

Convergence rates for the p -Wasserstein distance of the empirical measures of an ergodic Markov process

René L. Schilling Jian Wang Bingyao Wu Jie-Xiang Zhu

December 30, 2025

Abstract

Let $X := (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an ergodic Markov process on \mathbb{R}^d , and $p > 0$. We derive upper bounds of the p -Wasserstein distance between the invariant measure and the empirical measures of the Markov process X . For this we assume, e.g. that the transition semigroup of X is exponentially contractive in terms of the 1-Wasserstein distance, or that the iterated Poincaré inequality holds together with certain moment conditions on the invariant measure. Typical examples include diffusions and underdamped Langevin dynamics.

2020 MSC: 60F15; 60F25; 60G57; 60J60.

Keywords: Empirical measure, Markov process, Wasserstein distance, convergence rate, underdamped Langevin dynamics.

1 Introduction and main results

It is an interesting and fundamental problem in probability theory, (random) dynamical systems and numerical analysis to study the quantitative behaviour of the convergence of empirical measures in the Wasserstein distance.

To make this precise, let us state this problem in an Euclidean setting. By $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the set of all probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d , and $\mathcal{C}(\nu_0, \nu_1) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the set of couplings with marginals $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $c(x, y) := |x - y|^p$ with $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $p \in (0, \infty)$, we define the *optimal transport cost* as

$$\mathcal{T}_p(\nu_0, \nu_1) := \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\nu_0, \nu_1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^p \pi(dx, dy).$$

The (p) -Wasserstein (Kantorovich) distance is defined as $W_p(\nu_0, \nu_1) := [\mathcal{T}_p(\nu_0, \nu_1)]^{1 \wedge \frac{1}{p}}$, see Villani [20, Theorem 7.3].

Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an ergodic temporally homogeneous Markov process on \mathbb{R}^d with invariant probability measure μ , and let $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be its transition semigroup, i.e.

$$P_t f(x) := \mathbb{E}^x[f(X_t)], \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where \mathbb{E}^x denotes the expectation if $X_0 = x$. We write $L^p(\mu) := L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mu)}$. Let \mathcal{L} be the infinitesimal generator of $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $L^2(\mu)$ with domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$. Consider the empirical measure

$$\mu_T := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{X_t} dt, \quad T > 0,$$

where δ_{X_t} is the Dirac measure at X_t . One main problem is to establish convergence rates for $\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)$ both in expectation and almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Recently, there has been considerable progress in this problem. Following the ideas of [1, 13], several works [19, 23, 25] obtain bounds for $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)]$ by regularizing the empirical measure μ_T by a symmetric Markov semigroup (which is related to the original semigroup) and comparing the Wasserstein distance with negative Sobolev norms. This so-called PDE approach is particularly effective if $p = 2$. On the downside, this approach requires that the underlying distance is induced by a symmetric semigroup associated with the invariant measure, as well as a spectral gap – and both conditions fail for typical degenerate models, e.g. the underdamped Langevin dynamics. Recall that this is the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0} := (Y_t, Z_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, which is given by the following stochastic differential equation (SDE):

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} dY_t = Z_t dt, \\ dZ_t = -(Z_t + \nabla V(Y_t)) dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t, \end{cases}$$

where $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a confining potential, and $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard n -dimensional Brownian motion. The generator of this process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is not uniformly elliptic. The recent work [24] further develops the PDE approach and obtains quantitative bounds on $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_2(\mu_T, \mu)]$.

In this paper we use a method that differs from the approach in [24]. Our technique is related to the strategy in [9], which was useful for related questions in an i.i.d. setting. For the underdamped Langevin dynamics, an important observation is that, under suitable assumptions on the potential V , the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by (1.1) satisfies the iterated Poincaré inequality, which enables us to use a Bernstein-type inequality. These ingredients yield quantitative bounds for $\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)$, both in expectation and almost surely, for the underdamped Langevin dynamics. Our results do not only improve the bound obtained in [24] for $p = 2$, but also extend it to all $p > 0$; moreover, our approach gives new almost sure bounds; see Section 5.2.

In fact, our arguments are valid for general Markov processes that satisfy one of the following conditions: (i) the exponential contractivity condition in the 1-Wasserstein distance, (ii) the iterated Poincaré inequality, (iii) the $L^2(\mu)$ -coercivity. Within this setting, we improve and extend several results from [5, 23]. Besides the key lemma from [9], our proof relies on a smoothing procedure via compactly supported smooth densities (cf. [5, 7]) and on Bernstein-type inequalities (cf. [19, 25] for the compact setting). A new feature of our method is that it avoids any direct use of estimates involving the transition density $p_t(x, y)$ of the semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

Notation. Most of our notation is standard or should be clear from the context. We use \mathcal{L}_X for the law of the random variable X , and we write \mathbb{P}^ν and \mathbb{E}^ν for the probability and expectation corresponding to the initial law ν respectively. We also write $X \sim \mu$ if $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$. By $\mu(f)$ we denote the integral $\int f d\mu$; in particular, $\mu(| \cdot |^q) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^q \mu(dx)$ is the q -th moment of μ . We write $\mathbb{1}_A$ for the indicator function of a set or event A .

The shorthand $A \lesssim B$ means that there is a constant $C > 0$, depending only on the parameters in the assumptions, such that $A \leq C \cdot B$; if both $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ hold, we write $A \simeq B$; $\mathbb{I}_{d \times d}$ denotes the d -dimensional identity matrix. For any $a > 0$, $[a]$ denotes its integer part; $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}$ denotes the inner product in $L^2(\mu)$. Finally, $a \wedge b$ stands for the minimum of $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, and $a_+ := \max\{a, 0\}$.

Now, we introduce some assumptions and our main results.

(H1) (Exponential contractivity in the 1-Wasserstein distance) There exist constants $C \geq 1$ and $\lambda_E > 0$ such that for any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$W_1(\nu P_t, \mu P_t) \leq C e^{-\lambda_E t} W_1(\nu, \mu).$$

(H2) (Iterated Poincaré inequality) There exists a constant $\lambda_I > 0$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu(f) = 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{L}f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \geq \lambda_I \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

(H3) ($L^2(\mu)$ -coercivity) There exists a constant $\lambda_C > 0$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu(f) = 0$,

$$\langle -\mathcal{L}f, f \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} \geq \lambda_C \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2.$$

If \mathcal{L} is symmetric, then **(H3)** is also known as the *Poincaré inequality* or the *spectral gap inequality*. In Section 2.1 below, we will discuss the relationships among the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)**, and present some typical examples.

We will now state our main results on $\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)]$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an ergodic Markov process on \mathbb{R}^d with invariant measure μ . Assume that **(H1)** holds, let $p > 0$, and assume that μ has for some $q > \max\{p, 1\}$ a q -th moment $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$. Define*

$$\zeta := \zeta(p, q, d) := \max \left\{ \frac{q}{q-p}, \frac{d}{p} \right\} \in (1, \infty).$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $T \geq 2$,

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \leq C T^{-\frac{p}{2\zeta p+1}} \left((\log T)^{\frac{2d}{2d+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{q=\frac{dp}{d-p}\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{q \neq \frac{dp}{d-p}\}} \right) \left((\log T)^{\frac{2q}{2q+(q/d)-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{p=d\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{p \neq d\}} \right).$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an ergodic Markov process on \mathbb{R}^d with invariant measure μ . Assume that **(H2)** holds, let $p > 0$, and assume that μ has for some $q > p$ a q -th moment $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$. Define*

$$\gamma_1 := \gamma_1(p, q, d) := \max \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, 1 - \frac{p}{d} \right\} \in (0, 1).$$

Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $T \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \leq C T^{-\frac{2}{3}(1-\max\{\gamma_1, \frac{p}{q}\})} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma_1 q = p\}} \log T + \mathbf{1}_{\{\gamma_1 q \neq p\}} \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{p=\frac{3}{4}d\}} \log T + \mathbf{1}_{\{p \neq \frac{3}{4}d\}} \right).$$

In particular, if $q > 4p$, then

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \leq \begin{cases} CT^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } p > \frac{3}{4}d, \\ CT^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log T & \text{if } p = \frac{3}{4}d, \\ CT^{-\frac{2p}{3d}} & \text{if } p < \frac{3}{4}d. \end{cases}$$

The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality shows that **(H3)** implies **(H2)**. Under the stronger assumption **(H3)**, we get better rates.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an ergodic Markov process on \mathbb{R}^d with invariant measure μ . Assume that **(H3)** holds, let $p > 0$, and assume that μ has for some $q > p$ a q -th moment $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$. Define*

$$\gamma_2 := \gamma_2(p, q, d) := \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \frac{p}{d} \right\} \in (0, 1).$$

Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $T \geq 2$,

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu [\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \leq CT^{-(1-\max\{\gamma_2, \frac{p}{q}\})} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma_2 q = p\}} \log T + \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma_2 q \neq p\}} \right) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p = \frac{1}{2}d\}} \log T + \mathbb{1}_{\{p \neq \frac{1}{2}d\}} \right).$$

In particular, if $q > 2p$, then

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu [\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \leq \begin{cases} CT^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } p > \frac{d}{2}, \\ CT^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log T & \text{if } p = \frac{d}{2}, \\ CT^{-\frac{p}{d}} & \text{if } p < \frac{d}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Theorems 1.1–1.3 characterize the behaviour in expectation. We can also get almost sure upper bounds for $\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)$:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an ergodic Markov process on \mathbb{R}^d with invariant measure μ . Assume that **(H2)** holds, let $p > 0$, and assume that μ has for some $q > p$ a q -th moment $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$. For the rate function*

$$(1.6) \quad R_\eta(T) := \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{p}{2(p+d)}} (\log T)^\eta & \text{if } p + d < \frac{q}{4} \\ T^{-\frac{2p}{q}} (\log T)^{\frac{3}{2}} & \text{if } p + d = \frac{q}{4} \\ T^{-\frac{2p(q-p)}{q(3p+4d)}} (\log T)^\eta & \text{if } p + d > \frac{q}{4} \end{cases} \quad \text{with a fixed } \eta > 1,$$

one has

$$(1.7) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)}{R_\eta(T)} < \infty \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

If instead of **(H2)** the stronger condition **(H3)** is assumed, we get the same a.s. result (1.7) with the following modified rate function in place of $R_\eta(T)$:

$$(1.8) \quad \tilde{R}_\eta(T) := \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{p}{2(p+d)}} (\log T)^\eta & \text{if } p + d < \frac{q}{2} \\ T^{-\frac{p}{q}} (\log T)^{\frac{3}{2}} & \text{if } p + d = \frac{q}{2} \\ T^{-\frac{p(q-p)}{q(p+2d)}} (\log T)^\eta & \text{if } p + d > \frac{q}{2} \end{cases} \quad \text{with a fixed } \eta > 1.$$

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we explain the relations among the conditions **(H1)**, **(H2)** and **(H3)**, and we provide some useful lemmas needed in the proof of the main results. Section 3 is devoted to the proofs of the p -Wasserstein convergence in the mean sense, and Section 4 is about almost sure convergence. In Section 5 we apply our findings to specific processes, including diffusions and underdamped Langevin dynamics, and compare them with existing works.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 More about the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)**

Let us briefly discuss the relations among the assumptions **(H1)**, **(H2)** and **(H3)**. In practice, the exponential decay of the variance $\text{Var}_\mu(f) := \int (f - \mu(f))^2 d\mu = \mu((f - \mu(f))^2)$ along the semigroup is frequently considered. Therefore, we introduce the following auxiliary assumption:

(H2') There are constants $C \geq 1$ and $\lambda_V > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\text{Var}_\mu(P_t f) \leq C e^{-2\lambda_V t} \text{Var}_\mu(f).$$

This condition is in-between **(H2)** and **(H3)**, to wit

$$\mathbf{(H3)} \implies \mathbf{(H2')} \implies \mathbf{(H2)}.$$

Indeed, since $\text{Var}_\mu(P_t f) = \mu((P_t f)^2) - \mu(P_t f)^2 = \mu((P_t f)^2) - \mu(f)^2$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Var}_\mu(P_t f) = 2\langle \mathcal{L}P_t f, P_t f \rangle_{L^2(\mu)},$$

so **(H3)** yields **(H2')** with $C = 1$ and $\lambda_V = \lambda_C$.

Now we assume that **(H2')** holds. For any $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu(f) = 0$ we can use $\partial_t P_t f = P_t \mathcal{L}f$ and $L^2(\mu)$ - $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_T f = 0$, to see

$$f = - \int_0^\infty P_t \mathcal{L}f \, dt.$$

Combining this with **(H2')**, we obtain

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \int_0^\infty \|P_t \mathcal{L}f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \, dt \leq \sqrt{C} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_V t} \, dt \cdot \|\mathcal{L}f\|_{L^2(\mu)} = \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\lambda_V} \|\mathcal{L}f\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Hence, **(H2)** holds with $\lambda_I = C^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_V$.

Because of the Kantorovich duality, cf. [20, Remark 7.5], **(H1)** implies that for any Lipschitz function f on \mathbb{R}^d , all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$|P_t f(x) - \mu(f)| \leq W_1(\delta_x P_t, \mu P_t)[f]_{\text{Lip}} \leq C e^{-\lambda_E t} W_1(\delta_x, \mu)[f]_{\text{Lip}},$$

where $[f]_{\text{Lip}} := \sup_{x \neq y} |f(x) - f(y)|/|x - y|$ denotes the Lipschitz constant (or Lipschitz seminorm) of f . Moreover, if $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$ for some $q \geq 1$, then $f \in L^q(\mu)$ and

$$(2.1) \quad \|P_t f - \mu(f)\|_{L^q(\mu)} \leq C_\mu e^{-\lambda_E t} [f]_{\text{Lip}}$$

for some constant $C_\mu > 0$ depending only on μ . If the generator \mathcal{L} is normal, i.e. $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}^* = \mathcal{L}^*\mathcal{L}$, and $q = 2$, then the spectral representation of normal operators allows us to deduce **(H3)** with $\lambda_C = \lambda_E$ from (2.1), see [21, Theorem 4.1.4]. The same theorem also shows that **(H2')** implies **(H3)**. Summing up, we have

$$\text{if } \mathcal{L} \text{ is normal, then: } \mathbf{(H1)} \ \& \ \mu(|\cdot|^2) < \infty \implies \mathbf{(H3)} \iff \mathbf{(H2')}.$$

It is well known that functional inequalities of the type **(H1)**–**(H3)** are closely connected with curvature conditions. A classical example is provided by the symmetric diffusion on \mathbb{R}^d under the Bakry–Émery curvature condition $\text{CD}(\rho, \infty)$ for some $\rho > 0$: set $\mu(dx) := e^{-V(x)} dx$, where the potential $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies $\text{Hess } V \geq \rho \mathbb{I}_{d \times d}$ and is such that μ becomes a probability measure. Consider the diffusion with the generator $\mathcal{L} = \Delta - \nabla V \cdot \nabla$ and the transition operators $P_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$. For this diffusion, **(H1)**–**(H3)** are satisfied, see e.g. [2] or [21]. Recently, **(H1)** (even with both μ and ν being *arbitrary* probability measures) has been extended to diffusions whose potentials are not uniformly convex, see e.g. [8, 15, 22]. For related functional inequalities under a variable curvature lower bound, see also [4].

For the proof of our main result, we will need Bernstein-type inequalities for Markov processes, which quantitatively describe the concentration behaviour of the processes. The tail inequality under **(H2)** can be found in [11, Theorem 3.4], whereas the analogue under the weaker assumption **(H3)** was obtained in [14, Theorem 1.1 and Remark 1.2].

Theorem 2.1. Let $\nu = \mathcal{L}_{X_0}$ denote the initial distribution of the ergodic Markov process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathbb{R}^d with invariant measure μ , and assume that $\nu(dx) = h_\nu(x) \mu(dx)$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that $\mu(f) = 0$, $\|f\|_\infty \leq M$ and $\text{Var}_\mu(f) \leq \sigma^2$ for some $M, \sigma > 0$.

- (i) Assume that **(H2)** holds and $h_\nu \in L^p(\mu)$ for some $p \in (1, \infty]$. Denote by $q := p/(p-1)$ the conjugate index of p . Then for any $T > 0$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\nu \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t) dt \right| \geq \delta \right) &\leq 2 \|h_\nu\|_{L^p(\mu)} \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda_I T \delta^2}{4qM\sqrt{4\sigma^2 + \delta^2}} \right] \\ &\leq 2 \|h_\nu\|_{L^p(\mu)} \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda_I T}{4\sqrt{5}q} \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{\delta^2}{M\sigma}, \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbb{E}^\nu \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t) dt \right| \right] \lesssim \|h_\nu\|_{L^p(\mu)} \sqrt{M} \left(\sqrt{\sigma} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{M} T^{-1} \right).$$

- (ii) Assume that **(H3)** holds and $h_\nu \in L^2(\mu)$. Then for any $T > 0$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\nu \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t) dt \right| \geq \delta \right) &\leq 2 \|h_\nu\|_{L^2(\mu)} \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda_C T \delta^2}{(\sigma + \sqrt{\sigma^2 + 2M\delta})^2} \right] \\ &\leq 2 \|h_\nu\|_{L^2(\mu)} \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda_C T}{4 + 2\sqrt{3}} \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2}, \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{E}^\nu \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t) dt \right| \right] \lesssim \|h_\nu\|_{L^2(\mu)} \left(\sigma T^{-\frac{1}{2}} + M T^{-1} \right).$$

The moment bounds (2.2) and (2.3) follow directly from the tail bounds via the layer-cake formula:

$$\mathbb{E}^\nu \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t) dt \right| \right] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}^\nu \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(X_t) dt \right| \geq \delta \right) d\delta.$$

For large $T \gg 1$, the inequalities in (ii) are better if $\sigma \ll M$.

2.2 Upper bounds for \mathcal{T}_p

Let us briefly recall a key tool, due to [9, Lemma 5 and 6], to obtain upper bounds for \mathcal{T}_p ; see also [6, 10] for related bounds. For each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by \mathcal{P}_ℓ the natural partition of $(-1, 1]^d$ into $2^{d\ell}$ dyadic cubes of side-length $2 \cdot 2^{-\ell}$. For $F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $2^n F := \{2^n x : x \in F\}$, and set

$$B_0 := (-1, 1]^d, \quad B_n := (-2^n, 2^n]^d \setminus (-2^{n-1}, 2^{n-1}]^d, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Lemma 2.2. For every $p > 0$, there exists a constant $C_p > 0$ such that for all $\nu_0, \nu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{T}_p(\nu_0, \nu_1) \leq C_p \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} |\nu_0(2^n F \cap B_n) - \nu_1(2^n F \cap B_n)|.$$

With the help of this lemma, the problem of estimating $\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)]$ reduces to that of controlling mean differences of the form $\mathbb{E}^\mu[|\mu_T(A) - \mu(A)|]$, where A is a Borel subset of \mathbb{R}^d ; this is why the concentration results from Theorem 2.1 will come in.

3 Proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we establish upper bounds for $\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)]$ under **(H1)**. Since μ_T is singular with respect to μ , we first mollify it by convolving it with smooth densities, which has the form $\rho_\epsilon(x) := \epsilon^{-d}\rho(x/\epsilon)$, where ρ is a smooth function with support in $\overline{B_1(0)}$. As usual, $B_r(x)$ denotes the open ball in \mathbb{R}^d centred at x with radius $r > 0$.

Let ξ be a \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable, which is independent of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and has a probability density function $\rho \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\text{supp } \rho \subset \overline{B_1(0)}$. If $Y \sim \nu$ is a further \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable, which is independent of ξ , then for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\mathcal{L}_{Y+\epsilon\xi} = \nu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}$. Observe that $\epsilon\xi \sim \rho_\epsilon(x)dx$. From the definition of \mathcal{T}_p , we see that for all $p > 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}_p(\nu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}, \nu) \leq \mathbb{E}[|Y + \epsilon\xi - Y|^p] = \epsilon^p \mathbb{E}[|\xi|^p] \lesssim \epsilon^p.$$

Combining this with the triangle inequality for W_p shows

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu) &\lesssim \mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}) + \mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}, \mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}) + \mathcal{T}_p(\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}, \mu) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^p + \mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}, \mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi}). \end{aligned}$$

We can now use Lemma 2.2 in order to estimate the second term on the right-hand side.

For any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, it is easily checked that

$$(3.2) \quad (\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in A) dt, \quad (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) = \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in A),$$

where X is a random variable that is independent of ξ with $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$. If $\mathcal{L}_{X_0} = \mu$, then $\mathcal{L}_{X_t} = \mu$, since μ is an invariant measure. Consequently,

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^\mu[|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)|] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\mu[(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)] + (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in A)] dt + \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in A) \\ &= 2\mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in A). \end{aligned}$$

For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the function $f_{A,\epsilon} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{A,\epsilon}(z) &:= (\delta_z * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) \\ &= \int_A \rho_\epsilon(x - z) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_A \rho_\epsilon(x - y) dx \right) \mu(dy), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mu(f_{A,\epsilon}) = 0$ and $\|f_{A,\epsilon}\|_\infty \leq 1$. Furthermore, $f_{A,\epsilon}$ is Lipschitz continuous with

$$(3.5) \quad [f_{A,\epsilon}]_{\text{Lip}} \leq \min \{ \epsilon^{-d-1} \text{vol}(A), 2 \text{vol}(B_1(0))\epsilon^{-1} \} \cdot [\rho]_{\text{Lip}},$$

where $\text{vol}(\cdot)$ is Lebesgue measure. Indeed, since $\text{supp } \rho_\epsilon \subset \overline{B_\epsilon(0)}$, we have for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{A,\epsilon}(z_1) - f_{A,\epsilon}(z_2)| &= \left| \int_{A \cap B_\epsilon(z_1)} \rho_\epsilon(x - z_1) dx - \int_{A \cap B_\epsilon(z_2)} \rho_\epsilon(x - z_2) dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_{A \cap (B_\epsilon(z_1) \cup B_\epsilon(z_2))} |\rho_\epsilon(x - z_1) - \rho_\epsilon(x - z_2)| dx \\ &\leq \text{vol}(A \cap (B_\epsilon(z_1) \cup B_\epsilon(z_2))) \cdot [\rho_\epsilon]_{\text{Lip}} |z_1 - z_2|, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.5). By the Markov property of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the invariance of μ under the operators P_t for all $t > 0$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^\mu [|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_{A,\epsilon}(X_t) dt \right|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[\frac{1}{T^2} \int_0^T \int_0^T f_{A,\epsilon}(X_t) f_{A,\epsilon}(X_s) dt ds \right] \\ &= \frac{2}{T^2} \int_0^T \int_s^T \mathbb{E}^\mu [f_{A,\epsilon}(X_s) f_{A,\epsilon}(X_t)] dt ds = \frac{2}{T^2} \int_0^T \int_s^T \mu(P_s(f_{A,\epsilon} P_{t-s} f_{A,\epsilon})) dt ds \\ &= \frac{2}{T^2} \int_0^T \int_s^T \mu(f_{A,\epsilon} P_{t-s} f_{A,\epsilon}) dt ds \leq \frac{2}{T^2} \int_0^T \int_s^T \|P_{t-s} f_{A,\epsilon}\|_{L^1(\mu)} dt ds. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming **(H1)** and $\mu(|\cdot|) < \infty$, we get from (2.1) that for any $t > 0$,

$$\|P_t f_{A,\epsilon}\|_{L^1(\mu)} = \|P_t f_{A,\epsilon} - \mu(f_{A,\epsilon})\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim e^{-\lambda_{\text{E}} t} [f_{A,\epsilon}]_{\text{Lip}}.$$

Therefore, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality along with (3.5), we have

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu [|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)|] \lesssim \frac{1 \wedge \sqrt{\epsilon^{-d} \text{vol}(A)}}{\sqrt{T}\epsilon}.$$

Combining (3.3) with (3.6), we see for any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)|] \lesssim \min \left\{ \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in A), \frac{1 \wedge \sqrt{\epsilon^{-d} \text{vol}(A)}}{\sqrt{T}\epsilon} \right\},$$

where we recall that $X \sim \mu$ is independent of ξ .

We will now use the notation introduced in Section 2.2. For every $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mathbb{E}^\mu [|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n)|] \\ & \lesssim \min \left\{ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in 2^n F \cap B_n), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} (1 \wedge \sqrt{\epsilon^{-d} \text{vol}(2^n F \cap B_n)}) \right\} \\ & \lesssim \min \left\{ \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in B_n), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} (1 \wedge \sqrt{\epsilon^{-d} \text{vol}(2^n F \cap B_n)}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\xi| \leq 1$ a.s., we find for the ϵ -enlarged set $B_n^\epsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - y| < \epsilon \text{ for some } y \in B_n\}$ that $\mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in B_n) \leq \mathbb{P}(X \in B_n^\epsilon) = \mu(B_n^\epsilon)$. Since μ has a finite q -th moment $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$, we can use the Markov inequality to get for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu(B_n^\epsilon) = \mathbb{P}(X \in B_n^\epsilon) \lesssim 2^{-qn},$$

and, therefore, $\mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in B_n) \lesssim 2^{-qn}$.

Using that $\#\mathcal{P}_\ell = 2^{d\ell}$ and $\text{vol}(2^n F) = 2^d \cdot 2^{(n-\ell)d}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} 1 \wedge \sqrt{\epsilon^{-d} \text{vol}(2^n F \cap B_n)} \lesssim \left[(2^{n-\ell} \epsilon^{-1})^{\frac{d}{2}} \wedge 1 \right] \cdot 2^{d\ell}.$$

Combining all estimates from above, we see that

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mathbb{E}^\mu [|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n)|] \\ & \lesssim \min \left\{ 2^{-qn}, T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[(2^{n-\ell} \epsilon^{-1})^{\frac{d}{2}} \wedge 1 \right] \cdot 2^{d\ell} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For fixed $p > 0$ and $q > \max\{p, 1\}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T \geq 2$, $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we define

$$\mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) := \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \min \left\{ 2^{-qn}, T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[(2^{n-\ell} \epsilon^{-1})^{\frac{d}{2}} \wedge 1 \right] \cdot 2^{d\ell} \right\}.$$

Set $k := \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})$ and $k' := \log_2(T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Then

$$\mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell + \min\{-qn, -k' + d\ell - \frac{d}{2}(\ell - n - k)_+\}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq \ell < \ell_0} 2^{-p\ell - k' + d\ell - \frac{1}{2}d(\ell - n - k)_+} + 2^{-qn} \sum_{\ell \geq \ell_0} 2^{-p\ell},$$

where

$$\ell_0 := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} < 2^{qn}, \\ \frac{k' - qn}{d} & \text{if } T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 2^{qn} \text{ \& } T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2^{(q+d)n}, \\ \frac{2(k' - qn)}{d} - n - k & \text{if } T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{d+\frac{1}{2}} > 2^{(q+d)n}. \end{cases}$$

To keep notation simple, we define for $T \geq 2$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$N_1 := \frac{\log_2 \left(T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \right)}{q+d} \quad \text{and} \quad N_2 := \frac{\log_2 \left(T^{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)}{q}.$$

It is not hard to see that $N_2 - N_1 = O(\log_2(T\epsilon^{-(2q-1)}))$. Now we consider three cases. Below, we use several times the fact that a geometric series can be estimated by its leading term times a constant.

Case (i) $p \geq d$: A direct computation leads to

$$\mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) \lesssim 2^{-qn} \mathbf{1}_{\{n > N_2\}} + \begin{cases} (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{\{n \leq N_2\}} & \text{if } p > d, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\ell_0 \wedge (n + \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}))] \mathbf{1}_{\{n \leq N_2\}} & \text{if } p = d. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) \lesssim \begin{cases} (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{p}{q})} & \text{if } p > d, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{d}{q})} \log(T\epsilon^{-(2q-1)}) & \text{if } p = d. \end{cases}$$

Case (ii) $p \in [d/2, d)$: In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) &\lesssim 2^{-qn} \mathbf{1}_{\{n > N_2\}} \\ &+ \begin{cases} (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{p}{2d}} 2^{-(1-\frac{p}{d})qn} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_1 \leq n \leq N_2\}} + T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{-(d-p)-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(d-p)n} \mathbf{1}_{\{n < N_1\}} & \text{if } p \in (\frac{d}{2}, d), \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{4}} 2^{-\frac{qn}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_1 \leq n \leq N_2\}} + T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{\frac{dn}{2}} (\ell_0 - n - \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})) \mathbf{1}_{\{n < N_1\}} & \text{if } p = \frac{d}{2}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $p \in (d/2, d)$,

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{q}{2(q+d)}} \epsilon^{p-\frac{(2d+1)q}{2(q+d)}} & \text{if } q > \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{p}{2d}} \log(T\epsilon^{-(2q-1)}) & \text{if } q = \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{p}{q})} & \text{if } q < \frac{dp}{d-p}. \end{cases}$$

If $p = d/2$, we use that for $n < N_1$,

$$\ell_0 - n - \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}) \leq \frac{2k' - dk}{d} - \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}) = O(\log(T\epsilon^{2d+1})),$$

and so

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{q}{2(q+d)}} \epsilon^{\frac{d}{2} - \frac{(2d+1)q}{2(q+d)}} \log(T\epsilon^{2d+1}) & \text{if } q > d, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log(T\epsilon^{-(2q-1)}) & \text{if } q = d, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{4q}\right)} & \text{if } q < d. \end{cases}$$

Case (iii) $p < d/2$: In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) &\lesssim 2^{-qn} \mathbb{1}_{\{n > N_2\}} + (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{p}{2d}} 2^{-(1-\frac{p}{d})qn} \mathbb{1}_{\{N_1 \leq n \leq N_2\}} \\ &\quad + T^{-\frac{p}{d}} \epsilon^{-p-\frac{p}{d}} 2^{[p-(1-\frac{2p}{d})q]n} \mathbb{1}_{\{n < N_1\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon) \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{p}{d}} \epsilon^{-p-\frac{p}{d}} & \text{if } q > \frac{2dp}{d-2p}, \\ T^{-\frac{p}{d}} \epsilon^{-p-\frac{p}{d}} \log(T\epsilon^{2d+1}) & \text{if } q = \frac{2dp}{d-2p}, \\ T^{-\frac{q}{2(q+d)}} \epsilon^{p-\frac{q(2d+1)}{2(q+d)}} & \text{if } q \in \left(\frac{dp}{d-p}, \frac{2dp}{d-2p}\right), \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{p}{2d}} \log(T\epsilon^{-(2q-1)}) & \text{if } q = \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ (T\epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{p}{q})} & \text{if } q < \frac{dp}{d-p}. \end{cases}$$

Combining Lemma 2.2 with (3.1) and (3.7), we obtain for any $T \geq 2$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ that

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \epsilon^p + \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \mathcal{I}_{p,q}(n, T, \epsilon).$$

Optimizing in $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ yields, if $p \in (0, d)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{p}{2d+1}} & \text{if } q > \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ T^{-\frac{p}{2d+1}} (\log T)^{\frac{2d}{2d+1}} & \text{if } q = \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ T^{-\frac{q-p}{2q+(q/p)-1}} & \text{if } q < \frac{dp}{d-p}; \end{cases}$$

if $p \geq d$, then we get in this way

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{q-p}{2q+(q/p)-1}} & \text{if } p > d, \\ T^{-\frac{q-d}{2q+(q/d)-1}} (\log T)^{\frac{2q}{2q+(q/d)-1}} & \text{if } p = d. \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3.2 Proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

We will prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 with a unified argument based on the Bernstein-type inequalities from Theorem 2.1.

Because μ is an invariant measure of the semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$, we obtain that for every Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^\mu [|\mu_T(A) - \mu(A)|] &\leq \mathbb{E}^\mu[\mu_T(A)] + \mu(A) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}^\mu(X_t \in A) dt + \mu(A) = 2\mu(A). \end{aligned}$$

Define the function $f_A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_A(z) := \mathbb{1}_A(z) - \mu(A), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Clearly, $\mu(f_A) = 0$ and $\|f_A\|_\infty \leq 1$. A simple computation gives

$$\text{Var}_\mu(f_A) = \|f_A\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \mu(A)(1 - \mu(A)) \leq \mu(A).$$

Together with

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [|\mu_T(A) - \mu(A)|] = \mathbb{E}^\mu \left[\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_A(X_t) dt \right| \right],$$

we deduce from (2.2) and (2.3) that, under **(H2)**,

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [|\mu_T(A) - \mu(A)|] \lesssim T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(A)^{\frac{1}{4}} + T^{-1};$$

while under **(H3)**,

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [|\mu_T(A) - \mu(A)|] \lesssim T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(A)^{\frac{1}{2}} + T^{-1}.$$

Combining this with (3.11), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [|\mu_T(A) - \mu(A)|] \lesssim \begin{cases} \min \left\{ \mu(A), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(A)^{\frac{1}{4}} \right\} & \text{under } \mathbf{(H2)}, \\ \min \left\{ \mu(A), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(A)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} & \text{under } \mathbf{(H3)}, \end{cases}$$

where we use the fact that $0 \leq \mu(A) \leq 1$. This, together with Lemma 2.2, yields

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu [\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \min \left\{ \mu(2^n F \cap B_n), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n)^\alpha \right\},$$

where $\alpha = 1/4$ (respectively, $1/2$) under **(H2)** (respectively, **(H3)**).

For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $T \geq 2$, define

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) := \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \min \left\{ \mu(2^n F \cap B_n), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n)^\alpha \right\}.$$

The following lemma gives an upper bound for $\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T)$, α , p and q as above, and define*

$$\gamma := \gamma(\alpha, p, d) := \max \left\{ \alpha, 1 - \frac{p}{d} \right\} \in (0, 1).$$

Then, for all $T > 2$,

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) \lesssim T^{-\frac{1 - \max\{\gamma, p/q\}}{2(1-\alpha)}} \cdot (\mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma q = p\}} \log T + \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma q \neq p\}}) \cdot (\mathbb{1}_{\{p = (1-\alpha)d\}} \log T + \mathbb{1}_{\{p \neq (1-\alpha)d\}}).$$

Proof. First, for each $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \min \left\{ \mu(2^n F \cap B_n), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n)^\alpha \right\} \\ & \leq \min \left\{ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n), \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n)^\alpha \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \min \left\{ \mu(B_n), \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n)^\alpha \right\}.$$

Hölder's inequality shows

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n)^\alpha \leq (\#\mathcal{P}_\ell)^{1-\alpha} \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mu(2^n F \cap B_n) \right)^\alpha = 2^{(1-\alpha)d\ell} \mu(B_n)^\alpha.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \min \left\{ \mu(B_n), T^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(1-\alpha)d\ell} \mu(B_n)^\alpha \right\}.$$

Since $\mu(| \cdot |^q) < \infty$, we can use the Markov inequality to get that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mu(B_n) \lesssim 2^{-qn}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-(q-p)n} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \min \left\{ 1, T^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(1-\alpha)(d\ell+qn)} \right\}.$$

Set $L := \frac{1}{d} \left(\frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)} \log_2(T) - qn \right)$. If $L < 0$, i.e., if $n > \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}$, then

$$\sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \min \left\{ 1, T^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(1-\alpha)(d\ell+qn)} \right\} \lesssim 1.$$

If $L \geq 0$, i.e., if $n \leq \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \min \left\{ 1, T^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(1-\alpha)(d\ell+qn)} \right\} &= T^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(1-\alpha)qn} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq L} 2^{[(1-\alpha)d-p]\ell} + \sum_{\ell > L} 2^{-p\ell} \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{(1-\alpha)qn} & \text{if } (1-\alpha)d < p, \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\log T) 2^{(1-\alpha)qn} & \text{if } (1-\alpha)d = p, \\ T^{-\frac{p}{2(1-\alpha)d}} 2^{\frac{pq}{d}n} & \text{if } (1-\alpha)d > p. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We distinguish among three cases.

Case (i): $(1-\alpha)d < p$. We have

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) \lesssim T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}} 2^{(p-\alpha q)n} + \sum_{n > \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}} 2^{-(q-p)n} \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \alpha q > p, \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log T & \text{if } \alpha q = p, \\ T^{-\frac{q-p}{2(1-\alpha)q}} & \text{if } \alpha q < p. \end{cases}$$

Case (ii): $(1-\alpha)d = p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) &\lesssim T^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\log T) \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}} 2^{(p-\alpha q)n} + \sum_{n > \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}} 2^{-(q-p)n} \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log T & \text{if } \alpha q > p, \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\log T)^2 & \text{if } \alpha q = p, \\ T^{-\frac{q-p}{2(1-\alpha)q}} \log T & \text{if } \alpha q < p. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Case (iii): $(1 - \alpha)d > p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\alpha(T) &\lesssim T^{-\frac{p}{2(1-\alpha)d}} \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}} 2^{[p-(1-\frac{p}{d})q]n} + \sum_{n > \frac{\log_2(T)}{2(1-\alpha)q}} 2^{-(q-p)n} \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{p}{2(1-\alpha)d}} & \text{if } q > \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ T^{-\frac{p}{2(1-\alpha)d}} \log T & \text{if } q = \frac{dp}{d-p}, \\ T^{-\frac{q-p}{2(1-\alpha)q}} & \text{if } q < \frac{dp}{d-p}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The assertion of Lemma 3.1 follows from these three cases. \square

Finally, Theorem 1.2 (resp. Theorem 1.3) follows from (3.12) and Lemma 3.1 with $\alpha = 1/4$ assuming **(H2)** (resp. $\alpha = 1/2$ assuming **(H3)**).

4 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We continue to use the notation introduced in the proof of Theorem 1.1. We use (3.1) and Lemma 2.2 with $T \geq 2$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon(T) := \lfloor T \rfloor^{-\theta} \simeq T^{-\theta}$. The parameter θ will be chosen in the course of the proof. Then,

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu) \lesssim T^{-p\theta} + \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} |(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n)|.$$

Let $N = N(T) := \lfloor \kappa \log_2 \lfloor T \rfloor \rfloor$, where the parameter $\kappa > 0$ which will be chosen later on. In particular, $2^N \simeq T^\kappa$. Set

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{J}_1(T) := \sum_{0 \leq n \leq N} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} |(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n)|$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{J}_2(T) := \sum_{n > N} 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} |(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n)|.$$

We are going to bound $\mathcal{J}_1(T)$ and $\mathcal{J}_2(T)$ separately.

Estimating $\mathcal{J}_1(T)$: For every $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$\phi_\epsilon(x, z) := \rho_\epsilon(x - z) - \mu(\rho_\epsilon(x - \cdot)), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

By (3.4), we have for every Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)| &= \left| \int_A \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_A \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} (2^n F \cap B_n) = B_n$ is a union of disjoint sets, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.4) \quad \mathcal{J}_1(T) &\leq \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{-p\ell} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \int_{2^n F \cap B_n} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| dx \\ &= (1 - 2^{-p})^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \int_{B_n} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\Phi(T) := \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \int_{B_n} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| dx.$$

We use Bernstein's inequality (Theorem 2.1(i)) to estimate $\Phi(T)$. We subdivide the cube $[-2^N, 2^N]^d$ into disjoint smaller cubes with side-length $h = h(T)$, where h is the reciprocal of an integer. The exact value of h will be chosen later. Let \mathcal{Q}_n denote the collection of all cubes from the above partition that are contained in B_n ; clearly $\#\mathcal{Q}_n = \text{vol}(B_n)/h^d$. Set $\mathcal{Q} := \cup_n \mathcal{Q}_n$. Denote by $x_Q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the centre of the cube $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(T) &\leq \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \int_Q \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x_Q, X_t) dt \right| dx \\ (4.5) \quad &+ \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \int_Q \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (\phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) - \phi_\epsilon(x_Q, X_t)) dt \right| dx \\ &=: \Phi_1(T) + \Phi_2(T). \end{aligned}$$

We begin with the estimate for $\Phi_2(T)$. Since for fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|\phi_\epsilon(x, z) - \phi_\epsilon(x', z)| \leq 2\|\nabla \rho_\epsilon\|_\infty |x - x'| = 2\|\nabla \rho\|_\infty \epsilon^{-(d+1)} |x - x'|, \quad x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad \Phi_2(T) &\leq 2\|\nabla \rho\|_\infty \cdot \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \int_Q \epsilon^{-(d+1)} |x - x_Q| dx \lesssim \epsilon^{-(d+1)} h \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{(p+d)n} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-(d+1)} h 2^{(p+d)N} \lesssim h T^{(p+d)\kappa + (d+1)\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

We will now estimate $\Phi_1(T)$. From the definition of ϕ_ϵ , we see that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mu(\phi_\epsilon(x, \cdot)) = 0, \quad \|\phi_\epsilon\|_\infty \leq 2\|\rho_\epsilon\|_\infty = 2\|\rho\|_\infty \epsilon^{-d}$$

and

$$\text{Var}_\mu(\phi_\epsilon(x, \cdot)) = \|\phi_\epsilon(x, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq \|\rho_\epsilon\|_\infty^2 \cdot \mu(B_\epsilon(x)) \leq C_1(1 + |x|)^{-q} \epsilon^{-2d},$$

where in the last line we used $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$ and the fact that $1 + |x| \leq 2(1 + |y|)$ for all $y \in B_\epsilon(x)$. In order to keep notation simple, we write $w(x) := 1 + |x|$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Putting all the estimates above together and using Theorem 2.1(i), we have for any $\delta > 0$ and $T \geq 2$

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| \geq \delta \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-C_2 T \epsilon^d \min \left\{ w(x)^{\frac{q}{2}} \epsilon^d \delta^2, \delta \right\} \right)$$

for a suitable constant $C_2 = C_2(\lambda, \|\rho\|_\infty) > 0$. Since $\text{vol}(Q) = h^d$ and $w(x_Q)^p \simeq 2^{np}$ as $x_Q \in B_n$, we get

$$(4.8) \quad \Phi_1(T) \lesssim h^d \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} w(x_Q)^p \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x_Q, X_t) dt \right|.$$

Now we use the elementary inequality $\mathbb{P}(\sum_i Z_i \geq \sum_i u_i) \leq \sum_i \mathbb{P}(Z_i \geq u_i)$, and combine it with (4.7) and (4.8) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\mu(\Phi_1(T) \geq \delta_T) &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{P}^\mu \left(\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi_\epsilon(x_Q, X_t) dt \right| \geq \frac{\alpha_Q \delta_T}{h^d w(x_Q)^p} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \exp \left(-C_2 T \epsilon^d \min \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^d \alpha_Q^2 \delta_T^2}{h^{2d} w(x_Q)^{2p - \frac{q}{2}}}, \frac{\alpha_Q \delta_T}{h^d w(x_Q)^p} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the above calculation, $\{\alpha_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \subset (0, 1)$ is any positive sequence with $\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \alpha_Q = 1$, and the parameter $\delta_T > 0$ will be chosen later in such a way that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \delta_T = 0$. We will use the following α_Q 's. Let $\{\beta_n\}_{0 \leq n \leq N} \subset (0, 1)$ such that $\sum_{n=0}^N \beta_n = 1$, and define

$$\alpha_Q := \frac{\beta_n}{\#\mathcal{Q}_n} = \frac{\beta_n}{\text{vol}(B_n)/h^d} \quad \text{for } Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n.$$

Then,

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu(\Phi_1(T) \geq \delta_T) \lesssim h^{-d} T^{d\kappa} \cdot \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \exp \left(-C_3 T \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{(\epsilon^d \delta_T)^2 \beta_n^2}{2^{(2p+2d-\frac{q}{2})n}}, \frac{\epsilon^d \delta_T \beta_n}{2^{(p+d)n}} \right\} \right),$$

where we used that $\text{vol}(B_n) \simeq 2^{dn}$ and $w(x_Q) \simeq 2^n$ for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$. Set $\zeta := \epsilon^d \delta_T \in (0, 1)$. By (4.9), we have

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu(\Phi_1(T) \geq \delta_T) \lesssim h^{-d} T^{d\kappa} \cdot \exp(-C_3 T \cdot K(\zeta)),$$

where

$$K(\zeta) := \max_{\beta_n : \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n = 1} \min_{1 \leq n \leq N} \min \left\{ \frac{\zeta^2 \beta_n^2}{2^{(2p+2d-\frac{q}{2})n}}, \frac{\zeta \beta_n}{2^{(p+d)n}} \right\}.$$

We will now determine the order of magnitude of $K(\zeta)$. From its definition, we see that there exist positive numbers $\{\beta_n\}_{0 \leq n \leq N}$ with $\sum_{n=0}^N \beta_n = 1$ such that, for each $n = 0, \dots, N$,

$$\frac{\zeta^2 \beta_n^2}{2^{(2p+2d-\frac{q}{2})n}} \geq K(\zeta) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\zeta \beta_n}{2^{(p+d)n}} \geq K(\zeta).$$

Therefore,

$$\beta_n \geq \zeta^{-1} \max \left\{ 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{K(\zeta)}, 2^{(p+d)n} K(\zeta) \right\}.$$

Using the fact that $\sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n = 1$ yields

$$(4.11) \quad \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{(p+d)n} \cdot \max \left\{ 2^{-\frac{q}{4}n} \sqrt{K(\zeta)}, K(\zeta) \right\} \leq \zeta.$$

It would be helpful to write the left-hand side of the previous inequality by using the function $S : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is defined as

$$S(r) := \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{(p+d)n} \cdot \max \left\{ 2^{-\frac{q}{4}n} \sqrt{r}, r \right\}.$$

Since the function $r \mapsto S(r)$ is strictly increasing, the equation $S(r) = \zeta$ has a unique solution, which we denote by r_* . In view of (4.11) we have $K(\zeta) \leq r_*$. Furthermore, we see that $K(\zeta) = r_*$, if we choose $\beta_n^* := \zeta^{-1} 2^{(p+d)n} \cdot \max \{ 2^{-\frac{q}{4}n} \sqrt{r_*}, r_* \}$. Set

$$s := \min \left\{ \lfloor 2/q \log_2(r_*^{-1}) \rfloor, N \right\} \in \{0, \dots, N\}.$$

Then,

$$S(r_*) = \sum_{n=0}^s 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*} + \sum_{n=s+1}^N 2^{(p+d)n} r_* = \zeta,$$

where we use the “empty sum convention”, i.e. $\sum_{N+1}^N := 0$. Consequently,

$$(4.12) \quad \max \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^s 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*}, \sum_{n=s+1}^N 2^{(p+d)n} r_* \right\} \simeq \zeta.$$

A elementary computation reveals that

$$(4.13) \quad K(\zeta) = r_* \simeq \begin{cases} \min \{ \zeta^2, 2^{-(p+d)N} \zeta \} & \text{if } p+d < \frac{q}{4}, \\ \min \left\{ \frac{\zeta^2}{(\log(\zeta^{-1}) \wedge N)^2}, 2^{-(p+d)N} \zeta \right\} & \text{if } p+d = \frac{q}{4}, \\ \min \{ 2^{-(2p+2d-\frac{q}{2})N} \zeta^2, 2^{-(p+d)N} \zeta \} & \text{if } p+d \in (\frac{q}{4}, \frac{q}{2}], \\ 2^{-(2p+2d-\frac{q}{2})N} \zeta^2 & \text{if } p+d > \frac{q}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Exemplarily, let us deal with the case $p+d > \frac{q}{4}$ in (4.13); the other regimes follow similarly. If $s < N$, that is, if $r_* > 2^{-\frac{q}{2}N}$, then

$$\sum_{n=0}^s 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*} < \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*} \lesssim 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})N} \sqrt{r_*} \lesssim 2^{(p+d)N} r_*,$$

so that

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^s 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*}, \sum_{n=s+1}^N 2^{(p+d)n} r_* \right\} \simeq \sum_{n=s+1}^N 2^{(p+d)n} r_* \simeq 2^{(p+d)N} r_*.$$

If $s = N$, that is, if $r_* \leq 2^{-\frac{q}{2}N}$, then

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^s 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*}, \sum_{n=s+1}^N 2^{(p+d)n} r_* \right\} = \sum_{n=0}^s 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})n} \sqrt{r_*} \simeq 2^{(p+d-\frac{q}{4})N} \sqrt{r_*}.$$

Combining these two cases with (4.12), we immediately obtain (4.13).

Recall that $N = N(T)$ was chosen in such a way that $2^N \simeq T^\kappa$. In order to apply the Borel–Cantelli lemma, we need to find $\zeta(T)$ such that $K(\zeta) = CT^{-1} \log T$ for a sufficiently large C . Since $\epsilon(T) \simeq T^{-\theta}$ and $\zeta = \epsilon^d \delta_T$, it follows from (4.13) that the choice

$$(4.14) \quad \delta_T := \begin{cases} T^{-[1-(p+d)\kappa-d\theta]} \log T & \text{if } p+d \leq \frac{q}{2}, p+d \neq \frac{q}{4}, \min\{p+d, \frac{q}{4}\}\kappa \geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ & \text{or } p+d = \frac{q}{4}, (p+d)\kappa > \frac{1}{2}; \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}+d\theta} (\log T)^{\frac{3}{2}} & \text{if } p+d = \frac{q}{4}, (p+d)\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2}; \\ T^{-[\frac{1}{2}-(p+d-\frac{q}{4})+\kappa-d\theta]} (\log T)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } p+d \leq \frac{q}{2}, p+d \neq \frac{q}{4}, \min\{p+d, \frac{q}{4}\}\kappa < \frac{1}{2}, \\ & \text{or } p+d > \frac{q}{2} \end{cases}$$

achieves $K(\epsilon^d \delta_T) \simeq T^{-1} \log T$. Of course, the parameters $\kappa, \theta > 0$ have to be sufficiently small, so that all powers of T appearing in the expression for δ_T are negative.

Once κ and θ are fixed, we can choose $h = h(T) = \lfloor T \rfloor^{-\nu}$ in (4.6) with a sufficiently large integer $\nu > 0$, which ensures that

$$(4.15) \quad \Phi_2(T) = o(\delta_T) \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

As $h = h(T)$ is determined, we can combine (4.10) and (4.13) with (4.14), and find a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$(4.16) \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu(\Phi_1(T) \geq C_4 \delta_T) \lesssim T^{-2},$$

where δ_T is defined by (4.14).

Set $T := T_k := k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq 2$. From (4.5), (4.15), (4.16) and the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we obtain

$$(4.17) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(T_k)}{\delta_{T_k}} \leq M \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for some constant $M > 0$. If $T \geq 2$ is not an integer, then, by construction, $N(T) = N(\lfloor T \rfloor)$ and $\epsilon(T) = \epsilon(\lfloor T \rfloor)$. Because of the definition of Φ ,

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi(T) &\leq \frac{\lfloor T \rfloor}{T} \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \int_{B_n} \left| \frac{1}{\lfloor T \rfloor} \int_0^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| dx + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{pn} \int_{B_n} \left| \int_{\lfloor T \rfloor}^T \phi_\epsilon(x, X_t) dt \right| dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{\lfloor T \rfloor}{T} \Phi(\lfloor T \rfloor) + \frac{1}{T} \cdot \sum_{n=0}^N 2^{(p+d)n} \|\phi_\epsilon\|_\infty \\ &\leq \Phi(\lfloor T \rfloor) + O(T^{-[1-(p+d)\kappa-d\theta]}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.4), (4.17) and (4.18), we deduce that there is some constant $M' > 0$ such that

$$(4.19) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}_1(T)}{\delta_T + T^{-[1-(p+d)\kappa-d\theta]}} \leq M' \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Estimating $\mathcal{J}_2(T)$. Now we bound the term $\mathcal{J}_2(T)$ from (4.3). It follows from (3.2) that, for any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$|(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(A)| \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in A) dt + \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in A),$$

where X denotes a random variable that is independent of ξ and has the law μ . Then, for each $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} |(\mu_T * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n) - (\mu * \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon\xi})(2^n F \cap B_n)| \\ &\leq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in 2^n F \cap B_n) dt + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{P}_\ell} \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in 2^n F \cap B_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in B_n) dt + \mathbb{P}(X + \epsilon\xi \in B_n) \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_t \in B_n^\epsilon\}} dt + \mu(B_n^\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that if $X_t \notin B_n^\epsilon$ then $\mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in B_n) = 0$, and so $\mathbb{P}(X_t + \epsilon\xi \in B_n) \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{X_t \in B_n^\epsilon\}}$.

Recall that $\epsilon(T) \simeq T^{-\theta}$ and $N(T) \simeq \log_2 T$. If $T \gg 1$ is sufficiently large, then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $n > N(T)$ and $x \in B_n^\epsilon$,

$$c2^n \leq |x| \leq c^{-1}2^n.$$

Combining this with (4.20), we obtain for sufficiently large T there exists $c' > 0$ such that

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_2(T) &\leq (1 - 2^{-p})^{-1} \sum_{n > N} 2^{pn} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_t \in B_n^\epsilon\}} dt + \mu(B_n^\epsilon) \right) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n > N} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |X_t|^p \mathbb{1}_{\{c2^n \leq |X_t| \leq c^{-1}2^n\}} dt + \mu(|\cdot|^p \mathbb{1}_{\{c2^n \leq |\cdot| \leq c^{-1}2^n\}}) \right\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |X_t|^p \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_t| \geq c'T^\kappa\}} dt + \mu(|\cdot|^p \mathbb{1}_{\{|\cdot| \geq c'T^\kappa\}}) =: \Psi_1(T) + \Psi_2(T). \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we use the elementary estimate $\|\sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{1}_{\{c2^n \leq |\cdot| \leq c^{-1}2^n\}}\|_\infty < \infty$.

The term $\Psi_2(T)$ is deterministic. Since $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$, the Markov inequality shows that

$$(4.22) \quad \Psi_2(T) \lesssim T^{-(q-p)\kappa}.$$

Let us turn to $\Psi_1(T)$. Split this term into two parts

$$\Psi_1(T) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^2 |X_t|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_t| \geq c'T^\kappa\}} dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_2^T |X_t|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_t| \geq c'T^\kappa\}} dt =: \Psi_{1,1}(T) + \Psi_{1,2}(T).$$

Clearly,

$$\Psi_{1,1}(T) \lesssim T^{-1-(q-p)\kappa} \int_0^2 |X_t|^q dt.$$

Using the Tonelli-Fubini theorem,

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu \left[\int_0^2 |X_t|^q dt \right] = \int_0^2 \mathbb{E}^\mu [|X_t|^q] dt < \infty,$$

which implies that $\int_0^2 |X_t|^q dt < \infty$ almost surely. Thus,

$$(4.23) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_{1,1}(T)}{T^{-1-(q-p)\kappa}} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Using the Tonelli-Fubini theorem once again, we get for any $\eta > 1$

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu \left[\int_2^\infty \frac{|X_t|^q}{t(\log t)^\eta} dt \right] = \int_2^\infty \frac{\mathbb{E}^\mu [|X_t|^q]}{t(\log t)^\eta} dt < \infty.$$

Consequently, $\int_2^\infty \frac{|X_t|^q}{t(\log t)^\eta} dt < \infty$ almost surely. Since

$$\Psi_{1,2}(T) \lesssim T^{-(q-p)\kappa} \cdot \frac{1}{T} \int_2^T |X_t|^q dt \lesssim T^{-(q-p)\kappa} (\log T)^\eta \cdot \int_2^T \frac{|X_t|^q}{t(\log t)^\eta} dt,$$

we deduce that for any $\eta > 1$,

$$(4.24) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_{1,2}(T)}{T^{-(q-p)\kappa} (\log T)^\eta} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

From (4.21)–(4.24), we obtain that for any $\eta > 1$,

$$(4.25) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}_2(T)}{T^{-(q-p)\kappa} (\log T)^\eta} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Combining (4.1), (4.2), (4.3) and (4.19) with (4.25), and optimizing in $\kappa, \theta > 0$, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)}{R_\eta(T)} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where the rate function $R_\eta(T)$ is given by (1.6). To see this, we deal with the case $p + d = \frac{q}{4}$; the remaining regimes follow with similar arguments. Indeed, it suffices to choose $\kappa, \theta > 0$ so as to maximize

$$\min \left\{ 1 - \max \left\{ (p + d)\kappa, \frac{1}{2} \right\} - d\theta, (q - p)\kappa, p\theta \right\}.$$

The optimal choice can be taken as $\kappa = \theta = \frac{1}{2(p+d)}$. This gives precisely the rate function (1.6).

If assumption **(H2)** is replaced by **(H3)**, then the Bernstein inequality improves from the form of Theorem 2.1(i) to that in Theorem 2.1(ii). Consequently, in (4.7) $q/2$ should be replaced by q , causing the same change in (4.14). The same argument, with (4.25) unchanged, now yields

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)}{\tilde{R}_\eta(T)} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where the rate function $\tilde{R}_\eta(T)$ is given by (1.8).

5 Examples

In this section, we present several examples to illustrate our main results and subsequently compare them with related results in the literature.

5.1 Diffusions

Consider the following SDE

$$(5.1) \quad dX_t = b(X_t) dt + \sigma(X_t) dW_t$$

with measurable coefficients $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$. The recent paper [5] establishes convergence rates in the W_2 -distance assuming uniform dissipativity and Lipschitz continuity of the coefficients. The argument in [5] relies essentially on assumption **(H1)**, so Theorem 1.1 applies directly to that setting and yields, in addition, bounds in the \mathcal{T}_p -distance for general $p > 0$. In the following example, we consider a slightly different case where **(H1)** holds under a weaker long-distance dissipativity condition, cf. (II).

Example 5.1. Assume that $\sigma(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is uniformly elliptic, i.e., there is a constant $\theta > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma(x)\sigma^\top(x) \geq \theta \mathbb{I}_{d \times d}$. Write

$$(\sigma\sigma^\top)(x) = \theta \mathbb{I}_{d \times d} + (\hat{\sigma}\hat{\sigma}^\top)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\hat{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is measurable. Assume also that there are constants $L, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, R > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(I) \quad \|\hat{\sigma}(x) - \hat{\sigma}(y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq L|x - y|,$$

$$(II) \quad 2\langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle + \|\hat{\sigma}(x) - \hat{\sigma}(y)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq \phi(|x - y|)|x - y|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, and the function $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\phi(r) := r \cdot \left[\alpha_1 \mathbb{1}_{[0, R]}(r) + \left\{ \alpha_1 - (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \left(\frac{r}{R} - 1 \right) \right\} \mathbb{1}_{(R, 2R]}(r) - \alpha_2 \mathbb{1}_{(2R, \infty)}(r) \right].$$

Then, the SDE (5.1) admits a unique strong solution $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, and has a unique invariant probability measure μ satisfying $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$ for some $q > 2$. Moreover, we have for $\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)]$ and any $p < q$ the bound (1.2).

Proof. It is shown in [12, Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.4] that, under assumptions on the coefficients b and σ in the example, the SDE (5.1) has a unique strong solution $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, and has a unique invariant probability measure μ such that **(H1)** is satisfied. In order to apply Theorem 1.1, we need to show only that $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$ for some $q > 2$.

For $q > 2$, set $g(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}$. Then

$$\nabla g(x) = q(1 + |x|^2)^{-1}g(x)x, \quad \nabla^2 g(x) = q(1 + |x|^2)^{-1}g(x) \left(\mathbb{I}_{d \times d} + \frac{q-2}{1 + |x|^2}xx^\top \right),$$

Since the generator of the solution of the SDE (5.1) is

$$\mathcal{L}f(x) = \langle b(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}((\sigma\sigma^\top)(x)\nabla^2 f(x)), \quad f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

a short computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}g(x) &= q(1 + |x|^2)^{-1}g(x) \cdot \left[\langle b(x), x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}((\sigma\sigma^\top)(x)) + \frac{q-2}{2(1 + |x|^2)}|\sigma^\top(x)x|^2 \right] \\ &\leq q(1 + |x|^2)^{-1}g(x) \cdot \left[\langle b(x), x \rangle + \frac{q-1}{2}\|\hat{\sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \frac{\theta(q+d-2)}{2} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to

$$\text{Tr}((\sigma\sigma^\top)(x)) = \theta d + \|\hat{\sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2, \quad |\sigma^\top(x)x|^2 \leq \theta|x|^2 + \|\hat{\sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2|x|^2.$$

By the assumptions (I), (II) and the triangle inequality, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle b(x), x \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{\sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\leq \langle b(x), x \rangle + \frac{1}{2}[(1 + \epsilon)\|\hat{\sigma}(x) - \hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + (1 + \epsilon^{-1})\|\hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \\ &\leq \langle b(x) - b(0), x \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{\sigma}(x) - \hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \langle b(0), x \rangle + \frac{\epsilon L^2}{2}|x|^2 + \frac{(1 + \epsilon^{-1})}{2}\|\hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\phi(|x|)|x|}{2} + \frac{\epsilon(1 + L^2)}{2}|x|^2 + \frac{\epsilon^{-1}|b(0)|^2}{2} + \frac{1 + \epsilon^{-1}}{2}\|\hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\hat{\sigma}(x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq (L|x| + \|\hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}})^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)L^2|x|^2 + (1 + \epsilon^{-1})\|\hat{\sigma}(0)\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$

The above estimates and the definition of ϕ show that for any $2 < q < 2 + \alpha_2 L^{-2}$, one can choose ϵ sufficiently small so that there exist constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$ so that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{L}g(x) \leq K_1 - K_2 g(x).$$

Together with the invariance of μ , this implies that $\mu(|\cdot|^q) < \infty$. □

For the classical Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, our approach yields the p -Wasserstein convergence rate for the empirical measure. The next example treats a more general case, which has originally been considered by Wang in [23, Example 1.4].

Example 5.2. Suppose that

$$(5.2) \quad \sigma(x) = \mathbb{I}_{d \times d}, \quad b(x) = -\kappa\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}x + \nabla\varphi(x),$$

where $\alpha > 1$, $\kappa > 0$, and $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies $\|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty < \infty$. Then the SDE (5.1) has a unique strong solution $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, and has a unique invariant probability measure

$$\mu(dx) := \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\kappa|x|^\alpha + \varphi(x)} dx, \quad Z := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\kappa|y|^\alpha + \varphi(y)} dy.$$

Define, for $R > 1$, a smooth function $J(x)$ satisfying $J(x) = e^{|x|}$ for $|x| \geq R$ and $J(x) \geq 1$ for $|x| < R$. By $\|\nabla\varphi\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\alpha > 1$, we can show that, for $R > 1$ large enough,

$$\mathcal{L}J \leq -c_1J + c_2\mathbf{1}_{B_R(0)}$$

holds with some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$, where $\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{2}\Delta + \langle b, \nabla \rangle$ is the generator of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that is symmetric with respect to μ . From Lyapunov's criterion (see, e.g., [2, Theorem 4.6.2]), we can conclude that the assumption **(H3)** is satisfied. Consequently, Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 apply, yielding bounds for $\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)]$ as well as almost sure bounds for $\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)$.

When $p = 2$, by a different method, [23, (1.20)] establishes that

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_2(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{(d-2)\alpha+2}} & \text{if } 4(\alpha-1) < d\alpha, \\ T^{-1} \log(1+T) & \text{if } 4(\alpha-1) = d\alpha, \\ T^{-1} & \text{if } 4(\alpha-1) > d\alpha. \end{cases}$$

Our results here extend the findings of [23] to any $p > 0$ and yield sharper bounds for $p = 2$, provided that $1 < \alpha < \alpha_c(d)$, where

$$\alpha_c(d) := \begin{cases} \frac{6}{6-d} & \text{if } d < 4, \\ \frac{d+2}{2} & \text{if } d \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, let $\kappa = 1$, $\alpha = 2$ and $\varphi = 0$ in (5.2). Then we get the classical Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process. Combining (1.5) with (5.3), we obtain the best known bound for its empirical measure under the \mathbb{W}_2 distance.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the d -dimensional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process defined by*

$$dX_t = -X_t dt + dW_t.$$

Then its empirical measures μ_T satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu[\mathcal{T}_2(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-1} & \text{if } d = 1, \\ T^{-1} \log T & \text{if } d = 2, \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } d = 3, \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log T & \text{if } d = 4, \\ T^{-\frac{2}{d}} & \text{if } d \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

5.2 Underdamped Langevin Dynamics

Let us consider the following underdamped Langevin dynamics $(X_t)_{t \geq 0} = (Y_t, Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{cases} dY_t = Z_t dt, \\ dZ_t = -(Z_t + \nabla V(Y_t)) dt + \sqrt{2} dW_t, \end{cases}$$

where $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a confining potential, and $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the standard n -dimensional Brownian motion. Under mild assumptions (see [17, Chapter 6]), the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by (5.4) has a unique invariant probability measure given by

$$\mu(dy, dz) := \mu_V(dy) \mathcal{N}(dz) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{2n}),$$

where \mathcal{N} is the standard Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R}^n and

$$\mu_V(dy) := \frac{1}{Z_V} e^{-V(y)} dy, \quad Z_V := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-V(x)} dx.$$

Let $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the associated Markov semigroup of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, whose infinitesimal generator is

$$\mathcal{L} = \Delta_z - \langle z + \nabla V(y), \nabla_z \rangle + \langle z, \nabla_y \rangle, \quad (y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In order to apply our main results to (5.4), we have to verify the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H3)**.

We first note that, in general, assumption **(H3)** is not expected to hold for this dynamics. Indeed, for any potential V satisfying $\mu_V(|y|^2) < \infty$, denote $m_V := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} y \mu_V(dy) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let us consider the function $f(y, z) = \langle a, y - m_V \rangle$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a fixed nonzero vector. Clearly, f is in the (extended) domain of \mathcal{L} and with $(\mathcal{L}f)(y, z) = \langle a, z \rangle$. Moreover, it's obvious that $\mu(f) = \langle a, \mu_V(y - m_V) \rangle = 0$. Note that

$$\langle \mathcal{L}f, f \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle a, y - m_V \rangle \mu_V(dy) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle a, z \rangle \mathcal{N}(dz) = 0;$$

thus **(H3)** does not hold.

The assumptions **(H1)** and **(H2)** are known to hold under suitable conditions on V , see [18, Section 2] and [3], respectively; a very recent work [16] indicates validity of **(H2)** in the non-equilibrium case. Therefore, our results apply to the underdamped Langevin dynamics (5.4), and yield quantitative Wasserstein convergence rates for the empirical measures. From now on, we focus on the case where **(H2)** holds. In this setting, we may use the main theorem of [3]. As in [3], we impose the following assumptions on $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

- (i) Assume that the potential V satisfies a Poincaré inequality: there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $f \in H^1(\mu_V)$ (this is the standard Sobolev space) with $\mu_V(f) = 0$,

$$\mu_V(f^2) \leq c_1 \mu_V(|\nabla f|^2).$$

- (ii) The potential satisfies $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and there exist constants $c_2 \geq 1$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n |\partial_{ij} V(y)|^2 \leq c_2 (1 + |\nabla V(y)|^2), \quad \Delta V(y) \leq c_2 + \frac{\delta}{2} |\nabla V(y)|^2.$$

- (iii) The embedding $H^1(\mu_V) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mu_V)$ is compact.

The assumption (i) implies the exponential integrability of Lipschitz functions with respect to μ_V , see e.g. [2, Section 4.4.2], and therefore the measure $\mu = \mu_V \otimes \mathcal{N}$ has finite moments of any order. The assumption (iii) is satisfied, if

$$\lim_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V(y)}{|y|^\beta} = \infty$$

for some $\beta > 1$, see [3] for details. Under the above assumptions, Theorem 1 in [3] yields **(H2')**, which implies **(H2)**, cf. the discussion in Section 2.1. Thus, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.4. Assume that the potential V satisfies (i)–(iii). Then, for the underdamped Langevin dynamics $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by (5.4) and any $p > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } p > \frac{3}{2}n, \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log T & \text{if } p = \frac{3}{2}n, \\ T^{-\frac{p}{3n}} & \text{if } p < \frac{3}{2}n, \end{cases}$$

and for any $\eta > 1$,

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{T}_p(\mu_T, \mu)}{T^{-\frac{p}{2(p+2n)}} (\log T)^\eta} < \infty \quad a.s.$$

To further illustrate our results, we consider [24, Example 3.1] in the special case where $m = n$. The potential is given by

$$V(y) = \psi(y) + (1 + c|y|^2)^\theta, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\psi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and constants $c > 0$ and $\theta > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, assumptions (i)–(iii) are satisfied (for the verification of (i), see [24, Example 2.1]). Therefore, for $p = 2$, Corollary 5.4 yields

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu [\mathcal{T}_2(\mu_T, \mu)] \lesssim \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } n = 1, \\ T^{-\frac{2}{3n}} & \text{if } n \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

which improves the bound in [24, (3.24)] in the case $m = n \geq 2$ and $\alpha = 1$.

Acknowledgement. R.L. Schilling is supported by the ScaDS.AI centre (TU Dresden, Universität Leipzig). J. Wang is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2022YFA1006003) and the NNSFC (Grant Nos. 12225104 and 12531007). B. Wu is supported by the National Key R & D Program of China (Grant Nos. 2023YFA1010400 and 2022YFA1006003), the NNSFC (Grant No. 12401174), the Natural Science Foundation-Fujian (Grant No. 2024J08051), Fujian Alliance of Mathematics (Grant No. 2023SXLQM02), the Education and Scientific Research Project for Young and Middle-aged Teachers in Fujian Province of China (Grant No. JAT231014) and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. J.-X. Zhu acknowledges support from the Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (Grant No. 25ZR1402414) and the NNSFC (Grant Nos. 12271102 and 12501185).

References

- [1] Ambrosio, L.; Stra, F.; Trevisan, D.: A PDE approach to a 2-dimensional matching problem. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **173** (2019), 433–477.
- [2] Bakry, D.; Gentil, I.; Ledoux, M.: *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators*. Springer, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. **348**, Cham, 2014.
- [3] Cao, Y.; Lu, J.; Wang, L.: On explicit L^2 -convergence rate estimate for underdamped Langevin dynamics. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **247** (2023), Paper No. 90.
- [4] Cattiaux, P.; Fathi, M.; Guillin, A.: Self-improvement of the Bakry-Emery criterion for Poincaré inequalities and Wasserstein contraction using variable curvature bounds. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **166** (2022) 1–29.
- [5] Chassagneux, J.-F.; Pagès, G.: A note on the W_2 -convergence rate of the empirical measure of an ergodic \mathbb{R}^d -valued diffusion. *ArXiv preprint* arXiv:2502.07704.

- [6] Dereich, S.; Scheutnow, M.; Schottstedt, R.: Constructive quantization: approximation by empirical measures. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **49** (2013) 1183–1203.
- [7] Du, K.; Jiang Y.; Li, J.: Empirical approximation to invariant measures for McKean-Vlasov processes: mean-field interaction vs self-interaction, *Bernoulli* **29** (2023), 2492–2518.
- [8] Eberle, A.: Reflection coupling and Wasserstein contractivity without convexity. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **349** (2011) 1101–1104.
- [9] Fournier, N.; Guillin, A.: On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **162** (2015) 707–738.
- [10] Horowitz, J.; Karandikar, R.L.: Mean rates of convergence of empirical measures in the Wasserstein metric. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **55** (1994) 261–273.
- [11] Huang, D.; Li, X.: Bernstein-type inequalities for Markov chains and Markov processes: A simple and robust proof. *Bernoulli* (to appear). *ArXiv preprint* arXiv:2408.04930.
- [12] Huang, X.; Li, H.; Mu, L.: Exponential ergodicity in W_1 for SDEs with distribution dependent noise and partially dissipative drifts. *ArXiv preprint* arXiv:2411.14090.
- [13] Ledoux, M.: On optimal matching of Gaussian samples. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* 457, *Veroyatnost’i Statistika.* **457** (2017) 226–264 [Reprinted in *Journal of Mathematical Sciences* **238** (2019) 495–522].
- [14] Lezaud, P.: Chernoff and Berry-Esséen inequalities for Markov processes. *ESAIM Probab. Statist.* **5** (2001) 183–201.
- [15] Luo, D.; Wang, J.: Exponential convergence in L^p -Wasserstein distance for diffusion processes without uniformly dissipative drift. *Math. Nachr.* **289** (2016) 1909–1926.
- [16] Monmarché P.: L^2 geometric ergodicity for the kinetic Langevin process with non-equilibrium steady states. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **30** (2025) 1–7.
- [17] Pavliotis, G.A.: *Stochastic Processes and Applications: Diffusion Processes, the Fokker-Planck and Langevin Equations*. Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. **60**, Springer, New York 2014.
- [18] Schuh, K.: Global contractivity for Langevin dynamics with distribution-dependent forces and uniform in time propagation of chaos. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **60** (2024) 753–789.
- [19] Trevisan, D.; Wang, F.-Y.; Zhu, J.-X.: Wasserstein asymptotics for empirical measures of diffusions on four dimensional closed manifolds, *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **30** (2025), Paper No. 68.
- [20] Villani, C.: *Topics in Optimal Transportation*, American Mathematical Society, Graduate Studies Math. **58**, Providence (RI), 2003.
- [21] Wang, F.-Y.: *Functional Inequalities, Markov Semigroups and Spectral Theory*. Science Press, Beijing, 2005.
- [22] Wang, F.-Y.: Exponential contraction in Wasserstein distances for diffusion semigroups with negative curvature. *Potential Anal.* **53** (2020) 1123–1144.

- [23] Wang, F.-Y.: Wasserstein convergence rate for empirical measures on noncompact manifolds. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **144** (2022) 271–287.
- [24] Wang, F.-Y.: Wasserstein convergence rate for empirical measures of Markov processes. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **92** (2025) Paper No. 4.
- [25] Wang, F.-Y.; Wu, B.; Zhu, J.-X.: Sharp L^q -convergence rate in p -Wasserstein distance for empirical measures of diffusion processes. *ArXiv preprint* arXiv:2408.09116.

René L. Schilling: Institut für Mathematische Stochastik, Fakultät Mathematik, TU Dresden, Dresden 01062, Germany.
 rene.schilling@tu-dresden.de

Jian Wang: School of Mathematics and Statistics & Key Laboratory of Analytical Mathematics and Applications (Ministry of Education) & Fujian Provincial Key Laboratory of Statistics and Artificial Intelligence, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou 350007, China.
 jianwang@fjnu.edu.cn

Bingyao Wu: School of Mathematics and Statistics & Key Laboratory of Analytical Mathematics and Applications (Ministry of Education), Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou 350007, China;

Current address: Institut für Mathematische Stochastik, Fakultät Mathematik, TU Dresden, Dresden 01062, Germany.
 bingyaowu@163.com

Jie-Xiang Zhu: Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, China.
 jiexiangzhu7@gmail.com