

Convergence to the uniform distribution of moderately self-interacting diffusions on compact Riemannian manifolds

Simon Holbach*, Olivier Raimond†

August 29, 2023

Abstract: We consider a self-interacting diffusion X on a smooth compact Riemannian manifold \mathbb{M} , described by the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = \sqrt{2}dW_t(X_t) - \beta(t)\nabla V_t(X_t)dt,$$

where β is suitably lower-bounded and grows at most logarithmically, and

$$V_t(x) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t V(x, X_s)ds$$

for a suitable smooth function $V: \mathbb{M}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that makes the term $-\nabla V_t(X_t)$ self-repelling. We prove that the normalized occupation measure μ_t of X converges almost surely in total variation to the uniform distribution \mathcal{U} , and we provide a polynomial rate of convergence. The key to this result is showing that μ_{e^t} shadows the solution to the measure valued ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{\nu}_t = -\nu_t + \mathcal{U}.$$

This work complements and extends results from [13] and [4].

Keywords: self-interacting diffusion, ergodicity, asymptotic pseudotrajectory, measure-valued ordinary differential equation, stochastic calculus

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 60K35

Acknowledgments: S.H. acknowledges support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation)–Project No. 233630050–TRR 146 “Multiscale Simulation Methods for Soft Matter Systems”. This research has been conducted within the Fédération Parisienne de Modélisation Mathématique (FP2M)–CNRS FR 2036. This research has been conducted as part of the project Labex MME-DII (ANR11-LBX-0023-01).

*Institut für Mathematik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Staudingerweg 9, 55099 Mainz, Germany (s.holbach@uni-mainz.de)

†MODAL’X, Université Paris Nanterre, 200 Avenue de la République, 92000 Nanterre, France (oraimond@parisnanterre.fr)

1 Introduction and main result

Let \mathbb{M} a smooth compact Riemannian manifold, and let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ denote the space of finite signed Borel measures on \mathbb{M} . For any smooth function $V: \mathbb{M}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ we write

$$V_\mu(x) := \mu(V(x, \cdot)) := \int_{\mathbb{M}} V(x, y) \mu(dy) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{M}. \quad (1)$$

A stochastic process X is called a self-interacting diffusion on \mathbb{M} , if it satisfies an equation of the type

$$dX_t = \sqrt{2}dW_t(X_t) - \beta(t)\nabla V_{\mu_t}(X_t)dt, \quad (2)$$

where $V: \mathbb{M}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, ∇ denotes the surface gradient on \mathbb{M} , $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function,

$$\mu_t = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \delta_{X_s} ds$$

is the normalized occupation measure of the process X up until time t , and W is a standard Brownian vector field on \mathbb{M} .

Here, V describes the type of self-interaction and β is the temporal weight that is given to the self-interaction mechanism. The asymptotic behavior of X has been studied for different choices of V and β , and we provide a summary of corresponding results and methods in Section 1.1 below. Let us now describe the assumptions under which we work in the present article.

Assumption 1.1. *There is a smooth function $v: \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\|v\|_\infty = 1$ and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}} v(x) dx = 0 \quad (3)$$

such that

$$V(x, y) = v(x) \cdot v(y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{M},$$

where \cdot denotes the euclidean inner product.

With this choice of V , (1) yields

$$V_{\mu_t}(x) = \mu_t(v) \cdot v(x) = \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t v(X_s) ds \right) \cdot v(x).$$

Hence, the drift term $-\nabla V_{\mu_t}(X_t)$ is self-repelling in the sense that it tends to drive $v(X_t)$ away from the temporal mean of $(v(X_s))_{s \in [0, t]}$. This interpretation is particularly intuitive in the case where

$$\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{S}^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : |x| = 1\}$$

and $v(x) = x$, so that

$$V(x, y) = x \cdot y = \cos(d(x, y)) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{S}^n,$$

where d is the geodesic distance on \mathbb{S}^n .

Next, we explain our assumptions on β . Here and everywhere else in this article, C and t_0 denote finite, positive, deterministic constants, the exact value of which is unimportant and may change from one step to the next with no indication.

Assumption 1.2. *The function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable and there are $a \in (0, \infty)$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that*

$$|\beta(t)| \leq a \log t \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta'(t)| \leq Ct^{-\gamma} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0.$$

Assumption 1.2 allows the weight $\beta(t)$ of the self-repelling drift $-\nabla V_{\mu_t}$ to increase to infinity, but not fast enough to fully compensate the normalization $\frac{1}{t}$ of the occupation measure. The generic case that we will usually have in mind is that of

$$\beta(t) = b \log(t + 1) \quad \text{with } b > 0.$$

Other valid choices include $\beta(t) = b \log(\log(t+e))$ or simply $\beta \equiv b$. Note that we cap γ at 1 only for simplicity, as $\gamma > 1$ provides no meaningful improvement for the estimates that are relevant to our proofs and only results in awkward case distinctions. Also note that the normalization $\|v\|_\infty = 1$ in Assumption 1.1 makes sure that the parameter a is actually meaningful and cannot simply be hidden in v .

Assumption 1.2 does not require β to be non-negative, but we will assume a suitable lower bound in Assumption 1.3 below. Before we can state it precisely, we need to introduce some notation. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Setting

$$Z(m) = \int_{\mathbb{M}} e^{-m \cdot v(x)} dx,$$

we define a probability measure $\Pi(m)$ on \mathbb{M} via

$$\Pi(m)(dx) = \frac{e^{-m \cdot v(x)}}{Z(m)} dx.$$

We also interpret Π as a function on $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ by setting

$$\Pi(\mu) := \Pi(\mu(v)) \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M}). \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, for any probability measure μ on \mathbb{M} and any $f \in (\mathbb{L}^2(\mu))^N$ we write

$$\text{Cov}_\mu(f) = (\mu(f_i f_j) - \mu(f_i)\mu(f_j))_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}.$$

Assumption 1.3. *There is a $\beta_0 \geq 0$ such that*

$$\beta(t) \geq -\beta_0 > -\frac{1}{\Lambda} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \sup_{m \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N, |x|=1} x^T \text{Cov}_{\Pi(m)}(v)x \right).$$

Assumption 1.3 means that while the weight factor in front of the self-repelling drift $-\nabla V_{\mu_t}$ is in fact allowed to turn negative, we do require a suitable lower bound that depends on v . In other words, we allow a limited amount of self-attraction. Clearly,

$$0 < \Lambda \leq \|v\|_\infty^2, \quad (6)$$

so (5) makes sense. In particular, $\beta \equiv b$ is covered in our setting if and only if $b > -1/\Lambda$.

We always equip $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ with the total variation norm

$$\|\mu\| = \sup\{\mu(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}, \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\} \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M}),$$

which, due to density arguments, is the same whether we take \mathcal{F} as $C(\mathbb{M})$ or $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ or the real-valued measurable functions on \mathbb{M} or just the indicator functions of Borel-measurable subsets of \mathbb{M} . Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.4. *Let \mathcal{U} denote the uniform distribution on \mathbb{M} . There is a constant $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$ such that if the Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 hold with $2a\kappa < \gamma$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|\mu_t - \mathcal{U}\|}{\log t} \leq -\eta \quad \text{almost surely,} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\eta = \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{2} - a\kappa, 1 - \Lambda\beta_0 \right\} > 0.$$

In particular, Theorem 1.4 yields weak convergence

$$\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{U} \quad \text{almost surely for } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

i.e. the ergodicity property

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(X_s) ds \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}(f) \quad \text{almost surely for all } f \in C(\mathbb{M}).$$

However, Theorem 1.4 is much stronger than this, as it also includes some uniformity with respect to f and a polynomial convergence rate.

Example 1.5 (Weak self-interaction). Let

$$\beta \equiv b > -\frac{1}{\Lambda}.$$

Depending on the sign of b , this corresponds either to a self-repelling ($b > 0$) or self-attracting ($b < 0$) diffusion, and since β is constant in time, we speak of weak self-interaction.

Then $\beta' \equiv 0$ and for any $a > 0$ we have $|\beta(t)| \leq a \log t$ for all $t \geq t_0 = e^{b/a}$. Hence, Theorem 1.4 can be applied with $\gamma = 1$, $\beta_0 = \max\{0, -b\}$ and any $a > 0$, and we get that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|\mu_t - \mathcal{U}\|}{\log t} \leq -\min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \Lambda|b| \right\} \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

In the particular case $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{S}^n$ and $v(x) = x$, this strengthens part (i) of [4, Theorem 4.5]. In Section 3, we provide a more detailed investigation of this connection and also a proof that we can actually weaken Assumption 1.3 in this situation (Proposition 3.4).

Example 1.6 (Moderate self-repulsion). Let

$$\beta(t) = b \log(t + 1) \quad \text{with } b > 0.$$

In this situation, β is positive and increases to infinity, but slower than the normalization factor t in μ_t , so we speak of moderate self-repulsion.

Then $|\beta'(t)| \leq Ct^{-1}$ and for any $a > b$ there is a $t_0 > 0$ such that $|\beta(t)| \leq a \log t$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Hence, Theorem 1.4 can be applied whenever $b < \frac{1}{2\kappa}$, and we get that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|\mu_t - \mathcal{U}\|}{\log t} \leq -\left(\frac{1}{2} - b\kappa \right) \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

1.1 Context

The asymptotic behavior of self-interacting diffusions has been studied with various degrees of generality concerning the state space \mathbb{M} and the type of self-interaction governed by V . The weight $\beta(t)$ is usually chosen as either $\beta \equiv b$ or $\beta(t) = bt$, which are sometimes referred to as weak and strong self-interaction respectively. In this sense, the prototypical case $\beta(t) = b \log(t + 1)$ of Assumption 1.2 corresponds to moderate self-interaction.

There are a number of case studies and some general results for $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$ (e.g. [9, 12, 11, 8]), but our focus lies on compact state spaces. Some of the results in the following summary are more general than others, but all of them are valid for $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{S}^n$ and include the important case $V(x, y) = \cos(d(x, y))$ (self-repulsion) or $V(x, y) = -\cos(d(x, y))$ (self-attraction).¹ The general expectation is that a diffusion with sufficient self-attraction will asymptotically be concentrated around (or even converge to) some limit random variable $X_\infty \in \mathbb{M}$, while a self-repelling diffusion (on a compact state space) will quite contrarily be uniformly distributed in the limit.

We will now give a brief overview of the methods that have been used in these different cases, the corresponding results are summarized in Table 1.

The case of weak self-interaction has been studied the most thoroughly, in particular in the series of papers [4, 5, 6, 7]. Under mild conditions on V , the authors link μ_t to a measure-valued ordinary differential equation and use this to precisely describe its asymptotic behavior for some specific choices of V . The same approach is used in [13] to treat the case of moderate self-interaction. This turns out to be more delicate and only the self-attracting case is solved satisfyingly. The case of moderate self-repulsion is the content of the present paper, and we use a similar strategy. A detailed explanation of the general idea of this method is presented in Section 1.2 below, including a discussion of the differences between [4], [13], and the present paper. The case of strong interaction has been studied with different methods. In [3], the authors rewrite (2) as a time-homogeneous proper stochastic differential equation for an extended variable $(X_t, Y_t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and prove that in the self-repelling case it is Harris recurrent and exponentially ergodic, where the invariant distribution in restriction to X_t is the uniform distribution. Almost sure convergence in the self-attracting case is proved in [10], again with arguments that involve the shadowing of an ordinary differential equation, but in a completely different way than in [4], [13], or the present paper.

Of course, it seems plausible that increasing the strength of the repulsion or attraction by increasing the weight β should not change the results qualitatively. If $\tilde{\beta}$ is asymptotically larger than β , and the self-repelling diffusion with weight β is asymptotically uniformly distributed, then the same should be true for the self-repelling diffusion with weight $\tilde{\beta}$. Similarly, if the self-attracting diffusion with weight β converges to a random variable X_∞ in some sense, then the self-attracting diffusion with weight $\tilde{\beta}$ should converge to some \tilde{X}_∞ . However, such comparison theorems are not available, and they do not seem to be within reach. In view of these considerations, it also seems counter-intuitive that we need a to be sufficiently small in Theorem 1.4 and that the rate of convergence decreases when a increases. This can be thought of as a technical assumption that is an "artifact" of our method.

¹Of course, it is somewhat arbitrary to include the sign that distinguishes repulsion from attraction in V instead of β , but this choice reinforces the interpretation of V as the type of interaction and β as a weight (even though our Assumptions 1.2 and 1.3 do not require β to be non-negative).

$\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{S}^n$	strong $\beta(t) = bt$	moderate $\beta(t) = b \log(t + 1)$	weak $\beta(t) = b$
self-attraction $V(x, y) = -\cos(d(x, y))$	$X_t \rightarrow X_\infty$ a.s. ([10])	$\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \delta_{X_\infty}$ a.s. ([13])	$\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \mu_\infty(b, n)$ a.s. ([4, 5, 6, 7], this paper)
self-repulsion $V(x, y) = \cos(d(x, y))$	$\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{U}$ a.s. ([3, 2] for $n = 1$)	$\ \mu_t - \mathcal{U}\ \rightarrow 0$ a.s. (this paper)	$\ \mu_t - \mathcal{U}\ \rightarrow 0$ a.s. ([4, 5, 6, 7], this paper)

Table 1: An (incomplete) overview of the literature on the asymptotics of self-interacting diffusions on \mathbb{S}^n . In the case of weak self-attraction, we have $\mu_\infty(b, n) = \mathcal{U}$ if $b \leq n + 1$, and else $\mu_\infty(b, n)$ is a Gaussian distribution centered around a random $X_\infty \in \mathbb{S}^n$, but with a deterministic variance that depends on b and n . The present paper is primarily focussed on moderate and weak self-repulsion, but also contains a partial improvement of this result on weak self-attraction.

Remark 1.7. The factor $\sqrt{2}$ in front of $dW_t(X_t)$ in (2) is absent both in [13] (where this equation is mentioned explicitly only in the abstract) and in [4] (where the corresponding equation is the first one of the article).

In [13] this factor $\sqrt{2}$ is hidden in the vector fields e_i , so that (2) is entirely equivalent to [13, (1)] and the results from [13] are compatible with our setting with no adjustment of the parameters.

In [4] however, this is not the case and this factor $\sqrt{2}$ leads to a factor 2 in [4, (11)] when compared to our definition of Π in (4), and also to a factor 1/2 in the definition of A_μ just below [4, (2)] when compared to our definition in (12). This has to be taken into account when comparing our results with those from [4].

1.2 Outline of proof

In order to get a grip of the long time behavior of

$$\mu_t = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \delta_{X_s} ds,$$

we calculate its time evolution. First, we have

$$\partial_t \mu_t = \frac{1}{t} (-\mu_t + \delta_{X_t}),$$

where the derivative is to be understood as the derivative of a real function pointwise in all $f \in C(\mathbb{M})$. In order to eliminate the factor $\frac{1}{t}$, we look at the dynamics on an exponential time scale, i.e.

$$\partial_t \mu_{e^t} = -\mu_{e^t} + \delta_{X_{e^t}}.$$

If $t > 0$ is large, the distribution of X_t should be close to the equilibrium of the current drift potential $\beta(t)V_{\mu_t}(x)$, i.e. to the probability distribution $\Pi(\beta(t)\mu_t)$ as defined in (4). If our intuition of the process is correct, $\Pi(\beta(t)\mu_t)$ on the other hand should be close to the uniform distribution \mathcal{U} on \mathbb{M} . Therefore, we set

$$\varepsilon_t^1 := \delta_{X_{e^t}} - \Pi(\beta(e^t)\mu_{e^t})$$

and

$$\varepsilon_t^2 := \Pi(\beta(e^t)\mu_{e^t}) - \mathcal{U},$$

so that

$$\partial_t \mu_{e^t} = -\mu_{e^t} + \mathcal{U} + \varepsilon_t^1 + \varepsilon_t^2. \quad (8)$$

If ε_t^1 and ε_t^2 are asymptotically negligible in a suitable sense, then the trajectory $t \mapsto \mu_{e^t}$ shadows that of a solution to the measure-valued ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{\nu}_t = -\nu_t + \mathcal{U}, \quad (9)$$

so that in particular μ_t converges to \mathcal{U} . The details of this argument are given in Section 2.3 below, but first we devote Sections 2.1 and 2.2 to the required analysis of the asymptotics of ε^1 and ε^2 .

Our proof strategy is inspired by [4] and [13]. In these works, the authors study the equation

$$\partial_t \mu_{e^t} = -\mu_{e^t} + \Pi(\beta(e^t)\mu_{e^t}) + \varepsilon_t^1, \quad (10)$$

which will also be very useful for us in Section 2.2. The formal limit equation corresponding to (10) is

$$\dot{\nu}_t = -\nu_t + \Pi(\beta(e^t)\nu_t). \quad (11)$$

Note that under (3) we have $\Pi(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{U}$, and so (11) can be viewed as a variant of the limit equation (9) that is less specific to a particular situation. For constant β as in [4], the equation (11) is homogeneous in time and hence after establishing that μ_{e^t} shadows it, powerful results from the theory of dynamical systems can be used to study the long-time behavior of μ_t for several different choices of V (cf. [4, Sections 3 and 4]). For non-constant β as in [13], this link can still be established under certain conditions (cf. [13, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2]), but it is not as fruitful, since (11) is no longer homogeneous in time. In particular, [13, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2] are not used in the proof of the convergence result for moderately self-attracting diffusions on the sphere ([13, Theorem 3.1]) which is instead proved "by hand".

The limit equation (9) is much simpler than (11), because it is tailor-made for cases in which we expect μ_t to converge to the uniform distribution (while in other cases we might not expect a deterministic limit at all). Introducing the second error term ε^2 allows us to move the explicit dependence of the problem on β entirely into the error terms.

2 Proof of the main result

For Section 2.1, we only need the Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 to hold. In Sections 2.2 and 2.3 on the other hand, we suppose that all of the Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 hold.

2.1 Dealing with ε^1

This subsection is mostly taken from Section 2 of [13]. We include this detailed summary, since many of the objects and intermediate results will be used in the next subsection.

Let us fix $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ and consider the time-homogeneous stochastic differential equation with no self-interaction

$$dY_t = \sqrt{2}dW_t(Y_t) - \nabla V_\mu(Y_t)dt,$$

where we think of the dynamics as those arising from freezing the drift potential in (2) at some time t_0 , so that formally $\mu = \beta(t_0)\mu_{t_0}$. These dynamics can also be described via the infinitesimal generator

$$A_\mu f = \Delta f - \nabla V_\mu \cdot \nabla f \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{D}(A_\mu) \supset C^2(\mathbb{M}), \quad (12)$$

and the corresponding equilibrium is given by $\Pi(\mu)$ as defined in (4). Let $(P_s^\mu)_{s \geq 0}$ denote the transition semigroup on $\mathbb{L}^2(\Pi(\mu)) = \mathbb{L}^2(dx)$ generated by A_μ . Then A_μ satisfies a Poincaré inequality and therefore $P_s^\mu f$ converges to $\Pi(\mu)(f)$ exponentially fast with respect to the \mathbb{L}^2 -norm for any $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(dx)$ (see Sections 1.1 and 1.4.3 of [14]). Using this and basic semigroup theory, one can easily show that

$$Q_\mu f := - \int_0^\infty P_s^\mu (f - \Pi(\mu)(f)) ds \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{L}^2(dx),$$

is well-defined and satisfies

$$A_\mu Q_\mu f = Q_\mu A_\mu f = f - \Pi(\mu)(f) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{D}(A_\mu),$$

so Q_μ is "almost an inverse to A_μ ".

Now set

$$A_t := A_{\beta(t)\mu_t}, \quad Q_t := Q_{\beta(t)\mu_t}.$$

Then for all $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ we can rewrite

$$\varepsilon_t^1(f) = f(X_{e^t}) - \Pi(\beta(e^t)\mu_{e^t})(f) = A_{e^t} Q_{e^t} f(X_{e^t}).$$

If we set

$$F_t^f(x) := \frac{1}{t} Q_t f(x), \quad (13)$$

applying the change of variables $r \mapsto \log r$ and then Ito's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t \varepsilon_r^1(f) d = \int_{e^s}^{e^t} A_r F_r^f(X_r) dr \\ = F_{e^t}^f(X_{e^t}) - F_{e^s}^f(X_{e^s}) - \int_{e^s}^{e^t} \dot{F}_r^f(X_r) dr + (M_t^f - M_s^f), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $(M_t^f)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale with

$$\langle M^f, M^g \rangle_t = \int_1^{e^t} \nabla F_r^f(X_r) \cdot \nabla F_r^g(X_r) dr \quad \text{for all } f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}) \quad (15)$$

(compare [13, Section 3.3] and [4, Remark 2.2]). Therefore, in order to estimate the integral over ε^1 , we need to estimate F_t^f , ∇F_t^f , and the time derivative \dot{F}_t^f , which can be done with the help of the following lemma that will also be needed in Section 2.2 below in order to deal with ε^2 .

Lemma 2.1. *There is a constant*

$$\kappa \in (0, \infty) \quad (16)$$

such that for all $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ and $t \geq t_0$ the following estimates hold.

1. $\|Q_t f\|_\infty \leq C t^{a\kappa} \|f\|_\infty$,
2. $\|\nabla Q_t f\|_\infty \leq C(1 + a \log t)^{1/2} t^{a\kappa} \|f\|_\infty$,
3. $\|\partial_t Q_t f\|_\infty \leq C(\log t)^{3/2} t^{2a\kappa - \gamma} \|f\|_\infty$.

Proof. Thanks to Assumption 1.2, this follows from Lemmas 2.3 and 2.8 of [13]. These lemmas mainly rely on classical results about log-Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities for the operator A_t and an application of the Bakry-Emery criterion. \square

From now on, κ will always be the constant from (16). In particular, this is the same κ that we use in Theorem 1.4.

Proposition 2.2. *If $2a\kappa < \gamma$, then almost surely*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left(\sup_{s \geq 0} \left\| \int_t^{t+s} \varepsilon_r^1 dr \right\| \right) \leq - \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} - a\kappa \right).$$

Proof. This follows from [13, Theorem 2.1], which is proved via (14), (15), and Lemma 2.1. The exact value on the right hand side is not given explicitly in [13, Theorem 2.1], but can be deduced from a careful reading of the proofs in [13, Section 2.2.2]. \square

2.2 Dealing with ε^2

We start this section with a preparatory lemma about properties of Π . Recall that

$$\Pi(m)(dx) = \frac{e^{-m \cdot v(x)}}{Z(m)} dx \quad \text{with} \quad Z(m) = \int_{\mathbb{M}} e^{-m \cdot v(x)} dx$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Lemma 2.3. *1. The mapping $\Pi: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ is Lipschitz continuous, i.e.*

$$\|\Pi(m) - \Pi(m')\| \leq C |m - m'| \quad \text{for all } m, m' \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

2. For all $m \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have

$$\Pi(m)(v) = -\nabla \log Z(m) \tag{17}$$

and

$$\text{Cov}_{\Pi(m)}(v) = \text{Hess} \log Z(m), \tag{18}$$

where Hess denotes the Hessian matrix.

Proof. For the first part, it is easy to check that the derivative of Π is bounded. The second part is a simple calculation. \square

By combining the first part of Lemma 2.3 and the first part of Assumption 1.2, we get

$$\|\varepsilon_t^2\| = \|\Pi(\beta(e^t)\mu_{e^t}(v)) - \Pi(0)\| \leq Ct |\mu_{e^t}(v)|. \tag{19}$$

Lemma 2.6 below provides a speed of convergence to 0 for the right hand side, but we first need another preparatory lemma. For the remainder of this section, we use the shorthand notation

$$m_t := \mu_{e^t}(v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Lemma 2.4. *There is a family of strongly convex functions $J_t: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\dot{m}_t = -\nabla J_t(m_t) + \varepsilon_t^1(v) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \quad (20)$$

and

$$m \cdot \nabla J_t(m) \geq (1 - \Lambda\beta_0) |m|^2 \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (21)$$

Proof. By (10), we have

$$\dot{m}_t = -m_t + \Pi(\beta(e^t)m_t)(v) + \varepsilon_t^1(v).$$

Using (17) and the fact that $\Pi(0)(v) = 0$ due to (3), we see that (20) holds with

$$J_t: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad J_t(m) = \frac{1}{2} |m|^2 + 1_{\beta(e^t) \neq 0} \cdot \frac{1}{\beta(e^t)} \log Z(\beta(e^t)m).$$

Because of (18), we get

$$\text{Hess } J_t(m) = 1_{N \times N} + \beta(e^t) \text{Cov}_{\Pi(\beta(e^t)m)}(v),$$

and thanks to Assumption 1.3, this implies that the smallest eigenvalue of $\text{Hess } J_t(m)$ is at least $1 - \Lambda\beta_0 > 0$. Therefore J_t is strongly convex, more precisely

$$(m - m') \cdot (\nabla J_t(m) - \nabla J_t(m')) \geq (1 - \Lambda\beta_0) |m - m'|^2 \quad \text{for all } m, m' \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Since $\nabla J_t(0) = \Pi(0)(v) = 0$, setting $m' = 0$ yields (21). \square

Remark 2.5. $J_t(m)$, $\nabla J_t(m)$, and $\text{Hess } J_t(m)$ are all continuous with respect to $t \in [0, \infty)$.

In what follows, η will always be the constant from Theorem 1.4, i.e.

$$\eta = \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{2} - a\kappa, 1 - \Lambda\beta_0 \right\} > 0.$$

Lemma 2.6. *If $2a\kappa < \gamma$, then*

$$e^{\delta t} m_t \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{almost surely for all } \delta < \eta.$$

Proof. 1.) Set

$$\tilde{m}_t := m_t - F_{e^t}(X_{e^t}) \quad (22)$$

where

$$F_t(x) := (F_t^{v_i}(x))_{i=1, \dots, N} = t^{-1} (Q_t v_i(x))_{i=1, \dots, N}$$

(compare (13)). The first estimate of Lemma 2.1 implies

$$|e^{\delta t} m_t| \leq e^{\delta t} (|\tilde{m}_t| + |F_{e^t}(X_{e^t})|) \leq e^{\delta t} |\tilde{m}_t| + C e^{-(1-a\kappa-\delta)t} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0.$$

Since $\delta < \frac{\gamma}{2} - a\kappa < 1 - a\kappa$, the second summand in the above bound vanishes for $t \rightarrow \infty$, and hence it suffices to show for this lemma that

$$e^{\delta t} \tilde{m}_t \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{almost surely for all } \delta < \eta. \quad (23)$$

Note that we know a priori that $|m_t|$ has a deterministic upper bound and then (by Lemma 2.1) so has $|\tilde{m}_t|$.

2.) In this step, we use a similar approach as in Sections 3.1 - 3.4 of [13] in order to find a stochastic differential equation that is fulfilled by $|\tilde{m}_t|^2$. In order to calculate the dynamics of \tilde{m}_t , we first deduce from (14) that

$$F_{e^t}(X_{e^t}) - F_{e^s}(X_{e^s}) = \int_s^t \varepsilon_r^1(v) dr + \int_{e^s}^{e^t} \dot{F}_r(X_r) dr - (M_t^v - M_s^v), \quad (24)$$

where we read M_t^v as the vector $(M_t^{v_i})_{i=1, \dots, N}$. Combining (24) with (20) yields

$$d\tilde{m}_t = -\nabla J_t(m_t) dt - e^t \dot{F}_{e^t}(X_{e^t}) dt + dM_t^v. \quad (25)$$

We set

$$H_t = -e^t \dot{F}_{e^t}(X_{e^t}) - (\nabla J_t(m_t) - \nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t)) \quad (26)$$

and rewrite (25) as

$$d\tilde{m}_t = -\nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t) dt + H_t dt + dM_t^v.$$

Ito's formula and (15) then yield

$$d|\tilde{m}_t|^2 = (-2\tilde{m}_t \cdot \nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t) + 2\tilde{m}_t \cdot H_t + e^t |\nabla F_{e^t}(X_{e^t})|^2) dt + 2\tilde{m}_t \cdot dM_t^v. \quad (27)$$

3.) Our next goal is to find a suitable upper bound for the drift in (27). For the rest of the proof we assume that $t \geq t_0$ and

$$0 < \alpha < 2\eta = \min \{ \gamma - 2a\kappa, 2(1 - \Lambda\beta_0) \}.$$

Since

$$\dot{F}_t^{v_i} = -\frac{1}{t^2} Q_t v_i + \frac{1}{t} \partial_t Q_t v_i,$$

the first and third estimates of Lemma 2.1 yield

$$\left| e^t \dot{F}_{e^t}(X_{e^t}) \right| \leq C e^{(a\kappa-1)t} + C(1+at)^{3/2} e^{(2a\kappa-\gamma)t} \leq C e^{-\alpha t}. \quad (28)$$

By the first parts of Lemmas 2.3 and 2.1 respectively,

$$|\nabla J_t(m_t) - \nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t)| \leq (1 + C|\beta(e^t)|) |m_t - \tilde{m}_t| \leq C(1+t) e^{(a\kappa-1)t} \leq C e^{-\alpha t}. \quad (29)$$

Combining (28), (29), and the fact that $|\tilde{m}_t|$ is bounded, we can conclude that with H from (26) we have

$$2\tilde{m}_t \cdot H_t \leq C e^{-\alpha t}. \quad (30)$$

For the third summand of the drift term in (27), the second estimate of Lemma 2.1 implies

$$e^t |\nabla F_{e^t}(X_{e^t})|^2 = e^{-t} \sum_{i=1}^N |(\nabla Q_{e^t} v_i)(X_{e^t})|^2 \leq C(1+at) e^{(2a\kappa-1)t} \leq C e^{-\alpha t}. \quad (31)$$

Finally, plugging (30) and (31) as well as (21) from Lemma 2.4 into (27) yields

$$d|\tilde{m}_t|^2 \leq (-2(1 - \Lambda\beta_0)|\tilde{m}_t|^2 + C e^{-\alpha t}) dt + 2\tilde{m}_t \cdot dM_t^v. \quad (32)$$

4.) With (32) at hand, we can now investigate the asymptotics of \tilde{m}_t . Setting

$$\xi := 2(1 - \Lambda\beta_0)$$

and plugging (32) into

$$d(e^{\xi t}|\tilde{m}_t|^2) = \xi e^{\xi t}|\tilde{m}_t|^2 dt + e^{\xi t}d|\tilde{m}_t|^2,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{m}_t|^2 &\leq e^{-\xi(t-t_0)}|\tilde{m}_{t_0}|^2 + C \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\xi(t-r)-\alpha r} dr + 2 \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\xi(t-r)}\tilde{m}_r \cdot dM_r^v \\ &\leq Ce^{-\alpha t} + 2e^{-\xi t}N_t, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where

$$N_t = \int_{t_0}^t e^{\xi r}\tilde{m}_r \cdot dM_r^v.$$

By (15) and (31), we have

$$\langle N \rangle_t \leq \int_{t_0}^t e^{2\xi r} |\tilde{m}_r|^2 e^r |\nabla F_{e^r}(X_{e^r})|^2 dr \leq C \int_{t_0}^t e^{(2\xi-\alpha)r} |\tilde{m}_r|^2 dr. \quad (34)$$

Since \tilde{m} is bounded and $\alpha < 2\xi$, (34) yields

$$\langle N \rangle_t \leq Ce^{(2\xi-\alpha)t}, \quad (35)$$

so the law of the iterated logarithm implies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_t}{e^{(\xi-\frac{\alpha}{2})t} \log(t)} < \infty \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (36)$$

Combining (33) and (36) yields

$$e^{\delta t}\tilde{m}_t \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{almost surely for all } \delta < \frac{\alpha}{4}. \quad (37)$$

This can be plugged back into (34) in order to improve (35) to

$$\langle N \rangle_t \leq Ke^{(2\xi-(\alpha+2\delta))t}$$

for any $\delta < \frac{\alpha}{4}$, where $K = K(\delta)$ is an almost surely finite random variable. Then we use the same argument as above to improve (37) to

$$e^{\delta t}\tilde{m}_t \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{almost surely for all } \delta < \frac{3\alpha}{8}.$$

Iterating this argument shows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$e^{\delta t}\tilde{m}_t \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{almost surely for all } \delta < \frac{(2^n - 1)\alpha}{2^{n+1}}.$$

Since n can be arbitrarily large and α arbitrarily close to 2η , it follows that (23) holds, and thus the proof is completed. \square

Remark 2.7. Note that Lemma 2.6 can be interpreted as a statement on the polynomial decay of the drift potential $\beta(t)V_{\mu_t}$ of (2). More precisely, for $2a\kappa < \gamma$ it implies that almost surely

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|\beta(t)V_{\mu_t}\|_{\infty}}{\log t} \leq -\eta.$$

We can now prove the main result of this section.

Proposition 2.8. *If $2a\kappa < \gamma$, then almost surely*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\varepsilon_t^2\| \leq -\eta.$$

Proof. This follows from (19) and Lemma 2.6. □

2.3 Putting the pieces together

The unique solution to (9) with the initial value $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ is given by

$$\Phi(t, \nu_0) = e^{-t}\nu_0 + (1 - e^{-t})\mathcal{U} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (38)$$

and the mapping

$$\Phi: [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M}), \quad (t, \nu_0) \mapsto \Phi(t, \nu_0),$$

defines a semiflow on the normed space $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$ in the sense of [1, p. 9].

Proposition 2.9. *If $2a\kappa < \gamma$, then almost surely $(\mu_{e^t})_{t \geq 0}$ is a $(-\eta)$ -pseudotrajectory of the semiflow Φ , i.e. almost surely*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left(\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|\mu_{e^{t+s}} - \Phi(s, \mu_{e^t})\| \right) \leq -\eta \quad \text{for all } T > 0. \quad (39)$$

Proof. By (8) and (9) we have for all $f \in C(\mathbb{M})$

$$(\mu_{e^{t+s}} - \Phi(s, \mu_{e^t}))(f) = - \int_0^s (\mu_{e^{t+r}} - \Phi(r, \mu_{e^t}))(f) dr + \int_0^s (\varepsilon_{t+r}^1 + \varepsilon_{t+r}^2)(f) dr,$$

so

$$(\mu_{e^{t+s}} - \Phi(s, \mu_{e^t}))(f) = \int_t^{t+s} e^{-(t+s-r)} (\varepsilon_r^1 + \varepsilon_r^2)(f) dr. \quad (40)$$

Since integration by parts yields

$$\int_t^{t+s} e^{-(t+s-r)} \varepsilon_r^1(f) dr = \int_t^{t+s} \varepsilon_r^1(f) dr - \int_t^{t+s} e^{-(t+s-r)} \left(\int_t^r \varepsilon_u^1(f) du \right) dr,$$

we get from (40) that

$$\|\mu_{e^{t+s}} - \Phi(s, \mu_{e^t})\| \leq \left\| \int_t^{t+s} \varepsilon_r^1 dr \right\| + \int_t^{t+s} e^{-(t+s-r)} \left\| \int_t^r \varepsilon_u^1 du \right\| dr + \int_t^{t+s} \|\varepsilon_r^2\| dr.$$

The claim now follows from Propositions 2.2 and 2.8. □

Intuitively, Proposition 2.9 says that μ_{e^t} is exponentially close to the behavior of a solution of (9). Since any solution of (9) converges exponentially fast to \mathcal{U} , Theorem 1.4 now follows from a general result about pseudotrajectories.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By (38),

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\Phi(t, \nu_0) - \mathcal{U}\| = -1 \quad \text{for all } \nu_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M}).$$

Thanks to this and Proposition 2.9, all of the conditions of part (i) of [1, Lemma 8.7] (with $B = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{M})$, $K = \{\mathcal{U}\}$, $X(t) = \mu_{e^t}$, $Y(t) = \mathcal{U}$, $\alpha = -\eta > -1 = \lambda$) are fulfilled, and hence we get

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\mu_{e^t} - \mathcal{U}\| \leq -\eta \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

which is equivalent to (7). □

Remark 2.10. Note that the final step of the proof of Proposition 2.9 also works with the supremum in (39) being taken over all $s \geq 0$ instead of only $s \in [0, T]$. However, this stronger variant of the pseudotrajectory property is not needed for the argument in the proof of Theorem 1.4 to work.

3 A closer investigation of the case $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{S}^n$ and $v(x) = x$

For this entire section, let

$$\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{S}^n \quad \text{and} \quad v(x) = x.$$

In the case of weak self-interaction, i.e. $\beta \equiv b$, Theorem 4.5 of [4] then implies that²

$$\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{U} \quad \text{almost surely} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad b \geq -(n+1), \quad (41)$$

while Theorem 1.4 implies

$$b > -\frac{1}{\Lambda} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\mu_t - \mathcal{U}\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely with polynomial speed} \quad (42)$$

(compare Example 1.5). Because of (41) and (42), we already know that $\Lambda \geq (n+1)^{-1}$. In this section, we provide a way to calculate Λ , show numerically that it is in fact strictly larger than $(n+1)^{-1}$, but then prove that the conclusion of (42) nevertheless actually holds for all $b > -(n+1)$.

3.1 Calculating Λ

In the following, for any $m \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we use the notation

$$\bar{m} = \begin{cases} \frac{m}{|m|}, & \text{if } m \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } m = 0. \end{cases}$$

²Note that our notation differs slightly from that in [4]: the parameter a there corresponds to what is $b/2$ in our notation, and there is another factor 2 in [4, (11)] that is not in our definition of Π (compare Remark 1.7).




Figure 1: Plots of ϱ and λ for $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let*

$$\varrho(r) = -\frac{\int_0^\pi \cos x e^{-r \cos x} (\sin x)^{n-1} dx}{\int_0^\pi e^{-r \cos x} (\sin x)^{n-1} dx} \quad \text{for all } r \geq 0.$$

1. For all $m \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we have

$$\Pi(m)(v) = -\varrho(|m|)\bar{m}. \quad (43)$$

2. We have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varrho(r)}{r} = \frac{1}{n+1},$$

and we therefore interpret $\frac{\varrho(0)}{0}$ as $\frac{1}{n+1}$ in the following.

3. For all $m \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we have

$$\text{COV}_{\Pi(m)}(v) = \left(\varrho'(|m|) - \frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} \right) \bar{m} \bar{m}^T + \frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} 1_{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$$

and its largest eigenvalue is given by $\lambda(|m|)$, where

$$\lambda(r) = \frac{2\varrho(r)}{r} - \varrho'(r) \quad \text{for all } r \geq 0. \quad (44)$$

4. We have

$$\Lambda = \max_{r \geq 0} \lambda(r) \in \left[\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{2}{n+1} \right). \quad (45)$$

Proof. The first part of this lemma is just a reformulation of [4, Lemma 4.7]. Note that for all $r \geq 0$

$$\varrho(r) = \frac{H'(r)}{H(r)} \quad \text{with} \quad H(r) = \int_0^\pi e^{-r \cos x} (\sin x)^{n-1} dx$$

and hence

$$\varrho'(r) = \frac{H''(r)}{H(r)} - \left(\frac{H'(r)}{H(r)} \right)^2 > 0 \quad (46)$$

where the inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz. As shown in the proof of [4, Lemma 4.8],

$$\frac{d}{dr} \frac{H''(r)}{H(r)} > 0, \quad \frac{H''(0)}{H(0)} = \frac{1}{n+1},$$

and since an integration by parts yields

$$H'(r) = \frac{r}{n}(H(r) - H''(r)) \quad \text{for all } r \geq 0, \quad (47)$$

we get

$$\frac{d}{dr} \frac{\varrho(r)}{r} = \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{H''(r)}{H(r)} \right) \right) < 0, \quad \frac{\varrho(r)}{r} \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n+1}. \quad (48)$$

In particular, we have

$$0 > \frac{d}{dr} \frac{\varrho(r)}{r} = \frac{\varrho'(r)}{r} - \frac{\varrho(r)}{r^2} \quad \text{for all } r > 0$$

so, together with (46),

$$0 < \varrho'(r) < \frac{\varrho(r)}{r} \quad \text{for all } r > 0. \quad (49)$$

Combining (43) with the second part of Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_{\Pi(m)}(v) &= \left(\partial_{m_i} \left(\frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} m_j \right) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,n+1} \\ &= \left(\varrho'(|m|) - \frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} \right) \bar{m} \bar{m}^T + \frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} \mathbf{1}_{(n+1) \times (n+1)} \end{aligned}$$

and hence its largest eigenvalue is

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^n} x^T \text{Cov}_{\Pi(m)}(v) x = \left| \varrho'(|m|) - \frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} \right| + \frac{\varrho(|m|)}{|m|} = \lambda(|m|),$$

where the last equality uses (49). Plugging (49) into (44) yields

$$\frac{\varrho(r)}{r} < \lambda(r) < \frac{2\varrho(r)}{r} \quad \text{for all } r > 0,$$

which, in combination with (48), implies (45). \square

Remark 3.2. With the help of Lemma 3.1, one can easily show that if $(m_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ satisfies $|m_k| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\bar{m}_k \rightarrow m \in \mathbb{S}^n$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$, then $\Pi(m_k) \xrightarrow{w} \delta_{-m}$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 3.3. It follows from (46) and (47) that ϱ satisfies the differential equation

$$\varrho'(r) = 1 - \varrho(r) \left(\frac{n}{r} + \varrho(r) \right),$$

so thanks to (44), we can express both $\lambda(r)$ and $\lambda'(r)$ as functions of r and $\varrho(r)$. This makes it easy to calculate λ and λ' and thus approximate the maximum of λ numerically. Simulations suggest that $\lambda(r)$ attains Λ as its unique local and global maximum in a position $r = \arg\max \lambda$ that grows linearly in n . Furthermore, these simulations suggest that $\Lambda \cdot (n+1)$ is indeed strictly greater than 1, even though it is decreasing in n and the upper bound 2 from (45) is far from optimal. Note however, that even (45) is a vast improvement over the trivial bound from (6). See Table 2 for some approximate values and Figure 1 for a visualisation of ϱ and λ .

n	$\Lambda = \max \lambda$	$\Lambda \cdot (n + 1)$	$\operatorname{argmax} \lambda$
1	0.548	1.096	1.442
2	0.363	1.090	1.930
3	0.272	1.087	2.405
4	0.217	1.084	2.876
5	0.180	1.083	3.345
6	0.154	1.081	3.812
7	0.135	1.080	4.278
8	0.120	1.079	4.744
9	0.108	1.079	5.210
10	0.098	1.078	5.676
20	0.051	1.075	10.329
50	0.021	1.073	24.288
100	0.011	1.073	47.552

Table 2: Numerical approximations for Λ , $\Lambda \cdot (n + 1)$, and $\operatorname{argmax} \lambda$.

3.2 Improving Theorem 1.4 in the case of weak self-attraction

The following proposition means that we can improve [4, Theorem 4.5 (i)] for all cases in which the uniform distribution is the limit, with the exception of the critical value $b = -(n + 1)$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\beta \equiv b > -(n + 1)$. Then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|\mu_t - \mathcal{U}\|}{\log t} \leq -\min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 + \frac{b}{n + 1} \right\} \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Proof. The case $b \geq 0$ is already covered entirely in Example 1.5, so let

$$0 > b > -(n + 1).$$

Since Proposition 2.2 implies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left(\sup_{s \geq 0} \left\| \int_t^{t+s} \varepsilon_r^1 dr \right\| \right) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

it only remains to show that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\varepsilon_t^2\| \leq -\min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \frac{|b|}{n + 1} \right\} \quad \text{almost surely,} \quad (50)$$

since then the proof can be completed in the exact same way as in Section 2.3. In order to prove (50), we will need to revisit and refine the arguments from Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6 (the notation of which we adapt in the sequel) and make explicit use of [4, Theorem 4.5 (i)].

Since the second and third parts of Lemma 3.1 imply

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lambda(r) = \lambda(0) = \frac{1}{n + 1} < |b|^{-1},$$

we can choose $\vartheta > 0$ such that

$$\zeta := \sup_{m \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, |m| \leq \vartheta} \left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^n} x^T \operatorname{Cov}_{\Pi(bm)}(v)x \right) = \sup_{r \in [0, \vartheta|b|]} \lambda(r) < |b|^{-1}.$$

Then with the same argument as in Lemma 2.4 we get

$$m \cdot \nabla J_t(m) \geq (1 - |b|\zeta) |m|^2 \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \text{ with } |m| \leq \vartheta. \quad (51)$$

We already know from [4, Theorem 4.5 (i)] that almost surely $\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{U}$ (compare (41)), so $m_t \rightarrow 0$ and hence also $\tilde{m}_t \rightarrow 0$ (compare (22) and Lemma 2.1). Therefore, there is an almost surely finite random time $\tau = \tau(\vartheta)$ such that $|\tilde{m}_t| \leq \vartheta$ for all $t > \tau$, so with (51) we get

$$-\tilde{m}_t \cdot \nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t) \leq -(1 - |b|\zeta) |\tilde{m}_t|^2 \quad \text{for all } t \geq \tau. \quad (52)$$

Also note that

$$-\tilde{m}_t \cdot \nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t) \leq C \quad \text{for all } t \in [t_0, \tau). \quad (53)$$

With

$$0 < \alpha < \min \{1, 2 - 2|b|\zeta\},$$

we can show as in the proof of Lemma 2.6 that

$$d|\tilde{m}_t|^2 \leq (-2\tilde{m}_t \cdot \nabla J_t(\tilde{m}_t) + Ce^{-\alpha t}) dt + 2\tilde{m}_t \cdot dM_t^v \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0. \quad (54)$$

If we set $\xi := 2 - 2|b|\zeta$, plug (54) into

$$d(e^{\xi t} |\tilde{m}_t|^2) = \xi e^{\xi t} |\tilde{m}_t|^2 dt + e^{\xi t} d|\tilde{m}_t|^2,$$

and then apply (52) and (53), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{m}_t|^2 &\leq e^{-\xi(t-t_0)} |\tilde{m}_{t_0}|^2 + C \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\xi(t-r) - \alpha r} dr + C \int_{t_0}^{\tau} e^{-\xi(t-r)} dr + 2 \int_{t_0}^t e^{-\xi(t-r)} \tilde{m}_r \cdot dM_r^v \\ &\leq Ke^{-\alpha t} + 2e^{-\xi t} \int_{t_0}^t e^{\xi r} \tilde{m}_r \cdot dM_r^v, \end{aligned}$$

where K is a positive, almost surely finite random number. Now, (50) follows from the same line of reasoning as in the last step of the proof of Lemma 2.6 and in the proof of Proposition 2.8. \square

Remark 3.5. The general idea behind the proof of Proposition 3.4 is not restricted to the specific case treated in this section: there is potential for the Assumption 1.3 on the lower bound for β to be weakened, whenever we already know that $\mu_t \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{U}$ and thus only need to bound the eigenvalues of $\beta(e^t) \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{U}}(v)$ in order to make the arguments in the proofs of Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6 work.

References

- [1] M. BENAÏM: Dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms. *Seminaire de Probabilités XXXIII, Lecture Notes in Math.* 1709, 1–68 (1999)
- [2] M. BENAÏM, I. CIOTIR, C.E. GAUTHIER: Self-repelling diffusions via an infinite dimensional approach. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations* 3, 506–530 (2015)

- [3] M. BENAÏM, C.E. GAUTHIER: Self-repelling diffusions on a Riemannian manifold. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 169, 63–104 (2017)
- [4] M. BENAÏM, M. LEDOUX, O. RAIMOND: Self-interacting diffusions. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 122, 1–41 (2002)
- [5] M. BENAÏM, O. RAIMOND: Self-interacting diffusions II: convergence in law. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré – PR* 39, 6 (2003) 1043–1055
- [6] M. BENAÏM, O. RAIMOND: Self-interacting diffusions III: symmetric interactions. *The Annals of Probability* 33, 1716–1759 (2005)
- [7] M. BENAÏM, O. RAIMOND: Self-interacting diffusions IV: rate of convergence. *Electron. J. Probab.* 18, 1815–1843 (2011)
- [8] S. CHAMBEU, A. KURTZMANN: Some particular self-interacting diffusions: Ergodic behavior and almost sure convergence. *Bernoulli* 17(4), 1248–1267 (2011)
- [9] M. CRANSTON, Y. LE JAN: Self-attracting diffusions : Two case studies. *Math. Ann.* 303, 87–93 (1995)
- [10] C.E. GAUTHIER: Self attracting diffusions on a sphere and application to a periodic case. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 21 (53), 1–12 (2016)
- [11] S. HERRMANN , B. ROYNETTE: Boundedness and convergence of some self-attracting diffusions. *Math. Ann.* 325(1), 81–96 (2003)
- [12] O. RAIMOND: Self Attracting Diffusions: Case of the constant interaction. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 107, 177–196 (1996)
- [13] O. RAIMOND: Self-interacting diffusions: a simulated annealing version. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 144, 247–279 (2009)
- [14] F.Y. WANG: Functional Inequalities, Markov Semigroups and Spectral Theory. Elsevier (2006)