

Beyond Fixed Horizons: A Theoretical Framework for Adaptive Denoising Diffusions

Sören Christensen* Claudia Strauch† Lukas Trottner‡

Abstract

We introduce a new class of generative diffusion models that, unlike conventional denoising diffusion models, achieve a time-homogeneous structure for both the noising and denoising processes, allowing the number of steps to adaptively adjust based on the noise level. This is accomplished by conditioning the forward process using Doob’s h -transform, which terminates the process at a suitable sampling distribution at a random time. The model is particularly well suited for generating data with lower intrinsic dimensions, as the termination criterion simplifies to a first-hitting rule. A key feature of the model is its adaptability to the target data, enabling a variety of downstream tasks using a pre-trained unconditional generative model. These tasks include natural conditioning through appropriate initialization of the denoising process and classification of noisy data.

1. Introduction

Denoising Diffusion Models [20, 36] have gained significant attention in recent years due to their ability to generate high-quality data samples by iteratively denoising simple distributions based on the learned dynamics of a time-reversed forward noising process initialized in the target data distribution [14, 17, 21, 30, 39, 40]. A key limitation of these models, however, is their reliance on a fixed time horizon, which introduces an artificial time dependency in the drift function of the backward process. As a result, the generative denoising process follows a predefined number of steps, regardless of the actual level of noise present along the generated path.

To overcome this limitation, we introduce a novel class of diffusion models that dynamically adapt to the state of the denoising process. By replacing the fixed deterministic time horizon with a random one and conditioning the forward process to terminate at a predefined target distribution, our approach achieves greater flexibility and state awareness. The foundation of our method lies in Doob’s h -transforms with respect to underlying exponential times. While the theoretical groundwork for this concept exists, its explicit application and detailed exploration – particularly in comparison to deterministic time horizons – remains underrepresented in the literature.

A key feature of our model is its inherent adaptability: the number of denoising steps dynamically adjusts based on the noise level in the data, introducing a stochastic element. This randomness not only enhances the generation process, but also allows denoising to start from partially noisy data, naturally incorporating conditioning. Moreover, the time required for denoising

*Kiel University, Department of Mathematics, Kiel, Germany

Email: christensen@math.uni-kiel.de

†Heidelberg University, Institute of Mathematics, Heidelberg, Germany

Email: strauch@math.uni-heidelberg.de

‡University of Birmingham, School of Mathematics, Birmingham, UK.

Email: l.trottner@bham.ac.uk

serves as an intuitive measure of the distance between noisy observations and the underlying data distribution, providing the basis for tasks such as classification and anomaly detection. The model’s architecture also supports natural conditioning mechanisms, allowing seamless adaptation to diverse tasks without the need for task-specific design modifications.

Thanks to its flexible, time-homogeneous structure, our model offers a fresh perspective on generative tasks that enhances the adaptability and versatility of diffusion models and establishes a robust foundation for transfer learning.

Contributions and structure Let us briefly summarize our main contributions and the structure of the paper: after discussing related work in Section 2, we first present theoretical results on the h -transform and time reversal for exponential time horizons in Section 3. Building on this foundation, we develop a universal and flexible diffusion model, accompanied by the associated learning theory, in Section 4. In this framework, we identify the *polarity* of the data distribution as a central assumption for successful learning, offering a new perspective on the manifold hypothesis. Finally, we discuss the adaptability of the model across various application domains through transfer learning in Section 5.

2. Related work

This section reviews key works relevant to extending diffusion models beyond conventional time dependencies, incorporating elements such as random horizons, Doob’s h -transform, and conditioning.

Ye, Wu, and Liu [41] introduce first hitting diffusion models, which use first hitting times to capture the intrinsic geometry of data manifolds. Technically, their approach is related to ours in that it uses a random time horizon (in their case via first hitting times) and makes use of Doob’s h -transform. However, their method defines a backward process that ensures that the generated data lies on a predetermined manifold. In contrast, our approach inverts this perspective and uses the forward process to create a more flexible generative framework that is not constrained to predefined manifolds. Instead, the data manifold is dynamically learned.

De Bortoli et al. [12] explore diffusion generative modeling through the lens of Schrödinger Bridges (SB) and solving transport problems. Unlike traditional methods that require running forward SDEs over long durations, SB techniques generate samples in finite time. However, their approach is limited to a deterministic time horizon, where there are well-established connections between Schrödinger Bridges and h -transforms. Further developments in this direction are also presented in Peluchetti [32] and Shi et al. [35]. In contrast, our framework accommodates random time horizons, allowing for both finite and long durations.

The paper Zhao et al. [42] provides a comprehensive review of approaches to conditional sampling within generative diffusion models. It discusses methods that rely on joint distributions or pre-trained marginal distributions with explicit likelihoods to generate samples conditioned on certain information, addressing challenges in areas such as Bayesian inverse problems. In these approaches, the original unconditional processes are modified in various ways to introduce conditionality. Similarly, Didi et al. [15] unifies conditional training and sampling within a common framework based on the h -transform. However, the reliance on a fixed time horizon leads to notable differences from the approach presented in our work.

3. Doob’s h -transform and time-inversion from random times

Doob’s h -transform is a versatile mathematical technique for adjusting the dynamics of a stochastic process. It formalizes the concept of conditioning the process on specific events occurring at

a random time. This section outlines the key results relevant to our approach. For a more comprehensive discussion, including relevant literature and the proofs, readers are encouraged to consult the Appendix.

3.1. Doob's h -transform for random time horizons

In our approach, we will employ h -transforms of an underlying non-degenerate and symmetric d -dimensional diffusion process

$$dZ_t = b(Z_t) dt + \sigma(Z_t) dW_t,$$

to describe both the forward and backward process. Typically, Z will be a Brownian motion or a symmetric Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process on $\mathcal{J} = \mathbb{R}^d$, but other self-dual processes are also possible. The unkilled version of Z has the r -Green kernel

$$G_r(x, y) := \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} p_t(x, y) dt,$$

where $p_t(x, y)$ are the symmetric transition densities of Z with respect to a reference measure m . The reference measure m may, but does not necessarily, coincide with the standard Lebesgue measure. Up to scaling, G_r describes the pdf of Z at an independent exponential time. For a Brownian motion, for example, G_r can be found explicitly, see Remark A.1.

To specify the idea of conditioning at a random time, we introduce two major modifications for Z :

1. The drift is modified to attract the process towards the desired states.
2. A random stopping time ζ , referred to as the *lifetime*, is introduced to terminate the process at the point where the desired distribution is attained.

Both modifications are seamlessly implemented using the h -transform. The h -transform is constructed using an r -excessive function h , which can be defined via a probability measure β on the state space \mathcal{J} and a reference state $x_0 \in \mathcal{J}$. To condition the process Z to be distributed according to β at its killing time ζ when initiated from x_0 , we define

$$h(x) := \int \frac{G_r(x, y)}{G_r(x_0, y)} \beta(dy) = \int G_r(x, y) \kappa(dy),$$

where $\kappa(dy) = \kappa_{x_0, \beta}(dy) = \frac{1}{G_r(x_0, y)} \beta(dy)$ is called *representing measure* of h . Based on this, the h -transformed process Z^h is now a Markov process defined by the transition kernel

$$\mathbb{P}_x(Z_t^h \in dy) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[\frac{e^{-rt} h(Z_t)}{h(x)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_t \in dy\}} \right].$$

The essential properties of Z^h are as follows:

Proposition 3.1. 1. Z^h is killed at some random time ζ , the lifetime, which is an a.s. finite random variable.

2. Outside the support of β , Z^h is an Itô diffusion with dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} dZ_t^h &= b^h(Z_t^h) dt + \sigma(Z_t^h) dW_t, \\ b^h(y) &= b(y) + \sigma(y)\sigma(y)^\top \nabla \log h(y). \end{aligned}$$

3. The distribution of Z^h at its lifetime is supported in the support of β and given by

$$\mathbb{P}_x(Z_{\zeta-}^h \in dy) = \frac{G_r(x, y)}{h(x)} \kappa(dy).$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0}(Z_{\zeta-}^h \in dy) = \beta(dy).$$

3.2. Optimality properties of the h -transform

The h -transform is characterized by inherent optimality properties which underline its role as a canonical approach. We now demonstrate that it emerges as the solution to a stochastic stopping and control problem. In this context, the running cost component can be interpreted as minimizing the expected lifetime of the process while penalizing large drifts. By framing the h -transform within this stochastic control problem, we establish a connection to the KL divergence.

Proposition 3.2. *We write $k(u) = r + \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2$, $g(y) = -\log h(y)$ and consider the controlled process $dZ_t^u = (b(Z_t^u) + \sigma(Z_t^u)u_t)dt + \sigma(Z_t^u)dW_t$ for an (admissible) control u . The stochastic stopping and control problem of minimizing*

$$J(u, x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau k(u_t) dt + g(Z_{\tau-}^u) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

in both u and τ is solved by the h -transformed process Z^h with first entrance time into the support of β as stopping time. Furthermore, the variational gap in problem (3.1) can be interpreted as the KL divergence between Z^u and the h -transformed process until the lifetime.

Details can be found in Appendix B. We note here that for the cases we are interested in later, the first entrance time into the support just happens to coincide with the lifetime ζ .

3.3. Connection to time-inversion

Compared to the deterministic case, the time reversal from a random time is much less elaborated in the literature. In terms of the h -transform, however, the results are very clear: for the h -transformed process Z^h with (finite) lifetime ζ , we consider the time-reversed process

$$\tilde{Z}_s^h := Z_{\zeta-s}^h, \quad 0 < s < \zeta,$$

killed at $s = \zeta$. Let also α be a fixed initial distribution of Z^h , and define

$$\tilde{h}(x) = \int \frac{G_r(x, y)}{h(y)} \alpha(dy). \quad (3.2)$$

Proposition 3.3. 1. \tilde{Z}^h has the same distribution as $Z^{\tilde{h}}$, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{Z}_s^h &= \tilde{b}^h(\tilde{Z}_s^h)dt + \sigma(\tilde{Z}_s^h)d\tilde{W}_s, \\ \tilde{b}^h(y) &= b(y) + \sigma(y)\sigma(y)^\top \nabla \log \tilde{h}(y), \end{aligned}$$

\tilde{W} a Brownian motion, outside the support of α .

2. \tilde{Z}^h is killed on the support of α .

3. When started in x , the distribution of $Z^{\leftarrow h}$ at its lifetime ζ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_x(Z_{\zeta^-}^{\leftarrow h} \in dy) = \frac{G_r(x, y)}{\tilde{h}(x)h(y)} \alpha(dy).$$

The interpretation of the time reversal in terms of the h -transform has interesting consequences. Let us recall the concept of a polar set: for Z^h , $A \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ is called *polar* if $\mathbb{P}_x(Z_t^h \in A \text{ for some } t > 0) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{J}$. Typical examples of polar sets for diffusions are sets on low-dimensional submanifolds. For instance, if Z^h is a d -dimensional Brownian motion, any set with Hausdorff dimension less than $d - 2$ is polar, see e.g. Mörters and Peres [28]; a related result for general diffusions is also provided in Ramasubramanian [34].

Proposition 3.4. *Assume that the support of the initial distribution α is polar for Z^h . Then, $Z^{\leftarrow h}$ is killed at the first entry into the support of α . In particular, the distribution of $Z^{\leftarrow h}$ is entirely characterized by the drift \tilde{b}^h and the support of α .*

3.4. Key examples

1. In the case $\beta(dy) = rG_r(x_0, y) m(dy)$ (the distribution of Z at the exponential time when started in x_0), we have

$$h(x) = \int \frac{G_r(x, y)}{G_r(x_0, y)} \beta(dy) = \int rG_r(x, y) m(dy) = 1.$$

Then, Z^h has the same dynamics as Z and ζ is an independent $\text{Exp}(r)$ -time. The time-reversed process is given by $\tilde{h}(x) = \int G_r(x, y) \alpha(dy)$.

2. In the case $\beta(dy) = \delta_{x_1}$ for some $x_1 \in \mathcal{J}$, we have

$$h(x) = G_r(x, x_1)/c_{x_1}, \quad c_{x_1} = G_r(x_0, x_1).$$

h is thus independent of the starting point, except for a multiplicative constant that is irrelevant for the h -transform, so we may choose $c_{x_1} = 1$ w.l.o.g. Z^h is thus an exponential bridge killed in x_1 , no matter where the starting point was, with drift

$$b_h(x) = b(x) + \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top \nabla \log G_r(x, x_1).$$

In this case,

$$\tilde{h}(x) = \int \frac{G_r(x, y)}{G_r(x_1, y)} \alpha(dy).$$

3. In case $Z = W$ is a Brownian motion, we consider radially symmetric functions $h(x) = f(|x|)$ of the form

$$h(x) = \int_{\partial B_R} G_r(x, y) \sigma_R(dy),$$

where σ_R denotes the surface measure on the sphere with radius R . We obtain that (except for scaling)

$$f(y) = y^{-\nu} I_\nu(y\sqrt{2r}), \quad \nu = \frac{d-2}{2},$$

I_ν is a modified Bessel function of the first kind, and this results in the forward process Z^h with drift

$$b^h(x) = \nabla \log h(x) = \sqrt{2r} \frac{I_{\nu+1}(|x|\sqrt{2r})}{I_\nu(|x|\sqrt{2r})} \frac{x}{|x|},$$

killed when exiting B_R . For large dimensions d and moderate values of $|x|$, it holds that $b^h(x) \approx \frac{2r}{d}x$ (see 10.41 in [29]), so that the forward process Z^h can be approximated using the (non-stationary) Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process dynamics

$$d\tilde{Z}_t = \frac{2r}{d}\tilde{Z}dt + dW_t. \quad (3.3)$$

4. The proposed model

Standard diffusion generative models rely on a deterministic time horizon, leading to time-dependent backward processes and inefficiencies in the forward process due to excessive noise application. Two promising directions for improving these models can be identified: (1) replacing the deterministic time horizon with a randomized one to achieve time-homogeneous backward dynamics, and (2) introducing conditioning in the forward process to reduce the need for extensive noise application.

We achieve the simultaneous implementation of both modifications in a unified framework employing the h -transform described above. To this end, we use an appropriate choice of the process Z^h as our forward process and \overleftarrow{Z}^h as backward process, as discussed next.

4.1. Three possible implementations for unconditional sampling

The examples from Section 3.4 immediately suggest possible realizations of our framework. Specifically, we use Z^h as a forward process initialized in the data distribution α to learn the drift of the backward process \overleftarrow{Z}^h (see the following sections for details). To generate (unconditional) samples from α , we require suitable initial distributions for \overleftarrow{Z}^h , which are (approximately) given in the following examples:

1. **Long exponential time horizons:** If we choose an ergodic diffusion Z (e.g., an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process) and set $h = 1$, we can pick r small and let ζ follow an $\text{Exp}(r)$ distribution. Under this setup, $\mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta-}^h \in dy)$ is close to the stationary distribution of Z . Thus, we may initialize the backward process \overleftarrow{Z}^h in the stationary distribution of Z (if it exists).
2. **Exponential bridge:** In the second example, the forward process Z^h is an exponential bridge targeting a specific state x_1 . Here, we can sample from the data distribution by starting the backward process \overleftarrow{Z}^h at $Z_{\zeta-}^h = x_1$.
3. **Hitting a large sphere:** In the third example, if the radius R is chosen sufficiently large, $\mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta-}^h \in dy)$ is approximately a uniform distribution over the sphere, which can then serve as an initial distribution for \overleftarrow{Z}^h . If helpful, the forward process can be approximated by (3.3), which allows a more direct sampling.

In the idealized setting where α is known analytically, generation via the backward process for unconditional sampling, i.e., sampling from α , proceeds as described in Algorithm 1. This algorithm is derived from the results presented in Section 3.3. The simulation of the backward process up to the lifetime ζ can be implemented using standard numerical methods, such as the Euler–Maruyama scheme. In the most general setup, the backward process terminates at a randomized Markovian stopping time of the form

$$\zeta = \inf\{t : A_t^h \geq E\},$$

Algorithm 1 Idealized generation when no learning is necessary

Input: $r > 0$, Green kernel G_r of diffusion Z , forward transform h , target distribution α , backward initial distribution $\beta' \approx \mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta-}^h)$

Set $\tilde{h}(x) = \int \frac{G_r(x,y)}{h(y)} \alpha(dy)$

Generation:

draw $x \sim \beta'$

Simulate path $(y_t)_{t \in [0, \zeta]}$ of h -transform $Y = \tilde{Z}^h$ initialized in x until lifetime ζ , with dynamics given in Proposition 3.3;

Output: $y_{\zeta-}$

where E is an independent exponential random variable and A_t^h is an additive functional supported within the data distribution, which describes the measure of killing. For a detailed mathematical discussion and numerical approximations of A^h , see [4, 8, 37]. This framework directly enables simulation but poses challenges for estimation. However, the situation becomes significantly simpler when the data distribution α resides within a polar set, as will be discussed in the following section.

4.2. Polarity hypothesis

The target distribution α is typically unknown in practice. Consequently, we lack direct access to \tilde{h} as defined in (3.2), which is required to employ the backward generating process $Y = \tilde{Z}^h$. Thus, \tilde{h} must be inferred from the data. As discussed in Section 3, both the drift of the backward process and the mechanism governing killing must be learned. While the killing mechanism can be described by a measure on the state space \mathcal{J} (the killing measure), this adds significant complexity to the learning process.

A natural approach is to terminate the backward process as soon as a meaningful element of the data distribution is encountered. Proposition 3.4 offers a criterion for when this is feasible: specifically, when the data distribution is concentrated in a polar set for the forward process, such as a lower-dimensional manifold. This aligns naturally with the manifold hypothesis: this well-explored concept in the literature assumes that high-dimensional data typically lie on or near a low-dimensional manifold (or a union of such) [25] and has been empirically verified for image data [7, 33].

In our framework, we adopt a slightly more general assumption, referred to as the *polarity hypothesis*, which posits that the data resides in a polar set. This generalization allows us to disentangle the learning of drift and the killing mechanism, as detailed in the following sections.

4.3. Learning the drift

Here we focus on the case where the polarity hypothesis is satisfied, such that by Proposition 3.4 the lifetime of \tilde{Z}^h is given by the first hitting time of $\Omega := \text{supp } \alpha$, which we assume to be known for the moment. Based on Proposition 3.3, we aim to fit the data to a class of time-homogeneous diffusion processes

$$dY_s^\theta = \tilde{b}^\theta(Y_s^\theta) ds + \sigma(Y_s^\theta) dW_s, \quad Y_0^\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta-}^h \in \cdot),$$

$$\tilde{b}^\theta(y) = b(y) + \sigma(y)\sigma(y)^\top s^\theta(y),$$

induced by a suitable class of candidate functions $\mathcal{S} = \{s^\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$, and for an optimization objective and corresponding optimizer θ^* to be determined below, run the backward process Y^{θ^*}

until an appropriate stopping time. Ideally, we would like to stop in the first hitting time of Ω by Y^{θ^*} , i.e., in $\zeta^{\theta^*} = \tau_{\Omega}(Y^{\theta^*})$, denoting $\tau_A(X) := \inf\{t : X_t \in A\}$ for a process X and a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. However, in the typical situation where Ω is a lower dimensional manifold with no simple structure, designing a candidate class \mathcal{S} that guarantees $\mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\theta^*} < \infty) = 1$ is a difficult and highly problem-specific task (e.g., a C^2 submanifold Ω is polar for non-degenerate diffusions if its Hausdorff dimension is no larger than $d - 2$ [18, Chapter 11], [34]). Instead, for some small $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider the closed ε -environment $\Omega_{\varepsilon} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : d(x, \Omega) \leq \varepsilon\}$ and run Y^{θ^*} until

$$\zeta_{\varepsilon}^{\theta^*} = \tau_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}}(Y^{\theta^*}).$$

Thus, we are not targeting α directly, but the distribution of $\overleftarrow{Z}_{\zeta_{\varepsilon}}^h$ for

$$\zeta_{\varepsilon} := \tau_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}}(\overleftarrow{Z}^h).$$

This is justified for small $\varepsilon > 0$, since by continuity of the sample paths, we have that $\tau_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}}(\overleftarrow{Z}^h)$ almost surely increases to ζ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ if Ω is closed, and therefore obtain the a.s. convergence $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \overleftarrow{Z}_{\zeta_{\varepsilon}}^h = \overleftarrow{Z}_{\zeta}^h \sim \alpha$. This is comparable to early stopping of the generating process in standard diffusion models with deterministic time horizon, which implies that the generative model targets the original data set blurred by some small Gaussian noise. On a forward time scale, the first entrance time in Ω_{ε} of the backward process \overleftarrow{Z}^h corresponds to the last exit time σ_{ε} of Ω_{ε} by the forward process Z^h , that is,

$$\sigma_{\varepsilon} := \sup\{t < \zeta : Z_t^h \in \Omega_{\varepsilon}\} = \zeta - \zeta_{\varepsilon}.$$

As a natural optimization objective, we therefore target the Kullback–Leibler divergence between the law $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\varepsilon}$ of the theoretical generating process \overleftarrow{Z}^h killed in ζ_{ε} and the law $\mathbb{P}^{\theta, \varepsilon}$ of the parametrized generating process Y^{θ} killed at first entrance into Ω_{ε} , i.e., at $\zeta_{\varepsilon}^{\theta} := \tau_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}}(Y^{\theta})$. To this end, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* &\in \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ex}}(\theta), \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{ex}}(\theta) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_{\varepsilon}} \|s^{\theta}(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h) - \nabla \log \tilde{h}(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h)\|^2 dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\sigma_{\varepsilon}}^{\zeta} \|s^{\theta}(Z_t^h) - \nabla \log \tilde{h}(Z_t^h)\|^2 dt \right] \end{aligned}$$

which is the natural analogue to the *explicit score matching* objective in standard diffusion models. Then, given sufficient integrability conditions, Girsanov’s theorem indeed yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\varepsilon} \parallel \mathbb{P}^{\theta, \varepsilon}) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma^{-1}(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h)(\tilde{b}^h(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h) - \tilde{b}^{\theta}(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h))\|^2 dt \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\sigma}}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ex}}(\theta), \end{aligned}$$

for $C_{\sigma} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\sigma(x)\|^2$. Consequently,

$$\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}(\overleftarrow{Z}_{\zeta_{\varepsilon}}^h \in \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}(Y_{\zeta_{\varepsilon}^{\theta^*}}^{\theta^*} \in \cdot)) \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_{\varepsilon}} \|s^{\theta}(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h) - \nabla \log \tilde{h}(\overleftarrow{Z}_t^h)\|^2 dt \right],$$

showing that if \mathcal{S} is rich enough to guarantee a high approximation quality of $\nabla \log \tilde{h}$ on $(\Omega_{\varepsilon})^c$ (e.g., a suitable class of neural networks), our generative process produces high quality samples for slightly blurred target data. However, the general inaccessibility of \tilde{h} , and thus of \mathcal{L}_{ex} , requires us to determine a tractable training objective that is comparable to \mathcal{L}_{ex} . This is provided by our next result, which in our proposed model can be understood as an analog of the *denoising score matching loss* [38] employed in standard diffusion models.

Algorithm 2 Generation for unknown \bar{h} and known polar data support Ω

Input: data $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \alpha$, $\varepsilon > 0, r > 0$, Green kernel G_r of diffusion Z , enlarged data support Ω_ε , forward transform h , backward initialization $\beta' \approx \mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta_-}^h \in \cdot)$ with $\text{supp } \beta' \subset \Omega_\varepsilon^c$, function class \mathcal{S} .

for $i = 1$ to n **do**

Simulate path $(z_t^{h,i})_{t \in [0, \zeta^i]}$ of h -transform Z^h started in y_i ;

end for

Training: Learn $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\theta)$ for

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^i}^{\zeta^i} \|s^\theta(z_t^{h,i}) - \nabla_{z_t^{h,i}} \log G_r(z_t^{h,i}, y_i)\|^2 dt$$

Generation:

Draw x from β'

Simulate path $(y_t^{\hat{\theta}})_{t \in [0, \tau_{\Omega_\varepsilon}(y^{\hat{\theta}})]}$ of $Y^{\hat{\theta}}$ initialized in x

Output: $\hat{\theta}, y_{\tau_{\Omega_\varepsilon}(y^{\hat{\theta}})}^{\hat{\theta}}$

Proposition 4.1. *Given sufficient integrability conditions, there exists a constant C independent of θ , such that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ex}}(\theta) = \mathcal{L}(\theta) + C_\varepsilon(\theta) + C,$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\sigma_\varepsilon}^{\zeta} \|s^\theta(Z_t^h) - \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h)\|^2 dt \right]$$

and

$$C_\varepsilon(\theta) := 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\sigma_\varepsilon} \left\langle s_\theta(Z_t^h), \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log \frac{G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h)}{h(Z_t^h)} \right\rangle dt \right].$$

Since we assumed Ω to be polar, $C_\varepsilon(\theta)$ vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, so that for small $\varepsilon > 0$ we expect minimizers of \mathcal{L} – which is accessible for a given Green kernel G_r and can be efficiently approximated by a Monte-Carlo estimator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ based on simulated forward trajectories of Z^h – to be also approximate minimizers of \mathcal{L}_{ex} . This motivates the generative Algorithm 2, which outputs an estimated drift parameter $\hat{\theta}$ and a corresponding sample from the estimated backward generative process $Y^{\hat{\theta}}$ initialized in a distribution β' approximating the true forward terminal distribution $\mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta_-}^h \in \cdot)$. We note once again that a significant difference from most other methods is that there is no time dependence to be learned. This is also a feature of the first hitting model from [41], which, however, relies on non-polarity of Ω and access to the Ω -dependent Poisson kernel $\mathbb{P}_x(Z_{\tau_\Omega} \in dz)$ for training and generation purposes. Usually, this is analytically tractable only for simple sets Ω . In contrast, our learning and generation step only requires access to the Green kernel G_r of the *unconditioned* forward process Z , which is independent of Ω and therefore allows for enhanced flexibility.

4.4. Learning the manifold

We now turn to the most general setting, where the polar data support $\Omega = \text{supp } \alpha$ is unknown. Since the generative mechanism proposed in Algorithm 2 requires Ω_ε as input, a natural strategy

Algorithm 3 Full generative algorithm

Input: data $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \alpha$, $\varepsilon > 0, r > 0$, Green kernel G_r of diffusion Z , estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ of enlarged data support, forward transform h , backward initial distribution $\beta' \approx \mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_\zeta^h)$ with $\text{supp } \beta' \subset \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon^c$, function class \mathcal{S} .

Set $\Omega_\varepsilon \leftarrow \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$

Generation: Run Algorithm 2

Output: $\widehat{\theta}, y_{\tau_{\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon}^\theta}^{\widehat{\theta}}$

is to build an estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ based on the given data in a pre-processing step, and then use a plug-in approach to draw samples based on Algorithm 2. This is formalized in Algorithm 3.

To construct $\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ given a data sample $(Y_i)_{i=1}^n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \alpha$, we can consider the following two natural approaches:

First, we may target Ω_ε directly by first blurring the data via $Y_i^\varepsilon = Y_i + \eta_i^\varepsilon$, where $(\eta_i^\varepsilon)_{i=1}^n$ is some iid noise that is independent of the data sample and absolutely continuous with support $B(0, \varepsilon)$, e.g., $\eta_i^\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{U}(B(0, \varepsilon))$. Then, Y_i^ε is absolutely continuous with support Ω_ε and density $\pi^\varepsilon(x) = \int_\Omega \pi_{\eta^\varepsilon}(x - y) \alpha(dy)$. Recovering the compact support Ω_ε of such a data sample is a well-studied statistical problem. The most common approaches are perhaps plug-in estimators [10] that set

$$\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon = \{\widehat{\pi}^\varepsilon > \delta_n\}$$

for some nonparametric estimator $\widehat{\pi}^\varepsilon$ of π^ε and a tuning parameter $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, or the simple and intuitive *Devroye–Wise* estimator [13] given by

$$\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(Y_i^\varepsilon, \delta_n).$$

Minimax optimality of these estimators with respect to metrics such as the Hausdorff metric or the symmetric difference volume has been established under different assumptions on the data density π^ε and the geometry of Ω_ε [5, 10, 11, 23, 27]. The rates, however, generally slow down exponentially in terms of the ambient data dimension d , which motivates the second approach that allows to exploit directly the lower-dimensional structure of Ω .

For this second approach, instead of estimating Ω_ε directly, we may first construct an estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ of the true data support Ω based on the unmodified data sample $(Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ and then set

$$\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon = (\widehat{\Omega})_\varepsilon.$$

This approach might be more promising for high-dimensional data since a lot of progress has been made in recent years on statistical theory and algorithmic implementation for support estimation of distributions concentrated on lower-dimensional manifolds. Important contributions that provide estimators $\widehat{\Omega}$ with provable convergence rates only depending on the smoothness s and the dimension $d' < d$ of the data manifold include [1–3, 19, 22, 26]. While computationally more involved than the simple estimators based on noised data discussed above, the estimators from [1–3] are constructive and implementable.

5. Features of the model

5.1. Natural conditioning

In the procedure described above, we have explained how to sample from the data distribution α using the time-homogeneous backward processes $Y = \overleftarrow{Z}^h$ or a learned version thereof when

initialized from the terminal distribution of the forward process. The flexibility of our proposed model compared to existing diffusion models, however, arises from the observation that due to its time-homogeneous nature, the backward process Y can be started in an interpretable way directly from *any* initial state x , regardless of the specific time, along the following lines:

1. Initialize the backward process Y at a chosen state x , which could be:
 - A noisy version of a sample from α , or
 - Any point of interest in the state space.
2. Simulate the backward process Y until the lifetime ζ , generating the trajectory $\{Y_t\}_{t \leq \zeta}$.
3. Extract the value $Y_{\zeta-}$ as the final sample. Note that this value lies within the support of α , but is not necessarily distributed exactly according to α .
4. Optionally, repeat the process for multiple initial states x to analyze how the sampling distribution varies with the initialization.

In Bayesian terminology, unconditional sampling corresponds to drawing from the prior distribution α , whereas the current task involves sampling from $\mathbb{P}_x(Y_{\zeta-} \in dy)$, the posterior distribution conditioned on the input data x .

It is reasonable to expect that $Y_{\zeta-}$ will typically be close to x . Indeed, Proposition 3.3 states that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(Y_{\zeta-} \in dy) = \frac{1}{\bar{h}(x)} \frac{G_r(x, y)}{h(y)} \alpha(dy).$$

If $h(y)$ is approximately constant over the support of α , the sampling procedure approximates drawing from the measure proportional to $G_r(x, y) \alpha(dy)$ (up to a normalizing constant). Typically, $G_r(x, y)$ decreases with the distance between x and y , as illustrated in Remark A.1. Consequently, points y closer to x appear with higher frequency than those farther away.

In other words, if the backward process Y is started near the support of α , the resulting sample from α will tend to be close to x . Here, the choice of the diffusion process Z implicitly defines a corresponding notion of distance. So by choosing the starting point of Y , we get natural conditioning, and in exactly the same (learned) model as for unconditional sampling.

5.2. Distances to the distribution and anomaly detection

We now address the question of how to measure the distance of an input x from the data distribution α . The previous discussion provides a natural measure for this, namely the time it takes the forward process Y to transform the input x into a sample from α .

We can identify x as an anomaly if the average lifetime exceeds a certain threshold \underline{T} using the Monte-Carlo procedure given in Algorithm 4.

This can also serve as a criterion for determining whether new training data necessitates a modification of our trained model or not.

5.3. Class sampling and classification

The model can be naturally extended when the data can be decomposed into subclasses, i.e., when α is a mixture of distributions $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ with disjoint supports Ω^i . In this scenario, there is a corresponding decomposition $\tilde{h} = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{h}_i$. The lifetime ζ is then determined as the minimum of the first entry times ζ_i into the supports of the α_i . With unconditional sampling, this provides information about the specific class from which the sampled image originates.

Algorithm 4 Anomaly detection

Input: state x to be evaluated, estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ of data support environment, learned backward model $Y^\hat{\theta}$ based on Algorithm 3, threshold $\underline{T} > 0$, # of Monte-Carlo runs N

Initialize $\bar{\zeta} = 0$

if $x \notin \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ **then**

for $i = 1$ **to** N **do**

 Initialize $Y_0^\hat{\theta} = x$

repeat

 Simulate next step of $Y^\hat{\theta}$

until $Y_t^\hat{\theta} \in \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$

 Update $\bar{\zeta} \leftarrow \bar{\zeta} + t/N$

end for

end if

if $\bar{\zeta} > \underline{T}$ **then**

 Classify as anomaly

end if

The truly interesting aspect of class decomposition becomes evident when we consider the conditional setting as the previous observations induce the natural classification Algorithm 5 based on the (learned) unconditional model that records the class i responsible for killing the backward process initialized in x .

Algorithm 5 Classification

Input: state x to be classified, classes $i = 1, \dots, K$, estimates $\widehat{\Omega}^i$ of class supports Ω^i , learned backward model $Y^\hat{\theta}$ for $\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{i=1}^K (\widehat{\Omega}^i)_\varepsilon$ based on Algorithm 3

if $x \notin \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ **then**

 Initialize $Y_0^\hat{\theta} = x$

repeat

 Simulate next step of $Y^\hat{\theta}$

until $Y_t^\hat{\theta} \in (\widehat{\Omega}^i)_\varepsilon$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$

else

 Find $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ s.t. $i \in \arg \min_{i=1, \dots, K} d(x, \widehat{\Omega}^i)$

end if

Output: class i

The presented conditional diffusion model thus naturally enables classification through transfer learning. Refinements are also conceivable. For instance, by starting several runs from x we can estimate the conditional class distribution, which allows the construction of statistical tests. Analogously to the case of anomaly detection, the average lifetime $\bar{\zeta}$ can then be regarded as a measure of reliability.

5.4. General transfer learning

The idea of transfer learning presented in the previous section can be applied more generally. For instance, if the classes are not predefined, but clusters are to be learned from the data, the typical approach is to perform clustering with known algorithms only on the support of α , which is a significantly lower-dimensional task. Similar approaches may be possible for tasks in Reinforce-

ment Learning.

6. Conclusion

We have introduced a novel class of diffusion models grounded in Doob’s h -transform. This theoretical framework provides a general and adaptable foundation for time-homogeneous diffusion models that eliminates the necessity to model artificial time dependencies and thereby enhances interpretability. A key innovation in our model is the introduction of the polarity hypothesis, which closely parallels the manifold hypothesis in machine learning. This property enables an intuitive and efficient mechanism for determining the termination of the denoising process, addressing a crucial challenge in implementing our generative model.

Another notable feature of our framework is a methodological simplification for learning the dynamics of the denoising process. Unlike conventional diffusion models, which require estimating temporally inhomogeneous dynamics, our learning strategy separates the tasks of estimating the data manifold and learning a time-*independent* backward drift via denoising score matching. This establishes an interesting connection between recent advances in manifold learning and denoising diffusion generative modeling that can potentially reduce computational and modeling complexity.

The time-homogeneous nature of the model opens up numerous opportunities for practical applications. While its utility will depend on the specific requirements of each use case, the theoretical framework established here provides a robust foundation for experimental exploration, particularly in the context of transfer learning.

References

- [1] E. Aamari, C. Aaron, and C. Levrard. “Minimax boundary estimation and estimation with boundary”. In: *Bernoulli* 29.4 (2023), pp. 3334–3368.
- [2] E. Aamari and C. Levrard. “Nonasymptotic rates for manifold, tangent space and curvature estimation”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 47.1 (2019), pp. 177–204.
- [3] E. Aamari and C. Levrard. “Stability and minimax optimality of tangential Delaunay complexes for manifold reconstruction”. In: *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 59.4 (2018), pp. 923–971.
- [4] V. Bally. “Approximation models for the continuous additive functionals of multidimensional brownian motion”. In: *Stochastic processes and their applications* 32.2 (1989), pp. 331–345.
- [5] G. Biau, B. Cadre, and B. Pelletier. “Exact rates in density support estimation”. In: *J. Multivariate Anal.* 99.10 (2008), pp. 2185–2207.
- [6] A. N. Borodin and P. Salminen. *Handbook of Brownian Motion – Facts and Formulae*. Second. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002, pp. xvi+672.
- [7] B. C. Brown, A. L. Caterini, B. L. Ross, J. C. Cresswell, and G. Loaiza-Ganem. “Verifying the Union of Manifolds Hypothesis for Image Data”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023.
- [8] S. Christensen and B. Schultz. “On the existence of Markovian randomized equilibria in Dynkin games of war-of-attrition-type”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09820* (2024).
- [9] K. L. Chung and J. B. Walsh. *Markov processes, Brownian motion, and time symmetry*. Vol. 249. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [10] A. Cuevas and R. Fraiman. “A plug-in approach to support estimation”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 25.6 (1997), pp. 2300–2312.

- [11] A. Cuevas and A. Rodríguez-Casal. “On boundary estimation”. In: *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* 36.2 (2004), pp. 340–354.
- [12] V. De Bortoli, J. Thornton, J. Heng, and A. Doucet. “Diffusion Schrödinger Bridge with Applications to Score-Based Generative Modeling”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 34. 2021.
- [13] L. Devroye and G. L. Wise. “Detection of abnormal behavior via nonparametric estimation of the support”. In: *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 38.3 (1980), pp. 480–488.
- [14] P. Dhariwal and A. Nichol. “Diffusion Models Beat GANs on Image Synthesis”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 34. 2021.
- [15] K. Didi, F. Vargas, S. Mathis, V. Dutordoir, E. Mathieu, U. J. Komorowska, and P. Lio. “A framework for conditional diffusion modelling with applications in motif scaffolding for protein design”. In: *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop on New Frontiers of AI for Drug Discovery and Development*. 2023.
- [16] A. Erdélyi, W. Magnus, F. Oberhettinger, and F. Tricomi. *Tables of Integral Transforms*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- [17] Z. Evans, C. Carr, J. Taylor, S. H. Hawley, and J. Pons. “Fast Timing-Conditioned Latent Audio Diffusion”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024.
- [18] A. Friedman. *Stochastic differential equations and applications*. Vol. 1. Vol. Vol. 28. Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1975, pp. xiii+231.
- [19] C. R. Genovese, M. Perone-Pacífico, I. Verdinelli, and L. Wasserman. “Minimax manifold estimation”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 13 (2012), pp. 1263–1291.
- [20] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel. “Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 33. 2020, pp. 6840–6851.
- [21] J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet. “Video Diffusion Models”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 35. 2022, pp. 8633–8646.
- [22] A. K. H. Kim and H. H. Zhou. “Tight minimax rates for manifold estimation under Hausdorff loss”. In: *Electron. J. Stat.* 9.1 (2015), pp. 1562–1582.
- [23] A. P. Korostelëv and A. B. Tsybakov. *Minimax theory of image reconstruction*. Vol. 82. Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993, pp. xii+258.
- [24] N. N. Lebedev. *Special functions and their applications*. New York: Dover publications, 1972.
- [25] G. Loaiza-Ganem, B. L. Ross, R. Hosseinzadeh, A. L. Caterini, and J. C. Cresswell. “Deep Generative Models through the Lens of the Manifold Hypothesis: A Survey and New Connections”. In: *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2024).
- [26] Y. Ma and Y. Fu, eds. *Manifold learning theory and applications*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2012, pp. xxiv+290.
- [27] E. Mammen and A. B. Tsybakov. “Asymptotical minimax recovery of sets with smooth boundaries”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 23.2 (1995), pp. 502–524.
- [28] P. Mörters and Y. Peres. *Brownian motion*. Vol. 30. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [29] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <https://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.2.2 of 2024-09-15. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.

- [30] C. Niu, Y. Song, J. Song, S. Zhao, A. Grover, and S. Ermon. “Permutation invariant graph generation via score-based generative modeling”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 4474–4484.
- [31] B. Øksendal and A. Sulem. “Stochastic Control of jump diffusions”. In: *Applied Stochastic Control of Jump Diffusions*. Springer, 2019, pp. 93–155.
- [32] S. Peluchetti. “Diffusion bridge mixture transports, Schrödinger bridge problems and generative modeling”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 24 (2023), Paper No. [374], 51.
- [33] P. Pope, C. Zhu, A. Abdelkader, M. Goldblum, and T. Goldstein. “The Intrinsic Dimension of Images and Its Impact on Learning”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021.
- [34] S. Ramasubramanian. “Hitting of submanifolds by diffusions”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 78.1 (1988), pp. 149–163.
- [35] Y. Shi, V. De Bortoli, A. Campbell, and A. Doucet. “Diffusion Schrödinger Bridge Matching”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 36. 2023, pp. 62183–62223.
- [36] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole. “Score-Based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Differential Equations”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021.
- [37] L. Stoica. “The approximation of additive functionals of diffusion processes”. In: *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.* 38.3 (1992), pp. 185–200.
- [38] P. Vincent. “A connection between score matching and denoising autoencoders”. In: *Neural Comput.* 23.7 (2011), pp. 1661–1674.
- [39] J. L. Watson, D. Juergens, N. R. Bennett, B. L. Trippe, J. Yim, H. E. Eisenach, W. Ahern, A. J. Borst, R. J. Ragotte, L. F. Milles, B. I. M. Wicky, N. Hanikel, S. J. Pellock, A. Courbet, W. Sheffler, J. Wang, P. Venkatesh, I. Sappington, S. V. Torres, A. Lauko, V. De Bortoli, E. Mathieu, S. Ovchinnikov, R. Barzilay, T. S. Jaakkola, F. DiMaio, M. Baek, and D. Baker. “De novo design of protein structure and function with RFdiffusion”. In: *Nature* 620.7976 (2023), pp. 1089–1100.
- [40] L. Yang, Z. Zhang, Y. Song, S. Hong, R. Xu, Y. Zhao, W. Zhang, B. Cui, and M.-H. Yang. “Diffusion models: A comprehensive survey of methods and applications”. In: *ACM Computing Surveys* 56.4 (2023), pp. 1–39.
- [41] M. Ye, L. Wu, and Q. Liu. “First hitting diffusion models for generating manifold, graph and categorical data”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 27280–27292.
- [42] Z. Zhao, Z. Luo, J. Sjölund, and T. B. Schön. “Conditional sampling within generative diffusion models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.09650* (2024).

A. Doob's h -transform and lifetime of a diffusion process

The following is based on [9], which provides a level of generality necessary for our purposes. For a more explicit discussion in the univariate case, see also [6].

We first note that the Green kernel can be found explicitly for the Brownian motion:

Remark A.1. Let $Z = W$ be a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion, m Lebesgue measure, then

$$p_t(x, y) = (2\pi t)^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x - y|^2}{2t}\right).$$

In this case, [16, p. 146] yields

$$G_r(x, y) = G_r(|x - y|) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} 2 \left(\frac{|x - y|^2}{2r}\right)^{(2-d)/4} K_{(d-2)/2}(|x - y| \sqrt{2r}),$$

where K_ν is the modified Bessel function of the second kind as defined in [24], p. 109. The function $G_r(\cdot)$ has a pole in 0 and is decreasing.

Now we give the remaining proofs:

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The finiteness of ζ follows from [9, Theorem 13.50]:

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\zeta < \infty) = \int_0^\infty \int e^{-rt} \frac{1}{h(x)} p_t(x, y) \kappa(dy) dt = \frac{1}{h(x)} \int G_r(x, y) \kappa(dy) = 1.$$

The second statement follows by using the generator identity

$$A^h f(x) = \frac{1}{h(x)} (A(h(x)f(x)) - rh(x)f(x)),$$

taking into account that h is r -harmonic (i.e., $(A - r)h(x) = 0$) outside the support of β .

The third statement follows from [9, Theorem 13.39] (after correction of an obvious typo), where the special case $x = x_0$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0}(Z_{\zeta-}^h \in dy) = \frac{G_r(x_0, y)}{h(x_0)} \kappa(dy) = G_r(x_0, y) \kappa(dy) = \beta(dy).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.3. The first claim holds by combining [9, Theorem 13.34] with Proposition 3.1. The other two are direct consequences of Proposition 3.1. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4. The assumption implies that the starting distribution of Z^h lies in a polar set, which is not visited during the rest of the lifetime. This means that the time-reversed process \tilde{Z}^h only visits this set at the time of killing. □

B. Stochastic control

For the proof of Proposition 3.2, we start with the following

Lemma B.1. Let h be as above and $g(x) := -\log h(x)$. Then, outside of the support of β , it holds that

$$Ag(x) + r - \frac{1}{2} \nabla g(x)^\top \sigma(x) \sigma^\top(x) \nabla g(x) = 0.$$

Proof. Outside of $\text{supp } \kappa$, it holds that $Ah(x) - rh(x) = 0$, and a straightforward calculation shows that

$$Ag(x) = -r + \frac{1}{2} \nabla g(x)^\top \sigma(x) \sigma^\top(x) \nabla g(x).$$

□

Now, we follow the standard verification approach to stochastic stopping and control problems, see [31], Chapter 5, where we assume the appropriate standard regularity assumptions for the objects without explicitly mentioning them. Outside of $\text{supp } \kappa$, using the notation

$$A^u v(x) = \langle \sigma(x)u + b(x), \nabla v(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\Sigma(x) \nabla^2 v(x)],$$

where $\Sigma(x) = \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_u (A^u v(x) + k(u)) &= \langle b(x), \nabla v(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\Sigma(x) \nabla^2 v(x)] + r + \inf_u \left(\langle \sigma(x)u, \nabla v(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2 \right) \\ &= \langle b(x), \nabla v(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\Sigma(x) \nabla^2 v(x)] + r - \frac{1}{2} \|\sigma(x)^\top \nabla v(x)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

with minimizer $u = -\sigma(x)^\top \nabla v(x)$. Using $v(x) = g(x) = -\log h(x)$ and Lemma B.1, we see that $g(x)$ fulfills the HJB equation for problem (3.1). Following the steps in the verification procedure in [31], p. 92ff., it is easily seen that this solution to the HJB equation is indeed a solution to (3.1), proving the first part of Proposition 3.2.

Now, we study the connection to the KL divergence and write $Y = Z^h$. Note that

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{Z^u}}{d\mathbb{P}^Z} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta} = \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\zeta \|u_t\|^2 dt - M_\zeta \right),$$

for some (local) martingale M with $M_0 = 0$. For the killed process Y , by the definition of the h -transform,

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^Z}{d\mathbb{P}^Y} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta} = \frac{e^{r\zeta} h(Z_0)}{h(Z_\zeta)}.$$

This yields

$$\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{Z^u}}{d\mathbb{P}^Y} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta} = \log \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{Z^u}}{d\mathbb{P}^Z} \frac{d\mathbb{P}^Z}{d\mathbb{P}^Y} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\zeta \|u_t\|^2 dt + r\zeta + \log h(Z_0^u) - \log h(Z_\zeta^u) + M_\zeta.$$

We obtain that

$$\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_x^{Z^u} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta} \parallel \mathbb{P}_x^Y \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta}) = \mathbb{E}_x \log \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{Z^u}}{d\mathbb{P}^Z} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_\zeta} = J(u, x) + \log h(x) \geq v(x) + \log h(x) = 0$$

with equality for $u = u^*$, so that the KL divergence is the variational gap in problem (3.1).

C. Score matching

Proof of Proposition 4.1. It holds that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ex}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_\varepsilon} \|\nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(Z_t^h) - s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h)\|^2 dt \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_\varepsilon} |s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h)|^2 dt \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_\varepsilon} \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(\tilde{Z}_t^h), s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h) \rangle dt \right] + C, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where C is independent of θ . Let $\tilde{\beta}(dy) = \mathbb{P}_\alpha(Z_{\zeta_-}^h \in dy)$. Since the time reversal of the h -transform \tilde{Z}^h started in $\tilde{\beta}$ is equal in law to the h -transform Z^h started in α , we obtain from Proposition 3.3 that

$$\frac{G_r(x, y)}{\tilde{h}(x)} \tilde{\beta}(dx) = h(y) \frac{G_r(y, x)}{h(y)\tilde{h}(x)} \tilde{\beta}(dx) = h(y) \mathbb{P}_y(Z_{\zeta_-}^h \in dx).$$

Using this and assuming sufficient integrability properties that allow the application of Fubini's theorem and pulling the derivative inside the integral, we can calculate for the second term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(\tilde{Z}_t^h), s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h) \rangle dt \right] &= \int \int \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(y), s_\theta(y) \rangle \frac{\tilde{h}(y)}{\tilde{h}(x)} G_r(x, y) m(dy) \tilde{\beta}(dx) \\ &= \int \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(y), s_\theta(y) \rangle \tilde{h}(y) h(y) m(dy) \\ &= \int \langle \nabla_y \tilde{h}(y), s_\theta(y) \rangle h(y) m(dy) \\ &= \int \int \langle \nabla_y \frac{G_r(y, z)}{h(z)}, s_\theta(y) \rangle h(y) m(dy) \alpha(dz) \\ &= \int \int \langle \nabla_y \log G_r(y, z), s_\theta(y) \rangle \frac{h(y)}{h(z)} G_r(y, z) m(dy) \alpha(dz) \\ &= \int \int \langle \nabla_y \log G_r(y, z), s_\theta(y) \rangle \frac{h(y)}{h(z)} G_r(z, y) m(dy) \alpha(dz) \\ &= \int \mathbb{E}_z \left[\int_0^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h), s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right] \alpha(dz) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\alpha \left[\int_0^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h), s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_\varepsilon} \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(\tilde{Z}_t^h), s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h) \rangle dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(\tilde{Z}_t^h), s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h) \rangle dt \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\zeta_\varepsilon}^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(\tilde{Z}_t^h), s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h) \rangle dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h), s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\sigma_\varepsilon} \langle \nabla_y \log \tilde{h}(Z_t^h), s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\sigma_\varepsilon}^{\zeta} \langle \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h), s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\sigma_\varepsilon} \langle \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log \frac{G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h)}{\tilde{h}(Z_t^h)}, s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the first term satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\zeta_\varepsilon} \|s_\theta(\tilde{Z}_t^h)\|^2 dt \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\sigma_\varepsilon}^{\zeta} \|s_\theta(Z_t^h)\|^2 dt \right].$$

Substituting these results into (C.1), we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ex}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\sigma_\varepsilon}^{\zeta} \|\nabla_{Z_t^h} \log G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h) - s_\theta(Z_t^h)\|^2 dt \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\sigma_\varepsilon} \langle \nabla_{Z_t^h} \log \frac{G_r(Z_t^h, Z_0^h)}{\tilde{h}(Z_t^h)}, s_\theta(Z_t^h) \rangle dt \right] + C',$$

where C' is a constant independent of θ . \square