



**HAL**  
open science

## **L2-Hypocoercivity and large time asymptotics of the linearized Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system**

Lanoir Addala, Jean Dolbeault, Xingyu Li, M Lazhar Tayeb

► **To cite this version:**

Lanoir Addala, Jean Dolbeault, Xingyu Li, M Lazhar Tayeb. L2-Hypocoercivity and large time asymptotics of the linearized Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system. 2019. hal-02299535v1

**HAL Id: hal-02299535**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02299535v1>**

Preprint submitted on 27 Sep 2019 (v1), last revised 10 May 2021 (v4)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# $L^2$ -HYPOCOERCIVITY AND LARGE TIME ASYMPTOTICS OF THE LINEARIZED VLASOV-POISSON-FOKKER-PLANCK SYSTEM

LANOIR ADDALA, JEAN DOLBEAULT, XINGYU LI, AND M. LAZHAR TAYEB

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to the linearized Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system in presence of an external potential of confinement. We investigate the large time behaviour of the solutions using hypocoercivity methods and a notion of scalar product adapted to the presence of a Poisson coupling. Our framework provides estimates which are uniform in the diffusion limit. As an application, we study the one-dimensional case and prove the exponential convergence of the nonlinear Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system without any small mass assumption.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

The *Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system* in presence of an external potential  $V$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(VPFP)} \quad & \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f - (\nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi) \cdot \nabla_v f = \Delta_v f + \nabla_v \cdot (v f), \\ & -\Delta_x \phi = \rho_f = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \, dv. \end{aligned}$$

In this paper, we shall assume that  $\phi$  is a *self-consistent potential* corresponding to repulsive electrostatic forces and that  $V$  is a *confining potential* in the sense that the system has a unique nonnegative integrable stationary solution  $f_\star$  with associated potential  $\phi_\star$ . We shall denote by  $M = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f_\star \, dx \, dv > 0$  the mass. System (VPFP) is of interest for understanding the evolution of a system of charged particles with interactions of two different natures: a self-consistent, nonlinear interaction through the mean field potential  $\phi$  and collisions with a background inducing a diffusion and a friction represented by a Fokker-Planck operator acting on velocities. System (VPFP) describes the dynamics of a plasma of Coulomb particles in a thermal reservoir: see for instance [6], but it has also been derived in stellar dynamics for gravitational models, as in [19], in the case of an attractive mean field Newton-Poisson equation. Here we shall focus on the repulsive, electrostatic case. Applications range from plasma physics to semi-conductor modelling. A key open question is to get estimates on the rate of convergence to equilibrium in dimensions  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$ . As a step in this direction, we will establish a constructive estimate of the decay rate of the linearized problem, which provides us with an upper bound for the convergence rate of the nonlinear (VPFP) problem. A technical but important issue is to decide how one should measure such a rate of relaxation. For this purpose, we introduce a norm which is adapted to the linearized problem and consistent with the *diffusion limit*.

---

*Date:* September 27, 2019– File: VPFP.tex.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 82C40. Secondary: 35H10; 35P15; 35Q84; 35R09; 47G20; 82C21; 82D10; 82D37.

*Key words and phrases.* Vlasov equation, Fokker-Planck operator, Poisson coupling, electrostatic forces, confinement, Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system, convergence to equilibrium, large-time behavior, rate of convergence, hypocoercivity, diffusion limit, drift-diffusion equations.

Let us consider the linearized problem around  $f_\star$ . Let  $h$  be a function such that  $f = f_\star(1 + \eta h)$  with  $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} f dx dv = M$ , that is, such that  $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dx dv = 0$ . The system (VPFP) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t h + v \cdot \nabla_x h - (\nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi_\star) \cdot \nabla_v h + v \cdot \nabla_x \psi_h - \Delta_v h + v \cdot \nabla_v h &= \eta \nabla_x \psi_h \cdot \nabla_v h, \\ -\Delta_x \psi_h &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dv. \end{aligned}$$

At formal level, by dropping the  $\mathcal{O}(\eta)$  term, we obtain the *linearized Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system*

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t h + v \cdot \nabla_x h - (\nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi_\star) \cdot \nabla_v h + v \cdot \nabla_x \psi_h - \Delta_v h + v \cdot \nabla_v h &= 0, \\ -\Delta_x \psi_h &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dv, \quad \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dx dv = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define the norm

$$(2) \quad \|h\|^2 := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h^2 f_\star dx dv + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x \psi_h|^2 dx.$$

Our main result is devoted to the large time behaviour of a solution of *the linearized system* (1) on  $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (t, x, v)$  with given initial datum  $h_0$  at  $t = 0$ . For simplicity, we shall state a result for a simple specific potential, but an extension to more general potentials will be given to the price of a rather long list of technical assumptions that are detailed in Section 3.

**Theorem 1.** *Let us assume that  $d \geq 1$ ,  $V(x) = |x|^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 1$  and  $M > 0$ . Then there exist two positive constants  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda$  such that any solution  $h$  of (1) with a nonnegative initial datum  $h_0$  with  $\|h_0\|^2 < \infty$  is such that*

$$(3) \quad \|h(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \mathcal{C} \|h_0\|^2 e^{-\lambda t} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Our analysis is consistent with the *diffusion limit* of the linearized system, as we shall explain below. For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if we consider the solution of the *linearized problem in the parabolic scaling* given by

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon \partial_t h + v \cdot \nabla_x h - (\nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi_\star) \cdot \nabla_v h + v \cdot \nabla_x \psi_h - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\Delta_v h - v \cdot \nabla_v h) &= 0, \\ -\Delta_x \psi_h &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dv, \quad \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dx dv = 0, \end{aligned}$$

then we obtain a decay estimate which is uniform with respect to  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$ . The result goes as follows.

**Theorem 2.** *Let us assume that  $d \geq 1$ ,  $V(x) = |x|^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 1$  and  $M > 0$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, there exist two positive constants  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda$ , which do not depend on  $\varepsilon$ , such that any solution  $h$  of (4) with a nonnegative initial datum such that  $\|h_0\|^2 < \infty$  satisfies (3).*

The result of Theorem 1 will be extended in Theorem 21 to a larger class of external potentials  $V$ : in the technical part of the proof of Theorem 1, we will specify precise but more general conditions under which the same result holds. A similar extension applies in the case of Theorem 2. As an application of our method, we establish the exponential rate of convergence of the solution of *the non-linear system* (VPFP) when  $d = 1$ . For sake of simplicity, we state the result for the same potential  $V$  as in Theorem 2.

**Corollary 3.** *Assume that  $d = 1$ ,  $V(x) = |x|^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 1$  and  $M > 0$ . If  $h$  solves (VPFP) with a nonnegative initial datum  $h_0$  such that  $\|h_0\|^2 < \infty$ , then (3) holds for some positive constants  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda$ .*

The *diffusion limit* of systems of kinetic equations in presence of electrostatic forces has been studied in many papers. The mathematical results go back at least to the study of a model for semi-conductors involving a linear Boltzmann kernel by F. Poupaud in [51]. The case of a Fokker-Planck operator in dimension  $d = 2$  was later studied by F. Poupaud and J. Soler in [52], and by T. Goudon in [32], on the basis of the existence results of [48, 55]. With a self-consistent Poisson coupling, we refer to [11] for existence results in dimension  $d = 3$  and to [28, 22] for steady states, confinement and related issues. Based on free energy considerations introduced in [13, 22], N. El Ghani and N. Masmoudi were able in [30] to establish diffusion limits also when  $d = 3$ . Altogether, it is proved in dimensions  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$  that the Vlasov–Poisson–Fokker–Planck system, with parameters corresponding to the parabolic scaling,

$$(5) \quad \varepsilon \partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f - (\nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi) \cdot \nabla_v f = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\Delta_v f + \nabla_v \cdot (v f)), \quad -\Delta_x \phi = \rho_f = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \, dv,$$

has a weak solution  $(f^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)$  which converges as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$  to  $(f^0 = \rho \mathcal{M}, \phi)$  where

$$\mathcal{M}(v) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}|v|^2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

is the normalized Maxwellian function and where the charge density  $\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^0 \, dv$  is a weak solution of the *drift-diffusion-Poisson* system

$$(6) \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla_x \cdot (\nabla_x \rho + \rho \nabla_x (V + \phi)), \quad -\Delta_x \phi = \rho.$$

Another piece of information is the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of (6) for large times. As  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , it is well known (see for instance [3] in the case of a bounded domain, [2] in the Euclidean case when  $V(x) = |x|^2$ , and [5] in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with a confining external potential  $V$  for any  $d \geq 3$ ) that the solution of (6) converges a steady state  $(\rho_\star, \phi_\star)$  given by

$$(7) \quad -\Delta_x \phi_\star = \rho_\star = e^{-V - \phi_\star}$$

at an exponential rate. The optimal asymptotic rates have been characterized recently in [42] using the linearized drift-diffusion-Poisson system and a norm which involves the Poisson potential. Apart the difficulty arising from the self-consistent potential, the technique is based on relative entropy methods, which are by now standard in the study of large time asymptotics of drift-diffusion equations.

Our motivation is to study both regimes  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$  and  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  simultaneously. More precisely, we aim at proving that each solution  $(f^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)$  of (5) converges to  $(f_\star, \phi_\star)$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  in a weighted  $L^2$  sense at an exponential rate which is uniform in  $\varepsilon > 0$ , small. In the present paper, we will focus on a linearized regime in any dimension and obtain an estimate of the decay rate in the asymptotic regime. This allows us to obtain an asymptotic decay rates in the non-linear regime when  $d = 1$ , but so far not in higher dimensions because we are still lacking of some key estimates. Compared to the large time asymptotics of (6), the study of the convergence rate of the solution of (5) or, in the case  $\varepsilon = 1$ , of the decay rate of the solution of (1), is much more difficult because the diffusion only acts on the velocities and requires the use of hypocoercive methods.

T. Gallay coined the word *hypocoercivity* in the context of convergence without regularization as opposed to hypoellipticity where both properties arise simultaneously. It is well adapted to kinetic equations with general collision kernels and C. Villani made the *hypocoercivity* very popular in kinetic theory: see [56, 57]. Understanding the large time behavior

of the kinetic Fokker-Planck equation (without Poisson coupling) is an interesting problem which has a long history: see [40, 38, 39, 29, 35] for some earlier contributions. C. Villani [57] proved convergence results in various senses: in  $H^1$  [57, Theorem 35], in  $L^2$  [57, Theorem 37], and in entropy [57, Theorem 39] when  $\text{Hess}(V)$  is bounded. His approach is however inspired by hypoelliptic methods, as in [33, 34, 47]. The method of [1] is based on a spectral decomposition and produces an exponential decay in relative entropy with a sharp rate. In a somewhat similar spirit, we can also quote [14], which is based on a Fourier decomposition. Due to the Fokker-Planck operator, smoothing effects in (5) can be expected as was proved in [12], consistently with hypoelliptic methods: this will not be exploited in the present paper.

In presence of a Poisson coupling, several papers deal, without any rate, with the large time behavior of the solutions of (5), in presence of or without an external potential: cf. [13, 18, 22]. When  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$ , F. Hérau and L. Thomann [36] proved the trend to the equilibrium for the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system with a small nonlinear term but with a possibly large exterior confining potential. More recently, M. Herda and M. Rodrigues considered in [37] the double limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$  and  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . All these approaches are however essentially of perturbative nature.

In [26], J. Dolbeault, C. Mouhot, and C. Schmeiser studied the exponential decay in a modified  $L^2$  norm for the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation (and also for a larger class of linear kinetic equations). The method was motivated by the results of [33] but the main source of inspiration came from the analysis of the diffusion limit, as in [4, 45, 24] (also see [54] in presence of an oscillating external force field): the idea was to build a norm which reflects the spectral gap that determines the rate of convergence in (6). Inspired by [7, 9, 27], another idea emerged that asymptotic rates of convergence should be measured in a norm induced by a Taylor expansion of the entropy around the asymptotic state and that, in presence of a Poisson coupling, this norm should involve a non-local term: see [16, 42, 43]. The goal of this paper is to mix these two ideas.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we expose the strategy for the  $L^2$ -hypo-coercivity method of [26] in the abstract setting of a general Hilbert space. The notion of Hilbert space adapted to (1) is exposed in Section 3 with some fundamental considerations on confinement by an external potential and adapted Poincaré inequalities. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1: we have to check that the assumptions of Section 2 hold in the functional setting of Section 3, with the special scalar product for Poisson coupling involving a non-local term associated with the norm defined by (2). In Section 5, we prove Theorem 2: our estimates are compatible with the diffusion limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Coming back to the non-linear problem (VPFP) in dimension  $d = 1$ , we prove in this latter case that an exponential rate of convergence as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  can be measured in the hypo-coercive norm, that is, we prove Corollary 3.

To make *notation* slightly lighter, we adopt the convention that  $\nabla$  and  $\Delta$  denote respectively  $\nabla_x$  and  $\Delta_x$  unless the variable is  $v$  or when there is a possible ambiguity, and in that case, it will be explicitly specified. We shall also adopt the following conventions. If  $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i=1}^d$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (b_i)_{i=1}^d$  are two vectors with values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , then  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i b_i$  and  $|\mathbf{a}|^2 = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{a}$ . If  $\mathbf{A} = (A_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$  and  $\mathbf{B} = (B_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$  are two matrices with values in  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , then  $\mathbf{A} : \mathbf{B} = \sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij} B_{ij}$  and  $|\mathbf{A}|^2 = \mathbf{A} : \mathbf{A}$ . We shall use the tensor convention that  $\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}$  is the matrix of elements  $a_i b_j$ . By extension to functions,  $\nabla w$  is the gradient of a scalar function  $w$

while  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$  denotes the divergence of a vector valued function  $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i=1}^d$  and  $\nabla \otimes \mathbf{u}$  is the matrix valued function of elements  $\partial u_i / \partial x_j$ . Hence  $\text{Hess}(w) = (\nabla \otimes \nabla) w = (\partial^2 w / \partial x_i \partial x_j)_{i,j=1}^d$  denotes the Hessian of  $w$  and, for instance,  $\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} : \text{Hess}(w) = \sum_{i,j=1}^d u_i u_j (\text{Hess}(w))_{ij}$ . We shall also write that  $|\text{Hess}(w)|^2 = \text{Hess}(w) : \text{Hess}(w)$ .

## 2. HYPOCOERCIVITY RESULT AND DECAY RATES

This section is devoted to the abstract hypocoercivity method in general Hilbert spaces and it is inspired from [26, 14]. Since the methods sets the overall strategy of proof of our main results, we expose it for the convenience of the reader.

Let us consider the evolution equation

$$(8) \quad \frac{dF}{dt} + \mathbb{T}F = \mathbb{L}F$$

on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In view of the applications, we shall call  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{L}$  the *transport* and the *collision* operators and assume without further notice that they are respectively antisymmetric and symmetric. On  $\mathcal{H}$ , we shall denote by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\| \cdot \|$  the scalar product and the norm. As in [26], we assume that there are positive constants  $\lambda_m$ ,  $\lambda_M$ , and  $C_M$  such that, for any  $F \in \mathcal{H}$ , the following properties hold:

▷ *microscopic coercivity*

$$(H1) \quad -\langle \mathbb{L}F, F \rangle \geq \lambda_m \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|^2,$$

▷ *macroscopic coercivity*

$$(H2) \quad \|\mathbb{T}\Pi F\|^2 \geq \lambda_M \|\Pi F\|^2,$$

▷ *parabolic macroscopic dynamics*

$$(H3) \quad \Pi \mathbb{T} \Pi F = 0,$$

▷ *bounded auxiliary operators*

$$(H4) \quad \|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\| + \|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{L}F\| \leq C_M \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|.$$

Here  $\text{Id}$  is the identity,  $\Pi$  is the orthogonal projection onto the null space of  $\mathbb{L}$ ,  $*$  denotes the adjoint with respect to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and as in [25, 26], the operator  $\mathbb{A}$  is defined by

$$\mathbb{A} := (\text{Id} + (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^* \mathbb{T}\Pi)^{-1} (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*.$$

Since a solution  $F$  of (8) obeys to

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|F\|^2 = \langle \mathbb{L}F, F \rangle \leq -\lambda_m \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|^2,$$

this is not enough to conclude that  $\|F(t, \cdot)\|^2$  decays exponentially with respect to  $t \geq 0$  and this is why we shall consider the Lyapunov functional

$$\mathbb{H}_\delta[F] := \frac{1}{2} \|F\|^2 + \delta \langle \mathbb{A}F, F \rangle$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  to be determined later. If  $F$  solves (8), then

$$-\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{H}_\delta[F] = \mathbb{D}_\delta[F] := -\langle \mathbb{L}F, F \rangle + \delta \langle \mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}\Pi F, F \rangle - \delta \langle \mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}F, F \rangle + \delta \langle \mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(\text{Id} - \Pi)F, F \rangle - \delta \langle \mathbb{A}\mathbb{L}F, F \rangle.$$

Let us define

$$\delta_* = \min \left\{ 2, \lambda_m, \frac{4\lambda_m\lambda_M}{4\lambda_M + C_M^2(1 + \lambda_M)} \right\}.$$

We recall that the two main properties of the *hypo-coercivity* method of [26] for real valued operators and later extended in [14] to complex Hilbert spaces go as follows.

**Proposition 4.** *Assume that (H1)–(H4) hold and take  $\delta \in (0, \delta_*)$ . Then we have:*

(i)  $H_\delta$  and  $\|\cdot\|^2$  are equivalent in the sense that

$$(9) \quad \frac{2-\delta}{4} \|F\|^2 \leq H_\delta[F] \leq \frac{2+\delta}{4} \|F\|^2 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{H}.$$

(ii) For some  $\lambda > 0$  depending on  $\delta$ ,  $H_\delta$  and  $D_\delta$  are related by the entropy – entropy production inequality

$$(10) \quad \lambda H_\delta[F] \leq D_\delta[F] \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{H}.$$

As a straightforward consequence, we have that a solution  $F$  of (8) with initial datum  $F_0$  obeys to

$$H_\delta[F(t, \cdot)] \leq H_\delta[F_0] e^{-\lambda t}$$

and

$$(11) \quad \|F(t, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \frac{4}{2-\delta} H_\delta[F(t, \cdot)] \leq \frac{4}{2-\delta} H_\delta[F_0] e^{-\lambda t} \leq \frac{2+\delta}{2-\delta} \|F_0\|^2 e^{-\lambda t} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* For completeness, we sketch the main steps of the proof, with slightly improved estimates compared to [14, Theorem 3]. Since  $\text{AT}\Pi$  can be viewed as  $z \mapsto (1+z)^{-1}z$  applied to  $(\text{T}\Pi)^* \text{T}\Pi$ , (H1) and (H2) imply that

$$-\langle \text{L}F, F \rangle + \delta \langle \text{AT}\Pi F, F \rangle \geq \lambda_m \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|^2 + \frac{\delta \lambda_M}{1 + \lambda_M} \|\Pi F\|^2.$$

Our goal is to prove that the r.h.s. controls the other terms in the expression of  $D_\delta[F]$ . By (H4), we know that

$$|\langle \text{AT}(\text{Id} - \Pi)F, F \rangle + \langle \text{A}L F, F \rangle| \leq C_M \|\Pi F\| \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|.$$

As in [26, Lemma 1], if  $G = \text{A}F$ , i.e., if  $(\text{T}\Pi)^* F = G + (\text{T}\Pi)^* \text{T}\Pi G$ , then

$$\langle \text{T}A F, F \rangle = \langle G, (\text{T}\Pi)^* F \rangle = \|G\|^2 + \|\text{T}\Pi G\|^2 = \|\text{A}F\|^2 + \|\text{T}A F\|^2.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we know that

$$\langle G, (\text{T}\Pi)^* F \rangle = \langle \text{T}A F, (\text{Id} - \Pi)F \rangle \leq \|\text{T}A F\| \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\| \leq \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\text{T}A F\|^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|^2$$

for any  $\mu > 0$ . Hence

$$2\|\text{A}F\|^2 + \left(2 - \frac{1}{\mu}\right) \|\text{T}A F\|^2 \leq \mu \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|^2,$$

which, by taking either  $\mu = 1/2$  or  $\mu = 1$ , proves that

$$(12) \quad \|\text{A}F\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\text{T}A F\| \leq \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|.$$

This establishes (9) and, as a side result, also proves that

$$|\langle \text{T}A F, F \rangle| = |\langle \text{T}A F, (\text{Id} - \Pi)F \rangle| \leq \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|^2.$$

Collecting terms in the expression of  $D_\delta[F]$ , we find that

$$D_\delta[F] \geq (\lambda_m - \delta) X^2 + \frac{\delta \lambda_M}{1 + \lambda_M} Y^2 - \delta C_M X Y$$

with  $X := \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|$  and  $Y := \|\Pi F\|$ . We know that  $H_\delta[F] \leq \frac{1}{2}(X^2 + Y^2) + \frac{\delta}{2}XY$ , so that the largest value of  $\lambda$  for which  $D_\delta[F] \geq \lambda H_\delta[F]$  can be estimated by the largest value of  $\lambda$  for which

$$(X, Y) \mapsto (\lambda_m - \delta)X^2 + \frac{\delta \lambda_M}{1 + \lambda_M}Y^2 - \delta C_M XY - \frac{\lambda}{2}(X^2 + Y^2) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\delta XY$$

is a nonnegative quadratic form, as a function of  $(X, Y)$ . It is characterized by the discriminant condition

$$h(\delta, \lambda) := \delta^2 \left( C_M + \frac{\lambda}{2} \right)^2 - 4 \left( \lambda_m - \delta - \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) \left( \frac{\delta \lambda_M}{1 + \lambda_M} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) \leq 0$$

and the sign condition  $\lambda_m - \delta - \lambda/2 > 0$ . For any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_\star)$ , the sign condition is always satisfied by any  $\lambda > 0$  and we also have that  $h(\delta, 0) > 0$ . Since  $\lambda \mapsto h(\delta, \lambda)$  is a second order polynomial, the largest possible value of  $\lambda$  can be estimated by the positive root of  $h(\delta, \lambda) = 0$ .  $\square$

Notice that the proof of Proposition 4 provides us with a constructive estimate of the decay rate  $\lambda$ , as a function of  $\delta \in (0, \delta_\star)$ . We refer to [15] for a discussion of the best estimate of the decay rate of  $H_\delta$ , *i.e.*, the largest possible estimate of  $\lambda$  when  $\delta$  varies in the admissible range  $(0, \delta_\star)$ .

### 3. FUNCTIONAL SETTING

In this section, we collect a number of observations on the external potential  $V$  and on estimates based on the stationary solution obtained by solving the Poisson-Boltzmann equation. Depending on growth conditions on  $V$ , we establish a notion of *confinement* (which guarantees that (VPFP) admits an integrable stationary solution) and some coercivity properties (which amount to Poincaré type inequalities). Our goal is to give sufficient conditions in order that:

- 1) there exists a nonnegative stationary solution  $f_\star$  of (VPFP) of arbitrary given mass  $M > 0$ : see Section 3.2;
- 2) there is a Poincaré inequality associated with the measure  $e^{-V - \phi_\star} dx$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and variants of it, with weights: see Section 3.3;
- 3) there is a Hilbert space structure on which we can study the evolution equation (1): see Section 3.6.

These conditions on  $V$  determine a functional setting which is adapted to implement the method of Section 2. The reader is invited to check that  $V(x) = |x|^\alpha$  with  $\alpha > 1$  is an *admissible potential* in that perspective.

In [26], without Poisson coupling, sufficient conditions were given on  $V$  which were inspired by the *carré du champ* method and the Holley-Stroock perturbation lemma. These conditions are not well adapted to handle an additional Poisson coupling. Here we adopt a slightly different approach, which amounts to focus on sufficient growth conditions of the external potential  $V$  and on tools of spectral theory like Persson's lemma. For sake of simplicity, we require some basic regularity properties of  $V$  (which are not optimal but avoid technicalities) and assume that

$$(V1) \quad V \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} V(x) = +\infty.$$



**3.1. Preliminary considerations on the Poisson equation and conventions.** Let us consider the Green function  $G_d$  associated with  $-\Delta$ . We shall write  $\phi = (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho$  as a generic notation for  $\phi = G_d * \rho$  with  $G_d(x) = c_d |x|^{2-d}$ ,  $c_d^{-1} = (d-2) |\mathbb{S}^{d-1}|$  if  $d \geq 3$ . With no restriction, using integrations by parts, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \phi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\Delta \phi) \phi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx.$$

If  $d = 2$ , we use  $G_2(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log|x|$ . It is a standard observation that  $\phi = (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho$  is such that  $\nabla \phi(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho \, dx \right) \frac{x}{|x|^2}$  as  $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$  is not square integrable unless  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho \, dx = 0$ . If  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho \, dx = 0$ , one can prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho \phi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx < +\infty.$$

If  $d = 1$ , we have  $G_1(x) = -|x|/2$ , but it is sometimes more convenient to rely on the equivalent representation

$$(13) \quad \phi(x) = \frac{M}{2} x - \int_{-\infty}^x dy \int_{-\infty}^y \rho(z) \, dz + \phi_0$$

for some integration constant  $\phi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and we shall then write  $\phi - \phi_0 = (-d^2/dx^2)^{-1} \rho$  whenever we use (13). We can moreover notice that  $\phi - \phi_0 = (-d^2/dx^2)^{-1} \rho$  is such that  $\phi' = -m$  where  $m(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x \rho(y) \, dy$  if  $M = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho \, dx = 0$ . In that case, if we further assume that  $\rho$  is compactly supported or has a sufficient decay at infinity, an integration by parts shows that

$$(14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi \rho \, dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi' m \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\phi'|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} m^2 \, dx \geq 0.$$

Altogether, whenever  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \, dx = 0$ , we shall write  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \phi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx \geq 0$  without any further precaution, for any  $d \geq 1$ .

**3.2. The Poisson-Boltzmann equation.** According to [28, 55, 22], *stationary solutions* of the (VPFP) system are given by

$$f_{\star}(x, v) = \rho_{\star}(x) \mathcal{M}(v)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}(v) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-|v|^2/2}$  is the normalized Maxwellian function (or Gaussian function) and the spatial density  $\rho_{\star}$  is determined by the *Poisson-Boltzmann equation*

$$-\Delta \phi_{\star} = \rho_{\star} = M \frac{e^{-V - \phi_{\star}}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-V - \phi_{\star}} \, dx}.$$

It is obvious that  $\phi_{\star}$  is defined up to an additive constant which can be chosen such that  $M = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-V - \phi_{\star}} \, dx$  and therefore solves (7). Here  $M = \|\rho_{\star}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|f_{\star}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)} = M$  is the mass, which is a free parameter of the problem. The critical growth of  $V$  needed to obtain solutions  $\rho_{\star} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  of (7) which minimize the free energy strongly depends on the dimension. It is characterized as follows.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $M > 0$ . Assume that  $V$  satisfies (V1) and*

$$(V2) \quad \begin{aligned} |V| e^{-V} &\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) && \text{if } d \geq 3, \\ \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{V(x)}{\log|x|} &> 4 + \frac{M}{2\pi} && \text{if } d = 2, \\ \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{V(x) - M|x|/2}{\log|x|} &> 2 && \text{if } d = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then (7) has a unique solution  $\rho_\star \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\star dx = M$  and  $\phi_\star$  is the unique solution of (7). Moreover  $\phi_\star$  is of class  $C^2$  and  $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} W_\star(x) = +\infty$ , where

$$W_\star = V + \phi_\star \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_\star = e^{-W_\star}.$$

As a straightforward consequence of Lemma 5, we learn that under Assumptions (V1) and (V2), the potential  $W_\star$  also satisfies (V1).

*Proof.* The case  $d \geq 3$  is covered by [22, p. 123]. The free energy

$$\mathcal{F}[\rho] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \log \rho dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho V dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \phi dx$$

is bounded from below under the mass constraint  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho dx = M$  using the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \phi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx \geq 0$$

and Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}[\rho] &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho \log \rho dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho V dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u \log u) e^{-V} dx \\ &\geq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u e^{-V} dx \right) \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u e^{-V} dx \right) = M \log M \end{aligned}$$

applied to  $u := \rho e^V$ . Here we assume with no loss of generality that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-V} dx = 1$ . The existence follows by a minimization method. As noticed in [31, 21], the uniqueness is a consequence of the convexity of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Finally, by standard elliptic regularity,  $\phi_\star = (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_\star$  is continuous and has a limit as  $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$ .

In dimension  $d = 1$  or  $d = 2$ , the same scheme can be adapted after proving that  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded from below. This has been established in [23, Theorem 3.5] (also see [42]) when  $d = 2$  under Assumption (V2). The case  $d = 1$  can be dealt with by elementary methods. Let us consider the potential

$$V_0(x) = \frac{M}{2} \left( (x+1) \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, -1)}(x) + (x+1)(x-1) \mathbb{1}_{(-1, +1)}(x) - (x-1) \mathbb{1}_{(+1, +\infty)}(x) - 3 \right)$$

such that  $-V_0'' = \frac{M}{2} \mathbb{1}_{(-1, +1)} =: \rho_0$  and let  $\psi = V - V_0$ . We claim that

$$\mathcal{F}[\rho] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho \log \rho dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho (V + V_0) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi'' \psi dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_0 \psi dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho V_0 dx$$

is bounded from below because the first two integrals can be bounded using Jensen's inequality,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi'' \psi dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'|^2 dx$ ,  $\rho_0$  has compact support and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho |V_0| dx$  provides a moment bound. Combining these estimates provides us with the lower bound we need.  $\square$

**3.3. Some non-trivial Poincaré inequalities.** Assume that  $V$  is such that (V1)-(V2) hold. Before considering the case of the measure  $e^{-W_\star} dx$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , we may ask under which conditions on  $V$  the *Poincaré inequality*

$$(15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 e^{-V} dx \geq \mathcal{C}_P \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 e^{-V} dx \quad \forall u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{such that} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u e^{-V} dx = 0$$

is true for some constant  $\mathcal{C}_P > 0$ . Let us define  $w = u e^{-V/2}$  and observe that (15) is equivalent to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi |w|^2 dx \geq \mathcal{C}_P \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |w|^2 dx$$

under the condition that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w e^{-V/2} dx = 0$ . Here  $\Phi = \frac{1}{4} |\nabla V|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta V$  is obtained by expanding the square in  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w + \frac{1}{2} w \nabla V|^2 dx$  and integrating by parts the cross-term. It is also straightforward to observe that the kernel of the Schrödinger operator  $-\Delta + \Phi$  on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)$  is generated by  $e^{-V/2}$ . According to Persson's result [49, Theorem 2.1], the lower end  $\sigma$  of the continuous spectrum of the Schrödinger operator  $-\Delta + \Phi$  is such that

$$\sigma \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} \Phi(x) =: \sigma_0.$$

As a consequence, if  $\sigma$  is positive, either there is no eigenvalue in the interval  $(0, \sigma)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_p = \sigma$ , or  $\mathcal{C}_p$  is the lowest positive eigenvalue, and it is positive by construction. In both cases, we know that (15) holds for some  $\mathcal{C}_p > 0$  if  $\sigma_0 > 0$ . In order to prove (15), it is enough to check that

$$(V3a) \quad \sigma_V := \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} \left( \frac{1}{4} |\nabla V|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta V \right) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} |\nabla V| > 0.$$

Now let us consider the measure  $\rho_\star dx = e^{-W_\star} dx$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and establish the corresponding Poincaré inequality.

**Lemma 6.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2) and (V3a) hold. We further assume that*

$$(V4) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{|x| > r} \left( (M - 2V')^2 - 8V'' + M^2 \right) > 0 \quad \text{if } d = 1.$$

If  $\phi_\star$  solves (7) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , then there is a positive constant  $\mathcal{C}_\star$  such that

$$(16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 \rho_\star dx \geq \mathcal{C}_\star \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 \rho_\star dx \quad \forall u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u \rho_\star dx = 0.$$

*Proof.* It is enough to prove that

$$\sigma_{W_\star} := \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} \left( \frac{1}{4} |\nabla \phi_\star + \nabla V|^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\Delta \phi_\star + \Delta V) \right) > 0.$$

We observe that, by (V3a),  $|\Delta \phi_\star| = \rho_\star = 0(|x|^{-d}) = o(|\nabla V|^2 - 2\Delta V)$  and  $|\nabla \phi_\star| = \mathcal{O}(|x|^{1-d})$  is negligible compared to  $|\nabla V|$  if  $d \geq 2$ . If  $d = 1$ , the result follows from (V4) using the fact that  $\phi'_\star(\mp x) \sim \pm M/2$  as  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ .  $\square$

We shall now replace (V3a) by the slightly stronger assumption that for some  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ ,

$$(V3b) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} \left( \frac{\theta}{4} |\nabla V|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta V \right) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} |\nabla V| > 0.$$

**Corollary 7.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2), (V3b) and (V4) hold. If  $\phi_\star$  solves (7) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , then there is a positive constant  $\mathcal{C}$  such that*

$$(17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 \rho_\star dx \geq \mathcal{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \quad \forall u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u \rho_\star dx = 0.$$

*Proof.* By expanding  $|\nabla(u\sqrt{\rho_\star})|^2$ , using  $\nabla\sqrt{\rho_\star} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla W_\star \rho_\star$  and integrating by parts, we obtain that

$$0 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla(u\sqrt{\rho_\star})|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 \rho_\star dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \frac{1}{4} |\nabla W_\star|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta W_\star \right) |u|^2 \rho_\star dx.$$

Combined with (16), this shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 \rho_\star dx &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ (1-\eta) \mathcal{C}_\star + \eta \left( \frac{\theta}{4} |\nabla W_\star|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta W_\star \right) \right] |u|^2 \rho_\star dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta\theta}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ . With  $\eta$  chosen small enough so that  $(1-\eta) \mathcal{C}_\star + \eta \left( \frac{\theta}{4} |\nabla W_\star|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta W_\star \right)$  is nonnegative a.e., the conclusion holds with  $\mathcal{C} = \eta\theta/4$ .  $\square$

In the same spirit as for Corollary 7, we shall assume that for some  $\theta \in [0, 1)$ ,

$$(V5) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} \left( \frac{\theta}{4} |\nabla V|^4 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta V |\nabla V|^2 - \text{Hess}(V) : \nabla V \otimes \nabla V \right) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in B_r^c} |\nabla V| > 0.$$

**Corollary 8.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2), (V3b) and (V5) hold. If  $\phi_\star$  solves (7) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , then there is a positive constant  $\mathcal{C}_\circ$  such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \geq \mathcal{C}_\circ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^4 \rho_\star dx \quad \forall u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u \rho_\star dx = 0.$$

The proof is based on the expansion of the square in  $|\nabla(u\sqrt{\rho_\star})|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2$ , integrations by parts and an IMS truncation argument in order to use Lemma 6 in a finite centered ball of radius  $2R$ , on which  $\nabla W_\star$  is bounded and Assumption (V5) outside of the centered ball of radius  $R$ . Details are left to the reader. See [46, 53] or [10, section 2] for details on the IMS (for Ismagilov, Morgan, Morgan-Simon, Sigal) truncation method.

**3.4. Further inequalities based on pointwise estimates.** If  $\mathfrak{M}$  is a  $d \times d$  symmetric real valued matrix, let us denote by  $\Lambda(\mathfrak{M})$  the largest eigenvalue of  $\mathfrak{M}$ . With this notation, let us assume that

$$(V6) \quad \Lambda_V := \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in B_r^c} \frac{1}{|\nabla V(x)|^2} \Lambda \left( e^{V(x)} \left( \text{Hess}(e^{-V(x)}) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta(e^{-V(x)}) \text{Id} \right) \right) < +\infty.$$

In other words, Assumption (V6) means that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $R > 0$  such that

$$e^{V(x)} \left( \text{Hess}(e^{-V(x)}) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta(e^{-V(x)}) \text{Id} \right) \leq (\Lambda_V - \varepsilon) |\nabla V(x)|^2 \text{Id}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ a.e. such that } |x| > R,$$

where the inequality holds in the sense of positive matrices.

**Lemma 9.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2) and (V6) hold. If  $\phi_\star$  solves (7) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , then there is a positive constant  $\Lambda_\star$  such that*

$$(18) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \text{Hess}(\rho_\star) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta \rho_\star \text{Id} \right) : \nabla w \otimes \nabla w dx \leq \Lambda_\star \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx$$

for any function  $w \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

*Proof.* An elementary computation shows that

$$\text{Hess}(\rho_\star) = (\nabla W_\star \otimes \nabla W_\star - \text{Hess}(W_\star)) \rho_\star \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \rho_\star = (|\nabla W_\star|^2 - \Delta W_\star) \rho_\star.$$

The proof is then similar to the above estimates. Details are left to the reader.  $\square$

Similarly, let us assume that

$$(V7) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in B_r^c} \left| \nabla (\log(|\nabla V(x)|^2)) \right| < +\infty.$$

**Lemma 10.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2) and (V7) hold. If  $\phi_\star$  solves (7) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , then there is a positive constant  $\Lambda_\circ$  such that*

$$(19) \quad \left| \nabla (|\nabla W_\star(x)|^2) \nabla W_\star(x) \right| \leq \Lambda_\circ |\nabla W_\star(x)|^3, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ a.e. such that } |x| > R.$$

Here we mean that  $\nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2) \nabla W_\star = 2 \text{Hess}(W_\star) : \nabla W_\star \otimes \nabla W_\star$  and a straightforward consequence of (19) is that

$$\left| \nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2) \nabla w \right| = 2 \left| \text{Hess}(W_\star) : \nabla W_\star \otimes \nabla w \right| \leq \Lambda_\circ |\nabla W_\star(x)|^2 |\nabla w|.$$

The inequality follows from the regularity and decay estimates of  $\phi_\star$ . Details are left to the reader.

In the same vein, let us assume that

$$(V8) \quad \left\| |\nabla V|^2 e^{-V} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)} < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| |\nabla (|\nabla V|^2)|^2 e^{-V} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)} < +\infty.$$

**Lemma 11.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2) and (V8) hold. If  $\phi_\star$  solves (7) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$ , then  $\| |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)}$  and  $\| |\nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2)|^2 \rho_\star \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)}$  are finite.*

**3.5. A Bochner-Lichnerowicz-Weitzenböck identity and second order estimates.** Algebraic computations and a few integrations by parts provide us with the following estimate.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $M > 0$  and  $\rho_\star = e^{-W_\star} \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}} \cap W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then for any smooth function  $w$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with compact support, we have the identity*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{Hess}(w)|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{\rho_\star} |\nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w)|^2 dx + \frac{7}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w)^2 \rho_\star dx.$$

Notice that if  $V$  satisfies (V1)–(V2) and  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$  where  $\phi_\star$  is the unique solution of (7), then  $\rho_\star$  is an admissible function for Lemma 12.

*Proof.* Let us start by establishing a Bochner-Lichnerowicz-Weitzenböck identity as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Delta (\rho_\star |\nabla w|^2) &= \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \text{Hess}(w) \nabla w) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (|\nabla w|^2 \nabla \rho_\star) \\ &= \rho_\star |\text{Hess}(w)|^2 + \rho_\star \nabla w \cdot \nabla (\Delta w) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \rho_\star |\nabla w|^2 + \text{Hess}(w) : \nabla w \otimes \nabla \rho_\star \\ &= \rho_\star |\text{Hess}(w)|^2 + \nabla w \cdot \nabla (\rho_\star \Delta w) \\ &\quad - (\nabla w \cdot \nabla \rho_\star) \Delta w + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \rho_\star |\nabla w|^2 + \text{Hess}(w) : \nabla w \otimes \nabla \rho_\star. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain after a few integrations by parts on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta (\rho_\star |\nabla w|^2) dx &= 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla w \cdot \nabla (\rho_\star \Delta w) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta w)^2 \rho_\star dx, \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta \rho_\star |\nabla w|^2 dx &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{Hess}(w) : \nabla w \otimes \nabla \rho_\star dx = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves that

$$(20) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{Hess}(w)|^2 \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta w)^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla w \cdot \nabla \rho_\star) \Delta w dx.$$

We deduce from

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla w \cdot \nabla \rho_\star) \Delta w \, dx &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta w (\nabla w \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta w)^2 \rho_\star \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w)^2 \rho_\star \, dx \end{aligned}$$

that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{Hess}(w)|^2 \rho_\star \, dx = \frac{3}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta w)^2 \rho_\star \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w)^2 \rho_\star \, dx.$$

Since  $\nabla \rho_\star = -\nabla W_\star \rho_\star$  and  $\Delta w \rho_\star = \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w) + (\nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w) \rho_\star$ , we have the estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta w)^2 \rho_\star \, dx \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{\rho_\star} |\nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w)|^2 \, dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w)^2 \rho_\star \, dx,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.6. The scalar product.** Let us define the measure  $d\mu := f_\star(x, v) \, dx \, dv$  and consider the functional space

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ h \in L^1 \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, d\mu) : \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h \, d\mu = 0 \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_h|^2 \, dx < \infty \right\},$$

where we use the notation  $\rho_h = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star \, dv$  and  $\psi_h = (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_h$ . We also define

$$\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h_1 h_2 \, d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{h_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_{h_2} \, dx \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $M > 0$ . If  $V$  satisfies (V1)–(V2), then  $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$  is a Hilbert space for any dimension  $d \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Up to an integration by parts, we can rewrite  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle$  as

$$\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h_1 h_2 \, d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\Delta \psi_{h_1}) \psi_{h_2} \, dx = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h_1 h_2 \, d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \psi_{h_1} \cdot \nabla \psi_{h_2} \, dx$$

and observe that this determines a scalar product. This computation has to be justified. Let us distinguish three cases depending on the dimension  $d$ .

Let us assume first that  $d \geq 3$ . We know that  $\psi_\star = G_d \ast \rho_\star$  is nonnegative and deduce that  $\rho_\star$  is bounded because

$$0 \leq e^{-V-\psi_\star} \leq e^{-V} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Hence, for any  $p \in (1, 2]$ , we have

$$\|\rho_h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star \, dv \right|^p \, dx \leq \|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{p-1} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |h|^p \, d\mu.$$

According to [44], we know by the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\rho_1(x)| |\rho_2(x)|}{|x-y|^{d-a}} \, dx \, dy \leq \mathcal{C}_{\text{HLS}} \|\rho_1\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\rho_2\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

if  $a \in (0, d)$  and  $p, q \in (1, +\infty)$  are such that  $1 + \frac{a}{d} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q}$ . This justifies the fact that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_h \, dx$  is well defined if  $h \in L^1 \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, d\mu)$ . With  $a = 2$ ,  $p < 3/2$  if  $d = 3$ ,  $p < 2$  if  $d = 4$  and  $p \leq 2$  if  $d \geq 5$ , we deduce that  $\psi_h \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  where  $q' = q/(q-1) = d p / (d - 2 p)$ . A simple Hölder estimate shows the Gagliardo-Nirenberg type estimate

$$\|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \leq \|\Delta \psi\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\psi\|_{L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

and proves for an appropriate choice of  $(p_1, q_1) \in (1, 2) \times (2, +\infty)$  with  $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_1} = 1$  that  $\nabla\psi_h$  is bounded in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

The case  $d = 2$  is well known. The boundedness of  $\|\rho_h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$  for any  $p \in (1, 2]$  follows by the same argument as in the case  $d \geq 3$  and we learn that  $|\rho_h| \log|\rho_h|$  is integrable by log-Hölder interpolation. The boundedness from below of  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_h (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_h$  is then a consequence of the logarithmic Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, see [17, 23]. Using the fact that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h dx = 0$ , we also know from [8] that  $\nabla\psi_h$  is bounded in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ .

When  $d = 1$ , the nonnegativity of the scalar product is a consequence of (14) and holds without additional condition by a simple density argument.  $\square$

The condition  $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h d\mu = 0$  in the definition of  $h$  is simply an orthogonality condition with the constant functions, with respect to the usual scalar product in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, d\mu)$ . By taking the completion of smooth compactly supported functions with zero average with respect to the norm defined by  $h \mapsto \langle h, h \rangle$ , we recover  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is therefore a Hilbert space. In the next sections, we shall denote by  $\|\cdot\|$  the norm on  $\mathcal{H}$  associated with the scalar product so that

$$\|h\|^2 = \langle h, h \rangle \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

#### 4. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In this section, we prove Theorem 1. Our task is to check that the assumptions of Section 2 hold in the functional setting of Section 3.

**4.1. Definitions and elementary properties.** On the space  $\mathcal{H}$ , let us consider the transport and the collision operators respectively defined by

$$(21) \quad \mathbb{T}h := v \cdot \nabla_x h - \nabla_x W_\star \cdot \nabla_v h + v \cdot \nabla_x \psi_h, \quad \mathbb{L}h := \Delta_v h - v \cdot \nabla_v h$$

where  $\nabla_x W_\star = \nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi_\star$ . In the literature,  $\mathbb{L}$  is known as the *Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator*.

**Lemma 14.** *With the above notation,  $\mathbb{L}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  are respectively self-adjoint and anti-self-adjoint.*

*Proof.* If  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are two functions in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{M} dv)$ , then  $\mathbb{L}$  is such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}h_1) h_2 \mathcal{M} dv = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_v h_1 \cdot \nabla_v h_2 \mathcal{M} dv$$

and as a special case corresponding to  $h_1 = h$ ,  $h_2 = 1$ , we find that  $\rho_{\mathbb{L}h} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{L}h) f_\star dv = 0$  and also  $\psi_{\mathbb{L}h} = 0$  for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . As a straightforward consequence, we have that

$$\langle (\mathbb{L}h_1), h_2 \rangle = - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_v h_1 \cdot \nabla_v h_2 d\mu = \langle h_1, (\mathbb{L}h_2) \rangle \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Concerning the transport operator, we know that that  $\mathbb{T}f_\star = 0$ . Hence an integration by parts shows that

$$\langle (\mathbb{T}h_1), h_2 \rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (v \cdot \nabla_x h_1 - \nabla_x W_\star \cdot \nabla_v h_1) h_2 d\mu = - \langle h_1, (\mathbb{T}h_2) \rangle \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$$

because  $\rho_{\mathbb{T}h} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\mathbb{T}h) f_\star dv = \nabla_x \psi_h \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f_\star dv = 0$  and  $\psi_{\mathbb{T}h} = 0$  for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Microscopic coercivity.** By the Gaussian Poincaré inequality, we know that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_v g|^2 \mathcal{M} dv \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g - \Pi g|^2 \mathcal{M} dv \quad \forall g \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{M} dv),$$

where  $\Pi g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g \mathcal{M} dv$  denotes the average of  $g$  with respect to the Gaussian probability measure  $\mathcal{M} dv$ . By extension, we shall consider  $\Pi$  as an operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  and observe that

$$\Pi h = u_h := \frac{\rho_h}{\rho_\star} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dv}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_\star dv} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h \mathcal{M} dv \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Let us notice first that  $\Pi$  is an orthogonal projector.

**Lemma 15.**  $\Pi$  is a self-adjoint operator and  $\Pi \circ \Pi = \Pi$ .

*Proof.* It is straightforward to check that

$$(\Pi \circ \Pi) h = \Pi u_h = u_h, \quad \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (\Pi h_1) h_2 d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_{h_1} u_{h_2} \rho_\star dx$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\Pi h_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_{h_2} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{h_1} (-\Delta)^{-1} \rho_{h_2} dx$$

because  $\rho_{h_1} = \rho_\star u_{h_1} = \rho_\star u_{\Pi h_1} = \rho_{\Pi h_1}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 16.** *Microscopic coercivity (H1) holds with  $\lambda_m = 1$ .*

*Proof.* We already know that  $-\langle (Lh), h \rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_v h|^2 d\mu$  and  $\rho_{h-\Pi h} = \rho_h - \rho_{\Pi h} = 0$  so that

$$\|h - \Pi h\|^2 = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |h - \Pi h|^2 d\mu.$$

The conclusion is then a straightforward consequence of the Gaussian Poincaré inequality.  $\square$

**4.3. Macroscopic coercivity.**

**Lemma 17.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2), (V3a) and (V4) hold. With the notations of Lemma 6, macroscopic coercivity (H2) holds with  $\lambda_M = \mathcal{C}_\star$ .*

*Proof.* Using  $\mathbb{T}\Pi h = v \cdot (\nabla_x u_h + \nabla_x \psi_h)$ ,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v \cdot e)^2 \mathcal{M} dv = 1$  for any given  $e \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$  and (16), we find that

$$M \|\mathbb{T}\Pi h\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x u_h + \nabla_x \psi_h|^2 \rho_\star dx \geq \mathcal{C}_\star \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_h + \psi_h|^2 \rho_\star dx - \frac{1}{M} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_h \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \right]$$

because  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h dx = 0$ . We know from Lemma 13 that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h \psi_h \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h \psi_h dx \geq 0$  and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get that

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_h \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \leq M \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_h|^2 \rho_\star dx.$$

Altogether, we collect these estimates into

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla_x u_h + \nabla_x \psi_h|^2 \rho_\star dx \geq \mathcal{C}_\star \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_h|^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_h \psi_h dx \right] = \mathcal{C}_\star M \|u_h\|^2,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$



#### 4.4. Parabolic macroscopic dynamics.

**Lemma 18.** *The transport operator  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfies the parabolic macroscopic dynamics (H3).*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{T}\Pi h = v \cdot (\nabla_x u_h + \nabla_x \psi_h)$ , we obtain that

$$\Pi \mathbb{T} \Pi h = (\nabla_x u_h + \nabla_x \psi_h) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f_\star dv = 0.$$

□

**4.5. Bounded auxiliary operators.** The point is to prove that (H4) holds, *i.e.*, that for any  $F \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|$  and  $\|\mathbb{A}LF\|$  are bounded up to a constant by  $\|(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|$ . This is the purpose of Lemma 19 and Lemma 20. The two quantities,  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(\text{Id} - \Pi)F\|$  and  $\|\mathbb{A}LF\|$ , are needed to control the bad terms in the expression of  $D_\delta$ , in the abstract formulation of Proposition 4, namely  $\langle \mathbb{T}AF, F \rangle$ ,  $\langle \mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(\text{Id} - \Pi)F, F \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathbb{A}LF, F \rangle$  (which have no definite sign), by the two good terms,  $-\langle LF, F \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}\Pi F, F \rangle$  (which are both positive).

**Lemma 19.** *The operators  $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{A}L$  satisfy: for all  $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, d\mu)$*

$$\|\mathbb{A}Lh\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(1 - \Pi)h\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}h\| \leq \|(1 - \Pi)h\|.$$

*Proof.* If we denote the flux by  $j_h := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v h f_\star dv$ , we remark that  $j_{Lh} = -j_h$  and

$$\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}h = \nabla \cdot j_h - (\nabla_x V + \nabla \phi_\star) \cdot j_h.$$

Since  $\mathbb{A}h = g$  means  $g + (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*(\mathbb{T}\Pi)g = (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*h = -\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}h$ , this implies that

$$\mathbb{A}Lh = -\mathbb{A}h.$$

The same computation as for (12) shows that  $\|\mathbb{A}Lh\|^2 = \|\mathbb{A}h\|^2 = \|g\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \|(1 - \Pi)h\|^2$  and  $\|\mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}h\| = \|\mathbb{T}\Pi g\| \leq \|(1 - \Pi)h\|$ , which completes the proof. □

**Lemma 20.** *Assume that  $d \geq 1$  and consider  $V$  such that (V1), (V2), (V3b), (V4), (V5), (V6), (V7) and (V8) hold. There exists a constant  $\mathcal{C} > 0$  such that*

$$\|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(1 - \Pi)h\| \leq \mathcal{C} \|(1 - \Pi)h\| \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

*Proof.* In order to get an estimate of  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(1 - \Pi)h\|$ , we will compute  $\|(\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(1 - \Pi))^*h\|$ .

*Step 1: Reformulation of the inequality as an elliptic regularity estimate.* We claim that

$$(22) \quad \|(\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(1 - \Pi))^*h\|^2 = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |(\mathbb{A}\mathbb{T}(1 - \Pi))^*h|^2 d\mu \leq 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{Hess}(w_g)|^2 \rho_\star dx,$$

where  $w_g := u_g + \psi_g$  and  $-\Delta \psi_g = \rho_g$  is computed in terms of the solution  $g$  of (23).

Let  $u_h = \Pi h$  and  $w_h := u_h + \psi_h$ . We observe that  $\mathbb{T}\Pi h = v \cdot \nabla_x w_h$ ,  $\rho_{\mathbb{T}\Pi h} = 0$  and, as a consequence

$$(\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*(\mathbb{T}\Pi)h = -\mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}(\mathbb{T}\Pi h) = -\Delta w_h + \nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w_h = -e^{W_\star} \nabla (e^{W_\star} \nabla w_h)$$

where  $W_\star = V + \phi_\star$  is such that  $\rho_\star = e^{-W_\star}$ . For any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , the function

$$g = (1 + (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*(\mathbb{T}\Pi))^{-1}h$$

is obtained by solving the elliptic equation

$$(23) \quad g - \Delta w_g + \nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla w_g = h$$

and we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{AT}(1-\Pi))^* h &= -(1-\Pi)\text{TA}^* h = -(1-\Pi)\text{T}(\text{T}\Pi)(1+(\text{T}\Pi)^*(\text{T}\Pi))^{-1} h \\ &= -(1-\Pi)\text{T}(\text{T}\Pi)g = -(1-\Pi)(v \otimes v : \text{Hess}(w_g)) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Hess}(w) = (\nabla \otimes \nabla)w$  denotes the Hessian of  $w$ . Hence, with  $|\text{Hess}(w)|^2 = \text{Hess}(w) : \text{Hess}(w)$ , we obtain (22). A bound on  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{Hess}(w_g)|^2 \rho_\star dx$  will now be obtained by elliptic regularity estimates based on (23).

*Step 2: Some  $H^1$ -type estimates.* By integrating (23) against  $\mathcal{M}(v) dv$ , we notice that

$$(24) \quad u_g - \frac{1}{\rho_\star} \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g) = u_h$$

so that

$$(25) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h \rho_\star dx = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} h d\mu = 0.$$

If we multiply (24) by  $w_g \rho_\star$  and integrate over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we get after an integration by parts that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g (u_g + \psi_g) \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h (u_g + \psi_g) \rho_\star dx.$$

Using  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g \psi_g \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 dx$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h \psi_g \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \psi_h \cdot \nabla \psi_g dx$  on the one hand, and the elementary estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h u_g \rho_\star dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|u_g|^2 + |u_h|^2) \rho_\star dx, \\ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \psi_h \cdot \nabla \psi_g dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla \psi_h|^2 + |\nabla \psi_g|^2) dx, \end{aligned}$$

on the other hand, we obtain that

$$(26) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \|\Pi h\|^2$$

where

$$\|\Pi h\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_h|^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_h|^2 dx.$$

Using  $|\nabla u_g|^2 = |\nabla w_g - \nabla \psi_g|^2 \leq 2(|\nabla w_g|^2 + |\nabla \psi_g|^2)$ , we deduce from (26) that

$$(27) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w_g|^2 \rho_\star dx + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \mathcal{K} \|\Pi h\|^2$$

with  $\mathcal{K} = 1 + 2 \|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)}$ .

*Step 3: Weighted Poincaré inequalities and weighted  $H^1$ -type estimates.* The solution  $u_g$  of (24) has zero average according to (25). We deduce from Corollary 7 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \geq \mathcal{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx,$$

from which we get that

$$(28) \quad X_1^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \frac{\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{C}} \|\Pi h\|^2.$$

Next, we look for a similar estimate for  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx$ . The potential  $\psi_g$  has generically a non-zero average  $\bar{\psi}_g := \frac{1}{M} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g \rho_\star dx$  which can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} M^2 |\bar{\psi}_g|^2 &= \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g \rho_\star dx \right)^2 = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g (-\Delta \phi_\star) dx \right)^2 = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (-\Delta \psi_g) \phi_\star dx \right)^2 \\ &= \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g \phi_\star \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \kappa_1 \|\Pi h\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

with  $\kappa_1 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx$ , using (26). Since  $\nabla \rho_\star = -\nabla W_\star \rho_\star$ , we also have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g \nabla W_\star \cdot \nabla \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\psi_g \Delta W_\star + \nabla \psi_g \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star dx$$

and, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^2 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta W_\star)^2 \rho_\star dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 dx \|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6 applied to  $\psi_g - \bar{\psi}_g$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}_\star \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 dx + \mathcal{E}_\star |\bar{\psi}_g|^2,$$

and (26), we conclude that

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \leq \kappa_2 \|\Pi h\|^2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_2 &:= \left( \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}_\star} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta W_\star)^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \right) \|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)} \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_\star^2 \rho_\star dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\Delta W_\star)^2 \rho_\star dx. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Corollary 7 to  $\psi_g - \bar{\psi}_g$ , we deduce from

$$\mathcal{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_g - \bar{\psi}_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 \rho_\star dx$$

that

$$\mathcal{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 \rho_\star dx + 2\mathcal{E} \bar{\psi}_g \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_g \rho_\star |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx.$$

Hence

$$(29) \quad X_2^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \left( \frac{\|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)}}{\mathcal{E}} + 2 \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}}{M} \right) \|\Pi h\|^2.$$

Now we use (28) and (29) to estimate the weighted  $H^1$ -type quantity

$$X^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx.$$

Let us multiply (24) by  $u_g |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star$  and integrate by parts in order to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla u_g \cdot \nabla \psi_g) |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g \nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2) (\nabla u_g + \nabla \psi_g) \rho_\star dx \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h u_g |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 10 and Lemma 11, we obtain that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g \nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2) \nabla u_g \rho_\star dx \right| \leq \Lambda_\circ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g| |\nabla W_\star|^2 |\nabla u_g| \rho_\star dx \leq \Lambda_\circ X_1 X$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla u_g \cdot \nabla \psi_g) |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \kappa_3 X \|\Pi h\|. \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_g \nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2) \nabla \psi_g \rho_\star dx \leq \kappa_4 X_1 \|\Pi h\|. \end{aligned}$$

with  $\kappa_3 := \|\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)}^{1/2}$  and  $\kappa_4 := \left\| \nabla (|\nabla W_\star|^2) \rho_\star \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)}^{1/2}$ , because we know from (26) that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla \psi_g|^2 dx \leq \|\Pi h\|^2$ . Using Corollary 8, we obtain that

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h u_g |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_h|^2 \rho_\star dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^4 \rho_\star dx \leq \|\Pi h\|^2 \frac{X^2}{\mathcal{C}_\circ}.$$

Summarizing, we have shown that

$$X_1^2 + X^2 - \kappa_3 X \|\Pi h\| - \Lambda_\circ X_1 X - \kappa_4 X_1 \|\Pi h\| \leq X \frac{\|\Pi h\|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\circ}}.$$

Since  $X_1^2$  and  $X_2^2$  are bounded by  $\|\Pi h\|^2$ , we conclude that

$$(30) \quad X^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \kappa \|\Pi h\|^2$$

for some  $\kappa > 0$ , which has an explicit form in terms quantities involving  $\rho_\star$  and its derivatives, as well as all constants in the inequalities of Sections 3.3 and 3.4.

*Step 4: Second order estimates.* After multiplying (24) by  $\nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{\rho_\star} |\nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_h - u_g) \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g) dx \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_h \sqrt{\rho_\star} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_\star}} \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla u_g \cdot \nabla w_g \rho_\star dx \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( |u_h|^2 \rho_\star + \frac{1}{\rho_\star} |\nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g)|^2 \right) dx \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\nabla u_g|^2 + |\nabla w_g|^2) \rho_\star dx \end{aligned}$$

and after using (26) and (27), we obtain that

$$(31) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{\rho_\star} |\nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g)|^2 dx \leq \left( \mathcal{K} + \frac{3}{2} \right) \|\Pi h\|^2.$$

Let  $Y = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star)^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^{1/2}$ . After multiplying (24) by  $(\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star$ , we have that

$$Y^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta w_g (\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_h - u_g) (\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star dx.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we know that the right-hand side can be estimated by  $Y \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^{1/2} + Y \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_h|^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^{1/2} \leq 2Y \|\Pi h\|$  according to (26) and obtain that

$$Y^2 - 2Y \|\Pi h\| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta w_g (\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star dx.$$

Let us notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta w_g (\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star) \rho_\star dx &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta w_g \nabla w_g \cdot \nabla \rho_\star dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \text{Hess}(\rho_\star) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta \rho_\star \text{Id} \right) : \nabla w_g \otimes \nabla w_g dx. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, by Lemma 9 and (26), we arrive at

$$Y^2 - 2Y \|\Pi h\| \leq \frac{\Lambda_\star}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla w_g|^2 |\nabla W_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx = \frac{\Lambda_\star}{2} X^2$$

where  $X^2$  is the quantity that has been estimated in Step 4. Altogether, after taking (30) into account and with  $\lambda = \kappa \Lambda_\star / 2$ , this proves that

$$(32) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla w_g \cdot \nabla W_\star)^2 \rho_\star dx \leq \left( \sqrt{1 + \lambda} - 1 \right)^2 \|\Pi h\|^2.$$

*Step 5: Conclusion of the proof.* We read from Lemma 12, (22) and (31)-(32) that

$$\|(\text{AT}(1 - \Pi))^* h\|^2 \leq 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{Hess}(w_g)|^2 \rho_\star dx \leq 3 \left( 3 \left( \mathcal{K} + \frac{3}{2} \right) + \frac{7}{2} \left( \sqrt{1 + \lambda} - 1 \right)^2 \right) \|\Pi h\|^2,$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 20.  $\square$

**4.6. Proof of Theorem 1.** The reader is invited to check that the potential  $V(x) = |x|^\alpha$  satisfies the assumptions (V1), (V2), (V3b), (V4), (V5), (V6), (V7) and (V8) if  $\alpha > 1$ . The result is then a straightforward consequence of Proposition 4 and Lemmas 14-20. A slightly more general result goes as follows.

**Theorem 21.** *Let us assume that  $d \geq 1$  and  $M > 0$ . If  $V$  satisfies the assumptions (V1), (V2), (V3b), (V4), (V5), (V6), (V7) and (V8), then there exist two constants  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\lambda$  such that any solution  $h$  of (1) with a nonnegative initial datum  $h_0$  with  $\|h_0\|^2 < \infty$  is such that*

$$\|h(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \mathcal{C} \|h_0\|^2 e^{-\lambda t} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

## 5. UNIFORM ESTIMATES IN THE DIFFUSION LIMIT

The hypocoercivity method of [25, 26] is directly inspired by the drift-diffusion limit, as it relies on a micro/macro decomposition in which the relaxation in the velocity direction is given by the microscopic coercivity property (H1) while the relaxation in the position direction arises from the macroscopic coercivity property (H2) which governs the relaxation of the solution of the drift-diffusion equation obtained as a limit.

**5.1. Formal macroscopic limit.** Let us start with a formal analysis in the framework of Section 2, when (8) is replaced by the scaled evolution equation

$$(33) \quad \varepsilon \frac{dF}{dt} + \mathbb{T}F = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{L}F$$

on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . We assume that a solution  $F_\varepsilon$  of (33) can be expanded as

$$F_\varepsilon = F_0 + \varepsilon F_1 + \varepsilon^2 F_2 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)$$

in the asymptotic regime corresponding to  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$  and, at formal level, that (33) can be solved order by order:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-1}: \quad & \mathbb{L}F_0 = 0, \\ \varepsilon^0: \quad & \mathbb{T}F_0 = \mathbb{L}F_1, \\ \varepsilon^1: \quad & \frac{dF_0}{dt} + \mathbb{T}F_1 = \mathbb{L}F_2. \end{aligned}$$

The first equation reads as  $F_0 = \Pi F_0$ , that is,  $F_0$  is in the kernel of  $\mathbb{L}$ . Assume for simplicity that  $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{T}\Pi) = -\mathbb{L}$ , so that the second equation is simply solved by  $F_1 = -(\mathbb{T}\Pi)F_0$ . Let us consider the projection on the kernel of the  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^1)$  equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\Pi F_0) - \Pi \mathbb{T}(\mathbb{T}\Pi)F_0 = \Pi \mathbb{L}F_2 = 0.$$

If we denote by  $u$  the quantity  $F_0 = \Pi F_0$  and use (H3), then  $-(\Pi \mathbb{T})(\mathbb{T}\Pi) = (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*(\mathbb{T}\Pi)$  and the equation becomes

$$\partial_t u + (\mathbb{T}\Pi)^*(\mathbb{T}\Pi)u = 0,$$

which is our *drift-diffusion* limit equation. Notice that if  $u$  solves this equation, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|^2 = -2 \|(\mathbb{T}\Pi)u\|^2 \leq -2 \lambda_M \|u\|^2$$

according to (H2). This program applies in the case of the scaled evolution equation (4). Let us give a few additional details.

Let us assume that a solution  $h_\varepsilon$  of (4) can be expanded as  $h_\varepsilon = h_0 + \varepsilon h_1 + \varepsilon^2 h_2 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)$ , in the asymptotic regime as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$ . Solving (4) order by order in  $\varepsilon$ , we find the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-2}: \quad & \Delta_v h_0 - v \cdot \nabla_v h_0 = 0, \\ \varepsilon^0: \quad & v \cdot \nabla_x h_0 - \nabla_x W_\star \cdot \nabla_v h_0 + v \cdot \nabla_x \psi h_0 = \Delta_v h_1 - v \cdot \nabla_v h_1, \\ \varepsilon^1: \quad & \partial_t h_0 + v \cdot \nabla_x h_1 - \nabla_x W_\star \cdot \nabla_v h_1 = \Delta_v h_2 - v \cdot \nabla_v h_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define  $u = \Pi h_0$ ,  $\psi = \psi_{h_0}$  such that  $-\Delta \psi = u \rho_\star$ ,  $w = u + \psi$  and observe that the first two equations simply mean

$$u = h_0, \quad v \cdot \nabla_x w = \Delta_v h_1 - v \cdot \nabla_v h_1,$$

from which we deduce that  $h_1 = -v \cdot \nabla_x w$ . After projecting with  $\Pi$ , the third equation is

$$\partial_t u - \Delta w + \nabla_x W_\star \cdot \nabla u = 0,$$

using  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v \otimes v \mathcal{M}(v) dv = \text{Id}$ . If we define  $\rho = u \rho_\star$ , we have formally obtained that it solves

$$\partial_t \rho = \Delta \rho + \nabla \cdot \left( \rho (\nabla_x V + \nabla_x \phi_\star) \right) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla \psi), \quad -\Delta \psi = \rho.$$

At this point, we can notice that the solution  $\rho$  converges to  $\rho_\star$  according to the results of, e.g., [42], at an exponential rate which is independent of  $\varepsilon$ .

**5.2. Hypocoercivity.** Let us adapt the computations of Section 2 to the case  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  as in [14]. If  $F$  solves (33), then

$$-\varepsilon \frac{d}{dt} H_\delta[F] = D_{\delta, \varepsilon}[F],$$

$$D_{\delta, \varepsilon}[F] := -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle LF, F \rangle + \delta \langle A \Gamma \Pi F, F \rangle - \delta \langle \Gamma A F, F \rangle + \delta \langle A \Gamma (\text{Id} - \Pi) F, F \rangle - \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \langle A L F, F \rangle.$$

The estimates are therefore exactly the same as in Proposition 4, up to the replacement of  $\lambda_m$  by  $\lambda_m/\varepsilon$  and  $C_M$  by  $C_M/\varepsilon$ . Hence, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, we have that

$$\delta(\varepsilon) := \min \left\{ 2, \frac{\lambda_m}{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon \lambda_\star(\varepsilon) \right\} = \frac{4 \lambda_m \lambda_M \varepsilon}{4 \lambda_M \varepsilon^2 + C_M^2 (1 + \lambda_M)}.$$

We may notice that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+} \frac{\delta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} = 2\zeta$  with

$$\zeta := \frac{2 \lambda_m \lambda_M}{C_M^2 (1 + \lambda_M)}$$

and, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough,

$$\frac{2 - \zeta \varepsilon}{4} \|F\|^2 \leq H_{\zeta \varepsilon}[F] \leq \frac{2 + \zeta \varepsilon}{4} \|F\|^2 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{H}.$$

By revisiting the proof of Proposition 4, we find that with  $\delta = \zeta \varepsilon$  and  $\lambda = \eta \varepsilon$  with

$$\eta := \frac{\lambda_m \lambda_M^2}{C_M^2 (1 + \lambda_M)^2},$$

the quadratic form

$$(X, Y) \mapsto \left( \frac{\lambda_m}{\varepsilon} - \delta \right) X^2 + \frac{\delta \lambda_M}{1 + \lambda_M} Y^2 - \delta \frac{C_M}{\varepsilon} X Y - \frac{\lambda}{2} (X^2 + Y^2) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \delta X Y$$

is nonnegative quadratic form for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough. In the regime as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$ , the result of Proposition 4 can be adapted as follows.

**Corollary 22.** *Assume that (H1)–(H4) hold and take  $\zeta$  as above. Then for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough,*

$$\eta \varepsilon H_{\zeta \varepsilon}[F] \leq D_{\zeta \varepsilon, \varepsilon}[F] \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{H}.$$

*Proof.* The range for which the quadratic form is negative is given by the condition

$$\lambda_m^2 K^4 \varepsilon^4 + K C_M^3 (4 K \lambda_m + 3 C_M (K + 4)) \varepsilon^2 - 2 C_M^6 < 0.$$

Further details are left to the reader. □

As an easy consequence, if  $F_\varepsilon$  solves (33), we have that

$$H_{\zeta \varepsilon}[F(t, \cdot)] \leq H_{\zeta \varepsilon}[F(0, \cdot)] e^{-\eta t} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* With the abstract result on (33) applied to (4), the estimate (11) applies with  $\delta = \zeta \varepsilon$ . Hence the conclusion holds with  $\lambda = \eta$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  which can be chosen arbitrarily close to 4 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0_+$ . □

6. THE NONLINEAR SYSTEM IN DIMENSION  $d = 1$ 

With the notation (21), we can rewrite the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system (VPFP) as

$$\partial_t h + Th = Lh + Q[h], \quad -\Delta_x \psi_h = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h f_\star dv, \quad \text{with } Q[h] := \nabla_x \psi_h \cdot \nabla_v h.$$

Here we assume that  $d = 1$  and prove Corollary 3. Using the representation (13) and  $\iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} h f_\star dx dv = 0$ , we know that

$$\psi'_h(x) = - \int_{-\infty}^x u_h \rho_\star dx \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Lemma 23.** *Assume  $V$  satisfies (V1) and (V2) and let  $\rho_\star \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be the solution of (7) such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_\star dx = M$ . Let  $f = (1 + h) f_\star \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} f \log(f/f_\star) dx dv < \infty$ . Under the assumption  $\iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} h f_\star dx dv = 0$ ,  $\psi'_h$  as defined above satisfies the estimate*

$$\|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq 4M \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} f \log\left(\frac{f}{f_\star}\right) dx dv.$$

Additionally, under the assumptions of Corollary 3, if  $h$  solves (VPFP), then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|\psi'_h(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = 0.$$

*Proof.* We deduce from Jensen's inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f \log\left(\frac{f}{\mathcal{M}}\right) dv \geq \rho_h \log \rho_h$$

that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} f \log\left(\frac{f}{f_\star}\right) dx dv \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_h \log\left(\frac{\rho_h}{\rho_\star}\right) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + u_h) \log(1 + u_h) \rho_\star dx$$

and get according to [20, 41, 50] from the Csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequality that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + u_h) \log(1 + u_h) \rho_\star dx \geq \frac{1}{4M} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_h| \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \geq \frac{\|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^2}{4M}.$$

Concerning the evolution problem (VPFP), we recall that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} f \log\left(\frac{f}{f_\star}\right) dx dv + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_h|^2 dx \right) = - \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} f \left| \nabla_v \log\left(\frac{f}{f_\star}\right) \right|^2 dx dv,$$

as noticed in [13], shows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} f(t, x, v) \log\left(\frac{f(t, x, v)}{f_\star(x, v)}\right) dx dv = 0$ , which concludes the proof of Lemma 23.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 3.* With the notations of Section 3.6 and the functional  $H_\delta$  defined as in the linear case by

$$H_\delta[h] := \frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 + \delta \langle Ah, h \rangle,$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} H_\delta[h] + \langle Lh, h \rangle - \delta \langle AT\Pi h, h \rangle + \delta \langle TA h, h \rangle - \delta \langle AT(\text{Id} - \Pi)h, h \rangle + \delta \langle ALh, h \rangle \\ = \langle Q[h], h \rangle + \delta \langle AQ[h], h \rangle + \delta \langle Q[h], Ah \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let us give an estimate of the three terms of the right hand side.

1) In order to estimate

$$\langle Q[h], h \rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} (\psi'_h \partial_v h) h f_\star dx dv + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi'_h \rho_\star \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_v h \mathcal{M} dv \right) \psi_h dx,$$



we notice that  $\iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_v h|^2 f_\star dx dv = -\langle Lh, h \rangle$  and  $(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_v h \mathcal{M} dv)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\partial_v h|^2 \mathcal{M} dv$ . Simple Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities show that

$$|\langle Q[h], h \rangle| \leq \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} |\langle Lh, h \rangle|^{1/2} \left[ \|h\| + \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_h|^2 \rho_\star dx \right)^{1/2} \right].$$

Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_h \rho_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_h (-\phi_\star)'' dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (-\psi_h)'' \phi_\star dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_h \phi_\star \rho_\star dx,$$

we deduce from Lemma 6 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_h|^2 \rho_\star dx &\leq \mathcal{C}_\star^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_h|^2 \rho_\star dx + \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_h \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}{\mathcal{C}_\star} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_h|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_h|^2 \rho_\star dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\phi_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \end{aligned}$$

and finally that

$$|\langle Q[h], h \rangle| \leq \kappa \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} |\langle Lh, h \rangle|^{1/2} \|\Pi h\|$$

with

$$\kappa = 1 + \max \left\{ \|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \mathcal{C}_\star^{-1}, \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\phi_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \right\}.$$

2) Let us consider  $g = Ah = u_g$  given by

$$u_g - \frac{1}{\rho_\star} \nabla \cdot (\rho_\star \nabla w_g) = -\frac{1}{\rho_\star} \nabla \cdot j_h \quad \text{with} \quad j_h := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v h f_\star dv.$$

With  $\psi_g$  such that  $-\psi_g'' = u_g \rho_\star$ , we have to estimate

$$\langle Q[h], Ah \rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} (\psi'_h \partial_v h) u_g f_\star dx dv + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi'_h \rho_\star \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_v h \mathcal{M} dv \right) \psi_g dx.$$

Exactly as above, we have on the one hand that

$$\left| \iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} (\psi'_h \partial_v h) u_g f_\star dx dv \right| \leq \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \|g\| \|h\| \leq \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)h\| \|h\|$$

because  $\|Ah\| \leq \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)h\|$ , and on the other hand that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_g|^2 \rho_\star dx &\leq \mathcal{C}_\star^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_g|^2 \rho_\star dx + \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_g \rho_\star dx \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\|\rho_\star\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}{\mathcal{C}_\star} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_g|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_g|^2 \rho_\star dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\phi_\star|^2 \rho_\star dx \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 6 again, from which we conclude that

$$|\langle Q[h], Ah \rangle| \leq \kappa \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} |\langle Lh, h \rangle|^{1/2} \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)h\|.$$

3) With  $g$  given in terms of  $h$  by (23),  $A^*h = v w'_g$  and we learn from (26) that  $\|A^*h\| \leq \|\Pi h\|$ . Hence

$$|\langle AQ[h], h \rangle| = |\langle Q[h], A^*h \rangle| \leq \kappa \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} |\langle Lh, h \rangle|^{1/2} \|\Pi h\|.$$

Summing up all these estimates, we obtain as in the proof of Proposition 4 that

$$\frac{d}{dt} H_\delta[h] \leq -\lambda H_\delta[h]$$

for the largest value of  $\lambda$  for which

$$(X, Y) \mapsto (\lambda_m - \delta) X^2 + \frac{\delta \lambda_M}{1 + \lambda_M} Y^2 - \delta C_M X Y - \frac{\lambda}{2} (X^2 + Y^2) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \delta X Y - \epsilon X (X + 2 Y)$$

is a nonnegative quadratic form, as a function of  $(X, Y)$ . Here  $X := \|(\text{Id} - \Pi)h\|$ ,  $Y := \|\Pi h\|$ , and

$$\epsilon := \kappa \|\psi'_h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$$

can be taken as small as we wish, if we assume that  $t > 0$  is large enough. This completes the proof of Corollary 3.  $\square$

Let us conclude this section by a couple of remarks.

(i) It is clear from the proof of Corollary 3 that the optimal rate is as close as desired of the optimal rate in the linearized problem (1) obtained in Theorem 1. Up to a change of the constant  $\mathcal{C}$ , we can actually establish that these rates are equal because we read from the above proof that  $\epsilon(t) = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda t})$  and the result follows from a simple ODE argument. This is a standard observation in entropy methods, which has been used on many occasions: see for instance [7].

(ii) Corollary 3 is written for  $V(x) = |x|^\alpha$  but it is clear that it can be extended to the setting of Theorem 21. Similarly, the reader is invited to check that our estimates are compatible with the diffusion limit, as in Section 5.

**Acknowledgment:** This work has been partially supported by the Project EFI (ANR-17-CE40-0030) of the French National Research Agency (ANR) and by the research unit *Dynamical systems and their applications* (UR17ES21), Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Tunisia.

©2019 by the authors. This paper may be reproduced, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. ARNOLD AND J. ERB, *Sharp entropy decay for hypocoercive and non-symmetric Fokker-Planck equations with linear drift*, arXiv:1409.5425, (2014).
- [2] A. ARNOLD, P. MARKOWICH, G. TOSCANI, AND A. UNTERREITER, *On convex Sobolev inequalities and the rate of convergence to equilibrium for Fokker-Planck type equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 26 (2001), pp. 43–100.
- [3] N. BEN ABDALLAH, F. MÉHATS, AND N. VAUCHELET, *A note on the long time behavior for the drift-diffusion-Poisson system*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 339 (2004), pp. 683–688.
- [4] N. BEN ABDALLAH AND M. L. TAYEB, *Diffusion approximation for the one dimensional Boltzmann-Poisson system*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 4 (2004), pp. 1129–1142.
- [5] P. BILER AND J. DOLBEAULT, *Long time behavior of solutions of Nernst-Planck and Debye-Hückel drift-diffusion systems*, Ann. Henri Poincaré, 1 (2000), pp. 461–472.
- [6] J. A. BITTENCOURT, *Fundamentals of plasma physics*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1986.
- [7] A. BLANCHET, M. BONFORTE, J. DOLBEAULT, G. GRILLO, AND J. L. VÁZQUEZ, *Asymptotics of the fast diffusion equation via entropy estimates*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 191 (2009), pp. 347–385.
- [8] A. BLANCHET, J. DOLBEAULT, AND B. PERTHAME, *Two-dimensional Keller-Segel model: optimal critical mass and qualitative properties of the solutions*, Electron. J. Differential Equations, (2006), pp. No. 44, 32.
- [9] M. BONFORTE, J. DOLBEAULT, G. GRILLO, AND J. L. VÁZQUEZ, *Sharp rates of decay of solutions to the nonlinear fast diffusion equation via functional inequalities*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 107 (2010), pp. 16459–16464.
- [10] R. BOSI, J. DOLBEAULT, AND M. J. ESTEBAN, *Estimates for the optimal constants in multipolar Hardy inequalities for Schrödinger and Dirac operators*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal., 7 (2008), pp. 533–562.
- [11] F. BOUCHUT, *Existence and uniqueness of a global smooth solution for the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system in three dimensions*, J. Funct. Anal., 111 (1993), pp. 239–258.

- [12] F. BOUCHUT, *Smoothing effect for the non-linear Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system*, J. Differential Equations, 122 (1995), pp. 225–238.
- [13] F. BOUCHUT AND J. DOLBEAULT, *On long time asymptotics of the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation and of the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system with Coulombic and Newtonian potentials*, Differential Integral Equations, 8 (1995), pp. 487–514.
- [14] E. BOUIN, J. DOLBEAULT, S. MISCHLER, C. MOUHOT, AND C. SCHMEISER, *Hypocoercivity without confinement*, to appear in Pure and Applied Analysis, arXiv:1708.06180, (2017).
- [15] E. BOUIN, J. DOLBEAULT, S. MISCHLER, C. MOUHOT, AND C. SCHMEISER, *Two examples of accurate hypocoercivity estimates based on a mode-by-mode analysis in Fourier space*, In preparation, (2019).
- [16] J. F. CAMPOS AND J. DOLBEAULT, *Asymptotic estimates for the parabolic-elliptic Keller-Segel model in the plane*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 39 (2014), pp. 806–841.
- [17] E. CARLEN AND M. LOSS, *Competing symmetries, the logarithmic HLS inequality and Onofri's inequality on  $\mathbb{S}^n$* , Geom. Funct. Anal., 2 (1992), pp. 90–104.
- [18] J. A. CARRILLO, J. SOLER, AND J. L. VÁZQUEZ, *Asymptotic behaviour and self-similarity for the three-dimensional Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system*, J. Funct. Anal., 141 (1996), pp. 99–132.
- [19] S. CHANDRASEKHAR, *Brownian motion, dynamical friction, and stellar dynamics*, Rev. Modern Physics, 21 (1949), pp. 383–388.
- [20] I. CSISZÁR, *Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar., 2 (1967), pp. 299–318.
- [21] J. DOLBEAULT, *Stationary states in plasma physics: Maxwellian solutions of the Vlasov-Poisson system*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 1 (1991), pp. 183–208.
- [22] ———, *Free energy and solutions of the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system: external potential and confinement (large time behavior and steady states)*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 78 (1999), pp. 121–157.
- [23] J. DOLBEAULT AND X. LI, *Generalized logarithmic Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality*. hal-02281279 and arXiv:1909.03667, August 2019.
- [24] J. DOLBEAULT, P. MARKOWICH, D. ÖLZ, AND C. SCHMEISER, *Non linear diffusions as limit of kinetic equations with relaxation collision kernels*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 186 (2007), pp. 133–158.
- [25] J. DOLBEAULT, C. MOUHOT, AND C. SCHMEISER, *Hypocoercivity for kinetic equations with linear relaxation terms*, Comptes Rendus Mathématique, 347 (2009), pp. 511 – 516.
- [26] ———, *Hypocoercivity for linear kinetic equations conserving mass*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 367 (2015), pp. 3807–3828.
- [27] J. DOLBEAULT AND G. TOSCANI, *Fast diffusion equations: matching large time asymptotics by relative entropy methods*, Kinetic and Related Models, 4 (2011), pp. 701–716.
- [28] K. DRESSLER, *Steady states in plasma physics – the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., 12 (1990), pp. 471–487.
- [29] J.-P. ECKMANN AND M. HAIRER, *Spectral properties of hypoelliptic operators*, Comm. Math. Phys., 235 (2003), pp. 233–253.
- [30] N. EL GHANI AND N. MASMOUDI, *Diffusion limit of the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system*, Commun. Math. Sci., 8 (2010), pp. 463–479.
- [31] D. GOGNY AND P.-L. LIONS, *Sur les états d'équilibre pour les densités électroniques dans les plasmas*, RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér., 23 (1989), pp. 137–153.
- [32] T. GOUDON, *Hydrodynamic limit for the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system: analysis of the two-dimensional case*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 15 (2005), pp. 737–752.
- [33] F. HÉRAU, *Hypocoercivity and exponential time decay for the linear inhomogeneous relaxation Boltzmann equation*, Asymptot. Anal., 46 (2006), pp. 349–359.
- [34] ———, *Short and long time behavior of the Fokker-Planck equation in a confining potential and applications*, J. Funct. Anal., 244 (2007), pp. 95–118.
- [35] F. HÉRAU AND F. NIER, *Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 171 (2004), pp. 151–218.
- [36] F. HÉRAU AND L. THOMANN, *On global existence and trend to the equilibrium for the Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck system with exterior confining potential*, J. Funct. Anal., 271 (2016), pp. 1301–1340.
- [37] M. HERDA AND L. M. RODRIGUES, *Large-time behavior of solutions to Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck equations: from evanescent collisions to diffusive limit*, J. Stat. Phys., 170 (2018), pp. 895–931.
- [38] L. HÖRMANDER, *Hypoelliptic second order differential equations*, Acta Math., 119 (1967), pp. 147–171.

- [39] A. M. IL' IN AND R. Z. HAS' MINSKIĬ, *On the equations of Brownian motion*, Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen., 9 (1964), pp. 466–491.
- [40] A. KOLMOGOROFF, *Zufällige Bewegungen (zur Theorie der Brownschen Bewegung)*, Ann. of Math. (2), 35 (1934), pp. 116–117.
- [41] S. KULLBACK, *On the convergence of discrimination information*, IEEE Trans. Information Theory, IT-14 (1968), pp. 765–766.
- [42] X. LI, *Asymptotic behavior of Nernst-Planck equation*. In preparation, 2019.
- [43] ———, *Flocking: phase transition and asymptotic behaviour*, hal-02143985 and arXiv:1906.07517, (2019).
- [44] E. H. LIEB, *Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities*, Ann. of Math. (2), 118 (1983), pp. 349–374.
- [45] N. MASMOUDI AND M. L. TAYEB, *Diffusion limit of a semiconductor Boltzmann-Poisson system*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 38 (2007), pp. 1788–1807.
- [46] J. D. MORGAN, III, *Schrödinger operators whose potentials have separated singularities*, J. Operator Theory, 1 (1979), pp. 109–115.
- [47] C. MOUHOT AND L. NEUMANN, *Quantitative perturbative study of convergence to equilibrium for collisional kinetic models in the torus*, Nonlinearity, 19 (2006), p. 969.
- [48] H. NEUNZERT, M. PULVIRENTI, AND L. TRIOLO, *On the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., 6 (1984), pp. 527–538.
- [49] A. PERSSON, *Bounds for the discrete part of the spectrum of a semi-bounded Schrödinger operator*, Math. Scand., 8 (1960), pp. 143–153.
- [50] M. S. PINSKER, *Information and information stability of random variables and processes*, Translated and edited by Amiel Feinstein, Holden-Day Inc., San Francisco, Calif., 1964.
- [51] F. POUPAUD, *Diffusion approximation of the linear semiconductor Boltzmann equation: analysis of boundary layers*, Asymptotic Anal., 4 (1991), pp. 293–317.
- [52] F. POUPAUD AND J. SOLER, *Parabolic limit and stability of the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck system*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 10 (2000), pp. 1027–1045.
- [53] B. SIMON, *Semiclassical analysis of low lying eigenvalues. I. Nondegenerate minima: asymptotic expansions*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. A (N.S.), 38 (1983), pp. 295–308.
- [54] M. L. TAYEB, *Homogenized diffusion limit of a Vlasov-Poisson-Fokker-Planck model*, Ann. Henri Poincaré, 17 (2016), pp. 2529–2553.
- [55] H. D. VICTORY, JR. AND B. P. O'DWYER, *On classical solutions of Vlasov-Poisson Fokker-Planck systems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 39 (1990), pp. 105–156.
- [56] C. VILLANI, *Hypocoercive diffusion operators*, in International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. III, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 473–498.
- [57] C. VILLANI, *Hypocoercivity*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 202 (2009), pp. iv+141.

---

L. Addala: Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences of Bizerte,  
University of Carthage, 7021 Zarzouna, Banzart, Tunisia.

E-mail: [lanoiraddala@gmail.com](mailto:lanoiraddala@gmail.com)

J. Dolbeault: CEREMADE (CNRS UMR n° 7534), PSL research university,  
Université Paris-Dauphine, Place de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris 16, France.

E-mail: [dolbeaul@ceremade.dauphine.fr](mailto:dolbeaul@ceremade.dauphine.fr)

X. Li: CEREMADE (CNRS UMR n° 7534), PSL research university,  
Université Paris-Dauphine, Place de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris 16, France.

E-mail: [li@ceremade.dauphine.fr](mailto:li@ceremade.dauphine.fr)

M.L. Tayeb: Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences of Tunis,  
University of Tunis El Manar, 2092 El-Manar, Tunisia.

E-mail: [lazhar.tayeb@fst.rnu.tn](mailto:lazhar.tayeb@fst.rnu.tn)