

No-Regret Generative Modeling via Parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE

Nabarun Deb and Tengyuan Liang*

The University of Chicago

Abstract

We introduce a novel generative modeling framework based on a discretized parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE, which emerges as a continuous limit of the Sinkhorn algorithm commonly used in optimal transport. Our method performs iterative refinement in the space of Brenier maps using a mirror gradient descent step. We establish theoretical guarantees for generative modeling through the lens of no-regret analysis, demonstrating that the iterates converge to the optimal Brenier map under a variety of step-size schedules. As a technical contribution, we derive a new Evolution Variational Inequality tailored to the parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE, connecting geometry, transportation cost, and regret. Our framework accommodates non-log-concave target distributions, constructs an optimal sampling process via the Brenier map, and integrates favorable learning techniques from generative adversarial networks and score-based diffusion models. As direct applications, we illustrate how our theory paves new pathways for generative modeling and variational inference.

Keywords— Bregman divergence, generative models, parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE, regret bounds.

1 Introduction

Probabilistic generative models have demonstrated impressive empirical performance in modeling complex probability distributions for tasks deemed challenging under conventional statistical frameworks. Over the past decade, many probabilistic generative models have been proposed and analyzed, partly inspired by the theory of optimal transport (OT), including generative adversarial networks (GANs) [Goo+20; ACB17; Lia21; Lüb+22; HGL24], as well as flow-based and diffusion-based probabilistic models (DPMs) [SE19; Lim+23; Son+21; Che+22; Che+24; LDK24], among others.

At a high level, GANs and DPMs aim to model and learn the push-forward map between a *reference distribution* ν , which is easy to sample from, such as a Gaussian distribution, and the *target probability distribution* μ . With the learned push-forward map τ , one can generate new samples X from the target distribution by transforming fresh samples $Y \sim \nu$, specifically $X = \tau(Y)$. Despite abundant empirical evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in practice, these generative models possess certain unfavorable theoretical limitations, which we discuss below.

- (i) Ease of sampling: GANs model the push-forward map as a one-step map, namely $\mu = \tau\#\nu$, where sampling is easy; DPMs, on the other hand, represent the push-forward map as a composition of a series of non-linear transformations, expressed as $\mu = (\tau_1 \circ \tau_2 \circ \dots \circ \tau_T)\#\nu$, where sampling is less transparent since it requires inverting a sequence of non-linear maps known as denoising steps.

*Liang acknowledges the generous support from the NSF Career Award (DMS-2042473) and the Wallman Society of Fellows at the University of Chicago.

- (ii) Ease of learning: Brenier’s theorem [Bre91] demonstrates that the optimal transport map $\tau = \nabla\psi$ corresponds to a convex potential ψ . However, it is known in GANs that enforcing convexity constraints to regularize learning presents technical challenges. Additionally, learning the one-step map from uncoupled data $X \sim \mu, Z \sim \nu$ proves difficult. In contrast, DPMs propose decomposing the task into a sequence of sub-tasks where each map is a small deviation from the identity map, namely $\tau_k \approx \text{id}$, $k = 1, \dots, T$. Furthermore, for each step k , the deviation $\tau_k - \text{id}$ can be learned reliably from coupled data constructed using diffusions.

In this paper, we introduce a novel generative modeling framework inspired by parabolic Monge-Ampère partial differential equation (PDE), a nonlinear PDE that naturally arises in OT as the limit of Sinkhorn algorithm. Notably, our framework simultaneously integrates the ease of sampling and the ease of learning, two key features discussed earlier.

The core idea is as follows: we refine the Brenier map $\nabla\psi_k$ iteratively using a discretized version of a mirror gradient flow, thus constructing a chain $\nabla\psi_1, \nabla\psi_2, \dots, \nabla\psi_T \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \nabla\psi$. In particular, let $f(x) := -\log(d\mu/dx)$ be the target density, and define the density at step k as $\rho_k := (\nabla\psi_k)\#e^{-g}$ with $g(x) := -\log(d\nu/dx)$. We then study the following vector-field iterations

$$\frac{\nabla\psi_{k+1} - \nabla\psi_k}{\eta_k} = -\xi_k, \quad \text{where } \xi_k := \nabla(\log(\rho_k/e^{-f}) \circ \nabla\psi_k).$$

Here, ξ_k resembles a (preconditioned) gradient step under a (local) mirror geometry. Equivalently, the Brenier potential admits an iterative refinement of the form of a (discretized) Monge-Ampère PDE,

$$\frac{\psi_{k+1} - \psi_k}{\eta_k} = -f \circ \nabla\psi_k + g + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_k),$$

which is the limit of the Sinkhorn algorithm under certain scalings [Ber20; Deb+23].

Two modeling advantages of our idea are: (i) our iterative refinement acts directly on the space of Brenier maps, and thus the limit $(\nabla\psi_T)\#\nu \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \mu$ provides an optimal one-step sampling of the target measure in the context of Brenier’s theorem; (ii) at each iteration, one can learn the gradient ξ_k without worrying about enforcing notions of convexity/cyclic monotonicity. The convexity of ψ_{k+1} will follow as a consequence of the convexity of ψ_k and the small step-size η_k . These speak to the ease of sampling and learning, respectively.

As for theoretical contributions, we provide a refined no-regret analysis for the proposed generative modeling framework, without requiring the target distribution μ to be log-concave. Our regret analysis provides new technical tools to study generative models by introducing a new Evolution Variational Inequality (EVI) [AGS08; SKL20; Guo+22]—which connects geometry, transportation cost, and regret—tailored to the parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE. Our novel regret analysis significantly expands the theory of generative models to accommodate non-log-concave measures.

Organization. In Section 2, we provide background and motivation for parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE. In Section 3, we introduce and study the properties of Bregman divergence on the space of probability measures, as it serves as the key geometry with respect to which we shall study convergence. Specifically, Section 3.1 features a new three-point identity for Bregman divergences, while Section 3.2 presents a new notion of convexity of the KL divergence with respect to a Wasserstein Bregman divergence (introduced in Example 2 below). In Section 4, we present all our convergence and regret analyses: (i) Section 4.1 provides guarantees for average iterate convergence, (ii) Section 4.2 introduces a new EVI for the KL and Bregman divergences, and (iii) Section 4.3 contains regret bounds and non-asymptotic rates for the last iterate. In Section 5, we discuss how our proposed discretized parabolic PDE can be employed to design novel algorithms for generative modeling (see Section 5.1) and variational inference (see Section 5.2). Appendices A, B, C, and D include the proofs of the results from Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

Notations. We will write e^{-f} for the density of our target distribution μ supported on some $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and e^{-g} for the density of the reference distribution ν supported on $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Typically for simple e^{-g} like the Gaussian, we will have $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^d$. To help the reader distinguish between the domains, all integrals on $\mathcal{X}$ will be over the variable x and all integrals on $\mathcal{Y}$ will be over the variable y . Only μ, ν are reserved for probability measures, and the other Greek symbols ρ and π (with subscripts) will always refer to probability densities. All vector fields will be denoted using boldface notation, for instance, $\xi, \tau : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

The push-forward $\tau\#\mu$ for a vector field τ denotes the distribution of $\tau(X)$ when $X \sim \mu$. With slight notational abuse, we will sometimes directly apply the $\#$ notation on a probability density, say ρ , in which case $\tau\#\rho$ will also denote a density function. $KL(\rho|\pi)$ and $W_2(\rho, \pi)$ denote the standard KL divergence and the Wasserstein distance between ρ and π respectively. For densities π and ρ , we will use the standard definitions of Brenier potentials and Brenier maps between π and ρ from [Vil09, Theorem 2.12]. Typically, these potentials will be represented with ϕ or ψ (and the corresponding maps by $\nabla\phi$ and $\nabla\psi$), with appropriate indexing to make the probability measures involved transparent. $\mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ will denote the space of probability densities supported on some subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with finite second moments, and we will sometimes refer to it as the 2-Wasserstein space.

Given a diffeomorphism (continuously differentiable function with differentiable inverse) $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write its Fenchel dual as $\psi^*(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\langle x, y \rangle - \psi(y))$. We will call a twice differentiable function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a m -strongly convex function if $\inf_y \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2\psi(y)) \geq m$. Similarly, we will call it M -smooth if $\lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2\psi(y)) \leq M$. The following function spaces will be used : (i) $\mathcal{C}^2$ for continuously differentiable functions, (ii) $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty$ for infinitely differentiable functions with compact support, and (iii) $L^2(\rho)$ for square integrable functions with respect to some probability density ρ . Given a functional $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some function space $\mathcal{U}$, $\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta u}$ will denote the first variation/Gateaux derivative of $\mathcal{F}$ at u . Finally $\mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d}$ will denote the set of $d \times d$ symmetric positive semi-definite matrices; for instance, $\nabla^2\psi(y) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d}, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

2 Parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE

Recall that we wish to sample from a complicated *target distribution* with density $e^{-f} \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We also have a *reference distribution* with density $e^{-g} \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is easy to sample from, for instance, a standard Gaussian. By Brenier's Theorem [Bre91; McC95], there exists a Brenier potential $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\nabla\psi\#e^{-g} = e^{-f}$. The corresponding (static) Monge-Ampère equation [Mon84; Amp19] thus reads:

$$-f(\nabla\psi(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi(y)) = 0.$$

Learning $\nabla\psi$ is particularly useful for sampling as one can generate samples from e^{-f} by first sampling from $Y \sim e^{-g}$ (say a Gaussian) and then applying the optimal transform $\nabla\psi(Y)$. However, as the above is a non-linear second-order PDE, given e^{-f} and e^{-g} , solving the equation for $\nabla\psi$ is highly computationally intensive. An alternate approach adopted in the PDE literature is to study instead the natural dynamic version, that is, the parabolic PDE

$$\frac{\partial\psi_t}{\partial t}(y) = -f(\nabla\psi_t(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_t(y)). \quad (2.1)$$

The existence of solutions, uniqueness, smoothness, and exponential convergence of $\nabla\psi_t \rightarrow \nabla\psi$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ have been studied extensively in the PDE literature; see e.g. [KSW12; AK20; Ber20]. Therefore, $\{\nabla\psi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ can be viewed as a continuum of iterative refinements of some initial map $\nabla\psi_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, eventually leading to the target Brenier map $\nabla\psi$. Furthermore, define $\rho_t := \nabla\psi_t\#e^{-g}$. Then by sampling $Y \sim e^{-g}$, $\nabla\psi_t(Y) \sim \rho_t \approx e^{-f}$ (see [Deb+23]). Therefore, $\nabla\psi_t(Y)$ can be viewed as an approximate one-step sample from the target density e^{-f} , for large t . Due to these favorable properties of the parabolic PDE (2.1), it is natural to study an implementable time discretization of (2.1). In this paper, we therefore study the following natural (forward) update rule:

$$\frac{\psi_{k+1}(y) - \psi_k(y)}{\eta_k} = -f(\nabla\psi_k(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_k(y)) = -f(\nabla\psi_k(y)) - \log \rho_k(\nabla\psi_k(y)) \quad (2.2)$$

where $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ denotes the set of step-sizes, $\psi_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is some strongly convex function, and

$$\rho_k := (\nabla \psi_k) \# e^{-g}. \quad (2.3)$$

In this paper, we study the choice of step-sizes η_k , and its effect on the convergence of $\rho_k \rightarrow e^{-f}$. The implementation of (2.2) based on neural networks is possible using a classification technique as in [Goo+14, Proposition 1], or a score matching technique as in [Hyv05, Theorem 1]; we will discuss these in detail in Section 5.

Beyond the natural connections to the Monge-Ampère equation, the continuous and discrete systems (2.1) and (2.2) have several compelling properties that make them useful for applications. We present a few of them below: (i) they can lead to faster flows in the simple Gaussian setting than perhaps the widely studied dynamical system, namely the canonical Fokker-Planck equation [Fok14; Pla17]; (ii) they are closely related to the dynamics of the celebrated Sinkhorn algorithm [Cut13; FL89]; (iii) they can be viewed as steepest descent of the $KL(\cdot | e^{-f})$ functional with respect to a certain weighted local L^2 -metric; (iv) they can be used to construct novel generative learning algorithms that combine ease of sampling with ease of learning as mentioned in the introduction; and (v) they provide a new paradigm for variational inference. The first two points will be discussed in this section, while the latter three are deferred to Section 5.

2.1 Illustrative Example for Gaussians

We provide a simple example on the rate of convergence of the aforementioned parabolic PDE when both e^{-f} and e^{-g} are densities of centered univariate Gaussians, say $N(0, 1)$ and $N(0, \lambda^2)$, $\lambda < 1$. Suppose that $\psi_0(y) = y^2/2$. The continuous time system (2.1), after taking an additional space derivative then reduces to

$$\frac{\partial \psi'_t(y)}{\partial t} = -\psi''_t(y)\psi'_t(y) + \frac{1}{\lambda^2}y + \frac{\psi'''_t(y)}{\psi'_t(y)}.$$

As ψ'_0 is linear, it is easy to check that all ψ'_t s are linear. So, let $\psi'_t(y) = c_t y$ for some c_t . The above differential equation then becomes a Riccati equation $\dot{c}_t = -c_t^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2}$ with $c_0 = 1$, which implies $c_t = (1/\lambda) \tanh((t/\lambda) + \tanh^{-1}(\lambda))$. Writing $\rho_t = (\psi'_t) \# e^{-g}$ gives that ρ_t is the density of the $N(0, \sigma_t^2)$ distribution where $\sigma_t = \tanh((t/\lambda) + \tanh^{-1}(\lambda))$. It is easy to check that for the standard Fokker-Planck system, the corresponding solution, say $\rho_F(t)$ is the density of $N(0, \sigma_{F,t}^2)$ where $\sigma_{F,t}^2 = 1 - (1 - \lambda^2)e^{-2t}$. As a result,

$$\frac{1 - \sigma_{F,t}^2}{1 - \sigma_t^2} = \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{4} \left(e^{-t(1+\lambda^{-1}) - \tanh^{-1}(\lambda)} + e^{t(\lambda^{-1}-1) + \tanh^{-1}(\lambda)} \right)^2 \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

because $\lambda < 1$. Therefore, σ_t^2 converges to the target variance 1 faster than the Fokker-Planck variance $\sigma_{F,t}^2$. For the discretization scheme (2.2), it can be shown that the ρ_k 's (see (2.3)), under appropriate initialization, are all centered Gaussian distributions, and the variance converges to the target variance 1 locally at an exponential rate. For brevity, we defer further details to Appendix A.

In the sequel, we provide in Section 4 global regret analyses of the discretization (2.2) under general assumptions on e^{-f} and e^{-g} , extending far beyond Gaussianity and log-concavity.

2.2 Connection to Sinkhorn

The exploding literature on generative modeling over the recent years has witnessed state of the art methods that rely on entropy regularized optimal transport (EOT); see e.g. [GPC18; De +21; Cao+21; Wan+21]. Given a temperature parameter $\epsilon > 0$, the EOT problem is given by

$$\pi^\epsilon := \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi(e^{-f}, e^{-g})} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int \|x - y\|^2 \gamma(x, y) d(x, y) + \epsilon KL(\gamma | e^{-f} \otimes e^{-g}) \right\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\Pi(e^{-f}, e^{-g})$ denotes the class of probability densities on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with marginal densities e^{-f} and e^{-g} . The optimal π^ϵ from (2.4) is also referred to as the (static) Schrödinger Bridge (see [Sch35]) between e^{-f} and e^{-g} . By [For40; RT93], it is known that there exist potentials ϕ^ϵ and ψ^ϵ such that $\pi^\epsilon(x, y) = \exp(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\langle x, y \rangle - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\phi^\epsilon(x) - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\psi^\epsilon(y) - f(x) - g(y))$. As $\pi^\epsilon \in \Pi(e^{-f}, e^{-g})$, both ϕ^ϵ and ψ^ϵ will satisfy certain fixed point equations. In particular, the equation for ψ^ϵ is given by

$$\psi^\epsilon(y) = \mathcal{V}^\epsilon[\psi^\epsilon](y), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{V}^\epsilon[\psi^\epsilon](y) := \epsilon \log \int \frac{\exp(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\langle x, y \rangle)}{\int \exp(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\langle x, y' \rangle - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\psi^\epsilon(y') - g(y')) dy'} e^{-f(x)} dx.$$

Perhaps the most popular algorithm for solving (2.4) is the Sinkhorn algorithm (see [Rüs95; Cut13]) which solves for ϕ^ϵ , ψ^ϵ , π^ϵ using a natural iterative procedure to get $\{\phi_k^\epsilon, \psi_k^\epsilon, \pi_k^\epsilon\}_{k \geq 0}$. In particular, following the $\mathcal{V}^\epsilon$ notation above, the ψ_k^ϵ s are updated as

$$\psi_{k+1}^\epsilon = \mathcal{V}^\epsilon[\psi_k^\epsilon](y). \quad (2.5)$$

The parabolic PDE (2.1) can now be viewed as the *scaling limit* of the Sinkhorn algorithm in the low temperature regime $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ when the number of iterations k scales like t/ϵ for some $t > 0$. The following proposition (also see [Ber20, Lemma 4.2] and [Deb+23, Lemma 4.6]) demonstrates why such a scaling limit is natural. We provide a proof in Appendix A that is self-contained.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a uniformly strongly convex $\mathcal{C}^2$ function. Let $\tilde{\psi}^\epsilon(y) := \mathcal{V}^\epsilon[\psi](y)$. Then, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have:*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{\psi}^\epsilon(y) - \psi(y)}{\epsilon} = -f(\nabla\psi(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi(y)).$$

Assuming that the Sinkhorn iterates $\{\psi_k^\epsilon\}$'s are $\mathcal{C}^2$ smooth and strongly convex, Proposition 2.1 coupled with the Sinkhorn update rule (2.5) yields the following approximation

$$\frac{\psi_{k+1}^\epsilon(y) - \psi_k^\epsilon(y)}{\epsilon} \approx -f(\nabla\psi_k^\epsilon(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_k^\epsilon(y)),$$

which approximately coincides with our discretization scheme (2.2) with constant step-sizes $\eta_k = \epsilon$. Moreover, the above display implies that ψ_{k+1}^ϵ and ψ_k^ϵ are $O(\epsilon)$ apart. As a result, by running the Sinkhorn algorithm for $k = t/\epsilon$ iterations, we expect to get a limiting curve, call it $\{\psi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. Using similar heuristics as used in the discretization of the Cauchy problem [San17; Mér16], we expect that the LHS $\epsilon^{-1}(\psi_{t/\epsilon+1}^\epsilon(y) - \psi_{t/\epsilon}^\epsilon(y))$ will converge to the time derivative $\partial_t \psi_t(y)$ whereas the RHS $-f(\nabla\psi_{t/\epsilon}^\epsilon(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_{t/\epsilon}^\epsilon(y))$ should converge to the negative descent direction $-f(\nabla\psi_t(y)) + g(y) + \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_t(y))$. This yields the parabolic PDE in (2.1).

3 Bregman Divergences over Probability Measures

Our regret approach to studying the discretized parabolic Monge-Ampère equation (and its application to generative modeling) relies on a novel three-point identity that delineates geometry, transportation cost, and regret. This key analytic tool depends on the concept of Bregman divergences on the 2-Wasserstein space. To motivate it, we recall the definition of Bregman divergence on the standard Euclidean space — For a diffeomorphism $\phi(\cdot)$ and its Fenchel conjugate $\phi^*(\cdot)$, define

$$D_\phi(x|\nabla\phi^*(y)) := \phi(x) - \phi(\nabla\phi^*(y)) - \langle y, x - \nabla\phi^*(y) \rangle = \phi(x) + \phi^*(y) - \langle x, y \rangle. \quad (3.1)$$

It is easy to check that if $\phi(\cdot)$ is strictly convex, then $D_\phi(x|\nabla\phi^*(y)) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = \nabla\phi^*(y)$. The Bregman divergence is a fundamental notion in the celebrated field of Euclidean mirror descent (see [Tze+23; Bub+21; BT03], and the references therein) and is known to yield nearly dimension-free rates in certain constrained optimization problems. The following definition extends the Bregman divergence (also see [KHK24; Deb+23; AKL22; Bon+24]) from the finite-dimensional Euclidean space to the infinite-dimensional 2-Wasserstein space.

Definition 1 (Bregman divergence over probability measures). *Given a function $\Gamma : \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which admits a well-defined first variation, we define the Bregman divergence functional for Γ as follows:*

$$B_\Gamma(\rho_2|\rho_1) := \Gamma(\rho_2) - \Gamma(\rho_1) - \int \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta\rho}(\rho_1)(x) (\rho_2 - \rho_1)(x) dx ,$$

for probability density functions $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, provided the first variation is integrable under ρ_1, ρ_2 . We will refer to Γ as the mirror function.

The above definition of Bregman divergence on the 2-Wasserstein space is reminiscent of the usual Euclidean Bregman divergence defined in (3.1). The main difference here is that the role of the Euclidean derivative is played by the first variation. For notational clarity, we use different letters B and D for divergences on the Wasserstein space and on the Euclidean space, respectively. Below, we provide some examples of Bregman divergence over probability measures.

Example 1 (Entropy as mirror). *The most popular example of Bregman divergence is when the mirror is the entropy function $H(\rho) := \int \rho(x) \log \rho(x) dx$, in which case*

$$B_H(\rho_2|\rho_1) = H(\rho_2) - H(\rho_1) - \int \frac{\delta H}{\delta\rho}(\rho_1)(x) (\rho_2 - \rho_1)(x) dx = KL(\rho_2|\rho_1) ,$$

for probability density functions $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, provided the first variation is integrable under ρ_1, ρ_2 . We will refer to Γ as the mirror function.

Example 2 (Wasserstein distance as mirror). *Another example of Bregman divergence that will be useful in this paper is for the function $G(\rho) := (1/2)W_2^2(\rho, e^{-g})$, where e^{-g} is the reference distribution. To simplify the Bregman divergence for this example, we write ϕ_ρ to be a Brenier potential from ρ to e^{-g} . It is known (see [San15, Proposition 7.17] and [AGS08, Corollary 10.2.7]) that*

$$\frac{\delta G}{\delta\rho}(\rho)(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 - \phi_\rho(x) .$$

Therefore, the Bregman divergence of G is given by

$$B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) = G(\rho_2) - G(\rho_1) - \int \left(\frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 - \phi_{\rho_1}(x) \right) (\rho_2 - \rho_1)(x) dx ,$$

for probability densities $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

3.1 A New Three-Point Identity

The Bregman divergence function $B_G(\cdot|\cdot)$ satisfies non-negativity and can be expressed as the expectation of the standard Bregman divergence with respect to an appropriate probability measure. We defer the reader to Lemmas B.1 and B.2 for further details. To keep the discussion streamlined, we present the most important property of $B_G(\cdot|\cdot)$ here, namely a new three-point identity, that will be instrumental to our regret analysis.

Lemma 3.1 (A new Bregman three-point identity). *Consider probability densities $\rho_1, \rho_2, \pi \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and recall the definitions of $G(\cdot) = (1/2)W_2^2(\cdot, e^{-g})$, its induced $B_G(\cdot|\cdot)$, and the Brenier potentials ϕ_{ρ_i} for $i = 1, 2$ as in Example 2. Define in addition $\pi_i := (\nabla \phi_{\rho_i})\# \pi$ for $i = 1, 2$, and another Bregman divergence $B_{G_\pi}(\cdot|\cdot)$ induced by the function $G_\pi(\cdot) := (1/2)W_2^2(\cdot, \pi)$. Set $\psi_{\rho_i} = \phi_{\rho_i}^*$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then*

$$\int (\psi_{\rho_2} - \psi_{\rho_1})(y) (\pi_1 - e^{-g})(y) dy = B_G(\pi|\rho_1) - B_G(\pi|\rho_2) + B_{G_\pi}(\pi_1|\pi_2) .$$




Figure 1: The probability densities ρ_1, ρ_2, π live on the target domain $\mathcal{X}$ while the densities π_1, π_2, e^{-g} live on the reference domain $\mathcal{Y}$. $\nabla\phi_{\rho_i}$ is the Brenier map from ρ_i to e^{-g} , $i = 1, 2$. As $\pi_i = \nabla\phi_{\rho_i} \# \pi$, Brenier’s Theorem [Bre91] implies that $\nabla\phi_{\rho_i}$ is also the Brenier map from π to π_i , for $i = 1, 2$. The telescoping term in Lemma 3.1, $B_G(\pi|\rho_1) - B_G(\pi|\rho_2)$ involves densities ρ_1, ρ_2, π all of which live on the target space. One might naturally expect the transportation cost to be $B_G(\rho_1|\rho_2)$. In sharp contrast, the corresponding term in Lemma 3.1 is $B_{G_\pi}(\pi_1|\pi_2)$ where π_i lives on the reference domain and is the image of π under the Brenier map $\nabla\phi_{\rho_i}$, $i = 1, 2$.

Let us briefly examine why the above lemma will be useful in our regret bounds. We will use it with $\rho_2 = \rho_{k+1}$ and $\rho_1 = \rho_k$ (see (2.3)). The LHS will be the first order term in the expansion of the map $\rho \mapsto \text{KL}(\rho|e^{-f})$ around ρ_k . For the RHS, the term $B_G(\pi|\rho_1) - B_G(\pi|\rho_2) \equiv B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1})$ will be a “telescoping term” as we vary k . The term $B_{G_\pi}(\pi_1|\pi_2)$ is for the “transportation cost” to go from ρ_1 to ρ_2 , or equivalently ρ_k to ρ_{k+1} . Curiously, note that the transportation cost does not use the same mirror map G but instead requires a new mirror map G_π . Moreover, it is not directly a Bregman divergence between ρ_1 and ρ_2 but instead between the image of π under $\nabla\phi_{\rho_1}$ and $\nabla\phi_{\rho_2}$. Figure 1 summarizes the maps and probability measures involved in the transportation cost term.

Remark 1. In the mirror descent literature on Hilbert spaces, analogs of the above lemma are usually termed three-point inequalities or Bregman proximal inequalities; see [CT93, Lemma 3.2], [LLM11, Lemma 1], [Bon+24, Lemma 29]; also see [LFN18; FSG08]. For instance, in the Euclidean setting, the Bregman descent update for optimizing a function $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to a mirror $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\nabla\phi(x_{k+1}) = \nabla\phi(x_k) - \eta_k \nabla F(x_k) .$$

For any $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, regret bounds for Euclidean mirror descent rely on the following three-point identity:

$$\langle \nabla\phi(x_k) - \nabla\phi(x_{k+1}), x_k - z \rangle = D_\phi(z|x_k) - D_\phi(z|x_{k+1}) + D_\phi(x_k|x_{k+1}) , \quad (3.2)$$

which relates the three points z, x_k and x_{k+1} . Lemma 3.1 can be viewed as an extension of (3.2) to the 2-Wasserstein space which does not possess a Hilbert structure. Note that (4.2) captures the relationship between five different measures $\pi, \pi_1, \pi_2, \rho_1, \rho_2$, instead of three. As π_i is still a function of π, ρ_i, e^{-g} , we continue to use the term “three-point lemma” for (4.2); see Figure 1. Moreover, in contrast to the RHS of (3.2) where all the divergences use the same mirror ϕ , the RHS of (4.2) requires the use of two different mirrors $G(\cdot) = (1/2)W_2^2(\cdot, e^{-g})$ and $G_\pi(\cdot) = (1/2)W_2^2(\cdot, \pi)$. To the best of our knowledge, the existing three-point equalities/inequalities for other forms of Bregman descent on the 2-Wasserstein space, e.g. [AKL22, Lemma 3], [Lég21, Theorem 1], [Han+25, Lemma 8], also use the same mirror map on both the telescoping and the transportation cost terms. In that sense, Lemma 3.1 is new and is particularly well suited to analyze the discretization (2.2).

3.2 Bregman and KL: Relative Convexity

Our next main result in this section introduces a new notion of convexity for the KL divergence with respect to the Bregman divergence $B_G(\cdot|\cdot)$.

Lemma 3.2 (Bregman and KL: relative convexity). *Consider the reference distribution e^{-g} where $g(\cdot)$ is λ -strongly convex. Further, let ρ be a probability density such that the Brenier potential $\psi_\rho(\cdot)$ from e^{-g} to ρ satisfies $\sup_y \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \psi_\rho(y)) \leq \beta$, for some $\beta > 0$. Fix any absolutely continuous probability measure π such that the Brenier potential ψ_π from e^{-g} to π is strictly convex and twice differentiable. We also assume that for any $1 \leq i \leq d$, it holds that the map*

$$y \mapsto e^{-g(y)} \left((\partial_i \psi_\rho^*)(\nabla \psi_\pi(y)) - y_i \right)$$

vanishes as $|y_i| \rightarrow \infty$. Then the following inequality holds:

$$KL(\pi|\rho) \geq \frac{\lambda}{\beta} B_G(\pi|\rho) .$$

Remark 2. Recall $H(\rho) = \int \rho(x) \log \rho(x) dx$ for $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The Bregman convexity in Lemma 3.2 can be rewritten as $B_H(\pi|\rho) \geq (\lambda/\beta) B_G(\pi|\rho)$. We believe it introduces a new notion of convexity for the KL divergence. A crucial feature in our Lemma 3.2 is that we do not require strong log-concavity on either π or ρ ; we merely assume its Brenier potentials ψ_ρ, ψ_π to be strongly convex, a much milder assumption.

The two most popular existing notions of convexity, namely geodesic convexity (see [AGS08, Chapter 9], [LMS23]) which says $KL(\pi|\rho) \geq (\gamma/2) W_2^2(\pi, \rho)$ and generalized geodesic convexity (see [AGS08, Chapter 11], [SKL20]) which says $KL(\pi|\rho) \geq (\gamma/2) \int \|\nabla \phi_\rho^*(y) - \nabla \phi_\pi^*(y)\|^2 e^{-g(y)} dy$, both require $-\log \rho$ to be γ -strongly convex. However, since we apply Lemma 3.2 with $\rho = \rho_k$, such strong log-concavity is not available to us even if ψ_k and ψ_k^* are uniformly strongly convex.

Finally, we note that the strong convexity assumption of $g(\cdot)$ in Lemma 3.2 can be replaced by the assumption

$$D_g(y_1|y_2) \geq \lambda D_{\phi_\rho^*}(y_2|y_1) .$$

This is evident from the proof of Lemma 3.2. Such assumptions directly on divergences instead of metrics are common in the mirror descent literature; see e.g., [Che23, Definition 10.2.8]. However, for ease of presentation, we stick with the usual notion of strong convexity on g .

4 Regret and Convergence Analysis

In this section, we will discuss regret bounds and convergence rates for ρ_k (see (2.3)) as a function of the total number of iterations T .

4.1 Average Iterate Convergence

We start off deriving a result that holds under very weak assumptions and allows for large, constant step-sizes. We prove the KL distance between a weighted mixture of $\{\rho_k\}$'s and e^{-f} converges to 0, at a $O(T^{-1})$ rate.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose $\{\psi_k\}_{k=0}^T$ are generated according to the discretization (2.2). Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [\psi_{k+1}(Y) - \psi_k(Y)] = -\eta_k KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) . \quad (4.1)$$

Next define $S_T := \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \eta_k$ and the mixture distribution

$$\bar{\rho}_T := \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\eta_k}{S_T} \rho_k ,$$

we have:

$$KL(\bar{\rho}_T|e^{-f}) \leq S_T^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [\psi_0(Y) - \psi_T(Y)] .$$

Remark 3. Suppose we use time-invariant step sizes, i.e., $\eta_k = \eta$ for some $\eta > 0$. Then Theorem 4.1 implies

$$KL(\bar{\rho}_T|e^{-f}) \leq \frac{1}{\eta T} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [\psi_0(Y) - \psi_T(Y)] ,$$

thereby yielding a $O(1/T)$ rate of convergence for $\bar{\rho}_T$ to $\exp(-f)$, if $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} \psi_T(Y)$ is bounded in T . Note that Theorem 4.1 does not impose any convexity restrictions on f and g , nor does it require strong convexity/smoothness of the Brenier potentials ψ_k . This result, inspired by the Polyak-average scheme, also allows for large step-sizes.

While Theorem 4.1 provides convergence of the average iterate $\bar{\rho}_T$ to e^{-f} , it is more natural to use the ρ_k (for k large) directly to approximate e^{-f} . This is called the last iterate convergence. In the sequel, we derive last iterate convergence under the additional regularity assumptions on the Brenier potentials $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. A main technical tool is a new EVI that will be used to conduct regret analyses.

4.2 New Evolution Variational Inequality

We now adopt a regret analysis approach to study the theoretical guarantees of generative modeling with Monge-Ampère PDE. Our method aligns with the tradition of online learning literature [Sha12; Gor99; CL06] and, in particular, is inspired by [Guo+22], where EVIs were utilized to study regret bounds on the Wasserstein space. To establish these regret bounds, the primary tool will be the Bregman divergence on the Wasserstein space introduced in Section 3; specifically, refer to Definition 1.

Recall the Brenier potentials $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ from (2.2) and the corresponding probability densities $\{\rho_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ from (2.3). Our first main result in this section presents a new one-step EVI that will be applied multiple times in deriving our final regret bounds.

Lemma 4.1. Consider $\{\psi_k\}_{k=0}^T$ generated from discretization (2.2). Assume that $m_k := \inf_y \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \psi_k(y)) > 0$, namely, the potentials $\psi_k(\cdot)$ are m_k -strongly convex. Define $\xi_k(y) := \nabla_y((f + \log \rho_k)(\nabla \psi_k(y)))$. Given any probability density $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let π_k denote the probability density function of $(\nabla \psi_k^*) \# \pi$. In this setting, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} (B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1})) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\eta_k}{m_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy - KL(\pi|\rho_k) . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By a direct computation coupled with (2.2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f}) \\ & = \int (f + \log \rho_k)(x) (\rho_k - \pi)(x) dx - KL(\pi|\rho_k) \\ & = -\frac{1}{\eta_k} \int (\psi_{k+1} - \psi_k)(y) e^{-g(y)} dy + \frac{1}{\eta_k} \int (\psi_{k+1} - \psi_k)(y) \pi_k(y) dy - KL(\pi|\rho_k) . \end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 3.1 with π , $\rho_1 = \rho_k$, and $\rho_2 = \rho_{k+1}$, we note that:

$$\int (\psi_{k+1} - \psi_k)(y) (\pi_k - e^{-g})(y) dy = B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1}) + B_{G_\pi}(\pi_k|\pi_{k+1}) , \quad (4.2)$$

where $G_\pi(\cdot) = (1/2)W_2^2(\cdot, \pi)$. As a result,

$$KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\eta_k} [B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1}) + B_{G_\pi}(\pi_k|\pi_{k+1})] - KL(\pi|\rho_k) .$$

By Lemma B.2, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{G_\pi}(\pi_k|\pi_{k+1}) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_x \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \psi_{k+1}^*(x)) \int \|\nabla \psi_{k+1}(y) - \nabla \psi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy \\ &= \frac{\eta_k^2}{2} \left(\inf_y \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \psi_{k+1}(y)) \right)^{-1} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy \\ &\leq \frac{\eta_k^2}{2m_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy , \end{aligned}$$

where the equality in the second display uses Proposition A.2 and (2.2). By combining the above displays, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} (B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1})) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\eta_k}{m_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy - KL(\pi|\rho_k) . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

We note that EVIs are popular in the PDE literature and have been used in statistics to address questions on optimization and sampling; see [DDB20; SKL20; Guo+22]. To the best of our knowledge, none of these results cover EVIs with Bregman divergence over the space of probability measures.

4.3 Regret Bounds and Last Iterate Convergence

We now apply Lemma 4.1 to obtain different regret bounds. We present these bounds in progressive order by imposing slightly stronger regularity conditions on the reference distribution e^{-g} and the Brenier potentials $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. With more regularity conditions, the regret bounds will be stronger.

Our first result provides a $O(\sqrt{T})$ -regret bound that requires only a uniform lower bound on the convexity of the Brenier potentials $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

Theorem 4.2. *Recall the notation from Lemma 4.1. Suppose $m_k \geq m$ and $\int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy \leq A$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, T+1$, and some $m, A > 0$. Then by choosing $\eta_k = T^{-1/2}$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, T$, we get:*

$$\sum_{k=0}^T (KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f})) \leq \sqrt{T} \left(B_G(\pi|\rho_0) + \frac{A}{2m} \right).$$

While Theorem 4.2 shows that $O(\sqrt{T})$ -regret is attainable with time-invariant step-sizes, it is natural to ask if the regret can be improved under stronger conditions. To wit, we note that Theorem 4.2 only requires (i) uniform strong convexity of the potentials $\{\psi_k\}$ across iterations $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, T$, and (ii) uniform boundedness of the vector fields $\{\xi_k\}$ in the $L^2(\pi_k)$ norm. So far, we have not imposed any smoothness conditions on the $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. In the following result, we show that under additional smoothness conditions on $\{\psi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and a strong log-concavity assumption on the reference e^{-g} , logarithmic regret bound is attainable under a carefully chosen sequence of time-varying step-sizes.

Theorem 4.3. *Recall the notation from Lemma 4.1. Given a probability density $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let ψ_π denote a Brenier potential from e^{-g} to π . Also suppose $\sup_y \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \psi_k(y)) \leq M_k$, for some $M_k > 0$ (i.e., the potentials ψ_k are M_k -smooth) and the map*

$$y \mapsto e^{-g(y)} ((\partial_i \psi_k^*)(\nabla \psi_\pi(y)) - y_i)$$

vanishes as $|y_i| \rightarrow \infty$, for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, T$. Finally, let e^{-g} be a strongly log-concave distribution where $g(\cdot)$ is λ -strongly convex.

(i) Define the following:

$$S_{k+1} := \lambda \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{M_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k := S_{k+1}^{-1}.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^T (KL(\rho_k | e^{-f}) - KL(\pi | e^{-f})) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^T \frac{1}{m_{k+1} S_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy.$$

(ii) Now suppose that $M_k \leq M$, $m_k \geq m$, and $\int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy \leq A$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, T$, and some $m, M \in (0, \infty)$. Then by choosing $\eta_k^{-1} := (k+1)\lambda/M$, we have:

$$\sum_{k=0}^T (KL(\rho_k | e^{-f}) - KL(\pi | e^{-f})) \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{AM}{\lambda m} (1 + \log(T+1)).$$

We emphasize that our $O(\log T)$ -regret bound does not assume that the target distribution e^{-f} is strongly log-concave or that it satisfies log-Sobolev or Poicaré type inequalities. Instead, the time-independent constant in our bound depends on the ratio of the uniform smoothness parameter M and the uniform strong convexity parameter m on Brenier's potential ψ . This ratio M/m can be viewed as an analog of the condition number (see [Zha+23; Ma+21]) in the absence of any functional inequality assumptions on the target e^{-f} . Again, here we merely require strong convexity/smoothness of the Brenier potential ψ , which is known to be convex as a premise even for non-log-concave target distributions e^{-f} . Therefore, our assumptions are much weaker than log-concavity of e^{-f} . While it may be possible to improve the condition number dependence to $\sqrt{M/m}$ by proposing an accelerated version of (2.2), we leave that for future research.

Remark 4. In [Han+25, Theorem 2], the authors obtain a $O(\sqrt{T})$ -regret bound (similar to our Theorem 4.2) for a different mirror-descent-like algorithm, where the mirror map is also a certain KL divergence functional. Unlike us, they impose a uniform logarithmic Sobolev inequality type assumption on the KL divergence functional, which makes their approach very different from ours. The same mirror-descent algorithm was also studied in [AKL22], where the authors assume a stronger version of Lemma 3.2 (both an upper and lower bound). However, the authors do not establish sufficient conditions as we do in Lemma 3.2. These papers use fixed step-sizes and do not recover logarithmic regret bounds like our Theorem 4.3.

The final result in this section establishes the rate of convergence of the last iteration ρ_T to e^{-f} in terms of the Bregman divergence B_G , under the same assumptions that lead to logarithmic regret in Theorem 4.3. The choice of step-sizes $\{\eta_k\}$ is, however, different in the two cases.

Theorem 4.4. Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem 4.3, part (ii).

(i) The update from ρ_k to ρ_{k+1} satisfies the following asymptotic contraction:

$$\limsup_{\eta_k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta_k} \frac{B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_{k+1}) - B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_k)}{B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_k)} \leq -\frac{\lambda}{M}.$$

(ii) By choosing $\eta_k = (CMB_G(e^{-f} | \rho_0) \log T) / (\lambda T)$, $\forall k \leq T$ with $C > 0$, the following holds for all large enough $T > 0$:

$$B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_T) \leq \left(\frac{1}{TCB_G(e^{-f} | \rho_0)} + \frac{CM^2A \log T}{2\lambda^2 m T} \right) B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_0).$$

The first part of Theorem 4.4 demonstrates an “asymptotic contraction” of the sequence of probability measures $\{\rho_k\}$; that is, if $\eta_k \rightarrow 0$, then

$$B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_{k+1}) \leq (1 - \eta_k \cdot \lambda/M + o(\eta_k)) B_G(e^{-f} | \rho_k).$$

This implies that the local contraction rate of ρ_k is governed by the strong convexity parameter of g and the smoothness of the potentials $\{\psi_k\}_{k=0}^T$. Naturally, if the strong convexity parameter of g , specifically λ , is small, or if the smoothness parameter M of the $\{\psi_k\}$ s is large, the rate of asymptotic contraction slows down.

The second part concerns the last iterate convergence of rate $O(T^{-1} \log T)$. It presents a non-asymptotic convergence rate of ρ_T to e^{-f} under the Bregman divergence $B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_T)$. When $B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_0) > 0$, it indicates a nearly $O(T^{-1})$ rate up to logarithmic factors, as the first term in the bound can be made arbitrarily small by selecting C large enough. Note that this bound also captures the fact that if ρ_0 and e^{-f} are close, then so are ρ_T and e^{-f} .

5 Applications

5.1 Generative Modeling and Neural-PDE

In this section, we demonstrate how the discretized parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE (2.2) can be used to design new generative modeling algorithms, that is, learning to sample from a target measure μ with density $e^{-f} := d\mu/dx$. It turns out our discretized parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE integrates well with techniques established in current generative modeling literature: (i) learning density-ratio through logistic regression as in GANs [Goo+20]; (ii) learning the score function via score matching as in DPMs [Hyv05; SE19]. Additionally, our discretized parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE can be implemented as a neural PDE using a residual neural network architecture [He+16] with standard auto-differentiation libraries.

Recall the discretized Monge-Ampère PDE (2.2); one crucial step for implementation is to learn

- (i) the log density-ratio function $h_k(x) := \log(\rho_k(x)/e^{-f(x)})$, or
- (ii) its derivative, namely the score functions $\mathbf{m}_k(x) := \nabla \log(\rho_k(x)/e^{-f(x)})$,

given data $X \sim e^{-f}$ and $\tilde{X} \sim \rho_k$ drawn i.i.d. from the target distribution and the simulated distribution respectively.

The following two propositions directly address how to estimate each term, with the first taken from [Goo+14, Proposition 1], and the second from [Hyv05, Theorem 1]. We shall design new generative modeling algorithms with neural networks based on these two propositions, inspired by the discretized parabolic Monge-Ampère PDE.

Neural-PDE via Logistic Regression.

Proposition 5.1 (Log density-ratio via logistic regression). *Let $\rho, \pi \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and consider the following data-generating process $(X, L) \sim \gamma$: first, sample labels $L = 0$ or 1 with equal probability, and then generate data given the label as $X|L = 0 \sim \pi$ and $X|L = 1 \sim \rho$. With the data $(X, L) \sim \gamma$, define the logistic loss functional*

$$L(h) := \mathbb{E}_{(X, L) \sim \gamma} \left[L \log(1 + e^{-h(X)}) + (1 - L) \log(1 + e^{h(X)}) \right].$$

Assume $(\rho + \pi)(x) > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then the unique minimizer $h^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $L(h)$ satisfies $h^*(x) = \log(\rho(x)/\pi(x))$.

Proposition 5.1 provides a procedure to estimate the log-density-ratio: given i.i.d. data $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim e^{-f}$ and $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n \sim \rho_k = (\nabla \psi_k) \# e^{-g}$, augment to labeled data $\{(X_i, L_i = 0)\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{(\tilde{X}_i, L_i = 1)\}_{i=1}^n$ and denote its empirical distribution as $\hat{\gamma}_k$; specify a neural network $h(\cdot; \theta) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ parametrized by θ and solve

$$\hat{h}_k(\cdot) := h(\cdot; \hat{\theta}), \text{ where } \hat{\theta} \in \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(X, L) \sim \hat{\gamma}_k} \left[L \log(1 + e^{-h(X; \theta)}) + (1 - L) \log(1 + e^{h(X; \theta)}) \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

The minimizer $\hat{h}_k$ approximates h_k , the true log density-ratio function.

In practice, one can implement $\hat{h}_k(\cdot)$ with neural networks. This motivates a new generative modeling algorithm by iteratively refining the Brenier potential ψ_k with a new neural network $\hat{h}_k$, coupled with auto-differentiation, composition, and residual connections; See Algorithm 1 below for details.

Algorithm 1: Monge-Ampère Neural-PDE via Logistic Regression

Input : T , total number of steps; $\{\eta_k\}_{k \leq T}$, the step-sizes;
 initialize a neural network function $\psi_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and set $k = 0$.

Output: A neural network function $\psi_T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and samples from $(\nabla \psi_T) \# e^{-g}$.

while $k < T$ **do**

Sampling step: Given i.i.d. data $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim e^{-f}$, sample $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n \sim \rho_k = (\nabla \psi_k) \# e^{-g}$, augment to $\{(X_i, L_i = 0)\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{L}_i = 1)\}_{i=1}^n$, and form its empirical distribution as $(X, L) \sim \hat{\gamma}_k$;


Learning step: Estimate a neural network discriminator function $\hat{h}_k$ as in (5.1) ;

Neural Network update: Define a new neural network with the residual architecture shown on the right

$$\psi_{k+1} = -\eta_k \hat{h}_k \circ \nabla \psi_k + \psi_k ;$$

 Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$;

end



Neural-PDE via Score Matching.

Proposition 5.2 (Score matching via Fisher divergence). *Consider $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the corresponding data score function $\nabla \log \rho$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma_i(x)$ denote the i -th component of a vector-valued function. Consider the Fisher divergence functional $J(\sigma)$*

$$J(\sigma) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho} [\|\nabla \log \rho(X) - \sigma(X)\|^2] .$$

Assume σ is differentiable and that, $\forall i$, $\rho(x) \sigma_i(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x_i| \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$J(\sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i \sigma_i(X) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_i(X)^2 \right] + \text{const} .$$

Proposition 5.2 also sets forth the following procedure to estimate the score functions: given i.i.d. $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n \sim \rho_k = (\nabla \psi_k) \# e^{-g}$, denote its empirical distribution $\hat{\rho}_k$, specify a neural network $\sigma(\cdot; \omega) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ parametrized by ω and solve

$$\hat{\sigma}_k(\cdot) := \sigma(\cdot; \hat{\omega}) , \text{ where } \hat{\omega} \in \arg \min_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \hat{\rho}_k} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i \sigma_i(X; \omega) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_i(X; \omega)^2 \right] . \quad (5.2)$$

The minimizer $\hat{\sigma}_k$ approximates the score function $\nabla \log \rho_k$; similarly, one can solve for $\hat{\sigma}$ that approximates the data score function $\nabla \log e^{-f}$, and define

$$\hat{m}_k = \hat{\sigma}_k - \hat{\sigma} . \quad (5.3)$$

This motivates a new generative modeling algorithm to refine the Brenier map $n_k := \nabla \psi_k$ by iteratively adding neural network maps $\hat{m}_k$ using a residual connection, coupled with auto-differentiation and composition; we outline in Algorithm 2 below.

Algorithm 2: Monge-Ampère Neural-PDE via Score Matching

Input : T , total number of steps; $\{\eta_k\}_{k \leq T}$, the step-sizes;
 initialize a vector-valued neural network $\mathbf{n}_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$,
 and set $k = 0$.

Output: A vector-valued neural network function $\mathbf{n}_T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$,
 and samples from $(\mathbf{n}_T) \# e^{-g}$.


while $k < T$ **do**

Sampling step: Obtain i.i.d. samples from $\rho_k = (\mathbf{n}_k) \# e^{-g}$,
 form the empirical measure $\hat{\rho}_k$;

Learning step: Estimate a neural network score $\hat{\sigma}_k$ as in
 (5.2), and define the corresponding $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$ as in (5.3) ;

Neural Network update: Define a new neural network with
 the residual architecture shown on the right
 $\mathbf{n}_{k+1} = -\eta_k \nabla \mathbf{n}_k \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \circ \mathbf{n}_k) + \mathbf{n}_k$, here $\nabla \mathbf{n}_k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d}$, and
 $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \circ \mathbf{n}_k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and ‘ $\cdot$ ’ denotes the matrix-vector product ;
 Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$;

end



5.2 Variational Formulation of Parabolic PDE

We first present a variational objective that leads to the discretization (2.2). We will then use this variational objective to provide a new perspective on variational inference and also propose a new closed form iterative scheme for Gaussian variational inference.

Steepest Descent Interpretation. In Euclidean space, the forward gradient descent can be viewed as the solution of a minimizing movement scheme involving an objective function and a regularizer (the squared Euclidean distance). In this section, we show that the forward discretization (2.2) can also be viewed as the solution of a variational problem that involves (i) an objective function, which will be the KL divergence to e^{-f} and (ii) a regularizer which will be a divergence on the space of probability measures (to be defined below). This is in sharp contrast to usual Wasserstein gradient flows where the regularizer is the usual 2-Wasserstein distance. To recast (2.2) as a variational problem, we will define the divergence on the tangent set $\text{Tan}_{e^{-g}} := \{\nabla \psi : \psi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty\} \subseteq L^2(e^{-g})$ where the closure is taken with respect to the $L^2(e^{-g})$ norm.

Definition 2 (Linearized Wasserstein divergence). *Let $\nabla \psi_1, \nabla \psi_2 \in \text{Tan}_{e^{-g}}$ such that $\nabla \psi_1$ is twice differentiable and strictly convex. Then the linearized Wasserstein divergence*

$$LD_W(\nabla \psi_2; \nabla \psi_1) := \int (\nabla \psi_2(y) - \nabla \psi_1(y))^\top (\nabla^2 \psi_1(y))^{-1} (\nabla \psi_2(y) - \nabla \psi_1(y)) e^{-g(y)} dy.$$

We used the term linearized because without the inverse Hessian term, LD_W is exactly the popular linearized optimal transport distance in the literature; see [Cai+20; MC23; Wan+13]. On the other hand, we call it a divergence because if $\nabla \psi_2$ and $\nabla \psi_1$ are “close”, then $LD_W(\nabla \psi_2; \nabla \psi_1)$ is the second-order approximation for the following expected Bregman divergence $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [\psi_2^*(\nabla \psi_2(Y)) - \psi_2^*(\nabla \psi_1(Y)) - \langle \nabla \psi_2(Y) - \nabla \psi_1(Y), \nabla \psi_2^*(\nabla \psi_1(Y)) \rangle]$ (see Section 3 for more details on Bregman divergences). As a final step to defining the variational problem for (2.2), we reparametrize the KL divergence as a functional on $\text{Tan}_{e^{-g}}$, i.e., define $\tilde{F}(\nabla \psi) := KL((\nabla \psi) \# e^{-g} | e^{-f})$.

Proposition 5.3. Suppose $\nabla\psi_1 \in \text{Tan}_{e^{-g}}$ is strictly convex and twice differentiable. Also, assume that both f and g are twice differentiable and the map

$$y \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^d \int \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \Theta(y) e^{-g(y)} dy$$

vanishes as $|y_i| \rightarrow \infty$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$, and all $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_c(\infty)$. Let

$$\nabla\tilde{\psi} \in \arg \min_{\nabla\psi \in L^2(e^{-g})} \left[\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_1) + \left\langle \frac{\delta}{\delta(\nabla\psi)} \tilde{F}(\nabla\psi) \Big|_{\nabla\psi=\nabla\psi_1}, \nabla\psi - \nabla\psi_1 \right\rangle_{e^{-g}} + \frac{1}{2\tau} LD_W(\nabla\psi; \nabla\psi_1) \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

Then any optimizer $\nabla\tilde{\psi}$ of the above variational problem satisfies the following stationary condition:

$$\nabla\tilde{\psi}(y) - \nabla\psi_1(y) = -\tau \nabla (f(\nabla\psi_1(y)) - g(y) - \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_1(y)))$$

The above variational problem is reminiscent of preconditioned gradient descent [Bon+24; Li17] and Newton iterations [Bat92; CGT10]. However, to the best of our knowledge, the above variational problem is new in the literature, which makes our parabolic PDE-based approach different from contemporary mirror descent schemes on the 2-Wasserstein space, e.g., [KHK24; AKL22; Han+25; L  g21].

Bayesian Variational Inference. Our discretized parabolic PDE (2.2) and the variational interpretation in Proposition 5.3 can be leveraged to provide an alternate perspective on variational inference. A common computational challenge in Bayesian Statistics is to compute integrals with respect to a complicated high-dimensional probability distribution, say our target e^{-f} . Variational inference [BKM17] has emerged as a computationally viable approximation. At the core of variational inference is to find

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{V}} := \arg \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{V}} KL(\rho | e^{-f}),$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ denotes a candidate variational family of distributions. These families are chosen so that integrals against measures in $\mathcal{V}$ are easy to compute. Popular examples of variational families include:

- (i) Gaussian variational inference [KR24; Dia+23] - Here $\mathcal{V}$ is the family of d -dimensional Gaussian distributions, i.e., $\mathcal{V} := \{N(m, \Sigma) : m \in \mathbb{R}^d, \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d} \text{ is symmetric positive definite}\}$.
- (ii) Mean-field variational inference [JCP24; WJ08] - Here $\mathcal{V}$ is the family of d -dimensional product measures, i.e., $\mathcal{V} = \{\pi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_d : \pi_i \text{ is a probability measure on } \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq i \leq d\}$.

An alternate way of looking at the above variational inference problem is to formulate it in terms of transport maps from a simple reference distribution e^{-g} , say $N(0, \lambda^2 Id)$ for some $\lambda > 0$. So, instead of parameterizing with a family of distributions, we now parameterize with a family of transport maps. We define

$$\nabla\hat{\psi}_{\mathcal{S}} := \arg \min_{\nabla\psi \in \mathcal{S}} KL(\nabla\psi \# e^{-g} | e^{-f}), \quad (5.5)$$

where $\mathcal{S} \subseteq L^2(e^{-g})$ is now a *variational family of functions*. Some natural examples would include:

- (i) Gaussian variational inference - Here $\mathcal{S} := \{Ay + m : m \in \mathbb{R}^d, A \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d \times d} \text{ is symmetric positive definite}\}$.
- (ii) Mean-field variational inference - Here $\mathcal{S} := \{(S_1(y_1), \dots, S_d(y_d)) : S_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is monotone increasing}\}$.

The above formulation in (5.5) should immediately remind us of the variational form introduced in Proposition 5.3 as $KL(\nabla\psi \# e^{-g} | e^{-f})$ is exactly $\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi)$ from Proposition 5.3. Therefore, we can iteratively solve (5.4) over a potentially nonparametric class of vector fields $\mathcal{S} \subseteq L^2(e^{-g})$, i.e.,

$$\nabla\psi_{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\nabla\psi \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_k) + \left\langle \frac{\delta}{\delta(\nabla\psi)} \tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_k), \nabla\psi - \nabla\psi_k \right\rangle_{e^{-g}} + \frac{1}{2\tau} LD_W(\nabla\psi; \nabla\psi_k) \right]. \quad (5.6)$$

Here the first variation $\frac{\delta}{\delta(\nabla\psi)}\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_k)$ is the variation restricted to the class $\mathcal{S}$, i.e., for any $\nabla\Theta \in \mathcal{S}$, $\langle \frac{\delta}{\delta(\nabla\psi)}\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_k), \nabla\Theta \rangle_{e^{-g}} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_k + \epsilon \nabla\Theta) - \tilde{F}(\nabla\psi_k)}{\epsilon}$. For parametric classes of $\mathcal{S}$ such as in Gaussian variational inference, one could directly solve (5.6) over the natural parameters μ and A . In the univariate setting, the new Gaussian variation inference updates are summarized in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: Gaussian Variational Inference

Input : T , total number of steps; $\{\eta_k\}_{k \leq T}$, the step-sizes; e^{-g} , density of $N(0, \lambda^2)$, $\lambda > 0$, initializer (m_0, σ_0)

Output: Final mean and standard deviation (m_T, σ_T) .

while $k < T$ **do**

Update variational parameters:

$$(m_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+1}) \leftarrow G_{\eta_k}(m_k, \sigma_k) \quad \text{where}$$

$$G_{\eta}(t, s) := \begin{pmatrix} t - \frac{\eta s}{\lambda} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim N(0, \lambda^2)} f'((s/\lambda)Y + t) \\ s - \frac{\eta}{\lambda^2} (s^2 \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim N(0, \lambda^2)} f''((s/\lambda)Y + t) - 1) \end{pmatrix}$$

 Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$

end

To heuristically see the validity of Algorithm 3, consider the case $\eta_k \equiv \eta$ in which case the updates can be written as the fixed point iteration $(m_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+1}) = G_{\eta}(m_k, \sigma_k)$ where $G_{\eta}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined in Algorithm 3. Therefore, the limit (m_k, σ_k) as $k \rightarrow \infty$, say (m, σ) if it exists, would satisfy $(m, \sigma) = G_{\eta}(m, \sigma)$. This simplifies to

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim N(m, \sigma^2)} f'(X) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{X \sim N(m, \sigma^2)} f''(X) = \sigma^{-2},$$

which are exactly the stationary conditions for (m, σ^2) arising as a solution of the Gaussian variational inference problem; see [KR24, Equation 1.9].

References

- [ACB17] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. “Wasserstein generative adversarial networks”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2017, pp. 214–223.
- [AGS08] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Second. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2008, pp. x+334. ISBN: 978-3-7643-8721-1.
- [AK20] Farhan Abedin and Jun Kitagawa. “Exponential convergence of parabolic optimal transport on bounded domains”. In: *Analysis & PDE* 13.7 (2020), pp. 2183–2204.
- [AKL22] Pierre-Cyril Aubin-Frankowski, Anna Korba, and Flavien Léger. “Mirror descent with relative smoothness in measure spaces, with application to sinkhorn and em”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 17263–17275.
- [Amp19] André-Marie Ampère. *Mémoire contenant l’application de la théorie exposée dans le XVII. e Cahier du Journal de l’École polytechnique, à l’intégration des équations aux différentielles partielles du premier et du second ordre*. De l’Imprimerie royale, 1819.
- [Bat92] Roberto Battiti. “First-and second-order methods for learning: between steepest descent and Newton’s method”. In: *Neural computation* 4.2 (1992), pp. 141–166.

- [Ber20] Robert J Berman. “The Sinkhorn algorithm, parabolic optimal transport and geometric Monge–Ampère equations”. In: *Numerische Mathematik* 145.4 (2020), pp. 771–836.
- [BKM17] David M Blei, Alp Kucukelbir, and Jon D McAuliffe. “Variational inference: A review for statisticians”. In: *Journal of the American statistical Association* 112.518 (2017), pp. 859–877.
- [Bon+24] Clément Bonet, Théo Uscidda, Adam David, Pierre-Cyril Aubin-Frankowski, and Anna Korba. “Mirror and preconditioned gradient descent in wasserstein space”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08938* (2024).
- [Bre91] Yann Brenier. “Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions”. In: *Communications on pure and applied mathematics* 44.4 (1991), pp. 375–417.
- [BT03] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. “Mirror descent and nonlinear projected subgradient methods for convex optimization”. In: *Oper. Res. Lett.* 31.3 (2003), pp. 167–175. ISSN: 0167-6377,1872-7468.
- [Bub+21] Sébastien Bubeck, Michael B. Cohen, James R. Lee, and Yin Tat Lee. “Metrical task systems on trees via mirror descent and unfair gluing”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 50.3 (2021), pp. 909–923. ISSN: 0097-5397,1095-7111.
- [BV04] Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [Cai+20] Tianji Cai, Junyi Cheng, Nathaniel Craig, and Katy Craig. “Linearized optimal transport for collider events”. In: *Physical Review D* 102.11 (2020), p. 116019.
- [Cao+21] Tianshi Cao, Alex Bie, Arash Vahdat, Sanja Fidler, and Karsten Kreis. “Don’t generate me: Training differentially private generative models with sinkhorn divergence”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 12480–12492.
- [CGT10] Coralia Cartis, Nicholas IM Gould, and Ph L Toint. “On the complexity of steepest descent, Newton’s and regularized Newton’s methods for nonconvex unconstrained optimization problems”. In: *Siam journal on optimization* 20.6 (2010), pp. 2833–2852.
- [Che+22] Sitan Chen, Sinho Chewi, Jerry Li, Yuanzhi Li, Adil Salim, and Anru R Zhang. “Sampling is as easy as learning the score: theory for diffusion models with minimal data assumptions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11215* (2022).
- [Che+24] Sitan Chen, Sinho Chewi, Holden Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Jianfeng Lu, and Adil Salim. “The probability flow ode is provably fast”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [Che23] Sinho Chewi. “Log-concave sampling”. In: *Book draft available at <https://chewisinho.github.io>* (2023).
- [CL06] Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi and Gábor Lugosi. *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, pp. xii+394. ISBN: 978-0-521-84108-5; 0-521-84108-9.
- [CT93] Gong Chen and Marc Teboulle. “Convergence analysis of a proximal-like minimization algorithm using Bregman functions”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 3.3 (1993), pp. 538–543.

- [Cut13] Marco Cuturi. “Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [DDB20] Aymeric Dieuleveut, Alain Durmus, and Francis Bach. “Bridging the gap between constant step size stochastic gradient descent and Markov chains”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 48.3 (2020), pp. 1348–1382. ISSN: 0090-5364,2168-8966.
- [De +21] Valentin De Bortoli, James Thornton, Jeremy Heng, and Arnaud Doucet. “Diffusion schrödinger bridge with applications to score-based generative modeling”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 17695–17709.
- [Deb+23] Nabarun Deb, Young-Heon Kim, Soumik Pal, and Geoffrey Schiebinger. “Wasserstein mirror gradient flow as the limit of the sinkhorn algorithm”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16421* (2023).
- [Dia+23] Michael Ziyang Diao, Krishna Balasubramanian, Sinho Chewi, and Adil Salim. “Forward-backward Gaussian variational inference via JKO in the Bures-Wasserstein space”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2023, pp. 7960–7991.
- [FL89] Joel Franklin and Jens Lorenz. “On the scaling of multidimensional matrices”. In: *Linear Algebra and its applications* 114 (1989), pp. 717–735.
- [Fok14] Adriaan Daniël Fokker. “Die mittlere Energie rotierender elektrischer Dipole im Strahlungsfeld”. In: *Annalen der Physik* 348.5 (1914), pp. 810–820.
- [For40] Robert Fortet. “Résolution d’un système d’équations de M. Schrödinger”. In: *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées* 19.1-4 (1940), pp. 83–105.
- [FSG08] Béla A Frigyik, Santosh Srivastava, and Maya R Gupta. “Functional Bregman divergence and Bayesian estimation of distributions”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 54.11 (2008), pp. 5130–5139.
- [Goo+14] Ian J Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. “Generative adversarial nets”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 27 (2014).
- [Goo+20] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. “Generative adversarial networks”. In: *Communications of the ACM* 63.11 (2020), pp. 139–144.
- [Gor99] Geoffrey J. Gordon. “Regret bounds for prediction problems”. In: *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory (Santa Cruz, CA, 1999)*. ACM, New York, 1999, pp. 29–40. ISBN: 1-58113-167-4.
- [GPC18] Aude Genevay, Gabriel Peyré, and Marco Cuturi. “Learning generative models with sinkhorn divergences”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2018, pp. 1608–1617.
- [Guo+22] Wenxuan Guo, YoonHaeng Hur, Tengyuan Liang, and Chris Ryan. “Online learning to transport via the minimal selection principle”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 4085–4109.
- [Han+25] Dong-Sig Han, Jaein Kim, HEE BIN YOO, and Byoung-Tak Zhang. “Variational Mirror Descent for Robust Learning in Schrödinger Bridge”. In: (2025).

- [He+16] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. “Deep residual learning for image recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [HGL24] YoonHaeng Hur, Wenxuan Guo, and Tengyuan Liang. “Reversible Gromov–Monge sampler for simulation-based inference”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 6.2 (2024), pp. 283–310.
- [Hyv05] Aapo Hyvärinen. “Estimation of non-normalized statistical models by score matching”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 6 (2005), pp. 695–709. ISSN: 1532-4435,1533-7928.
- [JCP24] Yiheng Jiang, Sinho Chewi, and Aram-Alexandre Pooladian. “Algorithms for mean-field variational inference via polyhedral optimization in the Wasserstein space”. In: *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2024, pp. 2720–2721.
- [KHK24] Mohammad Reza Karimi, Ya-Ping Hsieh, and Andreas Krause. “Sinkhorn flow as mirror flow: A continuous-time framework for generalizing the sinkhorn algorithm”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2024, pp. 4186–4194.
- [KR24] Anya Katsevich and Philippe Rigollet. “On the approximation accuracy of Gaussian variational inference”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 52.4 (2024), pp. 1384–1409. ISSN: 0090-5364,2168-8966.
- [KS84] Martin Knott and Cyril S Smith. “On the optimal mapping of distributions”. In: *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 43 (1984), pp. 39–49.
- [KSW12] Young-Heon Kim, Jeffrey Streets, and Micah Warren. “Parabolic optimal transport equations on manifolds”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2012.19 (2012), pp. 4325–4350.
- [LDK24] Tengyuan Liang, Kulunu Dharmakeerthi, and Takuya Koriyama. “Denoising Diffusions with Optimal Transport: Localization, Curvature, and Multi-Scale Complexity”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01629* (2024).
- [Lég21] Flavien Léger. “A gradient descent perspective on Sinkhorn”. In: *Applied Mathematics & Optimization* 84.2 (2021), pp. 1843–1855.
- [LFN18] Haihao Lu, Robert M Freund, and Yurii Nesterov. “Relatively smooth convex optimization by first-order methods, and applications”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 28.1 (2018), pp. 333–354.
- [Li17] Xi-Lin Li. “Preconditioned stochastic gradient descent”. In: *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 29.5 (2017), pp. 1454–1466.
- [Lia21] Tengyuan Liang. “How well generative adversarial networks learn distributions”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22.228 (2021), pp. 1–41.
- [Lim+23] Sungbin Lim, Eunbi Yoon, Taehyun Byun, Taewon Kang, Seungwoo Kim, Kyungjae Lee, and Sungjoon Choi. “Score-based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Evolution Equations in Hilbert Spaces”. In: (2023).
- [LLM11] Guanghui Lan, Zhaosong Lu, and Renato DC Monteiro. “Primal-dual first-order methods with iteration-complexity for cone programming”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 126.1 (2011), pp. 1–29.

- [LMS23] Matthias Liero, Alexander Mielke, and Giuseppe Savaré. “Fine properties of geodesics and geodesic λ -convexity for the Hellinger–Kantorovich distance”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 247.6 (2023), p. 112.
- [Lüb+22] Frederike Lübeck, Charlotte Bunne, Gabriele Gut, Jacobo Sarabia del Castillo, Lucas Pelkmans, and David Alvarez-Melis. “Neural unbalanced optimal transport via cycle-consistent semi-couplings”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15621* (2022).
- [Ma+21] Yi-An Ma, Niladri S. Chatterji, Xiang Cheng, Nicolas Flammarion, Peter L. Bartlett, and Michael I. Jordan. “Is there an analog of Nesterov acceleration for gradient-based MCMC?” In: *Bernoulli* 27.3 (2021), pp. 1942–1992.
- [MC23] Caroline Moosmüller and Alexander Cloninger. “Linear optimal transport embedding: provable Wasserstein classification for certain rigid transformations and perturbations”. In: *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* 12.1 (2023), pp. 363–389.
- [McC95] Robert J. McCann. “Existence and uniqueness of monotone measure-preserving maps”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 80.2 (1995), pp. 309–323. ISSN: 0012-7094,1547-7398.
- [Mér16] Quentin Mérigot. “Discretization of Euler’s equations using optimal transport: Cauchy and boundary value problems”. In: *Séminaire Laurent Schwartz—EDP et applications* (2016), pp. 1–12.
- [Mon84] Gaspard Monge. *Mémoire sur le calcul intégral des équations aux différences partielles*. Imprimerie royale, 1784.
- [Pla17] VM Planck. “Über einen Satz der statistischen Dynamik und seine Erweiterung in der Quantentheorie”. In: *Sitzungsberichte der* (1917).
- [RT93] Ludger Rüschendorf and Wolfgang Thomsen. “Note on the Schrödinger equation and I-projections”. In: *Statistics & probability letters* 17.5 (1993), pp. 369–375.
- [Rüs95] Ludger Rüschendorf. “Convergence of the iterative proportional fitting procedure”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* (1995), pp. 1160–1174.
- [San15] Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*. Vol. 87. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. xxvii+353. ISBN: 978-3-319-20827-5; 978-3-319-20828-2.
- [San17] Filippo Santambrogio. “Euclidean, metric, and Wasserstein gradient flows: an overview”. In: *Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences* 7 (2017), pp. 87–154.
- [Sch35] Erwin Schrödinger. “The present status of quantum mechanics”. In: *Die Naturwissenschaften* 23.48 (1935), pp. 1–26.
- [SE19] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. “Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [Sha12] Shai Shalev-Shwartz. “Online learning and online convex optimization”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 4.2 (2012), pp. 107–194.
- [SKL20] Adil Salim, Anna Korba, and Giulia Luise. “The Wasserstein proximal gradient algorithm”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 12356–12366.

- [SM95] Zhenming Shun and Peter McCullagh. “Laplace approximation of high dimensional integrals”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 57.4 (1995), pp. 749–760.
- [Son+21] Yang Song, Conor Durkan, Iain Murray, and Stefano Ermon. “Maximum likelihood training of score-based diffusion models”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 1415–1428.
- [Tze+23] Belinda Tzen, Anant Raj, Maxim Raginsky, and Francis Bach. “Variational principles for mirror descent and mirror Langevin dynamics”. In: *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.* 7 (2023), pp. 1542–1547. ISSN: 2475-1456.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*. Vol. 338. Springer, 2009.
- [Wan+13] Wei Wang, Dejan Slepčev, Saurav Basu, John A Ozolek, and Gustavo K Rohde. “A linear optimal transportation framework for quantifying and visualizing variations in sets of images”. In: *International journal of computer vision* 101 (2013), pp. 254–269.
- [Wan+21] Gefei Wang, Yuling Jiao, Qian Xu, Yang Wang, and Can Yang. “Deep generative learning via schrödinger bridge”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 10794–10804.
- [WJ08] Martin J Wainwright and Michael I Jordan. “Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 1.1–2 (2008), pp. 1–305.
- [Zha+23] Shunshi Zhang, Sinho Chewi, Mufan Li, Krishna Balasubramanian, and Murat A Erdogdu. “Improved discretization analysis for underdamped Langevin Monte Carlo”. In: *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2023, pp. 36–71.

A Proofs for Section 2

First we present the rate of convergence of the discretization (2.2) for the univariate Gaussian case from Section 2.1. The main purpose here is to investigate the impact of the parameter λ in the rate of convergence “locally”.

Proposition A.1. *Suppose that e^{-f} and e^{-g} are densities of centered univariate Gaussians, say $N(0, 1)$ and $N(0, \lambda^2)$. Choose constant step size $\eta_k \equiv \eta$ for all $k \geq 0$ and some $\eta \in (0, \lambda)$. Let $v \in (|1 - 2\eta/\lambda|, 1)$ and $c_0 \in (\lambda^{-1} - \delta, \lambda^{-1} + \delta)$ with $\delta := \min\{2\eta - \lambda(1 - v), \lambda(1 + v) - 2\eta\}/2\eta\lambda > 0$. Suppose (2.2) is initialized with $\psi_0(y) = c_0 y^2/2$. Then the following conclusions hold:*

1. For each $k \geq 1$, $\psi'_k(y) = c_k y$ where each $c_k \in ((1 - v)/2\eta, (1 + v)/2\eta)$.
2. $|c_k - \lambda^{-1}| \leq v^k |c_0 - \lambda^{-1}|$.
3. Recall that $\rho_k = (\psi'_k) \# e^{-g}$ (see (2.3)), then each ρ_k is the density of $N(0, \sigma_k^2)$ where $|\sigma_k - 1| \leq v^k |\sigma_0 - 1|$.

Proof of Proposition A.1. We first show the existence of v, δ satisfying the conditions of the proposition. As $\eta \in (0, \lambda)$, we have $|1 - 2\eta/\lambda| < 1$ and consequently, there exists $v \in (|1 - 2\eta/\lambda|, 1)$. This also implies that both $2\eta - \lambda(1 - v) > 0$ and $\lambda(1 + v) - 2\eta > 0$, which in turn implies $\delta = \min\{2\eta - \lambda(1 - v), \lambda(1 + v) - 2\eta\}/2\eta\lambda > 0$.

The rest of the proof proceeds by induction. Suppose the conclusions in Proposition A.1, parts 1, 2, and 3 hold up to some k . As the conclusions hold for $k = 0$, it suffices to show that the conclusions hold at $k + 1$. By (2.2),

$$\psi'_{k+1}(y) = c_k y - \eta \left(c_k^2 y - \frac{y}{\lambda^2} \right) = \left(c_k - \eta \left(c_k^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right) \right) y.$$

This shows $\psi'_{k+1}(\cdot)$ is also linear. Writing $\psi'_{k+1}(y) = c_{k+1} y$, we then get the evolution equation $c_{k+1} = c_k - \eta(c_k^2 - \lambda^{-2})$. This equation can alternatively be expressed as $c_{k+1} = \theta(c_k)$ where the function $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $\theta(z) = z - \eta(z^2 - \lambda^{-2})$. We will use the following two properties of θ multiple times in the rest of the proof:

$$\theta(\lambda^{-1}) = \lambda^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad |\theta'(z)| \leq v \text{ for all } z \in ((1 - v)/2\eta, (1 + v)/2\eta). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Therefore by (A.1), we have:

$$|c_{k+1} - \lambda^{-1}| = |\theta(c_k) - \theta(\lambda^{-1})| = |\theta'(\vartheta_k)| |c_k - \lambda^{-1}|$$

where ϑ_k lies on the line joining c_k and λ^{-1} . By induction hypothesis $c_k \in ((1 - v)/2\eta, (1 + v)/2\eta)$. It is easy to check that $v \in (|1 - 2\eta/\lambda|, 1)$ implies $\lambda^{-1} \in ((1 - v)/2\eta, (1 + v)/2\eta)$. Therefore $\vartheta_k \in ((1 - v)/2\eta, (1 + v)/2\eta)$ and consequently by (A.1), $|\theta'(\vartheta_k)| \leq v$. As a result,

$$|c_{k+1} - \lambda^{-1}| \leq v |c_k - \lambda^{-1}| \leq v \times v^k |c_0 - \lambda^{-1}| = v^{k+1} |c_0 - \lambda^{-1}|.$$

In the above display, we have used the induction hypothesis $|c_k - \lambda^{-1}| \leq v^k |c_0 - \lambda^{-1}|$. This establishes part 2 of Proposition A.1. Moreover, the above display also yields $|c_{k+1} - \lambda^{-1}| \leq |c_0 - \lambda^{-1}| \leq \delta$ where $\delta > 0$ is defined in the proposition as $\delta = \min\{2\eta - \lambda(1 - v), \lambda(1 + v) - 2\eta\}/2\eta\lambda$. So $c_{k+1} \in (\lambda^{-1} - \delta, \lambda^{-1} + \delta) \subseteq ((1 - v)/2\eta, (1 + v)/2\eta)$. This establishes part 1 of the proposition. Finally, as $\psi'_k(\cdot)$ s are all linear and $\psi'_k(0) = 0$ for all k , we immediately get that ρ_k is the density of $N(0, \sigma_k^2)$ where $\sigma_k = c_k \lambda$. therefore,

$$|\sigma_{k+1} - 1| = |(c_{k+1} - \lambda^{-1})\lambda| \leq v |\sigma_k - 1| \leq v \times v^k |\sigma_0 - 1| = v^{k+1} |\sigma_0 - 1|.$$

This establishes part 3 of the proposition. □

Proposition A.1 proves a locally exponential rate of convergence to the target distribution $N(0, 1)$. In other words, once the algorithm reaches a sufficiently “local ball” around the target, the convergence is exponentially fast. To fix ideas, let us fix the step-size η . Then by choosing $\lambda \approx 2\eta$, we have $1 - 2\eta/\lambda \approx 0$.

This means we can choose $v \approx 0$ resulting in fast convergence. However the trade-off is that $v \approx 0$ and $\lambda \approx 2\eta$, implies $\delta \approx 0$, i.e., the local convergence radius needs to be very close to the target in order to witness such fast rates.

Next we will discuss the proof of Proposition 2.1. We begin with an elementary observation for strictly convex functions from $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We refer the reader to [Ber20, Lemma 2.3] for a proof.

Proposition A.2. *Suppose $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly convex function and ψ^* is its Fenchel dual. Then $\nabla \psi^*(\nabla \psi(y)) = y$, $\nabla^2 \psi(y) = (\nabla^2 \psi^*(\nabla \psi(y)))^{-1}$, and $\psi^*(\nabla \psi(y)) + \psi(y) = \langle y, \nabla \psi(y) \rangle$, for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let $\phi = \psi^*$ denote the Fenchel dual of ψ . Observe the following identity:

$$\exp\left(\frac{\langle x, y \rangle - \psi(y)}{\epsilon}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{D_\psi(y|\nabla \phi(x))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\phi(x)}{\epsilon}\right) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

As a result, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{\psi}^\epsilon(y) - \psi(y)}{\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \int \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\langle x, y \rangle - \psi(y)}{\epsilon}\right)}{\int \exp\left(\frac{\langle x, y' \rangle - \psi(y')}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-g(y')) dy'} \exp(-f(x)) dx \\ &= \int \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{D_\psi(y|\nabla \phi(x))}{\epsilon} - f(x)\right)}{\int \exp\left(-\frac{D_\psi(y'|\nabla \phi(x))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-g(y')) dy'} dx \\ &= \int \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{D_\phi(x|\nabla \psi(y))}{\epsilon} - f(x)\right)}{\int \exp\left(-\frac{D_\psi(y'|\nabla \phi(x))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-g(y')) dy'} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last equality uses (A.2), whereas the last equality uses fact that

$$D_\psi(y|\nabla \phi(x)) = D_\phi(x|\nabla \psi(y)).$$

Next, by using the Laplace approximation (see [SM95]), we note that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (2\pi\epsilon)^{-d/2} \int \exp\left(-\frac{D_\psi(y'|\nabla \phi(x))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-g(y')) dy' = \exp(-g(\nabla \phi(x))) |\det(\nabla^2 \psi(\nabla \phi(x)))|^{-1/2} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

uniformly in x . By combining the above displays with another application of the Laplace approximation, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{D_\phi(x|\nabla \psi(y))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-f(x))}{\int \exp\left(-\frac{D_\psi(y'|\nabla \phi(x))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-g(y')) dy'} dx \\ &= \left(\int \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{D_\phi(x|\nabla \psi(y))}{\epsilon}\right) \exp(-f(x))}{\exp(-g(\nabla \phi(x))) \cdot (2\pi\epsilon)^{d/2} |\det(\nabla^2 \psi(\nabla \phi(x)))|^{-1/2}} dx \right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \exp\left(-f(\nabla \psi(y)) + g(y) + \frac{1}{2} \log \det(\nabla^2 \psi(y)) - \frac{1}{2} \log \det(\nabla^2 \phi(\nabla \psi(y)))\right) (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

where the last line uses the fact $\nabla \psi = (\nabla \phi)^{-1}$. The conclusion now follows from the standard identity:

$$\det(\nabla^2 \phi(\nabla \psi(y))) = 1 / \det(\nabla^2 \psi(y))$$

□

B Proofs for Section 3

In this section, we will prove the two main results, namely Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, followed by two auxiliary lemmas on some fundamental properties of the Bregman divergence $B_G(\cdot|\cdot)$ (see Example 2), that will help prove the main results. First we state the two supporting lemmas. Recall that given a probability density $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we write ϕ_ρ to denote a Brenier potential from ρ to the reference distribution e^{-g} . We also recall $G(\cdot) = (1/2)W_2^2(\cdot, e^{-g})$.

Lemma B.1. *Let ρ_1, ρ_2 be two absolutely continuous probability measures. Then $B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) \geq 0$ and $B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) = 0$ if and only if $\rho_1 = \rho_2$. Further, the map $\rho_2 \mapsto B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1)$ is convex for all ρ_1 .*

Lemma B.2. *Given probability densities $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\phi_{\rho_1}, \phi_{\rho_2}$ be Brenier potentials from ρ_1, ρ_2 to e^{-g} . Also define $\psi_{\rho_1} := \phi_{\rho_1}^*$ and $\psi_{\rho_2} := \phi_{\rho_2}^*$. Then we have*

$$B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} D_{\phi_{\rho_1}}(\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y) | \nabla \psi_{\rho_1}(Y)) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho_2} D_{\psi_{\rho_1}}(\nabla \phi_{\rho_2}(X) | \nabla \phi_{\rho_1}(X)).$$

As a result, we have:

$$\frac{1}{2} \bar{d}^2 \sup_y \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \psi_{\rho_1}(y)) \geq B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \bar{d}^2 \inf_y \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \psi_{\rho_1}(y)),$$

where $\bar{d}^2 := \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho_2} \|\nabla \phi_{\rho_2}(X) - \nabla \phi_{\rho_1}(X)\|^2$. Similarly,

$$\frac{1}{2} \underline{d}^2 \sup_x \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \phi_{\rho_1}(x)) \geq B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \underline{d}^2 \inf_x \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \phi_{\rho_1}(x)),$$

where $\underline{d}^2 := \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} \|\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y) - \nabla \psi_{\rho_1}(Y)\|^2$.

B.1 Proof of Main Results

Proof of Lemma 3.1. By (B.3), we have:

$$B_G(\pi|\rho_1) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} (\psi_{\rho_1}^* - \psi_\pi^*)(X) + \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} (\psi_{\rho_1} - \psi_\pi)(Y),$$

$$B_G(\pi|\rho_2) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} (\psi_{\rho_2}^* - \psi_\pi^*)(X) + \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} (\psi_{\rho_2} - \psi_\pi)(Y),$$

and

$$B_{G_\pi}(\pi_1|\pi_2) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} (\psi_{\rho_2}^* - \psi_{\rho_1}^*)(X) + \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \pi_1} (\psi_{\rho_2} - \psi_{\rho_1})(Y).$$

The conclusion follows from direct computation. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let ψ_π^* be the Brenier potential from π to e^{-g} . By the change of variable formula, we have:

$$\log \pi = -g(\nabla \psi_\pi^*) + \log \det(\nabla^2 \psi_\pi^*)$$

and

$$\log \rho = -g(\nabla \psi_\rho^*) + \log \det(\nabla^2 \psi_\rho^*).$$

By subtracting the above equations, we have:

$$\log \frac{\pi}{\rho} = g(\nabla \psi_\rho^*) - g(\nabla \psi_\pi^*) - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2 \psi_\rho^*)}{\det(\nabla^2 \psi_\pi^*)}.$$

Let us write $Y = \nabla\psi_\pi^*(X)$, where $X \sim \pi$. Then $Y \sim e^{-g}$. By integrating the above equation with respect to π , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& KL(\pi|\rho) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} \left[g(\nabla\psi_\rho^*(X)) - g(\nabla\psi_\pi^*(X)) - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\rho^*(X))}{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\pi^*(X))} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} \left[g(\nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(Y)) - g(Y) - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\rho^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(Y)))}{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\pi^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(Y)))} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} D_g(\nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(Y)|Y) \\
&\quad + \int \left(\langle \nabla g(y), \nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y \rangle - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\rho^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))}{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\pi^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))} \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&\geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \int \|\nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y\|^2 e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&\quad + \int \left(\langle \nabla g(y), \nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y \rangle - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\rho^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))}{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\pi^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))} \right) e^{-g(y)} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore it suffices to show that

$$\int \|\nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y\|^2 e^{-g(y)} dy \geq \frac{2}{\beta} B_G(\pi|\rho), \tag{B.1}$$

and

$$\int \left(\langle \nabla g(y), \nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y \rangle - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\rho^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))}{\det(\nabla^2\psi_\pi^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))} \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \geq 0. \tag{B.2}$$

Proof of (B.1). By the change of variable $Y = \nabla\psi_\pi^*(X)$ for $X \sim \pi$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \int \|\nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y\|^2 e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \int \|\nabla\psi_\rho^*(x) - \nabla\psi_\pi^*(x)\|^2 \pi(x) dx \\
&\geq \frac{2}{\beta} \frac{\sup_y \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2\psi_\rho(y))}{2} \int \|\nabla\psi_\rho^*(x) - \nabla\psi_\pi^*(x)\|^2 \pi(x) dx \\
&\geq \frac{2}{\beta} B_G(\pi|\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second to last inequality uses the assumption that $\sup_y \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2\psi_\rho(y)) \leq \beta$, and the last inequality follows from Lemma B.2.

Proof of (B.2). By Proposition A.2, note that $(\nabla^2\psi_\pi^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y)))^{-1} = \nabla^2\psi_\pi(y)$. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\lambda_1(y) \geq \dots \lambda_d(y)$ denote the eigenvalues of the matrix $\nabla^2\psi_\rho^*(\nabla\psi_\pi(y))\nabla^2\psi_\pi(y)$. By applying integration by parts and the multivariate chain rule, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \langle \nabla g(y), \nabla\psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla\psi_\pi(y) - y \rangle e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \int \partial_i(e^{-g(y)}) (y_i - (\partial_i\psi_\rho^*)(\nabla\psi_\pi(y))) dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \int \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} ((\partial_i \psi_\rho^*)(\nabla \psi_\pi(y))) - 1 \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \int \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \psi_\rho^*(\nabla \psi_\pi(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \psi_\pi(y) - 1 \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \int (\text{Trace}(\nabla^2 \psi_\rho^*(\psi_\pi(y)) \nabla^2 \psi_\pi(y)) - d) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \int (\lambda_i(y) - 1) e^{-g(y)} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\int \log \det \frac{\nabla^2 \psi_\rho^*(\nabla \psi_\pi(y))}{\nabla^2 \psi_\pi^*(\nabla \psi_\pi(y))} e^{-g(y)} dy = \sum_{i=1}^d \int (\log \lambda_i(y)) e^{-g(y)} dy.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \left(\langle \nabla g(y), \nabla \psi_\rho^* \circ \nabla \psi_\pi(y) - y \rangle - \log \frac{\det(\nabla^2 \psi_\rho^*(\nabla \psi_\pi(y)))}{\det(\nabla^2 \psi_\pi^*(\nabla \psi_\pi(y)))} \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \int (\lambda_i(y) - 1 - \log \lambda_i(y)) e^{-g(y)} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion now follows from the fact that $\log z \leq z - 1$ for all $z > 0$. $\square$

B.2 Proof of Auxiliary Lemmas

Proof of Lemma B.1. By Brenier's Theorem [Bre91; KS84], we have for any probability density $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{ac}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have:

$$G(\rho) = \sup_{\phi \in L^1(\rho)} \left[\int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 - \phi(x) \right) \rho(x) dx + \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 - \phi^*(y) \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \right].$$

By the optimality of ϕ_{ρ_2} and $\psi_{\rho_1} = \phi_{\rho_1}^*$ (the Fenchel conjugate of ϕ_{ρ_1}), we therefore have:

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\rho_2) &\geq \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 - \phi_{\rho_1}(x) \right) \rho_2(x) dx + \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 - \psi_{\rho_1}(y) \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= G(\rho_1) + \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 - \phi_{\rho_1}(x) \right) (\rho_2 - \rho_1)(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging in the above inequality into the definition of $B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1)$ (see Example 2), we get $B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) \geq 0$. Here equality holds if and only if ϕ_{ρ_2} and ϕ_{ρ_1} are equal a.e. upto translations. This implies $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ by the uniqueness of optimal transport maps [McC95]. The convexity of $\rho_2 \mapsto B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1)$ follows from the convexity of the map $\rho_2 \mapsto W_2^2(\rho_2, e^{-g})$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma B.2. From direct simplification, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) \\
&= \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 - \phi_{\rho_2}(x) \right) \rho_2(x) dx + \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 - \psi_{\rho_2}(y) \right) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&\quad - \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 - \phi_{\rho_1}(x) \right) \rho_1(x) dx - \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 - \psi_{\rho_1}(y) \right) e^{-g(y)} dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int \left(\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 - \phi_{\rho_1}(x) \right) (\rho_2 - \rho_1)(x) dx \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho_2} (\phi_{\rho_1} - \phi_{\rho_2})(X) + \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} (\psi_{\rho_1} - \psi_{\rho_2})(Y).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

Recall the definition of Bregman divergence on the Euclidean space (see (3.1)). As $X \stackrel{d}{=} \nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y)$ and $\phi_{\rho_2}(\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(y)) + \psi_{\rho_2}(y) = \langle y, \nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(y) \rangle$ (by Proposition A.2), we can further simplify $B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} (\phi_{\rho_1}(\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y)) + \psi_{\rho_1}(Y) - \phi_{\rho_2}(\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y)) - \psi_{\rho_2}(Y)) \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} (\phi_{\rho_1}(\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y)) + \psi_{\rho_1}(Y) - \langle Y, \nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y) \rangle) \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} D_{\phi_{\rho_1}}(\nabla \psi_{\rho_2}(Y) | \nabla \psi_{\rho_1}(Y)).
\end{aligned}$$

By a similar computation, replacing $Y = \nabla \phi_{\rho_2}(X)$, $X \sim \rho_2$ in (B.3), we get:

$$B_G(\rho_2|\rho_1) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho_2} D_{\psi_{\rho_1}}(\nabla \phi_{\rho_2}(X) | \nabla \phi_{\rho_1}(X)).$$

The inequalities now follow from the following standard property of Bregman divergences for strictly convex ϕ , namely,

$$\frac{1}{2} \sup_z \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \phi(z)) \|x - \nabla \phi^*(y)\|^2 \geq D_{\phi}(x | \nabla \phi^*(y)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf_z \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \phi(z)) \|x - \nabla \phi^*(y)\|^2.$$

□

C Proofs for Section 4

In this section, we prove Theorems 4.1-4.4. Our key tool will be the one-step EVI Lemma 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Recall from (2.3) that $\rho_k := (\nabla \psi_k) \# e^{-g}$. Using the change of variable formula

$$\rho_k(\nabla \psi_k(y)) \det(\nabla^2 \psi_k(y)) = e^{-g(y)}.$$

Recall the following equation from the discretization (2.2)

$$\frac{\psi_{k+1}(y) - \psi_k(y)}{\eta_k} = -\eta_k (f(\nabla \psi_k(y)) + \log \rho_k(\nabla \psi_k(y)))$$

Now integrate both sides with respect to $Y \sim e^{-g}$ to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [\psi_{k+1}(Y) - \psi_k(Y)] & = -\eta_k \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [f(\nabla \psi_k(Y)) + \log \rho_k(\nabla \psi_k(Y))] \\
& = -\eta_k \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} \left[\log \frac{\rho_k(\nabla \psi_k(Y))}{e^{-f(\nabla \psi_k(Y))}} \right] \\
& = -\eta_k \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \rho_k} \left[\log \frac{\rho_k(X)}{e^{-f(X)}} \right] \\
& = -\eta_k KL(\rho_k | e^{-f})
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last line uses the fact that if $X = \nabla \psi_k(Y)$, $Y \sim e^{-g}$, then $X \sim \rho_k$. Chain this telescoping sum to get

$$\frac{1}{S_T} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \eta_k KL(\rho_k | e^{-f}) = \frac{1}{S_T} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim e^{-g}} [\psi_0(Y) - \psi_T(Y)]. \tag{C.1}$$

The conclusion now follows from Jensen's inequality. □

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Recall the parameter specifications in the statement of Theorem 4.2. Using Lemma 4.1 and the non-negativity of the Bregman divergence (see Lemma B.1) and the KL divergence, we then get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^T (KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f})) \\
& \leq \sqrt{T} \sum_{k=0}^T (B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1})) + \frac{AT}{2m\sqrt{T}} - \sum_{k=0}^T KL(\pi|\rho_k) \\
& \leq \sqrt{T} \left(B_G(\pi|\rho_0) + \frac{A}{2m} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Note that by Lemma 3.2, we have:

$$KL(\pi|\rho_k) \geq \frac{\lambda}{M_k} B_G(\pi|\rho_k).$$

Part (i). Set $S_0 = 0$. Observe that $S_{k+1} - \lambda/M_k = 1/\eta_k - \lambda/M_k = S_k$. By using Lemma 4.1, coupled with the above observation and the corresponding parameter specifications in part (i), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^T (KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) - KL(\pi|e^{-f})) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^T S_{k+1} (B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - B_G(\pi|\rho_{k+1})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^T \frac{1}{m_{k+1}S_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy - \frac{\lambda}{M_k} B_G(\pi|\rho_k) \\
& = \sum_{k=0}^T (S_k B_G(\pi|\rho_k) - S_{k+1} B_G(\pi|\rho_k)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^T \frac{1}{m_{k+1}S_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k\|^2 d\pi_k \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^T \frac{1}{m_{k+1}S_{k+1}} \int \|\xi_k(y)\|^2 \pi_k(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

The last line uses $S_0 = 0$ and the non-negativity of B_G (see Lemma B.1).

Part (ii). As $\sum_{k=0}^T (k+1)^{-1} \leq 1 + \log(T+1)$, the conclusion follows from part (i) after replacing M_k , m_k , and $\int \|\xi_k\|^2 d\pi_k$ with M , m , and A respectively. □

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Part (i). Set $\pi = e^{-f}$ and note that $KL(\rho_k|e^{-f}) \geq 0$. Using Lemma 4.1 and $KL(e^{-f}|\rho_k) \geq \frac{\lambda}{M} B_G(\pi|\rho_k)$ from Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} - \frac{\lambda}{M} \right) B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_k) - \frac{1}{\eta_k} B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2m} \eta_k A \\
& \implies B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_{k+1}) \leq \left(1 - \eta_k \frac{\lambda}{M} \right) B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_k) + \frac{1}{2m} \eta_k^2 A \\
& \implies \frac{1}{\eta_k} \frac{B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_{k+1}) - B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_k)}{B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_k)} \leq -\frac{\lambda}{M} + \frac{1}{2m} \eta_k A.
\end{aligned}$$

The result follows by taking limsup as $\eta_k \rightarrow 0$ on both sides.

Part (ii). Define $x_k := B_G(e^{-f}|\rho_k)$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, T+1$. As $\eta_k = (CMx_0 \log T)/(\lambda T)$, by part (i), we have:

$$x_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{Cx_0 \log T}{T} \right) x_k + \frac{C^2 M^2 A x_0^2}{2\lambda^2 m} \left(\frac{\log T}{T} \right)^2.$$

By a standard induction argument, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_T &\leq \left(1 - \frac{Cx_0 \log T}{T}\right)^T x_0 + \frac{C^2 M^2 A x_0^2}{2\lambda^2 m} \left(\frac{\log T}{T}\right)^2 \frac{T}{Cx_0 \log T} \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{Cx_0 \log T}{T}\right)^T x_0 + \frac{CM^2 A x_0 \log T}{2\lambda^2 m T} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{T^{Cx_0}} + \frac{CM^2 A \log T}{2\lambda^2 m T}\right) x_0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from the elementary inequality $(1-x)^a \leq e^{-ax}$ for $0 < x < 1$ and $a > 0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

D Proofs from Section 5

Proof of Proposition 5.3. We note that

$$\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi) = \int (f(\nabla\psi(y)) - g(y) - \log \det(\nabla^2\psi(y))) e^{-g(y)} dy.$$

We compute the first variation of $\tilde{F}$ at a point $\nabla\psi$ in the direct, say $\nabla\Theta \in \text{Tan}_{e^{-g}}$ where $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty$. In other words, we are interested in finding $A_{\nabla\psi} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi + \epsilon \nabla\Theta) - \tilde{F}(\nabla\psi) - \langle A_{\nabla\psi}, \nabla\Theta \rangle_{e^{-g}}}{\epsilon} = 0.$$

In the sequel, we will use the fact that given any positive definite matrix $(\partial/\partial B) \log \det(B) = B^{-1}$ (see [BV04, Section A.4.1]). We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{F}(\nabla\psi + \epsilon \nabla\Theta) - \tilde{F}(\nabla\psi) \\
&= \epsilon \int \langle (\nabla f)(\nabla\psi(y)), \nabla\Theta(y) \rangle e^{-g(y)} dy - \epsilon \int \langle (\nabla^2\psi(y))^{-1}, \nabla^2\Theta(y) \rangle e^{-g(y)} dy + o(\epsilon) \\
&= \epsilon \int \langle (\nabla f)(\nabla\psi(y)), \nabla\Theta(y) \rangle e^{-g(y)} dy - \epsilon \int \langle \nabla^2\psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)), \nabla^2\Theta(y) \rangle e^{-g(y)} dy + o(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses $\nabla^2\psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)) = (\nabla^2\psi(y))^{-1}$ (see Proposition A.2). Moreover by using integration by parts and the chain rule, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \langle \nabla^2\psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)), \nabla^2\Theta(y) \rangle e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \int \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \Theta(y) e^{-g(y)} dy \\
&= \int \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} g(y) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \Theta(y) - \sum_{i,j,k=1}^d \frac{\partial^3}{\partial y_i \partial y_j \partial y_k} \psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \Theta(y) \right) e^{-g(y)} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Define the vector

$$\mathbf{u}_{\nabla\psi}^\top(y) := (u_{\nabla\psi,1}(y), \dots, u_{\nabla\psi,d}(y)), \quad \text{where } u_{\nabla\psi,j}(y) := \sum_{i,k=1}^d \frac{\partial^3}{\partial y_i \partial y_j \partial y_k} \psi^*(\nabla\psi(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi(y).$$

By combining the above observations, we get that

$$A_{\nabla\psi}(y) = (\nabla f)(\nabla\psi(y)) - \nabla^2\psi^*(\nabla\psi(y))\nabla g(y) + \mathbf{u}_{\nabla\psi}(y).$$

Therefore, the stationary condition for the optimization problem (5.4) is given by

$$\nabla\tilde{\psi}(y) - \nabla\psi_1(y) = -\tau\nabla^2\psi_1(y) \left((\nabla f)(\nabla\psi_1(y)) - \nabla^2\psi^*(\nabla\psi_1(y))\nabla g(y) + \mathbf{u}_{\nabla\psi_1}(y) \right).$$

It thus suffices to show that $\nabla^2\psi_1(y)\mathbf{u}_{\nabla\psi_1}(y) = -\nabla(\log \det(\nabla^2\psi_1(y)))$. To wit, note that by the chain rule, we again get:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}(\log \det(\nabla^2\psi_1(y))) = \sum_{i,k=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi_1^*(\nabla\psi_1(y)) \frac{\partial^3}{\partial y_i \partial y_k \partial y_j} \psi_1(y).$$

Moreover, as $\nabla^2\psi_1^*(\nabla\psi_1(y)) = (\nabla^2\psi(y))^{-1}$ by Proposition A.2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,k=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi_1^*(\nabla\psi_1(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_k \partial y_i} \psi_1(y) = d \\ \implies & \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left(\sum_{i,k=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi_1^*(\nabla\psi_1(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_k \partial y_i} \psi_1(y) \right) = 0 \\ \implies & \sum_{i,k=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi_1^*(\nabla\psi_1(y)) \frac{\partial^3}{\partial y_i \partial y_k \partial y_j} \psi_1(y) = - \sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^d \frac{\partial^3}{\partial y_i \partial y_k \partial y_\ell} \psi_1^*(\nabla\psi_1(y)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_\ell \partial y_j} \psi_1(y) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_k} \psi_1(y) \\ \implies & \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \log \det(\nabla^2\psi_1(y)) = -(\nabla^2\psi_1(y)\mathbf{u}_{\nabla\psi_1}(y))_j. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □