

THE CUTOFF PHENOMENON IN WASSERSTEIN DISTANCE FOR NONLINEAR STABLE LANGEVIN SYSTEMS WITH SMALL LÉVY NOISE

G. BARRERA, M.A. HÖGELE, AND J.C. PARDO

ABSTRACT. This article establishes the cutoff phenomenon in the Wasserstein distance for systems of nonlinear ordinary differential equations with a unique coercive stable fixed point subject to general additive Markovian noise in the limit of small noise intensity. This result generalizes the results shown in Barrera, Högele, Pardo (EJP2021) in a more restrictive setting of Blumenthal-Gettoor index $\alpha > 3/2$ to the formulation in Wasserstein distance, which allows to cover the case of general Lévy processes with some given moment. The main proof techniques are based on the close control of the errors in a version of the Hartman-Grobman theorem and the adaptation of the linear theory established in Barrera, Högele, Pardo (JSP2021). In particular, they rely on the precise asymptotics of the nonlinear flow and the nonstandard shift linearity property of the Wasserstein distance, which is established by the authors in (JSP2021). Main examples are the Fermi-Pasta-Ulam-Tsingou gradient flow and coercive nonlinear oscillators subject to small (and possibly degenerate) Brownian or arbitrary α -stable noise.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction, setup and main results	1
2. Proofs of the main results	6
2.1. The first order approximation	6
2.2. Derivation of the cutoff phenomenon	7
2.3. Proof of Theorem 1	7
2.4. Proof of Theorem 2	8
3. Examples	9
Appendix A. Existence of the invariant measure	11
A.1. Invariant distribution μ^ε	11
A.2. Convergence to μ^ε in $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}$ for $p_* > 0$	11
Appendix B. L^p estimates for $p \in (0, p_*)$	11
B.1. Localization	12
B.2. First order approximation	13
B.3. Asymptotic first order approximation	17
B.4. Auxiliary moment estimates	19
Acknowledgments	22
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION, SETUP AND MAIN RESULTS

Let $L = (L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Lévy process taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ on a given filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, where $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the enhanced natural filtration of L satisfying the usual conditions of Protter [12]. It is well-known that the law of L is characterized by the triplet (a, Σ, ν) , where

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H10; 37A25; 60G51; 15A16.

Key words and phrases. Cutoff phenomenon, Exponential ergodicity, Lévy processes, Nonlinear Langevin dynamics, Nonstandard properties of the Wasserstein distance.

$a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a non-negative definite matrix and $\nu : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a locally finite Borel measure satisfying

$$\nu(\{0\}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 \wedge |z|^2) \nu(dz) < \infty,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard Euclidean inner product $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $|\cdot|$ the induced norm. We refer to [1, 14, 16, 20] for further details on Lévy processes. We also consider a vector field $b \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $b(0) = 0$ and the following dissipative condition.

Hypothesis 1 (Dissipativity). *There exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$(1.1) \quad \langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle \geq \delta |x - y|^2 \quad \text{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In this paper, we study the asymptotics of the ergodic behavior of the following stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$(1.2) \quad dX_t^\varepsilon(x) = -b(X_t^\varepsilon(x))dt + \varepsilon dL_t, \quad X_0^\varepsilon(x) = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

for small noise intensity $\varepsilon > 0$. Under Hypothesis 1, it is known that the SDE (1.2) has a pathwise unique strong solution, see for instance Theorem 1.1 in [9], here denoted by $X^\varepsilon(x) := (X_t^\varepsilon(x))_{t \geq 0}$. Moreover, $X^\varepsilon(x)$ is a Markov process and, in particular, it satisfies the Feller property see Proposition 2.1 in [19].

Our aim is to study the cutoff phenomenon for the family of processes $(X^\varepsilon(x))_{\varepsilon > 0}$ under the Wasserstein distance. Roughly speaking the cut-off phenomenon refers to the following asymptotic behaviour: as ε decreases, under the renormalized Wasserstein distance, the distance between the laws of $X_t^\varepsilon(x)$ and the corresponding limiting distribution μ^ε converges to a step function centered at deterministic times t_ε . In other words, the function $\varepsilon \mapsto t_\varepsilon$ is such that the distance is asymptotically maximal for times smaller than $t_\varepsilon - o(t_\varepsilon)$ and asymptotically zero for times larger than $t_\varepsilon + o(t_\varepsilon)$. The latter holds under some moment assumption on the Lévy measure ν which is implicit from the definition on the Wasserstein distance. In particular, our results generalize previous studies that appeared in [2] for the linear case, i.e. when $b(x) = Qx$ for Q being a square real matrix whose eigenvalues have positive real part, and complements those obtained in [3], [5] and [6] for similar SDEs under the total variation distance to general additive Markovian noise. For a detailed introduction on the subject we refer to the aforementioned articles.

There is a particular advantage of studying this problem under the Wasserstein distance rather than in the total variation. While the Wasserstein distance only requires the existence of moments of $X^\varepsilon(x)$ of a given order, the total variation distance needs existence of its density in addition of its regularity. The latter brings further requirements for the Lévy process L which can be quite restrictive, see [3] for further details. Furthermore the Wasserstein case, at least when $X^\varepsilon(x)$ possesses moments of order $p > 1$, the cutoff phenomenon of $(X^\varepsilon(x))_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is completely determined by an explicit function (see Theorem 2 below), here called as cutoff profile. On the contrary, in the total variation case the profile function can be very involved and even hard to simulate in examples. Moreover the profile function in the total variation case also requires the existence of the density for the limiting distribution in addition of its regularity.

In [4], the cutoff phenomenon with respect to the total variation distance covering SDEs of the type (1.2) in the one dimensional case, L being a standard Brownian motion and with general drift coefficient b (satisfying Hypothesis 1) is studied. In this case, we note that there is always a cutoff profile which can be given explicitly in terms of the Gauss error function. The follow-up work [5] covers the multidimensional case, where the picture is considerably richer, due to the presence of strong and complicated rotational patterns. The authors characterize sharply the existence of a cutoff profile in terms of the omega limit sets appearing in the long-term behavior of the matrix exponential function $e^{-Q_t}x$ in Lemma B.2 in [5], which plays an analogous role in this article. Barrera and Pardo [6] is the first attempt to study the cutoff phenomenon for such models with jumps. More

precisely, [6] covers the cutoff phenomenon with respect to the total variation distance of the generalized Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. The previous process satisfies an SDE of the form (1.2) with L being a Lévy process and $b(x) = Qx$, where Q is a squared real matrix whose eigenvalues have positive real part. The proof methods are based on concise Fourier inversion techniques. Due to the aforementioned regularity inherited by the total variation, the results in [6] are given under the hypothesis of continuous densities of the marginals, which to date is mathematically not characterized in simple terms. Here, the profile function is given in terms of the Lévy-Ornstein-Uhlenbeck limiting measure for $\varepsilon = 1$ and measured in the total variation distance. As we mentioned before such profile functions are theoretically highly insightful, but almost impossible to calculate and simulate in examples. The characterization of the existence of a cutoff-profile remains analogously to [5] in abstract terms of the behavior of the mentioned profile function on a suitably defined omega limit set. The Wasserstein case is treated in [2] where, contrary to the total variation case, it is noted that the profile function takes an explicit and simple shape. Finally, [3] treats the cutoff phenomenon with respect to the total variation distance for (1.2) with b satisfying Hypothesis 1 and where the noise is driven by a Lévy process in the class of strongly locally layered stable processes (see Definition 1.4 in [3]).

Here we follow the approach of [2] and extend the results therein to the case when the vector field b satisfies Hypothesis 1 and a moment condition for the Lévy measure ν . In particular, our main result explains the cutoff phenomenon for the family of processes $(X^\varepsilon(x))_{\varepsilon>0}$ under the Wasserstein distance in terms of a cutoff profile which can be explicit when the Lévy process L has moments of order bigger or equal than one. Our arguments uses the Freidlin-Wentzell first order approximation, similarly as in [3] the properties of the Wasserstein distance given in Lemma 1.1. In particular, we apply the non-standard shift linearity of Lemma 1.1.d).

In order to present the main results of this paper, we formally introduce the Wasserstein distance of order p_* . We assume some finite moment for L_t and hence $X_t^\varepsilon(x)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Hypothesis 2 (Finite p_* -th moment). *There exists $p_* > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{|z|>1} |z|^{p_*} \nu(dz) < \infty.$$

For any two probability distributions μ_1 and μ_2 on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with finite p_* -th moment for some $p_* > 0$, we define the Wasserstein p_* -distance between them as follows

$$\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{\Pi} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |u - v|^{p_*} \Pi(du, dv) \right)^{1 \wedge (1/p_*)},$$

where the infimum is taken over all couplings (joint distributions on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$) Π with marginals μ_1 and μ_2 . We refer to [11, 18] and references therein for more details. For convenience of notation we do not distinguish a random variable U and its law $\mathbb{P}_U$ as an argument of $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}$. That is, for random variables U_1, U_2 and probability measure μ we write $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(U_1, U_2)$ instead of $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(\mathbb{P}_{U_1}, \mathbb{P}_{U_2})$, $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(U_1, \mu)$ instead of $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(\mathbb{P}_{U_1}, \mu)$ etc. The next result establishes properties of the Wasserstein distance which turn out to be important for our arguments.

Lemma 1.1 (Properties of $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}$). *For $p_* > 0$, $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and U_1 and U_2 being random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with finite p_* -th moment it follows*

- a) *The Wasserstein distance $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}$ is a metric.*
- b) *Translation invariance: $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(u_1 + U_1, u_2 + U_2) = \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(u_1 - u_2 + U_1, U_2)$.*
- c) *Homogeneity:*

$$\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(c \cdot U_1, c \cdot U_2) = \begin{cases} |c| \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(U_1, U_2) & \text{for } p_* \in [1, \infty), \\ |c|^{p_*} \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(U_1, U_2) & \text{for } p_* \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

d) *Shift linearity: For $p_* \geq 1$ it follows*

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(u_1 + U_1, U_1) = |u_1|.$$

For $p_ \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$(1.4) \quad \max\{|u_1|^{p_*} - 2\mathbb{E}[|U_1|^{p_*}], 0\} \leq \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(u_1 + U_1, U_1) \leq |u_1|^{p_*}.$$

e) *Domination: For any given coupling $\tilde{\Pi}$ between U_1 and U_2 it follows*

$$\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(U_1, U_2) \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |v_1 - v_2|^{p_*} \tilde{\Pi}(dv_1, dv_2) \right)^{1 \wedge (1/p_*)}.$$

f) *Characterization: Let $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of random vectors with finite p_* -th moments and U a random vector with finite p_* -th moment the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(U_n, U) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (2) $U_n \xrightarrow{d} U$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[|U_n|^{p_*}] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|U|^{p_*}]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For $p_* \in (0, 1)$ equality (1.3) is false in general, see Remark 2.4 in [2]. The proof of the previous lemma is given in Lemma 2.2 in [2].

The following result yields the existence of a unique invariant distribution for (1.2) under Hypotheses 1 and 2. Moreover, under the Wasserstein distance, the strong solution of (1.2) is exponentially ergodic. Its proof is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 1.2 (Existence of a unique invariant distribution). *Under Hypothesis 1 for $p_* > 0$ and Hypothesis 2 there exists a unique invariant probability measure μ^ε such that*

$$\mathcal{W}_{p_*}(X_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon) \leq e^{-(1 \wedge p_*)\delta t} \left(|x|^{1 \wedge p_*} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{1 \wedge p_*} \mu^\varepsilon(dy) \right).$$

The zeroth-order approximation of a smooth dynamical systems on a finite time horizon $[0, T]$ subject to small perturbations is given by the deterministic system, that is, $(X_t^0(x))_{t \in [0, T]}$. Our main results treat small asymptotics close to the stable state 0 which translates to meaningful time scales $t_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. Before we state our main result, we first provide the long-time asymptotics of $X_t^0(x)$ in terms of the spectral decomposition of the solution $t \mapsto e^{-Db(0)t}x^*$ of the respective linear system for some x^* in a small neighbourhood of the origin.

Lemma 1.3 (Asymptotic Hartman-Grobman). *Assume Hypothesis 1. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ there exist:*

- (i) *positive constants q^x, τ^x, ℓ^x, m^x with $\ell^x, m^x \in \{1, \dots, d\}$,*
- (ii) *angles $\theta_1^x, \dots, \theta_m^x \in [0, 2\pi)$, where $\theta_k^x \in (0, 2\pi)$ for come in pairs $(\theta_{j_*}^x, \theta_{j_*+1}^x) = (\theta_{j_*}^x, 2\pi - \theta_{j_*}^x)$.*
- (iii) *linearly independent vectors $v_x^1, \dots, v_x^{m^x}$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$ satisfying $(v_{j_*}^x, v_{j_*+1}^x) = (v_{j_*}^x, \bar{v}_{j_*}^x)$ whenever $(\theta_{j_*}^x, \theta_{j_*+1}^x) = (\theta_{j_*}^x, 2\pi - \theta_{j_*}^x)$,*

such that

$$(1.5) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{e^{q^x t}}{t^{\ell^x - 1}} X_{t+\tau^x}^0(x) - \sum_{k=1}^{m^x} e^{i\theta_k^x t} v_k^x \right| = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$(1.6) \quad 0 < \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{m^x} e^{it\theta_k^x} v_k^x \right| \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{m^x} e^{it\theta_k^x} v_k^x \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m^x} |v_k^x|.$$

The proof of the previous lemma is given in Lemma B.2. in Appendix B of [5].

Remark 1.4 (Convention). Note that $\theta_k^x = 0$ is true for at most one index $k \in \{1, \dots, m^x\}$. If such an index shows up in $\theta_1^x, \dots, \theta_{m^x}^x$ we adopt the convention that $\theta_1^x = 0$ and hence $m^x = 2n + 1$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Otherwise, $m^x = 2n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and we eliminate θ_1^x and count the angles as follows $\theta_2^x, \dots, \theta_{2n+1}^x$.

Our first main result establishes $\infty/0$ collapse of the Wasserstein distance between the current state $X_t^\varepsilon(x)$ and dynamical equilibrium μ^ε along the critical time scale t_ε^x given in (1.7) under mild conditions.

Theorem 1 (Window cutoff). Let ν satisfies Hypothesis 2 for some $p_* > 0$. Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and assume that b satisfies Hypothesis 1 with the Hartman-Grobman representation $q^x > 0$, $\ell^x, m^x \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $\theta_1^x, \dots, \theta_{m^x}^x \in [0, 2\pi)$, $v_1^x, \dots, v_{m^x}^x \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\tau^x > 0$ of Lemma 1.3. Then the family of processes $(X^\varepsilon(x))_{\varepsilon>0}$ exhibits a window cutoff phenomenon on the time scale

$$(1.7) \quad t_\varepsilon^x = \frac{1}{q^x} |\ln(\varepsilon)| + \frac{\ell^x - 1}{q^x} \ln(|\ln(\varepsilon)|)$$

and for all asymptotically constant window sizes w_ε such that $w_\varepsilon \rightarrow w > 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as follows

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow -\infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = \infty$$

and

$$(1.9) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

for all $0 < p < p_*$.

The second main result provides two characterizations of the proper limit of the expressions in (1.8) and (1.9) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ exists for any fixed $r \in \mathbb{R}$. In addition, it yields the precise shape of the limit which turn out to be a simple exponential function for $p \in [1, p_*)$.

Theorem 2 (Dynamical profile cutoff characterization for $p_* > 0$).

Let the assumptions (and the notation) of Theorem 1 be valid for some $p_* > 0$.

(1) Then for any $0 < p < p_*$ the following statements are equivalent.

i) For any $\lambda > 0$, the abstract function $\omega(x) \ni u \mapsto \mathcal{W}_p(\lambda u + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty)$ is constant, where

$$\omega(x) := \left\{ \text{accumulation points of } \sum_{k=1}^m e^{it\theta_k^x} v_k^x \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \right\}.$$

ii) The family of processes $(X^\varepsilon(x))_{\varepsilon>0}$ exhibits a profile cutoff for any $0 < p < p_*$ as follows

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = \mathcal{P}_p^x(r) \quad \text{for any } r \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$(1.10) \quad \mathcal{P}_p^x(r) := \mathcal{W}_p(\kappa^x(r) v + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \quad \text{for any } v \in \omega(x)$$

and

$$\kappa^x(r) = e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} \cdot e^{-q^x w r}.$$

(2) For $p_* > 1$ and $p \in [1, p_*)$ the profile has the shape

$$\mathcal{P}_p^x(r) = \kappa^x(r) \cdot |v| \quad \text{for all } v \in \omega(x)$$

if and only if $\omega(x)$ is contained in a sphere.

- (3) *We recall the convention of Remark 1.4. For $p_* > 1$, $p \in [1, p_*)$ and the angles $\theta_2^x, \dots, \theta_{2n}^x$ being rationally π -independent, the statements i) and ii) are equivalent to the following normal growth condition of the linearization:*

The family of vectors $(w^x, \operatorname{Re} v_2^x, \operatorname{Im} v_2^x, \dots, \operatorname{Re} v_{2n}^x, \operatorname{Im} v_{2n}^x)$ is orthogonal in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and satisfies

$$|\operatorname{Re} v_{2k}^x| = |\operatorname{Im} v_{2k}^x| \quad \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Due to its relevance as physical observables, we formulate the corresponding window cutoff result for the respective moments.

Corollary 1.5 (Moments cutoff). *Let the assumptions (and the notation) of Theorem 1 be valid for some $p_* > 0$. For any $0 < p < p_*$ it follows*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^p} \mathbb{E}[|X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)|^p] &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^p} \mathbb{E}[|X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)|^p] = \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{O}_\infty|^p], \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow -\infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^p} \mathbb{E}[|X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)|^p] &= \lim_{r \rightarrow -\infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^p} \mathbb{E}[|X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)|^p] = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

2. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

2.1. The first order approximation. We define the Freidlin-Wentzell first order approximation given by

$$(2.1) \quad Y_t^\varepsilon(x) = X_t^0(x) + \varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_t^x, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $(\mathcal{Y}_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ is the unique strong solution of the linear SDE

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} d\mathcal{Y}_t^x = -Db(X_t^0(x))\mathcal{Y}_t^x dt + dL_t & \text{for any } t \geq 0, \\ \mathcal{Y}_0^x = 0. \end{cases}$$

In [3], Lemma C.4 in Section C.4 it is shown that $Y_t^\varepsilon(x)$ converges in total variation distance to a unique limiting distribution μ_*^ε as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, it is shown there that $\mu_*^\varepsilon \stackrel{d}{=} \varepsilon \mathcal{O}_\infty$, where $\mathcal{O}_\infty$ is the unique invariant probability measure of the homogeneous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck dynamics

$$d\mathcal{O}_t = -Db(0)\mathcal{O}_t + dL_t.$$

For any $0 < p \leq p_*$, by the triangle inequality it follows that

$$\mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) + \mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_*^\varepsilon, \mu_*^\varepsilon)$$

for any $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Analogously we estimate

$$\mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), X_t^\varepsilon(x)) + \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_*^\varepsilon, \mu_*^\varepsilon).$$

Combining the preceding inequalities we obtain the linear approximation

$$(2.3) \quad |\mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon)| \leq \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_*^\varepsilon, \mu_*^\varepsilon)$$

for any $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In Proposition 1 we show that for any $t_\varepsilon = O(|\ln(\varepsilon)|)$ and $0 < p < p_*$ the following limit holds

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), Y_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x))}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

Moreover, in Lemma B.2 we show that for $0 < p < p_*$

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\mu_*^\varepsilon, \mu_*^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

2.2. Derivation of the cutoff phenomenon. In the sequel, we analyze the asymptotic behavior of $\mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon)/\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}$ from which we recognize the cutoff. By the triangle inequality, translation invariance, homogeneity and shift linearity given in Lemma 1.1 we obtain for $0 < p \leq p_*$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) &= \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x) + \varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_t^x, \varepsilon \mathcal{O}_\infty) \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x) + \varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_t^x, X_t^0(x) + \varepsilon \mathcal{O}_\infty) + \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x) + \varepsilon \mathcal{O}_\infty, \varepsilon \mathcal{O}_\infty) \\ &= \varepsilon^{1\wedge p} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{O}_\infty) + \varepsilon^{1\wedge p} \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x)/\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously we deduce

$$\mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^{1\wedge p} \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x)/\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) - \varepsilon^{1\wedge p} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{O}_\infty).$$

Consequently,

$$(2.6) \quad \left| \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(Y_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu_*^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}} - \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x)/\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \right| \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{O}_\infty).$$

The right-hand side does not depend of ε and by Lemma B.3 it tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is therefore enough to study the precise longterm behavior of $\mathcal{W}_p(X_t^0(x)/\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty)$.

2.3. Proof of Theorem 1. For any $0 < p < p_*$, $\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x$ and w_ε being given in statement and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, (2.3), (2.4), (2.5), (2.6) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}} &= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\frac{X_t^0(x)}{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right), \\ \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}} &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\frac{X_t^0(x)}{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right). \end{aligned}$$

For short, we define

$$(2.7) \quad \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x = \mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon - \tau^x \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^x(\varepsilon) := \frac{(\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x)^{\ell-1}}{\varepsilon e^{q^x \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x}} \sum_{k=1}^m e^{i \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x \theta_k^x} v_k^x.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x + \tau^x = \mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon$.

Claim A.

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}} = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty)$$

and

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}} = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty).$$

for any $0 < p < p_*$. In particular, the limit

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1\wedge p}} \quad \text{exists iff} \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \quad \text{exists.}$$

Proof of Claim A. In the sequel we study the asymptotics of the drift term $\frac{X_t^0(x)}{\varepsilon}$. A straightforward calculation shows

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x)^{\ell-1} e^{-q^x \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x}}{\varepsilon} = e^{-q^x \tau} (q^x)^{1-\ell} e^{-q^x w r}.$$

The preceding limit with the help of the spectral decomposition (1.5) given in Lemma 1.3 and the triangle inequality imply

$$\mathcal{W}_p\left(\frac{X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^0(x)}{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right) \leq \mathcal{W}_p\left(\left(\frac{X_{\tau + \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x}^0(x)}{\varepsilon} - \Lambda^x(\varepsilon)\right) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right) + \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty).$$

We set

$$R_\varepsilon^x := \mathcal{W}_p\left(\left(\frac{X_{\tau+\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x}^0(x)}{\varepsilon} - \Lambda^x(\varepsilon)\right) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right).$$

Analogous reasoning yields

$$\mathcal{W}_p\left(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right) \leq \mathcal{W}_p\left(\frac{X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x+r\cdot w_\varepsilon}^0(x)}{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty\right) + R_\varepsilon^x.$$

In the sequel it remains to show that $R_\varepsilon^x \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. By the continuity of $z \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_p(z + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty)$ at $z = 0$ is enough to prove

$$\left|\frac{X_{\tau+\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon^x}^0(x)}{\varepsilon} - \Lambda^x(\varepsilon)\right| \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

which is valid due to the limit (1.5) and (2.9). This shows Claim A.

In the sequel, we prove window cutoff. Note that $\Lambda^x(\varepsilon)$ is uniformly bounded on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. For any accumulation point U (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of $(\mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty))_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1]}$ there exists a sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$U = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon_k) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty).$$

The Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem for the sequence $(\Lambda(\varepsilon_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, the limit (2.9) and the continuity of $\mathcal{W}_p$ yield

$$(2.10) \quad U = \mathcal{W}_p(e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r} u + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \quad \text{for some } u \in \omega(x).$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) &= \mathcal{W}_p(e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r} \hat{u} + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty), \\ \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) &= \mathcal{W}_p(e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r} \check{u} + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty), \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{u}, \check{u} \in \omega(x)$ and $\check{u} \neq 0$ by (1.6). Hence item d) in Lemma 1.1 implies

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow -\infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) = \infty.$$

2.4. Proof of Theorem 2. We keep the notation (2.7) of the proof of Theorem 1. By (2.8) it is enough to prove that the limit

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \quad \text{exists.}$$

For $p \geq 1$, the shift linearity given in item d) of Lemma 1.1 implies

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{W}_p(e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r} u + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) = e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r} |u|.$$

By (2.10) and (2.12) we infer

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} &\{\text{accumulation points of } \mathcal{W}_p(\Lambda^x(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathcal{W}_p((e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r}) u + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) : u \in \omega(x) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.14) \quad = \left\{ e^{-q^x \tau^x} (q^x)^{1-\ell^x} e^{-q^x w r} |u| : u \in \omega(x) \right\}.$$

Hence (2.13) and (2.14) imply that the limit (2.11) exists if and only if $\omega(x)$ is contained in a sphere. For $p \in (0, 1)$ the shift linearity is not valid and we are stuck after (2.13). Consequently, (2.13) holds true and the limit (2.11) exists if and only if for all $\lambda > 0$ the function

$$\omega(x) \ni u \mapsto \mathcal{W}_p(\lambda u + \mathcal{O}_\infty, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \quad \text{is constant.}$$

3. EXAMPLES

In this section we present two examples which illustrate the applicability of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 to nonlinear dynamics with degenerate noise.

Example 3.1 (The Fermi-Pasta-Ulam-Tsingou potential: a nonlinear gradient systems with degenerate noise). *We consider the Langevin gradient system*

$$(3.1) \quad dX_t^\varepsilon = -\nabla U(X_t^\varepsilon)dt + \varepsilon dL_t$$

for the strongly convex quartic Fermi-Pasta-Ulam-Tsingou potential $U(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|x|^4$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For any Lévy process L satisfying Hypothesis 2 for some $p_* > 0$ the system (3.1) exhibits a profile cutoff due to Theorem 2 where the cutoff time is given by $t_\varepsilon^x = |\ln(\varepsilon)|$. For $p_* > 1$ and any $p \in [1, p_*)$ the profile function in $\mathcal{W}_p$ is always of the following exponential shape

$$\mathcal{P}_p^x(r) = e^{-wr - \tau^x} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m v_k^x \right|,$$

where $\tau^x := \min\{t \geq 0 : |X_t^0(x)| \leq R_0/2\}$ and R_0 being an small radius inside of which Hartman-Grobman conjugation is valid. Note that τ^x can be replaced by any upper bound of τ^x such as for instance $(1/\delta) \ln(2|x|/R_0)$ given by Hypothesis 1.

In particular, the profile cutoff is satisfied for $L = L^\alpha$ being an (possibly degenerate) α -stable process with index $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. Note that for the limiting case of a possibly degenerate Cauchy process ($\alpha = 1$) and in fact of any L^α with index $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Theorem 2 also yields a profile cutoff, however, the profile function remains not explicit. This is due to the absence of a finite first moment and the shift linearity (1.4). In other words, the profile function is given in (1.10) for $p \in (0, \alpha)$ and up to our knowledge unknown how to simplify further. Note that the case of $\alpha \in (0, 3/2]$ is not covered in [3].

Example 3.2 (Nonlinear non-gradient with general degenerate noise). For $F, \mathcal{H} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ we consider the following perturbed simple harmonic oscillator with unit angular frequency given in Section 4 of [17] subject to a small noise perturbation

$$d \begin{pmatrix} X_t^{\varepsilon,1} \\ X_t^{\varepsilon,2} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} X_t^{\varepsilon,2} F(X_t^{\varepsilon,1}, X_t^{\varepsilon,2}) - \partial_1 \mathcal{H}(X_t^{\varepsilon,1}, X_t^{\varepsilon,2}) \\ -X_t^{\varepsilon,1} F(X_t^{\varepsilon,1}, X_t^{\varepsilon,2}) - \partial_2 \mathcal{H}(X_t^{\varepsilon,1}, X_t^{\varepsilon,2}) \end{pmatrix} dt + \varepsilon d \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_t \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a one dimensional Lévy process with finite p_* -th moments. The Jacobian matrix $Jb(v_1, v_2)$ at (v_1, v_2) of the respective vector field $b : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_2 \partial_1 F(v_1, v_2) - \partial_{11} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) & F(v_1, v_2) + v_2 \partial_2 F(v_1, v_2) - \partial_{12} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) \\ -F(v_1, v_2) - v_1 \partial_1 F(v_1, v_2) - \partial_{12} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) & -v_1 \partial_2 F(v_1, v_2) - \partial_{22} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We assume the existence of a positive constant δ such that for any $u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ it follows

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (u_1, u_2) Jb(v_1, v_2) (u_1, u_2)^* &= (v_2 \partial_1 F(v_1, v_2) - \partial_{11} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2)) u_1^2 + (-v_1 \partial_2 F(v_1, v_2) - \partial_{22} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2)) u_2^2 \\ &\quad + (v_2 \partial_2 F(v_1, v_2) - v_1 \partial_1 F(v_1, v_2) - 2\partial_{12} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2)) u_1 u_2 \\ &\geq \delta(u_1^2 + u_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

For instance, for a nonlinear perturbation of a linear oscillator, that is, $F(v_1, v_2) = \eta$ for some $\eta > 0$, the preceding condition reads

$$-\left(\partial_{11} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) u_1^2 + \partial_{22} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) u_2^2 + 2\partial_{12} \mathcal{H}(v_1, v_2) u_1 u_2 \right) \geq \delta(u_1^2 + u_2^2).$$

For $\mathcal{L}$ satisfying Hypothesis 2 with p_* , and $F, \mathcal{H}$ fulfilling (3.2) Theorem 1 implies window cutoff for any initial condition $(X_0^{\varepsilon,1}, X_0^{\varepsilon,2}) = x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and any $p \in (0, p_*)$. The cutoff time is given by

$$t_\varepsilon^x = \frac{1}{q^x} |\ln(\varepsilon)| + \frac{\ell^x - 1}{q^x} \ln(|\ln(\varepsilon)|).$$

Note that this result is new even in the Brownian case since the results of [3] and [5] are stated for the total variation distance which requires regularity on the transition probabilities given in the setting of non-degenerate noise. In our case, the Wasserstein distance circumvents this difficulty by the continuity of $\mathcal{W}_p(x + X, X)$ for any $X \in L^p$ as $|x| \rightarrow 0$ and $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. While for total variation distance it requires absolutely continuity on the distribution of X .

In the sequel, we characterize when there is a profile cutoff under (3.2) in terms of the linearization at the stable state $(0, 0)$. Let $a := -\partial_{11}^2 \mathcal{H}(0, 0)$, $b := -\partial_{22}^2 \mathcal{H}(0, 0)$, $c := -\partial_{12} \mathcal{H}(0, 0)$ and $\eta_0 := -F(0, 0)$. Then

$$Jb(0, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} a & -\eta_0 + c \\ \eta_0 + c & b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\eta_0 = c$ implies that the eigenvalues of $Jb(0, 0)$ are the numbers a and b which are positive and hence by Theorem 2 profile cutoff is valid. In the sequel we assume $\eta_0 \neq c$. Then the eigenvalues of $Jb(0, 0)$ are given by

$$\lambda_{\pm} := \frac{(a + b) \pm \sqrt{\Delta}}{2}, \quad \Delta := (a - b)^2 + 4(c^2 - \eta_0^2),$$

with corresponding eigenvectors

$$v_{\pm} := \left(1, -\frac{a - b \mp \sqrt{\Delta}}{2(-\eta_0 + c)} \right).$$

In addition,

$$\operatorname{Re}(v_{\pm}) = \begin{cases} \left(1, -\frac{a - b \pm \sqrt{\Delta}}{2(-\eta_0 + c)} \right) & \text{if } \Delta \geq 0, \\ \left(1, -\frac{a - b}{2(-\eta_0 + c)} \right) & \text{if } \Delta < 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Im}(v_{\pm}) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & \text{if } \Delta \geq 0, \\ \pm \left(0, \frac{\sqrt{|\Delta|}}{2(-\eta_0 + c)} \right) & \text{if } \Delta < 0. \end{cases}$$

For $\Delta \geq 0$ Theorem 2 yields a profile cutoff phenomenon. For $\Delta < 0$ Theorem 1 implies the weaker window cutoff phenomenon, however, by part (3) of Theorem 2 the stronger profile cutoff for $p_* > 1$ and $p \in [1, p_*)$ is valid if and only if

$$|\operatorname{Re}(v_+)|^2 = |\operatorname{Im}(v_+)|^2 \text{ and } \langle \operatorname{Re}(v_+), \operatorname{Im}(v_+) \rangle = 0$$

which is equivalent to special case $a = b$ and $c = 0$. In other words, $e^{-Jb(0,0)t} = e^{-at}R(\theta t)$, where $R(\theta t)$ is an orthogonal 2×2 matrix with angle θt .

Remark 3.3 (A word about the linear dynamics). In [2] the authors study the linear case $b(x) = \mathcal{Q}x$ for any Hurwitz stable matrix $-\mathcal{Q}$, that is, $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < 0$ for any eigenvalue λ of $-\mathcal{Q}$. Under these assumptions, Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 are shown.

It is not hard to see that Hypothesis 1 implies $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq -\delta$ for any eigenvalue λ of $-\mathcal{Q}$ and hence Hurwitz stability. However, the coercivity condition (1.1) (or equivalently the positive definiteness of the linearization $-Db(x)$ for any x) which is assumed in order to control the nonlinear vector field, is strictly stronger than Hurwitz stability. For instance, the vector field $b : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ given by $b(x) = \mathcal{Q}x$ with

$$-\mathcal{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \lambda & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } \lambda \in (0, 1/2)$$

has eigenvalues with real part $-\lambda/2 < 0$, but it does not satisfy Hypothesis 1 by a simple contradiction argument on the parameters. Note that coercivity is not even satisfied locally in a neighborhood of the origin. The extensions of our results to merely Hurwitz stable linearizations of b plus some recurrence condition on b due to the lack of control of the nonlinearity close to the linearization.

APPENDIX A. EXISTENCE OF THE INVARIANT MEASURE

A.1. Invariant distribution μ^ε . In the sequel we show the existence of a unique invariant distribution. We stress that beyond the existence of moments (Hypothesis 2), this does not include any regularity such as absolute continuity whatsoever in our setting. Hence our setting covers nonlinear oscillators with degenerate noise.

We recall the standing assumptions Hypothesis 1 with $\delta > 0$ and Hypothesis 2 with $p_* > 0$. For the existence of the invariant probability measure μ^ε it is enough to verify the following condition by [7], p. 388. For some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the limit

$$(A.1) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(|X_t^\varepsilon(x)| > R) dt = 0.$$

Hypotheses 1 and 2 imply inequality (D.3) p. 62 in [3]. That is to say, for $\gamma \in (0, 1 \wedge p_*)$ there exist positive constants C_1, C_2, C_3 such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $t \geq 0$, $A = \varepsilon \Pi$, $c = \varepsilon$

$$(A.2) \quad \mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x)|^\gamma] \leq e^{-\delta\gamma t} |x|^\gamma + C_3,$$

where $C_3 = c^\gamma + \frac{1}{\gamma\delta}(\gamma\delta c^\gamma + C_1\|A\|^\gamma + C_2c^{\gamma-2}\|A\|^2) = \varepsilon^\gamma \cdot (2 + \frac{1}{\gamma\delta}(C_1\|\Pi\|^\gamma + C_2\|\Pi\|^2))$. Inequality (A.2) implies (A.1) with the help of the Markov inequality.

For the uniqueness, it enough to verify the following condition given in Theorem 11.4.3 in [8]. For any given positive numbers η, δ and R , there exists a corresponding number $S > 0$ such that

$$(A.3) \quad \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^\varepsilon(y)| \geq \delta) dt < \eta \quad \text{for all } |x|, |y| \leq R \quad \text{and } T > S.$$

Hypotheses 1, 2 and the additivity of the noise imply (D.5) p. 62 in [3]. In other words, for any $\gamma \in (0, 1 \wedge p_*)$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $c = \varepsilon$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^\varepsilon(y)|^\gamma] \leq |x - y|^\gamma e^{-\delta\gamma t} + 2\varepsilon^\gamma.$$

The preceding inequality implies (A.3) with the help of the Markov inequality.

A.2. Convergence to μ^ε in $\mathcal{W}_{p_*}$ for $p_* > 0$. Due to Hypothesis 1 and the additive of the noise the natural coupling yields

$$(A.4) \quad |X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^\varepsilon(y)| \leq |x - y|e^{-\delta t} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0.$$

Since μ^ε is an invariant measure, disintegration implies

$$(A.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(X_t^\varepsilon(x), \mu^\varepsilon) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{W}_{p_*}(X_t^\varepsilon(x), X_t^\varepsilon(y)) \mu^\varepsilon(dy) \leq e^{-(1 \wedge p_*)\delta t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^{1 \wedge p_*} \mu^\varepsilon(dy) \\ &\leq e^{-(1 \wedge p_*)\delta t} |x|^{1 \wedge p_*} + e^{-(1 \wedge p_*)\delta t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{1 \wedge p_*} \mu^\varepsilon(dy), \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ provided that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{1 \wedge p_*} \mu^\varepsilon(dy) < \infty$ which is shown in (2.76) p. 41 in [3].

APPENDIX B. L^p ESTIMATES FOR $p \in (0, p_*)$

We recall the Lévy-Khinchin formula of L with characteristic triple (a, Σ, ν) satisfies

$$\ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{i\langle u, L_t \rangle}]) = t \left(i\langle a, u \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle u, \Sigma u \rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{i\langle u, z \rangle} - 1 - i\langle u, z \rangle \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(|z|) \right) \nu(dz) \right),$$

and has the following Lévy-Itô representation

$$(B.1) \quad L_t = at + \Sigma^{1/2} B_t + \int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} z \tilde{N}(ds dz) + \int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} z N(ds dz),$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, N is a Poisson random measure on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with intensity measure $dt \otimes \nu(dz)$ and $\tilde{N}$ is the compensated counterpart of N .

We recall the standing assumptions Hypothesis 1 with $\delta > 0$ and Hypothesis 2 with $p_* > 0$.

B.1. Localization. We start with the probability estimate of the event

$$\mathcal{D}_t^x = \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\mathcal{Y}_s^x| > \vartheta \right\}, \quad \vartheta > 0.$$

where $\mathcal{Y}^x$ is given in (2.2). Note that $\mathcal{Z} \cdot (0) = \mathcal{Y}^0$ satisfies

$$(B.2) \quad d\mathcal{Z}_t(x) = -Db(0)\mathcal{Z}_t(x)dt + dL_t, \quad \mathcal{Z}_0(x) = x$$

for $x = 0$.

Lemma B.1. *For any $\gamma \in (0, p_* \wedge 1]$ there is a positive constant C such that for any $\vartheta \geq 1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$(B.3) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_t^x) \leq C t \vartheta^{-\gamma}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 1 in [15] we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\mathcal{Y}_s^x| \leq 6\sqrt{[\mathcal{Y}^x(0)]_s} + 2 \int_0^t H_{s-} \cdot dL_s, \quad \text{where} \quad H_{s-} = \frac{\mathcal{Y}_{s-}^x}{\sqrt{\sup_{s \leq t} (|\mathcal{Y}_{s-}^x|^2 + [\mathcal{Y}^x]_{s-})}}.$$

In particular, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{Y}^x]_t &= [L]_t = \int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 N(ds dz) \quad \text{such that} \\ \int_0^t H_{s-} \cdot d\mathcal{Y}_s^x &= \int_0^t \langle H_{s-}, -Db(0)\mathcal{Y}_s^x \rangle ds + \int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle \tilde{N}(ds dz) + \int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle N(ds dz). \end{aligned}$$

By Hypothesis 1 we obtain $\int_0^t \langle H_{s-}, -Db(X_s^0(x))\mathcal{Y}_s^x \rangle ds \leq 0$ a.s. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\mathcal{Y}_s^x| > \vartheta\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(6\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 N(ds dz)\right)^{1/2} + 2 \int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle \tilde{N}(ds dz) + 2 \int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle N(ds dz) > \vartheta\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 N(ds dz) > \frac{\vartheta^2}{18^2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle \tilde{N}(ds dz) > \frac{2\vartheta}{3}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle N(ds dz) > \frac{2\vartheta}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We continue term by term. By the Markov inequality we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 N(ds dz) > \frac{\vartheta^2}{18^2}\right) \leq \frac{18^2 t}{\vartheta^2} \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 \nu(dz) =: C_1 \frac{t}{\vartheta^2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle \tilde{N}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z) > \frac{2\vartheta}{3}\right) &\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\vartheta^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle \tilde{N}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z)\right)^2\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\vartheta^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}z) \mathrm{d}s\right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^2 \frac{t}{\vartheta^2} \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}z) =: C_2 \frac{t}{\vartheta^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $\gamma \in (0, p_* \wedge 1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \langle H_{s-}, z \rangle N(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z) > \frac{2\vartheta}{3}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} |z| N(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z) > \frac{2\vartheta}{3}\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^\gamma \frac{1}{\vartheta^\gamma} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} |z| N(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z)\right)^\gamma\right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^\gamma \frac{1}{\vartheta^\gamma} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} |z|^\gamma N(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z)\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^\gamma \frac{t}{\vartheta^\gamma} \int_{|z| > 1} |z|^\gamma \nu(\mathrm{d}z) =: C_3 \frac{t}{\vartheta^\gamma},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the subadditivity of the power γ in the sense of Subsection 1.1.2, see formula (1.6) in [13]. This finishes the proof of the statement. $\square$

B.2. First order approximation. We start with technical preparation. In order to overcome that $u \mapsto |u|^p$ for $p \in (0, 2)$ is not twice continuously differentiable which turns out to be necessary for applying Itô's formula we use the following $\mathcal{C}^2$ norm approximation $|x|_c := \sqrt{|x|^2 + c^2}$, $c > 0$, with the limiting case $|x|_0 = |x|$. It is well-behaved in the following sense. For any $c > 0$ we have

$$c \leq |x|_c \leq |x| + c, \quad \nabla |x|_c := \frac{x}{|x|_c} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \frac{|x|}{|x|_c} < 1.$$

Furthermore, it is straightforward to verify for $G(x) = |x|_c^p$ the following calculations

$$\nabla G(x) = p|x|_c^{p-1} \frac{x}{|x|_c} = p|x|_c^{p-2} x \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla G(x)| \leq p|x|_c^{p-1}$$

and its respective L_1 -norm is estimated as follows for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|H_G(x)|_1 \leq pd|x|_c^{p-2} + pd(2-p)|x|_c^{p-2} = C(p, d)|x|_c^{p-2}.$$

For details of the estimates, we refer to p. 60 in [3]. Since $p \in (0, 2)$ and $c \leq |x|_c$, we obtain

$$(B.4) \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |H_G(x)|_1 \leq C(p, d)c^{p-2}.$$

Proposition 1. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in (0, p_*)$ it follows

$$(B.5) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), Y_{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x))}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

In particular, for $x = 0$ we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(0), Y_{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(0))}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

Proof. It is enough to show the preceding limit in the respective L^p space. By (2.1) we have

$$dY_t^\varepsilon(x) = (-Db(X_t^0(x))Y_t^\varepsilon(x) + Db(X_t^0(x))X_t^0(x) - b(X_t^0(x)))dt + \varepsilon dL_t.$$

Let $\Delta_t^\varepsilon := X_t^\varepsilon(x) - Y_t^\varepsilon(x)$, $t \geq 0$. Then

$$d\Delta_t^\varepsilon = -(b(X_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)))dt - (b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) - Db(X_t^0(x))\varepsilon\mathcal{Y}_t^x)dt,$$

where $(\mathcal{Y}_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ is given in (2.2). Elementary estimates of the power function $r \mapsto r^{p_*}$ yields for all $t \geq 0$

$$(B.6) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] = \mathbb{E}[|(X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)) + \varepsilon\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^{p_*}] \leq C_{p_*} (\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)|^{p_*}] + \varepsilon^{p_*} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^{p_*}]),$$

where C_{p_*} is a positive constant. Since $(\mathcal{Y}_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies a dissipative linear equation, it exhibits the same integrability as L , which is straightforward to verify. There are a positive constant $\tilde{C}_{p_*}$ and a function $S_{p_*}(t)$ of at most polynomial order such that

$$(B.7) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^{p_*}] \leq \tilde{C}_{p_*} \mathbb{E}[|L_t|^{p_*}] \leq \tilde{C}_{p_*} S_{p_*}(t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

For the first term of the right-hand side of (B.6) Lemma B.4 and Lemma B.5 we have the following estimate. For any $\eta \in (0, p_*)$ there is a map $R_\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ which increases with polynomial order as t tends to infinity, such that

$$(B.8) \quad \mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)|^{p_*}] \leq \varepsilon^{p_* - \eta} R_\eta(t) \quad \text{for any } t \geq 0.$$

We start with the case $p_* > 1$ and $p \in (1, p_*)$. The Hölder inequality implies

$$(B.9) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-1}] \leq (\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}])^{\frac{p-1}{p_*}} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{p_* - \eta}{p_*}(p-1)} \tilde{R}_\eta(t) = \varepsilon^{p-1-\eta'} \tilde{R}_\eta(t) \quad \text{for any } t \geq 0,$$

where $\tilde{R}_\eta$ is a function of at most polynomial order as t tends to infinity and $\eta' = \eta \frac{p-1}{p_*}$. For η small enough we fix $\eta' \in (0, 1/4)$. Since $p_* > 1$, we choose $p \in (1, p_*)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$. We split

$$(B.10) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p] = \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)],$$

where

$$(B.11) \quad \mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon := \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_s^x| \leq \varepsilon^{1-\theta} \right\}.$$

We first prove that

$$(\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)])^{1/p} \leq \left(pC(|x|) \int_0^t \tilde{R}_\eta(s) ds \right)^{1/p} \varepsilon^{1 + \frac{1-\eta'-2\theta}{p}},$$

where $C(|x|) = \max_{|u| \leq |x|+1} |D^2b(u)|$. The choice of η' and θ yields $1 - \eta' - 2\theta > 1/4$. For notational convenience, we use the differential formalism, however, we stress that all differential inequalities are understood in the integral sense. The chain rule, Hypothesis 1 and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} d|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p &= -p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-2} \langle \Delta_t^\varepsilon, b(X_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) \rangle dt \\ &\quad - p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-2} \langle \Delta_t^\varepsilon, b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) - Db(X_t^0(x))\varepsilon\mathcal{Y}_t^x \rangle dt \\ &\leq -\delta p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p + p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-1} |b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) - Db(X_t^0(x))\varepsilon\mathcal{Y}_t^x| dt. \end{aligned}$$

On the event $\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon$, Taylor's theorem applied to b implies

$$d|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \leq -\delta p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p dt + pC(|x|)|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-1} \varepsilon^{2-2\theta} dt.$$

Taking expectation, the integral monotonicity, Fubini's theorem and (B.9) yield

$$\begin{aligned} d \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] &\leq -\delta p \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-1} \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] dt + pC(|x|) \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-1} \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] \varepsilon^{2-2\theta} dt \\ &\leq pC(|x|) \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p-1}] \varepsilon^{2-2\theta} dt \\ &\leq pC(|x|) \tilde{R}_\eta(t) \varepsilon^{p+1-\eta'-2\theta} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Bearing in mind $|\Delta_0^\varepsilon|^p = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] \leq pC(|x|) \varepsilon^{p+1-\eta'-2\theta} \int_0^t \tilde{R}_\eta(s) ds.$$

Therefore

$$(B.12) \quad (\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)])^{1/p} \leq \left(pC(|x|) \int_0^t \tilde{R}_\eta(s) ds \right)^{1/p} \varepsilon^{1+\frac{1-\eta'-2\theta}{p}}.$$

We continue with the estimate on the complement of $\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon$. We show

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)] \leq \varepsilon^{p-\eta'} \mathcal{R}(t) \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_*}},$$

where $\mathcal{R}(t)$ is a function of at most polynomial order. Indeed, by Hölder's inequality, and the inequalities (B.6), (B.7) and (B.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}]^{\frac{p}{p_*}} \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_*}} \\ &\leq \left(C_{p_*} \varepsilon^{p_*-\eta} R_\eta(t) + C_{p_*} \varepsilon^{p_*} \tilde{C}_{p_*} S_{p_*}(t) \right)^{\frac{p}{p_*}} \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_*}} \\ &\leq \left((C_{p_*} \varepsilon^{p_*-\eta} R_\eta(t))^{\frac{p}{p_*}} + (C_{p_*} \varepsilon^{p_*} \tilde{C}_{p_*} S_{p_*}(t))^{\frac{p}{p_*}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_*}} \\ &= \left((C_{p_*} R_\eta(t))^{\frac{p}{p_*}} \varepsilon^{(p_*-\eta)\frac{p}{p_*}} + (C_{p_*} \tilde{C}_{p_*} S_{p_*}(t))^{\frac{p}{p_*}} \varepsilon^p \right) \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_*}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{p-\eta} \frac{p}{p_*} \mathcal{R}(t) \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_*}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{R}(t) := \max\{(C_{p_*} R_\eta(t))^{\frac{p}{p_*}}, (C_{p_*} \tilde{C}_{p_*} S_{p_*}(t))^{\frac{p}{p_*}}\}$. As a consequence,

$$(B.13) \quad (\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)])^{1/p} \leq \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\eta}{p_*}} (\mathcal{R}(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_* p}}.$$

Combining estimates (B.12), (B.13) in decomposition (B.10) we obtain a positive constant $C := C(p_*, p, \delta, |x|, |D^2 F|)$ such that for any $t \geq 0$

$$(B.14) \quad \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) \leq (\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p])^{1/p} \\ \leq \left(pC(|x|) \int_0^t \tilde{R}_\eta(s) ds \right)^{1/p} \varepsilon^{1+\frac{1-\eta'-2\theta}{p}} + \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\eta}{p_*}} (\mathcal{R}(t))^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)^{\frac{p_*-p}{p_* p}}.$$

By Lemma B.1 there exists a positive constant C such that for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ for the choice $\vartheta = \varepsilon^{-\theta/\gamma}$ and any $t \geq 0$ it follows

$$(B.15) \quad \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c) \leq Ct \varepsilon^\theta.$$

We further restrict θ such that additionally $0 < \theta < \min\{\frac{2\eta p}{p_*-p}, 1/4\}$. Hence, with the help of inequality (B.14) and (B.15) we have

$$\mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(x), Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) \leq \mathcal{R}_1(t) \varepsilon^{1+\frac{1}{4p}} + \mathcal{R}_2(t) \varepsilon^{1+\frac{\eta}{p_*}},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are functions of at most polynomial order. Consequently we obtain the desired limit

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon^\varepsilon + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x), Y_{t_\varepsilon^\varepsilon + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x))}{\varepsilon} = 0.$$

We continue with the case $p_* > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1 \wedge p_*)$. Let $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$ and recall the event $\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon$ in (B.11). For $p \in (0, 1 \wedge p_*)$ we split

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p] = \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)] =: J_1 + J_2.$$

We start with the term J_1 . The chain rule for $|x|_c^p = (\sqrt{|x|^2 + c^2})^p$ and Hypothesis 1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} d|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p &= -p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Delta_t^\varepsilon, b(X_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) \rangle dt \\ &\quad + p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Delta_t^\varepsilon, b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) - Db(X_t^0(x))\varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_t^x \rangle dt \\ &\leq -p\delta|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} |\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^2 dt + p|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-1} |b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) - Db(X_t^0(x))\varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_t^x| dt \\ &\leq -p\delta|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p dt + p\delta c^p dt + pc^{p-1} |b(Y_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) - Db(X_t^0(x))\varepsilon \mathcal{Y}_t^x| dt. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $|X_t^0(x)| \leq e^{-\delta t}|x|$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, Taylor's expansion for b on the event $\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon$ implies

$$d|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p \leq -p\delta|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p dt + p\delta c^p dt + pc^{p-1} C(|x|)\varepsilon^{2(1-\theta)},$$

where $C(|x|) = \max_{|u| \leq |x|+1} |D^2 b(u)|$. Hence

$$d\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] \leq -p\delta\mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] dt + p\delta c^p dt + pc^{p-1} C(|x|)\varepsilon^{2(1-\theta)} dt.$$

The Grönwall inequality implies for all $t \geq 0$

$$(B.16) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)] \leq c^p + \frac{1}{\delta} c^{p-1} C(|x|)\varepsilon^{2(1-\theta)}.$$

For $p \neq 1$ we have the following. Since $c > 0$ is arbitrary and $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$, the choice $c = \varepsilon^{1+\eta/p}$ with $\eta \in (0, \frac{p}{2(1-p)})$ implies for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(B.17) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^p} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)] = 0.$$

The case of $p = 1$ follows by the choice $c = \varepsilon^2$ in (B.16).

We continue with the term J_2 . By subadditivity of the power p and the Hölder inequality for the index p'/p where $p' \in (p, p_*)$ and r is such that $p/p' + 1/r = 1$ we have

$$(B.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_t^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x)|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)] + \mathbb{E}[|Y_t^\varepsilon(x)|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c)] \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x)|^{p'}])^{p/p'} (\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c))^{1/r} + (\mathbb{E}[|Y_t^\varepsilon(x)|^{p'}])^{p/p'} (\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A}_t^\varepsilon)^c))^{1/r}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.5 we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$(B.19) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x)|^{p'}])^{p/p'} &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)|^{p'}] + |X_t^0(x)|^{p'})^{p/p'} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^p (1 + C_{p'} \cdot t)^{p/p'} + |X_t^0(x)|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for all $t \geq 0$ it follows

$$(B.20) \quad (\mathbb{E}[|Y_t^\varepsilon(x)|^{p'}])^{p/p'} \leq \varepsilon^p (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^{p'}])^{p/p'} + |X_t^0(x)|^p.$$

Lemma A.1 in [3] yields the existence of a positive constant $C(r, |x|)$ such that

$$(B.21) \quad |X_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^0(x)| \leq C(r, |x|)\varepsilon.$$

Combining (B.18) with inequalities (B.15), (B.19), (B.20) and (B.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)^c)] &\leq (C(\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^\theta)^{1/r} C^p(r, |x|)\varepsilon^p \\ &\quad + (C(\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^\theta)^{1/r} (\varepsilon^p (1 + C_{p'} \cdot (\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon))^{p/p'}) \\ &\quad + (C(\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^\theta)^{1/r} (\varepsilon^p (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_{\mathfrak{t}_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^x|^{p'}])^{p/p'}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^{p'}] \leq \mathcal{R}(t)$ where $\mathcal{R}$ is a function of at most polynomial order, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{p'}} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon|^{p'} \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{A}_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)^c)] \\ & \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\theta/r} (C(t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon))^{1/r} (C^p(r, |x|) + (1 + C_{p'} \cdot (t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon))^{p/p'} + \mathcal{R}(t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of the preceding inequality equals zero. The preceding argument combined with (B.17) yields the desired limit (B.5). $\square$

B.3. Asymptotic first order approximation.

Lemma B.2. *For any $p \in (0, p_*)$ we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\mu_*^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

Proof. First we observe that $Y_t^\varepsilon(0) = \mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(0)$ for any $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, where $(\mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(0))_{t \geq 0}$ is given in (B.2). In abuse of notation, we write $(X_t^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon))_{t \geq 0}$ (and analogously respectively $(\mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(\mu_*^\varepsilon))_{t \geq 0}$) for the process starting at the random vector with distribution μ^ε independent of the noise process L . Since $X_t^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon) = \mu^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(\mu_*^\varepsilon) = \mu_*^\varepsilon$ for any $t \geq 0$, the triangle inequality yields

$$(B.22) \quad \mathcal{W}_p(\mu^\varepsilon, \mu_*^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon), \mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(\mu_*^\varepsilon)) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon), X_t^\varepsilon(0)) + \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(0), \mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(0)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(0), \mathcal{Z}_t^\varepsilon(\mu_*^\varepsilon)).$$

By Proposition 1 for $x = 0$, we have

$$(B.23) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(0), \mathcal{Z}_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(0))}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

By disintegration, inequalities (A.4) and (2.76) in [3] imply

$$\mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon), X_t^\varepsilon(0)) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{W}_p(X_t^\varepsilon(u), X_t^\varepsilon(0)) \mu^\varepsilon(du) \leq e^{-\delta(1 \wedge p)t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{1 \wedge p} \mu^\varepsilon(du) \leq C e^{-\delta(1 \wedge p)t} \varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}$$

for some positive constant C . As a consequence,

$$(B.24) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon), X_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(0))}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

Analogously,

$$(B.25) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Z}_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(\mu_*^\varepsilon), \mathcal{Z}_{t_\varepsilon^x + r \cdot w_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(0))}{\varepsilon^{1 \wedge p}} = 0.$$

Combining (B.22) with the estimates (B.23), (B.24) and (B.25) completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma B.3. *For any $p \in (0, p_*)$ we have*

$$(B.26) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{O}_\infty) = 0.$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{O}_\infty$ is the limiting and invariant distribution of the homogeneous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $(\mathcal{Z}(x)_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined in (B.2). That is $\mathcal{O}_\infty \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{Z}_\infty$. Since $-Db(X_t^0(x))$ converges exponentially fast to $-Db(0)$, it is natural to expect that the flow of $(\mathcal{Y}_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ behaves as the flow of $(\mathcal{Z}_t(x))_{t \geq 0}$ for large t . In [3], Lemma C.3, it is shown that $\mathcal{Y}_t^x \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in law. However, the law $\mathcal{O}_\infty$ is not invariant under the random dynamics of $(\mathcal{Y}_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ due to the time inhomogeneity. Analogously as in (A.5) we deduce

$$(B.27) \quad \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Z}_t(x), \mathcal{O}_\infty) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

We start with the proof of the statement. The triangle inequality yields

$$(B.28) \quad \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{O}_\infty) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Z}_t(0), \mathcal{O}_\infty),$$

where the second term on the right-hand side tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$ due to (B.27). Thus it remains to prove $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) \rightarrow 0$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) \leq (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p])^{1 \wedge (1/p)},$$

we derive the respective L^p estimates. By (2.2) and (B.2) we obtain

$$d(\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) = -Db(X_t^0(x))(\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0))dt + (Db(0) - Db(X_t^0(x)))\mathcal{Z}_t(0)dt.$$

We first consider the case $p_* > 1$ and $p \in (1, p_*)$. The chain rule and Hypothesis 1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} d|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p &= -p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0), Db(X_t^0(x))(\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) \rangle dt \\ &\quad + p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0), (Db(0) - Db(X_t^0(x)))\mathcal{Z}_t(0) \rangle dt \\ &\leq -p\delta|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p dt + p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^{p-1} |Db(0) - Db(X_t^0(x))| |\mathcal{Z}_t(0)| dt \\ &\leq -p\delta|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p dt + p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^{p-1} C(|x|) |X_t^0(x)| |\mathcal{Z}_t(0)| dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(|x|) = \max_{|u| \leq |x|+1} |D^2b(u)|$. Taking expectation, using the monotonicity of the integrals and Fubini's theorem imply

$$d\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] \leq -p\delta\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p]dt + pC(|x|) |X_t^0(x)| \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^{p-1} \cdot |\mathcal{Z}_t(0)|]dt.$$

By Young's inequality and $|X_t^0(x)| \leq e^{-\delta t}|x|$ for any $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it follows

$$d\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] \leq -p\delta\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p]dt + pC(|x|)|x|e^{-\delta t} (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p]dt + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p])dt.$$

A straightforward calculation yields (for any $p > 0$) that there exist functions $P_1(t)$ and $P_2(t)$ of polynomial order (depending of $p, \delta, |x|$) such that

$$(B.29) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] \leq P_1(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^p] \leq P_2(t) \quad \text{for any } t \geq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$d\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] \leq -p\delta\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p]dt + p2^p C(|x|)|x|e^{-\delta t} (P_1(t) + P_2(t))dt.$$

The integral version of the Grönwall inequality with negative linearity given in Lemma 1 in [10] yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] &\leq p2^p C(|x|)|x|e^{-p\delta t} \int_0^t e^{p\delta s} e^{-\delta s} (P_1(s) + P_2(s))ds \\ &\leq \frac{p2^p C(|x|)|x|}{\delta(p-1)} \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{(P_1(s), P_2(s))\} e^{-\delta t}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(B.30) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] = 0.$$

Combining (B.27) and (B.30) in (B.28) we conclude (B.26). Note that the case $p_* > 1$ and $p \in (0, 1]$ is covered in the sequel.

We continue with the case $p \in (0, p_* \wedge 1]$. By Lemma B.1 there exists a positive constant C such that for the choice $\gamma = p$, $\vartheta = e^{\frac{\delta}{2}t}$ and any $t \geq 0$ it follows

$$(B.31) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_t^0) \leq Cte^{-\frac{\delta p}{2}t}, \quad \text{where we recall} \quad \mathcal{D}_t^0 = \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\mathcal{Z}_s(0)| > \vartheta \right\}.$$

We split

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p] = \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{D}_t^0)] =: I_1 + I_2.$$

We start with the term I_1 . The chain rule for $|x|_c^p = (\sqrt{|x|^2 + c^2})^p$ and Hypothesis 1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} d|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p &= -p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0), Db(X_t^0(x))(\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) \rangle dt \\ &\quad + p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0), (Db(0) - Db(X_t^0(x)))\mathcal{Z}_t(0) \rangle dt \\ &\leq -p\delta|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^{p-2} |\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^2 dt + p|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^{p-1} C(|x|) |X_t^0(x)| |\mathcal{Z}_t(0)| dt \\ &= -p\delta|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p dt + p\delta c^p dt + pc^{p-1} C(|x|) |X_t^0(x)| |\mathcal{Z}_t(0)| dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(|x|) = \max_{|u| \leq |x|+1} |D^2 b(u)|$. On the event $(\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c$ we have

$$d|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \leq -p\delta|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p dt + p\delta c^p dt + pc^{p-1} C(|x|) |x| e^{-(\delta/2)t} dt$$

due to $|X_t^0(x)| \leq e^{-\delta t} |x|$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence

$$d\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] \leq -p\delta\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] dt + p\delta c^p dt + pc^{p-1} C(|x|) |x| e^{-(\delta/2)t} dt.$$

The Grönwall inequality implies

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] \leq c^p + pc^{p-1} C(|x|) |x| e^{-p\delta t} \int_0^t e^{p\delta s} e^{-(\delta/2)s} ds.$$

Then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] \leq c^p \quad \text{for all } c > 0,$$

which implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|_c^p \mathbf{1}((\mathcal{D}_t^0)^c)] = 0$.

We continue with the term I_2 . By the Hölder inequality for the index p'/p where $p' = (p + p_*)/2$ and r the conjugate index of p'/p we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p \mathbf{1}(D_t)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^p \mathbf{1}(D_t)] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p \mathbf{1}(D_t)] \\ (B.32) \quad &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x|^{p'}]^{p/p'} (\mathbb{P}(D_t))^{1/r} + (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^{p'}]^{p/p'} (\mathbb{P}(D_t))^{1/r}). \end{aligned}$$

By (B.31) and (B.29) the right-hand side of (B.32) tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

As a consequence we have $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{Y}_t^x, \mathcal{Z}_t(0)) \leq (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_t^x - \mathcal{Z}_t(0)|^p])^{1 \wedge (1/p)}$ which tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By (B.27) and (B.28) we obtain (B.26). $\square$

B.4. Auxiliary moment estimates.

Lemma B.4. *For any $2 \leq p < p_*$ (and $p = 2$ if $p_* = 2$) there is a function of at most polynomial order $R(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that for any $t \geq 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)|^{p_*}] \leq \varepsilon^p R(t).$$

Proof. First note that for $G(u) = |u|^{p_*}$, $p_* \geq 2$ we have

$$\nabla G(u) = p_* |u|^{p_*-2} u = p_* (|u|^2)^{\frac{p_*-2}{2}} u, \quad \text{with } \partial_i G(u) = p_* |u|^{p_*-2} u_i,$$

$$\sum_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j G(u) \leq p_* |u|^{p_*-4} (d|u|^2 + \sum_{ij} \frac{(p_*-2)}{2} (u_j^2 + u_i^2)) = p_* (p_* - 1) d |u|^{p_*-4} |u|^2.$$

Recall the notation (B.1) for L . The Itô formula for $\Theta_t^\varepsilon = X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} d|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*} &= -p_*|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}\langle\Theta_t^\varepsilon, b(X_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x))\rangle dt + p_*|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}\langle\Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon\Sigma^{1/2}dB_t\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\text{trace}(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{Hess}G(\Theta_t^\varepsilon)(\Sigma^{1/2})^*)dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|^{p_*} - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*} - p_*|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}\langle\Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z\rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{|z| \leq 1\}}) \nu(dz)dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|^{p_*} - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}) \tilde{N}(dt, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] &\leq -\delta p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 p_*(p_* - 1) d \text{trace}(\Sigma^{1/2}(\Sigma^{1/2})^*) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|^{p_*} - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*} - p_*|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}\langle\Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z\rangle] \nu(dz) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the mean value theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|^{p_*} - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*} - p_*|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}\langle\Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z\rangle] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[p_*(p_* - 1) d \int_0^1 |\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \theta \varepsilon z|^{p_*-2} d\theta\right] |\varepsilon z|^2 \\ &\leq (1 \vee 2^{p_*-2}) \mathbb{E}\left[p_*(p_* - 1) d (|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2} + |\varepsilon z|^{p_*-2})\right] |\varepsilon z|^2 \\ &\leq (1 \vee 2^{p_*-2}) p_*(p_* - 1) d \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}] (|\varepsilon z|^2 + |\varepsilon z|^{p_*}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|^{p_*} - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*} - p_*|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}\langle\Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z\rangle] \nu(dz) \leq C_{p_*,d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^2 \nu(dz) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^{p_*} \nu(dz) \right) \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}].$$

Hence there is a positive constant K such that

$$(B.33) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] \leq -\delta p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}] ds.$$

For $p_* = 2$ we have directly $\mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] \leq \varepsilon^2 K t$. For $p_* > 2$ we continue in (B.33) with Young's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] &\leq -\delta p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}] ds \\ &\leq -\delta p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K t \\ &\leq -(\delta/2) p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K t \end{aligned}$$

for $\varepsilon < (\frac{\delta p_*}{2K})^{1/2}$. Grönwall's lemma applied to the preceding estimate yields the a priori estimate $\mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] \leq \varepsilon^2 K t^2 =: \varepsilon^2 R_0(t)$. Inserting the a priori estimate in (B.33) and using the Hölder inequality for $p_* > 2$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] &\leq -\delta p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*-2}] ds \\ &\leq -\delta p_* \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] ds + \varepsilon^2 K \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p_*}]^{\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}} ds \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{2+2\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}} K^{1+\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}} \int_0^t s^{2\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}} ds =: \varepsilon^{2+2\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}} R_1(t). \end{aligned}$$

By induction we obtain after i iterations of the bootstrap the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] \leq \varepsilon^{2 \sum_{j=0}^i \left(\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}\right)^j} R_i(t)$$

for a polynomial order function $R_i(t)$. Clearly, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} 2 \sum_{j=0}^i \left(\frac{p_*-2}{p_*}\right)^j = p_*$ and therefore for any $0 < p < p_*$ there is an iteration $i_0 = i_0(p_*, p)$ such that we obtain $\mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|^{p_*}] \leq \varepsilon^p R_{i_0}(t)$. This shows the aforementioned claim. $\square$

Lemma B.5. *Let $p_* > 0$. Then for any $p \in (0, 2 \wedge p_*)$ there exists a positive constant C_p such that for any $t \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)|^p] \leq \varepsilon^p (1 + C_p \cdot t).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality let $p_* \in (0, 2]$. Itô's formula yields for $\Theta_t^\varepsilon = X_t^\varepsilon(x) - X_t^0(x)$ and the function $G(z) = |z|_c^p$

$$\begin{aligned} d|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p &= -p|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Theta_t^\varepsilon, b(X_t^\varepsilon(x)) - b(X_t^0(x)) \rangle dt + p|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon \Sigma^{1/2} dB_t \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \text{trace}(\Sigma^{1/2} \text{Hess} G(\Theta_t^\varepsilon) (\Sigma^{1/2})^*) dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p - p|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Theta_t^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z \rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{|z| \leq 1\}}) \nu(dz) dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\Theta_t^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p) \tilde{N}(dt, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and using Hypothesis 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p] &\leq c^p - p\delta \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^2] ds + \varepsilon^2 \int_0^t \text{trace}(\Sigma^{1/2} \text{Hess} G(\Theta_s^\varepsilon) (\Sigma^{1/2})^*) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p - p|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Theta_s^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z \rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{|z| \leq 1\}}] \nu(dz) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|x|^2 = |x|_c^2 - c^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p] &\leq c^p - p\delta \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p] ds + p\delta c^p t + \varepsilon^2 c^{p-2} t C(p, d) \text{trace}(\Sigma^{1/2} (\Sigma^{1/2})^*) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p - p|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Theta_s^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z \rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{|z| \leq 1\}}] \nu(dz) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{B.34}$$

In the sequel we estimate the second order term for small increments with the help of (B.4) by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \int_{|z| \leq 1} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p - p|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^{p-2} \langle \Theta_s^\varepsilon, \varepsilon z \rangle] \nu(dz) ds \\ &\leq C(p, d) \varepsilon^2 c^{p-2} t \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^2 \nu(dz) =: K_1 \varepsilon^2 c^{p-2} t. \end{aligned} \tag{B.35}$$

For the large increments, we use the mean value theorem and obtain

$$\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p] \nu(dz) ds = p\varepsilon \int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \theta \varepsilon z|_c^{p-1} |z|] d\theta \nu(dz) ds.$$

For $p \in (0, 1]$, note that $|x + y|_c^p \leq |x|^p + |y|^p + c^p$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon z|_c^p - |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p] \nu(dz) ds \leq \int_0^t \int_{|z| > 1} (\varepsilon^p |z|^p + c^p) \nu(dz) ds \\ &= t\varepsilon^p \int_{|z| > 1} |z|^p \nu(dz) + tc^p \nu(\{|z| > 1\}). \end{aligned} \tag{B.36}$$

For $p > 1$, due to $|x + y|_c^{p-1} \leq |x|^{p-1} + |y|^{p-1} + c^{p-1}$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we split the intermediate value as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 & p\varepsilon \int_0^t \int_{|z|>1} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon + \theta \varepsilon z|_c^{p-1}] |z| d\theta \nu(dz) ds \\
 & \leq p\varepsilon \int_0^t \int_{|z|>1} \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p-1}] |z| d\nu(dz) ds + p\varepsilon \int_0^t \int_{|z|>1} |\varepsilon z|^{p-1} |z| \nu(dz) ds + p\varepsilon c^{p-1} t \nu(\{|z| > 1\}) \\
 & = p\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \varepsilon |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p-1} ds\right] \int_{|z|>1} |z| d\nu(dz) + p\varepsilon^p t \int_{|z|>1} |z|^p \nu(dz) + p\varepsilon c^{p-1} t \nu(\{|z| > 1\}) \\
 (B.37) \quad & \leq tp(1/K_3)^p \varepsilon^p + \frac{p\delta}{2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p] ds + p\varepsilon^p t \int_{|z|>1} |z|^p \nu(dz) + p\varepsilon c^{p-1} t \nu(\{|z| > 1\}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used in the last line the weighted Young inequality and $|x| \leq |x|_c$

$$\int_0^t K_2 \varepsilon |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^{p-1} ds \leq (1/K_3)^p t K_2^p \varepsilon^p + K_3^{p/(p-1)} \int_0^t |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|^p ds \leq t(1/K_3)^p \varepsilon^p + \frac{\delta}{2} \int_0^t |\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p ds$$

where $K_2 = \int_{|z|>1} |z| d\nu(dz) + 1$ and $K_3 = (\delta/2)^{p/(p-1)}$. Combining (B.35) with (B.37) for $p \geq 1$ and (B.36) for $p < 1$, respectively, in (B.34) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p] & \leq c^p - \frac{p\delta}{2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Theta_s^\varepsilon|_c^p] ds + p\delta c^p t + K_0 \varepsilon^2 c^{p-2} t + K_1 \varepsilon^2 c^{p-2} t \\
 & \quad + tp(1/K_3)^p \varepsilon^p \cdot \mathbf{1}\{p \geq 1\} + p\varepsilon^p t \int_{|z|>1} |z|^p \nu(dz) + p\varepsilon c^{p-1} t \nu(\{|z| > 1\}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $K_0 = C(p, d) \text{trace}(\Sigma^{1/2}(\Sigma^{1/2})^*)$. Since $|x|^p \leq |x|_c^p$, the choice $c = c_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ yields for all $t \geq 0$ $\mathbb{E}[|\Theta_t^\varepsilon|_c^p] \leq \varepsilon^p(1 + Ct)$ for some constant $C = C(p, \delta)$. This shows the aforementioned claim. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research of GB has been supported by the Academy of Finland, via the Matter and Materials Profi4 university profiling action. GB also would like to express his gratitude to University of Helsinki for all the facilities used along the realization of this work. The research of MAH has been supported by the proyecto de la Convocatoria 2020-2021: “Stochastic dynamics of systems perturbed with small Markovian noise with applications in biophysics, climatology and statistics” of the School of Sciences (Facultad de Ciencias) at Universidad de los Andes. The authors would like to thank Carlos Gustavo Tamm de Araújo Moreira (Gugu) at IMPA for clarifying comments on the Hartman-Grobman theorem.

REFERENCES

1. APPLEBAUM, D. *Lévy processes and stochastic calculus*. Second edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2009).
2. BARRERA, G., HÖGELE, M. A., PARDO, J. C. Cutoff thermalization for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck systems with small Lévy noise in the Wasserstein distance. To appear in J. Stat. Phys. 2021.
3. BARRERA, G., HÖGELE, M. A., PARDO, J. C. The cutoff phenomenon in total variation for nonlinear Langevin systems with small layered stable noise. To appear in Electron. J. Probab. 2021.
4. BARRERA, G., JARA, M. Abrupt convergence of stochastic small perturbations of one dimensional dynamical systems. *J. Stat. Phys.* **163**, no. 1, (2016), 113-138.
5. BARRERA, G., JARA, M. Thermalisation for small random perturbation of hyperbolic dynamical systems. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **30**, no. 3, (2020), 1164-1208.
6. BARRERA, G., PARDO, J. C. Cut-off phenomenon for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes driven by Lévy processes. *Electron. J. Probab.* **25**, no. 15, (2020), 1-33.
7. DA PRATO, G., GATAREK, D., ZABCZYK, J. Invariant measures for semilinear stochastic equations. *Stochastic Anal. Appl.* **10**, no. 4, (1992), 387-408.

8. KALLIANPUR, G., SUNDAR, P. *Stochastic analysis and diffusion processes*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2014).
9. MAJKA M. A note on existence of global solutions and invariant measures for jump SDEs with locally one-sided Lipschitz drift. *Probab. Math. Statist.* **40**, no. 1, (2020), 37-55.
10. MIKAMI, T. Asymptotic expansions of the invariant density of a Markov process with a small parameter. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **24**, no. 3, (1988), 403-424.
11. PANARETOS, V., ZEMEL, Y. *An invitation to statistics in Wasserstein space*. Springer International Publishing, (2020)
12. PROTTER, P. *Stochastic integration and differential equations*. Second edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2004).
13. SAINT LOUBERT BIÉ, E. Étude d'une EDPS conduite par un bruit poissonnien. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **111**, no. 2, (1998), 287-321.
14. SATO, K. *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1999).
15. SIORPAES, P. Applications of pathwise Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities. *Bernoulli* **24**, 4B, (2018), 3222-3245.
16. SITU, R. *Theory of stochastic differential equations with jumps and applications*. Springer, New York, (2005).
17. TUDORAN, R. M. On the coercivity of continuously differentiable vector fields. *Qual. Theory Dyn. Syst.* **19**, no. 2, Paper No. 58, (2020), 1-7.
18. VILLANI, C. *Optimal transport. Old and new*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2009).
19. WANG, J. Regularity of semigroups generated by Lévy type operators via coupling. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **120**, no. 9, (2010), 1680-1700.
20. WATANABE, S., IKEDA, N. *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, Kodansha, Ltd., Tokyo, (1981).

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES. EXACTUM IN KUMPULA CAMPUS. PL 68, PIETARI KALMIN KATU 5. POSTAL CODE: 00560. HELSINKI, FINLAND.

Email address: gerardo.barreravargas@helsinki.fi

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE LOS ANDES, BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA.

Email address: ma.hoegele@uniandes.edu.co

CIMAT. JALISCO S/N, VALENCIANA, CP 36240. GUANAJUATO, GUANAJUATO, MÉXICO.

Email address: jcpardo@cimat.mx