

# Information-theoretic classification of the cutoff phenomenon in Markov processes

Youjia Wang<sup>\*1</sup> and Michael C.H. Choi<sup>†2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Science, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Science and Yale-NUS College, National University of Singapore, Singapore

July 10, 2024

## Abstract

We investigate the cutoff phenomenon for Markov processes under information divergences such as  $f$ -divergences and Rényi divergences. We classify most common divergences into four types, namely  $L^2$ -type, TV-type, separation-type and KL divergence, in which we prove that the cutoff phenomenon are equivalent and relate the cutoff time and window among members within each type. To justify that this classification is natural, we provide examples in which the family of Markov processes exhibit cutoff in one type but not in another. We also establish new product conditions in these settings for the processes to exhibit cutoff, along with new results in non-reversible or non-normal situations. The proofs rely on a functional analytic approach towards cutoff.

**Keywords:** Markov processes, cutoff,  $f$ -divergence, Rényi divergence, reversibility, spectral gap, log-Sobolev constant

**AMS 2020 subject classification:** 60J05, 60J10, 60J25, 60J27, 94A15, 94A17

## 1 Introduction

Given a family of Markov processes, the cutoff phenomenon describes the abrupt convergence to equilibrium of these processes when measured by a suitable probability metric. It was

---

<sup>\*</sup>Email: e1124868@u.nus.edu

<sup>†</sup>Email: mchchoi@nus.edu.sg

first observed in the context of card shuffling that entails the total variation (TV) cutoff (Aldous and Diaconis 1986; Diaconis 1996). Since then, the cutoff phenomenon has been studied in a diverse suite of important models with different probability metrics, such as cutoff under separation distance of birth-death processes (Diaconis and Saloff-Coste 2006),  $L^p$  distances with  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  (Chen 2006; Chen and Saloff-Coste 2010), relative entropy or KL divergence for random walk on groups or samples of Markov chains (Barrera et al. 2006; Su 1995), squared Hellinger distance and cutoff on product chains (Chen and Kumagai 2018), cutoff for Lévy driven OU processes under the Wasserstein distance (Barrera et al. 2021), cutoff for overdamped and underdamped Langevin dynamics (Barrera and Jara 2020; Lee et al. 2023), cutoff for the Dyson OU processes under KL, TV, squared Hellinger and Wasserstein distance (Boursier et al. 2023), cutoff for deep neural networks (Avelin and Karlsson 2022), cutoff for the Ising model on lattice (Lubetzky and Sly 2013), to name but a few.

In information theory, an important and natural family of information divergences is known as the  $f$ -divergences (Sason and Verdú 2016). With different choices of the function  $f$ , this family encompasses most of the common divergences in the literature such as the TV distance, KL divergence, squared Hellinger distance, chi-squared divergence and  $\alpha$ -divergence  $D_\alpha$ . This family is also related to the Rényi divergences  $R_\alpha$ . We shall give a brief review of these divergences in Definition 2.3 below. In the context of cutoff phenomenon, the total variation cutoff remains to be a focus in a majority of papers in the literature. It thus naturally raises a question: is total variation cutoff equivalent to other cutoff such as the separation cutoff? This has been answered in the negative in the paper (Hermon et al. 2016). In this paper, we aim at providing a systematic and unifying framework as well as a natural classification of these divergences under which the cutoff phenomenon is equivalent within each type. Specifically, we propose four main types of information divergences in this context, namely  $L^2$ -type, TV-type, separation-type and KL divergence. We prove that the cutoff phenomenon is equivalent among members within each type, along with some new product conditions to verify cutoff in these settings. We summarize these results in Table 1.

In order to justify that the above classification scheme is natural and is not due to artifacts in our proofs, we provide examples in which the family of Markov processes exhibit cutoff in one type but not in another, see the list below for pointers:

- $L^2$ -type and TV-type are not equivalent: Aldous' example (Example 3.6), Pak's example (Example 3.7)
- $L^2$ -type and KL-type are not equivalent: Product chains (Example 3.8)
- $L^2$ -type and separation-type are not equivalent: Pak's example (Example 3.7)
- TV-type and KL-type are not equivalent: Pak's example (Example 3.7)
- TV-type and separation-type are not equivalent: (Hermon et al. 2016)
- KL-type and separation-type are not equivalent: Pak's example (Example 3.7)

	Reversible	Normal	Non-reversible (bounded perturbation)
$L^2$ -type	$L^p (1 < p \leq \infty)$ (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008)		$L^p (1 < p < \infty)$ Theorem 4.1, 4.3
		$D_\alpha (1 < \alpha < \infty)$ , Theorem 3.1, 3.3, 4.2 $R_\alpha (1 < \alpha < \infty)$ , Theorem 3.2, 3.3, 4.2	
TV-type	Total variation distance $D_\alpha (0 < \alpha < 1)$ $R_\alpha (0 < \alpha < 1)$ Squared Hellinger distance Vincze-Le Cam distance Jensen-Shannon divergence Bhattacharyya distance Theorem 3.7, Corollary 3.4		
KL-type	KL divergence, Theorem 3.4		
Separation-type	Separation distance Reverse- $R_\infty$ divergence Section 3.5		

Table 1: Classification of some  $f$ -divergences and probability metrics by equivalence under cutoff phenomenon

We stress that, for possibly non-normal Markov generators that satisfy a bounded perturbation condition, we are able to characterize  $L^p$ -cutoff ( $1 < p < \infty$ ) with a product condition, and hence to prove its equivalence with  $\alpha$ -divergence or Rényi divergence cutoff in Section 4.2. It should be noted this is among the few results on cutoff for non-normal Markov processes. Owing to the absence of symmetry or reversibility, this direction has not received much attention in the literature.

In addition to these information divergences, we also consider cutoff under  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence and TV cutoff. These divergences are appealing to study for at least two reasons. First, these weighted divergences appear naturally as the information divergence rate between two Markov chains as well as the rate function in large deviations of Markov chains. Second, these weighted divergences present an “average-case” analysis of cutoff rather than the typical worst-case (TV or KL) cutoff. We highlight that in these settings, we obtain product-type sufficient conditions for the family of Markov chains to exhibit cutoff in these divergences in Section 3.3.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a brief overview on various notions in Markov processes, cutoff phenomenon as well as information divergences. In Section 3, we present some of our main results. Specifically, we first investigate the equivalence of  $L^2$ -type divergences among  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence by introducing the so-called  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family in Section 3.1 and 3.2, followed by studying  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence and TV cutoff, and new product conditions in these settings in Section 3.3. We then move

on to discuss cutoff phenomenon of TV-type divergences in Section 3.4 and separation-type in Section 3.5. We conclude this section by illustrating the results with examples in Section 3.6. We proceed to focus on cutoff phenomenon of normal Markov chains on finite state spaces in Section 4.1, and then to non-normal Markov chains via perturbation theory in Section 4.2.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we will follow the discussions as in (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008) to introduce some basic definitions and properties related to the cutoff phenomenon for general Markov processes. We first begin by introducing some basic definitions of Markov processes.

### 2.1 Markov process

Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $\{T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  being the time index set for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Markov process  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in T}$ , where we may write  $T = [0, \infty)$  for continuous-time Markov process, while  $T = \mathbb{N}$  for discrete-time Markov chains. We denote  $\mathcal{X}_n$  as the state space of  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in T}$ , which can be continuous or discrete. Besides, we set  $p_n(t, x, \cdot)$  with  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$  as the transition probability measure for  $n^{\text{th}}$  Markov process. When analyzing some general properties of a Markov process without stressing the order of it in the sequence  $n \geq 1$ , for simplicity of notation, we may omit the subscript/superscript  $n$  and simply use  $p(t, x, \cdot)$ ,  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $T$  and  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  to represent the transition probability measure, state space, time index set and Markov process respectively.

For a Markov process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  on state space  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $p(t, x, \cdot)$  as the transition probability measure, we define  $P_t$  as the Markov semigroup, which satisfies

$$P_t f(x) := \mathbb{E}^x[f(X_t)] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y) p(t, x, dy), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}$$

for any bounded measurable function  $f$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , and it is easy to verify that  $P_{t+s} = P_t \circ P_s$ . Besides, we denote

$$\mu P_t(A) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(t, x, A) \mu(dx)$$

as the probability measure of  $X_t$  if the initial distribution  $X_0 \sim \mu$  for any probability measure  $\mu$ . Moreover,  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  has an infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{A}$ , which satisfies  $P_t = e^{t\mathcal{A}}$  if  $T = [0, \infty)$  and  $\mathcal{A} = P - I$  if  $T = \mathbb{N}$ . As to a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , we similarly define  $P_{t,n}$  as the Markov semigroup of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process.

Suppose a Markov process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  admits  $\pi$  as its unique stationary distribution, we say the process is normal if the adjoint operator  $P_t^*$  of  $P_t$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$  satisfies  $P_t P_t^* = P_t^* P_t$ , and the process is reversible if  $P_t^* = P_t$ . Particularly for a finite Markov chain with transition

matrix  $(P(x, y))_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}}$ , the chain is reversible if  $\pi(x)P(x, y) = \pi(y)P(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ , and the adjoint transition matrix  $P^*$  of  $P$  with respect to  $\pi$  is given by the time reversal, i.e.

$$P^*(x, y) = \frac{\pi(y)P(y, x)}{\pi(x)}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}.$$

For any given initial distribution  $\mu_0$ , if we denote  $h_t = \frac{d\mu_0 P_t}{d\pi}$  as the probability density function of  $\mu_0 P_t$  with respect to  $\pi$ , we have  $h_t = P_t^* h_0$ , since for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ ,

$$\int_A h_t d\pi = \int_A d\mu_0 P_t = \mu_0 P_t(A) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P_t \mathbf{1}_A d\mu_0 = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P_t \mathbf{1}_A h_0 d\pi = \int_A P_t^* h_0 d\pi.$$

A fundamental fact regarding this is the time evolution of  $h_t$  under continuous-time, i.e.

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_t = \mathcal{A}^* h_t, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is the adjoint operator of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ , and this equation can be also referred to as Kolmogorov's backward equation in the context of diffusion processes.

For a finite Markov chain  $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  with transition matrix  $P$  and stationary distribution  $\pi$ , we define its continuized chain  $\{\widehat{X}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  on the same finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$  with transition matrix

$$P_t(x, y) := e^{t(P-I)}(x, y) = e^{-t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{P^k(x, y) t^k}{k!}, \quad (2)$$

then  $\pi P = \pi$  is equivalent to  $\pi P_t = \pi$ , i.e.  $\pi$  is also the stationary distribution of  $\{\widehat{X}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ . Moreover,  $P - I$  is also the generator of  $\{\widehat{X}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , which implies  $P_t$  is the semigroup for the continuized chain.

Denote the Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$  as  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, g) := \langle f, -\mathcal{A}g \rangle_{\pi}$ . Particularly for a discrete-time Markov chain with generator  $\mathcal{A} = P_1 - I$  and one-step transition probability  $p(x, \cdot)$  on state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, g) = \int_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) (g(x) - g(y)) p(x, dy) \pi(dx),$$

and further if  $\mathcal{A}$  is reversible,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, g) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) - f(y)) (g(x) - g(y)) p(x, dy) \pi(dx), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, f) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 p(x, dy) \pi(dx). \quad (4)$$

When estimating the convergence performance of a Markov process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  with generator  $\mathcal{A}$  to stationary distribution  $\pi$ , spectral gap is an important tool, and the spectral gap is defined in terms of Dirichlet form.

**Definition 2.1** (Spectral gap of Markov process). *For a Markov process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  with infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{A}$  and stationary distribution  $\pi$ , the spectral gap is defined as*

$$\lambda = \lambda(\mathcal{A}) := \inf \{ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, f) : f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi), \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f] = 0, \|f\|_2 = 1 \}.$$

*If  $\mathcal{A}$  is non-reversible, we have  $\lambda(\mathcal{A}) = \lambda(\mathcal{A}^*) = \lambda\left(\frac{\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}^*}{2}\right)$ .*

Particularly for a finite Markov chain with transition matrix  $P$ , we can assume its generator as the generator of the continuized chain, i.e.  $\mathcal{A} = P - I$ , and its spectral gap satisfies  $\lambda(\mathcal{A}) = 1 - \lambda_1$  if  $P$  is reversible, where  $\lambda_1$  is the second largest eigenvalue of  $P$ . It can be readily seen that the discrete-time finite Markov chain and its continuized chain share the same spectral gap. A useful application of spectral gap is the following Proposition 2.1, which involves a corollary of spectral mapping theorem, see (Haase 2018, Chapter 4) or (Whitley 1968).

**Proposition 2.1** (Convergence rate of Markov semigroup). *Assume a Markov process have a semigroup  $P_t$ , stationary distribution  $\pi$  and spectral gap  $\lambda \geq 0$ . For all  $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$  and  $t \in T$ , we have*

$$\|(P_t - \Pi)(f)\|_2 \leq e^{-\lambda t} \|f\|_2, \quad T = [0, \infty), \quad (5)$$

$$\|(P_t - \Pi)(f)\|_2 \leq \kappa^t \|f\|_2, \quad T = \mathbb{N}, \quad (6)$$

*where  $\kappa$  is the second largest singular value of  $P_1$ . Moreover, if  $P_t : L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$  is normal, we have*

$$\|P_t - \Pi\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = e^{-t\lambda}, \quad T = [0, \infty),$$

$$\|P_t - \Pi\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \kappa^t, \quad T = \mathbb{N},$$

*where  $\Pi f(x) := \pi(f), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ .*

This result applies in both cases of continuous and discrete-time, and will play an important role in analysis of cutoff phenomenon. Further explanations and pointers can be found in (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Section 3.2).

## 2.2 Cutoff phenomenon and $f$ -divergence

Next, we will give a brief overview on cutoff phenomenon and recall some definitions and properties of  $f$ -divergences. The terminology **cutoff** describes a phenomenon that a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  may exhibit a sharp transition in their mixing time to stationary distribution as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  under suitable probability metrics or information divergences. Now, we give a formal definition of cutoff phenomenon from (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Definition 2.1).

**Definition 2.2** (Cutoff phenomenon, Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008). Consider a sequence of non-increasing functions  $g_n : T \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  which vanish at infinity, i.e.  $g_n(\infty) = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . If  $M := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(0) > 0$ , where  $M$  can be **infinity**, then

(i)  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  present a **precutoff** if there exist a sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $t_n > 0$  and  $b > a > 0$  such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t > bt_n} g_n(t) = 0, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{t < at_n} g_n(t) > 0.$$

(ii)  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  present a **cutoff** if there exists a sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $t_n > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t > (1+\varepsilon)t_n} g_n(t) = 0, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t < (1-\varepsilon)t_n} g_n(t) = M,$$

and in this case we say  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  have a cutoff sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

(iii)  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  present a  $(t_n, w_n)$  cutoff if  $t_n > 0$ ,  $w_n \geq 0$ ,  $w_n = o(t_n)$ , and

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{G}(c) = 0, \quad \lim_{c \rightarrow -\infty} \underline{G}(c) = M,$$

where

$$\overline{G}(c) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t > t_n + cw_n} g_n(t), \quad \underline{G}(c) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t < t_n + cw_n} g_n(t),$$

and in this case we call  $\{w_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  as the **cutoff window**.

There is a deep connection between cutoff phenomenon and mixing times. Given a sequence of non-negative functions  $g_n$  on  $T$  as described earlier, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the mixing time of  $g_n$  is defined as

$$t(g_n, \varepsilon) := \inf\{t \in T : g_n(t) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

We note that the following result indicates that the choice of  $\varepsilon$  does not play a fundamental role in the analysis of cutoff phenomenon:

**Proposition 2.2** (Equivalence in  $\varepsilon$ , Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Corollary 2.5). Consider a sequence of non-increasing functions  $g_n : T \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  vanishing at infinity, and  $M := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(0) > 0$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , then we have the following statements.

- (i) If  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has a cutoff, then for any  $0 < \delta < M$ ,  $\{t(g_n, \delta)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a cutoff sequence.
- (ii)  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has a cutoff sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  if and only if  $t_n \sim t(g_n, \delta)$  for any  $0 < \delta < M$ .
- (iii) If  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has a cutoff sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , then  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has a cutoff sequence  $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  if and only if  $t_n \sim s_n$ .

Here for two sequences of numbers  $a_n$  and  $b_n$ ,  $a_n \sim b_n$  means  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, under discrete-time  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , if there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t(g_n, \delta_0) = \infty$ , then the statements above also hold.

Usually  $g_n(t)$  can be chosen as a specific information divergence between the distribution of  $X_t^{(n)}$  and the stationary distribution  $\pi_n$  of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process. Typical examples include

$$g_n(t) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{TV}(\delta_x P_{t,n}, \pi_n),$$

where we have used the total variation distance to measure the distance between the distributions, see (Levin and Peres 2017, Chapter 18) and (Ding et al. 2010). Another common choice is the separation cutoff phenomenon in finite Markov chains with transition matrix  $(P(x, y))_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}}$ , which utilize

$$g_n(t) = \max_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{P_{t,n}(x, y)}{\pi_n(y)} \right\},$$

see for example (Diaconis and Saloff-Coste 2006). It turns out that this two choices entail TV-type cutoff and separation-type cutoff, that we shall introduce in Section 3.

One of the main aims of the manuscript is to study cutoff phenomenon under information-theoretic  $f$ -divergences. To this end, let us now recall its definition:

**Definition 2.3** (Csiszár's  $f$ -divergence). *Given two probability measures  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\nu_1 \ll \nu_2$ , for a convex function  $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(1) = 0$ , we define the  $f$ -divergence from  $\nu_2$  to  $\nu_1$  as*

$$D_f(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} f\left(\frac{d\nu_1}{d\nu_2}\right) d\nu_2.$$

Many popular divergences belong to the family of  $f$ -divergences, and we refer to (Sason and Verdú 2016) and (Van Erven and Harremoës 2014) to give a few common examples:

- Total variation (TV) distance:  $f(t) = \frac{|t-1|}{2}$ , denoted as  $\text{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ .
- Relative entropy/Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence:  $f(t) = t \ln t - t + 1$ , denoted as  $\text{KL}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$ .
- $\chi^2$ -divergence:  $f(t) = |t-1|^2$ , denoted as  $\chi^2(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$ .
- $\chi^p$ -divergence ( $p > 0$ ):  $f(t) = |t-1|^p$ , denoted as  $\chi^p(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$ . When  $p = 1, 2$ , we recover the total variation distance and  $\chi^2$ -divergence up to a constant.
- Jensen-Shannon divergence:  $f(t) = t \ln t - (t+1) \ln \frac{t+1}{2}$ , denoted as  $\text{JS}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$ . It also has the property

$$\text{JS}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2) = \text{KL}\left(\nu_1 \parallel \frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2}{2}\right) + \text{KL}\left(\nu_2 \parallel \frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2}{2}\right). \quad (7)$$



- $\alpha$ -divergence ( $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ ):  $f(t) = f_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^\alpha - \alpha(t-1) - 1}{\alpha - 1}$ , denoted as  $D_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$ . A closely related divergence is the Rényi divergence defined as

$$R_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln(1 + (\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left( \frac{d\nu_1}{d\nu_2} \right)^\alpha d\nu_2. \quad (8)$$

- Squared Hellinger distance:  $f(t) = (\sqrt{t} - 1)^2$ , denoted as  $\text{Hel}^2(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ .
- Vincze-Le Cam distance:  $f(t) = \frac{(t-1)^2}{t+1}$ , denoted as  $\text{LC}(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ . An important relationship with  $\chi^2$ -divergence is that

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{LC}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \chi^2 \left( \nu_1 \parallel \frac{1}{2}\nu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\nu_2 \right) = \chi^2 \left( \nu_2 \parallel \frac{1}{2}\nu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\nu_2 \right). \quad (9)$$

In the following Proposition 2.3, we briefly recall some properties of information divergences in the literature:

**Proposition 2.3** (Some properties of information divergences). *Given two probability measures on  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\nu_1 \ll \nu_2$ , for a convex function  $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(1) = 0$ , then the following properties hold.*

- (i) (Sason and Verdú 2016, Theorem 5) Denote  $f^*(t) := tf\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)$  as the convex conjugate of  $f(t)$ , then we have

$$\sup_{\nu_1 \neq \nu_2} \frac{D_f(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)}{\text{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2)} = f(0) + f^*(0),$$

where  $f^*(0) := \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u}$ , and both  $f(0)$  and  $f^*(0)$  can be infinity.

- (ii) (Csiszár 1972, Theorem 3.1) If  $f$  is a strictly convex function, then there exists a function  $\phi_f$  with  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \phi_f(t) = 0$  such that

$$\text{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq \phi_f(D_f(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)).$$

- (iii) (Monotonicity of  $R_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$  and  $D_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$  in  $\alpha$ )  $R_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$  and  $D_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$  are non-decreasing with respect to  $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ , see (Van Erven and Harremoës 2014, Theorem 3, 6), (Sason and Verdú 2016, Theorem 36) and (Liese and Vajda 1987). Moreover, we have

$$\text{KL}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2) = \lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} R_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2),$$

and we can also write  $\text{KL}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$  as  $R_1(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2)$  to extend to the case of  $\alpha = 1$ . We also have

$$\text{KL}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2) = \lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} D_\alpha(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2),$$

where the limits in above two equations can be also taken from upside if  $D_\alpha(\nu_1\|\nu_2) < \infty$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ . With the monotonicity of Rényi divergence, we can also take the limit  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  to define

$$R_\infty(\nu_1\|\nu_2) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} R_\alpha(\nu_1\|\nu_2) = \ln \left( \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{d\nu_1}{d\nu_2} \right).$$

(iv) (Pinsker's inequality, Van Erven and Harremoës 2014, Theorem 31) For  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , we have

$$2\alpha \operatorname{TV}^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq R_\alpha(\nu_1\|\nu_2).$$

### 2.3 $L^p$ -cutoff

The  $f$ -divergence family is a rich class of information divergences with elegant mathematical properties, and it naturally suggests that there are many potential choices for  $g_n(t)$  to study cutoff phenomenon. One popular choice in the literature centers around the  $L^p$ -cutoff, which utilize the following divergence

$$d_p(x, t) := \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{d\delta_x P_t}{d\pi} - 1 \right|^p d\pi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|h(t, x, \cdot) - 1\|_p, \quad p \geq 1, \quad (10)$$

where  $h(t, x, y)$  is the probability density function of  $\delta_x P_t$  with respect to  $\pi$ . Taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we define

$$\bar{d}_p(t) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_p(x, t), \quad \tilde{d}_p(t) := \pi\text{-ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_p(x, t),$$

and take  $g_n(t) = \bar{d}_{p,n}(t)$  or  $g_n(t) = \tilde{d}_{p,n}(t)$ , where the  $n$  in subscripts refer to the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process. In particular when we take  $p = 1$ , it recovers the total variation distance up to a constant. For the adjoint operator  $P_t^*$  of  $P_t$ , we write

$$d_p^*(x, t) := \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{d\delta_x P_t^*}{d\pi} - 1 \right|^p d\pi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

and similarly

$$\bar{d}_p^*(t) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_p^*(x, t), \quad \tilde{d}_p^*(t) := \pi\text{-ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_p^*(x, t).$$

For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the  $L^p$ -mixing times are defined as

$$\bar{t}_p(\varepsilon) := \inf \{ t \in T : \bar{d}_p(t) \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad \tilde{t}_p(\varepsilon) := \inf \{ t \in T : \tilde{d}_p(t) \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad (11)$$

$$\bar{t}_p^*(\varepsilon) := \inf \{ t \in T : \bar{d}_p^*(t) \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad \tilde{t}_p^*(\varepsilon) := \inf \{ t \in T : \tilde{d}_p^*(t) \leq \varepsilon \}. \quad (12)$$

One of the reasons for the popularity of  $L^p$ -cutoff in the literature is that many useful tools can be applied regarding the space  $L^p(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ . We summarize some results from (Chen

and Saloff-Coste 2008, Section 3.2, 3.3, 5.2, 5.3), (Dunford and Schwartz 1988), (Stein and Shakarchi 2011) and (Bernard 2013) into Proposition 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, which may be used in the rest of the paper. Here in the subscripts of norms, we use the shorthand  $L^p$  to denote  $L^p(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ .

**Proposition 2.4** (Some properties of  $L^p(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$  and  $d_p(x, t)$ , Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Dunford and Schwartz 1988). *Given a Markov process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  with semigroup  $P_t$ , stationary distribution  $\pi$  and  $h(t, x, \cdot)$  defined before, for  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , let  $q$  be the conjugate of  $p$ , i.e.  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ , then the following statements hold.*

(i) *Given a function  $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ , its  $L^p$ -norm satisfies*

$$\|f\|_p = \sup \{ \langle f, g \rangle_\pi : g \in L^q(\mathcal{X}, \pi), \|g\|_q \leq 1 \},$$

*applied on  $h(t, x, \cdot)$ , we have*

$$d_p(x, t) = \sup \{ (\delta_x P_t - \Pi)(g) : g \in L^q(\mathcal{X}, \pi), \|g\|_q \leq 1 \}.$$

(ii) *The functions  $t \mapsto \bar{d}_p(t)$  and  $t \mapsto \tilde{d}_p(t)$  are non-increasing and sub-multiplicative.*

(iii)  *$\bar{d}_p(t)$  and  $\tilde{d}_p(t)$  can be interpreted as operator norms, i.e.*

$$\bar{d}_p(t) = \|P_t - \Pi\|_{L^q \rightarrow B}, \quad \tilde{d}_p(t) = \|P_t - \Pi\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^\infty},$$

*where  $B(\mathcal{X}) = \{f : f \text{ is bounded on } \mathcal{X}\}$ , which is equipped with sup-norm. Similarly, we have*

$$\tilde{d}_p^*(t) = \|P_t^*\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^\infty} = \|P_t\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^p}.$$

**Proposition 2.5** (Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem, Stein and Shakarchi 2011, Bernard 2013). *Consider a linear operator  $\mathcal{A} : L^{p_0}(\mathcal{X}, \mu) \cup L^{p_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mu) \rightarrow L^{q_0}(\mathcal{X}, \nu) \cup L^{q_1}(\mathcal{X}, \nu)$ , where  $p_0, p_1, q_0, q_1 \in [1, \infty]$ , and  $\nu$  is semifinite. If there exists  $M_0, M_1 > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}f\|_{q_0} &\leq M_0 \|f\|_{p_0}, & \forall f \in L^{p_0}(\mathcal{X}, \mu), \\ \|\mathcal{A}f\|_{q_1} &\leq M_1 \|f\|_{p_1}, & \forall f \in L^{p_1}(\mathcal{X}, \mu), \end{aligned}$$

*then for any  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-t}{p_0} + \frac{t}{p_1}$ ,  $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1-t}{q_0} + \frac{t}{q_1}$ , we have*

$$\|\mathcal{A}f\|_q \leq M_0^{1-t} M_1^t \|f\|_p, \quad \forall f \in L^p(\mathcal{X}, \mu).$$

As an application of Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem, the next result from (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 5.1) shows that  $L^p$ -mixing times of Markov process are equivalent for different choices of  $p$  in a broad sense.

**Proposition 2.6** (Relationships between  $L^p$ -mixing times, Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 5.1). *Consider a Markov process with semigroup  $P_t$  and adjoint operator  $P_t^*$ . Recalling the  $L^p$ -mixing times defined in (11) and (12), we have the following relationships:*

(i) For any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the mappings  $p \mapsto \bar{t}_p(\varepsilon)$  and  $p \mapsto \tilde{t}_p(\varepsilon)$  are non-decreasing on  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .

(ii) For  $1 \leq p, r, s \leq \infty$  with  $1 + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s}$  and any  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3 > 0$ , we have

$$\bar{t}_p(\varepsilon_1^{r/p} \varepsilon_2^{1-r/p} \varepsilon_3) \leq \max \{ \mathbf{1}_{[1, \infty)}(p) \tilde{t}_r(\varepsilon_1), \mathbf{1}_{(1, \infty]}(p) \tilde{t}_r^*(\varepsilon_2) \} + \bar{t}_s(\varepsilon_3).$$

(iii) For  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  with  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\bar{t}_\infty(\varepsilon^2) \leq \bar{t}_p(\varepsilon) + \tilde{t}_{p'}^*(\varepsilon).$$

(iv) For  $1 < p < q \leq \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\bar{t}_q(\varepsilon^{m_{p,q}}) \leq m_{p,q} \max \{ \bar{t}_p(\varepsilon), \tilde{t}_p^*(\varepsilon) \},$$

$$\text{where } m_{p,q} = \left\lceil \frac{p(q-1)}{q(p-1)} \right\rceil.$$

(v) If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , then  $\bar{d}_\infty(t) = \bar{d}_2^2\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)$ . If  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\bar{d}_\infty(t) \leq \bar{d}_2^2\left(\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil\right)$ .

The next result offers a characterization of  $L^p$ -cutoff for **reversible** Markov processes, which states that in such divergences, cutoff phenomenon occurs if and only if the associated product condition holds, that is, spectral gap multiplied by the  $L^p$ -mixing time tends to infinity.

**Proposition 2.7** (Characterization of  $L^p$ -cutoff, Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Theorem 5.3, 5.4). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$ , second largest singular value  $0 < \kappa_n \leq 1$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $g_n(t) := \bar{d}_{p,n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ , if  $T = [0, \infty)$ , then the following statements are equivalent:*

(A1) *There exists some  $p \in (1, \infty]$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon)$  tends to infinity.*

(A2) *For any  $p \in (1, \infty]$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon)$  tends to infinity.*

(A3) *There exists some  $p \in (1, \infty]$  such that precutoff occurs.*

(A4) *For any  $p \in (1, \infty]$ , cutoff occurs.*

(A5) *For any  $p \in (1, \infty]$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.*

Here the  $n$  in subscripts refer to the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process.

Furthermore, if  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume for some  $p \in (1, \infty]$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ , and we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, -\ln \kappa_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the items above are also equivalent. If we further assume  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  and that the Markov chains are lazy, i.e.

$$p_n(x, x) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad (13)$$

where  $p_n(x, \cdot)$  be the one-step transition probability of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  chain. Then, we can also take  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$ .

### 3 Reversible cases

In this section, under a reversible setting, we extend Proposition 2.7 from  $L^p$ -mixing times to other mixing times induced by general  $f$ -divergences satisfying some mild conditions. Moreover, we uncover new relationships between cutoff under different divergences by relating their cutoff time and window, and develop a classification scheme among these divergences based on equivalence in characterization of cutoff phenomenon.

#### 3.1 $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ family and Rényi divergence with $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$

We begin this subsection by introducing a family of convex functions that we call the  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family, which generates a few divergences, for instance the  $\alpha$ -divergence with  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ . The objective of this subsection is to prove that cutoff phenomenon are equivalent among members of the  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family and to give a product condition for cutoff to occur. We then extend these results to Rényi divergence with  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ .

**Definition 3.1** ( $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family). *Let  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ , we define*

$$\mathcal{F}_{p,q} := \left\{ \text{convex } f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(1) = 0 : \exists m, M > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall x \in [0, \infty), \right. \\ \left. m(|x-1|^p + |x-1|^q) \leq f(x) \leq M(|x-1|^p + |x-1|^q) \right\}.$$

**Example 3.1.** *For  $\alpha$ -divergence with  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ , the generator  $f_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^\alpha - \alpha(t-1) - 1}{\alpha - 1}$  satisfies*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \frac{f_\alpha(t)}{|t-1|^2 + |t-1|^\alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_\alpha(t)}{|t-1|^2 + |t-1|^\alpha} = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1}, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_\alpha(t)}{|t-1|^2 + |t-1|^\alpha} = \frac{1}{2},$$

which implies  $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_{2,\alpha}$ . Another example is that if  $f$  is strongly convex with  $f(1) = f'(1) = 0$  and  $f''(t)$  is bounded on  $[0, \infty)$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ . However, for  $1 < \alpha < 2$ , the  $\alpha$ -divergence may **not** belong to any  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family.

Analogous to the notations in Section 2.3, for a Markov process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  on state space  $\mathcal{X}$  with semigroup  $P_t$  and stationary distribution  $\pi$ , we define

$$d_f(x, t) := D_f(\delta_x P_t \| \pi), \quad (14)$$

$$\bar{d}_f(t) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_f(x, t), \quad \tilde{d}_f(t) := \pi\text{-esssup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_f(x, t), \quad (15)$$

and the  $f$ -divergence mixing times

$$\bar{t}_f(\varepsilon) := \inf \{t \in T : \bar{d}_f(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad \tilde{t}_f(\varepsilon) := \inf \{t \in T : \tilde{d}_f(t) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (16)$$

In the following result, for  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ , we give several equivalent criteria for the occurrence of  $f$ -divergence cutoff. Moreover, we will use  $n$  in the subscripts to denote the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process.

**Theorem 3.1** (Characterization of  $f$ -divergence cutoff for  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ ,  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ ). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$ , second largest singular value  $0 < \kappa_n \leq 1$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $g_n(t) := \bar{d}_{f,n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (B1) *There exists some  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ , some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon)$  tends to infinity.*
- (B2) *For any  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ , any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon)$  tends to infinity.*
- (B3) *For any  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$  and any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ , precutoff occurs.*
- (B4) *For any  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$  and any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ , cutoff occurs.*
- (B5) *For any  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ , any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.*

Moreover, items (B1) to (B5) are all equivalent to items (A1) to (A5).

For  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume for some  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ , some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, -\ln \kappa_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold. Besides, if  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  and the chains are lazy, we can also take  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$ .

*Proof.* We first consider the case of continuous-time. The proof sketch is that we will first prove items (B2) to (B5) are equivalent, then prove (B2) to (B5) and (A1) to (A5) are equivalent, and finally (B1) and (B2) to (B5) are equivalent.

(B2) $\Rightarrow$ (B5): For any given  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ , by definition we have for some  $m, M > 0$  depending on  $f$  such that

$$m(|x-1|^p + |x-1|^q) \leq f(x) \leq M(|x-1|^p + |x-1|^q),$$

which yields

$$m \left( d_{p,n}^p(x, t) + d_{q,n}^q(x, t) \right) \leq d_{f,n}(x, t) \leq M \left( d_{p,n}^p(x, t) + d_{q,n}^q(x, t) \right). \quad (17)$$

Following the proof in (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Theorem 3.3), we denote  $\mu_{t,n}^x = \delta_{x,n} P_{t,n}$  and let  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ ,  $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$ . For  $t = u + v$  and any  $g \in L^{p'}(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$ , we have

$$\left( \mu_{t,n}^x - \pi_n \right) (g) = \left( \mu_{u,n}^x - \pi_n \right) (P_{v,n} - \Pi_n) (g), \quad (18)$$

then by Hölder's inequality and Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem as in Proposition 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left( \mu_{t,n}^x - \pi_n \right) (g) \right| &\leq d_{p,n}(x, u) \|(P_{v,n} - \Pi_n)(g)\|_{p'} \\ &\leq d_{p,n}(x, u) 2^{|1-2/p|} e^{-v\lambda_n(1-|1-2/p|)} \|g\|_{p'}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the second inequality comes from  $\|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^1} \leq 2$ ,  $\|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq 2$  and (5) in Proposition 2.1. Taking supremum over  $g \in L^{p'}(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$ ,  $\|g\|_{p'} = 1$  and  $g \in L^{q'}(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$ ,  $\|g\|_{q'} = 1$  respectively, according to Proposition 2.4 item (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{p,n}^p(x, u + v) &\leq d_{p,n}^p(x, u) 2^{|p-2|} e^{-v\lambda_n(p-|p-2|)}, \\ d_{q,n}^q(x, u + v) &\leq d_{q,n}^q(x, u) 2^{|q-2|} e^{-v\lambda_n(q-|q-2|)}, \end{aligned}$$

Plugging into (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{f,n}(x, u + v) &\leq MC_{p,q} \left( d_{p,n}^p(x, u) + d_{q,n}^q(x, u) \right) e^{-v\lambda_n a_{p,q}} \\ &\leq \frac{MC_{p,q}}{m} \cdot d_{f,n}(x, u) \cdot e^{-v\lambda_n a_{p,q}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{p,q} := \max \{2^{|p-2|}, 2^{|q-2|}\} > 0$ ,  $a_{p,q} := \min \{p - |p - 2|, q - |q - 2|\} > 0$ . Taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$\bar{d}_{f,n}(u + v) \leq \frac{MC_{p,q}}{m} \cdot d_{f,n}(u) \cdot e^{-v\lambda_n a_{p,q}}. \quad (20)$$

Now taking  $u > \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon)$ ,  $v = \lambda_n^{-1}c$  with  $c > 0$  in (20), by monotonicity of  $\bar{d}_{f,n}(t)$  in  $t$  as shown in Proposition 2.4 item (ii), we have

$$\bar{G}(c) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t > \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) + c\lambda_n^{-1}} \bar{d}_{f,n}(t) \leq \frac{MC_{p,q}}{m} \cdot \varepsilon e^{-ca_{p,q}},$$

and similarly taking  $0 < u < \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) + \lambda_n^{-1}c$ ,  $v = -\lambda_n^{-1}c$  with  $c < 0$ , we have

$$\underline{G}(c) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{t < \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) + c\lambda_n^{-1}} \bar{d}_{f,n}(t) \geq \frac{m}{MC_{p,q}} \cdot \varepsilon e^{-ca_{p,q}}.$$

The desired result follows by taking  $c \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $c \rightarrow -\infty$  respectively.

(B5) $\Rightarrow$ (B4) $\Rightarrow$ (B3): By definition.

(B3) $\Rightarrow$ (B2): We follow the proof in (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Theorem 4.2). According to (17) and Proposition 2.4 item (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{d}_{f,n}(t) &\geq m\bar{d}_{q,n}^q(t) = m\|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow B} \\ &\geq m\|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}},\end{aligned}$$

where  $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$ . By Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}e^{-\lambda_n t} &= \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}}^{q'/2} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty}^{1-q'/2} \\ &\leq 2^{1-q'/2} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}}^{q'/2}, \quad q' \in (1, 2],\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}e^{-\lambda_n t} &= \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^1}^{1-\frac{q'}{2(q'-1)}} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}}^{\frac{q'}{2(q'-1)}} \\ &\leq 2^{1-\frac{q'}{2(q'-1)}} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}}^{\frac{q'}{2(q'-1)}}, \quad q' \in (2, \infty),\end{aligned}$$

hence we have

$$\|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}} \geq 2^{1-2/q'} e^{-2\lambda_n t/q'} \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\lambda_n t}, \quad q' \in (1, 2], \quad (21)$$

$$\|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{q'}} \geq 2^{-(q'-2)/q'} e^{-2\lambda_n t(q'-1)/q'} \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\lambda_n t}, \quad q' \in (2, \infty), \quad (22)$$

which implies

$$\bar{d}_{f,n}(t) \geq \frac{m}{2} e^{-2\lambda_n t}. \quad (23)$$

Next, we suppose there is a precutoff sequence  $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , then there exist  $0 < a < b$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$2\delta = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{f,n}(as_n) > 0, \quad (24)$$

$$0 = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{f,n}(bs_n) \geq \frac{m}{2} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-2b\lambda_n s_n}, \quad (25)$$

here (24) implies  $s_n = \mathcal{O}(\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta))$ , otherwise for some small  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\bar{d}_{f,n}(as_n) = \bar{d}_{f,n} \left( \frac{as_n}{(1+\eta)\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta)} (1+\eta)\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) \right) \leq \delta, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combined with (25) which indicates  $\lambda_n s_n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar to the proof of (B2) $\Rightarrow$ (B5) where only some fixed  $p, q, f$  and  $\varepsilon$  are studied, it is easy to verify that  $\{\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a cutoff sequence. Further by Proposition 2.2 items (ii) and (iii),  $\{\bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a cutoff sequence with  $\bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) \sim \bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta)$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , hence  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .



(B2) to (B5)  $\iff$  (A1) to (A5): It suffices to prove (B2) $\implies$ (A1) and (A2) $\implies$ (B2). For any  $p > 1$ ,  $f$  is convex with  $f(1) = 0$ , and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we denote

$$\bar{T}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) := \{t \in T : \bar{d}_{p,n}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad \bar{T}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) := \{t \in T : \bar{d}_{f,n}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Next, for any given  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ , by (17), if  $t \in \bar{T}_{q,n}(\varepsilon)$ , then

$$\bar{d}_{f,n}(t) \leq M(\varepsilon^p + \varepsilon^q),$$

where we have used monotonicity of  $L^p$  distance in  $p$ . Similarly if  $t \in \bar{T}_{f,n}(\varepsilon)$ , we have

$$\bar{d}_{q,n}(t) \leq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

and these two inequalities above imply

$$\bar{T}_{q,n}(\varepsilon) \subset \bar{T}_{f,n}(M(\varepsilon^p + \varepsilon^q)), \quad \bar{T}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) \subset \bar{T}_{q,n}\left(\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\right),$$

taking infimum we obtain

$$\bar{t}_{q,n}(\varepsilon) \geq \bar{t}_{f,n}(M(\varepsilon^p + \varepsilon^q)), \quad \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) \geq \bar{t}_{q,n}\left(\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\right). \quad (26)$$

Now if (B2) holds for some  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$  and  $\varepsilon' = M(\varepsilon^p + \varepsilon^q)$  with some  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon') \rightarrow \infty$ , by the first inequality in (26), we have  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{q,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ , which is (A1). Moreover, if (A2) holds, then for any given  $1 < q < \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon'' = (\varepsilon/m)^{\frac{1}{q}}$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{q,n}(\varepsilon'') \rightarrow \infty$ , by the second inequality in (26) we have  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ , which is (B2).

(B1)  $\iff$  (B2) to (B5): We only need to prove (B1) $\implies$ (A1), then by (A1) $\implies$ (B2) to (B5) and (B2) to (B5) $\implies$ (B1) we can get the result. Suppose there exist some  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ , some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar to the proof of (B2) $\implies$ (B5), there is a  $\{\bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  cutoff. According to Proposition 2.2 item (ii) and (iii), for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\{\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a cutoff sequence. Again similar to the proof of (B3) $\implies$ (B2) where only some fixed  $p, q, f$  are studied, we can obtain that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $\delta > 0$ . Then by the first inequality in (26), for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  which satisfies  $\delta = M(\delta_0^p + \delta_0^q)$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{q,n}(\delta_0) \rightarrow \infty$ , and this yields (A1).

As to the case of  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , the proof is similar.  $\square$

As shown in Example 3.1,  $\alpha$ -divergence belongs to the  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family for  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ , and we note that Rényi divergence is a monotonic function of  $\alpha$ -divergence, that is,

$$R_{\alpha}(\delta_x P_t || \pi) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln(1 + (\alpha - 1)D_{\alpha}(\delta_x P_t || \pi)).$$

In view of the above, in the following result we shall give equivalent conditions for cutoff phenomenon under Rényi divergence for  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ . Analogous to the notations introduced

earlier, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} d_{f_\alpha}(x, t) &:= D_\alpha(\delta_x P_t \| \pi), & d_{R_\alpha}(x, t) &:= R_\alpha(\delta_x P_t \| \pi), \\ \bar{d}_{f_\alpha}(t) &:= \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{f_\alpha}(x, t), & \bar{d}_{R_\alpha}(t) &:= \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{R_\alpha}(x, t), \\ \tilde{d}_{f_\alpha}(t) &:= \pi\text{-esssup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{f_\alpha}(x, t), & \tilde{d}_{R_\alpha}(t) &:= \pi\text{-esssup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{R_\alpha}(x, t), \end{aligned}$$

and the mixing times with respect to Rényi divergence for  $\varepsilon > 0$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{t}_{f_\alpha}(\varepsilon) &:= \inf \{t \in T : \bar{d}_{f_\alpha}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, & \tilde{t}_{f_\alpha}(\varepsilon) &:= \inf \{t \in T : \tilde{d}_{f_\alpha}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, \\ \bar{t}_{R_\alpha}(\varepsilon) &:= \inf \{t \in T : \bar{d}_{R_\alpha}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, & \tilde{t}_{R_\alpha}(\varepsilon) &:= \inf \{t \in T : \tilde{d}_{R_\alpha}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

and we still use  $n$  in the subscripts to denote the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process.

**Theorem 3.2** (Characterization of Rényi divergence cutoff for  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$ ). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$ , second largest singular value  $0 < \kappa_n \leq 1$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $g_n(t) := \bar{d}_{R_\alpha, n}(t)$ , and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (C1) *There exists some  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .*
- (C2) *For any  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .*
- (C3) *For any  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , precutoff occurs.*
- (C4) *For any  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , cutoff occurs.*
- (C5) *For any  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.*

Moreover, items (C1) to (C5) are equivalent to items (B1) to (B5) and (A1) to (A5).

For  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume for some  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, -\ln \kappa_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold. Besides, if  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  and the chains are lazy, we can also take  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$ .

**Remark 3.1.** *Theorem 3.1 and 3.2 indicate that for any given sequence of Markov processes,  $L^p$  cutoff with  $p \in (1, \infty]$ ,  $\alpha$ -divergence cutoff with  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and Rényi divergence cutoff with  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  are all equivalent, and we call these three types of divergences as well as members of the  $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$  family with  $1 < p \leq q < \infty$  as **L<sup>2</sup>-type** divergence under cutoff phenomenon.*

*Proof.* We only consider the case of continuous-time, and the proof for  $T = \mathbb{N}$  is similar. The proof sketch is that we first prove (C2) to (C5) are equivalent, and then prove (C1)  $\Rightarrow$  (B1) and (B2)  $\Rightarrow$  (C2)  $\Rightarrow$  (C1).

(C2) $\Rightarrow$ (C5): For any given  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_{2,\alpha}$  implies we can substitute  $p = 2$  and  $q = \alpha$  into (17), and therefore by (20) we have

$$\bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(u+v) \leq \frac{M2^{\alpha-2}}{m} \cdot d_{f_\alpha,n}(u) \cdot e^{-2v\lambda_n},$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(u+v)}{\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(u)} &= \frac{\ln(1 + (\alpha-1)\bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(u+v))}{\ln(1 + (\alpha-1)\bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(u))} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(u+v)}{\bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(u)} \cdot (1 + (\alpha-1)\bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(u)) \\ &\leq \frac{M2^{\alpha-2}}{m} \cdot e^{-2v\lambda_n} \cdot \exp((\alpha-1)\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(u)). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\varphi(t) = te^{(\alpha-1)t}$  be an increasing function with respect to  $t \in (0, \infty)$ , we have

$$\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(u+v) \leq \frac{M2^{\alpha-2}}{m} \cdot e^{-2v\lambda_n} \cdot \varphi(\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(u)),$$

using the same argument as the proof in (B2) $\Rightarrow$ (B5), we take  $u > \bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon)$ ,  $v = \lambda_n^{-1}c$  and  $0 < u < \bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon) - \lambda_n^{-1}c$ ,  $v = -\lambda_n^{-1}c$  with  $c > 0$ , as  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is strictly increasing, we get the result.

(C5) $\Rightarrow$ (C4) $\Rightarrow$ (C3): By definition.

(C3) $\Rightarrow$ (C2): By (23), we have

$$\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(t) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{m(\alpha-1)}{2} e^{-2\lambda_n t} \right),$$

which yields the result via a similar argument in the proof of (B3) $\Rightarrow$ (B2).

(C1) $\Rightarrow$ (B1): Suppose for some  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar to the proof of (B2) to (B5)  $\iff$  (A1) to (A5), for any  $\varepsilon' > 0$ , it is easy to verify that

$$\bar{t}_{f_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon') = \bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln(1 + (\alpha-1)\varepsilon') \right), \quad (27)$$

then if take some  $\varepsilon'$  such that  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln(1 + (\alpha-1)\varepsilon')$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon') \rightarrow \infty$ .

(B2) $\Rightarrow$ (C2) $\Rightarrow$ (C1): Take  $p = 2$ ,  $q = \alpha$  and  $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_{2,\alpha}$ , for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have  $\lambda_n \bar{d}_{f_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ , then by (27) we get the result.  $\square$

### 3.2 $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence with $1 < \alpha \leq 2$

While the previous subsection 3.1 investigates  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence with  $2 < \alpha < \infty$ , in this subsection we shall study equivalent conditions for cutoff phenomenon under

$\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence with  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ . The technique in this part utilizes an argument about non-linear log-Sobolev/Poincaré inequalities (LSI/PI), which can be found in (Chafaï 2004; Mossel et al. 2013; Polyanskiy and Samorodnitsky 2019; Raginsky 2016; Varopoulos 1985).

**Definition 3.2** (Non-linear functional constants). *Given an infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{A}$  and its associated Dirichlet form  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}$  with  $\pi$  as the stationary distribution, we define*

$$(Non-linear LSI) \quad \rho(p) := \frac{p^2}{4(p-1)} \inf_{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f^p] > 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, f^{p-1})}{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f^p]}, \quad (28)$$

$$(Non-linear PI) \quad \lambda(p) := \frac{p^2}{4(p-1)} \inf_{\text{Var}_{\pi}[f^{\frac{p}{2}}] > 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, f^{p-1})}{\text{Var}_{\pi}[f^{\frac{p}{2}}]}, \quad (29)$$

where  $p > 0$ ,  $p \neq 1$ ,  $f > 0$ ,  $\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f] := \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ f \ln \frac{f}{\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f]} \right]$  and  $\text{Var}_{\pi}[f] := \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [(f - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f])^2]$ . We can also extend to case of  $p = 1$  by taking limits, i.e.

$$\rho(1) := \inf_{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f] > 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, \ln f)}{4\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f]}, \quad \lambda(1) := \inf_{\text{Var}_{\pi}[f^{\frac{1}{2}}] > 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, \ln f)}{4\text{Var}_{\pi}[f^{\frac{1}{2}}]}.$$

In particular, it can be seen that  $\rho(2)$  is the classical log-Sobolev constant,  $\lambda(2)$  is the spectral gap or classical Poincaré constant and  $\rho_n(1)$  is the classical modified log-Sobolev constant as in (Bobkov and Tetali 2006).

**Lemma 3.1.** *The mappings  $p \mapsto \rho(p)$  and  $p \mapsto \lambda(p)$  are both non-increasing within  $p \in (0, 2]$ , and non-decreasing within  $p \in [2, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* According to (Mossel et al. 2013, Theorem 1.7),  $p \mapsto \rho(p)$  is non-increasing within  $p \in (0, 2]$ . For  $2 \leq p < q < \infty$ , it suffices to prove

$$\frac{p^2}{4(p-1)} \inf_{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f^p] > 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}(f, f^{p-1})}{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f^p]} \leq \frac{q^2}{4(q-1)} \inf_{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f^q] > 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(f^{\frac{p}{q}}, f^{\frac{q-1}{q}p}\right)}{\text{Ent}_{\pi}[f^p]} \quad (30)$$

by substituting  $f^{\frac{q}{p}}$  to  $f$  in the right hand side. For  $g = f^{\frac{q}{p}}$ , according to (Mossel et al. 2013, Theorem 2.1), we have

$$\frac{q^2}{q-1} \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(g^{\frac{1}{q}}, g^{\frac{q-1}{q}}\right) \geq \frac{p^2}{p-1} \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(g^{\frac{1}{p}}, g^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\right),$$

plugging into (30) we have  $\rho(p) \leq \rho(q)$ . The proof for the case of  $\lambda(p)$  is similar.  $\square$

The non-linear functional constants introduced above will be used in the proof of our next result, which is presented in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.3** (Characterization of  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence cutoff for  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ ). Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , generator  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$ , second largest singular value  $0 < \kappa_n \leq 1$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , let  $g_n(t) := \bar{d}_{f_\alpha, n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ , then the following statements are equivalent:

- (D1) There exists some  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (D2) For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (D3) For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , precutoff occurs.
- (D4) For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , cutoff occurs.
- (D5) For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.

Meanwhile, if we take  $g_n(t) := \bar{d}_{R_\alpha, n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ , then the following statements are equivalent:

- (D1') There exists some  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (D2') For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (D3') For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , precutoff occurs.
- (D4') For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , cutoff occurs.
- (D5') For any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.

Moreover, items (D1) to (D5) are equivalent to items (D1') to (D5').

For  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume for some  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$  respectively. If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, -\ln \kappa_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items and assume  $\kappa_n \rightarrow 1$ , then the statements above also hold. Besides, if  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  and the chains are lazy, we can also take  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$ .

**Remark 3.2.** Theorem 3.3 and 3.2 have a common ground of the  $R_2$  divergence for  $\alpha = 2$ , which indicates that items (D1) to (D5) and items (D1') to (D5') are all equivalent to items (A1) to (A5), (B1) to (B5) and (C1) to (C5), and hence we can still call  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence with  $1 < \alpha < 2$  as **L<sup>2</sup>-type** divergences under cutoff phenomenon, although some mild assumptions like (13) may be added in discrete-time case.

**Remark 3.3.** In Proposition 2.7, Theorem 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, if we replace the sup-norm with  $\pi$ -esssup-norm, i.e.  $g_n(t) = \tilde{d}_{p, n}(t), \tilde{d}_{f, n}(t), \tilde{d}_{R_\alpha, n}(t), \tilde{d}_{f_\alpha, n}(t)$  respectively, then the results still hold.

*Proof.* We first consider  $T = [0, \infty)$ . We first show that (D2) $\Rightarrow$ (D5) $\Rightarrow$ (D4) $\Rightarrow$ (D3) $\Rightarrow$ (D2), then the case for (D2') $\Rightarrow$ (D5') $\Rightarrow$ (D4') $\Rightarrow$ (D3') $\Rightarrow$ (D2') is similar using the idea in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Finally we prove (D1')  $\iff$  (D2') to (D5'), and (D1)  $\iff$  (D1') to (D5')  $\iff$  (D1) to (D5) to complete the proof.

(D2) $\Rightarrow$ (D5): Given  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we use  $h_{t,n}^x(y) = h_n(t, x, y)$  to represent the probability density function of  $\delta_x P_{t,n}$  with respect to  $\pi_n$  as shown in (10), and hence

$$d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}_n} h_n^\alpha(t, x, y) \pi_n(dy) - 1 \right) = \frac{\|h_n(t, x, \cdot)\|_\alpha^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1}.$$

Taking differentiation with respect to  $t$  and use (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \int_{\mathcal{X}_n} h_n^{\alpha-1}(t, x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h_n(t, x, y) \pi_n(dy) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \int_{\mathcal{X}_n} (h_{t,n}^x(y))^{\alpha-1} \mathcal{A}_n^* h_{t,n}^x(y) \pi_n(dy) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \mathcal{E} \left( h_{t,n}^x, (h_{t,n}^x)^{\alpha-1} \right) \\ &= -\frac{4(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{4(\alpha - 1)} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_n} \left( h_{t,n}^x, (h_{t,n}^x)^{\alpha-1} \right)}{\|h_{t,n}^x\|_\alpha^\alpha - 1} \cdot d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ (h_{t,n}^x)^{\alpha/2} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_\pi [h_{t,n}^x]^{\alpha/2} = 1$  for  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  by Hölder's inequality, recalling the non-linear Poincaré constant defined in (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) &\leq -\frac{4(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\alpha^2}{4(\alpha - 1)} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_n} \left( h_{t,n}^x, (h_{t,n}^x)^{\alpha-1} \right)}{\text{Var}_{\pi_n} \left[ (h_{t,n}^x)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right]} \cdot d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) \\ &\leq -\frac{4(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha} \cdot \lambda_n(\alpha) \cdot d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_n(\alpha)$  denotes the non-linear Poincaré constant of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process. According to Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\lambda_n(\alpha) \geq \lambda_n(2) = \lambda_n, \quad 1 < \alpha \leq 2,$$

therefore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) \leq -\frac{4(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha} \cdot \lambda_n \cdot d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t),$$

integrating from  $t = u$  to  $t = u + v$  for any  $u, v \geq 0$  yields

$$d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, u + v) \leq d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, u) \exp \left( -\frac{4(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha} \cdot \lambda_n v \right). \quad (31)$$

Taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$  and use the same argument in the proof of (B2) $\Rightarrow$ (B5) we get the result.

(D5) $\Rightarrow$ (D4) $\Rightarrow$ (D3): By definition.

(D3) $\Rightarrow$ (D2): Recalling Proposition 2.3 items (iii) and (iv), for any given  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ , we have

$$d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) \geq \text{KL}(\delta_x P_{t,n} \| \pi_n) \geq 2\text{TV}^2(\delta_x P_{t,n}, \pi_n) = \frac{1}{2} d_{1,n}^2(x, t).$$

Then by Proposition 2.4, we have

$$\bar{d}_{f_{\alpha,n}}(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} \bar{d}_{1,n}^2(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow B}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty}^2.$$

Recalling that  $\|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = e^{-\lambda n t}$  as stated in Proposition 2.1, using Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda n t} = \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} &\leq \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\bar{t}_{f_{\alpha,n}}(t) \geq \frac{1}{8} e^{-4\lambda n t},$$

then by similar argument in the proof of (B3) $\Rightarrow$ (B2) we get the result.

Equivalence within items (D2') to (D5'): Similar to the proof in Theorem 3.2.

(D1') $\Rightarrow$ (D2'): We follow the proof of (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 5.1). Suppose for some  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_{\alpha,n}}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ . We first recall that Rényi divergence can be written as the following form:

$$d_{R_{\alpha,n}}(x, t) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \|h_{t,n}^x\|_\alpha, \quad (32)$$

and that by Proposition 2.4,

$$\|h_{t,n}^x\|_\alpha = \sup \{ \mu_{t,n}^x(g) : \|g\|_{\alpha'} \leq 1 \},$$

where we denote  $\mu_{t,n}^x := \delta_x P_{t,n}$ , and  $\alpha'$  as the conjugate of  $\alpha$ , i.e.  $\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha'} = 1$ . Then, for  $t = u + v$  with  $u, v \geq 0$  and any  $g \in L^{\alpha'}(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$ , we have

$$\mu_{t,n}^x(g) = \mu_{u,n}^x P_{v,n}(g),$$

hence by Hölder's inequality, for any given  $1 < \beta < \alpha$ ,

$$|\mu_{t,n}^x(g)| \leq \|h_{u,n}^x\|_\beta \|P_{v,n}(g)\|_{\beta'} \leq \|h_{u,n}^x\|_\beta \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow L^{\beta'}},$$

where  $\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\beta'} = 1$ . Taking supremum over  $g \in L^{\alpha'}(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  yields

$$\|h_{t,n}^x\|_\alpha \leq \|h_{u,n}^x\|_\beta \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow L^{\beta'}}. \quad (33)$$

For some  $1 < \gamma < \alpha$  with  $\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma'} = 1$  which satisfies  $\frac{1}{\alpha'} = \frac{1}{\beta'} + \frac{1}{\gamma'}$  or equivalently  $1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\gamma}$ , by the Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow L^{\beta'}} &\leq \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\gamma}^{\gamma/\beta'} \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\gamma'} \rightarrow L^\infty}^{1-\gamma/\beta'} \\ &= \|P_{v,n}^*\|_{L^{\gamma'} \rightarrow L^\infty}^{\gamma/\beta'} \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\gamma'} \rightarrow L^\infty}^{1-\gamma/\beta'} \\ &= \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\gamma'} \rightarrow L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\gamma'} \rightarrow B}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that the processes are reversible. Therefore, we have

$$\|h_{t,n}^x\|_\alpha \leq \|h_{u,n}^x\|_\beta \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\gamma'} \rightarrow B}.$$

Plugging the above into (32), and observe that by Proposition 2.4,

$$\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \ln \|P_{t,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow B}, \quad (34)$$

we obtain

$$\bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(u+v) \leq \frac{\alpha'}{\beta'} \bar{d}_{R_\beta,n}(u) + \frac{\alpha'}{\gamma'} \bar{d}_{R_\gamma,n}(v),$$

which implies for any  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n} \left( \frac{\alpha'}{\beta'} \varepsilon_1 + \frac{\alpha'}{\gamma'} \varepsilon_2 \right) \leq \bar{t}_{R_\beta,n}(\varepsilon_1) + \bar{t}_{R_\gamma,n}(\varepsilon_2).$$

If we further take  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon) \leq \bar{t}_{R_\beta,n}(\varepsilon) + \bar{t}_{R_\gamma,n}(\varepsilon). \quad (35)$$

Note that the argument above does not have specific requirements for  $\alpha$  except for  $\alpha > 1$ , we can take

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_i} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta}\right) i + \frac{1}{\alpha}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

which satisfies  $1 + \frac{1}{\alpha_i} = \frac{1}{\alpha_{i+1}} + \frac{1}{\beta}$ ,  $\alpha_0 = \alpha$  and  $\alpha_i \leq \beta$  if and only if  $i + 1 \geq \frac{\beta'}{\alpha'}$ . Combining with (35), we get

$$\bar{t}_{R_{\alpha_i},n}(\varepsilon) \leq \bar{t}_{R_\beta,n}(\varepsilon) + \bar{t}_{R_{\alpha_{i+1}},n}(\varepsilon), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{\beta'}{\alpha'} \right\rceil - 1,$$

taking summation we have

$$\bar{t}_{R_\beta,n}(\varepsilon) \leq \bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon) \leq \left( \left\lceil \frac{\beta'}{\alpha'} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \bar{t}_{R_\beta,n}(\varepsilon), \quad (36)$$

where the left inequality comes from the monotonicity of Rényi divergence as shown in Proposition 2.3 item (iii). Recalling that by Proposition 2.2, (D1) implies for any  $\delta > 0$ ,



there is a  $(\bar{t}_{R_{\alpha,n}}(\delta), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff, which further yields for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_{\alpha,n}}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ , then by (36) we obtain that for any  $1 < \beta < \alpha$  and any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{R_{\beta,n}}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $\alpha \leq \beta \leq 2$ , the result also holds via monotonicity of Rényi divergence.

(D1)  $\iff$  (D1') to (D5')  $\iff$  (D2) to (D5): Use the identity (8).

Next, we consider  $T = \mathbb{N}$ . The discrete-time case for  $\alpha$ -divergence is not that trivial compared with  $L^p$ -cutoff, since the techniques in the continuous-time case involve taking derivative with respect to  $t$  which may not apply in discrete-time setting. We only need to give an adapted version of the proof in (D2) $\implies$ (D5), and the rest are similar to the continuous-time case. The idea for the proof is borrowed from (Miclo 1997, Proposition 6). In this case, the Markov semigroup satisfies  $P_{k,n} = P_{1,n}^k$ , and we denote the one-step transition probability of adjoint generator as  $p_n^*(x, \cdot)$ .

We observe that for any  $t, s \geq 0$  and any  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ ,

$$\frac{t^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} \geq \frac{s^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{\alpha s^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha - 1}(t - s) + (t^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - s^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})^2, \quad (37)$$

which can be easily verified via taking derivative with respect to  $\frac{t}{s} \geq 0$ . For any  $\mu_{0,n}$  on  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , let  $f = \frac{d\mu_{0,n}}{d\pi_n}$  be the initial density for simplicity of notation, and we have  $P_{1,n}^* f = \frac{d\mu_{0,n} P_{1,n}}{d\pi_n}$ . Plug  $t = f(z)$  and  $s = P_{1,n}^* f(y)$  into (37), and take expectation on both sides with respect to  $p_n^*(y, dz)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1,n}^* \left( \frac{f^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} \right) (y) &\geq \frac{(P_{1,n}^* f(y))^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} + \int_{z \in \mathcal{X}_n} \left( f(z)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - (P_{1,n}^* f(y))^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right)^2 p_n^*(y, dz) \\ &\geq \frac{(P_{1,n}^* f(y))^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} + \text{Var}_{p_n^*(y, \cdot)} [f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}] \\ &= \frac{(P_{1,n}^* f(y))^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} + P_{1,n}^* (f^\alpha) (y) - (P_{1,n}^* (f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) (y))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation on  $y$  with respect to  $\pi_n$ , we have

$$d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \| \pi_n) \geq d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} P_{1,n} \| \pi_n) + \langle f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, (I - P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*) f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rangle_{\pi_n}. \quad (38)$$

Similar to the proof in the continuous case, we have

$$\frac{\langle f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, (I - P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*) f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rangle_{\pi_n}}{d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \| \pi_n)} \geq (\alpha - 1) \frac{\langle f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, (I - P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*) f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rangle_{\pi_n}}{\text{Var}_{\pi_n} [f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}]} \geq (\alpha - 1) \lambda (P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^* - I), \quad (39)$$

where  $\lambda (P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^* - I)$  is the spectral gap of the generator  $P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^* - I$ . If the Markov chains are lazy and  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , denote  $q_n(x, \cdot)$  as the transition probability of  $P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi_n(dx) q_n(x, dy)}{dxdy} &\geq \frac{\pi_n(dx) p_n(x, x) p_n^*(x, dy)}{dxdy} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi_n(dx) p_n^*(x, dy)}{dxdy} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi_n(dy) p_n(y, dx)}{dxdy}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from the laziness (13). Recalling (4), we have

$$\langle f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, (I - P_{1,n}P_{1,n}^*) f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rangle_{\pi_n} \geq \frac{1}{2} \langle f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, (I - P_{1,n}) f^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rangle_{\pi_n}, \quad (40)$$

therefore

$$\lambda(P_{1,n}P_{1,n}^* - I) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda(P_{1,n} - I) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_n,$$

combined with (38) and (39) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n}P_{1,n} \|\pi_n) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} \lambda_n\right) d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \|\pi_n) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha - 1}{2} \lambda_n\right) d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \|\pi_n). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

On the other hand, if we use the condition of  $\kappa_n$ , recalling that  $P_{1,n} = P_{1,n}^*$ , we have

$$\lambda(P_{1,n}P_{1,n}^* - I) = 1 - \kappa_n^2,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n}P_{1,n} \|\pi_n) &\leq (1 - (\alpha - 1)(1 - \kappa_n^2)) d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \|\pi_n) \\ &\leq \exp(-(\alpha - 1)(1 - \kappa_n^2)) d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \|\pi_n) \\ &\leq \exp(2(\alpha - 1)\kappa_n^2 \ln \kappa_n) d_{f_{\alpha,n}}(\mu_{0,n} \|\pi_n), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where we have used  $1 - x \geq -x \ln x$  for  $x \geq 0$  in the last inequality. For (41), the desired result follows directly by using similar argument as in the continuous-time setting. For (42), since  $\kappa_n \rightarrow 1$ , we get the result.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** (36) indicates that mixing times of Rényi divergences, and hence  $\alpha$ -divergences, are equivalent for different  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ .

With the discussions before, we have a direct corollary of a common sufficient condition of cutoff phenomenon under all the  $L^2$ -type divergences in continuous-time finite state space. In discrete-time case, results similar to the following may not hold, and readers can check (Montenegro, Tetali, et al. 2006, Remark 4.14) for counterexamples.

**Corollary 3.1** (Common sufficient condition in terms of spectral gap and log-Sobolev constant, continuous-time, finite state space). *According to (Diaconis and Saloff-Coste 1996, Corollary 3.11), under the assumption of **continuous-time finite state space**, suppose the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Markov process has log-Sobolev constant  $\rho_n(2)$ , then*

$$\bar{t}_{2,n}(1/e) \geq \frac{1}{2\rho_n(2)},$$

which implies that the common sufficient condition for cutoff phenomenon for all the  $L^2$ -type divergences under this situation is

$$\lambda_n \rho_n(2)^{-1} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (43)$$

**Remark 3.5.** *The advantage of Corollary 3.1 lies in relaxing the requirement for the lower bound of mixing times, although extra knowledge of log-Sobolev constant is needed to check (43). There have been several numerical methods to approximately determine the log-Sobolev constant of a given Markov chain, for example the semidefinite programming with sum-of-squares method (Faust and Fawzi 2024).*

### 3.3 ( $\pi$ -weighted) KL divergence and total variation distance

In previous subsections, we have pointed out the equivalence of  $\alpha$ -divergence or Rényi divergence within  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$  under cutoff phenomenon. However, in the special case when  $\alpha = 1$  such that the divergence reduces to the KL divergence, the criterion for cutoff is more delicate. Generally the sufficient condition and necessary condition for cutoff may not be the same, and we will give an explicit explanation in the sequel, where the worst-case KL divergence and  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence or TV distance are considered.

Analogous to the notations introduced earlier, we write that

$$d_{\text{KL}}(x, t) := d_{f_1}(x, t) = \text{KL}(\delta_x P_t \| \pi),$$

$$\bar{d}_{\text{KL}}(t) = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{\text{KL}}(x, t), \quad \tilde{d}_{\text{KL}}(t) := \pi\text{-esssup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{\text{KL}}(x, t),$$

and the mixing times

$$\bar{t}_{\text{KL}}(\varepsilon) := \inf \{t \in T : \bar{d}_{\text{KL}}(t) \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad \tilde{t}_{\text{KL}}(\varepsilon) := \inf \left\{t \in T : \tilde{d}_{\text{KL}}(t) \leq \varepsilon\right\},$$

based on which we have the following result derived from non-linear log-Sobolev inequality as introduced in Definition 3.2.

**Theorem 3.4** (Characterization of KL divergence cutoff via modified LSI). *Recall the functional constants defined in Definition 3.2. Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , generator  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$ , modified log-Sobolev constant  $\rho_n(1) \geq 0$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , let  $g_n(t) := \bar{d}_{\text{KL},n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ , then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $\rho_n(1) \cdot \bar{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ , then there is a  $(\bar{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon), \rho_n^{-1}(1))$  cutoff.*
- (ii) *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if precutoff occurs, then  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*For  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume the Markov chains are lazy. Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , and for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold.*

*Proof.* We first consider the continuous-time case.

(i): For  $h_{t,n}^x = \frac{d\delta_x P_t}{d\pi}$ , recalling that

$$d_{\text{KL},n}(x, t) = \int_{\mathcal{X}_n} h_{t,n}^x(y) \ln h_{t,n}^x(y) \pi_n(dy) = \text{Ent}_{\pi_n} [h_{t,n}^x],$$

if we differentiate with respect to  $t$  and follow by using (1), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} d_{\text{KL},n}(x, t) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (h_{t,n}^x(y) \ln h_{t,n}^x(y)) \pi_n(dy) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}_n} (\mathcal{A}_n^* h_{t,n}^x(y) \ln h_{t,n}^x(y) + \mathcal{A}_n^* h_{t,n}^x(y)) \pi_n(dy) \\ &= -\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_n} (h_{t,n}^x, \ln h_{t,n}^x) \\ &= -4 \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_n} (h_{t,n}^x, \ln h_{t,n}^x)}{4 \text{Ent}_{\pi_n} [h_{t,n}^x]} \cdot d_{\text{KL},n}(x, t) \\ &\leq -4\rho_n(1) \cdot d_{\text{KL},n}(x, t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho_n(1)$  is defined in Definition 3.2. Taking integration from  $t = u$  to  $t = u + v$  with  $u, v \geq 0$  yields

$$d_{\text{KL},n}(x, u + v) \leq e^{-4\rho_n(1) \cdot v} d_{\text{KL},n}(x, u),$$

taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$  and use the same argument in the proof of (B2) $\Rightarrow$ (B5), we get the result.

(ii): Similar to the proof of (D3) $\Rightarrow$ (D2).

If  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , similar to (40), since  $f$  and  $\ln f$  have same monotonicity, we have

$$\rho(I - P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*, 1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \rho(I - P_{1,n}, 1) = \frac{1}{2} \rho_n(1),$$

where  $\rho(I - P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*, 1)$  is the modified log-Sobolev constant of the generator  $I - P_{1,n} P_{1,n}^*$ . Then the result is direct to obtain via (Miclo 1997, Proposition 6).  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** *There is a slight difference in the discrete-time case compared with results in Section 3.1 and 3.2: We do not have result in terms of second largest singular value, since in the proof of sufficient condition, we have used modified log-Sobolev constant instead of spectral gap.*

In Theorem 3.4, we have used log-Sobolev constant to characterize the cutoff phenomenon for KL divergence, which is inconsistent with the necessary condition yet. In finite Markov chains, the log-Sobolev constant  $\rho$  usually has a lower bound related to the parameters of whole state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , stationary distribution  $\pi$  and transition matrix, for instance  $\pi_{\min} := \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x)$ ,  $|\mathcal{X}|$ , diameter of the state space and so on. For example, in (Montenegro, Tetali, et al. 2006, Corollary 4.15) it is stated that

$$\rho \geq \frac{\lambda}{2 + \ln \frac{1 - \pi_{\min}}{\pi_{\min}}} \geq \frac{\lambda}{2 + \ln \frac{1}{\pi_{\min}}}. \quad (44)$$

We also refer readers to (Cryan et al. 2021) where extra conditions on  $\pi$  are proposed. In general state space Markov processes, similar lower bounds also exist using other quantities of the process, for example in (Wang 1997). These results can imply a lower bound of  $\rho$  in terms of spectral gap  $\lambda$ , which further suggests possible criteria for KL-cutoff. As a concrete example, (44) implies that a sufficient condition for KL divergence cutoff is

$$\frac{\lambda_n \bar{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon)}{2 + \ln \frac{1}{\pi_{\min,n}}} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (45)$$

Moreover, curvature is also a useful tool in bounding the divergences and functional constants, for example Bakry-Émery curvature (Bakry and Émery 2006), Ollivier-Ricci curvature (Ollivier 2009), and entropic-Ricci curvature (Erbar and Fathi 2018; Erbar and Maas 2012). Specifically in the problem of cutoff phenomenon, (Salez 2023) utilizes curvature to give a criterion for TV-cutoff.

In the remaining of this subsection, we shall limit ourselves to the setting of finite Markov chains. We will use the  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence between the transition matrix  $P$  and  $\Pi$  investigated in (Wang and Choi 2023; Wolfer and Watanabe 2021) and determine its affiliated criterion of cutoff phenomenon. Generally, the  $\pi$ -weighted  $f$ -divergence for two transition matrices  $M, L$  on a common finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$  is defined as follows:

**Definition 3.3** ( $\pi$ -weighted  $f$ -divergence, Wang and Choi 2023). *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function with  $f(1) = 0$ . Given a finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$  and any **positive** probability measure  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ , for any two transition matrices  $M, L$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  which may be irrelevant to  $\pi$ , the  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence from  $L$  to  $M$  is defined as*

$$\widehat{d}_f(M||L) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x) \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} L(x, y) f\left(\frac{M(x, y)}{L(x, y)}\right), \quad (46)$$

where we follow the convention that  $0f\left(\frac{0}{0}\right) := 0$  and  $0f\left(\frac{a}{0}\right) := af'(+\infty)$  with  $f'(+\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} xf\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)$  for  $a > 0$  in the definition above.

For a Markov chain with transition matrix  $P$  and stationary distribution  $\pi$ , we take  $M = P_t$  and  $L = \Pi = (\pi^T, \pi^T, \dots, \pi^T)^T$  in (46) to define the following  $\pi$ -weighted divergences and mixing times of its continuized chain with transition matrix  $(P_t(x, y))_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}}$  defined in (2).

- $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence and its mixing time:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}_{\text{KL}}(t) &:= \widehat{d}_{\text{KL}}(P_t||\Pi) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x) \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} P_t(x, y) \ln \frac{P_t(x, y)}{\pi(y)}, \\ \widehat{t}_{\text{KL}}(\varepsilon) &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \widehat{d}_{\text{KL}}(t) \leq \varepsilon \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

- $\pi$ -weighted  $\chi^2$ -divergence and its mixing time:

$$\widehat{d}_2^2(t) := \widehat{d}_2^2(P_t \| \Pi) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x) \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(y) \left( \frac{P_t(x, y)}{\pi(y)} - 1 \right)^2,$$

$$\widehat{t}_{\chi^2}(\varepsilon) := \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \widehat{d}_2^2(t) \leq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

- $\pi$ -weighted total variation distance and its mixing time:

$$\widehat{d}_{\text{TV}}(t) := \widehat{d}_{\text{TV}}(P_t, \Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x) \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} |P_t(x, y) - \pi(y)|,$$

$$\widehat{t}_{\text{TV}}(\varepsilon) := \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \widehat{d}_{\text{TV}}(t) \leq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

The motivation for introducing the  $\pi$ -weighted divergence  $\widehat{d}_{\text{KL}}(t)$  in this paper is to address the shortcomings of the result in Theorem 3.4: to provide a sufficient criterion for cutoff in terms of spectral gap instead of log-Sobolev constant, since the log-Sobolev constant is in general less tractable than the spectral gap. Moreover, we seek to reduce the dependence of the criterion on other parameters of the chain such as curvature, landscape of stationary distribution, etc., which requires us to impose additional conditions in the least restrictive manner. Compared to the worst-case KL-cutoff as in Theorem 3.4, an intuitive advantage of  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence is that the influence of any single initial point can be mitigated to a certain extent via taking weighted average, hence the dependence on the whole state space may be reduced.

In the following result, we present a criterion which is weaker than the product condition type conjecture that spectral gap times mixing time tends to infinity.

**Theorem 3.5** (Characterization of  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence cutoff via spectral gap, finite state space). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with **finite** state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$  and transition matrix  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , let  $g_n(t) := \widehat{d}_{\text{KL},n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ , then the following statements hold:*

- (i) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if

$$\frac{\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon)}{\ln |\mathcal{X}_n|} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (47)$$

then there is a  $(\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1} \ln |\mathcal{X}_n|)$  cutoff.

- (ii) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if there is a precutoff, then  $\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .

For discrete-time finite Markov chains, assume these chains are lazy. Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , and for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold.

*Proof.* (i): Recalling the monotonicity of  $\alpha$ -divergence as stated in Proposition 2.3 item (iii), for any initial distribution  $\mu_{0,n}$ , we have

$$\text{KL}(\mu_{0,n}P_{s,n}|\pi_n) \leq \chi^2(\mu_{0,n}P_{s,n}|\pi_n) \leq e^{-2\lambda_n s} \chi^2(\mu_{0,n}|\pi),$$

where the second inequality follows from the case of  $\alpha = 2$  in the proof of (D2) $\Rightarrow$ (D5). Taking  $\mu_{0,n} = P_{t,n}(x, \cdot)$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ , we have

$$\text{KL}(P_{t+s,n}(x, \cdot)|\pi_n) \leq e^{-2\lambda_n s} \chi^2(P_{t,n}(x, \cdot)|\pi),$$

taking expectation on  $x$  with respect to  $\pi_n$ , we have

$$\widehat{d}_{\text{KL},n}^2(t+s) \leq e^{-2\lambda_n s} \widehat{d}_2^2(t),$$

which implies for any given  $t \geq 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \leq t + \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \ln \widehat{d}_2^2(t) \right).$$

For any  $\eta > 0$ , plug  $t = \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta)$  into above inequality, we have

$$\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) - \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \ln \widehat{d}_2^2(\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta)) \right). \quad (48)$$

Note that for  $t = \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta)$ ,

$$\chi^2(P_{t,n}(x, \cdot)|\pi_n) = \chi^2(\delta_x P_{t,n}|\pi_n) \leq e^{-2\lambda_n t} \chi^2(\delta_x|\pi_n),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}_{2,n}^2(\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta)) &\leq e^{-2\lambda_n t} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(x) \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(y) \left( \frac{\delta_x(y)}{\pi_n(y)} - 1 \right)^2 \\ &= e^{-2\lambda_n t} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(x) \left( \pi_n(x) \left( \frac{1}{\pi_n(x)} - 1 \right)^2 + 1 - \pi_n(x) \right) \\ &= e^{-2\lambda_n t} (|\mathcal{X}_n| - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging into (48) yields, for  $\eta > \varepsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) - \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta) &\leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta) + \ln (|\mathcal{X}_n| - 1) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \ln |\mathcal{X}_n| \right), \quad \eta > \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for  $\eta < \varepsilon$ ,

$$\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta) - \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\eta} + \ln |\mathcal{X}_n| \right), \quad \eta < \varepsilon,$$

therefore for the fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$|\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) - \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\eta)| \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon \wedge \eta} + \ln |\mathcal{X}_n| \right) = \mathcal{O}_\eta(\lambda_n^{-1} \ln |\mathcal{X}_n|), \quad (49)$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_\eta$  is the big Oh notation with constant depending on  $\eta$ . According to (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 2.3), under the condition (47), there is a  $(\widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1} \ln |\mathcal{X}_n|)$  cutoff.

(ii): Suppose the  $n^{\text{th}}$  original discrete-time Markov chain before continuization has transition matrix  $(P_{(n)}(x, y))_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}_n}$  which satisfies  $P_{t,n} = e^{t(P_{(n)} - I)}$ . For any eigenvalue  $\gamma \neq 1$  of the transition matrix  $P_{(n)}$  and its eigenvector  $f$  on  $\mathcal{X}_n$  such that  $P_{(n)}f = \gamma f$ , we have

$$P_{t,n}f = e^{t(P_{(n)} - I)}f = e^{-t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^k P_{(n)}^k f}{k!} = e^{-t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^k \gamma^k f}{k!} = e^{t(\gamma-1)} f,$$

thus for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{t(\gamma-1)} f(x)| &= |P_{t,n}f(x)| = \left| \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_n} f(y) (P_{t,n}(x, y) - \pi_n(y)) \right| \\ &\leq \left( \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_n} |f(y)| \right) \left( \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_n} |P_{t,n}(x, y) - \pi_n(y)| \right), \end{aligned}$$

taking expectation on  $x$  with respect to  $\pi_n$  on both sides, we have

$$e^{t(\gamma-1)} \|f\|_1 \leq 2 \|f\|_1 \widehat{d}_{\text{TV},n}(t),$$

further by taking  $\gamma = 1 - \lambda_n$ , and using the Pinsker's inequality for  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence as shown in (Wang and Choi 2023, Proposition 3.5) (with corrected constant), we obtain

$$\widehat{d}_{\text{KL},n}(t) \geq 2\widehat{d}_{\text{TV},n}^2(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\lambda_n t}. \quad (50)$$

Use the same argument in the proof of (B3) $\Rightarrow$ (B2) we get the result.

For discrete-time finite Markov chains, the proof for the sufficient condition is similar to the proof in Theorem 3.3. As to the necessary condition, we observe that

$$\widehat{d}_{\text{KL},n}(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \lambda_n)^{2t} \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{2\lambda_n t}{1 - \lambda_n}\right), \quad (51)$$

recalling the condition that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  we get the result.  $\square$

It could be seen that the condition (47) is better than (45), since  $|\mathcal{X}_n| \leq \frac{1}{\pi_{\min,n}}$ , although such improvement is with respect to  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence instead of the classical one. Moreover, in the proof of Theorem 3.5, the properties of KL divergence that we have used are monotonicity of  $\alpha$ -divergence and Pinsker's inequality for  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence, which indicates that we can obtain analogues of the conditions in Theorem 3.5 for  $\pi$ -weighted total variation distance.



**Theorem 3.6** (Characterization of  $\pi$ -weighted TV distance cutoff via spectral gap, finite state space). Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with **finite** state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n \geq 0$  and transition matrix  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , let  $g_n(t) := \widehat{d}_{\text{TV},n}(t)$  and assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t) = 0$  for each  $n$ , then the following statements hold:

(i) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if

$$\frac{\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon)}{\ln |\mathcal{X}_n|} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (52)$$

then there is a  $(\widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1} \ln |\mathcal{X}_n|)$  cutoff.

(ii) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if there is a precutoff, then  $\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .

For discrete-time finite Markov chains, assume these chains are lazy. Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , and for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold.

**Remark 3.7.** Given a Markov chain on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$  with transition matrix  $P$ , we say the chain is **transitive** if for any pair  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists a bijection  $\phi_{x,y} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  such that

$$P(u, v) = P(\phi(u), \phi(v)), \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{X}.$$

According to (Levin and Peres 2017, Section 2.6.2), for a transitive Markov chain  $P$ , it can be verified that  $P^k$  is also transitive for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and that its stationary distribution is the discrete uniform distribution on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, the  $\pi$ -weighted  $f$ -divergence is the same as the worst-case divergence: Suppose  $\phi(x) = z$  for some  $x, z \in \mathcal{X}$ , then we have

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} f\left(\frac{P^k(x, y)}{\pi(y)}\right) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} f\left(\frac{P^k(z, \phi(y))}{\pi(\phi(y))}\right) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} f\left(\frac{P^k(z, y)}{\pi(y)}\right), \quad x, z \in \mathcal{X}.$$

It implies that,  $\pi$ -weighted KL divergence (resp. TV) cutoff is equivalent to the worst-case KL divergence (resp. TV) cutoff for transitive Markov chains. There have been some results for  $L^p$ -cutoff of transitive Markov chains, for example see (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Section 5.5).

*Proof.* We omit the same derivations that have appeared in the proof of Theorem 3.5, and only consider the case of continuous-time.

(i): By the Pinsker's inequality (Wang and Choi 2023, Proposition 3.5), we have

$$2\widehat{d}_{\text{TV},n}^2(t+s) \leq \widehat{d}_{\text{KL},n}(t+s) \leq e^{-2\lambda_n s} \widehat{d}_2^2(t),$$

hence similar to (48), for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon) - \widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\eta) \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} + \ln \widehat{d}_2^2(\widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\eta)) \right),$$

then the result is direct to obtain.

(ii): Use (50) and same argument in proof of (B3) $\Rightarrow$ (B2).  $\square$

A direct corollary is that the sufficient conditions (47) and (52) can be improved using the same proof.

**Corollary 3.2** (Refinement on sufficient conditions). *If we use  $\alpha$ -divergence with  $1 < \alpha < 2$  instead of  $\chi^2$ -divergence in the upper bound in the proof of Theorem 3.5 and 3.6 under the same setting, the sufficient conditions (47) and (52) can be refined to be, respectively,*

$$\frac{\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon)}{\ln S_\alpha(\pi_n)} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \frac{\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon)}{\ln S_\alpha(\pi_n)} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (53)$$

where  $S_\alpha(\pi_n) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n^{2-\alpha}(x)$ , and the cutoff windows become  $\lambda_n^{-1} \ln S_\alpha(\pi_n)$ . Clearly we have  $S_\alpha(\pi_n) \leq |\mathcal{X}_n|$ , which is an improvement on (47) and (52).

*Proof.* It suffices to calculate  $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(x) d_{f_\alpha, n}(\delta_x \| \pi_n)$ , which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(x) d_{f_\alpha, n}(\delta_x \| \pi_n) &= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(x) \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n(y) \left( \frac{\delta_x(y)}{\pi_n(y)} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n^{2-\alpha}(x) - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} (S_\alpha(\pi_n) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

If we want  $S_\alpha(\pi)$  to be small, we may impose additional assumptions on  $\pi$  so that its probability mass concentrates in some sense. The intuitive motivation is that  $S_\alpha(\pi)$  attains its maximum of  $|\mathcal{X}|^{\alpha-1}$  at the uniform distribution  $\pi(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|}$ , and its minimum of 1 if the mass concentrates on a single point. In the following results, we first introduce a sparsity condition on  $\pi$  which can be readily verified in some problems, and obtain a corollary about the refined sufficient conditions.

**Definition 3.4** ( $(C, \theta)$ -sparse distribution). *Given a finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , for a probability distribution  $\pi$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  whose entries are sorted such that  $\pi^{(1)} \geq \pi^{(2)} \geq \dots \geq \pi^{(|\mathcal{X}|)}$ , we say that  $\pi$  is  $(C, \theta)$ -sparse on  $\mathcal{X}$  if*

$$\pi^{(i)} \leq C \cdot i^{-\theta}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{X}|,$$

where  $C, \theta > 0$ .

**Corollary 3.3** (Refined sufficient conditions under sparsity assumption). *Under the same setting in Theorem 3.5 and 3.6, if there exists a common pair  $C, \theta$  independent of  $n$  with  $\theta > 1$ , such that  $\pi_n$  is  $(C, \theta)$ -sparse on  $\mathcal{X}_n$  for all  $n$ , then the sufficient conditions (47) and (52) can be refined to be*

$$\lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \lambda_n \widehat{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the cutoff windows become  $\lambda_n^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* Based on Corollary 3.2, for  $\theta > 1$ , take  $1 < \alpha < 2 - \frac{1}{\theta}$  which satisfies  $(2 - \alpha)\theta > 1$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_\alpha(\pi_n) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} \pi_n^{2-\alpha}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}_n|} (\pi_n^{(i)})^{2-\alpha} \\ &\leq C^{2-\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}_n|} i^{-(2-\alpha)\theta} \leq C^{2-\alpha} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{(2-\alpha)\theta - 1} \right), \quad \forall n \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{\pi_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}_n|}$  is the sorted sequence of  $\pi_n$  with descending order. This implies  $S_\alpha(\pi_n)$  are uniformly bounded.  $\square$

Finally, we illustrate how the stationary distribution of a lazy biased random walk on  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  fulfills Definition 3.4.

**Example 3.2** (Biased random walk on  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ ). *For  $\mathcal{X}_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  where  $n \geq 1$ , consider the lazy random walk  $\{X_k^{(n)}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with transition matrix  $P_n = (P_n(i, j))$*

$$P_n(i, i+1) = \frac{p}{2}, \quad P_n(i, i-1) = \frac{q}{2}, \quad P_n(i, i) = \frac{1}{2},$$

for any  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , and the boundary conditions

$$P_n(0, 1) = P_n(0, 0) = P_n(n, n) = P_n(n, n-1) = \frac{1}{2},$$

where  $0 < p < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $p + q = 1$ . The stationary distribution  $\pi_n$  is, for  $k \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,

$$\pi_n(k) = \frac{(p/q) - 1}{(p/q)^{n+1} - 1} \cdot (p/q)^k,$$

and it can be readily verified that there exists  $C > 0, \theta > 1$  such that  $\{\pi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  are uniformly  $(C, \theta)$ -sparse.

### 3.4 TV-type $f$ -divergences and Rényi divergence with $0 < \alpha < 1$

In this subsection, we will investigate a type of divergences, that we term as TV-type  $f$ -divergences, in Definition 3.5 below. These divergences will be shown to be equivalent to TV distance as well as Rényi divergence with  $0 < \alpha < 1$  under cutoff phenomenon. We stress that results in this subsection have no requirement for reversibility.

**Definition 3.5** (TV-type  $f$ -divergences). *Given a convex function  $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(1) = 0$ , the  $f$ -divergence  $D_f(\cdot \|\cdot)$  is called a TV-type  $f$ -divergence if there exists two continuous and strictly increasing functions  $\psi_f, \Psi_f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $\psi_f(0) = \Psi_f(0) = 0$ , such that for any two probability measures  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  on any  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\nu_1 \ll \nu_2$ ,*

$$\psi_f(\text{TV}(\nu_1 \|\nu_2)) \leq D_f(\nu_1 \|\nu_2) \leq \Psi_f(\text{TV}(\nu_1 \|\nu_2)). \quad (54)$$

**Example 3.3.** *The upper bound of  $\Psi_f$  can be readily identified using Proposition 2.3 item (i), and the lower bound  $\psi_f$  can be found via comparison between  $f(t)$  and  $\frac{|t-1|}{2}$ , the generator of total variation distance. Examples include:*

- $\alpha$ -divergence with  $0 < \alpha < 1$ :  $f_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^\alpha - \alpha(t-1) - 1}{\alpha - 1}$ , which satisfies

$$f_\alpha(0) = 1, \quad f_\alpha^*(0) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_\alpha(u)}{u} = \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha},$$

hence  $f_\alpha(0) + f_\alpha^*(0) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$ . Together with Pinsker's inequality in Proposition 2.3 item (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{f_\alpha}(s) &= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \left( \exp\left(\frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1)}{2} s^2\right) - 1 \right), \\ \Psi_{f_\alpha}(s) &= \frac{s}{1 - \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

- Squared Hellinger distance:  $f(t) = (\sqrt{t} - 1)^2$ , by (Gibbs and Su 2002, Equation 8) or (Cam 1972), we have

$$\psi_f(s) = s^2, \quad \Psi_f(s) = 2s.$$

- Vincze-Le Cam distance:  $f(t) = \frac{(t-1)^2}{t+1}$ , which satisfies

$$f(0) = 1, \quad f^*(0) = 1,$$

hence  $f(0) + f^*(0) = 2$ . Besides, by (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LC}(\nu_1, \nu_2) &= 2\chi^2 \left( \nu_1 \left\| \frac{1}{2}\nu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\nu_2 \right. \right) \geq 8\text{TV}^2 \left( \nu_1, \frac{1}{2}\nu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\nu_2 \right) \\ &= 2\text{TV}^2(\nu_1, \nu_2), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\psi_f(s) = 2s^2, \quad \Psi_f(s) = 2s.$$

- *Jensen-Shannon divergence*:  $f(t) = t \ln t - (t+1) \ln \frac{t+1}{2}$ , which satisfies

$$f(0) = \ln 2, \quad f^*(0) = \ln 2,$$

hence  $f(0) + f^*(0) = 2 \ln 2$ . Besides, by (7) and Pinsker's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{JS}(\nu_1 \parallel \nu_2) &= \text{KL} \left( \nu_1 \parallel \frac{1}{2} \nu_1 + \frac{1}{2} \nu_2 \right) + \text{KL} \left( \nu_2 \parallel \frac{1}{2} \nu_1 + \frac{1}{2} \nu_2 \right) \\ &\geq 2 \text{TV}^2 \left( \nu_1, \frac{1}{2} \nu_1 + \frac{1}{2} \nu_2 \right) + 2 \text{TV}^2 \left( \nu_2, \frac{1}{2} \nu_1 + \frac{1}{2} \nu_2 \right) \\ &= \text{TV}^2(\nu_1, \nu_2), \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\psi_f(s) = s^2, \quad \Psi_f(s) = 2s \ln 2.$$

The main result of this subsection demonstrates the equivalence between TV-type  $f$ -divergence cutoff and TV cutoff.

**Theorem 3.7** (Equivalence between TV-type  $f$ -divergence cutoff and TV cutoff). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **not necessarily reversible** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Suppose  $D_f(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$  is a TV-type  $f$ -divergence, assume  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{\text{TV},n}(t) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{f,n}(t) = 0$ , then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If there exists  $\{w_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon), w_n)$  cutoff under  $\bar{d}_{\text{TV},n}(\cdot)$ , then for any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta), w_n)$  cutoff under  $\bar{d}_{f,n}(\cdot)$ .*
- (ii) *If there exists  $\{w_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon), w_n)$  cutoff under  $\bar{d}_{f,n}(\cdot)$ , then for any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\delta), w_n)$  cutoff under  $\bar{d}_{\text{TV},n}(\cdot)$ .*

Note that  $\bar{d}_{\text{TV},n}(t)$  and  $\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon)$  are the worst-case TV distance and mixing time respectively, while  $\bar{d}_{f,n}(t)$  and  $\bar{t}_{f,n}(\varepsilon)$  are defined in (15) and (16).

*Proof.* (i): According to (54), for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,

$$\psi_f(d_{\text{TV},n}(x, t)) \leq d_{f,n}(x, t) \leq \Psi_f(d_{\text{TV},n}(x, t)),$$

taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$  we have

$$\psi_f(\bar{d}_{\text{TV},n}(t)) \leq \bar{d}_{f,n}(t) \leq \Psi_f(\bar{d}_{\text{TV},n}(t)),$$

which implies for any given  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\psi_f^{-1}(\delta)) \leq \bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) \leq \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\Psi_f^{-1}(\delta)). \quad (55)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) - \bar{t}_{f,n}(\eta) &\leq \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\Psi_f^{-1}(\delta)) - \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\psi_f^{-1}(\eta)), \quad \forall \eta > \delta, \\ \bar{t}_{f,n}(\eta) - \bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) &\leq \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\Psi_f^{-1}(\eta)) - \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\psi_f^{-1}(\delta)), \quad \forall \eta < \delta.\end{aligned}$$

Using (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 2.3) and the condition of TV cutoff in (i), we have  $w_n = o(\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon))$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and recalling the big Oh notation  $\mathcal{O}_\eta$  defined after (49), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}|\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\Psi_f^{-1}(\delta)) - \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\psi_f^{-1}(\eta))| &= \mathcal{O}_\eta(w_n), \quad \forall \eta > \delta, \\ |\bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\Psi_f^{-1}(\eta)) - \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\psi_f^{-1}(\delta))| &= \mathcal{O}_\eta(w_n), \quad \forall \eta < \delta,\end{aligned}$$

and hence, for any  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$|\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta) - \bar{t}_{f,n}(\eta)| = \mathcal{O}_\eta(w_n),$$

which shows that for any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{f,n}(\delta), w_n)$  cutoff under  $\bar{d}_{f,n}(\cdot)$ .

(ii): The proof is similar using an alternative of (55), i.e.

$$\bar{t}_{f,n}(\Psi_f(\delta)) \leq \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\delta) \leq \bar{t}_{f,n}(\psi_f(\delta)), \quad \forall \delta > 0.$$

□

**Corollary 3.4** (Extension to general divergences). *If an information divergence  $d(\cdot\|\cdot)$  satisfies*

- for all  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  on any  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $d(\nu_1\|\nu_2) \geq 0$ ,
- for any  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  on any  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $d(\nu_1\|\nu_2) = 0$  if and only if  $\nu_1 = \nu_2$ ,  $\nu_2$ -a.e.,
- there exists some TV-type  $f$ -divergence  $D_f(\cdot\|\cdot)$  and strictly increasing functions  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  with  $\varphi_1(x), \varphi_2(x) < \infty$  if  $x < \infty$ , such that for all  $\nu_1 \ll \nu_2$  on any  $\mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\varphi_1(D_f(\nu_1\|\nu_2)) \leq d(\nu_1\|\nu_2) \leq \varphi_2(D_f(\nu_1\|\nu_2)),$$

then  $d(\cdot\|\cdot)$  and TV distance are equivalent under cutoff phenomenon, i.e. analogues of results in Theorem 3.7 also hold. Important examples include:

- Rényi divergence  $R_\alpha$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , which can be directly obtained via (8).
- Bhattacharyya distance:  $d_B(\nu_1, \nu_2) := -\ln(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{d\nu_1 d\nu_2})$ , and we have

$$\text{Hel}^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) = 2 - 2 \exp(-d_B(\nu_1, \nu_2)).$$

### 3.5 Separation-type divergences

In this subsection, in the setting of finite discrete-time Markov chains, we will consider the divergences which are equivalent to separation distance under cutoff phenomenon. Part of the motivation stems from (Hermon et al. 2016) which states that separation cutoff and TV-cutoff are not equivalent for discrete-time lazy reversible Markov chains. As such we seek to find some divergences belonging to separation-type. For a Markov chain with transition matrix  $P$  and stationary distribution  $\pi$  on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , the separation distance and separation mixing time are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{sep}}(x, t) &:= \max_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{P^t(x, y)}{\pi(y)} \right\}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(t) &:= \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_{\text{sep}}(x, t) = \max_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{P^t(x, y)}{\pi(y)} \right\}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \bar{t}_{\text{sep}}(\varepsilon) &:= \inf \{ t \in \mathbb{N} : \bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(t) \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \varepsilon > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument as in Section 3.4, the divergence  $d(\|\cdot\|)$  is equivalent to separation distance under cutoff phenomenon if it satisfies

- For any discrete probability measures  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $d(\nu_1 \|\nu_2) \geq 0$ , and equality holds if and only if  $\nu_1 = \nu_2$ .
- There exists two continuous and strictly increasing functions  $\psi_f, \Psi_f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $\psi_f(0) = \Psi_f(0) = 0$ , such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\psi_f(\bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(t)) \leq \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d(P^t(x, \cdot) \|\pi) \leq \Psi_f(\bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(t)). \quad (56)$$

**Example 3.4.** *An example of divergence that satisfies the above items is the reverse- $R_\infty$  divergence, and it suffices to check (56).*

- *Reverse- $R_\infty$ : Recalling Proposition 2.3 item (iii), we define*

$$d_{R'_\infty}(x, t) := R_\infty(\pi \| P^t(x, \cdot)) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \ln \frac{\pi(y)}{P^t(x, y)},$$

and hence we have

$$d_{R'_\infty}(x, t) = \ln \frac{1}{1 - d_{\text{sep}}(x, t)},$$

where the right hand side is strictly increasing in  $d_{\text{sep}}(x, t)$ .

### 3.6 Examples

In this subsection, we will verify the cutoff phenomenon in some reversible models under different types of divergences. Here for two sequences  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$ , we recall that  $a_n \sim b_n$  means  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$ , and use  $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$  to denote  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  are of same asymptotic order.

**Example 3.5** (Lazy random walk on hypercube). Suppose the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process is the lazy random walk on hypercube  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . At each step, we pick uniformly at random a coordinate from the  $n$  coordinates and update it to 0 and 1 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  respectively. According to (Levin and Peres 2017, Example 12.16, Section 18.2), these models exhibit TV-cutoff, with spectral gap and mixing time satisfying

$$\lambda_n = \frac{1}{n}, \quad \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon) = \Theta(n \ln n).$$

Moreover, by (Bobkov and Tetali 2006, Example 3.7), the modified log-Sobolev constant  $\rho_n(1)$  is of order  $\frac{1}{n}$ , and recalling that

$$\bar{t}_{2,n}(\varepsilon) \geq \bar{t}_{\text{KL},n}(\varepsilon) \geq \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \right),$$

then by Theorem 3.1 to 3.4 and 3.7, there is cutoff under  $L^2$ -type divergences, TV-type divergences and KL divergence with cutoff window of the order  $n$ . Since the chains are transitive, by Remark 3.7, they also exhibit  $\pi$ -weighted KL/TV-cutoff.

**Example 3.6** (Aldous' example). We consider the Aldous' example which is a reversible lazy random walk on finite state space, and readers can check (Basu et al. 2017, Example 7.1), (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Section 6.1) or (Chen 2006, Section 4.2) for more details. This model has no TV-cutoff, and hence there is no cutoff for any TV-type divergence by Theorem 3.7. However, we still have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n > 0, \quad \bar{t}_{\text{TV},n}(\varepsilon) = \Theta(n),$$

which implies there is a cutoff for any  $L^2$ -type divergence by Theorem 3.1 to 3.3. This also demonstrates that cutoff under  $L^2$ -type divergence is not equivalent to cutoff under TV-type.

**Example 3.7** (Pak's example). We follow (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Section 6.2) to give a review. Suppose the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Markov chain  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$  has reversible transition matrix  $P_n$  and stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ . We stress the dependency on  $P_n$  of various quantities of interests: we write  $\bar{d}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, t)$  to be the worst-case TV distance and  $\bar{d}_2(P_n, t)$  as the worst-case  $L^2$  distance at time  $t$ ,  $\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \varepsilon)$  and  $\bar{t}_2(P_n, \varepsilon)$  as the TV and  $L^2$  mixing time of  $n^{\text{th}}$  chain respectively, the second largest singular value as  $\kappa(P_n)$ , and let  $\lambda'(P_n) := -\ln \kappa(P_n)$ . Assume  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a TV-cutoff,  $\lambda'(P_n) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\lambda'(P_n) \bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $L^2$ -cutoff also exists. Now, we consider another sequence of chain  $\{Y_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  on the same state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$  with transition matrix

$$Q_n := (1 - c_n)P_n + c_n\Pi_n, \quad c_n \in (0, 1), \tag{57}$$

then  $\pi_n$  is also the stationary distribution of  $Q_n$ , and we have

$$Q_{t,n} = (1 - c_n)^t P_{t,n} + (1 - (1 - c_n)^t) \Pi_n, \tag{58}$$



which yields for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\bar{d}_{\text{TV}}(Q_n, t) = (1 - c_n)^t \bar{d}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, t), \quad (59)$$

$$\bar{d}_2(Q_n, t) = (1 - c_n)^t \bar{d}_2(P_n, t), \quad (60)$$

$$\|Q_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = (1 - c_n)^t \|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}, \quad (61)$$

and (61) together with Proposition 2.1 indicate that

$$\lambda'(Q_n) = \lambda'(P_n) - \ln(1 - c_n). \quad (62)$$

In the following part, we will explain why the new process  $\{Y_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  can act as a counter-example. First of all, we assume  $c_n \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\lambda'(P_n)c_n^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$ , plugging into (62), we have  $\lambda'(Q_n) \sim \lambda'(P_n)$ . If  $c_n \bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $\varepsilon$ , then by (59) we have

$$\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(Q_n, \varepsilon) \sim c_n^{-1} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad (63)$$

and hence there is no cutoff for  $Q_n$  under any TV-type divergence. However, we have  $\lambda'(Q_n) \bar{t}_2(Q_n, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , hence cutoff still exists under  $L^2$ -type divergence for  $Q_n$ .

Here we give a rigorous proof for (63). Without loss of generality, for  $\varepsilon < 1$ , when  $n$  is very large, if there exists  $M > 1$  such that  $\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(Q_n, \varepsilon) \geq M c_n^{-1} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} =: t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq \bar{d}_{\text{TV}}(Q_n, t) = \varepsilon^{-M c_n^{-1} \ln(1-c_n)} \bar{d}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, t) \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{-M c_n^{-1} \ln(1-c_n)} \rightarrow \varepsilon^M, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. On the other hand, if there exists  $0 < m < 1$  such that  $\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(Q_n, \varepsilon) \leq m c_n^{-1} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} =: t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \bar{d}_{\text{TV}}(Q_n, t) = \varepsilon^{-m c_n^{-1} \ln(1-c_n)} \bar{d}_{\text{TV}}\left(P_n, m c_n^{-1} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\rightarrow \varepsilon^m, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used  $c_n^{-1} = o(\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \eta))$  for any  $\eta > 0$ , and that  $P_n$  exhibits TV-cutoff. This also forms a contradiction.

Secondly, we further suppose the original chain  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\frac{2}{3}$ -lazy (i.e.  $P_n(x, x) \geq \frac{2}{3}$ ) for each  $n$ , and denote its spectral gap as  $\lambda(P_n)$  and modified log-Sobolev constant as  $\rho(P_n, 1)$ . Since  $c_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\{Y_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is also lazy when  $n$  is large. Recalling that for lazy reversible chain, the second largest singular value equals to the second largest eigenvalue, then by (61), we have

$$1 - \lambda(Q_n) = (1 - c_n)(1 - \lambda(P_n)),$$

and  $c_n \rightarrow 0$  indicates  $\lambda(Q_n) \sim \lambda(P_n) \sim \lambda'(P_n)$ . We also assume that

$$\rho(P_n, 1) = \Theta(\lambda(P_n)), \quad (64)$$

then plugging (57) into (3) and recalling  $\rho(Q_n, 1) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda(Q_n))$ , we have  $\rho(Q_n, 1) = \Theta(\lambda(Q_n))$ , hence  $\rho(Q_n, 1)\bar{t}_{\text{KL}}(Q_n, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$  by Pinsker's inequality. Then by Theorem 3.4 there exists KL-cutoff for  $Q_n$ , where we recall that  $\bar{t}_{\text{KL}}(Q_n, \varepsilon)$  is the worst-case KL mixing time. This implies that TV-cutoff and KL-cutoff are not equivalent.

The assumption (64) can be easily verified. Recalling that the spectral gap and modified log-Sobolev constant remain the same order after lazifying the chain (i.e.  $P_n \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}(P_n + I)$ ), we can list a few examples satisfying (64):

- *Lazy random walk on hypercube: Example 3.5.*
- *Lazified random transpositions: (Bobkov and Tetali 2006, Example 3.12), (Diaconis and Shahshahani 1981), (Diaconis 1996), (Goel 2004, Corollary 3.1),  $\lambda(P_n), \rho(P_n, 1) = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ ,  $\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \varepsilon) = \Theta(n \ln n)$ .*
- *Lazified high-temperature Curie-Weiss model with Glauber dynamics: (Anari et al. 2021, Theorem 12), (Ding et al. 2009, Theorem 1), for the fixed inverse temperature  $\beta < 1$ ,  $\lambda(P_n), \rho(P_n, 1) = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ ,  $\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \varepsilon) = \Theta(n \ln n)$ .*

Thirdly, under all the assumptions before, we further assume  $P_n$  exhibits separation cutoff, and that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{\text{sep}}(P_n, \varepsilon) = \Theta(\bar{t}_{\text{TV}}(P_n, \varepsilon)), \quad (65)$$

hence  $c_n \bar{t}_{\text{sep}}(P_n, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ . Recalling the separation distance defined in Section 3.5, according to (58), we can write the separation distance of  $Q_{t,n}$  to  $\pi_n$  as

$$\bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(Q_n, t) = (1 - c_n)^t \bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(P_n, t),$$

and since  $\bar{d}_{\text{sep}}(P_n, t) \leq 1$ , similar to (63), we can still obtain

$$\bar{t}_{\text{sep}}(Q_n, \varepsilon) \sim c_n^{-1} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon},$$

hence there is no separation cutoff for  $Q_n$ . However, there are KL-cutoff and  $L^2$ -cutoff according to the above discussions, and this implies that separation cutoff is not equivalent to KL-cutoff or  $L^2$ -cutoff. Here assumption (65) can be readily verified for example for the lazy random walk on hypercube (Levin and Peres 2017, Theorem 18.8).

**Example 3.8** (Product chains). We follow (Su 1995, Section 5.4) and (Chen and Kumagai 2018) to construct a sequence of continuized product chains as an example to show that KL-cutoff and  $L^2$ -cutoff are not equivalent. For the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process, we consider the continuous-time random walk on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}_n = \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{G}_n$ , where  $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $0 \in \mathcal{G}_n$  and  $|\mathcal{G}_n| =: g_n < \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . At each step, according to a Poisson process with rate 1, we pick the first coordinate  $\mathcal{S}$  with probability  $p_n < \frac{1}{2}$  and the second coordinate  $\mathcal{G}_n$  with probability  $1 - p_n$ , then take a random walk uniformly in that coordinate. The random walk on  $\mathcal{S}$  has transition

matrix  $S(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\forall x, y \in S$ , and the transition matrix on  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is  $G_n(x, y) = \frac{1}{g_n}$ ,  $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . In view of these choices, the transition matrix for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$  is reversible, and can be written as

$$P_{t,n} = \exp(t(p_n S \otimes I + (1-p_n)I \otimes G_n - I \otimes I)) \quad (66)$$

$$= e^{p_n t(S-I)} \otimes e^{(1-p_n)t(G_n-I)}, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (67)$$

and the stationary distribution is  $\pi_n = \mu \otimes \nu_n$ , where  $\mu(x) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\nu_n(x) = \frac{1}{g_n}$ . Since both  $S$  and  $G_n$  have eigenvalues 0 and 1, by (66) and (Levin and Peres 2017, Corollary 12.13), the spectral gap of  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$  is  $\lambda_n = p_n$ .

By symmetry, the distribution of  $X_t^{(n)}$  at time  $t$  is independent of the initial state, and without loss of generality we assume the initial state to be  $X_0^{(n)} = (0, 0) \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{G}_n$ . Denote  $X_t^{(n)} =: (U_t^{(n)}, V_t^{(n)})$ , then by (67),  $\{U_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$  has transition matrix  $e^{p_n t(S-I)}$  and  $\{V_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$  has transition matrix  $e^{(1-p_n)t(G_n-I)}$ , hence we have

$$\mathbb{P}(U_t^{(n)} = 1) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-p_n t}), \quad \mathbb{P}(U_t^{(n)} = 0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{-p_n t}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_t^{(n)} = x) &= \frac{1}{g_n}(1 - e^{-(1-p_n)t}), \quad x \neq 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{G}_n, \\ \mathbb{P}(V_t^{(n)} = 0) &= \frac{1}{g_n}(1 + (g_n - 1)e^{-(1-p_n)t}). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $d_{\text{KL},n}(X, t)$ ,  $d_{\text{KL},n}(U, t)$  and  $d_{\text{KL},n}(V, t)$  be the KL divergences of  $X_t^{(n)}$ ,  $U_t^{(n)}$  and  $V_t^{(n)}$  to their stationary distributions  $\pi_n$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\nu_n$  respectively, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{KL},n}(U, t) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-p_n t}) \ln(1 - e^{-p_n t}) + \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{-p_n t}) \ln(1 + e^{-p_n t}), \\ d_{\text{KL},n}(V, t) &= \frac{g_n - 1}{g_n}(1 - e^{-(1-p_n)t}) \ln(1 - e^{-(1-p_n)t}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1 + (g_n - 1)e^{-(1-p_n)t}}{g_n} \ln(1 + (g_n - 1)e^{-(1-p_n)t}), \end{aligned}$$

then the mixing time for  $U_t^{(n)}$  can be written as

$$t_{\text{KL},n}(U, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon), \quad (68)$$

where  $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is strictly decreasing and satisfies  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \phi(\varepsilon) = \infty$  and  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \phi(\varepsilon) = 0$ . Moreover, using a similar argument in (Su 1995, Theorem 5.12), it is easy to check that when  $g_n \rightarrow \infty$  is very large (e.g.  $g_n \sim \exp(n^2)$ ),  $d_{\text{KL},n}(V, t)$  exhibits KL-cutoff at cutoff time

$$t_{\text{KL},n}(V, \varepsilon) \sim \frac{1}{1-p_n} \ln \ln g_n. \quad (69)$$

Similarly, for the  $L^2$  distances, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{2,n}(U, t) &= e^{-p_n t}, \\ d_{2,n}(V, t) &= \sqrt{g_n - 1} \cdot e^{-(1-p_n)t}, \end{aligned}$$

and the mixing times are

$$t_{2,n}(U, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{p_n} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad (70)$$

$$t_{2,n}(V, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{1-p_n} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \ln(g_n - 1) \right) \sim \frac{1}{2(1-p_n)} \ln g_n, \quad (71)$$

then  $V_t^{(n)}$  exhibits  $L^2$ -cutoff by (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 2.3).

Now, we take  $g_n \rightarrow \infty$  sufficiently large (e.g.  $g_n \sim \exp(n^2)$ ), and take  $p_n = (\ln \ln g_n)^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ , then we show that in this situation, for  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$ , there is  $L^2$ -cutoff but not KL-cutoff. We first prove that for  $\varepsilon < \phi^{-1}(1)$ , the KL mixing time of  $X_t^{(n)}$  is

$$t_{\text{KL},n}(X, \varepsilon) \sim \frac{1}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) = \phi(\varepsilon) \ln \ln g_n. \quad (72)$$

Without loss of generality, if there exists  $M > 1$  such that  $t_{\text{KL},n}(X, \varepsilon) > \frac{M}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon)$ , then by the tensorization rule of KL divergence for product chains as stated in (Barrera et al. 2006, Proposition 6) or (Boursier et al. 2023, Lemma A.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d_{\text{KL},n} \left( X, \frac{M}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) = d_{\text{KL},n} \left( U, \frac{M}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) + d_{\text{KL},n} \left( V, \frac{M}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) \\ &\leq \phi^{-1}(M\phi(\varepsilon)) + d_{\text{KL},n} \left( V, \frac{M}{p_n} \right) \\ &\rightarrow \phi^{-1}(M\phi(\varepsilon)) < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality utilizes  $\varepsilon < \phi^{-1}(1)$ , and the third line follows from the cutoff time of  $V_t^{(n)}$  in (69). On the other hand, if there exists  $0 < m < 1$  such that  $t_{\text{KL},n}(X, \varepsilon) < \frac{m}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq d_{\text{KL},n} \left( X, \frac{m}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) = d_{\text{KL},n} \left( U, \frac{m}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) + d_{\text{KL},n} \left( V, \frac{m}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) \\ &\geq d_{\text{KL},n} \left( U, \frac{m}{p_n} \phi(\varepsilon) \right) \\ &= \phi^{-1}(m\phi(\varepsilon)) > \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

therefore (72) is verified, and by (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 2.3), there is no KL-cutoff for  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$ . Next, according to the tensorization rule of  $L^2$  distance (Boursier et al. 2023, Lemma A.4), we have

$$d_{2,n}^2(X, t) = (1 + d_{2,n}^2(U, t)) (1 + d_{2,n}^2(V, t)) - 1 \geq d_{2,n}^2(V, t),$$

then by (71), we have

$$t_{2,n}(X, \varepsilon) \geq t_{2,n}(V, \varepsilon) \sim \ln g_n,$$

hence

$$\lambda_n t_{2,n}(X, \varepsilon) \geq p_n t_{2,n}(V, \varepsilon) \sim \frac{\ln g_n}{\ln \ln g_n} \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies there is  $L^2$ -cutoff for  $\{X_t^{(n)}\}_{t \geq 0}$  by Proposition 2.7.

## 4 Non-reversible cases

In this section, we will investigate the cutoff phenomenon of processes with non-reversible, or more generally, non-normal Markov generators. Non-reversibility arises naturally in many models as well as real-world applications. For example, non-reversible discrete-time algorithms appear as discretization of continuous-time reversible stochastic differential equations for sampling and optimization tasks, like (Roberts and Tweedie 1996; Vempala and Wibisono 2019; Zhang et al. 2017). Moreover, for finite state space Markov chains, breaking reversibility can sometimes serve as an acceleration technique, see for instance (Chatterjee and Diaconis 2021; Chen and Hwang 2013). However, current results about cutoff phenomenon under non-reversible setting are still at primary stage, most of which only deal with some specific models, and a universal criterion is still quite open. For references of these non-reversible models, readers can check (Bordenave et al. 2019; Lancia et al. 2012).

Our aim is to give a common criterion to characterize non-reversible cutoff phenomenon. In Theorem 4.1 and 4.3, we give a comparison of  $L^p$ -mixing times as complement to (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Theorem 4.2, 4.3), and extend (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Theorem 5.3, 5.4) to the non-reversible setting generated by slight perturbations.

### 4.1 Normal cases

In this subsection, given a Markov chain  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$  on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$  with semigroup  $P_t$  and stationary distribution  $\pi$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  where  $T = [0, \infty)$  or  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , we will investigate the case of normal processes, which refers to  $P_t P_t^* = P_t^* P_t$  as discussed in Section 2.1. Although  $P_t$  is not reversible, we still have the equalities in Proposition 2.1 which play a key role in quantifying lower bounds of mixing times.

In Theorem 4.1, we prove the equivalence of worst-case  $L^p$ -cutoff for  $p \in (1, \infty)$  for normal processes, which is an extension of (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Theorem 4.2, 4.3). In Theorem 4.2, we proceed to present similar results for  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence.

**Theorem 4.1** (Characterization of worst-case  $L^p$ -cutoff with  $1 < p < \infty$ , normal). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n$ , and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **normal** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for*

each  $n \geq 1$ . If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , let  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{p,n}(t) = 0$  for each  $1 < p < \infty$ , then the following statements hold:

(E1) There exists some  $1 < p < \infty$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .

(E2) For any  $1 < p < \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ .

(E3) For any  $1 < p < \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , precutoff occurs.

(E4) For any  $1 < p < \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , cutoff occurs.

(E5) For any  $1 < p < \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.

If  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , and that for some  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold.

*Proof.* We only consider  $T = [0, \infty)$ , and the case for  $T = \mathbb{N}$  is similar. We only prove (E1) $\Rightarrow$ (E2) and (E3) $\Rightarrow$ (E2), and the other proof is same with Theorem 3.1.

(E3) $\Rightarrow$ (E2): According to Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\|P_{t,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = e^{-\lambda_n t},$$

then use similar proof in (B3) $\Rightarrow$ (B2), we get the result.

(E1) $\Rightarrow$ (E2): We first give a comparison between mixing times. For any  $1 < s < \infty$  and  $r = \sqrt{s}$ , for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,  $g \in L^{s'}(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  and  $u, v > 0$ , let  $\mu_{t,n}^x = \delta_x P_{t,n}$ , by (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mu_{t,n}^x - \pi_n)(g)| &\leq d_{r,n}(x, u) \|(P_{v,n} - \Pi_n)(g)\|_{r'} \\ &\leq d_{r,n}(x, u) \|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{s'} \rightarrow L^{r'}}, \end{aligned}$$

taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ , we have

$$\bar{d}_{s,n}(u+v) \leq \bar{d}_{r,n}(u) \|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{s'} \rightarrow L^{r'}}. \quad (73)$$

By Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem in Proposition 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{s'} \rightarrow L^{r'}} &\leq \|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^1}^{1-\frac{1}{r}} \cdot \|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{r'} \rightarrow L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \bar{d}_{r,n}^{\frac{1}{r}}(v), \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where the second inequality comes from  $\|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^1} \leq 2$ . Plugging into (73), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}_{s,n}(u+v) &\leq \bar{d}_{r,n}(u) \|P_{v,n} - \Pi_n\|_{L^{s'} \rightarrow L^{r'}} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \bar{d}_{r,n}(u) \cdot \bar{d}_{r,n}^{\frac{1}{r}}(v), \end{aligned}$$

taking  $v = u$  yields

$$\bar{d}_{s,n}(2u) \leq 2 \cdot \bar{d}_{\sqrt{s},n}^{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}}(u),$$

which implies for any  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{s,n} \left( 2\delta^{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}} \right) \leq 2 \cdot \bar{t}_{\sqrt{s},n}(\delta).$$

Since the dynamics  $x_{k+1} = \varphi(x_k) = \sqrt{x_k}$  converge to 1, it is easy to see that for any  $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ , there exists two increasing mappings  $\delta \mapsto \psi_{p,q}(\delta)$ ,  $\delta \mapsto \Psi_{p,q}(\delta)$  and  $m_{p,q}, M_{p,q} > 0$  such that for any  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$m_{p,q} \cdot \bar{t}_{p,n}(\psi_{p,q}(\delta)) \leq \bar{t}_{q,n}(\delta) \leq M_{p,q} \cdot \bar{t}_{p,n}(\Psi_{p,q}(\delta)). \quad (75)$$

Now, suppose there exists some  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ . By (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Corollary 2.5), for any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{p,n}(\delta), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff, and hence  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ . Then by (75), for any  $1 < q < \infty$  and  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{q,n}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2** (Characterization of worst-case  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence cutoff with  $1 < \alpha < \infty$ , normal). *Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n$  and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **normal** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .*

*If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , for each  $1 < p < \infty$ , let  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{f_\alpha, n}(t) = 0$ , then the following statement are equivalent:*

- (F1) *There exists some  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon)$  tends to infinity.*
- (F2) *For any  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon)$  tends to infinity.*
- (F3) *For any  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ , precutoff occurs.*
- (F4) *For any  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ , cutoff occurs.*
- (F5) *For any  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.*

*If  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , assume  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , and that for some  $1 < \alpha < \infty$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\varepsilon) = \infty$ . If we substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the items, then the statements above also hold.*

*If we replace  $\bar{t}_{f_\alpha, n}(\cdot)$  with  $\bar{t}_{R_\alpha, n}(\cdot)$  in the above statements, then the results still hold.*

*Proof.* We only consider continuous-time, and it suffices to prove (F3) $\Rightarrow$ (F2) under  $\bar{d}_{f_\alpha, n}(\cdot)$  and (F1) $\Rightarrow$ (F2) under  $\bar{d}_{R_\alpha, n}(\cdot)$ , and the rest are similar to the proof in Theorem 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.1.

(F3) $\Rightarrow$ (F2): Similar to the proof of (D3) $\Rightarrow$ (D2).

(F1) $\Rightarrow$ (F2): Let  $h_{t,n}^x(y) = \frac{P_{t,n}(x,y)}{\pi_n(y)}$ , for any  $1 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $\beta = \sqrt{\alpha}$  and  $u, v \geq 0$ , similar to (73), we have

$$\|h_{u+v,n}^x\|_\alpha \leq \|h_{u,n}^x\|_\beta \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow L^{\beta'}},$$

taking supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}_n$ , similar to (74), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{u+v,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow B} &\leq \|P_{u,n}\|_{L^{\beta'} \rightarrow B} \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow L^{\beta'}} \\ &\leq \|P_{u,n}\|_{L^{\beta'} \rightarrow B} \|P_{v,n}\|_{L^{\beta'} \rightarrow B}^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence by taking  $v = u$ ,

$$\|P_{2u,n}\|_{L^{\alpha'} \rightarrow B} \leq \|P_{u,n}\|_{L^{\beta'} \rightarrow B}^{1+\frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

Recalling (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}_{R_\alpha,n}(2u) &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \cdot \frac{\beta+1}{\beta} \cdot \frac{\beta-1}{\beta} \cdot \bar{d}_{R_\beta,n}(u) \\ &= \bar{d}_{R_\beta,n}(u), \end{aligned}$$

which implies for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{R_\alpha,n}(\varepsilon) \leq 2 \cdot \bar{t}_{R_{\sqrt{\alpha}},n}(\varepsilon).$$

Then similar to (E1) $\Rightarrow$ (E2), we get the result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.1.** (E1) $\Rightarrow$ (E2) and (F1) $\Rightarrow$ (F2) also hold for **non-normal** cases, since the proofs have no requirement for normality.

## 4.2 Non-normal cases: A perturbation view

In this subsection, we shall consider non-normal Markov processes generated by suitably perturbing reversible processes. On a finite state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , we consider the Markov chain with transition matrix  $P$  and its continuized chain with transition matrix  $P_t = e^{t(P-I)}$ . To obtain relatively tight bounds for mixing times under non-normal setting, we may need to use other quantities apart from the classical spectral gap  $\lambda$  defined in Definition 2.1, which may meet trouble in obtaining the lower bound of mixing times without reversibility. An example can be found in (Hermon 2015, Page 6), where the worst-case TV mixing time is much smaller than the relaxation time  $\lambda^{-1}$ . There are already some techniques, like other way of defining the spectral gap of non-reversible processes, for example the multiplicative reversibilization in (Fill 1991), pseudo-spectral gap in (Paulin 2015) and Chatterjee's spectral gap in (Chatterjee 2023).

In the following part, we will use the eigenvalue of the second largest magnitude (resp. real part in discrete (resp. continuous) time) as the intermediate quantity in proving the equivalence of cutoff phenomenon between  $L^p$  distances.

**Proposition 4.1** (Lower bound in terms of eigenvalue for non-normal chains, Montenegro, Tetali, et al. 2006 Theorem 4.9). *For a finite state space Markov chain with transition matrix  $P$ , and its continuized chain  $P_t = e^{t(P-I)}$ , let  $\beta_1$  be eigenvalue of  $P$  with second largest*



magnitude, and  $\gamma_1$  be the eigenvalue with second largest real part. Then, for the continuized chain,

$$\bar{d}_1(t) \geq e^{-(1-\operatorname{Re}\gamma_1)t}, \quad \bar{t}_1(\varepsilon) \geq \frac{1}{1-\operatorname{Re}\gamma_1} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (76)$$

and for the discrete-time chain,

$$\bar{d}_1(k) \geq |\beta_1|^k, \quad \bar{t}_1(\varepsilon) \geq \frac{|\beta_1|}{1-|\beta_1|} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (77)$$

Our motivation comes from a key observation. If a reversible transition matrix is slightly perturbed, then the coefficients of its characteristic polynomial have only minor changes, hence its spectrum should not change too much, and its spectral gap and  $1-\operatorname{Re}\gamma_1$  or  $1-|\beta_1|$  should be approximately the same. To rigorously give a perturbation bound, we will use the result from (Cuenin and Tretter 2016).

**Definition 4.1** ( $(Q, a, b)$ -bounded perturbation). *Let  $Q$  be a self-adjoint linear operator on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ . We say the linear operator  $A$  is  $(Q, a, b)$ -bounded if there exists  $a, b \geq 0$  such that for any  $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ ,*

$$\|Af\|_2^2 \leq a^2 \|f\|_2^2 + b^2 \|Qf\|_2^2. \quad (78)$$

**Proposition 4.2** (Cuenin and Tretter 2016, Theorem 2.1, 2.12). *Let  $Q$  be a self-adjoint linear operator on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ , and  $A$  is  $(Q, a, b)$ -bounded with  $a \geq 0, 0 \leq b < 1$ . Denote  $\sigma(S)$  as the spectrum of any linear operator  $S$ , then the following statements hold.*

(i) *Suppose  $\lambda \in \sigma(Q)$  is an isolated eigenvalue with algebraic multiplicity  $1 \leq m < \infty$ , set*

$$\lambda_- := \sup\{\nu \in \sigma(Q) : \nu < \lambda\}, \quad \lambda_+ := \inf\{\nu \in \sigma(Q) : \nu > \lambda\}.$$

*If*

$$\sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda_-^2} + \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda^2} < \lambda - \lambda_-, \quad \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda^2} + \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda_+^2} < \lambda_+ - \lambda, \quad (79)$$

*then the strip  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda - \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda^2} < \operatorname{Re} z < \lambda + \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda^2}\}$  contains exactly  $m$  isolated eigenvalues of  $Q + A$  (counted with algebraic multiplicity).*

(ii) *The spectrum  $\sigma(Q + A)$  of  $Q + A$  lies between hyperbolas:*

$$\sigma(Q + A) \subset \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Im} z|^2 \leq \frac{a^2 + b^2|\operatorname{Re} z|^2}{1 - b^2} \right\}.$$

(iii) *For any  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \sigma(Q)$  and  $\sigma(Q) \cap (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \emptyset$ , if*

$$\sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda_1^2} + \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda_2^2} < \lambda_2 - \lambda_1,$$

*then*

$$\sigma(Q + A) \cap \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda_1 + \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda_1^2} < \operatorname{Re} z < \lambda_2 - \sqrt{a^2 + b^2\lambda_2^2} \right\} = \emptyset.$$

**Theorem 4.3** (Characterization of worst-case  $L^p$ -cutoff with  $1 < p < \infty$ , non-normal). Consider a sequence of Markov processes  $\{X_t^{(n)}, t \in T\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on finite state space  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , stationary distribution  $\pi_n$ , spectral gap  $\lambda_n$ , and semigroup  $P_{t,n}$ , where  $P_{t,n}$  is **non-normal** on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}_n, \pi_n)$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

If  $T = [0, \infty)$ , suppose  $P_{t,n} = e^{t(W_n - I)}$ , where  $W_n$  is a transition matrix, and  $1 - \lambda_n$  is an isolated eigenvalue of  $\frac{W_n + W_n^*}{2}$ . Let

$$\eta_n := \sup \left\{ \nu \in \sigma \left( \frac{W_n + W_n^*}{2} \right) : \nu < 1 - \lambda_n \right\}, \quad (80)$$

assume  $\frac{W_n - W_n^*}{2}$  is  $\left( \frac{W_n + W_n^*}{2}, a_n, b_n \right)$ -bounded with

$$\sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2} < \frac{1}{2} \min \{1 - \lambda_n - \eta_n, \lambda_n\}. \quad (81)$$

Let  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{p,n}(t) = 0$  for each  $1 < p < \infty$ , then the following statements hold:

- (i) For any  $1 < p < \infty$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$ , then there is a  $(\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.
- (ii) If for some  $1 < p < \infty$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff, then for any  $1 < q < \infty$  and any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a  $(\bar{t}_{q,n}(\delta), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.

If  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , suppose  $P_{k,n} = W_n^k$ ,  $1 - \lambda_n$  is an isolated eigenvalue of  $\frac{W_n + W_n^*}{2}$ , and  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ . We still denote  $\eta_n$  as in (80) and under the same assumption of (81), we further assume that  $b_n^2 < \frac{3}{4}$  for any  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}_{p,n}(t) = 0$  for each  $1 < p < \infty$ , and substitute  $\lambda'_n = \min\{1, \lambda_n\}$  into  $\lambda_n$  in the two items, then the statements above also hold.

**Remark 4.2.** The assumption of (81) can be readily verified in some instances. As a concrete example, suppose  $U$  is a reversible transition matrix on  $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi)$ , and transition matrix  $V$  admits  $\pi$  as its stationary distribution. Consider the following linear combination given by

$$W := (1 - \varepsilon)U + \varepsilon V, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which can be non-normal. In order that  $\frac{W - W^*}{2}$  is  $\left( \frac{W + W^*}{2}, a, b \right)$ -bounded, we need to ensure

$$\left\| \varepsilon \frac{V - V^*}{2} f \right\|_2^2 \leq a^2 \|f\|_2^2 + b^2 \left\| \left( (1 - \varepsilon)U + \varepsilon \frac{V + V^*}{2} \right) f \right\|_2^2, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, \pi). \quad (82)$$

Since the left hand side above is smaller than  $\varepsilon^2 \|f\|_2^2$ , after fixing  $a$  and  $b$  which satisfy (81), we can take any  $0 < \varepsilon \leq a$  and (82) holds.

*Proof.* It suffices to prove item (ii). We first consider the continuous-time case. Denote  $\gamma_{1,n}$  as the eigenvalue of  $W_n$  with second largest real part. Since  $W_n$  can be viewed as adding a perturbation to a reversible transition matrix:

$$W_n = \frac{W_n + W_n^*}{2} + \frac{W_n - W_n^*}{2},$$

then by condition (81), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2 \eta_n^2} + \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2 (1 - \lambda_n)^2} &\leq 2\sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2} < 1 - \lambda_n - \eta_n, \\ \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2 (1 - \lambda_n)^2} + \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2} &\leq 2\sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2} < \lambda_n,\end{aligned}$$

then by Proposition 4.2 item (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}1 - \operatorname{Re} \gamma_{1,n} &\leq 1 - \left( (1 - \lambda_n) - \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2 (1 - \lambda_n)^2} \right) \\ &\leq \lambda_n + \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot \lambda_n,\end{aligned}$$

together with (76), for any  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon_1) \geq \bar{t}_{1,n}(\varepsilon_1) \geq \frac{2}{3\lambda_n} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}, \quad (83)$$

hence

$$\frac{\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon_1)}{\bar{t}_{p,n}(1/4)} \geq \frac{2}{3\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(1/4)} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}. \quad (84)$$

The condition in item (ii) implies precutoff occurs for some  $1 < p < \infty$ , then if

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(1/4) = c < \infty, \quad (85)$$

plugging into (84) leads to

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon_1)}{\bar{t}_{p,n}(1/4)} \geq \frac{2}{3c} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1},$$

take  $\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$ , according to (Chen and Saloff-Coste 2008, Proposition 2.3), we get the contradiction of (85). Therefore, for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{p,n}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ . Then use the proof of (E1)  $\Rightarrow$  (E2) or Remark 4.1, for any  $1 < q < \infty$ ,  $\lambda_n \bar{t}_{q,n}(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ , and hence there is a  $(\bar{t}_{q,n}(\delta), \lambda_n^{-1})$  cutoff.

Next, we consider the discrete-time case. Denote  $\beta_{1,n}$  as the eigenvalue of  $W_n$  with second largest magnitude. Similar to the argument above, and according to Proposition 4.2 item (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}1 - |\beta_{1,n}| &\leq |1 - \beta_{1,n}| \leq 1 - \operatorname{Re} \beta_{1,n} + |\operatorname{Im} \beta_{1,n}| \\ &\leq 1 - \left( (1 - \lambda_n) - \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2 (1 - \lambda_n)^2} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{a_n^2 + b_n^2}{1 - b_n^2}} \\ &\leq \lambda_n + 3\sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2} \\ &\leq 4\lambda_n,\end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we have used  $b_n^2 < \frac{3}{4}$ . Since  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $|\beta_{1,n}| \rightarrow 1$ . Then by (77), when  $n$  is sufficiently large, for any  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ ,

$$\bar{t}_{p,n}(\varepsilon_1) \geq \bar{t}_{1,n}(\varepsilon_1) \geq \frac{1}{8\lambda_n} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1},$$

which is similar to (83), then we get the result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** *Theorem 4.3 indicates that under the assumption (81),  $L^p$ -cutoff are equivalent to  $L^2$ -cutoff for  $1 < p < \infty$ . Moreover, for  $\alpha$ -divergence and Rényi divergence, the proof and result are similar, and we can obtain that they are also  $L^2$ -type divergences under cutoff phenomenon.*

## Acknowledgements

Youjia Wang gratefully acknowledges the financial support from National University of Singapore via the Presidential Graduate Fellowship. Michael Choi acknowledges the financial support of the project “MAPLE: Mechanistic Accelerated Prediction of Protein Secondary Structure via Langevin Monte Carlo” with grant number 22-5715-P0001 under the NUS Faculty of Science Ministry of Education Tier 1 grant Data for Science and Science for Data collaborative scheme, project NUSREC-HPC-00001 and NUSREC-CLD-00001 for NUS HPC-AI Priority Projects for Research Program, as well as the startup funding of the National University of Singapore with grant number A-0000178-01-00.

## References

- Aldous, D., & Diaconis, P. (1986). Shuffling cards and stopping times. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 93(5), 333–348.
- Anari, N., Jain, V., Koehler, F., Pham, H. T., & Vuong, T.-D. (2021). Entropic independence I: Modified log-Sobolev inequalities for fractionally log-concave distributions and high-temperature Ising models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04105*.
- Avelin, B., & Karlsson, A. (2022). Deep limits and a cut-off phenomenon for neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(191), 1–29.
- Bakry, D., & Émery, M. (2006). Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XIX 1983/84: Proceedings* (pp. 177–206). Springer.
- Barrera, G., Högele, M. A., & Pardo, J. C. (2021). Cutoff thermalization for Ornstein–Uhlenbeck systems with small Lévy noise in the Wasserstein distance. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 184(3), 27.
- Barrera, G., & Jara, M. (2020). Thermalisation for small random perturbations of dynamical systems. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 30(3), 1164–1208.
- Barrera, J., Lachaud, B., & Ycart, B. (2006). Cut-off for  $n$ -tuples of exponentially converging processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 116(10), 1433–1446.
- Basu, R., Hermon, J., & Peres, Y. (2017). Characterization of cutoff for reversible Markov chains. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(3).
- Bernard, C. (2013). Interpolation theorems and applications. *University of Chicago REU*.
- Bobkov, S. G., & Tetali, P. (2006). Modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities in discrete settings. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 19, 289–336.
- Bordenave, C., Caputo, P., & Salez, J. (2019). Cutoff at the “entropic time” for sparse Markov chains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173, 261–292.

- Boursier, J., Chafaï, D., & Labbé, C. (2023). Universal cutoff for Dyson Ornstein Uhlenbeck process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 185(1), 449–512.
- Cam, L. (1972). *Théorie asymptotique de la décision statistique*. les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Chafaï, D. (2004). Entropies, convexity, and functional inequalities, on  $\Phi$ -entropies and  $\Phi$ -Sobolev inequalities. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University*, 44(2), 325–363.
- Chatterjee, S. (2023). Spectral gap of nonreversible Markov chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10876*.
- Chatterjee, S., & Diaconis, P. (2021). Correction to: Speeding up Markov chains with deterministic jumps. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 181, 377–400.
- Chen, G.-Y. (2006). *The cutoff phenomenon for finite Markov chains*. Cornell University.
- Chen, G.-Y., & Kumagai, T. (2018). Cutoffs for product chains. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 128(11), 3840–3879.
- Chen, G.-Y., & Saloff-Coste, L. (2008). The cutoff phenomenon for ergodic Markov processes. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 13, 26–78.
- Chen, G.-Y., & Saloff-Coste, L. (2010). The  $L^2$ -cutoff for reversible markov processes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 258(7), 2246–2315.
- Chen, T.-L., & Hwang, C.-R. (2013). Accelerating reversible Markov chains. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 83(9), 1956–1962.
- Cryan, M., Guo, H., & Mousa, G. (2021). Modified log-Sobolev inequalities for strongly log-concave distributions. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(1), 506–525.
- Csiszár, I. (1972). A class of measures of informativity of observation channels. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 2(1-4), 191–213.
- Cuenin, J.-C., & Tretter, C. (2016). Non-symmetric perturbations of self-adjoint operators. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 441(1), 235–258.
- Diaconis, P. (1996). The cutoff phenomenon in finite Markov chains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 93(4), 1659–1664.
- Diaconis, P., & Saloff-Coste, L. (1996). Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for finite Markov chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 6(3), 695–750.
- Diaconis, P., & Saloff-Coste, L. (2006). Separation cut-offs for birth and death chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 16, 2098–2122.
- Diaconis, P., & Shahshahani, M. (1981). Generating a random permutation with random transpositions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 57(2), 159–179.
- Ding, J., Lubetzky, E., & Peres, Y. (2009). The mixing time evolution of Glauber dynamics for the mean-field Ising model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 289(2), 725–764.
- Ding, J., Lubetzky, E., & Peres, Y. (2010). Total variation cutoff in birth-and-death chains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 146, 61–85.
- Dunford, N., & Schwartz, J. T. (1988). *Linear operators, part 1: General theory* (Vol. 10). John Wiley & Sons.
- Erbar, M., & Fathi, M. (2018). Poincaré, modified logarithmic Sobolev and isoperimetric inequalities for Markov chains with non-negative Ricci curvature. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 274(11), 3056–3089.

- Erbar, M., & Maas, J. (2012). Ricci curvature of finite Markov chains via convexity of the entropy. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 206, 997–1038.
- Faust, O., & Fawzi, H. (2024). Sum-of-Squares proofs of logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on finite Markov chains. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(2), 803–819.
- Fill, J. A. (1991). Eigenvalue bounds on convergence to stationarity for nonreversible Markov chains, with an application to the exclusion process. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 62–87.
- Gibbs, A. L., & Su, F. E. (2002). On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International Statistical Review*, 70(3), 419–435.
- Goel, S. (2004). Modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for some models of random walk. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 114(1), 51–79.
- Haase, M. (2018). Lectures on functional calculus. *21st International Internet Seminar, Kiel Univ.*
- Hermon, J. (2015). A technical report on hitting times, mixing and cutoff. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.01869*.
- Hermon, J., Lacoïn, H., & Peres, Y. (2016). Total variation and separation cutoffs are not equivalent and neither one implies the other. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 21, 1–36.
- Lancia, C., Nardi, F. R., & Scoppola, B. (2012). Entropy-driven cutoff phenomena. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 149, 108–141.
- Lee, S., Ramil, M., & Seo, I. (2023). Asymptotic stability and cut-off phenomenon for the underdamped Langevin dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18263*.
- Levin, D. A., & Peres, Y. (2017). *Markov chains and mixing times* (Vol. 107). American Mathematical Soc.
- Liese, F., & Vajda, I. (1987). *Convex statistical distances*. Teubner.
- Lubetzky, E., & Sly, A. (2013). Cutoff for the Ising model on the lattice. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 191, 719–755.
- Miclo, L. (1997). Remarques sur l’hypercontractivité et l’évolution de l’entropie pour des chaînes de Markov finies. *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg*, 31, 136–167.
- Montenegro, R., Tetali, P., et al. (2006). Mathematical aspects of mixing times in Markov chains. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 1(3), 237–354.
- Mossel, E., Oleszkiewicz, K., & Sen, A. (2013). On reverse hypercontractivity. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 23(3), 1062–1097.
- Ollivier, Y. (2009). Ricci curvature of Markov chains on metric spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 256(3), 810–864.
- Paulin, D. (2015). Concentration inequalities for Markov chains by Marton couplings and spectral methods. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20, 1–32.
- Polyanskiy, Y., & Samorodnitsky, A. (2019). Improved log-Sobolev inequalities, hypercontractivity and uncertainty principle on the hypercube. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 277(11), 108280.
- Raginsky, M. (2016). Strong data processing inequalities and  $\Phi$ -Sobolev inequalities for discrete channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(6), 3355–3389.

- Roberts, G. O., & Tweedie, R. L. (1996). Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 341–363.
- Salez, J. (2023). Cutoff for non-negatively curved Markov chains. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*.
- Sason, I., & Verdú, S. (2016).  $f$ -divergence inequalities. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(11), 5973–6006.
- Stein, E. M., & Shakarchi, R. (2011). *Functional analysis: Introduction to further topics in analysis* (Vol. 4). Princeton University Press.
- Su, F. E. (1995). *Methods for quantifying rates of convergence for random walks on groups*. Harvard University.
- Van Erven, T., & Harremoës, P. (2014). Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(7), 3797–3820.
- Varopoulos, N. T. (1985). Hardy-Littlewood theory for semigroups. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 63(2), 240–260.
- Vempala, S., & Wibisono, A. (2019). Rapid convergence of the unadjusted Langevin algorithm: Isoperimetry suffices. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Wang, F.-Y. (1997). Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 109, 417–424.
- Wang, Y., & Choi, M. C. (2023). Information divergences of Markov chains and their applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04863*.
- Whitley, R. (1968). The spectral theorem for a normal operator. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 75(8), 856–861.
- Wolfer, G., & Watanabe, S. (2021). Information geometry of reversible Markov chains. *Information Geometry*, 4(2), 393–433.
- Zhang, Y., Liang, P., & Charikar, M. (2017). A hitting time analysis of stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. *Conference on Learning Theory*, 1980–2022.