

Non-Asymptotic Convergence of Discrete Diffusion Models: Masked and Random Walk dynamics

Giovanni Conforti², Alain Durmus¹, Le-Tuyet-Nhi Pham^{1*}, and
Gaël Raoul¹

¹École Polytechnique, CMAP, IP Paris, Palaiseau, France

²Department of Mathematics, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

*Correspondence to: le-tuyet-nhi.pham@polytechnique.edu

Abstract

Diffusion models for continuous state spaces based on Gaussian noising processes are now relatively well understood, as many works have focused on their theoretical analysis. In contrast, results for diffusion models on discrete state spaces remain limited and pose significant challenges, particularly due to their combinatorial structure and their more recent introduction in generative modelling. In this work, we establish new and sharp convergence guarantees for three popular discrete diffusion models (DDMs). Two of these models are designed for finite state spaces and are based respectively on the random walk and the masking process. The third DDM we consider is defined on the countably infinite space \mathbb{N}^d and uses a drifted random walk as its forward process. For each of these models, the backward process can be characterized by a discrete score function that can, in principle, be estimated. However, even with perfect access to these scores, simulating the exact backward process is infeasible, and one must rely on approximations. In this work, we study Euler-type approximations and establish convergence bounds in both Kullback–Leibler divergence and total variation distance for the resulting models, under minimal assumptions on the data distribution. In particular, we show that the computational complexity of each method scales *linearly in the dimension, up to logarithmic factors*. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, this study provides the *first non-asymptotic* convergence guarantees for these noising processes that do not rely on boundedness assumptions on the estimated score.

1 Introduction

Diffusion Models (DMs) have established themselves as a fundamental tool for the generation of complex, high-dimensional data, including images (see, *e.g.*, [Rombach et al., 2022](#); [Ramesh et al., 2022](#)), audio ([Chen et al., 2020](#); [Kong et al., 2020](#)), and video ([Ho et al., 2022](#); [Villegas et al., 2022](#); [Bar-Tal et al., 2024](#)). In essence, DMs define a forward process governed by stochastic differential equations (SDEs) that progressively corrupt the data with noise until it reaches an easy-to-sample prior distribution, and then learn the corresponding reverse dynamics to reconstruct samples from this prior back to the data distribution. In their continuous-time formulation, DMs benefit from a rigorous theoretical foundation and an analytically stable learning objective ([Song et al., 2021](#); [Chen et al., 2022a](#); [Dockhorn et al., 2021](#); [Conforti et al., 2025](#)).

By contrast, Discrete Diffusion Models (DDMs) continue to pose significant challenges. Multiple diffusion-based methods have recently been proposed for discrete spaces ([Austin et al., 2021](#); [Shi et al., 2024](#); [Campbell et al., 2022](#); [Holderrieth et al., 2024](#); [Ren et al., 2024](#)), or spaces of mixed type ([Bertazzi et al., 2024](#)), but there is still no consensus on which approach is theoretically sound or most practically efficient. Various formulations

rely on complex forward kernels or computationally unstable ratio-based estimators for backward transitions, leading to limited convergence guarantees and high computational costs in high dimensions. Furthermore, recent studies on discrete diffusion models have introduced valuable theoretical tools (Campbell et al., 2022; Holderrieth et al., 2024; Ren et al., 2024), yet most approaches remain either too generic or rely on strong assumptions, limiting their scalability and stability during training. Recently, Bach and Saremi (2025) and Le-Tuyet-Nhi et al. obtained sharp convergence guarantees for data supported on the hypercube under mild assumptions, and Liang et al. (2025a) established error bounds for masked diffusion processes on \mathbb{Z}_m^d . However, these approaches are either tailored to the hypercube or rely on uniform boundedness conditions on the estimated score, and none extend to the countably infinite setting \mathbb{N}^d .

Contributions. This paper bridges these gaps by establishing theoretical guarantees for DDMs driven by masked and random walk dynamics, applicable to discrete data supported on both the finite space \mathbb{Z}_m^d and the countably infinite space \mathbb{N}^d , where Anonymous (2025) have demonstrated the necessity and strong empirical performance of such models. Specifically, we study DDMs driven by random walks on the cycle \mathbb{Z}_m^d , and establish the non-asymptotic error bounds that does not depend on the boundedness of the estimated score by leveraging the score monotonicity. For the random walk defined on \mathbb{N}^d , we further demonstrate that a similar type of bound holds under the mild assumption that the data distribution admits a finite second moment. Notably, this yields the *first rigorous convergence analysis* for data supported on the *countably infinite state space* \mathbb{N}^d . In addition, we investigate the widely adopted masked diffusion model for discrete data, originally introduced by Austin et al. (2021), which has demonstrated strong empirical performance in recent studies (Shi et al., 2024; Chao et al., 2025). This study provides the first *non-asymptotic* error bound for masked diffusion models under an early-stopping scheme, which does not rely on the boundedness assumption on the estimated score function. The result holds under the mild assumption that the data distribution is fully supported—a practical condition, since smoothing can always be applied in practice. These results underscore the generality and robustness of our analytical framework. In particular, our analysis crucially relies on the evolution of the score, especially its monotonicity estimates, along the backward dynamics, enabling rigorous error bounds without imposing overly restrictive assumptions on the data. Furthermore, by employing an appropriate sequence of step sizes, we achieve a complexity that scales *linearly* (up to logarithmic factors), rather than exponentially, with the dimension.

Methodology. We view the forward process as a CTMC defined by a generator matrix and characterize the reverse-time dynamics via a discrete score function, which is generally intractable. This issue can be addressed by using neural networks to obtain an approximate score. The generative process is then initialized from an easy-to-sample distribution—typically the stationary distribution—and is governed by this approximate score. To derive error bounds, our overall approach consists of:

- Characterizing the discrete score via a Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation derived from the forward Kolmogorov equation. Notably, an alternative perspective to obtain the HJB formulation comes from stochastic optimal control.
- Establishing the monotonicity of the score along the backward dynamics (Lemma 5.1.2, Lemma 5.2.2, Lemma 5.3.6) by leveraging Itô’s formula together with the HJB equation.
- Applying Girsanov’s theorem for jump processes to compute the Kullback–Leibler divergence between the generated and true data distributions, then simplifying the resulting expression using the score monotonicity. Notably, the integrability condition in Girsanov’s theorem holds naturally in the models we study, as it can be directly controlled under our assumptions. Similarly to continuous diffusion models, the overall

error can be decomposed into three components: (1) initialization error, (2) approximation error, and (3) discretization error. Importantly, leveraging score monotonicity allows us to derive simple and rigorous error bounds without imposing the restrictive assumptions on the data distribution or estimated score required by previous studies.

Notations. Given a measurable space $(\mathbf{E}, \mathcal{E})$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{E})$ the set of probability measures on \mathbf{E} . Given two probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{E})$, the Kullback–Leibler divergence (also called relative entropy) of μ with respect to ν is defined as $\text{KL}(\mu|\nu) := \int \log d\mu/d\nu d\mu$ if μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν , and $\text{KL}(\mu|\nu) = +\infty$ otherwise. The total variation distance between μ and ν is defined as $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{E}} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|$. Consider a random variable X , we denote by $\text{Law}(X)$ the law of X . We denote by δ_x the Dirac mass at x . We use $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ to denote an indicator function. We denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ as $[n]$ for a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

2 Discrete diffusion models

2.1 Continuous-Time Markov Chains and their time-reversal

Continuous-Time Markov Chain. We begin with a brief overview of Continuous-Time Markov Chains (CTMCs), which form the foundation of the discrete diffusion models studied in this work. Throughout this paper, we consider a discrete countable state space \mathbf{X} . A CTMC on \mathbf{X} is a time-indexed right-continuous stochastic process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that is Markov, *i.e.*, denoting by $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the corresponding filtration, for any $0 < t_0 < t_1 \dots < t_n$ and $x_{t_n} \in \mathbf{X}$, almost surely it holds

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t_n} = x_{t_n} | X_{t_0}, \dots, X_{t_{n-1}}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{t_n} = x_{t_n} | X_{t_{n-1}}) .$$

To design CTMCs, one central object is a rate matrix, *i.e.*, functions $(t, x, \mathbf{B}) \mapsto q_t^X(x, \mathbf{B})$; also referred to Q -function or generator. In particular, we consider the following assumption on $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$:

H1. $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ is a stable conservative rate matrix, *i.e.*, it satisfies the following properties:

- for all $(x, t) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbb{R}_+$, the function $q_t^X(x, \cdot)$ is a signed (discrete) measure on \mathbf{X} such that $q_t^X(x, \mathbf{X}) = 0$ and $0 \leq q_t^X(x, \mathbf{B} \setminus \{x\}) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{X}$;
- for all $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{X}$, the function $(t, x) \mapsto q_t^X(x, \mathbf{B})$ is measurable;
- for all $x \in \mathbf{X}$, the singleton $\{x\}$ is q^X -bounded, *i.e.*, $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} q_t^X(x) < \infty$, where $q_t^X(x) := -q_t^X(x, \{x\})$.

We will show that **H1** is satisfied by the generators of the forward processes considered in Section 2.2.

Under **H1**, the generator $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ allows to define a sub-Markov semigroup on \mathbf{X} and corresponding CTMCs. More precisely, following [Feller \(1940, Page 501, Theorem 1\)](#) and [Feinberg et al. \(2014, Theorem 2.2\)](#) we can define for any $0 < s < t$, the sub-Markov kernel $p_{s,t}^X$, for any $x \in \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{X}$ as

$$p_{s,t}^X(x, \mathbf{B}) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{p}_{s,t}^{(n)}(x, \mathbf{B}) , \tag{1}$$

where we set $\bar{p}_{s,t}^{(0)}(x, \mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{B}}(x) e^{-\int_s^t q_u^X(x) du}$ and for $n \geq 1$,

$$\bar{p}_{s,t}^{(n)}(x, \mathbf{B}) = \int_s^t \sum_{y \neq x} e^{-\int_s^u q_\theta^X(x) d\theta} q_u^X(x, y) \bar{p}_{u,t}^{(n-1)}(y, \mathbf{B}) du .$$

The family $\{p_{s,t}^X : 0 \leq s < t\}$ forms a sub-Markov semigroup, *i.e.*, for $0 \leq s < t$, $p_{s,t}^X$ is a transition sub-probability density and the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation holds, *i.e.*, for any $0 \leq s < u < t$ and $x_s, x_u, x_t \in \mathsf{X}$,

$$p_{s,t}^X(x_s, x_t) = (p_{s,u}^X p_{u,t}^X)(x_s, x_t) := \sum_{x_u \in \mathsf{X}} p_{s,u}^X(x_s, x_u) p_{u,t}^X(x_u, x_t) .$$

In the case where for any $0 < s < t$, $p_{s,t} = p_{0,t-s}$, then $\{p_{s,t}^X : 0 \leq s < t\}$ is said to be a homogeneous semigroup. Otherwise it is said to be inhomogeneous.

Here we suppose that there is no explosion which is equivalent to the fact that the family of semigroup $\{p_{s,t}^X : 0 \leq s < t\}$ is in fact Markov.

H2. For any $0 \leq s < t$ and $x \in \mathsf{X}$, $p_{s,t}^X(x, \mathsf{X}) = 1$.

Note that [Feller \(1940, Theorem 6\)](#) ensure that **H2** holds if there exists a measurable function $t \mapsto \phi_t^X$ such that $\sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} q_t^X(x) \leq \phi_t^X$ for any $t \geq 0$, and for a fixed $p > 1$, $\int_s^t (\phi_u^X)^p du < +\infty$ for any $0 \leq s < t$. We also refer to [Zhang \(2018\)](#) for conditions implying **H2** for unbounded generators.

In addition, for any initialization $X_0 \sim \mu_0^X$, there exists a CTMC $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ starting from X_0 and associated with the family of transitions $\{p_{s,t}^X : 0 \leq s < t\}$:

$$p_{s,t}^X(x_s, x_t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(X_t = x_t | X_s = x_s) & \text{if } \mathbb{P}(X_s = x_s) \neq 0 , \\ \mathbb{P}(X_t = x_t) & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Such a CTMC can be explicitly constructed as follows; see e.g., [Feinberg et al. \(2014, Lemma 2.1\)](#). More precisely, we define the jump times $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the embedded Markov chain $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as follows. First set $Y_0 \sim \mu_0^X$ and $T_0 = 0$. Given T_n and Y_n , we define T_{n+1} and S_{n+1} as:

(a) Set $T_{n+1} = T_n + \inf\{t \geq 0 : \int_{T_n}^{T_n+t} q_s^X(X_n) ds \geq E_{n+1}\}$ where E_{n+1} is an exponential random variable with parameter 1 independent from the past. Note that we use here the convention that $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$.

(b) In addition, conditionally on Y_n and T_{n+1} , and if $T_{n+1} < +\infty$, we define Y_{n+1} as a draw from the probability measure $\mathbb{B} \mapsto q_{T_{n+1}}^X(Y_n, \mathbb{B}) / q_{T_{n+1}}^X(Y_n)$. If $T_{n+1} = +\infty$, we simply set $Y_{n+1} = Y_n$.

Given now $(T_n, Y_n)_{n \geq 0}$, a CTMC with semigroup specified by [\(1\)](#) is defined by $X_t = Y_n$ for $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$.

Finally, under **H1** and **H2**, [\(Feinberg et al., 2014, Theorem 4.3.\)](#) shows that for all $(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathsf{X}$ and q^X -bounded sets X , the function $p_{s,t}^X(x, \mathbb{B})$ satisfies for almost $t > s$ the forward Kolmogorov equation:

$$\frac{\partial p_{s,t}^X}{\partial t}(x, \mathbb{B}) = \int_{\mathbb{B}} q_t^X(y, \{y\}) p_{s,t}^X(x, dy) + \int_{\mathsf{X}} q_t^X(y, \mathbb{B} \setminus \{y\}) p_{s,t}^X(x, dy) . \quad (2)$$

We note that while we restrict our presentation to a family of inhomogeneous generators $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ indexed by \mathbb{R}_+ , the same results and construction apply when it is restricted to a finite interval $[0, T_f]$ for an horizon $T_f > 0$.

Time-reversal process. Starting from the CTMC $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ starting from μ_0^X and associated with $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$, we define the corresponding time-reversal process $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ for a horizon T_f , for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ as $\bar{X}_t = X_{T_f-t}$. Under **H1** and **H2**, [\(Conforti and Léonard,](#)

2022, Theorem 2.8) applies (see Section A.2) and implies that $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is also an inhomogeneous CTMC, associated with a family of generator matrices $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfying the time-reversal formula:

$$\mu_{T_f-t}^X(x) \overleftarrow{q}_t^X(x, y) = \mu_{T_f-t}^X(y) q_{T_f-t}^X(y, x), \quad (3)$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq T_f$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbf{X}$, where for any $t \in [0, T_f]$, we denote by μ_t^X the forward marginal distribution:

$$\mu_t^X(x) = \mathbb{P}(X_t = x).$$

Equation (3) serves as the key tool to derive the backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, which inherits the stability of $(q_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Starting from (3), under mild assumptions on the target μ^* , we show in Section 2.2 that for all the models we consider, the associated backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ can be written for any $0 \leq t \leq T_f$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbf{X}$ as

$$\overleftarrow{q}_t^X(x, y) = u_t^X(x, y) \tilde{q}_t^X(x, y). \quad (4)$$

Here $(\tilde{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is an auxiliary generator derived straightforwardly from the forward generator $(q_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, and $(u_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is a family of non-negative function from \mathbf{X}^2 to \mathbb{R}_+ , which plays a similar role as the score function in continuous generative models. The explicit expression of $(\tilde{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ and $(u_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ are both provided in Section 2.2, and note that for all considered models except masked diffusion, $\tilde{q}^X = q^X$. Having access to these two objects, we can then construct the associated Markov kernel and CTMC just as before, enabling a thorough understanding of the time-reversed dynamics.

Approximation of the time-reversal process. Similar to standard continuous diffusion models, simulating the reverse process exactly is infeasible due to three main bottlenecks.

(i) the starting distribution $\overleftarrow{X}_0 \sim \mu_{T_f}^X$ is intractable; (ii) the dynamics of the backward process rely on the backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ that we do not have access; (iii) finally, even without the two previous limitations, inhomogeneous CTMCs have to be discretized in time.

Regarding (i), instead of sampling exactly from $\mu_{T_f}^X$, we can start the DDMs from an easy-to-sample distribution γ^X that approximates $\mu_{T_f}^X$, typically chosen as the invariant measure of the forward dynamics.

As for (ii), starting from (4), we will see that in all the models that we consider, the main unknown is the family of function $(u_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ which depends implicitly on the data distribution, while $(\tilde{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ can easily be derived from the forward matrix rate $(q_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Typically, $(u_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is approximated using a parameterized family $\{(u_t^{X, \theta})_{t \in [0, T_f]} : \theta \in \Theta\}$, which is trained using an appropriate loss function. In particular, following (Lou et al., 2023)¹ we consider the loss function

$$\theta \mapsto \int_0^{T_f} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{y \in \mathbf{X}} \left(u_t^X \log \frac{u_t^X}{u_t^{X, \theta}} - u_t^X + u_t^{X, \theta} \right) \tilde{q}_t^X(X_{T_f-t}, y) \mathbb{1}_{y \neq X_{T_f-t}} \right] dt.$$

Based on an approximate minimizer of this function, from (4), we could in principle consider the resulting backward generator defined for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $x, y \in \mathbf{X}$ as

$$u_t^{X, \theta^*}(x, y) \tilde{q}_t^X(x, y).$$

¹the score function considered in (Lou et al., 2023) corresponds to u_t^X in our notations. .

However, exact simulation of the CTMC associated with this rate matrix is infeasible in practice, so we discretize time and approximate the backward rate using piecewise constant functions.

Let $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K$ be a time grid with step sizes $h_k = t_k - t_{k-1}$. Overall, given an approximation γ^X from $\mu_{T_f}^X$, $(u_t^{X,\theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, a sequence of i.i.d. exponential random variable $(E_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ with parameter 1, and $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K$, the generative process $(\bar{X}_t^*)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ that we consider is defined as follows. First set $\bar{X}_0^* \sim \gamma^X$ and $\Gamma_0 = 0$. Given $\bar{X}_{t_k}^*$, for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbf{X}$, we set

$$\bar{q}_t^{X,\theta^*}(x, y) = u_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(x, y | \bar{X}_{t_k}^*) \bar{q}_{t_k}^X(x, y) \delta_{\bar{X}_{t_k}^*}(x), \quad (5)$$

where $(x, y) \mapsto u_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(x, y | \bar{X}_{t_k}^*)$ is a function that is straightforwardly designed from the estimate $u_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}$ and the current state $\bar{X}_{t_k}^*$. Equipped with this generator, we set the generated process as follows.

(1) If there exists $H_{k+1} \in [0, h_{k+1})$ such that $\Gamma_k + H_{k+1} \bar{q}_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*) \geq E_{k+1}$, then set $T_{k+1} = t_k + H_{k+1}$ and $\bar{X}_t^* = \bar{X}_{t_k}^*$ for $t \in [t_k, T_{k+1})$. Furthermore, draw $\bar{X}_{T_{k+1}}^*$ from the probability measure $\mathbf{B} \mapsto \bar{q}_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*, \mathbf{B}) / \bar{q}_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*)$, where

$$\bar{q}_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*, y) = u_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*, y) \bar{q}_{t_k}^X(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*, y),$$

and set $\bar{X}_t^* = \bar{X}_{T_{k+1}}^*$ for $t \in [T_{k+1}, t_{k+1})$ and $\Gamma_{k+1} = 0$.

(2) Otherwise, set $\Gamma_{k+1} = \Gamma_k + h_{k+1} \bar{q}_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^*)$ and $\bar{X}_t^* = \bar{X}_{t_k}^*$ for any $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$.

Notably, at each iteration we avoid solving the Kolmogorov equation to obtain the next state; instead, we simply use the transition rates together with exponential waiting times.

In what follows, we present the CTMC that we consider as forward process and specified the two functions $(x, y) \mapsto u_{t_k}^{X,\theta^*}(x, y | \bar{X}_{t_k}^*)$ and $(x, y) \mapsto \bar{q}_{t_k}^X(x, y)$ in the generator (5) of the resulting generative process. Next, we show that explicit convergence bounds between the associated generative distribution and the data distribution μ^* .

2.2 Studied Discrete Diffusion Models

We first focus on the finite state space $\mathbb{Z}_m^d = \{0, \dots, m-1\}^d$, where we consider two types of noising processes: the random walk process and the mask diffusion process originally proposed by Austin et al. (2021). Subsequently, we investigate the biased random walk on the countably infinite state space \mathbb{N}^d .

2.2.1 Random walk on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

We define the forward process $(X_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ on \mathbb{Z}_m^d over a fixed time horizon $T_f > 0$ as a homogeneous CTMC initialized from the data distribution μ^* , as a distribution on \mathbb{Z}_m^d , and associated with the generator q^{RW} specified for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$ as follows:

$$q^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{if } y = \sigma(x) \text{ for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M}, \\ -d & \text{if } y = x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\sigma_+^\ell, \sigma_-^\ell : \ell \in [d]\}, \quad (7)$$

and the operators $\sigma_+^\ell, \sigma_-^\ell$ correspond to the forward and backward jump on the ℓ -th component, respectively, defined as

$$\sigma_+^\ell(x) = x + e_\ell \pmod{m} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_-^\ell(x) = x - e_\ell \pmod{m} ,$$

for $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, where $\{e_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^d$ are the basic vectors of \mathbb{R}^d and \pmod{m} denotes the modulo operation by m . It follows directly from (6) that q^{RW} is a non-explosive stable conservative rate matrix, *i.e.*, satisfies **H1** and **H2**, ensuring that the process $(X_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is well-defined.

In addition, it is well known that $\gamma^{\text{RW}} = \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d)$ is an invariant distribution for q^{RW} by Norris (1998, Section 3.5) since for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, the following holds:

$$(\gamma^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}})(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \gamma^{\text{RW}}(y) q^{\text{RW}}(y, x) = \frac{1}{m^d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} q^{\text{RW}}(y, x) = 0 .$$

Moreover, $(X_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ converges geometrically fast to γ^{RW} in various metrics. Here we will exploit that it converges in Kullback-Leibler divergence. Indeed, since $(X_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is an irreducible CTMC associated with the fully supported invariant distribution γ^{RW} , it satisfies the Logarithm Sobolev inequality (LSI): Diaconis and Saloff-Coste (1996, Lemma 3.2, Section 4.2) and Bobkov and Tetali (2003, Theorem 2.4) imply that

$$\text{KL}(\mu_t^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) \leq e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2} t} \text{KL}(\mu_0^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) . \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, (4) holds for this choice of CTMC with $\tilde{q}_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = q^{\text{RW}}(x, y)$ and

$$u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x)) / \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x) & \text{if } y = \sigma(x) \text{ for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M} , \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) / 2d & \text{if } x = y , \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} , \end{cases}$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$; see Lemma 5.1.1 for detailed justification. In addition, similar to diffusion models in continuous settings, the discrete score above can be expressed as a conditional expectation, which suggests another stable loss term to be added to the training objective when learning neural network approximations of $(u_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, namely an L²-loss. Indeed, for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) &= \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} = \sum_{x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x_0, \sigma(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} \mu_0^{\text{RW}}(x_0) \\ &= \sum_{x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x_0, \sigma(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x_0, x)} \mathbb{P}(X_0^{\text{RW}} = x_0 | X_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}} = x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(X_0^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(X_0^{\text{RW}}, x)} \middle| X_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}} = x \right] . \end{aligned}$$

The generative process is then simulated as described in Section 2.1 using the generator given in (5) with

$$u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(x, y | \bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, *}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, *}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, *})) \mathbb{1}_{y=\sigma(x)} , \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{M} is defined in (7). The pseudo-code for simulating $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}, *})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is provided in Algorithm 1 for completeness.

2.2.2 Masked diffusion on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

Consider the state space \mathbb{Z}_m^d and we augment it with an additional mask state on each component, which is assigned the index m , to obtain the extended state space $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d = \{0, \dots, m\}^d$. The forward masking process $(X_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is then defined as an inhomogeneous CTMC on $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$, starting from μ^* distributed on \mathbb{Z}_m^d , and associated with the generator $(q_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ specified as follows: for $x, y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$,

$$q_t^M(x, y) := \begin{cases} \beta(t) & \text{if } \exists i \in \mathbf{M}_x^c : y = \mathbf{m}^{(i)}(x) , \\ -|\mathbf{M}_x^c| \beta(t) & \text{if } x = y , \\ 0 & \text{otherwise ,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $t \mapsto \beta(t)$ is a function satisfying **M1** and $\mathbf{m}^{(i)}(x)$ is the vector obtained from x by setting the i -th coordinate to the mask value m and leaving all other coordinates unchanged:

$$(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}(x))^j = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } j = i , \\ x^j & \text{if } j \neq i , \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i, j \in [d] .$$

In addition, we set here

$$\mathbf{M}_x := \{i \in [d] : x^i = m\} \text{ and } \mathbf{M}_x^c := \{i \in [d] : x^i \neq m\} \quad (11)$$

denoting the set of masked and non-masked (maskable) coordinates of x , respectively. We impose the following assumptions on the function β :

M1. $t \mapsto \beta(t)$ is continuous, non-decreasing from \mathbb{R}_+ to $[0, 1]$ and $\int_0^{+\infty} \beta(t) dt = +\infty$.

M1 ensures that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_f]} q_t^M(x) = |\mathbf{M}_x^c| \sup_{t \in [0, T_f]} \beta(t) < \infty$$

for $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$, i.e., $(q_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is stable and conservative. Furthermore, it also implies that

$$\sup_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} q_t^M(x) = d\beta(t) \leq d ,$$

and therefore $(q_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfies **H1** and **H2**.

In addition, based on the generator $(q_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, we can determine the transition probabilities $p_{s,t}^M$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_f$; see e.g., Section 2.1. Specifically, for $x, y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$, denoting by x^i and y^i the i -th component respectively, and for $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_f$, we have

$$p_{s,t}^M(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^d p_{s,t}^{M,1}(x^i, y^i) , \quad \text{where } p_{s,t}^{M,1}(x^i, y^i) = \begin{cases} \alpha_t / \alpha_s & \text{if } x^i = y^i , \\ 1 - \alpha_t / \alpha_s & \text{if } y^i = m , \\ 0 & \text{otherwise ,} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha_t := \exp\left(-\int_0^t \beta(s) ds\right)$. We can interpret (12): on each component, at time $s \in [0, T_f]$, if the process is at the normal state, it will jump to MASK at time $t \in [s, T_f]$ with probability $1 - \alpha_t / \alpha_s$ and remains staying the same state with probability α_t / α_s . Once it is masked, it will stay masked forever. Note that under **M1**, $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $\lim_{T_f \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{T_f} = 0$, meaning that every state is unmasked initially but at the end, almost states are masked.

For this choice of generator (10), (4) holds with $\tilde{q}_t^M(x, y) = q_{T_f-t}^M(y, x)$ and

$$u_t^M(x, y) = \begin{cases} \mu_{T_f-t}^M(y) / \mu_{T_f-t}^M(x) & \text{if } \exists i \in \mathbf{M}_y^c : x = \mathbf{m}^{(i)}(y) , \\ \sum_{y \neq x} u_t^M(x, y) \tilde{q}_t^M(x, y) / \tilde{q}_t^M(x) & \text{if } x = y , \\ 1 & \text{otherwise ,} \end{cases}$$

for $x, y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$; see Lemma 5.2.1 for the detailed proof. The key difference between this case and the others lies in the reversed order of x and y , which results in a generator distinct from the forward one. Similar to the random walk on \mathbb{Z}_m^d case, the discrete score above can also be expressed as a conditional expectation, which enables efficient training; see Proposition A.3.2 for completeness.

Then the backward dynamic can be approximated by using the generative process presented in Section 2.1, which is associated with the trained generator given in (5) with

$$u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*}(x, y | \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{M, \star}) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{M}_x} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{M, \star}, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{M, \star})) \mathbb{1}_{y = \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x)}, \quad (13)$$

where $\text{um}_j^{(i)}(x)$ is the vector obtained from $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ by setting the i -th coordinate to the original value j and keeping all other coordinated unchanged for fixed $i \in [d]$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$:

$$(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))^\ell = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } \ell = i, \\ x^\ell & \text{if } \ell \neq i, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \ell \in [d].$$

The pseudo-code for sampling $(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{M, \star})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is provided in Algorithm 2 for completeness.

Remark. Since the rate matrix associated with masked diffusion does not satisfy a logarithmic Sobolev inequality—typically used to control the initialization error in sampling—it is essential to initialize our generative process at $\text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0, T_f}^M$, which remains easy to sample from, rather than at the invariant measure δ_{MASK} . This choice enables a compact expression that facilitates straightforward evaluation of the initialization error.

2.2.3 Biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d

We consider here as state space \mathbb{N}^d and as forward process the biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d , $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, which is a homogeneous CTMC initialized from the data distribution μ^\star and governed by the generator q^{BRW} defined for $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{N}^d$ as

$$q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = \sigma_+^\ell(x) \text{ for } \ell \in [d], \\ x^\ell & \text{if } y = \sigma_-^\ell(x) \text{ for } \ell \in [d], \\ -d - \sum_{\ell=1}^d x^\ell & \text{if } y = x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Here x^ℓ denotes the ℓ -component of x and the operators σ_+^ℓ and σ_-^ℓ represent, respectively, the forward and backward jumps along the ℓ -th component for $\ell \in [d]$ defined as:

$$\sigma_+^\ell(x) = x + e_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_-^\ell(x) = x - e_\ell.$$

Note that at the boundary $x^\ell = 0$, backward jumps are not allowed, as the corresponding transition rate is zero, so the process can only move to the right from that state. In addition, since the generator q^{BRW} is time-independent, the stability condition is automatically satisfied, therefore **H1** holds. **H2** is also easily satisfied; see Proposition A.3.5 for completeness. Thus, $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is well-defined.

Concerning the long-term behavior, it is well-known that $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ converges geometrically in Kullback Leibler divergence to the multidimensional Poisson distribution $\gamma^{\text{BRW}} = \text{Poisson}(1)^{\otimes d} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}^d)$. Furthermore, Conforti (2022, Section 3) showed that γ^{BRW} satisfies the modified log-Sobolev inequality with constant 1, which implies an exponential entropy decay:

$$\text{KL}(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) \leq e^{-t} \text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}). \quad (15)$$

In this setting, (4) holds with $\tilde{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y)$ and

$$u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) / \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) & \text{if } y = \sigma(x) \text{ for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) / q^{\text{BRW}}(x) & \text{if } y = x, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$, where $\tilde{\mu}^{\text{BRW}} := \mu^{\text{BRW}} / \gamma^{\text{BRW}}$; see Lemma 5.3.1 for completeness. Similar to the two aforementioned cases, the discrete score above can also be expressed as a conditional expectation, which enables stable training; see Proposition A.3.6 for detailed proof.

The generative process described in Section 2.1 is associated with the trained generator specified in (5) with

$$u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(x, y | \bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, *}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, *}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, *})) \mathbb{1}_{y=\sigma(x)}. \quad (16)$$

The pseudo-code for sampling $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}, *})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is provided in Algorithm 3 for completeness.

3 Main results

This section provides quantitative error estimates for using the generative process to approximate the backward evolution and recover the data distribution in the aforementioned settings. To this end, we establish conditions ensuring the performance of the neural networks and mild regularity assumptions on the data distribution. While classical diffusion models typically rely on an L^2 -type approximation error condition, our analysis naturally leads to an entropic-type condition, reflecting the discrete nature of the state space. Moreover, the regularity assumptions we impose on the data distribution are minimal and, in some cases, can be further relaxed by employing an early stopping strategy. This bridges a gap in previous theoretical works, which often required significantly stronger assumptions.

3.1 Random walk on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

Assumptions. To bound the error of our DDM, we introduce assumptions concerning the accuracy of the training phase and the regularity properties of the data distribution:

RW1. *There exists $\epsilon^{\text{RW}} \geq 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}}{u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}} \right) (X_{T_f-t_k}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(X_{T_f-t_k}^{\text{RW}})) \right] \leq \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f,$$

where \mathcal{M} is defined in (7) and $\mathbf{h}(a) := a \log a - a + 1$ for $a > 0$.

This condition naturally appears as we bound the KL divergence of the path probability measures corresponding to the approximate discrete score $(u_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ and the true one $(u_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ respectively. While standard Girsanov theorem for diffusion implies an L^2 -type approximation error condition for generative models (Chen et al., 2022a), our result naturally involve the entropic-type condition due to the discrete structure of our noising process.

RW2. *The data distribution has full support on \mathbb{Z}_m^d , i.e., $\mu^*(x) \in (0, 1)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$.*

RW2 implies that the data distribution has finite discrete Fisher information defined as

$$\mathcal{I}(\mu^*) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\mu^*(\sigma(X_0^{\text{RW}}))}{\mu^*(X_0^{\text{RW}})} \right) \right] < \infty. \quad (17)$$

Here the discrete score u_t^{RW} is well-defined at T_f thanks to **RW2**; see (28) for completeness.

Note that **RW2** parallels the finite relative Fisher information condition introduced by Conforti et al. (2025). Nevertheless, **RW2** is considerably simpler: the state space is finite, and the function \mathbf{h} becomes infinite only when μ^* lacks full support. Moreover, this assumption can later be further relaxed via the early stopping strategy, so that only **RW1** is needed to ensure the convergence of DDMs.

Theorem 3.1.1. *Assume **RW1** and **RW2**, choose the discrete time scheme $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K$ such that $t_0 = 0$ and $t_K = T_f$. Then the following holds*

$$\text{KL}(\mu^* | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW},*})) \lesssim \underbrace{e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2}T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{RW}})}_{\text{initial error}} + \underbrace{h\mathcal{I}(\mu^*)}_{\text{discretization error}} + \underbrace{\epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f}_{\text{discrete score approx. error}}, \quad (18)$$

where $h := \max_k \{t_{k+1} - t_k\}$ denotes the maximum step-size. Furthermore, (18) still holds if we replace $\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{RW}})$ by $d \log(m)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1.1. The proof is postponed to Section 5.1.2. \square

Remark. When the data distribution coincides with the invariant measure $\text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d)$, we obtain $\mathcal{I}(\mu^*) = 0$, which in turn cancels the discretization error and makes our result sharp.

Following Conforti et al. (2025, Theorem 3), a tighter bound on the discretization error can be obtained by choosing an appropriate sequence of step sizes, resulting in a logarithmic rather than linear dependence on the discrete Fisher information.

Theorem 3.1.2. *Let $c \in (0, 1/2]$ and $T_f \geq 1 + 2c$. Suppose **RW1**, **RW2** hold and let $L = d^{-1}\mathcal{I}(\mu^*) \geq 2$. Choose $h_{k+1} = c \min \{\max \{T_f - t_k, a\}, 1\}$ for $k < K - 1$ and $h_K = T_f - t_{K-1}$, with $a = 1/L$, we then have that*

$$\text{KL}(\mu^* | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW},*})) \lesssim e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2}T_f} d \log(m) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f + cd \log(m) \log(L).$$

In particular, choosing the time horizon T_f and the maximum step-size c as

$$T_f = \frac{25m^2}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{d \log(m)}{\epsilon^{\text{RW}}} \quad \text{and} \quad c = \frac{\epsilon^{\text{RW}}}{d \log(m) \log(L)}, \quad (19)$$

implies the number of iterations as

$$K \lesssim d \log(m) \log(L) [m^2 \log(d \log(m)/\epsilon^{\text{RW}}) + \log(L)] / \epsilon^{\text{RW}},$$

and makes the approximation error $\tilde{O}(m^2 \epsilon^{\text{RW}})$, where the notation \tilde{O} means that logarithmic factors of $d, m, \epsilon^{\text{RW}}$ have been dropped.

Proof of Theorem 3.1.2. The proof of Theorem 3.1.2 benefits from the choice of the step-size's scheme and is postponed to Section 5.1.3. \square

In the next result, we remove **RW2** by employing an early stopping strategy, since the considered random walk on \mathbb{Z}_m^d is connected which implies in turn that μ_t is fully supported for any $t \in (0, T_f]$. This approach eliminates the assumption on the data distribution and thereby emphasizing the theoretical contribution of this work.

Theorem 3.1.3. Assume **RW1** holds. For $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, let $c \geq 1/2$, $T_f - \eta \geq 1 + 2c$. Set $L = d^{-1}\mathcal{I}(\mu_\eta^{\text{RW}})$ and assume $L \geq 2$. Choose $h_{k+1} = c \min\{\max\{T_f - \eta - t_k, 1/L\}, 1\}$ for $k < K-1$ and $h_K = T_f - \eta - t_{K-1}$, then the following holds

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW},\star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \underbrace{d\eta}_{\text{early stopping error}} + \sqrt{\underbrace{e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2}T_f} d \log(m)}_{\text{initial error}} + \underbrace{\epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f}_{\text{approx. error}} + \underbrace{cd \log(m) \log(\eta^{-1} \log(m))}_{\text{discretization error}}}.$$

In particular, choosing

$$\eta = \frac{\epsilon^{\text{RW}}}{d}, \quad c = \frac{(\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2}{d \log(m) \log(d \log(m)/\epsilon^{\text{RW}})}, \quad T_f = \frac{25m^2}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{d \log(m)}{(\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2}, \quad (20)$$

implies the following ϵ^{RW} -error:

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW},\star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\text{RW}} + m \sqrt{\epsilon^{\text{RW}} \log(d \log(m)/(\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2)},$$

with the number of iterations $\tilde{O}(dm^2/(\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1.3. It is deferred to Section 5.1.4. □

3.2 Masked diffusion on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

Assumptions. We first impose a regularity condition on the data distribution μ^\star to ensure the validity of the subsequent computations:

M2. The data distribution μ^\star has full support on \mathbb{Z}_m^d , i.e., $\mu^\star(x) \in (0, 1)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$ and $\mu^\star(x) = 0$ for $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}_m^d$.

Note that this assumption is crucial yet reasonable in practice, as we can always consider a smoothed version of the data distribution. Under **M1** and **M2**, μ_t^{M} is fully supported on $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ for any $t \in (0, T_f]$; see Lemma 5.2.1 for completeness. We now state an assumption on the approximation performance of the neural network:

M3. There exists $\epsilon^{\text{M}} \geq 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \beta(T_f - t_k) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_{T_f-t_k}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} u_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^\star} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{M}}}{u_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^\star}} \right) (X_{T_f-t_k}^{\text{M}}, \mathbf{u}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f-t_k}^{\text{M}})) \right] \leq \epsilon^{\text{M}} T_f,$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{T_f-t_k} = \mathcal{M}_{X_{T_f-t_k}^{\text{M}}}$, $\mathcal{M}_{X_{T_f-t_k}^{\text{M}}}$ is defined in (11).

Note that the properties of u_t^{M} can only be exploited on the interval $[0, T_f)$, since $u_{T_f}^{\text{M}}$ is not defined by its formula (see (38)), as the data is only supported on the original state space \mathbb{Z}_m^d . Consequently, the early-stopping scheme is essential in the masking setting, and the corresponding error bound is stated as follows:

Theorem 3.2.1. Assume **M1**, **M2** and **M3** hold. For any $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, choose the discrete time scheme $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^K$ such that $t_0 = 0$ and $t_K = T_f - \eta$. Then the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu_\eta^{\text{M}} | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{M},\star})) &\lesssim \underbrace{d\alpha_{T_f}(1 + \log(m/\alpha_{T_f}))}_{\text{initial error}} + \underbrace{\epsilon^{\text{M}} T_f}_{\text{approx. error}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{h [d\alpha_\eta/(1 - \alpha_\eta) + dm + C_1^{\text{M}}] + (e^h - 1)(C_2^{\text{M}} + dm)T_f}_{\text{discretization error}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h = \max_k \{t_{k+1} - t_k\}$ and

$$C_1^M := \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in M_{T_f - t_k}} \left| \tilde{u}_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*} - \tilde{u}_{t_k}^M \right| (X_{T_f - t_k}^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f - t_k}^M)) \right],$$

$$C_2^M := \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in M_{T_f - t_k}} (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i), j} \left| \log \frac{u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*}}{u_{t_k}^M} \right| (X_{T_f - t_k}^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f - t_k}^M)) \right].$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2.1. It is deferred to Section 5.2.2. \square

Theorem 3.2.2. *Under conditions and notations of Theorem 3.2.1, the following bound holds*

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \underbrace{1 - \alpha_\eta^d}_{\text{early stopping error}} + \sqrt{d\alpha_{T_f}(1 + \log(m/\alpha_{T_f})) + h[d\alpha_\eta/(1 - \alpha_\eta) + dm + C_1^M] + [\epsilon^M + (e^h - 1)(C_2^M + dm)] T_f}.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2.2. By total variation argument, we have

$$\|\mu_\eta^M - \mu^\star\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{P}(X_\eta^M \neq X_0^M) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X_\eta^M = X_0^M) = 1 - \alpha_\eta^d.$$

This together with Theorem 3.2.1 and the triangle and Pinsker inequalities yield the desired conclusion. \square

Next, we employ an exponentially decreasing sequence of step sizes to obtain a tighter bound on the discretization error.

Theorem 3.2.3. *Assume M2 and M3 hold and consider the constant generator $\beta(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T_f]$. For any $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, let $c \in (0, 1/2]$ and $T_f - \eta \geq 1 + 2c$, and $L = d^{-1}\mathcal{I}(\mu_\eta^M) \geq 2$. Choose $h_{k+1} = c \min \{\max \{T_f - \eta - t_k, a\}, 1\}$ for $k < K - 1$ and $h_K = T_f - \eta - t_{K-1}$, with $a = 1/L$, we then have*

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \underbrace{d\eta}_{\text{early stopping error}} + \sqrt{\underbrace{d \log(m) e^{-T_f/2}}_{\text{initial error}} + \underbrace{\epsilon^M T_f}_{\text{approx. error}} + \underbrace{(e^c - 1)[dm \log(\eta^{-1} + m) + (C_2^M + dm) T_f]}_{\text{discretization error}}}.$$

In particular, choosing

$$T_f = 2 \log \frac{d \log(m)}{(\epsilon^M)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = \frac{\epsilon^M}{d}, \quad (21)$$

then setting the maximum step-size as

$$c = \log \left(\frac{(\epsilon^M)^2}{2(C_2^M + dm) \log(d \log(m)/(\epsilon^M)^2) + dm \log(m + d/\epsilon^M)} + 1 \right), \quad (22)$$

imply the following bound

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \epsilon^M + \sqrt{\epsilon^M \log(d \log(m)/(\epsilon^M)^2)},$$

and is associated with the number of iterations $\tilde{O}(dm/(\epsilon^M)^2)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2.3. The proof benefits from the choice of the step-size's scheme and is postponed to Section 5.2.3. \square

Remark. The tighter bound above is attainable not only for the constant generator but also for any function β satisfying **M1**, since the bound on the Fisher information holds universally (see Lemma 5.2.4), and the choice of step sizes can be adapted to each specific case. Notably, Theorem 3.2.3 provides the first non-asymptotic error bound for masked diffusion models employing an early-stopping strategy, which does not rely on the boundedness of the estimated score as in (Liang et al., 2025a).

3.3 Biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d

Assumptions. In the same spirit as the previous settings, to control the resulting approximation error, we introduce the following assumptions concerning the accuracy of the approximation scheme and the regularity of the data distribution:

BRW1. *There exists $\epsilon^{\text{BRW}} \geq 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}}{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}} \right) u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_{T_f - t_k}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}})) \right] \leq \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f.$$

BRW2. *The data distribution has finite second order moment and finite discrete Fisher information:*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}}(\mu^*) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}^*(\sigma(X_0^{\text{BRW}}))}{\tilde{\mu}^*(X_0^{\text{BRW}})} \right) q^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_0^{\text{BRW}})) \right] < \infty, \quad (23)$$

where $\tilde{\mu}^* := \mu^* / \gamma^{\text{BRW}}$ represents the relative marginal density.

Note that the finite second moment assumption typically implies that μ^* has a finite first order moment by applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Furthermore, Conforti (2022, Section 3) showed that the invariant measure γ^{BRW} satisfies the convex Sobolev inequality with the constant 1, i.e.,

$$\text{KL}(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) \leq \mathcal{I}_{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}}(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, T_f],$$

thus (23) in turn implies $\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) < \infty$.

Theorem 3.3.1. *Let $c \in (0, 1/2]$ and $T_f \geq 1 + 2c$. Suppose **BRW1** and **BRW2** hold and assume that $L = d^{-1} \mathcal{I}(\mu^*) \geq 2$. Choose $h_{k+1} = c \min \{\max \{T_f - t_k, a\}, 1\}$ for $k < K - 1$ and $h_K = T_f - t_{K-1}$, with $a = 1/L$, then it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}, *})) &\lesssim \underbrace{e^{-T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}})}_{\text{initialization error}} + \underbrace{\epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f}_{\text{approx. error}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{(e^c - 1)[(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)]}_{\text{discretization error}}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$\mathbf{m}_1^* = \mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) = \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1], \quad \mathbf{m}_2^* = \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) = \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2]$$

denote the first and second order moment of μ^* , respectively. Here the constant $C^{\text{BRW}} = C_1^{\text{BRW}} + C_2^{\text{BRW}}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^{\text{BRW}} &:= \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left| (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} - \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}) (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} - 1) (X_{T_f - t_k}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}})) \right| \right] \\ C_2^{\text{BRW}} &:= \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d \left| u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} - u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \right| q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(X_{T_f - t_k}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_{-}^{\ell}(X_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}})) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (24) still holds if we replace $\text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{BRW}})$ by $d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star$. In particular, setting the time horizon T_f and the maximum step-size c as

$$T_f = \log \frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star}{\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}}, \quad c = \log \left(\frac{\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}}{(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^\star) \log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star)/\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}) + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star) \log(L)} + 1 \right), \quad (25)$$

implies the number of iterations

$$K \lesssim \frac{\log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star)/\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}) + \log(L)}{\log(1 + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} / [(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^\star) \log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star)/\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}) + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star) \log(L)])},$$

and makes the approximation error $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3.1. It is deferred to Section 5.3.2. \square

We now get rid of the finite Fisher information assumption by employing an early stopping strategy.

Theorem 3.3.2. Assume **BRW1** holds and suppose that the data distribution has finite second order moment, i.e., $\mathbf{m}_2^\star < \infty$. For $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, let $c \geq 1/2$, $T_f - \eta \geq 1 + 2c$. Set $L = d^{-1} \mathcal{I}(\mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}})$ and assume $L \geq 2$. Choose $h_{k+1} = c \min \{\max \{T_f - \eta - t_k, 1/L\}, 1\}$ for $k < K - 1$ and $h_K = T_f - t_{K-1}$, then it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW}, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \\ & \lesssim \underbrace{\eta(d + \mathbf{m}_1^\star)}_{\text{early stopping error}} + \left(e^{-T_f} (d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (e^c - 1) [(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^\star) T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star) \log(\eta^{-1}(1 + \mathbf{m}_2^\star d^{-1}))] \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C^{BRW} defined as in Theorem 3.3.1. Moreover, choosing

$$\eta = \frac{\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}}{d + \mathbf{m}_1^\star} \quad \text{and} \quad T_f = \log \frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star}{(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})^2}, \quad (26)$$

and setting the maximum step-size as

$$c = \log \left(\frac{(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})^2}{(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^\star) T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star) \log(\eta^{-1}(1 + \mathbf{m}_2^\star d^{-1}))} + 1 \right) \quad (27)$$

imply the following bound

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW}, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} + \sqrt{\epsilon^{\text{BRW}} \log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^\star)/(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})^2)},$$

with the number of iterations is $\tilde{O}(d/(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})^2)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3.2. It is postponed to Section 5.3.3. \square

Remark. The requirement $\mathbf{m}_2^\star < \infty$ coincides with the condition imposed on the data distribution in Conforti et al. (2025, Corollary 1). Theorem 3.3.2 delivers the *first non-asymptotic convergence* guarantee for DDMs on the countably *infinite* state space \mathbb{N}^d under mild assumptions. The resulting explicit bound underscores the robustness of our analysis: it accommodates both uniform and absorbing rate matrices and extends naturally from finite to countably infinite domains.

4 Related works

This section provides details of recent researches on discrete generative models.

Analysis of Discrete diffusion models.

There have been plenty of studies of diffusion models tailored for discrete data. [Hoogeboom et al. \(2021\)](#) proposed Argmax Flows and Multinomial Diffusion for categorical data. Argmax Flows linked discrete data to continuous models via an argmax with a probabilistic inverse, while Multinomial Diffusion added categorical noise and trains a model to reverse it. [Dieleman et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Chen et al. \(2022b\)](#) embedded discrete data in Euclidean space, while [Richemond et al. \(2022\)](#) used the simplex, all leveraging continuous forward diffusion models. Later, [Campbell et al. \(2022\)](#) introduced a continuous-time framework for discrete denoising diffusion using CTMCs and [Gat et al. \(2024\)](#) further added a correction step to bring the sample distribution closer to the desired one, but their general approach relies on ELBO-based marginal learning and costly correction steps, making it less efficient in high dimensions. Another recent approach to handle discrete data is generative modeling with arbitrary Markov processes using generator matching, introduced by [Holderrieth et al. \(2024\)](#). This method is flexible and can be applied to various state spaces, particularly in discrete settings. Recently, In [Anonymous \(2025\)](#), the authors introduced CountsDiff, a diffusion model tailored to \mathbb{N}^d -supported data. The forward noising dynamics are given by a pure-death chain with transition rates identical to the backward rates discussed in Section 2.2.3. Empirically, CountsDiff matches the performance of state-of-the-art discrete diffusion methods, emphasizing the need for dedicated approaches to \mathbb{N}^d -valued data. Nonetheless, despite these promising results, all of the aforementioned models came with limited theoretical justification.

Masked diffusion models.

One important step toward more advanced models is the “masked” diffusion process, a discrete diffusion approach first introduced by [Austin et al. \(2021\)](#). Later, [Shi et al. \(2024\)](#) looked into this model further, simplifying its training objective by expressing it as a signal-to-noise ratio, which helps highlight some useful features. However, despite these improvements, the model still lacks theoretical guarantees. [Sahoo et al. \(2024\)](#) improved upon this direction by leveraging the structure of the absorbing kernel and refining the bridge-based reverse process, leading to more efficient optimization. The model’s reliance on absorbing-state approximations and heuristic training objectives limits its theoretical grounding.

Convergence results of discrete diffusion models.

[Ren et al. \(2024\)](#) analyzed discrete diffusion models using Lévy-type stochastic integrals and Poisson random measures, deriving integral expressions for the noising and denoising processes of categorical data. They also introduced a unified error analysis and established the first KL-divergence bound for the τ -leaping algorithm, though under strong score assumptions (continuity and boundedness). [Chen and Ying \(2024\)](#) provided explicit error bounds for hypercube sampling with a uniform rate matrix, achieving near-linear iteration complexity (in expectation) under bounded score and score-entropy assumptions. Next, [Le-Tuyet-Nhi et al.](#) achieved to establish (worst case) computational complexity that scales linearly (up to logarithmic factors) with the dimension, under only statistical assumption on the score approximation. One key improvement in [Le-Tuyet-Nhi et al.](#) comes from avoiding the Kolmogorov equation at each iteration and instead using flip rates together with a Poisson clock. Complementing CTMC-based approaches, [Bach and Saremi \(2025\)](#) introduced a fully discrete denoising model using Bernoulli corruption as a Gaussian analogue, yielding a Langevin-style sampler on the hypercube with rigorous guarantees. However, their works remain restricted to the hypercube. For categorical data, [Zhang et al. \(2024\)](#), [Liang et al. \(2025b\)](#) and [Liang et al. \(2025a\)](#) established convergence guarantees under uniform and absorbing rate matrices, respectively, paralleling our results in Theorem 3.1.3 and Theorem 3.2.3. However, in all these works, the authors suppose that the score or its

approximation is bounded uniformly in time, conditions that do not hold in most cases. In contrast, our bounds require no assumptions on the score and hold under a simple statistical condition, which is also employed in the aforementioned literature. Furthermore, under stronger conditions than ours, [Liang et al. \(2025b\)](#) only obtain a computational complexity that grows quadratically with the dimension, our results scale linearly (up to logarithmic factors). Nonetheless, none of the above works establish theoretical foundations for DDMS on counted data, leaving this aspect unexplored.

To conclude, this paper bridges existing gaps by explicitly formulating the forward Markov process. By deriving the conditional expectation expression of the score, we can reduce the computationally expensive signal-to-noise ratio training as used in [Shi et al. \(2024\)](#). As a result, we obtain a simpler and more efficient training framework based on the L²-loss and entropy-based loss, supported by rigorous *non-asymptotic* convergence guarantees. The core of our results lies in the monotonicity of the score along the backward dynamics. Importantly, our analysis applies to both absorbing and uniform rate matrices and extends beyond finite to countably infinite state spaces, thereby highlighting the robustness and generality of our approach.

5 Main proofs

5.1 Random walk on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

5.1.1 Score monotonicity and supporting lemmas

The convergence proof relies on the monotonicity of the score, which is obtained through its characterization, along with several supporting lemmas presented below.

Lemma 5.1.1. *Under **RW2**, the time reversal process $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is associated with the backward generator $(\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ given in (4), where $\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}} := q^{\text{RW}}$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and the discrete score u^{RW} admits the following formula: for $(t, x, y) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d$,*

$$u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x)) / \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x) & \text{if } y = \sigma(x) \text{ for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) / 2d & \text{if } x = y, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, we can express $(u_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ as

$$u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) = e^{V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d \text{ and } \sigma \in \mathcal{M},$$

where $V_t^{\text{RW}} := -\log \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}$, which satisfies the following HJB equation:

$$\begin{cases} 2\partial_t V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} [e^{V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))} - 1] = 0, \\ V_{T_f}^{\text{RW}}(x) = -\log \mu^*(x), \end{cases} \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d. \quad (29)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1.1. See Section A.4.1 □

Lemma 5.1.2. *Under **RW2**, $(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})))_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is a martingale for fix $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$. Consequently, $\mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})))$ is a \mathbb{P}^{RW} -submartingale where $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$, and the monotonicity follows:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}(u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})))] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})))] \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_f.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1.2. Fix $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, apply Itô's formula on

$$f^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}) := u_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})) = e^{V_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}) - V_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}))},$$

and note that $\text{Law}((\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}) = \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ is associated to the generator $(u_t^{\text{RW}} q_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}) - f^\sigma(0, \bar{X}_0^{\text{RW}}) &= M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[\partial_s f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[f^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) - f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}) \right] u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t) = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \left[f^\sigma(s, x) - f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}) \right] \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}} q^{\text{RW}}} (dx ds)$$

is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ -true martingale (see Lemma A.3.1), where $\tilde{N}_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}} q^{\text{RW}}}$ denotes the compensated measure of the random point measure $N_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}} q^{\text{RW}}}$ corresponding to the CTMC associated with $(u_t^{\text{RW}} q_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Thus the process

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}) - f^\sigma(0, \bar{X}_0^{\text{RW}}) \\ - \int_0^t \left[\partial_s f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[f^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) - f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}) \right] u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ -martingale. Since $\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}} = \bar{X}_{t-}^{\text{RW}}$ for Lebesgue almost every $t \in (0, T_f]$, we can simplify the process above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}) - f^\sigma(0, \bar{X}_0^{\text{RW}}) \\ + \int_0^t \left[\partial_s f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[f^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) - f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) \right] u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ -martingale. For $s \in [0, T_f]$, denote

$$b^\sigma(s) := \partial_s f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[f^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) - f^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) \right] u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})).$$

We aim to prove that $b^\sigma(s) = 0$. Indeed, by the definition of f^σ and the HJB equation (29), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} b^\sigma(s) &= u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \left[\partial_s V_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}) - \partial_s V_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[u_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}), \sigma(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))) - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \right] u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) - \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} u_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}), \sigma'(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))) \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[u_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}), \sigma(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))) - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \right] u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[u_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}), \sigma(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))) u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}), \sigma'(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))) u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $u_s^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) = e^{V_s^{\text{RW}}(x) - V_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))}$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$ in Lemma 5.1.1, we derive

$$b^\sigma(s) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[e^{-V_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) + V_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})} - e^{-V_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma'(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))) + V_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})} \right] = 0,$$

where we use the fact that $\sigma(\sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}})) = \sigma'(\sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{RW}}))$ in the last equality.

We conclude that $u_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}))$ is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ -martingale, and as \mathbf{h} is a convex function, $\mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})))$ is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ -submartingale and the monotonicity follows. \square

Lemma 5.1.3. *The following holds for any $t \in [0, T_f)$:*

$$\Gamma_t^{\text{RW}} \lesssim (T_f - t)^{-1} d \log(m), \quad (30)$$

where $\Gamma_t^{\text{RW}} = \mathcal{I}(\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(X_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(X_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}))) \right]$.

Proof of Lemma 5.1.3. See Section A.4.2. \square

5.1.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1.1

We show first the bound for the “distance” between the backward path measure $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}}$ of $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ and the path measure $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}, \star}$ of the simulated backward process $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}, \star})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Consider the path measure $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}, \star} \in \text{MP}(\bar{q}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*})$ as the reference measure in Girsanov’s theorem A.7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, T_f]} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \left(\frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}} \log \frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}} - \frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}} + 1 \right) \bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, x) \mathbb{1}_{\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}} \neq x} dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

With a partition $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_K = T_f$ for $K \geq 1$ of $[0, T_f]$ associated with the sequence of step-size $h_{k+1} = t_{k+1} - t_k$, the previous expression rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \left(\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}} \log \frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}} - \bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}} + \bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*} \right) (\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, x) \mathbb{1}_{\bar{X}_t^{\text{RW}} \neq x} dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the expressions of $(\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ from Lemma 5.1.1 and $(\bar{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ from (5), (9) into the preceding equation, where q^{RW} given in (6), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma) \log \frac{u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)}{u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)} - u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma) + u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) \right) dt \right], \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

where we write $u_t^{\text{RW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW}}))$ as $u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)$ and $u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}))$ as $u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)$ for short. We rewrite (31) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}} | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}, *}) &= \underbrace{\text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}})}_{E_1} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) - \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma))) dt \right]}_{E_2} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) - \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)) + (u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) - u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \log u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) \right) dt \right]}_{E_3}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$ for $a > 0$. We bound $E_1 - E_2 - E_3$ one-by-one as follows. For E_2 , using the tower property and the submartingality of $(\mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)))_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ obtained in Lemma 5.1.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}] - \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma))) dt \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}(u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}] - \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma))) dt \right] \\ &\leq h \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_k^{\text{RW}}$ is the σ -algebra of $\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}$ and $h := \max_k \{t_{k+1} - t_k\}$. Observe that we obtain a telescoping sum on the right-hand side, which means we can simplify it as

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &\leq h \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{t_K}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{t_0}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] \right) \\ &\leq h \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{T_f}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] = h \mathcal{I}(\mu^*), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that \mathbf{h} is a nonnegative function to reduce the second term. Here $\mathcal{I}(\mu^*)$ is a discrete Fisher information defined in (17), which is finite by **RW2**.

We evaluate next E_3 by using again the tower property and the martingality of $(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma))_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ established in Lemma 5.1.2:

$$\begin{aligned} E_3 &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) - \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}[u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}]) \log u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) \right) dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) - \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) - u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \log u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) \right) dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma) \log \frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)}{u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)} + u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) - u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from **RW1**. Subsequently, E_1 can be controlled by (8):

$$E_1 \leq e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2}T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) .$$

Combining all the upper bounds on E_1, E_2, E_3 implies

$$\text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}} | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW},\star}) \lesssim e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2}T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) + h\mathcal{I}(\mu^\star) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}}T_f ,$$

Finally, notice that $\mu^\star = \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW}})$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu^\star | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW},\star})) &= \text{KL}(\text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW}}) | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW},\star})) \\ &\leq \text{KL}(\text{Law}((\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}) | \text{Law}((\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW},\star})_{t \in [0, T_f]})) \\ &= \text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW}} | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{RW},\star}) , \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is known as Data processing inequality for relative entropy (Nutz, 2021, Lemma 1.6). We then conclude that

$$\text{KL}(\mu^\star | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW},\star})) \lesssim e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2}T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) + h\mathcal{I}(\mu^\star) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}}T_f .$$

Moreover, since $\text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) \leq d \log(m)$ by (73), the previous estimate still holds if we replace $\text{KL}(\mu^\star | \gamma^{\text{RW}})$ by $d \log(m)$ and we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.1.

5.1.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1.2

We proceed analogously as Theorem 3.1.1, the only difference is the way we handle the term E_2 in (32). Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_{t_k}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma)) \right] \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\Gamma_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{RW}} - \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_t^{\text{M}} = \mathbb{E} [\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma))]$ for $t \in [0, T_f]$. Following precisely the argument structure in the proof of Theorem 3 from Conforti et al. (2025), fixing T_f , a , and c , we choose the sequence of step-size as

$$h_{k+1} = \begin{cases} T_f - t_{K-1} & k = K-1 , \\ ca & k_0 + k_1 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1 + k_2 - 1 , \\ c(T_f - t_k) & k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1 , \\ c & 0 \leq k \leq k_0 , \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

and set the number of iterations $K = k_0 + k_1 + k_2 + 1$, with

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 &= \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - t_k \geq 1\} \quad k_1 = \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - t_{k_0+k} \geq a\} \\ k_2 &= \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - t_{k_0+k_1+k} \geq 0\} . \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

It is shown in Conforti et al. (2025) that

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 &= \lfloor c^{-1}(T_f - 1) \rfloor, \quad k_1 = \lfloor \log(a/(T_f - t_{k_0}))/\log(1-c) \rfloor \lesssim \log(1/a)/c , \\ K - k_0 - k_1 &= k_2 + 1 \lesssim 1/c, \quad h_{k+1} = c(1-c)^{k-k_0}(T_f - t_{k_0}) \text{ for } k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1 . \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Using (33) and the monotonicity of Γ_t^{RW} showed in Lemma 5.1.2, we can bound E_2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2 &\leq h_K \Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{RW}} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{k_0+1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1+1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=k_0+k_1+2}^{k_0+k_1+k_2-1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) + \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+k_2}}^{\text{RW}} (h_{K-1} - h_K) + h_K \Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{RW}}}_{=0} \\
&\lesssim \underbrace{\Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^{\text{RW}} [c - c(T_f - t_{k_0+1})]}_{(1)} + c \underbrace{\sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} h_k}_{(2)} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+1}}^{\text{RW}} (T_f - t_{k_0+k_1} - a)}_{(3)} + \underbrace{\Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{RW}} h_{K-1}}_{(4)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now bound (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) one by one by exploiting the upper bound on Γ_t^{RW} (see Lemma 5.1.3). We start with

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) : \Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^{\text{RW}} [c - c(T_f - t_{k_0+1})] &\leq c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^{\text{RW}} \stackrel{(30)}{\lesssim} \frac{cd \log(m)}{T_f - t_{k_0+1}} \\
&= \frac{cd \log(m)}{T_f - t_{k_0} - h_{k_0+1}} \stackrel{(34)}{\leq} \frac{cd \log(m)}{1-c} \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} cd \log(m).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the second term

$$\begin{aligned}
(2) : c \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{RW}} h_k &\stackrel{(30)}{\lesssim} cd \log(m) \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{h_k}{T_f - t_k} \\
&\stackrel{(33)}{\leq} c^2 d \log(m) \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{h_k}{h_{k+1}} \\
&\stackrel{(35)}{=} c^2 d \log(m) \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{c(1-c)^{k-k_0-1} (T_f - t_{k_0})}{c(1-c)^{k-k_0} (T_f - t_{k_0})} \\
&\stackrel{(35)}{\lesssim} c^2 d \log(m) \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{1}{1-c} \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} c^2 d \log(m) k_1 \stackrel{(35)}{\lesssim} cd \log(m) \log(1/a).
\end{aligned}$$

The third term (3) can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) : c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+1}}^{\text{RW}} (T_f - t_{k_0+k_1} - a) &\stackrel{(30)}{\lesssim} \frac{cd \log(m) (T_f - t_{k_0+k_1})}{T_f - t_{k_0+k_1+1}} \\
&\leq \frac{cd \log(m) (T_f - t_{k_0+k_1})}{T_f - t_{k_0+k_1} - h_{k_0+k_1+1}} \\
&\stackrel{(33)}{\leq} \frac{cd \log(m) (T_f - t_{k_0+k_1})}{(1-c)(T_f - t_{k_0+k_1})} = \frac{cd \log(m)}{1-c} \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} cd \log(m).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the last term, we have by definition of $L = \Gamma_{T_f}^{\text{RW}}/d$,

$$(4) : \Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{RW}} h_{K-1} = \Gamma_{T_f}^{\text{RW}} ca = cdaL.$$

Plugging all the bounds of (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) into E_2 gives

$$E_2 \lesssim cd[\log(m) + \log(m) \log(1/a) + aL] .$$

Choosing $a = 1/L$ and noting that $L \geq 2$ yield

$$E_2 \lesssim cd \log(m) \log(L) .$$

Therefore, the ultimate sampling error admits the following expression

$$\text{KL}(\mu^\star | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW}, \star})) \lesssim e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2} T_f} d \log(m) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f + cd \log(m) \log(L) .$$

Finally, choosing T_f and c as in (19) immediately implies

$$\text{KL}(\mu^\star | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW}, \star})) \lesssim \epsilon^{\text{RW}} + m^2 \epsilon^{\text{RW}} \log(d \log(m) / \epsilon^{\text{RW}}) ,$$

with the number of iterations is given by

$$\begin{aligned} K = k_0 + k_1 + K - k_0 - k_1 &\stackrel{(35)}{\lesssim} \frac{T_f - 1}{c} + \frac{\log(1/a)}{c} + \frac{1}{c} = \frac{T_f + \log(L)}{c} \\ &\lesssim \frac{d \log(m) \log(L) [m^2 \log(d \log(m) / \epsilon^{\text{RW}}) + \log(L)]}{\epsilon^{\text{RW}}} , \end{aligned}$$

and we complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.2.

5.1.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1.3

For $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, we have

$$\|\mu^\star - \mu_\eta^{\text{RW}}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{P}(X_\eta^{\text{RW}} \neq X_0^{\text{RW}}) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^\star(x) (1 - e^{-d\eta}) = 1 - \underbrace{e^{-d\eta}}_{\geq -d\eta+1} \leq d\eta . \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, proceeding similarly as in Theorem 3.1.2 for the early-stopped process implies

$$\text{KL}(\mu_\eta^{\text{RW}} | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW}, \star})) \lesssim e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2} T_f} d \log(m) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f + cd \log(m) \log(L) ,$$

where $L = \mathcal{I}(\mu_\eta^{\text{RW}})/d$. Relying on the upper bound of discrete Fisher information showed in (30), we can deduce that

$$\text{KL}(\mu_\eta^{\text{RW}} | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW}, \star})) \lesssim e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2} T_f} d \log(m) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f + cd \log(m) \log(\eta^{-1} \log(m)) . \quad (37)$$

Combining (36) and (37), by triangle and Pinsker's inequalities, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW}, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \|\mu^\star - \mu_\eta^{\text{RW}}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\mu_\eta^{\text{RW}} - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW}, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\lesssim d\eta + \sqrt{e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{25m^2} T_f} d \log(m) + \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f + cd \log(m) \log(\eta^{-1} \log(m))} . \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, choosing η , T_f and c as in (20) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{\text{RW}, \star})\|_{\text{TV}} &\lesssim \epsilon^{\text{RW}} + \sqrt{\epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{\text{RW}} + m \sqrt{\epsilon^{\text{RW}} \log(d \log(m) / (\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2)} . \end{aligned}$$

By (35), the number of iterations is calculated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
K &= k_0 + k_1 + K - k_0 - k_1 \\
&\lesssim \frac{T_f - \eta - 1}{c} + \frac{\log(L)}{c} + \frac{1}{c} \stackrel{(30)}{\lesssim} \frac{T_f + \log(\eta^{-1} \log(m))}{c} \\
&\lesssim \frac{d \log(m) \log(d \log(m) / \epsilon^{\text{RW}}) [m^2 \log(d \log(m) / (\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2) + \log(d \log(m) / \epsilon^{\text{RW}})]}{(\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, our algorithm has the complexity $\tilde{O}(dm^2 / (\epsilon^{\text{RW}})^2)$, where the notation \tilde{O} indicates that all the logarithms of $d, m, \epsilon^{\text{RW}}$ have been dropped, and the proof of Theorem 3.1.3 concludes.

5.2 Masked diffusion on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

5.2.1 Score monotonicity and supporting lemmas

Lemma 5.2.1. *Under M1 and M2, the time reversal process $(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is associated with the backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{M}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ given in (4), where $\tilde{q}_t^{\text{M}}(x, y) := q_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(y, x)$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $(u_t^{\text{M}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ admits the following formula: for $(t, x, y) \in [0, T_f] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$,*

$$u_t^{\text{M}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(y) / \mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(x) & \text{if } \exists i \in \mathbf{M}_y^c : x = \mathbf{m}^{(i)}(y), \\ \sum_{y \neq x} u_t^{\text{M}}(x, y) \tilde{q}_t^{\text{M}}(x, y) / \tilde{q}_t^{\text{M}}(x) & \text{if } x = y, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Furthermore, u^{M} given above can be expressed as

$$u_t^{\text{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) = e^{V_t^{\text{M}}(x) - V_t^{\text{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathbf{M}_x, j \in \mathbb{Z}_m,$$

with $V_t^{\text{M}}(x) := -\log \mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(x)$ for $(t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$, and satisfies the following equation: for $(t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}_m^d$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m, i \in \mathbf{M}_x$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u_t^{\text{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) &= \beta(T_f - t) u_t^{\text{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[1 + \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(x)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)))}{\mu_{T_f - t}^{\text{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2.1. See Section A.4.3. □

Lemma 5.2.2. *Under M1, M2, for any $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, $i \in [d]$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, the process $(u_t^{\text{M}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}})) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}}})_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]}$ is a submartingale. In particular, for $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta$, the following holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{\text{M}}} \left[u_t^{\text{M}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}})) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] = e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} u_\nu^{\text{M}}(\overleftarrow{X}_\nu^{\text{M}}, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_\nu^{\text{M}})) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_\nu^{\text{M}}}},$$

where \mathcal{F}_ν is a σ -algebra of $\overleftarrow{X}_\nu^{\text{M}}$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2.2. Fix $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, $i \in [d]$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, applying Itô's formula on

$$f^{(i), j}(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}) := u_t^{\text{M}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}})) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}}} = e^{V_t^{\text{M}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}) - V_t^{\text{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}))} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}}}}$$

for $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$ and note that $\text{Law}((\hat{X}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]})$ corresponds to the generator $(u_t^M \tilde{q}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]}$ as well as $\hat{X}_t^M = \hat{X}_{t-}^M$ for Lebesgue almost every $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$, we obtain that

$$f^{(i),j}(t, \hat{X}_t^M) - f^{(i),j}(0, \hat{X}_0^M) = M_{(i),j}^M(t) + \int_0^t \left[\partial_s f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_s^M) + (u^M \tilde{q}^M) f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_s^M) \right] ds ,$$

with

$$M_{(i),j}^M(t) = \int_{[0,t] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \left[f^{(i),j}(s, x) - f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_{s-}^M) \right] \tilde{N}_{\hat{X}^M}^{u^M \tilde{q}^M}(dx ds)$$

is a $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -true martingale (see Lemma A.3.3), where $\tilde{N}_{\hat{X}^M}^{u^M \tilde{q}^M}$ denotes the compensated measure of the random point measure $N_{\hat{X}^M}^{u^M \tilde{q}^M}$ corresponding to the CTMC associated with $(u_t^M \tilde{q}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Consequently, the process

$$f^{(i),j}(t, \hat{X}_t^M) - f^{(i),j}(0, \hat{X}_0^M) - \int_0^t \left[\partial_s f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_s^M) + (u^M \tilde{q}^M) f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_s^M) \right] ds ,$$

is a $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -martingale. Denote

$$b_s^{(i),j} := \partial_s f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_s^M) + (u^M \tilde{q}^M) f^{(i),j}(s, \hat{X}_s^M), \quad \text{for } s \in [0, T_f - \eta] .$$

We aim to prove that $b_s^{(i),j} \geq 0$. Indeed, by the definition of $f^{(i),j}, \tilde{q}^M$ and the HJB equation shown in Lemma 5.2.1, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} b_s^{(i),j} &= \beta(T_f - s) u_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \left[1 + \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-s}^M(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M))}{\mu_{T_f-s}^M(\hat{X}_s^M)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-s}^M(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)))}{\mu_{T_f-s}^M(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M))} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left[u_s^M(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M), \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M))) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - u_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \right] u_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M, \text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M)) \beta(T_f - s) . \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbb{M}_{\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M)} = \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M} \setminus \{k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, thus $i \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M)}$ is equivalent to $i \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}$ and $i \neq k$. Therefore, our computation continues

$$\begin{aligned} b_s^{(i),j} &= \beta(T_f - s) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \left\{ u_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} e^{2V_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M))} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} e^{V_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)))} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} e^{V_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M)))} \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{M}_{\hat{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} e^{2V_s^M(\hat{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\hat{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\hat{X}_s^M))} \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Finally notice that $\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\text{um}_n^{(k)}(\bar{X}_s^M)) = \text{um}_n^{(k)}(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(\bar{X}_s^M))$ for $i \neq k \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_s^M}$, which allows us to cancel out all the sums above and yields that

$$b_s^{(i),j} = \beta(T_f - s) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_s^M}} u_s^M(\bar{X}_s^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\bar{X}_s^M)) = \beta(T_f - s) f^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_s^M) \geq 0,$$

and it follows that $u_t^M(\bar{X}_t^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\bar{X}_t^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_t^M}}$ is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -submartingale for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$. Furthermore, by the martingale property, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M} \left[f^{(i),j}(t, \bar{X}_t^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M} \left[f^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_s^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] = \int_s^t \beta(T - r) \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M} \left[f_r^{(i),j}(\bar{X}_r^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] dr,$$

for any $0 \leq \nu \leq s \leq t < T_f$, where \mathcal{F}_t denotes the σ -algebra of \bar{X}_t^M for $t \in [0, T_f]$. For fixed $i \in [d]$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ and $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta$, denote

$$y_\nu^{(i),j}(t) := \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M} \left[f^{(i),j}(t, \bar{X}_t^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right].$$

Then the previous equation yields the following ODE:

$$\frac{d}{dt} y_\nu^{(i),j}(t) = \beta(T_f - t) y_\nu^{(i),j}(t), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta,$$

which in particular implies

$$y_\nu^{(i),j}(t) = e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} y_\nu^{(i),j}(\nu),$$

and the proof concludes. \square

Lemma 5.2.3. *Assume **M1** and **M2** holds. Recall that $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$ for $a > 0$ with the convention $\mathbf{h}(0) = 0$. Fix $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, $i \in [d]$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, then for $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta$, the following holds*

$$\mathbf{h}(u_\nu^M(\bar{X}_\nu^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\bar{X}_\nu^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_\nu^M}}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{h}(u_t^M(\bar{X}_t^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\bar{X}_t^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_t^M}}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] + e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2.3. Fix $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, $i \in [d]$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, applying Itô's formula on

$$g^{(i),j}(t, \bar{X}_t^M) := \mathbf{h} \left(u_t^M(\bar{X}_t^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\bar{X}_t^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{X}_t^M}} \right)$$

for $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$ and note that $\text{Law}((\bar{X}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]})$ is associated with the generator $(u_t^M \bar{q}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]}$ as well as $\bar{X}_t^M = \bar{X}_{t-}^M$ for Lebesgue almost every $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$, we obtain that

$$g^{(i),j}(t, \bar{X}_t^M) - g^{(i),j}(0, \bar{X}_0^M) = \tilde{M}_{(i),j}^M(t) + \int_0^t \left[\partial_s g^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_s^M) + (u^M \bar{q}^M) g^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_s^M) \right] ds,$$

with

$$\tilde{M}_{(i),j}^M(t) = \int_{[0,t] \times \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \left[g^{(i),j}(s, x) - g^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^M) \right] \tilde{N}_{\bar{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M}(dx ds)$$

is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -local martingale. Recall that under **M1** and **M2**, we have $\mu_t^M(x) > 0$ for any $x \in \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ and $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$, therefore $u_t^M(x, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) > 0$. Argue similarly as Lemma A.3.3 while noting that \mathbf{h} is a continuous function, we attain that $M_{(i),j}^M(t)$ is integrable and thus a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -martingale. As a result, the process

$$g^{(i),j}(t, \bar{X}_t^M) - g^{(i),j}(0, \bar{X}_0^M) - \int_0^t \left[\partial_s g^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_s^M) + (u^M \bar{q}^M) g^{(i),j}(s, \bar{X}_s^M) \right] ds, \quad (39)$$

is a $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -martingale. Denote

$$c_s^{(i),j} := \partial_s g^{(i),j}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_s^M) + (u^M \tilde{q}^M) g^{(i),j}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_s^M), \quad \text{for } s \in [0, T_f - \eta].$$

By the definition of $g^{(i),j}$, \tilde{q}^M and the HJB equation shown in Lemma 5.2.1, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} c_s^{(i),j} &= \beta(T_f - s) u_s^M \log u_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \\ &\quad \left[1 + \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-s}^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))}{\mu_{T_f-s}^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-s}^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)))}{\mu_{T_f-s}^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left[(u_s^M \log u_s^M - u_s^M)(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M), \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (u_s^M \log u_s^M - u_s^M)(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \right] u_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) \beta(T_f - s). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)} = \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M} \setminus \{k\}$ for $k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, thus $i \in \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)}$ is equivalent to $i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}$ and $i \neq k$. Therefore, our computation continues

$$\begin{aligned} c_s^{(i),j} &= \beta(T_f - s) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \left\{ u_s^M \log u_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \log u_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) e^{2V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} (V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))) e^{V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)))} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} (V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))) - 1) \\ &\quad \quad e^{V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)))} \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} (\log u_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) - 1) e^{2V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally notice that $\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) = \mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))$ for $i \neq k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}$, which allows us to reduce the expression above as

$$\begin{aligned} c_s^{(i),j} &= \beta(T_f - s) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \left\{ u_s^M \log u_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left[V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) + V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))) - 1 \right] e^{V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)))} \\ &\quad \left. + \underbrace{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_s^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} e^{2V_s^M(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\overleftarrow{X}_s^M))}}_{c_1} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the inequality $e^a \geq a + 1$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ on the last exponential term, we achieve

$$c_1 \geq \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{X}_s^M} \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} e^{V_s^M(\widehat{X}_s^M) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\widehat{X}_s^M)))} \\ \left[V_s^M(\widehat{X}_s^M) + V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\widehat{X}_s^M))) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\widehat{X}_s^M)) - V_s^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\widehat{X}_s^M)) + 1 \right],$$

which helps us simplify $c_s^{(i),j}$ into

$$c_s^{(i),j} \geq \beta(T_f - s) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{X}_s^M}} u_s^M \log u_s^M(\widehat{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\widehat{X}_s^M)) \\ \geq \beta(T_f - s) \left\{ (u_s^M \log u_s^M - u_s^M)(\widehat{X}_s^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\widehat{X}_s^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\widehat{X}_s^M}} \right\} \\ = \beta(T_f - s) \left[g^{(i),j}(s, \widehat{X}_s^M) - 1 \right].$$

Plugging it into (39) and taking the expectation given \mathcal{F}_ν the σ -algebra of \widehat{X}_ν^M , we obtain for $0 \leq \nu \leq s \leq t \leq T_f - \eta$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^M} \left[g^{(i),j}(t, \widehat{X}_t^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^M} \left[g^{(i),j}(s, \widehat{X}_s^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] \\ \geq \int_s^t \beta(T - r) \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^M} \left[g_r^{(i),j}(\widehat{X}_r^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right] - 1 \right\} dr.$$

Denote the function $\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(t) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^M} \left[g^{(i),j}(t, \widehat{X}_t^M) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right]$ for fixed $i \in [d]$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ and $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta$, then the previous equation implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(t) \geq \beta(T_f - t) \left[\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(t) - 1 \right], \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta.$$

This together with the Gronwall's inequality yield

$$\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(t) - 1 \geq \left[\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(\nu) - 1 \right] e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} = \gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(\nu) e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} - e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds}.$$

Recall that $\beta(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(\nu) \geq 0$ as the function $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$ is nonnegative for any $a \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(t) \geq \gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(\nu) + 1 - e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds}.$$

As a result, for $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f - \eta$, the following holds

$$\gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(\nu) \leq \gamma_\nu^{(i),j}(t) + e^{\int_\nu^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1,$$

and we conclude the proof. \square

A useful result that can be leveraged to reduce the complexity of DDMS is the following upper bound on the discrete Fisher information of the marginal density.

Lemma 5.2.4. *Assume **M1** and **M2** hold. For $t \in [0, T_f]$, let us denote*

$$\Gamma_t^M := \mathcal{I}(\mu_{T_f-t}^M) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mathbf{h} \left(u_t^M(X_{T_f-t}^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f-t}^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} \right) \right],$$

where $\mathbf{M}_t := \mathbf{M}_{X_t^M}$. Then we have

$$\Gamma_t^M \lesssim d \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f-t}}{1 - \alpha_{T_f-t}} + m \right).$$

In particular, for a constant generator $\beta(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T_f]$, this estimate reduces to

$$\Gamma_t^M \lesssim d \left(\frac{1}{T_f - t} + m \right).$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2.4. See Section A.4.4. \square

5.2.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2.1

We show first the bound for the “distance” between the backward path measure $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M$ of $(\overleftarrow{X}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]}$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{M, \star}$ of the simulated backward process $(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{M, \star})_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]}$. Consider the path measure $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{M, \star} \in \text{MP}(\overleftarrow{q}^{M, \theta^*})$ as the reference measure in Girsanov’s theorem A.7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{M, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^M | \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0, T_f}^M) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M} \left[\int_{[0, T_f - \eta]} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \left(\frac{\overleftarrow{q}_t^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} \log \frac{\overleftarrow{q}_t^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} - \frac{\overleftarrow{q}_t^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} + 1 \right) \overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*} (\overleftarrow{X}_t^M, x) \mathbb{1}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^M \neq x} dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

With a partition $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_K = T_f - \eta$ for $K \geq 1$ of $[0, T_f - \eta]$ associated with the sequence of step-size $h_{k+1} = t_{k+1} - t_k$, the previous expression rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{M, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^M | \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0, T_f}^M) \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\overleftarrow{q}_t^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} \right) (\overleftarrow{X}_t^M, x) \mathbb{1}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^M \neq x} dt \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^M | \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0, T_f}^M)}_{F_1} \\ &+ \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\overleftarrow{q}_t^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} \right) (\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M, x) \mathbb{1}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M \neq x} dt \right]}_{F_2} \\ &+ \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \left\{ \overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\overleftarrow{q}_t^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} \right) (\overleftarrow{X}_t^M, x) \mathbb{1}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^M \neq x} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. - \overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^M}{\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*}} \right) (\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M, x) \mathbb{1}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M \neq x} \right\} dt \right]}_{F_3}. \end{aligned}$$

We now handle the terms $F_1 - F_2 - F_3$ one-by-one. First, replacing the expressions of $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ from Lemma 5.2.1 and $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ from (5), (13) into F_2 , and using that $\tilde{q}_t^M(x, y) = q_{T_f - t}^M(y, x)$ where $(q_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ given in (10), we obtain

$$F_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\beta(T_f - t_k) \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M}} u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^M}{u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*}} \right) (\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M)) dt \right].$$

F_2 is easily bounded by M3:

$$F_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \beta(T_f - t_k) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M}} u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^M}{u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*}} \right) (\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^M)) \right] \leq \epsilon^{\text{RW}} T_f. \quad (40)$$

We bound next the term F_1 . To this purpose, we first compute explicitly the starting measure of our generative process: for $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0,T_f}^M \right) (x) &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \text{Uniform}(y) p_{0,T_f}^M(y, x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \frac{1}{m^d} \prod_{i=1}^d p_{0,T_f}^{M,1}(y^i, x^i) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \frac{1}{m^d} \prod_{i \in \mathbb{M}_x} (1 - \alpha_{T_f}) \prod_{j \in \mathbb{M}_x^c} \alpha_{T_f} \mathbb{1}_{y^j = x^j} \\ &= \frac{1}{m^d} (1 - \alpha_{T_f})^{|\mathbb{M}_x|} \alpha_{T_f}^{d - |\mathbb{M}_x|} m^{|\mathbb{M}_x|} = (1 - \alpha_{T_f})^{|\mathbb{M}_x|} \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f}}{m} \right)^{d - |\mathbb{M}_x|}. \end{aligned}$$

It yields the expression of F_1 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^M | \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0,T_f}^M) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_{T_f}^M(x) \log \frac{\mu_{T_f}^M(x)}{(\text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0,T_f}^M)(x)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_{T_f}^M(x) \log \mu_{T_f}^M(x) - \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_{T_f}^M(x) \log \left(\text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0,T_f}^M \right) (x) \\ &\leq - \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_{T_f}^M(x) \log \left[(1 - \alpha_{T_f})^{|\mathbb{M}_x|} \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f}}{m} \right)^{d - |\mathbb{M}_x|} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first sum was reduced since $\mu_{T_f}^M(x) \leq 1$. Hence

$$F_1 \leq -\mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbb{M}_{X_{T_f}^M}| \right] \log(1 - \alpha_{T_f}) - \left(d - \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbb{M}_{X_{T_f}^M}| \right] \right) \log(\alpha_{T_f}/m).$$

Furthermore, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbb{M}_{X_{T_f}^M}| \right] &= \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{1}_{x^i = m} \mu_{T_f}^M(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}((X_t^M)^i = m) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \alpha_{T_f}) \mathbb{P}((X_0^M)^i \neq m) = d(1 - \alpha_{T_f}), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

since $X_0^M \sim \mu^*$ with μ^* only supports on \mathbb{Z}_m^d . Plugging this into F_1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &\leq -d(1 - \alpha_{T_f}) \log(1 - \alpha_{T_f}) - d\alpha_{T_f} \log(\alpha_{T_f}/m) \\ &\stackrel{\log a \leq a-1}{\leq} (1 - \alpha_{T_f}) (1/(1 - \alpha_{T_f}) - 1) + d\alpha_{T_f} \log(m/\alpha_{T_f}) \\ &\leq d\alpha_{T_f} (1 + \log(m/\alpha_{T_f})). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It remains to control the term F_3 . To simplify it, we use the formula of $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ from Lemma 5.2.1 and $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{M, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ from (5), (13) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} F_3 &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M}} \beta(T_f - t_k) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\beta(T_f - t) (u_t^M)^{(i), j}}{\beta(T_f - t_k) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j}} \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\tilde{X}_{t_k}^M}} \beta(T_f - t_k) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{(u_{t_k}^M)^{(i), j}}{(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j}} \right) \right\} dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $(u_t^M)^{(i), j} := u_t^M(\tilde{X}_t^M, \mathbf{u}_j^{(i)}(\tilde{X}_t^M))$ and $(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} := u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*}(\tilde{X}_{t_k}^M, \mathbf{u}_j^{(i)}(\tilde{X}_{t_k}^M))$. Let us denote $(\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i), j} := (u_t^M)^{(i), j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M}}$ and $(\tilde{u}_t^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} := (u_t^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M}}$ through out the

rest of this proof. Recall that $\beta : [0, T_f] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is an increasing function, therefore,

$$\beta(T_f - t_{k+1}) \leq \beta(T_f - t) \leq \beta(T_f - t_k) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}) ,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} F_3 &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \left\{ \beta(T_f - t) (\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j} \log \frac{(\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j}}{(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \beta(T_f - t) (\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j} + \beta(T_f - t_k) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^M}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \beta(T_f - t_k) \left[(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \log \frac{(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}}{(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j}} - (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} + (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \right] \right\} dt \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \left\{ \beta(T_f - t) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^M}} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{(\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j}}{(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j}} \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \beta(T_f - t) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^M}} + \beta(T_f - t_k) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^M}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \beta(T_f - t_k) \left[(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \log \frac{(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}}{(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j}} - (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} + (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \right] \right\} dt \right] . \end{aligned}$$

We arrange the upper bound of F_3 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F_3 &\leq \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \left[\mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j}) - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] dt \right]}_{F_{3.1}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} [\beta(T_f - t_k) - \beta(T_f - t)] (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^M}} dt \right]}_{F_{3.2}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \left[\mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^M}} - \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{t_k}^M}} \right] dt \right]}_{F_{3.3}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \log (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \left[(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} - (\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j} \right] dt \right]}_{F_{3.4}} . \end{aligned}$$

The first quantity $F_{3.1}$ can be controlled by the tower property and Lemma 5.2.3 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.1} &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \left[\mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j}) - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] dt \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_{k+1}}^M)^{(i),j}) | \mathcal{F}_t \right] - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + e^{\int_t^{t_{k+1}} \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1 \right\} dt \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \left\{ \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_{k+1}}^M)^{(i),j}) - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + e^{\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1 \right\} dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by Lemma 5.2.3, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_{k+1}}^M)^{(i),j}) - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) + e^{\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1 \right] \geq 0,$$

thus, we can further bound $F_{3.1}$ by exploiting the fact that $\beta(t) \in [0, 1]$ for all $t \in [0, T_f]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.1} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (t_{k+1} - t_k) \left\{ \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_{k+1}}^M)^{(i),j}) - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) + e^{t_{k+1} - t_k} - 1 \right\} \right] \\
&\leq h \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_{k+1}}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] \right\} + dm(e^h - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (t_{k+1} - t_k),
\end{aligned}$$

where $h = \max_k \{t_{k+1} - t_k\}$. Observe that we attain telescoping sums on the right hand side, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.1} &\leq h \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_K}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_0}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] \right\} + dm(e^h - 1)(t_K - t_0) \\
&= h \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{T_f - \eta}^M)^{(i),j}) \right] + dm(e^h - 1)(T_f - \eta) \\
&\leq h \mathcal{I}(\mu_\eta^M) + dm(e^h - 1)T_f,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\mu_\eta^M) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mathbf{h}((u_{T_f - \eta}^M)^{(i),j}) \right]$ is the discrete Fisher information of μ_η^M . Leveraging the upper bound of Fisher information showed in Lemma 5.2.4, we get

$$F_{3.1} \lesssim h \left(\frac{d\alpha_\eta}{1 - \alpha_\eta} + dm \right) + dm(e^h - 1)T_f. \quad (43)$$

Next we evaluate $F_{3.2}$ by exploiting the increasing property of β :

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.2} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} [\beta(T_f - t_k) - \beta(T_f - t_{k+1})] (u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M}} dt \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (t_{k+1} - t_k) [\beta(T_f - t_k) - \beta(T_f - t_{k+1})] \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} - (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i), j} \right| \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (t_{k+1} - t_k) [\beta(T_f - t_k) - \beta(T_f - t_{k+1})] \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i), j} \right] \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.2.2}}{\leq} C_1^M h \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} [\beta(T_f - t_k) - \beta(T_f - t_{k+1})] \\
&\quad + h \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_K}^M)^{(i), j} \right] \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} [\beta(T_f - t_k) - \beta(T_f - t_{k+1})] \\
&\leq C_1^M h [\beta(T_f - t_0) - \beta(T_f - t_K)] + h \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_K}^M)^{(i), j} \right] [\beta(T_f - t_0) - \beta(T_f - t_K)] \\
&\leq C_1^M h + h \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_K}^M)^{(i), j} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1^M := \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \left| (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i), j} - (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i), j} \right| \right]$, and in the second estimate, we benefited from the fact that $\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M} \subset \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_{t_k}^M}$ a.s. Indeed, from (12), we have

$$\mathbb{P}((X_t^M)^i = m | (X_s^M)^i = m) = 1 \quad \text{for any } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_f,$$

which yields $\mathbf{M}_{X_s^M} \subset \mathbf{M}_{X_t^M}$ a.s., i.e., $\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M} \subset \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_s^M}$ a.s. for $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_f$. In addition, this allows us to cancel $F_{3.3}$ since $\mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_t^M}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{X}_{t_k}^M}}$. Let us compute explicitly the expectation in the upper bound of $F_{3.2}$. From (5.2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_K}^M)^{(i), j} \right] &= \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{M}_x} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \frac{\mu_\eta^M(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{\mu_\eta^M(x)} \mu_\eta^M(x) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d : x^i = m} \mu_\eta^M(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d : y^i = j} \mu_\eta^M(y) \\
&= \sum_{y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_\eta^M(y) \# \{(i, j) \in [d] \times \mathbb{Z}_m : y^i = j\} \\
&\leq \sum_{y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_\eta^M(y) \# \{i \in [d] : y^i \neq m\} \leq d \sum_{y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_\eta^M(y) = d,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\#A$ refers to the cardinality of the set A . Therefore

$$F_{3.2} \leq h(C_1^M + d). \quad (44)$$

The last term $F_{3.4}$ can be controlled by tower property and Lemma 5.2.2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.4} &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m \\ i \in [d]}} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \log(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} \left[(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} - \mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j} | \mathcal{F}_{t_k} \right] \right] dt \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \beta(T_f - t_k) \log(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \left[1 - e^{\int_{t_k}^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} \right] dt \right] \\
&\leq \underbrace{C_2^M \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} [e^{t-t_k} - 1] dt}_{F_{3.4a}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \beta(T_f - t_k) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \log(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \left[1 - e^{\int_{t_k}^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} \right] dt}_{F_{3.4b}},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\beta(t) \in [0, 1]$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$, where

$$C_2^M := \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \left| \log(u_{t_k}^{M, \theta^*})^{(i),j} - \log(u_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \right| \right].$$

Let $h = \max_k h_{k+1}$, we then have

$$F_{3.4a} \leq C_2^M (e^h - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \leq C_2^M (e^h - 1) T_f.$$

The term $F_{3.4b}$ is handled as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.4b} &= - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \beta(T_f - t_k) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \log(\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \left[e^{\int_{t_k}^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1 \right] dt \right] \\
&\stackrel{\log x \geq 1-1/x}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \underbrace{\beta(T_f - t_k)}_{\leq 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[1 - (\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j} \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \left[e^{\int_{t_k}^t \beta(T_f - s) ds} - 1 \right] dt \\
&\leq md(e^h - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} = md(e^h - 1) T_f.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with the bound on $F_{3.4a}$ imply

$$F_{3.4} \leq (e^h - 1)(C_2^M + dm) T_f. \quad (45)$$

Combining (43), (44) and (45) yields

$$F_3 \lesssim h \left(\frac{d\alpha_\eta}{1 - \alpha_\eta} + dm + C_1^M \right) + (e^h - 1)(C_2^M + dm) T_f. \quad (46)$$

Substituting all (40), (42) and (46) into the bound of $\text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{M, \star})$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{M, \star}) &\leq d\alpha_{T_f} (1 + \log(m/\alpha_{T_f})) + \epsilon^M T_f \\
&\quad + h \left(\frac{d\alpha_\eta}{1 - \alpha_\eta} + dm + C_1^M \right) + (e^h - 1)(C_2^M + dm) T_f.
\end{aligned}$$

To this end, notice that $\mu_\eta^M = \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f-\eta}^M)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu_\eta^M | \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{M,\star})) &= \text{KL}(\text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f-\eta}^M) | \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{M,\star})) \\ &\leq \text{KL}(\text{Law}((\bar{X}_t^M)_{t \in [0, T_f-\eta]}) | \text{Law}((\bar{X}_t^{M,\star})_{t \in [0, T_f-\eta]})) \\ &= \text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^M | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{M,\star}), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is known as Data processing inequality for relative entropy (Nutz, 2021, Lemma 1.6). As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu_\eta^M | \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f-\eta}^{M,\star})) &\leq d\alpha_{T_f}(1 + \log(m/\alpha_{T_f})) + \epsilon^M T_f \\ &\quad + h \left(\frac{d\alpha_\eta}{1 - \alpha_\eta} + dm + C_1^M \right) + (e^h - 1)(C_2^M + dm)T_f, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 3.2.1.

5.2.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2.3

We proceed analogously as Theorem 3.2.2 and note that for a constant generator $\beta(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T_f]$, the term $F_{3,2}$ in (44) vanishes and the term $F_{3,1}$ in (43) is handled differently as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F_{3,1} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \left\{ \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_{k+1}}^M)^{(i),j}) - \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_{t_k}^M)^{(i),j}) + e^{t_{k+1}-t_k} - 1 \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\Gamma_{t_{k+1}}^M - \Gamma_{t_k}^M \right) + md(e^h - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\Gamma_{t_{k+1}}^M - \Gamma_{t_k}^M \right)}_{F_{3,1a}} + md(e^h - 1)T_f, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_t^M = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{h}((\tilde{u}_t^M)^{(i),j}) \right]$ for $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\max_k h_k = h$. Let us choose the following step-sizes:

$$h_{k+1} = \begin{cases} T_f - \eta - t_{K-1} & k = K-1, \\ ca & k_0 + k_1 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1 + k_2 - 1, \\ c(T_f - \eta - t_k) & k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1, \\ c & 0 \leq k \leq k_0, \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

then $\max_k h_k = h = c$. We set the number of iterations $K = k_0 + k_1 + k_2 + 1$, with

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 &= \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - \eta - t_k \geq 1\} \quad k_1 = \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k} \geq a\} \\ k_2 &= \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1+k} \geq 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

It is shown in Conforti et al. (2025) that

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 &= \lfloor c^{-1}(T_f - \eta - 1) \rfloor, \quad k_1 = \lfloor \log(a/(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0}))/\log(1-c) \rfloor \lesssim \log(1/a)/c, \\ K - k_0 - k_1 &= k_2 + 1 \lesssim 1/c, \quad h_{k+1} = c(1-c)^{k-k_0}(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0}) \text{ for } k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Using (47) and the monotonicity of Γ_t^M established in Lemma 5.2.3, we can bound $E_{3.1a}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{3.1a} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\Gamma_{t_{k+1}}^M - \Gamma_{t_k}^M \right) \\
&\leq h_K \Gamma_{t_K}^M + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \Gamma_{t_k}^M (h_k - h_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{k_0+1} \Gamma_{t_k}^M (h_k - h_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1+1} \Gamma_{t_k}^M (h_k - h_{k+1}) \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=k_0+k_1+2}^{k_0+k_1+k_2-1} \Gamma_{t_k}^M (h_k - h_{k+1}) + \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+k_2}}^M (h_{K-1} - h_K) + h_K \Gamma_{t_K}^M}_{=0} \\
&\lesssim \underbrace{\Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^M [c - c(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+1})]}_{(1)} + c \underbrace{\sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \Gamma_{t_k}^M h_k}_{(2)} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+1}}^M (T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1} - a)}_{(3)} + \underbrace{\Gamma_{t_K}^M h_{K-1}}_{(4)} + md(e^c - 1)T_f.
\end{aligned}$$

We now bound (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) by leveraging Lemma 5.2.4. We start with

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) : \Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^M [c - c(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+1})] &\leq c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^M \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.2.4}}{\lesssim} cd \left(\frac{1}{T_f - t_{k_0+1}} + m \right) \\
&= cd \left(\frac{1}{T_f - t_{k_0} - h_{k_0+1}} + m \right) \\
&\stackrel{(48)}{\leq} cd \left(\frac{1}{1-c} + m \right) \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} cd(m+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the second term

$$\begin{aligned}
(2) : c \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \Gamma_{t_k}^M h_k &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.2.4}}{\lesssim} cd \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} h_k \left(\frac{1}{T_f - t_k} + m \right) \\
&\stackrel{(47)}{\leq} c^2 d \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{h_k}{h_{k+1}} + c^2 dm \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} (T_f - \eta - t_k) \\
&\stackrel{(49)}{=} c^2 d \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{c(1-c)^{k-k_0-1} (T_f - \eta - t_{k_0})}{c(1-c)^{k-k_0} (T_f - \eta - t_{k_0})} + c^2 dm(k_1 - 1) \\
&\stackrel{(49)}{\lesssim} c^2 d \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{1}{1-c} + c^2 dm k_1 \\
&\stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} c^2 dk_1 + c^2 dm k_1 \stackrel{(49)}{\lesssim} cd(1+m) \log(1/a).
\end{aligned}$$

The third term (3) can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) : & c\Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+1}}^M(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1} - a) \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.2.4}}{\lesssim} cd(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1}) \left(\frac{1}{T_f - t_{k_0+k_1+1}} + m \right) \\
& \leq cd(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1}) \left(\frac{1}{T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1} - h_{k_0+k_1+1}} + m \right) \\
& \stackrel{(47)}{\leq} cd(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1}) \left(\frac{1}{(1-c)(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1})} + m \right) \\
& = \frac{cd}{1-c} + cdm \underbrace{(T_f - \eta - t_{k_0+k_1})}_{\leq 1} \\
& \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} cd(1+m).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the last term, we have by definition of $L = \Gamma_{T_f - \eta}^M/d$,

$$(4) : \Gamma_{t_K}^M h_{K-1} = \Gamma_{T_f - \eta}^M ca = cdaL.$$

Plugging all the bounds of (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) into $F_{3.1}$ gives

$$F_{3.1} \lesssim cd[m+1 + (m+1)\log(1/a) + aL] + md(e^c - 1)T_f.$$

Choosing $a = 1/L$ and noting that $c \leq e^c - 1$ and $m \geq 1$, $L \geq 2$ yield

$$F_{3.1} \lesssim (e^c - 1)[dm \log(L) + mdT_f].$$

Therefore, the ultimate sampling error admits the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu_\eta^M | \text{Law}(\hat{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M,\star})) & \lesssim de^{-T_f}(T_f + \log(m)) + \epsilon^M T_f \\
& + (e^c - 1)[dm \log(L) + (C_2^M + dm)T_f],
\end{aligned}$$

where we replace $\alpha_t = e^{-t}$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$. Now note that

$$de^{-T_f}(T_f + \log(m)) \lesssim de^{-T_f}(e^{T_f/2} + \log(m)) \stackrel{m \geq 2}{\lesssim} d \log(m) e^{-T_f/2},$$

and by Lemma 5.2.4, $L \leq m + 1/\eta$. Plugging it into the overall error yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu_\eta^M | \text{Law}(\hat{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M,\star})) & \lesssim d \log(m) e^{-T_f/2} + \epsilon^M T_f \\
& (e^c - 1)[dm \log(m + \eta^{-1}) + (C_2^M + dm)T_f].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with

$$\|\mu_\eta^M - \mu^\star\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - \alpha_\eta^d = 1 - e^{-d\eta} \leq d\eta,$$

then invoking triangle and Pinsker's inequalities gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\hat{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M,\star})\|_{\text{TV}} \\
& \lesssim d\eta + \sqrt{d \log(m) e^{-T_f/2} + \epsilon^M T_f + (e^c - 1)[dm \log(m + \eta^{-1}) + (C_2^M + dm)T_f]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, choosing T_f, η, c as in (21), (22) immediately yields

$$\|\mu^\star - \text{Law}(\hat{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{M,\star})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \epsilon^M + \sqrt{\epsilon^M T_f} \lesssim \epsilon^M + \sqrt{\epsilon^M \log(d \log(m)/(\epsilon^M)^2)},$$

and the number of iterations is given by

$$K = k_0 + k_1 + K - k_0 - k_1 \stackrel{(49)}{\lesssim} \frac{T_f - \eta - 1}{c} + \frac{\log(1/a)}{c} + \frac{1}{c} = \frac{T_f + \log(m + \eta^{-1})}{c},$$

where T_f, η , and c are specified in (21), (22). Note that $1/\log(1+h)$ has the complexity $\tilde{O}(1/h)$ for $h \approx 0$, therefore $K = \tilde{O}(dm/(\epsilon^M)^2)$ and we complete the proof of Theorem 3.2.3.

5.3 Biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d

5.3.1 Score monotonicity and supporting lemmas

Lemma 5.3.1. *The time reversal process $(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ corresponds to the backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ given in (4), where $\tilde{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y)$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and the discrete score $(u_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ admits the following formula: for $(t, x, y) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$,*

$$u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) / \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) & \text{if } y = \sigma(x) \text{ for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) / q^{\text{BRW}}(x) & \text{if } y = x, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\mu}^{\text{BRW}} := \mu^{\text{BRW}} / \gamma^{\text{BRW}}$ denotes the relative density with $\gamma^{\text{BRW}} = \text{Poisson}(1)^{\otimes d}$. Furthermore, we can express u_t^{BRW} as

$$u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) = e^{V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))} \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d \text{ and } \sigma \in \mathcal{M},$$

with $V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) = -\log \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)$ satisfying the following HJB equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) [e^{V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))} - 1] = 0, \\ V_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}}(x) = -\log \tilde{\mu}^*(x). \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3.1. See Section A.4.5. □

Lemma 5.3.2. *For any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\ell \in [d]$, the following holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right],$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right].$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3.2. See Section A.4.6. □

Lemma 5.3.3. *For any $t \in [0, T_f]$, the following holds for each fixed $\ell \in [d]$:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[u_t^{\text{BRW}} \log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] = -\mathbb{E} \left[\log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right],$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[u_t^{\text{BRW}} \log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] = -\mathbb{E} \left[\log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right].$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3.3. See Section A.4.7. □

Lemma 5.3.4. $\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{BRW}}) q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right]$ is non-decreasing on $[0, T_f]$, where $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$.

Proof of Lemma 5.3.4. Following Conforti (2022, Proposition 2.1), we have

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}), \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}) \geq \kappa_{\mathbf{h}} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}), \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}), \quad (51)$$

where $\tilde{\mu}^{\text{BRW}} = \mu^{\text{BRW}} / \gamma^{\text{BRW}}$ denotes the relative marginal density of $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, function $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$ for $a > 0$ and the Dirichlet form admits the following explicit formula

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) = - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} f(x) (q^{\text{BRW}} g)(x) \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x), \quad \text{for any functions } f, g.$$

The Dirichlet form in (51) can be computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}), \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}) &= \mathcal{E}(\log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}) \\ &= - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) (q^{\text{BRW}} \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}})(x) \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) (\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) - \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x)) \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))}{\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x)} - 1 \right) \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) \left(u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) - 1 \right) \mu_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \log \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}})} \left(u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We write the above in terms of $u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}), \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \left(u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\{ \log u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) - \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\{ \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}) - \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The last term can be cancelled out thanks to the following computation

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))} \mu_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) \\ &\stackrel{(78)}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), x) \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) \mu_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) \mu_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \log \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the Dirichlet form is simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}), \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(X_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}} u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} (\bar{X}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}})) \right].\end{aligned}$$

For $t \in [0, T_f]$, denote

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} &:= \mathcal{I}(\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{BRW}}) q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.2}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} \log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right],\end{aligned}$$

then the computation above shows that $\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}), \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}})$. Thus (51) implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} \geq \kappa_{\mathbf{h}} \Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}}.$$

Conforti (2022, Theorem 3.1) also provided the formulation to compute the constant $\kappa_{\mathbf{h}}$ and for the considered biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d , we obtain $\kappa_{\mathbf{h}} = 1$. Combining this with Gronwall's lemma yields

$$\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} \geq e^{t-s} \Gamma_s^{\text{BRW}}, \quad \text{for any } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_f.$$

In particular, Γ_t^{BRW} is non-decreasing on $[0, T_f]$ and the proof concludes. \square

The monotonicity established in Lemma 5.3.4 leads to the following bound on the discrete Fisher information, which will be used to reduce the complexity of DDMs later.

Lemma 5.3.5. *Assume $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) < \infty$ then the following holds for any $t \in [0, T_f]$:*

$$\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} \leq (T_f - t)^{-1} [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)], \quad (52)$$

where $\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} = \mathcal{I}_{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}}(\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h}(u_t^{\text{BRW}}) q^{\text{BRW}}(X_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}})) \right]$.

Proof of Lemma 5.3.5. See Section A.4.8. \square

Lemma 5.3.6. *Assume $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) < \infty$ and for fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, $0 \leq \nu \leq t < T_f$, denote*

$$y_{\nu}^{\sigma}(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} (\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 | \mathcal{F}_{\nu} \right],$$

where \mathcal{F}_{ν} is a σ -algebra of $\bar{X}_{\nu}^{\text{BRW}}$. Then it holds for any $0 \leq \nu \leq t < T_f$ and $\ell \in [d]$:

$$y_{\nu}^{\sigma, \ell+}(t) = y_{\nu}^{\sigma, \ell+}(\nu) e^{t-\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{\nu}^{\sigma, \ell-}(t) = y_{\nu}^{\sigma, \ell-}(\nu) e^{-(t-\nu)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3.6. Fix $t \in [0, T_f]$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$ and apply Itô's formula on

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{f}^{\sigma}(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) &:= q^{\text{BRW}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} (\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 \\ &= q^{\text{BRW}} (\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) e^{V_t^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) - V_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}))} - 1,\end{aligned}$$

and note that $\text{Law}((\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}) = \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}}$ is associated with $(u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(0, \bar{X}_0^{\text{BRW}}) &= M_\sigma^{\text{BRW}}(t) + \int_0^t \left[\partial_t \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}}) \right] q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})) \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$M_\sigma^{\text{BRW}}(t) = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{N}^d} \left[\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, x) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}}) \right] \tilde{N}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}} (dx ds)$$

is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}}$ -local martingale, where $\tilde{N}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}}$ denotes the compensated measure of the random point measure $N_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}}$ corresponding to the CTMC associated with $(u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$; see Section A.5 for completeness. Since

$$\tilde{N}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}} = N_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}} - \bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}},$$

where $\bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}}$ is the compensator of $N_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|M_\sigma^{\text{BRW}}(t)|] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{N}^d} |\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, x) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})| N_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}} (ds dx) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{N}^d} |\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, x) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})| \bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}} (ds dx) \right] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{N}^d} |\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, x) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})| \bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{BRW}}}^{u^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}} (ds dx) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption μ^\star has finite second order moment, we have $\mathbb{E}[|M_\sigma^{\text{BRW}}(t)|] < \infty$ by Lemma A.3.11. Consequently, the process $M_\sigma^{\text{BRW}}(t)$ is a true $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}}$ -martingale, i.e., the process

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(0, \bar{X}_0^{\text{BRW}}) &- \int_0^t \left[\partial_t \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}}) \right] q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})) \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

is a $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}}$ -martingale. Since $\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}} = \bar{X}_{t-}^{\text{BRW}}$ for Lebesgue almost every $t \in (0, T_f]$, then we can simplify the process above into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}^\sigma(t, \bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(0, \bar{X}_0^{\text{BRW}}) &- \int_0^t \left[\partial_t \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right] q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) \right] ds. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

For $s \in [0, T_f]$, denote

$$\mathbf{b}_s^\sigma := \partial_s \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right] q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})).$$

We write $\overleftarrow{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}$ as x and $u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x))$ as $u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma)$, $q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x))$ as $q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma)$ for convenience in the computation of \mathbf{b}_s^σ . By the definition of \mathbf{b}^σ and the HJB equation (50), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_s^\sigma &= q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma) [\partial_s V_s^{\text{BRW}}(x) - \partial_s V_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} [q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma'(x), \sigma) - q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma)] q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma') \\ &= q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma) \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma') (u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma') - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), \sigma') (u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), \sigma') - 1) \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} [q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma'(x), \sigma) - q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma)] q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma') u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma'). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the identity $u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma) = e^{V_s^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))}$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_s^\sigma &= q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma) \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} [q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), \sigma') - q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma')] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left[e^{V_s^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(\sigma'(x)))} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma') q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma'(x), \sigma) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - e^{V_s^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_s^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma'(\sigma(x)))} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma) q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), \sigma') \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Specifically, for fixed $\ell \in [d]$, we can compute $b_s^{\sigma_+^\ell}$ and $b_s^{\sigma_-^\ell}$ as follows

$$\mathbf{b}_s^{\sigma_+^\ell} = q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_+^\ell) + x^\ell - (x^\ell + 1) = q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_+^\ell) - 1,$$

and

$$\mathbf{b}_s^{\sigma_-^\ell} = -q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_-^\ell) + x^\ell + 1 - x^\ell = -q^{\text{BRW}} u_s^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_-^\ell) + 1.$$

Substituting this into (53) and taking the expectation yields

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^{\sigma_+^\ell}(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu] - \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^{\sigma_+^\ell}(0, \overleftarrow{X}_0^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu] = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^{\sigma_+^\ell}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu] ds,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^{\sigma_-^\ell}(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu] - \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^{\sigma_-^\ell}(0, \overleftarrow{X}_0^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu] = - \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^{\sigma_-^\ell}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu] ds,$$

for any $0 \leq \nu \leq t < T_f$, where \mathcal{F}_ν is the σ -algebra of $\overleftarrow{X}_\nu^{\text{BRW}}$. For $\nu \leq t < T_f$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, define the function

$$y_\nu^\sigma(t) := \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{f}^\sigma(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) | \mathcal{F}_\nu].$$

Then the previous computation implies

$$y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(t) - y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(0) = \int_0^t y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(r) dr \quad \text{and} \quad y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(t) - y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(0) = - \int_0^t y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(r) dr.$$

Divide the both hand sides by t and let $t \rightarrow 0^+$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(t) = y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt} y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(t) = -y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(t).$$

Solving these ordinary differential equations, we arrive at

$$y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(t) = y_\nu^{\sigma_+^\ell}(\nu) e^{t-\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(t) = y_\nu^{\sigma_-^\ell}(\nu) e^{-(t-\nu)}, \text{ for any } t \in [\nu, T_f],$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 5.3.6. \square

Lemma 5.3.7. Assume $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) < \infty$ and for fixed $\ell \in [d]$, $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f$, denote

$$\psi_\nu^\ell(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right],$$

where \mathcal{F}_ν is a σ -algebra of $\overleftarrow{X}_\nu^{\text{BRW}}$. Then the following holds

$$\psi_\nu^\ell(t) = \psi_\nu^\ell(s) e^{t-s} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \nu \leq s \leq t \leq T_f.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3.7. By applying Itô's formula on

$$q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) = (\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell = (X_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}})^\ell$$

for each fixed $\ell \in [d]$ and using the fact that $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is a CTMC with generator q^{BRW} satisfying $X_t^{\text{BRW}} = X_{t-}^{\text{BRW}}$ for Lebesgue almost every $t \in (0, T_f]$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & (X_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}})^\ell - (X_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}})^\ell \\ &= \mathbf{M}_\ell^{\text{BRW}}(t) + \int_{T_f}^{T_f-t} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} [(\sigma(X_s^{\text{BRW}}))^\ell - (X_s^{\text{BRW}})^\ell] q^{\text{BRW}}(X_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_\ell^{\text{BRW}}(t) = - \int_{[T_f-t, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d} [x^\ell - (X_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})^\ell] \tilde{N}_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}(\mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}s)$$

is a local martingale, where $\tilde{N}_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}$ denotes the compensated measure of the random point measure $N_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}$ corresponding to the CTMC associated with q^{BRW} ; see Section A.5 for completeness. Since

$$\tilde{N}_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}} = N_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}} - \bar{\mathbf{n}}_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{n}}_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}$ is the compensator of $N_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{M}_\ell^{\text{BRW}}(t)|] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[T_f-t, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d} |x^\ell - (X_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})^\ell| N_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[T_f-t, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d} |\mathbf{x}^\ell - (X_{s-}^{\text{BRW}})^\ell| \bar{\mathbf{n}}_{X^{\text{BRW}}}^{q^{\text{BRW}}}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \right] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[T_f-t, T_f]} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} |(\sigma(X_s^{\text{BRW}}))^\ell - (X_s^{\text{BRW}})^\ell| q^{\text{BRW}}(X_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_s^{\text{BRW}})) \mathrm{d}s \right] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[T_f-t, T_f]} ((X_s^{\text{BRW}})^\ell + 1) \mathrm{d}s \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) < \infty$, Proposition A.3.7 implies $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) < \infty$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$, which yields $\mathbb{E}[(X_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell] < \infty$ for any $\ell \in [d]$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{M}_\ell^{\text{BRW}}(t)|] \leq 2 \int_{[T_f-t, T_f]} (\mathbb{E}[(X_s^{\text{BRW}})^\ell] + 1) \mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

As a result, $\mathbf{M}_\ell^{\text{BRW}}(t)$ is a true martingale. It follows that

$$(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell - (\overleftarrow{X}_0^{\text{BRW}})^\ell - \int_{T_f-t_k}^{T_f-t} (q^{\text{BRW}}(X_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(X_s^{\text{BRW}})) - q^{\text{BRW}}(X_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(X_s^{\text{BRW}}))) \mathrm{d}s$$

is a martingale. Changing the variable in the integral, the following process is a martingale:

$$(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell - (\bar{X}_0^{\text{BRW}})^\ell - \int_0^t \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 \right) ds.$$

Denote $\psi_\nu^\ell(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_\nu \right]$ for $0 \leq \nu \leq t \leq T_f$, then the previous equation implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \psi_\nu^\ell(t) = \psi_\nu^\ell(t).$$

As a consequence, for any $0 \leq \nu \leq s \leq t \leq T_f$ we have

$$\psi_\nu^\ell(t) = \psi_\nu^\ell(s) e^{t-s},$$

which concludes the proof. \square

5.3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3.1

We show first the bound for the “distance” between the backward path measure $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}}$ of $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}, \star}$ of the simulated backward process $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}, \star})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Consider the path measure $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}, \star} \in \text{MP}(\bar{q}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star})$ as the reference measure in Girsanov’s theorem A.7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, T_f)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \left(\frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}} \log \frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}} - \frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}} + 1 \right) \bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, x) \mathbb{1}_{\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}} \neq x} dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

With a partition $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_K = T_f$ for $K \geq 1$ of $[0, T_f)$ associated with the sequence of step-size $h_{k+1} = t_{k+1} - t_k$, the previous expression rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}, \star}) &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \left(\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}} \log \frac{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}}{\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}} - \bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}} + \bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star} \right) (\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, x) \mathbb{1}_{\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}} \neq x} dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the expressions of $(\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f)}$ from Lemma 5.3.1 and $(\bar{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star})_{t \in [0, T_f)}$ from (5), (16) into the preceding equation, where q^{BRW} given in (14), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{KL}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}, \star}) \\ &= \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}(\sigma) \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)}{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}(\sigma)} \right) q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$. Here we write $u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) := u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}))$ and $q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) := q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}))$ and $u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}(\sigma) := u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^\star}(\bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}))$ for

short. We decompose the previous expression into three following terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}} | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}, \star}) \\
&= \underbrace{\text{KL}(\mu_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}})}_{G_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)}{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)} \right) u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) dt \right]}_{G_2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)}{u_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)} \right) u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \quad \quad \left. \left. - \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)}{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)} \right) u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right\} dt \right]}_{G_3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

We now handle $G_1 - G_2 - G_3$ one by one. By (15), we have

$$G_1 \leq e^{-T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}).$$

For G_2 , we use **BRW1** to control:

$$G_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{h} \left(\frac{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)}{u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma)} \right) u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right] \leq \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f.$$

Finally, G_3 can be simplified and decomposed into three terms

$$\begin{aligned}
G_3 &= \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (q_t^{\text{BRW}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} \log u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) - q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)) dt \right]}_{G_{3.1}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) + 1) (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) - u_t^{\text{BRW}} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)) dt \right]}_{G_{3.2}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) (q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) - q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma)) dt \right]}_{G_{3.3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We evaluate the term $G_{3.2}$ by the tower property and the evolution obtained in Lemma 5.3.6.

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{3.2} &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} + 1) (\sigma_+^\ell) (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) - u_t^{\text{BRW}} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)) dt \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma_-^\ell) + 1) (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - u_t^{\text{BRW}} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)) dt \right] \\
&= \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma_+^\ell) + 1) (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) - 1)(1 - e^{t-t_k}) dt \right]}_{G_{3.2}^+} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma_-^\ell) + 1) (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1)(1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt \right]}_{G_{3.2}^-}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first part $G_{3.2}^+$ can be bounded as follows

$$G_{3.2}^+ \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) + 1)(u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) - 1)(1 - e^{t-t_k}) dt \right] \\ + C_1^{\text{BRW}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt ,$$

where

$$C_1^{\text{BRW}} := \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left| (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma) - \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma))(u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) - 1) \right| \right] .$$

By Lemma 5.3.3, we have $\mathbb{E}[-\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] = \mathbb{E}[u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)]$. Using this and noting that $c = \max_k h_k$, we obtain

$$G_{3.2}^+ = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \mathbb{E} [u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) - \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] (1 - e^{t-t_k}) dt \\ + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) - 1] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{t-t_k}) dt + C_1^{\text{BRW}} (e^c - 1) T_f \\ \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.2}}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \mathbb{E} [-\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] (1 - e^{t-t_k}) dt \\ + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \underbrace{(1 - e^{t-t_k})}_{\leq 0} dt + C_1^{\text{BRW}} (e^c - 1) T_f \\ \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) + \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt \\ + d(e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} + C_1^{\text{BRW}} (e^c - 1) T_f \\ \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) + \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt \\ + (C_1^{\text{BRW}} + d)(e^c - 1) T_f \\ \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) + \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt \\ + (C_1^{\text{BRW}} + d)(e^c - 1) T_f .$$

In addition, for any $\ell \in [d]$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)] = \mathbb{E} [\log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \mathbb{1}_{q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \geq 1}] \\ \stackrel{\log x \leq x-1}{\leq} \mathbb{E} [q_t^{\text{BRW}}(u_t^{\text{BRW}} - 1)(\sigma_-^\ell) \mathbb{1}_{q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \geq 1}] \\ \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.2}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\underbrace{q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)}_{=1} - q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \right) \mathbb{1}_{q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \geq 1} \right] \leq 0 .$$

This together with $e^{t-t_k} - 1 \geq (e^{t-t_k} - 1)/e^{t-t_k} = 1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} G_{3.2}^+ &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt + (C_1^{\text{BRW}} + d)(e^c - 1)T_f \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The second part $G_{3.2}^-$ can be treated similarly as follows

$$\begin{aligned} G_{3.2}^- &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) + 1)(u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1)(1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt \right] \\ &\quad + C_1^{\text{BRW}} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.3.2 and Lemma 5.3.3, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} G_{3.2}^- &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \mathbb{E} [u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)] (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt + C_1^{\text{BRW}}(e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) + \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{-(t-t_k)} - 1) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)}_{=1} - 1 \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt + C_1^{\text{BRW}}(e^c - 1)T_f \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) + \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{-(t-t_k)} - 1) dt \\ &\quad + C_1^{\text{BRW}}(e^c - 1)T_f. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Combining (55) and (56) yields

$$\begin{aligned} G_{3.2} &\lesssim (C_1^{\text{BRW}} + d)(e^c - 1)T_f \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt}_{G_{3.2a}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} [\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{-(t-t_k)} + e^{t-t_k} - 2) dt}_{G_{3.2b}}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

We estimate $G_{3.2a}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{3.2a} &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} (q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1) \mathbb{1}_{q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \geq 1} \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt \\
&\stackrel{\log x \leq x-1}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[(u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1)(q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1) \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.2}}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)}_{=1} + 1 \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (1 - e^{-(t-t_k)}) dt \\
&\lesssim (e^c - 1)d \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} = (e^c - 1)dT_f. \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that $e^{-(t-t_k)} + e^{t-t_k} - 2 \geq 0$ by Cauchy inequality, thereby $G_{3.2b}$ is controlled as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{3.2b} &\stackrel{\log x \leq x-1}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[(u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} - 1)q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{-(t-t_k)} + e^{t-t_k} - 2) dt \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.2}}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1 \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{-(t-t_k)} + e^{t-t_k} - 2) dt \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.7}}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left(q_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1 \right) e^{-(T_f-t_k)} \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{-(t-t_k)} + e^{t-t_k} - 2) dt \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[q_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \right] \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt \\
&\leq (e^c - 1)\mathbf{m}_1^* T_f, \tag{59}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{m}_1^* = \mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) = \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1]$. Substituting (58) and (59) into (57) gives

$$G_{3.2} \lesssim (e^c - 1)T_f(C_1^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*). \tag{60}$$

The next term $E_{3.3}$ can be simplified into the sum over all σ_-^ℓ since $q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell) = 1$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\ell \in [d]$. Therefore we derive

$$G_{3.3} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma_-^\ell) (q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)) dt \right].$$

By the tower property and Lemma 5.3.7, we attain that

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{3.3} &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma_-^\ell) (\mathbb{E}[q_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}] - q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell)) dt \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\sigma_-^\ell) (q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) - 1) (e^{t-t_k} - 1) dt \right] \\
&\leq (e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \right] \\
&= (e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d (u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} - u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}) q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \right] \\
&\quad + (e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \right] \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.2}}{\leq} C_2^{\text{BRW}} (e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} + (e^c - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d \underbrace{q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell)}_{=1} \right] \\
&= (C_2^{\text{BRW}} + d)(e^c - 1)T_f, \tag{61}
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_2^{\text{BRW}} := \max_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^d |u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*} - u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}| q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell) \right]$.

The last term $G_{3.1}$ can be controlled using the tower property and the monotonicity showed in Lemma 5.3.4:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{3.1} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[q_t^{\text{BRW}} u_t^{\text{BRW}} \log u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k} \right] - q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right) dt \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{[t_k, t_{k+1})} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[q_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}} u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k} \right] - q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right) dt \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}} u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \log u_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma) \right] \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} h_{k+1} \left(\Gamma_{t_{k+1}}^{\text{BRW}} - \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We explicitly express the chosen sequence of step-sizes as follows

$$h_{k+1} = \begin{cases} T_f - t_{K-1} & k = K-1, \\ ca & k_0 + k_1 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1 + k_2 - 1, \\ c(T_f - t_k) & k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1, \\ c & 0 \leq k \leq k_0, \end{cases} \tag{62}$$

Then the number of iterations is $K = k_0 + k_1 + k_2 + 1$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
k_0 &= \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - t_k \geq 1\}, \quad k_1 = \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - t_{k_0+k} \geq a\} \\
k_2 &= \max \{k \geq 0 : T_f - t_{k_0+k_1+k} \geq 0\}. \tag{63}
\end{aligned}$$

It is shown in Conforti et al. (2025) that

$$\begin{aligned}
k_0 &= \lfloor c^{-1}(T_f - 1) \rfloor, \quad k_1 = \lfloor \log(a/(T_f - t_{k_0})) / \log(1 - c) \rfloor \lesssim \log(1/a)/c, \\
K - k_0 - k_1 &= k_2 + 1 \lesssim 1/c, \quad h_{k+1} = c(1 - c)^{k-k_0} (T_f - t_{k_0}) \text{ for } k_0 + 1 \leq k \leq k_0 + k_1. \tag{64}
\end{aligned}$$

By (62) and the monotonicity of Γ_t^{RW} showed in Lemma 5.3.4, we can bound $G_{3.1}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{3.1} &\leq h_K \Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{BRW}} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{k_0+1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1+1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=k_0+k_1+2}^{k_0+k_1+k_2-1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} (h_k - h_{k+1}) + \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+k_2}}^{\text{BRW}} (h_{K-1} - h_K) + h_K \Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{BRW}}}_{=0} \\
&\lesssim \underbrace{\Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^{\text{BRW}} [c - c(T_f - t_{k_0+1})]}_{(1)} + c \underbrace{\sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} h_k}_{(2)} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+1}}^{\text{BRW}} (T_f - t_{k_0+k_1} - a)}_{(3)} + \underbrace{\Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{BRW}} h_{K-1}}_{(4)} .
\end{aligned}$$

We now bound (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) one by one using the upper bound of Γ_t^{BRW} showed in Lemma 5.3.5. We start with

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) : \Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^{\text{BRW}} [c - c(T_f - t_{k_0+1})] &\leq c \Gamma_{t_{k_0+1}}^{\text{BRW}} \stackrel{(52)}{\lesssim} c \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{T_f - t_{k_0+1}} \right) \\
&= c \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{T_f - t_{k_0} - h_{k_0+1}} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(63)}{\leq} c \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{1 - c} \right) \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} c [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] .
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the second term

$$\begin{aligned}
(2) : c \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \Gamma_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}} h_k &\stackrel{(52)}{\lesssim} c \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} h_k \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{T_f - t_k} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(62)}{\leq} c^2 [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{h_k}{h_{k+1}} \\
&\stackrel{(64)}{\leq} c^2 [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{c(1-c)^{k-k_0-1} (T_f - t_{k_0})}{c(1-c)^{k-k_0} (T_f - t_{k_0})} \\
&\stackrel{(64)}{\lesssim} c^2 [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] \sum_{k=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1} \frac{1}{1-c} \\
&\stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} c^2 [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] k_1 \stackrel{(64)}{\lesssim} c [d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] \log(1/a) .
\end{aligned}$$

The third term (3) can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) : \quad & c\Gamma_{t_{k_0+k_1+1}}^{\text{BRW}}(T_f - t_{k_0+k_1} - a) \\
& \stackrel{(52)}{\lesssim} c(T_f - t_{k_0+k_1}) \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{T_f - t_{k_0+k_1+1}} \right) \\
& \leq c(T_f - t_{k_0+k_1}) \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{T_f - t_{k_0+k_1} - h_{k_0+k_1+1}} \right) \\
& \stackrel{(62)}{\leq} c(T_f - t_{k_0+k_1}) \left(\frac{d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)}{(1-c)(T_f - t_{k_0+k_1})} \right) \\
& = \frac{c[d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)]}{1-c} \stackrel{c \leq 1/2}{\lesssim} c[d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] .
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the last term, we have by definition of $L = \Gamma_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}}/d$,

$$(4) : \Gamma_{t_K}^{\text{BRW}} h_{K-1} = \Gamma_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}} ca = cdaL .$$

Plugging all the bounds of (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) into $G_{3.1}$ gives

$$G_{3.1} \lesssim c[d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + (\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d) \log(1/a) + daL] .$$

Choosing $a = 1/L$ and noting that $L \geq 2$ yield the following bound on $G_{3.1}$:

$$G_{3.1} \lesssim c[d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)] \log(L) . \quad (65)$$

From (60), (61) and (65) and note that $c \leq e^c - 1$, we obtain the universal bound on G_3 :

$$G_3 \lesssim (e^c - 1)[(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*)T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)] ,$$

where $\mathbf{m}_2^* := \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)$ and $C^{\text{BRW}} = C_1^{\text{BRW}} + C_2^{\text{BRW}}$. Substituting all the upper bounds of $G_1 - G_2 - G_3$ in (60), (61) and (65) into (54) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}} | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW},*}) & \lesssim e^{-T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \\
& + (e^c - 1)[(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*)T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)] .
\end{aligned}$$

To this end, notice that $\mu^* = \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}})$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu^* | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW},*})) & = \text{KL}(\text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}}) | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW},*})) \\
& \leq \text{KL}(\text{Law}((\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}) | \text{Law}((\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW},*})_{t \in [0, T_f]})) \\
& = \text{KL}(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW}} | \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^{\text{BRW},*}) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is known as Data processing inequality for relative entropy (Nutz, 2021, Lemma 1.6). We then conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu^* | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW},*})) & \lesssim e^{-T_f} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \\
& + (e^c - 1)[(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*)T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)] .
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (80) showed that $\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) \leq d + \mathbf{m}_2^*$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu^* | \text{Law}(\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW},*})) & \lesssim e^{-T_f} (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \\
& + (e^c - 1)[(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*)T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)] .
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, choosing T_f and c as in (25) immediately implies the error $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})$ with the number of iterations given by

$$\begin{aligned} K &= k_0 + k_1 + K - k_0 - k_1 \stackrel{(64)}{\lesssim} \frac{T_f - 1}{c} + \frac{\log(1/a)}{c} + \frac{1}{c} = \frac{T_f + \log(L)}{c} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^*)/\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}) + \log(L)}{\log(1 + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}}/[(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) \log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^*)/\epsilon^{\text{BRW}}) + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)])} , \end{aligned}$$

and the proof of Theorem 3.3.1 is finished.

5.3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3.2

For $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, the total variation between μ^* and μ_η^{BRW} is evaluated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu^* - \mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}}\|_{\text{TV}} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} |\mu^*(x) - \mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}}(x)| \leq \mathbb{P}(X_\eta^{\text{BRW}} \neq X_0^{\text{BRW}}) \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) (1 - e^{-(d + \sum_{\ell=1}^d x^\ell) \eta}) \\ &\stackrel{e^a \geq a+1}{\leq} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) \left(d + \sum_{\ell=1}^d x^\ell \right) \eta \\ &= \eta \mathbb{E} \left[d + \sum_{\ell=1}^d (X_0^{\text{BRW}})^\ell \right] = \eta(d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) . \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

On the other hand, note that the assumption \mathbf{m}_2^* suffices for all the computation in Theorem 3.3.1. Hence proceeding similarly for stopped process $(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW},*})_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}} | \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW},*})) &\lesssim e^{-T_f} (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \\ &\quad + (e^c - 1) [(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(L)] . \end{aligned}$$

Relying on the upper bound of discrete Fisher information given in (52) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}} | \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW},*})) &\lesssim e^{-T_f} (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \\ &\quad + (e^c - 1) [(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(\eta^{-1}(1 + \mathbf{m}_2^* d^{-1}))] . \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

From (66) and (67), by triangle and Pinsker's inequalities, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mu^* - \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW},*})\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \|\mu^* - \mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}} - \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW},*})\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mu^* - \mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}}\|_{\text{TV}} + \sqrt{\text{KL}(\mu_\eta^{\text{BRW}} | \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW},*}))} \\ &\lesssim \eta(d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) + \left(e^{-T_f} (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) + \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} T_f \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (e^c - 1) [(C^{\text{BRW}} + d + \mathbf{m}_1^*) T_f + (d + \mathbf{m}_2^*) \log(\eta^{-1}(1 + \mathbf{m}_2^* d^{-1}))] \right)^{1/2} . \end{aligned}$$

In particular, setting η, T_f, c as in (26), (27) directly implies

$$\|\mu^* - \text{Law}(\bar{X}_{T_f - \eta}^{\text{BRW},*})\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\text{BRW}} + \sqrt{\epsilon^{\text{BRW}} \log((d + \mathbf{m}_2^*)/(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})^2)} ,$$

and the number of iterations is given by

$$K \lesssim \frac{T_f + \log(L)}{c} = \tilde{O}(d/(\epsilon^{\text{BRW}})^2),$$

since $1/\log(1+h)$ admits the complexity $\tilde{O}(1/h)$ for $h \approx 0$. Thus, the proof of Theorem 3.3.2 concludes.

6 Conclusion

We present a first unified framework that provides non-asymptotic convergence guarantees for discrete data on both finite and countably infinite state spaces, without requiring boundedness of the estimated score. The analysis relies on monotonicity of the discrete score along the time-reversed dynamics and applies to both uniform and absorbing rate matrices, under early-stopping and exact-stopping schemes alike. Our key result shows that the error bounds scale linearly (up to logarithmic factors) with the dimension—rather than exponentially—highlighting both the effectiveness and the scalability of the approach in high-dimensional settings.

References

- Anonymous. Countsdiff: A diffusion model on the natural numbers for generation and imputation of count-based data. In *Submitted to The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=p6YqLhrdhJ>. under review.
- J. Austin, D. D. Johnson, J. Ho, D. Tarlow, and R. Van Den Berg. Structured denoising diffusion models in discrete state-spaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:17981–17993, 2021.
- F. Bach and S. Saremi. Sampling binary data by denoising through score functions, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.00557>.
- O. Bar-Tal, H. Chefer, O. Tov, C. Herrmann, R. Paiss, S. Zada, A. Ephrat, J. Hur, G. Liu, A. Raj, et al. Lumiere: A space-time diffusion model for video generation. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2024 Conference Papers*, pages 1–11, 2024.
- A. Bertazzi, D. Shariatian, U. Simsekli, E. Moulines, and A. Durmus. Piecewise deterministic generative models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.19448>.
- S. Bobkov and P. Tetali. Modified log-sobolev inequalities, mixing and hypercontractivity. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 287–296, 2003.
- A. Campbell, J. Benton, V. De Bortoli, T. Rainforth, G. Deligiannidis, and A. Doucet. A continuous time framework for discrete denoising models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:28266–28279, 2022.
- C.-H. Chao, W.-F. Sun, H. Liang, C.-Y. Lee, and R. Krishnan. Beyond masked and unmasked: Discrete diffusion models via partial masking. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.
- H. Chen and L. Ying. Convergence analysis of discrete diffusion model: Exact implementation through uniformization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08095*, 2024.
- N. Chen, Y. Zhang, H. Zen, R. J. Weiss, M. Norouzi, and W. Chan. Wavegrad: Estimating gradients for waveform generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.00713*, 2020.
- S. Chen, S. Chewi, J. Li, Y. Li, A. Salim, and A. R. Zhang. Sampling is as easy as learning the score: theory for diffusion models with minimal data assumptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11215*, 2022a.
- T. Chen, R. Zhang, and G. Hinton. Analog bits: Generating discrete data using diffusion models with self-conditioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04202*, 2022b.

- G. Conforti. A probabilistic approach to convex (ϕ) -entropy decay for markov chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(2):932–973, 2022.
- G. Conforti and C. Léonard. Time reversal of markov processes with jumps under a finite entropy condition. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 144:85–124, 2022.
- G. Conforti, A. Durmus, and M. G. Silveri. Kl convergence guarantees for score diffusion models under minimal data assumptions. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 7(1):86–109, 2025.
- P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste. Logarithmic sobolev inequalities for finite markov chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 6(3):695–750, 1996.
- S. Dieleman, L. Sartran, A. Roshannai, N. Savinov, Y. Ganin, P. H. Richemond, A. Doucet, R. Strudel, C. Dyer, C. Durkan, et al. Continuous diffusion for categorical data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15089*, 2022.
- T. Dockhorn, A. Vahdat, and K. Kreis. Score-based generative modeling with critically-damped langevin diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07068*, 2021.
- S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- E. A. Feinberg, M. Mandava, and A. N. Shiryaev. On solutions of kolmogorov’s equations for nonhomogeneous jump markov processes. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 411(1):261–270, 2014.
- W. Feller. On the integro-differential equations of purely discontinuous markoff processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 48(3):488–515, 1940.
- I. Gat, T. Remez, N. Shaul, F. Kreuk, R. T. Chen, G. Synnaeve, Y. Adi, and Y. Lipman. Discrete flow matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15595*, 2024.
- J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet. Video diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:8633–8646, 2022.
- P. Holderrieth, M. Havasi, J. Yim, N. Shaul, I. Gat, T. Jaakkola, B. Karrer, R. T. Chen, and Y. Lipman. Generator matching: Generative modeling with arbitrary markov processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20587*, 2024.
- E. Hoogeboom, D. Nielsen, P. Jaini, P. Forré, and M. Welling. Argmax flows and multinomial diffusion: Learning categorical distributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:12454–12465, 2021.
- Z. Kong, W. Ping, J. Huang, K. Zhao, and B. Catanzaro. Diffwave: A versatile diffusion model for audio synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09761*, 2020.
- P. Le-Tuyet-Nhi, D. Shariatian, A. Ocello, G. Conforti, and A. O. Durmus. Discrete markov probabilistic models: An improved discrete score-based framework with sharp convergence bounds under minimal assumptions. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- C. Léonard. Girsanov theory under a finite entropy condition. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XLIV*, pages 429–465. Springer, 2012.
- Y. Liang, R. Huang, L. Lai, N. Shroff, and Y. Liang. Absorb and converge: Provable convergence guarantee for absorbing discrete diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.02318*, 2025a.

- Y. Liang, Y. Liang, L. Lai, and N. Shroff. Discrete diffusion models: Novel analysis and new sampler guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.16756*, 2025b.
- A. Lou, C. Meng, and S. Ermon. Discrete diffusion modeling by estimating the ratios of the data distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16834*, 2023.
- P.-L. Méliot. Convergence of random variables and large deviations. *Lecture note*, 2025.
- M. S. U. Mozumder. Some derivations on levy and jump processes. *GANIT: Journal of Bangladesh Mathematical Society*, 29:11–22, 2009.
- J. R. Norris. *Markov chains*. Number 2. Cambridge university press, 1998.
- M. Nutz. Introduction to entropic optimal transport. *Lecture notes, Columbia University*, 2021.
- A. Ramesh, P. Dhariwal, A. Nichol, C. Chu, and M. Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 1(2):3, 2022.
- Y. Ren, H. Chen, G. M. Rotskoff, and L. Ying. How discrete and continuous diffusion meet: Comprehensive analysis of discrete diffusion models via a stochastic integral framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03601*, 2024.
- P. H. Richemond, S. Dieleman, and A. Doucet. Categorical sdes with simplex diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14784*, 2022.
- R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022.
- S. S. Sahoo, M. Arriola, Y. Schiff, A. Gokaslan, E. Marroquin, J. T. Chiu, A. Rush, and V. Kuleshov. Simple and effective masked diffusion language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07524>.
- J. Shi, K. Han, Z. Wang, A. Doucet, and M. K. Titsias. Simplified and generalized masked diffusion for discrete data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04329*, 2024.
- Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.13456>.
- R. Villegas, M. Babaeizadeh, P.-J. Kindermans, H. Moraldo, H. Zhang, M. T. Saffar, S. Castro, J. Kunze, and D. Erhan. Phenaki: Variable length video generation from open domain textual descriptions. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Y. Zhang. On the nonexplosion and explosion for nonhomogeneous markov pure jump processes. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 31(3):1322–1355, 2018.
- Z. Zhang, Z. Chen, and Q. Gu. Convergence of score-based discrete diffusion models: A discrete-time analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02321*, 2024.
- G. Zitikovic. Uniform integrability. *course notes: Theorem of Probability II, Fall 2015: Lecture*, 12, 2015.

A Appendix

A.1 DDMs algorithms

This section provides the pseudo-code for sampling the generative models in the considered cases.

Algorithm 1 DDM using Random Walk CTMC as noising process on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

Input: a time horizon $T_f \gg 1$, a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_K = T_f$ associated with the step-sizes $h_k = t_k - t_{k-1}$, a trained backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{RW}, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$

```

 $\overleftarrow{X}_0^{\text{RW}, \star} \sim \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d)$ 
 $\Gamma_0 \leftarrow 0$ 
for  $k = 0$  to  $K - 1$  do
   $E \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ 
  if  $(E - \Gamma_k) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star}) \in [0, h_{k+1})$  then

     $H_{k+1} \leftarrow (E - \Gamma_k) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star})$ 
     $T_{k+1} \leftarrow t_k + H_{k+1}$ 

     $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star}$  for  $t \in [t_k, T_{k+1})$ 

     $\sigma^* \sim \text{Cate} \left( \left\{ \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star}, \sigma(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star})) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star}) \right\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \right)$ 
     $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW}, \star} \leftarrow \sigma^*(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star})$  for  $t \in [T_{k+1}, t_{k+1}]$ 
     $\Gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow 0$ 
  else
     $\Gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow \Gamma_k + h_{k+1} \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star})$ 
     $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{RW}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{RW}, \star}$  for  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ 
  end if
end for
Output:  $\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{RW}, \star}$ 

```

Algorithm 2 DDMs with Masked diffusion on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

Input: a time horizon $T_f \gg 1$, a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_K = T_f$ associated with the step-sizes $h_k = t_k - t_{k-1}$, a trained backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{M}, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$

$\overleftarrow{X}_0^{\text{M}, \star} \sim \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) p_{0, T_f}^{\text{M}}$, where $p_{0, t}^{\text{M}}$ is given in (12)
 $\Gamma_0 \leftarrow 0$
for $k = 0$ to $K - 1$ **do**
 if $\text{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
 $E \sim \text{Exp}(1)$
 if $(E - \Gamma_k) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}) \in [0, h_{k+1})$ **then**
 $H_{k+1} \leftarrow (E - \Gamma_k) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star})$
 $T_{k+1} \leftarrow t_k + H_{k+1}$
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}$ for $t \in [t_k, T_{k+1})$
 $(i^*, j^*) \sim \text{Cate} \left(\left\{ \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star})) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}) \right\}_{(i, j) \in \text{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}} \times \mathbb{Z}_m} \right)$
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}, \star} \leftarrow \text{um}_{j^*}^{(i^*)}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star})$ for $t \in [T_{k+1}, t_{k+1}]$
 $\Gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow 0$
 else
 $\Gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow \Gamma_k + h_{k+1} \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star})$
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$
 end if
 else
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{M}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{M}, \star}$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$
 end if
end for
Output: $\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{M}, \star}$

Algorithm 3 DDMs with Biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d

Input: a time horizon $T_f \gg 1$, a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_K = T_f$ associated with the step-sizes $h_k = t_k - t_{k-1}$, a trained backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$

$\overleftarrow{X}_0^{\text{BRW}, \star} \sim \text{Poisson}(1)^{\otimes d}$
for $k = 0$ to $K - 1$ **do**
 $E \sim \text{Exp}(1)$
 if $(E - \Gamma_k) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star}) \in [0, h_{k+1})$ **then**
 $H_{k+1} \leftarrow (E - \Gamma_k) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star})$
 $T_{k+1} \leftarrow t_k + H_{k+1}$
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star}$ for $t \in [t_k, T_{k+1})$
 $\sigma^* \sim \text{Cate} \left(\left\{ \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star}, \sigma(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star})) / \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star}) \right\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \right)$
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}, \star} \leftarrow \sigma^*(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star})$ for $t \in [T_{k+1}, t_{k+1}]$
 $\Gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow 0$
 else
 $\Gamma_{k+1} \leftarrow \Gamma_k + h_{k+1} \overleftarrow{q}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \theta^*}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star})$
 $\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}, \star} \leftarrow \overleftarrow{X}_{t_k}^{\text{BRW}, \star}$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$
 end if
end for
Output: $\overleftarrow{X}_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}, \star}$

A.2 Time-reversal of CTMC

We provide in this section a sketch of existence proof of the time-reversal of CTMCs for completeness.

Proposition A.2.1. *Let $(q_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ be an irreducible and non-explosive generator matrix. The time-reversal $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ of a CTMC $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ associated with $(q_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is defined as $\overleftarrow{X}_t := X_{T_f - t}$. Then $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is also an inhomogeneous CTMC, associated with a family of generator matrices $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^X)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfying the time-reversal formula: for any $0 \leq t \leq T_f$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbb{X}$,*

$$\mu_{T_f - t}^X(x) \overleftarrow{q}_t^X(x, y) = \mu_{T_f - t}^X(y) q_{T_f - t}^X(y, x),$$

where $\mu_t^X(x) = \mathbb{P}(X_t = x)$.

Proof of Proposition A.2.1. We first show the Markov property of the time-reversal process: for any $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n \leq T_f$ and $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{X}$, almost surely it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_n} = x_n | \overleftarrow{X}_{t_0} = x_0, \dots, \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_n} = x_n | X_{T_f - t_0} = x_0, \dots, X_{T_f - t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_n} = x_n, X_{T_f - t_0} = x_0, \dots, X_{T_f - t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1})}{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_0} = x_0, \dots, X_{T_f - t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1})} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_n} = x_n) \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_i} = x_i | X_{T_f - t_{i+1}} = x_{i+1})}{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}) \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f - t_i} = x_i | X_{T_f - t_{i+1}} = x_{i+1})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Markov property of $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ to factorize as in the last equality. Simplifying the expression above yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\bar{X}_{t_n} = x_n | \bar{X}_{t_0} = x_0, \dots, \bar{X}_{t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t_n} = x_n) \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1} | X_{T_f-t_n} = x_n)}{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}, X_{T_f-t_n} = x_n)}{\mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1})} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t_n} = x_n | X_{T_f-t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\bar{X}_{t_n} = x_n | \bar{X}_{t_{n-1}} = x_{n-1}) ,
\end{aligned}$$

meaning that the time-reversal $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfies the Markov property, *i.e.*, it is indeed a CTMC. Moreover, the backward generator can be deduced by noting that: for $t \in [0, T_f]$, $x \neq y \in \mathbf{X}$ and $h > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{X}_{t+h} = y, \bar{X}_t = x) = \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-(t+h)} = y, X_{T_f-t} = x) .$$

By the Bayes' formula, we then have

$$\mu_{T_f-t}^X(x) \mathbb{P}(\bar{X}_{t+h} = y | \bar{X}_t = x) = \mathbb{P}(X_{T_f-t} = x | X_{T_f-(t+h)} = y) \mu_{T_f-(t+h)}^X(y) .$$

This together with the Kolmogorov equation imply, in particular, the following relation

$$\mu_{T_f-t}^X(x) [h \bar{q}_t^X(x, y) + o(h)] = \mu_{T_f-(t+h)}^X(y) [h q_{T_f-t}^X(y, x) + o(h)] \quad \text{for } h \rightarrow 0^+ ,$$

where o is the standard little-o Landau notation. Dividing both hand sides by h and letting $h \rightarrow 0^+$ give (3), which concludes our proof. \square

A.3 Further derivation of considered models

A.3.1 Random walk on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

Lemma A.3.1. *Assume **RW2** holds. For fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, the following process is a true martingale:*

$$M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t) = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \left[u_s^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) \right] \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}}}(\mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}s) .$$

Proof of Lemma A.3.1. Since the compensated measure $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}}}$ is a martingale, the stochastic integral $M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t)$ is a local martingale. Hence it suffices to show the integrability of $M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t)$ to conclude the proof. Note that

$$\tilde{N}_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}}} = N_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}}} - \bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}}} ,$$

where $\bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}}q^{\text{RW}}}$ is the compensator of $N_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}}q^{\text{RW}}}$, therefore for fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$ and for $t \in [0, T_f]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t)|] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d} |u_s^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}))| N_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}}q^{\text{RW}}}(\text{d}s \text{d}x) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d} |u_s^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}))| \bar{n}_{\bar{X}^{\text{RW}}}^{u^{\text{RW}}q^{\text{RW}}}(\text{d}s \text{d}x) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0,t]} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} |u_s^{\text{RW}}(\sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}), \sigma(\sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}))) - u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}))| \right. \\ &\quad \left. u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) \text{d}s \right] \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{(s,x) \in [0,t] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d} u_s^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0,t]} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} u_s^{\text{RW}}(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_{s-}^{\text{RW}})) \text{d}s \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since the state space \mathbb{Z}_m^d is finite, it suffices to show $\sup_{t \in [0, T_f]} u_t(x, \sigma(x)) < \infty$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$ to attain the integrability of $M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t)$. Recall the formula of the discrete score for fixed $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$:

$$u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) = \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)}, \quad \text{with } \mu_t^{\text{RW}}(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^\star(z) p_{0,t}^{\text{RW}}(z, x),$$

where $p_{0,t}^{\text{RW}}$ satisfies the forward Kolmogorov equation (2), implying $p_{0,t}^{\text{RW}} = e^{tq^{\text{RW}}}$ thus it is continuous in t . As a result, $t \mapsto \mu_t^{\text{RW}}(x)$ is continuous on $[0, T_f]$. This combined with the fact $\mu_t^{\text{RW}}(x) > 0$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ (by **RW2** and irreducibility of $(X_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$) implies $t \mapsto u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x))$ is continuous on $[0, T_f]$, thus $\sup_{t \in [0, T_f]} u_t(x, \sigma(x)) < \infty$. Therefore $M_\sigma^{\text{RW}}(t)$ is integrable and indeed a true martingale, which completes the proof of Lemma A.3.1. \square

A.3.2 Masked diffusion on \mathbb{Z}_m^d

One useful property of the discrete score is that it can be presented as the conditional expectation, which enables efficient training in practice via an L^2 -loss.

Proposition A.3.2. *Under **M1** and **M2**, for any $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$, $t \in [0, T_f]$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ and $i \in \mathbf{M}_x$, we have*

$$u_t^{\text{M}}(x, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(X_0^{\text{M}}, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(X_0^{\text{M}}, x)} \middle| X_{T_f-t}^{\text{M}} = x \right].$$

Proof of Proposition A.3.2. Using the formula of the discrete score showed in Lemma 5.2.1, for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, $t \in [0, T_f]$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ and $i \in \mathbf{M}_x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_t^{\text{M}}(x, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) &= \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(\text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(x)} = \sum_{x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(x_0, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(x)} \mu_0^{\text{M}}(x_0) \\ &= \sum_{x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(x_0, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(x_0, x)} \mathbb{P}(X_0^{\text{M}} = x_0 | X_{T_f-t}^{\text{M}} = x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(X_0^{\text{M}}, \text{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{M}}(X_0^{\text{M}}, x)} \middle| X_{T_f-t}^{\text{M}} = x \right], \end{aligned}$$

and we complete the proof. \square

Lemma A.3.3. Under **M1** and **M2**, for fixed $\eta \in (0, T_f)$, $i \in [d]$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_m$,

$$M_{(i),j}^M(t) = \int_{[0,t] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \left[f^{(i),j}(s, x) - f^{(i),j}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M) \right] \tilde{N}_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M}(\mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}s)$$

is a $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -true martingale on $[0, T_f - \eta]$, where

$$f^{(i),j}(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t^M) := u_t^M(\overleftarrow{X}_t^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^M)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^M}} = e^{V_t^M(\overleftarrow{X}_t^M) - V_t^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^M))} \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_t^M}}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.3.3. We begin by noting that $M_{(i),j}^M(t)$ is a $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -local martingale since the compensated measure $\tilde{N}_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M}$ is a martingale. Hence it suffices to show the integrability of $M_{(i),j}^M(t)$ to conclude the proof. Note that

$$\tilde{N}_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M} = N_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M} - \bar{n}_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M},$$

where $\bar{n}_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M}$ is the compensator of $N_{\overleftarrow{X}^M}^{u^M \bar{q}^M}$, therefore for $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|M_{(i),j}^M(t)|] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{[0,t]} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} |f^{(i),j}(s, \mathbf{um}_n^{(\ell)}(\overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M)) - f^{(i),j}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. f^{(\ell),n}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M) \beta(T_f - s) \mathrm{d}s\right] \\ &\leq 4 \sup_{(s,x) \in [0,t] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} f^{(i),j}(s, x) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{[0,t]} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{M}_{\overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} f^{(\ell),n}(s, \overleftarrow{X}_{s-}^M) \mathrm{d}s\right]. \end{aligned}$$

To acquire $\mathbb{E}[|M_{(i),j}^M(t)|] < \infty$, it suffices to show $\sup_{(t,x) \in [0, T_f - \eta] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} f^{(i),j}(t, x) < \infty$. For $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$ and $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$, recall that

$$f^{(i),j}(t, x) = u_t^M(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_x} = \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbb{M}_x} \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^M(x)},$$

with

$$\mu_t^M(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^*(z) p_{0,t}^M(z, x) = \mu^*(x) \alpha_t^d \mathbb{1}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} + (1 - \alpha_t)^{|\mathbb{M}_x|} \alpha_t^{d-|\mathbb{M}_x|} \mathbb{1}_{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}_m^d}.$$

Since $\alpha_t = \exp(-\int_0^t \beta(s) \mathrm{d}s)$ with $\beta(t)$ continuous and bounded, we can deduce that $t \mapsto \mu_t^M(x)$ is continuous on $[0, T_f]$. This together with the fact $\mu_{T_f-t}^M(x) > 0$ for any $t \in [0, T_f - \eta]$ (see detailed argument in the proof of Lemma 5.2.1) implies in turn that $t \mapsto f^{(i),j}(t, x)$ is continuous on $[0, T_f - \eta]$, therefore $\sup_{t \in [0, T_f - \eta]} f^{(i),j}(t, x) < \infty$ for any $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$. Taking the maximum of x over the finite set $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ yields

$$\sup_{(t,x) \in [0, T_f - \eta] \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} f^{(i),j}(t, x) < \infty,$$

hence $M_{(i),j}^M(t)$ is integrable and indeed a $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}^M$ -true martingale, which concludes the proof of Lemma A.3.3. \square

A.3.3 Biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d

We now present a detailed argument showing that the biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d is non-explosive.

Lemma A.3.4. *Follow [Zhang \(2018, Theorem 3.3\)](#), a stable conservative generator $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ on X is non-explosive if there exists a monotone nondecreasing sequence $(S_n) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X})$ and a $[0, \infty)$ -valued measurable function V on X such that the following conditions hold:*

- (a) *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $S_n \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$.*
- (b) *For each $n = 0, 1, \dots$, $\sup_{x \in S_n, t \geq 0} q_t^X(x) < \infty$.*
- (c) *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\inf_{x \in \mathsf{X} \setminus S_n} V(x) \rightarrow \infty$.*
- (d) *There exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ s.t. for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$ and $t \geq 0$,*

$$\int_{\mathsf{X}} V(y) q_t^X(x, dy) \leq \alpha V(x) .$$

Proposition A.3.5. *The forward generator $(q_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ in (14) associated with the biased random walk on \mathbb{N}^d is non-explosive.*

Proof of Proposition A.3.5. The proof relies on Lemma A.3.4. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $S_n := \{x \in \mathsf{X} : \sum_{i=1}^d x^i \leq n\}$ and consider the function $V(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d x^i$ for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$. Then it is clear that the condition (a) holds. Moreover, for each $n = 0, 1, \dots$, we have

$$\sup_{x \in S_n, t \geq 0} q_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) = \sup_{x \in S_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d x^i + d \right) \leq n + d < \infty ,$$

i.e., (b) holds as well. In addition, we observe that

$$\inf_{x \in \mathsf{X} \setminus S_n} V(x) = \inf_{x \in \mathsf{X} \setminus S_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d x^i + d \right) > n + d .$$

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we indeed obtain $\inf_{x \in \mathsf{X} \setminus S_n} V(x) \rightarrow \infty$ and the condition (c) is satisfied. Finally, for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$ and $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \mathsf{X}} V(y) q_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) &= \sum_{y \neq x} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) [V(y) - V(x)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \{ [V(x + e_i) - V(x)] + x^i [V(x - e_i) - V(x)] \} \\ &= d - \sum_{i=1}^d x^i \leq d + \sum_{i=1}^d x^i = V(x) , \end{aligned}$$

which implies the condition (d) in Lemma A.3.4. We then conclude that $(q_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is indeed non-explosive by using Lemma A.3.4, therefore satisfies **H2** and the forward process $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is then well-defined. \square

Similarly as before, the discrete score in this setting can also be expressed as a conditional expectation, enabling the stable L²-loss in training.

Proposition A.3.6. *For any $x \in \mathbb{N}_m^d$, $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, we have*

$$u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) = \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), x) \frac{p_{0, T_f - t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(x))}{p_{0, T_f - t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, x)} \middle| X_{T_f - t}^{\text{BRW}} = x \right] .$$

Proof of Proposition A.3.6. Using the formula of the discrete score established in Lemma 5.3.1, for any $t \in [0, T_f]$, $x \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) &= q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \\
&= q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))} \sum_{x_0 \in \mathbb{N}^d} \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x_0, \sigma(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \mu_0^{\text{BRW}}(x_0) \\
&\stackrel{(76)}{=} q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), x) \sum_{x_0 \in \mathbb{N}^d} \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x_0, \sigma(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x_0, x)} \mathbb{P}(X_0^{\text{BRW}} = x_0 | X_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} = x) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), x) \frac{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(x))}{p_{0, T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, x)} \middle| X_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} = x \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof concludes. \square

We now establish a connection between the moments of the data distribution and those of the marginal densities of $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, and then leverage this relation to derive integrability properties.

Proposition A.3.7. *Assume $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) < \infty$, then*

$$\mathbf{m}_1(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) = e^{-t} \mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + d(1 - e^{-t}) < \infty \quad \text{for any } t \geq 0.$$

Proof of Proposition A.3.7. For $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define the stopping time

$$\tau_m := \inf \{s \geq 0 : \|X_s^{\text{BRW}}\|_1 \geq m\},$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] < \infty$ implies $\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1 < \infty$ a.s., which combines with the fact $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \geq 0}$ is a non-explosive CTMC and each jump changes $\|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_1$ at most 1 in turn yield

$$\tau_m \uparrow \infty \text{ a.s. as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let us consider the stopped process $(X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}})_{t \geq 0}$. On the finite time interval $[0, t \wedge \tau_m)$, the process stays in the finite set $\{x : \|x\|_1 \leq m-1\}$, thus the integrability condition holds and we can apply Dynkin's formula to $\|\cdot\|_1$ for the stopped dynamic:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] = \mathbb{E}[\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} (q^{\text{BRW}} \|\cdot\|_1)(X_s^{\text{BRW}}) ds \right].$$

Plugging the formula of q^{BRW} in (14) and differentiating the integral expressions above yield

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] = d - \mathbb{E}[\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1].$$

As a result, for fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the function $\mathbf{M}_m(t) := \mathbb{E}[\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1]$ satisfies the following linear ODE

$$\mathbf{M}_m'(t) = d - \mathbf{M}_m(t) \quad \text{with } \mathbf{M}_m(0) = \mathbb{E}[\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1].$$

Solving this equation gives

$$\mathbf{M}_m(t) = e^{-t} \mathbb{E}[\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] + d(1 - e^{-t}).$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ and noting that $\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1 \uparrow \|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_1$ a.s., by monotone convergence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_1(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) &= \mathbb{E} [\|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (e^{-t} \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] + d(1 - e^{-t})) \\ &= e^{-t} \mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + d(1 - e^{-t}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) = \mathbb{E} [\|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_1]$ is finite for any $t \geq 0$, given $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*)$ is finite and admits an explicit expression above. \square

Proposition A.3.8. Assume $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) < \infty$, then for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) = e^{-2t} [\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) - 3\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + d] + 3e^{-t} [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) - d] + 2d < \infty.$$

Proof of Proposition A.3.8. We will employ the same trick as Proposition A.3.7. For $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define the stopping time

$$\tau_m := \inf \{s \geq 0 : \|X_s^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2 \geq m\},$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. Note that $\mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] < \infty$ implies $\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2 < \infty$ a.s., which combines with the fact $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \geq 0}$ is a non-explosive CTMC and each jump changes $\|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2$ at most 1 in turn yield

$$\tau_m \uparrow \infty \text{ a.s. as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let us consider the stopped process $(X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}})_{t \geq 0}$. On the finite time interval $[0, t \wedge \tau_m]$, the process stays in the finite set $\{x : \|x\|_2^2 \leq m - 1\}$, thus the integrability condition holds and we can apply Dynkin's formula to $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ for the stopped dynamic:

$$\mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] = \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} (q^{\text{BRW}} \|\cdot\|_2^2)(X_s^{\text{BRW}}) ds \right].$$

Plugging the formula of q^{BRW} in (14) and differentiating the integral expressions above yield

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] = d - 2\mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] + 3\mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1].$$

Note that $\mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] \leq \mathbb{E} [\|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] = \mathbf{m}_1(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}})$ for any $t \geq 0$. In addition, the finiteness of the second moment of μ_0^{BRW} implies that its first moment is also finite. Combined with Proposition A.3.7, this yields the finiteness of $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}})$ for any $t \geq 0$. Therefore, we can solve the ODE above to get

$$\mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] = e^{-2t} \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] + e^{-2t} \int_0^t e^{2s} (3\mathbb{E} [\|X_{s \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_1] + d) ds.$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ and noting that $\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2 \uparrow \|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2$ a.s., by monotone convergence, we achieve

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_2(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) &= \mathbb{E} [\|X_t^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\|X_{t \wedge \tau_m}^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2] \\ &= e^{-2t} \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + e^{-2t} \int_0^t e^{2s} (3\mathbf{m}_1(\mu_s^{\text{BRW}}) + d) ds < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \geq 0$, given $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) < \infty$. Furthermore, substituting the formula of $\mathbf{m}_1(\mu_s^{\text{BRW}})$ in Proposition A.3.7 leads to a closed form of $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_2(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) &= e^{-2t} \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + e^{-2t} \int_0^t e^{2s} (3e^{-s} \mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + 3d(1 - e^{-s}) + d) ds \\ &= e^{-2t} [\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) - 3\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + d] + 3e^{-t} [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) - d] + 2d. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is then finished. \square

Our next step is to determine the explicit transition probabilities of $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, enabling us to verify the integrability condition stated in Lemma 5.3.6. Given the componentwise factorization of the process, the task reduces to deriving the transition density in the one-dimensional case.

Proposition A.3.9. *The transition density of $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ admits the following formula:*

$$p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^d p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(x^i, y^i), \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{N}^d \text{ and } t \in [0, T_f],$$

where

$$p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k, n) = e^{-t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\min(k,n)} \binom{k}{j} e^{-tj} \frac{(1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j}}{(n-j)!}, \quad \text{for } k, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (68)$$

Proof of Proposition A.3.9. The proof amounts to checking that (68) indeed solves the forward Kolmogorov equation (2), namely, that the following relation is satisfied:

$$p_{0,0}^{\text{BRW},1} = \text{Id} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k, n) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k, i) q^{\text{BRW},1}(i, n), \quad (69)$$

for any $(k, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$, where $q^{\text{BRW},1}$ is the one-dimensional version of q^{BRW} . We begin by noting that

$$p_{0,0}^{\text{BRW},1}(k, n) = 0^{k+n-2\min(k,n)} \text{ for } k, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If $k = n$, $p_{0,0}^{\text{BRW},1}(k, n) = 0^0 = 1$, otherwise, it reduces to 0. Thus the initial condition $p_{0,0}^{\text{BRW},1} = \text{Id}$ holds. To verify the remaining equation, for $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T_f]$, let us consider the three following cases:

1. $k \leq n-1$: we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k, n) &= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{-t-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \\ &\quad [(-e^{-t} - j)(1 - e^{-t}) + (k + n - 2j)e^{-t}] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{-t-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} [(-e^{-t} - j)(1 - e^{-t}) + (n-j)e^{-t}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j+1} \frac{e^{-t-1-t(j+1)}}{(n-j)!} (1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} (j+1) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{-t-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} [e^{-2t} + e^{-t}(n-1) - j] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{-t-1-tj}}{(n-j+1)!} (1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j+1} j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{-t-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1 - e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \\ &\quad \left[e^{-2t} + e^{-t}(n-1) - j + \frac{j(1 - e^{-t})^2}{n-j+1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,i) q^{\text{BRW},1}(i,n) \\
&= \sum_{i=n-1}^{n+1} p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,i) q^{\text{BRW},1}(i,n) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \\
&\quad \left[n-j + \frac{n+1}{n-j+1} (1-e^{-t})^2 - (n+1)(1-e^{-t}) \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \\
&\quad \left[n-j + (1-e^{-t})^2 - (n+1)(1-e^{-t}) + \frac{j(1-e^{-t})^2}{n-j+1} \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \left[e^{-2t} + e^{-t}(n-1) - j + \frac{j(1-e^{-t})^2}{n-j+1} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore (69) holds.

2. $k \geq n+1$: same computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,n) = \binom{k}{n+1} e^{e^{-t}-1-t(n+1)} (1-e^{-t})^{k-n-1} (n+1) \\
&+ \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \left[e^{-2t} + e^{-t}(n-1) - j + \frac{j(1-e^{-t})^2}{n-j+1} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,i) q^{\text{BRW},1}(i,n) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-1-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n+1-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j+1} (n+1) \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j} (n+1) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{k}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{k+n-2j-1} \left[n-j + \frac{n+1}{n-j+1} (1-e^{-t})^2 - (n+1)(1-e^{-t}) \right] \\
&\quad + \binom{k}{n+1} e^{e^{-t}-1-(n+1)t} (1-e^{-t})^{k-n-1} (n+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (69) is satisfied.

3. $k = n$: computing analogously, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,n) = -e^{e^{-t}-1-(n+1)t} (n+1) \\
&+ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{2n-2j-1} \left[e^{-2t} + e^{-t}(n-1) - j + \frac{j(1-e^{-t})^2}{n-j+1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,i) q^{\text{BRW},1}(i,n) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{2n-2j-1} \left[n-j + \frac{n+1}{n-j+1} (1-e^{-t})^2 - (n+1)(1-e^{-t}) \right] \\
&\quad + e^{e^{-t}-1-nt} (n+1)(1-e^{-t}) - 1 \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{j} \frac{e^{e^{-t}-1-tj}}{(n-j)!} (1-e^{-t})^{2n-2j-1} \left[e^{-2t} + e^{-t}(n-1) - j + \frac{j(1-e^{-t})^2}{n-j+1} \right] \\
&\quad - e^{e^{-t}-1-(n+1)t} (n+1) = \partial_t p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(k,n).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $p^{\text{BRW},1}$ is indeed a solution to (69). By (Feinberg et al., 2014, Theorem 4.3), this equation admits a unique solution within the class of transition probabilities satisfying **H2** since $q^{\text{BRW},1}$ satisfies **H1** and **H2**. Hence we can conclude that $p^{\text{BRW},1}$ is a component-wise conditional density of $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ and the full transition density is then given by

$$p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW}}(x,y) = \prod_{i=1}^d p_{0,t}^{\text{BRW},1}(x^i, y^i), \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{N}^d \text{ and } t \in [0, T_f],$$

which is the desired conclusion. \square

Remark. The insight of formula (69) comes from the following expression:

$$(X_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell = (S_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell + (A_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_f],$$

where $(S_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell | (X_0^{\text{BRW}})^\ell \sim \text{Binomial}((X_0^{\text{BRW}})^\ell, e^{-t})$ denotes the number of survivors from X_0^{BRW} initial particles since each particle survives independently with probability e^{-t} (the death rate of n particles being n), and $(A_t^{\text{BRW}})^\ell \sim \text{Poisson}(1 - e^{-t})$ represents the number of arrivals still alive at time t , generated by the constant birth rate 1 (the forward rate).

Proposition A.3.10. Assume $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) < \infty$, then for any $t \in [0, T_f]$, the following holds

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right)^2 \right] \lesssim [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d] \left[1 + \frac{1}{(T_f - t)^2} \right].$$

Proof of Proposition A.3.10. Recall that $u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x))$ admits a conditional expectation expression for any $(t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$; see Proposition A.3.6. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(u_s^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x), x) \frac{p_{0, T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(x))}{p_{0, T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, x)} \middle| X_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}} = x \right]^2 \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(X_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}), X_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}) \frac{p_{0, T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(X_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}))}{p_{0, T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, X_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}})} \right)^2}_{\mathbf{d}_{T_f-s}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, X_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}})} \right], \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality in the last inequality. Substituting the formula of transition density given in (68) yields

$$\mathbf{d}_s(x_0, x_s) = \sum_{\ell=1}^d \left(\underbrace{(x_s^\ell + 1) \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{\min(x_0^\ell, x_s^\ell+1)} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell + 1 - 2j} / (x_s^\ell + 1 - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{\min(x_0^\ell, x_s^\ell)} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!}}_{\mathbf{d}_s^1(x_0, x_s)} + \underbrace{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{\min(x_0^\ell, x_s^\ell-1)} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 1 - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - 1 - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{\min(x_0^\ell, x_s^\ell)} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!}}_{\mathbf{d}_s^2(x_0, x_s)} \right)^2.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_s^1(x_0, x_s) &= \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell + 1} (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell + 1} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell + 1 - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \leq x_s^\ell} (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{x_0^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell + 1 - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_0^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell + 1} (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell + 1} (x_s^\ell + 1) \frac{\binom{x_0^\ell}{x_s^\ell + 1} e^{-s(x_s^\ell + 1)} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell - x_s^\ell - 1}}{\binom{x_0^\ell}{x_s^\ell} e^{-sx_s^\ell} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell - x_s^\ell}} + \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \leq x_s^\ell} (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) \\ &= (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) + \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell + 1} (x_0^\ell - x_s^\ell) e^{-s} (1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \\ &\leq (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) + \frac{x_0^\ell}{e^s - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

We evaluate next \mathbf{d}_s^2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_s^2(x_0, x_s) &= \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell} \frac{(1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell - 1} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} (x_s^\ell - j) / (x_s^\ell - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \leq x_s^\ell - 1} \frac{(1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{x_0^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} (x_s^\ell - j) / (x_s^\ell - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_0^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell} \frac{x_s^\ell (1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_s^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \leq x_s^\ell - 1} \frac{x_s^\ell (1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{x_0^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!}{\sum_{j=0}^{x_0^\ell} \binom{x_0^\ell}{j} e^{-sj} (1 - e^{-s})^{x_0^\ell + x_s^\ell - 2j} / (x_s^\ell - j)!} \\ &= x_s^\ell (1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \geq x_s^\ell} + x_s^\ell (1 - e^{-s})^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{x_0^\ell \leq x_s^\ell - 1} = \frac{x_s^\ell}{1 - e^{-s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mathbf{d}_s^1(x_0, x_s) + \mathbf{d}_s^2(x_0, x_s) \leq (x_s^\ell + 1) (1 - e^{-s}) + \frac{x_0^\ell}{e^s - 1} + \frac{x_s^\ell}{1 - e^{-s}}.$$

Since $\mathbf{d}_s^1(x_0, x_s) + \mathbf{d}_s^2(x_0, x_s)$ is nonnegative, we then attain

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{d}_s^1(x_0, x_s) + \mathbf{d}_s^2(x_0, x_s))^2 &\leq \left((x_s^\ell + 1)(1 - e^{-s}) + \frac{x_0^\ell}{e^s - 1} + \frac{x_s^\ell}{1 - e^{-s}} \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim ((x_s^\ell)^2 + 1)(1 - e^{-s})^2 + \frac{(x_0^\ell)^2}{(e^s - 1)^2} + \frac{(x_s^\ell)^2}{(1 - e^{-s})^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_s(x_0, x_s) &\lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^d \left[((x_s^\ell)^2 + 1)(1 - e^{-s})^2 + \frac{(x_0^\ell)^2}{(e^s - 1)^2} + \frac{(x_s^\ell)^2}{(1 - e^{-s})^2} \right] \\ &= (\|x_s\|_2^2 + d)(1 - e^{-s})^2 + \frac{\|x_0\|_2^2}{(e^s - 1)^2} + \frac{\|x_s\|_2^2}{(1 - e^{-s})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this estimate into (70) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(u_s^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim [\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}}) + d](1 - e^{-(T_f-s)})^2 + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*)(e^{T_f-s} - 1)^{-2} + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}})(1 - e^{-(T_f-s)})^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, the formula of $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}})$ showed in Proposition A.3.8 implies

$$\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}) \lesssim \mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, T_f].$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(u_s^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d] \left[\underbrace{(1 - e^{-(T_f-t)})^2}_{\leq 1} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{(e^{T_f-t} - 1)^2}}_{\leq \frac{1}{(T_f-t)^2}} + \frac{1}{(1 - e^{-(T_f-t)})^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Relying on the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(1 - e^{-(T_f-t)})^2} &= \frac{e^{2(T_f-t)}}{(e^{T_f-t} - 1)^2} = 1 + \frac{2}{e^{T_f-t} - 1} + \frac{1}{(e^{T_f-t} - 1)^2} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{2}{T_f - t} + \frac{1}{(T_f - t)^2} \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{(T_f - t)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

we can deduce the following for $t \in [0, T_f]$,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(u_s^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) \right)^2 \right] \lesssim [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d] \left[1 + \frac{1}{(T_f - t)^2} \right].$$

The proof is then complete. \square

Lemma A.3.11. *Assume μ^* has finite second order moment, we then have*

$$D_t^\sigma = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0,t]} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left| \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right| (\mathbf{f}^{\sigma'}(s, \check{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1) ds \right] < \infty,$$

for $t \in [0, T_f]$ and fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathbf{f}^\sigma(t, \check{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}) := q^{\text{BRW}} u_t^{\text{BRW}}(\check{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\check{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) - 1$.

Proof of Lemma A.3.11. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it suffices to show

$$\int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right)^2 ds \right] < \infty$$

and

$$\int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{f}^{\sigma'}(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1)^2 ds \right] < \infty$$

to obtain the finiteness of D_t^σ . By Proposition A.3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{f}^{\sigma'}(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1)^2 \right] ds \\ &= \int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left(u_s^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) \right)^2 \right] ds \\ &\lesssim [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d] \int_0^t \left[1 + \frac{1}{(T_f - s)^2} \right] ds \\ &= [\mathbf{m}_1(\mu^*) + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) + d] \left(t + \frac{1}{T_f - t} - \frac{1}{T_f} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is finite for any $t \in [0, T_f)$. It remains to show

$$\int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right)^2 ds \right] < \infty.$$

Notice that $\mathbf{f}^\sigma(t, x) + 1 = q^{\text{BRW}} u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x))$ is nonnegative for all $(t, x) \in [0, T_f) \times \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) - \mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) \right)^2 \right] ds \\ &\leq \underbrace{\int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \sigma'(\bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}})) + 1 \right)^2 \right] ds}_{A_1^\sigma} + \underbrace{\int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1 \right)^2 \right] ds}_{A_2^\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

The term A_2^σ can be estimated by Proposition A.3.10:

$$A_2^\sigma \leq 2d \int_{[0,t]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbf{f}^\sigma(s, \bar{X}_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1 \right)^2 \right] ds < \infty.$$

Next, A_1^σ can be controlled as follows

$$A_1^\sigma \leq \int_{T_f-t}^{T_f} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(\sigma'(X_s^{\text{BRW}})), \sigma'(X_s^{\text{BRW}})) \frac{p_{0,s}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma(\sigma'(X_s^{\text{BRW}})))}{p_{0,s}^{\text{BRW}}(X_0^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma'(X_s^{\text{BRW}}))} \right)^2 \right] ds.$$

Computing as in Proposition A.3.10, we obtain for any $\ell \in [d]$,

$$A_1^{\sigma_\ell} \lesssim \int_{T_f-t}^{T_f} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\|\sigma'(X_s^{\text{BRW}})\|_2^2 + 1)(1 - e^{-s})^2 + \|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2(e^s - 1)^{-2} \right] ds,$$

and

$$A_1^{\sigma_\ell^-} \lesssim \int_{T_f-t}^{T_f} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} [(\|\sigma'(X_s^{\text{BRW}})\|_2^2 + 1)(1 - e^{-s})^{-2}] ds .$$

For any $\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\|\sigma'(x)\|_2 \leq \|x\|_2 + 1$, hence $\|\sigma'(x)\|_2^2 \leq 2\|x\|_2^2 + 2$. Consequently, for any $t \in [0, T_f)$,

$$A_1^{\sigma_\ell^-} \lesssim 2d \left[(\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1) \int_{T_f-t}^{T_f} (1 - e^{-s})^2 ds + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^\star) \int_{T_f-t}^{T_f} (e^s - 1)^{-2} ds \right] < \infty ,$$

and

$$A_1^{\sigma_\ell^-} \lesssim 2d(\mathbf{m}_2(\mu_s^{\text{BRW}}) + 1) \int_{T_f-t}^{T_f} (1 - e^{-s})^{-2} ds < \infty .$$

Thus we get the desired integrability of D_t^σ for any $t \in [0, T_f)$ and conclude the proof of Lemma A.3.11. \square

A.4 Technical proofs

A.4.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1.1

Recall that the backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfies (4), i.e., for $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, the following holds

$$\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x) \overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(y) q_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(y, x) = \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(y) q^{\text{RW}}(x, y) , \quad (71)$$

since q^{RW} is time-independent and symmetric (see (10)). In addition, the forward generator $(q_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfies **H1**, **H2** and irreducible, which implies $\mu_t^{\text{RW}}(x) > 0$ for any $t \in (0, T_f]$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$. Therefore, (71) implies: for any $t \in [0, T_f)$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$,

$$\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} q^{\text{RW}}(x, y) .$$

Note that we only need to consider transitions where $q^{\text{RW}}(x, y) \neq 0$, that is, when $y \in \{\sigma_+^\ell(x), \sigma_-^\ell(x)\}$ for some $\ell \in [d]$. Hence, it suffices to compute u_t^{RW} in this setting. Define

$$u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) := \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} = e^{V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M} ,$$

where $V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) := -\log \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$. Otherwise, for $y \notin \{\sigma(x), x : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}\}$, we impose $u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) = 1$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$. Finally, the convention

$$u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, x) := \frac{-\sum_{y \neq x} u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y) q^{\text{RW}}(x, y)}{q^{\text{RW}}(x, x)} = \frac{\sum_{y \neq x} u_t^{\text{RW}}(x, y)}{2d}$$

ensures that $(u_t^{\text{RW}} q^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ in fact forms a generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Note that this expression of u_t^{RW} also holds for $t = T_f$ under **RW2**. In addition, the evolution of $(u_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ can be characterized by the function $(V_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ defined above, which satisfies the follow-

ing for $(t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{Z}_m^d$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) &= \frac{\partial_t \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(y) q^{\text{RW}}(y, x)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} \quad (\text{by (2)}) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(y) q^{\text{RW}}(x, y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}}(x)} \quad (\text{since } q^{\text{RW}} \text{ is symmetric}) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{RW}}(x, \sigma(x)) [e^{V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))} - 1] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} [e^{V_t^{\text{RW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{RW}}(\sigma(x))} - 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $(V_t^{\text{RW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ also satisfies the final condition

$$V_{T_f}^{\text{RW}}(x) = -\log \mu_0^{\text{RW}}(x) = -\log \mu^*(x),$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 5.1.1.

A.4.2 Proof of Lemma 5.1.3

Lemma 5.1.2 showed that $\Gamma_s^{\text{RW}} \geq \Gamma_t^{\text{RW}}$ for $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T_f$. Integrating from t to T_f gives

$$\int_0^{T_f-t} \Gamma_{T_f-s}^{\text{RW}} ds = \int_t^{T_f} \Gamma_s^{\text{RW}} ds \geq \Gamma_t^{\text{RW}} \int_t^{T_f} 1 ds = (T_f - t) \Gamma_t^{\text{RW}}. \quad (72)$$

By direct computation, we can show that

$$\Gamma_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}} = -2 \frac{d}{dt} \text{KL}(\mu_t^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}),$$

thus (72) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_t^{\text{RW}} &\leq (T_f - t)^{-1} \int_0^{T_f-t} -2 \frac{d}{ds} \text{KL}(\mu_s^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) ds \\
&\lesssim (T_f - t)^{-1} [\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) - \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{RW}} | \gamma^{\text{RW}})] \leq (T_f - t)^{-1} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{RW}}).
\end{aligned}$$

To this end, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{RW}}) &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^*(x) \underbrace{\log \mu^*(x)}_{\leq 0} - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^*(x) \log \gamma^{\text{RW}}(x) \\
&\leq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) \log(m^d), \quad \text{since } \gamma^{\text{RW}} = \text{Uniform}(\mathbb{Z}_m^d) \\
&= d \log(m) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^*(x) = d \log(m), \quad (73)
\end{aligned}$$

which yields (30) and we complete the proof.

A.4.3 Proof of Lemma 5.2.1

Under **M1** and **M2**, for any $t \in (0, T_f]$, we have $\mu_t^{\text{M}}(x) > 0$ for any $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$. Indeed, if $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, $\mu_t^{\text{M}}(x) \geq \mu^*(x) \alpha_t^d > 0$, otherwise, if $x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}_m^d$, we have

$$\mu_t^{\text{M}}(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_m^d} \mu^*(y) p_{0,t}^{\text{M}}(y, x) \geq \mu^*(z_x) \alpha_t^{d-|M_x|} (1 - \alpha_t)^{|M_x|} > 0,$$

where $z_x^i = x^i$ for any $i \in \mathbf{M}_x^c$ and $z_x^j = 0$ for any $j \in \mathbf{M}_x$. Thus (4) implies the following for any $t \in [0, T_f)$ and $x \neq y \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$:

$$\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) = \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)} q_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(y, x) = \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)} \tilde{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y), \quad (74)$$

where $\tilde{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) := q_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(y, x)$. We define the discrete score for $t \in [0, T_f)$ and $y \neq x \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ as follows:

$$u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) = \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)}, \quad \text{if } \exists i \in \mathbf{M}_y^c : x = \mathbf{m}^{(i)}(y),$$

otherwise, for $y \neq x$, we impose $u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) = 1$. Then (74) follows

$$\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) = u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) \tilde{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y).$$

Furthermore, the convention

$$u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, x) = \frac{\sum_{y \neq x} u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y) \tilde{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, y)}{\tilde{q}_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x)},$$

implies that $u^{\mathbf{M}} \tilde{q}^{\mathbf{M}}$ in fact forms a generator and is associated with $(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\mathbf{M}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Moreover, the discrete score $u^{\mathbf{M}}$ can be characterized by using the function $V_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x) := -\log \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)$ for $(t, x) \in [0, T_f) \times \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d$ as

$$u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) = e^{V_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x) - V_t^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \quad \text{for } i \in \mathbf{M}_x \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{Z}_m.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) &= u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[\partial_t V_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x) - \partial_t V_t^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \right] \\ &= u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[\frac{\partial_t \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)} - \frac{\partial_t \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the forward Kolmogorov equation (2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \\ &= u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[\frac{\sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(z) q_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(z, x)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)} - \frac{\sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_m^d} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(z) q_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(z, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \right] \\ &= u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[q_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x, x) + \frac{\beta(T_f - t) \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - q_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x), \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) - \frac{\beta(T_f - t) \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \right] \\ &= u_t^{\mathbf{M}}(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[-|\mathbf{M}_x^c| \beta(T_f - t) + \frac{\beta(T_f - t) \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(x)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)}^c| \beta(T_f - t) - \frac{\beta(T_f - t) \sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now use the relation $|\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)}^c| = |\mathbf{M}_x^c| + 1$, we obtain

$$\partial_t u_t^M(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) = \beta(T_f - t) u_t^M(x, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)) \left[1 + \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-t}^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^M(x)} - \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbf{M}_x \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \mu_{T_f-t}^M(\mathbf{um}_n^{(k)}(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x)))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^M(\mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))} \right],$$

which is the desired conclusion.

A.4.4 Proof of Lemma 5.2.4

For $t \in [0, T_f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_t^M &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left(u_t^M \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} \log u_t^M - u_t^M \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} + 1 \right) (X_{T_f-t}^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f-t}^M)) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\log a \leq a-1}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left(u_t^M \mathbb{1}_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} - 1 \right)^2 (X_{T_f-t}^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f-t}^M)) \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} (u_t^M - 1)^2 (X_{T_f-t}^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f-t}^M)) \right]}_{A_1} + m \mathbb{E} [|\mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}^c|]. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

From Proposition A.3.2, the first term A_1 can be written as

$$A_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{p_{0,T_f-t}^M(X_0^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(x))}{p_{0,T_f-t}^M(X_0^M, x)} - 1 \middle| X_{T_f-t}^M = x \right] \right)^2 \right].$$

Applying Jensen inequality gives

$$A_1 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} \left(\frac{p_{0,T_f-t}^M(X_0^M, \mathbf{um}_j^{(i)}(X_{T_f-t}^M))}{p_{0,T_f-t}^M(X_0^M, X_{T_f-t}^M)} - 1 \right)^2 \right].$$

Using the formula of the transition probability given in (12), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} \left(\frac{p_{0,T_f-t}^{M,1}((X_0^M)^i, j)}{p_{0,T_f-t}^{M,1}((X_0^M)^i, m)} - 1 \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}} \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f-t}}{1 - \alpha_{T_f-t}} - 1 \right)^2 \right] = \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f-t}}{1 - \alpha_{T_f-t}} - 1 \right)^2 \mathbb{E} [|\mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}|]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the previous computation in (41), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} [|\mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}|] = d(1 - \alpha_{T_f-t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} [|\mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}^c|] = d - \mathbb{E} [|\mathbf{M}_{T_f-t}|] = d\alpha_{T_f-t}.$$

Plugging altogether into (75) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_t^M &\leq d \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f-t}}{1-\alpha_{T_f-t}} - 1 \right)^2 (1-\alpha_{T_f-t}) + m d \alpha_{T_f-t} \\ &\leq d \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f-t}^2}{1-\alpha_{T_f-t}} - 2\alpha_{T_f-t} + 1 - \alpha_{T_f-t} + m\alpha_{T_f-t} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\alpha_{T_f-t} \in (0,1]}{\lesssim} d \left(\frac{\alpha_{T_f-t}}{1-\alpha_{T_f-t}} + m \right) .\end{aligned}$$

In particular, for a constant generator $\beta(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T_f]$, we then obtain the closed-form of α_t as follows

$$\alpha_t = e^{-\int_0^t 1 ds} = e^{-t} \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_f] .$$

As a result, we attain a clear and specific bound on Γ_t^M for any $t \in [0, T_f]$:

$$\Gamma_t^M \lesssim d \left(\frac{1}{e^{T_f-t} - 1} + m \right) \stackrel{e^a \geq a+1}{\leq} d \left(\frac{1}{T_f-t} + m \right) ,$$

and the proof concludes.

A.4.5 Proof of Lemma 5.3.1

Recall that the backward generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfies (4), i.e., for $t \in [0, T_f]$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbb{N}^d$, the following holds

$$\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) \overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y) q_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y, x) = \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y) q^{\text{BRW}}(y, x) , \quad (76)$$

since q^{BRW} is time-independent (see (14)). In addition, the forward generator $(q_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfies **H1**, **H2** and irreducible, which implies $\mu_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) > 0$ for any $t \in (0, T_f]$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Therefore, (76) implies: for any $t \in [0, T_f)$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbb{N}^d$,

$$\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} q^{\text{BRW}}(y, x) . \quad (77)$$

In order to interchange x and y on the right-hand side, observe that q^{BRW} satisfies the following balance equation: for all $x \neq y \in \mathbb{N}^d$,

$$\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(y) q^{\text{BRW}}(y, x) , \quad (78)$$

where $\gamma^{\text{BRW}} = \text{Poisson}(1)^{\otimes d}$ denotes the invariant measure of $(X_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Therefore

$$q^{\text{BRW}}(y, x) = \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(y)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) ,$$

and replacing it into (77) yields

$$\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(y) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} =: q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) \frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y)}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} ,$$

where $\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) := \mu_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) / \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)$ for $(t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbb{N}^d$ denotes the relative density of the forward dynamic. Note that we only need to consider transitions where $q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) \neq 0$, that is, when $y \in \{\sigma_+^\ell(x), \sigma_-^\ell(x)\}$ for some $\ell \in [d]$. Hence, it suffices to compute u_t^{BRW} in this setting. Define

$$u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) := \frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} = e^{V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathcal{M} ,$$

where $V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) := -\log \tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)$ for any $t \in [0, T_f)$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Otherwise, for $y \notin \{\sigma(x), x : \sigma \in \mathcal{M}\}$, we impose $u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) = 1$ for any $t \in [0, T_f)$. Finally, the convention

$$u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, x) := \frac{-\sum_{y \neq x} u_t^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y)}{q^{\text{BRW}}(x, x)} = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x))}{q^{\text{BRW}}(x)}$$

ensures that $(u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f)}$ in fact forms a generator $(\overleftarrow{q}_t^{\text{BRW}})_{t \in [0, T_f)}$.

Additionally, the function $V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x)$ characterizing the discrete score satisfies the following HJB equation: for $(t, x) \in [0, T_f) \times \mathbb{N}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) &= \frac{\partial_t \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y) q^{\text{BRW}}(y, x)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \\ &\stackrel{(78)}{=} \frac{\sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y) q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) / \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(y)}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}^d} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(y)}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma(x)) [e^{V_t^{\text{BRW}}(x) - V_t^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma(x))} - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, V^{BRW} also satisfies the terminal condition

$$V_{T_f}^{\text{BRW}}(x) = -\log \tilde{\mu}_0^{\text{BRW}}(x) = -\log \tilde{\mu}^*(x),$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 5.3.1.

A.4.6 Proof of Lemma 5.3.2

For any $t \in [0, T_f)$ and $\ell \in [d]$, following Lemma 5.3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \frac{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x))}{\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \cdot \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x))} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_-^\ell(x)) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{x^\ell \geq 1} \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x))} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_-^\ell(x)) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x)) \\ &\stackrel{(78)}{=} \sum_{x^\ell \geq 1} q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x), x) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_+^\ell(x)) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[q^{\text{BRW}}(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(\overleftarrow{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The second claim is obtained analogously and we conclude the proof.

A.4.7 Proof of Lemma 5.3.3

The characterization of the discrete score in Lemma 5.3.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[u_t^{\text{BRW}} \log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_+^\ell(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right] \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \log \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x))}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \right) \frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x))}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_+^\ell(x)) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\
&= - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \log \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x))} \right) \frac{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\gamma^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x))} q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_+^\ell(x)) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x)) \\
&\stackrel{(78)}{=} - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \log \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x))} \right) q^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x), x) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_+^\ell(x)) \\
&= - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \log \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(\sigma_-^\ell(x))}{\tilde{\mu}_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x)} \right) q^{\text{BRW}}(x, \sigma_-^\ell(x)) \mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\
&= - \mathbb{E} \left[\log u_t^{\text{BRW}} q^{\text{BRW}}(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \sigma_-^\ell(\bar{X}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The second claim follows by the same reasoning, which completes the proof.

A.4.8 Proof of Lemma 5.3.5

Lemma 5.3.4 showed that $\Gamma_s^{\text{BRW}} \geq \Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}}$ for $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T_f$. Integrating from t to T_f gives

$$\int_t^{T_f} \Gamma_s^{\text{BRW}} ds \geq \Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} \int_t^{T_f} 1 ds = (T_f - t) \Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}}.$$

Recall that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{KL}(\mu_t^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) = -\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{h}'(\tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}}, \tilde{\mu}_t^{\text{BRW}})) \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.3.4}}{=} -\Gamma_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}},$$

we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_t^{\text{BRW}} &\leq (T_f - t)^{-1} \int_0^{T_f-t} \Gamma_{T_f-s}^{\text{BRW}} ds \\
&= (T_f - t)^{-1} \int_0^{T_f-t} -\frac{d}{ds} \text{KL}(\mu_s^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) ds \\
&= (T_f - t)^{-1} \left[\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) - \text{KL}(\mu_{T_f-t}^{\text{BRW}} | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) \right] \\
&\leq (T_f - t)^{-1} \text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

To this end, let us compute $\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(\mu^* | \gamma^{\text{BRW}}) &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) \underbrace{\log \mu^*(x)}_{\leq 0} - \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) \log \gamma^{\text{BRW}}(x) \\
&\leq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) \log \left(e^d \prod_{\ell=1}^d ((x^\ell)!) \right) \\
&= d + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \mu^*(x) \sum_{\ell=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{x^\ell} \underbrace{\log(k)}_{\leq k-1 \leq x^\ell} \mathbb{1}_{x^\ell \geq 1} \\
&\leq d + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sum_{\ell=1}^d (x^\ell)^2 \mu^*(x) = d + \mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*),
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where $\mathbf{m}_2(\mu^*) = \mathbb{E} [\|X_0^{\text{BRW}}\|_2^2]$ represents the second order moment of μ^* . Replacing it into (79) yields the desired upper bound.

A.5 Stochastic-calculus viewpoint of CTMCs

We refer to [Le-Tuyet-Nhi et al.](#), Appendix F.1 for a detailed introduction to point processes, stochastic integrals with respect to point processes, and the corresponding Itô's formula. In this section, we present the stochastic-calculus viewpoint on CTMCs.

Let (X, \mathcal{X}) be a measurable space with $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ be a CTMC on X associated with the transition rate function $q^X : (0, T_f] \times X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying **H1** and **H2**, where $q^X(X_{t-}, x)$ represents the rate of jumping from the current state X_{t-} to the new state $x \in X$ at time $t \in (0, T_f]$. The CTMC $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ defines a point process $\mathbf{p}_X = (\mathbf{p}_X(t))_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ on (X, \mathcal{X}) , where

$$\mathbf{p}_X : D_{\mathbf{p}_X} \subset (0, T_f] \rightarrow X, \quad \mathbf{p}_X(t) = X_t, \quad t \in D_{\mathbf{p}_X},$$

with $D_{\mathbf{p}_X}$ is the set of jump times of $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. We observe that \mathbf{p}_X describes the new state after jumping at time $t \in (0, T_f]$ and it constructs a corresponding random measure $N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dtdx)$ on $(0, T_f] \times X$ by

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}((0, t] \times U) &= \text{Card} \{s \in D_{\mathbf{p}_X} : s \leq t, \mathbf{p}_X(s) \in U\} \\ &= \sum_{s \in D_{\mathbf{p}_X}} \delta_{(s, X_s)}((0, t] \times U) \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T_f], \quad U \in \mathcal{X}, \end{aligned}$$

that counts the total jumps into $U \in \mathcal{X}$ occurring during $(0, t]$. Then the random compensator $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$ of $N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$ is given by

$$\bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dtdx) = \sum_{y \in X} q^X(X_{t-}, y) \mathbb{1}_{X_{t-} \neq y} \delta_y(dx) dt,$$

since the corresponding compensated measure

$$\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dtdx) = N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dtdx) - \bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dtdx)$$

is an (\mathcal{F}_t) -martingale, where $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ denotes the right-continuous and complete natural filtration generated by the process $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$. Indeed, we can show the martingale property of $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$ as follows. For any function $f \in F_{\mathbf{p}_X}^1$, where the class $F_{\mathbf{p}_X}^1$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathbf{p}_X}^1 &= \left\{ f(t, x, \omega); f \text{ is } (\mathcal{F}_t)\text{-predictable and for each } t \in (0, T_f] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \int_X |f(s, x, \cdot)| \bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dsdx) \right] < \infty \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

define the following stochastic integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t+} \int_X f(s, x, \cdot) N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dsdx) &= \sum_{\substack{0 < s \leq t \\ s \in D_{\mathbf{p}_X}}} f(s, \mathbf{p}_X(s), \cdot), \\ \int_0^{t+} \int_X f(s, x, \cdot) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dsdx) &= \int_0^{t+} \int_X f(s, x, \cdot) N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dsdx) - \int_0^t \int_X f(s, x, \cdot) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(dsdx). \end{aligned}$$

Then for $0 \leq s < t \leq T_f$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^{t+} \int_{\mathbf{X}} f(z, x, \cdot) N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}z \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{s < z \leq t \\ z \in D_{\mathbf{p}_X}}} f(z, X_z, \cdot) \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbf{X}} \int_s^t f(z, x, \cdot) q^X(X_{z-}) \frac{q^X(X_{z-}, x)}{q^X(X_{z-})} \mathbb{1}_{X_{z-} \neq x} \mathrm{d}z \mathrm{d}x \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \int_{\mathbf{X}} f(z, x, \cdot) q^X(X_{z-}, x) \mathbb{1}_{X_{z-} \neq x} \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}z \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \int_{\mathbf{X}} f(z, x, \cdot) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}z \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right],
\end{aligned}$$

meaning that $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$ is indeed the compensator of the random measure $N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$. With those notations in hand, we can decompose the CTMC $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ as

$$X_t = X_0 + \sum_{\substack{0 < s \leq t \\ s \in D_{\mathbf{p}_X}}} (X_s - X_{s-}) = X_0 + \int_0^{t+} \int_{\mathbf{X}} (x - X_{s-}) N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_f],$$

under the assumption $f(s, x, \omega) := x - \omega_{s-} \in F_{\mathbf{p}_X}^1$. Applying Itô's formula to this process, for any bounded function $F : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(X_t) - F(X_0) &= \int_0^{t+} \int_{\mathbf{X}} \{F(X_{s-} + x - X_{s-}) - F(X_{s-})\} N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \\
&= \int_0^{t+} \int_{\mathbf{X}} \{F(x) - F(X_{s-})\} N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x)
\end{aligned}$$

Expressing $N_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X} = \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X} + \bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$ and plugging it into the formula above yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(X_t) - F(X_0) - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{X}} \{F(x) - F(X_{s-})\} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \\
&= \int_0^{t+} \int_{\mathbf{X}} \{F(x) - F(X_{s-})\} \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x).
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, the process

$$\left(F(X_t) - F(X_0) - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbf{X}} \{F(x) - F(X_{s-})\} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{s-} \neq x\}} q^X(X_{s-}, \mathrm{d}x) \mathrm{d}s \right)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$$

is an (\mathcal{F}_t) -local martingale as the compensated measure $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{p}_X}^{q^X}$ was shown to be an (\mathcal{F}_t) -martingale in the previous computation. It follows that for the CTMC $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ with generator $(q_t^X)_{t \in (0, T_f]}$, Itô's formula asserts that the process

$$\left(F(X_t) - F(X_0) - \int_0^t q^X F(X_{s-}) \mathrm{d}s \right)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$$

is an (\mathcal{F}_t) -local martingale for any bounded function $F : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This result aligns with Dynkin's formula.

A.6 CTMC and their corresponding martingale problem

Ethier and Kurtz (2009, Theorem 4.1) showed that the stable conservative generator $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ defines a well-posed martingale problem, whose unique solution is the distribution of the CTMC $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ associated with $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$. To be more precise, the definition of the martingale problem is given as follows.

Recall that the distribution of a stochastic process $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a solution of the martingale associated with a rate matrix $(\mathbf{q}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and initial distribution μ_0^{BRW} and write $\text{Law}((Y_t)_{t \geq 0}) \in \text{MP}(\mathbf{q}, \mu_0^{\text{BRW}})$ if $Y_0 \sim \mu_0^{\text{BRW}}$, almost surely $t \mapsto Y_t$ is Borel measurable, and for any bounded function $f : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left(f(\mathbf{X}_t) - f(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^t \mathbf{q}(s) f(\mathbf{X}_{s-}) ds \right)_{t \geq 0}$$

is an $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -local martingale, where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(Y_s : s \leq t) \vee \sigma\left(\int_0^t g(\mathbf{X}_s) ds : s \leq t, g : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded}\right).$$

We say that uniqueness holds for the martingale problem associated with $(\mathbf{q}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and initial distribution μ_0^{BRW} , if for any two processes $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y'_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are solutions to the associated martingale problem, then their distributions are equal. If uniqueness holds and for any μ_0^{BRW} , the martingale problem associated with associated $(\mathbf{q}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and μ_0^{BRW} admits a solution, we say that the martingale problem is well-posed. Note that since \mathbf{X} is a discrete countable space, Ethier and Kurtz (2009, Theorem 4.1) implies the following.

Theorem A.6.1. *Assume **H1** and **H2**. Then, the martingale problem associated with $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ is well-posed. In addition, the distribution of the CTMC $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ associated with $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ and starting from the distribution μ_0^{BRW} , is the unique solution of the martingale problem associated with $(q_t^X)_{t \geq 0}$ and μ_0^{BRW} .*

A.7 Girsanov change of measure

The convergence guarantee is established by leveraging Girsanov's theorem and Itô's formula for jump processes, combined with the martingale property of the score function along the time-reversed dynamics established in Section 5. We begin with stating the general Girsanov's theorem for jump processes on a discrete state space \mathbf{X} .

Let $\mathbb{D}_{T_f} = \mathbb{D}([0, T_f]; \mathbf{X})$ be the canonical space of all càdlàg (right-continuous with left limits) paths from $[0, T_f]$ to \mathbf{X} . Let $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ be the distribution of the CTMC associated with the generator $(\mathbf{q}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ satisfying **H1** and **H2**, endowed with the right-continuous and complete augmentation of the generated filtration, denoted by $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$.

We define the corresponding jump kernel for any $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]} \in \mathbb{D}_{T_f}$:

$$\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}, dt dx) = n_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(t, dx) dt, \quad n_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(t, dx) = \sum_{y \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_{t-} \neq y} \mathbf{q}_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, y) \delta_y(dx). \quad (81)$$

By convention, we denote $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}, dt dx)$ by $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dt dx)$ which corresponds to the compensator of $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ under \mathbb{P} , if under this distribution $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is a CTMC with generator $\mathbf{q} : \mathbf{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, the compensated sum of jumps $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} = N_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ forms a martingale under \mathbb{P} , where $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{X}}$, $N_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$, $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$, $n_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ defined as in Section A.5.

From Léonard (2012) we see that, for jump processes, the relative entropy of two path measures can be decomposed with the help of the Young function $\varrho(a) := e^a - a - 1$, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and its convex conjugate $\varrho^*(b) = (b+1) \log(b+1) - b$ for $b > -1$ with convention $\varrho^*(-1) = 1$ and $\varrho^*(b) = \infty$ for $b < -1$. Note that ϱ and ϱ^* are respectively equivalent to $a^2/2$ and $b^2/2$ near zero. This is proven by the following theorem.

Theorem A.7.1 (Girsanov theorem). *Let $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ are the distribution of CTMCs associated with $\text{MP}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}})$ and $\text{MP}(u\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}})$ with $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} \ll \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$, respectively, where \mathbf{q} is a given inhomogeneous generator satisfying **H1** and **H2**, $\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$ are given initial distributions and u is a non-negative function from $[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}^2$ to \mathbb{R}_+ satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) \right] < \infty. \quad (82)$$

Then the Radon-Nikodym density of $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ against $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ is given by

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) = \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) \right),$$

and the KL divergence reads as

$$\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}) = \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f]} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{h}(u_t(\mathbf{X}_t, x)) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_t \neq x} \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{X}_t, x) dt \right],$$

where $\mathbf{h}(a) = \varrho^(a - 1) = a \log a - a + 1$ for $a > 0$.*

Notably, the integrability condition in (82) is, by a Fenchel duality argument, equivalent to the following:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f]} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{h}(u_t(\mathbf{X}_t, x)) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_t \neq x} \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{X}_t, x) dt \right] < \infty.$$

This integrability condition holds naturally in the models we study, as it can be directly controlled under our assumptions. The proof of Theorem A.7.1 is given for completeness and is based on several technical lemmas, which we introduce in the following framework. Let $(\chi_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ be a \mathbb{R} -valued process on $[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}^2$ such that $\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}^2} \varrho(\chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) < \infty$, $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -a.s. Define

$$\mathbb{Z}_t^{\chi} := \exp \left(\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dsdx) - \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dsdx) \right), \text{ for } t \in [0, T_f]. \quad (83)$$

Lemma A.7.2. *Let $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ be the distribution of a CTMC with generator $\mathbf{q} : [0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying **H1** and **H2**. Let $(\chi_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ be as above. Then $\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dsdx)$ is a local $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale. Moreover, the process $(\mathbb{Z}_t^{\chi})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ defined in (83) is a local $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale and a positive $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -supermartingale, which satisfies*

$$d\mathbb{Z}_t^{\chi} = \mathbb{Z}_{t-}^{\chi} \int_{\mathbf{X}} (e^{\chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)} - 1) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx).$$

Proof of Lemma A.7.2. By definition, the process

$$M_t^{\chi} := \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dsdx)$$

is a local $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale. Denote $Y_t^{\chi} := M_t^{\chi} - \int_{[0, T_f]} \beta_s ds$ with $\beta_s := \int_{\mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)) n_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(s, dx)$.

Applying Itô's formula provided to the jump process $(Y_t^{\chi})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ and for a function f of class $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ implies

$$df(Y_t^{\chi}) = \left[\int_{\mathbf{X}} [f(Y_{t-}^{\chi} + \chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) - f(Y_{t-}^{\chi}) - f'(Y_{t-}^{\chi}) \cdot \chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)] n_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(t, dx) \right] dt + f'(Y_{t-}^{\chi}) \cdot \beta_t dt + dM_t^f, \quad \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}\text{-a.s.},$$

where M_t is given by

$$M_t^f = \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} [f(Y_{s-}^\chi + \chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)) - f(Y_{s-}^\chi)] \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dsdx)$$

is a local $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale, since the integrand is \mathbb{R} -valued predictable process and $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ forms a martingale under $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$. Using this formula for $f(y) = e^y$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d e^{Y_t^\chi} &= \left[\int_{\mathbf{X}} (e^{Y_{t-}^\chi + \chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)} - e^{Y_{t-}^\chi} - e^{Y_{t-}^\chi} \cdot \chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(t, dx) \right] dt - e^{Y_{t-}^\chi} \beta_t dt + dM_t^{\text{exp}} \\ &= e^{Y_{t-}^\chi} \beta_t dt - e^{Y_{t-}^\chi} \beta_t dt + dM_t^{\text{exp}} = dM_t^{\text{exp}}, \quad \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

This implies $Z_t^\chi = e^{Y_t^\chi}$ is a local $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale and, since Z_t^χ is positive, we can conclude that Z_t^χ is a $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -supermartingale thanks to Fatou's lemma. In addition, we have

$$dM_t^{\text{exp}} = \int_{\mathbf{X}} (e^{Y_{t-}^\chi + \chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)} - e^{Y_{t-}^\chi}) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) = e^{Y_{t-}^\chi} \int_{\mathbf{X}} (e^{\chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)} - 1) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx),$$

i.e., $dZ_t^\chi = Z_{t-}^\chi \int_{\mathbf{X}} (e^{\chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)} - 1) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx)$ and we conclude the proof of Lemma A.7.2. \square

We now define the stopping time for $k, j \geq 1$,

$$\sigma_j^k := \inf \left\{ t \in [0, T_f] : \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)) \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dsdx) \geq k \text{ or } \chi_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, \mathbf{X}_t) \notin [-j, k] \right\}. \quad (84)$$

For $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}_{T_f})$, let us denote $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma_j^k} := \mathbf{X}_{\#}^{\sigma_j^k} \mathbb{P}$ the law under \mathbb{P} of the process $\mathbf{X}_{\sigma_j^k}^{\sigma_j^k}$ which is stopped at the stopping time σ_j^k .

Lemma A.7.3. *Let $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ be the distribution of a CTMC with generator $\mathbf{q} : [0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying **H1** and **H2** and let $(\chi_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ be as above. Let $(Z_t^\chi)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ be defined in (83) and σ_j^k be defined in (84). For all $j, k \geq 1$, the process $(Z_t^{\sigma_j^k})_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ defined as $Z_t^{\sigma_j^k} := Z_t^{\chi_j^k}$, is a genuine $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale with $\chi_j^k = \mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]} \chi$, and the measure \mathbb{Q}_j^k initialized from \mathbb{Q}_0 and defined for any measurable function $F : \mathbb{D}_{T_f} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k}[F((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}[F((\mathbf{X}_{t \wedge \sigma_j^k})_{t \in [0, T_f]}) Z_{T_f}^{\sigma_j^k}], \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \mathbb{Q}_j^k = Z_{T_f}^{\sigma_j^k}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}})^{\sigma_j^k}$$

is a probability measure on \mathbb{D}_{T_f} which satisfies

$$\mathbb{Q}_j^k \in \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]} e^{\chi} \mathbf{q}, \mathbb{Q}_0).$$

Proof of Lemma A.7.3. Fix $j, k \geq 1$. We have

$$Z_t^{\sigma_j^k} = \exp \left(\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi_j^k d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi_j^k) d\tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right),$$

where $\chi_j^k = \mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]} \chi$ is predictable since χ is predictable and $\mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]}$ is left continuous. For simplicity, we drop the subscripts and superscripts and write $\tilde{\chi} = \chi_j^k$ and $\tilde{Z}_t = Z_t^{\sigma_j^k}$ for the rest of the proof. From the definition of σ_j^k , we obtain that $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ a.s.,

$$\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\tilde{\chi}_s) d\tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \leq k, \quad \text{and } \tilde{\chi}_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, \mathbf{X}_t) \in [-j, k], \text{ for any } t \in [0, T_f]. \quad (85)$$

First, we prove that (\tilde{Z}_t) is a \mathbb{P}^q -martingale. From Lemma A.7.2, (\tilde{Z}_t) is a local martingale. Therefore, it is enough to show that for $t \in [0, T_f]$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q}[\tilde{Z}_t^p] < \infty, \quad \text{for some } p > 1.$$

For $p > 1$, we have

$$\tilde{Z}_t^p = \exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q - p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \leq \exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right),$$

and

$$\exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q - \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \geq \exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) / C(k, p, t),$$

for some finite deterministic constant $0 < C(k, p, t) < \infty$. Indeed, \mathbb{P}^q -a.s., for any $s \in [0, T_f]$, it holds that $\varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) \leq e^{k(p-1)}(\varrho(\tilde{\chi}_s) + k + 1)$ since $\tilde{\chi}_s \leq k$ and $p > 1$. It yields that \mathbb{P}^q -a.s., it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left(\int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) &\leq \exp \left(e^{k(p-1)} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} (\varrho(\tilde{\chi}_s) + k + 1) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \\ &\stackrel{(85)}{\leq} \exp \left(k e^{k(p-1)} + (k + 1) e^{k(p-1)} \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} 1 d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \\ &\leq C(k, p, t) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the formula of $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q$ given in (81) and the fact that \mathbf{q} satisfies H2. This implies \mathbb{P}^q -a.s.,

$$\tilde{Z}_t^p \leq \exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \leq C(k, p, t) \exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q - \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right). \quad (86)$$

On the other hand, applying Lemma A.7.2 for $(p\tilde{\chi}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ yields that

$$\exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q - \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right)$$

is a \mathbb{P}^q -supermartingale, and we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\exp \left(p \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q - \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\exp \left(p \int_{[0,0] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{\chi}_s d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q - \int_{[0,0] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(p\tilde{\chi}_s) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \right) \right] = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this estimate into (86) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q}[\tilde{Z}_t^p] \leq C(k, p, t) < \infty, \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, T_f],$$

which allow us to conclude that $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ is a \mathbb{P}^q -martingale (see, e.g., Zitkovic, 2015). Thereby $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q}[\tilde{Z}_t] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q}[\tilde{Z}_0] = 1$ for any $t \in [0, T_f]$ and it follows \mathbb{Q}_j^k is a probability measure on \mathbb{D}_{T_f} .

Now, we show the second claim of Lemma A.7.3:

$$\mathbb{Q}_j^k \in \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]} e^{\chi \mathbf{q}}, \mathbb{Q}_0).$$

Let τ be a finitely valued stopping time which will be specified later, and for any function f , we denote

$$F_t := \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{f(\mathbf{X}_s) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} = \int_0^{t+} \int_{\mathbf{X}} \{f(x) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} N_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T_f].$$

Recall that by Lemma A.7.2, the martingale (\tilde{Z}_t) satisfies the followings for \mathbb{P}^q -a.s.,

$$\mathrm{d}\tilde{Z}_t = \mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]}(t) \tilde{Z}_{t-} \int_{\mathbf{X}} (e^{\tilde{\chi}_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)} - 1) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}t \mathrm{d}x).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} \left[\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \tau} \{f(\mathbf{X}_s) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} [F_{t \wedge \tau} | \mathcal{F}_0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} [\tilde{Z}_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} F_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} - \tilde{Z}_0 F_0 | \mathcal{F}_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Let us denote the two-dimensional process $(I_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]} = (I_t^1, I_t^2)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$, where

$$I_t^1 := F_t = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \underbrace{[f(x) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})]}_{=: v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X})} \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) + \underbrace{\int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} [f(x) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})] \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x)}_{=: A_t^1},$$

and

$$I_t^2 := \tilde{Z}_t = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \underbrace{\tilde{Z}_{s-} (e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} - 1)}_{=: v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X})} \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x).$$

Let $v = (v^1, v^2)$ and apply Itô's formula to the process $(I_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ using the function given by the product of the coordinates, treating $(A_t^1)_{t \in [0, T_f]}$ as a continuous, finite variation process adapted to the filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} [F_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} \tilde{Z}_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} - F_0 \tilde{Z}_0 | \mathcal{F}_0] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} [I_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k}^1 I_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k}^2 - I_0^1 I_0^2 | \mathcal{F}_0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \{ (I_{s-}^1 + v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X})) (I_{s-}^2 + v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X})) - I_{s-}^1 I_{s-}^2 \} \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \{ (I_s^1 + v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X})) (I_s^2 + v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - I_s^1 I_s^2 - I_s^2 v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) - I_s^1 v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X}) \} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} I_s^2 v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \{ I_s^2 v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) + v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X}) \} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &\quad \text{(as } \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}^q\text{-martingale)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \left\{ \tilde{Z}_s v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) + v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) \tilde{Z}_{s-} (e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} - 1) \right\} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}x) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we reduce the stochastic integral w.r.t. $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q$ as it is a local \mathbb{P}^q -martingale, since the integrand is \mathbb{R} -valued predictable process and $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q$ forms a martingale under \mathbb{P}^q . Since

$\tilde{Z}_s = \tilde{Z}_{s-}$ for Lebesgue almost every $s \in [0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k]$ (Mozumder, 2009, Proposition 2.1) and $\tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q$ is atomless in time, the calculation follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[F_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} \tilde{Z}_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} - F_0 \tilde{Z}_0 \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{Z}_s v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) \left(1 + e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} - 1 \right) \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{Z}_s v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right]. \tag{88}
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $G_t := \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx)$. Applying Itô's formula for the process (G_t, \tilde{Z}_t) analogously as argued before, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\tilde{Z}_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} G_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} - \tilde{Z}_0 G_0 \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \left\{ G_{s-} (\tilde{Z}_{s-} + v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X})) - G_{s-} \tilde{Z}_{s-} \right\} \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \left\{ (G_s (\tilde{Z}_s + v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X})) - G_s \tilde{Z}_s - G_s v^2(s, x, \mathbf{X})) \right\} \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{Z}_s v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k] \times \mathbf{X}} \tilde{Z}_s v^1(s, x, \mathbf{X}) e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right], \tag{89}
\end{aligned}$$

as the stochastic integral w.r.t. $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q$ is a local \mathbb{P}^q -martingale, since the integrand is \mathbb{R} -valued predictable process and $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^q$ forms a martingale under \mathbb{P}^q . Combining (87), (88) and (89) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} \left[\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \tau} \{f(\mathbf{X}_s) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^q} \left[\tilde{Z}_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} G_{t \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma_j^k} \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} [G_{t \wedge \tau} | \mathcal{F}_0] \quad (\text{since } G_0 = 0) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau] \times \mathbf{X}} \{f(x) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} \tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^q(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau] \times \mathbf{X}} \{f(x) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} e^{\tilde{\chi}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x)} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_{s-} \neq y} q_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, y) \delta_y(dx) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{e\tilde{\chi}q}$ the corresponding jump kernel for $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]} \in \mathbb{D}_{T_f}$ and $(t, x) \in [0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{e\tilde{\chi}q}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}, dt dx) &:= \sum_{y \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_{t-} \neq y} (e^{\tilde{\chi}} q)_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, y) \delta_y(dx) dt \\
&= \sum_{y \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_{t-} \neq y} e^{\tilde{\chi}_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, y)} q_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, y) \delta_y(dx) dt,
\end{aligned}$$

then the previous equation rewrites

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} [f(\mathbf{X}_{t \wedge \tau}) - f(\mathbf{X}_0) | \mathcal{F}_0] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau] \times \mathbf{X}} \{f(x) - f(\mathbf{X}_{s-})\} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{e}^{\chi_j^k} \mathbf{q}}(ds dx) \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_j^k} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau]} (e^{\chi_j^k} \mathbf{q})(s) f(\mathbf{X}_{s-}) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_0 \right].\end{aligned}$$

Choosing τ such that the above terms are meaningful, we conclude that $\mathbb{Q}_j^k \in \text{MP}(\mathbf{e}^{\chi_j^k} \mathbf{q})$ and finish the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem A.7.1. This proof is an adaptation of Theorem 2.6 in Léonard (2012) based on technical lemmas provided above applying on the reference measure $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}} \in \text{MP}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}})$. We first show the formulation of the Radon-Nikodym density $d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}/d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ when $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} \sim \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$. Define the stopping time τ_j^k as

$$\tau_j^k := \inf \left\{ t \in [0, T_f]; \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u_s(\mathbf{X}_{s-}, x) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dx ds)) \geq k \text{ or } \log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, \mathbf{X}_t) \notin [-j, k] \right\},$$

which coincides with the stopping time σ_j^k when $\chi = \log u$. Denote $u^{\sigma_j^k} := \mathbb{1}_{[0, \sigma_j^k]} u$ and for simplicity, we write $u = u^{\sigma_j^k}$. By conditioning w.r.t. \mathbf{X}_0 , we can assume without loss of generality that $\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}$, i.e., $d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}/d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{X}_0) = 1$.

Applying Lemma A.7.3 for $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} \in \text{MP}(u\mathbf{q})$ and $\chi = -\log u$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}^{\tau_j^k} := \mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{-\log u, u\mathbf{q}}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k} \in \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} e^{-\log u} u\mathbf{q}) = \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} \mathbf{q}). \quad (90)$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{Q}_0^{\tau_j^k} = (\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}})_0^{\tau_j^k} = (\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}})_0^{\tau_j^k}$, which combined with the equation (90) imply $\mathbb{Q}^{\tau_j^k} = (\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k}$ thanks to the uniqueness of $\text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} \mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}})$. Now, applying again Lemma A.7.3 for $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}} \in \text{MP}(\mathbf{q})$ and $\chi = \log u$ yields

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\tau_j^k} := \mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{\log u, \mathbf{q}}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k} \in \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} e^{\log u} \mathbf{q}) = \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} u\mathbf{q}).$$

Next reapplying Lemma A.7.3 with $(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{u\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k} \in \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} u\mathbf{q})$ and $\chi = -\log u$ implies

$$\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\tau_j^k} := \mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{-\log u, u\mathbf{q}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\tau_j^k} \in \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} e^{-\log u} u\mathbf{q}) = \text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} \mathbf{q}).$$

Argue as before, the previous equation together with the initial condition $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_0^{\tau_j^k} = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0^{\tau_j^k} = \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}$ yield that $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\tau_j^k} = \vec{R}^{\tau_j^k}$ thanks to the uniqueness of $\text{MP}(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k]} \mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}})$. Combining it with $\mathbb{Q}^{\tau_j^k} = (\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k}$ implies

$$\mathbb{Q}^{\tau_j^k} = \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\tau_j^k},$$

which means that

$$\mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{-\log u, u\mathbf{q}} \mathbb{P}^{\tau_j^k} = \mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{-\log u, u\mathbf{q}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\tau_j^k}. \quad (91)$$

Now observe that $\mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{-\log u, u\mathbf{q}} > 0$, therefore, equation (91) yields $(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k} = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{\tau_j^k}$. Hence $(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k} = \mathbb{Z}_{T_f}^{\log u, \mathbf{q}}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}})^{\tau_j^k}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k \wedge T_f]} \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) &= \mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k \wedge T_f]} \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \\ &\quad \exp \left(\int_{[0, \tau_j^k \wedge T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\mathbb{1}_{[0, \tau_j^k \wedge T_f]} \log u) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, \tau_j^k \wedge T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Letting k and j tend to infinity and noting that $\tau := \lim_{k,j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j^k = \infty$, we get $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ -a.s. under condition (82) that

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) = \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) \right).$$

We now extend the result above to the case when $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ might not be equivalent to $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$. The idea is to approximate $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ by a sequence $(\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}})$, which satisfies $\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}} \sim \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Denoting

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} + \frac{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}{n} \quad \text{for } n \geq 1, \quad (92)$$

we have $\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}} \sim \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}) = 0$. For simplicity, we write $\chi = \log u$ and $\chi^n = \log u^n$, which are well-defined $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ -a.s. From the variational representation of the KL divergence, using $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} \in \text{MP}(u\mathbf{q})$ combined with Lemma A.7.2, we obtain

$$\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi - \chi^n) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u^n \mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^n) d(u^n \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right].$$

By definition, we have

$$\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u^n \mathbf{q}} = N_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - u^n \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} = N_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - u \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} + (u - u^n) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} = \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u \mathbf{q}} + (u - u^n) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}},$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}) \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi - \chi^n) d(\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u \mathbf{q}} + \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(u - u^n)) - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \left(\frac{u}{u^n} - \log \frac{u}{u^n} - 1 \right) u^n d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi - \chi^n) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u \mathbf{q}} + \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} u \log \frac{u}{u^n} d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \left(\frac{u}{u^n} - 1 \right) u^n d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} \in \text{MP}(u\mathbf{q})$, we deduce that the stochastic integral $\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi - \chi^n) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u \mathbf{q}}$ is a local \mathbb{P} -martingale. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}) & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \left(u^n - u - u \log \frac{u^n}{u} \right) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \left(\frac{u^n}{u} - \log \frac{u^n}{u} - 1 \right) u d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi^n - \chi) d(u \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P} | \mathbb{P}_n) = 0$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi^n - \chi) d(u \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right] = 0. \quad (93)$$

On the other hand, the fact that $\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}} \sim \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}$ yields

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) = \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{n,0}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi^n d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi^n) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right). \quad (94)$$

To obtain the desired expression for the Radon–Nikodym density $\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}$, we represent it as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) \\
&= \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}} \right) ((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) \\
&\stackrel{(94)}{=} \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_n} \cdot \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{n,0}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}} \right) (\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi^n d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi^n) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right) \\
&= \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbb{P}_n^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}} \right) (\mathbf{X}_0) \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right) \\
&\exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\varrho(\chi^n) - \varrho(\chi)) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right), \mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}\text{-a.s.} \tag{95}
\end{aligned}$$

The last part can be rewritten as follows using the relation $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} = \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} + (u-1)\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\varrho(\chi^n) - \varrho(\chi)) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right) \\
&= \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^n) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We first handle the second integral above using (93) and the fact that ϱ is a non-negative function to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\left| \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^n) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right| \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This together with Markov's inequality lead to

$$\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^n) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} 0, \tag{96}$$

and therefore, from Méliot (2025, Proposition 1.4), there is a subsequence χ^{n_k} such that

$$\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^{n_k}) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}\text{-a.s.}$$

Furthermore, recall that $\varrho(a) = e^a - a - 1 \geq a^2/2$, hence (93) can be used to control the stochastic integral w.r.t. the $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ -martingale $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} \right)^2 \right] \stackrel{\text{Itô's isometry}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi)^2 d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right] \\
& \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^n) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This, along with Markov's inequality, results in

$$\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} 0.$$

Combining this with (96) implies that

$$\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^n - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^n) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} 0.$$

As a consequence, [Méliot \(2025, Proposition 1.4\)](#) asserts that there is a subsequence (χ^{n_k}) such that

$$\left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^{n_k} - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi - \chi^{n_k}) d(u\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}) \right] \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}\text{-a.s.}$$

It helps interpreting (95) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) &= \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n_k}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{n_k, 0}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}} \right) (\mathbf{X}_0) \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right) \\ &\quad \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\chi^{n_k} - \chi) d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (\varrho(\chi^{n_k}) - \varrho(\chi)) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right) \\ &\xrightarrow[\text{(92)}]{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \chi d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\chi) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right), \quad \mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\chi = \log u$, we arrive at our desired claim $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ -a.s.

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}}((\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T_f]}) = \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}}(\mathbf{X}_0) \exp \left(\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \log u d\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right).$$

Consequently, the KL divergence reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}) &= \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x) \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u_t(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} = \tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}} + (u - 1)\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ and relying on the fact that $\tilde{N}_{\mathbf{X}}^{u\mathbf{q}}$ is a martingale under $\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}) &= \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} (u - 1) \log u d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} - \int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \varrho(\log u) d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right] \\ &= \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} [(u - 1) \log u - u + \log u + 1] d\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}} \right] \\ &= \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f] \times \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{h}(u_t(\mathbf{X}_t, x)) \bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) \right], \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{X}_{t-}$ for Lebesgue almost every $t \in (0, T_f]$ and $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}$ is atomless in time, where $\mathbf{h}(a) = a \log a - a + 1$ for $a > 0$. In addition, we can simplify the KL expression above by replacing

$$\bar{n}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{q}}(dtdx) = \sum_{y \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{X}_{t-} \neq y\}} \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}, y) \delta_y(dx) dt$$

to arrive at

$$\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{q}}) = \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0^{u\mathbf{q}} | \mathbb{P}_0^{\mathbf{q}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{u\mathbf{q}}} \left[\int_{[0, T_f]} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{h}(u_t(\mathbf{X}_t, x)) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{X}_t \neq x} \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{X}_t, x) dt \right].$$

The proof of Theorem [A.7.1](#) is then complete. \square