arXiv:1911.01469v1 [stat.ML] 4 Nov 2019

Proximal Langevin Algorithm: Rapid Convergence Under Isoperimetry

Andre Wibisono
College of Computing
Georgia Institute of Technology
wibisono@gatech.edu

November 24, 2021

Abstract

We study the Proximal Langevin Algorithm (PLA) for sampling from a probability distribution $\nu = e^{-f}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ under isoperimetry. We prove a convergence guarantee for PLA in Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence when ν satisfies log-Sobolev inequality (LSI) and f has bounded second and third derivatives. This improves on the result for the Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (ULA), and matches the fastest known rate for sampling under LSI (without Metropolis filter) with a better dependence on the LSI constant. We also prove convergence guarantees for PLA in Rényi divergence of order $q > 1$ when the biased limit satisfies either LSI or Poincaré inequality.

1 Introduction

Sampling is a fundamental algorithmic task. While the case of logconcave sampling is relatively well-studied, there are recent efforts in understanding the convergence guarantees for non-logconcave sampling. This is motivated by practical applications which require sampling complicated distributions in high-dimensional spaces, as well as by the recent progress in non-convex optimization.

In this paper we study the *Proximal Langevin Algorithm (PLA)* for sampling from a probability distribution $\nu = e^{-f}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \epsilon \nabla f(x_{k+1}) + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is step size and $z_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is an independent Gaussian random variable in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The above is an implicit update, and we assume we can solve for x_{k+1}, for example via the proximal step (see Section 2 for more detail):

$$x_{k+1} = \arg\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ f(x) + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \|x - (x_k + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k)\|^2 \right\}.$$

PLA is a discretization of the continuous-time Langevin dynamics that uses the backward (implicit) method for the gradient. It is an implicit variant of the Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (ULA), which uses the forward (explicit) method for the gradient. PLA was introduced by Pereyra [45] (in a more general form with Metropolis filter) from a smoothing perspective, and it was also proposed by Bernton [3] from an optimization perspective of sampling. PLA has been widely applied in practice, in particular when combined with ULA to sample from composite distributions [20, 9, 47, 38], and analyzed under logconcavity or strong logconcavity [3, 8, 4, 49]. Analogous to implicit vs. explicit methods in optimization, we expect PLA to have better properties than ULA at the cost of a more expensive per-iteration complexity (solving an optimization problem). See also [23, 52] for some recent extensions of PLA.

In this paper we prove convergence guarantees for PLA under *isoperimetry*, namely, when the target distribution ν satisfies either log-Sobolev inequality (LSI) or Poincaré inequality. Isoperimetry is a natural relaxation of logconcavity that still allows for fast sampling in continuous time. Strong logconcavity (SLC) implies LSI, and in turn implies Poincaré inequality with the same constant. Moreover, logconcavity and bounded diameter implies LSI and Poincaré inequality. However, isoperimetry is more general, as it is preserved under Lipschitz mapping and bounded perturbation, whereas logconcavity is not. Therefore, there is a wide class of probability distributions, including multimodal ones, satisfying isoperimetry.

In continuous time, isoperimetry is sufficient for fast sampling. For example, if ν satisfies LSI with constant $\alpha > 0$, then along the Langevin dynamics, the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence converges exponentially fast at rate 2α. This means the Langevin dynamics reaches KL divergence less than δ in time $t = O(\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \frac{1}{\delta})$. In particular, there is no dependence on dimension and no assumption on the smoothness of ν is required, beyond differentiability in order to run the Langevin dynamics. This is analogous to the exponential convergence of gradient flow for optimization in continuous time under gradient domination condition (via the perspective of sampling as optimization in the space of measures [24, 55]).

In discrete time, sampling is more challenging. We can discretize continuous-time dynamics to obtain algorithms, such as PLA or ULA above from the Langevin dynamics. We need some smoothness assumptions (bounds on derivatives of ν) to control the discretization error, so the iteration complexity now depends on the condition number. However, the discretization error leads to an asymptotic *bias*, which means the algorithm converges to the wrong distribution. This bias arises because in algorithms such as PLA or ULA we are applying mismatched splitting methods for solving a composite optimization problem in the space of measures; see [55] for more discussion.

It is possible to remove the bias by applying the Metropolis filter (accept-reject step) in each iteration; this has a geometric interpretation as projection in total variation (TV) distance [5]. With the Metropolis filter, it is possible to prove the algorithm still converges exponentially fast in discrete time, and obtain an iteration complexity of $O(\log \frac{1}{\delta})$ to reach error δ in TV distance with warm start and under various conditions such as strong logconcavity, isoperimetry, or distant dissipativity [7,

21, 37, 41]. However, if we want convergence in KL divergence—which is stronger—then Metropolis filter does not work because it makes the distributions singular (have point masses). Furthermore, Metropolis filter can slow down the algorithm in practice when the rejection probability is high.

In this paper we follow another approach, which is to control the convergence of the algorithm and the size of the bias, then choose a small enough step size to make the error less than any given threshold. This approach was pioneered by Dalalyan [15, 14] and Durmus and Moulines [19] to analyze ULA under strong logconcavity, and has been extended to many other algorithms. However, the bias becomes a bottleneck in complexity. The bias scales with some power of the step size ϵ, resulting in an iteration complexity which is polynomial in $\frac{1}{\delta}$ (rather than logarithmic as in continuous time) to reach error δ in KL divergence. For example, we show in [53] that under LSI and second-order smoothness, the bias of ULA is $O(\epsilon)$, resulting in an iteration complexity of $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\delta})$ (ignoring dimension dependence for now). However, basic considerations suggest the correct bias is $O(\epsilon^2)$ since ULA and PLA are first-order discretization, which will yield an iteration complexity of $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}})$. In this paper we show this is indeed the case for PLA under LSI and third-order smoothness.

Our main result is the following. We say $\nu = e^{-f}$ is (L, M)-smooth if $\|\nabla^2 f\| \le L$ and $\|\nabla^3 f\| \le M$. Here $H_\nu(\rho)$ is the KL divergence of ρ with respect to ν. See Theorem 1 in Section 2.3 for detail.

Theorem 1. *Assume ν satisfies α-LSI and is (L, M)-smooth. For any $x_0 \sim \rho_0$, the iterates $x_k \sim \rho_k$ of PLA with step size $0 < \epsilon \le \min\{\frac{1}{8L}, \frac{1}{M}, \frac{3\alpha}{32L^2}\}$ satisfies:*

$$H_\nu(\rho_k) \le e^{-\alpha\epsilon k} H_\nu(\rho_0) + \frac{34\,\epsilon^2 n(L^3 + 9n^2M^2)}{\alpha}. \tag{7}$$

This implies the following iteration complexity for PLA under LSI: to reach $H_\nu(\rho_k) \le \delta$, it suffices to run PLA with $\rho_0 = \mathcal{N}(x^*, \frac{1}{L}I)$ and step size $\epsilon = \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha\delta}{n(L^3+n^2M^2)}}\right)$ for

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}} + nM)}{\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \tag{1}$$

iterations. Here x^* is a stationary point of f ($\nabla f(x^*) = 0$), which we can find via gradient descent.

This improves on the result [53] for ULA, in which we show under α-LSI and (L, ∞)-smoothness, ULA has iteration complexity $k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{nL^2}{\alpha^2\delta}\right)$. However, as noted above, it is likely the analysis in [53] is not tight since it only implies a bias of $O(\epsilon)$ for ULA rather than $O(\epsilon^2)$ for PLA in Theorem 1. We prove Theorem 1 by comparing a continuous-time interpolation of PLA with the Langevin dynamics to establish a recurrence for the decrease of KL divergence in each iteration; this technique is similar to [53] and earlier papers [14, 12]. Our improvement comes because we can show a tight error bound for the interpolation of PLA by comparing it with the weighted Langevin dynamics; see Section 2.5. Furthermore, we illustrate in the Gaussian case that the bias is indeed $\Theta(\epsilon^2)$.

We note a recent work [42] improves the analysis of ULA under LSI and third-order smoothness with an additional dissipativity assumption, and shows an iteration complexity for ULA which is similar to our result (1) for PLA.

Algorithm	**Assumptions**	**Iterations to** $H_\nu(\rho_k) \le \delta$	**Iterations to** $W_2(\rho_k, \nu) \le \delta$
ULA [53]	α-LSI, (L, ∞)-smoothness	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{nL^2}{\alpha^2\delta}\right)$	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{nL^2}{\alpha^3\delta^2}\right)$
Underdamped Langevin dynamics [32]	α-LSI, (L, M)-smoothness	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}}+n^{\frac{1}{2}}M)}{\alpha^2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}}+n^{\frac{1}{2}}M)}{\alpha^{\frac{5}{2}}\delta}\right)$
Randomized midpoint for ULD [50]	α-SLC, (L, ∞)-smoothness	-	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{3}}L}{\alpha^{\frac{4}{3}}\delta^{\frac{2}{3}}}\right)$
PLA (this paper)	α-LSI, (L, M)-smoothness	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}}+nM)}{\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}}+nM)}{\alpha^2\delta}\right)$

Table 1: Iteration complexities for Langevin algorithms under LSI, and the fastest under SLC. Here $H_\nu(\rho)$ is the KL divergence and $W_2(\rho, \nu)$ is the Wasserstein distance.

Currently the fastest (in terms of error δ in KL divergence) algorithm for sampling under LSI is a discretization of the underdamped Langevin dynamics [32], which has iteration complexity $k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{1/2}(L^{3/2}+n^{1/2}M)}{\alpha^2\delta^{1/2}}\right)$ under α-LSI and (L, M)-smoothness to reach $H_\nu(\rho_k) \le \delta$. We see from (1) that PLA has the same dependence on δ but better dependence on α.

We recall LSI implies Talagrand's inequality, which bounds Wasserstein distance by KL divergence $W_2(\rho, \nu)^2 \le \frac{2}{\alpha} H_\nu(\rho)$. Then Theorem 1 also implies the iteration complexity for PLA to reach $W_2(\rho_k, \nu) \le \delta$ under α-LSI and (L, M)-smoothness is

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}} + nM)}{\alpha^2\delta}\right).$$

A previous analysis [3] shows an iteration complexity of $k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{nL}{\alpha\delta^2}\right)$ for PLA to reach $W_2(\rho_k, \nu) \le \delta$ under α-SLC and (L, ∞)-smoothness. Thus, our result shows a better iteration complexity for PLA under SLC and third-order smoothness.

We note for sampling under SLC, faster rates are achieveable via more advanced algorithms, whose analyses are made possible by coupling techniques. Currently the fastest algorithm is a randomized midpoint discretization of the underdamped Langevin dynamics [50], which has iteration complexity $k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{1/3}L}{\alpha^{4/3}\delta^{2/3}}\right)$ to reach $W_2(\rho_k, \nu) \le \delta$ under α-SLC and (L, ∞)-smoothness, and it can be made faster by parallelizing. See also [43] for a higher-order Langevin dynamics that achieves a similar iteration complexity under an additional separability assumption. Previously the fastest results were by Hamiltonian Monte Carlo [27, 11, 35, 36], various discretization of the overdamped or underdamped Langevin dynamics [17, 18, 12, 14, 16], or using higher-order integrators such as stochastic Runge-Kutta [28]. Thus, there is a gap between the known complexity for sampling under LSI and under SLC. It is interesting to understand whether these more advanced algorithms

can be analyzed under LSI, when coupling techniques no longer work.

We also note that for the case when ν is logconcave, there are other methods that can be used, including the ball walk and hit-and-run [25, 30, 31, 29], which have iteration complexity with logarithmic dependence on the error δ in TV distance or χ^2-divergence, and no dependence on the condition number.

Our second main result is a convergence guarantee for Rényi divergence of order $q > 1$ along PLA when the biased limit satisfies either LSI or Poincaré inequality. Rényi divergence of order $q > 1$ is a stronger generalization of KL divergence (which is the case $q = 1$) with fundamental applications in statistics, physics, and computer science [46, 51, 6, 22]. Under LSI, Rényi divergence converges exponentially fast along the Langevin dynamics. Under Poincaré inequality, Rényi divergence still converges along the Langevin dynamics, but now at a rate which is initially linear, then exponential. We show that when the biased limit ν_ϵ of PLA satisfies either LSI or Poincaré inequality, Rényi divergence with respect to ν_ϵ converges along PLA at the same speed as along the Langevin dynamics. We can combine this with a decomposition property of Rényi divergence to obtain an iteration complexity for PLA in Rényi divergence which is controlled by the size of the bias; see Theorem 2 in Section 3.2 and Theorem 3 in Section 3.3. Furthermore, the iteration complexity under Poincaré inequality is a factor of n larger than the complexity under LSI. These results are similar to the result [53] for ULA. However, we illustrate with an example in the Gaussian case that the bias in Rényi divergence of PLA is smaller (and always finite) than the bias of ULA (which can be infinite).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state the algorithm and main result on the convergence of KL divergence under LSI. In Section 3 we state the second result on the convergence of Rényi divergence under LSI or Poincaré inequality. In Section 4 we review the Langevin dynamics. In Sections 5 and 6 we provide proofs and details. We conclude with a discussion in Section 7.

2 Algorithm and main result

Let $\nu = e^{-f}$ be the target probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We assume $f\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable.

2.1 Proximal Langevin Algorithm

We study the **Proximal Langevin Algorithm (PLA)** that starts from any random variable $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and maintains the iterates

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \epsilon \nabla f(x_{k+1}) + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k \tag{2}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is step size and $z_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is an independent Gaussian random variable. The above is an implicit update, and we assume we can solve for x_{k+1}, for example via the proximal step:

$$x_{k+1} = \arg\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ f(x) + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \|x - (x_k + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k)\|^2 \right\}. \tag{3}$$

Indeed, the solution of (3) satisfies $\nabla f(x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}(x_{k+1} - (x_k + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k)) = 0$, which is (2). Note that the formulation (3) also makes sense when f is not differentiable. If f is $(1/\epsilon)$-smooth ($\|\nabla^2 f\| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}$), then (3) is a strongly convex optimization problem with a unique minimizer x_{k+1}, so PLA is well-defined. If f is convex, then the restriction $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{\|\nabla^2 f\|}$ can be removed.

Example 1. *Let $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ be Gaussian with mean 0 and covariance $\Sigma \succ 0$, so $\nabla f(x) = \Sigma^{-1} x$. The PLA iteration is $x_{k+1} = A(x_k + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k)$, so $x_k \overset{d}{=} A^k x_0 + \sqrt{2\epsilon} A (I - A^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (I - A^{2k})^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{z}_k$ where $A = (I + \epsilon \Sigma^{-1})^{-1}$ and $\tilde{z}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is independent. Note that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $A^k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$, PLA converges to $\nu_\epsilon = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\epsilon)$ where $\Sigma_\epsilon = 2\epsilon A^2 (I - A^2)^{-1} = \Sigma (I + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \Sigma^{-1})^{-1}$.*

PLA (in a more general form with a Metropolis filter) was first introduced in [45] from a smoothing perspective. PLA was also studied in [3] from the optimization perspective of sampling under logconcavity assumption.[1] PLA is the implicit variant of another popular algorithm, the Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (ULA), which is the explicit iteration $x_{k+1} = x_k - \epsilon \nabla f(x_k) + \sqrt{2\epsilon} z_k$. PLA and ULA are discretization of the Langevin dynamics in continuous time (see Section 4 for a review), where PLA applies the backward (implicit) method to discretize the gradient, while ULA applies the forward (explicit) method. This makes PLA more expensive to implement in practice, but it offers better behavior and analysis than ULA. For example, in the Gaussian case $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, recall ULA converges to $\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}})$ only for $\epsilon < 2\|\Sigma^{-1}\|^{-1}$, where $\Sigma_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}} = \Sigma(I - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1})^{-1}$; see also [55]. In this case PLA always converges and the bias is smaller than the bias of ULA.

Example 2 (PLA vs. ULA for Gaussian)**.** *Let $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. For $\epsilon > 0$, the limit of PLA is $\nu_\epsilon^{PLA} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(I + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1})^{-1})$. For $0 < \epsilon < 2\|\Sigma^{-1}\|^{-1}$, the limit of ULA is $\nu_\epsilon^{ULA} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(I - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1})^{-1})$. Let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n > 0$ denote the eigenvalues of Σ. The bias of PLA in relative entropy is*

$$H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{PLA}}) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(I + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1}\right) - n - \log\det\left(I + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2\lambda_i} - \log\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2\lambda_i}\right)\right)$$

while the bias of ULA is

$$H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}}) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(I - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1}\right) - n - \log\det\left(I - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Sigma^{-1}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2\lambda_i} - \log\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2\lambda_i}\right)\right).$$

Note that we always have

$$H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{PLA}}) < H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}}).$$

Furthermore, $H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{PLA}}) = \frac{1}{16}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\lambda_i^2} - \frac{\epsilon^3}{3\lambda_i^3}\right) + O(\epsilon^4)$ and $H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}}) = \frac{1}{16}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\lambda_i^2} + \frac{\epsilon^3}{3\lambda_i^3}\right) + O(\epsilon^4)$.

[1] Both [45, 3] apply the proximal step before the Gaussian step in each iteration, while PLA applies them in the opposite order. Over k iterations, both [45, 3] and PLA only differ by a single proximal or Gaussian step.

2.2 Log-Sobolev inequality and smoothness assumption

Before stating our results, we recall some definitions for the analysis.

2.2.1 Log-Sobolev inequality

Let ρ, ν be probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth densities and finite second moments. We recall the *relative entropy* (or Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence) of ρ with respect to ν is

$$H_\nu(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x) \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\nu(x)}\, dx. \tag{4}$$

Relative entropy has the property that $H_\nu(\rho) \geq 0$, and $H_\nu(\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\rho = \nu$. The *relative Fisher information* of ρ with respect to ν is

$$J_\nu(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x) \left\| \nabla \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\nu(x)} \right\|^2 dx. \tag{5}$$

The geometric meaning of relative Fisher information is as the squared gradient of relative entropy in the space of probability measures with the Wasserstein metric.

We recall ν satisfies *log-Sobolev inequality* (LSI) with constant $\alpha > 0$ if for all ρ,

$$H_\nu(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} J_\nu(\rho). \tag{6}$$

LSI has the geometric interpretation as the gradient domination condition for relative entropy in the Wasserstein space [44], which ensures the Langevin dynamics converges exponentially fast in continuous time; see Section 4 for a review. We recall $\nu = e^{-f}$ is *strongly logconcave* (SLC) with constant $\alpha > 0$ if f is α-strongly convex: $\nabla^2 f(x) \succeq \alpha I$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. SLC is a strong condition that allows the analysis of many sampling algorithms. However, SLC is brittle, as it is not preserved under perturbation or arbitrary mapping. A classic result by Bakry and Émery [2] shows that SLC implies LSI with the same constant α. Furthermore, LSI is more stable, as it is preserved under bounded perturbation and Lipschitz mapping. LSI also has an isoperimetric content as a bound on the log-Cheeger constant, see for example [26]. Therefore, LSI provides a natural condition to obtain fast sampling in discrete time.

2.2.2 Smoothness assumptions

We say $\nu = e^{-f}$ is (L, M)-*smooth* if f is three-times differentiable and satisfies the following two conditions:

1. The gradient ∇f is L-Lipschitz:

$$\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\| \qquad \text{for all } \; x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

   or equivalently, $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\text{op}} \leq L$, which means $-LI \preceq \nabla^2 f(x) \preceq LI$.

2. The Hessian $\nabla^2 f$ is M-Lipschitz in the operator norm:

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(y)\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le M\|x-y\| \qquad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This implies $\|\nabla_i \nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le M$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $\nabla_i \nabla^2 f(x)$ is the matrix with (j,k) entry $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(\nabla^2 f(x))_{jk} = \frac{\partial^3 f(x)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_k}$.

2.3 Main result: Convergence of relative entropy along PLA under LSI

Our first main result is the following convergence guarantee of relative entropy along PLA when the target distribution ν satisfies LSI and a smoothness assumption. We note that smoothness is only used in the analysis and not for the definition of PLA.

Here ρ_k is the distribution of x_k along PLA. We provide the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 2.5.

Theorem 1. *Assume ν satisfies α-LSI and is (L, M)-smooth. For any $x_0 \sim \rho_0$, the iterates $x_k \sim \rho_k$ of PLA with step size $0 < \epsilon \le \min\{\frac{1}{8L}, \frac{1}{M}, \frac{3\alpha}{32L^2}\}$ satisfies:*

$$H_\nu(\rho_k) \le e^{-\alpha\epsilon k} H_\nu(\rho_0) + \frac{34\,\epsilon^2 n(L^3 + 9n^2M^2)}{\alpha}. \tag{7}$$

As $k \to \infty$, this implies the bias of PLA is $H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon) \le \frac{34\,\epsilon^2 n(L^3+9n^2M^2)}{\alpha} = O(\epsilon^2)$. This bias is of the right order, since for Gaussian we have $H_\nu(\nu_\epsilon) = \Theta(\epsilon^2)$. This is smaller than the bias for ULA from [53], and thus yields a faster iteration complexity for PLA.

Concretely, given $\delta > 0$, to reach error $H_\nu(\rho_k) \le \delta$, it suffices to run PLA such that the two terms in (7) are each less than $\frac{\delta}{2}$: So we want to run PLA with step size $\epsilon \le \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\delta}{68\,n(L^3+9n^2M^2)}}$ for $k \ge \frac{1}{\alpha\epsilon}\log\left(\frac{2H_\nu(\rho_0)}{\delta}\right)$ iterations. If we start with a Gaussian $\rho_0 = \mathcal{N}(x^*, \frac{1}{L}I)$ where x^* is a stationary point ($\nabla f(x^*) = 0$, which we can find via gradient descent), then $H_\nu(\rho_0) \le f(x^*) + \frac{n}{2}\log\frac{L}{2\pi} = \tilde{O}(n)$, see [53, Lemma 1]. Therefore, Theorem 1 implies the following iteration complexity for PLA.

Corollary 1. *Assume ν satisfies α-LSI and is (L, M)-smooth. To reach $H_\nu(\rho_k) \le \delta$, it suffices to run PLA with $\rho_0 = \mathcal{N}(x^*, \frac{1}{L}I)$ and step size $\epsilon = \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha\delta}{n(L^3+n^2M^2)}}\right)$ for*

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha\epsilon}\right) = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}} + nM)}{\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \tag{8}$$

iterations.

This matches the best known rate (in terms of δ) for sampling under LSI, achieved by the underdamped Langevin algorithm [32], but PLA has better dependence on the LSI constant α.

Furthermore, since LSI implies Talagrand's inequality ($H_\nu(\rho) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} W_2(\rho,\nu)^2$) with the same constant [44], Theorem 1 also implies the iteration complexity for PLA to reach $W_2(\rho_k,\nu) \leq \delta$ under α-LSI and (L,M)-smoothness is

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}(L^{\frac{3}{2}} + nM)}{\alpha^2 \delta}\right). \tag{9}$$

2.4 Analysis of relative entropy in one step of PLA

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the following result which says relative entropy decreases by a constant factor with an additional $O(\epsilon^3)$ error term in each step of PLA; this leads to $O(\epsilon^2)$ bias for PLA as stated in Theorem 1. In contrast, recall the analogous result for ULA [53, Lemma 3] has $O(\epsilon^2)$ error in each iteration, which leads to $O(\epsilon)$ bias for ULA.

In the following, ρ_k is the probability distribution of the iterates x_k of PLA. We provide the proof of Lemma 1 in Section 5.1.

Lemma 1. *Assume ν satisfies α-LSI and is (L,M)-smooth, and $0 < \epsilon \leq \min\{\frac{1}{8L}, \frac{1}{M}, \frac{3\alpha}{32L^2}\}$. In each step of PLA, we have*

$$H_\nu(\rho_{k+1}) \leq e^{-\alpha\epsilon} H_\nu(\rho_k) + 32\epsilon^3 n(L^3 + 9n^2M^2). \tag{10}$$

Proof sketch. The output x_{k+1} of PLA (2) is the value at time $t = \epsilon$ of the stochastic process

$$X_t = X_0 - t\nabla f(X_t) + \sqrt{2} W_t \tag{11}$$

starting at $X_0 = x_k$, where W_t is the standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We show in Lemma 5 that $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ (11) evolves following the SDE

$$dX_t = \mu\, dt + \sqrt{2G}\, dW_t \tag{12}$$

where $\mu = -\sqrt{G}\left(\nabla f(X_t) + t\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(X_t) G)\right)$ and $G = (I + t\nabla^2 f(X_t))^{-2}$. Recall the Langevin dynamics with covariance G converges to $\nu = e^{-f}$ if the drift is $\nabla \cdot G - G\nabla f$ (see Section 4 for a review). The difference between (12) and the ideal drift is $\tilde{\mu} = \mu - \nabla \cdot G + G\nabla f(X_t)$. In Lemma 6 we show that $\frac{3}{4} I \preceq G \preceq \frac{4}{3} I$ and $\|\tilde{\mu}\| \leq \frac{4}{3} tL \|\nabla f(X_t)\| + 6tn^{\frac{3}{2}} M$. Using these bounds and the LSI assumption, we can show the time derivative of relative entropy along (12) is bounded by

$$\frac{d}{dt} H_\nu(\rho_t) \leq -\alpha H_\nu(\rho_t) + 16t^2 n\left(L^3 + 9n^2M^2\right). \tag{13}$$

Integrating (13) for $0 \leq t \leq \epsilon$ yields the desired bound (10). See Section 5.1 for a full proof. □

2.5 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. By iterating the bound from Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_\nu(\rho_k) &\le e^{-\alpha\epsilon k} H_\nu(\rho_0) + \frac{32\,\epsilon^3 n(L^3+9n^2M^2)}{1-e^{-\alpha\epsilon}} \\ &\le e^{-\alpha\epsilon k} H_\nu(\rho_0) + \frac{34\,\epsilon^2 n(L^3+9n^2M^2)}{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we use $1-e^{-c} \ge \frac{16}{17}c$ for $0 < c = \alpha\epsilon \le \frac{3}{32}$, which holds because $\epsilon \le \frac{3}{32}\frac{\alpha}{L^2} \le \frac{3}{32\alpha}$ by assumption. □

3 Convergence in Rényi divergence

Before stating our next result, we review the definition and some properties of Rényi divergence.

3.1 Rényi divergence

The *Rényi divergence* of order $q > 0$, $q \neq 1$, of a probability distribution ρ with respect to ν is

$$R_{q,\nu}(\rho) = \frac{1}{q-1} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\rho(x)^q}{\nu(x)^{q-1}} dx. \tag{14}$$

As $q \to 1$, Rényi divergence recovers the relative entropy (KL divergence): $\lim_{q\to 1} R_{q,\nu}(\rho) = H_\nu(\rho)$. Rényi divergence satisfies $R_{q,\nu}(\rho) \ge 0$ for all ρ, and $R_{q,\nu}(\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\rho = \nu$. Furthermore, $q \mapsto R_{q,\nu}(\rho)$ is increasing. Therefore, Rényi divergence of order $q > 1$ is a family of stronger generalizations of KL divergence. Rényi divergence has fundamental applications in statistics, physics, and computer science [46, 22, 1, 39, 13, 40, 51, 6]. We recall Rényi divergence converges exponentially fast along the Langevin dynamics under LSI; see Section 4.

Convergence guarantee of Rényi divergence for sampling in discrete time was first studied in [53], who show that Rényi divergence converges along ULA to its biased limit $\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}}$ at the same rate as along the Langevin dynamics when $\nu_\epsilon^{\mathrm{ULA}}$ itself satisfies either LSI or Poincaré inequality. We will show a similar convergence guarantee for PLA in Section 3.2. Thus, the iteration complexity is dominated by the bias $R_{q,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon)$. We recall the bias of ULA can be infinite for large enough q, even in the Gaussian case [53, Example 3]. On the other hand, the bias of PLA in the Gaussian case is always finite and smaller than the bias of ULA, as we show in the following example.

Example 3. *Let $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\alpha}I)$. For $\epsilon > 0$, the limit of PLA is $\nu_\epsilon^{PLA} = \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\alpha(1+\frac{\epsilon\alpha}{2})}I)$, and the bias is finite for all $q > 1$:*

$$R_{q,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon^{PLA}) = \frac{n}{2(q-1)} \left(q \log\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon\alpha}{2}\right) - \log\left(1 + \frac{q\epsilon\alpha}{2}\right)\right).$$

On the other hand, for $0 < \epsilon < \frac{2}{\alpha}$*, the limit of ULA is* $\nu_\epsilon^{ULA} = \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\frac{\epsilon\alpha}{2})} I)$*, and the bias is:*

$$R_{q,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon^{ULA}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{2(q-1)} \left(q \log\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon\alpha}{2}\right) - \log\left(1 - \frac{q\epsilon\alpha}{2}\right)\right) & \text{for } 1 < q < \frac{2}{\epsilon\alpha}, \\ \infty & \text{for } q \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon\alpha}. \end{cases}$$

For $1 < q < \frac{2}{\epsilon\alpha}$*, we have* $R_{q,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon^{PLA}) < R_{q,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon^{ULA})$.

3.2 Convergence of Rényi divergence along PLA under LSI

Our second main result is the following convergence guarantee in Rényi divergence along PLA, assuming the biased limit ν_ϵ satisfies LSI. We provide the proof of Theorem 2 in Section 6.2.

Theorem 2. *Assume* ν_ϵ *satisfies LSI with constant* $\beta > 0$*,* ν *is* (L, ∞)*-smooth, and* $0 < \epsilon < \min\left\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2\beta}\right\}$*. Let* $q > 1$*. Then along PLA, for all* $k \geq 0$*,*

$$R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) \leq \left(\frac{q - \frac{1}{2}}{q-1}\right) R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon k}{2q}} + R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon). \tag{15}$$

This result shows the iteration complexity for Rényi divergence along PLA depends on the bias. For $\delta > 0$, let $h_q(\delta) = \sup\{\epsilon > 0 \colon R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon) \leq \delta\}$, and assume δ is small so $h_q(\delta) < \min\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2\beta}\}$. Theorem 2 states to achieve $R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) \leq 2\delta$, it suffices to run PLA with step size $\epsilon = \Theta(h_q(\delta))$ for

$$k = O\left(\frac{1}{\beta\epsilon} \log \frac{R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0)}{\delta}\right) \tag{16}$$

iterations. If we choose ρ_0 to be a proximal step from a Gaussian, then the initial Rényi divergence scales with n, as we show below. Here x^* is a stationary point for f ($\nabla f(x^*) = 0$).

Lemma 2. *Assume* ν *is* (L, ∞)*-smooth, and* $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{L}$*. Let* $\rho_0 = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)_\#^{-1} \mathcal{N}(x^*, 2\epsilon I)$ *(concretely,* $x_0 \sim \rho_0$ *solves* $x_0 + \epsilon\nabla f(x_0) = \tilde{x}_0$ *where* $\tilde{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(x^*, 2\epsilon I)$*). For all* $q \geq 1$*,* $R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) \leq \tilde{O}(n)$.

Thus, Theorem 2 yields an iteration complexity of

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\beta h_q(\delta)}\right) \tag{17}$$

for PLA under LSI to reach $R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) \leq 2\delta$ with $\epsilon = \Theta(h_q(\delta))$. For example, if $h_q(\delta) = \Omega(\delta)$, then the iteration complexity is $k = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\beta\delta})$. If $h_q(\delta) = \Omega(\sqrt{\delta})$, as in the Gaussian case (Example 3), then the iteration complexity is $k = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\beta\delta^{1/2}})$. However, in general we do not know how to control this bias.

3.3 Convergence of Rényi divergence along PLA under Poincaré

We recall ν satisfies *Poincaré inequality* with a constant $\alpha > 0$ if for all smooth $g\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathrm{Var}_\nu(g) \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathbb{E}_\nu[\|\nabla g\|^2]$$

where $\mathrm{Var}_\nu(g) = \mathbb{E}_\nu[g^2] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[g]^2$ is the variance of g under ν. Poincaré inequality is an isoperimetry condition which is weaker than LSI. LSI implies Poincaré inequality with the same constant, and in fact Poincaré inequality is a linearization of LSI [48, 54]. Like LSI, Poincaré inequality is preserved under bounded perturbation and Lipschitz mapping. However, Poincaré inequality is more general than LSI; for example, distributions satisfying LSI have sub-Gaussian tails, while distributions satisfying Poincaré inequality can have sub-exponential tails. Whereas LSI is equivalent to a bound on the log-Cheeger constant, Poincaré inequality is equivalent to a bound on the Cheeger constant [26]. We recall when ν satisfies Poincaré inequality, Rényi divergence converges along the Langevin dynamics at a rate which is initially linear then exponential; see Section 4 for a review.

Our third main result is the following convergence guarantee in Rényi divergence along PLA, assuming the biased limit ν_ϵ satisfies Poincaré inequality. We provide the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 6.5.

Theorem 3. *Assume ν_ϵ satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant $\beta > 0$, ν is (L, ∞)-smooth, and $0 < \epsilon < \min\left\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2\beta}\right\}$. Let $q > 1$. Then along PLA, for $k \ge k_0 := \frac{2q}{\beta\epsilon}(R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) - 1)$,*

$$R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) \le \left(\frac{q - \frac{1}{2}}{q-1}\right) e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon(k-k_0)}{2q}} + R_{2q-1,\nu_\epsilon}(\nu). \tag{18}$$

This result shows the iteration complexity for Rényi divergence along PLA depends on the bias. For $\delta > 0$, let $h_q(\delta) = \sup\{\epsilon > 0\colon R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon) \le \delta\}$, and assume δ is small so $h_q(\delta) < \min\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2\beta}\}$. Theorem 3 states to achieve $R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) \le 2\delta$, it suffices to run PLA with step size $\epsilon = \Theta(h_q(\delta))$ for

$$k = O\left(\frac{1}{\beta\epsilon}\left(R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) + \log\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right) \tag{19}$$

iterations. Note the dependence on $R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0)$ is now linear, rather than logarithmic under LSI (16). As in Lemma 2, if we choose ρ_0 to be a proximal step from a Gaussian, then $R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) \le \tilde{O}(n)$. Thus, Theorem 3 yields an iteration complexity of

$$k = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\beta h_q(\delta)}\right) \tag{20}$$

for PLA under Poincaré to reach $R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) \le 2\delta$ with $\epsilon = \Theta(h_q(\delta))$. This is a factor of n larger than the complexity under LSI (17).

4 A review on Langevin dynamics

Notation. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, let $\|A\| \equiv \|A\|_{\mathrm{op}}$ denote the operator norm and $\|A\|_{\mathrm{HS}}$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. If A is symmetric with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\|A\|_{\mathrm{op}} = \max_i |\lambda_i|$ and $\|A\|_{\mathrm{HS}} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2)^{1/2}$. Note that $\|A\|_{\mathrm{HS}} \le \sqrt{n}\|A\|_{\mathrm{op}}$.

For a differentiable function $\phi\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, let $\nabla\phi(x) = \left(\frac{\partial\phi(x)}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial\phi(x)}{\partial x_n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the gradient vector, $\nabla^2\phi(x) = \left(\frac{\partial^2\phi(x)}{\partial x_i\,\partial x_j}\right)_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ the Hessian matrix, and $\nabla^3\phi(x) = \left(\frac{\partial^3\phi(x)}{\partial x_i\,\partial x_j\,\partial x_k}\right)_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n\times n}$ the tensor of third-order derivatives. Let $\Delta\phi(x) = \mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^2\phi(x)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2\phi(x)}{\partial x_i^2} \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the Laplacian of ϕ.

Let $\nabla\cdot$ denote the divergence operator that acts on a vector field $v(x) = (v_1(x), \dots, v_n(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\nabla \cdot v(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial v_i(x)}{\partial x_i} \in \mathbb{R}$. The divergence of gradient is the Laplacian: $\nabla\cdot(\nabla\phi) = \Delta\phi$. We will use the integration by parts formula: $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle \nabla\phi(x), v(x)\rangle\,dx = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(x)\nabla\cdot v(x)\,dx$, where the boundary term is zero if ϕ, v have sufficiently fast decay at infinity.

For a matrix-valued function $G\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, let $\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3\phi(x)\,G(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the vector whose i-th component is $\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla_i\nabla^2\phi(x)\,G(x))$ where $\nabla_i\nabla^2\phi(x) = \left(\frac{\partial^3\phi(x)}{\partial x_i\,\partial x_j\,\partial x_k}\right)_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Let $\nabla\cdot G(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the vector whose i-th component is $\nabla\cdot G_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}$, where $G_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the i-th row of $G(x)$. Let $\langle\nabla^2, G(x)\rangle = \nabla\cdot(\nabla\cdot G(x)) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 G_{ij}(x)}{\partial x_i\,\partial x_j} \in \mathbb{R}$.

4.1 Weighted Langevin dynamics

Let $G\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be a differentiable matrix-valued function where $G(x) \succ 0$ is positive definite. Recall the *weighted Langevin dynamics* for $\nu = e^{-f}$ with covariance G is the SDE

$$dX_t = (\nabla\cdot G(X_t) - G(X_t)\nabla f(X_t))\,dt + \sqrt{2G(X_t)}\,dW_t \tag{21}$$

where $(W_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is the standard Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The drift term above is chosen to ensure $\nu = e^{-f}$ is a stationary measure for the weighted Langevin dynamics (21). This is apparent from the following Fokker-Planck equation; see also [33, 28].

Lemma 3. *If X_t evolves following the weighted Langevin dynamics (21), then the density ρ_t evolves following*

$$\frac{\partial\rho_t}{\partial t} = \nabla\cdot\left(\rho_t G\nabla\log\frac{\rho_t}{\nu}\right). \tag{22}$$

Proof. Recall for a general Langevin dynamics $dX_t = b(X_t)\,dt + \sqrt{2G(X_t)}\,dW_t$, the Fokker-Planck equation for the density ρ_t of X_t is (see for example [34, 56]):

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla\cdot(\rho b) + \langle\nabla^2, \rho G\rangle \tag{23}$$

where for simplicity we write ρ in place of ρ_t. For the drift $b = \nabla \cdot G - G\nabla f$ in (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \cdot \left(\rho G \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu}\right) &= \nabla \cdot (G\nabla\rho + \rho G \nabla f) \\
&= \nabla \cdot (\nabla \cdot (\rho G) - \rho \nabla \cdot G + \rho G \nabla f) \\
&= \nabla \cdot (\nabla \cdot (\rho G) - \rho b) \\
&= \langle \nabla^2, \rho G \rangle - \nabla \cdot (\rho b)
\end{aligned}$$

which matches (23), as desired. □

From (22) it is clear that ν is a stationary measure for the weighted Langevin dynamics (21). Furthermore, we can quantify how much the KL divergence with respect to ν decreases along (21).

We define the *(weighted) relative Fisher information* of ρ with respect to ν to be

$$J_{\nu,G}(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x) \left\| \nabla \log \frac{\rho(x)}{\nu(x)} \right\|_{G(x)}^2 dx. \tag{24}$$

Here $\|v\|_G^2 := \langle v, Gv \rangle$ is the weighted norm of a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by a positive definite matrix $G \succ 0$. Then we have the following generalization of De Bruijn's identity.

Lemma 4. *Along the weighted Langevin dynamics* (21),

$$\frac{d}{dt} H_\nu(\rho_t) = -J_{\nu,G}(\rho_t). \tag{25}$$

Proof. Using the Fokker-Planck equation (22) and integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} H_\nu(\rho_t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial t} \log \frac{\rho_t}{\nu} \, dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \cdot \left(\rho_t G \nabla \log \frac{\rho_t}{\nu}\right) \log \frac{\rho_t}{\nu} \, dx \\
&= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_t \left\langle G \nabla \log \frac{\rho_t}{\nu}, \nabla \log \frac{\rho_t}{\nu} \right\rangle dx \\
&= -J_{\nu,G}(\rho_t).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 Unweighted Langevin dynamics

The *(unweighted) Langevin dynamics* is when the covariance is the identity matrix ($G(x) = I$):

$$dX_t = -\nabla f(X_t)\, dt + \sqrt{2}\, dW_t \tag{26}$$

In this case the unweighted relative Fisher information is the usual one from (5): $J_{\nu,I}(\rho) = J_\nu(\rho)$. Then (25) becomes the usual De Bruijn's identity: $\frac{d}{dt}H_\nu(\rho_t) = -J_\nu(\rho_t)$. We see that under LSI (6) we have $\frac{d}{dt}H_\nu(\rho_t) \le -2\alpha H_\nu(\rho_t)$, which implies KL divergence converges exponentially fast:

$$H_\nu(\rho_t) \le e^{-2\alpha t} H_\nu(\rho_0).$$

We recall the interpretation of the Langevin dynamics (26) as the gradient flow of KL divergence in the space of measures with the Wasserstein metric, with LSI as the gradient domination condition [24, 44].

Under LSI, we can also show Rényi divergence of order $q \ge 1$ converges exponentially fast along the Langevin dynamics:

$$R_{q,\nu}(\rho_t) \le e^{-\frac{2\alpha}{q}t} R_{q,\nu}(\rho_0),$$

see for example [53, Theorem 3]. We also recall the interpretation of the Langevin dynamics (26) as the gradient flow of Rényi divergence in the space of measures with a suitably defined metric (which depends on ν), with LSI as the gradient domination condition [10].

Under Poincaré inequality, we can show Rényi divergence of order $q \ge 2$ converges at a rate which is initially linear then exponential:

$$R_{q,\nu}(\rho_t) \le \begin{cases} R_{q,\nu}(\rho_0) - \frac{2\alpha t}{q} & \text{if } R_{q,\nu}(\rho_0) \ge 1 \text{ and as long as } R_{q,\nu}(\rho_t) \ge 1, \\ e^{-\frac{2\alpha t}{q}} R_{q,\nu}(\rho_0) & \text{if } R_{q,\nu}(\rho_0) \le 1, \end{cases}$$

see for example [53, Theorem 5].

5 Proofs for Section 2

5.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof of Lemma 1. The output x_{k+1} of PLA (2) is the value at time $t = \epsilon$ of the stochastic process

$$X_t = X_0 - t\nabla f(X_t) + \sqrt{2}W_t \tag{27}$$

starting at $X_0 = x_k$, where W_t is the standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By Lemma 5, $(X_t)_{t\ge 0}$ (27) evolves following the SDE

$$dX_t = \mu\, dt + \sqrt{2G}\, dW_t \tag{28}$$

where $\mu = -\sqrt{G}\left(\nabla f(X_t) + t\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(X_t)G)\right)$ and $G = (I + t\nabla^2 f(X_t))^{-2}$. Recall the Langevin dynamics with covariance G converges to $\nu = e^{-f}$ if the drift is $\nabla \cdot G - G\nabla f$ (see Section 4). We write the SDE (28) as

$$dX_t = (\nabla \cdot G - G\nabla f(X_t) + \tilde{\mu})\, dt + \sqrt{2G}\, dW_t \tag{29}$$

where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the shifted drift:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu} &= \mu - \nabla \cdot G + G\nabla f(X_t) \\ &= -t\nabla^2 f(X_t) G \nabla f(X_t) - t\sqrt{G}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(X_t)\, G) - \nabla \cdot G.\end{aligned}$$

The Fokker-Planck equation of the SDE (29) for one step of PLA is then

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left(\rho G \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu}\right) - \nabla \cdot (\rho \tilde{\mu}).$$

The time derivative of KL divergence is, by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt} H_\nu(\rho) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} \log \frac{\rho}{\nu}\, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \cdot \left(\rho G \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu}\right) \log \frac{\rho}{\nu}\, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla \cdot (\rho \tilde{\mu}) \log \frac{\rho}{\nu}\, dx \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_\rho \left[\left\| \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu} \right\|_G^2\right] + \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[\left\langle \tilde{\mu}, \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu} \right\rangle\right].\end{aligned}$$

Since $G \succeq \frac{3}{4} I$ by Lemma 6, and using $\langle a, b\rangle \le 2\|a\|^2 + \frac{1}{8}\|b\|^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt} H_\nu(\rho) &\le -\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{E}_\rho \left[\left\| \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu} \right\|^2\right] + 2\mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\tilde{\mu}\|^2] + \frac{1}{8}\mathbb{E}_\rho \left[\left\| \nabla \log \frac{\rho}{\nu} \right\|^2\right] \\ &= -\frac{5}{8} J_\nu(\rho) + 2\mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\tilde{\mu}\|^2].\end{aligned}$$

Then by LSI $J_\nu(\rho) \ge 2\alpha H_\nu(\rho)$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} H_\nu(\rho) \le -\frac{5\alpha}{4} H_\nu(\rho) + 2\mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\tilde{\mu}\|^2]. \tag{30}$$

By the bound (40) in Lemma 6 and using $(a+b)^2 \le 2a^2 + 2b^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\tilde{\mu}\|^2] &\le \mathbb{E}_\rho \left[2\left(\frac{4}{3} tL \|\nabla f\|\right)^2 + 2(6tn^{\frac{3}{2}} M)^2\right] \\ &= \frac{32}{9} t^2 L^2 \mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\nabla f\|^2] + 72 t^2 n^3 M^2.\end{aligned}$$

We recall LSI implies Talagrand's inequality, which implies the following bound (see [53, Lemma 12]):

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\nabla f\|^2] \le \frac{4L^2}{\alpha} H_\nu(\rho) + 2nL.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\rho[\|\tilde{\mu}\|^2] &\le \frac{32}{9} t^2 L^2 \left(\frac{4L^2}{\alpha} H_\nu(\rho) + 2nL\right) + 72 t^2 n^3 M^2 \\ &= \frac{128 t^2 L^4}{9\alpha} H_\nu(\rho) + \frac{64}{9} t^2 n L^3 + 72 t^2 n^3 M^2.\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this to (30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}H_\nu(\rho) &\le \left(-\frac{5\alpha}{4}+\frac{256t^2L^4}{9\alpha}\right)H_\nu(\rho)+16t^2n\left(\frac{8}{9}L^3+9n^2M^2\right)\\ &\le -\alpha H_\nu(\rho)+16t^2n\left(L^3+9n^2M^2\right) \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where the last inequality above holds for $0 \le t \le \frac{3}{32}\frac{\alpha}{L^2}$.

We wish to integrate the differential inequality (31) for $0 \le t \le \epsilon$. First using $t \le \epsilon$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}H_\nu(\rho_t) \le -\alpha H_\nu(\rho_t)+\epsilon^2 C$$

where $C = 16n(L^3+9n^2M^2)$. Multiplying both sides by $e^{\alpha t}$, we can write the above as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(e^{\alpha t}H_\nu(\rho_t)\right) \le e^{\alpha t}\epsilon^2 C.$$

Integrating from $t=0$ to $t=\epsilon$ gives

$$e^{\alpha\epsilon}H_\nu(\rho_\epsilon)-H_\nu(\rho_0) \;\le\; \left(\frac{e^{\alpha\epsilon}-1}{\alpha}\right)\epsilon^2 C \;\le\; 2\epsilon^3 C$$

where in the last step we use $e^c \le 1+2c$ for $0 < c = \alpha\epsilon \le 1$, which holds because $0 < \epsilon \le \frac{3}{32}\frac{\alpha}{L^2} < \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Therefore, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}H_\nu(\rho_\epsilon) &\le e^{-\alpha\epsilon}H_\nu(\rho_0)+2e^{-\alpha\epsilon}\epsilon^3 C\\ &\le e^{-\alpha\epsilon}H_\nu(\rho_0)+2\epsilon^3 C\\ &= e^{-\alpha\epsilon}H_\nu(\rho_0)+32\epsilon^3 n(L^3+9n^2M^2)\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

5.2 SDE representation of one step of PLA

The output x_{k+1} of PLA (2) is the value at time $t=\epsilon$ of the stochastic process $(X_t)_{t\ge 0}$ given by

$$X_t = X_0 - t\nabla f(X_t)+\sqrt{2}W_t \tag{32}$$

starting at $X_0 = x_k$, where W_t is the standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 5. *The stochastic process $(X_t)_{t\ge 0}$ (32) evolves following the SDE*

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t,t)\,dt+\sqrt{2\,G(X_t,t)}\,dW_t \tag{33}$$

where

$$\mu(x,t) = -(I+t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-1}\left(\nabla f(x)+t\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)(I+t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2})\right) \tag{34}$$

$$G(x,t) = (I+t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2}. \tag{35}$$

Proof. For $t \geq 0$, let

$$\tilde{X}_t = X_t + t\nabla f(X_t)$$

so $\tilde{X}_0 = X_0$, and we can write (32) as

$$\tilde{X}_t = \tilde{X}_0 + \sqrt{2}W_t.$$

That is, $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ evolves following the SDE

$$d\tilde{X}_t = \sqrt{2}dW_t. \tag{36}$$

Suppose $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ evolves by

$$dX_t = \mu\, dt + \sqrt{2\,G}\, dW_t$$

for some $\mu \equiv \mu(X_t, t)$ and $G \equiv G(X_t, t) \succ 0$. Let $T_t(x) = x + t\nabla f(x)$, so $\frac{\partial T_t}{\partial t}(x) = \nabla f(x)$, $\nabla T_t(x) = I + t\nabla^2 f(x)$, and $\nabla^2 T_t(x) = t\nabla^3 f(x)$. Then by Itô's lemma for $\tilde{X}_t = T_t(X_t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{X}_t = dT_t(X_t) &= \left(\frac{\partial T_t}{\partial t}(X_t) + \nabla T_t(X_t)^\top \mu + \operatorname{Tr}\left(\nabla^2 T_t(X_t)\, G\right)\right) dt + \sqrt{2}\,\nabla T_t(X_t)\sqrt{G}\, dW_t \\ &= \left(\nabla f(X_t) + (I + t\nabla^2 f(X_t))\,\mu + t\operatorname{Tr}\left(\nabla^3 f(X_t)\, G\right)\right) dt + \sqrt{2}\,(I + t\nabla^2 f(X_t))\sqrt{G}\, dW_t \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Matching (36) and (37), we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(x) + (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))\,\mu + t\operatorname{Tr}\left(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G\right) &= 0 \\ (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))\sqrt{G} &= I \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= -(I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-1}\left(\nabla f(x) + t\operatorname{Tr}\left(\nabla^3 f(x)\,(I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2}\right)\right) \\ G &= (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

as desired. ∎

5.3 Bounds under smoothness

Recall μ, G are defined in (34), (35), and $\tilde{\mu}$ is the shifted drift:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu} &= \mu - \nabla \cdot G + G\nabla f(x) \\ &= -t\nabla^2 f(x) G\nabla f(x) - t\sqrt{G}\operatorname{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G) - \nabla \cdot G. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Lemma 6. *Assume ν is (L, M)-smooth. For $0 \le t \le \min\{\frac{1}{8L}, \frac{1}{M}\}$, we have the following bounds:*

$$\frac{3}{4}I \preceq G \preceq \frac{4}{3}I \tag{39}$$

$$\|\tilde{\mu}\| \le \frac{4}{3}tL\|\nabla f(x)\| + 6tn^{\frac{3}{2}}M. \tag{40}$$

Proof. Since $-LI \preceq \nabla^2 f(x) \preceq LI$, we have

$$\frac{1}{(1+tL)^2}I \preceq G = (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} \preceq \frac{1}{(1-tL)^2}I.$$

For $0 \le t \le \frac{1}{8L}$, we have

$$\frac{3}{4}I \prec \left(\frac{8}{9}\right)^2 I \preceq G \preceq \left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^2 I \prec \frac{4}{3}I$$

as claimed in (39).

To bound $\tilde{\mu}$ (38), we apply triangle inequality:

$$\|\tilde{\mu}\| \le \|t\nabla^2 f(x) G \nabla f(x)\| + \|t\sqrt{G}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G)\| + \|\nabla \cdot G\|. \tag{41}$$

We now bound the three terms above:

1. For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|t\nabla^2 f(x) G \nabla f(x)\| &\le t\|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|G\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|\nabla f(x)\| \\ &\le \frac{4}{3}tL\|\nabla f(x)\|.\end{aligned}$$

2. For the second term, we have:

$$\|t\sqrt{G}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G)\| \le t\|\sqrt{G}\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G)\|$$

We have $\|\sqrt{G}\|_{\mathrm{op}} = \sqrt{\|G\|_{\mathrm{op}}} \le (\frac{4}{3})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The i-th entry of $\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G)$ is $\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla_i \nabla^2 f(x)\, G)$, which is bounded:

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla_i \nabla^2 f(x)\, G)| &\le \|\nabla_i \nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\mathrm{HS}}\|G\|_{\mathrm{HS}} \\ &\le n\|\nabla_i \nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}}\|G\|_{\mathrm{op}} \\ &\le \frac{4}{3}nM.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G)\| \le \frac{4}{3}n^{\frac{3}{2}}M$. Then we can bound the second term of (41) by

$$\|t\sqrt{G}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla^3 f(x)\, G)\| \le t\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}M < 2tn^{\frac{3}{2}}M.$$

3. For the third term of (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla \cdot G\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla \cdot G_i)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial G_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \Big)^2 \\ &\le n \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \Big(\frac{\partial G_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \Big)^2 \\ &\le n \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \Big(\frac{\partial G_{ij}}{\partial x_k} \Big)^2 \\ &= n \sum_{k=1}^n \|\nabla_k G\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2 \\ &\le n^2 \sum_{k=1}^n \|\nabla_k G\|_{\mathrm{op}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

We now claim that for each $k = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\|\nabla_k G\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le 4tM \tag{42}$$

which will imply the desired bound $\|\nabla \cdot G\| \le 4tn^{\frac{3}{2}} M$.

To show (42), we will show that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|v\| = 1$, and $0 < u < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\|G(x + uv) - G(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le 4tM(u + o(u)). \tag{43}$$

Since $\nabla^2 f$ is M-Lipschitz, we have

$$\nabla^2 f(x) - uMI \ \preceq\ \nabla^2 f(x + uv) \ \preceq\ \nabla^2 f(x) + uMI.$$

Therefore,

$$(1 - utM)I + t\nabla^2 f(x) \ \preceq\ I + t\nabla^2 f(x + uv) \ \preceq\ (1 + utM)I + t\nabla^2 f(x).$$

Then

$$((1 + utM)I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} \ \preceq\ (I + t\nabla^2 f(x + uv))^{-2} \ \preceq\ ((1 - utM)I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2}.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}&((1 + utM)I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} - (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} && (44)\\ &\quad \preceq\ G(x + uv) - G(x) \ =\ (I + t\nabla^2 f(x + uv))^{-2} - (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} && (45)\\ &\quad \preceq\ ((1 - utM)I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2} - (I + t\nabla^2 f(x))^{-2}. && (46)\end{aligned}$$

For each eigenvalue $-L \le \lambda \le L$ of $\nabla^2 f(x)$, the eigenvalue of the left-hand side (44) above is at most (in magnitude)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{(1+utM+t\lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{(1+t\lambda)^2} \right| &= \frac{(1+utM+t\lambda)^2 - (1+t\lambda)^2}{(1+t\lambda)^2(1+utM+t\lambda)^2} \\
&= \frac{utM(2+utM+2t\lambda)}{(1+t\lambda)^2(1+utM+t\lambda)^2} \\
&\le \frac{utM(2+utM+2tL)}{(1-tL)^2(1+utM-tL)^2} \\
&\le \frac{utM(2+u+\frac{1}{4})}{(1-\frac{1}{8})^2(1+0-\frac{1}{8})^2} \\
&= \frac{9}{4}\left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^4 utM\left(1+\frac{4}{9}u\right) \\
&< 4utM\left(1+\frac{4}{9}u\right). \qquad (47)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, eigenvalue of the right-hand side (46) above is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{(1-utM+t\lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{(1+t\lambda)^2} &= \frac{(1+t\lambda)^2 - (1-utM+t\lambda)^2}{(1+t\lambda)^2(1-utM+t\lambda)^2} \\
&= \frac{utM(2-utM+2t\lambda)}{(1+t\lambda)^2(1-utM+t\lambda)^2} \\
&\le \frac{utM(2-utM+2tL)}{(1-tL)^2(1-utM-tL)^2} \\
&\le \frac{utM(2-0+\frac{1}{4})}{(1-\frac{1}{8})^2(1-u-\frac{1}{8})^2} \\
&= \frac{9}{4}\left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^4 \frac{utM}{(1-\frac{8}{7}u)^2} \\
&< \frac{4utM}{(1-\frac{8}{7}u)^2}. \qquad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (47) and (48) gives

$$\|G(x+uv) - G(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le 4utM \max\left\{\left(1+\frac{4}{9}u\right), \frac{1}{(1-\frac{8}{7}u)^2}\right\}.$$

Therefore, the partial derivative along direction v is

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_v G(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}} &= \left\| \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{G(x+uv)-G(x)}{u} \right\|_{\mathrm{op}} \\ &= \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{\|G(x+uv)-G(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}}}{u} \\ &\le \lim_{u\to 0}\ 4tM \max\left\{ \left(1+\frac{4}{9}u\right), \frac{1}{(1-\frac{8}{7}u)^2} \right\} \\ &= 4tM.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, when $v = e_k$, we have $\|\nabla_k G(x)\|_{\mathrm{op}} \le 4tM$, as desired.

Plugging in the three bounds above to (41) yields the desired bound (40) for $\tilde{\mu}$. □

6 Proofs for Section 3

6.1 Auxiliary results for LSI

We recall the following decomposition result for Rényi divergence.

Lemma 7 ([53, Lemma 7]). *Let $q > 1$. For all probability distributions ρ, ν, and ν_ϵ,*

$$R_{q,\nu}(\rho) \le \left(\frac{q-\frac{1}{2}}{q-1}\right) R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho) + R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon).$$

We recall Rényi divergence is preserved under bijective map. Here for $T\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and a probability distribution ρ, the pushforward $T_\#\rho$ is the distribution of $T(x)$ when $x \sim \rho$.

Lemma 8 ([53, Lemma 13]). *Let $T\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a differentiable bijective map. For any probability distributions ρ, ν, and for all $q > 0$,*

$$R_{q,T_\#\nu}(T_\#\rho) = R_{q,\nu}(\rho).$$

We recall how the LSI constant decays along Gaussian convolution.

Lemma 9 ([53, Lemma 15]). *Suppose ν satisfies LSI with constant $\alpha > 0$. For $t > 0$, the distribution $\tilde{\nu}_t = \nu * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$ satisfies LSI with constant $\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + 2t\right)^{-1}$.*

We recall the formula for the decrease of Rényi divergence along simultaneous heat flow. Here

$$F_{q,\nu}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_\nu\left[\left(\frac{\rho}{\nu}\right)^q\right] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nu(x)\frac{\rho(x)^q}{\nu(x)^q}\,dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\rho(x)^q}{\nu(x)^{q-1}}dx \tag{49}$$

so we can write the Rényi divergence as $R_{q,\nu}(\rho) = \frac{1}{q-1}\log F_{q,\nu}(\rho)$, and

$$G_{q,\nu}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_\nu\Big[\Big(\frac{\rho}{\nu}\Big)^q\Big\|\nabla\log\frac{\rho}{\nu}\Big\|^2\Big] = \mathbb{E}_\nu\Big[\Big(\frac{\rho}{\nu}\Big)^{q-2}\Big\|\nabla\frac{\rho}{\nu}\Big\|^2\Big] = \frac{4}{q^2}\mathbb{E}_\nu\Big[\Big\|\nabla\Big(\frac{\rho}{\nu}\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}\Big\|^2\Big] \tag{50}$$

is the Rényi information. Note the case $q = 1$ recovers relative Fisher information: $G_{1,\nu}(\rho) = J_\nu(\rho)$.

Lemma 10 ([53, Lemma 16])**.** *For any probability distributions ρ_0, ν_0, and for any $t \geq 0$, let $\rho_t = \rho_0 * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$ and $\nu_t = \nu_0 * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$. Then for all $q > 0$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_{q,\nu_t}(\rho_t) = -q\frac{G_{q,\nu_t}(\rho_t)}{F_{q,\nu_t}(\rho_t)}.$$

Finally, we recall the following relation between Rényi information and divergence under LSI. Note the case $q = 1$ recovers the original definition (6) of LSI.

Lemma 11 ([53, Lemma 5])**.** *Suppose ν satisfies LSI with constant $\alpha > 0$. Let $q \geq 1$. For all ρ,*

$$\frac{G_{q,\nu}(\rho)}{F_{q,\nu}(\rho)} \geq \frac{2\alpha}{q^2}R_{q,\nu}(\rho).$$

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We first show Rényi divergence to ν_ϵ converges exponentially fast along PLA when ν_ϵ satisfies LSI. The following is analogous to [53, Lemma 8] for ULA.

Lemma 12. *Assume ν_ϵ satisfies LSI with constant $\beta > 0$. Assume $\nu = e^{-f}$ is L-smooth, and $0 < \epsilon < \min\left\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2\beta}\right\}$. For $q \geq 1$, along PLA,*

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon k}{q}}R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0). \tag{51}$$

Proof. We will prove that along each step of PLA (2) from $x_k \sim \rho_k$ to $x_{k+1} \sim \rho_{k+1}$, the Rényi divergence with respect to ν_ϵ decreases by a constant factor:

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k+1}) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{q}}R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k). \tag{52}$$

Iterating the bound above yields the desired claim (51).

We decompose each step of PLA (2) into a sequence of two steps:

$$\tilde{\rho}_k = \rho_k * \mathcal{N}(0, 2\epsilon I), \tag{53a}$$

$$\rho_{k+1} = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)_{\#}^{-1}\tilde{\rho}_k. \tag{53b}$$

In the first step (53b) we convolve with a Gaussian, which is the result of evolving along the heat flow at time ϵ. For $0 \le t \le \epsilon$, let $\rho_{k,t} = \rho_k * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$ and $\nu_{\epsilon,t} = \nu_\epsilon * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$, so $\tilde{\rho}_k = \rho_{k,\epsilon}$, and let $\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon = \nu_{\epsilon,\epsilon}$. By Lemma 10,

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}) = -q \frac{G_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})}{F_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})}.$$

Since ν_ϵ satisfies LSI with constant β, by Lemma 9, $\nu_{\epsilon,t}$ satisfies LSI with constant $(\frac{1}{\beta} + 2t)^{-1} \ge (\frac{1}{\beta} + 2\epsilon)^{-1} \ge \frac{\beta}{2}$ for $0 \le t \le \epsilon \le \frac{1}{2\beta}$. Then by Lemma 11,

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}) = -q \frac{G_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})}{F_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})} \le -\frac{\beta}{q} R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}).$$

Integrating over $0 \le t \le \epsilon$ gives

$$R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k) = R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,\epsilon}}(\rho_{k,\epsilon}) \le e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{q}} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k). \tag{54}$$

In the second step (53b) we apply the proximal map $T(x) = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)^{-1}(x)$. Since ∇f is L-Lipschitz and $\epsilon < \frac{1}{L}$, T is a bijection. Furthermore, $\rho_{k+1} = T_\# \tilde{\rho}_k$ and $\nu_\epsilon = T_\# \tilde{\nu}_\epsilon$. Therefore, by Lemma 8,

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k+1}) = R_{q,T_\#\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(T_\#\tilde{\rho}_k) = R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k). \tag{55}$$

Combining (54) and (55) gives the desired inequality (52). □

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 7 and Lemma 12,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) &\le \left(\frac{q - \frac{1}{2}}{q - 1}\right) R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) + R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon) \\ &\le \left(\frac{q - \frac{1}{2}}{q - 1}\right) e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon k}{2q}} R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) + R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

□

6.3 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof of Lemma 2. The biased limit $\nu_\epsilon = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)^{-1}_\#(\nu_\epsilon * \mathcal{N}(0, 2\epsilon I))$ satisfies $\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)_\# \nu_\epsilon = \nu_\epsilon * \mathcal{N}(0, 2\epsilon I)$, so in particular $\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon$ is $(\frac{1}{2\epsilon}, \infty)$-smooth. Let $\tilde{\rho}_0 = \mathcal{N}(x^*, 2\epsilon I)$ where x^* is a stationary point of f ($\nabla f(x^*) = 0$). By [53, Lemma 4], we have $R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_0) \le \tilde{O}(n)$ for all $q \ge 1$. For $\epsilon < \frac{1}{L}$, $(I + \epsilon\nabla f)^{-1}$ is a bijective map. Then by Lemma 8, with $\rho_0 = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)^{-1}_\# \tilde{\rho}_0$, we have $R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) = R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_0) \le \tilde{O}(n)$, as desired. □

6.4 Auxiliary results for Poincaré inequality

We recall the decay of Poincaré constant along Gaussian convolution.

Lemma 13 ([53, Lemma 20]). *Suppose ν satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant $\alpha > 0$. For $t > 0$, the distribution $\tilde{\nu}_t = \nu * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$ satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant $\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + 2t\right)^{-1}$.*

We recall the relation between Rényi information and divergence under Poincaré inequality.

Lemma 14 ([53, Lemma 17]). *Suppose ν satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant $\alpha > 0$. Let $q \geq 2$. For all ρ,*

$$\frac{G_{q,\nu}(\rho)}{F_{q,\nu}(\rho)} \geq \frac{4\alpha}{q^2}\left(1 - e^{-R_{q,\nu}(\rho)}\right).$$

6.5 Proof of Theorem 3

We first show Rényi divergence to ν_ϵ converges along PLA when ν_ϵ satisfies Poincaré inequality, at the same speed as the continuous-time Langevin dynamics. The following is analogous to [53, Lemma 18] for ULA.

Lemma 15. *Assume ν_ϵ satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant $\beta > 0$. Assume $\nu = e^{-f}$ is L-smooth, and $0 < \epsilon < \min\left\{\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2\beta}\right\}$. For $q \geq 2$, along PLA (2),*

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \leq \begin{cases} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) - \frac{\beta\epsilon k}{q} & \text{if } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) \geq 1 \text{ and as long as } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \geq 1, \\ e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon k}{q}} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) & \text{if } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

Proof. Following the proof of Lemma 12, we decompose each step of PLA (2) into a sequence of two steps:

$$\tilde{\rho}_k = \rho_k * \mathcal{N}(0, 2\epsilon I), \tag{57a}$$

$$\rho_{k+1} = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)_{\#}^{-1}\tilde{\rho}_k. \tag{57b}$$

The first step (57a) is convolution with a Gaussian, which is the result of evolving along the heat flow at time ϵ. For $0 \leq t \leq \epsilon$, let $\rho_{k,t} = \rho_k * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$ and $\nu_{\epsilon,t} = \nu_\epsilon * \mathcal{N}(0, 2tI)$, so $\tilde{\rho}_k = \rho_{k,\epsilon}$, and let $\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon = \nu_{\epsilon,\epsilon}$. Since ν_ϵ satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant β, by Lemma 13, $\nu_{\epsilon,t}$ satisfies Poincaré inequality with constant $(\frac{1}{\beta} + 2t)^{-1} \geq (\frac{1}{\beta} + 2\epsilon)^{-1} \geq \frac{\beta}{2}$ for $0 \leq t \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}$. Then by Lemma 10 and Lemma 14,

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}) = -q\frac{G_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})}{F_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})} \leq -\frac{2\beta}{q}\left(1 - e^{-R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})}\right).$$

We consider two cases:

1. Suppose $R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k) = R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,\epsilon}}(\rho_{k,\epsilon}) \geq 1$. Then for $0 \leq t \leq \epsilon$ we have $1 - e^{-R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})} \geq 1 - e^{-1} > \frac{1}{2}$, so $\frac{d}{dt} R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}) \leq -\frac{\beta}{q}$, which implies $R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k) = R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,\epsilon}}(\rho_{k,\epsilon}) \leq R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) - \frac{\beta\epsilon}{q}$.

2. Suppose $R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \leq 1$, so $R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}) \leq 1$ and $\frac{1-e^{-R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})}}{R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})} \geq \frac{1}{1+R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\frac{d}{dt} R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t}) \leq -\frac{\beta}{q} R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,t}}(\rho_{k,t})$, which implies $R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k) = R_{q,\nu_{\epsilon,\epsilon}}(\rho_{k,\epsilon}) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{q}} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k)$.

In the second step (57b) we apply the proximal map $T(x) = (I + \epsilon\nabla f)^{-1}(x)$, which is a bijection since ∇f is L-Lipschitz and $\epsilon < \frac{1}{L}$. Then by Lemma 8,

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k+1}) = R_{q,T_\# \tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(T_\# \tilde{\rho}_k) = R_{q,\tilde{\nu}_\epsilon}(\tilde{\rho}_k). \tag{58}$$

Combining (58) with the two cases above gives us in one step of PLA:

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k+1}) \leq \begin{cases} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) - \frac{\beta\epsilon}{q} & \text{if } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \geq R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k+1}) \geq 1 \\ e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{q}} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) & \text{if } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

By iterating, we conclude that

$$R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \leq \begin{cases} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) - \frac{\beta\epsilon k}{q} & \text{if } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) \geq 1 \text{ and as long as } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \geq 1, \\ e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon k}{q}} R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) & \text{if } R_{q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_0) \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

as desired. □

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 15, after k_0 iterations we have $R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k_0}) \leq 1$. Applying the second case of Lemma 15 starting from k_0 gives $R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon(k-k_0)}{2q}} R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_{k_0}) \leq e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon(k-k_0)}{2q}}$. Then by Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{q,\nu}(\rho_k) &\leq \left(\frac{q-\frac{1}{2}}{q-1}\right) R_{2q,\nu_\epsilon}(\rho_k) + R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{q-\frac{1}{2}}{q-1}\right) e^{-\frac{\beta\epsilon(k-k_0)}{2q}} + R_{2q-1,\nu}(\nu_\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

7 Discussion

In this paper we study the Proximal Langevin Algorithm (PLA) for sampling in $\mathbb{R}^n$ under isoperimetry: log-Sobolev inequality (LSI) or Poincaré inequality. We prove an iteration complexity in KL divergence under LSI and third-order smoothness that matches the fastest known rate for sampling under LSI, with a better dependence on the LSI constant. We also prove iteration complexities in

Rényi divergence assuming the biased limit satisfies either LSI or Poincaré inequality; the iteration complexity under Poincaré is a factor of n larger than the complexity under LSI.

There are many directions for further study. Our results assume second or third-order smoothness; it is interesting to study the convergence of PLA under weaker smoothness assumptions. We can try to bound the bias of PLA in Rényi divergence. We can try to extend our results for approximate proximal solvers, for example using optimistic or extra-gradient methods. We can study whether proximal versions of other algorithms, such as the underdamped Langevin dynamics, have faster convergence. It is also interesting to study whether symmetrized methods [55] have smaller bias. Another intriguing question is how to perform affine-invariant sampling in discrete time.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Santosh Vempala for valuable and insightful discussions.

References

[1] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 308–318. ACM, 2016.

[2] Dominique Bakry and Michel Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XIX 1983/84*, pages 177–206. Springer, 1985.

[3] Espen Bernton. Langevin Monte Carlo and JKO splitting. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1777–1798, Stockholm, Sweden, 06–09 Jul 2018. PMLR.

[4] Pascal Bianchi, Adil Salim, and Sholom Schechtman. Passty Langevin. In *Conference on Machine Learning (CAp)*. Toulouse, France, July 2019.

[5] Louis J. Billera and Persi Diaconis. A geometric interpretation of the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm. *Statistical Science*, pages 335–339, 2001.

[6] SG Bobkov, GP Chistyakov, and Friedrich Götze. Rényi divergence and the central limit theorem. *The Annals of Probability*, 47(1):270–323, 2019.

[7] Nawaf Bou-Rabee and Martin Hairer. Nonasymptotic mixing of the MALA algorithm. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 33(1):80–110, 2013.

[8] Nicolas Brosse, Alain Durmus, Éric Moulines, and Marcelo Pereyra. Sampling from a log-concave distribution with compact support with proximal Langevin Monte Carlo. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 65 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 319–342, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 07–10 Jul 2017. PMLR.

[9] Xiaohao Cai, Marcelo Pereyra, and Jason D McEwen. Uncertainty quantification for radio interferometric imaging – I. Proximal MCMC methods. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 480(3):4154–4169, 07 2018.

[10] Yu Cao, Jianfeng Lu, and Yulong Lu. Exponential decay of Rényi divergence under Fokker–Planck equations. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, pages 1–13, 2018.

[11] Zongchen Chen and Santosh S. Vempala. Optimal convergence rate of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo for strongly logconcave distributions. In *RANDOM*, 2019.

[12] Xiang Cheng and Peter Bartlett. Convergence of Langevin MCMC in KL-divergence. In *Proceedings of Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 83 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 186–211. PMLR, 07–09 Apr 2018.

[13] Imre Csiszár. Generalized cutoff rates and Rényi's information measures. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 41(1):26–34, 1995.

[14] Arnak Dalalyan. Further and stronger analogy between sampling and optimization: Langevin Monte Carlo and gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 65 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 678–689. PMLR, 07–10 Jul 2017.

[15] Arnak S Dalalyan. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(3):651–676, 2017.

[16] Arnak S Dalalyan and Avetik Karagulyan. User-friendly guarantees for the Langevin Monte Carlo with inaccurate gradient. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2019.

[17] Arnak S Dalalyan and Lionel Riou-Durand. On sampling from a log-concave density using kinetic Langevin diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.09382*, 2018.

[18] Alain Durmus and Szymon Majewski. Analysis of Langevin Monte Carlo via convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(73):1–46, 2019.

[19] Alain Durmus and Éric Moulines. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(3):1551–1587, 06 2017.

[20] Alain Durmus, Éric Moulines, and Marcelo Pereyra. Efficient Bayesian computation by proximal Markov chain Monte Carlo: When Langevin meets Moreau. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 11(1):473–506, 2018.

[21] Raaz Dwivedi, Yuansi Chen, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Log-concave sampling: Metropolis-Hastings algorithms are fast! In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 793–797, Stockholm, Sweden, 06–09 Jul 2018. PMLR.

[22] Cynthia Dwork and Guy N Rothblum. Concentrated differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01887*, 2016.

[23] Liam Hodgkinson, Robert Salomone, and Fred Roosta. Implicit Langevin algorithms for sampling from log-concave densities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12322*, 2019.

[24] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker–Planck equation. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 29(1):1–17, January 1998.

[25] R. Kannan, L. Lovász, and M. Simonovits. Random walks and an $O^*(n^5)$ volume algorithm for convex bodies. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 11:1–50, 1997.

[26] M. Ledoux. A simple analytic proof of an inequality by P. Buser. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 121(3):951–959, 1994.

[27] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh S Vempala. Convergence rate of Riemannian Hamiltonian Monte Carlo and faster polytope volume computation. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1115–1121. ACM, 2018.

[28] Xuechen Li, Denny Wu, Lester Mackey, and Murat A Erdogdu. Stochastic Runge–Kutta accelerates Langevin Monte Carlo and beyond. In *Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS 2019, Vancouver, Canada*, 2019.

[29] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. Fast algorithms for logconcave functions: sampling, rounding, integration and optimization. In *FOCS*, pages 57–68, 2006.

[30] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. The geometry of logconcave functions and sampling algorithms. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 30(3):307–358, 2007.

[31] László Lovász and Santosh S. Vempala. Hit-and-run from a corner. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(4):985–1005, 2006.

[32] Yi-An Ma, Niladri Chatterji, Xiang Cheng, Nicolas Flammarion, Peter Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Is there an analog of Nesterov acceleration for MCMC? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00996v2*, 2019.

[33] Yi-An Ma, Tianqi Chen, and Emily Fox. A complete recipe for stochastic gradient MCMC. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS 2015, Montréal, Canada*, pages 2917–2925, 2015.

[34] Michael C. Mackey. *Time's Arrow: The Origins of Thermodynamics Behavior*. Springer-Verlag, 1992.

[35] Oren Mangoubi and Aaron Smith. Rapid mixing of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo on strongly log-concave distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07114*, 2017.

[36] Oren Mangoubi and Nisheeth Vishnoi. Dimensionally tight bounds for second-order Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 6027–6037. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.

[37] Oren Mangoubi and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Nonconvex sampling with the Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm. In *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2019, 25-28 June 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA*, pages 2259–2293, 2019.

[38] Corbineau Marie-Caroline, Kouamé Denis, Chouzenoux Emilie, Tourneret Jean-Yves, and Pesquet Jean-Christophe. Preconditioned P-ULA for joint deconvolution-segmentation of ultrasound images – extended version. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08111*, 2019.

[39] Ilya Mironov. Rényi differential privacy. In *2017 IEEE 30th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 263–275. IEEE, 2017.

[40] D Morales, L Pardo, and I Vajda. Rényi statistics in directed families of exponential experiments. *Statistics: A Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 34(2):151–174, 2000.

[41] Wenlong Mou, Nicolas Flammarion, Martin J. Wainwright, and Peter L. Bartlett. An efficient sampling algorithm for non-smooth composite potentials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00551*, 2019.

[42] Wenlong Mou, Nicolas Flammarion, Martin J. Wainwright, and Peter L. Bartlett. Improved bounds for discretization of Langevin diffusions: Near-optimal rates without convexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11331v1*, 2019.

[43] Wenlong Mou, Yi-An Ma, Martin J. Wainwright, Peter L. Bartlett, and Michael I. Jordan. High-order Langevin diffusion yields an accelerated MCMC algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10859*, 2019.

[44] Felix Otto and Cédric Villani. Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 173(2):361–400, 2000.

[45] Marcelo Pereyra. Proximal Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms. *Statistics and Computing*, 26(4):745–760, Jul 2016.

[46] Alfréd Rényi et al. On measures of entropy and information. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*. The Regents of the University of California, 1961.

[47] Audrey Repetti, Marcelo Pereyra, and Yves Wiaux. Scalable Bayesian uncertainty quantification in imaging inverse problems via convex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 12(1):87–118, 2019.

[48] OS Rothaus. Diffusion on compact Riemannian manifolds and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. *Journal of functional analysis*, 42(1):102–109, 1981.

[49] Adil Salim, Dmitry Kovalev, and Peter Richtárik. Stochastic proximal Langevin algorithm: Potential splitting and nonasymptotic rates. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.

[50] Ruoqi Shen and Yin Tat Lee. The randomized midpoint method for log-concave sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05503*, 2019.

[51] Tim Van Erven and Peter Harremos. Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(7):3797–3820, 2014.

[52] Luis Vargas, Marcelo Pereyra, and Konstantinos Zygalakis. Accelerating proximal Markov chain Monte Carlo by using explicit stabilised methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08845*, 2019.

[53] Santosh Vempala and Andre Wibisono. Rapid convergence of the Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm: Isoperimetry suffices. In *Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS 2019, Vancouver, Canada*, 2019.

[54] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*. Number 58 in Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2003.

[55] Andre Wibisono. Sampling as optimization in the space of measures: The Langevin dynamics as a composite optimization problem. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2093–3027, Stockholm, Sweden, 06–09 Jul 2018. PMLR.

[56] Andre Wibisono, Varun Jog, and Po-Ling Loh. Information and estimation in Fokker-Planck channels. In *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2017, Aachen, Germany*, pages 2673–2677, 2017.