

CRITERIA FOR ENTROPIC CURVATURE ON GRAPH SPACES

MARTIN RAPAPORT, PAUL-MARIE SAMSON

ABSTRACT. This paper presents local criteria for lower bounds on entropic curvature of *graph spaces* along Schrödinger bridges at zero temperature, according to the definition given by the second named author in [31], in the continuity of the work by C. Léonard [19] inspired by the Lott-Sturm-Villani theory.

A *graph space* is defined as a quadruple (\mathcal{X}, d, L, m) where \mathcal{X} is the set of vertices of a graph, d is the combinatorial distance of the graph and m is a reversible reference measure with respect to a generator L of a Markov semi-group. The criteria are given by local optimization problems on balls of radius two, depending only on the generator L and on the discrete structure of these balls. General tensorization properties of the criteria are presented for the study of the Cartesian product of graphs.

This approach is robust since it applies to a wide range of graph spaces and also for any measure m , including measures with interaction potential like Ising Models. We introduce a very large class of graphs, named *structured graphs*, for which the local criteria give non-negative entropic curvature for the uniform measure. A Bonnet-Myers type of theorem also ensures that any such graph with positive entropic curvature is finite.

On any *graph space* (\mathcal{X}, d, L, m) with $m(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$, positive entropic curvature provides transport-entropy inequalities with so-called weak optimal transport costs, as well as Poincaré or modified logarithmic-Sobolev inequalities for the renormalized probability measure $\mu = m/m(\mathcal{X})$. These functional inequalities are well known to be related to refined concentration properties of the measure μ , speed of convergence of semi-groups to the measure μ or bounds on its mixing time. For certain specific graph spaces, the local criteria are optimal and imply sharp functional inequalities.

We also present examples of graphs with negative curvature. Some comparisons of our results with other notions of curvature are established, such as Bakry-Emery curvature conditions [7, 8], Ollivier or Lin-Lu-Yau's curvature [28, 20].

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us present the framework of this research, in keeping with the seminal papers [19, 31]. Let \mathcal{X} be the set of vertices of a connected undirected graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ where $E \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ denotes the set of edges, without multiple edges and without loops. Two vertices x and y are *neighbours* if $(x, y) \in E$, we write $x \sim y$ in this case. Let d denote the combinatorial graph distance, so that $d(x, y) = 1$ if and only if $x \sim y$. The graph G is supposed to be *locally finite*, that is, the *vertex degree* $\text{Deg}(x) := \sum_{y \sim x} 1$ of any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is finite. The *maximal degree* of the graph is denoted by $\text{Deg}_{\max} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Deg}(x) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$. A *discrete geodesic path* α joining two vertices x and y is a sequence of neighbours of minimal size $d = d(x, y)$: $\alpha = (z_0, \dots, z_d)$ with $z_0 = x$ and $z_d = y$ and for any $i \in [d] := \{1, \dots, d\}$, $(z_{i-1}, z_i) \in E$. In the sequel, $z \in \alpha$ means that there exists $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$

Date: March 29, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60E15, 32F32 and 39A12.

Key words and phrases. Displacement convexity property, entropic curvature, Ricci curvature, optimal transport, graphs, lattices, discrete spaces, Schrödinger bridges, Bonnet-Myers theorem, transport-entropy inequalities, Poincaré inequality, logarithmic-Sobolev inequality, Prékopa-Leindler inequalities, Ising model, discrete hypercube.

This research is partly funded by the Bézout Labex, funded by ANR, reference ANR-10-LABX-58. The author is supported by a grant of the Simone and Cino Del Duca Foundation.

such that $z = z_i$, and $(z, w) \in \alpha$ means that there exists $0 \leq i < j \leq \ell$ such that $z = z_i$ and $w = z_j$. Let $G(x, y)$ be the set of all geodesic paths joining x to y , and let $[x, y]$ be the set of all vertices that belong to a geodesic from x to y ,

$$[x, y] := \{z \in \mathcal{X} \mid z \in \alpha, \alpha \in G(x, y)\},$$

$]x, y[:= [x, y] \setminus \{x, y\}$ and $[x, y[:= [x, y] \setminus \{y\}$. More generally, given two subsets A and B of \mathcal{X} , one defines

$$[A, B] := \bigcup_{x \in A, y \in B} [x, y] \quad \text{and} \quad]A, B[:= \bigcup_{x \in A, y \in B}]x, y[.$$

The set \mathcal{X} is endowed with the σ -algebra generated by singletons. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ denote the set of probabilities on \mathcal{X} , and $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$ the subset of probabilities with bounded support. The subset of probability measures μ satisfying $\int d(x_0, y) d\mu(y) < \infty$ for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{X})$, can be endowed with the W_1 -Wasserstein distance defined as usual by

$$(1) \quad W_1(\nu_0, \nu_1) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)} \iint d(x, y) d\pi(x, y), \quad \nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathcal{X}),$$

where $\Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ is the set of probability measures on the product space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ with first marginal ν_0 and second marginal ν_1 . We call W_1 -*optimal coupling* of ν_0 and ν_1 any coupling $\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ that achieves the infimum in (1). For any non negative measure M on a measurable space \mathcal{Y} , $\text{supp}(M)$ denotes the support of this measure. For further use, note that any measure $\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ admits the two following decompositions : for any $(x, y) \in \text{supp}(\pi)$,

$$\pi(x, y) = \nu_0(x) \pi_{\rightarrow}(y|x) = \nu_1(y) \pi_{\leftarrow}(x|y),$$

defining thus two Markov kernels π_{\rightarrow} and π_{\leftarrow} .

On a discrete space \mathcal{X} , recall that any generator L acting on functions from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} is entirely given by the jump rates from $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to $y \in \mathcal{X}$ denoted by $L(x, y)$, $L(x, y) := L\delta_y(x)$ with $\delta_y(y) = 1$ and $\delta_y(z) = 0$ for $z \neq y$.

In this paper, we call *graph space* any locally finite graph G as above endowed with a reference measure m on \mathcal{X} and a generator L satisfying the following two conditions :

- The measure m is reversible with respect to L , $m(x)L(x, y) = m(y)L(y, x)$ for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$.
- For any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, one has

$$(2) \quad L(x, y) > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad d(x, y) = 1,$$

(and $L(x, x) := -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}, y \neq x} L(x, y)$).

By definition, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, one denotes

$$L^k(x, y) := \sum_{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k-1} \in \mathcal{X}} L(x, z_1)L(z_1, z_2) \cdots L(z_{k-1}, y).$$

The property (2) ensures that for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$L^{d(x,y)}(x, y) = \sum_{\alpha \in G(x,y)} L(\alpha), \quad \text{where} \quad L(\alpha) := L(z_0, z_1) \cdots L(z_{d(x,y)-1}, z_{d(x,y)}),$$

for any $\alpha = (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{d(x,y)}) \in G(x, y)$.

As defined in [31], given $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$, a *Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature*, denoted by $(\widehat{\nu}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ in the present paper, is a particular W_1 constant speed geodesic between ν_0 and ν_1 on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, namely, $\widehat{\nu}_0 = \nu_0$, $\widehat{\nu}_1 = \nu_1$, and for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$,

$$W_1(\widehat{\nu}_t, \widehat{\nu}_s) = (t - s)W_1(\nu_0, \nu_1).$$

Such a path is obtained from a mixture of Schrödinger bridges, by a slowing down procedure as a temperature term goes to zero due to C. Léonard [18, Theorem 2.1] (see also [31]). These geodesic paths are mixture of W_1 -constant speed geodesics $\nu_t^{x,y}$ between the Dirac measures δ_x at $x \in \text{supp}(\nu_0)$ and δ_y at $y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1)$, according to a coupling $\widehat{\pi} \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$. Observe that given bounded marginals ν_0 and ν_1 , the Léonard slowing down procedure selects a single coupling $\widehat{\pi} \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ if some conditions are satisfied on the underlying space [18, Result 0.3]. The main property of $\widehat{\pi}$ is to be a W_1 -optimal coupling. As explained in [31], the structure of Schrödinger bridges at zero temperature that we also consider in this paper is the following: for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$

$$(3) \quad \widehat{\nu}_t(z) := \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \nu_t^{x,y}(z) \widehat{\pi}(x,y),$$

with for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4) \quad \nu_t^{x,y}(z) := \mathbb{1}_{[x,y]}(z) r(x, z, z, y) \rho_t^{d(x,y)}(d(x, z)),$$

where for $x, z, v, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(5) \quad r(x, z, v, y) := \frac{L^{d(x,z)}(x, z) L^{d(v,y)}(v, y)}{L^{d(x,y)}(x, y)},$$

and ρ_t^d denotes the binomial law with parameter $t \in [0, 1]$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\rho_t^d(k) := \binom{d}{k} t^k (1-t)^{d-k}, \quad k \in \{0, \dots, d\},$$

with the binomial coefficient $\binom{d}{k} := \frac{d!}{k!(d-k)!}$. All along the paper one omits the dependence in ν_0 and ν_1 of $(\widehat{\nu}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ and $\widehat{\pi}$ to lighten the notations.

In the paper [31], by analogy of the definition of entropic curvature due to Lott-Sturm-Villani on Riemannian manifold or more generally on geodesic spaces [24, 33, 36], this property is expressed on a graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, L, m) in terms of a convexity property of the relative entropy along Schrödinger bridges at zero temperature. By definition, the *relative entropy* of a probability measure q on a measurable space \mathcal{Y} with respect to a probability measure $r \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{H}(q|r) := \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log(dq/dr) dq \quad \in [0, \infty],$$

if q is absolutely continuous with respect to r and $\mathcal{H}(q|r) := +\infty$ otherwise. As recalled in [31], this definition extends to σ -finite non-negative measures r adding weak conditions on $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$, and in that case $\mathcal{H}(q|r) \in (-\infty, \infty]$.

Definition 1. [31] *On the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) , one says that the relative entropy is C -displacement convex where $C = (C_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$, if for any probability measures $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$, there exists a Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature $(\widehat{\nu}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ whose structure is given by (3), and such that for any $t \in (0, 1)$,*

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) \leq (1-t)\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m) + t\mathcal{H}(\nu_1|m) - \frac{t(1-t)}{2}C_t(\widehat{\pi}),$$

where $\widehat{\pi}$ is the W_1 -optimal coupling between ν_0 and ν_1 that appears in (3).

Observe that such a property on graphs has been first proposed by M. Erbar and J. Maas [25, 10, 11] where the cost $C_t(\hat{\pi})$ is replaced by $\kappa\mathcal{W}_2^2(\nu_0, \nu_1)$, with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and \mathcal{W}_2 an abstract Wasserstein distance on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. In that framework, Schrödinger bridges at zero temperature are also replaced by a \mathcal{W}_2 -geodesic, and the best constant κ represents the so-called entropic curvature of the space. Actually, the distance \mathcal{W}_2 is defined using a discrete type of Benamou-Brenier formula in order to provide a Riemannian structure for the probability space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. This distance \mathcal{W}_2 is greater than $\sqrt{2}W_1$, however \mathcal{W}_2 can not be expressed as a minimum of a cost among transference plans π as in the definition (1) of W_1 . As we will see further in this paper, one of the main advantages of the Schrödinger method initiated in [31], is to capture such types of costs and also to be able to introduce new interesting ones. These transport costs, also called *weak optimal transport costs*, appear in the literature to describe refined concentration phenomena in discrete spaces (see [14]).

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Main results for any graph space	5
3. Refined results for structured graph spaces	12
4. Perturbation results	18
4.1. Perturbation with a potential	18
4.2. Restriction to convex subsets	20
5. Tensorization properties	20
6. Entropic curvature on the discrete hypercube and on the lattice \mathbb{Z}^n	22
6.1. The discrete hypercube and the Ising model	22
6.2. The lattice \mathbb{Z}^n	26
7. Non positively curved graphs	29
8. Some combinatorial implications of the entropic curvature and a few comparisons with other notions of curvature	30
9. Appendix A	33
10. Appendix B	36
10.1. Proofs of Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 7	36
10.2. Proofs of Theorem 4, Theorem 6, Theorem 5, Theorem 8 and Theorem 11	49
10.3. Proofs of Proposition 3, Proposition 4, Proposition 5 and Proposition 6	58
References	61

2. MAIN RESULTS FOR ANY GRAPH SPACE

In this part, we focus on the convexity property (6) for very general graph spaces, which means without a particular geometric structure. We introduce a uniform local assumption on the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) under which the cost $C_t(\hat{\pi})$ can be replaced by $\kappa T_2(\hat{\pi})$ with

$$T_2(\hat{\pi}) := \iint d(x, y)(d(x, y) - 1) d\hat{\pi}(x, y).$$

By definition, we call *entropic curvature* of the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) denoted by κ the supremum of $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the C -displacement convexity property (6) holds with $C_t = k T_2$. Observe that if $\kappa = +\infty$ then (6) ensures that $T_2(\hat{\pi}) = 0$ since $H(\hat{\nu}_t|m) < +\infty$ for any $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$. As a convention $\kappa T_2(\hat{\pi}) = 0$ if $\kappa = +\infty$. When $\kappa > 0$ (respectively $\kappa \geq 0$), one says that the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) has positive entropic curvature (respectively non-negative entropic curvature). More generally, given a family of cost functions $c = (c_t)_{t \in (0,1)}$, $c_t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we call T_c -*entropic curvature* of the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) the best constant $\kappa_c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that the C -displacement convexity property (6) holds with $C_t = \kappa_c T_{c_t}$ with

$$T_{c_t}(\hat{\pi}) := \iint c_t(d(x, y)) d\hat{\pi}(x, y).$$

Similarly, let us also introduce a definition of \tilde{T} -*entropic curvature* as the best constant $\tilde{\kappa} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (6) holds with $C_t = \tilde{\kappa} \tilde{T}$, where

$$\tilde{T}(\hat{\pi}) := \int \left(\int d(x, w) d\hat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(w|x) \right)^2 d\nu_0(x) + \int \left(\int d(w, y) d\hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) \right)^2 d\nu_1(y).$$

Let us note that as soon as \mathcal{X} is not reduced to a singleton, there always exist ν_0 and $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\tilde{T}(\hat{\pi}) > 0$ and therefore $\tilde{\kappa} < +\infty$.

Analogously, we also call W_1 -*entropic curvature* of the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) the best constant $\kappa_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (6) holds with $C_t = \kappa_1 W_1^2$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and since $\hat{\pi}$ is a W_1 -optimal coupling, one has $\tilde{T}(\hat{\pi}) \geq 2 W_1^2(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ and therefore, if $\tilde{\kappa} \geq 0$ then one has

$$\kappa_1 \geq 2 \tilde{\kappa}.$$

Further in this introduction, one gives examples of graphs for which this inequality is strict.

For $z \in \mathcal{X}$, let $B_1(z) := \{w \in \mathcal{X} \mid d(z, w) \leq 1\}$ denotes *the ball of radius one* centered at z , and for $k = 1$ or $k = 2$ let *the combinatorial sphere* $S_k(z)$ denotes the set of vertices at distance k from z

$$S_k(z) := \left\{ w \in \mathcal{X} \mid d(z, w) = k \right\}.$$

Given a vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and a subset $W \subset S_2(z)$, one introduces a non-negative key quantity that will be used to locally lower bound the entropic curvature of the space

$$(7) \quad K_L(z, W) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \left(\frac{\alpha(z')}{L(z, z')} \right)^{\frac{2L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right. \\ \left. \alpha = (\alpha(v))_{v \in]z, W[} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{]z, W[}, \sum_{v \in]z, W[} \alpha(v) = 1 \right\}.$$

To simplify the notations, one omits the dependence in L and notices $K = K_L$ when there is no possible confusions. In this definition as in the all paper, we use the convention that a sum indexed

by an empty set is 0. Therefore, $K(z, W) = 0$ holds if and only if $W = \emptyset$. One may easily check that given z the quantity $K(z, W)$ is increasing in W . Namely, for $W \subset W' \subset S_2(z)$, it holds

$$(8) \quad K(z, W) \leq K(z, W') \leq K(z, S_2(z)).$$

For more comprehension about this quantity, consider the special case where $m = m_0$ is the counting measure. The counting measure is reversible with respect to the generator L_0 defined by $L_0(x, y) = 1$ if and only if $d(x, y) = 1$. Let $|A|$ denote the cardinal of any finite set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then (7) becomes

$$(9) \quad K_0(z, W) := K_{L_0}(z, W) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^{[z, W]}} \left\{ \sum_{z'' \in W} |]z, z''[| \left(\prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{|]z, z''[|}} \middle| \sum_{v \in]z, W[} \alpha(v) = 1 \right\}.$$

Note that given a vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$, the existence of edges between vertices exclusively within $S_1(z)$ or $S_2(z)$ respectively does not change the value of $K(z, S_2(z))$. Here is the main result of this paper that will be analyzed for a variety of graph spaces in this work. Its proof is given in Appendix B.

Theorem 1. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space. Let*

$$K = K_L := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{X}} K_L(z, S_2(z)).$$

Then the entropic curvature κ of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is bounded from below by $r = r^L := -2 \log K$ if $K > 0$, and $\kappa = +\infty$ if $K = 0$.

Comments:

- (i) Observe that $K = 0$ if and only if for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $S_2(z) = \emptyset$, which means that $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ is a complete graph.
- (ii) For $z \in \mathcal{X}$, let us define

$$(10) \quad r(z) = r^L(z) := -2 \log K(z, S_2(z)).$$

Theorem 1 ensures that $\kappa \geq r = \min_{z \in \mathcal{X}} r(z)$, and therefore the quantity $r(z)$ can be interpreted as a local lower bound on entropic curvature at the vertex z .

This quantity only depends on the structure of the ball of radius 2 centered at z and the value of L on this ball. Therefore, as the graph is equipped with the counting measure ($m = m_0$ and $L = L_0$), since $r(z)$ only depends on the structure of the ball $B_2(z)$ lower bound on these local quantities can be interpreted as a geometric property of the balls of radius 2.

- (iii) For more comprehension, let us present a simple necessary condition for positive curvature, $r > 0$, as $m = m_0$ is the counting measure. According to (9), if for some $z_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists $z_0'' \in S_2(z_0)$ such that $|]z_0, z_0''[| = 1$, or equivalently $]z_0, z_0''[= \{z_0'\}$, then by choosing the function $\alpha = \delta_{z_0'}$, one gets $K(z_0, S_2(z_0)) \geq 1$ and therefore $r \leq 0$. Therefore, if the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_0, L_0)$ has positive curvature, then necessarily for any $z, z'' \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(z, z'') = 2$, $|]z, z''[| \geq 2$. In other words, one needs that there is always at least 2 midpoints between two vertices at distance 2.
- (iv) A *graph isomorphism* between $G = (V, E)$ and $G = (V', E')$ is a bijection $\phi : V \rightarrow V'$ such that $(u, v) \in E$ if and only if $(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \in E'$. A *graph automorphism* is a graph isomorphism from a graph G to itself. A graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ is said to be vertex-transitive if every pair of vertices is equivalent under some element of the automorphism group.

Informally, it is a graph where no vertex can be distinguished from another. Some notable examples of vertex-transitive graphs are the *Cayley graphs* or the *Petersen graph*. If a graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ is vertex-transitive $B_2(z)$ is isomorphic to $B_2(z')$ for every $z, z' \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore if $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ is vertex-transitive, for any generator L , the value of the constant r as well as the value of the constants r_1, \bar{r}, \tilde{r} (see Theorem 2) does not depend on the chosen vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$.

If $r(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$, then the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) has non-negative entropic curvature, i.e. $\kappa \geq 0$, and the following result states that the space has also non-negative \tilde{T} and W_1 -entropic curvature .

Theorem 2. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space and such that for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $K(z, S_2(z)) < 1$.*

(i) *The \tilde{T} -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}$ of (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is bounded from below by $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}^L := 1 - K$.*

(ii) *The W_1 -entropic curvature κ_1 of (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is lower bounded by $4r_1$ with $r_1 = r_1^L := \inf_{z \in \mathcal{X}} r_1(z)$ and*

$$(11) \quad r_1(z) = r_1^L(z) := \left(\sup_{V_+, V_-, W_+, W_-} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K(z, W_-)} \right\} \right)^{-1},$$

where the supremum runs over all subsets $V_+, V_- \subset S_1(z)$, $(V_+, V_-) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, and all subsets $W_+, W_- \subset S_2(z)$ with $V_+ \supset]z, W_+[$ and $V_- \supset]z, W_-[$ satisfying

$$(12) \quad \forall x \in V_- \cup W_-, \quad \forall y \in V_+ \cup W_+, \quad z \in [x, y].$$

(iii) *For any $t \in (0, 1)$ and any integer d let*

$$(13) \quad u_t(d) := \frac{d(d-1)}{2} [\mathbb{1}_{d=2} + \mathbb{1}_{d=3}] + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{d \geq 4}}{2} \left[d(d-1) + \sum_{k=2}^{d-2} \sqrt{k(k-1)(d-k)(d-k-1)} \frac{\rho_t^d(k)}{t(1-t)} \right]$$

and

$$(14) \quad \bar{c}_t(d) := \int_0^1 u_s(d) q_t(s) ds,$$

where q_t is the kernel on $[0, 1]$ defined by

$$q_t(s) = \frac{2s}{t} \mathbb{1}_{[0, t]}(s) + \frac{2(1-s)}{1-t} \mathbb{1}_{[t, 1]}(s), \quad s \in [0, 1].$$

For $\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_t)_{t \in (0, 1)}$ the $T_{\bar{c}}$ -entropic curvature $\kappa_{\bar{c}}$ of (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is lower bounded by $4\bar{r}$, where $\bar{r} = \bar{r}^L := \inf_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{r}(z)$ with $\bar{r}(z) = +\infty$ if $S_2(z) = \emptyset$ and otherwise

$$(15) \quad \bar{r}(z) = \bar{r}^L(z) := \left(\sup_{W_+, W_-} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_+ \neq \emptyset}}{-\log K(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_- \neq \emptyset}}{-\log K(z, W_-)} \right\} \right)^{-1},$$

where the supremum runs over all subsets $W_+, W_- \subset S_2(z)$, $(W_+, W_-) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, satisfying

$$(16) \quad \forall x \in W_-, \quad \forall y \in W_+, \quad z \in [x, y].$$

The proof of this result is postponed in Appendix B.

Comments:

- (i) Since $\kappa_1 \geq 2\tilde{\kappa}$, the first result of this theorem implies $\kappa_1 \geq 2(1 - K) \geq 0$. This non negative lower-bound on κ_1 is actually improved by $4r_1$. Indeed, the monotonicity property (8) implies

$$0 < 2(1 - K(z, S_2(z))) = 4 \left(\frac{1}{1 - K(z, S_2(z))} + \frac{1}{1 - K(z, S_2(z))} \right)^{-1} \leq 4r_1(z) \leq 4(1 - K(z, S_2(z))),$$

and therefore $0 \leq 2(1 - e^{-r/2}) \leq 4r_1 \leq 4(1 - e^{-r/2}) \leq 2r$. As exposed in the next section, for the discrete hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$ $\kappa_1 = 4r_1 = 4(1 - K)$ is the optimal lower bound for the W_1 -entropic curvature, and $\tilde{\kappa} = 1 - K$ is the optimal \tilde{T} -entropic curvature too.

The proof of $\kappa_1 \geq 4r_1$ uses the fact that the coupling measure $\hat{\pi}$ in the definition (3) is a W_1 -optimal coupling. It is known that a coupling $\hat{\pi}$ is a W_1 -optimal coupling if and only if its support $\hat{S} := \text{supp}(\hat{\pi})$ is a d -cyclically monotone (see [36, Theorem 5.10]). This property provides a specific structure of the Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature as recalled at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1 in Appendix, which allows to reach the lower bound $4r_1$. This argument is also a key element of the proof of $\kappa_{\bar{c}} \geq 4\bar{r}$.

- (ii) Choosing $x \in V_-$ and $y \in V_+$, condition (12) implies $d(x, y) = 2$ since $z \in [x, y]$ and therefore $d(V_-, V_+) = 2$. Analogously, one has $d(W_-, W_+) = 4$ and $d(V_-, W_+) = d(V_+, W_-) = 3$ if V_-, V_+, W_-, W_+ are not empty sets. It follows that $V_+ \cap V_- = \emptyset$ and $W_+ \cap W_- = \emptyset$. This observation also holds considering condition (16), namely for $W_- \neq \emptyset$ and $W_+ \neq \emptyset$, $d(W_-, W_+) = 4$, $W_- \cap W_+ = \emptyset$, but also $d(]z, W_-[,]z, W_+[) = 2$, $]z, W_-[\cap]z, W_+[= \emptyset$.

- (iii) About the last result of Theorem 2, let us first give estimates of the family of cost functions $\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_t)_{t \in (0,1)}$. Since

$$\sum_{k=2}^{d-2} k(d-k) \frac{\rho_t^d(k)}{t(1-t)} = \sum_{k=0}^d k(d-k) \frac{\rho_t^d(k)}{t(1-t)} - (d-1)(t^{d-2} + (1-t)^{d-2}) \leq d(d-1),$$

one easily checks that for any integer d ,

$$u_t(d) \leq d(d-1) \quad \text{and therefore} \quad \bar{c}_t(d) \leq d(d-1).$$

Easy computations also give

$$\sum_{k=2}^{d-2} (k-1)(d-k-1) \frac{\rho_t^d(k)}{t(1-t)} = d(d-1) - (d-1) \frac{1-t^d - (1-t)^d}{t(1-t)},$$

that implies

$$u_t(d) \geq \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \left[\mathbf{1}_{d=2} + \mathbf{1}_{d=3} \right] + \mathbf{1}_{d \geq 4} \left[d(d-1) - (d-1) \frac{1-t^d - (1-t)^d}{2t(1-t)} \right] \geq \frac{d(d-1)}{2}.$$

As a consequence for $d \geq 4$, one has

$$\bar{c}_t(d) \geq d(d-1) - \frac{d-1}{2} \int_0^1 \gamma_s(d) q_t(s) ds,$$

with for $d \geq 2$

$$\gamma_s(d) := \frac{1-s^d - (1-s)^d}{s(1-s)} = \sum_{k=0}^{d-2} ((1-s)^k + s^k).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 \gamma_s(d) q_t(s) ds &= 2 \sum_{k=0}^{d-2} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} - \frac{1}{d} \right) (t^k + (1-t)^k) \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{d-2} \frac{1}{k+1} = 2\mathbb{1}_{d=2} + 3\mathbb{1}_{d=3} + \mathbb{1}_{d \geq 4} \left(3 + 2 \sum_{k=2}^{d-2} \frac{1}{k+1} \right) \\
(17) \quad &\leq 2\mathbb{1}_{d=2} + 3\mathbb{1}_{d=3} + \mathbb{1}_{d \geq 4} \left(3 + 2 \log \frac{d-2}{2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

we get for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $\bar{c}_t \geq \bar{c}_*$ where the cost function \bar{c}_* is given by

$$(18) \quad \bar{c}_*(d) := \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \mathbb{1}_{d < 4} + \mathbb{1}_{d \geq 4} \left[d(d-1) - (d-1) \left(\frac{3}{2} + \log \frac{d-2}{2} \right) \right], \quad d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As a main property for the cost \bar{c}_* , for large values of d , $\bar{c}_*(d)$ is of order d^2 , and for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{c}_*(d) \geq \frac{d(d-1)}{2}$ (which follows from the inequality $\log u \leq u - 1, u > 0$).

(iv) Concerning the constant \bar{r} , the monotonicity property (8) also gives

$$0 < -2 \log K(z, S_2(z)) = 4 \left(\frac{1}{-\log K(z, S_2(z))} + \frac{1}{-\log K(z, S_2(z))} \right)^{-1} \leq 4\bar{r}(z) \leq -4 \log K(z, S_2(z)),$$

and therefore $0 \leq r \leq 4\bar{r} \leq 2r$. As we will see, on the discrete hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$, $4\bar{r}$ and $2r$ are both of order $4/n$ for large n . Moreover, due to the central limit theorem, the lower bound $4\bar{r}$ of the $T_{\bar{c}}$ -entropic curvature is asymptotically sharp in n . On the discrete hypercube, we also have $\bar{r} = 1/n$ which is similar to \bar{r} . Actually in many cases r_1 and \bar{r} are of the same order since the inequality $\log u \leq u - 1, u > 0$, provides

$$\bar{r}(z) \geq \left(\sup_{W_+, W_-} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K(z, W_-)} \right\} \right)^{-1} := \bar{r}'(z),$$

The expression of $\bar{r}'(z)$ on the right-hand side is very similar to the one of $r_1(z)$. Actually using the concavity of the function $g : x \in]1, +\infty] \mapsto \left[-\log(1 - 1/x) \right]^{-1}$, the last inequality can be improved, namely

$$\bar{r}(z) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \log(1 - 2\bar{r}'(z)).$$

Applying Theorem 2.1 of [31], one gets the following curved Prékopa-Leindler type of inequality on discrete spaces with entropic curvature bounded from below.

Theorem 3. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space. Given a family of cost functions $c = (c_t)_{t \in (0, 1)}$, $c_t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, assume that the T_c -entropic curvature κ_c of the discrete space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is bounded from below, $\kappa_c > -\infty$. If f, g, h are real functions on \mathcal{X} satisfying for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$(1-t)f(x) + tg(y) \leq \int h d\nu_t^{x,y} + \frac{\kappa_c}{2} t(1-t)c(d(x, y)),$$

then

$$\left(\int e^f dm \right)^{1-t} \left(\int e^g dm \right)^t \leq \int e^h dm.$$

According to Theorem 1, this result applies replacing κ_c by $r = -2 \log K$, and with $c_t(d) = d(d-1), d \in \mathbb{N}$ for any $t \in (0, 1)$. Let us note that κ_c does not need to be positive. According to

Theorem 2, it also applies if $r(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$ replacing κ_c by $4\bar{r}$ and with the family of cost functions $\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_t)_{t \in (0,1)}$ given by (14).

As for other notions of discrete curvature such as the coarse Ricci curvature [28, Proposition 23], Lin-Lu-Yau curvature [20, Theorem 4.1], curvature-dimension conditions [12, Theorem 6,3]-[22, Theorem 2.1], and entropic curvature by Erbar-Maas [15, Theorem 1.3], one may prove a Bonnet-Myers theorem for graphs that ensures that \mathcal{X} is finite under the hypothesis of finiteness of the maximal degree, of positive entropic curvature and of mild assumptions on the measure m . The proof of the next theorem is given in Appendix B.

Theorem 4. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space. We assume that $\text{Deg}_{\max} < \infty$ and that the measure m is bounded and bounded away from 0 :*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x) < \infty, \quad \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x) > 0.$$

If the entropic curvature κ of (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is positive then the diameter of the space \mathcal{X} is bounded and therefore \mathcal{X} is finite. More precisely one has

$$\text{Diam}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \frac{8 \log \left(\text{Deg}_{\max} \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x)}{\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x)} \right)}{\kappa} + 1,$$

where $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{X}) := \sup_{x,y} d(x,y)$. Same type of results hold if the \tilde{T} -entropic curvature or the W_1 -entropic curvature of the space is positive.

Assume that $m(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$ and let $\mu := m/m(\mathcal{X})$ be the associated normalized probability measure. Since for any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, $\mathcal{H}(\nu|m) = \mathcal{H}(\nu|\mu) - \log m(\mathcal{X})$, the convexity property (6) holds for the measure m if and only if it holds for the probability measure μ . If $r > 0$ then Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 imply that the space has positive curvature, namely $\kappa_1 > 0, \kappa > 0, \tilde{\kappa} > 0$ and $\kappa_{\bar{c}} > 0$. Since by Jensen's inequality $\mathcal{H}(\hat{\nu}_t|\mu) \geq 0$, one gets for any $t \in (0, 1)$, for any probability measures $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$

$$\frac{1}{2} \max \left(\kappa_1 W_1^2(\nu_0, \nu_1), \tilde{\kappa} \tilde{T}(\hat{\pi}), \kappa T_2(\hat{\pi}), \kappa_{\bar{c}} T_{\bar{c}_t}(\hat{\pi}) \right) \leq \frac{1}{t} \mathcal{H}(\nu_0|\mu) + \frac{1}{1-t} \mathcal{H}(\nu_1|\mu),$$

where $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ is a W_1 -optimal coupling. Let us define

$$\tilde{T}(\nu_0, \nu_1) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)} \tilde{T}(\pi),$$

and similarly $T_2(\nu_0, \nu_1)$ and $T_{\bar{c}_t}(\nu_0, \nu_1)$. Since $\bar{c}_t \geq \bar{c}_*$ for any $t \in (0, 1)$, optimizing over all $t \in (0, 1)$ in the above transport-entropy inequality one gets the following result.

Corollary 1. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space with positive curvature, namely $\kappa_1 > 0, \kappa > 0, \tilde{\kappa} > 0$ and $\kappa_{\bar{c}} > 0$. If $m(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$ then the probability measure $\mu = m/m(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the following transport-entropy inequality, for any probability measures $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$*

$$\frac{1}{2} \max \left(\kappa_1 W_1^2(\nu_0, \nu_1), \tilde{\kappa} \tilde{T}(\nu_0, \nu_1), \kappa T_2(\nu_0, \nu_1), \kappa_{\bar{c}} T_{\bar{c}_*}(\nu_0, \nu_1) \right) \leq \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|\mu)} + \sqrt{\mathcal{H}(\nu_1|\mu)} \right)^2.$$

Remark 1. *The above transport-entropy inequalities also provide bounds on the diameter $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{X})$ of the space \mathcal{X} when the probability measure μ is bounded away from 0. Choosing Dirac measures for ν_0 and ν_1 , one gets*

$$\text{Diam}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \sqrt{-\frac{8 \log \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x)}{\kappa_1}}.$$

In some cases this upper bound is very accurate. For example, for the n -dimensional hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$ for which $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{X}) = n$, endowed with the uniform probability measure ($\mu(x) = 1/2^n$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$), the right hand side of this inequality is $n\sqrt{2\ln(2)}$ since $\kappa_1 = \frac{4}{n}$ (as we will show in section 6.1).

As the space has positive \tilde{T} -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}$, following the ideas of the seminal work [13], the probability measure μ also satisfies a modified logarithmic-Sobolev inequality, and therefore a discrete Poincaré inequality. Recall that for any positive function f on \mathcal{X} , the entropy of f with respect to μ is given by

$$\text{Ent}_\mu(f) := \mu(f \log f) - \mu(f) \log \mu(f) = \mathcal{H}(\nu|\mu),$$

where $\mu(f) := \int f d\mu$ and ν is the probability measure on \mathcal{X} with density $f/\mu(f)$ with respect to μ . The variance with respect to μ of any function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\text{Var}_\mu(f) = \mu(f^2) - \mu(f)^2.$$

Theorem 5. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space, with positive \tilde{T} -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}$ and such that $m(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. Then the probability measure $\mu := m/m(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the following modified logarithmic-Sobolev inequality, for any bounded function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$,*

$$(19) \quad \text{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}} \int \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f(x) - \log f(x')]_+^2 f(x) d\mu(x),$$

where $[a]_+ = \max(0, a)$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that the probability measure μ also satisfies the following Poincaré type of inequality, for any real bounded function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{Var}_\mu(g) \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\kappa}} \int \max_{x', x' \sim x} [g(x) - g(x')]_+^2 d\mu(x).$$

The proof of this result is given in Appendix B. According to Theorem 2, this result applies as soon as the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) satisfies $r > 0$ since $\tilde{\kappa} \geq r/2$.

Comments:

- (i) Actually, according to the proof of Theorem 5, one may prove the following improvement of the above modified modified logarithmic-Sobolev inequality :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}} \int \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f(x) - \log f(x')]_+^2 f(x) d\mu(x) \\ - \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{2} \mu(f) \int \left(\int d(x, y) d\hat{\pi}_\leftarrow(x|y) \right)^2 d\nu(y) \end{aligned}$$

where ν is the probability measure with density $f/\mu(f)$ with respect to μ and $\hat{\pi}$ is a W_1 -optimal coupling between μ and ν . Therefore Cauchy-Schwarz inequality also provides

$$\text{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}} \int \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f(x) - \log f(x')]_+^2 f(x) d\mu(x) - \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{2} \mu(f) W_1^2(\nu, \mu).$$

- (ii) Suppose that the space is equipped with the counting measure, $(\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) = (\mathcal{X}, d, m_0, L_0)$, and has strictly positive entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}$. Bonnet-Myers Theorem 4 ensures that \mathcal{X} is finite. Let $\mu_0 := m_0/m_0(\mathcal{X})$ and let Δ be the unnormalized *discrete Laplacian* defined for any real function f on \mathcal{X} as follows

$$\Delta f(z) = L_0 f(z) := \sum_{z', z' \sim z} (f(z') - f(z)).$$

Let \mathcal{L} be the operator defined as $\mathcal{L} = -\Delta$ which is positive definite. Let λ_1 denote the *spectral gap* of the graph (\mathcal{X}, d) that is the least non zero eigenvalue of \mathcal{L} . By the variation formula and Green formula,

$$\lambda_1 = \inf_{\int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\mu_0 = 0} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{X}} f \mathcal{L} f d\mu_0}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} f^2 d\mu_0} = \inf_{\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} f(z) = 0} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_{z, z' \in \mathcal{X}} (f(z) - f(z'))^2 \mu_0(x)}{\text{Var}_{\mu_0}(f)}$$

As a consequence, since

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{z', z' \sim x} [f(z) - f(z')]^2 \mu_0(z) \leq \sum_{z, z', z' \sim z} [f(z) - f(z')]^2 \mu_0(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f \mathcal{L} f d\mu_0,$$

Theorem 5 gives $\lambda_1 \geq 2\tilde{\kappa}$. For many graphs this lower estimate is not sharp. For instance on $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\lambda_1 = 2$ and we will prove in section 6.1 that $\tilde{\kappa} = \frac{1}{n}$. We explain below how to improve this estimate by considering another type of curvature constant for graphs with geometric structures such as Cayley graphs.

3. REFINED RESULTS FOR STRUCTURED GRAPH SPACES

Let us now consider classes of graphs with more structure in order to propose refinements of the results of the last part.

Definition 2. We say that a graph (\mathcal{X}, E) is *structured* if there exists a finite set \mathcal{S} of maps $\sigma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, with the following properties

- (i) For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, $d(z, \sigma(z)) \leq 1$.
- (ii) If z and z' are neighbours in \mathcal{X} , then there exists a single $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $z' = \sigma(z)$. One defines

$$\mathcal{S}_z := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{S} \mid \sigma(z) \sim z\},$$

so that

$$\mathcal{S}_1(z) := \{\sigma(z) \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_z\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{S}_1(z)| = |\mathcal{S}_z|.$$

- (iii) For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and for any $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, setting

$$\mathcal{S}_z^{\tau \rightarrow \cdot} := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau(z)} \mid d(z, \sigma(\tau(z))) = 2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_z^{\cdot \rightarrow \tau} := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_z \mid d(z, \tau(\sigma(z))) = 2\},$$

$\mathcal{S}_z^{\tau \rightarrow \cdot}$ is empty if and only if $\mathcal{S}_z^{\cdot \rightarrow \tau}$ is empty.

- (iv) For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and for any $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, if $\mathcal{S}_z^{\cdot \rightarrow \tau} \neq \emptyset$ then there exists a one to one map $\psi : \mathcal{S}_z^{\cdot \rightarrow \tau} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_z^{\tau \rightarrow \cdot}$ such that for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_z^{\cdot \rightarrow \tau}$,

$$\tau(\sigma(z)) = \psi(\sigma)(\tau(z)).$$

Let us introduce some paradigmatic examples of structured graphs.

Example 1 (Cayley graph). Let $(G, *)$ be a finite group and let \mathcal{S} be a subset of generators of the group (which does not contain the neutral element of the group denoted by e in order to avoid loops in the consequent graph). The group G and a subset \mathcal{S} determine a *Cayley graph* (\mathcal{X}, E) as follows: $\mathcal{X} = G$ and $x \sim y$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ if and only if $y = x * s$ for some $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Let us consider Cayley graphs that satisfy certain conditions: $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_e = \mathcal{S}_g$ for all $g \in G$ and for all $g, h \in \mathcal{S}$, $ghg^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}$. Then $(G, *)$ is a structured graph with set of moves \mathcal{S} . Indeed, the first three axioms are obviously satisfied and $\psi(h) := g * h * g^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}$ is a one to one map and satisfies for any $l \in G$, $g * h * l = \psi(h) * g * l$. The next three examples can be seen as Cayley graphs that satisfy the above hypotheses.

Example 2. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$ be the discrete hypercube. It is a structured graph with set of moves

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_i \mid i \in [n]\},$$

where for any $i \in [n]$, $\sigma_i(z)$ is defined by flipping the i 's coordinate of $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$. The discrete hypercube will be endowed with the *Hamming distance* : $d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{x_i \neq y_i}$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$.

Example 3. The lattice $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a structured graph with set of moves $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_{i+}, \sigma_{i-} \mid i \in [n]\}$ where for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ $\sigma_{i+}(z) = z + e_i$, $\sigma_{i-}(z) = z - e_i$, and (e_1, \dots, e_n) is the canonical base of \mathbb{R}^n . The graph distance is given by $d(x, y) := \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y_i|$, $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}$.

Example 4 (Transposition model). Let S_n be the symmetric group consisting of all bijective maps $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$. For any $z \in S_n$ and $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$, $i \neq j$, let $\sigma_{ij}(z)$ be the neighbour of z that differs from z by a *transposition* (ij) , $\sigma_{ij}(z) := z(ij)$. The graph distance between two elements of x and y of S_n , is the minimal number of transpositions τ_1, \dots, τ_k such that $x\tau_1 \cdots \tau_k = y$. The transposition model on S_n is a structured graph with $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_{ij} \mid \{i, j\} \subset [n]\}$.

Example 5 (Bernoulli-Laplace model). Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_m$ be the slice of the discrete hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\mathcal{X}_m := \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid x_1 + \dots + x_n = m\}$. For any $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$, let $\sigma_{ij} : \mathcal{X}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_m$ denote the one to one functions that exchanges the value of coordinate i with the one of coordinate j , namely for any $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{X}_m$

$$(\sigma_{ij}(z))_j := z_i, \quad (\sigma_{ij}(z))_i := z_j,$$

and for any $k \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$, $(\sigma_{ij}(z))_k := z_k$. Two vertices in \mathcal{X}_m are declared neighbours if they differ by exactly two coordinates and $d(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{x_i \neq y_i}$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{X}_m$. The Bernoulli-Laplace model is a structured graph with $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_{ij} \mid \{i, j\} \subset [n]\}$.

There is a notion related to structured graphs, the so-called *Ricci flat graphs*. The concept of Ricci flat graphs was first introduced by Chung and Yau for the study of logarithmic Harnack inequalities on graphs in [4] and recently revisited in [6]. These graphs generalize the Cayley graphs of Abelian groups.

Definition 3 ([4]). *Let (\mathcal{X}, E) be a D -regular graph. We say that $z \in \mathcal{X}$ is Ricci-flat if there exist some maps $\sigma_i : B_1(z) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $1 \leq i \leq D$, with the following properties*

- (i) $\sigma_i(z') \sim z'$ for all $z' \in B_1(z)$,
- (ii) $\sigma_i(z) \neq \sigma_j(z)$ if $i \neq j$,
- (iii) $S_1(\sigma_i(z)) = \sigma_i(S_1(z))$ for any $i \in [D]$.

A graph (\mathcal{X}, E) is said to be *Ricci flat* if it is Ricci flat for every $z \in \mathcal{X}$.

In the case that the maps $\sigma_i : B_1(z) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ do not depend on a chosen vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$, Ricci flat graphs are examples of structured graphs. Indeed under this condition, a Ricci flat graph is a structured graph with $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_i \mid i \in [D]\}$. Given $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{S}$, by the third property of Ricci flat graphs it follows that $\sigma_i(\sigma_j(z)) \in S_1(\sigma_i(z)) \cap S_1(\sigma_j(z))$ and thus it is immediate that there exists a one to one map $\phi : [D] \rightarrow [D]$ such that $\sigma_i(\sigma_j(z)) = \sigma_{\phi(j)}(\sigma_i(z))$. Since $d(z, \sigma_i(\sigma_j(z))) = 2$ if and only if $d(z, \sigma_{\phi(j)}(\sigma_i(z))) = 2$, it follows that the map $\psi : \sigma_j \rightarrow \sigma_{\phi_j}$ is one to one from $\mathcal{S}_z^{\rightarrow \sigma_i}$ to $\mathcal{S}_z^{\sigma_i \rightarrow \cdot}$, and for any $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}_z^{\rightarrow \sigma_i}$, $\sigma_i(\sigma_j(z)) = \psi(\sigma_j)(\sigma_i(z))$.

Ricci flat graphs have non negative *Bakry-Émery* curvature as well as non negative *Ollivier curvature* or *Lin-Lu-Yau* curvature [16, 6]. Actually the same kind of property holds for the entropic curvature for any structured graph.

Theorem 6. Let (\mathcal{X}, E) be a structured graph associated with a finite set of moves $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_i \mid i \in [n]\}$. The lower bound $r = r_0$ of the entropic curvature κ of the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_0, L_0)$ given by Theorem 1 is non negative.

Moreover, given $z \in \mathcal{X}$, if for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, $d(z, \sigma(\sigma(z))) \leq 1$ then

$$r(z) = r_0(z) = -2 \log K_0(z, S_2(z)) \geq -2 \log(1 - 1/|S_1(z)|) > \frac{2}{|S_1(z)|}.$$

The proof of this general result is postponed in Appendix B. In the following examples, we do not mention the discrete hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$, the lattice \mathbb{Z}^n which will be discussed in detail in section 6, by considering also perturbations of the counting measure m_0 on these graphs.

Example 1 (Cayley graph). Since the group $(G, *)$ is a structured graph, it has non negative entropic curvature. Moreover, if $s = s^{-1}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ then $d(z, s * s * z) = 0$ for all $z \in G$ and then

$$r_0(z) > \frac{2}{|S_1(z)|} = \frac{2}{|\mathcal{S}|}.$$

Example 4 (Transposition model). For all $z \in S_n$ let us note that

$$S_1(z) = \left\{ \sigma_{ij}(z) \mid \{i, j\} \in I \right\} \quad \text{with} \quad I = \left\{ \{i, j\} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n \right\}.$$

Also, $d(z, \sigma_{ij}(\sigma_{ij}(z))) = 0$ for all $\{i, j\} \in I$. Thus,

$$r_0(z) > \frac{2}{|S_1(z)|} = \frac{4}{n(n-1)}.$$

Example 5 (Bernoulli-Laplace model). For all $z \in \mathcal{X}_m$, denoting $J_0(z) := \{i \in [n] \mid z_i = 0\}$ and $J_1(z) := \{i \in [n] \mid z_i = 1\}$, one has $S_1(z) = \left\{ \sigma_{ij}(z) \mid i \in J_0(z), j \in J_1(z) \right\}$. Moreover, $d(z, \sigma_{ij}(\sigma_{ij}(z))) = 0$ for all $\{i, j\} \in [n]$. Thus,

$$r_0(z) > \frac{2}{|S_1(z)|} = \frac{2}{m(n-m)}.$$

For structured graphs, one introduces another type of transportation cost \tilde{T}_2 comparable to \tilde{T} , related to refined modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, as for the cost \tilde{T} in Theorem 5.

Given two probability measures $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, for any coupling measure $\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$, let us define

$$\tilde{T}_2(\pi) := \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_x} \Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x)^2 d\nu_0(x) + \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_y} \Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)^2 d\nu_1(y),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x) &:= \int \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(x) \in [x, y]} d(x, y) r(x, \sigma(x), \sigma(x), y) d\pi_{\rightarrow}(y|x), \\ \Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y) &:= \int \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in [y, x]} d(x, y) r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), x) d\pi_{\leftarrow}(x|y). \end{aligned}$$

As an example, on the discrete hypercube $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$, since $L_0^{d(x, y)}(x, y) = d(x, y)!$ and $\sigma_i(x) \in [x, y]$ if and only if $x_i \neq y_i$ for any $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Therefore, a simple expression holds for the cost $\tilde{T}_2(\pi)$ in that case, namely

$$(20) \quad \Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma_i}(x) = \int \mathbb{1}_{x_i \neq y_i} d\pi_{\rightarrow}(y|x) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma_i}(x) = \int \mathbb{1}_{x_i \neq y_i} d\pi_{\leftarrow}(x|y).$$

Such a type of cost has been first introduced by K. Marton [26] to get refined concentration properties on bounded spaces related to the one reached by M. Talagrand with the so-called convex-hull method (see [34, Section 4]). Actually, the definition of \tilde{T}_2 on any structure graph can be interpreted as an extension of the transportation costs introduced by K. Marton and M. Talagrand on the hypercube. These costs belong to a larger class of costs named *weak transport costs* introduced in the paper [13].

Observing that $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_x} r(x, \sigma(x), \sigma(x), y) = 1$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}(\pi) &\geq \tilde{T}_2(\pi) \geq \int \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_x|} \left(\int d(x, y) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_x} r(x, \sigma(x), \sigma(x), y) d\pi_{\rightarrow}(y|x) \right)^2 d\nu_0(x) \\ &\quad + \int \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_y|} \left(\int d(x, y) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_y} r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), x) d\pi_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \right)^2 d\nu_1(y) \\ &\geq \frac{\tilde{T}(\hat{\pi})}{\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathcal{S}_x|} \geq \frac{\tilde{T}(\hat{\pi})}{|\mathcal{S}|}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, let us call \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature of the discrete space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) the best constant $\tilde{\kappa}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (6) holds with $C_t = \tilde{\kappa}_2 \tilde{T}_2$. As a consequence of the last inequality, if $\tilde{\kappa}_2 \geq 0$ or $\tilde{\kappa} \geq 0$ then $\tilde{\kappa}_2 \geq \tilde{\kappa} \geq \tilde{\kappa}_2 / \sup_x |\mathcal{S}_x|$.

For a better lower-estimate of $\tilde{\kappa}_2$, one introduces a new quantity denoted by $\tilde{K}(z, W)$ defined for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W \subset S_2(z)$. Namely let $\tilde{K}(z, \emptyset) := 0$ and for $W \neq \emptyset$, let

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{K}(z, W) &= \tilde{K}_L(z, W) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \left(\frac{\beta(z')}{(L(z, z'))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{(z', w') \in]z, W[^2, z' \neq w'} \sqrt{\beta(z')} \sqrt{\beta(w')} \mid \beta = (\beta(z'))_{z' \in]z, W[} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{]z, W[}, \sum_{z' \in]z, W[} \beta(z') = 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For a structured graph, this quantity can also be expressed as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_L(z, W) &= \tilde{K}(z, W) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{]z, z''[}} \left(\frac{\beta(\sigma)}{(L(z, \sigma(z)))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{S}_{]z, W[}^2, \sigma \neq \tau} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \sqrt{\beta(\tau)} \mid \beta = (\beta(\sigma))_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{]z, W[}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{S}_{]z, W[}}, \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{]z, W[}} \beta(\sigma) = 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where for any subset $W \subset S_2(z)$, $\mathcal{S}_{]z, W[} := \{\sigma \in S \mid \sigma(z) \in]z, W[\}$. If $m = m_0$ and $L = L_0$, then we write $\tilde{K}_0(z, W) := \tilde{K}_{L_0}(z, W)$.

Theorem 7. *Let \mathcal{X} be a structured graph associated to a set of moves \mathcal{S} , and assume that (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is a graph space. For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, let us define $\tilde{r}_2 = \tilde{r}_2^L := \inf_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{r}_2(z)$, with*

$$(22) \quad \tilde{r}_2(z) = \tilde{r}_2^L(z) := 1 - \tilde{K}_L(z), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{K}_L(z) := \sup_{W \in \mathcal{S}_2(z)} \tilde{K}_L(z, W).$$

For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, one has

$$(23) \quad 1 - K(z, S_2(z)) \leq \tilde{r}_2(z) \leq |S_1(z)| (1 - K(z, S_2(z))).$$

(i) If the generator L satisfies for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{S}$ with $d(z, \tau(\sigma(z))) = 2$

$$(24) \quad L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), \tau(\sigma(z))) = L(z, \tau(z))L(\tau(z), \tau(\sigma(z))),$$

then the \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ of (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is bounded from below by $\tilde{r}_2 \geq 0$.

(ii) Assume that (24) holds and moreover that for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$(25) \quad d(z, \sigma(\sigma(z))) \leq 1$$

then the above result can be improved replacing the curvature cost $C_t(\hat{\pi}) = \tilde{r}_2 \tilde{T}_2(\hat{\pi})$ in the C -displacement convexity property of entropy (6) by the cost $C_t(\hat{\pi}) = \tilde{r}_2 \tilde{C}_t^1(\hat{\pi})$, $t \in (0, 1)$, where for any $D \geq 1$, the cost $\tilde{C}_t^D(\hat{\pi})$ is given by

$$\tilde{C}_t^D(\hat{\pi}) := \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} D^2 h_t \left(\frac{\Pi_{\sigma}^{\rightarrow}(x)}{D} \right) d\nu_0(x) + \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} D^2 h_{1-t} \left(\frac{\Pi_{\sigma}^{\leftarrow}(y)}{D} \right) d\nu_1(y),$$

where for any $u \geq 0$,

$$h_t(u) := \frac{th(u) - h(tu)}{t(1-t)}, \quad \text{with} \quad h(u) = \begin{cases} 2[(1-u)\log(1-u) + u] & \text{for } 0 \leq u \leq 1, \\ +\infty & \text{for } u > 1. \end{cases}$$

Assume that $D := \text{Diam}(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. If condition (25) is not satisfied, then the C -displacement convexity property of entropy (6) also holds with the cost $C_t(\hat{\pi}) = \tilde{r}_2 \tilde{C}_t^D(\hat{\pi})$, $t \in (0, 1)$.

The proof of this Theorem is given in Appendix B.

Comments:

- (i) Condition (24) makes sense since if $d(z, \tau(\sigma(z))) = 2$ then $\sigma(z) \in]z, \tau(\sigma(z))$, and according to the definition of structured graph there exists $\psi(\sigma) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau(z)}$ such that $\tau(\sigma(z)) = \psi(\sigma)(\tau(z))$, and therefore $\tau(z) \in]z, \tau(\sigma(z))$. Condition (24) actually provides needed properties to bound from below $\tilde{\kappa}_3$ by \tilde{r}_2 , which are collected in Lemma 4 in Appendix A.
- (ii) The second part of the theorem improves its first part since for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $u \geq 0$, $h_t(u) \geq u^2$, and therefore $C_t^D(\hat{\pi}) \geq \tilde{T}_2(\hat{\pi})$. This improvement is useful in particular when considering the derived modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. It allows to reach smaller discrete Dirichlet forms in the right-hand side of the modified Sobolev inequality (see the comments of Theorem 8 below).
- (iii) Condition (25) implies that any discrete geodesic (z_0, \dots, z_d) from $z_0 = z$ to any point $z_d \in \mathcal{X}$ ($d = d(z, z_d)$) does not use any move $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ more than one time. Indeed, if (z_0, \dots, z_d) is such that for some $0 \leq k < \ell \leq d-1$, $z_{k+1} = \sigma(z_k)$ and $z_{\ell+1} = \sigma(z_\ell)$, then Lemma 4 implies that $(z_0, \sigma(z_0), \sigma(\sigma(z_0)), \dots, \sigma(\sigma(z_\ell)), z_{\ell+2}, \dots, z_d)$ is also a geodesic. Therefore $d(z_0, \sigma(\sigma(z_0))) = 2$ which is a contradiction with condition (25).

As for \tilde{T} -entropic curvature, positive \tilde{T}_2 -entropic also provides transport entropy inequalities and also modified logarithmic-Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities. For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, and $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, let

$$\partial_\sigma g(z) := g(\sigma(z)) - g(z), \quad z \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Theorem 8. Let \mathcal{X} be a structured graph described by a set of moves \mathcal{S} and (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space with $m(\mathcal{X}) < +\infty$. Let $\mu := m/m(\mathcal{X})$.

(i) If the \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is positive, then μ satisfies the following transport-entropy inequality, for any probability measures ν_0 and ν_1 on $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathcal{X})$

$$\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_2}{2} \tilde{T}_2(\nu_0, \nu_1) \leq \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|\mu)} + \sqrt{\mathcal{H}(\nu_1|\mu)} \right)^2,$$

$$\text{with } \tilde{T}_2(\nu_0, \nu_1) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)} \tilde{T}_2(\pi).$$

(ii) If the \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is positive, then μ satisfies the following modified logarithmic-Sobolev inequality, for any bounded function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$,

$$(26) \quad \text{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}_2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_\sigma \log f]_-^2 f d\mu .$$

(iii) If the C -displacement convexity property of entropy (6) holds with the cost $C_t(\hat{\pi}) = \tilde{\kappa}_2 \tilde{C}_t^D(\hat{\pi})$ given in Theorem 7 for some $D \geq 1$ then for any bounded function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$,

$$(27) \quad \text{Ent}_\mu(f) \leq \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_2 D^2}{2} h^* \left(\frac{2}{D\tilde{\kappa}_2} [\partial_\sigma \log f]_- \right) f d\mu,$$

$$\text{where } [a]_- = \max(0, -a), a \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \frac{1}{2}h^*(2v) = e^{-v} + v - 1, v \geq 0.$$

In any case, it follows that μ also satisfies the following Poincaré inequality, for any real bounded function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$(28) \quad \text{Var}_\mu(g) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}_2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} (\partial_\sigma g)^2 d\mu.$$

The proof of the transport entropy inequality is identical to the one of Corollary 1. Proofs of modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and the Poincaré inequality are given together with the one of Theorem 5 in Appendix B.

Comments:

(i) Let us give few inequalities which are useful to compare the discrete Dirichlet forms on the right-hand side of (26) and (27) with other discrete Dirichlet forms. Let α, a, b be positive real numbers with $a \geq b$, one easily proves that

$$\frac{1}{2}h^*(2\alpha[\log a - \log b])a \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2}[\log a - \log b]^2 a$$

If $\alpha \leq 1$, then the convexity property of the function h^* implies

$$\frac{1}{2}h^*(2\alpha[\log a - \log b])a \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}h^*(2[\log a - \log b])a = \alpha(a[\log a - \log b] - [a - b])$$

and if $\alpha \geq 1$, then the decreasing monotonicity property of the function $u \in (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2u^2}h^*(2u)$ gives

$$\frac{1}{2}h^*(2\alpha[\log a - \log b])a \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2}h^*(2[\log a - \log b])a.$$

As a consequence, for any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} h^* (2\alpha [\log a - \log b]) a &\leq \frac{\alpha \max(1, \alpha)}{2} h^* (2[\log a - \log b]) a \\ &\leq \alpha \max(1, \alpha) \min \left\{ [\log a - \log b] [a - b], \frac{[a - b]^2}{2b} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying these inequalities with $\alpha = 1/(D\tilde{\kappa}_2)$, $a = f(x)$ and $b = f(\sigma(x))$, one gets the following comparisons

$$\begin{aligned} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_2 D^2}{2} h^* \left(\frac{2}{D\tilde{\kappa}_2} [\partial_\sigma \log f]_- \right) f d\mu &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}_2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_\sigma \log f]_-^2 f d\mu, \right. \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \max \left(D, \frac{1}{\tilde{\kappa}_2} \right) \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{[\partial_\sigma f(x)]_-^2}{f(\sigma(x))} d\mu(x), \\ &\quad \left. \max \left(D, \frac{1}{\tilde{\kappa}_2} \right) \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_\sigma \log f]_- [\partial_\sigma f]_- d\mu \right\} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, it follows that (27) is a refinement of (26).

- (ii) With respect to the spectral gap comparisons we made in the comments of Theorem 5 for generic graphs, the above Theorem makes it possible to obtain more precise estimates regarding the spectral gap for structured graphs. Indeed, thanks to the Poincaré inequality (28) one obtains that $\lambda_1 \geq 2\tilde{\kappa}_2$ and in many cases λ_1 and $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ are of the same order of magnitude. For example in the case of $\{0, 1\}^n$, $\lambda_1 = 2$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_2 \geq 1$ (as we shall see in section 6.1) and thus we obtain sharp estimates in this case.

4. PERTURBATION RESULTS

4.1. Perturbation with a potential. Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space satisfying a C -displacement convexity property of entropy (6). Let m_ν denote the measure with density e^{-v} with respect to m , where $v : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a potential. We want to understand how the constants $r, r_1, \bar{r}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_2$ defined in introduction are modified if the measure m is replaced by a perturbation m_ν of the measure m in the C -displacement convexity property of the relative entropy along the Schrödinger bridges at zero temperature of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) . The results of this part are used in section 6 for measures with interaction potential in particular on the discrete hypercube and on the lattice \mathbb{Z}^n .

Since for any probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ absolutely continuous with respect to m ,

$$(29) \quad H(\nu|m_\nu) = H(\nu|m) + \int v d\nu,$$

convexity properties of $t \in (0, 1) \rightarrow H(\hat{\nu}_t|m_\nu)$ may follow from convexity properties of $t \in (0, 1) \rightarrow H(\hat{\nu}_t|m)$ and convexity properties of $\psi : t \in (0, 1) \rightarrow \int v d\hat{\nu}_t$. According to Lemma 5, assuming ν_0 and ν_1 have bounded support,

$$(30) \quad \psi''(t) = \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X}^2} \left(\int v d\nu_t^{x,y} \right)'' \hat{\pi}(x,y) = \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X}^2} d(x,y)(d(x,y) - 1) D_t v(x,y) \hat{\pi}(x,y)$$

with

$$(31) \quad D_t v(x,y) := \sum_{(z,z'') \in [x,y], d(z,z'')=2} Dv(z,z'') L^2(z,z'') r(x,z,z'',y) \rho_t^{d(x,y)-2}(d(x,z)),$$

and for $z, z'' \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(z, z'') = 2$,

$$Dv(z, z'') := \sum_{z' \in]z, z''[} (v(z'') + v(z) - 2v(z')) \frac{L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}.$$

As a consequence one has

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t) &= (1-t)\psi(0) + t\psi(1) - \frac{t(1-t)}{2} \int_0^1 \psi''(s) q_t(s) ds \\ &= (1-t)\psi(0) + t\psi(1) - \frac{t(1-t)}{2} \iint c_t^v(x, y) d\widehat{\pi}(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$c_t^v(x, y) := d(x, y)(d(x, y) - 1) \int_0^1 D_s v(x, y) q_t(s) ds.$$

This gives the following result.

Theorem 9. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space. Assume that a C -displacement convexity property of entropy (6) holds. Given a potential $v : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let m_v denote the measure with density e^{-v} with respect to m . Then the relative entropy with respect to m_v , $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \mapsto H(\nu|m_v)$, satisfies the C^v -displacement convexity property (6) along the Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) , with for any $t \in (0, 1)$,*

$$C_t^v(\widehat{\pi}) = C_t(\widehat{\pi}) + \iint c_t^v(x, y) d\widehat{\pi}(x, y).$$

Another way to get C^v -displacement convexity property with the measure m_v is to consider the generator L_v defined by

$$L_v(x, y) = e^{\frac{1}{2}(v(x)-v(y))} L(x, y), \quad x, y \in \mathcal{X}, x \neq y.$$

One easily checks that the measure m_v is reversible with respect to L_v and that the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_v, L_v)$ is a graph space. Moreover, since for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$L_v^{d(x,y)}(x, y) = e^{\frac{1}{2}(v(x)-v(y))} L^{d(x,y)}(x, y),$$

the Schrödinger bridges at zero temperature of the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_v, L_v)$ are the same as the one of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) . Indeed for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z \in [x, y]$, the quantity

$$r(x, z, z, y) = \frac{L_v^{d(x,z)}(x, z) L_v^{d(z,y)}(z, y)}{L_v^{d(x,y)}(x, y)} = \frac{L^{d(x,z)}(x, z) L^{d(z,y)}(z, y)}{L^{d(x,y)}(x, y)},$$

does not depend on the potential v and therefore the Schrödinger bridges $\nu_t^{x,y}$ between Dirac measure on the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_v, L_v)$ are the same as the one of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) . Any result we get on the graph space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_v, L_v)$ on the lower bound on entropic curvature from Theorems 1, 2 and 7 can be interpreted as a perturbation result of the same result on (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) .

For further use, let us just simplify the definition of the key quantities $K^v := K_{L_v}$ and $\widetilde{K}^v := \widetilde{K}_{L_v}$ on the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_v, L_v)$. Observing that

$$Dv(z, z'') = 2 \sum_{z' \in]z, z''[} \left(\log \frac{L_v^2(z, z'')}{L^2(z, z'')} - 2 \log \frac{L_v(z, z')}{L(z, z')} \right) \frac{L_v(z, z') L_v(z', z'')}{L_v^2(z, z'')},$$

according to (7) and to (21), one has for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W \subset S_2(z)$,

$$(32) \quad K^v(z, W) = \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{z'' \in W} e^{-Dv(z, z'')/2} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \left(\frac{\alpha(z')}{L(z, z')} \right)^{\frac{2L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right\},$$

where the supremum is over all $\alpha = (\alpha(v))_{v \in]z, W[} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{]z, W[}$ such that $\sum_{v \in]z, W[} \alpha(v) = 1$, and $\tilde{K}^v(z) = \sup_{W \subset S_2(z)} \tilde{K}^v(z, W)$ with

$$(33) \quad \tilde{K}^v(z, W) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{z'' \in W} e^{-Dv(z, z'')/2} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in S_{]z, z''[}} \left(\frac{\beta(\sigma)}{(L(z, \sigma(z)))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} - \sum_{(\sigma, \tau) \in S_{]z, W[}^2, \sigma \neq \tau} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \sqrt{\beta(\tau)} \right\},$$

where the supremum is over all $\beta = (\beta(\sigma))_{\sigma \in S_{]z, W[}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{S_{]z, W[}}$ such that $\sum_{\sigma \in S_{]z, W[}} \beta(\sigma) = 1$.

4.2. Restriction to convex subsets. In this section, we consider another type of perturbation result, when the measure m is restricted to a convex subset \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{X} .

Definition 4. *On a graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) , a subset \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{X} is convex if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$[x, y] \subset \mathcal{C}.$$

Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space. Given a subset \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{X} , let $(\mathcal{C}, d_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}}, L_{\mathcal{C}})$ denotes the graph space restricted to \mathcal{C} defined by : $m_{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} m$, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{C}}$, $x \neq y$, $d_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) := 1$ if and only if $d(x, y) = 1$, and $L_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) := L(x, y)$. One easily checks that the space $(\mathcal{C}, d_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}}, L_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a graph space.

If \mathcal{C} is a convex subset of \mathcal{X} , then the set of discrete geodesics on $(\mathcal{C}, d_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}}, L_{\mathcal{C}})$ between two vertices x and y of \mathcal{C} is the same as the one on (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) . Since $L_{\mathcal{C}}(\gamma) = L(\gamma)$ for any discrete geodesic γ between x and y , it follows that the Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature between the Dirac measure at x and the Dirac measure at y is the same on the space $(\mathcal{C}, d_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}}, L_{\mathcal{C}})$ as on the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) . Therefore this observation also holds for any Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature between two probability measures ν_0 and ν_1 on \mathcal{C} . This remark implies the following result.

Theorem 10. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space and let \mathcal{C} be a convex subset of \mathcal{X} . If the relative entropy with respect to m satisfies a C -displacement convexity property (6) on the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) , then the same property holds for the relative entropy with respect to $m_{\mathcal{C}}$ on the space $(\mathcal{C}, d_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}}, L_{\mathcal{C}})$.*

5. TENSORIZATION PROPERTIES

In this part, we will study the *tensorization properties* of the constants r and \tilde{r}_2 with respect to the usual *Cartesian product of graphs*. For the sake of completeness let us recall the standard definition of Cartesian product of graphs. The Cartesian product of two graphs (\mathcal{X}_1, E_1) and (\mathcal{X}_2, E_2) endowed with distances d_1 and d_2 respectively is a graph

$$(\mathcal{X}, E) = (\mathcal{X}_1, E_1) \square (\mathcal{X}_2, E_2),$$

where $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ and the set of edges E is defined by

$$(x_1, x_2) \sim (x'_1, x'_2) \text{ if } \begin{cases} \text{either } x_1 \sim x'_1 \text{ and } x_2 = x'_2, \\ \text{or } x_2 \sim x'_2 \text{ and } x_1 = x'_1. \end{cases}$$

As a consequence if d_1 , respectively d_2 , denotes the graph distance on the graph (\mathcal{X}_1, E_1) , respectively (\mathcal{X}_2, E_2) , then the graph distance $d := d_1 \square d_2$ on (\mathcal{X}, E) is given by

$$d((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) := d_1(x_1, y_1) + d_2(x_2, y_2), \quad (x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Similarly, one defines the Cartesian product of two graph spaces $(\mathcal{X}_1, d_1, m_1, L_1)$, $(\mathcal{X}_2, d_2, m_2, L_2)$ the graph space

$$(\mathcal{X}_1, d_1, m_1, L_1) \square (\mathcal{X}_2, d_2, m_2, L_2) := (\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, d_1 \square d_2, m_1 \times m_2, L_1 \oplus L_2),$$

where the generator $L = L_1 \oplus L_2$ on $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ is given by: for $z = (z_1, z_2), z' = (z'_1, z'_2) \in \mathcal{X}$

$$L(z, z') := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d(z, z') \geq 2, \\ L_1(z_1, z'_1) & \text{if } z_1 \sim z'_1 \text{ and } z' = (z'_1, z_2), \\ L_2(z_2, z'_2) & \text{if } z_2 \sim z'_2 \text{ and } z' = (z_1, z'_2), \\ -\left(\sum_{z'_1, z'_1 \sim z_1} L_1(z_1, z'_1) + \sum_{z'_2, z'_2 \sim z_2} L_2(z_2, z'_2)\right) & \text{if } z = z'. \end{cases}$$

Since for $i = 1, 2$ the measures m_i is reversible with respect to the generators L_i , the product measure m is also reversible with respect to L . This definition can be iterated to define the product of a finite sequences of graph spaces. The following theorem states the tensorisation properties of the lower bounds r_1 and \tilde{r}_2 on entropic curvature introduced in Theorem 1 and Theorem 7. The proof is postponed in Appendix B.

Theorem 11. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be the cartesian product of n graph spaces $(\mathcal{X}_i, d_i, m_i, L_i), i \in [n]$,*

$$(\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) := (\mathcal{X}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_n, d_1 \square \cdots \square d_n, m_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes m_n, L_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus L_n).$$

For $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{X}$, let $r(z)$ denotes the quantity (10) defined on the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) and for $i \in [n]$, let $r(z_i)$ be the same quantity defined on the space $(\mathcal{X}_i, d_i, m_i, L_i)$. Identically one denotes $\tilde{r}_2(z), \tilde{r}_2(z_i), i \in [n]$ the quantities whose definition is given by (22). If $\min(r(z_1), \dots, r(z_n)) \leq 0$, then

$$r(z) \geq \min(r(z_1), \dots, r(z_n)),$$

and if $\min(r(z_1), \dots, r(z_n)) \geq 0$ then

$$r(z) \geq -2 \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} (1 - e^{-\min(r(z_1), \dots, r(z_n))/2}) \right) \geq \frac{1}{n} \min(r(z_1), \dots, r(z_n)).$$

We also have

$$\tilde{r}_2(z) \geq \min(\tilde{r}_2(z_1), \dots, \tilde{r}_2(z_n)).$$

Comments: If $\mathcal{X}_1 = \cdots = \mathcal{X}_n = \{0, 1\}$ is the two points space equipped with the counting measure $m_1 = \cdots = m_n = m_0$ then the graph space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is the discrete hypercube studied in section 6.1 equipped with the counting measure also, for which we prove that for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$

$$r(z) = -2 \log(1 - 1/n) \quad \text{for } n \geq 2, \quad \tilde{r}_2(z) = 1 \quad \text{for } n \geq 1,$$

and $r(z) = +\infty$ for $n = 1$. It follows that the last two tensorisation results of Theorem 11 can not be improved.

6. ENTROPIC CURVATURE ON THE DISCRETE HYPERCUBE AND ON THE LATTICE \mathbb{Z}^n

This part is devoted to applications of the perturbation results of section 4.1 for specific structure graphs : the discrete hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$ and the lattice \mathbb{Z}^n endowed with a measure m_v with density e^{-v} with respect to the counting measure m_0 on the set of vertices. We analyze the constants $r^v = r^{L_v}, r_1^v = r_1^{L_v}, \bar{r}^v = \bar{r}^{L_v}$, and $\tilde{r}_2^v = \tilde{r}_2^{L_v}$ that bound from below the different types of entropic curvature of the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_v, L_v)$, defined in section 4.1. One of the goals is to derive functional inequalities for the measure m_v or its associated normalized probability measure $\mu_v := m_v/m_v(\mathcal{X})$, by applying then Theorem 3, Corollary 1, Theorem 5 and Theorem 8.

6.1. The discrete hypercube and the Ising model. As mentioned in the introduction, the discrete hypercube is a structured graph with set of moves $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_i \mid i \in [n]\}$ where $\sigma_i(x)$ is defined by flipping the i 's coordinate of $x \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$. In this part μ_0 is the uniform probability measure on $\{0, 1\}^n$. Given $v : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $m_v = e^{-v}m_0$ is a perturbation of the counting measure m_0 on $\{0, 1\}^n$.

Remark 2. *The lower bounds $r, r_1, \bar{r}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_2$ on entropic curvature computed in this section for the hypercube are the same for any graph whose local structure is the one of the hypercube. As pointed out in [23], the hypercube is not determined by its local structure. Indeed, Laborde and Hebbare [17] showed that the conjecture according to which every bipartite, regular graph satisfying that all balls of radius 2 are isomorphic to those of the hypercube is necessarily the hypercube is false.*

Since for any $i \in [n]$ and $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $\sigma_i(\sigma_i(x)) = x$, Theorem 6 gives $K_0(z, S_2(z)) \leq 1 - 1/n$ for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$. Actually, by choosing $\alpha(z') = 1/n$ for any $z' \in S_1(z)$ in the definition of $K_0(z, S_2(z))$, one exactly gets $K_0(z, S_1(z)) = 1 - 1/n$ and therefore according to its definition (10), $r = -2 \log(1 - 1/n)$. Theorem 2 also provides the lower bound $\tilde{r} = 1/n$ for the \tilde{T} -entropic curvature of the space.

Let us now compute the lower bound r_1 of the W_1 -entropic curvature for the discrete hypercube. We need to estimate $r_1(z)$ for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$. Notice that

$$S_2(z) := \left\{ \sigma_j \sigma_i(z) \mid (i, j) \in I \right\} \quad \text{with} \quad I = \left\{ (i, j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n \right\}.$$

Given $W \subset S_2(z)$, $W = \left\{ \sigma_j \sigma_i(z) \mid (i, j) \in A \right\}$ for some $A \subset I$, and setting

$$(34) \quad A^1 := \left\{ i \in [n] \mid \exists j \in [n], (i, j) \in A \text{ or } (j, i) \in A \right\},$$

the expression (9) provides using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$(35) \quad K_0(z, W) := \sup_{\alpha} \sum_{(i, j) \in A} 2\alpha_i \alpha_j \leq \sup_{\alpha} \sum_{(i, j) \in A^1 \times A^1, i \neq j} \alpha_i \alpha_j \leq 1 - \frac{1}{|A^1|},$$

where the supremum runs over all vectors $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ with positive coordinate satisfying $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n = 1$. Let $V_+, V_- \subset S_1(z)$, $(V_+, V_-) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ and $W_+, W_- \subset S_2(z)$ with $V_+ \supset]z, W_+[$ and $V_- \supset]z, W_-[$ satisfying (12). Note that $||z, W|| = |A^1|$. Following the above notations for W and A^1 , one denotes by A_+^1 and A_-^1 the sets related to W_+ and W_- . If $W_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $W_- \neq \emptyset$, then $V_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $V_- \neq \emptyset$ with $V_+ \cap V_- = \emptyset$ and therefore (35) gives

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_-)} \leq |A_+^1| + |A_-^1| \leq |V_+| + |V_-| \leq n.$$

If $W_+ = \emptyset$ and $W_- \neq \emptyset$ then since $V_+ \cap V_- = \emptyset$ one has

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_-)} = \mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset} + \frac{1}{1 - K_0(z, W_-)} \leq \mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset} + |V_-| \leq n,$$

and if $(W_+, W_-) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ then

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{V_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_-)} = \mathbb{1}_{V_+ \neq \emptyset} + \mathbb{1}_{V_- \neq \emptyset} \leq n.$$

Thus one gets $r_1(z) \geq 1/n$ and according to Theorem 2 the W_1 -entropic curvature is bounded from below by $4r_1 \geq 4/n$. Asymptotically as n goes to $+\infty$, this lower bound is the best one may expect (see [13, Corollary 4.5]).

The estimate of the lower bound $\bar{r} = \min_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{r}(z)$ on the $T_{\bar{c}}$ -entropic curvature of the space is similar ($\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_t)_{t \in (0,1)}$ with \bar{c}_t defined by (14)). Let $W_+, W_- \subset S_2(z)$ with $(W_+, W_-) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, and satisfying (16). If $W_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $W_- \neq \emptyset$ then inequality (35) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_+ \neq \emptyset}}{-\log K_0(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_- \neq \emptyset}}{-\log K_0(z, W_-)} &\leq \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_-)} \\ &\leq |A_+^1| + |A_-^1| = \|z, W_+\| + \|z, W_-\| \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

If $W_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $W_- = \emptyset$, then

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_+ \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_+)} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{W_- \neq \emptyset}}{1 - K_0(z, W_-)} = \frac{1}{1 - K_0(z, W_+)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - K_0(z, S_2(z))} = n.$$

In any cases $\bar{r}(z) \geq 1/n$ and Theorem 2 ensures that the $T_{\bar{c}}$ -entropic curvature of the hypercube is bounded from below by $4\bar{r} \geq 4/n$. We know from [31] that this lower-bound is asymptotically optimal in n . Indeed, one may recover the optimal T_2 -transport entropy inequality for the standard Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R} from the transport entropy inequality with cost $T_{\bar{c}}$ derived from this entropic lower bound (see [31, Lemma 4.1]).

Let us now compute $\tilde{r}_2(z) = 1 - \sup_{W \subset S_2(z)} \tilde{K}_0(z, W)$. Using the above notations, for $z \in \mathcal{X}$, one has

$$\tilde{K}_0(z, W) = \tilde{K}(z, W) := \sup_{\beta} \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in A} 2\sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} - \sum_{(i,j) \in A^1 \times A^1, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} \right\},$$

where the supremum runs over all $\beta = (\beta_i)_{i \in A^1}$ such that $\beta_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i \in A^1} \beta_i = 1$. Obviously $\tilde{K}_0(z, W) = 0$ and therefore $\tilde{r}_2(z) = 1$.

Theorem 7 indicates that the \tilde{T}_2 entropic curvature of the discrete hypercube is bounded from below by $\tilde{r}_2 = 1$ and given that $\lambda_1 = 2$ in this case one gets that $\tilde{\kappa}_3 = 1$.

Since $\sigma_i(\sigma_i(x)) = x$ for any $i \in [n]$ and $z \in \mathcal{X}$, each moves σ_i is used at most one time along any discrete geodesic. It follows that the C -displacement convexity property (6) holds with the cost $C_t(\hat{\pi}) = \tilde{C}_t^1(\hat{\pi})$, $t \in (0, 1)$. As previously mentioned, the quantities $\Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma_i}(x)$ and $\Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma_i}(y)$ involved in the definition of the costs \tilde{T}_2 and $\tilde{C}_t^1(\hat{\pi})$ are given by (20). Thus, one exactly recovers the results of [31, Theorem 2.5] for the uniform probability measure μ_0 on the discrete hypercube. Applying Theorem 8, one exactly recovers the modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities given in [31, Comments (d) of Theorem 2.5] for μ_0 .

We want now to go a step further by considering perturbation measures m_v of m_0 . In order to apply Theorem 9, one needs to estimate the quantity $D_s v(x, y)$ given by (31) for any $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$. For that purpose let us introduce some kind of discrete hessian for the potential v . For any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ($n \geq 2$), and $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$, one denotes

$$z_{\overline{ij}} := (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_{j-1}, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \{0, 1\}^{n-2},$$

and one uses the notation $z_{\overline{ij}}z_iz_j = z$. Let $Hv(z)$ denote the symmetric matrix with off-diagonal entries and for $i \neq j$,

$$(Hv(z))_{ij} := \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}),$$

where

$$\partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}) := v(z_{\overline{ij}}11) + v(z_{\overline{ij}}00) - v(z_{\overline{ij}}01) - v(z_{\overline{ij}}10).$$

The minimum and maximum eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix $Hv(z)$ are denoted, respectively, by $\lambda_{\min}(Hv(z))$ and $\lambda_{\max}(Hv(z))$. We know that $\lambda_{\max}(Hv(z)) \geq 0$ and $\lambda_{\min}(Hv(z)) \leq 0$ since the matrix $Hv(z)$ has off diagonal. Let also

$$\lambda_{\max}^\infty(Hv) := \max_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_{\max}(Hv(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min}^\infty(Hv) := \min_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_{\min}(Hv(z)).$$

Lemma 1. *Let $v : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a potential. If for any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the matrix $Hv(z) = V$ does not depend on z , then setting $v_{ij} := \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}})$, one has for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(x, y) \geq 2$,*

$$\int_0^1 D_s v(x, y) q_t(s) ds = \frac{2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} (x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j) V_{ij}}{(d(x, y)(d(x, y) - 1))} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(V)}{d(x, y) - 1}.$$

In any other cases we also have

$$\int_0^1 D_s v(x, y) q_t(s) ds \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}^\infty(Hv)}{d(x, y) - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{d(x,y)-1} \frac{1}{k} \geq \lambda_{\min}^\infty(Hv).$$

As an example, let v be the potential defined by

$$(36) \quad v(z) = \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i z_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in [n], i \neq j} V_{ij} z_i z_j,$$

where $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $V = (V_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ is a symmetric matrix of real coefficients with off diagonal. In that case $Hv(z) = V$ for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, and Theorem 9 and Lemma 1 imply that the relative entropy with respect to m_v satisfies the C^v -displacement convexity property (6) with for any $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_t^v(\widehat{\pi}) &\geq \iint \left(\frac{4}{n} c_t(d(x, y)) + \lambda_{\min}(V) d(x, y) \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \geq 2} \right) d\widehat{\pi}(x, y) \\ &\geq \iint d(x, y) \left(\frac{2}{n} (d(x, y) - 1) + \lambda_{\min}(V) \right) \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \geq 2} d\widehat{\pi}(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that one needs $|\lambda_{\min}(V)| = -\lambda_{\min}(V)$ smaller than constant over n to get positive curvature from the last estimates. This condition is very strong in high dimension as regard to the condition we will get now by applying directly Theorem 1 on the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, L_v, m_v)$ as explained in section 4.1.

For that purpose, let us first observe that for any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and any $i \neq j$,

$$(37) \quad Dv(z, \sigma_i \sigma_j(z)) = v(\sigma_i \sigma_j(z)) + v(z) - v(\sigma_i(z)) - v(\sigma_j(z))$$

$$(38) \quad = (2z_i - 1)(2z_j - 1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}).$$

Therefore, applying Theorem 1, the entropic curvature κ^v of the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, L_v, m_v)$ is bounded from below by $r^v = -2 \log(\max_{z \in \{0,1\}^n} K^v(z, S_2(z)))$ with, according to (32),

$$K^v(z, S_2(z)) := \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} e^{-(2z_i-1)(2z_j-1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}})/2} \alpha_i \alpha_j \right\}.$$

In order to give estimates of this key quantity, let us introduce some notations. For any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$, let $|Hv(z)|$ denotes the symmetric matrix with off diagonal and with coefficients $(|Hv(z)|)_{ij} := |(Hv(z))_{ij}|$, $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$. Setting

$$|Hv(z)|_{\max} := \max_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} |(Hv(z))_{ij}| \quad \text{and} \quad |Hv|_{\max, \infty} := \sup_{z \in \{0,1\}^n} |Hv(z)|_{\max},$$

since $Hv(z)$ is an off diagonal symmetric matrix, one easily checks that

$$|\lambda_{\min}(Hv(z))| \leq \lambda_{\max}|Hv(z)|, \quad |\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)| \leq \lambda_{\max}^{\infty}|Hv|,$$

and

$$|Hv(z)|_{\max} \leq \min \{|\lambda_{\min}|Hv(z)|, \lambda_{\max}|Hv(z)|\}, \quad |Hv|_{\max, \infty} \leq \min \{|\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)|, \lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Hv)\}.$$

Lemma 2. *With the above notations, let*

$$r(v) := 1 + \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{2} - \frac{\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}|Hv|}{2} k\left(\frac{|Hv|_{\max, \infty}}{2}\right),$$

with $k(s) := \frac{1}{s}(e^s - s - 1)$, $s > 0$. For any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and for any $W \subset S_2(z)$, one has

$$K^v(z, W) \leq 1 - \inf_{\alpha} \left\{ r(v) \sum_{i \in A^1} \alpha_i^2 \right\},$$

where the subset of indices $A^1 \subset [n]$ is given by (34), and the infimum runs over all α with positive coordinates α_i satisfying $\sum_{i \in A^1} \alpha_i = 1$. Moreover if $r(v) > 0$, then it holds

$$-\frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{2} \leq \tilde{K}^v \leq -\frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{2} + k\left(\frac{|Hv|_{\max, \infty}}{2}\right) = 1 - r(v).$$

The proof of this lemma is postponed in Appendix B. Since $A^1 = [n]$ for $W = S_2(z)$, the upper estimate of $K^v(z, W)$ with $W = S_2(z)$ implies that : for $r(v) \leq 0$ the entropic curvature κ^v of the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, L_v, m_v)$ satisfies

$$\kappa^v \geq r^v \geq -2 \log(1 - r(v)) \geq 2r(v),$$

and for $r(v) > 0$ one has

$$\kappa^v \geq -2 \log\left(1 - \frac{r(v)}{n}\right) \geq \frac{2}{n} r(v) > 0.$$

Applying also Theorem 2 and Theorem 7 together with Lemma 2 we get the next result.

Proposition 1. *On the discrete hypercube $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$, let m_v denotes the measure with density e^{-v} with respect to the counting measure m_0 , with $v : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This measure is reversible with respect to the generator L_v given by $L_v(x, y) = e^{\frac{1}{2}(v(x) - v(y))} L_0(x, y)$ for any $x \neq y$. Let us assume that for any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $K^v(z, S_2(z)) < 1$. Then, denoting κ_1^v (respectively $\tilde{\kappa}^v, \bar{\kappa}^v, \tilde{\kappa}_2^v$) the W_1 -entropic curvature of the space $(\mathcal{X}, d, L_v, m_v)$ (respectively the $\tilde{T}, T_{\bar{c}}$ and \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature of the space), one has*

$$\kappa_1^v \geq 4r_1^v, \quad \tilde{\kappa}^v \geq r^v/2, \quad \bar{\kappa}^v \geq 4\bar{r}^v, \quad \tilde{\kappa}_2^v \geq \tilde{r}_2^v,$$

with, if $r(z) > 0$,

$$r_1^v \geq \frac{r(v)}{n}, \quad r^v/2 \geq -\log\left(1 - \frac{r(v)}{n}\right) \geq \frac{r(v)}{n}, \quad \bar{r}^v \geq \frac{r(v)}{n}, \quad \tilde{r}_2^v \geq r(v).$$

The inequality $\tilde{r}_2^v = 1 - \tilde{K}^v \geq r(v)$ is a consequence of the second part of Lemma 2. The lower bounds on r_1^v and \bar{r}^v follows from the first part of Lemma 2, by adapting the arguments we have used at the beginning of this section in order to estimate r_1 and \bar{r} . It suffices to observe that Lemma 2 implies that if $r(v) > 0$ then for any $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and any $W \subset S_2(z)$,

$$K^v(z, W) \leq 1 - r(v) \inf_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i \in A^1} \alpha_i^2 \right\} = 1 - \frac{r(v)}{|A^1|}.$$

Then, the details of the proofs are left to the reader.

Comments:

- (i) As example, if the potential v is given by (36) then

$$r(v) = 1 + \frac{\lambda_{\min}(V)}{2} - \frac{\lambda_{\max}(|V|)}{2} k\left(\frac{|V|_{\max}}{2}\right).$$

where V is a symmetric matrix with off diagonal.

If $V = 0$, then $r(v) = 1$ and μ_v is the product of Bernoulli measures with parameter $p_i = \frac{e^{u_i}}{1+e^{u_i}}$. Therefore, all the lower bounds we get on entropic curvature are the same as for the uniform probability measure μ_0 .

- (ii) Applying Theorem 3, Corollary 1, Theorem 5 and Theorem 8 also provide new functional inequalities for the measure m_v or $\mu_v = m_v/m_v(\{0, 1\}^n)$ on the discrete cube. In particular, if

$$(39) \quad \lambda_{\max}(|V|) k\left(\frac{|V|_{\max}}{2}\right) - \lambda_{\min}(V) < 2,$$

then $\tilde{\kappa}_2^v \geq r(v) > 0$ and according to Theorem 8, the measure μ_v satisfies the following modified logarithmic Sobolev inequality, for any positive function f on $\{0, 1\}^n$,

$$\text{Ent}_{\mu_v}(f) \leq \int \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{r(v)}{2} h^* \left(\frac{2}{r(v)} [\partial_{\sigma_i} \log f]_- \right) f d\mu_v \leq \frac{1}{r(v)} \int \sum_{i \in [n]} [\partial_{\sigma_i} \log f]_- [\partial_{\sigma_i} f]_- d\mu,$$

and also the following Poincaré inequality, for any real bounded function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{Var}_{\mu_v}(g) \leq \frac{1}{2r(v)} \int \sum_{i \in [n]} (\partial_{\sigma_i} g)^2 d\mu_v.$$

By a simple change of variable these results can be transposed on the set $\{-1, 1\}^n$ instead of $\{0, 1\}^n$, in order to compare this result with the one of Bauerschmidt-Bodineau [2] and Eldan-Koehler-Zeitouni [9]. Their condition lies on the difference between the largest and the smallest eigenvalue of the symmetric matrix V , which is comparable to (39).

6.2. The lattice \mathbb{Z}^n . In this part, let m_0 be the counting measure on $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{Z}^n$. Recall that the lattice \mathbb{Z}^n is a structured graph with set of moves $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_{i+}, \sigma_{i-} \mid i \in [n]\}$ with $\sigma_{i+}(z) = z + e_i$ and $\sigma_{i-}(z) = z - e_i$ for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. By Theorem 6, it has non-zero entropic curvature and since it is not a finite graph by Bonnet-Myers Theorem 4, $\kappa = 0$. As an illustrative example, it is easy to see that

$$K_0(z, S_2(z)) = \sup_{\alpha} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_{i+}^2 + \alpha_{i-}^2) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} 2(\alpha_{i-} \alpha_{j-} + \alpha_{i-} \alpha_{j+} + \alpha_{i+} \alpha_{j-} + \alpha_{i+} \alpha_{j+}) \right] = 1,$$

where the supremum runs over all $\alpha = (\alpha_{i+}, \alpha_{i-})_{i \in [n]}$ with non negatives coordinates satisfying $\sum_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_{i+} + \alpha_{i-}) = 1$.

Let m_v be a measure with potential $v : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to m_0 , $m_v = e^{-v}m_0$. As in the case of the discrete hypercube, let us define coefficients that can be interpreted as local second partial derivatives. For any $i \in [n]$, let

$$\partial_{ii}^2 v(z) := v(z + e_i) + v(z - e_i) - 2v(z),$$

and for $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$,

$$\partial_{ij}^2 v(z) := v(z + e_i + e_j) + v(z) - v(z + e_i) - v(z + e_j).$$

One may easily check that for any $i, j \in [n]$ and any $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}$,

$$(40) \quad Dv(z, z + \varepsilon_i e_i + \varepsilon_j e_j) = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \partial_{ij} v(z \wedge (z + \varepsilon_i e_i + \varepsilon_j e_j)),$$

where for $z, w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $z \wedge w$ is the vector with coordinates $\min(z_i, w_i), i \in [n]$.

As an example, if the potential v is given by the sum of a quadratic and a linear form,

$$(41) \quad v(z) := \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i z_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in [n]^2} V_{ij} z_i z_j, \quad z \in \mathbb{Z}^n,$$

with $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $V = (V_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ a symmetric matrix of real coefficients, then easy computations give

$$\partial_{ij} v(z \wedge (z + \varepsilon_i e_i + \varepsilon_j e_j)) = V_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad Dv(z, z + \varepsilon_i e_i + \varepsilon_j e_j) = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j V_{ij}$$

for any $i, j \in [n]$ and any $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}$.

Applying Theorem 1, we know that the entropic curvature κ^v of the space $(\mathbb{Z}^n, d, L_v, m_v)$ is bounded from below by $r^v = -2 \log(\max_{z \in \{0,1\}^n} K^v(z, S_2(z)))$ with, according to (32),

$$K^v(z, S_2(z)) := \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} \sum_{\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j \in \{-1, +1\}} e^{-\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \partial_{ij} v(z \wedge (z + \varepsilon_i e_i + \varepsilon_j e_j)) / 2} \alpha_{\varepsilon_i} \alpha_{\varepsilon_j} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, +1\}} e^{-\partial_{ii} v(z \wedge (z + 2\varepsilon_i)) / 2} \alpha_{\varepsilon_i}^2 \right\},$$

where the supremum runs over all vectors α with non-negative $\alpha_{i+}, \alpha_{i-}, i \in [n]$ such that $\sum_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_{i+} + \alpha_{i-}) = 1$, and with the notation $\alpha_{\varepsilon_i} = \alpha_{i+}$ if $\varepsilon_i = 1$ and $\alpha_{\varepsilon_i} = \alpha_{i-}$ if $\varepsilon_i = -1$.

The next lemma gives one way to upper bound $K^v(z, S_2(z))$ in general.

Lemma 3. *Given a potential $v : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, let $Av(z)$ denotes the n by n symmetric matrix defined by*

$$(Av(z))_{ii} := e^{-a_{ii}(z)/2} - 1, \quad i \in [n],$$

with $a_{ii}(z) := \min(\partial_{ii} v(z), \partial_{ii} v(z - 2e_i)), i \in [n]$ and

$$(Av(z))_{ij} := e^{a_{ij}(z)/2} - 1, \quad \{i, j\} \subset [n],$$

with $a_{ij}(z) := \max\{-\partial_{ij} v(z), -\partial_{ij} v(z - e_i - e_j), \partial_{ij} v(z - e_i), \partial_{ij} v(z - e_j)\}$.

If $\lambda_{\max}(Av(z)) \leq 0$, then one has

$$K^v(z, S_2(z)) \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Av(z))}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{K}^v(z) = \sup_{W \subset S_2(z)} \tilde{K}^v(z, W) \leq 1 + \lambda_{\max}(Av(z)).$$

The hypothesis $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \lambda_{\max}(Av(z)) \leq 0$ is not empty. For example, if v is given by (41) then for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, one has $(Av(z))_{ii} = e^{-V_{ii}/2} - 1$ and $(Av(z))_{ij} = e^{|V_{ij}|/2} - 1$. Clearly if for any $i \in [n]$, $V_{ii} > 0$ and for any $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$, $V_{ij} = 0$, then

$$\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) \leq -(1 - e^{-\min_{i \in [n]}(V_{ii})/2}) < 0.$$

By a continuity argument if for any $i \in [n]$, $V_{ii} > 0$ and the values of $|V_{ij}|$, $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$, are sufficiently small then $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) < 0$.

For instance, assume that $V_{i,j} \geq 0$ for all $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$ and that the matrix $-Av(z)$ is *diagonally dominant*, that is

$$|(-Av(z))_{ii}| \geq \sum_{j \neq i} |(-Av(z))_{ij}|, \quad \forall i \in [n],$$

or equivalently

$$(42) \quad n \geq e^{\frac{-V_{ii}}{2}} + \sum_{j \neq i} e^{\frac{V_{ij}}{2}}, \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

As a consequence of the Gershgorin's circle theorem the biggest eigenvalue of a diagonally dominant matrix with non negative diagonal entries is non-positive and therefore $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) \leq 0$. Observe that the above inequality implies the diagonal dominance of the matrix V , namely $V_{ii} \geq \sum_{j \neq i} V_{ij}$ for all $i \in [n]$, and therefore $\lambda_{\max}(V) \leq 0$. And conversely, for sufficiently small and non-negative V_{ij} (for all $\{i, j\} \subset [n]$), the inequality (42) is also close to the diagonal dominance property of the matrix V . As a comment, the diagonal dominance of the matrix V is known to be equivalent to a *discrete midpoint convexity* property of the quadratic form $v(z) = \sum_{i,j \in [n], i \neq j} V_{ij} z_i z_j$ on \mathbb{Z}^n (see details in [35, Theorem 9]).

Note that the bounds on $K^v(z, S_2(z))$ and $\tilde{K}^v(z)$ given in Lemma 3 can be improved if the potential v is given by (41) by introducing other matrices, and even more if the matrix V is specified. Applying Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 7 provides the following non-negative lower bounds on entropic curvatures if $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) \leq 0$.

Proposition 2. *With the above notations, if the graph space $(\mathbb{Z}^n, d, L_v, m_v)$ with $m_v = e^{-v} m_0$ is such that the potential v satisfies $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) \leq 0$, then the entropic curvature κ^v , the W_1 -entropic curvature κ_1^v , the \tilde{T} -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}^v$ and the \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature $\tilde{\kappa}_2^v$ of this space are non-negative, namely*

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^v &\geq 2 \log \left(1 + \lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av)/n \right) \geq -\frac{2\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av)}{n} & \kappa_1^v &\geq -\frac{2\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av)}{n}, \\ \tilde{\kappa}^v &\geq -\frac{\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av)}{n}, & \tilde{\kappa}_2^v &\geq -\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av). \end{aligned}$$

For any integers d, k_1, \dots, k_n such that $d = k_1 + \dots + k_n$, let $\binom{d}{k_1, \dots, k_n} = \frac{n!}{k_1! \dots k_n!}$ denote the multinomial coefficient. If $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) < 0$ then Theorem 3 applies with cost $c(d) = d(d-1)$ and $\kappa_c = \kappa^v$ and provides a Prékopa-Leindler type of inequality for the measure m_v with the Schrödinger bridge between Dirac measures at x and y in \mathbb{Z}^n given by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_t^{x,y}(z) &= \frac{\binom{d(x,z)}{|z_1-x_1|, \dots, |z_n-x_n|} \binom{d(z,y)}{|y_1-z_1|, \dots, |y_n-z_n|}}{\binom{d(x,y)}{|y_1-x_1|, \dots, |y_n-x_n|}} \binom{d(x,y)}{d(x,z)} t^{d(x,z)} (1-t)^{d(z,y)} \mathbb{1}_{[x,y]}(z) \\ &= \left(\frac{|y_1-x_1|}{|z_1-x_1|} \right) \dots \left(\frac{|y_n-x_n|}{|z_n-x_n|} \right) t^{d(x,z)} (1-t)^{d(z,y)} \mathbb{1}_{[x,y]}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$L_0^{d(x,y)}(x,y) = \#G(x,y) = \binom{d(x,y)}{|y_1 - x_1|, \dots, |y_n - x_n|}.$$

Assuming moreover that $m_v(\mathbb{Z}^n) < \infty$, Corollary 1 and the first part of Theorem 8 provide transport-entropy inequalities for the probability measure $\mu_v = m_v/m_v(\mathbb{Z}^n)$ involving the costs W_1, T_2, \tilde{T} and \tilde{T}_2 given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_2(\pi) := & \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\int [y_i - x_i]_+ d\pi_{\rightarrow}(y|x) \right)^2 d\nu_0(x) + \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\int [y_i - x_i]_- d\pi_{\rightarrow}(y|x) \right)^2 d\nu_0(x) \\ & + \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\int [x_i - y_i]_+ d\pi_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \right)^2 d\nu_1(y) + \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\int [x_i - y_i]_- d\pi_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \right)^2 d\nu_1(y), \end{aligned}$$

for any $\pi \in \Pi(\nu_0, \nu_1)$. This expression is a consequence of the following identities, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{i+}(x) \in [x,y]} r(x, \sigma_{i+}(x), \sigma_{i+}(x), y) = [y_i - x_i]_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{i+}(x) \in [x,y]} r(x, \sigma_{i-}(x), \sigma_{i-}(x), y) = [y_i - x_i]_-.$$

Theorem 8 also provides a modified logarithmic Sobolev inequality and a Poincaré inequality for the probability measure μ_v . Namely if $\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av) < 0$, then $\tilde{\kappa}_2 > -\lambda_{\max}^{\infty}(Av)$ and for any bounded function $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$,

$$\text{Ent}_{\mu_v}(f) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}_2} \int \sum_{i \in [n]} ([\partial_{\sigma_{i+}} \log f]_-^2 + [\partial_{\sigma_{i-}} \log f]_-^2) f d\mu_v,$$

and for any real bounded function $g : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{Var}_{\mu_v}(g) \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}_2} \int \sum_{i \in [n]} ((\partial_{\sigma_{i+}} g)^2 + (\partial_{\sigma_{i-}} g)^2) d\mu_v.$$

7. NON POSITIVELY CURVED GRAPHS

In this section we will give examples of graphs whose entropic curvature is negative. In particular, we will concentrate on the notion of *geodetic graphs* and see how this notion is closely related to negative curvature. In everything that follows the dynamics are determined by the generator L_0 with reversible measure associated the counting measure m_0 . In that way, we will always use the formulation developed in (9). Let us recall the definition of *geodetic graphs* introduced by Ore (see [29]).

Definition 5. *A graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ is called geodetic if for every two vertices u and v in G there exists a unique geodesic connecting u and v .*

For example, every tree, every complete graph, every odd-length cycle and the Petersen graph are geodetic graphs.

The following proposition states that if a graph has diameter greater or equal to two and is geodetic then its entropic curvature given by Theorem 1 is negative.

Proposition 3. *For the class of spaces $(\mathcal{X}, d, L_0, m_0)$ where $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ is a geodetic graph with diameter greater or equal to 2 the entropic curvature is always non positive. Moreover, one has*

$$r = -2 \log(K_0) = -2 \log \max_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\max_{z', z' \sim z} \text{Deg}(z') - 1 \right) \geq 2 \left(2 - \max_{z', z' \sim z} \text{Deg}(z') \right).$$

The proof of this proposition is postponed in Appendix B.

Comments:

- (i) Let us observe that the fact that $r \leq 0$ is consistent to the geometry of the underlying generic geodetic graph.
- (ii) One of Ore's questions focuses on the characterization of geodetic graphs which has recently been studied in [5]. Of course, note that if a space $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_0, L_0)$ has zero or negative entropic curvature it does not imply that the underlying graph is geodetic. Indeed, it was shown in [31], that the circle $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ of any length and parity satisfy null entropic curvature. Also, note that the hexagonal tiling of the plane is not a geodetic graph, however locally it looks like a 3-regular tree and has negative entropic curvature, i.e. for every vertex z in the hexagonal tiling $r(z) = -2$.

8. SOME COMBINATORIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE ENTROPIC CURVATURE AND A FEW COMPARISONS WITH OTHER NOTIONS OF CURVATURE

In this section we will discuss some combinatorial implications of the entropic curvature. As in the previous section, we will use the dynamics determined by the generator L_0 . Certain general conditions will be obtained for positive entropic curvature. Also, some comparisons with two other notions of curvatures will be discussed. In particular, we will establish a relation with the *Lin-Lu-Yau curvature* and make some comparative remarks with respect to the *Bakry-Émery curvature*.

General conditions for positive entropic curvature.

Let us introduce certain local combinatorial conditions to obtain positive entropic curvature for a vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$. To do so, let us introduce the notion of *admissible family*.

Let $z \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{W_i\}_{i=1}^d \subset S_2(z)$ with $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that the family $\mathcal{W} = \{W_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is *admissible* with respect to the vertex z if the family \mathcal{W} satisfies the following conditions

- (i) $S_2(z) = \bigcup_i^d W_i$,
- (ii) $]z, W_i[\neq]z, W_j[$ if $i \neq j$, for $i, j \in [d]$,
- (iii) For all $z'' \in W_i$, $]z, z''[=]z, W_i[$ for all $i \in [d]$.

Clearly, an admissible family always exists.

Proposition 4. *Let $z \in \mathcal{X}$. Let a family $\mathcal{W} = \{W_i\}_{i=1}^d$ admissible with respect to the vertex z . If $r(z) \geq 0$ then for all $i \in [d]$,*

$$]|z, W_i[\geq |W_i|,$$

and if

$$]|z, W_i[\geq |W_i| \text{ and }]z, W_i[\cap]z, W_j[= \emptyset \quad \text{for all } i, j \in [d], i \neq j,$$

then $r(z) \geq 0$.

The proof of this proposition is postponed in Appendix B.

Comment: It is conjectured that the hypothesis that $]z, W_i[\cap]z, W_j[= \emptyset$ for all $i, j \in [d], i \neq j$, can be removed. It is for now an open problem.

Some relations between entropic curvature and the Lin-Lu-Yau curvature.

The Lin-Lu-Yau curvature is a modified notion of the coarse Ollivier's Ricci curvature introduced by Lin, Lu and Yau in [20]. In [27], Florentin Münch and Radosław K. Wojciechowski, generalized the notion of Lin-Lu-Yau curvature for any graph Laplacian.

Definition 6 (Lin-Lu-Yau Ricci curvature). *Given $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ a graph endowed with its graph distance d and with a Markov chain defined by $m := \{m_z(\cdot)\}_{z \in \mathcal{X}}$. For $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, the α -lazy random walk m_x^α associated to the graph Laplacian L_0 is defined as*

$$m_x^\alpha(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} & \text{if } x \sim y, \\ 1 - \alpha \frac{\text{Deg}(x)}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} & \text{if } y = x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, one defines

$$\kappa_\alpha(x, y) := 1 - \frac{W_1(m_x^\alpha, m_y^\alpha)}{d(x, y)}.$$

As shown in [27], the limit as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ exists for any graph Laplacian and therefore one can define the Ricci Lin-Lu-Yau curvature along the edge $\{x, y\}$ denoted as $\kappa_{LLY}(x, y)$ by

$$\kappa_{LLY}(x, y) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\kappa_\alpha(x, y)}{\alpha}.$$

The following proposition establishes a link between the Lin-Lu-Yau curvature and the graph-theoretical notion of *girth*. Let us first introduce the concept of girth of a graph.

Definition 7. *The girth of a graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$, denoted in what follows $g(G)$ is the length of the shortest cycle contained in G . Acyclic graphs are considered to have infinite girth.*

Adapting the proof [3, Theorem 2.b(ii)], we obtain the following proposition with the measures m_x^α associated to the generator L_0 . Its proof of this proposition is postponed in Appendix B.

Proposition 5. *Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a graph . If for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(x, y) = 1$*

$$\kappa_{LLY}(x, y) < \frac{6 - \text{Deg}(x) - \text{Deg}(y)}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}$$

then $g(G) \geq 5$.

Remark 3. *Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a graph . If $g(G) \geq 5$, then there cannot be two midpoints between two vertices at distance two and thus as already noted in the introduction for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $r(z) \leq 0$.*

Thanks to the above remark we immediately obtain the following corollary which establishes a global relationship between the entropic curvature and the Lin-Lu-Yau curvature.

Corollary 2. *Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a graph. If for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$ $r(z) > 0$, then for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(x, y) = 1$,*

$$\kappa_{LLY}(x, y) \geq \frac{6 - \text{Deg}(x) - \text{Deg}(y)}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}.$$

If the Lin-Lu-Yau curvature is strictly positive on an edge $\{x, y\}$, it does not imply that $r(x) > 0$ nor that $r(y) > 0$. For this purpose, let us consider the following graph called the *windmill graph* $W_d(4, 2)$ consisting of 2 copies of the complete graph K_4 at a shared universal vertex (see Figure 1).




FIGURE 1. The value of *Lin-Lu-Yau Ricci curvature* according to the graph Laplacian L_0 for the edge $(x, y) \in W_d(4, 2)$ is $2/3$.

Indeed, it is easy to verify that $W_1(m_x^\alpha, m_y^\alpha) = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{6}$. Therefore, $\kappa_{LLY}(x, y) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\kappa_\alpha(x, y)}{\alpha} = \frac{2}{3}$. However, $\sup\{r(x), r(y)\} < 0$.

Some comparative aspects between entropic curvature and the *Bakry-Émery curvature*.

There are strong relationships between the entropic curvature and the *Bakry-Émery curvature*. The notion of Bakry-Émery curvature was first introduced by Bakry and Émery in [1]. The Bakry-Émery curvature is motivated by the Bochner's identity in Riemannian Geometry and has been extensively studied in discrete spaces recently [7, 8]. Let us make two qualitative remarks on the similarities with respect to the local structure and the negativity of curvature for both notions.

First, let us note that similarly to the entropic curvature in the case where $L = L_0$, recent works about the *Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension conditions* developed in the context of graphs [7, 8] show that the Bakry-Émery conditions are also related to the local structure of balls of radius 2. Indeed, in their setting [7], for a locally finite graph $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ the *curvature matrix* for a vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$ is completely determined by the ball of radius 2 around z denoted as $B_2(z)$. More precisely it is determined by the *incomplete ball of radius 2 around z* , that is, the graph induced by $B_2(z)$ removing all edges connecting vertices within $S_2(z)$. Interestingly, in our context our criteria for lower bounds on entropic curvature also depends on balls of radius 2 and its value is invariant with respect to the existence of edges connecting vertices within $S_2(z)$.

Second, let us note the relation between the negativity of the curvature for both concepts. Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a graph. If the *punctured 2-ball* defined in [8] as $B_2^o(z) := B_2(z) \setminus \{z\} = S_1(z) \cup S_2(z)$ has more than one connected component then the Bakry-Émery curvature criterion at the vertex z is always satisfied with curvature term $\kappa_{BE} < 0$ with five exceptions [8, Theorem 6.4]. Note that similarly in this configuration, the lower bound on entropic curvature r is always less or equal to zero. Indeed, let $z \in (\mathcal{X}, E)$ such that $B_2^o(z)$ has more than one connected component then by choosing two neighbours of z in two different connected components of $B_2^o(z)$ one obtains that there exists a unique midpoint between them (which is z), and thus $r \leq 0$.

Finally, let us recall that according to Theorem 6, any structured graph has non negative entropic curvature. Moreover, if it satisfies a commutativity assumption with respect to the set of moves \mathcal{S} ,

then every $z \in \mathcal{X}$ verifies the Bakry-Émery curvature condition $CD(\kappa_{BE}, \infty)$ with curvature term $\kappa_{BE} \geq 0$. For the sake of completeness, the definition of the Bakry-Émery curvature condition $CD(\kappa_{BE}, \infty)$ is recalled in Appendix B, together with the proof of the next result, adapted in the context of structured graphs from a proof in [4, 21] revisited in [6].

Proposition 6. *Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a structured graph with a finite set \mathcal{S} of maps and let us suppose that moves in \mathcal{S} commute, that is, $\sigma\tau = \tau\sigma$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{S}$ then the Bakry-Émery curvature criterion $CD(0, \infty)$ is satisfied for every $z \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Comment: The commutativity condition is not a necessary condition for structured graphs to satisfy the $CD(\kappa_{BE}, \infty)$ criterion with $\kappa_{BE} \geq 0$. Indeed, the Bernoulli-Laplace model corresponds to a non-commutative structured graph and satisfies the $CD(\kappa_{BE}, \infty)$ criterion with positive curvature term κ_{BE} as shown in [16, Theorem 2.7].

9. APPENDIX A

Lemma 4. *Let \mathcal{X} be a structured graph associated to a set of moves \mathcal{S} . Then the following properties hold :*

(i) *Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathcal{X}$, if $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d, \tau(\alpha_d)) \in G(\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_d))$ then for any $k \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ one has $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)) \in G(\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_d))$. If moreover the generator L on \mathcal{X} satisfies condition (24), then one has*

$$L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d, \tau(\alpha_d)) = L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)).$$

(ii) *For any $x, y, z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\tau(z) \sim z$, if $(z, \tau(z)) \in [x, y]$ then $\tau(x) \in [x, y]$ and $\tau(z) \in [\tau(x), y]$.*

(iii) *Let $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\tau, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $d(z, \tau(\sigma_1(z))) = 2$ and $\tau(\sigma_1(z)) = \tau(\sigma_2(z))$. Then one has $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.*

(iv) *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha_0, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1} \in \mathcal{X}$. If $(\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_0), \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1})$ then for any $k \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, there exists a single $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1}$ such that*

$$(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \beta_{k+2}, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1}),$$

and for any $\ell \in [k]$, $\beta_{\ell+1} = \tau(\alpha_\ell)$.

(v) *Given $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, let*

$$\mathcal{Y}(\alpha_0, \tau, d) := \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathcal{X}^{d+1} \mid (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d, \alpha_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \alpha_{d+1}), \alpha_{d+1} = \tau(\alpha_d)\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}(\alpha_0, \tau, d) := \{(\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in \mathcal{X}^d \mid (\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_0), \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1})\}.$$

The map $\Psi : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \mapsto (\tau(\alpha_1), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d))$ is one to one from the set $\mathcal{Y}(\alpha_0, \tau, d)$ to the set $\mathcal{W}(\alpha_0, \tau, d)$.

(vi) *Assume that L is a generator on \mathcal{X} satisfying condition (24). Let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\tau(x) \in [x, y]$ and let $k \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ where $d = d(x, y) - 1$. Then one has*

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, d(x, z) = k, (z, \tau(z)) \in [x, y]} L^k(x, z) L(z, \tau(z)) L^{d-k-1}(\tau(z), y) = L(x, \tau(x)) L^{d-1}(\tau(x), y).$$

Proof. The proof of (i) is by induction over $k \in \{0, \dots, d\}$. The property holds for $k = d$ by assumption. Assume that for some fixed $k \in [d]$, $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d))$ is a discrete geodesic. Then since $d(\alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_k) = 1$, there exists a single $\sigma_k \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1}) = \alpha_k$. Since $d(\alpha_{k-1}, \tau(\alpha_k)) = d(\alpha_{k-1}, \tau(\sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1}))) = 2$, according to the definition of structured graphs, there exists $\psi(\sigma_k) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau(\alpha_{k-1})}$ such that

$$\tau(\sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1})) = \psi(\sigma_k)(\tau(\alpha_{k-1})).$$

Therefore one has $\tau(\alpha_{k-1}) \in]\alpha_{k-1}, \tau(\alpha_k)[$ and $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, \tau(\alpha_{k-1}), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d))$ is a discrete geodesic. If moreover condition (24) holds, then by induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} & L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, \tau(\alpha_{k-1}), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)) \\ &= L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1})L(\alpha_{k-1}, \tau(\alpha_{k-1}))L(\tau(\alpha_{k-1}), \tau(\sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1})))L(\tau(\alpha_k), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)) \\ &= L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1})L(\alpha_{k-1}, \sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1}))L(\sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1}), \tau(\sigma_k(\alpha_{k-1})))L(\tau(\alpha_k), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)) \\ &= L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)) \\ &= L(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d, \tau(\alpha_d)). \end{aligned}$$

Item (ii) is an easy consequence of (i). Indeed, if $(z, \tau(z)) \in [x, y]$ then, setting $d = d(x, y)$ and $k = d(x, z)$, there exists $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \beta_{k+2}, \dots, \beta_d) \in G(x, y)$ with $\alpha_k = z$. Item (i) implies that

$$(x, \tau(x), \tau(\alpha_1), \dots, \tau(\alpha_k), \beta_{k+2}, \dots, \beta_d) = (\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_0), \dots, \tau(\alpha_k), \beta_{k+2}, \dots, \beta_d) \in G(x, y),$$

and therefore $\tau(x) \in]x, y]$ and $\tau(z) \in [\tau(x), y]$.

For the proof of (iii), let $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $d(z, \tau(\sigma_1(z))) = 2$. If $\tau(\sigma_1(z)) = \tau(\sigma_2(z))$ then according to the definition of structured graphs $\psi(\sigma_1)(\tau(z)) = \psi(\sigma_2)(\tau(z))$. It follows that $\psi(\sigma_1) = \psi(\sigma_2)$ and therefore $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ since the map ψ is one to one.

The proof of (iv) is by induction over $k \in \{0, \dots, d\}$. The property holds for $k = 0$ by assumption. Assume that for a fixed $k \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, there exists a single $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1}$ such that

$$(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \tau(\alpha_k), \beta_{k+2}, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1}),$$

and for any $\ell \in [k]$, $\beta_{\ell+1} = \tau(\alpha_\ell)$. According to the definition of structured graphs, since $d(\tau(\alpha_k), \beta_{k+2}) = 1$, there exists a single $\sigma'_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau(\alpha_k)}$ such that $\beta_{k+2} = \sigma'_{k+1}(\tau(\alpha_k))$, and since $d(\alpha_k, \sigma'_{k+1}(\tau(\alpha_k))) = 2$, one has

$$\beta_{k+2} = \sigma'_{k+1}(\tau(\alpha_k)) = \tau(\psi^{-1}(\sigma'_{k+1})(\alpha_k)).$$

Setting $\alpha_{k+1} = \psi^{-1}(\sigma'_{k+1})(\alpha_k)$, one has $\beta_{k+2} = \tau(\alpha_{k+1})$ and since $\alpha_{k+1} \in]\alpha_k, \beta_{k+2}[$ it follows that

$$(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}, \tau(\alpha_{k+1}), \beta_{k+3}, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1}).$$

Moreover if α'_{k+1} is such that $\beta_{k+2} = \tau(\alpha'_{k+1})$ and

$$(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \alpha'_{k+1}, \tau(\alpha'_{k+1}), \beta_{k+3}, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1}),$$

then there exists σ_{k+1} such that $\alpha'_{k+1} = \sigma_{k+1}(\alpha_k)$. Applying (iii) it follows that $\psi(\sigma_{k+1}) = \sigma'_{k+1}$ and therefore

$$\alpha'_{k+1} = \sigma_{k+1}(\alpha_k) = \psi^{-1}(\sigma'_{k+1})(\alpha_k) = \alpha_{k+1}.$$

This ends the proof of (iv).

We now turn to the proof of (v). Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. If $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathcal{Y}(\alpha_0, \tau, d)$ then according to (i) with $k = 0$, one has

$$(\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_0), \dots, \tau(\alpha_d)) \in G(\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_d)),$$

and therefore $\Psi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathcal{W}(\alpha_0, \tau, d)$. Conversely if $(\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in \mathcal{W}(\alpha_0, \tau, d)$, then

$$(\alpha_0, \tau(\alpha_0), \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1}),$$

and according to (iv) for $k = d$, there exists a single $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d)$ such that

$$(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d, \tau(\alpha_d)) \in G(\alpha_0, \beta_{d+1}),$$

and for all $\ell \in [d]$, $\beta_{\ell+1} = \tau(\alpha_\ell)$. Therefore, there exists a single $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathcal{Y}(\alpha_0, \tau, d)$ such that $\psi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) = (\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d+1})$.

For the proof of (vi), let L be a generator on \mathcal{X} satisfying condition (24), let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\tau(x) \in]x, y]$ and let $k \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ where $d = d(x, y) - 1$. By definition, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, d(x,z)=k, (z, \tau(z)) \in [x, y]} L^k(x, z) L(z, \tau(z)) L^{d-k-1}(\tau(z), y) \\ = \sum_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{Y}(x, \tau, k)} \sum_{\gamma \in G(\tau(\alpha_k), y)} L(x, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}) L(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (i) and then (v) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, d(x,z)=k, (z, \tau(z)) \in [x, y]} L^k(x, z) L(z, \tau(z)) L^{d-k-1}(\tau(z), y) \\ = \sum_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathcal{Y}(x, \tau, k)} \sum_{\gamma \in G(\tau(\alpha_k), y)} L(x, \tau(x), \tau(\alpha_1), \dots, \tau(\alpha_k)) L(\gamma) \\ = \sum_{(\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{W}(x, \tau, k)} \sum_{\gamma \in G(\beta_{k+1}, y)} L(x, \tau(x), \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{k+1}) L(\gamma) \\ = L(x, \tau(x)) \sum_{\gamma' \in G(\tau(x), y)} L(\gamma') = L(x, \tau(x)) L^{d-1}(\tau(x), y). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 4 is completed. \square

Lemma 5. *Let (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) be a graph space. Let $v : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function and given $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ let*

$$R(t) = \int v d\nu_t^{x,y}, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

where $(\nu_t^{x,y})_{t \in [0,1]}$ is the Schrödinger path between Dirac measures at x and y defined by (4). One has for any $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$R''(t) := d(x, y)(d(x, y) - 1) D_t v(x, y),$$

with

$$D_t v(x, y) := \sum_{(z, z'') \in [x, y], d(z, z'')=2} \left[\sum_{z' \in]z, z''[} (v(z'') + v(z) - 2v(z')) L(z, z') L(z', z'') \right] r(x, z, z'', y) \rho_t^{d(x,y)-2}(d(x, z))$$

Proof of Lemma 5. Let $d := d(x, y)$. For $t \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$R(t) = \sum_{k=0}^d \rho_t^d(k) R_k, \quad \text{with} \quad R_k := \sum_{z \in [x, y], d(x, z)=k} v(z) \frac{L^{d(x,z)}(x, z) L^{d(z,y)}(z, y)}{L^d(x, y)}$$

Simple computations give for any $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$R'(t) = d \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \rho_t^{d-1}(k) (R_{k+1} - R_k),$$

and therefore

$$R''(t) = d(d-1) \sum_{k=0}^{d-2} \rho_t^{d-2}(k) (R_{k+2} + R_k - 2R_{k+1}).$$

Then the result follows observing that for any $k \in \{0, \dots, d-2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{k+2} + R_k - 2R_{k+1} \\ &= \sum_{(z, z', z'') \in [x, y], d(x, z) = k} (v(z'') + v(z) - 2v(z')) \frac{L^{d(x, z)}(x, z) L(z, z') L(z', z'') L^{d(z'', y)}(z'', y)}{L^d(x, y)} \\ &= \sum_{(z, z'') \in [x, y], d(x, z) = k, d(z, z'') = 2} \left[\sum_{z' \in [z, z'']} (v(z'') + v(z) - 2v(z')) L(z, z') L(z', z'') \right] r(x, z, z'', y). \end{aligned}$$

□

10. APPENDIX B

10.1. Proofs of Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 7.

Proof of Theorem 1. Theorem 1 is a consequence of Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.5 of [31]. The results of this paper [31] are given for graph spaces and the two following additional assumptions : the measure m is uniformly upper bounded and lower bounded away from 0,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x) < \infty, \quad \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x) > 0,$$

and the generator L is uniformly upper bounded, and uniformly lower bounded away from zero on the set of neighbours,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |L(x, x)| < \infty, \quad \inf_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}, d(x, y) = 1} L(x, y) > 0.$$

These conditions are not in the setting of Theorem 1. To overcome this difficulty, one will consider a well chosen space $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$ defined as the restriction of the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) to a well chosen finite convex subset \mathcal{C} as defined in section 4.2.

Let ν_0 and ν_1 be two probability measures on \mathcal{X} with bounded support. Since each vertex has bounded degree, there exists a finite convex subset \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{X} that contains all the balls of radius 2 with center in the finite subset $[\text{supp}(\nu_0), \text{supp}(\nu_1)]$. Choose for example the convex subset \mathcal{C} with minimal elements. Let $(\widehat{\nu}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ denotes the Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature selected from the slowing down procedure on the space $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$. As explained in [31] there exists a W_1 -optimal coupling $\widehat{\pi}$ with marginals ν_0 and ν_1 such that the expression of $(\widehat{\nu}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ is given by (3) on the space $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$. Due to the assumption on the subset \mathcal{C} , for any $(x, y) \in \text{supp} \widehat{\pi}$, the set $[x, y]$ is the same on the space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) and on the space $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$. Moreover, since $L_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) = L(x, y)$ for $x \neq y$, the expression of $r(x, z, z, y)$ for $z \in [x, y]$ and $(x, y) \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\pi})$ is also the same on (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) and on $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$. Therefore the expression of the Schrödinger bridges between Dirac measure δ_x and δ_y is for us given by (4) does not depend on the chosen convex subset \mathcal{C} . Up to now we are working on $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$ but for most of all expressions we write, there is no dependence in \mathcal{C} or the subset \mathcal{C} may be replaced by \mathcal{X} .

For any $t \in (0, 1)$, the support of $\widehat{\nu}_t$, denoted by \widehat{Z} for simplicity sake, is given by

$$\widehat{Z} := \text{supp}(\widehat{\nu}_t) = \bigcup_{(x,y) \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\pi})} [x, y].$$

For any $z \in \widehat{Z}$, let

$$V_{\rightarrow}(z) := \left\{ z' \in S_1(z) \mid (z, z') \in C_{\rightarrow} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\leftarrow}(z) := \left\{ z' \in S_1(z) \mid (z, z') \in C_{\leftarrow} \right\},$$

and similarly

$$V_{\rightarrow}(z) := \left\{ z', \in S_2(z) \mid (z, z') \in C_{\rightarrow} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\leftarrow}(z) := \left\{ z', \in S_2(z) \mid (z, z') \in C_{\leftarrow} \right\},$$

where

$$C_{\rightarrow} := \left\{ (z, w) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mid z \neq w, \exists (x, y) \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\pi}), (z, w) \in [x, y] \right\},$$

and

$$C_{\leftarrow} := \left\{ (z, w) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mid (w, z) \in C_{\rightarrow} \right\}.$$

As explained in [31], C_{\rightarrow} and C_{\leftarrow} are disjoint sets which implies that $V_{\rightarrow}(z) \cap V_{\leftarrow}(z) = \emptyset$, and also $V_{\rightarrow}(z) \cap V_{\leftarrow}(z) = \emptyset$.

For any $z \in \widehat{Z}$ let

$$\widehat{Y}_z := \left\{ y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1) \mid \exists x \in \mathcal{X}, (x, y) \in \widehat{\pi}, z \in [x, y] \right\},$$

and identically let

$$\widehat{X}_z := \left\{ x \in \text{supp}(\nu_0) \mid \exists y \in \mathcal{X}, (x, y) \in \widehat{\pi}, z \in [x, y] \right\}.$$

For $y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1)$, $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, the quantity

$$(43) \quad a_t(z, y) := \int \nu_t^{w,y}(z) d\widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y),$$

is positive if and only if $z \in \widehat{Z}$ and $y \in \widehat{Y}_z$. Identically, for $x \in \text{supp}(\nu_0)$, $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, the quantity

$$b_t(z, x) := \int \nu_t^{x,w}(z) d\widehat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(w|x),$$

is positive if and only if $z \in \widehat{Z}$ and $x \in \widehat{X}_z$. Actually a_t and b_t represent conditional laws, $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} a_t(z, y) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} b_t(z, x) = 1$.

For $t \in [0, 1]$, $z \in \widehat{Z}$, $z' \in S_1(z)$ and $y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1)$, let

$$(44) \quad a_t(z, z', y) := \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}, (z, z') \in [y, w]} r(y, z, z', w) d(y, w) \rho_t^{d(y, w)-1}(d(z, w) - 1) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y),$$

and for any $x \in \text{supp}(\nu_0)$, let

$$b_t(z, z', x) := \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}, (z, z') \in [x, w]} r(x, z, z', w) d(x, w) \rho_t^{d(x, w)-1}(d(x, z)) \widehat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(w|x).$$

where the function r is given by (5). For $t \in (0, 1)$, the quantity $a_t(z, z', y)$ is positive if and only if $z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)$ and $y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z, z')}$ with

$$\widehat{Y}_{(z, z')} = \left\{ y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1) \mid \exists x \in \mathcal{X}, (x, y) \in \widehat{\pi}, (z, z') \in [y, x] \right\} \subset \widehat{Y}_z \cap \widehat{Y}_{z'},$$

According to [31, Lemma 3.4], given $z \in \widehat{Z}$ and $z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)$ the ratio $a_t(z, z', y)/a_t(z, y)$ does not depend on $y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z, z')}$. Therefore, for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z' \in S_1(z)$, one may define

$$A_t(z, z') := \begin{cases} \frac{a_t(z, z', y)}{a_t(z, y)} & \text{for } (z, z') \in \widehat{Z} \times V_{\leftarrow}(z) \text{ and } y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z, z')} \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Identically, for $t \in (0, 1)$, the quantity $\mathfrak{b}_t(z, z'', x)$ is positive if and only if $z' \in V_{\rightarrow}(z)$ and $x \in X_{(z, z')}$ with

$$\widehat{X}_{(z, z')} = \left\{ y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1) \mid \exists x \in \mathcal{X}, (x, y) \in \widehat{\pi}^0, (z, z') \in [x, y] \right\} \subset \widehat{X}_z \cap \widehat{X}_{z'},$$

and according to [31, Lemma 3.4], the ratio $\mathfrak{b}_t(z, z', x)/b_t(z, x)$ does not depend on $x \in X_{(z, z')}$. Therefore, for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z' \in S_1(z)$, one defines

$$B_t(z, z') := \begin{cases} \frac{b_t(z, z', x)}{b_t(z, x)} & \text{for } (z, z') \in \widehat{Z} \times V_{\rightarrow}(z) \text{ and } x \in \widehat{X}_{(z, z')} \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that by reversibility, for any $(z, z') \in C_{\rightarrow}$ with $d(z, z') = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} B_t(z, z')L(z, z')\widehat{\nu}_t(z) &= \sum_{x \in \widehat{X}_{(z, z')}} B_t(z, z')L(z, z')b_t(z, x)\nu_0(x) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \widehat{X}_{(z, z')}} b_t(z, z', x)L(z, z')\nu_0(x) \\ &= \sum_{(x, y) \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\pi}), (z, z') \in [x, y]} r(x, z, z', y)L(z, z')d(x, y)\rho_t^{d(x, y)-1}(d(x, z))\widehat{\pi}(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{(x, y) \in \text{supp}(\widehat{\pi}), (z', z) \in [y, x]} r(y, z', z, x)L(z', z)d(y, x)\rho_t^{d(y, x)-1}(d(x, z') - 1)\widehat{\pi}(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z', z)}} a_t(z', z, y)L(z', z)\nu_1(y) \\ &= A_t(z', z)L(z', z)\widehat{\nu}_t(z'). \end{aligned}$$

For $t \in [0, 1]$, $z \in \widehat{Z}$, $z'' \in S_2(z)$ and $y \in \text{supp}(\nu_1)$, define also

$$(45) \quad \mathfrak{a}_t(z, z'', y) := \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}, (z, z'') \in [y, w]} r(y, z, z'', w)d(y, w)(d(y, w) - 1)\rho_t^{d(y, w)-2}(d(z, w) - 2)\widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y),$$

and for $x \in \text{supp}(\nu_0)$

$$\mathfrak{b}_t(z, z'', x) := \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}, (z, z'') \in [x, w]} r(x, z, z'', w)d(x, w)(d(x, w) - 1)\rho_t^{d(x, w)-2}(d(x, z))\widehat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(w|x).$$

For $t \in (0, 1)$, we also have $\mathfrak{a}_t(z, z'', y) > 0$ if and only if $z'' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)$ and $y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z, z'')}$, and $\mathfrak{b}_t(z, z'', x) > 0$ if and only if $z'' \in V_{\rightarrow}(z)$ and $x \in \widehat{X}_{(z, z'')}$. Since according to [31, Lemma 3.4], the ratio $\mathfrak{a}_t(z, z'', y)/a_t(z, y)$ does not depend on $y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z, z'')}$, and the ratio $\mathfrak{b}_t(z, z'', x)/b_t(z, x)$ does not depend on $x \in X_{(z, z'')}$. Therefore one may define for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z'' \in S_2(z)$,

$$\mathbb{A}_t(z, z'') := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathfrak{a}_t(z, z'', y)}{a_t(z, y)} & \text{for } (z, z'') \in \widehat{Z} \times V_{\leftarrow}(z) \text{ and } y \in \widehat{Y}_{(z, z'')} \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathbb{B}_t(z, z'') := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{b}_t(z, z'', x)}{b_t(z, x)} & \text{for } (z, z'') \in \widehat{Z} \times \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) \text{ and } x \in \widehat{X}_{(z, z'')} \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

One also observe that for $t \in (0, 1)$ and $z \in \widehat{Z}$, if $z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)$ (or equivalently $\mathbb{A}_t(z, z'') > 0$), then $\mathbb{A}_t(z, z') > 0$ for any $z' \in S_1(z)$ with $z' \sim z''$ (since $z' \in V_\leftarrow(z)$). Therefore for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $z \in \widehat{Z}$, $z' \in S_1(z)$, $z'' \in S_2(z)$, one has $(\mathbb{A}_t(z, z'), \mathbb{A}_t(z, z'')) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$. Identically, one has $(\mathbb{B}_t(z, z'), \mathbb{B}_t(z, z'')) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$.

As above, one simply check that by reversibility, for any $(z, z'') \in C_\rightarrow$ with $d(z, z'') = 2$,

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{B}_t(z, z'') L^2(z, z'') \widehat{\nu}_t(z) = \mathbb{A}_t(z'', z) L^2(z'', z) \widehat{\nu}_t(z'').$$

One will apply the following theorem which is a direct result of Lemma 3.1 and the main Theorem 3.5 of [31]. For $z \in \widehat{Z}$ and $t \in (0, 1)$, let

$$H_t(z) := \left(\sum_{z' \in V_\leftarrow(z)} \mathbb{A}_t(z, z') L(z, z') \right)^2 + \sum_{z' \in V_\leftarrow(z), z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z), z' \sim z''} \rho\left(\mathbb{A}_t^2(z, z'), \mathbb{A}_t(z, z'')\right) L(z', z'') L(z, z'),$$

and let

$$K_t(z) := \left(\sum_{z' \in V_\rightarrow(z)} \mathbb{B}_t(z, z') L(z, z') \right)^2 + \sum_{z' \in V_\rightarrow(z), z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z), z' \sim z''} \rho\left(\mathbb{B}_t^2(z, z'), \mathbb{B}_t(z, z'')\right) L(z', z'') L(z, z'),$$

where the function $\rho : (0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \cup \{(0, 0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\rho(a, b) := (\log b - \log a - 1) b, \quad a > 0, b > 0,$$

and $\rho(a, 0) = 0$ for $a \geq 0$. According to [31, Lemma 3.1] and [31, Theorem 3.5] the following result holds.

Theorem 12. *We assume that the discrete space (\mathcal{X}, d, m, L) is a graph space. Let $(\widehat{\nu}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ be the Schrödinger bridge at zero temperature between two probability measures $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with bounded support defined above and given by (3). For any $t \in (0, 1)$, let q_t be the kernel on $[0, 1]$ defined by*

$$q_t(s) = \frac{2s}{t} \mathbf{1}_{[0, t]}(s) + \frac{2(1-s)}{1-t} \mathbf{1}_{[t, 1]}(s), \quad s \in [0, 1].$$

Then, one has

$$(1-t)H(\nu_0|m) + tH(\nu_1|m) - H(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) \geq \int_0^1 \left(\int (H_s + K_s) d\widehat{\nu}_s \right) q_t(s) ds.$$

As a consequence if there exists a real function $\zeta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\int (H_s + K_s) d\widehat{\nu}_s \geq \zeta(s),$$

and if ζq_t is integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$, then the convexity property of entropy (6) holds with, for any $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$C_t(\widehat{\pi}) = \int_0^1 \zeta(s) q_t(s) ds.$$

Observe that if ζ is a constant function then the cost $C_t(\widehat{\pi})$ is equal to this constant since $\int_0^1 q_t(s) ds = 1$. And if $\zeta = \xi''$ where ξ is a real continuous functions on $[0, 1]$, twice differentiable on $(0, 1)$, then one has

$$C_t(\widehat{\pi}) = \frac{2}{t(1-t)} \left[(1-t)\xi(0) + t\xi(1) - \xi(t) \right].$$

Using the following identity, for any integer N , for any $b \geq 0$, and any positive $L_1, \dots, L_N, a_1, \dots, a_N$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \rho(a_i^2, b) L_i = L \rho\left(\prod_{i=1}^N a_i^{2L_i/L}, b\right), \quad \text{with } L = \sum_{i=1}^N L_i,$$

one gets for any $z \in \widehat{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(z) &= \left(\sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} A_t(z, z') L(z, z') \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)} \sum_{z' \in]z, z''[} \rho\left(A_t^2(z, z'), \mathbb{A}_t(z, z'')\right) L(z', z'') L(z, z') \\ &= \left(\sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} A_t(z, z') L(z, z') \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)} L^2(z, z'') \rho\left(\prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} A_t(z, z')^{\frac{2L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}}}, \mathbb{A}_t(z, z'')\right) \\ (47) \quad &\geq \left(\sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} A_t(z, z') L(z, z') \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \rho\left(\sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} A_t(z, z')^{\frac{2L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}}}, \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)} L^2(z, z'') \mathbb{A}_t(z, z'')\right), \end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality we use the convexity property of the function ρ , and the identity $\rho(\lambda a, \lambda b) = \lambda \rho(a, b)$, $a > 0, b, \lambda \geq 0$.

Since the function $a \rightarrow \rho(a, b)$ is decreasing on $(0, +\infty)$ for any $b \geq 0$, setting

$$\overline{\mathbb{A}}_t(z) := \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)} \mathbb{A}_t(z, z'') L^2(z, z'') \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{A}_t(z) := \sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} A_t(z, z') L(z, z'),$$

and according to the definition (7) of $K(z, \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z))$ and since

$$\overline{A}_t(z) \geq \sum_{z' \in]z, \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)[} A_t(z, z') L(z, z'),$$

one gets

$$(48) \quad H_t(z) \geq \overline{A}_t^2(z) + \rho\left(K(z, \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z)) \overline{A}_t^2(z), \overline{\mathbb{A}}_t(z)\right).$$

One may identically prove that for any $z \in \widehat{Z}$,

$$(49) \quad K_t(z) \geq \overline{B}_t^2(z) + \rho\left(K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) \overline{B}_t^2(z), \overline{\mathbb{B}}_t(z)\right),$$

with

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}}_t(z) := \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)} \mathbb{B}_t(z, z'') L^2(z, z''), \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{B}_t(z) := \sum_{z' \in \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)} B_t(z, z') L(z, z').$$

Applying the inequality

$$\rho(Ka, b) = \rho(a, b) - b \log K \geq -a - b \log K,$$

for $K, a > 0, b \geq 0$, and integrating (48) and (49) with respect to $\widehat{\nu}_t$, it follows that

$$(50) \quad \begin{aligned} \int (H_t + K_t) d\widehat{\nu}_t &\geq \int -\overline{\mathbb{A}}_t(z) \log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)) - \overline{\mathbb{B}}_t(z) \log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) d\widehat{\nu}_t(z) \\ &\geq - \int \log K(z, S_2(z)) (\overline{\mathbb{A}}_t + \overline{\mathbb{B}}_t) d\widehat{\nu}_t \geq - \log K \int (\overline{\mathbb{A}}_t + \overline{\mathbb{B}}_t) d\widehat{\nu}_t \end{aligned}$$

Observe that in the last inequalities the definitions of $S_2(z)$ and the constant K should be first given on the space $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$. But according to the choose of \mathcal{C} the structure of the balls of radius 2 centered at $z \in \widehat{Z}$ are the same on $(\mathcal{C}, d, L_{\mathcal{C}}, m_{\mathcal{C}})$ as on (\mathcal{X}, d, L, m) . Therefore the definition of the constant K does not depend on the chosen \mathcal{C} . The proof of Theorem 1 ends by applying Theorem 12 and since, according to (45),

$$\begin{aligned} \int \overline{\mathbb{A}}_t d\widehat{\nu}_t &= \int \sum_{z \in \widehat{Z}} \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)} \frac{\mathfrak{a}_t(z, z'', y)}{a_t(z, y)} L^2(z, z'') a_t(z, y) d\nu_1(y) \\ &= \iint \sum_{(z, z''), (z, z'') \in [y, w]} r(y, z, z'', w) L^2(z, z'') d(y, w) (d(y, w) - 1) \rho_t^{d(y, w) - 2} (d(z, w) - 2) d\widehat{\pi}(w, y) \\ &= \iint \sum_{k=2}^{d(y, w)} \left(\sum_{(z, z'') \in [y, w], z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z), d(z, w) = k} r(y, z, z'', w) L^2(z, z'') \right) \\ &\quad \rho_t^{d(y, w) - 2} (k - 2) d(y, w) (d(y, w) - 1) d\widehat{\pi}(w, y) \\ &= \iint \sum_{k=2}^{d(y, w)} \rho_t^{d(y, w) - 2} (k - 2) d(y, w) (d(y, w) - 1) d\widehat{\pi}(w, y) = T_2(\widehat{\pi}). \end{aligned}$$

From the identity (46) it follows that $\int \overline{\mathbb{B}}_t d\widehat{\nu}_t = \int \overline{\mathbb{A}}_t d\widehat{\nu}_t = T_2(\widehat{\pi})$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. One assume that for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $K(z, S_2(z)) < 1$ and therefore $K \leq 1$. Applying the inequality $\rho(Ka, b) \geq -Ka$, for $K, a > 0, b \geq 0$, (48) and (49) provide

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} \int (H_t + K_t) d\widehat{\nu}_t &\geq \int [1 - K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z))] \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} \overline{A}_t^2(z) d\widehat{\nu}_t(z) \\ &\quad + \int [1 - K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z))] \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} \overline{B}_t^2(z) d\widehat{\nu}_t(z) \\ &\geq (1 - K) \int (\overline{A}_t^2 + \overline{B}_t^2) d\widehat{\nu}_t. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one has

$$\int \bar{A}_t^2 d\hat{\nu}_t = \int \sum_{z \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}} \left(\sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} \frac{a_t(z, z', y)}{a_t(z, y)} L(z, z') \right)^2 a_t(z, y) d\nu_1(y) \geq \int \left(\sum_{z \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} a_t(z, z', y) L(z, z') \right)^2 d\nu_1(y).$$

Moreover, according to (44), easy computations give

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} a_t(z, z', y) L(z, z') \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{(z, z') \in [y, w], z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} r(y, z, z', w) d(y, w) \rho_t^{d(y, w)-1} (d(z, w) - 1) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) L(z, z') \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{k=1}^{d(y, w)} \left(\sum_{(z, z') \in [y, w], z' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z), d(z, w)=k} r(y, z, z', w) L(z, z') \right) \rho_t^{d(y, w)-1} (k-1) d(y, w) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{k=1}^{d(y, w)} \rho_t^{d(y, w)-1} (k-1) d(y, w) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} d(y, w) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\int \bar{A}_t^2 d\hat{\nu}_t \geq \int \left(\int d(y, w) d\hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) \right)^2 d\nu_1(y)$. Identically, one gets $\int \bar{B}_t^2 d\hat{\nu}_t \geq \int \left(\int d(x, w) d\hat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(w|x) \right)^2 d\nu_0(x)$. Since $1 - K = r/2 \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\int (H_t + K_t) d\hat{\nu}_t \geq \frac{r}{2} \tilde{T}(\hat{\pi}).$$

Applying then Theorem 12 provides $C_t(\hat{\pi}) \geq r \tilde{T}(\hat{\pi})/2$ which ends the proof of the first part of Theorem 2.

Due to the above computations, we know that $\int \bar{A}_t d\hat{\nu}_t = \int \bar{B}_t d\hat{\nu}_t = W_1(\nu_0, \nu_1)$. Therefore, starting again from (51) and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (H_t + K_t) d\hat{\nu}_t \\ & \geq W_1^2(\nu_0, \nu_1) \left(\frac{1}{\int [1 - K(z, \mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z))]^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{V_{\leftarrow}(z) \neq \emptyset} d\hat{\nu}_t(z)} + \frac{1}{\int [1 - K(z, \mathbb{V}_{\rightarrow}(z))]^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{V_{\rightarrow}(z) \neq \emptyset} d\hat{\nu}_t(z)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to [31, Lemma 4.3], we know that if $(z, z_+) \in C_{\rightarrow}$ and $(z, z_-) \in C_{\leftarrow}$ then $z \in [z_-, z_+]$. As a consequence, the subsets $V_{\leftarrow}(z), V_{\rightarrow}(z)$ of $S_1(z)$ and $\mathbb{V}_{\leftarrow}(z), \mathbb{V}_{\rightarrow}(z)$ of $S_2(z)$ satisfy condition (12). Therefore, from the definition (11) of the constant r_1 given in Theorem 1, and the identity $\inf_{u, v > 0, u+v \leq r^{-1}} \left\{ \frac{1}{u} + \frac{1}{v} \right\} = 4r, r > 0$, it follows that

$$\int (H_t + K_t) d\hat{\nu}_t \geq 4r_1 W_1^2(\nu_0, \nu_1).$$

Applying Theorem 12 provides $C_t(\hat{\pi}) \geq 4r_1 W_1^2(\nu_0, \nu_1)$, which ends the proof of the second part of Theorem 2.

In order to prove the last part of Theorem 2, one extends to any graphs ideas from the proof of [31, Theorem 2.5] on the discrete hypercube. Coming back to (50), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\int (H_t + K_t) d\widehat{\nu}_t &\geq \int -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)) \overline{A}_t(z) - \log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) \overline{B}_t(z) d\widehat{\nu}_t(z) \\
&= \int \sum_{z \in \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)} -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} \mathfrak{a}_t(z, z'', y) L^2(z, z'') d\nu_1(y) \\
&\quad + \int \sum_{z \in \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{z'' \in \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)} -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} \mathfrak{b}_t(z, z'', x) L^2(z, z'') d\nu_0(x) \\
&= \iint C_t(x, y) d\widehat{\pi}(x, y),
\end{aligned}$$

with, setting $d(x, y) = d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_t(x, y) &:= \sum_{z \in [x, y]} -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} r(x, z, z, y) d(d-1) \rho_t^{d-2}(d(x, z) - 2) \\
&\quad + \sum_{z \in [x, y]} -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} r(x, z, z, y) d(d-1) \rho_t^{d-2}(d(x, z)) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^d \sum_{z \in [x, y], d(x, z)=k} -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} r(x, z, z, y) \frac{k(k-1)}{t^2} \rho_t^d(k) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^d \sum_{z \in [x, y], d(x, z)=k} -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) \neq \emptyset} r(x, z, z, y) \frac{(d-k)(d-k-1)}{(1-t)^2} \rho_t^d(k)
\end{aligned}$$

A lower bound on $C_t(x, y)$ as a function of $d = d(x, y)$ can be obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_t(x, y) \\
&\geq -\log K(z, S_2(z)) \left(\frac{d(d-1)}{t^2} \rho_t^d(d) + \frac{(d-1)(d-2)}{t^2} \rho_t^d(d-1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{d(d-1)}{(1-t)^2} \rho_t^d(0) + \frac{(d-1)(d-2)}{(1-t)^2} \rho_t^d(1) \right) \\
&+ \mathbf{1}_{d \geq 4} \sum_{k=0}^d \sum_{z \in [x, y], d(x, z)=k} \left(-\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z)) \frac{k(k-1)}{t^2} - \log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z)) \frac{(d-k)(d-k-1)}{(1-t)^2} \right) \\
&\quad \quad \quad r(x, z, z, y) \rho_t^d(k) \\
&\geq \bar{r} d(d-1) \left(t^{d-2} + (1-t)^{d-2} + (d-2)t^{d-3}(1-t) + (d-2)(1-t)^{d-3}t \right) \\
&\quad + \bar{r} \mathbf{1}_{d \geq 4} \sum_{k=2}^{d-2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{k(k-1)}}{t} + \frac{\sqrt{(d-k)(d-k-1)}}{1-t} \right)^2 \rho_t^d(k)
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequalities we use the fact that $\sum_{z \in [x, y], d(x, z)=k} r(x, z, z, y) = 1$ and the inequality

$$aA + bA = (a^{-1} + b^{-1})^{-1} \left(\frac{A}{\alpha} + \frac{B}{\beta} \right) \geq (a^{-1} + b^{-1})^{-1} \left(\sqrt{A} + \sqrt{B} \right)^2,$$

with $a = -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z) > 0)$, $b = -\log K(z, \mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) > 0)$, $A = \frac{k(k-1)}{t^2}$, $B = \frac{(d-k)(d-k-1)}{(1-t)^2}$, $\alpha = \frac{a^{-1}}{a^{-1}+b^{-1}}$, $\beta = \frac{b^{-1}}{a^{-1}+b^{-1}}$, so that $\alpha + \beta = 1$ and according to the definition of the constant \bar{r} , $(a^{-1} + b^{-1})^{-1} \geq \bar{r}$ (since for $z \in [x, y]$, $2 \leq d(x, z) \leq d-2$, $\mathbb{V}_\leftarrow(z) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{V}_\rightarrow(z) \neq \emptyset$).

Observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2}^{d-2} k(k-1)\rho_t^d(k) &= \sum_{k=0}^d k(k-1)\rho_t^d(k) - d(d-1)[t^d + (d-2)t^{d-1}(1-t)] \\ &= d(d-1)[t^2 - t^d - (d-2)t^{d-1}(1-t)], \end{aligned}$$

and according to the definition (13) of $u_t(d)$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} d(d-1)\left(t^{d-2} + (1-t)^{d-2} + (d-2)t^{d-3}(1-t) + (d-2)(1-t)^{d-3}t\right) \\ + \mathbb{1}_{d \geq 4} \sum_{k=2}^{d-2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{k(k-1)}}{t} + \frac{\sqrt{(d-k)(d-k-1)}}{1-t}\right)^2 \rho_t^d(k) = 4u_t(d), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $C_t(x, y) \geq 4\bar{r}u_t(d)$. Then Theorem 12 ensures that the displacement convexity property holds with

$$C_t(\hat{\pi}) = 4\bar{r} \iint \bar{c}_t(d(x, y)) d\hat{\pi}(x, y),$$

with $\bar{c}_t(d) := \int_0^1 u_s(d) q_t(s) ds$. □

Proof of Theorem 7. We start with the proof of inequality (23). Let $z \in \mathcal{X}$. According to (21) and (22)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_2(z) &= \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \left\{ 1 - \tilde{K}_L(z, W) \right\} \\ &= \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \inf_{\beta} \left\{ \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \right)^2 - \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, z''|}} \left(\frac{\beta(\sigma)}{(L(z, \sigma(z)))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right\} \\ &= \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \inf_{\beta} \left\{ \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \right)^2 - \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, z''|}} \left(\frac{\beta(\sigma)}{(L(z, \sigma(z)))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right\} \\ &= \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \inf \left\{ \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \right)^2 \left[1 - \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, z''|}} \left(\frac{\alpha(\sigma)}{L(z, \sigma(z))} \right)^{\frac{2L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right] \right\} \\ (52) \quad & \left| \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}}, \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \beta(\sigma) = 1, \alpha(\sigma) := \frac{\sqrt{\beta(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of $K(z, W)$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_2(z) &\geq \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \left[\inf \left\{ \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \right)^2 \left| \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}}, \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \beta(\sigma) = 1 \right\} (1 - K(z, W)) \right] \\ &= \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} (1 - K(z, W)) = 1 - K(z, S_2(z)) \end{aligned}$$

If $r(z) \geq 0$, by the Cauchy Schwarz inequality, (52) provides

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{r}_2(z) &\leq \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \inf \left\{ |S_{]z, W[} | \left[1 - \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in S_{]z, z''[}} \left(\frac{\alpha(\sigma)}{L(z, \sigma(z))} \right)^{\frac{2L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left| \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{S_{]z, W[}}, \sum_{\sigma \in S_{]z, W[}} \beta(\sigma) = 1, \alpha(\sigma) := \frac{\sqrt{\beta(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma \in S_{]z, W[}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)}} \right\} \\
&\leq |S_1(z)| \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \inf \left\{ 1 - \sum_{z'' \in W} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in S_{]z, z''[}} \left(\frac{\alpha(\sigma)}{L(z, \sigma(z))} \right)^{\frac{2L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left| \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{S_{]z, W[}}, \sum_{\sigma \in S_{]z, W[}} \beta(\sigma) = 1, \alpha(\sigma) := \frac{\sqrt{\beta(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma \in S_{]z, W[}} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)}} \right\} \\
&= |S_1(z)| \inf_{W \subset S_2(z)} \left(1 - K(z, W) \right) = |S_1(z)| (1 - K(z, S_2(z))).
\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of inequality (23).

The proof of the lower bound \tilde{r}_2 of the \tilde{T}_2 -entropic curvature of the space is similar to the one of Theorem 1 or Theorem 2. Starting again from inequality (47) and setting

$$\tilde{A}_t^2(z) := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}, \sigma(z) \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} \left(A_t(z, \sigma(z)) L(z, \sigma(z)) \right)^2,$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
(53) \quad H_t(z) &\geq \tilde{A}_t^2(z) + \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{S}, \sigma \neq \tau, \sigma(z), \tau(z) \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} A_t(z, \sigma(z)) L(z, \sigma(z)) A_t(z, \tau(z)) L(z, \tau(z)) \\
&\quad + \rho \left(\sum_{z'' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{z' \in [z, z''] \cap S_1(z)} A_t(z, z')^{\frac{2L(z, z')L(z', z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}}}, \bar{A}_t(z) \right) \\
&= \tilde{A}_t^2(z) \left[1 + \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in S_{]z, V_{\leftarrow}(z)[}, \sigma \neq \tau} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma, z)} \sqrt{\beta(\tau, z)} \right] \\
&\quad + \rho \left(\tilde{A}_t^2(z) \sum_{z'' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in S_{]z, z''[}} \left(\frac{\beta(\sigma, z)}{(L(z, \sigma(z)))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}}}, \bar{A}_t(z) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\sigma \in S_{]z, V_{\leftarrow}(z)[}$, $\beta(\sigma, z) := \frac{(A_t(z, \sigma(z)) L(z, \sigma(z)))^2}{\tilde{A}_t^2(z)}$. Using the inequality $\rho(a, b) \geq -a$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
H_t(z) &\geq \tilde{A}_t^2(z) \left[1 + \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in S_{]z, V_{\leftarrow}(z)[}, \sigma \neq \tau} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma, z)} \sqrt{\beta(\tau, z)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{z'' \in V_{\leftarrow}(z)} L^2(z, z'') \prod_{\sigma \in S_{]z, z''[}} \left(\frac{\beta(\sigma, z)}{(L(z, \sigma(z)))^2} \right)^{\frac{L(z, \sigma(z))L(\sigma(z), z'')}{L^2(z, z'')}}} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore, from the definition of $\tilde{K}(z, V_{\leftarrow}(z))$,

$$(54) \quad H_t(z) \geq (1 - \tilde{K}(z, V_{\leftarrow}(z))) \tilde{A}_t^2(z).$$

According to the definition of constant \tilde{r}_2 , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\int H_t d\hat{\nu}_t &\geq \tilde{r}_2 \int \tilde{A}_t^2(z) d\hat{\nu}_t(z) \\
&= \tilde{r}_2 \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \int \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{(a_t(z, \sigma(z), y)L(z, \sigma(z)))^2}{a_t(z, y)} \mathbf{1}_{z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} d\nu_1(y) \\
(55) \quad &\geq \tilde{r}_2 \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \int \frac{\left(\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, \sigma(z), y)L(z, \sigma(z)) \right)^2}{\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, y)} d\nu_1(y)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds if $\tilde{r}_2 \geq 0$ by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

According to the definition of $a_t(z, \sigma(z), y)$ given by (44), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, \sigma(z), y)L(z, \sigma(z)) \\
&= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}_{(z, \sigma(z)) \in [y, w]} d(y, w)r(y, z, \sigma(z), w)L(z, \sigma(z)) \rho_t^{d(y, w)-1} (d(z, w) - 1) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) \\
&= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{k=0}^{d(w, y)-1} d(y, w) \rho_t^{d(y, w)-1} (d(y, w) - 1 - k) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, d(y, z)=k, (z, \sigma(z)) \in [y, w]} r(y, z, \sigma(z), w)L(z, \sigma(z))
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4 (ii), we know that if $(z, \sigma(z)) \in [y, w]$ then $\sigma(y) \in [y, w]$, and $\sigma(z) \in [\sigma(y), w]$, and Lemma 4 (vi) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, d(y, z)=k, (z, \sigma(z)) \in [y, w]} r(y, z, \sigma(z), w)L(z, \sigma(z)) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, d(y, z)=k, (z, \sigma(z)) \in [y, w]} L^{d(y, z)}(y, z)L(z, \sigma(z))L^{d(\sigma(z), w)}(\sigma(z), w)}{L^{d(y, w)}(y, w)} \\
&= \frac{L(y, \sigma(y))L^{d(y, w)-1}(\sigma(y), w)}{L^{d(y, w)}(y, w)} = r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), w)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, \sigma(z), y)L(z, \sigma(z)) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(y) \in [y, w]} d(y, w)r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), w) \hat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(w|y) = \Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y).$$

Observing that

$$(56) \quad \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, y) \leq 1,$$

inequality (55) therefore provides

$$\int H_t d\hat{\nu}_t \geq \tilde{r}_2 \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)^2 d\nu_1(y).$$

We similarly prove that $\int K_t d\hat{\nu}_t \geq \tilde{r}_2 \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x)^2 d\nu_0(x)$, and thus we get

$$\int (H_t + K_t) d\hat{\nu}_t \geq \tilde{r}_2 \tilde{T}_3(\hat{\pi}).$$

The proof of the first part of Theorem 7 ends by applying Theorem 12.

Let now assume that condition (25) also holds, the second part of Theorem 7 will follow from improving the trivial bound (56). One has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, y) = 1 - \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, y) \\
(57) \quad & \leq 1 - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in]y, x]} \sum_{z \in [y, x], z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} r(y, z, z, y) \rho_t^{d(x, y)}(d(x, z)) \hat{\pi}_\leftarrow(x|y) \\
& = 1 - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in]y, x]}{L^{d(x, y)}(x, y)} \sum_{k=0}^{d(x, y)} \rho_t^{d(x, y)}(k) \left(\sum_{z \in [y, x], d(y, z) = d(x, y) - k, z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} \sum_{\gamma \in G(y, x), z \in \gamma} L(\gamma) \right) \hat{\pi}_\leftarrow(x|y)
\end{aligned}$$

Given $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ the set of geodesics from y to x contains the set of geodesics using the move σ , more precisely, setting $d(x, y) = d$

$$G(y, x) \supset \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{d-1} G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x), \quad \text{with } G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x) := \{\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_d) \in G(y, x) \mid z_{\ell+1} = \sigma(z_\ell)\}.$$

Observe that according to Lemma 4 (vi), if $\sigma(y) \in]y, x]$ then for any $\ell \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$

$$\sum_{\gamma \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)} L(\gamma) = L(y, \sigma(y)) L^{d(\sigma(y), x)}(\sigma(y), x).$$

According to assumption (25), for $\ell \neq \ell'$, $G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)$ and $G_{\sigma, \ell'}(y, x)$ are disjoint sets, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{z \in [y, x], d(y, z) = d(x, y) - k, z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} \sum_{\gamma \in G(y, x), z \in \gamma} L(\gamma) \\
& \geq \sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1} \sum_{z \in [y, x], d(y, z) = d(x, y) - k, z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} \sum_{\gamma \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x), z \in \gamma} L(\gamma) \\
& = \sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_d) \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)} \mathbb{1}_{z_{d-k} \notin [y, \sigma(z_{d-k})[} L(\gamma)
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\sigma(y) \in]y, x]$ and let $\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_d) \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)$ with $z_{d-k} \notin [y, \sigma(z_{d-k})[$. Observe first that $k \neq d$ (otherwise $y = z_0 \notin [y, \sigma(z_0)[= [y, \sigma(y)[$ which is impossible). If $0 \leq \ell < d-k$ then $\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_\ell, z_{\ell+1}, \dots, z_{d-k}, \dots, z_d)$ with $z_{\ell+1} = \sigma(z_\ell)$. It follows that necessarily $z_{d-k} \notin [y, \sigma(z_{d-k})[$, since otherwise $(z_0, \dots, z_\ell, z_{\ell+1}, z_{d-k}, \sigma(z_{d-k}))$ is a geodesic from z_0 to $\sigma(z_{d-k})$ that uses the move σ twice. It follows that

$$\sum_{\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_d) \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)} \mathbb{1}_{z_{d-k} \notin [y, \sigma(z_{d-k})[} L(\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_d) \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)} L(\gamma) = L(y, \sigma(y)) L^{d(\sigma(y), x)}(\sigma(y), x).$$

Assume now that $d-k \leq \ell \leq d-1$, then $\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_{d-k}, \dots, z_\ell, z_{\ell+1}, \dots, z_d)$ with $z_{\ell+1} = \sigma(z_\ell)$. According to Lemma 4 (i), $(z_0, \dots, z_{d-k}, \sigma(z_{d-k}), \dots, \sigma(z_\ell), z_{\ell+2}, \dots, z_d)$ is also a geodesic in $G(y, x)$ and therefore $z_{d-k} \in [y, \sigma(z_{d-k})[$. As a consequence

$$\sum_{\gamma = (z_0, \dots, z_d) \in G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)} \mathbb{1}_{z_{d-k} \notin [y, \sigma(z_{d-k})[} L(\gamma) = 0.$$

Finally, if $\sigma(y) \in]y, x]$, one gets for any fixed $k \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in [y, x], d(y, z) = d(x, y) - k, z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} \sum_{\gamma \in G(y, x), z \in \gamma} L(\gamma) &\geq \sum_{d=0}^{d-k-1} L(y, \sigma(y)) L^{d(\sigma(y), x)}(\sigma(y), x) \\ &= (d-k) L(y, \sigma(y)) L^{d(\sigma(y), x)}(\sigma(y), x). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if assumption (25) is not fulfilled, using the fact that $G(y, x) \supset G_{\sigma, \ell}(y, x)$, one identically gets

$$\sum_{z \in [y, x], d(y, z) = d(x, y) - k, z \notin [y, \sigma(z)[} \sum_{\gamma \in G(y, x), z \in \gamma} L(\gamma) \geq L(y, \sigma(y)) L^{d(\sigma(y), x)}(\sigma(y), x).$$

As a consequence, if assumption (25) is satisfied, (57) provides

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, y) &\leq 1 - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in]y, x]} r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), x) \sum_{k=0}^{d(x, y)-1} \rho_t^{d(x, y)}(k) (d(x, y) - k) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \\ &= 1 - (1-t) \Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y), \end{aligned}$$

and if assumption (25) is not fulfilled, (57) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}, z \in [y, \sigma(z)[} a_t(z, y) &\leq 1 - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in]y, x]} r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), x) \sum_{k=0}^{d(x, y)-1} \rho_t^{d(x, y)}(k) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in]y, x]} r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), x) (1 - t^{d(x, y)}) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \\ &\leq 1 - (1-t) \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(y) \in]y, x]} r(y, \sigma(y), \sigma(y), x) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \\ &\leq 1 - (1-t) \frac{\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)}{\text{Diam}(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

Setting $D = 1$ if assumption (25) holds and $D = \text{Diam}(\mathcal{X})$ otherwise, inequality (55) then provides

$$\int H_t d\widehat{\nu}_t \geq \widetilde{r}_2 \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)^2}{1 - (1-t) \frac{\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)}{D}} d\nu_1(y) = \xi_{\leftarrow}''(t),$$

with

$$\xi_{\leftarrow}(t) := \frac{\widetilde{r}_2 D^2}{2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} h\left((1-t) \frac{\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)}{D}\right) d\nu_1(y).$$

One identically proves that

$$\int K_t d\widehat{\nu}_t \geq \xi_{\rightarrow}''(t),$$

with

$$\xi_{\rightarrow}(t) := \frac{\widetilde{r}_2 D^2}{2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} h\left(t \frac{\Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x)}{D}\right) d\nu_0(x).$$

The proof of the second part of Theorem 7 ends by applying Theorem 12. □

10.2. Proofs of Theorem 4, Theorem 6, Theorem 5, Theorem 8 and Theorem 11.

Proof of Theorem 4. Let x, y be distinct vertices in \mathcal{X} . By definition of entropic curvature we have

$$(58) \quad \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) \leq (1-t)\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m) + t\mathcal{H}(\nu_1|m) - \kappa \frac{t(1-t)}{2} T_2(\widehat{\pi}),$$

for any $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $\nu_0 = \delta_x$ and $\nu_1 = \delta_y$ then (58) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y)(d(x, y) - 1) &\leq \frac{-2}{\kappa t(1-t)} \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) + \frac{2}{\kappa t} \log \frac{1}{m(x)} + \frac{2}{\kappa(1-t)} \log \frac{1}{m(y)} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\kappa t(1-t)} \left(-\mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) + \log \frac{1}{\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore by Jensen inequality we have

$$-\mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) \leq \log m(\text{supp}(\widehat{\nu}_t)) \leq \log \left(|\text{supp}(\widehat{\nu}_t)| \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x) \right),$$

and since $|\text{supp}(\widehat{\nu}_t)| \leq (\text{Deg}_{\max})^{d(x, y)}$ one finally gets

$$d(x, y) \leq \frac{2}{\kappa t(1-t)} \log \left(\text{Deg}_{\max} \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x)}{\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} m(x)} \right) + 1 < \infty.$$

Choosing $t = 1/2$ and maximizing over x and y ends the proof of Theorem 4. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. According to Theorem 1, in order to prove that a structured graph $(\mathcal{X}, d, m_0, L_0)$ with associated finite set of moves \mathcal{S} has non negative entropic curvature, it suffices to show that for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $K_0(z, S_2(z)) \leq 1$. Let $z \in \mathcal{X}$ be a fixed vertex, and for any $z'' \in S_2(z)$ let

$$U(z'') := \{(\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{S} \mid \tau(\sigma(z)) = z''\}.$$

Each couple (τ, σ) can be associated to a single geodesic $(z, \sigma(z), \tau(\sigma(z)))$ from z to z'' . Obviously for $w'' \in S_2(z)$ with $w'' \neq z''$, the sets $U(z'')$ and $U(w'')$ are disjoint.

According to the definition of structured graphs, if $(\tau, \sigma) \in U(z'')$ then $(\psi(\sigma), \tau) \in U(z'')$ where $\psi : \mathcal{S}_z^{\rightarrow \tau} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_z^{\tau \rightarrow \cdot}$ is a fixed one to one map. As a consequence, given $(\sigma_2, \sigma_1) \in U(z'')$, one may construct by induction a sequence (σ_{k+1}, σ_k) , $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, of elements in $U(z'')$ defined by $\sigma_{k+1} = \psi_{k-1}(\sigma_k)$ for all $k \geq 2$ with $\psi_{k-1} : \mathcal{S}_z^{\rightarrow \sigma_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_z^{\sigma_{k-1} \rightarrow \cdot}$. Let us define

$$\overline{(\sigma_2, \sigma_1)} := \{(\sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_k) \mid k \geq 1\}.$$

Since \mathcal{S} is finite, there exists $k \geq 2$ and $j \leq k$ such that $\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_j$. Let

$$\ell := \min \{k \geq 1 \mid \exists j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_j\}.$$

The maps $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_\ell$ all differs. Let $j \in [\ell]$ such that $\sigma_j = \sigma_{\ell+1}$. Let us prove that $j = 1$. If $j \geq 2$ then $\sigma_{\ell+1}(\sigma_\ell(z)) = z'' = \sigma_j(\sigma_{j-1}(z)) = \sigma_{\ell+1}(\sigma_{j-1}(z))$. Lemma 4 (iii) implies $\sigma_\ell = \sigma_{j-1}$ which contradicts the definition of ℓ . It follows that $j = 1$, i. e. $\sigma_{\ell+1} = \sigma_1$. As a consequence, one has $\sigma_{\ell+2} = \psi_\ell(\sigma_{\ell+1}) = \psi_\ell(\sigma_1)$ with $\sigma_{\ell+2}(\sigma_1(z)) = \sigma_{\ell+2}(\sigma_{\ell+1}(z)) = z'' = \sigma_2(\sigma_1(z))$. Therefore $\sigma_{\ell+2} = \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_2 = \psi_\ell(\sigma_1)$. By induction it follows that

$$\overline{(\sigma_2, \sigma_1)} := \{(\sigma_2, \sigma_1), (\sigma_3, \sigma_2), \dots, (\sigma_{\ell+1}, \sigma_\ell)\}.$$

Then one easily checks that for any $(\sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_k) \in \overline{(\sigma_2, \sigma_1)}$, one has $\overline{(\sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_k)} = \overline{(\sigma_2, \sigma_1)}$. It follows that the set

$$\mathcal{C}(z'') = \{\overline{(\tau, \sigma)} \mid (\tau, \sigma) \in U(z'')\},$$

is a partition of $U(z'')$.

For $c = \overline{(\sigma_2, \sigma_1)}$ as above, one denotes by

$$s(c) := \{\sigma_1(z), \dots, \sigma_\ell(z)\} \subset]z, z''[.$$

Observe that c and $s(c)$ have same number of elements. We claim that all sets $s(c)$ are pairwise disjoint. Indeed, note that if $c' \in \mathcal{C}(z'')$ with $s(c) \cap s(c') \neq \emptyset$, then there exist $\sigma, \tau, \tau' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\sigma(z), \tau(z) \in s(c)$, $\sigma(z), \tau'(z) \in s(c')$ and $\tau(\sigma(z)) = z'' = \tau'(\sigma(z))$. It follows that $\tau = \tau'$, $(\tau, \sigma) \in c \cap c'$ and therefore $c = c'$, $s(c) = s(c')$. Since $\mathcal{C}(z'')$ is a partition of $U(z'')$, we finally get that the collection of sets $\{s(c) \mid c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')\}$ is also a partition of $]z, z''[$.

Let $\alpha : S_1(z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\sum_{z' \in S_1(z)} \alpha(z') = 1$. Given $z'' \in S_2(z)$, applying the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}]z, z''[\left(\prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{\lVert z, z'' \rVert}} &= \left(\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')} |s(c)| \right) \prod_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')} \left(\prod_{z' \in s(c)} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')} |s(c)|}} \\ &\leq \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')} |s(c)| \left(\prod_{z' \in s(c)} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{|s(c)|}} \end{aligned}$$

Since $|s(c)| = |c|$, observing that

$$\left(\prod_{z' \in s(c)} \alpha(z') \right)^2 = \prod_{(\tau, \sigma) \in c} \alpha(\tau(z)) \alpha(\sigma(z)),$$

and applying again the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, one gets

$$]z, z''[\left(\prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{\lVert z, z'' \rVert}} \leq \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')} \sum_{(\tau, \sigma) \in c} \alpha(\tau(z)) \alpha(\sigma(z)).$$

Given $c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')$, either $|c| = 1 = |s(c)|$ and there exists $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $c = \{(\tau(z), \tau(z))\}$ and $d(z, \tau(\tau(z))) = 2$, either $|c| \geq 2$ and for any $(\tau, \sigma) \in c$, $\tau(z) \neq \sigma(z)$. As a consequence, setting

$$s_1(z'') := \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z''), |c|=1} s(c),$$

one has

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z'')} \sum_{(\tau, \sigma) \in c} \alpha(\tau(z)) \alpha(\sigma(z)) \leq \sum_{z' \in s_1(z'')} \alpha(z')^2 + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z''), |c| \geq 2} \sum_{(\tau, \sigma) \in c} \alpha(\tau(z)) \alpha(\sigma(z)).$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z'' \in S_2(z)}]z, z''[\left(\prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{\lVert z, z'' \rVert}} &\leq \sum_{z'' \in S_2(z)} \sum_{z' \in s_1(z'')} \alpha(z')^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{z'' \in S_2(z)} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(z''), |c| \geq 2} \sum_{(\tau, \sigma) \in c} \alpha(\tau(z)) \alpha(\sigma(z)) \\ &\leq \sum_{z' \in S_1(z)} \alpha(z')^2 + \sum_{((z', w') \in S_1(z), w' \neq z')} \alpha(z') \alpha(w') \\ &= \left(\sum_{z' \in S_1(z)} \alpha(z') \right)^2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of the fact that for $z'' \neq w''$, one has $U(z'') \cap U(w'') = \emptyset$ and also $s_1(z'') \cap s_1(w'') = \emptyset$. Then according to the definition of $K_0(z, S_2(z))$, one has $K_0(z, S_2(z)) \leq 1$.

If for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, $d(z, \sigma(\sigma(z))) \leq 1$, then for any $z'' \in S_2(z)$, $s_1(z'') = \emptyset$. Applying Cauchy Schwarz inequality, the above estimates provide

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z'' \in S_2(z)} ||z, z''|| \left(\prod_{z' \in]z, z''[} \alpha(z') \right)^{\frac{2}{||z, z''||}} &\leq \sum_{((z', w') \in S_1(z), w' \neq z')} \alpha(z') \alpha(w') \\ &= \left(\sum_{z' \in S_1(z)} \alpha(z') \right)^2 - \sum_{z' \in S_1(z)} \alpha(z')^2 \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{1}{|S_1(z)|}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $K_0(z, S_2(z)) \leq 1 - 1/|S_1(z)|$. The last statement of Theorem 6 then follows from Theorem 1. \square

Proofs of Theorem 5 and Theorem 8. Let ν_0 and ν_1 be probability measures with same convex bounded support $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and respective densities f_0 and f_1 with respect to the measure m . Modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities will follow from the convexity property

$$(59) \quad \mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m) \leq -\frac{\mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m) - \mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m)}{t} + \mathcal{H}(\nu_1|m) - \frac{1}{2}(1-t)C_t(\widehat{\pi}), \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

as t goes to zero, with $C_t(\widehat{\pi}) = \tilde{\kappa} \widetilde{T}(\widehat{\pi})$ in Theorem 5, and $C_t(\widehat{\pi}) = \tilde{\kappa}_3 \widetilde{T}_3(\widehat{\pi})$ or $C_t(\widehat{\pi}) = \tilde{\kappa}_3 \widetilde{C}_t(\widehat{\pi})$ in Theorem 8.

Let us start with the proof of Theorem 5. Observing that for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z \in [x, y]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \nu_t^{x,y}(z)|_{t=0} &= \frac{L^{d(x,z)}(x, z) L^{d(z,y)}(z, y)}{L^{d(x,y)}(x, y)} \begin{pmatrix} d(x, y) \\ d(x, z) \end{pmatrix} (\mathbb{1}_{[x,y]}(z) \mathbb{1}_{z \sim x} - d(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{x=z}) \\ &= \sum_{x' \in S_1(x) \cap [x,y]} d(x, y) \frac{L(x, x') L^{d(x',y)}(x', y)}{L^{d(x,y)}(x, y)} (\delta_{x'}(z) - \delta_x(z)) \end{aligned}$$

and since for any $t \in [0, 1]$ the finite convex subset \mathcal{C} is the support of $\widehat{\nu}_t$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m)|_{t=0} &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \partial_t \widehat{\nu}_t(z)|_{t=0} \log f_0(z) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{x' \in S_1(x) \cap [x,y]} d(x, y) \frac{L(x, x') L^{d(x',y)}(x', y)}{L^{d(x,y)}(x, y)} (\delta_{x'}(z) - \delta_x(z)) \log f_0(z) \widehat{\pi}(x, y) \\ (60) \quad &= \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{x' \in S_1(x) \cap [x,y]} (\log f_0(x') - \log f_0(x)) d(x, y) \frac{L(x, x') L^{d(x',y)}(x', y)}{L^{d(x,y)}(x, y)} \widehat{\pi}(x, y) \\ &\geq - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f_0(x) - \log f_0(x')]_+ \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}} d(x, y) \widehat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(y|x) \right) \nu_0(x) \\ &\geq - \frac{1}{2\tilde{\kappa}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f_0(x) - \log f_0(x')]_+^2 \nu_0(x) - \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}} d(x, y) \widehat{\pi}_{\rightarrow}(y|x) \right)^2 \nu_0(x), \end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality, one uses the inequality $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, from the definition of $\widetilde{T}(\widehat{\pi})$, (59) implies as t goes to zero

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m) &\leq \frac{1}{2\widetilde{\kappa}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f_0(x) - \log f_0(x')]_+^2 \nu_0(x) + \mathcal{H}(\nu_1|m) \\ &\quad - \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} d(x, y) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \right)^2 \nu_1(y) \end{aligned}$$

By choosing $\nu_1 = \mu_{\mathcal{C}} := \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}} m}{m(\mathcal{C})}$ and $f_0 := \frac{f \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}}{m(f \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}})}$, it gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_{\mu_{\mathcal{C}}}(f) &\leq \frac{1}{2\widetilde{\kappa}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f(x) - \log f(x')]_+^2 f(x) \mu_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \\ &\quad - \mu_{\mathcal{C}}(f) \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} d(x, y) \widehat{\pi}_{\leftarrow}(x|y) \right)^2 \mu_{\mathcal{C}}(y) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\widetilde{\kappa}} \int \max_{x', x' \sim x} [\log f(x) - \log f(x')]_+^2 f(x) d\mu_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \end{aligned}$$

Applying this inequality with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_n$ where (\mathcal{C}_n) is an increasing sequence of convex subsets with $\bigcup_n \mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{X}$, the monotone convergence theorem provides the expected modified logarithmic Sobolev inequality (19) for μ since f is bounded and $m(\mathcal{X}) < +\infty$.

Let $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function such that $\mu(g) = 0$. As usual, applying (19) to the function $f = 1 + \varepsilon g$ where ε is a sufficiently small parameter so that $f > 0$, a Taylor expansion as ε goes to zero gives

$$\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \mu(g^2) + o(\varepsilon^2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\widetilde{\kappa}} \int \max_{x', x' \sim x} [g(x) - g(x')]_+^2 d\mu(x) + o(\varepsilon^2).$$

It provides the Poincaré inequality of Theorem 5 as ε goes to zero.

The proof of Theorem 8 is similar. Starting again from equality (60), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m)|_{t=0} &= \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}, \sigma(x) \in [x, y]} \partial_{\sigma} \log f_0(x) \frac{L(x, \sigma(x)) L^{d(\sigma(x), y)}(\sigma(x), y)}{L^{d(x, y)}(x, y)} \widehat{\pi}(x, y) \\ &\geq - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_{\sigma} \log f_0(x)]_- \Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x) \nu_0(x) \\ &\geq - \frac{1}{2\widetilde{\kappa}_2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_{\sigma}(\log f_0)(x)]_-^2 \nu_0(x) - \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_2}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} (\Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x))^2 \nu_0(x) \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality together with (59) imply as t goes to zero

$$\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m) \leq \frac{1}{2\widetilde{\kappa}_2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_{\sigma}(\log f)]_-^2 d\nu_0 + \mathcal{H}(\nu_1|m) - \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_2}{2} \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} (\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y))^2 d\nu_1(y).$$

Then the end of the proof of the first part of Theorem 8 is similar to the one of Theorem 5 with approximation's arguments. For the proof of its second part, one uses the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\nu}_t|m)|_{t=0} &\geq - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [\partial_{\sigma} \log f_0(x)]_- \Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x) \nu_0(x) \\ &\geq - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_2 D^2}{2} h^* \left(\frac{2}{D \widetilde{\kappa}_2} [\partial_{\sigma}(\log f)(x)]_- \right) \nu_0(x) - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_2 D^2}{2} h \left(\frac{\Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x)}{D} \right) \nu_0(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $h^*(v) := \sup_{0 \leq u < 1} \{uv - h(u)\} = 2(e^{-v/2} + v/2 - 1)$, $v \geq 0$. Since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \tilde{C}_t^D(\hat{\pi}) = \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} D^2 h \left(\frac{\Pi_{\rightarrow}^{\sigma}(x)}{D} \right) d\nu_0(x) + \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} D^2 h_1 \left(\frac{\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)}{D} \right) d\nu_1(y),$$

with $h_1(u) := uh'(u) - h(u) = 2(-u - \log(1-u))$, $u \in [0, 1)$, as before inequality (59) implies as t goes to zero

$$\mathcal{H}(\nu_0|m) \leq \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_2 D^2}{2} h^* \left(\frac{2}{D\tilde{\kappa}_2} [\partial_{\sigma}(\log f)]_{-} \right) d\nu_0 + \mathcal{H}(\nu_1|m) - \int \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} D^2 h_1 \left(\frac{\Pi_{\leftarrow}^{\sigma}(y)}{D} \right) d\nu_1(y).$$

The proof of the second part of Theorem 8 ends as the one of Theorem 5. \square

Proof of Theorem 11. Let $(\mathcal{X}_i, d_{\mathcal{X}_i}, \mu_i, L_i)$, be graph spaces and let $(\prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i, d_{\mathcal{X}^{\square n}}, \mu_i^{\otimes n}, \oplus_{i=1}^n L_i)$ be the product graph space. Let $n \geq 2$ and let $z \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i$. Let us compute $K_{\oplus_{i=1}^n L_i}(z, S_2(z))$. According to the structure of Cartesian product of graphs, one has

$$K_{\oplus_{i=1}^n L_i}(z, S_2(z)) = \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{z''_i \in S_2(z_i)} L_i^2(z_i, z''_i) \left(\prod_{z'_i \in]z_i, z''_i[} \frac{\alpha_i(z'_i)}{L_i(z_i, z'_i)} \right)^{\frac{2L_i(z_i, z'_i)L_i(z'_i, z''_i)}{L_i^2(z_i, z''_i)}} \right. \\ \left. + 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} \sum_{z'_i, z'_i \sim z_i} \sum_{z'_j, z'_j \sim z_j} \alpha_i(z'_i) \alpha_j(z'_j) \right\},$$

where the supremum runs over all non negative vector α with coordinates $\alpha_i(z'_i)$, $i \in [n]$, $z'_i \sim z_i$, such that $\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{z'_i, z'_i \sim z_i} \alpha_i(z'_i) = 1$. Setting $\alpha_i = \sum_{z'_i, z'_i \sim z_i} \alpha_i(z'_i)$, and according to the definition of $K_{L_i}(z_i, S_2(z_i))$, it follows that

$$K_{\oplus_{i=1}^n L_i}(z, S_2(z)) = \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 K_{L_i}(z_i, S_2(z_i)) + 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} \alpha_i \alpha_j \right\} \\ = 1 - \inf_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 (1 - K_{L_i}(z_i, S_2(z_i))) \right\} \\ \leq 1 - \inf_{\alpha} \left\{ \left(1 - \max_{i \in [n]} K_{L_i}(z_i, S_2(z_i)) \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \right\},$$

where the supremum is over all $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. The expected result follows from the sign of $(1 - \max_{i \in [n]} K_{L_i}(z_i, S_2(z_i)))$ and since $\inf_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \right\} = 1/n$ and $\sup_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \right\} = 1$. This concludes the first part of Theorem 11.

Let us now study the constant $\tilde{r}_2(z)$. By easy induction arguments, it suffices to get the result for $n = 2$. Let $W \subset S_2(z)$. The set $]z, W[$ is the disjoint union of the two sets

$$]z, W^{[1]} := \{z' \in]z, W[\mid z' = (z'_1, z_2), z_1 \sim z'_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad]z, W^{[2]} := \{z' \in]z, W[\mid z' = (z_1, z'_2), z_2 \sim z'_2\}.$$

Let $V_1 := \{z'_1 \mid (z'_1, z_2) \in]z, W^{[1]}\}$ and $V_2 := \{z'_2 \mid (z_1, z'_2) \in]z, W^{[2]}\}$. Similarly, the set W is the disjoint union of the three following sets

$$\overline{W}_1 := \{(z''_1, z_2) \mid d_{\mathcal{X}_1}(z_1, z''_1) = 2\}, \quad \overline{W}_2 := \{(z_1, z''_2) \mid d_{\mathcal{X}_2}(z_2, z''_2) = 2\}, \\ \text{and} \quad \overline{W}_3 := \{(z'_1, z'_2) \mid z_1 \sim z'_1, z_2 \sim z'_2\}.$$

One has

$$]z, \overline{W}_1[\cup]z, \overline{W}_2[\cup]z, \overline{W}_3[=]z, W^{[1]}[\cup]z, W^{[2]}[.$$

If $W_1 := \{z_1'' \mid (z_1'', z_2) \in \overline{W}_1\}$ and $W_2 := \{z_2'' \mid (z_1, z_2'') \in \overline{W}_2\}$, then one has $]z_1, W_1[\subset V_1$ and $]z_2, W_2[\subset V_2$. With the above notations and according to the definition (21) of $\tilde{K}_L(z, W)$, the structure of product of graphs gives

$$1 - \tilde{K}_{L_1 \oplus L_2}(z, W) = \inf_{\beta} \left\{ \left(\sum_{z_1' \in V_1} \sqrt{\beta_1(z_1')} + \sum_{z_2' \in V_2} \sqrt{\beta_2(z_2')} \right)^2 - 2 \sum_{(z_1', z_2') \in \overline{W}_3} \sqrt{\beta_1(z_1')} \sqrt{\beta_2(z_2')} \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{z_1'' \in W_1} L_1^2(z_1, z_1'') \prod_{z_1', \in]z_1, z_1''[} \left(\frac{\beta_1(z_1')}{(L_1(z_1, z_1'))^2} \right)^{\frac{L_1(z_1, z_1') L_1(z_1', z_1'')}{L_1^2(z_1, z_1'')}} \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{z_2'' \in W_2} L_2^2(z_2, z_2'') \prod_{z_2', \in]z_2, z_2''[} \left(\frac{\beta_2(z_2')}{(L_2(z_2, z_2'))^2} \right)^{\frac{L_2(z_2, z_2') L_2(z_2', z_2'')}{L_2^2(z_2, z_2'')}} \right\},$$

where the supremum runs over all non negative vector β with coordinates $\beta_i(z_i')$, $i \in [2]$, $z_i' \in V_i$, such that $\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{z_i' \in V_i} \beta_i(z_i') = 1$. Since $\overline{W}_3 \subset V_1 \times V_2$, it follows

$$1 - \tilde{K}_{L_1 \oplus L_2}(z, W) \geq \inf_{\beta} \left\{ \left(\sum_{z_1' \in V_1} \sqrt{\beta_1(z_1')} \right)^2 - \sum_{z_1'' \in W_1} L_1^2(z_1, z_1'') \prod_{z_1', \in]z_1, z_1''[} \left(\frac{\beta_1(z_1')}{(L_1(z_1, z_1'))^2} \right)^{\frac{L_1(z_1, z_1') L_1(z_1', z_1'')}{L_1^2(z_1, z_1'')}} \right. \\ \left. + \left(\sum_{z_2' \in V_2} \sqrt{\beta_2(z_2')} \right)^2 - \sum_{z_2'' \in W_2} L_2^2(z_2, z_2'') \prod_{z_2', \in]z_2, z_2''[} \left(\frac{\beta_2(z_2')}{(L_2(z_2, z_2'))^2} \right)^{\frac{L_2(z_2, z_2') L_2(z_2', z_2'')}{L_2^2(z_2, z_2'')}} \right\}$$

For $i \in [2]$, $]z_i, W_i[\subset V_i$. Therefore, setting $\beta_i = \sum_{z_i' \in V_i} \beta_i(z_i')$, from the definition of $\tilde{K}_{L_i}(z_i, W_i)$ one gets

$$1 - \tilde{K}_{L_1 \oplus L_2}(z, W) \geq \inf_{\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1} \left\{ \beta_1 (1 - \tilde{K}_{L_1}(z_1, W_1)) + \beta_2 (1 - \tilde{K}_{L_2}(z_2, W_2)) \right\} \\ = \min (1 - \tilde{K}_{L_1}(z_1, W_1), 1 - \tilde{K}_{L_2}(z_2, W_2)) \geq \min (\tilde{r}_1(z_1), \tilde{r}_2(z_2)).$$

The second part of Theorem 11 then follows optimizing over all $W \subset S_2(z)$. \square

10.2.1. Proofs of Lemma 1, Lemma 2 and Lemma 3.

Proof of Lemma 1. We want to bound from below the quantity defined by (31), $D_t v(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $d = d(x, y) \geq 2$. The identity (37) provides

$$D_t v(x, y) \\ = 2 \sum_{z \in [x, y]} \sum_{\{i, j\} \subset [n], (z, \sigma_i \sigma_j(z)) \in [x, y]} (2z_i - 1)(2z_j - 1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}) r(x, z, \sigma_i \sigma_j(z), y) \rho_t^{d-2}(d(x, z)).$$

If $\sigma_i \sigma_j(z) \in [x, y]$ then $(2z_i - 1) = x_i - y_i$ and $(2z_j - 1) = x_j - y_j$. As a consequence, if $\partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}) := v_{ij}$ does not depend on $z_{\overline{ij}}$, one has

$$D_t v(x, y) = 2 \sum_{\{i, j\} \subset [n]} (x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j) v_{ij} \sum_{z \in [x, y], (z, \sigma_i \sigma_j(z)) \in [x, y]} r(x, z, \sigma_i \sigma_j(z), y) \rho_t^{d-2}(d(x, z)) \\ = \frac{2}{d(d-1)} \sum_{\{i, j\} \subset [n]} (x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j) v_{ij},$$

which ends the proof of the first part of Lemma 1. In any case, when $\partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}})$ depends on $z_{\overline{ij}}$, we also have

$$D_t v(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{d-2} \ell_t^{x,y}(k) \frac{k!(d-2-k)!}{d!} \rho_t^{d-2}(k) = \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \ell_t^{x,y}(k-1) \frac{(k-1)!(d-k-1)!}{d!} \rho_t^{d-2}(k-1),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_t^{x,y}(k) &:= 2 \sum_{z \in [x,y], d(x,z)=k} \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n], (z, \sigma_i, \sigma_j(z)) \in [x,y]} (2z_i - 1)(2z_j - 1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}) \\ &= 2 \sum_{z \in [x,y], d(x,z)=k} \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} (2z_i - 1) \mathbf{1}_{z_i \neq y_i} (2z_j - 1) \mathbf{1}_{z_j \neq y_j} \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}), \end{aligned}$$

or by symmetry,

$$\ell_t^{x,y}(k) = 2 \sum_{z \in [x,y], d(x,z)=k+2} \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} (2z_i - 1) \mathbf{1}_{z_i \neq x_i} (2z_j - 1) \mathbf{1}_{z_j \neq x_j} \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}}).$$

It follows that for $k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_t^{x,y}(k-1) &\geq \sum_{z \in [x,y], d(x,z)=k-1} \lambda_{\min}(Hv(z)) \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}_{z_i \neq y_i} (2z_i - 1)^2 \\ &\geq \lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv) (d-k+1) \frac{d!}{(k-1)!(d-k+1)!} \end{aligned}$$

and by symmetry

$$\ell_t^{x,y}(k-1) \geq \lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv) (k+1) \frac{d!}{(k+1)!(d-k-1)!},$$

Since $Hv(z)$ has off-diagonal entries, $\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv) \leq \lambda_{\min}(Hv(z)) \leq 0$ and therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_t v(x, y) &\geq \lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv) \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \min\{1/k, 1/(d-k)\} \rho_t^{d-2}(k-1) \\ &= \lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv) \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \min\{d-k, k\} \frac{\rho_t^d(k)}{t(1-t)d(d-1)} \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{2(d-1)} \frac{1 - \rho_t^d(0) - \rho_t^d(n)}{t(1-t)} = \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{2(d-1)} \gamma_t(d). \end{aligned}$$

Then inequality (17) provides the expected result,

$$\int_0^1 D_s v(x, y) q_t(s) ds \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{2(d-1)} \int_0^1 \gamma_s(d) ds \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)}{d-1} \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \frac{1}{k} \geq \lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $W \subset S_2(z)$. Using the definition of the subset of indices A^1 associated to the set W and given by (34), the quantity $K^v(s, W)$ given by (33) can be written as

$$K^v(s, W) = \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} e^{-(2z_i-1)(2z_j-1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{\overline{ij}})/2} \alpha_i \alpha_j \right\},$$

where the infimum runs over all $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i \in A^1}$ with positive coordinates α_i satisfying $\sum_{i \in A^1} \alpha_i = 1$. The upper bound on $K^v(s, W)$ is a consequence of the inequality $e^s \leq 1 + s + |s|k(|s|)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. It provides

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} e^{-(2z_i-1)(2z_j-1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}})/2} \alpha_i \alpha_j \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} (2z_i - 1)(2z_j - 1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}}) \right) \alpha_i \alpha_j + k(|Hv|_{\max, \infty}/2) \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} |\partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}})| \alpha_i \alpha_j \\
& \leq 1 - \left(\sum_{i \in A^1} \alpha_i^2 \right) \left[1 + \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Hv(z))}{2} - k(|Hv|_{\max, \infty}/2) \frac{\lambda_{\max}(|Hv|(z))}{2} \right] \\
& \leq 1 - \left(\sum_{i \in A^1} \alpha_i^2 \right) r(v),
\end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of the first part of Lemma 2.

For the second part of Lemma 2. The proof is similar for the upper bound of $\tilde{K}^v(z) = \sup_{W \in S_2(z)} \tilde{K}^v(z, W)$ with according to (33)

$$\tilde{K}^v(s, W) = \sup_{\beta} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} \left(e^{-(2z_i-1)(2z_j-1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}})/2} - 1 \right) \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} \right\},$$

where the infimum runs over all $\beta = (\beta_i)_{i \in A^1}$ with positive coordinates β_i satisfying $\sum_{i \in A^1} \beta_i = 1$. As above it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} \left(e^{-(2z_i-1)(2z_j-1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}})/2} - 1 \right) \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} \\
& \leq - \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} (2z_i - 1)(2z_j - 1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}}) \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} + k(|Hv|_{\max, \infty}/2) \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset A^1} |\partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}})| \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} \\
& \leq - \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Hv(z))}{2} + k(|Hv|_{\max, \infty}/2) \frac{\lambda_{\max}(|Hv|(z))}{2} \leq 1 - r(v),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the expected upper bound on $\tilde{K}^v = \sup_{z \in \{0,1\}^n} \tilde{K}^v(z)$. For the lower bound on \tilde{K}^v , since for any $z \in \{0,1\}^n$, $A^1 = [n]$ for $W = S_2(z)$, the inequality $e^s - 1 \geq s$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{K}^v(z) & \geq \tilde{K}^v(s, S_2(z)) = \sup_{\beta} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} \left(e^{-(2z_i-1)(2z_j-1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}})/2} - 1 \right) \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} \right\} \\
& \geq \sup_{\beta} \left\{ -2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} (2z_i - 1)(2z_j - 1) \partial_{ij}^2 v(z_{i\bar{j}}) \sqrt{\beta_i} \sqrt{\beta_j} \right\} \\
& \geq -\lambda_{\min}(Hv(z)).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\tilde{K}^v \geq -\lambda_{\min}^{\infty}(Hv)$. □

Proof of Lemma 3. We want to upper bound the quantity $K^v(z, S_2(z))$ for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ whose expression is given by (32). According to the structure of the lattice \mathbb{Z}^n and from the identity (40),

one has for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$K^v(z, S_2(z)) := \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} \left(\alpha_{i+} \alpha_{j+} e^{-\partial_{ij}v(z)/2} + \alpha_{i-} \alpha_{j-} e^{-\partial_{ij}v(z-e_i-e_j)/2} + \alpha_{i+} \alpha_{j-} e^{\partial_{ij}v(z-e_j)/2} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \alpha_{i-} \alpha_{j+} e^{\partial_{ij}v(z-e_i)/2} \right) + \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\alpha_{i+}^2 e^{-\partial_{ii}v(z)/2} + \alpha_{i-}^2 e^{-\partial_{ii}v(z-2e_i)/2} \right) \right\},$$

where the supremum runs over all vectors α with non-negative coordinates α_{i+}, α_{i-} satisfying $\sum_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_{i+} + \alpha_{i-}) = 1$. According to the definition of the matrix $Av(z)$ in Lemma 3, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & K^v(z, S_2(z)) \\ & \leq \sup_{\alpha} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n]} (\alpha_{i+} + \alpha_{i-})(\alpha_{j+} + \alpha_{j-}) ((Av(z))_{ij} + 1) + \sum_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_{i+} + \alpha_{i-})^2 ((Av(z))_{ii} + 1) \right\} \\ & \leq 1 + \lambda_{\max}(Av(z)) \sum_{i \in [n]} (\alpha_{i+} + \alpha_{i-})^2 \\ & \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Av(z))}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality if $\lambda_{\max}(A(z)) \leq 0$.

We want now to upper bound $\tilde{K}^v(z, W)$ for any $W \subset S_2(z)$. According to (21) it can be expressed as follows

$$\tilde{K}^v(z, W) = \sup \left\{ e^{-Dv(z, z'')/2} \sum_{z'' \in W} \|z, z''\| \left(\prod_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, z''|}} \beta(\sigma) \right)^{\frac{1}{\|z, z''\|}} - \sum_{(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}^2, \sigma \neq \tau} \sqrt{\beta(\sigma)} \sqrt{\beta(\tau)} \right. \\ \left. \left| \beta = (\beta(\sigma))_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}}, \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|z, W|}} \beta(\sigma) = 1 \right. \right\}.$$

Given $W \subset S_2(z)$, there exist subsets $I_+, I_- \subset [n]$, $J_+, J_- \subset \{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] \mid i < j\}$ and $K \subset \{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] \mid i \neq j\}$, such that

$$W = \{z + 2e_i \mid i \in I_+\} \cup \{z - 2e_i \mid i \in I_-\} \cup \{z + e_i + e_j \mid (i, j) \in J_+\} \\ \cup \{z - e_i - e_j \mid (i, j) \in J_-\} \cup \{z + e_i - e_j \mid (i, j) \in K\}.$$

Setting $L_+ = I_+ \cup \{i \mid \exists k \in [n], (i, k) \in J_+ \cup K \text{ or } (k, i) \in J_+\}$ and $L_- = I_- \cup \{j \mid \exists k \in [n], (k, j) \in J_- \cup K \text{ or } (j, k) \in J_-\}$, the identity (40) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}^v(z, W) &= \sup_{\beta} \left\{ 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in J_+} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j+}} e^{-\partial_{ij}v(z)/2} + 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in J_-} \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} e^{-\partial_{ij}v(z-e_i-e_j)/2} \right. \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in K} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} e^{\partial_{ij}v(z-e_j)/2} + \sum_{i \in I_+} \beta_{i+} e^{-\partial_{ii}v(z)/2} + \sum_{i \in I_-} \beta_{i-} e^{-\partial_{ii}v(z-2e_i)/2} \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{(i,j) \in L_+, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j+}} - \sum_{(i,j) \in L_-, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} - 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in L_+ \times L_-} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum runs over all vectors β with non-negative coordinates $\beta_{i+}, i \in L_+, \beta_{j-}, j \in L_-$ satisfying $\sum_{i \in L_+} \beta_{i+} + \sum_{j \in L_-} \beta_{j-} = 1$. The definition of the matrix $A(z)$ then provides

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}^v(z, W) &\leq 1 + \sup_{\beta} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset L_+} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j+}} ((Av(z))_{ij} + 1) + 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset L_-} \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} ((Av(z))_{ij} + 1) \right. \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in L_+ \times L_-, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} ((Av(z))_{ij} + 1) + \sum_{i \in L_+} \beta_{i+} (Av(z))_{ii} + \sum_{i \in L_-} \beta_{i-} (Av(z))_{ii} \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{(i,j) \in L_+, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j+}} - \sum_{(i,j) \in L_-, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} - 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in L_+ \times L_-} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} \right\} \\ &= 1 + \sup_{\beta} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset L_+} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j+}} (Av(z))_{ij} + 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset L_-} \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} (Av(z))_{ij} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in L_+ \times L_-, i \neq j} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} (Av(z))_{ij} + \sum_{i \in L_+} \beta_{i+} (Av(z))_{ii} + \sum_{i \in L_-} \beta_{i-} (Av(z))_{ii} - 2 \sum_{i \in L_+ \cap L_-} \sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Since $-1 \leq A_{ii}(z)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}^v(z, W) &\leq 1 + \sup_{\beta} \left\{ 2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset [n], i \neq j} (\sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \mathbf{1}_{i \in L_+} + \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \mathbf{1}_{i \in L_-}) (\sqrt{\beta_{j+}} \mathbf{1}_{j \in L_+} + \sqrt{\beta_{j-}} \mathbf{1}_{j \in L_-}) A_{ij}(z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i \in [n]} (\sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \mathbf{1}_{i \in L_+} + \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \mathbf{1}_{i \in L_-})^2 A_{ii}(z) \right\} \\ &\leq 1 + \lambda_{\max}(Av(z)) \sum_{i \in [n]} (\sqrt{\beta_{i+}} \mathbf{1}_{i \in L_+} + \sqrt{\beta_{i-}} \mathbf{1}_{i \in L_-})^2 \\ &\leq 1 + \lambda_{\max}(Av(z)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $\lambda_{\max} \leq 0$. Finally we get $\tilde{K}^v(z) = \sup_{W \subset S_2(z)} \tilde{K}^v(z, W) \leq 1 + \lambda_{\max}(Av(z))$. It ends the proof of Lemma 3. \square

10.3. Proofs of Proposition 3, Proposition 4, Proposition 5 and Proposition 6.

Proof of Proposition 3. Recall that $S_r(z)$ denotes the combinatorial sphere of radius $r \in \mathbb{N}$. It was proved in [30] that a graph G of finite diameter d is geodetic if and only if for every $z \in \mathcal{X}$, each vertex of $S_r(z)$ is adjacent to a unique vertex in $S_{r-1}(z)$ for each $0 \leq r \leq d$. Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a geodetic graph with diameter greater or equal to 2 and $z_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. By choosing $r = 2$, we obtain that there exists $z''_0 \in S_2(z_0)$ such that $\|z_0, z''_0\| = 1$. Therefore, we immediately conclude that $K \geq 1$. Moreover, for every $z \in \mathcal{X}$

$$K_0(z, S_2(z)) = \sup_{\alpha} \sum_{z' \sim z'', d(z, z'')=2} \alpha(z')^2 = \sup_{\alpha} \sum_{z', z' \sim z} (\text{Deg}(z') - 1) \alpha(z')^2 = \max_{z', z' \sim z} \text{Deg}(z') - 1,$$

and the conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. Let $z \in \mathcal{X}$. In order to simplify the notations, one denotes $V_i :=]z, W_i[$. We first remark that if \mathcal{W} is admissible for the vertex z then $K_0(z, S_2(z))$ admits the following reformulation

$$K_0(z, S_2(z)) = \max_{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |V_i| |W_i| \left(\prod_{i \in V_i} \alpha_i \right)^{\frac{2}{|V_i|}}.$$

If $r(z) = -2 \log K_0(z, S_2(z)) \geq 0$ then it follows that

$$\max_{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |V_i| |W_i| \left(\prod_{i \in V_i} \alpha_i \right)^{\frac{2}{|V_i|}} \leq 1 .$$

Choosing for some $i \in [d]$, $(\alpha_i)_i$ as follows

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|V_i|} & \text{if } i \in V_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

one immediately gets

$$1 \geq K_0(z, S_2(z)) \geq \frac{|W_i|}{|V_i|} .$$

Since, this argument holds for any $i \in [d]$, the first implication is proved.

If $|V_i| \geq |W_i|$ and $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for all $i, j \in [d]$ by the arithmetic-geometric inequality one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} K_0(z, S_2(z)) &= \sum_{i=1}^d |V_i| |W_i| \left(\prod_{i \in V_i} \alpha_i \right)^{\frac{2}{|V_i|}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d |V_i| |W_i| \frac{\left(\sum_{i \in V_i} \alpha_i \right)^2}{|V_i|^2} \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [d]} \frac{|W_i|}{|V_i|} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{i \in V_i} \alpha_i = \max_{i \in [d]} \frac{|W_i|}{|V_i|} \\ &\leq 1 . \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 5. Let suppose that $g(G) < 5$ then there exist $x' \sim x$ and $y' \sim y$ such that $d(x', y') \leq 1$. Without loss of generality, let suppose that $\text{Deg}(y) \geq \text{Deg}(x)$. Let us define the following transport π between m_x^α and m_y^α as follows (as shown in Figure 2)

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(x, x) = \pi(y, y) = \pi(y', x') &= \frac{\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}, & \pi\left(S_1(y) \setminus \{x, y'\}, S_1(x) \setminus \{y, x'\}\right) &= \frac{(\text{Deg}(x) - 2)\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}, \\ \pi(y, x) = 1 - \frac{\alpha \text{Deg}(y)}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} - \frac{\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}, & \pi\left(S_1(y) \setminus \{x, y'\}, x\right) &= \frac{(\text{Deg}(y) - \text{Deg}(x))\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(m_x^\alpha, m_y^\alpha) &= 1 - \kappa_\alpha(x, y) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} + 3 \frac{(\text{Deg}(x) - 2)\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} + 1 - \frac{\alpha \text{Deg}(y)}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} - \frac{\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}} + 2 \frac{(\text{Deg}(y) - \text{Deg}(x))\alpha}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}, \end{aligned}$$

one obtains that $\kappa_{LLY}(x, y) \geq \frac{6 - \text{Deg}(y) - \text{Deg}(x)}{\text{Deg}_{\max}}$ which is a contradiction.




FIGURE 2. Transport plan π between m_x^α and m_y^α

□

Proof of Proposition 6. For the proof it is necessary to recall the definition of the Bakry-Émery curvature condition. Let us briefly introduce the bilinear forms Γ and Γ_2 respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Gamma_2(f, g) &:= \Delta(fg) - f\Delta g - g\Delta f, \\ 2\Gamma_2(f, g) &:= \Delta(\Gamma(f, g)) - \Gamma(f, \Delta g) - \Gamma(g, \Delta f) \end{aligned}$$

where Δ is the discrete Laplace operator. As a convention $\Gamma(f) := \Gamma(f, f)$ and $\Gamma_2(f) := \Gamma_2(f, f)$.

Definition 8. [21, 32, Bakry-Émery curvature condition] *Let $G = (\mathcal{X}, E)$ be a graph. Let $\kappa_{BE} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in (0, \infty]$. A vertex $z \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfies the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension inequality $CD(\kappa_{BE}, N)$, if for any $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$\Gamma_2(f)(z) \geq \frac{1}{N}(\Delta f(z))^2 + \kappa_{BE}\Gamma(f)(z),$$

where N is a dimension parameter and κ_{BE} is regarded as a lower Ricci bound at $z \in \mathcal{X}$.

Let (\mathcal{X}, E) be a structured graph. We want to prove that any vertex z satisfies the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension inequality $CD(0, \infty)$. For the sake of simplicity let $\mathcal{S} := \{\sigma_i \mid i \in [n]\}$. From the definition, $2\Gamma_2(f)(z) := \Delta\Gamma(f)(z) - 2\Gamma(f, \Delta f)(z)$. From the same computations as in [4, 21, 6] we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\Gamma(f)(z) &= \sum_{i, \sigma_i z \sim z} (\Gamma(f)(\sigma_i z) - \Gamma(f)(z)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i, \sigma_i z \sim z} \sum_{j, \sigma_j z \sim z} (f(\sigma_j \sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_j z) + f(z))^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i, \sigma_i z \sim z} \sum_{j, \sigma_j z \sim z} (f(\sigma_j z) - f(z))(f(\sigma_j \sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_j z) + f(z)) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the identity $A^2 - B^2 = (A - B)^2 + 2B(A - B)$. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} -2\Gamma(f, \Delta f)(x) &= - \sum_{j, \sigma_j z \sim z} (f(\sigma_j z) - f(z))(\Delta f(\sigma_j z) - \Delta f(z)) \\ &= - \sum_{i, \sigma_i z \sim z} \sum_{j, \sigma_j z \sim z} (f(\sigma_j z) - f(z))(f(\sigma_i \sigma_j z) - f(\sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_j z) + f(z)) \end{aligned}$$

Using our assumption that $\sigma_i \sigma_j z = \sigma_j \sigma_i z$ for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all $i, j \in [n]$, summing up we get

$$2\Gamma_2(f)(z) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i, \sigma_i z \sim z} \sum_{j, \sigma_j z \sim z} (f(\sigma_j \sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_i z) - f(\sigma_j z) + f(z))^2 \geq 0.$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] Dominique Bakry and Michel Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Seminaire de probabilités XIX 1983/84*, pages 177–206. Springer, 1985.
- [2] R. Bauerschmidt and T. Bodineau. A very simple proof of the lsi for high temperature spin systems. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 276(8):2582–2588, 2019.
- [3] Hee Je Cho and Seong-Hun Paeng. Ollivier’s ricci curvature and the coloring of graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 34(5):916–922, 2013.
- [4] Fan RK Chung and S-T Yau. Logarithmic harnack inequalities. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 3(6):793–812, 1996.
- [5] Daniel Cizma and Nati Linial. Geodesic geometry on graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 68(1):298–347, 2022.
- [6] David Cushing, Supanat Kamtue, Riikka Kangaslampi, Shiping Liu, and Norbert Peyerimhoff. Curvatures, graph products and ricci flatness. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 96(4):522–553, 2021.
- [7] David Cushing, Supanat Kamtue, Shiping Liu, and Norbert Peyerimhoff. Bakry-émery curvature on graphs as an eigenvalue problem. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 61(2):62, 2022.
- [8] David Cushing, Shiping Liu, and Norbert Peyerimhoff. Bakry-émery curvature functions on graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 72(1):89–143, 2020.
- [9] Ronen Eldan, Frederic Koehler, and Ofer Zeitouni. A spectral condition for spectral gap: fast mixing in high-temperature ising models. *Probability theory and related fields*, 182(3-4):1035–1051, 2022.
- [10] Matthias Erbar and Jan Maas. Ricci curvature of finite markov chains via convexity of the entropy. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 206(3):997–1038, 2012.
- [11] Matthias Erbar and Jan Maas. Gradient flow structures for discrete porous medium equations. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A*, 34(4):1355, 2014.
- [12] Max Fathi and Yan Shu. Curvature and transport inequalities for markov chains in discrete spaces. *Bernoulli*, 24(1):672–698, 2018.
- [13] Nathael Gozlan, Cyril Roberto, Paul-Marie Samson, and Prasad Tetali. Displacement convexity of entropy and related inequalities on graphs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 160(1-2):47–94, 2014.
- [14] Nathael Gozlan, Cyril Roberto, Paul-Marie Samson, and Prasad Tetali. Kantorovich duality for general transport costs and applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 273(11):3327–3405, 2017.
- [15] Supanat Kamtue. A note on a bonnet-myers type diameter bound for graphs with positive entropic ricci curvature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01160*, 2020.
- [16] Bo’az Klartag, Gady Kozma, Peter Ralli, and Prasad Tetali. Discrete curvature and abelian groups. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 68(3):655–674, 2016.
- [17] Jean-Marie Laborde and Surya Prakash Rao Hebbare. Another characterization of hypercubes. *Discrete Mathematics*, 39(2):161–166, 1982.
- [18] Christian Léonard. Lazy random walks and optimal transport on graphs. *The annals of Probability*, 44(3):1864–1915, 2016.
- [19] Christian Léonard. On the convexity of the entropy along entropic interpolations. In *Measure Theory in Non-Smooth Spaces*, pages 194–242. De Gruyter Open Poland, 2017.
- [20] Yong Lin, Linyuan Lu, and Shing-Tung Yau. Ricci curvature of graphs. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 63(4):605–627, 2011.

- [21] Yong Lin and Shing-Tung Yau. Ricci curvature and eigenvalue estimate on locally finite graphs. *Mathematical research letters*, 17(2):343–356, 2010.
- [22] Shiping Liu, Florentin Münch, and Norbert Peyerimhoff. Bakry–émery curvature and diameter bounds on graphs. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 57(2):1–9, 2018.
- [23] Shiping Liu, Florentin Münch, and Norbert Peyerimhoff. Rigidity properties of the hypercube via bakry–émery curvature. *Mathematische Annalen*, pages 1–35, 2022.
- [24] John Lott and Cédric Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 903–991, 2009.
- [25] Jan Maas. Gradient flows of the entropy for finite markov chains. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 261(8):2250–2292, 2011.
- [26] K. Marton. Bounding \bar{d} -distance by informational divergence: a method to prove measure concentration. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(2):857 – 866, 1996.
- [27] Florentin Münch and Radosław K Wojciechowski. Ollivier ricci curvature for general graph laplacians: Heat equation, laplacian comparison, non-explosion and diameter bounds. *Advances in Mathematics*, 356:106759, 2019.
- [28] Yann Ollivier. Ricci curvature of markov chains on metric spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 256(3):810–864, 2009.
- [29] Oystein Ore. *Theory of graphs*, volume 38. American Mathematical Soc., 1987.
- [30] KR Parthasarathy and N Srinivasan. Some general constructions of geodetic blocks. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 33(2):121–136, 1982.
- [31] Paul-Marie Samson. Entropic curvature on graphs along schrödinger bridges at zero temperature. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 184(3-4):859–937, 2022.
- [32] Michael Schmuckenschläger. Curvature of nonlocal markov generators. *Convex geometric analysis (Berkeley, CA, 1996)*, 34:189–197, 1999.
- [33] Karl-Theodor Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. *Acta mathematica*, 196(1):65–131, 2006.
- [34] Michel Talagrand. Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Publications Mathématiques de l’Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques*, 81:73–205, 1995.
- [35] Akihisa Tamura and Kazuya Tsurumi. Directed discrete midpoint convexity. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 38:1–37, 2021.
- [36] Cédric Villani. Optimal transport, volume 338 of. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*, 2009.

UNIV GUSTAVE EIFFEL, UPEM, UNIV PARIS EST CRETEIL, CNRS, F-77447 MARNE-LA-VALLÉE, FRANCE

UNIV GUSTAVE EIFFEL, UPEM, UNIV PARIS EST CRETEIL, CNRS, F-77447 MARNE-LA-VALLÉE, FRANCE

Email address: martin.rapaport@univ-eiffel.fr, paul-marie.samson@univ-eiffel.fr