

Beyond Log-Concavity and Score Regularity: Improved Convergence Bounds for Score-Based Generative Models in \mathcal{W}_2 -distance

Marta Gentiloni-Silveri^{1*} Antonio Ocello^{1†}

¹CMAP, UMR CNRS 7641,
Ecole Polytechnique,

[marta.gentiloni-silveri, antonio.ocello]@polytechnique.edu

January 7, 2025

Abstract

Score-based Generative Models (SGMs) aim to sample from a target distribution by learning score functions using samples perturbed by Gaussian noise. Existing convergence bounds for SGMs in the \mathcal{W}_2 -distance rely on stringent assumptions about the data distribution. In this work, we present a novel framework for analyzing \mathcal{W}_2 -convergence in SGMs, significantly relaxing traditional assumptions such as log-concavity and score regularity. Leveraging the regularization properties of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) process, we show that weak log-concavity of the data distribution evolves into log-concavity over time. This transition is rigorously quantified through a PDE-based analysis of the Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equation governing the log-density of the forward process. Moreover, we establish that the drift of the time-reversed OU process alternates between contractive and non-contractive regimes, reflecting the dynamics of concavity. Our approach circumvents the need for stringent regularity conditions on the score function and its estimators, relying instead on milder, more practical assumptions. We demonstrate the wide applicability of this framework through explicit computations on Gaussian mixture models, illustrating its versatility and potential for broader classes of data distributions.

1 Introduction

In recent years, machine learning has made remarkable progress in generating samples from high-dimensional distributions with intricate structures. Among various generative models, *Score-based Generative Models* (SGMs) (see, *e.g.*, Sohl-Dickstein et al., 2015; Song and Ermon, 2019; Ho et al., 2020; Song et al., 2020b,a) have gained significant attention due to their versatility and computational efficiency. These models leverage the innovative approach of reversing the flow of a Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) and employ advanced techniques for learning time-reversed processes, enabling the generation of high-quality and visually compelling samples (Ramesh et al., 2022).

This breakthrough has spurred a rapid expansion in the applications of SGMs, which now span diverse domains. Examples include natural language generation (Gong et al., 2022), imputation for missing data (Zhang et al., 2024), computer vision tasks such as super-resolution and

*The work of this author has been supported by the Paris Ile-de-France Région in the framework of DIM AI4IDF

†The work of this author was funded by the European Union (ERC-2022-SYG-OCEAN-101071601). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

inpainting (Li et al., 2022; Lugmayr et al., 2022), and even applications in cardiology (Cardoso et al., 2023). For a comprehensive review of recent advancements, we refer readers to Yang et al. (2023).

SGMs. The primary goal of these models is to generate synthetic data that closely match a target distribution π_{data} , given a sample set. This is particularly valuable when the data distribution is too complex to be captured by traditional parametric methods. In such scenarios, classical maximum likelihood approaches become impractical, and non-parametric techniques like kernel smoothing fail due to the high dimensionality of real-world data.

SGMs address these challenges by focusing on the *score function*—the gradient of the log-density of the data distribution—instead of directly modeling the density itself. The score function describes how the probability density changes across different directions in the data space, guiding the data generation process.

The generation process begins with random noise and iteratively refines it into meaningful samples, such as images or sounds, through a denoising process that reverses a forward diffusion process. The forward diffusion process starts with a data sample (*e.g.*, an image) and gradually corrupts it by adding noise over several steps through an SDE flow, eventually transforming it into pure noise.

During generation, SGMs learn to reverse this diffusion process. Using noisy versions of the data, the model trains a deep neural network to approximate the score function. Starting from random noise, the model applies the learned score function iteratively, progressively removing noise and refining the sample to match the original data distribution. At each step, small, controlled adjustments based on the score function guide the noise toward realistic data, ensuring that the final sample aligns closely with the target distribution.

Related literature. The power and appeal of SGMs have spurred significant interest in establishing convergence bounds, leading to a variety of mathematical frameworks. Broadly, these contributions can be categorized into two primary approaches, focusing on different metrics and divergences.

The *first category* explores convergence bounds based on α -divergences and Total Variation (TV) distance (see, *e.g.*, Block et al., 2020; De Bortoli, 2022b; De Bortoli et al., 2021b; Lee et al., 2022, 2023; Chen et al., 2023, 2022a; Oko et al., 2023). For example, Chen et al. (2022a) derived upper bounds in TV distance, assuming smoothness of the score function. Recent works by Conforti et al. (2023a) and Benton et al. (2024) extended these results to Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence under milder assumptions about the data distribution. Importantly, bounds on KL divergence imply bounds on TV distance via Pinsker’s inequality, reinforcing their broader applicability.

The *second category* focuses on convergence bounds in Wasserstein distances of order $p \geq 1$, which are often more practical for estimation tasks. De Bortoli (2022a) established \mathcal{W}_1 bounds with exponential rates under the manifold hypothesis, assuming the target distribution lies on a lower-dimensional manifold or represents an empirical distribution. Mimikos-Stamatopoulos et al. (2024) provided \mathcal{W}_1 bounds on a torus of radius R , noting that the bounds depend on R and require early stopping criteria. For \mathcal{W}_2 -convergence, results by De Bortoli et al. (2021a) and Lee et al. (2023) rely on smoothness assumptions about the score function or its estimator, often under bounded support conditions. For such distributions, \mathcal{W}_2 -distance can also be bounded by TV distance, and thus by KL divergence, via Pinsker’s inequality.

In addition to these general approaches, reverse SDEs have been analyzed in the context of log-concave sampling. For instance, Chen et al. (2022b) studied the proximal sampler algorithm introduced by Lee et al. (2021), inspiring further work on \mathcal{W}_2 -convergence within the strongly log-concave framework. Current results often assume strong log-concavity of the data distribution and impose regularity conditions on the score function or its estimator (*e.g.*, Gao et al., 2023; Bruno et al., 2023; Tang and Zhao, 2024; Strasman et al., 2024). For strongly log-concave distributions, \mathcal{W}_2 bounds can also be estimated from KL divergence using Talagrand’s inequality (Corollary 7.2, Gozlan and Léonard, 2010).

These works share some notable features. A key insight, as highlighted by Strasman et al. (2024), is the contraction property of the backward process, which ensures convergence stability. Additionally, their results align with well-established findings for Euler–Maruyama (EM) discretization schemes (Pagès, 2018), showing a \sqrt{h} dependence on the step size h . Furthermore, Bruno et al. (2023) achieved optimal dimensional dependence in this framework, scaling as \sqrt{d} , where d is the dimensionality of the data distribution.

Contributions. Our work breaks through the traditional constraints of log-concavity in data distributions and strict regularity requirements for the score function or its estimator, offering a novel perspective on the \mathcal{W}_2 convergence of SGMs.

Building on the concept of weak log-concavity (see e.g. (Conforti, 2024)), we establish a foundational framework for studying data distributions under significantly relaxed convexity assumptions. By leveraging the regularizing properties of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) process, we demonstrate how its Gaussian stationary distribution progressively enhances the regularity of the initial data distribution. This regularization propagates weak log-concavity over time, ultimately transitioning into a strongly log-concave regime. Using a PDE-based approach inspired by Conforti et al. (2023a,b), we rigorously track the propagation of weak log-concavity through the Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation satisfied by the log-density of the forward process. Our analysis provides explicit estimates for the evolution of the weak log-concavity constant along the OU flow, culminating in a precise characterization of the transition to strong log-concavity (see Section C).

We also identify and analyze two regimes for the backward stochastic differential equation (SDE): a *contractive regime* and a *non-contractive one*. In Section C, we precisely quantify the transition point where the drift of the backward process ceases to be contractive, a critical insight for designing robust neural architectures and optimizing practical algorithms.

Additionally, we show that Gaussian mixtures inherently satisfy the weak log-concavity and log-Lipschitz assumptions required by our framework. In Proposition 4.1, we quantify these properties and demonstrate their compatibility with our approach. Moreover, our methods extend to the analysis of convolutions of densities with Gaussian kernels. The OU flow, which acts as a Gaussian kernel, regularizes the initial distribution, ensuring stability even under early stopping regimes. This versatility underscores the broad applicability of our results, transcending the assumptions specified in H1.

A key advantage of our approach is that it circumvents the strict regularity conditions on the score function and its estimator imposed by prior studies (e.g., Gao et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2022; Kwon et al., 2022; Bruno et al., 2023; Tang and Zhao, 2024). Instead, we rely solely on the mild assumptions of weak log-concavity and one-sided log-Lipschitz regularity of the data distribution. These assumptions suffice to derive the required score function regularity directly, eliminating the need for additional constraints (see Appendix B). This shift broadens the applicability of our framework while simplifying practical implementation.

Finally, we derive a fully explicit \mathcal{W}_2 -convergence bound, with all constants explicitly dependent on the parameters of the data distribution. Unlike previous works, which often present these constants in non-explicit forms or as arbitrarily rescaled factors, our analysis provides transparency. This clarity enables precise assessment of how input parameters influence convergence, facilitating informed decisions when designing neural architectures and optimizing SGMs for real-world applications.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces SGMs, presenting the general framework for analyzing these models and specifying the assumptions required to establish our convergence bounds. In Section 3, we focus on the main result: the convergence bound for SGMs in \mathcal{W}_2 -distance, highlighting parallels with the key features identified in KL-divergence bounds for SGMs. Section 4 demonstrates the validity of our assumptions by showing that the general class of Gaussian mixtures satisfies the conditions necessary for the bound to hold, thereby establishing a strong connection with bounds in early stopping regimes. Section 5 explores the underlying features contributing to the remarkable success and effectiveness of SGMs, including the contractive properties of the OU flow, which form the basis for proving our result. Finally, Section 6 provides a concise sketch of the proof of the main result.

2 Score Generative Models

Let $\pi_{\text{data}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ represent a probability distribution on \mathbb{R}^d , from which we want to generate samples. SGMs enable this by following a two-step approach: first, transforming data into noise, and second, learning how to reverse this process to recover data from noise.

To “create noise from data,” SGMs employ an ergodic forward Markov process that begins with the data distribution and eventually converges to an invariant distribution, usually Gaussian. This invariant distribution serves as the starting “noise,” which is easily generated by evolving the forward process from the data.

This corresponds to fixing a time horizon $T > 0$ and considering a d -dimensional ergodic diffusion over $[0, T]$ via the following SDE:

$$d\vec{X}_t = b(\vec{X}_t)dt + \Sigma dB_t, \quad (1)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, with $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ a drift function, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ a fixed covariance matrix, and $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a d -dimensional Brownian motion, initialized at $\vec{X}_0 \sim \pi_{\text{data}}$. Under mild assumptions on b , this equation admits unique solutions and is associated with a Markov semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with a unique stationary distribution π^∞ . Moreover, the law of the process \vec{X}_t admits a density \vec{p}_t w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure.

To “create data from noise,” the forward process is reversed using its time-reversal, known as the backward process. Specifically, we can sample from the noisy invariant distribution (which is easy to do), then apply the backward dynamics starting from these noisy samples. Since we are using the reversed process, at time $t = T$, the backward process ideally yields samples from the target distribution π_{data} .

More rigorously, SGMs aim at implementing the time-reversal process (see, *e.g.*, Anderson, 1982; Haussmann and Pardoux, 1986; Föllmer, 2005) defined by

$$d\overleftarrow{X}_t = \left(-b(\overleftarrow{X}_t) + \Sigma \Sigma^\top \nabla \log \vec{p}_{T-t}(\overleftarrow{X}_t) \right) dt + \Sigma d\bar{B}_t,$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, with $\overleftarrow{X}_0 \sim \mathcal{L}(\vec{X}_T)$ and $(\bar{B}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a Brownian motion, explicitly characterized in Haussmann and Pardoux (1986, Remark 2.5).

To put into practice such procedure, three approximations must be made:

1. Since sampling from $\mathcal{L}(\vec{X}_T)$ is not feasible, the backward process is initialized at the easy-to-sample stationary distribution π^∞ .
2. The score function $\nabla \log \vec{p}_t(x)$ is unknown in closed form, as it depends on the (not directly accessible) distribution π_{data} , and thus it needs to be estimated. This score function can be interpreted as a conditional expectation (see, *e.g.*, Equation 49, Conforti et al., 2023a), a key insight behind the success of SGMs. By leveraging the fact that a conditional expectation can be represented as an L^2 -projection (see, *e.g.*, Corollary 8.17, Klenke, 2013), the score function can be estimated by training a model $\theta \mapsto s_\theta(t, x)$ to minimize the score-matching loss

$$\theta \mapsto \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|s_\theta(t, \vec{X}_t) - \nabla \log \vec{p}_t(\vec{X}_t)\|^2 \right] dt, \quad (2)$$

over a (rich enough) parametric family $\{s_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$.

3. As the continuous-time SDE can not be simulated exactly, the process is discretized, often using the Euler–Maruyama (EM) scheme or other stochastic integrators.

The resulting algorithm $(X_t^*)_{t \in [0, T]}$ runs the EM scheme for the estimated backward process initialized at the stationary distribution of (1): for the learned parameter θ^* and a sequence of step sizes $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^N$, $N \geq 1$, such that $\sum_{k=1}^N h_k = T$, we set $X_0^* \sim \pi^\infty$ and compute for $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^* = X_{t_k}^* + h_k \left(-b(X_{t_k}^*) + s_{\theta^*}(T - t_k, X_{t_k}^*) \right) + \sqrt{2h_k} \Sigma Z_k,$$

with $\{Z_k\}_k$ a sequence of i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. Finally, this aims to return $\mathcal{L}(X_T^*)$, an approximation of π_{data} .

2.1 OU-base Score Generative Models

We focus now on the OU case. In this case, π^∞ is the standard Gaussian distribution, and forward and backward processes turn respectively into

$$d\vec{X}_t = -\vec{X}_t dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t, \quad (3)$$

$$d\overleftarrow{X}_t = \{\overleftarrow{X}_t + 2\nabla \log \vec{p}_{T-t}(\overleftarrow{X}_t)\}dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t, \quad (4)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Since $\nabla \log \pi^\infty(x) = -x$, equation (4) can be reformulated equivalently as

$$d\overleftarrow{X}_t = \left(-\overleftarrow{X}_t + 2\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\overleftarrow{X}_t)\right) dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t, \quad (5)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, with \tilde{p}_t the density of the law of \overleftarrow{X}_t against the Gaussian distribution, *i.e.*,

$$\tilde{p}_t(x) = \vec{p}_t(x)/\pi^\infty(x), \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (6)$$

This framework, opposed to (4), has been adopted in several works (see, *e.g.*, Conforti et al., 2023a; Strasman et al., 2024), due to its advantage of maintaining the same sign for the drift term as in the forward dynamics.

In this article, we shall consider SGMs that generate approximate trajectories of the backward process based on its representation (5). This means that, for the learned parameter θ^* and a sequence of step sizes $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^N$, with $N \geq 1$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^N h_k = T,$$

we consider the OU-based SGM described by $X_0^* \sim \pi^\infty$ and

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^* = X_{t_k}^* + h_k \left(-X_{t_k}^* + 2\tilde{s}_{\theta^*}(T - t_k, X_{t_k}^*)\right) + \sqrt{2h_k}Z_k, \quad (7)$$

for $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, with θ^* the minimizer of

$$\theta \mapsto \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{s}_\theta(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_t(\overleftarrow{X}_t)\|^2 \right] dt, \quad (8)$$

over a properly chosen parametric class $\{\tilde{s}_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$.

3 Convergence guarantees for OU-Based SGMs

To understand the performance of the proposed SGM algorithm, we aim to provide quantitative error estimates between the distribution $\mathcal{L}(X_T^*)$ and the data distribution π_{data} .

First, for a given differentiable vector field β , define its weak convexity profile as

$$\kappa_\beta(r) = \inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d: \|x-y\|=r} \left\{ \frac{(\nabla\beta(x) - \nabla\beta(y))^\top (x-y)}{\|x-y\|^2} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

This function can be regarded as an integrated convexity lower bound for β , for points that are at distance $r > 0$. This definition frequently arises in applications of coupling methods to study the long-term behavior of Fokker–Planck equations (see, *e.g.*, Conforti, 2023, 2024). While $\kappa_\beta \geq 0$ directly corresponds to the convexity of β , using non-uniform lower bounds on κ_β allows for the development of a more general notion of convexity, often called *weak convexity*.

Definition 3.1. We say that a vector field β is weakly convex if its weak convexity profile κ_β defined in (9) satisfies

$$\kappa_\beta(r) \geq \alpha - \frac{1}{r}f_M(r), \quad (10)$$

for some positive constants $\alpha, M > 0$, with f_M defined as

$$f_M(r) := 2\sqrt{M} \tanh\left(r\sqrt{M}/2\right). \quad (11)$$

Moreover, we say that β is weakly concave if $-\beta$ is weakly convex.

We are now able to state our assumptions.

H1 The data distribution π_{data} is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure with $\pi_{\text{data}}(dx) = \exp(-U(x))dx$, for some function $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that

(i) ∇U is L_U -one-sided Lipschitz, with $L_U \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$(\nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y))^\top (x - y) \leq L_U \|x - y\|^2; \quad (12)$$

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$;

(ii) U is weakly convex, with weak convexity profile κ_U satisfying

$$\kappa_U(r) \geq \alpha - \frac{1}{r} f_M(r), \quad (13)$$

for some $\alpha, M > 0$.

Remark 3.2. These weak assumptions represent a novel contribution to the literature on \mathcal{W}_2 convergence of SGMs. In fact, the entire class of Gaussian mixtures satisfies both the weak log-concavity and (one-sided) log-Lipschitz continuity conditions. In Proposition 4.1, we provide explicit values for the weak log-concavity constants as well as the (one-sided) log-Lipschitz constants, illustrating the broad applicability and generality of these assumptions.

H2 There exists $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\theta^* \in \Theta$ such that for any $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$

$$\|\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^*) - \tilde{s}_{\theta^*}(T - t_k, X_{t_k}^*)\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where the L^2 -norm is defined as $\|\cdot\|_{L^2} := \mathbb{E}[\|\cdot\|^2]^{1/2}$.

Remark 3.3. Assumptions of this type have already been considered in the literature (see, e.g., Gao et al., 2023; Bruno et al., 2023; Strasman et al., 2024). We remark that, since we take the expectation over the EM algorithm $(X_{t_k}^*)_{k=0}^N$, for which the density is known, Assumption 2 is not only theoretically well-founded but also practically verifiable. This makes it a robust and applicable framework in real-world settings. In addition, in the simple case $\pi_{\text{data}} = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \mathbb{I})$ for some unknown $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$, when approximating the score function $\nabla \log \tilde{p}_t(x)$ by means of the neural networks $\{e^{-t\theta} : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, Assumption H2 holds true for the minimizer $\theta = \mu$ of (2) and any $\varepsilon > 0$.

3.1 Main result

Under the previous assumptions, we now state our main result.

Theorem 3.4 (Informal). *Suppose that Assumption H1 and H2 hold. Consider the discretization $\{t_k, 0 \leq k \leq N\}$ of $[0, T]$ of constant step size h small enough. Then, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)) \lesssim e^{-T} \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \pi^\infty) + \varepsilon T + \sqrt{h} \sqrt{dT},$$

up to a multiplicative constant.

This \mathcal{W}_2 -convergence bound aligns with recent literature on these models, both by generalizing results previously established for log-concave distributions and by identifying the key features of these models as captured through KL divergence. In particular, our work highlights the following aspects:

- The framework exhibits an exponential contraction property, e^{-T} , toward the stationary distribution—a hallmark of the forward OU process. This property is preserved during the backward process, highlighting the inherent stability of the framework.
- The proportionality to εT . This term, arising from Assumption H2, takes track of the score approximation error and is consistent with the related literature (see, e.g., Conforti et al., 2023a; Lee et al., 2022, 2023; Chen et al., 2022a);

- The \sqrt{h} -dependence on the time-grid’s mesh. This dependence is grounded in the properties of stochastic integrals and the approximations inherent in the EM scheme (see, e.g., Pagès, 2018);
- The \sqrt{d} -dependence on the dimension. This dependence surpasses some earlier results (see, e.g., Bruno et al., 2023; Strasman et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2023) and ensures favorable scaling for high-dimensional distributions under minimal assumptions on the data distribution.

These features are present up to a finite multiplicative constant that depend on the parameters α , M , and L_U characterizing the data distribution π_{data} , and that is fully explicit.

Remark 3.5. For sake of simplicity, the theorem is presented for a uniform mesh of the interval $[0, T]$. However, proceeding as in Strasman et al. (2024), the analysis can be extended to a non-uniform subdivision of $[0, T]$ by considering the forward and backward SDEs (3)-(5) as time-inhomogeneous.

Remark 3.6. Following Conforti et al. (2023a), the bound can be reformulated to depend directly on ε by refining Assumption H2. As the solution X_t to (3) converges in law to π^∞ , the modified score function $(t, x) \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_t(x)$ approaches zero for large t . Accounting for this behavior allows to scale the required precision ε as $1/T$.

4 Gaussian mixture example

We demonstrate that Gaussian mixtures naturally fulfill the weak log-concavity and (one-sided) log-Lipschitz conditions central to our framework. As the OU flow—serving as a Gaussian kernel—regularizes the initial distribution, it guarantees stability even with early stopping. Consequently, our approach extends to the analysis of convolutions between densities and Gaussian kernels. This adaptability highlights the broad relevance of our findings, exceeding the specific assumptions outlined in H1.

Proposition 4.1. *Let p_n be a Gaussian mixture on \mathbb{R}^d having density law*

$$p_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x - \mu_i|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right), \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with $\sigma_i > 0$, $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\beta_i \in [0, 1]$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = 1$. Then, $-\log p_n$ is weakly convex and $\nabla \log p_n$ is Lipschitz.

In Section A, Proposition A.1, we also quantify and express the related constants.

Remark 4.2. The result presented above can be directly generalized to the case where the covariance matrices of each mode of the Gaussian mixture are of full rank but not scalar. In this more general setting, the parameter $1/\alpha_{p_n}$ (respectively, $1/\beta_{p_n}$) corresponds to the maximum (respectively, minimum) eigenvalue of the covariance matrices associated with each mode. Under the full-rank assumption, these eigenvalues are strictly positive, ensuring that the framework remains applicable and the bounds derived continue to hold with appropriately adjusted parameters.

5 Regime Switching

By exploiting the regularizing effects of the forward process, the weak log-concavity of the data distribution transitions to full log-concavity over time. Additionally, the drift of the time-reversed OU process alternates between contractive and non-contractive phase, reflecting the evolving concavity dynamics. By rigorously tracing how weak log-concavity propagates through the HJB equation governing the log-density of the forward process, we provide an exact characterization of the moments when the marginals of the forward OU process achieve strong log-concavity and when the drift of the backward OU process becomes non-contractive:

Log-Concavity.

- \vec{p}_t is only weakly log-concave for $t \in [0, \xi(\alpha, M)]$;
- \vec{p}_t is log-concave for $t \in [\xi(\alpha, M), T]$,

with

$$\xi(\alpha, M) := \begin{cases} \log \left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha^2 + M - \alpha}{\alpha^2}} \right) \wedge T, & \text{if } \alpha - M < 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Contractivity properties of the time-reversal process.

- $b_t(x)$ is contractive, for $t \in [0, T(\alpha, M, 0)]$;
- $b_t(x)$ is not (necessarily) contractive, for $t \in [T(\alpha, M, 0), T]$,

with $T(\alpha, M, \rho)$ as in (28). We refer to Section C for more details.

This regime shift is a key element in the effectiveness of the SGMs. SDEs with contractive flows exhibit advantageous properties related to efficiency guarantees (see, *e.g.*, Dalalyan, 2017; Durmus and Moulines, 2017; Cheng et al., 2018; Dwivedi et al., 2019; Shen and Lee, 2019; Cao et al., 2020; Mou et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021) that we can exploit in the low-time regime.

6 Sketch of the proof of the main result

We now present a sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.4. Our analysis is based on the observation that, in the practical implementation of the algorithm defined in (7), three successive approximations introduce distinct sources of error: time-discretization, initialization, and score-approximation. To analyze these errors, we work with time-continuous interpolations of the following four processes:

- **Backward OU process.** The time-reversal $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ of the OU process defined in (5).
- **EM-discretization scheme.** The EM-approximation $(X_{t_k}^N)_{k=0}^N$ of the backward process (5), started at $X_0^N \sim \mathcal{L}(\overleftarrow{X}_T)$
- **Initialization error.** The EM-approximation $(X_{t_k}^\infty)_{k=0}^N$ of the backward process (5), started at $X_0^\infty \sim \pi^\infty$
- **Score approximation.** The generative process $(X_{t_k}^*)_{k=0}^N$ defined in (7).

These auxiliary processes allow us to separately track the three sources of error. Using the triangle inequality, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)) \leq \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(\overleftarrow{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N)) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty)) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)).$$

Bound on $\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(\overleftarrow{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N))$. Consider the synchronous coupling between $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and the continuous-time interpolation of $(X_{t_k}^N)_{k=0}^N$ with the same initialization, *i.e.* use the same Brownian motion to drive the two processes and set $\overleftarrow{X}_0 = X_0^N$. Then, it holds

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(\overleftarrow{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N)) \leq \|\overleftarrow{X}_T - X_T^N\|_{L_2}.$$

To bound the right-hand side, we aim to estimate $\|\overleftarrow{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N\|_{L_2}$ in terms of $\|\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N\|_{L_2}$, developing a recursion. Since we have considered the synchronous coupling between \overleftarrow{X} and X^N , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N \\ &= \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ +2(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\overleftarrow{X}_t) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^N)) \right\} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the triangle inequality, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N \right\|_{L_2} \\
& \leq \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} dt \left\{ - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right\} \right\|_{L_2} \\
& \quad + \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} dt \left\{ - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t - \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) \right) \right\} \right\|_{L_2} \\
& =: A_{1,k} + A_{2,k},
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{1,k}^2 & = \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2}^2 + h^2 \left\| - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
& \quad + 2h \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right)^\top \left(- \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

To establish a bound, we need regularity properties of the score function. One of the main challenges in the proof is to derive minimal assumptions on the data that ensure the minimal regularity properties of the score function required for the bound.

We adopt a PDE-based approach, drawing on the insights from Conforti et al. (2023a,b), noting that $(t, x) \mapsto -\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ solves a HJB equation. By leveraging the regularizing effects of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, we show that the regularity Assumptions H1 propagate naturally along the HJB equation, as detailed in Appendix B.

We establish the following key properties:

- $(t, x) \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ which turns out to be L_t -Lipschitz in space, with L_t as in (16) and bounded by L as in (16);
- $(t, x) \mapsto -\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ has a weak convexity profile satisfying

$$\kappa_{-\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}}(r) \geq C_t,$$

with C_t as in (23).

These regularity properties enable us to bound $A_{1,k}$ as:

$$A_{1,k} \leq \delta_k \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2},$$

for some δ_k depending on L_t and C_t .

For the second term, we use the definition of the backward drift (27) to rewrite it as:

$$A_{2,k}^2 = \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ b_t(\overleftarrow{X}_t) - b_{t_k}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}) \right\} dt \right\|_{L_2}^2.$$

To bound this term, inspired by Conforti et al. (2023a, Proposition 2), we adopt a stochastic control perspective. We interpret the backward process (5) as a solution to a stochastic control problem and the term

$$\left(2 \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\overleftarrow{X}_t) \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$$

as the solution to the adjoint equation within a stochastic maximum principle. This allows us to bound the term with $Ch\sqrt{h}\sqrt{d}$, where h is mesh of the partition, d the dimension of the initial data and $C > 0$ a positive constant that may change from line to line. Combining the bounds on $A_{1,k}$ and $A_{2,k}$, we derive the recursion

$$\left\| \overleftarrow{X}_T - X_T^N \right\|_{L_2} \leq \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_0 - X_0^N \right\|_{L_2} \prod_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \delta_\ell + Ch\sqrt{h}\sqrt{d} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell = Ch\sqrt{h}\sqrt{d} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell.$$

Using the explicit form of C_t , we observe that weak log-concavity of the initial data distribution strengthens into strong log-concavity as time progresses. Additionally, the drift of the time-reversed OU process alternates between contractive and non-contractive regimes, capturing the

interplay between concavity and time. We further derive a quantitative lower bound, $T(\alpha, M, 0)$, for the point at which the drift transitions from contractive to non-contractive. We then analyze the low-time and large-time regimes separately, utilizing the contractive properties of SDEs at small times to establish $\delta_k \leq 1$, and applying brute force estimates for large times.

These remarks yields that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \leq \frac{C}{h} T.$$

Therefore, this let us conclude that

$$\mathcal{W}_2\left(\mathcal{L}(\bar{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N)\right) \lesssim \sqrt{h} \sqrt{dT}.$$

Bound on $\mathcal{W}_2\left(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty)\right)$. Consider again the synchronous coupling between the continuous-time interpolations of $(X_{t_k}^N)_{k=0}^N$ and $(X_{t_k}^\infty)_{k=0}^N$ with initialization satisfying

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\pi^\infty, \mathcal{L}(\bar{X}_T)) = \|X_0^\infty - X_0^N\|_{L^2}.$$

Then, we get

$$\mathcal{W}_2\left(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty)\right) \leq \|X_T^N - X_T^\infty\|_{L^2}.$$

As done before, developing a recursion over the time intervals $[t_{k+1}, t_k]$, we get

$$\|X_T^N - X_T^\infty\|_{L^2} \leq \|X_0^N - X_0^\infty\|_{L^2} \prod_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \delta_\ell,$$

with the δ_k s as before. We bound $\|X_0^\infty - X_0^N\|_{L^2}$ in the following (by now) standard way (see, *e.g.*, the proof of Proposition C.2, Strasman et al., 2024)

$$\|X_0^N - X_0^\infty\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{W}_2(\pi^\infty, \mathcal{L}(\bar{X}_T)) \leq e^{-T} \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \pi^\infty).$$

Using the previous considerations on the contractivity properties of the forward flow, we get that the product $\prod_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \delta_\ell$ is uniformly bounded by a constant depending on the parameters of the model. Therefore, this yields to have

$$\mathcal{W}_2\left(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty)\right) \lesssim e^{-T} \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \pi^\infty).$$

Bound on $\mathcal{W}_2\left(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)\right)$. Consider, as in the first bound, the synchronous coupling between the continuous-time interpolations of $(X_{t_k}^\infty)_{k=0}^N$ and $(X_{t_k}^*)_{k=0}^N$, with initialization satisfying $X_0^\infty = X_0^*$. Using the evolution of these processes, together with the triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|X_{t_{k+1}}^\infty - X_{t_{k+1}}^*\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \left\| X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^* + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} dt \left\{ -(X_t^\infty - X_t^*) + 2\left(\nabla \log \bar{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^\infty) - \nabla \log \bar{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^*)\right) \right\} \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + 4 \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} dt \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^*) - \tilde{s}_{\theta^*}(T-t_k, X_{t_k}^*)\right) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & =: B_{1,k} + B_{2,k}. \end{aligned}$$

. By reproposing a similar argument as before, we get

$$B_{1,k} \leq \delta_k \|X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^*\|_{L^2}.$$

By using Assumption H2, we obtain

$$B_{2,k} \leq 4h\epsilon.$$

Therefore, developing the recursion, we reach the bound

$$\mathcal{W}_2\left(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)\right) \lesssim \epsilon T.$$

7 Conclusions

This paper introduces a comprehensive framework for deriving convergence bounds in \mathcal{W}_2 distance for SGMs, leveraging a PDE-based approach while relaxing stringent regularity assumptions on the data distribution, the score function and its estimator. The results mark a significant advancement, as they rely only on mild assumptions of weak log-concavity and one-sided log-Lipschitzianity of the data distribution, without requiring regularity conditions on the score function or its estimator. This generality makes the proposed bounds applicable to a broad range of data types.

Through the example of Gaussian mixtures, we demonstrate the versatility of our framework, showing how convolutions with Gaussian kernels enhance early-stopping methods by leveraging their regularizing properties. This flexibility highlights the broad applicability and theoretical contribution of the presented results to the SGMs literature.

Furthermore, we explore how weak log-concavity evolves into full log-concavity over time and describe how the drift of the time-reversed OU process transitions between contractive and non-contractive regimes, mirroring the change in concavity.

References

- Brian DO Anderson. Reverse-time diffusion equation models. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 12(3):313–326, 1982.
- Joe Benton, VD Bortoli, Arnaud Doucet, and George Deligiannidis. Nearly d-linear convergence bounds for diffusion models via stochastic localization. 2024.
- Adam Block, Youssef Mroueh, and Alexander Rakhlin. Generative modeling with denoising auto-encoders and langevin sampling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00107, 2020.
- Francois Bouchut, Francois James, and Simona Mancini. Uniqueness and weak stability for multi-dimensional transport equations with one-sided lipschitz coefficient. Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze, 4(1):1–25, 2005.
- Stefano Bruno, Ying Zhang, Dong-Young Lim, Ömer Deniz Akyildiz, and Sotirios Sabanis. On diffusion-based generative models and their error bounds: The log-concave case with full convergence estimates. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13584, 2023.
- Yu Cao, Jianfeng Lu, and Lihan Wang. Complexity of randomized algorithms for underdamped langevin dynamics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09906, 2020.
- Gabriel V Cardoso, Lisa Bedin, Josselin Duchateau, Rémi Dubois, and Eric Moulines. Bayesian ecg reconstruction using denoising diffusion generative models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05388, 2023.
- Hongrui Chen, Holden Lee, and Jianfeng Lu. Improved analysis of score-based generative modeling: User-friendly bounds under minimal smoothness assumptions. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 4735–4763. PMLR, 2023.
- Sitan Chen, Sinho Chewi, Jerry Li, Yuanzhi Li, Adil Salim, and Anru R Zhang. Sampling is as easy as learning the score: theory for diffusion models with minimal data assumptions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11215, 2022a.
- Yongxin Chen, Sinho Chewi, Adil Salim, and Andre Wibisono. Improved analysis for a proximal algorithm for sampling. In Conference on Learning Theory, pages 2984–3014. PMLR, 2022b.
- Xiang Cheng, Niladri S Chatterji, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Underdamped langevin mcmc: A non-asymptotic analysis. In Conference on learning theory, pages 300–323. PMLR, 2018.

- Giovanni Conforti. Coupling by reflection for controlled diffusion processes: Turnpike property and large time behavior of hamilton–jacobi–bellman equations. The Annals of Applied Probability, 33(6A):4608–4644, 2023.
- Giovanni Conforti. Weak semiconvexity estimates for schrödinger potentials and logarithmic sobolev inequality for schrödinger bridges. Probability Theory and Related Fields, pages 1–27, 2024.
- Giovanni Conforti, Alain Durmus, and Marta Gentiloni Silveri. Score diffusion models without early stopping: finite fisher information is all you need. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12240, 2023a.
- Giovanni Conforti, Daniel Lacker, and Soumik Pal. Projected langevin dynamics and a gradient flow for entropic optimal transport. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08598, 2023b.
- Arnak S Dalalyan. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 79(3):651–676, 2017.
- Valentin De Bortoli. Convergence of denoising diffusion models under the manifold hypothesis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05314, 2022a.
- Valentin De Bortoli. Convergence of denoising diffusion models under the manifold hypothesis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05314, 2022b.
- Valentin De Bortoli, James Thornton, Jeremy Heng, and Arnaud Doucet. Diffusion schrödinger bridge with applications to score-based generative modeling. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:17695–17709, 2021a.
- Valentin De Bortoli, James Thornton, Jeremy Heng, and Arnaud Doucet. Diffusion schrödinger bridge with applications to score-based generative modeling. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:17695–17709, 2021b.
- Alain Durmus and Eric Moulines. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted langevin algorithm. The Annals of Applied Probability, 27(3):1551–1587, 2017.
- Raaz Dwivedi, Yuansi Chen, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Log-concave sampling: Metropolis-hastings algorithms are fast. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 20(183): 1–42, 2019.
- Hans Föllmer. An entropy approach to the time reversal of diffusion processes. In Stochastic Differential Systems Filtering and Control: Proceedings of the IFIP-WG 7/1 Working Conference Marseille-Luminy, France, March 12–17, 1984, pages 156–163. Springer, 2005.
- Xuefeng Gao, Hoang M Nguyen, and Lingjiong Zhu. Wasserstein convergence guarantees for a general class of score-based generative models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11003, 2023.
- Shansan Gong, Mukai Li, Jiangtao Feng, Zhiyong Wu, and LingPeng Kong. Diffuseq: Sequence to sequence text generation with diffusion models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08933, 2022.
- Nathael Gozlan and Christian Léonard. Transport inequalities. a survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:1003.3852, 2010.
- Ulrich G Haussmann and Etienne Pardoux. Time reversal of diffusions. The Annals of Probability, pages 1188–1205, 1986.
- Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- Achim Klenke. Probability theory: a comprehensive course. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

- Dohyun Kwon, Ying Fan, and Kangwook Lee. Score-based generative modeling secretly minimizes the wasserstein distance. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:20205–20217, 2022.
- Holden Lee, Jianfeng Lu, and Yixin Tan. Convergence for score-based generative modeling with polynomial complexity. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:22870–22882, 2022.
- Holden Lee, Jianfeng Lu, and Yixin Tan. Convergence of score-based generative modeling for general data distributions. In International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory, pages 946–985. PMLR, 2023.
- Yin Tat Lee, Ruoqi Shen, and Kevin Tian. Structured logconcave sampling with a restricted gaussian oracle. In Conference on Learning Theory, pages 2993–3050. PMLR, 2021.
- Haoying Li, Yifan Yang, Meng Chang, Shiqi Chen, Huajun Feng, Zhihai Xu, Qi Li, and Yueting Chen. Srdiff: Single image super-resolution with diffusion probabilistic models. Neurocomputing, 479:47–59, 2022.
- Ruilin Li, Hongyuan Zha, and Molei Tao. Sqrt (d) dimension dependence of langevin monte carlo. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03839, 2021.
- Andreas Lugmayr, Martin Danelljan, Andres Romero, Fisher Yu, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Repaint: Inpainting using denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 11461–11471, 2022.
- Nikiforos Mimikos-Stamatopoulos, Benjamin J Zhang, and Markos A Katsoulakis. Score-based generative models are provably robust: an uncertainty quantification perspective. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15754, 2024.
- Wenlong Mou, Yi-An Ma, Martin J Wainwright, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. High-order langevin diffusion yields an accelerated mcmc algorithm. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 22(42):1–41, 2021.
- Kazusato Oko, Shunta Akiyama, and Taiji Suzuki. Diffusion models are minimax optimal distribution estimators. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 26517–26582. PMLR, 2023.
- Gilles Pagès. Numerical probability. Universitext, Springer, 2018.
- Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125, 1(2):3, 2022.
- Saeed Saremi, Ji Won Park, and Francis Bach. Chain of log-concave markov chains. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19473, 2023.
- Adrien Saumard and Jon A Wellner. Log-concavity and strong log-concavity: a review. Statistics surveys, 8:45, 2014.
- Ruoqi Shen and Yin Tat Lee. The randomized midpoint method for log-concave sampling. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 32, 2019.
- Marta Gentiloni Silveri, Giovanni Conforti, and Alain Durmus. Theoretical guarantees in kl for diffusion flow matching. arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.08311, 2024.
- Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In International conference on machine learning, pages 2256–2265. PMLR, 2015.

- Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02502](#), 2020a.
- Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. [Advances in neural information processing systems](#), 32, 2019.
- Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13456](#), 2020b.
- Stanislas Strasman, Antonio Ocello, Claire Boyer, Sylvain Le Corff, and Vincent Lemaire. An analysis of the noise schedule for score-based generative models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04650](#), 2024.
- Wenpin Tang and Hanyang Zhao. Contractive diffusion probabilistic models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13115](#), 2024.
- Ling Yang, Zhilong Zhang, Yang Song, Shenda Hong, Runsheng Xu, Yue Zhao, Wentao Zhang, Bin Cui, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Diffusion models: A comprehensive survey of methods and applications. [ACM Computing Surveys](#), 56(4):1–39, 2023.
- Hengrui Zhang, Liancheng Fang, and Philip S Yu. Unleashing the potential of diffusion models for incomplete data imputation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20690](#), 2024.

Appendix

The appendix includes the additional materials to support the findings and analyses presented in the main paper. **Appendix A** delves into the Gaussian mixture example, establishing its weak log-concavity and log-Lipschitz properties with explicit derivations of the associated constants. **Appendix B** focuses on the propagation of regularity assumptions through the forward OU process, leveraging PDE-based techniques to demonstrate how weak log-concavity and Lipschitz regularity evolve over time. **Appendix C** examines the dynamics of concavity and contractivity in the time-reversed OU process, rigorously characterizing transitions from weak to strong log-concavity and identifying contractive and non-contractive regimes. **Appendix D** provides the formal counterpart of Theorem 3.4 and the proof of it. Finally, **Appendix E** compiles auxiliary results and technical lemmas needed to develop the argument carried on in the proof of the main result.

A Gaussian mixture example

Proposition A.1. *Let p_n be a Gaussian mixture in \mathbb{R}^d having density law*

$$p_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x - \mu_i|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (14)$$

with $\sigma_i > 0$, $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\beta_i \in [0, 1]$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = 1$. Then, $-\log p_n$ is weakly convex with coefficients

$$\alpha_{p_n} = \frac{1}{\max_{i \in \{0, \dots, n\}} \sigma_i^2}, \quad \sqrt{M_{p_n}} := 2n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mu_i\|}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

Moreover, we have that $\nabla \log p_n$ is $(\beta_{p_n} + \sqrt{M_{p_n}})$ -Lipschitz, with

$$\beta_{p_n} = \frac{1}{\min_{i \in \{0, \dots, n\}} \sigma_i^2}.$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Step 1. Gaussian mixture of two equi-weighted modes. Consider, first, the following Gaussian mixture of two modes with equal weight, *i.e.*, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1/2$, each mode having same variance $\sigma^2 \mathbb{I}$. Remark that the property of being weakly log-concave is invariant to translation. Therefore, up to a translation, we have that the density distribution of this law is

$$p_2(x) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x - \mu|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x + \mu|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right),$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This means that its score function is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \log p_2(x) &= -\frac{x}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{|x - \mu|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{|x + \mu|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}{\exp\left(-\frac{|x - \mu|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{|x + \mu|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)} \\ &= -\frac{x}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) - 1}{\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

We focus now on bounding $\kappa_{-\log p}$. Fix $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{(\nabla \log p_2(x) - \nabla \log p_2(y))^\top (x - y)}{\|x - y\|^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{\sigma^2 \|x - y\|^2} \times \left(\frac{\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) - 1}{\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) + 1} - \frac{\exp(\mu^\top y / \sigma^2) - 1}{\exp(\mu^\top y / \sigma^2) + 1} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{\sigma^2 \|x - y\|^2} \times \left(\frac{2(\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) - \exp(\mu^\top y / \sigma^2))}{(\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) + 1)(\exp(\mu^\top y / \sigma^2) + 1)} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{\sigma^2 \|x - y\|^2} \times \left(\frac{2(\exp(\mu^\top (x - y) / \sigma^2) - 1)}{(\exp(\mu^\top x / \sigma^2) + 1)(\exp(-\mu^\top y / \sigma^2) + 1)} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{\sigma^2 \|x - y\|^2} \times \left(\frac{2(\exp(\mu^\top (x - y) / \sigma^2) - 1)}{(\exp(\mu^\top (x - y) / \sigma^2) + 1)} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - 2 \frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{\sigma^2 \|x - y\|^2} \times \tanh \left(\frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{2\sigma^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that, the minimum of the r.h.s. of the previous inequality, under the constraint $|x - y| = r$, is reached for a vector $x - y$ that is colinear with μ . Taking $x = y - \frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}r$, we get

$$\kappa_{-\log p_2}(r) \geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - 2 \frac{\|\mu\|}{\sigma^2} r^{-1} \tanh \left(\frac{\|\mu\|}{2\sigma^2} r \right).$$

From the definition of f_M as in (11) and the fact that the function $M \mapsto f_M(r)$ is increasing for a fixed $r > 0$, we can take

$$\alpha_{p_2} := \frac{1}{\sigma^2}, \quad \sqrt{M_{p_2}} := 4\sqrt{2} \frac{\|\mu\|}{\sigma^2}.$$

Moreover, recalling the expression we got for $\nabla \log p_2$ and repeating similar computations, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla \log p_n(x) - \nabla \log p_n(y)\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \|x - y\| + \left\| \tanh \left(\frac{\mu^\top (x - y)}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right\| \left\| \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \|x - y\| + \left(\frac{\|\mu\|}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 \|x - y\| \leq (\beta_{p_2} + M_{p_2}) \|x - y\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the second inequality we have used the sub-linearity of $x \mapsto \tanh x$ together with Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

Step 2. General Gaussian mixture. Consider p_n defined as in (14). Therefore, its score function is

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \log p_n(x) &= \frac{1}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[-\beta_i \frac{x - \mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \times \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp \left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) \right] \\
&= -\frac{x}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp \left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mu_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp \left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Fix $r > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|x - y\| = r$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{r^2} (\nabla \log p_n(x) - \nabla \log p_n(y))^\top (x - y) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \frac{x}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mu_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{y}{p_n(y)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{p_n(y)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mu_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right\}^\top (x - y) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \left[\frac{x}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{y}{p_n(y)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right]^\top (x - y) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{r^2} \left[\frac{1}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mu_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{p_n(y)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mu_i \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right]^\top (x - y) \\
&= A_1 + A_2.
\end{aligned}$$

We now proceed in bounding the two terms in the r.h.s. of the previous equation. We see that

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{r^2} [x \psi_n(x) - y \psi_n(y)]^\top (x - y),$$

with

$$\psi_n(x) := \frac{1}{p_n(x)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta_i}{\sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right).$$

Without loss of generality, since x and y are interchangeable, we can suppose that $\psi_n(y) \leq \psi_n(x)$. From the definition of p_n as in (14), we have that $\alpha_{p_n} \leq \psi_n(x)$ and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \frac{1}{r^2} [x \psi_n(x) - y \psi_n(y)]^\top (x - y) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{r^2} \psi_n(x) (x - y)^\top (x - y) = \psi_n(x) \geq \alpha_{p_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now A_2 and denote $\mathbf{e}_i(z) := \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_i^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|z - \mu_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right)$, for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i \in$

$\{1, \dots, n\}$. Using a telescopic sum, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \left[\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{e}_j(x) + \beta_i \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mathbf{e}_i(x) + \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{e}_j(y)}{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \mathbf{e}_j(x) + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(x) + \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{e}_j(y)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{e}_j(x) + \beta_i \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mathbf{e}_i(y) + \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{e}_j(y)}{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \mathbf{e}_j(x) + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(y) + \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{e}_j(y)} \right]^\top (x - y) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \left[\frac{v_i + \beta_i \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mathbf{e}_i(x)}{\gamma_i + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(x)} - \frac{v_i + \beta_i \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \mathbf{e}_i(y)}{\gamma_i + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(y)} \right]^\top (x - y), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} v_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{e}_j(x) + \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{e}_j(y), \\ \gamma_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \beta_j \mathbf{e}_j(x) + \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{e}_j(y). \end{aligned}$$

This means that, using that

$$(\gamma_i + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(x)) (\gamma_i + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(y)) \geq \gamma_i \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(x) + \gamma_i \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(y)$$

since all $\gamma_i^2 \geq 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \left[\frac{\beta_i (\mathbf{e}_i(x) - \mathbf{e}_i(y)) \left(\gamma_i \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} - v_i \right)}{(\gamma_i + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(x)) (\gamma_i + \beta_i \mathbf{e}_i(y))} \right]^\top (x - y) \\ &\geq - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \left[\frac{\beta_i (\mathbf{e}_i(x) - \mathbf{e}_i(y)) \left(\gamma_i \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} - v_i \right)}{\beta_i \gamma_i (\mathbf{e}_i(x) + \mathbf{e}_i(y))} \right]^\top (x - y) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\mathbf{e}_i(x) - \mathbf{e}_i(y)}{\mathbf{e}_i(x) + \mathbf{e}_i(y)} \left(\frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} - \frac{v_i}{\gamma_i} \right)^\top (x - y) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \tanh \left(\frac{\mu_i^\top (x - y)}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) \left(\frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right)^\top (x - y) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \tanh \left(\frac{\mu_i^\top (x - y)}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) \left(\frac{v_i}{\gamma_i} \right)^\top (x - y). \end{aligned}$$

First, note that, as in the *Step 1*, we have that

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \tanh \left(\frac{\mu_i^\top (x - y)}{\sigma_i^2} \right) \left(\frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right)^\top (x - y) \leq \frac{1}{r} f_{M_i}(r), \quad \text{with } \sqrt{M_i} := \frac{\|\mu_i\|}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

Secondly, for a fixed $r > 0$, we see that the function $f_M(r)$ is increasing in M . Therefore, we get

$$- \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \tanh \left(\frac{\mu_i^\top (x - y)}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) \left(\frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right)^\top (x - y) \geq -n \frac{1}{r} f_{\hat{M}}(r), \quad \text{with } \sqrt{\hat{M}} := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mu_i\|}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

Note that v_i/γ_i is a convex combination of the vectors $\{\mu_j/\sigma_j^2\}_{j \neq i}$. Therefore, using again that $M \mapsto f_M(r)$ is increasing for a fixed $r > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{r^2} \tanh \left(\frac{\mu_i^\top (x - y)}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) \left(\frac{v_i}{\gamma_i} \right)^\top (x - y) \geq -n \frac{1}{r} f_{\hat{M}}(r).$$

Combining the previous bounds, together with monotonicity of $M \mapsto \tanh(\sqrt{M}r/2)$ for fixed $r > 0$, we can conclude that

$$A_2 \geq -\frac{1}{r} f_{M_{p_n}}(r), \quad \text{with } \sqrt{M_{p_n}} := 2n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mu_i\|}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

Combining the bound on A_1 with the one on A_2 , we can conclude that $-\log(p_n)$ is weakly convex with parameters α_{p_n} and M_{p_n} .

We now bound $\|\nabla \log p_n(x) - \nabla \log p_n(y)\|$. Following the same lines as before, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \log p_n(x) - \nabla \log p_n(y)\| &\leq \|x \psi_n(x) - y \psi_n(y)\| + \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \tanh\left(\frac{\mu_i^\top(x-y)}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \right| \left\| \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} - \frac{v_i}{\gamma_i} \right\| \\ &:= B_1 + B_2. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of p_n as in (14), we have that $\psi_n(x) \leq \beta_{p_n}$ and, therefore,

$$B_1 \leq \max\{\psi_n(x), \psi_n(y)\} \|x - y\| \leq \beta_{p_n} \|x - y\|.$$

Analogously to the bound on A_2 , we now use the sub-linearity of $x \mapsto \tanh x$, Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the triangle one, together with the fact that v_i/γ_i is a convex combination of the vectors $\{\mu_j/\sigma_j^2\}_{j \neq i}$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{\mu_i^\top(x-y)}{2\sigma_i^2} \right| \left\| \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} - \frac{v_i}{\gamma_i} \right\| \leq \|x - y\| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right\| \left(\left\| \frac{\mu_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right\| + \left\| \frac{v_i}{\gamma_i} \right\| \right) \\ &\leq 2n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\|\mu_i\|}{\sigma_i^2} \right)^2 \|x - y\| \leq M_{p_n} \|x - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Putting together these inequalities, we obtain that $\nabla \log(p_n)$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $(\beta_{p_n} + M_{p_n})$. \square

B Regularity properties of the modified score function

The proof of Theorem D.1 is based on some regularity properties of the score function $(t, x) \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$. Therefore, in this section, we establish the key regularity properties of $\nabla \log \tilde{p}$, which arise from the propagation of Assumption H1 through the OU process flow (3).

B.1 Weak-log concavity implies finite second order moment

Proposition B.1. *Suppose that Assumption H1(ii) holds. Then, π_{data} admits a second order moment.*

Proof. Consider the following Taylor development up to order two.

$$U(x) = U(0) + \nabla U(x)^\top x + \frac{1}{2} x^\top \nabla^2 U(y) x,$$

for some $y \in \{tx : t \in [0, 1]\}$. From Assumption H1(ii), we have that

$$-\nabla U(x)^\top x \leq -\alpha|x|^2 + f_M(|x|)|x| \leq -\alpha|x|^2 + M|x|.$$

This means that outside a ball $B(0, R)$ with R big enough, there exists $\alpha_R > 0$ such that

$$-\nabla U(x)^\top x \leq -\alpha_R|x|^2, \quad \text{for } x \notin B(0, R).$$

From Bouchut et al. (2005, Lemma 2.2), we get that the previous inequality implies that

$$\nabla^2 U \preceq -\alpha_R I_d.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 \exp(-U(x)) \, dx \\
&= \int_{B(0,R)} |x|^2 \exp(-U(x)) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0,R)} |x|^2 \exp(-U(x)) \, dx \\
&= \int_{B(0,R)} |x|^2 \exp(-U(x)) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0,R)} |x|^2 \exp\left(-U(0) - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2|x|^2\right) \, dx < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.2 Regularity in space of the modified score function

Proposition B.2. *Assume that Assumption H1(i) holds and fix $t \in [0, T]$. Then, it holds*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla^2 \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)\| \leq L_t \leq L, \quad (15)$$

where

$$L_t = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - e^{-2(T-t)}}; e^{2(T-t)} L_U \right\} + 1, \quad L = 2 + L_U. \quad (16)$$

In particular, the modified score function $x \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ is L_t -Lipschitz, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(y)\| \leq L_t \|x - y\|, \quad (17)$$

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Recall that the transition density associated to the Orstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup is given by

$$q_t(x, y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi(1 - e^{-2t}))^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - e^{-t}x\|^2}{2(1 - e^{-2t})}\right). \quad (18)$$

Therefore, \vec{p}_t is given by

$$\vec{p}_t(y) = \int \frac{1}{(2\pi(1 - e^{-2t}))^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - e^{-t}x\|^2}{2(1 - e^{-2t})} - U(x)\right) \, dx.$$

This means that \vec{p}_t is the density of the sum of two independent random variables $Y_t^1 + Y_t^0$ of density respectively $q_{0,t}$ and $q_{1,t}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{0,t}(x) &:= e^{td} e^{-U(e^t x)} = e^{-\phi_{0,t}(x)}, \\
q_{1,t}(x) &:= \frac{1}{(2\pi(1 - e^{-2t}))^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2(1 - e^{-2t})}\right) = e^{-\phi_{1,t}(x)},
\end{aligned}$$

for two functions $\phi_{0,t}$ and $\phi_{1,t}$. From the proof of Saumard and Wellner (Proposition 7.1, 2014), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 (-\log \vec{p}_t)(x) &= -\text{Var}(\nabla \phi_{0,t}(X_0) | X_0 + X_1 = x) + \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 \phi_{0,t}(X_0) | X_0 + X_1 = x] \\
&= -\text{Var}(\nabla \phi_{1,t}(X_1) | X_0 + X_1 = x) + \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 \phi_{1,t}(X_1) | X_0 + X_1 = x].
\end{aligned}$$

From Bouchut et al. (2005, Lemma 2.2) and Assumption H1(i), we get that the one-sided Lipschitz assumption entails the following inequality over the Hessian of the log-density

$$\nabla^2 U \preceq L_U I_d.$$

Combining this with the fact that $\phi_{0,t}(x) = U(e^t x) + C$ (resp. $\phi_1 = 1/(2(1 - e^{-2t})) \|y\|^2 + C'$) for some positive constant C (resp. C'), we obtain

$$\nabla^2 \phi_{0,t} \preceq e^{2t} L_U I_d \quad \left(\text{resp. } \nabla^2 \phi_{1,t} \preceq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-2t}} I_d \right),$$

which yields that

$$\nabla^2 (-\log \vec{p}_t)(x) \preceq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - e^{-2t}}; e^{2t} L_U \right\} I_d.$$

Moreover, since the difference between $\nabla \log \vec{p}_t$ and $\nabla \log \tilde{p}_t$ is a linear function, we define L_t as in (16). Moreover, a simple computation shows that the maximum over $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ of L_t is clearly L defined as in (16). \square

B.3 Weak-convexity of the modified score function

In this section, we leverage the invariance of the class of weakly convex functions for the HJB equation satisfied by the log-density of the OU process (demonstrated by Conforti (2024)) to show how weak log-concavity propagates along the flow of (3). To this end, let $(S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ denote the semigroup generated by a standard Brownian motion on \mathbb{R}^d , *i.e.*,

$$S_t f(x) = \int \frac{1}{(2\pi t)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2t}\right) f(y) dy, \quad (19)$$

with f a general test function.

Theorem B.3 (Theorem 2.1 in Conforti (2024)). *Consider the class*

$$\mathcal{F}_M := \left\{ g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : \kappa_g(r) \geq -f_M(r)r^{-1} \right\}.$$

Then, we have that

$$h \in \mathcal{F}_M \quad \Rightarrow \quad -\log S_t e^{-h} \in \mathcal{F}_M, \quad \text{for } t \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

Theorem B.3 provides a substantial generalization of the the principle “*once log-concave, always log-concave*” by Saremi et al. (2023), to the weak log-concave setting. Indeed, when $M = 0$, *i.e.*, e^{-h} is log-concave, (20) implies that $S_t e^{-h}$ remains log-concave. We remark that in the log-concave setting, (20) follows directly from the Prékopa-Leindler inequality, whose application is central to the findings in Bruno et al. (2023); Gao et al. (2023); Strasman et al. (2024).

We can now examine how the constant of weak log-concavity propagates. This result corresponds to Conforti et al. (2023b, Lemma 5.9), under the same set of assumptions.

Lemma B.4 (Lemma 5.9 in Conforti et al. (2023b)). *Assume that Assumption H1(ii) holds and fix $t \in [0, T]$. Then, the function $x \mapsto -\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ is weakly convex with weak convexity profile $\tilde{k}_t := \kappa_{-\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}}$ satisfying*

$$\tilde{k}_t(r) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)}} - 1 - \frac{e^{-(T-t)}}{\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)}} \frac{1}{r} f_M \left(\frac{e^{-(T-t)}}{\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)}} r \right). \quad (21)$$

In particular, the modified score function $x \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ satisfies

$$(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(y))^\top (x - y) \leq -C_t \|x - y\|^2, \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (22)$$

with C_t given by

$$C_t = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)}} - \frac{e^{-2(T-t)}}{(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)})^2} M - 1. \quad (23)$$

This lemma relies on the fact that the the flow of the OU process (3) can be rewritten w.r.t. the flow of the Brownian motion as

$$\tilde{p}_t(x) = S_{1-e^{-2t}} e^{-(U-\|\cdot\|^2/2)}(e^{-t}x) .$$

This remark enables the application of Theorem B.3, to obtain an estimation of the constant of weak log-concavity C_t .

C Propagation of the assumptions

As highlighted in Conforti et al. (2023a), we observe that the function $(t, x) \mapsto -\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ is a solution to a HJB equation. This observation allows us to establish an intriguing connection between the study of this class of non-linear PDEs and SGMs, as further explored in Conforti et al. (2023a); Silveri et al. (2024).

By leveraging the regularizing properties of the OU process, we observe that the assumptions made on U are propagated along the HJB equation under question, as we will prove in Appendix B. This has direct consequences on the modified score $(t, x) \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ which turns out to be L_t -Lipschitz in space, with

$$L_t := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - e^{-2(T-t)}}; e^{2(T-t)} L_U \right\} + 1 ,$$

Moreover, by leveraging the considerations made in Conforti (2023), we show that $(t, x) \mapsto -\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ has a weak convexity profile satisfying

$$\kappa_{-\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}}(r) \geq C_t , \quad (24)$$

with

$$C_t = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)}} - \frac{e^{-2(T-t)}}{(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2(T-t)})^2} M - 1 . \quad (25)$$

Therefore, the modified score function $(t, x) \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ satisfies

$$(x - y)^\top (\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(y)) \leq -C_t \|x - y\|^2 ,$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ and any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Log-concavity. Note that the constant $(C_{T-t} + 1)$ represents the (weak) log-concavity constant of the density \vec{p}_t associated with the process \vec{X}_t . The estimate for $(C_{T-t} + 1)$ is coherent with the intuition we have on the SGMs. Indeed, for $t = 0$ it matches the weak log-concavity constant of π_{data} , as $C_T + 1 = \alpha - M$, and for $t \rightarrow +\infty$ it matches the log-concavity constant of π^∞ , as

$$C_{T-t} + 1 = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2t}} - \frac{e^{-2t}}{(\alpha + (1 - \alpha)e^{-2t})^2} M \longrightarrow 1, \quad \text{for } t \rightarrow +\infty .$$

Computing when $C_{T-t} + 1 > 0$, we have that two regimes appear:

- \vec{p}_t is only weakly log-concave for $t \in [0, \xi(\alpha, M)]$;
- \vec{p}_t is log-concave for $t \in [\xi(\alpha, M), T]$,

with

$$\xi(\alpha, M) := \begin{cases} \log \left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha^2 + M - \alpha}{\alpha^2}} \right) \wedge T, & \text{if } \alpha - M < 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

When π_{data} is only weakly log-concave, *i.e.*, when $\alpha - M < 0$, we have that $\frac{\alpha^2 + M - \alpha}{\alpha^2} > 1$. Thus, $\xi(\alpha, M) > 0$ and two distinct regimes are present. Whereas, when the initial distribution π_{data} is log-concave, *i.e.*, when $\alpha - M \geq 0$, we have that $\xi(\alpha, M) = 0$ and \vec{p}_t is log-concave in the whole interval $[0, T]$.

Contractivity properties of the time-reversal process. Denote by T^* the following time

$$T^* := \inf \left\{ t \in [0, T] : 2\kappa_{-\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}} + 1 \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (26)$$

defining $\inf \emptyset := T$. From equation (5), we see that the time T^* corresponds to the first moment beyond which the drift b_t of the time reversal process is no longer contractive, with

$$b_t(x) := -x + 2\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x). \quad (27)$$

Indeed, from the very definition of $\kappa_{-\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}}$, we get that

$$(b_t(x) - b_t(y))^\top (x - y) \leq -(2\kappa_{-\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}}(\|x - y\|) + 1)\|x - y\|^2,$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ and any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Also, denote by

$$T(\alpha, M, \rho) := \sup \left\{ t \in [0, T] : 2C_t + 1 \geq 0 \right\},$$

for $\rho \in [0, 1)$, with $\inf \emptyset := T$. From (24), we have that $T(\alpha, M, 0) \leq T^*$. This means that two regimes are present in the time interval $[0, T]$:

- $b_t(x)$ is contractive, for $t \in [0, T(\alpha, M, 0)]$;
- $b_t(x)$ is not (necessarily) contractive, for $t \in [T(\alpha, M, 0), T]$.

The advantage of introducing $T(\alpha, M, \rho)$ is that we can compute it explicitly, thereby deriving a quantitative lower bound for T^* . Indeed, a straightforward computation shows that

$$T(\alpha, M, \rho) = T - \eta(\alpha, M, \rho), \quad (28)$$

with

$$\eta(\alpha, M, \rho) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{M + \rho\alpha(1-\alpha)}{(1-\rho)\alpha^2} + \sqrt{\frac{(1+\rho)(1-\alpha)^2}{(1-\rho)\alpha^2} + \left(\frac{M + \rho\alpha(1-\alpha)}{(1-\rho)\alpha^2} \right)^2} \right) \wedge T, & \text{if } 2\alpha - 2M - 1 < 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Note that the condition

$$\frac{M + \rho\alpha(1-\alpha)}{(1-\rho)\alpha^2} + \sqrt{\frac{(1+\rho)(1-\alpha)^2}{(1-\rho)\alpha^2} + \left(\frac{M + \rho\alpha(1-\alpha)}{(1-\rho)\alpha^2} \right)^2} > 1$$

is equivalent to the condition $2\alpha - 2M - 1 < 0$. This means that $T(\alpha, M, \rho)$ is well-defined and $T(\alpha, M, \rho) \in [0, T]$.

This regime shift is a key element in the effectiveness of the SGMs. SDEs with contractive flows exhibit advantageous properties related to efficiency guarantees (see, *e.g.*, Dalalyan, 2017; Durmus and Moulines, 2017; Cheng et al., 2018; Dwivedi et al., 2019; Shen and Lee, 2019; Cao et al., 2020; Mou et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021) that we can exploit in the low-time regime.

D Proof of the Main Theorem

Recall the main regularity properties from Section B:

1. the modified score function $(t, x) \mapsto \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ is L_t -Lipschitz in space (uniformly in time), with L_t as in (16), and bounded by $L = L_U + 2$ as seen in (15);
2. the function $(t, x) \mapsto -\log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(x)$ is C_t -weakly concave, with C_t as in (23).

In the practical implementation of the algorithm, three successive approximations are made, generating three distinct sources of errors. To identify them, we introduce the following two processes.

- Let $(X_{t_k}^N)_{k=0}^N$ be the EM–approximation of the backward process (5) started at $X_0^N \sim \mathcal{L}(\vec{X}_T)$ and defined recursively on $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ as

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^N = X_{t_k}^N + h_k (-X_{t_k}^N + 2\nabla \log \tilde{p}(T - t_k, X_{t_k}^N)) + \sqrt{2h_k} Z_k, \quad \text{for } t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}],$$

with $\{Z_k\}_k$ a sequence of i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables.

- Let $(X_{t_k}^\infty)_{k=0}^N$ be the EM–approximation of the backward process (5) started at $X_0^\infty \sim \pi^\infty$ and defined recursively on $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ as

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^\infty = X_{t_k}^\infty + h_k (-X_{t_k}^\infty + 2\nabla \log \tilde{p}(T - t_k, X_{t_k}^\infty)) + \sqrt{2h_k} Z_k, \quad \text{for } t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}].$$

We also recall that $(X_{t_k}^*)_{k=0}^N$ defined in (7) denotes the process started at $X_0^* \sim \pi^\infty$ and defined recursively on $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ as

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^* = X_{t_k}^* + h_k (-X_{t_k}^* + 2s_{\theta^*}(T - t_k, X_{t_k}^*)) + \sqrt{2h_k} Z_k, \quad \text{for } t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}].$$

By an abuse of notation, we use X^N , X^∞ , and X^* to refer to both the discrete-time versions of these processes and their continuous-time interpolations. Applying the triangle inequality, we derive the following decomposition of the error bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)) \\ & \leq \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(\vec{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N)) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty)) + \mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem D.1. *Suppose that Assumption H1 and H2 hold. Consider the discretization $\{t_k, 0 \leq k \leq N\}$ of $[0, T]$ of constant step size h such that*

$$h < \frac{2}{(2L_U + 5)^2}. \quad (30)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)) \\ & \leq e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(h, \alpha, M, L_U)} \left[e^{-T} \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \pi^\infty) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 4\varepsilon(T(\alpha, M, 0)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sqrt{2h}(B + 2(2L_U + 3)d)(T(\alpha, M, 0)) \right], \end{aligned}$$

with

$$B := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\|^2 \pi_{\text{data}}(dx) + d \right)^{1/2}. \quad (31)$$

In the following, we establish separate bounds for each term, contributing to the overall convergence bound, based on the preceding analysis.

D.1 Bound on $\mathcal{W}_2 \left(\mathcal{L}(\overleftarrow{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N) \right)$

Consider the synchronous coupling between $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and the continuous-time interpolation of $(X_{t_k}^N)_{k=0}^N$ with the same initialization, *i.e.* use the same Brownian motion to drive the two processes and set $\overleftarrow{X}_0 = X_0^N$. Then, it holds

$$\mathcal{W}_2 \left(\mathcal{L}(\overleftarrow{X}_T), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N) \right) \leq \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_T - X_T^N \right\|_{L_2}.$$

To upper bound the r.h.s., we estimate $\left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N \right\|_{L_2}$ by means of $\left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2}$, and develop the recursion.

Fix $0 < \epsilon < h$ and, with abuse of notation, use T to denote $T - \epsilon$ and N to denote $(T - \epsilon)/h$. This measure is necessary to enable the application of Conforti et al. (2023a, Proposition 2) later on. As we considered the synchronous coupling between \overleftarrow{X} and X^N , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N \\ &= \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t - X_{t_k}^N \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right\} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N \right\|_{L_2} \\ & \leq \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2} \\ & \quad + \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t - X_{t_k}^N \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right\} dt \right\|_{L_2} \\ & \quad + \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t - \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_t \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) \right) \right\} dt \right\|_{L_2} \\ & =: A_{1,k} + A_{2,k}, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Bound of $A_{1,k}$. The first term of r.h.s. of (32) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{1,k}^2 &= \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\ & \quad + h^2 \left\| - \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\ & \quad + 2h \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right)^\top \left(- \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} \right) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k} \left(X_{t_k}^N \right) \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since h satisfies (30), using Lemma E.2, we have that

$$h \leq \frac{2C_t + 1}{2(2L_U + 5)^2} \wedge 1, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)],$$

with $\eta(\alpha, M, \rho)$ as in (29).

Define $N_h := \sup \{k \in \{0, \dots, N\} : t_k \leq T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)\}$. Using the regularity properties of the score function from Proposition B.2 and Proposition B.4, we have

$$A_{1,k} \leq \begin{cases} \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2} \left(1 + h^2 (2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 - 2h(2C_{t_k} + 1) \right)^{1/2}, & \text{for } k < N_h, \\ \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2} \left(1 + h^2 (2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 + 2h(2L_{t_k} + 1) \right)^{1/2}, & \text{for } k \geq N_h \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

$$:= \delta_k \left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2}. \tag{34}$$

Bound of $A_{2,k}$. Given the definition (27) of the backward drift b_t , Jensen's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,k}^2 &= \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \{b_t(\bar{X}_t) - b_{t_k}(\bar{X}_{t_k})\} dt \right\|_{L^2}^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \{b_t(\bar{X}_t) - b_{t_k}(\bar{X}_{t_k})\} dt \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq h \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| b_t(\bar{X}_t) - b_{t_k}(\bar{X}_{t_k}) \right\|^2 \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula and Conforti et al. (Proposition 2, 2023a), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} db_t(\bar{X}_t) &= -d\bar{X}_t + \left(2\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\bar{X}_t) \right) dt \\ &= \left\{ \bar{X}_t - 2\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\bar{X}_t) + 2\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\bar{X}_t) \right\} dt + \sqrt{2} \left(1 + 2\nabla^2 \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\bar{X}_t) \right) dB_t \\ &= \bar{X}_t dt + \sqrt{2} \left(1 + 2\nabla^2 \log \tilde{p}_{T-t}(\bar{X}_t) \right) dB_t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using Jensen's inequality, Ito's isometry, Proposition B.2 and Lemma E.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| b_t(\bar{X}_t) - b_{t_k}(\bar{X}_{t_k}) \right\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_{t_k}^t \bar{X}_s ds + \sqrt{2} \int_{t_k}^t \left(1 + 2\nabla^2 \log \tilde{p}_{T-s}(\bar{X}_s) \right) dB_s \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[2 \int_{t_k}^t \left\| \bar{X}_s \right\|^2 ds + 4 \int_{t_k}^t \left\| \mathbb{I} + 2\nabla^2 \log \tilde{p}_{T-s}(\bar{X}_s) \right\|_{\text{Fr}}^2 ds \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[2 \int_{t_k}^t \left\| \bar{X}_s \right\|^2 ds + 8 \int_{t_k}^t d \left\{ 1 + 4 \left\| \nabla^2 \log \tilde{p}_{T-s}(\bar{X}_s) \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right\} ds \right] \\ &\leq 2 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \bar{X}_s \right\|^2 \right] ds + 8hd(1 + 4L^2d) \\ &\leq 2hB^2 + 8hd(1 + 4L^2). \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that

$$\|A\|_{\text{Fr}}^2 \leq d\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2, \quad \text{for a symmetric matrix } A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},$$

with $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Fr}}$ (resp. $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$) the Frobenius norm (operatorial norm) of a matrix.

Consequently, we have that

$$A_{2,k} \leq \left(h \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \{2hB^2 + 8hd(1 + 4L^2)\} dt \right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{2h}(B + 2(2L_U + 3)d)h.$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\left\| \bar{X}_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_{k+1}}^N \right\|_{L_2} \leq \delta_k \left\| \bar{X}_{t_k} - X_{t_k}^N \right\|_{L_2} + \sqrt{2h}(B + 2(2L_U + 3)d)h. \quad (35)$$

Developing the recursion (35) and using the fact that $\bar{X}_0 = X_0^N$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bar{X}_T - X_T^N \right\|_{L_2} &\leq \left\| \bar{X}_0 - X_0^N \right\|_{L_2} \prod_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \delta_\ell + \sqrt{2h}(B + 2(2L_U + 3)d)h \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \\ &= \sqrt{2h}(B + 2(2L_U + 3)d)h \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma E.2 yields that $\delta_k \leq 1$ for $k < N_h$. Whereas, for $k \geq N_h$, Proposition B.2 yields

$$\delta_k = \left(1 + h^2(2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 + 2h(2L_{t_k} + 1) \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 + h(2L_U + 5).$$

Combining the previous remarks, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell &= \sum_{k=0}^{N_h-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N_h-1} \delta_\ell \times \prod_{\ell=N_h}^{N-1} \delta_\ell + \sum_{k=N_h}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \\
&\leq N_h \prod_{\ell=N_h}^{N-1} \delta_\ell + \sum_{k=N_h}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \\
&\leq N_h (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-N_h} + \sum_{k=N_h}^{N-1} (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-k-1} \\
&\leq N_h (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-N_h} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-N_h-1} (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^k \\
&= N_h (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-N_h} + \frac{1 - (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-N_h}}{1 - (1 + h(2L_U + 5))} \\
&\leq \left(N_h + \frac{1}{h(2L_U + 5)} \right) \times (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-N_h} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)}{h} + \frac{1}{h(2L_U + 5)} \right) e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting all these inequalities together, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \overleftarrow{X}_T - X_T^N \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2h} (B + 2(2L_U + 3)d) \left(T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2) + \frac{1}{2L_U + 5} \right) e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2h} (B + 2(2L_U + 3)d) \left(T(\alpha, M, 0) + \frac{1}{2L_U + 5} \right) e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)},
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last inequality, we have used the fact that

$$T(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2) = T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2) \leq T - \eta(\alpha, M, 0) = T(\alpha, M, 0).$$

Recalling that we have used T to denote $T - \epsilon$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \overleftarrow{X}_{T-\epsilon} - X_{T-\epsilon}^N \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2h} (B + 2(2L_U + 3)d) \left(T(\alpha, M, 0) + \frac{1}{2L_U + 5} \right) e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2h} (B + 2(2L_U + 3)d) \left(T(\alpha, M, 0) + \frac{1}{2L_U + 5} \right) e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting ϵ going to zero and using Fatou's lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \overleftarrow{X}_T - X_T^N \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2h} (B + 2(2L_U + 3)d) \left(T(\alpha, M, 0) + \frac{1}{2L_U + 5} \right) e^{(2L_U + 5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

D.2 Bound on $\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty))$

Consider the synchronous coupling between the continuous-time interpolations of $(X_{t_k}^N)_{k=0}^N$ and $(X_{t_k}^\infty)_{k=0}^N$ with initialization satisfying

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\pi^\infty, \mathcal{L}(\overrightarrow{X}_T)) = \|X_0^\infty - X_0^N\|_{L^2}.$$

Then, we have that

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^N), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty)) \leq \|X_T^N - X_T^\infty\|_{L_2}.$$

As done in Section D.1, we aim to develop a recursion over the time intervals $[t_{k+1}, t_k]$. To this end, note that, based on the definitions of $(X_t^N)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(X_t^\infty)_{t \in [0, T]}$, and using the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| X_{t_{k+1}}^N - X_{t_{k+1}}^\infty \right\|_{L_2} \\ &= \left\| X_{t_k}^N - X_{t_k}^\infty + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ - (X_{t_k}^N - X_{t_k}^\infty) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^N) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^\infty) \right) \right\} dt \right\|_{L_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Proceeding as in Section D.1, we get

$$\|X_T^N - X_T^\infty\|_{L_2} \leq \|X_0^N - X_0^\infty\|_{L_2} \prod_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \delta_\ell,$$

with δ_k defined as in (34). We bound the first factor in the following (by now) standard (see, *e.g.*, the proof of Proposition C.2, Strasman et al., 2024)

$$\|X_0^N - X_0^\infty\|_{L_2} = \mathcal{W}_2(\pi^\infty, \mathcal{L}(\vec{X}_T)) \leq e^{-T} \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \pi^\infty).$$

To bound the second factor, we proceed as in Section D.1 and get

$$\prod_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \leq \prod_{\ell=N_h}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \leq (1 + h(2L_U + 5))^{N-N_h} \leq e^{(2L_U+5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U+5)^2 h/2)}.$$

Putting these inequalities together, we get

$$\|X_T^N - X_T^\infty\|_{L_2} \leq e^{-T} e^{(2L_U+5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U+5)^2 h/2)} \mathcal{W}_2(\pi_{\text{data}}, \pi^\infty).$$

D.3 Bound on $\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*))$

Consider the synchronous coupling between the continuous-time interpolation of $(X_{t_k}^\infty)_{k=0}^N$ and $(X_{t_k}^*)_{k=0}^N$, with the same initialization, *i.e.* use the same Brownian motion to drive the two processes and set $X_0^\infty = X_0^*$. Then, it holds

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^\infty), \mathcal{L}(X_{t_N}^*)) \leq \|X_T^\infty - X_T^*\|_{L_2}.$$

As done in Sections D.1-D.2, we aim to develop a recursion over the time intervals $[t_{k+1}, t_k]$. To this end, using the triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| X_{t_{k+1}}^\infty - X_{t_{k+1}}^* \right\|_{L_2} \\ &= \left\| X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^* + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ - (X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^*) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^\infty) - \tilde{s}_{\theta^*}(T-t_k, X_{t_k}^*) \right) \right\} dt \right\|_{L_2}^2 \\ &\leq \left\| X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^* \right\|_{L_2} \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\{ - (X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^*) + 2 \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^\infty) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^*) \right) \right\} dt \right\|_{L_2} \\ &+ 4 \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(\nabla \log \tilde{p}_{T-t_k}(X_{t_k}^*) - \tilde{s}_{\theta^*}(T-t_k, X_{t_k}^*) \right) dt \right\|_{L_2} \\ &= B_{1,k} + B_{2,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Following the same reasoning of the previous sections, we have that

$$B_{1,k} \leq \delta_k \|X_{t_k}^\infty - X_{t_k}^*\|_{L_2},$$

with δ_k defined as in (34). Moreover, using Assumption H2, we have that $B_{2,k} \leq 4h\epsilon$.

Developing the recursion as in the previous sections and recalling that $X_0^\infty = X_0^*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_T^\infty - X_T^*\|_{L_2}^2 &\leq 4h\epsilon \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \prod_{\ell=k}^{N-1} \delta_\ell \\ &\leq 4\epsilon \left(T(\alpha, M, 0) + \frac{1}{2L_U + 5} \right) e^{(2L_U+5)\eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U+5)^2h/2)}. \end{aligned}$$

E Technical lemmata

Lemma E.1. *Assume that H1(iii) holds. Then, for $t \geq 0$,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\overleftarrow{X}_t\|_{L_2} \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left(e^{-2(T-t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 \pi_{\text{data}}(dx) + \left(1 - e^{-2(T-t)}\right) d \right)^{1/2} \leq B < \infty,$$

for B defined as in (31).

Proof. Recall the following equality in law

$$\overrightarrow{X}_t = e^{-t} X_0 + \sqrt{(1 - e^{-2t})} G. \quad (38)$$

with $X_0 \sim \pi_{\text{data}}$, $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I})$, and X_0 and G taken to be independent. Therefore, since X_0 and G are independent and \overleftarrow{X}_t has the same law of \overrightarrow{X}_{T-t} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\overleftarrow{X}_t\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\|\overrightarrow{X}_{T-t}\|^2 \right] \leq e^{-2(T-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_0\|^2 \right] + \left(1 - e^{-2(T-t)}\right) \mathbb{E} \left[\|G\|^2 \right] \\ &= e^{-2(T-t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 \pi_{\text{data}}(dx) + \left(1 - e^{-2(T-t)}\right) d, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma E.2. *Suppose that Assumption H1 holds. Consider the regular discretization $\{t_k, 0 \leq k \leq N\}$ of $[0, T]$ of constant step size h . Assume that $h > 0$ satisfies (30). Then, we have that*

$$h \leq \frac{2(2C_t + 1)}{(2L_U + 5)^2} \wedge 1, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2h/2)], \quad (39)$$

with $\eta(\alpha, M, \rho)$ as in (29). Moreover, for all $0 \leq k \leq N - 1$ such that $t_k \leq T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2h/2)$,

$$0 < 1 + h^2(2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 - 2h(2C_{t_k} + 1) \leq 1.$$

Proof. Firstly, note that if h satisfies (30), then $\rho_h := (2L_U + 5)^2h/2$ is such that $\rho_h \in [0, 1)$. Recalling the definitions (28), (29) of $T(\alpha, M, \rho)$ and $\eta(\alpha, M, \rho)$, we have that $2C_t + 1 \geq \rho_h$, up to time $t \leq T - \eta(\alpha, M, \rho_h)$. Otherwise said, we have

$$h \leq \frac{2(2C_t + 1)}{(2L_U + 5)^2} \wedge 1, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2h/2)].$$

Let ϵ_1 be

$$\epsilon_1 := 1 + h^2(2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 - 2h(2C_{t_k} + 1). \quad (40)$$

Completing the square, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_1 &= (1 - h(2L_{t_k} + 1))^2 + 2h(2L_{t_k} + 1) - 2h(2C_{t_k} + 1) \\ &= (1 - h(2L_{t_k} + 1))^2 + 4h(L_{t_k} - C_{t_k}).\end{aligned}$$

The first term of the r.h.s. of the previous equality is a square, therefore always positive. The second term is always strictly positive, as $L_t \geq C_t$ for any t .

Secondly, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_1 &= 1 + h^2(2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 - 2h(2C_{t_k} + 1) \\ &\leq 1 + h\left(h(2L_{t_k} + 1)^2 - 2(2C_{t_k} + 1)\right) \\ &\leq 1 + h\left(h(2L + 1)^2 - 2(2C_{t_k} + 1)\right).\end{aligned}$$

From (39), we have that $\epsilon_1 \leq 1$, for $t_k \leq T - \eta(\alpha, M, (2L_U + 5)^2 h/2)$. This concludes the proof. \square