

Second order quantitative bounds for unadjusted generalized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo

Evan Camrud, Alain Oliviero Durmus, Pierre Monmarché, Gabriel Stoltz

June 19, 2023

Abstract

This paper provides a convergence analysis for generalized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo samplers, a family of Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods based on leapfrog integration of Hamiltonian dynamics and kinetic Langevin diffusion, that encompasses the unadjusted Hamiltonian Monte Carlo method. Assuming that the target distribution π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality and mild conditions on the corresponding potential function, we establish quantitative bounds on the relative entropy of the iterates defined by the algorithm, with respect to π . Our approach is based on a perturbative and discrete version of the modified entropy method developed to establish hypocoercivity for the continuous-time kinetic Langevin process. As a corollary of our main result, we are able to derive complexity bounds for the class of algorithms at hand. In particular, we show that the total number of iterations to achieve a target accuracy $\varepsilon > 0$ is of order $d/\varepsilon^{1/4}$, where d is the dimension of the problem. This result can be further improved in the case of weakly interacting mean field potentials, for which we find a total number of iterations of order $(d/\varepsilon)^{1/4}$.

1 Introduction

We consider in this paper the problem of sampling from a target distribution π . This problem is ubiquitous in various fields such as statistical physics [35], statistics [25], and machine learning [2]. However, in most applications, the distribution π has a density with respect to a dominating measure known up to an intractable multiplicative constant. Markov chain Monte Carlo methods are now a family of popular algorithms for solving this problem. They consist in designing a Markov chain associated with a Markov kernel for which π is an invariant distribution. One of the best known MCMC instances is the family of Metropolis-Hastings algorithms [40, 30]. In the case where the target distribution has a smooth and positive density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d , denoted by π still, another class of MCMC algorithms is based on discretizations of continuous-time stochastic dynamics [28, 27, 46]. Famous examples of such MCMC methods are the

Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (ULA) [45] and Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics [52], which are based on the overdamped Langevin diffusion.

Here we consider numerical schemes based on Hamiltonian-type dynamics, i.e., ideal Hamiltonian Monte Carlo and kinetic (or underdamped) Langevin diffusion. Although these two dynamics are different, they have many features in common. For example, both define an extended process on \mathbb{R}^{2d} that has the product of π and the standard Gaussian distribution as invariant measure, denoted hereafter by μ . Also, the infinitesimal generators of these extended processes differ only in their symmetric part, while their antisymmetric part is the same and corresponds to the Hamiltonian dynamics associated with the potential U associated with π , i.e., $\pi \propto \exp(-U)$. From this observation it follows that common discretization strategies have been employed for both dynamics. Among these methods, those based on splitting techniques [8, 33] are particularly attractive since they come with valuable properties and important convergence guarantees. In this paper, we are particularly interested in the family of splitting methods known as generalized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (gHMC). This method has been shown to yield weak second order errors. More precisely, denoting by P_ω the Markov kernel associated with gHMC, where ω are the hyperparameters of the algorithm including the step size $\delta > 0$ and the integration time $T > 0$, under suitable conditions, it holds (see e.g. [1]) that for any sufficiently regular function $f : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, number of iterations $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and initial distribution ν_0 , $|\nu_0 P_\omega^k f - \pi(f)| \leq C_f(e^{-c_1 T k} + \delta^2)$, for some constants $C_f \geq 0$ and $c_1 > 0$ independent of δ . This result illustrates the advantages of using well-chosen splitting strategies compared to traditional Euler schemes, for which similar conclusions can be drawn but with a second term of lower order with respect to δ , typically linear. While weak error bounds already provide significant convergence guarantees, another line of research is concerned with establishing quantitative bounds for MCMC algorithms, paying particular attention to the dimension dependence [16, 21]. Regarding the kinetic Langevin algorithm, existing works [36, 14, 53, 17] analyze for most of them a modification of the Euler scheme. For this particular algorithm, [36] shows that when π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality and under additional conditions on U , denoting by ν_k the distribution of the k -th iterate of the algorithm starting from ν_0 with step size $\delta > 0$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{H}(\nu_k | \pi) \leq C_{\nu_0}(e^{-c_1 \delta k} + \delta^2)$, for some constants $C_{\nu_0} \geq 0$, $c_1 > 0$ independent of δ , where \mathcal{H} denotes the relative entropy or Kullback Leibler divergence. Note that the Pinsker inequality then implies the same type of bounds for the total variation distance, but with a second term of order δ . Quantitative bounds for splitting schemes of the kinetic Langevin diffusion are scarcer and up to our knowledge. Higher order quantitative bounds are established in [42] in this context for the case when the potential U is convex. On the other hand, regarding unadjusted HMC, combining results from [6] and [19] implies that for a fixed integration time $T > 0$ there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and initial distribution ν_0 , $\mathbf{W}_1(\tilde{\nu}_k, \pi) \leq C_{\nu_0}(e^{-c_1 k} + \delta^2)$ for some $C_{\nu_0} \geq 0$, where $\tilde{\nu}_k$ is the distribution of the k -th iterates of unadjusted HMC starting from ν_0 , and \mathbf{W}_1 denotes the Wasserstein distance of order 1. This result once again highlights the improved accuracy of the leapfrog integrator. Finally, the analysis of

gHMC in the Wasserstein distance has been conducted in [26], but only for the strongly convex scenario.

The main contribution of this paper is to extend and generalize the results we just mentioned and to analyze gHMC in the non-convex scenario. In particular, we show that gHMC achieves higher order accuracy than traditional Euler schemes in relative entropy, under the condition that π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality, and additional relatively mild assumptions on the potential U . Roughly speaking, we establish a bound of the form $\mathcal{H}(\nu_0 \mathbf{P}^k | \mu) \leq C_{\nu_0} e^{-c_1 k} + C_2 \delta^4$ for some explicit $C_{\nu_0}, C_2 \geq 0$ and $c_1 > 0$. Our approach is based on a perturbative argument of the modified entropy approach initiated in [51], and more precisely to its recent discrete-time variation in [41] for idealized gHMC. From our main result, we derive bounds on the total number of iterations k and a step size δ to achieve $\mathcal{H}(\nu_0 \mathbf{P}^k | \mu) \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, where two cases can be distinguished. We obtain a bound on the number of gradient computations of order $\mathcal{O}(d/\varepsilon^{1/4})$ in the general case and an improved bound of order $\mathcal{O}((d/\varepsilon)^{1/4})$ in a weakly interactive mean-field regime.

The paper is organized as follows. The family of (unadjusted) generalized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo samplers is introduced in Section 2.1. Our main assumptions and results are stated in Section 2.2. They are discussed and compared to previous works in Section 2.3. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. Other more technical proofs are postponed to an Appendix.

Notation. We denote by $|x|$ the Euclidean norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We denote by $C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} with continuous derivatives up to order k . For $f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, ∇f stands for the gradient of f and $D^k f$, the k -th derivative of f . In addition, $|D^k f(x)|$ is the multilinear operator norm of $D^k f(x)$ with respect to the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d and $\|D^k f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |D^k f(x)|$. For a $d \times d$ matrix \mathbf{A} , $|\mathbf{A}|$ stands for the operator norm on \mathbb{R}^d with respect to the Euclidean norm. For a differentiable map $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\nabla \Phi(x) = (\partial_{x_i} \Phi_j(x))_{i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket}$ (where i stands for the line and j for the column). This notation is such that $\nabla(\Phi \circ \Psi) = \nabla \Psi \nabla \Phi \circ \Psi$ and is consistent in the case $p = 1$ (since $\nabla \Phi$ is in that case the gradient of Φ). Notice that $\nabla \Phi$ is the *transpose* of what is most commonly named the Jacobian matrix of Φ .

Leb stands for the Lebesgue measure, $N(0, I_d)$ for the d -dimensional standard Gaussian distribution and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for the set of distribution of \mathbb{R}^d endowed with its Borel σ -field denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We write $\nu \ll \mu$ as ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ . We define the relative entropy (or Kullback-Leibler [KL-] divergence) and the Fisher information of $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, by

$$\mathcal{H}(\nu_1 | \nu_2) = \begin{cases} \int \ln \left(\frac{d\nu_1}{d\nu_2} \right) d\nu_2 & \text{if } \nu_1 \ll \nu_2 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{I}(\nu_1 | \nu_2) = \begin{cases} \int \left| \nabla \ln \left(\frac{d\nu_1}{d\nu_2} \right) \right|^2 d\nu_1 & \text{if } \nu_1 \ll \nu_2 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where for a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $|\nabla f|$ is defined for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$|\nabla f|(z) = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(z) - f(y)|}{|z - y|} : y \in \mathbb{R}^d, 0 < |y - z| \leq r \right\}.$$

If f is continuously differentiable, note that $|\nabla f|(z)$ is simply the norm of $\nabla f(z)$ and therefore our notation is consistent.

We write $\llbracket i, j \rrbracket$ the integer interval $\{i, \dots, j\}$ for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

2 Non-asymptotic bounds for splitting schemes for Hamiltonian type dynamics

2.1 Splitting schemes for Hamiltonian type dynamics – gHMC

Recall that we assume that the target distribution π admits a positive density with respect to the Lebesgue measure $\pi \propto \exp(-U)$. In addition, we suppose the following condition on U .

H1. *The potential $U \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and it exists $L > 0$ such that $|\nabla^2 U(x)| \leq L$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

We introduce now more formally the two continuous dynamics that we are considered in this paper: Hamiltonian dynamics and kinetic (also referred to as underdamped) Langevin dynamics. As previously mentioned, these two dynamics leave the extended target distribution $\mu = \pi \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$ invariant.

Hamiltonian dynamics associated with the potential U defines the differential flow $(\psi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as $\psi_t(x, v) = (x_t, v_t)$ where $(x_t, v_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the solution of the Hamiltonian differential equation:

$$\partial_t x_t = v_t, \quad \partial_t v_t = -\nabla U(x_t), \quad \text{with } (x_0, v_0) = (x, v). \quad (1)$$

As discussed in [43], $(\psi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ preserves μ , *i.e.*, if (X_0, V_0) has distribution μ then so does $\psi_t(X_0, V_0)$ for all $t \geq 0$, but the trajectory $(\psi_t(X_0, V_0))_{t \geq 0}$ is not ergodic. Indeed, starting from any fixed initial conditions $x_0, v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it remains in the corresponding level set $\{(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : H(x, v) = H(x_0, v_0)\}$ of the Hamiltonian function H defined by

$$H(x, v) = U(x) + |v|^2 / 2.$$

To address this issue, a velocity randomization (or refreshment) at time $T > 0$ can be added. To this end, consider the Markov operator D_η given, for $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and any measurable and bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by

$$D_\eta f(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\left(x, \eta v + \sqrt{1 - \eta^2} g\right) \varphi(g) dg,$$

where φ stands for the density with respect to Leb of $N(0, I_d)$. Then, under mild assumptions, the resulting kernel,

$$K_{\eta, T} f(x, v) = D_\eta[f \circ \psi_T](x, v) , \quad (2)$$

is ergodic with respect to μ . Recently, [41] used hypocoercivity techniques from [51] to show exponential convergence of $K_{\eta, T}$ in a modified entropy with respect to μ .

The second process which shares some important features with Hamiltonian dynamics is the underdamped Langevin diffusion:

$$d\mathbf{X}_s = \mathbf{V}_s ds , \quad d\mathbf{V}_s = -\nabla U(\mathbf{X}_s) ds - \gamma \mathbf{V}_s ds + \sqrt{2\gamma} dB_s , \quad (3)$$

where $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion and $\gamma > 0$ is a damping parameter. It can easily be shown that under mild assumptions on U , the Hamiltonian dynamics with a suitably scaled refreshment weakly converges to (3): for any $s \geq 0$, $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and smooth and bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} K_{\eta_\delta, \delta}^{\lceil s/\delta \rceil} f(x, v) = \mathbf{P}_s f(x, v)$ where

$$\eta_\delta = e^{-\delta\gamma} , \quad (4)$$

and $(\mathbf{P}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is the Markov semigroup associated with (3).

We now present a family of splitting schemes which encompasses discretizations for both Hamiltonian and underdamped Langevin dynamics. This family of algorithms will be referred to as generalized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (gHMC). This family is based on the Verlet discretization of (1) defined at time $k\delta$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for a stepsize $\delta > 0$ by $(x_k, v_k) = \Phi_\delta^k(x_0, v_0)$ where $\Phi_\delta^k = \Phi_\delta^{k-1} \circ \Phi_\delta$, Φ_δ^0 is the identity function and

$$\Phi_\delta = \Phi_{\delta/2}^{(v)} \circ \Phi_\delta^{(x)} \circ \Phi_{\delta/2}^{(v)} , \quad \Phi_{\delta/2}^{(v)}(x, v) = v - (\delta/2)\nabla U(x) , \quad \Phi_\delta^{(x)}(x, v) = x + \delta v .$$

It is well-known that the integrator Φ_δ is symplectic and reversible (see [43]), *i.e.*, it is invertible with inverse

$$\Phi_\delta^{-1} = R \circ \Phi_\delta \circ R , \quad R(x, v) = (x, -v) . \quad (5)$$

The gHMC algorithm then consists of the composition of a (possibly partial) velocity refreshment with a K -step Verlet scheme. Setting $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta)$, this corresponds to the inexact Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method with Markov kernel specified by

$$P_\omega = D_\eta V_\delta^K ,$$

where V_δ corresponds to the deterministic kernel

$$V_\delta((x, v), \cdot) = \delta_{\Phi_\delta(x, v)}(\cdot) , \text{ for } x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d .$$

For $\eta = 0$ and $K\delta = T$ for an integration time $T > 0$, P_ω corresponds to the usual unadjusted Hamiltonian Monte Carlo algorithm which is a discretized version of the ideal

Hamiltonian dynamics $K_{t,\eta}$ defined by (2). On the other hand, taking $K = 1$ and the damping parameter η_δ defined in (4), P_ω corresponds to a second order splitting scheme of (3) as considered for example in [32, 35]. Alternatively, taking $\eta = 0$ and $K = 1$ leads to the Euler scheme with step size $\delta^2/2$ for the overdamped Langevin process.

Finally under **H1**, we write

$$\mathsf{T} = \delta K \sqrt{L}, \quad \gamma = (1 - \eta)/\mathsf{T}, \quad (6)$$

which respectively represent, suitably scaled, the physical time of integration of the Hamiltonian dynamics by the Verlet integrator, and the strength of the damping. As discussed in [26], rescaling the process so that $L = 1$ (see Section 2.2), $1/\gamma$ is the time needed for the process to forget its initial velocity, and is thus the typical distance covered by one of its coordinates in a single ballistic run in flat parts of the space.

2.2 Main result

We start by stating additional assumptions regarding π and U for our main results.

First, we assume that π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant $C_{\text{LS}} \geq 0$, i.e., for any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{H}(\nu|\pi) \leq C_{\text{LS}} \mathcal{I}(\nu|\pi). \quad (7)$$

This holds for instance if U is uniformly convex outside some compact set. Various estimates are available for C_{LS} , e.g. in mean-field, convex or low-temperature cases, which can grasp more specific information on the target π that uniform bounds on the curvature $\langle x - y, \nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y) \rangle / |x - y|^2$ that are used in direct coupling methods. Notably, in non-convex cases, for a fixed dimension d , up to polynomial terms in the other parameters, the log-Sobolev constant is of order e^{c_*} where c_* is the so-called critical height of U (see [41, Section 5] and references within).

Part of our analysis consists in controlling some numerical errors of the leapfrog integrator, i.e., for example differences of the Hamiltonian function evaluated at the dynamics at time 0 and $s > 0$ starting from the k -th iterates of the gHMC chain. To this end, we have to suppose additional regularity conditions on U . More specifically, we require uniform bounds on the third and fourth derivatives of U which is stated as follows:

H2. *There exist two norms N_3 and N_4 on \mathbb{R}^d such that for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\left| \left(\nabla^2 U(x + y) - \nabla^2 U(x) \right) z \right| \leq N_3(y) N_3(z) \quad (8)$$

$$\left| \nabla U(x + y) - \nabla U(x) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x + y) \right) y \right| \leq N_4^3(y). \quad (9)$$

Using a third order Taylor expansion of ∇U , (9) is equivalent to a uniform bound on the fourth derivative of U (see Proposition 2 below). **H2** may be relaxed, i.e. if only bounded

third derivative for U , our main results still hold but with worse dependencies with respect to the step size, see Remark 14 below.

Bounding the left-hand sides in (8) and (9) with respect to the Euclidean distance on \mathbb{R}^d may lead to sub-optimal dependencies in the dimension d in Theorem 1 below (for instance when U is separable, see Theorem 3 below), which is why we allow in H2 some flexibility in the choice of the norms.

As we will see, the numerical errors that we have to control at a point $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ can be bounded by the function

$$\mathbf{M}(x, v) = L^2|v|^2 + L^2|\nabla U(x)|^2 + \mathbf{N}_3^4(v) + \mathbf{N}_3^4(\nabla U(x)) + \mathbf{N}_4^6(v) + \mathbf{N}_4^6(\nabla U(x)). \quad (10)$$

In order to control the expectation of these errors, it thus remains to establish some uniform moment bounds for the Markov kernel \mathbb{P}_ω . These estimates can typically be established under a Lyapunov condition, but for clarity we postpone this analysis (see Theorem 3 below) and, for now, we state it as the next assumption.

H3. *There exist $\rho, C_1, C_2 > 0$ and $\mathfrak{W} : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega^n \mathbf{D}_\eta \mathbf{V}_\delta^k \mathbf{M}(x, v) \leq C_1 e^{-\rho n \mathbf{T}} \mathfrak{W}(x, v) + C_2,$$

where \mathbf{T} is defined in (6).

In practice, this can be established by designing a suitable Lyapunov function \mathfrak{W} such that $\mathbf{M} \leq C_1 \mathfrak{W}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega \mathfrak{W} \leq e^{-\rho \mathbf{T}} \mathfrak{W} + C_2' \mathbf{T}, \quad (11)$$

for some $C_1, C_2', \rho > 0$. As we will see in Theorem 3, C_1, C_2, ρ typically only depends on the parameters ω through γ defined in (6) (in particular they are uniform over all sufficiently small step-size δ). For the continuous-time kinetic Langevin diffusion and its discretizations, such Lyapunov functions have been designed in [39, 49, 20] under coercivity conditions on U . We show in Appendix B that appropriate modifications of these Lyapunov functions can be used to establish a drift condition (11) for \mathbb{P}_ω .

We can now state our main result. For the sake of clarity, we only consider the case where $L = 1$ in H1, the general case being obtained by rescaling as detailed at the end of this section, before Section 2.3.

Theorem 1. *Assume H1-H2 with $L = 1$ and let $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\delta > 0$ and $\eta \in [0, 1)$ such that H3 holds and $\mathbf{T} = K\delta \leq 1/10$. Furthermore, assume that π satisfies the log-Sobolev inequality (7). Consider an initial condition ν_0 such that $\mathcal{I}(\nu_0|\mu) < +\infty$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |z|^p d\nu_0(z) < +\infty$ for any $p > 0$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\nu_0 \mathbb{P}_\omega^n | \mu) &\leq (1 + \kappa \mathbf{T})^{-n} \{ \mathcal{H}(\nu_0 | \mu) + 2a \mathcal{I}(\nu_0 | \mu) \} \\ &\quad + \delta^4 M \{ n \mathbf{T} \theta^{n \mathbf{T}} C_1 \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2 (\kappa^{-1} + \mathbf{T}) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\theta = \max(e^{-\rho}, (1 + \kappa\mathbb{T})^{-1/\mathbb{T}})$ and

$$a = \frac{\gamma}{7 + 3(\gamma + 3)^2}, \quad \kappa = \frac{a}{3 \max(C_{\text{LS}}, 1) + 6a}, \quad M = 5 + \frac{1}{3a}. \quad (13)$$

The right hand side in the first line of (12) corresponds to the long-time convergence of the idealized HMC chain [41] (and goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$). The Fisher term $\mathcal{I}(\nu_0|\mu)$ appearing there is due to the fact Theorem 1 is proven using a modified entropy (defined in (20)) instead of \mathcal{H} . The second line of (12), of order δ^4 corresponds to the numerical error due to the Verlet integration which is decomposed into two terms. The first term reflects the fact that the initial condition is not invariant for \mathbb{P}_ω and highlights the exponential forgetting of this initial condition, through $\nu_0(\mathfrak{W})$, since $\theta < 1$. As for the second term involving C_2 , it accounts for the numerical error at stationarity.

Since, in the case $L = 1$, \mathbb{T} is the physical integration time of the Hamiltonian dynamics, $n\mathbb{T}$ is the total physical time of the simulation after n iterations. The constant κ is the convergence rate per unit physical time and depends on the parameters ω only through γ , with a dependency of order $\min(\gamma, \gamma^{-1})$ similarly to the continuous-time Langevin diffusion. From this observation, it follows that the convergence per gradient computation is $\kappa\mathbb{T}/K = \kappa\delta$.

At the expense of more involved expressions, we improve Theorem 1 in Theorem 5 below a little. In particular, we provide a slightly sharper value of κ , which is optimal in the overdamped case, i.e., considering an initial condition of the form $\nu_0 = \hat{\nu}_0 \otimes \mathbb{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_d)$, taking in the statement of Theorem 5, $K = 1$, $\eta = 0$, $n = 2s/\delta^2$ for some $s > 0$ (since $\delta^2/2$ is the effective step-size of the Euler scheme), $\varepsilon = \delta$, $a = \mathbb{T}/2$, assuming that $1 = L \geq 1/C_{\text{LS}}$ (which can always be enforced since L is any upper bound of $\|\nabla^2 U\|_\infty$, and then we can rescale the chain to get $L = 1$) and letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in (12) we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}(\hat{\nu}_0 \mathbb{Q}_s | \pi) \leq e^{-s/C_{\text{LS}}} \mathcal{H}(\hat{\nu}_0 | \pi),$$

where $(\mathbb{Q}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the semi-group associated to the overdamped Langevin diffusion. This shows that our result is sharp since it *implies* that π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant C_{LS} (see e.g., [4, Theorem 5.2.1]).

As highlighted in Remark 14, if in **H2** we only assume (8) but not (9) (i.e., we don't assume bounded fourth derivative of U), we get a similar result, except that the term δ^4 is replaced by δ^2 .

Let us now provide practical conditions on U to establish **H2** and **H3**. To ensure clarity, we assume that $d = d_0 q$ for some $d_0, q \geq 1$ and, decomposing $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d = (\mathbb{R}^q)^{d_0}$ that U is of the following form:

$$U(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} U^{(q)}(x_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_0} W^{(q)}(x_i - x_j), \quad (14)$$

where $U^{(q)}$ and $W^{(q)}$ are potentials defined on \mathbb{R}^q , and $\epsilon > 0$. Such mean field potentials are commonly encountered in various applications (see e.g., [10]). Furthermore, in line with the approach taken in [7], we consider this formulation as a representative example to demonstrate the dimension dependency in weakly correlated cases. It is important to note that (14) always holds with the choice $d_0 = 1$, $U^{(q)} = U$, and $W^{(q)} = 0$. However, as we will demonstrate, this mean-field formulation allows us to precisely determine the dependence of C_1 and C_2 in **H3** on the dimension d , particularly by distinguishing the roles of d_0 and q . For conditions under which π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with a constant C_{LS} independent of d_0 for U given by (14) (provided ϵ is sufficiently small), see [29, Theorem 8].

First, as elaborated in Appendix A, we can readily verify the following:

Proposition 2. *Assume that $d = d_0 q$ for some $d_0, q \geq 1$ and that U is of the form (14) where $U^{(q)}, W^{(q)} \in \mathcal{C}^4(\mathbb{R}^q)$ have uniformly bounded third and fourth derivatives. Then **H2** holds with $N_3(x) = L_3(\sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |x_i|^4)^{1/4}$ and $N_4(x) = L_4(\sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |x_i|^6)^{1/6}$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} L_3^4 &= (1 + \epsilon) \|D^3 U^{(q)}\|_\infty^2 + 16(\epsilon + \epsilon^2) \|D^3 W^{(q)}\|_\infty^2, \\ L_4^6 &= \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{144} \|D^4 U^{(q)}\|_\infty^2 + \frac{4(\epsilon + \epsilon^2)}{9} \|D^4 W^{(q)}\|_\infty^2 \right) q. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, assuming furthermore that $\nabla U^{(q)}(0) = 0 = \nabla W^{(q)}(0)$, the function $\mathbf{M}(x, v)$ defined in (10) is bounded as $\mathbf{M}(x, v) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \sum_{\ell \in \{2, 4, 6\}} L_\ell^\ell (r_\ell |x_i|^\ell + |v_i|^\ell)$, with $r_\ell = 2^{\ell-1} \|\nabla^2 U^{(q)}\|_\infty^\ell + 2^{3\ell} \epsilon^\ell \|\nabla^2 W^{(q)}\|_\infty^\ell$ for $\ell \in \{2, 4, 6\}$ and $L_2 = L$.

To establish moment bounds, we consider the following assumption:

H4. *The dimension is $d = d_0 q$ for some $d_0, q \geq 1$ and U is of the form (14) where $U^{(q)}, W^{(q)} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^q)$ have uniformly bounded second derivatives and are such that $\nabla U^{(q)}(0) = \nabla W^{(q)}(0) = 0$. In addition, there exist $\mathfrak{m} > 0$ and $\mathfrak{M} \geq 0$ such that for any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^q$,*

$$\langle x_1, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_1) \rangle \geq \mathfrak{m} |x_1|^2 - \mathfrak{M}. \quad (15)$$

Theorem 3. *Under **H4**, for any $\gamma_0 > 0$ there exist $\bar{\mathbf{T}}, \bar{\delta}, \bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2, \bar{\epsilon}, \rho > 0$ which depends on $\|\nabla^2 U^{(q)}\|_\infty, \|\nabla^2 W^{(q)}\|_\infty, \mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{M}, \gamma_0$ (and not on q, d_0, ϵ), such that the following holds. For all $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta)$ with $\delta \in (0, \bar{\delta}]$, $\eta \in [0, 1)$, $\mathbf{T} \in (0, \bar{\mathbf{T}}]$ and $\gamma = \gamma_0$ (with \mathbf{T} and γ given by (6), $L = \|\nabla^2 U\|_\infty$), assuming furthermore that $\epsilon \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ and setting*

$$\mathfrak{W}(x, v) = \sum_{\ell \in \{2, 4, 6\}} (|x_i|^\ell + |v_i|^\ell), \quad (16)$$

then, for all $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega^n D_\eta V_\delta^k \mathfrak{W}(x, v) \leq \bar{C}_1 e^{-\rho n \mathbf{T}} \mathfrak{W}(x, v) + \bar{C}_2 d_0 q^3.$$

Explicit expressions for $\bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2, \bar{\epsilon}, \rho$ are given in Appendix B, where a more detailed result, Theorem 17, is stated and proven. As explained in Appendix B, Theorem 3 is a straightforward corollary of Theorem 17.

Remark 4. *Combining Proposition 2 with Theorem 3, we get that H3 holds with \mathfrak{W} given by (16) and, writing $R = \max\{L_\ell^\ell \max(r_\ell, 1) : \ell \in \{2, 4, 6\}\}/q$,*

$$C_1 = R\bar{C}_1q, \quad C_2 = R\bar{C}_2d_0q^4.$$

Treating $\|\mathbf{D}^k U^{(q)}\|_\infty$ and $\|\mathbf{D}^k W^{(q)}\|_\infty$ for $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ as constants independent from q , we get that R is independent from d_0 and q .

Rescaling. As mentioned above, following [41, Section 1.3], assuming $L = 1$ in H1 is not a restriction. Indeed, if $Z_n = (X_n, V_n)$ is an unadjusted gHMC chain with potential U and parameters K, δ, η , then $(\sqrt{L}X_n, V_n)$ is an unadjusted gHMC chain associated with the potential $\tilde{U}(x) = U(x/\sqrt{L})$ (so that $\nabla\tilde{U}$ is 1-Lipschitz under H1) and parameters $K, \delta\sqrt{L}, \eta$. Moreover, if π satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant C_{LS} , then the change of variable $x \mapsto x/\sqrt{L}$ implies that the rescaled target measure $\tilde{\pi} \propto e^{-\tilde{U}}$ satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant LC_{LS} . Similarly, using the same change of variable, the relative entropy is invariant by scaling, namely, if (X, V) has distribution $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $\tilde{\nu}$ stands for the law of $(\sqrt{L}X, V)$, $\mathcal{H}(\nu|\mu) = \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{\mu})$, where $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{\pi} \otimes \mathbf{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$, while the Fisher information satisfies

$$\mathcal{I}(\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{\mu}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{L^{-1}|\nabla_x h|^2 + |\nabla_v h|^2}{h} d\mu,$$

where $h = d\nu/d\mu$.

2.3 Discussion and related works

Regarding the dependency in the dimension of the constants appearing in H3, in view of Remark 4, we distinguish two cases. In the first one, which we call the weakly interacting case, we consider that C_2 and $\nu_0(\mathfrak{W})$ in (12) are $\mathcal{O}(d)$. This corresponds in Remark 4 to the case where q is fixed so that d is proportional to d_0 . In the second case, which we call the general case, we consider that C_2 and $\nu_0(\mathfrak{W})$ are $\mathcal{O}(d^4)$. This corresponds in Remark 4 to the case $d_0 = 1, d = q$ in Remark 4. In both settings, we consider that L, C_1 and γ are constants independent from the dimension, and that $\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|\mu)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\nu_0|\mu)$ are $\mathcal{O}(d)$ (see e.g. [50, Lemma 1]). In this context, Theorem 1 gives the following complexity bounds. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a given error tolerance (in relative entropy). By choosing $\delta = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1/4}d^{-1})$ in the general case we get that $\mathcal{H}(\nu_0 P_\omega^n|\mu) \leq \varepsilon$ after a number $nK = \mathcal{O}(C_{\text{LS}}d\varepsilon^{-1/4} \ln(d\varepsilon^{-1}))$ of computations of the gradient ∇U . By choosing $\delta = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1/4}d^{-1/4})$ in the weakly interacting case we get that $\mathcal{H}(\nu_0 P_\omega^n|\mu) \leq \varepsilon$ after a number $nK = \mathcal{O}(C_{\text{LS}}(d/\varepsilon)^{1/4} \ln(d\varepsilon^{-1}))$ of computations of the gradient ∇U . Note that in both cases, Pinsker and Talagrand inequalities

imply $\|\mu - \nu_0 P_\omega^n\|_{\text{TV}} + \mathbf{W}_2(\mu, \nu_0 P_\omega^n) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1/2})$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ and \mathbf{W}_2 denotes the total variation distance and Wasserstein distance of order 2. In view of this, the dependence of the number of gradient evaluation on $\varepsilon^{1/2}$, $nK = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1/4})$ (omitting the logarithmic term), highlights that gMHC is a second-order splitting scheme and is consistent with existing weak error estimates; see [1] and references therein.

Finally, for a fixed set of parameters ω , if $\nu_0 P_\omega^n$ converges weakly to a stationary distribution μ_ω , Theorem 1 yields to $\|\mu - \mu_\omega\|_{\text{TV}} + \mathbf{W}_2(\mu, \mu_\omega) = \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$.

Comparison with previous works. There is an important literature on the convergence of Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms based on discretization of continuous-time dynamics [17, 42, 26, 47, 38, 13, 37, 12, 39, 49, 9, 3, 18]. Making a complete survey and a detailed description of these works is beyond the scope of the paper. Here, we focus on works establishing quantitative bounds for gHMC or some of its particular instances, and for discretization of the kinetic Langevin diffusion in entropy.

- **Entropy methods for discretization of the kinetic Langevin diffusion.** An adaptation of the modified entropy strategy from [51] for continuous-time processes have been conducted by [36] for a slight modification of the Euler scheme of the kinetic Langevin process. More precisely, the scheme considered in [36] (introduced in [14] in the machine learning community, and referred to as the Stochastic exponential Euler scheme in [34, 20] where earlier apparitions in the physics literature are mentioned [11, 24, 48]) is given by the solution of

$$d\mathbf{X}_t^\delta = \mathbf{V}_t^\delta dt, \quad d\mathbf{V}_t^\delta = -\nabla U(\mathbf{X}_{\delta[t/\delta]}^\delta)dt - \gamma \mathbf{V}_t^\delta dt + \sqrt{2\gamma} dB_t, \quad (17)$$

which is similar to (3) except that the force $-\nabla U$ is constant within each time interval $[k\delta, (k+1)\delta)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, in [36], the approximate entropy dissipation is established through a continuous-time derivation. By contrast, we follow the discrete time computations of [41], which is concerned with idealized gHMC where the exact Hamiltonian dynamics is performed instead of the Verlet integration (in particular we are not using the underdamped Langevin diffusion process as a continuous-time reference, since we also cover unadjusted HMC). Moreover, in terms of dependency with respect to the stepsize δ , the schemes of [36] are only first order (see the discussion in Section 3.3 of [36], in particular Equation (14)), and we get an improvement from $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ to $\varepsilon^{1/4}$ in the complexity. Concerning the dimension d , the stepsize in [36] scales as $d^{-1/2} L_H^{-1}$, where L_H is the Lipschitz constant of $\nabla^2 U$ in the Frobenius norm, i.e., U is supposed to satisfy $\|\nabla^2 U(x) - \nabla^2 U(y)\|_F \leq L_H |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assuming that L_H is independent from d thus corresponds to the weakly interacting case, while the assumption that the derivatives of U are bounded independently in d (in terms of the Euclidean norm) leads to L_H of order \sqrt{d} . We get an improvement from $d^{-1/2}$ to $d^{-1/4}$ in the first case and the same dependence d^{-1} in the second. Notice that, in order to take advantage of an higher order numerical scheme, we have to assume

that U has bounded first four derivatives, in contrast to [36] which only assumes that U has bounded first three derivatives. As discussed in Remark 14, if we consider this second conditions on U , a result similar to [36] and with the same dependence on ε and d , can be derived. The main takeaway of this observation is that gHMC can achieve better accuracy order if U is sufficiently smooth but do not yield worst complexity than the discretization (17) obtained in [36] under the same conditions. Finally, up to our knowledge, our result is the first one based on entropy methods for unadjusted HMC, and for splitting discretization schemes of the underdamped Langevin diffusion.

- **HMC.** Analyses of HMC for strongly convex potentials U have been conducted in [38, 6]. For non-convex potentials, [5, 6, 19, 7] have established several non-asymptotic convergence bounds for position HMC (i.e., $\eta = 0$), both in Wasserstein 1 distance and total variation norm. In the mean-field case in particular, [7, Theorem 10] shows that after $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d_0}/\varepsilon')$ gradient evaluations, then the law of the chain is at distance at most ε' to π in term of the \mathbf{W}_{ℓ_1} Wasserstein distance associated to the ℓ_1 norm $\|x - y\|_{\ell_1} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |x_i - y_i|$. To compare this result with ours, we can bound this distance by $\sqrt{d_0}$ times the standard \mathbf{W}_2 Wasserstein distance (associated with the Euclidean distance), whose square is bounded by the relative entropy times the log-Sobolev constant of π (which, from the results of [29], is independent from d_0 in the weakly interacting case where ε is small enough, which is the regime where this complexity is obtained in [7]). In other words, we should take $\varepsilon' = \sqrt{d_0}\varepsilon$ in the results of [7] for a fair comparison. In that case, the number of gradient computations required in [7, Theorem 10] is $\mathcal{O}((d_0/\varepsilon)^{1/4})$ in the weakly interacting case, which is the same as our results. The approach in [5, 6, 7] is based on reflection couplings and concave modifications of the distance (building upon the method developed for continuous-time diffusion processes, particularly [23] for the overdamped Langevin process and [22] for the underdamped one). In particular, it doesn't provide a result for the relative entropy or the \mathbf{W}_2 Wasserstein distance, and the bound on the convergence rate is expressed in terms of global bounds on $\langle x - y, \nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y) \rangle / |x - y|^2$.
- **Splitting schemes for kinetic Langevin diffusion for strongly convex potential U .** Splitting schemes for Langevin diffusion with strongly convex potential have been investigated in [42, 34]. Their conclusion on the complexity for the corresponding gHMC method is similar to ours. Finally, the analysis of the general gHMC methodology have been conducted in [26] under the same strong convexity condition. Once again, the same conclusions can be drawn

As a conclusion, up to our knowledge, none of existing works cover our results, which give simple higher order explicit estimates in relative entropy uniformly over the class of unadjusted gHMC samplers and for non-convex potentials U .

3 Proof of Theorem 1

3.1 A more detailed result: : modified entropy approximate dissipation

The proof of Theorem 1 will be an easy consequence of a more detailed result that we now state. For ease of presentation, we first introduce some notations.

Relative density and modified entropy. In the rest of the present Section 3, for an initial distribution $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ which satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1, parameters $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by

$$h_n = d\nu_0 P_\omega^n / d\mu, \text{ and write } \mathcal{H}(h_n) = \mathcal{H}(\nu_0 P_\omega^n | \mu), \quad \mathcal{I}(h_n) = \mathcal{I}(\nu_0 P_\omega^n | \mu),$$

where \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I} denotes the relative entropy and Fisher information with respect to μ respectively. More generally, we denote by $\mathcal{H}(h) = \mathcal{H}(\nu | \mu)$ and $\mathcal{I}(h) = \mathcal{I}(\nu | \mu)$ for any positive density $h : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to μ and ν stands for the distribution with density h . In addition, for $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, or possibly a matrix field $z \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(z)$ on \mathbb{R}^{2d} , define

$$\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}(\nu | \mu) = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \nabla \ln \left(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right) \right|^2 d\nu & \text{if } \nu \ll \mu \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Note that if $\nu \ll \mu$ and $h = d\nu/d\mu$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}(\nu | \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \nabla h|^2}{h} d\mu. \quad (18)$$

Following the convention above, we write $\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}(h) = \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}(\nu | \mu)$, for any positive density $h : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to μ with ν the distribution with density h . The main result of this section, from which we deduce Theorem 1, establishes the dissipation in time of a suitable modified entropy up to some numerical error. More precisely, we consider for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $\tilde{a} > 0$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(\nu | \mu) = \mathcal{H}(h) + \tilde{a} \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}}(h), \text{ with } \mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

In the case $\nu \ll \mu$ with $h = d\nu/d\mu$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(\nu | \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} h \ln(h) d\mu + \tilde{a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\nabla_x h + \nabla_v h|^2}{h} d\mu, \quad (20)$$

and following the same convention as previously, we write $\mathcal{L}(h) = \mathcal{L}(\nu | \mu)$, for any positive density $h : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to μ with ν the distribution with density h . With this choice, \mathcal{L}_a involves a mixed derivative term $\langle \nabla_x h, \nabla_v h \rangle$ in the Fisher part, which has been crucially used in hypocoercive studies of the continuous-time kinetic Langevin

process [49, 31, 51]. More specifically, (20) is exactly the modified entropy introduced in continuous-time settings in [51].

We are now ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 5. *Assume **H1-H2** with $L = 1$ and let $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\delta > 0$ and $\eta \in [0, 1)$ such that **H3** holds and $\mathsf{T} = K\delta \leq 1/10$. Furthermore, assume that π satisfies the log-Sobolev inequality (7). Consider an initial condition ν_0 such that $\mathcal{I}(\nu_0|\mu) < +\infty$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |z|^p d\nu_0(z) < +\infty$ for any $p > 0$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(1 + \kappa\mathsf{T}) \mathcal{L}_a(h_{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}_a(h_n) + \mathsf{T}\delta^4 M \left(C_1 e^{-\rho n \mathsf{T}} \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2 \right), \quad (21)$$

where a, κ, M are given in (13).

Alternatively, define

$$m_1 = 2 - 3\mathsf{T}, \quad m_2 = \frac{\gamma}{\eta} + 2 + 4\mathsf{T} \quad m_3 = \frac{\gamma(1+\eta)}{\eta^2} \left(\frac{1}{2\tilde{a}} + 1 \right) - 2 - 4\mathsf{T}$$

$$\lambda = \begin{cases} \frac{m_1+m_3}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{m_1+m_3}{2}\right)^2 - m_1 m_3 + m_2^2} & \text{if } \eta > 0 \\ 2 - 3\mathsf{T} - \frac{2\tilde{a}}{\mathsf{T}(1+2\tilde{a})} & \text{if } \eta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, for any $\tilde{a} > 0$ such that $\lambda > 0$, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1 + \tilde{\kappa}\mathsf{T}) \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_n) + \mathsf{T}\delta^4 \tilde{M} \left(C_1 e^{-\rho n \mathsf{T}} \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2 \right), \quad (22)$$

where

$$\tilde{\kappa} = \frac{\tilde{a}\lambda(1-\varepsilon)(1-3\mathsf{T})}{\max(LC_{\text{LS}}, 1) + 2\tilde{a}}, \quad \tilde{M} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon\lambda_-} \left(\frac{4}{15\tilde{a}} + 24\tilde{a} \right) + \tilde{a} \left((33\lambda + 4)\mathsf{T} + \frac{\lambda\varepsilon}{240} \right).$$

This result is proven below. First, let us deduce Theorem 1 from Theorem 5:

Proof of Theorem 1. An easy induction and Theorem 5 imply that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{L}_a(h_n) \leq (1 + \kappa\mathsf{T})^{-n} \mathcal{L}_a(h_0) + \mathsf{T}\delta^4 M \sum_{k=1}^n (1 + \kappa\mathsf{T})^{-k} \left[C_1 e^{-\rho(n-k)\mathsf{T}} \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2 \right].$$

Then, the proof is completed since

$$\mathcal{H}(h_n) \leq \mathcal{L}_a(h_n), \quad \mathcal{L}_a(h_0) \leq \mathcal{H}(h_0) + 2a\mathcal{I}(h_0), \quad \sum_{k=1}^n (1 + \kappa\mathsf{T})^{-k} \leq \frac{1 + \kappa\mathsf{T}}{\kappa\mathsf{T}},$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (1 + \kappa\mathsf{T})^{-k} e^{-\rho(n-k)\mathsf{T}} \leq n \left[\max \left((1 + \kappa\mathsf{T})^{-1/\mathsf{T}}, e^{-\rho} \right) \right]^{n\mathsf{T}}.$$

□

Before providing the proof of Theorem 5, let us recall the key steps of the proof of the similar result established in [51] for the continuous-time kinetic Langevin process, as the structure of the proof is similar. Denoting by $(\hat{h}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the analogous of $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in this continuous-time context, the first observation is that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(\hat{h}_t) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\nabla_v \hat{h}_t|^2}{\hat{h}_t} d\mu. \quad (23)$$

This entropy dissipation is not sufficient to conclude to an exponential decay, as it can be zero for non-constant densities \hat{h}_t (and thus in particular it cannot be upper bounded by $-\kappa \mathcal{H}(\hat{h}_t)$ for some $\kappa > 0$). A key observation is then that, when $\nabla^2 U$ is bounded,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\nabla_x \hat{h}_t + \nabla_v \hat{h}_t|^2}{\hat{h}_t} d\mu \right) \leq -c \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\nabla_x \hat{h}_t|^2}{\hat{h}_t} d\mu + C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\nabla_v \hat{h}_t|^2}{\hat{h}_t} d\mu \quad (24)$$

for some constants $c, C > 0$. The last term can be controlled thanks to the entropy dissipation (23). As a consequence, for a small enough, considering \mathcal{L}_a given by (20),

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{L}_a(\hat{h}_t) \leq -ac \mathcal{I}(\hat{h}_t), \quad (25)$$

and the conclusion follows from

$$\mathcal{L}_a(\hat{h}_t) \leq (\max(C_{LS}, 1) + 2a) \mathcal{I}(\hat{h}_t),$$

where we used that μ satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant $\max(C_{LS}, 1)$ as the tensor product of π and $N(0, I_d)$.

The proof of Theorem 5 is fundamentally based on the same ingredients. Instead of the time derivatives of (23) and (24), we have to estimate the discrete-time evolution of the two parts of the modified entropy along the two steps V_δ and D_η of the chain. The technical details of this analysis are postponed to Section 3.2, where this evolution is shown to involve, on the one hand, the Jacobian matrix of the Verlet map and, on the other hand, some numerical error terms (due to the fact μ is not invariant by V_δ). The study of these terms is performed respectively in Sections 3.3 and 3.4. Provided these postponed technical results, we can now prove Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. Let $\tilde{a} > 0$ such that $\lambda > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In this proof, we consider the matrix \mathbf{A} given in (19). We only give the proof for $\eta > 0$: the case $\eta = 0$ is obtained by seeing that all the computations are still valid if η^{-1} is replaced by $\tilde{\eta}^{-1}$ for an arbitrary $\tilde{\eta} \in (0, 1)$, using that $\nabla_v D_\eta = 0$ in that case (as in the proof of [41] in the idealized case, to which we refer for details).

The evolution of h_n is given for any bounded g by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} h_{n+1} g d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} h_n P_\omega g d\mu, \quad (26)$$

in other words $h_{n+1} = P_\omega^* h_n$ where, given Q a bounded operator in $L^2(\mu)$, Q^* stands for its adjoint operator. We now identify the adjoint of the operators constituting P_ω . A simple calculation shows that the damping step is reversible in the probabilistic sense, namely $D_\eta^* = D_\eta$. Since the Verlet map Φ_δ^K satisfies $|\det \nabla \Phi_\delta^K| \equiv 1$ and is and reversible in the physicist sense¹ (see [43, Equation (2.22)] and (5) respectively), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} h V_\delta^K g d\mu &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} h \left(\Phi_\delta^{-K}(z) \right) g(z) \mu \left(\Phi_\delta^{-K}(z) \right) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} g \left(V_\delta^K \right)^* h d\mu \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\left(V_\delta^K \right)^* h = h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} e^{\square H}, \quad \square H = H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}.$$

In addition using again (5), we get that $\Phi_\delta^{-K} = (\Phi_\delta^{-1})^{\circ K}$ with

$$\Phi_\delta^{-1}(x, v) = \left(x - \delta v - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla U(x), v + \frac{\delta}{2} \left[\nabla U(x) + \nabla U \left(x - \delta v - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla U(x) \right) \right] \right). \quad (27)$$

From these observations and since $P_\omega^* = (V_\delta^K)^* D_\eta^*$, we consider the decomposition

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{a}}(h_{n+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\bar{a}}(h_n) = \mathcal{L}_{\bar{a}}(P_\omega^* h_n) - \mathcal{L}_{\bar{a}}(h_n) = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \tilde{a} \Delta_3 + \tilde{a} \Delta_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \mathcal{H} \left((V_\delta^K)^* D_\eta h_n \right) - \mathcal{H}(D_\eta h_n), & \Delta_2 &= \mathcal{H}(D_\eta h_n) - \mathcal{H}(h_n) \\ \Delta_3 &= \mathcal{I}_A \left((V_\delta^K)^* D_\eta h_n \right), & \Delta_4 &= -\mathcal{I}_A(h_n). \end{aligned}$$

We bound these four terms as follows. By Corollary 11, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$,

$$\Delta_1 \leq 4\varepsilon_1 K \delta \mathcal{I}(D_\eta h_n) + E_{\varepsilon_1} W_n$$

where for conciseness we write $W_n = C_1 e^{-\rho n T} \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2$ (recall the notations from **H3**), and by Corollaries 13 and 16

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\varepsilon_1} &= \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \left[6\delta^7 j^2 \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1 \int_0^\delta 2s^6 ds + \frac{1}{30\varepsilon_1} \delta^5 \right] \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon_1 \delta^7 K^3 + \frac{2}{7} \varepsilon_1 K \delta^7 + \frac{1}{30\varepsilon_1} K \delta^5 \leq \frac{1}{30} (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1^{-1}) K \delta^5, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $K\delta \leq 1/10$.

¹This is also called R -reversibility in backward analysis

By Lemma 6, as $\eta > 0$,

$$\mathbf{\Delta}_2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}(\eta^{-2} - 1)\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{B}_v}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n), \quad \mathbf{\Delta}_4 \leq -\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1}}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n),$$

where

$$\mathbf{B}_v = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\eta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Finally, using Lemma 7 and Corollary 13 and setting

$$\Psi = (\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-K}) \circ \Phi_\delta^K, \quad (29)$$

for any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Delta}_3 &\leq (1 + \varepsilon_2)\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}\Psi}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + 2(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})|\mathbf{A}|^2 K^2 \delta^6 W_n \\ &\leq \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}\Psi}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + \varepsilon_2 |\mathbf{A}|^2 \|\Psi\|_\infty^2 \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + 2(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})|\mathbf{A}|^2 K^2 \delta^6 W_n \\ &\leq \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}\Psi}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + 3\varepsilon_2 \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + 4(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})K^2 \delta^6 W_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 10-Equation (34) (with $\mathbf{T} = K\delta \leq 1/10$) and that $|\mathbf{A}| = \sqrt{2}$.

Therefore, by combining the inequalities above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_n) &\leq -2^{-1}(\eta^{-2} - 1)\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{B}_v}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + \tilde{a}\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}\Psi}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) - \tilde{a}\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1}}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) \\ &\quad + (4\varepsilon_1 K\delta + 3\tilde{a}\varepsilon_2)\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + \left[(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1^{-1})K\delta^5/30 + 4\tilde{a}(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})K^2 \delta^6 \right] W_n. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The sum of the terms in the first line of the right hand side is equal to

$$-\tilde{a}\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{S}^{1/2}}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) = -\tilde{a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{\langle \nabla \mathbf{D}_\eta h_n, \mathbf{S} \nabla \mathbf{D}_\eta h_n \rangle}{\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n} d\mu, \quad (31)$$

with, for $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$\mathbf{S}(z) = (2\tilde{a})^{-1}(\eta^{-2} - 1)\mathbf{B}_v^\top \mathbf{B}_v - (\mathbf{A}\Psi(z))^\top \mathbf{A}\Psi(z) + (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1})^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1}$$

where Ψ is defined in (29).

The key of the proof is now to establish a positive lower bound on \mathbf{S} uniformly in z , for a small enough, which is the analogous in our context of (25). We introduce the $d \times d$ block decompositions

$$\Psi(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{11} & \psi_{12} \\ \psi_{21} & \psi_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} s_{11} &= \mathbf{I}_d - (\psi_{11} + \psi_{21})^\top (\psi_{11} + \psi_{21}), \quad s_{12} = s_{21} = \eta^{-1} \mathbf{I}_d - (\psi_{11} + \psi_{21})^\top (\psi_{12} + \psi_{22}), \\ s_{22} &= \left(\frac{\eta^{-2} - 1}{2\tilde{a}} + \eta^{-2} \right) \mathbf{I}_d - (\psi_{22} + \psi_{12})^\top (\psi_{22} + \psi_{12}), \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 10, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\psi_{11} + \psi_{21})x| &\leq \left| \left((1 - \mathsf{T}) \mathbf{I}_d - (\mathsf{T}^2/2)\alpha \right) x \right| + (2\mathsf{T}^3/3)|x| \leq (1 - \mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2) |x| \\ |(\psi_{22} + \psi_{12})x| &\leq \left| \left(\mathbf{I}_d + \mathsf{T}\beta - (\mathsf{T}^2/2)\zeta \right) x \right| + (2\mathsf{T}^3/3)|x| \leq (1 + \mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2) |x|, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$|(\psi_{11} + \psi_{21})x - x| \leq (\mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2) |x|, \quad |(\psi_{22} + \psi_{12})x - x| \leq (\mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2) |x|,$$

from which we get for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, s_{11}x \rangle &\geq \left[1 - (1 - \mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2)^2 \right] |x|^2 \geq (2\mathsf{T} - 3\mathsf{T}^2) |x|^2, \\ \langle y, s_{22}y \rangle &\geq \left[\frac{\eta^{-2} - 1}{2\tilde{a}} + \eta^{-2} - (1 + \mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2)^2 \right] |y|^2 \geq \left(\frac{\eta^{-2} - 1}{2\tilde{a}} + \eta^{-2} - 1 - 2\mathsf{T} - 4\mathsf{T}^2 \right) |y|^2, \\ \langle x, s_{12}y \rangle &= (\eta^{-1} - 1) x \cdot y + x \left(\mathbf{I}_d - (\psi_{11} + \psi_{21})^\top (\psi_{12} + \psi_{22}) \right) y \\ &= (\eta^{-1} - 1) x \cdot y + \langle (\mathbf{I}_d - (\psi_{11} + \psi_{21})) x, (\psi_{12} + \psi_{22}) y \rangle + \langle x, (\mathbf{I}_d - (\psi_{12} + \psi_{22})) y \rangle \\ &\geq -(\eta^{-1} - 1 + (2 + \mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2)(\mathsf{T} + \mathsf{T}^2)) |x||y| \\ &\geq -(\eta^{-1} - 1 + 2\mathsf{T} + 4\mathsf{T}^2) |x||y|. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus obtained that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}^\top \mathbf{S}(z) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \geq \mathsf{T}\lambda_- (|x|^2 + |y|^2),$$

where λ_- is the smallest eigenvalue of the symmetric 2×2 matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & m_2 \\ m_2 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} &:= \frac{1}{\mathsf{T}} \begin{pmatrix} 2\mathsf{T} - 3\mathsf{T}^2 & -(\eta^{-1} - 1 + 2\mathsf{T} + 4\mathsf{T}^2) \\ -(\eta^{-1} - 1 + 2\mathsf{T} + 4\mathsf{T}^2) & \frac{\eta^{-2} - 1}{2\tilde{a}} + \eta^{-2} - 1 - 2\mathsf{T} - 4\mathsf{T}^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 2 - 3\mathsf{T} & -(\gamma + \eta(2 + 4\mathsf{T})) \\ -(\gamma + \eta(2 + 4\mathsf{T})) & \gamma(1 + \eta) \left(\frac{1}{2\tilde{a}} + 1 \right) - \eta^2(2 + 4\mathsf{T}) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

recalling the notation $\gamma = (1 - \eta)/\mathsf{T}$. Now, the sharp expressions stated in Theorem 5 follows from

$$\lambda_- = \frac{m_1 + m_3}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{m_1 + m_3}{2} \right)^2 - m_1 m_3 + m_2^2},$$

which is positive under the condition stated in the second part of Theorem 5. Alternatively, to get the simpler expressions (13), we proceed as follows: using that $\eta \leq 1$ and $\mathsf{T} \leq 1/10$, we bound

$$m_1 \geq \frac{17}{10}, \quad |m_2| \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\gamma + \frac{12}{5} \right), \quad m_3 \geq \frac{1}{\eta^2} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\tilde{a}} - \frac{12}{5} \right),$$

to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & m_2 \\ m_2 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} &= m_1|x|^2 + 2m_2|x||y| + m_3|y|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}m_1|x|^2 + \left(m_3 - \frac{2m_2^2}{m_1}\right)|y|^2 \geq \frac{17}{20}(|x|^2 + |y|^2), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\lambda_- \geq 17/20, \text{ if we choose } a \text{ such that } \frac{\gamma}{2\tilde{a}} - \frac{12}{5} \geq \frac{17}{20} + \frac{20}{17} \left(\gamma + \frac{12}{5}\right)^2,$$

which holds in particular with the choice of a in (13).

In both cases, at this point, plugging this inequality in (31), we have determined $\lambda_- > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{a}\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{S}^{1/2}}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) \leq -\tilde{a}\lambda_- \mathbf{T}\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n).$$

Combining this result with (30) yields

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_n) \leq -\rho'\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) + \left[(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1^{-1})K\delta^5/30 + 4\tilde{a}(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})K^2\delta^6\right] W_n, \quad (32)$$

for

$$\rho' = \tilde{a}\lambda_- \mathbf{T} - 4\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{T} - 3\tilde{a}\varepsilon_2. \quad (33)$$

Now, applying Lemma 7 with $\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}$ (see Remark 8) we get for any $\varepsilon_3 > 0$

$$(1 + \varepsilon_3)\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) \geq \mathcal{I}_{\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}}(\mathbf{P}_\omega^* h_n) - (1 + \varepsilon_3^{-1})\|\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}\|_\infty^2 \text{Er}_1^{\delta, K}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n).$$

Thanks to Lemma 10, and more specifically to (34), for any $z, u \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi^{-1}(z)u|^2 &\geq \left(1 + \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{T}^2/2 + \mathbf{T}^3/3\right)^{-2} |u|^2 \\ &\geq (1 + 5\mathbf{T}/2)^{-1} |u|^2 \\ &\geq (1 - 5\mathbf{T}/2) |u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\mathcal{I}_{\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}}(\mathbf{P}_\omega^* h_n) \geq (1 - 5\mathbf{T}/2) \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{P}_\omega^* h_n).$$

Using Lemma 10 again, we have for any $z, u \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$|u| \leq |\Psi(z)u| + |\Psi(z)u - u| \leq |\Psi(z)u| + \left(\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{T}^2/2 + \mathbf{T}^3/3\right) |u|,$$

and thus $\|\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}\|_\infty \leq 2$. Plugging these bounds in (32) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_n) &\leq -\frac{\rho'}{1 + \varepsilon_3} \left[(1 - 5\mathbf{T}/2) \mathcal{I}(h_{n+1}) - 4(1 + \varepsilon_3^{-1}) \text{Er}_1^{\delta, K}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) \right] \\ &\quad + \left[(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1^{-1})K\delta^5/30 + 4\tilde{a}(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})K^2\delta^6 \right] W_n. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\varepsilon_3 = \mathbb{T}/4$, using Corollary 13 to bound the remaining numerical error term and setting

$$M = 8\rho'(1 + 4/\mathbb{T})\mathbb{T} + (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1^{-1})/30 + 4\tilde{a}(1 + \varepsilon_2^{-1})\mathbb{T},$$

we finally get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1}) - \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_n) &\leq -\rho'(1 - 3\mathbb{T})\mathcal{I}(h_{n+1}) + \mathbb{T}\delta^4 MW_n \\ &\leq -\frac{\rho'(1 - 3\mathbb{T})}{\max(1, C_{\text{LS}}) + 2\tilde{a}}\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1}) + \mathbb{T}\delta^4 MW_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the log-Sobolev inequality of μ (obtained by tensorization from the log-Sobolev inequalities satisfied by π and $\mathbf{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$), that $|\mathbf{A}|^2 = 2$ and that $\rho'(1 - 3\mathbb{T}) > 0$.

Finally, to obtain (21) with the simpler expressions of κ and M in (13), using that $\lambda_- \geq 17/20$ with the choice of $\tilde{a} = a$ in (13), we use $a \leq 1/10$ and choose $\varepsilon_1 = a/10$, $\varepsilon_2 = \mathbb{T}/10$ which implies that $\rho' = a\mathbb{T}/2$ since ρ' is given in (33) and $\lambda_- \geq 17/20$ by (32) (to see that $a \leq 1/10$, we can for instance distinguish the case $\gamma \leq 3$, for which $a \leq \gamma/34$, and the case $\gamma \geq 3$, for which $a \leq (\gamma + 3)/[3(\gamma + 3)^2]$). In the expression of M we simply bound $\rho' \leq 1/200$, $a \leq 1/10$, $\mathbb{T} \leq 1/10$.

To get the sharper inequality (22), we keep a free parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and choose $\varepsilon_1 = \tilde{a}\varepsilon\lambda_-/8$, $\varepsilon_2 = \mathbb{T}\varepsilon\lambda_-/6$ which implies that $\rho' = \tilde{a}\lambda_-\mathbb{T}(1 - \varepsilon)$ and

$$M = 8\tilde{a}\lambda_-\mathbb{T}(\mathbb{T} + 4) + \frac{a\lambda_-\varepsilon}{240} + \frac{4}{15a\lambda_-\varepsilon} + 4\tilde{a}(\mathbb{T} + \frac{6}{\varepsilon\lambda_-}),$$

and using that $\mathbb{T} \leq 1/10$ allows to conclude. \square

In the next sections, we derive the technical results that we used in the proof of Theorem 5. In Section 3.2, we bound $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{a}}(h_{n+1})$ in terms of h_n , the Jacobian matrix of the (reverse) Verlet map Φ_{δ}^{-K} and some numerical error terms. The latter are studied respectively in Sections 3.3 and 3.4.

3.2 Intermediary lemmas

In this section, we compute the evolution of the relative entropy and Fisher-like terms (18) along the damping and Verlet steps. The velocity randomization step is the same as in [41, Section 4.1.1], where the following is established:

Lemma 6 (Dissipation from velocity randomization). *Recalling from (28) the notations*

$$\mathbf{B}_v = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_\eta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta \end{pmatrix},$$

then, for all $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and all smooth positive h ,

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h) - \mathcal{H}(h) \leq -\left(\frac{\eta^{-2} - 1}{2}\right)\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{B}_v}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h).$$

and, for any matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1}}(\mathrm{D}h) \leq \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}(h).$$

Proof. The first part is [41, Equation (28)]. The second point follows from Jensen inequality and convexity of $(t, x) \mapsto |x|^2/t$ on $\mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by [15, Proposition 2.3], which imply

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\nabla h|^2}{h} \mathrm{d}\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathrm{D}_\eta \left(\frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\nabla h|^2}{h} \right) \mathrm{d}\mu \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\mathrm{D}_\eta \tilde{\mathbf{A}}\nabla h|^2}{\mathrm{D}_\eta h} \mathrm{d}\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{B}_\eta^{-1}\nabla \mathrm{D}_\eta h|^2}{\mathrm{D}_\eta h} \mathrm{d}\mu.$$

□

Lemma 7 (Fisher inequality on Verlet step). *For all matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, all smooth positive h and all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}} \left((\mathrm{V}_\delta^K)^* h \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\Psi}(h) + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) |\tilde{\mathbf{A}}|^2 \mathrm{Er}_1^{\delta, K}(h)$$

with $\Psi = (\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-K}) \circ \Phi_\delta^K$ and the error term

$$\mathrm{Er}_1^{\delta, K}(h) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla \square H \circ \Phi_\delta^K|^2 h \mathrm{d}\mu.$$

Proof. For all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\nabla(\mathrm{V}_\delta^K)^* h|^2}{(\mathrm{V}_\delta^K)^* h} \mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\nabla(h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} e^{\square H})|^2}{h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} e^{\square H}} \mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \left[\nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-K})(\nabla h) \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} - h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} \nabla \square H \right] e^{\square H}|^2}{h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} e^{\square H}} \mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \left[\nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-K})(\nabla h) \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} - h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} \nabla \square H \right]|^2}{h \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K}} e^{\square H} \mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \left[(\nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-K}) \circ \Phi_\delta^K) \nabla h - h(\nabla \square H) \circ \Phi_\delta^K \right]|^2}{h} \mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\Psi\nabla h|^2}{h} \mathrm{d}\mu + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) |\tilde{\mathbf{A}}|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla \square H \circ \Phi_\delta^K|^2 h \mathrm{d}\mu, \end{aligned}$$

with $\Psi = \nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-K}) \circ \Phi_\delta^K$, where we used the change of variable Φ_δ^{-K} in the penultimate line. □

Remark 8. *If the constant matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is replaced by a matrix field $z \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(z)$, the proof also works and yields*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}} \left((\mathrm{V}_\delta^K)^* h \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathcal{I}_{(\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \circ \Phi_\delta^K)\Psi}(h) + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1}) \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{Er}_1^{\delta, K}(h)$$

with $\|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\|_\infty = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(z)|$.

Lemma 9 (Entropy inequality on Verlet step). *For all smooth positive h and all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{H}\left((V_\delta^K)^*h\right) - \mathcal{H}(h) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_0^\delta \mathcal{I}\left((V_\delta^j V_s^1)^*h\right) ds + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \text{Er}_2\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \right]$$

with the error term

$$\text{Er}_2(h) = \int_0^\delta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\partial_s \Phi_s - F_H \circ \Phi_s|^2 h d\mu \right) ds,$$

where $F_H(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ -\nabla U(x) \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. Due to the decomposition

$$\mathcal{H}\left((V_\delta^K)^*h\right) - \mathcal{H}(h) = \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \left[\mathcal{H}\left((V_\delta^{j+1})^*h\right) - \mathcal{H}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \right],$$

we simply have to establish the result for $K = 1$.

For $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $t \in [0, \delta]$, let $z_t = \Phi_t(z)$. For f_0 an initial (smooth positive) distribution, denote by f_t the law of z_t when $z \sim f_0$ and $h_t = f_t/\mu$. By a change a variable we see that for any smooth function g on \mathbb{R}^{2d} ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} g(z) f_t(z) dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} g(z_t) f_0(z) dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} g(z) f_0\left(\Phi_t^{-1}(z)\right) dz,$$

i.e. $f_t(z) = f_0\left(\Phi_t^{-1}(z)\right)$, and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} g(z) \partial_t f_t(z) = \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} g(z_t) f_0(z) dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} j_t(z) \cdot \nabla g(z) f_t(z) dz$$

with $j_t = \partial_t \Phi_t \circ \Phi_t^{-1}$.

Then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_\delta \ln h_\delta - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0 \ln h_0 = \int_0^\delta \partial_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s \ln h_s ds,$$

and

$$\partial_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s \ln h_s = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \partial_s h_s d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \ln h_s \partial_s f_s.$$

The first term of the right hand side is equal to $\partial_s \int h_s d\mu = \partial_s(1) = 0$. From the previous computations,

$$\partial_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s \ln h_s = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} j_s \cdot \nabla \ln h_s f_s.$$

Let

$$F_H(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ -\nabla U(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

so that the Hamiltonian flow reads $\dot{z} = F_H(z)$. The latter leaves the Hamiltonian H (hence μ) invariant, in other words

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F_H \cdot \nabla \ln h_s f_s = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} F_H \cdot \nabla h_s \mu = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} h_s F_H \cdot \nabla \mu = 0.$$

Thus, we can add this term to the previous equality to get, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s \ln h_s &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (j_s(z) - F_H(z)) \cdot \nabla \ln h_s(z) f_s(z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |j_s(z) - F_H(z)|^2 f_s(z) dz + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\nabla \ln h_s(z)|^2 f_s(z), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the announced result once integrated over $s \in [0, \delta]$. \square

At this stage, gathering Lemmas 6, 7 and 9 yields a bound on $\mathcal{L}_a(h_{n+1})$ involving h_n , the matrix field Ψ of Lemma 7 and the numerical error terms of Lemmas 7 and 9. It remains to understand these parts. We give some estimates on Ψ in Section 3.3 and analyse the numerical errors in Section 3.4.

3.3 Jacobian matrix of the Verlet integrator

As mentioned above, this section focuses on the matrix field $\Psi = (\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-K}) \circ \Phi_\delta^K$ appearing in Lemma 7. The following result is the analogous for the Verlet scheme of the first part of [41, Lemma 1] for the Hamiltonian dynamics.

Lemma 10. *Under H1 with $L = 1$, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, there exist $d \times d$ matrices α, β, ζ with norms less than 1 such that, recalling the notation $\mathbf{T} = K\delta$,*

$$\left| \Psi(z) - \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} - \frac{\mathbf{T}^2}{2}\alpha & \mathbf{T}\beta \\ -\mathbf{T} & \text{Id} - \frac{\mathbf{T}^2}{2}\zeta \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{T}^3.$$

In particular,

$$|\Psi(z)| \leq 1 + \mathbf{T} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{T}^2 + \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{T}^3. \quad (34)$$

Proof. Denote by \mathcal{M}_1 the set of $d \times d$ matrices with operator norm bounded by 1. Fix $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. For $k \geq 1$, set $z_k = \Phi_\delta^{-1}(z_{k-1})$, with $z_0 = \Phi_\delta^K(z)$. For $k \geq 0$, set $Q_k = \nabla^2 U(x_k)$ (where $z_k = (x_k, v_k)$). By assumption, $Q_k \in \mathcal{M}_1$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Recall that for $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ we use the convention $\nabla F = (\partial_i F_j)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ where i stands for the row and j for the column. Hence, from (27), for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-1})(z_k) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_k & \frac{\delta}{2} [Q_k + (\mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_k)] Q_{k+1} \\ -\delta & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular,

$$\left| \nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-1})(z_k) - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_k & \frac{\delta}{2} [Q_k + Q_{k+1}] \\ -\delta & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq \frac{\delta^3}{4}. \quad (35)$$

Let us determine for all $k \in \llbracket 0, K \rrbracket$, by induction, a constant $C_k \geq 0$ and matrices $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \zeta_k \in \mathcal{M}_1$ such that

$$\left| \nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z_0) - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \alpha_k & \delta k \beta_k \\ -\delta k & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \zeta_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq C_k. \quad (36)$$

For $k = 1$, this is given by (35) (applied at $k = 0$) with $C_1 = \delta^3/4$ (also the case $k = 0$ is trivial with $C_0 = 0$). Suppose that the result is true for some $k \geq 1$. In particular, using that $\delta k \leq 1/10$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z_0)| &\leq \left| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \alpha_k & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \zeta_k \end{pmatrix} \right| + \left| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta k \beta_k \\ -\delta k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| + C_k \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{21}{20} \delta k + C_k. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Then,

$$\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k-1}(z_0) = \nabla \Phi_\delta^{-1}(z_k) \nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z_0).$$

We decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_k & \delta [Q_k + Q_{k+1}] \\ -\delta & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \alpha_k & \delta k \beta_k \\ -\delta k & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \zeta_k \end{pmatrix} \\ = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2(k+1)^2}{2} \alpha_{k+1} & \delta(k+1) \beta_{k+1} \\ -\delta(k+1) & \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2(k+1)^2}{2} \zeta_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} + \mathfrak{R} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} (Q_k + k^2 \alpha_k + k(Q_k + Q_{k+1})) & \beta_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{2(k+1)} (Q_k + Q_{k+1} + 2k\beta_k) \\ \zeta_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} (2k\beta_k + Q_{k+1} + k^2 \zeta_k) \end{aligned}$$

which are all three in \mathcal{M}_1 , and a remainder

$$\mathfrak{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\delta^4 k^2}{4} Q_k \alpha_k & -\frac{\delta^3 k}{4} (2Q_k \beta_k + k(Q_k + Q_{k+1}) \zeta_k) \\ \frac{\delta^3 k}{2} (Q_{k+1} + k \alpha_k) & \frac{\delta^4 k^2}{4} Q_{k+1} \zeta_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using that $\delta \leq 1/10$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{R}| &= \frac{\delta^4 k^2}{4} \left| \begin{pmatrix} Q_k \alpha_k & 0 \\ 0 & Q_{k+1} \zeta_k \end{pmatrix} \right| + \frac{\delta^3 k}{2} \left| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -Q_k \beta_k - \frac{k}{2} (Q_k + Q_{k+1}) \zeta_k \\ Q_{k+1} - k \alpha_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta^4 k^2}{4} + \frac{\delta^3 k}{2} (k+1) \\ &\leq \frac{21}{40} \delta^3 k (k+1). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

We get that

$$\begin{aligned} (\star) &:= \left| \nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k-1}(z_0) - \begin{pmatrix} \text{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2 (k+1)^2}{2} \alpha_{k+1} & \delta(k+1) \beta_{k+1} \\ -\delta(k+1) & \text{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2 (k+1)^2}{2} \zeta_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &\leq |\mathfrak{R}| + \left| \left[\nabla(\Phi_\delta^{-1})(z_k) - \begin{pmatrix} \text{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_k & \frac{\delta}{2} [Q_k + Q_{k+1}] \\ -\delta & \text{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \right] \nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z_0) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \begin{pmatrix} \text{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_k & \frac{\delta}{2} [Q_k + Q_{k+1}] \\ -\delta & \text{I}_d - \frac{\delta^2}{2} Q_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \left[\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z_0) - \begin{pmatrix} \text{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \alpha_k & \delta k \beta_k \\ -\delta k & \text{I}_d - \frac{(\delta k)^2}{2} \zeta_k \end{pmatrix} \right] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{21}{40} \delta^3 k (k+1) + \frac{1}{4} \delta^3 |\nabla \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z)| + \left(1 + \frac{21}{20} \delta\right) C_k \end{aligned}$$

where we used (38) to bound $|\mathfrak{R}|$, (35) for the second term and the induction hypothesis (36) for the third one (with the same computation as in (37) to get the $1 + \frac{21}{20} \delta$). Finally, using (37), we have finally concluded the proof by induction of (36) with

$$\begin{aligned} (\star) &\leq C_{k+1} := \frac{21}{40} \delta^3 k (k+1) + \frac{1}{4} \delta^3 \left(1 + \frac{21}{20} \delta k + C_k\right) + \left(1 + \frac{21}{20} \delta\right) C_k \\ &\leq \frac{13}{16} \delta^3 (k+1)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{11}{10} \delta\right) C_k. \end{aligned}$$

From this,

$$C_K \leq \frac{13}{16} \delta^3 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (k+1)^2 \left(1 + \frac{11}{10} \delta\right)^{K-1-k} \leq \frac{13}{16 \times 3} (\delta K)^3 e^{11\delta K/10} \leq \frac{1}{3} (\delta K)^3.$$

□

In particular, thanks to the bound on $|\Psi|$ of Lemma 10 and to Lemma 7 we can bound the Fisher term appearing in Lemma 9 to get the following somewhat more explicit estimate:

Corollary 11 (Improved entropy inequality on Verlet step). *For any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}\left((V_\delta^K)^*h\right) - \mathcal{H}(h) &\leq 4\varepsilon K \delta \mathcal{I}(h) \\ &+ \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \left[3\delta\varepsilon \text{Er}_1^{\delta,j}(h) + \varepsilon \int_0^\delta \text{Er}_1^{s,1}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) ds + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \text{Er}_2\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $j \in \llbracket 0, K-1 \rrbracket$ and $s \in [0, \delta]$, writing $\Psi_s = \nabla\Phi_s^{-1} \circ \Phi_s$ and $\Psi_j = \nabla\Phi_\delta^{-j} \circ \Phi_\delta^j$, applying Lemma 7 (with $A = I_{2d}$ and $\varepsilon = 1$) and using the bound (34) (with $s \leq K\delta \leq 1/10$) on $|\Psi_s|$ and $|\Psi_j|$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}\left((V_\delta^j V_s^1)^*h\right) &\leq 2\mathcal{I}_{\Psi_s}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) + 2\text{Er}_1^{s,1}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \\ &\leq 2|\Psi_s|^2 \mathcal{I}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) + 2\text{Er}_1^{s,1}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \\ &\leq 3\mathcal{I}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) + 2\text{Er}_1^{s,1}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \\ &\leq 6\mathcal{I}_{\Psi_j}(h) + 6\text{Er}_1^{\delta,j}(h) + 2\text{Er}_1^{s,1}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right) \\ &\leq 8\mathcal{I}(h) + 6\text{Er}_1^{\delta,j}(h) + 2\text{Er}_1^{s,1}\left((V_\delta^j)^*h\right). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this bound in the result of Lemma 9 concludes. \square

3.4 Numerical error

The goal of this section is to bound the numerical error appearing in Lemmas 7 and 9.

3.4.1 Error 1

Lemma 12. *Under H1 with $L = 1$ and H2, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \square H(z)|^2 &\leq 2\delta^6 K \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left[N_4^6(v_k) + N_4^6(\nabla U(x_k)) + N_3^4(v_k) + N_3^4(\nabla U(x_k)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |v_k|^2 + |\nabla U(x_k)|^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $(x_k, v_k) = \Phi_\delta^{-k}(z)$ for $k \in \llbracket 0, K \rrbracket$.

Proof. Decomposing

$$\square H = H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-K} = \sum_{k=1}^K \left(H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-k+1} - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-k} \right),$$

so that

$$|\nabla \square H|^2 \leq K \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \nabla \left[H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-k+1} - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-k} \right] \right|^2,$$

we focus from now on on the case $K = 1$. Recall $H(x, v) = U(x) + |v|^2/2$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1, v_1) &= \Phi_\delta^{-1}(x, v) \\ &= \left(x - \delta v - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla U(x), v + \frac{\delta}{2} \left[\nabla U(x) + \nabla U \left(x - \delta v - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla U(x) \right) \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, starting with the velocity contribution,

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_v \left(H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \right) (x, v) \\ &= v - \left[-\delta \nabla U(x_1) + \left(I - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla^2 U(x_1) \right) v_1 \right] \\ &= \frac{\delta}{2} (\nabla U(x_1) - \nabla U(x)) + \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla^2 U(x_1) v + \frac{\delta^3}{4} \nabla^2 U(x_1) (\nabla U(x) + \nabla U(x_1)) \\ &= \frac{\delta}{2} (\nabla U(x_1) - \nabla U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x_1)(x - x_1)) + \frac{\delta^3}{4} \nabla^2 U(x_1) \nabla U(x_1). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that (8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla U(x+y) - \nabla U(x) - \nabla^2 U(x)y| &= \left| \int_0^1 (\nabla^2 U(x+sy) - \nabla^2 U(x)) y ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} N_3^2(y). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Using this and that $\|\nabla^2 U\|_\infty \leq L = 1$, we have thus obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla_v \left(H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \right) (x, v)| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{4} N_3^2(x - x_1) + \frac{\delta^3}{4} |\nabla U(x_1)| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta^3}{2} N_3^2(v) + \frac{\delta^5}{8} N_3^2(\nabla U(x)) + \frac{\delta^3}{4} (|\nabla U(x)| + |x_1 - x|) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta^3}{2} N_3^2(v) + \frac{\delta^5}{8} N_3^2(\nabla U(x)) + \frac{\delta^4}{4} |v| + \left(\frac{\delta^3}{4} + \frac{\delta^5}{8} \right) |\nabla U(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\delta \leq 1/10$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla_v \left(H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \right) (x, v)|^2 \\ &\leq \delta^6 \left(\frac{1}{2} N_3^2(v) + \frac{1}{800} N_3^2(\nabla U(x)) + \frac{1}{40} |v| + \frac{201}{800} |\nabla U(x)| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\delta^6}{3} \left(N_3^4(v) + N_3^4(\nabla U(x)) + |v|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Turning to the position contribution,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nabla_x \left(H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \right) (x, v) \\
&= \nabla U(x) - \left[\left(I - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla^2 U(x) \right) \nabla U(x_1) + \frac{\delta}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) + \left(I - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \nabla^2 U(x) \right) \nabla^2 U(x_1) \right) v_1 \right] \\
&= (*) + (**) + (***)
\end{aligned}$$

with, organizing terms depending on their orders in δ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(*) &= \nabla U(x) - \nabla U(x_1) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x_1) \right) (x - x_1) \\
(**) &= \frac{\delta^2}{4} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) - \nabla^2 U(x_1) \right) \nabla U(x_1) \\
(***) &= \frac{\delta^3}{4} \nabla^2 U(x) \nabla^2 U(x_1) v_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the bound (9) on the fourth derivative of U and that $\delta \leq 1/10$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(*)| &\leq N_4^3(x - x_1) \leq \delta^3 \left(N_4(v) + 10^{-3} N_4(\nabla U(x)) \right)^3 \\
&\leq \delta^3 (1 + 10^{-3})^2 \left(N_4^3(v) + 10^{-3} N_4^3(\nabla U(x)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From the bound (8) on the third derivative of U and that $\|\nabla^2 U\|_\infty \leq L = 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
|(**)| &\leq \frac{\delta^2}{4} |(\nabla^2 U(x) - \nabla^2 U(x_1)) \nabla U(x)| + \frac{\delta^2}{2} |\nabla U(x_1) - \nabla U(x)| \\
&\leq \frac{\delta^2}{4} N_3(x - x_1) N_3(\nabla U(x)) + \frac{\delta^2}{2} |x_1 - x| \\
&\leq \frac{\delta^3}{8} N_3^2(v) + \frac{\delta^3 + \delta^4}{8} N_3^2(\nabla U(x)) + \frac{\delta^3}{2} |v| + \frac{\delta^4}{4} |\nabla U(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(***)| &\leq \frac{\delta^3}{4} |v_1| \leq \frac{\delta^3}{4} |v| + \frac{\delta^4}{4} |\nabla U(x)| + \frac{\delta^4}{4} |x_1 - x| \\
&\leq \frac{\delta^3 + \delta^5}{4} |v| + \frac{\delta^4 + \delta^6/2}{4} |\nabla U(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

As a conclusion, using that $\delta \leq 1/10$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\nabla_x \left(H - H \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \right) (x, v)|^2 \\
&\leq \delta^6 \left[(1 + 10^{-3})^2 \left(N_4^3(v) + 10^{-3} N_4^3(\nabla U(x)) \right) + \frac{1}{8} N_3^2(v) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{11}{80} N_3^2(\nabla U(x)) + \frac{301}{400} |v| + \frac{2 + 5 \times 10^{-3}}{40} |\nabla U(x)| \right]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5}{3} \delta^6 \left[N_4^6(v) + N_4^6(\nabla U(x)) + N_3^4(v) + N_3^4(\nabla U(x)) + |v|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (40), concludes. \square

Integrating this bound with respect to $h\mu$ immediately yields the following (recall the definitions of the Error 1 in Lemma 7 and of the function \mathbf{M} in (10)):

Corollary 13. *Under **H1** with $L = 1$ and **H2**, for any smooth positive relative density h ,*

$$\mathrm{Er}_1^{\delta,K}(h) \leq 2\delta^6 K \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (\mathbf{M} \circ \Phi_\delta^k) h d\mu.$$

*In particular, assuming moreover **H3**, and writing $h_n = (\mathbf{P}_\omega^n)^* h_0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Er}_1^{\delta,K}(\mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) &\leq 2\delta^6 K^2 (C_1(1 - \rho K \delta)^n \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2), \\ \mathrm{Er}_1^{\delta,1}((\mathbf{V}_\delta^j)^* \mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) &\leq 2\delta^6 (C_1(1 - \rho K \delta)^n \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2), \end{aligned}$$

for all $j \in \llbracket 0, K \rrbracket$.

Remark 14. *If in **H2** we only assume (8) but not (9), from (8), using that $\nabla U(x+y) - \nabla U(x) = \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(x+sy) y ds$, we deduce that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\left| \nabla U(x+y) - \nabla U(x) - \frac{1}{2} (\nabla^2 U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x+y)) y \right| \leq N_3^2(y).$$

We can thus use this inequality instead of (9) in Lemma 12 (which is the only place where (9) intervenes) and replace N_4^6 by N_3^4 in the definition (10) of \mathbf{M} . Following then the rest of the proof, we see that Theorem 1 still holds in this case, but with δ^4 replaced by δ^2 .

3.4.2 Error 2

Here, we only have to consider the case $K = 1$.

Lemma 15. *Under **H1** with $L = 1$ and **H2**, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $s \in [0, \delta]$, recalling $F_H(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ -\nabla U(x) \end{pmatrix}$,*

$$|\partial_s \Phi_s(z) - F_H(\Phi_s(z))|^2 \leq s^4 \left(\frac{1}{3} |v|^2 + \frac{1}{7} |\nabla U(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{7} N_3^4(v) + \frac{1}{140} N_3^4(\nabla U(x)) \right).$$

Proof. Decomposing $z_s = \Phi_s(x, v)$ as

$$z_s = \begin{pmatrix} x_s \\ v_s \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x + sv - \frac{s^2}{2} \nabla U(x) \\ v - \frac{s}{2} (\nabla U(x) + \nabla U(x + sv - \frac{s^2}{2} \nabla U(x))) \end{pmatrix},$$

we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_s \Phi_s)(z) - F_H(z_s) &= \begin{pmatrix} v - s\nabla U(x) \\ -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla U(x) + \nabla U(x_s)) - \frac{s}{2}\nabla^2 U(x_s)x'_s \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} v_s \\ -\nabla U(x_s) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} s(\nabla U(x_s) - \nabla U(x)) \\ \nabla U(x_s) - \nabla U(x) - s\nabla^2 U(x_s)(v - s\nabla U(x)) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, using (39) and that $\|\nabla^2 U\|_\infty \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\partial_s \Phi_s)(z) - F_H(z_s)|^2 &\leq \frac{s^2}{4}|x_s - x|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla U(x_s) - \nabla U(x) - \nabla^2 U(x_s)(x_s - x)|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{s^2}{2}|x_s - x - s(v - s\nabla U(x))|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{s^2}{4}|x_s - x|^2 + \frac{1}{8}N_3^4(x_s - x) + \frac{s^6}{8}|\nabla U(x)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $s \leq \delta \leq 1/10$, we bound

$$N_3^4(x_s - x) \leq \left(sN_3(v) + \frac{s}{20}N_3(\nabla U(x)) \right)^4 \leq \frac{21^3}{20^3}s^4 \left(N_3^4(v) + \frac{1}{20}N_3^4(\nabla U(x)) \right)$$

and similarly $|x_s - x|^2 \leq 21/20s^2 (|v|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^2/20)$, which concludes. \square

Again, integrating the previous bound immediately yields (recall the definitions of the Error 2 in Lemma 9 and of the function \mathbf{M} in (10)):

Corollary 16. *Under $\mathbf{H1}$ with $L = 1$ and $\mathbf{H2}$, for any smooth positive relative density h ,*

$$\text{Er}_2(h) \leq \frac{\delta^5}{15} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathbf{M} h d\mu.$$

In particular, assuming moreover $\mathbf{H3}$, and writing $h_n = (\mathbf{P}_\omega^n)^$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then, for any $j \in \llbracket 0, K-1 \rrbracket$,*

$$\text{Er}_2((\mathbf{V}_\delta^j)^* \mathbf{D}_\eta h_n) \leq \frac{\delta^5}{15} (C_1(1 - \rho K \delta)^n \nu_0(\mathfrak{W}) + C_2).$$

Proof. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Er}_2(\delta, h) &= \int_0^\delta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |\partial_s \Phi_s - F_H \circ \Phi_s|^2 h d\mu \right) ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3} \int_0^\delta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} s^4 \mathbf{M} h d\mu \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Acknowledgments

The works of P.M. and G.S. are supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (project EMC2, grant agreement No 810367); and by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche, under grant SWIDIMS (ANR-20-CE40-0022) for P.M., and ANR-19-CE40-0010-01 (QuAMProcs) and ANR-21-CE40-0006 (SINEQ) for G.S. A.O.D. would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences for support and hospitality during the programme The mathematical and statistical foundation of future data-driven engineering when work on this paper was undertaken. This work was supported by: EPSRC grant number EP/R014604/1.

References

- [1] Assyr Abdulle, Gilles Vilmart, and Konstantinos C Zygalakis. Long time accuracy of lie–trotter splitting methods for langevin dynamics. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 53(1):1–16, 2015.
- [2] Christophe Andrieu, Nando De Freitas, Arnaud Doucet, and Michael I Jordan. An introduction to mcmc for machine learning. *Machine learning*, 50:5–43, 2003.
- [3] Christophe Andrieu, Alain Durmus, Nikolas Nüsken, and Julien Roussel. Hypocoercivity of piecewise deterministic Markov process-Monte Carlo. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(5):2478 – 2517, 2021.
- [4] Dominique Bakry, Ivan Gentil, and Michel Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 348 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [5] Nawaf Bou-Rabee and Andreas Eberle. Mixing time guarantees for unadjusted Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *Bernoulli*, 29(1):75 – 104, 2023.
- [6] Nawaf Bou-Rabee, Andreas Eberle, and Raphael Zimmer. Coupling and convergence for Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 30(3):1209 – 1250, 2020.
- [7] Nawaf Bou-Rabee and Katharina Schuh. Convergence of unadjusted Hamiltonian Monte Carlo for mean-field models. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2009.08735, September 2020.
- [8] Giovanni Bussi and Michele Parrinello. Accurate sampling using langevin dynamics. *Physical Review E*, 75(5):056707, 2007.

- [9] Yu Cao, Jianfeng Lu, and Lihan Wang. On explicit L^2 -convergence rate estimate for underdamped Langevin dynamics. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1908.04746, August 2019.
- [10] Louis-Pierre Chaintron and Antoine Diez. Propagation of chaos: A review of models, methods and applications. ii. applications. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 15(6):1017–1173, 2022.
- [11] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar. Stochastic problems in physics and astronomy. *Reviews of modern physics*, 15(1):1, 1943.
- [12] Yuansi Chen, Raaz Dwivedi, Martin J. Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Fast mixing of metropolized hamiltonian monte carlo: Benefits of multi-step gradients. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(92):1–72, 2020.
- [13] Zongchen Chen and Santosh S. Vempala. Optimal convergence rate of hamiltonian monte carlo for strongly logconcave distributions. *Theory of Computing*, 18(9):1–18, 2022.
- [14] Xiang Cheng, Niladri S Chatterji, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Underdamped langevin mcmc: A non-asymptotic analysis. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 300–323. PMLR, 2018.
- [15] Patrick L. Combettes. Perspective functions: Properties, constructions, and examples, 2017.
- [16] Arnak S Dalalyan. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, pages 651–676, 2017.
- [17] Arnak S. Dalalyan and Lionel Riou-Durand. On sampling from a log-concave density using kinetic langevin diffusions. *ArXiv*, abs/1807.09382, 2018.
- [18] George Deligiannidis, Daniel Paulin, Alexandre Bouchard-Côté, and Arnaud Doucet. Randomized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo as scaling limit of the bouncy particle sampler and dimension-free convergence rates. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(6):2612 – 2662, 2021.
- [19] Alain Durmus and Andreas Eberle. Asymptotic bias of inexact markov chain monte carlo methods in high dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00682*, 2021.
- [20] Alain Durmus, Aurélien Enfroy, Éric Moulines, and Gabriel Stoltz. Uniform minorization condition and convergence bounds for discretizations of kinetic Langevin dynamics. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2107.14542, July 2021.

- [21] Alain Durmus and Éric Moulines. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted langevin algorithm. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(3):1551–1587, 2017.
- [22] Andreas Eberle. Reflection coupling and wasserstein contractivity without convexity. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 349(19):1101–1104, 2011.
- [23] Andreas Eberle, Arnaud Guillin, and Raphael Zimmer. Couplings and quantitative contraction rates for Langevin dynamics. *The Annals of Probability*, 47(4):1982 – 2010, 2019.
- [24] Donald L. Ermak and Helen Buckholz. Numerical integration of the langevin equation: Monte carlo simulation. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 35(2):169–182, 1980.
- [25] Andrew Gelman, John B Carlin, Hal S Stern, David B Dunson, Aki Vehtari, and Donald B Rubin. *Bayesian data analysis*. CRC press, 2013.
- [26] Nicolai Gouraud, Pierre Le Bris, Adrien Majka, and Pierre Monmarché. HMC and underdamped langevin united in the unadjusted convex smooth case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00977*, 2022.
- [27] Ulf Grenander. Tutorial in pattern theory. Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, 1983.
- [28] Ulf Grenander and Michael I. Miller. Representations of knowledge in complex systems. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 56(4):549–603, 1994. With discussion and a reply by the authors.
- [29] Arnaud Guillin, Wei Liu, Liming Wu, and Chaoen Zhang. Uniform Poincaré and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for mean field particle systems. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(3):1590 – 1614, 2022.
- [30] Wilfred Keith Hastings. Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57(1):97–109, 04 1970.
- [31] Frédéric Hérau. Short and long time behavior of the Fokker-Planck equation in a confining potential and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 244(1):95–118, 2007.
- [32] Benedict Leimkuhler and Charles Matthews. Rational Construction of Stochastic Numerical Methods for Molecular Sampling. *Applied Mathematics Research eXpress*, 2013(1):34–56, 06 2012.
- [33] Benedict Leimkuhler and Charles Matthews. Rational construction of stochastic numerical methods for molecular sampling. *Applied Mathematics Research eXpress*, 2013(1):34–56, 2013.

- [34] Benedict Leimkuhler, Daniel Paulin, and Peter A Whalley. Contraction and convergence rates for discretized kinetic langevin dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10684*, 2023.
- [35] Tony Lelièvre and Gabriel Stoltz. Partial differential equations and stochastic methods in molecular dynamics. *Acta Numerica*, 25:681–880, 2016.
- [36] Yi-An Ma, Niladri Chatterji, Xiang Cheng, Nicolas Flammarion, Peter Bartlett, and Michael I. Jordan. Is There an Analog of Nesterov Acceleration for MCMC? *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1902.00996, February 2019.
- [37] Yi-An Ma, Yuansi Chen, Chi Jin, Nicolas Flammarion, and Michael I. Jordan. Sampling can be faster than optimization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(42):20881–20885, 2019.
- [38] Oren Mangoubi and Aaron Smith. Mixing of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo on strongly log-concave distributions: Continuous dynamics. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(5):2019 – 2045, 2021.
- [39] Jonathan C. Mattingly, Andrew M. Stuart, and Desmond J. Higham. Ergodicity for sdes and approximations: locally lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 101(2):185–232, 2002.
- [40] Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W Rosenbluth, Marshall N Rosenbluth, Augusta H Teller, and Edward Teller. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The journal of chemical physics*, 21(6):1087–1092, 1953.
- [41] Pierre Monmarché. An entropic approach for Hamiltonian Monte Carlo: the idealized case. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2209.13405, September 2022.
- [42] Pierre Monmarché. High-dimensional MCMC with a standard splitting scheme for the underdamped Langevin diffusion. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2):4117 – 4166, 2021.
- [43] Radford M. Neal. MCMC using Hamiltonian dynamics. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, 54:113–162, 2010.
- [44] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [45] Gareth O. Roberts and Richard L. Tweedie. Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363, 1996.
- [46] Peter J Rossky, Jimmie D Doll, and Harold L Friedman. Brownian dynamics as smart monte carlo simulation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 69(10):4628–4633, 1978.

- [47] Christof Seiler, Simon Rubinstein-Salzedo, and Susan P. Holmes. Positive curvature and hamiltonian monte carlo. In *NIPS*, 2014.
- [48] Robert D. Skeel and Jesús A. Izaguirre. An impulse integrator for langevin dynamics. *Molecular Physics*, 100(24):3885–3891, 2002.
- [49] Denis Talay. Stochastic Hamiltonian systems: exponential convergence to the invariant measure, and discretization by the implicit Euler scheme. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 8(2):163–198, 2002.
- [50] Santosh Vempala and Andre Wibisono. Rapid convergence of the unadjusted langevin algorithm: Isoperimetry suffices. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [51] Cédric Villani. Hypocoercivity. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 202(950):iv+141, 2009.
- [52] Max Welling and Yee Whye Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-11)*, pages 681–688, 2011.
- [53] Matthew Zhang, Sinho Chewi, Mufan Bill Li, Krishnakumar Balasubramanian, and Murat A Erdogdu. Improved discretization analysis for underdamped langevin monte carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08049*, 2023.

A Regularity of U

Proof of Proposition 2. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left(\nabla^2 U(x+y) - \nabla^2 U(x) \right) z \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \left(\nabla_{i,j}^2 U(x+y) - \nabla_{i,j}^2 U(x) \right) z_j \right|^2 \\
&\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \left| \left(\nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i+y_i) - \nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i) \right) z_i \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon^2}{d_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \left(\nabla^2 W^{(q)}(x_i+y_i-x_j-y_j) - \nabla^2 W^{(q)}(x_i-x_j) \right) (z_i-z_j) \right|^2 \\
&\leq (1+\epsilon) \|D^3 U^{(q)}\|_\infty^2 \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |y_i|^2 |z_i|^2 + \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon^2}{d_0} \|D^3 W^{(q)}\|_\infty^2 \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |y_i - y_j|^2 |z_i - z_j|^2 \\
&\leq (1+\epsilon) (\|D^3 U^{(q)}\|_\infty^2 + 16(\epsilon + \epsilon^2) \|D^3 W^{(q)}\|_\infty^2) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |y_i|^4 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |z_j|^4},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to conclude the proof of (8). Following similar computations,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \nabla U(x+y) - \nabla U(x) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x+y) \right) y \right|^2 \\
&= \left| \left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(x+sy) ds - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x+y) \right) \right) y \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \left(\int_0^1 \nabla_{i,j}^2 U(x+sy) ds - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla_{i,j}^2 U(x) + \nabla_{i,j}^2 U(x+y) \right) \right) y_j \right|^2 \\
&\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \left| \left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i+sy_i) ds - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i) + \nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i+y_i) \right) \right) y_i \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_0} \left| \left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2 W^{(q)}(x_i-x_j+s(y_i-y_j)) ds \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 W^{(q)}(x_i-x_j) + \nabla^2 W^{(q)}(x_i+y_i-x_j-y_j) \right) \right) (y_i-y_j) \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using that, for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^2([0,1], \mathbb{R})$, integrating twice by parts,

$$\int_0^1 f(s) ds - \frac{f(0) + f(1)}{2} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 s(1-s) f''(s) ds,$$

fixing $i \in \llbracket 1, d_0 \rrbracket$, $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and writing \mathbf{e}_ℓ the ℓ -th canonical vector of \mathbb{R}^q ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{e}_\ell \cdot \left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i + sy_i) ds - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i) + \nabla^2 U^{(q)}(x_i + y_i) \right) \right) y_i \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_0^1 s(1-s) \mathbf{D}^4 U^{(q)}(x_i + sy_i) \{ \mathbf{e}_\ell, y_i, y_i, y_i \} ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \| \mathbf{D}^4 U^{(q)} \|_\infty |y_i|^3. \end{aligned}$$

The terms involving $W^{(q)}$ is treated similarly and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \nabla U(x+y) - \nabla U(x) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^2 U(x) + \nabla^2 U(x+y) \right) y \right|^2 \\ &\leq (1+\epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \frac{q}{144} \| \mathbf{D}^4 U^{(q)} \|_\infty^2 |y_i|^6 + \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_0} \frac{q}{144} \| \mathbf{D}^4 W^{(q)} \|_\infty^2 |y_i - y_j|^6 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{144} \| \mathbf{D}^4 U^{(q)} \|_\infty^2 + \frac{4(\epsilon + \epsilon^2)}{9} \| \mathbf{D}^4 W^{(q)} \|_\infty^2 \right) q \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |y_i|^6, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of (9).

Finally, to bound \mathbf{M} , for $\ell \in \{2, 4, 6\}$, using that $\nabla U^{(q)}(0) = 0 = \nabla W^{(q)}(0)$, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{x_i} U(x)|^\ell &= \left| \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) + \frac{2\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \nabla W^{(q)}(x_i - x_j) \right|^\ell \\ &\leq 2^{\ell-1} |\nabla U^{(q)}(x_i)|^\ell + \frac{2^{2\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |\nabla W^{(q)}(x_i - x_j)|^\ell \\ &\leq 2^{\ell-1} \| \nabla^2 U^{(q)} \|_\infty^\ell |x_i|^\ell + \frac{2^{2\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell}{d_0} \| \nabla^2 W^{(q)} \|_\infty^\ell \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding $|x_i - x_j|^\ell \leq 2^{\ell-1} (|x_i|^\ell + |x_j|^\ell)$ in the last term, we end up with

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |\nabla_{x_i} U(x)|^\ell \leq \left(2^{\ell-1} \| \nabla^2 U^{(q)} \|_\infty^\ell + 2^{3\ell} \epsilon^\ell \| \nabla^2 W^{(q)} \|_\infty^\ell \right) \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} |x_i|^\ell.$$

□

B Drift

In all this section, which is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3, **H4** is enforced, we write $L_1 = \max(\| \nabla^2 U^{(q)} \|_\infty, \| \nabla^2 W^{(q)} \|_\infty)$ and, in fact, using a rescaling as in Section 2.2, we

assume without loss of generality that $L_1 \leq 1$. Let us state a few consequence of **H4** which will be useful in the rest of this section. First, the drift condition (15) implies that for any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^q$,

$$\left| \nabla U^{(q)}(x_1) \right|^2 \geq (\mathfrak{m}/2)(\mathfrak{m}|x_1|^2/2 - \mathfrak{M}). \quad (41)$$

In addition, using that $\nabla U^{(q)}$ is Lipschitz and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality easily implies that $\mathfrak{m} \leq L_1 \leq 1$. Finally, since $\nabla U^{(q)}(0) = \nabla W^{(q)}(0) = 0$, we get that for any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^q$

$$\left| \nabla U^{(q)}(x_1) \right| \leq |x_1|, \quad \left| \nabla W^{(q)}(x_1) \right| \leq |x_1|, \quad U^{(q)}(x_1) \leq |x_1|^2/2. \quad (42)$$

Our analysis is based on the following Lyapunov functions. Under **H4**, for $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \times [0, 1)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define $\mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(\ell)} : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}), v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(\ell)}(x, v) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} (\mathfrak{W}_{\omega,i}(x, v))^\ell, \quad \mathfrak{W}_{\omega,i}(x, v) = (\gamma_0^2/2)|x_i|^2 + |v_i|^2 + \eta\gamma_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + U^{(q)}(x_i),$$

where

$$\gamma_0 = (1 - \eta)/(\delta K).$$

Note that since $\eta \in [0, 1)$, using Young's inequality $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq (\varepsilon/2)|\mathbf{a}|^2 + (1/(2\varepsilon))|\mathbf{b}|^2$ with $\varepsilon = 2/3$, we get

$$(1/6)[|x|^2 \gamma_0^2 + |v|^2] + \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} U^{(q)}(x_i) \leq \mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(1)}(x, v) \leq (3/2)[|x|^2 \gamma_0^2 + |v|^2] + \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} U^{(q)}(x_i). \quad (43)$$

The main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 17. *Assume **H4** holds with $L_1 = 1$ and let $\bar{\delta}, \bar{T}, \bar{\eta} > 0$. Then, for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\omega = (K, \delta, \eta)$, $\delta > 0$, $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\eta \in [0, \bar{\eta})$ satisfying*

$$\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1 \wedge \epsilon_2, \quad \delta \leq \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2 \wedge 1/[7 \times 8] \wedge \bar{\delta}, \quad K\delta \leq T_1 \wedge T_2 \wedge T_3 \wedge \bar{T},$$

for any $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_\omega^n D_\eta V_\delta^k \mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(\ell)}(x, v) &\leq C_{1,\ell}^\ell (1 - \rho_\omega K\delta)^{\ell n} \mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(\ell)}(x, v) \\ &\quad + d_0 (C_{2,\ell} q^\ell + C_{3,\ell}) \sup_{s \in [0, \bar{T}]} \frac{s}{1 - (1 - \rho_\omega s/8)^\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, T_1, T_2, T_3, \delta_1, \delta_2$ are defined in (68)-(69)-(70)-(72)-(73),

$$\rho_\omega = 2^5 [\gamma_0 \wedge \{\eta\gamma_0 + \gamma_0^2 K\delta/2\} \mathfrak{m}(2^6 3)^{-1}], \quad (45)$$

and $C_{1,\ell}, C_{2,\ell}, C_{3,\ell}$ are given in (74) and do not depend on d_0, q and only depend on δ, K, η through γ_0 and ρ_ω .

The rest of Section B is devoted to the proof of this result. Before proceeding with this proof, let us notice that Theorem 17 implies Theorem 3. Indeed, the rescaling needed to get that $L_1 = 1$ does not affect Theorem 3 and, as can be checked on their expressions, the constants $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, T_1, T_2, T_3, \delta_1, \delta_2, C_{1,\ell}, C_{2,\ell}, C_{3,\ell}$ appearing in Theorem 17 depends only on $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{M}, \bar{T}, \bar{\delta}, \gamma_0$ and not on q, d_0, ϵ (notice here that we can simply choose $\bar{\eta} = 1$). Moreover, thanks to (43) and the fact $0 \leq U^{(q)}(x_1) \leq |x_1|^2/2$, the function \mathfrak{W} defined in (16) is equivalent to $\mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(3)}$, more precisely there exists $A > 0$ which depends only on γ_0 such that, for all $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$A^{-1}\mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(3)}(x, v) \leq \mathfrak{W}(x, v) \leq A\mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(3)}(x, v).$$

As a consequence, the drift inequality (44) immediately implies a similar inequality but with \mathfrak{W} in place of $\mathfrak{W}_\omega^{(3)}$, which concludes the proof of Theorem 3.

We start the proof of Theorem 17 with the following technical lemma. Consider for any $\mathbf{o} = (a, b, c, b_0, e, f) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_q), v = (v_1, \dots, v_q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, v) &= a|x_i|^2 + b|v_i|^2 + c\langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0U^{(q)}(x_i) \\ &\quad + e\frac{\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \left[|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j|^2 \right] + f. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 18. *Assume that H4 holds. Suppose that $\epsilon \leq \mathfrak{m}/4$. Then, for any $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $\delta \in (0, \mathfrak{m}/40]$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$ and $\mathbf{o} = (a, b, c, b_0, e, f) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, $b_0 \leq b$,*

$$V_\delta \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, v) \leq \mathfrak{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{o}},i}(x, v),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{o}} = (\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c}, b_0, \tilde{e}, \tilde{f})$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a} &= a(1 - \mathfrak{m}\delta^2/2) + 10b\delta^2 - \delta\mathfrak{m}c/8 + 48\epsilon\delta + \delta|b - b_0| \\ \tilde{b} &= 2\delta^2a + (1 + \epsilon\delta + 17\delta^2)b + \delta(1 + 7\delta)c + \epsilon\delta + \delta|b - b_0| \\ \tilde{c} &= 2\delta a + c, \quad \tilde{e} = e + 17\delta(a\delta + b + c + e) \\ \tilde{f} &= f + a\delta^2\mathfrak{M} + b_0\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{M}\delta^2/4 + \delta\mathfrak{M}c. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note first that H4 implies that $\epsilon \leq \mathfrak{m}/4 \leq 1/4$. Let $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $\delta \leq \mathfrak{m}/40$ and $\mathbf{o} = (a, b, c, b_0, e, f)$. Define for $j \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $\psi_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for any $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\psi_j(\tilde{x}) = \nabla U^{(q)}(\tilde{x}_j) + \frac{\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} \nabla W^{(q)}(\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{x}_{j'}). \quad (46)$$

With this notation, by definition of V_δ , we have

$$V_\delta \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, v) = \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(y, p), \quad (47)$$

where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_q)$, $p = (p_1, \dots, p_q)$ and

$$y_j = x_j - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \psi_j(x) + \delta v_j, \quad p_j = v_j - \frac{\delta}{2} \{\psi_j(x) + \psi_j(y)\}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}. \quad (48)$$

First note that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (42), we have for any $j \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |y_j - x_j|^2 &\leq 2 \left(\delta^4 |\nabla U^{(a)}(x_j)|^2 + \delta^4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |\nabla W^{(a)}(x_j - x_{j'})|^2 + \delta^2 |v|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2 \left(\delta^4 |x_j|^2 + \delta^4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |x_j - x_{j'}|^2 + \delta^2 |v_j|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |y_j - x_j|^2 &\leq 4\delta^2 (\delta^2 |x_i|^2 + |v_i|^2) + 4\delta^2 \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2 \\ &\quad + 8\delta^4 (1 + \epsilon^2) d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By **H4** and Jensen inequality, for any $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_q)$, $\tilde{y} = (\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_j(\tilde{x}) - \psi_j(\tilde{y})|^2 &\leq 2 |\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{y}_j|^2 + 2 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{x}_{j'} - (\tilde{y}_j - \tilde{y}_{j'})|^2 \\ &\leq (2 + 4\epsilon^2) |\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{y}_j|^2 + 4\epsilon^2 \frac{1}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |\tilde{x}_{j'} - \tilde{y}_{j'}|^2, \\ |\psi_j(\tilde{x})|^2 &\leq 2 |\tilde{x}_j|^2 + \frac{2\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{x}_{j'}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

As a result, using (48) and $\epsilon \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)|^2 \\
& \leq 4 \left(1 + 2\epsilon^2\right) \left(\delta^4 |x_i|^2 + \delta^4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + \delta^2 |v_i|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 8\epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} \left(\delta^4 |x_j|^2 + \delta^4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |x_j - x_{j'}|^2 + \delta^2 |v_j|^2 \right) \\
& \leq 4 \left(1 + 26\epsilon^2\right) \left(\delta^4 |x_i|^2 + \delta^4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + \delta^2 |v_i|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 16\epsilon^2 \delta^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2 . \tag{51}
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $2\delta^2\epsilon \leq 1$ and $\delta \vee \epsilon \leq \mathfrak{m}/4 \leq 1/4$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|y_i|^2 &= |x_i|^2 + 2 \left\langle x_i, -\frac{\delta^2}{2} \psi_i(x) + \delta v_i \right\rangle + |y_i - x_i|^2 \\
&\leq |x_i|^2 - \delta^2 \left\langle x_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \right\rangle + \delta^2 \epsilon |x_i|^2 + \delta^2 \frac{\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\delta \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2 \left(\delta^4 |x_i|^2 + \delta^4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + \delta^2 |v_i|^2 \right) \\
&\leq (1 + \delta^2 \epsilon + 2\delta^4) |x_i|^2 + 2\delta \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2\delta^2 |v_i|^2 \\
&\quad - \delta^2 \left\langle x_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \right\rangle + \delta^2 \epsilon d_0^{-1} (1 + 2\delta^2 \epsilon) \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \delta^2 \epsilon + 2\delta^4) |x_i|^2 + 2\delta \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2\delta^2 |v_i|^2 \\
&\quad - \delta^2 \left\langle x_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \right\rangle + 2\delta^2 \epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\leq (1 - \delta^2 \mathfrak{m} + \delta^2 \epsilon + 2\delta^4) |x_i|^2 + 2\delta \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2\delta^2 |v_i|^2 + \delta^2 \mathfrak{M} + 2\delta^2 \epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\leq (1 - \delta^2 \mathfrak{m}/2) |x_i|^2 + 2\delta \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2\delta^2 |v_i|^2 + \delta^2 \mathfrak{M} + 2\delta^2 \epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 . \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (51)-(50) and $\delta \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|p_i|^2 &= |v_i|^2 - \delta \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y) \rangle + \frac{\delta^2}{4} |\psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y)|^2 \\
&\leq \|v_i\|^2 - 2\delta \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \frac{\delta^2}{2} \|v_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta^2}{2} \left\{ 4 \|\psi_i(x)\|^2 + \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\|^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \|v_i\|^2 - 2\delta \langle v_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \rangle + (\delta\epsilon + \delta^2/2) \|v_i\|^2 + \left(\frac{\delta^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) |\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)|^2 \\
&\quad + 4\delta^2 \left\{ |x_i|^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \right\} + \delta\epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \delta(\epsilon + 5(1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta)) |v_i|^2 - 2\delta \langle v_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \rangle + 4\delta^2(1 + \delta^2(1 + 26\epsilon^2)) |x_i|^2 \\
&\quad + \delta\epsilon d_0^{-1}(1 + 4\delta\epsilon + 4(1 + 26\epsilon^2)\epsilon\delta^3) \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + 8(1 + \delta^2)\epsilon^2\delta^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \delta(\epsilon + 5(1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta)) |v_i|^2 - 2\delta \langle v_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \rangle + 8\delta^2(1 + 13\epsilon^2\delta^2) |x_i|^2 \\
&\quad + \delta\epsilon d_0^{-1}(1 + 8\delta\epsilon + 4 \cdot 26\delta^3\epsilon^3) \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + 16\epsilon^2\delta^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2, \tag{53}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle y_i, p_i \rangle &= \left\langle x_i - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \psi_i(x) + \delta v_i, v_i - \frac{\delta}{2} \{ \psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y) \} \right\rangle \\
&= \langle x_i, v_i \rangle - \frac{\delta}{2} \langle x_i, \psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y) \rangle - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \delta \|v_i\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta^3}{4} \langle \psi_i(x), \psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y) \rangle - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y) \rangle \\
&\leq \langle x_i, v_i \rangle - \delta \langle x_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \frac{\delta}{2} \|x_i\| \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\| - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \delta \|v_i\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta^3}{2} \|\psi_i(x)\|^2 + \frac{\delta^3}{4} \|\psi_i(x)\| \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\| - \delta^2 \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \frac{\delta^2}{2} \|v_i\| \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\| \\
&\leq \langle x_i, v_i \rangle - \delta \langle x_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\delta^2}{2} \|x_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\|^2 \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{3}{2} \delta^2 \langle v_i, \psi_i(x) \rangle + \left(\delta + \frac{\delta^2}{4} \right) \|v_i\|^2 + 4^{-1} \delta^3 \|\psi_i(x)\|^2 + 4^{-1} \delta^2 (1 + \delta) \|\psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)\|^2 \\
&\leq \langle x_i, v_i \rangle - \delta \langle x_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \rangle - (3\delta^2/2) \langle v_i, \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \rangle \\
&\quad + (3\epsilon\delta^2/4 + \delta(1 + \delta/4) + (1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta^2(1 + \delta^2(1 + \delta))) |v_i|^2 \\
&\quad + (\delta\epsilon/2 + \delta^2/4 + \delta^3/2 + (1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta^4(1 + \delta^2(1 + \delta))) |x_i|^2 \\
&\quad + (\delta(1 + 3\delta + \delta^2\epsilon)/2 + (1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta^4(1 + \delta^2(1 + \delta))) \epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\quad + 8(1 + \delta^2(1 + \delta)) \delta^2 \epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2 \\
&\leq \langle x_i, v_i \rangle - \delta \mathbf{m} |x_i|^2 + \delta \mathbf{M} \\
&\quad + \delta(1 + (3 + 53\epsilon^2)\delta) |v_i|^2 + \delta(\epsilon/2 + 2\delta(2 + 26\epsilon^2\delta^2)) |x_i|^2 \\
&\quad + 2(1 + \delta^3(1 + 26\epsilon^2)) \delta \epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + 16\delta^2 \epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2 \\
&\leq \langle x_i, v_i \rangle - \delta \mathbf{m} |x_i|^2 / 2 + \delta \mathbf{M} + \delta(1 + 7\delta) |v_i|^2 \\
&\quad + 4\delta \epsilon d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + 16\delta^2 \epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_j|^2, \tag{54}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last inequality that $\epsilon \leq \mathbf{m}/4$ and $\delta \leq \mathbf{m}/40 \leq 1/40$.

By [44, Lemma 1.2.3], (49) and (41), it follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
U^{(q)}(y_i) &\leq U^{(q)}(x_i) + \left\langle \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i), -\frac{\delta^2}{2}\psi_i(x) + \delta v_i \right\rangle + 2^{-1} |y_i - x_i|^2 \\
&\leq U^{(q)}(x_i) - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \left| \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \right|^2 + \delta \langle \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i), v_i \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta^2 \epsilon}{2} \left(2|x_i|^2 + 2d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \right) + |y_i - x_i|^2 \\
&\leq U^{(q)}(x_i) - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \left| \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i) \right|^2 + \delta \langle \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i), v_i \rangle \\
&\quad + \delta^2(\epsilon + 2\delta^2) |x_i|^2 + 2\delta^2 |v_i|^2 + \epsilon \delta^2 d_0^{-1} (1 + 2\delta^2 \epsilon) \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 \\
&\leq U^{(q)}(x_i) - \mathbf{m}^2 \delta^2 |x_i|^2 / 8 + \mathbf{m} \mathbf{M} \delta^2 / 4 + \delta \langle \nabla U^{(q)}(x_i), v_i \rangle \\
&\quad + \delta^2(\epsilon + 2\delta^2) |x_i|^2 + 2\delta^2 |v_i|^2 + \epsilon \delta^2 d_0^{-1} (1 + 2\delta^2 \epsilon) \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 . \quad (55)
\end{aligned}$$

Using $\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon) \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 + (1 + \epsilon^{-1}) \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$ for $\epsilon = \delta^{-1}$, $\delta \leq \mathbf{m}/40 \leq 1/40$ and $\epsilon \leq \mathbf{m}/4 \leq 1/4$, and (46), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|y_i - y_j\|^2 \\
&= \left\| x_i - x_j - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \{\psi_i(x) - \psi_j(x)\} + \delta \{v_i - v_j\} \right\|^2 \\
&= (1 + \delta) \|x_i - x_j\|^2 + \delta^{-1} (1 + \delta) \delta^2 \left\| v_i - v_j - \frac{\delta}{2} (\psi_i(x) - \psi_j(x)) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \delta) \|x_i - x_j\|^2 + 2\delta (1 + \delta) \|v_i - v_j\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta^3}{2} (1 + \delta) \left[2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2 + 2\epsilon \|x_i - x_j\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq (1 + \delta (1 + \delta^2 (1 + \delta) (1 + \epsilon))) \|x_i - x_j\|^2 + \delta (1 + \delta) \|v_i - v_j\|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + 2\delta) \|x_i - x_j\|^2 + 2\delta \|v_i - v_j\|^2 . \quad (56)
\end{aligned}$$

and (48),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|p_i - p_j\|^2 \\
& \leq \|v_i - v_j\|^2 (1 + \delta) + \delta^{-1}(1 + \delta) \left| \frac{\delta}{2} (\psi_i(x) + \psi_j(x) + \psi_i(y) + \psi_j(y)) \right|^2 \\
& \leq \|v_i - v_j\|^2 (1 + \delta) \\
& \quad + \frac{\delta}{4}(1 + \delta) \left\{ 2|\psi_i(x) + \psi_i(y)|^2 + 2|\psi_j(x) + \psi_j(y) - \psi_i(x) - \psi_i(y)|^2 \right\} \\
& \leq \|v_i - v_j\|^2 (1 + \delta) + 4^{-1}\delta(1 + \delta)[4^3[2|x_i|^2 + 2\epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2]] \\
& \quad + 4^{-1}\delta(1 + \delta)[4^3(1 + 26\epsilon^2)\{\delta^4|x_i|^2 + \delta^4\epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_{j'}|^2 + \delta^2|v_i|^2\}] \\
& \quad + 4^{-1}\delta(1 + \delta)[4 \times 2(1 + \epsilon)\{|x_i - x_j|^2 + |y_i - y_j|^2\}] + 2^6\epsilon^2\delta^3(1 + \delta)d_0^{-1} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_{j'}|^2 \\
& \leq \|v_i - v_j\|^2 (1 + \delta) + 2^5\delta(1 + \delta)[|x_i|^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2] + \frac{2^6\epsilon^2\delta^3(1+\delta)}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_{j'}|^2 \\
& \quad + 4^2\delta(1 + \delta)(1 + 26\epsilon^2)\{\delta^4|x_i|^2 + \delta^4\epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_{j'}|^2 + \delta^2|v_i|^2\} \\
& \quad + 2\delta(1 + \delta)(1 + \epsilon)\{|x_i - x_j|^2(1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta|v_i - v_j|^2\} \\
& \leq \|v_i - v_j\|^2 (1 + \delta + 4\delta^2(1 + \delta)(1 + \epsilon)) + \frac{2^6\epsilon^2\delta^3(1+\delta)}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_{j'}|^2 \\
& \quad + |x_i|^2 \delta(1 + \delta)2^4[2 + (1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta^4] + |v_i|^2 16(1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta^3(1 + \delta) \\
& \quad + |x_i - x_j|^2 2(1 + \epsilon)\delta(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta) \\
& \quad + 4^2\delta(1 + \delta)\epsilon^2 d_0^{-1}[2 + (1 + 26\epsilon^2)\delta^4] \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_{j'}|^2 \\
& \leq \|v_i - v_j\|^2 (1 + \delta + 4\delta^2(1 + \delta)(1 + \epsilon)) + 48\delta|x_i|^2 + \delta|v_i|^2 + \frac{2^6\epsilon^2\delta^3(1+\delta)}{d_0} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |v_i - v_{j'}|^2 \\
& \quad + 3(1 + \epsilon)\delta|x_i - x_j|^2 + 48\delta\epsilon^2 d_0^{-1} \sum_{j'=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_{j'}|^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this last inequality with (52)-(53)-(54)-(55)-(56) in (47), and using that $\langle v_i, \nabla U^{(a)}(x_i) \rangle \leq |v_i|^2/2 + |x_i|/2$, $b_0 \leq b$, $\epsilon \leq 1/4$ and $\delta \leq 1/40$ complete the proof. \square

Lemma 19. Consider the four real sequences $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(b_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such as $a_0, b_0, c_0, e_0 > 0$ and define by recursion

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{k+1} &= (1 - \delta^2 C_{a,1})a_k - \delta c_k C_{a,2} + \delta^2 b_k C_{a,3} + \delta e_k C_{a,4} + C_{a,5}\delta(b_k - b_0) , \\
b_{k+1} &= (1 + C_{b,1}\delta + C_{b,2}\delta^2)b_k + \delta^2 C_{b,3}a_k + \delta c_k C_{b,4} + \delta e_k C_{b,5} + \delta(b_k - b_0) , \\
c_{k+1} &= c_k + C_{c,1}\delta a_k , \quad e_{k+1} = e_k + C_{e,1}\delta(a_k\delta + b_k + c_k + e_k) ,
\end{aligned}$$

for some non-negative real constants $\{C_{\square, \Delta} : \square \in \{a, b, c, e\}, \Delta \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}\}$ and $\delta > 0$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\delta \leq \tilde{\delta}_1 \wedge \tilde{\delta} , \quad k\delta \leq \tilde{T}_1 \wedge \tilde{T}_2 \wedge \tilde{T} , \tag{57}$$

for $\tilde{T}, \tilde{\delta} > 0$, with

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\delta}_1 &= [C_{b,2}]^{-1} \wedge [a_0 C_{a,2} C_{c,1} / \{8(\tilde{C}_{e,1} C_{a,4} + \tilde{C}_{b,3}(\tilde{\delta} C_{a,3} + C_{a,5}))\}] \\ \tilde{T}_1 &= 4^{-1} \{\tilde{C}_{b,1}^{-1} \wedge \tilde{C}_{b,2}^{-1/2} \wedge C_{e,1}^{-1} \wedge 1\}, \\ \tilde{T}_2 &= 4^{-1} \{[C_{a,2} / (4C_{b,4} C_{a,5})] \wedge [a_0 C_{a,2} C_{c,1} (2C_{a,5} \tilde{C}_{b,2} b_0)^{-1}] \wedge [a_0 (C_{a,2} c_0)^{-1}] \wedge [C_{c,1} C_{a,2}]^{-1/2}\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$2e_0 C_{a,4} \leq c_0 C_{a,2} / 4, \quad C_{a,5} (C_{b,1} b_0 + C_{b,5} e_0) + \tilde{C}_{e,1} C_{a,4} \leq C_{a,2} C_{c,1} a_0 / 8, \quad (58)$$

it holds

$$\begin{aligned}a_0 / 2 &\leq a_k \leq a_0 + \tilde{C}_{a,3} k \delta^2, \quad b_0 \leq b_k \leq 2b_0 + \tilde{C}_{b,3} k \delta^2, \quad e_k \leq 2e_0 + \tilde{C}_{e,1} k \delta + \tilde{C}_{e,2} k \delta^2, \\ c_0 + k \delta a_0 C_{c,1} / 2 &\leq c_k \leq c_0 + k \delta a_0 C_{c,1} + (\delta k)^2 \delta C_{c,1} \tilde{C}_{a,3} \\ b_k &\leq b_0 (1 + k \delta \tilde{C}_{b,1} + (k \delta)^2 \tilde{C}_{b,2}) + \delta^2 k \tilde{C}_{b,3} \\ e_k &\leq e_0 (1 + k \delta C_{e,1}) + \tilde{C}_{e,1} k \delta + \tilde{C}_{e,2} k \delta^2 \\ a_k &\leq a_0 (1 - k \delta \tilde{C}_{a,1} - (k \delta)^2 \tilde{C}_{a,2}) + \delta^2 k \tilde{C}_{a,3} \\ a_k &\geq a_0 (1 - k \delta C_{a,2} c_0 / a_0 - C_{a,2} C_{c,1} (k \delta)^2) \\ c_k &\geq c_0 + C_{c,1} k \delta a_0 - (k \delta)^2 C_{c,1} C_{a,2} c_0 - (k \delta)^3 C_{c,1}^2 C_{a,2} a_0,\end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{C}_{a,1} &= c_0 C_{a,2} / (2a_0), \quad \tilde{C}_{a,2} = a_0 [C_{a,1} \wedge C_{a,2} C_{c,1} / 16], \quad \tilde{C}_{a,3} = 2b_0 C_{a,3} + a_0 \tilde{T} (\tilde{C}_{a,1} + \tilde{T} \tilde{C}_{a,2}), \\ \tilde{C}_{b,1} &= C_{b,1} + c_0 C_{b,4} / b_0 + e_0 C_{b,5} / b_0, \\ \tilde{C}_{b,2} &= 4[C_{b,1} \tilde{C}_{b,1} + \tilde{C}_{b,1} + C_{b,4} (C_{c,1} a_0 + \tilde{C}_{e,1} C_{b,5})] / b_0, \\ \tilde{C}_{b,3} &= b_0 C_{b,2} + a_0 C_{b,3} + \tilde{T} (C_{b,3} \tilde{C}_{a,3} + b_0 C_{b,2} \tilde{C}_{b,1} + C_{b,5} \tilde{C}_{e,2} + \tilde{T} \tilde{C}_{a,3} C_{c,1} C_{b,4}) \\ \tilde{C}_{e,1} &= 2C_{e,1} (2b_0 + c_0 + \tilde{T} (C_{e,1} e_0 + C_{c,1} a_0 + \delta \tilde{C}_{b,3})) \\ \tilde{C}_{e,2} &= 2C_{e,1} (a_0 + \tilde{T} \delta \tilde{C}_{a,3} + \tilde{T}^2 C_{c,1} \tilde{C}_{a,3}).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is by induction. Equation (59) is trivially true for $k = 0$. Suppose that it is true for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose $\delta, k + 1$ satisfy (57). Then by definition, the induction hypothesis implies that $c_0 + (k+1)\delta a_0 C_{c,1} / 2 \leq c_{k+1} \leq c_0 + (k+1)\delta a_0 C_{c,1} + (k+1)\delta^2 C_{c,1} \tilde{C}_{a,3}$.

Similarly, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{k+1} &\leq [(1 + k\delta\tilde{C}_{b,1} + (k\delta)^2\tilde{C}_{b,2})b_0 + \tilde{C}_{b,3}\delta^2k](1 + C_{b,1}\delta + C_{b,2}\delta^2) \\
&\quad + \delta^2C_{b,3}(a_0 + \tilde{C}_{a,3}\delta^2k) + \delta C_{b,4}(c_0 + \delta kC_{c,1}a_0 + (\delta k)^2\delta C_{c,1}\tilde{C}_{a,3}) \\
&\quad + \delta C_{b,5}(2e_0 + \delta k\tilde{C}_{e,1} + \delta^2k\tilde{C}_{e,2}) \\
&\leq b_0 + \delta b_0(k\tilde{C}_{b,1} + C_{b,1} + c_0C_{b,4}/b_0 + 2C_{b,5}e_0/b_0) \\
&\quad + \delta^2kb_0 \left\{ \tilde{C}_{b,2} + k\delta\tilde{C}_{b,2}C_{b,1} + C_{b,1}\tilde{C}_{b,1} + \tilde{C}_{b,1} + C_{b,4} \frac{C_{c,1}a_0 + \tilde{C}_{e,1}C_{b,5}}{b_0} + k\delta(\delta\tilde{C}_{b,2}C_{b,2} + \tilde{C}_{b,2}) \right\} \\
&\quad + \delta^2(k\tilde{C}_{b,3} + b_0C_{b,2} + a_0C_{b,3} + \tilde{T}^2\tilde{C}_{a,3}C_{c,1}C_{b,4} + \tilde{T}C_{b,3}\tilde{C}_{a,3} + \tilde{T}b_0C_{b,2}\tilde{C}_{b,1} + \tilde{T}C_{b,5}\tilde{C}_{e,2}) \\
&\leq b_0(1 + (k+1)\delta\tilde{C}_{b,1} + k(k+2)\delta^2\tilde{C}_{b,2}) + \tilde{C}_{b,3}k\delta^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $k\delta \leq 4^{-1}[C_{b,1}^{-1} \wedge 1]$, $\delta \leq C_{b,2}^{-1}$ and $\tilde{C}_{b,1} \geq C_{b,1}$ by definition. In addition, $b_0 \leq b_{k+1} \leq 2b_0 + \delta^2k\tilde{C}_{b,3}$ since $\delta, k+1$ satisfy (57).

Similarly, using that $k\delta \leq (4C_{e,1})^{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{k+1} &\leq [(1 + k\delta C_{e,1})e_0 + \delta k\tilde{C}_{e,1} + \delta^2k\tilde{C}_{e,2}](1 + C_{e,1}\delta) \\
&\quad + C_{e,1}\delta^2(a_0 + \tilde{C}_{a,3}k\delta^2) + C_{e,1}\delta(2b_0 + \delta^2k\tilde{C}_{b,3}) + C_{e,1}\delta(c_0 + k\delta C_{c,1}a_0 + (k\delta)^2\delta C_{c,1}\tilde{C}_{a,3}) \\
&\leq (1 + (k+1)\delta C_{e,1})e_0 + \delta(k\tilde{C}_{e,1} + C_{e,1}(2b_0 + c_0 + \tilde{T}C_{e,1}e_0 + \tilde{T}\tilde{C}_{e,1} + \tilde{T}C_{c,1}a_0 + \delta\tilde{T}\tilde{C}_{b,3})) \\
&\quad + \delta^2(k\tilde{C}_{e,2} + C_{e,1}(k\delta\tilde{C}_{e,2} + a_0 + k\delta^2\tilde{C}_{a,3} + (k\delta)^2C_{c,1}\tilde{C}_{a,3})),
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of the upper bound for e_{k+1} .

Using the induction hypothesis, in particular the lower bounds on c_k and the definition of $\tilde{C}_{b,1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{k+1} &\leq a_0 - \delta(a_0k\tilde{C}_{a,1} + C_{a,2}c_0 - 2C_{a,4}e_0) - \delta^2a_0C_{a,1} \\
&\quad \delta^2(k\tilde{C}_{a,3} + 2b_0C_{a,3} + a_0\tilde{T}(\tilde{C}_{a,1} + \tilde{T}\tilde{C}_{a,2})) \\
&\quad - \delta^2k[k\tilde{C}_{a,2}a_0 + a_0C_{c,1}C_{a,2}/2 - C_{a,5}\tilde{C}_{b,1}b_0 - \tilde{C}_{e,1}C_{a,4} \\
&\quad - \delta kC_{a,5}\tilde{C}_{b,2}b_0 - \delta^2C_{a,3}\tilde{C}_{b,3} - \delta C_{a,4}\tilde{C}_{e,1} - \delta C_{a,5}\tilde{C}_{b,3}] \\
&\leq a_0 - \delta(a_0k\tilde{C}_{a,1} + C_{a,2}c_0 - 2C_{a,4}e_0 - c_0C_{b,4}C_{a,5}\delta k) - \delta^2a_0C_{a,1} \\
&\quad \delta^2(k\tilde{C}_{a,3} + 2b_0C_{a,3} + a_0\tilde{T}(\tilde{C}_{a,1} + \tilde{T}\tilde{C}_{a,2})) \\
&\quad - \delta^2k[k\tilde{C}_{a,2}a_0 + a_0C_{c,1}C_{a,2}/2 - C_{a,5}(C_{b,1}b_0 + C_{b,5}e_0) - \tilde{C}_{e,1}C_{a,4} \\
&\quad - \delta kC_{a,5}\tilde{C}_{b,2}b_0 - \delta^2C_{a,3}\tilde{C}_{b,3} - \delta C_{a,4}\tilde{C}_{e,1} - \delta C_{a,5}\tilde{C}_{b,3}].
\end{aligned}$$

Using the condition (58), $\delta, k+1$ satisfy (57), we get that $a_{k+1} \leq a_0 - a_0(k+1)\delta\tilde{C}_{a,1} - a_0(k+2)k\delta^2\tilde{C}_{a,2} - a_0C_{a,1}\delta^2 + \delta^2k\tilde{C}_{a,3} \leq a_0 - a_0(k+1)\delta\tilde{C}_{a,1} - a_0(k+1)^2\delta^2\tilde{C}_{a,2} + \delta^2\tilde{C}_{a,3}\delta^2(k+1)$. The lower bound for a_{k+1} proceeds similarly using the upper bound on c_k given by the induction hypothesis. Finally, the conditions $(k+1)\delta \leq 4^{-1}\{[a_0(C_{a,2}c_0)^{-1}] \wedge [C_{c,1}C_{a,2}]^{-1/2}\}$ and (58)

imply that $a_0/2 \leq a_{k+1} \leq a_0 + \delta^2 k \bar{C}_{a,3}$. The last inequality for c_{k+1} in (59) uses the induction hypothesis $a_k \geq a_0(1 - k\delta C_{a,2}c_0/a_0 - C_{a,2}C_{c,1}(k\delta)^2)$ and $c_{k+1} = c_k + C_{c,1}\delta a_k$. \square

Lemma 20. *Assume that **H4** holds. Let $\mathbf{o} = (a_0, b_0, c_0, 2b_0, e_0, f_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, $\bar{T}, \bar{\delta} > 0$ and denote*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{C}_{a,1} &= \mathfrak{m}/(3 \times 2^5), \quad \bar{C}_{a,2} = \mathfrak{m}/(3 \times 2^6), \quad \bar{C}_{a,3} = 20b_0 + a_0\bar{T}(\bar{C}_{a,1} + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,2}), \\ \bar{C}_{b,1} &= \epsilon + [c_0(1 + 7\bar{\delta}) + e_0]/b_0, \quad \bar{C}_{b,2,0} = 4[(1 + \epsilon)\bar{C}_{b,1} + (1 + 7\bar{\delta})(2a_0 + \bar{C}_{e,1}\epsilon)/b_0], \\ \bar{C}_{b,3,0} &= 17b_0 + 2a_0 + \bar{T}(2\bar{C}_{a,3} + 17b_0\bar{C}_{b,1} + \epsilon\bar{C}_{e,2} + 20\bar{T}(1 + 7\bar{\delta})), \\ \bar{C}_{b,2} &= \bar{C}_{b,2,0} + c_0\mathfrak{m}/8 + a_0\mathfrak{m}\bar{T}/4, \quad \bar{C}_{b,3} = \bar{C}_{b,3,0} + 20b_0 + a_0\bar{T}(\bar{C}_{a,1} + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,2}), \\ \bar{C}_{e,1} &= 37[2b_0 + c_0 + \bar{T}(17c_0 + 2a_0 + \bar{\delta}\bar{C}_{b,3})], \quad \bar{C}_{e,2} = 37(a_0 + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,3}(\bar{\delta}\bar{C}_{a,3} + 2\bar{T})), \\ \bar{C}_{f,1} &= a_0\mathfrak{M}\bar{\delta} + \bar{C}_{a,3}\mathfrak{M}\bar{\delta}\bar{T} + b_0\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}\bar{\delta}/2 + \mathfrak{M}(c_0 + \bar{T}a_0). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon \leq \mathfrak{m}/4$ and suppose that

$$2 \times 48e_0 \leq c_0\mathfrak{m}/2^5, \quad \epsilon[b_0 + e_0 + 48\bar{C}_{e,1}] \leq a_0\mathfrak{m}/2^5. \quad (60)$$

Then, for any $\delta > 0$, $\eta \in [0, 1)$, and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_1 \wedge \bar{\delta}$ and $K\delta \leq \bar{T}_1 \wedge \bar{T}_2 \wedge \bar{T}$, and

$$\delta\eta[20b_0 + a_0\bar{T}(\bar{C}_{a,1} + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,2})] \leq \frac{c_0\mathfrak{m}}{3 \times 2^4}, \quad 2\delta\frac{(1-\eta)}{\delta K}[20b_0 + a_0\bar{T}(\bar{C}_{a,1} + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,2})] \leq \frac{a_0\mathfrak{m}}{3 \times 2^6}, \quad (61)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta}_1 &= 17^{-1} \wedge [\mathfrak{m}/40] \wedge [a_02^{-5}/(48\epsilon\bar{C}_{e,1} + \bar{C}_{b,3}(1 + 10\bar{\delta}))], \\ \bar{T}_1 &= 4^{-1} [17^{-1} \wedge \bar{C}_{b,1}^{-1} \wedge \bar{C}_{b,2,0}^{-1/2}], \\ \bar{T}_2 &= 4^{-1} \{ [2^{-5}/(1 + 7\bar{\delta})] \wedge [8^{-1}a_0/(\bar{C}_{b,2}b_0)] \wedge a_0(8c_0)^{-1} \wedge 2 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

it holds

(a) For any $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $V_\delta^K \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, v) \leq \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o}_K,i}(x, v)$, where $\mathbf{o}_K = (a_K, b_K, c_K, 2b_0, e_K, f_K)$

$$\begin{aligned} a_K &= a_0 - K\delta\bar{C}_{a,1}c_0 - (K\delta)^2\bar{C}_{a,2}a_0, \quad b_K = b_0(1 + K\delta\bar{C}_{b,1} + (K\delta)^2\bar{C}_{b,2}) + \delta^2K\bar{C}_{b,3}, \\ c_K &= c_0 + 2K\delta a_0, \quad e_K = e_0(1 + 17K\delta) + \bar{C}_{e,1}K\delta + \bar{C}_{e,2}K\delta^2, \\ f_K &= f_0 + K\delta\bar{C}_{f,1}. \end{aligned}$$

(b) In addition for any $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $V_\delta^k \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, v) \leq \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o}_k,i}(x, v)$, where $\mathbf{o}_k = (a_k, b_k, c_k, 2b_0, e_k, f_k)$

$$\begin{aligned} a_k &= a_0 + (k\delta)^2c_0\mathfrak{m}/8 + a_0\mathfrak{m}(k\delta)^3/4 + 2\bar{C}_{a,3}\delta^2k, \\ b_k &= 2b_0 + \delta^2k\bar{C}_{b,3}, \quad c_k = c_0 + 2k\delta a_0, \quad e_k = 2e_0 + \bar{C}_{e,1}k\delta + \bar{C}_{e,2}k\delta^2, \quad f_k = f_0 + k\delta\bar{C}_{f,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (a) Let $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_1$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $K\delta \leq \bar{T} \wedge \bar{T}_1 \wedge \bar{T}_2$ and $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $(a_0, b_0, c_0, e_0, f_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$. By Lemma 18, we have starting from $\tilde{\mathbf{o}}_0 = \mathbf{o}_0 = (a_0, b_0, c_0, 2b_0, e_0, f_0)$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$V_\delta^{k+1} \mathfrak{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{o}}_0, i}(x, v) \leq V_\delta \mathfrak{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{o}}_k, i}(x, v) \leq \mathfrak{V}_{\tilde{\mathbf{o}}_{k+1}, i}(x, v),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{o}}_{k+1} = (\tilde{a}_{k+1}, \tilde{b}_{k+1}, \tilde{c}_{k+1}, b_0, \tilde{e}_{k+1}, \tilde{f}_{k+1})$ are defined by the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{k+1} &= \tilde{a}_k(1 - \mathfrak{m}\delta^2/2) + 10\tilde{b}_k\delta^2 - \delta\mathfrak{m}\tilde{c}_k/8 + 48\epsilon\tilde{e}_k\delta + \delta|\tilde{b}_k - b_0| \\ \tilde{b}_{k+1} &= 2\delta^2\tilde{a}_k + (1 + \epsilon\delta + 17\delta^2)\tilde{b}_k + \delta(1 + 7\delta)\tilde{c}_k + \epsilon\tilde{e}_k\delta + \delta|\tilde{b}_k - b_0| \\ \tilde{c}_{k+1} &= 2\delta\tilde{a}_k + \tilde{c}_k, \quad \tilde{e}_{k+1} = \tilde{e}_k + 17\delta(\tilde{a}_k\delta + \tilde{b}_k + \tilde{c}_k + \tilde{e}_k) \\ \tilde{f}_{k+1} &= \tilde{f}_k + \tilde{a}_k\delta^2\mathfrak{M} + \tilde{b}_k\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{M}\delta^2/4 + \delta\mathfrak{M}\tilde{c}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 19, we get that for any $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_k &\leq a_0(1 - \mathfrak{m}k\delta c_0/(16a_0) - \mathfrak{m}(k\delta)^2/2^6) + (20b_0 + a_0\bar{T}(\bar{C}_{a,1} + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,2}))\delta^2k \\ \tilde{b}_k &\leq b_0(1 + k\delta\bar{C}_{b,1} + (k\delta)^2\bar{C}_{b,2,0}) + \bar{C}_{b,3,0}k\delta^2 \\ |\tilde{c}_k - c_0 - 2k\delta a_0| &\leq (k\delta)^2 c_0\mathfrak{m}/4 + a_0\mathfrak{m}(k\delta)^3/2 + 2(20b_0 + a_0\bar{T}(\bar{C}_{a,1} + \bar{T}\bar{C}_{a,2}))\delta^2k \\ \tilde{e}_k &\leq e_0(1 + 17k\delta) + k\delta\bar{C}_{e,1} + k\delta^2\bar{C}_{e,2}, \quad \tilde{f}_k \leq f_0 + \delta k\bar{C}_{f,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $|[c_k - c_0 - 2\delta k a_0] \langle v, x \rangle| \leq 2^{-1} |c_k - c_0 - 2\delta k a_0| [|x|^2 + |v|^2]$, (61) and $K\delta \leq 3 \times 2^{-5}$ completes the proof.

(b) The proof of the second statement follows the same lines and is omitted. \square

Lemma 21. Assume that **H4** holds and that $\epsilon \leq \mathfrak{m}/4$ and consider the notations introduced in Lemma 20. Then, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$, $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\delta, K, \eta)$, $\delta > 0$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{o} = (a_0, b_0, c_0, 2b_0, e_0, f_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, satisfying $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_1$, $K\delta \leq \bar{T} \wedge \bar{T}_1 \wedge \bar{T}_2$ with $\bar{T} > 0$, (60)-(61),

$$\begin{aligned} c_0(\eta - 1) + 2\eta a_0 \delta K &= 0, \quad c_0 \leq 2\sqrt{a_0 b_0}, \quad c_0/b_0 \leq \eta(1 - \eta)/(\delta K), \\ \bar{C}_{b,1} - c_0/b_0 &\leq (1 - \eta)/[4\delta K], \quad \delta K[\tilde{\eta}\bar{C}_{b,1} + \bar{C}_{b,2}] \leq (1 - \eta)/[4\delta K], \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

it holds

(a) For any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}), v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0}), g = (g_1, \dots, g_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\delta^K \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o}, i}(x, \eta v + \tilde{\eta}g) &\leq (1 - \bar{\rho}\boldsymbol{\omega}K\delta)[a_0|x_i|^2 + b_0|v_i|^2 + c_0\langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0U^{(q)}(x_i)] + f_K \\ &+ 2\eta\tilde{\eta}b_K\langle v_i, g_i \rangle + c_K\tilde{\eta}\langle x, g \rangle + \tilde{\eta}^2b_K|g_i|^2 + e_K \frac{\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j + g_i - g_j|^2], \end{aligned}$$

where $b_K \leq 2b_0 + \delta^2 K \bar{C}_{b,3}$, $e_K \leq 2e_0 + (K\delta)\bar{C}_{e,1} + K\delta^2\bar{C}_{e,2}$,

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = 1 - \eta^2$$

$$\bar{\rho}_\omega = [(c_0 + K\delta a_0)\bar{C}_{a,2}/(4a_0)] \wedge [(1 - \eta)/(4K\delta)] \wedge [(c_0 + K\delta a_0)\bar{C}_{a,2}/(4b_0 a_0)].$$

(b) In addition for any $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0})$, $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0})$, $g = (g_1, \dots, g_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\delta^K \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, \eta v + \tilde{\eta}g) &\leq \bar{C}_1 [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(a)}(x_i)] + f_K \\ &+ 2\eta\tilde{\eta}b_K \langle v_i, g_i \rangle + c_K \tilde{\eta} \langle x, g \rangle + \tilde{\eta}^2 b_K |g_i|^2 + e_K \frac{\epsilon}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j + g_i - g_j|^2], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{C}_1 = [\{a_0 + 2c_0 + \bar{T}a_0 + \bar{T}^2 c_0 \mathfrak{m}/8 + a_0 \mathfrak{m} \bar{T}^3/4 + 2\bar{C}_{a,3} \bar{\delta} \bar{T}\}/a_0] \vee [\{2b_0 + 2c_0 + \bar{T}a_0 + \bar{\delta} \bar{T} \bar{C}_{b,3}\}/b_0].$$

Remark 22. Note that the condition (63) is in particular satisfied choosing $b_0 = 1$, $a_0 = (1 - \eta)^2/[2(\delta K)^2]$ and $c_0 = \eta(1 - \eta)/(\delta K)$.

Proof. (a) Let $\delta > 0$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{o} = (a_0, b_0, c_0, 2b_0, e_0, f_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, satisfying $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_1 \wedge \bar{\delta}$, $K\delta \leq \bar{T} \wedge \bar{T}_1 \wedge \bar{T}_2$, (60)-(61)-(63). For any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0})$, $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0})$, $g = (g_1, \dots, g_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, using Lemma 20-(a), we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_\delta^K \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, \eta v + \tilde{\eta}g) &\leq a_K |x_i|^2 + b_K \eta^2 |v_i|^2 + c_K \eta \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(a)}(x_i) + f_K \\ &+ 2\eta\tilde{\eta}b_K \langle v_i, g_i \rangle + \tilde{\eta}^2 b_K |g_i|^2 + c_K \tilde{\eta} \langle x_i, g_i \rangle + \frac{\epsilon e_K}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j + g_i - g_j|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by (63) and using $c_K = c_0 + 2K\delta a_0$, $\eta c_K \langle x, v \rangle = c_0 \langle x, v \rangle$. Then under **H4**, since $U(0) = 0$, $U(x) \leq |x|^2$, and using (63), $b_K \eta^2 = (1 + \bar{C}_{b,1} K\delta + \bar{C}_{b,2} (K\delta)^2) b_0 (1 - (1 + \eta)(1 - \eta)) \leq b_0 (1 - \delta K(1 - \eta)/[2\delta K])$, we get setting $\bar{C}_{a,4} = K\delta \bar{C}_{a,2} (c_0 + \delta K a_0)/a_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\delta^K \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o},i}(x, \eta v + \tilde{\eta}g) &\leq (1 - \bar{C}_{a,4}/2) a_0 |x_i|^2 + \delta K (1 - \eta) |v_i|^2 / [2K\delta] + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle \\ &+ (1 - \bar{C}_{a,4}/(4b_0)) 2b_0 U^{(a)}(x_i) + f_K + 2\eta\tilde{\eta}b_K \langle v_i, g_i \rangle + \tilde{\eta}^2 b_K |g_i|^2 + c_K \tilde{\eta} \langle x_i, g_i \rangle \\ &+ \frac{\epsilon e_K}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j + g_i - g_j|^2] \\ &\leq (1 - \bar{C}_{a,4}/2) a_0 |x_i|^2 + \delta K (1 - \eta) |v_i|^2 / [2K\delta] + c_0 (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K\delta) \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + \bar{\rho}_\omega K\delta c_0 \langle x, v \rangle \\ &+ (1 - \bar{C}_{a,4}/(4b_0)) 2b_0 U^{(a)}(x_i) + f_K + 2\eta\tilde{\eta}b_K \langle v_i, g_i \rangle + \tilde{\eta}^2 b_K |g_i|^2 + c_K \tilde{\eta} \langle x_i, g_i \rangle \\ &+ \frac{\epsilon e_K}{d_0} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j + g_i - g_j|^2], \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the condition $c_0 \leq 2\sqrt{a_0 b_0}$.

(b) The proof of the second statement follows the same lines using Lemma 20-(b) instead of Lemma 20-(a). \square

Lemma 23. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and G be a d -dimensional zero-mean Gaussian random variable with covariance matrix identity. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[(a + \langle G, x \rangle)^\ell] \leq a^{\ell-2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \left(a^2 + \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\ell |x|^2 \right)^{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\ell = e^2(\ell/2)^2 \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}^{1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}, \quad (64)$$

and $\mathbf{m}_{\ell'}$ is the ℓ' -th moment of the zero-mean one-dimensional Gaussian distribution with variance 1.

Proof. Expanding $(a + \langle G, x \rangle)^\ell$ and using that $\langle G, x \rangle$ is a zero-mean Gaussian random variable with variance $|x|^2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(a + \langle G, x \rangle)^\ell] &= \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{k} a^{\ell-k} \mathbb{E}[\langle G, x \rangle^k] = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \binom{\ell}{2k} |x|^{2k} a^{\ell-2k} \mathbf{m}_{2k}^{2k/2k} \\ &\leq a^{\ell-2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \binom{\ell}{2k} |x|^{2k} a^{2(\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - k)} \mathbf{m}_{2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}^{2k/2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Jensen inequality for the last step. Using that $\binom{\ell}{2k} \leq (e\ell/(2k))^{2k} \leq (e^2\ell/2)^k (\ell/(2k))^k \leq (e^2(\ell/2)^2 \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor^{-1})^k \binom{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}{k}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(a + \langle G, x \rangle)^\ell] &\leq a^{\ell-2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} (e^2(\ell/2)^2 \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor^{-1})^k \binom{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}{k} |x|^{2k} a^{2(\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - k)} \mathbf{m}_{2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}^{2k/2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \\ &\leq a^{\ell-2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \left(a^2 + e^2(\ell/2)^2 \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor^{-1} |x|^2 \mathbf{m}_{2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}^{1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \right)^{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Define for any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}), v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o}}^{(\ell)}(x, v) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \mathfrak{V}_{\mathbf{o}, i}^\ell(x, v).$$

Lemma 24. *Assume that **H4** holds and that $\epsilon \leq \mathfrak{m}/4$. Then, for any $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (K, \delta, \eta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$, $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{o} = (a_0, b_0, c_0, 2b_0, e_0, f_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, satisfying $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_1 \wedge \bar{\delta}$, $K\delta \leq \bar{T} \wedge \bar{T}_1 \wedge \bar{T}_2$ with $\bar{T}, \bar{\delta} > 0$, (60)-(61)-(63), it holds:*

(a) For any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}), v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_\omega \mathfrak{W}_{\mathbf{o},i}^\ell(x, v) &\leq (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^\ell [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(g)}(x_i)]^\ell \\ &\quad + 4^\ell \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor \bar{E}_\ell [(a_0 \bar{D}_1 + b_0 (\bar{D}_2 + 2\bar{D}_1) + c_0 \bar{D}_1^{1/2} \bar{D}_2^{1/2})^\ell + \bar{E}_\ell^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + f_K^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell \left[d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j|^2 \right]^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{D}_1 = 2c_K^2 \tilde{\eta}^2 / (a_0^2 \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta), \quad \bar{D}_2 = 32(\tilde{\eta}\eta)^2 / (\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta), \quad \bar{E}_\ell = [4(\tilde{\eta}\eta b_K)^2 \bar{D}_2 + 2(c_K \tilde{\eta})^2 \bar{D}_1] \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\ell. \quad (65)$$

(b) In addition, if for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$\epsilon \leq \ell^{1/(\ell-1)} (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4), \quad 24e_K \epsilon (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1/\ell} \leq \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 8, \quad (66)$$

for any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}), v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_\omega \mathfrak{W}_{\mathbf{o}}^{(\ell)}(x, v) &\leq (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 8)^\ell \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(g)}(x_i)]^\ell \\ &\quad + 4^\ell \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor d_0 \bar{E}_\ell [(a_0 \bar{D}_1 + b_0 (\bar{D}_2 + 2\bar{D}_1) + c_0 \bar{D}_1^{1/2} \bar{D}_2^{1/2})^\ell + \bar{E}_\ell^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} d_0 (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + f_K^\ell]. \end{aligned}$$

(c) Finally, for any $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_0}), v = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\eta V_\delta^k \mathfrak{W}_{\mathbf{o}}^{(\ell)}(x, v) &\leq \bar{C}_2^\ell \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(g)}(x_i)]^\ell \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} d_0 (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + f_K^\ell], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{C}_2 = (1 + \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4) [\bar{C}_1 + ([4(\tilde{\eta}\eta b_K)^2 b_0^{-1}] \vee [(c_K \tilde{\eta})^2 a_0^{-1}])] + 24(1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1/\ell} \epsilon e_K. \quad (67)$$

Proof. Let $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}_1 \wedge \bar{\delta}$, $K\delta \leq \bar{T} \wedge \bar{T}_1 \wedge \bar{T}_2$ with $\bar{T}, \bar{\delta} > 0$, satisfying (60)-(61)-(63).

(a) Consider $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Using Lemma 21-(a) we have, for any $g = (g_1, \dots, g_{d_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\delta^K \mathfrak{W}_{\mathbf{o},i}^\ell(x, \eta v + \tilde{\eta} g) &\leq (1 + \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^{\ell-1} \{A + 2\tilde{\eta}\eta b_K \langle v_i, g_i \rangle + c_K \tilde{\eta} \langle x_i, g_i \rangle\}^\ell \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta)^{\ell-1} [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell |g|^2 + \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} |g_i - g_j|^{2\ell} + f_K^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta)^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell \left[d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j|^2]^\ell \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $A = (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta)[a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(q)}(x_i)]$. Then, taking expectation and Lemma 23 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} P_\omega \mathfrak{Y}_{\mathbf{o},i}^\ell(x, v) &\leq (1 + \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^{\ell-1} A^{\ell-2[\ell/2]} B^{[\ell/2]} \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta)^{\ell-1} [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + f_K^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta)^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j|^2]^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

with $B = A^2 + [4(\eta \tilde{\eta} b_K)^2 |v_i|^2 + (c_K \tilde{\eta})^2 |x_i|^2] \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n$. For $|x|^2 \geq \bar{D}_1$ and $|v|^2 \geq \bar{D}_2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 + \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^{\ell-1} A^{\ell-2[n/2]} B^{[n/2]} \\ &\leq (1 + \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^\ell A^{\ell-2[n/2]} ((1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 2)[a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(q)}(x_i)]^{[n/2]} \\ &\leq (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^\ell [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(q)}(x_i)]^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $(t + s)^{\ell'} - t^{\ell'} \leq \ell' s(t + s)^{\ell'-1}$, for $s, t \geq 0$ and $\ell' \geq 1$, completes the proof.

(b) The proof of the last statement is direct consequence of the first one since by Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_\omega \mathfrak{Y}_{\mathbf{o}}^{(\ell)}(x, v) &\leq (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^\ell \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(q)}(x_i)]^\ell \\ &\quad + 4^\ell [\ell/2] d_0 \bar{E}_\ell [(a_0 \bar{D}_1 + b_0 (\bar{D}_2 + 2\bar{D}_1) + c_0 \bar{D}_1^{1/2} \bar{D}_2^{1/2})^\ell + \bar{E}_\ell^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} d_0 [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + f_K^\ell] \\ &\quad + 2 \times 24^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} [|x_i|^2 + |v_i|^2]^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

and using $(1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^\ell + 2 \times 24^{\ell-1} [a_0^{-1} \vee b_0^{-1}]^\ell (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell \leq (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^\ell + \ell (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4)^{\ell-1} [24e_K \epsilon [a_0^{-1} \vee b_0^{-1}] (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1/\ell}] \leq (1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4 + 24e_K \epsilon [a_0^{-1} \vee b_0^{-1}] (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1/\ell})^\ell$ by (66).

(c) Following the same lines as in the proof (a) using Lemma 21-(b) instead of Lemma 21-(a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\eta V_\delta^k \mathfrak{Y}_{\mathbf{o},i}^\ell(x, v) &\leq \bar{C}_{2,0}^\ell [a_0 |x_i|^2 + b_0 |v_i|^2 + c_0 \langle x_i, v_i \rangle + 2b_0 U^{(q)}(x_i)]^\ell \\ &\quad + 4^\ell [\ell/2] \bar{E}_\ell [(a_0 \bar{D}_1 + b_0 (\bar{D}_2 + 2\bar{D}_1) + c_0 \bar{D}_1^{1/2} \bar{D}_2^{1/2})^\ell + \bar{E}_\ell^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} [\tilde{\eta}^{2\ell} b_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell q^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + f_K^\ell] \\ &\quad + 12^{\ell-1} (1 + 4/(\bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta))^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell e_K^\ell d_0^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_0} [|x_i - x_j|^2 + |v_i - v_j|^2]^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\bar{C}_{2,0} = (1 + \bar{\rho}_\omega K \delta / 4) [\bar{C}_1 + ([4(\eta \tilde{\eta} b_K)^2 b_0^{-1}] \vee [(c_K \tilde{\eta})^2 a_0^{-1}])].$$

The proof is then easily completed. \square

Proof of Theorem 17. Taking

$$a_0 = \gamma_0^2/2, \quad b_0 = 1, \quad c_0 = \eta\gamma_0, \quad \gamma_0 = (1 - \eta)/(\delta K), \quad f_0 = 0, \quad e_0 = 0.$$

As mentioned in Remark 22, the first condition in (63) is satisfied for this case. In addition, for this choice of parameter, the constants appearing in Lemma 20 become:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{a,1} &= \mathfrak{m}/(3 \times 2^5), \quad C_{a,2} = \mathfrak{m}/(3 \times 2^6), \quad C_{a,3} = 20 + \gamma_0^2 \bar{T}(\mathfrak{m}/(3 \times 2^5) + \bar{T}\mathfrak{m}/(3 \times 2^6))/2, \\ C_{b,1} &= \epsilon + \eta\gamma_0(1 + 7\bar{\delta}), \quad C_{b,2,0} = 4[(1 + \epsilon)C_{b,1} + (1 + 7\bar{\delta})(\gamma_0^2 + C_{e,1}\epsilon)], \\ C_{b,3,0} &= 17 + \gamma_0^2 + \bar{T}(2C_{a,3} + 17C_{b,1} + \epsilon C_{e,2} + 20\bar{T}(1 + 7\bar{\delta})), \\ C_{b,2} &= C_{b,2,0} + \eta\gamma_0\mathfrak{m}/8 + a_0\mathfrak{m}\bar{T}/4, \quad C_{b,3} = C_{b,3,0} + 20 + 2C_{a,3}, \\ C_{e,1} &= 37[2 + \eta\gamma_0 + \bar{T}(17\eta\gamma_0 + \gamma_0^2 + \bar{\delta}C_{b,3})], \quad C_{e,2} = 37(\gamma_0^2 + \bar{T}C_{a,3}(\bar{\delta}C_{a,3} + 2\bar{T})), \\ C_{f,1} &= \gamma_0^2\mathfrak{M}\bar{\delta}/2 + \bar{C}_{a,3}\mathfrak{M}\bar{\delta}\bar{T} + \mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{M}\bar{\delta}/2 + \mathfrak{M}(\eta\gamma_0 + \bar{T}\gamma_0^2/2). \end{aligned}$$

Then, with these notations, $\delta_1, \bar{T}_1, \bar{T}_2$ in (62) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1 &= 17^{-1} \wedge [\mathfrak{m}/40] \wedge [\gamma_0^2 2^{-6}/(48\epsilon C_{e,1} + C_{b,3}(1 + 10\bar{\delta}))], \\ T_1 &= 4^{-1} \left[17^{-1} \wedge C_{b,1}^{-1} \wedge C_{b,2,0}^{-1/2} \right], \\ T_2 &= 4^{-1} \{ [2^{-5}/(1 + 7\bar{\delta})] \wedge [2^4 \gamma_0^2 / C_{b,2}] \wedge \gamma_0 / 2^4 \wedge 2 \}. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

and the condition (60)-(61) are equivalent to

$$\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1, \quad \epsilon_1 = \gamma_0^2 \mathfrak{m} 2^{-6} / [1 + 48C_{e,1}], \tag{69}$$

and

$$\delta \leq \delta_2, \quad \delta_2 = \gamma_0 \mathfrak{m} (3 \times 2^8)^{-1} / [20 + \gamma_0^2 \bar{T} (C_{a,1} + \bar{T} C_{a,2}) / 2]. \tag{70}$$

In addition,

$$b_K \leq \bar{b}, \quad \bar{b} = 2 + \bar{T}\bar{\delta}C_{b,3}, \quad e_K \leq K\delta\bar{e}, \quad \bar{e} = (C_{e,1} + \bar{\delta}C_{e,2}). \tag{71}$$

Furthermore, the second line of (63) is equivalent to $\delta \leq 1/(7 \times 8)$ and

$$K\delta \leq T_3, \quad T_3 = 4^{-1} \gamma_0 / [(1 - \eta^2)^{1/2} C_{b,1} + C_{b,2}]. \tag{72}$$

Then, the proof is an easy consequence of Lemma 24 with ρ_ω given by (45). Condition (66) is equivalent using (71) to

$$\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2, \quad \epsilon_2 = [\ell^{1/(\ell-1)}(1 - \bar{\rho}_\omega K\delta/4)] \wedge [(8 \times 24)^{-1} \bar{\rho}_\omega / \{\bar{e}(1 + 4/(\rho_\omega \bar{T}))^{(\ell-1)/\ell}\}]. \tag{73}$$

and (65)-(67) can be written using (71) and $1 + \eta \leq 2$, as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= 16\gamma_0\rho_\omega^{-1}\{\bar{\eta}^2 + \bar{T}^2\gamma_0^2\}, \quad D_2 = 32 \times 2\bar{\eta}^2\gamma_0/\rho_\omega, \\
E_\ell &= \delta K F_\ell, \quad F_\ell = 8\gamma_0[\bar{\eta}^2(2 + C_{b,3}\bar{\delta}\bar{T})D_2 + (\gamma_0^2\bar{\eta}^2 + \gamma_0^4\bar{T}^2)D_1]\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\ell, \\
C_2 &= (1 + \rho_\omega\bar{T}/4)[C_1 + ([8\gamma_0\bar{T}\bar{\eta}^2(2 + C_{b,3}\bar{\delta}\bar{T})] \vee [16\gamma_0\bar{T}(\bar{\eta}^2 + \gamma_0^2\bar{T}^2)])] \\
&\quad + 24\bar{T}(C_{e,1} + \bar{\delta}C_{e,2})(4 + \rho_\omega)^{(\ell-1)/\ell}, \\
C_1 &= [2\{(1 + \bar{T} + \bar{T}^3\mathbf{m}/4)\gamma_0^2/2 + 2\bar{\eta}(1 + \bar{T}^2\mathbf{m}/8)\gamma_0 + 2C_{a,3}\bar{\delta}\bar{T}\}/\gamma_0^2] \\
&\quad \vee [2 + 2\gamma_0\bar{\eta} + \bar{T}\gamma_0^2/2 + \bar{\delta}\bar{T}C_{b,3}],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_\ell$ is defined in (64). It completes the proof of (44) with

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{1,\ell} &= C_2, \\
C_{2,\ell} &= 4^\ell \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor F_\ell[(a_0D_1 + b_0(D_2 + 2D_1) + c_0D_1^{1/2}D_2^{1/2})^\ell + \bar{T}^\ell F_\ell^\ell], \\
C_{3,\ell} &= 2 \times 12^{\ell-1} \rho_\omega^{1-\ell} (4 + \rho_\omega\bar{T})^{\ell-1} [4^\ell \gamma_0^\ell (2 + \bar{\delta}\bar{T}C_{b,3}) \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + 8^{\ell-1} \epsilon^\ell (C_{e,1} + \bar{\delta}C_{e,2})^\ell \mathbf{m}_{2\ell} + C_{f,1}], \\
&\hspace{15em} (74)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{m}_{\ell'}$ is the ℓ' -th moment of the zero-mean one-dimensional Gaussian distribution with variance 1. □