

Convergence of Langevin-Simulated Annealing algorithms with multiplicative noise

Pierre Bras^{*†} and Gilles Pagès^{*}

Abstract

We study the convergence of Langevin-Simulated Annealing type algorithms with multiplicative noise, i.e. for $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a potential function to minimize, we consider the stochastic differential equation $dY_t = -\sigma \sigma^\top \nabla V(Y_t)dt + a(t)\sigma(Y_t)dW_t + a(t)^2\Upsilon(Y_t)dt$, where (W_t) is a Brownian motion, where $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an adaptive (multiplicative) noise, where $a : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a function decreasing to 0 and where Υ is a correction term. This setting can be applied to optimization problems arising in Machine Learning; allowing σ to depend on the position brings faster convergence in comparison with the classical Langevin equation $dY_t = -\nabla V(Y_t)dt + \sigma dW_t$. The case where σ is a constant matrix has been extensively studied however little attention has been paid to the general case. We prove the convergence for the L^1 -Wasserstein distance of Y_t and of the associated Euler scheme \bar{Y}_t to some measure ν^* which is supported by $\operatorname{argmin}(V)$ and give rates of convergence to the instantaneous Gibbs measure $\nu_{a(t)}$ of density $\propto \exp(-2V(x)/a(t)^2)$. To do so, we first consider the case where a is a piecewise constant function. We find again the classical schedule $a(t) = A \log^{-1/2}(t)$. We then prove the convergence for the general case by giving bounds for the Wasserstein distance to the stepwise constant case using ergodicity properties.

Keywords– Stochastic Optimization, Langevin Equation, Simulated Annealing, Neural Networks

MSC Classification– 62L20, 65C30, 60H35

1 Introduction

Langevin-based algorithms are used to solve optimization problems in high dimension and have gained much interest in relation with Machine Learning. The Langevin equation is a Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) which consists in a gradient descent with noise. More precisely, let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a coercive potential function, then the associated Langevin equation reads

$$dX_t = -\nabla V(X_t)dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where (W_t) is a d -dimensional Brownian motion and where $\sigma > 0$. Under standard assumptions, the invariant measure of this SDE is the Gibbs measure of density proportional to $e^{-2V(x)/\sigma^2}$ and for small enough σ , this measure concentrates around $\operatorname{argmin}(V)$ [4] [2]. Adding a small noise to the gradient descent allows to explore the space and to escape from traps such as local minima or saddle points appearing in non-convex optimization problems [12] [6]. This noise may also be interpreted as coming from the approximation of the gradient in stochastic gradient descent algorithms. Such methods have been recently brought up to light again with Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) algorithms [30] [14], especially for the deep learning and the calibration of large artificial neural networks, which is a high-dimensional non-convex optimization problem.

^{*}Sorbonne Université, Laboratoire de Probabilités, Statistique et Modélisation, UMR 8001, case 158, 4 pl. Jussieu, F-75252 Paris Cedex 5, France. E-mail: pierre.bras@sorbonne-universite.fr and gilles.pages@sorbonne-universite.fr.

[†]Corresponding author.

The Langevin-simulated annealing SDE is the Langevin equation where the noise parameter is slowly decreasing to 0, namely

$$dX_t = -\nabla V(X_t)dt + a(t)\sigma dW_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where $a : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is non-increasing and converges to 0. The idea is that the "instantaneous" invariant measure $\nu_{a(t)\sigma}$ which is the Gibbs measure of density $\propto \exp(-2V(x)/(a(t)^2\sigma^2))$ converges itself to $\operatorname{argmin}(V)$. This method indeed shares similarities with the original simulated annealing algorithm [26], which builds a Markov chain from the Gibbs measure using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and where the parameter σ , interpreted as a temperature, slowly decreases to zero over the iterations.

In [3] and [21] is shown that choosing $a(t) = A \log^{-1/2}(t)$ for some $A > 0$ in (1.1) guarantees the convergence of X_t to ν^* defined as the limit measure of $(\nu_{a(t)})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and which is supported by $\operatorname{argmin}(V)$. [16] proves again the convergence of the SDE using free energies inequalities. These studies deeply rely on some Poincaré and log-Sobolev inequalities and require the following assumptions on the potential function:

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |\nabla V(x)| = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \Delta V(x) \leq C + |\nabla V(x)|^2.$$

[32] proves that the convergence still holds under weaker assumptions, in particular where the gradient of the potential is not coercive, using weak Poincaré inequalities. In [8] is proved the convergence of the associated stochastic gradient descent algorithm.

All these results are established in the so-called additive case, i.e. they highly rely on the fact that σ is constant, whereas little attention has been paid to the multiplicative case, i.e. where $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is not constant and depends on X_t . Allowing σ to be adaptive and to depend on the position highly extends the range of applications of Langevin algorithms and such adaptive algorithms are already widely used by practitioners and prove to be faster than non-adaptive algorithms and competitive with standard non-Langevin algorithms or even faster. See Section 3.2 where various specifications for $\sigma(x)$ that can be found in the Stochastic Optimization literature are briefly presented, and Section 9 where we show results of simulations of the training of an artificial neural network for various choices of σ . However, to our knowledge, a general result of convergence for Langevin algorithms with multiplicative noise is yet to be proved. [19, Proposition 2.5] gives a general formula on b and σ so that the associated Gibbs measure is still the invariant measure of the SDE $dX_t = b(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t$; a simple example of acceleration of convergence using non-constant σ is then given in [19, Section 2.4]. More generally, [15] gives a characterization of any SGCMC (Stochastic Gradient Markov Chain Monte Carlo) algorithm with multiplicative noise and with the corresponding Gibbs measure as a target. In practice, the matrix σ is often chosen so that $\sigma\sigma^\top \simeq (\nabla^2 V)^{-1}$ but approximations are needed because of the high dimensions of the matrix (e.g. only considering diagonal matrices). Still, our results hold also for non-diagonal σ , which opens the way to algorithms with such σ .

In this paper, we consider the following SDE:

$$dY_t = -(\sigma\sigma^\top \nabla V)(Y_t)dt + a(t)\sigma(Y_t)dW_t + \left(a^2(t) \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j(\sigma\sigma^\star)(Y_t)_{ij} \right]_{1 \leq i \leq d} \right) dt$$

$$a(t) = \frac{A}{\sqrt{\log(t)}},$$

where the expression of the drift comes from [19, Proposition 2.5] and where the second drift term is interpreted as a correction term so that $\nu_{a(t)}$ is still the "instantaneous" invariant measure. This last term boils down to 0 if σ is constant. The aim of this paper is to prove the convergence for the

L^1 -Wasserstein distance of the law of Y_t to ν^* in the setting adopted in [19], assuming in particular the convex uniformity of the potential outside a compact set and the ellipticity and the boundedness of σ . We also prove the convergence of the corresponding Euler-Maruyama scheme with decreasing steps.

Considering the convex condition outside a compact set is in fact quite different from the convex setting and turns out to be more demanding. This setting often appears in optimization problems (see Section 3.1), where a characteristic set - the compact set - contains the interesting features of the model with traps such as local minima, and where outside of this set the loss function is coercive and convex. We give classic examples of neural networks where this setting applies.

We adopt a *domino strategy* like in [19], inspired by proofs of weak error expansion of discretization schemes of diffusion processes, see [25] and [1]. In [19] is proved the convergence of the Euler-Maruyama scheme \bar{X} with decreasing steps (γ_n) of an ergodic and homogeneous SDE X with non constant σ , to the invariant measure of X . It then appears that the multiplicative case is much more demanding than the additive case. For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *domino strategy* consists in a step-by-step decomposition of the weak error to produce an upper bound as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}f(\bar{X}_{\Gamma_n}^x) - \mathbb{E}f(X_{\Gamma_n}^x)| &= |\bar{P}_{\gamma_1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{P}_{\gamma_n} f(x) - P_{\Gamma_n} f(x)| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n |\bar{P}_{\gamma_1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{P}_{\gamma_{k-1}} \circ (\bar{P}_{\gamma_k} - P_{\gamma_k}) \circ P_{\Gamma_n - \Gamma_k} f(x)|, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

where P and \bar{P} are the transition kernels associated to X and \bar{X} respectively and where $\Gamma_n = \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_n$. Then two terms appear: first the "error" term, for large k , where the error is controlled by classic weak and strong bounds on the error of an Euler-Maruyama scheme, and the "ergodic" term, for small k , where the ergodicity of X is used.

However, we cannot directly apply this strategy of proof to our problem since we consider a non homogeneous SDE Y , so we proceed as follows: we consider instead the SDE X where the coefficient $a(t)$ is non-increasing and piecewise constant and where the successive plateaux $[T_{n-1}, T_n)$ of a are increasingly larger time intervals. On each plateau we obtain a homogeneous and uniformly elliptic SDE with an invariant Gibbs distribution ν_{a_n} where a_n is the constant value of a on $[T_{n-1}, T_n)$, to which a *domino strategy* can be applied. This ellipticity fades with time since a_n goes to 0 and we need to carefully control its impact on the way the diffusion X gets close to its "instantaneous" invariant Gibbs distribution ν_{a_n} . To this end we have to refine several one step weak error results from [19] and ergodic bounds from [29]. Doing so we derive by induction an upper-bound for the distance between X_t and ν^* after each plateau and prove that a coefficient $(a(t))$ of order $\log^{-1/2}(t)$ is a sufficient and generally necessary condition for convergence. Using this result, we then prove the convergence of Y_t and its Euler-Maruyama scheme \bar{Y}_t by bounding the distance between X_t and Y_t and X_t and \bar{Y}_t . We also consider the "Stochastic Gradient case" i.e. where the true gradient cannot be computed exactly and where a noise, which is a sequence of increments of a martingale, is added to the gradient. This case was treated in [8] in the additive setting. The process X is used as a tool for the proof of the convergence of Y_t , however the convergence of X_t to ν^* also has its own interest since the "plateau" method is also used by practitioners.

We also establish a convergence rate which is somehow limited by $\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a(t)}, \nu^*)$, which is of order $a(t)$ under the assumption that $\text{argmin}(V)$ is finite and that $\nabla^2 V$ is positive definite at every element of $\text{argmin}(V)$; if $\text{argmin}(V)$ is still finite but if $\nabla^2 V$ is not positive definite at every element of $\text{argmin}(V)$, but if we assume instead that all the elements of $\text{argmin}(V)$ are strictly polynomial minima, then the rate is of order $a(t)^\delta$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ [2]. We pay particular attention to the non-definite case, since it was pointed out in [22] and [23] that for some optimization problems arising in Machine Learning, the Hessian of the loss function at the end of the training tends out to be extremely singular. Indeed, as the dimension of the parameter which is used to minimize the loss function is large and as the neural network can be over-parametrized, many eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix are close to zero.

However, this subject is still new in the Stochastic Optimization literature and needs more theoretical background.

Still we give sharper bounds on the rate of convergence of the L^1 -Wasserstein distance between X or Y and $\nu_{a(t)}$ as in practice the optimization procedure stops at some (large) t and the target distribution is actually $\nu_{a(t)}$ instead of ν^* .

In a next paper, we shall prove the convergence in total variation distance. In this last case, the domino strategy is more complex to implement and requires regularization lemmas, as in [19] which studies the convergence for both distances.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first give the setting and assumptions of the problem we consider. This setting is taken from [19]. We then state our main results of convergence as well as convergence rates. In Section 3 we show how this setting applies to some classic optimization problems arising in Machine Learning and present several general choices for σ that are used in practice. In Section 4 we consider the case where the coefficient a is constant and give convergence rates to the invariant measure taking into account the ellipticity parameter. We also give preliminary lemmas for the rate of convergence of ν_{a_n} to ν^* . In Section 5 we prove the convergence of the solution of the SDE where a is piecewise constant, by "plateaux". Using the dependence in a of the rate of convergence to the invariant measure in the ergodic case we prove the convergence to $\operatorname{argmin}(V)$. In Section 6 we then prove the convergence of the SDE in the case where a is not by plateau but continuously decreasing. This is done by bounding the Wasserstein distance with the "plateau" case and revisiting the lemmas for strong and weak errors from [19]. In Section 7 and Section 8 we also prove the convergence for the corresponding the Euler-Maruyama schemes. The proofs actually follow the same strategy as the previous one. In Section 9 we present experiments of training of neural networks using various specifications for σ ; the algorithms with multiplicative σ prove to be faster than the algorithm with constant σ .

NOTATIONS

We endow the space \mathbb{R}^d with the canonical Euclidean norm denoted by $|\cdot|$ and we denote $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the associated canonical inner product. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for $R > 0$, we denote $\mathbf{B}(x, R) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y - x| \leq R\}$.

For $M \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$, we denote by $\|M\|$ its operator norm, i.e. $\|M\| = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d \times k, |u|=1} M \cdot u$. If $M : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$, we denote $\|M\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|M(x)\|$.

For $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\min_{\mathbb{R}^d}(f)$ exists, we denote $\operatorname{argmin}(f) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(x) = \min_{\mathbb{R}^d}(f)\}$. We say that f is coercive if $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = +\infty$. If f is Lipschitz continuous, we denote by $[f]_{\text{Lip}}$ its Lipschitz constant. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and if f is \mathcal{C}^k , we denote by $\nabla^k f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes k}$ its differential of order k .

For a random vector X , we denote by $[X]$ its law.

We denote the L^p -Wasserstein distance between two distributions π_1 and π_2 on \mathbb{R}^d :

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \inf \left\{ \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^p \pi(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p} : \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ stands for the set of probability distributions on $(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}or(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\otimes 2})$ with respective marginal laws π_1 and π_2 . For $p = 1$, let us recall the Kantorovich-Rubinstein representation of the Wasserstein distance of order 1 [27, Equation (6.3)]:

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) (\pi_1 - \pi_2)(dx) : f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, [f]_{\text{Lip}} = 1 \right\}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by δ_x the Dirac mass at x . For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote $(x, y) = \{ux + (1 - u)y, u \in [0, 1]\}$ the geometric segment between x and y .

For $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $u \bmod(v) = u - v \lfloor u/v \rfloor$.

If u_n and v_n are two real-valued sequences, we write $u_n \asymp v_n$ meaning that $u_n = O(v_n)$ and $v_n = O(u_n)$.

In this paper, we use the notation C to denote a positive real constant, which may change from line to line. The constant C depends on the parameters of the problem: the coefficients of the SDE, the choice of A in $a(t) = A \log^{-1/2}(t)$, the upper bound $\bar{\gamma}$ on the decreasing steps, but C does not depend on t nor x .

2 Assumptions and main results

2.1 Assumptions

Let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ be a C^2 potential function such that V is coercive and

$$(x \mapsto |x|^2 e^{-2V(x)/A^2}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ for some } A > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Then V admits a minimum on \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, let us assume that

$$V^* := \min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V > 0, \quad \operatorname{argmin}(V) = \{x_1^*, \dots, x_{m^*}^*\}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m^*, \quad \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) > 0, \quad (2.2, \mathcal{H}_{V1})$$

i.e. $\min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V$ is attained at a finite number m^* of points and in each point the Hessian matrix is positive definite. We then define for $a \in (0, A]$ the Gibbs measure ν_a of density :

$$\nu_a(dx) = \mathcal{Z}_a e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a^2} dx, \quad \mathcal{Z}_a = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a^2} dx \right)^{-1} \quad (2.3)$$

Following [9, Theorem 2.1], the measure ν_a converges weakly to ν^* as $a \rightarrow 0$, where ν^* is the weighted sum of Dirac measures:

$$\nu^* = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m^*} (\det \nabla^2 V(x_j^*))^{-1/2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m^*} (\det \nabla^2 V(x_i^*))^{-1/2} \delta_{x_i^*}. \quad (2.4)$$

We consider the following Langevin SDE in \mathbb{R}^d :

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^{x_0} &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ dY_t^{x_0} &= b_a(t)(Y_t^{x_0})dt + a(t)\sigma(Y_t^{x_0})dW_t, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where, for $a \geq 0$, the drift b_a is given by

$$b_a(x) = -(\sigma\sigma^\top \nabla V)(x) + a^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j (\sigma\sigma^\top)_{ij}(x) \right]_{1 \leq i \leq d} =: -(\sigma\sigma^\top \nabla V)(x) + a^2 \Upsilon(x), \quad (2.6)$$

where W is a standard \mathbb{R}^d -valued Brownian motion defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is C^2 and

$$a(t) = \frac{A}{\sqrt{\log(t+e)}} \quad (2.7)$$

where A is defined in (2.1) and with $\log(e) = 1$. This equation corresponds to a gradient descent on the potential V with preconditioning σ and multiplicative noise ; the second term in the drift (2.6) is a correction term (see [19, Proposition 2.5]) which is zero for constant σ .

We make the following assumptions on the potential V :

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} V(x) = +\infty, \quad |\nabla V|^2 \leq CV \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla^2 V(x)\| < +\infty, \quad (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2})$$

which implies in particular that V has at most a quadratic growth. Let us also assume that

$$\sigma \text{ is bounded and Lipschitz continuous, } \nabla^2 \sigma \text{ is bounded, } \nabla(\sigma \sigma^\top) \nabla V \text{ is bounded,} \quad (2.9, \mathcal{H}_\sigma)$$

and that σ is uniformly elliptic, i.e.

$$\exists \sigma_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (\sigma \sigma^\top)(x) \geq \sigma_0^2 I_d. \quad (2.10)$$

Assumptions (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}) and (2.9, \mathcal{H}_σ) imply that Υ is also bounded and Lipschitz continuous and that b_a is Lipschitz continuous uniformly in $a \in [0, A]$. Let the minimal constant $[b]_{\text{Lip}}$ be such that:

$$\forall a \in [0, A], \quad b_a \text{ is } [b]_{\text{Lip}}\text{-Lipschitz continuous.}$$

We make the non-uniform dissipative (or convexity) assumption outside of a compact set: there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbf{B}(0, R_0)^c, \quad \left\langle \left(\sigma \sigma^\top \nabla V \right)(x) - \left(\sigma \sigma^\top \nabla V \right)(y), x - y \right\rangle \geq \alpha_0 |x - y|^2. \quad (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf})$$

Taking $y \in \mathbf{B}(0, R_0)^c$ fixed, letting $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and using the boundedness of σ , (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}) implies that $|\nabla V|$ is coercive. Using (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}) and the boundedness of σ , there exists $C > 0$ (depending on A) such that:

$$\forall a \in [0, A], \quad 1 + |b_a(x)| \leq CV^{1/2}(x).$$

Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a non-increasing sequence of varying positive steps. We define $\Gamma_n := \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_n$ and for $t \geq 0$:

$$N(t) := \min\{k \geq 0 : \Gamma_{k+1} > t\} = \max\{k \geq 0 : \Gamma_k \leq t\}.$$

We make the classical assumptions on the step sequence, namely

$$\gamma_n \downarrow 0, \quad \sum_{n \geq 1} \gamma_n = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n \geq 1} \gamma_n^2 < +\infty \quad (2.12, \mathcal{H}_{\gamma1})$$

and we also assume that

$$\varpi := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_n - \gamma_{n+1}}{\gamma_{n+1}^2} < \infty. \quad (2.13, \mathcal{H}_{\gamma2})$$

For example, if $\gamma_n = \gamma_1/n^\alpha$ with $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ then $\varpi = 0$; if $\gamma_n = \gamma_1/n$ then $\varpi = \gamma_1$.

In Stochastic Gradient algorithms, the true gradient is measured with a zero-mean noise ζ , which law only depends on the current position. That is, let us consider a family of random fields $(\zeta_n(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \zeta_n(x, \omega)$ is measurable and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the law of $\zeta_n(x)$ only depends on x and $(\zeta_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence independent of W . We make the following assumptions:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \forall p \geq 1, \quad \mathbb{E}[\zeta_1(x)] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[|\zeta_1(x)|^p] \leq C_p V^{p/2}(x). \quad (2.14)$$

We then consider the Euler-Maruyama scheme with decreasing steps associated to (Y_t) :

$$\bar{Y}_0^{x_0} = x_0, \quad \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_{n+1}}^{x_0} = \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n} + \gamma_{n+1} (b_{a(\Gamma_n)}(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0}) + \zeta_{n+1}(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0})) + a(\Gamma_n) \sigma(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0})(W_{\Gamma_{n+1}} - W_{\Gamma_n}), \quad (2.15)$$

We extend \bar{Y}^{x_0} on \mathbb{R}^+ by considering its genuine continuous interpolation:

$$\forall t \in [\Gamma_n, \Gamma_{n+1}), \quad \bar{Y}_t^{x_0} = \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0} + (t - \Gamma_n) (b_{a(\Gamma_n)}(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0}) + \zeta_{n+1}(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0})) + a(\Gamma_n) \sigma(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n}^{x_0})(W_t - W_{\Gamma_n}). \quad (2.16)$$

2.2 Main results

We now state our main results.

Theorem 2.1. (a) Let Y be defined in (2.5). Assume (2.2, \mathcal{H}_{V1}), (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}), (2.9, \mathcal{H}_σ), (2.10) and (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). If A is large enough, then for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu^\star) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

More precisely, for every $t > 0$:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu^\star) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0))a(t)$$

and for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0))t^{-\alpha}.$$

(b) Let \bar{Y} be defined in (2.15). Assume (2.2, \mathcal{H}_{V1}), (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}), (2.9, \mathcal{H}_σ), (2.10) and (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). Assume furthermore (2.12, $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma 1}$) and (2.13, $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma 2}$), that V is \mathcal{C}^3 with $\|\nabla^3 V\| \leq CV^{1/2}$ and that σ is \mathcal{C}^3 with $\|\nabla^3(\sigma\sigma^\top)\| \leq CV^{1/2}$. If A is large enough then for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu^\star) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

More precisely, for every $t > 0$:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu^\star) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0))a(t),$$

and for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0))t^{-\alpha}.$$

Remark 2.2. In particular, if $\operatorname{argmin} V = \{x^\star\}$ is reduced to a point, we can rewrite the conclusions of Theorem 2.1 as $\|Y_t^{x_0} - x^\star\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\bar{Y}_t^{x_0} - x^\star\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ respectively and so on.

2.3 The degenerate case

In this subsection we consider the case where some of the $\nabla^2 V(x_i^\star)$'s may be not definite positive but where the x_i^\star 's are strictly polynomial minima, i.e. $V(x) - V(x_i^\star)$ is bounded below in a neighbourhood of x_i^\star by a non-negative polynomial function null only in x_i^\star . This case can be treated in a similar way using the change of variable given in [2].

First, let us restate the results from [2, Theorem 4]. To simplify, let us assume that $\operatorname{argmin}(V)$ is reduced to a point.

Theorem 2.3. Assume that V is C^{2p} with $p \geq 2$, is coercive, that $\operatorname{argmin}(V) = \{x^\star\}$, that $e^{-AV} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $A > 0$ and that x^\star is a strictly polynomial minimum of order $2p$ i.e. p is the smallest integer such that

$$\exists r > 0, \forall h \in \mathcal{B}(x^\star, r) \setminus \{0\}, \sum_{k=0}^{2p} \frac{1}{k!} \nabla^k V(x^\star) \cdot h^{\otimes k} > 0.$$

Assume also the technical hypothesis [2, (8)] if $p \geq 5$. Then there exist $B \in \mathcal{O}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \{1/2, \dots, 1/(2p)\}$ and a polynomial function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is not constant in any of its variables such that

$$\forall h \in \mathbb{R}^d, \frac{1}{s} [V(x^\star + B \cdot (s^{\alpha_1} h_1, \dots, s^{\alpha_d} h_d)) - V(x^\star)] \xrightarrow[s \rightarrow 0]{} g(h).$$

Moreover assume that g is coercive. Then if $Z_s \sim \nu_{\sqrt{2}s}$,

$$\left(\frac{(B^{-1} \cdot (Z_s - x^*))_1}{s^{\alpha_1}}, \dots, \frac{(B^{-1} \cdot (Z_s - x^*))_d}{s^{\alpha_d}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} Z \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow 0,$$

where Z has density proportional to $\exp(-g)$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let us make the same assumptions as in Theorem 2.3 and assume that $V^* > 0$. Assume furthermore (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}), (2.9, \mathcal{H}_σ), (2.10) and (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). Assume furthermore (2.12, \mathcal{H}_{γ_1}) and (2.13, \mathcal{H}_{γ_2}), that V is \mathcal{C}^3 with $\|\nabla^3 V\| \leq CV^{1/2}$ and that σ is \mathcal{C}^3 with $\|\nabla^3(\sigma\sigma^\top)\| \leq CV^{1/2}$. Let us denote $\alpha_{\min} := \min(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$. Then for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0)) t^{-\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0)) t^{-\alpha}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0)) a(t)^{2\alpha_{\min}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq C \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0)) a(t)^{2\alpha_{\min}}.$$

The proof is given in the Supplementary Material.

3 Application to optimization problems

3.1 Potential function associated to a Neural Regression Problem

The setting described in Section 2 can first be applied to convex optimization problems where the potential function V has a quadratic growth as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Classical examples are least-squares regression and logistic regression with quadratic regularization, that is:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \log(1 + e^{-v_i \langle u_i, x \rangle}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} |x|^2,$$

where $v_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the data samples associated with a binary classification problem and where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization parameter.

We now consider a scalar regression problem with a fully connected neural network with quadratic regularization. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the sigmoid function. To simplify the proofs, we may consider instead a smooth function approximating the sigmoid function such that φ' has compact support. Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of layers and for $k = 1, \dots, K$, let $d_k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the size of the k^{th} layer with $d_K = 1$. For $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{K-1}}$ and for $\theta \in \mathcal{M}_{d_k, d_{k-1}}(\mathbb{R})$, we define $\varphi_\theta(u) := [\varphi([\theta \cdot u]_i)]_{1 \leq i \leq d_k}$. The output of the neural network is

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \mathbb{R}^{d_1, d_0} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_K, d_{K-1}} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_0} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \psi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K, u) &= \psi(\theta, u) = \varphi_{\theta_K} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\theta_1}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Let $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}$ be the data samples for $1 \leq i \leq M$. The objective is

$$\underset{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K}{\text{minimize}} \quad V(\theta) := \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\psi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K, u_i) - v_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} |\theta|^2,$$

where $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$ and where $\lambda > 0$.

Proposition 3.1. *Consider a neural network with a single layer : $\psi(\theta, u) = \varphi(\langle \theta, u \rangle)$. Assume that the data u and v are bounded and that u admits a continuous density. Then V satisfies (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}) and for some $R_0, \alpha_0 > 0$,*

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbf{B}(0, R_0)^c, \quad \langle \nabla V(x) - \nabla V(y), x - y \rangle \geq \alpha_0 |x - y|^2 \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Note that φ, φ' and φ'' are bounded. The function ψ is bounded so

$$2V(\theta) = \int (\varphi(\langle \theta, u \rangle) - v)^2 P(du, dv) + \lambda |\theta|^2 \sim \lambda |\theta|^2 \quad \text{as } |\theta| \rightarrow \infty,$$

so V is coercive. Moreover, we have

$$\nabla V = \int u \varphi'(\langle \theta, u \rangle) (\varphi(\langle \theta, u \rangle) - v) P(du, dv) + \lambda \theta$$

so $\nabla V(\theta) \sim \lambda \theta$ as $|\theta| \rightarrow \infty$ and $|\nabla V|^2 \leq CV$. Then, let us assume that the support of φ is included in $[-1, 1]$, that u has its values in $\mathbf{B}(0, 1)$ and v in $[-1, 1]$. Then the set $\{u \in \mathbf{B}(0, 1), |\langle \theta, u \rangle| < 1\}$ has Lebesgue measure no larger than $C/|\theta|$ so

$$\left\| \nabla^2 \int (\varphi(\langle \theta, u \rangle) - v)^2 P(du, dv) \right\| \leq C/|\theta|,$$

so outside the compact set $\{|\theta| \leq 2C/\lambda\}$, we have $\|\nabla^2 V\| \geq \lambda/2$ which guarantees (3.1). \square

However, we cannot directly extend this proposition to multi-layers neural networks. Nevertheless, if we consider that the training stops if a parameter becomes too large and if we replace $\psi(\theta, u)$ by $\psi(\phi(\theta), u)$ where $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth approximation of $x \mapsto \min(x, R)\mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \max(x, -R)\mathbf{1}_{x < 0}$ where $R > 0$ is large and where ϕ is applied in order to avoid over-fitting coordinate by coordinate then the resulting potential V with quadratic regularization satisfies (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}) and (3.1).

3.2 Practitioner's corner: choices for σ

In this section we briefly present general choices for the non-constant matrix σ that are often used in the Stochastic Optimization and Machine Learning literature.

[30] introduced the Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) with constant preconditioner matrix σ . [5] adapted the well-known Newton method, which consists in considering $\sigma \sigma^\top = (\nabla^2 V)^{-1}$, to SGLD. Since the size of the Hessian matrix may be too large in practice, because inverting it is computationally costly and because the Hessian matrix may not be positive in every point, it is suggested to consider instead $|\text{diag}((\nabla^2 V)^2)|^{-1/2}$. However, computing high-order derivatives may be cumbersome; [24] adapts the quasi-Newton method [18] to approximate the Hessian matrix to SGLD, yielding the Stochastic Quasi-Newton Langevin algorithm.

[7] and [14] give algorithms where the choice for σ is $\sigma \simeq \text{diag}((\lambda + |\nabla V|)^{-1})$, where $\lambda > 0$ guarantees numerical stability. The idea of using geometry has been explored in [20], where σ^{-2} defines the local curvature of a Riemannian manifold, giving the Stochastic Gradient Riemannian Langevin Dynamics algorithm where σ is equal to $\mathcal{I}_x^{-1/2}$ where \mathcal{I}_x is the Fischer information matrix, or to some other choices (see [20, Table 1]) as \mathcal{I}_x may be intractable. [15] extends the previous algorithm to Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods, where a momentum variable is added in order to take into account the "inertia" of the trajectory, yielding the Stochastic Gradient Riemannian Hamiltonian Monte Carlo method.

Allowing the matrix σ to depend on the position yields a faster convergence; we refer to the previous references where the simulations prove that these new methods greatly improve classical stochastic gradients algorithms. In particular, we refer to the simulations [24, Figure 2], [20, Figure 2] and [15, Figure 3] where the different methods based on multiplicative noise are compared.

4 Langevin equation with constant time coefficient

In this section, we consider the following \mathbb{R}^d -valued homogeneous SDE:

$$X_0^x = x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad dX_t^x = b_a(X_t^x)dt + a\sigma(X_t^x)dW_t, \quad (4.1)$$

with $a \in (0, A]$ and where b_a is defined in (2.6). The drift is specified in such a way that the Gibbs measure ν_a defined in (2.3) is the unique invariant distribution of (X_t^x) (see [19, Proposition 2.5]).

4.1 Exponential contraction property

We now prove contraction properties of the SDE (4.1) under the uniform convex setting on the whole \mathbb{R}^d or outside a compact set (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). If the uniform dissipative assumption holds on \mathbb{R}^d then we have the following contraction property.

Proposition 4.1. *Let Z be the solution of*

$$Z_0^x = x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad dZ_t^x = b^Z(Z_t^x)dt + \sigma^Z(Z_t^x)dW_t,$$

where the coefficients b^Z and σ^Z are Lipschitz continuous. Assume the uniform convexity i.e. there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \langle b^Z(x) - b^Z(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\sigma^Z(x) - \sigma^Z(y)\|^2 \leq -\alpha |x - y|^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Then:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{W}_1([Z_t^x], [Z_t^y]) \leq C|x - y|e^{-\alpha t}.$$

Proof. By the Itô lemma, $t \mapsto e^{2\alpha t} |Z_t^x - Z_t^y|^2$ is a super-martingale, so

$$\mathbb{E} |Z_t^x - Z_t^y|^2 \leq e^{-2\alpha t} |x - y|^2,$$

which yields the desired result. \square

This proposition can be applied to X under the assumption

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \langle b_a(x) - b_a(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{a^2}{2} \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\|^2 \leq -\alpha |x - y|^2,$$

which may be hard to check because of the dependence in a . In [19, Corollary 2.4] is proved that this contraction property is still true under the uniform convexity outside a compact set (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). We make this statement more precise by expliciting the dependence in a .

Theorem 4.2. *Under the assumption (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}),*

(a) *For every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^x], [X_t^y]) \leq C e^{C_1/a^2} |x - y| e^{-\rho_a t}, \quad \rho_a := e^{-C_2/a^2} \quad (4.3, \mathcal{P}_{cf})$$

where the constants C, C_1, C_2 do not depend on a .

(b) *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^x], \nu_a) \leq C e^{C_1/a^2} e^{-\rho_a t} \mathcal{W}_1(\delta_x, \nu_a). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. (a) We refine the proof of [29, Theorem 2.6] to enhance the dependence of the constants in the parameter a . First we remark as in [19, Section 4.5] in the proof of Corollary 2.4, that Assumption (2.17) of [29], stating that there exist constants K_1, K_2 and $r_0 > 0$ such that, with $\underline{\sigma} := \sqrt{\sigma\sigma^\top - \underline{\sigma}_0^2 I_d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{a^2}{2} \|\underline{\sigma}(x) - \underline{\sigma}(y)\|^2 - \frac{|a^2(\sigma(x) - \sigma(y))^\top (x - y)|^2}{2|x - y|^2} + \langle b_a(x) - b_a(y), x - y \rangle \\ & \leq ((K_1 + K_2)\mathbb{1}_{|x-y|\leq r_0} - K_2) |x - y|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

is true, since $a \in (0, A]$ and $\sigma\sigma^\top$ bounded, as soon as there exist positive constants \tilde{K}_1, \tilde{K}_2 and R_1 such that

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle b_a(x) - b_a(y), x - y \rangle \leq \tilde{K}_1 \mathbb{1}_{|x-y|\leq R_1} - \tilde{K}_2 |x - y|^2,$$

which is, up to changing the positive constants, equivalent to

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \langle b_0(x) - b_0(y), x - y \rangle \leq \tilde{K}_1 \mathbb{1}_{|x-y|\leq R_1} - \tilde{K}_2 |x - y|^2,$$

which is in turn equivalent to (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). Then we repeat the argument leading to (4.3) in [29]. We reformulate the assumption of ellipticity (2.10) as:

$$dX_t = b_a(X_t)dt + a(\underline{\sigma}(X_t)dW_t^1 + \underline{\sigma}_0 dW_t^2),$$

where $\underline{\sigma} \geq 0$ and where (W_t^1) and (W_t^2) are two independent Brownian motions in \mathbb{R}^d (which can be expressed in terms of W). For $x \neq y$, let X^x be the solution of this SDE with $X_0 = x$ and let Y^y solve the following coupled SDE for $Y_0^y = y$:

$$dY_t^y = b_a(Y_t^y)dt + a\underline{\sigma}(Y_t^y)dW_t^1 + a\underline{\sigma}_0 \left(dW_t^2 - 2 \frac{\langle X_t^x - Y_t^y, dW_t^2 \rangle (X_t^x - Y_t^y)}{|X_t^x - Y_t^y|^2} \right).$$

The process Y^y is in fact defined by orthogonally symmetrizing the component of the noise in W^2 w.r.t. $X_t^x - Y_t^y$ at every instant t . This SDE has a unique solution up to the coupling time

$$T_{x,y} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^x = Y_t^y\},$$

and for $t \geq T_{x,y}$ we set $Y_t^y = X_t^x$. Then Y^y has the same distribution as X^y i.e. is a weak solution of (4.1) with starting value y and it follows from (4.5) and from the Itô formula applied to $|X^x - Y^y|$ that for every $0 \leq u \leq t \leq T_{x,y}$,

$$|X_t^x - Y_t^y| - |X_u^x - Y_u^y| \leq M_t - M_u + \int_u^t \left((K_1 + K_2)\mathbb{1}_{|X_s^x - Y_s^y|\leq r_0} - K_2 \right) |X_s^x - Y_s^y| ds,$$

where

$$M_t = \int_0^t \frac{a\langle 2\underline{\sigma}_0 dW_s^2 + (\underline{\sigma}(X_s) - \underline{\sigma}(Y_s^y))dW_s^1, X_s^x - Y_s^y \rangle}{|X_s^x - Y_s^y|}$$

is a true Brownian martingale with bracket process satisfying

$$\langle M \rangle_t \geq 4a^2 \underline{\sigma}_0^2 t. \quad (4.6)$$

We now set, still like in the proof of (4.3) in [29],

$$p_t := |X_t^x - Y_t^y| \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{p}_t := \varepsilon p_t + 1 - e^{-Np_t},$$

where

$$N := \frac{r_0}{a^2 \underline{\sigma}_0^2} (K_1 + K_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon := N e^{-Nr_0}.$$

Then we have :

$$\varepsilon p_t \leq \bar{p}_t \leq (N + \varepsilon)p_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \forall r \in [0, r_0), \quad \frac{2N^2}{r(\varepsilon e^{Nr} + N)} \geq \frac{K_1 + K_2}{a^2 \sigma_0^2}.$$

Then using (4.6) we derive for all $0 \leq u \leq t \leq T_{x,y}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p}_t - \bar{p}_u &\leq \int_u^t (\varepsilon + N e^{-N p_s}) dM_s + \int_u^t (\varepsilon + N e^{-N p_s}) \left((K_1 + K_2) \mathbf{1}_{p_s \leq r_0} - K_2 - \frac{2N^2 a^2 \sigma_0^2}{p_s(\varepsilon e^{N p_s} + N)} \right) p_s ds \\ &\leq \tilde{M}_t - \tilde{M}_u - K_2 \int_u^t (\varepsilon + N e^{-N p_s}) p_s ds \leq \tilde{M}_t - \tilde{M}_u - \varepsilon K_2 \int_u^t p_s ds \leq \tilde{M}_t - \tilde{M}_u - \frac{\varepsilon K_2}{N + \varepsilon} \int_u^t \bar{p}_s ds. \end{aligned}$$

So that we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{p}_t - \bar{p}_u] = \mathbb{E}[(\bar{p}_t - \bar{p}_u) \mathbf{1}_{t \leq T_{x,y}}] \leq -\frac{\varepsilon K_2}{N + \varepsilon} \int_u^t \mathbb{E} \bar{p}_s ds,$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\bar{p}_t] \leq -\frac{\varepsilon K_2}{N + \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[\bar{p}_t]$$

and then

$$\mathbb{E} \bar{p}_t \leq \bar{p}_0 e^{-\frac{\varepsilon K_2}{N + \varepsilon} t}.$$

Noting that $\bar{p}_0 \leq (N + \varepsilon)|x - y|$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} p_t \leq \frac{N + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} |x - y| e^{-\frac{\varepsilon K_2}{N + \varepsilon} t},$$

so that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^x], [X_t^y]) \leq \frac{N + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} |x - y| e^{-\frac{\varepsilon K_2}{N + \varepsilon} t} \leq C e^{C_1/a^2} |x - y| e^{-e^{-C_2/a^2} t}.$$

(b) As ν_a is the invariant distribution of the diffusion (4.1), using (4.3, \mathcal{P}_{cf}) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^x], \nu_a) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^x], [X_t^y]) \nu_a(dy) \leq C e^{C_1/a^2} e^{-\rho_a t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - y| \nu_a(dy) \\ &\leq C e^{C_1/a^2} e^{-\rho_a t} \mathcal{W}_1(\delta_x, \nu_a). \end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 Time schedule and Wasserstein distance between Gibbs measures

For $C_{(T)} > 0$ and for $\beta > 0$, let us define the time schedule that will be used for the plateau SDE in the next section:

$$T_n := C_{(T)} n^{1+\beta}, \tag{4.7}$$

and by a slight abuse of notation we define

$$a_n := a(T_n) = \frac{A}{\sqrt{\log(T_n + e)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n := \rho_{a_n} = e^{-C_2/a_n^2}. \tag{4.8}$$

Lemma 4.3. *The sequence $a_n = A \log^{-1/2}(T_n + e)$ satisfies*

$$0 \leq a_n - a_{n+1} \asymp (n \log^{3/2}(n))^{-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. One straightforwardly checks that

$$a_n - a_{n+1} \sim -\frac{d}{dn} \left(\frac{A}{\sqrt{\log(C_{(T)}n^{1+\beta}+e)}} \right) = \frac{A\beta}{2\log^{3/2}(C_{(T)}n^{1+\beta}+e) (n+e/(C_{(T)}n^\beta))} \asymp \frac{1}{n\log^{3/2}(n)}.$$

□

We prove the following result that will be useful to study the convergence of the plateau SDE.

Proposition 4.4. *Let ν_a , $a \in (0, A]$ be the Gibbs measure defined in (2.3). Assume that V is coercive, that $(x \mapsto |x|^2 e^{-2V(x)/A^2}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and (2.2, \mathcal{H}_{V1}). Then for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \leq \frac{C}{n\log^{3/2}(n)}.$$

Moreover, for every $s, t \in [a_{n+1}, a_n]$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_s, \nu_t) \leq \frac{C}{n\log^{3/2}(n)}.$$

The proof of this proposition is given in the Supplementary Material. It relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let μ and ν be two probability distributions on \mathbb{R}^d with densities f and g respectively with finite moments of order p . Assume that there exists $M \geq 1$ such that $f \leq Mg$. Then*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)^p \leq \mathbb{E}|X - Y|^p - \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}|^p,$$

where X and $\tilde{X} \sim \mu$, $Y \sim \nu$ and X, \tilde{X} and Y are mutually independent.

Proof. We define a coupling on μ and ν inspired from the acceptance rejection sampling as follows. Let $X \sim \mu$, $Y \sim \nu$, $U \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ and X, Y, U are independent, and let

$$X' = Y\mathbb{1}\{U \leq f(Y)/(Mg(Y))\} + X\mathbb{1}\{U > f(Y)/(Mg(Y))\}.$$

Then adapting the proof of the acceptance rejection method, $X' \sim \mu$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X' - Y|^p &= \mathbb{E}|Y - X|^p \mathbb{1}\{U > f(Y)/(Mg(Y))\} \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^2} |y - x|^p \left(\int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{u > f(y)/(Mg(y))\} du \right) f(x)g(y) dx dy \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^2} |y - x|^p f(x)g(y) dx dy - \frac{1}{M} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^2} |y - x|^p f(x)f(y) dx dy \\ &= \mathbb{E}|X - Y|^p - \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}|^p. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.6. *We have*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu^\star) \leq Ca_n. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. First let us prove that $\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_a, \nu^\star) \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow 0$. By Proposition 4.4 and using that

$$\sum_{n \geq 2} (n\log^{3/2}(n))^{-1} < \infty,$$

(ν_{a_n}) is a Cauchy sequence in $(L^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathcal{W}_1)$ so converges to some limit measure $\tilde{\nu}$. But (ν_{a_n}) also weakly converges to $\tilde{\nu}$, so $\tilde{\nu} = \nu^\star$. Moreover, $\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu^\star)$ is bounded by the tail of the above series, which is of order $\log^{-1/2}(n)$. □

5 Plateau case

We define (X_t) as the solution the following SDE where the coefficients piecewisely depend on the time; X is then said to be "by plateaux":

$$X_0^{x_0} = x_0, \quad dX_t^{x_0} = b_{a_{k+1}}(X_t^{x_0})dt + a_{k+1}\sigma(X_t^{x_0})dW_t, \quad t \in [T_k, T_{k+1}], \quad (5.1)$$

where b_a is defined in (2.6), (T_n) is defined in (4.7) and (a_n) is defined in (4.8). We note that although the coefficients are not continuous, the process $(X_t^{x_0})$ is well defined as it is the continuous concatenation of the solutions of the equations on the intervals $[T_k, T_{k+1}]$. More generally, we define $(X_t^{x,n})$ as the solution of

$$X_0^{x,n} = x, \quad dX_t^{x,n} = b_{a_{k+1}}(X_t^{x,n})dt + a_{k+1}\sigma(X_t^{x,n})dW_t, \quad t \in [T_k - T_n, T_{k+1} - T_n], \quad k \geq n,$$

i.e. $(X_t^{x,n})$ has the law of $(X_{T_n+t})_{t \geq 0}$ conditionally to $X_{T_n} = x$. We have $X_t^x = X_t^{x,0}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be defined in (5.1). If*

$$A > \max \left(\sqrt{(1 + \beta^{-1})C_2}, \sqrt{(1 + \beta)C_1} \right), \quad (5.2)$$

where C_1 and C_2 are given in in (4.3, \mathcal{P}_{cf}), then for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x_0}], \nu^\star) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

More precisely, for $t \geq 0$ we have:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x_0}], \nu^\star) \leq Ca(t)(1 + |x_0|),$$

for all $C' < C_{(T)}$, for all large enough $n \geq n(C'_{(T)})$, on the time schedule (T_n) we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) \leq Cn^{-1+(\beta+1)C_1/A^2} e^{-(C')^{1-C_2/A^2}(\beta+1)n^{\beta-(\beta+1)C_2/A^2}} (1 + |x_0|)$$

and we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq \frac{C(1 + |x_0|)}{t^{(\beta+1)^{-1}-C_1/A^2} \log^{3/2}(t)}.$$

Proof. For fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and using Theorem 4.2 we have:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \leq Ce^{C_1/a_{n+1}^2} e^{-\rho_{a_{n+1}}(T_{n+1}-T_n)} \mathcal{W}_1(\delta_x, \nu_{a_{n+1}}).$$

So integrating x with respect to the law of $X_{T_n}^{x_0}$ (and using the existence of the optimal coupling, see for example [28, Proposition 1.3]) yields:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \leq Ce^{C_1/a_{n+1}^2} e^{-\rho_{a_{n+1}}(T_{n+1}-T_n)} (\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) + \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}})). \quad (5.3)$$

Iterating this relation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) &\leq \mu_{n+1} \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) + \mu_{n+1} \mu_n \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_{n-1}}, \nu_{a_n}) + \cdots + \mu_{n+1} \cdots \mu_1 \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_0}, \nu_{a_1}) \\ &\quad + \mu_{n+1} \cdots \mu_1 \mathcal{W}_1(\delta_{x_0}, \nu_{a_0}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\mu_n := Ce^{C_1/a_n^2} e^{-\rho_{a_n}(T_n-T_{n-1})} = C(T_n + e)^{C_1/A^2} e^{-(T_n+e)^{-C_2/A^2}(T_n-T_{n-1})}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C(C_{(T)}n^{\beta+1} + e)^{C_1/A^2} e^{-(C_{(T)}n^{\beta+1}+e)^{-C_2/A^2} C_{(T)}(\beta+1)(n-1)^\beta} \\
&\leq Cn^{(\beta+1)C_1/A^2} e^{-(C')^{1-C_2/A^2}(\beta+1)n^{\beta-(\beta+1)C_2/A^2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where we have used (4.7) and where the last inequality holds for large enough n . Note that μ_n is bounded by a sequence in the form of $n^\delta \exp(-Ln^\eta) = o(n^{-\ell})$ for every $\ell \geq 0$. Owing to (5.2), we have $\beta - (\beta + 1)C_2/A^2 > 0$.

On the other hand, if $Z \sim \nu_{a_0}$ then $\mathcal{W}_1(\delta_{x_0}, \nu_{a_0}) = \mathbb{E}|x_0 - Z| \leq |x_0| + \mathbb{E}|Z|$. Plugging this into (5.4) and using that $\mu_n \rightarrow 0$ so is bounded and smaller than 1 for n large enough and then $(\mu_{n-1} \cdots \mu_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n-1}$ is bounded ; using Proposition 4.4 and that $\sum_n (n \log^{3/2}(n))^{-1} < \infty$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) &\leq \mu_{n+1} \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) + C\mu_{n+1}\mu_n (\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_{n-1}}, \nu_{a_n}) + \cdots + \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_0}, \nu_{a_1})) \\
&\quad + C\mu_{n+1}\mu_n \mathcal{W}_1(\delta_{x_0}, \nu_{a_0}) \\
&\leq \mu_{n+1} \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) + C\mu_{n+1}\mu_n + C\mu_{n+1}\mu_n(1 + |x_0|) \\
&\leq C \frac{\mu_{n+1}}{n \log^{3/2}(n)} (1 + |x_0|) \leq C\mu_{n+1}a_{n+1}(1 + |x_0|),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mu_n = o(\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}))$. Then using Lemma 4.6 we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) + \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_{n+1}}, \nu^*) \leq Ca_n(1 + |x_0|),$$

where we used once again $\mu_n \rightarrow 0$.

Now, let us prove that $\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x_0}], \nu^*) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. For $t \in [0, T_{n+1} - T_n]$ we integrate (4.4) with respect to the law of $X_{T_n}^{x_0}$, giving

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) &\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{a_{n+1}} t} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \\
&\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} (\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) + \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}})) \\
&\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) (1 + |x_0|) \\
&\leq \frac{C(1 + |x_0|)}{n^{1-(\beta+1)C_1/A^2} \log^{3/2}(n)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Now, for $t \geq 0$, let n be such that $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$. Then $(n+1) \geq t^{1/(\beta+1)}$ and

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) + \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_{n+1}}, \nu_{a(t)}) \leq \frac{C(1 + |x_0|)}{t^{(\beta+1)^{-1}-C_1/A^2} \log^{3/2}(t)}, \tag{5.7}$$

where we used the second claim of Proposition 4.4.

Furthermore owing to (5.2) we have $(\beta + 1)C_1/A^2 < 1$, so that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) + \mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_{n+1}}, \nu^*) \leq Ca_n(1 + |x_0|).$$

□

Remark 5.2. We find again the classic schedule $a(t)$ of order $\log^{-1/2}(t)$. If for example we choose instead $a_n = \log(T_n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then we obtain

$$\log(\mu_1 \cdots \mu_n) = n \log(C) + \frac{C_1}{A^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \log^{1+\varepsilon}(T_k) - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{T_k - T_{k-1}}{T_k^{\log^\varepsilon(T_k) C_2/A^2}}.$$

Hence, as $T_n - T_{n-1} = o(T_n^{\log^\varepsilon(T_n) C_2/A^2})$, $\mu_1 \cdots \mu_n$ does not converge to 0 whatever the value of $A > 0$ is.

6 Continuously decreasing case

We now consider (Y_t) solution to (2.5) i.e. the Langevin equation where the time coefficient $a(t)$ before σ is continuously decreasing. More generally, since Y is solution to a non-homogeneous SDE, we define for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for every fixed $u \geq 0$:

$$Y_{0,u}^x = x, \quad dY_{t,u}^x = b_{a(t+u)}(Y_{t,u}^x)dt + a(t+u)\sigma(Y_{t,u}^x)dW_t, \quad (6.1)$$

so that $Y^x = Y_{\cdot,0}^x$. We define the kernel associated to Y between the times t and $t+u$ as $P_{t,u}^Y$ such that for all $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ measurable, $P_{t,u}^Y f(x) = \mathbb{E}[f(Y_{t,u}^x)]$. We also consider X as defined in (5.1) and its associated kernel denoted as $P_t^{X,n}$ such that for every $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ measurable, $P_t^{X,n} f(x) = \mathbb{E}[f(X_t^{x,n})]$.

6.1 Boundedness of the potential

Lemma 6.1. *Let $p > 0$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $n \geq 0$, for every $u \geq 0$ and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$:*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} V^p(X_t^{x,n}) \leq C V^p(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} V^p(Y_{t,u}^x) \leq C V^p(x).$$

Proof. By the Itô Lemma, we have for $k \geq n$ and for $t \in [T_k - T_n, T_{k+1} - T_n]$:

$$\begin{aligned} dV^p(X_t^{x,n}) &= p \nabla V(X_t^{x,n})^\top \cdot V^{p-1}(X_t^{x,n}) \left(-\sigma \sigma^\top(X_t^{x,n}) \nabla V(X_t^{x,n}) + a_{k+1}^2 \Upsilon(X_t^{x,n}) \right) dt \\ &\quad + p \nabla V(X_t^{x,n})^\top \cdot V^{p-1}(X_t^{x,n}) a_{k+1} \sigma(X_t^{x,n}) dW_t \\ &\quad + \frac{p}{2} \left(\nabla^2 V(X_t^{x,n}) V^{p-1}(X_t^{x,n}) + (p-1) |\nabla V(X_t^{x,n})|^2 \cdot V^{p-2}(X_t^{x,n}) \right) a_{k+1}^2 \sigma \sigma^\top(X_t^{x,n}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using the facts that (a_k) , Υ , σ , $\nabla^2 V$ are bounded, that $|\nabla V| \leq C V^{1/2}$ and that V , $|\nabla V|$ are coercive and $\sigma \sigma^\top \geq \sigma_0^2 I_d$, there exists $R > 0$ such that if $|X_t^{x,n}| \geq R$ then the coefficient of dt in the last equation is bounded above by

$$p V^{p-1} \nabla V(X_t^{x,n})^\top \cdot (-\sigma_0^2(X_t^{x,n}) \nabla V(X_t^{x,n}) + C) + C V^{p-1}(X_t^{x,n}) \|\sigma\|_\infty^2 \leq 0,$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E}[V^p(X_t^{x,n})] \leq \max \left(\sup_{|z| \leq R} V^p(z), V^p(x) \right).$$

The proof is the same for Y , replacing a_{k+1} by $a(t)$. □

6.2 Strong and weak error bounds

In this subsection we adapt the proofs to bound weak and strong errors from [19] while paying attention to the dependence in a_n .

Lemma 6.2. *Let $p \geq 1$ and let $\bar{\gamma} > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 0$, $u, t \geq 0$ such that $u \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$, $u+t \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$ and $t \leq \bar{\gamma}$,*

$$\|X_t^{x,n} - Y_{t,u}^x\|_p \leq C \sqrt{t} (a_n - a_{n+1}).$$

Proof. We first consider the case $p \geq 2$. Noting that $a_{n+1} \leq a(u+s) \leq a_n$ for all $s \in [0, t]$ and using Lemma A.1 in the Appendix, with in mind that $b_a = b_0 + a^2 \Upsilon$, we have

$$\|X_t^{x,n} - Y_{t,u}^x\|_p \leq \left\| \int_0^t (b_{a_{n+1}}(X_s^{x,n}) - b_{a(u+s)}(Y_{s,u}^x)) ds \right\|_p + \left\| \int_0^t (a_{n+1} \sigma(X_s^{x,n}) - a(u+s) \sigma(Y_{s,u}^x)) dW_s \right\|_p$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq [b]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p ds + \int_0^t \|a_{n+1}^2 \Upsilon(X_s^{x,n}) - a(u+s)^2 \Upsilon(Y_{s,u}^x)\|_p ds \\
&\quad + C_p^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2} + \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(Y_{s,u}^x) (a_{n+1} - a(u+s)) dW_s \right\|_p \\
&\leq [b]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p ds + \|\Upsilon\|_\infty (a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2) t + a_{n+1}^2 [\Upsilon]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p ds \\
&\quad + C_p^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2} + \|\sigma\|_\infty \|W_1\|_p \sqrt{t} (a_n - a_{n+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the generalized Minkowski inequality. Set $\varphi(t) := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p$ and $\psi(t) := \|\Upsilon\|_\infty (a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2) t + \|\sigma\|_\infty \|W_1\|_p \sqrt{t} (a_n - a_{n+1})$. Both functions are non-decreasing and

$$\varphi(t) \leq \psi(t) + ([b]_{\text{Lip}} + a_{n+1}^2 [\Upsilon]_{\text{Lip}}) \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p ds + C_p^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - Y_{s,u}^x\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, for every $\alpha > 0$:

$$\left(\int_0^t \varphi(s)^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{\varphi(t)} \sqrt{\int_0^t \varphi(s) ds} \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \varphi(t) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_0^t \varphi(s) ds.$$

Taking $\alpha = (C_p^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}})^{-1}$ yields:

$$\varphi(t) \leq 2\psi(t) + (2[b]_{\text{Lip}} + 2a_{n+1}^2 [\Upsilon]_{\text{Lip}} + (C_p^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}})^2) \int_0^t \varphi(s) ds.$$

So the Gronwall Lemma yields for every $t \in [0, \bar{\gamma}]$

$$\varphi(t) \leq 2e^{(2[b]_{\text{Lip}} + 2a_{n+1}^2 [\Upsilon]_{\text{Lip}} + (C_p^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}})^2) \bar{\gamma}} \psi(t),$$

which completes the proof for $p \geq 2$, noting that $a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2 \leq 2a_n(a_n - a_{n+1}) = o(a_n - a_{n+1})$. If $p \in [1, 2)$, the inequality is still true remarking that $\|\cdot\|_p \leq \|\cdot\|_2$. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let $p \geq 1$ and let $\bar{\gamma} > 0$. There exists a real constant $C \geq 0$ such that for all $n \geq 0$,*

$$\forall t \in [0, \bar{\gamma}], \quad \|X_t^{x,n} - x\|_p \leq CV^{1/2}(x) \sqrt{t}.$$

Proof. We perform a proof similar to the proof of Lemma 6.2. For $p \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|X_t^{x,n} - x\|_p &\leq \left\| \int_0^t b_{a_{n+1}}(X_s^{x,n}) ds \right\|_p + \left\| \int_0^t a_{n+1} \sigma(X_s^{x,n}) ds \right\|_p \\
&\leq t |b_{a_{n+1}}(x)| + A \|\sigma\|_\infty \|W\|_1 \sqrt{t} + [b]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - x\|_p ds + A [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} C_p^{BDG} \left(\int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - x\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

From here we use the Gronwall Lemma as in the proof of Lemma 6.2. For $p \in [1, 2)$, we have $\|\cdot\|_p \leq \|\cdot\|_2$. \square

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\bar{\gamma} > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for every $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being \mathcal{C}^2 , for every $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, every $n \geq 0$ and every $u \geq 0$ such that $u \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$ and $u + \gamma \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{\gamma,u}^x)] - \mathbb{E}[g(X_{\gamma}^{x,n})]| \leq C\gamma(a_n - a_{n+1})\Phi_g(x) \\
&\text{with } \Phi_g(x) = \max \left(|\nabla g(x)|, \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_{\gamma}^{x,n}, Y_{\gamma,u}^x)} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2, V^{1/2}(x) \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_{\gamma}^{x,n})} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the second order Taylor formula, for every $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$g(z) - g(y) = \langle \nabla g(y) | z - y \rangle + \int_0^1 (1-s) \nabla^2 g(sz + (1-s)y) ds (z - y)^{\otimes 2}.$$

Applying this expansion with $y = X_\gamma^{x,n}$ and $z = Y_{\gamma,u}^x$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{\gamma,u}^x) - g(X_\gamma^{x,n})] &= \langle \nabla g(x) | \mathbb{E}[Y_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}] \rangle + \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla g(X_\gamma^{x,n}) - \nabla g(x), Y_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n} \rangle] \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 (1-s) \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 g(sY_{\gamma,u}^x + (1-s)X_\gamma^{x,n})(Y_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n})^{\otimes 2}] ds. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

The first term is bounded by $|\nabla g(x)| \cdot |\mathbb{E}[Y_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}]|$, with

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[Y_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}]| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\gamma (b_{a(s+u)}(Y_{s,u}^x) - b_{a(s+u)}(X_s^{x,n})) ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\gamma (b_{a(u+s)}(X_s^{x,n}) - b_{a_{n+1}}(X_s^{x,n})) ds \right] \right| \\ &\leq C[b]_{\text{Lip}}(a_n - a_{n+1}) \int_0^\gamma \sqrt{s} ds + \|\Upsilon\|_\infty \gamma (a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2) \leq C\gamma(a_n - a_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 6.2. Using Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.2 again, the second term in the right hand side of (6.2) is bounded by

$$C \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_\gamma^{x,n})} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2 \sqrt{\gamma} V^{1/2}(x) \sqrt{\gamma}(a_n - a_{n+1}).$$

Using Lemma 6.2, the third term is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2} C\gamma(a_n - a_{n+1})^2 \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_\gamma^{x,n}, Y_{\gamma,u}^x)} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2.$$

□

Proposition 6.5. *Let $T, \bar{\gamma} > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for every Lipschitz continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and every $t \in (0, T]$, for all $n \geq 0$, for all $\gamma < \bar{\gamma}$ and every $u \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$ such that $u + t + \gamma \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[P_t^{X,n} f(Y_{\gamma,u}^x) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[P_t^{X,n} f(X_\gamma^{x,n}) \right] \right| \leq C a_{n+1}^{-2} (a_n - a_{n+1}) [f]_{\text{Lip}} \gamma t^{-1/2} V(x).$$

Proof. We apply Proposition 6.4 to $g_t := P_t^{X,n} f$ with $t > 0$. Following [19, Proposition 3.2(b)] while paying attention to the dependence in the ellipticity parameter a , we have

$$\Phi_{g_t}(x) \leq C[f]_{\text{Lip}} a_{n+1}^{-2} t^{-1/2} \max \left(V^{1/2}(x), \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_\gamma^{x,n}, Y_{\gamma,u}^x)} V^{1/2}(\xi) \right\|_2, V^{1/2}(x) \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_\gamma^{x,n})} V^{1/2}(\xi) \right\|_2 \right).$$

But following (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}), $\nabla V/V^{1/2}$ is bounded so $V^{1/2}$ is Lipschitz continuous and then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_\gamma^{x,n})} V^{1/2}(\xi) \right\|_2 &\leq \left\| V^{1/2}(x) + [V^{1/2}]_{\text{Lip}} |X_\gamma^{x,n} - x| \right\|_2 \leq C V^{1/2}(x) \\ \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_\gamma^{x,n}, Y_{\gamma,u}^x)} V^{1/2}(\xi) \right\|_2 &\leq \left\| V^{1/2}(x) + [V^{1/2}]_{\text{Lip}} \max(|X_\gamma^{x,n} - x|, |Y_{\gamma,u}^x - x|) \right\|_2 \leq C V^{1/2}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemmas 6.3 and 6.2. We thus obtain the desired result. □




Figure 1: *Intervals for the domino strategy.*

6.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1.(a)

More precisely, we prove that for all $\beta > 0$, if

$$A > \max \left(\sqrt{(\beta + 1)(2C_1 + C_2)}, \sqrt{(1 + \beta^{-1})C_2} \right), \quad (6.3)$$

then

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq \frac{C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0))}{\log^{3/2}(t) t^{(1+\beta)^{-1} - (2C_1 + C_2)/A^2}}.$$

Proof. We apply the *domino strategy* (1.2). Let us fix $T \in (0, T_1)$ and $\gamma \in (0, T_1 - T)$. Here γ is not linked to any Euler-Maruyama scheme but is an auxiliary tool for the proof. Let $n \geq 0$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz continuous. We divide the two intervals $[T_n, T_{n+1} - T]$ and $[T_{n+1} - T, T_{n+1}]$ into smaller intervals of size γ (see Figure 1) and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ using the semi-group property of $P^{X,n}$ on $[T_n, T_{n+1})$ we write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}f(X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}) - \mathbb{E}f(Y_{T_{n+1}-T_n, T_n}^x) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (T_{n+1}-T_n-T)/\gamma \rfloor} \left| P_{(k-1)\gamma, T_n}^Y \circ (P_{\gamma, T_n+(k-1)\gamma}^Y - P_{\gamma}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma}^{X,n} f(x) \right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=\lfloor (T_{n+1}-T_n-T)/\gamma \rfloor+1}^{\lfloor (T_{n+1}-T_n)/\gamma \rfloor-1} \left| P_{(k-1)\gamma, T_n}^Y \circ (P_{\gamma, T_n+(k-1)\gamma}^Y - P_{\gamma}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma}^{X,n} f(x) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| P_{\gamma(\lfloor (T_{n+1}-T_n)/\gamma \rfloor-1), T_n}^Y \circ (P_{\gamma+(T_{n+1}-T_n) \bmod \gamma, T_n+\gamma(\lfloor (T_{n+1}-T_n)/\gamma \rfloor-1)}^Y - P_{\gamma+(T_{n+1}-T_n) \bmod \gamma}^{X,n}) f(x) \right| \\ & =: (a) + (b) + (c). \end{aligned}$$

The term (a) is the "ergodic term", for which the exponential contraction from Theorem 4.2 can be exploited. The terms (b) and (c) are the "error terms" where we bound the error on intervals of length no larger than T . The term (c) is a remainder term due to the fact that $T_{n+1} - T_n$ is generally not a multiple of γ .

- **Term (a) :** It follows from Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 6.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & |(P_{\gamma, T_n+(k-1)\gamma}^Y - P_{\gamma}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma}^{X,n} f(x)| \\ & = |\mathbb{E}P_{T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma}^{X,n} f(X_{\gamma}^{x,n}) - \mathbb{E}P_{T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma, n}^X f(Y_{\gamma, T_n+(k-1)\gamma}^x)| \\ & \leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} \mathbb{E}|X_{\gamma}^{x,n} - Y_{\gamma, T_n+(k-1)\gamma}^x| \\ & \leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-T_n-k\gamma)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} \sqrt{\gamma} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to $P_{(k-1)\gamma, T_n}^Y$ and summing up yields

$$(a) \leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} \sqrt{\gamma} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \frac{e^{-\rho_{n+1}T} - e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-T_n)}}{e^{\gamma \rho_{n+1}} - 1}$$

$$\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} \sqrt{\gamma} (a_n - a_{n+1}) (\gamma \rho_{n+1})^{-1}.$$

• **Term (b):** Applying Proposition 6.5 yields:

$$|(P_{\gamma, T_n + (k-1)\gamma}^Y - P_{\gamma}^{X, n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1} - T_n - k\gamma}^{X, n} f(x)| \leq Ca_n^{-2} (a_n - a_{n+1}) [f]_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{T_{n+1} - T_n - k\gamma}} V(x).$$

Integrating with respect to $P_{(k-1)\gamma, T_n}^Y$ and using Lemma 6.1 which guarantees that $P_{(k-1)\gamma, T_n}^Y V(x) \leq CV(x)$ and summing with respect to k implies

$$(b) \leq Ca_n^{-2} (a_n - a_{n+1}) [f]_{\text{Lip}} \gamma V(x) \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil T/\gamma \rceil} (k\gamma)^{-1/2} \leq Ca_n^{-2} (a_n - a_{n+1}) [f]_{\text{Lip}} T^{1/2} V(x).$$

• **Term (c):** Noting that $\gamma + (T_{n+1} - T_n) \bmod(\gamma) \leq 2\gamma$, Lemma 6.2 yields

$$(c) \leq C[f]_{\text{Lip}} \sqrt{\gamma} (a_n - a_{n+1}).$$

Now we sum up the terms (a), (b) and (c). Since γ is constant we have:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}f(X_{T_{n+1} - T_n}^{x, n}) - \mathbb{E}f(Y_{T_{n+1} - T_n, T_n}^x) \right| \leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \rho_{n+1}^{-1} [f]_{\text{Lip}} V(x),$$

so that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1} - T_n}^{x, n}], [Y_{T_{n+1} - T_n, T_n}^x]) \leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \rho_{n+1}^{-1} V(x). \quad (6.4)$$

Temporarily setting $x_n := X_{T_n}^{x_0}$ and $y_n := Y_{T_n}^{x_0}$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [Y_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) &= \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1} - T_n}^{x_n, n}], [Y_{T_{n+1} - T_n, T_n}^{y_n}]) \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1} - T_n}^{x_n, n}], [X_{T_{n+1} - T_n}^{y_n, n}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1} - T_n}^{y_n, n}], [Y_{T_{n+1} - T_n, T_n}^{y_n}]) \\ &\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1} - T_n)} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], [Y_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \rho_{n+1}^{-1} \mathbb{E}V(Y_{T_n}^{x_0}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Theorem 4.2 and (6.4). We then apply Lemma 6.1 which guarantees that $(\mathbb{E}V(Y_{T_n}^{x_0}))_n$ is bounded by $CV(x_0)$. Let us denote

$$\lambda_n := Ce^{C_1 a_n^{-2}} (a_{n-1} - a_n) \rho_n^{-1} = Ce^{(C_1 + C_2) a_n^{-2}} (a_{n-1} - a_n).$$

Owing to (6.3) we have $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$. Iterating this relation and using (μ_n) defined in (5.5) yields like in the proof of Theorem 5.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [Y_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) &\leq CV(x_0) (\lambda_{n+1} + \mu_{n+1} \lambda_n + \mu_{n+1} \mu_n \lambda_{n-1} + \cdots + \mu_{n+1} \cdots \mu_2 \lambda_1) \\ &\leq CV(x_0) (\lambda_{n+1} + \mu_{n+1} (\lambda_n + \cdots + \lambda_1)) \\ &\leq CV(x_0) (\lambda_{n+1} + n \mu_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

But following (5.5) one checks that $n \mu_{n+1} = o(\lambda_{n+1})$ so that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [Y_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) \leq CV(x_0) \lambda_{n+1} \leq \frac{CV(x_0)}{\log^{3/2}(n+1)(n+1)^{1-(\beta+1)(C_1+C_2)/A^2}}.$$

Moreover, owing to (6.3) and combining with Theorem 5.1 we get

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n}^{x_0}], [X_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) \leq \frac{C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0))}{\log^{3/2}(n) n^{1-(\beta+1)(C_1+C_2)/A^2}}$$




Figure 2: Decreasing of the noise coefficient a for the plateau and non plateau cases.

and as the right hand side of these inequalities is in $o(a_n)$, we derive

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n}^{x_0}], [X_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq C a_n \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0)).$$

• **Convergence for $t \rightarrow \infty$:** Now let us prove that $\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu^*) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. As before, let $T > 0$. For $t \geq T$, then we perform the same domino strategy where we replace T_{n+1} by $T_n + t$ and we consider the intervals $[T_n, T_n + t - T]$ and $[T_n + t - T, T_n + t]$. For $t < T$ then we only consider the terms (b) and (c) and we replace T by t in (b). Doing so we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_t^{x,n}], [Y_{t,T_n}^x]) \leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \rho_{n+1}^{-1} V(x).$$

So that, as before:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], [Y_{T_n+t}^x]) &\leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], [Y_{T_n+t}^x]) + C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \rho_{n+1}^{-1} V(x_0) \\ &\leq \frac{C V(x_0)}{\log^{3/2}(n) n^{1-(\beta+1)(2C_1+C_2)/A^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Owing to (6.3) we have $1 - (\beta + 1)(2C_1 + C_2)/A^2 > 1$, so that, using (5.6),

$$\mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([Y_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], [X_{T_n+t}^{x_0}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n+t}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \leq \frac{C \max(1 + |x_0|, V(x_0))}{\log^{3/2}(n) n^{1-(\beta+1)(2C_1+C_2)/A^2}}.$$

We then prove the bound for $\mathcal{W}_1([Y_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)})$ the same way as for (5.7), using the second claim of Proposition 4.4. □

7 Continuously decreasing case : the Euler-Maruyama scheme

We now consider (\bar{Y}_n) to be the Euler-Maruyama scheme of (Y_t) with steps (γ_n) defined in (2.15) and we also consider its genuine interpolation defined in (2.16). As with (6.1), we define more generally for every $n \geq 0$, $(\bar{Y}_{t,\Gamma_n}^x)_{t \geq 0}$, first at times $\Gamma_k - \Gamma_n$, $k \geq n$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_{0,\Gamma_n}^x &= x, \quad \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_{k+1}-\Gamma_n,\Gamma_n}^x = \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_k-\Gamma_n,\Gamma_n}^x + \gamma_{k+1} (b_{a(\Gamma_k)}(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_k-\Gamma_n,\Gamma_n}^x) + \zeta_{k+1}(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_k-\Gamma_n,\Gamma_n}^x)) \\ &\quad + a(\Gamma_k) \sigma(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_k-\Gamma_n,\Gamma_n}^x) (W_{\Gamma_{k+1}} - W_{\Gamma_k}), \end{aligned}$$

then at every time t by the genuine interpolation on the intervals $([\Gamma_k - \Gamma_n, \Gamma_{k+1} - \Gamma_n])_{k \geq n}$ as before. In particular $\bar{Y}^x = \bar{Y}_{\cdot,0}^x$. Still more generally, we define $\bar{Y}_{t,u}^x$ where $u \in (\Gamma_n, \Gamma_{n+1})$ as

$$\bar{Y}_{0,u}^x = x, \quad \bar{Y}_{t,u}^x = \begin{cases} x + t(b_a(x) + \zeta_{n+1}(x)) + a^2(u) \sigma(x) (W_t - W_{\Gamma_u}) & \text{if } t \in [u, \Gamma_{n+1}] \\ \bar{Y}_{t-(\Gamma_{n+1}-u),\Gamma_{n+1}}^x & \text{if } t > \Gamma_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

For $n, k \geq 0$, for $u \in [\Gamma_k, \Gamma_{k+1})$ and $\gamma \in [0, \Gamma_{k+1} - u]$, let $P_{\gamma,u}^{\bar{Y}}$ be the transition kernel associated to $\bar{Y}_{\cdot,u}$ between the times 0 and γ i.e. for all $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ measurable, $P_{\gamma,u}^{\bar{Y}} f(x) = \mathbb{E}[f(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)]$.

7.1 Boundedness of the potential

Lemma 7.1. *Let $p \geq 1/2$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $k \geq 0$, for every $u \in [\Gamma_k, \Gamma_{k+1})$ and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$:*

$$\sup_{n \geq k+1} \mathbb{E} V^p(\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n - u, u}^x) \leq C V^p(x).$$

Proof. We rework the proof of Lemma 2(b) in [11]. Let us assume directly that $u = \Gamma_k$. To simplify the notations, we define $\tilde{y}_n := \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_n - \Gamma_k, \Gamma_k}^x$ for $n \geq k$ and $\Delta \tilde{y}_{n+1} := \tilde{y}_{n+1} - \tilde{y}_n$. The Taylor formula applied to V^p between \tilde{y}_n and \tilde{y}_{n+1} yields for some $\xi_{n+1} \in (\tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_{n+1})$ and with $\nabla^2(V^p) = p(V^{p-1}\nabla^2 V + (p-1)V^{p-2}\nabla V \nabla V^T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} V^p(\tilde{y}_{n+1}) &= V^p(\tilde{y}_n) + pV^{p-1}\langle \nabla V(\tilde{y}_n), \Delta \tilde{y}_{n+1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2(V^p)(\xi_{n+1}) \cdot (\Delta \tilde{y}_{n+1})^{\otimes 2} \\ &= V^p(\tilde{y}_n) + pV^{p-1}\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n)^T \cdot (-\gamma_{n+1}\sigma\sigma^\top(\tilde{y}_n)\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n) + \gamma_{n+1}a^2(\Gamma_n)\Upsilon(\tilde{y}_n) \\ &\quad + \gamma_{n+1}\zeta_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n) + \sqrt{\gamma_{n+1}}a(\Gamma_n)\sigma(\tilde{y}_n)U_{n+1}) + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2(V^p)(\xi_{n+1}) \cdot (\Delta \tilde{y}_{n+1})^{\otimes 2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $U_{n+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Moreover using (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}), \sqrt{V} is Lipschitz continuous so

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{z \in (\tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_{n+1})} V^{1/2}(z)|\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n] \leq V^{1/2}(\tilde{y}_n) + [\sqrt{V}]_{\text{Lip}} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{y}_{n+1} - \tilde{y}_n\||\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n] \leq C V^{1/2}(\tilde{y}_n), \quad (7.1)$$

and in particular

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla^2(V^p)(\xi_{n+1})\||\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n] \leq C \|\nabla^2(V^p)(\tilde{y}_n)\|.$$

Moreover using that $\nabla^2 V$ is bounded and that $|\nabla V| \leq C V^{1/2}$ we have

$$\|\nabla^2(V^p)(\tilde{y}_n)\| \leq C \|(V^{p-1}\nabla^2 V + V^{p-2}\nabla V \nabla V^T)(\tilde{y}_n)\| \leq C V^{p-1}(\tilde{y}_n).$$

Then using the facts that $a, \Upsilon, \sigma, \nabla^2 V$ are bounded and that $\gamma_n^2 = o(\gamma_n)$, that $V, \nabla V$ are coercive and $\sigma\sigma^\top \geq \sigma_0^2 I_d$ and (2.14), there exists $R > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $|\tilde{y}_n| \geq R$ and $n \geq N$ then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[V^p(\tilde{y}_{n+1}) - V^p(\tilde{y}_n)|\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n] \\ &\leq pV^{p-1}\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n)^T \cdot (-\gamma_{n+1}\sigma_0^2(\tilde{y}_n)\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n) + C\gamma_{n+1}) \\ &\quad + C\|\nabla^2(V^p)(\tilde{y}_n)\| \cdot (\gamma_{n+1}^2\|\sigma\|_\infty^4|\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n)|^2 + C\gamma_{n+1}^2 + C\gamma_{n+1}V(x) + C\gamma_{n+1}\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)|^2) \\ &\leq C\gamma_{n+1}V^{p-1}(\tilde{y}_n) [|\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n)|(-|\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n)| + 1) + \gamma_{n+1}(|\nabla V(\tilde{y}_n)|^2 + 1) + 1] \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other side, if $|\tilde{y}_n| \leq R$ then

$$\mathbb{E}[|V^p(\tilde{y}_{n+1}) - V^p(\tilde{y}_n)||\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n] \leq C\gamma_{n+1} \sup_{|x| \leq R} V^p(x).$$

Moreover for $n \in \{k, \dots, N\}$ using (7.1) we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|V^p(\tilde{y}_{n+1}) - V^p(\tilde{y}_n)||\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n] \leq C V^p(\tilde{y}_n)$$

so that

$$\sup_{k \leq n \leq N+1} \mathbb{E}[V^p(\tilde{y}_n)] \leq C^{N-k} V^p(x).$$

Finally we obtain

$$\sup_{n \geq k} \mathbb{E}[V^p(\tilde{y}_n)] \leq C V^p(x).$$

□

7.2 Strong and weak error bounds for the Euler-Maruyama scheme

Lemma 7.2. *Let $p \geq 1$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for every $n, k \geq 0$, for every $u \in [\Gamma_k, \Gamma_{k+1})$ and every $t > 0$ such that $u \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$, $t \leq \Gamma_{k+1} - u$ and $u + t \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$,*

$$\|X_t^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{t,u}^x\|_p \leq C \left(V^{1/2}(x)t + \sqrt{t}(a_n - a_{n+1}) \right).$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6.2, if $p \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{t,u}^x\|_p &\leq [b]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - x\|_p ds + \|\Upsilon\|_\infty (a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2)t + a_{n+1}^2 [\Upsilon]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - x\|_p ds \\ &\quad + \|\zeta_1(x)\|_p t + C^{BDG} a_{n+1} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_0^t \|X_s^{x,n} - x\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2} + \|\sigma\|_\infty \|W_1\|_p \sqrt{t}(a_n - a_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging Lemma 6.3 and (2.14) into this inequality yields:

$$\|X_t^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{t,u}^x\|_p \leq CV^{1/2}(x)t^{3/2} + \|\Upsilon\|_\infty (a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2)t + CV^{1/2}(x)t + C\sqrt{t}(a_n - a_{n+1}),$$

which completes the proof for $p \geq 2$. If $p \in [1, 2)$, we remark that $\|\cdot\|_p \leq \|\cdot\|_2$. \square

Proposition 7.3. *For every $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being C^3 , for every $n, k \geq 0$ and every $u \in [\Gamma_k, \Gamma_{k+1})$ such that $u \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$, $\gamma \leq \Gamma_{k+1} - u$ and $u + \gamma \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$:*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[g(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)] - \mathbb{E}[g(X_\gamma^{x,n})]| &\leq CV^{1/2}(x) \left(V^{1/2}(x)\gamma^2 + \gamma(a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) \bar{\Phi}_{g,1}(x) \\ &\quad + CV(x) \left(V^{1/2}(x)\gamma^2 + \gamma^{3/2}(a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) \bar{\Phi}_{g,2}(x), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}_{g,1}(x) &= \max \left(|\nabla g(x)|, \|\nabla^2 g(x)\|, \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_\gamma^{x,n}, \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2 \right), \\ \bar{\Phi}_{g,2}(x) &= \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_\gamma^{x,n})} \|\nabla^3 g(\xi)\| \right\|_4. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is given in the Supplementary Material.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $T > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for every Lipschitz continuous function f and every $t \in (0, T]$, for all $n, k \geq 0$, for all $u \in [\Gamma_k, \Gamma_{k+1})$, for all γ such that $\Gamma_k \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$, $\gamma \leq \Gamma_{k+1} - u$ and $u + t + \gamma \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[P_t^{X,n} f(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[P_t^{X,n} f(X_\gamma^{x,n}) \right] \right| \\ \leq C[f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \cdot \left(a_{n+1}^{-2} t^{-1/2} (\gamma^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma) + a_{n+1}^{-3} t^{-1} (\gamma^2 + \gamma^{3/2}(a_n - a_{n+1})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is the same as for Proposition 6.5. \square

7.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1.(b)

More precisely, we prove that for all $\beta > 0$, if

$$A > \max \left(\sqrt{(\beta + 1)(2C_1 + C_2)}, \sqrt{(1 + \beta^{-1})C_2} \right), \quad (7.2)$$

then

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu_{a(t)}) \leq \frac{C \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0))}{t^{(1+\beta)^{-1} - (2C_1 + C_2)/A^2}}.$$

Proof. We apply the same *domino strategy* as in Section 6.3. Let $n \geq 0$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz continuous. Let us denote

$$\gamma^{\text{init}} := \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1} - T_n \leq \gamma_{N(T_n)+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{\text{end}} := T_{n+1} - \Gamma_{N(T_{n+1})} \leq \gamma_{N(T_{n+1})+1}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}f(X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}) - \mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}-T_n, T_n}^x) \right| \leq \left| (P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{X,n} f(x) \right| \\ & + \sum_{k=N(T_n)+2}^{N(T_{n+1}-T)} \left| P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_n)+2}, \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\gamma_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-2}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ (P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k}^{X,n} f(x) \right| \\ & + \sum_{k=N(T_{n+1}-T)+1}^{N(T_{n+1})-1} \left| P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_n)+2}, \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\gamma_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-2}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ (P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k}^{X,n} f(x) \right| \\ & + \left| P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_n)+2}, \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})-1}, \Gamma_{N(T_{n+1})-2}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ (P_{\gamma^{\text{end}}+\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}, \Gamma_{N(T_{n+1})-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma^{\text{end}}+\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}}^{X,n}) f(x) \right| \\ & =: (c^{\text{init}}) + (a) + (b) + (c^{\text{end}}). \end{aligned}$$

• **Term (a):** we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |(P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k}^{X,n} f(x)| \\ & = |P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{T/2}^{X,n} \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k-T/2}^{X,n} f(x) - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n} \circ P_{T/2}^{X,n} \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k-T/2}^{X,n} f(x)| \\ & \leq |\mathbb{E}P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k-T/2}^{X,n}(\Xi_k^x) - \mathbb{E}P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k-T/2}^{X,n}(\bar{\Xi}_k^x)| \leq Ce^{Ca_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k-T/2)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} \mathbb{E}|\Xi_k^x - \bar{\Xi}_k^x|, \end{aligned}$$

where Ξ_k^x and $\bar{\Xi}_k^x$ are any random vectors with laws $[X_{T/2}^{X_{\gamma_k}^{x,n}, n}]$ and $[X_{T/2}^{\bar{Y}_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^x, n}]$ respectively and where we used Theorem 4.2 to get the last inequality. Thus, it follows from the definition of the Wasserstein distance that

$$|(P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k}^{X,n} f(x)| \leq Ce^{Ca_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} \mathcal{W}_1 \left(X_{T/2}^{X_{\gamma_k}^{x,n}, n}, X_{T/2}^{\bar{Y}_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^x, n} \right).$$

On the other hand, the Kantorovich-Rubinstein representation of the L^1 -Wasserstein distance (see [27, Equation (6.3)]) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1 \left(X_{T/2}^{X_{\gamma_k}^{x,n}, n}, X_{T/2}^{\bar{Y}_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^x, n} \right) &= \sup_{[g]_{\text{Lip}}=1} \mathbb{E} \left[g \left(X_{T/2}^{X_{\gamma_k}^{x,n}, n} \right) - g \left(X_{T/2}^{\bar{Y}_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^x, n} \right) \right] \\ &= \sup_{[g]_{\text{Lip}}=1} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{T/2}^{X,n} g(X_{\gamma_k}^{x,n}) - P_{T/2}^{X,n} g(\bar{Y}_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^x) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Proposition 7.4 and using $[g]_{\text{Lip}} = 1$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[P_{T/2}^{X,n} g(X_{\gamma_k}^{x,n}) - P_{T/2}^{X,n} g(\bar{Y}_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^x) \right] \leq Ca_{n+1}^{-3} (\gamma_k^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma_k) V^2(x),$$

so that

$$|(P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k}^{X,n} f(x)| \leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} a_{n+1}^{-3} (\gamma_k^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma_k) V^2(x).$$

Finally, integrating with respect to $P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_n)+2}, \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\gamma_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-2}}^{\bar{Y}}$ yields:

$$\left| P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_n)+2}, \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ \cdots \circ P_{\gamma_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-2}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ (P_{\gamma_k, \Gamma_{k-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma_k}^{X,n}) \circ P_{T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k}^{X,n} f(x) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} a_{n+1}^{-3} (\gamma_k^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma_k) \left(\sup_{\ell \geq N(T_n)+1} \mathbb{E} V^2(\bar{Y}_{\gamma^{\text{init}} + \Gamma_\ell - \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}, T_n})^x \right) \\
&\leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-\Gamma_k)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} a_{n+1}^{-3} (\gamma_k^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma_k) V^2(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 7.1. Now, summing up over k yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
(a) &\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1} T_{n+1}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \sum_{k=N(T_n)+2}^{N(T_{n+1}-T)} ((a_n - a_{n-1}) + \gamma_k) \gamma_k e^{\rho_{n+1} \Gamma_k} \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1} T_{n+1}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} ((a_n - a_{n-1}) + \gamma_{N(T_n)}) V^2(x) \sum_{k=N(T_n)+2}^{N(T_{n+1}-T)} \gamma_k e^{\rho_{n+1} \Gamma_{k-1}} \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1} T_{n+1}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} ((a_n - a_{n-1}) + \gamma_{N(T_n)}) V^2(x) \int_{T_n}^{T_{n+1}-T} e^{\rho_{n+1} u} du \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} ((a_n - a_{n-1}) + \gamma_{N(T_n)}) V^2(x) \rho_{n+1}^{-1} \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} [f]_{\text{Lip}} (a_n - a_{n-1}) V^2(x) \rho_{n+1}^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $(e^{\rho_{n+1} \gamma_k})_{n,k \geq 0}$ is bounded and Lemma A.3 in the last inequality. We obtain likewise

$$(c^{\text{init}}) \leq C e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-T_n)} [f]_{\text{Lip}} a_{n+1}^{-3} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \gamma_{N(T_n)+1} V^2(x).$$

• **Term (b):** Applying Proposition 7.4 yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
(b) &\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} \left(\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)} + \sqrt{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \sum_{k=N(T_{n+1}-T)+1}^{N(T_{n+1})-1} \frac{\gamma_k}{T_{n+1} - \Gamma_k} \\
&\quad + C a_{n+1}^{-2} \left(\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)} + (a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \sum_{k=N(T_{n+1}-T)+1}^{N(T_{n+1})-1} \frac{\gamma_k}{\sqrt{T_{n+1} - \Gamma_k}} \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} \left(\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)} + \sqrt{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \int_{T_{n+1}-T}^{T_{n+1}-\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}} \frac{1}{T_{n+1} - u} du \\
&\quad + C a_{n+1}^{-2} \left(\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)} + (a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \int_{T_{n+1}-T}^{T_{n+1}-\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_{n+1} - u}} du \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} \left(\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)} + \sqrt{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \right) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x) \log(1/\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}) \\
&\quad + C a_{n+1}^{-2} (a_n - a_{n+1}) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.4 in Appendix, $\sqrt{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}} \log(1/\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}) \leq C \sqrt{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}} \log(1/\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}) \rightarrow 0$ and using Lemma A.3 we also have

$$\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)} \log(1/\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}) \leq C \gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}^{1-\varepsilon} = o\left(n^{-1-\beta'}\right) = o(a_n - a_{n+1})$$

where $\beta' > 0$ for small enough ε . So that

$$(b) \leq C a_{n+1}^{-3} (a_n - a_{n+1}) [f]_{\text{Lip}} V^2(x).$$

• **Term (c^{end}):** Using Lemma 7.2 and $\gamma^{\text{end}} \leq \gamma_{N(T_{n+1})+1} \leq \gamma_{N(T_n)}$ yields:

$$|(P_{\gamma^{\text{end}} + \gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}, \Gamma_{N(T_{n+1})-1}}^{\bar{Y}} - P_{\gamma^{\text{end}} + \gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}}^{X,n}) f(x)| \leq C [f]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\sqrt{\gamma_{N(T_n)}} (a_n - a_{n+1}) + \gamma_{N(T_n)} \right) V^{1/2}(x).$$

Then we integrate with respect to $P_{\gamma^{\text{init}}, T_n}^{\bar{Y}} \circ P_{\gamma_{N(T_n)+2}, \Gamma_{N(T_n)+1}}^{\bar{Y}} \circ \dots \circ P_{\gamma_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-2}}^{\bar{Y}}$ and apply Lemma 7.1.

- So we have finally that $|\mathbb{E}f(X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}) - \mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}-T_n, T_n}^x)|$ is bounded by

$$Ca_{n+1}^{-3}[f]_{\text{Lip}}(a_n - a_{n+1})e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} \rho_{n+1}^{-1} V^2(x),$$

which implies that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}], [\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}-T_n, T_n}^x]) \leq Ca_{n+1}^{-3}(a_n - a_{n+1})e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} \rho_{n+1}^{-1} V^2(x).$$

We integrate this inequality with respect to the laws of $X_{T_n}^{x_0}$ and $\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}$ and obtain, temporarily setting $x_n := X_{T_n}^{x_0}$ and $\bar{y}_n := \bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) &= \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}], [\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}-T_n, T_n}^{\bar{y}_n}]) \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x,n}], [X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{y}_n, n}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{y}_n, n}], [\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}-T_n, T_n}^{\bar{y}_n}]) \\ &\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-T_n)} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], [\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + Ca_{n+1}^{-3}(a_n - a_{n+1})e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} \rho_{n+1}^{-1} \mathbb{E}V^2(\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}) \\ &\leq Ce^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} e^{-\rho_{n+1}(T_{n+1}-T_n)} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], [\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + Ca_{n+1}^{-3}(a_n - a_{n+1})e^{C_1 a_{n+1}^{-2}} \rho_{n+1}^{-1} V^2(x_0) \\ &=: \mu_{n+1} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], [\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + v_{n+1} V^2(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

where μ_n is defined in (5.5) and where we used again Lemma 7.1. We use Lemma 4.3 to bound $(a_n - a_{n+1})$ and owing to (7.2) we have $v_n \rightarrow 0$, so is bounded. We iterate this inequality and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) &\leq CV^2(x_0) (v_{n+1} + \mu_{n+1}v_n + \mu_{n+1}\mu_nv_{n-1} + \dots + \mu_{n+1}\dots\mu_2v_1) \\ &\leq CV^2(x_0) (v_{n+1} + Cn\mu_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

But following (5.5) we have $n\mu_n = O(v_n)$ so that

$$\mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [\bar{Y}_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) \leq CV^2(x_0)v_{n+1} \leq \frac{CV^2(x_0)}{(n+1)^{1-(\beta+1)(C_1+C_2)/A^2}}.$$

Moreover, owing to (7.2) and combining with Theorem 5.1 we get

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}], [X_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu_{a_n}) \leq \frac{C \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0))}{n^{1-(\beta+1)(C_1+C_2)/A^2}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_{T_n}^{x_0}], [X_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq Ca_n \max(1 + |x_0|, V^2(x_0)).$$

Finally, to prove that $\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{Y}_t^{x_0}], \nu^*) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude as in the end of Section 6.3. \square

8 Convergence of the Euler-Maruyama scheme with plateau

In this section, we consider the Euler-Maruyama scheme for (X_t) , that is

$$\bar{X}_0^{x_0} = x_0, \quad \bar{X}_{\Gamma_{k+1}}^{x_0} = \bar{X}_{\Gamma_k} + \gamma_{k+1}b_{a_{n+1}}(\bar{X}_{\Gamma_k}) + a_{n+1}\sigma(\bar{X}_{\Gamma_k})(W_{\Gamma_{k+1}} - W_{\Gamma_k})$$

for $k \in \{N(T_n), \dots, N(T_{n+1}) - 1\}$. We also define as in Section 7 the genuine time-continuous scheme and the Euler-Maruyama scheme for $(X_t^{x,n})_t$ so that $\bar{X}^{x_0,0} = \bar{X}^x$.

Although we already proved the convergence of the Euler-Maruyama scheme for (Y_t) , we shall also prove the convergence of the present scheme, since this algorithm is also used by practitioners within the framework of batch methods.

Preconditioner	SGLD	L-RMSprop	L-Adam	L-Adadelta
Best accuracy	95,24 %	96,94 %	97,60 %	97,63 %

Table 1: *Best accuracy performance on the MNIST test set after 10 epochs.*

Theorem 8.1. Assume (2.2, \mathcal{H}_{V_1}), (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V_2}), (2.9, \mathcal{H}_σ), (2.10) and (2.11, \mathcal{H}_{cf}). Assume furthermore (2.12, \mathcal{H}_{γ_1}) and (2.13, \mathcal{H}_{γ_2}), that V is \mathcal{C}^3 with $\|\nabla^3 V\| \leq CV^{1/2}$ and that σ is \mathcal{C}^3 with $\|\nabla^3(\sigma\sigma^\top)\| \leq CV^{1/2}$. Then for large enough $A > 0$ and for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\bar{X}_t^{x_0}, \nu^*) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

The proof of this theorem is given in the Supplementary Material.

9 Experiments

In this section, we compare the performances of adaptive Langevin-Simulated Annealing algorithms versus vanilla SGLD, that is the Langevin algorithm with constant (additive) σ^1 . We train an artificial neural network on the MNIST dataset [13], which is composed of grayscale images of size 28×28 of handwritten digits (from 0 to 9). The goal is to recognize the handwritten digit and to classify the images. 60000 images are used for training and 10000 images are used for test.

We consider a feedforward neural network with two hidden dense layers with 128 units each and with ReLU activation. For the adaptive Langevin algorithms, we choose the function σ as a diagonal matrix which is the square root of the preconditioner in RMSprop [14], in Adam [10] and in Adadelta [31] respectively (see also Section 3.2), giving L-RMSprop, L-Adam and L-Adadelta respectively. The results are given in Figure 3 and in Table 1.

As pointed out in the literature (see the references Section 3.2), the preconditioned Langevin algorithms show significant improvement compared with the vanilla SGLD algorithm. The convergence is faster and they achieve a lower error on the test set. We also display the value of the loss function on the train set during the training to show that the better performances of the preconditioned algorithms are not due to some overfitting effect.

We also compare preconditioned Langevin algorithms with their respective non-Langevin counterpart. For shallow neural networks, adding an exogenous noise does not seem to improve significantly the performances of the optimization algorithm. However, for deep neural networks, which are highly non-linear and which loss function has many local minima, the Langevin version is competitive with the currently widely used non-Langevin algorithms and can even lead to improvement. The results are given in Figure 4 where we used a deep neural network with 20 hidden layers with 32 units each and with ReLU activation.

In order to understand how sensitive are these methods to poor initialization, we run an experiment on the previous deep neural network where all the weights are initialized to zero, as in [17, Section 4.1]. We plot the accuracy on the test set in Figure 5. We observe that the non-Langevin optimizer needs some time before escaping from the neighbourhood of the initial point whereas in its Langevin version, the Gaussian noise is effective to rapidly escape from highly degenerated saddle points of the loss.

¹Our code is available at <https://github.com/Bras-P/langevin-simulated-annealing>.




Figure 3: *Performance of preconditioned Langevin algorithms compared with vanilla SGLD on the MNIST dataset. The values of the hyperparameters are $a(n) = A \log^{-1/2}(c_1 n + e)$ with $A = 2.10^{-3}$ and where $c_1 n = 1$ after 5 epochs; $\gamma_n = \gamma_1 / (1 + c_2 n)$ where $c_2 n = 1$ after 5 epochs and where for SGLD, $\gamma_1 = 0.001$ for L-RMSprop and L-Adam and $\gamma_1 = 0.1$ for L-Adadelata.*




Figure 4: *Side-by-side comparison of optimization algorithms with their respective Langevin counterparts for the training of a deep neural network on the MNIST dataset. We display the performance of SGD for reference. The values of the hyperparameters are $a(n) = A \log^{-1/2}(c_1 n + e)$ with $A = 1.10^{-3}$ for L-Adam and $A = 5.10^{-4}$ for L-RMSprop and where $c_1 n = 1$ after 5 epochs; $\gamma_n = \gamma_1 / (1 + c_2 n)$ where $c_2 n = 1$ after 5 epochs and where $\gamma_1 = 0.01$ for SGLD and $\gamma_1 = 0.001$ for the others.*




Figure 5: Performance of the Adam optimizer compared with its Langevin version at the beginning of the training of a deep neural network on the MNIST dataset with poor initialization. We record the accuracy on the test set 10 times per epoch.

A Appendix

Lemma A.1. Let Z and \tilde{Z} be two continuous diffusion processes. Then for all $t \geq 0$ and for all $p \geq 2$:

$$\left\| \int_0^t (\sigma(Z_s) - \sigma(\tilde{Z}_s)) dW_s \right\|_p \leq C_p^{BDG} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_0^t \|Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2},$$

where C_p^{BDG} is a constant which only depends on p .

Proof. It follows from the generalized Minkowski and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities that

$$\left\| \int_0^t (\sigma(Z_s) - \sigma(\tilde{Z}_s)) dW_s \right\|_p \leq C_p^{BDG} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left\| \int_0^t |Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s|^2 ds \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \leq C_p^{BDG} [\sigma]_{\text{Lip}} \left(\int_0^t \|Z_s - \tilde{Z}_s\|_p^2 ds \right)^{1/2}$$

□

We now give some results on the step sequence (γ_n) associated to the Euler-Maruyama scheme. Let us recall that the sequence (T_n) is defined in (4.7).

Lemma A.2. Let (u_n) be a positive and non-increasing sequence such that $\sum_n u_n < \infty$. Then $u_n = o(n^{-1})$.

Proof. We have $Nu_{2N} \leq \sum_{n=N}^{2N} u_n \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

□

Lemma A.3. We have

$$\gamma_{N(T_n)} = o\left(n^{-(1+\beta)}\right). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. Using the previous lemma, $\gamma_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ so that $\Gamma_n = o(n^{1/2})$ and then $x^2 = o(N(x))$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\gamma_{N(T_n)} = o\left(N(T_n)^{-1/2}\right) = o\left(n^{-(1+\beta)}\right)$.

□

Lemma A.4. The sequence $(\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}/\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})})$ is bounded.

Proof. Using (2.13, \mathcal{H}_{γ_2}), we have for $\varpi' > \varpi$ and for large enough k , $(\gamma_k - \gamma_{k+1})/\gamma_{k+1}^2 \leq \varpi'$ so that $\gamma_k/\gamma_{k+1} \leq 1 + \varpi'\gamma_{k+1}$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\frac{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}}{\gamma_{N(T_{n+1})}}\right) &= \sum_{k=N(T_{n+1}-T)}^{N(T_{n+1})-1} \log\left(\frac{\gamma_k}{\gamma_{k+1}}\right) \leq C \sum_{k=N(T_n)}^{N(T_{n+1})-1} \gamma_k = C(\Gamma_{N(T_{n+1})} - \Gamma_{N(T_{n+1}-T)}) \\ &\leq C(T_{n+1} - (T_{n+1} - T)). \end{aligned}$$

□

References

- [1] BALLY, V., AND TALAY, D. The law of the Euler scheme for stochastic differential equations. I. Convergence rate of the distribution function. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 104, 1 (1996), 43–60.
- [2] BRAS, P. Convergence rates of Gibbs measures with degenerate minimum. *arXiv e-prints* (2021), arXiv:2101.11557.
- [3] CHIANG, T.-S., HWANG, C.-R., AND SHEU, S. J. Diffusion for global optimization in \mathbf{R}^n . *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 25, 3 (1987), 737–753.
- [4] DALALYAN, A. S. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 79, 3 (2017), 651–676.
- [5] DAUPHIN, Y., DE VRIES, H., AND BENGIO, Y. Equilibrated adaptive learning rates for non-convex optimization. In *Neural Information Processing Systems* (2015).
- [6] DAUPHIN, Y. N., PASCANU, R., GULCEHRE, C., CHO, K., GANGULI, S., AND BENGIO, Y. Identifying and Attacking the Saddle Point Problem in High-Dimensional Non-Convex Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2* (Cambridge, MA, USA, 2014), NIPS’14, MIT Press, p. 2933–2941.
- [7] DUCHI, J., HAZAN, E., AND SINGER, Y. Adaptive Subgradient Methods for Online Learning and Stochastic Optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), 2121–2159.
- [8] GELFAND, S. B., AND MITTER, S. K. Recursive stochastic algorithms for global optimization in \mathbf{R}^d . *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 29, 5 (1991), 999–1018.
- [9] HWANG, C.-R. Laplace’s method revisited: weak convergence of probability measures. *Ann. Probab.* 8, 6 (1980), 1177–1182.
- [10] KINGMA, D. P., AND BA, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings* (2015), Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun, Eds.
- [11] LAMBERTON, D., AND PAGÈS, G. Recursive computation of the invariant distribution of a diffusion. *Bernoulli* 8, 3 (2002), 367–405.
- [12] LAZAREV, V. A. Convergence of stochastic approximation procedures in the case of several roots of a regression equation. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* 28, 1 (1992), 75–88.
- [13] LECUN, Y., BOTTOU, L., BENGIO, Y., AND HAFFNER, P. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 86, 11 (1998), 2278–2324.
- [14] LI, C., CHEN, C., CARLSON, D., AND CARIN, L. Preconditioned stochastic gradient langevin dynamics for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2016), AAAI’16, AAAI Press, p. 1788–1794.
- [15] MA, Y., CHEN, T., AND FOX, E. B. A Complete Recipe for Stochastic Gradient MCMC. In *Neural Information Processing Systems* (2015).
- [16] MICLO, L. Recuit simulé sur \mathbf{R}^n . Étude de l’évolution de l’énergie libre. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 28, 2 (1992), 235–266.

- [17] NEELAKANTAN, A., VILNIS, L., LE, Q. V., SUTSKEVER, I., KAISER, L., KURACH, K., AND MARTENS, J. Adding Gradient Noise Improves Learning for Very Deep Networks. *arXiv e-prints* (Nov. 2015), arXiv:1511.06807.
- [18] NOCEDAL, J., AND WRIGHT, S. J. *Numerical optimization*, second ed. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, 2006.
- [19] PAGÈS, G., AND PANLOUP, F. Unadjusted Langevin algorithm with multiplicative noise: Total variation and Wasserstein bounds. *arXiv e-prints* (2020), arXiv:2012.14310.
- [20] PATTERSON, S., AND TEH, Y. W. Stochastic Gradient Riemannian Langevin Dynamics on the Probability Simplex. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2013), C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, Eds., vol. 26, Curran Associates, Inc.
- [21] ROYER, G. A remark on simulated annealing of diffusion processes. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 27, 6 (1989), 1403–1408.
- [22] SAGUN, L., BOTTOU, L., AND LECUN, Y. Eigenvalues of the Hessian in Deep Learning: Singularity and Beyond. *arXiv e-prints* (2016), arXiv:1611.07476.
- [23] SAGUN, L., EVCI, U., UGUR GUNEY, V., DAUPHIN, Y., AND BOTTOU, L. Empirical Analysis of the Hessian of Over-Parametrized Neural Networks. *arXiv e-prints* (2017), arXiv:1706.04454.
- [24] SIMSEKLI, U., BADEAU, R., CEMGIL, A. T., AND RICHARD, G. Stochastic Quasi-Newton Langevin Monte Carlo. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48* (2016), ICML’16, p. 642–651.
- [25] TALAY, D., AND TUBARO, L. Expansion of the global error for numerical schemes solving stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Anal. Appl.* 8, 4 (1990), 483–509 (1991).
- [26] VAN LAARHOVEN, P. J. M., AND AARTS, E. H. L. *Simulated annealing: theory and applications*, vol. 37 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987.
- [27] VILLANI, C. *Optimal transport*, vol. 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.
- [28] WANG, F.-Y. Coupling and applications. In *Stochastic analysis and applications to finance*, vol. 13 of *Interdiscip. Math. Sci.* World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2012, pp. 411–424.
- [29] WANG, F.-Y. Exponential contraction in Wasserstein distances for diffusion semigroups with negative curvature. *Potential Anal.* 53, 3 (2020), 1123–1144.
- [30] WELLING, M., AND TEH, Y. W. Bayesian Learning via Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning* (2011), ICML’11, Omnipress, p. 681–688.
- [31] ZEILER, M. D. ADADELTA: An Adaptive Learning Rate Method. *arXiv e-prints* (Dec. 2012), arXiv:1212.5701.
- [32] ZITT, P.-A. Annealing diffusions in a potential function with a slow growth. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 118, 1 (2008), 76–119.

B Supplementary Material

B.1 Proof of Proposition 4.4

Proof. We have

$$\frac{\nu_{a_{n+1}}(x)}{\nu_{a_n}(x)} = \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)(a_{n+1}^{-2}-a_n^{-2})} \leq \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}} =: M_n.$$

We now consider $(P_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m^*}$ a partition of \mathbb{R}^d such that for all i , $x_i^* \in \mathring{P}_i$. Let us prove that for all $1 \leq i \leq m^*$,

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a,i}^{-1} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx \underset{a \rightarrow 0}{\sim} a^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-x^\top \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) x} dx. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Let $r > 0$; let us consider \tilde{V}_i defined as

$$\tilde{V}_i(x) = \begin{cases} V(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r) \\ |x - x_i^*|^2 + V^* & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We also define $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(\tilde{V}_i(x)-V^*)/a^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx$. Then, owing to $V^* > 0$ and (2.8, \mathcal{H}_{V2}),

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad C|x - x_i^*|^2 \leq \tilde{V}_i(x) - V^* \leq C'|x - x_i^*|^2 \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1} = a^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(\tilde{V}_i(ax+x_i^*)-V^*)/a^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} dx \underset{a \rightarrow 0}{\sim} a^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-x^\top \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) x} dx,$$

where we get the equivalence by dominated convergence; the domination comes from (B.2). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{a,i}^{-1} - \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1} &= \int_{\mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx - \int_{\mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c} e^{-2(\tilde{V}_i(x)-V^*)/a^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx =: I_1 - I_2, \\ I_2 &= a^d \int_{\mathbf{B}(0, r/a)^c} e^{-2|x|^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} dx \leq a^d \int_{\mathbf{B}(0, r/a)^c} e^{-2|x|^2} dx = o(a^d) = o(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover using [2, Proposition 1] we have $\mathcal{Z}_{a,i} I_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow 0$, so that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a,i}^{-1} = \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1} + o(\mathcal{Z}_{a,i}^{-1}) + o(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1}) \sim \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,i}^{-1},$$

which proves (B.1) and then

$$\mathcal{Z}_a^{-1} \underset{a \rightarrow 0}{\sim} a^d \sum_{i=1}^{m^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-x^\top \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) x} dx. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We now prove that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}^{-1} - \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}^{-1} \leq C a_{n+1}^{d-1} (a_n - a_{n+1}). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Indeed, by convexity we have for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\left| e^{-2z/a_n^2} - e^{-2z/a_{n+1}^2} \right| \leq 2e^{-2z/a_n^2} z \left| \frac{1}{a_n^2} - \frac{1}{a_{n+1}^2} \right| \leq 4e^{-2z/a_n^2} \frac{z}{a_{n+1}^2} \frac{(a_n - a_{n+1})}{a_n}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and then

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a_n,i}^{-1} - \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1},i}^{-1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= a_{n+1}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} - e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} \right) dx \\
&\leq 4a_{n+1}^{d-1} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \frac{V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*}{a_{n+1}^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} dx}_{:=I_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us also define

$$\tilde{I}_3 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(\tilde{V}_i(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \frac{\tilde{V}_i(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*}{a_{n+1}^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} dx.$$

Then \tilde{I}_3 converges by dominated convergence and $|I_3 - \tilde{I}_3|$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \frac{V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*}{a_{n+1}^2} - e^{-2(\tilde{V}_i(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \frac{\tilde{V}_i(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*}{a_{n+1}^2} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} dx \right| \\
&\leq a_{n+1}^{-d-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a_n^2} (V(x) - V^*) \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbf{B}(0, r/a_{n+1})^c} e^{-2(\tilde{V}_i(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \frac{\tilde{V}_i(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*}{a_{n+1}^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The second integral converges to 0 by dominated convergence by similar arguments as for I_2 . Moreover we have for every $x \in \mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c \cap P_i$, $V(x) - V^* \geq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and then for n such that $a_n \leq A/\sqrt{2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_{n+1}^{-d-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a_n^2} (V(x) - V^*) \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-d-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/a_n^2} |x - x_i^*|^2 \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-d-2} e^{-\varepsilon/a_n^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}(x_i^*, r)^c} e^{-(V(x)-V^*)/a_n^2} |x - x_i^*|^2 \mathbb{1}_{x \in P_i} dx \\
&\leq C a_{n+1}^{-d-2} e^{-\varepsilon/a_n^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/A^2} |x - x_i^*|^2 dx \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $(x \mapsto |x|^2 e^{-2(V(x)-V^*)/A^2}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then we obtain that I_3 converges to \tilde{I}_3 , which proves (B.4). Then we have

$$1 - M_n^{-1} = \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}^{-1} - \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}^{-1}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}^{-1}} \leq C \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n} \leq \frac{C}{n \log(n)}.$$

On the other hand, if $X \sim \nu_{a_{n+1}}$, $\tilde{X} \sim \nu_{a_{n+1}}$, $Y \sim \nu_{a_n}$ and X , \tilde{X} and Y are mutually independent then

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}|X - Y| - \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}|| \\
&= \left| a_{n+1}^d \mathcal{Z}_{a_n} a_{n+1}^d \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m^*} \int \int a_{n+1} |x - y| e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_j^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} \mathbb{1}_{y \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_j-x_j^*)} dx dy \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (a_{n+1}^d \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}})^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^{m^*} \int \int a_{n+1} |x - y| e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} \\
& \quad \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} \mathbb{1}_{y \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_j-x_i^*)} dx dy \Big| \\
& = a_{n+1}^{2d+1} \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m^*} \int \int |x - y| e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} \\
& \quad \cdot \left| \mathcal{Z}_{a_n} e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} - \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}} e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} \right| \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} \mathbb{1}_{y \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_j-x_i^*)} dx dy \\
& \leq a_{n+1} \left(a_{n+1}^{2d} \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}^2 \right) \sum_{i,j=1}^{m^*} \int \int |x - y| e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} \\
& \quad \cdot \left| e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} - e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} \right| \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} \mathbb{1}_{y \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_j-x_i^*)} dx dy \\
& \quad + a_{n+1} \left(a_{n+1}^{2d} \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}^2 \right) \sum_{i,j=1}^{m^*} \int \int |x - y| e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}x+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_{n+1}^2} e^{-2(V(a_{n+1}y+x_i^*)-V^*)/a_n^2} \\
& \quad \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}} \right| \mathbb{1}_{x \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_i-x_i^*)} \mathbb{1}_{y \in a_{n+1}^{-1}(P_j-x_i^*)} dx dy.
\end{aligned}$$

So using (B.5), dominated convergence as for the proof of (B.3), (B.3) itself with (4.9) and the bound for $1 - \mathcal{Z}_{a_n}/\mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}} = 1 - M_n^{-1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[n \log^{3/2}(n) \left| \mathbb{E}|X - Y| - \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}| \right| \right] \\
& \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{m^*} \int \int |x - y| e^{-x^\top \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) x} e^{-y^\top \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) y} \left(1 + y^\top \nabla^2 V(x_i^*) y \right) dx dy.
\end{aligned}$$

So that using Lemma 4.5 and the fact that $\mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}|$ is of order a_n we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) & \leq \mathbb{E}|X - Y| - \frac{1}{M_n} \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}| \leq \mathbb{E}|X - Y| - \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}| + \frac{C}{n \log(n)} \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}| \\
& \leq \frac{C}{n \log^{3/2}(n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof for the second claim is similar. □

B.2 Proof of Proposition (7.3)

Proof. As in the proof of [19, Proposition 3.5], we split $|\mathbb{E}[g(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)] - \mathbb{E}[g(X_\gamma^{x,n})]|$ into four terms A_1 , A_2 , A_3 and A_4 , that is, by the Taylor formula, for every $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$g(z) - g(y) = \langle \nabla g(y) | z - y \rangle + \int_0^1 (1-u) \nabla^2 g(uz + (1-u)y) du (z-y)^{\otimes 2}.$$

For a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
g(z) - g(y) & = \langle \nabla g(x) | z - y \rangle + \langle \nabla g(y) - \nabla g(x) | z - y \rangle + \int_0^1 (1-u) \nabla^2 g(uz + (1-u)y) (z-y)^{\otimes 2} du \\
& = \langle \nabla g(x) | z - y \rangle + \langle \nabla^2 g(x)(y-x) | z - y \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^1 (1-u) \nabla^3 g(uy + (1-u)x)(y-x)^{\otimes 2}(z-y) du \\
& + \int_0^1 (1-u) \nabla^2 g(uz + (1-u)y) du (z-y)^{\otimes 2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying this expansion with $y = X_\gamma^{x,n}$ and $z = \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x$, this yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[g(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x) - g(X_\gamma^{x,n})] &= \underbrace{\langle \nabla g(x) | \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}] \rangle}_{=:A_1} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla^2 g(x)(X_\gamma^{x,n} - x) | \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n} \rangle]}_{=:A_2} \\
&+ \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1 (1-u) \nabla^3 g(uX_\gamma^{x,n} + (1-u)x)(X_\gamma^{x,n} - x)^{\otimes 2}(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}) du\right]}_{=:A_3} \\
&+ \underbrace{\int_0^1 (1-u) \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 g(u\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x + (1-u)X_\gamma^{x,n})(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n})^{\otimes 2}] du}_{=:A_4}.
\end{aligned}$$

- **Term A_1 :** The term A_1 is bounded by $|\nabla g(x)| \cdot |\mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}]|$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - X_\gamma^{x,n}] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\gamma b_{a(u)}(x) - b_{a(u)}(X_s^{x,n}) ds\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\gamma (b_{a(u)}(X_s^{x,n}) - b_{a_{n+1}}(X_s^{x,n})) ds\right] \\
&=: A_{11} + A_{12}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have $|A_{12}| \leq \gamma \|\Upsilon\|_\infty (a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_{11}| &= \left| \int_0^\gamma \int_0^s \mathbb{E}\left[\nabla b_{a(u)}(X_v^{x,n}) b_{a(u)}(X_v^{x,n}) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 b_{a(u)}(X_v^{x,n}) a_{n+1}^2 \sigma \sigma^\top(X_v^{x,n})\right] dv \right| \\
&\leq C \gamma^2 \sup_{v \in [0, \gamma]} \mathbb{E}[V^{1/2}(X_v^{x,n})] \leq C \gamma^2 V^{1/2}(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $|\nabla b_a| \leq C$ and $\|\nabla^2 b_a\| \leq C V^{1/2}$ because we assumed $\|\nabla^3 V\| \leq C V^{1/2}$ and $\|\nabla^3(\sigma \sigma^\top)\| \leq C V^{1/2}$.

- **Term A_2 :** We have:

$$|A_2| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} |\partial_{ij} g(x)| |\mathbb{E}[(X_\gamma^{x,n} - x)_i (X_\gamma^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)_j]|$$

and we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_\gamma^{x,n} - x)_i (X_\gamma^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)_j] = \mathbb{E}[(X_\gamma^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)_i (X_\gamma^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)_j] + \mathbb{E}[(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - x)_i (X_\gamma^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)_j].$$

Using Lemma 7.2, the first term of the right-hand side is bounded by $C(V^{1/2}(x)\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma}(a_n - a_{n+1}))^2$ and in the second term we write $(\bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x - x)_i = (\gamma b_{a(u)}(x) + \gamma \zeta_{k+1}(x) + a(u)\sigma(x)W_\gamma)_i$ and we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\gamma b_{a(u)}(x) + \gamma \zeta_{k+1}(x))_i (X_\gamma^{x,n} - \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)_j]| \leq \gamma V^{1/2}(x)(V^{1/2}(x)\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma}(a_n - a_{n+1}))$$

and using that the increments of ζ and W are independent,

$$|\mathbb{E}[(a(u)\sigma(x)W_\gamma)_i (\gamma \zeta_{k+1}(x))_j]| = 0$$

and using the Itô isometry:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\left[(a(u)\sigma(x)W_\gamma)_i \left(\int_0^\gamma (b_{a_{n+1}}(X_s^{x,n}) - b_{a_{n+1}}(x) + b_{a_{n+1}}(x) - b_{a(u)}(x))_j ds\right)\right] \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^\gamma ((a_{n+1}\sigma(X_s^{x,n}) - a_{n+1}\sigma(x) + a_{n+1}\sigma(x) - a(u)\sigma(x))dW_s)_j \Big) \Big] \Big| \\
& \leq C[b]_{\text{Lip}} \int_0^\gamma \|W_\gamma\|_2 \|X_s^{x,n} - x\|_2 ds + C(a_n^2 - a_{n+1}^2) \|W_\gamma\|_1 \gamma \|\Upsilon\|_\infty \\
& + C \left| \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^\gamma \mathbb{E}[\sigma_{ik}(x)(\sigma_{jk}(X_s^{x,n}) - \sigma_{jk}(x))] ds \right| + C(a_n - a_{n+1}) \mathbb{E}[W_\gamma^2] \\
& \leq CV^{1/2}(x)\gamma^2 + C(a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma^{3/2} + CV^{1/2}(x)\gamma^2 + C(a_n - a_{n+1})\gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used an argument similar to A_{11} to bound the third term, using that $\nabla\sigma$ and $\nabla^2\sigma$ are bounded.

• **Term A_3 :** Using the three fold Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 7.2, A_3 is bounded by

$$C \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_\gamma^{x,n})} \|\nabla^3 g(\xi)\| \right\|_4 V(x) \gamma \left(V^{1/2}(x) \gamma + \sqrt{\gamma}(a_n - a_{n+1}) \right).$$

• **Term A_4 :** Using Lemma 7.2, A_4 is bounded by

$$C \left(V^{1/2}(x) \gamma + \sqrt{\gamma}(a_n - a_{n+1}) \right)^2 \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_\gamma^{x,n}, \bar{Y}_{\gamma,u}^x)} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2.$$

□

B.3 Proof of Theorem 2.4

Proof. We remark that according to [2, Proposition 3], for all $\kappa > 0$ we have $e^{-\kappa g} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We first prove that

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}) \leq \frac{C}{n \log^{1+\alpha_{\min}}(n)}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

so that $(\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_{a_n}, \nu_{a_{n+1}}))$ is still a converging Bertrand series. To do so, we directly adapt the proof of Proposition 4.4, replacing the change of variables in the integrals in ax by the change of variables in $B \cdot (a^{2\alpha_1}x_1, \dots, a^{2\alpha_d}x_d)$. Still using (B.5), we successively obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_a^{-1} & \underset{a \rightarrow 0}{\sim} a^{2\alpha_1 + \dots + 2\alpha_d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2g(x)} dx \\
\mathcal{Z}_{a_n}^{-1} - \mathcal{Z}_{a_{n+1}}^{-1} & \leq 4a_{n+1}^{2\alpha_1 + \dots + 2\alpha_d - 1} (a_n - a_{n+1}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2g(x)} g(x) dx \\
1 - M_n^{-1} & \leq \frac{C}{n \log(n)} \\
\left| \mathbb{E}|X - Y| - \mathbb{E}|X - \tilde{X}| \right| & \leq \frac{Ca_{n+1}^{2\alpha_{\min}}}{n \log(n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using (B.6) we prove that $\mathcal{W}_1(\nu_n, \nu^*) \leq Ca_n^{2\alpha_{\min}}$ the same way as in Lemma 4.6.

The next parts of the proof are the same as for the definite positive case. □

B.4 Proof of Theorem 5.1

To prove Theorem 8.1, we proceed as for the proof of Theorem 2.1.

In the following, for $\gamma > 0$ we denote by $(\bar{X}_t^{x,n,\gamma})_{t \in [0,\gamma]}$ the Euler-Maruyama scheme over one step with coefficient a_{n+1} . We first recall [19, Lemma 3.4(b), Proposition 3.5(a)] giving bounds for

the weak and strong errors for the one-step Euler-Maruyama scheme, which do not depend on the ellipticity parameter a_n .

Lemma B.1. *Let $p \geq 1$ and let $\bar{\gamma} > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for every $n \geq 0$, for every $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and every $t \in [0, \gamma]$:*

$$\|X_t^{x,n} - \bar{X}_t^{x,n,\gamma}\|_p \leq CV^{1/2}(x)t.$$

Proposition B.2. *Let $\bar{\gamma} > 0$. Then for every $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being \mathcal{C}^3 and for every $0 \leq \gamma \leq \gamma' \leq \bar{\gamma}$:*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[g(\bar{X}_{\gamma'}^{x,n,\gamma'}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[g(X_{\gamma}^{x,n}) \right] \right| \leq CV^{3/2}(x)\gamma^2\Phi_g(x),$$

where

$$\Phi_g(x) = \max \left(|\nabla g(x)|, \|\nabla^2 g(x)\|, \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (X_{\gamma}^{x,n}, \bar{X}_{\gamma}^{x,n,\gamma'})} \|\nabla^2 g(\xi)\| \right\|_2, \left\| \sup_{\xi \in (x, X_{\gamma}^{x,n})} \|\nabla^3 g(\xi)\| \right\|_4 \right).$$

Proposition B.3. *Let $T, \bar{\gamma} > 0$. Then for every Lipschitz continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for every $n \geq 0$ and every $t \in (0, T]$ and every $0 \leq \gamma \leq \gamma' \leq \bar{\gamma}$:*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[P_t f(\bar{X}_{\gamma}^{x,n,\gamma'}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[P_t f(X_{\gamma}^{x,n}) \right] \right| \leq Ca_n^{-3}[f]_{\text{Lip}}\gamma^2 t^{-1}V^2(x).$$

Proof. The proof is the same as in [19, Proposition 3.6]. When applying [19, Proposition 3.2(b)], we remark that the lowest exponent of σ_0 is -3 . \square

Moreover, by the same proof as in Lemma 7.1 we get

$$\sup_{m \geq k+1} \mathbb{E}V^p(\bar{X}_{\Gamma_m - \Gamma_k}^{x,n}) \leq CV^p(x).$$

We now prove Theorem 8.1.

Proof. Let us write:

$$\mathcal{W}_1([\bar{X}_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu^*) \leq \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{X}_{T_n}^{x_0}], [X_{T_n}^{x_0}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_n}^{x_0}], \nu^*).$$

Temporarily setting $\bar{x}_n := \bar{X}_{T_n}^{x_0}$ and $x_n := X_{T_n}^{x_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{X}_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}], [X_{T_{n+1}}^{x_0}]) &= \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{X}_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{x}_n,n}], [X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x_n,n}]) \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_1([\bar{X}_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{x}_n,n}], [X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{x}_n,n}]) + \mathcal{W}_1([X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{x}_n,n}], [X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x_n,n}]), \end{aligned}$$

and we find a bound on the first term using the same proof as in [19, Section 4.2]. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we split $|\mathbb{E}f(\bar{X}_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{\bar{x}_n,n}) - \mathbb{E}f(X_{T_{n+1}-T_n}^{x_n,n})|$ into three terms (a), (b) and (c). We however pay attention to the dependence in a_n when applying Lemma B.1, Proposition B.3 and Theorem 4.2. We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} (c) &\leq C[f]_{\text{Lip}}\gamma_{N(T_n)}V^{1/2}(x), \\ (b) &\leq Ca_{n+1}^{-3}\gamma_{N(T_n)}\log\left(\frac{T + \|\gamma\|_{\infty}}{\gamma_{N(T_n)}}\right), \\ (a) &\leq Ca_{n+1}^{-3}e^{C_1a_{n+1}^{-2}}V(x)\gamma_{N(T_n)}\rho_{n+1}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we establish a recursive relation and prove the convergence as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square