

Explicit convergence rates of underdamped Langevin dynamics under weighted and weak Poincaré–Lions inequalities

Giovanni Brigati¹, Gabriel Stoltz^{2,3}, Andi Q. Wang⁴, Lihan Wang^{5*}

¹ Institute of Science and Technology Austria, Am Campus 1, Klosterneuburg, 3400, Austria.

²CERMICS, Ecole nationale des ponts et chaussées, 6/8 av. Blaise Pascal - Cité Descartes, Paris, 77455, Marne-La-Vallée, France.

³Materials team-project, Inria Paris, Paris, France.

⁴Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

⁵Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, 15213, PA, United States.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): lihanw@andrew.cmu.edu;

Contributing authors: giovanni.brigati@ist.ac.at; gabriel.stoltz@enpc.fr; andi.wang@warwick.ac.uk;

Abstract

We study the long-time convergence behavior of underdamped Langevin dynamics, when the spatial equilibrium satisfies a weighted Poincaré inequality, with a general velocity distribution, which allows for fat-tail or subexponential potential energies, and provide constructive and fully explicit estimates in \mathbf{L}^2 -norm with \mathbf{L}^∞ initial conditions. A key ingredient is a space-time weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality, which in turn implies a weak Poincaré–Lions inequality.

Keywords: underdamped Langevin dynamics, weighted Poincaré inequality, weak Poincaré inequality, Poincaré–Lions inequality, convergence rate

1 Introduction and main results

We consider in this work the long-time behavior of the *underdamped Langevin dynamics* on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \nabla_v \psi(V_t) dt, \\ dV_t = -\nabla_x \phi(X_t) dt - \gamma \nabla_v \psi(V_t) dt + \sqrt{2\gamma} dW_t, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\phi(x)$ is a *weak confining* potential energy, the precise meaning of which will be specified later, $\psi(v)$ is the kinetic energy that may or may not be weak confining, $\gamma > 0$ is the friction coefficient, and W_t is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion. As $t \rightarrow \infty$, under suitable conditions on ϕ and ψ , the joint distribution of (X_t, V_t) is expected to converge to the equilibrium distribution $\Theta(dx dv) := \mu(dx) \otimes \nu(dv)$, where μ, ν are the following probability measures, which are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure:

$$\mu(dx) := \frac{1}{Z_x} e^{-\phi(x)} dx, \quad \nu(dv) := \frac{1}{Z_v} e^{-\psi(v)} dv, \quad Z_x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\phi}, \quad Z_v = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\psi}, \quad (2)$$

with dx, dv Lebesgue measures on \mathbb{R}^d . For any observable function $h_0(x, v) \in L^2(\Theta)$, define $h_t(x, v) := \mathbb{E}_{x,v} [h_0(X_t, V_t)]$, where the expectation is taken over realizations of (1) starting from $(X_0, V_0) = (x, v)$. Then h_t satisfies the backward Kolmogorov equation, also known as the *kinetic Fokker–Planck equation*:

$$\partial_t h + \mathcal{T}h = -\gamma \nabla_v^* \nabla_v h, \quad (3)$$

with initial condition h_0 , where

$$\nabla_x^* := -(\nabla_x - \nabla_x \phi) \cdot, \quad \nabla_v^* := -(\nabla_v - \nabla_v \psi) \cdot,$$

are the adjoint operators in $L^2(\Theta)$ of ∇_x and ∇_v , respectively, and

$$\mathcal{T} := -\nabla_v^* \nabla_x + \nabla_x^* \nabla_v$$

is antisymmetric with respect to $L^2(\Theta)$. Due the long-time convergence of the law of (X_t, V_t) as $t \rightarrow \infty$, one also expects h_t to converge to the constant $\int h_0 d\Theta$.

(Sub)Exponential convergence.

The study of kinetic Fokker–Planck equations has a long history dating back to Kolmogorov [1]. In the seminal work of Hörmander [2], the *bracket conditions* were established for suitable second-order hypoelliptic operators to have regularizing properties. Early tools to study the long-time behavior of (3) include Lyapunov techniques [3–5] and subelliptic estimates [6–8]. The framework of *hypocoercivity* was popularized by Villani [9], inspired by earlier works [10, 11] which gave the first quantitative estimates on convergence rates of (3) in H^1 norm or relative entropy. Later, an L^2

approach was developed in [12, 13], based on the idea of [14]. Using this approach, the behaviour of the convergence rate of (3) can be studied in both limiting regimes $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ [15, 16]. The recent work of [17] constructed appropriate state dependent matrices and state dependent matrix inequalities so that the modified energy functional decays exponentially, which enables to establish exponential convergence without any growth assumption on the potentials. Other techniques for studying (3) include Γ_2 calculus [18] and coupling techniques [19]. For a more detailed overview of literature review, we refer the readers to the introduction of [20].

Assuming for a moment ν is Gaussian (which is the case for many physical models), then, if μ satisfies a *Poincaré inequality*:

$$\forall f \in H^1(\mu), \quad \text{Var}_\mu(f) \leq \frac{1}{C_{P,\mu}} \mu(|\nabla f|^2),$$

for some constant $C_{P,\mu} > 0$ (which essentially amounts to (super-)linear growth of ϕ at infinity; see for example [21, Proposition 4.4.2]), then it is well-known from the many aforementioned works that the convergence to equilibrium is exponential. Based on the space-time H^{-1} -hypo-coercivity framework developed in [22], the work [23] proved sharp convergence rates of (1). In particular, it was shown in [23] that if ϕ is convex and $C_{P,\mu} \ll 1$, then, by optimizing γ , solutions to (3) converge exponentially with rate $O(\sqrt{C_P})$. This was previously known only in the Gaussian setting, and shows the optimality of the Langevin dynamics as a second-order lift [24] of reversible *overdamped Langevin dynamics*:

$$dX_t = -\nabla\phi(X_t) dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t. \quad (4)$$

The framework was further developed in [25, 26], where general and potentially weak confining kinetic energies are treated, and the $H^1(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mu)$ compact embedding assumption is removed. This largely enables the further development of the framework in this paper. Other notable developments of this framework include [27], where linear Boltzmann-type operator could be tackled, [28] which allows the diffusion to be degenerate in various parts of the domain, and [29] which considers Lindblad dynamics that arise in quantum systems.

If a Poincaré inequality does not hold for either μ or ν , then convergence of solutions to (3) is no longer exponential [26, 30–33]. The work [34] indicates that the framework of [22] is still applicable to obtain convergence results, although explicit convergence rates were not established. The goal of this work is to fully harness the strength of the framework of [22, 23, 26] and obtain explicit convergence rates in the weak spatial confinement setting.

Assumptions on the potential and kinetic energies.

Our main assumption is the following *weighted Poincaré inequality* on μ .

Assumption 1. *There exist a function $W \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $1 \leq W(x) \leq \langle x \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |x|^2}$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W^\sigma d\mu < \infty. \quad (5)$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $P_W > 0$ such that, for any function $f \in L^2(\mu_W)$ such that $\nabla_x f \in L^2(\mu)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(f - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu_W \right)^2 d\mu_W \leq P_W \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x f|^2 d\mu, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mu_W := \frac{1}{Z_W} W^{-2} d\mu, \quad Z_W = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W^{-2} d\mu \in (0, 1).$$

Finally, there exists a constant $\theta_W \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\nabla_x W|}{W} \leq \theta_W. \quad (7)$$

Let us mention two representative potentials for which Assumption 1 holds true with appropriate choices of function W :

- if $\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then $W(x) = \langle x \rangle^{1-\alpha}$ (see [35]), and (5) holds for any $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$;
- if $\phi(x) = (p + d) \log \langle x \rangle$ for some $p > 0$, then $W(x) = \langle x \rangle$ (see [36, 37]), (5) holds when $\sigma \in (0, p)$, and corresponding constant $P_W = 2Z_W^{-1}/p$ (see [37]).

In both cases the bound (7) holds with $\theta_W = 1$. In general we expect θ_W to be dimension-free.

We also assume pointwise bounds on the first and second derivatives of ϕ , a condition which holds for the above benchmark examples.

Assumption 2. *The potential ϕ belongs to $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $e^{-\phi}$ is in $L^1(dx)$. Moreover, there exist constants $M, L > 0$ such that*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad |\nabla_x \phi(x)| \leq L, \quad -M \text{Id} \leq \nabla_{xx}^2 \phi(x) \leq M \text{Id}. \quad (8)$$

The bound on the Hessian, which is essentially the ‘‘Ricci curvature’’ of μ , is standard and allows for a simpler presentation of the results compared to works like [9, 20]. We believe that our assumed bound on the first derivative is only technical, as it is used only to prove $L^2 \rightarrow H^2$ elliptic regularity for solutions of (19) (in particular we use it to show that the right hand side of (28) belongs to the correct functional space).

As for $\psi(v)$, we assume the following moment bounds to prove the crucial averaging lemma (see Lemma 1).

Assumption 3. *The function ψ belongs to $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $e^{-\psi}$ is in $L^1(dv)$. Moreover,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_v \psi(v)|^4 dv + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_v^2 \psi(v)|^2 dv < +\infty. \quad (9)$$

By straightforward computation, one notices that underdamped Langevin dynamics (1) is a second-order lift of the overdamped dynamics (4) in the sense of [24] if and only if $\mathcal{M} = \text{Id}$, which includes the case of standard Gaussian.

Convergence result for a weighted Poincaré inequality.

We are now in position to state our first convergence result, which is directly based on the weighted Poincaré inequality (6) (see Section 3 for the proof).

Theorem 1. *Suppose that the potential ϕ and the weight function W satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2, and that the kinetic energy ψ satisfies Assumption 3. Let h_t be the solution of (3), for an initial condition $h_0 \in L^\infty(\Theta)$ such that $\int \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h_0(x, v) \Theta(dx dv) = 0$. Then,*

(i) *If ν satisfies the Poincaré inequality*

$$\text{Var}_\nu(f) \leq \frac{1}{C_{P,\nu}} \nu(|\nabla_v f|^2), \quad (10)$$

then, there exists an explicitly computable constant $C > 0$ depending on $\phi, \psi, W, \sigma, \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$ such that

$$\|h_t\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \leq C(1+t)^{-\sigma/2}.$$

(ii) *If there exists some weight function $1 \leq \mathcal{G}(v) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and some $\delta > 0$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{G}^\delta d\nu < \infty$, and ν satisfies the weighted Poincaré inequality*

$$\int \mathcal{G}^{-2}(v) (f(v) - \nu(f))^2 \nu(dv) \leq P_v \int |\nabla_v f|^2 d\nu, \quad (11)$$

then there exists an explicitly computable constant $C > 0$ depending on $\phi, \psi, W, \mathcal{G}, \sigma, \delta, \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, such that

$$\|h_t\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \leq C(1+t)^{-\sigma\delta/(2\sigma+2\delta+4)}.$$

Note that item (i) in the above theorem can be recovered from item (ii) if one can choose $\mathcal{G} = 1$ and let $\delta \rightarrow \infty$.

Readers familiar with any of [23, 24, 26, 28] may realize that the Poincaré–Lions inequality on the space-time strip $[0, \tau] \times (\mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$, which states that the L^2 norm of functions can be controlled by H^{-1} norm of some of its derivatives, is the crucial functional inequality used in the framework. We know from [34] that such a Poincaré–Lions inequality is still the crucial step in our weak confinement setting, although both the statement and the proof have to be modified. We present here the weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality needed in our work, with constants explicitly computed (which was not made precise in [34]). The proof of this result can be read in Section 2.

Theorem 2 (Weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality). *Suppose that the potential ϕ and the weight function W satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2. For any $\tau > 0$, let*

$$U_\tau(dt) := \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau]} dt$$

denote the normalized Lebesgue measure on $[0, \tau]$, and introduce the Radon–Nikodym derivative

$$\zeta^2 = \frac{d\mu}{d\mu_W} = Z_W W^2.$$

Then, for any $g \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ such that

$$\bar{g} = \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} g(t, x) U_\tau(dt) \mu_W(dx) = 0,$$

there exist functions F_0, F_1 satisfying the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t F_0 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x F_1 = g, \\ F_0(t=0, \cdot) = F_0(t=\tau, \cdot) = \nabla_x F_1(t=0, \cdot) = \nabla_x F_1(t=\tau, \cdot) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

with estimates

$$\|F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} + \|\nabla_x F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \leq C \left(\tau + \sqrt{\frac{P_W}{1 - R_{W, \tau}}} \right) \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}, \quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} + \|\nabla_x F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_x \partial_t F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_{xx}^2 F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \\ & \leq C \left[\sqrt{M} \tau + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - R_{W, \tau}}} \left(Z_W^{-1/2} + \sqrt{M P_W} + \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\tau/\sqrt{P_W}}} \right) \right] \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where C denote universal constants which can be made explicit (see (44)-(45)), and

$$R_{W, \tau} = \frac{2\tau e^{-\tau/\sqrt{P_W}}}{\sqrt{P_W}(1 - e^{-2\tau/\sqrt{P_W}})} \in (0, 1) \quad (15)$$

Remark 1. By $L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ -duality, Theorem 2 implies the Poincaré–Lions inequality

$$\|g - \bar{g}\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq C_{\text{Lions}} \left(\|\zeta^{-1} \partial_t g\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_x g\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \right), \quad (16)$$

with $C_{\text{Lions}} := C_0 + C_1$, where C_0, C_1 are the exact constants appearing in (44) and (45). Indeed, the estimates (13) and (14) together with (7) imply that, for any $g \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ with $\bar{g} = 0$, the solutions F_0, F_1 in (12) satisfy $\zeta^{-1} F_0, \nabla_x F_1 \in H^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$. Therefore, using integration by parts,

$$\|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \stackrel{(12)}{=} \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} g(-\partial_t F_0 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x F_1) dU_\tau d\mu_W$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\zeta^{-1} \partial_t g \zeta^{-1} F_0 + \nabla_x g \cdot \nabla_x F_1) dU_\tau d\mu \\
&\leq \left\| \zeta^{-1} \partial_t g \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \left\| \zeta^{-1} F_0 \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_x g\|_{\mathbb{H}^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \|\nabla_x F_1\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \\
&\lesssim \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \left(\left\| \zeta^{-1} \partial_t g \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_x g\|_{\mathbb{H}^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is (16).

Remark 2. It is possible to prove similar results by slightly different proofs, which yield better estimates in terms of scaling of the parameters. When μ satisfies a standard Poincaré inequality, an improved result is announced in [24]. The proof of this result will be presented in an upcoming work by these authors.

Convergence result for a weak Poincaré inequality.

When ϕ and ψ both grow algebraically at infinity, Theorem 1 states that the solution h_t of (3) with $h_0 \in L^\infty(\Theta)$ converges to equilibrium with a superalgebraic rate. However, we know from [33] that such solutions should converge with a stretched exponential rate, which cannot be easily captured by slightly modifying the proof of Theorem 1. This is the motivation for the results which we now present, which allow to obtain stretched exponential rates by combining the hypocoercive framework of [22, 23, 26] with weak Poincaré inequalities [38]. As shown in [39], such inequalities are a consequence of weighted Poincaré inequalities.

Definition 1. The probability measure μ satisfies a weak Poincaré inequality, if for any $s > 0$ and $f \in \mathbb{H}^1(\mu)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f - \mu(f))^2 d\mu \leq s \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x f|^2 d\mu + \beta(s) \Phi(f), \quad (17)$$

where $\beta : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a decreasing function such that $\beta(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$, and $\Phi(f) := \|f\|_{\text{osc}}^2 = (\text{ess}_\mu \sup f - \text{ess}_\mu \inf f)^2$ is the squared oscillation.

Let us make precise the corresponding functions β for the benchmark cases under consideration:

- if $\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then $\beta(s) = \exp(-cs^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}})$ for some constant $c > 0$;
- if $\phi(x) = (p+d) \log \langle x \rangle$ for some $p > 0$, then $\beta(s) = cs^{-\frac{p}{2}}$.

Weak Poincaré inequalities provide an alternative approach for establishing long-time convergence rates of overdamped Langevin dynamics (4) with L^∞ initial conditions. These inequalities were formally introduced in [38], with ideas that can be traced back to [40], and have been well-studied for reversible processes, see for instance [39, 41], also finding recent applications in the study of discrete-time Markov chains [42]. For nonreversible processes, weak Poincaré inequalities have also been used previously; see [31, 33, 43] for underdamped Langevin and piecewise-deterministic Markov processes. In particular, improving the convergence rates of [33], which is built upon the hypocoercivity framework of [13] is one of the motivations behind the present work.

potential $\phi(x)$	$W(x)$ for weighted Poincaré inequality (6)	$\beta(s)$ for weak Poincaré Inequality (17)	convergence rate
$\langle x \rangle^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$	$\langle x \rangle^{1-\alpha}$	$\exp(-cs^{\alpha/[2(1-\alpha)]})$	$\exp(-ct^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}})$
$(p+d)\log\langle x \rangle$ for $p > 0$	$\langle x \rangle$	$cs^{-p/2}$	$ct^{-p/2}$

Table 1 Choice of weight function $W(x)$ for the weighted Poincaré inequality (6), $\beta(s)$ for the weak Poincaré inequality (17), and associated L^2 convergence rate for both overdamped (4) and underdamped Langevin dynamics (3) for ν satisfying the Poincaré inequality (10) and L^∞ initial data, for the two benchmark examples of potential ϕ . Here the constant c may differ from case to case. The rates match the optimal scalings obtained in [44] in total variation norm.

One key advantage of working with weak Poincaré inequalities is that they allow for a concrete characterization of the dependence of convergence rates on the tail of the potential ϕ ; see Table 1 for convergence rates of (4) for benchmark examples of ϕ . The rates in the last column of Table 1 match with the lower bound for convergence estimates in total variation obtained in [44, Theorems 3.1 and 3.6], which we believe are also optimal in L^2 . In Section 4, we show that identical arguments can also be used to study the underdamped Langevin dynamics (3) despite the loss of coercivity, thanks to the weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality (16) and the space-time-velocity Poincaré-type inequality (46) shown later on in Lemma 1. In particular, when ν satisfies the Poincaré inequality (10), our convergence rates for (3) in Theorem 3 match with those of (4) for the benchmark examples (see the second column of Table 2), therefore improving the estimates of [32, 33].

Potential	$\psi(v) = \langle v \rangle^\delta$ $\delta \geq 1$	$\psi(v) = \langle v \rangle^\delta$ $\delta \in (0, 1)$	$\psi(v) = (d+q)\log\langle v \rangle$
$\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$ $\alpha \geq 1$	$\exp(-\lambda t)$	$\exp(-ct^{\delta/(2-\delta)})$	$t^{-q/2}$
$\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$ $\alpha < 1$	$\exp(-ct^{\alpha/(2-\alpha)})$	$\exp(-ct^{\alpha\delta/(2\alpha+2\delta-3\alpha\delta)})$	$t^{-q/2-}$
$\phi(x) = (d+p)\log\langle x \rangle$	$t^{-p/2}$	$t^{-p/2-}$	$t^{-pq/(4+2p+2q)}$

Table 2 Explicit convergence rates for solutions of (3) for various benchmark potentials and L^∞ initial data. The results in the second row are not directly derived from our work, but are rather either well-known (the exponential convergent case) or direct corollaries of [26].

We now state the second main convergence result of our work.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold true, and that ν satisfies either the Poincaré inequality (10) or the weak Poincaré inequality (17). Denote by $h_t : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the solution at time t of (3), for any initial condition $h_0 \in L^\infty(\Theta)$. Then there exists a positive decreasing function F such that $F(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ and*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|h_t\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \leq \Phi(h_0)F(t).$$

More precisely, F is the inverse of the function F_α introduced in Definition 2.

Remark 3. *The statements of Theorems 1 and 3 are similar, with a few key differences however, as the requirement on the initial condition is stronger for Theorem 3,*

but the functional inequality satisfied by ν is weaker. Indeed, Theorem 1 in principle does not require $h_0 \in L^\infty(\Theta)$, see Remark 5; while Theorem 3 crucially relies on the fact that $h_0 \in L^\infty(\Theta)$. On the other hand, Theorem 1 requires ν to satisfy a weighted Poincaré inequality, while Theorem 3 requires a weak Poincaré in ν , which is less demanding as a weighted Poincaré inequality implies a weak Poincaré inequality [39].

While the statement of Theorem 3 looks abstract and not quantitative, we specify the convergence rates in the specific benchmark examples in Section 4.2. Our results are summarized in Table 2. The examples we consider are inspired by those in [33], the rates we obtain being sharper than those of [33] in all weak confining cases. The results in [30] only provide algebraic decay rates instead of stretched exponential ones for the situations where we obtain the latter rates, although the initial conditions need not be in L^∞ in [30]. The work [32] establishes slightly worse decay rates in Example 1 with weaker assumptions on h_0 , but does not cover any other example that we consider here. When ν is Gaussian, building upon the weak Poincaré inequalities obtained in [39] and the hypocoercivity approach of [9], the work [31] obtains convergence rates identical to the ones we obtain both for Examples 1 and 2, but the approach relies on the Gaussianity of ν and is difficult to generalize. Our results can be adapted to piecewise deterministic Markov processes, by combining our work with previously established arguments from works such as [27, 45], but we do not consider such extensions for simplicity.

Similar to the argument in [39] which allow to derive a weak Poincaré inequality from a weighted Poincaré inequality, one could also derive on $[0, \tau] \times (\mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$ a weak Poincaré–Lions inequality from the weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality (16):

$$\|g - \bar{g}\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq s \left(\|\zeta^{-1} \partial_t g\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_x g\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \right) + \tilde{\beta}(s) \Phi(f),$$

with $\tilde{\beta}$ a decreasing function such that $\tilde{\beta}(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$ (similarly to (17)). While we do not explicitly state the above inequality in the proof, the proof of Theorem 3 essentially follows from the combination of the above weak Poincaré–Lions inequality and the averaging Lemma 1, together with the Bihari–LaSalle argument.

2 Weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality and Averaging Lemma

In this section, we prove the important technical tools that will be used to prove both Theorems 1 and 3. As in [23, 24, 26], the crucial step for obtaining convergence rates is to establish the solution of a divergence equation in the space-time strip $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, which is the statement of Theorem 2. Since the operator $\nabla_x^* \nabla_x^*$ does not admit a spectral gap (as this would be equivalent to μ satisfying a Poincaré inequality), one cannot rely the original divergence equation, but rather needs to consider a modified divergence equation where the weight is accounted for.

Proof of Theorem 2. As is laid out in [23, 26], we divide the proof of Theorem 2 into five steps.

Step 1: Tensorized weighted space-time Poincaré inequality

Consider any function $z(t, x)$ such that $\partial_t z, \nabla_x z \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$ with $\bar{z} = 0$, and denote by $Z = \int_0^\tau z \, dU_\tau$. In view of the standard Poincaré–Wirtinger inequality for U_τ and (6) (noting that $\mu_W(Z) = 0$),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 &= \|z - Z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|Z\|_{L^2(\mu_W)}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2} \|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + P_W \|\nabla_x Z\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2} \|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + P_W \|\nabla_x z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\
&\leq \max\left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W\right) \left(\|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we used a Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to obtain the second inequality.

Step 2: An elliptic estimate

We would like to find a solution to the equation $-\partial_t F_0 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x F_1 = g$ for $g \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$. A natural way to find a solution is to look for F of the form $F_0 = \partial_t u$ and $F_1 = u$ for some function u . The key observation here is that the operator $-\partial_{tt}^2 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x$ with Neumann boundary conditions is self-adjoint and positive definite over the space of functions $u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ with $\bar{u} = 0$, so that one can solve the equation using a weak formulation and Lax–Milgram’s theorem.

More precisely, we claim that we can find a solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_{tt}^2 u + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u = g, \\ \partial_t u(0, \cdot) = \partial_t u(\tau, \cdot) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

which satisfies the estimates

$$\|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq \max\left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W\right) \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2, \tag{20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_{tt}^2 u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x \partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_{xx}^2 u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\
&\leq \left[1 + 4Z_W^{-1} + M \max\left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W\right)\right] \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The equation (19) has the following weak formulation: define the Hilbert space

$$V := \left\{ u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W) \mid \bar{u} = 0, \partial_t u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W), \nabla_x u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu) \right\}, \tag{22}$$

with associated norm

$$\|u\|_V^2 = \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2. \quad (23)$$

The tensorized weighted Poincaré inequality (18) indeed ensures that $V \subseteq L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$. A function $u \in V$ is a weak solution of (19) if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \forall v \in V, \quad & \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t u \partial_t v \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W + \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x u \cdot \nabla_x v \, dU_\tau \, d\mu \\ & = \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} g v \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Note that the left hand side of the above equality is a continuous bilinear form on $V \times V$, which is coercive by definition of the norm (23); while the right hand side is a linear form which is continuous in view of the tensorized weighted Poincaré inequality (18). The Lax–Milgram theorem therefore ensures that (24) has a unique solution $u \in V$. Moreover, from the weak formulation (24),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 &= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} u g \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}, \end{aligned}$$

so that the weighted space-time Poincaré inequality (18) yields the estimate (20).

We now establish the claimed H^2 estimates. We first prove that $\partial_{tt}^2 u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ and $\nabla_x \partial_t u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$. Note that $w_0 = \partial_t u$ satisfies the following PDE with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_{tt}^2 w_0 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x w_0 = \partial_t g; \\ w_0(0, \cdot) = w_0(\tau, \cdot) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Its weak formulation requires to introduce a slightly different Hilbert space than (22), namely

$$\tilde{V} := \left\{ w \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W) \mid w(0, \cdot) = w(\tau, \cdot) = 0, \partial_t w \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W), \nabla_x w \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu) \right\},$$

endowed with the norm (23). Note that the Poincaré inequality for H^1 functions of time vanishing at $t = 0$ and $t = \tau$, integrated in the x variable, ensures that

$$\iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} w^2 \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W \leq \frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2} \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_t w)^2 \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W \leq \frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2} \|w\|_V^2.$$

Therefore, one can again apply Lax–Milgram’s theorem to the weak formulation associated with (25) and obtain that there exists a unique $w_0 \in V$ solution of this weak formulation for $g \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$. The comparison of (19) and (25) shows

that $w_0 = \partial_t u$. Testing (25) with $\partial_t u$ itself leads to

$$\|\partial_t u\|_{\tilde{V}}^2 = \iint \left(|\zeta^{-1} \partial_{tt}^2 u|^2 + |\nabla_x \partial_t u|^2 \right) dU_\tau d\mu = \langle \partial_t g, \partial_t u \rangle_{\tilde{V}^*, \tilde{V}} \leq \|\partial_t g\|_{\tilde{V}^*} \|\partial_t u\|_{\tilde{V}}.$$

Now,

$$\|\partial_t g\|_{\tilde{V}^*} = \sup_{\|z\|_{\tilde{V}} \leq 1} \langle \partial_t g, z \rangle_{\tilde{V}^*, \tilde{V}} = \sup_{\|z\|_{\tilde{V}} \leq 1} (g, \partial_t z)_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)},$$

so that

$$\|\partial_{tt}^2 u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x \partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2. \quad (26)$$

It remains to show $\nabla_{xx}^2 u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$. Note first that $\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u = g + \partial_{tt}^2 u \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality and (26),

$$\|\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \leq 4 \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2. \quad (27)$$

Formally differentiating (19) with respect to ∂_{x_i} , we find that $w_i = \partial_{x_i} u$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_{tt}^2 w_i + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x w_i = \partial_{x_i} g - 2\zeta \partial_{x_i} \zeta \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u - \zeta^2 \nabla_x \partial_{x_i} \phi \cdot \nabla_x u =: I, \\ \partial_t w_i(0, \cdot) = \partial_t w_i(\tau, \cdot) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

The latter equation has a unique weak solution in V provided $I \in V^*$ with $\bar{I} = 0$. Since w_i and $\partial_{x_i} u - \overline{\partial_{x_i} u}$ solve the same PDE and both have a vanishing integral with respect to $U_\tau \otimes \mu_W$, they are equal in the sense of distributions, and finally $\partial_{x_i} u - \overline{\partial_{x_i} u} \in V$. In order to prove that $I \in V^*$, we consider an arbitrary smooth and compactly supported test function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ (which may not vanish at the boundaries $t = 0$ or $t = \tau$), and use an integration by parts to write

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \partial_{x_i} g dU_\tau d\mu_W &= - \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} g \partial_{x_i} \varphi dU_\tau d\mu_W \\ &+ 2 \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi g \zeta^{-1} \partial_{x_i} \zeta dU_\tau d\mu_W + \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi g \partial_{x_i} \phi dU_\tau d\mu_W. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (29) is bounded by $\|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \|\partial_{x_i} \varphi\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}$. The second term can be paired with the second term of I , the resulting quantity being bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| 2 \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \zeta^{-1} \partial_{x_i} \zeta (g - \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u) dU_\tau d\mu_W \right| &= 2 \left| \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \zeta^{-1} \partial_{x_i} \zeta \partial_{tt}^2 u dU_\tau d\mu_W \right| \\ &= 2 \left| \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t \varphi \zeta^{-1} \partial_{x_i} \zeta \partial_t u dU_\tau d\mu_W \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} 2\theta_W \|\partial_t \varphi\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}.$$

Finally the last term of (29) can be paired with the last term of I , and (using the equation (19) satisfied by u) bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi \left(g \partial_{x_i} \phi - \zeta^2 \nabla_x \partial_{x_i} \phi \cdot \nabla_x u \right) dU_\tau d\mu_W \right| \\ &= \left| \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi (\partial_{tt}^2 u) (\partial_{x_i} \phi) dU_\tau d\mu_W + \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi (\nabla_x^* \nabla_x u (\partial_{x_i} \phi) - \nabla_x \partial_{x_i} \phi \cdot \nabla_x u) dU_\tau d\mu \right| \\ &= \left| \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_t \varphi) (\partial_t u) (\partial_{x_i} \phi) dU_\tau d\mu_W + \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_{x_i} \phi) \nabla_x \varphi \cdot \nabla_x u dU_\tau d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x \phi| \left(\|\partial_t \varphi\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} + \|\nabla_x \varphi\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Combining the latter estimates, using (20) and the pointwise bound (8) on $|\nabla_x \phi|$, we can conclude that

$$\left| \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} I \varphi dU_\tau d\mu_W \right| \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \|\varphi\|_V,$$

which ensures that $I \in V^*$ as desired. The above calculations also hold for $\varphi = 1$, which leads to $\bar{I} = 0$ since all expressions in the end involve derivatives of φ .

Now that it has been established that $\nabla_{xx}^2 u$ and $\nabla_x^* \nabla_x u$ both belong to $L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$, we can use Bochner's formula

$$|\nabla_{xx}^2 u|^2 = \nabla_x u \cdot \nabla_x (\nabla_x^* \nabla_x u) - (\nabla_x u)^\top \nabla_x^2 \phi \nabla_x u - \nabla_x^* \nabla_x \left(\frac{|\nabla_x u|^2}{2} \right), \quad (30)$$

and integrate it against $U_\tau \otimes \mu$ to obtain (since $\zeta^2/Z_W \geq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{xx}^2 u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 &\stackrel{(8)}{\leq} \|\nabla_x^* \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + M \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\ &= \|\zeta \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + M \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\ &\leq Z_W^{-1} \|\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + M \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(27)}{\leq} 4Z_W^{-1} \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + M \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(20)}{\leq} \left[4Z_W^{-1} + M \max \left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W \right) \right] \|g\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (21) then follows from the latter inequality and (26).

Remark 4. As is commented after Assumption 2, we believe that our assumed bound on $\nabla_x \phi$ is only technical, as it is used only to prove $I \in V^*$, which is essential for proving $L^2 \rightarrow H^2$ elliptic regularity for solutions of (19). Another possible assumption to guarantee that the solution of (19) is in H^2 is that $W|\nabla_{xx}^2 \phi| \lesssim 1$, which is also satisfied for many interesting benchmark examples.

Step 3: An orthogonal decomposition

In order to follow the construction of [26], it is helpful to first prove that the operator $\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x$ is self-adjoint and positive over the Hilbert space

$$L_0^2(\mu_W) = \left\{ z \in L^2(\mu_W) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} z \, d\mu_W = 0 \right\}.$$

It is clear that this operator is symmetric and positive on $L_0^2(\mu_W)$. For smooth functions f, g with compact support, consider the bilinear form

$$Q(f, g) := \langle f, g \rangle_{L^2(\mu_W)} + \langle \nabla_x f, \nabla_x g \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} = \langle f, \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x g \rangle_{L^2(\mu_W)} + \langle f, g \rangle_{L^2(\mu_W)}.$$

By density, we can extend Q to the Hilbert space (note that this is not the usual Sobolev space)

$$H_1 := \left\{ f \in L^2(\mu_W) \mid \nabla_x f \in L^2(\mu) \right\},$$

and notice that $Q(f, f) < \infty$ if and only if $f \in H_1$. This allows us to consider the Friedrichs extension (see for example [46, Section 2.3]) to define $\text{Id} + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x$ as a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mu_W)$ with maximal domain; and hence define $\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x$ as well. Note moreover that $\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x$ is coercive over $L_0^2(\mu_W)$ since, for any $f \in L_0^2(\mu_W)$ in the domain of the operator, the weighted Poincaré inequality (6) implies

$$\|Lf\|_{L_0^2(\mu_W)}^2 = \langle f, \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x f \rangle_{L^2(\mu_W)} = \|\nabla_x f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \geq \frac{1}{P_W} \|f\|_{L^2(\mu_W)}^2. \quad (31)$$

In particular, the operator L is invertible and

$$\|L^{-1}\|_{L_0^2(\mu_W) \rightarrow L_0^2(\mu_W)} \leq \sqrt{P_W}. \quad (32)$$

With the above preparations, we can now construct $L := \sqrt{\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x}$ using functional calculus, and consider the following subspace of $L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$:

$$\mathcal{N} := \left\{ z \in L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W) \mid \exists z_\pm \in L_0^2(\mu_W) : z = e^{-tL} z_+ + e^{-(\tau-t)L} z_- \right\}. \quad (33)$$

Referring to the statement of Theorem 2, we claim that, if $g \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, namely

$$\forall z \in \mathcal{N}, \quad \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} gz \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W = 0,$$

then $(F_0, F_1) := (\partial_t u, u)$ with u the solution to (19) with right hand side g , provides a solution to (12). This choice ensures that the estimates (20) and (21) hold true, and so that (13) and (14) are respectively satisfied. Since $F_0(0, \cdot) = F_0(\tau, \cdot) = 0$ by the boundary conditions in (19), it therefore remains to prove that $\nabla_x F_1(0, \cdot) = \nabla_x F_1(\tau, \cdot) = 0$, *i.e.* $\nabla_x u(0, \cdot) = \nabla_x u(\tau, \cdot) = 0$.

To prove the latter property, note first that, for any $z \in \mathcal{N}$, it holds $(-\partial_{tt}^2 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x)z = -L^2 z + L^2 z = 0$. If $g \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ and u solves (19), then, for all $z \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} g z \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W \\
&= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (-\partial_{tt}^2 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x) u z \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W \\
&= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} u (-\partial_{tt}^2 + \zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x) z \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u(\tau, x) \partial_t z(\tau, x) - u(0, x) \partial_t z(0, x)] \mu_W(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [u(\tau, x) \partial_t z(\tau, x) - u(0, x) \partial_t z(0, x)] \mu_W(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(0, x) (Lz_+ - Le^{-\tau L} z_-)(x) - u(\tau, x) (Le^{-\tau L} z_+ - Lz_-)(x) \mu_W(dx),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the third equality the boundary conditions of (19). By choosing $z_+ = e^{-\tau L} z_-$, the last equality implies that

$$\forall z_- \in L_0^2(\mu_W), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(\tau, \cdot) L(e^{-2\tau L} - 1)z_- \, d\mu_W = 0.$$

As L^2 is coercive over $L_0^2(\mu_W)$, the operator $L(e^{-2\tau L} - 1)$ is invertible over the same space. Since z_- is arbitrary, we find that $L(e^{-2\tau L} - 1)u(\tau, \cdot) = 0$ in $L_0^2(\mu_W)$. Therefore, $u(\tau, \cdot)$ is a constant function. The same can be said for $u(0, \cdot)$, so that the boundary conditions in (12) are satisfied.

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 2, we analyse what happens for $g \in \mathcal{N}$, and how to find an admissible solution to (12) in this case, following the strategy of [23, 26].

Step 4: The exceptional space

Assume that g is of the form $g = e^{-tL} g_+$, for some function $g_+ \in L^2(\mu_W)$. Our goal is to solve (12) with $e^{-tL} g_+$ playing the role of g and appropriate estimates on F_0, F_1 . We repeat here the equation to solve for convenience:

$$-\partial_t F_0 + L^2 F_1 = e^{-tL} g_+. \quad (34)$$

A solution to (34) has already been computed in [26]:

$$F_0(t, \cdot) = -2L^{-1}(1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-2}(1 - e^{-tL})(1 - e^{-(\tau-t)L}) \left(e^{-tL} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{-\tau L}) \right) e^{-tL} g_+,$$

$$F_1(t, \cdot) = 6L^{-2}(1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-2}(1 - e^{-tL})(e^{-tL} - e^{-\tau L})e^{-tL}g_+.$$

These functions indeed make sense since, for any $t \in (0, \tau)$, the operators $(1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-1}(1 - e^{-tL})$, $(1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-1}(1 - e^{-(\tau-t)L})$, and $e^{-tL} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{-\tau L})$ are all contractions on $L_0^2(\mu_W)$. Moreover, the operators L^{-1} and L^{-2} are bounded on $L_0^2(\mu_W)$, so that $F_0(t, \cdot)$ and $F_1(t, \cdot)$ are well defined and both belong to $L_0^2(\mu_W)$. Overall, F_0 and F_1 belong to $L_{0,0}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W) := L^2(U_\tau, L_0^2(\mu_W)) \subseteq L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$. The bound (32) allow us to control

$$\|F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq 2\sqrt{PW}\|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}, \quad (35)$$

and, in view of the equality $\partial_t F_0 = L^2 F_1 - e^{-tL}g_+$,

$$\|\partial_t F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq \|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} + \|L^2 F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq 7\|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}. \quad (36)$$

To control $\|\nabla_x F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}$, it suffices to bound the norm of the operator $\nabla_x L^{-1}$ considered on $L_{0,0}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ since the remaining part of F_0 is a contraction in $L_0^2(\mu_W)$ for any $t \in [0, \tau]$. Now, for any $f \in L_{0,0}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ (note that $L^{-1}f(t, \cdot)$ is a well defined element of $L_0^2(\mu_W)$ for almost every $t \in [0, \tau]$),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x L^{-1}f\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 &= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x L^{-1}f \cdot \nabla_x L^{-1}f \, dU_\tau \, d\mu \\ &= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\nabla_x^* \nabla_x L^{-1}f \right) L^{-1}f \, dU_\tau \, d\mu \\ &= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\zeta^2 \nabla_x^* \nabla_x L^{-1}f \right) L^{-1}f \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W \\ &= \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(L^2 L^{-1}f \right) L^{-1}f \, dU_\tau \, d\mu_W = \|f\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Therefore, with $e^{-tL}g_+$ playing the role of f in (37), we arrive at

$$\|\nabla_x F_0\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \leq 2\|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}. \quad (38)$$

Let us next turn to $\nabla_x F_1$ and its derivatives. To alleviate the notation, we introduce for $t \in [0, \tau]$ the operator

$$B(t) := 6(1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-2}(1 - e^{-tL})(e^{-tL} - e^{-\tau L}),$$

which is bounded on $L_0^2(\mu_W)$ with $\|B(t)\|_{L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W) \rightarrow L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq 6$. The bound $\|\nabla_x F_1\|$ is obtained similarly to the bound on $\nabla_x F_0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 &= \int_0^\tau \|\nabla_x L^{-2}B(t)e^{-tL}g_+\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 U_\tau(dt) \\ &\stackrel{(37)}{=} \int_0^\tau \|L^{-1}B(t)e^{-tL}g_+\|_{L^2(\mu_W)}^2 U_\tau(dt) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(32)}{\leq} P_W \int_0^\tau \|B(t) e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(\mu_W)}^2 U_\tau(dt) \\
&\leq 36P_W \|e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

To estimate $\nabla_{xx}^2 F_1(t) = \nabla_{xx}^2 L^{-2} B(t) e^{-tL} g_+$, we use again Bochner's formula (30) (with $L^{-2} B(t) e^{-tL} g_+$ playing the role of u), integrated against $dU_\tau d\mu$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{xx}^2 F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 &\stackrel{(8)}{\leq} \|\nabla_x^* \nabla_x L^{-2} B(t) e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + M \|\nabla_x L^{-2} B(t) e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} \|\zeta^{-1} B(t) e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + M \|L^{-1} B(t) e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(32)}{\leq} (Z_W^{-1} + MP_W) \|B(t) e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \\
&\leq 36(Z_W^{-1} + MP_W) \|e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Finally, for the time derivative of $\nabla_x F_1$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_x \partial_t F_1 &= -6 \nabla_x L^{-1} (1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-2} (1 - e^{-tL}) (e^{-tL} - e^{-\tau L}) e^{-tL} g_+ \\
&\quad + 6 \nabla_x L^{-1} (1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-2} e^{-tL} (e^{-tL} - e^{-\tau L}) e^{-tL} g_+ \\
&\quad - 6 \nabla_x L^{-1} (1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-2} (1 - e^{-tL}) e^{-tL} e^{-tL} g_+.
\end{aligned}$$

The coercivity inequality (31) implies by functional calculus that

$$\|(1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-1}\|_{L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W) \rightarrow L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq (1 - e^{-\tau/\sqrt{P_W}})^{-1},$$

which, combined with (37) and operator inequalities such as $0 \leq (1 - e^{-\tau L})^{-1} (1 - e^{-tL}) \leq 1$, allows us to conclude that

$$\|\nabla_x \partial_t F_1\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \leq \left(6 + \frac{12}{1 - e^{-\tau/\sqrt{P_W}}}\right) \|e^{-tL} g_+\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}. \tag{41}$$

Step 5: Conclusion

We combine the estimates of Steps 1 to 4 to finish the proof. For any $g \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$ with $\bar{g} = 0$, we perform an orthogonal decomposition with respect to the space \mathcal{N} defined in (33):

$$g = g^\perp + e^{-tL} g_+ + e^{-(\tau-t)L} g_-, \quad g^\perp \in \mathcal{N}^\perp, \quad g_\pm \in L_0^2(\mu_W).$$

Recall that $\bar{z} = 0$ whenever $z \in \mathcal{N}$ since the latter functional space is a subspace of $L_0^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$. Therefore, $\overline{g^\perp} = 0$ as well since $\bar{g} = 0$. We can therefore construct a solution of (12) by setting

$$F_0 = \partial_t u + F_0^+ + F_0^-, \quad F_1 = u + F_1^+ + F_1^-,$$

where u is constructed via Step 2 and solves (19) with g^\perp on the right hand side instead of g , and F_0^\pm, F_1^\pm are constructed via Step 4 and solve (34) with right hand-sides $e^{-tL}g_+$ and $e^{-(\tau-t)L}g_-$ respectively. Note that F_0^- and F_1^- satisfy estimates similar to those satisfied by F_0^+ and F_1^+ .

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|e^{-(\tau-t)L}g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{1 - R_{W,\tau}} \|e^{-tL}g_+ + e^{-(\tau-t)L}g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

with $R_{W,\tau}$ defined in (15). To prove this inequality, we first note that, by functional calculus,

$$\|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 = \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} g_+ e^{-2tL} g_+ dU_\tau d\mu_W = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_+ \frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1} g_+ d\mu_W.$$

We next expand

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{-tL}g_+ + e^{-(\tau-t)L}g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_+ \frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1} g_+ d\mu_W + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_- \frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1} g_- d\mu_W + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_+ e^{-\tau L} g_- d\mu_W \\ & \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_+ \frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1} g_+ d\mu_W + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_- \frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1} g_- d\mu_W \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_+ e^{-\tau L} g_+ d\mu_W - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_- e^{-\tau L} g_- d\mu_W, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where we used a Cauchy–Schwarz inequality in the last step. Now, in view of the coercivity inequality (31) and the fact that the function $s \mapsto 2se^{-s}/(1 - e^{-2s})$ is nonincreasing when $s \geq 0$, it holds

$$2\tau L e^{-\tau L} (1 - e^{-2\tau L})^{-1} \leq R_{W,\tau},$$

so that

$$\frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1} - e^{-\tau L} \geq (1 - R_{W,\tau}) \frac{\text{Id} - e^{-2\tau L}}{2\tau} L^{-1}.$$

Combining this inequality and (43) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{-tL}g_+ + e^{-(\tau-t)L}g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \\ & \geq (1 - R_{W,\tau}) \left(\|e^{-tL}g_+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|e^{-(\tau-t)L}g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

which leads to (42). The estimate (13) is then a combination of (20), (35), (39) and (42), as g^\perp is orthogonal to $e^{-tL}g_\pm$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)$, and

$$\|F_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 3 \left[\|\partial_t u\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|F_0^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|F_0^-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\nabla_x u\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x F_1^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x F_1^-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \right] \\
&\leq 3 \max\left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W\right) \|g^\pm\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + 120P_W \left(\|e^{-tL} g_+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|e^{-(\tau-t)L} g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C_0^2 \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$C_0 := \max\left\{ \frac{\sqrt{3}\tau}{\pi}, 11\sqrt{\frac{P_W}{1-R_{W,\tau}}} \right\}. \quad (44)$$

Likewise, the estimate (14) is a combination of (21)-(26), and (36)-(38)-(40)-(41). More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_t F_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x F_0\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_x \partial_t F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_{xx}^2 F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\
&\leq 3 \left(\|\partial_{tt}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + 2\|\nabla_x \partial_t u\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_{xx}^2 u\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \|\partial_t F_0^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x F_0^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_x \partial_t F_1^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_{xx}^2 F_1^+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \\
&\quad \left. + \|\partial_t F_0^-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|\nabla_x F_0^-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_x \partial_t F_1^-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|\nabla_{xx}^2 F_1^-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq \left[6 + 12Z_W^{-1} + 3M \max\left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W\right) \right] \|g^\pm\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \\
&\quad + \left(159 + 108(Z_W^{-1} + MP_W) + 3\left(6 + \frac{12}{1 - e^{-\tau/\sqrt{P_W}}}\right)^2 \right) \left(\|e^{-tL} g_+\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 + \|e^{-(\tau-t)L} g_-\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C_1^2 \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the fully explicit constant amounts to

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1 := \max \left\{ \sqrt{6 + 12Z_W^{-1} + 3M \max\left(\frac{\tau^2}{\pi^2}, P_W\right)}, \right. \\
\left. \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 - R_{W,\tau}}} \sqrt{159 + 108(Z_W^{-1} + MP_W) + 3\left(6 + \frac{12}{1 - e^{-\tau/\sqrt{P_W}}}\right)^2} \right\}. \quad (45)
\end{aligned}$$

The result then holds, via elementary estimates on C_0, C_1 . \square

It remains to use Theorem 2 to prove the convergence result in Theorem 1. The intermediate step, given below, is a space-time-velocity averaging lemma. The main idea, which is classical in the kinetic theory, is the following: averaging in velocity a solution to (3) has a regularising effect. The extra information we recover on the velocity average $\Pi_v h$ then allows us to control the L^2 energy of the solution h by means

of the terms appearing in the kinetic equation (3). For a solution of (3), this inequality directly gives control of its L^2 norm by its energy dissipation. Similar inequalities appeared already in [22–24, 26, 34], and our Lemma 1 below is a slight adaptation of these estimates.

Lemma 1. *Consider $(t, x, v) \mapsto h(t, x, v) \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)$. Then,*

$$\|\Pi_v h - \overline{\Pi_v h}\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq C_{0,\tau} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)} + C_{1,\tau} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T})h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu; H^{-1}(\nu))}, \quad (46)$$

where Π_v denote the projection operator in the v variable:

$$(\Pi_v f)(t, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t, x, v) \nu(dv),$$

and the constants $C_{0,\tau}, C_{1,\tau}$ have explicit expressions given in (50) and (51).

See also [26, Section 7] for a discussion about the precise dimensional dependence of $C_{0,\tau}, C_{1,\tau}$.

Proof. The proof closely follows the proof of [26, Lemma 2]. As a first step, we apply the weighted Lions inequality (16), with $g = \Pi_v h$, to obtain

$$\|\Pi_v h - \overline{\Pi_v h}\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu_W)} \leq C_{\text{Lions}} \left(\|\zeta^{-1} \partial_t \Pi_v h\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_x \Pi_v h\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \right). \quad (47)$$

We next separately bound the two terms on the right hand side of this inequality.

To bound $\|\zeta^{-1} \partial_t \Pi_v h\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}$, we fix a test function $z \in H_{\text{DC}}^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$ with $\|z\|_{H^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq 1$; while the estimation of $\|\nabla_x \Pi_v h\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}$ can be performed by taking a test function $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_d) \in H_{\text{DC}}^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)^d$ with $\|Z\|_{H^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq 1$. We remind the readers that the test functions z, Z do not depend on the v variable.

Estimate of the time derivative. For $\zeta^{-1} \partial_t \Pi_v h$, we start by noticing that $\nabla_v \Pi_v h = 0$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_v \psi(v) \nu(dv) = 0,$$

so that, by skew-symmetry of $\partial_t + \mathcal{T}$ and the boundary conditions for z in the integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \zeta^{-1} (\partial_t \Pi_v h) z \, dU_\tau \, d\mu = \iiint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} [(\partial_t + \mathcal{T}) \Pi_v h] \zeta^{-1} z \, dU_\tau \, d\Theta \\ &= \iiint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} [(\partial_t + \mathcal{T}) h] \zeta^{-1} z \, dU_\tau \, d\Theta + \iiint_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (h - \Pi_v h) (\partial_t + \mathcal{T}) (\zeta^{-1} z) \, dU_\tau \, d\Theta \\ &\leq Z_W^{-1/2} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T}) h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu; H^{-1}(\nu))} \|z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \|1\|_{H^1(\nu)} \\ &\quad + \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T}) (\zeta^{-1} z)\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of $\|z\|_{H^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \leq 1$, it remains to estimate

$$\|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T}) (\zeta^{-1} z)\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)} \leq Z_W^{-1/2} \|\partial_t z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} + \|\nabla_v \psi \cdot \nabla_x (\zeta^{-1} z)\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}.$$

Define the symmetric matrix

$$\mathcal{M} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_v \psi \otimes \nabla_v \psi \, d\nu.$$

By [47, Appendix A], the matrix \mathcal{M} is positive definite. Denote by $\rho(\mathcal{M}) > 0$ the largest eigenvalue of the matrix \mathcal{M} , the last factor in the last inequality can be bounded as

$$\|\nabla \psi \cdot \nabla_x(\zeta^{-1}z)\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 = \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x(\zeta^{-1}z)^\top \mathcal{M} \nabla_x(\zeta^{-1}z) \, dU_\tau \, d\mu \leq \rho(\mathcal{M}) \|\nabla_x(\zeta^{-1}z)\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2.$$

Finally, write $\nabla_x(\zeta^{-1}z) = \zeta^{-1}\nabla_x z - \frac{\nabla_x \zeta}{\zeta} \zeta^{-1}z$, and we may estimate using triangle inequality and (7)

$$\|\nabla_x(\zeta^{-1}z)\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq 2Z_W^{-1} \|\nabla_x z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 + 2\theta_W^2 Z_W^{-1} \|z\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq 2Z_W^{-1} \max\{1, \theta_W^2\}.$$

By taking the supremum over functions $z \in H_{DC}^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)$ with $\|z\|_{H^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq 1$, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t \zeta^{-1} \Pi_v h\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \\ & \leq Z_W^{-1/2} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T})h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu, H^{-1}(\nu))} + Z_W^{-1/2} \left(1 + \sqrt{2\rho(\mathcal{M})} \max\{1, \theta_W\}\right) \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Estimate of the spatial derivatives. Turning to the estimation of $\|\nabla_x \Pi_v h\|_{H^{-1}(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}$, the result is shown with the same exact computations as in [26, Lemma 2], with the only difference that the role of [26, Assumption 4] is played here by Assumption 2, which ensures that $\|Z_i \nabla_x \phi\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)} \leq L \|Z_i\|_{H^1(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}$. Introduce

$$G = \frac{\nabla_v \psi}{\|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}}, \quad \mathcal{M} = \|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \mathcal{M}^{-1}, \quad G^{\mathcal{M}} = (G_1^{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, G_d^{\mathcal{M}}) = \mathcal{M}G.$$

The arguments of [26, Lemma 2] then yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x \Pi_v h \cdot Z \, dU_\tau \, d\mu \\ & \leq \|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-1} \rho(\mathcal{M}) \|G\|_{H^1(\nu)} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T})h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu, H^{-1}(\nu))} \\ & \quad + \|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-1} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|G_i^{\mathcal{M}} \nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \right)^{1/2} + L \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|\nabla_v G_i^{\mathcal{M}}\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ & \quad + \rho(\mathcal{M}) \|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-1} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Combining (47), (48) and taking the supremum over Z in (49), we conclude the proof of (46) with

$$C_{0,\tau} = C_{\text{Lions}} \left(\|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-1} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|G_i^{\mathcal{M}} \nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \right)^{1/2} + L \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|\nabla_v G_i^{\mathcal{M}}\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] + Z_W^{-1/2} \left(1 + \sqrt{2\rho(\mathcal{M})} \max\{1, \theta_W\} \right) + \rho(\mathcal{M}) \|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-1} \right). \quad (50)$$

$$C_{1,\tau} = C_{\text{Lions}} \left(Z_W^{-1/2} + \|\nabla_v \psi\|_{L^2(\nu)}^{-1} \rho(\mathcal{M}) \|G\|_{H^1(\nu)} \right), \quad (51)$$

All the quantities in (50) and (51) are finite thanks to Assumption 3. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1: Convergence Result with Weighted Poincaré-Lions Inequality

As in [23, 24, 26], after proving Theorem 2 and Lemma 1, one could prove long-time convergence of solutions of (3) using energy estimate on time-averaged L^2 -energy

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) := \int_t^{t+\tau} \|h(s, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 U_\tau(ds). \quad (52)$$

With the time-averaged functional inequalities obtained in Section 2, we could use the energy dissipation

$$\mathcal{D}_\tau(t) := 2\gamma \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 U_\tau(ds). \quad (53)$$

to control a fraction of the L^2 -norm of the solution to (3). Note that by energy estimate,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_\tau(t) = -\mathcal{D}_\tau(t). \quad (54)$$

Proof. It is well-known that (3) is well posed and $h(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in L^2(\Theta)$ for all $t \geq 0$. In addition, the total mass is conserved:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h(t, x, v) \Theta(dx dv) = 0,$$

and the L^2 norm of the solution is nonincreasing:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h(t, x, v)^2 \Theta(dx dv) = -2\gamma \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_v h|^2 d\Theta \leq 0, \quad (55)$$

which implies (54) after integrating in time. Solutions of (3) moreover satisfy the maximum principle, so

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|h(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)} \leq \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}. \quad (56)$$

We next fix $t, \tau > 0$, and write

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) = \int_t^{t+\tau} \|h - \Pi_\nu h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau + \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 dU_\tau, \quad (57)$$

by orthogonal decomposition in $L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)$.

Let us first focus on the case when ν satisfies the Poincaré inequality (10). The first contribution is simply estimated from above by

$$\frac{1}{C_{P,\nu}} \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_\nu h(s, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 ds.$$

For the second contribution, we note that $\int \Pi_\nu h(t, x) \mu(dx) = 0$ for any $t \geq 0$, so that, by standard properties of the average, we have, for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 U_\tau(ds) \leq \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h(s, \cdot) - a\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 U_\tau(ds).$$

In particular,

$$\int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 U_\tau(ds) \leq \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h(s, \cdot) - \overline{\Pi_\nu h}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 U_\tau(ds). \quad (58)$$

Via Hölder's inequality, the right hand side of the above inequality is controlled by

$$\left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h(s, \cdot) - \overline{\Pi_\nu h}\|_{L^2(\mu_W)}^2 U_\tau(ds) \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Pi_\nu h - \overline{\Pi_\nu h})^2 Z_W^{\sigma/2} W^\sigma dU_\tau d\mu \right)^{\frac{2}{\sigma+2}}, \quad (59)$$

for σ being given by (5). The idea is to use Lemma 1 to control the first term of (59), while the second term can be bounded by $\|h_0\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, thanks to (5). For the first term of (59),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \|\Pi_\nu h(s, \cdot) - \overline{\Pi_\nu h}\|_{L^2(\mu_W)}^2 U_\tau(ds) \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \\ & \leq 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \left(C_{0,\tau}^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|h - \Pi_\nu h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau + C_{1,\tau}^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T})h\|_{L^2(\mu; H^{-1}(\nu))}^2 dU_\tau \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \left(C_{0,\tau}^2 C_{P,\nu}^{-1} \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau + \gamma^2 C_{1,\tau}^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v^* \nabla_v h\|_{L^2(\mu; H^{-1}(\nu))}^2 dU_\tau \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \\
&\leq 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \left(C_{0,\tau}^2 C_{P,\nu}^{-1} + \gamma^2 C_{1,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} \mathcal{D}_\tau(t) \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (46), the Poincaré inequality (10) for ν and the fact that h solves (3); as well as the following inequality for $g \in L^2(\nu)^d$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_v^* g\|_{H^{-1}(\nu)} &= \sup_{\|z\|_{H^1(\nu)} \leq 1} \langle \nabla_v^* g, z \rangle_{H^{-1}(\nu), H^1(\nu)} \\
&= \sup_{\|z\|_{H^1(\nu)} \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g^\top \nabla_v z \, d\nu \leq \|g\|_{L^2(\nu)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

On the other hand, since $\|\Pi_\nu h\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \|h\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$,

$$\left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Pi_\nu h - \overline{\Pi_\nu h})^2 Z_W^{\sigma/2} W^\sigma \, dU_\tau \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{2}{\sigma+2}} \leq 4^{\frac{2}{\sigma+2}} Z_W^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}^{\frac{4}{\sigma+2}} \|W\|_{L^\sigma(\mu)}^{\frac{2\sigma}{\sigma+2}} =: C_3.$$

This, together with (55), allows finally to estimate (57) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) &\leq C_{P,\nu}^{-1} \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h(s, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 U_\tau(ds) \\
&\quad + C_2 \left(C_{0,\tau}^2 C_{P,\nu}^{-1} + \gamma^2 C_{1,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \left(2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{P,\nu}} \mathcal{D}_\tau(t) + C_2 \left(\gamma^{-1} C_{0,\tau}^2 C_{P,\nu}^{-1} + \gamma C_{1,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \mathcal{D}_\tau(t)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be the inverse of the increasing function $y \mapsto A_1 y + A_2 y^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}}$ with $A_1 = \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{P,\nu}}$ and $A_2 = C_2 \left(\gamma^{-1} C_{0,\tau}^2 C_{P,\nu}^{-1} + \gamma C_{1,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}}$. Then, (62) can be rewritten as

$$\varphi(\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)) \leq \mathcal{D}_\tau(t). \tag{63}$$

For $0 \leq y \leq \varphi(\mathcal{H}_\tau(0)) =: \varphi_0$, it holds $\varphi^{-1}(y) \leq (A_1 \varphi_0^{2/(\sigma+2)} + A_2) y^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}}$, and so $\varphi(z) \geq (A_1 \varphi_0^{2/(\sigma+2)} + A_2)^{-\frac{\sigma+2}{\sigma}} z^{\frac{\sigma+2}{\sigma}}$ for $z = \varphi^{-1}(y) \leq \mathcal{H}_\tau(0)$. Substituting this into (63) (note that $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq \mathcal{H}_\tau(0)$ by (55)) and solving the ODE, we end up with

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq \left(\mathcal{H}_\tau(0)^{-2/\sigma} + \frac{2 \left(A_1 \varphi_0^{2/(\sigma+2)} + A_2 \right)^{-\frac{\sigma+2}{\sigma}}}{\sigma} t \right)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}. \tag{64}$$

As for case (ii), the main difference with case (i) is the treatment of $\int_t^{t+\tau} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau$: instead of directly using the Poincaré inequality (10), we use Hölder's inequality in a similar way to (59) in conjunction with the weighted Poincaré inequality (11) in ν to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_t^{t+\tau} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau \\ & \leq \left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{G}^{-2} |h - \Pi_v h|^2 dU_\tau d\Theta \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} \left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{G}^\delta |h - \Pi_v h|^2 dU_\tau d\Theta \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\delta}} \\ & \leq 4^{\frac{2}{2+\delta}} P_v^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{G}^\delta d\nu \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\delta}} \|h_0\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}^{\frac{2}{2+\delta}} \left(\int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} =: C_3 \mathcal{D}_\tau(t)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (57) and (60), we derive the energy dissipation inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\tau(t) & \leq C_3 \mathcal{D}_\tau(t)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} C_2 \left(C_{1,\tau}^2 C_3 \mathcal{D}_\tau(t)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + \gamma^2 C_{0,\tau}^2 \mathcal{D}_\tau(t) \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} \\ & = C_3 (2\gamma)^{-\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} \mathcal{D}_\tau(t)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} C_2 \left[C_{1,\tau}^2 C_3 (2\gamma)^{-\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} \mathcal{D}_\tau(t)^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + \frac{\gamma}{2} C_{0,\tau}^2 \mathcal{D}_\tau(t) \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This also leads to an inequality of the same form as (63), but with a different function φ given by the inverse function of $y \mapsto C_3 (2\gamma)^{-\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} y^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} C_2 \left(C_{1,\tau}^2 C_3 (2\gamma)^{-\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} y^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + \frac{\gamma}{2} C_{0,\tau}^2 y \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}}$. The final step is also similar to case (i): if $y \leq \varphi(\mathcal{H}_\tau(0)) =: \varphi_0$, then $\varphi^{-1}(y) \leq B y^{\frac{\delta\sigma}{(\delta+2)(\sigma+2)}}$ with

$$B = C_3 (2\gamma)^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta+2}} \varphi_0^{\frac{2\delta}{(\delta+2)(\sigma+2)}} + 2^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}} C_2 \left(C_{1,\tau}^2 C_3 (2\gamma)^{-\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} + \frac{\gamma}{2} C_{0,\tau}^2 \varphi_0^{\frac{2}{\delta+2}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma+2}},$$

and consequently $\varphi(z) \geq B^{-\frac{(\delta+2)(\sigma+2)}{\delta\sigma}} z^{\frac{(\delta+2)(\sigma+2)}{\delta\sigma}}$ for $z = \varphi^{-1}(y) \leq \mathcal{H}_\tau(0)$. Substituting this into the ODE, we finally obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq \left(\mathcal{H}_\tau(0)^{-\frac{2(\sigma+\delta+2)}{\sigma\delta}} + \frac{2(\sigma+\delta+2)B^{-\frac{(\delta+2)(\sigma+2)}{\delta\sigma}}}{\sigma\delta} t \right)^{-\frac{\sigma\delta}{2(\sigma+\delta+2)}}. \quad (65)$$

This concludes the proof as $\|h_t\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \leq \mathcal{H}_\tau(t - \tau)$ for $t \geq \tau$, and $\mathcal{H}_\tau(0) \leq \|h_0\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2$ in view of (55). \square

Remark 5. A careful inspection of the proof shows that it is possible to remove the assumption $h_0 \in L^\infty(\Theta)$ and obtain a similar result if one obtain the following moment

bounds for solutions of (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \geq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} W(x)^\sigma h(t, x, v)^2 \Theta(dx dv) &< \infty, \\ \sup_{t \geq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{G}(v)^\delta h(t, x, v)^2 \Theta(dx dv) &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

To the best of our knowledge, these moment estimates are currently open and being studied by another group of researchers.

4 Weak Poincaré–Lions inequality and Proof of Theorem 3

Our goal in this section is to derive a new weak Poincaré–Lions inequality and use it to give another proof of long-time convergence rate for solutions of (3). The weighted Poincaré–Lions inequality in Theorem 2 and the averaging Lemma 1 are still important building blocks for our proof. In this section, we will use the Dirichlet form \mathcal{D}_τ to control \mathcal{H}_τ in a slightly different way: since in general \mathcal{D}_τ only controls a fraction of \mathcal{H}_τ , we will instead add an additional term onto the right-hand side involving the functional $\Phi = \|\cdot\|_{\text{osc}}^2$.

Working in full generality, we now suppose that a weak Poincaré inequality holds for $\nu(dv)$.

Assumption 4. For any $f \in H^1(\nu)$ and any $s > 0$,

$$\|f - \nu(f)\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 \leq s \|\nabla_v f\|_{L^2(\nu)}^2 + \beta_v(s) \Phi(f),$$

where $\beta_v : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies the standard conditions given in Definition 1, and Φ is defined in Definition 1.

The following Assumption will be proven to hold in the subsequent lemma.

Assumption 5. The following weak Poincaré-type inequality holds for solutions of (3): For any $s, t, \tau > 0$,

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq s \mathcal{D}_\tau(t) + \beta(s) \Phi(h_0), \quad (66)$$

for an initial condition $h_0(x, v)$, assumed to be bounded (almost everywhere) and with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h_0 d\Theta = 0$. Here we recall that $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$ and $\mathcal{D}_\tau(t)$ are defined in (52) and (53) respectively.

Lemma 2. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4, we have that Assumption 5 holds for β as given in (70).

Proof. The argument we present is inspired by [39, Theorem 4.2]. Given a function $h(t, x, v)$, compactly supported on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h dU_\tau d\Theta = 0$, we have, for any $a \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\|h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 \stackrel{(57), (58)}{\leq} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 + \left\| \Pi_v h - \overline{\Pi_v h} \right\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu)}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 + \int_{\{W < a\}} \left(\Pi_v h - \overline{\Pi_v h} \right)^2 \frac{a^2}{W^2} dU_\tau d\mu \\
&\quad + \int_{\{W \geq a\}} \left(\Pi_v h - \overline{\Pi_v h} \right)^2 dU_\tau d\mu \\
&\leq \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 + a^2 Z_W \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\Pi_v h - \overline{\Pi_v h} \right)^2 dU_\tau d\mu_W \\
&\quad + \mu(a \leq W) \Phi(\Pi_v h) \\
&\leq (2a^2 Z_W C_{0, \tau}^2 + 1) \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 + 2Z_W C_{1, \tau}^2 \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T})h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(U_\tau \otimes \mu; \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\nu))}^2 \\
&\quad + \mu(a \leq W) \Phi(h), \tag{67}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 1. Here we also denote with a slight abuse of notation, for a function $h(t, x, v)$ with $t \in [0, \tau]$,

$$\Phi(h) = \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \|h(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{\text{osc}}^2.$$

By definition of the oscillation norm, $\Phi(\Pi_v h) \leq \Phi(h)$.

Now, for h a solution of (3), we consider the part from time t to $t + \tau$, which also satisfies (67) by a density argument. In addition, in view of (61),

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{t+\tau} \|(\partial_t + \mathcal{T})h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu; \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\nu))}^2 dU_\tau &= \gamma^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v^* \nabla_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu; \mathbb{H}^{-1}(\nu))}^2 dU_\tau \\
&\leq \gamma^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

By maximum principle we also have that $\Phi(h) \leq \Phi(h_0)$, and we therefore obtain from (67)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{t+\tau} \|h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau &\leq (2a^2 Z_W C_{0, \tau}^2 + 1) \int_t^{t+\tau} \|h - \Pi_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau \\
&\quad + 2Z_W C_{1, \tau}^2 \gamma^2 \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau + \mu(a \leq W) \Phi(h_0). \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

Continuing from (68), and using Assumption 4, we then have, for any $a > 0$ and $b > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{t+\tau} \|h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau &\leq \left((2a^2 Z_W C_{0, \tau}^2 + 1)b + 2Z_W C_{1, \tau}^2 \gamma^2 \right) \int_t^{t+\tau} \|\nabla_v h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 dU_\tau \\
&\quad + \left[\mu(a \leq W) + (2a^2 Z_W C_{0, \tau}^2 + 1)\beta_v(b) \right] \Phi(h_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, utilising *chaining* of weak Poincaré inequalities [45, Theorem 33], namely setting $s = \frac{1}{2\gamma}((2a^2 Z_W C_{0, \tau}^2 + 1)b + 2Z_W C_{1, \tau}^2 \gamma^2)$ and introducing $a' = 2a^2 Z_W C_{0, \tau}^2 + 1 > 1$

in order to minimize over a' and b with the product $a'b$ fixed, we arrive at the following inequality: For any $s > 0$,

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq s\mathcal{D}_\tau(t) + \beta(s)\Phi(h_0), \quad (69)$$

with

$$\beta(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & s \leq \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma}; \\ \inf \left\{ s_1\beta_\nu(s_2) + \mu(s_1 \leq \tilde{C}_{0,\tau}W^2 + 1) \mid s_1 > 1, s_2 > 0, s = \frac{s_1s_2}{2\gamma} + \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma} \right\} & s > \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma}; \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

with constants

$$\tilde{C}_{0,\tau} := 2Z_W C_{0,\tau}^2, \quad \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma} := Z_W C_{1,\tau}^2 \gamma.$$

Note that the function $\beta : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is monotone decreasing, with $\beta(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$, by [45, Theorem 33]. \square

Remark 6. When ν satisfies the Poincaré inequality (10), which includes the case when ν is a standard Gaussian distribution, by simply choosing $s_2 = 1$ we can derive a simpler form for β :

$$\beta(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & s \leq \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma} + \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{P,\nu}} \\ \mu \left(s \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{0,\tau}}{2\gamma C_{P,\nu}} W^2 + \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma} + \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{P,\nu}} \right); & s > \tilde{C}_{1,\tau,\gamma} + \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{P,\nu}}. \end{cases} \quad (71)$$

4.1 General case

We now state a general and abstract theorem, which will be used to deduce convergence from (69). We follow the approach of [45], and make a series of analogous definitions.

Definition 2. Consider the function β introduced in Assumption 5, and let $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be given by $K(0) = 0$ and, for $u > 0$,

$$K(u) := u\beta(u^{-1}).$$

The convex conjugate (or Legendre transform) of this function, $K^* : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, is

$$K^*(w) := \sup_{u \geq 0} \{uw - K(u)\}.$$

Finally, we define $F_a : (0, a) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$F_a(z) := \int_z^a \frac{dw}{K^*(w)}.$$

We let

$$\mathbf{a} := \sup \left\{ \|f\|_{L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta)}^2 / \Phi(f) : f \in L^2(U_\tau \otimes \Theta), \int f dU_\tau d\Theta = 0 \right\} \leq 1/4. \quad (72)$$

Lemma 3. Under Assumption 5, it holds $K^*(0) = 0$ and $K^*(w) > 0$ for $w > 0$. The function K^* is convex, continuous and strictly increasing on its domain. For $w \in [0, \mathbf{a}]$, it holds $K^*(w) \leq w$; moreover, the function $w \mapsto w^{-1}K^*(w)$ is increasing.

The function $F_{\mathbf{a}}$ is well-defined, convex, continuous and strictly decreasing, with $\lim_{z \downarrow 0} F_{\mathbf{a}}(z) = \infty$, and possesses a well-defined inverse function $F_{\mathbf{a}} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \mathbf{a})$ with $F_{\mathbf{a}}^{-1}(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. This is Lemma 1 from [45, Supplementary Material] and [45, Lemma 7]. \square

Lemma 4. Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then, for non-zero $h_0 \in \mathbb{L}^\infty$,

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \geq K^* \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \right).$$

Proof. This proof closely follows the discrete-time argument in the Proof of Theorem 8 of [45]. We start by reformulating (66) as

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \geq \frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{s \Phi(h_0)} - \frac{\beta(s)}{s}.$$

Rewriting the inequality in terms of K , and reparameterizing $u := s^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \geq u \frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} - K(u).$$

Since u is arbitrary, we can take a supremum over $u \geq 0$ to conclude that

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \geq K^* \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \right). \quad (73)$$

\square

Lemma 4 allows us to use a Bihari–LaSalle argument to deduce (potentially subgeometric) convergence of the semigroup.

Theorem 4. Suppose that Assumption 5 holds true. Then,

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq \Phi(h_0) F_{\mathbf{a}}^{-1}(t).$$

Theorem 3 is then a direct corollary of Theorem 4 since for any $t \geq \tau$ we have $\|h_t\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Theta)}^2 \leq \mathcal{H}_\tau(t - \tau)$ following (55).

Proof. By (55) and (73),

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_\tau(t) = -\mathcal{D}_\tau(t) \leq -\Phi(h_0) K^* \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \right),$$

using also Lemma 4. Thus we obtain the inequality,

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \leq \frac{\|h_0\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2}{\Phi(h_0)} - \int_0^t K^* \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(s)}{\Phi(h_0)} \right) ds.$$

Thus from a Bihari–LaSalle argument, we can conclude that

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)}{\Phi(h_0)} \leq F_a^{-1} \left(F_a \left(\frac{\|h_0\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2}{\Phi(h_0)} \right) + t \right) \leq F_a^{-1}(t),$$

using the monotonicity of F_a . □

4.2 Specific cases

Having formulated a general convergence bound in Theorem 4, we now apply this in several concrete situations of interest.

4.2.1 Strong velocity confinement

Let us start with the situation where ν satisfies a Poincaré inequality (10). This includes the case when ν is Gaussian.

Lemma 5. ([45, Lemma 15]) *Suppose that we have $\beta(s) = \eta_0 \exp(-\eta_1 s^{\eta_2})$, for some $\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2 > 0$. Then for some $c > 0$ we have for $v > 0$ sufficiently small,*

$$K^*(w) \geq cw \left(\log \frac{1}{w} \right)^{-1/\eta_2},$$

and the resulting convergence rate can be bounded as

$$F_a^{-1}(t) \leq C \exp \left(-C' t^{\frac{\eta_2}{1+\eta_2}} \right),$$

for some $C, C' > 0$.

Example 1. *Consider the case when $\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Since $W = \langle x \rangle^{1-\alpha}$, we have $u \leq W \iff \langle x \rangle \geq u^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$, and hence it follows that using a change of variables and integration by parts,*

$$\mu(u \leq W) = \int_{\langle x \rangle \geq u^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} \exp(-\langle x \rangle^\alpha) dx \lesssim \int_{u^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}^{\infty} r^{d-1} \exp(-r^\alpha) dr \lesssim \exp(-cu^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}), \quad (74)$$

where the inequalities omit constants which do not depend on u .

Thus referring to (71), we see that a weak Poincaré inequality holds in this case with

$$\beta(s) = \eta_0 \exp \left(-\eta_1 s^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} \right),$$

and correspondingly,

$$K^*(w) \geq cw \left(\log \frac{1}{w} \right)^{-\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{\alpha}}.$$

We note that this offers an improvement upon the corresponding weak Poincaré inequality derived in [38, Example 1.4]. Applying Lemma 5, we arrive at the convergence bound, for some $C, C' > 0$,

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq C\Phi(h_0) \exp\left(-C't^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}\right).$$

Lemma 6. ([45, Lemma 14]) Suppose that we have $\beta(s) = \eta_0 s^{-\eta_1}$, for some $\eta_0, \eta_1 > 0$. Then we have $K^*(w) = \frac{\eta_0 \eta_1}{(\eta_0(1+\eta_1))^{1+\eta_1}} w^{1+\eta_1^{-1}}$, and the resulting convergence rate can be bounded as

$$F_a^{-1}(t) \leq 2^{-\eta_1} \eta_0 (1 + \eta_1)^{1+\eta_1} t^{-\eta_1}.$$

Example 2. Now we consider the case when $\phi(x) = (d+p) \log\langle x \rangle$, for some $p > 0$. We have $W(x) = \langle x \rangle$, and then

$$\mu(u \leq W) \lesssim \int_{\langle x \rangle \geq u} \langle x \rangle^{-(d+p)} \lesssim u^{-p}.$$

Referring again to (71), we have that a weak Poincaré inequality holds with

$$\beta(s) = \eta_0 s^{-p/2}.$$

Applying Lemma 6, we conclude the convergence bound

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq C\Phi(h_0) t^{-p/2}.$$

We comment here that in both Examples 1 and 2, the scalings of $\beta(s)$ match these of weak Poincaré inequalities for μ obtained in [39, Propositions 4.9, 4.11], which improves upon [38].

4.2.2 Weak velocity confinement

We consider now some cases when the velocity distribution is weakly confining and does not satisfy the Poincaré inequality. These examples are largely inspired by the previous work of [33]. In this case, a useful property of weak Poincaré inequalities is chaining, namely that they can be naturally composed.

Proposition 5. ([45, Theorem 33]) Given a weak Poincaré inequality with β of the form

$$\beta(s) = \inf\{s_1\beta_2(s_2) + \beta_1(s_1) \mid s_1 > 0, s_2 > 0, s_1 s_2 = s\},$$

where each β_1, β_2 has corresponding function K_1^*, K_2^* respectively (as in Definition 2), the resulting K^* for β is

$$K^* = K_2^* \circ K_1^*,$$

from which a rate of convergence can be derived following Lemma 4 and Theorem 4.
Example 3. Suppose the velocity distribution is given by $\psi(v) = (d+q) \log\langle v \rangle$ and $\phi(x) = (d+p) \log\langle x \rangle$, for some $p > 0$ and $q > 0$. Similarly to Example 2, we have now additionally a weak Poincaré inequality for v , namely with function

$$\beta_v(s) = \eta'_0 s^{-q/2}. \quad (75)$$

Then by (70) and the principle of chaining weak Poincaré inequalities, Proposition 5 and [45, Example 34], we see that β from (70) can be bounded by

$$\beta(s) \leq \eta_0 s^{-\frac{pq}{4+2p+2q}},$$

so by Lemma 6 we have the rate of convergence

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq C\Phi(h_0) t^{-\frac{pq}{4+2p+2q}}.$$

The rate is symmetric in p and q , and is consistent with Example 2 in the limit $q \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 4. Consider the case when the velocity is $\psi(v) = (d+q) \log\langle v \rangle$ for $q > 0$ and spatially we have $\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. As in Example 3, we have the weak Poincaré inequality (75) for v , and we for the spatial domain we have the tail decay as (74). Applying Proposition 5, we compute that

$$F_\alpha(x) = \int_x^a \frac{dw}{K^*(w)} \lesssim \int_{\log \frac{1}{a}}^{\log \frac{1}{x}} e^{\frac{2y}{q}} y^{\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{q+2}{q}} dy \lesssim x^{-\frac{2}{q}} \left(\log \frac{1}{x} \right)^{\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{q+2}{q}},$$

where we used a substitution $y = \log \frac{1}{w}$ and performed an asymptotic analysis. It then follows, again through asymptotic analysis that, by inverting F_α , that

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq C\Phi(h_0) t^{-q/2} (\log t)^{\frac{(1-\alpha)(q+2)}{\alpha}},$$

for some constant C .

Example 5. Consider the case when the velocity is $\psi(v) = \langle v \rangle^\delta$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and we have $\phi(x) = (d+p) \log\langle x \rangle$, for some $p > 0$. Applying Proposition 5, and the same argument as Example 4, we obtain the bound

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq C\Phi(h_0) t^{-p/2} (\log t)^{\frac{p(1-\delta)}{\delta}},$$

for some constant C .

Example 6. Consider the case when the velocity is $\psi(v) = \langle v \rangle^\delta$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and we have $\phi(x) = \langle x \rangle^\alpha$, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Applying Proposition 5, we obtain the convergence rate

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \leq C\Phi(h_0) \exp\left(-C' t^{\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\alpha+2\delta-3\alpha\delta}}\right),$$

for some constants C, C' . As is the case with Example 3, the rates are symmetric with respect to α and δ . In addition, the result is consistent with Example 1 when taking the limit $\delta \rightarrow 1$.

Acknowledgements. The idea of this work was first originated when three of the authors met at the 14th International Conference on Monte Carlo Methods and Applications at Sorbonne University in Paris in June 2023. Part of this work was completed when LW was visiting Institute of Science and Technology, Klosterneuburg, Austria. LW would like to thank ISTA for their hospitality.

The work of G.S. was funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (project EMC2, grant agreement No 810367), and by Agence Nationale de la Recherche, under grants ANR-19-CE40-0010-01 (QuAMProcs) and ANR-21-CE40-0006 (SINEQ).

The work of G.B. has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101034413.

References

- [1] Kolmogorov, A.: Zufällige bewegungen (zur theorie der Brownschen bewegung). *Annals of Mathematics*, 116–117 (1934)
- [2] Hörmander, L.: Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Mathematica* **119**, 147–171 (1967)
- [3] Mattingly, J.C., Stuart, A.M., Higham, D.J.: Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **101**(2), 185–232 (2002) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4149\(02\)00150-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4149(02)00150-3)
- [4] Wu, L.: Large and moderate deviations and exponential convergence for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems. *Stochastic processes and their applications* **91**(2), 205–238 (2001)
- [5] Rey Bellet, L.: Ergodic properties of Markov processes. In: *Open Quantum Systems II: The Markovian Approach*, pp. 1–39. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2006)
- [6] Eckmann, J.-P., Hairer, M.: Spectral properties of hypoelliptic operators. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **235**(2), 233–253 (2003) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-003-0805-9>
- [7] Hérau, F., Nier, F.: Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **171**(2), 151–218 (2004) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-003-0276-3>

- [8] Helffer, B., Nier, F.: Hypocoercive Estimates and Spectral Theory for Fokker-Planck Operators and Witten Laplacians vol. 1862. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2005)
- [9] Villani, C.: Hypocoercivity. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* **202**(950) (2009)
- [10] Talay, D.: Stochastic Hamiltonian systems: exponential convergence to the invariant measure, and discretization by the implicit Euler scheme. *Markov Process. Related Fields* **8**(2), 163–198 (2002)
- [11] Mouhot, C., Neumann, L.: Quantitative perturbative study of convergence to equilibrium for collisional kinetic models in the torus. *Nonlinearity* **19**(4), 969 (2006)
- [12] Dolbeault, J., Mouhot, C., Schmeiser, C.: Hypocoercivity for kinetic equations with linear relaxation terms. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* **347**(9), 511–516 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2009.02.025>
- [13] Dolbeault, J., Mouhot, C., Schmeiser, C.: Hypocoercivity for linear kinetic equations conserving mass. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **367**(6), 3807–3828 (2015)
- [14] Hérau, F.: Hypocoercivity and exponential time decay for the linear inhomogeneous relaxation Boltzmann equation. *Asymptotic Analysis* **46**(3-4), 349–359 (2006)
- [15] Grothaus, M., Stilgenbauer, P.: Hypocoercivity for Kolmogorov backward evolution equations and applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **267**(10), 3515–3556 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2014.08.019>
- [16] Dolbeault, J., Klar, A., Mouhot, C., Schmeiser, C.: Exponential rate of convergence to equilibrium for a model describing fiber lay-down processes. *Applied Mathematics Research eXpress* **2013**(2), 165–175 (2013)
- [17] Arnold, A., Toshpulatov, G.: Exponential stability and hypocoercive regularization for the kinetic Fokker–Planck equation with confining potential. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **191**(5), 51 (2024)
- [18] Baudoin, F.: Bakry–émery meet Villani. *Journal of functional analysis* **273**(7), 2275–2291 (2017)
- [19] Eberle, A., Guillin, A., Zimmer, R.: Couplings and quantitative contraction rates for Langevin dynamics. *The Annals of Probability* **47**(4), 1982–2010 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOP1299>
- [20] Bernard, É., Fathi, M., Levitt, A., Stoltz, G.: Hypocoercivity with Schur

- complements. *Annales Henri Lebesgue* **5**, 523–557 (2022)
- [21] Bakry, D., Gentil, I., Ledoux, M.: *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators*. Springer, Cham; New York (2014)
 - [22] Albritton, D., Armstrong, S., Mourrat, J.-C., Novack, M.: Variational methods for the kinetic Fokker-Planck equation (2019) [arXiv:1902.04037](#)
 - [23] Cao, Y., Lu, J., Wang, L.: On Explicit L^2 -Convergence Rate Estimate for Underdamped Langevin Dynamics. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **247**(5), 1–34 (2023) [arXiv:1908.04746](#)
 - [24] Eberle, A., Lörler, F.: Non-reversible lifts of reversible diffusion processes and relaxation times. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05041 (2024)
 - [25] Brigati, G.: Time averages for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations. *Kinetic & Related Models* **16**(4) (2023)
 - [26] Brigati, G., Stoltz, G.: How to construct decay rates for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations?, 1–36 (2023) [arXiv:2302.14506](#)
 - [27] Lu, J., Wang, L.: On explicit L^2 -convergence rate estimate for piecewise deterministic Markov processes in MCMC algorithms. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **32**(2), 1333–1361 (2022)
 - [28] Dietert, H., Hérau, F., Hutridurga, H., Mouhot, C.: Quantitative geometric control in linear kinetic theory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09340 (2022)
 - [29] Li, B., Lu, J.: Quantum space-time Poincaré inequality for Lindblad dynamics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09115 (2024)
 - [30] Bouin, E., Dolbeault, J., Ziviani, L.: L^2 hypocoercivity methods for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations with factorised Gibbs states. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12040 (2023)
 - [31] Hu, S., Wang, X.: Subexponential decay in kinetic Fokker-Planck equation: Weak hypocoercivity. *Bernoulli* **25**(1), 174–188 (2019)
 - [32] Cao, C.: The kinetic Fokker-Planck equation with weak confinement force. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* **17**(8), 2281–2308 (2020)
 - [33] Grothaus, M., Wang, F.-Y.: Weak Poincaré inequalities for convergence rate of degenerate diffusion processes. *The Annals of Probability* **47**(5), 2930–2952 (2019)
 - [34] Dietert, H.: L^2 -Hypocoercivity for non-equilibrium kinetic equations, 1–14 (2023) [arXiv:2310.13456](#)

- [35] Bouin, E., Dolbeault, J., Lafleche, L., Schmeiser, C.: Hypocoercivity and sub-exponential local equilibria. *Monatshefte für Mathematik* **194**, 41–65 (2021)
- [36] Blanchet, A., Bonforte, M., Dolbeault, J., Grillo, G., Vázquez, J.-L.: Hardy–Poincaré inequalities and applications to nonlinear diffusions. *Comptes rendus. Mathématique* **344**(7), 431–436 (2007)
- [37] Bobkov, S.G., Ledoux, M.: Weighted Poincaré-type inequalities for Cauchy and other convex measures. *The Annals of Probability*, 403–427 (2009)
- [38] Röckner, M., Wang, F.-Y.: Weak Poincaré inequalities and L^2 -convergence rates of Markov semigroups. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **185**(2), 564–603 (2001)
- [39] Cattiaux, P., Gozlan, N., Guillin, A., Roberto, C.: Functional inequalities for heavy tailed distributions and application to isoperimetry. *Electronic Journal of Probability* **15**, 346–385 (2010)
- [40] Liggett, T.M.: L_2 Rates of Convergence for Attractive Reversible Nearest Particle Systems: The Critical Case. *Ann. Probab.* **19**(3), 935–959 (1991) <https://doi.org/10.1214/AOP/1176990330>
- [41] Barthe, F., Cattiaux, P., Roberto, C.: Concentration for independent random variables with heavy tails. *Applied Mathematics Research eXpress* **2005**(2), 39–60 (2005) <https://doi.org/10.1155/AMRX.2005.39> [arXiv:0505492](https://arxiv.org/abs/0505492) [math]
- [42] Andrieu, C., Lee, A., Power, S., Wang, A.Q.: Weak Poincaré Inequalities for Markov chains: theory and applications (2023) [arXiv:2312.11689](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11689)
- [43] Andrieu, C., Dobson, P., Wang, A.Q.: Subgeometric hypocoercivity for piecewise-deterministic Markov process Monte Carlo methods. *Electronic Journal of Probability* **26**(none), 1–26 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-EJP643>
- [44] Brešar, M., Mijatović, A.: Subexponential lower bounds for f -ergodic Markov processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14826* (2024)
- [45] Andrieu, C., Lee, A., Power, S., Wang, A.Q.: Comparison of Markov chains via weak Poincaré inequalities with application to pseudo-marginal MCMC. *The Annals of Statistics* **50**(6), 3592–3618 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-AOS2241>
- [46] Teschl, G.: *Mathematical Methods in Quantum Mechanics* vol. 157. American Mathematical Soc., Providence, RI (2014)
- [47] Stoltz, G., Trstanova, Z.: Langevin dynamics with general kinetic energies. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation* **16**(2), 777–806 (2018)