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#### Abstract

We present two methods to obtain $O\left(1 / N^{2}\right)$ local propagation of chaos bounds for $N$ diffusive particles in $W^{-1, \infty}$ mean field interaction. This extends the recent finding of Lacker [Probab. Math. Phys., 4(2):377-432, 2023] to the case of singular interactions. The first method is based on a hierarchy of relative entropies and Fisher informations, and applies to the 2D viscous vortex model in the high temperature regime. Time-uniform local chaos bounds are also shown in this case. In the second method, we work on a hierarchy of $L^{2}$ distances and Dirichlet energies, and derive the desired sharp estimates for the same model in short time without restrictions on the temperature.


## 1 Introduction and main results

In this work, we are interested in the following system of $N \geqslant 2$ interacting particles on the $d$-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^{d}=(\mathbb{R} / \mathbb{Z})^{d}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} X_{t}^{i}=\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j \in[N]: j \neq i} K\left(X_{t}^{i}-X_{t}^{j}\right) \mathrm{d} t+\sqrt{2} \mathrm{~d} W_{t}^{i}, \quad \text { for } i \in[N] \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K$ is a singular interaction kernel, $W^{i}$ are independent Brownian motions. and $[N]:=\llbracket 1, N \rrbracket=\{1, \ldots, N\}$. To be precise, we will consider kernels admitting the decomposition $K=K_{1}+K_{2}$ such that $K_{1}$ is divergence-free and belongs to $W^{-1, \infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}^{d}\right)$, in the sense that $K_{1, \alpha}=\sum_{\beta=1}^{d} \partial_{\beta} V_{\beta \alpha}$ for some matrix field $V \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}\right)$, and $K_{2} \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}^{d}\right)$. We then write the particle system's formal mean field limit when $N \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} X_{t}=\left(K \star m_{t}\right) \mathrm{d} t+\sqrt{2} \mathrm{~d} W_{t}, \quad m_{t}=\operatorname{Law}\left(X_{t}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and wish to show that the system (1) converges to (2) when $N \rightarrow \infty$ in an appropriate sense.

The main example of the system in singular interaction is the $2 D$ viscous vortex model, where $d=2$ and $K$ is a periodic version of the following kernel defined on $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ :

$$
K^{\prime}(x)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \frac{x^{\perp}}{|x|^{2}}=\frac{1}{2 \pi}\left(-\frac{x_{2}}{|x|^{2}}, \frac{x_{1}}{|x|^{2}}\right)^{\top}, \quad x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)^{\top} .
$$
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Notice that we have $K^{\prime}=\nabla \cdot V^{\prime}$ for

$$
V^{\prime}(x)=\frac{1}{2 \pi}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-\arctan \left(x_{2} / x_{1}\right) & 0 \\
0 & \arctan \left(x_{1} / x_{2}\right)
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The model originates from the studies of 2D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations and we refer readers to the work of Jabin and Z. Wang [15] and the expository article [22] (and references therein) for details.

Throughout the paper, we suppose that the $N$ particles in the dynamics (1) are exchangeable, that is, for all permutation $\sigma$ of the index set $[N]$, we have $\operatorname{Law}\left(X_{t}^{1}, \ldots, X_{t}^{N}\right)=\operatorname{Law}\left(X_{t}^{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, X_{t}^{\sigma(N)}\right)$, and denote $m_{t}^{N, k}=\operatorname{Law}\left(X_{t}^{1}, \ldots, X_{t}^{k}\right)$. The aim of this paper is then to investigate quantitatively the behavior of the distance between $m_{t}^{N, k}$ and $m_{t}^{\otimes k}$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $k$ remains fixed, that is, a quantitative propagation of chaos $(\mathrm{PoC})$ phenomenon. The distances with which we work are the relative entropy

$$
H\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)=\int \log \frac{m_{1}(x)}{m_{2}(x)} m_{1}(\mathrm{~d} x)
$$

and the so-called $\chi^{2}$ distance

$$
D\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)=\int\left(\frac{m_{1}(x)}{m_{2}(x)}-1\right)^{2} m_{2}(\mathrm{~d} x)
$$

The second distance will also be called the $L^{2}$ distance colloquially, if that leads to no confusion. In both of the two equations above, we have identified the probability laws $m_{1}, m_{2}$ with their density functions (with respect to the appropriate Lebesgue measure). The results of this paper are thus upper bounds on

$$
H_{t}^{k}=H\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right), D_{t}^{k}=D\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right)
$$

that are diminishing when $N \rightarrow \infty$. In the case of diffusion processes, the two crucial quantities

$$
\begin{aligned}
I\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right) & =\int\left|\nabla \log \frac{m_{1}(x)}{m_{2}(x)}\right|^{2} m_{1}(\mathrm{~d} x), \\
E\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right) & =\int\left|\nabla \frac{m_{1}(x)}{m_{2}(x)}\right|^{2} m_{2}(\mathrm{~d} x),
\end{aligned}
$$

called respectively (relative) Fisher information and Dirichlet energy, also appear when we study the time-evolution of the relative entropy and the $L^{2}$ distance. In fact, the inclusion of these quantities in the analysis is the main novelty of this work.

Recently, the propagation of chaos phenomenon of singular mean field dynamics has raised high interests, and the main technique to overcome the singularity in the interaction is to study the evolution PDE describing the joint probability distribution of the $N$ particles $m_{t}^{N}:=m_{t}^{N, N}:=\operatorname{Law}\left(X_{t}^{1}, \ldots, X_{t}^{N}\right)$, i.e. the Liouville or the Fokker-Planck equation of the particle system (1):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} m_{t}^{N}=\sum_{i \in[N]} \Delta_{i} m_{t}^{N}-\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i, j \in[N]: i \neq j} \nabla_{i} \cdot\left(m_{t}^{N} K\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that the $N$-tensorization $m_{t}^{\otimes N}$ of the mean field system (2) solves

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} m_{t}^{\otimes N}=\sum_{i \in[N]} \Delta_{i} m_{t}^{\otimes N}-\sum_{i \in[N]} \nabla_{i} \cdot\left(m_{t}^{\otimes N}\left(K \star m_{t}\right)\left(x^{i}\right)\right) . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it remains to find the appropriate functionals measuring the distance between $m_{t}^{N}$ and $m_{t}^{\otimes N}$, and study the functionals' evolution. For $W^{-1, \infty}$ kernels with $W^{-1, \infty}$ divergences, Jabin and Z. Wang [15] have revealed that the relative entropy is the right functional and derived global-in-time PoC in this case. ${ }^{1}$ For deterministic dynamics with repulsive or conservative Coulomb and Riesz interactions, Serfaty constructed the modulated energy in [23] and derived their global-intime PoC. Then, Bresch, Jabin and Z. Wang [6, 5] extended the method of Serfaty to diffusive (and possibly attractive) Coulomb and Riesz systems and showed the global-in-time PoC by marrying relative entropy with modulated energy, the new functional being called modulated free energy. We mention here also another work [8] on the attractive case with logarithmic potentials. More recently, refinements of the methods above allow for uniform-in-time PoC estimates [11, 7] and extensions to the whole space have been done in [10, 19, 21].

The main result of [15] applied to our dynamics (1), (2) already indicates

$$
H\left(m_{t}^{N} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes N}\right) \leqslant C e^{C t}
$$

for some $C \geqslant 0$, if the initial distance is zero: $m_{0}^{N}=m_{0}^{\otimes N}$. Then by the superadditivity of relative entropy, we get

$$
H\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right) \leqslant \frac{C e^{C t}}{\lfloor N / k\rfloor}
$$

and this is already a quantitative PoC estimate. However, the findings of Lacker in [17] reveal that the $O(k / N)$-order bound obtained above is sub-optimal for regular interactions (where $K$ is e.g. bounded), and the sharp order in this case is $O\left(k^{2} / N^{2}\right)$. The method of Lacker is to consider the BBKGY hierarchy of the marginal distrbutions $\left(m_{t}^{N, k}\right)_{k \in[N]}$, where the evolution of $m_{t}^{N, k}$ depends on itself and the higher-level marginal $m_{t}^{N, k+1}$, namely

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_{t} m_{t}^{N, k}= & \sum_{i \in[k]} \Delta_{i} m_{t}^{N, k}-\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \nabla_{i} \cdot\left(m_{t}^{N, k} K\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)\right) \\
& -\frac{N-k}{N-1} \sum_{i \in[k]} \nabla_{i} \cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} K\left(x^{i}-x_{*}\right) m_{t}^{N, k+1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}, x^{*}\right) \mathrm{d} x^{*}\right) \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

and then to calculate the evolution of $H_{t}^{k}=H\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right)$, which yields a hierarchy of ODE where $\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$ depends on $H_{t}^{k}$ and $H_{t}^{k+1}$. Solving this ODE system allows for the sharp $O\left(k^{2} / N^{2}\right)$ bounds on $H_{t}^{k}$. This method of Lacker is local in the sense that the quantity of interest describes the behavior of a fixed number of particles even when $N \rightarrow \infty$, and stand in contrast with the global approaches mentioned in the paragraph above, where the $N$-particle joint law is instead considered. Then, together with Le Flem, Lacker [18] strengthened his result and proved uniform-in-time $O\left(k^{2} / N^{2}\right)$ rate in a high temperature regime, with the help of log-Sobolev

[^0]inequalities. Very recently, Hess-Childs and Rowan [13] extended this hierarchical method to the $L^{2}$ distance and obtained sharp convergence rates for higher-order expansions in the case of bounded interactions (the convergence of $m_{t}^{N, k}$ to the tensorized law $m_{t}^{\otimes k}$ being merely zeroth-order). One limitation of the entropy and $L^{2}$ methods is that we require the diffusivity of the dynamics to be non-zero, thus excluding deterministic Vlasov dynamics considered in the recent work of Duerinckx [9]. Still, two improvements are made possible via the entropy and $L^{2}$ methods. First, the norm-distance between $m_{t}^{N, k}$ and $m_{t}^{\otimes k}$ (which scales as the square root of relative entropy) can be shown to be of order $O(k / N)$, while directly applying the correlation bounds in [9] gives only an $O\left(k^{2} / N\right)$-order control. Note that this is also the order obtained in [20] for dynamics with collision terms. Second, we do not need to assume high regularity for the kernel and work with weaker norms for higher-order corrections as in [9], thanks to the fact that the Laplace operator prevents loss of derivatives in the BBKGY hierarchy. Finally, we note that Bresch, Jabin and coauthors have also applied hierarchical methods to study second-order dynamics of singular interaction in recent works [4, 3], and have shown respectively short-time strong PoC and global-in-time weak PoC under different regularity assumptions. This is significant progress, as the previous best PoC results for second-order systems, to the knowledge of the author, apply only to mildly singular kernels satisfying $K(x)=O\left(|x|^{-\alpha}\right)$ for $\alpha<1$.

In this work, we extend the entropic hierarchy of Lacker and the $L^{2}$ hierarchy of Hess-Childs-Rowan (only in the zeroth-order) to the case of $W^{-1, \infty}$ interactions. In the new hierarchies of ODE, which describe the evolution of $H_{t}^{k}$ and $D_{t}^{k}$ respectively, Fisher information and Dirichlet energy of the next level appear, and we develop new methods to solve the ODE systems. In the first entropic case, we show that $H_{t}^{k}=O\left(k^{2} / N^{2}\right)$ globally in time, if the temperature of the system is high enough (or equivalently, upon a rescaling of time, the interaction is weak enough). Moreover, in the case of 2D vortex model, we show that $\sup _{t \geqslant 0} H_{t}^{k}=O\left(k^{2} / N^{2}\right)$ and $H_{t}^{k}=$ $O\left(k^{3} e^{-r t} / N^{2}\right)$ for some $r>0$, thanks to the exponential decay established in [11, 7]. In the second $L^{2}$ case, we remove the restriction on the temperature by working with $L^{2}$ distances $D_{t}^{k}$ and show that $D_{t}^{k}=O\left(1 / N^{2}\right)$ for $k=O(1)$ but only in a short time interval.

We state the main results and discuss them in the rest of this section, and give their proof in Section 2. The studies of the ODE hierarchies, which are the final steps of the proof and the main technical contributions of this work, are postponed to Section 3. We present some other technical results in Section 4.

Throughout the paper, we will work with solution $m_{t}^{N}$ of the Liouville equation (3) for which we can find a sequence of kernels $K^{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)$ and probability densities $m_{t}^{N, \varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)$ such that they satisfies (3) when $K, m_{t}^{N}$ are respectively replaced by $K^{\varepsilon}, m_{t}^{N, \varepsilon}$; that $K^{\varepsilon} \rightarrow K$ almost everywhere and $m_{t}^{N, \varepsilon} \rightarrow m_{t}^{N}$ weakly as probability measures; and finally that $m_{t}^{N, \varepsilon}$ is lower bounded from 0 . We suppose also that the mean field flow $m_{t}$ is the weak limit of $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ approximations $m_{t}^{\varepsilon}$ that correspond to the McKean-Vlasov SDE (2) driven by the regularized kernel $K^{\varepsilon}$, and that each $m_{t}^{\varepsilon}$ has also strictly positive density. In particular, the 2D viscous vortex model verifies this assumption. See e.g. [19] for details. (Although the setting there is on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ instead of $\mathbb{T}^{d}$ but the argument is the same.) We impose this technical assumption in order to avoid subtle well-posedness issues in the singular

PDE (3) and we mention that it is also possible to work with entropy solutions for the same purpose. See [15] for details.

The main assumption of this paper is the following.
Assumption. The interaction kernel admits the decomposition $K=K_{1}+K_{2}$, where $K_{1}=\nabla \cdot V$ for some $V \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}^{d} \times \mathbb{R}^{d}\right)$ and satisfies $\nabla \cdot K_{1}=0$, and $K_{2} \in L^{\infty}$.

We then state our main results.
Theorem 1 (Entropic PoC). Let the main assumption hold. Suppose that the marginal relative entropies at the initial time satisfy

$$
H_{0}^{k} \leqslant C_{0} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

for all $k \in[N]$, for some $C_{0} \geqslant 0$. If $\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}<1$, then for all $T>0$, there exists $M$ depending on

$$
C_{0},\|V\|_{L^{\infty}},\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}, \sup _{t \in[0, T]}\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla^{2} \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}
$$

such that for all $t \in[0, T]$,

$$
H_{t}^{k} \leqslant M e^{M t} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

If additionally $K_{2}=0$ and

$$
\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla^{2} \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant M_{m} e^{-\eta t}
$$

for all $t \geqslant 0$, for some $M_{m} \geqslant 0$ and $\eta>0$, then for all $r$ such that $0<r<r_{*}:=$ $\min \left(\eta,\left(1-\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\right) 8 \pi^{2}\right)$, there exists $M^{\prime}$ depending on

$$
C_{0},\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}, M_{m}, \eta, r
$$

such that for all $t \geqslant 0$, we have

$$
H_{t}^{k} \leqslant M^{\prime} \min \left(1, k e^{-r t}\right) \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

Theorem $2\left(L^{2} \mathrm{PoC}\right)$. Let the main assumption hold. Suppose that the marginal $L^{2}$ distances at the initial time satisfy

$$
D_{0}^{k} \leqslant C_{0} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

for all $k \in[N]$, for some $C_{0} \geqslant 0$. Let $T>0$ be arbitrary. If the matrix field $V$ satisfies

$$
M_{V}:=\sup _{t \in[0, T]} \sup _{x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}|V(x-y)|^{2} m_{t}(\mathrm{~d} y)<1
$$

then there exists $T_{*}>0$, depending on

$$
\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}, M_{V},\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}, \sup _{t \in[0, T]}\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla^{2} \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}
$$

such that for all $t \in\left[0, T_{*} \wedge T\right)$, we have

$$
D_{t}^{k} \leqslant \frac{M e^{M k}}{\left(T_{*}-t\right)^{3} N^{2}}
$$

for some $M$ depending additionally on $C_{0}$.
We discuss some consequences of the two theorems above.
$\nabla \cdot K_{1}=0$ is not restrictive. First, as noted in [15], the condition that the singular part $K_{1}$ is divergence-free is not restrictive. Indeed, if the interaction kernel $K$ admits the decomposition $K=K_{1}^{\prime}+K_{2}^{\prime}$, where both $K_{1}^{\prime}$ and $\nabla \cdot K_{1}^{\prime}$ belong to $W^{-1, \infty}$ (which is the regularity assumption of [15]), and $K_{2}^{\prime} \in L^{\infty}$, we can find, by definition, a bounded vector field $S$ such that $\nabla \cdot K_{1}^{\prime}=\nabla \cdot S$. By shifting the components of $S$ by constants, we can also suppose without loss of generality that this vector field verifies $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} S=0$. Thus, we have the alternative decomposition

$$
K=\left(K_{1}^{\prime}-S\right)+\left(K_{2}^{\prime}+S\right),
$$

where the first part $K_{1}^{\prime}-S$ is divergence-free and the second part $K_{2}^{\prime}+S$ is bounded. Since $S \in L^{\infty}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} S=0$, we can find a bounded matrix field $V_{S}$ such that $\nabla \cdot V_{S}=S$ and $\left\|V_{S}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant C_{d}\|S\|_{L^{\infty}}$ for some $C_{d}$ depending only on the dimension $d .^{2}$ So the new decomposition satisfies the main assumption and it only remains to verify the respective "smallness" conditions of the two theorems for the kernel $K_{1}^{\prime}-S$.

2D vortex at high temperature. Second, Theorem 1 applies to the 2D viscous vortex model if the vortex interaction is weakly enough. Indeed, in the vortex case, we have $K=\nabla \cdot V$ for some $V \in L^{\infty}$ and $\nabla \cdot K=0$ so the main assumption is satisfied with $K_{2}=0$. The required regularity bounds for the mean field flow $m_{t}$ have been established in [11, 7]. More precisely, it is shown in [7, Section 3.2] that if the initial value $m_{0}$ of the mean field equation belongs to $W^{2, \infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)$ and verifies the lower bound $\inf m_{0}>0$, then we have the required decaying bound on the regularity:

$$
\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla^{2} \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant M_{m} e^{-\eta t} .{ }^{3}
$$

So Theorem 1 applies if $\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}<1$. Upon a time-rescaling, this result can be extended to 2 D viscous vortex at any temperature $\tau>0$ (where the diffusion coefficient in (1) is $\sqrt{\tau}$ instead of $\sqrt{2}$ ), once $\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}<\tau / 2$. In this high temperature regime, the second assertion of Theorem 1 provides a finer long-time convergence estimate on the relative entropies for the 2D viscous vortex model compared to the global results in [11, 7]. These results seems to be new, but it is unclear to the author if the high-temperature restriction can be lifted. (See also the discussion on $L^{2}$ results in below.)
$L^{d}$ interaction at any temperature. On the contrary, if the interaction kernel $K$ is of the slightly higher regularity class

$$
K \in L^{d}, \nabla \cdot K \in L^{d}
$$

[^1]then Theorem 1 can be applied without any restriction on the strengh of $K$. To this end, we consider $K^{\varepsilon}=K \star \rho^{\varepsilon}$ where $\rho^{\varepsilon}$ is a sequence of $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ mollifiers on $\mathbb{T}^{d}$. Since $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} K-K^{\varepsilon}=0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \nabla \cdot K-\nabla \cdot K^{\varepsilon}=0$, the result of Bourgain and Brezis [2] indicates that we can find a matrix field $V$ and a vector field $S$ on $\mathbb{T}^{d}$ solving the equations $\nabla \cdot V=K-K^{\varepsilon}$ and $\nabla \cdot S=\nabla \cdot K-\nabla \cdot K^{\varepsilon}$ with the bounds
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|V\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant C_{d}\left\|K-K^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \\
& \|S\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant C_{d}\left\|\nabla \cdot K-\nabla \cdot K^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

for some $C_{d}>0$ depending only on $d$. By shifting the components of $S$, we can suppose that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} S=0$ and this does not alter the $L^{\infty}$ bound on $S$ above. We find again a matrix field $V_{S}$ such that $\nabla \cdot V_{S}=S$ and $\left\|V_{S}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant C_{d}\|S\|_{L^{\infty}}$. Then we decompose the kernel $K$ in the following way:

$$
K=\left(K-K^{\varepsilon}\right)+K^{\varepsilon}=\nabla \cdot V+K^{\varepsilon}=\nabla \cdot\left(V-V_{S}\right)+\left(K^{\varepsilon}+S\right)
$$

By construction, the singular part is divergence-free:

$$
\nabla^{2}:\left(V-V_{S}\right)=\nabla \cdot\left(K-K^{\varepsilon}\right)-\nabla \cdot S=0
$$

and the remaining part $K^{\varepsilon}+S$ is bounded, so the main assumption is satisfied. The $W^{-1, \infty}$ norm of the singular part is controlled by

$$
\left\|V-V_{S}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}+\left\|V_{S}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant C_{d}\left(\left\|K-K^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{d}}+\left\|\nabla \cdot K-\nabla \cdot K^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{d}}\right)
$$

Yet, the mollification is continuous in $L^{d}$ :

$$
\left\|K-K^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{d}},\left\|\nabla \cdot K-\nabla \cdot K^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{d}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text { when } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0
$$

So in order to apply Theorem 1, it suffices to take an $\varepsilon$ small enough. In a previous work, Han [12, Theorem 1.2] derived global $O\left(1 / N^{2}\right)$ PoC under the assumption that $K$ is divergence-free and belongs to $L^{p}$ for some $p>d$, and the $N$-particle initial measure satisfies the density bound $\lambda^{-1} \leqslant m_{0}^{N} \leqslant \lambda$ uniformly in $N$. In comparison to this work, our method achieves two major improvements: first, the critical Krylov-Röckner exponent $p=d$ is treated [16]; and second, the rather demanding condition on $m_{0}^{N}$ (which excludes non-trivial chaotic data $m_{0}^{N}=m_{0}^{\otimes N}$ for $m_{0} \neq 1$ ) is lifted. These improvements are made possible by our consideration of the new hierarchy involving Fisher information (see Proposition 5) and a JabinWang type large deviation estimate (see Corollary 10).

2D vortex at any temperature through $L^{2}$. By a similar regularity trick, the $L^{2}$ result of Theorem 2 can be applied to the 2 D viscous vortex model at any temperature (or equivalently, without restriction on the interaction strength). Indeed, as in the case, $K=\nabla \cdot V$ for $V \in L^{\infty}$ and $\nabla \cdot K=0$, we can decompose

$$
K=\left(K-K^{\varepsilon}\right)+K^{\varepsilon}=\nabla \cdot\left(V-V^{\varepsilon}\right)+K^{\varepsilon}
$$

where $K^{\varepsilon}=K \star \rho^{\varepsilon}$ and $V^{\varepsilon}=V \star \rho^{\varepsilon}$. Then the $L^{2}$ constant in Theorem 2 satisfies

$$
M_{V-V^{\varepsilon}}:=\sup _{t \in[0, T]} \sup _{x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\left|\left(V-V^{\varepsilon}\right)(x-y)\right|^{2} m_{t}(\mathrm{~d} y) \leqslant\left\|V-V^{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \sup _{t \in[0, T]}\left\|m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}
$$

and can be arbitrarily small as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus Theorem 2 gives an $O\left(1 / N^{2}\right) \mathrm{PoC}$ estimate in short time. Since our treatment of the $L^{2}$ hierarchy in Proposition 6 is rather crude, it seems possible to the author that the explosion in finite time is suboptimal. Here, the major technical difficulty is that we cannot force the hierarchy to stop at a certain level $k \sim N^{\alpha}, \alpha<1$ as done in Hess-Child-Rowan [13]. And this is due to the fact that we do not have a priori bounds on $L^{2}$ distances and Dirichlet energies that are strong enough.

Dynamics on the whole space. As a concluding remark, we could also expect that similar results on $O\left(1 / N^{2}\right) \mathrm{PoC}$ hold for dynamics on the whole space, since the Jabin-Wang results have been migrated to that case [10, 19, 21], and the original theorem of Lacker [17] is already on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$.

## 2 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

### 2.1 Setup and proof outline

In the proof we will work with regularized solutions introduced in Section 1 and prove the bounds in both theorems for these approximations. Then the result holds for the original solutions by lower semi-continuity. See [19] for details.

In the following, we will perform the entropic and $L^{2}$ computations at the same time in order to exploit the similarity between them. We set $p=1$ for the entropic computations and $p=2$ for the $L^{2}$ computations. Then, we can write the relative entropy and the $L^{2}$ distance between $m_{t}^{N, k}$ and $m_{t}^{\otimes k}$ formally as

$$
\mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}:=\mathcal{D}_{p}\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right):=\frac{1}{p-1}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p} \mathrm{~d} m_{t}^{\otimes k}-1\right), \quad \text { where } h_{t}^{N, k}:=\frac{m_{t}^{N, k}}{m_{t}^{\otimes k}} .
$$

The expression makes sense classically in the $L^{2}$ case where $p=2$. In the entropic case, this notation is motivated by the fact that

$$
\lim _{p \searrow 1} \frac{1}{p-1}\left(\int h^{p} \mathrm{~d} m-1\right)=\int h \log h \mathrm{~d} m
$$

for all postive $h$ that is upper and lower bounded (away from zero) and all probability measure $m$ such that $\int h \mathrm{~d} m=1$.

Then, we use the BBKGY hierarchy (5) and the tensorized mean field equation (4) to calculate the time derivative of $\mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}$. We find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p} \frac{\mathrm{~d} \mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t}= & -\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-2}\left|\nabla h_{t}^{N, k}\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} m_{t}^{\otimes k} \\
& +\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \\
& \cdot\left(K\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-K \star m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
+ & \frac{N-k}{N-1} \sum_{i \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \\
& \cdot\left\langle K\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the conditional measure $m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}(\cdot \mid \cdot)$ is defined as

$$
m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(x^{*} \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right):=\frac{m_{t}^{N, k+1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}, x^{*}\right)}{m_{t}^{N, k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)}
$$

Define also

$$
\mathcal{E}_{p}^{k}:=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-2}\left|\nabla h_{t}^{N, k}\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} m_{t}^{\otimes k} .
$$

This expression makes sense for both $p=1$ and 2 , and is the relative Fisher information $I_{t}^{k}=I\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right)$ for $p=1$, and the Dirichlet energy $E_{t}^{k}=E\left(m_{t}^{N, k} \mid m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right)$ for $p=2$. Denote by $A$ and $B$ the last two terms in the equality above for $p^{-1} \mathrm{~d} D_{p}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$. We find that $A=A_{1}+A_{2}$ and $B=B_{1}+B_{2}$ where

$$
A_{a}:=\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d k}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \cdot\left(K_{a}\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-K_{a} \star m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B_{a}:=\frac{N-k}{N-1} \sum_{i \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d k}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \\
& \cdot\left\langle K_{a}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for $a=1,2$, since the expressions are linear in $K$ and the kernel admits the decomposition $K=K_{1}+K_{2}$. Thus, the evolution of $\mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}$ writes

$$
\frac{1}{p} \frac{\mathrm{~d} \mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t}=-\mathcal{E}_{p}^{k}+A_{1}+A_{2}+B_{1}+B_{2}
$$

We call $A_{1}, A_{2}$ the inner interaction terms, and $B_{1}, B_{2}$ the outer interaction terms, as the first two terms correspond to the interaction between the first $k$ particles themselves, and the last two terms to the interaction between the first $k$ and the remaining $N-k$ particles.

We aim to find appropriate upper bounds for the last four interaction terms $A_{1}$, $A_{2}, B_{1}, B_{2}$ in the rest of the proof. To be precise, we will show in the entropic case $p=1$ the following system of differential inequalities:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} I_{t}^{k}+c_{2} I_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{1} H_{t}^{k}+M_{2} k\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

where $\beta$ is an integer $\geqslant 2$ and $c_{1}, c_{2}, M_{i}, i \in[3]$ are nonnegative constants such that $c_{1}>c_{2}$. And in the $L^{2}$ case $p=2$, we show that

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} D_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} E_{t}^{k}+c_{2} E_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{2} k D_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

where again $c_{1}>c_{2} \geqslant 0$ and $M_{2}, M_{3} \geqslant 0$. We will then apply the results from the following section (Propositions 5 and 6) to solve the hierarchies and this will conclude the proof.

### 2.2 Two lemmas on inner interaction terms

We establish two lemmas that will be useful for controlling the inner interactions terms $A_{1}, A_{2}$.

Lemma 3. Let $p \in\{1,2\}$ and $k$ be an integer $\geqslant 2$. Let $m \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)$ and $h: \mathbb{T}^{k d} \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be exchangeable. Suppose additionally that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k}=1$. Let $U: \mathbb{T}^{2 d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d}$ be bounded. For $i \in[k]$, denote

$$
a:=\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right),
$$

where $\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} U\left(x^{i}, y\right) m(\mathrm{~d} y)$. Then in the case $p=1$, we have for all $\varepsilon>0,{ }^{4}$

$$
a \leqslant \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k} d} \frac{\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2}}{h} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k}+\frac{\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon} \times\left\{\begin{array}{l}
(k-1)^{2} \\
(k-1)+(k-1)(k-2) \sqrt{2 H\left(m^{3} \mid m^{\otimes 3}\right)}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $m^{3}$ is the 3-marginal of the probability measure $h m^{\otimes k}$ :

$$
m^{3}\left(\mathrm{~d} x^{[3]}\right)=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{(k-3) d}} h m^{\otimes k} \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k] \backslash[3]} .
$$

And in the case $p=2$, we have for all $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
a \leqslant \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k}+\frac{2(k-1)^{2}\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon} D+\frac{2(k-1)\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon},
$$

where $D=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}(h-1)^{2} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k}$.
Proof of Lemma 3. This estimate with $p=1$ has already been established in [17], and with $p=2$ it is done implicitly in [13]. Nevertheless, we give a full proof here for self-containedness. In the simpler case $p=2$, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$
h \nabla_{i} h \cdot \xi=((h-1)+1) \nabla_{i} h \cdot \xi \leqslant \varepsilon\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon}\left((h-1)^{2}+1\right)|\xi|^{2},
$$

we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i} h \nabla_{i} h \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) \\
& \leqslant \varepsilon\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon}\left((h-1)^{2}+1\right)\left|\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

[^2]Thus, integrating against $m^{\otimes k}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i} & \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
\leqslant \varepsilon & \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k} \\
& +\left.\left.\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left((h-1)^{2}+1\right)\right|_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2} m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
\leqslant \varepsilon & \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}+\frac{(k-1)^{2}\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{2 \varepsilon} D \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \right\rvert\, \sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left.\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right|^{2} m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

The integral in the last term is equal to

$$
\sum_{j_{1}, j_{2} \in[k] \backslash\{i\}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{1}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{2}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)
$$

and we notice that by independence, the integral above does not vanish only if $j_{1}=j_{2}$. Thus we get the upper bound

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \mid \sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left.\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\left(x^{i}\right)\right|^{2} m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant 4(k-1)\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\right.
$$

and this finishes the proof for the $p=2$ case.
Now treat the entropic case where $p=1$. Using Cauchy-Schwarz, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i} \nabla_{i} h \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) \\
& \leqslant \varepsilon h^{-1}\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{4 \varepsilon}\left|\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then integrating against $m^{\otimes k}$, we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i, j \in[k]: j \neq i} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k} d} \nabla_{i} h \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \leqslant \varepsilon
\end{aligned} \begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \frac{\left|\nabla_{i} h\right|^{2}}{h} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k} \\
& \quad+\frac{1}{4 \varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2} h m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So it remains to upper bound the last integral. Employing the crude bound

$$
\left|\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2} \leqslant 4(k-1)^{2}\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}
$$

and the fact that $h m^{\otimes k}$ is a probability measure, we get

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2} h m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant 4(k-1)^{2}\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}
$$

This yields the first claim for the case $p=1$. For the finer bound, we again expand the square in the integrand:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \mid & \left.\sum_{j \in[k]: j \neq i}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right)\right|^{2} h m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
= & \sum_{j \in[k] \backslash\{i\}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|U\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right|^{2} h m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \quad+\sum_{j_{1}, j_{2} \in[k] \backslash\{i\}: j_{1} \neq j_{2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{1}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) \\
& \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{2}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) h m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term can be bounded crudely by $4(k-1)\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}$ as before. For the second term, we notice that the integration against the measure $h m^{\otimes k}$ can be replaced by the integration against the 3-marginal

$$
m^{3}\left(\mathrm{~d} x^{i} \mathrm{~d} x^{j_{1}} \mathrm{~d} x^{j_{2}}\right)=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{(k-3) d}} h m^{\otimes k} \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k] \backslash\left\{i, j_{1}, j_{2}\right\}} .
$$

Notice that, by independence, we have
$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3 d}}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{1}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{2}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) m^{\otimes 3}\left(\mathrm{~d} x^{i} \mathrm{~d} x^{j_{1}} \mathrm{~d} x^{j_{2}}\right)=0$.
Using the Pinsker inequality between $m^{3}$ and $m^{\otimes 3}$, we find for $j_{1} \neq j_{2}$,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{3 d}}\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{1}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) \cdot\left(U\left(x^{i}, x^{j_{2}}\right)-\left\langle U\left(x^{i}, \cdot\right), m\right\rangle\right) m^{3}\left(\mathrm{~d} x^{i} \mathrm{~d} x^{j_{1}} \mathrm{~d} x^{j_{2}}\right) \\
\leqslant 4\|U\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} \sqrt{2 H\left(m^{3} \mid m^{\otimes 3}\right)}
\end{array}
$$

and this concludes the proof for the case $p=1$.
Lemma 4. Under the same setting as in Lemma 3, let $\phi: \mathbb{T}^{2 d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function verifying $\phi(x, x)=0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}$ and the (second-order) cumulant property:

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(x, y) m(\mathrm{~d} y)=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(y, x) m(\mathrm{~d} x)=0, \quad \text { for all } x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}
$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h^{p} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \quad \leqslant\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}\left[\sqrt{2 C_{\mathrm{JW}}} N\left(\mathcal{D}_{p}+\frac{3 k^{2}}{N^{2}}\right)+k^{2} \mathcal{D}_{p} \mathbb{1}_{p=2}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C_{\mathrm{JW}}$ is a universal constant to be defined in Section 4.2 and $\mathcal{D}_{p}$ is defined by

$$
\mathcal{D}_{p}:= \begin{cases}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h \log h \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k} & \text { when } p=1 \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}(h-1)^{2} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k} & \text { when } p=2\end{cases}
$$

Proof of Lemma 4. In the case $p=1$, thanks to the convex duality of entropy, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i, j \in[k]} & \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& =\sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}(h-1) \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \leqslant \eta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h \log h \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k}+\eta^{-1} \log \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \exp \left(\eta \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $\eta>0$. Then taking $\eta$ such that $\sqrt{2 C_{\mathrm{JW}}}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}} N \eta=1$ and applying the modified Jabin-Wang estimates in Corollary 10, we get

$$
\sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant \sqrt{2 C_{\mathrm{JW}}}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}} N\left(\mathcal{D}_{1}+\frac{3 k^{2}}{N^{2}}\right) .
$$

In the case $p=2$, we use the elementary equality

$$
h^{2}=(h-1)^{2}+2(h-1)+1
$$

and get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h^{2} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& =\sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}(h-1)^{2} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \quad+2 \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}(h-1) \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \leqslant
\end{aligned} \quad k^{2}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}(h-1)^{2} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k} .
$$

The last integral has already been estimated in the intermediate (and in fact the easiest) step of the Jabin-Wang large deviation lemma (see Proposition 9):

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(\sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right)^{2} \mathrm{~d} m^{\otimes k} \leqslant 2 k^{2} C_{\mathrm{JW}}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}
$$

Thus we have

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} h^{2} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant k^{2}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}} \mathcal{D}_{2}+2 k\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}} \sqrt{2 C_{\mathrm{JW}} \mathcal{D}_{2}}
$$

so the desired result follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

### 2.3 Control of the inner interaction terms

In this step, we aim to find appropriate upper bounds for the inner interactions terms
$A_{a}:=\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d k}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \cdot\left(K_{a}\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-K_{a} \star m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)$,
where $p=1,2$ and $a=1,2$.

### 2.3.1 Control of the regular part $A_{2}$

First start with the regular part. In this case, we directly invoke Lemma 3 with $U(x, y)=K_{2}(x-y)$ and $\varepsilon=(N-1) \varepsilon_{1}$ for some $\varepsilon_{1}>0$. Summing over $i \in[k]$, we get

$$
A_{2} \leqslant \varepsilon_{1} I_{t}^{k}+\frac{C\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k}{\varepsilon_{1}(N-1)^{2}} \times\left\{\begin{array}{l}
(k-1)^{2} \\
(k-1)+(k-1)(k-2) \sqrt{H_{t}^{3}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for the case $p=1$, and

$$
A_{2} \leqslant \varepsilon_{1} E_{t}^{k}+\frac{C\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k(k-1)^{2}}{\varepsilon_{1}(N-1)^{2}} D_{t}^{k}+\frac{C\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k(k-1)}{\varepsilon_{1}(N-1)^{2}}
$$

for the case $p=2$. In both inequalities above, $C$ denotes a universal constant that may change from line to line, and we adopt this convention in the rest of the proof.

### 2.3.2 Control of the singular part $A_{1}$

Recall that $K_{1}=\nabla \cdot V$ and $\nabla \cdot K_{1}=0$. Then we perform the integrations by parts:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p(N-1) A_{1} \\
& \begin{aligned}
&= p \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \cdot\left(K_{1}\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-\left(K_{1} \star m_{t}\right)\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \nabla_{i}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p} \cdot\left(K_{1}\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-\left(K_{1} \star m_{t}\right)\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
&=-\sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p} \nabla \log m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right) \\
&=\sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \nabla_{i}\left(\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p} \nabla \log m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right) \\
& \quad:\left(V\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-\left(V \star m_{t}\right)\left(x^{i}\right)\right) \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]} .
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

Noticing that $\nabla \log m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}=\nabla_{i}\left(m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right)$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{i}\left(\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p}\right. & \left.\nabla \log m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\right) \\
& =p\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \otimes \nabla \log m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}+\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p} \frac{\nabla^{2} m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)}{m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)} m_{t}^{\otimes k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p(N-1) A_{1} \\
& \begin{aligned}
= & p \sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \otimes \nabla \log m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right) \\
& :\left(V\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-\left(V \star m_{t}\right)\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& +\sum_{i, j \in[k]: i \neq j} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p} \frac{\nabla^{2} m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)}{m_{t}\left(x^{i}\right)}:\left(V\left(x^{i}-x^{j}\right)-\left(V \star m_{t}\right)\left(x^{i}\right)\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
= & p(N-1)\left(A_{11}+A_{12}\right) .
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

For the first part $A_{11}$, we invoke Lemma 3 with $U(x, y)=\nabla \log m_{t}(x) \cdot V(x-y)$ and $\varepsilon=(N-1) \varepsilon_{2}$ for some $\varepsilon_{2}>0$. Summing over $i \in[k]$, we get

$$
A_{11} \leqslant \varepsilon_{2} I_{t}^{k}+\frac{C\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k}{\varepsilon_{2}(N-1)^{2}} \times\left\{\begin{array}{l}
(k-1)^{2} \\
(k-1)+(k-1)(k-2) \sqrt{H_{t}^{3}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for the case $p=1$, and
$A_{11} \leqslant \varepsilon_{2} E_{t}^{k}+\frac{C\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k(k-1)^{2}}{\varepsilon_{2}(N-1)^{2}} D_{t}^{k}+\frac{C\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k(k-1)}{\varepsilon_{2}(N-1)^{2}}$
for the case $p=2$.
For the second part $A_{12}$, we invoke Lemma 4 with

$$
\phi(x, y)= \begin{cases}\frac{\nabla^{2} m_{t}(x)}{m_{t}(x)}:\left(V(x-y)-\left(V \star m_{t}\right)(x)\right) & \text { if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text { if } x=y\end{cases}
$$

Note that the cumulant condition

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(x, y) m_{t}(\mathrm{~d} y)=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(y, x) m_{t}(\mathrm{~d} y)=0
$$

is verified due to the definition of convolution and the fact that $\nabla^{2}: V=\nabla \cdot K_{1}=0$. Thus, we get

$$
A_{12} \leqslant \frac{\left\|\nabla^{2} m_{t} / m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}}{N-1}\left[C N\left(\mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}+\frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}\right)+k^{2} \mathcal{D}_{p}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{p=2}\right]
$$

where $C$ is a universal constant.
Denote

$$
M_{V, m_{t}}:=\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla^{2} m_{t} / m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}
$$

and note that here, since $\nabla^{2} m_{t} / m_{t}=\left(\nabla \log m_{t}\right)^{\otimes 2}+\nabla^{2} \log m_{t}$, the constant $M_{V, m_{t}}$ is finite by the assumptions of the theorems. Summing up $A_{11}$ and $A_{12}$, we get

$$
A_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon_{2} I_{t}^{k}+C M_{V, m_{t}}\left(H_{t}^{k}+\frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}\right)+\frac{C M_{V, m_{t}} k}{\varepsilon_{2} N^{2}} \times\left\{\begin{array}{l}
k^{2} \\
k+k^{2} \sqrt{H_{t}^{3}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for the case $p=1$, and

$$
A_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon_{2} E_{t}^{k}+C M_{V, m_{t}}\left(1+\frac{k^{2}}{N}+\frac{k^{3}}{\varepsilon_{2} N^{2}}\right) D_{t}^{k}+C M_{V, m_{t}}\left(1+\varepsilon_{2}^{-1}\right) \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

for the case $p=2$.

### 2.4 Control of the outer interaction terms

Now we move on to the upper bounds for the terms $B_{1}, B_{2}$. Recall that they are defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B_{a}:=\frac{N-k}{N-1} \sum_{i \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d k}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \\
& \cdot\left\langle K_{a}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $p=1,2$ and $a=1,2$.

### 2.4.1 Control of the regular part $B_{2}$

For the term $B_{2}$, we notice that in the entropic case, we have by the Pinsker inequality

$$
\left|\left\langle K_{2}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \sqrt{2 H\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right)}
$$

and in the $L^{2}$ case, we have

$$
\left|\left\langle K_{2}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \sqrt{D\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right)}
$$

In both cases, we apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-1} \nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k} \cdot\left\langle K_{a}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle \\
& \quad \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon_{3}(N-1)}{N-k}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p-2}\left|\nabla_{i} h_{t}^{N, k}\right|^{2} \\
& \quad \quad \quad+\frac{(N-k)}{4 \varepsilon_{3}(N-1)}\left|\left\langle K_{2}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle\right|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Integrating against the measure $m_{t}^{\otimes k}$ and summing over $i \in[k]$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_{2} \leqslant & \varepsilon_{3} \mathcal{E}_{p}^{k}+\frac{\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty} \infty}^{2}(N-k)^{2} k}{4 \varepsilon_{3}(N-1)^{2}} \\
& \times \begin{cases}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} 2 H\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) & \text { when } p=1 \\
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k} d} D\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) & \text { when } p=2\end{cases} \\
= & \varepsilon_{3} \mathcal{E}_{p}^{k}+\frac{\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}(N-k)^{2} k}{2 p \varepsilon_{3}(N-1)^{2}}\left(\mathcal{D}_{p}^{k+1}-\mathcal{D}_{p}^{k}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The last equality is a "towering" property of relative entropy and $\chi^{2}$ distance, which can be verified directly from the definition of conditional density.

### 2.4.2 Control of the singular part $B_{1}$

By the same Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as in the previous step, the term $B_{1}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon_{4} \mathcal{E}_{p}^{k}+ & \frac{(N-k)^{2} k}{4 \varepsilon_{4}(N-1)^{2}} \\
& \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left(h_{t}^{N, k}\right)^{p}\left|\left\langle K_{1}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle\right|^{2} m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the entropic case where $p=1$, applying the first inequality of Proposition 7 in Section 4 with $m_{1} \rightarrow m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right), m_{2} \rightarrow m_{t}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left\langle K_{1}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle\right|^{2} \\
& \qquad \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right) I\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) \\
& \quad+2\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right)\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} H\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Noticing that the conditional entropy and Fisher information satisfy the towering property:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} H\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) m_{t}^{N, k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)=H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}, \\
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k} d} I\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) m_{t}^{N, k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)=\frac{I_{t}^{k+1}}{k+1},
\end{aligned}
$$

we integrate the equality above with respect to $m_{t}^{N, k}$ and obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon_{4} I_{t}^{k}+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right)\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}(N-k)^{2} k}{4 \varepsilon_{4}(N-1)^{2}(k+1)} I_{t}^{k+1} \\
& \quad+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right)\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}(N-k)^{2} k}{2 \varepsilon_{4}(N-1)^{2}}\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the $L^{2}$ case where $p=2$, we apply the second inequality of Proposition 7 in Section 4 with $m_{1} \rightarrow m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right), m_{2} \rightarrow m_{t}$, and get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left\langle K_{2}\left(x^{i}-\cdot\right), m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)-m_{t}\right\rangle\right|^{2} \\
& \leqslant \\
& \quad M_{V}\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right) E\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right) \\
& \quad+\quad M_{V}\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right)\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} D\left(m_{t}^{N,(k+1) \mid k}\left(\cdot \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \mid m_{t}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $M_{V}:=\sup _{t \in[0, T]} \sup _{x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}|V(x-y)|^{2} m_{t}(\mathrm{~d} y)$. Noticing that the towering property holds for $\chi^{2}$ distance and Dirichlet energy:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} D\left(m_{t, \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}}^{N,(k+1) \mid k} \mid m_{t}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)=D_{t}^{k+1}-D_{t}^{k} \\
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} E\left(m_{t, \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}}^{N,(k+1) \mid k} \mid m_{t}\right) m_{t}^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)=\frac{E_{t}^{k+1}}{k+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

we integrate against $m_{t}^{\otimes k}$ and get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon_{4} E_{t}^{k}+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right)}{4 \varepsilon_{4}(N-1)^{2}(k+1)} E_{t}(N-k)^{2} k \\
&+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right) M_{V}\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}(N-k)^{2} k}{4 \varepsilon_{4}(N-1)^{2}}\left(D_{t}^{k+1}-D_{t}^{k}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.5 Conclusion of the proof

By combining the upper bounds on $A_{1}, A_{2}, B_{1}, B_{2}$ obtained in the previous steps, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant & \left(1-\sum_{n=1}^{4} \varepsilon_{n}\right) I_{t}^{k}+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right)\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{4 \varepsilon_{4}} I_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
& +C M_{V, m_{t}} H_{t}^{k} \\
& +\left(\frac{C\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon_{3}}+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right)\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{2 \varepsilon_{4}}\right) k\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
& +C M_{V, m_{t}} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}+C\left(\frac{\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon_{1}}+\frac{M_{V, m_{t}}}{\varepsilon_{2}}\right) \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}} \times\left\{\begin{array}{l}
k \\
1+k \sqrt{H_{t}^{3}}
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

for the entropic case $p=1$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d} D_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant & -\left(1-\sum_{n=1}^{4} \varepsilon_{n}\right) E_{t}^{k}+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right) M_{V}}{4 \varepsilon_{4}} E_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
& +C\left[M_{V, m_{t}}\left(1+\frac{k^{2}}{N}+\frac{k^{3}}{\varepsilon_{2} N^{2}}\right)+\frac{\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} k^{3}}{N^{2}}\right] D_{t}^{k} \\
& +\left(\frac{C\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon_{3}}+\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right) M_{V}\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{4 \varepsilon_{4}}\right) k\left(D_{t}^{k+1}-D_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
& +C\left(\frac{\left\|K_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}}{\varepsilon_{1}}+M_{V, m_{t}}\left(1+\varepsilon_{2}^{-1}\right)\right) \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for the $L^{2}$ case $p=2$.
Since $\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}, M_{V}$ are respectively supposed to be smaller than 1 in Theorems 1 and 2 , we can take

$$
\varepsilon_{4}= \begin{cases}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}} / 2 & \text { when } p=1 \\ \sqrt{M_{V}} / 2 & \text { when } p=2\end{cases}
$$

so that for $\varepsilon_{1}, \varepsilon_{2}, \varepsilon_{3}, \varepsilon_{5}$ small enough, we have

$$
1-\sum_{n=1}^{4} \varepsilon_{n}>\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right)}{4 \varepsilon_{4}} \cdot \begin{cases}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} & \text { when } p=1 \\ M_{V} & \text { when } p=2\end{cases}
$$

Additionally, for the second assertion of Theorem 1, since we have

$$
\frac{r_{*}}{8 \pi^{2}\left(1-\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\right)} \leqslant 1
$$

we can pick the $\varepsilon_{i}$, for $i \in[3]$ and $i=5$, such that

$$
1-\sum_{n=1}^{4} \varepsilon_{n}-\frac{\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}\right)}{4 \varepsilon_{4}}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}=1-\frac{2+\varepsilon_{5}}{2}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}-\sum_{i=1}^{3} \varepsilon_{i} \geqslant \frac{r_{*}}{8 \pi^{2}} .
$$

Fix these choices of $\varepsilon_{i}$ for $i \in[5]$ in the respective situations.
Then, for the first assertion of Theorem 1, we choose the first alternative in the upper bound of $\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$, and get

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} I_{t}^{k}+c_{2} I_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{1}^{\prime} H_{t}^{k}+M_{2}^{\prime} k\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3}^{\prime} \frac{k^{3}}{N^{2}}
$$

for $c_{1}>c_{2} \geqslant 0$ and some set of constants $M_{i}^{\prime}, i \in[3]$. Applying the first case of Proposition 5 in Section 3 to the system of differential inequalities of $H_{t}^{k}, I_{t}^{k}$, we get an $M^{\prime}$ such that $H_{t}^{k} \leqslant M^{\prime} e^{M^{\prime} t} k^{3} / N^{2}$. So taking $k=3$, we get the bound on the 3 -marginal's relative entropy: $H_{t}^{3} \leqslant 27 M^{\prime} e^{M^{\prime} t} / N^{2}$. Plugging this bound into the second alternative in the upper bound of $\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$, we get

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} I_{t}^{k}+c_{2} I_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{1} H_{t}^{k}+M_{2} k\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3} e^{M_{3} t} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

for some other set of constants $M_{i}, i \in[3]$. We apply again the first case of Proposition 5 to obtain the desired result $H_{t}^{k} \leqslant M e^{M t} k^{2} / N^{2}$.

For the second assertion of Theorem 1, we have $K_{2}=0$ and

$$
\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}+\left\|\nabla^{2} \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leqslant M_{m} e^{-\eta t}
$$

Taking the first alternative in the upper bound of $\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} I_{t}^{k}+c_{2} I_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N} & \\
& \quad+C M_{m} e^{-\eta t} H_{t}^{k}+C\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right) M_{m} e^{-\eta t} k\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
& +C\left(1+\varepsilon_{2}^{-1}\right) M_{m} e^{-\eta t} \frac{k^{3}}{N^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that by our choice of constants, we have

$$
c_{1}-c_{2} \geqslant \frac{r_{*}}{8 \pi^{2}} .
$$

On the other hand, according to [1, Proposition 5.7.5], the uniform measure 1 on $\mathbb{T}=\mathbb{R} / \mathbb{Z}$ verifies a log-Sobolev inequality:

$$
\forall m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}) \text { regular enough, } \quad 8 \pi^{2} H(m \mid 1) \leqslant I(m \mid 1)
$$

and the inequality with the same $8 \pi^{2}$ constant for the uniform measure on $\mathbb{T}^{d}$ by tensorization property. By the gradient bound $\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} \leqslant M_{m} e^{-\eta t}$, we can control the oscillation of $\log m_{t}$ :

$$
\sup _{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \log m_{t}-\inf _{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \log m_{t} \leqslant \frac{M_{m} \sqrt{d}}{2} e^{-\eta t}
$$

Thus, by Holley-Stroock's perturbation result [14], the measure $m_{t}$ satisfies a logSobolev inequality with constant

$$
8 \pi^{2} \exp \left(-\frac{M_{m} \sqrt{d}}{2} e^{-\eta t}\right)
$$

which implies

$$
I_{t}^{k} \geqslant \frac{r_{*}}{c_{1}-c_{2}} H_{t}^{k}
$$

for sufficiently large $t$. Let $r \in\left(0, r_{*}\right)$ be arbitrary. We can apply the second case of Proposition 5 and get

$$
H_{t}^{k} \leqslant M^{\prime \prime} \min \left(1, k e^{-r t}\right) \frac{k^{3}}{N^{2}}
$$

We then plug the bound for $H_{t}^{3}$ back to the second alternative in the upper bound for $\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$ to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} I_{t}^{k}+c_{2} I_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
& \quad+C M_{m} e^{-\eta t} H_{t}^{k}+C\left(1+\varepsilon_{5}^{-1}\right) M_{m} e^{-\eta t} k\left(H_{t}^{k+1}-H_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N} \\
&
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying again the second case of Proposition 5, we obtain the desired control

$$
H_{t}^{k} \leqslant M^{\prime} \min \left(1, k e^{-r t}\right) \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

Finally, in the $L^{2}$ case, we apply the crude bounds $k^{2} / N \leqslant k, k^{3} / N^{2} \leqslant k, D_{t}^{k} \leqslant$ $D_{t}^{k+1}$ in the second line of the upper bound for $\mathrm{d} D_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$, and $k\left(D_{t}^{k+1}-D_{t}^{k}\right) \leqslant k D_{t}^{k+1}$ in the third line. So we get

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} D_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-c_{1} E_{t}^{k}+c_{2} E_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{2} k D_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

for some $c_{1}>c_{2} \geqslant 0$ and $M_{2}, M_{3} \geqslant 0$. We conclude the proof by applying Proposition 6 in Section 3 to the system of $D_{t}^{k}, E_{t}^{k}$.

## 3 ODE hierarchies

### 3.1 Entropic hierarchy

Now we move on to solving the ODE hierarchy that is "weaker" than that considered in [17]. As we have seen in the previous section, in the time-derivative of the $k$-th level entropy $\mathrm{d} H_{t}^{k} / \mathrm{d} t$, we allow the Fisher information of the next level, i.e. $I_{t}^{k+1}$, to appear. In this section, we show that as long as the extra term's coefficient is controlled by the heat dissipation, the hierarchy still preserves the $O\left(k^{2} / N^{2}\right)$ order globally in time. This is achieved by choosing a weighted mix of entropies at all levels $\geqslant k$ so that when we consider its time-evolution, a telescoping sequence appears and cancels all the Fisher informations.
Proposition 5. Let $T \in(0, \infty]$ and let $x_{.}^{k}$, $y^{k}:[0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be $\mathcal{C}^{1}$ functions, for $k \in[N]$. Suppose that $x_{t}^{k+1} \geqslant x_{t}^{k}$ for all $k \in[N-1]$. Suppose that there exist integer $\beta \geqslant 2$, real numbers $c_{1}>c_{2} \geqslant 0$ and $C_{0} \geqslant 0$, and functions $M_{1}, M_{2}$, $M_{3}:[0, T) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in[0, T)$ and $k \in[N]$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
x_{0}^{k} & \leqslant \frac{C_{0} k^{2}}{N^{2}} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d} x_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} & \leqslant-c_{1} y_{t}^{k}+c_{2} y_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{1}(t) x_{t}^{k}+M_{2}(t) k\left(x_{t}^{k+1}-x_{t}^{k}\right) \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3}(t) \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Then we have the following results.

1. If $M_{1}, M_{2}$ are constant functions and $M_{3}(t) \leqslant L e^{L t}$ for some $L \geqslant 0$, then there exists $M>0$, depending only on $\beta, c_{1}, c_{2}, C_{0}, M_{1}, M_{2}$ and $L$, such that for all $t \in[0, T)$, we have

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant M e^{M t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

2. If $T=\infty$, the functions $M_{1}, M_{2}, M_{3}$ are non-increasing and satisfy

$$
M_{i}(t) \leqslant L e^{-\eta t}
$$

for all $t \in[0, \infty)$ and all $i \in[3]$, for some $L \geqslant 0, \eta>0$ and if $y_{t}^{k} \geqslant \rho x_{t}^{k}$ for all $t \in\left[t_{*}, \infty\right)$ for some $\rho>0$ and some $t_{*} \geqslant 0$, then for all $r \in\left(0, \rho\left(c_{1}-c_{2}\right)\right)$, there exists $M^{\prime} \geqslant 0$, depending only on $r, \beta, c_{1}, c_{2}, C_{0}, L, \rho$ and $t_{*}$, such that for all $t \in[0, \infty)$, we have

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant M^{\prime} \min \left(1, k e^{-\min (r, \eta) t}\right) \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

Proof. We prove the proposition by considering the two cases at the same time. Notice that the relation

$$
y_{t}^{k} \geqslant \rho x_{t}^{k}
$$

trivially holds for $\rho=0$. We set $t_{*}=\infty$ in the first case. Allowing $\rho$ to be a function of time, we simply set $\rho(\cdot)=0$ in the first situation and in the second situation on the interval $\left[0, t_{*}\right]$ for the rest of the proof. So formally we can write

$$
\rho(t)=\rho \mathbb{1}_{t \geqslant t_{*}} .
$$

To avoid confusion we will always write $\rho(\cdot)$ for the time-dependent function and $\rho$ for the constant.

Step 1: Reduction to $M_{1}=0$. We first notice that, by defining the new variables

$$
x_{t}^{\prime k}=x_{t}^{k} \exp \left(-\int_{0}^{t} M_{1}(s) \mathrm{d} s\right), y_{t}^{\prime k}=y_{t}^{k} \exp \left(-\int_{0}^{t} M_{1}(s) \mathrm{d} s\right)
$$

we can reduce to the case where $M_{1}=0$ upon redefining $M_{3}$ (and therefore $L$ in the second case, but not $\eta$ ). This transform does not change the relations

$$
x_{t}^{k+1} \geqslant x_{t}^{k}, \quad y_{t}^{k} \geqslant \rho x_{t}^{k}
$$

and the initial values of $x^{k}$, so we can suppose $M_{1}=0$ without loss of generality.
Step 2: Reduction to $k \leqslant N / 2$. Second, by taking $k=N$ in the hierarchy (6), we find

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} x_{t}^{N}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-\rho(t) x_{t}^{N}+M_{3}(t) N^{\beta-2}
$$

and thus the a priori bound follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{t}^{N} \leqslant\left(C_{0} e^{-\int_{0}^{t} \rho(\cdot)}+\int_{0}^{t} e^{-\int_{s}^{t} \rho(\cdot)} M_{3}(s) \mathrm{d} s\right) N^{\beta-2}=: M_{t}^{N} N^{\beta-2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the second case where $\rho(\cdot)$ is eventually constant: $\rho(\cdot)=\rho>0$, the quantity $M_{t}^{N}$ is exponentially decreasing in $t$ with rate $\min (\rho, \eta)$. By the monotonicity of $k \mapsto x_{t}^{k}$, we get that for all $k>N / 2$,

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant x_{t}^{N} \leqslant M_{t}^{N} N^{\beta-2}<2^{\beta} M_{t}^{N} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} .
$$

So it only remains to establish the upper bound of $x_{t}^{k}$ for $k \leqslant N / 2$.

Step 3: New hierarchy. Let $\alpha$ be an arbitrary real number $\geqslant \beta+3$. Recall that in the second case, $r \in\left(0, \rho\left(c_{1}-c_{2}\right)\right)$ and in the first case we simply set $r=0$ and adopt the convention $0 / 0=0$. Let

$$
i_{0}:=\max \left(1, \inf \left\{i>0: \frac{i^{\alpha}}{(i+1)^{\alpha}} \geqslant \frac{c_{2}+r / \rho}{c_{1}}\right\}\right)
$$

The number $i_{0}$ is always well defined, as $\lim _{i \rightarrow \infty} i^{\alpha} /(i+1)^{\alpha}=1>\left(c_{2}+r / \rho\right) / c_{1}$.
Thus, for any $i \geqslant i_{0}$, we have

$$
\frac{c_{1}}{(i+1)^{\alpha}} \geqslant \frac{c_{2}}{i^{\alpha}}+\frac{r}{\rho i^{\alpha}} .
$$

Define, for $k \in[N]$ and $t \geqslant 0$, the following new variable:

$$
z_{t}^{k}:=\sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{x_{t}^{i}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} .
$$

By summing up the ODE hierarchy (6) (with $M_{1}=0$ ), we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{d} z_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-\sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{c_{1} y_{t}^{i}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}+\sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \frac{c_{2} y_{t}^{i+1}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \\
&+\frac{M_{3}(t)}{N^{2}} \sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{i^{\beta}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}+M_{2}(t) \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\left(x_{t}^{i+1}-x_{t}^{i}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The sum of the first two terms satisfy

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{c_{1} y_{t}^{i}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}+\sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \frac{c_{2} y_{t}^{i+1}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \\
& \quad=-\frac{c_{1} y_{t}^{k}}{i_{0}^{\alpha}}+\sum_{i=k}^{N}\left(-\frac{c_{1}}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}+\frac{c_{2}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\right) y_{t}^{i} \\
& \quad \leqslant-\sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{r \rho(t) y_{t}^{i}}{\rho\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \leqslant-\sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{r x_{t}^{i}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}=-r z_{t}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{t \geqslant t_{*}}
\end{aligned}
$$

thanks to our choice of $i_{0}$. For the third term, we find

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{i^{\beta}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \leqslant C_{\beta} \sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{(i-k)^{\beta}+k^{\beta}}{(i-k+1)^{\alpha}} \leqslant C_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(i-1)^{\beta}}{i^{\alpha}}+C_{\beta} k^{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{\alpha}} \\
\leqslant C_{\alpha, \beta} k^{\beta} \tag{8}
\end{array}
$$

where $C_{\beta}>0$ (resp. $C_{\alpha, \beta}>0$ ) depends only on $\beta$ (resp. $\alpha$ and $\beta$ ). In the following, we allow these constants to change from line to line. For the last term, we perform the summation by parts:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=k}^{N-1} & \frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\left(x_{t}^{i+1}-x_{t}^{i}\right) \\
& =-\frac{k}{i_{0}^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{k}+\frac{N}{\left(N-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{N}+\sum_{i=k}^{N-1}\left(\frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}-\frac{(i+1)}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\right) x_{t}^{i+1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The coefficient in the last summation satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}-\frac{(i+1)}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \\
&=\left(\frac{1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha-1}}-\frac{1}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha-1}}\right) \\
& \quad+\left(k-i_{0}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}-\frac{1}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\right) \\
& \leqslant \frac{\alpha-1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}+k\left(\frac{1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}-\frac{1}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality is due to $j^{-\alpha+1}-(j+1)^{-\alpha+1} \leqslant(\alpha-1) j^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha>1$ and $j>0$. Thus, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\left(x_{t}^{i+1}-x_{t}^{i}\right) \\
& \leqslant-\frac{k}{i_{0}^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{k}+\frac{N}{\left(N-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{N}+(\alpha-1) \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \frac{x_{t}^{i+1}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \\
& \quad+k \sum_{i=k}^{N-1}\left(\frac{1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}-\frac{1}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\right) x_{t}^{i+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

The difference between $z_{t}^{k+1}$ and $z_{t}^{k}$ reads

$$
z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}=\sum_{i=k}^{N-1}\left(\frac{1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}-\frac{1}{\left(i+1-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\right) x_{t}^{i+1}-\frac{x_{t}^{k}}{i_{0}^{\alpha}} .
$$

Then, rewriting in terms of $z_{t}^{k}$ and $z_{t}^{k+1}$, we find that, for $k \in[N-1]$, the last summation satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=k}^{N-1} & \frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\left(x_{t}^{i+1}-x_{t}^{i}\right) \\
& \leqslant \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{i+1}+k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+\frac{N}{\left(N-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{N} \\
& \leqslant \frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1}}{c_{2}} \sum_{i=k+1}^{N} \frac{x_{t}^{i}}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}+k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+\frac{N}{\left(N-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{N} \\
& =\frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1}}{c_{2}} z_{t}^{k}+k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+\frac{N}{\left(N-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{N}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then for $k \leqslant N / 2$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=k}^{N-1} & \frac{i}{\left(i-k+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}}\left(x_{t}^{i+1}-x_{t}^{i}\right) \\
& \leqslant \frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1}}{c_{2}} z_{t}^{k}+k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+\frac{N}{(N / 2)^{\alpha}} x_{t}^{N} \\
& \leqslant \frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1}}{c_{2}} z_{t}^{k}+k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+\frac{2^{\alpha}}{N^{\alpha-1}} M_{t}^{N} N^{\beta-2} \\
& \leqslant \frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1}}{c_{2}} z_{t}^{k}+k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+\frac{2^{\alpha} M_{t}^{N}}{N^{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality is due to $\alpha \geqslant \beta+3$. Combining the upper bounds for all the terms, we get, for $k \leqslant N / 2$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\mathrm{d} z_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant-r z_{t}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{t \geqslant t_{*}}+\frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1} M_{2}(t)}{c_{2}} z_{t}^{k}+ & M_{2}(t) k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right) \\
& +C_{\alpha, \beta} M_{3}(t) \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}+\frac{2^{\alpha} M_{t}^{N} M_{2}(t)}{N^{2}} \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

For $k=\bar{k}:=\lfloor N / 2\rfloor+1$, we have by the a priori bound (7),

$$
z_{t}^{\bar{k}}=\sum_{i=\bar{k}}^{N} \frac{x_{t}^{i}}{\left(i-\bar{k}+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \leqslant x_{t}^{N} \sum_{i=k}^{N} \frac{1}{\left(i-\bar{k}+i_{0}\right)^{\alpha}} \leqslant C_{\alpha} M_{t}^{N} N^{\beta-2} .
$$

According to the computations in (8), the initial values of $z_{0}^{k}$, for $k \leqslant N / 2$, satisfy

$$
z_{0}^{k} \leqslant C_{\alpha} C_{0} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}=: C_{0}^{\prime} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

In the following we apply the estimates of Lacker [17] and the time-uniform estimates of Lacker and Le Flem [18] respectively in the two cases to conclude. We first treat the first exponential growth case.

Step 4.1: Applying Lacker's estimate in the first case. Recall that in the first case, $M_{2}$ is a constant function and $M_{3}(t) \leqslant L e^{L t}$. We can control explicitly $M_{t}^{N}$ in (7) as follows:

$$
M_{t}^{N} \leqslant C_{0}+e^{L t}-1
$$

Thus, the hierarchy (9) for $z_{t}^{k}$ writes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d} z_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} & \leqslant M_{1}^{\prime} z_{t}^{k}+M_{2} k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+L^{\prime} e^{L^{\prime} t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}, \quad \text { for } k<\bar{k}, \\
z_{t}^{\bar{k}} & \leqslant C_{\alpha}\left(C_{0}+e^{L t}-1\right) N^{\beta-2},
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $M_{1}^{\prime}, L^{\prime} \geqslant 0$. Define again the new variables

$$
z_{t}^{\prime k}=e^{-M_{1}^{\prime} t} z_{t}^{k}
$$

Then they satisfy the system of differential inequalities

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} z_{t}^{\prime k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \leqslant M_{2} k\left(z_{t}^{\prime k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+L^{\prime} e^{\left(L^{\prime}-M_{1}^{\prime}\right) t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

for $k \leqslant N / 2$. By iteratively applying Grönwall's lemma to the differential inequality above, we find

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{t}^{\prime k} \leqslant \sum_{\ell=k}^{\bar{k}-1}\left(B_{k}^{\ell}(t) z_{0}^{\prime \ell}+\frac{L^{\prime} e^{\left(L^{\prime}-M_{1}^{\prime}\right) t} \ell^{\beta-1}}{M_{2} N^{2}} A_{k}^{\ell}(t)\right)+A_{k}^{\bar{k}-1}(t) \sup _{s \in[0, t]} z_{s}^{\bar{k}} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{k}^{\ell}(\cdot), B_{k}^{\ell}(\cdot)$ are defined by
$A_{k}^{\ell}\left(t_{k}\right):=\left(\prod_{j=k}^{\ell} M_{2} j\right) \int_{0}^{t_{k}} \int_{0}^{t_{k+1}} \cdots \int_{0}^{t_{\ell}} e^{-\sum_{j=k}^{\ell} M_{2} j\left(t_{j}-t_{j+1}\right)} \mathrm{d} t_{\ell+1} \cdots \mathrm{~d} t_{k+2} \mathrm{~d} t_{k+1}$,
$B_{k}^{\ell}\left(t_{k}\right):=\left(\prod_{j=k}^{\ell-1} M_{2} j\right) \int_{0}^{t_{k}} \int_{0}^{t_{k+1}} \cdots \int_{0}^{t_{\ell-1}} e^{-M_{2} \ell t_{\ell}-\sum_{j=k}^{\ell-1} M_{2} j\left(t_{j}-t_{j+1}\right)} \mathrm{d} t_{\ell} \cdots \mathrm{d} t_{k+2} \mathrm{~d} t_{k+1}$.
According to Lacker [17, Lemma 4.8], these combinatorical quantities satisfy the bounds

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{k}^{\ell}(t) & \leqslant \exp \left(-2(\ell+1)\left(e^{-M_{2} t}-\frac{k}{\ell+1}\right)_{+}^{2}\right) \\
\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{r} A_{k}^{\ell}(t) & \leqslant \frac{(k+r)!}{(k-1)!} \frac{e^{M_{2}(r+1) t}-1}{r+1} \\
\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{2} B_{k}^{\ell}(t) & \leqslant 2 k^{2} e^{2 M_{2} t}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then plugging the upper bounds of $z_{0}^{\prime \ell}$ and $z_{t}^{\prime \bar{k}}$ into (10), we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
z_{t}^{\prime k} \leqslant & \frac{C_{0}^{\prime}}{N^{2}} \sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{2} B_{k}^{\ell}(t)+\frac{L^{\prime} e^{\left(L^{\prime}-M_{1}^{\prime}\right) t}}{M_{2} N^{2}} \sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{\beta-1} A_{k}^{\ell}(t) \\
& +C_{\alpha}\left(C_{0}+e^{L t}-1\right) N^{\beta-2} A_{k}^{\bar{k}-1}(t) \\
\leqslant & 2 C_{0}^{\prime} e^{2 M_{2} t} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}+\frac{L^{\prime} e^{\left(L^{\prime}-M_{1}^{\prime}\right) t}\left(e^{\beta M_{2} t}-1\right)}{\beta M_{2}} \frac{(k+\beta)!}{(k-1)!N^{2}} \\
& +C_{\alpha}\left(C_{0}+e^{L t}-1\right) N^{\beta-2} \exp \left(-N\left(e^{-M_{2} t}-\frac{2 k}{N}\right)_{+}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that in the second term, we have

$$
\frac{(k+\beta)!}{(k-1)!N^{2}} \leqslant C_{\beta} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

and in the last term, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N^{\beta-2} \exp \left(-N\left(e^{-M_{2} t}-\frac{2 k}{N}\right)_{+}^{2}\right) \\
& \leqslant N^{\beta-2} \times \begin{cases}\exp \left(-N e^{-2 M_{2} t} / 4\right) & \text { for } k \leqslant e^{-M_{2} t} N / 4 \\
1 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the first case, we use the elementary inequality $e^{-a} \leqslant \beta!a^{-\beta}$ for $a>0$ and obtain that, for all $k \geqslant 1$,

$$
N^{\beta-2} \exp \left(-\frac{N e^{-2 M_{2} t}}{4}\right) \leqslant \frac{\beta!4^{\beta} e^{2 \beta M_{2} t}}{N^{2}} \leqslant \beta!4^{\beta} e^{2 \beta M_{2} t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} .
$$

And in the second case, we observe that, for all $k>e^{-M_{2} t} N / 4$,

$$
N^{\beta-2}=4^{\beta} e^{\beta M_{2} t}\left(\frac{e^{-M_{2} t} N}{4}\right)^{\beta} N^{-2} \leqslant 4^{\beta} e^{\beta M_{2} t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

Combining two cases above, we find that, for all $k \geqslant 1$,

$$
N^{\beta-2} \exp \left(-N\left(e^{-M_{2} t}-\frac{2 k}{N}\right)_{+}^{2}\right) \leqslant M_{4} e^{M_{4} t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}},
$$

where we set $M_{4}=\max \left(\beta!4^{\beta}, 2 \beta M_{2}\right)$. Hence, for $k \leqslant N / 2$, the new variable $z_{t}^{\prime k}$ has the upper bound

$$
\begin{aligned}
z_{t}^{\prime k} \leqslant & 2 C_{0}^{\prime} e^{M_{2} t} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}+\frac{C_{\beta} L^{\prime} e^{\left(L^{\prime}-M_{1}^{\prime}\right) t}\left(e^{\beta M_{2} t}-1\right)}{\beta M_{2}} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} \\
& \quad+C_{\alpha}\left(C_{0}+e^{L t}-1\right) M_{4} e^{M_{4} t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} \\
\leqslant & M_{5} e^{M_{5} t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $M_{5}$ depending on all the constants appearing in the first inequality (but independent from $N, t$. To conclude, we simply notice that, for $k \leqslant N / 2$,

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant i_{0}^{\alpha} z_{t}^{k} \leqslant i_{0}^{\alpha} e^{M_{1}^{\prime} t} z_{t}^{\prime k} \leqslant i_{0}^{\alpha} M_{5} e^{\left(M_{5}+M_{1}^{\prime}\right) t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} .
$$

Now we treat the exponential decay case.
Step 4.2: Applying Lacker-Le Flem's uniform estimates in the second case. In the second case, we can find $t_{*}^{\prime} \in\left[t_{*}, \infty\right)$ such that

$$
r-\frac{(\alpha-1) c_{1} M_{2}\left(t_{*}^{\prime}\right)}{2} \geqslant(\beta+1) M_{2}\left(t_{*}^{\prime}\right)
$$

On the interval $\left[0, t_{*}^{\prime}\right)$, we apply the argument of Step 4.1 and get

$$
z_{t}^{k} \leqslant M \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

for all $k \in[N]$, for some $M \geqslant 0$. So it remains only to prove the exponential decay of $x_{t}^{k}$ for $t \geqslant t_{*}^{\prime}$. Define

$$
M_{2}^{\prime}(t)= \begin{cases}M_{2}(t), & \text { for } t<t_{*}^{\prime} \\ M_{2}\left(t_{*}\right), & \text { for } t \geqslant t_{*}^{\prime}\end{cases}
$$

And we denote $M_{*}=M_{2}\left(t_{*}^{\prime}\right)$ for brevity in the rest of the proof. Since $k \mapsto x_{t}^{k}$ is increasing, we can replace the function $M_{2}$ by $M_{2}^{\prime}$ in the original hierarchy (6) and
all the arguments in the previous three steps go through. Then the new hierarchy (9) implies that for $t \geqslant t_{*}^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d} z_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} & \leqslant-r^{\prime} z_{t}^{k}+M_{*} k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+M_{3}^{\prime}(t) \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}, \quad \text { for } k<\bar{k}, \\
z_{t}^{\bar{k}} & \leqslant C_{\alpha} M_{t}^{N} N^{\beta-2},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we set

$$
\begin{aligned}
r^{\prime} & =(\beta+1) M_{*}, \\
M_{3}^{\prime}(t) & =C_{\alpha, \beta} M_{3}(t)+2^{\alpha} M_{*} M_{t}^{N},
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying iteratively Grönwall's lemma, we find

$$
z_{t}^{k} \leqslant \sum_{\ell=k}^{\bar{k}-1}\left(\tilde{B}_{k}^{\ell}\left(t-t_{*}^{\prime}\right) z_{t_{*}^{\prime}}^{\ell}+\tilde{A}_{k}^{\ell}\left(t-t_{*}^{\prime}\right) \frac{\ell^{\beta-1}}{M_{*} N^{2}} \sup _{s \in\left[t, t_{*}^{\prime}\right]} M_{3}^{\prime}(s)\right)+\tilde{A}_{k}^{\bar{k}-1}\left(t-t_{*}^{\prime}\right) \sup _{s \in\left[t_{*}^{\prime}, t\right]} z_{s}^{\bar{k}},
$$

where $\tilde{A}_{k}^{\ell}(\cdot), \tilde{B}_{k}^{\ell}(\cdot)$ are given by

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\tilde{B}_{k}^{\ell}\left(t_{k}\right):=\left(\prod_{j=k}^{\ell-1} M_{*} j\right) \int_{0}^{t_{k}} \int_{0}^{t_{k+1}} \cdots \int_{0}^{t_{\ell-1}} e^{-\left(r^{\prime}+M_{*} \ell\right) t_{\ell}-\sum_{j=k}^{\ell-1}\left(r^{\prime}+M_{*} j\right)\left(t_{j}-t_{j+1}\right)} \\
\mathrm{d} t_{\ell} \cdots \mathrm{d} t_{k+2} \mathrm{~d} t_{k+1}
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\tilde{A}_{k}^{\ell}\left(t_{k}\right):=M_{*} \ell \int_{0}^{t_{k}} \tilde{B}_{k}^{\ell}(s) \mathrm{d} s
$$

As we have $r^{\prime} / M_{*}=\beta+1>\beta$, we can apply [18, Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8$]$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup _{t \geqslant 0} \tilde{A}_{k}^{\ell}(t) & \leqslant C_{\beta}\left(\frac{k}{\ell+1}\right)^{\beta+1}, \\
\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{\beta-1} \sup _{t \geqslant 0} \tilde{A}_{k}^{\ell}(t) & \leqslant C_{\beta} k^{\ell}, \\
\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} \ell^{\beta} \tilde{B}_{k}^{\ell}(t) & \leqslant C_{\beta} k^{\beta} e^{-\left(r^{\prime}-M_{*}\right) t} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, plugging in the bound $z_{t_{*}^{\prime}}^{\ell} \leqslant M k^{\beta} / N^{2}$, we get

$$
z_{t}^{k} \leqslant C_{\beta} M \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}+\frac{C_{\beta} k^{\beta}}{M_{*} N^{2}} \sup _{s \in\left[t_{*}^{\prime}, t\right]} M_{3}^{\prime}(s)+C_{\beta}\left(\frac{k}{N / 2}\right)^{\beta+1} \sup _{s \in\left[t_{*}^{\prime}, t\right]} z_{s}^{\bar{k}}
$$

Crudely bounding the last two terms by

$$
M_{3}^{\prime}(s) \leqslant M_{3}^{\prime}\left(t_{*}^{\prime}\right), \quad z_{s}^{\bar{k}} \leqslant M^{\prime \prime} N^{\beta-2},
$$

and combining with the result on $\left[0, t_{*}^{\prime}\right]$, we obtain the time-uniform estimate

$$
\sup _{t \geqslant 0} z_{t}^{k} \leqslant M^{\prime \prime \prime} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
$$

It remains only to prove the exponential decay. The hierarchy (9) implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d} z_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} & \leqslant-r z_{t}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{t \geqslant t_{*}}+L^{\prime} e^{-\eta t} k\left(z_{t}^{k+1}-z_{t}^{k}\right)+L^{\prime} e^{-\eta t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}} \\
& \leqslant-r z_{t}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{t \geqslant t_{*}}+L^{\prime} e^{-\eta t} k z_{t}^{k+1}+L^{\prime} e^{-\eta t} \frac{k^{\beta}}{N^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $L^{\prime}>0$. Applying Grönwall's lemma on the interval $\left[t_{*}, t\right]$ and using the time-uniform bound on $z_{t}^{k+1}$, we get

$$
z_{t}^{k} \leqslant L^{\prime} e^{-\min (r, \eta) t} \frac{k^{\beta+1}}{N^{2}}
$$

for some $L^{\prime}$ possibly different. We conclude by using

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant i_{0}^{\alpha} z_{t}^{k}
$$

## $3.2 \quad L^{2}$ hierarchy

For the ODE system obtained from the $L^{2}$ hierarchy, we only show that the $O\left(1 / N^{2}\right)$-order bound holds until some finite time. We note that similar hierarchies have appeared recently in $[4,3]$.

Proposition 6. Let $T>0$ and let $x_{+}^{k}$, $y^{k}:[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be $\mathcal{C}^{1}$ functions, for $k \in[N]$. Suppose that there exist real numbers $c_{1}>c_{2} \geqslant 0$, and $C_{0}, M_{2}, M_{3} \geqslant 0$ such that for all $t \in[0, T]$ and $k \in[N]$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{0}^{k} & \leqslant \frac{C_{0} k^{2}}{N^{2}} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d} x_{t}^{k}}{\mathrm{~d} t} & \leqslant-c_{1} y_{t}^{k}+c_{2} y_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{2} k x_{t}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}_{k<N}+M_{3} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, there exist $T_{*}, M>0$, depending only on $\beta, c_{1}, c_{2}, C_{0}, M_{2}, M_{3}$ such that for all $t \in\left[0, T_{*} \wedge T\right)$, we have

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant \frac{M e^{M k}}{\left(T_{*}-t\right)^{3} N^{2}}
$$

Proof. For $t \in[0, T]$ and $r \in\left[c_{2} / c_{1}, 1\right]$, we define the generating function (or the Laplace transform) associated to $x_{t}^{k}$ :

$$
F(t, r)=\sum_{k=1}^{N} r^{k} x_{t}^{k}
$$

Then, taking the time-derivative of $F(t, r)$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial F(t, r)}{\partial t} & \leqslant-c_{1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} r^{k} y_{t}^{k}+c_{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} r^{k} y_{t}^{k+1}+M_{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} k r^{k} x_{t}^{k+1}+\frac{M_{3}}{N^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} k^{2} r^{k} \\
& \leqslant-c_{1} r y_{t}^{1}+\sum_{k=2}^{N}\left(c_{2}-c_{1} r\right) r^{k-1} y_{t}^{k+1}+M_{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} k r^{k} x_{t}^{k+1}+\frac{M_{3}}{N^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} k^{2} r^{k} \\
& \leqslant M_{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} k r^{k} x_{t}^{k+1}+\frac{M_{3}}{N^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} k^{2} r^{k} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that, by taking partial derivatives in $r$, we get

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{\partial F(t, r)}{\partial r}=\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}(k+1) r^{k} x_{t}^{k+1} \\
\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial r^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+2)(k+1) r^{k}
\end{gathered}
$$

Thus, we find

$$
\frac{\partial F(t, r)}{\partial t} \leqslant M_{2} \frac{\partial F(t, r)}{\partial r}+\frac{2 M_{3}}{N^{2}(1-r)^{3}}
$$

The initial condition of $F$ satisfies

$$
F(0, r)=\sum_{k=1}^{N} r^{k} x_{0}^{k} \leqslant \frac{C_{0}}{N^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} r^{k} k^{2} \leqslant \frac{2 C_{0}}{N^{2}(1-r)^{3}}
$$

Let

$$
T_{*}=\frac{1}{M_{2}}\left(1-\frac{c_{2}}{c_{1}}\right)
$$

and for $t<T_{*} \wedge T$, let $\left(r_{s}\right)_{s \in[0, t]}$ be the characteristic line:

$$
r_{s}=\frac{c_{2}}{c_{1}}+M_{2}(t-s)
$$

We then have $r_{0} \leqslant c_{2} / c_{1}+M_{2} t$. Integrating along this line, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
F\left(t, r_{t}\right) & \leqslant F\left(0, r_{0}\right)+\frac{2 M_{3}}{N^{2}} \int_{0}^{t} \frac{\mathrm{~d} s}{\left(1-r_{s}\right)^{3}} \\
& \leqslant \frac{2 C_{0}}{N^{2}\left(1-r_{0}\right)^{3}}+\frac{2 M_{3}}{M_{2} N^{2}} \int_{r_{t}}^{r_{0}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} r}{(1-r)^{3}} \\
& \leqslant\left(\frac{2 C_{0}}{\left(1-r_{0}\right)^{3}}+\frac{M_{3}}{M_{2}\left(1-r_{0}\right)^{2}}\right) \frac{1}{N^{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we get

$$
x_{t}^{k} \leqslant r_{t}^{-k} F\left(t, r_{t}\right) \leqslant\left(\frac{c_{1}}{c_{2}}\right)^{k}\left(\frac{2 C_{0}}{\left(1-M_{2} t-\frac{c_{2}}{c_{1}}\right)^{3}}+\frac{M_{3}}{M_{2}\left(1-M_{2} t-\frac{c_{2}}{c_{1}}\right)^{2}}\right) \frac{1}{N^{2}}
$$

## 4 Other technical results

### 4.1 Transport inequality for $W^{-1, \infty}$ kernels

One key ingredient of the entropic hierarchy of Lacker [17] is to control the outer interaction terms by the relative entropy through the Pinsker or Talagrand's transport inequality. In our situation, the interaction kernel is more singular, and we are no longer able to control the difference by the mere relative entropy. It turns out that the additional quantity to consider is the relative Fisher information. ${ }^{5}$ We also include the inequality for the $L^{2}$ hierarchy here, as the two inequalities share the same form.

[^3]Proposition 7. For all $K=\nabla \cdot V$ with $V \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}^{d} \times \mathbb{R}^{d}\right)$ and all regular enough measures $m_{1}, m_{2} \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left\langle K, m_{1}-m_{2}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\left(\sqrt{I\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)}+\left\|\nabla \log m_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \sqrt{2 H\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)}\right) \\
& \left|\left\langle K, m_{1}-m_{2}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{2}\left(m_{2}\right)}\left(\sqrt{E\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)}+\left\|\nabla \log m_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \sqrt{D\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. For the first inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mid\langle K, & \left.m_{1}-m_{2}\right\rangle \mid \\
& =\left|\left\langle V, \nabla m_{1}-\nabla m_{2}\right\rangle\right| \\
& \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}|V|\left|\frac{\nabla m_{1}}{m_{1}}-\frac{\nabla m_{2}}{m_{2}}\right| \mathrm{d} m_{1}+\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \frac{\left|\nabla m_{2}\right|}{m_{2}}|V| \mathrm{d}\left|m_{1}-m_{2}\right| \\
& \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}}\left|\nabla \log \frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}}\right|^{2} \mathrm{~d} m_{1}\right)^{1 / 2}+\left\|\nabla \log m_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\left\|m_{1}-m_{2}\right\|_{L^{1}} \\
& \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\left(\sqrt{I\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)}+\left\|\nabla \log m_{2}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \sqrt{2 H\left(m_{1} \mid m_{2}\right)}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

For the second inequality, we set $h=m_{1} / m_{2}$ and find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mid\left\langle K_{1}\right. & \left., m_{1}-m_{2}\right\rangle \mid \\
& =\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} K(h-1) \mathrm{d} m_{2}\right| \\
& \leqslant\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} V \nabla h \mathrm{~d} m_{2}\right|+\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} V(h-1) \nabla \log m_{2} \mathrm{~d} m_{2}\right| \\
& \leqslant\|V\|_{L^{2}\left(m_{2}\right)}\left(\|\nabla h\|_{L^{2}\left(m_{2}\right)}+\left\|\nabla \log m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}\|h-1\|_{L^{2}\left(m_{2}\right)}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

### 4.2 Improved Jabin-Wang lemma

In the following we state a slight improvement to [15, Theorem 4], in the sense that we get the correct asymptotic behavior when the cumulant "test function" ( $\phi$ as denoted in their work) tends to zero. This behavior is not needed for their global approach but is necessary for the inner interaction bound in our local approach. For simplicity, we denote the universal constant of Jabin-Wang by

$$
C_{\mathrm{JW}}:=1600^{2}+36 e^{4}
$$

Theorem 8 (Alternative version of [15, Theorem 4]). Let $\phi \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} \times \mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}\right)$ and $m \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d}\right)$ be such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(x, y) m(\mathrm{~d} y)=\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(y, x) m(\mathrm{~d} y)=0$ and $\phi(x, x)=0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}$. Denote $\gamma=C_{\mathrm{JW}}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2}$. If $\gamma \in\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$, then for all integer $k \geqslant 1$, we have

$$
\log \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \exp \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant 6 \gamma
$$

The proof will depend on two combinatorical estimates in [15], which we state here for the readers' convenience.
Proposition 9 ([15, Propositions 4 and 5]). Under the assumptions of Theorem 8, for all integer $r \geqslant 1$, we have

$$
\frac{1}{(2 r)!} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right|^{2 r} m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant \begin{cases}\left(6 e^{2}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}\right)^{2 r} & \text { if } 4 r>k \\ \left(1600\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}\right)^{2 r} & \text { if } 4 \leqslant 4 r \leqslant k\end{cases}
$$

Proof of Theorem 8. Let $a \neq 0$. We have the elementary inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{a}-a-1 & =\sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \frac{a^{r}}{r!} \leqslant \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{r}}{r!} \\
& =\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{2 r}}{(2 r)!}+\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{2 r+1}}{(2 r+1)!} \\
& \leqslant \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{2 r}}{(2 r)!}+\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{2 r+1}}{2(2 r+1)!}\left(\frac{|a|}{2 r+2}+\frac{2 r+2}{|a|}\right) \\
& \leqslant 3 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{2 r}}{(2 r)!} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The inequality $e^{a}-a-1 \leqslant 3 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a|^{2 r}}{(2 r)!}$ holds true for $a=0$ as well. Taking $a=\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)$ in the inequality above and integrating with $m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \exp \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \leqslant 1+\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
&+3 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2 r)!} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}}\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right|^{2 r} m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The second term on the right hand side vanishes, as if $i \neq j$, we have $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right)=$ 0 , and if $i=j$, we have $\phi\left(x^{i}, x^{i}\right)=0$. Thus, using the counting result of Proposition 9 , we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k d}} & \exp \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \\
& \leqslant 1+3 \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor k / 4\rfloor}\left(1600\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}\right)^{2 r}+3 \sum_{r=\lfloor k / 4\rfloor+1}^{\infty}\left(6 e^{2}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}\right)^{2 r}=1+\frac{3 \gamma}{1-\gamma}
\end{aligned}
$$

We conclude by noting that $\log \left(1+\frac{3 \gamma}{1-\gamma}\right) \leqslant \frac{3 \gamma}{1-\gamma} \leqslant 6 \gamma$ for $\gamma \in\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$.
Then, taking a rescaling of $\phi$, we get the following.
Corollary 10. Let $\phi \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{T}^{d} \times \mathbb{T}^{d} ; \mathbb{R}\right)$ and $m \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d}\right)$ be such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(x, y) m(\mathrm{~d} y)=$ $\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \phi(y, x) m(\mathrm{~d} y)=0$ and $\phi(x, x)=0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^{d}$. Then, for all integer $N \geqslant 2$ and $k \in[N]$, we have

$$
\log \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k} k} \exp \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i, j \in[k]} \phi\left(x^{i}, x^{j}\right)\right) m^{\otimes k}\left(\mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{x}^{[k]}\right) \leqslant 6 C_{\mathrm{JW}}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} \frac{k^{2}}{N^{2}}
$$

given that $C_{\mathrm{JW}}\|\phi\|_{L^{\infty}}^{2} \leqslant 1 / 2$.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This work will be referred as "Jabin-Wang" in the following of this paper without including the name initial of the second author.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ For example one can take $V_{S}^{1 i}\left(x^{1}, x^{2}, \ldots, x^{d}\right)=\int_{0}^{x^{1}} S^{i}\left(y, x^{2}, \ldots, x^{d}\right) \mathrm{d} y$ for $i \in[d]$ and $V_{S}^{j i}=0$ for $j \neq 1$.
    ${ }^{3}$ The rate of convergence stated in [7] is not explicit. However, it seems to the author that we can take $\eta=4 \pi^{2}$ by the following argument. First by computing the evolution of the entropy $H\left(m_{t}\right)$ and integrating by parts à la Jabin-Wang, we find that $\mathrm{d} H\left(m_{t}\right) / \mathrm{d} t=-I\left(m_{t}\right) \leqslant$ $-8 \pi^{2} H\left(m_{t}\right)$ thanks to the log-Sobolev inequality (see also [19, Proof of Theorem 4.11]), and therefore $H\left(m_{t}\right) \lesssim e^{-8 \pi^{2} t}$. This implies that $\left\|m_{t}-1\right\|_{L^{1}} \lesssim e^{-4 \pi^{2} t}$ by Pinsker. Then we use the hypercontractivity [7, Corollary 2.4] and the regularization [7, Proposition 2.6] to find that $\left\|\nabla m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}},\left\|\nabla^{2} m_{t}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim e^{-4 \pi^{2} t}$ so the desired bound follows with $\eta=4 \pi^{2}$. This rate is optimal as it is verified by the heat equation $(K=0)$ with initial data $m_{0}(x)=1+a \sin (2 \pi x)+b \cos (2 \pi x)$. With $\eta=4 \pi^{2}$, the minimum for the rate in the second assertion of Theorem 1 is equal to $\min \left(1,2-2\|V\|_{L^{\infty}}\right) 4 \pi^{2}$.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Here, and in the following, if a bracket without conditions appears in a math expression, it means that both alternatives are valid.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ It has been communicated to the author that Lacker has also obtained the inequality independently.

