

Convergence of non-reversible Markov processes via lifting and flow Poincaré inequality

Andreas Eberle* Arnaud Guillin† Leo Hahn‡
Francis Lörler§ Manon Michel¶

7th March 2025

We propose a general approach for quantitative convergence analysis of non-reversible Markov processes, based on the concept of second-order lifts and a variational approach to hypocoercivity. To this end, we introduce the flow Poincaré inequality, a space-time Poincaré inequality along trajectories of the semigroup, and a general divergence lemma based only on the Dirichlet form of an underlying reversible diffusion. We demonstrate the versatility of our approach by applying it to a pair of run-and-tumble particles with jamming, a model from non-equilibrium statistical mechanics, and several piecewise deterministic Markov processes used in sampling applications, in particular including general stochastic jump kernels.

Keywords: Lift; non-reversible Markov process; run-and-tumble particles; piecewise deterministic Markov process.

1 Introduction

For reversible Markov processes, the inverse Poincaré constant or spectral gap is a powerful tool for deriving quantitative convergence bounds, as it coincides with the rate of convergence and the asymptotic decorrelation time. For non-reversible processes, however, the inverse Poincaré constant can be much lower than the convergence rate, and

*Institute for Applied Mathematics, University of Bonn. E-Mail: eberle@uni-bonn.de

†Laboratoire de Mathématiques Blaise Pascal, CNRS and Université Clermont Auvergne. E-Mail: arnaud.guillin@uca.fr

‡Université de Neuchâtel. E-Mail: leo.hahn@unine.ch

§Institute for Applied Mathematics, University of Bonn. E-Mail: loerler@uni-bonn.de

¶Laboratoire de Mathématiques Blaise Pascal, CNRS and Université Clermont Auvergne. E-Mail: manon.michel@uca.fr

the process may not even satisfy a Poincaré inequality but still converge rapidly. In fact, acceleration of convergence stemming from non-reversibility has been shown in different models [HHMS93, DHN00, CLP99, HHMS05, LNP13, GM16, CH13, EGZ19] and observed in many more [Hor91, MKK14, NMKH15, BFR19, Nea11]. The design of fast non-reversible processes often relies on the lifting procedure, which introduces an enlarged position-velocity state space to incorporate persistence, as introduced in [DHN00] for discrete chains. In the continuous-time and -space setting, this approach has led to the use of piecewise deterministic Markov processes (PDMPs) [Dav84]. These processes combine deterministic motion with discrete velocity jumps at event times, along with velocity refreshments typically occurring after exponentially distributed waiting times [MKK14, BFR19, BCVD18]. Despite their impressive numerical performance, the analytical understanding of these processes remains limited, posing challenges for rigorous theoretical analysis. Therefore, obtaining quantitative bounds on the rate of convergence of non-reversible processes has attracted a lot of attention, while being much more involved than in the reversible case. For degenerate diffusions at first, this active area of research has become known as hypocoercivity [Hé07, Vil09, DMS15]. Recently, a variational approach to hypocoercivity pioneered by Albritton, Armstrong, Mourrat and Novack [AAMN24] was applied by Cao, Lu and Wang [CLW23] for Langevin dynamics, for the first time obtaining rates of convergence of the correct order. This approach has further been applied to discretisations of Langevin dynamics [Leh24] and to show that some PDMPs exhibit sharp dimensional dependence [LW22].

Inspired by the notion of lifts of discrete Markov chains [DHN00, CLP99], second-order lifts of reversible diffusions [EL24a] were introduced as their counterpart in continuous time and space. This enables the analysis of the convergence rate of non-reversible Markov processes by yielding an upper bound in terms of the spectral gap of an associated reversible collapsed process, generalising the related result for discrete Markov chains [CLP99] by showing that the relaxation time can at most be improved by a square root through lifting. Furthermore, the variational approach to hypocoercivity [AAMN24, CLW23, LW22] can be simplified by phrasing it in the language of second-order lifts, allowing for a systematic derivation of lower bounds on the convergence rates. The second-order lift property enables the exploitation of properties of the simpler collapsed process to obtain bounds on the convergence rate of the lifted process.

In this work, we provide a general space-time approach to get convergence results that encompasses the aforementioned models yet is applicable much more generally by exploiting the second-order lift property implicitly considered in [AAMN24, LW22, CLW23]. We prove a flow Poincaré inequality via a divergence lemma that requires only Dirichlet forms at the level of the collapsed process. Such a flow Poincaré inequality is tailored to showing dissipation of time-averaged L^2 -norms and is simpler to state than the full space-time Poincaré inequality introduced by [AAMN24, CLW23]. Previously, such divergence lemmas were only considered for the overdamped Langevin diffusion, whereas our more general result allows for the treatment of non-reversible processes whose collapse is not an overdamped Langevin process, for example by incorporating non-trivial boundary conditions. Finally, our framework allows for a simple treatment of PDMPs with general refreshment mechanisms.

We demonstrate the versatility of our approach by applying it in two examples. Firstly, we consider a pair of jamming run-and-tumble particles (RTPs), a model of active particles which maintain persistent movement, lying at the interface of out-of-equilibrium statistical mechanics and biology. The speed of their convergence to equilibrium is physically relevant, as it is linked to the time scale of the onset of out-of-equilibrium phenomena [VZ12, EWG15], such as motility-induced phase separation [CT15]. The prevailing method in the statistical physics literature to address this question is the spectral approach [MBE19, AG19, MJK⁺18], leading to convergence speeds which are only valid asymptotically due to non-reversibility. Hence the value of non-asymptotic convergence bounds [GHM24, Hah25] as we achieve in the present article. Secondly, we consider piecewise deterministic Markov processes (PDMPs) used in sampling applications [MDS20, BFR19]. Due to the degeneracy introduced through their definition on an enlarged position-velocity state space, the analysis of their convergence is delicate [BRZ19, DGM20, BVL22].

The paper is divided into four more sections. In Section 2, we begin by summarizing and illustrating the concept of second-order lifts using overdamped Langevin diffusion as a simple example. We then focus on the more intricate case of a pair of jamming RTPs, demonstrating how this system can be understood as a lift of sticky Brownian motion. Then Section 3 presents the main results on convergence to equilibrium of lifts via the flow Poincaré inequality. Section 4 applies our framework to a pair of RTPs with jamming. Finally, Section 5 presents applications to PDMPs for sampling, namely the Forward process and variants of the Zig-Zag process.

2 Second-order lifts

We begin by summarising the definition of second-order lifts and the related upper bound on the convergence rate and then illustrate the concept through lifts of overdamped Langevin diffusions. These include Langevin dynamics, randomised Hamiltonian Monte Carlo and many PDMPs introduced in sampling applications. We subsequently introduce the system formed by a pair of jamming RTPs on the torus and show how it can be understood as a lift of a sticky Brownian motion. Such a system presents unique challenges within the second-order lift framework. Specifically, the presence of boundaries at which the process spends a non-zero amount of time complicates the identification of the underlying collapsed process. Additionally, the RTP velocity dynamics differ from previously considered mechanisms, requiring distinct proof techniques. The convergence of such systems will be explored in greater detail in Section 4.

2.1 Definition and examples

Consider a time-homogenous Markov process (\hat{Z}_t) with invariant probability measure $\hat{\mu}$ on a Polish space $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Let $\pi: \hat{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be a measurable surjection onto another Polish space, and let (Z_t) be a reversible diffusion process with state space \mathcal{S} whose invariant probability measure is the pushforward $\mu = \hat{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ of $\hat{\mu}$ under π . We denote their

associated transition semigroups on $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ and $L^2(\mu)$ by (\hat{P}_t) and (P_t) , and the associated generators by $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}))$ and $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$, respectively. The Dirichlet form associated to (Z_t) is the extension of

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) = - \int_{\mathcal{S}} f \mathcal{L}g \, d\mu$$

to a closed symmetric bilinear form with domain $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{E})$ given by the closure of $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ with respect to the norm $\|f\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \mathcal{E}(f, f)^{1/2}$.

Definition 1 (Second-order lifts [EL24a]). The process (\hat{Z}_t) is a *second-order lift* of (Z_t) if there exists a core C of $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ such that

$$f \circ \pi \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}) \text{ for all } f \in C \tag{1}$$

and for all $f, g \in C$ we have

$$\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi), g \circ \pi \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} = 0, \tag{2}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}(g \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} = - \langle f, \mathcal{L}g \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} = \mathcal{E}(f, g). \tag{3}$$

If in addition

$$\{f \in L^2(\mu) : f \circ \pi \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})\} = \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}),$$

then (\hat{Z}_t) is called a *strong second-order lift* of (Z_t) . Conversely, we refer to the process (Z_t) as the *collapse* of (\hat{Z}_t) .

We also say that $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}))$ or (\hat{P}_t) is a second-order lift of $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ or (P_t) , respectively. In the rest of this paper, we simply refer to second-order lifts as lifts. Usually, $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{V}$ will be a product space, $\pi(x, v) = x$ is the projection on \mathcal{S} , and we think of $(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ as a position and a velocity. More generally, \mathcal{S} could for example be a Riemannian manifold and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ the tangent bundle, see [EL24b].

To get a better understanding of the definition of lifts, disintegrate the measure $\hat{\mu}$ as

$$\hat{\mu}(A) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \kappa_x(A) \mu(dx) \quad \text{for all measurable } A \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{S}},$$

i.e. $\hat{\mu}(dx \, dv) = \mu(dx) \kappa_x(dv)$ in case $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{V}$. Then, under minor technical assumptions, see [EL24a, Remark 2 (v)], the first- and second-order conditions (2) and (3) are equivalent to the limit

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} \hat{P}_t(g \circ \pi)(x, v) \kappa_x(dv) = (P_t g)(x) + o(t^2)$$

in $L^2(\mu)$ as t goes to 0. Hence, for small values of t , the transition semigroup (P_t) of the collapse behaves approximately as an averaged version of the transition semigroup (\hat{P}_t) . Compared to lifts of Markov chains as introduced in [CLP99, DHN00], the interplay

between the quadratic and linear timescales can be directly obtained in the continuous-time case.

By the spectral theorem, the rate of convergence to equilibrium in $L^2(\mu)$ of the reversible process (Z_t) is accurately measured by the inverse of the spectral gap

$$\text{Gap}(\mathcal{L}) = \inf \{ \text{Re}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \text{spec}(-\mathcal{L}|_{L_0^2(\mu)}) \}$$

of its generator \mathcal{L} , where $L_0^2(\mu) = \{f \in L^2(\mu) : \int f \, d\mu = 0\}$ denotes the subspace of mean-zero functions. This is no longer true for non-reversible Markov processes since their generators are not self-adjoint. Even in the exponentially ergodic case, the associated transition semigroup only satisfies

$$\|\hat{P}_t f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \leq C e^{-\nu t} \|f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \quad \text{for all } f \in L_0^2(\hat{\mu}) \quad (4)$$

with $\nu \in [0, \infty)$ and some constant $C \in [1, \infty)$. However, the rate of convergence to equilibrium of a lift can be bounded above by the square root of that of the collapsed process in the following way.

Theorem 2 ([EL24a, Theorem 11]). *Suppose that (\hat{P}_t) is a second-order lift of (P_t) . Assume that there exist constants $C \in [1, \infty)$ and $\nu \in [0, \infty)$ such that (4) is satisfied. Then*

$$\nu \leq (1 + \log C) \sqrt{2 \text{Gap}(\mathcal{L})}. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 2 provides a bound on the rate of convergence achievable through lifting in terms of the spectral gap of the collapsed process, generalising a related result [CLP99, Theorem 3.1] in discrete time and space. This motivates the search for optimal lifts, in the sense that they satisfy (4) with ν of order $\sqrt{\text{Gap}(\mathcal{L})}$ when $\text{Gap}(\mathcal{L})$ is small. Proving such a statement requires quantitative lower bounds on the rate of convergence of non-reversible Markov processes. We show in Section 3 how to obtain such bounds using the framework of lifts under general assumptions on the collapsed process and the structure of the lift. The result is demonstrated in several applications in Sections 4 and 5.

Example 3 (Lifts of overdamped Langevin diffusions). Prototypical examples of second-order lifts are given by lifts of overdamped Langevin diffusions. Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider a potential $U \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $U(x) \rightarrow +\infty$ when $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\int e^{-U(x)} \, dx < +\infty$.

The *overdamped Langevin diffusion* is the process (Z_t) with state space \mathcal{S} given by the stochastic differential equation

$$dZ_t = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla U(Z_t) \, dt + dB_t,$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. Its unique invariant probability measure is the Boltzmann-Gibbs measure

$$\mu(dx) \propto e^{-U(x)} \, dx,$$

and the associated generator in $L^2(\mu)$ is

$$\mathcal{L}f = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla U \cdot \nabla f + \frac{1}{2} \Delta f = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^* \nabla f$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is a core of the generator [Wie85, Theorem 3.1]. Here ∇^* is the adjoint of ∇ in $L^2(\mu)$.

Lifts of overdamped Langevin diffusions are now given by Markov processes on $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, see [EL24a, Example 3]. They include processes based on Hamiltonian dynamics, such as the Langevin diffusion or randomised Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (RHMC), but also other piecewise deterministic Markov processes (PDMPs) used in sampling applications, that we will treat in Section 5. These processes have in common that their invariant probability measure is a product measure $\hat{\mu} = \mu \otimes \kappa$, where κ is for example the d -dimensional standard normal distribution, the uniform distribution on the hypercube $\{-1, +1\}^d$, or the uniform distribution on the coordinate directions $\{\pm e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. For functions $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$, their generators take the form $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi)(x, v) = v \cdot \nabla f(x)$, so that (2) and (3) can immediately be verified.

2.2 Jamming run-and-tumble particles as a lift of sticky Brownian motion

Run-and-tumble particles (RTPs), a close approximation for the movement of bacteria such as *E. coli* [Sch93, Ber04], alternate between long straight runs and rapid reorientations. In addition to their use in biological modelling, they are a topic of investigation in statistical mechanics as they break time reversibility at the particle level and achieve persistent motion. This can drive them out of thermodynamic equilibrium and lead to interesting phenomena not found in passive systems, such as motility-induced phase separation [CT15] where the particles form clusters. Even a single RTP displays rich long-term behaviour not observed in passive systems, such as accumulation at boundaries [Ang17, MJK⁺18, DKM⁺19]. From a mathematical perspective, systems of RTPs can be framed as piecewise deterministic Markov processes [HGM23, GHM24], for which many fundamental questions, such as the regularity of invariant measures, remain open.




Figure 1: Two run-and-tumble particles on the 1D torus

Here, we focus on the two-particle case and start with an informal description of the model. Consider two point particles on the 1D torus of length L described by their positions $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ and their velocities $v_1, v_2 \in \{\pm 1\}$ (see Figure 1). The velocities are independent Markov jump processes switching between $+1$ and -1 with rate $\omega > 0$, corresponding to the *instantaneous* tumble mechanism. Between two velocity switches,

each particle x_i moves around the 1D torus with constant velocity v_i until the two particles collide. Colliding particles jam and stop moving until a velocity flip allows them to separate.

A discrete version of this process was introduced in [SEB16] where jammed configurations were found to have increased mass under the invariant measure. This is a form of clustering hinting at motility-induced phase separation. A continuous-space version was later considered in [HGM23] for velocities following an arbitrary Markov jump process, revealing two universality classes for the invariant measure.




Figure 2: Jump rates of the relative velocity $v = v_2 - v_1$

When modelling the two-particle system as a Markov process, it suffices to keep track of the separation from the first to the second particle $x \in \mathcal{S} = [0, L]$ (see Figure 1) and the relative velocity $v = v_2 - v_1 \in \mathcal{V} = \{-2, 0, 2\}$ (see Figure 2). Figure 3 shows a realisation of the process.

Definition 4 (Jamming RTP process [GHM24]). Let $(x_0, v_0) \in [0, L] \times \{-2, 0, +2\}$ and $\omega \in (0, \infty)$ be given. Let the relative velocity $v(t)$ be a Markov jump process with initial state v_0 and the jump rates of Figure 2. Denote $0 = T_0 < T_1 < \dots$ its jump times, i.e. $v(t) = v(T_n)$ for $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$. Recursively define the particle separation $x(t)$ by $x(0) = x_0$ and

$$x(t) = \max[0, \min[L, x(T_n) + v(T_n)(t - T_n)]] \quad \text{for } t \in [T_n, T_{n+1}).$$

We call $X(t) = (x(t), v(t))$ the jamming RTP process on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω .




Figure 3: Realisation of the jamming RTP process

Henceforth, for conciseness, and when no confusion arises, we will occasionally refer to the jamming RTP process simply as the RTP process. The following theorem gives the invariant measure and the generator of the jamming RTP process. Its proof is relegated to Section 4.2.

Theorem 5 (Invariant measure and generator of the jamming RTP process). *Let $\omega, L \in (0, \infty)$.*

(i) ([HGM23]) The jamming RTP process on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω takes its values in $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{V} = [0, L] \times \{-2, 0, +2\}$ and its unique invariant probability is given by

$$\hat{\mu} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (d_v^0 \delta_0 + a_v dx + d_v^L \delta_L) \otimes \delta_v, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d_2^0 &= 0, & a_2 &= \frac{\omega/4}{2 + \omega L}, & d_2^L &= \frac{1/2}{2 + \omega L}, \\ d_0^0 &= \frac{1/2}{2 + \omega L}, & a_0 &= \frac{\omega/2}{2 + \omega L}, & d_0^L &= \frac{1/2}{2 + \omega L}, \\ d_{-2}^0 &= \frac{1/2}{2 + \omega L}, & a_{-2} &= \frac{\omega/4}{2 + \omega L}, & d_{-2}^L &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) The domain $\text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ of its $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ -generator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is the set of functions $f \in L^2(\hat{\mu})$ s.t.

$$f(x, \pm 2) \in H^1(0, L), \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow L} f(x, 2) = f(L, 2), \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x, -2) = f(0, -2).$$

For $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ one has

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}f(x, v) = v 1_{\{0 < x < L\}} \partial_x f(x, v) + \sum_{\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda_{v\tilde{v}} f(x, \tilde{v}), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{+2,+2} & \lambda_{+2,0} & \lambda_{+2,-2} \\ \lambda_{0,+2} & \lambda_{0,0} & \lambda_{0,-2} \\ \lambda_{-2,+2} & \lambda_{-2,0} & \lambda_{-2,-2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2\omega & 2\omega & 0 \\ \omega & -2\omega & \omega \\ 0 & 2\omega & -2\omega \end{pmatrix}$$

is the discrete generator of the relative velocity (see Figure 2).

Regarding the second-order lift framework, this process differs from previously studied PDMPs and is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, the state space has boundaries and the process spends a non-zero amount of time on them. This is particularly interesting as the behaviour at boundaries usually manifests itself not in the formula for the generator but rather in its domain. Because second-order lifts are defined in terms of generators, even identifying the associated collapsed process becomes delicate. Secondly, different velocity processes necessitate different proofs, as was previously done when the velocity is an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process [CLW23, EL24b] and when the velocity is completely resampled at Poisson times [LW22, EL24a]. The jamming RTP process’s velocity, however, is a Markov jump process with the rates of Figure 2, requiring a new approach.

In [HGM23], this particular jamming RTP process is shown to belong to a class of near-equilibrium systems, whose steady states differ from those of equilibrium diffusive particles only by the presence of positive mass on the boundaries. This suggests that the jamming RTP process can be understood as the lift of a sticky diffusion, whose invariant measure is the image measure

$$\mu = \hat{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1} = \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} \delta_0 + \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} dx + \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} \delta_L$$

under the projection $\pi(x, v) = x$. An integration by parts argument further supports this interpretation by pointing to a diffusion, as

$$\int \hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi) \hat{\mathcal{L}}(g \circ \pi) d\hat{\mu} = -\frac{2\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L f'' g dx$$

for all $f, g \in C^\infty([0, L])$ with $\text{supp}(f), \text{supp}(g) \subset (0, L)$. These heuristic arguments are made rigorous in Theorem 7.

Definition 6 (Sticky Brownian motion). For $\omega \in (0, \infty)$, sticky Brownian motion on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω is the $[0, L]$ -valued Feller process with generator

$$\mathcal{L}_{C^0} f = f'', \quad \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}) = \{f \in C^2([0, L]): f''(0) = \omega f'(0) \text{ and } f''(L) = -\omega f'(L)\}.$$

Conventionally, sticky Brownian motion is defined with $\mathcal{L}_{C^0} f = \frac{1}{2} f''$, see [Lig10, Section 3.5.2]. The process defined in Definition 6 would be a sticky Brownian motion accelerated by a factor 2. However, leaving out the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is more convenient for our purpose. In this setting, the tumble rate ω quantifies the *stickiness* at the boundaries. The limits $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega \rightarrow +\infty$ describe the asymptotic *persistent* and *diffusive* dynamical regimes [HGM23, GHM24] and correspond here to absorption and reflection at the boundaries, respectively.

Theorem 7 (Jamming RTP is a lift of sticky Brownian motion). *Let $\omega, L \in (0, \infty)$.*

(i) *Sticky Brownian motion on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω has a unique invariant probability measure given by*

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} \delta_0 + \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} dx + \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} \delta_L.$$

(ii) *Its C^0 -generator $(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}))$ is a core of its $L^2(\mu)$ -generator $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$.*

(iii) *The jamming RTP process on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω is a lift of sticky Brownian motion on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω .*

Proof. (i) Follows from the generator characterisation of invariance [Lig10, Theorem 3.37].

(ii) The set $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$ is dense in $L^2(\mu)$ and invariant by the L^2 -semigroup. Hence the claim follows from [EN99, Proposition II.1.7].

(iii) For $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$ one has $f \circ \pi \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ and

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi)(x, v) = v 1_{\{0 < x < L\}} f'(x).$$

Hence, for $f, g \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$, integrating first with respect to v and then with respect to x yields

$$\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi), g \circ \pi \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} = \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L g(x) \left(\frac{1}{4}(2f'(x)) + \frac{1}{2}(0f'(x)) + \frac{1}{4}(-2f'(x)) \right) dx = 0.$$

Again integrating first with respect to v and then x yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}(g \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} &= \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L f'(x)g'(x) \, dx \\
&= \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \left(f'(L)g(L) - f'(0)g(0) - \int_0^L f''g \, dx \right) \\
&= \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \left(-\frac{1}{\omega} f''(L)g(L) - \frac{1}{\omega} f''(0)g(0) - \int_0^L f''g \, dx \right) \\
&= \int_{[0,L]} (-\mathcal{L}f)g \, d\mu. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

3 Convergence to equilibrium

In this section, the variational approach for convergence results in [AAMN24, CLW23, LW22, EL24a] is extended to unify a broad class of examples. This unification is made possible by characterising the collapsed process solely through its Dirichlet form.

3.1 Assumptions

As in Section 2, we consider a time-homogenous Markov process with state space $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{V}$, where $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and invariant probability measure $\hat{\mu}$ and a reversible diffusion on \mathcal{S} with invariant measure $\mu = \hat{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$, where $\pi(x, v) = x$ is the projection from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ to \mathcal{S} . The associated transition semigroups acting on $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ and $L^2(\mu)$ and their generators are denoted by (\hat{P}_t) and (P_t) , as well as $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}))$ and $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$, respectively. The Dirichlet form associated to $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ is the extension of

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) = - \int_{\mathcal{S}} f \mathcal{L}g \, d\mu$$

to a closed symmetric bilinear form with domain $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{E})$ given by the closure of $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ with respect to the norm $\|f\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \mathcal{E}(f, f)^{1/2}$. Disintegrating $\hat{\mu}(dx \, dv) = \mu(dx) \kappa_x(dv)$ yields the conditional expectation

$$\Pi_v f(x, v) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} f(x, \tilde{v}) \, d\kappa_x(\tilde{v}).$$

The following first set of assumptions ensures that the process on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ can be split into a weakly antisymmetric part acting on both $x \in \mathcal{S}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$, usually interpreted as a transport term and a refresh term which acts only on v .

Assumption (A). Assume that there exist $\gamma > 0$ and two linear operators $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}))$ and $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v))$ on $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ such that $\text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}) \subseteq \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}) \cap \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v)$ and

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f + \gamma \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f \quad \text{for all } f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}).$$

Further assume that:

- (i) The operator $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}))$ is a lift of $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ that is *weakly antisymmetric*, i.e. there exists a core C of \mathcal{L} such that for all $f \in C$, $f \circ \pi \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^*)$, and

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^*(f \circ \pi) = -\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f \circ \pi).$$

- (ii) The operator $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v))$ leaves the conditional distribution of v invariant, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f(x, v) d\kappa_x(v) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}),$$

and has a spectral gap $m_v > 0$ in v , i.e.

$$\|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \leq \frac{1}{m_v} \mathcal{E}_v(f) \quad \text{for all } f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}),$$

where $\mathcal{E}_v(f) = \langle f, -\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}$.

By assumption, $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}))$ is a lift and hence generates a transition semigroup of contractions on $L^2(\hat{\mu})$. In particular, this means that $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}))$ is non-negative definite, i.e. $\langle f, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \leq 0$ for all $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}})$.

Such a splitting into two distinct dynamics, interpreted as a transport and velocity refreshment, is natural in many examples. For instance, in the case of Langevin dynamics or randomised Hamiltonian Monte Carlo, one chooses

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f(x, v) = v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) - \nabla U(x) \cdot \nabla_v f(x, v)$$

to be the generator of the Hamiltonian flow associated to the Hamiltonian $H(x, v) = U(x) + \frac{1}{2}|v|^2$. The operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ is usually interpreted as a velocity refreshment. This could be the full refreshment $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v = \Pi_v - I$ with respect to the conditional distribution κ_x but much more general mechanisms are possible, as discussed in Section 4. Regarding the jamming RTP process, the transport and velocity refreshments terms correspond to the run and tumble mechanisms, respectively, with the latter differing from a complete refreshment.

Remark 8. If $\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f + \gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_vf$ for all $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$, where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ are operators whose domains contain the domain of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ only acts on v in the sense that there exists a core C of \mathcal{L} such that $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v(f \circ \pi) = 0$ for all $f \in C$, then $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is a lift of \mathcal{L} if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ is a lift of \mathcal{L} .

In line with the general principles of hypocoercivity, the idea is that the dynamics in v has strong relaxation properties that are then propagated to the variable x by the rest of the dynamics. It is thus natural to ask that the refreshment term satisfy a Poincaré inequality in v .

Assumption (B). The operator $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ has purely discrete spectrum on $L^2(\mu)$ and satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant $\frac{1}{m}$, i.e.

$$\|f - \mu(f)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \mathcal{E}(f) \tag{7}$$

for all $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E})$. In particular, $m = \text{Gap}(\mathcal{L}) > 0$ is the spectral gap of \mathcal{L} .

The assumption of a purely discrete spectrum, which was also considered in [CLW23, EL24a], allows for simple calculations using a spectral decomposition that enables us to prove a divergence lemma not limited to the generator of an overdamped Langevin diffusion. This technical assumption can be relaxed, see [BS24]. The Poincaré inequality (7) is equivalent to exponential decay of the semigroup (P_t) generated by \mathcal{L} with rate m and thus allows us to compare the decay of (\hat{P}_t) to that of (P_t) . It can however also be relaxed to a weak Poincaré inequality, see [BSWW24], yielding subexponential convergence to equilibrium.

The last assumption ensures good interactions between $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ and the refreshment $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$.

Assumption (C). There exist constants $C_1^*, C_1^\dagger > 0$ such that

$$|\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}| \leq \left(C_1^* \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)} + C_1^\dagger \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}(g)} \right) \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

and $C_2^* > 0$ such that

$$|\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}| \leq C_2^* \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_v(f)} \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}(g)}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

for all functions $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}})$ with $\Pi_v f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}})$ and g in a core of \mathcal{L} .

Remark 9. We now explain how to verify Assumption (C1) in applications. If $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^*)$ for all g in a core of \mathcal{L} , the second order lift condition becomes

$$\Pi_v \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) = -(2\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi, \quad \text{and thus}$$

$$|\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}| \leq \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + (2\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}.$$

Hence it suffices to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_S \text{Var}_{\kappa_x}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)) \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + (2\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \\ &\leq C_1^* \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)} + C_1^\dagger \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}(g)}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. that the $L^2(\mu)$ -norm of the standard deviation of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)$ with respect to κ_x is bounded by the $L^2(\mu)$ -norm of its expectation $-2\mathcal{L}g$ and the square root of the Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}(g)$, since then

$$|\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}| \leq \left(C_1^* \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)} + C_1^\dagger \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}(g)} \right) \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}.$$

Remark 10. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the second-order lift condition (3), Assumption (C2) is satisfied if

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \leq (C_2^*)^2 \mathcal{E}_v(f) = (C_2^*)^2 \langle f, -\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})},$$

which is the case if $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ is a bounded operator. For example, if $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v = \Pi_v - I$ is the full refreshment with respect to the conditional distribution $\kappa_x(dv)$, Assumptions (A) (ii) and (C2) hold with $C_2^* = 1$ and $m_v = 1$.

Assumptions (A) and (B) are closely related to Assumptions (H1), (H2), and (H3) in the seminal work [DMS15], while Assumption (C) ensuring good interaction between $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ is reminiscent of Assumption (H4). The connection between second-order lifts and the approach [DMS15] to hypocoercivity is detailed in [BLW24].

3.2 Flow Poincaré inequality

The principle of energy dissipation is often used to get an exponential decay in L^2 -norm. It amounts to differentiating the L^2 -norm along the semigroup and controlling this dissipation by the original L^2 -norm. In the elliptic (often reversible) setting, this is precisely where a Poincaré inequality is needed. However, such a Poincaré inequality is no longer valid in the hypoelliptic setting, as in the case of Langevin dynamics. In [DMS15, Vil09], a mixing term is added to the L^2 -norm to ensure the control of the dissipation. Here, we instead consider time averages of the L^2 -norm over a fixed time length $T > 0$, as considered in [AAMN24, CLW23, EL24a], but control the dissipation of the time-averaged L^2 -norm through a more natural integrated Poincaré inequality instead of the more involved space-time Poincaré inequality. We call this inequality the *flow Poincaré inequality*.

In the following, let $T \in (0, \infty)$ and let λ denote the Lebesgue measure on $[0, T]$. We denote the time-integrated Dirichlet forms by

$$\mathcal{E}_T(f) = \int_0^T \mathcal{E}(f(t, \cdot)) dt \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f) = \int_0^T \mathcal{E}_v(f(t, \cdot)) dt$$

for functions $f \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ such that the right-hand sides are defined.

Theorem 11 (Flow Poincaré inequality). *Let Assumptions (A), (B) and (C) hold. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $f_0 \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ with $\int f_0 d\hat{\mu} = 0$, the function $f(t, x, v) = (\hat{P}_t f_0)(x, v)$ satisfies*

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq (\gamma^2 C_0(T) + C_1(T)) \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_0(T) &= C \left(C_2^*(T + m^{-1/2}) \right)^2, \\ C_1(T) &= C \frac{1}{m_v} \left(1 + \frac{1}{mT^2} + (C_1^*)^2 + \left(C_1^\dagger(T + m^{-1/2}) \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The constant C in Theorem 11 does not depend on any parameters and can easily be made explicit. This flow Poincaré inequality differs from the space-time Poincaré inequality as in [AAMN24, CLW23], as it is only valid along trajectories $t \mapsto \hat{P}_t f_0$ of the semigroup. However, this is not a restriction, as it is specifically intended for application to solutions of the corresponding Kolmogorov backward equation, and our proof strategy would also allow us to prove a more general space-time Poincaré inequality. More importantly, this formulation allows for its extension to a broad class of refreshment mechanisms. The flow Poincaré inequality avoids the use of the H^{-1} -norm in the velocity that is present in the formulation of a space-time Poincaré inequality as in [AAMN24, CLW23].

One of the main tools to get such a flow Poincaré inequality is a so-called divergence lemma. There are now several different works [AAMN24, CLW23, BS24, EL24b] which aim at providing such a divergence lemma under general hypotheses. We take a Dirichlet

form approach enabling general assumptions on the collapsed process, imposing only the assumption of a spectral gap and discrete spectrum.

With all these ingredients we may now present our main result, adopting the terminology of [EL24a].

Theorem 12 (Exponential decay). *Let Assumptions (A), (B) and (C) hold. The semigroup (\hat{P}_t) generated by $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}))$ is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate*

$$\nu = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^2 C_0(T) + C_1(T)},$$

i.e. for all $f \in L_0^2(\hat{\mu})$ and $t \geq 0$ we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} ds \leq e^{-\nu t} \|f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}. \quad (8)$$

Theorem 12 in particular yields $\|\hat{P}_t f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \leq e^{-\nu(t-T)} \|f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}$ for all $f \in L_0^2(\hat{\mu})$ and $t \geq 0$. The proof of Theorem 12 using a Poincaré-type inequality is well-established, see e.g. [AAMN24, CLW23, EL24a]. For the convenience of the reader, we demonstrate the proof based on our formulation of the flow Poincaré inequality from Theorem 11.

Proof. Let $f \in L_0^2(\hat{\mu})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 ds &= \|\hat{P}_{t+T} f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 - \|\hat{P}_t f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \\ &= \int_t^{t+T} \frac{d}{ds} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 ds \\ &= 2 \int_t^{t+T} \langle \hat{P}_s f, (\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} + \gamma \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v) \hat{P}_s f \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} ds \\ &\leq 2\gamma \int_t^{t+T} \langle \hat{P}_s f, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v \hat{P}_s f \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} ds \\ &= -2\gamma \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(\hat{P}_{t+} f). \end{aligned}$$

By the semigroup property, the flow Poincaré inequality Theorem 11 implies

$$\|\hat{P}_{t+} f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2 = \|\hat{P} \cdot \hat{P}_t f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2 \leq (\gamma^2 C_0(T) + C_1(T)) \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(\hat{P}_{t+} f),$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 ds \leq -2 \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^2 C_0(T) + C_1(T)} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 ds.$$

Grönwall's inequality yields

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 ds \leq e^{-2\nu t} \|f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2.$$

Finally, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} ds \leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|\hat{P}_s f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \leq e^{-\nu t} \|f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}$$

and thus the ν -exponential contractivity in T -average. \square

Remark 13. To obtain an explicit rate in Theorem 12, one can choose $T = m^{-1/2}$. If $\frac{1}{m_\nu}$ and C_2^* are bounded by absolute constants, as is the case if $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\nu = \Pi_\nu - I$ is the full refreshment with respect to κ_x by Remark 10, this yields

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + (1 + (C_1^*)^2) m + (C_1^\dagger)^2} \right).$$

Optimising by choosing $\gamma = (1 + C_1^*)\sqrt{m} + C_1^\dagger$ yields $\nu = \Omega \left(\sqrt{m} / (1 + C_1^* + C_1^\dagger/\sqrt{m}) \right)$. For many examples, including Langevin dynamics, randomised HMC, and the RTP process considered here, one can choose $C_1^\dagger = 0$ and there exists an absolute explicit constant $C > 0$ such that $C_1^* \leq C$, see Section 4. The expression then further simplifies to

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + m} \right),$$

and if $\gamma = \Theta(\sqrt{m})$ then $\nu = \Omega(\sqrt{m})$, i.e. we obtain a square-root speed-up with the optimal choice of γ .

The usual example of Langevin dynamics (e.g. [CLW23, EL24a]) serves as a useful base case in demonstrating the arguments involved in applying Theorem 12.

Example 14 (Langevin dynamics). Consider a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d with density proportional to $\exp(-U)$, where $U: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-U(x)} dx < \infty$ and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} U(x) = +\infty$. Let us assume that μ satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant $\frac{1}{m}$, and that the generator $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ of the associated overdamped Langevin diffusion, see Example 3, has discrete spectrum. Furthermore, let the potential U satisfy the lower curvature bound

$$\nabla^2 U(x) \geq -Km \cdot I_d \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (9)$$

for some $K \geq 0$. Langevin dynamics is the $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ -valued diffusion process (X, V) solving the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= V_t dt, \\ dV_t &= -\nabla U(X_t) dt - \gamma V_t dt + \sqrt{2\gamma} dB_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion and $\gamma \geq 0$ is the friction parameter, see e.g. [Pav14]. Its invariant measure is $\hat{\mu} = \mu \otimes \kappa$ with the standard normal distribution $\kappa = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, and its generator in $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ is given by $\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f + \gamma \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\nu f$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f(x, v) &= v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) - \nabla U(x) \cdot \nabla_v f(x, v), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\nu f(x, v) &= -v \cdot \nabla_v f(x, v) + \Delta_v f(x, v), \end{aligned}$$

are the generators of the Hamiltonian flow associated to the Hamiltonian $H(x, v) = U(x) + \frac{1}{2}|v|^2$, and of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process in the velocity, respectively. Let us check Assumptions (A)–(C). The generator $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}))$ of the Hamiltonian flow is antisymmetric in $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ and is a lift of an overdamped Langevin diffusion with generator $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ by [EL24a, Example 3(i)]. This can be checked immediately since $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f \circ \pi)(x, v) = v \cdot \nabla f(x)$ for all $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Furthermore, the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with generator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ leaves κ invariant and has spectral gap $m_v = 1$, see for example [BGL14], so that Assumption (A) is satisfied. Furthermore, Assumption (B) is satisfied by our assumptions on the potential. It remains to check Assumption (C). For (C1), by Remark 9, it is enough to prove

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + (2\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \leq C_1^* \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

We have

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)(x, v) = -v^\top \nabla^2 g(x) v - \nabla U(x) \cdot \nabla g(x)$$

and $2\mathcal{L}g = \Delta g + \nabla U \cdot \nabla g$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)(\cdot, v) + 2\mathcal{L}g \right)^2 d\kappa(v) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v^\top \nabla^2 g v - \Delta g)^2 d\kappa(v), \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v^\top \nabla^2 g v)^2 d\kappa(v) - (\Delta g)^2, \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $\int v^\top \nabla^2 g v d\kappa(v) = \Delta g$. Furthermore, since v_i, v_j, v_k, v_l are independent standard Gaussians,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v^\top \nabla^2 g v)^2 d\kappa(v) &= \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^d (\partial_{ij} g)(\partial_{kl} g) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_i v_j v_k v_l d\kappa(v) \\ &= (\Delta g)^2 + 2\|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^d (\partial_{ij} g)^2$ is the squared Frobenius norm of $\nabla^2 g$. By Bochner's formula, using the lower curvature bound (9), we have

$$\|\|\nabla^2 g\|_F\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \|2\mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla g^\top \nabla^2 U \nabla g d\mu \leq \|2\mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + 2Km \mathcal{E}(g),$$

Overall we obtain

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + (2\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 = 2\|\|\nabla^2 g\|_F\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq 2(\|2\mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + 2Km \mathcal{E}(g))$$

and (C1) holds with $C_1^* = \sqrt{2}$ and $C_1^\dagger = \sqrt{2Km}$. Finally, Assumption (C2) is satisfied with $C_2^* = 1$ since

$$\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} = \langle -\nabla_v^* \nabla_v f, v \cdot \nabla_x g \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} = \langle -\nabla_v f, \nabla_x g \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 12, when choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup (\hat{P}_t) associated to Langevin dynamics is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + (K+1)m} \right).$$

Choosing $\gamma = \sqrt{(K+1)m}$ yields the rate $\nu = \Omega(\sqrt{m}/\sqrt{K+1})$. We thus recover the result of [CLW23, Theorem 1].

3.3 Divergence lemma and space-time property of the lift

In the classical elliptical setting, a Poincaré inequality can be established by solving the Poisson equation $-\mathcal{L}g = f$ with explicit bounds on g . Similarly, in the hypoelliptic setting, a generalised time-dependent Poisson equation may be used to obtain a flow Poincaré inequality. The divergence Lemma 15 provides solutions to such an equation with explicit bounds on the solution and is at the heart of the proof of the flow Poincaré inequality Theorem 11. Different versions of this divergence lemma have been studied recently by [CLW23, BS24, EL24b, Leh24], and a related divergence equation with different boundary conditions is of fundamental importance in fluid mechanics [Gal11]. We take an approach using Dirichlet forms, adapting the proof of [EL24b] and enabling minimal structural assumptions on \mathcal{L} .

Let us assume that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and that $C^\infty(\mathcal{S}) \cap L^2(\mu) \subseteq \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$. Let the Sobolev space $H_D^{1,2}(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions in time be the closure of

$$\{u \in C^\infty([0, T] \times \mathcal{S}) \cap L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) : u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0\}$$

with respect to the norm given by

$$\|u\|_{1,2} = \|u\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + \mathcal{E}_T(u)^{1/2} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)},$$

and similarly let $H_D^{2,2}(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ be the closure of the same set with respect to

$$\|u\|_{2,2} = \|u\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + \mathcal{E}_T(u)^{1/2} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + \|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + \|\partial_{tt}u\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + \mathcal{E}_T(\partial_t u)^{1/2}.$$

In particular, if $u \in H_D^{2,2}(\lambda \otimes \mu)$, then $u(t, \cdot) \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ for λ -a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ since $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ is closed. The assumption that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ can be relaxed to \mathcal{S} being a Riemannian manifold with boundary, see [EL24b].

Lemma 15 (Divergence lemma). *Suppose that Assumption (B) is satisfied. Then for any $T \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for any $f \in L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ there are functions*

$$h \in H_D^{1,2}(\lambda \otimes \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad g \in H_D^{2,2}(\lambda \otimes \mu)$$

such that

$$\partial_t h - 2\mathcal{L}g = f,$$

and the functions h and g satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\lambda\otimes\mu)} &\leq c_1\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda\otimes\mu)}, \\ \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_T(h)} &\leq c_2\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda\otimes\mu)}, \\ \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_T(g)} &\leq c_3\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda\otimes\mu)}, \\ \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_T(\partial_t g)} &\leq c_4\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda\otimes\mu)},\end{aligned}$$

with $c_1 = c_2 = C$, $c_3 = C(T + m^{-1/2})$, and $c_4 = C(1 + T^{-1}m^{-1/2})$.

The proof of Lemma 15 is delayed until Section 3.5. The final ingredient for the proof of the flow Poincaré inequality is the following space-time property of lifts. We consider the operator $(A, \text{Dom}(A))$ on $L^2([0, T] \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}, \lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})$ defined by

$$Af = -\partial_t f + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f \quad (10)$$

with domain consisting of all functions $f \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})$ such that $f(\cdot, x, v)$ is absolutely continuous for $\hat{\mu}$ -a.e. $(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ with $\partial_t f \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})$, and $f(t, \cdot) \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}})$ for λ -a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ with $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})$.

Lemma 16 (Space-time property of lifts). *Let $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}))$ be a lift of $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$. Then, for any $f, g, h \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ such that $f \circ \pi \in \text{Dom}(A)$ and $g(t, \cdot) \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$ with $\mathcal{L}g \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$, we have*

$$\langle A(f \circ \pi), h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} = -\langle h, \partial_t f \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + 2\mathcal{E}(f, g).$$

Proof. This follows directly from the defining properties (2) and (3) of second-order lifts, see [EL24a, Lemma 18]. \square

3.4 Proof of the flow Poincaré inequality

We now prove Theorem 11. The proof is similar to that of [EL24a, Theorem 23]. However, bounding $\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2$ directly by the time-integrated velocity Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}_{v, T}(f)$ in this general setting requires more refined estimates.

Proof of Theorem 11. Let $\tilde{f} \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ be such that $\Pi_v f = \tilde{f} \circ \pi$. Let $\tilde{f} = \partial_t h - 2\mathcal{L}g$ with h and g as in Lemma 15. Because Π_v is an orthogonal projection, we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2 = \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 + \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2.$$

Furthermore, by an integration by parts and the space-time property of lifts in Lemma 16,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 &= \langle \partial_t h - 2\mathcal{L}g, \tilde{f} \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} = -\langle h, \partial_t \tilde{f} \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + 2\mathcal{E}(\tilde{f}, g) \\ &= \langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), A(\tilde{f} \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &= \langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), Af \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} + \langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), A(\Pi_v f - f) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}\end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The two summands on the right-hand side of (11) can be bounded separately.

Firstly, because $f(t, x, v) = (\hat{P}_t f_0)(x, v)$, we have $Af = -\partial_t f + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f = -\gamma \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f$, so that

$$\langle h \circ \pi, Af \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} = -\gamma \int_0^T \int_S h(x) \int_{\mathcal{V}} (\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f)(x, v) d\kappa_x(v) d\mu(x) dt = 0$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), Af \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} &= -\gamma \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &\leq C_2^* \gamma \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f)} \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_T(g)} \\ &\leq C_2^* c_3 \gamma \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f)} \end{aligned}$$

using Assumption (C2) for the first inequality and Lemma 15 for the second.

The second summand in (11) can be estimated using (10). The Dirichlet boundary conditions in time of h and g give

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), -\partial_t(\Pi_v f - f) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} &= \langle \partial_t h \circ \pi + \partial_t \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \Pi_v f - f \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &= \langle \partial_t \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \Pi_v f - f \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \leq \|\partial_t \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using the fact that ∂_t commutes with $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(\cdot \circ \pi)$, we get

$$\|\partial_t \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} = \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}((\partial_t g) \circ \pi)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} = \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_T(\partial_t g)}.$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), -\partial_t(\Pi_v f - f) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} &\leq \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_T(\partial_t g)} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &\leq c_4 \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \leq m_v^{-1/2} c_4 \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &= -\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(h \circ \pi), f - \Pi_v f \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} + \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &\leq \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(h \circ \pi)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &\quad + \left(C_1^* \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} + C_1^\dagger \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}(g)} \right) \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \end{aligned}$$

using the weak antisymmetry of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ and assumption (C1). Hence, using Lemma 15, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle h \circ \pi + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &\leq (c_2 + C_1^* c_1 + C_1^\dagger c_3) \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})} \\ &\leq m_v^{-1/2} (c_2 + C_1^* c_1 + C_1^\dagger c_3) \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining everything and using the inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ finally leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2 &\leq \|\Pi_v f - f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \hat{\mu})}^2 + (C_2^* c_3 \gamma + m_v^{-1/2} c_4 + m_v^{-1/2} (c_2 + C_1^* c_1 + C_1^\dagger c_3))^2 \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f) \\ &\leq \left(m_v^{-1} + \left(C_2^* c_3 \gamma + m_v^{-1/2} c_4 + m_v^{-1/2} (c_2 + C_1^* c_1 + C_1^\dagger c_3) \right)^2 \right) \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f) \\ &\leq \left(2(C_2^* c_3)^2 \gamma^2 + m_v^{-1} (1 + 2(c_4 + c_2 + C_1^* c_1 + C_1^\dagger c_3)^2) \right) \mathcal{E}_{v,T}(f), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

3.5 Proof of the divergence lemma

We now prove Theorem 15. The proof closely follows that of [EL24b, Theorem 5], which is a careful refinement of [CLW23, Lemma 2.6]. Some differences arise in the treatment of the first case, and due to the fact that we estimate slightly different quantities. We hence omit the details where they are identical to [EL24b].

Proof of Theorem 15. Consider an orthonormal basis $\{e_k : k \geq 0\}$ of eigenfunctions of \mathcal{L} with eigenvalues $-\alpha_k^2$, where e_0 is constant and $\alpha_0 = 0$. In particular, $\inf\{\alpha_k^2 : k > 0\} = m$ is the spectral gap of \mathcal{L} . Then $\{H_k^a : k \geq 0\} \cup \{H_k^s : k > 0\}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^a(t, x) &= (t - (T - t))e_0(x), \\ H_k^a(t, x) &= \left(e^{-\alpha_k t} - e^{-\alpha_k(T-t)} \right) e_k(x) \text{ for } k > 0, \\ H_k^s(t, x) &= \left(e^{-\alpha_k t} + e^{-\alpha_k(T-t)} \right) e_k(x) \text{ for } k > 0, \end{aligned}$$

defines an orthogonal basis of the space

$$\mathbb{H} = \left\{ u \in L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) : u(\cdot, x) \in H^2((0, T)) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x, u(t, \cdot) \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}) \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } t, \text{ and } \partial_{tt}u + 2\mathcal{L}u = 0 \right\}$$

of mean-zero harmonic functions for $\partial_{tt} + 2\mathcal{L}$. We consider a simultaneous decomposition of \mathbb{H} into high and low modes and symmetric and antisymmetric functions, i.e.

$$L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) = \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{H}^\perp = \mathbb{H}_{l,a} \oplus \mathbb{H}_{l,s} \oplus \mathbb{H}_{h,a} \oplus \mathbb{H}_{h,s} \oplus \mathbb{H}^\perp,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_{l,a} &= \text{span} \left\{ H_k^a : \alpha_k \leq \frac{2}{T} \right\}, & \mathbb{H}_{l,s} &= \text{span} \left\{ H_k^s : \alpha_k \leq \frac{2}{T} \right\}, \\ \mathbb{H}_{h,a} &= \overline{\text{span}} \left\{ H_k^a : \alpha_k > \frac{2}{T} \right\}, & \mathbb{H}_{h,s} &= \overline{\text{span}} \left\{ H_k^s : \alpha_k > \frac{2}{T} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to linearity, it suffices to prove the statement separately for right-hand sides f in these subspaces and in \mathbb{H}^\perp

Case 1: Let $f \in \mathbb{H}^\perp$. Consider the operator $(\bar{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}))$ on $L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$ given by $\bar{\mathcal{L}}f = \partial_{tt}f + 2\mathcal{L}f$ with Neumann boundary conditions in time, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dom}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}) = \{ & f \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) : f(t, \cdot) \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}) \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } t \in (0, T), \\ & f(\cdot, x) \in H^{2,2}((0, T)) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \partial_t f = 0 \text{ on } \{0, T\} \times \mathcal{S}, \\ & \partial_{tt}f + \mathcal{L}f \in L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By tensorisation, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant $\min(2m, \frac{\pi^2}{T})$. Hence $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ has a spectral gap, so that

$$-\bar{\mathcal{L}}|_{L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} : \text{Dom}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}) \cap L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) \rightarrow L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)$$

admits a bounded linear inverse

$$\bar{G} : L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) \rightarrow L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) \cap \text{Dom}(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$$

whose operator norm is bounded above by $\max(\frac{1}{2m}, \frac{T^2}{\pi^2})$. We hence set $g = \bar{G}f$ and $h = -\partial_t g$. The Dirichlet boundary conditions in time for h are satisfied by construction, and the Dirichlet boundary conditions for g follow from an integration by parts as in [EL24b]. On $L_0^2(\lambda \otimes \mu) \cap \text{Dom}(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$, the operators $-\partial_{tt}$ and $-2\mathcal{L}$ commute and have discrete spectrum, so that the operators norms of

$$2\mathcal{L}\bar{G} = 2\mathcal{L}(-\partial_{tt} - 2\mathcal{L})^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{tt}\bar{G} = \partial_{tt}(-\partial_{tt} - 2\mathcal{L})^{-1}$$

are bounded by one. In particular, we can take $c_1^\perp = 1$. Similarly,

$$2\mathcal{E}_T(g) = \langle g, -2\mathcal{L}g \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} = \langle \bar{G}f, -2\mathcal{L}\bar{G}f \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \leq \max\left(\frac{1}{2m}, \frac{T^2}{\pi^2}\right) \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}$$

and

$$2\mathcal{E}_T(h) = 2\mathcal{E}_t(\partial_t g) = \langle -\partial_{tt}\bar{G}f, -2\mathcal{L}\bar{G}f \rangle_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}.$$

For right-hand sides $f \in \mathbb{H}^\perp$, we hence obtain the claim with the constants

$$c_1^\perp = 1, \quad c_2^\perp = 1, \quad c_3^\perp = \max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}}, \frac{T}{\pi}\right), \quad c_4^\perp = 1.$$

Case 2: Let $f \in \mathbb{H}_{l,a}$. Here, as in [EL24b], we set $h(t, x) = \int_0^t f(s, x) ds$ and $g(t, x) = 0$. Then the boundary conditions are satisfied due to the antisymmetry of f and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 & \leq \frac{T^2}{2} \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2, \\ \|\mathcal{L}h\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 & \leq \int_0^T t \int_0^t \frac{16}{T^4} \|f(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 ds dt \leq \frac{8}{T^2} \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\|\mathcal{L}f(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)} \leq \frac{4}{T^2} \|f(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}$ since $f \in \mathbb{H}_{l,a}$. By Cauchy-Schwarz, this yields $\mathcal{E}_T(h) \leq 2\|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}$, so that, for right-hand sides $f \in \mathbb{H}_{l,a}$, we obtain the statement with

$$c_1^{l,a} = 0, \quad c_2^{l,a} = 2, \quad c_3^{l,a} = 0, \quad c_4^{l,a} = 0.$$

Case 3: Let $f \in \mathbb{H}_{l,s}$. Since f is symmetric, it no longer necessarily integrates to 0 in time and we cannot argue as previously. We consider the decomposition $f = f_0 + f_1$ with

$$f_0(t, x) = f(0, x) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{T}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad f_1(t, x) = f(t, x) - f_0(t, x)$$

into a part f_0 that integrates to 0 in time and a part f_1 with Dirichlet boundary values. We then set $h(t, x) = \int_0^t f_0(s, x) ds$ and $g(x) = Gf_1(t, \cdot)(x)$, where $G = -(2\mathcal{L})^{-1}$ on $\text{span}\{e_k : \alpha_k \leq \frac{2}{T}\}$, i.e. $Ge_k = \frac{1}{2\alpha_k^2}e_k$, so that indeed $f = \partial_t h - 2\mathcal{L}g$. As in [EL24b], one shows that

$$\|f_0\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq e^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 = \|f_1\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq (1+e)^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2,$$

and the same estimate as previously yields $2\mathcal{E}_T(h) \leq 2\|f_0\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 \leq 4e^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2$. The terms $2\mathcal{E}_T(g)$ and $2\mathcal{E}_T(\partial_t g)$ can be bounded as in [EL24b], giving

$$2\mathcal{E}_T(g) \leq \frac{(1+e)^2}{2m} \|f\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad 2\mathcal{E}_T(\partial_t g) \leq \frac{(2 + \sqrt{2}\pi e)^2}{2mT^2} \|\partial_t f_1\|_{L^2(\lambda \otimes \mu)}^2.$$

Hence, for right-hand sides $f \in \mathbb{H}_{l,s}$, the statement is satisfied with constants

$$c_1^{l,s} = 1 + e, \quad c_2^{l,s} = 2e, \quad c_3^{l,s} = \frac{1+e}{\sqrt{2m}}, \quad c_4^{l,s} = \frac{\sqrt{2} + \pi e}{\sqrt{mT}} \leq \frac{10}{\sqrt{mT}}.$$

Case 4: Let $f \in \mathbb{H}_{h,a}$. As in [EL24b], we use the expansion $f(t, x) = \sum_{\alpha_k > \frac{\beta}{T}} b_k H_k^a(t, x)$, and it is sufficient to derive a representation

$$H_k^a = \partial_t h_k - 2\mathcal{L}g_k$$

for each of the basis functions H_k^a with $k \geq 1$ fixed. We write $u_k(t) = e^{-\alpha_k t} - e^{-\alpha_k(T-t)}$, so that $H_k^a(t, x) = u_k(t)e_k(x)$ and employ the ansatz

$$u_k = \dot{v}_k + w_k \quad \text{with} \quad v_k(0) = v_k(T) = w_k(0) = w_k(T) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Then setting $h_k(t, x) = v_k(t)e_k(x)$ and $g_k(t, x) = \frac{1}{2\alpha_k^2}w_k(t)e_k(x)$ yields $H_k^a = \partial_t h_k - 2\mathcal{L}g_k$ as desired. The construction of such v_k and w_k and the associated bounds follow as in [EL24b], we finally obtain the claim for right-hand sides $f \in \mathbb{H}_{h,a}$ with the constants

$$c_1^{h,a} = 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad c_2^{h,a} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{15}}, \quad c_3^{h,a} = \frac{T}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right), \quad c_4^{h,a} = 8.$$

Case 5: Let $f \in \mathbb{H}_{h,s}$. This can be treated as in the previous case, the bounds even improve slightly, see [EL24b]. We obtain the claim for $f \in \mathbb{H}_{h,s}$ with the constants

$$c_1^{h,s} = 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad c_2^{h,s} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{15}}, \quad c_3^{h,s} = \frac{T}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right), \quad c_4^{h,s} = 5 + \sqrt{2}.$$

Finally, the statement follows with the constants

$$c_i = 5 \max(c_i^{l,a}, c_i^{l,s}, c_i^{h,a}, c_i^{h,s}, c_i^\perp), \quad i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}.$$

□

4 Convergence of the jamming RTP process

The challenges posed by the RTP process are twofold, namely the non-trivial boundary behaviour with positive time spent on the boundary, and the intricate refreshment mechanism described by the velocity jumps. Addressing the first difficulty, we have already seen in Section 2.2 that the RTP process on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω is a lift of a time-changed sticky Brownian motion on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω . We now begin by proving the main result of convergence to equilibrium in Section 4.1 and continue in Section 4.2 by completing the proof of Theorem 5 which is necessary to characterise the L^2 -generator of the RTP process.

4.1 Convergence to equilibrium

We have to verify Assumptions (A)–(C) for the RTP process. To do so, the first step is splitting the generator

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}f(x, v) = v1_{\{0 < x < L\}}\partial_x f(x, v) + \sum_{\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda_{v\tilde{v}}f(x, \tilde{v}),$$

of the RTP process, see (6), into $\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} + \gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$. By analogy with Langevin dynamics, it would be tempting to choose

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f(x, v) = v1_{\{0 < x < L\}}\partial_x f(x, v) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_vf(x, v) = \sum_{\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda_{v\tilde{v}}f(x, \tilde{v})$$

to be the deterministic part of the dynamics and the random jumps, respectively. Unfortunately, that splitting does not take into account the interplay with the boundaries properly and $\hat{\mu}$ is invariant for neither $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ nor $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$. Indeed, $\gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ should leave

$$\kappa_x = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{-2} & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \frac{1}{4}\delta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{4}\delta_{-2} & \text{if } x \in (0, L), \\ \frac{1}{2}\delta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 & \text{if } x = L, \end{cases}$$

invariant. Therefore, $\gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$ is taken to be jumps in v with the rates of Figure 2 when $x \in (0, L)$, the rates of Figure 4a when $x = 0$ and the rates of Figure 4b when $x = L$.



Figure 4: Transition rates of v under $\gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v$.

Choosing $\gamma = \omega$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_vf(x, +2) &= 1_{\{x < L\}}2(f(x, 0) - f(x, +2)) + 1_{\{x = L\}}(f(x, 0) - f(x, +2)), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_vf(x, 0) &= 1_{\{x > 0\}}(f(x, +2) - f(x, 0)) + 1_{\{x < L\}}(f(x, -2) - f(x, 0)), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_vf(x, -2) &= 1_{\{x > 0\}}2(f(x, 0) - f(x, -2)) + 1_{\{x = 0\}}(f(x, 0) - f(x, -2)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f(x, +2) &= 1_{\{x < L\}}(+2)\partial_x f(x, +2) + 1_{\{x=L\}}\omega(f(x, 0) - f(x, +2)), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f(x, 0) &= 1_{\{x=0\}}\omega(f(x, +2) - f(x, 0)) + 1_{\{x=L\}}\omega(f(x, -2) - f(x, 0)), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f(x, -2) &= 1_{\{x > 0\}}(-2)\partial_x f(x, -2) + 1_{\{x=0\}}\omega(f(x, 0) - f(x, -2)).\end{aligned}$$

The transport term $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ hence describes motion with constant velocity v in the interior $(0, L)$ combined with velocity jumps with rate ω on the boundary.

Since the RTP process on $[0, L]$ with parameter ω is a lift of a sticky Brownian motion with parameter ω by Theorem 7, we begin by showing that the generator of sticky Brownian motion satisfies a Poincaré inequality and has discrete spectrum.

Lemma 17 (Poincaré inequality for sticky Brownian motion). *There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|f - \mu(f)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq C \frac{\omega L + (\omega L)^2}{\omega^2} \langle f, (-\mathcal{L}f) \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}$$

for all $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$.

Proof. Note that

$$\langle f, (-\mathcal{L}f) \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} = \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L (f')^2 dx$$

hence the goal is to establish an inequality of the form

$$\text{Var}_\mu(f) \leq \frac{1}{m} \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L (f')^2 dx.$$

Recall that if $\mu_p = \int \Pi_\theta dp(\theta)$ with probability measures Π_θ and p then

$$\text{Var}_{\mu_p}(f) = \int \text{Var}_{\Pi_\theta}(f) p(d\theta) + \text{Var}_p \left(\int f d\Pi_\theta \right).$$

Recall also that

$$\text{Var}_{\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_L}(g) = \frac{1}{4}(g(0) - g(L))^2 = \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_0^L g'(x) dx \right)^2.$$

Rather than applying this to the triple mixture we have, we apply it twice on a mixture of two components by rewriting

$$\mu = \frac{\omega L}{2 + \omega L} \mathcal{U}_{[0, L]} + \frac{2}{2 + \omega L} \left(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_L \right),$$

where $\mathcal{U}_{[0,L]}$ is the uniform distribution on $[0, L]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}_\mu(f) &= \frac{\omega L}{2 + \omega L} \mathrm{Var}_{\mathcal{U}_{[0,L]}}(f) + \frac{2}{2 + \omega L} \mathrm{Var}_{\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_L}(f) \\ &\quad + \frac{2\omega L}{(2 + \omega L)^2} \left(\frac{1}{L} \int_0^L f(x) \, dx - \frac{1}{2}f(0) - \frac{1}{2}f(L) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\omega L}{2 + \omega L} \mathrm{Var}_{\mathcal{U}_{[0,L]}}(f) + \frac{1/2}{2 + \omega L} \left(\int_0^L f'(x) \, dx \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2\omega L}{(2 + \omega L)^2} \left(\int_0^L f'(x) \frac{x - L/2}{L} \, dx \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

We apply the Poincaré inequality for the uniform measure and Cauchy-Schwarz to get

$$\mathrm{Var}_\mu(f) \leq \left(\frac{L}{\pi^2} \frac{\omega L}{2 + \omega L} + \frac{L}{2(2 + \omega L)} + \frac{2\omega L}{(2 + \omega L)^2} \cdot \frac{L}{12} \right) \int_0^L (f'(x))^2 \, dx$$

using $\int_0^L \left(\frac{x-L/2}{L}\right)^2 \, dx = \frac{L}{12}$. The claim follows since

$$\left(\frac{L}{\pi^2} \frac{\omega L}{2 + \omega L} + \frac{L}{2(2 + \omega L)} + \frac{2\omega L}{(2 + \omega L)^2} \cdot \frac{L}{12} \right) \frac{2 + \omega L}{\omega} = \frac{L^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{L}{2\omega} + \frac{L^2}{6(2 + \omega L)}. \quad \square$$

Let us now prove that the generator of sticky Brownian motion has a discrete spectrum. While this result is surely known, we were unable to find a suitable reference.

Lemma 18. *The generator $(\mathcal{L}, \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ of sticky Brownian motion has discrete spectrum.*

Proof. We will prove a Nash inequality for the Dirichlet form associated to the sticky Brownian motion and invariant measure μ . Starting from [Bre11, Chapter 8, eq. (42)], a Nash inequality holds for any interval in dimension 1 for the Lebesgue measure, i.e. there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\left(\int_0^L f^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \leq c \left(\int_0^L |f| \, dx \right)^{2/3} \left(\left(\int_0^L f^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_0^L (f')^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \right)^{1/3}.$$

By [Wan00] or [Bre11, Chapter 8, eq. (43)], this Nash inequality is equivalent to a super Poincaré inequality: For all $s > 0$

$$\int_0^L f^2 \, dx \leq s \int_0^L (f')^2 \, dx + \beta(s) \left(\int_0^L |f| \, dx \right)^2,$$

with $\beta(s)$ going to infinity of order $\sim s^{-2}$ when s goes to 0, so that we may assume $\beta(s) > 1$. Now, let us prove that it implies the same type of super Poincaré inequality

for the Dirichlet form associated to sticky Brownian motion. Denoting $a_0 = \frac{1}{2+\omega L}$ and $b_0 = \omega a_0$, for all $s > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int f^2 d\mu &= a_0(f(0)^2 + f(L)^2) + b_0 \int_0^L f^2 dx, \\ &\leq a_0(f(0)^2 + f(L)^2) + b_0 s \int_0^L (f')^2 dx + b_0 \beta(s) \left(\int_0^L |f| dx \right)^2, \\ &\leq b_0 s \int_0^L (f')^2 dx + b_0 \max(b_0^{-2}, a_0^{-1}) \beta(s) \left(\int |f| d\mu \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the sticky Brownian satisfies a super Poincaré inequality. Then by [Wan00, Th. 5.1], it has an empty essential spectrum. Now, by [BGL14, Th. A.6.4], the resolvent is compact and thus the generator has discrete spectrum. \square

Corollary 19. *Choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup of the RTP process is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate*

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\omega}{1 + (\omega L)^2} \right).$$

Note that the relaxation time corresponding to this decay rate is of the same order as the mixing time obtained in [GHM24]. It reveals the existence of two regimes controlled by the parameter ωL . In the ballistic regime $\omega L \ll 1$, velocity flips are rare, leading to a fast exploration of the position space \mathcal{S} and a comparatively slow exploration of the velocity space \mathcal{V} . This results in the scaling $\nu \propto \omega$. On the contrary, in the diffusive regime $\omega L \gg 1$, the high frequency of velocity flips makes the exploration of \mathcal{V} faster than the exploration of \mathcal{S} . This leads to the scaling $\nu \propto \omega^{-1} L^{-2}$.

Proof. We begin by verifying Assumption (A). Recall that $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$ is a core of \mathcal{L} by Theorem 7. For all $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$ we have $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v(f \circ \pi) = 0$ hence $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}$ is a lift of \mathcal{L} by Remark 8. Furthermore, for $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$ one has

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^*(f \circ \pi)(x, v) = -v 1_{\{0 < x < L\}} f'(x) = -\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f \circ \pi)(x, v).$$

A straightforward computation yields

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f(x, v) d\kappa_x(v) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}).$$

Finally, we prove $\|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \leq \frac{1}{m_v} \mathcal{E}_v(f)$ with $m_v = 2$. Define the matrices

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1/4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & -2 \end{pmatrix},$$

as well as the scalar product $\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} = x^\top S y$ and let Π be the orthogonal projection on the kernel of \mathcal{Q} with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{S}}$. The matrix \mathcal{Q} is symmetric w.r.t. the scalar

product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_S$ (i.e. $\mathcal{Q} = S^{-1} \mathcal{Q}^\top S$) so it admits an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors. Its eigenvalues are 0, -2, -4 and thus

$$\|\xi - \Pi\xi\|_S^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle \xi, (-\mathcal{Q})\xi \rangle_S \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

For $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$, taking $\xi = (f(x, 2), f(x, 0), f(x, -2))^\top$ in the inequality above yields

$$\kappa_x(f(x, \cdot)^2) - \kappa_x(f(x, \cdot))^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f(x, v) (-\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f)(x, v) d\kappa_x(v)$$

for $x \in (0, L)$. A similar argument leads to the same inequality for $x = 0$ and $x = L$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 &= \int_{[0, L]} [\kappa_x(f(x, \cdot)^2) - \kappa_x(f(x, \cdot))^2] d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[0, L]} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f(x, v) (-\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f)(x, v) d\kappa_x(v) d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_v(f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Assumption (A) is satisfied with $m_v = 2$. Assumption (B) is satisfied by Lemmas 17 and 18. In order to verify Assumption (C), let $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}})$ and $g \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0})$. We have that $u = f - \Pi_v f$ satisfies $\Pi_v u = 0$, so, in particular,

$$u(x, 2) + u(x, -2) = -2u(x, 0) \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, L].$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \\ &= \frac{\omega/4}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L (+2)\partial_x g(x)(+2)\partial_x u(x, +2) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\omega/4}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L (-2)\partial_x g(x)(-2)\partial_x u(x, -2) dx \\ &= \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L \partial_x g(x)(\partial_x u(x, +2) + \partial_x u(x, -2)) dx \\ &= \frac{-2\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L \partial_x g(x)\partial_x u(x, 0) dt, \\ &|\langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}| \\ &= |\langle 2\mathcal{L}g, u(\cdot, 0) \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}| \leq \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)} \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 &= \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} u(0, 0)^2 + \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L u(x, 0)^2 dx + \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} u(L, 0)^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2 + \omega L} \left(\frac{1}{2} u(0, -2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} u(0, 0)^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega L} \int_0^L \left(\frac{1}{4} u(x, -2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} u(x, 0)^2 + \frac{1}{4} u(x, +2)^2 \right) dx \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2 + \omega L} \left(\frac{1}{2} u(L, +2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} u(L, 0)^2 \right) \right] \\
&\leq 2 \|u\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left| \langle \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi), \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(f - \Pi_v f) \rangle_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \right| \leq \sqrt{2} \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)} \|f - \Pi_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}.$$

Therefore, (C1) is satisfied with $C_1^* = \sqrt{2}$ and $C_1^\dagger = 0$. Finally, let us show that (C2) is satisfied with $C_2^* = 2$. By Remark 10, it suffices to prove $\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})} \leq 2\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_v(f)}$. It is enough to show

$$\int [\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f(x, v)]^2 d\kappa_x(v) \leq 4 \int f(x, v) (-\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f)(x, v) d\kappa_x(v)$$

for all $x \in [0, L]$. For $x \in (0, L)$ this is equivalent to

$$\|\mathcal{Q}f\|_S^2 \leq 4 \langle f, -\mathcal{Q}f \rangle_S$$

with the same notation as above. The inequality again follows from the spectral decomposition of \mathcal{Q} in an orthonormal basis. The cases $x = 0$ and $x = L$ follow from the same arguments. To obtain the final convergence rate, we observe that $\frac{1}{m_v} \leq 2$, $C_1^* \leq 2$, $C_2^* \leq 2$, $C_1^\dagger = 0$, and that $\gamma = \omega$ is fixed. Hence Remark 13 yields exponential contractivity in $T = m^{-1/2}$ -average with the claimed rate. \square

4.2 Proof of Theorem 5

The following lemma is surely known, or at least folklore, but we did not find a reference, so the proof is included.

Lemma 20. *Let $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}))$ (resp. $(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}))$) be the extended (resp. C^0) generator of a Feller process $X(t)$ taking its values in the compact state space \mathcal{S} . Then $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}) = \{f \in C^0(\mathcal{S}) : f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}) \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}} f \in C^0(\mathcal{S})\}$ and*

$$\mathcal{L}_{C^0} f = \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}} f \quad \text{for all } f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{C^0}).$$

Proof. It follows from [Lig10, Theorem 3.32] that the extended generator is an extension of the C^0 -generator.

Let $f \in C^0(\mathcal{S})$ be such that $f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f \in C^0(\mathcal{S})$. Then

$$M(t) = f(X(t)) - f(X(0)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f(X(s)) \, ds$$

is a local martingale. Hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| f(X(t)) - f(X(0)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f(X(s)) \, ds \right| \right] \leq 2\|f\|_\infty + t\|\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f\|_\infty < +\infty$$

implies that $M(t)$ is a martingale and thus

$$P_t f(x) - f(x) = \mathbb{E}_x [f(X(t)) - f(X(0))] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f(X(s)) \, ds \right] = \int_0^t (P_s \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f)(x) \, ds.$$

The function $s \mapsto P_s \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f$ is continuous from \mathbb{R}_+ to $C^0(\mathcal{S})$ hence the integral $\int_0^t P_s \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f \, ds$ is well-defined in C^0 and the pointwise equality above implies

$$\frac{P_t f - f}{t} = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_s \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f \, ds \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0,$$

using the continuity of $s \mapsto P_s \mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}}f$ to obtain a $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -limit. \square

Lemma 21 (C^0 -generator of the RTP process).

(i) *The RTP process is Feller.*

(ii) *Its C^0 -generator is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f(x, 2) &= 2\partial_x f(x, 2) + 2\omega(f(x, 0) - f(x, 2)), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f(x, 0) &= \omega f(x, 2) + \omega f(x, -2) - 2\omega f(x, 0), \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f(x, -2) &= -2\partial_x f(x, -2) + 2\omega(f(x, 0) - f(x, -2)), \end{aligned}$$

and its domain $\text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0})$ consists of all $f \in C^0(\hat{\mathcal{S}})$ such that

$$f(\cdot, \pm 2) \in C^1([0, L]) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_x f(L, 2) = \partial_x f(0, -2) = 0.$$

Proof. (i) It is enough to show that $\mathbb{P}_{(\tilde{x}_0, v_0)}$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{P}_{(x_0, v_0)}$ when $\tilde{x}_0 \rightarrow x_0$. Following arguments in [GHM24], we consider the coupling of $\mathbb{P}_{(\tilde{x}_0, v_0)}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{(x_0, v_0)}$ obtained by taking the same relative velocity process $v(t)$. Since $y \mapsto \min(L, \max(0, y + v(0)t))$ is 1-Lipschitz, we have

$$|x(t) - \tilde{x}(t)| = |\min(L, \max(0, x_0 + v(0)t)) - \min(L, \max(0, \tilde{x}_0 + v(0)t))| \leq |x_0 - \tilde{x}_0|$$

for $t \leq T_1$. In particular, $|x(T_1) - \tilde{x}(T_1)| \leq |x_0 - \tilde{x}_0|$. So, by induction, $|x(t) - \tilde{x}(t)| \leq |x_0 - \tilde{x}_0|$ for all $t \geq 0$, and the Feller property follows.

(ii) The claim follows from the derivation of the extended generator in [GHM24] and Lemma 20. \square

The invariance of $\hat{\mu}$ (Theorem 5 (i)) is already proven in [HGM23] and can be directly checked here using the generator [Lig10, Theorem 3.37]. We now provide the proof for the $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ generator and its domain.

Proof of Theorem 5 (ii). The $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ generator is the closure of $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0}))$ in $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ by [EN99, Proposition II.1.7]. We concentrate on the case $v = 2$ as cases $v = 0$ and $v = -2$ follow from the same arguments. Denote $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}))$ the operator defined in Theorem 5 (ii).

We first show $\overline{(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0}))} \subseteq (\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}))$: Let $f_n \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0})$ be such that

$$f_n \longrightarrow f \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f_n \longrightarrow g \quad \text{in } L^2(\hat{\mu}).$$

We need to show that $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = g$. On $(0, L)$ one has

$$\partial_x f_n(\cdot, 2) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f_n(\cdot, 2) - 2\omega [f_n(\cdot, 0) - f_n(\cdot, 2)] \right)$$

hence $\partial_x f_n(\cdot, 2)$ converges in $L^2((0, L), dx)$ to $h = \frac{1}{2} (g(\cdot, 2) - 2\omega (f(\cdot, 0) - f(\cdot, 2)))$. For $\phi \in C_c^\infty((0, L))$ we have

$$- \int_0^L f(\cdot, 2) \phi' dx = - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L f_n(\cdot, 2) \phi' dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L \partial_x f_n(\cdot, 2) \phi dx = \int_0^L h \phi dx.$$

Hence $f(\cdot, 2) \in H^1((0, L))$, $f_n(\cdot, 2) \rightarrow f(\cdot, 2)$ in $H^1((0, L))$, and $g(x, 2) = 2\partial_x f(x, 2) + 2\omega (f(x, 0) - f(x, 2))$ for $x \in (0, L)$. Since function evaluations at $(L, 2)$ and $(L, 0)$ are well-defined and continuous from $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ to \mathbb{R} , we obtain $g(L, 2) = \omega (f(L, 0) - f(L, 2))$. Furthermore, $F \mapsto F(L-, 2)$ is the trace operator which is continuous on $H^1((0, L))$, so that

$$f_n(L-, 2) = f_n(L, 2) \text{ for all } n \geq 0 \implies f(L-, 2) = f(L, 2),$$

which yields $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = g$.

It remains to show $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})) \subseteq \overline{(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0}, \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0}))}$: Let $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ be given. We now construct a sequence $f_n \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0})$ such that $f_n \longrightarrow f$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f_n \longrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{L}}f$ in $L^2(\hat{\mu})$.

Let $h_n \in C^\infty((0, L))$ be a sequence converging to $f(\cdot, 2)$ in $H^1((0, L))$. Define

$$\chi_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq L(1 - 1/n), \\ \frac{x - L(1 - 1/n)}{L(1 - 1/(2n)) - L(1 - 1/n)} & \text{if } x \in (L(1 - 1/n), L(1 - 1/(2n))), \\ 1 & \text{if } x \geq L(1 - 1/(2n)). \end{cases}$$

which is in $C^0([0, L])$. Set $g_n(x) = h_n(x) - \int_0^x h'_n(y) \chi_n(y) dy$. One has $g_n \in C^1([0, L])$ as well as

$$g'_n(L) = h'_n(L) - h'_n(L) \chi_n(L) = 0.$$

Furthermore,

$$\left(\int_0^x h'_n \chi_n dy \right)^2 \leq \left(\int_0^L (h'_n)^2 dy \right) \left(\int_0^L \chi_n^2 dy \right) \leq \left(\int_0^L (h'_n)^2 dy \right) \cdot \frac{L}{n}$$

so that $x \mapsto \int_0^x h'_n(y) \chi_n(y) dy$ converges to 0 uniformly and thus in $L^2((0, L), dx)$. For all $a \in (0, L)$ we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L (h'_n \chi_n)^2 dy \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^L (h'_n)^2 dy = \int_a^L (\partial_x f(\cdot, +2))^2 dy,$$

so taking $a \rightarrow L$ yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L (h'_n \chi_n)^2 dy = 0.$$

Hence $x \mapsto \int_0^x h'_n(y) \chi_n(y) dy$ converges to 0 in $H^1((0, L))$. We deduce that g_n converges to $f(\cdot, 2)$ in $H^1((0, L))$. Because the trace $F \mapsto F(L-, 2)$ is continuous from $H^1((0, L))$ to \mathbb{R} and $f(L-, 2) = f(L, 2)$ we have that $g_n \rightarrow f(\cdot, 2)$ in $L^2([0, L], \lambda_{[0, L]} + \delta_L)$ as required. Thus taking $f_n(x, +2) = g_n(x)$ yields convergence of $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{C^0} f_n)(\cdot, +2)$ to $\hat{\mathcal{L}} f(\cdot, +2)$ in $L^2(\lambda_{[0, L]} + \delta_L)$. The cases $v = 0$ and $v = -2$ can be treated similarly to obtain an approximating sequence for $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{L})$ that converges in $L^2(\hat{\mu})$. \square

5 PDMPs for sampling

In this section, we consider a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d with density proportional to $\exp(-U)$, where $U: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-U(x)} dx < \infty$. We assume that μ satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant $\frac{1}{m}$ and that the generator $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$ of the overdamped Langevin diffusion with invariant probability measure μ , see Example 3, has discrete spectrum. The latter is for instance satisfied if there exists $\beta > 1$ such that

$$\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nabla U(x) \cdot x}{|x|^\beta} > 0,$$

see [BGW15, Theorem 5]. As in Example 14, we assume the lower curvature bound

$$\nabla^2 U(x) \geq -Km \cdot I_d \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (13)$$

for some $K \geq 0$.

Piecewise deterministic Markov processes (PDMPs) have recently been studied as highly efficient non-reversible samplers in physics and statistics, where proving exponential ergodicity is crucial. Depending on communities or the specific choice of dynamics, these processes appear under different algorithmic names, including (Forward) Event Chain Monte Carlo [MKK14, MDS20], the Zig-Zag sampler [BRZ19] and the Bouncy Particle sampler [DGM20]. Very recently, using the Dolbeault-Mouhot-Schmeiser approach [DMS15], results with well-controlled dimensional dependence were established in [ADNR21]. These results were refined in [LW22] using the variational approach by Albritton, Armstrong, Mourrat and Novack for the Zig-Zag process and the Bouncy Particle sampler. Here, we extend these results using our method, treating in particular two previously unaddressed cases: the true Zig-Zag process, without the condition of Gaussian velocities, and the Forward generalisation that incorporates stochastic jumps at events.

5.1 Forward process

The forward Event Chain process introduced in [MDS20] is a PDMP (X_t, V_t) with state space $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and invariant probability measure $\hat{\mu} = \mu \otimes \kappa$, where κ is the d -dimensional standard Gaussian. It extends previously developed algorithms, as the Bouncy Particle Sampler and the Zig-Zag process, as the velocity update at an event is now governed more generally by a Markov kernel. We consider the *full-orthogonal refresh* variant whose generator is given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}f(x, v) = v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) + (v \cdot \nabla U(x))_+(B_-f - f)(x, v) + \gamma(\Pi_v f - f)(x, v)$$

for $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where

$$B_{\pm}f(x, v) = \frac{1}{Z_x} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (w \cdot \nabla U(x))_{\pm} f(x, w) \kappa(dw)$$

and $Z_x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (w \cdot \nabla U(x))_+ \kappa(dw) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} |\nabla U(x)|$. It moves along straight lines between events occurring with rate $(v \cdot \nabla U)_+$. At an event, the velocity V_t is resampled according to the distribution $Z_{X_t}^{-1} (v \cdot \nabla U(X_t))_- \kappa(dw)$, corresponding to the distribution for the reflection of the new direction to trigger an event. This corresponds to a resampling of the whole vector V_t , including its component along the direction $\nabla U(X_t)$, as opposed to a simple reflection or flip as respectively for the Bouncy Particle Sampler or Zig-Zag process. The forward Event Chain process admits a natural splitting of its generator. For $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f(x, v) &= v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) + (v \cdot \nabla U(x))_+(B_-f - f)(x, v) \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f(x, v) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, w) \kappa(dw) - f(x, v) = \Pi_v f(x, v) - f(x, v), \end{aligned}$$

so that $\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f + \gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_vf$.

Assumption 1. There exist $a \in [0, 1)$ and $b \geq 0$ such that

$$\Delta U(x) \leq a|\nabla U(x)|^2 + b \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (14)$$

For example, Assumption 1 is satisfied with $a = 0$ and $b = dL$ if $\nabla^2 U(x) \leq L \cdot I_d$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Corollary 22. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied. Then, choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup of the Forward process is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate*

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + \frac{m(K+1)+b}{(1-a)^2}} \right).$$

In particular, if $\gamma = \Theta \left(\frac{\sqrt{m(K+1)+b}}{(1-a)^2} \right)$ then $\nu = \Omega \left(\sqrt{m}(1-a) / \sqrt{1+K+b/m} \right)$.

Remark 23. In case $m \cdot I_d \leq \nabla^2 U \leq L \cdot I_d$, and with $\gamma = \Theta(\sqrt{m + dL})$, we obtain $\nu = \Omega(\sqrt{m}/\sqrt{dL/m})$. We thus recover the same dimension dependence as for the Bouncy Particle sampler in [LW22] but an additional dependence on the condition number.

Proof of Corollary 22. Assumptions (A) and (B) can be verified as for the Langevin dynamics in Example 14. Indeed, the forward Event Chain process is a lift of an overdamped diffusion with generator $(\mathcal{L}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L}))$, and Assumption (A)(ii) is satisfied with $m_v = 1$. Assumption (C2) holds with $C_2^* = 1$ by Remark 10, we hence focus on Assumption (C1).

It is enough to estimate $\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + (\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}$ by Remark 9. Noticing

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) = v \cdot \nabla_x g \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* f = -v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) + (v \cdot \nabla U(x))_-(B_+ f - f)(x, v)$$

for $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, one has

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)(x, v) = -v^\top \nabla^2 g(x) v + \frac{1}{Z_x} (v \cdot \nabla U(x))_- \left(\frac{1}{2} \nabla U(x) \cdot \nabla g(x) - Z_x v \cdot \nabla g(x) \right).$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \int (\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^*(v \cdot \nabla_x g))^2 \kappa(dv) &\leq 2 \int (v \cdot \nabla^2 g v)^2 \kappa(dv) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{Z^2} \int (v \cdot \nabla U)_-^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \nabla U \cdot \nabla g - Z v \cdot \nabla g \right)^2 \kappa(dv) \\ &= 4 \|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2 + 2(\Delta g)^2 \\ &\quad + 2\left(3 + \frac{\pi}{4}\right) (\nabla U \cdot \nabla g)^2 + |\nabla U|^2 |\nabla g|^2. \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Using (14) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla U|^2 |\nabla g|^2 d\mu &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta U |\nabla g|^2 d\mu + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla U^\top \nabla^2 g \nabla g d\mu \\ &\leq a \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla U|^2 |\nabla g|^2 d\mu + b \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla g|^2 d\mu + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla U^\top \nabla^2 g \nabla g d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now using $2\nabla U^\top \nabla^2 g \nabla g \leq 2|\nabla U| |\nabla g| \|\nabla^2 g\|_F \leq p|\nabla U|^2 |\nabla g|^2 + \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2$ for any $p > 0$, choosing $p = \frac{1-a}{2}$ and rearranging yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla U|^2 |\nabla g|^2 d\mu &\leq \frac{2b}{1-a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla g|^2 d\mu + \frac{4}{(1-a)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2 d\mu \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2b}{1-a} + \frac{4Km}{(1-a)^2} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla g|^2 d\mu + \frac{4}{(1-a)^2} \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Finally, the bounds $(\Delta g)^2 \leq 2(2\mathcal{L}g)^2 + (\nabla U \cdot \nabla g)^2$ and $(\nabla U \cdot \nabla g)^2 \leq |\nabla U|^2 |\nabla g|^2$ as well

as Bochner's identity yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \\
& \leq C \left(\|\|\nabla^2 g\|_F\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + \|\Delta g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + \|\nabla U \cdot \nabla g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + \|\|\nabla U\|\nabla g\|\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + 2Km\mathcal{E}(g) + \|\|\nabla U\|\nabla g\|\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\frac{1}{(1-a)^2} \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + \frac{b(1-a) + Km}{(1-a)^2} (2\mathcal{E}(g)) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ denotes an absolute constant changing from line to line. Therefore, overall, one can choose $C_1^* = C \frac{1}{1-a}$ and $C_1^\dagger = C \frac{\sqrt{b(1-a)+Km}}{1-a} \leq C \frac{\sqrt{b+Km}}{1-a}$. \square

5.2 Zig-Zag process

The convergence to equilibrium for the Zig-Zag process with Gaussian velocities is considered in [LW22]. In practice, one usually considers velocities chosen uniformly among the (scaled) coordinate directions $\{\pm\sqrt{d}e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ or from the hypercube $\{-1, +1\}^d$ [BRZ19]. We consider any of these dynamics, i.e. let \mathcal{V} be \mathbb{R}^d , $\{\pm\sqrt{d}e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, or $\{-1, +1\}^d$, and consider $\kappa = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ or $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\mathcal{V})$, correspondingly.

The Zig-Zag process (X_t, V_t) is a PDMP with state space $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{V}$ that, between events, moves with constant velocity $v \in \mathcal{V}$. The k -th component v_k of the velocity is then flipped with rate $(v_k \partial_k U(x))_+$. Additionally, with rate $\gamma > 0$, a new velocity is chosen from \mathcal{V} according to the distribution κ . Note that this velocity refreshment mechanism may not be needed for ergodicity in the hypercube case [BRZ19], but it is essential in our approach. This process has $\hat{\mu} = \mu \otimes \kappa$ as its invariant probability measure [BRZ19], and the generator of the associated transition semigroup in $L^2(\hat{\mu})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{L}}f(x, v) &= v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) + \sum_{i=1}^d (v_i \partial_i U(x))_+ (f(x, v - 2e_i v_i) - f(x, v)) \\
&\quad + \gamma \left(\int f(x, w) \kappa(dw) - f(x, v) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for compactly supported functions $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{V}$. Under additional assumptions, see [DGM21], $C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ forms a core for $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$. For $f \in \text{Dom}(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}} f(x, v) &= v \cdot \nabla_x f(x, v) + \sum_{i=1}^d (v_i \partial_i U(x))_+ (f(x, v - 2e_i v_i) - f(x, v)) \quad \text{and} \\
\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f(x, v) &= \int_{\mathcal{V}} f(x, w) \kappa(dw) - f(x, v) = (\Pi_v f)(x, v) - f(x, v),
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\hat{\mathcal{L}}f = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}f + \gamma\hat{\mathcal{L}}_v f$.

Assumption 2. There exists $L \geq 0$ such that $\partial_{kk}U(x) \leq L$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In particular, Assumption 2 holds if $\nabla^2 U(x) \leq L \cdot I_d$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Corollary 24. *Let Assumption 2 be satisfied.*

- (i) *Let $\kappa = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ or $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\{-1, +1\}^d)$. Then, choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup (\hat{P}_t) of the Zig-Zag process is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate*

$$\nu = \Omega\left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + m(1+K) + L}\right).$$

If $\gamma = \Theta\left(\sqrt{m(1+K) + L}\right)$ then $\nu = \Omega\left(\sqrt{m} / \sqrt{(1+K) + L/m}\right)$.

- (ii) *Let $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\{\pm\sqrt{d}e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\})$. Then, choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup (\hat{P}_t) of the Zig-Zag process is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate*

$$\nu = \Omega\left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + md(K+1) + Ld}\right).$$

If $\gamma = \Theta\left(\sqrt{(m(1+K) + L)d}\right)$ then $\nu = \Omega\left(\sqrt{m} / \sqrt{((1+K) + L/m)d}\right)$.

In [LW22], quantitative convergence rates for the Zig-Zag process with Gaussian velocities are shown. Corollary 24 recovers the same scaling in m , d and L under slightly weaker assumptions in the practically relevant case of velocities chosen from the hypercube [BFR19].

Proof of Corollary 24. Assumptions (A) and (B) can be verified as for the Langevin dynamics in Example 14. Indeed, the Zig-Zag process satisfies $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(f \circ \pi)(x, v) = v \cdot \nabla f(x)$ for all $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since the distributions κ we consider are centred and have identity covariance matrix, the Zig-Zag process is a lift of the overdamped Langevin diffusion with invariant measure μ and generator $\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla^* \nabla$ in $L^2(\mu)$ and core $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any of these choices of velocity distribution, and Assumption (A)(ii) is satisfied with $m_v = 1$. Assumption (C2) holds with $C_2^* = 1$ by Remark 10, we hence focus on Assumption (C1).

We have

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* f(x, v) = -v \cdot \nabla_x f + \sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U(x))_- (f(x, v - 2e_k v_k) - f(x, v))$$

for all $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and thus

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) = -v \cdot \nabla^2 g(x) v - 2 \sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U(x))_- v_k \partial_k g(x).$$

for all $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This gives

$$\text{Var}_\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi)) \leq 2 \text{Var}_\kappa(v \cdot \nabla^2 g v) + 8 \text{Var}_\kappa\left(\sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U)_- v_k \partial_k g\right).$$

This can be bounded using the moments of κ in the following way.

(i) If $\kappa = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ or $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\{-1, +1\}^d)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_\kappa (v \cdot \nabla^2 g v) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_\kappa (v_i^4) (\partial_{ii} g)^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_\kappa (v_i^2 v_j^2) (2(\partial_{ij} g)^2 + \partial_{ii} g \partial_{jj} g) - (\Delta g)^2 \\
&\leq 2 \|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2, \quad \text{and} \\
\text{Var}_\kappa \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U) - v_k \partial_k g \right) &= \sum_{k=1}^d \text{Var}_\kappa ((v_k \partial_k U) - v_k \partial_k g) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E}_\kappa ((v_k \partial_k U)^2 - (v_k \partial_k g)^2) - (\mathbb{E}_\kappa ((v_k \partial_k U) - v_k \partial_k g))^2 \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^d \partial_k U^2 \partial_k g^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\kappa (v_k^4) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\kappa (v_k^2) \right)^2 \right) \\
&= C_\kappa \sum_{k=1}^d (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2
\end{aligned}$$

with $C_\kappa = \frac{5}{4}$ in the Gaussian case, and $C_\kappa = \frac{1}{4}$ in the hypercube case. Hence

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + 2(\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \leq 4 \|\|\nabla^2 g\|_F\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + 8C_\kappa \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu.$$

(ii) If $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\{\pm\sqrt{d}e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\})$ is the uniform distribution on the scaled coordinate directions, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_\kappa (v \cdot \nabla^2 g v) &= d \sum_{k=1}^d (\partial_{kk} g)^2 - (\Delta g)^2 \leq d \|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2, \quad \text{and} \\
\text{Var}_\kappa \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U) - v_k \partial_k g \right) &= \mathbb{E}_\kappa \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U)^2 - (v_k \partial_k g)^2 \right) - \left(\mathbb{E}_\kappa \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (v_k \partial_k U) - v_k \partial_k g \right) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{d}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 - \frac{1}{4} (\nabla U \cdot \nabla g)^2 \leq \frac{d}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2
\end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}^* \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{tr}}(g \circ \pi) + 2(\mathcal{L}g) \circ \pi\|_{L^2(\hat{\mu})}^2 \leq 2d \|\|\nabla^2 g\|_F\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + 4d \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu.$$

It thus remains to bound $\sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu$ in all three cases. An integration by parts and $2ab \leq \frac{1}{2}a^2 + 2b^2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu &= \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k g)^2 \partial_{kk} U d\mu + 2 \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_k U \partial_{kk} g \partial_k g d\mu \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k g)^2 \partial_{kk} U d\mu + \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 + 2 (\partial_{kk} g)^2 \right) d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

so that rearranging yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_{kk} U (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu + 4 \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_{kk} g)^2 d\mu.$$

Therefore, by Assumption 2,

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu \leq 2L \|\nabla g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + 4 \|\nabla^2 g\|_F^2_{L^2(\mu)}. \quad (16)$$

Hence, using Bochner's identity and (13), Assumption (C1) is satisfied with

$$C_1^* = \sqrt{4 + 32C_\kappa} \leq \sqrt{44} \quad \text{and} \quad C_1^\dagger = \sqrt{16LC_\kappa + (32C_\kappa + 4)Km} \leq \sqrt{44Km + 20L}$$

in the Gaussian and hypercube case, and with

$$C_1^* = \sqrt{18d} \quad \text{and} \quad C_1^\dagger = \sqrt{8dL + 18dKm}$$

in the case of uniform distribution on the scaled coordinate directions. One then concludes by Remark 13. \square

If instead of Assumption 2 we assume the weaker Assumption 1, we obtain the same rate as for the Forward process in Corollary 22, at least for Gaussian or uniform on the hypercube velocities.

Corollary 25. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied.*

(i) *Let $\kappa = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ or $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\{-1, +1\}^d)$. Then, choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup (\hat{P}_t) of the Zig-Zag process is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate*

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + \frac{m(K+1)+b}{(1-a)^2}} \right).$$

If $\gamma = \Theta \left(\frac{\sqrt{m(K+1)+b}}{1-a} \right)$ then $\nu = \Omega \left((1-a)\sqrt{m} / \sqrt{(1+K)+b/m} \right)$.

(ii) Let $\kappa = \text{Unif}(\{\pm\sqrt{d}e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\})$. Then, choosing $T = m^{-1/2}$, the transition semigroup (\hat{P}_t) of the Zig-Zag process is exponentially contractive in T -average with rate

$$\nu = \Omega \left(\frac{\gamma m}{\gamma^2 + \frac{md(K+1)+bd}{(1-a)^2}} \right).$$

If $\gamma = \Theta \left(\frac{\sqrt{md(K+1)+bd}}{(1-a)^2} \right)$ then $\nu = \Omega \left((1-a)\sqrt{m} / \sqrt{((1+K)+b/m)d} \right)$.

Proof. The only difference to the proof of Corollary 24 is the treatment of the term $\sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu$ in the verification of Assumption (C1). We can use (15) to get

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_k U)^2 (\partial_k g)^2 d\mu \leq \| \|\nabla U\| \|\nabla g\| \|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq \frac{2b(1-a) + 4Km}{(1-a)^2} 2\mathcal{E}(g) + \frac{4}{(1-a)^2} \|2\mathcal{L}g\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2.$$

Assumption (C1) then follows with the constants

$$C_1^* = \sqrt{\frac{32C_\kappa}{(1-a)^2} + 4} \leq \frac{\sqrt{44}}{1-a} \quad \text{and}$$

$$C_1^\dagger = \sqrt{4Km + 8C_\kappa \frac{2b(1-a) + 4Km}{(1-a)^2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{44Km + 20b}}{1-a}$$

in the Gaussian and hypercube case, and with

$$C_1^* = \sqrt{2d + 4d \frac{4}{(1-a)^2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{18d}}{1-a} \quad \text{and}$$

$$C_1^\dagger = \sqrt{2dKm + 4d \frac{2b(1-a) + 4Km}{(1-a)^2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{18dKm + 8db}}{1-a}$$

in the case of uniform distribution on the scaled coordinate directions. One then concludes by Remark 13. \square

Acknowledgments

A. Eberle and F. Lörler were supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy – GZ 2047/1, Project-ID 390685813. A. Eberle and F. Lörler wurden gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) im Rahmen der Exzellenzstrategie des Bundes und der Länder – GZ 2047/1, Projekt-ID 390685813. All the authors acknowledge the support of the French Agence nationale de la recherche under the grant ANR-20-CE46-0007 (SuSa project). A. Guillin and M. Michel are supported by the ANR-23-CE-40003, Conviviality. A. Guillin has benefited from a government grant managed by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche under the France 2030 investment plan ANR-23-EXMA-0001.

References

- [AAMN24] Dallas Albritton, Scott Armstrong, Jean-Christophe Mourrat, and Matthew Novack. Variational methods for the kinetic Fokker–Planck equation. *Analysis & PDE*, 17(6):1953–2010, 2024.
- [ADNR21] Christophe Andrieu, Alain Durmus, Nikolas Nüsken, and Julien Roussel. Hypocoercivity of piecewise deterministic Markov process-Monte Carlo. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 31(5):2478–2517, 2021.
- [AG19] L Angelani and R Garra. Run-and-tumble motion in one dimension with space-dependent speed. *Phys. Rev. E*, 100(5):052147, 2019.
- [Ang17] Luca Angelani. Confined run-and-tumble swimmers in one dimension. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 50(32):325601, 2017.
- [BCVD18] Alexandre Bouchard-Côté, Sebastian J Vollmer, and Arnaud Doucet. The bouncy particle sampler: A nonreversible rejection-free markov chain monte carlo method. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 113(522):855–867, 2018.
- [Ber04] Howard C Berg. *E. Coli in Motion*. Springer, New York, 2004.
- [BFR19] Joris Bierkens, Paul Fearnhead, and Gareth Roberts. The zig-zag process and super-efficient sampling for Bayesian analysis of big data. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(3):1288–1320, 2019.
- [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.
- [BGW15] François Bolley, Arnaud Guillin, and Xinyu Wang. Non ultracontractive heat kernel bounds by Lyapunov conditions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(3):857–870, 2015.
- [BLW24] Giovanni Brigati, Francis Lörler, and Lihan Wang. Hypocoercivity meets lifts, 2024.
- [Bre11] Haim Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [BRZ19] Joris Bierkens, Gareth O. Roberts, and Pierre-André Zitt. Ergodicity of the zigzag process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 29(4):2266–2301, 2019.
- [BS24] Giovanni Brigati and Gabriel Stoltz. How to construct decay rates for kinetic fokker–planck equations?, 2024.

- [BSWW24] Giovanni Brigati, Gabriel Stoltz, Andi Q. Wang, and Lihan Wang. Explicit convergence rates of underdamped langevin dynamics under weighted and weak poincaré–lions inequalities, 2024.
- [BVL22] Joris Bierkens and Sjoerd M Verduyn Lunel. Spectral analysis of the zigzag process. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 58, pages 827–860. Institut Henri Poincaré, 2022.
- [CH13] Ting-Li Chen and Chii-Ruey Hwang. Accelerating reversible Markov chains. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 83(9):1956–1962, 2013.
- [CLP99] Fang Chen, László Lovász, and Igor Pak. Lifting markov chains to speed up mixing. In *Proceedings of the thirty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 275–281, 1999.
- [CLW23] Yu Cao, Jianfeng Lu, and Lihan Wang. On explicit l_2 -convergence rate estimate for underdamped langevin dynamics. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 247(90), 2023.
- [CT15] Michael E Cates and Julien Tailleur. Motility-induced phase separation. *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.*, 6(1):219–244, 2015.
- [Dav84] Mark HA Davis. Piecewise-deterministic markov processes: A general class of non-diffusion stochastic models. *J. R. Stat. Soc.*, 46(3):353–376, 1984.
- [DGM20] Alain Durmus, Arnaud Guillin, and Pierre Monmarché. Geometric ergodicity of the Bouncy Particle Sampler. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30(5), October 2020.
- [DGM21] Alain Durmus, Arnaud Guillin, and Pierre Monmarché. Piecewise deterministic Markov processes and their invariant measures. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(3):1442 – 1475, 08 2021.
- [DHN00] Persi Diaconis, Susan Holmes, and Radford M Neal. Analysis of a nonreversible markov chain sampler. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 10(3):726–752, 2000.
- [DKM⁺19] Abhishek Dhar, Anupam Kundu, Satya N Majumdar, Sanjib Sabhapandit, and Grégory Schehr. Run-and-tumble particle in one-dimensional confining potentials: Steady-state, relaxation, and first-passage properties. *Phys. Rev. E*, 99(3):032132, 2019.
- [DMS15] Jean Dolbeault, Clément Mouhot, and Christian Schmeiser. Hypocoercivity for linear kinetic equations conserving mass. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(6):3807–3828, 2015.
- [EGZ19] Andreas Eberle, Arnaud Guillin, and Raphael Zimmer. Couplings and quantitative contraction rates for Langevin dynamics. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):1982–2010, 2019.

- [EL24a] Andreas Eberle and Francis Lörler. Non-reversible lifts of reversible diffusion processes and relaxation times. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, pages 1–31, 2024.
- [EL24b] Andreas Eberle and Francis Lörler. Space-time divergence lemmas and optimal non-reversible lifts of diffusions on Riemannian manifolds with boundary, 12 2024.
- [EN99] Klaus-Jochen Engel and Rainer Nagel. *One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*, volume 194 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 10 1999.
- [EWG15] Jens Elgeti, Roland G Winkler, and Gerhard Gompper. Physics of microswimmers—single particle motion and collective behavior: a review. *Reports on progress in physics*, 78(5):056601, 2015.
- [Gal11] G. P. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2 edition, 2011.
- [GHM24] Arnaud Guillin, Leo Hahn, and Manon Michel. Long-time analysis of a pair of on-lattice and continuous run-and-tumble particles with jamming interactions, 2024.
- [GM16] Arnaud Guillin and Pierre Monmarché. Optimal linear drift for the speed of convergence of an hypoelliptic diffusion. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 21:Paper No. 74, 14, 2016.
- [Hah25] Leo Hahn. Steady state and mixing of two run-and-tumble particles interacting through jamming and attractive forces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.11379*, 2025.
- [HGM23] Léo Hahn, Arnaud Guillin, and Manon Michel. Jamming pair of general run-and-tumble particles: Exact results and universality classes, 2023.
- [HHMS93] Chii-Ruey Hwang, Shu-Yin Hwang-Ma, and Shuenn Jyi Sheu. Accelerating Gaussian diffusions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(3):897–913, 1993.
- [HHMS05] Chii-Ruey Hwang, Shu-Yin Hwang-Ma, and Shuenn-Jyi Sheu. Accelerating diffusions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(2):1433–1444, 2005.
- [Hor91] Alan M Horowitz. A generalized guided monte carlo algorithm. *Phys. Lett. B*, 268(2):247–252, 1991.
- [Hé07] Frédéric Hérau. Short and long time behavior of the Fokker-Planck equation in a confining potential and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 244(1):95–118, 2007.

- [Leh24] Joseph Lehec. Convergence in total variation for the kinetic langevin algorithm, 2024.
- [Lig10] Thomas Milton Liggett. *Continuous time Markov processes: an introduction*, volume 113. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [LNP13] T. Lelièvre, F. Nier, and G. A. Pavliotis. Optimal non-reversible linear drift for the convergence to equilibrium of a diffusion. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 152(2):237–274, 2013.
- [LW22] Jianfeng Lu and Lihan Wang. On explicit l_2 -convergence rate estimate for piecewise deterministic markov processes in mcmc algorithms. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 32(2):1333–1361, 2022.
- [MBE19] Emil Mallmin, Richard A Blythe, and Martin R Evans. Exact spectral solution of two interacting run-and-tumble particles on a ring lattice. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2019(1):013204, 2019.
- [MDS20] Manon Michel, Alain Durmus, and Stéphane Sénécal. Forward event-chain Monte Carlo: fast sampling by randomness control in irreversible Markov chains. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, 29(4):689–702, 2020.
- [MJK⁺18] Kanaya Malakar, V Jemseena, Anupam Kundu, K Vijay Kumar, Sanjib Sabhapandit, Satya N Majumdar, S Redner, and Abhishek Dhar. Steady state, relaxation and first-passage properties of a run-and-tumble particle in one-dimension. *J. Stat. Mech.*, 2018(4), 2018.
- [MKK14] Manon Michel, S-C. Kapfer, and Werner Krauth. Generalized event-chain monte carlo: Constructing rejection-free global-balance algorithms from infinitesimal steps. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 140, 2014.
- [Nea11] Radford M. Neal. MCMC using Hamiltonian dynamics. In Steve Brooks, Andrew Gelman, Galin Jones, and Xiao-Li Meng, editors, *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, Handbooks of Modern Statistical Methods, pages 113–162. CRC Press, New York, 2011.
- [NMKH15] Yoshihiko Nishikawa, Manon Michel, Werner Krauth, and Koji Hukushima. Event-chain algorithm for the heisenberg model: Evidence for $z \simeq 1$ dynamic scaling. *Phys. Rev. E*, 92:063306, 12 2015.
- [Pav14] Grigorios A. Pavliotis. *Stochastic Processes and Applications: Diffusion Processes, the Fokker-Planck and Langevin Equations*, volume 60 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2014.
- [Sch93] Mark J Schnitzer. Theory of continuum random walks and application to chemotaxis. *Physical Review E*, 48(4):2553, 1993.

- [SEB16] AB Slowman, MR Evans, and RA Blythe. Jamming and attraction of interacting run-and-tumble random walkers. *Physical review letters*, 116(21):218101, 2016.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. *Hypocoercivity*, volume 202. American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [VZ12] Tamás Vicsek and Anna Zafeiris. Collective motion. *Physics reports*, 517(3-4):71–140, 2012.
- [Wan00] Feng-Yu Wang. Functional inequalities for empty essential spectrum. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 170(1):219–245, 2000.
- [Wie85] Norbert Wielens. The essential selfadjointness of generalized Schrödinger operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 61(1):98–115, 1985.