On quantitative Laplace-type convergence results for some exponential probability measures, with two applications
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Abstract

Laplace-type results characterize the limit of sequence of measures \((\pi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}\) with density w.r.t the Lebesgue measure \((d\pi_\varepsilon/d\lambda)(x) \propto \exp[-U(x)/\varepsilon]\) when the temperature \(\varepsilon > 0\) converges to 0. If a limiting distribution \(\pi_0\) exists, it concentrates on the minimizers of the potential \(U\). Classical results require the invertibility of the Hessian of \(U\) in order to establish such asymptotics. In this work, we study the particular case of norm-like potentials \(U\) and establish quantitative bounds between \(\pi_\varepsilon\) and \(\pi_0\) w.r.t the Wasserstein distance of order 1 under an invertibility condition of a generalized Jacobian. One key element of our proof is the use of geometric measure theory tools such as the coarea formula. We apply our results to the study of maximum entropy models (microcanonical/macrocanonical distributions) and to the convergence of the iterates of the Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) algorithm at low temperatures for non-convex minimization.
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1 Introduction

Asymptotic expansions of integrals are ubiquitous in probability theory with applications in simulated annealing [34, 58], Bayesian inference [41, 65, 63], statistical physics [25] or chaos expansion [48]. In this paper, we are interested in families of Gibbs probability measures given by the density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure \((d\pi_\varepsilon/d\lambda)(x) \propto \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k/\varepsilon]\) for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\), where \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p\) is some function with \(F(0) = 0\). In particular, we derive non asymptotic bounds between \((\pi_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon > 0\) and \(\pi_0\) when \(\varepsilon \to 0\).

Taking a step back, one way to deal with expansion of integrals of the form \(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-U(x)/\varepsilon]dx\) where \(U : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+\) is to rely on Laplace-type techniques, see [6, 57, 22, 28, 26, 30, 5, 70] for instance. Assuming that \(U\) admits a unique minimizer \(U(0) = 0\) and under additional regularity conditions, it can be shown that if the Hessian of \(U\) evaluated at 0 is invertible then \(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-U(x)/\varepsilon]dx \sim C_U \varepsilon^{d/2}\), with explicit constant \(C_U > 0\) (series expansions are also available under similar conditions). This result on asymptotic integrals can be immediately used to prove the convergence of probability measures with density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure \((d\pi_\varepsilon/d\lambda)(x) \propto \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k/\varepsilon]\).
exp\[-U(x)/\varepsilon\], see [44] for instance. However the invertibility of the Hessian is a restricting condition which is not satisfied in the setting of this paper where \(U(x) = \|F(x)\|^k\) in the case \(p \leq d\).

When the Hessian \(\nabla^2 U(0)\) is not invertible, the asymptotic integral expansion becomes 

degenerate

and is more difficult to analyze. However, several approaches have been proposed in order to tackle this issue. For instance in [64] a multidimensional version of the Watson lemma is established under restrictive conditions on the potential \(U\) near its singularities. Another approach consists in integrating over the manifold of minimizers and apply local change of variables [48], see also [4, 11]. In particular, [48] derives an asymptotic integral expansion similar to the one obtained in the non-degenerate case, under some invertibility condition of the minors of the Hessian. Similarly, [44] uses the tubular neighborhood theorem to obtain that \(\pi_\varepsilon\) converges to a limiting measure under the assumption that the minimizers of \(U\) can be partitioned into a collection of manifolds. Closer to the method introduced in the present paper, [18, 3] propose to use the so-called Gelfand-Leray forms to tackle the non-degeneracy problem. By integrating over the level sets it can be shown that

\[
\int_{V} \varphi(x) \exp[-U(x)/\varepsilon] \, dx = \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp[-t/\varepsilon] \left( \int_{U^{-1}(t) \cap V} \varphi(x) \omega_U(x) \right) dt,
\]

(1)

where \(V\) is an open set, \(\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})\) a test function and \(\omega_U\) the so-called Gelfand-Leray form associated with \(U\). Then by establishing regularity properties for the functional \(t \mapsto \int_{U^{-1}(t) \cap V} \varphi(x) \omega_U(x)\) one can recover asymptotic integral expansion in the case where \(U\) is analytic, see [18, 3]. This theory does not rely on any invertibility condition on the Hessian of \(U\) but the exponents appearing in the asymptotic expansion are usually not available in closed form in general since their derivation relies on resolution of singularities [42].

In this paper, we consider a different approach which also does not rely on invertibility conditions on the Hessian of \(U\) at singularity points but allows us to derive quantitative expansions. To do so, we restrict the set of functions \(U : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+\) to the set of norm-like functions, i.e. \(U\) is norm-like if there exists \(F: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p\) and \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) such that for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\), \(U(x) = \|F(x)\|^k\) (however our results can be extended to general potentials \(U\) under classical invertibility conditions on the Hessian of \(U\)). Instead of invertibility conditions of the Hessian of \(U\) we require invertibility conditions on the generalized Jacobian of \(F\) to be defined below. Our approach relies on tools from

the geometric measure theory and in particular the coarea formula, see [1] for instance. Indeed, using this formula we are able to establish a similar result as (1) where the Gelfand-Leray form is replaced by a twisted Hausdorff measure \(\nu\). By establishing the Lipschitz regularity of the mapping \(t \mapsto \int_{U^{-1}(t) \cap V} \varphi(x) d\nu(x)\) we are able to provide quantitative bounds for the integral expansion. This expansion is the key to our main result which establishes quantitative bounds w.r.t. the Wasserstein distance of order 1 between \(\pi_\varepsilon\) and a limit probability measure \(\pi_0\) for \(\varepsilon > 0\) small enough. Concurrently to this work, [10] establishes similar quantitative results in the case where the Hessian of \(U\) is invertible.

One of our main motivation for this study is the application of Laplace-type results to maximum entropy models. In particular, using our quantitative bounds, we are able to provide a link between two possible maximum entropy models commonly used in statistical physics and image processing [12, 21]. Given a reference measure \(\mu\) and constraints \(F: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p\) it is possible to define the microcanonical model, which corresponds to the probability measure \(\pi_{\text{mic}}\) with the minimum Kullback-Leibler divergence w.r.t \(\mu\) and such that \(\pi_{\text{mic}}\) is supported on the set \(\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : F(x) = 0 \}\). Similarly, one can define the macrocanonical model with level \(\varepsilon > 0\) denoted \(\pi^\varepsilon_{\text{mac}}\) such that \(\pi^\varepsilon_{\text{mac}}\) minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence w.r.t \(\mu\) and satisfies the integrability condition

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|F(x)\|^2 d\pi^\varepsilon_{\text{mac}}(x) = \varepsilon.
\]

Using results from information geometry [19] and under mild regularity
conditions, \( \pi_\varepsilon \) can be written as a Gibbs measure and its limiting behavior when \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) can be investigated in the context of asymptotic expansions of integrals. In this work, we show that the limit of the macrocanonical models when \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) is a twisted microcanonical model and propose an algorithm to asymptotically recover the original microcanonical distribution.

Another application we consider in this paper is the non-asymptotic study of Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) \cite{68}, a popular algorithm used to approximate the minimizers of non-convex functions in a machine learning setting. Given a potential (or population risk) \( U: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) which can be written for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) as \( U(x) = \int_\mathbb{Z} u(x, z) d\mu(z) \), we assume that we have access to an empirical version of this risk for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( z^{1:n} = \{ z_1 \}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) given by \( U_n(x, z^{1:n}) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n u(x, z_i) \) as well as an unbiased estimator of its gradient denoted \( g \). Conditionally to the samples \( z^{1:n} \), SGLD corresponds to the recursion associated with an unadjusted Langevin dynamics \cite{61, 24, 20} with target \( U_n(\cdot, z^{1:n})/\varepsilon \) for a small value of \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and where the gradient of \( U_n(\cdot, z^{1:n}) \) is replaced by its unbiased estimator \( g \). Since the invariant measure of the underlying Langevin diffusion is given by \( \pi_\varepsilon \) with density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure \( \sum_{i=1}^n \exp[-U_n(x, z^{1:n})/\varepsilon] \), we obtain that for small values of the parameter \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the samples \( (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) are approximately concentrated around the minimizers of \( U_n(\cdot, z^{1:n}) \). In existing works on SGLD \cite{60, 14, 32, 27, 55, 71} all quantitative theoretical guarantees are obtained w.r.t. the sequence of \( (\mathbb{E} U(X_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \). On the contrary, we characterize the limiting distribution of SGLD and establish non-asymptotic quantitative bounds between SGLD and this limit. Finally, we show that the support of the limiting distribution is included into (but not necessarily equal to) the set of minimizers of \( U \) when \( n \) is large. This last result relies on the notion of thermodynamic barrier which we introduce in the context of integral expansion. To our knowledge this is the first time that the importance of such a barrier to derive parametric Laplace-type results is highlighted (as opposed to the kinetic barrier which is a well-known quantity in simulated annealing \cite{40}).

To summarize, our main contributions are three-fold:

(i) We establish quantitative bounds between \( \pi_\varepsilon \) and \( \pi_0 \) under the assumption that the potential \( U \) is norm-like and additional regularity conditions. In particular we provide an upper-bound between \( \pi_\varepsilon \) and \( \pi_0 \) w.r.t. the Wasserstein distance of order 1. We emphasize that our results also hold under the more classical invertibility condition on the Hessian of \( U \).

(ii) We apply this result to show that under mild conditions the limit of a natural class of macrocanonical models is not the original microcanonical model. However, we prove that a twisted sequence of macrocanonical models converges to the microcanonical distribution. This observation allows us to construct a Langevin-based algorithm in order to sample from this distribution. We illustrate our method in low-dimensional settings.

(iii) Finally, we apply our theory to study the behavior of the iterates of SGLD in the context of non-convex optimization. In particular, we characterize the limiting distribution of SGLD at low temperature and show that it concentrates on the minimizers of the population loss for a large number of samples using the notion of thermodynamic barrier. Note that in this study, we no longer assume that \( U \) is norm-like but instead rely on invertibility conditions on the Hessian of \( U \).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present our main results, i.e. quantitative bounds between \( \pi_\varepsilon \) and the limiting distribution \( \pi_0 \). In Section 3, we present our two main applications: the links between the macrocanonical and microcanonical maximum entropy models in Section 3.1, and a study of the convergence of SGLD for non-convex minimization in Section 3.2. The proofs of our results are gathered in Section 4.
Notation

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We denote $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^d$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the Euclidean scalar product over $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $| \cdot |$ be the corresponding norm. We denote $B(x, r)$ the ball with center $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and radius $r > 0$ w.r.t. the norm $\| \cdot \|$. Similarly, we denote $B_\infty(x, r)$ the ball with center $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and radius $r > 0$ w.r.t. the norm $\| \cdot \|_\infty$ given for any $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\|x\|_\infty = \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} |x_i|$.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $\text{diam}(A) = \sup_{x, y \in A} |x - y|$ its diameter and $A^c$ its complementary set. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the Borel $\sigma$-field of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $U$ be an open set of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and let $C^n(U, \mathbb{R}^p)$ be the set of the $n$-differentiable $\mathbb{R}^p$-valued functions defined over $U$. If $p = 1$ we simply denote $C^n(U)$. Let $f \in C^1(U)$, we denote by $\nabla f$ its gradient. Furthermore, if $f \in C^2(U)$ we denote $\nabla^2 f$ its Hessian and $\Delta f$ its Laplacian. By convention we denote $\nabla^0 f = f$. We also denote $C(U, \mathbb{R}^p)$ the set of continuous functions defined over $U$. Let $f : A \to \mathbb{R}^p$ with $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The function $f$ is said to be $L$-Lipschitz with $L \geq 0$ if for any $x, y \in A$, $\|f(x) - f(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|$. Let $F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $F$ is differentiable at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and denote $DF(x) = (\partial_j F_i(x))_{i,j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}}$ the Jacobian matrix of $F$ which is a $p \times d$ matrix. We define the generalized Jacobian $JF : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ given for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$JF(x) = \begin{cases} \det(DF(x))^{1/2}, & \text{if } d \geq p, \\ \det((DF(x))^{\top}DF(x))^{1/2}, & \text{if } d \leq p. \end{cases}$$

Finally, if $F \in C^d(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ with $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $D^\ell F$ for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$, recursively by $D^{\ell+1} F = D(D^\ell F)$. Note that for any $j \in \{0, \ldots, \ell\}$, $D^\ell F$ can be represented as $p \times d \times \cdots \times d$ tensor (where $d$ appears $j$ times) with symmetric last $j$ coordinates. Hence, we can define $D^{\ell+1} F^\top$ the tensor where the first and last dimension have been exchanged, which is a $d \times \cdots \times d \times p$ tensor. If $p = 1$ then, we write $\nabla^j F = D^j F$ for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a measurable space. We denote by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ the set of the $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable real functions over $\mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of finite signed measures over $\mathcal{X}$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$. For $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ a $\mu$-integrable function we denote

$$\mu[f] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) d\mu(x),$$

the integral of $f$ w.r.t. $\mu$ when it is well-defined. We also define $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ the set of probability measures over $\mathcal{X}$ and when there is no ambiguity on the sigma-field we simply denote it by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. We denote by $\lambda$ the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ be two measurable spaces. A Markov kernel $K$ is a mapping $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \to [0, 1]$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $K(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ and for any $A \in \mathcal{Y}$, $K(\cdot, A)$ is measurable.

Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$. A probability measure $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{A})$ is said to be a transference plan between $\mu$ and $\nu$ if for any $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\zeta(A \times \mathcal{X}) = \mu(A)$ and $\zeta(\mathcal{X} \times A) = \nu(A)$. We denote by $T(\mu, \nu)$ the set of all transference plans between $\mu$ and $\nu$. We define the Wasserstein metric/distance of order $\ell \geq 1$ $W_\ell(\mu, \nu)$ between $\mu$ and $\nu$ by

$$W_\ell(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{T(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} \|x - y\|^\ell d\zeta(x, y).$$

We denote $\mathcal{H}^r$ the Hausdorff measure of order $r > 0$, given for any $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\mathcal{H}^r(A) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathcal{H}^{r, \delta}(A)$, where for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{r, \delta}(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{diam}(U_i)^r : A \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} U_i, \text{diam}(U_i) \leq \delta \right\}.$$

Basic facts on the Hausdorff measure are gathered in Appendix C. Finally, we denote by $\text{Poly}(k, \mathcal{A})$ the set of polynomials of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ variables with coefficients in $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}$. 

2 Limit theorems

In this section, we state our main theorem and draw links with previous approximation results for probability integrals. Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \varepsilon > 0 \), \( F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p \) with \( d, p \in \mathbb{N}^* \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon) \), \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k / \varepsilon] \, dx < +\infty \). For any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon) \), we define \( \pi_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that for any \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \)

\[
\pi_\varepsilon(A) = \int_A \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k / \varepsilon] \, dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k / \varepsilon] \, dx .
\]

Our goal is to study the behavior of \( \pi_\varepsilon \) when \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). In particular, we identify a limit \( \pi_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and derive non-asymptotic convergence bounds. For any \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) we let (when it is well-defined)

\[
\pi_0(A) = \int_{F^{-1}(0) \cap A} JF(x)^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^{d-\min(d,p)}(x) / \int_{F^{-1}(0)} JF(x)^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^{d-\min(d,p)}(x) .
\]

In what follows we consider the following assumption on \( F \) which implies that \( \pi_\varepsilon \) is well-defined for any \( \varepsilon \geq 0 \).

**H1.** \( F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \) and \( F(0) = 0 \). For any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \), \( JF(x) \neq 0 \). There exist \( m, \alpha > 0 \) and \( R \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( \|x\| \geq R \), \( \|F(x)\| \geq m \|x\|^\alpha \).

A few remarks are in order. First, the assumption \( F(0) = 0 \) is only technical and can be replaced by \( F^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset \). Similarly, the smoothness assumption \( F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \) allows us to avoid some technicalities in the proofs but can be relaxed. Second, we assume that \( x \mapsto \|F(x)\| \) grows at least polynomially when \( \|x\| \to +\infty \). This condition can also be relaxed to handle sub-polynomial growth at infinity. However, changing the rate of growth might affect the quantitative convergence properties of \( (\pi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0} \) towards \( \pi_0 \). A study of sub-polynomial growth is left for future work. Finally the assumption that for any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \), \( JF(x) \neq 0 \) is necessary in order to define \( \pi_0 \).

**Theorem 1.** Assume **H1.** Then for any \( \varepsilon \geq 0 \), \( \pi_\varepsilon \) is well-defined. Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open and bounded such that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset U \). Let \( \varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \) and \( C_\varphi \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
|\varphi(x)| \leq C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi \|x\|^\alpha k] ,
\]

with \( \alpha > 0 \) defined in **H1** and \( k \in \mathbb{N}^* \) in (2). Then \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |\pi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi]| = 0 \). In addition, if \( \varphi \) is \( M_{1,\varphi} \)-Lipschitz on \( U \) with \( M_{1,\varphi} \geq 0 \), then there exist \( A \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \), \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \tilde{\varepsilon}(C_\varphi)) \) we have

\[
|\pi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi]| \leq A(C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})\varepsilon^{1/k} ,
\]

with \( M_{0,\varphi} = \sup\{|\varphi(x)| : x \in U\} \), \( A, \tilde{\varepsilon} \) independent functions from \( \varphi \), \( A \) is non-decreasing and \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) is non-increasing.

**Proof.** We provide a sketch of the proof. The whole proof is postponed to Section 4.1. We first start by showing that we can restrict our study to versions of \( \pi_\varepsilon \) and \( \pi_0 \) with truncated support. Then our study differs depending on if \( d \geq p \) or \( d \leq p \). If \( d \geq p \) then we use tools from geometric measure theory, and in particular the coarea formula in combination with the Lipschitz property of applications of the form \( t \mapsto \int_{F^{-1}(t)} \varphi(x)d\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(x) \). In the case \( d \leq p \) we adapt arguments from Morse theory and Laplace theory to derive quantitative bounds on \( |\pi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi]| \). These analyses are conducted with smooth test functions \( \varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \) and we relax this hypothesis using smoothing arguments.
We highlight a few key points from this theorem and draw links with the existing literature.

(a) Our result is related to the Laplace-type convergence results of \cite{70, 48, 4, 11, 11, 6, 57, 22, 28, 26, 30, 5}. In these works, the authors study integrals of the form $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \exp[-U(x)/\varepsilon]dx$ in the limiting case where $\varepsilon \to 0$ under regularity assumptions on $U$ and $\varphi$, and the non-degeneracy condition that for any $x \in \arg \min_{\mathbb{R}^d} U$, $\nabla^2 U(x)$ is invertible. We say that $U: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is norm-like with exponent $2$ if there exist $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $F: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $U(x) = \|F(x)\|^2$. In this case, and under additional regularity assumptions, we have for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\nabla^2 U(x) = 2D^2 F(x)^\top F(x) + 2DF(x)^\top DF(x).$$

In particular for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $\nabla^2 U(x)$ is invertible if and only if $JF(x) \neq 0$ which is precisely the non-degeneracy condition imposed in H1 (note that this directly implies that $d \leq p$). For any $U \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$ with Lipschitz third order derivatives, there exist $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ with Lipschitz derivatives such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $U(x) = \|F(x)\|^2$, see \cite{7, 31}. Hence, our restriction to functions $U: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ of the form $U = \|F\|^k$ for some $F: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p$ with $p, k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is not too constraining under additional regularity assumptions.

(b) We emphasize that our results can be extended to a general potential $U \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$ if the Hessian of $U$ is invertible on the set $U^{-1}(0)$, thus recovering the usual setting of Laplace-type convergence results.

(c) As highlighted previously, we aim at providing quantitative bounds for $|\pi_{\varepsilon}[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi]|$. In the case where $d \leq p$ we adapt classical arguments from Morse and Laplace theory. Our main contribution is the use of geometric measure theory to cover the case $d \geq p$ which cannot be treated with classical Laplace arguments. The case $d \geq p$ is of particular interest in machine learning applications requiring to sample from distributions of the form $(d\pi/d\lambda)(x) \propto \exp[-\|F(x)\|^2]$; where $F: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p$ is an encoder neural network with $d \geq p$. In Section 3.1 we investigate this situation in details in the case of generative modeling with macrocanonical and microcanonical models.

As a by-product of Theorem 1 we obtain the following corollary which establishes quantitative bounds for the Wasserstein distance of order 1 between $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ and $\pi_0$.

**Corollary 2.** Assume H1. Then for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ is well-defined. In addition, there exist $A_1 \geq 0$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon})$ we have

$$W_1(\pi_{\varepsilon}, \pi_0) \leq A_1 \varepsilon^{1/k},$$

where we recall that $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is defined in (2).

**Proof.** Denote Lip = $\{\varphi: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}: |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq \|x - y\|$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. In addition, denote Lip$_0$ = $\{\varphi: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}: |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq \|x - y\|$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\varphi(0) = 0\}$. First, using \cite[Theorem 5.10]{66} we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

$$W_1(\pi_{\varepsilon}, \pi_0) = \sup\{\pi_{\varepsilon}[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi] : \varphi \in \text{Lip}\} = \sup\{|\pi_{\varepsilon}[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi]| : \varphi \in \text{Lip}_0\}.$$

Let $r = \alpha k$ and $\beta_r = [1/r]$. For any $\varphi \in \text{Lip}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\| \geq 1$ we have

$$\beta_r \exp[\beta_r \|x\|^\alpha] \geq \beta_r^{\alpha \beta_r} \|x\|^\beta_r \geq \|x\| \geq |\varphi(x)|.$$
Similarly, if \( \|x\| \leq 1 \) we have that \( |\varphi(x)| \leq 1 \leq \beta_\varepsilon \exp[\beta_\varepsilon \|x\|] \). Hence for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( |\varphi(x)| \leq \beta_\varepsilon \exp[\beta_\varepsilon \|x\|] \). For any \( \varphi \in \text{Lip}_0 \) we have \( M_{1,\varphi} = 1 \). In addition, the set \( F^{-1}(0) \) is compact since \( \lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} \|F(x)\| = +\infty \) and \( F \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \). Therefore there exists \( R > 0 \) such that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset B(0, R) \). In particular, note that \( U = B(0, R) \) is open and bounded. We have that for any \( \varphi \in \text{Lip}_0 \) and \( x \in U \)

\[
|\varphi(x)| \leq \|x\| \leq R.
\]

Therefore we get that \( M_{0,\varphi} = R \). Combining these results with Theorem 1 we have for any \( \varphi \in \text{Lip}_0 \) and \( \varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon(\lceil 1/r \rceil)] \)

\[
|\pi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi_0[\varphi]| \leq A(C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})\varepsilon^{1/k} \leq 2A([1/r])(1 + R)\varepsilon^{1/k}.
\]

We conclude the proof upon combining this result and (4).

Concurrently to our work, [10] establishes similar quantitative bounds w.r.t the Wasserstein distance of order 1 without the norm-like assumption on the potential \( U \) but assuming that the Hessian of \( U \) is invertible on arg min\{\( U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)\}, see [10, Lemma 4.6]. To do so, the authors derive estimates of the form \( W_1(\pi_\varepsilon, \pi_0) \leq C|\varepsilon|^{1/2 - \varepsilon_1^{1/2}} \) with \( C \geq 0 \) for \( \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0 \) using a coupling lemma and results from Morse theory. The final bound is obtained by letting \( \varepsilon_2 \to 0 \) in the previous inequality and the fact that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \pi_\varepsilon = \pi_0 \) weakly. Corollary 2 extends these bounds to the case where the Hessian of \( U \) is no longer invertible under a norm-like condition on the potential.

Also, note that [44] establishes that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \pi_\varepsilon = \pi_0 \) weakly without any norm-like assumption on \( U \) under the condition that \( C^* = \arg \min\{U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \) can be partitioned into a collection of manifolds and that for any \( x \in C^* \), the Hessian of \( U \) along the normal plan to the manifold associated with \( x \) is invertible (we denote \( \nabla^2_U U(x) \) this quantity). In Lemma A.1, we show that if \( U = \|F\|^2 \) then we have that \( \det(\nabla^2_U U(x)) = JF(x)^2 \) for any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \). Hence, the invertibility condition can be written as: for any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \), \( JF(x) \neq 0 \) similarly to \( H1 \) and the limiting measure identified by [44] is exactly \( \pi_0 \).

The next result is an extension of Theorem 1 where, given \( k \in \mathbb{N}^*, \Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+, \pi_\varepsilon \) is replaced by \( \pi_\varepsilon^\Psi \) defined for any \( A \in B(\mathbb{R}^d) \) by

\[
\pi_\varepsilon^\Psi(A) = \int_A \Psi(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k/\varepsilon]dx/\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k/\varepsilon]dx.
\]

Similarly, for any \( A \in B(\mathbb{R}^d) \) we let (when it is well-defined)

\[
\pi_0^\Psi(A) = \int_{F^{-1}(0) \cap A} \Psi(x) JF(x)^{-1}d\mathcal{H}^{d-\min(d,p)}(x)/\int_{F^{-1}(0)} \Psi(x) JF(x)^{-1}d\mathcal{H}^{d-\min(d,p)}(x).
\] 

(5)

We consider the following assumption on \( \Psi \) which ensures that \( \pi_\varepsilon^\Psi \) is well-defined for \( \varepsilon \geq 0 \) when combined with \( H1 \).

**H2.** \( \Psi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+) \), there exists \( C_\Psi \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \Psi(x) \leq C_\Psi \exp[C_\Psi \|x\|^\alpha k] \) and \( \Psi(x) > 0 \) for any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \).

Note that in \( H2, \alpha > 0 \) is given in \( H1 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N}^* \) is given in (2). Under this assumption, we derive the following quantitative bounds.

**Theorem 3.** Assume \( H1 \) and \( H2 \). Then for any \( \varepsilon \geq 0, \pi_\varepsilon \) is well-defined. Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open and bounded such that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset U \). Let \( \varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \) and \( C_\varphi \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
|\varphi(x)| \leq C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi \|x\|^\alpha k],
\] 

(6)
with $\alpha > 0$ defined in $H1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ in (2). Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |\pi^\Psi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi^\Psi_0[\varphi]| = 0$. In addition, if $\varphi$ and $\Psi$ are respectively $M_{1,\varphi}$-Lipschitz and $M_{1,\Psi}$-Lipschitz on $U$ with $M_{1,\varphi}, M_{1,\Psi} \geq 0$, then there exist $A \in C(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R}_+)$, $\bar{\varepsilon} \in C(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}(C_\varphi))$ we have

$$|\pi^\Psi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi^\Psi_0[\varphi]| \leq A(C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})\varepsilon^{1/k},$$

with $M_{0,\varphi} = \sup\{|\varphi(x)| : x \in U\}$, $A, \bar{\varepsilon}$ independent functions from $\varphi$, $A$ non-decreasing and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ non-increasing.

**Proof.** The proof is postponed to Section 4.1. \qed

The same remarks formulated after Theorem 1 hold for this extension. In particular the norm-like assumption on $U$ can be omitted and replaced by a classical invertibility condition on the Hessian at $U^{-1}(0)$. Note that Theorem 1 is a direct consequence of Theorem 3 upon letting $\Psi = 1$. An important consequence of Theorem 3 is the case where for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Psi(x) = JF(x)$. Indeed, doing so we obtain that $\pi^\Psi_0$ is the uniform distribution on $F^{-1}(0)$, i.e. the maximum entropy distribution with support $F^{-1}(0)$. We discuss this special case in Section 3.1. Similarly to Corollary 2 we can also establish the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.** Assume $H1$ and $H2$. Then for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\pi_\varepsilon$ is well-defined. In addition, assume that $\Psi$ is Lipschitz continuous. Then there exist $A_2 \geq 0$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$ we have

$$W_1(\pi^\Psi_\varepsilon, \pi^\Psi_0) \leq A_2\varepsilon^{1/k},$$

where we recall that $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is defined in (2).

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the one of Corollary 2. \qed

## 3 Applications

In this section, we present two applications of our results. First, we draw links between two different maximum entropy models in Section 3.1. Then, we study the convergence of SGLD for non-convex minimization in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 Maximum entropy distribution

**3.1.1 Maximum entropy models**

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact space with $\text{int}(X) \neq \emptyset$ and $G : X \to \mathbb{R}^p$ measurable. The maximum entropy model with constraint $G$ is denoted $\pi_{\text{Ent}}$ and is given by

$$\pi_{\text{Ent}} = \arg \max \{H(\pi) : \pi \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(X), \pi[\|G\|] < +\infty, \pi[G] = 0\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(X)$ is the set of probability measures on $X$ which admit a density w.r.t the Lebesgue measure, $\pi[G] = \int_X G(x)d\pi(x)$ and $H(\pi) = -\int_X \log(d\pi/d\lambda)(x)d\pi(x)$ for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(X)$, where $\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that $H(\pi)$ is well-defined (but can be infinite) since $X$ is compact and in this case $\text{KL}(\pi[\mu]) = -H(\pi) + \log(\lambda(X))$, where $\mu$ is the uniform measure on $X$ and we recall that $\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure.
Such maximum entropy models naturally arise in many areas such as statistical physics [46, 12], econometrics [38], generative modeling [59, 52, 21], reinforcement learning [76] or image processing [35, 23]. In what follows, we introduce two extensions of (7). More precisely, we use the analogy between the maximization of the entropy and the minimization of an appropriate Kullback-Leibler divergence to extend (7) on non-compact spaces, following [21].

**Macrocanonical distributions** Given $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $G : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p$ measurable, we say that $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a macrocanonical distribution [12] with reference measure $\mu$ and constraint $G$ if it satisfies

$$
\pi^* \in \arg\min\{\text{KL}(\pi|\mu) : \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \pi[\|G\|] < +\infty, \pi[G] = 0\}.
$$

Using results from information geometry [19] any macrocanonical model can be written as an exponential distribution under mild assumptions.

**Proposition 5** ([21]). Assume that $G \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ and that there exist $\alpha, \beta, \eta > 0$ with $\beta > \alpha$ such that

$$
\sup\{\|G(x)\|(1 + \|x\|^\alpha)^{-1} : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} < +\infty, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[\eta\|x\|^\beta]d\mu(x) < +\infty,
$$

In addition, assume that for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|\theta\| = 1$, we have $\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \theta, G(x) \rangle < 0\}) > 0$. Then there exists a unique macrocanonical distribution with constraint $G$ and reference measure $\mu$ denoted $\pi^*$. In addition, there exists $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(d\pi^*/d\mu)(x) = \exp[-\langle \theta^*, G(x) \rangle - L(\theta^*)], \quad L(\theta^*) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\langle \theta^*, G(x) \rangle]d\mu(x).$$

We refer to [21] for a relaxation of these conditions and a detailed study of the macrocanonical model. Proposition 5 ensures that macrocanonical distributions can be written as Gibbs measures. We emphasize that these distributions satisfy a constraint in expectation. An alternative way to define maximum entropy models under constraints is to ensure almost sure equality. This tighter constraint yields new maximum entropy models called microcanonical distributions.

**Microcanonical distributions** A microcanonical model $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with reference measure $\mu$ and constraint $G$ can be defined as

$$
\pi^* \in \arg\min\{\text{KL}(\pi|\mu) : \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \pi[\|G\|] = 0\}.
$$

We emphasize that imposing (8) is equivalent to impose that $\pi^*$ has minimum Kullback-Leibler divergence w.r.t $\mu$ among all distributions which satisfy $G = 0$ almost surely. Note that if there exists a microcanonical model $\pi^*$ with $\text{KL}(\pi^*|\mu) < +\infty$ then $\mu(A) > 0$ where $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : G(x) = 0\}$ and in this case $\pi^* = \mu(\cdot \cap A)/\mu(A)$. In what follows, we will say that $\pi^*$ is the uniform microcanonical distribution with constraint $G$ if $G^{-1}(0)$ is compact with $H^{d-min(d,p)}(G^{-1}(0)) < +\infty$ and $\pi^*$ is the uniform distribution on $G^{-1}(0)$, i.e. for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have

$$
\pi^*(A) = \int_{G^{-1}(0) \cap A} dH^{d-min(d,p)}(x)/H^{d-min(d,p)}(G^{-1}(0)).
$$

Note that contrary to macrocanonical distributions which admit a representation as a Gibbs measure, see Proposition 5, the microcanonical models are concentrated on the set $G^{-1}(0)$. In the next section, we draw links between these two maximum entropy distributions.
3.1.2 From macrocanonical to microcanonical

In order to draw links between macrocanonical and microcanonical models we consider a specific sequence of macrocanonical models associated with the constraint \( G_\varepsilon = \| F \|^2 - \varepsilon \) for \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) be a reference probability measure. Under the conditions of Proposition 5, we define a family of measures \( \{ \rho_\varepsilon \}_{\varepsilon > 0} \) such that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), \( \rho_\varepsilon \) is the macrocanonical distribution associated with \( G_\varepsilon \) and \( \mu \). More precisely, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \theta_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R} \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
(\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{d\mu})(x) = \exp[-\theta_\varepsilon \| F(x) \|^2 - L_\varepsilon], \quad L_\varepsilon = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\theta_\varepsilon \| F(x) \|^2] d\mu(x).
\]

Our goal is to study the behavior of the family \( \{ \rho_\varepsilon \}_{\varepsilon > 0} \) when \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). In particular, we show that there exists a reference measure \( \mu \) such that the limit \( \pi_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho_\varepsilon \) exists where \( \pi_0 \) is the uniform microcanonical distribution (9). We start with the following proposition which ensures that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \theta_\varepsilon = +\infty \) with linear rate.

**Proposition 6.** Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p \). Assume that the conditions of Proposition 5 with \( G_\varepsilon = \| F \|^2 - \varepsilon \) for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) are satisfied and let \( \rho_\varepsilon \) be the macrocanonical distribution with constraint \( G_\varepsilon \) and reference measure \( \mu \). Assume that there exists \( \Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( \mu \) admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure given by \( \Psi \). In addition, assume that \( H1 \) and \( H2 \) hold. Then, we have that \( \theta_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon \to 0 \) \( p/(2\varepsilon) \).

**Proof.** We provide a sketch of the proof. The whole proof is postponed to Section 4.2. In particular we show that under the same conditions as Proposition 6, we have that \( \pi_\varepsilon \| F \|^2 \sim \varepsilon \to 0 \) \( p/(2\varepsilon) \), where we recall that \( \pi_\varepsilon \| F \|^2 = \varepsilon \).

Note that the equivalent in Proposition 6 is independent from the reference measure \( \mu \). In Section 4.2, we prove an extension of Proposition 6, see Proposition 18. In particular we show that \( G_\varepsilon = \| F \|^2 - \varepsilon \) can be replaced by \( G_\varepsilon = \| F \|^k - \varepsilon \) with \( k \in \mathbb{N}^* \) under similar conditions. In particular, we get that for any \( k \in \mathbb{N}^* \), \( \theta_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon \to 0 \) \( C_k/\varepsilon \) with \( C_k \) explicit if \( k = 2 \). Finally note that under the same conditions as Proposition 6, we have that \( \pi_\varepsilon \| F \|^2 \sim \varepsilon \to 0 \) \( p/(2\varepsilon) \), where we recall that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \)

\[
\pi_\varepsilon^\Psi(A) = \int_A \Psi(x) \exp[-\| F(x) \|^2/\varepsilon] dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(x) \exp[-\| F(x) \|^2/\varepsilon] dx.
\]

This comes from the facts that \( \rho_\varepsilon = \pi_\varepsilon^\Psi \) and \( \rho_\varepsilon \| F \|^2 = \varepsilon \).

The following proposition establishes quantitative bounds w.r.t. the Wasserstein of order 1 between \( \{ \rho_\varepsilon \}_{\varepsilon > 0} \) and a limiting measure. We obtain this result upon combining Proposition 6 and Corollary 2.

**Proposition 7.** Assume the same conditions as Proposition 6. Then there exist \( \bar{\varepsilon} > 0 \) and \( A_3 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}] \) we have

\[ W_1(\rho_\varepsilon, \pi_0^\Psi) \leq A_3 \varepsilon^{1/2}, \]

where \( \pi_0^\Psi \) is given in (5).

Proposition 7 establishes quantitative bounds between the family of macrocanonical models \( \{ \rho_\varepsilon \}_{\varepsilon > 0} \) and a limiting distribution \( \pi_0^\Psi \). Note that this limiting distribution is not the uniform microcanonical distribution \( \pi^* \) defined in (9) in general, even though it is supported on the set \( F^{-1}(0) \). However, it is possible to sample from this \( \pi^* \) by choosing \( \mu \) such that for any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \),

\[ \Psi(x) = (d\mu/d\lambda)(x) = JF(x). \]
3.1.3 Some simple experiments

Methodology In this experimental section we consider two simple examples of functions $F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p$ with $d = 1$ or $2$ and $p = 1$. We consider the associated models $\{\pi_{\varepsilon}\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ and $\{\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ and their limit as $\varepsilon$ goes to $0$, showing in particular that for $\Psi = JF$, it converges to the uniform microcanonical model that is the uniform distribution on $F^{-1}(0)$. We also check experimentally the scaling relation of Proposition 6.

Zeros of a polynomial In this first example, let $P : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial. We are interested in the zeros of $P$, and, more precisely in sampling in a uniform way on the set of the zeros of $P$. Using the notations of the previous sections, we set $F = P$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let us define the two distributions, with respective densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ given for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(d\pi_{\varepsilon}/d\lambda)(x) = \exp[-F(x)^2/\varepsilon]/\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp[-F(\tilde{x})^2/\varepsilon]d\tilde{x},$$

$$(d\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}/d\lambda)(x) = JF(x) \exp[-F(x)^2/\varepsilon]/\int_{\mathbb{R}} JF(\tilde{x}) \exp[-F(\tilde{x})^2/\varepsilon]d\tilde{x},$$

where for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Psi(x) = JF(x) = |P'(x)|$.

In Figure 1, we display the polynomial $P$ where for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $P(x) = x(x-0.5)(x-1.7)(x-2.5)$. We also check numerically the scaling relation of Proposition 6. Then, in Figure 2, we illustrate the different behaviors of $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ and $\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}$ when $\varepsilon$ is small ($\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$ in our experiments). We also present the histograms obtained using of $N = 10^4$ independent samples of $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ and of $\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}$. The stars indicate the target limit distributions (that is the uniform distribution on the zeros of $P$ for the limit of $\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}$).

Two-dimensional ellipse In this second example, we consider the function $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ given for any $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by $F(x) = a_1 x_1^2 + a_2 x_2^2 - 1$ with $a_1, a_2 > 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ and $\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}$ whose densities w.r.t the Lebesgue measure are given for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$(d\pi_{\varepsilon}/d\lambda)(x) = \exp[-\|F(x)\|^2/\varepsilon]/\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \exp[-\|F(\tilde{x})\|^2/\varepsilon]d\tilde{x},$$

$$(d\pi_{\varepsilon}^{\Psi}/d\lambda)(x) = JF(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^2/\varepsilon]/\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} JF(\tilde{x}) \exp[-\|F(\tilde{x})\|^2/\varepsilon]d\tilde{x},$$

Figure 1: Left: graph of the polynomial $x \mapsto P(x)$, that has 4 zeros. Right: verifying the scaling relation of Proposition 6 by plotting $\varepsilon \mapsto 2\pi_{\varepsilon}|P|^2$, which is equivalent to $\varepsilon$ as $\varepsilon$ goes to 0.
Figure 2: Distributions $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ and $\pi_\Psi^\varepsilon$ (first line), and histogram of their samples from them (second line). This experiment shows that the limit distribution of $\pi_{\varepsilon}$ as $\varepsilon$ goes to 0 is the uniform microcanonical model given by the uniform distribution on the zeros of $P$.

$$(d\pi_\Psi^\varepsilon/d\lambda)(x) = JF(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^2/\varepsilon] \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} JF(\tilde{x}) \exp[-\|F(\tilde{x})\|^2/\varepsilon]d\tilde{x},$$

To sample from $\pi_\varepsilon$ and $\pi_\Psi^\varepsilon$, we use two Markov chains given by the Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm [61, 24, 20], given respectively by

$$X_{n+1} = X_n - \gamma(\nabla\|F\|^2(X_n)/\varepsilon + \sqrt{2\gamma}Z_{n+1}),$$

$$Y_{n+1} = Y_n - \gamma(\nabla\|F\|^2(Y_n)/\varepsilon - \nabla \log JF(Y_n)) + \sqrt{2\gamma}Z_{n+1},$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a stepsize and $\{Z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a family of independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and identity covariance matrix. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we have

$$JF(x) = 2(a_1^2x_1^2 + a_2^2x_2^2)^{1/2}, \quad \nabla\|F\|^2(x) = 2F(x)\nabla F(x) = 4(a_1x_1^2 + a_2x_2^2 - 1)\begin{pmatrix} a_1x_1 \\ a_2x_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\nabla \log JF(x) = (a_1^2x_1^2 + a_2^2x_2^2)^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} a_1^2x_1 \\ a_2^2x_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$
In Figure 3, we set $a_1 = 1$, $a_2 = 4$, $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$, $\gamma = 10^{-5}$, $N = 9 \times 10^7$ iterations in the Markov chains, and histograms with bins of size 0.05. In Figure 3, we compare two different histograms: the ones of the angle values $(\theta)$ for the points of the chain $X_n$ (diamonds), of the chain $Y_n$ (stars), and the two distributions with density $\theta \mapsto \frac{\ell(\theta)}{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \ell(\theta) d\theta}$ (black curve) and $\theta \mapsto \frac{\ell(\theta)JF(\theta)^{-1}}{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \ell(\theta)JF(\theta)^{-1} d\theta}$ (red curve). Note that $\theta \mapsto \frac{\ell(\theta)}{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \ell(\theta) d\theta}$ corresponds to the Hausdorff measure on the ellipse pushed by the polar parametrisation $\theta \mapsto r(\theta)$, i.e. the uniform microcanonical model pushed by $\theta \mapsto r(\theta)$. We observe that the Markov chain corrected with the generalized Jacobian indeed achieves the uniform microcanonical model on the set $F^{-1}(0)$. Finally, we also check experimentally the scaling relation of Proposition 6.

### 3.2 Non-convex minimization

#### 3.2.1 Non-convex setting and related work

In this section, we consider the following minimization problem:

$$\text{find } x^* \in \arg \min \{ U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \} ,$$

with $U \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\arg \min \{ U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \} \neq \emptyset$. Here, we do not assume that $U$ is convex. Hence, classical first-order optimization schemes such as gradient descent might get trapped in saddle points. Adding isotropic Gaussian noise to this dynamics circumvents this issue, see [9, 58] for instance. The algorithm is then given by the following recursion: $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma_k \nabla U(X_k) + Z_{k+1} ,$$

where $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and covariance matrix $\sigma_k^2 I_d$, with $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^\mathbb{N}$ a sequence of stepsizes and $(\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^\mathbb{N}$. If $\sigma_k^2 = \gamma_k^2$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k = +\infty$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_k^2 < +\infty$ then the algorithm is in the weakly disturbed regime and under additional assumptions on $U$ one can show that $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges almost surely to a local minimizer of $U$, see [58] for instance. However, $(U(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}})$ does not necessarily converges to the global minimum of $U$. The intuition behind this behavior is that the variance of the noise decreases too quickly for the sequence to explore efficiently the landscape of $U$. 
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In order to perform global optimization, one can consider simulated annealing algorithms where \( \sigma_k^2 = \gamma_k T_k \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), with \( (T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)\mathbb{N} \) a sequence of temperatures which slowly decrease. These algorithms were introduced in the context of discrete optimization in [47] and have been thoroughly investigated in [37] (discrete state-space), [33, 34] (discrete-time algorithm), [36, 15, 43] (diffusion), [58] (CLT type results), [62] (constrained optimization), [72] (non Gaussian noise) and [2] (control of the sequence in total variation) for instance. In [40, 39] a sufficient and necessary condition is given on the rate of decrease \( (T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) so that \( U(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges towards the minimum of \( U \), more precisely the condition reads \( \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \exp[-b^*/T_k] = +\infty \), where \( b^* > 0 \) is a parameter which depends only on \( U \) called the kinetic barrier (or depth in [40, 39]). One of the main limiting factor of simulated annealing is the slow rate of convergence of \( (T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) towards 0, which is often set as \( T_k = C/\log(k+1) \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and for some constant \( C \geq 0 \). Note that recently the convergence of modifications of the simulated annealing algorithms under faster cooling rates have been investigated in discrete spaces by either changing the Markov chain transitions [16] or the energy landscape [17], see also [13]. Finally, we emphasize that most of the results regarding the convergence of (10) can be extended to the case where \( \nabla U \) is replaced by an unbiased estimator under additional conditions.

With the advent of neural networks, numerous schemes exploiting the annealing structure have been proposed to minimize the non-convex losses which arise in deep learning applications, see [73] for instance. Drawing connections with unadjusted Langevin algorithms, and in particular Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) [68], [60, 75] replace \( \nabla U \) by an unbiased estimator and let \( \gamma_k = \gamma > 0, \sigma_k^2 = 2\gamma \varepsilon \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( \varepsilon > 0 \) in (10). Under curvature and regularity assumptions on the potential \( U \), the authors derive quantitative bounds on \( (\mathbb{E}[U(X_k) - \min_{\mathbb{R}^d} U])_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \). Since then several accelerations have been proposed in the literature [14, 32, 27, 55, 74, 71].

In the next section, we improve the results of [60] by providing upper bounds w.r.t the first order Wasserstein distance between the distribution of \( (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) given by SGLD and an explicit limiting distribution. Our results complete the ones of [60] which deals with the behavior of \( (\mathbb{E}[U(X_k) - \min_{\mathbb{R}^d} U])_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result establishing quantitative bounds on the distance between the iterates of SGLD and a limiting measure concentrated on the minimizers of the target potential \( U \).

### 3.2.2 Quantitative convergence for SGLD

In this section we start by recalling the setting considered in [60]. We assume that there exist a topological space \( (Z, B(Z)) \), a probability measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(Z, B(Z)) \) and \( u : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that for any \( z \in Z \), \( u(\cdot, z) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+) \), and define for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
U(x) = \int_Z u(x, z) d\mu(z).
\]

We also denote \( U^* \) the global minimum of \( U \). We do not have access to \( \mu \) and \( U \) directly but instead consider an empirical version of the target. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). We define \( U_n : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) given for any \( z^{1:n} = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^n \in Z^n \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) by

\[
U_n(x, z^{1:n}) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n u(x, z_i).
\]

Let \( (Y, \mathcal{Y}) \) be a measurable space, \( R : Z^n \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1] \) a Markov kernel and \( g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( z^{1:n} \in Z^n \) we have

\[
\nabla_x U_n(x, z^{1:n}) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g(x, y) R(z^{1:n}, dy).
\]
Let $Z$ be a random variable on $\mathbb{Z}^n$ with distribution $\mu^{\otimes n}$. Let $\{Y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a family of independent random variables on $Y$ such that conditionally to $Z$ we have for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $Y_k$ has distribution $\delta_Z$. Finally, let $\varepsilon > 0$. We consider the Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) sequence $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by the following recursion: $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma g(X_k, Y_k) + \sqrt{2\gamma\varepsilon} G_{k+1},$$

where $(G_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and identity covariance matrix and $\gamma > 0$ is a stepsize. We also assume that $\{Y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{G_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $Q_k : \mathbb{Z}^n \times B(\mathbb{R}^d) \to [0, 1]$, the Markov kernel such that for any random variable $Z$ on $\mathbb{Z}^n$ with distribution $\mu^{\otimes n}$, we have that $X_k$ has distribution $\delta_Z Q_k$ conditionally to $Z$. We consider the following assumption, which is similar to the one of [60].

**H3 (n).** For any $z \in Z$, $u(\cdot, z) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and the following hold:

(a) There exist $A, B \geq 0$ such that for any $z \in Z$, $|u(0, z)| \leq A$ and $\|\nabla_z u(0, z)\| \leq B$.

(b) There exists $M \geq 0$ such that for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $z \in Z$, $\|\nabla_z u(x_1, z) - \nabla_z u(x_2, z)\| \leq M \|x_1 - x_2\|$ for any $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

(c) There exist $m > 0$, $c \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $z \in Z$, $\langle \nabla_z u(x, z), x \rangle \geq m \|x\|^2 - c$.

(d) There exists $C \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla_x U_n(x, z^{1:n}) - g(x, y)\| R(z^{1:n}, dy) d\mu^{\otimes n}(z^{1:n}) \leq C(1 + \|x\|^2).$$

Similar to [60] we define the uniform spectral gap

$$\lambda^* = \inf\{\delta_{z^{1:n}} R[\|\nabla h\|^2] / \delta_{z^{1:n}} R[\|h\|^2] : z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, h \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\delta_{z^{1:n}} R), h \neq 0, \delta_{z^{1:n}} R[h] = 0\},$$

and note that under H3(n), $\lambda^* > 0$. Finally, we also consider the following assumption which ensures that the limiting measures we consider are well-defined.

**H4 (n).** $u \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times Z, \mathbb{R})$ and the following hold:

(a) $Z$ is compact.

(b) There exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x_0^k\}_{k=1}^N \in C(\mathbb{Z}^n, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for any $z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $C(z^{1:n}) \subset \{x_0^k(z)\}_{k=1}^N$ and $C(z^{1:n}) \neq \emptyset$, where $C(z^{1:n}) = \arg\min\{U_n(x, z^{1:n}) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$.

(c) For any $\beta > 0$, $\int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} \sigma_\beta(z^{1:n}) d\mu^{\otimes n}(z^{1:n}) < +\infty$, where

$$\sigma_\beta(z^{1:n}) = \sum_{x \in C(z^{1:n})} \det(\nabla_x^2 U(x, z^{1:n}))^{-\beta}.$$  

(11)

We also introduce the thermodynamic barrier $c^* : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $c^*(z^{1:n}) = +\infty$ if $U_n(\cdot, z^{1:n})$ does not admit a local minimizer which is not a global minimizer and $c^*(z^{1:n}) = \inf\{U_n(x, z^{1:n}) : x \text{ is a local minimizer of } U_n(\cdot, z) \text{ but not a global minimizer}\} - U_n^*(z^{1:n})$, with $U_n^*(z^{1:n}) = \inf\{U_n(x, z^{1:n}) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. We refer to Section 3.2.3 for a discussion on the thermodynamic barrier and its importance in non-convex optimization. Under H3(n) and H4(n), we derive quantitative bounds for the sequence $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. 
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Proposition 8. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume $H3(n)$ and $H4(n)$. Then there exist $C \geq 0$, $\varepsilon, \gamma, \beta > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon]$, $\gamma \in (0, \gamma]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq k_0$ we have

$$ W_1(\mu^\cap^n Q_k, \mu^\cap^n S_0) \leq C(1/\varepsilon + d)^2(\gamma^{1/4} \log(1/\gamma) + \gamma)/(\lambda^* \varepsilon) + C(1 + D_n)(\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} \exp[{-c^*(z^n)/\varepsilon}]d\mu^\cap^n(z^n)),$$

with $D_n = \int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} \sigma^*_{\beta}(z^n) d\mu^\cap^n(z^n) < +\infty$ and $S_0 : \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ the Markov kernel given for any $z^n \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$ S_0(z^n, A) = \int_{\mathcal{C}(z^n) \cap A} \det(\nabla^2 U_n(x, z^n))^{-1/2} d\mathcal{H}^0(x)/\int_{\mathcal{C}(z^n)} \det(\nabla^2 U_n(x, z^n))^{-1/2} d\mathcal{H}^0(x),$$

with $\mathcal{C}(z^n) = \arg\min\{U_n(x, z^n) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$.

Proof. We provide a sketch of the proof. The whole proof is postponed to Section 4.3.1. First, we assess the convergence of $(\mu^\cap^n Q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by splitting the error in two parts. A first part is bounded using the geometric ergodicity of SGLD as in [60] and controls the distance between

$$ \mu'_{\ast}(\epsilon, \gamma, \beta > 0)$$

and

$$ \mu^\cap^n S_0.$$
Proposition 9. Assume that \( \mathbf{H}_3(n) \) and \( \mathbf{H}_4(n) \) hold uniformly w.r.t \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). In addition, assume that there exist \( C_0, \alpha, \varepsilon > 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon] \)
\[
\varepsilon^{-d/2} \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n}} \exp[-c^*(z^{1:n})/\varepsilon] d\mu^\otimes_n(z^{1:n}) \leq C_0 \varepsilon^{\alpha}.
\]
Then for any \( \eta \in (0, 1) \), there exist \( C_{\eta} \geq 0 \) and \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for any \( n \geq n_0 \) we have
\[
\mu^\otimes_n S_0[U] - U^* \leq C_{\eta} n^{-s_{\eta}(1+\eta)},
\]
with \( s = \min(1/4, \alpha/2) \) and where we recall that \( U^* \) is the global minimum of \( U \).

Proof. The proof is postponed to Section 4.3.2.

Note that Proposition 9 implies that the sequence \( (\mu^\otimes_n S_0[U])_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) is tight since under \( \mathbf{H}_3(n) \) we have that there exist \( R \geq 0 \) and \( \alpha > 0 \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( \|x\| \geq R \), \( U(x) \geq m\|x\|^\alpha \). Furthermore, Proposition 9 implies that each limiting point of the sequence \( (\mu^\otimes_n S_0[U])_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) is concentrated on the minimizers of \( U \) when \( n \to +\infty \), i.e. when the number of training points \( \{z_i\}_{i=1}^n \) grows to infinity. However, we do not necessarily have that \( (\mu^\otimes_n S_0[U])_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges towards \( \pi_0 \) given for any \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) by
\[
\pi_0(A) = \int_{A \cap C} \det(\nabla^2 U(x))^{-1/2} d\mathcal{H}^0(x) / \int_C \det(\nabla^2 U(x))^{-1/2} d\mathcal{H}^0(x),
\]
where \( C = \arg\min \{U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \).

In what follows, we describe a counter-example for which \( (\mu^\otimes_n S_0[U])_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) does not converges weakly towards \( \pi_0 \). Let \( X = \mathbb{R} \), \( Z = [-1/2, 1/2] \) and \( u : X \times Z \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( z \in [-1/2, 1/2] \) we have
\[
u(x, z) = \begin{cases} 
(x + \pi)^4/(1 + (x + \pi)^2) + \cos(3x) + zx , & \text{if } x < -\pi, \\
\cos(3x) + zx , & \text{if } -\pi \leq x \leq \pi, \\
(x - \pi)^4/(1 + (x - \pi)^2) + \cos(3x) + zx , & \text{if } x > \pi.
\end{cases}
\]
We also let \( \mu \) to be the uniform measure on \([-1/2, 1/2] \). We obtain that for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) and \( x \in X \)
\[
U(x) = u(x, 0), \quad U_n(x, z^{1:n}) = u(x, (1/n) \sum_{k=1}^n z^k).
\]
Note that for any \( x \neq 0 \), \( x \mapsto u(x, z) \) admits a unique global minimizer, see the proof of Proposition 10, whereas if \( z = 0 \), \( x \mapsto u(x, z) \) admits four global minimizers \( \{x_i^*\}_{i=1}^4 = \{-\pi, -\pi/3, \pi/3, \pi\} \), see Figure 4 for an illustration. In the next proposition, we show that \( \lim_{n \to +\infty} \mu^\otimes_n S_0[U] = U^* \) but that \( (\mu^\otimes_n S_0)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) does not converge weakly towards \( \pi_0 \).

Proposition 10. Let \( u \) be given by (13) and \( \mu \) be the uniform measure on \([-1/2, 1/2] \). Then, we have that for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \)
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \mu^\otimes_n S_0 = (\delta_{-\pi} + \delta_\pi)/2 , \quad \mu^\otimes_n S_0[U] - U^* \leq (\pi/6\sqrt{3}) n^{-1/2}.
\]

Proof. The proof is postponed to Section 4.3.3.
3.2.3 The importance of the thermodynamic barrier

To conclude this section, we investigate the role of the thermodynamic barrier in order to establish quantitative parametric Laplace-type results. This quantity should not be confused with the concept of kinetic barrier which has been investigated in the context of simulated annealing, see [40, 39] for instance. We refer to [67] for an introduction to the concept of thermodynamic barrier and kinetic barrier in the context of chemistry, see also Figure 5 for an illustration.

In a general setting, we consider a function $f : X \times Z \to \mathbb{R}$ where $X$ and $Z$ are topological spaces and $f(\cdot, z)$ admits a global minimizer for any $z \in Z$. Let $z \in Z$, if $f(\cdot, z)$ admits a local minimizer which is not a global minimizer we recall that the thermodynamic barrier $c^*(z)$ is given by

$$c^*(z) = \inf \{f(x, z) : x \text{ is a local minimizer of } f(\cdot, z) \text{ but not a global minimizer} \},$$

with $f^*(z) = \inf \{f(x, z) : x \in X\}$. The thermodynamic barrier quantifies how close the values of the local minima are to the global ones. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $z \in Z$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define

$$\delta_z S_\varepsilon(A) = \int_A \exp[-f(x, z)/\varepsilon] \, dx, \quad \delta_z S_0(A) = \int_{A \cap C(z)} \det(\nabla_x^2 f(x, z))^{-1/2} \, d\mathcal{H}^0(x)/\int_{C(z)} \det(\nabla_x^2 f(x, z))^{-1/2} \, d\mathcal{H}^0(x),$$

with $C(z) = \arg \min \{f(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. In Proposition B.5 we show (under assumptions on $f$) that for any $z \in Z$ and for any $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ which satisfies the conditions of Proposition B.5 there exist $A, \beta \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$

$$|\delta_z S_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \delta_z S_0[\varphi]| \leq A(1 + \sigma_\beta^*(z))\{\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2} \exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon]\},$$

with $A, \beta$ independent from $z$. The dependency of the right-hand side w.r.t $\sigma_\beta^*(z)$ comes from the fact that $\delta_z S_0$ is well-defined if and only if $\nabla_x^2 f(x, z)$ is invertible at the global minimizers of $f(\cdot, z)$.

We now investigate the dependency w.r.t the thermodynamic barrier $c^*$. We are going to build a simple example for which the thermodynamic barrier plays a crucial role. In particular, we will show that the dependency of the form $\exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon]$ is tight in (14). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $X = \{0, 1\}$, $Z = \mathbb{R}$.
and $f : X \times Z \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $x \in X$ and $z \in Z$, $f(x, z) = x z^{2k+1}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$ we define $\delta_z S_\varepsilon$ by

$$
\delta_z S_\varepsilon = (\delta_0 \exp[-f(0, z)/\varepsilon] + \delta_1 \exp[-f(1, z)/\varepsilon])/(1 + \exp[-f(1, z)/\varepsilon])
= \delta_0 \text{sigmoid}(z^{2k+1}/\varepsilon) + \delta_1 \text{sigmoid}(-z^{2k+1}/\varepsilon),
$$

where $\text{sigmoid} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the sigmoid function given for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by $\text{sigmoid}(t) = (1 + \exp[-t])^{-1}$. When $z > 0$ the minimum of $f(\cdot, z)$ is 0 and is attained at $x = 0$. When $z = 0$, we have $f = 0$ (and the minimum is therefore attained at $x = 0$ and $x = 1$). When $z < 0$ the minimum of $f(\cdot, z)$ is $-z^{2k+1}$ and is attained at $x = 1$. Therefore we have that $\delta_z S_0 = \delta_0$ if $z > 0$, $\delta_z S_0 = \delta_1$ if $z < 0$ and $\delta_z S_0 = (\delta_0 + \delta_1)/2$ if $z = 0$. Using that the Wasserstein distance of order 1 between two Bernoulli distribution with parameter $p_1$ and $p_2$ is given by $|p_1 - p_2|$ we get that for any $z \in Z$ and $\varepsilon > 0$

$$
W_1(\delta_z S_\varepsilon, \delta_z S_0) = \text{sigmoid}(-|z|^{2k+1}/\varepsilon).
$$

Hence, for a fixed value of $z \in Z$, we get that $W_1(\delta_z S_\varepsilon, \delta_z S_0)$ is of order $O(\exp[-|z|^{2k+1}/\varepsilon])$. In particular, we get that for any $z \in Z$, $\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} W_1(\delta_z S_\varepsilon, \delta_z S_0)/\varepsilon$ is bounded. In what follows, we show that $\liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} W_1(\mu S_\varepsilon, \mu S_0)/\varepsilon = +\infty$ for some probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$.

Let $\chi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\chi(1) = 0$. First, note that for any $z > 0$ we have

$$
\delta_z S_z[\chi] - \delta_z S_0[\chi] = \text{sigmoid}(-z^{2k+1}/\varepsilon).
$$

Hence, using that $c^*(z) = |z|^{2k+1}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and that $\text{sigmoid}(-t) \geq \exp[-2t]$ for any $t > 0$ we have for any $z > 0$,

$$
\delta_z S_z[\chi] - \delta_z S_0[\chi] \geq \exp[-2z^{2k+1}/\varepsilon] \geq \exp[-2c^*(z)/\varepsilon]. \quad (15)
$$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$. Using (15) and that $\chi$ is 1-Lipschitz, we have

$$
W_1(\mu S_\varepsilon, \mu S_0) \geq \int_0^{+\infty} \exp[-2c^*(z)/\varepsilon] d\mu(z).
$$

Assume that $\mu$ is the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Then, we have for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$

$$
W_1(\mu S_\varepsilon, \mu S_0) \geq \int_0^1 \exp[-2z^{2k+1}/\varepsilon] dz \geq 2^{-1/(2k+1)} \int_0^1 \exp[-z^{2k+1}] dz \varepsilon^{1/(2k+1)}.
$$

This shows that the order of $W_1(\mu S_\varepsilon, \mu S_0)$ is at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/(2k+1)})$. This is in stark contrast with the order identified for $W_1(\delta_z S_\varepsilon, \delta_z S_0)$.

This latter observation highlights the crucial role of the thermodynamic barrier when establishing uniform Laplace-type results w.r.t some parameter $z \in Z$. Note that we recover that $W_1(\mu S_\varepsilon, \mu S_0)$ is of order at least $O(\varepsilon)$ if $\mu$ is supported on $[z_0, +\infty)$ with $z_0 > 0$. Similar conclusions hold if we show that $c^*(z) \geq c_0$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c_0 > 0$. Hence, (assuming that $c^*$ is continuous) the discrepancy between the order of $W_1(\mu S_\varepsilon, \mu S_0)$ and the one of $W_1(\delta_z S_\varepsilon, \delta_z S_0)$ might arise if:

(a) At least one of the local minima (which is not a global minimum) converges towards a global minimum when $z \to z^*$ for some value of $z^* \in Z$,
(b) $z^*$ belongs to the support of $\mu$. If these two conditions are fulfilled then a more careful study of $\int_Z \exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon] d\mu(z)$ is needed in order to obtain quantitative bounds.
Figure 5: Difference between the \textit{thermodynamic barrier} (blue) and the \textit{kinetic barrier} (red).

4 Proofs

In this section, we gather the proofs of the previous sections. In Section 4.1 we prove Theorem 3. Then, in Section 4.2 we provide the proofs of the results of Section 3.1. Finally, the proofs of the results of Section 3.2 are given in Section 4.3.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we prove Theorem 3. We recall that Theorem 1 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 3 upon letting $\Psi = 1$. We let $k \in \mathbb{N^*}$, $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. For any $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$I_{\varepsilon}^{\phi} = \frac{C_{\varepsilon}^{-1}}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) \Psi(x) \exp\left[-\frac{\|F(x)\|^k}{\varepsilon}\right] dx,$$

$$J_{\varepsilon}^{\phi} = I_{\varepsilon}^{\phi}(1), \quad (16)$$

$$C_{\varepsilon} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left[-\frac{\|x\|^k}{\varepsilon}\right] dx = \varepsilon^{d/k} C_1.$$

In addition, we define

$$I_0(\phi) = \int_{F^{-1}(0)} \phi(x) \Psi(x) JF(x)^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(x), \quad J_0 = I_0(1), \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{d} = \min(d, p)$ and we recall that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $JF(x) = \det(DF(x)DF(x)^\top)^{1/2}$ if $d \geq p$ and $JF(x) = \det(DF(x)^\top DF(x))^{1/2}$ otherwise. If $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $L_\varepsilon(\|\varphi\|) < +\infty$ for some $\varepsilon \geq 0$ we define $L_\varepsilon(\varphi)$ similarly as in (16) and (17). Note that for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that it is defined we have $\pi_{\varepsilon}[\varphi] = I_{\varepsilon}(\varphi)/J_{\varepsilon}$.

The rest of this section is organized as follows. In Section 4.1.1, we prove our main result, i.e. a quantitative Laplace-type result in the case $d \geq p$ using the coarea formula. In Section 4.1.2, we prove similar results in the case $d \leq p$ using Laplace’s method and Morse theory. Finally, we conclude with the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 4.1.3. Additional technical results are postponed to Appendix A.

4.1.1 The case $d \geq p$

In what follows, we assume that $d \geq p$ and for any $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we define $L_t(\varphi)$ by

$$L_t(\varphi) = \int_{F^{-1}(t)} \varphi(x) \Psi(x) JF(x)^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(x). \quad (18)$$
Note that \( \mathcal{L}_0(\varphi) = \mathcal{L}_0(\varphi) \). Let \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \). Then, if \( \mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) < +\infty \), we define \( \mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) \) similarly to (18). The following proposition establishes that \( t \mapsto \mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) \) is Lipschitz under mild regularity conditions. We emphasize that this proposition is no longer true if \( d \leq p \). Indeed, let us consider the following counterexample. Let \( F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2 \) given for any \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) by \( F(x) = ((1-x^2)/(1+x^2), (x-1-x^2)/(1+x^2)) \). The set \( F(\mathbb{R}) \) defines a right strophoid. Then, for any \( t \neq 0 \) we have \( \mathcal{H}^0(F^{-1}(t)) = 1 \) or 0, but \( \mathcal{H}^0(F^{-1}(0)) = 2 \) and therefore \( \mathcal{L}_t(1/F) = 1 \) or 0 near \( t = 0 \) but \( \mathcal{L}_0(1/F) = 2 \) with \( \Psi = 1 \). Hence \( t \mapsto \mathcal{L}_t(1/F) \) is not even continuous.

**Proposition 11.** Assume \( H_1, H_2 \) and that \( d \geq p \). Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open such that \( F^{-1}(0) \cup U \) and \( \varphi \in C^1(U, \mathbb{R}) \). Then there exist \( B_0 \geq 0 \) and \( \eta > 0 \) such that for any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
|\mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) - \mathcal{L}_0(\varphi)| \leq B_0(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi}) ||t|| ,
\]

with for any \( i \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \), \( M_{i,f} = \sup\{||\nabla^i f(x)|| : x \in F^{-1}(\overline{B}(0, \eta))\} \), \( B_0 \) and \( \eta \) are independent from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \) and \( F^{-1}(\overline{B}(0, \eta)) \subset U \).

**Proof.** First, we show that there exists an explicit diffeomorphism between \( F^{-1}(t) \) and \( F^{-1}(0) \) for \( ||t|| \) small enough. Then we use the coarea formula to express \( \mathcal{L}_t \) as an integral over \( F^{-1}(0) \) and use the dominated convergence theorem to conclude the first part of the proof. For the second part of the proof we differentiate the diffeomorphism w.r.t the parameter \( t \) and provide explicit bounds for the derivative.

(a) The set \( F^{-1}(0) \) is compact since \( \lim_{||x|| \to \infty} ||F(x)|| = +\infty \). First, there exists \( \eta_0 > 0 \) such that \( F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta_0)) \subset U \). Indeed, since \( F^{-1}(0) \) is compact, there exists \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that \( F^{-1}(0) + \overline{B}_\infty(0, \varepsilon_0) \subset U \). We now show that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \eta_\varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta_\varepsilon)) \subset F^{-1}(0) + \overline{B}_\infty(0, \varepsilon) \). If this is false, we let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that for any \( \eta > 0 \), \( F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta)) \not\subset F^{-1}(0) + \overline{B}_\infty(0, \varepsilon) \). Hence there exists a sequence \((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}\) such that \( ||F(x_k)||_\infty \leq 1/(k+1) \) and \( d(x_k, F^{-1}(0)) \geq \varepsilon \). But, up to extraction, there exists \( x^* \in F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, 1)) \) such that \( \lim_{k \to +\infty} x_k = x^* \). Then, we have \( F(x^*) = 0 \) and \( d(x^*, F^{-1}(0)) > \varepsilon \), which is absurd. Hence for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \eta_\varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta_\varepsilon)) \subset F^{-1}(0) + \overline{B}_\infty(0, \varepsilon) \). We let \( \eta_\eta = \eta_{\eta_0} \).

Second, there exists \( \eta_1 > 0 \) such that for any \( x \in F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta_1)) \), \( JF(x) > 0 \). Indeed, if this is not the case then there exists \((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) with \( \lim_{k \to +\infty} F(x_k) = 0 \) and \( JF(x_k) = 0 \). Since \( F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, 1)) \) is compact there exists \( x^* \) such that, up to extraction, \( \lim_{k \to +\infty} x_k = x^* \). Then \( F(x^*) = 0 \) and \( JF(x^*) = 0 \), which is absurd. We define \( K_0 = F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta_1)) \) and \( K_1 = F^{-1}(\overline{B}_\infty(0, \eta)) \) with \( \eta = (\eta_1/2, \eta_0) \). Note that \( K_1 \subset U \) and \( K_1 \subset \text{int}(K_0) \).

In what follows for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) we define \( G(x) = DF(x)DF(x)^T \). Note that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \det(G(x))^{1/2} = \det(F(x)) \) since \( d \geq p \). We also have that for any \( x \in K_0 \), \( G(x) \) is invertible since \( JF(x) > 0 \). In addition, we have that for any \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
G_{i,j}(x) = \langle \nabla F_i(x), \nabla F_j(x) \rangle .
\]

We define \( \{f_i\}_{i=1}^p \) such that for any \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \), \( f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) with for any \( x \in K_0 \)

\[
f_i(x) = \sum_{k=1}^p h_{i,k}(x) \nabla F_k(x) ,
\]

with \( \{h_{i,j}(x)\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} = G(x)^{-1} \). For any \( x \in K_0 \) and \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) we have

\[
\langle f_i(x), \nabla F_j(x) \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^p h_{i,k}(x) \langle \nabla F_k(x), \nabla F_j(x) \rangle = \delta_i(j) ,
\]
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where $\delta_i$ is the Dirac mass at $i$. In what follows, we let $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^p$ such that for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g_i \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $g_i(x) = f_i(x)$ for any $x \in K_1$, and $g_i(x) = 0$ for $x \in \text{int}(K_0)^c$, such functions exist using Whitney extension theorem for instance, see [69]. In what follows, we fix $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_p) \in \bar{B}_\infty(0, \eta)$. For any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ let $\Phi_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ given by $\Phi_i(0, x) = x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\partial_s \Phi_i(s, x) = -g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)).$$ (20)

For any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $\Phi_i$ is well-defined using Lemma C.1. Therefore, we have for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\Phi_i(s, x) \in K_1$

$$\partial_s F(\Phi_i(s, x)) = -(\langle g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)), \nabla F_1(\Phi_i(s, x)) \rangle, \ldots, \langle g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)), \nabla F_p(\Phi_i(s, x)) \rangle) = -e_i,$$

where we recall that $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^p$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^p$. We define $\bar{\Phi}_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\bar{\Phi}_i(x) = x^{(p)}$ with $x^{(0)} = x$ and for any $i \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$, $x^{(i+1)} = \Phi_i(t_{i+1}, x^{(i)})$. Note that $\bar{\Phi}_i \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and is a diffeomorphism, see Lemma C.1. Using (20) we have that $\bar{\Phi}_i(F^{-1}(t)) = F^{-1}(0)$. In addition, $F^{-1}(t)$ is $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}$ countably rectifiable using Lemma C.5. Using this result and the coarea formula, see Theorem C.6, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) = \int_{F^{-1}(0)} \varphi(\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))\Psi(\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))|JF(\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))|^{-1} |\det(D\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))|d\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(x).$$

Since $F^{-1}(0) \times B_\infty(0, \eta)$ is compact and $(t, x) \mapsto \bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x)$ and $(t, x) \mapsto D\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x)$ are continuous with for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\bar{\Phi}_0^{-1}(x) = x$ and $D\bar{\Phi}_0^{-1}(x) = \text{Id}$, we get that $\lim_{t \to 0} \mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) = \mathcal{L}_0(\varphi)$ using the dominated convergence theorem.

(b) For the second part of the proof we control the derivative of $t \mapsto \chi(t, x)$ where for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$\chi(t, x) = \varphi(\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))\Psi(\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))|JF(\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))|^{-1} |\det(D\bar{\Phi}_i^{-1}(x))|.$$ (21)

Using Lemma A.5, there exists $P \in \text{Poly}(4, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$||\partial_t \chi(t, x)|| \leq (1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi}) 	imes P(M_{1,\varphi}, M_{2,\varphi}, M_{3,\varphi}, 1/m_{1,\varphi}) \exp[P(M_{1,\varphi}, M_{2,\varphi}, M_{3,\varphi}, 1/m_{1,\varphi})],$$

with $P$ independent from $\varphi$ and $\Psi$. Hence we have that for any $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$

$$|\mathcal{L}_t(\varphi) - \mathcal{L}_0(\varphi)| \leq \int_{F^{-1}(0)} |\chi(t, x) - \chi(0, x)|d\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(x)$$

$$\leq (1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi})P(M_{1,\varphi}, M_{2,\varphi}, M_{3,\varphi}, 1/m_{1,\varphi})$$

$$\exp[P(M_{1,\varphi}, M_{2,\varphi}, M_{3,\varphi}, 1/m_{1,\varphi})] \mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(0)) \|t\|,$$

which concludes the proof since $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(0)) < +\infty$ by Lemma C.5.

\[\square\]

**Proposition 12.** Assume $H_1$, $H_2$ and that $d \geq p$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded such that $F^{-1}(0) \subset U$ and $\varphi \in C(U, \mathbb{R})$. Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I_{\varepsilon}^p(\varphi) = I_0(\varphi)$, where for
any ε > 0, \( I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) = I_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_{F^{-1}(B(0,\eta))}) \). In addition, assume that \( \varphi, \Psi \in C^1(\bar{U}, \mathbb{R}) \), then there exists \( A_2 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \)

\[
|I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) - I_0(\varphi)| \leq A_2(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi})\varepsilon^{1/k},
\]

with for any \( i \in \{0,1\} \) and \( f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \), \( M_{i,f} = \sup\{\|\nabla^i f(x)\| : x \in F^{-1}(B(0,\eta))\} \), \( A_2 \) and \( \eta \) are independent from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \) and \( F^{-1}(B(0,\eta)) \subset U \).

**Proof.** First, note that \( I_0(\varphi) = L_0(\varphi) \), see (17) and (18). In what follows, we let \( \eta > 0 \) be given by Proposition 11 and define \( I_0^{in}(\varphi) = C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,\eta)} \exp[-\|t\|^k/\varepsilon]L_0(\varphi)dt \). We have

\[
|I_0(\varphi) - I_0^{in}(\varphi)| = |I_0(\varphi)|C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,\eta)} \exp[-\|t\|^k/\varepsilon]dt \leq 2^{d/k} |I_0(\varphi)|\exp[-\eta^k/(2\varepsilon)].
\]

Using the coarea formula, see Theorem C.6, we have for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) = C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{F^{-1}(B(0,\eta))} \Psi(x)\varphi(x)\exp[-\|F(x)\|^k/\varepsilon] = C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,\eta)} \exp[-\|t\|^k/\varepsilon]L_\varepsilon(\varphi)dt.
\]

Therefore, using this result and the change of variable \( t \mapsto \varepsilon^{1/k}t \) we have

\[
|I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) - I_0^{in}(\varphi)| \leq C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,\eta)} \exp[-\|t\|^k/\varepsilon]\|L_\varepsilon(\varphi) - L_0(\varphi)\|dt \\
\leq C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B(0,\eta/\varepsilon^{1/k})} \exp[-\|t\|^k]\|L_{\varepsilon^{1/k}}(\varphi) - L_0(\varphi)\|dt.
\]

Hence, we get that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) - I_0^{in}(\varphi)| = 0 \) using the dominated convergence theorem and that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |L_{\varepsilon^{1/k}}(\varphi) - L_0(\varphi)| = 0 \) according to Proposition 11. This concludes the first part of the proof upon combining this result and (22). In addition, assume that \( \varphi \in C^1(\bar{U}, \mathbb{R}) \) then using the second part of Proposition 11 and (23) we have

\[
|I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) - I_0^{in}(\varphi)| \leq B_0 C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |t|\exp[-\|t\|^k]dt(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi})\varepsilon^{1/k},
\]

which concludes the proof upon combining this result and (22). 

\[\square\]

### 4.1.2 The case \( d \leq p \)

We now turn to the case \( d \leq p \). The proof of this result is more classical and does not rely on geometric measure theory. Instead we build on the Morse theory approach for Laplace approximation, see [70] for example. The following proposition is a quantitative extension of [70, Theorem 3, p.495].

**Proposition 13.** Assume H1, H2 and that \( d \leq p \). Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open and bounded such that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset U \) and \( \varphi \in C(\bar{U}, \mathbb{R}) \). Then \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) - I_0(\varphi)| = 0 \), with \( I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) = I_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_V) \) and \( V \) open such that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset V \subset U \). In addition, assume that \( \varphi, \Psi \in C^1(\bar{U}, \mathbb{R}) \). Then there exists \( B_1 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) we have

\[
|I_\varepsilon^{in}(\varphi) - I_0(\varphi)| \leq B_1(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi})\varepsilon^{1/k},
\]

with \( B_1 \) independent from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \) and for any \( i \in \{0,1\} \) and \( f \in C^1(\bar{U}, \mathbb{R}) \), \( M_{i,f} = \sup\{\|\nabla^i f(x)\| : x \in U\} \).
Proof. Let \( \{ x_0^\ell \}_{\ell=1}^N \) and \( \{ W_\ell \}_{\ell=1}^N \) be given by Lemma A.4 such that \( F^{-1}(0) = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^N (x_0^\ell) \) and \( dF(x) \) is injective for any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \) and \( x \in W_\ell \). In addition, for any \( \ell, m \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \), \( W_\ell \cap W_m = \emptyset \). Let \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \) and \( U : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( U(x) = \| F(x) \|^2 \). Since \( F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \) we have that \( U \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \). We divide the rest of the proof into two parts.

(a) First, we have that \( \nabla^2 U(x_0^\ell) = 2DF(x_0^\ell)^\top DF(x_0^\ell) \) which is invertible since \( JF(x_0^\ell) > 0 \). Therefore, we can apply Morse's lemma [56, Theorem 3.1.1] and there exists a diffeormorphism \( \Phi_\ell \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}_\ell, \bar{\mathcal{W}}_\ell) \) with \( 0 \in \Omega_\ell \), \( x_0^\ell \in \mathcal{W}_\ell \) and \( \Omega_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open such that for any \( x \in \Omega_\ell \), \( U(\Phi_\ell(x)) = \| x \|^2 \), \( \Phi_\ell(0) = x_0^\ell \) and \( D\Phi_\ell(0) = (DF(x_0^\ell)^\top DF(x_0^\ell))^{-1/2} \). Note that \( \det(D\Phi_\ell(0)) = JF(x_0^\ell)^{-1} \).

Let \( r_\ell > 0 \) such that \( \mathcal{B}(0, r_\ell) \subset \Omega_\ell \). We have

\[
1 - \int_{\Omega_\ell \setminus \varepsilon_1/k} \exp[-\| x \|^k] \, dx / C_1 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\| x \|^k / 2] \, dx \exp[-r_\ell^k/(2\varepsilon)] / C_1 \, .
\] (24)

In what follows, we no longer consider \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \) to be fixed. Let \( \mathcal{V} = \cup_{\ell=1}^N \Phi_\ell(\Omega_\ell) \) and \( I_{0,\varepsilon}^n(\varphi) = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \int_{\Omega_\ell \setminus \varepsilon_1/k} \exp[-\| x \|^k] \, dx \frac{\partial \varphi(x_0^\ell) \Psi(x_0^\ell) JF(x_0^\ell)^{-1}}{\partial \varphi} / C_1 \). We recall that we have

\[
I_0(\varphi) = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \varphi(x_0^\ell) \Psi(x_0^\ell) JF(x_0^\ell)^{-1} \, .
\]

Combining this result and (24) we get

\[
|I_{0,\varepsilon}^n(\varphi) - I_0(\varphi)| \leq N M \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\| x \|^k / 2] \, dx \exp[-r_\ell^k/(2\varepsilon)] / C_1 \, ,
\] (25)

where \( r_{\min} = \min\{ r_\ell : \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \} \) and \( M = \max\{ |\varphi(x_0^\ell) \Psi(x_0^\ell) JF(x_0^\ell)^{-1} : \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \} \). Using for any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \) the change of variable \( x \mapsto \Phi_\ell(x) \) and \( x \mapsto \varepsilon_1/k \) we have

\[
|I_{0,\varepsilon}^n(\varphi) - I_0^n(\varphi)| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^N \int_{\Omega_\ell \setminus \varepsilon_1/k} |\varphi(\Phi_\ell(\varepsilon_1/kx))| \Psi(\Phi_\ell(\varepsilon_1/kx)) \det(D\Phi_\ell(\varepsilon_1/kx))
\]

\[
- \varphi(x_0^\ell) \Psi(x_0^\ell) JF(x_0^\ell)^{-1} \| x \|^k \, dx / C_1 \, ,
\] (26)

For any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \), let \( \chi_\ell : \Omega_\ell \to \mathbb{R} \) given for any \( x \in \Omega_\ell \) by

\[
\chi_\ell(x) = \varphi(\Phi_\ell(x)) \Psi(\Phi_\ell(x)) \det(D\Phi_\ell(x)) \, .
\]

We conclude the first part of the proof using (25), the dominated convergence theorem in (26) and that for any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \), \( \chi_\ell \in C(\Omega_\ell, \mathbb{R}) \).

(b) For the second part of the proof, since \( \varphi, \Psi \in C^1(\bar{\mathcal{U}}, \mathbb{R}) \) and for any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \), \( \Phi_\ell \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}_\ell, \bar{\mathcal{W}}_\ell) \) since \( F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \) using [56, Theorem 3.1.1], we have that for any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \), \( \chi_\ell \in C^1(\Omega_\ell, \mathbb{R}) \) and there exists \( B_1^\ell \geq 0 \) (independent from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \)) such that for any \( \ell \in \{ 1, \ldots, N \} \) and \( x \in \Omega_\ell \) we have

\[
\| |D\chi_\ell(x)| \| \leq B_1^\ell (1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + M_{0,\Psi} + M_{1,\Psi}) \, .
\]

Using this result and (26) we get that

\[
|I_{0,\varepsilon}^n(\varphi) - I_0^n(\varphi)| \leq N B_1^\ell (1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi}) \varepsilon_1/k \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \| x \|^k \, dx / C_1 \, .
\]

Combining this result and (25) concludes the proof. 

\[ \square \]
4.1.3 Proof of Theorem 3

We start by proving the results of Theorem 3 in a smooth setting, then we deduce the general case using a smoothing lemma.

**Proposition 14.** Assume H1 and H2. Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open and bounded such that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset U \) and \( \varphi \in C(U, \mathbb{R}) \) which satisfies (6). Then, \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |\pi^\Psi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi^\Psi_0[\varphi]| = 0 \). In addition, assume that \( \varphi, \Psi \in C^1(U, \mathbb{R}) \). Then there exists \( A \in C(\mathbb{R}^3_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, m^k/(4(C_\varphi + C_\Psi + C_\varphi C_\Psi + 1))) \)

\[
|\pi^\Psi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi^\Psi_0[\varphi]| \leq A(C_\varphi, C_\Psi, m_0, \Psi)(1 + M_0, \varphi + M_1, \varphi)(1 + M_0, \psi + M_1, \psi)\varepsilon^{1/k},
\]

with for any \( i \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}), M_{i,f} = \sup\{\|\nabla^i f(x)\| : x \in U\}, m_{0, \Psi} = \inf\{\Psi(x) : x \in F^{-1}(0)\} \) and \( A \) independent function from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \). Finally, \( A \) is non-decreasing w.r.t its first two variables and non-increasing w.r.t its last variable.

**Proof.** For any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we have

\[
|\pi^\Psi_\varepsilon[\varphi] - \pi^\Psi_0[\varphi]| \leq |\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \mathcal{I}_0(\varphi)| \leq |\mathcal{J}^{-1}_\varepsilon| \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \mathcal{I}_0(\varphi) + \mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon)(|\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{J}_0) - \mathcal{I}_0(\mathcal{J}_0)|).
\]

Let \( \eta > 0 \) be given by Proposition 11 and let \( V = F^{-1}(B(0, \eta)) \) if \( d \geq p \), and \( V \) given by Proposition 13 otherwise. Note that \( F^{-1}(0) \subset V \). For any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we define \( \mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}_\varepsilon(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbf{1}_V) \) and \( \mathcal{I}^{\text{in}}_\varepsilon(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbf{1}_V) \). Let \( \bar{\varepsilon} = m^k/(4 + 4C_\varphi, \Psi) \), with \( C_\varphi, \Psi = (C_\Psi + 1)(C_\varphi + 1) \) and note that we have

\[
\bar{\varepsilon} < \min(m^k/(1 + C_\varphi, \Psi), m^k/(1 + C_\varphi, 1)).
\]

We divide the rest of the proof into two parts. First, we control \( \mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}_\varepsilon(\varphi) \) using the technical bounds of Lemma A.3. Then, we control \( |\mathcal{I}^{\text{in}}_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \mathcal{I}_0(\varphi)| \) using either Proposition 12 if \( d \geq p \) or Proposition 13 if \( d \leq p \). We conclude upon combining these results.

(a) Using (28) and Lemma A.3 we get that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we have

\[
\mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}_\varepsilon(\varphi) \leq A_1(C_\varphi, \Psi)\varepsilon^{-d/k}\exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon], \quad \mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}_\varepsilon(1) \leq A_1(C_1, \Psi)\varepsilon^{-d/k}\exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon], \quad (29)
\]

with \( \beta_1 > 0 \) and \( A_1 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) independent from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \) and non-decreasing.

(b) Using either Proposition 12 if \( d \geq p \) or Proposition 13 if \( d \leq p \) we have that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \)

\[
|\mathcal{I}^{\text{in}}_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \mathcal{I}_0(\varphi)| \leq A_2(1 + M_0, \varphi + M_1, \varphi)(1 + M_0, \psi + M_1, \psi)\varepsilon^{1/k}, \quad (30)
\]

with for any \( i \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}), M_{i,f} = \sup\{\|\nabla^i f(x)\| : x \in U\}, A_2 \) independent from \( \varphi \) and \( \Psi \).

Combining (29) and (30) we get that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \)

\[
|\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \mathcal{I}_0(\varphi)| \leq A_2(1 + M_0, \varphi + M_1, \varphi)(1 + M_0, \psi + M_1, \psi)\varepsilon^{1/k} + A_1(C_\varphi, \Psi)\varepsilon^{-d/k}\exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon],
\]

\[
|\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(1) - \mathcal{I}_0(1)| \leq 2A_2(1 + M_0, \psi + M_1, \psi)\varepsilon^{1/k} + A_1(C_1, \Psi)\varepsilon^{-d/k}\exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon].
\]
Lemma C.5. Combining these results, (27) and (31) concludes the proof.

\[ |I_\epsilon(\varphi) - I_\epsilon(\varphi)| \leq \bar{A}(C_\varphi, C_\Psi)(1 + M_{0, \varphi} + M_{1, \varphi})(1 + M_{0, \Psi} + M_{1, \Psi})\epsilon^{1/k}, \]
\[ |I_\epsilon(1) - I_\epsilon(0)| \leq 2\bar{A}(1, C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0, \varphi} + M_{1, \varphi})\epsilon^{1/k}, \]

with \(\bar{A}\) independent from \(\Psi\) and \(\varphi\) and \(\bar{A}\) non-decreasing w.r.t. to each of its variables. Using Lemma A.2, there exists \(A_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^*_+)\) such that for any \(\epsilon \in [0, \bar{\epsilon}]\), \(J_\epsilon \geq A_0(m_{0, \varphi})\) with \(m_{0, \varphi} = \inf\{\Psi(x) : x \in F^{-1}(0)\}\) and \(A_0\) independent from \(\Psi\) and non-increasing. Finally, note that \(I_0(\varphi) \leq \inf\{\phi F(x)^{-1} : x \in F^{-1}(0)\} M_{0, \varphi} H^{d-p}(F^{-1}(0))\) with \(H^{d-p}(F^{-1}(0)) < +\infty\) by Lemma C.5. Combining these results, (27) and (31) concludes the proof.

Using this proposition along with a smoothing lemma, see Lemma A.6, we conclude the proof of Theorem 3.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** We begin by introducing the families \(\{\varphi^\delta : \delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})\}\) and \(\{\Psi^\delta : \delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})\}\) which are smooth approximations of \(\varphi\) and \(\Psi\) respectively. Since \(F^{-1}(0)\) is compact and \(U^\epsilon\) is closed there exists \(r > 0\) such that \(F^{-1}(0) + B(0, r) \subset U\). Let \(U_0 = F^{-1}(0) + B(0, r/2)\) and remark that \(F^{-1}(0) \subset U_0\) and \(U_0 + B(0, r/2) \subset U\). Let \(\{\varphi^\delta : \delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})\}\) and \(\{\Psi^\delta : \delta \in (0, \bar{\delta})\}\) with \(\bar{\delta} > 0\) given by Lemma A.6, \(V \leftarrow U\) and \(U \leftarrow U_0\). Then using the dominated convergence theorem and the fact that \(F^{-1}(0)\) is compact we have that \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \pi_\delta^\epsilon [\varphi^\delta] = \pi_\epsilon^\varphi [\varphi]\). Similarly, using the dominated convergence theorem we get that there exists \(\bar{\epsilon}_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^*_+)\) such that for any \(\epsilon \in (0, \bar{\epsilon}_0(C_\varphi))\) we have \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} \pi_\delta^\epsilon [\varphi^\delta] = \pi_\epsilon^\varphi [\varphi]\). We conclude upon using Proposition 14 and Lemma A.6.

**4.2 Proofs of Section 3.1**

In this section, we prove Proposition 6. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3 we divide the proof into two parts depending on whether \(d \geq p\) in Section 4.2.1 or \(d \leq p\) in Section 4.2.2. Our main result, which is a generalization of Proposition 6 is presented in Section 4.2.3. We define \(I_\epsilon\) and \(I_0\) as in (16) and (17).

**4.2.1 The case \(d \geq p\)**

Our first result corresponds to an adaptation of Proposition 12 to the case where \(\varphi = \|F\|^k\). Indeed, in this case we have that \(I_0(\varphi) = 0\) and we can tighten our previous results.

**Proposition 15.** Assume \(H_1, H_2\) and that \(d \geq p\). Then there exists \(\eta > 0\) with \(\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} I_\epsilon^m(\|F\|^k)/\epsilon = C_k I_0(1),\) where for any \(\epsilon > 0\), \(I_\epsilon(\varphi) = I_\epsilon(\varphi I_{F^{-1}(B(0, \eta))})\) for any \(\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})\) and

\[ C_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \|t\|^k \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt / \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt . \]

**Proof.** Let \(\eta > 0\) be given by Proposition 11 with \(\varphi = 1\). We recall that for any \(\epsilon > 0\) we have that

\[ I_\epsilon^m(\|F\|^k) = \int_{F^{-1}(B(0, \eta))} \|F(x)\|^k \Psi(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k / \epsilon] dx / C_\epsilon . \]

Using the coarea formula, see Theorem C.6, we have for any \(\epsilon > 0\),

\[ I_\epsilon^m(\|F\|^k) / \epsilon = \int_{B(0, \eta)} \|t\|^k / \epsilon \exp[-\|t\|^k / \epsilon] \mathcal{L}_1(1) dt / C_\epsilon , \]
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where $\mathcal{L}_t(1)$ is defined in (18) for any $t \in B(0, \eta)$. Using the change of variable $t \mapsto \varepsilon^{1/k} t$ we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = \int_{B(0,\eta/\varepsilon^{1/k})} \|t\|^k \exp[\varepsilon \|t\|^k] \mathcal{L}_{t\varepsilon^{1/k}}(1) dt / C_1.$$  

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ let $g_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $g_\varepsilon(t) = \mathcal{L}_{t\varepsilon^{1/k}}(1) \mathbb{1}_{B(0,\eta/\varepsilon^{1/k})}(t)$. Note that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $|g_\varepsilon(t)| \leq \sup_{B(0, \eta)} |\mathcal{L}_t(1)|$. In addition, we have that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} g_\varepsilon(t) = \mathcal{L}_0(1)$ using Proposition 11. Therefore, we get that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}_0(1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \|t\|^k \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt / C_1.$$  

We conclude the proof upon noting that $I_0(1) = \mathcal{L}_0(1)$ and that $C_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \|t\|^k \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt / C_1$.

### 4.2.2 The case $d \leq p$

We now adapt Proposition 13 to the case where $\varphi = \|F\|^k$.

**Proposition 16.** Assume H1, H2 and $d \leq p$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded such that $F^{-1}(0) \subset U$. Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = C_k I_0(1)$, where for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $I^*_{\varepsilon}(\varphi) = I_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_V)$ for any $\varphi \in C(U, \mathbb{R})$, with $V$ open such that $F^{-1}(0) \subset V \subset U$, and

$$C_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \|t\|^k \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt / \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt .$$

**Proof.** Let $\{x^\ell \}_{\ell=1}^N$, $\{\Omega^\ell \}_{\ell=1}^N$ and $\{\Phi^\ell \}_{\ell=1}^N$ be given as in the proof of Proposition 13. Let $V = \cup_{\ell=1}^N \Phi^\ell(\Omega^\ell)$. Using for any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ the change of variable $x \mapsto \Phi^\ell(x)$ and $x \mapsto \varepsilon^{1/k} x$ we have

$$I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \int_{\Phi^\ell(\Omega^\ell)} \|x\|^k \exp[-\|x\|^k] \Psi(\Phi^\ell(x)) \det(D\Phi^\ell(x)) dx / C_1 .$$

For any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $g_{\varepsilon^\ell} : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$g_{\varepsilon^\ell}(x) = \Psi(\Phi^\ell(x)) \det(D\Phi^\ell(x)) \mathbb{1}_{\Phi^\ell(\Omega^\ell)}(x) .$$

Note that for any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, \varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$|g_{\varepsilon^\ell}(x)| \leq \sup\{\Psi(\Phi^\ell(x)) \det(D\Phi^\ell(x)) : \ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, x \in \Omega^\ell\} .$$

In addition, we have that for any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} g_{\varepsilon^\ell}(x) = \Psi(x^\ell)J_F(x^\ell)^{-1}$. We conclude upon using the dominated convergence theorem.  

### 4.2.3 Main result

**Proposition 17.** Assume H1 and H2. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded such that $F^{-1}(0) \subset U$. Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \pi^{\varphi}_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = C_k$, where

$$C_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \|t\|^k \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt / \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp[-\|t\|^k] dt .$$

**Proof.** Let $\eta > 0$ be given by Proposition 11 with $\varphi = 1$ and let $V = F^{-1}(B(0, \eta))$ if $d \geq p$. If $d \leq p$, let $V$ be given by Proposition 16. We have that $F^{-1}(0) \subset V$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$ we define $I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\|F\|^k \mathbb{1}_V)$ and $I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k) = \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k \mathbb{1}_V)$. Using Lemma A.3, we have that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I^*_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = 0$. Hence, using Proposition 15 if $d \geq p$ and Proposition 16 if $d \leq p$, we get that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k)/\varepsilon = C_k \mathcal{I}_0(1)$. Similarly, using Lemma A.3 and Proposition 12 we have that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{I}_0(1)/\varepsilon = \mathcal{I}_0(1)$, which concludes the proof upon remarking that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\pi^{\varphi}_{\varepsilon}(\|F\|^k) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\|F\|^k)/\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(1)$.
We are now ready to prove a generalization of Proposition 6.

**Proposition 18.** Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), \( F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N}^* \). Assume that the conditions of Proposition 5 with \( G_\varepsilon = \|F\|^k - \varepsilon \) for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) are satisfied and for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), let \( \rho_\varepsilon \) the macrocanonical distribution with constraint \( G_\varepsilon \) and reference measure \( \mu \). Assume that there exists \( \Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( \mu \) admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure given by \( \Psi \). In addition, assume that \( \text{H}1 \) and \( \text{H}2 \) hold. Then, we have that \( \theta_\varepsilon \sim_{\varepsilon \to 0} C_k / \varepsilon \), where

\[
C_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |t|^k \exp[-||t||^k]dt / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-||t||^k]dt .
\]

**Proof.** Recall that using Proposition 5 we have that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \)

\[
\rho_\varepsilon(A) = \int_A \Psi(x) \exp[-\theta_\varepsilon \|F(x)\|^k]dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(x) \exp[-\theta_\varepsilon \|F(x)\|^k]dx .
\]

Hence, using Proposition 17 we have that \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho_\varepsilon(\|F\|^k) \theta_\varepsilon = C_k \). Since \( \rho_\varepsilon[G_\varepsilon] = 0 \) we have also have that \( \rho_\varepsilon[\|F\|^k] = \varepsilon \), which concludes the proof. \( \square \)

Note that Proposition 6 is obtained upon noting that \( C_2 = p/2 \).

### 4.3 Proofs of Section 3.2

In Section 4.3.1, we establish Proposition 8. In Section 4.3.2 we use stability results from [60, 8] to obtain Proposition 9. Finally, we prove Proposition 10 in Section 4.3.3. Additional technical results are postponed to Appendix B.

#### 4.3.1 Proof of Proposition 8

In this section, we prove Proposition 8 which is an application of a parametric version of the results presented in Section 4.1.2. We refer to Appendix B for a detailed presentation of these results. We will apply them in the context of the non-convex minimization setting presented in Section 3.2 which we recall here.

We aim at minimizing \( U : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \). We assume that there exist a topological space \((Z, \mathcal{B}(Z))\), a probability measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}(Z, \mathcal{Z}) \) and \( u : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
U(x) = \int_Z u(x, z) d\mu(z).
\]

For any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) we define \( U_n : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z^n \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( z^{1:n} = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^n \in Z^n \)

\[
U_n(x, z^{1:n}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u(x, z_i).
\]

For all \( \varepsilon > 0 \), when it is well-defined we denote \( S_\varepsilon : Z^n \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to [0, 1] \) the Markov kernel such that for any \( z^{1:n} \in Z^n \) and \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) we have

\[
\delta_{z^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon(A) = \frac{\int_A \exp[-U_n(x, z^{1:n})/\varepsilon]dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-U_n(x, z^{1:n})/\varepsilon]dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-U_n(x, z^{1:n})/\varepsilon]dx} .
\]

Similarly, when it is well-defined, we denote \( S_0 : Z^n \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to [0, 1] \) the Markov kernel such that for any \( z^{1:n} \in Z^n \) and \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) we have

\[
\delta_{z^{1:n}} S_0(A) = \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z^{1:n})} \det(\nabla^2 U_n(x, z^{1:n}))^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^0(x) / \int_{\mathcal{C}_n(z^{1:n})} \det(\nabla^2 U_n(x, z^{1:n}))^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^0(x) ,
\]

where \( \mathcal{C}_n(z^{1:n}) = \arg \min U_n(\cdot, z^{1:n}) \). We recall that for any \( \beta > 0 \), \( \sigma^\beta_0 \) is defined in (11). We begin with the following proposition.
Proposition 19. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume $\mathbf{H3}(n)$ and $\mathbf{H4}(n)$. Then there exist $C \geq 0$ and $\beta, \varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$

$$
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} W_1(\delta_{z_1 \ldots z_n}^n, \delta_{z_1 \ldots z_n}^0) d\mu^n(z_1 \ldots z_n) \leq C(1 + D_n)(\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2}) \int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} \exp[-c^* z_1 \ldots z_n] d\mu^n(z_1 \ldots z_n),
$$

with $D_n = \int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} \sigma_\beta(z_1 \ldots z_n) d\mu^n(z_1 \ldots z_n) < +\infty$ and $C, \varepsilon, \beta$ independent from $n$.

Proof. The proof of this result is a direct application of Proposition B.5 which is a parametric version of Theorem 3. In order to apply Proposition B.5, we check that $\mathbf{H5}$ is satisfied for $Z \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $u \leftarrow U_n$. We only need to check that there exists $m_0, \alpha_0 > 0$ and $R_0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\| \geq R_0$ and $z_1 \ldots z_n \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $U_n(x, z_1 \ldots z_n) \geq m_0 \|x\|^{\alpha_0}$. We have that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$
u(x, z) = u(0, z) + \int_0^1 \langle \nabla_x u(tx, z), x \rangle dt \geq -A - c + (m/2)\|x\|^2.
$$

Hence, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\| \geq 2((A + c)/m)^{1/2}$ we have that for any $z_1 \ldots z_n \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $U_n(x, z_1 \ldots z_n) \geq (m/4)\|x\|^2$. Hence, combining this result, $\mathbf{H3}(n)$ and $\mathbf{H4}(n)$, we can apply Proposition B.5 which states that for any $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $M_1, \varphi$-Lipschitz function with $M_1, \varphi, C_\varphi \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\varphi(x)| \leq C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi \|x\|^\alpha]$ then, there exist $B_2 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $\beta > 0$ such that

$$
|\delta_{z_1 \ldots z_n} \varphi - \delta_{z_2 \ldots z_n} \varphi| \leq B_2((C_\varphi(1 + M_{0, \varphi} + M_1, \varphi))\|x\|^\alpha_1 \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2} \exp[-c^* z_1 \ldots z_n]/\varepsilon),
$$

with $M_{0, \varphi} = \sup\{|\varphi(x)| : x \in K\}$, $K$, $B_2$ and $\beta$ independent from $z$ and $B_2$ non-decreasing. The rest of the proof is similar to the one of Corollary 2 upon replacing Theorem 1 by (32).

The proof of Proposition 8 is then a direct application of [60, Proposition 3.3] and Proposition 19.

4.3.2 Proof of Proposition 9

In this section, we prove Proposition 9. We start by recalling a proposition from [60, Proposition 3.5] about the uniform stability of the exponential measure with potential $U_n$, see [8] for a definition of the uniform stability.

Lemma 20. Assume that $\mathbf{H3}(n)$ holds uniformly w.r.t $n$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $z_0^{1 \ldots n}, z_1^{1 \ldots n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ which only differs along one index, we have

$$
|\delta_{z_0^{1 \ldots n}} S_x u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_1^{1 \ldots n}} S_x u(\cdot, z)| \leq 4(M^2(c + d\varepsilon)/m + B^2) c_{LS}/(n\varepsilon),
$$

where $c_{LS} > 0$ is such that for any $z_1^{1 \ldots n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\delta_{z_1^{1 \ldots n}} S_x$ satisfies the logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant $c_{LS}$, see [60, Proposition 3.2].

For completeness, we recall that a probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to satisfy the logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant $c_{LS}$ if for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with positive density w.r.t $\nu$ given by $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ we have

$$
KL(\pi|\nu) \leq 2c_{LS} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla \log(g(x))\|^2 d\pi(x).
$$

We are now ready to show that the limiting measures are stable.
Proposition 21. Assume that $H^3(n)$ and $H^4(n)$ hold uniformly w.r.t $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, assume that there exist $C_0, C_\sigma, \alpha, \bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$

\[
\varepsilon^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp[-c^* (2^{1/n})/\varepsilon]d\mu^{\otimes n}(z^{1:n}) \leq C_0 \varepsilon^\alpha , \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sigma_\beta^*(2^{1/n})d\mu^{\otimes n}(z^{1:n}) \leq C_\sigma.
\]

Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\eta \in (0,1)$, there exists $C \geq 0$ such that for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq n_0$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}} |\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z)| d\mu^{\otimes n}(z^{1:n}) \mu(z_{1,j}) \leq C n^{-\eta s/(1+\eta s)},
\]

where $s = \min(\alpha/2, 1/4)$ and for any $z_1^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ we let $z_{1,i}^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $z_{0,i} = z_{1,i}$ for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $i \neq j$.

Proof. Let $\eta \in (0,1), n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq n_0$ and $n_0^{-1/(1+\eta s)} < \bar{\varepsilon} = \min(\bar{\varepsilon}_0, \bar{\varepsilon}_1)$ (where $\bar{\varepsilon}_1$ is given by $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \leftarrow \bar{\varepsilon}$ in Proposition 19) with $s = \min(\alpha/2, 1/4)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$ and $z_0^{1:n}, z_1^{1:n}, z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ where there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, i \neq j$, $z_{0,i} = z_{1,i}$. Using the triangle inequality we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$

\[
|\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z)| \leq |\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z)| + |\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z)|.
\]

Using [60, Lemma 3.5] and Lemma B.6, there exists $C_0 \geq 0$ (independent from $\varepsilon, z_1^{1:n}$ for $i \in \{0,1\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$) such that for any $i \in \{0,1\}$

\[
|\delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z)| \leq C_0 W_2(\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_0, \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon).
\]

Using this result, Lemma B.6 and Lemma B.7, there exists $C_1 \geq 0$ (independent from $\varepsilon, z_1^{1:n}$ for $i \in \{0,1\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$) such that for any $i \in \{0,1\}$

\[
|\delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z)| \leq C_1 W_2^{\eta s/2}(\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_0, \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon).
\]

In addition, using Proposition 19, there exists $C_2 \geq 0$ (independent from $\varepsilon, z_1^{1:n}$ for $i \in \{0,1\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$) such that for any $i \in \{0,1\}$

\[
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} W_1(\delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_0, \delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon) d\mu^{\otimes n}(z_1^{1:n}) \leq C_2 \max(\varepsilon^{\eta s}, \varepsilon^{1/2}).
\]

Combining this result, (34) and the fact that $t \mapsto t^{\eta/2}$ is concave, we get that there exists $C_3 \geq 0$ (independent from $\varepsilon, z_1^{1:n}$ for $i \in \{0,1\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$) such that for any $i \in \{0,1\}$

\[
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^n} |\delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_i^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z)| d\mu^{\otimes n}(z_1^{1:n}) \leq C_3 \max(\varepsilon^{\eta s/2}, \varepsilon^{\eta/4}).
\]

In addition, using Lemma 20 we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}} |\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_\varepsilon u(\cdot, z)| d\mu^{\otimes n}(z_1^{1:n}) \nu(\varepsilon, \eta s) \leq 4(\|c + d\| + B^2) c_{LS}/(n\varepsilon),
\]

Combining this result, (33) and (35) we get

\[
\int_{\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}} |\delta_{z_0^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z) - \delta_{z_1^{1:n}} S_0 u(\cdot, z)| d\mu^{\otimes n}(z_1^{1:n}) \nu(\varepsilon, \eta s) \leq 4(\|c + d\| + B) c_{LS}/(n\varepsilon) + 2C_3 \max(\varepsilon^{\eta s/2}, \varepsilon^{\eta/4}) + 2C_3 \varepsilon^{\eta s}.
\]

with $s = \min(\alpha/2, 1/4)$. We conclude the proof upon letting $\varepsilon = n^{-1/(1+\eta s)}$.
The stability of the limiting measures allows us to establish Proposition 9 which provides quantitative bounds on $\mu^\otimes S_0[U] - U^*$ for large values of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, once Proposition 21 is established the proof of Proposition 9 is classical and follows the lines of [60, Section 3.7].

**Proof.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq n_0$ with $n_0$ given by Proposition 9. For any $z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ we define $U_n^*(z^{1:n}) = \inf \{U_n(x, z^{1:n}) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \}$, using that $U^* \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_n^*(z^{1:n})d\mu^\otimes S_0(z^{1:n})$ we have

\[
\mu^\otimes S_0[U] - U^* \leq \mu^\otimes S_0[U] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_n^*(z^{1:n})d\mu^\otimes S_0(z^{1:n}) \\
\leq \mu^\otimes S_0[U] - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_n(x, z^{1:n})S_0(z^{1:n}, dx)d\mu^\otimes S_0(z^{1:n}) \\
- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} U_n(x, z^{1:n})S_0(z^{1:n}, dx)d\mu^\otimes S_0(z^{1:n}) \\
\leq (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{u(x, z_i) - u(x, z_i)\}S_0(z^{1:n}, dx)d\mu^\otimes S_0(z^{1:n})d\mu(\tilde{z}_i) \\
\leq (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x, z_i)S_0(z^{1:n}, dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x, z_i)S_0(z^{1:n}, dx)\}d\mu^\otimes S_0(z^{1:n})d\mu(\tilde{z}_i),
\]

where for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\tilde{z}_{i,j} = z_i$ and $\tilde{z}_{i,i} = \tilde{z}_i$. Using Proposition 9 we have $\mu^\otimes S_0U - U^* \leq C\eta^{-\infty}/(1+n^\epsilon)$ with $C_\eta \geq 0$, which concludes the proof.

4.3.3 **Proof of Proposition 10**

We recall that $u$ is given in (13). We divide the proof into two parts.

(a) First, we prove that $\mu^\otimes S_0((-\pi/2, \pi/2)) = \pi_0((-\pi/2, \pi/2)) = -1/2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $z < 0$. Then the minimum of $x \mapsto u(x, z)$ is attained on $[\pi, +\infty)$. Denote $\tilde{u} : \mathbb{R} \times [-1/2, 0) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z \in [-1/2, 0)$, $\tilde{u}(x, z) = h(x) + xz + \pi z + 1 - \cos(3x)$ with $h(x) = x^4/(1 + x^2)$. Note that for any $x \geq 0$ and $z \in [-1/2, 0)$, $\tilde{u}(x, z) = u(x + \pi, z)$. There exists $a \in (0, \pi/3)$ such that for any $x \geq 0$, $h'(x) - 1 \leq 0$ if $x \leq a$ and $h'(x) - 1 > 0$ otherwise. Hence, we get that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x \geq \pi/3$ and $z \in [-1/2, 0)$

$$
\tilde{u}(x, z) - \tilde{u}(0, z) = \tilde{u}(x, z) - \pi z \geq h(\pi/3) - \pi/6 > 0.
$$

Therefore, for any $z \in [-1/2, 0)$, the global minimum of $x \mapsto u(x, z)$ is attained on $(\pi, 4\pi/3)$. We have that for any $x \in [\pi/6, \pi/3]$ and $z \in [-1/2, 0)$

$$
\partial_z \tilde{u}(x, z) = h'(x) - 1/2 + 3(2 - (6/\pi)x) > 0.
$$

In addition, we have that for any $x \in [-1/2, 0)$, $\partial_z \tilde{u}(0, z) = -z$. Hence, there exists $\bar{z}(z) \in [0, \pi/6]$ such that $\partial_z \tilde{u}(\bar{z}(z), z) = 0$. In addition we have that for any $z \in [-1/2, 0)$, $x \mapsto \partial_z \tilde{u}(x, z)$ is increasing on $[0, \pi/6]$. Therefore, for any $z \in [-1/2, 0)$ there exists a unique minimizer of $x \mapsto u(x, z)$ on $[\pi, 5\pi/6]$ given by $x^*(z) = \pi + \bar{z}(z)$. The same conclusion holds with $x^*(z) \in [-5\pi/6, -\pi]$ if $z \in (0, 1/2]$. We have that $\lim_{z \to 0} \{\infty \} = \{x \in [-5\pi/6, 5\pi/6] \} = 0$. Therefore we have that every limit point of $\{x^*(z)\}_{z \to 0}$ when $z \to 0$ is a global minimizer of $u(-\cdot, 0)$. But recall that $\{x^*(z)\}_{z \to 0} \subset \{\pi, 5\pi/6\}$. Therefore, every limit point of $\{x^*(z)\}_{z \to 0}$ is equal to $\pi$ and we have that $\lim_{z \to 0} x^*(z) = \pi$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $g_n$ the density of $T^\# \mu^\otimes n$ where $T : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathbb{Z}$ is given by $T(z^{1:n}) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n z_i$. For any $r, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq n_0$, $\int_{B(0, r)} g_n(z)dz \leq \varepsilon$. Let $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ bounded and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $r > 0$ such that for any $z \in [0, r]$, $|\varphi(x^*(z)) - \varphi(-\pi)| \leq \varepsilon$ and for any $z \in [-r, 0)$, $|\varphi(x^*(z)) - \varphi(\pi)| \leq \varepsilon$. Using this result, we have for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq n_0$

$$
|\mu^\otimes S_0[\varphi] - (\varphi(-\pi) + \varphi(\pi))/2| \leq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\varphi(x^*(z)) - \varphi(-\pi)|g_n(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^{0} |\varphi(x^*(z)) - \varphi(\pi)|g_n(z)dz.
$$
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\[
(1 + 2\|\varphi\|_{\infty}) \varepsilon.
\]

Therefore, we get that \(\lim_{n \to +\infty} \mu^\otimes n S_0[\varphi] = (\varphi(-\pi) + \varphi(\pi))/2\), which concludes the first part of the proof.

(b) Second, we prove that for any \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), \(\mu^\otimes n S_0[U] - U^* \leq (\pi/(6\sqrt{3}))n^{-1/2}\). Note that for any \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(z^{1:n} \in [-1/2, 1/2]^n\), with \(\sum_{i=1}^n z_i \neq 0\), \(\delta_{z^{1:n}} S_0[U] = U(x^*(z^{1:n}))\) with \(x^*(z^{1:n}) \in [-5\pi/6, 5\pi/6]\).

We also have that for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(z_1, z_2 \in [-1/2, 1/2]\), \(|u(x, z_1) - u(x, z_2)| \leq |x||z_1 - z_2|\). In particular, we have that for any \(z^{1:n} \in [-1/2, 1/2]^n\) and \(x \in [-\pi/3, \pi/3]\)

\[
|U(x) - U_n(x, z^{1:n})| \leq (\pi/3)(1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|.
\]

Hence, using this result and that \(U^* = U(\pi/3) = 0\), we have that for any \(z^{1:n} \in [-1/2, 1/2]\)

\[
U_n(x^*(\bar{z}^{1:n}), z^{1:n}) \leq U_n(\pi/3, z^{1:n}) \leq U^* + (\pi/3)(1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|.
\]

Combining this result and that \(\int_{\mathbb{R}} z^2 d\mu(z) = 1/12\) we have \(\mu^\otimes n S_0[U] - U^* \leq (\pi/(6\sqrt{3}))n^{-1/2}\), which concludes the proof.

\[\square\]
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In this supplementary material we derive technical lemmas and additional results. In particular, we gather the technical lemmas of Section 2 in Appendix A and the ones of Section 4.3.1 in Appendix B. In Appendix C, we recall basic results from differential geometry and geometric measure theory.

A Technical results for Section 2

In this section, we derive some technical lemmas used in Section 4.1 in order to prove Theorem 3 and other results from Section 2. We recall that for any $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, when this is well-defined, we set

$$I_\varepsilon(\varphi) = C_\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \Psi(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k / \varepsilon] dx, \quad J_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(1),$$

$$C_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|x\|^k / \varepsilon] dx = \varepsilon^{d/k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|x\|^k] dx = \varepsilon^{d/k} C_1.$$

In addition, we define

$$I_0(\varphi) = \int_{F^{-1}(0)} \varphi(x) \Psi(x) \exp[-\|x\|^k / \varepsilon] \mathcal{H}^{d-d}(x), \quad J_0 = I_0(1),$$

with $\hat{d} = \min(d,p)$.

In Appendix A.1 we establish a link between a Hessian computed on the normal bundle of a manifold and the generalized Jacobian. In Appendix A.2 we derive technical truncation bounds for the proof of Theorem 3. Explicit controls of some derivative are presented in Appendix A.3 in order to derive Proposition 11. Finally, we present a smoothing lemma in Appendix A.4 which is key to weaken the regularity assumptions of Proposition 14.
A.1 From normal Hessian to generalized Jacobian

Let $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $M$ a manifold in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For any $x \in M$ we define $\nabla^2 f(x)$ to be the projection of the Hessian on the orthogonal of the tangent space of $M$ at $x$, see [44].

**Lemma A.1.** Let $U : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $U(x) = \|F(x)\|^2$. In addition, assume that $F^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$ and that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $JF(x) > 0$. Then, $\text{arg min}\{U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a smooth manifold and for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ we have that $\det(\nabla^2 U(x)) = JF(x)^2$.

**Proof.** First, we have that $\text{arg min}\{U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} = F^{-1}(0)$. Hence, $\text{arg min}\{U(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a smooth manifold since $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$. Let $x \in F^{-1}(0)$. We have that $\nabla^2 U(x) = DF(x)^\top DF(x)$. Note that $DF(x)^\top = (\nabla F_1(x), \ldots, \nabla F_p(x))$ is a basis of $\ker(DF(x))^\perp$, where we recall that $\ker(DF(x))$ is the tangent space to $F^{-1}(0)$ at $x$. Denote by $O(x) = (f_1(x), \ldots, f_p(x))$ the orthonormal basis of $\ker(DF(x))^\perp$ obtained from $DF(x)^\top$ using the Gram-Schmidt process. There exists a triangular $p \times p$ matrix $T(x)$ such that $O(x) = DF(x)^\top T(x)$. We also have

$$\text{Id} = O(x)^\top O(x) = T(x)^\top DF(x)DF(x)^\top T(x).$$

Hence, we get that $\det(T(x)) = JF(x)^{-1}$. We also have that

$$\det(\nabla^2 U(x)) = \det(O(x)^\top \nabla^2 U(x)O(x)) = \det(T(x)^\top DF(x)DF(x)^\top DF(x)DF(x)^\top T(x)) = JF(x)^2,$$

which concludes the proof. \hfill $\Box$

A.2 Truncation and lower bounds

**Lemma A.2.** Assume $H_1$ and $H_2$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $A_0 \geq 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon]$, $J_\varepsilon \geq A_0 m_{0, \Psi}$ with $m_{0, \Psi} = \inf\{\Psi(x) : x \in F^{-1}(0)\}$ and $A_0$ independent from $\Psi$.

**Proof.** Since $F(0) = 0$ and $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$, there exists $M \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \overline{B}(0,1)$, $\|F(x)\| \leq M \|x\|$. Note that $F^{-1}(0)$ is compact since $\lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} \|F(x)\| = +\infty$ and $F \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$. Hence, since for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $\Psi(x) > 0$ and $\Psi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^+)$ there exists $\eta \in (0,1)$ such that for any $x \in B(0, \eta) \cup F^{-1}(0)$, $\Psi(x) \geq m_{0, \Psi}/2$. Using this result we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$J_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d/2}C_1^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi(x) \exp[-\|F(x)\|^k/\varepsilon]dx$$

$$\geq \varepsilon^{-d/2}(m_{0, \Psi}/2)C_1^{-1} \int_{B(0, \eta)} \exp[-Mk\|x\|^k/\varepsilon]dx$$

$$\geq C_1^{-1}(m_{0, \Psi}/2)M^{-d} \int_{B(0, M\eta^{1/k})} \exp[-\|x\|^k]dx.$$

Using that $F^{-1}(0)$ is compact, there exists $M \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $JF(x) \leq M$. Therefore, we get that

$$J_0 = \int_{F^{-1}(0)} \Psi(x)JF(x)^{-1}d\mathcal{H}^{d-d}(x) \geq m_{0, \Psi}M^{-1}\mathcal{H}^{d-d}(F^{-1}(0)).$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^{d-d}(F^{-1}(0)) > +\infty$ using Lemma C.5 in the case where $d \geq p$ and the fact that $\mathcal{H}^0(F^{-1}(0)) < +\infty$ if $d \leq p$ (see the first part of the proof of Lemma A.4), we have that for any $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon]$

$$J_\varepsilon \geq A_0 m_{0, \Psi}, \quad A_0 = \min(A_0^1, A_0^2),$$

$$A_0^1 = (1/2)C_1^{-1}M^{-d} \int_{B(0, M\eta^{1/k})} \exp[-\|x\|^k]dx, \quad A_0^2 = M^{-1}\mathcal{H}^{d-d}(F^{-1}(0)).$$

which concludes the proof. \hfill $\Box$
Lemma A.3. Assume $H1$ and $H2$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $C_\varphi \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\varphi(x)| \leq C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi \|x\|^{\alpha k}]. \quad (36)$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \mathbb{R}^k \beta + (1 + C_\varphi, \Psi))$ and $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded such that $F^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{V}$ there exist $\beta_1 > 0$ and $A_1 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$

$$\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{out}}(\varphi) \leq A_1(C_\varphi, \Psi)\varepsilon^{-d/k} \exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon],$$

with $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{out}}(\varphi) = \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{V})$, $C_\varphi, \Psi = C_\varphi + C_\Psi + C_\varphi C_\Psi$ and $A_1, \beta_1$ independent functions from $\varphi$ and $\Psi$. Finally, $A_1$ is non-decreasing.

Proof. First using $H2$ and $(36)$ there exists $C_\varphi, \Psi$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\varphi(x)| \Psi(x) \leq C_\varphi, \Psi \exp[C_\varphi, \Psi \|x\|], \quad C_\varphi, \Psi = C_\varphi + C_\Psi + C_\varphi C_\Psi.$$  

Since $\mathcal{V}$ is bounded there exists $R' \geq R$ (where $R$ is given in $H1$) such that $\mathcal{V} \subset \bar{B}(0, R')$. Note that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{out}}(\varphi) = \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi) + \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^2(\varphi), \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^2(\varphi) = \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V} \cap \bar{B}(0, R')}).$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon})$, we divide the rest of the proof into two parts. First, we bound $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi)$ and then $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^2(\varphi)$.

(a) Let $u = (\mathbb{R}^k/\varepsilon - C_\varphi, \Psi)^{1/\alpha k}$ (which makes sense, since $\varepsilon < \mathbb{R}^k/(C_\varphi, \Psi + 1)$). Since $R' \geq R$ we have using $(6)$ and that $u \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi) = C_\alpha^{-1} \varepsilon^{-d/k} \int_{\mathcal{V} \cap \bar{B}(0, R') \cap \varepsilon \exp[-\|F(x)/\|/\varepsilon]dx$$

$$\leq C_\alpha^{-1} C_\varphi, \Psi \varepsilon^{-d/k} \int_{\mathcal{V} \cap \bar{B}(0, R') \cap \varepsilon \exp[-(\mathbb{R}^k/\varepsilon - C_\varphi, \Psi) \|x\|^{\alpha k}]dx$$

$$\leq C_\alpha^{-1} C_\varphi, \Psi \varepsilon^{-d/k} \int_{\mathcal{V} \cap \bar{B}(0, R') \cap \varepsilon \exp[-\|x\|^{\alpha k}]dx.$$  

Let $C_\alpha = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|x\|^{\alpha k}]dx$. Using that $u = (\mathbb{R}^k/\varepsilon - C_\varphi, \Psi)^{1/\alpha k}$, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi) \leq C_\alpha^{-1} C_\varphi, \Psi \exp[-\|x\|^{\alpha k}]dx$$

$$\leq C_\alpha^{-1} C_\varphi, \Psi \varepsilon^{-d/k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|x\|^{\alpha k}] dx \exp[-(R')^{\alpha k}] / 2$$

$$\leq 2d/\alpha k C_\alpha C_\varphi, \Psi \exp[(R')^{\alpha k} C_\varphi, \Psi / 2] \varepsilon^{-d/k} \exp[-(R')^{\alpha k} \mathbb{R}^k / (2\varepsilon)] \leq A_1^{1} \varepsilon^{d/k} \exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon]. \quad (37)$$

with

$$A_1^{1} = 2d/\alpha k C_\alpha C_\varphi, \Psi \exp[(R')^{\alpha k} C_\varphi, \Psi / 2], \quad \beta_1^{1} = (R')^{\alpha k} \mathbb{R}^k / (2\varepsilon).$$

(b) Second, note that $K = \mathcal{V} \cap \bar{B}(0, R')$ is bounded and closed, i.e. $K$ is compact. Note that for any $x \in K$, $\|F(x)\| > 0$, hence there exists $m > 0$ such that for any $x \in K$, $\|F(x)\| \geq m$. In addition, we have that for any $x \in K$,

$$|\varphi(x)| \Psi(x) \leq C_\varphi, \Psi \exp[C_\varphi, \Psi \|x\|^{\alpha k}] \leq C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi, \Psi (R')^{\alpha k}].$$
Therefore, we have
\[
\mathcal{I}_c^2(\varphi) \leq C_{\chi^{-1},C_{\varphi},\psi} \varepsilon^{-d/k} \exp[C_{\varphi,\psi}(R')^{ak}] \exp[-m^k/\varepsilon] \lambda(K),
\]
where we recall that \(\lambda(K)\) is the Lebesgue measure of \(K\). Since \(K \subseteq B(0,R')\) we have
\[
\mathcal{I}_c^2(\varphi) \leq \pi^{d/2}(R')^d \Gamma^{-1}(d/2 + 1) C_{\chi^{-1},C_{\varphi},\psi} \exp[(R')^{ak}] \varepsilon^{-d/k} \exp[-m^k/\varepsilon] \leq A_1^2 \varepsilon^{-d/k} \exp[-\beta_1^2/\varepsilon],
\]
where \(\Gamma : (0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}_+\) is given for any \(s \in (0, +\infty)\) by \(\Gamma(s) = \int_0^{+\infty} t^{s-1} \exp[-t]dt\) and
\[
A_1^2 = \pi^{d/2}(R')^d \Gamma^{-1}(d/2 + 1) C_{\chi^{-1},C_{\varphi},\psi}\exp[C_{\varphi,\psi}(R')^{ak}], \quad \beta_1^2 = m^k.
\]
We conclude the proof upon combining (37), (38), letting \(\beta_1 = \min(\beta_1^1, \beta_1^2)\) and \(A_1 = A_1^1 + A_1^2\).

**Lemma A.4.** Assume \(H 1\) and that \(d \leq p\). Then there exist \(N \in \mathbb{N}\), \(\{x_0^k\}_{k=1}^N \subset (\mathbb{R}^d)^N\) and \(W_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) open such that for any \(k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\), \(x_0^k \in W_k\), \(F : W_k \to F(W_k)\) is a bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism, for any \(x \in W_k\), \(dF(x)\) is injective and for any \(j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, W_k \cap W_j = \emptyset\). In addition, \(F^{-1}(0) = \cup_{k=1}^N \{x_0^k\}\).

**Proof.** Since, for any \(x \in F^{-1}(0), JF(x) > 0\) and \(d \leq p\) there exists \(r_x > 0\) such that for any \(y \in B(x, r_x)\), \(F(y) = F(x)\) implies that \(y = x\). Since \(\lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} \|F(x)\| = +\infty\) we have that \(F^{-1}(0)\) is compact. Assume that \(\mathcal{H}^d(F^{-1}(0)) = +\infty\). Then, there exists \((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) such that for any \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), \(F(x_k) = 0\) and for any \(j \in \{0, \ldots, k-1\}, x_j \neq x_k\). Up to extraction, there exists \(x^* \in F^{-1}(0)\) such that \(\lim_{k \to +\infty} x_k = x^*\) and for any \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), \(x_k \neq x^*\). Hence, there exists \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(x_k \in B(0, r_{x^*})\) which is absurd. Hence \(\mathcal{H}^d(F^{-1}(0)) < +\infty\). In what follows, we let \(N = \mathcal{H}^d(F^{-1}(0))\) and denote \(\{x_0^k\}_{k=1}^N \subset (\mathbb{R}^d)^N\) such that \(F^{-1}(0) = \{x_0^k\}_{k=1}^N\). There exists \((r_k^{'})_{k=1}^N \subset (\mathbb{R}^d)^N\) such that for any \(k, j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, \bar{B}(x_0^k, r_k^{'}) \cap \bar{B}(x_0^j, r_j^{'}) = \emptyset\). For any \(k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\), we let \(V_k = B(x_0^k, \min(r_k^{'}, r_{x_0^k}^2/2))\). Let \(k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\). By construction, \(F : V_k \to F(V_k)\) is bijective and continuous. Since \(V_k\) is compact, we have that \(F : V_k \to F(V_k)\) is a homeomorphism. Since for any \(k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\), \(JF(x_0^k) > 0\), there exists \(m > 0\) such that for any \(k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\) and \(v \in \mathbb{R}^d\), \(v^\top H(x_0^k, x_0^k)v \geq m\|v\|^2\) with \(H(x, y) = DF(x)^\top DF(y)\) for any \(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\). For any \(k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\), there exists \(W_k \subset V_k\) such that for any \(x, y \in W_k\) we have \(\|H(x, y) - H(x_0^k, x_0^k)\|_2 \leq m/2\). Therefore, we have for any \(x, y \in W_k\)
\[
\|F(x) - F(y)\|^2 = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \langle DF(x + t(y - x))(y - x), DF(x + s(y - x))(y - x) \rangle dt ds
\]
\[
= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (y - x)^\top H(x, x_t)(y - x) dt ds
\]
\[
= (y - x)^\top H(x_0^k, x_0^k)(y - x) + \int_0^1 (y - x)^\top (H(x_t, x_s) - H(x_0^k, x_0^k))(y - x) dt ds
\]
\[
\geq (m/2)\|y - x\|^2,
\]
where \(x_t = x + t(y - x)\), which concludes the proof. \(\Box\)

**A.3 Quantitative control of the derivative**

**Lemma A.5.** Under the same assumptions as Proposition 11, there exist \(\eta > 0\) and \(P \in \text{Poly}(4, \mathbb{R}_+)\) such that for \(x \in F^{-1}(0)\) and \(t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)\) we have
\[
\|D_t \chi(t, x)\| \leq (1 + M_{0, \chi} + M_{1, \chi})(1 + M_{0, \psi} + M_{1, \psi})
\]
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× \exp[P(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F})] \exp[P(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F})]

where we recall that χ is defined in (21) and for any ℓ ∈ N, i ∈ {0, ..., ℓ} and f ∈ C^{ℓ}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p),

\begin{align*}
M_{i,F} &= \sup\{\|D^i f(x)\| : x ∈ F^{-1}(B_\infty(0, \eta))\}.
\end{align*}

**Proof.** In this proof, for any f : \mathbb{R}^{m_0} → \mathbb{R}^{m_1} with m_0, m_1 ∈ N differentiable, we denote df its differential. Recall that Φ : \mathbb{R}^d → \mathbb{R}^d is defined such that for any x ∈ \mathbb{R}^d, Φ(x) = x^{(p)} with x^{(0)} = x and for any i ∈ \{0, ..., p - 1\}, x^{(i+1)} = Φ_{i+1}(t_{i+1}, x^{(i)}), with Φ_{i+1} given by (20). The compact sets K_0 and K_1 are defined in the proof of Proposition 11. Since for any x ∈ F^{-1}(0), \det(D\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) > 0, we assume without loss of generality that \det(D\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) > 0. For ease of notation we denote φ = \varphi ⊗ \Psi. We have

\begin{align*}
M_{0,\varphi ψ} &= M_{0,\varphi}M_{0,\psi}, \quad M_{1,\varphi ψ} = M_{0,\varphi}M_{1,\psi} + M_{1,\varphi}M_{0,\psi}.
\end{align*}

In addition, we have for any x ∈ \mathbb{R}^d and t ∈ K_0

\begin{align*}
\chi(t, x) = φ(Φ^{-1}(x))JF(Φ^{-1}(x))^{-1} \det(DΦ^{-1}(x)). \tag{39}
\end{align*}

We now control the first derivative of χ. We divide the rest of the proof in three steps.

(a) We start by providing upper bounds for x ↦ h_{i,j}(x), x ↦ Dh_{i,j}(x) and x ↦ D^2h_{i,j}(x) for any i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\} where we recall that for any x ∈ K_1 we have

\begin{align*}
\{h_{i,j}(x)\}_{1≤i,j≤p} = G(x)^{-1} = \text{Adj}(G(x))/\det(G(x)) = \text{Adj}(G(x))/JF(x)^2,
\end{align*}

where \text{Adj}(G(x)) is the adjugate of G(x) = \{(∇F_i(x), ∇F_j(x))\}_{1≤i,j≤p}, where for any x ∈ K_1 and i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\}

\begin{align*}
\text{Adj}(G(x)) = (-1)^{i+j} \det(G^{i,j}(x))\}_{1≤i,j≤p},
\end{align*}

where for any i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\}, \det(G^{i,j}(x)) is the (i, j) minor of G(x). Hence, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality there exists D_0 ≥ 0 such that for any x ∈ K_1 and i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\}

\begin{align*}
|h_{i,j}(x)| ≤ D_0M_{1,F}^{2p-2}/m_{1,F}, \tag{40}
\end{align*}

where we define

\begin{align*}
M_{1,F} &= \sup\{\|∇F_i(x)\| : x ∈ K_1, i ∈ \{1, ..., p\}\}, \quad m_{1,F} = \inf\{JF(x) : x ∈ K_1\}.
\end{align*}

Recall that m_{1,F} > 0 since K_1 is compact and for any x ∈ K_1, JF(x) > 0. We have that for any x ∈ K_1, u ∈ \mathbb{R}^d and i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\}

\begin{align*}
dh_{i,j}(x)(u) = e_i^\top dG(x)^{-1}(u)e_j = -e_i^\top G(x)^{-1}dG(x)(u)G(x)^{-1}e_j. \tag{41}
\end{align*}

In addition, we have for any x, u ∈ \mathbb{R}^d and i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\}

\begin{align*}
dG_{i,j}(x)(u) = d^2F_i(x)(∇F_j(x), u) + d^2F_j(x)(∇F_i(x), u). \tag{42}
\end{align*}

Combining this result and (41) we get that there exists C_1 ≥ 0 such that for any x ∈ K_1 and i, j ∈ \{1, ..., p\}

\begin{align*}
\|Dh_{i,j}(x)\| ≤ C_1M_{1,F}^{p-2}M_{2,F}/m_{1,F}^4, \tag{43}
\end{align*}
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where \( M_{2,F} = \sup\{\|\nabla^2 F_i(x)\| : x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \} \). Hence using (19), (40) and (43), there exist \( C_2, C_3 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in K_1 \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \)

\[ \|g_i(x)\| \leq C_2 M_{2,F}^{2p-1}/m_{1,F}^2, \quad \|Dg_i(x)\| \leq C_3 M_{2,F}/m_{1,F} \left\{ M_{1,F}^{4p-2}/m_{1,F}^2 + M_{2,F}^{2p-2} \right\}. \]  

Similarly, for any \( x \in K_1, \ u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) we have

\[
d^2 h_{i,j}(x)(u,v) = e_i^\top d^2 G(x)^{-1}(u,v)e_j
= e_i^\top \{ G(x)^{-1}dG(x)(u)G(x)^{-1}dG(x)(v)G(x)^{-1}
+ G(x)^{-1}dG(x)(v)G(x)^{-1}dG(x)(u)G(x)^{-1}
- G(x)^{-1}d^2 G(x)(u,v)G(x)^{-1} \} e_j .
\]

We also have for any \( x, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \)

\[
d^2 G_{i,j}(x) = d^3 F_i(x)(\nabla F_j(x), u, v) + d^3 F_j(x)(\nabla F_i(x), u, v)
+ d^2 F_i(x)(d^2 F_j(x)(v), u) + d^2 F_j(x)(d^2 F_i(x)(v), u).
\]

Hence there exist \( P_3 \in \text{Poly}(4,\mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( x \in K_1 \) we have

\[ \|D^2 h_{i,j}(x)\| \leq P_3(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) , \]  

where \( M_{3,F} = \sup\{\|\nabla^3 F_i(x)\| : x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \} \). Next, note that for any \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \), we can choose \( g_i \) such that \( g_i \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \) (and therefore \( \Phi_i \in C^{3,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \) by Lemma C.1).

Combining this result, (44) and (45), there exist \( P_1 \in \text{Poly}(2,\mathbb{R}_+) \), \( P_2 \in \text{Poly}(3,\mathbb{R}_+) \) and \( P_3 \in \text{Poly}(4,\mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( x \in K_1 \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \)

\[ \|g_i(x)\| \leq P_1(M_{1,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) , \quad \|Dg_i(x)\| \leq P_2(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) , \]  

\[ \|D^2 g_i(x)\| \leq P_3(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) . \]  

(b) For any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have \( |t_i| \leq 2\eta \), since \( F_i(\Phi_i(t_i, x)) = F_i(x) - t_i \). Hence combining this result, the fact that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \Phi_i(0, x) = x \), (20) and (44), for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have

\[ \|\Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq \|x\| + \int_{0}^{t_i} \|D\Phi_i(s, x)\| \, ds \leq \|x\| + 2\eta C_2 M_{1,F}^{2p-1}/m_{1,F}^2 . \]

Therefore, there exists \( C_4 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have

\[ \|\Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq C_4(1 + M_{1,F}^{2p-1}/m_{1,F}^2) , \quad \|D\Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq C_2 M_{1,F}^{2p-1}/m_{1,F}^2 . \]  

Similarly, for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have

\[
\|D_x \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq \|\text{Id}\| + \int_{0}^{t_i} \|D_{x,s} \Phi_i(s, x)\| \, ds
\leq \|\text{Id}\| + \int_{0}^{t_i} \|Dg_i(\Phi_i(t_i, x))\| \, ds
\leq \|\text{Id}\| + C_3(M_{2,F}/m_{1,F}^2 \left\{ M_{1,F}^{4p-2}/m_{1,F}^2 + M_{2,F}^{2p-2} \right\}) \int_{0}^{t_i} \|D_x \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \, ds .
\]
Hence, using Grönwall’s lemma, for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have
\[
\|D_x \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq \|\text{Id}\| \exp[2\eta C_3(M_{2,F}/m_{1,F}^2)\{M_{1,F}^{4p-2}/m_{1,F}^2 + M_{2,F}^{2p-2}\}] .
\]
Therefore, there exists \( C_5 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have
\[
\|D_x \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq C_5 \exp[C_5(M_{2,F}/m_{1,F}^2)\{M_{1,F}^{4p-2}/m_{1,F}^2 + M_{2,F}^{2p-2}\}] . \tag{48}
\]
Using this result, \( (20) \) and \( (46) \), there exists \( C_6 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have
\[
\|D_{t,x} \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq C_6 \exp[C_6(M_{2,F}/m_{1,F}^2)\{M_{1,F}^{4p-2}/m_{1,F}^2 + M_{2,F}^{2p-2}\}] . \tag{49}
\]
Hence combining \( (47), (48) \) and \( (49) \), there exist \( P_4 \in \text{Poly}(2, \mathbb{R}_+) \) and \( P_5 \in \text{Poly}(3, \mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}, \ t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\|D_t \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| + \|\Phi_i(t_i, x)\| & \leq P_4(M_{1,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) , \\
\|D_x \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| + \|D_{t,x} \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| & \leq P_5(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) . \tag{50}
\end{align*}
\]
In addition, using \( (20) \) we have for any \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}, \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)
\[
D_t D_x^2 \Phi_i(s, x) = D g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)) D_x^2 \Phi_i(s, x) + D^2 g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)) D_x \Phi_i(s, x) .
\]
Therefore, using \( (46) \) and \( (50) \), we have for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\|D_x^2 \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| & \leq \int_0^{t_i} \{\|D_{g_i}(\Phi_i(s, x))\| \|D_x^2 \Phi_i(s, x)\| + \|D^2 g_i(\Phi_i(s, x))\| \|D_x \Phi_i(s, x)\|\} ds \\
& \leq 2\eta P_3(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) P_5(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_5(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})] \\
& \quad + P_2(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \int_0^{t_i} \|D_x^2 \Phi_i(s, x)\| ds .
\end{align*}
\]
Hence, using Grönwall’s lemma, there exists \( P_6 \in \text{Poly}(4, \mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \) we have
\[
\|D_x^2 \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| \leq P_6(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_6(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F})] .
\]
Hence, combining this result and \( (50) \), we have for any \( x \in K_1, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) and \( t_i \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \Phi_i(t_i, x) \in K_1 \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\|D_t \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| + \|\Phi_i(t_i, x)\| & \leq P_4(M_{1,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) , \\
\|D_x \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| + \|D_{t,x} \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| & \leq P_5(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_5(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})] , \\
\|D_x^2 \Phi_i(t_i, x)\| & \leq P_6(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_6(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F})] . \tag{51}
\end{align*}
\]
(c) In what follows, we fix \( t \in B_\infty(0, \eta) \) and use \( (51) \) to provide uniform bounds for \( D_t \Phi_i^{-1}, D_x D \Phi_i^{-1} \) and \( D \Phi_i^{-1} \) on \( F^{-1}(0) \). We introduce \( \{\Phi_i^{-1}_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^p \) such that for any \( x \in F^{-1}(0) \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \)
\[
\Phi_i^{-1}_{t,i}(x) = \Phi_i(-t_i, \Phi_i^{-1}_{t,i+1}(x)) , \quad \Phi_i^{-1}_{t,p+1}(x) = x .
\]
Note that \( \Phi_i^{-1} = \Phi_i^{-1}_{t,i} \). Let \( j \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \). For any \( i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \) we distinguish three cases:
distinguish three cases: Finally, we give a uniform upper-bound on $i > j$, then for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x) = 0$.

(iii) $i < j$, then for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x) = D_t \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x)$.

Combining these results, (51) and the fact that $\Phi_{t}^{-1} = \Phi_{t,1}^{-1}$ we get that there exists $\bar{P}_7 \in \text{Poly}(3, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, and $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ we have

$$\|D_t \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x)\| \leq \bar{P}_7(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[\bar{P}_7(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})].$$

Hence, there exists $P_7 \in \text{Poly}(3, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ we have

$$\|D_t \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_7(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_7(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})].$$

Next, note that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ we have

$$D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x) = D_t \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x) D_t \Phi_{t,i+1}^{-1}(x), \quad D_t \Phi_{t,p+1}^{-1}(x) = I_d.$$

Combining this result and (51), there exists $P_8 \in \text{Poly}(3, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$

$$\|D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_8(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_8(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})].$$

In particular, since $\Phi_1 = \Phi_{t,1}$ we have for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$

$$\|D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_8(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_8(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})].$$

Finally, we give a uniform upper-bound on $D_t D_t \Phi_{t}^{-1}$. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. For any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ we distinguish three cases:

(i) $i > j$, then for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $D_t D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x) = 0$.

(ii) $i = j$, then for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $D_t D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x) = -D_t D_t \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x)$.

(iii) $i < j$, then for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, we have

$$D_t D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x) = D_t D_t \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x) D_t D_t \Phi_{t,i+1}^{-1}(x) + D_t^2 \Phi_{t,j}^{-1}(x) D_t D_t \Phi_{t,i+1}^{-1}(x).$$

Using (51) and (53), there exists $P_9 \in \text{Poly}(4, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ we have

$$\|D_t D_t \Phi_{t,i}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_9(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_9(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F})].$$

Therefore, summarizing (52), (54) and (55), there exist $P_7, P_8 \in \text{Poly}(\mathbb{R}_+, 3)$ and $P_9 \in \text{Poly}(4, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$\|D_t D_t \Phi_{t}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_7(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_7(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})],$$

$$\|D_t \Phi_{t}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_8(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_8(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, 1/m_{1,F})],$$

$$\|D_t D_t \Phi_{t}^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_9(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F}) \exp[P_9(M_{1,F}, M_{2,F}, M_{3,F}, 1/m_{1,F})].$$
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(d) Next, we use (56) to conclude the proof by providing uniform upper-bounds on the differential $\chi$ on $F^{-1}(0)$ w.r.t. $t$, where $\chi$ given in (39). For any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$D_t \chi(t, x) = D_t \phi_t^{-1}(x) J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) (57)$$

$$= + \phi_t^{-1}(x) D_t J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) + \phi_t^{-1}(x) J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) + \phi_t^{-1}(x) J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) .$$

First, for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$|\phi_t^{-1}(x)| \leq M_0, \quad J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) \leq 1/m_1, F . \quad (58)$$

In addition, using (56), there exists $P_{10} \in \text{Pol}(3, \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that for any $x \in K_1$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$

$$\left| \det(D \phi_t^{-1}(x)) \right| \leq P_{10}(M_1, F, M_2, F, 1/m_1, F) \exp[P_{10}(M_1, F, M_2, F, 1/m_1, F)] . \quad (59)$$

For any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$D_t \phi_t^{-1}(x) = D_t \phi_t^{-1}(x) D_t \phi_t^{-1}(x) .$$

Combining this result and (56), there exists $P_{11} \in \text{Pol}(3, \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$\|D_t \phi_t^{-1}(x)\| \leq P_{11}(M_1, F, M_2, F, 1/m_1, F) \exp[P_{11}(M_1, F, M_2, F, 1/m_1, F)] . \quad (60)$$

For any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$D_t J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) = D_t \det(G(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)))^{1/2} = J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)) \det(G(\Phi_t^{-1}(x))) . \quad (61)$$

In addition, for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$D_t \det(G(\Phi_t^{-1}(x)))(h) = \text{Tr}(\text{Adj}(G(\Phi_t^{-1}(x))) DG(\Phi_t^{-1}(x))(D_t \Phi_t^{-1}(x)(h))) .$$

Using this result, (61), (42) and (56), there exists $P_{12} \in \text{Pol}(3, \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$\|D_t J F(\Phi_t^{-1}(x))\| \leq P_{12}(M_1, F, M_2, F, 1/m_1, F) \exp[P_{12}(M_1, F, M_2, F, 1/m_1, F)] . \quad (62)$$

Finally, for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have

$$D_t \det(D \phi_t^{-1}(x)) = \text{Tr}(\text{Adj}(D \phi_t^{-1}(x)) D_t D \phi_t^{-1}(x)(h)) .$$

Hence, using (56), there exists $P_{13} \in \text{Pol}(4, \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$ and $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ we have

$$\|D_t \det(D \phi_t^{-1}(x))\| \leq P_{13}(M_1, F, M_2, F, M_3, F, 1/m_1, F) \times \exp[P_{13}(M_1, F, M_2, F, M_3, F, 1/m_1, F)] . \quad (63)$$

We conclude the proof upon combining (57), (58), (59), (60), (62) and (63).
A.4 Regularity results

In the following section we prove a smoothing lemma which is key to extend Proposition 14 to the case where $\Psi$ and $\varphi$ are no longer in $C^1(U, \mathbb{R})$ but are Lipschitz continuous.

**Lemma A.6.** Let $U$ be open bounded, $r > 0$, $V = U + B(0, r)$ and $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ which satisfies (6) and is Lipschitz on $V$, i.e. there exists $M_{1, \varphi} \geq 0$ such that for any $x, y \in V$ we have

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq M_{1, \varphi} \|x - y\|.$$  

In addition, let $M_{0, \varphi} = \sup\{|\varphi(x)| : x \in V\}$. Then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $\{\varphi^\delta : \delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta})\}$ such that the following hold:

(a) For any $x \in U$, $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \varphi^\delta(x) = \varphi(x)$.

(b) For any $\delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta})$, $\varphi^\delta \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and there exists $L_\delta \geq 0$ such that for any $x, y \in U$,

$$|\varphi^\delta(x) - \varphi^\delta(y)| \leq L_\delta \|x - y\|.$$  

Let $L_0 = \sup\{L_\delta : \delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta})\} < +\infty$ and we have $L_0 \leq C_1(1 + M_{0, \varphi} + M_{1, \varphi})(1 + C_\varphi)$, with $C_1 \geq 0$ independent from $\varphi$.

(c) For any $\delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta})$ there exists $M_\delta \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in U$, $|\varphi^\delta(x)| \leq M_\delta$ and $M_0 = \sup\{M_\delta : \delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta})\} < +\infty$. In addition, $M_0 \leq C_2(1 + M_{0, \varphi})(1 + C_\varphi)$ with $C_2 \geq 0$ independent from $\varphi$.

(d) For any $\delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta})$ there exists $D_\delta \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$|\varphi^\delta(x)| \leq D_\delta \exp[D_\delta \|x\|^{\alpha \delta}]$$  

and $D_\delta \leq C_3(1 + C_\varphi)\exp[C_3 C_\varphi]$ with $C_3$ independent from $\varphi$.

(e) Assume $H_1$, that $F^{-1}(0) \subset U$ and that there exists $m_{0, \varphi} > 0$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $\varphi(x) \geq m_{0, \varphi}$. Then there exists $\delta^* > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta^*)$ and $x \in F^{-1}(0)$, $\varphi^\delta(x) \geq m_{0, \varphi}/2$. In addition if $\varphi \geq 0$ then for any $\delta > 0$, $\varphi^\delta \geq 0$.

In addition, $\delta = f_1(C_\varphi)$ and $\delta^* = f_2(M_{0, \varphi}, M_{1, \varphi}, 1/m_{0, \varphi}, C_\varphi)$ with $f_1 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $f_2 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and are non-decreasing w.r.t to each of their variables. Finally, there exists $C_4 \geq 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{\delta \to 0} M_\delta \leq C_4 M_{0, \varphi}, \quad \limsup_{\delta \to 0} L_\delta \leq C_4 M_{1, \varphi}, \quad \limsup_{\delta \to 0} D_\delta \leq C_4 C_\varphi,$$

with $C_4$ independent from $\varphi$.

**Proof.** Since $U$ is bounded there exists $R \geq 0$ such that $U \subset B(0, R)$. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2p > \alpha k$ and for any $\delta > 0$ define $k_\delta : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$k_\delta(x) = \exp[-\|x\|^{2p}/\delta] / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|\bar{x}\|^{2p}/\delta] d\bar{x}.$$  

Let $C_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|\bar{x}\|^{2p}] d\bar{x}$ and we have for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $k_\delta(x) = C_1^{-1} \delta^{-d/2p} \exp[-\|x\|^{2p}/\delta]$. Note that since $2p > \alpha k$ and using (6) we have that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x - y)| k_\delta(y) dy < +\infty$. For any $\delta > 0$ we define $\varphi^\delta$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\varphi^\delta(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x - y) k_\delta(y) dy.$$  

(64)

We divide the rest of the proof into five parts.
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(a) We have that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \varphi^\delta(x) = \varphi(x)$, since $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\{k_\delta : \delta > 0\}$ is a mollifier. This concludes the proof of Lemma A.6-(a).

(b) Using that $2p > \alpha k$ and (6) we have that for any $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^\beta |\varphi(x - y)| k_\delta(y) < +\infty$. Hence, $\varphi^\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Let $x \in U$. Using that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y||y|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy = 0$, we have that for any $\delta > 0$

$$
\|\nabla \varphi^\delta(x)\| = (2p/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)||y|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy
$$

$$
= (2p/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)| |y|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy
$$

$$
\leq (2pM_1/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{2p} k_\delta(y)dy + (2p/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)||y|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy
$$

$$
\leq (2pM_1/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^{2p} \exp[-|y|^{2p}]dy + (2p/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)||y|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy.
$$

(65)

We now bound the second term. Let $\alpha_k = \lfloor \alpha k \rfloor$. Using (6), we have for any $x \in U$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$
|\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)| \leq (1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \exp(C_\varphi \|x - y\|^{\alpha_k})
$$

$$
\leq (1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \exp[3^{\alpha_k-1}C_\varphi(1 + \|x\|^\alpha_k + \|y\|^{\alpha_k})]
$$

$$
\leq (1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \exp[3^{\alpha_k-1}C_\varphi(1 + R^{\alpha_k})] \exp[3^{\alpha_k-1}C_\varphi\|y\|^{\alpha_k}].
$$

Therefore we get that for any $x \in U$ and $y \in \mathbb{B}(0,r/2)^c$

$$
\|\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)\|^{2p-1} \leq (1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \exp[3^{\alpha_k-1}C_\varphi(1 + R^{\alpha_k})] \exp[3^{\alpha_k-1}C_\varphi\|y\|^{2p}] + 1 \|y\|^{2p}.
$$

Therefore there exists $C_\alpha \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in U$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$
|\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)| \|y\|^{2p-1} \leq C_\alpha(1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \exp[C_\alpha(1 + C_\varphi)\|y\|^{2p}],
$$

with $C_\alpha \geq 0$ independent from $\varphi$. Using this result, we have for any $x \in U$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/(2C_\alpha(1 + C_\varphi)))$

$$
(2p/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)| \|y\|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy
$$

$$
\leq 2pC_\alpha(1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \delta^{-d/2p-1} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/2)^c} \exp[(C_\alpha(1 + C_\varphi) - 1/\delta) \|y\|^{2p}]dy
$$

$$
\leq 2^{1+d(1+2p)/2p} pC_\alpha(1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi(\delta C_\alpha) \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/(2^{1+2p}\delta)^{1/2p})^c} \exp[-\|y\|^{2p}]dy.
$$

We have for any $\delta \in (0, 1/(2C_\alpha(1 + C_\varphi)))$

$$
\int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/(2^{1+2p}\delta)^{1/2p})^c} \exp[-\|y\|^{2p}]dy / C_1 \leq \exp[-r^{2p}/(2^{2+2p}\delta)] \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|y\|^{2p}/2]dy / C_1.
$$

Therefore, there exists $C_b \geq 0$ (independent from $\varphi$) such that for any $x \in U$ and $\delta \in (0, 1/(2C_\alpha(1 + C_\varphi)))$ we have

$$
(2p/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(x - y) - \varphi(x)| \|y\|^{2p-1} k_\delta(y)dy \leq C_b(1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \delta^{-1} \exp[-r^{2p}/(2^{2+2p}\delta)].
$$

(66)

Combining this bound and (65) we get that for any $\delta \in (0, 1/(2C_\alpha(1 + C_\varphi)))$ there exists $L_\delta \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in U$, $|\nabla \varphi^\delta(x)| \leq L_\delta$. Let $L_0 = \sup\{L_\delta : \delta \in (0, \delta)\} < +\infty$ and using, (65), (66) and that for any $t \geq 0$, $t \exp[-r^{2p}t/2^{2+2p}] \leq 2^{2+2p}/(er^{2p})$ we have

$$
L_0 \leq (2pM_1/\delta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|y\|^{2p} \exp[-\|y\|^{2p}]dy + 2^{2+2p} C_b(1 + M_{0,\varphi}) C_\varphi(1 + C_\varphi)/ (er^{2p}).
$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma A.6-(b).
(c) For any $x \in U$ and $\delta \in (1/(2C_\alpha C_\varphi))$ we have
\[
|\varphi(x)| \leq \int_{B(0,r/2)} |\varphi(y-x)|k_\delta(y)dy + \int_{B(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(y-x)|k_\delta(y)dy \tag{67}
\]
\[
\leq M_{0,\varphi} + \int_{B(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(y-x)|k_\delta(y)dy .
\]
Similarly to (66), there exists $c \geq 0$ (independent from $\varphi$) such that for $x \in U$ and $\delta \in (1/(2C_\alpha C_\varphi))$
\[
\int_{B(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(y-x)|k_\delta(y)dy \leq (C_\varphi/c)\exp[-c/\delta] .
\]
Combining this result and (67) for any $\delta \in (0,1/(2C_\alpha C_\varphi))$ there exists $M_\delta > 0$ such that for any $x \in U$, $|\varphi^\delta(x)| \leq M_\delta$. Let $M_0 = \sup\{M_\delta : \delta \in (0,\delta)\} < +\infty$. We have that
\[
M_0 \leq M_{0,\varphi} + (C_\varphi/c)\exp[-c(1+C_\varphi)] ,
\]
which concludes the proof of Lemma A.6-(c).

(d) Using that for any $a,b \geq 0$ and $p \geq 0$, $(a+b)^p \leq 2^{\min(p-1,0)}(ap + bp)$ we have that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta > 0$
\[
|\varphi^\delta(x)| \leq C_\varphi \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[C_\varphi |y|^\delta] |k_\delta(y)|dy ,
\]
where $\beta_{\alpha,k} = 2^{\min(ak-1,0)}$. Hence, using this result we have for any $\delta \in (0,1/(2\beta_{\alpha,k} C_\varphi))$
\[
|\varphi^\delta(x)| \leq C_\varphi/(C_\varphi^\delta/2\beta_{\alpha,k}) \exp[C_\varphi |y|^{\delta/2}] \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-||y||^{2p} / (2\delta)]dy
\]
\[
\leq C_\varphi/(C_\varphi^\delta/2\beta_{\alpha,k}) \exp[C_\varphi |y|^\delta] \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-||y||^{2p} / (2\delta)]dy
\]
\[
\leq 2^\delta/2C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi \beta_{\alpha,k} |x|^{\delta}] .
\]
Therefore, for any $\delta \in (0,1/(2\beta_{\alpha,k} C_\varphi))$ there exists $D_\delta \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,$\varphi(x) \leq D_\delta \exp[|x|^\delta]$. In addition, there exists $C_d \geq 0$ (independent of $\varphi$) such that $D_\delta \leq C_d(1+C_\varphi)\exp[|C_d C_\varphi|]$, which concludes the proof of Lemma A.6-(d).

(e) If $\varphi \geq 0$ then for any $\delta > 0$, $\varphi^\delta \geq 0$ using (64). For any $x \in U$ we have
\[
\varphi^\delta(x) = \varphi(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\varphi(y-x) - \varphi(x))k_\delta(y)dy \geq m_{0,\varphi} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(y-x) - \varphi(x)|k_\delta(y) .
\]
For any $x \in U$ we have
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(y-x) - \varphi(x)|k_\delta(y) \leq M_{1,\varphi} \delta^{1/k} + \int_{B(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(y-x) - \varphi(x)|k_\delta(y)dy .
\]
Similarly to (66), there exists $C_d \geq 0$ independent from $\varphi$ such that for any $x \in U$
\[
\int_{B(0,r/2)^c} |\varphi(y-x) - \varphi(x)|k_\delta(y)dy \leq C_d(1 + M_{0,\varphi})C_\varphi \exp[-1/(C_d \delta)] .
\]
Let $\tilde{\delta}_1 = (m_{0,\varphi}/(4M_{1,\varphi}))^k$ and $\tilde{\delta}_2 = C_{\varphi}^{-1} (\log(4C_d C_\varphi (1 + M_{0,\varphi})) - \min(0,\log(m_{0,\varphi})))^{-1}$. Then for any $\delta \in (0,\min(\tilde{\delta}_1, \tilde{\delta}_2))$ we have that for any $x \in U$
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(y-x) - \varphi(x)|k_\delta(y) \leq m_{0,\varphi}/2 ,
\]
which concludes the proof of Lemma A.6-(e) upon combining this result with (68).

$\square$
B Technical results for Section 4.3.1

In this section, we derive a quantitative parametric theory for Laplace-type expansion in Appendix B.1 and Appendix B.2. We start by deriving bounds in Appendix B.1. Our main result, Proposition B.5, is presented in Appendix B.2 along with a quantitative Morse lemma. Finally, in Appendix B.3 we derive some moments bounds.

Let $u : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $Z$ a topological space. We consider the following assumption.

**H5.** $u \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times Z, \mathbb{R})$, for any $z \in Z$, $u(\cdot, z) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and the following hold:

(a) $Z$ is compact.

(b) There exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x_k^0\}_{k=1}^N \subset C(Z, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\arg \min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \subset \{x_k^0(z)\}_{k=1}^N$ and $\arg \min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \neq \emptyset$ for any $z \in Z$.

(c) There exists $M \geq 0$ such that for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z \in Z$, $\|\nabla^k_x u(x_1, z) - \nabla^k_x u(x_2, z)\| \leq M \|x_1 - x_2\|$.

(d) There exists $m, \alpha > 0$ and $R \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\| \geq R$, $u(x, z) \geq m \|x\|^\alpha$.

We denote $u^* : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $z \in Z$, $u^*(z) = \min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. Under H5 we have that for any $z \in Z$, $u^* = \min \{u(x_k^0(z), z) : k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\}$ and therefore $u^* \in C(Z, \mathbb{R})$. For any $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$I_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) = C^{-1}_\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \exp\left[\frac{-(u(x, z) - u^*(z))/\varepsilon}{dx}\right]dx, \quad J_\varepsilon(z) = I_\varepsilon(1, z),$$

$$C_\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left[\frac{\|x\|^2}{\varepsilon}\right]dx = (\pi \varepsilon)^{d/2}. \quad (69)$$

In addition, we define

$$I_0(\varphi, z) = \int_{\arg \min u(\cdot, z)} \varphi(x) \det(\nabla^2_x u(x, z))^{-1/2} d\mathcal{H}^{\beta}(x), \quad J_0(z) = I_0(1, z), \quad (70)$$

where $\det(\nabla^2_x u(x, z))^{-1/2} = +\infty$ if $\nabla^2_x u(x, z)$ is not invertible. If $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $I_\varepsilon(\|\varphi\|) < +\infty$ for some $\varepsilon \geq 0$ we define $I_\varepsilon(\varphi)$ similarly as in (69), (70). For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that it is defined we let $\delta_z S_\varepsilon[\varphi] = I_\varepsilon(\varphi, z)/J_\varepsilon(z)$. We emphasize that these definitions are the parametric counterparts to the ones introduced in Section 4.1.

In what follows, we define $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times Z \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that for any $z \in Z$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ $\sigma(x, z)$ is the inverse of the minimum eigenvalue of $\nabla^2_x u(x, z)$. In addition, for any $\beta > 0$, we define $\sigma^*_\beta : Z \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that for any $z \in Z$, $\sigma^*_\beta(z) = \int_{\arg \min u(\cdot, z)} \sigma(x, z)^\beta d\mathcal{H}^0(x)$.

B.1 Parametric lower and truncation bounds

**Lemma B.1.** Assume H5. Then, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ there exists $A_0 > 0$ such that for any $z \in Z$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$ we have $J_\varepsilon(z) \geq A_0$.

**Proof.** Let $z \in Z$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $x^*(z)$ be a global minimizer of $x \mapsto u(x, z)$ which exists since $\arg \min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \neq \emptyset$. Using the change of variable $x \mapsto x + x^*(z)$ we have

$$J_\varepsilon(z) = C^{-1}_\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left[-(u(x, z) - u^*(z))/\varepsilon\right]dx = C^{-1}_\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left[-(u(x^*(z) + x, z) - u^*(z))/\varepsilon\right]dx. \quad (71)$$
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For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) we have
\[
u(x^*(z) + x, z) - u^*(z) = \int_0^1 (\nabla_x u(x^*(z) + tx, z) - \nabla_x u(x^*(z), z)) \, dt \leq M\|x\|^2 / 2.
\]
Combining this result and (71) we get \( \mathcal{J}_0(z) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-(M/2)\|x\|^2/\varepsilon] \, dx \geq (2M)^{d/2} \). In addition, we have that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \mathcal{J}_0(z) = \int_{\arg\min u(\cdot, z)} \det(\nabla^2 u(x, z))^{-1/2} \, dH^0(x) \). Note that if \( \sigma^*_1(z) = +\infty \), then there exists \( \mathcal{J}_0(z) = \arg\min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \) such that \( \sigma(x, z) = +\infty \) and therefore \( \mathcal{J}_0(z) = +\infty \). We have that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \det(\nabla^2 u(x, z)) \leq M^d \) and therefore, \( \mathcal{J}_0(z) \geq N^d/2 \). We conclude upon letting \( A_0 = \min(N, 2^{d/2}/M^{d/2}) \).

**Lemma B.2.** Assume \( H_5 \). Let \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( C_\varphi \geq 0 \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)
\[
|\varphi(x)| \leq C_\varphi \exp[C_\varphi \|x\|^\alpha].
\]
Let \( \varepsilon \in (0, \mathbb{M}(1 + C_\varphi)) \) and \( z \in Z \). Assume that there exists \( V(z) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) open and bounded such that
\[
\arg\min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \subset V(z) \subset \arg\min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} + \mathbb{B}(0, 1).
\]
Then, there exist \( \beta_1 > 0 \) and \( A_1 \in C[\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+] \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\varepsilon}) \)
\[
T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) \leq A_1(C_\varphi)\exp[-m(z)/\varepsilon] + \exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon],
\]
with \( m(z) = \inf \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus V(z)\} - u^*(z) \), \( T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_{V(z)^c}, z) \) and \( A_1, \beta_1 \) independent from \( \varphi, z \), with \( A_1 \) non-decreasing.

**Proof.** First, we have that
\[
V(z) \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{x^k_0(z) : z \in Z\} + \mathbb{B}(0, 1).
\]
Since \( Z \) is compact and that for any \( k \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \), \( x^k_0 \in C(Z, \mathbb{R}^d) \), there exists \( R' \geq 0 \) (independent from \( z \)) such that \( R' \geq R \) (where \( R \) is given in \( H_5 \)) and \( V(z) \subset \mathbb{B}(0, R') \). Note that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), we have
\[
T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) = \mathcal{I}^\varepsilon_1(\varphi, z) + \mathcal{I}^\varepsilon_2(\varphi, z),
\]
\[
\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi, z) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{B}(0,R')}, z), \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^2(\varphi, z) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon(\varphi \mathbb{1}_{V(z)^c}, z).
\]
Let \( \varepsilon \in (0, \hat{\varepsilon}) \). The rest of the proof is similar to the one of Lemma A.3 but is given for completeness. We divide the proof into two parts. First, we bound \( \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi, z) \) and then \( \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^2(\varphi, z) \).

(a) Let \( w = (m/\varepsilon - C_\varphi)^{1/\alpha} \) (which makes sense, since \( \varepsilon < m/(C_\varphi + 1) \)). Since \( R' \geq R \), using (72) and the fact that \( u \geq 1 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi, z) = C_1^{-1}e^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,R')} \varphi(x) \exp[-(u(x, z) - u^*(z))/\varepsilon] \, dx
\leq C_1^{-1}C_\varphi e^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,R')} \varphi \exp[-(m/\varepsilon - C_\varphi)\|x\|^\alpha] \, dx
\leq C_1^{-1}C_\varphi \exp[\bar{u}^*] e^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,R')} \exp[-\|x\|^\alpha] \, dx,
\]
where \( \bar{u}^* = \sup \{u^*(z) : z \in Z\} \). Let \( C_\alpha = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp[-\|x\|^\alpha] \, dx \). Using that \( w = (m/\varepsilon - C_\varphi)^{1/\alpha} \), we have
\[
\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^1(\varphi, z) \leq C_1^{-1}C_\varphi \exp[\bar{u}^*] e^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,R')} \exp[-\|x\|^\alpha] \, dx.
\]
\[ \leq C_{1}^{-1}C_{x} \exp[\bar{u}^{*}e^{-d/2}] \exp[-\|x\|^{2}/2] \exp[-(R'u)^{2}/2] \]
\[ \leq 2^{d/2}C_{x}C_{1}^{-1}C_{x} \exp[\bar{u}^{*}] \exp[(R')^{2}C_{x}/2]e^{-d/2} \exp[-(R')^{2}m/(2\varepsilon)] \leq A_{1}^{\varepsilon}e^{-d/2} \exp[-\beta_{1}^{\varepsilon}/\varepsilon], \tag{73} \]

with
\[ A_{1}^{\varepsilon} = 2^{d/2}C_{x}C_{1}^{-1}C_{x} \exp[\bar{u}^{*}] \exp[(R')^{2}C_{x}/2], \quad \beta_{1}^{\varepsilon} = (R')^{2}m/2. \]

(b) Second, let \( K(z) = V^{c}(z) \cap B(0, R') \). Note that for any \( x \in K(z) \), \( u(x, z) - u_{*}(z) \geq m(z) \). Hence, we have
\[ T_{x}(\varphi, z) \leq C_{1}^{-1}C_{x} \exp[-d/2] \exp[C_{x}(R')^{2}] \exp[-m(z)/\varepsilon] \lambda(K(z)), \]
where we recall that \( \lambda(K(z)) \) is the Lebesgue measure of \( K(z) \). Since \( K(z) \subset B(0, R') \) we have
\[ T_{x}(\varphi, z) \leq \pi^{d/2}(R')^{2} \Gamma^{-1} \exp[(R')^{2}] \exp[-m(z)/\varepsilon] \leq A_{2}^{\varepsilon}e^{-d/2} \exp[-m(z)/\varepsilon], \tag{74} \]
where \( \Gamma : (0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}_{+} \) is given for any \( s \in (0, +\infty) \) by \( \Gamma(s) = \int_{0}^{+\infty} t^{s-1} \exp[-t]dt \) and
\[ A_{2}^{\varepsilon} = \pi^{d/2}(R')^{2} \Gamma^{-1}(d/2 + 1)C_{1}^{-1} \exp[C_{x}(R')^{2}]. \]

We conclude the proof upon combining (73), (74) and letting \( \beta_{1}^{\varepsilon} = \beta_{2}^{\varepsilon} \) and \( A_{1} = A_{1}^{\varepsilon} + A_{2}^{\varepsilon}. \)

\[ \Box \]

**B.2 Quantitative Morse lemma and parametric Laplace-type results**

We begin by recalling a quantitative version of the Morse lemma, see [51, Theorem 4.2].

**Proposition B.3.** Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d} \) be open with \( x_{0} \in U \) and \( f \in C^{k}(U, \mathbb{R}) \) with \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( k \geq 3 \). Assume that \( \nabla f(x_{0}) = 0 \) and let \( K \geq 0 \) such that \( K \geq \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} \sup\{\|D^{j}f(x)\| : x \in U\} < +\infty \). Let \( \sigma \) be the minimal eigenvalue of \( \nabla^{2}f(x_{0}) \) and assume that \( \sigma > 0 \). Let \( \sigma_{0} = \min(\sigma, 1) \).

Then, there exist \( c_{0} > 0, \delta = c_{0}\sigma_{0}^{\delta} \) and \( \Phi : B(0, \delta) \to \Phi(B(0, \delta)) \) such that the following hold:

(a) \( \Phi \in C^{k-1}(B(0, \delta), \Phi(B(0, \delta))) \) is a diffeomorphism.

(b) For any \( x \in B(0, \delta), f(\Phi(x)) = f(x_{0}) + \|x\|^{2}. \)

(c) There exist \( c_{1}, \beta > 0 \) such that \( \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}} \sup\{\|D^{j}\Phi(x)\| : x \in B(0, \delta)\} \leq c_{1}\sigma_{0}^{-\beta}. \)

In addition, \( c_{0}, c_{1} \) and \( \beta \) depend only on \( k, d \) and \( K \).

Note that in [51, Theorem 4.2], the constant \( c_{1}\sigma_{0}^{-\beta} \) is replaced by \( M(K, \sigma_{0}, k) \) where \( M : \mathbb{R}_{+} \to \mathbb{R}_{+} \). However, a close examination of the proof reveals that the dependency of \( M(K, \sigma_{0}, k) \) with respect to \( \sigma_{0}^{-1} \) is of order \( \sigma_{0}^{-\beta} \) for some \( \beta > 0 \) which can be made explicit. Using Proposition B.3 we derive the following parametric version of Proposition 13.

This proposition relies on the notion of *thermodynamic barrier* associated with \( u \) which we define as follows. Assume that \( \arg \min\{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}\} \neq \emptyset \) for any \( z \in \mathbb{Z} \). For any \( z \in \mathbb{Z} \) we introduce \( A(z) \) such that \( A(z) = \emptyset \) if there are no other minimizers than the global minimizers and \( A(z) = \{u(x, z) : x \text{ is a local minimizer of } u(\cdot, z) \text{ but not a global minimizer}\} \) otherwise. Then we define \( c^{\ast} : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for any \( z \in \mathbb{Z} \) we have
\[ c^{\ast}(z) = \inf A(z) - \inf\{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}\}, \]
with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. In words, the *thermodynamic barrier* constant quantifies how close the value of the local minimizers are from the global ones. We refer to Section 3.2.3 for a discussion on the importance of *thermodynamic barrier* when establishing parametric Laplace-type expansions.

**Proposition B.4.** Assume $\textbf{H5}$. Let $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, and assume that $\sigma_1^*(z) < +\infty$. There exists $V(z)$ open such that

$$\arg \min \{ u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \} \subset V(z) \subset \arg \min \{ u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \} + \bar{B}(0, 1).$$

We have that $\lim_{z \to 0} |I_0^\varphi(\varphi, z) - I_0(\varphi, z)| = 0$, with $I_0^\varphi(\varphi, z) = I_0(\varphi 1_{V(z)}, z)$. Assume that $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Then there exist $B_1 \geq 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$|I_0^\varphi(\varphi, z) - I_0(\varphi, z)| \leq B_1 \sigma_1^*(z)(1 + M_{0, \varphi}(z) + M_1, \varphi(z))e^{1/2},$$

(75)

with $B_1$ independent from $\varphi$ and $z$ and for any $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $M_{i, \varphi}(z) = \sup\{\|\nabla^i \varphi(z)\| : x \in V(z)\}$. In addition, there exist $c_1, \gamma > 0$ (independent from $z$) such that $m(z) \geq \min(c_1/\sigma_1^*(z), e^\gamma(z))$, with $m(z) = \inf\{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus V(z)\} - u^*(z)$.

**Proof.** Let $\{x_k^i(\bar{z})\}_{k=1}^M = \arg \min \{ u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \}$. Note that for any $k \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ there exists $i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $x_k^i(\bar{z}) = x_k^{i_k}(\bar{z})$. We recall that $K = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{x_k^i(z) : z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is compact. Therefore there exists $R \geq 0$ such that for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\{x_k^i(z)\}_{k=1}^M \subset \bar{B}(0, R)$. We define $K_{\text{global}} \geq 0$ such that

$$K_{\text{global}} = \sup\{\|\nabla^i u(x, z)\| : x \in K, z \in \mathbb{Z}, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}.$$

Let $i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. Using that $\sigma_1^*(z) < +\infty$ and Proposition B.3 with $K = K_{\text{global}}$ and $k = 3$, there exist $\Phi_2^i \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\Phi_2^i(B(0, \delta(z)))$ which is a diffeomorphism, with $\Phi_2^i(0) = x_k^i(z)$, $\delta_1(z) = c_0 \min(\sigma_1^*(x_k^i(z)), 1)$ and for any $x \in B(0, \delta(z))$ we have $u(\Phi_2^i(x), z) = u^* + \|x\|^2$. Let $\delta_0(z) = \min\{\delta(z) : i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}\}$. Using Proposition B.3, there exist $c_0' \geq 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ independent from $z$ such that for any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and $x \in B(0, \delta(z))$, $\|\nabla^\ell \varphi(z)\| \leq c_0' \sigma_1^*(z)$. Let $\delta(z) = \min(\delta(z), 1/(c_0' \sigma_1^*(z)))$. We have that for any $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, $\Phi_\ell(B(0, \delta(z))) \subset B(x_k^i(z), c_0' \sigma_1^*(z) \delta(z)) \subset \arg \min \{u(x, z) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d \} + \bar{B}(0, 1)$. We let $V(z) = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^\ell \Phi_\ell(B(0, \delta(z)))$. We now show that for any $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and for ease of notation let $W_i = \Phi_2^i(B(0, \delta(z)))$ for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. Assume that $W_i \cap W_j \neq \emptyset$. Then, since $W_i$ and $W_j$ are connected, $W = W_i \cup W_j$ is connected as well. In addition, note that $\Phi_2^i(0) \notin W_j$ and $\Phi_2^j(0) \notin W_i$. There exists $\gamma \in C([0, 1], W)$ such that $\gamma(0) = \Phi_2^j(0)$ and $\gamma(1) = \Phi_2^i(0)$. Denote $t^* = \inf\{t \in [0, 1] : \gamma(t) \in W_j\}$. We have that $\gamma(t^*) \in W_j \setminus W_i$. Hence $u(\gamma(t^*), z) < \delta(z)^2 + u^*(z)$. But $\gamma(t^*) \in W_i$ and therefore $u(\gamma(t^*), z) < \delta(z)^2 + u^*(z)$. This is absurd hence for any $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, $W_i \cap W_j = \emptyset$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_{0, \varepsilon}$ be given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{0, \varepsilon}^\varphi(\varphi, z) = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \int_{B(0, \varepsilon/z)} \exp[-\|x\|^2] d\varphi(x_k^i(z)) \det(\nabla^2 u(\varphi(z), z))^{-1/2} / C_1.$$  

(76)

Recall that $\mathcal{I}_{0}(\varphi, z) = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \varphi(x_k^i(z)) \det(\nabla^2 u(x_k^i(z), z))^{-1/2}$. Therefore, we have

$$|\mathcal{I}_0(\varphi, z) - \mathcal{I}_{0, \varepsilon}(\varphi, z)| \leq \sigma_{1/2}^* M_{0, \varphi} \exp[-\delta(z)^2/(2\varepsilon^2)] f_{R, d} \exp[-\|x\|^2/2] dx / C_1$$

(77)

$$\leq 2^{d/2} \sigma_{1/2}^* M_{0, \varphi} \exp[-\delta(z)^2/(2\varepsilon^2)].$$
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Finally, using (76), that for any \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \) and \( x \in B(0, \delta(z)) \), \( u(\Phi^0_\ell(x), z) = u^*(z) + \|x\|^2 \), that for any \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \), \( \det(\Phi^0_\ell(0)) = \det(\nabla^2_x u(x^*_\ell(z), z))^{-1/2} \) and \( \Phi^0_\ell(0) = x^*_\ell(z) \), we have

\[
|T^\text{in}_{\delta,z}(\varphi, z) - T^\text{in}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z)| = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \int_{B(0, \delta(z)/\varepsilon^{1/2})} \left| \varphi(\Phi^0_\ell(0)) \det(\Phi^0_\ell(0)) \right| \left( -\varphi(\Phi^0_\ell(\varepsilon^{1/2} x)) \right) \left| \det(\Phi^0_\ell(\varepsilon^{1/2} x)) \right| \exp[-\|x\|^2]dx/C_1,
\]

which concludes the first part of the proof upon combining this result and the dominated convergence theorem. Next assume that \( \varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \) and for any \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \), let \( \chi^\ell \colon B(0, \delta(z)) \to \mathbb{R} \) given for any \( x \in B(0, \delta(z)) \) by

\[
\chi^\ell(x) = \varphi(\Phi^0_\ell(x)) \det(\Phi^0_\ell(x))
\]

We have that for any \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \), \( \chi^\ell \in C^1(B(0, \delta)) \). Therefore, we have that for any \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \) and \( x \in B(0, \delta(z)) \) and \( h \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
d\chi(x)(h) = d\varphi(\Phi^0_\ell(x))d\Phi^0_\ell(x)(h) \det(d\Phi^0_\ell(x)) + \varphi(\Phi^0_\ell(x)) \text{Tr}(\text{Adj}(d\Phi^0_\ell(x))d^2\Phi^0_\ell(x)(h))
\]

Therefore, using Proposition B.3 we have that there exist \( C \geq 0 \) and \( \beta > 0 \) such that for any \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \) and \( x \in B(0, \delta(z)) \), \( \|d\chi(x)\| \leq C(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})\sigma^\beta_\delta(z) \). Using this result in (78) we get that

\[
|T^\text{in}_{\delta,z}(\varphi, z) - T^\text{in}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z)| \leq C\sigma^\beta_\delta(z)\varepsilon^{1/2}(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\| \exp[-\|x\|^2]dx/C_1,
\]

which concludes the proof of (75) upon combining this result, (77), and the fact that \( \exp[-t] \leq 1/t \) for any \( t > 0 \).

Next, we show that there exist \( c_1, \beta > 0 \) such that \( m(z) \geq c_1 \min(1/\sigma^\beta_\delta(z), c^*(z)) \) with \( c_1, \beta > 0 \) independent from \( z \). Since \( \lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} u(x, z) = +\infty \), there exists \( \tilde{x}(z) \) which minimizes \( x \mapsto u(x, z) \) on \( \mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{int}(z) \). We distinguish two cases. If \( \tilde{x}(z) \in \text{int}(z) \) then \( \tilde{x}(z) \) is a local minimizer of \( x \mapsto u(x, z) \). Hence \( m(z) \geq c^*(z) \). If \( \tilde{x}(z) \notin \mathbb{E} \setminus \text{int}(z) \) then \( \tilde{x}(z) \notin \text{V}(z) \), \( \tilde{x}(z) \notin \text{V}(z) \setminus \text{int}(z) \) and we have that \( m(z) = \delta(z)^2 \), which concludes the proof.

Finally using Lemma B.1, Lemma B.2 and Proposition B.4 we establish our main result.

**Proposition B.5. Assume H5.** Let \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) be a \( M_{1,\varphi} \)-Lipschitz function, \( M_{1,\varphi}, C_\varphi \geq 0 \) and \( z \in \mathbb{Z} \). Assume that \( \sigma^\beta_\delta(z) < +\infty \) and that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( |\varphi(x)| \leq C_\varphi \exp(C_\varphi \|x\|^n) \). Then, there exist \( B_2 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) and \( \beta > 0 \) such that

\[
|\delta \sigma_\varphi \varphi| - \delta S_0(\varphi) \leq B_2(C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + \sigma^\beta_\delta(z))(\epsilon^{1/2} + \epsilon^{-d/2} \exp(-c^* \delta(z)/\epsilon) \}
\]

with \( M_{0,\varphi} = \sup |\varphi(x)| : x \in K \), \( K \), \( B_2 \) and \( \beta \) independent from \( z \) and \( B_2 \) non-decreasing.

**Proof.** In this proof we assume that \( \varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \). The extension to Lipschitz function is similar to the proof of Theorem 3, see Section 4.1.3, i.e. we use the smoothing Lemma A.6. Let \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, m/(1 + C_\varphi)) \). First, let \( V(z) \) be given by Proposition B.4 and set \( K \) such that

\[
K = \{ x^k_0(z) : z \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \} + \tilde{B}(0, 1).
\]

Note that \( V(z) \subset K \). Applying Lemma B.1 there exists \( A_0 \geq 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in [0, \tilde{\varepsilon}] \),

\[
\mathcal{J}(\varepsilon) \geq A_0.
\]
In addition, using Lemma B.2 we have that there exist \( \beta_1 > 0 \) and \( A_1 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we have

\[
T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) \leq A_1(C_\varphi)\varepsilon^{-d/2}\{\exp[-m(z)/\varepsilon] + \exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon]\}. \tag{80}
\]

Using Proposition B.4 there exist \( c_1, \gamma > 0 \) (independent from \( z \)) such that \( m(z) \geq \min(c_1/\sigma^*_\gamma(z), c^*(z)) \). Hence, combining this result, (80) and the fact that there exists \( c_3 \) such that for any \( t > 0 \), \( \exp[-1/t] \leq c_3t^{(d+1)/2} \), we get

\[
T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) \leq A_1(C_\varphi)\varepsilon^{-d/2}\{\exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon] + (\sigma^*_\beta(z))^{d+1/2}\varepsilon^{(d+1)/2}/c_3 + \exp[-\beta_1/\varepsilon]\}. \tag{81}
\]

Therefore, there exist \( \beta' > 0 \) and \( A_2 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) (non-increasing) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we have

\[
|T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) - I_0(\varphi, z)| \leq A_2(C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})\{1 + \sigma^*_\beta_1(z)\}^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2}\exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon]. \tag{82}
\]

Note that \( M_{i,\varphi}(z) \leq M_{i,\varphi} \) for \( i \in \{0,1\} \). Hence, combining (81) and (82), there exist \( A_3 \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) \) (non-increasing) and \( \beta_0 > 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we have

\[
|T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) - I_0(\varphi, z)| \leq A_3(C_\varphi)(1 + M_{0,\varphi} + M_{1,\varphi})(1 + \sigma^*_\beta_1(z))^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2}\exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon]. \tag{83}
\]

Similar results hold if \( \varphi \) is replaced by 1 and we get that there exist \( A_4 \geq 0, \beta_1 > 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \) we have

\[
|T^\text{in}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) - I_0(\varphi, z)| \leq A_4\{1 + \sigma^*_\beta_1(z)\}^{1/2} + \varepsilon^{-d/2}\exp[-c^*(z)/\varepsilon]. \tag{84}
\]

In addition, we have that

\[
|\delta_2S_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \delta_2S_0(\varphi)| \leq \|T^\text{out}_\varepsilon(\varphi, z) - I_0(\varphi, z)\|/|J_\varepsilon(z)| + \|I_0(\varphi, z)(J_\varepsilon(z) - J_0(z))/|J_0(z)|J_\varepsilon(z)\|. \tag{85}
\]

Finally, we have that \( I_0(\varphi, z) \leq M_{0,\varphi}\sigma^*_1(z) \). Combining this result (79), (83) and (84) concludes the proof.

\[\square\]

### B.3 Control of the moments

In order to derive the uniform stability of the limiting measure, we first need to control the moments of \( \delta_{z:1:S_\varepsilon} \) uniformly in \( \varepsilon, z, n \). Let \( z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \). We consider the Langevin diffusion \((X^\varepsilon_t(z^{1:n}))_{t\geq0}\) given by the following Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE): \( X^\varepsilon_0(z^{1:n}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and

\[
dX^\varepsilon_t(z^{1:n}) = -\nabla_x U_n(X^\varepsilon_t(z^{1:n}), z^{1:n})dt + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon dB_t,
\]

where \( (B_t)_{t\geq0} \) is a \( d \)-dimensional Brownian motion with filtration \((\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq0}\). We recall that for any \( n \in \mathbb{N}, z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) we have \( U_n(x, z^{1:n}) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n u(x, z_i) \). Therefore, under \( \text{H}3(n) \) we have that \((X^\varepsilon_t(z^{1:n}))_{t\geq0}\) is well-defined and admits \( \delta_{z:1:S_\varepsilon} \) as an invariant measure, see [61] for instance.
Lemma B.6. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and assume \( H^3(n) \) and \( H^1(n) \). Let \( z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) and assume that \( \sigma^*_z(z^{1:n}) < +\infty \). Then there exist \( \bar{\varepsilon} > 0 \) such that for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists \( C_k \geq 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}) \)

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\|^{2k} S_c(z^{1:n}, dx) \leq C_k ,
\]

with \( C_k \) and \( \bar{\varepsilon} \) independent from \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( z^{1:n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \).

Proof. Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). First, since \( x \mapsto \nabla x U_n(x, z^{1:n}) \) is Lipschitz continuous we have that \( (X_t(z^{1:n})^n)_{t \geq 0} \) is well-defined and is a continuous semi-martingale using [45, Theorem 2.3, Theorem 2.4, Chapter 4] such that for any \( t \geq 0 \)

\[
X_t^z(z^{1:n}) = X_0^z(z^{1:n}) - \int_0^t \nabla x U_n(X_s^z(z^{1:n}), z^{1:n}) ds + \sqrt{2} B_t .
\]

Let \( m_0 > 0 \). Using Itô’s formula, see [45, Theorem 5.1] we have that for any \( t \geq 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( k \geq 2 \)

\[
\|X_t^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k} \exp[\|m_0 t\|] = X_0^z(z^{1:n}) + 2k \int_0^t (X_s^z(z^{1:n}), \nabla x U_n(X_s^z(z^{1:n}), z^{1:n}))) X_s^z(z^{1:n}) \|^{2(k-1)} \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds + m_0 \int_0^t \|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k} \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds + 4\varepsilon k (2k - 1) \int_0^t \|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2(k-1)} \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds + M_t^z(z^{1:n}) ,
\]

with \((M_t^z(z^{1:n}))_{t \geq 0} \) a \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-martingale such that \( M_0^z(z^{1:n}) = 0 \). First, using Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we have that for any \( t \geq 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \)

\[
E[\|X_t^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k} \exp[\|m_0 t\|] \leq X_0^z(z^{1:n}) + |2km - m_0| \int_0^t E[\|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k}] \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds + (4\varepsilon k (2k - 1) + 2kc)(1 + \int_0^t E[\|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k}] \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds) .
\]

Using Grönwall’s lemma we have that for any \( t \geq 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( E[\|X_t^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k}] < +\infty \). Hence, using this result, the Fubini theorem and \( H^3(n) \), we have that for any \( t \geq 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \)

\[
E[\|X_t^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k} \exp[\|m_0 t\|] \leq X_0^z(z^{1:n}) - (2km - m_0) \int_0^t E[\|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k}] \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds + (4\varepsilon k (2k - 1) + 2kc)(1 + \int_0^t E[\|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2(k-1)}] \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds) .
\]

Combining this result and the fact that for any \( t, a, b > 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( at^{2(k-1)} \leq bt^{2k} + a^k/b^{k-1} \), we have for any \( t \geq 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \)

\[
E[\|X_t^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k} \exp[\|m_0 t\|] \leq X_0^z(z^{1:n}) - (km - m_0) \int_0^t E[\|X_s^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k}] \exp[\|m_0 s\|] ds + (4\varepsilon k (2k - 1) + 2kc)(1 + (km - m_0)^{k-1}) \exp[\|m_0 t\|] .
\]

Therefore, for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists \( C_k \geq 0 \) such that for any \( t \geq 0 \), \( E[\|X_t^z(z^{1:n})\|^{2k}] \leq C_k \) upon letting \( m_0 = km \) in (85) with \( C_k \) independent from \( \varepsilon \) and \( z^{1:n} \). Therefore, using the sequence of distributions associated with \((X_t^z(z^{1:n}))_{t \geq 0} \) weakly converges towards \( \delta_{z^{1:n}} S_c \), see [61] for instance, and the monotone convergence theorem we get that \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\|^{2k} S_c(z^{1:n}, dx) \leq C_k \). We conclude upon using Proposition B.5 in the case where \( \varepsilon = 0 \). \( \blacksquare \)

Finally, we will make use of the following lemma.

Lemma B.7. Let \( \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists \( C_k \geq 0 \) such that \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\|^{2k} d\mu(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|x\|^{2k} d\nu(x) \leq C_k \). Then, for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) we have that \( W_2(\mu, \nu) \leq \sqrt{2C_k W_1(\mu, \nu)^{(k-1)/(2k-1)}} \).
Proof. Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \((X,Y)\) be the optimal coupling between \(\mu\) and \(\nu\) w.r.t. the Wasserstein distance of order one. Let \( Z = X - Y \). Using Hölder’s inequality we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[|Z|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Z|^{2k}]^{1/(2k-1)} \mathbb{E}[|Z|^{(2k-2)/(2k-1)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Z|^{2k}]^{1/(2k-1)} \mathbb{W}_1(\mu,\nu)^{(2k-2)/(2k-1)} .
\]

We conclude upon combining this result and the fact that \( \mathbb{E}[|Z|^{2k}]^{1/(2k-1)} \leq 2C_k \).

C Basics on flows and geometric measure theory

In this section, we recall basic facts from geometric measure theory. We refer to \([29, 54, 1]\) for a complete exposition of geometric measure theory concepts. We begin with a proposition establishing the existence of flows. Then, we prove useful facts on rectifiable sets. Finally, we state area and coarea formulas which are central to our analysis.

Lemma C.1. Let \( k \in \mathbb{N}^* \) and \( X \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \). Assume that \( X \) is compactly supported. Then, there exists a unique mapping \( \Phi \in C^{k+1,1}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \Phi(0,x) = x \) and \( \partial_x \Phi(s,\mathbb{R}^d) = X(\Phi(s,\mathbb{R}^d)) \). In addition, for any \( s \in \mathbb{R} \), \( x \mapsto \Phi(s,x) \) is a diffeomorphism.

Proof. The first part of the proposition is an application of \([49, \text{Theorem 2.5, Theorem 2.6}]\). The second part is an application of \([53, \text{Lemma 2.4}]\).

Note that the previous lemma can be extended to smooth manifolds.

Definition C.2. \([1, \text{Definition 2.57}]\) Let \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( k \leq d \). \( E \) is countably \( \mathcal{H}^k \)-rectifiable if there exists \( (\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) such that for any \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \psi_i : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^d \) is Lipschitz continuous and

\[
\mathcal{H}^k(E \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \psi_i(\mathbb{R}^k)) = 0 .
\]

In what follows, we provide an easy criterion to verify if a given level set is a countably \( \mathcal{H}^k \)-rectifiable set. We start by recalling the following proposition.

Proposition C.3. \([50, \text{Theorem 10.5}]\) Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( k \leq d \) and \( F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) be Lipschitz continuous. Then for \( \lambda \)-almost every \( y \in \mathbb{R}^k \), \( F^{-1}\{y\} \) is countably \( \mathcal{H}^{d-k} \)-rectifiable.

The following lemma ensures the stability of countably \( \mathcal{H}^k \)-rectifiable sets through diffeomorphisms.

Lemma C.4. Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( k \leq d \), \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) be a compact countably \( \mathcal{H}^k \)-rectifiable set and \( \Phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \) be a diffeomorphism. Then \( \Phi(E) \) is countably \( \mathcal{H}^k \)-rectifiable.

Proof. Since \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is countably \( \mathcal{H}^k \)-rectifiable there exists \( (\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) such that for any \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \psi_i : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^d \) is Lipschitz continuous and

\[
\mathcal{H}^k(E \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \psi_i(\mathbb{R}^k)) = 0 .
\]

Let \( y \in \Phi(E) \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\Phi \circ \psi_i)(\mathbb{R}^k) \). Then there exists \( x \in E \) such that \( y = \Phi(x) \) and for any \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( y_i \in \psi_i(\mathbb{R}^k) \), \( \Phi(x) \neq \Phi(y_i) \), i.e. \( x \neq y_i \). Therefore \( \Phi(E) \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\Phi \circ \psi_i)(\mathbb{R}^k) \subset \Phi(E \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \psi_i(\mathbb{R}^k)) \). \( \Phi \) is Lipschitz-continuous on \( E \) with constant \( L_E \geq 0 \) and therefore using \([1, \text{Proposition 2.49 (iv)}]\) we get

\[
0 \leq \mathcal{H}^k\left(\Phi(E) \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\Phi \circ \psi_i)(\mathbb{R}^k)\right) \leq L_E^k \mathcal{H}^k\left(E \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \psi_i(\mathbb{R}^k)\right) \leq 0 ,
\]

which concludes the proof.
Finally, we show that if a function is regular enough then its level-sets are countably $\mathcal{H}^k$-rectifiable.

**Lemma C.5.** Let $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ with $d \geq p$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ compact such that $F^{-1}(A)$ is compact and $0 \in \text{int}(A)$. In addition, assume that for any $x \in F^{-1}(\{0\})$, $|JF(x)| > 0$. Then, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for any $t \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$, $F^{-1}(t)$ is countably $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}$-rectifiable and $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(t)) < +\infty$.

**Proof.** In this proof, we show that the level sets $F^{-1}(t)$ and $F^{-1}(s)$ are diffeomorphic for $t, s \in B(0, \eta)$. Then, we conclude upon combining Proposition C.3 and Lemma C.4. First, note that $F^{-1}(0)$ is compact since it is closed in $F^{-1}(A)$ which is compact. There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(B_\infty(0, \eta_0))$, $|JF(x)| > 0$. Indeed, if this is not the case then there exists $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{k \to +\infty} F(x_k) = 0$ and $|JF(x_k)| = 0$. Since $0 \in \text{int}(A)$ there exists $\eta' > 0$ such that $F^{-1}(B(0, \eta'))$ is compact and therefore there exists $x^*$ such that, up to extraction, $\lim_{k \to +\infty} x_k = x^*$. Then $F(x^*) = 0$ and $|JF(x^*)| = 0$, which is absurd. We define $K_0 = F^{-1}(B_\infty(0, \eta_0))$ and $K_1 = F^{-1}(B_\infty(0, \eta))$ with $\eta = \min(\eta_0/2, \eta')$. Note that $K_1 \subset \text{int}(K_0)$.

Let $G(x) = DF(x)DF(x)^T$. Note that for any $x \in K_0$, $G(x)$ is invertible. We define $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^p$ such that for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with for any $x \in K_0$ $f_i(x) = \sum_{k=1}^p h_{i,k}(x)\nabla F_k(x)$, with $\{h_{i,j}(x)\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} = G^{-1}(x)$. In addition, we assume that $f_i(x) = 0$ for any $x \notin K_1$. For any $x \in K_1$ and $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ we have $$\langle f_i(x), \nabla F_j(x) \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^p h_{i,k}(x)\langle \nabla F_k(x), \nabla F_j(x) \rangle = \delta_{i,j}.$$ In what follows, we let $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^p$ such that for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $g_i \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for any $x \in K_1$, $g_i(x) = f_i(x)$ and for any $x \notin \text{int}(K_1)$, $g_i(x) = 0$, such functions exist using Whitney extension theorem for instance, see [69]. In what follows, we fix $t = (t_0, \ldots, t_p) \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$. For any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ let $\Phi_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ given by $\Phi_i(0, \cdot) = \text{Id}$ and for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ $\partial_s\Phi_i(s, x) = -g_i(\Phi_i(s, x))$. For any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $\Phi_i$ is well-defined using Lemma C.1. Therefore, we have for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\Phi_i(s, x) \in K_1$ $\partial_s F(\Phi_i(s, x)) = -\langle g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)), \nabla F_i(\Phi_i(s, x)) \rangle, \ldots, \langle g_i(\Phi_i(s, x)), \nabla F_p(\Phi_i(s, x)) \rangle = -e_i,$ where we recall that $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^p$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^p$. We define $\tilde{\Phi}_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\tilde{\Phi}_1(x) = x^{(p)}$ with $x^{(0)} = x$ and for any $i \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$, $x^{(i+1)} = \Phi_{i+1}(t_{i+1}, x^{(i)})$. Note that $\tilde{\Phi}_1 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ is a diffeomorphism using Lemma C.1. Using Proposition C.3, there exists $t_0 \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ such that $F^{-1}(t_0)$ is countably $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}$ rectifiable. Let $s \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$. Using Lemma C.4 and that $\tilde{\Phi}_{-s} \circ \tilde{\Phi}_{t_0}$ is a diffeomorphism between $F^{-1}(t_0)$ and $F^{-1}(s)$ we get that $F^{-1}(s)$ is countably $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}$ rectifiable, which concludes the first part of the proof.

For the second part of the proof, we let $R \geq 0$ such that $F^{-1}(A) \subset B(0, R)$. Since $\bar{B}(0, R)$ is $\mathcal{H}^{d}$-rectifiable we obtain using the coarea formula Theorem C.6 $$\int_{B(0,R)} |JF(x)| \, dx = \int_{B_\infty(0,R)} \mathcal{H}^{d-p}(\bar{B}(0,R) \cap F^{-1}(t)) \, dt \geq \int_{B_\infty(0,\eta)} \mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(t)) \, dt.$$ Therefore, there exists $t_0 \in B_\infty(0, \eta)$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(t_0)) < +\infty$. Let $\Psi = \Phi_{-s} \circ \tilde{\Phi}_{t_0}$ and $L \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in F^{-1}(t_0)$ we have $|d\Psi(x)| \leq L$. Then, using [1, Proposition 2.49 (iv)] we have $\mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(t)) = \mathcal{H}^{d-p}(\Psi(F^{-1}(t_0))) \leq L^{d-p} \mathcal{H}^{d-p}(F^{-1}(t_0)) < +\infty$, 
which concludes the proof.

We conclude this section with the area and coarea formulae.

**Theorem C.6.** Let $F : C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ be Lipschitz continuous, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq d$ and $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a countably $\mathcal{H}^k$-rectifiable set. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ measurable such that

$$\int_E |\varphi(x)| JF(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(x) < +\infty,$$

or assume that $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, +\infty)$. Then, the following hold:

- **(Area formula)** If $d \leq p$ then
  $$\int_E \varphi(x) JF(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \left( \int_{E \cap F^{-1}(y)} \varphi(x) d\mathcal{H}^0(x) \right) d\mathcal{H}^k(y).$$

- **(Coarea formula)** If $k \geq p$ then
  $$\int_E \varphi(x) JF(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \left( \int_{E \cap F^{-1}(y)} \varphi(x) d\mathcal{H}^{k-p}(x) \right) d\mathcal{H}^p(y).$$

**Proof.** These results follow from [1, Theorem 2.91, Theorem 2.93] combined with [1, Exercise 2.12].

In particular, note that if $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a Lipschitz diffeomorphism we have using Theorem C.6 that for any $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ measurable such that

$$\int_E |\varphi(x)| |J\Phi(x)| d\mathcal{H}^k(x) < +\infty,$$

the following change of variable formula with respect to $\mathcal{H}^k$ holds

$$\int_E \varphi(x) JF(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{E \cap F^{-1}(y)} \varphi(x) d\mathcal{H}^0(x) \right) d\mathcal{H}^k(y) = \int_{F(E)} \varphi(F^{-1}(y)) d\mathcal{H}^k(y). \quad (86)$$

Note that in order for (86) to hold, $E$ needs to be countably $\mathcal{H}^k$-rectifiable.