

A UNIFORM RATE OF CONVERGENCE FOR THE ENTROPIC POTENTIALS IN THE QUADRATIC EUCLIDEAN SETTING

PABLO LÓPEZ-RIVERA

*Université Paris Cité & Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions (LJLL),
F-75013 Paris, France*

ABSTRACT. We bound the rate of uniform convergence in compact sets for both entropic potentials and their gradients towards the Brenier potential and its gradient, respectively. Both results hold in the quadratic Euclidean setting for absolutely continuous measures satisfying some convexity assumptions.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Optimal transport. This note concerns the quadratic Euclidean optimal transport problem between absolutely continuous measures: given two probability measures μ and ν on \mathbb{R}^d which are absolutely continuous with respect to the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, we define the quadratic optimal transport problem associated to them, in its Kantorovich formulation, as

$$\mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |x - y|^2 d\pi(x, y), \quad (1)$$

where $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with first and second marginals equal to μ and ν , respectively. Among excellent monographs on general optimal transport theory, we can cite [Vil03, Vil09, San15]. The Brenier-McCann theorem [Bre91, McC95] states that there exists a convex function $\varphi_0: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the map $T_0: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $T_0 := \nabla \varphi_0$ pushes forward the measure μ towards ν and induces the unique optimal coupling $\pi_0 \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ for the variational problem (1). We say that T_0 is the Brenier or the optimal transport map and φ_0 is a Brenier potential. Moreover, if we define $\psi_0 := \varphi_0^*$ as the convex conjugate of φ_0 , the pair $(f_0, g_0) := \left(\frac{1}{2} |\cdot|^2 - \varphi_0, \frac{1}{2} |\cdot|^2 - \psi_0\right)$ solves the dual problem to (1):

$$\mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\substack{(f, g) \in L^1(\mu) \times L^1(\nu), \\ f \oplus g \leq \frac{1}{2} |\cdot|^2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g d\nu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0 d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_0 d\nu, \quad (2)$$

where for $(f, g) \in L^1(\mu) \times L^1(\nu)$, the function $f \oplus g: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes their sum, which is defined for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by $(f \oplus g)(x, y) := f(x) + g(y)$.

E-mail address: plopez@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr.
Date: February 4, 2025.

1.2. Entropic optimal transport. We can regularize Problem (1) by adding an entropy to the objective function: for $\varepsilon > 0$, we define the entropic regularization of the optimal transport problem (equivalent as well to the Schrödinger bridge [Léo14]) as

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} |x - y|^2 d\pi(x, y) + \varepsilon \mathbf{H}(\pi | \mu \otimes \nu), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{H}(\cdot | \mu \otimes \nu)$ denotes the relative entropy functional with respect to the measure $\mu \otimes \nu$: for any $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathbf{H}(\eta | \mu \otimes \nu) := \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \log \frac{d\eta}{d(\mu \otimes \nu)} d\eta, & \text{if } \eta \ll \mu \otimes \nu \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \eta \not\ll \mu \otimes \nu. \end{cases}$$

An excellent introductory reference to the subject is [Nut21].

The problem (3) is strictly convex, so there automatically exists a unique $\pi_\varepsilon \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ that solves (3). On the other hand, there exists a pair of functions $(f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) \in L^1(\mu) \times L^1(\nu)$ which solves the dual problem to (3):

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{(f, g) \in L^1(\mu) \times L^1(\nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g d\nu - \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{f \oplus g - \frac{1}{2} |\cdot - \cdot|^2}{\varepsilon}} d(\mu \otimes \nu) + \varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_\varepsilon d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_\varepsilon d\nu. \quad (4)$$

We define for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the entropic potentials as $(\varphi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon) := \left(\frac{1}{2} |\cdot|^2 - f_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2} |\cdot|^2 - g_\varepsilon \right)$, in analogy to their unregularized counterpart (φ_0, ψ_0) .

1.3. The connection between both problems. It is known that computing φ_0 or $T_0 = \nabla \varphi_0$ is difficult, as one would solve the associated Monge-Ampère equation [Fig19], a second order nonlinear PDE. One of the advantages of the entropic problem is that the potentials $(\varphi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon)$ are very tractable, numerically speaking, thanks to the Sinkhorn algorithm [Cut13, ANWR17, PC19]. On the other hand, as the regularization parameter ε vanishes, the problem (3) converges in many senses to (1), a fact which allows us to approximate the optimal transport through the entropic regularization for small values of the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$.

More precisely, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the entropic problem Γ -converges towards the unregularized one [Léo12, CDPS17], which yields the convergence of the value functions, $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu)$, and the convergence of the optimal couplings in the weak topology, $\pi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \pi_0$. Concerning the dual optimizers, it is known that $\varphi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \varphi_0$ (modulo subsequence) both in $L^1(\mu)$ and uniformly on compact sets [GT21, NW22] and $\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla \varphi_0$ (modulo subsequence) in $L^2(\mu)$ [CCGT23]. All of the above results use Γ -convergence or compactness arguments, so a natural question is whether it is possible to quantify the rate at which these convergences happen.

In the case of the convergence of the value functions, several contributions have been made in the continuous setting: the first-order expansion

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu) - \frac{d}{2} \varepsilon \log \varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\mathbf{H}(\mu) + \mathbf{H}(\nu)) + o(\varepsilon)$$

was proven to be true for the quadratic case and as a Γ -limit in dimension one in [ADPZ11, DLR13] and in higher dimensions in [EMR15]. The same expansion was established as a pointwise limit for strictly convex cost functions in [Pal24] (thus generalizing the quadratic case). The second-order expansion

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu) - \frac{d}{2} \varepsilon \log \varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\mathbf{H}(\mu) + \mathbf{H}(\nu)) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8} \mathbf{I}(\mu, \nu) + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

where $I(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the integrated Fisher information on the Wasserstein geodesic between μ and ν , was proven for the Euclidean setting in [CRL⁺20, CT21]. For more general cost functions, the expansion

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu) - \frac{d}{2}\varepsilon \log \varepsilon + O(\varepsilon)$$

was established in [CPT23, EN24]. In [MS23], the same formula was demonstrated. Additionally, the authors were able to identify the separate asymptotic behavior of $H(\pi_\varepsilon | \mu \otimes \nu)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) - H(\pi_\varepsilon | \mu \otimes \nu)$ as ε vanishes.

Concerning the convergence of the optimal plans π_ε , in [MS23] the authors were able to quantify the 2-Wasserstein distance between π_ε and π_0 :

$$W_2(\pi_\varepsilon, \pi_0) = \Theta(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

Up to now, the convergence of potentials in the continuous setting was only quantified in the $L^2(\mu)$ norm in terms of the difference of their gradients: in [PNW21], for the quadratic setting under compactness and convexity assumptions, it was proven that

$$\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = O(\varepsilon^2).$$

The rate

$$\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = O(-\varepsilon \log \varepsilon)$$

was found in [CPT23] under slightly weaker assumptions. Finally, the rate

$$\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = O(\varepsilon)$$

was established in [MS23] for non-necessarily compactly supported measures.

This note aims to exhibit a bound for the rate of convergence of uniform convergence on compact sets of the potentials φ_ε and their gradients $\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, when both measures μ and ν are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, under the quadratic cost. The following observation is the starting point of our analysis: the entropic potentials φ_ε are convex functions (see Proposition 2.1 below in Section 2). As mentioned above, they converge (up to a subsequence) uniformly on compact sets to φ_0 . It is a classical fact (see, for example, [Roc70, Theorem 25.7]) that convexity yields the convergence of the gradients $\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$ to $\nabla\varphi_0$ uniformly on compact sets as well. This justifies to search, for a fixed compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, an asymptotic rate of convergence as ε goes to 0 for $\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{K, \infty} := \sup_{x \in K} |\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla\varphi_0(x)|$.

If both μ and ν are Gaussian we can explicitly bound $\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{K, \infty}$. We present the result of this computation as an appetizer and defer its proof to the Section 4.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $\mu = \mathcal{N}(0, A)$ and $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, B)$ be two non-degenerate Gaussian measures with $A, B \succ 0$. For $R > 0$, set $K := \overline{B}(0, R) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ as the Euclidean closed ball of radius R . Then*

$$\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{K, \infty} \leq R\varepsilon \frac{|A^{-1}|_{\text{op}}}{2} \left(\varepsilon \frac{|(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}|_{\text{op}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{4} + \varepsilon^3 \frac{|(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}|_{\text{op}}^{\frac{3}{2}}}{16} + 1 \right), \quad (5)$$

where $|\cdot|_{\text{op}}$ denotes the operator norm of a matrix.

The Proposition 1.1 reveals that we can quantify uniform convergence on compact sets as $O(\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, with a dimension-free bound depending only on the size of the compact set K and the operator norms of the matrices A and B .

1.4. Main results. Our first result gives an estimate in the spirit of Proposition 1.1 for measures μ and ν satisfying convexity assumptions (see the end of Section 2 for their precise statement), in order to generalize what happens in the Gaussian case.

Theorem 1.2. *Let μ and ν be two probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d that are absolutely continuous with respect to the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure and satisfy the assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A3). Then, for any $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ compact, there exists a computable constant $C_{\text{grad}} = C_{\text{grad}}(K, \mu, \nu, d) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{K,\infty} \leq C_{\text{grad}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{d+4}}.$$

Our next result is a corollary of the previous theorem: we can also quantify the convergence in compact sets of the entropic potentials. For $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ compact we define, doing an abuse of notation, $\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_{K,\infty} := \sup_{x \in K} |\varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \varphi_0(x)|$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let μ and ν be two probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d that are absolutely continuous with respect to the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure and satisfy the assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A3). In addition, suppose that the following normalization holds: for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_0 d\mu = 0. \tag{6}$$

Then, for any $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ compact and connected, there exists a computable constant $C_{\text{pot}} = C_{\text{pot}}(K, \mu, \nu, d) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_{K,\infty} \leq C_{\text{pot}} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{d+4}} + \varepsilon \right).$$

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that addresses this problem for the entropic regularization in the continuous setting. Previously in the literature, this question has been answered both in the discrete [CSM94] and semi-discrete [Del22, SGK24] settings for the entropic regularization. On the other hand, in [GSN24], a rate was found for the quadratic-regularized optimal transport problem in dimension one.

1.5. Organization. In Section 2, we will present all the necessary preliminaries on optimal transport and its entropic regularization, and we detail the assumptions for our main results, Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. Then, in Section 3, we prove both results. Finally, in Section 4, we prove the Proposition 1.1.

1.6. Acknowledgments. I want to thank my advisor, Max Fathi, for his guidance, corrections, and continuous support with this project. I also thank Aymeric Baradat, Joaquín Fontbona, Maxime Laborde, Flavien Léger, and Hugo Malamut for very useful conversations.

This work has received support under the program “Investissement d’Avenir” launched by the French Government and implemented by ANR, with the reference ANR-18-IdEx-0001 as part of its program “Emergence”. It was also supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) Grant ANR-23-CE40-0003 (Project CONVIVIALITY). This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 945332.

2. PRELIMINARIES, NOTATION AND ASSUMPTIONS

In this section, we state the basic notation used in this note and then review some properties of both the Brenier and entropic potentials that complement the basic statements previously introduced. Finally, we state our main assumptions and discuss their consequences and some sufficient conditions for them to hold.

2.1. Basic notation. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote the Euclidean inner product between x and y as $x \cdot y$ and the Euclidean norm of x as $|x| := \sqrt{x \cdot x}$. We write the set of square matrices of dimension $d \times d$ with real entries as $\mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and for $M \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ we define its Hilbert-Schmidt norm, doing an abuse of notation, as $|M| := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^d |M_{ij}|^2}$. For a twice differentiable function $u: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote its gradient as $\nabla u(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and its Hessian matrix as $\nabla^2 u(x) \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$. For a function $u: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define its convex conjugate as

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad u^*(y) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (x \cdot y - \varphi(x)).$$

For a Polish space \mathcal{X} equipped with its Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ the set of probability measures on \mathcal{X} ; typically $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$. For a non-negative measure η on \mathcal{X} and $p \in [1, +\infty]$, we will write $L^p(\eta)$ for the classical p -Lebesgue space, which is a Banach space if we furnish it with the p norm, $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\eta)}$. If $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and η is the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, we write the associated p -norm as $\|\cdot\|_p$. If we have a sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of continuous functions $u_n: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say that it converges uniformly on compact sets to a continuous $u: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if for each $K \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ compact, $\|u_n - u\|_{K, \infty} := \sup_{x \in K} |u_n(x) - u(x)| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $u: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ or $u: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$, we can extend the definitions of both $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $\|\cdot\|_{K, \infty}$ to them by doing the following abuses of notation: $\|u\|_p := \| |u| \|_p$ and $\|u\|_{K, \infty} := \| |u| \|_{K, \infty}$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean or Hilbert-Schmidt norm depending on the codomain of u .

Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be two Polish spaces. If we fix two probability measures $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$, we define $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ as the associated set of coupling measures, also named the set of transport plans between μ and ν , as the set containing all the measures $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ such that for $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ Borel, $\pi(A \times \mathcal{Y}) = \mu(A)$ and for each $B \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ Borel, $\pi(\mathcal{X} \times B) = \nu(B)$. We immediately observe that $\mu \otimes \nu$, the product measure between μ and ν , is in $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$, so $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is a nonempty set. Given a Borel map $T: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, we say that it pushes forward the measure μ towards ν if for any $B \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ Borel, $\nu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}(B))$. We remark that the map T induces a natural coupling between μ and ν , which is given by the pushforward of the measure μ by the map $x \mapsto (x, T(x))$.

2.2. Further properties of the potentials. We recall the definitions of the Brenier potentials (φ_0, ψ_0) and their entropic counterparts $(\varphi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon)$. Note that they are not unique, since for any constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(\varphi_0 + \alpha, \psi_0 - \alpha)$ and $(\varphi_\varepsilon + \alpha, \psi_\varepsilon - \alpha)$ are two new pairs of Brenier and entropic potentials, respectively. Therefore, if we need to enforce the uniqueness of the potentials, an additional normalization condition has to be imposed, for example, (6). Nevertheless, we remark that their gradients are uniquely determined.

Recall that for $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that $(f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) = (\frac{1}{2}|\cdot| - \varphi_\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}|\cdot| - \psi_\varepsilon)$. The pair $(f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ is intimately linked with π_ε , the optimal coupling for (3):

$$\frac{d\pi_\varepsilon}{d(\mu \otimes \nu)}(x, y) = \exp\left(\frac{f_\varepsilon(x) + g_\varepsilon(y) - \frac{1}{2}|x - y|^2}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (7)$$

A direct consequence of (7) is that the pair $(f_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ satisfies the so-called Schrödinger system: for any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$f_\varepsilon(x) = -\varepsilon \log \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[g_\varepsilon(y) - \frac{1}{2}|x-y|^2]} d\nu(y) \right), \quad (8)$$

$$g_\varepsilon(y) = -\varepsilon \log \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[f_\varepsilon(x) - \frac{1}{2}|y-x|^2]} d\mu(x) \right). \quad (9)$$

In particular, the Schrödinger system allows us to prove fine properties of the pair $(\varphi_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon)$ such as convexity.

Proposition 2.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ the potentials φ_ε and ψ_ε are convex functions.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then by (8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\varphi_\varepsilon(x_1) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\varepsilon(x_2) &= \varepsilon \log \left(\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[x_1 \cdot y - \psi_\varepsilon(y)]} d\nu(y) \right]^\lambda \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[x_2 \cdot y - \psi_\varepsilon(y)]} d\nu(y) \right]^{1-\lambda} \right) \\ &\geq \varepsilon \log \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[(\lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_2) \cdot y - \psi_\varepsilon(y)]} d\nu(y) \right) \\ &= \varphi_\varepsilon(\lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_2), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Hölder's inequality for $p = 1/\lambda$ and $q = 1/(1-\lambda)$. The convexity of ψ_ε follows similarly from (9). \square

2.3. Assumptions. Our main results are stated in terms of two probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that are absolutely continuous with respect to the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure and satisfy the following assumptions.

(A1) The measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ have the form $d\mu(x) = e^{-V(x)} dx$ and $d\nu(y) = e^{-W(y)} dy$, where $V, W: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions and there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \nabla^2 V(x) \preceq \alpha I_d \quad (10)$$

and

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \nabla^2 W(y) \succeq \beta I_d, \quad (11)$$

where I_d is the identity matrix of dimension d and \preceq denotes the Löwner order on the set of positive semidefinite matrices.

(A2) The measure μ satisfies a Poincaré inequality: there exists $C_P(\mu) > 0$ such that for any $h: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h d\mu = 0$,

$$\|h\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C_P(\mu) \|\nabla h\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2.$$

(A3) The measure μ has finite differential entropy:

$$-\infty < H(\mu) := - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) e^{-V(x)} dx < +\infty.$$

The main consequence of (A1) is that we obtain quantitative control on both $\nabla^2 \varphi_0$ and $\nabla^2 \varphi_\varepsilon$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$; that is, both $\nabla \varphi_0$ and $\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon$ are Lipschitz and we have explicit control on the value of their Lipschitz constants. Caffarelli's contraction theorem [Caf00] provides global Lipschitz regularity for the Brenier map $\nabla \varphi_0$, which pushes μ towards ν .

Theorem 2.2 (Caffarelli). *Suppose that both $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy (A1). Then the Brenier map $\nabla\varphi_0$ is globally Lipschitz. Moreover, the following estimate holds:*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad 0 \preceq \nabla^2\varphi_0(x) \preceq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} I_d.$$

For the entropic counterpart of the Brenier map, namely $\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$, we can also exhibit bounds on its derivative. These bounds were used in [FGP20, CP23] to give alternative proofs of the Theorem 2.2 based on the entropic regularization. Here, we use the ones proven in [CP23, Theorem 4].

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that both $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy (A1). Then the entropic Brenier map $\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$ is globally Lipschitz. Moreover, the following estimate holds:*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad 0 \preceq \nabla^2\varphi_\varepsilon(x) \preceq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{4\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon^2\alpha^2} - \varepsilon\alpha \right) I_d.$$

As we will see in the following remark, the functional inequality provided by (A2) also entails regularity properties for the measure μ itself.

Remark 2.1. A Poincaré inequality implies that the measure has finite moments of all orders [BGL14, Proposition 4.4.2], so under (A2), the measure μ will have this property.

Remark 2.2. Log-concavity is a sufficient condition that entails both (A2) and (A3). We say that the measure $d\mu(x) = e^{-V(x)} dx$ is log-concave if V is convex. Since we assumed V to be smooth, this is equivalent to

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \nabla^2 V(x) \succeq 0.$$

First, log-concavity yields the validity of a Poincaré inequality (see, for example, [BGL14, Theorem 4.6.2]). Second, let us see that log-concavity implies (A3): indeed,

$$\mathsf{H}(\mu) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) e^{-V(x)} dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) d\mu(x) \leq -V(0) - \nabla V(0) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu}[X] < +\infty,$$

where we used the convexity of V . For the lower bound, we recall that μ has finite moments of all orders (see Remark 2.1), so

$$-\infty < \mathsf{H}(\mathcal{N}) \leq \mathsf{H}(\mu),$$

where \mathcal{N} is the d -dimensional Gaussian measure with the same mean and covariance as μ .

Remark 2.3. Note that under (A1), the measure ν is log-concave (see (11)); in particular, it has finite differential entropy and finite moments of all orders as well.

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

This section aims to prove Theorem 1.2 and then to obtain as a corollary Theorem 1.3. The starting point of our proof will be the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, which allows us to control the p norm of the derivatives of order j of a function by the r norm of its derivatives of order k and the q norm of the function itself, where the parameters i, j, p, q , and r satisfy some relations. We state the inequality in the following version, found in [SMR18, Theorem 3.1], since it allows the critical values $p = +\infty$, $r = +\infty$. Here the ambient space is \mathbb{R}^d and we recall the notation $\|\cdot\|_s = \|\cdot\|_{L^s(\text{Leb})}$.

Theorem 3.1 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg). *Let $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 \leq j < k$. Let $\theta \in [j/k, 1]$, $q \in [1, +\infty]$, $p \in (1, +\infty]$, $r \in [1, +\infty]$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{j}{d} + \theta \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{k}{d} \right) + \frac{1-\theta}{q} \quad (12)$$

and such that

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq k-j-1, \quad r^{(i)} \neq d, \quad (13)$$

where $r^{(0)} := r$ and $r^{(i)} := \frac{nr^{(i-1)}}{n-r^{(i-1)}}$, for $i \geq 1$. Then there exists a constant $C_{\text{GN}} = C_{\text{GN}}(j, k, d, \theta, p, q, r) > 0$ such that for any $u: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently smooth and integrable

$$\|\nabla^j u\|_p \leq C_{\text{GN}} \left\| \nabla^k u \right\|_r^\theta \|u\|_q^{1-\theta}. \quad (14)$$

We are ready to start the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof (of Theorem 1.2): The proof is divided into three consecutive steps.

Step 1: The first step will be to choose appropriate parameters to apply the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (14). From the Theorem 3.1 and choosing

$$j = 1, k = 2, p = +\infty, q = 2, r = +\infty,$$

the value of θ is determined by (12), so we get

$$\theta = \frac{d+2}{d+4} \in [1/2, 1].$$

On the other hand, we notice that the condition (13) is trivially verified as $r^{(0)} = +\infty$. Hence the inequality (14) takes the following form:

$$\|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq C_{\text{GN}} \left\| \nabla^2 u \right\|_\infty^{\frac{d+2}{d+4}} \|u\|_2^{\frac{2}{d+4}}. \quad (15)$$

Now let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set. If we apply (15) to $u := (\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0)\mathbf{1}_K$, the resulting inequality reads

$$\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla \varphi_0(x)| \leq C_{\text{GN}} \left(\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla^2 \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla^2 \varphi_0(x)| \right)^{\frac{d+2}{d+4}} \|(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0)\mathbf{1}_K\|_2^{\frac{2}{d+4}}. \quad (16)$$

Step 2: Now we will bound the first term on the right-hand side of (16):

$$\left(\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla^2 \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla^2 \varphi_0(x)| \right)^{\frac{d+2}{d+4}}. \quad (17)$$

Here (A1) plays a key role: note that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the upper bound in the Theorem 2.3 is such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{4\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon^2 \alpha^2} - \varepsilon \alpha \right) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}.$$

In particular, using also the estimate granted by Theorem 2.2, we get

$$\|\nabla^2 \varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla^2 \varphi_0\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla^2 \varphi_\varepsilon\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 \varphi_0\|_\infty \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}},$$

so we can bound (17) and get

$$\left(\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla^2 \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla^2 \varphi_0(x)| \right)^{\frac{d+2}{d+4}} \leq \left(2\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \right)^{\frac{d+2}{d+4}}. \quad (18)$$

Step 3: Now we aim to bound the remaining term in the right-hand side of (16) in an asymptotic way in order to obtain a quantity that converges to 0 as ε vanishes. There is an intermediate result that says that if the Brenier map is globally Lipschitz, then we can control the difference in the $L^2(\mu)$ norm by the difference between both costs (see, for example, [MS23, Lemma 3.8] or [CPT23, Proposition 4.5], which are based on an unpublished result of Ambrosio which was reported in [Gig11]). Recall that Theorem 2.2 ensures that the map T_0 is Lipschitz.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that the Brenier map is L -Lipschitz. Then*

$$\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq 2L\langle \pi_\varepsilon - \pi_0, \frac{1}{2}|\cdot - \cdot|^2 \rangle = 2L(\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon(\mu, \nu) - \varepsilon\mathbf{H}(\pi_\varepsilon|\mu \otimes \nu) - \mathcal{C}_0(\mu, \nu)).$$

That is, if we are able to control $\langle \pi_\varepsilon - \pi_0, \frac{1}{2}|\cdot - \cdot|^2 \rangle$, then we can control the L^2 norm of the difference. In [MS23, Theorem 3.7], we can find this desired control, which can be applied as a consequence of both (A2) and (A3) (cf. Remarks 2.1 and 2.3).

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that both μ and ν have finite moments of order $2 + \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$, and that both have finite differential entropy. Then*

$$\langle \pi_\varepsilon - \pi_0, \frac{1}{2}|\cdot - \cdot|^2 \rangle \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Since we are working with the gradients of the potentials, they are uniquely determined, so we may assume without loss of generality that the following normalization holds, which induces the uniqueness of the potentials: for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_0 d\mu = 0. \quad (19)$$

In particular, under this normalization, we can use (A2) to control the L^2 norm of the difference ($\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0$):

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C_P(\mu) \|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2.$$

That is, we have that there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on d, μ and ν such that

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon. \quad (20)$$

Now we want to control $\|(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0)\mathbf{1}_K\|_2^{\frac{2}{d+4}}$. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0)\mathbf{1}_K\|_2^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \varphi_0(x)|^2 \mathbf{1}_K(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \varphi_0(x)|^2 e^{V(x)} \mathbf{1}_K(x) e^{-V(x)} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \varphi_0(x)|^2 e^{V(x)} \mathbf{1}_K(x) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in K} e^{V(x)} \|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2; \end{aligned}$$

so if we combine this with (20) we get

$$\|(\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0)\mathbf{1}_K\|_2^{\frac{2}{d+4}} \leq C' \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{d+4}}, \quad (21)$$

where $C' > 0$ is a constant depending on d, K, μ and ν . Finally, if we combine (16), (18) and (21) we obtain the desired inequality. \square

We end by proving Theorem 1.3.

Proof (of Theorem 1.3): Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact and connected set. Since we have assumed that the potentials are normalized as $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_0 d\mu = 0$, we can use [Eva10, Theorem 1, page 290] and the bound (21) to get

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_{K,\infty} \leq C'' \left(\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_{K,\infty} + \varepsilon \right),$$

where $C'' > 0$ is a constant depending on d, K, μ and ν . The conclusion follows from the estimate given by Theorem 1.2. \square

4. THE GAUSSIAN CASE

In this section, we provide the proof of Proposition 1.1.

Proof (of Proposition 1.1): For Gaussian measures, we may compute explicitly $\nabla\varphi_0$ and $\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$ (see [Gel90, JMPC20, dBL20, MGM22]): both are linear maps given by

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \nabla\varphi_0(x) = A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}A^{-\frac{1}{2}}x$$

and

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \nabla\varphi_\varepsilon(x) = \left(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}A^{-1} \right) x.$$

Now fix $R > 0$ and let $K = \overline{B}(0, R) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, so that

$$\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla\varphi_0(x)| = R \left\| \left(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}A^{-1} \right) - A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\text{op}},$$

where for a matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ we write $|M|_{\text{op}} := \sup_{|x|=1} |Mx|$ for its operator norm.

Let us note that we may expand the matrix $\left(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, using a Taylor expansion of order one for the matrix square root function around the point $A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (see [DMN18, Theorem 1.1]):

$$\left(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-2t(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}} dt + R(A, B, \varepsilon),$$

where $R(A, B, \varepsilon)$ is a matrix such that

$$|R(A, B, \varepsilon)|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^4}{32} \lambda_{\min}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-\frac{3}{2}} = \frac{\varepsilon^4}{32} \left| (A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \right|_{\text{op}}^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of a positive-definite matrix. On the other hand, note that

$$\left| \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-2t(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}} dt \right|_{\text{op}} \leq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-2t\lambda_{\min}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}} dt = \frac{1}{2\lambda_{\min}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{1}{2} \left| (A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} \right|_{\text{op}}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In consequence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla \varphi_0(x)| &= R \left| \left(A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} A^{-1} \right) - A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|_{\text{op}} \\
&\leq R \left| A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} - A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right|_{\text{op}} + R \left| \frac{\varepsilon}{2} A^{-1} \right|_{\text{op}} \\
&\leq \varepsilon R \frac{|A^{-1}|_{\text{op}}}{2} \left(\varepsilon \frac{|(A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}|_{\text{op}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{4} + \varepsilon^3 \frac{|(A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}|_{\text{op}}^{\frac{3}{2}}}{16} + 1 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

so $\sup_{x \in K} |\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla \varphi_0(x)| = O(\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, with a constant which depends only on R and the matrices A and B . \square

REFERENCES

- [ADPZ11] Stefan Adams, Nicolas Dirr, Mark A. Peletier, and Johannes Zimmer. From a large-deviations principle to the Wasserstein gradient flow: a new micro-macro passage. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 307(3):791–815, 2011.
- [ANWR17] Jason Altschuler, Jonathan Niles-Weed, and Philippe Rigollet. Near-linear time approximation algorithms for optimal transport via sinkhorn iteration. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [BGL14] Dominique Bakry, Ivan Gentil, and Michel Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 348 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [Bre91] Yann Brenier. Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 44(4):375–417, 1991.
- [Caf00] Luis A. Caffarelli. Monotonicity properties of optimal transportation and the FKG and related inequalities. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 214(3):547–563, 2000.
- [CCGT23] Alberto Chiarini, Giovanni Conforti, Giacomo Greco, and Luca Tamanini. Gradient estimates for the Schrödinger potentials: convergence to the Brenier map and quantitative stability. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 48(6):895–943, 2023.
- [CDPS17] Guillaume Carlier, Vincent Duval, Gabriel Peyré, and Bernhard Schmitzer. Convergence of entropic schemes for optimal transport and gradient flows. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(2):1385–1418, 2017.
- [CP23] Sinho Chewi and Aram-Alexandre Pooladian. An entropic generalization of Caffarelli’s contraction theorem via covariance inequalities. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 361:1471–1482, 2023.
- [CPT23] Guillaume Carlier, Paul Pegon, and Luca Tamanini. Convergence rate of general entropic optimal transport costs. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 62(4):Paper No. 116, 28, 2023.
- [CRL⁺20] Lenaïc Chizat, Pierre Roussillon, Flavien Léger, François-Xavier Vialard, and Gabriel Peyré. Faster Wasserstein distance estimation with the Sinkhorn divergence. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2257–2269, 2020.
- [CSM94] Roberto Cominetti and Jaime San Martín. Asymptotic analysis of the exponential penalty trajectory in linear programming. *Math. Programming*, 67(2):169–187, 1994.
- [CT21] Giovanni Conforti and Luca Tamanini. A formula for the time derivative of the entropic cost and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 280(11):Paper No. 108964, 48, 2021.
- [Cut13] Marco Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In C.J. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [dBL20] Eustasio del Barrio and Jean-Michel Loubes. The statistical effect of entropic regularization in optimal transportation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05199*, 2020.
- [Del22] Alex Delalande. Nearly tight convergence bounds for semi-discrete entropic optimal transport. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1619–1642. PMLR, 2022.

- [DLR13] Manh Hong Duong, Vaios Laschos, and Michiel Renger. Wasserstein gradient flows from large deviations of many-particle limits. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 19(4):1166–1188, 2013.
- [DMN18] Pierre Del Moral and Angèle Niclas. A Taylor expansion of the square root matrix function. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 465(1):259–266, 2018.
- [EMR15] Matthias Erbar, Jan Maas, and D. R. Michiel Renger. From large deviations to Wasserstein gradient flows in multiple dimensions. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 20:no. 89, 12, 2015.
- [EN24] Stephan Eckstein and Marcel Nutz. Convergence rates for regularized optimal transport via quantization. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 49(2):1223–1240, 2024.
- [Eva10] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2010.
- [FGP20] Max Fathi, Nathael Gozlan, and Maxime Prod’homme. A proof of the Caffarelli contraction theorem via entropic regularization. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 59(3):Paper No. 96, 18, 2020.
- [Fig19] Alessio Figalli. On the Monge-Ampère equation. *Astérisque*, (414):Exp. No. 1148, 477–503, 2019.
- [Gel90] Matthias Gelbrich. On a formula for the L^2 Wasserstein metric between measures on Euclidean and Hilbert spaces. *Math. Nachr.*, 147:185–203, 1990.
- [Gig11] Nicola Gigli. On Hölder continuity-in-time of the optimal transport map towards measures along a curve. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2)*, 54(2):401–409, 2011.
- [GSN24] Alberto González-Sanz and Marcel Nutz. Sparsity of quadratically regularized optimal transport: Scalar case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03353*, 2024.
- [GT21] Nicola Gigli and Luca Tamanini. Second order differentiation formula on $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ spaces. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 23(5):1727–1795, 2021.
- [JMPC20] Hicham Janati, Boris Muzellec, Gabriel Peyré, and Marco Cuturi. Entropic optimal transport between unbalanced gaussian measures has a closed form. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:10468–10479, 2020.
- [Léo12] Christian Léonard. From the Schrödinger problem to the Monge-Kantorovich problem. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(4):1879–1920, 2012.
- [Léo14] Christian Léonard. A survey of the Schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 34(4):1533–1574, 2014.
- [McC95] Robert J. McCann. Existence and uniqueness of monotone measure-preserving maps. *Duke Math. J.*, 80(2):309–323, 1995.
- [MGM22] Anton Mallasto, Augusto Gerolin, and Hà Quang Minh. Entropy-regularized 2-Wasserstein distance between Gaussian measures. *Inf. Geom.*, 5(1):289–323, 2022.
- [MS23] Hugo Malamut and Maxime Sylvestre. Convergence rates of the regularized optimal transport: Disentangling suboptimality and entropy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06940*, 2023.
- [Nut21] Marcel Nutz. Introduction to entropic optimal transport, 2021. Lecture notes, Columbia University.
- [NW22] Marcel Nutz and Johannes Wiesel. Entropic optimal transport: convergence of potentials. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 184(1-2):401–424, 2022.
- [Pal24] Soumik Pal. On the difference between entropic cost and the optimal transport cost. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 34(1B):1003–1028, 2024.
- [PC19] Gabriel Peyré and Marco Cuturi. Computational optimal transport. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [PNW21] Aram-Alexandre Pooladian and Jonathan Niles-Weed. Entropic estimation of optimal transport maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12004*, 2021.
- [Roc70] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*, volume No. 28 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- [San15] Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, volume 87 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling.
- [SGK24] Ritwik Sadhu, Ziv Goldfeld, and Kengo Kato. Approximation rates of entropic maps in semidiscrete optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07947*, 2024.
- [SMR18] Filip Soudský, Anastasia Molchanova, and Tomáš Roskovec. Interpolation between Hölder and Lebesgue spaces with applications. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 466(1):160–168, 2018.
- [Vil03] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.

- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.