

The ballistic limit of the log-Sobolev constant equals the Polyak–Łojasiewicz constant

Sinho Chewi* Austin J. Stromme†

November 19, 2024

Abstract

The Polyak–Łojasiewicz (PL) constant of a function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ characterizes the best exponential rate of convergence of gradient flow for f , uniformly over initializations. Meanwhile, in the theory of Markov diffusions, the log-Sobolev (LS) constant plays an analogous role, governing the exponential rate of convergence for the Langevin dynamics from arbitrary initialization in the Kullback–Leibler divergence. We establish a new connection between optimization and sampling by showing that the low temperature limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{-1} C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ of the LS constant of $\mu_t \propto \exp(-f/t)$ is exactly the PL constant of f , under mild assumptions. In contrast, we show that the corresponding limit for the Poincaré constant is the inverse of the smallest eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 f$ at the minimizer.

1 Introduction

Let $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote a fixed twice continuously differentiable function and, for each $t > 0$, consider the probability measure $\mu_t := \frac{1}{Z_t} e^{-f/t}$ for an appropriate normalizing constant Z_t . In this paper, we study the asymptotic behavior of the log-Sobolev constant of μ_t in the low temperature regime $t \rightarrow 0^+$.

Recall that for a probability measure ν on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\nu \ll \mu_t$ and $(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu_t})^{1/2}$ is compactly supported and smooth, we define the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence, and Fisher information of ν relative to μ_t , as

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) := \int \log \frac{d\nu}{d\mu_t} d\nu, \quad \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) := \int \left\| \nabla \log \frac{d\nu}{d\mu_t} \right\|^2 d\nu,$$

respectively. The log-Sobolev constant $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ is then defined to be the smallest constant $C > 0$ such that, for all compactly supported probability measures ν with smooth density, it holds that

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) \leq \frac{C}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t). \quad (1.1)$$

The log-Sobolev constant is the fundamental quantity which governs the exponential rate of convergence for the Langevin dynamics in KL divergence [BGL14].

*Department of Statistics and Data Science, Yale University, sinho.chewi@yale.edu.

†Department of Statistics, ENSAE/CREST, austin.stromme@ensae.fr.

In the low temperature limit $t \rightarrow 0^+$, the behavior of the log-Sobolev constant $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ is intimately related to the optimization landscape of f . Indeed, the Langevin dynamics $(X_s^t)_{s \geq 0}$ for μ_t can be written, up to a rescaling of time, as

$$dX_s^t = -\nabla f(X_s^t) ds + \sqrt{2t} dB_s. \quad (1.2)$$

In particular, as $t \rightarrow 0^+$, these dynamics formally converge to the gradient flow of f . It is therefore intuitive that the convergence rate for the Langevin dynamics for μ_t should reflect the convergence rate for the gradient flow for f . For example, if f has multiple local minima, then the Langevin dynamics converge exponentially slowly, and the classical Eyring–Kramers formula gives precise asymptotics for this blow-up [Eyr35, Kra40], which were rigorously established in [BEGK04]. These results were extended to characterize the exponential blow-up of the log-Sobolev constant $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ in [MS14]. In the case where f has a “benign landscape”, meaning that it has no spurious local minima and constant curvature around its critical points, it is known in various settings that $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ remains of constant order [MS14, KS22, LE23].

But in contrast to these cases, if f has an ideal optimization landscape, namely f is α -strongly convex, then $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t) \leq t/\alpha$, as a consequence of the Bakry–Émery theory [BGL14]. In this paper, we develop an understanding of when the log-Sobolev constant is expected to exhibit this scaling. Since the vanishing noise limit is also referred to as “ballistic”, we refer to the following quantity as the *ballistic log-Sobolev constant* of f , which we define as

$$C_{\text{bLS}}(f) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)}{t}, \quad (1.3)$$

provided it exists.

Main result. Our main result gives an exact characterization of $C_{\text{bLS}}(f)$ in terms of a fundamental constant from optimization, namely the *Polyak–Łojasiewicz (PL) constant* of f [Lo63, Pol64]. Assume that f is bounded below, so that $f_\star := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) > -\infty$. Then the PL constant $C_{\text{PL}}(f)$ is defined to be the least constant $C > 0$ such that

$$f(x) - f_\star \leq \frac{C}{2} \|\nabla f(x)\|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.4)$$

or $+\infty$ if no such constant exists. As we recall in more detail in Section 2, the PL constant can be equivalently characterized as the best possible rate of exponential convergence of gradient flow, uniformly over initializations, and is thus a fundamental constant associated to f . If f is α -strongly convex, then it is well-known that $C_{\text{PL}}(f) \leq 1/\alpha$, yet $C_{\text{PL}}(f)$ can be finite even when f is non-convex [KNS16]. Although the PL constant is therefore strictly weaker than strong convexity, it yields comparable optimization guarantees [KNS16], and thus forms the cornerstone of modern non-convex optimization.

Theorem 1 (Main result: ballistic log-Sobolev equals PL). *Suppose that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a unique global minimizer, and that there is a constant $L > 0$ so that $\Delta f \leq L(1 + \|\nabla f\|^2)$. For each $t > 0$, let $\mu_t := \frac{1}{Z_t} e^{-f/t}$ be a probability measure. Then $C_{\text{bLS}}(f)$, defined in (1.3), exists if and only if $C_{\text{PL}}(f) < \infty$, and in this case*

$$C_{\text{bLS}}(f) = C_{\text{PL}}(f).$$

The proof of this result is broken up into a lower bound in Section 3 and an upper bound in Section 4. Although the result is presented for the asymptotic quantity $C_{\text{bLS}}(f)$, we also extract non-asymptotic bounds for $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ in Remark 13. We remark here that the unique minimizer assumption is necessary for a connection between $C_{\text{PL}}(f)$ and $C_{\text{bLS}}(f)$; see below for more discussion on this point.

En route to proving Theorem 1, we also establish the following characterization of the *ballistic Poincaré constant* of f , defined analogously as

$$C_{\text{bP}}(f) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)}{t}. \quad (1.5)$$

(We recall the definition of the Poincaré constant $C_{\text{P}}(\cdot)$ in Section 2.)

Theorem 2 (Ballistic Poincaré constant). *Suppose that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a unique global minimizer x_* , $C_{\text{PL}}(f) < \infty$, and there exists $L > 0$ so that $\Delta f \leq L(1 + \|\nabla f\|^2)$. Then $C_{\text{bP}}(f)$, defined in (1.5), exists and*

$$C_{\text{bP}}(f) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_*))}.$$

This result is proved in Section 2.2. Note that Theorem 2 is well-posed, since the Hessian at the unique global minimizer is positive definite when $C_{\text{PL}}(f) < \infty$ (we recall background on PL functions in Section 2). And, as for Theorem 1, although the result is presented for the asymptotic quantity $C_{\text{bP}}(f)$, we also extract non-asymptotic bounds from the proof in Remark 9. Theorem 2 reveals that under our assumptions, $C_{\text{bLS}}(f)$ depends on the *global* optimization landscape of f , whereas $C_{\text{bP}}(f)$ only depends on the *local* behavior of f around its minimizer. On the other hand, it is known that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) < \infty$ when f merely has a benign landscape, including, in particular, some f such that $C_{\text{PL}}(f) = \infty$ [Li21, KS22, LE23]. Theorem 2 therefore leaves open a precise characterization of $C_{\text{bP}}(f)$ in the setting where $C_{\text{PL}}(f) = \infty$ yet its landscape is benign; we leave this interesting direction to future work.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the remainder of this section we give some remarks, review additional related works, and finally fix our basic notation. In Section 2, we collect together relevant background material and prove Theorem 2. Then, we establish the lower bound for Theorem 1 in Section 3, and the upper bound in Section 4.

Interpretation via Otto calculus. Theorem 1 is appealing in light of the interpretation, due to Otto [Ott01], of a “Riemannian geometry” over the space $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of probability measures with finite second moment. In this interpretation, the distance between two measures is given by the 2-Wasserstein distance; the KL divergence $\text{KL}(\cdot \parallel \mu_t)$ is viewed as a functional over this space; the Fisher information $\text{FI}(\cdot \parallel \mu_t)$ is the squared norm of the gradient of $\text{KL}(\cdot \parallel \mu_t)$; and the marginal law of the Langevin diffusion (1.2) is the gradient flow of $\text{KL}(\cdot \parallel \mu_t)$. The seminal work [OV00] was the first to introduce this connection.

From this perspective, the LSI arises precisely as a PL inequality for the KL divergence. Indeed, just as the PL inequality governs the exponential rate of convergence for the gradient flow of f , the LSI governs the exponential rate of convergence in KL divergence of the marginal law of the Langevin diffusion.

When we write the density of the stationary distribution as $\mu \propto e^{-f}$, properties of the negative log-density f give rise to properties of μ . Namely, it is known that strong convexity of f implies strong convexity of the functional $\text{KL}(\cdot \| \mu)$ over $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is therefore quite natural to ask whether a PL inequality for f implies a PL inequality for $\text{KL}(\cdot \| \mu)$, i.e., a log-Sobolev inequality for μ . Although natural, it appears that no such connection was known prior to our work, as well as the recent concurrent work of [CS24], which we discuss in detail below. Theorem 1 establishes such a correspondence in the low temperature limit.

Beyond the unique minimizer case. We remark on the assumption that f admits a unique global minimizer. In fact, this assumption is necessary for a connection between the ballistic log-Sobolev constant and $C_{\text{PL}}(f)$. Indeed, consider the prototypical example where $f(x) = \frac{\alpha}{2} d^2(x, K)$ for a convex set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with non-empty interior, where $d^2(\cdot, K)$ denotes the squared distance function to K . Then $C_{\text{PL}}(f) \leq 1/\alpha$, yet $e^{-f/t}$ may not even be integrable. Even when μ_t is well-defined, the log-Sobolev constants $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ will not converge to 0, since μ_t itself will converge to the uniform measure on K , so that $C_{\text{bLS}}(f) = \infty$.

On the other hand, the fact that $C_{\text{PL}}(f)$ can be finite even when f has multiple global minima is indeed one of the appealing properties of the PL condition, particularly when compared with strong convexity. One may thus hope that, so long as μ_t is well-defined, the limiting behavior of $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ still contains information about the optimization properties of f . Thus, we ask whether the following more general limit holds as soon as $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_0) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t) < \infty$:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t) - C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_0)}{t} = C_{\text{PL}}(f). \quad (1.6)$$

Theorem 1 corresponds to the case $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_0) = 0$ in (1.6). A proof of (1.6) with exact constant appears out of reach of our proof techniques, since we strongly rely on the strong convexity of f around its unique minimizer.

Related work. Motivated by applications in statistical physics, the study of the convergence of Langevin dynamics in the low temperature regime has historically focused on the setting where the potential f has multiple local minima. Here, the convergence is exponentially slow, and the Arrhenius law predicts that the rate is proportional to the height of the energy barrier between the local minima [HKS89, Ber13]. The Eyring–Kramers formula refines the Arrhenius law to include a precise description of the prefactor in front of the exponential in terms of the spectra of the Hessians at the local minimizer and the barrier [Eyr35, Kra40]. The Eyring–Kramers formula was not rigorously proved until the papers [BEGK04, GBK05], which additionally provided asymptotics for the spectrum of the weighted Laplacian, including the Poincaré constant. These results were extended to the log-Sobolev constant in [MS14], building on Lyapunov criteria developed in [BBCG08, CGW10]. We refer to the survey [Ber13] for more discussion of the regime in which f has multiple local minima.

When the Langevin diffusion with small temperature is used for finding minima of the function f , it is generally called “annealing”: intuitively, the addition of Brown-

ian motion allows the particle to escape bad regions of the landscape. Annealing is a classical and natural approach [GM91], which has seen a resurgence of interest in recent years [Dal17, RRT17, XCZG17, ZLC17, TLR18], largely motivated by major recent progress in sampling [Che24]. Of course, by the Arrhenius law, annealing converges exponentially slowly when f has multiple local minima. However, one can also consider annealing when f has only one local minimizer (the global minimizer). Here, it turns out that the Langevin diffusion—as well as the relevant functional inequality—behaves completely differently than in the case of multiple local minimizers. In particular, so long as f has constant curvature around each spurious critical point, the Poincaré constants are $O(t)$, the log-Sobolev constants are $O(1)$ [MS14, LE23], and annealing yields a polynomial-time algorithm for optimization [Li21, KS22, LE23]. In this paper, we essentially consider the regime where f not only has just one local minimizer, but also has just one critical point; as far as we are aware, no other work has considered the asymptotic behavior of the functional inequalities in this regime.

The PL condition was first considered, independently, by [Pol64] and in greater generality by [Lo63]. It was Polyak [Pol64] who first showed it implies linear convergence of gradient descent. The work [Lo63] was focused on applications in real algebraic geometry; we refer to [CM14] for an overview of some modern developments in this vein. While the PL condition is quite natural for optimization, it appears to have only recently received sustained interest [KNS16], motivated by the widespread empirical success of first-order methods for non-convex objectives. Recent work, in particular, has been focused on applications of the PL condition to the theory of deep learning, where it is known to hold for sufficiently wide networks near initialization [LZB22]. We have also found the PL condition to be strikingly powerful in our past work, both in non-convex Riemannian optimization [CMRS20, ACGS21], as well as statistics [RS22, Str23], leading us to believe that the PL inequality merits further study.

To the best of our knowledge, there is only one other work which considers functional inequalities under a PL assumption for the negative log-density: the concurrent paper [CS24], which uses Lyapunov functions and is focused on non-asymptotic bounds. In particular, they consider f with potentially more than one global minimizer: their bounds for $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ are of order t^{-1} when f admits multiple minimizers, and of constant order when f does have a unique minimizer. By contrast, our main Theorem 1 provides a new characterization of the PL condition itself by showing $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t) = t C_{\text{PL}}(f) + o(t)$ when f has a unique minimizer. In particular, our non-asymptotic upper bounds on $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ are better by a factor of t , but also capture the exact leading order constant. Our analysis for $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ also largely differs from that of [CS24], in that we mainly rely on a novel direct argument to establish the LSI, rather than Lyapunov criteria. While both papers use Lyapunov functions to control $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)$, theirs uses a different Lyapunov function and more customized analysis, which, in particular, incurs additional f -dependent constants in the unique minimizer case, as compared to ours. In particular, the exact asymptotics for $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)$ from Theorem 2 cannot be recovered from their bounds.

We finally mention that in the low temperature regime, [CGLL23] showed that the problem of finding a measure with Fisher information $O(d/t)$ relative to μ_t is equivalent to finding an $O(\sqrt{dt})$ -stationary point of f , and subsequently used this to prove query lower bounds for the task of finding measures ν with small $\text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t)$. This is another

example of the connection between optimization and the low temperature limit of the Fisher information, in a similar spirit as investigated here.

Acknowledgements. We thank Pierre Monmarché for helpful discussions, and Andre Wibisono for his involvement at an earlier stage of this project.

Notation. Since we only work with absolutely continuous measures in this work, we abuse notation by identifying a probability measure ν with its Lebesgue density. We write $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for the space of probability measures over \mathbb{R}^d , $\mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)$ for the Gaussian measure with mean m and covariance Σ , and $T_{\#}\mu$ to denote the pushforward of a measure μ under the mapping T . We also define $\|x\|_{\Sigma}^2 := \langle x, \Sigma x \rangle$.

The notation $B(x, r)$ refers to the open ball centered at x with radius r .

2 Preliminaries and the ballistic Poincaré constant

In this section, we collect together background material on functional inequalities and PL functions, and then prove Theorem 2 on the ballistic Poincaré constant.

2.1 Background on functional inequalities and PL functions

Background on functional inequalities. Given a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, recall that its *Poincaré constant*, written $C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu)$, is the least constant C such that for all smooth, compactly supported $h: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int h^2 d\mu - \left(\int h d\mu \right)^2 \leq C \int \|\nabla h\|^2 d\mu.$$

For a function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for each $t > 0$ we define the probability measure $\mu_t := \frac{1}{Z_t} e^{-f/t}$, as before.

For $C, D \geq 0$, we say that μ satisfies a (C, D) -defective log-Sobolev inequality (LSI) if, for all probability distributions ν such that $(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu})^{1/2}$ is smooth,

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu) \leq \frac{C}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu) + D.$$

Defective log-Sobolev inequalities are useful because, in the presence of a Poincaré inequality, they imply a full log-Sobolev inequality via the so-called *tightening* procedure. Although this is typically established via the Rothaus lemma [Rot85], our proofs crucially make use of the following recent improvement, from [Wan24, Prop. 5].

Lemma 3 (Improved tightening [Wan24]). *Suppose that $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu) < \infty$ and $C, D \geq 0$. If μ satisfies a (C, D) -defective LSI, then*

$$C_{\text{LS}}(\mu) \leq C + \frac{D}{2} C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu).$$

We remark that the standard tightening result obtained from the Rothaus lemma, e.g., [BGL14, Prop. 5.1.3], reads

$$C_{\text{LS}}(\mu) \leq C + \left(\frac{D}{2} + 1\right) C_{\text{P}}(\mu).$$

Hence Lemma 3 improves upon standard tightening by a factor of $C_{\text{P}}(\mu)$. In particular, the improved tightening result has the appealing property of being stable under taking $C = C_{\text{LS}}(\mu)$ and $D = 0$. This stability is key for our upper bound on $\frac{1}{t} C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$, since it permits us to obtain the correct constants by proving a defective LSI with $D = o(1)$; without the improved tightening our upper bound would be off by a factor of 2.

We recall that by linearization, a log-Sobolev inequality implies a Poincaré inequality with the same constant, $C_{\text{P}}(\mu) \leq C_{\text{LS}}(\mu)$. From the Bakry–Émery theory, if μ is α -strongly log-concave, then $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu) \leq 1/\alpha$ [BGL14].

Finally, we shall write the Lebesgue density of a probability measure ν as e^{-g} . Let us briefly comment on this point.

Remark 4 (Notation for the negative log-density). *Suppose that μ is a probability measure which admits a Lebesgue density, also denoted μ , such that $\log \mu \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and that ν is another probability measure such that $(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu})^{1/2}$ is well-defined and smooth. We shall often write the density of ν as e^{-g} and then manipulate expressions such as $\int \|\nabla g\|^2 e^{-g}$ and $\int \langle \nabla g, \nabla \log \mu \rangle e^{-g}$. These expressions should be understood as $4 \int \|\nabla e^{-g/2}\|^2$ and $-\int \langle \nabla e^{-g}, \nabla \log \mu \rangle$, respectively. These latter expressions are well-defined because we can write $e^{-g} = \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}$, so that $e^{-g/2}$, as well as e^{-g} , is C^2 .*

Background on PL functions. We begin by recalling the dynamical formulation of the PL constant. Although the static formulation of the PL constant (1.4) is ultimately more convenient for our proofs, the dynamical formulation is more intuitive, and emphasizes the fundamental nature of this constant.

Suppose $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with a finite infimum $h_\star := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} h(x) > -\infty$. Consider the gradient flow for h initialized at any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, so that $\dot{x}_s = -\nabla h(x_s)$. Then the dynamic Polyak–Łojasiewicz constant of h , written $C_{\text{PL}}^{\text{dyn}}(h)$, is defined to be the least constant C such that, for all $s \in [0, \infty)$, we have

$$h(x_s) - h_\star \leq e^{-2s/C} (h(x_0) - h_\star), \quad (2.1)$$

uniformly over all initial conditions $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, or $+\infty$ if no such constant exists. The next proposition shows that this is precisely $C_{\text{PL}}(h)$.

Proposition 5 (Dynamic and static PL constants are equal). *Suppose $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with a finite infimum $h_\star := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} h(x) > -\infty$. Then $C_{\text{PL}}(h) < \infty$ if and only if $C_{\text{PL}}^{\text{dyn}}(h) < \infty$, and in this case*

$$C_{\text{PL}}^{\text{dyn}}(h) = C_{\text{PL}}(h).$$

Proof. Suppose $C_{\text{PL}}(h) < \infty$. Then

$$\partial_s(h(x_s) - h_\star) = -\|\nabla h(x_s)\|^2 \leq -\frac{2}{C_{\text{PL}}(h)} (h(x_s) - h_\star).$$

Grönwall's inequality thus implies that (2.1) holds with $C = C_{\text{PL}}(h)$, so that $C_{\text{PL}}^{\text{dyn}}(h) \leq C_{\text{PL}}(h)$.

On the other hand, suppose $C_{\text{PL}}^{\text{dyn}}(h) < C < \infty$. Then, fix any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and note that

$$-\|\nabla h(x_0)\|^2 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{h(x_s) - h(x_0)}{s} \leq (h(x_0) - h_\star) \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{e^{-2s/C} - 1}{s} = -\frac{2}{C} (h(x_0) - h_\star).$$

Therefore $C_{\text{PL}}(h) \leq C_{\text{PL}}^{\text{dyn}}(h)$. The result follows. \square

For our proofs, we frequently use two important consequences of the PL condition. The following is known as the *quadratic growth inequality*. The earliest proof we are aware of is a beautiful gradient flow argument in the optimal transport literature, due to [OV00]. A closely related proof appears in [KNS16].

Proposition 6 (PL functions have quadratic growth). *Suppose $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $h_\star := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} h(x) > -\infty$, and such that $C_{\text{PL}}(h) < \infty$. Let S denote the set of minimizers of f . Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\frac{1}{2C_{\text{PL}}(h)} d(x, S)^2 \leq h(x) - h_\star, \quad (2.2)$$

where $d(x, S) := \inf_{y \in S} \|x - y\|$ is defined as usual.

We remark that in the literature on optimal transport, the above statement is the well-known fact that the log-Sobolev inequality implies Talagrand's transport-entropy inequality [OV00]. When h has a unique minimizer, the quadratic growth inequality (2.2) implies the following useful control on the Hessian.

Proposition 7 (Hessian of PL functions at the minimizer). *Suppose $h: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $C_{\text{PL}}(h) < \infty$, and that h has a unique minimizer x_\star , around which it is C^2 . Then the quadratic growth inequality (2.2) implies that*

$$\nabla^2 h(x_\star) \succeq \frac{1}{C_{\text{PL}}(h)} I. \quad (2.3)$$

2.2 Ballistic Poincaré constant of PL functions

In this subsection, we study the Poincaré constants $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)$, as well as the ballistic Poincaré constant defined in (1.5). We perform this study for several reasons. First, in the course of establishing an upper bound for $C_{\text{bLS}}(f)$, we will require the preliminary estimate $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) = O(t)$ in order to apply tightening. While such bounds have been found under weaker assumptions than PL (allowing for saddle points and local maxima) in previous works [MS14, Li21, KS22, LE23], in the case of PL functions we can establish improved non-asymptotic bounds. Finally, these non-asymptotic bounds permit us to derive the exact characterization of the ballistic Poincaré constant from Theorem 2.

Lemma 8 (Upper bound on the ballistic Poincaré constant for PL functions). *Suppose that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, has a unique minimizer x_\star , is such that $C_{\text{PL}} := C_{\text{PL}}(f) < \infty$, and*

that $\Delta f \leq L_0 + L_1 \|\nabla f\|^2$ for some constants $L_0, L_1 > 0$. Let $\alpha, r_0 > 0$ be such that $\nabla^2 f(x) \succeq \alpha I$ for all $x \in B(x_*, r_0)$. Define $\delta := r_0^2/(2C_{\text{PL}})$, take any $k \geq 1$, and put

$$t_0 := \frac{2\delta}{C_{\text{PL}}L_0 + 2\delta L_1 + 2k - 2}.$$

Then for all $t < t_0$, we have

$$C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}t/k}{1 - L_1t - (k-1)t/\delta - C_{\text{PL}}L_0t/(2\delta)} + \left(1 + \frac{C_{\text{PL}}L_0t}{\delta - \delta L_1t - (k-1)t - C_{\text{PL}}L_0t/2}\right) \frac{t}{\alpha}. \quad (2.4)$$

In particular,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)}{t} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_*))}. \quad (2.5)$$

We emphasize that the statement is not vacuous since, under the hypotheses, Proposition 7 implies there is always some radius for which $\nabla^2 f$ is positive-definite on $B(x_*, r_0)$.

Remark 9. Consider the smooth case $\nabla^2 f \preceq \beta I$, and take $L_0 = \beta d$, $L_1 = 0$. To obtain a non-asymptotic bound which is loose but more interpretable, we can take $k = 1$ and $\alpha = 1/(2C_{\text{PL}})$. Then, for all $t \leq \delta/(C_{\text{PL}}\beta d)$, (2.4) yields $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) \leq 5C_{\text{PL}}t$.

Before we turn to the proof, let us apply this result to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $f(x_*) = 0$. For any unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by applying the Poincaré inequality to the test function $h = \langle v, \cdot \rangle$, we obtain $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) \geq \int \langle v, x - x_* \rangle^2 d\mu_t(x) - (\int \langle v, x - x_* \rangle d\mu_t(x))^2$. Further, by applying the change of variables $x = x_* + \sqrt{t}z$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) &\geq \int \langle v, x - x_* \rangle^2 \frac{e^{-f(x)/t}}{Z_t} dx - \left(\int \langle v, x - x_* \rangle \frac{e^{-f(x)/t}}{Z_t} dx \right)^2 \\ &= t \left[\int \langle v, z \rangle^2 a_t b_t(z) dz - \left(\int \langle v, z \rangle a_t b_t(z) dz \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$a_t := \frac{\sqrt{\det(2\pi t [\nabla^2 f(x_*)]^{-1})}}{Z_t}, \quad b_t(z) = \frac{e^{-f(x_* + \sqrt{t}z)/t}}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi [\nabla^2 f(x_*)]^{-1})}}.$$

We observe that $\int a_t b_t(z) dz = 1$, $b_t(z) dz \rightarrow \bar{\mu} := \mathcal{N}(0, [\nabla^2 f(x_*)]^{-1})$ pointwise, and hence $\int b_t(z) dz \rightarrow 1$ by dominated convergence. Then,

$$1 = \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\int b_t} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} a_t \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} a_t \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\int b_t} = 1.$$

We conclude that $a_t \rightarrow 1$, hence $a_t b_t \rightarrow \bar{\mu}$ pointwise, hence $a_t b_t \rightarrow \bar{\mu}$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by Scheffé's lemma. Moreover, for any $R > 0$, the quadratic growth inequality (2.2) shows that

$$\int_{\|z\| \geq R} \|z\|^2 a_t b_t(z) dz \leq \frac{a_t}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi [\nabla^2 f(x_*)]^{-1})}} \int_{\|z\| \geq R} \|z\|^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|z\|^2}{2C_{\text{PL}}(f)}\right) dz$$

and therefore $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\|z\| \geq R} \|z\|^2 a_t b_t(z) dz = 0$. By [Vil03, Thm. 7.12], we have the convergence $W_2(a_t b_t, \bar{\mu}) \rightarrow 0$. From (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu_t)}{t} &\geq \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|=1} \left[\int \langle v, z \rangle^2 d\bar{\mu}(z) - \left(\int \langle v, z \rangle d\bar{\mu}(z) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|=1} \langle v, [\nabla^2 f(x_*)]^{-1} v \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(x_*))}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

To prove Lemma 8, we use the Lyapunov criterion for the Poincaré inequality [BGL14, Theorem 4.6.2], which we include below for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 10 (Poincaré Lyapunov criterion). *Suppose that there exists a Lyapunov function $W: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $W \geq 1$, and a set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, such that the following hold.*

1. *The restricted measure $\mu|_K$ satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant C_K , so that $C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu|_K) \leq C_K$.*
2. *There are constants $b, \lambda > 0$ such that for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$:*

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu} W(x)}{W(x)} \geq \lambda(1 - b\mathbb{1}_K(x)),$$

where \mathcal{L}_{μ} is the generator for μ , namely $\mathcal{L}_{\mu} := \Delta + \langle \nabla \log \mu, \nabla \cdot \rangle$.

Then,

$$C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu) \leq \lambda^{-1} + bC_K.$$

Proof of Lemma 8. Assume without loss of generality that the unique minimizer of f is 0, and that $f(0) = 0$. Define $K := B(0, r_0)$ and set $W := (1 + f/\delta)^k$. We apply Lemma 10. Notice that since f is α -strongly convex on K and K is convex, we have

$$C_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu_t|_K) \leq \frac{t}{\alpha},$$

c.f. [Wan14, Theorem 3.3.2].

On the other hand, we may compute

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t} W}{W} = \left\{ \frac{k}{t} - \frac{k(k-1)}{f+\delta} \right\} \frac{\|\nabla f\|^2}{f+\delta} - \frac{k\Delta f}{f+\delta}.$$

Applying the assumption on Δf and the fact that $f \geq 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t} W}{W} &\geq \left\{ \frac{k}{t} - kL_1 - \frac{k(k-1)}{f+\delta} \right\} \frac{\|\nabla f\|^2}{f+\delta} - \frac{kL_0}{f+\delta} \\ &\geq \left\{ \frac{1}{t} - L_1 - \frac{k-1}{\delta} \right\} \frac{k\|\nabla f\|^2}{f+\delta} - \frac{kL_0}{f+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

For t sufficiently small, we may apply the PL inequality to obtain

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t} W}{W} \geq \left\{ \frac{1}{t} - L_1 - \frac{k-1}{\delta} \right\} \frac{2k}{C_{\text{PL}}} \frac{f}{f+\delta} - \frac{kL_0}{f+\delta}. \quad (2.7)$$

When $x \notin K$, the quadratic growth inequality (2.2) implies

$$f(x) \geq \frac{1}{2C_{\text{PL}}} \|x\|^2 \geq \frac{r_0^2}{2C_{\text{PL}}} = \delta.$$

But notice that (2.7) is monotonic in f , so for $x \notin K$,

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t} W}{W} \geq \left\{ \frac{1}{t} - L_1 - \frac{k-1}{\delta} \right\} \frac{k}{C_{\text{PL}}} - \frac{kL_0}{2\delta} =: \lambda.$$

So long as t is as small as in the statement, $\lambda > 0$. On the other hand, if $x \in K$, then by monotonicity of f in (2.7) again, we obtain

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t} W}{W} \geq -\frac{kL_0}{\delta}.$$

Defining $b := 1 + \frac{kL_0}{\delta\lambda}$, we conclude that $W \geq 1$ and

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t} W}{W} \geq \lambda(1 - b\mathbb{1}_K).$$

Lemma 10 thus implies

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} + bC_{\text{P}}(\mu_t|_K) \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}t/k}{1 - L_1t - (k-1)t/\delta - C_{\text{PL}}L_0t/(2\delta)} \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \frac{C_{\text{PL}}L_0t}{\delta - \delta L_1t - (k-1)t - C_{\text{PL}}L_0t/2} \right) \frac{t}{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (2.4). Forming $\frac{1}{t} C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)$ and taking $t \rightarrow 0^+$ yields

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t)}{t} \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}}{k} + \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

But since the above is true for every $k \geq 1$ and $\alpha < \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 f(0))$, equation (2.5) follows. \square

3 Lower bound for the ballistic log-Sobolev constant

In this section, we prove the following lower bound.

Theorem 11 (Lower bound of ballistic log-Sobolev by PL). *Suppose $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is minimized by some $x_\star \in \mathbb{R}^d$ around which it is Lipschitz continuous. Then, for any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ around which f is continuously differentiable, we have*

$$f(x) - f(x_\star) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)}{t} \right) \|\nabla f(x)\|^2.$$

In particular, if f is minimized by some $x_\star \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and is continuously differentiable everywhere, then

$$C_{\text{PL}}(f) \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)}{t}.$$

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that $x_\star = 0$ and $f(x_\star) = 0$. Take such an $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $C > \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$. Then, there is some decreasing sequence $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers such that $t_k \rightarrow 0$ and $C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_{t_k}) < Ct_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\nu = e^{-g}$ be any smooth density which is supported in the neighborhood of x where f is differentiable. Then, it holds that

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_{t_k}) \leq \frac{Ct_k}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_{t_k}).$$

We may expand to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t_k} \int f \, d\nu + \log Z_{t_k} - H(\nu) &\leq \frac{Ct_k}{2} \int \left\| \nabla g - \frac{\nabla f}{t_k} \right\|^2 \, d\nu \\ &= \frac{Ct_k}{2} \int \left[\frac{1}{t_k^2} \|\nabla f\|^2 - \frac{2}{t_k} \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle + \|\nabla g\|^2 \right] \, d\nu, \end{aligned}$$

where $H(\nu) := \int g e^{-g}$.

On the other hand, let L be the Lipschitz constant of f near 0. Then for t sufficiently small we have

$$\log Z_t = \log \int \exp\left(-\frac{f}{t}\right) \geq \log \int_{B(0,t)} \exp\left(-\frac{f}{t}\right) \geq -L + \log(t^d \omega_d),$$

where we write the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d as ω_d . In particular,

$$\frac{1}{t_k} \int f \, d\nu - L + \log(t_k^d \omega_d) - H(\nu) \leq C \int \left[\frac{1}{2t_k} \|\nabla f\|^2 - \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle + \frac{t_k}{2} \|\nabla g\|^2 \right] \, d\nu,$$

Multiplying by t_k and re-arranging, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int f \, d\nu &\leq \frac{C}{2} \int \|\nabla f\|^2 \, d\nu - Ct_k \int \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle \, d\nu \\ &\quad + (L + H(\nu) - \log(t_k^d \omega_d)) t_k + \frac{Ct_k^2}{2} \int \|\nabla g\|^2 \, d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\int f \, d\nu \leq \frac{C}{2} \int \|\nabla f\|^2 \, d\nu.$$

Since $C > \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)$ was arbitrary, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu f \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)}{t} \right) \int \|\nabla f\|^2 \, d\nu.$$

Finally, since ν was an arbitrary smooth distribution supported near x and $f, \|\nabla f\|^2$ are continuous around x , we can take $\nu \rightarrow \delta_x$ to conclude. \square

4 Upper bound for the ballistic log-Sobolev constant

In this section, we prove the following upper bound.

Theorem 12 (Upper bound of ballistic LSI by PL). *Suppose $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a unique global minimizer, and that there are constants $L_0, L_1 > 0$ so that $\Delta f \leq L_0 + L_1 \|\nabla f\|^2$. For each $t > 0$, let $\mu_t := \frac{1}{Z_t} e^{-f/t}$. Then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)}{t} \leq C_{\text{PL}}(f).$$

By combining this result with Theorem 11 from the last section, we immediately arrive at our main result, Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 12. If $C_{\text{PL}} = C_{\text{PL}}(f) = \infty$, then there is nothing to show, so we may assume $C_{\text{PL}} < \infty$. Throughout the proof, we assume without loss of generality that $x_* = 0$ and $f(x_*) = f(0) = 0$, and let $\Sigma_t := t[\nabla^2 f(0)]^{-1}$, which is well-defined by (2.3).

Let ν be any compactly supported probability measure such that $(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu_t})^{1/2}$ is smooth and write the Lebesgue density of ν as e^{-g} ; see Remark 4 for an explanation of this notation.

We begin by expanding the KL divergence

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) = - \int g e^{-g} + \frac{1}{t} \int f e^{-g} + \log Z_t.$$

Step 1: Gaussian log-Sobolev inequality. For this step, we start by rewriting the KL divergence to obtain a $\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t))$ term:

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) = \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)) + \int \left(\frac{f}{t} - \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2 \right) e^{-g} + \log \frac{Z_t}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_t)}}.$$

In Lemma 15 below, we verify that the last term involving the ratio of normalizing constants is $o(1)$.

Next, we apply the Gaussian log-Sobolev inequality with covariance Σ_t (see the discussion after [BGL14, Prop. 5.5.1]) to the first term, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) &= \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)) + \int \left(\frac{f}{t} - \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2 \right) e^{-g} + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int \|\nabla g - \Sigma_t^{-1} x\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 e^{-g} + \int \left(\frac{f}{t} - \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2 \right) e^{-g} + o(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \|\nabla g\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 e^{-g} + \frac{1}{t} \int f e^{-g} - d + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by integration by parts.

Step 2: Separating into small and large scales. The second step is to split into a small-scale region $B := B(0, r)$ for some $r = r(t)$ to be chosen later, and its complement B^c . Define the modulus of continuity of the Hessian,

$$\rho(r) := \sup_{x \in B(0, r)} \|\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(0)\|_{\text{op}},$$

and note that since f is of class C^2 , we have $\rho(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$. In the small-scale region B , we use Taylor expansion to observe that if $x \in B$, then

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \nabla^2 f(0) x \rangle + O(r^2 \rho(r)), \quad \nabla f(x) = \nabla^2 f(0) x + O(r \rho(r)).$$

Therefore, for all $x \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x)\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 &= t \langle \nabla f(x), \nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla f(x) \rangle = t \{ \langle x, \nabla f(x) \rangle + O(r \rho(r) \|\nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla f(x)\|) \} \\ &= t \{ \langle x, \nabla^2 f(0) x \rangle + O(r^2 \rho(r) + C_{\text{PL}} r^2 \rho(r)^2) \} \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \preceq C_{\text{PL}} I$ from (2.3). Hence,

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_B f e^{-g} = \frac{1}{2t^2} \int_B \|\nabla f\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 e^{-g} + \underbrace{O\left(\frac{r^2 \rho(r) + C_{\text{PL}} r^2 \rho(r)^2}{t}\right)}_{=: \mathbf{E}_0(r)}.$$

On the large-scale region B^c we use the fact that $\Sigma_t \preceq C_{\text{PL}} t I$ via (2.3), and the PL inequality directly to note that

$$\int_{B^c} \left\{ \frac{f}{t} + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla g\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 \right\} e^{-g} \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \int_{B^c} \left\{ \frac{\|\nabla f\|^2}{t^2} + \|\nabla g\|^2 \right\} e^{-g}.$$

Combining these bounds yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int \|\nabla g\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 e^{-g} + \frac{1}{t} \int f e^{-g} - d + o(1) \\ &= \int_B \left\{ \frac{f}{t} + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla g\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 \right\} e^{-g} + \int_{B^c} \left\{ \frac{f}{t} + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla g\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 \right\} e^{-g} - d + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_B \left\{ \frac{1}{t^2} \|\nabla f\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 + \|\nabla g\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 \right\} e^{-g} + \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \int_{B^c} \left\{ \frac{\|\nabla f\|^2}{t^2} + \|\nabla g\|^2 \right\} e^{-g} \\ &\quad - d + \mathbf{E}_0(r) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Adding and subtracting inner product terms and applying $\Sigma_t \preceq C_{\text{PL}} t I$ again, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_B \left\| \frac{\nabla f}{t} - \nabla g \right\|_{\Sigma_t}^2 e^{-g} + \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \int_{B^c} \left\| \frac{\nabla f}{t} - \nabla g \right\|^2 e^{-g} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{t} \int_B \langle \nabla f, \Sigma_t \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} - d + C_{\text{PL}} \int_{B^c} \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} + \mathbf{E}_0(r) + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{t} \int_B \langle \nabla f, \Sigma_t \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} - d + C_{\text{PL}} \int_{B^c} \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} + \mathbf{E}_0(r) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Reduction to large-scale terms. To handle these inner product terms, we apply integration by parts. To this end, let ω_d denote the standard volume measure on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Then, by the divergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t} \int_B \langle \nabla f, \Sigma_t \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} &= \int_B \langle \nabla f, \nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} \\ &= \int_B \text{tr}(\nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla^2 f) e^{-g} - \int \langle w, \nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla f(rw) \rangle r^{d-1} e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w). \end{aligned}$$

Also, for all $x \in B$ we have

$$\text{tr}(\nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla^2 f(x)) = d + O(C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(r)).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{t} \int_B \langle \nabla f, \Sigma_t \nabla f \rangle e^{-g} - d \\ &= d \int_B e^{-g} - d - \int \langle w, \nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla f(rw) \rangle r^{d-1} e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w) + O(C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(r)) \\ &\leq - \int \langle w, \nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla f(rw) \rangle r^{d-1} e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w) + O(C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(r)). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy–Schwarz, equation (2.3), and the fact that ∇f is Lipschitz around the minimizer, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int \langle w, \nabla^2 f(0)^{-1} \nabla f(rw) \rangle r^{d-1} e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w) \\ &\leq \int \{-r + O(C_{\text{PL}} r \rho(r))\} r^{d-1} e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w) = O(C_{\text{PL}} r^d \rho(r)) \int e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w). \end{aligned}$$

For ease of notation, let us write this last integral in terms of $s(r) := r^d \int e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w)$. Applying the divergence theorem to the large-scale inner product term, as well as our assumption on Δf , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B^c} \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} &= \int_{B^c} \Delta f e^{-g} + \int \langle \nabla f(rw), w \rangle r^{d-1} e^{-g(rw)} d\omega_d(w) \\ &\leq L_0 \int_{B^c} e^{-g} + L_1 \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} + \lambda_{\max} s(r) + O(\rho(r) s(r)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{\max} = \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 f(0))$.

To control the spherical integral $s(r)$, we argue that there must be some radius of the same order such that it is bounded by the tail $\int_{B^c} e^{-g}$. Indeed, fix any $r_0 > 0$, and integrate over the annulus $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d: r_0 \leq \|x\| \leq 2r_0\}$ to find

$$\int_{r_0}^{2r_0} s(r) dr = \int_{r_0 \leq \|\cdot\| \leq 2r_0} \|\cdot\| e^{-g} \leq 2r_0 \int_{r_0 \leq \|\cdot\| \leq 2r_0} e^{-g} \leq 2r_0 \int_{\|\cdot\| \geq r_0} e^{-g}.$$

It follows that there exists some $r \in [r_0, 2r_0]$, depending on ν , such that

$$s(r) \leq 2 \int_{\|\cdot\| \geq r_0} e^{-g}.$$

If we choose r so that the above holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) &\leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + C_{\text{PL}} L_0 \int_{B^c} e^{-g} + C_{\text{PL}} L_1 \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} \\ &\quad + O((C_{\text{PL}} \lambda_{\max} + C_{\text{PL}} \rho(r)) s(r) + C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(r)) + \mathbf{E}_0(r) + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + O(C_{\text{PL}} (L_0 + \lambda_{\max} + \rho(2r_0))) \int_{\|\cdot\| \geq r_0} e^{-g} \\ &\quad + C_{\text{PL}} L_1 \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} + \underbrace{O(C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(2r_0))}_{=:\mathbf{E}_1} + \underbrace{\mathbf{E}_0(2r_0)}_{=:\mathbf{E}_0} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used $r \in [r_0, 2r_0]$ and the fact that $\mathbf{E}_0(r)$ is monotonic in r .

Step 4: Controlling the large-scale terms. We control the tail term by observing that by the quadratic growth inequality (2.2), we have for all x such that $\|x\| \geq r_0$,

$$1 \leq \frac{2C_{\text{PL}}}{r_0^2} f(x) \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}^2}{r_0^2} \|\nabla f(x)\|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\|\cdot\| \geq r_0} e^{-g} \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}^2}{r_0^2} \int_{\|\cdot\| \geq r_0} \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}^2}{r_0^2} \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g}.$$

Next, we apply an integration by parts argument, similar to that used in [CEL⁺24, Lemma 20]. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t^2} \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} &= \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) - \int \|\nabla g\|^2 e^{-g} + \frac{2}{t} \int \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} \\ &\leq \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + \frac{2}{t} \int \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} = \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + \frac{2}{t} \int \Delta f e^{-g}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying our assumption on Δf , we obtain

$$\frac{2}{t} \int \Delta f e^{-g} \leq \frac{2L_0}{t} + \frac{2L_1}{t} \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g}.$$

So long as $t < \frac{1}{2L_1}$, the above can be arranged to yield

$$\frac{1}{t^2} \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2t/L_1} \left(\text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + \frac{2L_0}{t} \right).$$

Thus, if we set

$$\mathbf{E}_2 := C_{\text{PL}} L_1 + \frac{C_{\text{PL}}^3}{r_0^2} (L_0 + \lambda_{\max} + \rho(2r_0)),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) &\leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + O(\mathbf{E}_2) \int \|\nabla f\|^2 e^{-g} + \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{E}_1 + o(1) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_{\text{PL}} t}{2} + \frac{O(\mathbf{E}_2 t^2)}{1 - 2t/L_1} \right) \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu_t) + \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{E}_1 + O\left(\frac{\mathbf{E}_2 L_0 t}{1 - 2t/L_1} \right) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Step 5: Conclusion. We now recall that

$$\mathbf{E}_0 = O\left(\frac{r_0^2 \rho(2r_0) + C_{\text{PL}} r_0^2 \rho(2r_0)^2}{t} \right), \quad \mathbf{E}_1 = O(C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(2r_0)).$$

We choose $r_0 = A\sqrt{t}$ for some $A > 0$, so that for small t ,

$$\mathbf{E}_0 = O(A^2 \rho(2A\sqrt{t}) + A^2 C_{\text{PL}} \rho(2A\sqrt{t})^2) = o_A(1), \quad \mathbf{E}_1 = O(C_{\text{PL}} d \rho(2A\sqrt{t})) = o_A(1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{E_2 L_0 t}{1 - 2t/L_1} &= O\left(C_{\text{PL}} L_0 L_1 t + \frac{C_{\text{PL}}^3 L_0}{A^2} (L_0 + \lambda_{\max} + \rho(2r_0))\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{A^2}\right), \\ \frac{E_2 t^2}{1 - 2t/L_1} &= O\left(C_{\text{PL}} L_1 t^2 + \frac{C_{\text{PL}}^3 t}{A^2} (L_0 + \lambda_{\max} + \rho(2r_0))\right) = O\left(t^2 + \frac{t}{A^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 8, $C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t) = O(t)$. Using the improved tightening result [Wan24, Prop. 5], included here as Lemma 3 for the reader's convenience, we obtain

$$C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t) \leq C_{\text{PL}} t + O\left(t^2 + \frac{t}{A^2}\right) + \left(o_A(1) + O\left(\frac{1}{A^2}\right)\right) C_{\text{P}}(\mu_t),$$

or

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t)}{t} \leq C_{\text{PL}} + O\left(\frac{1}{A^2}\right).$$

Finally, letting $A \rightarrow \infty$ yields the result. \square

Remark 13 (Quantitative estimate). *Assume now that $\nabla^2 f \preceq \beta I$ and that $\nabla^3 f$ is γ -Lipschitz in the operator norm. Keeping the leading order terms in t ,*

$$E_0 = O(\gamma A^3 \sqrt{t}), \quad E_1 = O(C_{\text{PL}} \gamma d A \sqrt{t}), \quad E_2 = O\left(\frac{\beta C_{\text{PL}}^3 d}{A^2 t}\right).$$

To balance the terms, we will take A of order $t^{-1/10}$, so that E_1 and the $o(1)$ term—quantified in Remark 16—are both negligible. Specifically, by applying Remark 9 and taking $A \asymp \beta^{2/5} C_{\text{PL}}^{3/5} d^{2/5} / (\gamma^{1/5} t^{1/10})$, up to leading order in t ,

$$C_{\text{LS}}(\mu_t) \leq C_{\text{PL}} t + O\left((\beta C_{\text{PL}}^{7/3} \gamma^{1/3} d t)^{6/5}\right).$$

To conclude this section, we establish a weaker, but simple non-asymptotic defective log-Sobolev inequality. In particular, the following proposition does not require $t \rightarrow 0^+$, so we state it as a result for $\mu \propto e^{-f}$ itself. In fact, the argument below is a precursor for the more delicate proof of Theorem 12 and could be of interest.

Proposition 14 (Non-asymptotic defective log-Sobolev inequality). *Assume that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ admits a unique minimizer, that $C_{\text{PL}} = C_{\text{PL}}(f) < \infty$, and that $\Delta f \leq L_0$. Then, μ satisfies a $(C_{\text{PL}}, C_{\text{PL}} L_0 - d)$ -defective log-Sobolev inequality.*

Proof. We begin with the KL divergence decomposition as in the proof of Theorem 12, except that instead of comparing to $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)$, we compare to $\mathcal{N}(0, C_{\text{PL}} I)$. As usual, we assume without loss of generality that the minimizer is 0 and that $f(0) = 0$. It yields

$$\text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu) \leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}}{2} \int \|\nabla g\|^2 e^{-g} + \int f e^{-g} - d + \log \frac{Z}{(2\pi C_{\text{PL}})^{d/2}}.$$

The last term is non-positive because by the quadratic growth inequality (2.2),

$$Z = \int e^{-f} \leq \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2C_{\text{PL}}} \|\cdot\|^2\right) \leq (2\pi C_{\text{PL}})^{d/2}.$$

We can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu) &\leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu) + C_{\text{PL}} \int \left\{ \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f\|^2 \right\} e^{-g} + \int f e^{-g} - d \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\text{PL}}}{2} \text{FI}(\nu \parallel \mu) + C_{\text{PL}} \int \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} - d, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied the PL inequality. Integrating by parts,

$$\int \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle e^{-g} = \int \Delta f e^{-g} \leq L_0.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

A Estimate for the normalizing constant

In this section, we establish the following estimate for the normalizing constant.

Lemma 15 (Normalizing constant control). *Assume that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a unique minimizer x_* and satisfies a PL inequality. For all $t > 0$, let μ_t be a probability measure with density $\mu_t = \frac{1}{Z_t} e^{-f/t}$, $f(x_*) = 0$, and define $\Sigma_t := t [\nabla^2 f(x_*)]^{-1}$. Then*

$$\log \frac{Z_t}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_t)}} = o(1).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x_* = 0$. Let $C_{\text{PL}} = C_{\text{PL}}(f)$ and $r > \sqrt{C_{\text{PL}} dt}$. We split into two regions: $B_r := B(0, r)$ and B_r^c . For the latter, we note that by the quadratic growth inequality (2.2) and Gaussian concentration,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r^c} e^{-f/t} &\leq \int_{B_r^c} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2C_{\text{PL}}t} \|\cdot\|^2\right) \\ &\leq (2\pi C_{\text{PL}}t)^{d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{(r - \sqrt{C_{\text{PL}} dt})^2}{2tC_{\text{PL}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us take $r = (\sqrt{d} + A)\sqrt{C_{\text{PL}}t}$ for some $A > 0$. Then, the above becomes

$$\int_{B_r^c} e^{-f/t} \leq (2\pi C_{\text{PL}}t)^{d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{A^2}{2}\right).$$

For the remaining region, let

$$\rho(r) := \sup_{x \in B_r} \|\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(0)\|_{\text{op}}$$

denote the modulus of continuity of the Hessian near the minimizer, and note that since f is of class C^2 , we have $\rho(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$. Taylor expansion shows that for all $x \in B_r$,

$$\left| f(x) - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \nabla^2 f(0) x \rangle \right| = \left| \int_0^1 (1-t) \langle x, [\nabla^2 f(tx) - \nabla^2 f(0)] x \rangle dt \right| \leq \frac{\rho(r) r^2}{2}.$$

Hence, for $\Sigma_t = t [\nabla^2 f(0)]^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r} e^{-f/t} &\leq \int_{B_r} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2 + \frac{\rho(r)r^2}{2t}\right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_t)} \exp(C_{\text{PL}}(d+A^2)\rho((\sqrt{d}+A)\sqrt{C_{\text{PL}}t})). \end{aligned}$$

Putting these results together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t &\leq \sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_t)} \\ &\times \left[\exp(C_{\text{PL}}(d+A^2)\rho((\sqrt{d}+A)\sqrt{C_{\text{PL}}t})) + C_{\text{PL}}^{d/2} \sqrt{\det(\nabla^2 f(0))} \exp\left(-\frac{A^2}{2}\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows by letting $t \rightarrow 0^+$ first, followed by $A \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Remark 16. To extract a quantitative estimate, let us assume that $\nabla^2 f \preceq \beta I$ and that $\nabla^3 f$ is γ -Lipschitz in the operator norm, so that $\rho(r) \leq \gamma r$. Assume that $C_{\text{PL}}^{3/2} \gamma \geq 1$ for simplicity. If we choose $A \asymp \sqrt{d \log(\beta C_{\text{PL}})} + \sqrt{\log(1/t)}$, it leads to the estimate

$$\log \frac{Z_t}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_t)}} = O\left(C_{\text{PL}}^{3/2} \gamma \left(d \log \frac{\beta C_{\text{PL}}}{t}\right)^{3/2} t^{1/2}\right).$$

References

- [ACGS21] Jason Altschuler, Sinho Chewi, Patrik R Gerber, and Austin J. Stromme. Averaging on the Bures–Wasserstein manifold: dimension-free convergence of gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [BBCG08] Dominique Bakry, Franck Barthe, Patrick Cattiaux, and Arnaud Guillin. A simple proof of the Poincaré inequality for a large class of probability measures including the log-concave case. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 13:60–66, 2008.
- [BEGK04] Anton Bovier, Michael Eckhoff, Véronique Gaynard, and Markus Klein. Metastability in reversible diffusion processes. I. Sharp asymptotics for capacities and exit times. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 6(4):399–424, 2004.
- [Ber13] Nils Berglund. Kramers’ law: validity, derivations and generalisations. *Markov Process. Relat. Fields*, 19(3):459–490, 2013.
- [BGL14] Dominique Bakry, Ivan Gentil, and Michel Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 103. Springer, 2014.
- [CEL⁺24] Sinho Chewi, Murat A. Erdogdu, Mufan (B.) Li, Ruoqi Shen, and Matthew S. Zhang. Analysis of Langevin Monte Carlo from Poincaré to log-Sobolev. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 24(4), 2024.
- [CGLL23] Sinho Chewi, Patrik R. Gerber, Holden Lee, and Chen Lu. Fisher information lower bounds for sampling. In Shipra Agrawal and Francesco Orabona, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 201 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 375–410. PMLR, 2 2023.

- [CGW10] Patrick Cattiaux, Arnaud Guillin, and Li-Ming Wu. A note on Talagrand’s transportation inequality and logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 148:285–304, 2010.
- [Che24] Sinho Chewi. Log-concave sampling. *Book draft available at <https://chewisinho.github.io>*, 2024.
- [CM14] Tobias H. Colding and William P. Minicozzi II. Łojasiewicz inequalities and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.5087*, 2014.
- [CMRS20] Sinho Chewi, Tyler Maunu, Philippe Rigollet, and Austin J Stromme. Gradient descent algorithms for Bures–Wasserstein barycenters. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1276–1304. PMLR, 2020.
- [CS24] August Y. Chen and Karthik Sridharan. From optimization to sampling via Lyapunov potentials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02979*, 2024.
- [Dal17] Arnak Dalalyan. Further and stronger analogy between sampling and optimization: Langevin Monte Carlo and gradient descent. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 678–689. PMLR, 2017.
- [Eyr35] Henry Eyring. The activated complex in chemical reactions. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 3(2):107–115, 1935.
- [GBK05] Véronique Gayraud, Anton Bovier, and Markus Klein. Metastability in reversible diffusion processes II: precise asymptotics for small eigenvalues. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 7(1):69–99, 2005.
- [GM91] Saul B. Gelfand and Sanjoy K. Mitter. Recursive stochastic algorithms for global optimization in \mathbb{R}^d . *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 29(5):999–1018, 1991.
- [HKS89] Richard A. Holley, Shigeo Kusuoka, and Daniel W. Stroock. Asymptotics of the spectral gap with applications to the theory of simulated annealing. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 83(2):333–347, 1989.
- [KNS16] Hamed Karimi, Julie Nutini, and Mark Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak–Łojasiewicz condition. *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, 2016.
- [Kra40] Hendrik A. Kramers. Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions. *Physica*, 7(4):284–304, 1940.
- [KS22] Yuri Kinoshita and Taiji Suzuki. Improved convergence rate of stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics with variance reduction and its application to optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19022–19034, 2022.
- [LE23] Mufan (B.) Li and Murat A. Erdogdu. Riemannian Langevin algorithm for solving semidefinite programs. *Bernoulli*, 29(4):3093–3113, 2023.

- [Li21] Mufan (B.) Li. On escape time, Lyapunov function, Poincaré inequality, and the KLS conjecture beyond convexity. https://mufan-li.github.io/lyapunov_escape/, 2021.
- [Lo63] Stanislaw Łojasiewicz. A topological property of real analytic subsets (in French). *Coll. du CNRS, Les équations aux dérivées partielles*, 117(87-89):2, 1963.
- [LZB22] Chaoyue Liu, Libin Zhu, and Mikhail Belkin. Loss landscapes and optimization in over-parameterized non-linear systems and neural networks. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 59:85–116, 2022.
- [MS14] Georg Menz and André Schlichting. Poincaré and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities by decomposition of the energy landscape. *Ann. Probab.*, pages 1809–1884, 2014.
- [Ott01] Felix Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 26(1-2):101–174, 2001.
- [OV00] Felix Otto and Cédric Villani. Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 173(2):361–400, 2000.
- [Pol64] Boris T. Polyak. Gradient methods for solving equations and inequalities (in Russian). *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 4(6):17–32, 1964.
- [Rot85] Oscar S. Rothaus. Analytic inequalities, isoperimetric inequalities and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 64(2):296–313, 1985.
- [RRT17] Maxim Raginsky, Alexander Rakhlin, and Matus Telgarsky. Non-convex learning via stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics: a nonasymptotic analysis. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1674–1703. PMLR, 2017.
- [RS22] Philippe Rigollet and Austin J. Stromme. On the sample complexity of entropic optimal transport. *arXiv preprint 2206.13472*, 2022.
- [Str23] Austin J. Stromme. Minimum intrinsic dimension scaling for entropic optimal transport. *arXiv preprint 2306.03398*, 2023.
- [TLR18] Belinda Tzen, Tengyuan Liang, and Maxim Raginsky. Local optimality and generalization guarantees for the Langevin algorithm via empirical metastability. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 857–875. PMLR, 2018.
- [Vil03] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [Wan14] Feng-Yu Wang. *Analysis for diffusion processes on Riemannian manifolds*, volume 18 of *Advanced Series on Statistical Science & Applied Probability*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2014.

- [Wan24] Songbo Wang. Uniform log-Sobolev inequalities for mean field particles with flat-convex energy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03283*, 2024.
- [XCZG17] Pan Xu, Jinghui Chen, Difan Zou, and Quanquan Gu. Global convergence of Langevin dynamics based algorithms for nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06618*, 2017.
- [ZLC17] Yuchen Zhang, Percy Liang, and Moses Charikar. A hitting time analysis of stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1980–2022. PMLR, 2017.