

VIII Partial differential equations, optimal design and  
numerics, 2019, Aug 18 – Aug 30

Relaxed multimarginal costs and quantization  
effects

G. Bouchitté, IMATH, Université de Toulon (FRANCE)

joined work with:

G. Buttazzo (Pisa), L. De Pascale (Firenze), T. Champion (Toulon)

preprint [bbcd19] available in [arXiv:1907.08425](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.08425)

# An asymptotic model in quantum chemistry, P. Gori-Giorgi)

In the framework of *Strongly Correlated Electrons Density Functional Theory* (SCE-DFT), a very challenging issue is the asymptotic behavior as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  of the infimum problem

$$\inf \{ \varepsilon T(\rho) + C(\rho) - U(\rho) : \rho \in \mathcal{P} \} \quad (1_\varepsilon)$$

where the parameter  $\varepsilon$  stands for the Planck constant and

- $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  is a probability over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  associated with the random distribution of  $N$ -electrons (given by  $|\psi|^2$ ,  $\psi \in L^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$ )
- $T(\rho)$  is the kinetic energy

$$T(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \sqrt{\rho}|^2 dx;$$

- $C(\rho)$  describes the electron-electron interaction;
- $U(\rho)$  is the potential term (created by  $M$  nuclei)

$$U(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)\rho dx;$$

The case  $N = 1$ ,  $V(x) = \frac{Z}{|x|}$  and  $d = 3$

Then  $C(\rho) \equiv 0$ . The (negative) minimum in  $(1_\varepsilon)$  is reached for  $\rho_\varepsilon = \psi_\varepsilon^2$  where the wave function  $\psi_\varepsilon$  satisfies  $\|\psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} = 1$  and

$$-\varepsilon \Delta \psi^\varepsilon - \frac{Z}{|x|} \psi^\varepsilon = \lambda_1^\varepsilon \psi^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3$$

Then  $\rho_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-3} \rho_1(x/\varepsilon)$  where

$$\rho_1(x) = \frac{Z^3}{8\pi} \exp(-Z|x|) \quad , \quad \lambda_1^\varepsilon = -\frac{Z^2}{4\varepsilon} = \min(1_\varepsilon).$$

Thus  $\rho_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{*} \delta_{X=0}$  and  $\varepsilon \min(1_\varepsilon) \rightarrow -\frac{Z^2}{4}$

The case  $C(\rho) \equiv 0$  and  $V$  associated with  $M$ -nuclei

Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_M$  the position of  $M$  nuclei in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with charges  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_M$ . The Coulomb potential reads:

$$V(x) = \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{Z_k}{|x - X_k|} .$$

Then owing to [bbcd18](the  $\Gamma$ - limit of energies is local):

$$\rho^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{*} \sum_1^M \alpha_k \delta_{X_k} \quad , \quad \varepsilon \min(1_\varepsilon) \sim -\frac{1}{4} \sum_k \alpha_k Z_k^2$$

**Consequence:** By minimizing with respect to the  $\alpha_k$ 's subject to  $\sum \alpha_k = 1$ , we see that  $\rho_\varepsilon$  concentrates on the nuclei with maximal mass (not physically reasonable !)

[bbcd18] Dissociating limit in Density Functional Theory with Coulomb optimal transport cost in arXiv:1811.12085

## $N$ -electrons (repulsive) interaction

It can be interpreted as a multi-marginal transport cost:

$$C(\rho) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{Nd}} c(x_1, \dots, x_N) dP : P \in \Pi(\rho) \right\}$$

when

$$c(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \frac{1}{|x_i - x_j|}$$

and  $\Pi(\rho)$  is the family of multi-marginal transport plans

$$\Pi(\rho) = \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) : \pi_i^{\#} P = \rho \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, N \right\}$$

being  $\pi_i$  the projections from  $\mathbb{R}^{Nd}$  on the  $i$ -th factor  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\pi_i^{\#}$  the push-forward operator

$$\pi_i^{\#} P(E) = P(\pi_i^{-1}(E)) \quad \text{for all Borel sets } E \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

## Basic facts about $C(\rho)$

- $C : \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow ]0, +\infty]$  is convex weakly\* l.s.c.  
However  $\rho_n \xrightarrow{*} \rho$ ,  $\sup_n C(\rho_n) < +\infty \not\Rightarrow \rho \in \mathcal{P}$
- $C(\rho) < +\infty$  whenever  $\rho \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $p > 1$ , in particular if  $T(\rho) < +\infty$  (since  $\sqrt{\rho} \in W^{1,2} \Rightarrow \rho \in L^3$ )
- $C(\rho) = +\infty$  if it exists  $x_0$  such that  $\rho(\{x_0\}) > \frac{1}{N}$ .
- If  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$  are distincts, then

$$C\left(\frac{\delta_{x_1} + \delta_{x_2} + \dots + \delta_{x_N}}{N}\right) = c(x_1, \dots, x_N)$$

- For every  $x$ , there exists  $\rho_n \xrightarrow{*} \frac{\delta_x}{N}$  and  $C(\rho_n) \rightarrow 0$ .  
(apply above with  $x_1 = x$  and  $\|x_i\| \rightarrow \infty$  for  $2 \leq i \leq N$ )

## Asymptotic in the interacting case

The asymptotic in  $(1_\varepsilon)$  in presence of the  $N$ -interactions term  $C(\rho)(= C_N(\rho))$  is open for  $N > 2$ . In [bbcd18], the  $\Gamma$ -limit of energies is derived in the case  $N = 2$  ( $\rightsquigarrow \inf \sum g(\alpha_k, Z_k)$ )

In fact the situation gets much simpler if one assume that

$$V \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Then  $\inf(1_\varepsilon)$  remains finite and by  $\Gamma$ -convergence, we get:

$$\inf(1_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \inf \left\{ C(\rho) - \int V d\rho : \rho \in \mathcal{P} \right\}$$

### Main questions

- Existence of an optimal probability  $\rho$ ? (non existence means “ionization”)
- How to characterize the weak\* limit of minimizing sequences in case of non existence?
- Are they limit points  $\rho$  with fractional mass  $\|\rho\| = \frac{k}{N}$ ? ( $k$  electrons among  $N$  remain at finite distance)

# Outline

1. A non existence result.
2. Relaxed cost on  $\mathcal{P}^-$  (sub-probabilities)
3. Dual formulation and Kantorovich potential
4. Mass quantization of optimal measures
5. Open problems and perspectives



## I- A case of non existence

For every  $V \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we denote

$$\alpha_N(V) = \inf \left\{ C(\rho) - \int V d\rho : \rho \in \mathcal{P} \right\}$$

**Remark** If  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = -\infty$  (confining potential), then the existence of an optimal probability is standard. The situation changes drastically when  $V$  is bounded from below.

In fact when  $V \in C_0$ , it is not restrictive to assume that  $V \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 1**  $\alpha_N(V) = \alpha_N(V^+) \leq -\frac{1}{N} \sup V^+$ . In particular  $\alpha_N(V) < 0$  for any non zero  $V \geq 0$ .

*Proof:* The first equality is deduced by duality techniques. For the second inequality, choose  $x_0$  s.t.  $V^+(x_0) = \max V^+$  and  $\rho_n \xrightarrow{*} \frac{1}{N} \delta_{x_0}$  s.t.  $C(\rho_n) \rightarrow 0$ .

## Case where $V$ has compact support

**Proposition 2** Let  $V \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^+)$  with  $\text{spt } V \subset B_R$ . Then the infimum  $\alpha_N(V)$  is not attained on  $\mathcal{P}$  whenever

$$\max V \leq \frac{N(N-1)}{2R}$$

*Proof:* In a first step we show that if  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  is optimal, then  $\text{spt } \rho \subset \overline{B_R}$ . As a consequence the optimal transport plan associated with  $\rho$  is supported in  $(\overline{B_R})^N$  where  $c(x) \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$ . Thus, if  $\max V \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2R}$ , we find a contradiction with Lemma 1:

$$\alpha_N(V) = C(\rho) - \int V d\rho \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2R} - \max V \geq 0$$



**Consequence:** there is a loss of mass at infinity !

## 2- Relaxed cost on $\mathcal{P}^-$

For every  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$  (with mass  $\|\rho\|$  in  $[0, 1]$ ), we need to characterize

$$\bar{C}(\rho) = \inf \left\{ \liminf_n C(\rho_n) : \rho_n \xrightarrow{*} \rho, \rho_n \in \mathcal{P} \right\}$$

We already know that  $\bar{C}(\rho) = C(\rho)$  if  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ . A first guess would be that  $\bar{C}(\rho) = C_N(\rho)$  for every  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$ , being  $C_N(\mu)$  the 1-homogeneous extension:

$$C_N(\mu) := \|\mu\| C\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}\right) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{Nd}} c(x_1, \dots, x_N) dP : P \in \Pi(\mu) \right\}$$

We have indeed  $\bar{C}(\rho) \leq C_N(\rho)$  but the converse inequality is untrue. In fact we have

$$\bar{C}(\rho) = 0 \iff \|\rho\| \leq \frac{1}{N}.$$

## Stratification formula for $\bar{C}(\rho)$

Let us set  $C_1 \equiv 0$  whereas, for  $2 \leq k \leq N$ ,  $C_k$  denote the homogeneous version of the  $k$ -points interaction.

**Theorem 3** For every  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$  it holds

$$\bar{C}(\rho) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^N C_k(\rho_k) : \rho_k \in \mathcal{P}^-, \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{k}{N} \rho_k = \rho, \sum_{k=1}^N \|\rho_k\| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

**Remarks:**

- If  $\bar{C}(\rho) < +\infty$ , the infimum is achieved and  $\sum_{k=1}^N \|\rho_k\| = 1$ .  
*Open question:* how many indices  $k$  are active (i.e.  $\rho_k \neq 0$ ) in an optimal decomposition. On numerical examples it seems that only  $k$  and  $k+1$  are involved if  $\frac{k}{N} < \|\rho\| < \frac{k+1}{N}$ .
- Case of fractional masses: a useful inequality

$$\|\rho\| = \frac{k}{N} \Rightarrow \bar{C}(\rho) \leq \frac{N}{k} C_k(\rho) \quad (\rho_k = \frac{N}{k} \rho \text{ and } \rho_l = 0 \text{ if } l \neq k)$$

## Sketch of the proof

- In a first step, we associate to  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$  a probability  $\tilde{\rho}$  on  $X = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\omega\}$  the the Alexandrov's compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  defined by  $\tilde{\rho} = \rho + (1 - \|\rho\|)\delta_\omega$ . Then, if  $\tilde{c}$  denotes the natural l.s.c. extension of the Coulomb cost to  $X^N$ ,

$$\bar{C}(\rho) = \tilde{C}(\tilde{\rho}) := \min \left\{ \int_{X^N} \tilde{c} d\tilde{P} : \tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}(X^N), \tilde{P} \in \Pi(\tilde{\rho}) \right\}.$$

- Let  $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}(X^N)$  be an optimal symmetric plan for  $\tilde{C}(\tilde{\rho})$  and set

$$\tilde{\mu}_k := \pi_1^\# \left( \tilde{P} \llcorner (\mathbb{R}^d)^k \times \{\omega\}^{N-k} \right)$$

Then the stratification formula holds with  $\rho_k$  given by

$$\rho_k := \binom{N}{k} \tilde{\mu}_k \llcorner \mathbb{R}^d$$

### 3- Dual formulation and Kantorovich potential

**Duality:** Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\tilde{\rho} = \rho + (1 - \|\rho\|)\delta_\omega \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . It is natural to use the duality between  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  and  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \oplus \mathbb{R}$  the set of continuous potentials  $u$  with a constant value  $u_\infty$  at infinity:

$$\langle u, \tilde{\rho} \rangle = \int_X u d\tilde{\rho} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u d\rho + (1 - \|\rho\|)u_\infty .$$

**Theorem 4** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the class of admissible functions defined by

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ u \in C_0 \oplus \mathbb{R} : \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u(x_i) \leq c(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad \forall x_i \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N \right\} .$$

Then  $\bar{C}(\rho) = \sup \left\{ \int u d\rho + (1 - \|\rho\|)u_\infty : u \in \mathcal{A} \right\} .$

## For practical computations

In Theorem 4, the class  $\mathcal{A}$  of admissible  $u$  can be enlarged to

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{S}(X) : \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u(x_i) \leq c(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad \tilde{\rho}^{N \otimes} \text{ a.e. } x \in X^N \right\}$$

being  $\mathcal{S}(X)$  the l.s.c. functions  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .

This allows to reduce to a finite number of constraints in case of a discrete measure  $\rho$ . For instance if  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i \delta_{a_i}$  where  $|a_i - a_j| = 1$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $\|\rho\| = \sum \alpha_i < 1$ , then we are reduced to an elementary LP problem

$$\bar{C}(\rho) = \sup \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i y_i + (1 - \sum_j \alpha_j) y_4 : \frac{y_1 + y_2 + y_3}{3} \leq 3 \\ y_k + 2y_4 \leq 0, \quad k \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad \frac{y_k + y_l + y_4}{3} \leq 1, \quad k < l \end{array} \right\}$$

where  $y_i = u(a_i)$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $y_4 = u(\omega)$ .

## Existence of a Kantorovich potential

In the case  $\|\rho\| = 1$ , existence of a Lipschitz dual potential appeared in [bcd16] under a non concentration assumption. For every  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$ , we define

$$K(\rho) = \sup \{ \rho(\{x\}) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \}.$$

After a technical and long proof, we extend [bcd16] as follows:

**Theorem 5** Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$  such that  $K(\rho) < \frac{1}{N}$ . Then  $\bar{C}(\rho)$  is finite and there exists an optimal Lipschitz potential  $u \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ . Any other optimal potential  $\tilde{u}$  satisfies  $\tilde{u} = u + \tilde{\rho}$  - a.e.

**Remark** If  $(\rho_n)$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{P}^-$  such that  $\sup_n K(\rho_n) < \frac{1}{N}$ , then the Lipschitz constant of the associated potentials  $u_n$  is uniformly bounded. This happens in particular if  $T(\rho_n) = \int |\nabla \sqrt{\rho_n}|^2 \leq C$ .



## 4- Mass quantization of optimal measures

Let  $V$  be a given potential in  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $N \geq 2$ . We focus on the relaxed problem associated with

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_N(V) &= \inf \left\{ C(\rho) - \int V d\rho : \rho \in \mathcal{P} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \bar{C}(\rho) - \int V d\rho : \rho \in \mathcal{P}^- \right\}\end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathcal{P}^-$  is compact for the weak\* convergence, solutions to latter problem always exist. As they might be non unique, we consider the minimal mass among them

$$\mathcal{I}_N(V) := \min \left\{ \|\rho\| : \bar{C}(\rho) - \int V d\rho = \alpha_N(V) \right\}$$

( $\mathcal{I}_N(v) = 1$  means that all minimizers are probabilities solving the non relaxed problem)

## Quantization statement

**Theorem 5.** Let  $V \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^+)$  be such that  $\sup V > 0$ . Then

$$\mathcal{I}_N(V) \in \left\{ \frac{k}{N} : 1 \leq k \leq N \right\} .$$

The proof relies on primal-dual optimality conditions. Let us introduce, for  $1 \leq k \leq N$ :

$$M_k(V) = \sup_{x \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N} \left\{ \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k V(x_i) - c_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \right\}$$

The definition of  $M_k(V)$  extends to unbounded potentials. In particular if  $V(x) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ , the supremum is attained on  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ .

## Systems of points with Coulomb interactions.

If  $V$  is *confining*,  $M_N(V)$  is related to a huge literature about the systems of points interactions theory (see for instance Choquet (58) and the recent papers by Serfaty-Leblé, Serfaty-Petrache and references therein, M. Lewin.

$$-M_N(-N^2V) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{H}_N(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) : x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_N$  is of the form

$$\mathcal{H}_N(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j} \ell(|x_i - x_j|) + N \sum_{i=1}^N V(x_i).$$

In such a setting, the asymptotic limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  is one of the main point of interest of the mathematical physics community.

## Useful properties of functionals $M_k : C_0 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$

- i) The functional  $M_k(V)$  is convex, 1-Lipschitz on  $C_0$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{M_k(tV)}{t} = M_1(V) = \sup V .$$

- ii) For every  $V \in C_0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we have:

$$M_1\left(\frac{V}{N}\right) \leq \dots \leq M_k\left(\frac{kV}{N}\right) \leq M_{k+1}\left(\frac{(k+1)V}{N}\right) \leq \dots \leq M_N(V).$$

- iii) For every  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$ , we have

$$\bar{C}(\rho) = \sup_{V \in C_0} \left\{ \int V d\rho - M_N(V) \right\}$$

In particular  $\alpha_N(V) = -M_N(V) \leq -\frac{1}{N} \sup V$  and  $\partial M_N(V)$  is the set of minimizers.

- iv) For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$  and  $V \in C_0$ , it holds

$$M_k(V) = M_k(V_+) , \quad C_k(\rho) = \sup_{V \in C_0} \left\{ \int V d\rho - \|\rho\| M_k(V) \right\}$$

# Optimality conditions

**Theorem 6.** Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}^-$  and  $V \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^+)$  be s.t.  $\sup V > 0$ . Let  $\{\rho_k\}$  be an admissible decomposition of  $\rho$  i.e.:

$$\rho = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{k}{N} \rho_k \quad , \quad \sum_{k=1}^N \|\rho_k\| \leq 1.$$

Then  $\{\rho_k\}$  is optimal for  $\bar{C}(\rho)$  and  $V$  is an optimal potential for  $\rho$  iff the following conditions hold:

- i)  $\sum_{k=1}^N \|\rho_k\| = 1,$
- ii) For all  $k$ ,  $C_k(\rho_k) - \int \frac{kV}{N} d\rho_k = -M_k\left(\frac{kV}{N}\right)$
- iii)  $M_k\left(\frac{kV}{N}\right) = M_N(V)$  holds whenever  $\|\rho_k\| > 0.$

## Additional comments

- As noticed in Sec 1, we have  $\alpha_N(V) \leq -\frac{1}{N} \sup V < 0$ . Thus an optimal  $\rho$  satisfies  $\|\rho\| \geq \frac{1}{N}$   
(otherwise  $\bar{C}(\rho) - \int V d\rho = -\int V d\rho > -\frac{1}{N} \sup V$ )
- By the monotonicity property of the  $M_k$ 's, the equality in iii) holds whenever it exists  $l \leq k$  such that  $\|\rho_l\| > 0$ .
- Let  $\bar{k}$  denote the integer part of  $N\|\rho\|$ . Then  $N\|\rho\| = \sum_{k=1}^N k\|\rho_k\|$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^N \|\rho_k\| = 1$  imply the existence of two integers  $l_- \leq \bar{k} \leq l_+$  such that  $\|\rho_{l_\pm}\| > 0$ . Accordingly by iii):

$$M_k\left(\frac{k}{N}V\right) = M_N(V) \quad \text{for all } k > N\|\rho\| - 1.$$

# A quantitative criterium for existence in $\mathcal{P}$

**Corollary 7.** Assume that the potential  $V$  satisfies the condition

$$M_N(V) > M_{N-1}\left(\frac{N-1}{N}V\right). \quad (*)$$

Then the supremum defining  $M_N(V)$  is achieved in  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^N$  and all optimal  $\rho$  satisfy  $\|\rho\| = 1$ .

## Remarks:

- Recall that  $M_N(V) \geq M_{N-1}\left(\frac{N-1}{N}V\right)$  is always true.
- If  $\sup V > 0$ , condition (\*) is satisfied for *large*  $V$  (i.e. by  $tV$  for  $t \gg 1$ ).
- If  $\rho$  is optimal and equality holds in (\*), we do not know if  $\|\rho\| < 1$  except if  $\partial M_N(V) = \{\rho\}$   
( $\partial M_N(V)$  = the set of optimal  $\rho$  associated with  $V$ )

## Proof and consequence of Corollary 7

If an optimal  $\rho$  satisfies  $\|\rho\| < 1$ , then  $\bar{k}$  the integer part of  $N\|\rho\|$  is not larger than  $N - 1$ . This implies that  $M_N(V) = M_{N-1}\left(\frac{N-1}{N}V\right)$  in contradiction with (\*). For the first statement we consider a maximal  $N$ -uplet  $x \in X^N$  ( $X = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\omega\}$ ). If the supremum is not reached on  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^N$ , this means that  $x_i = \omega$  for at most one index  $i$  and in this case we would have again  $M_N(V) = M_{N-1}\left(\frac{N-1}{N}V\right)$ .



**Corollary 8** Let  $V$  be a potential  $V \in C_0^+$  such that:

$$\beta := \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} |x|V(x) > 0.$$

Then all optimal  $\rho$  are in  $\mathcal{P}$  provided  $\beta > N(N - 1)$ .



## Proof of Theorem 5 (quantization)

We introduce

$$\bar{k} := \max \left\{ k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\} : M_k \left( \frac{k}{N} V \right) > M_{k-1} \left( \frac{k-1}{N} V \right) \right\}$$

With the convention  $M_0 = 0$  and since  $M_1(\frac{V}{N}) = \frac{1}{N} \sup V > 0$ ,  $\bar{k}$  is well defined. As  $M_{\bar{k}}(\frac{\bar{k}}{N} V) > M_{\bar{k}-1}(\frac{\bar{k}-1}{N} V)$ , we apply Corollary 7 considering instead of  $C = C_N$  the  $\bar{k}$ -multimarginal energy  $C_{\bar{k}}$  and choosing  $\bar{k}V/N$  as a potential. We infer the existence of an optimal proba  $\rho_{\bar{k}}$  such that

$$C_{\bar{k}}(\rho_{\bar{k}}) - \int V d\rho_{\bar{k}} = -M_{\bar{k}} \left( \frac{\bar{k}V}{N} \right)$$

Then  $\rho := \frac{\bar{k}}{N} \rho_{\bar{k}}$  has a mass  $\frac{\bar{k}}{N}$  and satisfies

$$\bar{C}(\rho) - \int V d\rho \leq C_{\bar{k}}(\rho_{\bar{k}}) - \int \frac{\bar{k}V}{N} d\rho_{\bar{k}} = -M_{\bar{k}} \left( \frac{\bar{k}V}{N} \right) = -M_N(V).$$

Thus  $\mathcal{I}_N(V) \leq \frac{\bar{k}}{N}$ .

Let us prove now the opposite inequality. Let  $\rho$  optimal and let  $\{\rho_k\}$  be an optimal decomposition for  $\rho$  according to the stratification formula

$$\rho = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{k}{N} \rho_k.$$

By using the monotonicity property of the  $M_k$ 's and the definition of  $\bar{k}$ , we infer that  $M_k(\frac{k}{N}V) < M_N(V)$  for every  $k \leq \bar{k} - 1$ , thus by the optimality condition iii) of Theorem 6, it holds  $\rho_k = 0$  for  $k \leq \bar{k} - 1$ .

Recalling that  $\sum_k \|\rho_k\| = 1$  (by optimality condition i)), we have

$$\|\rho\| = \sum_{k=\bar{k}}^N \frac{k}{N} \|\rho_k\| \geq \frac{\bar{k}}{N} \sum_{k=\bar{k}}^N \|\rho_k\| \geq \frac{\bar{k}}{N},$$

hence  $\mathcal{I}_N(V) \geq \bar{k}/N$ . □

## 5- Open problems and perspectives

- Let  $C$  be the  $N$ -multimarginal cost and  $\rho$  a probability with finite support such that  $C(\rho) < +\infty$ . Then the function

$$\varphi : t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \overline{C}(t\rho)$$

is convex continuous and vanishes on  $[0, \frac{1}{N}]$ . It seems that in addition  $\varphi$  is piecewise affine and that the jump set of the

slope is contained in  $\left\{ \frac{k}{N} : 1 \leq k \leq N-1 \right\}$

- If  $\|\rho\| = \frac{k}{N}$ , do we have  $\overline{C}(\rho) = C_k(\frac{N}{k}\rho)$ ? It seems that counterexamples exist, M.Lewin -S Di Marino-L. Nenna in progress
- The quantization result hold merely for the minimal mass of a minimizer. Can this be improved ?

THANK YOU