

Exponential Contraction in Wasserstein Distances for Diffusion Semigroups with Negative Curvature*

Feng-Yu Wang

Laboratory of Mathematical and Complex Systems, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

Department of Mathematics, Swansea University, Singleton Park, SA2 8PP, United Kingdom

wangfy@bnu.edu.cn, F.-Y.Wang@swansea.ac.uk

November 24, 2016

Abstract

Let P_t be the (Neumann) diffusion semigroup P_t generated by a weighted Laplacian on a complete connected Riemannian manifold M without boundary or with a convex boundary. It is well known that the Bakry-Emery curvature is bounded below by a positive constant $\lambda > 0$ if and only if

$$W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq e^{-\lambda t} W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad t \geq 0, p \geq 1$$

holds for all probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on M , where W_p is the L^p Wasserstein distance induced by the Riemannian distance. In this paper, we prove the exponential contraction

$$W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq ce^{-\lambda t} W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad p \geq 1, t \geq 0$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$ for a class of diffusion semigroups with negative curvature where the constant c is essentially larger than 1. Similar results are derived for SDEs with multiplicative noise by using explicit conditions on the coefficients, which are new even for SDEs with additive noise.

AMS subject Classification: 60J75, 47G20, 60G52.

Keywords: Wasserstein distance, diffusion semigroup, Riemannian manifold, curvature condition, SDEs with multiplicative noise.

*Supported in part by NNSFC (11131003, 11431014).

1 Introduction

Let M be a d -dimensional connected complete Riemannian manifold possibly with a convex boundary ∂M . Let ρ be the Riemannian distance. Consider $L = \Delta + Z$ for the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ and some C^1 -vector field Z such that the (reflecting) diffusion process generated by L is non-explosive. Then the associated Markov semigroup P_t is the (Neumann if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$) semigroup generated by L on M . In particular, it is the case when the curvature of L is bounded below; that is,

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Ric}_Z := \text{Ric} - \nabla Z \geq K$$

holds for some constant $K \in \mathbb{R}$. Here and throughout the paper, we write $\mathcal{T} \geq h$ for a (not necessarily symmetric) 2-tensor \mathcal{T} and a function h provided

$$\mathcal{T}(X, X) \geq h(x)|X|^2, \quad X \in T_x M, x \in M.$$

There exist many inequalities on P_t which are equivalent to the curvature condition (1.1), see [5, 19, 22, 39] for details. In particular, for any constant $K \in \mathbb{R}$, the Wasserstein distance inequality

$$(1.2) \quad W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq e^{-Kt} W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad t \geq 0, p \geq 1, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$$

is equivalent to the curvature condition (1.1). Here, $\mathcal{P}(M)$ is the class of all probability measures on M ; W_p is the L^p -Wasserstein distance induced by ρ , i.e.,

$$W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \|\rho\|_{L^p(\pi)}, \quad \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(M),$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the class of all couplings of μ_1 and μ_2 ; and for a Markov operator P on $\mathcal{B}_b(M)$ (i.e. P is a positivity-preserving linear operator with $P1 = 1$),

$$(\nu P)(A) := \nu(P1_A), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(M), \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M),$$

where $\nu(f) := \int_M f d\nu$ for $f \in L^1(\nu)$. In some references, νP is also denoted by $P^* \nu$. In the sequel we will use P_t^* to stand for the adjoint operator of P_t in $L^2(\mu)$ for the invariant probability measure μ , hence adopt the notation νP rather than $P^* \nu$ to avoid confusion. When the curvature is positive (i.e. $K > 0$), (1.2) implies the W_p -exponential contraction of P_t for $p \geq 1$.

In this paper, we aim to consider the case when (1.1) only holds for some negative constant K , and to prove the exponential contraction

$$(1.3) \quad W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq c e^{-\lambda t} W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad t \geq 0, p \geq 1, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$. It is crucial that the exponential rate λ is independent of p . Due to the equivalence of (1.1) and (1.2), in the negative curvature case it is essential that $c > 1$.

According to [34], even when Ric_Z is unbounded below, i.e. Ric_Z goes to $-\infty$ when $\rho_o := \rho(o, \cdot) \rightarrow \infty$ for a fixed $o \in M$, there may exist the log-Sobolev inequality which implies the exponential convergence of P_t in entropy. This suggests that (1.3) may also hold for a class of diffusion semigroups with negative curvature.

Recently, some efforts have been made in this direction for $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, see [10, 11, 17]. More precisely, let P_t be the diffusion semigroup for the solution to the following SDE on \mathbb{R}^d :

$$dX_t = \sqrt{2} dB_t + b(X_t)dt,$$

where B_t is the d -dimensional Brownian motion and $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous. If there exist constants $K_1, K_2, r_0 > 0$ such that

$$(1.4) \quad \langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle \leq 1_{|x-y| \leq r_0} (K_1 + K_2)|x - y|^2 - K_2|x - y|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

then due to [10, 11] we have

$$(1.5) \quad W_1(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq ce^{-\lambda t}|x - y|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$, where δ_x is the Dirac measure at point x . Indeed, [10, 11] proved the W_1 -exponential contraction with respect to a modified distance $f(|x - y|)$ in place of $|x - y|$ as constructed in [7, 8] for estimates of the spectral gap using the coupling by reflection. Under condition (1.4) the modified distance is comparable with the usual one so that (1.5) follows. As mentioned in [11] that there is essential difficulty to prove (1.3) for $p > 1$ even for this flat case.

In Luo and Wang [17] the estimate (1.5) was extended as

$$(1.6) \quad W_p(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq ce^{-\lambda t/p}(|x - y| + |x - y|^{\frac{1}{p}}), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0, p \geq 1$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$. Comparing with (1.3) which is equivalent to

$$W_p(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq ce^{-\lambda t}|x - y|, \quad p \geq 1, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \geq 0$$

according to [16] (see Proposition 3.1 below), (1.6) is less sharp for small $|x - y|$ and/or large p . It is open whether (1.4), or in the Riemannian setting that Ric_Z is uniformly positive outside a compact domain, implies (1.3) for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$.

As in [15, 16], we will consider the Wasserstein distances induced by Young functions in the class

$$\mathcal{N} := \left\{ \Phi \in C^1([0, \infty); [0, \infty)) : \Phi' \text{ is nonnegative and increasing,} \right. \\ \left. \Phi(0) = 0, \Phi(r) > 0 \text{ for } r > 0, \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(r)}{r} = \infty \right\}.$$

For any $\Phi \in \mathcal{N}$ and a measure ν on M , consider the gauge norm in $L^\Phi(\nu)$:

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)} := \inf \left\{ r > 0 : \nu(\Phi(r^{-1}|f|)) \leq 1 \right\}, \quad \inf \emptyset := \infty.$$

In particular, we have $\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_p}(\nu)} = \|f\|_{L^p(\nu)}$ for $\Phi_p(r) := r^p$, $p \in (1, \infty)$. This is the reason why we do not take $\Phi_p(r) = \frac{1}{p}r^p$ in the characterization of Legendre conjugates. We extend the notion Φ_p to $p = 1, \infty$ by letting $\Phi_1(r) = r$, $\Phi_\infty = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_p$ and $\|f\|_{L^{\Phi_p}(\nu)} = \|f\|_{L^p(\nu)}$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$. Now, let

$$W_\Phi(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \|\rho\|_{L^\Phi(\pi)}, \quad \Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}} := \mathcal{N} \cup \{\Phi_1, \Phi_\infty\}.$$

In particular, $W_{\Phi_p} = W_p$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$. We aim to prove the exponential decay

$$(1.7) \quad W_\Phi(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq c\Phi^{-1}(1)e^{-\lambda t} \rho(x, y), \quad x, y \in M, t \geq 0, \Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$$

when (1.1) only holds for a negative constant K , where Φ^{-1} is the inverse of $\Phi (\neq \Phi_\infty)$ and we set $\Phi_\infty^{-1}(1) = 1$ by convention.

To extend condition (1.4) to the Riemannian setting, consider the index

$$I(x, y) = \int_0^{\rho(x, y)} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \left\{ |\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} J_i|^2 - \langle \mathcal{R}(\dot{\gamma}, J_i)\dot{\gamma}, J_i \rangle \right\} (\gamma_s) ds, \quad x, y \in M,$$

where ρ is the Riemannian distance, \mathcal{R} is the curvature tensor; $\gamma : [0, \rho(x, y)] \rightarrow M$ is the minimal geodesic from x to y with unit speed; $\{J_i\}_{i=1}^{d-1}$ are Jacobi fields along γ such that

$$J_i(y) = P_{x, y} J_i(x), \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1$$

holds for the parallel transform $P_{x, y} : T_x M \rightarrow T_y M$ along the geodesic γ , and $\{\dot{\gamma}(s), J_i(s) : 1 \leq i \leq d-1\}$ ($s = 0, \rho(x, y)$) is an orthonormal basis of the tangent space (at points x and y , respectively).

Note that when $(x, y) \in \text{Cut}(M)$, i.e. x is in the cut-locus of y , the minimal geodesic may be not unique. As a convention in the literature, all conditions on the index I are given outside $\text{Cut}(M)$. We now extend condition (1.4) to the non-flat case as follows: for some constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$,

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} I_Z(x, y) &:= I(x, y) + \langle Z, \nabla \rho(\cdot, y) \rangle(x) + \langle Z, \nabla \rho(x, \cdot) \rangle(y) \\ &\leq \{(K_1 + K_2)1_{\{\rho(x, y) \leq r_0\}} - K_2\} \rho(x, y), \quad x, y \in M. \end{aligned}$$

In the flat case we have $I(x, y) = 0$ and $\rho(x, y) = |x - y|$, so that this condition reduces back to (1.4). Moreover, the curvature condition (1.1) is equivalent to

$$I_Z(x, y) \leq -K\rho(x, y), \quad x, y \in M,$$

so that (1.8) implies $\text{Ric}_Z \geq -(K_1 + K_2)$.

In the next section, we state our main results and present examples. With condition (1.8) we first extend the main results of [10, 17] to the present Riemannian setting and give the exponential convergence of P_t in W_2 . Under the ultracontractivity and condition (1.1) for some $K < 0$, our the second result ensures the desired inequality (1.7). Finally, we extend these results to SDEs with multiplicative noise by using explicit conditions on the coefficients. To prove these results, we make some preparations in Section 3. Complete proofs of the main results are addressed in Sections 4-6 respectively.

2 Main Results and examples

We first consider the Riemannian setting, then extend to SDEs with multiplicative noise by using explicit conditions on the coefficients instead of the less explicit curvature condition.

2.1 The Riemannian setting

We start with condition (1.8). Besides the extension of (1.6), this condition also implies the hypercontractivity and the exponential convergence in W_2 for the semigroup P_t . For a measure μ and constants $p, q \geq 1$, let $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^q(\mu)}$ stand for the operator norm from $L^p(\mu)$ to $L^q(\mu)$. Recall that P_t is called hypercontractive if it has a unique invariant probability measure μ and $\|P_t\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^4(\mu)} = 1$ holds for large $t > 0$. By interpolation theorem, $\|P_t\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^4(\mu)} = 1$ can be replaced by $\|P_t\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^q(\mu)} = 1$ for some $\infty > q > p > 1$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let (1.8) hold for some constants K_1, K_2 and $r_0 > 0$. Then:*

- (1) *There exist two constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that for any $\Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$ and $x, y \in M$,*

$$(2.1) \quad W_\Phi(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq \inf \left\{ r > 0 : \sup_{s \in (0, 1 + \rho(x, y)]} \frac{\Phi(r^{-1}s)}{s} \leq \frac{e^{\lambda t}}{c\rho(x, y)} \right\}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

In particular,

$$W_p(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq \{ce^{-\lambda t}\}^{\frac{1}{p}} (\rho(x, y) + \rho(x, y)^{\frac{1}{p}}), \quad p \geq 1, t \geq 0, x, y \in M.$$

- (2) *P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ and the log-Sobolev inequality*

$$(2.2) \quad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq C\mu(|\nabla f|^2) + \mu(f^2) \log \mu(f^2), \quad f \in C_b^1(M)$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$. Consequently, P_t is hypercontractive.

- (3) *There exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad W_2(\nu P_t, \mu) \leq ce^{-\lambda t} W_2(\nu, \mu), \quad t \geq 0, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M).$$

To illustrate this result, we present below a consequence with explicit curvature conditions in the spirit of [34]. These conditions allow Ric_Z to be negative everywhere, for instance, when $-C_1 \leq \text{Ric} \leq -C_2$ and $C_2 > -\nabla Z \geq \delta$ for some constants $C_1 > C_2 > \delta > 0$. As indicated in Introduction that (1.8) implies $\text{Ric}_Z \geq -(K_1 + K_2)$, so in the following corollary we assume that Ric_Z is bounded below.

Corollary 2.2. *Assume that Ric_Z is bounded below. Let $\rho_o = \rho(o, \cdot)$ for a fixed point $o \in M$. If there exist constants $\sigma > 0$ and $\delta > \sigma(1 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{d-1}$ such that*

$$(2.4) \quad -\nabla Z \geq -\delta \text{ and } \text{Ric} \geq -\sigma^2 \rho_o^2 \text{ outside a compact set,}$$

then all assertions in Theorem 2.1 hold.

Next, we introduce sufficient conditions for (1.7) which allow Ric_Z to be negative. Due to technical reason, we will need the ultracontractivity of P_t , which is essentially stronger than the hypercontractivity. We call P_t ultracontractive if $\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty$ for all $t > 0$. The ultracontractivity implies that P_t has a density $p_t(x, y)$ with respect to μ (called heat kernel) and

$$\|p_t\|_{L^\infty(\mu \times \mu)} = \|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty, \quad t > 0.$$

In references (see e.g. [9]), the ultracontractivity is also defined by $\|P_t\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty$ for $t > 0$. When P_t is symmetric in $L^2(\mu)$ we have

$$(2.5) \quad \|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)}^2, \quad t > 0,$$

so that these two definitions are equivalent. However, when P_t is non-symmetric, the former might be stronger than the latter. The appearance of the ultracontractivity in our study is very nature: by Theorem 2.3(1) we already have (1.7) for $\Phi = \Phi_1$ (the weakest case), and by the ultracontractivity we are able to deduce the inequality from Φ_1 to Φ_∞ (the strongest case). On the other hand, the result also indicates that (1.7) implies the hypercontractivity of P_t .

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that Ric_Z is bounded below.*

(1) *If P_t is ultracontractive, then there exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that for any $\Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$,*

$$(2.6) \quad W_\Phi(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq \frac{c}{\Phi^{-1}(1)} e^{-\lambda t} \min \left\{ \rho(x, y), G_\Phi(t) \right\}, \quad t > 0, x, y \in M$$

holds for

$$G_\Phi(t) := \inf \left\{ r > 0 : (\mu \times \mu) \left(\Phi(r^{-1} \rho) \right) \leq \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)}^{-2} \right\}.$$

Consequently, for any $p \in [1, \infty], t \geq 0$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$,

$$(2.7) \quad W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq c e^{-\lambda t} \min \left\{ W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \|\rho\|_{L^p(\mu \times \mu)} \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)}^{\frac{2}{p}} \right\}.$$

(2) *On the other hand, if there exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that*

$$(2.8) \quad W_\infty(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq c e^{-\lambda t} \rho(x, y), \quad x, y \in M, t \geq 0,$$

then the log-Sobolev inequality (3.4) holds for $c = \frac{2c^2}{\lambda}$, so that P_t is hypercontractive.

We note that in Theorem 2.3(1) we have $\|\rho\|_{L^p(\mu \times \mu)} < \infty$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$. Indeed, since Ric_Z is bounded below, by [23, Theorem 2.1] the ultracontractivity implies the super log-Sobolev inequality (3.3) below, so that due to Herbst we have $(\mu \times \mu)(e^{r\rho^2}) < \infty$ for all $r > 0$ (see e.g. [1]). Therefore, $G_\Phi(t) < \infty$ for $t > 0$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \Phi(r)}{r^2} < \infty.$$

In the symmetric case (i.e. $Z = \nabla V$ for some $V \in C^2(M)$), explicit sufficient conditions for the ultracontractivity have been introduced in [34] by using the dimension-free Harnack inequality in the sense of [30]. Together with a suitable exponential estimate on the diffusion process, this inequality implies $\|P_t\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty$ for $t > 0$ and thus, P_t is ultracontractive due to (2.5). The conditions can be formulated as

$$(2.9) \quad -\nabla Z \geq \Psi_1 \circ \rho_o \text{ and } \text{Ric} \geq -\Psi_2 \circ \rho_o \text{ hold outside a compact subset of } M,$$

where $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ are increasing functions such that

$$(2.10) \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{ds}{\sqrt{s} \int_0^{\sqrt{s}} \Psi_1(u) du} < \infty, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ \Psi_1(r), \frac{(\int_0^r \Psi_1(s) ds)^2}{\Psi_1(r)} \right\} = \infty,$$

and for some constants $\theta \in (0, 1/(1 + \sqrt{2}))$ and $C > 0$,

$$(2.11) \quad \sqrt{\Psi_2(r+t)(d-1)} \leq \theta \int_0^r \Psi_1(s) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{t/2} \Psi_1(s) ds + C, \quad r, t \geq 0.$$

When Ric is bounded below, (2.11) as well as the second inequality in (2.9) hold for Ψ_2 being a large enough constant. In general, since $\int_0^r \Psi_1(s) ds \geq 2 \int_0^{r/2} \Psi_1(s) ds$, (2.11) with $\theta = \frac{1}{4} < \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{2}}$ follows from

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \sqrt{\Psi_2(r)(d-1)} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \inf_{t \in [0, r]} \left\{ \int_0^{t/2} \Psi_1(s) ds + \int_0^{(r-t)/2} \Psi_1(s) ds \right\} + C \\ &= \int_0^{r/4} \Psi_1(s) ds + C, \quad r \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since (2.5) fails for non-symmetric semigroups, we apply the inequality

$$\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)} \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)}$$

due to the semigroup property. So, to ensure the ultracontractivity, we need an additional condition implying $\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)} < \infty$ (see Corollary 2.4(2) below).

To estimate $G_\Phi(t)$ in (2.6) using Ψ_1 , we introduce

$$\Lambda_1(r) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \int_0^{\sqrt{r}} \Psi_1(s) ds, \quad \Lambda_2(r) := \int_r^\infty \frac{ds}{\sqrt{s} \int_0^{\sqrt{s}} \Psi_1(u) du}, \quad r > 0.$$

Obviously, the inverse function Λ_2^{-1} exists on $(0, \infty)$, and since Λ_1 is increasing with $\Lambda_1(\infty) = \infty$, we have

$$\Lambda_1^{-1}(r) := \inf \{s \geq 0 : \Lambda_1(s) \geq r\} < \infty, \quad r \geq 0.$$

Corollary 2.4. *Assume that (2.10) and (2.11) hold for some constants $\theta \in (0, 1/(1 + \sqrt{2}))$ and $C > 0$.*

- (1) If P_t is symmetric, i.e. $Z = \nabla V$ for some $V \in C^2(M)$, then there exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that (2.6) and (2.7) hold for

$$G_\Phi(t) := \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : (\mu \times \mu)(\Phi(\lambda^{-1}\rho)) \leq e^{-ct^{-1}\{1+\Lambda_1^{-1}(ct^{-1})-\Lambda_2^{-1}(c^{-1}t)\}} \right\}, \quad t > 0.$$

- (2) If P_t is non-symmetric but there exists continuous $h \in C([0, 1]; [0, \infty))$ with $h(r) > 0$ for $r > 0$ such that $\int_0^1 \frac{h(r)}{r} dr < \infty$ and

$$H(\theta) := \int_0^1 \frac{\theta}{h(r)} \left\{ 1 + \Lambda_1^{-1}(\theta/h(r)) + \Lambda_2^{-1}(h(r)/\theta) \right\} dr < \infty, \quad \theta > 0,$$

then there exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that (2.6) holds for

$$G_\Phi(t) := \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : (\mu \times \mu)(\Phi(\lambda^{-1}\rho)) \leq e^{-ct^{-1}\{1+\Lambda_1^{-1}(ct^{-1})-\Lambda_2^{-1}(c^{-1}t)\}-cH(ct^{-1})} \right\}.$$

To conclude this part, we present a simple example to illustrate Corollary 2.4.

Example 2.1. Let M have non-positive sectional curvatures and a pole $o \in M$. Let $Z = Z_0 - \delta \nabla \rho_o^{2+\varepsilon}$ outside a compact domain, where $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ are constants and Z_0 is a C^1 vector field with

$$(2.13) \quad \limsup_{\rho_o \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\nabla Z_0|}{\rho_o^\varepsilon} < \delta(1 + \varepsilon)(2 + \varepsilon).$$

Let $\Psi_2 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be increasing such that

$$(2.14) \quad \text{Ric} \geq -\Psi_2(\rho_o), \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi_2(r)}{r^{2(1+\varepsilon)}} = 0.$$

By (2.13), (2.14) and the Hessian comparison theorem, we see that (2.9), (2.10) and (2.12) hold with $\Psi_1(r) = c_1 r^\varepsilon$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$. According to Corollary 2.4, there exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that for any $p \geq 1$,

$$W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq ce^{-\lambda t} \min \left\{ W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \|\rho\|_{L_p(\mu \times \mu)} \exp \left[\frac{c}{pt^{1+\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}} \right] \right\}, \quad t > 0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(M).$$

2.2 SDEs with multiplicative noise

Consider the following SDE on \mathbb{R}^d :

$$(2.15) \quad dX_t = b(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2}\sigma(X_t)dB_t,$$

where B_t is the m -dimensional Brownian motion, $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^m$ (the space of $d \times m$ -matrices) are locally Lipschitz such that

$$\|\sigma\|_{HS}^2(x) + \langle b(x), x \rangle \leq C(1 + |x|^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$, where and in the following, $\|\cdot\|_{HS}$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Hilbert-Schmidt and the operator norms respectively. Then the SDE has a unique solution $\{X_t(x)\}_{t \geq 0}$ for every initial point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let P_t be the associated Markov semigroup:

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

We intend to investigate the W_p -exponential contraction for $p \in [1, \infty)$. As mentioned in Introduction that existing results only apply to $p = 1$ and $\sigma = I$, and as mentioned in [11, 17] that there is essential difficulty to prove (1.3) for $p > 1$ even for $\sigma = I$. So, the present study is non-trivial.

Corresponding to that (1.1) implies (1.2) in the Riemannian setting, we have the following assertion.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$. If*

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{(p-2)|(\sigma(x) - \sigma(y))^*(x-y)|^2}{|x-y|^2} + \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\|_{HS}^2 + \langle b(x) - b(y), x-y \rangle \\ & \leq -K_p |x-y|^2, \quad x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned}$$

holds for some constant $K_p \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq e^{-K_p t} W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad t \geq 0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Note that this result does apply to $p = \infty$ when σ is non-constant. Next, as in the Riemannian case, we intend to prove the exponential contraction in W_p when (2.16) only holds for some negative constant K_p . To this end, we need the SDE to be non-degenerate. The following result contains analogous assertions in Theorems 2.1 and 2.3, where the first assertion extends (1.5) to the multiplicative noise setting.

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that $\sigma\sigma^* \geq \lambda_0^2 I$ for some constant $\lambda_0 > 0$.*

- (1) *If there exist constants $K_1, K_2, r_0 > 0$ such that Z and $\sigma_0 := \sqrt{\sigma\sigma^* - \lambda_0^2 I}$ satisfy*

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\sigma_0(x) - \sigma_0(y)\|_{HS}^2 - \frac{|(\sigma(x) - \sigma(y))^*(x-y)|^2}{|x-y|^2} + \langle b(x) - b(y), x-y \rangle \\ & \leq \{(K_1 + K_2)1_{\{|x-y| \leq r_0\}} - K_2\} |x-y|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned}$$

then there exist constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that

$$W_1(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq c e^{-\lambda t} W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad t \geq 0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

- (2) *Let P_t have a unique invariant probability measure μ such that the log-Sobolev inequality*

$$(2.18) \quad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq C \mu(|\sigma^* \nabla f|^2), \quad f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu(f^2) = 1$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$. If there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$(2.19) \quad \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\|_{HS}^2 + \langle b(x) - b(y), x-y \rangle \leq K |x-y|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

then (2.3) holds for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$ and $M = \mathbb{R}^d$.

- (3) Let P_t be ultracontractive and let (2.19) hold for some constant $K > 0$. Then there exist a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that for any $p \in [1, \infty)$, condition (2.16) implies (2.7) for some constant $c = c(p) > 0$, and all $t \geq 0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

According to [21, Lemma 3.3], we have

$$(2.20) \quad \|\sigma_0(x) - \sigma_0(y)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4\lambda_0} \|(\sigma\sigma^*)(x) - (\sigma\sigma^*)(y)\|_{HS}^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Combining this with $\|\cdot\|_{HS}^2 \leq d\|\cdot\|^2$, we see that (2.17) follows from the following more explicit condition:

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d-1}{4\lambda_0} \|(\sigma\sigma^*)(x) - (\sigma\sigma^*)(y)\|_{HS}^2 + \langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle \\ & \leq \{(K_1 + K_2)1_{\{|x-y| \leq r_0\}} - K_2\}|x - y|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Note that conditions in Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6(1) are explicit. To illustrate Theorem 2.6(2)-(3), we present below sufficient conditions for the log-Sobolev inequality (2.18) and the ultracontractivity of P_t . For $a := \sigma\sigma^*$ and $(g_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} := a^{-1}$, we introduce the Christoffel symbols

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d (\partial_i g_{mj} + \partial_j g_{im} - \partial_m g_{ij}) a_{km}, \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq d,$$

and the matrix Γab :

$$(\Gamma ab)_{ij} := \sum_{k, l=1}^d \Gamma_{kl}^i a_{kj} b_k, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\sigma \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $a := \sigma\sigma^* \geq \alpha I$ for some constant $\alpha > 0$, and let $b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$(2.22) \quad \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma ab + \nabla_b a) - (\nabla b)a \geq -K_0 I$$

for some constant K_0 . If there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\delta > 1$ such that

$$(2.23) \quad L|\cdot|^2 \leq c_1 - c_2|\cdot|^{2\delta},$$

then P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ and there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \exp \left[c + ct^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta-1}} \right], \quad t > 0.$$

We now introduce a simple example to illustrate Theorem 2.6.

Example 2.2. Let $\sigma \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $a := \sigma\sigma^* \geq \alpha I$ for some constant $\alpha > 0$. Let $b(x) = -c_0|x|^\theta x$ for large $|x|$, where $c_0 > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ are constants. Obviously, condition (2.19) holds. If

$$(2.24) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x| \cdot \|\nabla\sigma(x)\| = 0,$$

then (2.22) holds for some constant K_0 . Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$L|\cdot|^2 \leq c_1 - c_2|x|^{\theta+2}, \quad \lambda > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

holds for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. By Proposition 2.7 and Theorem 2.6(3), for any $p \in [1, \infty)$, there exist constants $\lambda, c > 0$ such that

$$W_p(\mu_1 P_t, \mu_2 P_t) \leq ce^{-\lambda t} \min \left\{ W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2), \exp \left[ct^{-\frac{\theta+2}{\theta}} \right] \right\}, \quad t > 0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

3 Preparations

This section includes some propositions which will be used to prove the results introduced in Section 2. We first recall a link between the Wasserstein distance and gradient estimates due to [16], then deduce the hyperboundedness and the exponential convergence in entropy from the log-Sobolev inequality for non-symmetric diffusion semigroups, and finally prove the exponential contraction in gradient for ultracontractive semigroups in a general framework including both diffusion and jump Markov semigroups.

3.1 Wasserstein distance and gradient inequalities

Let (E, ρ) be a geodesic Polish space, i.e. it is a Polish space and for any two different points $x, y \in E$, there exists a continuous curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow E$ such that $\gamma_0 = x, \gamma_1 = y$ and $\rho(\gamma_s, \gamma_t) = |s - t|\rho(x, y)$ for $s, t \in [0, 1]$. Then for any $f \in \text{Lip}_b(E)$, the class of bounded Lipschitz functions on E , the length of gradient

$$|\nabla f|(x) := \limsup_{\rho(x,y) \downarrow 0} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\rho(x, y)}, \quad x \in E$$

is measurable. Moreover, let $P(x, dy)$ be a Markov transition kernel and define the Markov operator

$$Pf(x) := \int_E f(y)P(x, dy), \quad x \in E, f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E).$$

For any $\Phi \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{\Phi_\infty\}$, consider the Young norm induced by Φ with respect to P

$$(3.1) \quad \|f\|_{L_\Phi^*(P)}(x) := \sup \left\{ P(fg)(x) : g \in \mathcal{B}_b(E), P\Phi(|g|)(x) \leq 1 \right\}, \quad x \in E, f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E),$$

and set $\|f\|_{L_\infty^*(P)}(x) = P|f|(x)$. Then $\|\cdot\|_{L_\Phi^*(P)} = \|\cdot\|_{L_\Phi^*(P)}$ for $p \in [1, \infty], q = \frac{p}{p-1}$. The following result follows from [16, Theorem 2.2, Remark 2 and Remark 3].

Proposition 3.1 ([16]). *For any constant $C > 0$ and $\Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$, the following statements are equivalent to each other:*

- (1) $|\nabla P f| \leq C \|\nabla f\|_{L^{\Phi}(P)}$ for $f \in \text{Lip}_b(E)$.
- (2) $W_{\Phi}(\delta_x P, \delta_y P) \leq C \rho(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$.

When $\Phi = \Phi_p$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$, they are also equivalent to

- (3) $W_p(\mu_1 P, \mu_2 P) \leq C W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(E)$.

3.2 Hyperboundedness and exponential convergence in entropy

When P_t is symmetric, it is well known that the hyperboundedness, exponential convergence in entropy and the log-Sobolev inequality are equivalent each other, see [5, 33] and references within. In the non-symmetric case, the log-Sobolev inequality implies the former two properties if the generator L and the symmetric part of the Dirichlet form \mathcal{E} satisfy

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\mu((1 + \log f)Lf) \geq c_0 \mathcal{E}(\sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f}) \text{ and} \\ & -\mu(f^{p-1}Lf) = \frac{c_0(p-1)}{p^2} \mathcal{E}(f^{\frac{p}{2}}, f^{\frac{p}{2}}), \quad p > 1, f \in \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$ and a reasonable class \mathcal{D} of non-negative bounded functions, which is stable under P_t and dense in $L^p_+(\mu) := \{f \in L^p(\mu) : f \geq 0\}$ for any $p \geq 1$, see e.g. [13]. In applications, it may be not easy to figure out the class \mathcal{D} such that (3.2) holds. But in general this condition can be replaced by the following approximation formula Lemma 3.2 in the spirit of [24].

Now, consider the (Neumann) semigroup P_t generated by $L := \Delta + Z$ for a local bounded vector field Z such that P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ . Let

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \{f \in C_0^\infty(M) : f \text{ satisfies the Neumann condition if } \partial M \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then (L, \mathcal{D}_0) is dissipative (thus, closable) in $L^1(\mu)$ with closure $(L, \mathcal{D}_1(L))$ generating P_t in $L^1(\mu)$, see e.g. [26] and references within. Let

$$\mathcal{D} = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_1(L) \cap L^\infty(\mu) : f \geq 0\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in C_b^\infty([\text{ess}_\mu \inf f, \infty))$. There exists a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{D}_0$ with $\inf f_n = \inf f$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $L^m(\mu)$ for any $m \geq 1$, $L f_n \rightarrow L f$ in $L^1(\mu)$, and*

$$\mu(\psi(f)Lf) = - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\psi'(f_n)|\nabla f_n|^2).$$

Proof. Since $f \in \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(L) \cap L^\infty(\mu)$, there exists a uniformly bounded sequence $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{D}_0$ such that $\inf f_n = \text{ess}_\mu \inf f$ and $f_n \rightarrow f, L f_n \rightarrow L f$ in $L^1(\mu)$. By the uniform boundedness, $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $L^m(\mu)$ for any $m \geq 1$. Since $\psi \in C_b^\infty([\inf f_n, \infty))$,

$$g_n := \int_{\inf f_n}^{f_n} \psi(s) ds \in \mathcal{D}_c := \{g + c : c \in \mathbb{R}, g \in \mathcal{D}_0\} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(L).$$

This implies $\mu(Lg_n) = 0$ since μ is P_t -invariant. So, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\mu(\psi(f)Lf) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\psi(f_n)Lf_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(Lg_n - \psi'(f_n)|\nabla f_n|^2) = - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\psi'(f_n)|\nabla f_n|^2).$$

□

Proposition 3.3. *Let Z be a locally bounded vector field such that the (Neumann) semigroup P_t generated by $L := \Delta + Z$ has a unique invariant probability measure μ .*

(1) *If the super log-Sobolev inequality*

$$(3.3) \quad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq r\mu(|\nabla f|^2) + \beta(r), \quad r > 0, \quad f \in C_b^1(M), \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

holds for some $\beta \in C((0, \infty); (0, \infty))$, then for any constants $q > p \geq 1$ and $\gamma \in C((p, q); (0, \infty))$ such that $t := \int_p^q \frac{\gamma(r)}{r} dr < \infty$, there holds

$$\|P_t\|_{L^p(\mu) \rightarrow L^q(\mu)} \leq \exp \left[\int_p^q \frac{\beta(4\gamma(r)(1-r^{-1}))}{r^2} dr \right].$$

(2) *If the log-Sobolev inequality*

$$(3.4) \quad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq C\mu(|\nabla f|^2) + \mu(f^2) \log \mu(f^2), \quad f \in C_b^1(M)$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$, then

$$\mu((P_t g) \log P_t g) \leq e^{-4t/C} \mu(g \log g), \quad g \in \mathcal{B}_b(M), g \geq 0, \mu(g) = 1.$$

Proof. (1) According to Lemma 3.2, for any $f \in \mathcal{D}$ and $p > 1$, there exists $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{D}_0$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f^{\frac{p}{2}}$ in $L^m(\mu)$ for all $m \geq 1$, and

$$(3.5) \quad -\mu(f^{p-1}Lf) = \frac{4(p-1)}{p^2} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(|\nabla f_n|^2).$$

Applying (3.3) to f_n and using (3.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p\mu(f^p \log f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(f_n^2 \log f_n^2) \leq r \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(|\nabla f_n|^2) + \beta(r) \\ &\leq \frac{rp^2}{4(p-1)} \left(-\mu(f^{p-1}Lf) + \frac{4\beta(r)(p-1)}{rp^2} \right), \quad r > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Set $c(p) = \frac{rp}{4(p-1)}$, we have

$$\frac{4\beta(r)(p-1)}{rp^2} = \frac{\beta(4c(p)(1-p^{-1}))}{pc(p)}, \quad p > 1,$$

so that the above inequality becomes

$$\mu(f^p \log f) \leq c(p) \left(-\mu(f^{p-1}Lf) + \gamma(p) \right), \quad p > 1, f \in \mathcal{D}$$

for $\gamma(p) := \frac{\beta(4c(p)(1-p^{-1}))}{pc(p)}$. Noting that \mathcal{D} is P_t -invariant (i.e. $P_t\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}$) and dense in $L^p_+(\mu)$ for any $p \geq 1$, the desired assertion follows from the proof of [13, Corollary 3.13].

(2) It suffices to prove for $g \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\inf g > 0$. Applying Lemma 3.2 to $f = P_t g$ and $\psi(s) = 1 + \log s$, and using (3.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mu((P_t g) \log P_t g) &= \mu((1 + \log P_t g)LP_t g) = -4 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(|\nabla \sqrt{f_n}|^2) \\ &\leq -\frac{4}{C} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(f_n \log f_n) = -\frac{4}{C} \mu((P_t g) \log P_t g), \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired exponential estimate. \square

3.3 Exponential contraction in gradient

In this part, we consider a general framework including both diffusion and jump processes. Let (E, \mathcal{F}, μ) be a separable complete probability space, and let P_t be a Markov semigroup on $L^2(\mu)$ with μ as invariant probability measure. Let $(L, \mathcal{D}(L))$ be the generator of P_t in $L^2(\mu)$. We assume that there exists an algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{D}(L)$ such that

- (i) $1 \in \mathcal{A}$, \mathcal{A} is dense in $L^2(\mu)$ and the algebra induced by

$$\mathcal{D} := \{P_s f : s \geq 0, f \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

is contained in $\mathcal{D}(L)$.

- (ii) $\Gamma(f, g) := \frac{1}{2}(L(fg) - fLg - gLf)$ gives rise to a non-degenerate positive definite bilinear form on $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$; i.e., for any $f \in \mathcal{D}$, $\Gamma(f, f) \geq 0$ and it equals to 0 if and only if f is constant.

In particular, when P_t is the (Neumann) semigroup generated by $L := \Delta + Z$ on M with Ric_Z bounded below, the assumption holds for

$$\mathcal{A} := \{f + c : f \in C_0^\infty(M) \text{ satisfying the Neumann condition if } \partial M \neq \emptyset, c \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Under the above conditions,

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) := \mu(\Gamma(f, g)), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{A}$$

is closable and the closure $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}))$ is a conservative symmetric Dirichlet form. Although P_t is not associated to $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}))$ when it is non-symmetric, we have

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{d}{dt}\mu((P_t f)^2) = -2\mathcal{E}(P_t f, P_t f), \quad t \geq 0, f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

If $\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty$, then P_t has a heat kernel $p_t(x, y)$ with respect to μ , i.e.

$$P_t f = \int_E p_t(\cdot, y) f(y) \mu(dy), \quad f \in L^2(\mu),$$

and

$$\text{ess}_{\mu \times \mu} \sup p_t = \|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty.$$

We consider the “gradient” length $|\nabla_\Gamma f| = \sqrt{\Gamma(f, f)}$ induced by Γ . Note that for jump processes the length is non-local and thus essentially different from the usual gradient length. As shown below that estimates of $|\nabla_\Gamma P_t|$ have a close link to functional inequalities of the associated Dirichlet form.

Proposition 3.4. *Assume that there exist $t_1 > 0$ and $\eta \in C([0, \infty); (0, \infty))$ such that*

$$(3.7) \quad \|P_{t_1}\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} < \infty, \quad |\nabla_\Gamma P_t f|^2 \leq \eta(t) P_t |\nabla_\Gamma f|^2, \quad t \geq 0, f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Then there exist constants $c, \lambda, t_2 > 0$ such that for any $q \geq 1$ and $\eta_q \in C([0, \infty); (0, \infty))$, the gradient estimate

$$(3.8) \quad |\nabla_\Gamma P_t f|^2 \leq \eta_q(t) (P_t |\nabla_\Gamma f|^q)^{\frac{2}{q}}, \quad t \geq 0, f \in \mathcal{D}$$

implies

$$(3.9) \quad \|\nabla_\Gamma P_t f\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}^2 \leq \left(c \sup_{[0, t_2]} \eta_q \right) e^{-\lambda t} \text{ess}_\mu \inf (P_t |\nabla_\Gamma f|^q)^{\frac{2}{q}}, \quad t \geq t_2, f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Proof. (a) We first prove

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{E}(P_t f, P_t f) \leq C e^{-\lambda t} \mathcal{E}(f, f), \quad f \in \mathcal{D}, t \geq 0$$

for some constants $C, \lambda > 0$. By the second inequality in (3.7), for any $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}$ we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} P_s (P_{t-s} f)^2 = 2 P_s |\nabla_\Gamma P_{t-s} f|^2 \leq 2 \eta(t-s) P_t |\nabla_\Gamma f|^2, \quad s \in [0, t].$$

Integrating both sides over $[0, t]$ leads to

$$P_t f^2 \leq (P_t f)^2 + C(t) P_t |\nabla_\Gamma f|^2, \quad C(t) := 2 \int_0^t \eta(s) ds, \quad t > 0.$$

Taking $t = t_1$ and noting that μ is the invariant probability measure of P_t , we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \mu(f^2) \leq C(t_1) \mathcal{E}(f, f) + \|P_{t_1}\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}^2 \mu(|f|)^2, \quad f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$ is the closure of \mathcal{D} under the \mathcal{E}_1 -norm, this inequality also holds for $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$. By condition (ii), the symmetric Dirichlet form is irreducible. So, according to [38, Corollary 1.2] the defective Poincaré inequality (3.11) implies the Poincaré inequality

$$(3.12) \quad \mu(f^2) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{E}(f, f) + \mu(f)^2, \quad f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$$

for some constant $\lambda > 0$. By (3.6) and that \mathcal{D} is dense in $L^2(\mu)$, the Poincaré inequality is equivalent to

$$(3.13) \quad \|P_t f - \mu(f)\|_2 \leq e^{-\lambda t} \|f - \mu(f)\|_2, \quad t \geq 0, f \in L^2(\mu).$$

On the other hand, by the second inequality in (3.7), for any $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}$ we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} P_s(P_{t-s}f)^2 = 2P_s|\nabla_\Gamma P_{t-s}f|^2 \geq \frac{2}{\eta(s)}|\nabla_\Gamma P_t f|^2, \quad s \in [0, t].$$

So,

$$|\nabla_\Gamma P_t f|^2 \leq \frac{P_t f^2 - (P_t f)^2}{2 \int_0^t \eta(s)^{-1} ds}, \quad t > 0, f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Using $P_t f - \mu(f)$ to replace f and integrating with respect to μ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(P_{2t}f, P_{2t}f) \leq \frac{\|P_t f - \mu(f)\|_2^2}{2 \int_0^t \eta(s)^{-1} ds}, \quad t > 0, f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Combining this with (3.13) and (3.12) we arrive at

$$\mathcal{E}(P_t f, P_t f) \leq c_1 e^{-\lambda t} \mathcal{E}(f, f), \quad t \geq 1, f \in \mathcal{D}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$; that is, (3.10) holds for $t > 1$. Finally, (3.7) implies (3.10) for $t \in [0, 1]$.

(b) Next, we intend to find out a constant $t_0 \geq t_1$ such that

$$(3.14) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq p_t \leq 2, \quad (\mu \times \mu)\text{-a.e.}, t \geq t_0.$$

Indeed, by (3.13) and the first inequality in (3.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_E (p_{t+2t_1}(\cdot, y) - 1) f(y) \mu(dy) \right| = |P_{t_1}(P_{t+t_1}f - \mu(f))| \\ & \leq c_0 \mu(|P_{t+t_1}f - \mu(f)|) \leq c_0 e^{-\lambda t} \|P_{t_1}f - \mu(f)\|_2 \leq c_0^2 e^{-\lambda t} \mu(|f|), \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}, t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 := \|P_{t_1}\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)}$. This implies the desired assertion for $t_0 > 0$ such that $c_0^2 e^{-\lambda t_0} \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

(c) Finally, combining (3.7), (3.14), (3.10) and (3.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla_\Gamma P_{t+2t_0}f\|_{L^\infty(\mu)}^2 \leq c_1 \|P_{t_0}|\nabla_\Gamma P_{t+t_0}f|^2\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \leq 2c_1 \mathcal{E}(P_{t+t_0}f, P_{t+t_0}f) \\ & \leq c_2 e^{-\lambda t} \mathcal{E}(P_{t_0}f, P_{t_0}f) \leq c_2 \eta_q(t_0) e^{-\lambda t} \mu((P_{t_0}|\nabla_\Gamma f|^q)^{\frac{2}{q}}) \\ & \leq c_3 \eta_q(t_0) e^{-\lambda t} \text{ess}_\mu \inf(P_{t+2t_0}|\nabla_\Gamma f|^q)^{\frac{2}{q}} \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$. Then (3.9) holds for $t_2 = 2t_0$. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 2.1

The first assertion is a generalization of the main result in [17] where $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ is considered. As in [17], the key point of the proof is to construct a coupling by parallel transform for long

distance but by reflection for short distance. The only difference is that we are working on a non-flat Riemannian manifold for which the curvature term appears in calculations. Since Itô's formula of the distance process has been well developed for couplings by both parallel displacement and reflection, the proof is also straightforward.

The proofs of the other two assertions are based on the log-Sobolev inequality and the log-Harnack inequality derived in [23] and [36] respectively for bounded below Ric_Z .

Proof of Theorem 2.1. (a) For two different points $x, y \in M$, let $P_{x,y} : T_x M \rightarrow T_y M$ be the parallel displacement along the minimal geodesic $\gamma : [0, \rho(x, y)] \rightarrow M$ from x to y , and let $M_{x,y} := P_{x,y} - 2\langle \cdot, \dot{\gamma}_0 \rangle \dot{\gamma}_{\rho(x,y)} : T_x M \rightarrow T_y M$ be the mirror reflection. Both maps are smooth in (x, y) outside the cut-locus $\text{Cut}(M)$. According to [14] and [29], the appearance of the cut-locus and/or a convex boundary helps for the success of coupling, i.e. it makes the distance between two marginal processes smaller. So, for simplicity, we may and do assume that both the cut-locus and the boundary are empty, see [2, Section 3] or [33, Chapter 2] for details.

Now, let X_t solve the SDE

$$d_I X_t = \sqrt{2} u_t dB_t + Z(X_t) dt, \quad X_0 = x,$$

where d_I denotes the Itô differential introduced in [12] on Riemannian manifolds, B_t is the d -dimensional Brownian motion, and u_t is the horizontal lift of X_t to the frame bundle $O(M)$. Then X_t is a diffusion process generated by L . To construct the coupling by reflection for short distance and parallel displacement for long distance, we introduce a cut-off function $h \in C^1([0, \infty))$ which is decreasing such that $h(r) = 1$ for $r \leq r_0$, $h(r) = 0$ for $r \geq r_0 + 1$, and $\sqrt{1 - h^2}$ is also in C^1 , see e.g. [40, (3.1)] for a concrete example. To construct the coupling in the above spirit, we split the noise into two parts, i.e. to replace dB_t by $h(\rho(X_t, Y_t)) dB'_t + \sqrt{1 - h(\rho(X_t, Y_t))^2} dB''_t$ for two independent Brownian motions B'_t and B''_t , then make reflection for the B'_t part and parallel displacement for the B''_t part. More precisely, let (X_t, Y_t) solve the following SDE on $M \times M$ for $(X_0, Y_0) = (x, y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} d_I X_t &= \sqrt{2} \left(h(\rho(X_t, Y_t)) u_t dB'_t + \sqrt{1 - h(\rho(X_t, Y_t))^2} u_t dB''_t \right) + Z(X_t) dt, \\ d_I Y_t &= \sqrt{2} \left(h(\rho(X_t, Y_t)) M_{X_t, Y_t} u_t dB'_t + \sqrt{1 - h(\rho(X_t, Y_t))^2} P_{X_t, Y_t} u_t dB''_t \right) + Z(Y_t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since the coefficients of the SDE are at least C^1 outside the diagonal $\{(z, z) : z \in M\}$, it has a unique solution up to the coupling time

$$T := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = Y_t\}.$$

We then let $X_t = Y_t$ for $t \geq T$ as usual. By the second variational formula and the index lemma (see e.g. the proof of [34, Lemma 2.3] and [29, (2.4)]), the process $\rho_t := \rho(X_t, Y_t)$ satisfies

$$d\rho_t \leq 2\sqrt{2}h(\rho_t)db_t + I_Z(X_t, Y_t)dt, \quad t \leq T$$

for some one-dimensional Brownian motion b_t . Thus, by condition (1.8),

$$(4.1) \quad d\rho_t \leq 2\sqrt{2}h(\rho_t)db_t + \{(K_1 + K_2)1_{\{\rho_t \leq r_0\}} - K_2\}\rho_t dt, \quad t \leq T.$$

Since $h(\rho_t) = 0$ for $\rho_t \geq r_0 + 1$ while $d\rho_t < 0$ when $\rho_t \geq r_0 + 1$, this implies

$$(4.2) \quad \rho_t \leq (r_0 + 1) \vee \rho_0 \leq 1 + r_0 + \rho(x, y).$$

On the other hand, since $h(\rho_t) = 1$ for $\rho_t \leq r_0$, as observed in [17] we have

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{E}\rho_t \leq ce^{-\lambda t}\rho(x, y), \quad t \geq 0$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$. Indeed, let

$$\bar{\rho}_t = \varepsilon\rho_t + 1 - e^{-N\rho_t}, \quad N = \frac{r_0}{2}(K_1 + K_2), \varepsilon = Ne^{-Nr_0}.$$

Then

$$\varepsilon\rho_t \leq \bar{\rho}_t \leq (N + \varepsilon)\rho_t, \quad \frac{4N^2}{r(\varepsilon e^{Nr} + N)} \geq K_1 + K_2 \text{ for } r \in (0, r_0],$$

so that (4.1) and Itô's formula lead to

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{\rho}_t &\leq 2\sqrt{2}(\varepsilon + Ne^{-N\rho_t})h(\rho_t)db_t \\ &\quad + (\varepsilon + Ne^{-N\rho_t})\left\{(K_1 + K_2)1_{\{\rho_t \leq r_0\}} - K_2 - \frac{4N^2}{\rho_t(\varepsilon e^{N\rho_t} + N)}1_{\{\rho_t \leq r_0\}}\right\}\rho_t dt \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2}(\varepsilon + Ne^{-N\rho_t})h(\rho_t)db_t - c_1\bar{\rho}_t dt, \quad t \leq T \end{aligned}$$

for some constant c_1 . This implies $\mathbb{E}\bar{\rho}_t \leq \bar{\rho}_0 e^{-c_1 t}$. Then (4.3) holds for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$. Combining (4.2) with (4.3) we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi(\rho_t/r) \leq \sup_{s \in (0, 1+r_0+\rho_0]} \frac{\Phi(s/r)}{s} \mathbb{E}\rho_t \leq ce^{-\lambda t}\rho(x, y) \sup_{s \in (0, 1+r_0+\rho_0]} \frac{\Phi(s/r)}{s}.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} W_\Phi(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) &\leq \|\rho_t\|_{L^\Phi(\mathbb{P})} = \inf \left\{ r > 0 : \mathbb{E}\Phi(\rho_t/r) \leq 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ r > 0 : \sup_{s \in (0, 1+\rho(x, y))} \frac{\Phi(\frac{s}{r})}{s} \leq \frac{e^{\lambda t}}{c\rho(x, y)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (2.1). Therefore, the proof of (1) is finished since the second inequality therein is a simple consequence of (2.1).

(b) According to the proofs of [34, Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 1.1], our conditions imply that P_t is hyperbounded; that is, $\|P_t\|_{2 \rightarrow 4} < \infty$ holds for some $t > 0$. Since (1.8) implies $\text{Ric}_Z \geq -(K_1 + K_2)$, by the hyperboundedness and [23, Theorem 2.1], we have the defective log-Sobolev inequality

$$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq C_1 \mu(|\nabla f|^2) + C_2, \quad f \in C_b^1(M), \mu(f^2) = 1$$

for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Since the symmetric Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}(f, g) := \mu(\langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle)$ with domain $H^{1,2}(\mu)$ is irreducible, according to [38] (see also [18]), the log-Sobolev inequality (3.4) holds for some constant $C > 0$, so that (2) is proved.

(c) According to [25, Theorem 1.10] (see [4, 32, 20] for the case without boundary), the log-Sobolev inequality implies the Talagrand inequality

$$(4.4) \quad W_2(f\mu, \mu)^2 \leq \frac{C}{2}\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1.$$

Next, let P_t^* be the adjoint of P_t in $L^2(\mu)$. By Proposition 3.3 for P_t^* in place of P_t , the log-Sobolev inequality implies

$$(4.5) \quad \mu((P_t^* f) \log P_t^* f) \leq e^{-4t/C} \mu(f \log f), \quad t \geq 0, f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1.$$

Moreover, according to [36, Theorem 1.1], the curvature condition $\text{Ric}_Z \geq -(K_1 + K_2) =: -K$ is equivalent to the log-Harnack inequality

$$P_t(\log f)(x) \leq \log P_t f(y) + \frac{K\rho(x, y)^2}{2(1 - e^{-2Kt})}, \quad t \geq 0, x, y \in M, 0 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(M).$$

By [39, Proposition 1.4.4(3)], this implies

$$(4.6) \quad \mu((P_t^* f) \log P_t^* f) \leq \frac{K}{2(1 - e^{-2Kt})} W_2(f\mu, \mu)^2, \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1, t > 0.$$

Combining (4.4), (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} W_2((f\mu)P_{1+t}, \mu)^2 &= W_2((P_{1+t}^* f)\mu, \mu)^2 \leq \frac{C}{2}\mu((P_{1+t}^* f) \log P_{1+t}^* f) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2}e^{-4t/C} \mu((P_1^* f) \log P_1^* f) \leq c_1 e^{-4t/C} W_2(f\mu, \mu)^2, \quad t \geq 0, f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Noting that $\text{Ric}_Z \geq -K$ implies $|\nabla P_t f| \leq e^{Kt} P_t |\nabla f|$ (see e.g. [36]), by Proposition 3.1 we have

$$W_2((f\mu)P_t, \mu) = W_2((f\mu)P_t, \mu P_t) \leq c_2 W_2(f\mu, \mu), \quad t \in [0, 1], f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1.$$

Combining with (4.7) yields

$$W_2((f\mu)P_t, \mu) \leq c e^{-\lambda t} W_2(f\mu, \mu), \quad t \geq 0, f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$. Therefore, the proof of (3) is finished. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.4

Proof of Theorem 2.3. (1) Since $\text{Ric}_Z \geq -K$ for some constant $K \geq 0$, we have (see e.g. [36])

$$|\nabla P_t f| \leq e^{Kt} P_t |\nabla f|, \quad f \in C_b^1(M).$$

Combining this with Proposition 3.4 for $q = 1$ and noting that $P_t|\nabla f|$ is continuous, we obtain

$$|\nabla P_t f| \leq c_0 e^{-\lambda t} P_t |\nabla f|, \quad t \geq t_0, f \in C_b^1(M)$$

for some constants $c_0, \lambda, t_0 > 0$. Obviously, (3.1) implies

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^1(P_t)} \leq \frac{\|\cdot\|_{L^{\Phi}(P_t)}}{\Phi^{-1}(1)}, \quad \Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}.$$

Then

$$|\nabla P_t f| \leq \frac{c_0}{\Phi^{-1}(1)} e^{-\lambda t} \|\nabla f\|_{L^{\Phi}(P_t)}, \quad t \geq 0, \Phi \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}, f \in C_b^1(M).$$

According to Proposition 3.1, this is equivalent to

$$(5.1) \quad W_{\Phi}(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq c_0 \Phi^{-1}(1) e^{-\lambda t} \rho(x, y), \quad t \geq 0, x, y \in M.$$

On the other hand, noting that

$$\mathcal{C}(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \ni \pi_t := (\delta_x P_t) \times (\delta_y P_t) \leq \|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^{\infty}(\mu)}^2 (\mu \times \mu),$$

we obtain

$$W_{\Phi}(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq \|\rho\|_{L^{\Phi}(\pi_t)} \leq G_{\Phi}(2t), \quad t > 0.$$

Combining this with (5.1) and the semigroup property, we arrive at

$$W_{\Phi}(\delta_x P_t, \delta_y P_t) \leq \frac{c_0}{\Phi^{-1}(1)} e^{-\lambda t/2} W_{\Phi}(\delta_x P_{t/2}, \delta_y P_{t/2}) \leq \frac{c_0}{\Phi^{-1}(1)} e^{-\lambda t/2} G_{\Phi}(t).$$

This together with (5.1) implies (2.6) for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$. Moreover, (2.7) follows from (2.6) according to Proposition 3.1.

(2) By Proposition 3.1, (2.8) implies

$$|\nabla P_t f| \leq c e^{-\lambda t} P_t |\nabla f|, \quad t \geq 0, f \in C_b^1(M).$$

Then using the standard semigroup calculation of Bakry-Emery, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} P_t(f^2 \log f^2) - (P_t f^2) \log P_t f^2 &= \int_0^t \frac{d}{ds} P_s \{(P_{t-s} f^2) \log P_{t-s} f^2\} ds \\ &= \int_0^t P_s \left(\frac{|\nabla P_{t-s} f^2|^2}{P_{t-s} f^2} \right) ds \leq 4c^2 \int_0^t e^{-2\lambda(t-s)} P_s \left(\frac{(P_{t-s} \{f|\nabla f\})^2}{P_{t-s} f^2} \right) ds \\ &\leq 4c^2 \int_0^t e^{2\lambda(t-s)} (P_t |\nabla f|^2) ds = \frac{2c^2(1 - e^{-2\lambda t})}{\lambda} P_t |\nabla f|^2, \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P_t g = \mu(g)$ for $g \in \mathcal{B}_b(M)$ due to the ergodicity, by letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ we prove the log-Sobolev inequality for (3.4) for $C = \frac{2c^2}{\lambda}$. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.4. We first observe that the proof of [34, Theorem 4.2] works also for the non-symmetric case with ∇Z in place of Hess_V , so that

$$(5.2) \quad \|P_t\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \exp \left[c + \frac{c}{t} \left(1 + \Lambda_1^{-1}(ct^{-1}) + \Lambda_2^{-1}(c^{-1}t) \right) \right], \quad t > 0.$$

Since in the symmetric case we have $\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)}^2$, the first assertion follows immediately from Theorem 2.3.

As for the non-symmetric case, since

$$\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)} \|P_{t/2}\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)},$$

by Theorem 2.3 and (5.2) it suffices to prove

$$(5.3) \quad \|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)} \leq c' + c'H(c't^{-1}), \quad t > 0$$

for some constant $c' > 0$. According to [23, Theorem 2.1], (5.2) implies the super log-Sobolev inequality (3.3) for

$$\beta(r) := c + \frac{c}{r} \left\{ 1 + \Lambda_1^{-1}(cr^{-1}) + \Lambda_2^{-1}(c^{-1}r) \right\}, \quad r > 0$$

for some (possibly different) constant $c > 0$. Then Proposition 3.3 with $p = 1, q = 2$ and $\gamma(r) := \frac{trh(r-1)}{(r-1) \int_0^1 s^{-1}h(s)ds}$ implies (5.3). □

6 Proofs of Theorems 2.5-2.6 and Proposition 2.7

Proof of Theorems 2.5. Let $X_t(x)$ solve (2.15) with initial point x . By Itô's formula and condition (2.16) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & d|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|^p \\ & \leq dM_t + p|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|^{p-2} \left\{ \frac{(p-2)|(\sigma(X_t(x)) - \sigma(X_t(y)))^*(X_t(x) - X_t(y))|^2}{|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|^2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\sigma(X_t(x)) - \sigma(X_t(y))\|_{HS}^2 + 2\langle b(X_t(x)) - b(X_t(y)), X_t(x) - X_t(y) \rangle \right\} dt \\ & \leq dM_t - pK_p|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|^p dt \end{aligned}$$

for some martingale M_t . This implies

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|^p \leq e^{-pK_p t} |x - y|^p, \quad t \geq 0, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and thus,

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} |\nabla P_t f(x)| & \leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{|f(X_t(x)) - f(X_t(y))|}{|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|} \cdot \frac{|X_t(x) - X_t(y)|}{|x - y|} \right) \\ & \leq e^{-K_p t} (P_t |\nabla f|)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the desired assertion follows from Proposition 3.1. □

Proof of Theorem 2.6. (1) We reformulate (2.15) as

$$(6.2) \quad dX_t = b(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2}(\sigma_0(X_t)dB'_t + \lambda_0 dB''_t),$$

where B'_t and B''_t are independent d -dimensional Brownian motions. For any $x \neq y$, let X_t solve this SDE with $X_0 = x$, and let Y_t solve the following coupled SDE with $Y_0 = y$:

$$dY_t = b(Y_t)dt + \sqrt{2}\sigma_0(Y_t)dB'_t + \lambda_0\sqrt{2}\left(dB''_t - 2\frac{\langle X_t - Y_t, dB''_t \rangle (X_t - Y_t)}{|X_t - Y_t|^2}\right).$$

That is, under the flat metric we have made coupling by reflection for B''_t and coupling by parallel displacement for B'_t . Obviously, the coupled SDE has a unique solution up to the coupling time

$$T_{x,y} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = Y_t\}.$$

We set $Y_t = X_t$ for $t \geq T_{x,y}$ as usual. Then by (2.17) and Itô's formula, we obtain

$$(6.3) \quad d|X_t - Y_t| \leq dM_t + \{(K_1 + K_2)1_{\{|X_t - Y_t| \leq r_0\}} - K_2\}|X_t - Y_t|dt, \quad t \leq T_{x,y}$$

for

$$dM_t := \frac{\sqrt{2}\langle 2\lambda_0 dB''_t + (\sigma_0(X_t) - \sigma_0(Y_t))dB'_t, X_t - Y_t \rangle}{|X_t - Y_t|}$$

being a martingale with

$$(6.4) \quad d\langle M \rangle_t \geq 8\lambda_0^2 dt.$$

By repeating the argument leading to (4.3), it is easy to see that (6.3) and (6.4) imply

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t - Y_t| \leq ce^{-\lambda t}|x - y|, \quad t \geq 0$$

for some constants $c, \lambda > 0$ independent of x, y . Therefore,

$$|\nabla P_t f| \leq ce^{-\lambda t} \|\nabla f\|_\infty, \quad t \geq 0, f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

so that the first assertion follows from Proposition 3.1.

(2) According to [37, Theorem 1.1], $a \geq \alpha I$ and (2.19) imply the log-Harnack inequality

$$P_t(\log f)(x) \leq \log P_t f(y) + \frac{c_1|x - y|^2}{1 - e^{-c_2 t}}, \quad t \geq 0, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, 0 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Combining this with the log-Sobolev inequality, we prove the second assertion as in (c) in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

(3) According to the proof of Theorem 2.5, the condition (2.16) implies the gradient estimate (6.1). Next, by Proposition 3.4, the ultracontractivity and (6.1) imply

$$|\nabla P_t f| \leq c(p)e^{-\lambda t}(P_t|\nabla f|^{\frac{p}{p-1}})^{\frac{p-1}{p}}, \quad t \geq 0, f \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

for some $c(p) > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ independent of p . Then the proof is finished by Proposition 3.1. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.7. We will apply results in [23] and [35]. To this end, we introduce the Riemannian metric

$$g(\partial_i, \partial_j) = g_{ij} := (a^{-1})_{i,j}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d,$$

and let $\Delta^g, \nabla^g, \text{Hess}^g$ be the corresponding Laplacian, gradient and Hessian tensor respectively. Then $L = \Delta^g + Z$ for some C^1 vector field Z . We first verify the Bakry-Emery curvature condition (1.1) for some constant K . Using the Christoffel symbols, the intrinsic Hessian tensor induced by g is formulated as

$$\text{Hess}_f^g(\partial_i, \partial_j) = \partial_{ij}^2 f - \sum_{k=1}^d \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k f.$$

So, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\text{Hess}_f^g(x) = 0$, we have

$$\partial_{ij}^2 f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^d \Gamma_{ij}^n \partial_n f(x), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Thus, by Bochner-Weitzenböck formula and (2.22), at point x there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ric}_Z(\nabla^g f, \nabla^g f) + K_0 |\nabla f|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} L \langle a \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle - \langle a \nabla f, \nabla L f \rangle + K_0 |\nabla f|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^d a_{kl} \left[(\partial_{kl}^2 a_{ij})(\partial_i f)(\partial_j f) + 2a_{ij}(\partial_{ki}^2 f)(\partial_l^2 f) + 2(\partial_l a_{ij}) \{ (\partial_{ki}^2 f) \partial_j f - (\partial_{ij}^2 f) \partial_k f \} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^d a_{kl} \left[(\partial_{kl}^2 a_{ij})(\partial_i f)(\partial_j f) + 2(\partial_l a_{ij}) \sum_{n=1}^d (\partial_n f) \{ \Gamma_{ki}^n \partial_i f - \Gamma_{ij}^n \partial_k f \} \right] \\ &\geq -K_1 |\nabla f|^2 \geq -\frac{K_1}{\alpha} \langle a \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle = -\frac{K_1}{\alpha} g(\nabla^g f, \nabla^g f) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant K_1 . Then (1.1) hold for some constant K .

Next, (2.23) implies that P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ such that $\mu(e^{c_2|\cdot|^2}) < \infty$ for some $c_2 > \frac{K}{2\alpha}$. By our assumption on a , the Riemannian distance ρ induced by the metric g is equivalent to the Euclidian metric:

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{1}{\|a\|_\infty} |\cdot|^2 \leq \rho_a^2(0, \cdot) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} |\cdot|^2.$$

Then we may repeat the proof of [23, Corollary 2.5] with $\gamma(r) = c_2 r^\delta$ and $\rho = |\cdot|$ to prove

$$(6.6) \quad \|P_t\|_{L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \exp \left[c_3 t^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta-1}} \right], \quad t > 0$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$. Combining this with the curvature condition (1.1), we obtain from [23, Theorem 2.1] for $p = 2$ and $q = \infty$ that

$$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq r \mathcal{E}(f, f) + c_4 r^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta-1}}, \quad r \in (0, 1), \mu(f^2) = 1$$

holds for some constant $c_4 > 0$. Applying Proposition 3.3 below for $p = 1, q = 2$ and $\gamma(r) = c_5 t(r-1)^{\frac{\delta-1}{2\delta}-1}$ for constant $c_5 > 0$ such that $t = \int_1^2 \frac{\gamma(r)}{r} dr$, we obtain

$$\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)} \leq \exp \left[c_6 t^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta-1}} \right], \quad t \in (0, 1)$$

for some constant $c_6 > 0$. Combining this with (6.6) we arrive at

$$\|P_t\|_{L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mu)} \leq c_7 \exp \left[c_7 t^{-\frac{\delta}{\delta-1}} \right], \quad t > 0$$

for some constant $c_7 > 0$. □

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Jian Wang for helpful comments.

References

- [1] S. Aida, T. Masuda, I. Shigekawa, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and exponential integrability*, J. Funct. Anal. 126(1994), 83–101.
- [2] M. Arnaudon, A. Thalmaier, F.-Y. Wang, *Harnack inequality and heat kernel estimate on manifolds with curvature unbounded below*, Bull. Sci. Math. 130(2006), 223–233.
- [3] D. Bakry, M. Emery, *Hypercontractivité de semi-groupes de diffusion*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Sér. I Math. 299(1984), 775–778.
- [4] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, *Hypercontractivity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. 80(2001), 669–696.
- [5] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators*, Springer, 2014.
- [6] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, *On Harnack inequalities and optimal transportation*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) XIV(2015), 705–727.
- [7] M.-F. Chen, F.-Y. Wang, *Estimates of logarithmic Sobolev constant: an improvement of Bakry-Emery criterion*, J. Funct. Anal. 144(1997), 287–300.
- [8] M.-F. Chen, F.-Y. Wang, *Estimation of spectral gap for elliptic operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 349(1997), 1239–1267.
- [9] E. B. Davies, B. Simons, *Ultracontractivity and heat kernel for Schrödinger operators and Dirichlet Laplacians*, J. Funct. Anal. 59(1984), 335–395.
- [10] A. Eberle, *Reflection coupling and Wasserstein contractivity without convexity*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Sér. I Math. 349(2011), 1101–1104.

- [11] A. Eberle, *Reflection couplings and contraction rates for diffusions*, to appear in Probab. Thero. Relat. Fields.
- [12] M. Emery, *Stochastic Calculus in Manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989, with an appendix by P.-A. Meyer.
- [13] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and contractivity properties of semigroups*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1563, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [14] W. S. Kendall, *Nonnegative Ricci curvature and the Brownian coupling property*, Stochastics 19(1986), 111–129.
- [15] K. Kuwada, *Duality on gradient estimates and Wasserstein controls*, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), 3758–3774.
- [16] K. Kuwada, *Gradient estimate for Markov kernels, Wasserstein control and Hopf-Lax formula*, In “Potential Theory and Its Related Fields”, 61–80, RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu, B43, Res. Inst. Math. Sci. (RIMS), Kyoto, 2013.
- [17] D. Luo, J. Wang, *Exponential convergence in L^p -Wasserstein distance for diffusion processes without uniform dissipative drift*, to appear in Math. Nachr.
- [18] L. Miclo, *On hyperboundedness and spectrum of Markov operators*, Inven. Math. 200(2015), 311–343.
- [19] F. Otto, *The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation*, Comm. Part. Diff. Equat. 26(2001), 101–174.
- [20] F. Otto, C. Villani, *Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality*, J. Funct. Anal. 173(2000), 361–400.
- [21] E. Priola, F.-Y. Wang, *Gradient estimates for diffusion semigroups with singular coefficients*, J. Funct. Anal. 236(2006), 244–264.
- [22] M.-K. von Renesse, K.-T. Sturm, *Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy, and Ricci curvature*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 58(2005), 923–940.
- [23] M. Röckner, F.-Y. Wang, *Supercontractivity and ultracontractivity for (non-symmetric) diffusion semigroups on manifolds*, Forum Math. 15(2003), 893–921.
- [24] M. Röckner, F.-Y. Wang, *Spectrum for a class of (nonsymmetric) diffusion operators*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 36(2004), 95–104.
- [25] J. Shao, *Hamilton-Jacobi semi-groups in infinite dimensional spaces*, Bull. Sci. math. 130(2006), 720–738.
- [26] W. Stannat, *(Nonsymmetric) Dirichlet operators on L^1 : Existence, uniqueness and associated Markov processes*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. 28(1999) 99–140.

- [27] C. Villani, *Topics in Optimal Transportation*, Amer. Math. Soc. 2003.
- [28] C. Villani, *Optimal Transport, Old and New*, Springer, 2009.
- [29] F.-Y. Wang, *Application of coupling method to the Neumann eigenvalue problem*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 98(1994), 299–306.
- [30] F.-Y. Wang, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 109(1997), 417–424.
- [31] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional inequalities for empty essential spectrum*, J. Funct. Anal. 170(2000), 219–245.
- [32] F.-Y. Wang, *Probability distance inequalities on Riemannian manifolds and path spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 206(2004), 167–190.
- [33] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional Inequalities, Markov Semigroups and Spectral Theory*, Science Press, 2005, Beijing.
- [34] F.-Y. Wang, *Log-Sobolev inequalities: different roles of Ric and Hess*, Ann. Probab. 37(2009), 1587–1604.
- [35] F.-Y. Wang, *Log-Sobolev inequality on non-convex manifolds*, Adv. Math. 222(2009), 1503–1520.
- [36] F.-Y. Wang, *Harnack inequalities on manifolds with boundary and applications*, J. Math. Pures Appl. 94(2010) 304–321.
- [37] F.-Y. Wang, *Harnack inequality for SDE with multiplicative noise and extension to Neumann semigroup on nonconvex manifolds*, Ann. Probab. 39(2011), 1449–1467.
- [38] F.-Y. Wang, *Criteria on spectral gap of Markov operators*, J. Funct. Anal. 266(2014), 2137–2152.
- [39] F.-Y. Wang, *Analysis for Diffusion Processes on Riemannian Manifolds*, Springer, 2014.
- [40] F.-Y. Wang, *Asymptotic couplings by reflection and applications for nonlinear monotone SPDEs*, Nonlinear Anal. 117(2015), 169–188.