

Extended deterministic mean-field games

Diogo A. Gomes*, Vardan K. Voskanyan†

October 4, 2018

Abstract

In this paper, we consider mean-field games where the interaction of each player with the mean-field takes into account not only the states of the players but also their collective behavior. To do so, we develop a random variable framework that is particularly convenient for these problems. We prove an existence result for extended mean-field games and establish uniqueness conditions. In the last section, we consider the Master Equation and discuss properties of its solutions.

D. Gomes was partially supported by KAUST baseline and start-up funds and KAUST SRI, Center for Uncertainty Quantification in Computational Science and Engineering.

V. Voskanyan was supported by KAUST baseline and start-up funds and KAUST SRI, Center for Uncertainty Quantification in Computational Science and Engineering.

1 Introduction

Mean-field games, MFGs, (see [14], [15] and [16, 17, 18, 19]) describe the behavior of systems involving a large number of rational agents who play dynamic games under partial information and symmetry assumptions. For recent surveys on MFGs, see [2, 13, 20]. In many applications, including crowd dynamics and economic problems, the behavior of each agent depends on the statistical properties of the distribution of the agents and their collective actions. In the stationary case, such an extension was introduced and studied in [8]. Here, we use a random variable formulation to examine this class of problems. These games are defined by the following system:

$$\begin{cases} -u_t(x, t) + H(x, D_x u(x, t), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) = 0, \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}, D_x u(\mathbf{X}, t), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}), \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)). \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In the previous system, the unknowns are the value function $u(x, t): \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a path in a space of random variables $\mathbf{X}: [0, T] \rightarrow L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, where (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is a probability space and $1 \leq q < \infty$. The Hamiltonian $H: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the terminal cost $\psi: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the initial state $X_0 \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ of the population are given. Detailed assumptions are presented in Section 4. Two Hamiltonians for which those assumptions hold are

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|p|^2}{2} + \beta p E Z + V(x, X) \quad \text{and} \quad H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|\beta E Z + p|^2}{2} + V(x, X),$$

where $V: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, $V(x, X)$ is twice differentiable in the x variable, $|D_x V|$ and $|D_{xx}^2 V|$ are uniformly bounded, and V is Lipschitz in the variable X . Regarding the terminal cost,

*King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), CEMSE Division, Thuwal 23955-6900. Saudi Arabia. e-mail: diogo.gomes@kaust.edu.sa

†King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), CEMSE Division, Thuwal 23955-6900. Saudi Arabia. e-mail: vartanvos@gmail.com

we suppose that $\psi(x, X)$ is a continuous function, bounded by below, and uniformly Lipschitz in the first coordinate, x .

Our main result is a proof of existence of solutions to extended mean-field games:

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions A)-J)(cf. Section (4)), there exist a Lipschitz continuous function, $u: \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a path on the space of random variables, $\mathbf{X} \in C^{1,1}([0, T], L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d))$, such that (u, \mathbf{X}) solves (1). More precisely, $u \in C([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ is a viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation:*

$$\begin{cases} -u_t + H(x, D_x u, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) = 0, & \text{in } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)), \end{cases}$$

where u is P -a.s. differentiable at every point $(\mathbf{X}(t), t)$, $t > 0$, and $\mathbf{X} \in C^{1,1}([0, T]; L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d))$ is a solution of the ODE:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}, D_x u(\mathbf{X}, t), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}), & \text{in } [0, T] \times \Omega \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases}$$

The key difficulty in establishing the previous theorem is that, in general, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation in (1) does not admit classical solutions. Therefore, the right-hand side of the infinite dimensional ODE determining $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ in (1) is not locally Lipschitz. The proof of this theorem uses a new fixed-point argument. We observe that even for the original mean-field game problem, that is, if H does not depend on $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$, our results are not implied from the existing results in the literature; for example see [2] and Remark 2 at the end of Section 4.

We conclude this introduction, by giving a brief outline of the paper. We begin Section 2 with a concise discussion of the original formulation by Lasry and Lions of mean-field games as a transport equation coupled with a Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Then, in Section 2.1, we develop a reformulation of this problem as an ordinary differential equation for a random variable in $L^q(\Omega)$ coupled with a Hamilton-Jacobi equation. This formulation is similar to the one used in [15]. These ideas were explored in [6, 4, 5] for problems with common noise. Next, in Section 3, we discuss extended MFGs, where we derive (1). In addition, in Section 3.1, we present some examples for which the solutions can be found explicitly. In Section 4, we prove the existence of solutions to the extended mean-field game system. Next, we discuss conditions for the absolute continuity of the law in Theorem 2. Concerning the uniqueness, we first consider a version of the Lasry-Lions monotonicity argument for classical solutions (Theorem 3) and an additional improvement for viscosity solutions (Theorem 4). Then, we present the second approach to the uniqueness that uses the optimality nature of the solutions. We give a uniqueness condition (in terms of the Lagrangian (Theorem 5)) that does not require the absolute continuity of the law or regularity of the solution. Finally, in Section 7, we consider the Master Equation and discuss some of its properties.

2 Two formulations of deterministic mean-field games

In this section, we review the original formulation for deterministic mean-field games from [16, 17, 18, 19]. Then, we discuss a reformulation in terms of random variables. This set-up is very close to the one used in [15] (although they considered second-order equations) and it is particularly suited for the extensions we study here.

The standard mean-field game setting models a population in which each individual has a state $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and has access to the probability distribution of the remaining players' states. We denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of probability measures in \mathbb{R}^d . This set is a metric space endowed with the Wasserstein metric W_2 , see, for instance, [23]. At each time t , the population is characterized by a probability measure $\theta(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Each player seeks to minimize a performance criterion.

For this, let $L : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a running cost, and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a terminal cost. For definiteness, in this section, we suppose that both L and ψ satisfy standard hypotheses for optimal control problems, that is,

a) L and ψ are continuous and bounded by below, without loss of generality, we can assume $L, \psi \geq 0$.

b) ψ is Lipschitz in the first coordinate.

c) L is coercive:

$$\frac{L(x, v, \theta)}{|v|} \xrightarrow{|v| \rightarrow \infty} \infty, \text{ uniformly in } x.$$

d) L is uniformly convex in v .

e) There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that $L(x, 0, \theta) \leq C$, $|D_x L(x, v, \theta)|, |D_v L(x, v, \theta)| \leq C[1 + L(x, v, \theta)]$, for any $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

An example that satisfies a)-e) is

$$L(x, v, \theta) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x, y) d\theta(y), \quad (2)$$

where $V : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has a bounded C^1 norm.

We suppose each player directly controls his speed, that is, his state evolves according to $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = v$. Assume that the distribution of the players is given by a continuous curve $\theta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Fix a reference player, and let x be the location of that player at time t . His value function is determined by the optimal control problem:

$$u(x, t) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \theta(s)) ds + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \theta(T)),$$

where the infimum is taken over all Lipschitz trajectories with $\mathbf{x}(t) = x$. By Assumption a), the map $(x, v, t) \mapsto L(x, v, \theta(t))$ is continuous. Due to Assumptions c)-e), it satisfies standard assumptions in control theory (cf. [7], Chapter I, sec. 9). Then, Assumption b) gives that u is bounded and globally Lipschitz. For $(x, p, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the Hamiltonian

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

Under the above assumptions, u is the unique globally Lipschitz and semiconvex viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-u_t + H(x, D_x u, \theta) = 0 \quad (3)$$

satisfying the terminal condition $u(x, T) = \psi(x, \theta(T))$. Moreover, if u is a classical solution to (3), the optimal trajectories are given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(s) = -D_p H(\mathbf{x}(s), D_x u(\mathbf{x}(s), s), \theta(s)). \quad (4)$$

In mean-field games, all players have access to the same statistical information and act in a rational way. Therefore, each one of them follows the optimal trajectories (4). Consequently, the probability distribution of players is transported by the vector field $-D_p H(x, D_x u(x, t), \theta(t))$. Thus, in this MFG model, we require θ to be a (weak) solution to the equation

$$\theta_t - \operatorname{div}(D_p H(x, D_x u, \theta)\theta) = 0,$$

satisfying the initial condition $\theta(0) = \theta_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The probability measure θ_0 encodes the distribution of players at $t = 0$. The above reasoning leads to the system:

$$\begin{cases} -u_t + H(x, D_x u, \theta) = 0 \\ \theta_t - \operatorname{div}(D_p H(x, D_x u, \theta)\theta) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

subjected to the initial and terminal conditions

$$\begin{cases} u(x, T) = \psi(x, \theta(T)) \\ \theta(x, 0) = \theta_0. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

A second-order version of (5) was first introduced and studied in [17]. Detailed proofs of the existence and uniqueness of solutions to those systems can be found in [2]. Existence of smooth solutions of mean-field games for sub-quadratic and super-quadratic Hamiltonians with power-like and logarithmic local dependence on the population density has been established in [10], [9], [11], and [12]. Weak solutions have been considered in [21], [22], and [3].

2.1 Random variable framework

Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space, where Ω is an arbitrary nonempty set, \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra on Ω , and P is a probability measure. We recall that an \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable X is a \mathcal{F} -measurable function $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. We denote by $L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables with a finite q -th moment, $E|X|^q < \infty$. The law $\mathcal{L}(X)$ of an \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable is the probability measure in \mathbb{R}^d defined by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) d\mathcal{L}(X)(x) = E\varphi(X).$$

Since all relevant random variables are \mathbb{R}^d valued, we write $L^q(\Omega)$ instead of $L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ to simplify the notation. Next, we reformulate the mean-field game problem by replacing the probability $\theta(t)$ encoding the distribution of players by a random variable $\mathbf{X}(t) \in L^q(\Omega)$. The law of $\mathbf{X}(t)$ determines the distribution of players, that is $\theta(t) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}(t))$. Each outcome of the random variable \mathbf{X} gives the state of a particular player chosen accordingly to the probability θ . For each measure θ , there is an infinite number of random variables with law θ . However, this ambiguity is harmless and does not create any technical difficulty.

A function $f : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depends only on the law if for any $X, \tilde{X} \in L^q(\Omega)$ such that, $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X})$, we have $f(X) = f(\tilde{X})$. Let $\mathcal{P}_q(\Omega)$ be the set of probability measures $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ with finite q -th moment: $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^q d\theta(x) < +\infty$. For $\eta : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define $\tilde{\eta} : L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by

$$\tilde{\eta}(X) = \eta(\mathcal{L}(X)), \quad (7)$$

for $X \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Clearly $\tilde{\eta}$ depends only on the law of X . Using this construction, we can identify functions in $\mathcal{P}_q(\Omega)$ with functions in $L^q(\Omega)$ that depend only on the law. Because there is no ambiguity, to simplify the notation, we omit the tilde in (7) and write without distinction $\eta(X)$ or $\eta(\mathcal{L}(X))$.

In this new setting, the Lagrangian is the function $L : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $L(x, v, X)$, and the terminal cost is the function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\psi(x, X)$. Again, for definiteness, we assume here that

- a') $L(x, v, X)$ and $\psi(x, X)$ depend only on the law of X .
- b') L and ψ are continuous functions in all variables and are bounded by below.
- c') ψ is Lipschitz in the first coordinate.

d') L is coercive:

$$\frac{L(x, v, X)}{|v|} \xrightarrow{|v| \rightarrow \infty} \infty, \text{ uniformly in } x.$$

e') L is strictly convex in v .

f') There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that $L(x, 0, X) \leq C$, $|D_x L(x, v, X)|, |D_v L(x, v, X)| \leq C(1 + L(x, v, X))$, for any $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $X \in L^q(\Omega)$.

A Lagrangian that satisfies the above assumptions is

$$L(x, v, X) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} - EV(x, X),$$

for $V : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with bounded C^1 norm. This Lagrangian is the analog of (2).

As before, suppose a given player knows the distribution of the remaining players. This distribution is determined by a path $\mathbf{X} \in C([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$. He/she seeks to minimize a performance criterion, comprising a running cost $L : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a terminal cost $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The value function for a reference player who is in the state x at time t is

$$u(x, t) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{X}(s)) ds + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)).$$

For each trajectory $\mathbf{X} \in C([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$, by Assumption b'), the function $(x, v, t) \mapsto L(x, v, \mathbf{X}(t))$ is continuous. Furthermore, due to Assumptions c')-f'), it satisfies standard assumptions of the control theory (cf. [7], Chapter I, sec. 9). Thus, u is bounded and globally Lipschitz. As before, for $(x, p, X) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega)$, the Hamiltonian $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

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

The function $H(x, p, X)$ depends only on the law of the last coordinate. Accordingly, if $X, \tilde{X} \in L^q(\Omega)$ have the same law (i.e., $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X})$) then

$$H(x, p, X) = H(x, p, \tilde{X}).$$

Under Assumptions b')-f'), u is the unique bounded, globally Lipschitz and semiconvex viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-u_t(x, t) + H(x, D_x u(x, t), \mathbf{X}(t)) = 0$$

with the terminal condition $u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T))$.

Because of the rationality hypothesis, a typical player $\omega \in \Omega$ has a trajectory determined by

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)(\omega) = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}(s)(\omega), D_x u(\mathbf{X}(s)(\omega), s), \mathbf{X}(s)).$$

This results in the system:

$$\begin{cases} -u_t(x, t) + H(x, D_x u(x, t), \mathbf{X}(t)) = 0 \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)(\omega) = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}(t)(\omega), D_x u(\mathbf{X}(t)(\omega), t), \mathbf{X}(t)), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A})$$

where the initial and terminal conditions (6) are replaced by

$$\begin{cases} u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)) \\ \mathbf{X}(0)(\omega) = X_0(\omega), \end{cases} \quad (\text{B})$$

and $\mathcal{L}(X_0) = \theta_0$. Here, the transport equation in (5) is replaced by an infinite-dimensional ODE in (A). To simplify, we omit ω in (A) and (B). The connection between the two formulations is a consequence of the next well-known result: Let $b: \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded, continuous, uniformly Lipschitz in x vector field over \mathbb{R}^d and let $\mathbf{X}: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a solution to

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}} = b(\mathbf{X}, t). \quad (8)$$

Then, the law $\theta = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})$ is a weak solution to

$$\theta_t + \operatorname{div}(b \cdot \theta) = 0,$$

with the initial condition $\theta(0) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}(0))$.

A proof of a stochastic version of this fact can be found in [2] (Lemma 3.3). The proof of the present result follows along similar lines.

3 Extended mean-field games

In many applications, it is natural to consider mean-field games where the payoff of each player depends on the actions of the remaining players. In the random variable framework, this corresponds to running costs that depend on $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$. As before, we assume that the distribution of the players is represented by a curve of random variables $\mathbf{X}(t) \in L^q(\Omega)$. We require \mathbf{X} to be differentiable with derivative $\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) \in L^q(\Omega)$.

Each player seeks to minimize a performance criterion. For this, let $L: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lagrangian and $\psi: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a terminal cost. We assume that $L(x, v, X, Z)$ depends only on the joint law of (X, Z) , that is, if $X, Z, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z} \in L^q(\Omega)$ satisfy $\mathcal{L}(X, Z) = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z})$ then

$$L(x, v, X, Z) = L(x, v, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}).$$

Additionally, we require $\psi(x, X)$ to depend only on the law of X . To ensure that the formulation of the problem makes sense, we need additional assumptions on L and ψ . These are discussed in detail in the next section, however, for convenience, here, we outline the main requirements:

- ψ is continuous and Lipschitz in the first coordinate (Assumption B));
- $L(x, v, X, Z)$ is coercive and uniformly convex in v (Assumption C));
- L is satisfy suitable continuity assumptions and bounds by below (Assumptions D) and E)).

Additional assumptions are required for existence and uniqueness results, which will be discussed later.

The value function for a player at state x at time t is

$$u(x, t) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)) ds + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)), \quad (9)$$

where the infimum is taken over all absolutely continuous trajectories $\mathbf{x}: [t, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathbf{x}(t) = x$. As before, the Hamiltonian $H: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d} -v \cdot p - L(x, v, X, Z).$$

We have that $H(x, p, X, Z)$ depends only on the joint law of the last two coordinates.

An important example is the Lagrangian

$$L(x, v, X, Z) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} + \beta v \cdot EZ - V(x, X), \quad (10)$$

to which corresponds the Hamiltonian

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|\beta EZ + p|^2}{2} + V(x, X). \quad (11)$$

If a player knows the trajectory $\mathbf{X}(t)$ of the remaining players, the value function u is determined by the Hamilton-Jacobi equation:

$$-u_t + H(x, D_x u, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) = 0.$$

Hence, by the mean-field hypothesis, each player follows the optimal trajectory determined by

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{x}, D_x u(\mathbf{x}, t), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}).$$

Thus, we are led to the extended mean-field game

$$\begin{cases} -u_t + H(x, D_x u, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) = 0 \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}, D_x u(\mathbf{X}, t), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

with

$$\begin{cases} u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

3.1 Examples

The second equation in (1) involves a fixed-point problem for $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ that poses additional difficulties. To ensure solvability, one possibility is to assume that

$$|D_p H(x, p, X, Z) - D_p H(x, p, X, \tilde{Z})| \leq \rho \|Z - \tilde{Z}\|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \quad (14)$$

for some $\rho < 1$ and all $x, p \in \mathbb{R}^d, X, Z \in L^q(\Omega)$. In this last case, the equation

$$Z = -D_p H(X, P, X, Z), \quad (15)$$

for $X, P \in L^q(\Omega)$, has a unique solution $Z \in L^q(\Omega)$, by a standard contraction argument.

However, it may not be appropriate for all applications to impose such restrictive assumptions. For instance, the Hamiltonian (11) does not satisfy (14). Nevertheless, (15) becomes

$$Z = -\beta EZ - P$$

that has a unique solution Z , if $1 + \beta \neq 0$. Indeed,

$$Z + \beta EZ = -P.$$

From this, we gather $EZ = -\frac{1}{1+\beta}EP$. Consequently, $Z = \frac{\beta}{1+\beta}EP - P$.

In most cases, (1) cannot be solved explicitly. In what follows, we present two examples with explicit solutions.

3.2 Linear - Quadratic

We consider the Hamiltonian

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|p + \beta EZ|^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} x^T A(X) x + B(X) \cdot x + C(X),$$

where $A : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $B : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and $C : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lipschitz. The term $\frac{|p + \beta EZ|^2}{2}$ in the Hamiltonian results in a corresponding term $\frac{|v|^2}{2} - \beta v \cdot EZ$ in the Lagrangian. For $\beta < 0$,

it penalizes players who move in the same direction as the aggregate of the players, encoded here in EZ .

We assume that the terminal condition is also quadratic in x , we have

$$\psi(x, X) = \frac{1}{2}x^T M(X)x + N(X) \cdot x + Q(X),$$

with $M : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $N : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and $Q : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Due to the quadratic structure, we look for solutions of the form

$$u(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}x^T \Gamma(t)x + \Theta(t) \cdot x + \zeta(t).$$

Using separation of variables, we obtain the system of differential equations

$$\begin{cases} -\dot{\Gamma} + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma^T \Gamma + A(X) = 0 \\ -\dot{\Theta} + \beta \Gamma E \dot{X} + \Gamma \Theta + B(X) = 0 \\ -\dot{\zeta} + \frac{1}{2}|\Theta + \beta E \dot{X}|^2 + C(X) = 0, \end{cases}$$

with terminal conditions

$$\Gamma(T) = M(\mathbf{X}(T)), \Theta(T) = N(\mathbf{X}(T)), \zeta(T) = Q(\mathbf{X}(T)).$$

This system is coupled with the forward equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -\Gamma \mathbf{X} - \Theta - \beta E \dot{\mathbf{X}}, \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0, \end{cases}$$

that is,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -\Gamma \mathbf{X} - \frac{1}{1+\beta}\Theta + \frac{\beta}{1+\beta}(\Gamma E \mathbf{X}) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases}$$

3.3 A second example

In addition to linear-quadratic Hamiltonians, we were able to find another class of problems, for which (1) can be solved explicitly. We consider the Lagrangian

$$L(x, v, X, Z) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} + x^4 + U(X, Z).$$

This example features a quartic repulsive potential and allows for an arbitrary dependence on the mean-field through the function $U(X, Z)$, that we assume here to be continuous. In contrast to the setting of Section 2, we assume here that players follow a distinct dynamic, namely: $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f(\mathbf{x}, v)$, where $f(x, v) = \frac{v}{x}$. Also, we suppose that the terminal cost is of the form $\psi(x, X) = A(X)x^4 + B(X)$. Then, the Hamiltonian is

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|p|^2}{2x^2} - x^4 - U(X, Z).$$

Thanks to the distinctive structure of the Hamiltonian, $D_p H$ does not depend on Z . So, it is trivial to solve the equation $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}})$. Moreover, the joint distribution of (X, Z) gives an additive cost in the Lagrangian, identical for any player regardless of their location.

The mean-field equations are

$$\begin{cases} -u_t + \frac{|Du|^2}{2x^2} - x^4 - U(\mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) = 0 \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -\frac{Du(\mathbf{X}, t)}{\mathbf{X}^2} \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)). \end{cases}$$

We look for solutions of the form $u(x, t) = x^4 p(t) + q(t)$. Note that the power x^4 is the only power for which we can use this separation of variables method. This specific choice for u gives

$$\begin{cases} p' - 8p^2 + 1 = 0 \\ q' = -U(X, \dot{X}) \\ \dot{X} = -4pX \\ p(T) = A(\mathbf{X}(T)), q(T) = B(\mathbf{X}(T)) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases}.$$

Elementary computations yield

$$p(t) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{1 + ce^{4\sqrt{2}t}}{1 - ce^{4\sqrt{2}t}},$$

and

$$\mathbf{X}(t) = \left[\frac{ce^{4\sqrt{2}t} - 1}{c - 1} \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\sqrt{2}t} X_0.$$

Next, we determine the constant c from the terminal condition on p . Then

$$u(x, t) = \frac{x^4}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{1 + ce^{4\sqrt{2}t}}{1 - ce^{4\sqrt{2}t}} + q(t),$$

where $q(t)$ solves $\dot{q} = -U(\mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}})$ with $q(T) = B(\mathbf{X}(T))$.

4 Existence of solutions to extended mean-field games

Here, we study the existence of solutions to (1). In what follows, $1 \leq q < \infty$,

$$\psi: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

$$L: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

and $H = L^*$ is the Legendre transform of L defined by

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \sup_v \{ -v \cdot p - L(x, v, X, Z) \}.$$

Moreover, we assume that $L(x, v, X, Z)$ depends only on the joint law of (X, Z) and that $\psi(x, X)$ depends only on the law of X .

To prove existence of solutions to (1), we require X_0 , ψ , and L to satisfy the following properties:

- A) $X_0 \in L^q(\Omega)$ and has an absolutely continuous law.
- B) ψ is Lipschitz continuous in x , and it is bounded.
- C) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $X, Z \in L^q(\Omega)$, $L(x, v, X, Z)$ is uniformly convex in v and satisfies the coercivity condition

$$\lim_{|v| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(x, v, X, Z)}{|v|} = \infty,$$

uniformly in x .

- D) There exists a constant c_0 , such that $L(x, v, X, Z) \geq -c_0 E(|X|^q + |Z|^q + 1)$.

- E) There exist a constant $c_1 > 0$ and a continuous function $v_0: L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $L(x, v_0(X, Z), X, Z) \leq c_1$.
- F) There exist constants $c_2, c_3 > 0$, such that $|D_v L|, |D_{xv}^2 L|, |D_{xx}^2 L|, |D_{vv}^2 L| \leq (c_2 L + c_3)E(|X|^q + |Z|^q + 1)$, and $|D_x L| \leq c_2 L + c_3$.
- G) For any $X, Y, P \in L^q(\Omega)$, the equation $Z = -D_p H(X, P, Y, Z)$ can be solved with respect to Z as

$$Z = G(X, P, Y).$$

Moreover, the map $G: L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ is Lipschitz.

- H) H is continuous in X, Z locally uniformly in x, p .
- I) $D_x H$ is Lipschitz in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \times L^q(\Omega)$.
- J) For any $R > 0$ there exists a constant $C(R)$ such that

$$|H(x_1, p_1, X_1, Z_1) - H(x_2, p_2, X_2, Z_2)| \leq C(R)(|p_1 - p_2| + |x_1 - x_2| + W_q(\mathcal{L}(X_1, Z_1), \mathcal{L}(X_2, Z_2))).$$

for $|p_i|, |x_i|, \|X_i\|_{L^q(\Omega)}, \|Z_i\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq R, i = 1, 2$. Here, W_q denotes the q -Wasserstein metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (cf. [23]).

From Assumption J), we have

$$|H(x_1, p_1, X_1, Z_1) - H(x_2, p_2, X_2, Z_2)| \leq C(R)(|p_1 - p_2| + |x_1 - x_2| + \|X_1 - X_2\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|Z_1 - Z_2\|_{L^q(\Omega)}).$$

Two examples that satisfy the above conditions are:

$$L(x, v, X, Z) = \frac{|\beta EZ + v|^2}{2} - V(x, X) \text{ and } L(x, v, X, Z) = \frac{|v|^2}{2} + \beta vEZ - V(x, X), \quad (16)$$

with $V: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ bounded, C^∞ in the x variable with derivative $D_x V$ Lipschitz in X . Quadratic Lagrangians are standard in optimal control. The extra dependence on Z indicates that players prefer to move with a velocity close to $-\beta EZ$ (i.e., in the opposite direction of the average of the population). The corresponding Hamiltonians are

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|p|^2}{2} + \beta pEZ + V(x, X) \text{ and } H(x, p, X, Z) = \frac{|\beta EZ + p|^2}{2} + V(x, X). \quad (17)$$

Assumption G) can be checked explicitly in the examples above. For both Lagrangians, the function G is given by $G(X, P, Y) = -P + \frac{\beta}{1+\beta}EP$. We also note that by the inverse function theorem, suitably small perturbations of the Lagrangians in these examples also satisfy assumption G).

For each Lipschitz continuous function $\Phi \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, consider the system of ODEs in $L^q(\Omega)$

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \dot{\mathbf{P}} = D_x H(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0, \mathbf{P}(0) = D_x \Phi(X_0). \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Using Assumption G), this system can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}} = G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{X},) \\ \dot{\mathbf{P}} = D_x H(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{X}, G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{X},)) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0, \mathbf{P}(0) = D_x \Phi(X_0). \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Since Φ is Lipschitz, $D_x\Phi$ exists almost everywhere. Additionally, because X_0 has an absolutely continuous law, $\mathbf{P}(0)$ is well defined on a set of full measure. Assumptions I) and G) on G and D_xH imply that the right-hand sides of the equations in (19) are Lipschitz in \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{P} . Furthermore, it has uniform linear growth. Consequently, a Picard-Lindelof-type argument ensures the existence and uniqueness of global solutions of (19) and hence to (18). Standard arguments imply that $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P} \in C^1([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$ and, additionally, $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ is Lipschitz in t , that is, $\mathbf{X} \in C^{1,1}([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\Phi \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a bounded Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant $Lip(\Phi) \leq R$. Let $\mathbf{X} \in C^{1,1}([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$ be the random variable determined by (18). Then there exists a constant $c_4 = c_4(L, R, X_0, T, q)$ such that*

$$E|\mathbf{X}(t)|^q + |\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)|^q \leq c_4, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Proof. From (19), since G and D_xH are Lipschitz, we have

$$\begin{cases} E|\dot{\mathbf{X}}|^q \leq CE(|\mathbf{X}|^q + |\mathbf{P}|^q) + C \\ E|\dot{\mathbf{P}}|^q \leq CE(|\mathbf{X}|^q + |\mathbf{P}|^q) + C. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Combining the two estimates in (20) yields

$$E(|\dot{\mathbf{X}}|^q + |\dot{\mathbf{P}}|^q) \leq CE(|\mathbf{X}|^q + |\mathbf{P}|^q) + C,$$

where C depends on only G and D_xH . Let $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P})$ and $\|\mathbf{R}\| = [E(|\mathbf{X}|^q + |\mathbf{P}|^q)]^{\frac{1}{q}}$. The inequality above gives $\|\dot{\mathbf{R}}\| \leq C + C\|\mathbf{R}\|$. From Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$\mathbf{R}(t) \leq C(T)(1 + \|\mathbf{R}(0)\|), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Therefore,

$$E(|\mathbf{X}|^q + |\mathbf{P}|^q) \leq C(T)(1 + E(|X_0|^q + |D\Phi(X_0)|^q)) \leq C(T)(1 + E|X_0|^q + |Lip(\Phi)|^q).$$

The previous estimate together with (20) yields the required result. \square

Next, suppose (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}) is a solution of (18). We define $\tilde{u}(x, t)$ to be the solution to the optimal control problem

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)), \quad (21)$$

where the infimum is taken over all absolutely continuous trajectories $\mathbf{x}(s)$, with $\mathbf{x}(t) = x$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\Phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be any bounded, Lipschitz function and let (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}) be a solution of (18). Then, $\tilde{u}(x, t)$ defined by (21) is uniformly bounded and Lipschitz in x . Furthermore, for any $t < T$, \tilde{u} is semiconcave in x . More specifically, there exists constants c_5 and c_6 , such that c_5 depends only on L, ψ, T and c_6 depends only on $L, Lip(\Phi), T$ and $T - t_1$, and*

1. $\tilde{u} \leq c_1(T - t) + \|\psi\|_\infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, 0 \leq t \leq T$.
2. $|\tilde{u}(x + y, t) - \tilde{u}(x, t)| \leq c_5|y|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, 0 \leq t \leq T$.
3. $\tilde{u}(x + y, t) + \tilde{u}(x - y, t) - 2\tilde{u}(x, t) \leq c_6|y|^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, 0 \leq t \leq t_1 < T$

Remark 1. *The above lemma is classical, and similar results can be found in [1] (Theorem 4.9, p. 69) or [7] (c.f. the discussion in IV.9, p. 186). For our purposes, we need to ensure the uniformity of the constants in the data of the problem, namely the explicit dependence on the norms of \mathbf{X} and $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ is essential to use a fixed point theorem. Hence, we present here a detailed proof in the Appendix.*

Let $\overline{c}_5 = c_5, \overline{c}_6 = c_6$ be the constants from Lemma 2 for $t_1 = 0$, and

$$\overline{c}_7 = \max\{Tc_0(c_4(L, c_5, X_0, T, q) + 1) + \|\psi\|_\infty, Tc_1 + \|\psi\|_\infty\}.$$

We denote by \mathcal{A} the set of functions $\Phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with $|\Phi| \leq \overline{c}_7$, $Lip(\Phi) \leq \overline{c}_5$ and Φ semiconcave with the constant \overline{c}_6 .

Lemma 3. *The mapping*

$$F: \Phi(\cdot) \mapsto \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0)$$

is a continuous compact mapping from \mathcal{A} into itself (with respect to the topology of locally uniform convergence).

Proof. First, we show that F maps the set \mathcal{A} into itself. According to the estimate from Lemma 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(x, 0) &= \inf_{\mathbf{x}} \int_0^T L(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) \geq -c_0 \int_0^T E(|\mathbf{X}|^q + |\dot{\mathbf{X}}|^q + 1) - \|\psi\|_\infty \\ &\geq -Tc_0(c_4(L, c_5, X_0, T, q) + 1) - \|\psi\|_\infty \geq -\overline{c}_7. \end{aligned}$$

The previous identity, combined with Lemma 2, implies that $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{A}$. To prove the continuity of the mapping F we argue by contradiction. Suppose there exists $\Phi_n \rightarrow \Phi$ in $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $F(\Phi_n) \not\rightarrow F(\Phi)$ in $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, since $F(\Phi_n) \in \mathcal{A}$ and \mathcal{A} is compact, we can assume, without loss of generality, that $\tilde{u}_n = F(\Phi_n) \rightarrow \bar{\Phi} \neq F(\Phi)$, locally uniformly. Because Φ_n are uniformly semiconcave, we can assume that $D\Phi_n \rightarrow D\Phi$ almost everywhere. We have that the corresponding trajectories $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{P}_n)$ solve

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_n = G(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{X}_n) \\ \dot{\mathbf{P}}_n = D_x H(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{X}_n, G(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{X}_n)) \\ \mathbf{X}_n(0) = X_0, \mathbf{P}_n(0) = D_x u_n(X_0). \end{cases}$$

By Gronwall's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E(|\mathbf{X}_n(t) - \mathbf{X}(t)|^q + |\mathbf{P}_n(t) - \mathbf{P}(t)|^q) &\leq C(E|\mathbf{X}_n(0) - \mathbf{X}(0)|^q + |\mathbf{P}_n(0) - \mathbf{P}(0)|^q) = \\ &CE|D\Phi_n(X_0) - D\Phi(X_0)|^q. \end{aligned}$$

The dominated convergence theorem entails that the right-hand side of the preceding expression converges to zero. Consequently, $\mathbf{X}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$ in $L^\infty([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$. Equation (19) implies that $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_n \rightarrow \dot{\mathbf{X}}$. Thus, using Assumptions H) and B),

$$H(x, p, \mathbf{X}_n, \dot{\mathbf{X}}_n) \rightarrow H(x, p, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \text{ locally uniformly in } x, p,$$

and

$$\psi(x, \mathbf{X}_n(T)) \rightarrow \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)) \text{ locally uniformly in } x.$$

Because $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \bar{\Phi}$ locally uniformly, the stability of viscosity solutions (cf [7]) implies that $\bar{\Phi}$ is a viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{cases} -\bar{u}_t(x, t) + \tilde{H}(x, D_x \bar{u}(x, t), t) = 0, \\ \bar{u}(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)), \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

with Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H}(x, p, t) = H(x, p, \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)).$$

On the other hand, the definition of $\tilde{u} = F(\Phi)$ implies that \tilde{u} is a viscosity solution of (22).

Since \mathbf{X} and $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ are Lipschitz continuous in t , Assumption J) implies

$$|\tilde{H}(x, p, t) - \tilde{H}(y, p', s)| \leq C(R)(|p - p'| + |x - y| + |t - s|),$$

for any $R > 0$ and $t, s \in [0, T]$ and all $x, y, p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|p|, |p'| \leq R$. This condition gives the uniqueness of the viscosity solutions to (22)([7]), thus $\bar{\Phi} = \tilde{u}$. This establishes the contradiction. Hence the mapping F is continuous. Finally, the compactness of \mathcal{A} implies that F is compact. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. The set $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, endowed with the topology of locally uniform convergence, is a topological vector space. Moreover, \mathcal{A} is a compact convex subset. Thus, by Lemma 3 and Schauder's fixed-point theorem, there exists $\Phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\Phi(\cdot) = F(\Phi) = \tilde{u}(\cdot, 0),$$

where $\tilde{u}(x, t)$ is defined as in (21). Let $u(x, t) := \tilde{u}(x, t)$. Then, u solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{cases} -u_t(x, t) + H(x, D_x u(x, t), \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)) = 0 \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)). \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

From standard results in optimal control theory (see [7]), for almost every x , there exists an optimal trajectory given by the Hamiltonian flow

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(x, t) = -D_p H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \dot{\mathbf{p}}(x, t) = D_x H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \mathbf{x}(x, 0) = x, \mathbf{p}(x, 0) = D_x u(x, 0). \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

We also know that $\mathbf{p}(x, t) = Du(\mathbf{x}(x, t), t)$ and that Du exists at all points $(\mathbf{x}(x, t), t)$ with $t > 0$. Set $\mathbf{Y}(t) = \mathbf{x}(X_0, t)$ and $\mathbf{Q}(t) = \mathbf{p}(X_0, t)$. Then, by (24), we have

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{Y}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \dot{\mathbf{Q}} = D_x H(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \mathbf{Y}(0) = X_0, \mathbf{Q}(0) = D_x u(X_0). \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Since $D_p H, D_x H$ are Lipschitz in p, x , the uniqueness of solutions to the system of ordinary differential equations in $L^q(\Omega), (25)$, yields $\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathbf{Y}(t)$ and $\mathbf{P}(t) = \mathbf{Q}(t) = \mathbf{p}(X_0, t) = Du(\mathbf{Y}(t), t)$, for all $t \in [0, T]$. In this way

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}(t), Du(\mathbf{X}(t), t), \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases}$$

\square

Remark 2. *This existence proof does not require the absolute continuity of the law of \mathbf{X} , only the absolute continuity of the law of the initial condition X_0 . Accordingly, the preceding theorem extends the results in [2].*

5 Absolute continuity of the law of trajectories

In the present section, we give conditions under which solutions to extended mean-field games have an absolutely continuous law. Our techniques are related to the ones in [2], where the case of quadratic Hamiltonians was discussed.

Consider a Hamiltonian $H^\sharp: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the corresponding Lagrangian L^\sharp satisfying the following conditions:

1. L^\sharp is continuous in all variables and there exist constants $c_0, c_1 > 0$ and $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $L^\sharp(x, v, t) \geq -c_0$, and $L^\sharp(x, v_0, t) \leq c_1$.

2. L^\sharp is coercive in v :

$$\lim_{|v| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L^\sharp(x, v, t)}{|v|} = \infty,$$

uniformly in x .

3. There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that $|D_x L^\sharp|, |D_v L^\sharp|, |D_{vv}^2 L^\sharp|, |D_{vx}^2 L^\sharp|, |D_{xx}^2 L^\sharp| \leq CL^\sharp + C$.

4. H^\sharp is twice differentiable in p, x with bounded derivatives: $|D_{pp}^2 H^\sharp|, |D_{px}^2 H^\sharp| \leq C$.

5. $D_{pp}^2 H^\sharp(x, p, t)$ is uniformly Lipschitz in x, p, t .

To obtain the absolute continuity of the law for extended mean-field games, we apply the next theorem to

$$L^\sharp(x, v, t) = L(x, v, \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t))$$

and

$$H^\sharp(x, p, t) = H(x, p, \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)).$$

Assumptions 1-3 are implied by the hypotheses in the previous section for any solution \mathbf{X} to (1). The last two, however, do not follow from the ones in the prior section. Nevertheless, for $\mathbf{X} \in C^{1,1}([0, T]; L^q(\Omega))$ and the Lagrangians (16) and Hamiltonians (17), the corresponding Lagrangians and Hamiltonians, L^\sharp and H^\sharp , satisfy 1-5.

Theorem 2. *Assume Assumptions 1-5 hold. Let u be a globally Lipschitz viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation:*

$$\begin{cases} -u_t + H^\sharp(x, Du, t) = 0 \\ u(x, T) = \psi(x), \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and Lipschitz. Suppose $X_0 \in L^q(\Omega)$ has an absolutely continuous law with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Let $\mathbf{X} \in C^1([0, T], L^q(\Omega))$ solve

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) = -D_p H^\sharp(\mathbf{X}, Du(\mathbf{X}, t), t) \\ \mathbf{X} = X_0. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Then, under the above conditions on H^\sharp , for every $t < T$, $\mathbf{X}(t)$ has an absolutely continuous law with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

REMARK: As above, (27) has a well-defined solution since X_0 has an absolutely continuous law. The key point is the absolute continuity of the law of \mathbf{X} .

Before proving the theorem, we establish an auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{q} \in C^1([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $A, B \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ be such that*

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}}(t) = -A(t)\mathbf{q}(t) - B(t)\mathbf{z}(t).$$

Suppose further there exist constants $C, \theta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{z}(t)|, |\mathbf{q}(t)| &\leq C, \quad \mathbf{z}(t) \cdot \mathbf{q}(t) \leq C|\mathbf{z}(t)|^2, \\ |A(t)|, |B(t)| &\leq C, \quad A(t) \geq \theta I, \\ |A(t_2) - A(t_1)| &\leq C|t_2 - t_1|. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Then, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$, which only depends on C, θ and T , such that

$$|\mathbf{z}(t)| \geq C_1 |\mathbf{z}(0)|, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. Since A is Lipschitz in t with Lipschitz constant C , there exist matrices $A_n \in C^1([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $A_n \geq \theta I$, $\|A_n\| \leq C$ and $\|\frac{d}{dt}A_n(t)\| \leq C$ such that $A_n \rightarrow A$ uniformly in $[0, T]$. Let $\mathbf{z}_n \in C^1([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ solve the equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{z}}_n(t) = -A_n(t)\mathbf{q}(t) - B(t)\mathbf{z}_n(t), \\ \mathbf{z}_n(0) = \mathbf{z}(0). \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

By standard ODE arguments, we have $|\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{z}| \leq \epsilon_n$, where $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$.

Since $A_n \geq \theta I$, $\|A_n\| \leq C$, $\|\frac{d}{dt}A_n(t)\| \leq C$, there exist constants $\theta', C' > 0$ such that $A_n^{-1} \geq \theta' I$, $\|A_n^{-1}\| \leq C'$ and $\|\frac{d}{dt}A_n^{-1}(t)\| \leq C'$. In this way, from (29) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_n \cdot A_n^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{z}}_n &= -\mathbf{z}_n \cdot \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{z}_n A_n^{-1} B \mathbf{z}_n = -(\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{z}) \cdot \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{z}_n \cdot A_n^{-1} B \mathbf{z}_n \geq \\ &= -(\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{z}) \cdot \mathbf{q} - C|\mathbf{z}|^2 - \mathbf{z}_n \cdot A_n^{-1} B \mathbf{z}_n \geq -C\epsilon_n - C|\mathbf{z}_n|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\mathbf{z}_n \cdot A_n^{-1} \mathbf{z}_n) \geq -C\epsilon_n - C|\mathbf{z}_n|^2 - \mathbf{z}_n \cdot \left(\frac{d}{dt}A_n^{-1}\right) \mathbf{z}_n \geq -C\epsilon_n - C|\mathbf{z}_n|^2 - \frac{C}{\theta'} \mathbf{z}_n \cdot A_n^{-1} \mathbf{z}_n.$$

Gronwall's inequality implies

$$\mathbf{z}_n(t) \cdot A_n^{-1}(t) \mathbf{z}_n(t) \geq -C''\epsilon_n + C''' e^{-C'''t} \mathbf{z}_n(0) \cdot A_n^{-1}(0) \mathbf{z}_n(0).$$

Passing to the limit when $n \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\mathbf{z}(t) \cdot A^{-1}(t) \mathbf{z}(t) \geq C''' e^{-C'''t} \mathbf{z}(0) \cdot A^{-1}(0) \mathbf{z}(0).$$

The previous estimate together with $A_n^{-1} \geq \theta' I$, $\|A_n^{-1}\| \leq C'$ implies

$$|\mathbf{z}(t)| \geq C_1 |\mathbf{z}(0)|,$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. □

Now, we proceed to the proof of Theorem 2:

Proof. Due to the assumptions on L^\sharp and ψ , the value function

$$u^\sharp(x, t) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}: \mathbf{x}(t)=x} \int_t^T L^\sharp(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, s) ds + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T)),$$

is a viscosity solution of (26). Moreover, under the hypothesis on L^\sharp , arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2, we have that u^\sharp is uniformly bounded, Lipschitz, and semiconcave in any interval $[0, T']$, $T' < T$. Hence, it is the unique viscosity solution to (26), so $u = u^\sharp$.

The optimal trajectories starting at $(x, 0)$ for every point of differentiability x of u are given by the Hamiltonian flow:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(x, t) = -D_p H^\sharp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{p}}(x, t) = D_x H^\sharp(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, t) \\ \mathbf{x}(x, 0) = x, \mathbf{p}(x, 0) = Du(x, 0). \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Furthermore, along these trajectories, $(\mathbf{x}(x, t), t)$, $t > 0$, u is differentiable and $\mathbf{p}(x, t) = Du(\mathbf{x}(x, t), t)$. Fix a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $x, y \in K$ points for which the flow is defined. Set $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{x}(x, t) - \mathbf{x}(y, t)$ and $\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{p}(x, t) - \mathbf{p}(y, t)$. Then

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}}(t) = -A(t)\mathbf{q}(t) - B(t)\mathbf{z}(t),$$

where

$$A(t) = \int_0^1 D_{pp}^2 H^\sharp(\tau \mathbf{x}(x, t) + (1 - \tau) \mathbf{x}(y, t), \tau \mathbf{p}(x, t) + (1 - \tau) \mathbf{p}(y, t), t) d\tau$$

and

$$B(t) = \int_0^1 D_{px}^2 H^\sharp(\tau \mathbf{x}(x, t) + (1 - \tau) \mathbf{x}(y, t), \tau \mathbf{p}(x, t) + (1 - \tau) \mathbf{p}(y, t), t) d\tau.$$

Equation (31) implies that there exists a constant C_K such that the trajectories $\mathbf{x}(x, t)$, $\mathbf{p}(x, t)$ are C_K -Lipschitz in t and $|\mathbf{z}|, |\mathbf{q}| \leq C_K$. The assumptions on H^\sharp imply that $A(t)$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant C_K , provided C_K is large enough. In addition, $A(t) \geq \theta I$. Since u is semiconcave in x uniformly for $t \in [0, T']$, we have

$$\mathbf{z}(t) \cdot \mathbf{q}(t) = (\mathbf{x}(x, t) - \mathbf{x}(y, t), Du(\mathbf{x}(x, t), t) - Du(\mathbf{x}(y, t), t)) \leq C|\mathbf{x}(x, t) - \mathbf{x}(y, t)|^2 = C|\mathbf{z}(t)|^2.$$

Thus \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{q} satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4. Hence $|\mathbf{x}(x, t) - \mathbf{x}(y, t)| \geq C_K(T')|x - y|$, $t \in [0, T']$. Therefore, the mapping $x \mapsto \mathbf{x}(x, t)$ is invertible on the set where it is defined. Moreover, for any compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the inverse of the map $x \in K \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(x, t)$ is Lipschitz.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of Lebesgue measure zero. Set $B = (\mathbf{x})^{-1}(\cdot, t)(A)$. For any compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the inverse of the map $x \in K \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(x, t)$ is Lipschitz. Hence, $B \cap K$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Therefore, B has Lebesgue measure zero. Since \mathbf{x} is defined a.e., we have that $\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathbf{x}(X_0, t)$ a.s.. So $X_0 = (\mathbf{x})^{-1}(\cdot, t)(\mathbf{X}(t))$ a.s.. Consequently, $P(\mathbf{X}(t) \in A) = P(X_0 \in B) = 0$. Accordingly, $\mathbf{X}(t)$ has an absolutely continuous law. \square

Corollary 1. *Assume that H, Ψ, X_0 satisfy Assumptions A)-F). Further suppose that*

1. *H is twice differentiable in p, x with bounded derivatives: $|D_{pp}^2 H|, |D_{px}^2 H| \leq C(X, Z)$.*
2. *$D_{pp}^2 H(x, p, X, Z)$ is uniformly Lipschitz in x, p, X, Z .*

Then for any solution (u, \mathbf{X}) of (1) (in the sense of Theorem 1), $\mathbf{X}(t)$, $t < T$, has an absolutely continuous law.

The Corollary follows from Theorem 2 for the Hamiltonian $H^\sharp(x, p, t) = H(x, p, \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t))$.

6 Uniqueness

In this section, we discuss two approaches to the uniqueness problem. First, we illustrate how to adapt Lasry-Lions monotonicity argument for the random variable framework. However, this proof applies only to classical solutions (though it may prove possible to extend it to viscosity solutions if the mean-field trajectories admit an absolutely continuous law). Next, we consider a second uniqueness technique that gives uniqueness for a more general class of problems without any further conditions on solutions. This method generalizes, even for classical mean-field games, prior results in the literature.

6.1 Lasry-Lions monotonicity argument

In this section, we consider a version of Lasry-Lions monotonicity method to prove uniqueness for extended mean-field games. The original idea can be explained as follows: let (θ, u) and $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{u})$ be two distinct solutions of (5). Monotonicity conditions on H give

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int (\theta - \tilde{\theta})(u - \tilde{u}) > 0.$$

Hence, $\int (\theta - \tilde{\theta})(u - \tilde{u})$ is strictly monotone in time. However, this quantity also vanishes at $t = 0$ and $t = T$. This establishes a contradiction. For a more detailed argument, see [16] or the notes [2].

In the current setting, given two solutions (X, u) and (\tilde{X}, \tilde{u}) , it suffices to show that

$$E \left(u(X(t), t) - \tilde{u}(X(t), t) + \tilde{u}(\tilde{X}(t), t) - u(\tilde{X}(t), t) \right),$$

is strictly monotone. To simplify, we assume that

1.

$$H(x, p, X, Z) = H_0(x, p + \beta EZ) + V(x, X),$$

with $\beta \geq 0$.

2. $H_0(x, p)$ is convex in p .

3. Monotonicity Condition:

$$E \left(V(X, X) - V(X, \tilde{X}) + V(\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}) - V(\tilde{X}, X) \right) < 0,$$

if $\text{Law}(X) \neq \text{Law}(\tilde{X})$. For all $X, \tilde{X} \in L^q(\Omega)$.

4. ψ satisfies

$$E \left(\psi(X, X) - \psi(X, \tilde{X}) + \psi(\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}) - \psi(\tilde{X}, X) \right) \geq 0,$$

for all $X, \tilde{X} \in L^q(\Omega)$.

Theorem 3. Assume H satisfies conditions 1-3, ψ satisfies 4. Then, there exists at most one (classical, in the sense of the definition in Theorem 1) solution (u, \mathbf{X}) to (3).

Proof. Let (u, \mathbf{X}) and $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ be two solutions of (3). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) - \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t)) &= H_0(\mathbf{X}(t), D_x u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) + \beta E \dot{\mathbf{X}}) - \\ &H_0(\mathbf{X}(t), D_x \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t) + \beta E \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}) + V(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}(t)) - V(\mathbf{X}(t), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t)) + \\ &\dot{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (D_x u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) - D_x \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t)) \leq (D_p H_0(\mathbf{X}(t), D_x u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) + \beta E \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ &+ \dot{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (D_x u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) - D_x \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t)) + \beta \dot{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (E \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}} - E \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + V(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}(t)) - V(\mathbf{X}(t), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

We add a similar expression for $\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t) - u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t)$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) - \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t) + \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t) - u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t)) \\ = V(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}(t)) - V(\mathbf{X}(t), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t)) + V(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t)) - V(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), \mathbf{X}(t)) \\ + \beta (\dot{\mathbf{X}} - \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}) E (\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}} - E \dot{\mathbf{X}}). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the expectation and using both the monotonicity condition and $\beta \geq 0$, we get that

$$\frac{d}{dt} E \left(u(\mathbf{X}(t), t) - \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t) + \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t) - u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t) \right) < 0. \quad (\star)$$

This is a contradiction since

$$E \left(u(\mathbf{X}(0), 0) - \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(0), 0) + \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(0), 0) - u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(0), 0) \right) = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(u(\mathbf{X}(T), T) - \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(T), T) + \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), T) - u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), T) \right) = \\ E \left(\psi(\mathbf{X}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) - \psi(\mathbf{X}(T), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T)) + \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T)) - \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3. *Assumption 1 is not essential, but it simplifies the computations and the remaining conditions substantially. To obtain a more general condition for uniqueness one can compute the expression on the left-hand side of (\star) in terms of Du , $D\tilde{u}$, X , and \tilde{X} and require the resulting expression to be positive, unless $Du = D\tilde{u}$ and $\text{Law}(\mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) = \text{Law}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}})$. However, a general condition is easier to write in terms of Lagrangians and is considered in the next section.*

To prove the uniqueness of solutions (u, \mathbf{X}) , if u is not everywhere differentiable, we assume further

5. $X_0 \in L^q(\Omega)$ has an absolutely continuous law with respect to the Lebesgue measure;
6. ψ is bounded and Lipschitz in x ;
7. V is C^2 bounded in x ;
8. There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that $|D_v L_0|, |D_{vv}^2 L_0| \leq CL_0 + C$, where L_0 is the Legendre transform of H_0 ;
9. $D_{pp}^2 H_0$ is Lipschitz continuous.

Theorem 4. *Suppose Conditions 1-9 hold. Then, there exists at most one solution (u, \mathbf{X}) to (3) with $\mathbf{X} \in C^1([0, T], L^q(\Omega))$ and $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ Lipschitz in t .*

Proof. Let (u, \mathbf{X}) and $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ be two solutions of the system (3) with $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C^1([0, T], L^q(\Omega))$ and $\dot{\mathbf{X}}, \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}$ Lipschitz in t . It is easy to check that under the conditions on H_0 and V the Hamiltonians $\tilde{H}_1(x, p, t) = H(x, p, \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t))$ and $\tilde{H}_2(x, p, t) = H(x, p, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(t))$ satisfy the conditions of the Theorem 2. Thus, we conclude that $\mathbf{X}(t)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t)$, $t < T$ have absolutely continuous laws with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Because u, \tilde{u} are Lipschitz, $Du(\mathbf{X}(t), t)$, $Du(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t)$, $D\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(t), t)$, $D\tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(t), t)$ are well defined almost surely. Therefore, the arguments from the proof of Theorem 3 hold without changes. \square

6.2 The second approach for uniqueness

In this section, we discuss another method to prove the uniqueness of solutions of (1). This approach is valid even if the law of \mathbf{X} is not absolutely continuous and extends Theorem (4). Consequently, it leads to a more general uniqueness result. We will assume that L satisfies the following monotonicity condition:

10.

$$E \left(L(X, Z, X, Z) - L(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}, X, Z) + L(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}) - L(X, Z, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}) \right) > 0$$

if $\text{Law}(X, Z) \neq \text{Law}(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z})$.

Theorem 5. *Under Assumptions A)-F), 4 and 10 there exists at most one solution to (1).*

Proof. Suppose (\mathbf{X}, u) and $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{u})$ are two solutions of (1). For a.e. ω , $\mathbf{X}(\omega)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\omega)$ are optimal trajectories for the optimal control problems with Lagrangians $L(x, v, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}})$ and $L(x, v, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}})$ and terminal values $\psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T))$ and $\psi(x, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T))$, respectively. Since u, \tilde{u} are the respective value functions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(\mathbf{X}(0), 0) &= \int_0^T L(\mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s), \mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)) ds + \psi(\mathbf{X}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)), \\ u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(0), 0) &\leq \int_0^T L(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s), \mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)) ds + \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(0), 0) = \int_0^T L(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s)) ds + \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T)),$$

and

$$\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(0), 0) \leq \int_0^T L(\mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s)) ds + \psi(\mathbf{X}(T), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T)).$$

By combining the previous expressions, we get the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= E \left(u(\mathbf{X}(0), 0) - \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}(0), 0) + \tilde{u}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(0), 0) - u(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(0), 0) \right) \geq \\ &\int_0^T E \left(L(\mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s), \mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)) - L(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s), \mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. L(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s)) - L(\mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s), \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s)) \right) ds + \\ &E \left(\psi(\mathbf{X}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) - \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) + \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T)) - \psi(\mathbf{X}(T), \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(T)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Conditions 10, 4, and the preceding inequalities imply $\mathbf{X}(s) = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(s)$. Then, the uniqueness of viscosity solutions yields $u = \tilde{u}$. \square

The monotonicity condition 10 is implied by a condition that depends only on the second derivatives of L . Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(L(X, Z, X, Z) - L(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}, X, Z) + L(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}) - L(X, Z, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}) \right) = \\ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 E[(Z - \tilde{Z})^T D_{vZ}^2 L \cdot (Z - \tilde{Z}) + (X - \tilde{X})^T D_{xX}^2 L \cdot (X - \tilde{X}) + \\ (Z - \tilde{Z})^T D_{vX}^2 L \cdot (X - \tilde{X}) + (X - \tilde{X})^T D_{xZ}^2 L \cdot (Z - \tilde{Z})] d\tau d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Here, all the derivatives of L are evaluated at $(Z_\tau, X_\tau, Z_\theta, X_\theta)$, with $X_\theta = (1 - \theta)X + \theta\tilde{X}$ and $Z_\theta = (1 - \theta)Z + \theta\tilde{Z}$.

Consequently, uniqueness holds if

$$E[Z^T D_{vZ}^2 L \cdot Z + Y^T D_{xX}^2 L \cdot Y + Z^T D_{vX}^2 L \cdot Y + Y^T D_{xZ}^2 L \cdot Z] > 0, \text{ for all } (Y, Z) \neq 0,$$

where the derivatives are evaluated at an arbitrary point $(A, B, C, D) \in (L^q(\Omega))^4$.

It is easy to see that, in the proof of Theorem 5, we use a weaker version of condition 10, namely

11.

$$E \left(L(X, Z, X, Z) - L(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}, X, Z) + L(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}) - L(X, Z, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}) \right) \leq 0,$$

if and only if $L(x, v, X, Z) = L(x, v, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Z})$ for all $v, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

An example that satisfies 11 is:

$$L(x, v, X, Z) = L_0(v) + \beta v E Z - V(x, X),$$

where L_0 is strictly convex, $\beta \geq 0$ and V satisfies the monotonicity condition 4. The corresponding Hamiltonian for this Lagrangian is

$$H(x, p, Z) = H_0(p + \beta E Z) + V(x, X)$$

where $H_0 = L_0^*$. Thus, the uniqueness result in this section generalizes the result in the previous section.

Another example of a Lagrangian that satisfies condition 11 is

$$L(x, v, X, Z) = \frac{|v + \beta EZ|^2}{2} - V(x, X),$$

where V satisfies the monotonicity condition 4.

7 Final Remarks

In this concluding section, we briefly discuss the master equation formulation for deterministic mean-field games. A probabilistic approach for mean-field problems with common noise was examined extensively in [6].

7.1 Master Equation in the deterministic case

In this section, we consider the so-called *Master Equation* for deterministic MFG's. The Master Equation for mean-field games was introduced by Lions in his Collège de France lectures. Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space, where Ω is an arbitrary set, \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra on Ω , and P is a probability measure. We start by considering the optimal control problem:

$$V(x, Y, t) = \inf_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}(s), \mathbf{v}(s), \mathbf{Y}(s), \dot{\mathbf{Y}}(s)) ds + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \mathbf{Y}(T)) \right], \quad (33)$$

where \mathbf{x} is the trajectory of a player starting at time t at the point $\mathbf{x}(t) = x$, controlled by $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}$. $\mathbf{Y}(\cdot)$ is the trajectory of the population of the players who move along a vector field

$$b: L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

More precisely, if the random variable Y corresponds to the initial states of the population, its evolution is given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{Y}} = b(\mathbf{Y}, t), \quad \mathbf{Y}(0) = Y. \quad (34)$$

We define $L_{ac}^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ to be the subspace of $L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$, consisting of random variables that have absolutely continuous laws. We assume the vector field b is such that for any $Y \in L_{ac}^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, equation (34) has a unique solution in $L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. It follows from above that V is well defined and is a viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-V_t - D_Y V(x, Y, t) \cdot b(Y, t) + H(x, D_x V(x, Y, t), Y, b(Y, t)) = 0, \quad (35)$$

where

$$H(x, p, Y, Z) = \sup_v \{ -p \cdot v - L(x, v, Y, Z) \}.$$

If V is a classical solution to (35), the optimal control is given in the feedback form by $v^* = -D_p H(x, D_x V(x, Y, t), Y, \dot{Y})$.

As before, we assume all players act rationally. Then each of them follows the optimal flow, that is

$$\dot{\mathbf{Y}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{Y}, D_x V(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}, t), \mathbf{Y}, \dot{\mathbf{Y}}).$$

We assume one can solve the previous equation with respect to $\dot{\mathbf{Y}}$ as $\dot{\mathbf{Y}} = G(D_x V(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}, t), \mathbf{Y})$. Hence, we have $b(Y, t) = G(D_x V(Y, Y, t), Y)$. Thus, we end up with the equation

$$\begin{cases} -V_t(x, Y, t) + D_Y V(x, Y, t) \cdot G(D_x V(Y, Y, t), Y) + H(x, D_x V(x, Y, t), Y, b(Y, t)) = 0, \\ V(x, Y, T) = \psi(x, Y). \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

We call this the *master equation*.

In general, first-order PDEs do not admit classical solutions. Consequently, we must look, for instance, for solutions that are differentiable almost everywhere with respect to the variable x . Therefore, one can make sense of $G(D_x V(Y, Y, t), Y)$ provided Y has an absolutely continuous law. For this reason, we work in the space $L^q_{ac}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Definition 1. Let $V: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q_{ac}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function, Lipschitz continuous in the first variable, and $b: L^q_{ac}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ a vector field. We say that the couple (V, b) is a solution to (36) if

- V is a viscosity solution of

$$\begin{cases} -V_t(x, Y, t) + D_y V(x, Y, t) \cdot b(Y, t) + H(x, D_x V(x, Y, t), Y, b(Y, t)) = 0, \\ V(x, Y, T) = \psi(x, Y), \end{cases}$$

that is, for any continuous function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega) \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any point $(x, Y, t) \in \operatorname{argmax} V - \phi$ (resp. argmin) where ϕ is differentiable

$$-\phi_t(x, Y, t) + D_y \phi(x, Y, t) \cdot b(Y, t) + H(x, D_x \phi(x, Y, t), Y, b(Y, t)) \leq 0 \text{ (resp. } \geq 0 \text{)}.$$

- $b(Y, t) = G(D_x V(Y, Y, t), Y)$ a.s. for any $Y \in L^q_{ac}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Next, we assume that L and ψ satisfy the following hypotheses:

1. ψ is bounded in both variables and Lipschitz in x :

$$|\psi(x_1, X) - \psi(x_2, X)| \leq C|x_1 - x_2|, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

2. There exist constants $c_0, c_1 > 0$ and a vector function $v_0: L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$L(x, v, X, Z) \geq -c_0$$

and

$$L(x, v_0(X, Z), X, Z) \leq c_1$$

for all $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d, X, Z \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

3. L is twice differentiable in x, v , and we have the following bounds

$$|D_x L(x, v, X, Z)|, |D_{xx}^2 L(x, v, X, Z)|, |D_{xv}^2 L(x, v, X, Z)|, |D_{vv}^2 L(x, v, X, Z)| \leq CL(x, v, X, Z) + C$$

for all $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d, X \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proposition 1. Assume that 1-3 hold. Then the function V defined in (33) for a fixed vector field b is finite, bounded, Lipschitz and semiconcave in x :

1. There exists a constant C such that

$$|V(x, Y, t)| \leq C, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], x, h \in \mathbb{R}^d, Y \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

2. There exists a constant C such that

$$|V(x + h, Y, t) - V(x, Y, t)| \leq C|h|, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], x, h \in \mathbb{R}^d, Y \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

3. For any $t, t < T$ there exists a constant $C(t)$ such that

$$V(x + h, Y, t) + V(x - h, Y, t) - 2V(x, Y, t) \leq C(t)|h|^2, \quad \forall x, h \in \mathbb{R}^d, Y \in L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Moreover, the constants are uniform in b .

Proof. The proof is standard and follows the arguments in Section 4. \square

In the following, we will present two simple results. These make the connection between master equation and extended mean-field game equation (1) from Section 4. Let V be a classical solution to (36), and let $\mathbf{X}(\cdot)$ be a solution to the ODE

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}} = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}, D_x V(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}, t), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \\ \mathbf{X}(0) = X_0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2. *Let $u(x, t) = V(x, \mathbf{X}(t), t)$, then the pair (u, \mathbf{X}) solves equation (1).*

Proof. Since V is smooth, we have

$$D_x u(x, t) = D_x V(x, \mathbf{X}(t), t),$$

and

$$u_t(x, t) = V_t + D_y V \cdot \dot{\mathbf{X}} = V_t(x, \mathbf{X}(t), t) - D_y V(x, \mathbf{X}(t), t) \cdot D_p H(\mathbf{X}(t), D_x V(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}(t), t), \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)).$$

Plugging this in (36) with $Y = \mathbf{X}(t)$ we get

$$-u_t(x, t) + H(x, D_x u(x, t), \mathbf{X}(t), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)) = 0.$$

Additionally, we have $u(x, T) = V(x, \mathbf{X}(T), T) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T))$. \square

Now we assume that ψ and L satisfy conditions B)-J). Because of this, by Theorem 1, for any $Y \in L^q_{ac}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ there exist solutions $(u(x, s, t), \mathbf{X}(s, t))$ to

$$\begin{cases} -u_s(x, s, t) + H(x, D_x u(x, s, t), \mathbf{X}(s, t), \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial s}(s, t)) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial s}(s, t) = -D_p H(\mathbf{X}(s, t), D_x u(\mathbf{X}(s, t), s), \mathbf{X}(s, t), \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial s}(s, t)) \\ u(x, T, t) = \psi(x, \mathbf{X}(T)), \mathbf{X}(t, t) = Y, \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

where we set $\tilde{V}(x, Y, t) = u(x, t, t)$.

Proposition 3. *Assume ψ and L satisfy conditions B)-J). Then \tilde{V} is a viscosity solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -V_t(x, Y, t) + D_y V(x, Y, t) \cdot b(Y, t) + H(x, D_x V(x, Y, t), Y, b(Y, t)) = 0, \\ V(x, Y, T) = \psi(x, Y), \end{cases}$$

for $b(Y, t) = G(D_x V(Y, Y, t), Y)$.

Proof. Note that by definition of \tilde{V} , $\tilde{V}(x, \mathbf{X}(s, t), s) = u(x, s, t)$. Let $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \times L^q(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, differentiable at (x, Y, t) . Suppose $\tilde{V} - \phi$ has a local maximum at (x, Y, t) . Let $\varphi(\cdot, s) = \phi(\cdot, X(s, t), s)$. Hence φ is a continuous function that is differentiable at (x, t) , and $u - \varphi$ has a local maximum at (x, t) . Since u is a viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have

$$-\varphi_t(x, t) + H(x, D_x \varphi(x, t), \mathbf{X}(t, t), \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial s}(t, t)) \leq 0.$$

Because $\varphi_t(x, t) = \phi_t(x, \mathbf{X}(t, t), t) + D_y \phi(x, \mathbf{X}(t, t), t) \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial s}(t, t) = \phi_t(x, Y, t) + D_y \phi(x, Y, t) \cdot b(Y, t)$ and $D_x \varphi(x, t) = D_x \phi(x, Y, t)$, we get

$$-\phi_t(x, Y, t) - D_y \phi(x, Y, t) \cdot b(Y, t) + H(x, D_x \phi(x, Y, t), Y, b(Y, t)) \leq 0.$$

This proves that \tilde{V} is a viscosity subsolution. Similarly, we show that it is also a supersolution. For $t = T$, $\mathbf{X}(\cdot, T) \equiv Y$ thus, $\tilde{V}(x, Y, T) = u(x, T, T) = \psi(x, Y)$. \square

7.2 Conclusion

The random variable framework developed in this paper is a powerful tool for studying of mean-field games. It allows the formulation of extensions of the original problem in which each player takes into consideration the actions of the rest of the population. We obtained new existence and uniqueness results that extend those presently available. We provide conditions for the absolute continuity of the law and exhibited two problems for which exact solutions can be computed.

The master equation was introduced by P.L. Lions in his lectures at College de France. It makes it possible to study mean-field game problems using a single equation, making it an important aspect of the general theory of mean-field games. The master equation and its solution can be defined within the framework of this paper. Propositions 3 and 4 illustrate the connection between solutions of the master equation and the extended mean-field games system. Finally, the master equation can be used to formulate games with correlations between the players caused by a common Brownian noise without using backward-forward stochastic differential equations. Recent substantial progress on this subject was achieved in [6, 4, 5]. Nevertheless, many questions remain unanswered, and we regard this as an important direction that should be pursued further.

Appendix: Proof of Lemma 2

Here, we give the proof of Lemma 2 and determine explicitly the dependence of c_1 , c_5 , and c_6 on the data of the problem.

Proof. For the first claim, note that

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) \leq \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}, v_0(\mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}), \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) \leq (T - t)c_1 + \|\psi\|_\infty.$$

To prove that \tilde{u} is Lipschitz, take $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $|y| \leq 1$. Let x^* be the optimal trajectory at a point (x, t) . Such optimal trajectory exists by standard control theory arguments. We have $\tilde{u}(x, t) = \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}^*, \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}^*(T), \mathbf{X}(T))$, and $\tilde{u}(x + y, t) \leq \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}^* + y, \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + \psi(\mathbf{x}^*(T) + y, \mathbf{X}(T))$. Let $f(\tau) = \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}^* + \tau y, \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}})$. Then $f(0) = \tilde{u}(x, t) - \psi(\mathbf{x}^*(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) \leq C(T - t) + C$, where the constant C depends only on L, ψ and T . Using Assumption F), we obtain

$$f'(\tau) = \int_t^T D_x L(\mathbf{x}^* + \tau y, \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \cdot y \leq \int_t^T (c_2 L(\mathbf{x}^* + \tau y, \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*, \mathbf{X}, \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + c_3) |y| \leq (c_2 f(\tau) + T c_3) |y|.$$

Consequently, by Gronwall inequality, $f(\tau) \leq C$ and $f'(\tau) \leq (C(T - t) + C)|y|$. Therefore,

$$\tilde{u}(x + y, t) - \tilde{u}(x, t) \leq f(1) - f(0) + \psi(\mathbf{x}^*(T) + y, \mathbf{X}(T)) - \psi(\mathbf{x}^*(T), \mathbf{X}(T)) \leq (C(T - t) + C)|y|.$$

The previous estimate proves that \tilde{u} is uniformly Lipschitz in x .

For the semi-concavity, we take any $t_1 < T$, $t \leq t_1$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|y| \leq 1$, \mathbf{x}^* as above, $\mathbf{y}(s) = y \frac{T-s}{T-t}$, and let

$$g(\tau) = \int_t^T L(\mathbf{x}^*(s) + \tau \mathbf{y}(s), \dot{\mathbf{x}}^*(s) + \tau \dot{\mathbf{y}}(s), \mathbf{X}(s), \dot{\mathbf{X}}(s)) ds.$$

Using Lemma 1 with the bounds on DL from Assumption F), we get $g'(\tau) \leq C(\text{Lip}(\Phi), T - t_1)(g(\tau) + 1)$. Hence, by Gronwall inequality, $g(\tau) \leq C'(\text{Lip}(\Phi), T - t_1)$. Similarly, using Lemma 1 with the bounds on D^2L from Assumption F), we get

$$g''(\tau) \leq (1 + c_4)(Cg(\tau) + C) \left(C + \frac{C}{(T - t)^2} \right) |y|^2 \leq c'|y|^2,$$

where c' depends only on $L, \psi, T, \text{Lip}(\Phi)$ and $T - t_1$. We conclude

$$\tilde{u}(x + y, t) + \tilde{u}(x - y, t) - 2\tilde{u}(x, t) \leq g(1) + g(-1) - 2g(0) \leq 2 \max_{[-1,1]} g'' \leq c_6 |y|^2.$$

□

References

- [1] M. Bardi and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta. *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1997. With appendices by Maurizio Falcone and Pierpaolo Soravia.
- [2] P. Cardaliaguet. Notes on mean-field games. 2011.
- [3] P. Cardaliaguet, P. Garber, A. Porretta, and D. Tonon. Second order mean field games with degenerate diffusion and local coupling. *Preprint*, 2014.
- [4] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. Mean field forward-backward stochastic differential equations. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 18:no. 68, 15, 2013.
- [5] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(4):2705–2734, 2013.
- [6] R. Carmona, F. Delarue, and D. Lacker. Mean field games with common noise. *Preprint*, 2013.
- [7] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner. *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, volume 25 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.
- [8] D. Gomes, S. Patrizi, and V. Voskanyan. On the existence of classical solutions for stationary extended mean field games. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 99:49–79, 2014.
- [9] D. Gomes and E. Pimentel. Time dependent mean-field games with logarithmic nonlinearities. *Preprint*, 2014.
- [10] D. Gomes and E. Pimentel. Local regularity for mean-field games in the whole space. *To appear in Minimax Theory and its Applications*, 2015.
- [11] D. Gomes, E. Pimentel, and H. Sánchez-Morgado. Time dependent mean-field games in the superquadratic case. *To appear in ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*.
- [12] D. Gomes, E. Pimentel, and H. Sánchez-Morgado. Time-dependent mean-field games in the subquadratic case. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(1):40–76, 2015.
- [13] D. Gomes and J. Saúde. Mean field games models—a brief survey. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 4(2):110–154, 2014.
- [14] M. Huang, P. E. Caines, and R. 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.

- [15] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. 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.
- [16] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.
- [17] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.
- [18] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [19] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Cahiers de la Chaire Finance et Développement Durable*, 2007.
- [20] J.-M. Lasry, P.-L. Lions, and O. Guéant. Mean field games and applications. *Paris-Princeton lectures on Mathematical Finance*, 2010.
- [21] A. Porretta. On the planning problem for the mean-field games system. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 2013.
- [22] A. Porretta. Weak solutions to Fokker-Planck equations and mean field games. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 216(1):1–62, 2015.
- [23] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.