

# ON CUTOFF VIA RIGIDITY FOR HIGH DIMENSIONAL CURVED DIFFUSIONS

DJALIL CHAFAÏ AND MAX FATHI

ABSTRACT. It is known that a cutoff phenomenon occurs in high dimension for certain positively curved overdamped Langevin diffusions in the Euclidean space, including the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process and its Dyson version. In this note, we provide a structural explanation of this phenomenon, and we extend the result to a wide class of non-Gaussian and non-product models with a convex interaction. The key observation is a relation to a spectral rigidity result of Cheng and Zhou, linked to the presence of a Gaussian factor. We formulate the phenomenon using a Wasserstein coupling distance, and we deduce from it the formulation for total variation distance and relative entropy divergence. Furthermore, we discuss a natural extension to Riemannian manifolds, and ask about a possible extension or stability by perturbation.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
1.1. Diffusions on Euclidean spaces, with convex potential	1
1.2. Cutoff for high dimensional curved diffusions	2
1.3. Rigidity and Gaussian factorization for curved diffusions	4
1.4. Extension to Riemannian manifolds	5
1.5. About stability	6
2. Proofs	7
2.1. Preliminaries on rigidity	7
2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1	8
2.3. Proof of Corollary 1.3	8
2.4. Proof of Corollary 1.4	9
2.5. Proof of Theorem 1.5	10
2.6. Proof of Corollary 1.6	10
2.7. Proof of Theorem 1.10	10
References	11

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

**1.1. Diffusions on Euclidean spaces, with convex potential.** Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the Markov diffusion process solving the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dX_t = -\nabla V(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t, \quad X_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a standard Brownian motion in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is strictly convex and  $\mathcal{C}^2$  with  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = +\infty$ , and  $|\cdot|$  is the Euclidean norm of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In Statistical Physics, this drift-diffusion is also known as an overdamped Langevin process with potential  $V$ . By adding a constant to  $V$ , we can assume without loss of generality that  $\mu = e^{-V}$  namely

$$d\mu(x) = e^{-V(x)} dx \quad (1.2)$$

---

*Date:* Autumn 2024.

is a probability measure. It is the unique invariant law of the process, and it is moreover reversible. The associated infinitesimal generator is the linear differential operator

$$\mathcal{L} = \Delta - \nabla V \cdot \nabla \quad (1.3)$$

acting on smooth functions. It is symmetric in  $L^2(\mu)$ , and its kernel is the set of constant functions. Moreover, its spectrum is included in  $(-\infty, -\lambda_1] \cup \{0\}$ , for some  $\lambda_1 > 0$  called the spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}$ . The Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) process is obtained when  $V(x) = \frac{\rho}{2}|x|^2$ ,  $\rho > 0$ , for which  $\lambda_1 = \rho$  while  $\text{Hess}(V)(x) = \rho \mathbf{I}_d$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Also note that when  $V - \frac{\rho}{2}|\cdot|^2$  is convex for some  $\rho > 0$ , then the spectral gap is an eigenvalue of  $-\mathcal{L}$ , since the spectrum is discrete, as a consequence of [15, Proposition 6.7].

**1.2. Cutoff for high dimensional curved diffusions.** Let us denote by  $W_2$  the  $L^2$  Wasserstein (or Monge–Kantorovich) coupling distance between probability measures on the same metric space with finite second moment, see [27]. By an abuse of notation, for a random variable  $X$  and a probability measure  $\mu$ , we write  $W_2(X, \mu) = W_2(\text{Law}(X), \mu)$ .

**Theorem 1.1** (Wasserstein estimate for curved Langevin). *Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the process (1.1), with potential  $V$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_1$ , and invariant law  $\mu = e^{-V}$ . If*

$$\text{Hess}(V)(x) \geq \lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_d \quad \text{as quadratic forms, for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.4)$$

then for all set of initial conditions  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\frac{e^{-\lambda_1 t}}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} \left( \sup_{x_0 \in S} \Lambda(x) \right)^{1/2} \leq \sup_{x_0 \in S} W_2(X_t, \mu) \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t} \sup_{x_0 \in S} \left( \int |x - x_0|^2 d\mu(x) \right)^{1/2} \quad (1.5)$$

with, denoting  $E_1$  the eigenspace of  $-\mathcal{L}$  associated to  $\lambda_1$ , and  $k_1 = \dim(E_1)$ ,

$$\Lambda(x) = k_1 + \sup_{(f_1, \dots, f_{k_1})} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} |f_i(x_0)|^2, \quad (1.6)$$

where the supremum runs over the set of orthonormal bases of  $E_1$ . Moreover, if  $\mu$  is centered and  $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq R\}$ , then  $\sup_{x_0 \in S} \Lambda(x)$  can be replaced by  $k_1 + \lambda_1 R^2$ .

**Remark 1.2** (Dimensions). *By [4, Lemma 14], we always have  $k_1 \leq d$ .*

**Corollary 1.3** (Wasserstein cutoff). *Let  $(X_t^{(d)})$ ,  $V^{(d)}$ ,  $\lambda_1^{(d)}$ ,  $\mu^{(d)}$  be as in Theorem 1.1, satisfying (1.4) for any dimension  $d$ . Let  $m^{(d)}$  be the mean of  $\mu^{(d)}$ , and assume that*

$$\liminf_{d \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1^{(d)} > 0. \quad (1.7)$$

Then a cutoff phenomenon occurs at critical time  $t_* = \frac{\log(d)}{2\lambda_1^{(d)}}$ , namely for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in S^{(d)}} W_2(X_{t_d}^{(d)}, \mu^{(d)}) = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } t_d = (1 - \varepsilon)t_* \\ 0 & \text{if } t_d = (1 + \varepsilon)t_* \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where the set of initial conditions is a ball of the following form

$$S^{(d)} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - m^{(d)}| \leq c\sqrt{d}\}, \quad \text{for an arbitrary constant } c. \quad (1.9)$$

The cutoff phenomenon for diffusion processes was explored by Laurent Saloff-Coste [25], notably for Brownian motion on compact Lie groups, using functional inequalities for the upper bound, and representation theory for the lower bound. This context was further explored by Pierre-Loïc Méliot [22]. The cutoff for diffusions on non-compact spaces such as the Dyson–Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (DOU) process, is considered in [7], for various distances and divergences, in relation with the integrability of this model. The OU process is a special DOU process, and is also a special Gaussian ergodic Markov process

with independent components, a tensorized or product situation for which the cutoff was studied earlier notably in [18, 3]. The role of the eigenfunctions associated to the spectral gap for lower bounds is an old observation that dates back to Persi Diaconis and David Wilson, see for instance [25] and [7] and references therein for the case of diffusions.

Guan-Yu Chen and Laurent Saloff-Coste have shown in [9] that for ergodic Markov processes, cutoff occurs at the mixing time, in  $L^p$  distance,  $p > 1$ , provided that the product of the spectral gap and the mixing time tends to infinity. The method relies on a reduction to the Euclidean case  $p = 2$  by interpolation. In particular, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, an  $L^p$  cutoff,  $p > 1$ , could follow from [9, Corollary 3.4] by using the affine nature of the eigenfunctions of the spectral gap provided by rigidity.

For probability measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  on the same space, we denote by

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_A |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| \in [0, 1] \quad (1.10)$$

their total variation distance, and by

$$H(\nu \mid \mu) = \int \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \log\left(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu}\right) d\mu \in [0, +\infty] \quad (1.11)$$

the relative entropy or Kullback–Leibler divergence of  $\nu$  with respect to  $\mu$ , with convention  $H(\nu \mid \mu) = +\infty$  if  $\nu$  is not absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu$ . By an abuse of notation, we write  $d_{\text{TV}}(X, \mu) = d_{\text{TV}}(\nu, \mu)$  and  $H(X \mid \mu) = H(\nu \mid \mu)$  when  $X \sim \nu$ .

**Corollary 1.4** (TV and H cutoffs). *Under the setting of Corollary 1.3, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in S^{(d)}} d_{\text{TV}}(X_{t_d}^{(d)}, \mu^{(d)}) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_d = (1 - \varepsilon)t_* \\ 0 & \text{if } t_d = (1 + \varepsilon)t_* \end{cases} \\ \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in S^{(d)}} H(X_{t_d}^{(d)} \mid \mu^{(d)}) &= \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } t_d = (1 - \varepsilon)t_* \\ 0 & \text{if } t_d = (1 + \varepsilon)t_* \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that in contrast with what is done for instance in [7], we obtain the total variation and relative entropy cutoffs from the Wasserstein cutoff. Moreover, they occur at exactly the same critical time, due to the choice of initial condition that we make.

Condition (1.4) states that the process has curvature at least equal to the spectral gap. It turns out that it is the best possible lower bound on the curvature, as we explain later on in relation with a notion of spectral rigidity. Condition (1.4) is satisfied by the OU process with  $V = \frac{\rho}{2} |\cdot|^2$ , and in this case, we have  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ ,  $k_1 = d$ , and  $f_i(x) = \sqrt{\rho} x_i$ . An important class of non-Gaussian and non-product examples beyond pure OU is

$$V(x) = \frac{\rho}{2} |x|^2 + W(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.12)$$

where  $\rho > 0$  and where  $W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex and translation invariant in the direction  $(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , namely for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  and all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$W(x + u(1, \dots, 1)) = W(x). \quad (1.13)$$

This is the case for example when for some convex even function  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$W(x) = \sum_{i < j} h(x_i - x_j), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.14)$$

If  $\pi$  and  $\pi^\perp$  are the orthogonal projections on  $\mathbb{R}(1, \dots, 1)$  and its orthogonal, respectively, then  $|x|^2 = |\pi(x)|^2 + |\pi^\perp(x)|^2$ , while the translation invariance of  $W$  in the direction  $(1/\sqrt{n}, \dots, 1/\sqrt{n})$  gives  $W(x) = W(\pi(x) + \pi^\perp(x)) = W(\pi^\perp(x))$ , therefore

$$e^{-V(x)} = e^{-\frac{\rho}{2} |\pi(x)|^2} e^{-W(\pi^\perp(x)) - \frac{\rho}{2} |\pi^\perp(x)|^2} \quad (1.15)$$

which means that  $\mu$  has, up to a rotation, a one-dimensional Gaussian factor  $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\rho})$ .

**Theorem 1.5** (Boltzmann – Gibbs measure with convex interactions). *Let us consider the Langevin process (1.1) with potential (1.12) with  $\rho > 0$  and with  $W$  convex and translation invariant in the direction  $(1, \dots, 1)$ . Then the following properties hold true:*

- (i)  $\lambda_1 = \rho$  and the symmetric Hermite polynomial  $x_1 + \dots + x_d$  belongs to  $E_1$ .
- (ii) The law  $\mu$  is  $\rho$ -convex and has a Gaussian factor  $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\rho})$  in the direction  $(1, \dots, 1)$ .
- (iii) The curvature condition (1.4) is satisfied.

This model covers as a special degenerate case the DOU process studied in [8, 7], when

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} -\beta \log(x) & \text{if } x > 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } x \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{for an arbitrary constant } \beta \geq 0, \quad (1.16)$$

the degeneracy of this potential being equivalent to define the DOU process on the convex domain  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 > \dots > x_n\}$  instead of on the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , to exploit convexity. In this case, the symmetric Hermite polynomial  $x_1 + \dots + x_d$  is an eigenfunction associated to the spectral gap, and this is the tip of an iceberg of integrability, as observed in [19].

**Corollary 1.6** (Cutoff for Langevin with convex interactions). *Let  $(X_t^{(d)})$ ,  $V^{(d)}$ ,  $\mu^{(d)}$  be as in Theorem 1.5, for any dimension  $d$ , and for a fixed  $\rho > 0$ . Then there is cutoff at critical time  $t_* = \frac{\log(d)}{2\rho}$  in the sense that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in S^{(d)}} W_2(X_{t_*}^{(d)}, \mu^{(d)}) = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } t_d = (1 - \varepsilon)t_* \\ 0 & \text{if } t_d = (1 + \varepsilon)t_* \end{cases} \quad (1.17)$$

where the set of initial conditions  $S^{(d)}$  can be either  $B(m^{(d)}, c\sqrt{d})$  or  $m^{(d)} + [-c, c]^d$ , where  $c > 0$  is an arbitrary constant and where  $m^{(d)}$  is the mean of  $\mu^{(d)}$ .

It turns out that the presence of a Gaussian factor, as well as the  $\lambda_1$  uniform lower bound on the Hessian of the potential (1.4), are both equivalent to a notion of rigidity.

**1.3. Rigidity and Gaussian factorization for curved diffusions.** For a Langevin process in the Euclidean space as in (1.2), for all  $\rho > 0$ , the following items are equivalent, and we say then that the process has Bakry – Émery curvature  $\rho$ :

- (C1)  $V - \frac{\rho}{2}|\cdot|^2$  is convex
- (C2)  $\text{Hess}(V)(x) \geq \rho I_d$  as quadratic forms, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- (C3)  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies the curvature-dimension inequality<sup>1</sup>  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty) : \Gamma_2 \geq \rho\Gamma$ .

The equivalence between (C1) and (C2) is immediate. For (C3), let us recall that the  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_2$  functional quadratic forms of a Markov infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{L}$  are defined by

$$\Gamma(f, g) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}(fg) - f\mathcal{L}g - g\mathcal{L}f) \quad (1.18)$$

$$\Gamma_2(f, g) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}\Gamma(f, g) - \Gamma(f, \mathcal{L}g) - \Gamma(g, \mathcal{L}f)). \quad (1.19)$$

They are fully characterized by their diagonal  $\Gamma(f) = \Gamma(f, f)$  and  $\Gamma_2(f) = \Gamma_2(f, f)$ , by polarization. In the case of the Langevin operator (1.3), they simply boil down to

$$\Gamma(f) = |\nabla f|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_2(f) = \|\text{Hess}(f)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \langle \text{Hess}(V)\nabla f, \nabla f \rangle \quad (1.20)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$  is the Hilbert – Schmidt or trace or Frobenius norm. Now (C2) implies  $\Gamma_2 \geq \rho\Gamma$ , while (C3) used with  $f$  affine gives back (C2) since  $\text{Hess}(f) \equiv 0$  in this case. We refer to [2] for background about the curvature-dimension condition and its applications.

When (C1)-(C2)-(C3) hold, then an observation dating back to André Lichnerowicz [20], in the context of positively curved manifolds, is that

$$\lambda_1 \geq \rho, \quad (1.21)$$

<sup>1</sup>More generally, the Bakry – Émery curvature-dimension inequality  $\text{CD}(\rho, n)$  for an infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{L}$  writes  $\Gamma_2(f) \geq \rho\Gamma(f) + \frac{1}{n}(\mathcal{L}f)^2$ , where  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  is the curvature and  $n \in \mathbb{R}$  is the dimension.

with equality for the OU case  $V = \frac{\rho}{2} |\cdot|^2$ . More generally, we say that the process is **rigid** when the spectral gap matches the curvature lower bound. Rigidity can be reformulated, and it turns out that the following items are all equivalent:

- (R1)  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  and  $\lambda_1 = \rho$  for some  $\rho > 0$
- (R2)  $\text{CD}(\lambda_1, \infty)$
- (R3)  $\text{Hess}(V)(x) \geq \lambda_1 \text{Id}$  as quadratic forms, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- (R4) Up to a rotation and translation,  $e^{-V}$  can be written as a product measure with a one-dimensional Gaussian factor  $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\rho})$  and a second factor satisfying  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$ .

In which case, all the eigenfunctions associated to  $\lambda_1$  are affine.

This equivalence is due to Xu Cheng and Detang Zhou [10] in a broader Riemannian setting, that we shall discuss in Section 2.7. An alternative proof in this Euclidean setting, based on optimal transport, was found by Guido De Philippis and Alessio Figalli [12].

The formulation of curvature and rigidity in terms of the CD inequality allows to extend the approach beyond the Euclidean space, typically to Riemannian manifolds as well as to abstract Markov setting. More generally, if the process is rigid then the Gaussian factor has the same dimension as the eigenspace associated with  $\lambda_1$ .

**Remark 1.7** (Relation to optimal logarithmic Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities). *An observation that dates back to Dominique Bakry and Michel Émery [1] is that  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  implies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality (LSI) with constant  $2/\rho$  as well as a Poincaré inequality (PI) of constant  $1/\rho$  (directly as well as by linearization). Recall that the optimal Poincaré constant is precisely the inverse of the spectral gap  $1/\lambda_1$ . It follows that rigidity implies that the optimal LSI constant is twice the optimal PI constant, just like for the OU process. By the way, a famous alternative due to Oscar Rothaus states that in the compact setting, if the optimal LSI constant is not twice the optimal PI constant, then there exists an extremal function for LSI, see for instance [24, Theorem at the bottom of page 107] as well as [26, Theorem 2.2.3 page 333] in the lecture notes by Laurent Saloff-Coste for a discrete version. Note also that in the case (1.12), the function  $x \mapsto e^{\alpha(x_1 + \dots + x_d)}$  is extremal for LSI, as observed in [8], while  $x \mapsto x_1 + \dots + x_d$  is extremal for PI.*

**Remark 1.8** (Normalization). *For any  $\alpha > 0$  which may depend on  $d$ , the time-changed process  $X^{(\alpha)} := (X_{\alpha t})_{t \geq 0}$  solves the SDE  $dX_t^{(\alpha)} = \sqrt{2\alpha} dB_t - \alpha \nabla V(X_t^{(\alpha)}) dt$  and has generator  $\mathcal{L}^{(\alpha)} = \alpha \mathcal{L}$ . The process  $X^{(\alpha)}$  has cutoff at critical time  $t_*$  if and only if  $X$  has cutoff at critical time  $t_*/\alpha$ . Such scaled processes play a role with respect to mean-field limits of interacting particle systems related to McKean – Vlasov semilinear PDE, see [7].*

**1.4. Extension to Riemannian manifolds.** We now discuss Theorem 1.1 in a broader geometric context. A weighted Riemannian manifold is a triplet  $(M, g, \mu)$ , where  $(M, g)$  is a Riemannian manifold with metric tensor  $g$ , and  $\mu$  is a measure on  $M$ . Here we shall assume that  $\mu$  is a probability measure, absolutely continuous with respect to the volume measure. We shall write  $\mu = e^{-V}$ , so that  $V$  plays the same role of a potential as in the Euclidean setting. The Markov process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  we consider is the drift diffusion that combines a Brownian motion  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on  $(M, g)$  and drift  $-\nabla V$ , given by the SDE

$$dX_t = -\nabla V(X_t) dt + \sqrt{2} dB_t, \quad X_0 = x_0 \in M, \quad (1.22)$$

where  $\nabla$  is the gradient on  $(M, g)$ . We refer to [2, 17] for more background. A key role is played by the Ricci curvature tensor of the manifold, which we shall denote by  $\text{Ric}$ . We refer to [23] for an introduction to curvature on Riemannian manifolds. Under the assumption that the Ricci curvature is bounded from below, and that  $V$  is geodesically semi-convex, then solutions to the dynamic (1.22) exist for all times [16, Theorem 11.8]. We shall not make use of the SDE (1.22), and only rely on the generator of the process

$$\mathcal{L} = \Delta - \nabla V \cdot \nabla \quad (1.23)$$

where  $\Delta$  is the Laplace–Beltrami operator on  $(M, g)$ .

Recall that the weighted manifold  $(M, g, \mu)$  satisfies the Bakry–Émery curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  for some  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  when

$$\text{Ric} + \nabla^2 V \geq \rho g \quad (1.24)$$

A celebrated result due to Dominique Bakry and Michel Émery [1] states that  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  for  $\rho > 0$  implies a lower bound on the spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}$  in the sense that

$$\lambda_1 \geq \rho. \quad (1.25)$$

When the manifold is unweighted, this is the dimension-free version of the famous spectral gap bound due to André Lichnerowicz [20]. Actually  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  for  $\rho > 0$  implies stronger functional inequalities, such as a logarithmic Sobolev inequality, and an isoperimetric inequality. Note that in this setting, and following for instance [15, Proposition 6.7], the spectrum of  $\mathcal{L}$  is discrete and the spectral gap  $\lambda_1$  is always an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

In order to formulate a neat abstract analogue of Theorem 1.1, we shall use vector-valued functions whose coordinates are eigenfunctions, as defined in the following:

**Definition 1.9** (Multi-eigenfunction). *Let  $E_1$  be the eigenspace of  $\mathcal{L}$  associated with the eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$ , in  $L^2(\mu)$ . Let  $k_1 = \dim E_1$ . We define a multi-eigenfunction as being a map  $M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_1}$  whose coordinates are orthogonal elements of  $E_1$  in  $L^2(\mu)$ . We denote by  $F_1$  the set of all multi-eigenfunctions, and by  $\mathbb{S}_{F_1}$  the set of multi-eigenfunctions whose coordinates are elements of the unit sphere of  $E_1$  in  $L^2(\mu)$ , thus orthonormal.*

The link between this definition and Theorem 1.1 is that the component  $\sum_{i=1}^d |f_i(x_0)|^2$  in the definition of  $\Lambda$  in Theorem 1.1 is exactly the  $\ell^2$  norm of  $T(x_0)$  where  $T$  is some element of  $\mathbb{S}_{F_1}$ . The Riemannian analog of Theorem 1.1 is now the following.

**Theorem 1.10** (Wasserstein estimate on weighted Riemannian manifold). *Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the diffusion (1.22), and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be its generator (1.23). Assume that for some  $\rho > 0$ ,*

- (i)  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$ ,
- (ii)  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ .

*Then for all non-empty set of possible initial conditions  $S \subset M$ , and all  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$\frac{e^{-\rho t}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \left( \sup_{x_0 \in S} \Lambda(x_0) \right)^{1/2} \leq W_2(X_t, \mu) \leq e^{-\rho t} \sup_{x_0 \in S} \left( \int d(x_0, x)^2 d\mu(x) \right)^{1/2},$$

where

$$\Lambda(x) = k_1 + \sup_{T \in \mathbb{S}_{F_1}} |T(x)|^2. \quad (1.26)$$

Moreover, if  $S = \{x \in M : d(x, m) \leq R\}$ , then we can replace  $\sup_{x_0 \in S} \Lambda(x_0)$  by

$$\sup_{T \in \mathbb{S}_{F_1}} (|T(m)|^2 + \rho R^2). \quad (1.27)$$

**1.5. About stability.** Our study is under the strong assumption  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ . For the  $d$ -dimensional unit sphere, we have  $\rho = d - 1$  and  $\lambda_1 = d$ , so the abstract theorem does not apply. Yet cutoff does occur, and moreover  $\lambda_1/\rho \rightarrow 1$ . This naturally leads to asking

**Question 1.11.** *Is there a (useful) analog of Corollary 1.3 under the weaker assumption*

$$\frac{\lambda_1^{(d)}}{\rho^{(d)}} \xrightarrow{d \rightarrow \infty} 1 \quad ? \quad (1.28)$$

There are some results on properties of positively curved manifolds when  $\lambda_1$  is close to  $\rho$  [11, 21, 5, 13]. However, the quantitative estimates on eigenfunctions seem to be too weak to easily generalize Theorem 1.10. The estimate on the Wasserstein distance strongly relies on the fact that the eigenfunction is Lipschitz, and the estimate is sharp

because it is actually affine, namely that  $\text{Hess}f = 0$ . When  $\lambda_1$  is close to  $\rho$ , then  $\text{Hess}f$  is small, but for example the smallness estimates in [5] are only in  $L^2$  norm, so we do not actually control the Lipschitz norm of  $f$ . It is unclear if a stronger  $L^\infty$  estimate can be expected in general, so maybe some extra assumptions are needed.

## 2. PROOFS

**2.1. Preliminaries on rigidity.** As discussed in the introduction, the starting point for our analysis is a Gaussian splitting or factorization theorem of [10], which in the Euclidean setting takes the following form :

**Theorem 2.1** (Gaussian factorization in the Euclidean space). *Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy the curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  for some constant  $\rho > 0$ . Assume that the spectral gap satisfies  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ . Then there is an orthonormal basis  $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and a vector  $m \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $V$  is of the form*

$$V(x) = \frac{\rho}{2}((x_1 - m_1)^2 + \dots + (x_k - m_{k_1})^2) + \tilde{V}(x_{k_1+1}, \dots, x_d) \quad (2.1)$$

where  $k_1$  is the dimension of the eigenspace associated with  $\lambda_1$ , and  $\tilde{V}$  satisfies the  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  condition on  $\mathbb{R}^{d-k_1}$ . Moreover, all eigenfunctions with eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  are affine, and only depend on the first  $k_1$  coordinates in the above basis.

The vector  $m$  actually is the center of mass of the probability measure  $e^{-V}$ .

**Remark 2.2** (Eigenfunctions structure). *Since eigenfunctions satisfy*

$$\int |\nabla f|^2 d\mu = - \int (\mathcal{L}f)f d\mu = \lambda_1 \int f^2 d\mu, \quad (2.2)$$

any eigenfunction with eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  is of the form  $\langle a, p(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^k} + b$  with  $p$  the projection on the  $k$ -dimensional Gaussian factor and  $|a|^2 = \lambda_1 \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2$ .

Another way of stating this result is that up to a rotation (the change of basis) and a translation by the vector  $m$ , the law  $e^{-V}$  is a product measure, with a centered Gaussian factor with variance  $\rho$  on the first  $k$  coordinates, and a  $\rho$ -uniformly log-concave factor on the last  $d - k$  coordinates. Note that the result can only be true up to a rotation and translation, since the assumptions are stable by isometries.

An alternative proof in the Euclidean setting, based on a rigidity property for regularity of solutions to the Monge–Ampère PDE for optimal transport maps, was given in [12]. We shall discuss some elements of proof in the full Riemannian setting in Section 2.7.

**Lemma 2.3** (OU process associated to an eigenfunction). *Under the setting of Theorem 2.1, for all  $T \in \mathbb{S}_{F_1}$ , the process  $(T(X_t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a  $k$ -dimensional OU process scaled by a factor  $\rho$ , that is a process on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  with generator  $\rho\Delta - \rho x \cdot \nabla$ .*

*Proof.* We shall show that  $T(X)$  is a Markov process and recognize it as an OU process by computing the generator.

Let us now compute the generator. If  $\vec{v}$  is a vector-valued function, then  $\vec{\mathcal{L}}\vec{v}$  is the vector obtained by applying  $\mathcal{L}$  to each coordinate, and  $\Gamma(\vec{v})$  the matrix whose coefficients are  $\Gamma(\vec{v}_i, \vec{v}_j)$ . Since the coordinates of  $T$  are orthogonal normalized eigenfunctions,  $\vec{\mathcal{L}}T = -\lambda_1 T$  and  $\Gamma(T) = \rho \text{Id}$ , as per Remark 2.2. By the diffusion property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}g \circ T &= \nabla g \circ T \cdot \vec{\mathcal{L}}T + \langle \nabla^2 g \circ T, \Gamma(T) \rangle \\ &= -\lambda_1 \nabla g \circ T \cdot T + \rho \Delta g \circ T \\ &= -\rho \nabla g \circ T \cdot T + \rho \Delta g \circ T \end{aligned}$$

This is a function of  $T$ , so  $T(X)$  is a Markov process, and when viewing it as such it is indeed the generator of an OU process with variance  $\rho^{-1}$ , applied to a function  $g$ .  $\square$

Hence, in the rigid case, the full process contains an OU subprocess, and hence cannot converge to equilibrium faster than it. This will yield the lower bound in Theorem 1.1.

**2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1.** The upper bound is an immediate (and well-known) consequence of the exponential convergence to equilibrium in Wasserstein coupling distance under the  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  condition [28] : for all  $X_0, Y_0$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$W_2(X_t, Y_t) \leq e^{-\rho t} W_2(X_0, Y_0). \quad (2.3)$$

The desired upper bound follows by taking  $Y_0 \sim \mu$  and  $X_0$  deterministic.

Let us now prove the lower bound. Consider a multi-eigenmap  $T$ . Up to an isometry, it is of the form  $T(x) = Ax + b$ . Moreover, since the coordinates of  $T$  are orthogonal eigenfunctions, the columns of  $A$  are orthogonal vectors. If moreover we assume that  $T \in \mathbb{S}_{F_1}$ , then each column of  $A$  has norm  $\sqrt{\rho} = \sqrt{\lambda_1}$ . Hence we immediately have

$$W_2(T(X_t), T(Y_t)) \leq \sqrt{\lambda_1} W_2(X_t, Y_t). \quad (2.4)$$

Applying Lemma 2.3,  $T(X_t)$  and  $T(Y_t)$  are OU processes with speed accelerated by a factor  $\rho$ . If we take  $Y_0$  distributed according to the equilibrium measure, then  $T(Y_t)$  follows a standard Gaussian law for any  $t$ . Moreover, for an OU process  $Z_t$  with deterministic initial data  $z_0$  and identity covariance, we have

$$W_2(Z_t, \gamma)^2 = e^{-2\rho t} \int |z_0 - y|^2 d\gamma_k(y) = e^{-2\rho t} (|z_0|^2 + k_1). \quad (2.5)$$

Hence

$$W_2(X_t, \mu) \geq \frac{e^{-\rho t}}{\rho} (|T(x_0)|^2 + k_1)^{1/2}. \quad (2.6)$$

Optimizing over  $x_0$  and  $T$  concludes the proof.

We now consider the case where  $\mu$  is centered and  $S = B(0, R)$ . For any  $T \in \mathbb{S}_{F_1}$ , writing  $T = Ax + b$ , since  $\int T d\mu = 0$  we see that  $b = 0$ . Therefore  $T(0) = 0$ . Moreover, since the columns of  $A$  are orthogonal and have norm  $\sqrt{\lambda_1}$ , we get  $\sup_{x \in S} |Ax|^2 = \rho R^2$ .

**2.3. Proof of Corollary 1.3.** Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $m^{(d)} = 0$  by translating  $V^{(d)}$ . We start by using the lower bound of Theorem 1.1 to prove the convergence to infinity when  $t_d = (1 - \epsilon)t_*$ . Since we are in the centered setting and the set of initial conditions is a centered ball of radius  $c\sqrt{d}$ , the lower bound is

$$\frac{e^{-\rho t}}{\sqrt{\rho}} (\rho c^2 d + k_1)^{1/2} \leq W_2(X_t, \mu). \quad (2.7)$$

Evaluating at  $t = t_d$  and neglecting  $k_1$ , we get

$$cd^{\epsilon/2} \leq W_2(X_{t_d}, \mu) \quad (2.8)$$

and letting  $d$  go to infinity concludes the proof of the lower bound. Let us now prove the case  $t_d = (1 + \epsilon)t_*$  via the upper bound in Theorem 1.1. Since  $\mu^{(d)}$  is centered,

$$\int |x - x_0|^2 d\mu(x) = |x_0|^2 + \int |x|^2 d\mu(x). \quad (2.9)$$

From the spectral gap, for any centered  $f$  we have the Poincaré inequality

$$\int f^2 d\mu \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{(d)}} \int |\nabla f|^2 d\mu \quad (2.10)$$

so that in particular

$$\int f^2 d\mu \leq \frac{\|f\|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{\lambda_1^{(d)}}. \quad (2.11)$$



Applying this inequality to each coordinate yields

$$\int |x|^2 d\mu \leq \frac{d}{\lambda_1^{(d)}}. \quad (2.12)$$

Therefore we have the upper bound

$$W_2(X_t, \mu) \leq e^{-\lambda_1^{(d)} t} \left( \sup_{x_0 \in \mathcal{S}} |x_0|^2 + \frac{d}{\lambda_1^{(d)}} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.13)$$

Since  $\sup_{x_0 \in \mathcal{S}} |x_0|^2 = c^2 d$ , evaluating at  $t_d = (1 + \epsilon)t_*$  yields

$$W_2(X_{t_d}, \mu) \leq d^{-\epsilon/2} (c^2 + (\lambda_1^{(d)})^{-1})^{1/2}. \quad (2.14)$$

Since  $\liminf_{d \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1^{(d)} > 0$ , letting  $d$  go to infinity concludes the proof.

**Remark 2.4.** Note that in the proof, the assumption  $\liminf_{d \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1^{(d)} > 0$  could have been replaced by a slow enough growth of  $(\lambda_1^{(d)})^{-1}$ , e.g.  $(\lambda_1^{(d)})^{-1} \leq (\log d)^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ .

**2.4. Proof of Corollary 1.4.** Let us deduce Corollary 1.4 from Corollary 1.3, in other words let us show that the Wasserstein distance can be replaced by total variation distance as well as by relative entropy. Let us drop the superscript  $(d)$  to simplify the notation.

*Upper bound.* It is well known that  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  with  $\rho > 0$  implies that for all  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$H(X_t | \mu) \leq e^{-\rho(t-1)} H(X_1 | \mu). \quad (2.15)$$

Despite the fact that the law of  $X_0$  is a Dirac mass, we use here the fact that the law of  $X_t$  with  $t > 0$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu$ . We could of course replace 1 by any strictly positive time. On the other hand, following for instance [6, Lemma 4.2],  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  with  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  implies that for all  $\forall t > 0$ ,

$$H(X_t | \mu) \leq \frac{\rho e^{-2\rho t}}{1 - e^{-2\rho t}} W_2(X_0, \mu)^2. \quad (2.16)$$

Using (2.16) and  $\frac{\rho e^{-2\rho t}}{1 - e^{-2\rho t}} \leq \frac{1}{2t}$  with  $t = 1$ , and combining with (2.15) yields, for all  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$2H(X_t | \mu) \leq e^{-\rho(t-1)} W_2(X_0, \mu)^2. \quad (2.17)$$

By combining with the general Csiszár–Kullback–Pinsker inequality

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu)^2 \leq 2H(\nu | \mu), \quad (2.18)$$

we get finally, for all  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$d_{\text{TV}}(X_t, \mu)^2 \leq 2H(X_t | \mu) \leq e^{-\rho(t-1)} W_2(X_0, \mu)^2. \quad (2.19)$$

Now, since  $t_* \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $d \rightarrow \infty$  in Corollary 1.3, we get, for all  $c > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in B(m, c\sqrt{d})} H(X_{(1+\varepsilon)t_*} | \mu) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in B(m, c\sqrt{d})} d_{\text{TV}}(X_{(1+\varepsilon)t_*}, \mu) = 0. \quad (2.20)$$

The approach differs from the one in [7], in the way we regularize in (2.16) as well as in the way we control relative entropy, here via the Wasserstein distance.

*Lower bound.* Both total variation distance and relative entropy decrease by mappings,

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu \circ T^{-1}, \nu \circ T^{-1}) \leq d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad H(\nu \circ T^{-1} | \mu \circ T^{-1}) \leq H(\nu | \mu). \quad (2.21)$$

This contractibility argument is also at the heart of the lower bounds in [7]. It follows that we can bound from below the relative entropy and total variation mixing times by those of a suitable OU process, by taking a multi-eigenfunction map. The lower bounds for OU processes have been established for example in [18, 3] and [7, Theorem 1.2]. As a consequence, we have, in the setting of Corollary, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in B(m, c\sqrt{d})} d_{\text{TV}}(X_{(1-\varepsilon)t_*}, \mu) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_0 \in B(m, c\sqrt{d})} H(X_{(1-\varepsilon)t_*} | \mu) = \infty, \quad (2.22)$$

when  $X_0 = x_0$ , and for an arbitrary constant  $c > 0$ . This is compatible with (2.18).

Another viewpoint for relative entropy is to get the Talagrand inequality

$$W_2(X_t, \mu)^2 \leq \frac{2}{\rho} H_\mu(X_t) \quad (2.23)$$

from  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$ , and deduce the relative entropy lower bound from the  $W_2$  lower bound.

**2.5. Proof of Theorem 1.5.** Let  $h(x) = x_1 + \dots + x_d$  be the symmetric Hermite polynomial of first degree. Its gradient is the constant vector  $\nabla h = (1, \dots, 1)$ . Since (1.4) holds, we have  $\lambda_1 \geq \rho$ . Hence, to get  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ , it suffices to show that  $h$  is an eigenfunction of  $-\mathcal{L}$  with eigenvalue  $\rho$ , and then apply the splitting theorem. The generator is

$$\mathcal{L}f = \Delta f - \rho x \cdot \nabla f - \nabla W \cdot \nabla f. \quad (2.24)$$

Since  $W$  is invariant along  $\mathbb{R}(1, \dots, 1)$ , we have  $\nabla W \cdot (1, \dots, 1) = 0$ , therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}h = 0 - \rho h - \nabla W \cdot (1, \dots, 1) = -\rho h. \quad (2.25)$$

This gives  $h \in E_1$  and  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ . Note that by rigidity, all the elements of  $E_1$  are affine.

**2.6. Proof of Corollary 1.6.** First, note that  $\sum_{i=1}^d m_i^{(d)} = \int \sum_{i=1}^d x_i d\mu^{(d)}(x) = 0$  since the image law of  $\mu^{(d)}$  by  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto x_1 + \dots + x_d$  is a centered Gaussian.

*Lower bound when  $t_d = (1 - \epsilon)t_*$ .* As per Theorem 1.5,  $x_1 + \dots + x_d$  is an eigenfunction. Since its squared  $L^2(\mu)$  norm is  $d\rho^{-1}$ ,  $f_d(x) = \sqrt{\rho/d}(x_1 + \dots + x_d)$  is a normalized eigenfunction. Now, for both  $S^{(d)} = B(m^{(d)}, c\sqrt{d})$  and  $S^{(d)} = m^{(d)} + [-c, c]^d$  we have

$$\sup_{x \in S^{(d)}} |f_d(x)| = c\sqrt{d}. \quad (2.26)$$

Hence the lower bound in Theorem 1.1 yields

$$W_2(X_{t_d}^{(d)}, \mu^{(d)}) \geq e^{-\rho t_d} c\sqrt{d} = cd^{\epsilon/2} \xrightarrow{d \rightarrow \infty} +\infty. \quad (2.27)$$

*Upper bound when  $t_d = (1 + \epsilon)t_*$ .* As in the proof of Corollary 1.3, the uniform convexity yields, via the Poincaré inequality, for all  $1 \leq i \leq d$ ,

$$\int (x_i - m_i^{(d)})^2 d\mu^{(d)}(x) \leq \rho^{-1}. \quad (2.28)$$

Hence when applying Theorem 1.1 we get

$$W_2(X_{t_d}^{(d)}, \mu^{(d)}) \leq e^{-\lambda_1^{(d)} t_d} \left( \sup_{x_0 \in S^{(d)}} |x_0|^2 + d/\rho \right)^{1/2} \leq (c^2 + \rho^{-1})^{1/2} d^{-\epsilon/2} \xrightarrow{d \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (2.29)$$

This concludes the proof.

**2.7. Proof of Theorem 1.10.** The proof is exactly the same as in the Euclidean setting (Theorem 1.1), up to the use of the Riemannian splitting (Theorem 2.5) below, and the fact that first eigenfunctions are affine through the splitting (Lemma 2.6). We shall hence only discuss these two elements, and omit the repetition of the proof.

In this setting, the rigidity theorem of [10] when  $\lambda_1 = \rho$  is the following.

**Theorem 2.5** (Riemannian splitting with Gaussian factor). *Let  $(M, g, \mu)$  be a weighted Riemannian manifold with probability measure  $\mu = e^{-V}$ . If for some  $\rho > 0$ ,*

- (i)  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$  is satisfied,
- (ii) the first positive eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  of  $-\mathcal{L}$  is  $\rho$ ,

then  $(M, g, \mu)$  is isometric to a product weighted Riemannian manifold

$$(\mathbb{R}^k, |\cdot|_2, \gamma_{k, \rho^{-1}}) \times (M', g', \mu') = (\mathbb{R}^k \times M', |\cdot|_2 \oplus g', \gamma_{k, \rho^{-1}} \otimes \mu')$$

where

- $k$  is the dimension of the eigenspace of  $-\mathcal{L}$  associated with the eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$ ;

- $\gamma_{k,\rho^{-1}}$  is the centered Gaussian law on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  with covariance matrix  $\rho^{-1}\text{Id}_k$ ;
- $(M', g', \mu')$  is a weighted Riemannian manifold satisfying  $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$ .

This theorem was proved by Xu Cheng and Detang Zhou [10] in the setting of smooth weighted manifolds, and by Nicola Gigli, Christian Ketterer, Kazumasa Kuwada, and Shin-ichi Ohta [14] in the more general setting of RCD spaces. Splitting theorems for manifolds satisfying a curvature constraint and optimizing certain geometric quantities is a well-studied problem in Riemannian geometry, going back to the Cheeger–Gromoll splitting theorem for non-negatively curved manifolds containing infinite geodesics.

We now state a lemma on the structure of eigenfunctions, which is an element in the proof of Theorem 2.5 in [10].

**Lemma 2.6** (Rigidity for eigenfunctions when  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ ). *Under the setting of Theorem 2.5, and through the isometry that it provides, any element of  $E_1$  is of the form  $a \cdot p(x)$  with  $p$  the projection on the Euclidean factor of dimension  $k$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $|a| = \sqrt{\rho}\|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$ . Moreover, if  $f_i = a_i \cdot p(x)$  (for  $i = 1, 2$ ) are two orthogonal eigenfunctions, then  $a_1 \perp a_2$ .*

*Proof.* What follows is a broad sketch, were we focus on justifying the form of the eigenfunctions, but do not discuss in too much detail the splitting of the space, that was established in [10]. See also [14] for a full proof in the non-smooth setting of RCD spaces.

From the integrated Bochner formula, for any  $g$  in the domain of  $\mathcal{L}$  we have

$$\int -\Gamma(g, \mathcal{L}g) d\mu \geq \rho \int \Gamma(g) d\mu + \int \|\text{Hess}g\|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mu. \quad (2.30)$$

Taking  $g$  to be an eigenfunction with eigenvalue  $\lambda_1 = \rho$ , we get

$$\rho \int \Gamma(f) d\mu \geq \rho \int \Gamma(f) d\mu + \int \|\text{Hess}f\|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mu \quad (2.31)$$

which forces  $\text{Hess}f = 0$  almost everywhere, and thus everywhere since eigenfunctions are smooth. Therefore  $f$  is affine, and non-constant. In particular,  $\nabla f$  is a non-trivial parallel vector field, which forces the splitting of the manifold in a product form  $\mathbb{R} \times M'$ , along which  $f$  is only an affine function of the first coordinate. Repeating this strategy for successive orthogonal eigenfunctions gives a splitting with a  $k$ -dimensional Euclidean factor. See [10] for full details. And once the splitting is established, we can view the eigenfunctions as functions on  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

Since for an affine function  $f = a \cdot x + b$ , we have  $\Gamma(f) = |a|^2$ , and

$$|a|^2 = \int \Gamma(f) d\mu = - \int f(\mathcal{L}f) d\mu = \rho \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2. \quad (2.32)$$

Let us now compute  $\Gamma(f_1, f_2)$  where  $f_1, f_2$  are orthogonal eigenfunctions. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(f_1, f_2) &= \frac{1}{4}(\Gamma(f_1 + f_2) - \Gamma(f_1 - f_2)) \\ &= \frac{\rho}{4}(\|f_1 + f_2\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 - \|f_1 - f_2\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $f_1 \pm f_2$  are also eigenfunctions, with the same eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$ . But since  $\Gamma(f_1, f_2) = \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$ , the vectors driving  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  must be orthogonal.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bakry and M. Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. Sémin. de probabilités XIX, Univ. Strasbourg 1983/84, Proc., Lect. Notes Math. 1123, 177-206 (1985)., 1985.
- [2] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 348 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Cham: Springer, 2014.
- [3] J. Barrera, B. Lachaud, and B. Ycart. Cut-off for  $n$ -tuples of exponentially converging processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 116(10):1433–1446, 2006.

- [4] F. Barthe and B. Klartag. Spectral gaps, symmetries and log-concave perturbations. *Bull. Hell. Math. Soc.*, 64:1–31, 2020.
- [5] J. Bertrand and M. Fathi. Stability of eigenvalues and observable diameter in  $\text{RCD}(1, \infty)$  spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 32(11):38, 2022. Id/No 270.
- [6] S. G. Bobkov, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. Hypercontractivity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 80(7):669–696, 2001.
- [7] J. Boursier, D. Chafaï, and C. Labbé. Universal cutoff for Dyson Ornstein Uhlenbeck process. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 185(1-2):449–512, 2023.
- [8] D. Chafaï and J. Lehec. On Poincaré and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for a class of singular Gibbs measures. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis. Vol. I*, volume 2256 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 219–246. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020.
- [9] G.-Y. Chen and L. Saloff-Coste. The cutoff phenomenon for ergodic Markov processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 13:no. 3, 26–78, 2008.
- [10] X. Cheng and D. Zhou. Eigenvalues of the drifted Laplacian on complete metric measure spaces. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 19(1):17, 2017. Id/No 1650001.
- [11] T. A. Courtade and M. Fathi. Stability of the Bakry-émery theorem on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *J. Funct. Anal.*, 279(2):28, 2020. Id/No 108523.
- [12] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli. Rigidity and stability of Caffarelli’s log-concave perturbation theorem. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A, Theory Methods*, 154:59–70, 2017.
- [13] M. Fathi, I. Gentil, and J. Serres. Stability estimates for the sharp spectral gap bound under a curvature-dimension condition. *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 74(6):2425–2459, 2024.
- [14] N. Gigli, C. Ketterer, K. Kuwada, and S.-I. Ohta. Rigidity for the spectral gap on  $\text{RCD}(K, \infty)$ -spaces. *Am. J. Math.*, 142(5):1559–1594, 2020.
- [15] N. Gigli, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. Convergence of pointed non-compact metric measure spaces and stability of Ricci curvature bounds and heat flows. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 111(5):1071–1129, 2015.
- [16] A. Grigor’yan. *Heat kernel and analysis on manifolds*, volume 47 of *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS); Somerville, MA: International Press, 2009.
- [17] E. P. Hsu. *Stochastic analysis on manifolds*, volume 38 of *Grad. Stud. Math.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2002.
- [18] B. Lachaud. Cut-off and hitting times of a sample of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes and its average. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 42(4):1069–1080, 2005.
- [19] M. Lassalle. Polynômes de Hermite généralisés. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 313(9):579–582, 1991.
- [20] A. Lichnérowicz. *Géométrie des groupes de transformations*, volume 3 of *Trav. Rech. Math.* Dunod, Paris, 1958.
- [21] C. H. Mai and S.-I. Ohta. Quantitative estimates for the Bakry-Ledoux isoperimetric inequality. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 96(4):693–739, 2021.
- [22] P.-L. Méliot. The cut-off phenomenon for Brownian motions on compact symmetric spaces. *Potential Anal.*, 40(4):427–509, 2014.
- [23] Y. Ollivier. A visual introduction to Riemannian curvatures and some discrete generalizations. In *Analysis and geometry of metric measure spaces. Lecture notes of the 50th Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures (SMS), Montréal, Canada, June 27 – July 8, 2011*, pages 197–220. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2013.
- [24] O. S. Rothaus. Diffusion on compact Riemannian manifolds and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. *J. Functional Analysis*, 42(1):102–109, 1981.
- [25] L. Saloff-Coste. Precise estimates on the rate at which certain diffusions tend to equilibrium. *Math. Z.*, 217(4):641–677, 1994.
- [26] L. Saloff-Coste. Lectures on finite Markov chains. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1996)*, volume 1665 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 301–413. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [27] F. Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, volume 87 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling.
- [28] M.-K. von Renesse and K.-T. Sturm. Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy and Ricci curvature. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 58(7):923–940, 2005.

DMA, ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE, UNIVERSITÉ PSL, CNRS, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE, AND CEREMADE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-DAUPHINE, PSL, CNRS., DJALIL.CHAFAI@ENS.PSL.EU

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ AND SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, LABORATOIRE JACQUES-LOUIS LIONS AND LABORATOIRE DE PROBABILITÉS, STATISTIQUE ET MODÉLISATION, F-75013 PARIS, FRANCE, AND DMA, ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE, UNIVERSITÉ PSL, CNRS, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE, AND INSTITUT UNIVERSITAIRE DE FRANCE, MFATHI@LPSM.PARIS