x, \mu * \phi_\epsilon(x))$. For each fixed $\epsilon > 0$, F_ϵ is a nonlocal coupling function satisfying (A1)–(A2), since $\|D^\beta(\mu * \phi_\epsilon)\|_\infty \leq \|\mu\|_1 \|D^\beta \phi_\epsilon\|_\infty = \|D^\beta \phi_\epsilon\|_\infty$. Assumptions (L1)–(L2), (A1)–(A6) then hold for the approximate system

$$(42) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u_\epsilon - \mathcal{L}u_\epsilon + H(x, Du_\epsilon) = F_\epsilon(x, m_\epsilon(t)) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \partial_t m_\epsilon - \mathcal{L}^* m_\epsilon - \operatorname{div}(m_\epsilon D_p H(x, Du_\epsilon)) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ m(0) = m_0, \quad u(x, T) = g(x), \end{cases}$$

and by Theorem 3.4 there exist a classical solution (u_ϵ, m_ϵ) of this system.

2. (Uniform bounds) Since either (A3') or (A2'') holds, $F_\epsilon(x, m_\epsilon(t))$ is uniformly bounded in ϵ . In the case of (A3') this follows from Lemma 6.7 and the estimate

$$(43) \quad \|m_\epsilon\|_{C_b} \leq 1 \vee \left[\|m_0\|_{C_b} + CT^{\frac{d-p(1+d-\sigma)}{p\sigma}} \|D_p H(\cdot, Du_\epsilon)\|_\infty \right]^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq K$$

for K independent of ϵ . By Theorem 5.3 (b) and (A3) we then have

$$(44) \quad \|u_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq \|g\|_\infty + (T-t)(\|F_\epsilon(\cdot, m_\epsilon(t))\|_\infty + \|H(\cdot, 0)\|_\infty) \leq \tilde{K}$$

for $\tilde{K} > 0$ independent of ϵ , and since F_ϵ is also continuous, by Theorem 5.4

$$(45) \quad \|Du_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq C$$

for $C \geq 0$ independent of ϵ (C depends on F_ϵ only through its C_b -norm). Under (A3') m is bounded and satisfies (43), and this is still true if (A3') is replaced by (A2'') in view of the uniform bound on Du_ϵ in (45).

3. (Improvement of regularity) The Duhamel formulas for m_ϵ and Du_ϵ are given by

$$(46) \quad m_\epsilon(t) = K_\sigma^*(t) * m_0 - \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \partial_i K_\sigma^*(t-s) * m_\epsilon [D_p H(\cdot, Du_\epsilon(s))]_i ds,$$

$$(47) \quad Du_\epsilon(t) = K_\sigma(t) * Du_0 - \int_0^t D_x K_\sigma(t-s) * (H(\cdot, Du_\epsilon(s)) - F_\epsilon(\cdot, m_\epsilon(s, \cdot))) ds.$$

where $K_\sigma(t) = K_\sigma(t, x)$ and $K_\sigma^*(t) = K_\sigma^*(t, x)$ are the fractional heat kernels in \mathbb{R}^d corresponding to \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* . Fractional differentiations of these will lead to improved regularity.

Assume that for $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, there is $C \geq 0$ independent of ϵ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(48) \quad \|m_\epsilon(t)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|Du_\epsilon(t)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C.$$

We will show that for any $\delta \in (0, \alpha)$ and $s \in (0, \sigma - 1)$ there is $\tilde{C} \geq 0$ independent of ϵ and t such that

$$(49) \quad \begin{cases} \|m_\epsilon(t)\|_{C^{k,s+\alpha-\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|Du_\epsilon(t)\|_{C^{k,s+\alpha-\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \tilde{C}, & \text{for } s + \alpha - \delta \leq 1, \\ \|m_\epsilon(t)\|_{C^{k+1,s+\alpha-\delta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|Du_\epsilon(t)\|_{C^{k+1,s+\alpha-\delta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \tilde{C}, & \text{for } s + \alpha - \delta > 1, \end{cases}$$

Assume first $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and consider the m_ϵ -estimate. When (48) holds, then $m_\epsilon D_p H(x, Du_\epsilon) \in C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by the chain rule and (A3), and $|D|^{\alpha-\delta} D^k (m_\epsilon D_p H(x, Du_\epsilon)) \in C_b^{0,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $\delta \in (0, \alpha)$ by [37, Proposition 2.7]. Let $s \in (0, \sigma - 1)$ and apply $|D|^s |D|^{\alpha-\delta} D^k$ to (46),

$$\begin{aligned} |D|^s |D|^{\alpha-\delta} D^k m_\epsilon &= K_\sigma^*(t) * |D|^{s+\alpha-\delta} D^k m_0 \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t |D|^s D K_\sigma^*(t-s) * |D|^{\alpha-\delta} D^k [m_\epsilon D_p H(\cdot, Du_\epsilon)]_i ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality and Proposition 4.9 (heat kernel estimates),

$$\| |D|^{s+\alpha-\delta} D^k m_\epsilon \|_\infty \leq \| |D|^{s+\alpha-\delta} D^k m_0 \|_\infty + c \frac{T^{1-\frac{1+s}{\sigma}}}{1-\frac{1+s}{\sigma}} \| |D|^{\alpha-\delta} D^k (m_\epsilon D_p H(\cdot, Du_\epsilon)) \|_\infty,$$

and taking $\delta < \alpha/2$, we get uniform in ϵ Hölder estimates by [37, Proposition 2.9],

$$m_\epsilon(t) \in \begin{cases} C_b^{k,s+\alpha-2\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d), & \text{for } s + \alpha - 2\delta \leq 1, \\ C_b^{k+1,s+\alpha-2\delta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d), & \text{for } s + \alpha - 2\delta > 1. \end{cases}$$

The case $\alpha = 0$ follows in a similar but more direct way differentiating (46) by $|D|^s D^k$ instead of $|D|^s |D|^{\alpha-\delta} D^k$ as above. The estimates on Du_ϵ follow similarly.

4. (Iteration and compactness) Starting from (43), (44), and (A2') and (A3), we iterate using (49) to find that

$$\|u_\epsilon(t)\|_{C_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|m_\epsilon(t)\|_{C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C$$

independent of ϵ and $t \in [0, T]$. By Proposition 5.9 and Proposition 6.8, we then find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq U \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t u_\epsilon, u_\epsilon, Du_\epsilon, D^2 u_\epsilon, \mathcal{L}u_\epsilon \quad \text{equicontinuous with modulus } \omega, \\ \|\partial_t m_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t m_\epsilon, m_\epsilon, Dm_\epsilon, \mathcal{L}^* m_\epsilon \quad \text{equicontinuous with modulus } \bar{\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where U , ω , M and $\bar{\omega}$ are independent of ϵ . As in the proof of Theorem 3.4, these bounds imply compactness of (m_ϵ, u_ϵ) in $X_1 \times X_2$ (see below Lemma 7.1 for the definitions).

5. (Passing to the limit) We extract a convergent subsequence, $(u_{\epsilon_k}, m_{\epsilon_k}) \rightarrow (u, m)$ in $X_1 \times X_2$. By a direct calculation the limit (u, m) solves equation (8). This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.7.

APPENDIX A. UNIQUENESS OF SOLUTIONS OF MFGs – PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5

The proof of uniqueness is essentially the same as the proof in the College de France lectures of P.-L. Lions [33, 9]. Let (u_1, m_1) and (u_2, m_2) be two classical solutions, and set $\tilde{u} = u_1 - u_2$ and $\tilde{m} = m_1 - m_2$. By (7) and integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{u} \tilde{m} \, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\tilde{u} \tilde{m}) \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_t \tilde{u}) \tilde{m} + \tilde{u} (\partial_t \tilde{m}) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[\left(-\mathcal{L}\tilde{u} + H(x, Du_1) - H(x, Du_2) - F(x, m_1) + F(x, m_2) \right) \tilde{m} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tilde{u} \mathcal{L}^* \tilde{m} - \langle D\tilde{u}, m_1 D_p H(x, Du_1) - m_2 D_p H(x, Du_2) \rangle \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the adjoint, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathcal{L}\tilde{u}) \tilde{m} - \tilde{u} (\mathcal{L}^* \tilde{m}) \, dx = 0$, and from (A7) we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-F(x, m_1) + F(x, m_2)) \, d(m_1 - m_2)(x) \geq 0 \quad \forall m_1, m_2 \in P(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

For the remaining terms on the right hand side, we use a Taylor expansion and (A8),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[-m_1 \left(H(x, Du_1) - H(x, Du_2) - \langle D_p H(x, Du_1), Du_2 - Du_1 \rangle \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - m_2 \left(H(x, Du_2) - H(x, Du_1) - \langle D_p H(x, Du_2), Du_1 - Du_2 \rangle \right) \right] dx \\ &\leq - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{m_1 + m_2}{2C} |Du_2 - Du_1|^2 \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating from 0 to T , using the fact that $\tilde{m}(t=0) = 0$ and $\tilde{u}(t=T) = G(x, m_1(T)) - G(x, m_2(T))$,

$$\int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{u} \tilde{m} dx dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (G(x, m_1(T)) - G(x, m_2(T))) (m_1(x, T) - m_2(x, T)) dx \geq 0,$$

where we used (A7) again. Combining all the estimates we find that

$$0 \leq - \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{m_1 + m_2}{2C} |Du_1 - Du_2|^2 dx dt$$

Hence since the integrand is nonnegative it must be zero and $Du_1 = Du_2$ on the set $\{m_1 > 0\} \cup \{m_2 > 0\}$. This means that m_1 and m_2 solve the same equation (the divergence terms are the same) and hence are equal by uniqueness. Then also u_1 and u_2 solve the same equation and $u_1 = u_2$ by standard uniqueness for nonlocal HJB equations (see e.g. [29]). The proof is complete.

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 5.11

a) The proof is exactly the same as in [28]. The difference is that f only needs to be C^1 in space, since $D_x K$ is integrable in t .

b) *Part 1:* Uniform continuity in x for $\mathcal{L}\Phi(f)$ and $\partial_t \Phi(f)$. By the definition of \mathcal{L} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[\Phi(f)](t, x) &= \int_0^t \mathcal{L}K(t-s, \cdot) * f(s, \cdot)(x) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(t-s, y+z) - K(t-s, y) - \nabla_x K(t-s, y) \cdot z 1_{|z| < 1} d\mu(z) \right] f(s, x-y) dy ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|z| < 1} (\dots) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|z| > 1} (\dots) =: I_1(t, x) + I_2(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

After a change of variables and $\|K(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2(t, x_1) - I_2(t, x_2)| &\leq \int_0^t \int_{|z| \geq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(t-s, y) \left[f(s, x_1 - y + z) - f(s, x_1 - y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f(s, x_2 - y + z) + f(s, x_2 - y) \right] dy d\mu(z) ds \\ &\leq 2t \|f\|_{C_{b,t} C_{b,x}^1} |x_1 - x_2| \int_{|z| \geq 1} d\mu(z). \end{aligned}$$

Then since and $\|I_2(t, \cdot)\|_{C_b} \leq 2t \|f\|_{C_{b,t} C_{b,x}^1} \int_{|z| \geq 1} d\mu(z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2(t, x_1) - I_2(t, x_2)| &\leq (2\|I_2(t, \cdot)\|_{C_b})^\beta |I_2(t, x_2) - I_2(t, x_2)|^{1-\beta} \\ &\leq 4t \|f\|_{C_{b,t} C_{b,x}^1} \int_{|z| \geq 1} d\mu(z) |x_1 - x_2|^{1-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

By the fundamental theorem, Fubini, and a change of variables,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(t, x) &= \int_0^t \int_{|z|<1} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^1 \nabla_x K(t-s, y+\sigma z) - \nabla_x K(t-s, y) \right] \cdot z f(s, x-y) d\sigma dy d\mu(z) ds, \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|z|<1} \nabla_x K(t-s, y) \cdot z \left[f(s, x-y+\sigma z) - f(s, x-y) \right] d\mu(z) dy d\sigma ds. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(t, x_1) - I_1(t, x_2) &= \int_0^t \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x K(t-s, y) \cdot \int_{|z|<1} z \left[f(s, x_1-y+\sigma z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f(s, x_2-y+\sigma z) - (f(s, x_1-y) - f(s, x_2-y)) \right] d\mu(z) dy d\sigma ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|f(x_1+\sigma z) - f(x_1) - f(x_2+\sigma z) - f(x_2)|^{1-\beta+\beta} \leq 2\|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1}^{1-\beta} |x_1 - x_2|^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1}^\beta |\sigma z|^\beta,$$

we see by Theorem 4.3 and (L1) that

$$\begin{aligned} &|I_1(t, x_1) - I_1(t, x_2)| \\ &\leq \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x K(t-s, y)| dy ds 2\|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1}^{1-\beta} |x_1 - x_2|^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1}^\beta \int_{|z|<1} |z|^{\beta+1} d\mu(z) \\ &\leq \mathcal{K} \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} T^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^{\beta+1} d\mu(z) \|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1} |x_1 - x_2|^{1-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two estimates, we conclude that

$$|\mathcal{L}[\Phi(f)](t, x_1) - \mathcal{L}[\Phi(f)](t, x_2)| \leq c \|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1} |x_1 - x_2|^{1-\beta},$$

with $c = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} T^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \mathcal{K} \int_{|z|<1} |z|^{1+\beta} d\mu(z) + 4T \int_{|z|\geq 1} d\mu(z)$. By part a), $\partial_t \Phi(f)(t, x) = f(t, x) + \mathcal{L}[\Phi(f)](t, x)$. Since

$$|f(t, x) - f(t, y)| \leq (2\|f\|_{C_b})^\beta |f(t, x) - f(t, y)|^{1-\beta} \leq 2\|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1} |x - y|^{1-\beta},$$

we then also get that

$$|\partial_t \Phi[f](t, x_1) - \partial_t \Phi[f](t, x_2)| \leq (2+c) \|f\|_{C_{b,t}^1 C_{b,x}^1} |x_1 - x_2|^{1-\beta}.$$

b) *Part 2:* Uniform continuity in time. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\Phi[f](t, x) - \mathcal{L}\Phi[f](s, x) &= \int_0^t \mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * f(t - \tau, \cdot) d\tau - \int_0^s \mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * f(s - \tau, \cdot) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^s \mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * (f(t - \tau, \cdot) - f(s - \tau, \cdot)) d\tau + \int_s^t \mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * f(t - \tau, \cdot) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Now we do as before: Split the z -domain in two parts, use the fundamental theorem and a change of variables to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * (f(t - \tau, \cdot) - f(s - \tau, \cdot)) \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|z| < 1} \nabla_x K(\tau, x - y) \cdot z [f(t - \tau, y + \sigma z) - f(t - \tau, y) \\ &\quad - f(s - \tau, y + \sigma z) + f(s - \tau, y)] d\mu(z) dy d\sigma. \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{|z| \geq 1} K(\tau, x - y) [f(t - \tau, y + z) - f(t - \tau, y) \\ &\quad - f(s - \tau, y + z) + f(s - \tau, y)] d\mu(z) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then we apply the trick

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(t - \tau, y + \sigma z) - f(t - \tau, y) - f(s - \tau, y + \sigma z) + f(s - \tau, y)| \\ &\leq 2\omega_f(|t - s|)^{1-\beta} (\|f\|_{C_{b,t}C_{b,x}^1} |z|)^\beta \quad \text{or} \quad 4\omega_f(|t - s|)^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{C_b}^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

and find using Theorem 4.3 and (L1) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_0^s \mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * (f(t - \tau, \cdot) - f(s - \tau, \cdot)) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \left[\frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} s^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \mathcal{K} \int_{|z| < 1} |z|^{1+\beta} d\mu(z) + 4s \int_{|z| \geq 1} d\mu(z) \right] \|f\|_{C_{b,t}C_{b,x}^1}^\beta \omega_f(|t - s|)^{1-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_s^t \mathcal{L}K(\tau, \cdot) * f(t - \tau, \cdot) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \left[2 \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} (t^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} - s^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}) \mathcal{K} \int_{|z| < 1} |z|^{1+\beta} d\mu(z) + 2(t - s) \int_{|z| \geq 1} d\mu(z) \right] \|f\|_{C_b} \\ &\leq c_1 \|f\|_{C_b} |t - s|^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all above estimates leads to

$$\left| \mathcal{L}\Phi[f](t, x) - \mathcal{L}\Phi[f](s, x) \right| \leq c \|f\|_{C_{b,t}C_{b,x}^1}^\beta \omega_f(|t - s|)^{1-\beta} + \tilde{c} \|f\|_{C_b} |t - s|^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}},$$

where c is defined above and in the Lemma and

$$\tilde{c} = 2 \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \mathcal{K} \int_{|z| < 1} |z|^{1+\beta} d\mu(z) \max_{s, t \in [0, T]} \frac{|t \frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma} - s \frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}|}{|t-s| \frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + 2T^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \int_{|z| \geq 1} d\mu(z).$$

Note that \tilde{c} is finite. Then since

$$\partial_t \Phi[f](t, x) - \partial_t \Phi[f](s, x) = f(t, x) - f(s, x) + \mathcal{L}\Phi[f](t, x) - \mathcal{L}\Phi[f](s, x),$$

and $|f(t, x) - f(s, x)| \leq (2\|f\|_{C_b})^\beta \omega_f(|t-s|)^{1-\beta}$, the continuity estimate for $\partial_t \Phi[f]$ follows.

c) The proof follows by writing

$$\partial_{x_i} \Phi(g)(t, x) = \int_0^t \partial_{x_i} K(\tau, z) g(t - \tau, x - z) dz d\tau,$$

and then directly compute the difference $|\partial_{x_i} \Phi(g)(t, x) - \partial_{x_i} \Phi(g)(s, y)|$.

The proof is complete.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Achdou, P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, A. Porretta, and F. Santambrogio. Mean field games. *Lectures Notes in Mathematics 2281 (CIME - subseries)*, Springer, 2020.
- [2] F. Achleitner and C. Kuehn. Traveling waves for a bistable equation with nonlocal diffusion. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 20(9-10):887–936, 2015.
- [3] David Applebaum. Lévy processes and stochastic calculus. *Cambridge university press*, 2009.
- [4] M. Bardi and M. Cirant. Uniqueness of solutions in mean field games with several populations and neumann conditions. *PDE models for multi-agent phenomena*, 1–20, Springer INdAM Ser.d 28, Springer, 2018.
- [5] G. Barles, E. Chasseigne, A. Ciomaga, and C. Imbert. Lipschitz regularity of solutions for mixed integro-differential equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 252(11):6012–6060, 2012.
- [6] G. Barles and C. Imbert. Second-order elliptic integro-differential equations: viscosity solutions’ theory revisited. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(3):567–585, 2008.
- [7] A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and P. Yam. Mean field games and mean field type control theory. *Springer-Briefs in Mathematics* 101, Springer, 2013.
- [8] F. Camilli, R. De Maio, et al. A time-fractional mean field game. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 24(9/10):531–554, 2019.
- [9] P. Cardaliaguet. Notes on Mean Field Games (from P.-L. Lions’ lectures at college de france). *Preprint: <https://www.ceremade.dauphine.fr/~cardaliaguet/MFG20130420.pdf>*, 2013.
- [10] P. Cardaliaguet, F. Delarue, J.-M. Lasry, and P.-L. Lions. The Master Equation and the Convergence Problem in Mean Field Games. *Annals of Mathematics Studies* 201, Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [11] 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(5):1287–1317, 2015.

- [12] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. Probabilistic theory of Mean Field Games with applications I and II. *Springer Verlag*, 2018.
- [13] A. Cesaroni, M. Cirant, S. Dipierro, M. Novaga, and E. Valdinoci. On stationary fractional mean field games. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 122(9):1–22, 2019.
- [14] E. Chasseigne, O. Ley, T. T. Nguyen. A priori Lipschitz estimates for solutions of local and nonlocal Hamilton-Jacobi equations with Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 35(5): 1415–1449, 2019.
- [15] I. Chowdhury, E. R. Jakobsen, and K. Milosz. On fully nonlinear parabolic mean field games with examples of nonlocal and local diffusions. *Preprint*, 2020.
- [16] M. Cirant and A. Goffi. On the existence and uniqueness of solutions to time-dependent fractional MFG. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51(2):913–954, 2019.
- [17] M. Cirant and D. Tonon. Time-dependent focusing mean-field games: the sub-critical case. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 31(1):49–79, 2019.
- [18] R. Cont and P. Tankov. Financial modelling with jump processes. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2004.
- [19] J. Droniou, T. Gallouët, and J. Vovelle. Global solution and smoothing effect for a non-local regularization of a hyperbolic equation. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 3(3):499–521, 2003.
- [20] J. Droniou and C. Imbert. Fractal first-order partial differential equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 182(2):299–331, 2006.
- [21] M. G. Garroni and J. L. Menaldi. Second order elliptic integro-differential problems. *Chapman & Hall/CRC*, 2002.
- [22] D. A. Gomes, L. Nurbekyan, and E. A. Pimentel. Economic models and mean-field games theory. *IMPA Mathematical Publications*. IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, 2015.
- [23] D. A. Gomes, E. A. Pimentel, and V. Voskanyan. Regularity theory for mean-field game systems. *Springer Berlin*, 2016.
- [24] P. J. Graber, V. Ignazio, and A. Neufeld. Nonlocal bertrand and cournot mean field games with general nonlinear demand schedule. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 148:150-198, 2021.
- [25] T. Grzywny and K. Szczypkowski. Estimates of heat kernels of non-symmetric Lévy processes. *Preprint*, *arXiv:1710.07793*, 2017.
- [26] O. Gueant, J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games and applications. *Paris-Princeton lectures on mathematical finance* (pp. 205-266), Springer, 2010.
- [27] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, P. E. Caines, et al. Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop mckean-vlasov systems and the nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 6(3):221–252, 2006.
- [28] C. Imbert. A non-local regularization of first order Hamilton–Jacobi equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 211(1):218–246, 2005.
- [29] E. R. Jakobsen and K. H. Karlsen. Continuous dependence estimates for viscosity solutions of integropdes. *J. Differential Equations*, 212(2):278–318, 2005.
- [30] E. R. Jakobsen and K. H. Karlsen. A “maximum principle for semicontinuous functions” applicable to integro-partial differential equations. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 13(2):137–165, 2006.

- [31] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. (French) *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 343(10): 679–684, 2006.
- [32] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [33] P.-L. Lions. Courses in College de France on Mean Field Games, 2006-2012. https://www.college-de-france.fr/site/en-pierre-louis-lions/_course.htm.
- [34] R. Metzler and J. Klafter. The random walk’s guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach. *Phys. Rep.*, 339(1):77, 2000.
- [35] A. Porretta. Weak solutions to Fokker-Planck equations and mean field games. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 216(1):1-62, 2015.
- [36] R. L. Schilling, P. Sztonyk, and J. Wang. Coupling property and gradient estimates of Lévy processes via the symbol. *Bernoulli*, 18(4):1128–1149, 2012.
- [37] L. Silvestre. Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the laplace operator. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(1):67–112, 2007.
- [38] W. A. Woyczyński. Lévy processes in the physical sciences. In *Lévy processes*, pages 241–266. Birkhäuser, 2001.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
NTNU, NORWAY

Email address: `olav.ersland@ntnu.no`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
NTNU, NORWAY

Email address: `espen.jakobsen@ntnu.no`

Paper 2

**On numerical approximations of fractional and
nonlocal Mean Field Games**

Indranil Chowdhury, Olav Ersland, and Espen R. Jakobsen

Submitted for publication

This paper is awaiting publication and is not included in NTNU Open

ISBN 978-82-326-6274-6 (printed ver.)
ISBN 978-82-326-6298-2 (electronic ver)
ISSN 1503-8181 (printed ver.)
ISSN 2703-8084 (online ver.)



NTNU

Norwegian University of
Science and Technology