

An Improved Analysis of Langevin Algorithms with Prior Diffusion for Non-Log-Concave Sampling

Xunpeng Huang^{*†}, Hanze Dong[†], Difan Zou[§], and Tong Zhang[‡]

[†]Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

[§]The University of Hong Kong

[‡]University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Abstract

Understanding the dimension dependency of computational complexity in high-dimensional sampling problem is a fundamental problem, both from a practical and theoretical perspective. Compared with samplers with unbiased stationary distribution, e.g., Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (MALA), biased samplers, e.g., Underdamped Langevin Dynamics (ULD), perform better in low-accuracy cases just because a lower dimension dependency in their complexities. Along this line, [Freund et al. \(2022\)](#) suggest that the modified Langevin algorithm with prior diffusion is able to converge dimension independently for strongly log-concave target distributions. Nonetheless, it remains open whether such property establishes for more general cases. In this paper, we investigate the prior diffusion technique for the target distributions satisfying log-Sobolev inequality (LSI), which covers a much broader class of distributions compared to the strongly log-concave ones. In particular, we prove that the modified Langevin algorithm can also obtain the dimension-independent convergence of KL divergence with different step size schedules. The core of our proof technique is a novel construction of an interpolating SDE, which significantly helps to conduct a more accurate characterization of the discrete updates of the overdamped Langevin dynamics. Our theoretical analysis demonstrates the benefits of prior diffusion for a broader class of target distributions and provides new insights into developing faster sampling algorithms.

1 Introduction

Sampling from unnormalized distribution aims to obtain the particles from a target density function $p_* \propto \exp(-U)$ on \mathbb{R}^d , which is a fundamental task in statistics ([Neal, 1993](#)), scientific computing ([Robert et al., 1999](#)), and machine learning ([Bishop and Nasrabadi, 2006](#)). Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) ([Gilks et al., 1995](#); [Brooks et al., 2011](#)) is a class of sampling algorithms to construct Markov chains, achieving the target distribution when it becomes stable. Many previous works concentrate on the Markov properties to investigate the behavior of MCMC algorithms.

Langevin algorithms, a specific type of MCMC methods, offer a compelling approach to constructing Markov chains for sampling. These algorithms leverage the Stein score, which corresponds to the gradient of the logarithm of the density function, making them practical and

*Mail to xhuangck@connect.ust.hk, dzou@cs.hku.hk

efficient in real-world applications. Thus, the variants of Langevin algorithms (Rosicky et al., 1978) have gained significant popularity in the sampling literature, such as Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (ULA) (Dalalyan, 2017b; Vempala and Wibisono, 2019; Durmus and Moulines, 2019), Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD) (Welling and Teh, 2011; Teh et al., 2016) and Metropolis-Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA) (Roberts and Stramer, 2002; Xifara et al., 2014). One intriguing aspect of continuous Langevin algorithms is their connection to the gradient flow of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence (Risken, 1996). This characteristic makes them valuable as first-order optimizers in probability spaces, especially when dealing with different subsampling and discretization strategies (Jordan et al., 1998, 1999; Wibisono, 2018; Ma et al., 2019a).

For a more in-depth analysis of optimization algorithms, the objectives are usually restricted to a certain family of functions, e.g., strong convexity or Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) inequality. Similarly, in sampling problems, researchers often consider target distributions, denoted as p_* , that adhere to two types of assumptions: (1) log-concavity and (2) isoperimetric inequalities. The first case is presented as the convexity of $-\log p_*$, resulting in the KL divergence to p_* being a strongly geodesic convex functional (Ambrosio et al., 2005). For the second case, isoperimetric inequalities, such as Poincaré inequality and log-Sobolev inequality (LSI), encompass a broader range of distribution classes. Beyond the log-concavity, it also includes non-log-concave distributions, such as mixtures and perturbations of log-concave distributions, which are of great interest in real applications. Besides, Wibisono (2018) explain LSI as the gradient-dominant condition or PL condition in a geodesic sense. Although both of these two assumptions will lead to the linear convergence of KL divergence for continuous Langevin algorithms just like their counterpart in Euclidean space, compared with the variants of gradient descent in conventional optimization (Nesterov et al., 2018), the convergence rate of discrete Langevin algorithms usually has an additional $\mathcal{O}(d)$ dimensional dependency (Dalalyan, 2017b; Cheng and Bartlett, 2018; Ma et al., 2019b; Dalalyan and Karagulyan, 2019; Vempala and Wibisono, 2019). The distinction between the convergence of sampling and optimization is so conspicuous and needs to be explored further.

To fill this gap, Freund et al. (2022) suggest that Langevin algorithms can achieve dimension-independent convergence rate for posterior sampling when the negative log-likelihood is convex and Lipschitz smooth (or Lipschitz continuous). With tractable strongly log-concave prior, the convergence rate of the modified Langevin dynamics¹ only depends on the trace of log-likelihood Hessian, rather than the explicit dimension d . In the ridge separable case, the trace of Hessian can be independent of the dimension d (Freund et al., 2022). However, for more general target distributions beyond log-convexity, whether such a dimension-independent convergence will establish remains unknown. From a technical view, due to the lack of convexity (Durmus and Moulines, 2019; Freund et al., 2022) and irregular iterations it is more sophisticated to control the bias deliberately for the inexact discretization of the continuous Langevin dynamics Vempala and Wibisono (2019).

Therefore, in this paper, we attempt to answer the question

Can we achieve dimension-independent convergence rate for sampling from non-log-concave distributions?

In particular, we will focus on the distributions that satisfy LSI, a general condition for non-log-concave distributions that have been widely made in prior works (Cheng and Bartlett, 2018; Vempala and Wibisono, 2019; Ma et al., 2019a). Additionally, we perform a slight modification on the Langevin

¹The diffusion term is solved with both Brownian motion and the tractable prior. When the prior is Gaussian, the diffusion term is the solution of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process.

algorithm with prior diffusion considered in [Freund et al. \(2022\)](#) and investigate the convergence rate for this modified version. Technically, based on the equivalent transition kernel of the Markov Chain deduced by the iterations, we consider performing an analytic continuation for the two-stage discretized algorithm rather than relying on the geodesic convexity of KL divergence. By tracking the evolution of an analytic continuation of the density, we can obtain the largest possible step sizes by controlling the discretization-induced error. The convergence rate of the proposed algorithm can be deduced subsequently. Besides, we also introduce varying step sizes to improve the iteration complexity with a logarithmic factor. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized in the following three perspectives:

- We show that under log-Sobolev inequality and proper regularity conditions, the KL convergence rate of Langevin dynamics with prior diffusion can be $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})\epsilon^{-1})$ where the matrix \mathbf{H} depends on the property of U , rather than $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d\epsilon^{-1})$ in ULA or $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(-d\log^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(\epsilon))$ in MALA. Compared with [Freund et al. \(2022\)](#), the target distribution in our work can go beyond strongly log-concave and thus covers a much larger class of non-log-concave target distributions.
- From a technical perspective, we innovatively construct an interpolate SDE to approximate the gradient flow, which helps to characterize a multi-stage update in overdamped Langevin dynamics more accurately and inspire the design of samplers, especially for composite and finite-sum potentials. Besides, compared with the specially designed step sizes in [Freund et al. \(2022\)](#), our technique can cover more general steps in practice.
- From an extension perspective, due to a good correspondence to the analysis in ([Vempala and Wibisono, 2019](#)) (one of the most flexible frameworks to analyze overdamped Langevin), our analysis can be easily generalized to a broader class of Langevin algorithms such as underdamped Langevin MCMC, SGLD, MALA, and even proximal samplers.

2 Related Work

The dimension dependency of the computational complexity has been of interest to the sampling community for a long time. In the following, we will divide the sampling algorithms into several categories and introduce their dimension dependency under different settings.

Biased samplers. Algorithms stemming from the discretization of stochastic processes, which have a stationary distribution denoted as p_* , including Langevin and underdamped Langevin diffusions, are the focus of this discussion. The bias inherent in the stationary distribution causes the overall runtime to scale with $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$. In the realm of Langevin diffusion, [Dalalyan \(2017a\)](#); [Dalalyan and Karagulyan \(2019\)](#) initially established a convergence rate for the Wasserstein 2 distance of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d\epsilon^{-2})$ when p_* exhibits strong log-concavity. Subsequently, [Cheng and Bartlett \(2018\)](#); [Vempala and Wibisono \(2019\)](#) achieved a convergence rate for the KL divergence of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d\epsilon^{-1})$, under strong log-concavity and the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality (LSI) conditions, respectively. For underdamped Langevin diffusion, [Shen and Lee \(2019\)](#) reached a state-of-the-art convergence of the Wasserstein 2 distance at $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d^{1/3}\epsilon^{-2/3})$, applicable when p_* is strongly log-concave. Furthermore, [Ma et al. \(2019a\)](#) demonstrated an $\mathcal{O}(d^{1/2}\epsilon^{-1/2})$ KL convergence rate for underdamped Langevin diffusion, assuming LSI and high-order smoothness conditions for p_* . More recently, [Huang et al. \(2024a\)](#) developed a novel diffusion-based Monte Carlo method that can provably sample from broader target

distributions not limited by the LSI condition. This method’s convergence rate was notably enhanced through the integration of a recursive score estimation technique, as detailed in [Huang et al. \(2024b\)](#).

Unbiased samplers. Such algorithms are typically designed in a way that the stationary distribution is unbiased w.r.t. the target distribution, which is achieved by introducing a Metropolis-Hastings filter to each step. It makes the iteration complexity usually related to $\log(1/\epsilon)$ rather than ϵ^{-1} . However, the filter which debiases the algorithm also greatly complicates the analysis, and [Dwivedi et al. \(2018\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2020\)](#) provide $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d \log^{O(1)}(1/\epsilon))$ Wasserstein 2 distance when p_* is strongly log-concave. Recently, [Altschuler and Chewi \(2023\)](#) provides $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d^{1/2} \log^{O(1)}(1/\epsilon))$ KL convergence with proximal sampler reduction and even extend the assumption of p_* to the LSI.

Dimension-free samplers. Such samplers usually expect the spectrum property of $-\log p_*$ to bring some benefit to the iteration complexity. When p_* is strongly log-concave, A very recent work ([Freund et al., 2022](#)) find a Langevin algorithm to achieve an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{1/2})\epsilon^{-1})$ dimension-independent KL convergence rate where \mathbf{H} is an uniform upper bound of the Hessian matrix of $-\log p_*$. Besides, [Liu et al. \(2024\)](#) proved an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})^{1/3}\epsilon^{-2/3})$ iteration complexity in Wasserstein distance for a double randomized ULD in the same setting, i.e., strongly log-concave. The prior diffusion trick can be considered as re-balancing the coefficients of strong convexity for the energy term and the entropy term in [Durmus et al. \(2019\)](#). It is worth noting that the analysis along this line is similar to the techniques in conventional convex optimization ([Durmus et al., 2019](#)) because the geodesic convexity in probability space is extremely similar to the convexity of objectives in Euclidean space. However, unlike the first kind of proof, high dependency on geodesic convexity limits their extension to milder assumptions: the analysis under LSI can be hard.

In this work, our algorithm can be recognized as a dimension-free sampler while the analysis is more similar to biased samplers. Specifically, we approximate the ideal gradient flow by controlling the discretization error along a constructed interpolate SDE. This trick allows our analysis to be generalized to a broader class of Langevin algorithms such as underdamped Langevin MCMC, SGLD, and MALA.

3 Problem Setup and Preliminaries

This section will first introduce the notations commonly used and problem settings in the following sections. Then, we will show the main algorithm, i.e., Langevin Algorithm with Prior Diffusion as Alg 1, and the slight differences between our version and that provided in [Freund et al. \(2022\)](#). Besides, we will also explain the intuitions about designing Alg 1. After that, we will demonstrate the main difficulty when we expect to extend such a result to a broader class of target distributions.

Notations. In this paper, we use letters \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{w} to denote vectors in \mathbb{R}^d and random variables in \mathbb{R}^d . For any function, $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\nabla f(\cdot)$ and $\nabla^2 f(\cdot)$ denote the corresponding gradient and Hessian matrix, respectively. The Euclidean norm (vector) and its induced norm (matrix) are denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. For density p and q , the KL divergence is denoted by $\text{KL}(p||q) = \mathbb{E}_p[\log(p/q)]$. Besides, suppose $\mathbf{w} \sim p$ and $\mathbf{w}' \sim q$, and let $\Gamma(p, q)$ be the class of joint distribution $\gamma(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\int \gamma(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') d\mathbf{w}' = p(\mathbf{w})$ and $\int \gamma(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') d\mathbf{w} = q(\mathbf{w}')$, the Wasserstein distance between p and q is

defined as

$$W_2^2(p, q) = \min_{\gamma \in \Gamma(p, q)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \sim \gamma} \left[\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|^2 \right].$$

Specifically, we say p_* satisfies LSI with constant α_* if for all smooth function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{E}_{p_*}[\|\mathbf{w}\|^2] \leq \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_*}[\phi^2 \ln \phi^2] - \mathbb{E}_{p_*}[\phi^2] \ln \mathbb{E}_{p_*}[\phi^2] \leq \frac{2}{\alpha_*} \mathbb{E}_{p_*}[\|\nabla \phi\|^2].$$

By choosing $\phi^2 = p/p_*$, we have

$$2\alpha_* \text{KL}(p \| p_*) \leq \int p(\mathbf{w}) \left\| \nabla \log \frac{p(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w}.$$

Problem setup. When the dataset is given as \mathbf{z} , we consider sampling from a posterior distribution over parameter $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$p(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{z}) \propto p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{w}) \pi(\mathbf{w}) \propto \exp(-U(\mathbf{w})) := p_*(\mathbf{w}).$$

The potential $U: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be decomposed as $U(\mathbf{w}) = f(\mathbf{w}) + g(\mathbf{w})$, where $f, g: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This formulation is general in machine learning tasks. From a Bayesian view, we can divide the regularized empirical risk minimization loss to two parts: we can consider f as the negative log-likelihood (loss function) and g as the negative log-prior (regularization term). Without loss of generality, we suppose g is simple, and the SDE involving g can be solved to high precision. Besides, the negative log-likelihood f shares a similar setting with that in (Freund et al., 2022).

[A1] The function g is m -strongly convex and can be explicitly integrated. For simplicity, we choose $g(\mathbf{w}) = (m/2) \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$ in following sections.

[A2] The function f is second derivative, and for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it has

$$\|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w})\| \preceq L\mathbf{I}.$$

[A3] For any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we suppose

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) (\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}))^\top \preceq \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^\top = \mathbf{H} \preceq L^2 \mathbf{I}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \succeq \mathbf{0}.$$

[A4] The posterior distribution, $p_* \propto \exp(-U)$, satisfies α_* -log-Sobolev inequality (LSI).

By choosing the Gaussian prior, Freund et al. (2022) actually needs the strongly log-concave property for the posterior distribution p_* . In our analysis, p_* is only required to satisfy LSI, i.e., [A4], which is a standard assumption in recent sampling works (Vempala and Wibisono, 2019; Wibisono, 2019) and covers a wider class of measures than log-concave distributions Bakry and Émery (1985). It can be preserved with bounded perturbation and Lipschitz mapping Vempala and Wibisono (2019) where log-concavity fails. For [A3], due to the general Hessian condition under LSI (may not be positive semi-definite), we require the upper bound for the Hessian square, which is slightly stronger than that (only assuming upper bound of Hessian) in Freund et al. (2022). However, similar to Freund et al. (2022), [A3] provides the potential for achieving a sharper convergence independent of the dimension number. Specifically, in Section 4.2, we demonstrate that [A1]-[A4] can be verified when the target distribution is a Gaussian mixture.

Langevin Algorithm with Prior Diffusion (LAPD). We show a variant of LAPD in Alg 1. It should be noted that LAPD was first proposed by (Freund et al., 2022). Compared with that in Freund et al. (2022), the main differences lay in two aspects. First, the order of stages is swapped in our variant, which only leads to the SDE stage at the first iteration being omitted. Second, the output of Alg 1 is $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T$ which violates the theoretical analysis in Freund et al. (2022). The intuition of designing LAPD is the alternative iteration in composition optimization. Specifically, for any distribution p , we decompose KL divergence between p and the target distribution p_* , as follows

$$\text{KL}(p||p_*) = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w} \sim p} [f(\mathbf{w})]}_{\text{Term 1}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w} \sim p} [g(\mathbf{w}) + \log p(\mathbf{w})]}_{\text{Term 2}}. \quad (1)$$

According to [A1], the log-prior g is relatively simple, e.g., quadratic functions, which means its SDE can be solved with high precision or even with a closed form. Thus, the exact gradient flow of Term 2 in Wasserstein space leads to exponential decay even though discretization error of Term 1 will dominate the decrease of the total functional.

Main difficulties. According to the Alg 1, we introduce some other notations. Given a random variable $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 \sim \tilde{p}_0$, we would like to update $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k \sim \tilde{p}_k$, $t = 1, \dots, T$. From a composition optimization perspective, to get an explicit bound on the convergence of the sequence $\{f(\mathbf{w}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_+}$, deduced by the gradient descent type iteration, e.g.,

$$\mathbf{w}_{k+1} = \mathbf{w}_k - \eta_{k+1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_k) + \eta_{k+1} \xi(\mathbf{w}_k),$$

to the minima $f(\mathbf{w}_*)$, one possibility (see Beck and Teboulle (2009)) is to upper bound function value differences by the distance among variables:

$$2\eta_{k+1} (f(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}) - f(\mathbf{w}_*)) \leq \|\mathbf{w}_k - \mathbf{w}_*\|^2 - \|\mathbf{w}_{k+1} - \mathbf{w}_*\|^2 + C\eta_{k+1}^2,$$

which highly depends on the convexity of function f . Similarly, the convergence of Eq. 1 requires

$$\text{Term 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w} \sim p_*} [f(\mathbf{w})] \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Term 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w} \sim p_*} [g(\mathbf{w}) + \log p(\mathbf{w})].$$

To upper bound the difference between Term 1 and its limit with the Wasserstein 2 distance (corresponds to L_2 norm in Euclidean space), a crucial assumption is a geodesic convexity of Term 1, which can be deduced by the convexity of f in the target distribution p_* . While such a convexity will be violated when p_* only satisfies LSI. Specifically, LSI is just like Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) inequality in a geodesic sense (Wibisono, 2018) due to the following equation

$$2\alpha_* \text{KL}(p||p_*) \leq \|\text{grad}_p \text{KL}(p||p_*)\|_p^2 := \int p(\mathbf{w}) \left\| \frac{\delta \text{KL}(p||p_*)}{\delta p} \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w}.$$

However, unlike general convergence analysis with PL inequality, the functional Eq. 1 does not have any property in Wasserstein space which is similar to the smoothness in Euclidean space. Hence, there is no existing mature solution to extend the analysis of the optimization problem under PL inequality to the sampling problem under LSI inequality except for tracking the dynamics of SDE directly. On the other hand, we will readily observe that, different from ULA Vempala and Wibisono (2019) described by one single SDE, the two-stage iteration of Alg. 1 makes it challenging to present the dynamic of the particles with one Itô's SDE. We defer the solution in the next section.

Algorithm 1 Langevin Algorithm with Prior Diffusion (LAPD)

- 1: **Input:** Initialization \tilde{p}_0 , step size $\{\eta_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, target $p_* \propto \exp(-f(x) - g(x))$.
- 2: Draw $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ from \tilde{p}_0 .
- 3: **for** $k = 1$ to T **do**
- 4: **Stage1:** Let

$$\mathbf{w}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} - \tilde{\eta}_{k-1} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}).$$

- 5: **Stage2:** Sample $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$ from $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\eta_k)$ denoted by the following SDE

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\eta_k) = & \mathbf{w}_k - \int_0^{\eta_k} \nabla g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(s)) ds \\ & + \sqrt{2} \int_0^{\eta_k} d\mathbf{B}_t. \end{aligned}$$

- 6: **end for**
 - 7: **Return:** $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T$
-




Figure 1: An illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.4. In each iteration, we compare the evolution of (a) the continuous-time KL divergence flow for time η_k , and (b) the constructed SDE equivalent to a two-stage update at time η_k .

4 Theoretical Results

In this section, we will show the dimension-independent convergence rate of Alg 1 with different step size schedules, e.g., fixing step sizes and varying step sizes, and compare them with previous work. Besides, we will provide a roadmap for our analysis, which helps to understand our theoretical results. Due to space limitations, we defer details in the Appendix.

KL convergence with a fixed step size. Our main result for Alg 1 can be stated as follows.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume the posterior p_* satisfies [A1]-[A4], and $\alpha_* \leq L$ without loss of generality, we suppose the step size $\eta_k = \eta \in (0, \hat{\eta}]$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ where*

$$\hat{\eta} := \min \left\{ (8m)^{-1}, (8 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}))^{-1}, (1.5\alpha_*)^{-1}, \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2}, \frac{\alpha_*\epsilon}{64\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})} \right\},$$

and $(m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}) / (e^{m\eta_k} - 1) = 1$, then Alg 1 satisfies

$$\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k || p_*) \leq e^{-\alpha_*\eta k} \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 || p_*) + \frac{32\eta}{\alpha_*} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}).$$

In this condition, requiring

$$k \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_*\eta} \log \frac{2\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 || p_*)}{\epsilon},$$

we have $\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k || p_*) \leq \epsilon$.

Reference	Assumption	Iteration Complexity
Cheng and Bartlett (2018)	[A1], [A2], Convexity of f	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{L^2}{m^2} \cdot \frac{d}{\epsilon}\right)$
Freund et al. (2022)	[A1]-[A3], Convexity of f	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}})}{m^2\epsilon} + \frac{U(0)}{\epsilon}\right)$
Vempala and Wibisono (2019)	Smoothness of U , [A4]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{L^2}{\alpha_*^2} \cdot \frac{d}{\epsilon}\right)$
Theorem 4.1	[A1]-[A4]	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*^2\epsilon}\right)$
Dalalyan and Karagulyan (2019)	[A1],[A2], Convexity of f	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^2}{m^3} \cdot \frac{d}{\epsilon}\right)$
Theorem 4.2	[A1]-[A4]	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*^3\epsilon}\right)$

Table 1: Comparison with previous results on overdamped Langevin algorithm. The first four lines utilize fixed step sizes and consider the KL convergence. The last two lines use varying step sizes, and consider the Wasserstein 2 distance convergence (with additional m or α_* factor in the denominator). For the convergence of ULD and proximal samplers, we omit the detailed comparison here for ease of presentation due to their explicit dependency on dimension d shown in Section 2.

It should be noted that the step size η_k will be selected as $\alpha_*\epsilon/(64 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}))$ with ϵ diminishing. In this condition, by requiring

$$k \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_*\hat{\eta}} \log \frac{2\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0\|p_*)}{\epsilon} \approx \frac{64 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*^2\epsilon} \log \frac{2\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0\|p_*)}{\epsilon},$$

we have $\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0\|p_*) \leq \epsilon$. This theorem differs from the main results of Freund et al. (2022) from two perspectives. First, in Freund et al. (2022), the convergence is about the weighted average of KL divergence at different iterations, which does not correspond to some underline distribution obviously though the weighted average can be achieved with additional steps. However, Theorem 4.1 denotes that dimension-independent convergence can be obtained with only respect to the distribution of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_T$, and the particle of the last iteration can be output directly. This property makes the results more clear and practical. Second, the dimension-free convergence of KL divergence is required decreasing step sizes in Freund et al. (2022), while Theorem 4.1 denotes that fixed step sizes can also achieve a similar result with an additional logarithmic term.

KL convergence with a varying step size. To get rid of the logarithmic terms in the number of iterations required to achieve the precision level ϵ , we introduce varying step sizes with the inspire of Dalalyan and Karagulyan (2019). Hence, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.2. Consider Alg 1 with varying step size η_{k+1} defined by

$$\eta_{k+1} = \frac{8\hat{\eta}}{9 + 3(k - K_0)_+ \hat{\eta}\alpha_*} \quad \text{and} \quad (m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}) / (e^{m\eta_k} - 1) = 1$$

where $\hat{\eta}$ is denoted as

$$\hat{\eta} := \min \left\{ (8m)^{-1}, (8 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}))^{-1}, (1.5\alpha_*)^{-1}, \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2} \right\}$$

and K_0 denotes the smallest non-negative integer satisfying

$$T_0 \geq \frac{9}{8\hat{\eta}\alpha_*} \ln \left(\frac{\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*) \alpha_*}{123\hat{\eta}\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})} \right).$$

If the target p_* satisfies [A1]-[A4] and $\alpha_* \leq L$, for every $k \geq T_0$, we have

$$\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) \leq \frac{2^{10} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{27L^{1.5}\alpha_* + 6(k - T_0)\alpha_*^2}.$$

The varying step sizes has two important advantages as compared to the fixed step sizes. The first is the independence of the target precision level ϵ . The second advantage is saving the logarithmic terms in Theorem 4.1. Actually, it suffices $T = T_0 + 2^9 \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) / (3\epsilon\alpha_*^2)$ iterations to get $\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_T \| p_*) \leq \epsilon$. More details of this theorem are provided in Appendix B. We also provide Table 1 to show the comparison of assumptions and iteration complexity with several previous work.

4.1 Proof sketch

In this section, we expect to highlight the technical novelties by introducing the roadmap of our analysis. Due to space limitations, we leave the technical details in Appendix B.

In Section 3, it has demonstrated that for functionals without the geodesic convexity in Wasserstein space, we can hardly upper-bound them by a global metric, e.g., the Wasserstein 2 distance between the current and the target distribution. From another perspective, different from standard ULA (Dalalyan, 2017b; Vempala and Wibisono, 2019), it is not easy to directly find an Itô's SDE corresponding to the two-stage update of particles. Therefore, the contraction of KL divergence with Alg 1 remains a mystery in isoperimetry, e.g., log-Sobolev assumption. To overcome these problems, for each iteration, we utilize a stochastic process $\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ deduced by a constructed SDE and required to exist some random variable $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\eta_k}$ shares the same distribution with the particles after the two-stage update in Alg 1. Then, by controlling the difference between such an SDE and the standard gradient flow of KL divergence, we may obtain the discretization error bounded by both $\tilde{\eta}_k$ and η_k and prove the contraction of KL divergence in Alg 1. Hence, there are two key steps in our analysis: (1). Find the equivalent Itô SDE for each two-stage update iteration. (2). Control the error between the constructed Itô SDE and standard KL divergence flow; see Fig 1 for an illustration.

Construction of Equivalent SDE. From Alg 1, the transformation of density function from $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}$ to $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$ can be considered as a combination of the change of variables (if the step size $\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}$ is small enough) and an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process (if we suppose $g(\mathbf{w}) = (m/2) \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$). With the Green's function of OU processes, the probability density of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$ conditioning on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$ as

$$p(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m\eta_k})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - (\mathbf{w}_0 - \tilde{\eta}_{k-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) e^{-m\eta_k}\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m\eta_k}} \right].$$

Besides, various literature, e.g., Oksendal (2013) shows that solutions to Itô SDE are Markov processes. In a probabilistic sense, it means that all Itô processes are completely characterized by the transition densities from $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_s$ to $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$, i.e., $p(\mathbf{w}_t, t | \mathbf{w}_s, s)$. Meanwhile, the transition density is also a solution to the Kolmogorov forward equation with a Dirac delta initial density concentrated on $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_s$ at

time s . Hence, conditioning on $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_0 := \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$, if there is some transition density $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')$, solving some Itô SDE, to satisfy

$$p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, \eta_k | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) = p(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0)$$

for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we consider its corresponding SDE equivalent to the two-stage update in Alg 1. Then, such an equivalent SDE can be constructed by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Conditioning on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$, there is a Markov process $\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ deduced by the following SDE*

$$d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t = - \left(m\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t + \frac{m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}}{e^{m\eta_k} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) dt + \sqrt{2}d\mathbf{B}_t. \quad (2)$$

Then $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\eta_k} \sim p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\cdot, \eta_k | \mathbf{w}_0, 0)$ shares the same distribution as $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$ because

$$p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, \eta_k | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m\eta_k})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - (\mathbf{w}_0 - \tilde{\eta}_{k-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) e^{-m\eta_k}\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m\eta_k}} \right].$$

We leave more detailed proof of Lemma 4.3 in Appendix A and the connection between Kolmogorov equations and transition density in Appendix D. Then, for any suitable probability density function \tilde{p}_{k-1} of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}$, we set

$$\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) := \int_{\mathbf{w}_0} p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) \cdot \tilde{p}_{k-1}(\mathbf{w}_0) d\mathbf{w}_0,$$

where $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}$ is the transition density solving SDE 2, and

$$\hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) := p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}_0, 0), \quad \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) := \tilde{p}_{k-1}(\mathbf{w}_0) \cdot p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}_0, 0)$$

for abbreviation. Follows from Lemma 4.3, we have $\hat{p}_{\eta_k}(\mathbf{w}) = \tilde{p}_k(\mathbf{w})$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It also implies

$$\text{KL}(\hat{p}_{\eta_k} \| p^*) = \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{KL}(\hat{p}_0 \| p^*) = \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_{k-1} \| p^*). \quad (3)$$

Therefore, the contraction of KL divergence for each iteration of Alg 1 can be obtained by tracking the conditional dynamics shown in SDE 2.

Control the variance of particles for each iteration. Combining Lemma 4.3 and Eq. 3, the dynamic of KL divergence can be upper bounded as

$$\frac{d\text{KL}(\hat{p}_t \| p_*)}{dt} \leq -\frac{3\alpha_*}{2} \cdot \text{KL}(\hat{p}_t \| p_*) + \underbrace{\int \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w})\|^2 d(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w})}_{\text{discretization error}}$$

with an appropriate choice of step sizes when the target distribution satisfies [A4]. Actually, the discretization error is from the difference between SDE 2 and the standard Langevin dynamics

$$d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t = - (m\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t + \nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)) dt + \sqrt{2}d\mathbf{B}_t.$$

To control the error, we introduce the mean of particles along SDE 2 at time t given \mathbf{w}_0 , i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0) = e^{-mt} \mathbf{w}_0 - \frac{1 - e^{-mt}}{m} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0),$$

The discretization error can be divided into two parts, relating to the bias of the particles' mean, i.e.,

$$\int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 d\mathbf{w}_0, \quad (4)$$

and their variance, i.e.,

$$\int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \int \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0))\|^2 d\mathbf{w}d\mathbf{w}_0, \quad (5)$$

at time t along SDE 2. The key point for LAPD to get rid of the dependence on the dimension number d is that the difference in gradients here (Eq. 4 and Eq. 5) is w.r.t. the function f whose Hessian is upper bounded by the semi-positive definite $\mathbf{H}^{1/2}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \ll d$. However, in standard ULA, the discretization error is related to the difference of gradients w.r.t. U containing the quadratic g , which leads to $\text{Tr}(\nabla^2 U) = \Omega(d)$. Then, with the definition of particles' mean and smooth properties ([A2] and [A3]), Eq. 4 can be controlled by $\mathcal{O}(\eta_k^2)$. Besides, due to the Gaussian-type distribution $\hat{p}_{t|0}$, Eq. 5 only has the following upper bound

$$\frac{1 - e^{-2mt}}{m} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{O}(\eta_k),$$

which dominates the discretization error. Such a result can be summarized as the following lemma about the contraction of KL divergence along SDE 2.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose the target distribution p_* satisfies [A1]- [A4], if we set*

$$(m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}) / (e^{m\eta_k} - 1) = 1$$

and

$$0 < \eta_k \leq \min \left\{ (8m)^{-1}, (8 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{1/2}))^{-1}, (1.5\alpha_*)^{-1}, \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

then along each iteration of Alg 1, it has

$$\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) \leq e^{-\alpha_* \eta_k} \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_{k-1} \| p_*) + 16\eta_k^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}).$$

4.2 Discussion on specific examples

In this section, we discuss some specific examples which can be coupled with Alg 1 to demonstrate that LAPD is better than ULA in general and has a greater advantage in some cases.

General target distributions and the choice of g . From Table 1, it can be observed that the convergence rate of LAPD can directly imply the convergence rate of ULA by taking $g(\mathbf{w}) = 0$ and using the inequality $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \leq \text{Tr}(L^2 \mathbf{I}) = L^2 d$. Moreover, since the parameter $m > 0$ can be arbitrarily chosen, LAPD can be considered as a more general version of ULA and is able to achieve a faster convergence by properly tuning m . In particular, note that the convergence rate of LAPD is roughly $\mathcal{O}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}_m)/\epsilon)$, where \mathbf{H}_m is a union upper bound of $\nabla^2 f_m(\mathbf{w})(\nabla^2 f_m(\mathbf{w}))^\top$, where $f_m(\mathbf{w}) = U(\mathbf{w}) - m\|\mathbf{w}\|^2/2$. In contrast, the convergence rate of ULA is roughly $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}_0)/\epsilon)$, which in the worse case could be $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}_m^{1/2} + m\mathbf{I})(\mathbf{H}_m^{1/2} + m\mathbf{I})^\top)/\epsilon)$, thus can be much slower than the convergence rate of LAPD, especially when $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{1/2})$ is small.

Moreover, we can also extend the function $g(\mathbf{w}) = m\|\mathbf{w}\|^2/2$ to a more general quadratic function, e.g., $g(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{w}/2$, the additional tunable parameters in Σ provides higher flexibility to further improve the convergence rate.

Dimension-independent convergence for Gaussian mixtures. We further provide some example non-log-concave data distributions to demonstrate the efficiency of LAPD. We show that by properly choosing m , the quantity $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})$ is independent of the problem dimension d . We may consider p_* as a simple Gaussian mixture density function presented as follows $p_*(\mathbf{w}) \propto \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i\|^2\right)$, which means

$$U(\mathbf{w}) = -\ln \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K e^{\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{w} - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i\|^2} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 := f(\mathbf{w}) + g(\mathbf{w}).$$

We should note that p_* is not strongly log-concave but satisfies log-Sobolev inequality [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#). If we define $v_i = \exp(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \mathbf{w} - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i\|^2) \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the Hessian of f satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \right)^{-2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \boldsymbol{\mu}_j^\top - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\top \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \right)^{-2} \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} v_i v_j (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j) (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j)^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can set $\mathbf{H}^{1/2} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j) (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j)^\top$ that satisfies $0 \leq -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) \leq \mathbf{H}^{1/2}$.

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{1/2})^2 = \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j) (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j)^\top \right)^2 \leq 16K^4 R_\mu^4,$$

where the means of the Gaussian mixture satisfy $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i\| \leq R_\mu$. This implies that the convergence rate of LAPD only depends on the number of mixture components K and the radius of means R_μ , rather than the dimension number d due to [Theorem 4.1](#), thus can be regarded as dimension-independent.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we study the complexity of the (unadjusted) Langevin algorithm with prior diffusion, in terms of KL divergence. By carefully tracking the dynamics of our proposed algorithm and the associated discretization errors, we discover that under the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality (LSI), the algorithm's convergence can be independent of the dimensionality, applicable for both fixed and variable step sizes. This finding aligns well with the analysis provided by [Vempala and Wibisono \(2019\)](#), which offers one of the most versatile frameworks for analyzing overdamped Langevin dynamics. This alignment prompts us to propose an intriguing avenue for future research: extending our analysis to underdamped Langevin dynamics to explore the possibility of dimension-independent convergence in higher-order Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs).

Furthermore, given the typically higher dimension dependence in the convergence rates of unbiased samplers, such as the Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA) ([Dwivedi et al., 2019](#)) and proximal samplers ([Chen et al., 2020](#)), which rely on a restricted Gaussian oracle, our findings suggest a promising direction. By integrating our approach ([Alg 1](#)) with fast, unbiased sampling algorithms, we anticipate the development of novel unbiased sampling methods that boast even more rapid convergence rates. Additionally, we propose to broaden our analysis to stochastic settings, utilizing stochastic gradients for Langevin algorithm updates. We believe that the dimension dependency established in [Raginsky et al. \(2017\)](#); [Xu et al. \(2018\)](#); [Zou et al. \(2021\)](#) can be also improved.

References

- Altschuler, J. M. and Chewi, S. (2023). Faster high-accuracy log-concave sampling via algorithmic warm starts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10249*.
- Ambrosio, L., Gigli, N., and Savaré, G. (2005). *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bakry, D. and Émery, M. (1985). Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Seminaire de probabilités XIX 1983/84*, pages 177–206. Springer.
- Bakry, D., Gentil, I., Ledoux, M., et al. (2014). *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 103. Springer.
- Beck, A. and Teboulle, M. (2009). A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *Siam J Imaging Sciences*, 2(1):183–202.
- Bellman, R. (1968). Some inequalities for the square root of a positive definite matrix. *Linear Algebra and its applications*, 1(3):321–324.
- Bishop, C. M. and Nasrabadi, N. M. (2006). *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, volume 4. Springer.
- Brooks, S., Gelman, A., Jones, G., and Meng, X.-L. (2011). *Handbook of markov chain monte carlo*. CRC press.
- Chen, H.-B., Chewi, S., and Niles-Weed, J. (2021). Dimension-free log-sobolev inequalities for mixture distributions. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 281(11):109236.
- Chen, Y., Dwivedi, R., Wainwright, M. J., and Yu, B. (2020). Fast mixing of metropolized hamiltonian monte carlo: Benefits of multi-step gradients. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):3647–3717.
- Cheng, X. and Bartlett, P. (2018). Convergence of langevin mcmc in kl-divergence. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 186–211. PMLR.
- Dalalyan, A. (2017a). Further and stronger analogy between sampling and optimization: Langevin monte carlo and gradient descent. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 678–689. PMLR.
- Dalalyan, A. S. (2017b). Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(3):651–676.
- Dalalyan, A. S. and Karagulyan, A. (2019). User-friendly guarantees for the langevin monte carlo with inaccurate gradient. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(12):5278–5311.
- Durmus, A., Majewski, S., and Miasojedow, B. (2019). Analysis of langevin monte carlo via convex optimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):2666–2711.
- Durmus, A. and Moulines, E. (2019). High-dimensional bayesian inference via the unadjusted langevin algorithm. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2854–2882.

- Dwivedi, R., Chen, Y., Wainwright, M. J., and Yu, B. (2018). Log-concave sampling: Metropolis-hastings algorithms are fast! In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 793–797. PMLR.
- Dwivedi, R., Chen, Y., Wainwright, M. J., and Yu, B. (2019). Log-concave sampling: Metropolis-hastings algorithms are fast. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(183):1–42.
- Freund, Y., Ma, Y.-A., and Zhang, T. (2022). When is the convergence time of langevin algorithms dimension independent? a composite optimization viewpoint. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(214):1–32.
- Gilks, W. R., Richardson, S., and Spiegelhalter, D. (1995). *Markov chain Monte Carlo in practice*. CRC press.
- Huang, X., Dong, H., HAO, Y., Ma, Y., and Zhang, T. (2024a). Reverse diffusion monte carlo. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Huang, X., Zou, D., Dong, H., Ma, Y., and Zhang, T. (2024b). Faster sampling without isoperimetry via diffusion-based monte carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06325*.
- Jordan, M. I., Ghahramani, Z., Jaakkola, T. S., and Saul, L. K. (1999). An introduction to variational methods for graphical models. *Machine learning*, 37(2):183–233.
- Jordan, R., Kinderlehrer, D., and Otto, F. (1998). The variational formulation of the fokker–planck equation. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 29(1):1–17.
- Liu, Y., Fang, C., and Zhang, T. (2024). Double randomized underdamped langevin with dimension-independent convergence guarantee. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Ma, Y.-A., Chatterji, N., Cheng, X., Flammarion, N., Bartlett, P., and Jordan, M. I. (2019a). Is there an analog of nesterov acceleration for mcmc? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00996*.
- Ma, Y.-A., Chen, Y., Jin, C., Flammarion, N., and Jordan, M. I. (2019b). Sampling can be faster than optimization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(42):20881–20885.
- Neal, R. M. (1993). *Probabilistic inference using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods*. Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto Toronto, ON, Canada.
- Nesterov, Y. et al. (2018). *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer.
- Oksendal, B. (2013). *Stochastic differential equations: an introduction with applications*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Raginsky, M., Rakhlin, A., and Telgarsky, M. (2017). Non-convex learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics: a nonasymptotic analysis. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1674–1703. PMLR.
- Risken, H. (1996). Fokker-planck equation. In *The Fokker-Planck Equation*, pages 63–95. Springer.
- Robert, C. P., Casella, G., and Casella, G. (1999). *Monte Carlo statistical methods*, volume 2. Springer.

- Roberts, G. O. and Stramer, O. (2002). Langevin diffusions and metropolis-hastings algorithms. *Methodology and computing in applied probability*, 4(4):337–357.
- Rosky, P. J., Doll, J. D., and Friedman, H. L. (1978). Brownian dynamics as smart monte carlo simulation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 69(10):4628–4633.
- Särkkä, S. and Solin, A. (2019). *Applied stochastic differential equations*, volume 10. Cambridge University Press.
- Shen, R. and Lee, Y. T. (2019). The randomized midpoint method for log-concave sampling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Teh, Y. W., Thiery, A. H., and Vollmer, S. J. (2016). Consistency and fluctuations for stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17.
- Vempala, S. and Wibisono, A. (2019). Rapid convergence of the unadjusted langevin algorithm: Isoperimetry suffices. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Welling, M. and Teh, Y. W. (2011). Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*, pages 681–688. Citeseer.
- Wibisono, A. (2018). Sampling as optimization in the space of measures: The langevin dynamics as a composite optimization problem. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2093–3027. PMLR.
- Wibisono, A. (2019). Proximal langevin algorithm: Rapid convergence under isoperimetry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01469*.
- Xifara, T., Sherlock, C., Livingstone, S., Byrne, S., and Girolami, M. (2014). Langevin diffusions and the metropolis-adjusted langevin algorithm. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 91:14–19.
- Xu, P., Chen, J., Zou, D., and Gu, Q. (2018). Global convergence of Langevin dynamics based algorithms for nonconvex optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3126–3137.
- Zou, D., Xu, P., and Gu, Q. (2021). Faster convergence of stochastic gradient langevin dynamics for non-log-concave sampling. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1152–1162. PMLR.

A Proof of Lemma 4.3

Consider the posterior distribution with the following density function:

$$p_*(\mathbf{w}) = \exp(-U(\mathbf{w})). \quad (7)$$

Such density function can be reformulated as

$$p_*(\mathbf{w}) = \exp(-(U(\mathbf{w}) - g(\mathbf{w})) - g(\mathbf{w})) := \exp(-f(\mathbf{w}) - g(\mathbf{w})). \quad (8)$$

For simplicity, we suppose $g(\mathbf{w}) = (m/2) \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$. With the same algorithm as Freund et al. (2022), There are some different notations. Each iteration of the algorithm is divided into two stages. In this first stage, it has

$$\mathbf{w}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} - \tilde{\eta}_{k-1} \nabla f(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}). \quad (9)$$

Then, for the second stage, there is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k := \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\eta_k) = \mathbf{w}_k - \int_0^{\eta_k} \nabla g(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(s)) ds + \sqrt{2} \int_0^{\eta_k} d\mathbf{B}_t, \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{B}_t denotes the standard Brownian motion. In the following, we only consider one iteration and abbreviate $\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}$ and η_k as $\tilde{\eta}$ and η . Due to the quadratic form of $g(\mathbf{w})$, stage 2 is a standard Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) process, which implies, the transition density is given as follows

$$\tilde{p}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t') = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')}\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right].$$

Hence, conditioning on $\mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{w}'_0$, we have the probability density of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t$ is given as

$$\tilde{p}(\mathbf{w}, \eta | \mathbf{w}'_0, 0) = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m\eta})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'_0 e^{-m\eta}\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m\eta}} \right].$$

With the change of variable, i.e., Lemma C.2, we can deduce the probability density of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t$ conditioning on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$ as

$$p(\mathbf{w}, \eta | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m\eta})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - (\mathbf{w}_0 - \tilde{\eta} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) e^{-m\eta}\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m\eta}} \right].$$

Hence, conditioning on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$, we expect some transition density $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')$, solving some equivalent Itô SDE, to satisfy $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, \eta | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) = p(\mathbf{w}, \eta | \mathbf{w}_0, 0)$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, we consider the following transition density

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t') \\ &= \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \left(\mathbf{w}' - \left(e^{m(t-t')} - 1 \right) \cdot \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\tilde{\eta}} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) e^{-m(t-t')}\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + \left(1 - e^{-m(t-t')} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\tilde{\eta}} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and try to obtain the equivalent SDE. For clarity, we leave the calculation of the partial derivatives in Appendix E. Conditioning on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$, we have the following equation

$$-\frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} = \left(-m\mathbf{w}' - \frac{m\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \cdot \frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} + 1 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 p(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t', \mathbf{w}_0)}{(\partial \mathbf{w}_i)^2}. \quad (12)$$

Suppose there is an Itô SDE

$$d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t = -\boldsymbol{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)d\mathbf{B}_t.$$

Its the infinitesimal operator is given as that in Eq. 33, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}\phi(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_i \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}_i} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \phi(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}_i \partial \mathbf{w}_j} \right] \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w})^\top \right]_{ij}. \quad (13)$$

If we choose

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{w}') = -m\mathbf{w}' - \frac{m\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w}') = \sqrt{2}\mathbf{I},$$

Eq. 12 denotes that then $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}$ solves the following backward Kolmogorov equation

$$-\frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}_t, t | \mathbf{w}_s, s)}{\partial s} = \mathcal{L}p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}_t, t | \mathbf{w}_s, s), \quad p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}', s | \mathbf{w}, s) = \delta(\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}).$$

According to Lemma D.2, we can consider $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}$ as the transition density of $\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ obtained by the following SDE

$$d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t = - \left(m\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t + \frac{m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}}{e^{m\eta_k} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) dt + \sqrt{2}d\mathbf{B}_t.$$

It means, conditioning on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{t-1} = \mathbf{w}_0$, $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\eta_k}$ shares the same distribution as $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$ because

$$p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, \eta | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) = p(\mathbf{w}, \eta | \mathbf{w}_0, 0).$$

Hence, the proof is completed.

B Convergence of KL divergence under LSI

With the same setting as Appendix A, we assume $U(\mathbf{w})$ in Eq. 7 satisfies the following assumptions.

[A1] The function g is m -strongly convex and can be explicitly integrated. For simplicity, we choose $g(\mathbf{w}) = (m/2) \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$ in following sections.

[A2] L_U -smoothness of negative log-likelihood, i.e., for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we suppose

$$\|\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w})\| \preceq L\mathbf{I}.$$

[A3] Similar to the assumption in Freund et al. (2022), for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we suppose

$$\mathbf{0} \preceq \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w})(\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}))^\top \preceq \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^\top = \mathbf{H} \preceq L^2 \mathbf{I}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

[A4] The posterior distribution, $\mu_* \propto \exp(-U)$, satisfies log-Sobolev inequality (LSI). It means

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_*}[q^2 \log q^2] - \mathbb{E}_{\mu_*}[q^2] \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu_*}[q^2] \leq \frac{2}{\alpha_*} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_f} [\|\nabla q\|^2]$$

for any smooth function $q: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where

$$d\mu_*(\mathbf{w}) = \exp(- (f(\mathbf{w}) + g(\mathbf{w}))) d\mathbf{w} = \exp(-U(\mathbf{w}))d\mathbf{w}.$$

For any suitable probability density function \tilde{p}_{k-1} of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}$, we set

$$\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) := \int_{\mathbf{w}_0} p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) \cdot \tilde{p}_{k-1}(\mathbf{w}_0) d\mathbf{w}_0,$$

where $p_{\mathbf{w}_0}$ is defined in Eq. 11, and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) &:= p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) \\ \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) &:= \tilde{p}_{k-1}(\mathbf{w}_0) \cdot p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}_0, 0) \end{aligned}$$

for abbreviation. According to Appendix A, we have $\hat{p}_{\eta_k}(\mathbf{w}) = \tilde{p}_k(\mathbf{w})$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where \tilde{p}_k denotes the density function of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$. It also implies

$$\text{KL}(\hat{p}_{\eta_k} \| p^*) = \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{KL}(\hat{p}_0 \| p^*) = \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_{k-1} \| p^*).$$

B.1 Proof of Lemma 4.4

Conditioning on \mathbf{w}_0 , the Kolmogorov forward equation (Fokker-Planck equation), i.e., Lemma D.1, shows

$$\frac{\partial \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0)}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}^* \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) = \nabla \cdot \left(\hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) \left(m\mathbf{w} + \frac{m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}}{e^{m\eta_k} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \right) + \Delta \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0),$$

where \mathcal{L}^* is adjoint operator of \mathcal{L} given in Eq. 13. In this condition, we set

$$(m\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}) / (e^{m\eta_k} - 1) = 1 \tag{14}$$

in the following. It means the evolution of p_t can be derived as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{\partial t} &= \int \frac{\partial \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0)}{\partial t} p_0(\mathbf{w}_0) d\mathbf{w}_0 \\ &= \int [\nabla \cdot (\hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0))) + \Delta \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0)] p_0(\mathbf{w}_0) d\mathbf{w}_0 \\ &= \int \nabla \cdot (\hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0))) d\mathbf{w}_0 + \int \Delta \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{w}_0 \\ &= \nabla \cdot \left(\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \int \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0 | \mathbf{w}) (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) \right) + \Delta \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Hence, the dynamic of KL divergence can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d\text{KL}(\hat{p}_t \| p_*)}{dt} \\
&= \frac{d}{dt} \int \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} d\mathbf{w} = \int \frac{\partial \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{\partial t} \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} d\mathbf{w} \\
&= \int \left[\nabla \cdot \left(\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \int \hat{p}_{0|t}(\mathbf{w}_0 | \mathbf{w}) (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) \right) + \Delta \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \right] \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} d\mathbf{w} \\
&= \int \nabla \cdot \left(\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \left(\int \hat{p}_{0|t}(\mathbf{w}_0 | \mathbf{w}) (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) d\mathbf{w}_0 + \nabla \log \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \right) \right) \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} d\mathbf{w} \\
&= - \int \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \left[\nabla \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} + \int \hat{p}_{0|t}(\mathbf{w}_0 | \mathbf{w}) (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) d\mathbf{w}_0 - (m\mathbf{w} + \nabla f(\mathbf{w})) \right] \\
&\quad \nabla \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} d\mathbf{w} \\
&= - \int \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \left\| \nabla \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w} - \underbrace{\int \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) (\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}))^\top \nabla \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} d(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w})}_{\text{term 1}} \\
&\leq -\frac{3}{4} \int \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \left\| \nabla \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w} + \underbrace{\int \hat{p}_{0t}(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w})\|^2 d(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w})}_{\text{term 1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we start to upper bound term 1 of Eq. 16. For abbreviation, we set

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0) = e^{-mt} \mathbf{w}_0 - \frac{1 - e^{-mt}}{m} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0),$$

and have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{term 1} &= \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \int \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{w}_0 \\
&= \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \int \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) + \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{w}_0 \\
&\leq 2 \underbrace{\int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \int \hat{p}_{t|0}(\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0))\|^2 d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{w}_0}_{\text{term 1.1}} \\
&\quad + 2 \underbrace{\int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 d\mathbf{w}_0}_{\text{term 1.2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

We first consider term 1.1. Following from Lemma C.3, for any $\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)$ we have

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0))\|^2 \leq (\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0))^\top \mathbf{H} (\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) = \left\| \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) \right\|^2$$

According to the transition kernel conditioning on \mathbf{w}_0 shown in Eq. 11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{term 1.1} &= \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \int \left(\frac{2\pi(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)\|^2}{1-e^{-2mt}}\right) \cdot \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0))\|^2 d\mathbf{w}d\mathbf{w}_0 \\
&\leq \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \int \left(\frac{2\pi(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)\|^2}{1-e^{-2mt}}\right) \cdot \left\| \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w}d\mathbf{w}_0 \\
&= \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \sum_{i=1}^d \text{var}_{\mathbf{w} \sim \hat{p}_{t|0}} \left[[\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{w}]_i \right] d\mathbf{w}_0 = \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \text{Tr} \left(\text{cov} \left[\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{w} \right] \right) d\mathbf{w}_0 \\
&= \frac{1-e^{-2mt}}{m} \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) d\mathbf{w}_0 = \frac{1-e^{-2mt}}{m} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}),
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the fourth equation follows from the definition of $\hat{p}_{t|0}$ and Lemma C.4.

Similar to term 1.1, following from Lemma C.3, term 1.2 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 &\leq (\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0) - \mathbf{w}_0)^\top \mathbf{H} (\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0) - \mathbf{w}_0) \\
&= \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot (m\mathbf{w}_0 + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0))^\top \mathbf{H} (m\mathbf{w}_0 + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)) \\
&= \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \nabla U(\mathbf{w}_0)^\top \mathbf{H} \nabla U(\mathbf{w}_0)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, suppose $\mathbf{w}_0 \sim \hat{p}_0$ and $\mathbf{w}^* \sim p_*$ with an optimal coupling $(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w}_0) \sim \gamma$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{term 1.2} &= \int \hat{p}_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \|\nabla f(\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t, \mathbf{w}_0)) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 d\mathbf{w}_0 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \int \gamma(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w}_0) \left\| \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\nabla U(\mathbf{w}_0) - \nabla U(\mathbf{w}^*)) + \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla U(\mathbf{w}^*) \right\|^2 d(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w}_0) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \int 2L^2(L+m)^2 \cdot \gamma(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w}_0) \|\mathbf{w}^* - \mathbf{w}_0\|^2 d(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w}_0) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \int 2p_*(\mathbf{w}^*) \left\| \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla U(\mathbf{w}^*) \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w}^* \\
&= 2L^2(L+m)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{2}{\alpha_*} \text{KL}(\hat{p}_0 \| p_*) + 2 \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \int p_*(\mathbf{w}^*) \left\| \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla U(\mathbf{w}^*) \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w}^*
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

For the last term, it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int p_*(\mathbf{w}^*) \left\| \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla U(\mathbf{w}^*) \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w}^* = \int \nabla p_*^\top(\mathbf{w}^*) \mathbf{H} \nabla \ln p_*(\mathbf{w}^*) d\mathbf{w}^* \\
&= \int p_*(\mathbf{w}^*) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H} (-\nabla^2 \ln p_*(\mathbf{w}^*))) d\mathbf{w}^* \\
&= \int p_*(\mathbf{w}^*) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H} (\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}^*) + m\mathbf{I})) d\mathbf{w}^* \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma C.1. Therefore, we have

$$\text{term 1.2} \leq \left(\frac{L}{m} \right)^2 \cdot (1-e^{-mt})^2 \cdot \left(\frac{4(L+m)^2}{\alpha_*} \text{KL}(p_0 \| p_*) + \frac{2}{L^2} \left(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \right) \tag{19}$$

Combining Eq. 16, Eq. 16, Eq. 17 and Eq. 19, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*)}{dt} &\leq -\frac{3}{4} \int \hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w}) \left\| \nabla \log \frac{\hat{p}_t(\mathbf{w})}{p_*(\mathbf{w})} \right\|^2 d\mathbf{w} + \frac{2(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{L}{m} \right)^2 \cdot (1-e^{-mt})^2 \cdot \left(\frac{4(L+m)^2}{\alpha_*} \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + \frac{2}{L^2} \left(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by LSI of p_* , i.e., [A4], it has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*)}{dt} &\leq -\frac{3\alpha_*}{2} \cdot \text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*) + \frac{2(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{L}{m} \right)^2 \cdot (1-e^{-mt})^2 \cdot \left(\frac{4(L+m)^2}{\alpha_*} \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + \frac{2}{L^2} \left(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We wish to integrate the inequality above for $0 \leq t \leq \eta$. If we require

$$\eta \leq \min \left\{ (8m)^{-1}, (8 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{1/2}))^{-1}, (1.5\alpha_*)^{-1}, \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2} \right\}, \quad (21)$$

then it has

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(1-e^{-mt})^2}{m^2} \cdot 4 \left(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \cdot \frac{1-e^{-2mt}}{2m} \cdot 4 \left(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \cdot 4t \left(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{3/2}) + m \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \leq \frac{2(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the first inequality follows from the monotonicity of e^{-x} , the second inequality follows from the fact $(1-e^{-mt})/m \leq t$ for any $m \geq 0$, and the last inequality establishes by choice of η , i.e., Eq. 21 and $t \leq \eta$. Plugging Eq. 22 into Eq. 20, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*)}{dt} &\leq -\frac{3\alpha_*}{2} \cdot \text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*) + \frac{8(L+m)^2L^2}{\alpha_*} \cdot \left(\frac{1-e^{-mt}}{m} \right)^2 \cdot \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + \frac{4(1-e^{-2mt})}{m} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &\leq -\frac{3\alpha_*}{2} \cdot \text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*) + \frac{8(L+m)^2L^2}{\alpha_*} \eta^2 \cdot \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + 8\eta \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Multiplying both sides by $\exp((3\alpha_*t)/2)$, then we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{\frac{3\alpha_*t}{2}} \text{KL}(\hat{p}_t\|p_*) \right) \leq e^{\frac{3\alpha_*t}{2}} \left(\frac{8(L+m)^2L^2}{\alpha_*} \eta^2 \cdot \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + 8\eta \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right).$$

By integrating from $t = 0$ to $t = \eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\frac{3\alpha_*\eta}{2}} \text{KL}(\hat{p}_\eta\|p_*) - \text{KL}(\hat{p}_0\|p_*) &\leq \frac{2}{3\alpha_*} \cdot \left(e^{\frac{3\alpha_*\eta}{2}} - 1 \right) \cdot \left(\frac{8(L+m)^2L^2}{\alpha_*} \eta^2 \cdot \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + 8\eta \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right) \\ &\leq 2\eta \cdot \left(\frac{8(L+m)^2L^2}{\alpha_*} \eta^2 \cdot \text{KL}(p_0\|p_*) + 8\eta \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from

$$e^c \leq 1 + 2c \quad \text{when } c \in [0, 1]$$

by choosing $c = (3\alpha_*\eta)/(2)$. The range of $(3\alpha_*\eta)/(2)$ can be obtained by Eq. 21. Hence, we have

$$\text{KL}(\hat{p}_\eta \| p_*) \leq e^{-\frac{3\alpha_*\eta}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{16(L+m)L^2}{\alpha_*} \eta^3 \right) \text{KL}(\hat{p}_0 \| p_*) + e^{-\frac{3\alpha_*\eta}{2}} \cdot 16\eta^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}).$$

Without loss of generality, we suppose $m \leq L$, then because of Eq. 21, we have

$$1 + \frac{16(L+m)L^2}{\alpha_*} \eta^3 \leq 1 + \frac{64L^4}{\alpha_*} \eta^3 \leq 1 + \frac{\alpha_*\eta}{2} \leq e^{\frac{1}{2}\alpha_*\eta}.$$

Combining the previous inequality with the fact $\exp(-(3\alpha_*)/2) \leq 1$, it has

$$\text{KL}(\hat{p}_\eta \| p_*) \leq e^{-\alpha_*\eta} \text{KL}(\hat{p}_0 \| p_*) + 16\eta^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}). \quad (24)$$

Hence, the proof is completed.

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Suppose η_k is fixed for all iterations, which implies $\tilde{\eta}_{k-1}$ can also be obtained by Eq. 14. Then, applying the recursion of Eq. 24, we have

$$\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) \leq e^{-\alpha_*\eta k} \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*) + \frac{16\eta^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{1 - e^{-\alpha_*\eta}} \leq e^{-\alpha_*\eta k} \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*) + \frac{32\eta}{\alpha_*} \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}),$$

where the last inequality follows from

$$1 - e^{-c} \geq \frac{3}{4}c \quad \text{when } c \in \left[0, \frac{1}{4}\right].$$

By supposing $c = \alpha_*\eta$, we have

$$\eta \leq \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2} \leq \frac{1}{4\alpha_*} \Rightarrow c := \alpha_*\eta \quad \text{and} \quad c \in \left[0, \frac{1}{4}\right].$$

Hence, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we set

$$\eta \leq \min \left\{ (8m)^{-1}, (8 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}))^{-1}, (1.5\alpha_*)^{-1}, \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2}, \frac{\alpha_*\epsilon}{64\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})} \right\}, \quad (25)$$

then it has

$$\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) \leq e^{-\alpha_*\eta k} \text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

In this condition, requiring

$$k \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_*\eta} \log \frac{2\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*)}{\epsilon},$$

we have $\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) \leq \epsilon$, and the proof is completed.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Using the step size $\eta_k = (8\hat{\eta})/9$ where

$$\hat{\eta} := \min \left\{ (8m)^{-1}, (8 \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}))^{-1}, (1.5\alpha_*)^{-1}, \frac{\alpha_*}{8\sqrt{2}L^2} \right\},$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) &\leq e^{-\alpha_* k \cdot 8\hat{\eta}/9} \operatorname{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*) + \frac{24 \cdot \left(\frac{8\hat{\eta}}{9}\right)^2 \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{1 - e^{-\alpha_* \cdot 8\hat{\eta}/9}} \\ &\leq e^{-\alpha_* k \cdot 8\hat{\eta}/9} \operatorname{KL}(\tilde{p}_0 \| p_*) + \frac{32}{\alpha_*} \cdot \frac{8\hat{\eta}}{9} \cdot \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &\leq \frac{123\hat{\eta}}{\alpha_*} \cdot \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) + \frac{32}{\alpha_*} \cdot \frac{8\hat{\eta}}{9} \cdot \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \leq \frac{2^9 \cdot \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \cdot \frac{8\hat{\eta}}{9} = \frac{64\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \eta_{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 4.1. Starting from iteration K_0 , we use the decreasing step size

$$\eta_{k+1} = \frac{8\hat{\eta}}{9 + 3(k - K_0)c\alpha_*}.$$

Let us show by induction over k that

$$\operatorname{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) \leq \frac{2^9 \cdot \hat{\eta} \cdot \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{3\alpha_* (3 + (k - K_0)c\alpha_*)} = \frac{64\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \eta_{k+1}, \quad k \geq K_0. \quad (27)$$

For $k = K_0$, this inequality is true in view of Eq. 26. Assume Eq. 27 establishes at iteration k . For $k + 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{KL}(\tilde{p}_{k+1} \| p_*) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{3}{4}\alpha_*\eta_{k+1}\right) \operatorname{KL}(\tilde{p}_k \| p_*) + 24\eta_{k+1}^2 \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{3}{4}\alpha_*\eta_{k+1}\right) \cdot \frac{64\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \cdot \eta_{k+1} + 24\eta_{k+1}^2 \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &= \frac{64\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \cdot \eta_{k+1} - 24\eta_{k+1}^2 \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H}) \\ &= \frac{64\operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \eta_{k+1} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{3}{8}\alpha_*\eta_{k+1}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c\alpha_*}{1 + (k - K_0 + 1)c\alpha_*} &\leq \frac{c\alpha_*}{1 + (k - K_0)c\alpha_*} \\ \Leftrightarrow 1 - \frac{c\alpha_*}{1 + (k - K_0)c\alpha_*} &\leq \frac{1 + (k - K_0)c\alpha_*}{1 + (k - K_0 + 1)c\alpha_*} \\ \Leftrightarrow 1 - \frac{c\alpha_*}{1 + (k - K_0)c\alpha_*} &\leq \frac{8c}{3 + 3(k - K_0 + 1)c\alpha_*} \cdot \frac{3 + 3(k - K_0)c\alpha_*}{8c} \\ \Leftrightarrow \left(1 - \frac{3}{8}\alpha_*\eta_{k+1}\right) \eta_{k+1} &\leq \eta_{k+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this inequality into Eq. 28, we have

$$\text{KL}(\tilde{p}_{k+1} \| p_*) \leq \frac{64\text{Tr}(\mathbf{H})}{\alpha_*} \eta_{k+2}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

C Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma C.1. (Theorem 1.a in [Bellman \(1968\)](#)) If $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B} \succeq \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{A}^{\frac{1}{2}} \succeq \mathbf{B}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $\mathbf{A}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is semi-positive definite square root of \mathbf{A} .

Lemma C.2. Suppose the joint density function of random variables \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} is denoted as $p_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, the marginal density function of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are denoted as $p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y})$ respectively, and the conditional probability density function of \mathbf{y} given the occurrence of the value \mathbf{x} of \mathbf{x} can be written as

$$p_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{p_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y})}.$$

Consider another random variable \mathbf{z} satisfying $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})$ where $\mathbf{T}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is bijective and differential. We have

$$p_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) = p_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})).$$

Proof. According to the change of variable, we have

$$p_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}) = p_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})) |\det(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z}))|,$$

and

$$p_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = p_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})) |\det(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z}))|.$$

Then, we have

$$p_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) = \frac{p_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{p_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})} = \frac{p_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})) |\det(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z}))|}{p_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})) |\det(\nabla_{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z}))|} = p_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{z})).$$

Hence, the proof is completed. □

Lemma C.3. Suppose function f satisfies [\[A3\]](#), for any $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}')\|^2 \leq (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}')^{\mathbf{H}} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}').$$

Proof. We first define the following two functions

$$\begin{aligned} g(t) &:= \nabla f(\mathbf{w} + t(\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})) \\ g'(t) &:= \mathbf{H}(t) (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}) = \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w} + t(\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})) \cdot (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}) \end{aligned}$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{w}') - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}) = g(1) - g(0) = \int_0^1 g'(t) dt = \int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(t) dt \cdot (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}).$$

It implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{w}')\|^2 &= (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})^\top \left(\int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(t) dt \right)^\top \left(\int_0^1 \mathbf{H}(t) dt \right) (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}) \\
&\leq (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})^\top \int_0^1 \int_0^t \left[\mathbf{H}^\top(t) \mathbf{H}(t') + \mathbf{H}^\top(t') \mathbf{H}(t) \right] dt' dt (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}) \\
&\leq (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})^\top \int_0^1 \int_0^t \left[\mathbf{H}^\top(t) \mathbf{H}(t) + \mathbf{H}^\top(t') \mathbf{H}(t') \right] dt' dt (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}) \\
&\leq (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})^\top \int_0^1 \int_0^t 2\mathbf{H} dt' dt (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}) \\
&= (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{H} (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from

$$(\mathbf{H}(t) - \mathbf{H}(t'))^\top (\mathbf{H}(t) - \mathbf{H}(t')) \succeq \mathbf{0},$$

and the last inequality follows from [\[A3\]](#). Hence, the proof is completed. \square

Lemma C.4. For a random (column) vector \mathbf{w} with mean vector $\mathbf{m} = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{w})$, the covariance matrix is defined as

$$\text{cov}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{m})(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{m})^\top \right].$$

Thus, for any fixed $\mathbf{Q}: \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, the covariance of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}$, whose mean vector is $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{m}$, is given as $\mathbf{A}\text{cov}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{A}^\top$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{m})(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{m})^\top \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{m})(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{m})^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \right] \\
&= \mathbf{A} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{m})(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{m})^\top \right] \mathbf{A}^\top \\
&= \mathbf{A}\text{cov}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{A}^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the proof is completed. \square

Lemma C.5. Assume the density function $p_* = e^{-U}$, where U can be decomposed as Eq. 8, satisfies [\[A2\]](#) and [\[A3\]](#). Then, we have

$$\int p_*(\mathbf{w}) \|\nabla U(\mathbf{w})\|^2 d\mathbf{w} = \int p_*(\mathbf{w}) \|\nabla f(\mathbf{w}) + m\mathbf{w}\|^2 d\mathbf{w} \leq \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + md.$$

Proof. Since $p_* = e^{-U}$, due to the integration by parts we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_*} \left[\|\nabla U\|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{p_*} [\Delta U]. \quad (29)$$

For each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we suppose $\nabla^2 U(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{V}\Sigma\mathbf{V}^\top$, where the i -th column vector \mathbf{v}_i of \mathbf{V} denotes the i -th eigenvector and σ_i denotes the corresponding eigenvalue satisfying

$$\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r \geq m \geq \sigma_{(r+1)} \geq \dots \geq \sigma_d.$$

According to the decomposition of U , we have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) &= \nabla^2 U(\mathbf{w}) - m\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{V}(\Sigma - m\mathbf{I})\mathbf{V}^\top \\ &\preceq \mathbf{V} \text{diag}\{(\sigma_1 - m), (\sigma_2 - m), \dots, (\sigma_r - m), 0, \dots, 0\} \mathbf{V}^\top \preceq \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from

$$\sum_{i=1}^r (\sigma_i - m)^2 \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \preceq \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}) (\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{w}))^\top = \sum_{i=1}^d (\sigma_i - m)^2 \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \preceq \mathbf{H},$$

and Lemma C.1. In this condition, we have

$$\text{Tr}(\nabla^2 U(\mathbf{w})) \leq \text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} + m\mathbf{I}\right) = \text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + md.$$

Combining this inequality with Eq. 29, we can complete the proof. \square

Lemma C.6. *Assume $p_* = e^U$, where U can be decomposed as Eq. 8, satisfies [A2]-[A3]. It implies the establishment of Talagrand's inequality with constant α_* , and $L + m$ smooth. For any p ,*

$$\int p(\mathbf{w}) \|\nabla U(\mathbf{w})\|^2 d\mathbf{w} \leq \frac{4(L + m)^2}{\alpha_*} \text{KL}(p \| p_*) + 2\text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + 2md.$$

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{w} \sim p$ and $\mathbf{w}_* \sim p_*$ with an optimal coupling $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_*) \sim \gamma$ and $W_2^2(p, p_*) = \mathbb{E}_\gamma \left[\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_*\|^2 \right]$. Due to the $L + m$ smoothness of U , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla U(\mathbf{w})\| &= \|\nabla U(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla U(\mathbf{w}_*)\| + \|\nabla U(\mathbf{w}_*)\| \\ &\leq (L + m) \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_*\| + \|\nabla U(\mathbf{w}_*)\|\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_p \left[\|\nabla U(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \right] &\leq 2(L + m)^2 \mathbb{E}_\gamma \left[\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_*\|^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E}_{p_*} \left[\|\nabla U(\mathbf{w}_*)\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2(L + m)^2 W_2^2(p, p_*) + 2\text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + 2md \\ &\leq \frac{4(L + m)^2}{\alpha_*} \text{KL}(p \| p_*) + 2\text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + 2md,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma C.5 and the third inequality follows from Talagrand's inequality. \square

D Background on Kolmogorov equations and transition density

Our analysis relies on the theory of Markov diffusion operators. In this section of the Appendix, we summarize some key ideas and results; the book Bakry et al. (2014) and Särkkä and Solin (2019) provide a more detailed exposition.

Suppose $\{\mathbf{w}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a continuous-time homogeneous Markov process with values in \mathbb{R}^d . Then, we define one Markov semigroup as

$$\mathcal{P}_t \phi(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathbf{w}_t | \mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{w})] \tag{30}$$

for all bounded measurable function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Such a semigroup can be driven by an infinitesimal operator defined as

$$\mathcal{L}\phi(\mathbf{w}) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{P}_\tau \phi(\mathbf{w}) - \phi(\mathbf{w})}{\tau}. \quad (31)$$

Due to the semigroup property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathcal{P}_t &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{P}_{t+\tau} - \mathcal{P}_t}{\tau} = \mathcal{P}_t \left[\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{P}_\tau - \mathcal{I}}{\tau} \right] = \mathcal{P}_t \mathcal{L} \\ &= \left[\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{P}_\tau - \mathcal{I}}{\tau} \right] \mathcal{P}_t = \mathcal{L} \mathcal{P}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where the second and the fourth equation follows from the linear property of semigroup \mathcal{P}_t .

Specifically, for an Itô process that solves the following SDE

$$d\mathbf{w}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{w}_t, t)dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w}_t, t)d\mathbf{B}_t, \quad (32)$$

where $\{\mathbf{B}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the standard Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^d with $\mathbf{B}_t = \mathbf{0}$, the generator of \mathbf{w}_t is given as

$$\mathcal{L}\phi(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_i \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_i} \mu_i(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \phi(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_i \partial w_j} \right] \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w})^\top \right]_{ij} \quad (33)$$

by definition Eq. 31. Here, we suppose \mathbf{w}_t is time-invariant, which implies $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ in SDE. 32 will not explicitly depend on time t .

Then, we will establish the connection between \mathcal{L} and forward Kolmogorov equation (Fokker-Planck equation) with an operator formulation. Suppose $\mathbf{w}_t \sim p_t$, with a bit of abuse of notation, p_t denotes the density function. In this condition, the expectation of a function ϕ at time t is given as

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathbf{w}_t)] = \langle \phi, p_t \rangle := \int \phi(\mathbf{w}) p_t(\mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{w},$$

which implies

$$\frac{d \langle \phi, p_t \rangle}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \int p_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \mathcal{P}_t \phi(\mathbf{w}_0) d\mathbf{w}_0 = \int p_0(\mathbf{w}_0) \mathcal{P}_t \mathcal{L} \phi(\mathbf{w}_0) d\mathbf{w}_0 = \langle \mathcal{L} \phi, p_t \rangle.$$

Note that the second equation follows from the definition of \mathcal{L} . Using the adjoint operator \mathcal{L}^* , we can write the previous equation as

$$\frac{d \langle \phi, p_t \rangle}{dt} = \left\langle \phi, \frac{\partial p_t}{\partial t} \right\rangle = \langle \mathcal{L} \phi, p_t \rangle = \langle \phi, \mathcal{L}^* p_t \rangle. \quad (34)$$

Due to the arbitrary of ϕ , Eq. 34 can only be true if

$$\frac{\partial p_t}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}^* p_t. \quad (35)$$

For the infinitesimal operator Eq. 33 of Itô SDE, its adjoint operator is given as

$$\mathcal{L}^* \phi(\mathbf{w}) = - \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} (\mu_i(\mathbf{w}) \phi(\mathbf{w})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_i \partial w_j} \left(\left[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{w})^\top \right]_{ij} \right). \quad (36)$$

In this condition, Eq. 35 is exactly the operator appearing in the forward Kolmogorov equation.

For all Itô processes, the solution to the corresponding SDE. 32, satisfies the Markov property, which means

$$p_t \left(\cdot \mid \{ \mathbf{w}_s \}_{s \in [t, 0]} \right) = p_t (\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}_s).$$

This result can be found, for example, in Oksendal (2013). Hence, in a probability sense, the transition density $p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s)$ not only characterizes Itô processes but also be a solution to the forward Kolmogorov equation with a degenerate (Dirac delta) initial density concentrated on \mathbf{w}_s at time s .

Lemma D.1. (Theorem 5.10 in Särkkä and Solin (2019)) *The transition density $p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s)$ of SDE. 32, where $t \geq s$ is the solution of forward Komolgorov equation 35 with the initial condition $p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s) = \delta(\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_s)$ at $t = s$. It means*

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s)}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}^* p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s), \quad p(\mathbf{w}', s \mid \mathbf{w}, s) = \delta(\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}).$$

Interestingly, the transition density also satisfies another equation, the backward Kolmogorov equation, as follows

Lemma D.2. (Theorem 5.11 in Särkkä and Solin (2019)) *The transition density $p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s)$ of SDE. 32, where $t \geq s$ is the solution of backward Komolgorov equation*

$$-\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s)}{\partial s} = \mathcal{L} p(\mathbf{w}_t, t \mid \mathbf{w}_s, s), \quad p(\mathbf{w}', s \mid \mathbf{w}, s) = \delta(\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}).$$

E Proof of Equation 12

Following from Appendix A, we suppose

$$p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t \mid \mathbf{w}', t') = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\tilde{\eta}} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right].$$

For abbreviation, we set

$$l_1(\mathbf{w}', t) = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2}$$

$$l_2(\mathbf{w}', t) = \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\tilde{\eta}} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right].$$

Considering the partial derivative of l_1 w.r.t. t' , we have

$$\frac{\partial \left(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')} \right)}{\partial t'} = (-2m) \cdot e^{-2m(t-t')}. \quad (37)$$

By the chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial l_1(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} &= -\frac{d}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2-1} \cdot \frac{2\pi}{m} \cdot \frac{\partial (1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{\partial t'} \\ &= 2\pi d \cdot \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2-1} \cdot e^{-2m(t-t')}.\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

Then, we consider the partial derivative of l_2 w.r.t. t' , and set

$$\begin{aligned}l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t') &= \left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2 \\ l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t') &= 1 - e^{-2m(t-t')} \\ \Rightarrow l_2(\mathbf{w}', t') &= \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')} \right].\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} &= 2 \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{\partial \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right)}{\partial t'} \\ &= 2 \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(-e^{-m(t-t')} m \cdot \mathbf{w}' - e^{-m(t-t')} \cdot m \cdot \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \cdot \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \\ &= -2me^{-m(t-t')} \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\mathbf{w}' + \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

partial derivative of $l_{2.2}$ w.r.t. t' is provided by Eq. 37, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} = (-2m) \cdot e^{-2m(t-t')}.\tag{40}$$

In this condition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial l_2(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} &= \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')} \right] \cdot \frac{-m}{2} \cdot (l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')) \cdot \\ &\quad \left(\left(\frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} \right) \cdot l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t') - l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t') \left(\frac{\partial l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} \right) \right) \\ &= \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')} \right] \cdot \frac{-m}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} \right) \cdot l_{2.2}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}', t') \\ &\quad + \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')} \right] \cdot \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{l_{2.2}^2(\mathbf{w}', t')} \cdot \frac{\partial l_{2.2}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'}\end{aligned}$$

Plugging Eq. 39 and Eq. 40 into the previous equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial l_2(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} &= \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right) \cdot \frac{m^2 e^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{w}' + \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \\
&\quad - \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right) \cdot \frac{m^2 e^{-2m(t-t')}}{(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})^2} \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Combining Eq. 38 and Eq. 41, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} &= \frac{\partial (l_1(\mathbf{w}', t') l_2(\mathbf{w}', t'))}{\partial t'} = \frac{\partial l_1(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} \cdot l_2(\mathbf{w}', t') + l_1(\mathbf{w}', t') \cdot \frac{\partial l_2(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'} \\
&= \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot 2\pi d \cdot \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2-1} \cdot e^{-2m(t-t')} \\
&\quad + \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \left[\frac{m^2 e^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \cdot \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \left(\mathbf{w}' + \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) - \frac{m^2 e^{-2m(t-t')}}{(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})^2} \cdot \left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2 \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Next, we consider the partial derivative of l_1 w.r.t. \mathbf{w}' . We have

$$\frac{\partial l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} = \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0)$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} &= l_1(\mathbf{w}', t') \cdot \frac{\partial l_2(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} = l_1(\mathbf{w}', t') \cdot l_2(\mathbf{w}', t') \cdot \frac{-m}{2(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})} \cdot \frac{\partial l_{2.1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} \\
&= \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{m e^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \cdot \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}' e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Then, we can easily obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^2 p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'_i \partial \mathbf{w}'_i} = \partial \left(l_1(\mathbf{w}', t') \cdot l_2(\mathbf{w}', t') \cdot \frac{-m}{2(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})} \cdot \frac{\partial l_{2,1}(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} \right)_i / \partial \mathbf{w}'_i \\
& = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \frac{me^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \cdot \left[\left(-e^{-m(t-t')} \right) \cdot l_2(\mathbf{w}', t') \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\partial l_2(\mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'_i} \cdot \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right)_i \right] \\
& = \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \frac{me^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \cdot \\
& \quad \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right) \cdot (-e^{-m(t-t')}) \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \frac{m^2 e^{-2m(t-t')}}{(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})^2} \cdot \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right)_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In this condition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(-m\mathbf{w}' - \frac{m\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \cdot \frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial \mathbf{w}'} + 1 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 p(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t', \mathbf{w}_0)}{(\partial \mathbf{w}_i)^2} \\
& = - \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right] \\
& \quad \cdot \frac{me^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \cdot \left(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \cdot \left(m\mathbf{w}' + \frac{m\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right) \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \frac{m^2 e^{-2m(t-t')}}{(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})^2} \cdot \left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{2\pi(1 - e^{-2m(t-t')})}{m} \right)^{-d/2} \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\left\| \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'e^{-m(t-t')} + (1 - e^{-m(t-t')}) \cdot \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{e^{m\eta} - 1} \right) \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_0) \right\|^2}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot d \cdot \frac{me^{-m(t-t')}}{1 - e^{-2m(t-t')}} \cdot (-e^{-m(t-t')}) \\
& = - \frac{\partial p_{\mathbf{w}_0}(\mathbf{w}, t | \mathbf{w}', t')}{\partial t'},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation can be obtained by comparing the result with Eq. 42 Hence, Eq. 12 is established.