THE POINCARÉ INEQUALITY AND QUADRATIC TRANSPORTATION-VARIANCE INEQUALITIES

YUAN LIU

Abstract. It is known that the Poincaré inequality is equivalent to the quadratic transportation-variance inequality (namely $W^2_2(f\mu, \mu) \leq CV\text{Var}_\mu(f)$), see Jourdain [10] and most recently Ledoux [12]. We give two alternative proofs to this fact. In particular, we achieve a smaller $CV$ than before, which equals the double of Poincaré constant. Applying the same argument leads to more characterizations of the Poincaré inequality. Our method also yields a by-product as the equivalence between the logarithmic Sobolev inequality and strict contraction of heat flow in Wasserstein space provided that the Bakry-Émery curvature has a lower bound (here the control constants may depend on the curvature bound).

Next, we present a comparison inequality between $W^2_2(f\mu, \mu)$ and its centralization $W^2_2(f_c\mu, \mu)$ for $f_c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)}}|\sqrt{f} - \mu(\sqrt{f})|^2$, which may be viewed as some special counterpart of the Rothaus’ lemma for relative entropy. Then it yields some new bound of $W^2_2(f\mu, \mu)$ associated to the variance of $\sqrt{f}$ rather than $f$. As a by-product, we have another proof to derive the quadratic transportation-information inequality from Lyapunov condition, avoiding the Bobkov-Götze’s characterization of the Talagrand’s inequality.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to investigate links between the Poincaré inequality (PI for short) and various comparisons of quadratic Wasserstein distance to variance. Many conclusions might be extended to abstract settings of metric measure spaces, nevertheless for simplicity, our basic framework is specified as follows. Let $E$ be a connected complete Riemannian manifold of finite dimension, $d$ the geodesic distance, $d\mu$ the volume measure, $\mathcal{P}(E)$ the collection of all probability measures on $E$, $\nu(dx) = e^{-V(x)}dx \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ with $V \in C^1(E)$, $L = \Delta - \nabla V \cdot \nabla$ the $\mu$-symmetric diffusion operator with domain $\mathbb{D}(L)$, $\Gamma(f,g) = \nabla f \cdot \nabla g$ the carré du champ operator with domain $\mathbb{D}(\Gamma)$. Define the $L^p$ Wasserstein (transportation) distance between $\nu, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ for any $p \geq 1$ by

$$W^p_2(\nu, \mu) = \left( \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)} \int_{E \times E} d^p(x, y) \pi(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p},$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\nu, \mu)$ denotes the set of any coupling $\pi$ on $E \times E$ with marginals $\nu$ and $\mu$ respectively. Throughout this paper we focus on quadratic Wasserstein distance, so it is convenient to assume $\mu$ has a finite moment of order 2. The reader is referred
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to several constant references as Bakry-Gentil-Ledoux \cite{2} and Villani \cite{16,17} for detailed presentations.

Our motivation partially arises from the problem of how to characterize the exponential decay of quadratic Wasserstein distance along heat flow. It is known that the exponential decay of heat semigroup $P_t = \exp(tI)$ in $L^2$-norm is equivalent to PI which reads for any $f \in D(I) \cap L^2(\mu)$

$$\operatorname{Var}_\mu(f) \leq C_T \int \Gamma(f,f) d\mu$$

(simply denote by $\mu(h) = \int hd\mu$ the expectation and by $\operatorname{Var}_\mu(f) = \mu(f^2) - (\mu(f))^2$ the variance), and the exponential decay of $P_t$ in relative entropy is equivalent to the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (LSI for short) for any positive $f$ with $\sqrt{T} \in D(I)$

$$\operatorname{Ent}_\mu(f) := \int f \log f d\mu \leq C_L \int \frac{\Gamma(f,f)}{f} d\mu,$$

denote also by $I_\mu(f) = \int \frac{\Gamma(f,f)}{f} d\mu$ the Fisher information). Somehow, we think it is tough to give a proper answer to the same question in Wasserstein space, namely to find some equivalent inequality characterizing $W^2_2(P_t \nu, \mu) \leq e^{-2\kappa t}W^2_2(\nu, \mu)$ (or up to a multiple) with $\kappa > 0$ for any $\nu = f \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. When we turn to some weak replacements, one natural candidate is to compare $W_2$ with variance, which can be quickly derived from the control inequality of weighted total variation (see \cite[Proposition 7.10]{16}) and Hölder inequality that

$$W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2||d^2(x, \cdot)(f - 1)||_{TV} \leq 2 \int |f - 1| (d^2(x_0, \cdot) + 1) \, d\mu \leq C \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}_\mu(f)}$$

if $d^4(x_0, \cdot)$ is $\mu$-integrable. At least, it follows the integrability of $W^2_2(P_t \nu, \mu)$ for $t \in [0, \infty)$ provided that PI holds true, which is helpful to the semigroup analysis more or less.

If $\mu$ fulfills the Talagrand’s inequality ($W_2 H$ for short), namely the control of relative entropy on $W^2_2(\nu, \mu)$ as

$$W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_T \operatorname{Ent}_\mu(f),$$

it follows from the preliminary inequality $\operatorname{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq p \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}_\mu(f)}$ for $p \geq 1$ that

$$W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_T p \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}_\mu(f)}.$$  

In particular, for $p = 2$ it covers $W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq C \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}_\mu(f)}$, and for $p = 1$ it gives

$$W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_T \operatorname{Var}_\mu(f),$$

which suggests an improved decay rate of $W_2$ along heat flow. Since $W_2 H$ implies PI with $C_P \leq C_T$ (see \cite{2} for example), it is natural to ask what about the relation between PI and a transportation-variance inequality like \cite{14}. Indeed, Jourdain \cite{10} proved their equivalence in dimension one. Ding \cite{6} claimed a general inequality between $W_2$ and the so called Rényi-Tsallis divergence of order $\alpha$, which equals the variance for $\alpha = 2$ (somehow, it is obscure for us to check Remark 3.3 therein for small variance, maybe we misunderstand something). Then Ledoux \cite{12} provided a very streamlined proof to show a general result that PI is equivalent to the quadratic transportation-variance inequality ($W_2 V$ for short)

$$W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq C_V \operatorname{Var}_\mu(f)$$
for $C_V = 4C_P$. We give two alternative proofs to this fact and achieve a smaller constant as $C_V = 2C_P$. On the contrary, various perturbation techniques ensure PI with a constant no more than $C_V$ if assume $W_2V$ (see also [12]).

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $\nu = f\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. The Poincaré inequality is equivalent to next every inequality:

1. $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)}$.
2. $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P \text{Var}_\mu(f)$.
3. $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P \inf_{p \geq 1} \left\{ p^2 \text{Var}_\mu(f) \right\}$.
4. $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P \inf_{p \geq 1} \left\{ p^2 (C_P \mu(\Gamma(f, f))) \right\}$.
5. $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P^2 \mu(\Gamma(f, f))$.

**Remark 1.2.** If assume (5) prior to PI, the perturbation technique ensures PI with a constant $\sqrt{2C_P}$. It is very interesting that if assume (1) first, the same technique gives us PI with the same constant $\sqrt{2C_P}$ again.

There are two approaches to this end. The first one is a shortcut based on the interpolation technique developed by Kuwada [11] and further by [12]. The other one appeals to the derivative formula of $W_2^2(P_t f\mu, \mu)$, which is slightly different from what Otto-Villani employed in [15, Lemma 2]. Our method doesn’t involve the theory of solving Fokker-Planck equation on Riemannian manifolds, so we have a by-product as reproving their lemma for nice initial data but avoiding the curvature condition.

Another by-product is to show the equivalence between the LSI and strict contraction of heat flow in Wasserstein space (here we actually mean a strictly exponential decay of $W_2^2(P_t f\mu, \mu)$ with some multiple) provided that the Bakry-Émery curvature has a lower bound. One can compare the following with the well known characterization of curvature-dimension condition through the heat flow contraction (see [2, Theorem 9.7.2] for this fact and [2, Subsection 3.4.5] for precise definition of curvature-dimension condition $CD(\rho, \infty)$).

**Proposition 1.3.** Assume $V$ is a smooth potential such that the curvature-dimension condition $CD(\rho, \infty)$ holds. Then the next two statements are equivalent:

1. there exist two constants $C > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$ and any $\nu = f\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$
   
   $W_2^2(P_t \nu, \mu) \leq Ce^{-\kappa t} W_2^2(\nu, \mu)$;

2. there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that the LSI holds.

**Remark 1.4.** The constants involved here may depend on $\rho$. If the LSI holds, then we have $\kappa = \frac{1}{4} C_L$.

Next, we are interested in the comparison of $W_2^2(\nu, \mu)$ to $\text{Var}_\mu(\sqrt{f})$ rather than $\text{Var}_\mu(f)$. In general, one can’t expect a strong form as $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq C \text{Var}_\mu(\sqrt{f})$, since from PI it follows $W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 4C_P \mu(\Gamma(f, f))$, which is called the quadratic transportation-information inequality ($W_2I$ for short, see [9]), and it is known that $W_2I$ is strictly stronger than PI and even than $W_2H$. Actually what we present first is a new inequality between the Wasserstein distance and its “centralization”, which may be viewed as a special counterpart of the Rothaus’ lemma for relative...
entropic (see [2, Lemma 5.1.4]), namely for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$
\[ \text{Ent}_\mu ((h + a)^2) \leq \text{Ent}_\mu (h^2) + 2\mu (h^2). \]

Precisely we have

**Theorem 1.5.** Let $\nu = f \mu$, $c = \mu (\sqrt{f})$ and $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}_\mu (\sqrt{f})$. Let $f_c = \frac{\sqrt{f} - c}{\sigma f_c}$. If the Poincaré inequality holds, then there exists two constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ such that
\[ W_2^2 (\nu, \mu) \leq C_1 \sigma^2 W_2^2 (f_c \mu, \mu) + C_2 \sigma^2. \]

**Remark 1.6.** For instance, we can take $C_1 = 2$ and $C_2 = 96C_P$. Actually our method implies that $C_1$ can approach 1 but should be strictly greater than 1. Moreover, $f_c$ can be extended to $\tilde{f}_\theta = \frac{\sqrt{f} - \theta \sigma^2}{\mu (\sqrt{f} - \theta \sigma^2)}$ for any $\theta \in (0, 2c)$ associated with two constants $C_1 (\theta)$ and $C_2 (\theta)$ depending on $\theta$.

As consequence, when $E$ has a finite diameter, it follows by the definition of $W_2$
\[ W_2^2 (\nu, \mu) \leq \sigma^2 (C_1 (\text{diam} E)^2 + C_2), \]
which can’t be directly concluded by Theorem 1.1 we think. Then it quickly derives $W_2 I$ from PI again. Moreover, a LSI holds by using the HWI inequality in [15] [16] [2] under the curvature-dimension condition $CD (\rho, \infty)$, with the control constant $C_L = \frac{\sqrt{CC}}{\rho (\sqrt{f} - \rho \sigma^2)}$ for $C = C_1 (\text{diam} E)^2 + C_2$. There is a lot of literature concerning LSI, for example one can compare the above conclusion with [15, Theorem 4.1] about the constant estimate on compact manifolds by means of semigroup analysis.

When $E$ is unbounded, we have at least by using [16, Proposition 7.10] that
\[ W_2^2 (\nu, \mu) \leq C \left( \sigma^2 + \int d^2 (x, \cdot) (\sqrt{f} - c)^2 d\mu \right). \]

It gives a direct way to derive $W_2 I$ from the so-called Lyapunov condition. Recall [13], the Lyapunov condition here means there exists such a function $W > 0$ satisfying that $W^{-1}$ is locally bounded and for some $c > 0, b > 0$ and $x_0 \in E$ holds in the sense of distribution
\[ LW \leq (-c d^2 (x, x_0) + b) W. \]

Partial proof in [13] applied the Bobkov-Götze’s characterization of $W_2 H$, namely there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $\mu (\exp (Q_C h)) \leq \exp (\mu (h))$ for all $h \in L^\infty (\mu)$, where $Q_C$ denotes the infimum-convolution operator and $Q_C h$ solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation $\frac{d}{dt} Q_C h + \frac{1}{2} \nabla Q_C h^2 = 0$ for initial data $h$, see [2] [3] for example. Nevertheless, facing the stability problem for $W_2 H$ under bounded perturbation, one needs various additional curvature conditions so far, for example see [13] [13]. When we turn to the same problem for $W_2 I$, it would be more robust if we can find a direct method to derive $W_2 I$ from [12] with no appearance of $W_2 H$. Actually, Theorem 1.5 takes on such a role.

The paper is organized as follows. In next Section 2 we give a quick proof to Theorem 1.1. In Section 3 and 4 we compute the derivative of quadratic Wasserstein distance along heat flow, and then complete the other proof of Theorem 1.1. The equivalence of the LSI and strict contraction of heat flow in Wasserstein space is shown in Section 5. Section 6 is devoted to the comparison inequality about centralization of quadratic Wasserstein distance, and Section 7 provides a direct proof of $W_2 I$ under the Lyapunov condition.
2. The first proof of Theorem 1.1

Recall the notation $\nu_t = P_t \mu$. According to [11] [12], for any bounded Lipschitz $h$ and any decreasing function $\lambda \in C^1(0, +\infty)$ with $\lambda(0) = 1$ and $\lim_{t \to \infty} \lambda(t) = 0$, one has a semigroup interpolation by virtue of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, integration by parts and the Hölder inequality that

$$
\int_E Q_1 h f d\mu - \int_E h d\mu = \int_E \int_0^\infty -\frac{d}{dt} Q_\lambda h P_t f dtd\mu
$$

$$
\quad = \int_E \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2} \lambda' |\nabla Q_\lambda h|^2 P_t f - Q_\lambda h \cdot LP_t f dtd\mu
$$

$$
\quad = \int_0^\infty \int_E \frac{1}{2} \lambda' |\nabla Q_\lambda h|^2 P_t f + \nabla Q_\lambda h \cdot \nabla LP_t f d\mu dt
$$

$$
\quad \leq \int_0^\infty -\frac{L_\mu(P_t f)}{2\lambda'} dt.
$$

Using the Kantorovich dual yields

$$W_2^2(\nu, \mu) = 2 \sup_h \left\{ \int_E Q_1 h f d\mu - \int E h d\mu \right\} \leq \int_0^\infty -\frac{L_\mu(P_t f)}{\lambda'} dt.
$$

It is flexible to choose a nice $\lambda$ to prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof.** It consists of two parts.

**Part 1.** First of all, using the Jensen inequality yields that

$$\text{Ent}_\mu(f) = \int f \log \frac{f}{\mu(f)} d\mu \leq \int f \cdot \frac{f - \mu(f)}{\mu(f)} d\mu = \frac{1}{\mu(f)} \text{Var}_\mu(f).$$

For $\mu(f) = 1$, we have $\text{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq \text{Var}_\mu(f)$. If PI holds with a constant $C_P$, we have further

$$\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f) \leq \text{Var}_\mu(P_t f) \leq e^{-\frac{2C_P t}{\lambda'}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)},$$

and then $\sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)}$ is integrable on $[0, \infty)$. Let $\lambda(t) = \frac{\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)} dt}{\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)} dt}$, it follows

$$W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq \int_0^\infty \frac{L_\mu(P_t f)}{\sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)}} dt \cdot \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)} dt
$$

$$\quad = 2\sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)} dt
$$

$$\quad \leq 2\sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{2C_P t}{\lambda'}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)} dt
$$

$$\quad = 2C_P \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)}.
$$

Inversely, assume there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)}.$$

Various perturbation techniques give PI with a constant $\sqrt{2C}$, see [12] [17] and the references therein. For completeness, we write down a sketch.

Let $h$ be smoothing and bounded with $\mu(h) = 0$. Let $f_1 = 1 + \lambda h$ for $t \approx 0$ and some parameter $\lambda > 0$. It follows from [13] that

$$2 \int Q_1(th)f_1 d\mu \leq W_2^2(f_1, \mu) \leq 2C \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f_1)} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f_1)}.$$
Substituting the Taylor’s expansion $Q_1(th) = tQ_t h = ht - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla h|^2 t^2 + o(t^2)$ at $t = 0$ into the above inequality yields

\begin{equation}
- \mu(\Gamma(h, h)) + 2\lambda \mu(h^2) \leq \sqrt{2C} \lambda^2 \mu(h^2),
\end{equation}

which implies PI by taking $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} C^{-1}$. We obtain the equivalence between PI and \eqref{2.1} now.

**Part 2.** When we bound relative entropy by other functionals, it should lead to new types of transportation-variance inequalities. Indeed, for any $p \geq 1$ holds

\begin{align*}
\text{Ent}_\mu(f) &= \int f \log f \, d\mu \\
&\leq \log \mu(f^2) = \log(\text{Var}_\mu(f) + 1) \\
&\leq p \log((\text{Var}_\mu(f))^\frac{1}{p} + 1) \leq p(\text{Var}_\mu(f))^\frac{1}{p}.
\end{align*}

If PI holds, it follows similarly for any $p \geq 1$

\begin{align*}
W^2_2(\nu, \mu) &\leq 2 \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)} \, dt \\
&\leq 2p \text{Var}_\mu^\frac{1}{p} (f) \int_0^\infty \text{Var}_\mu^\frac{1}{p} (P_t f) \, dt \\
&\leq 2C_P p^2 \text{Var}_\mu^\frac{1}{p}(f),
\end{align*}

which covers the second inequality in Theorem 1.1 for $p = 1$ and also gives the third one

\begin{equation}
W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P \inf_{p \geq 1} \left\{ p^2(\text{Var}_\mu(f))^\frac{1}{p} \right\}.
\end{equation}

Using PI again yields

\begin{align*}
W^2_2(\nu, \mu) &\leq 2C_P \inf_{p \geq 1} \left\{ p^2(\text{Var}_\mu(f))^\frac{1}{p} \right\} \leq 2C_P \inf_{p \geq 1} \left\{ p^2(C_P \mu(\Gamma(f, f)))^\frac{1}{p} \right\},
\end{align*}

which gives the fourth inequality in Theorem 1.1. It follows the fifth inequality by taking $p = 1$ that

\begin{equation}
W^2_2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P^2 \mu(\Gamma(f, f)).
\end{equation}

Inversely, still following the routine of perturbation technique, \eqref{2.3} implies PI too. More precisely, recall the first part, we have a similar result as \eqref{2.2} that

\[- \mu(\Gamma(h, h)) + 2\lambda \mu(h^2) \leq 2C_P^2 \lambda^2 \mu(\Gamma(h, h)),
\]

which implies PI with a constant $\sqrt{2}C_P$ by taking $\lambda = (\sqrt{2}C_P)^{-1}$. \hfill \Box

3. Derivative of quadratic Wasserstein distance along heat flow

In this section, we compute the derivative formula of $W_2(\nu_t, \mu)$ for $\frac{d\nu_t}{d\mu} = P_t f$. Recall that, in our notation, Otto-Villani [15, Lemma 2] (see [16, Subsection 9.3.4] also) was actually concerned to the upper right-hand derivative of $W_2(\nu, \nu_t)$ and found a bound as

\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt}^+ W_2(\nu, \nu_t) \leq \limsup_{s \to 0^+} W_2(\nu_t, \nu_{t+s})/s \leq \sqrt{L_\mu(P_t f)},
\end{equation}

where $L_\mu(P_t f)$ is the quadratic transportation-variance inequality.
provided that $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $D^2V \geq \rho I$ for some $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ (namely the curvature-dimension condition $CD(\rho, \infty)$). The difference between $W_2(\nu_t, \mu)$ and $W_2(\nu, \nu_t)$ is that the former might be integrable for $t \in [0, +\infty)$.

According to [16] Exercise 2.36, there exists $h_t \in L^1(\mu)$ such that $\mu(h_t) = 0$, and its infimum-convolution satisfies

$$Q_1 h_t := \inf_y \left\{ h_t(y) + \frac{1}{2} d^2(x, y) \right\} \in L^1(\nu_t),$$

and the conjugate pair $(Q_1 h_t, h_t)$ attains the supremum as

$$(3.2) \quad W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu) = 2 \sup_{\nu(\phi) = 0} \int Q_1 \phi d\nu_t = 2 \int Q_1 h_t d\nu_t = 2 \int Q_1 h_t P_t f d\mu.$$ 

For nice initial data, we obtain the derivative formula for $W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu)$ with no condition on curvature.

**Lemma 3.1.** Assume $f$ is smoothing and has a positive lower bound. Assume $L f$ is bounded. Then there exists some $h_t \in L^1(\mu)$ satisfying (3.2) such that for almost all $t > 0$

$$\frac{d}{dt} W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu) = 2 \int Q_1 h_t L P_t f d\mu.$$ 

Moreover $|\frac{d}{dt} W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu)| \leq 2W(\nu_t, \mu)\sqrt{\mu(P_t)}$.

**Proof.** It consists of four steps. Note that $L^1(\nu_t) \subset L^1(\mu)$ in our case since $f$ has a positive lower bound and then $\nu_t(|h|) \geq \inf f \cdot \mu(|h|)$. The assumption of $L f \in L^\infty$ is reasonable due to that the resolvent operator $R_\lambda$ sends $C_b(E)$ into $C_b(E) \cap D(L)$ and $R_\lambda^{-1} = -L + \lambda I$ (see for example Evans [7] Subsection 7.4.1).

**Step 1.** To show the continuity of $W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu)$ in $t$.

For any $t, t' > 0$ and any test function $h \in C_b(E)$ or $h = d^2(x_0, \cdot)$, we have

$$|\nu_t(h) - \nu_t(h)| = \left| \int E h \int_t^{t'} L P_s f ds d\mu \right| \leq |t' - t| \cdot ||L f||_\infty \cdot \mu(|h|),$$

which implies $\nu_t$ is continuous in the topology of weak convergence and $\nu_t(d^2(x_0, \cdot))$ is also continuous. According to [16] Theorem 7.12, it is known that quadratic Wasserstein distance metrizes weak convergence, namely $W_2(\nu_t, \nu_t) \to 0$ in $t' \to t$. It follows from the triangle inequality $|W_2(\nu_t, \mu) - W_2(\nu_t, \nu_t)| \leq W_2(\nu_t, \nu_t)$ that $W_2(\nu_t, \mu)$ is continuous as well.

**Step 2.** To choose a conjugate pair $(Q_1 h_t, h_t)$ satisfying (3.2) and some auxiliary “maximality” (which will be introduced in (3.3) and applied for next step).

First of all, let $(Q_1 \tilde{h}_t, \tilde{h}_t) \in L^1(\nu_t) \times L^1(\mu)$ satisfy $\mu(\tilde{h}_t) = 0$ and

$$W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu) = 2 \int Q_1 \tilde{h}_t d\nu_t.$$ 

Take a sequence of bounded Lipschitz functions $\{\tilde{h}_{k, t}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mu(\tilde{h}_{k, t}) = 0$ and $(Q_1 \tilde{h}_{k, t}, \tilde{h}_{k, t})$ tends to $(Q_1 \tilde{h}_t, \tilde{h}_t)$ in $L^1(\nu_t) \times L^1(\mu)$ as $k \to \infty$. Then $Q_1(h_{k, t})$ is bounded Lipschitz too (see [7] Subsection 3.3.2), and there exists $u_k \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$(3.3) \quad \int Q_1((1 - u_k)\tilde{h}_{k, t}) d\nu_t = \sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \int Q_1((1 - u)\tilde{h}_{k, t}) d\nu_t.$$ 

Denote $h_{k, t} = (1 - u_k)\tilde{h}_{k, t}$. 

---
Without loss of generality, assume \( u_\infty = \lim_{k \to \infty} u_k \in [0, 1] \), denote
\[
h_t := (1 - u_\infty) \hat{h}_t = \lim_{k \to \infty} h_{k,t} \in L^1(\mu).
\]
By the definition of infimum convolution, we have
\[
h_{k,t} \geq Q_1 h_{k,t} = (1 - u_k)Q_{1 - u_k} \hat{h}_{k,t} \geq (1 - u_k)Q_1 \hat{h}_{k,t},
\]
which means that \( Q_1 h_{k,t} \) falls between two \( L^1 \)-convergent sequences. By virtue of the Prokhorov theorem (namely the tightness argument), besides \( L^1(\nu_t) \subset L^1(\mu) \), one can extract a subsequence of \( Q_1 h_{k,t} \) (denoted by itself for the ease of notation) converging in \( L^1(\nu_t) \). Denote \( \phi_t = \lim_{k \to \infty} Q_1 h_{k,t} \), which satisfies
\[
\phi_t(x) - h_t(y) \leq \frac{1}{2} d^2(x, y)
\]
almost everywhere and then (since \( \mu(h_t) = 0 \))
\[
2\nu_t(\phi_t) \leq W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu).
\]
On the other hand, due to the definition of \( h_{k,t} \) in (3.3), it follows
\[
2\nu_t(\phi_t) = \lim_{k \to \infty} 2\nu_t(Q_1 h_{k,t}) \geq \lim_{k \to \infty} 2\nu_t(Q_1 \hat{h}_{k,t}) = W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu).
\]
Hence, \( (\phi_t, h_t) \) attains the supremum of the dual Kantorovich problem too.

For any positive \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) with \( \alpha + \beta = 1 \), we have
\[
\alpha Q_1 \hat{h}_t + \beta \phi_t \leq \alpha Q_1 \hat{h}_t + \beta Q_1 h_t \leq Q_1 (\alpha \hat{h}_t + \beta h_t),
\]
which implies
\[
(3.4) \ W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu) = 2 \int \alpha Q_1 \hat{h}_t + \beta \phi_t d\nu \leq 2 \int Q_1 (\alpha \hat{h}_t + \beta h_t) d\nu \leq W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu).
\]
It follows \( \phi_t = Q_1 \hat{h}_t \) almost everywhere.

**Step 3.** To estimate upper and lower derivatives.

For \( (Q_1 h_t, h_t) \), we have
\[
\overline{D}_t^+ := \limsup_{s \to 0^+} \frac{W_2^2(\nu_{t+s}, \mu) - W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu)}{s}
\]
\[
\geq \lim_{s \to 0^+} \frac{2}{s} \left( \int Q_1 h_t d\nu_{t+s} - \int Q_1 h_t d\nu_t \right) = 2 \int Q_1 h_t \, L_P f \, d\mu.
\]
Similarly, we have
\[
\overline{D}_t^- := \liminf_{s \to 0^+} \frac{W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu) - W_2^2(\nu_{t-s}, \mu)}{s}
\]
\[
\leq \lim_{s \to 0^+} \frac{2}{s} \left( \int Q_1 h_t d\nu_t - \int Q_1 h_{t-s} d\nu_t \right) = 2 \int Q_1 h_t \, L_P f \, d\mu.
\]
Recall the approximating sequence \( (Q_1 h_{k,t}, h_{k,t}) \), using integration by parts and the Hölder inequality yields that
\[
\left| \int Q_1 h_{k,t} \, L_P f \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int \nabla Q_1 h_{k,t} \nabla P_t f \, d\mu \right| \leq \sqrt{\int |\nabla Q_1 h_{k,t}|^2 \, d\nu_t \cdot \sqrt{1(P_t f)}}.
\]
Since $Q_u h_{k,t}$ solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation $\frac{\partial}{\partial u} Q_u h_{k,t} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 Q_u h_{k,t} = 0$ (see [2, Subsection 3.3.2]), we have by (3.3) that

$$\int |\nabla Q_{1 h_{k,t}}|^2 d\nu_t = \lim_{u \to 0^+} 2 \int \frac{Q_{1 - u h_{k,t}} - Q_{1 h_{k,t}}}{u} d\nu_t$$

$$= \lim_{u \to 0^+} 2 \int \frac{1}{u} Q_{1}((1 - u) h_{k,t}) - Q_{1 h_{k,t}} d\nu_t$$

$$\leq \lim_{u \to 0^+} 2 \cdot \frac{1}{u} \cdot \int Q_{1 h_{k,t}} d\nu_t \leq W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu),$$

which implies by taking $k \to \infty$

$$2 \left| \int Q_{1 h_{t}} L P_t f d\mu \right| \leq 2 W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu) \sqrt{I_t(P_t f)} =: A_t. \tag{3.7}$$

**Step 4.** To show the Lipschitz property of $W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu)$.

Fix arbitrary $b > a > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, for any $t \in [a, b]$, there exists $\eta_t \in (0, b - a]$ by using (3.5) and (3.7) such that for all $s \in [0, \eta_t]$

$$W^2_2(\nu_{t+s}, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu) > s \left( 2 \int Q_{1 h_{t}} L P_t f d\mu - \varepsilon \right) \geq -s(A_t + \varepsilon).$$

On the other hand, the continuity of $W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu)$ implies there exists $\tilde{\eta}_t > 0$ such that for all $-s \in [-\tilde{\eta}_t, 0]$

$$W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_{t-s}, \mu) > -\eta_t(A_t + \varepsilon).$$

Then there is an open covering $\{(t - \tilde{\eta}_t, t + \eta_t) : t \in [a, b]\}$, and we need to choose a finite sub-covering. Starting from $a$, one can successively take the $i$-th open interval $I_i = (t_i - \tilde{\eta}_t, t_i + \eta_t)$ for $i \geq 0$ such that

$$t_0 = a, \ t_i > t_{i-1} + \eta_{t_{i-1}} > t_i - \tilde{\eta}_t.$$

By reduction to absurdity, this procedure can be ended at $b$ in a finite number of steps (say $N$ steps). Hence we obtain

$$W^2_2(\nu_b, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_a, \mu) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} W^2_2(\nu_{t_j}, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_{t_{j-1}}, \mu)$$

$$\geq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( W^2_2(\nu_{t_j}, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_{t_{j-1} + \eta_{t_{j-1}}}, \mu) \right) + \left( W^2_2(\nu_{t_{j-1} + \eta_{t_{j-1}}}, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_{t_{j-1}}, \mu) \right)$$

$$\geq \sum_{j=1}^{N} -\eta_t(A_t + \varepsilon) \cdot -\eta_{t_{j-1}}(A_{t_{j-1}} + \varepsilon) \geq -3(b - a) \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} A_t + \varepsilon \right).$$

Similarly, it follows from (3.6) and (3.7) that

$$W^2_2(\nu_b, \mu) - W^2_2(\nu_a, \mu) \leq 3(b - a) \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} A_t + \varepsilon \right).$$

Combining the above estimates yields that $W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu)$ is locally Lipschitz and then has a derivative for almost all $t > 0$ as

$$\frac{d}{dt} W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu) = 2 \int Q_{1 h_{t}} L P_t f d\mu.$$
It follows that for almost all $t > 0$
\[
\left| \frac{d}{dt} W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu) \right| \leq A_t,
\]
which can be rewritten to
\[
\left| \frac{d}{dt} W_2(\nu_t, \mu) \right| \leq \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)}.
\]
The proof is completed. 

**Remark 3.2.** It is interesting to ask further that whether $h_t = \tilde{h}_t$ (namely $u_\infty = 0$). From (3.4), we know that for almost every $\xi$, exponentially fast due to that for any continuous $h$ where the integrability of $\nabla h$ we have
\[
\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f) \approx \int \nu_t(x) \sqrt{\text{Var}_\nu(h(x))} d\nu_t(x).
\]

From part of [15, Lemma 3] yields $\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f) \rightarrow 0$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$. Using the same method in the second part of [15] Lemma 3] yields $W_2(\nu_t, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ too. More precisely, $W_2(\nu_t, \mu)$ decays exponentially fast due to that for any continuous $\xi$ with $|\xi(x)| \leq C(d^2(x_0, x) + 1)$,
\[
\left| \int \xi \nu_t - \int \xi \mu \right| \leq C \int |P_t f - 1|(d^2(x_0, \cdot) + 1) d\mu
\]
\[
\leq C \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(P_t f)} \sqrt{\mu((d^2(x_0, \cdot) + 1)^2)},
\]
where the integrability of $d^2(x_0, \cdot)$ comes from PI as well.

For simplicity, assume $f$ fulfills all the conditions in Lemma 2. Using (3.7) and Hölder inequality yields for any $t > 0$
\[
W^2_2(\nu_t, \mu) = \int_t^\infty \frac{d}{ds} W^2_2(\nu_s, \mu) ds \leq 2 \int_t^\infty W_2(\nu_s, \mu) \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_s f)} ds
\]
\[
\leq 2 \sqrt{\int_t^\infty W_2^2(\nu_s, \mu) ds} \cdot \sqrt{\int_t^\infty \text{Ent}_\mu(P_s f) ds}
\]
\[
(4.1)
\]
\[
= 2 \sqrt{\int_t^\infty W_2^2(\nu_s, \mu) ds} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(P_t f)}
\]
\[
(4.2)
\]
\[
\leq 2 \sqrt{\int_t^\infty W_2^2(\nu_s, \mu) ds} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(P_t f)}.
\]
Denote $W_t = \sqrt{\int_t^\infty W_2^2(\nu_s, \mu) \, ds}$ (it is finite since $W_2(\nu, \mu)$ decays exponentially fast), the above estimate can be written to

$$-\frac{d}{dt} W_t \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(P_t f)} \leq \exp\{-t/C_P\} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)}.$$

and then

$$W_t = \int_t^\infty -\frac{d}{ds} W_s \, ds \leq \int_t^\infty \exp\{-s/C_P\} ds \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)} = C_P \exp\{-t/C_P\} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(f)}.$$

Recall (4.2), we have for $t = 0$

$$W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_P \text{Var}_\mu(f).$$

Substituting the above estimate back to (4.1) for $t = 0$ gives us

$$W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2 \sqrt{\int_0^\infty 2C_P \text{Var}_\mu(P_t f) \, ds \cdot \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)}} \leq 2 \sqrt{\int_0^\infty 2C_P \exp\left(-\frac{2}{C_P} s\right) \text{Var}_\mu(f) \, ds \cdot \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)}}$$

(4.3)

$$ = 2C_P \text{Var}_\mu(f) \cdot \sqrt{\text{Ent}_\mu(f)}.$$

This result can be extended to $f \in L^2(\mu)$ by approximation.

The following steps are the same as those in Section 2. □

By the way, if one is concerned to the quantity $W_2^2(\nu_t, \mu)$ for $\frac{d\nu_t}{d\mu} = \frac{P_t \sqrt{\psi}}{\mu(P_t \sqrt{\psi})}$, it also decays exponentially fast provided that PI holds. Firstly we have for any $g^2 \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ (denote $m = \mu(g)$ and $\sigma^2 = \mu(\langle P_t g - m \rangle^2)$)

$$\text{Var}_\mu(g^2) \leq \int |g^2 - m^2|^2 \, d\mu \leq 2 \int |g - m|^4 \, d\mu + 8m^2 \int |g - m|^2 \, d\mu.$$

Then it follows from PI that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mu \left(\langle P_t g - m \rangle^4\right) = -12 \mu \left(\langle P_t g - m \rangle^2 |\nabla P_t g|^2\right) \leq -3C_P^{-1} \mu \left(\langle P_t g - m \rangle^2 - \sigma^2\right)^2 \leq -3C_P^{-1} \mu \left(\langle P_t g - m \rangle^4 - \sigma^4\right),$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sigma^4 = -4 \sigma^2 \mu \left(\nabla P_t g|^2\right) \leq -4C_P^{-1} \sigma^4.$$

Set $\Lambda_t = \mu \left(\langle P_t g - m \rangle^4\right) + \lambda \sigma^4$ with the parameter $\lambda$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Lambda_t \leq C_P^{-1} (-3\Lambda_t + (3 - \lambda)\sigma^4),$$

which implies by taking $\lambda = 3$ that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Lambda_t \leq -3C_P^{-1} \Lambda_t$$

and then $\Lambda_t \leq \exp\left(-3C_P^{-1} t\right) \Lambda_0$. 
Hence using Theorem 1.3 yields for $g = \sqrt{T}$ that

\[
W^2_2(\tilde{\nu}_t, \mu) \leq 2C_P \text{Var}_\mu \left( \frac{d\tilde{\nu}_t}{d\mu} \right) \leq \frac{2C_P}{\mu((P_t g)^2)} \text{Var}_\mu \left( (P_t g)^2 \right) \leq \frac{4C_P}{m^4} (\Lambda_t + 4m^2\sigma^2_t) \leq \frac{4C_P}{m^4} (e^{-3C^{-1}t}\Lambda_0 + e^{-2C^{-1}t}4m^2\sigma^2_0),
\]

where the total rate is no more than $e^{-2C^{-1}t}$.

5. The logarithmic Sobolev inequality and strict contraction of heat flow in Wasserstein space

In this section, we prove Proposition 1.3. The curvature-dimension condition plays a fundamental role such that we can compare several functionals for heat flow at different times. The derivative estimate in previous section is also useful.

Proof. Assume $V$ is a smooth potential such that the curvature-dimension condition $CD(\rho, \infty)$ holds.

If the LSI holds, it is known that the entropy along heat flow decays exponentially fast. Moreover, the Talagrand inequality comes true (see [15] or [2, Theorem 9.6.1]), namely for any positive bounded $f$ and any $t > T > 0$

\[
W^2_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu) \leq 2C_L \text{Ent}_\mu \left( P_t f \right) \leq 2C_L e^{C_L(t-T)} \text{Ent}_\mu \left( P_T f \right).
\]

On the other hand, based on the so-called logarithmic Harnack inequality (see [2, Remark 5.6.2])

\[
P_T(\log f)(x) \leq \log P_T f(y) + \frac{\rho d(x, y)^2}{2(e^{2\rho T} - 1)},
\]

it follows from the the same argument as [2, Page 446] that

\[
\text{Ent}_\mu(P_T f) \leq \frac{1}{2\gamma(T)} W^2_2(f, \mu, \mu),
\]

where $\frac{1}{2\gamma(T)} = \frac{1}{1-e^{-2\rho T}} - \rho = \frac{1}{2\rho}$ for $\rho = 0$. Combining the above estimates yields

\[
W^2_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu) \leq \gamma(T)e^{-C_L t} W^2_2(f, \mu, \mu)
\]

by letting $\gamma(T) = \frac{2C_L e^{C_L T}}{2\rho(T)}$, which attains its minimum at $T_0 = \frac{1}{2\rho T} \log (1 + \frac{2\rho}{C_L})$. Now we obtain the exponential decay for $t > T_0$.

For $t \leq T_0$, there is a general bound according to the heat flow contraction in Wasserstein space (see [2, Theorem 9.7.2]) as

\[
W^2_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu) \leq e^{-2\rho t} W^2_2(f, \mu, \mu) = e^{(C_L -2\rho)t} e^{-C_L t} W^2_2(f, \mu, \mu).
\]

Combining two regimes gives us a control constant $C := \sqrt{\max\{\gamma(T_0), e^{(C_L -2\rho)T_0}, 1\}}$ such that for all $t > 0$ and $\kappa := \frac{1}{2}C_L$

\[
W_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu) \leq Ce^{-\kappa t} W_2(f, \mu, \mu).
\]

Conversely, if $W^2_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu)$ contracts exponentially fast, there exists $t$ such that $\eta := Ce^{-\kappa t} < 1$. Using the derivative estimate for nice $f$ (see Lemma 3.1) yields

\[
W^2_2(f, \mu, \mu) = W^2_2(f, \mu, \mu) - W^2_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu) + W^2_2(P_t f, \mu, \mu)
\]
explicitly taking $\varepsilon$ we have further where the last step comes from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. It follows $W$ we complete the proof. (see [15] or [2, Subsection 9.3])

Based on the information estimate (see [2, Eq. 5.7.4])

Since $W^2$ the Cauchy-Schwarz, Hölder and Poincaré inequalities yields for any $\mu$

For convenience, denote the right-hand three terms by $I_1, I_2, I_3$ respectively. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz, Hölder and Poincaré inequalities yields for any $\lambda > 0$

6. CENTRALIZATION OF QUADRATIC WASSERSTEIN DISTANCE

Recall the notation $c = \mu(\sqrt{f})$ and $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}_\mu(\sqrt{f})$, now we prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof. For any bounded Lipschitz $h$ with $\mu(h) = 0$, let $m_t = \mu(Q_t h)$, we have

\[ \mu(Q_t h f) = \int Q_t h(\sqrt{f} - c)^2 \text{d}\mu + 2c \int Q_t h(\sqrt{f} - c) \text{d}\mu + c^2 \int Q_t h \text{d}\mu \]

Taking any interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and nonnegative $\phi \in L^\infty([a, b])$, we integrate both sides to get

\[ I_0 := \int_a^b \mu(Q_t h f) \phi(t) \text{d}t \]

\[ = \int_a^b \mu(Q_t h(\sqrt{f} - c)^2) \phi(t) \text{d}t + 2c \int_a^b \mu((Q_t h - m_t)(\sqrt{f} - c)) \phi(t) \text{d}t + c^2 \int_a^b m_t \phi(t) \text{d}t. \]

For convenience, denote the right-hand three terms by $I_1, I_2, I_3$ respectively. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz, Hölder and Poincaré inequalities yields for any $\lambda > 0$

\[ I_2 = 2c \int_a^b \int_a^b (Q_t h - m_t) \phi(t) \text{d}t (\sqrt{f} - c) \text{d}\mu. \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\leq & \quad \lambda c^2 \int_a^b \left( \int_a^b (Q_t h - m_t) \phi(t) dt \right)^2 d\mu + \frac{1}{\lambda} \mu((\sqrt{f} - c)^2) \\
\leq & \quad \lambda c^2 (b-a) \int_a^b (Q_t h - m_t)^2 \phi^2(t) dt d\mu + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sigma^2 \\
= & \quad \lambda c^2 (b-a) \int_a^b \mu ((Q_t h - m_t)^2) \phi^2(t) dt + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sigma^2 \\
\leq & \quad \lambda c^2 (b-a) C_P \int_a^b \mu (|\nabla Q_t|^2) \phi^2(t) dt + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sigma^2 \\
= & \quad 2 \lambda c^2 (b-a) C_P \int_a^b -\frac{d}{dt} Q_t h \phi^2(t) dt d\mu + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sigma^2,
\end{align*}
\]
where the last step comes from the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Using the integration by parts gives
\[
\int_a^b \frac{d}{dt} Q_t h \phi^2(t) dt = Q_a h \phi^2(a) - Q_b h \phi^2(b) + \int_a^b Q_t h \cdot 2 \phi \phi' dt.
\]
If \( \phi(a) = \phi(b) = 0 \), we have further
\[
\mathbb{I}_2 \leq 4 \lambda c^2 (b-a) C_P \int_a^b m_t \phi \phi' dt + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sigma^2,
\]
and then
\[
\mathbb{I}_2 + \mathbb{I}_3 \leq c^2 \int_a^b m_t \phi [4 \lambda (b-a) C_P \phi' + 1] dt + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sigma^2.
\]
Now we want to drop the first integral on the right side of above inequality. For instance, take \( a = \frac{1}{2}, b = 1, \phi(t) = (t-a)(b-t) \) (satisfying \( \phi(a) = \phi(b) = 0, \phi \geq 0 \) and \( |\phi'| \leq \frac{1}{2} \)), and \( \lambda = C_P^{-1} \), then for \( t \in [a, b] \), the quantity
\[
\psi := (4 \lambda (b-a) C_P \phi' + 1) \geq 0,
\]
which implies \( \int_a^b m_t \phi \psi dt \leq 0 \) since the monotonicity of \( Q_t \) in \( t \) gives \( m_t = \mu(Q_t h) \leq \mu(h) = 0 \). Hence \( \mathbb{I}_2 + \mathbb{I}_3 \leq C_P \sigma^2 \).

Finally, combining all above estimates yields
\[
\mathbb{I}_0 \leq \mathbb{I}_1 + C_P \sigma^2.
\]
Denote \( M = \int_a^b \phi dt = \frac{1}{2} \), it follows
\[
M \cdot \mu(Q_b h \phi) \leq \mathbb{I}_0 \leq \mathbb{I}_1 + C_P \sigma^2 \leq M \cdot \mu(Q_a h (\sqrt{f} - c)^2) + C_P \sigma^2,
\]
which implies by the Kantorovich dual of \( W_2 \)-distance that
\[
\frac{M}{2b} W_2^2(f, \mu) \leq \frac{M}{2a} \mathbb{I}_1 \leq \frac{M}{2a} \sigma^2 W_2 \left( \frac{(\sqrt{f} - c)^2}{\sigma^2}, \mu, \mu \right) + C_P \sigma^2.
\]
The proof is completed. \( \square \)

When we check the proof, for any \( \theta \) still holds
\[
\begin{align*}
\mu(Q_t h \phi) & = \mu(Q_t h (\sqrt{f} - \theta)^2) + 2 \theta \mu((Q_t h (\sqrt{f} - \theta)) + \theta^2 \mu(Q_t h) \\
& = \mu(Q_t h (\sqrt{f} - \theta)^2) + 2 \theta \mu((Q_t h - m_t)(\sqrt{f} - \theta)) + (2 \theta c - \theta^2 \mu(Q_t h) \\
& = \mu(Q_t h (\sqrt{f} - \theta)^2) + 2 \theta \mu((Q_t h - m_t)(\sqrt{f} - c)) + (2 \theta c - \theta^2 \mu(Q_t h).
\end{align*}
\]
Denote $\sigma_\theta^2 = \mu((\sqrt{f} - \theta)^2)$. Once $\theta \in (0, 2c)$, we have by the same argument

$$W_2^2(f, \mu, \mu) \leq C_1(\theta)\sigma_\theta^2 W_2^2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{f} - \theta}{\sigma_\theta} \mu, \mu \right) + C_2(\theta) C_P \sigma^2,$$

where $C_1(\theta)$ and $C_2(\theta)$ are two constants depending on $\theta$.

7. Application to quadratic transportation-information inequality

According to [4, 5, 13], the Lyapunov condition (1.2) implies that there are two constants $C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\int d^2(x_0, \cdot) h^2 d\mu \leq C_3 \int |\nabla h|^2 d\mu + C_4 \int h^2 d\mu,$$

and then implies $W_2 I$ by [13], which partially depends on two facts that (7.1) implies $W_2 H$ and $W_2 H$ has a Bobkov-Götze’s characterization.

Now there appears another way. For unbounded manifolds, (7.1) implies there exists some $r > 0$ such that

$$\int d^2(x_0, \cdot) h^2 d\mu \leq C_5 \int |\nabla h|^2 d\mu + C_6 \int_{d(x_0, \cdot) \leq r} h^2 d\mu,$$

which leads to PI by [1]. Then using Theorem [13] and (7.1) and PI yields

$$W_2^2(\nu, \mu) \leq 2C_1 \int \left( d^2(x_0, \cdot) + \mu \left( d^2(x_0, \cdot) \right) \right) \left( \sqrt{f} - c \right)^2 d\mu + C_2 \sigma^2 \leq C_7 I_\mu(\nu | \mu),$$

where we use the fact that for any $x$ and any bounded $h$ with $\mu(h) = 0$ holds

$$Q_1 h(x) \leq \int h(y) + \frac{1}{2} d^2(x, y) d\mu(y) \leq d^2(x_0, \cdot) + \mu \left( d^2(x_0, \cdot) \right).$$

Hence we reach $W_2 I$.
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