

# On the convergence of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo

Alain Durmus <sup>\*</sup> <sup>1</sup>, Éric Moulines <sup>†</sup> <sup>2</sup>, and Eero Saksman <sup>‡</sup> <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CMLA - École normale supérieure Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay,  
94235 Cachan, France.

<sup>2</sup>Centre de Mathématiques Appliquées,, UMR 7641, Ecole Polytechnique

<sup>3</sup>University of Helsinki, Department of Mathematics and Statistics

May 14, 2019

## Abstract

This paper discusses the irreducibility and geometric ergodicity of the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) algorithm. We consider cases where the number of steps of the symplectic integrator is either fixed or random. Under mild conditions on the potential  $U$  associated with target distribution  $\pi$ , we first show that the Markov kernel associated to the HMC algorithm is irreducible and recurrent. Under more stringent conditions, we then establish that the Markov kernel is Harris recurrent. Finally, we provide verifiable conditions on  $U$  under which the HMC sampler is geometrically ergodic. We compare our assumptions with those recently presented in [15] and [5].

## 1 Introduction

We consider in this paper the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC), a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm designed to sample target probability density  $\pi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . This method was first proposed by [8] in computational physics. It has later been introduced in the statistics community in the early paper of [20] and quickly gained popularity; see for example [14, chapter 9], [21] and [12]. The most attractive feature of the HMC algorithm is to allow the possibility of generating proposals - obtained by integrating a system of Hamiltonian equations - that are far away from the current position but still having a high probability of being accepted. The HMC algorithm therefore offer promise for eliminating the random walk behavior of most classical Monte Carlo algorithms. The distance between the

---

<sup>\*</sup>Email: alain.durmus@cmla.ens-cachan.fr

<sup>†</sup>Email: eric.moulines@polytechnique.edu

<sup>‡</sup>Email: eero.saksman@helsinki.fi

current state and the proposal is controlled by length of the time interval along which the Hamiltonian equations are integrated; see [14, chapter 9] and [26].

HMC algorithms have achieved many empirical successes. Recently, the theory on HMC have been addressed by many authors ; see [6, 28, 27, 3, 15]. An in depth discussion of the HMC method and a survey of the existing results are given in [4].

Consider a target probability density  $\pi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure, defined for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\pi(q) = e^{-U(q)} / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-U(\tilde{q})} d\tilde{q} , \quad (1)$$

where  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuously differentiable function. Note that this representation implies that the density is nonzero everywhere (this can be relaxed; see [21, Section 5.5.1]).

The properties of Hamiltonian dynamics have been discussed in numerous papers. We provide here only a brief outlook mainly aimed at introducing the notations and the essence of the main ideas. We refer the interested readers to the monograph [13] and the surveys given in [14, Chapter 9], [21], [3] and [4]. The key idea behind HMC is to exploit the measure-preserving properties of Hamiltonian flow over an extended phase space. For simplicity, we restrict our study to the phase space  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . Hamiltonian dynamics describes the evolution of a physical system which consists in the *position*  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and the *momentum*  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The total energy of the system is given by the Hamiltonian function  $H$  defined for  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$H(q, p) = U(q) + \|p\|^2 / 2 , \quad (2)$$

which is the sum of a potential energy  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , a function solely of the position, and the kinetic energy  $p \mapsto \|p\|^2 / 2$  (note that other choices of kinetic energy have proposed recently, see e.g. [16] and [17]). The system then evolves in time  $(q(t), p(t))_{t \geq 0}$  according to Hamilton's equations on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ p(t) \end{bmatrix} &= J^{-1} \nabla H(q(t), p(t)) , \\ \text{where } J &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & -\text{Id}_{d \times d} \\ \text{Id}_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix} , \quad \nabla H(q, p) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla U(q) \\ p \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We denote by  $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$  the differential flow associated to the system (3). For each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varphi_t : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  is the map that associates to each  $(p_0, q_0)$  the value at time  $t$  of the (unique) solution of (3) that takes the value  $(p_0, q_0)$  at time  $t = 0$ . We shall assume hereafter that  $\varphi_t(p_0, q_0)$  is defined for any  $(p_0, q_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

A mapping  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  is said to be *symplectic* if, at each point  $(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ,  $\mathbf{J}_\Phi(p, q)^T J \mathbf{J}_\Phi(p, q) = J$ , where  $\mathbf{J}_\Phi(p, q)$  denotes the  $2d \times 2d$  Jacobian of  $\Phi$ . Note that in particular, symplectic transformations are volume preserving on  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . An important property of Hamiltonian systems (3) is that, for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varphi_t$  is a symplectic mapping; see [4, Theorem 2.1].

Another important property of Hamiltonian flow is the conservation of energy. Since  $J^{-1}$  is skew-symmetric, for any solution  $(q(t), p(t))$  of (3)

$$\frac{d}{dt}H(q(t), p(t)) = \nabla H(q(t), p(t))^T J^{-1} \nabla H(q(t), p(t)) = 0.$$

Then, the value of the Hamiltonian function is preserved by the flow of the corresponding Hamiltonian system,  $H \circ \varphi_t = H$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Denote by  $S$  the momentum flip involution,  $S(q, p) = (q, -p)$ ,  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . A mapping  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  is said to be *reversible* with respect to  $S$  (or  $S$ -reversible for short) if  $S \circ \Phi = \Phi^{-1} \circ S$ . If the mapping  $\Phi$  is differentiable, the  $S$ -reversibility implies that  $|\det \mathbf{J}_\Phi(S \circ \Phi)| = |\det \mathbf{J}_\Phi|^{-1}$ , where  $\mathbf{J}_\Phi$  is the Jacobian of  $\Phi$ . By uniqueness of solutions of (3), for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the flow  $\varphi_t$  is a  $S$ -reversible mapping. More precisely, if  $(q_0, p_0)$  is the initial state and  $(q(t), p(t)) = \varphi_t(q_0, p_0)$  is the state of the system after  $t$  units of times, then

$$\varphi_t(q(t), -p(t)) = \varphi_t(S \circ \varphi_t(q_0, p_0)) = (q_0, -p_0) = S(q_0, p_0).$$

Consider the extended target distribution with density given for any  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  by

$$\tilde{\pi}(q, p) = Z^{-1} \exp(-H(q, p)), \quad Z = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \exp(-H(q, p)) dq dp. \quad (4)$$

Since the flow  $\varphi_t$  preserves the oriented volumes and the Hamiltonian, the probability measure with density  $\tilde{\pi}$  is preserved by the flow  $\varphi_t$ , for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$  (the Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ),  $\tilde{\pi}(\varphi_t(A)) = \tilde{\pi}(A)$  where, with a slight abuse in notations,  $\tilde{\pi}(A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathbb{1}_A(q, p) \tilde{\pi}(q, p) dq dp$ .

For the Hamiltonian function (2), the density  $\tilde{\pi}$  may be factorized

$$\exp(-H(q, p)) = \exp(-U(q)) \exp(-\|p\|^2/2)$$

and then, under the distribution  $\tilde{\pi}$ , the position  $q$  and the momentum  $p$  are independent, the marginal distribution of the position has a probability density function proportional to the target distribution (1) and the momentum  $p$  is Gaussian with zero mean and identity covariance matrix.

In most cases, it is not possible to compute explicitly the solutions of (3); discretization must be used instead. A crucial point in the construction of HMC sampler is that symplecticness and  $S$ -reversibility can be preserved exactly by discretization, provided that we use a *symplectic integrator* like the Störmer-Verlet (referred to as *leap-frog*) integrator. The Hamiltonian is not exactly preserved in the discretization, but it is expected that a sensible integrator conserves this quantity at least "approximately". Given a time step  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and a number of iterations  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , the Störmer-Verlet integrator proceeds as follows: starting from an initial point  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $T$  leap frog steps are performed, where for each

$\ell \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$  the  $\ell$ -th leap frog step is defined as

$$\begin{cases} p_{\ell+1/2} &= p_\ell - (h/2)\nabla U(q_\ell) \\ q_{\ell+1} &= q_\ell + hp_{\ell+1/2} \\ p_{\ell+1} &= p_{\ell+1/2} - (h/2)\nabla U(q_{\ell+1}) . \end{cases}$$

The sequence  $(q_\ell, p_\ell)_{\ell \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$  is an approximation of the solution of (3) at times  $\{\ell h : \ell \in \{0, \dots, T\}\}$  started at  $(q_0, p_0)$ . This sequence defines a discrete dynamical system given for  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$  by

$$(q_{\ell+1}, p_{\ell+1}) = \Psi_{h/2}^{(1)} \circ \Psi_h^{(2)} \circ \Psi_{h/2}^{(1)}(q_\ell, p_\ell) = \Phi_h^{(1)}(q_\ell, p_\ell) ,$$

where for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\Psi_t^{(1)}, \Psi_t^{(2)} : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  are given for all  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  by

$$\Psi_t^{(1)}(q, p) = (q, p - t\nabla U(q)) , \quad \Psi_t^{(2)}(q, p) = (q + tp, p)$$

These mappings in molecular dynamics are called the *kick* (the system stays in its current configuration and the momentum is incremented by action of the force  $\nabla U(q)$ ) and the *drift* (the position  $q$  advances at constant speed while the momentum  $p$  remains constant). One iteration of the Störmer-Verlet formula comprises two kicks of duration  $h/2$  separated by a drift of duration  $h$ . Define the sequence of iterates  $\{\Phi_h^{\circ(\ell)} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d : \ell \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$  for  $\ell \geq 1$  by induction

$$\Phi_h^{\circ(\ell+1)} = \Phi_h^{\circ(\ell)} \circ \Phi_h^{\circ(1)} , \tag{5}$$

Set for all  $\ell \geq 1$ ,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(\ell)} = \text{proj} \circ \Phi_h^{\circ(\ell)} , \tag{6}$$

where  $\text{proj} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is the projection on the first  $d$  coordinates, for all  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\text{proj}(q, p) = q$ . Thus, with our notation for all  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $(q_\ell, p_\ell) = \Phi_h^{\circ(\ell)}(q_0, p_0)$  and  $q_\ell = \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(\ell)}(q_0, p_0)$

Because each inner step in the leap-frog step are *shear* transformations of the phase variable (only the position or the momentum are updated by a quantity that depends only on the variable that do not change), it is clear that this transformation is volume preserving (the Jacobian of each individual transformation is equal to 1). Each inner leap frog step due of its symmetry is also  $S$ -reversible: starting from  $(q_{\ell+1}, -p_{\ell+1})$ , applying the leap-frog step forward and then negating the momentum variable again, we obtain again  $(q_\ell, p_\ell)$ .

We now have all the background required to describe the HMC algorithm, which is a special instance of Metropolis-Hastings algorithm aimed at sampling the target distribution  $\pi$ . It is similar to most classical MCMC algorithm in that we propose a new point based on the current position and then either accept or reject it. Denote by  $(Q_k, P_k)$  the value of the position and momentum at the  $k$ -th iteration of the algorithm. Each iteration of the algorithm may be decomposed into two steps, which are constructed to leave the

extended distribution  $\tilde{\pi}$  invariant; see [21], [11] and [4, Theorem 5.2]. In the first step, we draw  $G_{k+1}$  from the  $d$ -dimensional normal distribution with zero mean and identity covariance matrix, independent of  $\{(Q_j, P_j)\}_{j=0}^k$ . In the second step, we set the initial conditions  $(Q_k, G_{k+1})$  and compute the position and the momentum after  $T$  leapfrog steps. This move is accepted with probability  $\alpha_H \left\{ (Q_k, G_{k+1}), \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(Q_k, G_{k+1}) \right\}$  where for all  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\alpha_H \{(q, p), (\tilde{q}, \tilde{p})\} = \min [1, \exp (H(q, p) - H(\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}))] . \quad (7)$$

It is easily seen that  $\tilde{\pi}$  is invariant with respect to  $\tilde{\pi}$  (see [11]). Since  $\tilde{\pi}$  (4) is invariant with respect to the Markov kernel defined by the HMC algorithm on the extended state space  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , it naturally implies that  $\pi$  is a stationary distribution for the Markov chain  $(Q_k)_{k \geq 0}$ , which is the process which we are interested in. The number of steps  $T$  is either a deterministic quantity or a random variable independent of the current state. If the number of steps  $T = 1$ , then the algorithm reduces to the Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA).

Despite many recent advances, theoretical properties of the HMC algorithm are still not completely understood. This paper addresses two important issues in the analysis of HMC algorithm: irreducibility and geometric ergodicity.

Irreducibility plays an essential role in the theory of Markov chains. In particular, it implies uniqueness of a invariant distribution. The classical approach to derive irreducibility of Hastings-Metropolis algorithms on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , outlined for example in [18] [24], is to use that the proposal distribution admits a (sufficiently regular) transition density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For HMC, this condition does not necessarily hold. HMC has been shown to be irreducible in [7] in the case where the state space is compact and the potential is twice continuously differentiable. In [15], under appropriate conditions, irreducibility is shown for a version of HMC where the number of leap-frog steps  $T$  is random, independent of the proposal, and such that  $T = 1$  with positive probability. Under such assumption, irreducibility of HMC boils down to irreducibility of MALA which has been established in [23]. In this paper, we establish the irreducibility of the HMC algorithm under a general tail condition of the target density which significantly relaxes the condition of [7] and [15]. This result follows from a general irreducibility result for iterative Markov models (derived under conditions which are weaker than the ones reported in the literature) which we believe to be of independent interest; see Section 4. Our main tool to establish irreducibility is the degree theory for continuous maps [22].

In a second part, we establish the geometric ergodicity of the HMC sampler under the assumptions that the potential  $U$  is homogeneous outside a ball (or is a perturbation of an homogeneous function) and that the level sets are convex. Our assumptions imply that the proposal kernel of HMC satisfies an ‘inwards acceptance’ property [23], which is essential to show that HMC (and MALA) is geometrically ergodic.

Our results complement the recent paper [15]. This paper provides a variety of con-

ditions under which the HMC algorithm is not geometrically ergodic. It establishes the geometric ergodicity under the abstract 'inwards acceptance' property for which we provide verifiable sufficient conditions.

In [5], a variant of HMC, referred to as the Randomized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (RHMC), is analyzed. This method is associated with a continuous-time Markov process for which  $\tilde{\pi}$  given by (4) is invariant [5, Proposition 3.1]. However, sampling such a process requires the exact Hamiltonian flow (and hence exact integration of the Hamilton dynamics (3)). The use of the Hamiltonian flow allows to by-pass the acceptance-rejection step and makes the analysis easier. By-passing the discretization step nevertheless reduces the applicability of the results, since direct integration of the Hamiltonian flow is most of the time not an option. We numerically show on a simple example that the conditions given by [5] which imply geometric ergodicity of RHMC are not sufficient in the case of HMC.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, conditions upon which the HMC kernel, associated with  $(Q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , is irreducible, recurrent and Harris-recurrent are given. In Section 3, conditions under which the HMC kernel is  $V$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic are developed and discussed. Some general irreducibility results which are of independent interest, are stated in Section 4. The proofs are gathered in Section 5.

## Notations

Denote by  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ , the set of non-negative and positive real numbers respectively. Denote by  $I_n$  the identity matrix. Denote by  $\|\cdot\|$  the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -field of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{F}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the set of all Borel measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and for  $f \in \mathbb{F}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|$ . Denote by  $\text{Leb}$  the Lebesgue-measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For  $\mu$  a probability measure on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  and  $f \in \mathbb{F}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  a  $\mu$ -integrable function, denote by  $\mu(f)$  the integral of  $f$  w.r.t.  $\mu$ . For  $f \in \mathbb{F}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , set  $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|$ . Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  be a measurable function. For  $f \in \mathbb{F}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the  $V$ -norm of  $f$  is given by  $\|f\|_V = \|f/V\|_\infty$ . For two probability measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ , the  $V$ -total variation distance of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is defined as

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_V = \sup_{f \in \mathbb{F}(\mathbb{R}^d), \|f\|_V \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\mu(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\nu(x) \right|$$

If  $V \equiv 1$ , then  $\|\cdot\|_V$  is the total variation denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ . For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $M > 0$ , we denote by  $B(x, M)$ , the ball centered at  $x$  of radius  $M$ . Let  $M$  be a  $d \times m$ -matrix, then denote by  $M^T$  and  $\det(M)$  (in the case  $m = d$ ) the transpose and the determinant of  $M$  respectively. Let  $k \geq 1$ . Denote by  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$  the  $k^{\text{th}}$  tensor power of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, y \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ ,  $x \otimes y \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes 2}$  the tensor product of  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $x^{\otimes k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$  the  $k^{\text{th}}$  tensor power of  $x$ . For all  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , set  $\|x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_k\| = \sup_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \|x_i\|$ . We let  $\mathcal{L}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  stand for the set of linear maps from  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$  and for  $L \in \mathcal{L}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , we denote by  $\|L\|$  the operator norm of  $L$ . Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  be a Lipschitz function, namely there exists  $C \geq 0$  such that for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|f(x) - f(y)\| \leq C \|x - y\|$ . Then we denote

$\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} = \inf\{\|f(x) - f(y)\| / \|x - y\| \mid x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq y\}$ . Let  $k \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote by  $C^k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  the set of all  $k$  times continuously differentiable functions from  $\mathbf{U}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ . Let  $\Phi \in C^k(\mathbf{U}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ . Write  $\mathbf{J}_\Phi$  for the Jacobian matrix of  $\Phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , and  $D^k\Phi : \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  differential of  $\Phi \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ . For smooth enough functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denote by  $\nabla f$  and  $\nabla^2 f$  the gradient and the Hessian of  $f$  respectively. Let  $\mathbf{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . We write  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}^\circ$  and  $\partial\mathbf{A}$  for the closure, the interior and the boundary of  $\mathbf{A}$ , respectively. For any  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_1 > n_2$ , we take the convention that  $\sum_{k=n_2}^{n_1} = 0$ .

## 2 Ergodicity of the HMC algorithm

For  $h > 0$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , consider the Markov kernel  $\mathbf{P}_{h,T}$  associated with the Markov chain of the HMC algorithm  $(Q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , given for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{h,T}(q, \mathbf{A}) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{A}} \left( \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}) \right) \alpha_H \left\{ (q, \tilde{p}), \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}) \right\} \frac{e^{-\|\tilde{p}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} d\tilde{p} \\ &\quad + \delta_q(\mathbf{A}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ 1 - \alpha_H \left\{ (q, \tilde{p}), \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}) \right\} \right] \frac{e^{-\|\tilde{p}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} d\tilde{p}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}, \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}$  and  $\alpha_H$  are defined by (5)-(6) and (7) respectively. In this Section, we establish conditions upon which the Markov kernel  $\mathbf{P}_{h,T}$  is irreducible or (Harris) recurrent. For  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ , we consider the following assumption on the potential  $U$ .

**A1** ( $\beta$ ).  $U$  is continuously differentiable and

(i) there exists  $L_1 > 0$  such that for all  $q, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\nabla U(q) - \nabla U(x)\| \leq L_1 \|q - x\| .$$

(ii) there exists  $M_1 \geq 0$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\nabla U(q)\| \leq M_1 \left\{ 1 + \|q\|^\beta \right\} .$$

Before going further, we need to briefly recall some definitions pertaining to Markov chains. Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be a Markov kernel on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . Let  $n$  be an integer and  $\mu$  be a nontrivial measure on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . A set  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is called a  $(n, \mu)$ -small set for  $\mathbf{P}$  if for all  $x \in \mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\mathbf{P}^n(x, \mathbf{A}) \geq \mu(\mathbf{A})$ . A set  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is said to be accessible for  $\mathbf{P}$  if for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}^i(x, \mathbf{A}) > 0$ . A non-trivial  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\mu$  is an irreducibility measure of  $\mathbf{P}$  if and only if any set  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying  $\mu(\mathbf{A}) > 0$  is accessible. The Markov kernel  $\mathbf{P}$  is said to be irreducible if it admits an accessible small set or equivalently an irreducibility measure (in [19], our notion of irreducibility is referred to as  $\phi$ -irreducibility, where  $\phi$  is

an irreducibility measure; here irreducibility therefore means  $\phi$ -irreducibility).  $P$  is said to be a  $T$ -kernel if there exists a kernel  $T$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and a sequence of non-negative numbers  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  satisfying  $\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} a_i = 1$ , such that (i) for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $T(x, \mathbb{R}^d) > 0$ ; (ii) for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $x \mapsto T(x, A)$  is lower semi-continuous; (iii) for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} a_i P^i(x, A) \geq T(x, A)$ .  $T$  is referred to as a continuous component of  $P$ .

Let  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  be the canonical chain associated with  $P$  defined on the canonical space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathbb{P}_x, x \in \mathbb{R}^d))$ . A set  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is said to be recurrent if for all  $x \in A$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_x[N_A] = +\infty$  where  $N_A = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{1}_A(X_i)$  is the number of visits to  $A$ . The set  $A$  is Harris recurrent if for any  $x \in A$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_x(N_A = +\infty) = 1$ . The Markov kernel  $P$  is said to be Harris recurrent if all accessible sets are Harris recurrent. In this case, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and all accessible sets  $A$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_x(N_A = +\infty) = 1$ .

Define  $\vartheta_1 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$  by

$$\vartheta_1(s) = 1 + s/2 + s^2/4. \quad (9)$$

**Theorem 1.** *Assume  $A1(\beta)$  for some  $\beta \in [0, 1]$  and that  $U$  is twice continuously differentiable. Then, for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , and  $h > 0$  satisfying*

$$\left[ \{1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})\}^T - 1 \right] < 1, \quad (10)$$

and  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a  $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ -diffeomorphism  $\tilde{q} \mapsto \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \tilde{q})$  such that for any  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\text{if } q_T = \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p), \text{ defined by (6), then } p = \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, q_T). \quad (11)$$

Moreover,

(i) *The Markov kernel  $P_{h,T}$ , is a  $T$ -kernel; more precisely, for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{h,T}(q, B) &= T_{h,T}(q, B) \\ &+ \delta_q(B)(2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ 1 - \alpha_H \left\{ (q, \tilde{p}), \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}) \right\} \right] e^{-\|\tilde{p}\|^2/2} d\tilde{p}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the kernel  $T_{h,T}$  is a continuous component of  $P_{h,T}$  and is given by

$$T_{h,T}(q, B) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_B \bar{\alpha}_H(q, \bar{q}) e^{-\left\| \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \bar{q}) \right\|^2/2} D_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(\bar{q}) d\bar{q}, \quad (13)$$

setting for  $q, \bar{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_H(q, \bar{q}) = \alpha_H \left\{ (q, \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \bar{q})), \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \bar{q})) \right\}$  and  $D_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(\bar{q}) = |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(\bar{q}))|$ .

(ii) *The Markov kernel  $P_{h,T}$  is irreducible and the Lebesgue measure is an irreducibility measure. Moreover,  $P_{h,T}$  is aperiodic, Harris recurrent and all the compact sets are 1-small. Therefore, for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\delta_q P_{h,T}^n - \pi\|_{TV} = 0. \quad (14)$$



*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.1.1.  $\square$

For all  $h > 0$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we have  $\{1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})\}^T - 1 \leq e^{hL_1^{1/2}T\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}T)} - 1$ , using that  $\vartheta_1$  is nondecreasing. Then, setting  $\bar{S} = cL_1^{-1/2}$  where  $c$  is the unique positive root of the equation  $c\vartheta_1(c) = \log(2)$ , all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T)$  satisfy (10)<sup>1</sup>.

In our next result, we relax the second order differentiability condition on  $U$ , and in the case  $\beta < 1$  we even allow for arbitrary large values of the step size  $h$  and the number of iterations  $T$ . The result is less quantitative and the proof is more involved: we use degree theory for continuous mapping (the main notions required in the proof are recalled in Section 4).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $h > 0$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and assume either*

- (a) **A1** ( $\beta$ ) for some  $\beta \in [0, 1)$ ,
- (b) **A1** (1) and that  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$  satisfy (10).

*Then,*

- (i) *the HMC kernel  $P_{h,T}$  defined by (8) is irreducible, aperiodic, the Lebesgue measure is an irreducibility measure and any compact set of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is small.*
- (ii)  *$P_{h,T}$  is recurrent and for  $\pi$ -almost every  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\delta_q P_{h,T}^n - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.1.2.  $\square$

To the best of the author's knowledge, the first results regarding the irreducibility of the HMC algorithm are established in [7] under the assumption that  $U$  and  $\|\nabla U\|$  are bounded above. Note that these assumptions are in general satisfied only for compact state space. Irreducibility has also been tackled in [15]: in this work however, the number of leapfrog steps  $T$  is assumed to be random and independent of the current position and momentum. Under this setting and additional conditions which in particular imply that the number of leapfrog steps  $T$  is equal to 1 with positive probability, [15] shows that the kernel associated with the HMC algorithm is irreducible. Under this condition, the proof is a direct consequence of the irreducibility of the MALA algorithm - a mixture of Markov kernels is irreducible as soon as one component of the mixture is irreducible; the irreducibility of MALA kernel has been established in [23]). Finally, [5, Proposition 3.7] shows that RHMC is irreducible under the condition that  $U$  is at least quadratic. Note that Theorem 2 establishes irreducibility of HMC of sub-quadratic potential. However, leapfrog integrator is not numerically stable for lighter than Gaussian target density, therefore other kind of integrators should be used instead, see e.g. [10, Chapter VI].

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that conversely, if  $h > 0$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  satisfies (10), necessarily  $h \in (0, L_1^{-1/2})$  because for any  $s > 0$ ,  $\vartheta_1(s) \geq 1$ . In addition, since  $e^{\log(2)s} \leq (1+s)$  for all  $s \in (0, 1)$ ,  $T$  and  $h$  satisfy  $hT \leq \bar{S} = L_1^{-1/2}$ .

Note that if  $\beta < 1$ , then there is no condition in Theorem 2 on the step-size for HMC to be ergodic. This conclusion may at first glance be surprising since if  $\pi$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian distribution with covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , then the step-size  $h$  has to be chosen smaller than  $2/\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}$ , where  $\lambda_{\max}$  is the largest eigenvalues of  $\Sigma$ , which is also the Lipschitz constant of the gradient of the associated potential. If a larger step-size  $h$  is used, the leapfrog integrator is unstable, see e.g. [4, Example 3.4, Proposition 3.1], meaning that the iterates of the algorithm diverge. But the Gaussian distribution satisfies **A1**( $\beta$ ) for  $\beta = 1$  strictly. We illustrate on a numerical example that under **A1**( $\beta$ ), for  $\beta < 1$ , the *unadjusted* HMC proposal is in fact numerically stable and the HMC algorithm does converge for a step-size  $h > 2/\sqrt{L_1}$ , where  $L_1$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla U$ . In this example, we consider the potential  $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  by  $U(x) = 2\{1 + |x|^2\}^{3/4}$ . Then  $U'(x) = 3(|x|^2 + 1)^{-1/4}x$  and is Lipschitz with constant  $L_1 = 3$ . We then run the unadjusted/adjusted HMC algorithm for a step-size  $h = 1.5 > 2/\sqrt{L_1} \approx 1.15$  and a number of leapfrog-step  $T = 2$ . We can observe in Figure 1 the convergence of the HMC algorithm for the test function  $f : q \mapsto |q|^2$ . Figure 2 illustrates that the adjusted/unadjusted HMC are numerically stable even if  $h = 1.5 > 2/\sqrt{L_1} \approx 1.15$ , since the gradient is sub-linear.




Figure 1: Convergence of the HMC algorithm for  $U(x) = 2\{1 + |x|^2\}^{3/4}$ ,  $h = 1.5 > 2/\sqrt{L_1}$  and  $T = 2$ . The test function is  $f : q \mapsto |q|^2$ . The red line indicates the real value of  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(q)d\pi(q)$  estimated by numerical integration

Finally, note that our results can be easily extended to the case where the number of steps is random. We briefly describe the main arguments to obtain such extension. Let  $(\varpi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  be a probability distribution on  $\mathbb{N}^*$  and  $(h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  be a sequence of positive real numbers. Define the randomized Hamiltonian kernel  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  associated with




Figure 2: Trace plots for the adjusted (a) / unadjusted (b) HMC algorithm for  $U(x) = 2\{1 + |x|^2\}^{3/4}$ ,  $h = 1.5 > 2/\sqrt{L_1}$  and  $T = 2$ .

$(\varpi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and  $(h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  by

$$\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \varpi_i P_{h_i, i}. \quad (15)$$

We denote by  $\text{supp}(\varpi) = \{i \in \mathbb{N}^* : \varpi_i \neq 0\}$  the support of the distribution  $\varpi$ .

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\beta \in [0, 1]$  and assume **A1**( $\beta$ ). Let  $(\varpi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  be a probability distribution on  $\mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $(h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  be a sequence of positive real numbers, and  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$  be the randomized Hamiltonian kernel associated with  $(\varpi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and  $(h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ .*

- (a) *Assume that  $U$  is twice continuously and there exists  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $[\{1 + h_i L_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(h_i L_1^{1/2})\}^i - 1] < 1$  and  $\varpi_i > 0$  where  $\vartheta_1$  is given by (9). Then the conclusions of Theorem 1-(ii) hold for  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$ .*
- (b) *If  $\beta \in [0, 1)$ , then the conclusions of Theorem 2-(a) hold for  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$ .*
- (c) *If  $\beta = 1$  and there exists  $i \in \text{supp}(\varpi)$  such that  $[\{1 + h_i L_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(h_i L_1^{1/2})\}^i - 1] < 1$ , then the conclusions of Theorem 2-(b) hold for  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$ .*

*Proof.* (a) follows from Theorem 1 and Proposition 26. (b) and (c) are straightforward applications of Theorem 2.  $\square$

### 3 Geometric ergodicity of HMC

In this section, we give conditions on the potential  $U$  which imply that the HMC kernel (6) converges geometrically fast to its invariant distribution. Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  be a measurable function and  $P$  be a Markov kernel on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . The Markov kernel  $P$  is said to be  $V$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic if  $P$  admits an invariant probability  $\pi$  and there exists  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  and  $\varsigma \geq 0$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,

$$\|P^k(q, \cdot) - \pi\|_V \leq \varsigma \rho^k V(q).$$

By [19, Theorem 16.0.1], if  $P$  is aperiodic, irreducible and satisfies a Foster-Lyapunov drift condition, i.e. there exists a small set  $C$  for  $P$ ,  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$  and  $b < +\infty$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$PV \leq \lambda V + b \mathbb{1}_C, \quad (16)$$

then  $P$  is  $V$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic. If a function  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  satisfies (16), then  $V$  is said to be a Foster-Lyapunov function for  $P$ . We first give an elementary condition to establish the  $V$ -uniform geometric ergodicity for a class of generalized Metropolis-Hastings kernels which includes HMC kernels as a particular example.

Let  $K$  be a proposal kernel on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$  and  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^{3d} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be an acceptance probability, assumed to be Borel measurable. Consider the Markov kernel  $P$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  defined for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by

$$P(q, A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathbb{1}_A(\text{proj}(z)) \alpha(q, z) K(q, dz) + \delta_q(A) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{1 - \alpha(q, z)\} K(q, dz), \quad (17)$$

where  $\text{proj} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is the canonical projection onto the first  $d$  components. For  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $P_{h,T}$  corresponds to  $P$  with  $K$  and  $\alpha$  given for all  $q, p, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$  respectively by

$$K_{h,T}(q, B) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_B \left( \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}), \tilde{p} \right) e^{-\|\tilde{p}\|^2/2} d\tilde{p}, \quad (18)$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_H(q, (\tilde{q}, \tilde{p})) = \begin{cases} \alpha_H \left\{ (q, \tilde{p}), \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}) \right\}, & \text{if } \tilde{q} = \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{p}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where  $\Phi_h^{\circ(T)}$ ,  $\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}$  and  $\alpha_H$  are defined in (5), (6) and (7), respectively. Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  be a *norm-like* function, i.e. a measurable function such that for all  $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , the level sets  $\{q \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(q) \leq M\}$  are compact. Note that if  $V$  is norm-like, for any  $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\{q \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(q) \leq M\}^c$  is non-empty. The function  $V$  naturally extends on  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$  by setting for all  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ,  $V(q, p) = V(q)$ . For all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , define:

$$\mathcal{R}(q) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \alpha(q, z) < 1 \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}(q) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, V(\text{proj}(z)) \leq V(q) \right\}. \quad (20)$$

The set  $\mathcal{R}(q)$  is the potential rejection region. Our next result gives a condition on  $K$  and  $\alpha$  which implies that if  $V$  is a Foster-Lyapunov function for  $K$  then  $P$  satisfies a Foster-Lyapunov drift condition as well. This result is inspired by [23, Theorem 4.1], which is used to show the  $V$ -uniform geometric ergodicity of the MALA algorithm.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  be a norm-like function. Assume moreover that there exist  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that*

$$KV \leq \lambda V + b. \quad (21)$$

and

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\{q \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(q) \geq M\}} \mathbf{K}(q, \mathcal{R}(q) \cap \mathcal{B}(q)) = 0 . \quad (22)$$

Then there exist  $\tilde{\lambda} \in [0, 1)$  and  $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\mathbf{P}V \leq \tilde{\lambda}V + \tilde{b}$  where  $\mathbf{P}$  is given by (17).

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.2.1.  $\square$

We show below that under appropriate conditions, the proposal kernel  $\mathbf{K}_{h,T}$  and the acceptance probability  $\tilde{\alpha}_H$  given by (18) and (19) satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4 which imply that the HMC kernel  $\mathbf{P}_{h,T}$  is  $V$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic. For  $m \in (1, 2]$ , consider the following assumption:

**A2** ( $m$ ). There exist  $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\langle \nabla U(q), q \rangle \geq A_1 \|q\|^m - A_2 .$$

For all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , define

$$V_a(q) = \exp(a \|q\|) . \quad (23)$$

**Proposition 5.** (a) Assume **A1**( $m-1$ ) and **A2**( $m$ ) for some  $m \in (1, 2)$ . Then, for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , and  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , there exist  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$\mathbf{K}_{h,T}V_a \leq \lambda V_a + b . \quad (24)$$

(b) Assume **A1**(1) and **A2**(2). Let  $\bar{S} > 0$  be such that  $\Theta(S) < A_1$  for any  $S \in (0, \bar{S}]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(s) = & 2L_1^{1/2}\vartheta_2(s)\{e^{L_1^{1/2}s\vartheta_1(L_1^{1/2}s)} - 1\} \\ & + 6s^2 \left( M_1^2 + L_1\vartheta_2^2(s)\{e^{L_1^{1/2}s\vartheta_1(L_1^{1/2}s)} - 1\}^2 \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Then, for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T]$ , there exist  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  which satisfy (24).

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.2.2  $\square$

We now derive sufficient conditions under which the condition (22) of Proposition 4 is satisfied.

**A3** ( $m$ ). (i)  $U \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and there exists  $A_3 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k = 2, 3$ :

$$\|D^k U(q)\| \leq A_3 \{1 + \|q\|\}^{m-k} .$$

(ii) There exist  $A_4 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $R_U \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \geq R_U$ ,

$$D^2U(q) \{ \nabla U(q) \otimes \nabla U(q) \} \geq A_4 \|q\|^{3m-4} .$$

It is easily checked that under **A3**, the results of Section 2 can be applied, i.e.  $\nabla U$  satisfies **A1**( $m-1$ ); see Lemma 21.

Condition **A2**( $m$ ) and **A3**( $m$ ) are satisfied by power functions  $q \mapsto c\|q\|^m$ . More generally, they are satisfied by  $m$ -homogeneously quasiconvex functions with convex level sets outside a ball and by perturbations of such functions.

We say that a function  $U_0$  is  $m$ -homogeneous quasi-convex outside a ball of radius  $R_1$  if the following conditions are satisfied:

(QC-1) for all  $t \geq 1$  and  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \geq R_1$ ,  $U_0(tq) = t^m U_0(q)$ .

(QC-2) for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \geq R_1$ , the level sets  $\{x : U_0(x) \leq U_0(q)\}$  are convex.

**Proposition 6.** Let  $m \in [1, 2]$  and  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Assume that the potential  $U$  may be decomposed as

$$U(q) = U_0(q) + G(q) , \quad q \in \mathbb{R}^d , \quad \|q\| \geq R_1 ,$$

where the functions  $U_0, G \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfy the following two conditions:

(A)  $U_0$  is  $m$ -homogeneously quasiconvex outside a ball of radius  $R_1$  and  $\lim_{\|q\| \rightarrow +\infty} U_0(q) = \infty$ .

(B) For  $k = 2, 3$ ,  $\lim_{\|q\| \rightarrow +\infty} \|D^k G(q)\| / \|q\|^{m-k} = 0$ .

Then  $U$  satisfies **A2**( $m$ ) and **A3**( $m$ ).

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.2.3. □

To show that the condition (22) of Proposition 4 is satisfied under **A3**( $m$ ), we rely on the following important result which implies that the probability of accepting a move goes to 1 as  $\|q\| \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Proposition 7.** Assume **A3**( $m$ ) for some  $m \in (1, 2]$ . Let  $\gamma \in (0, m-1)$ .

(a) If  $m \in (1, 2)$ , for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , there exists  $R_H \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq R_H$  and  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ ,  $H(\Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q_0, p_0)) - H(q_0, p_0) \leq 0$ .

(b) If  $m = 2$ , there exists  $\bar{S} > 0$  such that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T^{3/2}]$ , there exists  $R_H \in \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq R_H$  and  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ ,  $H(\Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q_0, p_0)) - H(q_0, p_0) \leq 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.2.4. □

This result means that far in the tail the HMC proposal are "inward". We illustrate the result of Proposition 7-(a) in Figure 3 for  $U$  given by  $q \mapsto (\|q\|^2 + \delta)^\kappa$  for  $\kappa = 3/4$ ,  $h = 0.9$  and  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|p_0\| = 1$ . Note that this potential satisfies the condition of the proposition. We can observe that choosing the different initial conditions  $q_0$  with increasing norm imply that  $\tilde{T} = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}; H(\Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)) - H(q_0, p_0) < 0\}$  increases as well.




Figure 3: Behaviour of  $(H(\Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)))_{k \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$  for different initial conditions  $q_0$ .

However, in the case  $m = 2$ , Proposition 7-(b) only implies that the HMC proposal is inward only if the step size  $h$  is sufficiently small with respect to the number of leapfrog step  $T$ , i.e. is of order  $\mathcal{O}(T^{-3/2})$ . To relax this condition, we strengthen A3(2) by assuming that  $U$  is a smooth perturbation of a quadratic function.

**A4.** *There exist  $\tilde{U} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , continuously differentiable, and a positive definite matrix  $\Sigma$  such that  $U(q) = \langle \Sigma q, q \rangle / 2 + \tilde{U}(q)$  and there exist  $A_5 \geq 0$  and  $\varrho \in [1, 2)$  such that for any  $q, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{U}(q)| &\leq A_5(1 + \|q\|^\varrho), & \|\nabla \tilde{U}(q)\| &\leq A_5(1 + \|q\|^{\varrho-1}), \\ \|\nabla \tilde{U}(q) - \nabla \tilde{U}(x)\| &\leq A_5 \|q - x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that it is straightforward to check that under A4, the conditions A1(1) and A2(2) hold.

**Proposition 8.** *Assume A4 and let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . There exists a constant  $\bar{S} > 0$  such that for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T]$ , there exists  $R_H \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq R_H$  and  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ ,  $H(\Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q_0, p_0)) - H(q_0, p_0) \leq 0$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to Section 5.2.5. □

We now can establish the geometric ergodicity of the HMC sampler.

**Theorem 9.** (a) If **A2**( $m$ ) and **A3**( $m$ ) hold for some  $m \in (1, 2)$ , then for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$ , the HMC kernel  $P_{h,T}$  is  $V_a$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic, where  $V_a$  is defined by (23).

(b) If **A2**(2) and **A3**(2) hold, then there exists  $\bar{S} > 0$  such that for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T^{3/2})$ ,  $P_{h,T}$  is  $V_a$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic.

(c) If **A4** holds, then there exists  $\bar{S} > 0$  (depending only on  $\Sigma$  and  $A_5$ ) such that for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T)$ ,  $P_{h,T}$  is  $V_a$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic.

*Proof of Theorem 9.* It is enough to consider (a) as the proof of (b) and (c) follows exactly the same lines taking  $\bar{S}$  small enough. Proposition 5 shows that for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , and  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , there exist  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that the Foster-Lyapunov drift condition  $K_{h,T}V_a \leq \lambda V_a + b$  is satisfied. By Proposition 7, there exists  $R_H \geq 0$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \geq R_H$ ,

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}(q)} K_{h,T}(q, dz) \leq (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\{\|p\| \geq \|q\|^\gamma\}} e^{-\|p\|^2/2} dp,$$

for  $\gamma \in (0, m - 1)$  where  $\mathcal{R}(q) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : \tilde{\alpha}_H(q, z) < 1\}$  (see (19)), which implies that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|q\| \geq M} \int_{\mathcal{R}(q)} K_{h,T}(q, dz) = 0,$$

Since  $V_a$  is norm-like, Proposition 4 implies that for all  $T > 0$  and  $h > 0$ , there exists  $\tilde{\lambda}$  and  $\tilde{b}$  (depending upon  $a$ ,  $h$  and  $T$ ) such that  $P_{h,T}V_a \leq \tilde{\lambda}V_a + \tilde{b}$ . For all  $M \geq 0$  the level sets  $\{V_a \leq M\}$  are compact and hence small by Theorem 2. [1, Corollary 14.1.6] then shows that there exists a small set  $C$ ,  $\check{\lambda} \in [0, 1)$  and  $\check{b} \in [0, 1)$  such that  $P_{h,T}V_a \leq \check{\lambda}V_a + \check{b}\mathbb{1}_C$ . Since  $P_{h,T}$  is aperiodic, the result follows from [1, Theorem 15.2.4].  $\square$

We finally consider the case where the number of leapfrog steps is a random variable independent of the current state.

**Theorem 10.** (a) If **A2**( $m$ ) and **A3**( $m$ ) hold for  $m \in (1, 2)$ , then for all probability distributions  $\varpi = (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  on  $\mathbb{N}^*$ , all sequences  $\mathbf{h} = (h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  of positive numbers, and  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , the randomized kernel  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$  (15) is  $V_a$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic, where  $V_a$  is defined by (23).

(b) If **A2**(2) and **A3**(2) hold, then there exists  $\bar{S} > 0$  such that for all probability distributions  $\varpi = (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  on  $\mathbb{N}^*$ , all sequences  $\mathbf{h} = (h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  satisfying  $\max_{i \in \text{supp}(\varpi)} i^{3/2} h_i \leq \bar{S}$ , and  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$  is  $V_a$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic.



(c) If **A4** holds, then there exists  $\bar{S} > 0$  (depending only on  $\Sigma$  and  $A_5$ ) such that for all probability distributions  $\varpi = (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  on  $\mathbb{N}^*$ , all sequences  $\mathbf{h} = (h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  satisfying  $\max_{i \in \text{supp}(\varpi)} ih_i \leq \bar{S}$ , and  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$  is  $V_a$ -uniformly geometrically ergodic.

*Proof.* It is enough to consider (a) as the proofs of (b) and (c) are along the same lines. Set  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . It is established in the proof of Theorem 9 that for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$   $P_{i, h_i}$  satisfies a Foster-Lyapunov drift condition: there exists  $\check{\lambda}_i \in [0, 1)$  and  $\check{b}_i < \infty$  such that  $P_{i, h_i} V_a \leq \check{\lambda}_i V_a + \check{b}_i$ . By Corollary 3,  $\bar{P}_{\mathbf{h}, \varpi}$  is irreducible and aperiodic and all the compact sets are small. We conclude by applying [1, Theorem 15.2.4].  $\square$

Compared to [15], which establishes geometric ergodicity of the HMC kernel under an implicit assumption on the behaviour of the acceptance rate, our conditions are directly verifiable on the potential  $U$ .

On the other hand, our conditions are different than the one given by [5] to establish the geometric ergodicity of the idealized randomized HMC, which assumed to exactly solve the Hamiltonian ODE (3). These conditions are the following 1)  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|q\|^2 d\pi(q) < +\infty$ , 2) there exist  $C_1 \in (0, 1)$  and  $C_2 > 0$  such that for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(1/2) \langle \nabla U(q), q \rangle \geq C_1 U(q) + \frac{(\tau^{-1} C_1 / 4)^2 + \tau^{-2} C_1 (1 - C_1) / 4}{2(1 - C_1)} \|q\|^2 - C_2, \quad (26)$$

where  $\tau > 0$  is the duration parameter of the RHMC algorithm. Note that these conditions assumed that the target density is lighter than Gaussian. In comparison, our results can be applied to sub-quadratic potentials. In addition, it can be shown that HMC is not geometrically ergodic under (26) on the following example associated with the potential defined by (28) below.

The main difference with the setting of [5] is that HMC has a acceptance/rejection step and the integrated acceptance ratio

$$q \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha_H\{(q, p), \Phi_h^{o(T)}(q, p)\} e^{-\|p\|^2/2} (2\pi)^{-d/2} dp$$

must not go to 0 as  $\|q\|$  goes to  $+\infty$ . This is essentially the reason why **A3** differs from (26). Indeed, to show that an irreducible Markov kernel  $P$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  is not geometrically ergodic with respect to an invariant measure  $\mu$ , [24, Theorem 5.1] states the following sufficient condition

$$\text{ess sup}_{q \in \mathbb{R}^d} P(q, \{q\}) = 1, \quad (27)$$

where  $\text{ess sup}$  is taken with respect to  $\mu$ . Consider then the target density  $\pi$  with potential  $U$  given for all  $q = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  by

$$U(q) = -\log(e^{-q_1^2 - 5q_2^2} + e^{-5q_1^2 - q_2^2}). \quad (28)$$

Note that  $U$  satisfies the condition (26). On the contrary, we may show that (27) holds, and therefore HMC is not geometrically ergodic for such a potential  $U$ . However, the detailed

calculations are very technical and not particularly informative and we prefer to present a numerical evidence that (27) holds. Indeed, Figure 4 displays numerical computations of the mean acceptance ratio,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \alpha_H\{q, p\} \Phi_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p) e^{-\|p\|^2/2} (2\pi)^{-1} dp = 1 - P_{h,T}(q, \{q\})$  for  $q_1 \in \{200, 250, 300, 350, 400, 450, 500\}$ ,  $q_2 \in [q_1 + 10^{-4}, q_1 + 2 \cdot 10^{-4}]$  and  $T = 1$  which corresponds to MALA. We can observe that the larger  $q_1$ , the smaller  $1 - P_{h,T}(q, \{q\})$ , which illustrates that (27) holds for the HMC kernel.




Figure 4:

## 4 Irreducibility for a class of iterative models

In this Section we establish the irreducibility of a Markov kernel associated to a random iterative model. These results are of independent interest. Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be Borel measurable functions and  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  be a probability density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Consider the Markov kernel  $K$  defined for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by

$$K(x, A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_A(f(x, z)) \alpha(x, z) \phi(z) dz + \bar{\alpha}(x) \delta_x(A), \quad (29)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha(x, z) \phi(z) dz$ . Define for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f_x : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $f_x = f(x, \cdot)$ .

First, we give a result from geometric measure theory together with a proof for the reader's convenience, which will be essential for the proof of the statements of this section. Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open set and  $\Theta : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a measurable function such that there exist  $y_0, \tilde{y}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $M, \tilde{M} > 0$  satisfying  $B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M}) \subset U$  and

$$B(y_0, M) \subset \Theta(B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})). \quad (30)$$

Define the measure  $\lambda_\Theta$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  by setting for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\lambda_\Theta(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Leb} \left\{ \Theta^{-1}(A) \cap B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M}) \right\}.$$

Note that  $\lambda_\Theta$  is a finite measure. Therefore by the Lebesgue decomposition theorem (see [25, Section 6.10]) there exist two measures  $\lambda_\Theta^{(a)}, \lambda_\Theta^{(s)}$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ , which are absolutely continuous and singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  respectively, such that  $\lambda_\Theta = \lambda_\Theta^{(a)} + \lambda_\Theta^{(s)}$ .

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be open and  $\Theta : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a Lipschitz function satisfying (30). For any version  $\phi_\Theta$  of the density of  $\lambda_\Theta^{(a)}$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , it holds*

$$\phi_\Theta(y) \geq \mathbb{1}_{B(y_0, M)}(y) \|\Theta\|_{\text{Lip}}^{-d}, \quad \text{Leb-a.e.}$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $L = \|\Theta\|_{\text{Lip}}$ . Let  $y \in B(y_0, M)$ . By (30), we may pick  $z \in B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})$  such that  $\Theta(z) = y$ . Let  $\delta_0 > 0$  be such that  $B(z, \delta_0/L) \subset B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})$ . Since  $\Theta$  is Lipschitz continuous, for all  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $\Theta(B(z, \delta/L) \cap U) \subset B(y, \delta)$ . Hence, for all  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ , we have

$$\lambda_\Theta(B(y, \delta)) \geq L^{-d} \text{Leb}(B(z, \delta)) = L^{-d} \text{Leb}(B(y, \delta)).$$

The claim follows from the differentiation theorem for measures, see [25, Theorem 7.14].  $\square$

We can now state our main results. Let  $R, M \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Consider the following assumptions.

**G1.**  $\phi$  and  $\alpha$  are lower semicontinuous and positive on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$  respectively.

**G2**  $(R, y_0, M)$ . (i) *There exists  $L_f \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $x \in B(0, R)$ ,  $f_x$  is  $L_f$ -Lipschitz, i.e. for all  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|f_x(z_1) - f_x(z_2)\| \leq L_f \|z_1 - z_2\|$ .*

(ii) *There exist  $\tilde{y}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\tilde{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , such that for all  $x \in B(0, R)$ ,  $B(y_0, M) \subset f_x(B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M}))$ .*

**Theorem 12.** *Assume G1 and that there exist  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $R > 0$  and  $M > 0$  such that G2  $(R, y_0, M)$  is satisfied. Then  $B(0, R)$  is 1-small for  $K$ : for all  $x \in B(0, R)$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$K(x, A) \geq L_f^{-d} \min_{(x, z) \in B(0, R) \times B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})} \{\alpha(x, z)\phi(z)\} \text{Leb}\{A \cap B(y_0, M)\},$$

where  $(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^*$  is defined in G2  $(R, y_0, M)$ .

*Proof.* For all  $x \in B(0, R)$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} K(x, A) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_A(f(x, z)) \alpha(x, z)\phi(z) dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{f_x^{-1}(A)}(z) \alpha(x, z)\phi(z) dz \\ &\geq \min_{(x, z) \in B(0, R) \times B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})} \{\alpha(x, z)\phi(z)\} \text{Leb}\{f_x^{-1}(A) \cap B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})\}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows from Proposition 11 and G2  $(R, y_0, M)$ -(i) which imply  $\text{Leb}\{f_x^{-1}(A) \cap B(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{M})\} \geq L_f^{-d} \text{Leb}\{A \cap B(y_0, M)\}$ .  $\square$

The following Corollary is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 12.

**Corollary 13.** *Assume **G1** and that there exists  $(y_0, M) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^*$  such that for all  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  **G2**( $R, y_0, M$ ). Then  $K$  is irreducible with irreducibility measure  $\text{Leb} \{ \cdot \cap B(y_0, M) \}$ . In addition, all the compact sets are 1-small.*

In the next proposition, we give examples of functions  $f$  which satisfy **G2**.

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $g$  a function from  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . Assume that*

(i) *there exists  $L_{g,R} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $z_1, z_2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|x\| \leq R$ ,*

$$\|g(x, z_1) - g(x, z_2)\| \leq L_{g,R} \|z_1 - z_2\| .$$

(ii) *there exist  $C_{R,0}, C_{R,1} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|x\| \leq R$*

$$\|g(x, z)\| \leq C_{R,0} + C_{R,1} \|z\|$$

*Let  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and define  $f^g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by*

$$f^g(x, z) = bz + g(x, z) .$$

*If  $\|b\| > C_{R,1}$ , then  $f^g$  satisfies **G2**( $R, 0, M$ ) for all  $M \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  with  $\tilde{y}_0 = 0$  and*

$$\tilde{M} = \{M + C_{R,0}\} / (\|b\| - C_{R,1}) . \tag{31}$$

We preface the proof by recalling some basic notions of degree theory. Let  $D$  be a bounded open set of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $f : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a continuous function on  $\bar{D}$  continuously differentiable on  $D$ . An element  $x \in D$  is said to be a *regular point* of  $f$  if the Jacobian matrix of  $f$  at  $x$ ,  $\mathbf{J}_f(x)$ , is invertible. An element  $y \in f(D)$  is said to be a *regular value* of  $f$  if any  $x \in f^{-1}(\{y\})$  is a regular point.

Let  $f : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a continuous function,  $C^\infty$ -smooth on  $D$ . Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus f(\partial D)$  be a regular value of  $f$ . It is shown in [22, Proposition and Definition 1.1] that the set  $f^{-1}(\{y\})$  is finite. The degree of  $f$  at  $y$  is defined by

$$\deg(f, D, y) = \sum_{x \in f^{-1}(\{y\})} \text{sign} \{ \det (\mathbf{J}_f(x)) \} .$$

**Proposition 15** ([22, Proposition and Definition 2.1]). *Let  $f : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a continuous function and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus f(\partial D)$ .*

(a) *Then there exists  $g \in C(\bar{D}, \mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^\infty(D, \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $y$  is a regular value of  $g$  and  $\sup_{x \in \bar{D}} |f(x) - g(x)| < \text{dist}(y, f(\partial D))$ .*

(b) For all functions  $g_1, g_2 : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying (a),

$$\deg(g_1, D, y) = \deg(g_2, D, y) .$$

Under the assumptions of Proposition 15, the degree of  $f$  at  $y$  is then defined for any  $g : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying (a) by

$$\deg(f, D, y) = \deg(g, D, y) .$$

**Proposition 16** ([22, Proposition 2.4]). *Let  $f, g : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be continuous functions. Define  $H : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $H(t, x) = tf(x) + (1 - t)g(x)$ . Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus H([0, 1] \times \partial D)$ . Then*

$$\deg(f, D, y) = \deg(g, D, y) .$$

We have now all the necessary results to prove Proposition 14.

*Proof of Proposition 14.* Since  $f^g(x, z) = bz + g(x, z)$  and  $g(x, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz with a Lipschitz constant which is uniformly bounded over the ball  $B(0, R)$ ,  $f_x^g$  is Lipschitz with bounded Lipschitz constant over this ball. Hence **G2**( $R, 0, M$ )-(i) holds.

For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , denote by  $f_x^g : z \mapsto f^g(x, z)$  where  $f^g(x, z) = bz + g(x, z)$ . Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . We show that for all  $x \in B(0, R)$ ,  $B(0, M) \subset f_x^g(B(0, \tilde{M}))$ , where  $\tilde{M}$  is given by (31), which is precisely **G2**( $R, 0, M$ )-(ii).

Let  $x \in B(0, R)$  and consider the continuous homotopy  $H^g : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  between the functions  $z \mapsto bz$  and  $f_x^g$  defined for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$H^g(t, z) = tbz + (1 - t)f_x^g(z) = bz + (1 - t)g(x, z) .$$

Then by (ii), since  $|b| \geq C_{R,1}$ , for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $z \notin B(0, \tilde{M})$ , where  $\tilde{M}$  is given by (31),

$$|H^g(t, z)| \geq |bz| - (1 - t)\{C_{R,0} + C_{R,1}|z|\} \geq M .$$

In particular, we have  $H^g([0, 1] \times \partial B(0, \tilde{M})) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, M)$ . Let  $z \in B(0, M)$ , then by Proposition 16 we have

$$\deg(f_x^g, B(0, \tilde{M}), z) = \deg(b \text{Id}, B(0, \tilde{M}), z) = 1 .$$

Besides, by [22, Corollary 2.5, Chapter IV],  $\deg(f_x^g, B(0, \tilde{M}), z) \neq 0$  implies that there exists  $y \in B(0, \tilde{M})$  such that  $f_x^g(y) = z$ . Finally **G2**( $R, 0, M$ )-(ii) follows since this result holds for all  $z \in B(0, M)$ .  $\square$

## 5 Proofs

In the sequel,  $C \geq 0$  is a constant which can change from line to line but does not depend on  $h$ . Let  $h > 0$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Note that a simple induction (see [15, Proposition 4.2]) implies that for all  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration of the leap-frog integration,  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q, p)$ , where  $\Phi_h^{\circ(k)}$  is defined by (5), takes the form

$$q_k = q_0 + kh p_0 - \frac{kh^2}{2} \nabla U(q_0) - h^2 \Xi_{h,k}(q_0, p_0) \quad (32)$$

$$p_k = p_0 - \frac{h}{2} \left\{ \nabla U(q_0) + \nabla U \circ \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\} - h \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \nabla U \circ \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q_0, p_0), \quad (33)$$

where  $\Xi_{h,k} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is given for all  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\Xi_{h,k}(q, p) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (k-i) \nabla U \circ \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p). \quad (34)$$

We preface the proofs of our main results by useful bounds on the position and the momentum in the intermediate steps of the leap-frog integration.

**Lemma 17.** *Assume **A1**( $\beta$ )-(i). Then, for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \geq 0$ ,  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  and  $(x_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|q_k - x_k\| + L_1^{-1/2} \|p_k - v_k\| \\ & \leq \left\{ 1 + h L_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(h L_1^{1/2}) \right\}^k \left\{ \|q_0 - x_0\| + L_1^{-1/2} \|p_0 - v_0\| \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$ ,  $(x_k, v_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(x_0, v_0)$  and  $\Phi_h^{\circ(k)}$  and  $\vartheta_1$  are defined by (5) and (9), respectively.

*Proof.* Note that it is sufficient to show the result for  $k = 1$  and to apply a straightforward induction. Let  $h > 0$ ,  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  and  $(x_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . Using (32), the triangle inequality and **A1**( $\beta$ )-(i), we first obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_1 - x_1\| &= \left\| q_0 - h^2 \nabla U(q_0)/2 + h p_0 - \left\{ x_0 - h^2/2 \nabla U(x_0) + h v_0 \right\} \right\| \\ &\leq (1 + h^2 L_1/2) \|q_0 - x_0\| + h \|p_0 - v_0\|. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Second, similarly using (33), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|p_1 - v_1\| \\ &= \|p_0 - v_0 - (h/2) \{ \nabla U(q_1) + \nabla U(q_0) \} + (h/2) \{ \nabla U(x_1) + \nabla U(x_0) \}\| \\ &\leq \|p_0 - v_0\| + (h L_1/2) \{ \|x_1 - q_1\| + \|x_0 - q_0\| \} \\ &\leq \left( 1 + h^2 L_1/2 \right) \|p_0 - v_0\| + h L_1 (1 + h^2 L_1/4) \|q_0 - x_0\|, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where we have used (35) for the last inequality. Summing up (35) and (36), we get the desired result for  $k = 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $\beta \in [0, 1]$  and assume **A1**( $\beta$ )-(ii).*

(i) *For any  $h_0 > 0$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , there exists  $C < \infty$  (which depends only on  $T, h_0$  and  $M_1$ ) such that for all  $h \in (0, h_0]$ ,  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$*

$$\|q_k - q_0\| \leq Ch \left\{ \|p_0\| + h(1 + \|q_0\|^\beta) \right\} \quad (37)$$

$$\|p_k - p_0\| \leq Ch \left\{ 1 + \|p_0\|^\beta + \|q_0\|^\beta \right\}, \quad (38)$$

where  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ k}(q_0, p_0)$  and  $\Phi_h^{\circ k}$  is defined by (5).

(ii) *If in addition **A1**( $\beta$ )-(i) holds, for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h > 0$ ,  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_k - q_0\| + L_1^{-1/2} \|p_k - p_0\| &\leq (L_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(h L_1^{1/2}))^{-1} \\ &\times \left\{ (1 + h L_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(h L_1^{1/2}))^{k+1} - 1 \right\} \left\{ \vartheta_2(h) (\|q_0\|^\beta + 1) + \vartheta_3(h) \|p_0\| \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\vartheta_1$  is defined by (9) and

$$\vartheta_2(h) = M_1/L_1^{1/2} + M_1 h/2 + L_1^{1/2} M_1 h^2/4, \quad (39)$$

$$\vartheta_3(h) = 1 + L_1^{1/2} h/2.$$

*Proof.* (i) Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h_0 > 0$ . We prove by induction that for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  there exists  $C_k \geq 0$  (which depends only on  $T, h_0$  and  $M_1$ ) such that for all  $h \in (0, h_0]$  and  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_k - q_0\| &\leq C_k h \left\{ \|p_0\| + h(1 + \|q_0\|^\beta) \right\} \\ \|p_k - p_0\| &\leq C_k h \left\{ 1 + \|p_0\|^\beta + \|q_0\|^\beta \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ k}(q_0, p_0)$ . Let  $h \in (0, h_0]$  and  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . The case  $k = 1$  is immediate by **A1**( $\beta$ )-(ii) and (32). Let  $k \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$  and assume that the inequalities hold for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Then by (32) and **A1**( $\beta$ )-(ii), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{k+1} - q_0\| &\leq (k+1)h \|p_0\| + \frac{k+1}{2} h^2 M_1 \left\{ 1 + \|q_0\|^\beta \right\} \\ &+ h^2 M_1 \sum_{i=1}^k (k+1-i) \left\{ 1 + \|q_i\|^\beta \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

By the induction hypothesis and using that  $t \mapsto t^\beta$  is sub-additive on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  and  $t^\beta \leq 1 + t$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , we get for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,

$$\|q_i\|^\beta \leq \|q_0\|^\beta + \|q_i - q_0\|^\beta \leq 1 + \|q_0\|^\beta + C_i h \left\{ \|p_0\| + h(1 + \|q_0\|^\beta) \right\},$$

Plugging this inequality in (41) conclude the proof of (40). Consider now (38). Since by definition  $p_{k+1} = p_k - (h/2)\{\nabla U(q_k) + \nabla U(q_{k+1})\}$ , using the triangle inequality, **A1**( $\beta$ )-(ii), (40) to bound  $\|q_k\|$  and  $\|q_{k+1}\|$ , and the induction hypothesis, we get that there exist some constants  $C_{k+1,1}, C_{k+1,2}$  which only depend on  $T, h_0$  and  $M_1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{k+1} - p_0\| &\leq \|p_k - p_0\| + (h/2)\{\|\nabla U(q_k)\| + \|\nabla U(q_{k+1})\|\} \\ &\leq C_{k+1,1}h \left\{1 + \|p_0\|^\beta + \|q_0\|^\beta\right\} + (M_1h/2) \left\{2 + \|q_k\|^\beta + \|q_{k+1}\|^\beta\right\} \\ &\leq C_{k+1,1}h \left\{1 + \|p_0\|^\beta + \|q_0\|^\beta\right\} + (C_{k+1,2}h/2) \left\{1 + \|q_0\|^\beta + \|p_0\|^\beta\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (40) is satisfied which concludes the induction and the proof.

(ii) Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $h > 0$  and  $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . Using (32), the triangle inequality and **A1**( $\beta$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{k+1} - q_0\| &= \left\|q_k - q_0 - (h^2/2)\nabla U(q_k) + hp_k\right\| \\ &\leq (1 + h^2L_1/2) \|q_k - q_0\| + (h^2M_1/2)(\|q_0\|^\beta + 1) + h \|p_k - p_0\| + h \|p_0\|. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Second, similarly using (33), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{k+1} - p_0\| &\leq \|p_k - p_0 + (h/2)\{\nabla U(q_{k+1}) + \nabla U(q_k)\}\| \\ &\leq \|p_k - p_0\| + (hL_1/2) \left\{\|q_{k+1} - q_0\| + \|q_k - q_0\|\right\} + hM_1 \left\{\|q_0\|^\beta + 1\right\} \\ &\leq \|p_k - p_0\| + hM_1 \left\{\|q_0\|^\beta + 1\right\} + (hL_1/2) \left\{+h \|p_k - p_0\| + h \|p_0\|\right\} \\ &\quad + (hL_1/2) \left\{(2 + L_1h^2/2) \|q_k - q_0\| + (h^2M_1/2)(\|q_0\|^\beta + 1)\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where we have used (42) for the last inequality. Summing up (42) and (43) and using the definition (9) of  $\vartheta_1(h)$ , we get that, setting  $A_k = \|q_k - q_0\| + L_1^{-1/2} \|p_k - p_0\|$ ,

$$A_{k+1} \leq (1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))A_k + h \left\{\vartheta_2(h)(\|q_0\|^\beta + 1) + \vartheta_3(h) \|p_0\|\right\}.$$

By a straightforward induction, we obtain that

$$A_{k+1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \left[ (1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))^{k+1-i} h \left\{\vartheta_2(h)(\|q_0\|^\beta + 1) + \vartheta_3(h) \|p_0\|\right\} \right],$$

which completes the proof of (ii). □

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $\beta \in [0, 1]$  and assume **A1**( $\beta$ ). Then for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(q,p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}} \left\{ \|\Xi_{h,T}(q,p) - \Xi_{h,T}(q,v)\| / \|p-v\| \right\} \\ \leq (T/h) \left\{ (1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))^T - 1 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$



where  $\Xi_{h,T}$  and  $\vartheta_1$  are defined by (34) and (9) respectively. In addition, for any  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\Xi_{h,T}(q, 0)\| \leq (T/h)\{(1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))^T - 1\}\vartheta_2(h)(\|q\|^\beta + 1) + T^2 \|\nabla U(q)\|, \quad (45)$$

where  $\vartheta_2$  is defined in (39).

*Proof.* By Lemma 17, for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we get

$$\sup_{(q,p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}} \left\{ \|\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p) - \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, v)\| / \|p - v\| \right\} \leq L_1^{-1/2} A^i$$

where  $A = (1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))$ . Therefore by definition of  $\Xi_{h,T}$  (34) and using **A1**( $\beta$ ), for any  $h > 0$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(q,p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}} \left\{ \|\Xi_{h,T}(q, p) - \Xi_{h,T}(q, v)\| / \|p - v\| \right\} \\ & \leq L_1 \sum_{k=1}^{T-1} (T - i) \sup_{(q,p,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}} \left\{ \|\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p) - \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, v)\| / \|p - v\| \right\} \\ & \leq T \left[ A^T - 1 \right] / (h\vartheta_1(L_1^{1/2}h)) \end{aligned}$$

showing (44) since  $\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}) \geq 1$ .

We now consider (45). By (34), **A1**( $\beta$ )-(i) and Lemma 18-(ii), we have that for any  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Xi_{h,T}(q, 0)\| & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T - i) \left\| \nabla U \circ \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, 0) - \nabla U(q) \right\| + T^2 \|\nabla U(q)\| \\ & \leq TL_1 \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, 0) - q \right\| + T^2 \|\nabla U(q)\| \\ & \leq TL_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1^{-1}(hL_1^{1/2}) \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \{A^{i+1} - 1\} \left\{ \vartheta_2(h)(\|q\|^\beta + 1) \right\} + T^2 \|\nabla U(q)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (45) using that  $\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}) \geq 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** Assume **A1**(1). Then for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h > 0$ , and  $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^T \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p) - q \right\| \\ & \leq L_1^{-1/2} T \left\{ [1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})]^T - 1 \right\} \left\{ \vartheta_2(h)(1 + \|q\|) + \vartheta_3(h) \|p\| \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\vartheta_1$  is defined by (9).

*Proof.* For  $T \geq 2$  and  $h > 0$ , by Lemma 18-(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p) - q \right\| &\leq L_1^{-1/2} \vartheta_1^{-1}(hL_1^{1/2}) T \left\{ \{1 + hL_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})\}^T - 1 \right\} \\ &\quad \times \{ \vartheta_2(h)(\|q\| + 1) + \vartheta_3(h) \|p\| \} . \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed upon using that  $\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}) \geq 1$ .  $\square$

## 5.1 Proofs of Section 2

### 5.1.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We first prove (11). Under the assumption that  $U$  is twice continuously differentiable, it follows by a straightforward induction, that for all  $h > 0$  and  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $p \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q, p)$ , defined by (6), and  $p \mapsto \Xi_{h,k}(q, p)$ , defined by (34), are continuously differentiable and for all  $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathbf{J}_{p, \Xi_{h,T}}(q, p) = \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T-i) \left\{ \nabla^2 U \circ \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p) \right\} \mathbf{J}_{p, \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}}(q, p) ,$$

where for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{J}_{p, \Xi_{h,k}}(q, p)$  ( $\mathbf{J}_{p, \tilde{\Phi}_i^{\circ(h)}}(q, p)$  respectively) is the Jacobian of the function  $\tilde{p} \mapsto \Xi_{h,k}(q, \tilde{p})$  ( $\tilde{p} \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}_i^{\circ(h)}(q, \tilde{p})$  respectively) at  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Under A1,  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla^2 U(x)\| \leq L_1$ , therefore by Lemma 19, we have that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{(q,p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left\| \mathbf{J}_{p, \Xi_{h,T}}(q, p) \right\| \leq T(\{1 + hL_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})\}^T - 1)/h . \quad (46)$$

For any  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$ , define  $\phi_{q,T,h}(p)$  for all  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\phi_{q,T,h}(p) = p - (h/T) \Xi_{h,T}(q, p) .$$

It is a well known fact (see for example [9, Exercise 3.26]) that if

$$\sup_{(q,p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (h/T) \left\| \mathbf{J}_{p, \Xi_{h,T}}(q, p) \right\| < 1 , \quad (47)$$

then for any  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\phi_{q,T,h}$  is a diffeomorphism and therefore by (32), the same conclusion holds for  $p \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p)$ . Using (46), if  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$  satisfies (10), then the condition (47) is verified and as a result (11).

Denoting for any  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  the continuously differentiable inverse of  $p \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p)$  and using a change of variable with  $\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)$  in (8) concludes the proof of (12).

We now show that  $T_{h,T}$  satisfies the condition which implies that  $P_{h,T}$  is a T-kernel. We first establish some estimates on the function  $(q, p) \mapsto \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p)$ . By (47) and (32), for any  $q, p, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\|\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p) - \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, v)\| \geq (hT)\|\phi_{q,T,h}(p) - \phi_{q,T,h}(v)\| \geq (hT)(1 - \varepsilon)\|p - v\|$  which implies that there exists  $C \geq 0$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p) - \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, v) \right\| &\leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1} \|v - p\| , \\ \left\| \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p) \right\| &\leq C \left\{ \|p\| + \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, 0) \right\| \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In addition, for  $q, x, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have setting  $\tilde{q} = \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p) - \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(x, p) \right\| &= \left\| \tilde{q} - \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(x, \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{q})) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(x, \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(x, \tilde{q})) - \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(x, \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \tilde{q})) \right\| , \end{aligned}$$

which implies by (48) and Lemma 17 that there exists  $C \geq 0$  satisfying

$$\left\| \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p) - \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(x, p) \right\| \leq C \|q - x\| . \quad (49)$$

We now can prove that  $T_{h,T}$  is the continuous component of  $P_{h,T}$ . First by (13), for all  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$T_{h,T}(q, \mathbf{B}) \geq (2\pi)^{-d/2} \text{Leb}(\mathbf{B}) \times \inf_{\bar{q} \in \mathbf{B}} \left\{ \bar{\alpha}_H(q, \bar{q}) e^{-\|\bar{\Psi}_q(\bar{q})\|^2/2} D_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(\bar{q}) \right\} ,$$

with the convention  $0 \times +\infty = 0$  and

$$\bar{\alpha}_H(q, \bar{q}) = \alpha_H \left\{ (q, \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \bar{q}), \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \bar{q})) \right\} .$$

Since the function  $(q, p) \mapsto (\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p), \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p), D_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(p))$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  by Lemma 17, (48) and (49), and for any  $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, \cdot)}(\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p)) \mathbf{J}_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(p) = \mathbf{I}_n$ , we get that  $T_{h,T}(q, \mathbf{B}) > 0$  for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and all compact set  $\mathbf{B}$  satisfying  $\text{Leb}(\mathbf{B}) > 0$ . Therefore, using that the Lebesgue measure is regular which implies that for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\text{Leb}(\mathbf{A}) > 0$ , there exists a compact set  $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{A}$ ,  $\text{Leb}(\mathbf{B}) > 0$ , we can conclude that  $P_{h,T}$  is irreducible with respect to the Lebesgue measure. In addition, we get  $T_{h,T}(q, \mathbb{R}^d) > 0$ , and therefore we obtain that  $P_{h,T}$  is aperiodic. Similarly we get that any compact set is  $(1, \text{Leb})$ -small.

It remains to show that for any  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $q \mapsto T_{h,T}(q, \mathbf{B})$  is lower semi-continuous which is a straightforward consequence of Fatou's Lemma and that for any  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $q \mapsto (\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p), \bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, p), D_{\bar{\Psi}_h^{(T)}(q, \cdot)}(p))$  is continuous.

Finally, the last statements of (ii) follows from Proposition 26 in Appendix A which implies that  $P_{h,T}$  is Harris recurrent and [19, Theorem 13.0.1] which implies (14).

### 5.1.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We use Corollary 13. Indeed  $P_{h,T}$  is of form (29) and it is straightforward to check that it satisfies **G1** (note that Lemma 17 shows that  $\Phi_h^{\circ(T)}$  is a Lipschitz function on  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ).

We now check that  $P_{h,T}$  satisfies **G2**( $R, 0, M$ ) for all  $R, M \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  using Proposition 14. By (32), for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h > 0$ ,  $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q, p) = Thp + g_{q,T,h}(p)$$

where  $g_{q,T,h}(p) = q - (Th^2/2)\nabla U(q) - h^2\Xi_{h,T}(q, p)$  where  $\Xi_{h,T}$  is defined by (34). Lemma 19 shows that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$ , it holds that

$$\sup_{p,v,q \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\|g_{q,T,h}(p) - g_{q,T,h}(v)\|}{\|p - v\|} \leq Th\{[1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})]^T - 1\},$$

which implies that the condition Proposition 14-(i) is satisfied. To check that condition Proposition 14-(ii) holds, we consider separately the two cases:  $\beta < 1$  and  $\beta = 1$ .

- Consider first the case  $\beta < 1$ . By **A1**-(ii), for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$ , we get

$$\|\Xi_{h,T}(q, p)\| \leq T \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|\nabla U \circ \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p)\| \leq M_1 T \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \left\{ 1 + \|\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q, p)\|^\beta \right\}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 18-(i) there exists  $C \geq 0$  such that for all  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \leq R$ ,

$$\|g_{q,T,h}(p)\| \leq C \left\{ 1 + R^\beta + \|p\|^\beta \right\},$$

which implies that condition (ii) of Proposition 14 holds for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$ .

- Consider now the case  $\beta = 1$ . For any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h > 0$ ,  $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we get using **A1**-(i)

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_{q,T,h}(p)\| &\leq \|q\| + Th^2L_1\|q\|/2 + Th^2\|\nabla U(0)\|/2 \\ &\quad + h^2\|\Xi_{h,T}(q, p) - \Xi_{h,T}(q, 0)\| + h^2\|\Xi_{h,T}(q, 0)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore using Lemma 19, for any  $q, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \leq R$  for  $R \geq 0$ , for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$  satisfying (10), there exists  $C \geq 0$  such that

$$\|g_{q,T,h}(p)\| \leq C + hT\{[1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2})]^T - 1\}\|p\|,$$

showing that condition (ii) of Proposition 14 is satisfied.

Therefore, Proposition 14 can be applied and for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h > 0$  if  $\beta < 1$  and for any  $h > 0$  and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  satisfying (10) if  $\beta = 1$ ,  $P_{h,T}$  satisfies **G2**( $R, 0, M$ ) for all  $R, M \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . Corollary 13 concludes the proof of (a) and (b). The last statement then follows from [19, Theorem 14.0.1].

## 5.2 Proofs of Section 3

### 5.2.1 Proof of Proposition 4

By construction (17), for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} PV(q) - V(q) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{V(\text{proj}(z)) - V(q)\} \alpha(q, z) K(q, dz) \\ &= KV(q) - V(q) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{V(\text{proj}(z)) - V(q)\} \{\alpha(q, z) - 1\} K(q, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Using (21), this implies for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$PV(q) \leq \lambda V(q) + b + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{V(\text{proj}(z)) - V(q)\} \{\alpha(q, z) - 1\} K(q, dz). \quad (50)$$

Note that by definition (20) of  $\mathcal{B}(q)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(q)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{V(\text{proj}(z)) - V(q)\} \{\alpha(q, z) - 1\} K(q, dz) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{B}(q) \cap \mathcal{B}(q)} \{V(q) - V(\text{proj}(z))\} K(q, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by (22), we get

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\{q \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(q) \geq M\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \{V(\text{proj}(z))/V(q) - 1\} \{\alpha(q, z) - 1\} K(q, dz) \leq 0.$$

The proof then follows from combining this result and (50) since they imply

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\{q \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(q) \geq M\}} PV(q)/V(q) \leq \lambda.$$

### 5.2.2 Proof of Proposition 5

Let  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . Under **A1**( $m - 1$ ) with  $m \in (1, 2]$ , Lemma 17 shows that, for all  $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $p \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q_0, p)$  is Lipschitz, with a Lipschitz constant  $L_{h,T} \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$L_{h,T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ 1 + hL_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}) \right\}^T.$$

Therefore by the log-Sobolev inequality [2, Proposition 5.5.1, (5.4.1)] and (18), we get for all  $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$K_{h,T} V_a(q_0) \leq \exp \left( (aL_{h,T})^2 / 2 + a E_{h,T}(q_0) \right),$$

with

$$E_{h,T}(q_0) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(T)}(q_0, p) \right\| e^{-\|p\|^2/2} dp.$$

Set  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,  $q_k = \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$  and consider the following decomposition given by (32):

$$\|q_T\|^2 = \|q_0\|^2 + A_{h,T}^{(1)}(q_0, p_0) - 2h^2 A_{h,T}^{(2)}(q_0, p_0),$$

where

$$A_{h,T}^{(1)}(q_0, p_0) = 2Th \langle q_0, p_0 \rangle + \left\| Thp_0 - (Th^2/2)\nabla U(q_0) - h^2 \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T-i)\nabla U(q_i) \right\|^2$$

$$A_{h,T}^{(2)}(q_0, p_0) = \left\langle q_0, (T/2)\nabla U(q_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T-i)\nabla U(q_i) \right\rangle.$$

Jensen's inequality shows that, for all  $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{h,T}(q_0) \leq \left( \|q_0\|^2 + \bar{A}_{h,T}^{(1)}(q_0) - 2h^2 \bar{A}_{h,T}^{(2)}(q_0) \right)^{1/2},$$

where we have set  $\bar{A}_{h,T}^{(i)}(q_0) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} A_{h,T}^{(i)}(q_0, p) e^{-\|p\|^2/2} dp$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Therefore to conclude the proof, it is sufficient to show that

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \{\mathbb{E}_{h,T}(q_0) - \|q_0\|\} = -\infty. \quad (51)$$

(a) Consider the case  $m \in (1, 2)$ . Using **A1**( $m-1$ ) and Lemma 18-(i), we get that there exists a constant  $C_0 \geq 0$  such that for all  $p_0, q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$ ,

$$\|\nabla U(q_i)\| \leq C_0 \{1 + \|p_0\| + \|q_0\|^{m-1}\} \quad (52)$$

which implies that

$$|\bar{A}_{h,T}^{(1)}(q_0)| \leq C_1 \{1 + \|q_0\|^{2(m-1)}\}, \quad (53)$$

for some constant  $C_1 \geq 0$ . On the other hand, note that for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $A_{h,T}^{(2)}(q_0, p_0) = A_{h,T}^{(2,1)}(q_0, p_0) + A_{h,T}^{(2,2)}(q_0, p_0)$  with

$$A_{h,T}^{(2,1)}(q_0, p_0) = \frac{T}{2} \langle q_0, \nabla U(q_0) \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T-i) \langle q_i, \nabla U(q_i) \rangle,$$

$$A_{h,T}^{(2,2)} = - \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T-i) \langle q_0 - q_i, \nabla U(q_i) \rangle.$$

Under **A2**( $m$ ), for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have that

$$A_{h,T}^{(2,1)}(q_0, p_0) \geq A_1 \frac{T}{2} \|q_0\|^m - \frac{T(T-1)}{2} A_2. \quad (54)$$

Further, by (52) and Lemma 18-(i), there exists  $C_2 \geq 0$ , such that for all  $p_0, q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|A_{h,T}^{(2,2)}(q_0, p_0)| \leq C_2 \{1 + \|p_0\|^2 + \|q_0\|^{2(m-1)}\}, \quad (55)$$

Combining (54) and (55), there exists  $C_3 \geq 0$  such that for any  $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\bar{A}^{(2)}(q_0) \geq \frac{T A_1}{2} \|q_0\|^m - C_3 \{1 + \|q_0\|^{2(m-1)}\}. \quad (56)$$

Combining (53) and (56), and using that  $m < 2$ , we finally obtain that (51) holds.

(b) By Cauchy-Schwarz and Hölder inequality and since  $\nabla U$  satisfies **A1**(1), we have for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{h,T}^{(1)}(q_0, p_0) &\leq 2hT \|q_0\| \|p_0\| \\ &+ 3 \left[ h^2 T^2 \|p_0\|^2 + 2h^4 T^4 M_1^2 (1 + \|q_0\|^2) + 2h^4 T^2 L_1^2 \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|q_i - q_0\| \right\}^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

which implies using Lemma 20,  $\vartheta_1(s) \geq 1$  for any  $s \geq 0$ , and the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} |\bar{A}_{h,T}^{(1)}(q_0)| / \|q_0\|^2 \\ \leq 6h^4 T^4 \left( M_1^2 + L_1 \vartheta_2^2(h) \left[ \{1 + hL_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(L_1^{1/2} h)\}^T - 1 \right]^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly using in addition **A2**(2), we get that for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{h,T}^{(2)}(q_0, p_0) &= \left\langle q_0, (T^2/2) \nabla U(q_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (T-i) \{ \nabla U(q_i) - \nabla U(q_0) \} \right\rangle \\ &\geq (T^2/2) \{ A_1 \|q_0\|^2 - A_2 \} - TL_1 \|q_0\| \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|q_i - q_0\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, Lemma 20 and the Fatou Lemma imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} h^2 \bar{A}_{h,T}^{(2)}(q_0) / \|q_0\|^2 \\ \geq h^2 T^2 \left( A_1 / 2 - L_1^{1/2} \vartheta_2(h) [(1 + hL_1^{1/2} \vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))^T - 1] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all  $h > 0$ , and  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , one obtains

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \{E_{h,T}(q_0)\}^2 / \|q_0\|^2 \leq 1 - T^2 h^2 (A_1 - \Theta(hT)),$$

where  $\Theta$  is defined in (25). The proof follows.

### 5.2.3 Proof of Proposition 6

Note that condition (A) implies that

$$\inf_{\{q: \|q\|=R_1\}} U_0(q) > 0. \quad (57)$$

Condition A3-(i) follows from (B) using that, by (A), for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \geq R_1$

$$U_0(q) = (\|q\|/R_1)^m U_0(R_1 q / \|q\|)$$

In addition, A2 is also easy to check using the Euler's homogeneous function theorem that  $\langle \nabla U_0(q), q \rangle = mU_0(q)$  for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q\| \geq R_1$ .

We show below that A3-(ii) holds. First, since  $\lim_{\|q\| \rightarrow +\infty} U_0(q) = +\infty$  and  $U_0$  is continuous for all  $K \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_K = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^d ; U_0(q) \leq K\}$  is compact. Besides, using (57) and that  $U_0$  is continuous, we can define

$$M = \sup_{q \in \mathbf{B}(0, R_1)} U_0(q) + 1 \in (1, +\infty), \quad (58)$$

and for all  $q \notin \mathbf{L}_M$ ,

$$t_q = \sup \{t \in [0, 1] ; U_0(tq) = M\}, \quad (59)$$

which satisfies

$$U_0(t_q q) = M > \sup_{x \in \mathbf{B}(0, R_1)} U_0(x), \quad t_q q \in \partial \mathbf{L}_M \text{ and } t_q \|q\| > R_1. \quad (60)$$

Finally using (A), we get that the set  $\mathbf{L}_M$  is convex.

To show A3-(ii), we check first that it is sufficient to prove that

$$D^2 U_0(x) \{ \nabla U_0(x) \otimes \nabla U_0(x) \} > 0 \text{ for any } x \in \partial \mathbf{L}_M.$$

Indeed note that if this statement holds, since  $U \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\partial \mathbf{L}_M$  is compact, we have

$$\varepsilon = \inf_{x \in \partial \mathbf{L}_M} D^2 U_0(x) \{ \nabla U_0(x) \otimes \nabla U_0(x) \} > 0.$$

Let now  $q \notin \mathbf{L}_M$  and  $t_q$  defined by (59). Since by (A), for all  $u \geq 1$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|z\| \geq R_1$ ,  $U_0(uz) = u^m U_0(z)$ , differentiating with respect to  $z$ , we get  $\nabla U_0(uz) = u^{m-1} \nabla U_0(z)$  and  $D^2 U_0(uz) = u^{m-2} D^2 U_0(z)$ . Therefore by (60), we get

$$D^2 U_0(q) \{ \nabla U_0(q) \otimes \nabla U_0(q) \} = t_q^{4-3m} D^2 U_0(t_q q) \{ \nabla U_0(t_q q) \otimes \nabla U_0(t_q q) \}. \quad (61)$$

Using (60) again and since  $\partial \mathbf{L}_M$  is compact, we get that there exists  $R_2 \geq 0$  such that  $t_q \|q\| \in [R_1, R_2]$ . Hence by (61), we have

$$D^2 U_0(q) \{ \nabla U_0(q) \otimes \nabla U_0(q) \} \geq \varepsilon \|q\|^{3m-4} \min \left[ R_1^{4-3m}, R_2^{4-3m} \right].$$



Thus **A3-(ii)** holds for  $U_0$ . Finally **(B)** implies that the function  $U = U_0 + G$  satisfies **A3-(ii)** as well.

Let  $x \in \partial\mathbf{L}_M$ , we now show that  $D^2U_0(x) \{\nabla U_0(x) \otimes \nabla U_0(x)\} > 0$ . By Euler's homogeneous function theorem and since  $M \geq 1$ , we have that  $|\langle \nabla U_0(x), x \rangle| \geq m > 0$ . Denote by  $\Pi$  the tangent hyperplane of  $\partial\mathbf{L}_M$  at  $x$ , defined by  $\Pi = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \nabla U_0(x), x - q \rangle = 0\}$ . Since  $\mathbf{L}_M$  is convex, for all  $q \in \mathbf{L}_M$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $t^{-1}(U_0(tq + (1-t)x) - U_0(x)) \leq 0$ . So taking the limit as  $t$  goes to 0, we get that  $\langle \nabla U_0(x), q - x \rangle \leq 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{L}_M$  is contained in the half-space  $\Pi^- = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^d; \langle \nabla U_0(x), q - x \rangle \leq 0\}$ .

Define the  $m$ -homogeneous function  $\tilde{U} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  for all  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\tilde{U}(q) = M \left| \frac{\langle q, \nabla U_0(x) \rangle}{\langle x, \nabla U_0(x) \rangle} \right|^m. \quad (62)$$

Since  $U_0(x) = M$ , by (58),  $\|x\| > R_1$  and therefore there exists  $\epsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  such that

$$\mathbf{B}(x, \epsilon_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbf{B}(0, R_1). \quad (63)$$

We now show that  $\tilde{U}(q) \leq U_0(q)$  for all  $q \in \mathbf{B}(x, \epsilon)$  with

$$\epsilon = 2^{-1} \min \left[ \epsilon_0, \{\langle x, \nabla U_0(x) \rangle\} / \|\nabla U_0(x)\|^2 \right].$$

First consider  $q \in \Pi$ . We next argue by contradiction that

$$U_0(q) \geq M = \tilde{U}(q). \quad (64)$$

Indeed assume that  $U_0(q) < M$ . Then by continuity of  $U_0$ , we get that  $q \in \mathbf{L}_M^\circ$ . But since  $\mathbf{L}_M \subset \Pi^-$ , we get  $q \in (\Pi^-)^\circ$  which is impossible since  $q \in \Pi = \partial\Pi^- = \overline{\Pi^-} \setminus (\Pi^-)^\circ$ .

Let  $q \in \mathbf{B}(x, \epsilon)$ . Note that  $q = x + \|\nabla U_0(x)\|^{-2} \langle q - x, \nabla U_0(x) \rangle \nabla U_0(x) + z$ , where  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is orthogonal to  $\nabla U_0(x)$ . Define

$$u = \frac{\langle x, \nabla U_0(x) \rangle}{\langle q, \nabla U_0(x) \rangle}.$$

Then  $uq \in \Pi$  and by (64),  $U_0(uq) \geq M$ . If  $u \geq 1$ , using **(A)** and (62), we get

$$U_0(q) \geq u^{-m} M = \tilde{U}(q). \quad (65)$$

In turn, if  $u < 1$ , since  $\|q - x\| \leq \epsilon_0$ , by (63) and **(A)**,  $U_0(q) = u^{-1}U_0(uq)$  and (65) still holds.

Consider the three times differentiable functions  $\phi$  and  $\tilde{\phi}$  defined for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi(v) = U_0(x + v\nabla U_0(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\phi}(v) = \tilde{U}(x + v\nabla U_0(x)).$$

First, since for all  $q \in \mathbf{B}(x, \epsilon)$ ,  $U_0(q) \geq \tilde{U}(q)$ , we have

$$\phi(v) \geq \tilde{\phi}(v), \text{ for all } v \in [-\epsilon / \|\nabla U_0(x)\|, \epsilon / \|\nabla U_0(x)\|]. \quad (66)$$

Moreover, by definition  $U_0(x) = \tilde{U}(x)$  and  $\nabla \tilde{U}(x)$  is colinear to  $\nabla U_0(x)$ . Using Euler's homogeneous function theorem for  $U_0$  and  $\tilde{U}$ , we get that  $\nabla \tilde{U}(x) = \nabla U_0(x)$ . Therefore  $\phi(0) = \tilde{\phi}(0)$ ,  $\phi'(0) = \tilde{\phi}'(0)$ . Combining these equalities, (66) and using a Taylor expansion around 0 of order 2 with exact remainder for  $\phi$  and  $\tilde{\phi}$  shows that necessary

$$D^2U_0(x) \{ \nabla U_0(x) \otimes \nabla U_0(x) \} = \phi''(0) \geq \tilde{\phi}''(0) > 0 ,$$

which concludes the proof.

#### 5.2.4 Proof of Proposition 7

We preface the proof by several technical preliminary Lemmas.

**Lemma 21.** *Assume **A3**( $m$ )-(i) for some  $m \in (1, 2]$ . Then, for all  $q, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|\nabla U(q) - \nabla U(x)\| \leq A_3 \|q - x\|$  and  $\|\nabla U(q) - \nabla U(x)\| \leq A_3(m-1)^{-1} \|q - x\|^{m-1}$ . In particular, **A1**( $m-1$ ) holds with  $L_1 = A_3$  and  $M_1 = A_3(m-1)^{-1} \vee \|\nabla U(0)\|$ .*

*Proof.* First by **A3**( $m$ )-(i), we get for all  $q, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla U(q) - \nabla U(x)\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(x + t(q-x)) \{q-x\} dt \right\| \\ &\leq A_3 \|q-x\| \int_0^1 \{1 + \|x + t(q-x)\|\}^{m-2} dt . \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Therefore, for all  $q, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we get  $\|\nabla U(q) - \nabla U(x)\| \leq A_3 \|q-x\|$ . For all  $q, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , since  $m \in (1, 2]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \{1 + \|x + t(q-x)\|\}^{m-2} dt &\leq \int_0^1 \{1 + \||x\| - t\|q-x\|\}^{m-2} dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{1 \wedge \frac{\|x\|}{\|q-x\|}} \{1 + \|x\| - t\|q-x\|\}^{m-2} dt + \int_{1 \wedge \frac{\|x\|}{\|q-x\|}}^1 \{1 + t\|q-x\| - \|x\|\}^{m-2} dt \\ &\leq (m-1)^{-1} \|q-x\|^{m-2} . \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this result in (67) concludes the proof. □

**Lemma 22.** *Assume **A1**( $\beta$ ) for  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ . Let  $\gamma \in (0, \beta)$ .*

(i) *If  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , there exist  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $h \in (0, h_0]$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq R$ , and  $i, j, k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_0\| &\leq \kappa \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| , \\ \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q_0, p_0) - \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(j)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| &\leq \kappa h \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\|^\beta , \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(\ell)}$  are defined by (6) for  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$ .

(ii) If  $\beta = 1$ , then there exist  $\kappa, \bar{S} \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  (depending only on  $L_1$  and  $M_1$ ) such that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T)$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq 1$ , and  $i, j, k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_0\| &\leq 2 \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| \leq 3 \|q_0\| , \\ \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q_0, p_0) - \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(j)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| &\leq \kappa T h e^{(1+\vartheta_1(T)h)Th} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| , \end{aligned}$$

where  $\vartheta_1$  is defined in (9).

*Proof.* (i) Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $h \in (0, h_0]$ . Denote for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$  by  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . By **A1**( $\beta$ ) and Lemma 18-(i), there exist  $C \geq 0$  and  $R_1 \geq 0$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq R_1$ , for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ , we have

$$\|q_k - q_0\| \leq Ch \|q_0\|^{m-1} . \quad (68)$$

Then since  $m < 2$ , there exists  $R_2 \geq R_1$  and  $\omega > 0$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq R_2$ , for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\|q_0\| \leq \omega \|q_k\| .$$

In addition, using this inequality and (68) again, we get that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq R_2$ , for all  $i, j, k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\|q_i - q_j\| \leq 2Ch \|q_0\|^{m-1} \leq 2Ch\omega^{m-1} \|q_k\|^{m-1} .$$

(ii) Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . Denote for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$  by  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . By **A1**(1) and Lemma 18-(ii),  $\vartheta(s) \geq 1$  for any  $s \geq 0$ , we get that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\|q_k - q_0\| \leq L_1^{-1/2} \left\{ (1 + hL_1^{1/2}\vartheta_1(hL_1^{1/2}))^{k+1} - 1 \right\} \{ \vartheta_2(h) \vee \vartheta_3(h) \} (1 + \|q_0\|) , \quad (69)$$

where  $\vartheta_1$ ,  $\vartheta_2$  and  $\vartheta_3$  are defined in (9) and (39) respectively.

Therefore, there exists  $\bar{S} > 0$  (depending only on  $L_1$  and  $M_1$ ) such that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T)$ , for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq 1$ ,  $\|\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) - q_0\| \leq \|q_0\|/2$  for any  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ . As a result, for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T)$ , for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq 1$ , for any  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\|q_0\| \leq 2 \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| \leq 3 \|q_0\| .$$

In addition, using this inequality and (69) again, we get that there exists  $C \geq 1$  (depending only on  $L_1$  and  $M_1$ ) such that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}/T)$ , setting  $S = hT$ , and for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq 1$ , for all  $i, j, k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(i)}(q_0, p_0) - \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(j)}(q_0, p_0) \right\| &\leq 2CS e^{(1+\vartheta_1(S))S} \|q_0\| \\ &\leq 4CS e^{(1+\vartheta_1(S))S} \left\| \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 23.** *Assume  $\mathbf{A3}(m)$  for some  $m \in (1, 2]$ . Then there exist  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $R_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  such that for all  $q, x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with*

$$\|q\| \geq R_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \max(\|q - x\|, \|q - z\|) \leq \delta \|q\|, \quad (70)$$

we have

$$D^2U(q) \{ \nabla U(x) \otimes \nabla U(z) \} \geq B_0 \|q\|^{3m-4}.$$

*Proof.* Under  $\mathbf{A3}(m)$ , using Lemma 21, it can be easily checked that there exists  $C_U \geq 0$  (depending only on  $A_3$  and  $m$ ) such that for all  $q, x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying (70), for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $R_0 \geq R_U$ ,

$$D^2U(q) \{ \nabla U(x) \otimes \nabla U(z) \} \geq A_4 \|q\|^{3m-4} - C_U \{1 + \delta^{m-1} \|q\|^{3m-4}\}.$$

The proof is concluded by taking  $\delta$  sufficiently small and  $R_0$  sufficiently large. □

**Lemma 24.** *Assume that  $U$  is twice continuously differentiable. Then for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ , the following identity holds*

$$\begin{aligned} H \circ \Phi_h^{\circ(1)}(q_0, p_0) - H(q_0, p_0) &= h^2 \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0\}^{\otimes 2} (1/2 - t) dt \\ &+ h^3 \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0 \otimes \nabla U(q_0)\} (t - 1/4) dt \\ &- \frac{h^4}{4} \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{ \nabla U(q_0) \}^{\otimes 2} t dt + \frac{h^4}{8} \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) p_0 dt \right\|^2 \\ &- \frac{h^5}{8} \left\langle \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \nabla U(q_0) dt, \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) p_0 dt \right\rangle \\ &+ \frac{h^6}{32} \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \nabla U(q_0) dt \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Phi_h^{\circ(1)}$  is defined in (5),  $(q_1, p_1) = \Phi_h^{\circ(1)}(q_0, p_0)$ , and  $q_t = q_0 + t(q_1 - q_0)$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* Using the definition of  $H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2} \|p\|^2 + U(q)$ , we get

$$H(q_1, p_1) - H(q_0, p_0) = (1/2)(\|p_1\|^2 - \|p_0\|^2) + U(q_1) - U(q_0) .$$

First, Taylor's formula with exact remainder enables us to write

$$U(q_1) - U(q_0) = \langle \nabla U(q_0), (q_1 - q_0) \rangle + \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\}^{\otimes 2} (1 - t) dt . \quad (71)$$

Since  $\nabla U(q_1) = \nabla U(q_0) + \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\} dt$ , we get

$$p_1 = p_0 - \frac{h}{2} (\nabla U(q_0) + \nabla U(q_1)) = p_0 - h \nabla U(q_0) - \frac{h}{2} \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\} dt . \quad (72)$$

Using that  $q_1 = \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(1)}(p_0, q_0)$ , with  $\tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(1)}$  defined by (6), in (71) and (72), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & U(q_1) - U(q_0) \\ &= \langle \nabla U(q_0), h p_0 - (h^2/2) \nabla U(q_0) \rangle + \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\}^{\otimes 2} (1 - t) dt , \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (\|p_1\|^2 - \|p_0\|^2) &= \frac{h^2}{2} \|\nabla U(q_0)\|^2 + \frac{h^2}{8} \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\} dt \right\|^2 \\ &\quad - h \langle p_0, \nabla U(q_0) \rangle - (h/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0 \otimes (q_1 - q_0)\} dt \\ &\quad + (h^2/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{\nabla U(q_0) \otimes (q_1 - q_0)\} dt . \end{aligned}$$

Summing these equalities up and observing appropriate cancellations yields

$$\begin{aligned} H(q_1, p_1) - H(q_0, p_0) &= \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\}^{\otimes 2} (1 - t) dt \\ &\quad - (h/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0 \otimes (q_1 - q_0)\} dt + (h^2/8) \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \{q_1 - q_0\} dt \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + (h^2/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{\nabla U(q_0) \otimes (q_1 - q_0)\} dt \end{aligned}$$

$$= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 . \quad (73)$$

By using  $q_1 = \tilde{\Phi}_h^{\circ(1)}(p_0, q_0)$  again in the definition of each  $I_j$  we obtain successively

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= h^2 \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0\}^{\otimes 2} (1-t) dt - h^3 \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0 \otimes \nabla U(q_0)\} (1-t) dt \\ &\quad + (h^4/4) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{\nabla U(q_0)\}^{\otimes 2} (1-t) dt , \\ I_2 &= -(h^2/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0\}^{\otimes 2} dt + (h^3/4) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{p_0 \otimes \nabla U(q_0)\} dt , \\ I_3 &= (h^4/8) \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) p_0 dt \right\|^2 + (h^6/32) \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \nabla U(q_0) dt \right\|^2 \\ &\quad - (h^5/8) \left\langle \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) \nabla U(q_0) dt, \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_t) p_0 dt \right\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= (h^3/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{\nabla U(q_0) \otimes p_0\} dt \\ &\quad - (h^4/4) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_t) \{\nabla U(q_0)\}^{\otimes 2} dt , \end{aligned}$$

Gathering all these equalities in (73) concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 7.* Let  $\gamma \in (0, m-1)$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $h \in (0, h_0]$ . Denote for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$  by  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_h^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . For all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , consider the following decomposition

$$H(p_T, q_T) - H(p_0, q_0) = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \{H(p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) - H(p_k, q_k)\} .$$

We show that each term in the sum in the right hand side of this equation is nonpositive if  $\|q_0\|$  is large enough and  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ . By Lemma 24, we have

$$H(q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}) - H(q_k, p_k) = -(h^4/4)A_k + h^2B_k + h^3C_k + (h^4/8)D_k , \quad (74)$$

where, setting  $q_{t,k} = q_k + t(q_{k+1} - q_k)$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_k &= \int_0^1 D^2U(q_{t,k}) \{\nabla U(q_k)\}^{\otimes 2} t \, dt \\
B_k &= \int_0^1 D^2U(q_{t,k}) \{p_k\}^{\otimes 2} (1/2 - t) \, dt \\
C_k &= \int_0^1 D^2U(q_{t,k}) \{p_k \otimes \nabla U(q_k)\} (t - 1/4) \, dt \\
D_k &= \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_{t,k}) p_k \, dt \right\|^2 + (h^2/4) \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_{t,k}) \nabla U(q_k) \, dt \right\|^2 \\
&\quad - h \left\langle \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_{t,k}) \nabla U(q_k) \, dt, \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U(q_{t,k}) p_k \, dt \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $q_{t,k} - q_k = -(th^2/2)\nabla U(q_k) + thp_k$  and  $\int_0^1 (1/2 - t) \, dt = 0$ , we have for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
B_k &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 D^3U(q_k + s(q_{t,k} - q_k)) \{p_k^{\otimes 2} \otimes (q_{t,k} - q_k)\} (1/2 - t) \, ds \, dt \\
&= hB_{k,1} - h^2B_{k,2}
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{k,1} &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 D^3U(q_k + s(q_{t,k} - q_k)) \{p_k\}^{\otimes 3} t(1/2 - t) \, ds \, dt \\
B_{k,2} &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 D^3U(q_k + s(q_{t,k} - q_k)) \{p_k^{\otimes 2} \otimes \nabla U(q_k)\} t(1/2 - t) \, ds \, dt .
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the term  $C_k$  in (74). Similarly, using again  $\int_0^1 (t - 1/2) \, dt = 0$  and then (33), we get  $C_k = C_{k,1} + C_{k,2} + C_{k,3}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{k,1} &= h \int_0^1 \int_0^t D^3U(q_k + s(q_{k,t} - q_k)) \{p_k^{\otimes 2} \otimes \nabla U(q_k)\} t(t - 1/2) \, ds \, dt \\
&\quad - (h^2/2) \int_0^1 \int_0^t D^3U(q_k + s(q_{k,t} - q_k)) \{p_k \otimes (\nabla U(q_k))^{\otimes 2}\} t(t - 1/2) \, ds \, dt \\
C_{k,2} &= \int_0^1 D^2U(q_{t,k}) \{p_0 \otimes \nabla U(q_k)\} \, dt , \\
C_{k,3} &= -h \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_0^1 D^2U(q_{t,k}) \{\nabla U(q_i) \otimes \nabla U(q_k)\} \, dt \\
&\quad - (h/2) \int_0^1 D^2U(q_{t,k}) \{(\nabla U(q_0) + \nabla U(q_k)) \otimes \nabla U(q_k)\} \, dt
\end{aligned}$$

We will next estimate each of these terms separately. Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  be the constants defined in Lemma 23.

(a) We first consider the case  $m \in (1, 2)$ . By Lemma 21 and Lemma 18-(i), there exist  $C \geq 0$  and  $R_1 \geq R_U$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq R_1$ , for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_i - q_0\| &\leq (\delta/2) \|q_0\| \\ \|p_i - p_0\| &\leq C(\|p_0\| + h \|q_0\|^{m-1}) \leq C(\|q_0\|^\gamma + h \|q_0\|^{m-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

By Lemma 23, Lemma 22-(i) and (76), there exists  $R_2 \geq R_1$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq R_2$  and  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ , we get that

$$\inf_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} A_k \geq B_0 \|q_k\|^{3m-4} \geq B_0 \{(1 - \delta/2)^{3m-4} \wedge (1 + \delta/2)^{3m-4}\} \|q_0\|^{3m-4}. \quad (77)$$

Hence,  $\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{A_k / \|q_0\|^{3m-4}\} > 0$ . We now bound  $B_k$ . Using A3-(i), Lemma 21 and (76), we get by (75) that

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|B_k| / \|q_0\|^{4m-6}\} < \infty.$$

Combining A3-(i), Lemma 21 and (76) again, we get by crude estimate that there exists  $C \geq 0$  such that

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|D_k| / \|q_0\|^{4m-6}\} \leq Ch^2.$$

We finally bound the two terms  $C_{k,1}$  and  $C_{k,2}$ . First, using the same reasoning as for  $B_k$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|C_{k,1}| / \|q_0\|^{4m-6}\} &< \infty, \\ \limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|C_{k,2}| / \|q_0\|^{2m-3+\gamma}\} &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing like in (77), we get that  $\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{C_{k,3} / \|q_0\|^{3m-4}\} < 0$ . Gathering all these results and using that  $3m-4 \geq \max(4m-6, 2m-3+\gamma)$  for  $m \in (1, 2)$  and  $\gamma \in (0, m-1)$ , we get that for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ ,

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{H(q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}) - H(q_k, p_k)\} / \|q_0\|^{3m-4} < 0,$$

which concludes the proof.

(b) Consider now the case  $m = 2$ . First by Lemma 21 and Lemma 18-(ii), there exist  $\bar{S}_1 \geq 0$  and  $R_1 \geq R_U$  such that for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $h \in (0, \bar{S}_1/T]$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$  and  $\|q_0\| \geq R_1$ , and  $i \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,

$$\|q_i - q_0\| \leq (\delta/2) \|q_0\|. \quad (78)$$



and

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_i - q_0\| &\leq \|p_0\| Th + (1/2)(T+1)^2 h^2 (M_1 + L_1 \delta/2) \|q_0\|, \\ \|p_i - p_0\| &\leq hT \{M_1 + (M_1 + L_1 \delta/2) \|q_0\|\}, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

where  $L_1$  and  $M_1$  are defined in Lemma 21. By Lemma 23, Lemma 22-(ii) and (78), there exists  $R_2 \geq R_1$  such that for all  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq R_2$  and  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$

$$\inf_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} A_k \geq B_0 \|q_k\|^2 \geq B_0 (1 - \delta/2)^2 \|q_0\|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{A_k / \|q_0\|^2\} \geq B_0 (1 - \delta/2)^2. \quad (80)$$

We now bound  $B_k$ . Using A3-(i), Lemma 21 and (79), we get by (75) that there exists  $D_1 \geq 0$  which does not depend on  $T$  and  $h$  such that

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|B_k| / \|q_0\|^2\} \leq D_1 h \{(hT)^3 + (hT)^4\}. \quad (81)$$

Combining A3-(i), Lemma 21 and (79) again, we get by crude estimate that there exists  $D_2 \geq 0$  which does not depend on  $T$  and  $h$  such that

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|D_k| / \|q_0\|^2\} \leq D_2 (hT)^2. \quad (82)$$

We finally bound the two terms  $C_{k,1}$  and  $C_{k,2}$ . First, using the same reasoning as for  $B_k$ , we get that there exists  $D_3 \geq 0$  which does not depend on  $T$  and  $h$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|C_{k,1}| / \|q_0\|^2\} &< D_3 h \{(hT)^4 + (hT)^5\}, \\ \limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|C_{k,2}| / \|q_0\|^{1+\gamma}\} &< \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Finally, arguing like in (80), we get that

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{C_{k,3} / \|q_0\|^2\} < 0. \quad (84)$$

Combining (80)-(81)-(82)-(83) and (84) in (74), and using that  $2 \geq 1 + \gamma$  for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , we get that for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{H(q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}) - H(q_k, p_k)\} / \|q_0\|^2 \\ \leq -B_0 (1 - \delta/2)^2 h^4 + D_1 \{(hT)^3 + (hT)^4\} h^3 \\ + D_2 (hT)^2 h^4 + D_3 \{(hT)^4 + (hT)^5\} h^4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists  $\bar{S}_4 \leq \bar{S}_3$  such for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in (0, \bar{S}_4/T^{3/2}]$ ,

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{H(q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}) - H(q_k, p_k)\} / \|q_0\|^2 < 0 ,$$

which completes the proof. □

### 5.2.5 Proof of Proposition 8

**Lemma 25.** *Assume **A4**. Then there exist  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$  such that for all  $q, x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with*

$$\|q\| \geq R_1 , \quad \max(\|q - x\|, \|q - z\|) \leq \delta \|q\| ,$$

we have

$$\langle \Sigma \nabla U(x), \Sigma z \rangle \geq B_1 \|q\|^2 .$$

*Proof.* Under **A4**, it can be easily checked that there exists  $\tilde{C}_U \geq 0$  (depending only on  $A_5$  and  $\Sigma$ ) such that for all  $q, x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying (70) for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\langle \Sigma \nabla U(x), \Sigma z \rangle \geq \langle \Sigma^2 q, \Sigma q \rangle - \tilde{C}_U (\delta \|q\|^2 + \|q\|^\rho) , \quad \|q\| \geq R_1 .$$

The proof is concluded by using that  $\Sigma$  is definite positive and taking  $\delta$  sufficiently small and  $R_1$  sufficiently large. □

*Proof of Proposition 8.* Note that by **A4**, Lemma 18-(ii), Lemma 22-(ii) and Lemma 25, there exists  $B_1, \bar{S}_1 > 0$ ,  $R_1 \geq 0$ , such that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in (0, \bar{S}_1/T]$ ,  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq \max(1, R_1)$  and  $k, i \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,  $\|q_0\| \leq 2 \|q_k\| \leq 3 \|q_0\|$ ,  $|\tilde{U}(q_k)| \leq C_1 \|q_0\|^\rho$ ,

$$\langle \Sigma \nabla U(q_i), \Sigma q_k \rangle \geq B_1 \|q_k\|^2 , \quad \|\nabla U(q_i)\| \leq C_1 \|q_k\| , \quad (85)$$

where  $q_k = \tilde{\Phi}_T^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$  and  $C_1 = \max(4A_5, 3(\|\Sigma\| + 2A_5))$ . Let now  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $h \in (0, \bar{S}_1/T]$  and denote for any  $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,  $(q_k, p_k) = \Phi_T^{\circ(k)}(q_0, p_0)$  for  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We consider the following decomposition:

$$H(p_T, q_T) - H(p_0, q_0) = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \{H(p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) - H(p_k, q_k)\} .$$

We show below that there exists  $\bar{S} < \bar{S}_1$  such that, for all  $h \geq 0$  and  $T \geq 0$  satisfying  $hT \leq \bar{S}$ ,

$$\limsup_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} [\{H(p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) - H(p_k, q_k)\} / \|q_0\|^2] < 0 , \quad (86)$$

from which the proof follows. First for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ , we have

$$H(p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) - H(p_k, q_k) = A_k + B_k + C_k, \quad (87)$$

where  $2A_k = \langle \Sigma q_{k+1}, q_{k+1} \rangle - \langle \Sigma q_k, q_k \rangle$ ,  $B_k = \tilde{U}(q_{k+1}) - \tilde{U}(q_k)$ , and  $2C_k = \|p_{k+1}\|^2 - \|p_k\|^2$ . By (85) and **A4**, we have

$$\lim_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} |B_k| / \|q_0\|^2 = 0, \quad (88)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= h \langle \Sigma p_k, q_k \rangle + h^2 \langle \Sigma p_k, p_k \rangle / 2 - h^2 \langle \Sigma q_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 2 \\ &\quad - h^3 \langle \Sigma p_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 2 + h^4 \langle \Sigma^2 q_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 8 + A_{k,1}, \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_k &= -h \langle \Sigma p_k, q_k \rangle - h^2 \langle \Sigma p_k, p_k \rangle / 2 + h^2 \langle \Sigma q_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 2 \\ &\quad + 3h^3 \langle \Sigma p_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 4 + h^4 \langle \Sigma p_k, \Sigma p_k \rangle / 8 - h^4 \langle \Sigma^2 q_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 4 \\ &\quad - h^5 \langle \Sigma^2 p_k, q_k \rangle / 8 + h^6 \langle \Sigma^2 q_k, \Sigma^2 q_k \rangle / 32 + C_{k,1}, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

where

$$\lim_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} \{|A_{k,1}| + |C_{k,1}|\} / \|q_0\|^2 = 0, \quad (91)$$

Using (87), (89) and (90), we obtain that for any  $q_0, p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$H(q_{k+1}, p_{k+1}) - H(q_k, p_k) = D_k + A_{k,1} + B_k + C_{k,1}, \quad (92)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_k &= h^3 \langle \Sigma p_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 4 + h^4 \langle \Sigma p_k, \Sigma p_k \rangle / 8 - h^4 \langle \Sigma^2 q_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 8 \\ &\quad - h^5 \langle \Sigma^2 p_k, q_k \rangle / 8 + h^6 \langle \Sigma^2 q_k, \Sigma^2 q_k \rangle / 32. \end{aligned}$$

Using that for  $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $p_k = p_0 - (h/2)\{\nabla U(q_0) + \nabla U(q_k)\} - h \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \nabla U(q_i)$  and (85), we obtain that for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  and  $q_0, p_0$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq \max(1, R_1)$ ,  $\|p_0\| \geq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_k &\leq -h^4 k B_1 \|q_k\|^2 / 8 + h^6 k^2 \|\Sigma\|^2 C_1 \|q_k\|^2 - h^4 \langle \Sigma^2 q_k, \Sigma q_k \rangle / 8 \\ &\quad + h^6 k C_1 \|\Sigma\|^2 \|q_k\|^2 / 8 + h^6 \|\Sigma\|^4 \|q_k\|^2 / 32 + D_{k,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\lim_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} |D_{k,1}| / \|q_0\|^2 = 0. \quad (93)$$

Define

$$\bar{S}_2 = \min \left\{ S \in (0, \bar{S}_1] : S^2(2C_1 \|\Sigma\|^2 + \|\Sigma\|^4) - B_1/8 \geq -B_1/16 \right\} .$$

Then, if  $Th \leq \bar{S}_2$  for any  $q_0, p_0$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq \max(1, R_1)$ ,  $\|p_0\| \geq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ , we get that

$$D_k \leq -B_1 h^4 k \|q_k\|^2 / 16 + D_{k,1} . \quad (94)$$

Similarly using that  $\Sigma$  is definite positive, we obtain that there exist  $B_2 > 0$  and  $\bar{S}_3 \in (0, \bar{S}_1]$  such that if  $hT \leq \bar{S}_3$ , for any  $q_0, p_0$ ,  $\|q_0\| \geq \max(1, R_1)$ ,  $\|p_0\| \geq \|q_0\|^\gamma$ , we get that

$$D_0 \leq -B_2 \|q_0\|^2 + D_{0,1} , \quad \text{where} \quad \lim_{\|q_0\| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\|p_0\| \leq \|q_0\|^\gamma} |D_{0,1}| / \|q_0\|^2 = 0 . \quad (95)$$

Combining (88)-(91)-(93)-(94) and (95) in (92), we obtain that (86) holds with  $\bar{S} = \min(\bar{S}_2, \bar{S}_3)$  since (85) implies that  $\|q_k\| \geq \|q_0\|/2$ .  $\square$

## A Harris recurrence for mixture of Metropolis-Hastings type Markov kernels

Let  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  be a measurable space and  $\lambda$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $\mathcal{X}$ . For all  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , let  $\alpha_i : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a measurable function and  $k_i : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  be a Markov transition density w.r.t.  $\lambda$ . Consider the Markov kernel  $K_i$  on  $X \times \mathcal{X}$  defined by

$$K_i(x, A) = \int_A \alpha_i(x, y) k_i(x, y) \lambda(dy) + \delta_x(A) r_i(x) , \quad x \in X \text{ and } A \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (96)$$

where for all  $x \in X$

$$r_i(x) = 1 - \int_X \alpha_i(x, y) k_i(x, y) \lambda(dy) . \quad (97)$$

For instance,  $K_i$  may be a Markov kernel associated to the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, i.e.

$$\alpha_i(x, y) = \begin{cases} \min \left[ 1, \frac{\pi(y) k_i(y, x)}{\pi(x) k_i(x, y)} \right] , & \text{if } \pi(x) k_i(x, y) > 0 , \\ 1 , & \text{otherwise ,} \end{cases} \quad (98)$$

for some probability density  $\pi : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  with respect to  $\lambda$ . We use the results below in the case where for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $K_i$  is a Markov kernel associated to the HMC algorithm. [29, Corollary 2] considers Metropolis-Hastings kernels  $K_i$  with  $\alpha_i$  defined by (98) and shows that that if  $K_i$  is irreducible, then  $K_i$  is Harris recurrent. We extend this result to kernels  $K_i$  of the form (96) (but that do not satisfy (98)) and mixture of Markov kernels  $K_\varpi$  defined on  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  by

$$K_\varpi = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \varpi_i K_i \quad (99)$$

where  $(\varpi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is a sequence of non-negative numbers satisfying  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \varpi_i = 1$ .

**Proposition 26.** *Let  $K_{\varpi}$  be the Markov kernel given by (99) and associated with the sequence of Markov kernel  $(K_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  given by (96). Let  $\pi$  be a probability measure on  $(X, \mathcal{X})$ . Assume that  $\pi$  and  $\lambda$  are mutually absolutely continuous and for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $\pi$  is invariant for  $K_i$ . If  $K_{\varpi}$  is irreducible and there exists  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $\varpi_i > 0$  and for all  $x \in X$   $r_i(x) < 1$ , with  $r_i$  defined by (97), then  $K$  is Harris recurrent.*

*Proof.* A bounded measurable function is said to be harmonic if  $K_{\varpi}\phi = \phi$ . By [19, Theorem 17.1.4, Theorem 17.1.7] a Markov kernel  $K_{\varpi}$  is Harris recurrent if  $K_{\varpi}$  is recurrent and any bounded harmonic function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is constant. By [19, Theorem 10.1.1], since  $K_{\varpi}$  is irreducible and admits  $\pi$  as an invariant probability measure, then  $K_{\varpi}$  is recurrent. On the other hand, any bounded harmonic function  $\phi$  is  $\pi$ -almost surely equal to  $\pi(\phi)$  by [19, Theorem 17.1.1, Lemma 17.1.1]. Using that  $\pi$  and  $\lambda$  are mutually absolutely continuous, and  $\pi$  is an invariant probability measure for  $K_i$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we get by (96) that for all  $x \in X$

$$K_{\varpi}\phi(x) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \varpi_i \{ \pi(\phi)(1 - r_i(x)) + \phi(x)r_i(x) \} .$$

Combining this result with  $K_{\varpi}\phi = \phi$ , we get for all  $x \in X$

$$\{ \phi(x) - \pi(\phi) \} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \varpi_i \{ 1 - r_i(x) \} = 0 .$$

The condition that there exists  $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $\varpi_i > 0$  and for all  $x \in X$   $r_i(x) < 1$ , implies that for all  $x \in X$ ,  $\phi(x) = \pi(\phi)$ . □

## References

- [1]
- [2] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 348 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [3] M. Betancourt, S. Byrne, S. Livingstone, and M. Girolami. The geometric foundations of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *BERNOULLI*, 23(4A):2257–2298, NOV 2017.
- [4] N. Bou-Rabee and J. M. Sanz-Serna. Geometric integrators and the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo method. *Acta Numerica*, pages 1–92, 2018.
- [5] N. Bou-Rabee and J.M. Sanz-Serna. Randomized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(4):2159–2194, 2017.
- [6] S. Byrne and M. Girolami. Geodesic Monte Carlo on Embedded Manifolds. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 40(4):825–845, December 2013.

- [7] E. Cancès, F. Legoll, and G. Stoltz. Theoretical and numerical comparison of some sampling methods for molecular dynamics. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 41(2):351–389, 2007.
- [8] S. Duane, A.D. Kennedy, B. J. Pendleton, and D. Roweth. Hybrid monte carlo. *Physics Letters B*, 195(2):216 – 222, 1987.
- [9] J. J. Duistermaat and J. A. C. Kolk. *Multidimensional real analysis. I. Differentiation*, volume 86 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. Translated from the Dutch by J. P. van Braam Houckgeest.
- [10] C. Lubich E. Hairer, G. Wanner. *Geometric Numerical Integration: Structure-Preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics 31. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2nd ed edition, 2002.
- [11] Y. Fang, J. M. Sanz-Serna, and R. D. Skeel. Compressible generalized hybrid Monte Carlo (vol 140, 174108, 2014). *JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL PHYSICS*, 144(2), JAN 14 2016.
- [12] M. Girolami and B. Calderhead. Riemann manifold Langevin and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 73(2):123–214, 2011. With discussion and a reply by the authors.
- [13] B. Leimkuhler and S. Reich. *Simulating Hamiltonian dynamics*, volume 14 of *Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [14] J. S. Liu. *Monte Carlo strategies in scientific computing*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2008.
- [15] S. Livingstone, M. Betancourt, S. Byrne, and M. Girolami. On the geometric ergodicity of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.08057v2*, 2016.
- [16] S. Livingstone, M. F Faulkner, and G. O. Roberts. Kinetic energy choice in hamiltonian/hybrid monte carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02649*, 2017.
- [17] X. Lu, V. Perrone, L. Hasenclever, Y. W. Teh, and S. Vollmer. Relativistic monte carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04388*, 2016.
- [18] K. L. Mengersen and R. L. Tweedie. Rates of convergence of the hastings and metropolis algorithms. *Ann. Statist.*, 24(1):101–121, 02 1996.
- [19] S. Meyn and R. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2nd edition, 2009.

- [20] R. M. Neal. Bayesian learning via stochastic dynamics. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 475–475, 1993.
- [21] R. M. Neal. MCMC using Hamiltonian dynamics. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, pages 113–162, 2011.
- [22] E. Outerelo and J. M. Ruiz. *Mapping degree theory*, volume 108. American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 2009.
- [23] G. O. Roberts and R. L. Tweedie. Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363, 1996.
- [24] G. O. Roberts and R. L. Tweedie. Geometric convergence and central limit theorems for multidimensional Hastings and Metropolis algorithms. *Biometrika*, 83(1):95–110, 1996.
- [25] W. Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1987.
- [26] J. M. Sanz-Serna. Markov chain Monte Carlo and numerical differential equations. In *Current challenges in stability issues for numerical differential equations*, volume 2082 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 39–88. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [27] M. R. Schofield, R. J. Barker, A. Gelman, E. R. Cook, and K. R. Briffa. A model-based approach to climate reconstruction using tree-ring data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 111(513):93–106, 2016.
- [28] Y. Tang, N. Srivastava, and R. R. Salakhutdinov. Learning generative models with visual attention. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1808–1816, 2014.
- [29] L. Tierney. Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions (with discussion). *Ann. Statist.*, 22(4):1701–1762, 1994.