
Gradient is All You Need?

Konstantin Riedl^{1,2} Timo Klock³ Carina Geldhauser^{1,2} Massimo Fornasier^{1,2,4}

¹Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

²Munich Center for Machine Learning, Munich, Germany

³Deeptech Consulting, Oslo, Norway

⁴Munich Data Science Institute, Munich, Germany

{konstantin.riedl, carina.geldhauser, massimo.fornasier}@ma.tum.de

timo@deeptechconsulting.no

Abstract

In this paper we provide a novel analytical perspective on the theoretical understanding of gradient-based learning algorithms by interpreting consensus-based optimization (CBO), a recently proposed multi-particle derivative-free optimization method, as a stochastic relaxation of gradient descent. Remarkably, we observe that through communication of the particles, CBO exhibits a stochastic gradient descent (SGD)-like behavior despite solely relying on evaluations of the objective function. The fundamental value of such link between CBO and SGD lies in the fact that *CBO is provably globally convergent to global minimizers for ample classes of nonsmooth and nonconvex objective functions*, hence, on the one side, offering a novel explanation for the success of stochastic relaxations of gradient descent. On the other side, contrary to the conventional wisdom for which zero-order methods ought to be inefficient or not to possess generalization abilities, our results unveil an intrinsic gradient descent nature of such heuristics. This viewpoint furthermore complements previous insights into the working principles of CBO, which describe the dynamics in the mean-field limit through a nonlinear nonlocal partial differential equation that allows to alleviate complexities of the nonconvex function landscape. Our proofs leverage a completely nonsmooth analysis, which combines a novel quantitative version of the Laplace principle (log-sum-exp trick) and the minimizing movement scheme (proximal iteration). In doing so, we furnish useful and precise insights that explain how stochastic perturbations of gradient descent overcome energy barriers and reach deep levels of nonconvex functions. Instructive numerical illustrations support the provided theoretical insights.

1 Introduction

Gradient-based learning algorithms, such as stochastic gradient descent (SGD), AdaGrad [1], RMSProp and Adam [2], just to name a few of the most known and advocated, have undoubtedly been one of the cornerstones of the astounding successes of machine learning [3–5] in the last decades. In particular, the efficient computation of gradients through backpropagation [6] and automatic differentiation [7] has allowed practitioners to leverage nowadays enormous amounts of data to train huge models [8]. Despite an ever-growing relevance of advancing our mathematical understanding concerning the behavior of gradient-based learning algorithms when employed to train neural networks, the fundamental reasons behind their empirical successes largely remain elusive [9] and defy our theoretical understanding [10]. Yet, over the last years, several studies have started shedding light on the peculiarities of neural network loss functions as well as the training dynamics of SGD and its variants, see, e.g., [10–24] and references therein.

In this work, we consider the more generic, ubiquitous problem of finding a global minimizer of a potentially nonsmooth and nonconvex objective function $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., solving

$$x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}(x). \quad (1)$$

We shall provide a novel analytical perspective on the theoretical understanding of gradient-based learning algorithms for such general global optimization problem by interpreting a recently proposed multi-particle metaheuristic derivative-free (zero-order) optimization method, called consensus-based optimization (CBO) [25], as a stochastic relaxation of gradient descent (GD), see Theorem 1 below for the statement of our main result and Figure 1 for an illustration. The essential benefit of establishing such link between CBO and (S)GD lies in the fact that CBO is provably capable of achieving global convergence towards global minimizers for rich classes of nonsmooth and nonconvex objective functions [26–31], see Section 3 and in particular Theorem 4 for a review of [30, 31]. Hence, such up to now largely unexplored connection between mathematically explainable derivative-free optimization methods and gradient-based learning algorithms discloses, on the one side, a novel and complementary perspective on why stochastic relaxations of GD are so successful, and, conversely, but no less surprising, unveils an intrinsic GD nature of heuristics on the other.

Before elaborating on the aforementioned connection, let us introduce CBO in detail, distill its fundamental conceptual principles, and explain the mechanisms behind its functioning. Inspired by particle swarm optimization (PSO) [32], the method employs an interacting stochastic system of N particles X^1, \dots, X^N to explore the domain and to form consensus about the global minimizer x^* over time. More concretely, given a finite number of time steps K , a discrete time step size $\Delta t > 0$ and denoting the position of the i -th particle at time step $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ by X_k^i , this position is computed for user-specified parameters $\alpha, \lambda, \sigma > 0$ according to the iterative update rule

$$X_k^i = X_{k-1}^i - \Delta t \lambda (X_{k-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_{k-1}^N)) + \sigma D(X_{k-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_{k-1}^N)) B_k^i, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\rho}_k^N$ denotes the empirical measure of the particles at time step k , i.e., $\hat{\rho}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_k^i}$. In the spirit of the exploration-exploitation philosophy of evolutionary computation techniques [33–35], the dynamics (2) of each particle is governed by two competing terms, one being stochastic, the other deterministic in nature. The first of the two terms on the right-hand side of (2) imposes a deterministic drift towards the so-called consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$, which is defined for a measure $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho) := \int x \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L^1(\varrho)}} d\varrho(x), \quad \text{with} \quad \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) := \exp(-\alpha \mathcal{E}(x)). \quad (3)$$

Notice that in the case $\varrho = \hat{\rho}_k^N$, Formula (3) is just a weighted (exploiting the particles' knowledge of their objective function values) convex combination of the positions X_k^i . To be precise, owed to the particular choice of Gibbs weights $\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$, larger mass is attributed to particles with comparably low objective value, whereas only little mass is given to particles whose value is undesirably high. This facilitates the interpretation that $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_k^N)$ is an approximation to $\arg \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \mathcal{E}(X_k^i)$, which improves as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and which can be regarded as a proxy for the global minimizer x^* , based on the information currently available to the particles. Theoretically, this is justified by the log-sum-exp trick or the Laplace principle [36, 37]. Let us further remark that the particles communicate and exchange information amongst each other exclusively through sharing the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$. The other term in (2) is a stochastic diffusion injecting randomness into the dynamics, thereby encoding its explorative nature. Given i.i.d. Gaussian random vectors B_k^i in \mathbb{R}^d with zero mean and covariance matrix $\Delta t \text{Id}$, each particle is subject to anisotropic noise, i.e., $D(\bullet) = \text{diag}(\bullet)$,¹ which favors exploration the farther a particle is away from the consensus point in a certain direction. In particular, the diffusive character of the dynamics vanishes over time as consensus is reached. The described exploration-exploitation mechanism can be seen as a multi-particle reincarnation of similar ones executed by simulated annealing [38–40] and the annealed Langevin dynamics [41]. System (2) is complemented with independent initial data x_0^i distributed according to a common probability measure $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., $X_0^i = x_0^i \sim \rho_0$.

Hence, CBO distills fundamental principles from other popular and successful metaheuristics, in particular PSO and simulated annealing, but, let us emphasize, that it comes with two fundamental

¹ $\text{diag} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ denotes the operator mapping a vector onto a diagonal matrix with the vector as its diagonal.

advantages compared to these algorithms. Firstly, it outperforms such well-established methods in experiments over challenging benchmarks [42–44]. Secondly, and remarkably, it comes with solid and robust theoretical guarantees of global convergence to global minimizers [26–31]. For these reasons, it has to be considered a baseline for understanding heuristics.




Figure 1: An illustration of the intuition that the CBO scheme (4) can be regarded as a stochastic derivative-free (zero-order) relaxation of gradient descent. To find the global minimizer x^* of the nonconvex objective function \mathcal{E} depicted in (a), we run the CBO algorithm (2) for $K = 250$ iterations with parameters $\Delta t = 0.1$, $\alpha = 100$, $\lambda = 1$ and $\sigma = 1.6$, and $N = 200$ particles, initialized i.i.d. according to $\rho_0 = \mathcal{N}((8, 8), 0.5\text{Id})$. This experiment is performed 50 times. For each run we depict in (b) the positions of the consensus points computed during the CBO algorithm (2), i.e., the iterates of the CBO scheme (4) for $k = 1, \dots, K$. The color of the individual points corresponds to time, i.e., iterates at the beginning of the scheme are plotted in blue, whereas later iterates are colored orange. We observe that, after starting close to the initial position, the trajectories of the consensus points follow the path of the valley leading to the global minimizer x^* , until it is reached. In particular, unlike gradient descent (cf. Figure 2b), the scheme (4) has the capability of jumping over locally deeper passages. Such desirable behavior is observed also for the Langevin dynamics (6) (see Figure 2c), which can be regarded as a stochastic (noisy) version of gradient descent.

An insightful theoretical understanding of the behavior of CBO is to be gained, as we are about to show, by tracing the dynamics of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$ of the CBO algorithm (2). For this purpose, let us introduce the CBO scheme as the iterates $(x_k^{\text{CBO}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ defined according to

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{CBO}} &= x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_k^N), \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{\rho}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_k^i}, \\ x_0^{\text{CBO}} &= x_0 \sim \rho_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the particles' positions X_k^i are given by Equation (2). The main theoretical finding of this work is concerned with the observation that the iterates of the CBO scheme (4), i.e., the trajectory of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$, follow, with high probability, a stochastically perturbed GD. This is illustrated in Figure 1 below and made rigorous in the following Theorem 1, whose proof is deferred to Section 4.1.

Theorem 1 (CBO is a stochastic relaxation of GD (main result)). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be L -smooth² and satisfy minimal assumptions (summarized in Assumption 2 below). Then, for $\tau > 0$ (satisfying $\tau < 1/(-2\Lambda)$ if $\Lambda < 0$) and with parameters $\alpha, \lambda, \sigma, \Delta t > 0$ such that $\alpha \gtrsim \frac{1}{\tau} d \log d$, the iterates $(x_k^{\text{CBO}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of the CBO scheme (4) follow a stochastically perturbed GD, i.e., they obey*

$$x_k^{\text{CBO}} = x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} - \tau \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}) + g_k, \quad (5)$$

where g_k is stochastic noise fulfilling for each $k = 1, \dots, K$ with high probability the quantitative estimate $\|g_k\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(|\lambda - 1/\Delta t| + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t} + \sqrt{\tau/\alpha} + N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}(\tau)$.

²A function $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is L -smooth if $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x')\|_2 \leq L \|x - x'\|_2$ for all $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The statement of Theorem 1 has to be read with a twofold interpretation, highlighting the two sides of the same coin. First, in view of the powerful capability of CBO to converge to global minimizers for rich classes of nonsmooth and nonconvex objective functions (see Section 3 and in particular Theorem 4), Theorem 1 states that there exist stochastic relaxations of GD that are provably able to robustly and reliably overcome energy barriers and reach deep levels of nonconvex functions. Such relaxations may even be derivative-free and do not require smoothness of the objective, as is the case with CBO. Second, and conversely, against the common wisdom that derivative-free optimization heuristics search the domain mainly by random exploration and therefore ought to be inefficient, we provide evidence that such heuristics in fact work successfully in finding benign optima [45–51], precisely because they are suitable stochastic relaxations of gradient-based methods. The similar behavior of CBO and SGD is further substantiated by the following numerical illustration. While the trajectories of the CBO scheme (4) are to be seen Figure 1b, we depict for comparison in Figure 2c below the discretized dynamics of the annealed Langevin dynamics [52–54],

$$dX_t = -\nabla\mathcal{E}(X_t) dt + \sqrt{2\beta_t^{-1}} dB_t. \quad (6)$$

Both stochastic methods are capable of global minimization while overcoming energy barriers and escaping local minima. For analyses of the (annealed) Langevin dynamics we refer to [41, 55–58].

Let us now comment on a few more technical aspects of Theorem 1. First to be mentioned is that, in particular compared to Polyak-Łojasiewicz-like conditions [59] or certain families of log-Sobolev inequalities [11] required to analyze the dynamics of gradient-based methods such as (S)GD or the Langevin dynamics, the assumptions under which our statement holds are rather weak. Combined with similar assumptions being sufficient to prove global convergence of CBO (as stated in Theorem 4), this extends the class of functions, for which stochastic gradient-based methods are successful in global optimization. Secondly, the stochastic perturbations g_k in (5) are not generic as they obey precise scalings. In particular, they get tighter as soon as the discrete CBO time step size $\Delta t \ll 1$, the drift parameter $\lambda \approx 1/\Delta t \gg 1$, the noise parameter $\sigma \ll 1$, the weight parameter $\alpha \gg 1$, the number of employed particles $N \gg 1$ and the GD time step size $\tau \ll 1$. For the latter we conjecture a potential amelioration of the estimate by refining even more the quantitative Laplace principle involved in the proof of Proposition 7, which would allow to improve the order $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ dependence of the bound for $\|g_k\|_2$. Yet, as it stands, the $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ term is about a deterministic *bounded* perturbation of the gradient, which is possibly of smaller magnitude than the gradient. Let us stress that such bounded perturbations of gradients alone do not allow to overcome local energy barriers in general (just think of a local minimizer, around which the magnitude of gradients grows faster than the displacement: any movement from the minimizer ought necessarily to get reverted). Hence, it is the stochastic part of the perturbation that enables the convergence to global minimizers. In fact, for a moderate time step size $\Delta t > 0$, a drift parameter $\lambda > 0$ relatively small compared to $1/\Delta t$, a non-insignificant noise parameter $\sigma > 0$, a moderate value of the weight parameter $\alpha > 0$ and a modest number N of particles, CBO is factually a stochastic relaxation of GD with strong noise.

Apart from gaining primarily theoretical insights from this link, let us conclude the introduction by mentioning a further, more practical aspect of establishing such a connection. In several real-world applications, including various machine learning settings, using gradients may be undesirable or even not feasible. This can be due to the black-box nature or nonsmoothness of the objective, memory limitations constraining the use of automatic differentiation, a substantial presence of spurious local minima, or the fact that gradients carry relevant information about data, which one may wish to keep undisclosed. In machine learning, in specific, the problems of hyperparameter tuning [60, 61], convex bandits [62, 63], reinforcement learning [64], the training of sparse and pruned neural networks [65], and federated learning [66–68] stimulate interest in alternative methods to gradient-based ones. In such situations, if one still wishes to rely on a GD-like optimization behavior, Theorem 1 suggests the use of CBO (or related methods such as PSO [69]), which will be both reliable and efficient,³ with linear complexity in the number of deployed particles. We report, for instance, recent ideas in the setting of clustered federated learning [71], where CBO is leveraged to avoid reverse engineering of private data through exchange of gradients. While we do not empirically investigate the complexity of CBO or provide comparisons with the state of the art for different applications in this paper, a summary of the existing literature on this matter may be found in the footnote of Section 3.

³Needlessly to be said, but if gradients are available and inexpensive to compute, methods which exploit this information are expected to be more efficient and competitive. However, incorporating a gradient drift into CBO is possible and may bear advantages of theoretical and practical nature [70, 71].

Contributions. In view of the overwhelming empirical evidence that gradient-based learning algorithms exceed in a variety of machine learning tasks what is mathematically rigorously justified, we provide in this work a novel and surprising analytical perspective on their theoretical understanding by interpreting consensus-based optimization (CBO), which is guaranteed to globally converge to global minimizers of potentially nonsmooth and nonconvex loss functions [30, 31], as a stochastic relaxation of gradient descent (GD). Specifically, we show that in suitable scalings of its parameters, CBO — despite being a derivative-free (zero-order) optimization method — naturally approximates a stochastic gradient flow dynamics, hence implicitly behaves like a gradient-based (first-order) method, see Theorem 1 and Figure 1. To establish this connection we leverage a completely nonsmooth analysis that combines simultaneously a recently obtained quantitative version of the Laplace principle [30] (log-sum-exp trick) and the minimizing movement scheme [72] (proximal iteration [73]), which is well-known from gradient flow theory [74]. Our results furnish useful and precise insights that explain the mechanisms which enable stochastic perturbations of GD to overcome energy barriers and to reach deep levels of nonconvex objective functions, even allowing for global optimization. While the usual approach to a global analysis of (stochastic) GD requires the loss to be L -smooth and to obey the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition, for the global convergence of CBO merely local Lipschitz continuity and a certain growth condition around the global minimizer are required [30, 31]. By establishing such surprising link between stochastic GD on the one hand and metaheuristic black-box optimization algorithms such as CBO on the other, we not just allow for complementing our theoretical understanding of successfully deployed optimization algorithms in machine learning and beyond, but we also widen the scope of applications of methods which — in one way or another, be it explicitly or implicitly — estimate and exploit gradients.

Organization. Section 2 summarizes the main assumptions under which the theoretical results of this work are valid. In Section 3 we recapitulate state-of-the-art global convergence results for CBO in the setting of potentially nonsmooth and nonconvex objective functions \mathcal{E} . Section 4 is dedicated to presenting the technical details behind the main theoretical findings of this work. We first sketch how to interpret CBO as a stochastic relaxation of GD by introducing the consensus hopping scheme, which interconnects the derivative-free with the gradient-based world in optimization. It further highlights a connection between sampling and optimization. Afterwards, the proof of our main result, Theorem 1, is provided in Section 4.1 with the central technical tools being collected in Section 4.2. The proof details together with further discussions and insights are deferred to the supplemental material. Section 5 eventually concludes the paper by discussing future perspectives. In the GitHub repository <https://github.com/> we provide the implementation of the algorithms analyzed in this work and the code used to create the visualizations.

Notation. We write $\mathcal{C}(X)$ and $\mathcal{C}^k(X)$ for the spaces of continuous and k -times continuously differentiable functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, respectively. With ∇f we denote the gradient of a differentiable function f . $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, respectively $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the set containing all probability measures over \mathbb{R}^d (with finite p -th moment). $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is metrized by the Wasserstein- p distance W_p , see, e.g., [75, 76]. $\mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)$ denotes a Gaussian distribution with mean m and covariance matrix Σ .

2 Characterization of the class of objective functions

The theoretical findings of this work hold for objective functions satisfying the following conditions.

Assumption 2. *Throughout we consider objective functions $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

A1 *for which there exists $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathcal{E}(x^*) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}(x) =: \underline{\mathcal{E}}$,*

A2 *for which there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{E}(x) - \mathcal{E}(x')| \leq C_1(\|x\|_2 + \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 \quad \text{for all } x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (7)$$

$$|\mathcal{E}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{E}}| \leq C_2(1 + \|x\|_2^2) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (8)$$

A3 *for which either $\bar{\mathcal{E}} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}(x) < \infty$, or for which there exist $C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{E}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{E}} \geq C_3 \|x\|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with } \|x\|_2 \geq C_4, \quad (9)$$

A4 which are semi-convex (Λ -convex for some $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$), i.e., $\mathcal{E}(\bullet) - \frac{\Lambda}{2} \|\bullet\|_2^2$ is convex.

A detailed discussion of Assumptions A1–A4 may be found in Appendix B.

3 Consensus-based optimization converges globally

Let us recapitulate in this section recent global convergence results for CBO. Optimizing a nonconvex objective \mathcal{E} using the CBO dynamics (2) corresponds to an evolution of N particles in an interaction potential generated by \mathcal{E} . A global convergence analysis of this algorithm on the microscopic level proves difficult as it requires to study a system of a large number of interacting stochastic processes, which are highly correlated due to the dependence injected by communication through the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$. However, with the particles being interchangeable by design of the method [25], the object of analytical interest is the empirical measure $\hat{\rho}_t^N$, whose continuous-time dynamics can be approximated, assuming propagation of chaos [77], in the mean-field limit (large-particle limit) by the solution of a nonlinear nonlocal Fokker-Planck equation of the form

$$\partial_t \rho_t = \lambda \operatorname{div}((x - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\rho_t)) \rho_t) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \partial_{kk} \left(D(x - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\rho_t))_{kk}^2 \rho_t \right). \quad (10)$$

This perspective enables the use of powerful deterministic calculus tools for analysis [26]. Fornasier et al. [30, 31] recently proved that, in the mean-field limit, CBO performs a gradient descent of the Wasserstein-2 distance to a Dirac measure located at the global minimizer x^* with exponential rate. Their results are valid for large classes of optimization problems under minimal assumptions about the initialization and are in particular generic in the sense that the convergence of ρ_t is independent of the original hardness of the underlying optimization problem. More precisely it holds the following.

Theorem 3 (CBO asymptotically convexifies nonconvex problems, [31, Theorem 2]). *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1 and $\|x - x^*\|_\infty \leq (\mathcal{E}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{E}})^\nu / \eta$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with constants $\eta, \nu > 0$. Moreover, let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $x^* \in \operatorname{supp} \rho_0$. Then, for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and parameters $\lambda, \sigma > 0$ with $2\lambda > \sigma^2$, there exists $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(\varepsilon, \gamma, \lambda, \sigma, d, \nu, \eta, \rho_0)$ such that for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ a weak solution $(\rho_t)_{t \in [0, T^*]}$ to (10) satisfies $\min_{t \in [0, T^*]} W_2^2(\rho_t, \delta_{x^*}) \leq \varepsilon$, where $T^* = \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)(2\lambda-\sigma^2)} \log(W_2^2(\rho_0, \delta_{x^*})/\varepsilon)$. Furthermore, until the accuracy ε is reached, it holds*

$$W_2^2(\rho_t, \delta_{x^*}) \leq W_2^2(\rho_0, \delta_{x^*}) \exp(-(1-\gamma)(2\lambda-\sigma^2)t). \quad (11)$$

While Theorem 3 captures a canonical convexification of a large class of nonconvex optimization problems as the number of optimizing particles of CBO approaches infinity, it fails to explain empirically observed successes of the method using just few particles for high-dimensional problems coming from signal processing [29, 70] and machine learning [27, 31, 29, 70, 71].⁴ However, by ensuring that propagation of chaos [77] holds, Fornasier et al. [30] quantify that the fluctuations of the empirical measure $\hat{\rho}_t^N$ around ρ_t are of order $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ for any finite time horizon. This allows to obtain probabilistic global convergence guarantees of the CBO dynamics (2) of the following kind.

Theorem 4 (Global CBO convergence, [30, Theorem 13]). *Let $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3 and consider valid the assumptions of Theorem 3. Then, with probability larger than $1 - (\delta + \varepsilon_{\text{total}}^{-1}(C_D \Delta t + C_{\text{MF}} N^{-1} + \varepsilon))$, the final iterations $(X_K^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ of (2) fulfill*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_K^i - x^* \right\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{total}}, \quad (12)$$

where, besides problem-dependent constants, $C_D = C_D(d, N, T^*, \delta^{-1})$ and $C_{\text{MF}} = C_{\text{MF}}(\alpha, T^*, \delta^{-1})$.

Despite the results of this section requiring the global minimizer x^* to be unique, there exists a polarized variant of CBO [78] capable of finding multiple global minimizers at the same time.

⁴[29] applies CBO for a phase retrieval problem, robust subspace detection, and the robust computation of eigenfaces; [70] solves a compressed sensing task; [27, 31, 70] train shallow neural networks; [71] devises FedCBO to solve clustered federated learning problems while ensuring maximal data privacy

Remark 5. A conceptually similar philosophy has been taken recently by Mei et al. [10], Rotskoff and Vanden-Eijnden [12], Chizat and Bach [11], and Sirignano and Spiliopoulos [13] to explain the generalization capabilities of over-parameterized neural networks. Leveraging that the mean-field description (w.r.t. the number of neurons) of the SGD learning dynamics is captured by a nonlinear PDE that admits a gradient flow structure on $(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d), W_2)$, they show that, remarkably, original complexities of the loss landscape are alleviated in this scaling. Together with a quantification of the fluctuations of the empirical neuron distribution around this mean-field limit, they derive convergence results for SGD for sufficiently large networks with optimal generalization error.


4 Consensus-based optimization is a stochastic relaxation of gradient descent

In this section we present the technical details behind the main theoretical result of this work, Theorem 1, i.e., we explain how to establish a connection between the CBO scheme (4), which captures the flow of the derivative-free CBO dynamics (2), and GD.

From CBO to consensus hopping. Let us envision for the moment the movement of the particles during the CBO dynamics (2). At every time step k , after having computed $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_{k-1}^N)$, each particle moves a $\Delta t \lambda$ fraction of its distance towards this consensus point, before being perturbed by stochastic noise. As we let $\lambda \rightarrow 1/\Delta t$, the particles' velocities increase, until, in the case $\lambda = 1/\Delta t$, each of them hops directly to the previously computed consensus point, followed by a random fluctuation. Put differently, we are left with a numerical scheme, which, at time step k , samples N particles around the old iterate in order to subsequently compute as new iterate the consensus point (3) of the empirical measure of the samples. Such algorithm is precisely a Monte Carlo approximation of the consensus hopping (CH) scheme with iterates $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{CH}} &= x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k), \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id}), \\ x_0^{\text{CH}} &= x_0. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Theorem 6 in Section 4.2 makes this intuition rigorous by quantifying the approximation quality between CBO and CH in terms of the parameters of the schemes. Sample trajectories of the CH scheme are depicted in Figure 2a.



(a) The CH scheme (13) (sampled over several runs) follows on average the valley of \mathcal{E} and can occasionally escape local minima.

(b) Gradient descent gets stuck in a local minimum of \mathcal{E} .

(c) The Langevin dynamics (6) (sampled over several runs) follows on average the valley of \mathcal{E} and escapes local minima.

Figure 2: An illustrative comparison between the algorithms discussed in this work. While gradient descent (obtained as an explicit Euler time discretization of $\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = -\nabla\mathcal{E}(x(t))$ with time step size $\Delta t = 0.01$ and ran for $K = 10^4$ iterations) gets stuck in a local minimum along the valley of \mathcal{E} (see (b)), the stochastic algorithms in (a) and (c) as well as Figure 1b have the capability of escaping local minima. In (a) we depict the positions of the consensus hopping scheme (13) for $K = 250$ iterations with parameters $\alpha = 100$ and $\tilde{\sigma} = 0.6$, and where we approximate the underlying measure μ_k at each step k using 200 samples. The ability of the CH scheme to escape local minima improves with larger $\tilde{\sigma}$, see Figure F.1 in Appendix F. In (c) we depict the trajectory of the overdamped Langevin dynamics (6) with $\beta_t = 0.02 \log(t + 1)$ (obtained as an Euler-Maruyama time discretization of (6) with time step size $\Delta t = 0.001$ and ran for $K = 10^4$ iterations). The remaining setting is as in Figure 1, in particular, 50 individual runs of the experiment are plotted in (a) and (c).

From CH to GD. With the sampling measure μ_k assigning (in particular for small $\tilde{\sigma}$) most mass to the region close to the old iterate, the CH scheme (13) improves at every time step k its objective function value while staying near the previous iterate. A conceptually analogous behavior to such localized sampling can be achieved through penalizing the length of the step taken at time step k . This gives rise to an implicit version of the CH scheme with iterates $(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0,\dots,K}$ given as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} &= \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x), \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) := \frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x), \\ \tilde{x}_0^{\text{CH}} &= x_0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Actually, the modulated objective $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ defined in (14) naturally appears when writing out the expression of $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k)$ from (13) using that μ_k is a Gaussian. This creates a link between the sampling width $\tilde{\sigma}$ and the step size τ . The fact that the parameter τ can be seen as the step size of (14) becomes apparent when observing that the optimality condition of the k -th iterate of (14) reads $\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} = x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tau \nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})$, which is an implicit gradient step. Proposition 7 in Section 4.2 estimates the discrepancy between x_k^{CH} and \tilde{x}_k^{CH} employing the quantitative Laplace principle [30, Proposition 18].

Let us conclude this discussion by remarking that the scheme (14) itself is not self-consistent but requires the computation of the iterates of the CH scheme (13). For this reason we introduce the minimizing movement scheme (MMS) [72] as the iterates $(x_k^{\text{MMS}})_{k=0,\dots,K}$ given according to

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{MMS}} &= \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}_k(x), \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{E}_k(x) := \frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x), \\ x_0^{\text{MMS}} &= x_0, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

which is known to be the discrete-time implicit Euler of the gradient flow $\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = -\nabla \mathcal{E}(x(t))$ [74].

4.1 Proof of the main result, Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. From the optimality condition of the scheme $(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=1,\dots,K}$ in (14) and with the iterations $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=1,\dots,K}$ as in (13), we get $(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}) + \tau \nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) = 0$. Using this we decompose

$$x_k^{\text{CBO}} = \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} + (x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) = x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tau \nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) + (x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}).$$

Since $x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} = x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} + (x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}})$ and $\nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) = \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}) + (\nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) - \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}))$ we can continue the former to obtain

$$x_k^{\text{CBO}} = x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} - \tau \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}) + (x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}) - \tau (\nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) - \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}})) + (x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}),$$

where it remains to control the stochastic error term g_k from (5), which is comprised of the terms $g_k^1 := x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}$, $g_k^2 := \tau (\nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) - \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}))$ and $g_k^3 := x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}$. By Theorem 6,

$$\|g_k^1\|_2 = \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(|\lambda - 1/\Delta t| + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t} + \tilde{\sigma} + N^{-1/2})$$

with high probability. For g_k^2 , first notice that $\frac{1}{2\tau} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \leq \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}})$ by definition of \tilde{x}_k^{CH} , which facilitates a bound on $\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2$ of order $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ with high probability under A2 and by means of Remark C.7. Since \mathcal{E} is L -smooth, with the latter derivations and Theorem 6,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_k^2\|_2 &= \tau \|\nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) - \nabla \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}})\|_2 \leq \tau L \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}\|_2 \\ &\leq \tau L (\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}\|_2) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\tau^2) + \mathcal{O}(\tau(|\lambda - 1/\Delta t| + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t} + \tilde{\sigma} + N^{-1/2})) \end{aligned}$$

with high probability. Eventually, by Theorem 6 and Proposition 7 (hence, the quantitative Laplace principle [30, Proposition 18], see Proposition E.2), it holds for a sufficiently large choice of α that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_k^3\|_2 &= \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \leq \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \|x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(|\lambda - 1/\Delta t| + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t} + \tilde{\sigma} + N^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

with high probability, which concludes the proof recalling that $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \tau/(2\alpha)$ as of Proposition 7. \square

4.2 Technical details connecting CBO with GD via the CH scheme (13)

We now make rigorous what was described colloquially at the beginning of this section. The proofs of the results below are deferred to Appendices D and E. \mathcal{M} is the moment bound from Remark C.7.

CBO is a stochastic relaxation of CH. Theorem 6 explains how the CBO scheme (4) can be interpreted as a stochastic relaxation of the CH scheme (13).

Theorem 6 (CBO relaxes CH). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3. We denote by $(x_k^{\text{CBO}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ the iterates of the CBO scheme (4) and by $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ the ones of the CH scheme (13). Then, with probability larger than $1 - (\delta + \varepsilon)$, it holds for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that

$$\|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon^{-1} C (|\lambda - 1/\Delta t|^2 + \sigma^2 \Delta t + \tilde{\sigma}^2 + N^{-1}) \quad (16)$$

with a constant $C = C(\delta^{-1}, \Delta t, d, \alpha, \lambda, \sigma, b_1, b_2, C_1, C_2, K, \mathcal{M})$.

CH behaves like a gradient-based method. Since by definition of the iterates \tilde{x}_k^{CH} in (14), it holds $\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} = x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tau \nabla \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})$, Proposition 7 constitutes that (granted a sufficiently large choice of α and a suitably small choice of $\tilde{\sigma}$) the CH scheme (13) performs a gradient step at every time step k .

Proposition 7 (CH performs gradient steps). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A4. We denote by $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ the iterations of the CH scheme (13) and by $(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ the ones of the scheme (14). Moreover, assume that the parameters α, τ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are such that $\tau < 1/(-2\Lambda)$ if $\Lambda < 0$, $\alpha \gtrsim \frac{1}{\tau} d \log d$ is sufficiently large and $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \tau/(2\alpha)$. Then, with probability larger than $1 - (\delta + \varepsilon)$, it holds for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that

$$\|x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon^{-1} c \tau^2 \quad (17)$$

with a constant $c = c(\delta^{-1}, C_1, \mathcal{M})$.

The proof of Proposition 7 is based on the quantitative Laplace principle [30, Proposition 18] (see also Proposition E.2). We conjecture that a refinement thereof may allow to control the error in (17) just through α and $\tilde{\sigma}$ without creating a dependence on τ . Nevertheless, the bound is sufficient to suggest a gradient-like behavior of the CH scheme (13) (see the discussion after Theorem 1).

Combining Proposition 7 with a stability argument for the MMS and applying Grönwall's inequality allows to control in Theorem 8 the divergence between the CH scheme (13) and the MMS (15).

Theorem 8 (CH relaxes a gradient flow). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A4. We denote by $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ the iterations of the CH scheme (13) and by $(x_k^{\text{MMS}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ the ones of the MMS (15). Moreover, assume that the parameters α, τ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are such that $\tau < 1/(-2\Lambda)$ if $\Lambda < 0$, $\alpha \gtrsim \frac{1}{\tau} d \log d$ is sufficiently large and $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \tau/(2\alpha)$. Then, with probability larger than $1 - (\delta + \varepsilon)$, it holds for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that

$$\|x_k^{\text{CH}} - x_k^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon^{-1} c (1 + \vartheta^{-1}) \tau^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1 + \vartheta}{(1 + \tau\Lambda)^2} \right)^\ell \quad (18)$$

for any $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$ and with a constant $c = c(\delta^{-1}, C_1, \mathcal{M})$.

Corollary 9. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A4 with $\Lambda > 0$. Then, in the setting of Theorem 8 and with probability larger than $1 - (\delta + \varepsilon)$, it holds for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that

$$\|x_k^{\text{CH}} - x_k^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon^{-1} c (1 + \vartheta^{-1}) \tau^2 \frac{(1 + \tau\Lambda)^2}{(1 + \tau\Lambda)^2 - (1 + \vartheta)}. \quad (19)$$

5 Conclusions

In this paper we provided a novel analytical perspective on the theoretical understanding of gradient-based learning algorithms by showing that consensus-based optimization (CBO), an intrinsically derivative-free optimization method guaranteed to globally converge to global minimizers of potentially nonsmooth and nonconvex loss functions, implicitly behaves like a gradient-based method. This allows to interpret CBO as a stochastic relaxation of gradient descent. Besides forging such unexpected link and thereby driving forward our theoretical understanding of both gradient-based

learning methods and metaheuristic black-box optimization algorithms, we widen the scope of applications of methods which — in one way or another, be it explicitly or implicitly — estimate and exploit gradients. In particular, we believe these insights to bear the potential for designing efficient and reliable training methods which behave like first-order methods while not relying on the ability of computing gradients. Potential areas of application in machine learning may include the usage of nonsmooth losses, hyperparameter tuning, convex bandits, reinforcement learning, the training of sparse and pruned neural networks, or federated learning.

An analogous analysis approach may be carried over to second-order methods (with momentum), allowing to establish a link between Adam [2] and the well-known particle swarm optimization method [32], which is related to CBO through a zero-inertia limit [42, 69]. Together with recent observations [79] based on tools from kinetic theory that simulated annealing [38–40] is related to the Langevin dynamics [52–54], this would strengthen even further the surprising and yet largely unexplored link between gradient-based learning algorithms and derivative-free metaheuristic optimization methods. Beyond that we envisage the likely connections between consensus-based sampling [80] and log-concave sampling or sampling by Langevin flows [81–84].

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

The authors would like to profusely thank Hui Huang, Giuseppe Savaré, and Alessandro Scagliotti for many fruitful and stimulating discussions about the topic.

This work has been funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research and the Bavarian State Ministry for Science and the Arts. The authors of this work take full responsibility for its content. KR further acknowledges the financial support from the Technical University of Munich – Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence (IEAI).

References

- [1] John C. Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12:2121–2159, 2011.
- [2] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [3] Ronan Collobert and Jason Weston. A unified architecture for natural language processing: Deep neural networks with multitask learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 160–167, 2008.
- [4] Alex Graves, Abdel-rahman Mohamed, and Geoffrey Hinton. Speech recognition with deep recurrent neural networks. In *2013 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing*, pages 6645–6649. IEEE, 2013.
- [5] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 60(6):84–90, 2017.
- [6] David E. Rumelhart, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Ronald J. Williams. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Nature*, 323(6088):533–536, 1986.
- [7] Atılım Güneş Baydin, Barak A. Pearlmutter, Alexey Andreyevich Radul, and Jeffrey Mark Siskind. Automatic differentiation in machine learning: a survey. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18:Paper No. 153, 43, 2017.
- [8] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- [9] Chiyuan Zhang, Samy Bengio, Moritz Hardt, Benjamin Recht, and Oriol Vinyals. Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(3):107–115, 2021.
- [10] Song Mei, Andrea Montanari, and Phan-Minh Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(33):E7665–E7671, 2018.
- [11] Lenaïc Chizat and Francis Bach. On the global convergence of gradient descent for over-parameterized models using optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.

- [12] Grant Rotskoff and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Trainability and accuracy of artificial neural networks: An interacting particle system approach. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 75(9):1889–1935, 2022.
- [13] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos. Mean field analysis of neural networks: A law of large numbers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 80(2):725–752, 2020.
- [14] Anna Choromanska, Mikael Henaff, Michael Mathieu, Gérard Ben Arous, and Yann LeCun. The loss surfaces of multilayer networks. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 192–204. PMLR, 2015.
- [15] Daniel Soudry and Yair Carmon. No bad local minima: Data independent training error guarantees for multilayer neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08361*, 2016.
- [16] Kenji Kawaguchi. Deep learning without poor local minima. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [17] Quynh Nguyen and Matthias Hein. The loss surface of deep and wide neural networks. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2603–2612. PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017.
- [18] Itay Safran and Ohad Shamir. Spurious local minima are common in two-layer relu neural networks. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4430–4438. PMLR, 2018.
- [19] Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, Adel Javanmard, and Jason D. Lee. Theoretical insights into the optimization landscape of over-parameterized shallow neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(2):742–769, 2018.
- [20] Simon Du and Jason Lee. On the power of over-parametrization in neural networks with quadratic activation. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1329–1338. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.
- [21] Simon Du, Jason Lee, Haochuan Li, Liwei Wang, and Xiyu Zhai. Gradient descent finds global minima of deep neural networks. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1675–1685. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019.
- [22] Samet Oymak and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. Overparameterized nonlinear learning: Gradient descent takes the shortest path? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4951–4960. PMLR, 2019.
- [23] Hung-Hsu Chou, Carsten Gieshoff, Johannes Maly, and Holger Rauhut. Gradient descent for deep matrix factorization: Dynamics and implicit bias towards low rank. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13772*, 2020.
- [24] Benjamin Fehrman, Benjamin Gess, and Arnulf Jentzen. Convergence rates for the stochastic gradient descent method for non-convex objective functions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(136):1–48, 2020.
- [25] René Pinnau, Claudia Totzeck, Oliver Tse, and Stephan Martin. A consensus-based model for global optimization and its mean-field limit. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 27(1):183–204, 2017.
- [26] José A. Carrillo, Young-Pil Choi, Claudia Totzeck, and Oliver Tse. An analytical framework for consensus-based global optimization method. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 28(6):1037–1066, 2018.
- [27] José A. Carrillo, Shi Jin, Lei Li, and Yuhua Zhu. A consensus-based global optimization method for high dimensional machine learning problems. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 27(suppl.):Paper No. S5, 22, 2021.
- [28] Seung-Yeal Ha, Shi Jin, and Doheon Kim. Convergence and error estimates for time-discrete consensus-based optimization algorithms. *Numer. Math.*, 147(2):255–282, 2021.
- [29] Massimo Fornasier, Hui Huang, Lorenzo Pareschi, and Philippe Sünnen. Consensus-based optimization on the sphere: convergence to global minimizers and machine learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22:Paper No. 237, 55, 2021.
- [30] Massimo Fornasier, Timo Klock, and Konstantin Riedl. Consensus-based optimization methods converge globally. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15130*, 2021.

- [31] Massimo Fornasier, Timo Klock, and Konstantin Riedl. Convergence of anisotropic consensus-based optimization in mean-field law. In Juan Luis Jiménez Laredo, J. Ignacio Hidalgo, and Kehinde Oluwatoyin Babaagba, editors, *Applications of Evolutionary Computation*, pages 738–754, Cham, 2022. Springer International Publishing.
- [32] James Kennedy and Russel C. Eberhart. Particle swarm optimization. In *Proceedings of ICNN'95 - International Conference on Neural Networks*, volume 4, pages 1942–1948. IEEE, 1995.
- [33] John H. Holland. *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems. An introductory analysis with applications to biology, control, and artificial intelligence*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1975.
- [34] Thomas Bäck, David B. Fogel, and Zbigniew Michalewicz, editors. *Handbook of evolutionary computation*. Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol; Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.
- [35] David B. Fogel. *Evolutionary computation. Toward a new philosophy of machine intelligence*. IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, second edition, 2000.
- [36] Amir Dembo and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*, volume 38 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [37] Peter D. Miller. *Applied asymptotic analysis*, volume 75 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
- [38] Scott Kirkpatrick, C. Daniel Gelatt Jr., and Mario P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220(4598):671–680, 1983.
- [39] Stuart Geman and Chii-Ruey Hwang. Diffusions for global optimization. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 24(5):1031–1043, 1986.
- [40] Richard Holley and Daniel Stroock. Simulated annealing via Sobolev inequalities. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 115(4):553–569, 1988.
- [41] Saul B. Gelfand and Sanjoy K. Mitter. Recursive stochastic algorithms for global optimization in \mathbb{R}^d . *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 29(5):999–1018, 1991.
- [42] Sara Grassi and Lorenzo Pareschi. From particle swarm optimization to consensus based optimization: stochastic modeling and mean-field limit. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 31(08):1625–1657, 2021.
- [43] Sara Grassi, Hui Huang, Lorenzo Pareschi, and Jinniao Qiu. Mean-field particle swarm optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00393*, 2021.
- [44] Hui Huang, Jinniao Qiu, and Konstantin Riedl. On the global convergence of particle swarm optimization methods. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 88(2):30, 2023.
- [45] John C. Duchi, Michael I. Jordan, Martin J. Wainwright, and Andre Wibisono. Optimal rates for zero-order convex optimization: The power of two function evaluations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(5):2788–2806, 2015.
- [46] Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 17(2):527–566, 2017.
- [47] Pin-Yu Chen, Huan Zhang, Yash Sharma, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Zoo: Zeroth order optimization based black-box attacks to deep neural networks without training substitute models. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pages 15–26, 2017.
- [48] Konstantinos Nikolakakis, Farzin Haddadpour, Dionysis Kalogierias, and Amin Karbasi. Black-box generalization: Stability of zeroth-order learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31525–31541, 2022.
- [49] Ping-yeh Chiang, Renkun Ni, David Yu Miller, Arpit Bansal, Jonas Geiping, Micah Goldblum, and Tom Goldstein. Loss landscapes are all you need: Neural network generalization can be explained without the implicit bias of gradient descent. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [50] Björn Engquist, Kui Ren, and Yunan Yang. Adaptive state-dependent diffusion for derivative-free optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04370*, 2023.
- [51] Howard Heaton, Samy Wu Fung, and Stanley Osher. Global solutions to nonconvex problems by evolution of Hamilton-Jacobi PDEs. *Communications on Applied Mathematics and Computation*, pages 1–21, 2023.

- [52] Tzoo-Shuh Chiang, Chii-Ruey Hwang, and Shuenn Jyi Sheu. Diffusion for global optimization in \mathbb{R}^n . *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 25(3):737–753, 1987.
- [53] Gareth O. Roberts and Richard L. Tweedie. Exponential convergence of langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, pages 341–363, 1996.
- [54] Alain Durmus and Éric Moulines. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(3):1551 – 1587, 2017.
- [55] David Márquez. Convergence rates for annealing diffusion processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 1118–1139, 1997.
- [56] Mariane Pelletier. Weak convergence rates for stochastic approximation with application to multiple targets and simulated annealing. *Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 10–44, 1998.
- [57] Pan Xu, Jinghui Chen, Difan Zou, and Quanquan Gu. Global convergence of Langevin dynamics based algorithms for nonconvex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [58] Lénaïc Chizat. Mean-field Langevin dynamics: Exponential convergence and annealing. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [59] Hamed Karimi, Julie Nutini, and Mark Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition. In Paolo Frasconi, Niels Landwehr, Giuseppe Manco, and Jilles Vreeken, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 795–811. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [60] James Bergstra, Rémi Bardenet, Yoshua Bengio, and Balázs Kégl. Algorithms for hyper-parameter optimization. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011.
- [61] Jeremy Rapin and Olivier Teytaud. Nevergrad — a gradient-free optimization platform, 2018.
- [62] Alekh Agarwal, Dean P. Foster, Daniel J. Hsu, Sham M. Kakade, and Alexander Rakhlin. Stochastic convex optimization with bandit feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 24, 2011.
- [63] Ohad Shamir. An optimal algorithm for bandit and zero-order convex optimization with two-point feedback. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18(1):1703–1713, 2017.
- [64] Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [65] Torsten Hoefler, Dan Alistarh, Tal Ben-Nun, Nikoli Dryden, and Alexandra Peste. Sparsity in deep learning: Pruning and growth for efficient inference and training in neural networks. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22(1): 10882–11005, 2021.
- [66] Reza Shokri and Vitaly Shmatikov. Privacy-preserving deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 1310–1321, 2015.
- [67] H. Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [68] Jakub Konečný, H. Brendan McMahan, Daniel Ramage, and Peter Richtárik. Federated optimization: Distributed machine learning for on-device intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02527*, 2016.
- [69] Cristina Cipriani, Hui Huang, and Jinniao Qiu. Zero-inertia limit: from particle swarm optimization to consensus-based optimization. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 54(3):3091–3121, 2022.
- [70] Konstantin Riedl. Leveraging memory effects and gradient information in consensus-based optimization: On global convergence in mean-field law. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12184*, 2022.
- [71] José A. Carrillo, Nicolas Garcia Trillos, Sixu Li, and Yuhua Zhu. FedCBO: Reaching group consensus in clustered federated learning through consensus-based optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02894*, 2023.
- [72] Ennio De Giorgi. New problems on minimizing movements. In *Boundary value problems for partial differential equations and applications*, volume 29 of *RMA Res. Notes Appl. Math.*, pages 81–98. Masson, Paris, 1993.
- [73] Neal Parikh and Stephen Boyd. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and trends® in Optimization*, 1(3): 127–239, 2014.

- [74] Filippo Santambrogio. {Euclidean, metric, and Wasserstein} gradient flows: an overview. *Bull. Math. Sci.*, 7(1):87–154, 2017.
- [75] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.
- [76] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport: Old and new*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
- [77] Alain-Sol Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. In *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, volume 1464 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 165–251. Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [78] Leon Bungert, Philipp Wacker, and Tim Roith. Polarized consensus-based dynamics for optimization and sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05238*, 2022.
- [79] Lorenzo Pareschi. Boltzmann’s legacy in global optimization. Workshop on Optimal Transport, Mean-Field Models, and Machine Learning, 2023. URL <https://www.ias.tum.de/ias/event-pages/workshop-otmfml/talk-details/>.
- [80] José A. Carrillo, Franca Hoffmann, Andrew M. Stuart, and Urbain Vaes. Consensus-based sampling. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 148(3):1069–1140, 2022.
- [81] Alan Frieze, Ravi Kannan, and Nick Polson. Sampling from log-concave distributions. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 812–837, 1994.
- [82] Espen Bernton. Langevin Monte Carlo and JKO splitting. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 1777–1798. PMLR, 2018.
- [83] Raaz Dwivedi, Yuansi Chen, Martin J. Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Log-concave sampling: Metropolis-hastings algorithms are fast! In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 793–797. PMLR, 2018.
- [84] Yin Tat Lee, Ruoqi Shen, and Kevin Tian. Structured logconcave sampling with a restricted gaussian oracle. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2993–3050. PMLR, 2021.
- [85] Mihai Anitescu. Degenerate nonlinear programming with a quadratic growth condition. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 10(4):1116–1135, 2000.
- [86] Yi Xu, Qihang Lin, and Tianbao Yang. Adaptive SVRG methods under error bound conditions with unknown growth parameter. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’17, pages 3279–3289, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2017. Curran Associates Inc.
- [87] Jérôme Bolte, Trong Phong Nguyen, Juan Peypouquet, and Bruce W. Suter. From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions. *Math. Program.*, 165(2, Ser. A):471–507, 2017.
- [88] Ion Necoara, Yurii Nesterov, and François Glineur. Linear convergence of first order methods for non-strongly convex optimization. *Math. Program.*, 175(1-2, Ser. A):69–107, 2019.
- [89] Yuan Shih Chow and Henry Teicher. *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [90] Massimo Fornasier, Hui Huang, Lorenzo Pareschi, and Philippe Sünnen. Consensus-based optimization on hypersurfaces: Well-posedness and mean-field limit. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 30(14):2725–2751, 2020.
- [91] Nicolas Fournier and Arnaud Guillin. On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 162(3-4):707–738, 2015.

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material for the paper: “**Gradient is All You Need?**” authored by **Konstantin Riedl, Timo Klock, Carina Geldhauser, and Massimo Fornasier**.

This supplemental material is organized into the following six appendices.

- Appendix A: Introductory facts
- Appendix B: Discussion of Assumption 2
- Appendix C: Boundedness of the numerical schemes
- Appendix D: Proof details for Theorem 6
- Appendix E: Proof details for Proposition 7 and Theorem 8
- Appendix F: Additional numerical experiments

A Introductory facts

Notation. To keep the notation concise, we hide generic constants, i.e., we write $a \lesssim b$ for $a \leq cb$, if c is a constant independent of problem-dependent constants. Moreover, since we work with random variables in several instances, many equalities and inequalities hold almost surely without being mentioned explicitly. We abbreviate with i.i.d. independently and identically distributed.

We write $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the Euclidean norm and scalar product on \mathbb{R}^d , respectively. Euclidean balls are denoted by $B_r(x) := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z - x\|_2 \leq r\}$. Moreover, we write $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ for the ℓ^∞ -norm and denote the associated ℓ^∞ -balls by $B_r^\infty(x) := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z - x\|_\infty \leq r\}$.

For the space of continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow Y$ we write $\mathcal{C}(X, Y)$, with $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a suitable topological space Y . For an open set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for $Y = \mathbb{R}^m$ the space $\mathcal{C}^k(X, Y)$ contains functions $f \in \mathcal{C}(X, Y)$ that are k -times continuously differentiable. We omit Y in the real-valued case, i.e., $\mathcal{C}(X) = \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{C}^k(X) = \mathcal{C}^k(X, \mathbb{R})$.

The operator ∇ denotes the gradient of a function on \mathbb{R}^d .

Convex analysis. For a convex function $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the subdifferential $\partial f(x)$ at a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the set

$$\partial f(x) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle p, y - x \rangle \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

In the setting $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\partial f(x)$ is closed, convex, nonempty and bounded. If $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$. Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that for $x_1, x_2, p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $p_1 \in \partial f(x_1)$ and $p_2 \in \partial f(x_2)$ it holds $\langle p_1 - p_2, x_1 - x_2 \rangle \geq 0$.

Probability measures. The set of all Borel probability measures over \mathbb{R}^d is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $p > 0$, we collect measures $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with finite p -th moment $\int \|x\|_2^p d\varrho(x)$ in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

The Dirac delta δ_x for a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a measure satisfying $\delta(B) = 1$ if $x \in B$ and $\delta(B) = 0$ if $x \notin B$ for any measurable set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Wasserstein distance. For any $1 \leq p < \infty$, the Wasserstein- p distance between two Borel probability measures $\varrho, \varrho' \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by

$$W_p(\varrho, \varrho') = \left(\inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\varrho, \varrho')} \int \|x - x'\|_2^p d\gamma(x, x') \right)^{1/p}, \quad (20)$$

where $\Pi(\varrho, \varrho')$ denotes the set of all couplings of (a.k.a. transport plans between) ϱ and ϱ' , i.e., the collection of all Borel probability measures over $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with marginals ϱ and ϱ' on the first and second component, respectively, see, e.g., [75, 76]. $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ endowed with the Wasserstein- p distance W_p is a complete separable metric space [75, Proposition 7.1.5].

A generalized triangle-type inequality. It holds for $p, J \in \mathbb{N}$ by Hölder’s inequality

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^J a_j \right|^p \leq J^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^J |a_j|^p. \quad (21)$$

A discrete variant of Grönwall’s inequality. If $z_k \leq az_{k-1} + b$ with $a, b \geq 0$ for all $k \geq 1$, then

$$z_k \leq a^k z_0 + b \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} a^\ell \leq a^k z_0 + b \prod_{\ell=1}^{k-1} (1 + a) \leq a^k z_0 + be^{a(k-1)} \quad (22)$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Notice that, while the first inequality in (22) is as sharp as the initial estimates, the remaining two inequalities are rather rough upper bounds.

B Discussion of Assumption 2

Assumption A1 requires that the continuous objective function \mathcal{E} attains its globally minimal value $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ at some $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This does in particular not exclude objectives with multiple global minimizers.

Remark B.1. For the global convergence results [30, 31] of CBO (which we recapitulated in Section 3), however, uniqueness of the global minimizer x^* is required and implied by an additional coercivity condition of the form $\|x - x^*\|_\infty \leq (\mathcal{E}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{E}})^\nu / \eta$, which has to hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with constants $\eta, \nu > 0$. It can be regarded as a tractability condition of the energy landscape of \mathcal{E} and is also known as the inverse continuity property from [29] or as the error bound condition from [85–88]. Actually, as stated in [30, Assumption A2], it is sufficient if such coercivity condition holds locally around the unique global minimizer x^* , provided that in the farfield, \mathcal{E} is well above $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$. More precisely, for the results of Section 3 to hold, it is sufficient if $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - x^*\|_\infty &\leq \frac{1}{\eta} (\mathcal{E}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{E}})^\nu \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{R_0}^\infty(x^*) \\ \mathcal{E}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{E}} &> \mathcal{E}_\infty \quad \text{for all } x \in (B_{R_0}^\infty(x^*))^c \end{aligned}$$

with constants $\eta, \nu, \mathcal{E}_\infty, R_0 > 0$.

To deploy CBO in the setting of objective functions with several global minima, Bungert et al. [78] propose a polarized variant of CBO, which localizes the dynamics by integrating a kernel in the computation of the consensus point (3). This ensures that each particle is primarily influenced by particles close to it, allowing for the creation of clusters.

Assumptions A2 and A3 can be regarded as regularity conditions on the objective landscape of \mathcal{E} . The first part of A2, Equation (7), is a local Lipschitz condition, which ensures that the objective function does not change too quickly, assuring that the information obtained when evaluating the function is informative within a region around the point of evaluation. The second part of A2, Equation (8), controls and limits the growth of the objective in the farfield. In combination with the second option in A3, Equation (9), this forces the objective to grow quadratically in the farfield. However, note that one can always redefine the objective outside a sufficiently large ball such that both conditions are met while the other assumptions are preserved. Alternatively, the first option in A3 allows for bounded functions.

Assumption A4 requires the objective \mathcal{E} to be semi-convex with parameter $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\Lambda > 0$, Λ -convexity is stronger than convexity (strong convexity with parameter Λ). For $\Lambda < 0$, semi-convexity is weaker, i.e., potentially nonconvex functions \mathcal{E} are included in the definition. The class of semi-convex functions is typical in the literature of gradient flows, since their general theory extends from the convex to this more general setting [74]. One particular property, which we shall exploit in this work, is that for such functions the time discretization of a gradient flow, potentially for a small step size, defined through an iterated scheme, called minimizing movement scheme [72], is well-defined. However, while semi-convexity is useful to ensure the well-posedness of gradient flows, it is not sufficient to obtain convergence to global minimizers. Other properties such as the Polyak-Łojasiewicz condition [59] or the log-Sobolev inequalities governing the flow of the Langevin dynamics [11] may be necessary.

C Boundedness of the numerical schemes

Before showing the boundedness in expectation of the numerical schemes (4), (13), (15) and (14) over time in Sections C.1–C.4, respectively, let us first recall from [26, Lemma 3.3] an estimate on the consensus point (3), which facilitates the subsequent proofs.

Lemma C.1 (Boundedness of consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3. Moreover, let $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then it holds*

$$\|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho)\|_2^2 \leq b_1 + b_2 \int \|x\|_2^2 d\varrho(x)$$

with constants $b_1 = 0$ and $b_2 = b_2(\alpha, \mathcal{E}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}) > 0$ in case the first condition of A3 holds and with $b_i = b_i(\alpha, C_2, C_3, C_4) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ as given in (23) in case of the second condition of A3.

Proof. In case the first condition of A3 holds, we have by definition of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$ in (3) and Jensen's inequality

$$\|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho)\|_2^2 \leq \int \|x\|_2^2 \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} d\varrho(x) \leq e^{\alpha(\bar{\mathcal{E}}-\mathcal{E})} \int \|x\|_2^2 d\varrho(x).$$

In case of the second condition of A3, the statement follows from [26, Lemma 3.3] with constants

$$b_1 = C_4^2 + b_2 \quad \text{and} \quad b_2 = 2 \frac{C_2}{C_3} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha C_3} \frac{1}{C_4^2} \right), \quad (23)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

With this estimate we have all necessary tools at hand to prove the boundedness of the numerical schemes investigated in this paper.

C.1 Boundedness of the consensus-based optimization (CBO) dynamics (2) and (4)

Let us remind the reader that the iterates $(x_k^{\text{CBO}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of the consensus-based optimization (CBO) scheme (4) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{CBO}} &= x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_k^N), \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\rho}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_k^i}, \\ x_0^{\text{CBO}} &= x_0 \sim \rho_0, \end{aligned}$$

where the iterates $((X_k^i)_{k=0, \dots, K})_{i=1, \dots, N}$ are given as in (2) by

$$\begin{aligned} X_k^i &= X_{k-1}^i - \Delta t \lambda (X_{k-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_{k-1}^N)) + \sigma D(X_{k-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_{k-1}^N)) B_k^i, \\ X_0^i &= x_0^i \sim \rho_0 \end{aligned}$$

with B_k^i being i.i.d. Gaussian random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d with zero mean and covariance matrix $\Delta t \text{Id}$ for $k = 0, \dots, K$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$, i.e., $B_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t \text{Id})$.

Lemma C.2 (Boundedness of the CBO dynamics (2) and the CBO scheme (4)). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3. Moreover, let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for the empirical random measures $(\hat{\rho}_k^N)_{k=0, \dots, K}$ and the iterates $(X_k^i)_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of (2) it holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^N(x) \leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|X_k^i\|_2^4 \leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}$$

with a constant $\mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}(\lambda, \sigma, d, b_1, b_2, K \Delta t, K, \rho_0) > 0$. Moreover, for the iterates $(x_k^{\text{CBO}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of (4) it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^4 \leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}.$$

Proof. We first note that X_k^i as defined iteratively in (2) satisfies

$$X_k^i = X_0^i - \Delta t \lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^k (X_{\ell-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)) + \sigma \sum_{\ell=1}^k D(X_{\ell-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)) B_\ell^i$$

and that for any $k = 1, \dots, K$ by means of the standard inequality (21) for $p = 4$ and $J = 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\ell=0, \dots, k} \|X_\ell^i\|_2^4 &\lesssim \|X_0^i\|_2^4 + (\Delta t \lambda)^4 \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} (X_{m-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{m-1}^N)) \right\|_2^4 \\ &\quad + \sigma^4 \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} D(X_{m-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{m-1}^N)) B_m^i \right\|_2^4. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Noticing that the random process $Y_\ell^i := \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} D(X_{m-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{m-1}^N)) B_m^i$, $\ell = 0, \dots, k$ is a martingale w.r.t. the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_\ell = \sigma(\{X_0^i\} \cup \{B_m^i, m = 1, \dots, \ell\})\}_{\ell=0}^{k-1}$ since it satisfies $\mathbb{E}[Y_\ell^i | \mathcal{F}_{\ell-1}] = Y_{\ell-1}^i$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, we can apply a discrete version of the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality [89, Corollary 11.2.1] yielding

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} D(X_{m-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{m-1}^N)) B_m^i \right\|_2^4 \lesssim d \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^k (D(X_{\ell-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)))_{jj}^2 (B_\ell^i)_j^2 \right)^2.$$

Thus, when taking the expectation on both sides of (24) and employing Jensen's inequality, we can use the latter to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=0, \dots, k} \|X_\ell^i\|_2^4 &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \|X_0^i\|_2^4 + (\Delta t \lambda)^4 K^3 \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \|X_{\ell-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)\|_2^4 \\ &\quad + \sigma^4 d K \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\ell=1}^k (D(X_{\ell-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)))_{jj}^4 (B_\ell^i)_j^4 \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \|X_0^i\|_2^4 + (\Delta t \lambda)^4 K^3 \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left(\|X_{\ell-1}^i\|_2^4 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)\|_2^4 \right) \\ &\quad + (\Delta t)^2 \sigma^4 d K \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left((X_{\ell-1}^i)_j^4 + (x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N))_j^4 \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 + (\Delta t \lambda)^4 K^3 + (\Delta t \sigma^2 d)^2 K) \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left(\|X_{\ell-1}^i\|_2^4 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)\|_2^4 \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \lambda^4 (K \Delta t)^4 + \sigma^4 d^2 (K \Delta t)^2) \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \left(\|X_{\ell-1}^i\|_2^4 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N)\|_2^4 \right) \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \left(\|X_{\ell-1}^i\|_2^4 + b_1^2 + b_2^2 \int \|x\|_2^4 d\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N(x) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with a constant $C = C(\lambda, \sigma, d, K \Delta t)$. In the second step we made use of the standard inequality (21) for $p = 4$ and $J = 2$, exploited that B_ℓ^i is independent from $D(X_{\ell-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{\ell-1}^N))$ for any $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ and used that the fourth moment of a Gaussian random variable $B \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is $\mathbb{E} B^4 = 3$ (e.g., by recalling that $\mathbb{E} B^4 = \frac{d^4}{dx^4} M_B(x) \Big|_{x=0}$, where M_B denotes the moment-generating function of B). Moreover, recall that $K \Delta t$ denotes the final time horizon, and note that the last step is due to Lemma C.1. Averaging (25) over i allows to bound

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=0, \dots, k} \|X_\ell^i\|_2^4 \leq \widetilde{C} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \|X_{\ell-1}^i\|_2^4 \right) \quad (26)$$

with a constant $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\lambda, \sigma, d, b_1, b_2, K \Delta t)$. Since $\mathbb{E} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_0^N(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|x_0^i\|_2^4$, an application of the discrete variant of Grönwall's inequality (22) yields the second inequality in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=0, \dots, k} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_\ell^N(x) &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=0, \dots, k} \|X_\ell^i\|_2^4 \\ &\leq \tilde{C}^k \mathbb{E} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_0^N(x) + \tilde{C} e^{\tilde{C}(k-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

showing that the left-hand side is bounded independently of N , which gives the first bound in the first part of the statement. Making use thereof in (25) also yields the second part after another application of Grönwall's inequality. The second part of the statement follows by noting that an application of Lemma C.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \|x_\ell^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^4 &= \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_\ell^N)\|_2^4 \\ &\leq 2b_1^2 + 2b_2^2 \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_\ell^N(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the last expression is bounded as in (27). Recalling that $x_0^{\text{CBO}} = x_0 \sim \rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and choosing the constant \mathcal{M}^{CBO} large enough for all three estimates to hold with $k = K$ concludes the proof. \square

C.2 Boundedness of the consensus hopping scheme (13)

Let us recall that the iterates $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of the consensus hopping (CH) scheme (13) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{CH}} &= x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k), \quad \text{with } \mu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id}), \\ x_0^{\text{CH}} &= x_0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.3 (Boundedness of the CH scheme (13)). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3. Moreover, let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for the random measures $(\mu_k)_{k=1, \dots, K}$ in (13) it holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=1, \dots, K} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\mu_k(x) \leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}$$

with a constant $\mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}(\tilde{\sigma}, d, b_1, b_2, K, \rho_0) > 0$. Moreover, for the iterates $(x_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of (13) it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 \leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}.$$

Proof. According to the definition of the scheme (13) and with the standard inequality (21) for $p = 4$ and $J = 2$, we observe that for any $k = 2, \dots, K$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\mu_k(x) &= \int \|x\|_2^4 d\mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})(x) \\ &\lesssim \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 + \int \|x\|_2^4 d\mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})(x) \\ &= \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_{k-1})\|_2^4 + (d^2 + 2d)\tilde{\sigma}^4 \\ &\lesssim b_1^2 + b_2^2 \int \|x\|_2^4 d\mu_{k-1}(x) + d^2\tilde{\sigma}^4, \end{aligned}$$

where for the third step we explicitly computed that for the fourth moment of a multivariate Gaussian distribution it holds $\int \|x\|_2^4 d\mathcal{N}(0, \text{Id})(x) = d^2 + 2d$. Moreover, in the final step we employed Lemma C.1 together with Jensen's inequality. Along the same lines we have $\int \|x\|_2^4 d\mu_1(x) \lesssim \|x_0\|_2^4 + d^2\tilde{\sigma}^4$. An application of the discrete variant of Grönwall's inequality (22) therefore allows to obtain

$$\int \|x\|_2^4 d\mu_k(x) \lesssim b_2^{2k} \|x_0\|_2^4 + (b_1^2 + d^2\tilde{\sigma}^4) e^{cb_2^2(k-1)}$$

with a generic constant $c > 0$. Taking the maximum over the iterations k and the expectation w.r.t. the initial condition ρ_0 gives the first part of the statement. Recalling that $x_0^{\text{CH}} = x_0 \sim \rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the second part follows after an application of Lemma C.1, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \|x_\ell^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 &= \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_\ell)\|_2^4 \\ &\leq 2b_1^2 + 2b_2^2 \mathbb{E} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\mu_\ell(x). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing the constant \mathcal{M}^{CH} large enough for either estimate to hold with $k = K$ concludes the proof. \square

Lemma C.4. *Let $Y_k^i \sim \mu_k$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and let $\widehat{\mu}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y_k^i}$. Then, under the assumptions of Lemma C.3, for the empirical random measures $(\widehat{\mu}_k^N)_{k=1,\dots,K}$ it holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\widehat{\mu}_k^N(x) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}$$

with a constant $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}(\bar{\sigma}, d, b_1, b_2, K, \rho_0) > 0$.

Proof. By definition of the empirical measure $\widehat{\mu}_k^N$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \int \|x\|_2^4 d\widehat{\mu}_k^N(x) = \mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Y_k^i\|_2^4 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \|Y_k^i\|_2^4. \quad (28)$$

Since $Y_k^i \sim \mu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, \bar{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})$ for any $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$, we can write $Y_k^i = x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} + \bar{\sigma} B_{Y,k}^i$, where $B_{Y,k}^i$ is a standard Gaussian random vector, i.e., $B_{Y,k}^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{Id})$. By means of the standard inequality (21) for $p = 4$ and $J = 2$ we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \|Y_k^i\|_2^4 &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 + \bar{\sigma}^4 \mathbb{E} \max_{k=1,\dots,K} \|B_{Y,k}^i\|_2^4 \\ &\leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}} + K\bar{\sigma}^4(d^2 + 2d), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where in the last step we employed Lemma C.3 for the first term and bounded the maximum by the sum in the second term before using again that $\mathbb{E} \|B\|_2^4 = d^2 + 2d$ for $B \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{Id})$. Inserting (29) into (28) yields the claim. \square

C.3 Boundedness of the minimizing movement scheme (15)

We recall that the iterates $(x_k^{\text{MMS}})_{k=0,\dots,K}$ of the minimizing movement scheme (MMS) (15) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{MMS}} &= \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}_k(x), \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{E}_k(x) := \frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x), \\ x_0^{\text{MMS}} &= x_0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.5 (Boundedness of the MMS (15)). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A2. Moreover, let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for the iterates $(x_k^{\text{MMS}})_{k=0,\dots,K}$ of (15) it holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0,\dots,K} \|x_k^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^4 \leq \mathcal{M}^{\text{MMS}}$$

with a constant $\mathcal{M}^{\text{MMS}} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{MMS}}(K\tau, C_2, \rho_0) > 0$.

Proof. Since x_k^{MMS} is the minimizer of \mathcal{E}_k , see (15), a comparison with the old iterate x_{k-1}^{MMS} yields

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x_k^{\text{MMS}}) \leq \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}})$$

for any $k = 1, \dots, K$. Using the standard inequality (21) for $p = 2$ and $J = k$, this can be utilized to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_k^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 &\leq 2\|x_0^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 + 2K \sum_{\ell=1}^k \|x_\ell^{\text{MMS}} - x_{\ell-1}^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 2\|x_0^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 + 4K\tau \sum_{\ell=1}^k (\mathcal{E}(x_{\ell-1}^{\text{MMS}}) - \mathcal{E}(x_\ell^{\text{MMS}})) \\
&= 2\|x_0^{\text{MMS}}\|_2^2 + 4K\tau (\mathcal{E}(x_0^{\text{MMS}}) - \mathcal{E}(x_k^{\text{MMS}})) \\
&\leq 2\|x_0\|_2^2 + 4K\tau (\mathcal{E}(x_0) - \underline{\mathcal{E}}) \\
&\leq 2\|x_0\|_2^2 + 4K\tau C_2(1 + \|x_0\|_2^2) \\
&= 2(1 + 2K\tau C_2)\|x_0\|_2^2 + 4K\tau C_2,
\end{aligned}$$

which trivially also holds for $k = 0$. Taking the square and expectation w.r.t. the initial condition ρ_0 on both sides concludes the proof. \square

C.4 Boundedness of the implicit version of the CH scheme (14)

Let us recall that the iterates $(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of the scheme (14) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} &= \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x), \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) := \frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x), \\
\tilde{x}_0^{\text{CH}} &= x_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.6 (Boundedness of the implicit version of the CH scheme (14)). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3. Moreover, let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, for the iterates $(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})_{k=0, \dots, K}$ of (14) it holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 \leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}$$

with a constant $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}} = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}(\tau, C_2, \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}) > 0$.

Proof. Since \tilde{x}_k^{CH} is the minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$, see (14), a comparison with x_{k-1}^{CH} yields

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \leq \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}).$$

This can be utilized to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 &= 2\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + 2\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 4\tau (\mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})) + 2\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 4\tau (\mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}) - \underline{\mathcal{E}}) + 2\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 4\tau C_2 \left(1 + \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2\right) + 2\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \\
&= 2(1 + 2\tau C_2)\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + 4\tau C_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the square and expectation w.r.t. the initial condition ρ_0 on both sides concludes the proof by virtue of Lemma C.3. \square

C.5 Boundedness of all numerical schemes

Remark C.7 (Boundedness of the schemes (4), (13), (14) and (15)). *To keep the notation of the main body of the paper concise, we denote by \mathcal{M} the collective moment bound*

$$\mathcal{M} = \max \left\{ \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CBO}}, \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{MMS}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}} \right\}, \quad (30)$$

where \mathcal{M}^{CBO} , \mathcal{M}^{CH} , $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{MMS}}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}$ are as defined in Lemmas C.2, C.3, C.4, C.5, and C.6, respectively. Moreover, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CBO}} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}(1/\Delta t, \sigma, d, b_1, b_2, K\Delta t, K, \rho_0)$.

D Proof details for Theorem 6

Theorem 6 is centered around the observation that, as $\lambda \rightarrow 1/\Delta t$ in the CBO dynamics (2), the CBO scheme (4) resembles an implementation of the CH scheme (13) via sampling from the underlying distribution μ_k and computing the associated weighted empirical average. Accordingly, the proof of Theorem 6 consists of three ingredients. First, a stability estimate for the CBO dynamics (2) w.r.t. the parameter λ , see Lemma D.2. Second, a quantification of the structural difference in the noise component between the CBO scheme (4) and the CH scheme (13), and third a large deviation bound to control the sampling error associated with the Monte Carlo approximation of the CH scheme (13), see Lemma D.3.

D.1 Stability of the consensus point (3) w.r.t. the underlying measure

We first recall from [26, Lemma 3.2] in a slightly modified form a stability estimate for the consensus point (3) w.r.t. the measure from which it is computed. Loosely speaking, we show that the mapping $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is Lipschitz-continuous in the Wasserstein-2 metric.

Lemma D.1 (Stability of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A2. Moreover, let $\varrho, \varrho' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be random measures and define the cutoff function (random variable)*

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \max \left\{ \int \|\cdot\|_2^4 d\varrho, \int \|\cdot\|_2^4 d\varrho' \right\} \leq M^4, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then it holds

$$\|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho')\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \leq c_0 W_2(\varrho, \varrho') \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1$$

with a constant $c_0 = c_0(\alpha, C_1, C_2, M) > 0$.

Proof. To start with, we note that under A2 and with Jensen's inequality it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{-\alpha\mathcal{E}} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1}{\int \exp(-\alpha(\mathcal{E}(x) - \mathcal{E})) d\varrho(x)} \leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1}{\int \exp(-\alpha C_2(1 + \|x\|_2^2)) d\varrho(x)} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1}{\exp(-\alpha C_2(1 + \int \|x\|_2^2 d\varrho(x)))} \leq \exp(\alpha C_2(1 + M^2)) =: c_M. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

An analogous statement can be obtained for the measure ϱ' .

By definition of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$ in (3), it holds for any coupling $\gamma \in \Pi(\varrho, \varrho')$ between ϱ and ϱ' by Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho')\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 &\leq \iint \left\| x \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} - x' \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x')}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho')}} \right\|_2 d\gamma(x, x') \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \\ &\leq \iint (\|T_1(x, x')\|_2 + \|T_2(x, x')\|_2 + \|T_3(x, x')\|_2) d\gamma(x, x') \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the terms T_1, T_2 and T_3 are defined implicitly and bounded as follows. For the first term T_1 we have

$$\|T_1(x, x')\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 = \|x - x'\|_2 \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \leq c_M \|x - x'\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1, \quad (33)$$

where we utilized (31) in the last step. For the second term T_2 , with A2 and again (31) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_2(x, x')\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 &= \|x'\|_2 \frac{|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) - \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x')|}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \\ &\leq \|x'\|_2 \frac{\alpha e^{-\alpha\mathcal{E}} C_1 (\|x\|_2 + \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} \\ &\leq \alpha c_M C_1 \|x'\|_2 (\|x\|_2 + \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Eventually, for the third term T_3 it holds by following similar steps

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_3(x, x')\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 &= \|x'\|_2 \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x') \frac{\left| \|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho')} - \|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)} \right|}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)} \|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho')}} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \\
&\leq c_M \|x'\|_2 \frac{\iint \alpha e^{-\alpha \mathcal{E}} C_1 (\|x\|_2 + \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 d\pi(x, x')}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \\
&\leq \alpha c_M^2 C_1 \|x'\|_2 \iint (\|x\|_2 + \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 d\pi(x, x') \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Collecting the estimates (33)–(35) in (32), we obtain with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and by exploiting the definition of $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1$ that

$$\|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho')\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1 \leq c_M (1 + 2\alpha(1 + c_M)C_1 M^2) \sqrt{\iint \|x - x'\|_2^2 d\gamma(x, x')} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_M^1. \tag{36}$$

Squaring both sides and optimizing over all couplings $\gamma \in \Pi(\varrho, \varrho')$ concludes the proof. \square

D.2 Stability of the CBO dynamics (2) w.r.t. the parameters λ and σ

Let us now show the stability of the CBO dynamics (2) w.r.t. its parameters, in particular, the drift and noise parameters λ and σ . For this we control in Lemma D.2 below the mismatch of the iterates of the CBO dynamics (2) for different parameters, however, provided coinciding initialization and discrete Brownian motion paths.

Lemma D.2 (Stability of the CBO dynamics (2)). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A3. Moreover, let $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}_4(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We denote by $((X_k^{i,1})_{k=0,\dots,K})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ and $((X_k^{i,2})_{k=0,\dots,K})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ solutions to (2) with parameters λ_1, σ_1 and λ_2, σ_2 , respectively. Furthermore, we write $(\hat{\rho}_k^{N,1})_{k=0,\dots,K}$ and $(\hat{\rho}_k^{N,2})_{k=0,\dots,K}$ for the associated empirical measures and introduce the cutoff function (random variable)*

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \max \left\{ \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^{N,1}, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^{N,2} \right\} \leq M^4, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

Then, under the assumption of coinciding initial conditions $X_0^{i,1} = X_0^{i,2}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ as well as Gaussian random vectors B_k^i for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ and all $i = 1, \dots, N$, it holds

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \leq c_1 \left(|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \right) e^{c_2(k-1)}$$

with constants $c_1 = c_1(\Delta t, d, b_1, b_2, M) > 0$ and $c_2 = c_2(\Delta t, d, \alpha, \lambda_2, \sigma_2, C_1, C_2, M) > 0$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Proof. Let us first remark that the cutoff function $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1$ defined in (37) is adapted to the natural filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=0,\dots,K}$, where \mathcal{F}_k denotes the sigma algebra generated by $\{B_\ell^i, \ell = 1, \dots, k, i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Now, using the iterative update rule (2) for $X_k^{i,1}$ and $X_k^{i,2}$ with parameters λ_1, σ_1 and λ_2, σ_2 , respectively, we obtain, by employing the standard inequality (21) for

$p = 2$ and $J = 5$, for their squared norm difference the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 &\lesssim \|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 + (\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\quad + (\Delta t \lambda_2)^2 \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\quad + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})\|_2^2 \right) \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + \sigma_2^2 \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \right) \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + (\Delta t \lambda_2)^2 + \sigma_2^2 \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \right) \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \left((\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \right) \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})\|_2^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Since $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1$ satisfies $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 = \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,\ell}^1$ for all $\ell \leq k$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \leq 1$, we obtain from (38) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + (\Delta t \lambda_2)^2 + \sigma_2^2 \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \right) \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \right) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \\
&\quad + \left((\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \right) \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})\|_2^2 \right) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1.
\end{aligned}$$

With the random variables $X_{k-1}^{i,1}$, $X_{k-1}^{i,2}$, $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})$, $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1$ being \mathcal{F}_{k-1} -measurable, taking the expectation w.r.t. the sampling of the random vectors B_k^i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, i.e., the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_k = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_k \|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + (\Delta t \lambda_2)^2 + d \Delta t \sigma_2^2 \right) \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \right) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \\
&\quad + \left((\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 + d \Delta t |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \right) \left(\|X_{k-1}^{i,1}\|_2^2 + \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})\|_2^2 \right) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\mathbb{E}_k \|B_k^i\|_2^2 = d \Delta t$. Taking now the total expectation \mathbb{E} on both sides, we have by tower property (law of total expectation)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + (\Delta t \lambda_2)^2 + d \Delta t \sigma_2^2 \right) \left(\mathbb{E} \|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 + \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \right) \\
&\quad + \left((\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 + d \Delta t |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \right) \left(\mathbb{E} \|X_{k-1}^{i,1}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 + \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1})\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

As a consequence of the stability estimate for the consensus point, Lemma D.1, it holds for a constant $c_0 = c_0(\alpha, C_1, C_2, M) > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2})\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \leq c_0 \mathbb{E} W_2^2(\widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,1}, \widehat{\rho}_{k-1}^{N,2}) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \\
&\leq c_0 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1,
\end{aligned}$$

where we chose $\pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_{k-1}^{i,1}} \otimes \delta_{X_{k-1}^{i,2}}$ as viable transportation plan in Definition (20) to upper bound the Wasserstein distance in the second step. Utilizing this when averaging (39) over i gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \lesssim (1 + c_0) \left(1 + (\Delta t \lambda_2)^2 + d \Delta t \sigma_2^2 \right) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|X_{k-1}^{i,1} - X_{k-1}^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1 \\
&\quad + \left((\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 + d \Delta t |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \right) (b_1 + (1 + b_2) M^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where we employed Lemma C.1 together with the definition of the cutoff function $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k-1}^1$ to obtain the bound in the second line of (40). Exploiting that $X_0^{i,1} = X_0^{i,2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ by assumption, we conclude the proof by an application of the discrete variant of Grönwall's inequality (22), which proves that for all $k \geq 1$ it holds

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|X_k^{i,1} - X_k^{i,2}\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \leq c_1 \left((\Delta t |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|)^2 + d \Delta t |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \right) e^{c_2(k-1)}$$

with constants $c_1 = c_1(b_1, b_2, M) > 0$ and $c_2 = c_2(c_0, \Delta t, d, \lambda_2, \sigma_2) > 0$. \square

D.3 A large deviation bound for the consensus point (3)

For a given measure $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and a set of N i.i.d. random variables $Y^i \sim \varrho$ with empirical random measure $\hat{\varrho}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y^i}$, one expects that under certain regularity assumptions it holds by the law of large numbers

$$x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\varrho}^N) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\varrho) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

This is made rigorous in the subsequent lemma, which is based on arguments from [90, Lemma 3.1] and [30, Lemma 23].

Lemma D.3 (Large deviation bound for the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$). *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy A1–A2. Moreover, for $k = 1, \dots, K$, let $\mu_k \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a random measure, let $(Y_k^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ be N i.i.d. random variables distributed according to μ_k , denote by $\hat{\mu}_k^N$ the empirical random measure $\hat{\mu}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y_k^i}$ and define the cutoff function (random variable)*

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \max \left\{ \int \|\cdot\|_2^4 d\hat{\mu}_k^N, \int \|\cdot\|_2^4 d\mu_k \right\} \leq M^4, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

Then it holds

$$\max_{k=1, \dots, K} \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k)\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \leq c_3 N^{-1}$$

with a constant $c_3 = c_3(\alpha, b_1, b_2, C_2, M) > 0$.

Proof. To start with, we note that under A2 and with Jensen's inequality it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{-\alpha \mathcal{E}} \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \exp(-\alpha(\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j) - \mathcal{E}))} \leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \exp(-\alpha C_2(1 + \|Y_k^j\|_2^2))} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2}{\exp(-\alpha C_2(1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|Y_k^j\|_2^2))} \leq \exp(\alpha C_2(1 + M^2)) =: c_M. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

By definition of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$ in (3), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k)\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N Y_k^i \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} - \int x \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\mu_k)}} d\mu_k(x) \right\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\ &\leq (\|T_1\|_2 + \|T_2\|_2) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where the terms T_1 and T_2 are defined implicitly and bounded as follows. For the first term T_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_1\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N Y_k^i \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} - \int x \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} d\mu_k(x) \right\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\ &= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_k^i \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i) - \int x \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq c_M e^{\alpha \mathcal{E}} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_k^i \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i) - \int x \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x) \right\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where we utilized (42) in the last step. Similarly, for the second term T_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_2\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 &= \left\| \int x \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} d\mu_k(x) - \int x \frac{\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x)}{\|\omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}\|_{L_1(\mu_k)}} d\mu_k(x) \right\|_2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\
&= \frac{\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j)} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k)\|_2 \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j) - \int \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x) \right|_2 \\
&\leq c_M e^{\alpha\mathcal{E}} (b_1 + b_2 M) \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^j) - \int \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x) \right|_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where the last step involved additionally Lemma C.1. Let us now introduce the random variables

$$Z_k^i := Y_k^i \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i) - \int x \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x) \quad \text{and} \quad z_k^i := \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i) - \int \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x),$$

respectively, which have zero expectation, and are i.i.d. for $i = 1, \dots, N$. With these definitions as well as the bounds (44) and (45) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|T_1\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 &\leq c_M^2 e^{2\alpha\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_k^i \right\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 = c_M^2 e^{2\alpha\mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \langle Z_k^i, Z_k^j \rangle \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\
&= c_M^2 e^{2\alpha\mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Z_k^i\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \leq 4c_M^2 M^2 \frac{1}{N}
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

and, analogously,

$$\mathbb{E} \|T_2\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \leq c_M^2 e^{2\alpha\mathcal{E}} (b_1 + b_2 M)^2 \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N \|z_k^i\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \leq 4c_M^2 (b_1 + b_2 M)^2 \frac{1}{N}. \tag{47}$$

The last inequalities of (46) and (47) are due to the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Z_k^i\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Y_k^i \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(Y_k^i)\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 + 2\mathbb{E} \left\| \int x \omega_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(x) d\mu_k(x) \right\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\
&\leq 2e^{-2\alpha\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|Y_k^i\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 + 2e^{-2\alpha\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E} \int \|x\|_2^2 d\mu_k(x) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\
&\leq 4e^{-2\alpha\mathcal{E}} M^2
\end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \|z_k^1\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \leq 4e^{-2\alpha\mathcal{E}}.$$

Combining (46) and (47) concludes the proof. \square

Remark D.4. Alternatively to the explicit computations of Lemma D.3, the stability estimate for the consensus point, Lemma D.1, would allow to obtain

$$\max_{k=1, \dots, K} \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k)\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \leq c_0 \max_{k=1, \dots, K} \mathbb{E} W_2^2(\hat{\mu}_k^N, \mu_k) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2,$$

where $\mathbb{E} W_2^2(\hat{\mu}_k^N, \mu_k)$ can be controlled by employing [91, Theorem 1]. This, however, only gives a quantitative convergence rate of order $\mathcal{O}(N^{-2/d})$, which is affected by the curse of dimensionality. The convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$ obtained in Lemma D.3 matches the one to be expected from Monte Carlo sampling.

D.4 Proof of Theorem 6

We now have all necessary tools at hand to present the detailed proof of Theorem 6.

Proof of Theorem 6. We notice that for the choice $\lambda = 1/\Delta t$ the iterative update rule of the particles of the CBO dynamics (2) becomes

$$\tilde{X}_k^i = x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\rho}_{k-1}^N) + \sigma D(\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\rho}_{k-1}^N)) B_k^i, \quad (48)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{X}_k^i}$. In this case, the associated CBO scheme (4) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} &= x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\rho}_k^N) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\rho}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{X}_k^i}, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{X}_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}, \Delta t \sigma^2 D(\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i - \tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}})^2\right), \\ \tilde{x}_0^{\text{CBO}} &= x_0, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

which resembles the CH dynamics (13) with the difference in the underlying measure on which basis the consensus point (3) is computed. Let us further denote by $\hat{\mu}_k^N$ the empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y_k^i}$, where $Y_k^i \sim \mu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, i.e., $Y_k^i = x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} + \tilde{\sigma} B_{Y,k}^i$ with $B_{Y,k}^i$ being a standard Gaussian random vector.

To obtain the probabilistic formulation of the statement, let us denote the underlying probability space over which all considered random variables get their realizations by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and introduce the subset Ω_M of Ω of suitably bounded random variables according to

$$\Omega_M := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \max \left\{ \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^N, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\tilde{\rho}_k^N, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\mu_k, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\mu}_k^N \right\} \leq M^4 \right\}.$$

For the associated cutoff function (random variable) we write $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M}$. Moreover, let us define the cutoff functions

$$\mathcal{I}_{M,k} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \max \left\{ \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^N, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\tilde{\rho}_k^N, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\mu_k, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\mu}_k^N \right\} \leq M^4 \text{ for all } \ell \leq k, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

which are adapted to the natural filtration and satisfy $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M} \leq \mathcal{I}_{M,k}$ as well as $\mathcal{I}_{M,k} = \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \mathcal{I}_{M,\ell}$ for all $\ell \leq k$.

We can decompose the expected squared discrepancy $\mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M}$ between the CBO scheme (4) and the CH scheme (13) as

$$\mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} + 2\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k}. \quad (51)$$

In what follows we individually bound the two terms on the right-hand side of (51).

First term: Let us start with the term $\mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k}$, which we bound by combining the stability estimate for the consensus point, Lemma D.1, with Lemma D.2, a stability estimate for the underlying CBO dynamics (2) w.r.t. its parameters λ and σ . Denoting the auxiliary cutoff function defined in (37) in the setting $\hat{\rho}_k^{N,1} = \hat{\rho}_k^N$ and $\hat{\rho}_k^{N,2} = \tilde{\rho}_k^N$ by $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1$, we have due to Lemma D.1 the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} &= \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\rho}_k^N)\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\rho}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\rho}_k^N)\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \leq c_0 \mathbb{E} W_2^2(\hat{\rho}_k^N, \tilde{\rho}_k^N) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

with a constant $c_0 = c_0(\alpha, C_1, C_2, M) > 0$. In the first inequality of (52) we exploited $\mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1$. The Wasserstein distance appearing on the right-hand side of (52) can be upper bounded by choosing $\pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_k^i} \otimes \delta_{\tilde{X}_k^i}$ as viable transportation plan in Definition (20). This constitutes the first inequality in the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} W_2^2(\hat{\rho}_k^N, \tilde{\rho}_k^N) \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|X_k^i - \tilde{X}_k^i\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^1 \\ &\leq c_1 \left(|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2 \right) e^{c_2(k-1)} \leq c_1 \left| \lambda - \frac{1}{\Delta t} \right|^2 e^{c_2(k-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

whereas the second step is a consequence of Lemma D.2 applied with $\lambda_1 = \lambda, \sigma_1 = \sigma$ and $\lambda_2 = 1/\Delta t, \sigma_2 = \sigma$ as exploited in the third step. Hence, the constants are $c_1 = c_1(\Delta t, d, b_1, b_2, M) > 0$ and $c_2 = c_2(\Delta t, d, \alpha, \lambda, \sigma, C_1, C_2, M) > 0$.

Second term: To control the term $\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k}$ we start by decomposing it according to

$$\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N)\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} + 2\mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N) - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k}, \quad (54)$$

where $\hat{\mu}_k^N$ is introduced at the beginning of the proof. For the first summand in (54) the stability estimate for the consensus point, Lemma D.1, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N)\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} &= \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\rho}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N)\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \\ &\leq c_0 \mathbb{E} W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_k^N, \hat{\mu}_k^N) \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

with a constant $c_0 = c_0(\alpha, C_1, C_2, M) > 0$. By choosing $\pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{X}_k^i} \otimes \delta_{Y_k^i}$ as viable transportation plan in Definition (20), we can further bound

$$\mathbb{E} W_2^2(\tilde{\rho}_k^N, \hat{\mu}_k^N) \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_k^i - Y_k^i\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \quad (56)$$

and since $\tilde{X}_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}, \Delta t \sigma^2 D(\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i - \tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}})^2)$ and $Y_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_k^i - Y_k^i\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sigma^2 \mathbb{E} \|D(\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i - \tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}) B_k^i\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} + \tilde{\sigma}^2 \mathbb{E} \|B_{Y_k^i}^i\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} + 8\sigma^2 \Delta t (b_1 + (1 + b_2)M^2) + 4\tilde{\sigma}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Note that in the last step we exploited the definition of the cutoff function $\mathcal{I}_{M,k}$, which allowed to derive the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|D(\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i - \tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}) B_k^i\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} &\leq \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left(\|\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i\|_2^2 + \|\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^2 \right) \|B_k^i\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} \\ &\leq 2(b_1 + (1 + b_2)M^2) \end{aligned}$$

by using Lemma C.1 and the fact that $B_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t \text{Id})$ is independent from \tilde{X}_{k-1}^i and $\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}}$. Inserting (57) into (56) and this into (55) afterwards, we are left with

$$\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N)\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq c \left(\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} + \sigma^2 \Delta t + \tilde{\sigma}^2 \right) \quad (58)$$

with a constant $c = c(c_0, b_1, b_2, M) > 0$. For the second summand in (54) we have by Lemma D.3

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N) - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} &\leq \mathbb{E} \|x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mu}_k^N) - x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k)\|_2^2 \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2 \\ &\leq c_3 N^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

with $c_3 = c_3(\alpha, b_1, b_2, C_2, M) > 0$ and where $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{M,k}^2$ is an auxiliary cutoff function as defined in (41). Combining (58) with (59) we arrive for (54) at

$$\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq c \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_{k-1}^{\text{CBO}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k-1} + c\sigma^2 \Delta t + c\tilde{\sigma}^2 + c_3 N^{-1}. \quad (60)$$

An application of the discrete variant of Grönwall's inequality (22) shows that

$$\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathcal{I}_{M,k} \leq c^k \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{x}_0^{\text{CBO}} - x_0^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + (c\sigma^2 \Delta t + c\tilde{\sigma}^2 + c_3 N^{-1}) e^{c(k-1)}, \quad (61)$$

where the first term vanishes as both schemes are initialized with x_0 .

Concluding step: Collecting the estimates (52) combined with (53), and (61) yields for (51) the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M} &\lesssim c_0 c_1 \left| \lambda - \frac{1}{\Delta t} \right|^2 e^{c_2(k-1)} + (c\sigma^2 \Delta t + c\tilde{\sigma}^2 + c_3 N^{-1}) e^{c(k-1)} \\ &\leq C \left(\left| \lambda - \frac{1}{\Delta t} \right|^2 + \sigma^2 \Delta t + \tilde{\sigma}^2 + c_3 N^{-1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

with a constant $C = C(\Delta t, d, \alpha, \lambda, \sigma, b_1, b_2, C_1, C_2, K, M) > 0$. Observe that we additionally used $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M} \leq \mathcal{I}_{M,k}$ as observed at the beginning.

Probabilistic formulation: We first note that with Markov's inequality we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_M^c) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=0, \dots, K} \max \left\{ \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^N, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\tilde{\rho}_k^N, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\mu_k, \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\tilde{\mu}_k^N \right\} > M^4 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^4} \left(\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\hat{\rho}_k^N + \mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\tilde{\rho}_k^N \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\mu_k + \mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \int \|\bullet\|_2^4 d\tilde{\mu}_k^N \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^4} (\mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}} + \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CBO}} + \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}} + \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemmas C.2, C.3 and C.4. Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CBO}}$ represents the constant \mathcal{M}^{CBO} from Lemma C.2 in the setting where $\lambda = 1/\Delta t$, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CBO}} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}(1/\Delta t, \sigma, d, b_1, b_2, K\Delta t, K, \rho_0)$. Thus, for any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, a sufficiently large choice $M = M(\delta^{-1}, \mathcal{M}^{\text{CBO}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CBO}}, \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}})$ allows to ensure $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_M^c) \leq \delta$. To conclude the proof, let us denote by $K_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$ the set, where (16) does not hold and abbreviate

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1} C \left(\left| \lambda - \frac{1}{\Delta t} \right|^2 + \sigma^2 \Delta t + \tilde{\sigma}^2 + c_3 N^{-1} \right).$$

For the probability of this set we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(K_\varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(K_\varepsilon \cap \Omega_M) + \mathbb{P}(K_\varepsilon \cap \Omega_M^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(K_\varepsilon | \Omega_M) \mathbb{P}(\Omega_M) + \mathbb{P}(\Omega_M^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(K_\varepsilon | \Omega_M) + \delta \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mid \Omega_M \right] + \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where the last step is due to Markov's inequality. By definition of the conditional expectation we further have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mid \Omega_M \right] \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_M)} \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M} \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CBO}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_M}.$$

Inserting now the expression from (62) concludes the proof. \square

E Proof details for Proposition 7 and Theorem 8

Proposition 7 and Theorem 8 are centered around the observation that the CH scheme (13) behaves gradient-like. To establish this, Proposition 7 exploits, by using the quantitative nonasymptotic Laplace principle (see Section E.1 and in particular Proposition E.2 for a review of [30, Proposition 18]), that one step of the implicit CH scheme (14) can be recast into the computation of a consensus point $x_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$ for an objective function of the form $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) = \frac{1}{2\tau} \|\bullet - x\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x)$. To prove Theorem 8, this is combined with a stability argument for the MMS (15), which relies on the Λ -convexity of \mathcal{E} (Assumption A4).

E.1 A quantitative nonasymptotic Laplace principle

The Laplace principle [36, 37] asserts that for any absolutely continuous probability measure $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ it holds

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left(-\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left(\int \exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x)) d\varrho(x) \right) \right) = \inf_{x \in \text{supp}(\varrho)} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x).$$

This suggests that, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, the Gibbs measure $\eta_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} = \omega_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \varrho / \|\omega_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}\|_{L_1(\varrho)}$ converges to a discrete probability distribution (i.e., a convex combination of Dirac measures) supported on the set of global minimizers of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$. However, even in the case that such minimizer is unique, it does not permit to quantify the proximity of $x_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(\varrho) = \int x d\eta_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$ (see also Equation (3)) to the minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ without the following assumption (see also Remark B.1).

Definition E.1 (Inverse continuity property). *A function $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies the ℓ^2 -inverse continuity property globally if there exist constants $\eta, \nu > 0$ such that*

$$\|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\eta} (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) - \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}})^\nu \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (64)$$

where $\tilde{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the unique global minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ with objective value $\underline{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x)$.

As elaborated on in Remark B.1 for the (ℓ^∞ -)inverse continuity property, it is usually sufficient if (64) holds locally around the global minimizer \tilde{x}^* . In the following Proposition E.2, however, we recall the quantitative Laplace principle in the slightly more specific form, where the ℓ^2 -inverse continuity property holds globally as required by Definition E.1. For the general version, namely in the case of functions which satisfy (64) only on an ℓ^2 -ball around \tilde{x}^* (see [30, Definition 8 (A2)] for the details), we refer to [30, Proposition 18].

Proposition E.2 (Quantitative Laplace principle). *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy the ℓ^2 -inverse continuity property in form of Definition E.1. Moreover, let $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For any $r > 0$ define $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r := \sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}^*)} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) - \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$. Then, for fixed $\alpha > 0$ it holds for any $r, q > 0$ that*

$$\|x_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(\varrho) - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \leq \frac{(q + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r)^\nu}{\eta} + \frac{\exp(-\alpha q)}{\varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*))} \int \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 d\varrho(x). \quad (65)$$

Proof. W.l.o.g. we may assume $\underline{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} = 0$ since a constant offset to $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ neither affects the definition of the consensus point in (3) nor the quantities appearing on the right-hand side of (65).

By Markov's inequality it holds $\|\exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}})\|_{L_1(\varrho)} \geq a \varrho(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x)) \geq a\})$ for any $a > 0$. With the choice $a = \exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r)$ and noting that

$$\varrho \left(\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x)) \geq \exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r) \right\} \right) = \varrho \left(\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r \right\} \right) \geq \varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*)),$$

we obtain $\|\exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}})\|_{L_1(\varrho)} \geq \exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r) \varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*))$. Now let $\tilde{r} \geq r > 0$. With the definition of the consensus point in (3) and by Jensen's inequality we can decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(\varrho) - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 &\leq \int_{B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*)} \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \frac{\exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x))}{\|\exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}})\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} d\varrho(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{(B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*))^c} \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \frac{\exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x))}{\|\exp(-\alpha \tilde{\mathcal{E}})\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} d\varrho(x). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by \tilde{r} since $\|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \leq \tilde{r}$ for all $x \in B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*)$. For the second term we use the formerly derived $\|\exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}})\|_{L_1(\varrho)} \geq \exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r)\varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*))$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*))^c} \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \frac{\exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x))}{\|\exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}})\|_{L_1(\varrho)}} d\varrho(x) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r)\varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*))} \int_{(B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*))^c} \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x)) d\varrho(x) \\ & \leq \frac{\exp\left(-\alpha\left(\inf_{x \in (B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*))^c} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r\right)\right)}{\varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*))} \int \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 d\varrho(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\tilde{r} \geq r > 0$ we obtain

$$\|x_{\alpha}^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(\varrho) - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 \leq \tilde{r} + \frac{\exp\left(-\alpha\left(\inf_{x \in (B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*))^c} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r\right)\right)}{\varrho(B_r(\tilde{x}^*))} \int \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 d\varrho(x). \quad (66)$$

We now choose $\tilde{r} = (q + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r)^\nu / \eta$, which satisfies $\tilde{r} \geq r$, since (64) with $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = 0$ implies

$$\tilde{r} = \frac{(q + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r)^\nu}{\eta} \geq \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r^\nu}{\eta} = \frac{\left(\sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}^*)} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x)\right)^\nu}{\eta} \geq \sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}^*)} \|x - \tilde{x}^*\|_2 = r.$$

Using again (64) with $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = 0$ we thus have

$$\inf_{x \in (B_{\tilde{r}}(\tilde{x}^*))^c} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r \geq (\eta\tilde{r})^{1/\nu} - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r = q + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_r = q.$$

Inserting this and the definition of \tilde{r} into (66) gives the statement. \square

E.2 The auxiliary function $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$

Let us now show that the function $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) := \frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(x)$, which appears later in the proofs of Proposition 7 and Theorem 8, satisfies the ℓ^2 -inverse continuity property in form of Definition E.1 if \mathcal{E} is Λ -convex and the parameter τ sufficiently small. As we discuss in Remark E.4 below, the condition on the parameter τ vanishes if \mathcal{E} is convex, i.e., $\Lambda \geq 0$.

Lemma E.3 ($\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ satisfies the ℓ^2 -inverse continuity property). *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ be defined as above with $\tau > 0$ and with $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying A4. Moreover, if $\Lambda < 0$, assume further that $\tau < 1/(-\Lambda)$. Then, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ satisfies the ℓ^2 -inverse continuity property (64) with parameters*

$$\nu = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\tau} + \frac{\Lambda}{2}}.$$

I.e., denoting the unique global minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ by \tilde{x}_k^{CH} , it holds

$$\|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \right)^\nu \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (67)$$

Proof. We first notice that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ is $2\eta^2 = \left(\frac{1+\Lambda\tau}{\tau}\right)$ -strongly convex ($2\eta^2 > 0$ by assumption), since

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1+\Lambda\tau}{\tau} \right) \|x\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{2\tau} \left(\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 \right) + \mathcal{E}(x) - \frac{\Lambda}{2} \|x\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\tau} \underbrace{\left(\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 - 2\langle x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, x \rangle \right)}_{\text{convex since linear}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{E}(x) - \frac{\Lambda}{2} \|x\|_2^2}_{\text{convex by A4}} \end{aligned}$$

is convex by being the sum of two convex functions. By strong convexity of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$, \tilde{x}_k^{CH} exists, is unique and for all $\xi \in [0, 1]$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1+\Lambda\tau}{\tau} \right) \xi(1-\xi) \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 &\leq \xi\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) + (1-\xi)\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(\xi x + (1-\xi)\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \\ &\leq \xi \left(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last inequality that \tilde{x}_k^{CH} minimizes $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$. Dividing both sides by ξ , letting $\xi \rightarrow 0$ and reordering the inequality gives the result. \square

Remark E.4. In the case that \mathcal{E} is Λ -convex with $\Lambda < 0$ (i.e., potentially nonconvex), Lemma E.3 requires that the parameter τ is sufficiently small, in order to ensure that $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ is strongly convex and therefore has a unique global minimizer \tilde{x}_k^{CH} . On the other hand, if \mathcal{E} is convex, i.e., $\Lambda \geq 0$, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ is strongly convex and therefore such constraint is not necessary, i.e., τ can be chosen arbitrarily.

Next, we give technical estimates on the quantities $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r$, $\nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}))$ and $\int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x)$, which appear when applying Proposition E.2 in the setting of the function $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ and the probability measure $\nu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, 2\tilde{\sigma}^2\text{Id})$. This allows to keep the proof of Proposition 7 more concise.

Lemma E.5. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be as defined above with $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying A2. Then for the expressions $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r$, $\nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}))$ and $\int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x)$ appearing in Equation (65) the following estimates hold. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2\tau} \left(r + 4\tau C_1 (\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) \right) + C_1 (r + 2\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) \right) r, \\ \nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})) &\geq \frac{1}{(2\tilde{\sigma})^d} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\tilde{\sigma}^2} \left(r^2 + 8\tau^2 C_1^2 (\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2) \right)\right) \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)} r^d, \\ \int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x) &\leq 2\tau C_1 (\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) + \sqrt{2d}\tilde{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us start by investigating the expressions $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r$, $\nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}))$ and $\int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x)$ individually.

Term $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r$: By definition (see Proposition E.2) and under A2 it holds

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r &= \sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\tau} \sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} \left(\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - x\|_2^2 - \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \right) + \sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} \mathcal{E}(x) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\tau} (r + 2\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) r + C_1 (r + 2\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) r \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2\tau} (r + 2\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) + C_1 (r + 2\|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) \right) r. \end{aligned}$$

Term $\nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}))$: Using the density of the multivariate normal distribution $\nu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, 2\tilde{\sigma}^2\text{Id})$ we can directly compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})) &= \frac{1}{(4\pi\tilde{\sigma}^2)^{d/2}} \int_{B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2} \|x - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2\right) d\lambda(x) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(4\pi\tilde{\sigma}^2)^{d/2}} \int_{B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\tilde{\sigma}^2} \left(\|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \right)\right) d\lambda(x) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(4\pi\tilde{\sigma}^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\tilde{\sigma}^2} \left(r^2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \right)\right) \int_{B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} d\lambda(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\tilde{\sigma})^d} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\tilde{\sigma}^2} \left(r^2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \right)\right) \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)} r^d, \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last step that the volume of a d -dimensional unit ball is $\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)$. Here, Γ denotes Euler's gamma function. We recall for the readers' convenience that by Stirling's approximation $\Gamma(x + 1) \sim \sqrt{2\pi x} (x/e)^x$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Term $\int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x)$: A straightforward computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x) &= \int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})(x) \\ &= \int \|x + x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\mathcal{N}(0, 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})(x) \\ &\leq \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \int \|x\|_2 d\mathcal{N}(0, 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})(x) \\ &\leq \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \sqrt{2d}\tilde{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Concluding step: To conclude the proof, we further observe that since \tilde{x}_k^{CH} is the minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$, see (14), a comparison with x_{k-1}^{CH} yields

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 + \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}) \leq \mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}).$$

With A2 it therefore holds

$$\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \leq 2\tau (\mathcal{E}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}) - \mathcal{E}(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})) \leq 2\tau C_1 (\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2) \|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2,$$

or rephrased

$$\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \leq 2\tau C_1 (\|x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2 + \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2).$$

Exploiting this estimate in the former bounds, gives the statements. \square

E.3 Proof of Proposition 7

We now have all necessary tools at hand to present the detailed proof of Proposition 7.

Proof of Proposition 7. By using the quantitative Laplace principle E.2, we make rigorous and quantify the fact that x_k^{CH} approximates the minimizer of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$, denoted by \tilde{x}_k , for sufficiently large α .

To obtain the probabilistic formulation of the statement, let us again denote the underlying probability space by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ (note that we can use the same probability space as in Section D since the stochasticity of both schemes (13) and (14) is solely coming from the initialization) and introduce the subset $\tilde{\Omega}_M$ of Ω of suitably bounded random variables according to

$$\tilde{\Omega}_M := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \max \{ \|x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2, \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \} \leq M \right\}.$$

For the associated cutoff function (random variable) we write $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}$.

We first notice that by definition of the consensus point $x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}$ in (3) it holds

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^{\text{CH}} = x_\alpha^\mathcal{E}(\mu_k) &= \int x \frac{\exp(-\alpha\mathcal{E}(x))}{\|\exp(-\alpha\mathcal{E})\|_{L^1(\mu_k)}} d\mu_k(x) \\ &= \int x \frac{\exp(-\alpha\mathcal{E}(x)) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2} \|x - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2\right)}{\int \exp(-\alpha\mathcal{E}(x')) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2} \|x' - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2\right) d\nu_k(x')} d\nu_k(x) \\ &= \int x \frac{\exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x))}{\|\exp(-\alpha\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)\|_{L^1(\nu_k)}} d\nu_k(x) \\ &= x_\alpha^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k}(\nu_k), \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

which introduces the relation $\tau = 2\alpha\tilde{\sigma}^2$ and where we chose $\nu_k = \mathcal{N}(x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 \text{Id})$, which is globally supported, i.e., $\text{supp}(\nu_k) = \mathbb{R}^d$. Since, according to Lemma E.3, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ satisfies the inverse

continuity property (67) with $\nu = 1/2$ and $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\tau} + \frac{\Lambda}{2}} > 0$, the quantitative Laplace principle, Proposition E.2, gives for any $r, q > 0$ the bound

$$\|x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 = \|x_{\alpha}^{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k}(\nu_k) - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \leq \frac{(q + (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r)^\nu}{\eta} + \frac{\exp(-\alpha q)}{\nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}))} \int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x), \quad (69)$$

where $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r := \sup_{x \in B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}})$. We further notice that by the assumption $\tau < 1/(-2\Lambda)$ if $\Lambda < 0$ it holds $\eta \geq 1/(2\sqrt{\tau})$ (in the case $\Lambda \geq 0$ the same bound holds trivially). Combining (69) with the technical estimates of Lemma E.5 and the definition of the cutoff function $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}$ allows to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(q + (\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k)_r)}{\eta^2} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\exp(-2\alpha q)}{\nu_k(B_r(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}))^2} \left(\int \|x - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 d\nu_k(x) \right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \right] \\ & \leq 8\tau \left(q + \left(\frac{r}{2\tau} + C_1 r + 6C_1 M \right) r \right) \\ & \quad + 4 \exp \left(-2\alpha q + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} (r^2 + 16\tau^2 C_1^2 M^2) \right) \frac{2^d (2\tilde{\sigma}^2)^d}{r^{2d}} \Gamma \left(\frac{d}{2} + 1 \right)^2 (16\tau^2 C_1^2 M^2 + 2d\tilde{\sigma}^2) \\ & = 8\tau \left(q + \left(\frac{r}{2\tau} + C_1 r + 6C_1 M \right) r \right) \\ & \quad + 4 \exp \left(-2\alpha \left(q - \left(\frac{r^2}{\tau} + 16\tau C_1^2 M^2 \right) \right) \right) \frac{2^d \tau^d}{\alpha^d r^{2d}} \Gamma \left(\frac{d}{2} + 1 \right)^2 \left(16\tau^2 C_1^2 M^2 + d \frac{\tau}{\alpha} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where in the last step we just replaced $2\tilde{\sigma}^2$ by τ/α according to the relation. We now choose

$$r = \tau, \quad q = \frac{3}{2}\tau + 16\tau C_1^2 M^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \geq \alpha_0 := \frac{1}{\tau} \left(d \log 2 + \log(1+d) + 2 \log \Gamma \left(\frac{d}{2} + 1 \right) \right),$$

where Γ denotes Euler's gamma function, for which, by Stirling's approximation, it holds $\Gamma(x+1) \sim \sqrt{2\pi x} (x/e)^x$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. With this we can continue the computations of (70) with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} & \leq 8 \left(2 + C_1 \tau + 6C_1 M + 16C_1^2 M^2 \right) \tau^2 \\ & \quad + 4 \exp(-\alpha \tau) \frac{2^d}{\alpha^d \tau^d} \Gamma \left(\frac{d}{2} + 1 \right)^2 \left(16\tau^2 C_1^2 M^2 + d \frac{\tau}{\alpha} \right) \\ & \leq 8 \left(3 + C_1 \tau + 6C_1 M + 24C_1^2 M^2 \right) \tau^2 \\ & \leq c\tau^2 \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

with a constant $c = c(C_1, M)$. Notice that to obtain the last inequality one may first note and exploit that one has $\alpha\tau \geq 1$ as well as $1/\alpha \leq \tau$ as a consequence of $\alpha \geq 1/\tau$.

Probabilistic formulation: We first note that with Markov's inequality we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M^c) & = \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=0, \dots, K} \max \{ \|x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2, \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \} > M \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M^4} \left(\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 + \mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M^4} (\mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}} + \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemmas C.3 and C.6. Thus, for any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, a sufficiently large choice $M = M(\delta^{-1}, \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}})$ allows to ensure $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M^c) \leq \delta$. To conclude the proof, let us denote by $\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$ the set, where (17) does not hold and abbreviate

$$\epsilon = \varepsilon^{-1} c\tau^2.$$

For the probability of this set we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \cap \tilde{\Omega}_M) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \cap \tilde{\Omega}_M^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M) + \delta \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M \right] + \delta,\end{aligned}\quad (72)$$

where the last step is due to Markov's inequality. By definition of the conditional expectation we further have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M \right] \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M)} \mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}.$$

Inserting now the expression from (71) concludes the proof. \square

E.4 Proof of Theorem 8

We now have all necessary tools at hand to present the detailed proof of Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. We combine in what follows Proposition 7 with a stability argument for the MMS (15).

To obtain the probabilistic formulation of the statement, let us denote, as in the proof of Proposition 7, the underlying probability space by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ (note that we can use the same probability space as in Section D since the stochasticity of the three schemes (13), (14) and (15) is solely coming from the initialization) and introduce the subset $\tilde{\Omega}_M$ of Ω of suitably bounded random variables according to

$$\tilde{\Omega}_M := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \max \left\{ \left\| x_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2, \left\| \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2 \right\} \leq M \right\}.$$

For the associated cutoff function (random variable) we write $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}$.

We can decompose the expected squared discrepancy $\mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}$ between the MMS (15) and the CH scheme (13) for any $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$ as

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \leq (1 + \vartheta) \mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} + (1 + \vartheta^{-1}) \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}. \quad (73)$$

In what follows we individually estimate the two terms on the right-hand side of (73).

First term: Let us first bound the term $\mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}$. By definition of x_k^{MMS} and \tilde{x}_k^{CH} as minimizers of (15) and (14), respectively, and with the definition $\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(x) := \mathcal{E}(x) - \frac{\Lambda}{2} \|x\|_2^2$ it holds

$$\frac{(1 + \tau\Lambda)x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}}}{\tau} \in -\partial\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(x_k^{\text{MMS}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(1 + \tau\Lambda)\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}}{\tau} \in -\partial\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}).$$

Since \mathcal{E}_Λ is convex due to A4 and as consequence of the properties of the subdifferential we have

$$\left\langle -\frac{(1 + \tau\Lambda)x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}}}{\tau} + \frac{(1 + \tau\Lambda)\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}}{\tau}, x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\rangle \geq 0,$$

which allows to obtain by means of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$(1 + \tau\Lambda) \left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \leq \langle x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}, x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \rangle \leq \left\| x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2 \left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2$$

or, equivalently,

$$\left\| x_k^{\text{MMS}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{1 + \tau\Lambda} \left\| x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2. \quad (74)$$

Second term: For the term $\mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} - x_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}$ we obtained in (71) in the proof of Proposition 7, for suitable choices of $\tilde{\sigma}$ and α , the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| x_k^{\text{CH}} - \tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \leq c\tau^2 \quad (75)$$

with a constant $c = c(C_1, M)$.

Concluding step: Combining this with the estimate (74) yields for (73) the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \leq \frac{1 + \vartheta}{(1 + \tau\Lambda)^2} \mathbb{E} \|x_{k-1}^{\text{MMS}} - x_{k-1}^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} + c(1 + \vartheta^{-1}) \tau^2. \quad (76)$$

An application of the discrete variant of Grönwall's inequality (22) shows that

$$\mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \leq c(1 + \vartheta^{-1}) \tau^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1 + \vartheta}{(1 + \tau\Lambda)^2} \right)^\ell \quad (77)$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, K$, where we used that both schemes are initialized by the same x_0 .

Probabilistic formulation: We first note that with Markov's inequality we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M^c) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=0, \dots, K} \max \{ \|x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2, \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2 \} > M \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^4} \left(\mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 + \mathbb{E} \max_{k=0, \dots, K} \|\tilde{x}_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^4 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^4} (\mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}} + \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemmas C.3 and C.6. Thus, for any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, a sufficiently large choice $M = M(\delta^{-1}, \mathcal{M}^{\text{CH}}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{CH}})$ allows to ensure $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M^c) \leq \delta$. To conclude the proof, let us denote by $\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$ the set, where (18) does not hold and abbreviate

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1} c(1 + \vartheta^{-1}) \tau^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{1 + \vartheta}{(1 + \tau\Lambda)^2} \right)^\ell.$$

For the probability of this set we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \cap \tilde{\Omega}_M) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \cap \tilde{\Omega}_M^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{K}_\varepsilon \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M) + \delta \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M \right] + \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

where the last step is due to Markov's inequality. By definition of the conditional expectation we further have


$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mid \tilde{\Omega}_M \right] \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_M)} \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M} \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \|x_k^{\text{MMS}} - x_k^{\text{CH}}\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\Omega}_M}.$$

Inserting now the expression from (77) concludes the proof. \square

F Additional numerical experiments

F.1 Comparison of the CH scheme (13) for different sampling widths $\tilde{\sigma}$

To complement Figure 2a, we visualize in Figure F.1 the influence of the sampling width $\tilde{\sigma}$ on the behavior of the CH scheme (13).



(a) The CH scheme (13) with sampling width $\tilde{\sigma} = 0.4$ gets stuck in a local minimum of \mathcal{E} .


(b) The CH scheme (13) with sampling width $\tilde{\sigma} = 0.6$ can occasionally escape local minima of \mathcal{E} .

(c) The CH scheme (13) with sampling width $\tilde{\sigma} = 0.7$ can escape local minima of \mathcal{E} .


Figure F.1: A visual comparison of the CH scheme (13) for different sampling widths $\tilde{\sigma}$. We depict the positions of the consensus hopping scheme (13) for different values of $\tilde{\sigma}$ (0.4 in (a), 0.6 in (b) and 0.7 in (c)) in the setting of Figure 2a. While for small $\tilde{\sigma}$ the numerical scheme gets stuck in a local minimum of the objective, the ability to escape such critical points improves with larger $\tilde{\sigma}$. Notice that (b) coincides with Figure 2a.

F.2 The numerical experiments of Figures 1 and 2 for a different objective


In the style of Figures 1 and 2 we provide in Figure F.2 an additional set of illustrations of the behavior of the different algorithms analyzed in this work for a noisy Canyon function with a valley shaped as a second degree polynomial.




(a) A noisy Canyon function \mathcal{E} with a valley shaped as a second degree polynomial




(b) The CBO scheme (4) (sampled over several runs) follows on average the valley while passing over local minima.



(c) The CH scheme (13) (sampled over several runs) follows on average the valley of \mathcal{E} and can occasionally escape local minima.



(d) Gradient descent gets stuck in a local minimum of \mathcal{E} .



(e) The Langevin dynamics (6) (sampled over several runs) follows on average the valley of \mathcal{E} and escapes local minima.

Figure F.2: An additional numerical experiment illustrating the behavior of the CBO scheme (4) (see (b)), the consensus hopping scheme (13) (see (c)), gradient descent (see (d)) and the overdamped Langevin dynamics (6) (see (e)) in search of the global minimizer x^* of the nonconvex objective function \mathcal{E} depicted in (a). The experimental setting is the one of Figures 1 and 2 with the only difference of the particles being initialized around $(5, -1)$.