A NON-LOCAL PROBLEM FOR THE FOKKER-PLANCK EQUATION RELATED TO THE BECKER-DÖRING MODEL

JOSEPH G. CONLON

University of Michigan
Department of Mathematics
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109

ANDRÉ SCHLICHTING

Universität Bonn
Institut für Angewandte Mathematik
Endenicher Allee 60, 53129 Bonn

Abstract. This paper concerns a Fokker-Planck equation on the positive real line modeling nucleation and growth of clusters. The main feature of the equation is the dependence of the driving vector field and boundary condition on a non-local order parameter related to the excess mass of the system.

The first main result concerns the well-posedness and regularity of the Cauchy problem. The well-posedness is based on a fixed point argument, and the regularity on Schauder estimates. The first a priori estimates yield Hölder regularity of the non-local order parameter, which is improved by an iteration argument.

The asymptotic behavior of solutions depends on the initial density ρ_0. For some $\rho_s > 0$ and $0 \leq \rho_0 \leq \rho_s$, there exists an equilibrium solution $c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{(\rho_0)}$. If $\rho_0 \leq \rho_s$ the solution converges strongly to $c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{(\rho_0)}$, while if $\rho_0 > \rho_s$ the solution converges weakly to $c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{(\rho_s)}$. The excess density $\rho_0 - \rho_s$ gets lost due to the formation of larger and larger clusters. In this regard, the model behaves similarly to the classical Becker-Döring equation.

The system possesses a free energy, strictly decreasing along the evolution, which establishes the long time behavior. In the subcritical case $\rho_0 < \rho_s$ the entropy method, based on suitable weighted logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and interpolation estimates, is used to obtain explicit convergence rates to the equilibrium solution.

The close connection of the present and the Becker-Döring model is outlined by a family of discrete Fokker-Planck type equations interpolating between both of them. This family of models possesses a gradient flow structure emphasizing the common structure.

E-mail addresses: conlon@umich.edu, schlichting@iam.uni-bonn.de.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35Q84; secondary: 35F05, 35K55, 37D35, 82C26, 82C70.

Key words and phrases. non-linear non-local pde, Fokker-Planck equation, coarsening, convergence to equilibrium, entropy method, gradient flow.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. The model, its well-posedness and convergence to equilibrium 2
1.2. Convergence rate to equilibrium (subcritical) 4
1.3. Relation with the classical Becker-Döring model 5
1.4. Transformation to $a \equiv 1$ 7
2. Existence and uniqueness Theorems 8
2.1. Notion of solutions, existence and uniqueness results 8
2.2. A priori estimates for local existence and proof of Proposition 2.1 9
2.3. A priori estimates for global existence and proof of Theorem 2.1 13
3. Regularity Theory 17
3.1. Strategy and results 17
3.2. Proof of basic regularity Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 19
3.3. Proof of Schauder Lemmas 3.3-3.5 21
3.4. Proof of parabolic regularization (Lemma 3.6) and tightness (Lemma 3.7) 30
4. Convergence to equilibrium 33
4.1. Characterization of constrained minimizer of free energy 34
4.2. The energy–energy-dissipation principle 37
4.3. Convergence to equiibrium 40
5. Rate of convergence to equilibrium (subcritical) 42
5.1. Basic estimates for the free energy and dissipation 42
5.2. Weighted logarithmic Sobolev inequalities 44
5.3. Quantitative long-time behavior: Proof of Theorem 1.2 48
6. A family of discrete Fokker-Planck equations and their gradient structures 51
6.1. The family and its free energy 51
6.2. The Becker-Döring model for $\varepsilon = 1$ 52
6.3. The Fokker-Planck model for $\varepsilon \to 0$ 53
6.4. Gradient flow structures 53
References 56

1. Introduction

1.1. **The model, its well-posedness and convergence to equilibrium.** In this paper we shall be concerned with a non-linear non-local problem associated to the Fokker-Planck equation on the half line $\mathbf{R}^+ := [0, \infty)$,

$$\partial_t c(x,t) + \partial_x \big(b(x,t)c(x,t)\big) \;=\; \partial_x^2 \big(a(x)c(x,t)\big) \;, \quad x,t \in \mathbf{R}^+. \tag{1.1}$$

We shall be primarily interested in the large time behavior of solutions to (1.1) with non-negative initial data and Dirichlet boundary condition at $x = 0$. We shall assume that $a(\cdot)$ is differentiable and strictly positive, and that the drift $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ has the form

$$b(x,t) \;=\; a(x)\big(\theta(t)W'(x) - V'(x)\big) \;, \tag{1.2}$$

where $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$ are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions and $\theta(\cdot)$ is continuous. If the function $\theta(\cdot)$ in (1.2) is constant $\theta(\cdot) \equiv \theta$, then $c(x,t) = c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)$, where

$$c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x) \;=\; a(x)^{-1} \exp(-V(x) + \theta W(x)) \;, \tag{1.3}$$

is a steady state solution of (1.1), (1.2). Furthermore it is known, under fairly general assumptions on $a(\cdot), V(\cdot), W(\cdot), \theta$ and the Dirichlet boundary condition, that the solution $c(\cdot,t)$ to (1.1) converges as $t \to \infty$ to $c_\theta^{\rm eq}(\cdot)$.

In the problem we study here $\theta(\cdot)$ is non-constant and is determined by the conservation law

$$\theta(t) + \int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x = \;\rho \;, \quad \text{where } \rho > 0 \text{ is constant.} \tag{1.4}$$

We impose a Dirichlet boundary condition which is consistent with the requirement that $c(x,t) = c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)$ is a solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4). Our Dirichlet condition is therefore given by

$$c(0,t) \;=\; c_{\theta(t)}^{\rm eq}(0) \;=\; a(0)^{-1}\exp(-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0))\;, \quad t>0\;. \tag{1.5}$$

Observe now that if we assume W is a positive function and that $W(\cdot)a(\cdot)^{-1}\exp[-V(\cdot)]$ is integrable on $(0,\infty)$, then $W(\cdot)c_\theta^{\rm eq}(\cdot)$ is integrable for $\theta\le 0$. Furthermore, the function $\theta\mapsto\theta+\|W(\cdot)c_\theta^{\rm eq}(\cdot)\|_1$ is strictly increasing and maps $(-\infty,0]$ to $(-\infty,\rho_s]$ where $\rho_s=\|W(\cdot)c_0^{\rm eq}(\cdot)\|_1$. We denote by $\theta_{\rm eq}(\cdot)$ the inverse function with domain $(-\infty,\rho_s]$. Evidently $\theta_{\rm eq}(\rho_s)=0$, and so we may extend $\theta_{\rm eq}(\cdot)$ in a continuous way to have domain $\mathbf{R}$ by setting $\theta_{\rm eq}(\rho)=0$ for $\rho>\rho_s$.

The goal of the work is to establish well-posedness of the system, to investigate the long-time behavior and to obtain the rate for convergence in the subcritical case $\rho<\rho_s$.

Let us specify the set of assumptions on the functions $a(\cdot)$, $V(\cdot)$, $W(\cdot)$ needed to obtain statements for the equation (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5).

Assumption 1.1.

(a) $a(\cdot),\ V(\cdot),\ W(\cdot)\in\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbf{R}^+)$ *satisfy for some* $C_0>0$

$$\big(|V''(x)|+|W''(x)|\big)\,a(x)+\big(|V'(x)|+|W'(x)|\big)\,|a'(x)|+|a''(x)|\le C_0 \qquad \text{for } x\in\mathbf{R}^+.$$

(b) $W(\cdot)$ *is an increasing function with* $W(0)>0$ *and* $\inf_{x\in\mathbf{R}^+}a(x)\ge c_0>0$.

(c) For any $\delta>0$ *there exists* $x_\delta>0$ *such that*

$$|V'(x)|+|(\log a(x))'| \;\le\; \delta W'(x)\;, \quad \text{if } x\ge x_\delta\;.$$

and

$$|V''(x)|+|(\log a)''(x)|+|W''(x)| \;\le\; \delta W'(x)^2\;, \quad \text{if } x\ge x_\delta\;.$$

(d) There exists $C_0,c_0>0$ *such that*

$$c_0\le a(x)W'(x)^2\le C_0W(x)\;, \qquad \text{for } x\in\mathbf{R}^+\;. \tag{1.6}$$

(e) The function $W(\cdot)a(\cdot)^{-1}\exp(-V(\cdot))$ *is integrable on* $(0,\infty)$.

Remark 1.1. *To illustrate the above set of assumption, we take for* a,V,W *power laws*

$$W(x)=(1+x)^\kappa \qquad a(x)=(1+x)^\alpha \qquad \text{and} \qquad V(x)=(1+x)^\gamma.$$

Then, the admissible range of exponents is

$$0<\kappa\le 2, \qquad \max\{2-2\kappa,0\}\le\alpha\le 2-\kappa \qquad \text{and} \qquad 0<\gamma<\min\{2-\alpha,\kappa\}.$$

Theorem 1.1. *Assume the functions* $a(\cdot)$, $V(\cdot)$, $W(\cdot)$ *satisfy Assumption 1.2. Let* $c(x,0),\ x>0$, *be a non-negative measurable function such that*

$$\int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,0)\,{\rm d}x \;<\; \infty\;. \tag{1.7}$$

Then there exists a unique solution $c(\cdot,t),\ t>0$, *to the Cauchy problem* (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) *with initial condition* $c(\cdot,0)$.

For all $t>0$ *the function* $c(\cdot,t)\in\mathcal{C}^1([0,\infty))$ *and* $\theta\in\mathcal{C}^1([0,\infty))$.

For any $L>0$ *the solution* $c(\cdot,t)$ *converges uniformly on the interval* $[0,L]$ *as* $t\to\infty$ *to the equilibrium* $c_\theta^{\rm eq}(\cdot)$ *with* $\theta=\theta_{\rm eq}(\rho)$. *If* $\rho\le\rho_s$ *then also*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\int_0^\infty W(x)|c(x,t)-c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)|\,{\rm d}x \;=\; 0\;. \tag{1.8}$$

The three statements on well-posedness, regularity and convergence to equilibrium are proven in the next three sections §2, §3 and §4, respectively.

1.2. **Convergence rate to equilibrium (subcritical).** We derive in the subcritical case $\rho < \rho_s$ a quantified rate of convergence to equilibrium. The proof relies on the entropy method and the convergence statement is shown with respect to a free energy, which is decreasing along the solution. For the calculations it is convenient to rewrite the set of equations (1.1), (1.2), (1.5) in the form

$$\partial_t c(x,t) = \partial_x \left(a(x)c(x,t)\, \partial_x \log \frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta(t)}(x)} \right) \quad \text{with b.c.} \quad \log \frac{c(0,t)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta(t)}(0)} = 0$$

together with the equation (1.4) for $\theta(t)$. In this form, the following energy dissipation estimate is formally verified and established after proving enough regularity properties of the solution

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^+}{\mathrm{d}t} \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)) \le -\mathcal{D}(c(t),\theta(t)) \tag{1.9}$$

where $\frac{\mathrm{d}^+}{\mathrm{d}t} f(t) = \limsup_{\delta\to 0^+} \frac{f(t+\delta)-f(t)}{\delta}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)) &:= \int (\log c - 1)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int (V + \log a)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\theta(t)^2 \\ &\qquad \text{with} \quad \theta(t) := \rho - \int W(x)c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ \mathcal{D}(c(\cdot),\theta) &:= \int a(x) \left(\partial_x \log \frac{c}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta} \right)^2 c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

Remark 1.2 (Relation to McKean-Vlasov dynamic)**.** *The term $\frac{1}{2}\theta^2$ in (1.10) is characteristic for free energies of McKean-Vlasov equations*

$$\mathcal{F}_{MV}(c) = \int c\log c + \int c\tilde{V} + \frac{1}{2}\iint K(x,y)c(x)c(y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

with some kernel function K. For the product kernel $K(x,y) = W(x)W(y)$, the last term becomes $(\int Wc)^2$. By choosing $\tilde{V} = V - \rho W$, the free energy $\mathcal{F}_{MV}$ agrees with $\mathcal{G}$ from (1.10) up to a constant. Hence, the presented Fokker-Planck equation is a particular case of the McKean-Vlasov equation with a product kernel, however with a non-local boundary condition. Equations with non-local interaction and some boundary are just recently studied in [25]. However, the particular boundary condition (1.5) enforcing a non-local Lagrangian multiplier (1.4) has been to our knowledge not studied in the literature so far.

The function $\mathcal{G}$ is proven to be convex with a unique minimizer satisfying the constraint (1.4) (see Lemma 4.1) given by

$$\inf_c \left\{ \mathcal{G}(c,\theta) : \theta + \int W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \rho \right\} = \mathcal{G}(c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}})$$

where $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$ is uniquely determined by ρ through the identity $\rho = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}} + \int W c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}$. This allows to define the normalized free energy functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) := \mathcal{G}(c,\theta) - \mathcal{G}(c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}) \qquad \text{with} \qquad \theta := \rho - \int W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{1.11}$$

Therewith, we can state the second main result on the rate of convergence to equilibrium.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\rho < \rho_s$. Assume the function $a(\cdot), V(\cdot),\ W(\cdot)$ to satisfy Assumption 1.2 and in addition for some $\beta \in (0,1]$ and constants $0 < c_0 < C_0 < \infty$ holds the refinement of (1.6)*

$$c_0 W^{1-\beta}(x) \le a(x)W'(x)^2 \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbf{R}^+. \tag{1.12}$$

Let c be a solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial condition $c(\cdot,0)$ satisfying (1.7) and for some C_0 and $k > 0$ the moment condition

$$\int W(x)^{1+k\beta}\, c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_0, \tag{1.13}$$

Then there exists λ and C depending on $a, V, W, \theta_{\rm eq}, C_0, k$ such that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t)) \leq \frac{1}{(C+\lambda t)^k} \ .$$

Moreover, if (1.12) holds with $\beta = 0$, that is $c_0 W(x) \leq a(x)W'(x)^2 \leq C_0 W(x)$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^+$, then there exists $C > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t)) \leq C e^{-\lambda t}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is contained in §5.

By a suitable Pinsker inequality (see Corollary 5.1), the convergence of Theorem 1.2 also implies the quantified version of the statement (1.8) of Theorem 2.1 as well as a quantified convergence statement for $\theta(t)$.

Corollary 1.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 there exists for any $T > 0$ an explicit constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left(\int W(x)|c(x,t) - c^{\rm eq}_{\theta^{\rm eq}}(x)|\,{\rm d}x\right)^2 + (\theta(t) - \theta^{\rm eq})^2 \leq C\ \mathcal{F}_\rho(c(\cdot,t)) \qquad \text{for all } t \geq T.$$

Remark 1.3. *Firstly, let us emphasize, that the rates given in Remark 1.1 satisfy the refined assumption (1.12) with $\beta = \frac{2-\alpha-\kappa}{\kappa} \in [0,1]$.*

To explain the quantity (1.13), we introduce $\omega(x) := W(x)/\big(a(x)W'(x)^2\big)$. Then, by using (1.12), we have $\omega(x) \leq c_0^{-1} W(x)^\beta$ and the moment condition (1.13) gives a bound on

$$\int \omega(x)^k\, W(x)\, c(x,0)\,{\rm d}x \leq C_0.$$

The weight function $\omega(x)$ is essential for the derivation of suitable functional inequalities, in this case weighted logarithmic Sobolev inequalities (see Section 5.2). Together with an interpolation argument, this is the essential ingredient to obtain a suitable differential inequality for the time-derivative of $\mathcal{F}_\rho$. We decided for the sake of presentation to use the slightly simplifying assumption (1.12).

In addition, it is possible by the same technique, to obtain subexponential convergence rates of the form $\exp(-\lambda t^\nu)$ for some $\nu \in (0,1)$ by using an interpolation argument with stretched exponential moments and suitable bounds on the initial data. We refer to [12], where this kind of result is obtained for the Becker-Döring equation.

1.3. **Relation with the classical Becker-Döring model.** The system (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) may be considered a continuum analogue of the classical Becker-Döring model for cluster evolution [6]. Letting $c_\ell(t)$, $\ell = 1, 2, ...$, denote the density at time t of clusters of volume ℓ, the cluster evolution is determined by the equations

$$\frac{{\rm d}c_\ell(t)}{{\rm d}t} \ = \ J_{\ell-1}(t) - J_\ell(t)\ , \quad \ell = 2, 3, ... \tag{1.14}$$

and the mass conservation law

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell c_\ell(t) \ = \ \rho\ . \tag{1.15}$$

It follows from (1.14), (1.15) that monomer evolution is determined by the equation

$$\frac{{\rm d}c_1(t)}{{\rm d}t} \ = \ -J_1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} J_\ell\ .$$

The flux J_ℓ is the rate at which clusters of volume ℓ become clusters of volume $\ell+1$, and is given by the formula

$$J_\ell \ = \ a_\ell c_1 c_\ell - b_{\ell+1} c_{\ell+1}\ , \tag{1.16}$$

where a_ℓ, $b_\ell > 0$ are given functions of ℓ. Thus an ℓ-cluster can combine with a monomer at rate a_ℓ to become an $\ell+1$-cluster. An $\ell+1$-cluster can evaporate a monomer at rate $b_{\ell+1}$ to become an ℓ-cluster. One looks for equilibrium solutions to (1.14), (1.15) by solving the

equations $J_\ell = 0,\ \ell = 1, 2, ...$ From (1.16) it follows that $c_{\ell+1} = a_\ell c_1 c_\ell / b_{\ell+1},\ \ell = 1, 2, ...$ Hence $c_\ell = Q_\ell c_1^\ell,\ \ell = 1, 2, ..$ is an equilibrium solution where

$$Q_\ell \ = \ \prod_{r=1}^{\ell-1} \frac{a_r}{b_{r+1}} \ , \qquad Q_1 = 1, \tag{1.17}$$

provided (1.15) holds. Making the assumption that there exists $z_s > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \frac{a_\ell}{b_\ell} \ = \ \frac{1}{z_s} \ , \tag{1.18}$$

it is clear there is a family of equilibria for every density ρ with $0 < \rho < \rho_s$, where

$$\rho_s \ = \ \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} Q_\ell z_s^\ell \ .$$

If $\rho_s < \infty$ then the equilibrium corresponding to $\rho = \rho_s$ is critical: there are no equilibria with $\rho > \rho_s$.

Global existence and uniqueness theorems for the BD system (1.14), (1.15) were proven in the seminal paper of Ball, Carr and Penrose [3] under fairly mild assumptions on the rates $a_\ell, b_\ell,\ \ell = 1, 2, ..$, the main ones being that a_ℓ, b_ℓ should grow at sub-linear rates in ℓ as $\ell \to \infty$. It was also shown (Theorem 5.6 of [3]) under stronger assumptions on a_ℓ, b_ℓ, in particular (1.18), that if $\rho \le \rho_s < \infty$, then the solution of (1.14), (1.15) converges strongly at large time to the corresponding equilibrium solution, in the sense that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell |c_\ell(t) - Q_\ell c_1^\ell| \ = \ 0 \ .$$

If $\rho > \rho_s$ then $c_\ell(t)$ converges weakly to the equilibrium solution with maximal density,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} c_\ell(t) \ = \ Q_\ell z_s^\ell \ , \quad \ell = 1, 2, ...$$

Our first main result Theorem 1.1 can be seen as the analog of the these results. A key tool in the proof of Theorem 5.6 of [3] is a Lyapunov function $\mathcal{G}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(c(\cdot)) \ = \ \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} c_\ell \left\{ \log \frac{c_\ell}{Q_\ell} - 1 \right\} \ , \tag{1.19}$$

which is decreasing on solutions to (1.14), (1.15).

To make the connection between the Becker-Döring model and the model (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) we formulate, following Velázquez [38], equation (1.14) as a discretization of a diffusion equation. From (1.16) we have that

$$J_\ell \ = \ [b_\ell c_\ell - b_{\ell+1} c_{\ell+1}] + \{(a_\ell z_s - b_\ell) + \theta(t) a_\ell\} c_\ell \ ,$$

where the function $\theta(t)$ is given by

$$c_1(t) \ = \ z_s + \theta(t) \ . \tag{1.20}$$

Setting $c(\ell, t) = c_\ell(t),\ \ell = 1, 2, \ldots,$ and denoting by D the forward difference operator with adjoint D^*, we have from (1.14) that

$$\partial_t c(\ell, t) \ = \ -D^* D[b_\ell c(\ell, t)] + D^*[\{(a_\ell z_s - b_\ell) + \theta(t) a_\ell\} c(\ell, t)] \ , \quad \ell \ge 2. \tag{1.21}$$

We also have from (1.20) the boundary condition

$$c(1, t) \ = \ z_s + \theta(t) \ . \tag{1.22}$$

The dynamics is now completed from the conservation law (1.15). Evidently (1.21), (1.22) can be considered a discretization on the positive integers of (1.1), (1.2), (1.5). In §6 we describe for $\varepsilon > 0$ a family of models on $\varepsilon \mathbf{Z}^+$, where $\mathbf{Z}^+$ denotes the non-negative integers. The Becker-Döring model is a member of this family corresponding to $\varepsilon = 1$, and the model (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5)

corresponds to the limiting case $\varepsilon \to 0$. For each model there is a Lyapunov function analogous to (1.19), which decreases on solutions. In the case of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) the Lyapunov function is consistent with (1.10). Moreover, each model posses a gradient flow structure for which the Lyapunov function is the driving free energy with respect to a Wasserstein metric with Dirichlet boundary condition.

An important example of $a_\ell,\ b_\ell$ is

$$a_\ell \ = \ a_1 \ell^\alpha \ , \quad b_\ell \ = \ a_\ell(z_s + q/\ell^\gamma) \ , \ \ell = 1, 2, ..., \tag{1.23}$$

where $\alpha \in [0,1]$, $\gamma \in (0,1)$ and $q, z_s > 0$. The classical theory of coarsening is obtained by the choice $\alpha = \gamma = \frac{1}{3}$. We refer to [29] for some heuristic derivation of these more general rates and their physical interpretation. In that case we have an asymptotic formula for Q_ℓ at large ℓ given by

$$Q_\ell \ \simeq \ z_s^{-(\ell-1)} \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \exp\left[-\frac{q}{z_s(1-\gamma)} \ell^{1-\gamma} \right] \ , \quad \ell \to \infty \ .$$

Hence there are equilibria for every density ρ with $0 < \rho \le \rho_s$. Using (1.21) to make a comparison between the Becker-Döring model with parameter values given by (1.23) and (1.1), (1.2), we see that it is appropriate to set

$$a(x) \ = \ (1+x)^\alpha \ , \quad V(x) \ = (1+x)^{1-\gamma} \ , \quad W(x) \ = \ 1 + x \ ,$$

in (1.1), (1.2). Note that in view of Remark 1.1 the functions satisfy Assumption 1.1 and convergence to equilibrium is obtained through Theorem 1.2. In particular the case $\alpha = 1$ yields exponential convergence to equilibrium in analogy to the result of [12] for the Becker-Döring equation.

1.4. **Transformation to $a \equiv 1$.** For the rest of the paper and the sake of presentation, we are going to transform the equation by a change of variable to a Fokker-Planck equation of the same type but with constant diffusion constant $a \equiv 1$. We achieve this by making the change of variable

$$z = \int_0^x \frac{\mathrm{d}x'}{\sqrt{a(x')}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{c}(z,t) \ = \ \sqrt{a(x)} c(x,t) \ .$$

Note, that by Assumption 1.1 it holds $\int_0^\infty dx/\sqrt{a(x)} = \infty$ and hence $z : \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$. Then (1.1) becomes

$$\partial_t \tilde{c}(z,t) + \partial_z \big[\tilde{b}(z,t) \tilde{c}(z,t) \big] \ = \ \partial_z^2 \tilde{c}(z,t) \ , \quad 0 < z < \infty, \ t > 0,$$
$$\text{where } \tilde{b}(z,t) \ = \ \frac{b(x,t)}{\sqrt{a(x)}} - \frac{a'(x)}{2\sqrt{a(x)}} \ , \quad x = x(z) \ .$$

Note that (1.2) implies that

$$\tilde{b}(z,t) = \theta(t) \tilde{W}'(z) - \tilde{V}'(z)$$
$$\text{where} \quad \tilde{W}(z) = W(x(z)) \ \text{ and } \ \tilde{V}(z) = V(x(z)) + \frac{1}{2} \log[a(x(z))] \ .$$

Evidently the conservation law (1.4) becomes

$$\theta(t) + \int_0^\infty \tilde{W}(z) \tilde{c}(z,t) \, \mathrm{d}z \ = \ \rho \ ,$$

and the boundary condition (1.5) becomes

$$\tilde{c}(0,t) \ = \ \exp\big(-\tilde{V}(0) + \theta(t) \tilde{W}(0) \big) \ .$$

Moreover, it holds

$$\tilde{V}'(z(x)) = V'(x)\sqrt{a(x)} + \frac{a'(x)}{\sqrt{a(x)}} \ , \quad \tilde{V}''(z(x)) = V''(x)a(x) + \frac{1}{2} V'(x) a'(x) + a''(x) - \frac{(a'(x))^2}{a(x)} \ ,$$
$$\tilde{W}'(z(x)) = W'(x)\sqrt{a(x)} \ , \qquad \tilde{W}''(z(x)) = W''(x)a(x) + \frac{1}{2} W'(x) a'(x) \ .$$

In particular, the functions $\tilde{V}$ and $\tilde{W}$ satisfy again Assumption 1.1 with $a(\cdot) \equiv 1$. From now on, we drop the tilde-superscript, assume $a \equiv 1$ and V, W to satisfy Assumption 1.1, which then take the following simple form:

Assumption 1.2 ($a \equiv 1$)**.**

(a) $V(\cdot), W(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbf{R}^+)$ *satisfy satisfy for some* $C_0 > 0$

$$|V''(x)| + |W''(x)| \le C_0 \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbf{R}^+ \ . \tag{1.24}$$

(b) $W(\cdot)$ *is an increasing function with* $W(0) > 0$ *and* $\inf_{x\in\mathbf{R}^+} a(x) \ge c_0 > 0$.

(c) For any $\delta > 0$ *there exists* $x_\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$|V'(x)| \ \le \ \delta W'(x) \ , \quad \text{if } x \ge x_\delta \ . \tag{1.25}$$

and

$$|V''(x)| + |W''(x)| \ \le \ \delta W'(x)^2 \ , \quad \text{if } x \ge x_\delta \ . \tag{1.26}$$

(d) There exists $C_0, c_0 > 0$ *such that*

$$c_0 \le W'(x)^2 \le C_0 W(x) \ , \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbf{R}^+ \ . \tag{1.27}$$

(e) The function $W(\cdot)\exp(-V(\cdot))$ *is integrable on* $(0,\infty)$.

2. Existence and uniqueness Theorems

2.1. **Notion of solutions, existence and uniqueness results.** Now, we are going to prove that there exists a solution globally in time to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) under Assumption 1.2 on the functions $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$ as well as a W-moment of the initial data (1.7). In order to carry this out it will be helpful for us to consider solutions to the PDE adjoint to (1.1),

$$\mathcal{L}_{x,t} w(x,t) = \partial_t w(x,t) + \partial_x^2 w(x,t) + b(x,t)\, \partial_x w(x,t) = 0 \ . \tag{2.1}$$

We shall be interested in solutions $w(x,t)$ to (2.1) in domains $\{(x,t) \ : \ x > 0, \ t < T\}$ for $T > 0$ with zero Dirichlet boundary condition at $x = 0$ and terminal condition at $t = T$. That is

$$w(x,T) \ = \ w_0(x), \ x > 0, \quad w(0,t) \ = \ 0, \ t < T, \tag{2.2}$$

where $w_0(\cdot)$ is a given function. We assume that

$$\begin{aligned} b : [0,\infty) \times [0,T] \to \mathbf{R}, \quad \frac{\partial b}{\partial x} : [0,\infty) \times [0,T] \to \mathbf{R} \ \text{ are continuous,} \\ \text{and} \quad \sup_{x\ge 0,\ 0\le t\le T} \frac{|b(x,t)|}{1+x} < \infty \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Then the terminal-boundary value problem (2.1), (2.2) has a unique classical solution in $[0,T]\times[0,\infty)$ provided $w_0(\cdot)$ is a continuous function satisfying $\sup_{x\ge 0} |w_0(x)| \exp(-Ax) < \infty$ for some $A \ge 0$. That is there is a unique function $w : (0,\infty) \times (0,T) \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $w(x,t)$ is $\mathcal{C}^2$ in x, $\mathcal{C}^1$ in t, denoted by $w \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}_{t,x}(\mathbf{R}^+ \times [0,T])$, and satisfies the PDE (2.1). In addition, w extends to a continuous function on the set $\{(x,t) \in [0,\infty) \times [0,T] \ : \ (x,t) \ne (0,T) \ \}$ and satisfies (2.2). This follows from the Green's function estimates in [15, Lemma 3.4]. In this section we shall always assume that (2.3) holds.

We shall be concerned mostly with solutions to (2.1) where the drift $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ is given by (1.2) with $a(\cdot) \equiv 1$, that is

$$b(x,t) \ = \ \theta(t) W'(x) - V'(x) \ , \quad x \ge 0 \ . \tag{2.4}$$

In order for the condition (2.3) to hold we shall need $W(\cdot), V(\cdot)$ to be $\mathcal{C}^2$ on $[0,\infty)$ with bounded second derivative, which is (1.24) of Assumption 1.2, and the function $\theta(\cdot)$ to be continuous.

Suppose now that the continuous function $\theta : [0,T] \to \mathbf{R}$ is given. If the function $c(x,t), \ x > 0, 0 < t < T$, is a classical solution to (1.1), (1.5), and $w(x,t), \ x > 0, t < T$, a classical solution to (2.1), (2.2) then we have that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int_0^\infty w(x,t) c(x,t)\, \mathrm{d}x \ = \ \partial_x w(0,t) \ \exp[-V(0) + \theta(t) W(0)] \ \ge \ 0 \ . \tag{2.5}$$

We use an integrated form of the identity (2.5) (see (2.6) below) to construct a unique measure valued weak solution to the initial-boundary value problem (1.1), (1.5). We recall some well known properties of spaces of measures [7, 32]. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ be the $\sigma-$algebra of Borel sets on $\mathbf{R}^+ = [0,\infty)$, and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ be the Banach space of real Borel measures $\mu : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^+) \to \mathbf{R}$. Let $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{R}^+)$ be the Banach space of continuous functions $f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ which vanish at ∞ with norm $\|f\| = \sup_{x\in\mathbf{R}^+} |f(x)|$. Then by the Riesz representation theorem $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ is the dual of $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{R}^+)$.

Definition 2.1. *Let $T > 0$. A family $[0,T] \ni t \mapsto c(\cdot,t) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ is a solution to (1.1), (1.5) with b satisfying (2.4) and $\theta \in \mathcal{C}([0,T],\mathbf{R}^+)$ if for all $T \in (0,T_0)$ and all solutions $w \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}_{x,t}(\mathbf{R}^+ \times [0,T])$ to the adjoint equation (2.1), (2.2) with $w_0 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ satisfying $\sup_{x\geq 0}|w_0(x)|\exp(-Ax) < \infty$ for some $A \geq 0$ the following identity holds*

$$\int_0^\infty w_0(x)c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; \int_0^\infty w(x,0)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^T \partial_x w(0,t)\,\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ . \tag{2.6}$$

The existence of a unique measure valued weak solution $t \mapsto c(t,\cdot)$ is then ensured by the Riesz representation theorem, since $w \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{R}^+)$ satisfies especially $\sup_{x\geq 0}|w_0(x)|\exp(-Ax) < \infty$ with $A = 0$.

Using this construction, we prove a local existence and uniqueness theorem for the system (1.1), (1.5) including the conservation law (1.4) based on a fixed point argument.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that the functions $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$ satisfy Assumption 1.2 and that the initial data $c(x,0) \geq 0,\ x \geq 0$, satisfies (1.7) with $\theta(0) = \theta_0$ so that (1.4) holds at $t = 0$. Then there exists a unique solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) in some interval $0 \leq t \leq T$, where the time period T is bounded below by a constant depending only on θ_0.*

Next, a global existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) for non-negative initial data $c(x,0),\ x > 0$, satisfying (1.7) is obtained by a further control on the time period T. This requires certain uniform in time estimates for the adjoint problem controlling both terms of the RHS of (2.6).

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose Assumption 1.2 holds and $c(0,\cdot)$ satisfies (1.7), then the local in time solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) constructed in Proposition 2.1 can be extended to all times $T > 0$.*

2.2. A priori estimates for local existence and proof of Proposition 2.1.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $W : [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^2$ increasing function which satisfies $W(0) > 0$ and $\sup_{x\geq 0} W(x)\exp(-Ax) < \infty$ for some $A \geq 0$. In addition assume that $V : [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ is $\mathcal{C}^2$ and there exists $x_0, C_0 > 0$ such that*

$$W'(x)^2 + |W''(x)| \;\leq\; C_0 W(x), \quad |V'(x)| \;\leq\; C_0 W'(x) \quad \text{for } x \geq x_0. \tag{2.7}$$

Let $\theta : [0,T] \to \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function and $w(x,t),\ x > 0, t < T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $w_0(x) = W(x),\ x > 0$. Then for any $T, \theta_\infty > 0$ and $\theta(\cdot)$ satisfying $\|\theta(\cdot)\|_\infty \leq \theta_\infty$, there is a constant $C(T,\theta_\infty)$ such that $w(x,0) \leq C(T,\theta_\infty)W(x)$ for all $x > 0$. The constant $C(T,\theta_\infty)$ has the property that $\lim_{T\to 0} C(T,\theta_\infty) = 1$ for any $\theta_\infty > 0$.

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ let $w_\lambda(x,t) = e^{\lambda(T-t)}W(x),\ x > 0, t < T$. Letting $\mathcal{L}_{x,t}$ denote the partial differential operator of (2.1), with b given by (2.4) then

$$e^{-\lambda(T-t)}\mathcal{L}_{x,t}w_\lambda(x,t) \;=\; -\lambda W(x) + W''(x) + [\theta(t)W'(x) - V'(x)]W'(x)\ . \tag{2.8}$$

We see from (2.7), (2.8) that $\mathcal{L}_{x,t}w_\lambda(x,t) \leq 0,\ x > 0, t < T$, provided λ is taken sufficiently large. In addition $w_\lambda(x,T) = W(x),\ x \geq 0$, and $w_\lambda(0,t) > 0,\ t < T$. We conclude from the maximum principle that $w(x,t) \leq w_\lambda(x,t),\ x > 0, t < T$. □

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfies (2.3) and $x_1 > 0$. Let $w(x,t),\ 0 < x < x_1,\ 0 \leq t < T$, be the solution to (2.1) with terminal data $w(x,T) = w_0(x),\ 0 < x < x_1$, and Dirichlet boundary conditions $w(0,t) = 0, w(x_1,t) = w_1(t),\ t < T$, where $w_0 : [0,x_1] \to \mathbf{R}$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and $w_1 : [0,T] \to \mathbf{R}$ are continuous. Setting $\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty = \sup\{|b(x,t)| \ :\ 0 < x < x_1,\ \max[0,T-1] < t < T\}$, and*

$\|\partial b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty = \sup\{|\partial b(x,t)/\partial x| \ : \ 0<x<x_1,\ \max[0,T-1]<t<T\}$, *then there exists a constant* $C>0$ *depending only on* x_1 *and* $\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty,\ \|\partial b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty$, *such that*

$$|\partial_x w(x,t)| \ \le \ \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-t}}\big[\|w_0(\cdot)\|_\infty + (T-t)\|w_1(\cdot)\|_\infty\big] \ , \tag{2.9}$$

for $0<x<x_1/2,\quad \max[0,T-1]<t<T$. *In the case when* $x=x_1/2$ *there is the stronger inequality, for all* $\max[0,T-1]<t<T$ *it holds*

$$\big|\partial_x w(x_1/2,t)\big| \ \le \ C\big[\|w_0'(\cdot)\|_\infty + \|w_0(\cdot)\|_\infty + (T-t)\|w_1(\cdot)\|_\infty\big] \ , \tag{2.10}$$

where C *depends only on* $x_1,\ \|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty,\ \|\partial b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty$.

Proof. We follow the standard perturbative approach pioneered by Schauder [21]. We consider the terminal value problem for (2.1) in the interval $0<x<x_1, t<T$ with terminal data and Dirichlet boundary conditions given by

$$w(x,T) \ = \ w_0(x), \quad 0<x<x_1, \quad w(0,t) \ = \ w(x_1,t) \ = \ 0, \quad t<T. \tag{2.11}$$

The solution to (2.1), (2.11) can be represented in terms of the Dirichlet Green's function G_D as

$$w(x,t) \ = \ \int_0^{x_1} G_D(x,x',t,T)w_0(x')\,\mathrm{d}x' \ .$$

The function $w(x,t)$ in the statement of the lemma can also be represented in terms of G_D as

$$w(x,t) \ = \ \int_0^{x_1} G_D(x,x',t,T)w_0(x')\,\mathrm{d}x' - \int_t^T \frac{\partial G_D}{\partial x'}(x,x_1,t,s)w_1(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \ . \tag{2.12}$$

If $b(\cdot,\cdot)\equiv 0$ then G_D can be obtained from the method of images. For x' in the interval $[0,x_1]$ let $x_0'=x'$, and $x_1'=-x'$ be the reflection of x' in the boundary 0 of the interval. More generally we denote by $x_m', m=0,1,2,..$, all multiple reflections of x' in the boundaries $0,x_1$. Letting

$$G(x,t) \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4t}\right] \ ,$$

we define the function $K(x,x',t,T)$ by

$$K(x,x',t,T) \ = \ \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(-1)^{p(m)}G(x-x_m',T-t) \ , \tag{2.13}$$

where $p(m)=0,1$, depending on the number of reflections to obtain x_m'. It is easy to see that the series (2.13) converges and that $G_D(x,x',t,T)=K(x,x',t,T)$ when $b(\cdot,\cdot)\equiv 0$. In the case of nontrivial b one can obtain G_D by perturbation expansion. Let $\mathcal{L}_{x,t}$ denote the operator on the LHS of (2.1), so (2.1) is $\mathcal{L}_{x,t}w=0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} G_D(x,x',t,T) &= K(x,x',t,T) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} v_n(x,x',t,T), \\ v_n(x,x',t,T) &= \int_t^T \mathrm{d}s \int_0^{x_1} \mathrm{d}x''\ K(x,x'',t,s)g_n(x'',x',s,T), \\ g_0(x,x',t,T) &= \mathcal{L}_{t,x}K(x,x',t,T), \\ g_{n+1}(x,x',t,T) &= \int_t^T \mathrm{d}s \int_0^{x_1} \mathrm{d}x''\ \mathcal{L}_{t,x}K(x,x'',t,s)g_n(x'',x',s,T). \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

One easily obtains from (2.14) the estimate for $n=0,1,2,\dots,$

$$|g_n(x,x',t,T)| \ \le \ \frac{C^{n+1}}{\Gamma((n+1)/2))}\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty^{n+1}(T-t)^{n/2-1/2}G(x-x',2(T-t)) \ , \tag{2.15}$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function and C is a constant depending only on x_1. It follows from (2.14), (2.15) that there are constants C_1,C_2 depending only on x_1 such that for $\max\{0,T-1\}<t<T$, $0<x,x'<x_1$ it holds

$$0 \ \le \ G_D(x,x',t,T) \ \le \ C_1\exp\big[C_2\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty^2(T-t)\big]G(x-x',2(T-t)) \tag{2.16}$$

Similarly we have that

$$\left|\frac{\partial G_D(x,x',t,T)}{\partial x}\right| \;\le\; \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{T-t}}\exp\big[C_2\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty^2(T-t)\big]\; G(x-x',2(T-t))\;, \tag{2.17}$$

where C_1, C_2 depend only on x_1. Estimates on other derivatives of G_D involve $\|\partial b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty$ as well as $\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty$. Following the argument of [15, Lemma 3.4], we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{\partial G_D(x,x',t,T)}{\partial x'}\right| + \sqrt{T-t}\left|\frac{\partial^2 G_D(x,x',t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'}\right| \;&\le\; \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{T-t}}\; G(x-x',2(T-t))\\ &\times\Big\{1+\sqrt{T-t}\Big[\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty + \|\partial b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty\sqrt{T-t}\Big]\exp\big[C_2\|b(\cdot,\cdot)\|_\infty^2(T-t)\big]\Big\}\;,\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where C_1, C_2 depend only on x_1.

The inequality (2.9) evidently follows by differentiating (2.12) with respect to x and using the bounds (2.17), (2.18). To obtain the inequality (2.10) it is sufficient to bound the derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\int_0^{x_1} K(x,x',t,T)w_0(x')\,\mathrm{d}x' \tag{2.19}$$

by a constant. The reason for this is that (2.18) implies that the derivative of the second integral in (2.12) is bounded by a constant, and one also easily sees that the derivative of the higher terms in the perturbation series (2.14) for the first integral in (2.12) are bounded by a constant. To bound the integral (2.19) we observe that the derivative $\partial/\partial x$ can be replaced by $\partial/\partial x'$ in the expansion (2.13). Hence on integration by parts in the integral (2.19) we obtain a uniform bound. □

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that the functions V, W are $\mathcal{C}^2$ on $[0,\infty)$, satisfy $\|W''\|_\infty + \|V''\|_\infty < \infty$ and the conditions of Lemma 2.1.*

Let $w(x,t)$, $x>0, t<T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $w_0(x) = W(x)$, $x>0$. Then for any $x_1>0$ there is a constant C depending only on $x_1, \|\theta(\cdot)\|_\infty$ such that

$$0 \;\le\; \frac{\partial w(x,t)}{\partial x} \;\le\; C\sqrt{W(x)} \quad \text{for } x>x_1/2,\ \max[0,T-1]<t<T\;.$$

Proof. Setting $u(x,t) = \partial w(x,t)/\partial x$, we see from (2.1) that

$$\frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 u(x,t)}{\partial x^2} + b(x,t)\frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial b(x,t)}{\partial x}u(x,t) = 0\;. \tag{2.20}$$

We argue now as in Lemma 2.1. Thus for any $\lambda\in\mathbf{R}$ let $w_\lambda(x,t) = e^{\lambda(T-t)}\sqrt{W(x)}$, $x>0, t<T$. Letting $\mathcal{L}$ denote the partial differential operator of (2.20), then

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda(T-t)}\sqrt{W(x)}\;\mathcal{L}w_\lambda(x,t) \;&=\\ &[-\lambda+\theta(t)W''(x)-V''(x)]\,W(x)\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\left\{W''(x) - \frac{W'(x)^2}{2W(x)} + [\theta(t)W'(x)-V'(x)]W'(x)\right\}\;.\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

It follows from (2.21), in view of (2.7) and the boundedness of the second derivatives of $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$, that there exists $\lambda>0$ depending on $\|\theta(\cdot)\|_\infty$ such that $\mathcal{L}w_\lambda(x,t)<0$ for $x>0, t<T$. We also have that $\mathcal{L}u(x,t) = 0$ for $x>0, t<T$, and from (2.7) there is a constant C_1 such that $0\le u(x,T) = W'(x) \le C_1\sqrt{W(x)}$ for $x>x_1/2$. Also from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 it follows that the constant C_1 can be chosen sufficiently large so that $u(x_1/2,t)\le C_1 w_\lambda(x,t)$ for $\max[0,T-1]<t<T$. We conclude from the maximum principle that $u(x,t)\le C_1 w_\lambda(x,t)$ for $x>x_1/2$, $\max[0,T-1]<t<T$. □

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that the functions $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$ are $\mathcal{C}^2$ on $[0,\infty)$, satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1, and also $\|W''(\cdot)\|_\infty + \|V''(\cdot)\|_\infty<\infty$. For $i=0,1$ let $\theta_i:[0,T]\to\mathbf{R}$ be continuous functions and $w_i(x,t)$, $x>0, t<T$, the corresponding solutions to (2.1), (2.2),(2.4) with $\theta(\cdot)=\theta_i(\cdot)$ and terminal data $W(\cdot)$. Then there is a constant C depending on $\|\theta_0(\cdot)\|_\infty, \|\theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty$ such that*

$$|w_1(x,t)-w_0(x,t)| \;\le\; C\|\theta_1(\cdot)-\theta_0(\cdot)\|_\infty\sqrt{T-t}\;W(x) \quad \text{for } x>0, \tag{2.22}$$

$$\left|\frac{\partial w_1(0,t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial w_0(0,t)}{\partial x}\right| \;\le\; C\|\theta_1(\cdot)-\theta_0(\cdot)\|_\infty \;, \tag{2.23}$$

provided $\max[0,T-1] < t < T$.

Proof. For $0 \le \mu \le 1$ let $w_\mu(x,t),\ x>0, t<T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $\theta(\cdot) = (1-\mu)\theta_0(\cdot) + \mu\theta_1(\cdot) = \theta_\mu(\cdot)$ and terminal data $W(\cdot)$. Then

$$w_1(x,t) - w_0(x,t) \;=\; \int_0^1 \frac{\partial w_\mu(x,t)}{\partial \mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mu \;=\; \int_0^1 v_\mu(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}\mu \;, \tag{2.24}$$

where $v_\mu(x,t),\ x>0, t<T$, is the solution to the PDE

$$\frac{\partial v_\mu(x,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 v_\mu(x,t)}{\partial x^2} + b_\mu(x,t)\frac{\partial v_\mu(x,t)}{\partial x} \;=\; [\theta_0(t)-\theta_1(t)]W'(x)\frac{\partial w_\mu(x,t)}{\partial x} \;, \tag{2.25}$$
$$\text{for } \ 0<x<\infty,\ t<T, \quad \text{and } b_\mu(x,t) \;=\; \theta_\mu(t)W'(x) - V'(x) \;.$$

The function v_μ also satisfies the terminal and boundary conditions

$$v_\mu(x,T) \;=\; 0,\ x\ge 0, \quad v_\mu(0,t)=0,\ t\le T. \tag{2.26}$$

The solution to (2.25), (2.26) can be represented as

$$v_\mu(x,t) \;=\; \int_t^T [\theta_1(s)-\theta_0(s)]h_\mu(x,t;s)\,\mathrm{d}s \;, \tag{2.27}$$

where $w(x,t) = h_\mu(x,t;s)$ is the solution to (2.1), (2.4) for $t<s, x>0$ with $\theta(\cdot) = \theta_\mu(\cdot)$ and terminal and boundary conditions given by

$$h_\mu(x,s;s) = W'(x)\frac{\partial w_\mu(x,s)}{\partial x}, \quad h_\mu(0,t;s)=0,\ t<s.$$

Observe from (2.7), Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 that there is a constant C depending on $\|\theta_0(\cdot)\|_\infty, \|\theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty$ such that

$$|h_\mu(x,s;s)| \;\le\; \frac{CW(x)}{\sqrt{T-s}} \;, \quad \text{for } x>0,\ \max[0,T-1]<s<T \;. \tag{2.28}$$

Hence from (2.28) and Lemma 2.1 we have that

$$|h_\mu(x,t;s)| \;\le\; \frac{CW(x)}{\sqrt{T-s}} \;, \quad \text{for } x>0,\ \max[0,T-1]<t<s<T \;, \tag{2.29}$$

for some constant C depending on $\|\theta_0(\cdot)\|_\infty, \|\theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty$. The inequality (2.22) follows now from (2.24), (2.27), (2.29). To prove (2.23) we observe from (2.29) and Lemma 2.2 that

$$\left|\frac{\partial h_\mu(0,t;s)}{\partial x}\right| \;\le\; \frac{C}{\sqrt{(s-t)(T-s)}} \;, \quad \text{for } \max[0,T-1]<t<s<T, \tag{2.30}$$

where again C depends on $\|\theta_0(\cdot)\|_\infty, \|\theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty$. The inequality (2.23) follows now from (2.24), (2.27), (2.30). □

Proof of Proposition 2.1. For $T>0$ and $\delta>0$ we define the metric space

$$X_{T,\delta} = \Big\{\theta \in \mathcal{C}([0,T],\mathbf{R}) \;:\; \theta(0)=\theta_0 \;,\; \theta_0-\delta \le \theta(t) \le \rho \;\; \forall t\in[0,T]\Big\} \;,$$

together with the distance $d_\infty(\theta_1,\theta_2) = \|\theta_1-\theta_2\|_\infty$. Given $\theta(\cdot)\in X_{T,\delta}$, we define the function

$$\mathcal{B}\theta : [0,T] \to \mathbf{R} \qquad \text{by} \qquad \mathcal{B}\theta(t) + \int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; \rho \;, \tag{2.31}$$

where $c(\cdot,t),\ 0\le t\le T$, is the solution to (1.1), (1.5) with the given initial data satisfying (1.7) and $\theta(\cdot)\in X_{T,\delta}$.

We show that $\mathcal{B}\theta(\cdot)\in X_{T,\delta}$ provided T is sufficiently small. By the non-negativity of the function $c(\cdot,\cdot)$ we have from (2.31) that $\mathcal{B}\theta(\cdot)\le\rho$. From (2.6) we have that

$$\mathcal{B}\theta(T)-\theta_0 \;=\; \int_0^\infty [W(x)-w(x,0)]c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^T dt\,\frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)] \;, \tag{2.32}$$

where $w(\cdot,t)$ is the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with terminal data $w_0(\cdot)=W(\cdot)$. From Lemma 2.1 we have that

$$\int_0^\infty [W(x)-w(x,0)]c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x \;\geq\; -C(T,\theta_0,\delta)\int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; C(T,\theta_0,\delta)[\theta_0-\rho]\ ,$$

for some constant $C(T,\theta_0,\delta)$ which satisfies $\lim_{T\to 0} C(T,\theta_0,\delta)=0$. We have also from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 that

$$0 \;\leq\; \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\ \frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)] \;\leq\; C(\theta_0,\delta)\ \sqrt{T}\ ,\quad 0<T\leq 1, \tag{2.33}$$

for some constant $C(\theta_0,\delta)$. It follows from (2.32)–(2.33) that there exists a positive constant $\gamma(\theta_0,\delta)<1$ such that $\mathcal{B}\theta(T)\geq\theta_0-\delta$ if $T\leq\gamma(\theta_0,\delta)$. A similar argument also implies that $\mathcal{B}\theta(t)\geq\theta_0-\delta$ for $0\leq t\leq T$. We have therefore shown that $\mathcal{B}\theta(\cdot)\in X_{T,\delta}$ provided $T\leq\gamma(\theta_0,\delta)$.

Next we show that T can be taken sufficiently small, depending only on θ_0,δ, so that the mapping $\mathcal{B}: X_{T,\delta}\to X_{T,\delta}$ is a contraction with respect to d_∞. For $i=1,2$ let $\theta_i(\cdot)\in X_{T,\delta}$ and $w_i(x,t),\ x>0, t<T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $\theta(\cdot)=\theta_i(\cdot)$ and terminal data $w_i(\cdot,T)=W(\cdot)$. From (2.32) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}\theta_1(T)-\mathcal{B}\theta_2(T) = &\int_0^\infty (w_2(x,0)-w_1(x,0))\ c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &+\int_0^T\left(\frac{\partial w_2(0,t)}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial w_1(0,t)}{\partial x}\right)e^{-V(0)+\theta_2(t)W(0)}\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &+\int_0^T\frac{\partial w_1(0,t)}{\partial x}\left(e^{-V(0)+\theta_2(t)W(0)}-e^{-V(0)+\theta_1(t)W(0)}\right)\mathrm{d}t\ .\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

We can bound the first two integrals on the RHS of (2.34) by using Lemma 2.4. Thus from (2.22) we have that

$$\left|\int_0^\infty [w_2(x,0)-w_1(x,0)]c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \;\leq\; C(\theta_0,\delta)\sqrt{T}\ \|\theta_2(\cdot)-\theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty\ .$$

From (2.23) we have that

$$\left|\int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\ \left[\frac{\partial w_2(0,t)}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial w_1(0,t)}{\partial x}\right]\exp[-V(0)+\theta_2(t)W(0)]\right| \;\leq\; C(\theta_0,\delta)T\ \ \|\theta_2(\cdot)\ -\ \theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty\ .$$

The third integral on the RHS of (2.34) can be bounded just as in (2.33), yielding also a bound $C(\theta_0,\delta)\sqrt{T}\ \|\theta_2(\cdot)-\theta_1(\cdot)\|_\infty$.

Since the argument of the previous paragraph also applies for $\mathcal{B}\theta_1(t)-\mathcal{B}\theta_2(t),\ 0<t<T$, we conclude that

$$\|\mathcal{B}\theta_1(\cdot)-\mathcal{B}\theta_2(\cdot)\|_\infty \;\leq\; C(\theta_0,\delta)\sqrt{T}\ \|\theta_1(\cdot)-\theta_2(\cdot)\|_\infty$$

provided $T\leq C(\theta_0,\delta)$. Hence by taking T small enough, depending only on θ_0,δ, the mapping $\mathcal{B}$ is a contraction on $X_{T,\delta}$. It follows that there is a unique solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) in the interval $0\leq t\leq T$. □

2.3. A priori estimates for global existence and proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that the functions $V(\cdot),W(\cdot)$ are $\mathcal{C}^2$ on $[0,\infty)$, satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1 and in addition the inequality*

$$W''(x) \;\leq\; C_0W'(x)^2\ ,\quad \text{for } x\geq x_0\ , \tag{2.35}$$

where C_0,x_0 can be taken to be the same as in (2.7). Let $\theta:[0,T]\to\mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function and $w(x,t),\ x>0,t<T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $w_0(x)=W(x),\ x>0$. Then there exists $C_\infty>0,\ \theta_\infty<0$, independent of T, such that $w(x,0)\leq C_\infty W(x)$ for $x\geq 0$, provided $\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\theta(t)\leq\theta_\infty$.

Proof. We use the representation of the solution to (2.1), (2.2) as an expectation value. Thus if $X(\cdot)$ is the solution to the SDE

$$dX(t) \;=\; b(X(t),t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{d}B(t)\ , \tag{2.36}$$

then

$$w(x,0) \;=\; \mathbb{E}\Big[w_0(X(T));\ \inf_{0\le s\le T} X(s) > 0 \ \Big|\ X(0)=x\ \Big]\ . \tag{2.37}$$

It follows from (2.36) and the Itô calculus that

$$dW(X(t)) \;=\; [W'(X(t))b(X(t),t) + W''(X(t))]\,\mathrm{d}t + W'(X(t))\sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{d}B(t)\ . \tag{2.38}$$

Let $\psi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ convex decreasing function with the properties

$$\psi(0)=1,\quad \psi(x)=0 \text{ for } x\ge x_0+1,\quad \psi'(x)<0 \text{ for } 0\le x<x_0+1.$$

Then there exists $\delta>0$ such that the function $\Phi(x)=W(x)-\delta\psi(x)$ has the property $\Phi(x)\ge W(x)/2,\ x\ge 0$. Setting $Y(t)=\Phi(X(t))$, then (2.36) yields an evolution equation

$$dY(t) \;=\; \mu(Y(t),t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(Y(t))\,\mathrm{d}B(t)\ , \tag{2.39}$$

with

$$\mu(y,t) = \Phi'(y)b(y,t) + \Phi''(y) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma(y) = \sqrt{2}\,\Phi'(y).$$

Then we see from (2.37) that the solution to (2.1), (2.2) with $w_0(\cdot)=W(\cdot)$ satisfies the inequality

$$w(x,0) \;\le\; 2\,\mathbb{E}\Big[Y(T),\ \inf_{0\le s\le T} Y(s) > \Phi(0) \ \Big|\ Y(0)=\Phi(x)\ \Big] \qquad \text{for } x>0. \tag{2.40}$$

With $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ given by (2.4), it follows from (2.7), (2.35), (2.38), (2.39) that for θ_∞ sufficiently negative the functions $\mu(\cdot,\cdot),\ \sigma(\cdot)$ in (2.39) satisfy the inequalities

$$\mu(y,t) \;\le\; -\sigma(y)^2\ ,\quad \sigma(y) \;\le\; \sqrt{2C_0 y} \quad \text{for } y\ge W(x_0+1),\ 0\le t\le T. \tag{2.41}$$

Let $\phi : [\Phi(0),\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ be given by

$$\phi(y) \;=\; K\big(\exp[-\xi\Phi(0)] - e^{-\xi y}\big) + \exp[Ay] - \exp[A\Phi(0)]\ , \tag{2.42}$$

where $K,\xi,A>0$. Then

$$\mu(y,t)\frac{\mathrm{d}\phi(y)}{\mathrm{d}y} + \frac{\sigma(y)^2}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\phi(y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} \;= \tag{2.43}$$
$$\mu(y,t)\big(K\xi e^{-\xi y} + A\exp[Ay]\big) + \frac{\sigma(y)^2}{2}\big(-K\xi^2 e^{-\xi y} + A^2\exp[Ay]\big)\ .$$

In view of (2.41), we see that if $A<2$ the RHS of (2.43) is negative for all $y\ge W(x_0+1), K,\xi\ge 0$. Since the function $\psi(\cdot)$ is convex and decreasing, it follows from (2.35) that $\Phi''(x)\le C_0W'(x)\Phi'(x)$ if $x\ge x_0$. We conclude that $\mu(y,t)\le 0$ for $\Phi(x_0)\le y\le W(x_0+1)$ provided θ_∞ is sufficiently negative. For any $\xi>1$ let $K(\xi)$ be such that $K(\xi)\xi\exp[-\xi y]\ge 2A\exp[Ay]$ for $y=W(x_0+1)$. Then if $K\ge K(\xi)$ the RHS of (2.43) is negative for $\Phi(x_0)\le y\le W(x_0+1)$. We can also see that there are constants $C_1,c_1>0$ such that $\mu(y,t)\le C_1$ and $\sigma(y)\ge c_1$ for $\Phi(0)\le y\le\Phi(x_0)$. Hence there exists $\xi>1$ such that the RHS of (2.43) is negative for all $\Phi(0)\le y\le\Phi(x_0)$ provided $K\ge K(\xi)$.

It follows from the argument of the previous paragraph that for any $L>W(x_0+1)$ there exists positive K,ξ,A with $\xi>1, A<2$ such that the RHS of (2.43) is negative for all $\Phi(0)\le y\le L$. We can use the corresponding function $\phi(\cdot)$ of (2.42) to obtain a bound on the expectation in (2.40). For $L>W(x_0+1)$ and $\Phi(0)<y<L$ let τ be the first exit time from the interval $[\Phi(0),L]$ for the diffusion $Y(t),\ t\ge 0$. We have from the maximum principle that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y(\tau)=L \mid Y(0)=y) \;\le\; \frac{\phi(y)}{\phi(L)}\ . \tag{2.44}$$

Let A_ℓ be the event $A_\ell = \{\ell + \Phi(0) \le \sup_{0\le s\le T} Y(s) \le \ell + 1 + \Phi(0)\}$. Then, for any integer ℓ_0 which satisfies $\ell_0 + \Phi(0) > \max[y, W(x_0+1)]$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[Y(T);\ \inf_{0\le s\le T} Y(s) > \Phi(0) \ \Big|\ Y(0) = y\Big] \\
&\qquad \le \ell_0 + \Phi(0) + \mathbb{E}\Big[Y(T);\ \bigcup\nolimits_{\ell\ge\ell_0} A_\ell;\ \inf_{0\le s\le T} Y(s) > \Phi(0) \ \Big|\ Y(0) = y\Big] \\
&\qquad \le \ell_0 + \Phi(0) + \phi(y) \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\infty} \frac{\ell + 1 + \Phi(0)}{\phi(\ell + \Phi(0))}\ , \qquad (2.45)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last bound follows from (2.44). Since the sum in (2.45) is bounded, we conclude that for any $x_1 > 0$ there is a constant $C(x_1)$, independent of T such that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} w(x_1, t) \ \le\ C(x_1)\ . \qquad (2.46)$$

To complete the proof of the lemma we now argue as in Lemma 2.1. Thus we see from (2.7), (2.8), (2.35) that θ_∞ can be chosen sufficiently negative so that $\mathcal{L}w_\lambda(x,t) \le 0$ for $x \ge x_0,\ \lambda \ge 0$. It follows then from (2.46) and the maximum principle that $w(x,0) \le [C(x_0)/W(x_0) + 1]W(x)$ for $x \ge x_0$. □

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that the functions $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$ are $\mathcal{C}^2$ on $[0,\infty)$, satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1, and in addition the inequality*

$$W'(x)^2 \ \ge\ c_0, \quad \text{for } x \ge x_0, \qquad (2.47)$$

where c_0 is a positive constant. Let $\theta : [0,T] \to \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function and $w(x,t),\ x > 0, t < T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $w_0(x) = W(x),\ x > 0$. Then there exists $\theta_\infty < 0$ and $C_\infty, \delta_\infty > 0$, independent of T, such that

$$0 \ \le\ \frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x} \ \le C_\infty \max\Big\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}, 1\Big\} e^{-\delta_\infty (T-t)} \quad \text{for } 0 \le t \le T. \qquad (2.48)$$

provided $\sup_{0\le t\le T} \theta(t) \le \theta_\infty$.

Proof. From (2.47) there exists $\theta_\infty < 0$ such that the drift $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ of (2.4) satisfies the inequality $b(x,t) \le -\theta_\infty\sqrt{c_0}/2,\ x \ge x_0, 0 \le t \le T$. From (2.7) we have that

$$\frac{W'(x)}{\sqrt{W(x)}} \ \le C_0 \quad \text{for } x \ge x_0\ ,$$

whence we conclude that $W(x) \le C_1[1+x^2],\ x \ge 0$, for some constant C_1. Let $v(x,t),\ x \ge 0, t < T$ be the solution to the PDE

$$\frac{\partial v(x,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 v(x,t)}{\partial x^2} + b(x)\frac{\partial v(x,t)}{\partial x} \ =\ 0, \quad x > 0, t < T, \qquad (2.49)$$

with terminal and boundary conditions given by

$$v(x,T) \ =\ C_1[1+x^2],\ x > 0, \quad v(0,t) = 0,\ t < T.$$

Then one has that $w(x,t) \le v(x,t)$ for $(x,t) \in \mathbf{R}^+ \times (0,T)$ provided that $\sup_{0\le t\le T} b(x,t) \le b(x),\ x \ge 0$.

For any $a > 0$ let $\Phi(\cdot)$ be the function $\Phi(x) = 1 - e^{-ax} + ae^{-ax_0}x,\ x \ge 0$. Making the change of variable $y = \Phi(x),\ v(x,t) = \tilde{v}(y,t)$ in (2.49) we obtain the PDE

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \tilde{v}(y,t)}{\partial t} + \tilde{a}(y)\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{v}(y,t)}{\partial y^2} + \tilde{b}(y)\frac{\partial \tilde{v}(y,t)}{\partial y} \ =\ 0, \quad y > 0, t < T, \qquad (2.50)\\
&\qquad \tilde{a}(y) \ =\ \Phi'(x)^2\ , \quad \tilde{b}(y) \ =\ \Phi'(x)b(x) + \Phi''(x)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $a > 0$ can be chosen sufficiently large, depending on θ_∞, so that

$$\tilde{b}(y) \ \le\ -ae^{-ax_0}\theta_\infty\sqrt{c_0}/2\ , \quad \tilde{a}(y) \ \le 4a^2 \quad \text{for } y \ge 0. \qquad (2.51)$$

Let $Y(\cdot)$ be the solution to the SDE

$$dY(s) \;=\; \tilde{b}(Y(s))\,\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2\tilde{a}(Y(s))}\,\mathrm{d}B(s)\ , \tag{2.52}$$

and for $y > 0$ let $\tau_{y,t}$ be the first exit time from $[0,\infty)$ for the solution $Y(s),\ s \geq t$, to (2.52) with $Y(t) = y$. Then

$$\tilde{v}(y,t) \;=\; \mathbb{E}[\ \tilde{v}(Y(T),T)H(\tau_{y,t} - T) \mid Y(t) = y\ ]\ , \tag{2.53}$$

where $H : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ is the Heaviside function $H(s) = 0, s < 0,\ H(s) = 1, s > 0$. We conclude from (2.53) and the Schwarz inequality that

$$\tilde{v}(y,t) \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\big[\ \tilde{v}(Y(T),T)^2 \mid Y(t) = y\ \big]^{1/2}\mathbb{P}(\tau_{y,t} > T)^{1/2}\ . \tag{2.54}$$

We can estimate the first expectation on the RHS of (2.53) by following the argument of Lemma 2.5 and using (2.51). Thus there is a constant $C(y)$, independent of T, such that

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \mathbb{E}\big[\ \tilde{v}(Y(T),T)^2 \mid Y(t) = y\ \big] \;\leq\; C(y)\ .$$

To estimate $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{y,t} > T)$ we use the fact that the function $\phi(y) \;=\; \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\delta\tau_{y,0}\}\ ],\ y > 0$, is the solution to the boundary value problem

$$\delta\phi(y) + \tilde{b}(y)\frac{\mathrm{d}\phi(y)}{\mathrm{d}y} + \tilde{a}(y)\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\phi(y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} \;=\; 0, \quad \phi(0) = 1. \tag{2.55}$$

From (2.51) and the maximum principle we see that there exists $\delta, \eta > 0$ such that $\phi(y) \leq e^{\eta y},\ y > 0$. We conclude that $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{y,t} > T) \leq \exp[-\delta(T-t) + \eta y]$. Now (2.54) yields a bound on the function $\tilde{v}$, and hence on w. We see that for any $x_1 > 0$ there is a constant $C(x_1)$, independent of T such that

$$w(x,t) \;\leq\; C(x_1)e^{-\delta(T-t)/2} \quad \text{if } 0 < x < x_1,\ 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{2.56}$$

To complete the proof of (2.48) we argue as in Lemma 2.2. Thus there is a constant C depending only on θ_∞ such that

$$\frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x} \;\leq C\max\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}, 1\right\}\left(\sup_{0<x<1} w(x,t+1) + \sup_{t\leq s\leq t+1} w(1,s)\right) \tag{2.57}$$

The inequality (2.48) follows from (2.56), (2.57) on taking $\delta_\infty = \delta/2$. □

Remark 2.1. *The exponential bound (2.48) is sufficient for our purposes. However one could obtain more accurate asymptotics as $T \to \infty$ by using the theory of large deviations [20, 37]. In [16] precise asymptotics for $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{y,0} > T)$ have been obtained for drifts $\tilde{b}(y) = -\beta/y^p$ with $\beta > 0, 0 < p < 1$.*

The above Lemmas ensure that the local in time solution of Proposition 2.1 can be prolonged to all times.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For any $T > 0$, let $c(\cdot,t), \theta(t),\ 0 \leq t \leq T$, be the solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) constructed in Proposition 2.1. We have then from (1.4), (2.6) that

$$\rho - \theta(T) \;=\; \int_0^\infty w(x,0)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\ \frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0) + \theta(t)W(0)]\ , \tag{2.58}$$

where w is the solution to (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $w_0(\cdot) \equiv W(\cdot)$. Assume now that $\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\theta(t) \leq \theta_\infty$, where θ_∞ is as in the statements of Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.6. Then we conclude from Lemmas 2.2, 2.5, 2.6 and (2.58) that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho - \theta(T) \;\leq\; & C_\infty[\rho - \theta(0)] + \\ & \exp[-V(0) + \theta_\infty W(0)]\left\{C_\infty\int_0^{\max[0,T-1]} e^{-\delta_\infty(T-t)}\,\mathrm{d}t + C\int_{\max[0,T-1]}^T \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\sqrt{T-t}}\right\}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{2.59}$$

for some constants C_∞, C independent of $T, c(\cdot,\cdot)$. The inequality (2.59) implies a lower bound on $\theta(T)$ of the form

$$\theta(T) \;\geq C_\infty\theta(0) + C'_\infty, \quad C_\infty, C'_\infty \ \text{ independent of } T, c(\cdot,\cdot)\ . \tag{2.60}$$

Since (2.60) yields a lower bound on $\theta(\cdot)$ uniform for all time, we conclude from the local existence result that the solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) can be extended for all time. □

3. Regularity Theory

3.1. **Strategy and results.** In this section we shall prove various regularity results for the solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) assuming that $a(\cdot) \equiv 1$ and the initial data satisfies (1.7). First we shall just be concerned with the solution to the PDE (1.1) with general drift $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfying (2.3). In §2 we defined the solution to the initial value problem for (1.1) with boundary data (1.5) and integrable initial data by (2.6) (see Definition 2.1). This uniquely determines the function $c(\cdot,T)$ for $T>0$ as a positive measure on $[0,\infty)$, but yields no regularity properties. The first step is to establish some interior regularity for $c(\cdot,\cdot)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that for some $T_0>0$ the function $\theta:[0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ is continuous and that $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfies (2.3) with $T=T_0$. If the initial data $c(x,0)$, $x>0$, for (1.1), (1.5) is integrable, then the function $c:[0,\infty)\times(0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ determined by (2.6) is continuous and satisfies (1.5). In addition, the function $c(\cdot,T)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in $(0,\infty)$ for all $0<T\le T_0$.*

We suppose now that the drift for (1.1) with $a(\cdot)\equiv 1$ is given by (2.4), and that the initial data for (1.1), (1.5) satisfies (1.7). Provided $\theta(\cdot)$ is continuous and V,W satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1 we may define a function $\Theta(T)$, $T\ge 0$, in terms of the solution to (1.1), (1.5) by

$$\Theta(T)+\int_0^\infty W(x)\,c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; \rho\;. \tag{3.1}$$

Our goal will be to show that the function $\Theta(\cdot)$ is more regular by roughly a half derivative than the function $\theta(\cdot)$ which enters the boundary condition (1.5).

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that for some $T_0>0$ the function $\theta:[0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ is continuous, V,W satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1, and $b(x,t)=\theta(t)W'(x)-V'(x)$ satisfies (2.3) with $T=T_0$. If the initial data $c(x,0)$, $x>0$, for (1.1), (1.5) satisfies (1.7) then for any positive α,β with $\alpha<1/2$, $\beta<T_0$, there is a constant C depending on α,β such that*

$$|\Theta(T)-\Theta(T')| \;\le\; C|T-T'|^\alpha \quad \text{for } \beta\le T,T'\le T_0\;. \tag{3.2}$$

This basic regularity estimate follows from a comparison principle. To obtain more detailed properties, we take an alternative approach to the proof of Lemma 3.2 by formally differentiating (3.1) with respect to T. Then, using (1.1) and twice formally integrating by parts with respect to x, we obtain the identity

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\Theta(T)}{\mathrm{d}T} \;=\; W(0)\frac{\partial c(0,T)}{\partial x} - [W(0)b(0,T)+W'(0)]\,c(0,T)\\ -\int_0^\infty [W'(x)b(x,T)+W''(x)]\,c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x\;.\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

From (2.7) we see that the LHS of (3.3) minus the first term on the RHS is bounded. We therefore expect from Lemma 3.2 that the function $T\to\partial c(0,T)/\partial x$ has roughly the same regularity as the derivative of a Hölder continuous function of order 1/2. To see this we consider for any $L>0$ the perturbation expansion (2.14) for the Dirichlet Green's function G_D on the interval $0<x<L$. We define $c_{0,L}(x,T)$, $c_{1,L}(x,T)$, $0<x<L, T>0$ by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{0,L}(x,T) \;&=\; \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\;\frac{\partial K_L(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\;,\\ c_{1,L}(x,T) \;&=\; \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\;\frac{\partial v_{0,L}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\;,\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where K_L is given by (2.13) and $v_{0,L}$ by (2.14).

The next Lemma, will show that the functions $c_{0,L}$ and $c_{1,L}$ after passing to the limit $L\to\infty$ yield the leading order contribution in terms of regularity of a solution.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $\theta(\cdot)$, $b(\cdot,\cdot)$, $c(\cdot,0)$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.1 and let $c(x,T)$, $x>0$, $0<T\le T_0$, be the solution of (1.1), (1.5) determined by (2.6). Then the function $(x,T)\to[c(x,T)-c_{0,\infty}(x,T)-c_{1,\infty}(x,T)]$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0\le x<\infty$, $0<T\le T_0$. Moreover, it holds $\lim_{x\to 0}c_{0,\infty}(x,T)=\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]$, $0<T\le T_0$ and $\lim_{x\to 0}c_{1,\infty}(x,T)=0$, $0<T\le T_0$.*

Next we prove a regularity result for $c_{1,\infty}(x,T)$ as $x\to 0$, which is consistent with Lemma 3.2 and the formula (3.3).

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that for some $T_0>0$ the function $\theta:[0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ is continuous and that $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfies (2.3) with $T=T_0$. Then for any positive α,β with $\alpha<1$, $\beta<T_0$, there is a constant C depending on α,β such that*

$$\sup_{0<x<1}\left|\int_{T'}^{T}\frac{\partial c_{1,\infty}(x,t)}{\partial x}\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \;\le\; C|T-T'|^{\alpha}\quad\text{for } \beta\le T,T'\le T_0\ . \tag{3.5}$$

If $s\to b(0,s)$ is locally Hölder continuous in the interval $0<s\le T_0$, then the function $(x,T)\to c_{1,\infty}(x,T)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0\le x<\infty$, $0<T\le T_0$.

The proof of regularity for $c_{0,\infty}(x,T)$ as $x\to 0$, consistent with Lemma 3.2 and the formula (3.3), is much simpler than for $c_{1,\infty}(x,T)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume that for some $T_0>0$ the function $\theta:[0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ is continuous, and locally Hölder continuous on the interval $0<T\le T_0$ with order γ, $0\le\gamma<1/2$. Then for any positive $\beta\le T_0$ there is a constant C depending on β,γ such that*

$$\sup_{0<x<1}\left|\int_{T'}^{T}\frac{\partial c_{0,\infty}(x,t)}{\partial x}\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \;\le\; C|T-T'|^{\alpha}\quad\text{for } \beta\le T,T'\le T_0\ , \tag{3.6}$$

where $\alpha=\gamma+1/2$. If $T\to\theta(T)$ is locally Hölder continuous in the interval $0<T\le T_0$ of order $\gamma>1/2$, then the function $(x,T)\to c_{0,\infty}(x,T)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0\le x<\infty$, $0<T\le T_0$.

We use Lemmas 3.3-3.5 to obtain a sharper version of Lemma 3.2.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 3.2 and in addition that the function $\theta:[0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ is locally Hölder continuous on the interval $0<T\le T_0$ with order γ, $0\le\gamma<1/2$. Then the inequality (3.2) holds with $\alpha=\gamma+1/2$. If $\theta(\cdot)$ is locally Hölder continuous in the interval $0<T\le T_0$ of order $\gamma>1/2$, then the function $\Theta(T)$, $0<T<T_0$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and the identity (3.3) holds.*

Proof. Let $\phi:[0,\infty)\to\mathbf{R}^+$ be a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function which has the property that $\phi(x)=1$, $0\le x\le 1$, and $\phi(x)=0$, $x\ge 2$. For $0<\varepsilon\le 1$ and $L\ge 1$ we define the function $\Theta_{\varepsilon,L}(T)$, $0<T\le T_0$ by

$$\Theta_{\varepsilon,L}(T)+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}W(x)\phi(x/L)\,c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; \rho\ .$$

Then $\Theta_{\varepsilon,L}(T)$, $0<T<T_0$, is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\Theta_{\varepsilon,L}(T)}{\mathrm{d}T} \;&=\; W(\varepsilon)\frac{\partial c(\varepsilon,T)}{\partial x}-[W(\varepsilon)b(\varepsilon,T)+W'(\varepsilon)]\,c(\varepsilon,T)\\ &\quad-\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\left[W'(x)\phi(x/L)+L^{-1}W(x)\phi'(x/L)\right]b(x,T)c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad-\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}\left[W''(x)\phi(x/L)+2L^{-1}W'(x)\phi'(x/L)+L^{-2}W(x)\phi''(x/L)\right]c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

To establish (3.7) we first assume that the drift $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ has sufficient regularity that $c(x,T)$, $x>0$, $0<T<T_0$ is a classical solution to (1.1), (1.4). Then (3.7) follows from integration by parts. The identity continues to hold for $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ just satisfying (2.3) by an approximation argument. Next we define $\Theta_\varepsilon(T)$ by

$$\Theta_{\varepsilon}(T)+\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty}W(x)\,c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x \;=\; \rho\ . \tag{3.8}$$

so $\Theta_\varepsilon(T) = \lim_{L\to\infty} \Theta_{\varepsilon,L}(T)$. It follows from (2.3) that $|L^{-1}W'(x)\phi'(x/L)| \le C,\ x \ge 0,\ L \ge 1$, for some constant C. Hence on taking $L \to \infty$ in (3.7) we conclude that $\Theta_\varepsilon(T),\ 0 < T < T_0$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and satisfies the identity

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\Theta_\varepsilon(T)}{\mathrm{d}T} = W(\varepsilon)\frac{\partial c(\varepsilon,T)}{\partial x} - [W(\varepsilon)b(0,T) + W'(\varepsilon)]\, c(\varepsilon,T) - \int_\varepsilon^\infty [W'(x)b(x,T) + W''(x)]\, c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x\ . \tag{3.9}$$

To conclude the proof we observe from (3.1), (3.8) that $\Theta(T) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\Theta_\varepsilon(T),\ 0 < T < T_0$. The result then follows from (3.9) and Lemmas 3.3-3.5. □

The smoothness result of Theorem 1.1 follows now by iteratively applying the improvement of the Hölder exponent of Proposition 3.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.1 hold, and let $c(x,t),\ x \ge 0,\ 0 < t < T_0$ be the corresponding local in time solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4). Then $c(x,t)$ and $\partial c(x,t)/\partial x$ are continuous in the region $x \ge 0,\ 0 < t < T_0$, and the function $\theta(t),\ 0 < t < T_0$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$. Furthermore the identity (3.3) with $\Theta(\cdot) = \theta(\cdot)$ holds for $0 < t < T_0$.*

Proof. Proposition 2.1 shows that the function $\theta(\cdot)$ is continuous in the interval $[0,T_0]$. Since $\Theta(\cdot) = \theta(\cdot)$ we can conclude from Lemma 3.2 that $\theta(\cdot)$ is locally Hölder continuous of order γ for any $\gamma < 1/2$. Now Proposition 3.1 implies that $\theta(\cdot)$ is locally Hölder continuous of order γ for any $\gamma < 1$. Applying Proposition 3.1 again we conclude that $\theta(\cdot)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$. The regularity of the function $c(\cdot,\cdot)$ follows from Lemma 3.1 and Lemmas 3.3-3.5. □

We close this section with two more regularity properties. The first one is a parabolic regularization property of the solution, which shows that starting from $c(\cdot,0)$ satisfying (1.7), the solution will be bounded for any positive time and is in addition equicontinuous.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)],\ 0 < t \le T_0$, be the solution of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial data satisfying (1.7) constructed in Proposition 2.1. Then for any t_0 satisfying $0 < t_0 < T_0$, there exists $N > 0$ depending only on t_0, T_0 and $\|\theta(\cdot)\|_\infty$ such that*

$$\sup c(\cdot,t) \le N \qquad \text{for} \qquad t_0 \le t \le T_0\ .$$

In addition, for any $L > 0$ the family of functions $c(\cdot,t),\ t_0 \le t \le T_0$, is equicontinuous on the interval $[0,L]$.

The second result is a tightness property for the solution on time intervals, where θ is negative.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that the functions $V(\cdot), W(\cdot)$ are $\mathcal{C}^2$ on $[0,\infty)$, satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.1 and in addition (1.26) of Assumption 1.2. Let $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)],\ t > 0$, be the solution of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial data satisfying (1.7) constructed in Theorem 2.1 and $\Theta_\infty \le \theta(t) \le \theta_\infty$ for all $t > 0$ and some $\Theta_\infty \le \theta_\infty < 0$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $M(\delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{M(\delta)}^\infty W(x)c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \ < \ \delta \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0\ . \tag{3.10}$$

3.2. Proof of basic regularity Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For $L \ge 1,\ 0 < T \le T_0$, let $w_L(x,t),\ 0 \le x \le L,\ t \le T$, be the solution to (2.1) on the interval $0 < x < L, t < T$, with terminal and boundary conditions given by (2.11) where $x_1 = L$. We define the function $c_L(x,T),\ 0 < x < L,\ 0 < T \le T_0$, similarly to (2.6) by

$$\int_0^L w_0(x)c_L(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_0^L w_L(x,0)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^T \frac{\partial w_L(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ . \tag{3.11}$$

Observe that if w_0 is a continuous function of compact support then the RHS of (3.11) converges to the RHS of (2.6) as $L \to \infty$. In Lemma 2.2 we constructed the Green's function $G_{D,L}$ for the solution to the terminal-boundary value problem for w_L. It follows then from (3.11) that

(3.12)
$$c_L(x,T) \;=\; \int_0^L G_{D,L}(x',x,0,T)c(x',0)\,\mathrm{d}x' + \int_0^T \frac{\partial G_{D,L}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ .$$

From (3.12) and the Green's function estimates in [15, Lemma 3.4] we see that the function c_L with domain $(0,L)\times(0,T_0]$ extends to a continuous function $c_L : [0,L]\times(0,T_0] \to \mathbf{R}$ which satisfies the boundary conditions

$$c_L(0,T) \;=\; \exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\ , \quad c_L(L,T) \;=\; 0, \quad 0<T\le T_0\ . \tag{3.13}$$

We wish to show that the function $c_L(\cdot,\cdot)$ given by (3.12) converges as $L\to\infty$ to a continuous function, whence it will follow that the function $c(\cdot,\cdot)$ defined by (2.6) is continuous. To do this we observe that for any $0<L'<L$ then

(3.14)
$$\begin{aligned} c_L(x,T) \;=\; &\int_0^{L'} G_{D,L'}(x',x,0,T)c(x',0)\,\mathrm{d}x' + \int_0^T \frac{\partial G_{D,L'}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &- \int_0^T \frac{\partial G_{D,L'}(L',x,T',T)}{\partial x'}c_L(L',T')\,\mathrm{d}T'\ , \quad 0<x<L',\ 0<T\le T_0\ . \end{aligned}$$

The identity (3.14) can easily be established for a drift $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ with sufficient regularity that $c_L(x,T)$ is a classical solution to (1.1), (3.13) in the interval $0<x<L, 0<T<T_0$. This requires greater regularity on $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ than (2.3). From the Green's function estimates in [15, Lemma 3.4] we can then infer by a limiting argument that (3.14) continues to hold just under the assumption (2.3). To show that $c_L(x,T)$ converges as $L\to\infty$, we consider a continuous function $w_1 : (0,\infty)\to\mathbf{R}$ of compact support with integral equal to 1. We then multiply (3.14) by $w_1(L')$ and integrate with respect to L'. After integration, the contribution of the first two integrals on the RHS of (3.14) to $c_L(x,T)$ continue to be independent of L.

To estimate the contribution of the third integral on the RHS of (3.14) we use (3.11) with T' in place of T and w_0 given by the formula

$$w_0(L') \;=\; \frac{\partial G_{D,L'}(L',x,T',T)}{\partial x'}w_1(L')\ . \tag{3.15}$$

Hence the integral with respect to L' of $w_1(L')$ times the third integral on the RHS of (3.14) can be written in terms of an integral in which $c_L(L',T')$ is replaced by $c(L',0)$, plus a boundary term corresponding to the second integral on the RHS of (3.11). Assuming that $x>0$ in (3.15) lies to the left of the support of w_1, we see that the function w_0 in (3.15) is continuous and uniformly bounded for $0<T'<T$. Hence we can control the limit as $L\to\infty$ of the integral involving $c(L',0)$, and we can similarly control the boundary term. We conclude that $\lim_{L\to\infty} c_L(x,T) = c(x,T)$, and the limit is uniform in any rectangle $\{0\le x\le x_0,\ T_1\le T\le T_0\}$ with $x_0,T_1>0$. It follows that the function $c:[0,\infty)\times(0,T_0]\to\mathbf{R}$ determined by (2.6) is continuous and satisfies (1.5). Upon differentiating (3.14) with respect to x, we similarly see from the Green's function estimates in [15, Lemma 3.4] that $\partial c_L(x,T)/\partial x$ also converges uniformly as $L\to\infty$ in rectangles $\{x_1\le x\le x_0,\ T_1\le T\le T_0\}$ with $x_1,T_1>0$. Hence $\partial c(x,T)/\partial x$ exists and is continuous for $x>0,\ 0<T\le T_0$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Since $\beta>0$ we may assume from Lemma 3.1 that the initial data $c(\cdot,0)$ is continuous on $[0,\infty)$. Hence it will be sufficient for us prove (3.2) assuming this and $T'=0$. From (2.6), (3.1) we have that

$$\Theta(T)-\Theta(0) \;=\; \int_0^\infty [W(x)-w(x,0)]c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\ \frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\ , \tag{3.16}$$

where $w(\cdot,t)$, $t<T$, is the solution to (2.1), (2.2) with terminal data $w_0(\cdot)=W(\cdot)$. From Lemma 2.2 we see that the second integral on the RHS of (3.16) is bounded by $C_1T^{1/2}$ for some constant C_1. To bound the first integral on the RHS of (3.16) we use the argument of Lemma 2.1. In particular, since from (2.1) it follows $\mathcal{L}_{x,t}w_\lambda(x,t)\le 0$ for $x\ge 0,\ t<T$, if $\lambda>0$ is sufficiently large, we see that the first integral is bounded below as

$$\int_0^\infty [W(x)-w(x,0)]c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x \ \ge\ -C_2T\int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\ ,$$

for some constant C_2.

To obtain an upper bound we first show that for any positive $\alpha<1/2$ there is a positive constant C_3 depending only on α such that

$$w(T^\alpha,t)\ \ge\ W(0)\left[1-C_3\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4T^{1-2\alpha}}\right\}\right]\quad \text{for } 0\le t<T\ . \tag{3.17}$$

To prove (3.17) we note that, since $W(\cdot)$ is an increasing function, it is sufficient to show that the diffusion $X(\cdot)$ defined by (2.36) satisfies the inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t\le s\le T}X(s)<0\ \middle|\ X(t)=T^\alpha\right)\ \le\ C_3\exp\left[-\frac{1}{4T^{1-2\alpha}}\right]\qquad \text{for } 0\le t<T\ . \tag{3.18}$$

Let $\tau_{t,T}$ be the exit time from the interval $[0,2T^\alpha]$ for $X(s), s\ge t$, started at $X(t)=T^\alpha$. Then the LHS of (3.18) is bounded above by $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{t,T}\le T)$. Since the drift for $X(\cdot)$ in the interval $[0,2T^\alpha]$ is bounded by a constant, we can compare $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{t,T}\le T)$ with the exit probability of a pure diffusion from the interval $[0,2T^\alpha]$. In this way, we conclude that $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{t,T}\le T)$ is bounded by the RHS of (3.18) for a suitable constant C_3.

Next we use the fact that $\mathcal{L}_{x,t}w_\lambda(x,t)\ge 0$ for $x\ge 0,\ 0\le t<T$, if $\lambda<0$ is sufficiently small. It follows from (3.17) and the maximum principle that for such λ,

$$w(x,t)\ \ge\ c(T)w_\lambda(x,t)\quad \text{for } x\ge T^\alpha,\ 0\le t<T\ , \tag{3.19}$$
$$\text{where } c(T)=\frac{W(0)}{W(T^\alpha)}\left[1-C_3\exp\left[-\frac{1}{4T^{1-2\alpha}}\right]\right]\ .$$

From (3.19) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty [W(x)-w(x,0)]c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x&\\ \le\ \int_0^{T^\alpha} W(x)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\ &+\ \left[1-c(T)e^{\lambda T}\right]\int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Since $c(\cdot,0)$ is continuous the RHS of (3.20) is bounded above by a constant times T^α. We conclude that (3.2) holds for $T'=0$. □

3.3. **Proof of Schauder Lemmas 3.3-3.5.**

Proof of Lemma 3.3. As in Lemma 3.2 we may assume that the initial data $c(\cdot,0)$ is continuous on $[0,\infty)$. Choosing $L\ge 1$, we have similarly to (3.14) the representation

$$\begin{aligned}c(x,T)\ =\ &\int_0^L G_{D,L}(x',x,0,T)c(x',0)\,\mathrm{d}x'+\int_0^T\frac{\partial G_{D,L}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &-\int_0^T\frac{\partial G_{D,L}(L,x,T',T)}{\partial x'}c(L,T')\ \mathrm{d}T'\ ,\quad 0<x<L,\ 0<T\le T_0\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

From (2.18) we see that the derivatives with respect to x of the first and third integrals on the RHS of (3.21) exist and are continuous in (x,T) for $0\le x<L,\ 0<T\le T_0$. Hence we are left to estimate the derivative with respect to x of the second integral on the RHS of (3.21). To show this

we first observe that, in addition to (2.18), the Green's functions estimates in [15, Lemma 3.4] also imply that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 G_{D,L}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 K_L(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 v_{0,L}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'}\right| \le CG(x-x',2(T-t)) \ , \quad \text{where } C \text{ depends only on } L,T. \tag{3.22}$$

It follows from (3.4) and (3.22) that the function $(x,T)\to[c(x,T)-c_{0,L}(x,T)-c_{1,L}(x,T)]$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0\le x<L,\ 0<T\le T_0$.

Finally we need to estimate the differences between the second derivatives of $K_L,\ v_{0,L}$ and $K_\infty,\ v_{0,\infty}$ respectively. It is evident from the representation (2.13) for K_L that for some constant C depending only on L,T, it holds for $0<x,x'<L/3,\ 0<t<T$

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 K_L(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 K_\infty(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'}\right| \le C\exp\left[-\frac{L^2}{4(T-t)}\right] . \tag{3.23}$$

It follows from (3.4), (3.23) that the function $(x,T)\to[c_{0,L}(x,T)-c_{0,\infty}(x,T)]$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0\le x<L/3,\ 0<T\le T_0$.

To estimate the difference between the second derivatives of $v_{0,L}$ and $v_{0,\infty}$ we first note from (2.14) that

$$v_{0,L}(x',x,t,T) = \int_t^T I_L(x',x,t,s,T)\,\mathrm{d}s \ , \qquad 0<x',x<L,\ \ 0<t<T\le T_0 \ , \tag{3.24}$$

where $I_L(x',x,t,s,T)$ is defined by

$$I_L(x',x,t,s,T) = \int_0^L K_L(x',x'',t,s)\ b(x'',s)\ \frac{\partial K_L(x'',x,s,T)}{\partial x''}\,\mathrm{d}x'' \ . \tag{3.25}$$

Since $K_L(x'',x,s,T)=0$ for $x''=0,L$, we have on integration by parts in (3.25) that I_L is also given by the expression

$$\begin{aligned} I_L(x',x,t,s,T) = &-\int_0^L K_L(x',x'',t,s)\ \frac{\partial b(x'',s)}{\partial x''} K_L(x'',x,s,T)\,\mathrm{d}x'' \\ &-\int_0^L \frac{\partial K_L(x',x'',t,s)}{\partial x''}\ b(x'',s)\ K_L(x'',x,s,T)\,\mathrm{d}x'' \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

We may estimate the second mixed derivative of $v_{0,L}(x',x,t,T)$ with respect to x,x' by using the representation (3.25) for I_L in the integration (3.24) over $t<s<(T+t)/2$, and the representation (3.26) over $(T+t)/2<s<T$. We conclude from (2.3) that there is a constant C depending only on L,T such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 v_{0,L}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x\partial x'}\right| \le \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-t}}\ G(x-x',2(T-t)) \ , \qquad 0<x,x'<L,\ 0<t<T \ .$$

We use the same method as in the previous paragraph to estimate the difference between the second derivatives of $v_{0,L}$ and $v_{0,\infty}$. Similarly to how we obtained (3.23) we see from (3.25) that there is a constant C depending only on L,T such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\frac{\partial^2 I_L(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x\partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 I_\infty(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x\partial x'}\right| \le \\ &\qquad C\left[\frac{1}{(s-t)^{1/2}}+\frac{1}{(T-s)}\right]\exp\left[-\frac{L^2}{16(T-t)}\right] \ , \quad 0<x,x'<L/3\ ,\ 0<t<s<T \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

From (3.26) we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\frac{\partial^2 I_L(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x\partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 I_\infty(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x\partial x'}\right| \le \\ &\qquad C\left[\frac{1}{(s-t)}+\frac{1}{(T-s)^{1/2}}\right]\exp\left[-\frac{L^2}{16(T-t)}\right] \ , \quad 0<x,x'<L/3\ ,\ 0<t<s<T \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

It follows from (3.27), (3.28) and (3.24) that for $0 < x, x' < L/3$, $0 < t < T \le T_0$

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 v_{0,L}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x \partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 v_{0,\infty}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x \partial x'} \right| \le C \exp\left[-\frac{L^2}{16(T-t)} \right] , \tag{3.29}$$

for some constant C depending only on L, T_0. We conclude from (3.29) that the function $(x,T) \to [c_{1,L}(x,T) - c_{1,\infty}(x,T)]$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0 \le x < L/3,\ 0 < T \le T_0$.

Taking $L \to \infty$ in (2.13) we have that $K_\infty(x',x,t,T) = G(x-x',T-t) - G(x+x',T-t)$, whence

$$\left. \frac{\partial K_\infty(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x'} \right|_{x'=0} = \frac{x}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{3/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-t)} \right] , \quad x > 0,\ t < T . \tag{3.30}$$

From (3.30) it is easy to compute the integral

$$\int_{-\infty}^{T} \frac{\partial K_\infty(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x'} \, \mathrm{d}t \Bigg|_{x'=0} = 1. \tag{3.31}$$

Since the integration in (3.31) is concentrated on the scale $T - t \simeq x^2$, it follows from (3.4) that $\lim_{x\to 0} c_{0,\infty}(x,T) = \exp[-V(0) + \theta(T)W(0)],\ 0 < T \le T_0$. We can also easily see from (3.4), (3.24), (3.25) that $\lim_{x\to 0} c_{1,\infty}(x,T) = 0,\ 0 < T \le T_0$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We define $\tilde{I}_\infty$ similarly to (3.25) with $L = \infty$ by

$$\tilde{I}_\infty(x',x,t,s,T) = \int_0^\infty K_\infty(x',x'',t,s)\ b(x',s)\ \frac{\partial K_\infty(x'',x,s,T)}{\partial x''} \, \mathrm{d}x'' . \tag{3.32}$$

Corresponding to (3.24), (3.4) we aso define

$$\tilde{v}_{0,\infty}(x',x,t,T) = \int_t^T \tilde{I}_\infty(x',x,t,s,T) \, \mathrm{d}s , \qquad 0 < x', x < \infty, \quad 0 < t < T \le T_0 , \tag{3.33}$$

$$\tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T) = \int_0^T \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'} \exp[-V(0) + \theta(t)W(0)] \, \mathrm{d}t . \tag{3.34}$$

We first show that the function $(x,T) \to [c_{1,\infty}(x,T) - \tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T)]$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0 \le x < \infty,\ 0 < T \le T_0$. To see this we write

$$I_\infty(x',x,t,s,T) - \tilde{I}_\infty(x',x,t,s,T) = \hat{I}_{1,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T) + \hat{I}_{2,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T) ,$$

where

$$\hat{I}_{2,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T) = \int_2^\infty K_\infty(x',x'',t,s)\ [b(x'',s) - b(x',s)]\ \frac{\partial K_\infty(x'',x,s,T)}{\partial x''} \, \mathrm{d}x'' . \tag{3.35}$$

Using integration by parts as in (3.26) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_{1,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T) = & -\int_0^2 K_\infty(x',x'',t,s)\ \frac{\partial b(x'',s)}{\partial x''} K_\infty(x'',x,s,T) \, \mathrm{d}x'' \\ & - \int_0^2 \Bigg(\frac{\partial K_\infty(x',x'',t,s)}{\partial x''}\ [b(x'',s) - b(x',s)]\ K_\infty(x'',x,s,T) \\ & \qquad + K_\infty(x',2,t,s)\ [b(2,s) - b(x',s)]\ K_\infty(2,x,s,T) \Bigg) \, \mathrm{d}x'' . \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

From (2.3), (3.35) we easily see that there is a constant C depending only on T such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 \hat{I}_{2,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x \partial x'} \right| \le C \exp\left[-\frac{1}{8(T-t)} \right] , \quad 0 < x, x' < 1,\ 0 < t < s < T . \tag{3.37}$$

From (2.3), (3.36) we see there is a constant C depending only on T such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 \hat{I}_{1,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x \partial x'}\right| \le \frac{C}{(s-t)^{1/2}(T-s)^{1/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x'-x'',2(s-t))G(x''-x,2(T-s))\,\mathrm{d}x'' + C\exp\left[-\frac{1}{8(T-t)}\right], \qquad 0<x,x'<1,\ 0<t<s<T\ . \tag{3.38}$$

Evidently (3.38) implies that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 \hat{I}_{1,\infty}(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x \partial x'}\right| \le \frac{C}{(s-t)^{1/2}(T-s)^{1/2}} G(x'-x,2(T-t)) \tag{3.39}$$

for some constant C depending only on T. Using (3.37), (3.39) in the integrations (3.24), (3.33) we conclude that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 v_{0,\infty}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x \partial x'} - \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}(x',x,t,T)}{\partial x \partial x'}\right| \le CG(x'-x,2(T-t)) \tag{3.40}$$

for some constant C depending only on T. It follows from (3.4), (3.34), (3.40) that the function $(x,T) \to [c_{1,\infty}(x,T) - \tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T)]$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0 \le x < \infty,\ 0 < T \le T_0$.

We consider next the regularity of the function $\tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T)$ defined by (3.34). To understand the degree of regularity one might expect we first look at the case when the function $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ is constant say $b(\cdot,\cdot) \equiv 1$. In that case we observe that $w(z,t) = \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}(z,x,t,T)$ is the solution to the terminal-boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w(z,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 w(z,t)}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial K_\infty(z,x,t,T)}{\partial z} &= 0\ , \quad z>0,\ t<T\ , \\ w(0,t) = 0,\ \ t<T\ , \quad w(z,T) &= 0\ , \quad z>0\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

Evidently $w(z,t) = (x-z)K_\infty(z,x,t,T)/2$ is the solution to (3.41). It follows that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'} = \frac{x}{2}\frac{\partial K_\infty(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\ . \tag{3.42}$$

If we use (3.42) in (3.34) we have from (3.30) that

$$\tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T) = \frac{x^2}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^T \frac{1}{(T-t)^{3/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-t)}\right] \exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ . \tag{3.43}$$

Letting $x \to 0$ in (3.43) we have using identities similar to (3.31) that

$$\lim_{x\to 0} \tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T) = 0\ , \qquad \lim_{x\to 0} \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T)}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{2}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\ . \tag{3.44}$$

It follows from (3.44) that in the case when $b(0,s)$ is independent of s, the function $(x,T) \to \tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T)$ of (3.34) is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0 \le x < \infty,\ 0 < T \le T_0$.

The argument in the previous paragraph can be extended to include functions $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ which have the property that $s \to b(0,s)$ is Hölder continuous in the interval $0 < s \le T_0$. To see this we observe from (3.32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\frac{\partial \tilde{I}_\infty(x',x,t,s,T)}{\partial x'}\right|_{x'=0} &= b(0,s)\int_0^\infty \frac{\partial K_\infty(0,x'',t,s)}{\partial x'}\,\frac{\partial K_\infty(x'',x,s,T)}{\partial x''}\,\mathrm{d}x'' \\ &= b(0,s)J_1(x,t,s,T)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Using integration by parts as in (3.26) we see there is a universal constant C such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial J_1(x,t,s,T)}{\partial x}\right| \le \frac{C}{(s-t)^{1/2}(T-s)^{1/2}} \min\Big\{(s-t)^{-1/2},\ (T-s)^{-1/2}\Big\} G(x,2(T-t))\ . \tag{3.46}$$

It follows from (3.33) and (3.45), (3.46) that if the function $s \to b(0,s)$ is Hölder continuous of order $\gamma > 0$ at $s = T$ then there is a constant C_γ such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{v}_{0,\infty}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x' \partial x} - b(0,T)\int_t^T \frac{\partial J_1(x,t,s,T)}{\partial x}\,\mathrm{d}s\right| \le C_\gamma (T-t)^{-1/2+\gamma}\; G(x,2(T-t))\ . \tag{3.47}$$

From (3.42) we have that

$$\int_t^T J_1(x,t,s,T)\,\mathrm{d}s \;=\; \frac{x}{2}\frac{\partial K_\infty(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\ . \tag{3.48}$$

We conclude from (3.47), (3.48) and the argument of the previous paragraph that when $s \to b(0,s)$ is Hölder continuous in the interval $0 < s \le T_0$, then the function $(x,T) \to \tilde{c}_{1,\infty}(x,T)$ of (3.34) is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in x in the region $0 \le x < \infty,\ 0 < T \le T_0$.

Finally we wish to establish (3.5) assuming only that $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfies (2.3). To prove this it will be sufficient to consider the function $\tilde{c}_{2,\infty}$ defined by

$$\tilde{c}_{2,\infty}(x,T) \;=\; \int_0^T \Gamma(x,t,T)\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ , \tag{3.49}$$

where Γ is the function

$$\Gamma(x,t,T) \;=\; \int_t^T b(0,s)J_1(x,t,s,T)\,\mathrm{d}s\ . \tag{3.50}$$

If $b(0,\cdot) \equiv 1$ then the RHS of (3.49) is given by the RHS of (3.43). We observe from (3.45) that

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(x,t,s,T) \;&=\; \frac{1}{8\pi(s-t)^{3/2}(T-s)^{3/2}}\int_0^\infty z\exp\left[-\frac{z^2}{4(s-t)}\right] \\ &\qquad\times\left\{(x-z)\exp\left[-\frac{(x-z)^2}{4(T-s)}\right]+(x+z)\exp\left[-\frac{(x+z)^2}{4(T-s)}\right]\right\}\mathrm{d}z \\ &=\; \frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-s)\right]}{4\pi(s-t)^{3/2}(T-s)^{3/2}}\;J_2(x,t,s,T)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

where $J_2(x,t,s,T)$ is given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(x,t,s,T) \;&=\; \int_0^\infty z\exp\left[-\frac{(T-t)z^2}{4(s-t)(T-s)}\right] \\ &\qquad\times\left\{x\cosh\left[\frac{zx}{2(T-s)}\right]-z\sinh\left[\frac{zx}{2(T-s)}\right]\right\}\mathrm{d}z\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Using integration by parts in (3.52) we have that

$$J_2(x,t,s,T) \;=\; \frac{2x(T-s)^2(s-t)}{(T-t)^2} \;+\; \left\{\frac{x^2(T-s)(s-t)}{(T-t)^2}-\frac{2(T-s)(s-t)}{(T-t)}\right\}\;J_3(x,t,s,T)\ ,$$

where J_3 is given by the formula

$$J_3(x,t,s,T) \;=\; \int_0^\infty \exp\left[-\frac{(T-t)z^2}{4(s-t)(T-s)}\right]\;\sinh\left[\frac{zx}{2(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}z\ . \tag{3.53}$$

Differentiating (3.53) with respect to x and integrating by parts we have that

$$\frac{\partial J_3(x,t,s,T)}{\partial x} \;=\; \frac{s-t}{T-t}+\frac{(s-t)x}{2(T-t)(T-s)}\;J_3(x,t,s,T)\ . \tag{3.54}$$

Integrating the differential equation in (3.54), we see that

$$J_3(x,t,s,T) \;=\; \left(\frac{s-t}{T-t}\right)\exp\left[\frac{(s-t)x^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\int_0^x \exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)z^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}z\ . \tag{3.55}$$

We conclude from (3.51)–(3.55) that

$$J_1(x,t,s,T) \;=\; \frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-t)\right]}{2\pi(T-t)^2}\left\{x\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{-1/2}\exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)x^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\right. \tag{3.56}$$

$$+\left(\frac{x^2}{2(T-t)}-1\right)\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{1/2}\int_0^x \exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)z^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}z\Bigg\}\ .$$

Note that it follows from (3.30), (3.48), (3.56) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{x^2\sqrt{\pi(T-t)}}{2} &= \int_t^T\Bigg\{x\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{-1/2}\exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)x^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\\ &\quad+\left(\frac{x^2}{2(T-t)}-1\right)\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{1/2}\int_0^x \exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)z^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}z\Bigg\}\,\mathrm{d}s\ .\end{aligned}$$

From (3.50), (3.56) we have that

$$\Gamma(x,t,T) = \frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-t)\right]}{2\pi(T-t)^2}\left\{\frac{x^2}{2(T-t)}\Gamma_1(x,t,T)+\Gamma_2(x,t,T)\right\}\ ,$$

where $\Gamma_1(x,t,T)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1(x,t,T) &= \int_t^T b(0,s)\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{1/2}\int_0^x \exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)z^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}s\\ &= \sqrt{T-t}\int_t^T b(0,s)\int_0^{(s-t)^{1/2}x/(T-t)^{1/2}(T-s)^{1/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{y^2}{4}\right]\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}s\ .\end{aligned}\tag{3.57}$$

It is easy to see from (3.57) that

$$\left|\frac{\partial\Gamma_1(x,t,T)}{\partial x}\right| \le C(T-t)\ ,\quad 0<t<T\le T_0\ ,\tag{3.58}$$

for some constant C. Hence if we define the function $\tilde{c}_{3,\infty}$ by

$$\tilde{c}_{3,\infty}(x,T) = x^2\int_0^T\frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-t)\right]}{4\pi(T-t)^3}\Gamma_1(x,t,T)\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ ,$$

we conclude from (3.58) that $\lim_{x\to 0}\tilde{c}_{3,\infty}(x,T)=0$ and $\partial\tilde{c}_{3,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ remains bounded as $x\to 0$. In view of the continuity of the functions $\theta(\cdot)$, $b(0,\cdot)$, we may further conclude that $\lim_{x\to 0}\partial\tilde{c}_{3,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ exists and its dependence on $\theta(\cdot)$, $b(0,\cdot)$, is only through the values $\theta(T)$ and $b(0,T)$.

From (3.56) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\Gamma_2(x,t,T)}{\partial x} &= x\frac{\partial\Gamma_3(x,t,T)}{\partial x}+\\ &\quad\int_t^T b(0,s)\left\{\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{-1/2}-\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{1/2}\right\}\exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)x^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}s\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_3(x,t,T)$ is given by

$$\Gamma_3(x,t,T) = \int_t^T b(0,s)\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{-1/2}\exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)x^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}s\ .\tag{3.59}$$

We see from (3.59) that

$$\left|\frac{\partial\Gamma_3(x,t,T)}{\partial x}\right| \le Cx\ ,\quad 0<t<T\le T_0\ ,\tag{3.60}$$

for some constant C. Hence if we define the function $\tilde{c}_{4,\infty}$ by

$$\tilde{c}_{4,\infty}(x,T) = \int_0^T\int_0^x\frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-t)\right]}{2\pi(T-t)^2}x'\frac{\partial\Gamma_3(x',t,T)}{\partial x'}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}x'\,\mathrm{d}t\ ,$$

we conclude from (3.60) that $\lim_{x\to 0}\tilde{c}_{4,\infty}(x,T)=0$ and $\partial\tilde{c}_{4,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ remains bounded as $x\to 0$. We may further conclude as with $\tilde{c}_{3,\infty}$ that $\lim_{x\to 0}\partial\tilde{c}_{4,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ exists and its dependence on $\theta(\cdot),\ b(0,\cdot)$, is only through the values $\theta(T),\ b(0,T)$.

We define $\Gamma_4(x,t,T)$ by

$$\Gamma_4(0,t,T)=0 \tag{3.61}$$

$$\frac{\partial\Gamma_4(x,t,T)}{\partial x}=\int_t^T b(0,s)\left\{\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{-1/2}-\left(\frac{s-t}{T-s}\right)^{1/2}\right\}\exp\left[-\frac{(s-t)x^2}{4(T-t)(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}s\ .$$

We see from (3.61) that

$$\left|\frac{\partial\Gamma_4(x,t,T)}{\partial x}\right|\ \le\ C(T-t)\ ,\quad 0<t<T\le T_0\ , \tag{3.62}$$

for some constant C. We define the function $\tilde{c}_{5,\infty}$ by

$$\tilde{c}_{5,\infty}(x,T)\ =\ \int_0^T\frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-t)\right]}{2\pi(T-t)^2}\Gamma_4(x,t,T)\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ .$$

The bound (3.62) implies that $\tilde{c}_{5,\infty}(x,T)$ is continuous for $x\ge 0,\ 0<T\le T_0$ and satisfies $\lim_{x\to 0}\tilde{c}_{5,\infty}(x,T)=0$, but $\partial\tilde{c}_{5,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ may diverge as $x\to 0$. Let $f(x,T)$ be the function

$$\begin{aligned} f(x,T)\ &=\ \int_0^T\frac{\exp\left[-x^2/4(T-t)\right]}{2\pi(T-t)^2}\frac{\partial\Gamma_4(x,t,T)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &=\ \int_{0<t<s<T} b(0,s)\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)] \\ &\qquad\qquad\times\frac{(T+t-2s)}{2\pi(T-t)^2(s-t)^{1/2}(T-s)^{1/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.63}$$

We can see as in the previous paragraph that $\lim_{x\to 0}[\partial\tilde{c}_{5,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x-f(x,T)]$ exists. Hence in order to complete the proof of (3.5) it will be sufficient to show for $0<\alpha<1,\ 0<\beta<T_0$, there is a constant $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that

$$\sup_{0<x<1}\left|\int_{T_1}^{T_2}f(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}T\right|\ \le\ C_{\alpha,\beta}|T_2-T_1|^\alpha\quad\text{for }\beta\le T_1<T_2\le T_0\ . \tag{3.64}$$

To prove (3.64) we first observe for fixed s,t with $0<t<s<T_1$ that

$$\int_{T_1}^{T_2}\frac{(T+t-2s)}{2\pi(T-t)^2(s-t)^{1/2}(T-s)^{1/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-s)}\right]\mathrm{d}T\ =\ g(x,s-t,t)\ , \tag{3.65}$$

where the function $g(x,\tau,t)$ is given by

$$g(x,\tau,t)\ =\ \frac{1}{2\pi\tau}\int_{1-2\tau/(T_1-t)}^{1-2\tau/(T_2-t)}\frac{z}{\sqrt{1-z^2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2(1-z)}{4\tau(1+z)}\right]\mathrm{d}z\ . \tag{3.66}$$

In obtaining (3.65), (3.66) we have used the substitution $z=(T+t-2s)/(T-t)$. Note also that the integration in (3.66) is over a subinterval of $\{-1<z<1\}$. To estimate the integral in (3.66) we first assume that $0<\tau<(T_1-t)/2$ in which case the integrand is positive and

$$\begin{aligned} 0\ &<\ g(x,\tau,t) \\ &\le\ g(0,\tau,t)\ =\ \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\tau(T_1-t)}}\left\{\left[1-\frac{\tau}{T_1-t}\right]^{1/2}-\left(\frac{T_1-t}{T_2-t}\right)^{1/2}\left[1-\frac{\tau}{T_2-t}\right]^{1/2}\right\}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

We have from (3.67) that

$$g(0,\tau,t)\ \le\ \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\tau}}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1-t}}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{T_2-t}}\right\}\ . \tag{3.68}$$

It follows from (3.68) that

$$\int_0^{(T_1-t)/2} g(0,\tau,t)\,\mathrm{d}\tau \;\le\; \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\left[1-\left(\frac{T_1-t}{T_2-t}\right)^{1/2}\right] \;\le\; \frac{C(T_2-T_1)}{T_2-t} \tag{3.69}$$

for some constant C. Next we show that there is a constant C such that

$$|g(x,\tau,t)| \;\le\; \frac{C(T_2-T_1)}{(T_2-t)\sqrt{(T_1-t)(T_1-t-\tau)}}\;, \qquad (T_1-t)/2<\tau<T_1-t\;. \tag{3.70}$$

Evidently (3.70) holds if $(T_2-T_1)/(T_2-t)\ge 1/4$ so we shall assume that $(T_2-T_1)/(T_2-t)<1/4$, which implies that $2\tau/(T_1-t)-2\tau/(T_2-t)<1/2$. In this case one has from (3.66) that

$$|g(x,\tau,t)| \;\le\; \frac{C_1}{T_1-t}\int_{1-2\tau/(T_1-t)}^{1-2\tau/(T_2-t)} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\sqrt{1+z}}\;, \quad \text{where } C_1 \text{ is a constant.} \tag{3.71}$$

The integration in (3.71) can be computed to give

$$\left[2-\frac{2\tau}{(T_2-t)}\right]^{1/2}-\left[2-\frac{2\tau}{(T_1-t)}\right]^{1/2} \;\le\; \frac{(T_2-T_1)\sqrt{2(T_1-t)}}{(T_2-t)\sqrt{T_1-t-\tau}}\;,$$

whence (3.70) follows. Now (3.70) implies that

$$\int_{(T_1-t)/2}^{(T_1-t)} |g(x,\tau,t)|\,\mathrm{d}\tau \;\le\; \frac{C(T_2-T_1)}{T_2-t} \quad \text{for some constant } C. \tag{3.72}$$

Letting $h(x,t,s,T)$ denote the integrand of the integral on the RHS of (3.63), it follows from (3.69), (3.72) that

$$\int_{T_1}^{T_2}\mathrm{d}T\int_{0<t<s<T_1}\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s\;|h(x,t,s,T)| \;\le\; C(T_2-T_1)[|\log(T_2-T_1)|+1] \tag{3.73}$$

for some constant C.

We consider next the situation where $0<t<T_1$ and $T_1<s<T$ and proceed similarly to the previous paragraph. The integration with respect to T in (3.65) is now replaced by integration over the interval $s<T<T_2$. Correspondingly, in the definition of the function g the lower integration limit $1-2\tau/(T_1-t)$ in (3.66) is replaced by -1, while the upper limit is still given by $1-2\tau/(T_2-t)$. Since $T_1-t<\tau<T_2-t$, it follow that the maximum value of the upper limit is $-1+2(T_2-T_1)/(T_2-t)$. Assuming that $(T_2-T_1)/(T_2-t)\le 1/2$, we have from (3.66) that

$$|g(x,\tau,t)| \;\le\; |g(0,\tau,t)| \;=\; \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\tau(T_2-t)}}\left[1-\frac{\tau}{T_2-t}\right]^{1/2}\;. \tag{3.74}$$

It is easy to see from (3.74) that

$$\int_{T_1-t}^{T_2-t} |g(x,\tau,t)|\,\mathrm{d}\tau \;\le\; \frac{C(T_2-T_1)^{3/2}}{(T_2-t)^{3/2}} \quad \text{for some constant } C\;. \tag{3.75}$$

In the case when $(T_2-T_1)/(T_2-t)>1/2$ we can easily see from (3.74) that if $x=0$ then the LHS of (3.75) is bounded by a constant. However when $x>0$ the inequality in (3.74) only holds for $\tau\ge(T_2-t)/2$. It does not hold for $T_1-t<\tau<(T_2-t)/2$ since the integrand of (3.66) changes sign in the interval $-1<z<1-2\tau/(T_2-t)$. To bound $g(x,\tau,t)$ in this case we consider the situation when $\tau\le x^2$. For $n\ge 1$ an integer and $x^2/(n+1)<\tau\le x^2/n$ we have that

$$|g(x,\tau,t)| \;\le\; \frac{1}{2\pi\tau}\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{|z|}{\sqrt{1-z^2}}\exp\left[-\frac{n(1-z)}{4(1+z)}\right]\mathrm{d}z \;\le\; \frac{C}{\tau\sqrt{n}}\;,$$

for some constant C. Hence the integral of $|g(x,\tau,t)|$ over the interval $0<\tau<x^2$ is bounded by a constant independent of x. To estimate $|g(x,\tau,t)|$ for $\tau>x^2$ we split the integral representation

and use the cancellation properties of the function $z \to z/\sqrt{1-z^2}$. Thus for $n \geq 1$ an integer and $nx^2 < \tau < (n+1)x^2$ let $\alpha(n) = \min\{1 - 1/n, 1 - 2\tau/(T_2 - t)\}$. Then we have that

$$|g(x,\tau,t)| \;\leq\; \frac{1}{2\pi\tau}\int_{\{-1<\tau<-\alpha(n),\ \alpha(n)<\tau<1\}} \frac{|z|}{\sqrt{1-z^2}}\,\mathrm{d}z + \frac{x^2}{8\pi\tau^2}\int_{-\alpha(n)}^{\alpha(n)} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{(1+z)^{3/2}}\ . \tag{3.76}$$

The first integral on the RHS of (3.76) is bounded by $C\left[1/\tau\sqrt{n} + 1/\sqrt{\tau(T_2-t)}\right]$, and the second by $Cx^2\sqrt{n}/\tau^2$ for some constant C. Therefore the integral of $|g(x,\tau,t)|$ over the interval $\min\{x^2, T_2 - t\} < \tau < T_2 - t$ is bounded by a constant independent of x. We have shown then that the integral of $|g(x,\tau,t)|$ over the interval $0 < \tau < T_2 - t$ is bounded by a constant independent of x, whence (3.75) holds for $(T_2 - T_1)/(T_2 - t) > 1/2$. It easily follows from (3.75) that

$$\int_{T_1}^{T_2}\int_{0<t<T_1<s<T} |h(x,t,s,T)|\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}T \;\leq\; C(T_2 - T_1) \tag{3.77}$$

for some constant C.

Finally we consider the situation where $T_1 < t < T_2$ and $t < s < T$. The function $g(x,\tau,t)$ is defined as in the previous paragraph but now we need to estimate the integral of $g(x,\tau,t)$ over the interval $0 < \tau < T_2 - t$. We have already established that the integral is bounded by a constant independent of x. This implies that

$$\int_{T_1}^{T_2}\int_{T_1<t<s<T} |h(x,t,s,T)|\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}T \;\leq\; C(T_2 - T_1) \tag{3.78}$$

for some constant C. The inequality (3.64) follows now from (3.73), (3.77), (3.78). □

Proof of Lemma 3.5. From (3.4), (3.30) we have that

$$c_{0,\infty}(x,T) \;=\; \frac{x}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\int_0^T \frac{1}{(T-t)^{3/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-t)}\right]\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\,\mathrm{d}t\ . \tag{3.79}$$

Hence we have that

(3.80)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{c_{0,\infty}(x,T) - c_{0,\infty}(0,T)}{x} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\int_0^T \frac{1}{(T-t)^{3/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-t)}\right] \\ &\qquad\times\left\{\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)] - \exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\right\}\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad - \frac{\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{1}{(T-t)^{3/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-t)}\right]\mathrm{d}t\ .\end{aligned}$$

It is evident from (3.80) that if $\theta(\cdot)$ is Hölder continuous at T of order $\gamma > 1/2$ then

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\frac{c_{0,\infty}(x,T) - c_{0,\infty}(0,T)}{x} \;=\; \frac{\partial c_{0,\infty}(0,T)}{\partial x} \quad \text{exists}\ . \tag{3.81}$$

To prove the continuity of $\partial c_{0,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ as $x \to 0$ we observe from (3.79) that

$$\frac{\partial c_{0,\infty}(x,T)}{\partial x} \;=\; f(x,T) - \frac{\sqrt{2}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]}{x\sqrt{\pi}}\int_0^{x/\sqrt{2T}} (1-z^2)e^{-z^2/2}\,\mathrm{d}z\ , \tag{3.82}$$

where $f(x,T)$ is given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} f(x,T) \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\int_0^T \left\{1 - \frac{x^2}{2(T-t)}\right\}\frac{1}{(T-t)^{3/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4(T-t)}\right] \\ \times\left\{\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)] - \exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\right\}\mathrm{d}t\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.83}$$

We see from (3.82), (3.83), similarly to (3.81), that $\lim_{x\to 0}\partial c_{0,\infty}(x,T)/\partial x$ exists provided $\theta(\cdot)$ is Hölder continuous at T of order $\gamma > 1/2$.

To prove (3.6) when $\gamma < 1/2$, we first note from (3.83) that

$$f(x,T) \;=\; \int_0^T g(x,t,T)\,\mathrm{d}t\ , \quad \text{where} \;\; |g(x,t,T)| \le C/(T-t)^{\gamma-3/2}$$

for some constant C. Evidently for $0 < T_1 < T_2$,

$$\int_{0<t<T_1}\int_{T_1}^{T_2} (T-t)^{\gamma-3/2}\,\mathrm{d}T\,\mathrm{d}t \;\le\; C(T_2-T_1)^{\gamma+1/2}$$

for some constant C, so we are left to estimate the integral of $g(x,t,T)$ over the region $\{T_1 < t < T,\ T_1 < T < T_2\}$. Letting $h(x,s)$ be the function

$$h(x,s) \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\left\{1-\frac{x^2}{2s}\right\}\frac{1}{s^{3/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{4s}\right]\ ,$$

we see that

$$\int_{T_1<t<T}\int_{T_1}^{T_2} g(x,t,T)\,\mathrm{d}T\,\mathrm{d}t \;= \int_{T_1}^{T_2}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\left\{\int_0^{T_2-T} h(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s - \int_0^{T-T_1} h(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right\}\mathrm{d}T\ . \tag{3.84}$$

It follows from (3.84) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{T_1<t<T}\int_{T_1}^{T_2} g(x,t,T)\,\mathrm{d}T\,\mathrm{d}t \;&=\; \int_{T_1}^{(T_1+T_2)/2}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\int_{T-T_1}^{T_2-T} h(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}T \\ &\quad - \int_{(T_1+T_2)/2}^{T_2}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(T)W(0)]\int_{T_2-T}^{T-T_1} h(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}T\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.85}$$

Making the change of variable $T = (T_1+T_2)/2 - \tau$ in the first integral on the RHS of (3.85), and $T = (T_1+T_2)/2 + \tau$ in the second integral, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{T_1<t<T}\int_{T_1}^{T_2} g(x,t,T)\,\mathrm{d}T\,\mathrm{d}t \;&=\; \int_0^{(T_2-T_1)/2}\Big\{\exp[-V(0)+\theta(\{T_1+T_2\}/2-\tau)W(0)] \\ &\quad - \exp[-V(0)+\theta(\{T_1+T_2\}/2+\tau)W(0)]\Big\}\int_{(T_2-T_1)/2-\tau}^{(T_2-T_1)/2+\tau} h(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}\tau\ .\end{aligned} \tag{3.86}$$

Using the fact that

$$\int_0^{(T_2-T_1)/2}\int_{(T_2-T_1)/2-\tau}^{(T_2-T_1)/2+\tau}\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{s^{3/2}}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \;\le\; C(T_2-T_1)^{1/2}$$

for some constant C, we conclude from (3.86) that

$$\left|\int_{T_1<t<T}\int_{T_1}^{T_2} g(x,t,T)\,\mathrm{d}T\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \;\le\; C(T_2-T_1)^{\gamma+1/2}$$

for some constant C. □

3.4. **Proof of parabolic regularization (Lemma 3.6) and tightness (Lemma 3.7).**

Proof of Lemma 3.6. It follows from Proposition 2.1 that the drift b for (1.1) is uniformly Lipschitz. Thus there is a constant A depending on $\|\theta(\cdot)\|_\infty$ such that

$$|\partial b(x,t)/\partial x| \;\le\; A \quad \text{for } x>0,\ 0\le t\le T_0\ . \tag{3.87}$$

We note that if $\sup c(\cdot,0) < \infty$ then $\sup c(\cdot,t) < \infty$ for $t > 0$. This follows by the maximum principle from (1.5), (3.87). In fact we have that

$$\sup c(\cdot,t) \;\le\; e^{At}\sup c(\cdot,0) + \sup_{0<s<t}\left\{\exp[A(t-s) - V(0) + \theta(s)W(0)]\right\} .$$

Hence to establish boundedness of $\sup c(\cdot,t),\ t_0 \le t \le T_0$, it will be sufficient to show that if $c(\cdot,0)$ satisfies (1.7), then $\sup c(\cdot,T) < \infty$ for $T > 0$ sufficiently small.

Let $x_0 \ge 3$ and $x(\cdot)$ be the solution to the ODE terminal value problem

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \;=\; b(x(t),t)\ , \quad t < T,\ \ x(T) = x_0\ .$$

Then if $w_{x_0}(x,t),\ x > 0,\ t < T$, denotes the solution to (2.1), (2.2) with $w_0(x) = \delta(x - x_0),\ x > 0$, we show that for $T > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\sup_{x>0} w_{x_0}(x,0) \le C_1(T), \qquad \sup_{\{|x-x(t)|\ge 1,\ 0\le t<T\}} w_{x_0}(x,t) \le C_2(T), \tag{3.88}$$

where $C_1(T),\ C_2(T)$ are constants depending on T, but not on x_0. To see this we approximate the Dirac delta function at x_0 by bounded functions. Thus let $\phi : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function with compact support in the interval $[-1,1]$ and with integral equal to 1. We then take

$$w_0(x) \;=\; \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\phi\left(\frac{x-x_0}{\varepsilon}\right)\ , \quad x > 0,\ 0 < \varepsilon \le 1\ ,$$

so the function on the RHS converges to $\delta(x - x_0)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Next we use the representation (2.36), (2.37) for solutions to (2.1), (2.2). If $X(\cdot)$ is a solution to (2.36) then $Y(\cdot) = X(\cdot) - x(\cdot)$ is a solution to the SDE

$$dY(t) \;=\; [b(Y(t) + x(t),t) - b(x(t),t)]\,\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{d}B(t)\ .$$

Hence the representation (2.37) yields $w(x,0) = \tilde{w}(x - x(0),0)$, where

$$\tilde{w}(y,0) \;=\; \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\phi\left(\frac{Y(T)}{\varepsilon}\right)\ ;\ \inf_{0<s<T}[Y(s) + x(s)] > 0 \;\middle|\; Y(0) = y\right]\ . \tag{3.89}$$

We assume now that $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, whence $\phi(Y(T)/\varepsilon) \ne 0$ only if $|Y(T)| < 1/2$. We consider paths $Y(s),\ 0 \le s \le T$, such that $Y(0) = y$ and $|y| < 2$. Then for T sufficiently small independent of $x_0 \ge 3$, the expectation on the RHS of (3.89) can be written as a sum of expectations over paths $Y(\cdot)$ such that $\sup_{0\le s\le T}|Y(s)| < 2$ and $\sup_{0\le s\le T}|Y(s)| \ge 2$. For the paths with $\sup_{0\le s\le T}|Y(s)| \ge 2$ which contribute to the expectation (3.89), there exists a stopping time $\tau_y,\ 0 < \tau_y < T$, such that $|Y(\tau_y)| = 1$ and $|Y(s)| < 2,\ \tau_y \le s \le T$. We can use this decomposition of paths to obtain a representation of $\tilde{w}(y,0)$ in terms of a Dirichlet Green's function on the interval $[-2,2]$. Thus we consider the terminal value problem

$$\frac{\partial u(y,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 u(y,t)}{\partial y^2} + \tilde{b}(y,t)\frac{\partial u(y,t)}{\partial y} = 0\ , \quad |y| < 2,\ t < T, \tag{3.90}$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{b}(y,t) \;=\; b(y + x(t),t) - b(x(t),t)\ .$$

The solution $u(y,t)$ to (3.90) with terminal and boundary conditions given by

$$u(y,T) \;=\; u_0(y),\ |y| < 2, \quad u(y,t) \;=\; 0,\ |y| = 2,\ t < T,$$

has the representation

$$u(y,t) \;=\; \int_{-2}^{2} G_{D,x_0}(y,y',t,T)u_0(y')\,\mathrm{d}y'\ ,$$

in terms of the Dirichlet Green's function G_{D,x_0}, which depends through $\tilde{b}(\cdot,\cdot)$ on x_0. Hence we have that

$$\tilde{w}(y,0) \;=\; \int_{-2}^{2} G_{D,x_0}(y,y',0,T)\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\phi\left(\frac{y'}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathrm{d}y' + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-2}^{2} G_{D,x_0}(Y(\tau_y),y',\tau_y,T)\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\phi\left(\frac{y'}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathrm{d}y'\right] . \tag{3.91}$$

From (3.87), (3.90) it follows that $|\tilde{b}(y,t)| \le A|y|,\ 0 \le t \le T_0$, whence the series expansion (2.14) for G_{D,x_0} converges for T small and independent of x_0. This allows us to take the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (3.91) to obtain the representation

$$w_{x_0}(x,0) \;=\; G_{D,x_0}(x-x(0),0,0,T) + \mathbb{E}\big[G_{D,x_0}(Y(\tau_{x-x(0)}),0,\tau_{x-x(0)},T)\big] , \tag{3.92}$$

valid for $|x-x(0)| < 2$. It follows from (2.16), (3.92) that $\sup_{|x-x(0)|<2} w_{x_0}(x,0) \le C_1(T)$, where $C_1(T)$ is independent of $x_0 \ge 3$. Since we have an analogous representation to (3.92) for $w_{x_0}(x,0)$ when $|x-x(0)| > 2$, we conclude the first inequality of (3.88). The second inequality of (3.88) follows by a similar argument.

To show that $\sup c(\cdot,T) < \infty$, we observe by the continuity of the function $x \to c(x,T),\ x \ge 0$, that it is sufficient to obtain a uniform estimate on $c(x_0,T)$ for $x_0 \ge 3$. To do this we use the representation (2.6). Thus we have that

$$c(x_0,T) \;=\; \int_0^\infty w_{x_0}(x,0)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^T dt\ \frac{\partial w_{x_0}(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)] . \tag{3.93}$$

We see from the first inequality of (3.88) and (1.7) that the first term on the RHS of (3.93) is uniformly bounded for $x_0 \ge 3$. The second inequality of (3.88) and Lemma 2.2 imply that the second term on the RHS of (3.93) is uniformly bounded for $x_0 \ge 3$.

To prove equicontinuity of the functions $c(\cdot,t),\ t_0 \le t \le T_0$ on $[0,L]$ we argue as in Lemma 3.1. In particular, using the notation of (3.14) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} c(x,T) = &\int_0^{L+1} G_{D,L+1}(x',x,t_0,T)c(x',t_0)\,\mathrm{d}x' + \int_{t_0}^T \frac{\partial G_{D,L+1}(0,x,t,T)}{\partial x'}\ e^{-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &- \int_{t_0}^T \frac{\partial G_{D,L+1}(L+1,x,T',T)}{\partial x'}c(L+1,T')\,\mathrm{d}T' , \quad 0 < x < L+1,\ t_0 < T \le T_0 . \end{aligned} \tag{3.94}$$

Since $c(\cdot,t_0)$ is continuous, the equicontinuity follows from (3.94) and the properties of $G_{D,L+1}$ already established in §2. □

The proof of the tightness Lemma 3.7 is based on a more quantified version of Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 3.8. *Under the Assumption of Lemma 3.7. For $M \ge 0$ let $w_M(x,t),\ x > 0, t < T$, be the solution to (2.1), (2.2) with $w_0(x) = 0,\ 0 < x < M,\ w_0(x) = W(x),\ x > M$. Then there exists $C_\infty > 0$, independent of M, T, such that $w_M(x,0) \le C_\infty W(x)$ for $x \ge 0$. For any $x_0, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists $M(\varepsilon,x_0) > 0$, independent of T, such that*

$$w_M(x,0) \;\le\; \varepsilon \quad \text{for } 0 < x \le x_0,\ M \ge M(\varepsilon,x_0) . \tag{3.95}$$

Proof. To show that $w_M(x,0) \le C_\infty W(x),\ x > 0$, we proceed as in Lemma 2.5. Choosing $\delta > 0$ to satisfy $\delta \le |\theta_\infty|/3$, we see from (1.26) that (2.41) holds with $x_0 = x_\delta$, upon modifying the first inequality of (2.41) to $\mu(y,t) \le -6\sigma^2(y)\theta_\infty$. The remaining argument of Lemma 2.5 similarly goes through.

To prove (3.95) we observe from the first inequality of (1.26) that there exists $x_1 > 0$ such that $b(x,t) \le 0$ for $x \ge x_1,\ 0 \le t \le T$. Now let $L > x_0$ and $\tau_{x,t}^L > t$ be the first exit time from the interval $[0,L]$ of the diffusion $X(\cdot)$ of (2.36) started at $X(t) = x$ with $0 < x < L$. It follows that for any $\nu > 0$ there exists $L_\nu > x_0$ such that $\mathbb{P}\big(X(\tau_{x,t} = L)\big) < \nu,\ 0 < x < x_0$, provided $L \ge L_\nu$. Similarly to (2.37) we have that

$$w_M(x,0) \;=\; \mathbb{E}[w_M(L,\tau_{x,t})\ ;\ \tau_{x,t} < T,\ X(\tau_{x,t}) = L\ ] , \quad 0 < x < L,\ M > L . \tag{3.96}$$

Since (3.96) implies that $w_M(x,0) \le \mathbb{P}(X(\tau_{x,t}) = L)\sup W(\cdot)$, the inequality (3.95) follows provided $\sup W(\cdot) < \infty$. In the case when $\sup W(\cdot) = \infty$ we use the transformation $Y = \Phi(X)$

introduced in the proof of Lemma 2.5. We have similarly to (2.40) that there exists $M_\delta > 0$ such that

$$w_M(x,0) \le \mathbb{E}\Big[Y(T);\ \inf_{0\le s\le T} Y(s) > \Phi(0),\ Y(T) \ge \Phi(M) \ \Big|\ Y(0) = \Phi(x)\ \Big],\quad x > 0, M \ge M_\delta\ .$$

We also have similarly to (2.45) that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[Y(T);\ \inf_{0\le s\le T} Y(s) > \Phi(0),\ Y(T) \ge \Phi(M) \ \Big|\ Y(0) = y\ \Big] \le \phi(y)\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k+1+\Phi(M)}{\phi(k+\Phi(M))}\ . \tag{3.97}$$

Since $\lim_{M\to\infty}\Phi(M) = \lim_{M\to\infty} W(M) = \infty$, we see from (2.42) that there exists $M(\varepsilon, x_0) > 0$ such if $M \ge M(\varepsilon, x_0)$ then the RHS of (3.97) is less than ε provided $\Phi(0) < y < \Phi(x_0)$. The inequality(3.95) follows. □

Lemma 3.8 gives us enough to control on the adjoint problem to prove (3.10) of Lemma 3.7 by means of the representation (2.6).

Proof of Lemma 3.7. For any $M > 0$ the identity (2.6) implies that

$$\int_M^\infty W(x)c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x \ = \ \int_0^\infty w_M(x,0)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t \frac{\partial w(0,t)}{\partial x}\exp[-V(0)+\theta(t)W(0)]\ . \tag{3.98}$$

We can bound the first term on the RHS of (3.98) by using Lemma 3.8. Thus we have that

$$\int_0^\infty w_M(x,0)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x \ \le\ \frac{\varepsilon}{W(0)}\int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x + C_\infty\int_{x_0}^\infty W(x)c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\ , \tag{3.99}$$

provided $M > M(\varepsilon, x_0)$. Evidently by choosing x_0 sufficiently large and ε sufficiently small the RHS of (3.99) can be made smaller than $\delta/2$. Hence there exists $M(\delta) > 0$ such that if $M \ge M(\delta)$ the first term on the RHS of (3.98) is less than $\delta/2$.

We use Lemma 2.6 to estimate the second term on the RHS of (3.98). Thus there exists $\delta_\infty > 0$, independent of M, T, such that

$$0 \ \le\ \frac{\partial w_M(0,t)}{\partial x} \ \le\ C_\infty e^{-\delta_\infty(T-t)} \quad \text{for } 0 \le t \le T-1. \tag{3.100}$$

We also have from Lemma 3.8 that

$$w_M(x,t) \ \le\ \varepsilon\ ,\quad 0 < x < 1,\ 0 < t < T, \quad \text{for } M > M(\varepsilon, 1)\ . \tag{3.101}$$

We conclude from (3.101) and Lemma 2.2 that

$$0 \ \le\ \frac{\partial w_M(0,t)}{\partial x} \ \le\ C\varepsilon \max\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}, 1\right]\ ,\quad 0 < t < T\ . \tag{3.102}$$

It follows from (3.100), (3.102) that there exists $M(\delta) > 0$ such that if $M \ge M(\delta)$ the second term on the RHS of (3.98) is less than $\delta/2$. We have proven that the inequality (3.10) holds for $T \ge 0$. □

4. Convergence to equilibrium

In this section we will prove convergence to equilibrium for the system (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5). Let us recall some basic notion of the convergence of measures: A sequence $\mu_n,\ n = 1, 2, ..,$ of measures in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ converges *weakly* to a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int f\,\mathrm{d}\mu_n \ =\ \int f\,\mathrm{d}\mu \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{R}^+)\ . \tag{4.1}$$

Hence weak convergence for measures corresponds to weak* convergence in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$. In the following we will work exclusively with absolutely continuous measure satisfying a moment condition with respect to W and it is convenient to introduce the space of densities with finite W-moment

$$L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+) := \{f \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^+) : f \geq 0, \quad \|f\|_{L^1_W} < \infty\} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \|f\|_{L^1_W} := \int f(x)\, W(x)\, \mathrm{d}x.$$

We identify functions in $L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with measures in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ by their densities and speak just of weak convergence in the sense of (4.1). Especially, lower semicontinuity is understood as sequentially lower semicontinuity with respect to the weak convergence in the sense of (4.1).

4.1. **Characterization of constrained minimizer of free energy.** We start by defining the free energy and stating its properties.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose V, W satisfy Assumption 1.2. For $c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ and $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ the unconstrained free energy $\mathcal{G} : L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+) \times \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}^+$ is defined by*

$$\mathcal{G}(c,\theta) = \int c(x)(\log c(x) - 1)\, \mathrm{d}x + \int V(x)c(x)\, \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 + \mathcal{G}_0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_0 = \int e^{-V(x)}\, \mathrm{d}x < \infty$. The function $\mathcal{G}$ is for any $M > 0$ lower semi-continuous on $U_M := \big\{(c,\theta) \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+) \times \mathbf{R} : \|c\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)} \leq M\big\}$ and for any $M, N > 0$ continuous on

$$\tilde{U}_{M,N} \subset \Big\{(c,\theta) \in C(\mathbf{R}^+) \times \mathbf{R} : \|c\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)} \leq M, \|c\|_\infty \leq N\Big\},$$

such that $\forall L > 0 : \big\{c|_{[0,L]} : (c,\theta) \in \tilde{U}_{M,N}\big\}$ is equicontinuous.
The unconstrained minimizer is uniquely given by

$$\arg\min\big\{\mathcal{G}(c,\theta) : c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+), \theta \in \mathbf{R}\big\} = (c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}, 0).$$

Moreover, the constrained minimizer is uniquely given by

$$\arg\min\left\{\mathcal{G}(c,\theta) : c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+), \theta + \int W(x)c(x)\, \mathrm{d}x = \rho\right\} = \left(c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}\right)$$

where $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$ is given for $\rho \geq \rho_s := \int W(x)c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x$ by $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} = 0$ and for $\rho < \rho_s$ implicitly by

$$\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} + \int W(x)c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}\, \mathrm{d}x = \rho.$$

Proof. Let us first note, that $\mathcal{G}(c,\theta)$ is bounded from below by 0. We rewrite it in the following way

$$\mathcal{G}(c,\theta) = \mathcal{H}(c|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}) + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2, \qquad \text{with} \qquad c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x) = e^{-V(x)}$$

and the relative entropy for $c, c_0^{\mathrm{eq}} \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}(c|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}) = \int \Psi\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right) c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\ \mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{with} \qquad \Psi(r) := r\log r - r + 1.$$

Since Ψ is non-negative, we obtain the lower bound. In addition $r \mapsto \Psi(r)$ is strictly convex with convex dual $\Psi^*(s) = e^s - 1$ and it holds the dual variational characterization

$$\mathcal{H}(c|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}) = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{R}^+)} \left\{\int g(x)c(x)\, \mathrm{d}x - \int \Big(e^{g(x)} - 1\Big) c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x\right\}.$$

From this representation the lower semicontinuity on U_M for any $M > 0$ is immediate (see also [1, 11]).

Next we consider the function $\mathcal{G}$ restricted to the set $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$ with $M, N > 0$. It follows from (4.2), the bounds (1.25) and the lower bound $\inf W(\cdot) > 0$ that $\mathcal{G}(c,\theta) < \infty$ for all $[c,\theta] \in \tilde{U}_{M,N}$. Furthermore, the energy part $\int (V + \log a)c\, \mathrm{d}x$ is continuous and we see that in order to prove continuity of $\mathcal{G}$ on $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$ it is sufficient to prove continuity of the entropy $\mathcal{S}(c) := \int c(x)\log c(x)\, \mathrm{d}x$

on $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$. Since (1.27) implies that $\lim_{x\to\infty} W(x) = \infty$, we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $L_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall [c,\theta] \in \tilde{U}_{M,N} : \qquad \int_{\{x\geq L_\varepsilon:\ c(x)\geq 1\}} c(x)\log c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ < \ \varepsilon \ . \tag{4.3}$$

Now, for $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ let $g_\lambda : (0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ be the convex function $g_\lambda(z) = z\log z + \lambda z,\ z > 0$, which has a minimum at $z = e^{-(1+\lambda)}$ given by $\inf_{z>0} g(z) = -e^{-(1+\lambda)}$. Hence, we can estimate for any $L \geq 0$ choosing $\lambda = V(x)$

$$\int_{\{x\geq L: c(x)\leq 1\}} c(x)\log c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ \geq \ -\int_L^\infty V(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - e^{-1}\int_L^\infty c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ . \tag{4.4}$$

It follows now from (1.25) and (e) of Assumption 1.2 that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $L_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\{x\geq L_\varepsilon,\ c(x)\leq 1\}} c(x)\log c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ > \ -\varepsilon \ , \quad [c,\theta] \in \tilde{U}_{M,N} \ . \tag{4.5}$$

Let $[c_m,\theta_m],\ m = 1,2,..$, be a sequence in $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$ which converges in the topology of $\mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)\times\mathbf{R}$ to $[c,\theta] \in \tilde{U}_{M,N}$, then by the equicontinuity of the sequence, it follows

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\int_0^L c_m(x)\log c_m(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ = \ \int_0^L c(x)\log c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ . \tag{4.6}$$

The continuity of $\mathcal{S}$ on $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$ follows from (4.3), (4.5), (4.6).

The unique global minimizer $[c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}, 0]$ follows by strict convexity of the functional and the just proven lower bound 0. To prove the constraint minimizer, we observe that the function

$$m(\theta) := \mathcal{G}(c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}},\theta) = \int_0^\infty (\theta W(x) - 1)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2$$

is well defined for any $\theta \leq 0$, since $c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(\cdot) \leq c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(\cdot)$. Moreover, we have

$$m'(\theta) = \theta\int_0^\infty W(x)^2 c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \theta < 0 \qquad \text{for } \theta < 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Let $c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with $\mathcal{H}(c|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}) < \infty$ and for $\eta \in \mathbf{R}$ define the function $h : [0,1] \to \mathbf{R}$ by

$$h_\theta(\lambda) := \mathcal{G}((1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c, (1-\lambda)\theta + \lambda\eta).$$

By convexity of $\mathcal{G}$, also h_θ is convex, and we have for all $\lambda \in (0,1]$ the secant inequality

$$\frac{h_\theta(\lambda) - h_\theta(0)}{\lambda} \leq \mathcal{G}(c,\eta) - \mathcal{G}(c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}},\theta). \tag{4.8}$$

We can let $\lambda \to 0$ and obtain for the relative entropy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\lambda}\Big(\mathcal{H}((1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}) - \mathcal{H}(c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}})\Big) &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\int\left(\Psi\left(\frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right) - \Psi\left(\frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right)\right)c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\overset{\lambda\to 0}{\to} \int \Psi'\left(\frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right)(c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x))\,\mathrm{d}x = \theta\int W(x)\big(c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the estimate (4.8) becomes by using the constraint

$$\theta\left\{\rho - \int W(x)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \theta\right\} \leq \mathcal{G}(c,\eta) - \mathcal{G}(c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}},\theta). \tag{4.9}$$

If $\rho \leq \rho_s := \int W(x)c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, then we can choose $\theta = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$ and obtain that the LHS of (4.9) is zero and the desired inequality. Now, if $\rho > \rho_s$, we show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ and $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfying the constraint and $\mathcal{G}(c,\theta) - \mathcal{G}(c_0^{\mathrm{eq}},0) < \varepsilon$. To construct c, we use (1.25) combined with (1.27) of Assumption 1.2, in the integrated form

$$|V(x)| + C \leq \delta W(x) \qquad \text{for } x \geq x_\delta.$$

We define $y_\delta \geq x_\delta$ such that

$$\int_0^{x_\delta} W(x) c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{x_\delta}^{y_\delta} W(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \rho \tag{4.10}$$

and set

$$c(x) = \begin{cases} c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x) & , x \in [0, x_\delta) \\ 1 & , x \in [x_\delta, y_\delta) \\ 0 & , x \geq y_\delta \end{cases}.$$

Then, by construction $\int W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \rho$, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(c|c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}) &= \int_{x_\delta}^{y_\delta} \Psi\left(\frac{1}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right) c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{y_\delta}^{\infty} c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_{x_\delta}^{y_\delta} (V(x) - 1)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{x_\delta}^{\infty} c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \delta \int_{x_\delta}^{y_\delta} (W(x) + C) + \int_{x_\delta}^{\infty} c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_0^{\mathrm{eq}} \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ by assumption, we obtain that the second integral goes to zero as $x_\delta \to \infty$, which is the case as $\delta \to 0$. The first integral is bounded by δC for some $C > 0$ by the definition of y_δ in (4.10) and the growth assumption of W (1.27) in Assumption 1.2.

To prove uniqueness of the minimizer we use the inequality (4.8) again. But, now we calculate $h'_\theta(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in (0,1)$, which is given by

$$h'_\theta(\lambda) = \int \Psi'\left(\frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right)(c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}})\,\mathrm{d}x + \big((1-\lambda)\theta + \lambda\eta\big)(\eta - \theta) := I + II.$$

We can bound the first term, by noting that $\Psi'(r) = \log r$ and the elementary inequality

$$\log\left(\frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right)(c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}) \leq \frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right) - \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}{\lambda} \log\left(\frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right).$$

We obtain the bound

$$I \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\mathcal{H}\big((1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c \,|\, c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}\big) + \int ((1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c - c_0^{\mathrm{eq}})\,\mathrm{d}x - \int (\log(1-\lambda) + \theta W) c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}\,\mathrm{d}x\right) < \infty,$$

since $c, c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+) \subset L^1(\mathbf{R}^+)$ due to $W(x) \geq W(0) > 0$ by Assumption 1.2 and $\theta \leq 0$ and convexity of the relative entropy. Likewise, it holds by strict monotonicity of the function $\lambda \mapsto a\log(b + \lambda a)$ as long as $b + \lambda a > 0$ the lower bound

$$\log\left(\frac{(1-\lambda)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}} + \lambda c}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right)(c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}) \geq \log\left(\frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}}\right)(c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}) = \theta W\,(c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}),$$

where the inequality is strict as long as $c \neq c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}$. Hence, we obtain for any $c \neq c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}$

$$h'_\theta(\lambda) > \theta \int W(x)(c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x))\,\mathrm{d}x + ((1-\lambda)\theta + \lambda\eta)(\eta - \theta) = \lambda(\theta - \eta)^2 \geq 0,$$

by using the constraints $\eta + \int Wc = \rho = \theta + \int Wc_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}$. The uniqueness from the minimizer follows now from (4.8) and the mean value theorem. □

Lemma 4.1 justifies that the normalized constrained free energy $\mathcal{F}_\rho$ from (1.11) is well-defined for any $c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$.

4.2. **The energy–energy-dissipation principle.** Let $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)]$, $t>0$, be the solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5). We wish to show that the function $t\to\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t,\cdot))$ is decreasing. For the calculations it is convenient to rewrite the set of equations (1.1), (1.2), (1.5) in the form

$$\partial_t c(x,t)=\partial_x\left(c(x,t)\,\partial_x\log\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)\quad\text{with b.c.}\quad \log\frac{c(0,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(0)}=0 \tag{4.11}$$

Then, we obtain by formal integration by parts using the above boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}t}\mathcal{F}(c(t,\cdot)) &= \int_0^\infty\frac{\partial c(x,t)}{\partial t}(\log c(x,t)+V(x))\,{\rm d}x+\theta(t)\frac{{\rm d}\theta(t)}{{\rm d}t}\\ &= \int_0^\infty\frac{\partial c(x,t)}{\partial t}\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right){\rm d}x \;=\; -\int_0^\infty\left(\partial_x\log\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)^2c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\ .\end{aligned}$$

We wish to justify this calculation only under the assumption that the initial data satisfies (1.7).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)]$, $0<t\le T_0$, be the solution of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial data satisfying (1.7) constructed in Proposition 2.1. Then for any t_0 satisfying $0<t_0<T_0$, the function $(t_0,T_0)\ni t\to\mathcal{F}(c(t,\cdot))$ is continuous, decreasing and satisfies*

$$\frac{{\rm d}^+}{{\rm d}t}\mathcal{F}(c(t))\le-\mathcal{D}(c(t),\theta(t)):=-\int_0^\infty\left(\partial_x\log\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)^2c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\ , \tag{4.12}$$

where $\frac{{\rm d}^+}{{\rm d}t}f(t)=\limsup_{\delta\to0}\frac{f(t+\delta)-f(t)}{\delta}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, we have for any $t_0>0$ that $\sup c(\cdot,t)\le N$ and hence also $\mathcal{F}(c(\cdot,t))$ is well-defined for $t\in(t_0,T_0)$. We are going to use a cut-off at 0 and ∞. Let $\phi:[0,\infty)\to\mathbf{R}^+$ be a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function which has the property that $\phi(x)=1$, $0\le x\le1$, and $\phi(x)=0$, $x\ge2$. For $0<\varepsilon\le1$ and $L\ge1$ we define a function $\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $t>t_0$, by

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)\;=\;\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)\Psi\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_0(x)}\right)c^{\rm eq}_0(x)\,{\rm d}x+\frac12\left(\rho-\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\right)^2\ . \tag{4.13}$$

Then the function $t\to\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $t>t_0$, is $\mathcal{C}^1$. To calculate its time derivative, we use the identity

$$\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)\underbrace{\Psi'}_{=\log}\left(\frac{c^{\rm eq}_\theta(x)}{c^{\rm eq}_0(x)}\right)\partial_tc(x,t)\,{\rm d}x=\left(\varrho-\int_0^\infty W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\right)\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)W(x)\partial_tc(x,t)\,{\rm d}x.$$

Now, we calculate using this identity

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}t}\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)&=\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)\Psi'\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_0(x)}\right)\partial_tc(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\\ &\quad-\left(\rho-\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\right)\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)W(x)\partial_tc(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\\ &=\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)\partial_tc(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\\ &\quad-\left(\int_0^\varepsilon W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x+\int_\varepsilon^\infty(1-\phi(x/L))W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\right)\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)W(x)\partial_tc(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\\ &=-\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)-I^1_{\varepsilon,L}(t)-I^2_{\varepsilon,L}(t)+I^3_{\varepsilon,L}(t)\left[I^4_{\varepsilon,L}(t)+I^5_{\varepsilon,L}(t)\right]\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

where the last step follows by using $\partial_tc=\partial_x\left(c\partial_x\log\frac{c}{c^{\rm eq}_\theta}\right)$ and integration by parts with $\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $I^1_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $I^2_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $I^3_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $I^4_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$, $I^5_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$ are given by the formulas

$$\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)=\int_\varepsilon^\infty\phi(x/L)\left(\partial_x\log\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}}\right)^2c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x$$

$$I^1_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = \log\left(\frac{c(\varepsilon,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(\varepsilon)}\right)\,\partial_x \log\left(\frac{c(\varepsilon,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(\varepsilon)}\right)\,c(\varepsilon,t)\ ,$$

$$I^2_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = \frac{1}{L}\int_\varepsilon^\infty \phi'(x/L)\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)\,\partial_x \log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)\,c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\ ,$$

$$I^3_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = \int_0^\varepsilon W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x + \int_\varepsilon^\infty [1-\phi(x/L)]W(x)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\ ,$$

$$I^4_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = W(\varepsilon)\,\partial_x \log\left(\frac{c(\varepsilon,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(\varepsilon)}\right)\,c(\varepsilon,t)\ ,$$

$$I^5_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = \int_\varepsilon^\infty (\phi(x/L)W(x))'\,\partial_x \log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)\,c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\ .$$

To prove (4.14) we assume first that $b(x,t) = \partial_x \log c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x) = \theta(t)W'(x) - V'(x)$ has sufficient regularity so that $c(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a classical solution to (1.1), (1.5). It is clear in this case that the function $t \mapsto \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$, and upon using (1.4) that

$$\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}t}\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t) \;=\; \int_\varepsilon^\infty \phi(x/L)\frac{\partial c(x,t)}{\partial t}\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right){\rm d}x - I^3_{\varepsilon,L}(t)\int_\varepsilon^\infty \phi(x/L)W(x)\partial_t c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\ . \tag{4.15}$$

From (4.11) we see upon integration by parts in x, that the first term on the RHS of (4.15) is identical to the sum of the first term on the RHS of (4.14) minus $I^1_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$ and $I^2_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$. Again integrating by parts using (4.11) we see that the coefficient of $I^3_{\varepsilon,L}(t)$ in (4.15) is equal to $-[I^4_{\varepsilon,L}(t) + I^5_{\varepsilon,L}(t)]$. Once we have the formula (4.14) we can remove the extra regularity assumption on $b(\cdot,\cdot)$ since by Lemma 3.1 we see that the RHS of (4.14) is continuous in t with just the assumption (2.3).

We observe next from (4.13) that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = \mathcal{G}_{0,L}(t)$ exists and is given by the integral on the RHS of (4.13) with $\varepsilon = 0$. Similarly Theorem 3.1 implies that we may let $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (4.14) to conclude that the function $t \mapsto \mathcal{G}_{0,L}(t),\ t > t_0$, is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and its derivative is given by the RHS of (4.14) with $\varepsilon = 0$. Note from (1.5) that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} I^1_{\varepsilon,L}(t) = I^1_{0,L}(t) = 0$. Let $0 < t_0 < t_1 < t_2$ such that $c(\cdot,t)$ is a solution for $t \in (t_1,t_2)$ as constructed in Proposition 2.1. We shall show that for some constant C,

$$\sup_{t_1\le t\le t_2} |I^j_{0,L}(t)| \;\le C\ ,\quad j = 2,3,4,5,\ L \ge 1\ , \tag{4.16}$$

and also that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} I^j_{0,L}(t) \;=\; 0\ ,\quad j = 2,3,\ t_1 < t < t_2\ . \tag{4.17}$$

The result follows from (4.14) with $\varepsilon = 0$ and (4.16), (4.17) since $\mathcal{G}(c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)) = \lim_{L\to\infty}\mathcal{G}_{0,L}(t)$ and $\mathcal{D}(c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)) = \lim_{L\to\infty}\mathcal{D}_{0,L}(t)$.

To bound $I^2_{0,L}(t),\ t_1 \le t \le t_2$, uniformly as $L \to \infty$ we first note that for some constant C_0 and the support restriction for ϕ, we have uniformly in L for any $x \in [L,2L]$

$$\sup_{x\in[L,2L]} \frac{\phi(x/L)}{L^2} \le C_0$$

by the uniform bound on a'' in Assumption 1.2. Now, use integration by parts such that

$$\begin{aligned}
I^2_{0,L}(t) &= \frac{1}{L}\int \phi'(x/L)\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)\left(\partial_x c(x,t) - c(x,t)\partial_x \log c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)\right){\rm d}x\\
&= -\frac{1}{L^2}\int \phi''(x/L)\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_{\theta(t)}(x)}\right)c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x - \int \phi'(x/L)\partial_x c(x,t)\,{\rm d}x\\
&= -\frac{1}{L^2}\int \phi''(x/L)\left(\log\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_0(x)}\right) - c(x,t) + c^{\rm eq}_0(x)\right){\rm d}x
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{\theta(t)}{L^2}\int \phi''(x/L)W(x)c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x+\frac{1}{L^2}\int \phi''(x/L)c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x$$
$$\le C_0\int_L^{2L}\Psi\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right)c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x+C_0\int_L^{2L}W(x)c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x+C_0\int_L^{2L}c_0^{\mathrm{eq}}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The first of the above integral is bounded by $\mathcal{H}(c|c_0)\le\mathcal{G}(c,\theta)$, the second by the conservation law (1.4) and the third by the integrability condition of Assumption 1.2, whence we see that (4.16), (4.17) hold for $j=2$. Evidently (1.4) implies that (4.16), (4.17) hold for $j=3$, and Theorem 3.1 implies that (4.16) holds for $j=4$.

We are left then to prove (4.16) for $j=5$. First, since $\log\left(\frac{c(0,t)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta(t)}(0)}\right)=0$, we can integrate by parts and obtain

$$I^5_{0,L}(t)=-\int\underbrace{\Big(\big(\phi(x/L)W(x)\big)''-\big(\phi(x/L)W(x)\big)'\,\partial_x\log c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta(t)}(x)\Big)}_{=:I(x)}c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Due to the growth bounds (1.24), (1.25), (1.26), (1.27) of Assumption 1.2, we obtain

$$|\partial_x\log c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta(t)}(x)|=|-V'(x)+\theta(t)W'(x)|\le C_0(1+|\theta(t)|)W'(x).$$

Then, the prefactor I in front of $c(x,t)$ is bounded by

$$I(x)\le\|\phi''\|_\infty\frac{W(x)}{L^2}+2\|\phi'\|\frac{W'(x)}{L}+W''(x)+C_0\left(\|\phi'\|_\infty\frac{W(x)}{L}+W'(x)\right)(1+|\theta(t)|)W'(x),$$

which can further estimated by $W(x)$ with the help of Assumption 1.2.

Hence, the $I^5_{0,L}(t)$ is bounded with the help of (1.4) by a constant depending on $\|\theta\|_\infty$, uniformly in $L\ge1$ and $t_1\le t\le t_2$. □

Remark 4.1. *Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 combined with the local existence result Proposition 2.1 imply global existence of solutions to* (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) *with initial data satisfying* (1.7). *The reason is that Lemma 4.2 implies that* $\theta(t)$, $t>0$, *is bounded by a constant depending only on* $\theta(0)$ *and* ρ.

The last ingredient for the proof of the convergence to equilibrium is a dual variational characterization of the dissipation, which allows to prove it lower semicontinuity.

Lemma 4.3. *Let* C_1,C_2 *be positive constants and the convex set* $\mathcal{X}=\{[c,\theta]\in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)\times\mathbf{R}\ :\ \mathcal{G}(c,\theta)\le C_1,\ \|c\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)}\le C_2\ \}$. *Then the domain of* $\mathcal{D}$ *as defined in* (4.12) *extends from* $\mathcal{C}^1(\mathbf{R}^+)\times\mathbf{R}^+$ *to* $\mathcal{X}$ *by defining*

$$\mathcal{D}(c,\theta)=\sup_{\phi\in\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^+)}\int\mathcal{D}^*_\theta[\phi](x)\,c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\tag{4.18}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}^*_\theta[\phi](x)=2\partial_x\phi(x)+2\phi(x)\,\partial_x\log c_\theta(x)-|\phi(x)|^2.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{D}$ *by this definition is sequentially lower semicontinuous on* $\mathcal{X}$.

Proof. From the definition (4.18), it is clear that we can use test function $\phi\in\mathcal{C}^1_0(\mathbf{R}^+)$. Let us first assume, that $c\in\mathcal{C}^1(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with $c(0)=c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(0)$. Then, we can integrate by parts in the first term using $\phi(0)=0$ and obtain

$$\int\mathcal{D}^*_\theta[\phi](x)\,c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x=\int\left(-2\phi(x)\,\partial_x\log\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta(x)}-|\phi(x)|^2\right)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.\tag{4.19}$$

Let $\psi:\mathbf{R}\to\mathbf{R}$ be a non-negative $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function with support in the interval $[-1,1]$, with integral equal to 1 and define for $\varepsilon>0$ the function $\psi_\varepsilon:\mathbf{R}\to\mathbf{R}$ by $\psi_\varepsilon(x)=\varepsilon^{-1}\psi(x/\varepsilon)$, $x\in\mathbf{R}$. Then, we set

$$c_\varepsilon(x)=c(x)\int_0^x\psi_\varepsilon(y-\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}y+c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\left(1-\int_0^x\psi_\varepsilon(y-\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}y\right).$$

By choosing $\phi_\varepsilon = -\partial_x \log \frac{c_\varepsilon}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}}$, we have

$$\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)}{c_\varepsilon(x)}\left(\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)} - 1\right)\psi_\varepsilon(x-\varepsilon) + \int_0^x \psi_\varepsilon(y-\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\left(\frac{\partial_x c(x)}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)} - \frac{\partial_x c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)\,c(x)}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)^2}\right)\right)$$

and hence $\phi_\varepsilon(0) = 0$, since $c(0) = c_\theta^{\rm eq}(0)$. For $x \in [0, 2\varepsilon)$ by using again the boundary condition and the $\mathcal{C}^1$ assumption, we obtain for some $x_1, x_2 \in (0, x) \subseteq (0, 2\varepsilon)$

$$|\phi_\varepsilon(x)| \le C\left(\frac{|\partial_x c(x_1)| + |\partial_x c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x_2)|}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)} x\psi_\varepsilon(x-\varepsilon) + 1\right) \le C\left(\varepsilon \sup_{z>0} \psi_\varepsilon(z) + 1\right) \le C, \tag{4.20}$$

where C is independent of ε. Hence, by using ϕ_ε as test function in (4.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int \mathcal{D}_\theta^*[\phi_v e](x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ge &-\int_0^{2\varepsilon}\left(2|\phi_\varepsilon(x)|\left|\partial_x \log\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)}\right| + |\phi_\varepsilon(x)|^2\right)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_{2\varepsilon}^\infty \left(\partial_x \log\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}(x)}\right)^2 c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

The bound (4.20) and $\mathcal{C}^1$ assumption ensure that we can let $\varepsilon \to 0$ and obtain a lower bound of $\mathcal{D}(c,\theta)$ as defined in (4.18) in terms of the one in (4.12). On the other hand, we can interchange the integration and sup in (4.18). The sup is attained for $\phi = -\partial_x \log \frac{c}{c_\theta^{\rm eq}}$ and we obtain an upper bound by (4.12). This shows, that the definition (4.18) is consistent with (4.12) for $c \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with $\mathcal{D}(c,\theta) < \infty$.

Finally, we observe that $\mathcal{D}_\theta^*[\phi] \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbf{R}^+)$ due to $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^+)$ and Assumption 1.2. Hence, if $[c_m, \theta_m]$, $m = 1, 2, ..$, is a sequence in $\mathcal{X}$ such that c_m converges weakly (see (4.1)) to some $c \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\theta_m \to \theta$, then the statement on the lower semicontinuity follows by interchanging the lim and sup in the dual formulation of the dissipation (4.18). □

4.3. **Convergence to equiibrium.** We can now use the LaSalle invariance principle to prove convergence of the solution of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) to an equilibrium solution (1.3) and finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of convergence to equilibrium statements of Theorem 1.1. We start with following preliminary observation and summary of the results. Let C_1, C_2 be positive constants and the convex set $\mathcal{X} = \{[c,\theta] \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+) \times \mathbf{R}\ : \mathcal{G}(c,\theta) \le C_1,\ \|c\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)} \le C_2\ \}$, then the superlinear growth of Ψ and the growth condition (1.27) on W in Assumption 1.2 imply uniform integrability of $\mathcal{X} \subset L^1(\mathbf{R}^+) \times \mathbf{R}^+$. Indeed, since W is increasing, we have $W(\cdot) \ge W(0) > 0$ and we can estimate $\|c\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^+)} \le W(0)^{-1}\|c\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)} \le W(0)^{-1}C_2$ for all $c \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence $\mathcal{X}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\mathbf{R}^+)$. In addition, we obtain from (4.4), applied with $L = 0$, the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\int \max\{0, c\log c\}\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int c\log c\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{\{c\le 1\}} c\log c\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \mathcal{H}(c|c_0^{\rm eq}) + \int (1 + \log c_0^{\rm eq} + V)c\,\mathrm{d}x + \left(e^{-1} - 1\right)\int c_0^{\rm eq}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \mathcal{G}(c,\theta) + \int c\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_1 + W(0)^{-1}C_2,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $c_0^{\rm eq} = \exp(-V)$ and $e^{-1} - 1 \le 0$. Hence, the convex set $\mathcal{X}$ is uniform integrable in $L^1(\mathbf{R}^+)$ (see [9, Theorem 4.5.9]). Now, the set $\mathcal{X}$ has uniform absolutely continuous integrals. By the uniform integrability we find for $\varepsilon > 0$ a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\{c\ge C\}} c\,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\,, \qquad \text{for all } c \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Set $\delta = \varepsilon(2C)^{-1}$ and let $A \subset \mathbf{R}^+$ with $|A| \le \delta$. Then, for any $c \in \mathcal{X}$ holds

$$\int_A c\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{A\cap\{c\le C\}} c\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{A\cap\{c\ge C\}} c\,\mathrm{d}x \le \delta C + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \le \varepsilon$$

by our choice of δ. Hence $\mathcal{X}$ has also uniform absolutely continuous integrals. The last condition to obtain relative compactness is a uniform tightness condition. For $\varepsilon > 0$ fix L_ε such that $C_2 W(L_\varepsilon)^{-1} \le \varepsilon$. Then, we obtain

$$\int_{L_\varepsilon}^{\infty} c\,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{1}{W(L_\varepsilon)} \int_{L_\varepsilon}^{\infty} W\,c\,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{C_2}{W(L_\varepsilon)} \le \varepsilon.$$

We obtain that $\mathcal{X}$ is relative compact in $L^1(\mathbf{R}^+)$ by an application of [9, Theorem 4.7.20]). Since, the Lyapunov function $[c,\theta] \mapsto \mathcal{G}(c,\theta)$ by Lemma 4.1 and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)}$ are lower semicontinuous, we obtain that $\mathcal{X}$ is a compact metric space. Finally, also the dissipation $[c,\theta] \mapsto \mathcal{D}(c,\theta)$ lower semi-continuous from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathbf{R}$ by Lemma 4.3.

We have already observed the Remark 4.1 that the solution $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)],\ t>0$, of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial data satisfying (1.7) exists globally in time. Furthermore, for any $t_0 > 0$ there exist by Lemma 3.6 constants C_1, C_2 depending on t_0 such that $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)] \in \mathcal{X}$ for $t \ge t_0$. It follows now from [40, Theorem 4.2 in Chapter IV] that $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)]$ converges in $\mathcal{X}$ as $t \mapsto \infty$ to the largest invariant subset of $[c,\theta] \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{D}(c,\theta) = 0$. Evidently this invariant set is the subset $\Omega := \{[c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta, \theta] : \theta \le 0\} \subset \mathcal{X}$.

Observe now from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 3.6 that if $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$ is the union of $\{[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)] :\ t \ge t_0\}$ and Ω then $\mathcal{G}$ is continuous on $\tilde{U}_{M,N}$. Hence there exists $\theta_\infty \le 0$ such that $\inf_{t>0} \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)) = \mathcal{G}(c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_\infty}, \theta_\infty)$, and from (4.7) it follows that this θ_∞ is unique. We conclude that $[c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)]$ converges in $\mathcal{X}$ as $t \to \infty$ to $[c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_\infty}, \theta_\infty]$. From Lemma 4.1 we have that $\inf_{t>0} \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot,t),\theta(t)) \ge \mathcal{G}(c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}})$ with $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$, whence it follows from (4.7) that $\theta_\infty \le \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$.

Now, we assume that $\theta_\infty < \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$ and then obtain a contradiction. Since $\theta_\infty < 0$ by assumption, we may apply Lemma 3.7 and have for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $M(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{M(\delta)}^{\infty} W(x) c(x,T)\,\mathrm{d}x \ < \ \delta \quad \text{for all } T \ge 0\ . \tag{4.21}$$

The proof of the proposition follows by observing from Lemma 3.6 that $c(\cdot,t)$ converges uniformly on any finite interval $[0,L]$ as $t \to \infty$ to $c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(\cdot)$ with $\theta = \theta_\infty$. It follows from this and (4.21) that

$$\theta + \int_0^{\infty} W(x) c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ = \ \rho \quad \text{when } \theta = \theta_\infty\ . \tag{4.22}$$

The identity (4.22) yields a contradiction to our assumption that $\theta_\infty < \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho)$.

Let us now prove (1.8). We assume first that $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho) < 0$, then (1.8) follows from Lemma 3.6 and (4.21). If $\rho = \int W(x) c^{\mathrm{eq}}_0(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$ then Lemma 3.6 again implies for any $L > 0$ that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \int_0^L W(x) |c(x,t) - c^{\mathrm{eq}}_0(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \ = \ 0\ . \tag{4.23}$$

For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $L_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^{L_\delta} W(x) c^{\mathrm{eq}}_0(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \ > \ \rho - \delta\ . \tag{4.24}$$

In this case, we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} \theta(t) = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho) = 0$. Hence using (1.4) we have from (4.23), (4.24) that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $T_\delta > 0$ with the property

$$\int_{L_\delta}^{\infty} W(x) c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x \ \le \ 2\delta \quad \text{for } t \ge T_\delta\ . \tag{4.25}$$

Now (1.8) follows from (4.25) just as in the case $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}(\rho) < 0$. □

5. Rate of convergence to equilibrium (subcritical)

The proof on the rate of convergence to equilibrium is based on exploiting further the energy–dissipation relation established in Lemma 4.2 in more detail and give a quantitative bound of the energy in terms of the dissipation. This approach was first implemented for the classical Becker-Döring equation in [27] and recently generalized in [12]. Moreover, a similar strategy was recently applied to obtain rates of convergence to equilibrium for Fokker-Planck equation with constraints [17].

5.1. **Basic estimates for the free energy and dissipation.** First, we derive the following identity and properties of the normalized free energy (1.11).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\rho < \rho_s$. Let $\mathcal{F}_\rho$ be defined as in (1.11), then it holds for all $c \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$*

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) = \mathcal{H}\big(c|c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}\big) + \tfrac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}})^2 \qquad \textit{with} \qquad \theta = \rho - \int W(x)\, c(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \tag{5.1}$$

and where $\mathcal{H}(f|g)$ is the relative entropy

$$\mathcal{H}(f|g) := \int g(x)\Psi\left(\frac{f(x)}{g(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x \qquad \textit{with} \qquad \Psi(r) := r\log r - r + 1.$$

Moreover, for any $\theta < 0$ and any $c \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ such that $\theta + \int Wc = \rho$ holds

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) + \tfrac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}})^2 \le \mathcal{H}(c|c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta). \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. For the proof we neglect the argument and integration variable, which will be always $\mathrm{d}x$. As a preliminary step, we obtain for some $\bar\theta < 0$ the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) &= \int c\,(\log c - 1) + \int cV + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 - \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}(\log c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}} - 1) + \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}} V - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2_{\mathrm{eq}} \\
&= \int c\,\log\frac{c}{c_{\bar\theta}} - \int c + \bar\theta\int cW + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}\int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}} W + \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}} - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2_{\mathrm{eq}} \\
&= \mathcal{H}(c|c_{\bar\theta}) + \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}} - \int c_{\bar\theta} + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2 - \bar\theta\,\theta + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2_{\mathrm{eq}} - \rho\big(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \bar\theta\big) \\
&=: \mathcal{H}(c|c_{\bar\theta}) + I\big(\bar\theta, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}, \theta\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the identity (5.1) follows by setting $\bar\theta = \theta_{\mathrm{eq}} < 0$ by the assumption $\rho < \rho_s$ and hence noting that $I(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}})^2$. The estimate (5.2) follows by setting $\bar\theta = \theta$ once we have shown $I(\theta, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}, \theta) \le -\frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}})^2$. First, we note that

$$I(\theta, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}, \theta) = \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}} - \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta + \left(\frac{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} + \theta}{2} - \rho\right)(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \theta).$$

We introduce $m(\theta) := \int c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta < \infty$ having derivatives

$$0 < m^{(k)}(\theta) = \int W^k c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta < \infty \qquad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

for any $\theta < 0$ by Assumption 1.2. Hence, we have from the conservation of mass $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} + m'(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}) = \rho$ the following identity

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\theta, \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}, \theta) &= m(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}) - m(\theta) + \left(\frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}) - m'(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}})\right)(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \theta) \\
&= m(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}) - m(\theta) - m'(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}})(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \theta) - \frac{1}{2}(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \theta)^2 \\
&\le -\Big(1 + \min\big\{m''(\theta), m''(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}})\big\}\Big)\,\frac{1}{2}(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \theta)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used a Taylor expansion of $m(\theta_{\mathrm{eq}})$ and the monotonicity of $m''(\theta)$, that is $0 < m'''(\theta) < \infty$ for any $\theta < 0$. □

The next ingredient is a weighted Pinsker inequality, which in the setting of the classical Becker-Döring model is derived in [27, 29] and for probability measures is proven by similar means in [10].

Lemma 5.2 (Pinsker inequality)**.** *Let $\theta < 0$ and V, W satisfy Assumption 1.2. Then it holds for all $c \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$*

$$\int W(x)\,|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{2}{|\theta|}\max\Big\{\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}), \sqrt{C_V\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}})}\Big\}, \tag{5.3}$$

with $C_V = \int e^{-V} < \infty$.
Moreover, for any $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ and any $L > 0$ exists $C = C(V, W, \theta, L)$ such that

$$\int_0^L W(x)|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)| \le 2\max\Big\{\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq},L}), \sqrt{C\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq},L})}\Big\}, \tag{5.4}$$

where $c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq},L}(x) := \mathbf{1}_{[0,L]}(x)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)$.

Proof. We introduce the convex non-negative function $\varphi(r) = (1 + r)\log(1 + r) - r$, which allows to rewrite

$$\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}) = \int c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\varphi\Big(\frac{c - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The convex dual function $\varphi^*(s) = e^s - s - 1$ has the property $\varphi^*(\varepsilon s) \le \varepsilon^2\varphi^*(s)$ for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, it holds $\varphi(|r|) \le \varphi(r)$. By convex duality, the bound $rs \le \varphi(r) + \varphi^*(s)$ holds. Hence, by setting $r = \frac{|c(x)-c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}$ and $s = \varepsilon\eta W(x)$ for some $\eta > 0$ to be determined later, we arrive at

$$\varepsilon\eta W(x)\frac{|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)} \le \varphi\Big(\frac{c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\Big) + \varepsilon^2 e^{\eta W(x)}.$$

Dividing by ε, multiplying by $c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)$ and integrating over $[0, L]$ leads to

$$\eta\int_0^L W(x)|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le \varepsilon\int_0^L e^{\eta W(x)}c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}). \tag{5.5}$$

To proof (5.3), we set $\eta = |\theta|$, $L = \infty$ in (5.5) and obtain

$$|\theta|\int W(x)|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le \varepsilon\int_0^\infty e^{-V(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}).$$

The integral $\int e^{-V(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x$ is bounded by Assumption 1.2 and we obtain the result (5.3) by setting $\varepsilon = \min\big\{\sqrt{\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}})}/\sqrt{C_V}, 1\big\}$.
To proof (5.4), we just set $\eta = 1$ in (5.5) and get the constant

$$C(V, W, \theta, L) := \int_0^L e^{W(x)}c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_0^L \exp(-V(x) + (\theta + 1)W(x))\,\mathrm{d}x < \infty,$$

which by setting $\varepsilon = \min\Big\{\sqrt{\mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}})}/\sqrt{C}, 1\Big\}$ gives again the result. □

We give an immediate Corollary of the above Pinsker inequality and Lemma 5.1, which by the convergence statement of Theorem 1.2 proofs Corollary 1.1.

Corollary 5.1. *For $\rho < \rho_s$ and with Assumption 1.2 it holds for any $c \in L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with $\theta + \|c\|_{L^1_W(\mathbf{R}^+)} = \rho$ the estimate*

$$\Big(\int W(x)|c(x) - c_{\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\Big)^2 + (\theta - \theta^{\mathrm{eq}})^2 \le \Big(1 + 4|\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}|^{-2}\max\Big\{\mathcal{F}_\rho(c), C_V\Big\}\Big)\mathcal{F}_\rho(c),$$

where $C_V = \int e^{-V(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x$.

Proof. By the representation (5.1) of Lemma 5.1, it is enough to bound $\mathcal{H}(c|c_{\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}^{\mathrm{eq}})$ from below, for which we use the Pinsker inequality of Lemma 5.2 with $\theta = \theta^{\mathrm{eq}}$. □

Since, by the energy dissipation identity (1.9) the free energy $\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t))$ is decreasing along a solution c of (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5), we find that whenever $c(t)$ is such that $\theta(t) \le -\delta$, the estimate $\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t)) \le C\mathcal{H}(c(t)|c^{\mathrm{eq}}_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}})$ for some constant only depending on Assumption 1.2 and δ.

The following weighted L^1 estimate will help to control error terms occurring in the derivation of the dissipation inequality.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose Assumption 1.2 holds.*

(a) Let $\delta > 0$. Then, for any $\theta < 0$ and all c smooth enough with $\theta + \|Wc\|_1 = \rho$ as well as $c(0) = c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(0)$ holds for some $C = C(V, W, \theta)$

$$\int \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x)\, |c(x) - c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)|\, \mathrm{d}x \le C\sqrt{(\rho - \theta)\, \mathcal{D}(c, \theta)}.$$

(b) Let $\Theta > 0$ and $L > 0$. Then for all $|\theta| \le \Theta$ and all c smooth enough with $\theta + \int Wc = \rho$ as well as $c(0) = c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(0)$ holds for some $C = C(V, W, \Theta, L)$

$$\int_0^L \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x)\, |c(x) - c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)|\, \mathrm{d}x \le C\sqrt{(\rho - \theta)\, \mathcal{D}(c, \theta)}. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Let us start by noting that since $c(0) = c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(0)$, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x)\, |c(x) - c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)|\, \mathrm{d}x &= \int_0^\infty \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x) \left| \frac{c(x)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)} - 1 \right| c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_0^\infty \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x) \left| \int_0^x \partial_y \frac{c(y)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(y)}\, \mathrm{d}y \right| c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \\
&\le \int_0^\infty \left| \partial_y \frac{c(y)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(y)} \right| \int_y^\infty \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x)\, c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\, \mathrm{d}x\, \mathrm{d}y.
\end{aligned}$$

The inner integral can be bounded by applying (1.25) of Assumption 1.2 leading to $c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x) \le e^{-(|\theta|-\delta)W(x)}$ for $x \ge x_\delta$. Then, we have by integration by parts for any $y \ge x_\delta$ the bound

$$\int_y^\infty \sqrt{W(x)}\, \underbrace{W'(x)\, e^{-(|\theta|-\delta)W(x)}}_{=-(|\theta|-\delta)^{-1}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} e^{-(|\theta|-\delta)W(x)}}\, \mathrm{d}x \le \frac{\sqrt{W(y)} e^{-(|\theta|-\delta)W(y)}}{|\theta| + \delta} + \frac{\int_y^\infty \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x)\, c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\, \mathrm{d}x}{2(|\theta| + \delta)W(y)}.$$

Hence, we obtain a bound, if we choose x_δ large enough such that $(|\theta| + \delta)W(y) \ge 1$. On the other hand, for $y \le x_\theta$ the integral on $[y, x_\theta]$ is anyway bounded. Hence, for a constant $C = C(V, W, \theta)$, we can further estimate by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \sqrt{W(x)}\, W'(x)\, |c(x) - c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)|\, \mathrm{d}x &\le C \int \sqrt{W(x)} \left| \partial_y \log \frac{c(y)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(y)} \right| c(y)\, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\le C \left(\int W(x) c(x)\, \mathrm{d}x\, \mathcal{D}(c, \theta) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the estimate (5.6) is an immediate consequence by suitable truncating the above occurring integrals to the interval $[0, L]$. □

5.2. **Weighted logarithmic Sobolev inequalities.** In this section, we are going to show the following result:

Theorem 5.1. *Take $\rho < \rho_{\mathrm{s}}$, $\delta > 0$ and $k > 0$. Let $-1/\delta \le \theta \le -\delta$ and define the weight*

$$\omega(x) := \frac{W(x)}{(W'(x))^2}. \tag{5.7}$$

Then, for any $c \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ such that $\theta + \int Wc = \rho$, $c(0) = c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(0)$ and

$$\left(\int \omega(x)^k c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)\, \Psi\left(\frac{c(x)}{c^{\mathrm{eq}}_\theta(x)} \right) \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} =: C_k \tag{5.8}$$

there exists a constant $C_{\mathrm{LSI}} = C_{\mathrm{LSI}}(V, W, \delta)$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c)^{\frac{1+k}{k}} \leq C_k\, C_{\mathrm{LSI}}\, \mathcal{D}(c, \theta). \tag{5.9}$$

In particular, if (1.12) *holds with* $\beta = 0$*, that is* $c_0 W(x) \leq W'(x)^2$*, then there exists* $C_{\mathrm{LSI}} = C_{\mathrm{LSI}}(V, W, \delta)$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) \leq \frac{C_{\mathrm{LSI}}}{c_0}\, \mathcal{D}(c, \theta). \tag{5.10}$$

A form of the above weighted entropy dissipation inequality (5.9) was recently derived in [12] for the classical Becker-Döring model with subcritical inital mass. The main ingredient of the proof is a weighted logarithmic Sobolev inequality, which we adopt to our setting with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Therefore, we slightly modify the arguments in [2, 4, 5, 8] to deduce a criterion for logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on the positive half real line incorporating functions with fixed boundary conditions at 0.

Proposition 5.1. *Let* $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ *and* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ *be absolutely continuous and by abuse of notation let its density be denoted by* $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$*. Let* A *be the smallest constant such that for any smooth* f *on* $\mathbf{R}^+$ *with* $f(0) = 1$ *it holds*

$$\mathrm{Ent}_\nu(f) := \int f \log \frac{f}{\int f\,\mathrm{d}\nu}\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq A \int |\partial_x \log f|^2 f\,\mathrm{d}\mu. \tag{5.11}$$

Then, it holds $B/4 \leq A \leq B$ *where*

$$B := \sup_{x>0} B(x) \qquad \textit{with} \qquad B(x) := \nu\big([x,\infty]\big) \log\left(1 + \frac{e^2}{\nu\big([x,\infty]\big)}\right) \int_0^x \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{\mu(y)} \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. For the proof it will be convenient to proof the equivalent formulation of (5.11) with f replaced by f^2, which does not change the boundary value $f(0) = f^2(0) = 1$. Hence, we want to prove the inequality

$$\mathrm{Ent}_\nu(f^2) := \int f^2 \log \frac{f^2}{\int f^2\,\mathrm{d}\nu} \leq 4A \int |f'|^2\,\mathrm{d}\mu. \tag{5.13}$$

Let us write $\Phi(r) := e^r - 1$. Therewith, we can define an Orlicz type of norm, by setting for $K > 0$

$$\|f\|_{\nu,\Phi,K} := \sup\left\{ \int |f| g\,\mathrm{d}\nu : g \geq 0, \int \Phi(g)\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq K \right\}. \tag{5.14}$$

Let us assume, for a moment, that the following facts hold true

$$\mathrm{Ent}_\nu(f^2) \leq \big\|(f-1)^2\big\|_{\nu,\Phi,e^2} \tag{5.15}$$

$$\forall I \subset \mathbf{R}^+ : \qquad \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{\nu,\Phi,K} = \nu[I] \log\left(1 + \frac{K}{\nu[I]}\right) \tag{5.16}$$

The identity (5.15) shows, that it is enough to show that the best constant A in

$$\|(f-1)^2\|_{\nu,\Phi,e^2} \leq A \int |f'|^2\,\mathrm{d}\mu$$

satisfies $B \leq A \leq 4B$ with B as in (5.12). This result follows by an application of [4, Proposition 2] or [8, Corollary 5.2], which yields the following expression for B

$$B = \sup_{x>0} \|\mathbf{1}_{[x,\infty)}\|_{\nu,\Phi,e^2} \int_0^x \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{\mu(y)}.$$

Hence, the identity (5.16) gives the conclusion. It is left to show (5.15) and (5.16).

For the proof of (5.15), let us start from the following observation by [35, Lemma 9] for any $a \in \mathbf{R}$

$$\mathrm{Ent}_\nu\big(f^2\big) \leq \mathrm{Ent}_\nu\big((f-a)^2\big) + 2\int (f-a)^2\,\mathrm{d}\nu.$$

On the other hand by the variational characterization of the entropy follows for any $f \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ent}_\nu(f) + 2\int f\,\mathrm{d}\nu &= \sup_g\Big\{\int f(g+2)\,\mathrm{d}\nu : \int e^g\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq 1\Big\}\\ &\leq \sup_g\Big\{\int fg\mathbf{1}_{\{g\geq 0\}}\,\mathrm{d}\nu : \int e^g\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq e^2\Big\}\\ &\leq \sup_g\Big\{\int fg\,\mathrm{d}\nu : g\geq 0, \int (e^g-1)\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq e^2\Big\} = \|f\|_{\nu,\Phi,e^2}.\end{aligned}$$

The last step is a consequence of $\int e^{g\mathbf{1}_{\{g\geq 0\}}}\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq \int_{\{g\geq 0\}} e^g\,\mathrm{d}\nu + \int_{\{g<0\}} e^g\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq e^2+1$. A combination of the above two estimates yields (5.15).

One direction of the proof of (5.16) from using the function $g(x) = \mathbf{1}_I(x)\,\log(1+K/\nu[I])$ in the definition of (5.14). Using the fact that $s \mapsto \log(1+s)$ is concave, the estimate in the other direction follows from an application of the Jensen inequality

$$\int_I g\,\mathrm{d}\nu = \nu[I]\int_I \log(1+\Phi(g))\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu}{\nu[I]} \leq \nu[I]\log\Big(1+\int_I \Phi(g)\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu}{\nu[I]}\Big).$$

Taking finally the supremum over all g with $\int \Phi(g)\,\mathrm{d}\nu \leq K$ concludes (5.13). □

We derive the following consequence of Proposition 5.1 as a version of the entropy production inequality with a weight, which does not need any additional exponent. Again, the need for the weight is directly related to the fact that logarithmic Sobolev inequalities do not hold for an exponentially decaying measure such as c_θ^{eq}, but in general need a Gaussian decay to be valid.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose Assumption 1.2 holds and let $\delta > 0$. Then, there exists a constant $C_{\mathrm{LSI}} = C_{\mathrm{LSI}}(V,W,\delta)$ depending only on δ and the constants in Assumption 1.2, such that for all c with $\theta + \|Wc\|_1 = \rho$ and $-1/\delta \leq \theta \leq -\delta$ as well as $c(0) = c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)$ holds for ω given by (5.7)*

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{\omega(x)}\,\Psi\Big(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C_{\mathrm{LSI}}\mathcal{D}(c,\theta). \tag{5.17}$$

Likewise, let $\Theta > 0$ and $L > 0$, then there exists $C_{\mathrm{LSI}} = C_{\mathrm{LSI}}(V,W,\Theta,L)$ such that for any $|\theta| \leq \Theta$ and any $c \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ such that $\theta + \int Wc = \rho$ and $c(0) = c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)$ holds

$$\int_0^L \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{\omega(x)}\,\Psi\Big(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C_{\mathrm{LSI}}\mathcal{D}(c,\theta). \tag{5.18}$$

Proof. Let us set $\nu(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{\omega(x)Z_{\theta,W}}\,\mathrm{d}x$ with $Z_{\theta,W} = \int \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{\omega(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x$, $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{Z_{\theta,W}}$ and $f(x) = \frac{c}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}}(x)$. Then, it holds $\mathcal{D}(c,\theta) = Z_{\theta,W}\int |\partial_x \log f|^2 f\,\mathrm{d}\mu$ and we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}\int \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{Z_{\theta,W}\,\omega(x)}\Psi\Big(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{Z_{\theta,W}\,\omega(x)}\,\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\,\log\Big(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int \frac{c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{Z_{\theta,W}\,\omega(x)} + 1\\ &= \int f\log f\,\mathrm{d}\nu - \int f\,\mathrm{d}\nu\,\log\Big(\int f\,\mathrm{d}\nu\Big) + \Psi\Big(\frac{c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{Z_{\theta,W}\,\omega(x)}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The first term is exactly $\mathrm{Ent}_\nu(f)$. Hence, we can apply Proposition 5.1, since $f(0) = 1$ by definition and the assumption $c(0) = c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)$. The second term can be estimated by using $\Psi(x) \leq (x-1)^2$ and by noting that $1 = \int \frac{c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{Z_{\theta,W}\,\omega(x)}$ from the definition of $Z_{\theta,W}$. Then, we can apply Lemma 5.3 to it, where we note that $\frac{1}{w(x)} \leq C\sqrt{W}W'$ by (1.27) of Assumption 1.2. By doing so, we arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\int \frac{c(x)}{Z_{\theta,W}\,\omega(x)}\Psi\Big(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x &\leq \frac{A}{Z_{\theta,W}}\mathcal{D}(c,\theta) + \Big(\frac{1}{Z_{\theta,W}}\int \frac{1}{\omega(x)}|c(x)-c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\Big)^2\\ &\leq \Big(\frac{A}{Z_{\theta,W}} + \frac{C}{Z_{\theta,W}^2}\Big)\mathcal{D}(c,\theta).\end{aligned}$$

Now, we multiply by $Z_{\theta,W}$ and note that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\theta} Z_{\theta,W} = \int a(x) c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x > 0$$

and hence it holds $\infty > Z_{0,W} \geq Z_{\theta,W} \geq Z_{-\delta^{-1},W} > 0$.

For the constant A, we have that $A \leq B$ with B defined in (5.12) of Proposition 5.1. First, we obtain an upper and lower bound on $\nu([x,\infty))$. We introduce the function $b_\theta(x) = V(x) - \theta W(x)$ and have thanks to (1.25) and (1.27) for $y \geq x_{\bar\delta}$ the estimate

$$b_\theta'(x) \geq \big(|\theta| - \bar\delta\big) W'(x) \geq \big(|\theta| - \bar\delta\big)\sqrt{c_0}. \tag{5.19}$$

Hence, for $\bar\delta$ sufficiently small is b_θ monotone increasing. We assume from now on that $2\bar\delta \leq |\theta|$ To do so, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{\omega(y)} e^{-b_\theta(y)}\,\mathrm{d}y &= -\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{\omega(y)\,b_\theta'(y)} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}y} e^{-b_\theta(y)}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= \frac{e^{-b_\theta(x)}}{\omega(x) W'(x)} + \int_x^\infty \left(\frac{1}{\omega(x)\,b_\theta'(x)}\right)' e^{-b_\theta(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1}{\omega(x)\,b_\theta'(x)}\right)' &= \frac{2W'(x)W''(x)}{W(x)b_\theta'(x)} - \frac{W'(x)^3}{W(x)^2 b_\theta'(x)} - \frac{W'(x)^2\,b_\theta''(x)}{W(x)b_\theta'(x)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega(x)}\left(\frac{2W''(x)}{W'(x)^2}\frac{W'(x)}{b_\theta'(x)} - \frac{1}{W(x)}\frac{W'(x)}{b_\theta'(x)} - \frac{b_\theta''(x)}{b_\theta'(x)^2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Each term in the bracket can be made arbitrary small. Indeed, we have by (1.26) that $|W''(x)| \leq \bar\delta W'(x)^2$ for $x \geq \bar\delta$. Then, from (5.19), we have $W'(x)/b_\theta'(x) \leq \big(|\theta| - \bar\delta\big)^{-1}$ and likewise by using once more (1.25) also $W'(x)/b_\theta'(x) \geq \big(|\theta| + \bar\delta\big)^{-1}$. Moreover, again by (1.26), we have $|b_\theta''(x)| = |V''(x) - \theta W''(x)| \leq \bar\delta(1 + |\theta|)W'(x)^2$. Finally, the strict monotonic growth from (1.27) implies that $W(x)$ becomes small for $x \geq x_{\bar\delta}$ large. In total, we find by choosing a sufficiently small $\bar\delta$ and sufficiently large $x_{\bar\delta}$ that for all $x \geq x_{\bar\delta}$

$$-\frac{1}{2\omega(x)} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\omega(x)\,b_\theta'(x)}\right)' \leq \frac{1}{2\omega(x)}.$$

By plugging this estimate into (5.20) and rearrange, we have obtained the bound for $x \geq x_{\bar\delta}$

$$\frac{e^{-b_\theta(x)}}{2\omega(x)W'(x)} \leq Z_{\theta,W}\nu([x,\infty)) \leq \frac{2e^{-b_\theta(x)}}{\omega(x)W'(x)}. \tag{5.21}$$

By very similar arguments, we can estimate for $x \geq x_{\bar\delta}$

$$Z_{\theta,W}\int_{x_{\bar\delta}}^x \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{\mu(y)} = \int_{x_{\bar\delta}}^x e^{b_\theta(x)}\,\mathrm{d}y \leq \frac{2e^{b_\theta(x)}}{W'(x)}, \tag{5.22}$$

By the smoothness of V and W from Assumption 1.2 it is enough to estimate $B(x)$ as defined in (5.12) of Proposition 5.1 for $x \geq x_{\bar\delta}$. Hence, we can bound by using the estimates (5.21) and (5.22), recalling that $\omega(x) = W(x)/W'(x)^2$, for $x \geq x_{\bar\delta}$

$$\begin{aligned}B(x) &= \nu([x,\infty)) \log\left(1 + \frac{e^2}{\nu([x,\infty))}\right)\int_0^x \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{\mu(y)} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{W(x)}\log\left(1 + \frac{2W(x)}{W'(x)}\,e^{V(x)-\theta W(x)}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{W(x)}\left(\log\left(1 + \frac{2W(x)}{\sqrt{c_0}}\right) + \log\left(1 + e^{(\delta^{-1}+C_V)W(x)}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where we used the bound $\log(1+ab) \leq \log(1+a)+\log(1+b)$ for any $a, b > 0$ and the growth conditions on V and W from Assumption 1.2 implying $V(x) \leq C_V W(x)$ for some $C_V > 0$. We conclude with

the help of the estimate $\log(1+e^x) \le x + \log(2)$ for $x \ge 0$ that $\limsup_{x\to\infty} B(x) \le C < \infty$ and hence also $B = \sup_{x>0} B(x) \le C < \infty$ for some $C = C(V, W, \delta)$.

The proof of (5.18) follows by the same arguments, suitable truncation of the integrals as well as (5.6) from Lemma 5.3. □

The previous result essentially contains Theorem 5.1. The proof can now be finished by an interpolation argument based on the moment assumption on c (5.8).

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By (5.2) from Lemma 5.1, we have $\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) \le \mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}})$. Next, we are going to use (5.17) of Proposition 5.2 by an interpolation argument. Set $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{k}{1+k}$ and $\frac{1}{q} = 1 - \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{1+k}$. Then, we have $(\omega)^{\frac{k}{q}} = (\omega)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ and hence by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_\rho(c) \le \mathcal{H}(c|c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}) &= \int c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\Psi\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \left(\int \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{\omega(x)}\Psi\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\int \omega(x)^k c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\Psi\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\le C_k^{\frac{k}{q}} C_{\mathrm{LSI}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathcal{D}(c,\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}},\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of the first part. For the second part, we note that (1.12) with $\beta = 0$ implies $\omega(x) \le \frac{1}{c_0}$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^+$ and the estimate (5.17) becomes already inequality (5.10). □

The final ingredient from the static investigation of the entropy and dissipation is a lower bound on the dissipation in the case where θ is not strictly negative.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $\Theta > 0$. Then there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(V, W, \delta, \Theta) > 0$ such that for all $\delta \le |\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}}| \le \Theta$ and all $c \in \mathcal{M}_{ac}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with $\theta + \int Wc = \rho$ and $c(0) = c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)$ holds*

$$\mathcal{D}(c,\theta) \ge \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let us show, that there exists $L = L(\delta)$ such that

$$\int_0^L W(x)|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \ge \left|\int_0^L W(x)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^L W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{2} \tag{5.23}$$

Indeed, if $\theta > 0$, it holds $\int_0^L W(x)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \to \infty$ as $L \to \infty$ and $\int_0^L W(x)c(x) \to \rho - \theta < \infty$ and the statement holds. For $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} + \delta \le \theta < 0$, we have by the monotonicity of $\theta \mapsto \int W(x)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$

$$\int W(x)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int W(x)c(x) \ge \int W(x)c_{\theta_{\mathrm{eq}}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \theta - \theta_{\mathrm{eq}} \ge \delta$$

and the statement (5.23) also holds. The argument for $\theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \Theta \le \theta \le \theta_{\mathrm{eq}} - \delta$ is similar. Now, we can use the truncated logarithmic Sobolev inequality (5.18) of Proposition 5.2, the truncated Pinsker inequality (5.4) from Lemma 5.2 as well as the Assumption 1.2 to estimate

$$\mathcal{D}(c,\theta) \ge \frac{1}{C_{\mathrm{LSI}}}\int_0^L \frac{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}{\omega(x)}\Psi\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x \ge \frac{c_0}{2W(L)\,C_{\mathrm{LSI}}}\int_0^L W(x)|c(x) - c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x \ge \frac{\delta}{C} =: \varepsilon,$$

for some $C = C(V, W, \Theta, L)$. □

5.3. **Quantitative long-time behavior: Proof of Theorem 1.2.** The last ingredient are stability estimates for solutions, such that the Assumption (5.8) of Theorem 5.1 is preserved uniformly in time by the evolution. Let us summarize the bounds obtained from the existence and regularity so far.

Corollary 5.2. *Let c be the solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial value satisfying (1.7). Then for any $t_0 > 0$ exists $C_0 < \infty$ such that it holds*

$$\sup_{t\ge 0}|\theta(t)| \le C_0\,, \qquad \sup_{t\ge t_0}\|c(\cdot,t_0)\|_\infty \le C_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sup_{t\ge t_0}\mathcal{F}(c(\cdot,t)) \le C_0. \tag{5.24}$$

Proof. The bound on $\|c(\cdot,t_0)\|_\infty$ on any time interval $[t_0,T_0]$ is a consequence of Lemma 3.6. Therewith, we can proof the bound $\mathcal{F}(c(\cdot,t_0))\le C_0$. Indeed, we calculate using the representation (5.1) and Assumption 1.2

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(c(\cdot,t_0)) &= \mathcal{H}\Big(c|c^{\rm eq}_{\theta_{\rm eq}}\Big)+\tfrac12(\theta(t_0)-\theta_{\rm eq})^2\\ &\le \int c\log c\,\mathrm{d}x+\int (V-\theta(t_0)W)c\,\mathrm{d}x-\int c\,\mathrm{d}x+\int c_{\theta^{\rm eq}_{\rm eq}}\,\mathrm{d}x+\tfrac12(\theta(t_0)-\theta_{\rm eq})^2\\ &\le C\Big(1+(1+|\theta(t_0)|)\int W\,c\,\mathrm{d}x\Big)+\tfrac12(\theta(t_0)-\theta_{\rm eq})^2\\ &\le C\big(1+|\theta(t_0)|^2\big)\end{aligned}$$

where we in addition also used the conservation law $\theta(t)+\int W\,c\,\mathrm{d}x=\rho$. To make this bounds uniform in time, we have from (5.1) and the previous estimates that $\frac12(\theta(t_0)-\theta_{\rm eq})^2\le\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t_0))\le C_0$. This implies, that $\sup_{t\ge0}|\theta(t)|\le|\theta_{\rm eq}|+\sqrt{2C_0}$ and the global in time bound (5.24), since the bound in Lemma 3.6 only depends on $\sup_{t_0\le t\le T_0}|\theta(t)|$. □

From the bound (5.24) and especially $\mathcal{F}(c(t_0,\cdot))\le C_0$, we can conclude the following: For any $\delta>0$ there exists by the identity (5.1), the energy–energy-dissipation principle Lemma 4.2 and the lower bound on the dissipation in Theorem 5.2 a constant $C=C(V,W,\delta,\Theta,C_0)>0$ such that

$$|\{t\ge t_0:\delta\le|\theta(t)-\theta_{\rm eq}|\le\Theta\}|\le C. \tag{5.25}$$

Moreover, the bound (5.24) allows to estimate for any $t\ge t_0$

$$\begin{aligned}\int\omega(x)^k c^{\rm eq}_\theta(x)\Psi\Big(\frac{c(x,t)}{c^{\rm eq}_\theta}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int\omega(x)^k c(x,t)\log c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x-\int\omega(x)^k c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad+\int\omega(x)^k(V(x)-\theta(t)W(x))c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int\omega(x)^k c^{\rm eq}_\theta(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\le(\log C_0-1)\int\omega(x)^k c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int\omega(x)^k(C_V+C_0)C_0W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x+C_{k,\theta}\\ &\le C\Big(1+\|c\|_\infty+\int\omega(x)^k\,W(x)\;c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\Big),\end{aligned}\tag{5.26}$$

Hence, it is left to show the uniform propagation in time of the moment

$$\int\omega(x)^k\,W(x)\;c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

However, to avoid assumptions on third derivatives on W, we use (1.12) with $\beta\in(0,1]$ of Theorem 1.2 to bound

$$\omega(x)\le c_0^{-1}W(x)^\beta.$$

Hence, it is sufficient under assumption (1.12) to obtain uniform propagation in time of the moment

$$\int W(x)^p c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for $p=1+k\beta$. The result is a consquence of the following Lemma, which itself is a refinement of Lemma 2.5 and 2.6 using $w_0(x)=W(x)^p$ as terminal data for the adjoint problem and the representation (2.6) for solutions.

Lemma 5.4. *Let V,W satisfy Assumption 1.2 and take $p>1$. Let c be the solution to (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) with initial value satisfying for some $p>1$*

$$\int W(x)^p\,c(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}x\le C_0.$$

For $T,\delta>0$ let Θ and $m(\delta)$ satisfy the inequalities $\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\theta(t)\le\Theta$ and $m\{t\in[0,T]:\ \theta(t)\ge-\delta\}\le m(\delta)$. Then there exists $M_p=M_p(\Theta,\delta,m(\delta))$ independent of T, such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\int W(x)^p\,c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\le M_p(C_0+1). \tag{5.27}$$

Proof. The proof follows by a modification of Lemma 2.5 and 2.6 using $w_0(x) = W(x)^p$ as terminal data for the adjoint problem and the representation (2.6) for solutions.

Thus to modify Lemma 2.5 we let $w_\lambda(x,t) = \exp\left[\lambda \int_t^T H(\theta(s)+\delta)\ ds\right]\ W(x)^p$, where $H(\cdot)$ is the Heaviside function. We have then similarly to (2.8) that

$$\exp\left[-\lambda \int_t^T H(\theta(s)+\delta)\ ds\right] W(x)^{p-1}\mathcal{L}w_\lambda(x,t) \ = \ -\lambda H(\theta(t)+\delta)W(x) + pW''(x) \\ + p(p-1)W'(x)^2W(x)^{-1} + [\theta(t)W'(x) - V'(x)]pW'(x)\ .$$

From Assumption 1.2 it follows that there exists $x_\delta,\ \lambda_\Theta > 0$ such that if $\lambda \geq \lambda_\Theta$, then $\mathcal{L}w_\lambda(x,t) \leq 0$ for $x > x_\delta,\ 0 < t < T$. Letting $w(x,t)$ be the solution of (2.1), (2.2), (2.4) with $w_0(x) = W(x)^p$, we have by the maximum principle that $w(x,t) \leq [\sup_{0<t<T} w(x_\delta,t)]\exp[\lambda_\Theta m(\delta)][W(x)/W(x_\delta)]^p$ for $x > x_\delta,\ 0 < t < T$. To see that $\sup_{0<t<T} w(x_\delta,t) \leq C_\delta$, where the constant C_δ is independent of T, we set $Y(t) = \exp\left[\lambda \int_t^T H(\theta(s)+\delta)\ ds\right]\Phi(X(t))$ in Lemma 2.5. Then one sees if λ is sufficiently large that $Y(t)$ satisfies (2.39), and (2.41) continues to hold up to some changes in the constants. In particular, we have now that $\mu(y,t) \leq -0.5\delta\exp[-\lambda m(\delta)]\sigma(y,t)^2$. With these bounds one can argue as before to estimate the expectation of $Y(T)^p$, and so we conclude that $w(x,t) \leq C_pW(x)^p$ for $x > 0,\ 0 < t < T$, where the constant C_p is independent of T.

For the modification of Lemma 2.6 we need to show that (2.48) of Lemma 2.6 holds when $w_0(x) = W(x)^p$. The main issue is to prove there exist constants $C, \nu > 0$ independent of T such that the exit time $\tau_{x,t}$ for the diffusion $X(\cdot)$ with initial condition $X(t) = x \leq 1$ and dynamics (2.36) satisfies the bound $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{x,t} > T) \leq Ce^{-\nu(T-t)},\ t < T$. We can establish this by moving to the variable $Y(t)$ defined in the previous paragraph. The key point is that the lower bound condition on $W'(\cdot)$ implies there are positive constants C_0, c_0 such that $\sigma(y,t) \geq c_0$ for $y \geq C_0$. We choose now a barrier $y_{\min}$ such that $Y(t) > y_{\min}$ for all $t < T$ provided $X(t) > 0$ for all $t < T$. Evidently $y_{\min}$ depends on $m(\delta)$. Letting $\tau^*_{y,t}$ be the exit time from the interval $(y_{\min},\infty)$ for the diffusion $Y(\cdot)$ with $Y(t) = y > y_{\min}$, it is clear that if $x \leq 1$ one has $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{x,t} > T) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^*_{y,t} > T)$ for some y close to $y_{\min}$. We may estimate $\mathbb{P}(\tau^*_{y,t} > T)$ by considering the function

$$u(y,t) \ = \ \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\delta \int_t^{\tau^*_{y,t}\wedge T} \sigma(Y(s),s)^2 + 1\ ds\right)\right]\ , \quad y > y_{\min},\ t < T\ .$$

Then $u(y,t)$ is a solution to the PDE

$$\frac{\partial u(y,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\sigma(y,t)^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2 u(y,t)}{\partial y^2} + \mu(y,t)\frac{\partial u(y,t)}{\partial y} + \delta[\sigma(y,t)^2+1]u(y,t) \ = \ 0\ , \tag{5.28}$$

with terminal and boundary conditions given by

$$u(y_{\min},t) \ = \ 1,\quad t < T,\quad u(y,T) \ = \ 1\ ,\quad y > y_{\min}\ .$$

We make now a change of variable $y \to z$ as in (2.50) so that the transformed diffusion and drift coefficients $\tilde\sigma,\ \tilde\mu$ satisfy an inequality $\tilde\mu(z,t) \leq -c_0\tilde\sigma(z,t)^2,\ \tilde\sigma(z,t)^2 \geq c_1$ for $z > z_{\min},\ t < T$, where c_0, c_1 are positive constants independent of T. We can now construct a time independent super-solution of the transformed PDE (5.28) by finding a super-solution to a PDE similar to (2.55). We obtain from this as in the proof of Lemma 2.6 an exponential decay bound on $\mathbb{P}(\tau^*_{y,t} > T)$, and hence on $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{x,t} > T)$. □

Hence, we can combine the result (5.27) with the estimate (5.25), which gives the desired uniform in time moment bound, which was the last ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\theta_{\text{eq}} + 2\delta \leq 0$ and choose $t_0 > 0$. To apply Theorem 5.1, we have to verify (5.8). We obtain from the estimate (5.26) together Corollary 5.2 and the (1.12) that for any $t \geq T_\delta > 0$

$$\int \omega(x)^k c_\theta^{\text{eq}}(x)\Psi\left(\frac{c(x,t)}{c_\theta^{\text{eq}}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x \leq C\left(1 + \int W(x)^{1+k\beta}c(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x\right).$$

Hence, the estimate (5.27) of Lemma 5.4 together with (5.25) yields that Assumption (5.8) is satisfied for a constant C_k uniform in time. An application of Theorem 5.1 yields for any $t \geq t_0$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t)) \leq -\lambda \mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t))^{\frac{1+k}{k}} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \lambda := C^{-\frac{k}{k+1}} C_{\mathrm{LSI}}^{-1},$$

which integrates for any $t \geq t_0$ to

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t)) \leq \frac{1}{\left(\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(\cdot,t_0))^{-\frac{1}{k}} + \frac{1}{k}\lambda(t-T_\delta)\right)^k}.$$

Since $t_0 > 0$, we have $\mathcal{F}_\rho(c(t_0)) \leq C_0$ by Corollary 5.2, we conclude the proof for the algebraic decay. The arguments for the proof of the exponential decay follow the same lines, but do not need any uniform in time moment bounds, by using the linear energy dissipation estimate (5.10). □

6. A family of discrete Fokker-Planck equations and their gradient structures

In this section, we want to motivate the connection of the continuum model (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) and the Becker-Döring model (1.14), (1.15) by interpolating between both of them with a family of discrete Fokker-Planck equations. In Section 6.1, we introduce the family of discrete Fokker-Planck equations and show its formal connection to the continuum and the Becker-Döring equation model. In Section 6.4, we show that this family posses a gradient flow structure.

6.1. **The family and its free energy.** We consider functions $F : \varepsilon\mathbf{Z}_0^+ \to \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{Z}_0^+ = \{0,1,2,3,\ldots\}$ and define the difference operator D_ε on such functions by $D_\varepsilon F(x) = [F(x+\varepsilon) - F(x)]/\varepsilon$. Denoting by D_ε^* the formal adjoint of D_ε, we consider the partial difference equation on $\mathbf{Z}^+ = \{1,2,3,\ldots\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t c_\varepsilon(x,t) - D_\varepsilon^*\left[b_\varepsilon(x,t)c_\varepsilon(x,t)\right] = -D_\varepsilon^* D_\varepsilon\left[a_\varepsilon(x)c_\varepsilon(x,t)\right] \ , x \in \varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+,\ t>0, \\ &\qquad \text{where } b_\varepsilon(x,t) = a_\varepsilon(x)\{\theta_\varepsilon(t)\Lambda_\varepsilon(x) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(x)\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Hereby, the functions $\Lambda_\varepsilon, \Gamma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+ \to \mathbf{R}$ are given. If the function $\theta_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is known, then (6.1) is uniquely solvable with given Dirichlet condition $c_\varepsilon(0,t),\ t \geq 0$. An equilibrium $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)$ for (6.1) satisfies the identity

$$D_\varepsilon[a_\varepsilon(x)c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)] \ = \ \{\theta\Lambda_\varepsilon(x) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(x)\}a_\varepsilon(x)c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x) \ , \tag{6.2}$$

whence

$$c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x) \ = \ a_\varepsilon(x)^{-1}a_\varepsilon(0)c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0) \prod_{0\leq z<x,\ z\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}} \left[1+\varepsilon\{\theta\Lambda_\varepsilon(z) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(z)\}\right] \ . \tag{6.3}$$

Let us introduce the relative entropy with respect to the equilibrium $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot),\theta)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot),\theta) \ = \ \varepsilon \sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+} \left\{\log\left[\frac{c_\varepsilon(x)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right] - 1\right\} c_\varepsilon(x) \ . \tag{6.4}$$

If $c_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)$ is a solution to (6.1) then

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot,t),\theta_\varepsilon(t)) \ = \ \varepsilon \sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+} \partial_t c_\varepsilon(x,t)\log\left[\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(x)}\right] - \varepsilon \sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+} c_\varepsilon(x,t)\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\log c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(x) \ . \tag{6.5}$$

Next we impose the Dirichlet condition

$$c_\varepsilon(0,t) \ = \ c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(0) \ , \quad t>0 \ , \tag{6.6}$$

on the solution to (6.1), which is convenient to omit boundary terms in the summation by parts of the first term on the RHS of (6.5)

$$\varepsilon \sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+} \partial_t c_\varepsilon(x,t)\log\left[\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(x)}\right] \ = \tag{6.7}$$

$$- \varepsilon \sum_{x \in \varepsilon \mathbf{Z}_0^+} \{D_\varepsilon \left[a_\varepsilon(x) c_\varepsilon(x,t)\right] - b_\varepsilon(x,t) c_\varepsilon(x,t)\} \, D_\varepsilon \log \left[\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(x)} \right] \ .$$

Observe now that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\varepsilon \log \left[\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(x)} \right] &= \varepsilon^{-1} \log \left[\frac{a_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon) c_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon,t)}{a_\varepsilon(x) \left[1 + \varepsilon\{\theta_\varepsilon(t)\Lambda_\varepsilon(x) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(x)\}\right] c_\varepsilon(x,t)} \right] \\ &= \varepsilon^{-1} \log \left[1 + \varepsilon \frac{D_\varepsilon \left[a_\varepsilon(x) c_\varepsilon(x,t)\right] - b_\varepsilon(x,t) c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{a_\varepsilon(x) \left[1 + \varepsilon\{\theta_\varepsilon(t)\Lambda_\varepsilon(x) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(x)\}\right] c_\varepsilon(x,t)} \right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

From (6.8) we see that the RHS of (6.7) is negative provided

$$1 + \varepsilon\{\theta_\varepsilon(t)\Lambda_\varepsilon(x) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(x)\} \ > \ 0 \ , \quad x \geq 0, \ x \in \varepsilon \mathbf{Z}, \ t \geq 0 \ .$$

We consider next the second term on the RHS of (6.5). We have from (6.3) that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\theta} \log c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x) \ = \ \frac{\mathrm{d} \log c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0)}{\mathrm{d}\theta} + \varepsilon \sum_{0 \leq z < x, \ z \in \varepsilon \mathbf{Z}} \frac{\Lambda_\varepsilon(z)}{1 + \varepsilon\{\theta\Lambda_\varepsilon(z) - \Gamma_\varepsilon(z)\}} \ =: \ W_\varepsilon(x,\theta) \ , \tag{6.9}$$

which defines the function W_ε. It follows that

$$\varepsilon \sum_{x \in \varepsilon \mathbf{Z}^+} c_\varepsilon(x,t) \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \log c_{\varepsilon,\theta_\varepsilon(t)}(x) \ = \ \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta_\varepsilon(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \, \varepsilon \sum_{x \in \varepsilon \mathbf{Z}^+} W_\varepsilon(x, \theta_\varepsilon(t)) c_\varepsilon(x,t) \ .$$

We now introduce the conservation law

$$\varepsilon \sum_{x \in \varepsilon \mathbf{Z}^+} W_\varepsilon(x, \theta_\varepsilon(t)) c_\varepsilon(x,t) \ = \ H_\varepsilon'(\theta_\varepsilon(t)) \ , \tag{6.10}$$

where $H_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbf{R};\mathbf{R})$ is given. The conservation law determines the dependency of $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0)$ in (6.3) on θ via the identity (6.9).

Defining now the function $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot),\theta)$ by

$$\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot),\theta) \ = \ \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot),\theta) + H_\varepsilon(\theta) \ , \tag{6.11}$$

we see that by construction the function $t \to \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(\cdot,t),\theta_\varepsilon(t))$ is decreasing for solutions $c_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)$ and $\theta_\varepsilon(t)$ of (6.1), (6.6), (6.10).

6.2. **The Becker-Döring model for $\varepsilon = 1$.** The Becker-Döring model (1.14), (1.15) is a particular case of (6.1), (6.6), (6.10). Thus we take $\varepsilon = 1$ and $c_1(x,t) = c_{x+1}(t), \ x \geq 0, \ x \in \mathbf{Z}$, where $c_\ell(t), \ \ell \geq 1$, is the solution to (1.14), (1.15). Comparing (1.21), (6.1) we have that

$$a_1(x) \ = \ b_{x+1} \ , \quad \Lambda_1(x) \ = \ \frac{a_{x+1}}{b_{x+1}} \ , \quad \Gamma_1(x) \ = \ 1 - z_s \frac{a_{x+1}}{b_{x+1}} \ , \ x \geq 0 \ . \tag{6.12}$$

The boundary condition (1.22), (6.6) becomes

$$c_1(0,t) \ = c_{1,\theta_1(t)}(0) \ = \ z_s + \theta(t) \ . \tag{6.13}$$

From (6.9), (6.12), (6.13) we then have that

$$W_1(x,\theta) \ = \ \frac{1}{z_s + \theta} + \sum_{r=0}^{x-1} \frac{1}{z_s + \theta} \ = \ \frac{x+1}{z_s + \theta} \ . \tag{6.14}$$

The conservation law (6.10) becomes then

$$\sum_{x=1}^{\infty} (x+1) c_1(x,t) \ = \ [z_s + \theta(t)] H_1'(\theta(t)) \ ,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell c_\ell(t) \ = \ [z_s + \theta(t)][H_1'(\theta(t)) + 1] \ . \tag{6.15}$$

Comparing (1.15), (6.15) we conclude that

$$H_1(\theta) \;=\; \rho\log(z_s+\theta)-\theta+\text{constant}\;. \tag{6.16}$$

We have also from (6.3), (6.12), (6.13) that

$$c_{1,\theta}(x) \;=\; \frac{b_1}{b_{x+1}}(z_s+\theta)^{x+1}\prod_{\ell=1}^{x}\frac{a_\ell}{b_\ell} \;=\; (z_s+\theta)^{x+1}Q_{x+1}\;. \tag{6.17}$$

We conclude from (6.4), (6.11), (6.16), (6.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1(c_1(\cdot),\theta) \;&=\; \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot))-c_1[\log c_1-1]-\log(z_s+\theta)\sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty}\ell c_\ell+H_1(\theta)\\ &=\; \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot))-c_1[\log c_1-1]-(\rho-c_1)\log c_1+H_1(\theta) \;=\; \mathcal{G}(c(\cdot))+\text{constant}\;,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{G}(c(\cdot))$ is given by (1.19).

6.3. **The Fokker-Planck model for $\varepsilon\to 0$.** Likewise the continuum model (1.1), (1.2), (1.4), (1.5) can be obtained from (6.1), (6.6), (6.10) by taking the formal limit $\varepsilon\to 0$. Therefore, we choose $\Lambda_0(x)=W'(x)$ and $\Gamma_0(x)=V'(x)$. Then, (6.3) becomes (1.3) after choosing $c_{0,\theta}(0)=a_0(0)e^{-V(0)+\theta W(0)}$, which also identifies the boundary condition (1.5). In addition, (6.9) reads

$$W(0)+\int_0^x W'(z)\,\mathrm{d}z=W(x)=W_0(x,\theta).$$

Hence, to obtain the conservation law (1.4), we have to choose $H_0'(\theta)=\rho-\theta$ in (6.10), whence $H_0(\theta)=-\frac{1}{2}\theta^2+\rho\theta$. Therewith, the Lyapunov function (6.11) becomes (1.10) after some manipulations.

6.4. **Gradient flow structures.** The state manifold is given by all possible states satisfying the constraint (6.10)

$$\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon=\left\{(c,\theta):\varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}W_\varepsilon(x,\theta)c(x)=H'(\theta)\right\}. \tag{6.18}$$

Therewith, possible variations of (c,θ) denoted by (s,t) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}T_{(c,\theta)}\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon=\Bigg\{(s,t):\,&s(0)=\partial_\theta c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0)t\\ &\text{and}\quad \varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}(t\partial_\theta W(x,\theta)c(x)W(x,\theta)s(x))\\ &\qquad+\varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}W_\varepsilon(x,\theta)s(x)=H''(\theta)t\Bigg\}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

Therewith, the variation of the free energy $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$ (6.11), denoted by $\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$ calculates as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)\cdot(s,t)&=\varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}\log\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right)s(x)-t\varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}\partial_\theta c(x)\log c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)+H_\varepsilon'(\theta)t\\ &=\varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}\log\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right)s(x)-\varepsilon t\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}W_\varepsilon(x,\theta)c(x)+H_\varepsilon'(\theta)t.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, from the conservation law (6.10) follows

$$\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)\cdot(s,t)=\varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}\log\left(\frac{c(x)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right)s(x), \tag{6.20}$$

which is independent of the variation in t and hence we identify $\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)$ with the function $\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+\ni x\mapsto\log\frac{c(x)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}$. The gradient flow formulation of (6.1) can be obtained by rewriting it in flux form

$$\partial_t c_\varepsilon(x,t)=\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\big(J_\varepsilon(x-\varepsilon,t)-J_\varepsilon(x,t)\big)=D_\varepsilon^*J_\varepsilon(x,t), \tag{6.21}$$

where the net flux $J_\varepsilon(x,t)$ from state x to $x+\varepsilon$ is given by

$$\varepsilon J_\varepsilon(x,t) := a_\varepsilon(x)(1+\varepsilon(\theta(t)\Lambda_\varepsilon(x)-\Gamma_\varepsilon(x)))c_\varepsilon(x,t) - a_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon)c_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon,t).$$

Let us rewrite the identity (6.2) determining the equilibrium states (6.3) as a detailed balance condition

$$a_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon)c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x+\varepsilon) = a_\varepsilon(x)(1+\varepsilon(\theta(t)\Lambda_\varepsilon(x)-\Gamma_\varepsilon(x)))c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x) := k_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x). \tag{6.22}$$

Therewith, we can rewrite the flux as

$$J_\varepsilon(x,t) = k_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)\,\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)} - \frac{c_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x+\varepsilon)}\right) = -k_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)\,D_\varepsilon\left(\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right).$$

This can be brought into the gradient of the energy (6.20) by introducing the quantity

$$\frac{D_\varepsilon\left(\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right)}{D_\varepsilon\left(\log\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}\right)} = \Lambda\left(\frac{c_\varepsilon(x,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)}, \frac{c_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x+\varepsilon)}\right) =: \widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x,t), \tag{6.23}$$

where the function $\Lambda : \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$ is the logarithmic mean defined by

$$\Lambda(a,b) = \int_0^1 a^s b^{1-s}\,\mathrm{d}s = \begin{cases} \frac{a-b}{\log a - \log b} & , a \neq b \\ a & , a = b \end{cases}.$$

Therewith, we finally obtain the identity

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon(x,t) &= -k_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)\,\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x,t)\,D_\varepsilon\left(\log\frac{c_\varepsilon}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}}\right)(x,t) \\ &= -k_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)\,\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x,t)\,D_\varepsilon\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)(x,t), \end{aligned}$$

which yields in (6.21)

$$\partial_t c(x,t) = -D_\varepsilon^*\big(k_{\varepsilon,\theta}\,\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}\,D_\varepsilon\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)\big)(x,t) \tag{6.24}$$

To conclude that (6.24) is a gradient flow, we show that the operator given by $D_\varepsilon^*\big(k_{\varepsilon,\theta}\,\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}\,D_\varepsilon\varphi\big)$ is non-negative inducing a metric. Therewith, we justify its identification as a gradient. Also, this forces us to introduce the boundary condition (6.6), which we rewrite as

$$\log\frac{c(0,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0)} = 0.$$

Therewith, let us introduce for a non-negative measure $\nu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}(\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+)$ weighted Sobolev spaces

$$H_\varepsilon^1(\nu_\varepsilon) = \left\{\varphi : \varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+ \to \mathbf{R} \;\middle|\; \varphi(0) = 0 \quad\text{and}\quad \varepsilon\sum_{x\in\varepsilon\mathbf{Z}^+}|D_\varepsilon\varphi(x)|^2\nu_\varepsilon(x) < \infty\right\}$$

$$H_\varepsilon^{-1}(\nu_\varepsilon) = \big(H_\varepsilon^1(\nu_\varepsilon)\big)^* \quad\text{with}\quad \|s\|_{H_\varepsilon^{-1}(\nu_\varepsilon)} = \sup_{\varphi\in H_\varepsilon^1(\nu_\varepsilon)}\frac{\langle\varphi,s\rangle}{\|\varphi\|_{H_\varepsilon^1(\nu_\varepsilon)}}.$$

By these definitions, the linear operator

$$K_\varepsilon[\nu_\varepsilon] : H_\varepsilon^1(\nu_\varepsilon) \to H_\varepsilon^{-1}(\nu_\varepsilon) \quad\text{given by}\quad K_\varepsilon[\nu_\varepsilon]\varphi = D_\varepsilon^*(\nu_\varepsilon D_\varepsilon\varphi) \tag{6.25}$$

is well defined. It is non negative, since $\langle\varphi, K_\varepsilon[\nu_\varepsilon]\varphi\rangle = \varepsilon\sum_{x\in\mathbf{Z}^+}|D_\varepsilon\varphi(x)|^2\nu_\varepsilon(x) \geq 0$, where the boundary condition $\varphi(1) = 0$ ensures no extra terms in the summation by parts. Therewith, the gradient flow formulation (6.24) becomes

$$\partial_t c = -K_\varepsilon[k_{\varepsilon,\theta}\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}]\,\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta).$$

Solutions then satisfy the condition $\delta G_\varepsilon(c,\theta) \in H_\varepsilon^1(k_{\varepsilon,\theta}\widehat{c}_{\eta,\theta})$ and in particular the boundary condition $\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)(0,t) = 0$, which translates to

$$\log\frac{c(0,t)}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0)} = 0 \qquad\text{whence}\qquad c(0,t) = c_{\varepsilon,\theta}(0).$$

Together, with the constraint (6.10), which implicitly defines θ in terms of c the system is closed. Note, that we immediately recover, that $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$ is a Lyapunov function

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta) &= \langle \delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta), \partial_t c\rangle = -\langle \delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta), K_\varepsilon[k_{\varepsilon,\theta}\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}]\,\delta\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(c,\theta)\rangle \\ &= -\varepsilon \sum_{x\in\mathbf{Z}^+} k_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x)\,\widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x,t)\left|D_\varepsilon \log\frac{c}{c_{\varepsilon,\theta}}(x,t)\right|^2\end{aligned}$$

6.4.1. *Gradient flow structure for $\varepsilon = 1$.* Let us denote $n_\ell(t) := c_1(\ell-1,t)$ for $\ell = 1,2,\dots$ to omit notational confusion. The state manifold (6.18) becomes by using (6.14), (6.16) and (6.13)

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{(n,\theta) : \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \ell n_\ell = \rho, n_1 = z_s + \theta\right\}.$$

Since, $n_1 = z_s + \theta$, we only consider the reduced state manifold

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{n : \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \ell n_\ell = \rho\right\}.$$

Then, it is easy to check, that the possible variations are given by

$$T_{n,\theta}\mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{s : \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \ell s_\ell = 0\right\},$$

which can be checked to be consistent with (6.19).

Now, let us compare the gradient structure, which we obtain for $\varepsilon = 1$ with the one contained in [36]. In Section 6.2, the free energy is already identified and can be written for any $z \in [0, z_s]$ as

$$\mathcal{F}_z(n) = \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty z^\ell Q_\ell\,\lambda_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{n_\ell}{z^\ell Q_\ell}\right) + C_z \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_{\mathrm{B}}(a) = a\log a - a + 1,$$

for some constant C_z only depending on z and Q_ℓ as defined in (1.17). By (6.13) it holds $n_1(t) - z_s = \theta(t)$ and therefore the local equilibrium state $c_{1,\theta}(x)$ (6.17) is given by

$$c_{1,\theta}(\ell-1) = n_1^\ell Q_\ell =: \omega_\ell(n_1). \tag{6.26}$$

Hence, from (6.22), we obtain

$$k_{1,\theta}(\ell-1) = b_{\ell+1}c_{1,\theta}(\ell) = n_1 a_\ell c_{1,\theta}(\ell-1) \tag{6.27}$$

Therewith, it follows

$$k_{1,\theta}(\ell-1)\widehat{c}_{1,\theta}(\ell-1) = \Lambda(a_\ell n_1 n_\ell, b_{\ell+1}n_{\ell+1}) =: \nu_\ell.$$

The semi-norm introduced by K_1 (6.25) is given for $\phi \in H^1_1(\nu)$ by

$$\langle \varphi, K_1[\nu]\psi\rangle = \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \nu_\ell(\varphi_{\ell+1} - \varphi_\ell)(\psi_{\ell+1} - \psi_\ell).$$

To identify [36, Equation (1.14)], we note that there no restriction on the boundary values of the function space is assumed, but the 0 boundary value for functions is implemented by using the modified gradient $\left(\tilde{D}\varphi\right)_\ell := \varphi_{\ell+1} - \varphi_\ell - \varphi_1$. Moreover, one can check again using the explicit definition of the local equilibrium states (6.26) and the detailed balance condition (6.27)

$$\nu_\ell = a_\ell\omega_\ell(z)\Lambda\left(\frac{n_1 n_\ell}{\omega_1(z)\omega_\ell(z)}, \frac{n_{\ell+1}}{\omega_{\ell+1}(z)}\right).$$

Once, the driving energy functional and metric in terms of the operator K_1 are identified, the gradient structures agree.

6.4.2. *Gradient flow structure for $\varepsilon \to 0$.* In the setting of Section 6.3, let us take the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the definition of the state manifold (6.18) to find

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \left\{ (c, \theta) : \int W(x)c(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \rho - \theta, c(0) = c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(0) \right\}$$

with possible variations

$$T_{(c,\theta)}\mathcal{M}_0 = \left\{ (s, t) : \int W(x)s(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = -t, s(0) = W(0)c_\theta^{\mathrm{eq}}(0)t \right\}$$

The weighted Sobolev $H_0^1(\nu)$ is now defined for a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}^+)$ by taking the closure of function with $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbf{R}^+)$ with $\varphi(0) = 0$ with respect to the weighted homogeneous Sobolev norm defined by

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\nu)}^2 = \int |\partial_x \varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}\nu$$

with dual space $H_0^{-1}(\nu) = \left(H_0^1(\nu)\right)^*$. Therewith, the operator K_0 (6.25) is defined as

$$K_0[\nu] : H_0^1(\nu) \to H_0^{-1}(\nu) \quad \text{with} \quad \langle \psi, K_0[\nu]\varphi \rangle = \int \partial_x \psi\, \partial_x \varphi\,\mathrm{d}\nu.$$

Finally, we obtain from (6.22) and (6.23) the identity

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} k_{\varepsilon,\theta} \widehat{c}_{\varepsilon,\theta}(x, t) = a(x)c_0(x, t).$$

The driving free energy was already identified in Section 6.3 and is given by (1.10), which first variation is identified in analog to (6.20) with the function $\log \frac{c_0(\cdot,t)}{c_{0,\theta}(\cdot)}$, where $c_{0,\theta}$ is given by (1.3). Thus, the gradient flow formulation of the system (1.1), (1.2), (1.5) becomes

$$\partial_t c_0(x, t) = K_0[a(\cdot)\, c_0(\cdot, t)] \log \frac{c_0(\cdot, t)}{c_{0,\theta}(\cdot)}(x, t) = \partial_x \left(a(\cdot)c_0(\cdot, t)\partial_x \log \frac{c_0(\cdot, t)}{c_{0,\theta(t)}(\cdot)} \right).$$

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank José Cañizo for fruitful discussions on the quantified convergence to equilibrium in the subcritical case. A.S. gratefully acknowledges support by the German Research Foundation through the Collaborative Research Center 1060. *The Mathematics of Emergent Effects.* J.G.C. gratefully acknowledges support through a Simons Foundation travel grant.

References

[1] Ambrosio, L.; Buttazzo, G. Weak lower semicontinuous envelope of functionals defined on a space of measures. *Ann. Di Mat. Pura Ed Appl.* **150** (1988), 311–339.

[2] Ané, C.; Blachère, S.; Chafai, D.; Fougères, P.; Gentil, I.; Malrieu, F.; Roberto, C.; Scheffer, G. Sur les inégalités de Sobolev logarithmiques. *Société Mathématique de France*, Paris, 2000.

[3] Ball, J.M.; Carr, J.; Penrose, O. The Becker Döring cluster equations: basic properties and asymptotic behavior of solutions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **104** (1986), 657-692, MR 0841675.

[4] Barthe, F.; Roberto, C. Sobolev inequalities for probability measures on the real line. *Stud. Math.* **159** (2003), 481-497, doi:10.4064/sm159-3-9.

[5] Barthe, F.; Roberto, C. Modified Logarithmic Sobolev Inequalities on $\mathbb{R}$. *Potential Anal.* **29** (2008) 167-193. doi:10.1007/s11118-008-9093-5.

[6] Becker, R.; Döring, W. Kinetische Behandlung der Keimbildung in übersättigten Dämpfen. *Ann. Der Phys.* **24** (1935) 719-752.

[7] Billingsley, P. Convergence of Probability Measures, *Wiley* 1968, New York-London.

[8] Bobkov, S.G.; Götze, F. Exponential Integrability and Transportation Cost Related to Logarithmic Sobolev Inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.* **163** (1999), 1-28, doi:10.1006/jfan.1998.3326.

[9] Bogachev, V.I. *Measure Theory*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (2007). doi:10.1007/978-3-540-34514-5.

[10] Bolley, F.; Villani, C. Weighted Csiszar-Kullback-Pinsker inequalities and applications to transportation inequalities. *Fac. Des Sci. Toulouse.* **XIV** (2005), 331-352, doi:10.5802/afst.1095.

[11] G. Buttazzo, *Semicontinuity, Relaxation and Integral Representation in the Calculus of Variations*, vol. 207 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow; copublished in the United States with John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1989.

[12] Cañizo, J.A.; Einav, A.; Lods, B. Trend to Equilibrium for the Becker-Döring Equations: An Analogue of Cercignani's Conjecture. *Preprint 2015*, arXiv:1509.07631.

[13] Cañizo, J.A.; Einav, A.; Lods, B. Uniform moment propagation for the Becker-Döring equation. *Anal. PDE. 10* **10** (2017), 1663–1708. doi:10.2140/apde.2017.10.1663.

[14] Cañizo, J.; Lods, B. Exponential convergence to equilibrium for subcritical solutions of the Becker-Döring equations, *Journ. Diff. Eqns.* **255** (2013), 905-950.

[15] Conlon, J.; Guha, M. Stochastic Variational formulas for linear diffusion equations, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **30** (2014), 581-666. MR 3231211

[16] DeBlassie, D.; Smits, R. The influence of a power law drift on the exit time of Brownian motion from a half-line, *Stochastic processes and their applications* **117** (2007), 629-654.

[17] Eberle, S.; Niethammer, B.; Schlichting, A. Gradient flow formulation and longtime behaviour of a constrained Fokker–Planck equation, *Nonlinear Anal.* **158** (2017) 142-167. doi:10.1016/j.na.2017.04.009.

[18] Evans, L.C. *Weak convergence methods for nonlinear partial differential equations*. Regional Conference Series in Mathematics Vol **74**, Amer. Math. Soc. 1990.

[19] Evans, L.C. Partial Differential Equations, *Amer. Math. Soc. Graduate Study in Mathematics* **19**, 1998, AMS Providence.

[20] Friedlin, M.; Wentzell, A.D. Random perturbations of dynamical systems. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften* **260**, Springer, Heidelberg 2012.

[21] Friedman, A. Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type. *Prentice-Hall, Inc.,* 1964, 347 pp., MR 0181836.

[22] Hadamard, J. Extension à l'équation de la chaleur d'un théorème de A. Harnack.

[23] Laurençot, P.; Mischler, S. From the Becker–Döring to the Lifshitz–Slyozov–Wagner Equations, *J. Stat. Phys.* **106** (2002) 957–991. doi:10.1023/A:1014081619064.

[24] Matthes, D.; Jüngel, A.; Toscani, G. Convex Sobolev Inequalities Derived from Entropy Dissipation, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **199** (2011), 563-596.

[25] Morales, J. A new family of transportation costs with applications to reaction-diffusion and parabolic equations with boundary conditions. *2016 preprint*, arXiv: 1604.00551

[26] Muckenhoupt, B. Hardy's inequality with weights. *Stud. Math.* **44** (1972), 31-38.

[27] Jabin, P.-E.; Niethammer, B. On the rate of convergence to equilibrium in the Becker–Döring equations. *J. Differ. Equ.* **191** (2003), 518-543, doi:10.1016/S0022-0396(03)00021-4.

[28] Murray, R.; Pego, Robert L. Polynomial decay to equiibrium for the Becker-Döring equations. *2015 preprint*, arXix:1509.01762

[29] Niethammer, B. On the Evolution of Large Clusters in the Becker-Döring Model. *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **13** (2003), 115–155, doi:10.1007/s00332-002-0535-8.

[30] Niethammer, B. ; Pego, Robert L. On the initial value problem in the Lifschitz-Slyozov-Wagner theory of Ostwald ripening. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **31** (2000), 467-485, MR 1735959.

[31] Niethammer, B. ; Pego, Robert L. Well-posedness for measure transport in a family of nonlocal domain coarsening models. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **54** (2005), 499-530, MR 2136819.

[32] Prokhorov. Y.V. *Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory*, Theor. Prob. Appl. **1** (1956), 157-214.

[33] Protter, M. and Weinberger, H. Maximum principles in Differential Equations. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 1984.

[34] Reed, M.; Simon B. Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I. Functional Analysis. *Academic Press, New York-London*, 1972.

[35] Rothaus, O.S. Analytic inequalities, isoperimetric inequalities and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.* **64**, (1985) 296-313, doi:10.1016/0022-1236(85)90079-5.

[36] Schlichting, A. Macroscopic limit of the Becker-Döring equation via gradient flows. *arXiv: 1607.08735*, 2016.

[37] Varadhan, S.R.S. *Large Deviations and Applications*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1984.

[38] Velázquez, J.J.L. The Becker-Döring equations and the Lifschitz-Slyozov theory of coarsening. *J. Stat. Phys.* **92**, 195-236 (1998).

[39] Villani, C. *Topics in Optimal Transportation.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics **58**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence R.I., 2003.

[40] Walker, J.A. Dynamical Systems and Evolution Equations: Theory and Applications. *Plenum Press, New York-London*, 1980.