

---

# Reducing the cost of posterior sampling in linear inverse problems via task-dependent score learning

---

**Fabian Schneider**

Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology  
and Vienna University of Technology  
Fabian.Schneider@lut.fi

**Duc-Lam Duong**

Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology  
Duc-Lam.Duong@lut.fi

**Matti Lassas**

University of Helsinki  
Matti.Lassas@helsinki.fi

**Maarten V. de Hoop**

Rice University  
mvd2@rice.edu

**Tapio Helin**

Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology  
Tapio.Helin@lut.fi

## Abstract

Score-based diffusion models (SDMs) offer a flexible approach to sample from the posterior distribution in a variety of Bayesian inverse problems. In the literature, the prior score is utilized to sample from the posterior by different methods that require multiple evaluations of the forward mapping in order to generate a single posterior sample. These methods are often designed with the objective of enabling the direct use of the unconditional prior score and, therefore, task-independent training. In this paper, we focus on linear inverse problems, when evaluation of the forward mapping is computationally expensive and frequent posterior sampling is required for new measurement data, such as in medical imaging. We demonstrate that the evaluation of the forward mapping can be entirely bypassed during posterior sample generation. Instead, without introducing any error, the computational effort can be shifted to an offline task of training the score of a specific diffusion-like random process. In particular, the training is task-dependent requiring information about the forward mapping but not about the measurement data. It is shown that the conditional score corresponding to the posterior can be obtained from the auxiliary score by suitable affine transformations. We prove that this observation generalizes to the framework of infinite-dimensional diffusion models introduced recently and provide numerical analysis of the method. Moreover, we validate our findings with numerical experiments.

## 1 Introduction

Inverse problems seek to determine unknown quantities through indirect and noisy measurements, typically leading to ill-posed scenarios. The Bayesian approach to inverse problems frames the task as a quest for information. Blending statistical prior information of the unknown with a likelihood model for the measurement data gives rise to a posterior distribution, which fully characterizes the unknown conditioned on noisy data [29, 43]. In severely ill-posed problems, the quality of inference is strongly dependent on the expressivity of the prior. Traditional hand-crafted priors, such as the total-variation prior, tend not to be expressive enough to characterize complicated structures [44].

Generative models offer a flexible and computationally feasible approach to prior modeling as they offer the possibility of generating new samples after training on a data set characterizing the prior.

This work investigates sampling from the posterior distribution of linear inverse problems using score-based diffusion models (SDMs) [41], which have recently received wide attention in the literature (in the context of inverse problems, see e.g. [5, 35, 21, 20, 19, 44, 36, 17, 25, 18, 4, 7]). An SDM consists of two main components: a forward diffusion process and a reversed generative process. In the forward diffusion, the model gradually transforms the target distribution into a simpler, tractable distribution with a specific stochastic differential equation (SDE) driven by Gaussian noise. The generative process simulates the time-reversal of the diffusion process with a backwards SDE. This denoising phase relies on the drift, which is computed using the logarithmic gradients (scores) of the diffused data densities. These scores are typically estimated using a neural network, allowing efficient simulation of the backwards SDE and, consequently, sample generation from the target distribution. SDMs have demonstrated significant success across variety of domains, including inverse problems such as medical imaging [17, 34, 4, 13, 42].

For inverse problems, posterior sampling with SDMs involves the challenging task of estimating the score function conditioned on the measurements. Two main approaches have emerged in the literature: (1) modifying the unconditional reverse diffusion process to guide the sample trajectories towards the posterior by adding a correction term to the score [28, 12, 39, 1, 11, 34] or data consistency optimization step to the process [42, 17, 10]; and (2) using existing gradient-based Monte Carlo sampling techniques [7, 44, 28]. In both approaches, the underlying idea is to leverage a pre-trained unconditional prior score and, thereby, to accommodate different imaging tasks simultaneously without the need to perform training from scratch. While such *task-independent* approach is beneficial in a context, such as image processing, involving extensive training sets, it may incur a significant computational cost during the sampling process due to the requirement for multiple evaluations of the forward mapping to generate a single posterior sample.

This work is motivated by an alternative scenario: we consider a fixed imaging task with a repetitive need to efficiently estimate the posterior distribution for different sets of measurement data. In particular, we assume that the computational overhead of applying the forward mapping - such as simulating a partial differential equation (PDE) - in the sampling process is prohibitive and, therefore, undesirable. The question we tackle here is whether this computational overhead can be offloaded to the training phase, thereby accelerating the posterior sampling process. Such a scenario emerges in variety of inverse problems including e.g. medical imaging. As we demonstrate affirmatively below, the shift of computational effort can be carried out by customizing the training phase to be *task-dependent*. In our case this corresponds to the training phase being dependent upon the forward mapping, i.e., the imaging setup, but *not* the measurement data. More precisely, we introduce a diffusion-like random process whose distribution depends on the forward mapping, allowing the score (called *task-dependent score* below) to be estimated using standard methods. We then show that the conditional score corresponding to the posterior distribution can be recovered from this task-dependent *unconditional* score by simple affine transformations involving the measurement data. Moreover, we modify the training procedure of the task-dependent score to enable evaluation of the conditional score without applying the forward mapping.

Inverse problems are often about inferring quantities represented by functions such as solutions or parameters to PDEs. In Bayesian inversion, there has been a long standing effort to develop methods that are discretization independent [33, 31, 30], aligned with the principle to “avoid discretization until the last possible moment” [43]. This is also critical for the success of SDMs in Bayesian inversion as recent theoretical studies indicate that the performance guarantees do not always generalize well on increasing dimension [9, 6, 36]. Inspired by recent development on defining the score-based diffusion framework in infinite-dimensional spaces [36, 3], we also extend our method rigorously to a separable Hilbert-space setting. In particular, we provide a numerical analysis of our method in the spirit of [36]. Moreover, we conduct a numerical experiment with two inverse problems related to deblurring and computerized tomography (CT) to illustrate practical applicability of our method.

## 1.1 Related work

The body of literature on SDMs is growing rapidly. Let us mention that Song et al. [41] developed a unified framework combining score-based [26, 40] and diffusion [38, 24] models to interpret SDMs as a time-reversal of certain SDEs. Our paper is inspired by the work on conditional SDMs in the

context of inverse problems. One line of work seeks to modify the unconditional prior score function to generate samples which approximately follow the posterior distribution. Examples of this include projection-based approaches [42, 17], which project the samples on a subspace that solves the inverse problem during the generating process, methods based on the gradient of a log-likelihood [28, 12, 34] and plug and play approaches [20] which add appropriately chosen constraint-terms to the unconditional score function to steer the process towards generating desirable samples. While these approaches are convenient as the unconditional score function can be learned independent of the inverse problems, they usually do not have mathematical error bounds as the approximation errors are hard to quantify. Moreover, the information about the forward map has to be incorporated during the sampling process inducing potentially large computational overhead if the forward mapping is expensive to evaluate.

Another line of work seeks to approximate the conditional score function of the posterior distribution directly [37, 5, 3]. As this approach increases the input dimension of the score function drastically, the training process is more computationally expensive and requires more high quality training samples, which may be restrictive, especially in very high dimensional problems. In relation to this line of work, we demonstrate that in the context of linear inverse problems the dependence of the conditional score to the measurement data can be simplified and training is not needed in full product space, reducing the computational cost dramatically.

The theory of infinite-dimensional SDMs has been initiated only very recently. Hagemann et al. [21] modify the training phase of diffusion models to enable simultaneous training on multiple discretization levels of functions and prove consistency of their method. Lim et al. [35] also generalize the trained model over multiple discretization levels proposing to generate samples with the annealed Langevin algorithm in infinite dimensions. Pidstrigach et al. [36] were first to formulate the SDM directly on infinite-dimensional space proving that the formulation is well-posed and provide theoretical guarantees. Our work is closely connected to Baldassari et al. [3], where the authors introduce the conditional score in an infinite-dimensional setting. Moreover, they provide a set of conditions to be satisfied to ensure robustness of the generative method and prove that the conditional score can be estimated via a conditional denoising score matching objective in infinite dimensions.

## 1.2 Main contribution

The main contribution of this work is to demonstrate that the posterior sample generation by conditional SDMs can be performed without the need to evaluate the forward mapping. Instead, without introducing any error, the computational effort can be shifted to the offline task of training the *unconditional* score of a specific diffusion-like random process. This foundational principle generalizes to other infinite-dimensional diffusion models, beyond the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process studied here. More precisely,

- In Theorem 1 we establish an identity for the conditional score connecting it to a task-dependent unconditional score through affine transformations depending on the forward mapping and the measurement data. The theorem extends this general principle to infinite-dimensional setting.
- In Theorem 2 we derive an error estimate for the generative process following the ideas suggested by Pidstrigach, Marzouk, Reich, and Wang in [36]. In particular, the error estimate explicitly underscores the contribution of the loss function employed in training.

We numerically explore our method in Section 5 demonstrating that the task-dependent training is effective in practise and the online posterior sampling can be performed without evaluations of the forward operator.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Score-based diffusion models in infinite dimensions

**Finite-dimensional score-based diffusion models** Score-based diffusion models (SDMs) are state-of-the-art machine learning generative models ([41]) that learn a data distribution through gradual denoising of a normally distributed random variable. A diffusion process diffuses an image

$X_0 \sim p_0$  from  $t = 0$  to  $t = T$  via the SDE (Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, or OU)

$$dX_t = -\frac{1}{2}X_t dt + dW_t,$$

where the marginal densities are denoted by  $p_t$ , in particular, for large  $T$ ,  $p_T$  is close to the Gaussian density  $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$ . The marginal densities are then reversed using the backward SDE

$$dY_t = \frac{1}{2}Y_t dt + \nabla_x \log p_{T-t}(Y_t) dt + dW_t,$$

such that  $Y_T \sim p_0$ .

**Infinite-dimensional score-based diffusion models** Let us now review the unconditional SDMs in infinite dimensions proposed by [36]. Let  $\mu$  be the target distribution, supported on a separable Hilbert space  $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H)$ . Let  $\{X_t^\mu\}_{t=0}^T$  stand for the infinite-dimensional diffusion process for a continuous time variable  $t \in [0, T]$  satisfying the following infinite-dimensional SDE

$$dX_t^\mu = -\frac{1}{2}X_t^\mu dt + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} dB_t, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a fixed trace class, positive-definite, symmetric covariance operator  $\mathcal{C} : H \rightarrow H$  and  $B_t$  is a Wiener process on  $H$  with covariance  $tI$ , see Appendix A.2. We assume that the process  $X_t^\mu$  is initialized with  $\mu$ , i.e.,  $X_0^\mu \sim \mu$ . Notice carefully that we embed the initial condition  $\mu$  to the notation  $X_t^\mu$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , as we later analyze the interplay between different initializations. Here and in what follows, we assume that the initial conditions and the driving process are independent. We adopt the formal definition of the score functions by Pidstrigach et al. [36]:

**Definition 1.** Define the (weighted, unconditional) score function  $s(x, t; \mu)$  for  $x \in H$  as

$$s(x, t; \mu) = -\frac{1}{1 - e^{-t}} \left( x - e^{-t/2} \mathbb{E}(X_0^\mu | X_t^\mu = x) \right). \quad (2)$$

*Remark 1.* Assume that  $H = \mathbb{R}^n$  and that the distribution  $\mu$  admits a density  $p_0$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For any  $t \geq 0$  the random variable  $X_t^\mu$  obtained through SDE in (1) has a density  $p_t$ . The unconditional score  $s(x, t; \mu)$  given in (2) then satisfies

$$s(x, t; \mu) = \mathcal{C} \nabla_x \log p_t(x).$$

In other words, in finite dimensions the Definition 1 reduces to the common score identified as the log-gradient of the density, scaled by the covariance matrix  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ .

Now assume that for  $T > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \|s(X_t^\mu, t; \mu)\|_H^2 < \infty, \quad (3)$$

Pidstrigach et al. show in [36, Thm. 1] that given  $Y_T^\mu \sim \mathcal{L}(X_T^\mu)$  the following SDE

$$dY_t^\mu = \left( -\frac{1}{2}Y_t^\mu - s(Y_t^\mu, t; \mu) \right) dt + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} d\bar{B}_t \quad (4)$$

is the time-reversal of (1), where  $\bar{B}_t$  is a different Wiener process on  $H$ . The process  $Y_t^\mu$  is independent of the past increments of  $\bar{B}_t$ , but not of the future ones, see [2].

**Training and sampling** In both finite and infinite dimensional diffusion models, the score function is learned by a neural network  $s_\theta(\cdot, \cdot; \mu) : H \times [0, t] \rightarrow H$  such that  $s_\theta(x, t; \mu) \approx s(x, t; \mu)$  (where in finite dimension  $H = \mathbb{R}^n$  we interpret  $s(x, t; \mu)$  as  $\nabla \log p(x)$ ). A common technique to enable empirical learning of the score function is conditional denoising score matching, introduced in [45]. This method has been shown to work in the conditional [5] and infinite dimensional setting [3] for the forward SDE given by the OU process. Training is performed via stochastic gradient descent by minimizing a score-matching objective (loss function),

$$\text{SM}(s_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t \sim U[\delta, T]} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu)} \lambda(t)^2 \|s_\theta(x, t; \mu) - s(x, t; \mu)\|_H^2, \quad (5)$$

over some appropriate class of neural network. Here  $\lambda : [\delta, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is a positive weighted function and  $0 \leq \delta < T$  a truncation that avoids numerical instability for small times. In general, the score function  $s$  is intractable, such that a denoising score-matching objective is introduced,

$$\text{DSM}(s_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t \sim U[\delta, T]} \mathbb{E}_{(x, x_0) \sim \mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, X_0^\mu)} \lambda(t)^2 \|s_\theta(x, t; \mu) - (1 - e^{-t})^{-1/2} (x - e^{-t/2} x_0)\|_H^2.$$

It can be shown, that the two objectives equal up to a constant that does not depend on the parameter  $\theta$ . After training a score  $s_\theta(\cdot, t)$  for all time  $t \in [0, T]$ , we can then generate samples from  $\mu$  by running the backward SDE (4) with the trained score  $s_\theta$  instead of  $s$ . The solution of the backward SDE can then be numerically solved using traditional methods such as Euler–Maruyama approximations.

## 2.2 Bayesian inverse problems and conditional score

In this paper, we focus on the setting, where the score corresponding to the reverse drift is conditioned on observations. We consider a linear inverse problem

$$y = Ax + \epsilon, \quad (6)$$

where  $x \in H$  is the unknown in some separable Hilbert space  $H$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$  stands for the measurement and  $A : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a bounded linear operator. The random noise is modeled by a centered Gaussian distribution  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma)$ ,  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ . We adopt a Bayesian approach to inverse problem (6) [43] and assume to have some prior knowledge of the distribution of  $x$  before any measurement is made. This knowledge is encoded in a given prior  $\mu$ , defined as a probability measure on  $H$ . This approach gives rise to a posterior that is absolutely continuous with respect to the prior and its Radon–Nikodym derivative is given by,  $\mu$ -almost everywhere,

$$\frac{d\mu^y}{d\mu}(x) = \frac{1}{Z(y)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|Ax - y\|_\Gamma^2\right), \quad Z(y) = \int_H \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|Ax - y\|_\Gamma^2\right) \mu(dx). \quad (7)$$

In this context, Baldassari et al. in [3] define the conditional infinite-dimensional score as follows:

**Definition 2.** Define the (weighted) conditional score function  $s(x, t; \mu)$  for  $x \in H$  as

$$s(x, t; \mu^y) = -\frac{1}{1 - e^{-t}} \left( x - e^{-t/2} \mathbb{E}(X_0^\mu | Y = y, X_t^\mu = x) \right). \quad (8)$$

Similar to the bound (3) for unconditional score, Baldassari et al. in [3, Prop. 2] assume that the expected square norm of the score is uniformly finite in time for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$  to prove that the corresponding time-reversal is given by the SDE in (4) with the score replaced by the one in (8) and  $\mu = \mu^y$ .

## 3 Infinite-dimensional diffusion models for posterior measures

In this section we prove that the conditional score obtained through linear observations in (6) can be identified as an affine transformation of a unconditional score from a different diffusion process weighted by the mapping  $A$ . Let us first illustrate this idea in finite dimensions  $H = \mathbb{R}^n$ : consider the posterior  $\mu^y$  in (7) diffused by (1). Suppose the probability densities of the prior  $\mu$  and  $X_t^{\mu^y}$  are absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure and denote them by  $p_0$  and  $q_t(\cdot|y)$ , respectively. The transitional probability for the multivariate OU process is given by  $\rho_t(x|x_0) = \mathcal{N}(e^{-t/2}x_0, (1 - e^{-t})C)$  and thus

$$\begin{aligned} q_t(x|y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q_0(z|y) \rho_t(x|z) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{Z(y)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p_0(z) \underbrace{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|Az - y\|_\Gamma^2\right)}_{\text{complete square}} \rho_t(x|z) dz \\ &= \frac{\omega_t(x, y)}{Z(y)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p_0(z) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|z - m'_t(x, y)\|_{\Sigma'_t}^2\right) dz, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we completed the square w.r.t. the product of likelihood and transitional probability  $\rho_t$ . Here, the quantities  $\Sigma'_t$ ,  $m'_t(x, y)$  and  $\omega(x, y)$  satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma'_t &= \left( \frac{1}{e^t - 1} C^{-1} + A^\top \Gamma^{-1} A \right)^{-1} \\ m'_t(x, y) &= \Sigma_t \left( A^\top \Gamma^{-1} y + \frac{1}{e^{t/2} - e^{-t/2}} C^{-1} x \right) \quad \text{and} \\ \omega_t(x, y) &\propto \exp\left(-\|y - e^t Ax\|_{C_t}^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_t = (e^t - 1)ACA^\top + \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ . Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x \log q_t(x|y) &= -\nabla_x \|y - e^t Ax\|_{C_t}^2 + \nabla_x \log((p_0 * \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma'_t))(m'_t(x, y))) \\ &= -\nabla_x \|y - e^t Ax\|_{C_t}^2 + (\nabla_x m'_t(x, y))^\top [\nabla_x \log(p_0 * \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma'_t))](m'_t(x, y)). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The identity (9) can be formally interpreted as expressing  $q_t$  for a given time as a mixture of the prior  $p_0$  and a Gaussian distribution with time-dependent covariance  $\Sigma_t$  modulo transformations with  $\omega_t$  and  $m_t$ . What is more, the conditional score corresponding to  $q_t$  in equation (10) can be expressed as a transformation of the score of this mixture, i.e.  $\nabla_x \log(p_0 * \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t))$ . This idea enables us to approximate the posterior score off-line up to affine transformations.

*Remark 2.* The principled idea of transforming from task-dependent unconditional score to the conditional score outlined above generalizes to other linear diffusion models beyond the specific Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process (1) studied here. This raises the important question how to design an efficient underlying diffusion model to balance the computational effort further in a desirable way, e.g. by temporal or spectral weighting of the diffusion. This consideration is beyond the scope of this paper.

We will now make the transformation above precise in infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert space  $H$ . First, we define a random process  $\{\tilde{X}_t^\mu\}_{t=0}^T$  such that its distribution is given by the mixture model

$$\tilde{X}_t^\mu = \tilde{X}_0^\mu + Z_t, \quad \tilde{X}_0^\mu \sim \mu \text{ and } Z_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t) \quad (11)$$

with  $\Sigma_t$  given by

$$\Sigma_t = (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C} - (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C} A^* C_t^{-1} A \mathcal{C} \quad (12)$$

and

$$C_t = (e^t - 1) A \mathcal{C} A^* + \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}. \quad (13)$$

The next lemma ensures that  $\Sigma_t$  is a valid covariance operator.

**Lemma 1.** *For  $t > 0$ , the operator  $\Sigma_t : H \rightarrow H$  is trace class, self-adjoint and positive definite.*

*Remark 3.* While the mixture in (11) is well-defined for any  $t > 0$ , we observe that the process  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  is no longer diffusive in the sense that it may stay dependent of  $\tilde{X}_0^\mu$  as  $t$  grows. Indeed, we notice the dual behaviour from two cases: if  $A = I$ , we have  $\Sigma_t = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C} + (e^t - 1)^{-1}\Gamma)^{-1}\Gamma$  and for  $A = 0$  we have  $\Sigma_t = (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}$  indicating different asymptotics for the variance of  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  depending on the singular values of  $A$ . We note studying an SDE corresponding to  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  or its time-reversal is beyond the scope of this paper.

**Definition 3.** We define the (weighted) unconditional score function of the process (11) by

$$\tilde{s}(z, t; \mu) = - \left( z - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu = z) \right). \quad (14)$$

**Lemma 2.** *Assume that  $H = \mathbb{R}^n$  and our prior measure  $\mu$  admits a density given by  $p_0$ . Moreover, let  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  be defined by (11). Then for every  $t \geq 0$ , the random variable  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  admits a density  $\tilde{p}_t(x)$  satisfying*

$$\tilde{s}(z, t; \mu) = \Sigma_t \nabla_z \log \tilde{p}_t(z).$$

Let us now proceed to the main result of this section.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $H_C$  be the Cameron-Martin space of  $\mathcal{C}$  (see Appendix A) and assume that the prior satisfies  $\mu(H_C) = 1$ . For  $t > 0$ , let  $\Sigma_t$  be given by (12) and define*

$$m_t(x, y) = e^{t/2}x + (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}(y - e^{t/2}Ax). \quad (15)$$

*Then the conditional score function  $s(x, t; \mu^y)$  related to it holds that*

$$s(x, t; \mu^y) = \lambda(t) \left( \tilde{s}(m_t(x, y), t; \mu) + m_t(x, y) - e^{t/2}x \right). \quad (16)$$

*for  $(x, y) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^m$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, Y)$  and  $t > 0$ , where*

$$\lambda(t) = (e^{t/2} - e^{-t/2})^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

**Special case of Gaussian prior** Let us now study the score  $\tilde{s}$  corresponding to the special case of a Gaussian prior measure. This enables us to derive an explicit formula which can give insights, in particular, regarding the regularity of the score function.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, S_0)$  be a Gaussian measure and suppose the covariance operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. Then there exists a covariance operator  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $H$  such that  $\Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1} : H \rightarrow H$  can be well-defined as a linear and bounded operator for  $t > 0$ . Moreover, in that case*

$$\tilde{s}(z, t; \mu) = \Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1}z.$$

**Approximation of the task-dependent score  $\tilde{s}$**  The result of Theorem 1 motivates a new way to approximate the score function in a task-dependent manner. Notice first that the term  $m_t(x, y)$  in (15) depends on the forward map  $A$  in a non-trivial and time-dependent way. Therefore, even if training of  $\tilde{s}$  can be performed offline and utilized as an approximation in equation (16), one would still need to evaluate  $A$  during the sample generation. In what follows, we propose an approximation scheme for the conditional score that circumvents this issue. Let us fix some  $t > 0$  and define the operator

$$R_t := (e^t - 1)I + (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}A. \quad (18)$$

Observe that  $R_t : H \rightarrow H$  is bijective and we have

$$m_t(x, y) = R_t \xi_t(x, y) \quad (19)$$

for any  $x \in H, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $t > 0$ , where

$$\xi_t(x, y) := \mathcal{C}A^*\Gamma^{-1}y + \lambda(t)x \quad (20)$$

and  $\lambda$  is given in (17). For the proof, see Lemma 9. Notice that the first term of  $\xi$  depends on  $A$ , and can be computed once for any  $y$ , but does not depend on  $t$ . Motivated by this transformation, we propose to learn  $\tilde{s}(R_t \cdot, t; \mu) + R_t \cdot$  by a neural network  $r_\theta(\cdot, t; \mu)$ . Equivalently, since  $R_t$  is bijective,

$$r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\xi, t; \mu) \approx \tilde{s}(\xi, t; \mu) + \xi. \quad (21)$$

Note that by Lemma 3, the target operator on the right-hand side of (21) is bounded.

The next lemma adapts the training procedure discussed in Section 2.1 to the setting of forward process  $\tilde{X}^\mu$ . Let us define continuous-time score matching objective (loss function) and the denoising score-matching objective

$$\widetilde{\text{SM}}(r_\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{t \sim U[\delta, T]} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)} \left[ \lambda(t)^2 \left\| \tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) + \tilde{x}_t - r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) \right\|_H^2 \right], \quad (22)$$

$$\widetilde{\text{DSM}}(r_\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{t \sim U[\delta, T]} \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{x}_t) \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu, \tilde{X}_t^\mu)} \left[ \lambda(t)^2 \left\| r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_0 \right\|_H^2 \right].$$

We make an assumption regarding the boundedness of the second moment of the conditional score uniformly in time following [3].

**Assumption 1.** The prior  $\mu$  has bounded second moment:  $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} \|X\|_H^2 < \infty$  and

$$\sup_{t \in [\delta, T]} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_y} \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{L}(X_t^{\mu^y})} \|s(x_t, t; \mu^y)\|_H^2 < \infty.$$

Notice that assumption 1 does not require us to sample from  $Y \sim \pi_y$  or to compute the transform  $m_t(x, y)$ . The reasoning for this is justified by Lemma 6 given in the appendix.

**Lemma 4.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. It follows that*

$$\widetilde{\text{SM}}(r_\theta) = \widetilde{\text{DSM}}(r_\theta) + V,$$

where the constant  $V < \infty$  is independent of  $\theta$ .

The result follows from repeating the arguments in [3, Prop. 4]. Truncation  $t \geq \delta$  guarantees that complications with singularity at  $t \rightarrow 0$  are avoided, see Appendix B.4 for details.

## 4 Numerical analysis

The aim of this section is to establish a quantitative bound of the error term that indicates how far the samples generated by our method lie from the true posterior target measure. In particular, we quantify how this error term depends on different types of numerical approximations. Let us fix  $T > 0$  and  $\delta \in (0, T)$ . Consider a partition  $\{\delta = t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n = T\}$  of  $[\delta, T]$  with mesh size  $\Delta t := \min\{t_i - t_{i+1} | 0 \leq i \leq N - 1\}$  and define  $[t] := \max\{t_i | 1 \leq i \leq n, t_i \leq t\}$ . For clarity, we reverse time in (4) and let  $W_t^{\mu^y} = Y_{T-t}^{\mu^y}$  for  $y \sim \pi_y$ -a.e. be the ideal solution satisfying

$$dW_t^{\mu^y} = \left( -\frac{1}{2}W_t^{\mu^y} - s(W_t^{\mu^y}, T - t; \mu^y) \right) dt + \mathcal{C}^{1/2}dB_t \quad (23)$$

initiated at  $w_0 = (1 - e^{-T})z + e^{-T/2}x_0$  for  $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C})$  and  $x_0 \sim \mu^y$ . Observe that (23) is a ‘standard’ SDE where  $W_t^{\mu^y}$  is independent of the future increments of  $B_t$ . Moreover, let  $v_t$  correspond the numerical approximation to  $W_t^{\mu^y}$  satisfying

$$dV_t^{\mu^y} = -\frac{1}{2}V_{[t]}^{\mu^y} - \lambda(T - [t]) \left[ r_\theta \left( \xi_{T-[t]}(V_{[t]}^{\mu^y}, y), T - [t]; \mu \right) - e^{(T-[t])/2} V_{[t]}^{\mu^y} \right] dt + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} dB_t$$

and initiated at  $v_0 = (1 - e^{-T})z$ . Here, the two stochastic processes share the same Wiener process  $B_t$  and initialization  $z$ . In what follows, we consider a discrete-time loss given by

$$\varepsilon_{LOSS} = \mathbb{E}_{t \sim U[\delta, T]} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_{[t]} \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_{[t]}^\mu)} \lambda([t])^2 \left\| \tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_{[t]}, [t]; \mu) + \tilde{x}_{[t]} - r_\theta(R_{[t]}^{-1} \tilde{x}_{[t]}, [t]; \mu) \right\|_H^2. \quad (24)$$

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

**Theorem 2.** *Let Assumption 1 and the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Assume further that  $s(\cdot, t; \mu)$  and  $r_\theta(\cdot, t; \mu)$  are Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant  $L_s(\cdot) \in L^2([\delta, T])$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_y} \mathbb{E}_{(w_T, v_{T-\delta}) \sim \mathcal{L}(W_T^{\mu^y}, V_{T-\delta}^{\mu^y})} \|w_T - v_{T-\delta}\|_H^2 \leq M (\varepsilon_{NUM} + \varepsilon_{LOSS} + \varepsilon_{INIT} + \varepsilon_{TRUNC}),$$

where  $\varepsilon_{LOSS}$  is given in (24), and

$$\varepsilon_{TRUNC} \leq \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad \varepsilon_{INIT} \leq e^{-T} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} \|X\|_H^2, \quad \varepsilon_{NUM} \leq \mathcal{O}(\Delta t),$$

and the constant  $M$  depends on the quantities

$$\mathbb{E}_{t \sim U[0, T-\delta]} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_y} \mathbb{E}_{w_t \sim \mathcal{L}(w_t)} \|s(w_t, T - t; \mu^y)\|_H^2, \quad \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} \|X\|_H^2, \quad \int_\delta^T L_s^2(\tau) d\tau, \quad \text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) \quad \text{and} \quad T.$$

Note that the Lipschitz continuity assumption of the drift is a natural setup for the backward SDE to retain the uniqueness of a (strong) solution, see [36]. It also follows from there that for  $\pi_y$ -almost every  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$  the random variable  $W_T^{\mu^y}$  is distributed according to the posterior  $\mu^y$ .

## 5 Numerical experiments

We showcase our method in the context of inverse problems related to deblurring and computerized tomography (CT). Details of the numerical implementation are described in Section D. In both applications, our prior distribution is characterized by samples of the MNIST-dataset [32], which depict handwritten digits from 0 to 9. For convenience of the implementation, we re-scale the digits to  $32 \times 32$  pixel resolution. Following [41], we utilize the U-Net architecture to parameterise  $r_\theta$  and perform training outlined in Section 2.1 on a Nvidia A100 GPU with 80 GiB. We compare our method to Langevin dynamics [28] (SDE LD) and annealed Langevin dynamics [28] (SDE ALD) for the score function. While the referenced work uses a conditional score approximation to sample using a Langevin dynamics based sampler, we use the same approximation in a reverse time SDE sampling method. Further we compare to Diffusion Posterior Sampling (DPS) [12] and projection based methods for general Inverse Problems (Proj) [17]. The findings are summarised in Figures 1 and 2. The numerical implementation can be found at <https://github.com/FabianSBD/SBD-task-dependent>.

**Deblurring** In this example, the forward operator  $A$  corresponds to a two-dimensional convolution with a Gaussian kernel over the image domain. We observe the output function on the same grid with an additive Gaussian noise vector. In figure 1 we demonstrate that, in comparison to other methods listed above, the posterior ensemble ( $N = 1000$  samples) generated by our method exhibits the smallest bias while maintaining a standard deviation comparable to those of the other methods.

**CT-Imaging** Here, we model  $A$  as a sparse-view CT imaging with a view angle of 7.5 degrees (see figure 2) with design of 2 angles. The detector is assumed to have 32 apertures spanning over the width of 32 pixels (i.e., 32 parallel line integrals per angle are measured) and the measurement is corrupted with additive Gaussian noise.

Similar to the deblurring application, we demonstrate in figure 2 that the posterior ensemble ( $N = 1000$ ) generated by our method is most concentrated around the ground truth in terms of bias and standard deviation.



Figure 1: Posterior samples for de-blurring problem. From left to right: measurement, ground truth, 7 posterior samples, bias and pixel wise standard deviation (both computed on 1000 samples),  $L^2$  norm of bias and standard deviation. Methods from top to bottom: SDE LD, SDE ALD, DPS, Proj, ours.



Figure 2: Posterior samples for CT imaging problem. From left to right: measurement data (sinogram), ground truth (straight lines representing the two unique angles at which CT takes projections; 32 parallel projections are measured from both angles), 7 posterior samples, bias and pixel wise standard deviation (both computed on 1000 samples),  $L^2$  norm of bias and standard deviation. Methods from top to bottom: SDE LD, SDE ALD, DPS, Proj, ours.

## 6 Conclusions

This paper is about balancing the computational cost of offline training and online sampling. In high-dimensional inverse problems, the computational effort introduced by evaluating forward mapping during posterior sampling can be prohibitive, and this paper puts forward a novel method to transfer, without introducing any error, this computational overhead to the training phase. What is more, we demonstrate that this method is rigorous in infinite-dimensional setting and, therefore, independent of the discretization.

The general principle of transforming a task-dependent unconditional score to a conditional score proposed in this paper extends beyond the specific OU diffusion process considered here. This opens up intriguing questions about selecting the appropriate process to achieve a more efficient balance of computational effort.

## Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the Research Council of Finland (RCoF) through the *Flagship of advanced mathematics for sensing, imaging and modelling*, decision number 358944. Moreover, TH was supported through RCoF decision numbers 353094 and 348504. M.L. was partially supported by PDE-Inverse project of the European Research Council of the European Union, the FAME and Finnish Quantum flagships and the grant 336786 of the RCoF. Views and opinions expressed are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the other funding organizations. Neither the European Union nor the other funding organizations can be held responsible for them. MVdH acknowledges support from the Department of Energy under grant

DE-SC0020345, the Simons Foundation under the MATH + X program, and the corporate members of the Geo-Mathematical Imaging Group at Rice University.

## References

- [1] Alexandre Adam et al. “Posterior samples of source galaxies in strong gravitational lenses with score-based priors”. In: *CoRR* abs/2211.03812 (2022).
- [2] Brian D.O. Anderson. “Reverse-time diffusion equation models”. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 12.3 (1982), pp. 313–326. ISSN: 0304-4149.
- [3] Lorenzo Baldassari et al. “Conditional score-based diffusion models for Bayesian inference in infinite dimensions”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 36. 2023.
- [4] Riccardo Barbano et al. “Steerable conditional diffusion for out-of-distribution adaptation in imaging inverse problems”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14409* (2023).
- [5] Georgios Batzolis et al. *Conditional Image Generation with Score-Based Diffusion Models*. 2021. arXiv: 2111.13606 [cs.LG].
- [6] Valentin De Bortoli. “Convergence of denoising diffusion models under the manifold hypothesis”. In: *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2022). Expert Certification. ISSN: 2835-8856.
- [7] Gabriel Cardoso, Sylvain Le Corff, Eric Moulines, et al. “Monte Carlo guided Denoising Diffusion models for Bayesian linear inverse problems.” In: *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023.
- [8] Hongrui Chen, Holden Lee, and Jianfeng Lu. “Improved Analysis of Score-based Generative Modeling: User-Friendly Bounds under Minimal Smoothness Assumptions”. In: *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Vol. 202. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2023, pp. 4735–4763.
- [9] Sitan Chen et al. “Sampling is as easy as learning the score: theory for diffusion models with minimal data assumptions”. In: *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023.
- [10] Hyungjin Chung, Byeongsu Sim, and Jong Chul Ye. “Come-Closer-Diffuse-Faster: Accelerating Conditional Diffusion Models for Inverse Problems through Stochastic Contraction”. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2022, pp. 12403–12412.
- [11] Hyungjin Chung and Jong Chul Ye. “Score-based diffusion models for accelerated MRI”. In: *Medical Image Analysis* 80 (2022), p. 102479. ISSN: 1361-8415. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2022.102479>.
- [12] Hyungjin Chung et al. “Diffusion Posterior Sampling for General Noisy Inverse Problems”. In: *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023.
- [13] Hyungjin Chung et al. “Solving 3d inverse problems using pre-trained 2d diffusion models”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 22542–22551.
- [14] G. Da Prato. *An Introduction to Infinite-Dimensional Analysis*. Universitext. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006. ISBN: 9783540290216.
- [15] Giuseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [16] Jurij L Daleckij. *Measures and differential equations in infinite-dimensional space*. eng. Mathematics and its applications : Soviet series ; 76. Dordrecht [u.a.]: Kluwer, 1991. ISBN: 9789401051484.
- [17] Sreemanti Dey et al. “Score-based Diffusion Models for Photoacoustic Tomography Image Reconstruction”. In: *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, Apr. 2024. DOI: 10.1109/icassp48485.2024.10447579. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP48485.2024.10447579>.
- [18] Zehao Dou and Yang Song. “Diffusion posterior sampling for linear inverse problem solving: A filtering perspective”. In: *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023.

- [19] Berthy T. Feng et al. “Score-Based Diffusion Models as Principled Priors for Inverse Imaging”. In: *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2023, pp. 10486–10497.
- [20] Alexandros Graikos et al. “Diffusion Models as Plug-and-Play Priors”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2022.
- [21] Paul Hagemann et al. “Multilevel diffusion: Infinite dimensional score-based diffusion models for image generation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04772* (2023).
- [22] Martin Hairer. *An Introduction to Stochastic PDEs*. 2023. arXiv: 0907.4178 [math.PR].
- [23] Martin Hairer et al. “Analysis of SPDEs arising in path sampling. Part I: The Gaussian case”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* 3 (Jan. 2006).
- [24] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 6840–6851.
- [25] Benjamin Holzschuh, Simona Vegetti, and Nils Thuerey. “Solving Inverse Physics Problems with Score Matching”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023).
- [26] Aapo Hyvärinen and Peter Dayan. “Estimation of non-normalized statistical models by score matching.” In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 6.4 (2005).
- [27] Kiyosi Itô. “Infinite Dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Processes”. In: *Stochastic Analysis*. Ed. by Kiyosi Itô. Vol. 32. North-Holland Mathematical Library. Elsevier, 1984, pp. 197–224.
- [28] Ajil Jalal et al. “Robust compressed sensing mri with deep generative priors”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 14938–14954.
- [29] Jari Kaipio and Erkki Somersalo. *Statistical and computational inverse problems*. Vol. 160. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [30] Matti Lassas, Eero Saksman, and Samuli Siltanen. “Discretization-invariant Bayesian inversion and Besov space priors”. In: *Inverse Problems and Imaging* 3.1 (2009), pp. 87–122. ISSN: 1930-8337. DOI: 10.3934/ipi.2009.3.87.
- [31] Matti Lassas and Samuli Siltanen. “Can one use total variation prior for edge-preserving Bayesian inversion?” In: *Inverse problems* 20.5 (2004), p. 1537.
- [32] Yann LeCun and Corinna Cortes. “The mnist database of handwritten digits”. In: 2005. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:60282629>.
- [33] Markku S Lehtinen, Lassi Paivarinta, and Erkki Somersalo. “Linear inverse problems for generalised random variables”. In: *Inverse Problems* 5.4 (1989), p. 599.
- [34] Brett Levac et al. “MRI reconstruction with side information using diffusion models”. In: *2023 57th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*. IEEE. 2023, pp. 1436–1442.
- [35] Jae Hyun Lim et al. “Score-based diffusion models in function space”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07400* (2023).
- [36] Jakiw Pidstrigach et al. *Infinite-Dimensional Diffusion Models for Function Spaces*. 2023. arXiv: 2302.10130 [stat.ML].
- [37] Chitwan Saharia et al. “Image Super-Resolution via Iterative Refinement”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 45.4 (2023), pp. 4713–4726.
- [38] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein et al. “Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2015, pp. 2256–2265.
- [39] Jiaming Song et al. “Pseudoinverse-Guided Diffusion Models for Inverse Problems”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023.
- [40] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. “Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [41] Yang Song et al. “Score-Based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Differential Equations”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021.
- [42] Yang Song et al. “Solving Inverse Problems in Medical Imaging with Score-Based Generative Models”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2022.

- [43] Andrew M Stuart. “Inverse problems: a Bayesian perspective”. In: *Acta numerica* 19 (2010), pp. 451–559.
- [44] Yu Sun et al. “Provable probabilistic imaging using score-based generative priors”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10835* (2023).
- [45] Pascal Vincent. “A Connection Between Score Matching and Denoising Autoencoders”. In: *Neural Computation* 23 (2011), pp. 1661–1674.

## A Probability measures on Hilbert spaces

### A.1 Gaussian random processes in an infinite dimensional Hilbert space

This section introduces notations and outlines some basic properties of probability measures on Hilbert spaces. For a more comprehensive introduction, we refer to [15, 22].

**Gaussian measures on Hilbert space** Let  $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H)$  be a separable Hilbert space with norm  $\| \cdot \|_H = \sqrt{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H}$ . A bounded linear operator  $C : H \rightarrow H$  is called *self-adjoint* if  $\langle x, Cy \rangle_H = \langle Cx, y \rangle_H$  for all  $x, y \in H$  and *positive definite* if  $\langle Cx, x \rangle_H \geq 0$  for all  $x \in H$ . We say that a self-adjoint and positive definite operator  $C$  is of *trace class* if

$$\text{tr}_H(C) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle Ce_n, e_n \rangle < \infty,$$

where  $\{e_n\}$  is an orthogonal basis of  $H$ . We denote by  $L_1^+(H)$  the space of all self-adjoint, positive definite and trace class operators on  $H$ . A random variable taking values in  $H$  is called *Gaussian* if the law of  $\langle h, X \rangle_H$  is Gaussian for each  $h \in H$ . Gaussian random variables are determined by their *mean*  $m = \mathbb{E}[X] \in H$  and their *covariance operator* defined as

$$\langle Cg, h \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\langle g, X - m \rangle \langle h, X - m \rangle].$$

In this case, we denote  $X \sim \mathcal{N}(m, C)$ . If  $m = 0$ ,  $X$  is called *centred*. It can be shown that if  $X$  is a Gaussian random variable on  $H$  then  $C \in L_1^+(H)$ , moreover,  $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|_H^2] = \text{tr}_H(C)$ .

**The Cameron–Martin space** We define the Cameron–Martin space associated with a Gaussian measure  $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, C)$  on  $H$  to be the intersection of all linear spaces of full measure under  $\mu$ , and denote it by  $H_\mu$  or  $H_C$ . It can be shown that  $H_\mu = C^{1/2}H$  and  $H_\mu$  is compactly embedded and dense in  $H$ . In infinite dimensions, it is necessarily the case that  $\mu(H_\mu) = 0$ . Moreover,  $H_\mu$  can be endowed with a Hilbert space structure with an inner product

$$\langle g, h \rangle_{H_\mu} = \langle g, C^{-1}h \rangle_H = \langle C^{-1/2}g, C^{-1/2}h \rangle_H.$$

*Example 1.* Let  $H = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, C)$  be a Gaussian measure on  $H$  with a positive definite covariance matrix  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Then since  $C^{1/2}H = H$ , the Cameron–Martin space is the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Cameron–Martin’s theorem** The Cameron–Martin space  $H_\mu$  plays a special role in that it characterises precisely those directions in which one can translate the Gaussian measure  $\mu$  without changing its null sets, thus  $\mu_h := \mathcal{N}(h, C)$  and  $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, C)$  are equivalent if and only if  $h \in H_\mu$ . Moreover, the Radon–Nikodym derivative of  $\mu_h$  with respect to  $\mu$  is given by

$$\frac{d\mu_h}{d\mu}(x) = \exp\left(\langle h, x \rangle_{H_\mu} - \frac{1}{2}\|h\|_{H_\mu}^2\right), \quad \mu\text{-a.s.}, x \in H. \quad (25)$$

Note that since  $H_\mu = C^{1/2}H$  is dense in  $H$ , the random variable  $\langle h, x \rangle_{H_\mu} = \langle C^{-1/2}h, C^{-1/2}x \rangle_H$ ,  $x \in H$ , can be defined properly using a limiting process, see [15, Remark 2.24].

### A.2 Wiener processes $B_t$ in an infinite dimensional Hilbert space

In this subsection, we recall the definition of the Wiener processes  $B_t$  in an infinite dimensional Hilbert space. As  $H$  is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, the process  $B_t$  can not be defined as

random variable taking values in the Hilbert space  $H$ , but we need to start our considerations with a larger Hilbert space  $Y$  having the additional properties that are described below. At each time  $t \in [0, T]$  the process  $B_t$  is defined to be a Gaussian random variable taking values in the Hilbert space  $Y$  so that the expectation of  $B_t$  is zero and the covariance operator is  $tC_Y$ , where  $C_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a symmetric and injective trace-class operator in  $Y$ . That is, for  $\phi, \psi \in Y$  and  $0 \leq t < t + s \leq T$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\langle B_t, \phi \rangle_Y) &= 0, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B_t, \phi \rangle_Y \cdot \langle B_t, \psi \rangle_Y) &= t\langle \phi, C_Y \phi \rangle_Y, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B_{t+s} - B_t, \phi \rangle_Y \cdot \langle B_{t+s} - B_t, \psi \rangle_Y) &= s\langle \phi, C_Y \phi \rangle_Y.\end{aligned}$$

We require that  $Y$  and  $C_Y$  are such that

$$H = \text{Ran}(C_Y^{1/2}) = C_Y^{1/2}(Y).$$

Under the above assumptions,  $H$  is the Cameron-Martin of the Gaussian random variable  $B_t$  for  $t > 0$ . Then, we can define for  $b \in Y$  and  $\phi \in C_Y(Y)$  an extension of  $H$ -inner product  $\langle u, \phi \rangle_H$  by setting

$$\langle u, \phi \rangle_H := \langle u, C_Y^{-1} \phi \rangle_Y.$$

Using these definitions, it holds that for all  $\phi, \psi \in C_Y(Y) \subset H$  and  $0 \leq t < t + s \leq T$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\langle B_t, \phi \rangle_H) &= 0, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B_t, \phi \rangle_H \cdot \langle B_t, \psi \rangle_H) &= t\langle \phi, \phi \rangle_H, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B_{t+s} - B_t, \phi \rangle_H \cdot \langle B_{t+s} - B_t, \psi \rangle_H) &= s\langle \phi, \phi \rangle_Y.\end{aligned}$$

Motivated by these formulas, we call  $B_t$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , a Wiener process in  $H$  having the (generalized) covariance operator  $tI$ .

We also note that in formula (1), we use the symmetric trace-class operator  $\mathcal{C} : H \rightarrow H$  and the increments  $\mathcal{C}^{1/2}dB_t$ . These increments can be interpreted as the differences of the random process  $t \mapsto \mathcal{C}^{1/2}B_t$ . At any time  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , the random variable  $\mathcal{C}^{1/2}B_t$  takes values in the space  $H$ , and its covariance operator in  $H$  is  $\mathcal{C} : H \rightarrow H$ .

## B Proofs for Section 3

### B.1 Task-dependent score

Recall that  $C_t = \Gamma + (e^t - 1)ACA^* : H \rightarrow H$  and  $\Sigma_t = (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C} - (e^t - 1)^2\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}AC : H \rightarrow H$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.* It is clear that  $\Sigma_t$  is self-adjoint. For positive definiteness, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_t &= \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \left( (e^t - 1)I - (e^t - 1)^2\mathcal{C}^{1/2}A^*C_t^{-1}AC^{1/2} \right) \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \\ &= \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{e^t - 1}I + \mathcal{C}^{1/2}A^*\Gamma^{-1}AC^{1/2} \right)^{-1} \mathcal{C}^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemma 5 (a) for the last identity. Since  $\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}AC$  is also positive definite, it immediately follows that

$$0 < \text{tr}_H(\Sigma_t) = (e^t - 1)\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) - (e^t - 1)^2\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}AC) \leq (e^t - 1)\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) < \infty$$

and, consequently,  $\Sigma_t$  is trace-class.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* We replicate the proof of [36, Lemma 1] for the process  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$ . The density  $\tilde{p}_t(\cdot | x_0)$  of  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  conditioned on  $\tilde{X}_0^\mu = x_0$  is Gaussian centered at  $x_0$  with covariance  $\Sigma_t$ .

For what follows, let  $\tilde{p}_0(x_0)$  be the density of  $\tilde{X}_0^\mu$  and  $\tilde{p}_t(x)$  the density of  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$ . We apply Leibniz's rule to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_t \nabla_x \log \tilde{p}_t(x) &= \Sigma_t \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_t(x)} \nabla_x \int \tilde{p}_t(x|x_0) d\tilde{p}_0(x_0) \right) \\
&= -\Sigma_t \int \Sigma_t^{-1}(x-x_0) \frac{\tilde{p}_t(x|x_0)}{\tilde{p}_t(x)} d\tilde{p}_0(x_0) \\
&= -\int (x-x_0) \tilde{p}(x_0|x) \\
&= -\left( x - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu = x) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we utilized Bayes' formula for the second last identity. This proves the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** For any  $t > 0$ , we have that

(a) the linear operator  $\Xi_t = (e^t - 1)I - (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C}^{1/2} A^* C_t^{-1} A \mathcal{C}^{1/2} : H \rightarrow H$  is bijective and

$$\Xi_t^{-1} = \frac{1}{e^t - 1} I + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C}^{1/2},$$

(b) the linear operator  $\Xi'_t = I - (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* C_t^{-1} A$  is bijective and

$$(\Xi'_t)^{-1} = I + (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A; \quad \text{and}$$

(c) it holds that

$$(e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* C_t^{-1} = \Sigma_t A^* \Gamma^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* a) Invertibility from the right can be derived by straightforward computation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Xi_t \left( \frac{1}{e^t - 1} I + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C}^{1/2} \right) \\
&= I + (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C}^{1/2} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C}^{1/2} - (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C}^{1/2} A^* C_t^{-1} \underbrace{\left( (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* + \Gamma \right)}_{=C_t} \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C}^{1/2} = I
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, invertibility from the left follows from an analogous computation. The invertibility in (b) can be established using the same arguments. For the identity in (c), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_t A^* \Gamma^{-1} C_t &= (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* - (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C} A^* C_t^{-1} A \mathcal{C} A^* + (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C} A^* \\
&\quad - (e^t - 1)^3 \mathcal{C} A^* C_t^{-1} A \mathcal{C} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C} A^* \\
&= (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* + (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C} A^* \\
&\quad - (e^t - 1)^2 \mathcal{C} A^* C_t^{-1} \underbrace{\left( (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^* + \Gamma \right)}_{=C_t} \Gamma^{-1} A \mathcal{C} A^* \\
&= (e^t - 1) \mathcal{C} A^*.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired identity follows by inverting  $C_t$ .  $\square$

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 is a direct consequence of the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Then

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu = m_t(x, y)) = \mathbb{E}(X_0^\mu | Y = y, X_t^\mu = x), \quad (26)$$

for  $(x, y) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^m$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, Y)$  and  $t > 0$ .

Throughout this section, we denote the transition kernel densities

$$n_t(x_0, x) := \frac{d\mathcal{N}(x_0, (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C})}{d\mathcal{N}(0, (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C})}(e^{t/2}x), \quad \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x) := \frac{d\mathcal{N}(x_0, \Sigma_t)}{d\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)}(x),$$

whenever the Radon–Nykodym derivatives make sense.

A plan of proof for Proposition 1 is as follows. We first develop auxiliary results: Lemma 6 shows that the laws of  $m_t(X_t^\mu, Y)$  and  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  coincide when conditioned on  $X_0 = 0$ . Lemma 7 is used to express each expectation in (26) in terms of transition kernels  $n_t$  and  $\tilde{n}_t$  of the corresponding forward SDEs, which in turn can be written as Radon–Nykodym derivatives of certain measures. After that, we use Lemma 8 to show that the measures  $\mathcal{N}(0, (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C})$  and  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)$  are equivalent, in particular their Cameron–Martin spaces equal, which concludes the proof. Finally, we put together the argument at the end of the section.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (1 - e^{-t})\mathcal{C})$ ,  $Z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma)$  and  $Z_3 = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)$  be mutually independent Gaussian random variables on  $H$ . Moreover, let  $x_0 \in H$  be arbitrary. It holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}(m_t(e^{-t/2}x_0 + Z_1, Ax_0 + Z_2)) = \mathcal{L}(x_0 + Z_3).$$

for any  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} m_t(e^{-t/2}x_0 + Z_1, Ax_0 + Z_2) &= x_0 + e^{t/2}Z_1 + (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}(Z_1 - e^{t/2}AZ_1) \\ &= x_0 + e^{t/2}\frac{1}{e^t - 1}\Sigma_t\mathcal{C}^{-1}Z_1 + \Sigma_tA^*\Gamma^{-1}Z_2 \end{aligned}$$

is a Gaussian random variable centered at  $x_0$  with a covariance

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(m_t(e^{-t/2}x_0 + Z_1, Ax_0 + Z_2)) &= \Sigma_tA^*\Gamma^{-1}A\Sigma_t + \frac{1}{e^t - 1}\Sigma_t\mathcal{C}^{-1}\Sigma_t \\ &= \Sigma_t\left(A^*\Gamma^{-1}A + \frac{1}{e^t - 1}\mathcal{C}^{-1}\right)\Sigma_t = \Sigma_t. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *The following holds*

(i) For  $(x, y) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^m$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, Y)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_0^\mu | Y = y, X_t^\mu = x) = \frac{\int_H x_0 n_t(x_0, x) \mu^y(dx_0)}{\int_H n_t(x_0, x) \mu^y(dx_0)}.$$

(ii) For  $x \in H$   $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)$ -a.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu = x) = \frac{\int_H x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x) \mu(dx_0)}{\int_H \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x) \mu(dx_0)}.$$

*Proof. (i):* We first observe that, if  $X \sim \mathcal{N}(x_0, \mathcal{C})$  then  $\alpha X \sim \mathcal{N}(\alpha x_0, \alpha^2 \mathcal{C})$  for any  $\alpha > 0$ , and as a direct consequence

$$\mathcal{N}(x_0, \mathcal{C})(A) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha x_0, \alpha^2 \mathcal{C})(\alpha A), \quad (27)$$

for any  $\alpha > 0$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ . By using this property for  $\alpha = e^{-t/2}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} n_t(x_0, x) &= \frac{d\mathcal{N}(x_0, (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C})}{d\mathcal{N}(0, (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C})}(e^{t/2}x) \\ &= \frac{d\mathcal{N}(e^{-t/2}x_0, (1 - e^{-t})\mathcal{C})}{d\mathcal{N}(0, (1 - e^{-t})\mathcal{C})}(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(X_0^\mu | Y = y, X_t^\mu = x), \end{aligned}$$

for  $(x, y) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^m$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, Y)$ , where the last equality follows from [36, Proof of Thm. 2] and that  $\mathcal{N}(e^{-t/2}x_0, (1 - e^{-t})\mathcal{C})$  is the transition kernel of the forward SDE (4).

**(ii):** We repeat the aforementioned argument from [36] adapted to our case. The joint distribution of  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu, \tilde{X}_0^\mu$  is given by  $\tilde{n}(x_0, x)\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)(dx) \otimes \mu(dx_0)$ . Indeed, for any  $\mathcal{A} \in \sigma(\tilde{X}_0^\mu), \mathcal{B} \in \sigma(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} \tilde{n}(x_0, x)\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)(dx)\mu(dx_0) &= \iint_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} \frac{d\mathcal{N}(x_0, \Sigma_t)}{d\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)}(x)\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)(dx)\mu(dx_0) \\ &= \iint_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{N}(x_0, \Sigma_t)(dx)\mu(dx_0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu \in \mathcal{A}, \tilde{X}_t^\mu \in \mathcal{B}), \end{aligned}$$

where it is used that  $\mathcal{N}(x_0, \Sigma_t)$  is the forward transition kernel of the process  $\tilde{X}^\mu$ . We show that

$$f(x) = \frac{\int x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)}{\int \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)}$$

is a version of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu = x)$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_t$  be the law of  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_t(A) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu \in A), \quad A \in \sigma(\tilde{X}_t^\mu).$$

The function  $f(x)$  is  $\sigma(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)$ -measurable by Fubini's theorem and for any  $\mathcal{A} \in \sigma(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu)}(1_{\mathcal{A}}f(x)) &= \int_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{\int_H x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)}{\int_H \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)} d\mathbb{P}_t(x) \\ &= \iint_{H \times \mathcal{A}} \frac{\int_H x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)}{\int_H \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)} \tilde{n}(\tilde{x}_0, x_t)\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)(dx)\mu(d\tilde{x}_0) \\ &= \iint_{\mathcal{A} \times H} x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0) \frac{\int_H \tilde{n}(\tilde{x}_0, x)\mu(d\tilde{x}_0)}{\int_H \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)(dx) \\ &= \iint_{\mathcal{A} \times H} x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, x)\mu(dx_0)\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)(dx) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \tilde{X}_0^\mu}(1_{\mathcal{A}}x_0). \end{aligned}$$

The above properties define the conditional expectation and we can conclude the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *We have that*

(i)  $\Sigma_t(H) = \mathcal{C}(H)$ ; moreover,

$$\Sigma_t^{-1}|_{\Sigma_t(H)} = (A^*\Gamma^{-1}A + (e^t - 1)^{-1}\mathcal{C}^{-1})|_{\mathcal{C}(H)}. \quad (28)$$

(ii)  $H_{(e^t-1)\mathcal{C}} = H_{\Sigma_t}$ .

(iii) The measures  $\mathcal{N}(0, (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C})$  and  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)$  are equivalent.

(iv) For  $x_0 \in H_{(e^t-1)\mathcal{C}}$ , we have

$$\langle x_0, \cdot \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} = \langle x_0, A^*\Gamma^{-1}A \cdot \rangle_H + \langle x_0, \cdot \rangle_{H_{(e^t-1)\mathcal{C}}} \quad (29)$$

in  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)$ -a.e.

*Proof.* For the purpose of this proof, we abbreviate

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t = (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}. \quad (30)$$

**(i):** We first show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t(H) = \Sigma_t(H)$ . Note that we can write  $\Sigma_t$  as

$$\Sigma_t = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t \left( I - \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t A^* C_t^{-1} A \right),$$

where the last factor on the right-hand side is invertible (see Lemma 5 (b)) proving that ranges of  $\Sigma_t$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t$  coincide. To prove (28), let  $z \in \Sigma_t(H) = \mathcal{C}(H)$ , then for some  $x \in H$ ,

$$z = \Sigma_t x = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t x - \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t x.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( A^* \Gamma^{-1} A + \tilde{C}_t^{-1} \right) z &= A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t x - A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t x + x - A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t x \\ &= x + A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t x - A^* \Gamma^{-1} \left( \Gamma + A \tilde{C}_t A^* \right) C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t x = x, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\Gamma + A \tilde{C}_t A^* = C_t$ . This shows that

$$\Sigma_t^{-1} z = x = \left( A^* \Gamma^{-1} A + \tilde{C}_t^{-1} \right) z.$$

**(ii):** Notice first that we can write

$$H_{\tilde{C}_t} = \text{cl}^{\|\cdot\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}}(\tilde{C}_t(H)), \quad H_{\Sigma_t} = \text{cl}^{\|\cdot\|_{H_{\Sigma_t}}}(\Sigma_t(H)),$$

where  $\text{cl}^{\|\cdot\|_{H_1}}(H_2)$  denotes the closure of  $H_2 \subset H_1$  w.r.t  $\|\cdot\|_{H_1}$ . Let us prove that the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\Sigma_t}}$  are equivalent on  $\Sigma_t(H) = \tilde{C}_t(H)$  as, together with (i), this will prove the statement.

To this end, let  $x \in \Sigma_t(H) = \tilde{C}_t(H)$  and apply (i) and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}^2 &\leq \|x\|_{H_{\Sigma_t}}^2 = \langle x, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x \rangle_H + \|x\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \|x\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}^2 + \|x\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}^2 \\ &= \left( 1 + \left\| \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \right) \|x\|_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the operator norm  $\left\| \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} A^* \Gamma^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)}$  is finite.

**(iii):** From (ii), the covariance operators of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  have the same Cameron–Martin space, by the Feldman–Hajek theorem we need to show that  $\tilde{C}_t^{-1/2} \Sigma_t \tilde{C}_t^{-1/2} - I$  is Hilbert-Schmidt. To this end, note that

$$\tilde{C}_t^{-1/2} \Sigma_t \tilde{C}_t^{-1/2} - I = -\tilde{C}_t^{1/2} A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} := B.$$

The operator  $B^2$  is of trace class, since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_H(B^2) &= \text{tr}_H \left( \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq \left\| A^* C_t^{-1} A \tilde{C}_t A^* C_t^{-1} A \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)} \text{tr}_H(\tilde{C}_t) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

proving the claim.

**(iv):** Let  $x_0 \in \Sigma_t(H)$ . By (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_0, \cdot \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} &= \langle \Sigma_t^{-1} x_0, \cdot \rangle_H \\ &= \langle A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0, \cdot \rangle_H + \langle \tilde{C}_t^{-1} x_0, \cdot \rangle_H \\ &= \langle A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0, \cdot \rangle_H + \langle x_0, \cdot \rangle_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}} \quad \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)\text{-a.e.} \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Now since  $\Sigma_t(H) = \mathcal{C}(H)$  is dense in  $H_{\Sigma_t} = H_{\tilde{C}_t}$ , the identity above can be uniquely extended to  $H_{\Sigma_t}$  by the white noise mapping, see [14, p. 23]. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *We have*

$$e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}} + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} Y \rangle_H = \langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} \tag{32}$$

*in distribution.*

*Proof.* Combining Lemmas 8 (iv) and 6, it follows that

$$\langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} = \langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\tilde{C}_t}} + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_H$$

in distribution. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} \\
&= \langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_H \\
&= e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + \langle x_0, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t A^* C_t^{-1} (Y - e^{t/2} A X_t^\mu) \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + e^{t/2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A X_t^\mu \rangle_H \\
&\quad + \langle x_0, (e^t - 1) A^* \Gamma^{-1} A C A^* C_t^{-1} (Y - e^{t/2} A X_t^\mu) \rangle_H \\
&= e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + e^{t/2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A X_t^\mu \rangle_H + \langle x_0, A^* C_t^{-1} (Y - e^{t/2} A X_t^\mu) \rangle_H \\
&\quad + (e^t - 1) \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A C A^* C_t^{-1} (Y - e^{t/2} A X_t^\mu) \rangle_H \\
&= e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + e^{t/2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A X_t^\mu \rangle_H + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} (Y - e^{t/2} X_t^\mu) \rangle_H \\
&= e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} Y \rangle_H
\end{aligned}$$

in distribution, where we have used that

$$A^* C_t^{-1} + (e^t - 1) A^* \Gamma^{-1} A C A^* C_t^{-1} = A^* \Gamma^{-1} \underbrace{(\Gamma + (e^t - 1) A C A^*)}_{=C_t} C_t^{-1} = A^* \Gamma^{-1}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* Let  $x_0 \in H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t} \subset H$  where  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t = (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}$ . By virtue of Lemma 7, we will prove that

$$\frac{\int_H x_0 n_t(x_0, x) \mu^y(dx_0)}{\int_H n_t(x_0, x) \mu^y(dx_0)} = \frac{\int_H x_0 \tilde{n}_t(x_0, m_t(x, y)) \mu(dx_0)}{\int_H \tilde{n}_t(x_0, m_t(x, y)) \mu(dx_0)}, \quad (33)$$

for  $(x, y) \in H \in \mathbb{R}^m$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, Y)$ . Notice that it suffices to show that

$$n_t(x_0, x) \frac{d\mu^y}{d\mu}(x_0) = \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}(y)} \tilde{n}_t(x_0, m_t(x, y)), \quad (34)$$

for  $x_0 \in H$   $\mu$ -a.e. and for  $(x, y) \in H \in \mathbb{R}^m$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{L}(X_t^\mu, Y)$ , where  $\tilde{Z}(y)$  does not depend on  $x_0$ , hence will be canceled out in (33). By Bayes' theorem (7),

$$\frac{d\mu^y}{d\mu}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{Z(y)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|A \cdot -y\|_\Gamma^2\right) \quad \text{in } L^1(\mu),$$

Let us now write

$$-\frac{1}{2} \|A x_0 - y\|_\Gamma^2 = \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} y \rangle_H - \frac{1}{2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0 \rangle_H - \frac{1}{2} \|y\|_\Gamma^2$$

and set  $\tilde{Z}(y) = Z(y) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \|y\|_\Gamma^2\right)$ . For  $x_0 \in H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& n_t(x_0, X_t^\mu) \exp\left(\langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} Y \rangle_H - \frac{1}{2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0 \rangle_H - \frac{1}{2} \|Y\|_\Gamma^2\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}(Y)} \exp\left(e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} - \frac{1}{2} \|x_0\|_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}}^2 + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} Y \rangle_H - \frac{1}{2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0 \rangle_H\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}(Y)} \exp\left(e^{t/2} \langle x_0, X_t^\mu \rangle_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}} + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} Y \rangle_H - \frac{1}{2} \|x_0\|_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0 \rangle_H\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}(Y)} \exp\left(\langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} - \frac{1}{2} \|x_0\|_{H_{\Sigma_t}}^2\right),
\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

in distribution, where we have used Corollary 1 and the identity

$$\|x_0\|_{H_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t}}^2 + \langle x_0, A^* \Gamma^{-1} A x_0 \rangle_H = \|x_0\|_{H_{\Sigma_t}}^2, \quad (36)$$

which follows from Lemma 8 (iv).

Now by Lemma 8 (ii),  $x_0 \in H_{\Sigma_t}$  and thus the Cameron–Martin theorem gives

$$\exp\left(\langle x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y) \rangle_{H_{\Sigma_t}} - \frac{1}{2} \|x_0\|_{H_{\Sigma_t}}^2\right) = \tilde{n}_t(x_0, m_t(X_t^\mu, Y))$$

in distribution, which together with (35) lead to (34). Therefore, identity (33) holds true, which completes the proof.  $\square$

### B.3 Gaussian example

*Proof for Lemma 3.* Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  be a covariance operator such that  $\mu\left(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2}(H)\right) = 1$ . As  $S_0^{1/2}(H)$  is the intersection of all linear subspaces of full measure under  $\mu$  [22, Prop. 4.45], it holds  $S_0^{1/2}(H) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2}(H)$ .

We now find another covariance operator  $\mathcal{C}$  such that the score function  $\tilde{s}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{C}$  is bounded linear. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be such that  $\mathcal{C}^{1/2}(X) \subset S_0^{1/2}(X)$  for any linear subset  $X$  of  $H$ . This implies

$$S_0(H) \subset \mathcal{C}(H) = \Sigma_t(H). \quad (37)$$

We identify the law of  $\tilde{X}_t^\mu$  by using the relation

$$\tilde{X}_t^\mu | x_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(x_0, \Sigma_t),$$

where  $x_0$  is a realisation of the prior  $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, S_0)$ . Hence

$$\tilde{X}_t^\mu \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t + S_0).$$

By the reasoning of [23, Lemma 4.4] it holds that

$$\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu \sim \mathcal{N}(m', C')$$

with some covariance operator  $C'$  and

$$m' = \Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1} \tilde{X}_t^\mu.$$

Note that in [23, Lemma 4.4] the operator  $\Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1}$  is defined as a measurable extension of the bounded map

$$A : (\Sigma_t + S_0)^{1/2}(H) \rightarrow H, \quad x \mapsto \Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1}x$$

to the whole space  $H$  as per [16, Theorem II.3.3]. In our case, it is possible to give an explicit formula for a possible extension using the inclusion (37). We define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1} &:= ((\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1} \Sigma_t)^* \\ &= ((I + \Sigma_t^{-1} S_0)^{-1} \Sigma_t^{-1} S_0)^*. \end{aligned}$$

This map coincides with  $A$  on  $(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{1/2}(H)$  and as we will now show, it is defined even the whole space  $H$ . The operator  $\Sigma_t : H \rightarrow \Sigma_t(H)$  is bounded and invertible. Hence also  $\Sigma_t^{-1} : \Sigma_t(H) \rightarrow H$  is bounded. By (37) the map  $\Sigma_t^{-1} S_0$  is well defined and bounded. We can now identify the score function  $\tilde{s}$  as by using the previous equality for the conditional expectation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s}(z, t; \mu) &= -\left(z - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{X}_t^\mu = z)\right) \\ &= -z + S_0(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1}z \\ &= [S_0(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1} - I]z. \\ &= \Sigma_t(\Sigma_t + S_0)^{-1}z. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the claim.  $\square$

#### B.4 Conditional score matching

Recall that  $m_t(x, y) = e^{t/2}x + (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}(y - e^{t/2}Ax)$  and  $\xi_t(x, y) := \mathcal{C}A^*\Gamma^{-1}y + \lambda(t)x$  for  $x \in H$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Moreover,  $R_t := (e^t - 1)I + (e^t - 1)^2\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}A : H \rightarrow H$ .

**Lemma 9.** *The operator  $R_t : H \rightarrow H$  is bijective and the identity*

$$m_t(x, y) = R_t\xi_t(x, y).$$

holds for all  $x \in H$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .

*Proof.* First note that bijectivity is implied by Lemma 5 (b). By direct computation,

$$\begin{aligned} R_t\xi_t(x, y) &= R_t(\mathcal{C}A^*\Gamma^{-1}y + \lambda(t)x) \\ &= (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*\Gamma^{-1}y - (e^t - 1)^2\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}ACA^*\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &\quad + e^{t/2}x - e^{t/2}(e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}Ax \\ &= e^{t/2}x - e^{t/2}(e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}Ax \\ &\quad + (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*(\underbrace{C_t^{-1}[(e^t - 1)ACA^* + \Gamma]}_{=C_t} + (e^t - 1)C_t^{-1}ACA^*)\Gamma^{-1}y \\ &= e^{t/2}x + (e^t - 1)\mathcal{C}A^*C_t^{-1}(y - e^{t/2}Ax) \\ &= m_t(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* We replicate the arguments of [3] adapted to our setting. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_t\|_H^2 \\ &= \|r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu)\|_H^2 + \|\tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_t\|_H^2 - 2\langle r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu), \tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_t \rangle_H. \end{aligned}$$

It holds by definition (14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)} \langle r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu), \tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_t \rangle_H \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)} \left\langle r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu), \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu | \tilde{x}_t)} (\tilde{x}_t - \tilde{x}_0) - \tilde{x}_t \right\rangle_H \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu | \tilde{x}_0)} \langle r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu), \tilde{x}_0 \rangle_H. \end{aligned}$$

Hence it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda(t)^2 \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)} \|r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) + \tilde{x}_t\|_H^2 \\ &= V'(t) + \lambda(t)^2 \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu | \tilde{x}_0)} \|r_\theta(R_t^{-1}\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_0\|_H^2 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$V'(t) = \lambda(t)^2 \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_t \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t^\mu)} \|\tilde{s}(\tilde{x}_t, t; \mu) - \tilde{x}_t\|_H^2 - \lambda(t)^2 \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu)} \|\tilde{x}_0\|_H^2. \quad (38)$$

To conclude, we add expectation with respect to  $t \sim [\delta, T]$ . Note that by Assumption 1 the first term on the rhs of (38) is uniformly bounded in  $t$  and by elementary calculations

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_0^\mu)} \lambda(t)^2 \|\tilde{x}_0\|_H^2 \leq \lambda(\delta)^2 \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} \|x\|_H,$$

such that

$$V := \mathbb{E}_{t \sim [\delta, T]} V'(t) \leq \frac{1}{T - \delta} \sup_{t \in [\delta, T]} V'(t) < \infty.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

## C Proofs for Section 4

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Below, we use the notation  $f \lesssim g$ , if  $f(x) \leq Cg(x)$  for all  $x$  with some universal constant  $C > 0$ . Recall that true solution  $W_t^{\mu^y}$  of the time-reversed denoising process and corresponding approximative solution process  $V_t^{\mu^y}$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} dW_t^{\mu^y} &= \left( -\frac{1}{2}W_t^{\mu^y} - s(W_t^{\mu^y}, T-t; \mu^y) \right) dt + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} dB_t, \\ dV_t^{\mu^y} &= -\frac{1}{2}V_t^{\mu^y} - \lambda(T-\lfloor t \rfloor) \left[ r_\theta \left( \xi_{T-\lfloor t \rfloor}(V_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\mu^y}, y), T-\lfloor t \rfloor; \mu \right) - e^{(T-\lfloor t \rfloor)/2} V_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\mu^y} \right] dt + \mathcal{C}^{1/2} dB_t. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we abbreviate the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_y} \mathbb{E}_{(w_T, v_{T-\delta}) \sim \mathcal{L}(W_T^{\mu^y}, V_{T-\delta}^{\mu^y})}$  as  $\mathbb{E}$ , unless otherwise specified.

**Decomposition of the error.** Let us first consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|w_t - v_t\|_H^2 &= \mathbb{E} \|w_t - w_0 - (v_t - v_0) + (w_0 - v_0)\|_H^2 \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \|w_t - w_0 - (v_t - v_0)\|_H^2 + \varepsilon_{INIT}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon_{INIT} := \mathbb{E} \|w_0 - v_0\|_H^2$ . Now we decompose the difference into three terms as follows:

$$w_t - w_0 - (v_t - v_0) = \int_0^t [\mathcal{I}_1(\tau) + \mathcal{I}_2(\tau) + \mathcal{I}_3(\tau)] d\tau,$$

where we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1(\tau) &= -\frac{1}{2}(w_\tau - w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}) + s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y) - s(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu^y), \\ \mathcal{I}_2(\tau) &= s(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu^y) - \lambda(T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor) \left( r_\theta(\xi_{T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor}(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, y), T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu) - e^{(T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor)/2} w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor} \right) \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{I}_3(\tau) &= \lambda(T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor) \left\{ r_\theta(\xi_{T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor}(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, y), T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu) - r_\theta(\xi_{T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor}(v_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, y), T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu) \right\} \\ &\quad - (\lambda(T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor)e^{(T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor)/2} + 1)(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor} - v_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}). \end{aligned}$$

**Bound for  $\varepsilon_{INIT}$ .** Recall that  $v_0 = (1 - e^{-T})Z$  and  $w_0 = (1 - e^{-T})Z + e^{-T/2}X_0$ , where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C})$  and  $X_0 \sim \mu^y$ . It directly follows that

$$\varepsilon_{INIT} \leq e^{-T} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_y} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu^y} \|x\|_H^2 = e^{-T} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} \|x\|_H^2.$$

where we applied marginalization of the joint distribution.

**Contribution from  $\mathcal{I}_1$ :** We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{NUM} &:= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T-\delta} \|\mathcal{I}_1(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T-\delta} \left\| -\frac{1}{2}(w_\tau - w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}) + s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y) - s(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu^y) \right\|_H^2 d\tau \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T-\delta} \|w_\tau - w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}\|_H^2 d\tau + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T-\delta} \|s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y) - s(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu^y)\|_H^2 d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By [36, Lemma 2], it holds that

$$s(X_t^{\mu^y}, t; \mu^y) = e^{(t-\tau)/2} \mathbb{E} \left( s(X_\tau^{\mu^y}, \tau; \mu^y) | X_t^{\mu^y} \right), \quad 0 < t \leq \tau \leq T,$$

for  $\pi_y$ -a.e.  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Therefore, we deduce by [8, Lemma 11] that for the time-reversed process it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \|s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y) - s(w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, T-\lfloor \tau \rfloor; \mu^y)\|_H^2 \\ &\leq 4\mathbb{E} \|s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y) - s(e^{(\tau-\lfloor \tau \rfloor)/2} w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}, T-\tau; \mu^y)\|_H^2 \\ &\quad + 2(1 - e^{\tau-\lfloor \tau \rfloor})^2 \mathbb{E} \|s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y)\|_H^2 \\ &\leq 4L_s^2(T-\tau) \mathbb{E} \|w_\tau - e^{(t-\lfloor t \rfloor)/2} w_{\lfloor \tau \rfloor}\|_H^2 + 2(1 - e^{\tau-\lfloor \tau \rfloor})^2 \mathbb{E} \|s(w_\tau, T-\tau; \mu^y)\|_H^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Lipschitz continuity of  $s$ . We note that

$$w_s|w_t \sim \mathcal{N}\left(e^{-(t-s)/2}w_t, (1 - e^{-(t-s)})\mathcal{C}\right), \quad (39)$$

for  $T \geq t \geq s \geq 0$ , see [27]. It immediately follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|w_\tau - e^{(\tau-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)/2}w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\right\|_H^2 = (1 - e^{-(\tau-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)})\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}),$$

and, consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|w_\tau - w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\|_H^2 &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left\|w_\tau - e^{(\tau-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)/2}w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\right\|_H^2 + (1 - e^{-(\tau-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)})^2\mathbb{E}\|w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\|_H^2 \\ &\lesssim (1 - e^{-(\tau-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)})\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) \\ &\quad + (1 - e^{-(\tau-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)})^2\left(\mathbb{E}_{y\sim\pi_y}\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu^y}\|x\|_H^2 + \left(1 - e^{-(T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)}\right)\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C})\right) \\ &\lesssim (1 - e^{-\Delta t})\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) + (1 - e^{\Delta t/2})^2\left(\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu}\|x\|_H^2 + \text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the arguments yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{NUM} &\lesssim (T - \delta)\left((1 - e^{-\Delta t})\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) + (1 - e^{\Delta t/2})^2\left(\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu}\|x\|_H^2 + \text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C})\right)\right) \\ &\quad + L_s^2(T - \tau)(1 - e^{-\Delta t})\text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) + (1 - e^{\Delta t})^2\mathbb{E}\|s(w_\tau, T - \tau; \mu^y)\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the last expectation and  $\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu}\|x\|_H^2$  are bounded by assumption, and note that  $1 - e^{-\Delta t} = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ ,  $(1 - e^{\Delta t/2})^2 = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ , we obtain the required upper bound.

**Contribution from  $\mathcal{I}_2$ :** Applying Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2(\tau) &= \lambda(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)\left\{\tilde{s}(R_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\xi(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y), T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor; \mu) + R_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\xi(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - r_\theta(\xi_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y), T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor; \mu)\right\} \\ &= \lambda(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)\left\{\tilde{s}(m_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y), T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor; \mu) + m_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - r_\theta(R_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}^{-1}m_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y), T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor; \mu)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

and now it follows by reversing time and applying Lemma 6 that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T-\delta}\|\mathcal{I}_2(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau = \varepsilon_{LOSS},$$

where  $\varepsilon_{LOSS}$  is given by (24).

**Contribution from  $\mathcal{I}_3$ :** By triangle inequality and the assumption on uniform Lipschitzness of  $r_\theta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{I}_3(\tau)\|_H &\leq \lambda(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)L_s(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)\|\xi_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}(w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y) - \xi_{T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor}(v_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}, y)\|_H \\ &\quad + \lambda(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)e^{(T-\lfloor\tau\rfloor)/2} + 1\|w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor} - v_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\|_H \\ &\leq \kappa_s(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)\|w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor} - v_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\|_H, \end{aligned}$$

where we abbreviate  $\kappa_s(\tau') = L_s(\tau')\lambda(\tau')^2 + \lambda(\tau')e^{\tau'/2} + 1$  for convenience. Note that by assumption  $\kappa_s(\cdot) \in L^2[\delta, T]$ .

Combining the estimates, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\|w_{T-\delta} - v_{T-\delta}\|_H^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_{NUM} + \varepsilon_{LOSS} + \varepsilon_{INIT} + \mathbb{E}\int_0^{T-\delta}\kappa_s(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)^2\|w_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor} - v_{\lfloor\tau\rfloor}\|_H^2 d\tau.$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality, it follows

$$\mathbb{E}\|w_{T-\delta} - v_{T-\delta}\|_H^2 \lesssim (\varepsilon_{NUM} + \varepsilon_{LOSS} + \varepsilon_{INIT}) \exp\left(\int_0^{T-\delta}\kappa_s(T - \lfloor\tau\rfloor)^2 d\tau\right).$$

We may factor in the truncation by utilizing (39)

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{TRUNC} &:= \mathbb{E} \|w_T - w_{T-\delta}\|_H^2 = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_y} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu^y, z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C})} \left\| (1 - e^{-\delta/2})x + \sqrt{1 - e^{-\delta}}z \right\|_H^2 \\ &\lesssim (1 - e^{-\delta/2})^2 \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} \|x\|_H^2 + (1 - e^{-\delta}) \text{tr}_H(\mathcal{C}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|w_T - v_{T-\delta}\|_H^2 \\ \lesssim (\varepsilon_{NUM} + \varepsilon_{LOSS} + \varepsilon_{INIT}) \exp \left( 2 \int_0^{T-\delta} \kappa_s (T - \lfloor T \rfloor)^2 d\tau \right) + \varepsilon_{TRUNC}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the result.  $\square$

## D Details of numerical implementation

**Neural network architecture** We use the U-Net architecture from [41] and choose  $\delta = 10^{-3}$  and  $T = 2$ . We train the neural network for 30 epochs (40 epochs for our method and the deblurring inverse problems), where training on a Nvidia A100 GPU with 80 GB of memory takes around 3 minutes per epoch. During the training process we use the Adam stochastic optimiser with learning rate  $10^{-4}$  and a scheduler that reduces the learning rate on a Plateau of the loss function. While we monitor the loss function (24), gradients are computed without scaling by  $\lambda(t)$ . Samples are generated on a Nvidia V100 GPU with 32 GB of memory. A uniform Euler–Maruyama approximation with 1000 steps is employed. Sample generation takes around 32 minutes for the methods except DMP, which takes around 63 minutes for all 1000 posterior samples. No significant differences in runtime were expected as the computational effort of applying the forward operator was negligible in our examples. Additional information can be found in the numerical implementation <https://github.com/FabianSBD/SBD-task-dependent>.

**Comparison methods** For clarity, let us give the precise score approximation of the following methods that we compare our method with. Note that some of these methods are used in combination with some other sampling method in the reference but we will always utilise backwards in time Euler–Maruyama approximations.

- SDE LD [28] adjusts the unconditional score function by adding the gradient of the negative log-likelihood:

$$s_\theta(x, t; \mu^y) = s(x, t, \mu) + A^* \Gamma^{-1} (y - Ax).$$

This approximation is exact only at  $t = 0$ .

- Annealing the previous term by adding the hyper-parameter  $\gamma_t$  (SDE ALD [28]) can be found to improve posterior sample consistency:

$$s_\theta(x, t; \mu^y) = s(x, t, \mu) + A^* (\Gamma^{-1} + \gamma_t I) (y - Ax).$$

In line with [19], we tune  $\gamma_t$  such that the additive term has equal norm to the score function.

- DPS [12] modifies the approach of SDE LD by changing the mean of the Gaussian likelihood to be an estimate of  $x_0$ :

$$s_\theta(x, t; \mu^y) = s(x, t, \mu) - \rho \nabla_x \|y - A(\hat{x}_0(x))\|_2^2$$

for some  $\rho$  which is chosen such that  $\rho = \xi / \|y - A(\hat{x}_0(x))\|$  for some constant  $\xi$ . In our experiments this leads to greatly overestimated posterior sample variance. Hence we use [12, eq. (12)]:

$$s_\theta(x, t; \mu^y) = s(x, t, \mu) - \nabla_x \|y - A(\hat{x}_0(x))\|_\Gamma^2.$$

Above  $\hat{x}_0(x)$  is an estimate of  $\mathbb{E}(X_0 | X_t = x)$  using the definition of the score function (1).

- Proj [17]: This projection-based approach adds a data consistency step before every reverse time Euler–Maruyama step:

$$x_t = (\lambda A^\top A + (1 - \lambda)I)^{-1} ((1 - \lambda)x'_t + \lambda A^\top y_t).$$

We tune the hyperparameter  $\lambda$  by visual inspection of the generated samples.