

APPROXIMATION TO STOCHASTIC VARIANCE REDUCED GRADIENT LANGEVIN DYNAMICS BY STOCHASTIC DELAY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

PENG CHEN

1. *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology
University of Macau Av. Padre Tomás Pereira, Taipa Macau, China*

2. *UMacau Zhuhai Research Institute, Zhuhai, China
yb77430@connect.um.edu.mo*

JIANYA LU

1. *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology
University of Macau Av. Padre Tomás Pereira, Taipa Macau, China*

2. *UMacau Zhuhai Research Institute, Zhuhai, China
yb87454@connect.um.edu.mo*

LIHU XU ¹

1. *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology
University of Macau Av. Padre Tomás Pereira, Taipa Macau, China*

2. *UMacau Zhuhai Research Institute, Zhuhai, China
lihuxu@um.edu.mo*

ABSTRACT. We study in this paper weak approximations in Wasserstein-1 distance to stochastic variance reduced gradient Langevin dynamics by stochastic delay differential equations, and obtain uniform error bounds. Our approach is via Malliavin calculus and a refined Lindeberg principle.

Key words: stochastic variance reduced gradient Langevin dynamics (SVRG-LD), stochastic delay differential equations (SDDEs), Malliavin calculus, Refined Lindeberg principle, Wasserstein-1 distance.

MSC2020: 60H07, 60H10, 60H30, 90C59

1. INTRODUCTION

A large body of optimization problems can be formulated as follows: Let ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n be a sequence of functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} , the goal is to find an approximate solution of the following optimization problem

$$(1.1) \quad \omega^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d} P(\omega), \quad P(\omega) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\omega).$$

In order to fast search the minimizer ω^* , [21, Algorithm 2] puts forward the stochastic variance reduced gradient Langevin dynamics (SVRG-LD) algorithm as the following: for an $\eta > 0$ as the step size, an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ as an epoch length, a $B \in \mathbb{N}$ as the size of mini-batch, and an inverse temperature parameter $\delta > 0$,

- (1) let the initial value be $\tilde{\omega}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,
- (2) for $l = 0, 1, \dots$,

¹* Corresponding author

(i) we update the internal iteration as follows:

$$\omega_{l,0} = \tilde{\omega}_l, \quad \tilde{\mu}_l = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla \psi_i(\tilde{\omega}_l),$$

for $t = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\omega_{l,t} = \omega_{l,t-1} - \eta \left(\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i_t \in \mathbf{I}_{l,t}} (\nabla \psi_{i_t}(\omega_{l,t-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_t}(\tilde{\omega}_l)) + \tilde{\mu}_l \right) + \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_{l,t},$$

where $\mathbf{I}_{l,t}$ is a subset of size B randomly drawn from $\{1, \dots, n\}$, $W_{l,t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d \times d})$ and $\mathcal{N}(0, I_{d \times d})$ is the d -dimensional normal distribution with mean 0 and covariance matrix $I_{d \times d}$, where $I_{d \times d}$ is a $d \times d$ identity matrix,

(ii) $\tilde{\omega}_{l+1} = \omega_{l,m}$,

(3) the outcomes are $\tilde{\omega}_0, \tilde{\omega}_1, \dots, \dots$

In particular, as $\delta = 0$ and $B = 1$, SVRG-LD turns to be the stochastic variance reduction gradient descent (SVRG) algorithm in [37]. The step size η is often called learning rate. We call the procedures (i) and (ii) in (2) as internal iteration, and the those of obtaining $(\tilde{\omega}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ as external iteration.

We study in this paper the approximation of SVRG-LD by stochastic differential delay equations (SDDEs) in Wasserstein-1 distance, and understand the algorithm from the point of view of continuous stochastic dynamics.

1.1. Literature review. Stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics (SGLD) model was put forward in [58], and has been extensively applied to study optimization problems arising in lots of research problems, see [15, 65, 53, 43]. However, using SGLD often comes at a cost of high variance and thus leads to a slow convergence. Borrowing the variance reduction techniques developed for stochastic gradient descent (SGD) algorithms, Dubey et al. [21] proposed an SVRG-LD algorithm.

The weak approximations in most of the aforementioned literatures are defined in the following way: given a family \mathcal{H} of test functions with high order derivatives and a certain growth condition, the approximation error is defined as

$$(1.2) \quad \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |\mathbb{E}h(\omega_{n\eta}) - \mathbb{E}h(X_{n\eta})|,$$

where $\omega_{n\eta}$ is the stochastic algorithm at the n -th iteration, $X_{n\eta}$ is the continuous dynamics at the time $n\eta$, and η is the step size of the algorithm. As $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\eta \rightarrow 0$, the bounds obtained in these literatures tends to 0. It is not easily seen that the error defined in (1.2) implies an error in a Wasserstein type metric. Note that Wasserstein-1 (W1) and Wasserstein-2 (W2) distances often play a crucial role in approximations arising in machine learning and probability measure samplings, and are connected to many important research fields [42, 48, 61, 7]. Although [44] gave a bound for the error between SGD and stochastic differential equations (SDEs) in a so-called smoothed Wasserstein distance, it seems to us that smoothed Wasserstein distances have not been widely applied in research.

The works [9, 24, 23, 28], arising from the Langevin dynamics samplings or diffusion approximations, have a nature similar to ours. Due to the distribution sampling motivation, the SDEs in [9, 24, 23] are a reversible gradient system, i.e. the drift is the gradient of a potential U , thus the equilibrium measure is known in advance and has a density proportion to e^{-U} . Under certain conditions on the drift, they proved non-asymptotic bounds for total variation or W2 distance between the equilibrium measure and the ergodic measure of the EM scheme of Langevin dynamics, their analysis heavily depends on the gradient form of the drift, and is not easily seen to be extended to a non-gradient system. Our SDDE is not

a gradient system in that the system has a delay and that the diffusion term depends on the state rather than a constant. [28] is concerning estimating the error between the ergodic measures of an SDE and its EM scheme, the approach does not work for our problem since it is especially designed for bounding the errors between ergodic measures. We refer the reader to [4, 5, 10] for the study of SDDEs.

1.2. Our motivations, contributions and methods. It was recently discovered in [44, 43, 29, 31, 55, 36, 27, 60, 30, 14] that SGD algorithms can be (weakly) approximated by continuous time SDEs. These SDEs often offer much needed insight to the algorithms under considerations, for instance, the continuous time treatment allows applications of stochastic control theory to develop novel adaptive algorithms [64, 66]. It is natural to consider the continuous time approximation problem of SVRG-LD, and understand the algorithm from the point of view of continuous stochastic dynamics.

Our approximation result establishes a connection between SVRG-LD and SDDE, we know from the theory of SDDE if the diffusion term has a delay, a dissipation will be produced to reduce the fluctuation from Brownian motion, see [54] for instance. This provides an intuitive interpretation why SVRG and SVRG-LD can reduce variances. As is shown in Appendix D, when K in Assumption 1.4 and δ in the SDDE (2.7) below both are small enough, the distribution of the solution of the SDDE (2.7) below is close to the minimizer ω^* . This gives another motivation to understand the SVRG-LD and SVRG from SDDE.

Under the assumptions which hold true for a large family of nonconvex minimization problems, our main result Theorem 2.5 provides an error bound for the approximation which is uniform with respect to external iteration length s and the internal iteration length m , from which we can see that the approximation error tends to 0 as long as the step size η tends to 0, see Corollary 2.6 and 2.7. Combining this with the exponential convergence result in [21], we know that our approximating SDDE will be close to the minimizer ω^* exponentially fast.

Our approach to proving our main results is via a refined Lindeberg principle developed in [14] and Malliavin calculus, it seems that this method has not been reported in the study of stochastic algorithms. The classical Lindeberg principle provides an elegant way to prove the normal CLT, and has been applied to many other research topics, see [16, 13, 56, 11, 17, 45, 38]. Although Malliavin calculus has been extensively applied to statistical simulation problems such as Langevin dynamics samplings, see [47, 32, 51, 8, 28, 33, 18]. It seems to us that our paper is the first one to apply Malliavin calculus to study stochastic algorithms approximation problems.

In order to use the refined Lindeberg principle and Bismut's version of Malliavin calculus mentioned above, we need to overcome several difficulties due to the memory property of SVRG-LD and SDDE. Whereas the iteration sequence of SGD is a Markov chain, that of SVRG-LD is not Markovian due to the memory in each internal iteration (see (2).(i) in SVRG-LD algorithm above). The approximation methods developed for SGD is therefore not applicable. Based on the special structure of SVRG-LD, we divide the algorithm into local patches which are internal iterations, each patch is a Markov chain, while all of these patches can be viewed as a function valued Markov chain. It is well known that an SDDE system is not Markovian, whence many stochastic analysis methods such as Fokker-Planck equation are not available. Similar as analyzing SVRG-LD, we split the approximating SDDE into local patches, each patch being a Markov process and all of them forming a function-valued Markov process. Malliavin calculus is applied to the Markov dynamics in patches.

1.3. Our Assumptions. For the convenience of analysis, we will consider the case of $B = 1$ from now on.

Let I be a uniformly distributed random variable valued on $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(I = i) = \frac{1}{n}, \quad i \in [n].$$

The Euclidean norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the inner product of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are denoted by $|x|$ and $\langle x, y \rangle$, respectively. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|x - y|$ is naturally the Euclidean distance between x and y . Under the assumptions 1.1 and 1.4 below, [59] gave the analysis of convergence of SVRG-LD.

Assumption 1.1. (Smoothness) *The function $\psi_i(x)$ is L -smooth for $L > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, i.e.,*

$$|\nabla\psi_i(x) - \nabla\psi_i(y)| \leq L|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The assumption above can be relaxed to the following assumption:

Assumption 1.2. *Let I be a uniformly distributed random variable valued on $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbb{E} [|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4] \leq L^4|x - y|^4.$$

Remark 1.3. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Assumption 1.2 immediately implies that $P(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(x)$ is also L -smooth, i.e.,

$$(1.4) \quad |\nabla P(x) - \nabla P(y)| \leq L|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

which further implies

$$(1.5) \quad |\nabla P(x)| \leq |\nabla P(0)| + L|x|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Assumption 1.4. (Dissipative) *There exist constants $\gamma, K \geq 0$, such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\langle \nabla P(x), x \rangle \geq \gamma|x|^2 - K.$$

Assumption 1.4 is usually replaced by the following condition, which is slightly stronger than Assumption 1.4.

Assumption 1.5. *There exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $K \geq 0$, such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$(1.6) \quad \langle x - y, \nabla P(x) - \nabla P(y) \rangle \geq \gamma|x - y|^2 - K, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

1.4. Notations. Each time we speak about Lipschitz functions on \mathbb{R}^d , we use the Euclidean norm. $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the collection of all continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ with $k \geq 1$ denotes the collection of all k -th order continuously differentiable functions. $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of smooth functions that vanish at infinity. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $v, v_1, v_2, v_3, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the directional derivative $\nabla_v f(x)$, $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)$ and $\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_v f(x) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x + \varepsilon v) - f(x)}{\varepsilon}, \\ \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla_{v_1} f(x + \varepsilon v_2) - \nabla_{v_1} f(x)}{\varepsilon}, \\ \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x + \varepsilon v_3) - \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)}{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Let $\nabla f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\nabla^2 f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ denote the gradient and the Hessian of f , respectively. It is known that $\nabla_v f(x) = \langle \nabla f(x), v \rangle$ and $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) = \langle \nabla^2 f(x), v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}$,

where T is the transpose operator and $\langle A, B \rangle_{\text{HS}} := \sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij} B_{ij}$ for $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. We define the operator norm of $\nabla^2 f(x)$ by

$$\|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{|v_1|, |v_2|=1} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)|$$

and

$$\|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{op}, \infty} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\text{op}}.$$

We often drop the subscript "op" in the definitions above and simply write $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\| = \|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\text{op}}$ and $\|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\infty} = \|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\text{op}, \infty}$ if no confusions arise. Similarly we define

$$\|\nabla^3 f(x)\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{|v_i|=1, i=1,2,3} |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)|$$

and $\|\nabla^3 f\|_{\text{op}, \infty}$ and the short-hand notations $\|\nabla^3 f(x)\|$ and $\|\nabla^3 f\|_{\infty}$.

Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, its Hilbert-Schmidt norm is $\|A\|_{\text{HS}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij}^2} = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^T A)}$ and its operator norm is $\|A\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{|v|=1} |Av|$. We have the following relations:

$$(1.7) \quad \|A\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{|v_1|, |v_2|=1} |\langle A, v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}|, \quad \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|A\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \sqrt{d} \|A\|_{\text{op}}.$$

We can also define $\nabla_v f(x)$, $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)$ and $\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)$ for a third-order differentiable function $f = (f_1, \dots, f_d)^T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ in the same way as above. Define $\nabla f(x) = (\nabla f_1(x), \dots, \nabla f_d(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\nabla^2 f(x) = \{\nabla^2 f_i(x)\}_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d \times d}$ and $\nabla^3 f(x) = \{\nabla^3 f_i(x)\}_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d \times d \times d}$. In this case, we have $\nabla_v f(x) = [\nabla f(x)]^T v$,

$$\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) = \{\langle \nabla^2 f_1(x), v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}, \dots, \langle \nabla^2 f_d(x), v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}\}^T,$$

$$\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) = \{\langle \langle \nabla^3 f_1(x), v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}, v_3 \rangle, \dots, \langle \langle \nabla^3 f_d(x), v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}, v_3 \rangle\}^T,$$

here, for any tensor $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d \times d}$, $\langle \langle A, v_1 v_2^T \rangle_{\text{HS}}, v_3 \rangle = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^d A_{ijk} v_1^{(i)} v_2^{(j)} v_3^{(k)}$ with $v_l^{(i)}$ is the i -th component of the vector v_l , $l = 1, 2, 3$.

Inductively, for $M \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ and $v, v_1, v_2, v_3, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the directional derivative $\nabla_v M(x)$, $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} M(x)$ and $\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} M(x)$ are defined by

$$\nabla_v M(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{M(x + \epsilon v) - M(x)}{\epsilon},$$

$$\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} M(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla_{v_1} M(x + \epsilon v_2) - \nabla_{v_1} M(x)}{\epsilon}$$

and

$$\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} M(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} M(x + \epsilon v_3) - \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} M(x)}{\epsilon},$$

respectively. For a more thorough discussion on the norms and the derivatives, we refer the reader to [20, Chapters V and VIII], [22, Chapter 5] and the references therein.

For any $x \geq 0$, let $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denote the largest integer which is less than x . The symbols C_\cdot denote positive numbers depending on subscripts \cdot and their values may vary from line to line. In addition, we have the convention that $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$.

The paper is organized as following. Our main results and applications are stated in Section 2. In Section 3, we provide some preliminary lemmas and the proof of our main result. We conclude the paper in Section 4. The proofs of example in Section 2 are given in Appendix A, and the proof of the crucial lemma in Section 3 is deferred to Appendix B. In

Appendix C, we give the proof of the key preliminary lemma using Malliavian calculus that can be read independently.

2. MOTIVATION AND MAIN RESULT

On the basis of Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and Assumption 2.1 below, we establish our main results, Theorem 2.5, Corollary 2.6 and Corollary 2.7, about approximating the SVRG-LD by SDDE which are uniform with respect to s and the internal iteration length m . From Corollary 2.6, we can see that the approximation error tends to 0 as long as the temperature parameter δ takes $\delta = C|\ln \eta|^{-1}$ and η tends to 0. From Corollary 2.7, the approximation error tends to 0 when $K \leq \delta$. Combining this with the exponential convergence result in [21], we know that our approximating SDDE will be close to the minimizer ω^* exponentially fast. Furthermore, we can clearly see the variance reduction effect of the SVRG-LD from the analysis of the SDDE below.

In the above SVRG-LD algorithm, if we take $k = ml + t$ and denote $\omega_k = \omega_{l,t}$, it is easy to check that the iteration in the algorithm can be represented as the following difference equation:

$$(2.1) \quad \omega_0 = \tilde{\omega}_0, \\ \omega_k = \omega_{k-1} - \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) + \nabla P(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) \right] + \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k, \quad k \geq 1,$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lceil x \rceil$ is the largest integer which is strictly less than x . Its output is

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{\omega}_s = \omega_{ms}, \quad s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

In order to compare (2.1) with an SDDE, we rewrite it as

$$(2.3) \quad \omega_k = \omega_{k-1} - \eta \nabla P(\omega_{k-1}) + \sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta, \delta}(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}, i_k, W_k),$$

where

$$V_{\eta, \delta}(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}, i_k, W_k) \\ = -\sqrt{\eta} \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) - \nabla P(\omega_{k-1}) + \nabla P(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) \right] + \sqrt{\delta} W_k.$$

Note that i_k is randomly chosen from $[n]$ and independent of each other. Denote by I a uniformly distributed random variable valued on the set $[n]$. Moreover, W_k is also independent of each other, and it is independent of i_k . A straightforward calculation yields

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbb{E} [V_{\eta, \delta}(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}, i_k, W_k) | \omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}] = 0,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \text{Cov} [V_{\eta, \delta}(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}, i_k, W_k) | \omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}] = \eta \Sigma(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) + \delta I_d,$$

where

$$\Sigma(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) \\ = \mathbb{E}_I \left[(\nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m})) (\nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}))^T \right] \\ - \mathbb{E}_I \left[\nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) \right] \left(\mathbb{E}_I \left[\nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) \right] \right)^T.$$

By Assumption 1.2, we further get

$$(2.6) \quad \eta \text{tr} \left(\Sigma(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) \right) \\ = \eta \mathbb{E} \left[|\nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m})|^2 | \omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m} \right] - \eta |\nabla P(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla P(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m})|^2$$

$$\leq \eta \mathbb{E}_I \left(|\nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m})|^2 \right) \leq L^2 \eta |\omega_{k-1} - \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}|^2.$$

Because the renewal of ω_k not only depends on ω_{k-1} but also on $\omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}$, it is clear that $\{\omega_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is not a Markov chain. Alternatively, if we take the m -tuple $\bar{\omega}_i = \{\omega_{im}, \omega_{im+1}, \dots, \omega_{im+m-1}\}$ with $i \geq 0$ as one element, then $\{\bar{\omega}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain. This has a nature that is very similar to an SDDE, and inspires us to consider the following SDDE:

$$(2.7) \quad dX_t = -\nabla P(X_t)dt + \sqrt{\eta} Q_{\eta, \delta}(X_t, X_{\lceil \frac{t}{m\eta} \rceil m\eta})dB_t,$$

where

$$Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y) = \left(\Sigma(x, y) + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$$

is a positive definite matrix for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and B_t is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. The Euler-Maruyama discretization with a step-size η to (2.7) reads as

$$\hat{X}_k = \hat{X}_{k-1} - \eta \nabla P(\hat{X}_{k-1}) + \eta Q_{\eta, \delta}(\hat{X}_{k-1}, \hat{X}_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) Z_{k-1},$$

where Z_{k-1} is a sequence of d -dimensional i.i.d. standard normally distributed random vectors. We denote

$$(2.8) \quad \tilde{X}_s = X_{sm\eta}, \quad s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

We know from Assumption 1.2 that ∇P is Lipschitz, it is natural to assume that the higher order derivatives of P is uniformly bounded. On the other hand, (2.6) implies that

$$(2.9) \quad \|Q_{\eta, \delta}(\omega_{k-1}, \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m})\|_{\text{HS}} \leq L |\omega_{k-1} - \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}| + \sqrt{\frac{\delta d}{\eta}}.$$

We see that Q has linear growth. Based on the analysis above, in order to bound the distributions between the SDDE and the SVRG-LD, we further assume that

Assumption 2.1. *There exist constants $A_i \geq 0$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., $|v_i| = 1$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, ∇P satisfies*

$$|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \leq A_1, \quad |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \leq A_2;$$

and that any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $Q_{\eta, \delta}$ satisfies

$$(2.10) \quad \|\nabla_{1, v_1} Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_3, \quad \|\nabla_{2, v_1} Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_3,$$

$$\|\nabla_{1, v_1} \nabla_{1, v_2} Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_4, \quad \|\nabla_{1, v_1} \nabla_{1, v_2} \nabla_{1, v_3} Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_5,$$

where $\nabla_{1, v}$ is the partial derivative acting on x along the direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e.,

$$\nabla_{1, v} Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{Q_{\eta, \delta}(x + \varepsilon v, y) - Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y)}{\varepsilon}$$

and $\nabla_{2, v}$ is the partial derivative acting on y along the direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, similarly defined as above.

In addition, from Assumption 1.2, it is easy to verify that

$$|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \leq L |v_1|.$$

Under the Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1, there exists a unique solution to the SDDE (2.7) and (2.7) has a unique invariant measure when $K = 0$ (see, e.g., [46, 10, 4, 5, 3]). From now on, we simply write a number C_{A_1, \dots, A_5} , depending on A_1, \dots, A_5 , by C_A in shorthand.

In the following two examples, inspired from the law of large numbers, we will show that the Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1 holds with high probability in Appendix A. Note that in

practice one only verifies that the designs of statistical models holds with a high probability, see [63] for lasso models and [14] for logistic regression models.

Example 2.2. (Alternate Model in [44, Section 5.1]). Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be a symmetric, positive definite matrix, we diagonalize it in the form $H = \tilde{Q}D\tilde{Q}^T$, where \tilde{Q} is an orthogonal matrix and D is a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. Given a sequence of n samples a_1, \dots, a_n , where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a sequence of random vectors independently drawn from a standard normally distributed random vector, that is, $a_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We then define the loss function

$$\psi_i(\omega) := \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{Q}^T \omega)^T [D + \text{diag}(a_i)](\tilde{Q}^T \omega),$$

where $\text{diag}(a_i)$ is a diagonal matrix, whose diagonal elements are each component of the vector a_i . Therefore, the SVRG-LD iterates in (2.1) become,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_k &= \omega_{k-1} - \eta \left[\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_{i_k})]\tilde{Q}^T(\omega_{k-1} - \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m} \right] \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\eta\delta} W_k, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\nabla P(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T x = Hx + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T x$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(x, y) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x - y) \right) \left(\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x - y) \right)^T \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x - y) \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x - y) \right)^T. \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.3. (Penalized Logistic regression). In machine learning, one of the most popular generalized linear model is the penalized logistic regression for binary classification problem. Given a sequence of n samples $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)$, where a_i is a sequence of i.i.d. random vectors and the binary response $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is generated by the following probabilistic model,

$$\mathbb{P}(b_i = 1 | a_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T \omega^*}}, \quad \mathbb{P}(b_i = 0 | a_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{a_i^T \omega^*}}.$$

The corresponding loss function at ω is

$$\psi_i(\omega) := -[b_i a_i^T \omega - \ln(1 + e^{a_i^T \omega})] + \frac{\lambda}{2} \omega^T \omega,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the tuning parameter (see, e.g., [35, (4.20) and (18.11)]). Therefore, the SVRG-LD iterates in (2.1) become,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_k &= \omega_{k-1} - \eta \left[a_{i_k} \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_{i_k}^T \omega_{k-1}}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_{i_k}^T \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T \omega_{\lceil \frac{k}{m} \rceil m}} - b_i \right) + \lambda \omega_{k-1} \right] + \sqrt{\eta\delta} W_k, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\nabla P(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - b_i \right) + \lambda x$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(x, y) = & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right) \left(a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right)^T \right] \\ & - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right)^T. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.4. In Example 2.2, when n is large enough, with high probability, we can calculate the matrix $Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y)$ directly. However, to the best of our knowledge, for any positive definite matrix $\hat{\Sigma}(x)$, it is very difficult to calculate the derivative of $\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. With the help of [19], we give a way to estimate the constants A_3, A_4 and A_5 in Assumption 2.1, which depend on η and δ . Moreover, when $\eta \leq \delta$, A_3, A_4 and A_5 are always bounded. For simplicity, we assume that $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $\eta \leq \delta$ throughout the paper.

Recall that W_1 distance between two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 is defined as

$$(2.11) \quad W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathbb{E}|X - Y|,$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the set of all the coupling realizations of μ_1, μ_2 . By a duality,

$$W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mu_1(h) - \mu_2(h)|,$$

where $\text{Lip}(1) = \{h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; |h(y) - h(x)| \leq |y - x|\}$ and

$$\mu_i(h) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x) \mu_i(dx), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The main result of this paper is the following theorem, which provides an approximation error between the distributions of $\tilde{\omega}_s$ and \tilde{X}_s .

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that the Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1 hold. Choosing $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $\eta \leq \min\{\delta, (\frac{\gamma}{432L^4})^{\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{\gamma}{96L^2}, (\frac{\gamma}{576L^3})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\gamma}{8L^2}, \frac{\gamma\delta}{2A_3}\}$. Then, for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $\lambda := \frac{\gamma}{4} \exp\{-\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta}\} > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & W_1 \left(\mathcal{L} \left(\tilde{X}_s \right), \mathcal{L} \left(\tilde{\omega}_s \right) \right) \\ & \leq C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} \frac{1}{1-a} \left(\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + \frac{1+K^2}{1-\rho} \right)^{\frac{7}{4}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2} e^\lambda \right) (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a = e^{\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta} - \lambda m \eta} < 1$, $\rho = (1 - \gamma\eta)^m + \frac{1}{2} < 1$ (when m is large enough).

Corollary 2.6. *Keep the same assumptions and notations as Theorem 2.5. In addition, suppose $\delta = \frac{8K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma} |\ln \eta|^{-1}$ and $m = \eta^{\frac{5}{4} + \varepsilon}$ for any positive ε , then we have*

$$W_1 \left(\mathcal{L} \left(\tilde{X}_s \right), \mathcal{L} \left(\tilde{\omega}_s \right) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0.$$

Corollary 2.7. *Keep the same assumptions and notations as Theorem 2.5. In addition, suppose $K \leq \delta$, then we have*

$$W_1 \left(\mathcal{L} \left(\tilde{X}_s \right), \mathcal{L} \left(\tilde{\omega}_s \right) \right)$$

$$\leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1 - e^{-\frac{7}{4}m\eta})^{-1}(\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + \frac{1}{1-\rho})^{\frac{7}{4}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right) (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

the error bound tends to 0 as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ and $m\eta = O(1)$.

Remark 2.8. When K in Assumption 1.4 and δ in the SDDE (2.7) both are small enough, the distribution of the solution \tilde{X}_s of the SDDE (2.7) is close to the minimizer ω^* as $s \rightarrow \infty$, see Appendix D below, this gives another motivation to understand the SVRG-LD and SVRG by SDDE.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5

The strategy of proving Theorem 2.5 is divided into two steps. The first step uses a refined Lindeberg principle and Malliavin calculus to prove an approximation error bound for the internal Markov chains $\{\omega_k\}_{ms \leq k \leq m(s+1)}$ and $\{X_t\}_{ms\eta \leq t \leq m(s+1)\eta}$ in Subsection 3.1, whereas the second step only uses the refined Lindeberg principle to approximate the external Markov chain $\{\tilde{\omega}_s\}_{s \geq 0}$ by $\{\tilde{X}_{s\eta}\}_{s \geq 0}$ in Subsection 3.2.

3.1. Approximation of internal Markov chain.

Lemma 3.1. *Both $(\tilde{\omega}_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ and $(\tilde{X}_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ are Markov chains.*

Proof. The proof is standard. For an $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, given $\tilde{\omega}_s$ (i.e. ω_{sm}), by (2.1) we know that the distribution of $\tilde{\omega}_{s+1}$ (i.e. $\omega_{(s+1)m}$) is uniquely determined by $\tilde{\omega}_s$ and the i.i.d. random variables $i_{sm+1}, \dots, i_{s(m+1)}$, whence

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\omega}_{s+1} \in A | \tilde{\omega}_s, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_0) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\omega}_{s+1} \in A | \tilde{\omega}_s), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

So $(\tilde{\omega}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain.

Similarly, given \tilde{X}_s (i.e. $X_{sm\eta}$), by (2.7), the distribution of \tilde{X}_{s+1} is determined by \tilde{X}_s and $(B_t)_{sm\eta \leq t \leq (s+1)m\eta}$, from which we know

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_{s+1}\eta \in A | \tilde{X}_s, \dots, \tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_{s+1} \in A | \tilde{X}_s), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

so $(\tilde{X}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain. \square

It is easy to see that an internal iteration of SVRG-LD $\{\omega_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq m}$ is a time homogeneous Markov chain with states on \mathbb{R}^d , while the SDDE (2.7) restricted on the time period $[0, m\eta]$ reads as

$$(3.1) \quad dX_t = -\nabla P(X_t)dt + \sqrt{\eta}Q_{\eta,\delta}(X_t, X_0)dB_t \quad \text{for } t \in [0, m\eta].$$

When $X_0 = \omega_0$ is fixed, the above SDDE is equivalent to the following SDE:

$$(3.2) \quad dX_t = -\nabla P(X_t)dt + \sqrt{\eta}Q_{\eta,\delta}(X_t, \omega_0)dB_t \quad \text{for } t \in [0, m\eta],$$

thus the solution $(X_t)_{t \in [0, m\eta]}$ is a time homogeneous Markov process with states on \mathbb{R}^d . We denote $X_{s,t}^x$ with $s \leq t \in [0, \eta]$ to stress the dependence of process on the value $X_s = x$. For the simplicity of notations, we denote $X_{s,t}^x$ by X_{t-s}^x according to time homogeneous property. ω_k^x is denoted by same way.

Let $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, which is independent of I . The infinitesimal generators of $\{\omega_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq m}$ and $(X_t)_{t \in [0, m\eta]}$ are respectively

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_j^\omega f(x) &= \mathbb{E}[f(\omega_{j+1}) | \omega_j = x] - f(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[f(x - \eta \nabla \psi_I(x) + \eta \nabla \psi_I(\omega_0) - \eta \nabla P(\omega_0) + \sqrt{\eta \delta} W) \right] - f(x) \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m - 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{A}_t^X f(x) &= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(X_{t+\Delta t}) | X_t = x] - f(x)}{\Delta t} \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \eta \langle Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, \omega_0)^2, \nabla^2 f(x) \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \langle \nabla P(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle \\
 (3.4) \quad &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta \Sigma(x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d, \nabla^2 f(x) \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \langle \nabla P(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, m\eta)$. Due to time homogeneous property of the two processes, their generators do not depend on the time, as we have seen from the above, so from now on we shall simply write

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{A}^X = \mathcal{A}_t^X, \quad \mathcal{A}^\omega = \mathcal{A}_j^\omega.$$

Under the above assumptions, we have the following exponential convergence for the SDE (3.2), which will be proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.2. *Under Assumption 1.5, (1.4) and (2.10), for any $t > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as $\eta \leq \min\{1, \frac{\gamma\delta}{2A_3}\}$, there exists a constant $\lambda = \frac{\gamma}{4} \exp\{-\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta}\} > 0$, we have*

$$(3.6) \quad W_1(\mathcal{L}(X_t^x), \mathcal{L}(X_t^y)) \leq C_\gamma \lambda^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} |x - y|.$$

Note that the diffusion coefficient of SDE (3.2) is positive definite, we have the following estimates, which will be proved in Appendix C.

Lemma 3.3. *Let X_t be the solution to the equation (3.2) and denote $P_t h(x) = \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]$ for $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v, v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as $\eta \in (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$(3.7) \quad |\nabla_v (P_t h)(x)| \leq e^{L+4},$$

$$(3.8) \quad |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} (P_t h)(x)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} P_t h(x)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right).$$

Now, we give some moment estimates of SDDE and SVRG-LD, which will be proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.4. *Let X_t be the solution to the equation (3.2) and $\eta < \frac{\gamma}{8L^2}$. Then, we have*

$$(3.10) \quad \mathbb{E}|X_t^x|^2 \leq C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K)$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad \mathbb{E}|X_t^x - x|^2 \leq C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K) t(t + \eta + \delta).$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let ω_k^x be defined in (2.1) and $\eta \leq \min\{1, (\frac{\gamma}{432L^4})^{\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{\gamma}{96L^2}, (\frac{\gamma}{576L^3})^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$. Then, for any $0 \leq k \leq m$, we have*

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}|\omega_k^x|^4 \leq C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + |x|^4 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2).$$

Moreover, we also need the following lemma, which will be proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $Z_t = X_{\eta t}$, \mathcal{A}^Z be the infinitesimal generator. Let \mathcal{A}^ω be defined by (3.5) and $u_t(x) = \mathbb{E}h(X_t^x)$ for $0 \leq k \leq m$. Then, as $\eta \leq \min\{\delta, \frac{\gamma}{8L^2}\}$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 [\mathcal{A}^Z u_t(Z_s^x) - \mathcal{A}^\omega u_t(x)] ds \right| \\ & \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} + \frac{\delta}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K)(1 + |x|^3) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that the Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1 hold. Choosing $\eta \leq \min\{\delta, (\frac{\gamma}{432L^4})^{\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{\gamma}{96L^2}, (\frac{\gamma}{576L^3})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\gamma}{8L^2}, \frac{\gamma}{2A_3}\}$, for any $0 \leq k \leq m$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & W_1(\mathcal{L}(X_{k\eta}), \mathcal{L}(\omega_k)) \\ & \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2} e^\lambda\right), \end{aligned}$$

where λ is a positive constant defined in Lemma 3.2.

Proof. When $k = 0, 1$, the above inequalities hold obviously.

When $k \geq 2$, let $X_0 = Y_0 = \omega_0$, denote $u_t(x) = \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]$ and $Z_t = X_{\eta t}$ for $0 \leq l \leq k$ and $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$. For the ease of further use, for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and any $r, t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $t \geq r$, we denote by $Z_t(t, z)$ the random variable Z_t given $Z_r = z$, and similarly $\omega_t(r, z)$ is similarly defined, it is easily seen that

$$(3.13) \quad Z_t = Z_t(r, Z_r), \quad \omega_t = \omega_t(r, \omega_r).$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}h(Z_k) = \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(1, Z_1)) - \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(1, \omega_1)) + \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(1, \omega_1)).$$

By (3.13) again, we know $Z_k(1, \omega_1) = Z_k(2, Z_2(1, \omega_1))$ and thus

$$\mathbb{E}h(Z_k(1, \omega_1)) = \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(2, Z_2(1, \omega_1))) - \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(2, \omega_2)) + \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(2, \omega_2)).$$

Continue this process with repeatedly using (3.13), we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E}h(Z_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k [\mathbb{E}h(Z_k(j, Z_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1}))) - \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(j, \omega_j))] + \mathbb{E}h(\omega_k),$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}h(Z_k) - \mathbb{E}h(\omega_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k [\mathbb{E}h(Z_k(j, Z_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1}))) - \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(j, \omega_j))].$$

Let us now bound each term on the right hand side. Because Z_t is a time homogeneous Markov chain, we have

$$u_{\eta(k-j)}(z) = \mathbb{E}[h(X_{\eta k}) | X_{\eta j} = z] = \mathbb{E}[h(Z_k) | Z_j = z].$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(j, Z_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1}))) - \mathbb{E}h(Z_k(j, \omega_j)) \\ & = \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1})) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_j) \\ & = \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1})) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1})) \\ & = \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is by (3.13) and the last one is by the relation $Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}} \stackrel{d}{=} Z_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1})$ and $\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}} \stackrel{d}{=} \omega_j(j-1, \omega_{j-1})$. Hence, we have

$$(3.14) \quad \mathbb{E}h(Z_k) - \mathbb{E}h(\omega_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k [\mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}})],$$

which further implies

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} W_1(\mathcal{L}(Z_k), \mathcal{L}(\omega_k)) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}})| \\ &+ \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mathbb{E}h(Z_1^{\omega_{k-1}}) - \mathbb{E}h(\omega_1^{\omega_{k-1}})|. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, if $k \leq \eta^{-1} + 1$, denote the generator of the process Z_t by \mathcal{A}^Z . Then, by Itô's formula and the definition of \mathcal{A}^ω , for any $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, we have

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_{j-1})] - \mathbb{E}[u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_{j-1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 [\mathcal{A}^Z u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_s^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathcal{A}^\omega u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_{j-1})] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta(k-j) \in (0, 1]$, one can derive from Lemma 3.6, the Hölder inequality and Lemma 3.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(Z_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}})| \\ &\leq C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta(k-j)} + \frac{\delta}{[\eta(k-j)]^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K)(1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_{j-1}|^3) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta(k-j)} + \frac{\delta}{[\eta(k-j)]^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} (\eta \delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

If $k > \eta^{-1} + 1$, we consider the following two cases. When $1 \leq j < k - \eta^{-1}$, notice that $u_{\eta(k-j)}(x) = \mathbb{E}[h(X_{\eta(k-j)}^x)] = \mathbb{E}[h(X_{\eta(k-j)-1}^{\bar{X}})]$, by (3.6) with $t = (k-j)\eta - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E}u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}})| \\ &= \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E}h\left(X_{\eta(k-j)}^{X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}}\right) - \mathbb{E}h\left(X_{\eta(k-j)}^{\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}}\right) \right| \\ &= \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E}h\left(X_{\eta(k-j)-1}^{\bar{X}}\right) - \mathbb{E}h\left(X_{\eta(k-j)-1}^{\bar{Y}}\right) \right| \\ &= W_1\left(\mathcal{L}\left(X_{\eta(k-j)-1}^{\bar{X}}\right), \mathcal{L}\left(X_{\eta(k-j)-1}^{\bar{Y}}\right)\right) \leq e^{\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta}} e^{-\lambda[\eta(k-j)-1]} \mathbb{E}|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|, \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are any random vectors such that $\bar{X} \stackrel{d}{=} X_1^{X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}}$ and $\bar{Y} \stackrel{d}{=} X_1^{\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}}$. Thus, noting that \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are arbitrary, it follows from the definition of the Wasserstein-1 distance

(see (2.11), taking the infimum about \bar{X} and \bar{Y} on the right side of the above inequality) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} u_{\eta(k-j)} \left(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}} \right) - \mathbb{E} u_{\eta(k-j)} \left(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}} \right) \right| \\
& \leq C_{\gamma} \lambda^{-1} e^{-\lambda[\eta(k-j)-1]} W_1 \left(\mathcal{L} \left(X_1^{X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}} \right), \mathcal{L} \left(X_1^{\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}} \right) \right) \\
& = C_{\gamma} \lambda^{-1} e^{-\lambda[\eta(k-j)-1]} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} h \left(X_1^{X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}} \right) - \mathbb{E} h \left(X_1^{\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}} \right) \right| \\
& = C_{\gamma} \lambda^{-1} e^{-\lambda[\eta(k-j)-1]} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} u_1 \left(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}} \right) - \mathbb{E} u_1 \left(\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}} \right) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (3.16), Lemmas 3.6 and 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} [u_{\eta(k-j)}(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}) - u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_j)] \right| \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \lambda^{-1} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} e^{-\lambda[\eta(k-j)-1]} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_{j-1}|^3) \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \lambda^{-1} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} e^{-\lambda[\eta(k-j)-1]} \left(1 + (\mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4)^{\frac{3}{4}} + K^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \lambda^{-1} e^{\lambda} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} e^{-\lambda\eta(k-j)}
\end{aligned}$$

which further implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} [u_{\eta(k-j)}(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}) - u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_j)] \right| \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \lambda^{-1} e^{\lambda} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=k-\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor}^{k-1} e^{-\lambda\eta j} \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \lambda^{-1} e^{\lambda} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\eta^{-1}-1}^k e^{-\lambda\eta y} dy \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \lambda^{-2} e^{\lambda} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $k - \eta^{-1} \leq j \leq k - 1$, by (3.16), Lemmas 3.6 and 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor+1}^{k-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} [u_{\eta(k-j)}(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}) - u_{\eta(k-j)}(\omega_j)] \right| \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=\lfloor k-\eta^{-1} \rfloor+1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta(k-j)} + \frac{\delta}{[\eta(k-j)]^{\frac{5}{4}}} \right) \\
& \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E} u_{\eta(k-j)} (X_{\eta}^{\omega_{j-1}}) - \mathbb{E} u_{\eta(k-j)} (\omega_1^{\omega_{j-1}}) \right| \\ & \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2} e^{\lambda} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, by (2.1), (1.3), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (1.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\omega_k - \omega_{k-1}| & \leq \eta \left[\mathbb{E} |\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0)| + \left(\frac{\delta}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} |W_k| \right] \\ & \leq C_L \eta (\mathbb{E} |\omega_{k-1}| + \mathbb{E} |\omega_0| + |\nabla P(0)| + \left(\frac{\delta d}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (3.11) and (3.12), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} h (Z_1^{\omega_{k-1}}) - \mathbb{E} h (\omega_1^{\omega_{k-1}}) \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} |h(X_{\eta}^{\omega_{k-1}}) - h(\omega_{k-1})| + \mathbb{E} |h(\omega_k) - h(\omega_{k-1})| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} |X_{\eta}^{\omega_{k-1}} - \omega_{k-1}| + \mathbb{E} |\omega_k - \omega_{k-1}| \\ & \leq C_{\gamma,L} \eta (\sqrt{\mathbb{E} |\omega_{k-1}|^2} + K^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\mathbb{E} |\omega_0|^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} + |\nabla P(0)| + \left(\frac{\delta d}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ & \leq C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} [1 + (\mathbb{E} |\omega_0|^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} + K^{\frac{1}{2}}] (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all of above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & W_1(\mathcal{L}(X_{\eta N}), \mathcal{L}(Y_N)) \\ & \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}} (\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2} e^{\lambda} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2. Approximation of external Markov chain. Recall \tilde{X}_s from (2.8). Let $h \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ be Lipschitz, define

$$(3.17) \quad U_h(s, x) = \mathbb{E} \left[h(\tilde{X}_s^x) \right], \quad s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

where \tilde{X}_s^x stresses that the initial value of \tilde{X}_s is x .

In this subsection, we first give the regularity of $(\tilde{X}_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ in Lemma 3.8. Combining with Proposition 3.7, we prove Theorem 2.5 by the Lindeberg principle.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$. Choosing $\eta \leq \min\{1, \frac{\gamma\delta}{2A_3}\}$. Then, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$|U_h(s, x) - U_h(s, y)| \leq a^s |x - y|,$$

where $a = e^{\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta} - \lambda m \eta} < 1$ (when m is large enough).

In particular, when $K = 0$, further assume $\eta \leq \gamma$, we have

$$|U_h(s, x) - U_h(s, y)| \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} s m \eta} |x - y|.$$

Proof. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} h(\tilde{X}_s^x) - \mathbb{E} h(\tilde{X}_s^y) \right| & = \left| \mathbb{E} h(X_{sm\eta}^x) - \mathbb{E} h(\tilde{X}_{sm\eta}^y) \right| \\ & = \left| \mathbb{E} h(X_{m\eta}^{X_{(s-1)m\eta}^x}) - \mathbb{E} h(X_{m\eta}^{X_{(s-1)m\eta}^y}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \mathbb{E}h \left(X_{m\eta}^{\bar{X}} \right) - \mathbb{E}h \left(X_{m\eta}^{\bar{Y}} \right) \right| \\
&\leq W_1 \left(\mathcal{L} \left(X_{m\eta}^{\bar{X}} \right), \mathcal{L} \left(X_{m\eta}^{\bar{Y}} \right) \right) \leq e^{\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta}} e^{-\lambda m\eta} \mathbb{E}|\bar{X} - \bar{Y}|,
\end{aligned}$$

where \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are many random vectors such that $\bar{X} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{(s-1)m\eta}^x$ and $\bar{Y} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{(s-1)m\eta}^y$. Thus, noting that \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are arbitrary, it follows from the definition of the W1 distance that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s^x) - \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s^y) \right| \leq e^{\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta}} e^{-\lambda m\eta} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} \left| \mathbb{E}h \left(X_{(s-1)m\eta}^x \right) - \mathbb{E}h \left(X_{(s-1)m\eta}^y \right) \right|.$$

Continue this process with repeatedly using (3.6), we finally obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s^x) - \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s^y) \right| \leq e^{s \left(\frac{2K(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma\delta} - \lambda m\eta \right)} |x - y|.$$

□

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\tilde{\omega}_s = \omega_{sm}$ and $\eta \leq \min\{1, (\frac{\gamma}{432L^4})^{\frac{1}{3}}, \frac{\gamma}{96L^2}, (\frac{\gamma}{576L^3})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{6(1+\gamma)10^2L^2}}\}$. Then, for any $0 \leq k \leq m$, we have*

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_s|^4 \leq \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + \frac{C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1+K^2)}{1-\rho}.$$

where $\rho = (1 - \gamma\eta)^m + \frac{1}{2} < 1$ (when m is large enough).

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 3.5 below, it is easy to verify that

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_1|^4 \leq \left[(1 - \gamma\eta)^m + 3 \times 10^4 \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \right) L^4 \eta^2 \right] \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1+K^2),$$

noticing that $\eta < \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{6(1+\gamma)10^2L^2}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_1|^4 \leq \rho \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1+K^2).$$

Inductively, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_s|^4 \leq \rho^s \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1+K^2) \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \rho^k \leq \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + \frac{C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1+K^2)}{1-\rho}.$$

□

3.3. Proofs of Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. By the same argument as the proof of (3.15), we have

$$\mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s) - \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{\omega}_s) = \sum_{i=1}^s \left[\mathbb{E}U_h(s-i, \tilde{X}_1^{\tilde{\omega}_{i-1}}) - \mathbb{E}U_h(s-i, \tilde{\omega}_1^{\tilde{\omega}_{i-1}}) \right].$$

Then, according to Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 with Lip(1) function replaced by Lip(a^{s-i}) function for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s) - \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{\omega}_s)| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left| \mathbb{E}U_h(s-i, \tilde{X}_1^{\tilde{\omega}_{i-1}}) - \mathbb{E}U_h(s-i, \tilde{\omega}_1^{\tilde{\omega}_{i-1}}) \right| \\
&\leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2} e^\lambda \right) \sum_{i=1}^s a^{s-i} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_{i-1}|^4 + K^2)^{\frac{7}{4}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}h(\tilde{X}_s) - \mathbb{E}h(\tilde{\omega}_s)| \\ & \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2}e^\lambda\right) \left(\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + \frac{1+K^2}{1-\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{4}} \sum_{i=1}^s a^{s-i} \\ & \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(\eta\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\ln \eta| + \frac{\delta}{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \lambda^{-2}e^\lambda\right) \left(\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\omega}_0|^4 + \frac{1+K^2}{1-\rho}\right)^{\frac{7}{4}} \frac{1}{1-a}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.6. Following the assumption, a straight calculation implies $\lambda = \frac{\gamma}{4}\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}$, thus $\lambda^{-2}e^\lambda(\eta\delta)^{1/2}$ converges to 0. The condition of m guarantees $a < 1$ and we get the result. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.7. The fact $\frac{K}{\delta} \leq 1$ implies $\frac{4}{\gamma} \exp\{-\frac{2(L+3\gamma/4)}{\gamma}\} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{4}{\gamma}$ and thus $\lambda^{-2}e^\lambda$ is bounded. We can get the result following the Theorem 2.5. \square

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we establish a weak approximation error bound (in W1 distance) between SVRG-LD and SDDE under the assumptions which are true for a large family of nonconvex minimization problems, from this bound we can see that the approximation error can tends to 0 by carefully choosing the inverse temperature parameter δ according to the learning rate η . When the optimization problem is convex, combining our result with the exponential convergence result in [21], we know that our approximating SDDE will be close to the minimizer ω^* exponentially fast. Furthermore, we can clearly see the variance reduction effect of the SVRG-LD from the analysis of the SDDE.

Our approach to proving the main results is by a refined Lindeberg principle and Malliavin calculus. This method provides a mathematical framework for weak approximations, and we hope it can be applied to study other stochastic algorithms. As is shown in Theorem 2.5, the error bound will explode if the inverse temperature parameter δ is not specifically chosen according to the learning rate η . We will attempt to solve this problem in the future research, one possible way is to use the frame of Stein's method developed in [28]. Another interesting research direction is borrowing the well established properties of SDDEs to develop stochastic algorithms with variance reduction effect.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF EXAMPLE 2.3

In this section, we will verify Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1 for Examples 2.2 and 2.3, respectively.

A.1. **Example 2.2.** Recall $a_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| H(x-y) + \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T (x-y) \right|^4, \\ \nabla P(x) &= Hx + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T x, \end{aligned}$$

$$\Sigma(x, y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{Q} [D + \text{diag}(a_i)] \tilde{Q}^T (x-y) \right) \left(\tilde{Q} [D + \text{diag}(a_i)] \tilde{Q}^T (x-y) \right)^T$$

$$- \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} [D + \text{diag}(a_i)] \tilde{Q}^T (x - y) \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} [D + \text{diag}(a_i)] \tilde{Q}^T (x - y) \right)^T.$$

and $Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, y) = (\Sigma(x, y) + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Inspired from the law of large numbers, we first give the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and unit vectors $v, v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$(A.1) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{d}{n\epsilon^2},$$

$$(A.2) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^4 - \mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}|a_1|^8}{n\epsilon^2}$$

and

$$(A.3) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_1 \left(\tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_2 \right)^T v - \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_1) \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_2) \tilde{Q}^T v \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{6d^6}{n\epsilon^2}.$$

Proof. By Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}|a_i|^2}{n^2 \epsilon^2} = \frac{d}{n\epsilon^2}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^4 - \mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| |a_i|^4 - \mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 \right|^2}{n^2 \epsilon^2} \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^8}{n\epsilon^2}.$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_1 \left(\tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_2 \right)^T v \right] = \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_1) \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_2) \tilde{Q}^T v$, $\|\tilde{Q}\|_{\text{HS}} = \sqrt{d}$ and $\mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 = 3d^2$, by Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_1 \left(\tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_2 \right)^T v - \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_1) \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_2) \tilde{Q}^T v \right| > \epsilon \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_1 \left(\tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T v_2 \right)^T v - \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_1) \text{diag}(\tilde{Q} v_2) \tilde{Q}^T v \right|^2 / (n\epsilon)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2\|\tilde{Q}\|_{\text{HS}}^8 \mathbb{E}|a_1|^4}{n\epsilon^2} = \frac{6d^6}{n\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Then, we first verify the Assumptions 1.2 and 1.5.

Lemma A.2. *Denote the smallest eigenvalue of H by λ_{\min} . When n is large enough, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the following inequalities*

$$\langle \nabla^2 P(x) v, v \rangle \geq \lambda_{\min} |v|^2$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} |\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(y)|^4 \leq 8(\|H\|_{\text{HS}}^4 + 3d^6) |x - y|^4$$

holds with high probability.

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by (A.1), it is easy to verify that with high probability, we have

$$\nabla P(x) = Hx,$$

which implies

$$\langle \nabla^2 P(x)v, v \rangle \geq \lambda_{\min}|v|^2.$$

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| H(x-y) + \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \right|^4 \\ &\leq 8\|H\|_{\text{HS}}^4|x-y|^4 + \frac{8}{n} \|\tilde{Q}\|_{\text{HS}}^8 \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^4|x-y|^4, \end{aligned}$$

by (A.2), with high probability, we further have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 \leq 8(\|H\|_{\text{HS}}^4 + 3d^6)|x-y|^4.$$

□

Next, with the help of Lemma A.1, we will calculate the matrix $Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)$ directly.

Lemma A.3. *When n is large enough, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the following equality*

$$Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y) = \tilde{Q} \left[\text{diag}(\tilde{Q}(x-y))^2 + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{Q}^T$$

holds with high probability.

Proof. Since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T 0 \right) \left(\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T 0 \right)^T = 0$, by integration and (A.3), the following equality

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \left(\tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \right)^T = \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(\tilde{Q}(x-y))^2 \tilde{Q}^T.$$

By (A.1), with high probability, we have $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(a_i) \tilde{Q}^T x = 0$. These imply that with high probability,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(x, y) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \right) \left(\tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \right)^T \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}[D + \text{diag}(a_i)]\tilde{Q}^T(x-y) \right)^T \\ &= \tilde{Q} \text{diag}(\tilde{Q}(x-y))^2 \tilde{Q}^T. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y) = \left(\Sigma(x, y) + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \tilde{Q} \left[\text{diag}(\tilde{Q}(x-y))^2 + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{Q}^T.$$

□

With the above results, we will verify Assumption 2.1.

Lemma A.4. *When n is large enough, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, the following inequalities*

$$|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| = 0, \quad |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| = 0,$$

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq d^2, \quad \|\nabla_{2,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq d^2$$

and

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d^2, \quad \|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} \nabla_{1,v_3} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 3\frac{\eta}{\delta} d^3.$$

hold with high probability.

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by (A.1), the equality

$$\nabla P(x) = Hx$$

holds with high probability, which implies

$$\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x) = 0, \quad \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x) = 0.$$

By Lemma A.3, it is straightforward to calculate that with high probability, we have

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \|\tilde{Q}\|_{\text{HS}}^3 \sqrt{d} = d^2, \quad \|\nabla_{2,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq d^2,$$

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \|\tilde{Q}\|_{\text{HS}}^4 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{d} = \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{5}{2}}$$

and

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} \nabla_{1,v_3} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 3\|\tilde{Q}\|_{\text{HS}}^5 \frac{\eta}{\delta} \sqrt{d} = 3\frac{\eta}{\delta} d^3.$$

□

A.2. Example 2.3. Recall

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) + \lambda(x - y) \right|^4,$$

$$\nabla P(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - b_i \right) + \lambda x,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(x, y) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right) \left(a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right)^T \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right)^T. \end{aligned}$$

and $Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y) = (\Sigma(x, y) + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Inspired from the law of large numbers, we immediately have the following lemma.

Lemma A.5. *In Example 2.3, suppose $\mathbb{E}|a_i|^{16} < \infty$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$(A.4) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{a_1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T x}}\right]\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^2}{n\epsilon^2},$$

$$(A.5) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i - \mathbb{E}[a_i b_i]\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^2}{n\epsilon^2},$$

$$(A.6) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^8 - \mathbb{E}|a_1|^8 \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^{16}}{n\epsilon^2},$$

and

$$(A.7) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(a_i \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1+e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right) \left(a_i \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1+e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right)^T \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a_1 \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-a_1^T x}} - \frac{1}{1+e^{-a_1^T y}} \right) \right) \left(a_1 \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-a_1^T x}} - \frac{1}{1+e^{-a_1^T y}} \right) \right)^T \right] \right\|_{\text{HS}} > \epsilon \right) \\ \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^4}{n\epsilon^2}.$$

Proof. We only give the proof of the first inequality, the other three are similar. By Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{1+e^{-a_i^T x}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_1}{1+e^{-a_1^T x}} \right] \right| > \epsilon \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{a_i}{1+e^{-a_i^T x}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_1}{1+e^{-a_1^T x}} \right] \right] \right| > \epsilon \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{a_i}{1+e^{-a_i^T x}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_1}{1+e^{-a_1^T x}} \right] \right|^2}{n^2\epsilon^2} \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^2}{n\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

From above lemma, it is easily seen that with high probability, we have

$$\nabla P(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[a_1 \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-a_1^T x}} - b_1 \right) \right] + \lambda x.$$

Then, we first verify the Assumptions 1.2 and 1.5.

Lemma A.6. *In Example 2.3, suppose $\mathbb{E}|a_i|^{16} < \infty$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. When n is large enough, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\langle \nabla^2 P(x)v, v \rangle \geq \lambda|v|^2,$$

and the following inequality

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 \leq 8(\mathbb{E}|a_1|^8 + \lambda^4)|x - y|^4$$

holds with high probability.

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, notice

$$\nabla^2 P(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i a_i^T e^{-a_i^T x}}{(1+e^{-a_i^T x})^2} + \lambda I_d,$$

since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i a_i^T}{(1+e^{-a_i^T x})^2}$ is a positive semi-definite matrix, we have

$$\langle \nabla^2 P(x)v, v \rangle \geq \lambda|v|^2.$$

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| a_i \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1+e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) + \lambda(x - y) \right|^4$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{8}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| a_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_i^T y}} \right) \right|^4 + 8\lambda^4 |x - y|^4 \\
&\leq \frac{8}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^8 |x - y| + 8\lambda^4 |x - y|^4,
\end{aligned}$$

by (A.6), with high probability, we further have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla\psi_I(x) - \nabla\psi_I(y)|^4 \leq 8(\mathbb{E}|a_1|^8 + \lambda^4)|x - y|^4,$$

the desired result follows. \square

Before verifying Assumption 2.1, we first give the following lemma, which plays a crucial role in proving Assumption 2.1. We first state the following lemma, which gives the upper bounds of the derivatives of $Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)$. Since x, y in the function $Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)$ is symmetric, for simplicity, we only consider the univariate function in the following.

Lemma A.7. *Let $\hat{\Sigma}(x)$ be a symmetric positive function matrix and $\hat{\Sigma}(x) \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$. Then, for any $x, v, v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\|\nabla_v \hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_v \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HS}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}})\|_{\text{HS}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{3}{2}} (\|\nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} + \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}) \\
&\quad + \frac{3}{8} d \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{5}{2}} \|\nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $\hat{\Sigma}(x)$.

Proof. For simplicity, denote the square root function $\varphi(\hat{\Sigma}) = \hat{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for any symmetric positive matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$. Then, [19, Theorem 1.1] shows that for $n \geq 0$

$$(A.8) \quad \|\|\nabla^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{\Sigma})\|\| \leq d^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{(2n)!}{n!} 2^{-(2n+1)} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma})^{-(n+\frac{1}{2})},$$

where the multi-linear operator norm $\|\|\cdot\|\|$ is defined by

$$\|\|\nabla^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{\Sigma})\|\| = \sup_{\|H\|_{\text{HS}}=1} \|\nabla^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}) H\|_{\text{HS}}.$$

Therefore, by Chain rule (see, e.g., [1, Proposition 3.2]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_v (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}})\|_{\text{HS}} &= \|\nabla_v \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x))\|_{\text{HS}} = \|\nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_v \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
&= \|\|\nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x))\|\| \|\nabla_v \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_v \hat{\Sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Product rule (see, e.g., [1, Proposition 3.3]) and Chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}})\|_{\text{HS}} &= \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \left(\nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &= \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) + \nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\leq \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} + \left\| \nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}}, \end{aligned}$$

then, by (A.8) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\leq \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} + \left\| \nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, notice

$$\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \nabla_{v_1} \left(\nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) + \nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right),$$

by Linearity (see, e.g., [1, Proposition 3.1]), Product rule and Chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= \nabla_{v_1} \left(\nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right) + \nabla_{v_1} \left(\nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right) \\ &= \nabla^3 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) + \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \\ &\quad + \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) + \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \\ &\quad + \nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\leq \left\| \nabla^3 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\quad + \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \right\| \left(\left\| \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} + \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \right) \\ &\quad + \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\quad + \left\| \nabla \varphi(\hat{\Sigma}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (A.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} (\hat{\Sigma}(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\left\| \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} + \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{8} d \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{5}{2}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_2} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \left\| \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \hat{\Sigma}(x) \right\|_{\text{HS}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we can verify Assumption 2.1.

Lemma A.8. *In Example 2.3, suppose $\mathbb{E}|a_i|^9 < \infty$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. When n is large enough, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, the following inequalities*

$$|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \leq 3\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3, \quad |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \leq 13\mathbb{E}|a_1|^4,$$

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\nabla_{2,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 4\left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 + \mathbb{E}|a_1|^6 d^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\eta}{\delta}),$$

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} \nabla_{1,v_3} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 4\left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} [12d^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}|a_1|^7 \frac{\eta}{\delta} + 6d \mathbb{E}|a_1|^9 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^2 + 11\mathbb{E}|a_1|^5].$$

hold with high probability.

Proof. By (A.4), with high probability, we have

$$\nabla^2 P(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a_1 a_1^T e^{-a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^2} \right] - \lambda I_d,$$

which implies

$$|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^2} |a_1|^3 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-2a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^3} |a_1|^3 \right] \leq 3\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3,$$

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \nabla P(x)| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^2} |a_1|^4 \right] + 6\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-2a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^3} |a_1|^4 \right] + 6\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-3a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^4} |a_1|^4 \right] \leq 13\mathbb{E}|a_1|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2 = \Sigma(x, y) + \frac{\delta}{\eta} I_d$ and $\Sigma(x, y)$ is a positive semi-definite matrix, we have $\inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \lambda_{\min}(Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2) \geq \frac{\delta}{\eta}$. Moreover, by (A.7), with high probability, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{1,v_1} \Sigma(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^2} \left| \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T y}} \right| |a_1|^3 \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|a_1|^2 e^{-a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^2} \right] \left| \mathbb{E} \left[a_1 \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T y}} \right) \right] \right| \\ & \leq 4\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3, \end{aligned}$$

$$\|\nabla_{2,v_1} \Sigma(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 4\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3,$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} \Sigma(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \\ & \leq 4\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{e^{-a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^2} + \frac{2e^{-2a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^3} \right) \left| \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T x}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a_1^T y}} \right| + \frac{e^{-2a_1^T x}}{(1 + e^{-a_1^T x})^4} \right] |a_1|^4 \\ & \leq 16\mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} \nabla_{1,v_3} \Sigma(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 88\mathbb{E}|a_1|^5.$$

Therefore, by Lemma A.7, we have

$$\|\nabla_{1,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{1,v} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\|\nabla_{2,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}|a_1|^3 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_{\min}(Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla_{1,v_1} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2\|_{\text{HS}} \|\nabla_{1,v_2} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)^2\|_{\text{HS}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} 16 \mathbb{E}|a_1|^6 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} 16 \mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 = 4 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2 \mathbb{E}|a_1|^4 + \mathbb{E}|a_1|^6 d^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\eta}{\delta})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_{1,v_1} \nabla_{1,v_2} \nabla_{1,v_3} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \\
& \leq 32 d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \mathbb{E}|a_1|^7 + 24 d \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}} \mathbb{E}|a_1|^9 + 16 d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \mathbb{E}|a_1|^7 + 44 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}|a_1|^5 \\
& = 4 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} [12 d^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}|a_1|^7 \frac{\eta}{\delta} + 6 d \mathbb{E}|a_1|^9 \left(\frac{\eta}{\delta}\right)^2 + 11 \mathbb{E}|a_1|^5].
\end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMAS IN SECTION 3

B.1. Proof of Lemma 3.2. Following [62, Theorem 2.1], one can immediately finish the proof. To verify the condition of [62, Theorem 2.1], we take

$$\sigma(x) = \sqrt{\eta} Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0) = (\eta \Sigma(x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$\sigma_0^2 = \delta/2$, $\theta = 0$, $q = 1$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(x) = (\sigma^2(x) - \sigma_0^2 I_d)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ therein. Following [62, Example 2.4] and assumption (2.10), it is easy to see

$$\|\tilde{\sigma}(x) - \tilde{\sigma}(y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma_0^2} |\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq \frac{\eta A_3}{2\sigma_0^2} |x - y|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} |x - y|^2.$$

Combining equation above with assumptions (1.4) and (1.6), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle -\nabla P(x) + \nabla P(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\sigma}(x) - \tilde{\sigma}(y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + (q - 3/2) \frac{|\tilde{\sigma}(x) - \tilde{\sigma}(y)(x - y)|^2}{|x - y|^2} \\
& \leq (L + \frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{\gamma}{2}) |x - y|^2 1_{\{|x-y|^2 \leq \frac{4K}{\gamma}\}} - \frac{\gamma}{2} |x - y|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\bar{K}_1(x) = (L + \frac{3}{4}\gamma) 1_{\{|x|^2 \leq \frac{4K}{\gamma}\}} |x|^2$ and $\bar{K}_2 = \frac{\gamma}{2}$, [62, Condition (H)] is satisfied. Let $\tilde{K}_2 = \frac{\gamma}{2}$, a straight calculation implies that $C_1 = 1$, $c_0 = C_2 = \exp\{\frac{2K}{\delta\gamma}(L + \frac{3}{4}\gamma)\}$ and $\kappa = \frac{\gamma}{4} \exp\{-\frac{2K}{\delta\gamma}(L + \frac{3}{4}\gamma)\}$ therein, then we obtain

$$W_1(\mathcal{L}(X_t^x), \mathcal{L}(X_t^y)) \leq e^{\frac{2K(L + \frac{3}{4}\gamma)}{\gamma\delta}} e^{-\lambda t} |x - y| = \frac{4}{\gamma} \lambda^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} |x - y|,$$

where $\lambda = \frac{\gamma}{4} \exp\{-\frac{2K(L + \frac{3}{4}\gamma)}{\gamma\delta}\}$.

□

B.2. Proof of Lemma 3.4. Recall (3.2), by Itô's formula, (1.6) and (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E}|X_s^x|^2 & = 2\mathbb{E}\langle X_s, -\nabla P(X_s) \rangle + \eta \mathbb{E}\|Q_{\eta,\delta}(X_s, \omega_0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\
& \leq -2\gamma \mathbb{E}|X_s^x|^2 + 2K + 2\mathbb{E}|X_s| |\nabla P(0)| + 2\eta(L^2 |X_s - \omega_0|^2 + \frac{\delta d}{\eta}) \\
& \leq -(2\gamma - 4L^2\eta - \frac{\gamma}{2}) \mathbb{E}|X_s^x|^2 + 2K + \frac{2}{\gamma} |\nabla P(0)|^2 + 4\eta L^2 \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + 2\delta d
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq -\gamma \mathbb{E}|X_s^x|^2 + 2K + \frac{2}{\gamma} |\nabla P(0)|^2 + 4\eta L^2 \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + 2\delta d,$$

where the last two lines following Young's inequality and the fact $\eta < \frac{\gamma}{8L^2}$. Solving this differential inequality with initial data $X_0^x = x$, gives

$$(B.1) \quad \mathbb{E}|X_t^x|^2 \leq e^{-\gamma t} |x|^2 + \frac{2(K + \gamma^{-1} |\nabla P(0)|^2 + 2\eta L^2 \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + \delta d)}{\gamma} \\ \leq C_{\gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} (1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K).$$

Thus (3.10) is proved.

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Itô's isometry, (1.5) and (2.9), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^x - x|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t -\nabla P(X_r^x) dr \right|^2 + 2\mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \sqrt{\eta} Q_{\eta, \delta}(X_r, \omega_0) dB_r \right|^2 \\ \leq 2t \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\nabla P(X_r^x)|^2 dr + 2\eta \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|Q_{\eta, \delta}(X_r, \omega_0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 dr \\ \leq 4t \int_0^t (|\nabla P(0)|^2 + L^2 \mathbb{E}|X_r|^2) dr + 4\eta \int_0^t (L^2 \mathbb{E}|X_s - \omega_0|^2 + \frac{\delta d}{\eta}) dr \\ \leq 4L^2(t + 2\eta) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|X_r|^2 dr + 4t(t |\nabla P(0)|^2 + 2L^2 \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + \delta d),$$

which, together with (3.10), implies (3.11). \square

B.3. Proof of Lemma 3.5. By (2.1), it is easy to see

$$\mathbb{E}|\omega_k|^4 = \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + \mathbb{E} \left[\eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right]^4 \\ - 4\mathbb{E} \left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \left\langle \omega_{k-1}, \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right\rangle \right] \\ + 4\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \omega_{k-1}, \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right\rangle^2 \right] \\ + 2\mathbb{E} \left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \left| \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right|^2 \right] \\ - 4\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right|^2 \right. \\ \left. \left\langle \omega_{k-1}, \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right\rangle \right].$$

Now we estimate each term on the right hand side. For the second term, the fact $\eta < \left(\frac{\gamma}{432L^4}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, (1.3) and (1.5) imply

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \eta \left[\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0) \right] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \right|^4 \\ \leq 27\eta^4 \left[\mathbb{E} |\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0)|^4 + \mathbb{E} |\nabla P(\omega_0)|^4 \right] + 27(\eta \delta)^2 \mathbb{E} |W_1|^4 \\ \leq 27\eta^4 \left[L^4 \mathbb{E} |\omega_{k-1} - \omega_0|^4 + \mathbb{E} |\nabla P(\omega_0)|^4 \right] + 27(\eta \delta)^2 \mathbb{E} |W|^4 \\ \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \eta \mathbb{E} |\omega_{k-1}|^4 + 216\eta^4 (2L^4 \mathbb{E} |\omega_0|^4 + |\nabla P(0)|^4) + 81(\eta \delta d)^2,$$

where the last line following $\mathbb{E}|W|^4 \leq 3d^2$.

For the third term, since i_k is independent of ω_{k-1} and uniformly distributed on $[n]$, (1.6) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \left\langle \omega_{k-1}, \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) \right\rangle \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_I \left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \left\langle \nabla \psi_I(\omega_{k-1}), \omega_{k-1} \right\rangle \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \langle \nabla P(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla P(0), \omega_{k-1} \rangle] + \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \langle \nabla P(0), \omega_{k-1} \rangle] \\
&\geq \gamma \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 - K \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^2 + \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \langle \nabla P(0), \omega_{k-1} \rangle],
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&- 4\eta \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \langle \omega_{k-1}, \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) \rangle] \\
&\leq -4\gamma \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + 4K \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^2 + 4\eta \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^3 |\nabla P(0)|] \\
&\leq -3\gamma \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + \frac{8K^2}{\gamma} \eta + \frac{216|\nabla P(0)|^4}{\gamma^3} \eta,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by Young's inequality. In addition, since W_k is independent of i_k and ω_{k-1} , we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \langle \omega_{k-1}, \eta [\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) - \nabla P(\omega_0)] + \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \rangle\right] = 0.$$

For the fourth term, the fact $\eta < \frac{\gamma}{96L^2}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \omega_{k-1}, \eta [\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0)] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \rangle^2\right] \\
&\leq 12\eta^2 \mathbb{E}\left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 (|\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0)|^2 + |\nabla P(\omega_0)|^2)\right] + 12\eta \delta \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 |W_k|^2] \\
&\leq 12\eta^2 \mathbb{E}\left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 (2L^2|\omega_{k-1}|^2 + 4L^2|\omega_0|^2 + 2|\nabla P(0)|^2)\right] + 12\eta \delta d \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}|^2] \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + \frac{144\eta}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}[4L^2\eta|\omega_0|^2 + 2\eta|\nabla P(0)|^2 + \delta d]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + \frac{432\eta}{\gamma} (16L^4\eta^2 \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + 4\eta^2 |\nabla P(0)|^4 + (\delta d)^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The fifth term can be estimated by a similar calculation with the fourth term, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\mathbb{E}\left[|\omega_{k-1}|^2 \left|\eta (\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0)) - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k\right|^2\right] \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma}{4} \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + \frac{216\eta}{\gamma} [16L^4\eta^2 \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + 4\eta^2 |\nabla P(0)|^4 + (\delta d)^2].
\end{aligned}$$

For the last term, noticing that $\eta < (\frac{\gamma}{576L^3})^{\frac{1}{2}}$, by (1.3), the Hölder inequality, (1.5) and Young's inequality, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\mathbb{E}\left[|\eta [\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0)] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k\right|^2 \\
&\quad \langle \omega_{k-1}, \eta [\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0) + \nabla P(\omega_0)] - \sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k \rangle\bigg] \\
&\leq 36\mathbb{E}\left[|\eta^3 |\nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_{k-1}) - \nabla \psi_{i_k}(\omega_0)|^3 + \eta^3 |\nabla P(\omega_0)|^3 + |\sqrt{\eta \delta} W_k|^3\right] |\omega_{k-1}| \\
&\leq 144\eta^3 \mathbb{E}\left[|\omega_{k-1}| [L^3|\omega_{k-1}|^3 + 2L^3|\omega_0|^3 + |\nabla P(0)|^3]\right] + 36(\eta \delta)^{\frac{3}{2}} \mathbb{E}[|\omega_{k-1}| |W|^3] \\
&\leq \frac{3\gamma}{4} \eta \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + \frac{200\eta^{\frac{5}{3}}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{3}}} [16\eta^2 (L^4 \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + |\nabla P(0)|^4) + (\delta d)^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta < 1$, the inequalities above imply

$$\mathbb{E}|\omega_k|^4 \leq (1 - \gamma \eta) \mathbb{E}|\omega_{k-1}|^4 + C_{\gamma, L} (K^2 + |\nabla P(0)|^4 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + \delta^2 d^2) \eta.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\omega_k^x|^4 &\leq (1 - \gamma\eta)^k |x|^4 + C_{\gamma,L}(K^2 + |\nabla P(0)|^4 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + \delta^2 d^2) \eta \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (1 - \gamma\eta)^j \\ &\leq C_{\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L}(1 + |x|^4 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

B.4. Proof of Lemma 3.6. Recall (3.4), for any $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it is easy to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^Z f(x) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}f(X_{\eta t}^x) - f(x)}{\eta t} \eta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \eta \langle \eta \Sigma(x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d, \nabla^2 f(x) \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \eta \langle \nabla P(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $u_t(x) = \mathbb{E}h(X_t^x)$ with $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}^Z u_t(X_{\eta s}^x) ds \\ &= -\eta \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla u_t(X_{\eta s}^x), \nabla P(X_{\eta s}^x) \rangle ds + \frac{1}{2} \eta \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla^2 u_t(X_{\eta s}^x), \eta \Sigma(X_{\eta s}^x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d \rangle_{\text{HS}} ds \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla u_t(X_s^x), \nabla P(X_s^x) \rangle ds + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla^2 u_t(X_s^x), \eta \Sigma(X_s^x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d \rangle_{\text{HS}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Recall (3.3), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^\omega u_t(x) &= \mathbb{E} \left[u_t(x - \eta \nabla \psi_I(x) + \eta \nabla \psi_I(\omega_0) - \eta \nabla P(\omega_0) + \sqrt{\eta} \delta W) \right] - u_t(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[u_t(x + \sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x)) \right] - u_t(x) \end{aligned}$$

with $V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) = -\sqrt{\eta} [\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(\omega_0) - \nabla P(x) + \nabla P(\omega_0)] + \sqrt{\delta} W$. Then, by Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^\omega u_t(x) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \nabla u_t(x), \sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x) \rangle \right] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}^{u_t}(x)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), [\sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x)] \\ &\quad \quad \quad [\sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x)]^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &= \langle \nabla u_t(x), -\eta \nabla P(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \eta^2 \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), \mathbb{E}[Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0)]^2 + \nabla P(x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}^{u_t}(x)], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{R}^{u_t}(x) \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^r \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x + s [\sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x)]) - \nabla^2 u_t(x), \\ &\quad \quad \quad [\sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x)] [\sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x)]^T \rangle ds dr. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 [\mathcal{A}^Z u_t(Z_s^x) - \mathcal{A}^\omega u_t(x)] ds \right| \leq \mathcal{J}_1 + \mathcal{J}_2 + \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}^{u_t}(x)|,$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_1 := \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla u_t(X_s^x), \nabla P(X_s^x) \rangle ds - \eta \langle \nabla u_t(x), \nabla P(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \eta^2 \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), \nabla P(x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right|$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_2 := \left| \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla^2 u_t(X_s^x), \eta \Sigma(X_s^x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d \rangle_{\text{HS}} ds - \frac{1}{2} \eta^2 \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), \mathbb{E}[Q_{\eta, \delta}(x, \omega_0)]^2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right|.$$

For \mathcal{J}_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla u_t(X_s^x), \nabla P(X_s^x) - \nabla P(x) \rangle ds \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla u_t(X_s^x) - \nabla u_t(x), \nabla P(x) \rangle ds + \frac{1}{2} \eta^2 \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), \nabla P(x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right| \\ &:= \mathcal{J}_{11} + \mathcal{J}_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.7), (1.4), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.11), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{11} &\leq C_L \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} |X_s^x - x| ds \\ &\leq C_{\gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} \int_0^\eta (1 + |x| + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2} + K^{\frac{1}{2}}) \sqrt{s(s + \eta + \delta)} ds \\ &\leq C_{\gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} (1 + |x| + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2} + K^{\frac{1}{2}}) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} (\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \langle \nabla u_t(X_s^x) - \nabla u_t(x), \nabla P(x) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), (X_s^x - x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x + r(X_s^x - x)) - \nabla^2 u_t(x), (X_s^x - x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} dr \\ &= - \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), \nabla P(X_v^x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} dv \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x + r(X_s^x - x)) - \nabla^2 u_t(x), (X_s^x - x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} dr. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.8), (3.9), (1.4) and (1.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{12} &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^\eta \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x), (\nabla P(X_v^x) - \nabla P(x)) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} dv ds \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_0^\eta \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 u_t(x + r(X_s^x - x)) - \nabla^2 u_t(x), (X_s^x - x) (\nabla P(x))^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} dr ds \right| \\ &\leq C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\right) (1 + |x|) \int_0^\eta \int_0^s \mathbb{E} |X_v^x - x| dv ds \\ &\quad + C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + |x|) \int_0^\eta \int_0^1 r \mathbb{E} |X_s^x - x|^2 dr ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.11), we can get

$$\mathcal{J}_{12} \leq C_{A, \gamma, d, |\nabla P(0)|, L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\right) (1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K) \eta^{\frac{5}{2}} (\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$$

$$+ C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + |x|)(1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K)\eta^2(\eta + \delta).$$

The condition $\eta \leq \delta \leq 1$ further implies

$$\mathcal{J}_{12} \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} + \frac{\delta}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + |x|)(1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K)\eta^2.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{J}_1 \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} (1 + |x|)(1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K) \left[\left(\frac{1}{t} + \frac{\delta}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right)\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

For \mathcal{J}_2 , notice that $\eta \mathbb{E}[Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0)]^2 = \eta \mathbb{E}[\Sigma(x, \omega_0)] + \delta I_d$, and for $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, following the definition of $\Sigma(x, y)$, a straight calculation gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(x, y) - \Sigma(z, y) &= \mathbb{E} \left[(\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(z)) (\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(y))^{\top} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} [\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(z)] (\mathbb{E}_I [\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(y)])^{\top} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(\nabla \psi_I(z) - \nabla \psi_I(y)) (\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(z))^{\top} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} [\nabla \psi_I(z) - \nabla \psi_I(y)] (\mathbb{E}_I [\nabla \psi_I(x) - \nabla \psi_I(z)])^{\top}. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.3), (1.4) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we further have

$$(B.2) \quad \|\Sigma(x, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2L^2|x - y|^2 \leq 4L^2(|x|^2 + |y|^2),$$

and

(B.3)

$$\|\Sigma(x, y) - \Sigma(z, y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2L^2(|x - y| + |z - y|)|x - z| \leq 2L^2(|x| + 2|y| + |z|)|x - z|.$$

Then, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (3.8) and (3.9) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2 &\leq \frac{\eta}{2} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla^2 u_t(X_s^x), \Sigma(X_s^x, \omega_0) - \Sigma(x, \omega_0) \rangle_{\text{HS}} ds \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla^2 u_t(X_s^x) - \nabla^2 u_t(x), \eta \Sigma(x, \omega_0) + \delta I_d \rangle_{\text{HS}} ds \right| \\ &\leq \eta C_{A,\gamma,d,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\right) \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} [(|X_s^x| + |\omega_0| + |x|) |X_s^x - x|] ds \\ &\quad + C_{A,\gamma,d,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} [|X_s^x - x| (\eta |x|^2 + \eta |\omega_0|^2 + \delta)] ds, \end{aligned}$$

Following the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (3.10) and (3.11), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2 &\leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\right) (1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2 + K)\eta^{\frac{5}{2}}(\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\quad + C_{A,\gamma,d,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^2} + K^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\quad \quad (1 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4})(1 + |x|^3)\eta^{\frac{3}{2}}(\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}})(\eta + \delta). \end{aligned}$$

The condition $\eta \leq \delta \leq 1$ further implies

$$\mathcal{J}_2 \leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} + \frac{\delta}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K)(1 + |x|^3)\eta^{\frac{3}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In addition, by (3.9), (1.3), Hölder's inequality and (1.4), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}^{u_t}(x)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq C_{A,\gamma,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) \mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{\eta} V_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0, I, W) - \eta \nabla P(x) \right|^3 \\
 &\leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) \left[\eta^3 (1 + |x|^3 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^3) + (\eta\delta)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right] \\
 &\leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} + \frac{\delta}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + |x|^3 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^3) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining all of above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 [\mathcal{A}^Z u_t(Z_s^x) - \mathcal{A}^\omega u_t(x)] ds \right| \\
 &\leq C_{A,\gamma,d,|\nabla P(0)|,L} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} + \frac{\delta}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right) (1 + \mathbb{E}|\omega_0|^4 + K) (1 + |x|^3) \eta^{\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.3

Under the Assumptions 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1 in Sections 1 and 2, we recall some preliminary of Malliavin calculus and derive standard estimates related to Malliavin calculus and SDE, which will be applied to prove the Lemma 3.3 in Section 3.

C.1. Malliavin calculus of SDE (3.2) ([28]). For simplicity, denote $B(x) := -\nabla P(x)$ and $\sigma_{\eta,\delta,\omega_0}(x) = Q_{\eta,\delta}(x, \omega_0)$. If there is no ambiguity, we abbreviate it as $\sigma(x) = \sigma_{\eta,\delta,\omega_0}(x)$. Then, the SDE (3.2) can be written as the following form:

$$(C.1) \quad dX_t = B(X_t)dt + \sqrt{\eta}\sigma(X_t)dB_t, \quad X_0 = x,$$

where B_t is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. Moreover, the Assumptions 1.2 and 2.1 can be rewritten as the following form:

Assumption A There exist constants $L \geq 0$, $A_i \geq 0$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and unit vectors $v, v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$(C.2) \quad |\nabla_v B(x)| \leq L, \quad |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} B(x)| \leq A_1,$$

$$(C.3) \quad |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} B(x)| \leq A_2, \quad \|\nabla_{v_1} \sigma(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_3$$

$$(C.4) \quad \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \sigma(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_4, \quad \|\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_3} \sigma(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq A_5.$$

Remark C.1. Since $S(x) = \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^T = \Sigma(x) + \frac{\delta}{\eta}I_d$ and $\Sigma(x)$ is semi-positive definite, for any $0 \neq \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$(C.5) \quad \xi^T S(x) \xi \geq \frac{\delta}{\eta} \xi^T I_d \xi = \frac{\delta}{\eta} |\xi|^2.$$

Under the **Assumption A**, there exists a unique solution to the SDE (C.1) and the SDE (C.1) has a unique non-degenerate invariant measure (see, e.g., [6, 12, 26, 39, 50]).

Next, we briefly recall Bismut's approach to Malliavin calculus, which is crucial to prove Lemma 3.3.

We first consider the derivative of X_t^x with respect to initial value x , which is called the Jacobian flow. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the Jacobian flow $\nabla_v X_t^x$ along the direction u is defined by

$$\nabla_v X_t^x = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{X_t^{x+\epsilon v} - X_t^x}{\epsilon}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

The above limit exists and satisfies

$$(C.6) \quad d\nabla_v X_t^x = \nabla B(X_t^x) \nabla_v X_t^x dt + \sqrt{\eta} \nabla \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_v X_t^x dB_t, \quad \nabla_v X_0^x = v.$$

Then, we use the notations $J_{s,t}^x$ with $0 \leq s \leq t < \infty$ for the stochastic flow between time s and t , that is,

$$\nabla_v X_t^x = J_{0,t}^x v.$$

Note that we have the important cocycle property $J_{0,s}^x J_{s,t}^x = J_{0,t}^x$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t < \infty$. For a more thorough discussion on stochastic flow, we refer the reader to [40, 41, 2, 34] and the references therein.

For $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can define $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$, which satisfies

$$(C.7) \quad \begin{aligned} d\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x &= \nabla B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt + \nabla^2 B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt \\ &+ \sqrt{\eta} \nabla \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dB_t + \sqrt{\eta} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dB_t, \end{aligned}$$

with $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0$.

For $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can define $\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$, which satisfies

$$(C.8) \quad \begin{aligned} d\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x &= \nabla^2 B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt + \nabla B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt \\ &+ \nabla^3 B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt + \nabla^2 B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt \\ &+ \nabla^2 B(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dt + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x dB_t \\ &+ \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x + \nabla^3 \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] dB_t \\ &+ \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla^2 \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] dB_t, \end{aligned}$$

with $\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0$.

Then, we have the following estimate:

Lemma C.2. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v, v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$(C.9) \quad \mathbb{E} |\nabla_v X_t^x|^8 \leq e^{8L+28A_3} |v|^8,$$

$$(C.9) \quad \mathbb{E} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^4 \leq 2(A_1 + 6A_4) e^{12L+3A_1+12A_3+6A_4+28} |v_1|^4 |v_2|^4,$$

and

$$(C.10) \quad \mathbb{E} |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \leq C_{A,L} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

Proof. Recalling (C.6), by Itô's formula, (C.2), (C.3) and (1.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E} |\nabla_v X_s^x|^8 &= 8\mathbb{E} [|\nabla_v X_s^x|^6 \langle \nabla B(X_s^x) \nabla_v X_s^x, \nabla_v X_s^x \rangle] + 4\eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_v X_s^x|^6 \|\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_v X_s^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \\ &+ 24\eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_v X_s^x|^4 |\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_v X_s^x \nabla_v X_s^x|^2] \\ &\leq (8L + 28\eta A_3) \mathbb{E} |\nabla_v X_s^x|^8. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality, together with $\nabla_v X_0^x = v$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\mathbb{E} |\nabla_v X_t^x|^8 \leq |v|^8 e^{(8L+28\eta A_3)t} \leq e^{8L+28A_3} |v|^8.$$

Using Itô's formula to $\varsigma_1(t) = \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$, by (C.7), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and **Assumption A**, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E} |\varsigma_1(s)|^4 &= 4\mathbb{E} [|\varsigma_1(s)|^2 \langle \nabla B(X_s^x) \varsigma_1(s) + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x, \varsigma_1(s) \rangle] \\ &+ 2\eta \mathbb{E} [|\varsigma_1(s)|^2 \|\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \varsigma_1(s) + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \\ &+ 4\eta \mathbb{E} [|\langle \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \varsigma_1(s) + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x, \varsigma_1(s) \rangle|^2] \\ &\leq 4L\mathbb{E} |\varsigma_1(s)|^4 + 4A_1 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_2} X_s^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_s^x| |\varsigma_1(s)|^3] \\ &+ 12\eta \mathbb{E} [|\varsigma_1(s)|^2 (\|\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \varsigma_1(s)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \|\nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2)] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 4(L + 3A_3\eta)\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_1(s)|^4 + 4A_1\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x||\varsigma_1(s)|^3] \\ &\quad + 12A_4\eta\mathbb{E}[|\varsigma_1(s)|^2|\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^2|\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2], \end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality and (C.8), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds}\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_1(s)|^4 &\leq (4L + 3A_1 + 12A_3 + 6A_4)\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_1(s)|^4 + (A_1 + 6A_4)\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^4|\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^4] \\ &\leq (4L + 3A_1 + 12A_3 + 6A_4)\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_1(s)|^4 + (A_1 + 6A_4)e^{8L+28A_3}|v_1|^4|v_2|^4. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality, together with $\varsigma_1(0) = 0$ and Gronwall's inequality, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\varsigma_1(t)|^4 &\leq (A_1 + 6A_4)e^{8L+28A_3}|v_1|^4|v_2|^4t + (A_1 + 6A_4)e^{8L+28A_3}|v_1|^4|v_2|^4 \\ &\quad (4L + 3A_1 + 12A_3 + 6A_4) \int_0^t se^{(4L+3A_1+12A_3+6A_4)(t-s)}ds \\ &\leq 2(A_1 + 6A_4)e^{12L+3A_1+12A_3+6A_4+28A_3}|v_1|^4|v_2|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Writing $\varsigma_2(t) = \nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_t^x$, by Itô's formula, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{ds}\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(s)|^2 \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla B(X_s^x)\varsigma_2(s) + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\nabla_{v_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, \varsigma_2(s) \rangle] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla^2 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, \varsigma_2(s) \rangle] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla^3 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, \varsigma_2(s) \rangle] \\ &\quad + \eta\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\varsigma_2(s) + \nabla^2\sigma(X_s^x)(\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\nabla_{v_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x) \\ &\quad + \nabla^3\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \nabla^2\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

By (C.2), (C.3) and (C.4), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds}\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(s)|^2 &\leq 2L\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(s)|^2 + 2A_2\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x||\varsigma_2(s)|] \\ &\quad + 2A_1\mathbb{E}[(|\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x| + |\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|)|\varsigma_2(s)|] \\ &\quad + 2A_1\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x||\varsigma_2(s)|] + 5A_3\eta\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(s)|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\eta(A_5\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|]^2 + A_4\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x||\nabla_{v_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|]^2) \\ &\quad + 5A_4\eta\mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^2|\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2|\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality, (C.8) and (C.9), we can get

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(s)|^2 \leq (2L + A_2 + 3A_1 + 5A_3)\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(s)|^2 + C_{A,L}|v_1|^2|v_2|^2|v_3|^2.$$

This inequality, together with $\varsigma_2(0) = 0$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\mathbb{E}|\varsigma_2(t)|^2 \leq C_{A,L}|v_1|^2|v_2|^2|v_3|^2.$$

□

Next, we use Bismut's approach to Malliavin calculus for SDE (C.1)([49]). Let $u \in L_{loc}^2([0, \infty) \times (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |u(s)|^2 ds < \infty$ for all $t > 0$. Further assume that u is adapted to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(B_s : 0 \leq s \leq t)$; i.e., $u(t)$ is \mathcal{F}_t measurable for $t \geq 0$. Define

$$(C.11) \quad U_t = \int_0^t u(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

For a $t > 0$, let $F_t : \mathcal{C}([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a \mathcal{F}_t measurable map. If the following limit exists

$$D_U F_t(B) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_t(B + \epsilon U) - F_t(B)}{\epsilon}$$

in $L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R})$, then $F_t(B)$ is said to be *Malliavin differentiable* and $D_U F_t(B)$ is called the Malliavin derivative of $F_t(B)$ in the direction u .

Let $F_t(B)$ and $G_t(B)$ both be Malliavin differentiable, then the following product rule holds:

$$(C.12) \quad D_U(F_t(B)G_t(B)) = F_t(B)D_U G_t(B) + G_t(B)D_U F_t(B).$$

When

$$F_t(B) = \int_0^t \langle a(s), dB(s) \rangle,$$

where $a(s) = (a_1(s), \dots, a_d(s))$ is a deterministic function such that $\int_0^t |a(s)|^2 ds < \infty$ for all $t > 0$, and it is easy to verify that

$$D_U F_t(B) = \int_0^t \langle a(s), u(s) \rangle ds.$$

Moreover, if $a(s)$ is a stochastic process adapted to the filtration \mathcal{F}_s such that $\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |a(s)|^2 ds < \infty$ for all $t > 0$, it is easy to check that

$$(C.13) \quad D_U F_t(B) = \int_0^t \langle a(s), u(s) \rangle ds + \int_0^t \langle D_U a(s), dB_s \rangle.$$

Then, we consider the following integration by parts formula, which is called Bismut's formula. For Malliavin differentiable $F_t(B)$ such that $F_t(B), D_U F_t(B) \in L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R})$, we have

$$(C.14) \quad \mathbb{E}[D_U F_t(B)] = \mathbb{E}\left[F_t(B) \int_0^t \langle u(s), dB_s \rangle\right].$$

Let $\phi \in \text{Lip}(1)$ and let $F_t(B) = (F_t^1(B), \dots, F_t^d(B))$ be a d -dimensional Malliavin differentiable functional. The following chain rule holds:

$$D_U \phi(F_t(B)) = \langle \nabla \phi(F_t(B)), D_U F_t(B) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i \phi(F_t(B)) D_U F_t^i(B).$$

Now, we come back to the SDE (C.1). Fixing $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution X_t^x is a d -dimensional functional of Brownian motion $(B_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$.

The following Malliavin derivative of X_t^x along the direction U exists in $L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R}^d)$ and is defined by

$$D_U X_t^x(B) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{X_t^x(B + \epsilon U) - X_t^x(B)}{\epsilon}.$$

We drop the B in $D_U X_t^x(B)$ and write $D_U X_t^x = D_U X_t^x(B)$ for simplicity. It satisfies the equation

$$dD_U X_t^x = \nabla B(X_t^x) D_U X_t^x dt + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \sigma(X_t^x) D_U X_t^x dB_t + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_t^x) u(t) dt, \quad D_U X_0^x = 0,$$

and the equation has a unique solution:

$$D_U X_t^x = \int_0^t J_{r,t}^x \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_r^x) u(r) dr.$$

Noticing that $\nabla_v X_t^x = J_{0,t}^x v$, if we take

$$(C.15) \quad u(s) = \frac{1}{t} \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_v X_s^x, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

then (C.5) and (C.8) imply $u \in L_{loc}^2([0, \infty) \times (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $\nabla_v X_r^x = J_{0,r}^x v$ and $J_{0,r}^x J_{r,t}^x = J_{0,t}^x$, for all $0 \leq r \leq t$, we have

$$(C.16) \quad D_U X_t^x = \nabla_v X_t^x$$

and

$$(C.17) \quad D_U X_s^x = \frac{s}{t} \nabla_v X_s^x, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t.$$

Let $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define u_i and U_i as (C.15) and (C.11), respectively, for $i = 1, 2$. We can similarly define $D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, which satisfies the following equation: for $s \in [0, t]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & dD_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \\ &= [\nabla B(X_s^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) D_{U_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x u_2(s)] ds \\ & \quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s \\ &= [\nabla B(X_s^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{s}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x] ds \\ (C.18) \quad & + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{s}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s, \end{aligned}$$

with $D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0$, where the second equality is by (C.15) and (C.17).

For further use, we define

$$\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x, dB_s \rangle$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t) := \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x - D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x.$$

Then, we have the following upper bounds on Malliavin derivatives.

Lemma C.3. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and*

$$U_{i,s} = \int_0^s u_i(r) dr, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

where $u_i(r) = \frac{1}{t} \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_i} X_r^x$ for $0 \leq r \leq t$ and $i = 1, 2$. Then, as $\eta \in (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$(C.19) \quad \mathbb{E} |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} (1 + \frac{1}{t}) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2$$

and

$$(C.20) \quad \mathbb{E} |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^4 \leq C_{A,L,d} (1 + \frac{1}{t^3}) |v_1|^4 |v_2|^4.$$

Proof. Writing $\zeta(s) = D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, by Itô's formula, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.2), (C.3) and (C.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\zeta(r)|^2 &= 2\mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla B(X_r^x) \zeta(r) + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x, \zeta(r) \rangle] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} [\langle \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x, \zeta(r) \rangle] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \eta \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \zeta(r) + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \\
& \leq 2L \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^2 + 2A_1 \frac{r}{t} \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\| \|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\| \|\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x\|] \\
& \quad + 2\sqrt{A_3} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\| \|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\| \|\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x\| \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}] \\
& \quad + 2\eta \mathbb{E}[A_3 |\zeta(r)|^2 + A_4 \frac{r^2}{t^2} |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality, (C.5), Cauchy's inequality, (C.8) and the assumption $\eta \leq \delta$, we further have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^2 & \leq (2L + A_1 + 3A_3) \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^2 \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(A_1 + 2A_4 + \frac{1}{t^2} \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \right) |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 \right] \\
& \leq (2L + A_1 + 3A_3) \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^2 + \left(A_1 + 2A_4 + \frac{\eta d}{\delta} \frac{1}{t^2} \right) e^{4L+14A_3} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 \\
& \leq (2L + A_1 + 3A_3) \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^2 + \left(A_1 + 2A_4 + \frac{d}{t^2} \right) e^{4L+14A_3} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This inequality, together with $\zeta(0) = 0$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|\zeta(s)|^2 & \leq \left(A_1 + 2A_4 + \frac{d}{t^2} \right) e^{4L+14A_3} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 \left[s + \int_0^s r(2L + A_1 + 3A_3) e^{(2L+A_1+3A_3)(s-r)} dr \right] \\
& \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} \right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For (C.20), Itô's formula, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and **Assumption A** yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^4 & = 4\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\|^2 \langle \nabla B(X_r^x) \zeta(r) + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x, \zeta(r) \rangle] \\
& \quad + 4\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\|^2 \langle \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x, \zeta(r) \rangle] \\
& \quad + 2\eta \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\|^2 \|\nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \zeta(r) + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \\
& \quad + 4\eta \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \zeta(r) + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \\
& \leq 4L \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^4 + 4A_1 \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\|^3 \|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\| \|\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x\|] \\
& \quad + 4\sqrt{A_3} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\|^3 \|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\| \|\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x\| \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}] \\
& \quad + 12\eta \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta(r)\|^2 (A_3 |\zeta(r)|^2 + A_4 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2)].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by Young's inequality, (C.5), the assumption $\eta \leq \delta$ and (C.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^4 & \leq (4L + 3A_1 + 3A_3^{\frac{2}{3}} + 12A_3 + 6A_4) \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^4 \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(A_1 + 6A_4 + \frac{1}{t^4} \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^4 \right) |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^4 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^4 \right] \\
& \leq (4L + 3A_1 + 3A_3^{\frac{2}{3}} + 12A_3 + 6A_4) \mathbb{E}|\zeta(r)|^4 \\
& \quad + \left(A_1 + 6A_4 + \frac{d^2}{t^4} \right) e^{8L+28A_3} |v_1|^4 |v_2|^4.
\end{aligned}$$

This inequality, together with $\zeta(0) = 0$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\mathbb{E}|\zeta(s)|^4 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^3}\right) |v_1|^4 |v_2|^4.$$

□

Based on the results above, we have the following two lemmas:

Lemma C.4. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for all $\eta \leq (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$(C.21) \quad \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^4 \leq \frac{10 d^2}{t^2 \delta^2} e^{4L+14A_3} |v_1|^4,$$

$$(C.22) \quad \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_2} \mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^2 \leq \frac{C_{A,L,d}}{t\delta} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2,$$

$$(C.23) \quad \mathbb{E}|D_{U_2} \mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{t\delta} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t\delta}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2.$$

Proof. By Burkholder's inequality [52, Theorem 2], (C.5) and (C.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^4 &= \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x, dB_s \rangle\right|^4 \\ &\leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{t^4} \eta^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t |\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 ds\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{10 d^2}{t^4 \delta^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t |\nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 ds\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{10 d^2}{t^3 \delta^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^4 ds \leq \frac{10 d^2}{t^2 \delta^2} e^{4L+14A_3} |v_1|^4. \end{aligned}$$

For (C.22), the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{v_2} \mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t) &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \nabla_{v_2} \langle \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x, dB_s \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \langle -\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} \sigma(X_s^x) \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x, dB_s \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Itô isometry, (C.3) and (C.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_2} \mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{t^2} \eta^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} \sigma(X_s^x) \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x - \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{2}{t^2} \eta^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} \sigma(X_s^x) \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 + |\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2] ds \\ &\leq \frac{2}{t^2} \eta^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[A_3 \|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^4 |\nabla_{v_2} X_s^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 + \|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2] ds \\ &\leq \frac{2}{t^2} \eta^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[A_3 \frac{\eta^2 d^2}{\delta^2} |\nabla_{v_2} X_s^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 + \frac{\eta d}{\delta} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2] ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8) and (C.9), we further have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_2} \mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{t^2} \eta^{-1} \int_0^t \left[\frac{\eta^2}{\delta^2} + \frac{\eta}{\delta} \right] |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 ds \leq \frac{C_{A,L,d}}{t\delta} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2.$$

Recall (C.15) and (C.17), it is easy to see that $D_{U_2}\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)$ can be computed by (C.13) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& D_{U_2}\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, u_2(s) \rangle ds + \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, dB_s \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}D_{U_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, dB_s \rangle \\
&= \frac{\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \int_0^t \langle \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x \rangle ds + \frac{\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{t} \int_0^t \langle \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, dB_s \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{t} \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \langle \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\frac{s}{t}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, dB_s \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Itô isometry and (C.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}|D_{U_2}\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{3\eta^{-2}}{t^3} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\langle \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x, \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x \rangle|^2 ds + \frac{3\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2 ds \\
&\quad + \frac{3\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\frac{s}{t}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2 ds \\
&\leq \frac{3\eta^{-2}}{t^3} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^4 |\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^2] ds + \frac{3\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 |D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2] ds \\
&\quad + A_3 \frac{3\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^4 |\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (C.5), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8) and (C.19) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}|D_{U_2}\mathcal{I}_{v_1}^x(t)|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{3\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \left(\frac{\eta^{-1}}{t} + A_3 \right) \int_0^t \frac{\eta^2 d^2}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x|^2] ds + \frac{3\eta^{-1}}{t^2} \int_0^t \frac{\eta d}{\delta} \mathbb{E}|D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x|^2 ds \\
&\leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{t\delta} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t\delta} \right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Furthermore, let $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define u_i and U_i as (C.15) and (C.11), respectively, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. From (C.18), we can similarly define $\nabla_{v_3}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x$, which satisfies the following equation: for $s \in [0, t]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\nabla_{v_3}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x \\
&= [\nabla^2 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \nabla B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x \\
&\quad + \frac{s}{t}\nabla^3 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \frac{s}{t}\nabla^2 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x \\
&\quad + \frac{s}{t}\nabla^2 B(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \frac{1}{t}\nabla^2\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{t}\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)(\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x + \nabla_{v_1}X_s^x\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_3}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{t}\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x\sigma(X_s^x)^{-1}\nabla_{v_2}X_s^x] ds \\
&\quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla^2\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}X_s^x D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x + \nabla\sigma(X_s^x)\nabla_{v_3}D_{U_2}\nabla_{v_1}X_s^x
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{S}{t} \nabla^3 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \\
& + \frac{S}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s
\end{aligned}$$

with $\nabla_{v_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0$.

Then, we have the following upper bounds on Malliavin derivatives.

Lemma C.5. *Let $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and let*

$$U_{i,s} = \int_0^s u_i(r) dr, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

where $u_i(r) = \frac{1}{t} \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_i} X_r^x$ for $0 \leq r \leq t$. Then, for all $\eta \in (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$(C.24) \quad \mathbb{E} |\nabla_{v_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

Proof. Writing $\tau_1(s) = \nabla_{v_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, by Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_1(r)|^2 \\
& = 2\mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 B(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla B(X_r^x) \tau_1(r) \\
& \quad + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^3 B(X_r) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_r) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \\
& \quad + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_r) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \frac{1}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) (\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x + \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x) \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x, \tau_1(r) \rangle \\
& \quad + \eta \mathbb{E} \|\nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \tau_1(r) + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \\
& \quad + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^3 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x\|_{\text{HS}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from **Assumption A** and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_1(r)|^2 \\
& \leq 2L\mathbb{E} |\tau_1(r)|^2 + 2A_1 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\tau_1(r)|] \\
& \quad + 2\mathbb{E} [A_2 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\tau_1(r)| + A_1 |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\tau_1(r)|] \\
& \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[(A_1 |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + \frac{\sqrt{A_4}}{t} |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}) |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\tau_1(r)| \right] \\
& \quad + 2\sqrt{A_3} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} [(|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| + |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|) \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} |\tau_1(r)|] \\
& \quad + 2A_3 \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\tau_1(r)|] \\
& \quad + 5A_4 \eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2] \\
& \quad + 5\eta \mathbb{E} [A_3 |\tau_1(r)|^2 + A_5 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (C.5) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_1(r)|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (2L + 3A_1 + A_2 + 8A_3 + A_4)\mathbb{E}|\tau_1(r)|^2 \\
&\quad + \left(A_2 + \frac{1}{t^2} \frac{\eta d}{\delta} + \frac{A_3 \eta^2 d^2}{t^2 \delta^2} + 5A_5 \right) \mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2] \\
&\quad + A_1 \mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{t^2} \frac{\eta d}{\delta} \mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2] \\
&\quad + 5A_4 \eta \mathbb{E}[|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2],
\end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8), (C.20) and (C.9), we further have

$$\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E}|\tau_1(r)|^2 \leq (2L + 3A_1 + A_2 + 8A_3 + A_4)\mathbb{E}|\tau_1(r)|^2 + C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^2}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

This inequality, together with $\tau_1(0) = 0$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\mathbb{E}|\tau_1(s)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

□

Let $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define u_i and U_i as (C.15) and (C.11), respectively, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. From (C.7), we can similarly define $D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, which satisfies the following equation: for $s \in [0, t]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&dD_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \\
&= [\nabla B(X_s^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^3 B(X_s^x) D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] ds \\
&\quad + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) [D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] ds \\
&\quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] u_3(s) ds \\
&\quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^3 \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s \\
&\quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) [D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s \\
&= [\nabla B(X_s^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^3 B(X_s^x) \frac{s}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] ds \\
&\quad + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) \left[\frac{s}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \right] ds \\
&\quad + [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] \frac{1}{t} \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x ds \\
&\quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla^3 \sigma(X_s^x) \frac{s}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s \\
&\quad + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \left[\frac{s}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \right] dB_s
\end{aligned}$$

with $D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0$, where the second equality is by (C.15) and (C.17).

Then, we have the following upper bounds on Malliavin derivatives.

Lemma C.6. *Let $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and let*

$$U_{i,s} = \int_0^s u_i(r) dr, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

where $u_i(r) = \frac{1}{t} \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_i} X_r^x$ for $0 \leq r \leq t$. Then, for all $\eta \in (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$(C.25) \quad \mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^3.$$

Proof. Writing $\tau_2(s) = D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, by Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 \\
 = & 2\mathbb{E} \langle \nabla B(X_r^x) \tau_2(r) + \nabla^3 B(X_r^x) \frac{r}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x, \tau_2(r) \rangle \\
 & + 2\mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 B(X_r^x) \left[\frac{r}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \right], \tau_2(r) \rangle \\
 & + 2\mathbb{E} \langle [\nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x] \frac{1}{t} \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x, \tau_2(r) \rangle \\
 & + \eta \mathbb{E} \|\nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \tau_2(r) + \nabla^3 \sigma(X_r^x) \frac{r}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \\
 & \quad + \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \left[\frac{r}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \right]\|_{\text{HS}}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and **Assumption A** imply

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 \\
 \leq & 2L \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 + 2A_2 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\tau_2(r)|] \\
 & + 2A_1 \mathbb{E} [(|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|) |\tau_2(r)|] \\
 & + 2\mathbb{E} [(\sqrt{A_3} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + \sqrt{A_4} |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|) \frac{1}{t} \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\tau_2(r)|] \\
 & + 5\eta \mathbb{E} [A_3 |\tau_2(r)|^2 + A_5 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2] \\
 & + 5A_4 \eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2].
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (C.5) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 \\
 \leq & (2L + 3A_1 + A_2 + 6A_3 + A_4) \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 + (A_2 + 5A_5) \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2] \\
 & + A_1 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2] \\
 & + \mathbb{E} [(|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2) \frac{1}{t^2} \frac{\eta d}{\delta} |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2] \\
 & + 5A_4 \eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2].
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8), (C.9) and (C.20) that

$$\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 \leq (2L + 3A_1 + A_2 + 6A_3 + A_4) \mathbb{E} |\tau_2(r)|^2 + C_{A,L,d} (1 + \frac{1}{t^2}) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^3.$$

This inequality, together with $\tau_2(0) = 0$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\mathbb{E} |\tau_2(s)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} (1 + \frac{1}{t}) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^3.$$

□

Let $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define u_i and U_i as (C.15) and (C.11), respectively, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. From (C.18), we can similarly define $D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, which satisfies the following equation: for $s \in [0, t]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & dD_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \\
 = & \left[\frac{s}{t} \nabla^3 B(X_s^x) D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla B(X_s^x) D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \right] ds
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) [D_{U_3} X_s^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] ds \\
& + \frac{1}{t} [\nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x + \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x] ds \\
& + \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x ds \\
& - \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x ds \\
& + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] u_3(s) ds \\
& + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) [D_{U_3} X_s^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s \\
& + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\frac{S}{t} \nabla^3 \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s
\end{aligned}$$

with $D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0$. Furthermore, by (C.15) and (C.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& dD_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \\
& = [\frac{S^2}{t^2} \nabla^3 B(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla B(X_s^x) D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] ds \\
& + \frac{S}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_s^x) [\nabla_{v_3} X_s^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] ds \\
& + \frac{1}{t} [\nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \frac{S}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x + \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x] ds \\
& + \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x ds \\
& - \frac{S}{t^2} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x ds \\
& + [\nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \frac{S}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] \frac{1}{t} \sigma(X_s^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x ds \\
& + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{S}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_s^x) [\nabla_{v_3} X_s^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s \\
& + \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} [\frac{S^2}{t^2} \nabla^3 \sigma(X_s^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_s^x \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x + \nabla \sigma(X_s^x) D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x] dB_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following upper bounds on Malliavin derivatives.

Lemma C.7. *Let $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and let*

$$U_{i,s} = \int_0^s u_i(r) dr, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

where $u_i(r) = \frac{1}{t} \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_i} X_r^x$ for $0 \leq r \leq t$. Then, for all $\eta \in (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$(C.26) \quad \mathbb{E} |D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} (1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{2}}}) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

Proof. Writing $\tau_3(s) = D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_s^x$, by Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 \\
& = 2 \mathbb{E} \langle \frac{r^2}{t^2} \nabla^3 B(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla B(X_r^x) \tau_3(r), \tau_3(r) \rangle \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \langle \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 B(X_r^x) [\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x], \tau_3(r) \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2\mathbb{E}\langle \frac{1}{t} [\nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \frac{r}{t} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x] \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x, \tau_3(r) \rangle \\
& + 2\mathbb{E}\langle \frac{1}{t} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x, \tau_3(r) \rangle \\
& - 2\mathbb{E}\langle \frac{r}{t^2} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x, \tau_3(r) \rangle \\
& + 2\mathbb{E}\langle [\nabla \sigma(X_r^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x] \frac{1}{t} \sigma(X_r^x)^{-1} \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x, \tau_3(r) \rangle \\
& + \eta \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{r}{t} \nabla^2 \sigma(X_r^x) [\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{r^2}{t^2} \nabla^3 \sigma(X_r^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_r^x \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x + \nabla \sigma(X_r^x) \tau_3(r) \right\|_{\text{HS}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

Following the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and **Assumption A**, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 \\
\leq & 2L \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 + 2A_2 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| |\tau_3(r)|] \\
& + 2A_1 \mathbb{E} [(|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|) |\tau_3(r)|] \\
& + \frac{2}{t} \mathbb{E} [(\sqrt{A_4} |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + \sqrt{A_3} |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|) \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\tau_3(r)|] \\
& + \frac{2}{t} \sqrt{A_3} \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\tau_3(r)|] \\
& + \frac{2}{t} A_3 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\tau_3(r)|] \\
& + \frac{2}{t} \mathbb{E} [(\sqrt{A_3} |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x| + \sqrt{A_4} |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x| |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|) \|\sigma(X_r^x)^{-1}\|_{\text{HS}} |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x| |\tau_3(r)|] \\
& + 5A_4 \eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2] \\
& + 5\eta \mathbb{E} [A_5 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + A_3 |\tau_3(r)|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

By (C.5) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 \\
\leq & (2L + 3A_1 + A_2 + 9A_3 + 2A_4) \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 + (A_2 + 5A_5) \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2] \\
& + A_1 \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2] \\
& + \frac{1}{t^2} \mathbb{E} [(|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2) \frac{\eta d}{\delta} |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2] \\
& + \frac{1}{t^2} \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 \frac{\eta d}{\delta} + A_3 \frac{\eta^2 d^2}{\delta^2} |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2] \\
& + \frac{1}{t^2} \mathbb{E} [(|D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2) |\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 \frac{\eta d}{\delta}] \\
& + 5A_4 \eta \mathbb{E} [|\nabla_{v_3} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2 + |\nabla_{v_2} X_r^x|^2 |D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_r^x|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8) and (C.20), we have

$$\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 \leq (2L + 3A_1 + A_2 + 9A_3 + 2A_4) \mathbb{E} |\tau_3(r)|^2 + C_{A,L,d} (1 + \frac{1}{t^2}) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

This inequality, together with $\tau_3(0) = 0$ and Gronwall inequality, implies

$$\mathbb{E}|\tau_3(s)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{2}}}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

□

With the above results, we have the following estimates:

Lemma C.8. *Let $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, as $\eta \in (0, \delta]$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$(C.27) \quad \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2,$$

$$(C.28) \quad \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2$$

and

$$(C.29) \quad \mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2 \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{2}}}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2.$$

Proof. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.9) and (C.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x - D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}|D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^4} + 2\mathbb{E}|D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $t \leq \frac{4}{\gamma} e^{\frac{\gamma}{4}t}$, by (C.10) and (C.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x - \nabla_{v_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By (C.25) and (C.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x - D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \\ &\leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{2}}}\right) |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 |v_3|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.2. Proof of Lemma 3.3. Recall $P_t h(x) = \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]$ for $h \in Lip(1)$, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (C.8), we have

$$|\nabla_v \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]| = |\mathbb{E}[\nabla h(X_t^x) \nabla_v X_t^x]| \leq \|\nabla h\| \mathbb{E}|\nabla_v X_t^x| \leq e^{L+4},$$

(3.7) is proved.

Denote

$$(C.30) \quad h_\epsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_\epsilon(y) h(x-y) dy,$$

with $\epsilon > 0$ and f_ϵ is the density of the normal distribution $N(0, \epsilon^2 I_d)$. It is easy to see that h_ϵ is smooth, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h_\epsilon(x) = h(x)$, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \nabla h_\epsilon(x) = \nabla h(x)$ and $|h_\epsilon(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for all

$x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and some $C > 0$. Moreover, $\|\nabla h_\epsilon\| \leq \|\nabla h\| \leq 1$. Then, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] = \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x],$$

by (C.15) and (C.16), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_2} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{U_2}(\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x)) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{U_2}(\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x)] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x]. \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by Bismut's formula (C.14). These imply

$$(C.31) \quad \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] = \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)]$$

Therefore, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8), (C.21) and (C.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]| &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| + \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)|^2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|^2} \leq C_{A, L, d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}, \end{aligned}$$

(3.8) is proved.

By (C.31) and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] &= \nabla_{v_3} \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] + \nabla_{v_3} \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)], \end{aligned}$$

by (C.15), (C.16) and (C.14), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} X_t^x \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{U_3}(\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x)) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{U_3}(\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t))] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x D_{U_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x D_{U_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} X_t^x \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} X_t^x \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{U_3}(\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x)) \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{U_3}(\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t))] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

These imply

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)] - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x D_{U_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]| &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)| + \mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x D_{U_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| + \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| + \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)| + \mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (C.8) and (C.21), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)| \leq C_{L,d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}.$$

By (C.19) and (C.21), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right).$$

By (C.8) and (C.23), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x D_{U_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\right).$$

By (C.9) and (C.21), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}.$$

By (C.8) and (C.22), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{I}_{v_2}^x(t)| \leq \frac{C_{A,L,d}}{\sqrt{\delta t}}.$$

By (C.27) and (C.21), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t) \mathcal{I}_{v_3}^x(t)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right).$$

By (C.29), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|D_{U_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right).$$

By (C.28), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\nabla_{v_3} \mathcal{R}_{v_1, v_2}^x(t)| \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right).$$

These imply

$$|\nabla_{v_3} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]| \leq C_{A,L,d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\delta t} + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{5}{4}}}\right).$$

□

APPENDIX D. THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SOLUTION OF THE SDDE (2.7)

In this section, we will prove that when K in Assumption 1.4 and δ in the SDDE (2.7) both are small enough, the distribution of the solution \tilde{X}_s of the SDDE (2.7) is close to the minimizer ω^* as $s \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma D.1. *Under the Assumptions 1.2 and 1.4. Let $b := e^{-2(\gamma-L^2\eta)m\eta} + \frac{\eta L^2}{\gamma-L^2\eta}$. For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, as $\eta \leq \frac{\gamma}{3L^2}$ and $b < 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_s - \omega^*|^2 \leq b^s |x - \omega^*|^2 + \frac{2K + \delta d}{2(\gamma - L^2\eta)} \frac{1}{1 - b}.$$

Proof. By Itô's formula, for any $s, t \in [0, m\eta]$ with $s \leq t$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t - \omega^*|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|X_s - \omega^*|^2 - 2 \int_s^t \mathbb{E}\langle X_r - \omega^*, \nabla P(X_r) \rangle dr \\ &\quad + \eta \int_s^t \mathbb{E} \text{tr} [\Sigma(X_r, x)] dr + \delta d(t - s). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla P(\omega^*) = 0$ for the minimizer ω^* , (1.6) implies

$$\langle X_r - \omega^*, \nabla P(X_r) \rangle = \langle X_r - \omega^*, \nabla P(X_r) - \nabla P(\omega^*) \rangle \geq \gamma |X_r - \omega^*|^2 - K.$$

By (2.6), one has

$$\mathbb{E} \text{tr} [\Sigma(X_r, x)] \leq L^2 \mathbb{E}|X_r - x|^2 \leq 2L^2 \mathbb{E}|X_r - \omega^*|^2 + 2L^2 |x - \omega^*|^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}|X_t - \omega^*|^2 - |X_s - \omega^*|^2 \\ &\leq -2(\gamma - L^2\eta) \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|X_r - \omega^*|^2 dr + (2K + 2\eta L^2 |x - \omega^*|^2 + \delta d)(t - s). \end{aligned}$$

Denote $F(t) = \mathbb{E}|X_t - \omega^*|^2$ for $t > 0$, then for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq m\eta$,

$$(D.1) \quad F(t) - F(s) \leq -2(\gamma - L^2\eta) \int_s^t F(r) dr + (2K + 2\eta L^2 |x - \omega^*|^2 + \delta d)(t - s).$$

Let $s = 0$ and $\eta < \frac{\gamma}{L^2}$, the relation above yields

$$F(t) \leq F(0) + (2K + 2\eta L^2 |x - \omega^*|^2 + \delta d)m\eta, \quad t \in [0, m\eta],$$

which, together with (D.1), further implies $F(t)$ is absolutely continuous on $[0, m\eta]$. So $F(t)$ is differentiable on $[0, \eta]$ a.e.. Moreover, it is easy to see that the following differential inequality holds by (D.1),

$$F'(t) \leq -2(\gamma - L^2\eta)F(t) + 2K + 2\eta L^2 |x - \omega^*|^2 + \delta d \quad t \in (0, m\eta].$$

Solving this differential inequality further gives

$$F(t) \leq e^{-2(\gamma-L^2\eta)t} F(0) + \frac{2K + 2\eta L^2 |x - \omega^*|^2 + \delta d}{2(\gamma - L^2\eta)},$$

that is,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t - \omega^*|^2 \leq \left[e^{-2(\gamma-L^2\eta)t} + \frac{\eta L^2}{\gamma - L^2\eta} \right] |x - \omega^*|^2 + \frac{2K + \delta d}{2(\gamma - L^2\eta)}, \quad t \in [0, m\eta].$$

Inductively, for any $s \geq 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_s - \omega^*|^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{X}_s - \omega^*|^2 | \tilde{X}_{s-1} \right] \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq b\mathbb{E}|X_{(s-1)m\eta} - \omega^*|^2 + \frac{2K + \delta d}{2(\gamma - L^2\eta)} \\
&\leq b^s|x - \omega^*|^2 + \frac{2K + \delta d}{2(\gamma - L^2\eta)} \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} b^k \\
&\leq b^s|x - \omega^*|^2 + \frac{2K + \delta d}{2(\gamma - L^2\eta)} \frac{1}{1-b}.
\end{aligned}$$

The case $s = 0$ holds obviously and we finish the proof. \square

REFERENCES

1. S. Arora, H. Browne and D. Daners (2019): An alternative approach to Fréchet derivatives. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11531. [22](#), [23](#)
2. K. Bahlali (1999): Flows of homeomorphisms of stochastic differential equations with measurable drift. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*. [J]. **67**(1-2), pp. 53-82. [32](#)
3. J. Bao, P. Ren, F. Y. Wang (2020): Bismut Formula for Lions Derivative of Distribution-Path Dependent SDEs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14629. [7](#)
4. J. Bao, G. Yin and C. Yuan (2004): Ergodicity for functional stochastic differential equations and applications. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications*. [J]. **98**, pp. 66-82 [3](#), [7](#)
5. J. Bao, G. Yin, C. Yuan (2016): Asymptotic analysis for functional stochastic differential equations. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics: Springer. [3](#), [7](#)
6. V. I. Bogachev and M. Rockner (1995): Regularity of Invariant Measures on Finite and Infinite Dimensional Spaces and Applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis*. [J]. **133**(1), pp. 168-223. [31](#)
7. V. De Bortoli, A. Durmus, X. Fontaine, and U. Simsekli (2020): Quantitative propagation of chaos for sgd in wide neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.06352. [2](#)
8. C. Bréhier (2014): Approximation of the invariant measure with an Euler scheme for stochastic PDEs driven by space-time white noise. *Potential Analysis*. [J]. **40**(1), pp. 1-40. [3](#)
9. N. Brosse, A. Durmus, E. Moulines and S. Sabanis (2019): The tamed unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **129**(10), pp. 3638-3663. [2](#)
10. E. Buckwar (2000): Introduction to the numerical analysis of stochastic delay differential equations. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*. **125**(1-2), pp. 297-307. [3](#), [7](#)
11. F. Caravenna, R. Sun and N. Zygouras (2017): Polynomial chaos and scaling limits of disordered systems. *Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*. [J]. **19**(1), pp. 1-65. [3](#)
12. S. Cerrai (1996): Elliptic and parabolic equations in \mathbb{R}^n with coefficients having polynomial growth. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*. [J]. **21**, pp. 857-872. [31](#)
13. S. Chatterjee (2012): A generalization of the Lindeberg principle. *Annals of Probability*. **34**(6), pp. 2061-2076. [3](#)
14. P. Chen, Q. M. Shao, L. Xu (2020): A universal probability approximation method: Markov process approach. arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10985. [3](#), [8](#)
15. X. Chen, S. S. Du, X. T. Tong (2020): On Stationary-Point Hitting Time and Ergodicity of Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. **21**(68), pp. 1-41. [2](#)
16. P. Chen, L. Xu (2019): Approximation to stable law by the Lindeberg principle, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*. **480** (2), 123338. [3](#)
17. V. Chernozhukov, D. Chetverikov, K. Kato (2013): Gaussian approximations and multiplier bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *Annals of Statistics*. **41**(6), pp. 2786-2819. [3](#)
18. M. H. Davis and M. P. Johansson(2006): Malliavin Monte Carlo greeks for jump diffusions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. [J]. **116**(1), pp. 101-129. [3](#)
19. P. Del Moral, A. Niclas (2018): A Taylor expansion of the square root matrix function. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*. [J]. **465**(1), pp. 259-266. [9](#), [22](#)
20. J. Dieudonné (1969): Foundations of Modern Analysis. Academic press, Boston, MA, MR 0349288. [5](#)
21. A. Dubey, S. J. Reddi, B. Póczos, A. J. Smola, E. P. Xing and S. A. Williamson (2016): Variance reduction in stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. [J]. **29**, 1154. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [17](#)
22. R. M. Dudley, R. Norvaiša and R. Norvaiša (2011): Concrete functional calculus. New York: Springer. [5](#)

23. A. Durmus, E. Moulines (2017): Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *Annals of Applied Probability*. **27**(3), pp. 1551-1587. [2](#)
24. A. Durmus, E. Moulines (2019): High-dimensional Bayesian inference via the unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *Bernoulli*. **25**(4A), pp. 2854-2882. [2](#)
25. A. Eberle (2011): Reflection coupling and wasserstein contractivity without convexity. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*. **349**(19-20), pp. 1101-1104.
26. L. C. Evans. (2014): *An introduction to stochastic differential equations*. Amer Mathematical Society. [31](#)
27. J. Fan, W. Gong, C. Li and Q. Sun (2018): Statistical Sparse Online Regression: A Diffusion Approximation Perspective. *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR*. **84**, pp. 1017-1026. [3](#)
28. X. Fang, Q. M. Shao and L. Xu (2019): Multivariate approximations in Wasserstein distance by Stein's method and Bismut's formula. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*. **174**(3-4), pp. 945-979. [2](#), [3](#), [17](#), [31](#)
29. X. Fontaine, V. De Bortoli and A. Durmus (2020): Continuous and discrete-time analysis of stochastic gradient descent for convex and non-convex functions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04193. [3](#)
30. Y. Feng, L. Li, and J.G. Liu (2018): Semigroups of stochastic gradient descent and online principal component analysis: properties and diffusion approximations. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*. **16**(3), pp. 777-789. [3](#)
31. Y. Feng, T. Gao, L. Li, J. G. Liu and Y. Lu (2020): Uniform-in-time weak error analysis for stochastic gradient descent algorithms via diffusion approximation. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*. **18**(1), pp. 163-188. [3](#)
32. E. Fournié, J. Lasry, J. Lebuchoux, P. Lions, and N. Touzi (1999): Applications of Malliavin calculus to Monte Carlo methods in finance. *Finance Stochast*. **3**(4), pp. 391-412. [3](#)
33. E. Gobet and R. Munos (2005): Sensitivity Analysis Using Itô-Malliavin Calculus and Martingales, and Application to Stochastic Optimal Control. *SIAM Journal on control and optimization*. **43**(5), 1676-1713. [3](#)
34. M. Hairer, J. C. Mattingly (2006): Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Annals of Mathematics*. **164**, pp. 993-1032. [32](#)
35. T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman (2009): *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer Science & Business Media. [8](#)
36. W. Hu, C. Li, L. Li and J.G. Liu (2019): On the diffusion approximation of nonconvex stochastic gradient descent. *Annals of Mathematical Sciences and Applications*. **4**(1), pp.3-32. [3](#)
37. R. Johnson, T. Zhang(2013): Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. **26**, pp. 315-323. [2](#)
38. S.B. Korada, A. Montanari (2011): Applications of the Lindeberg principle in communications and statistical learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*. **57**(4), pp. 2440-2450. [3](#)
39. N. V. Krylov (1991): *Introduction to the Theory of Diffusion Processes*. Vol. 142, Providence. [31](#)
40. H. Kunita (1984): Stochastic differential equations and stochastic flows of diffeomorphisms. *Ecole d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XII-1982*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 143-303. [32](#)
41. H. Kunita (1997): *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*. Vol. 24, Cambridge university press. [32](#)
42. A. Lamperski (2020): Projected Stochastic Gradient Langevin Algorithms for Constrained Sampling and Non-Convex Learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.12137. [2](#)
43. Q. Li, C. Tai and Weinan E. (2017): Stochastic modified equations and adaptive stochastic gradient algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*(pp. 2101-2110). PMLR. [2](#), [3](#)
44. Q. Li, C. Tai and Weinan E. (2018): Stochastic Modified Equations and Dynamics of Stochastic Gradient Algorithms I: Mathematical Foundations. *J. Mach. Learn. Res*. **20**, pp. 40-1. [2](#), [3](#), [8](#)
45. F. Merlevède, M. Peligrad (2016): On the empirical spectral distribution for matrices with long memory and independent rows. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*. **126**(9), pp. 2734-2760. [3](#)
46. S-E A. Mohammed (1984): Stochastic functional differential equations. Research Notes in Mathematics 99, Pitman Advanced Publishing Program, Boston, MA. [7](#)
47. B. Muzellec, K. Sato, M. Massias and T. Suzuki (2020): Dimension-free convergence rates for gradient Langevin dynamics in RKHS. arXiv preprint arXiv: 2003.00306. [3](#)
48. D. Nagaraj, P. Jain, and P. Netrapalli(2019): Sgd without replacement: Sharper rates for general smooth convex functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 4703-4711). PMLR. [2](#)
49. J. Norris (1986): Simplified malliavin calculus. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XX 1984/85*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 101-130. [33](#)

50. G. D. Prato, B. Goldys (2001): Elliptic Operators on \mathbb{R}^d with Unbounded Coefficients. *Journal of Differential Equations*. **172**(2), pp. 333-358. [31](#)
51. N. Privault and A. Réveillac (2008): Stein estimation for the drift of Gaussian processes using the Malliavin calculus. *The Annals of Statistics*. **36**(5), pp. 2531–2550. [3](#)
52. Y. F. Ren (2008): On the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequalities for continuous martingales. *Statistics and probability letters*. **78**(17), pp. 3034-3039. [37](#)
53. G. Rotskoff and E. Vanden-Eijnden (2018). Parameters as interacting particles: long time convergence and asymptotic error scaling of neural networks. *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 7146–7155 [2](#)
54. M. Scheutzow (2013). Exponential growth rate for a singular linear stochastic delay differential equation. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems. Series B*. **18**(6) 1683-1696. [3](#)
55. U. Simsekli, L. Sagun and M. Gurbuzbalaban (2019). A Tail-Index Analysis of Stochastic Gradient Noise in Deep Neural Networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 5827-5837). PMLR [3](#)
56. T. Tao, V. Vu (2011): Random matrices: Universality of local eigenvalue statistics. *Acta Mathematica*. **206**(1), pp. 127-204. [3](#)
57. F. Y. Wang (2020): Exponential contraction in Wasserstein distances for diffusion semigroups with negative curvature. *Potential Analysis*. **53**(3), pp. 1123-1144.
58. M. Welling and Y.W. Teh (2011). Bayesian Learning via Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 681-688). PMLR. [2](#)
59. P. Xu, J. Chen, D. Zou, Q. Gu (2018): Global convergence of Langevin dynamics based algorithms for nonconvex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. **31**, pp. 3122-3133. [4](#)
60. J. Yang, W. Hu and C. Li (2021). On the fast convergence of random perturbations of the gradient flow. *Asymptotic Analysis*. **122**(4), pp. 371-393. [3](#)
61. K. S. Zhang, G. PeyrÉ, J. Fadili, and M. Pereyra(2020): Wasserstein control of mirror langevin monte carlo. In *Conference on Learning Theory* (pp. 3814-3841). PMLR. [2](#)
62. S.Q. Zhang (2019). Exponential convergence in Wasserstein Distance for Diffusion Semigroups with Irregular Drifts. arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.10190 [25](#)
63. P. Zhao, B. Yu (2006): On Model Selection Consistency of Lasso. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **7**, 2541-2563. [8](#)
64. X. Zhou, H. Yuan, C. J. Li and Q. Sun (2020): Stochastic Modified Equations for Continuous Limit of Stochastic ADMM. arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03532. [3](#)
65. Z. Zhu, J. Wu, B. Yu, L. Wu, and J. Ma (2019). The anisotropic noise in stochastic gradient descent: Its behavior of escaping from minima and regularization effects. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 7654-7663). PMLR. [2](#)
66. D. Zou, P. Xu and Q. Gu (2020). Faster Convergence of Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics for Non-Log-Concave Sampling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09597. [3](#)