

Error Analysis of Generalized Langevin Equations with Approximated Memory Kernels ^{*}

Quanjun Lang[†] and Jianfeng Lu[‡]

Abstract

We analyze prediction error in stochastic dynamical systems with memory, focusing on generalized Langevin equations (GLEs) formulated as stochastic Volterra equations. We establish that, under a strongly convex potential, trajectory discrepancies decay at a rate determined by the decay of the memory kernel and are quantitatively bounded by the estimation error of the kernel in a weighted norm. Our analysis integrates synchronized noise coupling with a Volterra comparison theorem, encompassing both subexponential and exponential kernel classes. For first-order models, we derive moment and perturbation bounds using resolvent estimates in weighted spaces. For second-order models with confining potentials, we prove contraction and stability under kernel perturbations using a hypocoercive Lyapunov-type distance. This framework accommodates non-translation-invariant kernels and white-noise forcing, explicitly linking improved kernel estimation to enhanced trajectory prediction. Numerical examples validate these theoretical findings.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Main contributions	2
1.2	Related works	3
2	Preliminary on Volterra equations and subexponential kernels	4
2.1	Resolvent of Volterra equations	5
2.2	Subexponential functions and exponential-type functions	6
2.3	Proof of Theorem 2.1	10
2.4	Exactly exponential case via characteristic equations	10
3	Error analysis for first-order equations	11
4	Error analysis for second-order equations	14
5	Numerical Examples	18
5.1	Preliminary results	18
5.2	First-order GLE	19
5.3	Second-order GLE	20
6	Conclusion	22

1 Introduction

The generalized Langevin equation (GLE) describes the dynamics of a particle influenced by conservative forces, friction with memory, and stochastic forcing. The GLE for position $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and velocity V_t is given

^{*}Funding: The research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation through awards DMS-2309378 and IIS-2403276.

[†]Department of Mathematics, Duke University, Durham, NC (quanjun.lang@duke.edu).

[‡]Departments of Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, NC (jianfeng@math.duke.edu).

by

$$dX_t = V_t dt, \quad dV_t = \left(-\gamma V_t - \nabla U(X_t) - \int_0^t K(t-s) V_s ds \right) dt + d\eta(t),$$

where $U(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a confining potential, $\gamma > 0$ is the friction parameter, and $\eta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a random noise process. The kernel $K(t)$ accounts for history-dependent interaction, and in thermal equilibrium, the fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) requires the noise to satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta(t)\eta(s)^\top] = \beta^{-1}K(t-s),$$

where β is the inverse temperature. In the absence of external forcing, i.e., when $\nabla U \equiv 0$, the second-order GLE can be reduced to a first-order stochastic integro-differential equation for the velocity:

$$dV_t = \left(-\gamma V_t - \int_0^t K(t-s) V_s ds \right) dt + d\eta(t). \quad (1.1)$$

Such memory-dependent equations arise naturally in Mori-Zwanzig coarse-graining of high-dimensional systems, where non-Markovian terms are essential to capture effective dynamics [43, 19, 31].

In practice, it is common to model the forcing $\eta(t)$ as mean-zero Gaussian white noise with fixed covariance $\sigma\sigma^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, independent of the memory kernel $K(t)$. This leads to a simplified non-Markovian model with delta-correlated noise:

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta(t)] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\eta(t)\eta(s)^\top] = \sigma\sigma^\top \delta(t-s).$$

Moreover, non-translation-invariant memory kernels are also used, that is, $K(t, s)$ that depend on both time variables independently. This direction is motivated in part by recent developments in large language models (LLMs), particularly the HiPPO state-space model framework [21, 22], which represents history using projections onto time-evolving orthogonal polynomial bases and yields explicit time-dependent kernels. Such constructions naturally lead to kernels with explicit time dependence and are well-suited for modeling non-stationary and transient dynamics. With this broader view, we focus on two simplified yet widely applicable variants of the GLE framework.

- The *first-order GLE with white noise*:

$$dV_t = -\gamma V_t dt - \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds dt + \sigma dB_t. \quad (1.2)$$

- The *second-order GLE with white noise*:

$$dX_t = V_t dt, \quad dV_t = -\gamma V_t dt - \nabla U(X_t) dt - \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds dt + \sigma dB_t. \quad (1.3)$$

In both of the above equations, $B_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a standard Brownian motion, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the diffusion matrix, and $K(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix-valued memory kernel.

Remark 1.1. We emphasize that the first-order GLE above is not obtained as the overdamped (large-friction) limit of the second-order GLE. In the overdamped regime, one eliminates the inertia variable and derives an effective non-Markovian dynamics for the position process alone, with a memory kernel that differs from the one in our formulation of the first-order GLE.

These models capture a broad class of non-Markovian stochastic systems and support modeling, simulation, and inference in physical, biological, financial, and scientific computing [26, 27, 41, 35]. We focus on *error analysis* when the memory kernel $K(t, s)$ is learned from data or approximated with perturbation. Our goal is to quantify how kernel approximation errors affect trajectory behavior, thereby informing both prediction and interpretability.

1.1 Main contributions

Our main result shows that the estimation error of the memory kernel directly controls the prediction error of generalized Langevin dynamics. In other words, if the approximate kernel is sufficiently well-behaved (in the sense of satisfying mild integrability and decay assumptions), then the difference between the true and perturbed trajectories remains uniformly bounded, with magnitude proportional to the kernel discrepancy. The primary tool we use is the resolvent of Volterra equations, along with a comparison theorem. We summarize the main results as follows.

Theorem 1.1 (Informal main result). *Let K be the true memory kernel and \tilde{K} an estimated kernel. Consider the generalized Langevin dynamics (1.2) and (1.3) driven by K and its perturbed version driven by \tilde{K} , under synchronized noise. Suppose that both kernels satisfy standard regularity and decay fast enough compared to a given function h . Then the coupled dynamics are contractive with respect to an appropriate quadratic distance on trajectories. Moreover, the trajectory error decays at least at the rate prescribed by h and is proportional to the L^2 kernel estimation error weighted by h . See Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.2 for precise statements and constants.*

1.2 Related works

Memory kernel identification Recovering the memory kernel in the GLE is a central problem for constructing accurate non-Markovian models. The authors in [30] proposed a rational approximation method in the Laplace domain to estimate the kernel. The authors in [36] developed a machine-learning framework that integrates a multilayer perceptron (MLP) with the GLE to learn memory kernels directly from data, enabling data-driven reduced non-Markovian modeling. The authors in [6] employed the Prony method to approximate autocorrelation functions and represented the memory kernel via finite-dimensional Markovian embeddings. Our previous work [29] decoupled the learning process into two stages: a regularized Prony method to estimate autocorrelation functions, followed by a balanced Sobolev-norm-based regression that guarantees theoretical performance bounds. In particular, the kernel L^2 estimation error is rigorously controlled by the error in the estimated autocorrelation functions.

Error analysis Analyses of the Mori-Zwanzig formalism provide a priori error estimates for short memory, t -model, and hierarchical finite-memory closures, including convergence conditions and computable upper bounds on the memory integral [42]. These results bound the errors of *closure approximations* rather than providing stability of a prescribed non-Markovian model in terms of an explicit norm for the kernel discrepancy. In [25], the authors used the resolvent-kernel framework to prove that, for second-kind Volterra equations with non-negative convolution kernels, relative perturbations in the kernel lead to bounded relative errors in the solution (including defect-renewal equations as a special case). This is close to our setting. However, they did not consider the specific decay rate of the trajectory error and different types of memory kernels. In [13], the authors considered the Prony series approximation of the memory kernel and provided error analysis for a simple case of a one-dimensional harmonic oscillator. However, the kernel is assumed to have exponential decay, and the error analysis for more general cases remains open.

Decay rate analysis for equations with memory The classical reference [20] provides a comprehensive treatment of Volterra theory, including resolvent bounds, contractivity results, and their stochastic extensions in weighted L^p spaces. These tools are fundamental for analyzing systems with memory and characterizing their decay properties. Later work considered the decay rate using characteristic equations [28]. Building on this foundation, Appleby and collaborators investigated Volterra differential equations under various settings [3, 4, 1]. In particular, they developed a rigorous framework for describing trajectory decay rates for a broad class of subexponential functions. This line of work was later extended to stochastic Volterra equations in [34], though in a slightly different setting where the diffusion term depends linearly on the state variable, leading to trajectories and noise that both decay to zero. Perturbation effects were also examined in [2], where the analysis relies on direct comparison arguments rather than an L^2 -based error framework. Our analysis extends these approaches to the GLE context.

On the other hand, for fluctuation-dissipation balanced GLE, where the noise term is correlated with the memory kernel, the decay behavior has been investigated in detail in [18, 24, 12]. These studies cover systems with power-law and singular memory kernels and provide a careful analysis of their long-time dynamics. In such settings, the coupling between the correlated noise and the perturbed kernel becomes involved. To focus on the kernel-dependent dynamics, we consider a simplified model with additive Gaussian noise and defer the development of consistent correlated-noise formulations to future work.

Langevin equations For the Langevin equation, establishing exponential convergence to equilibrium through direct coupling was posed as an open problem in [40]. This question was later addressed in [7], where the authors employed a synchronous coupling under relatively restrictive assumptions on the potential. Further progress was made in [14], where the authors introduced a special Lyapunov function inspired by

[32] and developed a sticky coupling that combines synchronized and reflection couplings. This approach successfully handled certain nonconvex potentials at the borderline between the overdamped and underdamped regimes. The sharpest contraction rate for strongly convex potentials so far was obtained in [8], and [37] further improved the result to achieve a dimension-free convergence rate by introducing two separate distance scales for coupling.

Another line of research focuses on the evolution of the probability law through the Fokker-Planck equation; see, for instance, [10, 15, 23]. However, in the presence of memory effects, such a convenient Fokker-Planck structure is not available. There are works that focus on deriving hierarchical Fokker-Planck equations and on analyzing delayed stochastic systems and their associated evolution equations; see, for example, [17]. An alternative approach uses Markovian embedding, where the memory kernel is approximated by a Prony series, and the Fokker-Planck equation of the resulting extended system is derived. The marginal distribution of the original variables can then be obtained as in [18]. Nonetheless, performing rigorous error analysis within this framework remains technically challenging.

Positioning To our knowledge, a trajectory-level stability theorem that scales linearly with a weighted L^2 kernel discrepancy for GLEs with general, non-translation-invariant kernels has not appeared. Our contribution closes this gap by establishing trajectory-level stability bounds whose constants scale linearly with the kernel estimation error measured in a weighted Schur-type L^2 norm.

Notations We use the notation $A(t) \lesssim B(t)$ to indicate that $A(t) \leq cB(t)$ for some constant $c > 0$ independent of t . The convolution of two functions is written as $(h * g)(t) = \int_0^t h(t-s)g(s) ds$, and the n -fold convolution is denoted by h^{*n} . The Laplace transform of a function k is defined as $\hat{k}(\mu) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu s} k(s) ds$, whenever the integral is convergent. In particular, $\hat{k}(0) = \int_0^\infty k(s) ds$.

We use $|\cdot|$ to denote vector norms and $\|\cdot\|$ to denote matrix operator norms. The L^1 -norm of a function f is given by $\|f\|_1 := \int_0^\infty |f(s)| ds$. For a function f , its weighted supremum norm with respect to a positive weight function h is denoted by $\|f\|_h$, as introduced in (2.16). The Schur-type norm of a matrix-valued kernel function K , weighted by a positive function h , is written as $\|K\|_h$ and defined in Theorem 3.1.

We use $\mathcal{U}(\mu)$ to denote the class of functions with a prescribed decay rate, as defined in Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.6. Note that a negative value of μ corresponds to exponential decay. Throughout the paper, we write \tilde{K} to denote an approximated or learned version of K , and use the notation $\delta K := K - \tilde{K}$ for their difference. We adopt the convention that the capital letter K denotes a matrix-valued kernel, while the lower-case k denotes a scalar-valued kernel.

Outline Section 2 develops the Volterra resolvent framework and the weighted spaces used throughout, including subexponential and exponential-type kernels and the key comparison estimate (Theorem 2.1). Section 3 establishes trajectory and perturbation bounds for the first-order GLE with white noise. Section 4 extends the analysis to the second-order GLE using a hypocoercive Lyapunov metric and proves the stability of the perturbed dynamics. Section 5 presents numerical examples for subexponential kernels and both GLE models.

2 Preliminary on Volterra equations and subexponential kernels

In this section, we establish a comparison theorem that converts an integro-differential inequality into an explicit bound with the same decay rate as the kernel.

We let $\mathcal{U}(0)$ denote a class of subexponentially decaying functions (see Theorem 2.4). Moreover, for any $k \in \mathcal{U}(\mu)$ with $\mu \neq 0$, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{U}(0)$ such that $k(t) = e^{\mu t} \varphi(t)$. In the case $\mu < 0$, the kernel k decays slightly faster than $e^{\mu t}$. Precise definitions are given in Section 2.2.

Theorem 2.1 (Volterra comparison). *Let $a > 0$ be a constant, $g \geq 0$ be a bounded and continuous function, and suppose that $y: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfies the integro-differential inequality*

$$y'(t) \leq -ay(t) + \int_0^t k(t-s)y(s) ds + g(t), \quad y(0) = y_0. \quad (2.1)$$

where $k \in \mathcal{U}(\mu)$ for some $\mu \leq 0$. If

$$\mu + a > \hat{k}(\mu),$$

then there exists a positive constant $C_0 < \infty$ which depends on a, k, μ such that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$y(t) \leq C_0(y_0 k(t) + (k * g)(t)).$$

In particular, when $g \equiv 0$, y has at least the same decay rate as k .

This result is crucial for controlling trajectory errors of GLEs with approximated memory terms. It enables decay rate analysis beyond the exponential case, including subexponential kernels where Grönwall-type arguments fail. In this section, we prove the theorem as follows. We first introduce the resolvent for Volterra equations and the function class $\mathcal{U}(\mu)$. We then establish the theorem for subexponential functions with $\mu = 0$ and treat the equality case of (2.1), reducing the problem to an integro-differential equation. The inequality case follows from a standard comparison argument. At last, we apply a change of variables to extend the proof to the exponential case with $\mu < 0$.

Remark 2.1. The main focus here is on kernels k with only subexponential decay. For exponential decay, one can analyze the characteristic equation related to (2.1) (cf., e.g., [28]),

$$\lambda + a = \hat{k}(\lambda). \quad (2.2)$$

If it admits a root with negative real parts, then y decays exponentially. In contrast, when k decays only subexponentially, such a root may not exist, leaving the decay rate undetermined. Also see Theorem 2.11 for more details.

2.1 Resolvent of Volterra equations

Consider the following Volterra equation for $t \geq 0$,

$$w(t) = \int_0^t h(t-s)w(s)ds + f(t) = (w * h)(t) + f(t). \quad (2.3)$$

The n -fold convolution h^{*n} is defined as $h^{*1} = h$ and $h^{*(n+1)} = h * h^{*n}$ for $n \geq 1$. The solution to the Volterra equation is closely related to the *resolvent*, which is defined through

$$r(t) = h(t) + (h * r)(t). \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 2.2. Suppose r is the resolvent of h , where $h(t) > 0$ is a continuous function with $\|h\|_1 < 1$. Then the following Neumann series converges uniformly and gives the resolvent operator,

$$r(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h^{*n}(t). \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, the solution to the Volterra equation (2.3) is given explicitly by

$$w(t) = f(t) + (r * f)(t). \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Define the operator $L_h f := h * f$. Then from Young's inequality, we have the L^1 operator $\|L_h\|_1 < 1$ if $\|h\|_{L^1} < 1$. Then the Neumann series $(I - L_h)^{-1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} L_h^n$ is uniformly convergent, therefore the function r in (2.5) is well-defined. Direct computation shows that (2.4) holds. Let w be given by (2.6) and convolute it with h , it holds that

$$w * h = (f + r * f) * h = f * h + f * (r - h) = f * r = w - f,$$

where the second last equality follows from the identity (2.4) and the last from (2.6). This suggests that the function defined in (2.6) is the solution to (2.3). \square

We now consider the integro-differential equation

$$x'(t) = -ax(t) + \int_0^t k(t-s)x(s)ds + g(t), \quad x(0) = x_0. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that this is the case where equality holds for (2.1).

Lemma 2.3. Suppose $x_0 \geq 0$, $k(t) \geq 0$ is a bounded continuous function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $g(t) \geq 0$ is bounded continuous. Then the solution to (2.7) can be expressed as

$$x(t) = z(t)x_0 + (z * g)(t), \quad (2.8)$$

where $z(t)$ is called the differential resolvent that satisfies

$$z'(t) = -az(t) + \int_0^t k(t-s)z(s)ds, \quad z(0) = 1. \quad (2.9)$$

Moreover, z also admits the expression

$$z = e + e * r,$$

with $e := e^{-at}$ and r is the resolvent of h defined in (2.5) with $h = k * e$.

Proof. Direct computation shows that x defined as in (2.8) is a solution to (2.7) if z satisfies (2.9). To find the expression of z , we shall transfer (2.9) to a Volterra equation. Note that $\frac{d}{dt}(e^{at}z(t)) = e^{at}(az(t) + z'(t))$, therefore (2.9) implies

$$\frac{d}{dt}(e^{at}z(t)) = e^{at} \int_0^t k(t-s)z(s)ds.$$

Integrating from 0 to T yields

$$z(T) = \int_0^T \int_0^t k(t-s)e^{-a(T-t)}z(s)dsdt + e^{-aT}z(0) = h * z + e,$$

where $h = k * e$ and $e(t) = e^{-at}$. Let r be the resolvent of h , and the result follows from Theorem 2.2. \square

The asymptotic behavior of z has been extensively studied in [4] and related references therein. A key result shows that if k belongs to a class of *subexponential functions*, then z decays at the same rate as k , with

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{z(t)}{k(t)} = \frac{1}{(a - \int_0^\infty k(s)ds)^2}.$$

In the following discussion, we first derive an explicit bound $z(t) \leq Ck(t)$ valid for all $t \geq 0$ and then obtain a control of the decay rate of $x(t)$. Our approach builds on definitions and analytical techniques similar to those in [4]. Then we provide the same bound on y using the comparison theorem, similar to [5]. Finally, we generalize the result to kernels with exponential decay.

2.2 Subexponential functions and exponential-type functions

Let us recall a class of subexponential functions introduced in [4].

Definition 2.4. A subexponential function is a positive continuous function $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ so that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{h^{*2}(t)}{h(t)} = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h^{*2}(t)}{h(t)} = 2 \int_0^\infty h(s)ds < \infty, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t-s)}{h(t)} = 1, \quad \text{uniformly for } 0 \leq s \leq S, \text{ for all } S > 0. \quad (2.12)$$

The set of subexponential functions is denoted as $\mathcal{U}(0)$.

Remark 2.5. Chover et al. [9] employ Banach algebra methods to demonstrate the following result. Let $h(t) > 0$ be a continuous function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(h * h)(t)}{h(t)} = c.$$

Then it follows that, $c = 2 \int_0^\infty h(s)ds$. Moreover, (2.12) implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t)e^{\gamma t} = \infty$ for every $\gamma > 0$. Examples of subexponential functions include the familiar $h(t) \sim e^{-t^\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $h(t) \sim (1+t)^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 1$.

We now introduce a more general class of functions that allows an exponential decay rate.

Definition 2.6. Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. A function $h(t) > 0$ is in $\mathcal{U}(\mu)$ if it is continuous for all $t \geq 0$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(h * h)(t)}{h(t)} = 2\hat{h}(\mu) < \infty, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t-s)}{h(t)} = e^{-\mu s}, \quad \text{uniformly for } 0 \leq s \leq S, \text{ for all } S > 0. \quad (2.14)$$

It can be readily verified that $\mathcal{U}(0)$ coincides with the definition of the class of subexponential functions. Moreover, it holds that (see [9])

$$h \in \mathcal{U}(\mu) \iff h(t) = \varphi(t)e^{\mu t}, \text{ with } \varphi(t) \in \mathcal{U}(0). \quad (2.15)$$

Thus, it suffices to analyze the subexponential case and transfer the results to exponential-type functions.

Remark 2.7. Note that for $\mu < 0$, the function class $\mathcal{U}(\mu)$ corresponds to at least exponential decay: any $h \in \mathcal{U}(\mu)$ decays slightly faster than $e^{\mu t}$. In fact, the pure exponential $k(t) = e^{\mu t} \notin \mathcal{U}(\mu)$ for $\mu < 0$ since it violates (2.13), as $(k * k)(t) = \int_0^t e^{\mu(t-s)} e^{\mu s} ds = te^{\mu t}$. We shall use a more direct method to handle this case. See Theorem 2.11.

For a positive continuous function $h(t)$, we define the function space $BC_h(\mathbb{R}^+)$ to consist of all functions $f(t) > 0$ such that the ratio f/h is a bounded continuous function on \mathbb{R}^+ . For brevity, we write $BC_h = BC_h(\mathbb{R}^+)$. This space becomes a Banach space when equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_h = M_h \sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{f(t)}{h(t)} \right|, \quad \text{with } M_h = \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{h^{*2}(t)}{h(t)}. \quad (2.16)$$

If $h \in \mathcal{U}(0)$, such a constant exists because of (2.11) and the continuity of h on \mathbb{R}^+ . In particular for $f, g \in BC_h$, we have

$$M_h \frac{|(f * g)(t)|}{h(t)} \leq \int_0^t \left| \frac{f(t-s)}{h(t-s)} \right| \left| \frac{g(s)}{h(s)} \right| \frac{h(t-s)h(s)}{h(t)} ds \leq \|f\|_h \|g\|_h \frac{1}{M_h} \frac{h^{*2}(t)}{h(t)}, \quad (2.17)$$

which implies

$$\|f * g\|_h \leq \|f\|_h \|g\|_h. \quad (2.18)$$

Here we include the two useful lemmas for subexponential functions from [4]. The proof is included to complete the discussion.

Lemma 2.8 (Lemma 3.7 in [4]). Let h be subexponential. For any $\eta \in (0, 1)$, there is a constant $B > 0$ independent of n , such that for all $n \geq 2$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq B} \frac{h^{*n}(t)}{h(t)} \leq \eta^{n-1}.$$

Proof. The result follows from the inequality

$$\frac{h^{*(n+1)}(t)}{h(t)} = \int_0^t \frac{h^{*n}(s)}{h(s)} \frac{h(t-s)h(s)}{h(t)} ds \leq \sup_{0 < s < t} \frac{h^{*n}(s)}{h(s)} \frac{h^{*2}(t)}{h(t)}.$$

Because of (2.10), we can choose B such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq B} \frac{h^{*2}(t)}{h(t)} \leq \eta.$$

The result follows from induction. □

The second lemma is a generalization of the Kesten-type bound for subexponential distributions [16, Theorem 4.11]. See also [4, Lemma 3.6]. The proof is slightly adapted for our interest.

Lemma 2.9. *Let h be subexponential. For each $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there is a constant $\kappa > 0$ independent of n , such that for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{h^{*n}(t)}{h(t)} \leq \kappa[(1 + \varepsilon)\rho]^{n-1},$$

where $\rho = \int_0^\infty h(s)ds$.

Proof. Let $f = h/\rho$ so that f is a subexponential function with $\int_0^\infty f(s)ds = 1$. We denote that

$$\alpha_n = \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{f^{*n}(t)}{f(t)}.$$

Note that $\alpha_1 = 1$. We aim to prove for some constants c and ε independent of n with $(1 + \varepsilon)\rho < 1$, such that the following holds

$$\alpha_{n+1} \leq c + (1 + \varepsilon)\alpha_n, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (2.19)$$

Then by induction,

$$\alpha_n \leq c \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} (1 + \varepsilon)^k + (1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1} \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon} [(1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1} - 1] + (1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1} \leq (c/\varepsilon + 1)(1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1},$$

At last, since $h^{*n}(t) = \rho^n f^{*n}(t)$, it follows

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{h^{*n}(t)}{h(t)} = \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{\rho^n f^{*n}(t)}{\rho f(t)} = \kappa[(1 + \varepsilon)\rho]^{n-1},$$

where

$$\kappa = c/\varepsilon + 1.$$

To show (2.19), we first notice that for $n \geq 2$,

$$\alpha_{n+1} \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds + \sup_{t > T} \int_0^A \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds + \sup_{t > T} \int_A^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds, \quad (2.20)$$

with $0 < A < T$ chosen large enough so that

$$\left| \int_0^t \frac{f(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds - \int_0^A f(s) ds \right| < (1 + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon), \quad t \geq A, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq A} \left| \frac{f(t-s)}{f(t)} - 1 \right| \leq \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \quad t \geq T. \quad (2.22)$$

The first inequality follows from (2.11) together with the normalization condition of f , while the second is a direct consequence of (2.12). Then, for the third term in (2.20), since

$$\int_A^t \frac{f(t-s)f(s)}{f(t)} ds = \int_0^t \frac{f(t-s)f(s)}{f(t)} ds - \int_0^A f(s) ds - \int_0^A f(s) \left[\frac{f(t-s)}{f(t)} - 1 \right] ds,$$

it follows that

$$\sup_{t > T} \int_A^t \frac{f(t-s)f(s)}{f(t)} ds \leq (1 + \varepsilon),$$

therefore

$$\sup_{t > T} \int_A^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds = \sup_{t > T} \int_A^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)}{f(s)} \frac{f(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\alpha_n.$$

For the first term in (2.20), since f is a subexponential function, we can choose constants $0 < \eta < 1$ and $0 < B < A$ for f by Theorem 2.8. Then, for $0 \leq t \leq B$,

$$\int_0^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds = \int_0^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)}{f(s)} \cdot \frac{f(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds \leq \eta^{n-1} \frac{f^{*2}(t)}{f(t)} \leq \alpha_2.$$

For $B \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds &= \int_0^B \frac{f^{*n}(s)}{f(s)} \cdot \frac{f(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds + \int_B^t \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds \\ &\leq \eta^{n-1} \frac{f^{*2}(t)}{f(t)} + \frac{\max_{0 \leq t < \infty} f(t)}{\min_{B \leq t \leq T} f(t)} \int_B^t f^{*n}(s) ds \\ &\leq \alpha_2 + \frac{\max_{0 \leq t < \infty} f(t)}{\min_{B \leq t \leq T} f(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since $\int_0^\infty f^{*n}(t)dt = 1$. For the second term in (2.20), we have similarly that

$$\sup_{t>T} \int_0^A \frac{f^{*n}(s)f(t-s)}{f(t)} ds \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2) \int_0^A f^{*n}(s) ds \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2),$$

where the inequality follows from (2.22). We have established (2.19) for $c_0 = (1 + \varepsilon/2) + \alpha_2 + \frac{\max_{0 \leq t < \infty} f(t)}{\min_{B \leq t \leq T} f(t)}$, including the trivial case of $n = 1$. Hence, the proof is complete. \square

We are now ready to characterize the decay rates of z and x in terms of k . It remains to estimate $\|z\|_k$ and $\|x\|_k$, defined analogously to (2.16).

Theorem 2.2. *Let $k \in \mathcal{U}(0)$ be a subexponential function and $g(t) \geq 0$ be a bounded continuous function. Suppose that*

$$a > \int_0^\infty k(s)ds.$$

Then the differential resolvent z defined in (2.9) satisfies $\|z\|_k < \infty$. Moreover for all $t \geq 0$, the solution to (2.7) satisfies

$$x(t) \lesssim x_0 k(t) + (k * g)(t).$$

Proof. From Theorem 6.2 in [4], $h = e * k$ is subexponential where $e(t) = e^{-at}$. By (2.18), we have

$$\|z\|_k \leq \|e\|_k + \|e\|_k \|r\|_k$$

Moreover,

$$\|r\|_k = M_k \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{r(t)}{k(t)} \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{r(t)}{h(t)} \cdot M_k \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{h(t)}{k(t)} = \frac{1}{M_h} \|r\|_h \|h\|_k,$$

where $M_k := \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{k^{*2}(t)}{k(t)}$. Since $\|e\|_k < \infty$ and $\|h\|_k \leq \|e\|_k \|k\|_k = M_k \|e\|_k$ are finite, we are left to control $\|r\|_h$. Through the Fubini theorem,

$$\rho = \int_0^\infty h(s)ds = \frac{1}{a} \int_0^\infty k(s)ds.$$

Hence $\rho < 1$ provided $a > \int_0^\infty k(s)ds$. We can choose small $\varepsilon = \frac{1-\rho}{2\rho}$ so that $(1 + \varepsilon)\rho = \frac{\rho+1}{2} < 1$. By Theorem 2.9, the Neumann series (2.5) is uniformly convergent, so that

$$\frac{1}{M_h} \|r\|_h \leq \frac{1}{M_h} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \|h^{*n}\|_h \leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{h^{*n}(t)}{h(t)} \leq \kappa \sum_{n=1}^\infty [(1 + \varepsilon)\rho]^{n-1} = \frac{\kappa}{1 - (1 + \varepsilon)\rho} = \frac{2\kappa}{1 - \rho}.$$

Therefore

$$\|z\|_k = \|e\|_k (1 + \|r\|_k) \leq \|e\|_k (1 + M_k \|e\|_k \frac{2\kappa}{1 - \rho}) < \infty.$$

At last, our result follows from (2.18) and (2.8),

$$x(t) = x_0 z(t) + z * g(t) \lesssim x_0 k(t) + k * g(t),$$

where the implicit constant is

$$\frac{\|z\|_k}{M_k} \leq \|e\|_k \left(\frac{1}{M_k} + \|e\|_k \frac{2\kappa}{1 - \rho} \right) := D_{\{a,k\}}. \quad (2.23)$$

\square

2.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. We first consider the case of $k \in \mathcal{U}(0)$. Let $w(t) = x(t) - y(t)$, where x is the solution to (2.7) with $x(0) = y(0)$. Then w satisfies

$$w'(t) \geq -aw(t) + \int_0^t k(t-s)w(s)ds, \quad w(0) = 0.$$

Observe that $e^{-at}(e^{at}w(t))' = w'(t) + aw(t)$, so multiplying the inequality by e^{at} and integrate, we obtain

$$w(T) \geq \int_0^T \int_0^t e^{-a(T-t)} k(t-s)w(s)dsdt = (h * w)(T),$$

where $h = e * k$. Define $f := w - h * w \geq 0$, so that w satisfies the Volterra equation (2.3). By Theorem 2.2, the solution admits the representation

$$w = f + r * f,$$

where r is the resolvent associated with h . Since $k(t) \geq 0$ implies $h(t) \geq 0$, it follows from the Neumann series that $r(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Given that $f(t) \geq 0$, we conclude that $w(t) \geq 0$, i.e. $y(t) \leq x(t)$. Applying the bound for $x(t)$ from Theorem 2.2, which requires $a > \int_0^\infty k(s)ds = \hat{k}(0)$, the desired result follows, with the implicit constant $C_0 = D_{\{a,k\}}$ defined as in (2.23).

For the case of $k \in \mathcal{U}(\mu)$ for $\mu < 0$, it holds from (2.15) that $k(t) = e^{\mu t}\varphi(t)$ where $\varphi(t) \in \mathcal{U}(0)$. Let $w(t) = e^{-\mu t}y(t)$, then (2.1) implies

$$e^{\mu t}(w'(t) + \mu w(t)) \leq -ae^{\mu t}w(t) + \int_0^t e^{\mu(t-s)}\varphi(t-s)e^{\mu s}w(s)ds + g(t),$$

which simplifies to the previous case when dividing $e^{\mu t}$,

$$w'(t) \leq -(a + \mu)w(t) + \int_0^t \varphi(t-s)w(s)ds + e^{-\mu t}g(t).$$

Hence when

$$a + \mu > \int_0^\infty \varphi(s)ds = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu s}k(s)ds = \hat{k}(\mu),$$

it holds that $w(t) \lesssim w(0)\varphi(t) + \varphi * (e^{-\mu t}g(t))$, which implies

$$y(t) \lesssim y_0 e^{\mu t}\varphi(t) + e^{\mu t} \int_0^t \varphi(s)e^{-\mu(t-s)}g(t-s)ds = y_0 k(t) + k * g(t).$$

Following the convention in (2.23), the implicit constant is $C_0 = D_{\{a+\mu, e^{-\mu t}k(t)\}}$. Note that it also covers the case of $\mu = 0$. \square

Example 2.10. Consider the case that $k(t) = c(t + \alpha)^{-\beta}$. Note that $k \in \mathcal{U}(0)$ is subexponential when $\beta > 1$. By Theorem 2.1, if

$$a > \int_0^\infty k(t)dt = \frac{c\alpha^{1-\beta}}{\beta-1},$$

then $y(t) \lesssim k(t) + k * g(t)$. In particular, if $g(t) = 0$, we have $y(t) \lesssim t^{-\beta}$.

2.4 Exactly exponential case via characteristic equations

We conclude the discussion by incorporating a classical method that uses the Laplace transform and characteristic equations for the case where k exhibits exactly exponential decay.

Lemma 2.11. Suppose (2.1) holds for any $t \geq 0$, where $a > 0$ is a constant and $g(t) \geq 0$ is a bounded continuous function. Assume that the following holds.

- (i) The constant $\gamma^* = \sup\{\operatorname{Re} \lambda : \lambda + a - \hat{k}(\lambda) = 0\} < \infty$ and fix $\gamma > \gamma^*$.
- (ii) The function $k \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ so that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} |k(t)| dt < \infty, \quad \int_0^\infty t e^{-\gamma t} |k(t)| dt < \infty. \quad (2.24)$$

Then we have

$$y(t) \lesssim e^{\gamma t} + \int_0^t e^{\gamma(t-s)} g(s) ds.$$

Proof. Because of the comparison used in the proof of Theorem 2.1, it suffices to prove for the equality case. From Theorem 2.3, we only need to show that the differential resolvent satisfies $|z(t)| \lesssim e^{\gamma t}$ for all $\gamma > \operatorname{Re} \gamma^*$. Take Laplace transform to (2.9), we have

$$\hat{z}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda + a - \hat{k}(\lambda)} := \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}. \quad (2.25)$$

To determine the decay rate of z , we apply the Bromwich integral for the inverse Laplace transform (cf., e.g., [11]). Let $m(\xi) := \hat{z}(\gamma + i\xi) = \frac{1}{\Delta(\gamma + i\xi)}$ and apply change of variable $\lambda = \gamma + i\xi$, it holds

$$z(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma - iT}^{\gamma + iT} e^{\lambda t} \hat{z}(\lambda) d\lambda = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{\gamma t} R_\gamma(t), \quad R_\gamma(t) := \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{i\xi t} m(\xi) d\xi.$$

Note that the integral is well-defined since γ is chosen to avoid all the singularities of $m(\xi)$. We are left to show that $|R_\gamma(t)|$ is bounded for large t .

From the first assumption in (2.24), $k(t)e^{-\gamma t} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(t)$ is integrable, and its Fourier transform is expressed as $\hat{k}(\gamma + i\xi)$, which converges to 0 as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ by the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma. Hence from (2.25), it holds $|\Delta(\gamma + i\xi)| = O(\xi)$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, which implies $m(\xi) \rightarrow 0$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$. Apply integration by parts on $R_\gamma(t)$, it holds

$$R_\gamma(t) = -\frac{1}{it} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{i\xi t} m'(\xi) d\xi.$$

Note that the second assumption in (2.24) implies that \hat{k} is differentiable, so is m . Hence $m'(\xi) = -\frac{i\Delta'(\gamma + i\xi)}{\Delta(\gamma + i\xi)^2}$. From the second assumption in (2.24), $tk(t)e^{-\gamma t}$ is integrable and its Fourier transform $-\hat{k}'(\gamma + i\xi)$ converges to 0 as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$, and hence is bounded. We have shown that $|\Delta(\gamma + i\xi)|^2 = O(\xi^2)$ when ξ is large. To handle the region where ξ is small, we notice from the selection of γ , there exists $\delta_0 := \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta(\gamma + i\xi)| > 0$. Hence, the $R_\gamma(t)$ is bounded for all large t , and the proof is complete. \square

Example 2.12. Consider $k(t) = ce^{-\beta t}$ with $\beta > 0$ and $c > 0$. Note that $k \notin \mathcal{U}(-\beta)$ as demonstrated in Theorem 2.7. We shall use Theorem 2.11, which needs to find the (maximal real part of) characteristic roots of (2.2). Since $\hat{k}(\lambda) = \frac{c}{\beta + \lambda}$, it holds that

$$\lambda + a = \frac{c}{\beta + \lambda} \implies \lambda = \frac{1}{2} [-(a + \beta) \pm \sqrt{(a + \beta)^2 - 4(a\beta - c)}].$$

Note that there are always two real roots since the determinant is $(a - \beta)^2 + 4c > 0$. By Theorem 2.11, $y(t) \lesssim e^{\gamma t} + (\exp(\gamma \cdot) * g)(t)$ for all $\gamma > \gamma^* = \frac{1}{2} [-(a + \beta) + \sqrt{(a + \beta)^2 - 4(a\beta - c)}]$. In particular, if $g(t) = 0$, $y(t) \lesssim e^{(\gamma^* + \varepsilon)t}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. It is clear that $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^* = -\beta$.

3 Error analysis for first-order equations

We consider the first-order Volterra-type stochastic differential equation:

$$dV_t = -\gamma V_t dt - \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds dt + \sigma dB_t, \quad (3.1)$$

where $K(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the true memory kernel, and B_t is a standard Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^d . Now consider a perturbed system with an approximate (or learned) kernel $\tilde{K}(t, s)$, we define a new process \tilde{V}_t that satisfies

$$d\tilde{V}_t = -\gamma \tilde{V}_t dt - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s) \tilde{V}_s ds dt + \sigma d\tilde{B}_t. \quad (3.2)$$

Let $\delta K := K - \tilde{K}$. To characterize the kernel difference, we define the following norm.

Definition 3.1 (Schur-type norm). *For any kernel function $K(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and a positive function $h(t)$, we define the following Schur-type weighted norm as*

$$\|K\|_h = \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(\int_0^t \frac{\|K(t, s)\|^2}{h(t-s)} ds \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\|K(t, s)\|$ inside the integral represents the operator norm for the matrix $K(t, s)$.

It is straightforward to verify that $\|\cdot\|_h$ is a norm. Moreover, the norm $\|\cdot\|_h$ mirrors the weighted Schur test for integral operators. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with the weight h yields

$$\left| \int_0^t K(t, s) f(s) ds \right| \leq \left(\int_0^t \frac{\|K(t, s)\|^2}{h(t-s)} ds \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^t h(t-s) |f(s)|^2 ds \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.3)$$

Taking the supremum over t shows that $\|K\|_h$ controls the operator norm of the integral operator with K . This resembles the Schur-test (cf. [38]; also [39, Theorem 0.3.1]), which motivates the term ‘‘Schur-type’’ norm.

We make an assumption on the decay rate and the estimation error of the kernels.

Assumption 1. *There exists a function $h \in \mathcal{U}(\mu)$ (see Theorem 2.6) for some $\mu \leq 0$ such that*

$$\|K\|_h < \infty, \quad \|\tilde{K}\|_h < \infty, \quad \|\delta K\|_h < \infty.$$

Remark 3.2. *When K is a one-dimensional translation-invariant kernel, the condition $\|K\|_h < \infty$ implies that the decay rate of K is sufficiently fast compared to \sqrt{h} . Specifically,*

$$\|K\|_h^2 = \sup_{t \geq 0} \int_0^t \frac{(K(t-s))^2}{h(t-s)} ds = \int_0^\infty |K(s)|^2 \rho(s) ds = \|K\|_{L^2(\rho)}^2,$$

where the weight function $\rho(s) = \frac{1}{h(s)}$ is supported on $[0, \infty)$. Thus, the condition $\|\delta K\|_h < \infty$ is equivalent to

$$\|K - \tilde{K}\|_{L^2(\rho)} < \infty,$$

Our goal is to analyze the difference process $V_t - \tilde{V}_t$. We will first derive the bound for the true trajectory in (3.1), and then control the difference. Both analyses rely on Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Consider the SDE (3.1). Suppose Assumption 1 holds and moreover,*

$$\mu + 2\gamma > 2\|K\|_h \left(\hat{h}(\mu) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then there exists positive constants C_1 and c_1 such that for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}|V_t|^2 \leq C_1 h(t) + c_1.$$

Proof. From Itô’s formula, Cauchy-Schwarz, and Young’s inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d|V_t|^2 &= -2\gamma|V_t|^2 dt - 2V_t \cdot \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds + \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top) dt + 2V_t \cdot \sigma dB_t \\ &\leq -2\gamma|V_t|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}|V_t|^2 + \varepsilon \left| \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds \right|^2 + \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top) dt + 2V_t \cdot \sigma dB_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a positive constant to be chosen later. By (3.3), it holds

$$\left| \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds \right|^2 \leq \left(\int_0^t \|K(t, s)\| \|V_s\| ds \right)^2 \leq \int_0^t \frac{\|K(t, s)\|^2}{h(t-s)} ds \cdot \int_0^t h(t-s) |V_s|^2 ds \leq \|K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s) |V_s|^2 ds, \quad (3.5)$$

where the last follows from the Assumption 1. Then we take expectation, use Fubini theorem and let $y(t) = \mathbb{E}|V_t|^2$, so that

$$y'(t) \leq -2\gamma y(t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} y(t) + \varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s) y(s) ds + \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top).$$

Denoting $a = 2\gamma - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, $g(t)$ as a constant $\text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top)$ and $k(t-s) = \varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 h(t-s)$, we achieve

$$y'(t) \leq -ay(t) + \int_0^t k(t-s)y(s)ds + g(t).$$

In view of (3.4), we choose $\varepsilon = (\|K\|_h(\hat{h}(\mu))^{1/2})^{-1}$, which ensures the kernel k satisfies the requirement in Theorem 2.1. Hence

$$y(t) \leq C_0 \|K\|_h(\hat{h}(\mu))^{-1/2} (y_0 h(t) + (h * g)(t)),$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where C_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.1 with a and k substituted. Note that $(h * g)(t) \leq \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top) \|h\|_1$ since g is a constant, the desired result follows with

$$C_1 = \mathbb{E}|V_0|^2 \|K\|_h(\hat{h}(\mu))^{-1/2} C_0, \quad c_1 = C_0 \|K\|_h(\hat{h}(\mu))^{-1/2} \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top) \|h\|_1.$$

It is clear that $c_1 = 0$ if $\sigma = 0$. □

We now prove the error estimate with perturbed memory kernels.

Theorem 3.2. *Consider the equations (3.1) and (3.2) under a synchronized coupling where $B_t = \tilde{B}_t$. Suppose Assumption 1 and (3.4) hold, and moreover,*

$$\mu + 2\gamma > 2\|\tilde{K}\|_h \left(2\hat{h}(\mu)\right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.6)$$

Then for all $t > 0$, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}|V_t - \tilde{V}_t|^2 \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}|V_0 - \tilde{V}_0|^2 + \|\delta K\|_h^2\right) h(t) + \|\delta K\|_h^2 \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top),$$

where the constant depends on \tilde{K} , h , γ and K . See (3.8) for explicit constants.

Proof. With synchronized coupling, define $W_t = V_t - \tilde{V}_t$. It holds that

$$\frac{d}{dt}W_t = -\gamma W_t - \int_0^t \left(K(t,s)V_s - \tilde{K}(t,s)\tilde{V}_s\right) ds.$$

From Cauchy-Schwarz and Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}|W_t|^2 &= 2W_t \cdot \frac{d}{dt}W_t = -2\gamma|W_t|^2 - 2W_t \cdot \int_0^t \left(K(t,s)V_s - \tilde{K}(t,s)\tilde{V}_s\right) ds \\ &\leq -2\gamma|W_t|^2 + 2|W_t| \cdot \int_0^t \|K(t,s) - \tilde{K}(t,s)\| |V_s| ds + 2|W_t| \cdot \int_0^t \|\tilde{K}(t,s)\| |V_s - \tilde{V}_s| ds \\ &\leq -2\gamma|W_t|^2 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}|W_t|^2 + \varepsilon \left| \int_0^t \|\delta K(t,s)\| |V_s| ds \right|^2 + \varepsilon \left| \int_0^t \|\tilde{K}(t,s)\| |W_s| ds \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined later. Apply the estimation in (3.3), it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \|\tilde{K}(t,s)\| |W_s| ds \right|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\|\tilde{K}(t,s)\|^2}{h(t-s)} ds \cdot \int_0^t h(t-s) |W_s|^2 ds \leq \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s) \mathbb{E}|W_s|^2 ds,$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 1 and the Fubini Theorem. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \|\delta K(t,s)\| |V_s| ds \right|^2 \leq \|\delta K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s) (C_1 h(s) + c_1) ds \leq \|\delta K\|_h^2 (C_1 M_h h(t) + c_1 \|h\|_1),$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 3.1 and Assumption 1 on δK with the constant C_1 and c_1 , and the second follows from the definition of M_h in (2.16). At last, (3.7) simplifies to

$$y'(t) \leq -ay(t) + \int_0^t k(t-s)y(s)ds + g(t),$$

where $y(t) = \mathbb{E}|W_t|^2$, $a = 2\gamma - \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$, $k(s) = \varepsilon \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 h(s)$ and $g(t) = \varepsilon \|\delta K\|_h^2 (C_1 M_h h(t) + c_1 \|h\|_1)$. By Theorem 2.1, we need to choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mu + 2\gamma - 2/\varepsilon > \varepsilon \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\mu s} h(s) ds,$$

which was enabled by (3.6). Then it follows

$$y(t) \leq C_0 y(0) k(t) + C_0 (k * g)(t),$$

where C_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.1 with k and a defined as above. Applying the fact $(h * h)(t) \leq M_h h(t)$ again, it holds

$$k * g(t) \leq \varepsilon \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 h * g(t) \leq \varepsilon^2 \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \|\delta K\|_h^2 (C_1 M_h^2 h(t) + c_1 \|h\|_1^2).$$

Therefore, the desired result follows from

$$\mathbb{E}|V_t - \tilde{V}_t|^2 \leq C_2 h(t) + c_2,$$

where

$$C_2 = \varepsilon C_0 \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 (\mathbb{E}|V_0 - \tilde{V}_0|^2 + \varepsilon C_1 M_h^2 \|\delta K\|_h^2), \quad c_2 = \varepsilon^2 c_1 C_0 \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \|\delta K\|_h^2 \|h\|_1^2. \quad (3.8)$$

Note that C_1, c_1 are constants in Theorem 3.1 and C_0 is the constant in Theorem 2.1.

It is clear that the constant $c_2 = 0$ if $\sigma = 0$ (hence $c_1 = 0$) or $\delta K = 0$. Suppose the initial value coincides, then both C_2 and c_2 scale with the kernel error $\|\delta K\|_h$ quadratically. While the constant can be slightly improved by an optimal choice of ε , this does not change the order of dependence on the kernel error. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Under the same condition in Theorem 3.2, the 2-Wasserstein distance of the Law of V_t and \tilde{V}_t follows*

$$W_2^2(\text{Law}(V_t), \text{Law}(\tilde{V}_t)) \lesssim (\mathbb{E}|V_0 - \tilde{V}_0|^2 + \|\delta K\|_h^2) + \|\delta K\|_h^2 \text{Tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top),$$

where the implicit constants are given in (3.8).

Proof. By definition,

$$W_2^2(\text{Law}(V_t), \text{Law}(\tilde{V}_t)) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\text{Law}(V_t), \text{Law}(\tilde{V}_t))} \mathbb{E}_{(V_t, \tilde{V}_t) \sim \pi} |V_t - \tilde{V}_t|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi'} |V_t - \tilde{V}_t|^2,$$

where Π represents all couplings between $\text{Law}(V_t)$ and $\text{Law}(\tilde{V}_t)$, and π' represents the synchronized coupling. The result follows from Theorem 3.2 directly. \square

4 Error analysis for second-order equations

In the presence of an external force, we consider the second-order Volterra-type stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = V_t dt, \quad dV_t = -\gamma V_t dt - u \nabla U(X_t) dt - \int_0^t K(t, s) V_s ds dt + \sigma dB_t. \quad (4.1)$$

Here $u, \gamma > 0$ are constants. Consider a perturbed system with approximated kernel,

$$d\tilde{X}_t = \tilde{V}_t dt, \quad d\tilde{V}_t = -\gamma \tilde{V}_t dt - u \nabla U(\tilde{X}_t) dt - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s) \tilde{V}_s ds dt + \sigma d\tilde{B}_t. \quad (4.2)$$

We will show the contraction of the trajectories (X_t, V_t) and $(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t)$. We first introduce the assumption on the potential U .

Assumption 2. *There exists a positive definite matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with smallest eigenvalue $\kappa_0 > 0$ and a convex function $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with L_G -Lipschitz continuous gradients, i.e. for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\langle \nabla G(x) - \nabla G(y), x - y \rangle \geq 0, \quad (4.3)$$

$$|\nabla G(x) - \nabla G(y)| \leq L_G |x - y|, \quad (4.4)$$

such that $U(x) = x \cdot Rx/2 + G(x)$ and $\nabla U(x) = Rx + \nabla G(x)$.

Note that such an assumption covers the case that U is κ_0 -strongly convex with L_U -Lipschitz continuous gradients. In particular, we can set $R = \kappa_0 Id$ so that $G(x) = U(x) - (\kappa_0/2)|x|^2$, where Id is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. Such a setup follows from [37], which separates the discussion for the parameters.

We will establish a contraction result with the following Lyapunov-type distance function for Langevin dynamics, $r : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, where

$$r((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) = \left(\gamma^{-2} u(x - \tilde{x}) \cdot R(x - \tilde{x}) + \frac{1}{2} |(1 - 2\lambda)(x - \tilde{x}) + \gamma^{-1}(y - \tilde{y})|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{-2} |y - \tilde{y}|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for $(x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with

$$\lambda := \min(1/8, \kappa_0 u \gamma^{-2}/2). \quad (4.5)$$

The above definition shall be justified in Theorem 4.1. Note that

$$r((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}))^2 = (x - \tilde{x}) \cdot A(x - \tilde{x}) + (x - \tilde{x}) \cdot B(y - \tilde{y}) + (y - \tilde{y}) \cdot C(y - \tilde{y}),$$

where

$$A = \gamma^{-2} u R + (1/2)(1 - 2\lambda)^2 Id, \quad B = (1 - 2\lambda) \gamma^{-1} Id, \quad C = \gamma^{-2} Id. \quad (4.6)$$

The strategy is similar to the first-order case. We first derive the contraction for the solution to equation (4.1), and then prove the contraction for the discrepancy between (4.1) and (4.2). We will apply Theorem 2.1 to the Lyapunov function r . The following technical result is introduced in [37, Theorem 2.1] and also in [14, Lemma 2.2], which is useful for derivative estimations.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $X_t, V_t, \tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and set $Z_t = X_t - \tilde{X}_t$, $W_t = V_t - \tilde{V}_t$. Define*

$$\Gamma(X_t, \tilde{X}_t, V_t, \tilde{V}_t) = (2AZ_t + BW_t) \cdot W_t + (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot [-\gamma W_t - u(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(\tilde{X}_t))], \quad (4.7)$$

where A, B, C are fixed matrices defined in (4.6). Suppose Assumption 2 holds and let λ be as in (4.5). If in addition,

$$L_G u \gamma^{-2} \leq 3/4, \quad (4.8)$$

Then for the above choice of λ , we have for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Gamma(X_t, \tilde{X}_t, V_t, \tilde{V}_t) \leq -2\lambda \gamma (Z_t \cdot AZ_t + Z_t \cdot BW_t + W_t \cdot CW_t) = -2\lambda \gamma r((X_t, V_t), (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t))^2.$$

Proof. By Assumption 2, it follows $\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(\tilde{X}_t) = RZ_t + (\nabla G(X_t) - \nabla G(\tilde{X}_t))$. Then for the cross terms involving Z_t and W_t in (4.7), it holds

$$2AZ_t \cdot W_t - BZ_t \cdot \gamma W_t - 2CW_t \cdot uRZ_t = Z_t \cdot (2A - \gamma B - 2uCR)W_t = -2\lambda \gamma Z_t \cdot BW_t.$$

Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds that

$$2CW_t \cdot (u\nabla G(X_t) - u\nabla G(\tilde{X}_t)) \leq \gamma^{-1} \left(|W_t|^2 + \gamma^{-2} u^2 |\nabla G(X_t) - \nabla G(\tilde{X}_t)|^2 \right),$$

and together with the $|W_t|^2$ terms in (4.7), it holds

$$BW_t \cdot W_t - 2CW_t \cdot \gamma W_t - 2CW_t \cdot (u\nabla G(X_t) - u\nabla G(\tilde{X}_t)) \leq -2\lambda \gamma W_t \cdot CW_t + \gamma^{-3} u^2 |\nabla G(X_t) - \nabla G(\tilde{X}_t)|^2$$

Moreover, for the Z_t terms, it remains to show that

$$-BZ_t \cdot uRZ_t + 2\lambda \gamma Z_t \cdot AZ_t = Z_t \cdot [-u\gamma^{-1}(1 - 4\lambda)R + \lambda\gamma(1 - 2\lambda)^2 Id] Z_t \leq 0.$$

Using (4.5), we have

$$-Z_t \cdot u\gamma^{-1}(1 - 4\lambda)RZ_t \leq -u\gamma^{-1}(1/2)Z_t \cdot RZ_t \leq -u\gamma^{-1}(1/2)\kappa_0|Z_t|^2 \leq -\lambda\gamma|Z_t|^2 \leq -\lambda\gamma(1 - 2\lambda)^2|Z_t|^2,$$

which proves the desired inequality.

We now turn to the remaining terms. From [33, Theorem 2.1.5], since G is continuously differentiable, convex and has L_G -Lipchitz continuous gradients, G is co-coercive, i.e.

$$|\nabla G(x) - \nabla G(\tilde{x})|^2 \leq L_G(\nabla G(x) - \nabla G(\tilde{x})) \cdot (x - \tilde{x}), \quad \text{for all } x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} -BZ_t \cdot u \left(\nabla G(X_t) - \nabla G(\tilde{X}_t) \right) + \gamma^{-3} u^2 \left| \nabla G(X_t) - \nabla G(\tilde{X}_t) \right|^2 \\ \leq \gamma^{-1} u \left[\gamma^{-2} u L_G - (1 - 2\lambda) \right] Z_t \cdot \left(\nabla G(X_t) - \nabla G(\tilde{X}_t) \right) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (4.3) and $\lambda \leq 1/8 \leq (1 - \gamma^{-2} u L_G)/2$ because of (4.5) and (4.8). \square

We are ready to introduce the contraction result of the process (X_t, V_t) .

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose (X_t, V_t) satisfies (4.1). If Assumption 1, Assumption 2 and (4.8) hold, and moreover,*

$$\mu + 2\gamma\lambda > 2(2\|K\|_h^2 \hat{h}(\mu))^{1/2}. \quad (4.9)$$

Then let $R_t = r((X_t, V_t), (x^, 0))^2$, where x^* is the unique minimum of $U(x)$ with $\nabla U(x^*) = 0$, there exist positive constants C_3 and c_3 such that for all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}R_t \leq C_3 h(t) + c_3.$$

Proof. Let $Z_t = X_t - x^*$ and $W_t = V_t$, so that

$$R_t = Z_t \cdot AZ_t + Z_t \cdot BW_t + W_t \cdot CW_t.$$

Therefore, from the Itô's formula,

$$dR_t = 2dZ_t \cdot AZ_t + dZ_t \cdot BW_t + Z_t \cdot BdW_t + 2W_t \cdot CdW_t + \text{Tr}(C\sigma\sigma^\top)dt.$$

Note that $dZ_t = dX_t$ and $dW_t = dV_t$, hence from (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} dR_t = (2AZ_t + BW_t) \cdot W_t dt + (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \left(-\gamma W_t - u(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(x^*)) - \int_0^t K(t, s)W_s ds \right) dt \\ + \text{Tr}(C\sigma\sigma^\top)dt + (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \sigma dB_t. \end{aligned}$$

Separate the Markovian term and denote using Γ as in (4.7), we have

$$dR_t = \left[\Gamma(X_t, x^*, V_t, 0) - (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \int_0^t K(t, s)W_s ds + \text{Tr}(C\sigma\sigma^\top) \right] dt + (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \sigma dB_t.$$

By Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\Gamma(X_t, x^*, V_t, 0) \leq -2\lambda\gamma R_t.$$

Furthermore, for the memory term, separate the summation and apply Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \int_0^t K(t, s)W_s ds &= [((1 - 2\lambda)Z_t + \gamma^{-1}W_t) + \gamma^{-1}W_t] \cdot \int_0^t K(t, s)\gamma^{-1}W_s ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} (|(1 - 2\lambda)Z_t + \gamma^{-1}W_t|^2 + \gamma^{-2}|W_t|^2) + \varepsilon \left| \int_0^t K(t, s)\gamma^{-1}W_s ds \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} R_t + 2\varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t - s)R_s ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, the first term follows from the definition of R_t , and the second term from the Assumption 1, similar steps in (3.5) and the fact that $\gamma^{-2}|W_t|^2 \leq 2R_t$.

Finally, take expectation and let $r(t) = \mathbb{E}R_t$, it follows that

$$r'(t) \leq -2\lambda\gamma r(t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} r(t) + 2\varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t - s)r(s)ds + \gamma^{-2} \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top)$$

Take $a = 2\lambda\gamma - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, $k(t) = 2\varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 h(t)$ and $g(t) = \gamma^{-2} \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top)$. We choose $\varepsilon = (2\|K\|_h^2 \hat{h}(\mu))^{-1/2}$, therefore by (4.9), we can apply Theorem 2.1, and it follows with appropriately constructed C_0 that

$$r(t) \leq C_0 r(0)k(t) + C_0(k * g)(t) = C_0 r(0)2\varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 h(t) + C_0 2\varepsilon \|K\|_h^2 \gamma^{-2} \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top) \|h\|_1,$$

where the last term follows since g is a constant. Taking into account the value of ε , the desired result follows, where

$$C_3 = \sqrt{2}C_0\mathbb{E}R_0\|K\|_h(\hat{h}(\mu))^{-1/2}, \quad c_3 = \sqrt{2}C_0\|K\|_h(\hat{h}(\mu))^{-1/2}\gamma^{-2}\text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top)\|h\|_1.$$

It is clear that $c_3 = 0$ if $\sigma = 0$. \square

We shall now consider the difference between (4.1) and its perturbation (4.2).

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose (X_t, V_t) and $(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t)$ satisfy the equations (4.1), and (4.2). If Assumption 1, Assumption 2, (4.8) and (4.9) hold, and moreover,*

$$\mu + 2\gamma\lambda > 4(\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2\hat{h}(\mu))^{1/2}. \quad (4.10)$$

Then let $R_t = r((X_t, V_t), (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t))^2$ and assume synchronized coupling $B_t = \tilde{B}_t$, it holds for all $t > 0$ that

$$\mathbb{E}R_t \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}R_0 + \|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2\right)h(t) + \|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2\text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top),$$

where the constant depends on h, \tilde{K}, γ, U and K . See (4.11) for explicit constants.

Proof. Denote the difference $Z_t = X_t - \tilde{X}_t$ and $W_t = V_t - \tilde{V}_t$. Let $B_t = \tilde{B}_t$, it follows that

$$\begin{cases} dZ_t = W_t dt, \\ dW_t = -\gamma W_t dt - uRZ_t - \left(u\nabla G(X_t) - u\nabla G(\tilde{X}_t)\right) dt - \left(\int_0^t K(t, s)V_s ds - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\tilde{V}_s ds\right) dt. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}R_t &= (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \left[-\gamma W_t - u(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(\tilde{X}_t)) - \left(\int_0^t K(t, s)V_s ds - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\tilde{V}_s ds\right)\right] \\ &\quad + (2AZ_t + BW_t) \cdot W_t + \text{Tr}(C\sigma\sigma^\top). \end{aligned}$$

Separate the Markovian term and denote using Γ as in (4.7), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_t = \Gamma(X_t, \tilde{X}_t, V_t, \tilde{V}_t) - (BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \left(\int_0^t K(t, s)V_s ds - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\tilde{V}_s ds\right) + \gamma^{-2}\text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top).$$

By Theorem 4.1, it holds that

$$\Gamma(X_t, \tilde{X}_t, V_t, \tilde{V}_t) \leq -2\lambda\gamma R_t.$$

Moreover, for the memory term,

$$\begin{aligned} &(BZ_t + 2CW_t) \cdot \left(\int_0^t K(t, s)V_s ds - \int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\tilde{V}_s ds\right) \\ &\leq [(1 - 2\lambda)Z_t + \gamma^{-1}W_t] \cdot \left(\left|\int_0^t \delta K(t, s)\gamma^{-1}V_s ds\right| + \left|\int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\gamma^{-1}W_s ds\right|\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}[(1 - 2\lambda)Z_t + \gamma^{-1}W_t]^2 + \gamma^{-2}|W_t|^2 + \varepsilon\left(\left|\int_0^t \delta K(t, s)\gamma^{-1}V_s ds\right|^2 + \left|\int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\gamma^{-1}W_s ds\right|^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

Take expectation and let $r(t) = \mathbb{E}R_t$. Recall the similar estimate as in (3.3), it holds

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t \tilde{K}(t, s)\gamma^{-1}W_s ds\right|^2 \leq \|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s)\mathbb{E}|\gamma^{-1}W_s|^2 ds \leq 2\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s)r(s)ds.$$

Moreover, Theorem 4.1 suggests that

$$\mathbb{E}|\gamma^{-1}V_t|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}r((X_t, V_t), (x^*, 0))^2 \leq 2C_3h(t) + 2c_3.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t \delta K(t, s)\gamma^{-1}V_s ds\right|^2 &\leq \|\delta K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s)\mathbb{E}|\gamma^{-1}V_s|^2 ds \leq \|\delta K\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s)(2C_3h(s) + 2c_3)ds \\ &\leq \|\delta K\|_h^2(2C_3M_hh(t) + 2c_3\|h\|_1)ds. \end{aligned}$$

We finally achieve

$$r'(t) \leq -2\lambda\gamma r(t) + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}r(t) + 2\varepsilon\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \int_0^t h(t-s)r(s)ds + 2\varepsilon\|\delta K\|_h^2(C_3M_h h(t) + c_3\|h\|_1).$$

Denote $a = 2\lambda\gamma - 2/\varepsilon$, $k(t) = 2\varepsilon\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 h(t)$ and $g(t) = 2\varepsilon\|\delta K\|_h^2(C_3M_h h(t) + c_3\|h\|_1)$. By Theorem 2.1, if we take ε so that

$$\mu + 2\gamma\lambda - 2/\varepsilon > 2\varepsilon\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 \int_0^\infty e^{\mu s} h(s)ds,$$

which was enabled by (4.10), then with appropriately constructed C_0 , it holds

$$r(t) \leq C_0(r(0)k(t) + k * g(t)).$$

We note that

$$k * g(t) \leq 4\varepsilon^2\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2\|\delta K\|_h^2 \left(C_3M_h^2 h(t) + c_3\|h\|_1^2 \right).$$

Therefore, the desired result follows from

$$\mathbb{E}R_t \leq C_4 h(t) + c_4,$$

where

$$C_4 = 2\varepsilon C_0\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2 (\mathbb{E}R_0 + 2\varepsilon C_3M_h^2\|\delta K\|_h^2), \quad c_4 = 4\varepsilon^2 c_3 C_0\|\tilde{K}\|_h^2\|\delta K\|_h^2\|h\|_1^2. \quad (4.11)$$

It is clear that $c_4 = 0$ if $\sigma = 0$, as $c_3 = 0$. Moreover, assume identical initial values $X_0 = \tilde{X}_0$ and $V_0 = \tilde{V}_0$, both C_4 and c_4 scale with $\|\delta K\|_h$ quadratically. \square

The following Corollary is a natural consequence. The proof is similar to Theorem 3.3 and hence omitted.

Corollary 4.2. *Under the same condition in Theorem 4.2, the 2-Wasserstein distance of the Law of (X_t, V_t) and $(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t)$ follows*

$$W_2^2(\text{Law}(X_t, V_t), \text{Law}(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t)) \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}r((X_0, V_0), (\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{V}_0))^2 + \|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2 \right) h(t) + \|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2 \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top),$$

where the implicit constants are defined in (4.11).

Remark 4.3. *The conditions (4.5) and (4.8) are satisfied when the friction coefficient γ is large, corresponding to the overdamped regime of the Langevin equation. However, numerical results suggest that contraction may also occur for moderate values of γ . This might be a result of the coupling technique applied in the proof, as PDE techniques [8] can establish contraction behavior in the underdamped regime. Extending such quantitative estimates to generalized Langevin equations with memory kernels remains an important and challenging open problem.*

5 Numerical Examples

We first illustrate Theorem 2.1 numerically. Then we validate the error convergence rate of the first-order (Theorem 3.2) and second-order GLE (Theorem 4.2).

5.1 Preliminary results

Subexponential kernels Consider Theorem 2.10 in one dimension with

$$k(t) = c(t + \alpha)^{-\beta}.$$

Suppose $x(t)$ solves (2.7) with $g(t) \equiv 0$ and

$$a > \frac{c\alpha^{1-\beta}}{\beta-1} =: f(\beta).$$

Then, by Theorem 2.1, we have $x(t) \lesssim (t + \alpha)^{-\beta}$. In the following experiment, we set $\alpha = 0.1$, $c = 1$, vary $\beta \in [1.05, 20]$ and $a \in [5, 50]$, and generate trajectories for $t \in [0, 100]$. For large $t \in [5, 100]$, we fit $x(t) \sim t^{-r}$ and compare the empirical decay r with the theoretical exponent β . The results are summarized in Figure 1, which confirms that the empirical decay agrees with the theory whenever a exceeds the threshold $f(\beta)$. For parameter pairs with $a < f(\beta)$, the least-squares fit yields unreliable exponents, so we set the ratio r/β to zero in the plot.




Figure 1: **Left:** Ratio r/β between fitted and theoretical decay rates for trajectories with power-law kernel $k(t) = (t + 0.1)^{-\beta}$. Optimal rate ($r/\beta = 1$) is observed whenever a exceeds the threshold $f(\beta)$. **Right:** Comparison of theoretical (black solid) and fitted (red dashed) exponential decay rates with kernel $k(t) = e^{-\beta t}$. Fitted decay rates match the theoretical rates for a large range of β and a .

Exactly exponential kernels Consider Theorem 2.12 in one dimension with

$$k(t) = ce^{-\beta t}.$$

Suppose $x(t)$ solves (2.7) with $g(t) \equiv 0$. Then according to Theorem 2.1, the solution has an exponential decay rate of

$$p(a, \beta) := \frac{1}{2}[-(a + \beta) + \sqrt{(a + \beta)^2 - 4(a\beta - c)}].$$

In the following experiment, we set $c = 1$, vary $\beta \in [1, 6]$, $a \in [1, 10]$ and generate trajectories for $t \in [0, 100]$. For large t , we fit $x(t) \sim \exp(-rt)$ and compare the empirical decay rate r with the theoretical rate $p(a, \beta)$. The result is presented in Figure 1. The fitted decay rates closely match the theoretical prediction $p(a, \beta)$ across a wide range of β and a .

5.2 First-order GLE

In this example, we consider the one-dimensional ($d = 1$) first-order GLE (1.1) with perturbed equation (3.2). Suppose the true kernel is translation-invariant and is given by

$$K(t) = (t + 1)^{-4}.$$

We assume four kinds of kernel perturbations,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Translation: } \tilde{K}_1(t) &= (t + 1 + \alpha)^{-4}, & \alpha &\in [1, 3]; \\ \text{Cut-off: } \tilde{K}_3(t) &= (t + 1)^{-4} \mathbf{1}_{t \leq \alpha}, & \alpha &\in [0.1, 3]; \\ \text{Dilation: } \tilde{K}_2(t) &= (t + 1)^{-4-\alpha}, & \alpha &\in [0, 1]; \\ \text{Oscillation: } \tilde{K}_4(t) &= (t + 1)^{-4} \cos(\alpha t), & \alpha &\in [0.1, 4]. \end{aligned}$$

Translation corresponds to mis-specified short-term memory magnitude while preserving long-term effects. Dilation reflects an overestimation of the power-law decay rate. The cut-off represents a finite-range approximation of the kernel, and oscillation errors typically arise from frequency-based methods, such as inverse Laplace transforms.

Let $\gamma = 3$ and $\sigma = 10^{-3}$. We choose $h(t) = (1+t)^{-6}$ and generate trajectories for 20 independent batches, each initialized with random but identical initial conditions for both the true and the estimated trajectories.




Figure 2: Numerical example for the first-order equation with a power-law kernel $k(t) = (1+t)^{-4}$ in dimension $d = 1$. **Top:** Scatter plots showing the relationship between the empirical error upper-bound constant C_2 estimated in (5.1), and the squared kernel perturbation error $\|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2$ under four types of perturbations: translation, dilation, cut-off, and oscillation. Translation perturbations preserve the kernel decay rate, yielding an approximately linear relation consistent with Theorem 3.2. In contrast, dilation and cut-off perturbations modify the kernel decay behavior, leading to a higher-order decrease in C_2 with increasing kernel error. Such an effect also appears in oscillation, as it introduces negative memory. **Bottom:** The decay rate of the trajectory difference, obtained by fitting in the log-log scale for representative trajectories, is consistently close to 8, which is the decay rate of the square of $K(t)$. This suggests that the selected function $h(t) = (1+t)^{-6}$ provides an appropriate and reliable upper bound for the observed decay.

From these simulations, we obtain an empirical estimate of

$$C_2 = \sup_{t>0} \frac{\mathbb{E}|V_t - \tilde{V}_t|^2}{h(t) + \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top)}. \quad (5.1)$$

According to Theorem 3.2, C_2 is expected to depend linearly on the squared kernel error $\|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2$. For various values of α in the kernel perturbation, we present the convergence of the constants C_2 with the squared kernel error $\|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2$ in the first row of Figure 2. Although the actual decay rate of the trajectory error may exceed h , this choice guarantees that (3.6) holds uniformly across all perturbed kernels, providing a common reference for comparing C_2 across experiments. The trajectory decay rate is fitted and presented in the second row of Figure 2.

5.3 Second-order GLE

In this example, we study the second-order GLE (4.1) and its perturbed form (4.2) in three dimensions $d = 3$. The translation-invariant memory kernel is defined as

$$K(t) = e^{-At} = Qe^{-\Sigma t}Q^\top,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ denotes a randomly generated symmetric matrix. It admits the eigendecomposition $A = Q\Sigma Q^\top$, with Σ diagonal, and the smallest eigenvalue of A is fixed to be 0.5. We examine four types of kernel perturbations as before,




Figure 3: Numerical experiments for three-dimensional ($d = 3$) second-order dynamics with a matrix-valued kernel exhibiting exponential decay at rate 0.5. **Top:** Scatter plots showing the relationship between the error upper-bound constant C_4 , defined in (5.2), and the squared kernel perturbation error $\|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2$ under four types of perturbations: translation, dilation, cutoff, and oscillation. The first three scatter plots exhibit an approximately linear relation, consistent with Theorem 4.2. The oscillation perturbations deviate from the linear trend, reflecting the effect of negative memory and the comparatively large kernel error in this case. **Bottom:** Fitted decay rate of the expected value of the Lyapunov distance of the difference $\mathbb{E}[R_t]$ presented in log scale. The fitted rate is approximately 1, which corresponds to twice the decay rate of the kernel, consistent with Theorem 4.2. The upper bound used here, $h(t) = e^{-0.9t}$, may not be optimal but remains universal across all perturbed kernels.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Translation: } \tilde{K}_1(t) &= Qe^{-(\Sigma+\alpha I)t}Q^\top, & \alpha &\in [0, 0.5]; \\
\text{Cut-off: } \tilde{K}_3(t) &= Qe^{-\Sigma t}\mathbf{1}_{t \leq \alpha}Q^\top, & \alpha &\in [1, 20]; \\
\text{Dilation: } \tilde{K}_2(t) &= Qe^{-\Sigma(t+\alpha)}Q^\top, & \alpha &\in [0, 1]; \\
\text{Oscillation: } \tilde{K}_4(t) &= Qe^{-\Sigma t}\cos(\alpha t)Q^\top, & \alpha &\in [0, 1].
\end{aligned}$$

We set $\gamma = 10$ and choose U to be a confining potential such that $\kappa = u = 10$ and $L_G = 0.01$. The noise level is set to $\sigma = 10^{-4}$. We choose $h(t) = e^{-0.9t}$, which decays slightly slower than $e^{-2 \cdot 0.5t} = e^{-t}$, so that Assumption 1 holds uniformly over all perturbations. We then generate trajectories over 20 independent batches and compute an empirical estimate of

$$C_4 = \sup_{t>0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[R_t]}{h(t) + \text{Tr}(\sigma\sigma^\top)}, \quad (5.2)$$

where $R_t = r((X_t, V_t), (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{V}_t))^2$ denotes the squared Lyapunov-type distance between the true and estimated trajectories. As stated in Theorem 4.2, the constant C_4 is expected to scale linearly with the squared kernel discrepancy $\|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2$ since the initial values coincide. The scatter plots are presented in the first row of Figure 3. The actual decay rate of the Lyapunov distance function is close to one, exceeding the decay rate of h . The choice of h is intended to provide a consistent basis for comparing the scaling of C_4 and $\|K - \tilde{K}\|_h^2$. The decay rates of several representative trajectories are shown in the second row of Figure 3.

6 Conclusion

This work establishes a trajectory-wise error analysis framework for generalized Langevin dynamics with approximated memory kernels. Our analysis quantifies how trajectory discrepancies evolve according to the decay rate of the underlying kernel and provides explicit, time-uniform bounds that scale with the weighted kernel error. Unlike previous studies that focused on moment or equilibrium estimates, the present approach yields path-wise control over prediction accuracy and extends naturally to subexponentially decaying kernels, for which classical Grönwall-type arguments fail. The combination of Volterra resolvent theory and synchronized coupling allows for a unified treatment of both first- and second-order dynamics, including non-translation-invariant and matrix-valued kernels. Numerical experiments confirm that the empirical decay of trajectory differences aligns closely with theoretical predictions.

Future directions include incorporating fluctuation-dissipation-consistent noise processes and extending the analysis to the underdamped Langevin regime with small friction γ , where hypocoercivity interacts nontrivially with memory effects. Such extensions would further bridge microscopic stochastic modeling with effective non-Markovian representations in coarse-grained dynamics.

Acknowledgment

The research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation through awards DMS-2309378 and IIS-2403276. The authors are grateful to Jing An for many helpful discussions, which have significantly improved the presentation of this paper.

References

- [1] John AD Appleby, István Györi, and David W Reynolds. “On exact rates of decay of solutions of linear systems of Volterra equations with delay”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 320.1 (2006), pp. 56–77.
- [2] John AD Appleby and Denis D Patterson. “Memory dependent growth in sublinear Volterra differential equations”. In: *Journal of Integral Equations and Applications* 29.4 (2017), pp. 531–584.
- [3] John AD Appleby and David W Reynolds. “On the non-exponential convergence of asymptotically stable solutions of linear scalar Volterra integro-differential equations”. In: *Journal of Integral Equations and Applications* 14 (2002), pp. 109–118.
- [4] John AD Appleby and David W Reynolds. “Subexponential solutions of linear integro-differential equations and transient renewal equations”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* 132.3 (2002), pp. 521–543.
- [5] Paul R Beesack. “Comparison theorems and integral inequalities for Volterra integral equations”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 20.1 (1969), pp. 61–66.
- [6] Niklas Bockius, Jeanine Shea, Gerhard Jung, Friederike Schmid, and Martin Hanke. “Model reduction techniques for the computation of extended Markov parameterizations for generalized Langevin equations”. In: *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* 33.21 (2021), p. 214003.
- [7] François Bolley, Arnaud Guillin, and Florent Malrieu. “Trend to equilibrium and particle approximation for a weakly self-consistent Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation”. In: *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 44.5 (2010), pp. 867–884.
- [8] Yu Cao, Jianfeng Lu, and Lihan Wang. “On explicit L^2 -convergence rate estimate for underdamped Langevin dynamics”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 247.5 (2023), p. 90.
- [9] Joshua Chover, Peter Ney, and Stephen Wainger. “Functions of probability measures”. In: *Journal d’analyse mathématique* 26.1 (1973), pp. 255–302.
- [10] Laurent Desvillettes and Cédric Villani. “On the trend to global equilibrium in spatially inhomogeneous entropy-dissipating systems: The linear Fokker-Planck equation”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences* 54.1 (2001), pp. 1–42.
- [11] Gustav Doetsch. *Introduction to the Theory and Application of the Laplace Transformation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- [12] Manh Hong Duong and Hung Dang Nguyen. “Asymptotic analysis for the generalized Langevin equation with singular potentials”. In: *Journal of Nonlinear Science* 34.4 (2024), p. 62.
- [13] Manh Hong Duong and Xiaocheng Shang. “Accurate and robust splitting methods for the generalized Langevin equation with a positive Prony series memory kernel”. In: *Journal of Computational Physics* 464 (2022), p. 111332.
- [14] Andreas Eberle, Arnaud Guillin, and Raphael Zimmer. “Couplings and quantitative contraction rates for Langevin dynamics”. In: *Annals of Probability* 47.4 (2019), pp. 1982–2010.
- [15] Jean-Pierre Eckmann and Martin Hairer. “Spectral properties of hypoelliptic operators”. In: *Communications in mathematical physics* 235.2 (2003), pp. 233–253.
- [16] Sergey Foss, Dmitry Korshunov, and Stan Zachary. *An introduction to heavy-tailed and subexponential distributions*. Vol. 6. Springer, 2011.
- [17] Luca Giuggioli and Zohar Neu. “Fokker–Planck representations of non-Markov Langevin equations: application to delayed systems”. In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 377.2153 (2019), p. 20180131.
- [18] Nathan E Glatt-Holtz, David P Herzog, Scott A McKinley, and Hung D Nguyen. “The generalized Langevin equation with power-law memory in a nonlinear potential well”. In: *Nonlinearity* 33.6 (2020), p. 2820.
- [19] Hermann Grabert. *Projection operator techniques in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*. Vol. 95. Springer, 2006.
- [20] Gustaf Gripenberg, Stig-Olof Londen, and Olof Staffans. *Volterra integral and functional equations*. 34. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [21] Albert Gu, Tri Dao, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. “HiPPO: Recurrent memory with optimal polynomial projections”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 1474–1487.
- [22] Albert Gu, Karan Goel, and Christopher Ré. “Efficiently modeling long sequences with structured state spaces”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00396* (2021).
- [23] Frédéric Hérau and Francis Nier. “Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 171.2 (2004), pp. 151–218.
- [24] David P Herzog, Jonathan C Mattingly, and Hung D Nguyen. “Gibbsian dynamics and the generalized Langevin equation”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 28 (2023), pp. 1–29.
- [25] Frank R de Hoog and Robert S Anderssen. “Kernel perturbations for a class of second-kind convolution Volterra equations with non-negative kernels”. In: *Applied Mathematics Letters* 25.9 (2012), pp. 1222–1225.
- [26] Illia Horenko, Carsten Hartmann, Christof Schütte, and Frank Noe. “Data-based parameter estimation of generalized multidimensional Langevin processes”. In: *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* 76.1 (2007), p. 016706.
- [27] Karmeshu, Varun Gupta, and KV Kadambari. “Neuronal model with distributed delay: analysis and simulation study for gamma distribution memory kernel”. In: *Biological cybernetics* 104.6 (2011), pp. 369–383.
- [28] Ioannis-Georgios E. Kordonis and Christos G. Philos. “The behavior of solutions of linear integro-differential equations with unbounded delay”. In: *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 38.2 (1999), pp. 45–50.
- [29] Quanjun Lang and Jianfeng Lu. “Learning memory kernels in generalized Langevin equations”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* (2025). to appear; also available as arXiv:2402.11705.
- [30] Huan Lei, Nathan A Baker, and Xiantao Li. “Data-driven parameterization of the generalized Langevin equation”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113.50 (2016), pp. 14183–14188.
- [31] Xiantao Li. “A coarse-grained molecular dynamics model for crystalline solids”. In: *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 83.8-9 (2010), pp. 986–997.

- [32] Jonathan C Mattingly, Andrew M Stuart, and Desmond J Higham. “Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise”. In: *Stochastic processes and their applications* 101.2 (2002), pp. 185–232.
- [33] Yurii Nesterov. *Lectures on convex optimization*. Vol. 137. Springer, 2018.
- [34] David W Reynolds and John AD Appleby. “Decay rates of solutions of linear stochastic Volterra equations”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 13 (2008), pp. 922–943.
- [35] Ricardo Buitrago Ruiz, Tanya Marwah, Albert Gu, and Andrej Risteski. “On the benefits of memory for modeling time-dependent PDEs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02313* (2024).
- [36] Antonio Russo, Miguel A Durán-Olivencia, Ioannis G Kevrekidis, and Serafim Kalliadasis. “Machine learning memory kernels as closure for non-Markovian stochastic processes”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 35.5 (2022), pp. 6531–6543.
- [37] Katharina Schuh. “Global contractivity for Langevin dynamics with distribution-dependent forces and uniform in time propagation of chaos”. In: *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et statistiques*. Vol. 60. 2. Institut Henri Poincaré. 2024, pp. 753–789.
- [38] Issai Schur. “Bemerkungen zur Theorie der beschränkten Bilinearformen mit unendlich vielen Veränderlichen.” In: *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* (1911).
- [39] Christopher D Sogge. *Fourier integrals in classical analysis*. Vol. 210. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [40] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*. Vol. 338. Springer, 2008.
- [41] Alexander Wehrli, Spencer Wheatley, and Didier Sornette. “Scale-, time- and asset-dependence of Hawkes process estimates on high frequency price changes”. In: *Quantitative Finance* 21.5 (2021), pp. 729–752.
- [42] Yuanran Zhu, Jason M Dominy, and Daniele Venturi. “On the estimation of the Mori-Zwanzig memory integral”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 59.10 (2018).
- [43] Robert Zwanzig. *Nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*. Oxford University Press, 2001.