HAL open science

Quasi-stationary distribution for strongly Feller Markov processes by Lyapunov functions and applications to hypoelliptic Hamiltonian systems

Arnaud Guillin , Liming Wu, Boris Nectoux

▶ **To cite this version:**

Arnaud Guillin , Liming Wu, Boris Nectoux . Quasi-stationary distribution for strongly Feller Markov processes by Lyapunov functions and applications to hypoelliptic Hamiltonian systems. Journal of the European Mathematical Society, In press. hal-03068461v2

HAL Id: hal-03068461

https://hal.science/hal-03068461v2

Submitted on 4 Jul 2023

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.

QUASI-STATIONARY DISTRIBUTION FOR STRONGLY FELLER MARKOV PROCESSES BY LYAPUNOV FUNCTIONS AND APPLICATIONS TO HYPOELLIPTIC HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS

ARNAUD GUILLIN[†], **BORIS NECTOUX**[†], AND **LIMING WU**[†]

Abstract. In this paper, we establish a general result for the existence and the uniqueness of the quasi-stationary distribution $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ of a strongly Feller Markov process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ killed when it exits a domain $\mathcal{D}$, under some Lyapunov function condition. Our result covers the case of hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems. Our method is based on the characterization of the essential spectral radius by means of Lyapunov functions and measures of non-compactness.

AMS 2010 Subject classifications. 74A25, 37A60, 60B10, 60F99, 60J25, 60J60, 37A30.

Key words and Phrases. Quasi-stationary distribution, strong Feller property, Lyapunov functions, essential spectral radius, hypoelliptic diffusions.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Setting and literature.** The notion of quasi-stationary distribution is a central object in the study of population processes or more generally of models derived from biological systems, see for instance [24, 60, 25, 14, 17, 22] and references therein. More recently, the notion of quasi-stationary distribution has attracted a lot of attention in the mathematical justification of the very efficient accelerated dynamics algorithms [71, 81, 80, 64] (see also [65, 66]) which are widely used in practice and aim at simulating the atomistic evolution of statistical systems over long time scales (by accelerating the sampling of the exit event from a metastable macroscopic state $\mathcal{D}$). Let us be more precise on this. A typical process used in simulation in statistical physics to model the evolution of the positions of the particles of a system is a (stochastic) hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems $((x_t, v_t), t \geq 0)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (see (6.1)), where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ gathers the positions of the particles of the system and $v_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ their velocities at time $t \geq 0$, ($d = 3\mathsf{N}$, N being the number of particles). In most applications of the algorithms mentioned above, the macroscopic state is associated with a subdomain $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ of the form $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where O is a subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The set O is defined in practice as a neighborhood (bounded or not) of some local minimum of the potential energy function $V : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ (the interatomic potential function), where the process $(x_t, t \geq 0)$ can spend a huge amount of time before leaving it [1] (in this case,

Date: July 4, 2023.

[1]Because of the presence of energetic barriers.

$\mathcal{D}$ is called a metastable region). For such domains $\mathcal{D}$, it is thus expected that the conditional distribution of (x_t, v_t) before leaving $\mathcal{D}$ is close to a local equilibrium inside $\mathcal{D}$. This local equilibrium inside $\mathcal{D}$ is described by a quasi-stationary distribution (see (2.3)). The exit event from $\mathcal{D}$ can thus be studied starting from this quasi-stationary distribution [51, 29, 2, 56] which is at the heart of the mathematical analysis of the accelerated dynamics algorithms mentioned above (see [53, 29, 31, 52, 30, 2] when the considered process is the overdamped Langevin process, an elliptic diffusion).

The existence of a quasi-stationary distribution (as well as its uniqueness) for hypoelliptic processes is therefore of important interest in Molecular Dynamics. This question is an open problem (as mentioned e.g. in [51, 56]) that we answer in this work in our main result Theorem 6.9. More precisely Theorem 6.9 provides existence and uniqueness of a quasi-stationary distribution for hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems (6.1) on domains $\mathcal{D}$ of the form $\mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. It also provides the exponential convergence of the law at time t of the conditioned process towards this quasi-stationary distribution.

The method we develop in this work allows to deal with hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems with coefficients which are only continuous. In addition, the damping coefficient can be unbounded and the position state space O is not necessarily bounded. The latter is of practical interest for the following reason. In many applications of the accelerated algorithms mentioned above, O is defined as the basin of attraction of a local minimum of the potential function V for the dynamics $\dot{x} = -\nabla V(x)$. In many situations, these basins of attraction are unbounded.

Quasi-stationary distributions for hypoelliptic diffusions have also been studied at the same time in [55, 68] for the Langevin dynamics with $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ coefficients, constant damping coefficient, and bounded position state space O. Hypoelliptic diffusions killed at the boundary of a subdomain D of $\mathbb{R}^m$ have also been studied at the same time in [8] when D is bounded and satisfies a noncharacteristic boundary condition, and the coefficients of the diffusions are smooth and satisfies some Hörmander conditions. None of these conditions are satisfied when $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and for the processes considered in Theorem 6.9. Let us also mention that non conservative force fields are also considered in [55], and the approach developed in [8] allows to deal with some non strong Feller processes.

Many different criteria have been given to ensure the existence and uniqueness of a quasi-stationary distribution for different Markov processes, see [18, 38, 19, 42, 21, 67, 49, 72, 74, 86, 44, 20] and [76, 3] (based on the R-theory for Markov chains [77, 78]). We also mention [43] for the study of existence of quasi-stationary distributions through the notion of quasi-compact operators in the case of discrete time Markov chains, see also [46, 39]. In particular, for elliptic diffusions killed when exiting a bounded subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^d$, the existence and uniqueness of a quasi-stationary distribution are well known, see for instance [45, 21, 18, 51, 67, 42]. When considering unbounded domains, it is known that it might exist many quasi-stationary distributions, see [57]. We also refer to [33, 32] for the study of quasi-stationary distributions on a finite state space (see also [23] when considering a discrete state space) and to [26, 79, 11, 37, 60], and

references therein, for the approximation of the quasi-stationary distribution using interacting particle system in different settings (see also [9, 10]).

We finally refer to [62] for a spectral study of the kinetic Fokker-Planck operator on $L^2(\mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ when O is bounded with several boundary conditions on $\partial\mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (see also [4, 47] and references therein).

1.2. **Purpose of this work.** We recall that the main result of this work is Theorem 6.9. It provides existence and uniqueness of a quasi-stationary distribution for hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems (6.1) on domains $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, as well as the exponential convergence of the law at time t of the conditioned process towards this quasi-stationary distribution.

Theorem 6.9 is based on the general result Theorem 2.2 which gives a general framework (see more precisely **(C1)**-**(C5)** in the next section) in which we can establish for general strong Feller Markov processes $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ valued in a Polish space $\mathcal{S}$:

(1) the existence of quasi-stationary distribution μ_D of the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ inside $\mathcal{D}$ (see (2.3) for definition);
(2) the uniqueness of a quasi-stationary distribution μ_D satisfying $\mu_D(\mathsf{W}^{1/p}) < +\infty$, where W is the Lyapunov functional appearing in **(C3)**;
(3) the exponential convergence of the conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_t \in \cdot | t < \sigma_D)$ towards μ_D, for any given initial distribution ν such that $\nu(\mathsf{W}^{1/p}) < +\infty$.

In particular, when the Lyapunov functional W is bounded (which is the case for instance when $\mathcal{S}$ is compact), the uniqueness of the quasi-stationary distribution holds (see more precisely (b) in Theorem 2.2 and the discussion after Theorem 2.2). Our conditions on the semigroup of the killed Markov processes are quite general for strongly Feller Markov processes. We build our argument upon the litterature on non-killed Markov processes, where Lyapunov type conditions have already been widely investigated these past few years, in particular to:

- Study the stability of differential equations with random right-hand side (since the pioneer works of Khasminskii, see the reference textbook [48]). We also refer to [1] where Lyapunov type conditions are used to characterize the stability of controlled diffusions or to obtain asymptotic flatness of controlled diffusions.
- Derive regularity estimates and upper bounds on the invariant measure, as it is done in [12, Chapter 7].
- To obtain the existence of a spectral gap for the associated Markov semigroup (see for example [34] in weighted spaces and [5] in L^2).

Note that the use of Lyapunov type conditions to study quasi-stationarity is also present in the recent works [45, 21, 18].

Then as explained, Theorem 2.2 is then applied to a wide range of hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems, this is the purpose of Theorem 6.9, for which the checking of the assumptions **(C1)**-**(C5)** of Theorem 2.2 requires some extra fine analysis.

Finally, we point out that Theorem 2.2 can also be used to prove existence and uniqueness of a quasi-stationary distribution for elliptic diffusion processes, for which the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 are much easier to check.

1.3. **Organization.** This paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the general framework and the main theoretical result Theorem 2.2 for the quasi-stationary distribution. To prove the main result, a first key point is the existence of the spectral gap for the semigroup of the killed Markov process. For obtaining it we will use the measures of non-weak-compactness of a positive kernel introduced in [84] to establish the formula of the essential spectral radius by means of the Lyapunov function for non killed Markov processes, which generalizes [84] from discrete time to continuous time case. The use of measures of non-compactness allows us to obtain the existence of a spectral gap for the semigroup of the killed Markov process. That is the content of Theorem 3.5 in Section 3.

The second key ingredient for the main result is a Perron-Frobenius type theorem (see Theorem 4.1) for a general Feller kernel. This is the purpose of Section 4.

With those preparations which should have independent interest, we prove the main result in Section 5. Finally the applications to hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems are developed in Section 6.

2. Main result

2.1. **Framework: notations and conditions.** Let $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ be a time homogeneous Markov process valued in a metric complete separable (say Polish) space $\mathcal{S}$, with càdlàg paths and satisfying the strong Markov property, defined on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, (\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}})_{x\in\mathcal{S}})$ where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_0 = \mathsf{x}) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$ (and where the filtration satisfies the usual condition). Its transition probability semigroup is denoted by $(P_t, t \geq 0)$. Given an initial distribution ν on $\mathcal{S}$, we write $\mathbb{P}_\nu(\cdot) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\cdot)\nu(d\mathsf{x})$. Under $\mathbb{P}_\nu$, the distribution of X_0 is ν.

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ be the Borel σ-algebra of $\mathcal{S}$, $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ the space of all bounded and Borel measurable functions f on $\mathcal{S}$ (its norm will be denoted by $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}) \mapsto \|f\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} = \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} |f(\mathsf{x})|$). The space $\mathbb{D}([0,T], \mathcal{S})$ of $\mathcal{S}$-valued càdlàg paths defined on $[0,T]$ is equipped with the Skorokhod topology.

We suppose that

- **(C1) (strong Feller property)** There exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for each $t \geq t_0$, P_t is strong Feller, i.e. $P_t f$ is continuous on $\mathcal{S}$ for any $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$.
- **(C2) (trajectory Feller property)** For every $T > 0$, $\mathsf{x} \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot)$ (the law of $X_{[0,T]} := (X_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$) is continuous from $\mathcal{S}$ to the space $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{D}([0,T], \mathcal{S}))$ of probability measures on $\mathbb{D}([0,T], \mathcal{S})$, equipped with the weak convergence topology.

Now let $\mathcal{D}$ be a nonempty open domain of $\mathcal{S}$, different from $\mathcal{S}$. Consider the first exit time of $\mathcal{D}$

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} := \inf\{t \geq 0, X_t \in \mathcal{D}^c\} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathcal{D}^c = \mathcal{S}\backslash\mathcal{D}$ is the complement of $\mathcal{D}$. The transition semigroup of the killed process $(X_t, 0 \leq t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}})$ is for $t \geq 0$ and $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f(\mathsf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}}[1_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}} f(X_t)], \tag{2.2}$$

for $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$. Let us now recall the definition of a quasi-stationary distribution.

Definition 2.1. *A quasi-stationary distribution (QSD in short) of the Markov process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ in the domain $\mathcal{D}$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{D}$ such that*

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(A) = \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(X_t \in A | t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(X_t \in A, t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}})}{\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}})}, \ \forall t > 0, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) := \big\{A \cap \mathcal{D}; A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})\big\}$.

2.2. **Main general result.** For a continuous time Markov process, often what is given is its generator $\mathcal{L}$, not its transition semigroup $(P_t, t \geq 0)$, which is unknown in general. We say that a continuous function f belongs to the extended domain $\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$ of $\mathcal{L}$, if there is some measurable function g on $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\int_0^t |g|(X_s)ds < +\infty, \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}} - a.e.$ for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$, and

$$M_t(f) := f(X_t) - f(X_0) - \int_0^t g(X_s)ds \tag{2.4}$$

is a $\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}$-local martingale for all x. Such a function g, denoted by $\mathcal{L}f$, is not unique in general. But it is unique up to the equivalence of *quasi-everywhere* (q.e.): two functions g_1, g_2 are said to be equal q.e., if $g_1 = g_2$ almost everywhere in the (resolvent) measure $R_1(\mathsf{x}, \cdot) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-t} P_t(\mathsf{x}, \cdot)dt$ for **every** $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Let us introduce the Lyapunov function condition:

(C3) (Lyapunov condition) *There exist a continuous function $\mathsf{W} : \mathcal{S} \to [1, +\infty[$, belonging to the extended domain $\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$, two sequences of positive constants (r_n) and (b_n) where $r_n \to +\infty$, and an increasing sequence of compact subsets (K_n) of $\mathcal{S}$, such that*

$$-\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x}) \geq r_n \mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x}) - b_n \mathbb{1}_{K_n}(\mathsf{x}), \ q.e,$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{K_n}$ is the indicator function of K_n.

We say that a class $\mathcal{A}$ of bounded continuous functions on $\mathcal{D}$ is *measure-separable*, if for any bounded (signed) measure ν on $\mathcal{D}$, if $\nu(f) = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\nu = 0$.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that* **(C1)**, **(C2)**, *and* **(C3)** *hold. Suppose that the killed process $(X_t, 0 \leq t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}})$ satisfies:*

(C4) (weak Feller property) *For $t \geq 0$, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is weakly Feller, i.e. for a measure-separable class $\mathcal{A}$ of continuous bounded functions f with support contained in $\mathcal{D}$, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f$ is continuous on $\mathcal{D}$.*

(C5) (topological irreducibility and almost sure extinction) *There exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq t_0$, for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and nonempty open subsets O of $\mathcal{D}$,*

$$P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, O) > 0$$

(we can assume this $t_0 > 0$ is the same as the one in **(C1)***), and there is some $\mathsf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} < +\infty) > 0$.*

Then, for any $p \in]1, +\infty[$ fixed:

(a) There is only one QSD $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}^p$ of the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ in $\mathcal{D}$ satisfying

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}^p(\mathsf{W}^{1/p}) := \int_{\mathcal{D}} \mathsf{W}^{1/p}(\mathsf{x}) \mu_{\mathcal{D}}^p(d\mathsf{x}) < +\infty. \tag{2.5}$$

(b) In particular if W *is bounded over* $\mathcal{D}$*, the QSD inside* $\mathcal{D}$ *is unique.*

(c) There exists $\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$ *(which is often called least Dirichlet eigenvalue of the killed Markov process) such that the spectral radius of* $P^{\mathcal{D}}_t$ *on* $b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ *equals to* $e^{-\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}}t}$ *for all* $t \geq 0$*. Furthermore,* $\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}P^{\mathcal{D}}_t = e^{-\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}}t}\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}$*, for all* $t \geq 0$*, and* $\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}(O) > 0$ *for all nonempty open subsets* O *of* $\mathcal{D}$*. In addition, there is a unique continuous function* φ^p *bounded by* $c\mathsf{W}^{1/p}$ *such that* $\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}(\varphi^p) = 1$ *and*

$$P^{\mathcal{D}}_t\varphi^p = e^{-\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}}t}\varphi^p \text{ on } \mathcal{D}, \forall t \geq 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, $\varphi^p > 0$ *everywhere on* $\mathcal{D}$*. Here* $b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ *is the Banach space of all* $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$*-measurable functions on* $\mathcal{D}$ *with norm*

$$\|f\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})} := \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{|f(\mathsf{x})|}{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}(\mathsf{x})} < +\infty.$$

(d) There are some constants $\delta > 0$ *and* $C \geq 1$ *such that for any initial distribution* ν *on* $\mathcal{D}$ *with* $\nu(\mathsf{W}^{1/p}) < +\infty$*,*

$$\left|\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_t \in A | t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}) - \mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}(A)\right| \leq Ce^{-\delta t}\frac{\nu(\mathsf{W}^{1/p})}{\nu(\varphi^p)}, \ \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}), t > 0. \tag{2.7}$$

(e) $\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} < +\infty) = 1$ *for every* $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$*,* $X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}$ *and* $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ *are* $\mathbb{P}_{\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}}$*-independent and*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}}(t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}) = e^{-\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}}t}.$$

Notice that the set of initial distributions ν on $\mathcal{D}$ with $\nu(\mathsf{W}^{1/p}) < +\infty$ includes any initial distribution ν with compact support in $\mathcal{D}$, and thus includes in particular Dirac measures δ_{x} ($\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$), which is for instance of interest to analyse the mathematical foundations of the accelerated algorithms we mentioned in the introduction[2]. In addition, choosing $\nu = \delta_{\mathsf{x}}$ in (2.7) ($\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$) for each $p > 1$, one deduces that $\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}}$ is actually independent of $p > 1$ (and then also $\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}}$), i.e. for any $p, q > 1$, $\mu^p_{\mathcal{D}} = \mu^q_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\lambda^p_{\mathcal{D}} = \lambda^q_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Theorem 2.2 is applied in Section 6 to hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems, see (6.1) and Theorem 6.9. Let us mention that under the assumptions of Theorem 2.2, from Corollary 3.6 and (5.3), for each $t > 2t_0$ (see **(C1)**):

$$P^{\mathcal{D}}_t : b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) \to b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) \text{ is compact.}$$

Remark 2.3. From Definition (2.3), $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a QSD if and only if

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}P^{\mathcal{D}}_t = \lambda(t)\mu_{\mathcal{D}}, \ \lambda(t) = \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}})$$

in other words, $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ must be a common positive left-eigenvector of $P^{\mathcal{D}}_t$. The part (c) above says that $\lambda(t) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}t}$ is exactly the spectral radius of $P^{\mathcal{D}}_t$ on $b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$.

We now discuss the assumptions **(C1)** and **(C3)**, and the uniqueness of the QSD in the whole space of measures on $\mathcal{D}$.

On assumption (C1). As already explained, a key point in the proof of Theorem 2.2 is the existence of the spectral gap for the semigroup of the killed Markov process. This

[2]Which is based on the comparison of the exit event from $\mathcal{D}$ when $X_0 = \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and when X_0 is distributed according to a quasi-stationary distribution of the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ in $\mathcal{D}$.

spectral gap is obtained using the formula (3.3) valid for a bounded nonnegative kernel P on $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying in particular the condition (see (3.1) and **(A1)**)

$$\exists N \geq 1,\ \beta_\tau(1_K P^N) = 0, \text{ for all compact subset } K \text{ of } \mathcal{S}. \tag{2.8}$$

This is where **(C1)** is used in this work (see Remark 3.3). Condition **(A1)** is not restricted to strong Feller kernels but they are cases where it is easier to check **(A1)**. We have decided to work with **(C1)** instead of (2.8) for ease of exposition and because most of the hypoelliptic processes we consider in Section 6 satisfy **(C1)**. We also mention that one advantage of the method based on the formula (3.3) is that it provides an explicit upper bound on the spectral radius (see Theorem 3.5). This can be used to derive a spectral gap when one has a sufficiently good lower bound on the spectral radius of the killed process, and we hope to develop this method for non strong Feller processes in future works.

On Assumption (C3). If we replace in **(C3)**, the assumption that $r_n \to +\infty$ as $n \to +\infty$ by $r_n \to r_\infty$ as $n \to +\infty$ with $r_\infty > \lambda_{\mathcal{D}}$, then all the statements of Theorem 2.2 remain valid. It is the condition used by [21]. Such a criterion is in practice quite hard to check since one does not know the Dirichlet eigenvalue $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}$. Note that **(C3)** is known to imply various functional inequalities, depending on the growth of r_n to infinity such as logarithmic Sobolev inequalities or various F-Sobolev type inequalities, see [6, 16, 15]. If r_n goes to infinity slowly one may show that the F-Sobolev inequalities implied by **(C3)** is weaker than ultracontractivity, condition which was behind the "coming down from infinity" property used in [14] for example.
Let us also comment on the other assumptions imposed in [21]. The authors introduce condition (F) which includes in particular the variant of **(C3)**, (F2) in their work, but also a local Harnack inequality (F3) which seems quite hard to verify in non elliptic case. We prefer to use our conditions **(C4)** and **(C5)**, easily verified for muldimensionnal elliptic diffusion processes thus recovering the extent of their results [21, Sect. 4.], but which will be also useful in hypoelliptic cases.

Let us also mention that Lyapunov type conditions to study quasi-stationary distributions has also been used before in [20]. The Lyapunov conditions in [20] imply uniqueness of the QSD, which does not hold in general assuming only **(C3)** (see indeed the next discussion). Note also that **(C3)** only involves the non killed process.

We finally mention that **(C3)** implies that $\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W} \leq b_n \mathsf{W}$, which causes that the quasi-stationary measure $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{W}^{1/p}) < \infty$, $p > 1$.

Uniqueness of the QSD in certain cases. We give two situations for which there will be a unique QSD of $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ in $\mathcal{D}$ (i.e. in the whole space of probability measures over $\mathcal{D}$).

- When in addition to **(C1)**→**(C5)** in Theorem 2.2, it holds for some $t > 0$ and some $p > 1$, $P_t(b_{\mathsf{W}^{1/p}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})) \subset b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$, then the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ has a unique QSD in $\mathcal{D}$.
- When **(C1)**, **(C2)**, **(C4)**, and **(C5)** hold, and $\mathcal{S}$ is compact, all the results of Theorem 2.2 are valid with $\mathsf{W} = 1$ there (indeed **(C3)** is always satisfied with $\mathsf{W} = 1$, $K_n = \mathcal{S}$, and $r_n = b_n = n$ for instance). Thus, in this case, item (b)

in Theorem 2.2 holds and item (d) in Theorem 2.2 is satisfied for any initial distribution ν in $\mathcal{D}$.

Without extra assumptions in Theorem 2.2, $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ does not have a unique QSD in $\mathcal{D}$. Indeed consider the Ornstein Uhlenbeck process $dX_t = -X_t dt + dB_t$ on $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}$ and with $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{R}^*_-$ (for which it is known that there are infinitely many QSD [57]). One can easily check with much easier arguments than those used in Section 6 (since this process is elliptic), that Theorem 2.2 is valid with $\mathsf{W}(x) = e^{\epsilon x^2/2}$ ($\epsilon \in (0,1)$). Theorem 2.2 allows us to catch its *minimal* QSD, namely $\nu_1 = 2xe^{-x^2}$, see [57] and references therein.

Remark 2.4. The key, like in the current literatures, consists in proving that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ has a spectral gap at its spectral radius $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}})$ acting on some Banach lattice space $\mathbb{B}$ of functions. We will work on $\mathbb{B} = b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ (introduced in Section 3.3 below), which are well adapted to our Lyapunov function condition **(C3)**. The problem is: $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is not strongly continuous on such Banach spaces, and the domain $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{B}}(L)$ of the generator L is not dense in $\mathbb{B}$. So we cannot use the spectral theory of strongly continuous semigroups in Functional Analysis. Let us finally mention [58] for an analytical study (using the notions of minimal positive solutions and *weak generator*) of some classes of non strongly continuous nor analytical Markov semigroups induced by some degenerate second-order operators on $\mathbb{R}^N$ (the case of unbounded domains is also considered there for uniformly elliptic second-order operators).

3. Essential spectral radius of P_t

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 3.5 which aims at giving a lower bound on the essential spectral radius of P_t, $t > 0$. To this end, we first recall a characterization of the essential spectral radius of a semigroup of transition kernels (see Theorem 3.4) obtained in [84].

3.1. **Essential spectral radius.** Let $\mathbb{B}$ be a real Banach lattice and P a nonnegative, linear and bounded operator on $\mathbb{B}$. A complex number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is said to be in the resolvent set $\rho(P)$ of P if the inverse $(\lambda I - P)^{-1}$ on the complexified Banach space $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathbb{B}$ exists and is bounded, by definition. The complementary $\sigma(P) := \mathbb{C}\backslash\rho(P)$ is the spectrum of P on $\mathbb{B}$. The spectral radius of P is given by Gelfand's formula

$$\mathsf{r}_{sp}(P|_{\mathbb{B}}) := \sup\left\{|\lambda|; \lambda \in \sigma(P)\right\} = \lim_{n\to+\infty}\left(\|P^n\|_{\mathbb{B}\to\mathbb{B}}\right)^{1/n}.$$

A complex number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ does not belong to the (Wolf) essential spectrum $\sigma_{ess}(P|_{\mathbb{B}})$ of $P|_{\mathbb{B}}$, iff $\lambda I - P$ is a Fredholm operator on the complexified Banach space $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathbb{B}$, by definition. For a point λ_0 in the spectrum $\sigma(P|_{\mathbb{B}})$, $\lambda_0 \notin \sigma_{ess}(P|_{\mathbb{B}})$ iff λ_0 is isolated in $\sigma(P|_{\mathbb{B}})$ and the associated eigen-projection

$$E_{\lambda_0} := \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma}(\lambda I - P)^{-1}d\lambda$$

(Dunford integral in the counter-clockwise way) is finite dimensional, where Γ is a circumference of sufficiently small radius: $|\lambda - \lambda_0| = \delta$ such that the disk $|\lambda - \lambda_0| \leq \delta$ contains no other spectral point than λ_0. Let us recall that by definition, the algebraic multiplicity of $\lambda_0 \notin \sigma_{ess}(P|_{\mathbb{B}})$ is the dimension of the range of E_{λ_0}. Let us finally

mention that since P is bounded, $\lambda_0 \notin \sigma_{ess}(P|_{\mathbb{B}})$ is a pole of the resolvent [85, Theorem 4 in §8 in Chap. VIII].

Definition 3.1. *The essential spectral radius of P on $\mathbb{B}$ is defined by*

$$\mathsf{r}_{ess}(P|_{\mathbb{B}}) = \sup\big\{|\lambda|;\ \lambda \in \sigma_{ess}(P|_{\mathbb{B}})\big\}.$$

3.2. **Two parameters of non weak compactness and the formulas of the essential spectral radius.** Our state space $\mathcal{S}$ is Polish with a compatible metric d (i.e., $(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{d})$ is complete and separable), whose Borel σ-field is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$. The notation "$K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$" means that K is compact in $\mathcal{S}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_b^+(\mathcal{S})$, $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{S})$) be the space of all σ-additive (resp. and nonnegative; probability) measures of bounded variation on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}))$. The pair relation between $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$ and $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ is

$$\langle \nu, f\rangle := \nu(f) := \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(\mathsf{x}) d\nu(\mathsf{x}).$$

Using the pair above, $\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$ is a subspace of the dual Banach space $(b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}))^*$. For a nonnegative kernel $P(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y})$, bounded on $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$, its adjoint operator P^* on $(b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}))^*$ keeps $\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$ stable, i.e., for each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$,

$$P^*\nu(\cdot) = (\nu P)(\cdot) := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \nu(d\mathsf{x}) P(\mathsf{x}, \cdot) \in \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S}).$$

Besides the variation norm $\|\nu\|_{TV}$-topology, we shall also consider the following two weak topologies on $\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$. The weak topology $\sigma(\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S}), b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}))$ (i.e., the weakest topology on $\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S})$ for which $\nu \mapsto \nu(f)$ is continuous for all $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$), according to the usual language, will be called *τ-topology*, denoted simply by τ. And the weak topology $\sigma(\mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S}))$ (the most often used *weak convergence* topology) will be denoted by w. The space $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ is the space of all functions $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ such that f is continuous on $\mathcal{S}$ (its norm is the one of $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ but we will sometimes write it $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$ when we want to emphasize that we work on $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$).

The following measures of non weak compactness of a positive (i.e. nonnegative and non-zero) kernel $P(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y})$ were introduced in the third author's [84].

Definition 3.2. *(a) For a bounded sub-family $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}_b^+(\mathcal{S})$, define*

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_w(\mathcal{M}) &:= \inf_{K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}} \nu(K^c) \\ \beta_\tau(\mathcal{M}) &:= \sup_{(A_n)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}} \nu(A_n) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\sup_{(A_n)}$ is taken over all sequences $(A_n)_n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ decreasing to $\emptyset$.

(b) Let $P(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y})$ be a nonnegative kernel on $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in E} P(\mathsf{x}, \mathcal{S}) = \|P1\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} < +\infty$ (i.e., the boundedness of kernel P). We call

$$\beta_w(P) := \beta_w(\mathcal{M});\quad \beta_\tau(P) := \beta_\tau(\mathcal{M}) \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \{P(\mathsf{x}, \cdot);\ \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}\}$, measure of non-$\tau$-compactness and measure of non-"w"-compactness of P, respectively.

Here and in the following, $\mathsf{1}$ will denote the constant function equal to 1 on $\mathcal{S}$. Introduce the following assumption

$$\beta_w(\mathsf{1}_K P) = 0 \text{ and } \exists N \geq 1 : \ \beta_\tau(\mathsf{1}_K P^N) = 0, \ \forall K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}. \qquad \textbf{(A1)}$$

Remark 3.3. If P is Feller and P^k is strong Feller on $\mathcal{S}$, i.e. $P^k(b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})) \subset \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$, then **(A1)** is satisfied with $N = k$.
In fact for any sequence $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$, $f_n(x) = P^k(x, A_n)$ is continuous and converges to zero for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$. In addition $f_{n+1}(\mathsf{x}) \leq f_n(\mathsf{x})$ for all n and $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$. Then, by Dini's monotone convergence theorem, for each $K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \mathsf{1}_K(\mathsf{x}) P^k(\mathsf{x}, A_n) = 0$. That yields $\beta_\tau(\mathsf{1}_K P^k) = 0$.
When P is Feller, the fact that $\beta_w(\mathsf{1}_K P) = 0$ for all $K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$ is proved similarly using Prokorov's theorem (see for instance [84, $(a.iii)$ in Lemma 3.1]).

Theorem 3.4. ([84, Theorem 3.5]) *Let P be a bounded nonnegative kernel on $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying* **(A1)**. *Then, it holds:*

$$\mathsf{r}_{ess}(P|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left[\beta_w(P^n)\right]^{1/n}. \tag{3.3}$$

3.3. **Lyapunov function criterion for the essential spectral radius of** $(P_t, t \geq 0)$**.** The main objective of this section is to apply the results of Theorem 3.4 to P_t, where we recall that $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ is the semigroup of the (non killed) process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$. Let us first introduce some notation. Given a continuous function $\mathsf{W} : \mathcal{S} \to [1, +\infty[$ (weight function), let

$$b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}) := \left\{ f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable such that } \ \|f\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} := \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{|f(\mathsf{x})|}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} < +\infty \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S}) = \left\{ f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}) \ \text{ such that } \ f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is continuous} \right\}$$

which are Banach spaces with norm $\|\cdot\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$. Notice that when $\mathsf{W} = 1$, $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}) = b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$, where $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ are introduced above. The space of measures

$$\mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S}) = \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S}) \ \text{ such that } \ \mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})\nu(d\mathsf{x}) \in \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{S}) \right\}$$

is a subspace of the dual Banach space $(b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}))^*$ by regarding each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ as a bounded linear form $f \to \nu(f)$ on $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$. We now turn to the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume* **(C1)** *and* ***(C2)***. *Assume that there is some continuous Lyapunov function $\mathsf{W} : \mathcal{S} \to [1, +\infty[$ such that for some $K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$, $r > 0$, and $b > 0$, it holds:*

$$-\frac{\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}} \geq r\mathsf{1}_{K^c} - b\mathsf{1}_K \tag{3.4}$$

and for some $p > 1$,

$$\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}^p \leq b\mathsf{W}^p. \tag{3.5}$$

Then for every $t > 0$,

$$\beta_w(P_{t,\mathsf{W}}) \leq e^{-rt} \quad \text{and in particular } \mathsf{r}_{ess}(P_t|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) \leq e^{-rt} \tag{3.6}$$

where for $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y} \in \mathcal{S}$*, we set*

$$P_{t,\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) = \frac{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{y})}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_t(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}). \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Let $t > 0$ be fixed. Consider the isomorphism $M_{\mathsf{W}} : f \to \mathsf{W}f$ from $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ to $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$. We have, for $t \geq 0$, $P_{t,\mathsf{W}} = M_{\mathsf{W}}^{-1} P_t M_{\mathsf{W}}$. Then

$$\mathsf{r}_{ess}(P_t|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{ess}(P_{t,\mathsf{W}}|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}).$$

Then, $(P_{t,\mathsf{W}}, t \geq 0)$ is again a semigroup of transition kernels, but it is not Markov in general.

Step 1. Let us check that $Q = P_{t,\mathsf{W}}$ satisfies **(A1)** for $t > 0$. At first, from (3.5), $(e^{-bt}\mathsf{W}^p(X_t), t \geq 0)$ is a supermartingale, and then for any $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$, $t \geq 0$,

$$P_t\mathsf{W}^p(\mathsf{x}) = e^{bt}\mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}}[e^{-bt}\mathsf{W}^p(X_t)] \leq e^{bt}\mathsf{W}^p(\mathsf{x}). \tag{3.8}$$

Therefore, for any compact $K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$, letting $q = p/(p-1)$, we have using in addition Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_w(\mathbf{1}_K Q) &= \inf_{K' \subset\subset \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\mathsf{x} \in K} Q(\mathsf{x}, \mathcal{S} \backslash K') \\
&\leq \inf_{K' \subset\subset \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\mathsf{x} \in K} \frac{\big((P_t\mathsf{W}^p)(\mathsf{x})\big)^{1/p}}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_t(\mathsf{x}, \mathcal{S} \backslash K')^{1/q} \\
&\leq e^{bt/p} \left(\inf_{K' \subset\subset \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\mathsf{x} \in K} P_t(\mathsf{x}, \mathcal{S} \backslash K') \right)^{1/q} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

by the Feller property of P_t (guaranteed by **(C2)**), see Remark 3.3.

Let us check the second condition in **(A1)** with some N so that $Nt \geq t_0$ (see **(C1)**).

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_\tau(\mathbf{1}_K Q^N) &= \sup_{(A_n)} \lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\mathsf{x} \in K} Q^N(\mathsf{x}, A_n) \\
&\leq \sup_{(A_n)} \lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\mathsf{x} \in K} \frac{\big((P_{Nt}\mathsf{W}^p)(\mathsf{x})\big)^{1/p}}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_{Nt}(\mathsf{x}, A_n)^{1/q} \\
&\leq e^{Nbt/p} \left(\sup_{(A_n)} \lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\mathsf{x} \in K} P_{Nt}(\mathsf{x}, A_n) \right)^{1/q}
\end{aligned}$$

where the sup above is taken over all sequences $(A_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ decreasing to $\emptyset$. The last factor above, being $\beta_\tau(\mathbf{1}_K P_{Nt})$, is equal to zero by the strong Feller property of P_{Nt} (see **(C1)**) and Remark 3.3.

Step 2. Let us prove $\beta_w(Q) \leq e^{-rt}$, which yields $\beta_w(Q^n) \leq \beta_w(Q)^n$ ([84, Proposition 3.2.(e)]) for all n and then the desired result by Theorem 3.4 (results that we can use since Q satisfies **(A1)**).

To prove that $\beta_w(Q) \leq e^{-rt}$, we introduce the first hitting time $\tau_K := \inf\{s \geq 0; X_s \in K\}$ to the compact K for the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$, where K is the compact set appearing

in the Lyapunov condition (3.4). We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_w(Q) &= \inf_{K'\subset\subset\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} Q(\mathsf{x},\mathcal{S}\backslash K') \\ &= \inf_{K'\subset\subset\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{X_t\notin K'}].\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Notice that for $\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{X_t\notin K'}] &\le \frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{X_t\notin K',\tau_K\le t}] + \frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\tau_K>t}] \\ &\le e^{bt/p}\left(\sup_{\mathsf{y}\in K}\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{y}}(\exists s\in[0,t], X_s\notin K')\right)^{1/q} + \frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\tau_K>t}]\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where the second inequality follows by Hölder's inequality and the strong Markov property of the process $(X_t, t\ge 0)$.

Let us first deal with the first term in the r.h.s. of (3.10). By condition **(C2)**, for any $\varepsilon>0$, there is some compact subset A_ε in $\mathbb{D}([0,t],\mathcal{S})$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathsf{y}\in K}\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{y}}\big(X_{[0,t]}\notin A_\varepsilon^c\big) < \varepsilon.$$

By the well known property of the Skorokhod topology ([36]), the set

$$B_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{s\in[0,t]}\{\gamma(s);\ \gamma\in A_\varepsilon\}$$

is relatively compact in $\mathcal{S}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{K'\subset\subset\mathcal{S}}\sup_{\mathsf{y}\in K}\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{y}}(\exists s\in[0,t], X_s\notin K') &\le \sup_{\mathsf{y}\in K}\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{y}}\big(\exists s\in[0,t], X_s\notin \overline{B_\varepsilon}\big) \\ &\le \sup_{\mathsf{y}\in K}\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{y}}(X_{[0,t]}\notin A_\varepsilon^c) < \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary, $\inf_{K'\subset\subset\mathcal{S}}\sup_{\mathsf{y}\in K}\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{y}}(\exists s\in[0,t], X_s\notin K')=0$. Substituting it into (3.10), we see from (3.9) that it remains to show that

$$\frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\tau_K>t}] \le e^{-rt},\ \forall \mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}. \tag{3.11}$$

This is the purpose of the next step.

Step 3. Let us deal with (3.11). To this end, introduce for $t\ge 0$,

$$M_t := \frac{\mathsf{W}(X_t)}{\mathsf{W}(X_0)}\exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}}(X_s)ds\right).$$

The key ingredient is the fact that $(M_t, t\ge 0)$ is a local $\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}$-martingale (for every x), by Ito's formula. Thus, $(M_t, t\ge 0)$ is then a supermartingale by Fatou's lemma. Then, by the Lyapunov condition (3.4),

$$e^{rt}\frac{1}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})}\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_t)\mathbf{1}_{\tau_K>t}] \le \mathbb{E}_x[M_t] \le M_0 = 1.$$

This is (3.11). Therefore, the proof of Theorem 3.5 is complete. □

Corollary 3.6. *Assume that* **(C1)**, **(C2)**, *and* **(C3)** *are satisfied. If* (3.5) *holds, then, for each* $t > 2t_0$ *(see* **(C1)***),* $P_t^{\mathcal{D}} : b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) \to b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ *is compact.*

Proof. From the first step of the proof of Theorem 3.5, $P_{t,\mathsf{W}}$ satisfies **(A1)** with N such that $Nt \geq t_0$. For $t \geq 0$, one has

$$P_{t,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{y})}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) \leq \frac{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{y})}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_t(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) = P_{t,\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}).$$

Let us show that for $t \geq t_0$, $P_{t,\mathsf{W}}$ is strongly Feller like P_t, i.e. for any $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$, $P_t(\mathsf{W}f)$ is continuous. Let us consider, for any $n \geq 1$, let

$$f_n := \frac{\mathsf{W} \wedge n}{\mathsf{W}} f.$$

Since $\mathsf{W}f_n$ is bounded, $P_t(\mathsf{W}f_n)$ is continuous by the strong Feller property of P_t (by **(C1)**). Now for any compact $K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$, it holds

$$\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left| P_t(\mathsf{W}f)(\mathsf{x}) - P_t(\mathsf{W}f_n)(\mathsf{x}) \right| \leq \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left[(P_t \mathsf{W}^p)(\mathsf{x}) \right]^{1/p} \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left[(P_t |f_n - f|^q)(\mathsf{x}) \right]^{1/q}.$$

We have for all n, $|f_n - f| \leq \|f\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$, and $|f_n - f| \downarrow 0$ pointwisely on $\mathcal{S}$. Since P_t is strongly Feller (by **(C1)**), the sequence of functions $h_n(\mathsf{x}) := (P_t|f_n - f|^q)(\mathsf{x})$ is continuous over $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, $h_n \downarrow 0$ pointwisely on $\mathcal{S}$. Consequently, by Dini's monotone convergence theorem, we then have

$$\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left(P_t|f_n - f|^q \right)(\mathsf{x}) \to 0.$$

Thus, for $t \geq t_0$, $P_t(\mathsf{W}f)$ is continuous, which implies that $P_{t,\mathsf{W}}$ is strongly Feller.

From Theorem 3.5 (with $r = r_n \to +\infty$ by **(C3)**), we obtain

$$\beta_w(P_{t,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}}) \leq \beta_w(P_{t,\mathsf{W}}) = 0, \text{ for each } t > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Because for each $t \geq t_0$, $P_{t,\mathsf{W}}$ is strongly Feller on $\mathcal{S}$, we have for all $K \subset\subset \mathcal{D}$:

$$\beta_\tau(\mathbf{1}_K P_{t,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}}) \leq \beta_\tau(\mathbf{1}_K P_{t,\mathsf{W}}) = 0, \text{ for each } t \geq t_0. \tag{3.13}$$

Therefore, by [84, (f) in Proposition 3.2], it holds for each $s > 0$:

$$\beta_\tau(P_{s+t_0,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}}) \leq \beta_w(P_{s,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}}) \beta_\tau(P_{t_0,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}}) = 0.$$

Finally, applying [84, (g) in Proposition 3.2], $P_{s+2t_0,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}} : b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) \to b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ is compact. This concludes the proof of Corollary 3.6. □

4. A Perron-Frobenius type theorem on $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}$

In this section, we present a version of Perron-Frobenius' theorem we will need for Feller kernels Q on $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ or $\mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$, which is of independent interest.

Theorem 4.1. *Let* $Q = Q(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y})$ *be a positive bounded kernel on* $\mathcal{S}$ *and* $\mathsf{W} \geq 1$ *a continuous weight function on* $\mathcal{S}$*. Assume that:*

(1) There exists $N_1 \geq 1$ *such that* Q^k *is Feller for all* $k \geq N_1$*, i.e.* $Q^k f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ *if* $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$*.*

(2) There exists $N_2 \geq 1$ such that for any $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ and nonempty open subset O of $\mathcal{S}$,

$$Q^{N_2}(\mathsf{x}, O) > 0.$$

(3) For some $p > 1$ and constant $C > 0$, it holds:

$$Q\mathsf{W}^p \leq C\mathsf{W}^p.$$

Notice that this implies that Q is well defined and bounded on $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$.

(4) Q has a spectral gap in $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$,

$$\mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) < \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}). \tag{4.1}$$

Then, there exist a unique couple (μ, φ) where μ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{S}$ with $\mu(\mathsf{W}) < +\infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ is positive everywhere on $\mathcal{S}$ with $\mu(\varphi) = 1$, and constants $r \in]0, 1[, C \geq 1$, such that

$$\mu Q = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{S}))\mu, \;\; Q\varphi = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})\varphi \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\Big\| \frac{1}{\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^n} Q^n f - \varphi\mu(f) \Big\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} \leq Cr^n \|f\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}, \;\; \forall f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}). \tag{4.3}$$

In particular

(a) If $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ satisfies for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu Q = \lambda\nu$ and $\nu(\varphi) \neq 0$, then $\lambda = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ and $\nu = c\mu$ for some constant c.

(b) If $f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ satisfies $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $Qf = \lambda f$ and $\mu(f) \neq 0$, then $\lambda = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ and $f = c\varphi$ for some constant c.

Remark 4.2. Let us mention that the standard Krein-Rutman theorem [35, Theorem 1.2] or its generalization [69, Theorem 7], with the natural choice of cone $K = \{\phi \in \mathbb{B}, \phi \geq 0\}$ (recall $\mathbb{B} = b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ which is endowed with the norm $\sup_{\mathcal{S}} |f|/\mathsf{W}$), do not apply here in general, for the following reason. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth bounded domain and $Q(\mathsf{x}, \cdot) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_1 \in \cdot, 1 < \sigma_{\mathcal{S}})$ where $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ is a standard (d-dimensional) Brownian motion. It is well-known that Q has a smooth (positive) density $q(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y})$ in $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{S}$, which moreover has a continuous extension to $\overline{\mathcal{S}} \times \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ which vanishes on $\partial(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S})$. Thus, if $u \in \mathbb{B}$ is an eigenfunction for Q on $\mathbb{B}$ associated with an eigenvalue $r > 0$, then $u = r^{-1}Qu$ has a continuous extension to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ which vanishes on $\partial\mathcal{S}$. Thus, $u \notin \mathrm{int}(K) = \{\phi \in \mathbb{B}, \exists c > 0 \text{ s.t. } \phi \geq c\}$ and therefore [69, (2) in Theorem 7] (see also [69, (2) in Theorem 1]) as well as [35, Theorem 1.2] cannot hold. Notice that one would naturally then want to work with $K_1 = \{\phi \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathcal{S}}), \phi \geq 0, \phi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{S}\}$, but K_1 has empty interior. Note also that Q satisfies (1)→(4).

We start the proof of Theorem 4.3 with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let Q be a bounded (resp. and Feller) kernel with $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = 1$. Then,*

(a) For any λ in the resolvent set $\rho(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ with $|\lambda| > \mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$,

$$R(\lambda) := (\lambda I - Q)^{-1}$$

is a bounded (resp. and Feller) kernel.

(b) If Q is Feller, $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$, and $\mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$.

Proof. **(a).** At first for $\lambda > \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$,

$$R(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{n+1}} Q^n$$

is a bounded (resp. Feller) kernel.

Now for any $\lambda \in \rho(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ with $|\lambda| > \mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$, there is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto \gamma(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\lambda = \gamma(1)$ and $\gamma(0) > \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ and such that $\mathrm{Ran}(\gamma) \subset \rho(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$. It is enough to show that there is some (common) $\delta > 0$ such that for any $t_0 \in [0,1]$ such that $R(\gamma(t_0))$ is a bounded (resp. Feller) kernel, so is $R(\gamma(t))$ once if $|t - t_0| < \delta$.

To this end, let $M = \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|R(\gamma(t))\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ which is finite (where $\|R(\gamma(t))\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ is the operator norm of $R(\gamma(t))$ on $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$). Let $t \in [0,1]$ such that $|t - t_0| \leq \frac{1}{2M(|\gamma'|_{L^\infty}+1)}$, so that $|\gamma(t_0) - \gamma(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2M}$. Then, for such t, we have

$$R(\gamma(t)) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} (\gamma(t_0) - \gamma(t))^n R(\gamma(t_0))^{n+1}$$

Thus $R(\gamma(t))$ is a bounded (resp. and Feller) kernel.

(b). The fact that $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ follows by Gelfand's formula for the spectral radius and the fact that $\|Q^n\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} = \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} Q^n(\mathsf{x}, \mathcal{S}) = \|Q^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$ (for all $n \geq 0$). The fact that the essential spectral radius of Q on $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ and on $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ is the same is proved in [84, Proposition 4.7]. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. The proof of Theorem 4.1 is divided into several steps.

Step 1: reduction to $\mathsf{W} = 1$.

Let us consider, for $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$

$$Q_{\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) := \frac{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{y})}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} Q(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}).$$

Since by Hölder's inequality (see also item (3) in Theorem 4.1), we have for $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$Q\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x}) \leq [Q1(\mathsf{x})]^{1/q} [Q\mathsf{W}^p(\mathsf{x})]^{1/p} \leq \|Q1\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}^{1/q} C^{1/p} \mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})$$

where $q = p/(p-1)$, we obtain that $Q_{\mathsf{W}}1 \leq \|Q1\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}^{1/q} C^{1/p}$, i.e. Q_{W} is a bounded positive kernel on $\mathcal{S}$.

Let us prove that Q_{W}^k is again Feller for $k \geq N_1$, that is, for any $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$, $Q^k(\mathsf{W}f)$ is continuous (notice that $\mathsf{W}f$ is continuous over $\mathcal{S}$ but not necessarily bounded on $\mathcal{S}$). To this end, let us introduce for any $n \geq 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$,

$$f_n := \frac{\mathsf{W} \wedge n}{\mathsf{W}} f.$$

The function $Q^k(\mathsf{W}f_n)$ is continuous by the Feller property of Q^k. Now for any compact $K \subset\subset \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left|Q^k(\mathsf{W}f)(\mathsf{x}) - Q^k(\mathsf{W}f_n)(\mathsf{x})\right| \leq \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left[(Q^k\mathsf{W}^p)(\mathsf{x})\right]^{1/p} \sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K} \left[(Q^k|f_n - f|^q)(\mathsf{x})\right]^{1/q}.$$

By assumption (3) in Theorem 4.1, $\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K}\left[(Q^k\mathsf{W}^p)(\mathsf{x})\right]^{1/p} \leq C^{k/p}\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K}\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})$. Since $|f_n - f| \leq \|f\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ and $f_n \to f$ uniformly over compacts on $\mathcal{S}$, by the tightness of $\{Q^k(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}); \mathsf{x}\in K\}$, we have

$$\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in K}\left(Q^k|f_n - f|^q\right)(\mathsf{x}) \to 0.$$

Thus $Q^k(\mathsf{W}f)$ is continuous.

Finally letting $M_{\mathsf{W}}f = \mathsf{W}f$ which is an isomorphism from $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ to $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$, we have $Q_{\mathsf{W}} = M_{\mathsf{W}}^{-1}QM_{\mathsf{W}}$, i.e. $Q|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ is similar to $Q_{\mathsf{W}}|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$. Hence for this theorem, it is enough to prove it for Q_{W} on $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ (note that it also satisfies Condition (2)).

From now on, we assume without loss of generality that $\mathsf{W} = 1$ and $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = 1$ (otherwise consider $Q/\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$).

Step 2: existence of positive eigenfunction and eigen probability measure.

The fact that $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ ($= 1$ by assumption) is in the spectrum of $Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ is well known (see [70, Chap.V, Proposition 4.1]). In addition, by condition (4), $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) \notin \sigma_{ess}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$. We recall (see Section 3.1) that this implies that $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$ is isolated in the spectrum of $Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$, its associated eigen-projection $E_{\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})}$ has finite rank, and is a pole of the resolvent of $Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$. We can thus use [70, Chap. V, Theorem 5.5 and its note] (cyclic property of the peripheral spectrum) to deduce that there exists $m \geq \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ such that

$$\text{for any } \lambda \in \sigma(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) \text{ with } |\lambda| = 1,\ \lambda^m = 1. \tag{4.4}$$

For such a m, we have:

(1) $\mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) < \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = 1$ (which follows from the fact that for all $k \geq 1$, $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^k|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{1/k} = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = 1$ and $\mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q^k|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{1/k} = \mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) < 1$).

(2) $1 = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q|^m_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) \in \sigma(Q|^m_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})$. In particular 1 is an isolated eigenvalue of Q^m and is a pole of the resolvent of $Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$.

(3) the peripheral spectrum of $Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ is reduced to $\{1\}$ (by (4.4) and the fact that $\sigma(Q^m) = \sigma(Q)^m$), that is:

$$\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}, |\lambda| = 1\right\} \cap \sigma(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = \{1\}.$$

Let $\Gamma := \left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}; |\lambda - 1| = \delta\right\}$ where $\delta > 0$ is such that

$$\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}; 0 < |\lambda - 1| \leq \delta\} \subset \rho(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) \cap \left\{\lambda, |\lambda| > \mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})\right\}. \tag{4.5}$$

Let us denote by

$$\Pi = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma (\lambda I - Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{-1} d\lambda. \tag{4.6}$$

Using the Riesz decomposition theorem, $Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} = Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}\Pi + Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}(I - \Pi)$ where $I - \Pi$ is the Riesz projector associated with the spectrum of $Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ in $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}, |\lambda| <$

1}, $\Pi(I-\Pi) = (I-\Pi)\Pi = 0$, $Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ commutes with both Π and $(I-\Pi)$, and $r_{sp}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}(I-\Pi)) < 1$, i.e:

$$\mathsf{r}_{sp}\big(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} - Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}\Pi|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}\big) < 1. \tag{4.7}$$

Notice that condition (2) still holds for all $k > N_2$. Indeed condition (2) implies that $Q(\mathsf{x},\cdot)$ is positive measure for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ (otherwise, if $Q(\mathsf{x}_1,\mathcal{S}) = 0$ for some x_1, then, $Q^{N_2}(\mathsf{x}_1,\mathcal{S}) = 0$, which contradicts condition (2) in Theorem 4.1). Consequently for any nonempty open subset O of $\mathcal{S}$ and for any $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$Q^k(\mathsf{x},O) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} Q^{N_2}(\mathsf{y},O)Q^{k-N_2}(\mathsf{x},d\mathsf{y}) > 0.$$

By applying [61, Theorem 4.1.4 and its note][3] to $Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$ there are some nonnegative $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ (with $\varphi \neq 0$) and some nonnegative $\psi \in (\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S}))^*$ (with $\psi \neq 0$) such that

$$Q^m\varphi = \varphi \ \text{ and } \ (Q^m)^*\psi = \psi.$$

By [84, Proposition 4.3], ψ is a positive bounded measure μ on $\mathcal{S}$. We may assume that μ is a probability measure. We claim that μ charges all nonempty open subsets O of $\mathcal{S}$. Indeed, as $\mu Q^m = (Q^m)^*\mu = \mu$,

$$\mu(O) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} Q^m(\mathsf{x},O)\mu(d\mathsf{x}) > 0$$

since $Q^m(\mathsf{x},O) > 0$ everywhere on $\mathcal{S}$, proved before.

In the same way, for any $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$, since $\varphi \neq 0$ is continuous, one has

$$\varphi(\mathsf{x}) = Q^m\varphi(\mathsf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \varphi(\mathsf{y})Q^m(\mathsf{x},d\mathsf{y}) > 0,$$

i.e. φ is everywhere positive on $\mathcal{S}$.

By considering $\varphi/\mu(\varphi)$ if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $\mu(\varphi) = 1$.

Step 3: proof that the eigenspace Ker $(I-Q^m) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ is one-dimensional, i.e., generated by φ.

Let $f \in$ Ker $(I-Q^m) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$, i.e. $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ and $Q^m f = f$. Then $Q^m|f| \geq |f|$. Since

$$\mu(Q^m|f|) = \mu(|f|),$$

the function $Q^m|f| - |f|$ is non negative and continuous over $\mathcal{S}$, and μ charges all nonempty open subsets of $\mathcal{S}$, one deduces that $Q^m|f| = |f|$ everywhere on $\mathcal{S}$. In other words $|f| \in$ Ker $(I-Q^m) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$, that is Ker $(I-Q^m) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ is a lattice.

If $0 \neq f \in$ Ker $(I-Q^m) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ were linearly independent of φ, as f/φ is not constant, we can find $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the open sets

$$O_+ = \{f > c\varphi\} \ \text{ and } \ O_- := \{f < c\varphi\}$$

[3]Because $1 = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})})$ is a pole of the resolvent of $Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$. Indeed, by (b) in Lemma 4.3, $1 = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})})$. In addition, $\mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}) \in \sigma(Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})})$ (see [70, Chap.V, Proposition 4.1]). Finally, 1 is a pole of the resolvent of $Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$ because $\mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{ess}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) < \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}) = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(Q^m|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}) = 1$.

are both nonempty. Since $(f-c\varphi)^+ \in \mathrm{Ker}\,(I-Q^m)$, we obtain for $\mathsf{x} \in O_-$,

$$0 = (f-c\varphi)^+(\mathsf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} (f-c\varphi)^+(\mathsf{y}) Q^m(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) > 0.$$

This contradiction shows that $\mathrm{Ker}\,(I-Q^m) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ is generated by φ.

Step 4: proof that the algebraic multiplicity and the geometric multiplicity of 1 of $Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$ coincide.

Let us prove that $(Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} - I)\Pi = 0$. To this end, consider the Laurent series of $(\lambda I - Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{-1}$ in a neighborhood of 1 in $\mathbb{C}$,

$$(\lambda I - Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{-1} = A_{-l}(\lambda-1)^{-l} + \cdots + A_{-1}(\lambda-1)^{-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k(\lambda-1)^k$$

where (see (4.6))

$$A_{-1} = \Pi$$

and $A_{-k-1} = (Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} - I)^k \Pi$ ([85], Chap. VIII, §8). Notice that Π is a bounded Feller kernel by Lemma 4.3 and its definition, and thus, so are $A_{-2}, \ldots, A_{-l}$.

We must prove that $l = 1$. For any bounded and measurable function f over $\mathcal{S}$ such that $|f| \le c\varphi$ for some $c > 0$, we have for any $\lambda > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\lambda-1)(\lambda I - Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{-1} f| &= \Big|(\lambda-1)\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{n+1}} Q^{mn} f\Big| \\ &\le (\lambda-1)\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{n+1}} Q^{mn} \big|f\big| \\ &\le c(\lambda-1)\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{n+1}} Q^{mn} \varphi = c\varphi \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\big\{(\lambda-1)(\lambda I - Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})^{-1} f, \lambda > 1\big\}$ is uniformly bounded. Letting $\lambda \to 1^+$, we obtain $A_{-k} f = 0$ for any $k \ge 2$. Because A_{-k} is a bounded kernel and $A_{-k} f(\mathsf{x}) = 0$ for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ and such f, it holds $A_{-k} = 0$ for all $k \ge 2$.

Step 5: proof of (4.3).

By (b) in Lemma 4.3 and (4.7),

$$\mathsf{r}_{sp}\big((Q^m - Q^m\Pi)|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}\big) < 1.$$

Since $Q^m\Pi|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})} = \Pi|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$ by Step 4 (because $A_{-2} = 0$ implies $Q^m\Pi|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})} = \Pi|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}$), one has $\mathsf{r}_{sp}((Q^m - \Pi)|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})})) < 1$ and for all $n \ge 1$, $Q^{mn}|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})} - \Pi|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})} = (Q^m - \Pi)^n|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$. Therefore, by Gelfand's formula, there exist $C \ge 1$ and $r \in]0,1[$ such that

$$\|Q^{mn} - \Pi\|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})} = \|(Q^m - \Pi)^n\|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})} \le Cr^n, \ \forall n \ge 1.$$

Then Π is a nonnegative (Feller) kernel and $\mu\Pi = \mu$.

As $\Pi|_{\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})}$ is a one-dimensional projection to $\{c\varphi; c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ by Step 3 and Step 4, there is some $\psi \in (\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S}))^*$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$,

$$\Pi f = \psi(f)\varphi.$$

Integrating it w.r.t. μ and since $\mu(\varphi)=1$, we obtain $\mu(f)=\psi(f)$ for all $f\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$, i.e. $\Pi f=\mu(f)\varphi$ for all $f\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$ (and thus also for all $f\in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$). In other words,

$$\Pi(\mathsf{x},d\mathsf{y})=\varphi(\mathsf{x})\mu(d\mathsf{y}).$$

In addition, we have

$$\|Q^{mn}-\Pi\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}\leq Cr^n,\ \forall n\geq 1. \tag{4.8}$$

because for a Feller kernel, such as $Q^{mn}-\Pi$, its norm on $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ coincides with its norm on $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{S})$. This implies in particular that Ker $(I-Q^m|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})})=\{c\varphi;c\in\mathbb{R}\}$ and Ker $(I-(Q^m)^*|_{M_b(\mathcal{S})})=\{c\mu;c\in\mathbb{R}\}$.

Now for any eigenfunction f of Q in $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$ associated with 1, we have $Q^mf=f$, then $f=c\varphi$. Thus $Q\varphi=\varphi$. Thus $Q\Pi=\Pi$ on $b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})$.

Finally the desired geometric convergence (4.3) follows by (4.8), because for $0\leq k\leq m-1$,

$$\|Q^{mn+k}-\Pi\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}=\|Q^k(Q^{mn}-\Pi)\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}\leq\max_{k\leq m-1}\|Q^k\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}\cdot\|(Q^{mn}-\Pi)\|_{b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S})}.$$

Step 6: Proofs of (a) and (b).

By (4.3), if $\nu\in\mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ is such that $\nu Q=\lambda\nu$, and $\nu(\varphi)\neq 0$, we have

$$\|\nu Q^n-\nu(\varphi)\mu\|_{TV}=\|\lambda^n\nu-\nu(\varphi)\mu\|_{TV}\to 0$$

as $n\to+\infty$. As $\nu(\varphi)\neq 0$, $\lambda=1$ and $\nu=\nu(\varphi)\cdot\mu$. That is part (a). In the same way we get part (b). This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

5. Proof of Theorem 2.2

In this section, one proves Theorem 2.2 (see Section 5.2). We first start with preliminary results.

5.1. Preliminary results.

Let us start with the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *If $a<f\in\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$ where $a\in[-\infty,+\infty[$, then for any $\mathcal{C}^2$-concave function $\varphi:]a,+\infty[\to\mathbb{R}$, $\varphi\circ f\in\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$ and*

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi\circ f\leq\varphi'(f)\mathcal{L}f. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. For $t\geq 0$, let

$$M_t=f(X_t)-f(X_0)-\int_0^t\mathcal{L}f(X_s)ds$$

which is a local martingale. By Ito's formula (Dellacherie-Meyer [28, p350, Théorème 27]), $\varphi\circ f\in\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$ and

$$d\varphi\circ f(X_t)=\varphi'(f)(X_{t-})[\mathcal{L}f(X_{t-})dt+dM_t]+\frac{1}{2}\varphi''(X_{t-})d[M_c,M_c]_t+dS_t$$

where M_c is the continuous martingale part of M, and

$$S_t=\sum_{0<s\leq t}(\varphi\circ f(X_s)-\varphi\circ f(X_{s-})-\varphi'(f)(X_{s-})[f(X_s)-f(X_{s-})])$$

By the concavity of φ, $d\varphi\circ f(X_t)\leq\varphi'(f)(X_{t-})[\mathcal{L}f(X_t)dt+dM_t]$. Thus (5.1) holds. □

The following lemma establishes the strong Feller property of $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ on $\mathcal{D}$ for $t \geq t_0$.

Lemma 5.2. *Under* **(C1)** *and* **(C4)**, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ *is strong Feller on* $\mathcal{D}$ *for all* $t \geq t_0$.

Proof. Let $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence of points in $\mathcal{D}$ converging to $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$. Let us prove that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f(x_n) \to P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f(\mathsf{x})$ for any $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ and $t \geq t_0$ fixed. Let $K = \{\mathsf{x}, x_n; n \geq 0\}$. One has:

$$\beta_\tau(1_K P_t^{\mathcal{D}}) \leq \beta_\tau(1_K P_t) = 0$$

by the strong Feller property of $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ on $\mathcal{S}$, see **(C1)**. In other words the family $\{P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(x_n, \cdot); n \geq 0\}$ is relatively compact in the τ-topology. That is equivalent to say that

$$\left\{h_n := \frac{dP_t^{\mathcal{D}}(x_n, \cdot)}{dm}; n \geq 0\right\}$$

is relatively compact in the weak topology $\sigma(L^1(m), L^\infty(m))$, where m is the reference measure given by

$$m(\cdot) = P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, \cdot) + \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(x_n, \cdot).$$

By the well known equivalence of the relative compactness and the sequential compactness in $\sigma(L^1, L^\infty)$ (by the Dunford-Pettis theorem [27, Théorème 25 p. 43]) , we have only to prove that the limit point in the τ-topology of $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(x_n, \cdot)$ is unique and coincides with $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, \cdot)$, i.e. if $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(x_{n_k}, \cdot) \to \nu$ in τ-topology for a subsequence (n_k), then $\nu = P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, \cdot)$. By **(C4)**, we have for any $f \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\nu(f) = \lim_{k\to\infty} P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f(x_{n_k}) = P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f(\mathsf{x})$$

By the measure-separability of $\mathcal{A}$, $\nu = P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, \cdot)$. □

5.2. **Proof of the main result.** We will formulate a weaker version of Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that* **(C1), (C2), (C3), (C4),** *and* ***(C5)*** *hold. Suppose moreover that for some* $p > 1$ *and* $M > 0$,

$$\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}^p \leq M\mathsf{W}^p. \tag{5.2}$$

Then, all claims in Theorem 2.2 hold with $\mathsf{W}^{1/p}$ *replaced by* W.

Admitting this result, we give at first the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. For any $p > 1$ fixed, by Proposition 5.1 and **(C3)**, it holds:

$$\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}^{1/p} \leq \frac{1}{p}\mathsf{W}^{1/p-1}\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W} \leq -\frac{r_n}{p}\mathsf{W}^{1/p} + \frac{b_n}{p}1_{K_n}.$$

In other words, $\tilde{\mathsf{W}} = \mathsf{W}^{1/p}$ satisfies **(C3)**. Furthermore for each n,

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathsf{W}})^p = \mathcal{L}\mathsf{W} \leq b_n 1_{K_n} \leq b_n \mathsf{W} = b_n(\tilde{\mathsf{W}})^p. \tag{5.3}$$

Thus applying Theorem 5.3 to $\tilde{\mathsf{W}}$, we obtain Theorem 2.2. □

Let us now prove Theorem 5.3.

Proof of Theorem 5.3. The proof of Theorem 5.3 is divided into several steps.

Step 1. Let $t > 0$ be arbitrary but fixed. Let us prove that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies Assumptions (1), (2), (3), and (4) in Theorem 4.1 with $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{D}$ there. First, reasoning as in (3.8), one deduces using (5.2) together with the fact that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}} \leq P_t$, that for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}\mathsf{W}^p(\mathsf{x}) \leq e^{Mt}\mathsf{W}^p(\mathsf{x})$. Thus $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies Assumption (3) in Theorem 4.1. In addition **(C5)** implies that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies Assumption (2) in Theorem 4.1. Recall that

$$P_{t,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{y})}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) \leq \frac{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{y})}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} P_t(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y}) = P_{t,\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{x}, d\mathsf{y})$$

and that $P_{t,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}}$ also satisfies **(A1)** (by (3.12) and (3.13)). Then, by Theorem 3.4, and in view of (3.12),

$$\mathsf{r}_{ess}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left[\beta_w(P_{nt,\mathsf{W}}^{\mathcal{D}})\right]^{1/n} = 0.$$

Furthermore by Lemma 5.2, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is strong Feller on $\mathcal{D}$ for all $t \geq t_0$ (and thus $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies in particular Assumption (1) in Theorem 4.1). This together with the topological transitivity in **(C5)** implies that for any $t > 0$, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is m_1-irreducible where $m_1 = \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} e^{-s} P_s^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}_1, \cdot) ds$, for some $\mathsf{x}_1 \in \mathcal{D}$. Indeed, let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ such that $m_1(A) > 0$. The function $g_1(\mathsf{x}) := \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} e^{-s} P_s^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}, A) ds$ is continuous (since $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is strong Feller on $\mathcal{D}$ for all $t \geq t_0$) and positive at x_1 (by choice of A). Then, by **(C5)**, we have once if $Nt \geq t_0$,

$$P_{Nt}^{\mathcal{D}} g_1(\mathsf{x}) > 0, \ \forall \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}.$$

By Nummelin [63, Theorem 3.2],

$$\mathsf{r}_{sp}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \left(\sup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{\mathbb{E}_x[\mathsf{W}(X_{nt})\mathbf{1}_{nt<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}]}{\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{x})} \right)^{1/n} > 0.$$

Thus, we have proved that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies the Assumption (4) in Theorem 4.1.

Step 2. Let $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} := -\log \mathsf{r}_{sp}(P_1^{\mathcal{D}}|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})})$. Applying Theorem 4.1 to $Q = P_1^{\mathcal{D}}$ on $b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$, there is a unique couple $(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}, \varphi)$ where $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{D}$ with $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{W}) < +\infty$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{S})$ positive everywhere on $\mathcal{D}$, $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\varphi) = 1$ and

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_1^{\mathcal{D}} = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}, \ P_1^{\mathcal{D}} \varphi = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} \varphi,$$

and for all $f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ and $n \geq 1$

$$\left\| e^{n\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} P_n^{\mathcal{D}} f - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f)\varphi \right\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})} \leq C e^{-\delta n} \|f\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}. \tag{5.4}$$

where $C \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ are independent of f and n. In addition for any $t > 0$, since $(\mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}}) P_1^{\mathcal{D}} = (\mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_1^{\mathcal{D}}) P_t^{\mathcal{D}} = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} \mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ and Ker $(e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} I - (P_1^{\mathcal{D}})^*)$ in $\mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{D})$ is one dimensional and $\mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{D})$, one deduces that $\mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}} = \lambda(t)\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$. By the semigroup property, $\lambda(t+s) = \lambda(t) \cdot \lambda(s)$. As $\lambda(1) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}}$, one obtains that:

$$\lambda(t) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t}, \ t \geq 0.$$

By (a) in Theorem 4.1,

$$\mathsf{r}_{sp}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}) = \lambda(t) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t}.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(t < \tau_D) = \mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{1} = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{1}) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t}$$

then $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} \geq 0$ and

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(X_t \in \cdot | t < \tau_D) = e^{\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} \mu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot) = \mu_{\mathcal{D}},$$

i.e. $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a QSD. Let us now prove the uniqueness of the QSD of $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ in $\mathcal{D}$ in the set of measures ν such that $\nu(\mathsf{W}) < +\infty$. To this end, let us consider $\nu_{\mathcal{D}}$ a QSD satisfying $\nu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{W}) < +\infty$. Then for all $t \geq 0$

$$\nu_{\mathcal{D}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}} = \lambda(t) \nu_{\mathcal{D}}, \ \lambda(t) = \mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\mathcal{D}}}(t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}).$$

By (a) in Theorem 4.1, this implies necessarily that

$$\lambda(t) = \mathsf{r}_{sp}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} \text{ and } \nu_{\mathcal{D}} = \mu_{\mathcal{D}},$$

which conludes the proof of the uniqueness. Finally for any $t = n + s$ with $s \in [0, 1[$, by (5.4) we have for all $f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$

$$\left\| e^{(n+s)\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} P_{n+s}^{\mathcal{D}} f - e^{s\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(P_s^{\mathcal{D}} f) \varphi \right\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})} \leq C r^n e^{s\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} \| P_s^{\mathcal{D}} f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}.$$

As $e^{s\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(P_s^{\mathcal{D}} f) = \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f)$ and $\sup_{s\in[0,1]} \|P_s^{\mathcal{D}}\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})} \leq \sup_{s\in[0,1]} \|P_s \mathsf{W}\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})} \leq e^{b_1}$ (by the proof in Step 1 of Theorem 3.5 and **(C3)**), we obtain for all $f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$,

$$\left\| e^{t\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}} P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) \varphi \right\|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})} \leq C' e^{-\delta t} \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}, \ \delta := -\log r, \ C' = C e^{b_1} e^{\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}}. \tag{5.5}$$

Thus, one has for all $f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$ and all measures $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{b\mathsf{W}}(\mathcal{D})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbb{E}_\nu[f(X_t) | t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}] - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) \right| &= \left| \frac{e^{\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} \nu(P_t^{\mathcal{D}} f)}{e^{\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} \nu(P_t^{\mathcal{D}} 1)} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f)\nu(\varphi) + O_1(e^{-\delta t})\nu(\mathsf{W}) \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}}{\nu(\varphi) + O_2(e^{-\delta t})\nu(\mathsf{W}) \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) + O_1(e^{-\delta t}) \frac{\nu(\mathsf{W})}{\nu(\varphi)} \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}}{1 + O_2(e^{-\delta t}) \frac{\nu(\mathsf{W})}{\nu(\varphi)} \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}} - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) \right| \\
&\leq O_3(t) \frac{\nu(\mathsf{W})}{\nu(\varphi)} \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})},
\end{aligned}$$

where for all $k = 1, 2, 3$ and for all $t \geq 0$, $|O_k(t)| \leq C e^{-\delta t}$, for some constant C independent of ν and f. That yields:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\nu[f(X_t) | t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}] - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(f) \right| \leq C e^{-\delta t} \frac{\nu(\mathsf{W})}{\nu(\varphi)} \| f \|_{b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})}, \ \forall f \in b_{\mathsf{W}}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}), t > 0.$$

Step 3. We have proved that $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} \in [0, +\infty)$. Let us now prove that $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$. If in contrary $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} = 0$, then for all $t \geq 0$, $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}} 1) = \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(1) = 1$. This implies that $P_t^{\mathcal{D}} 1(\mathsf{x}) = 1$ for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t > 0$, due to the fact that the function $1 - P_t^{\mathcal{D}} 1$ is nonnegative and continuous over $\mathcal{D}$ (by the Feller property of $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$) and that $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ charges all nonempty open subsets of $\mathcal{D}$. That is in contradiction with the second assumption in **(C5)**. Then $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$. Now for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, it holds by (5.5) with $f = 1$:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} = +\infty) = \lim_{t \to +\infty} e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} e^{\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} t} \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}) = 0 \times \varphi(\mathsf{x}) \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(1) = 0.$$

Next $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}(t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}) = \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}1) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}t}$. It remains to prove the independence of $X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$, under $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}$. For any $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\partial\mathcal{D})$, letting for $x \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$u(\mathsf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}}[f(X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}})],$$

we have by the strong Markov property

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}[f(X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}})1_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}] = \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}u) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}t}\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(u) = e^{-\lambda_{\mathcal{D}}t}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}[f(X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}})], t \geq 0,$$

which is the desired independence. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.3. □

Remark 5.4 (On Step 3 in the proof of Theorem 5.3)**.** To prove that $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$, it is also possible to use the standard result [60, Proposition 2]. In addition, it is also standard that $X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ are $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{\mathcal{D}}}$-independent as soon as $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a QSD, see indeed [60, Proposition 2].

6. Application to hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems

In this section, we apply Theorem 2.2 to hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ (see (6.1)) when $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ($\mathsf{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, see more precisely (6.25)). To this end, we first define the setting we consider and then, we check that the assumptions required to apply Theorem 2.2 are satisfied for such processes (namely **(C1)**-**(C5)**): these are the purposes of Sections 6.1 and 6.2 respectively. Finally, in Section 6.3, we state the main result of this section which is Theorem 6.9.

6.1. **Framework and assumptions.** Let $d \geq 1$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space. Let $(X_t = (x_t, v_t), t \geq 0)$ be the solution of the following hypoelliptic stochastic differential equation on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$:

$$\begin{cases} dx_t = v_t dt, \\ dv_t = -\nabla V(x_t)dt - c(x_t, v_t)v_t dt + \Sigma(x_t, v_t)dB_t, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

where $(B_t, t \geq 0)$ is a standard d-dimensional Brownian motion on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. Here the state space is $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Equation (6.1) describes a system of N particles (in this case $d = 3\mathsf{N}$) moving under interaction forces which are subject to random collisions. The function c is the damping (or friction) coefficient and V is the particle interaction potential function. We refer for instance to [75, 83, 59], and to the review of the literature [56] for the study of such processes in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Let us define the following assumptions on V and c:

(Av1) $V : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and V is lower bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

(Ac1) $c : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is continuous. In addition, there exist $\eta > 0$ and $L > 0$, such that

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d, |x| \geq L : \ \frac{1}{2}\big[c(x, v) + c^T(x, v)\big] \geq \eta\, I_{\mathbb{R}^d}.$$

Finally, for all $N > 0$,

$$\sup_{|x|\leq N, v\in\mathbb{R}^d} \|c(x, v)\|_{\text{H.S}} < +\infty,$$

where $\|c(x, v)\|_{\text{H.S}}$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of matrix and where c^T is the the transpose matrix of c.

(AΣ) $\Sigma : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}$ a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function, uniformly Lipschitz over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, and such that for some $\Sigma_0 > 0$ and $\Sigma_\infty > 0$,

$$\forall \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},\ \Sigma_0 \leq \Sigma(\mathsf{x}) \leq \Sigma_\infty.$$

For some results below, **(Ac1)** can be replaced by the less stringent assumption:

(Ac0) $c : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is continuous and

$$\exists A \geq 0, \forall x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d :\ \frac{1}{2}\big[c(x,v) + c^T(x,v)\big] \geq -A\, I_{\mathbb{R}^d}.$$

This will allow us to consider in particular the hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems with unbounded v-dependent damping coefficient:

$$\text{for some } \ell_0 > 0,\ \forall x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ c(x,v) = |v|^{\ell_0} \tag{6.2}$$

and fast growing potential, in the sense that there exist $\mathsf{n}_0 > 2$, $r_0 > 0$, and $r > 0$, for all $|x| \geq r_0$,

$$V \text{ satisfies } \textbf{(Av1)},\ r^{-1}|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0} \leq V(x) \leq r|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0} \text{ and } r^{-1}|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0} \leq x \cdot \nabla V(x). \tag{6.3}$$

Notice that when (6.2) holds, Assumption **(Ac1)** is not satisfied but **(Ac0)** is satisfied. The condition that $\mathsf{n}_0 > 2$ is justified in item (2) in Proposition 6.5 below.

Remark 6.1. Condition (6.3) is satisfied for instance for a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function V over $\mathbb{R}^d$ which equal a polynomial function with leading terms $a|x|^{2n}$, with $n \geq 2$ and $a > 0$, outside a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

When V, c, and Σ satisfy respectively **(Av1)**, **(Ac0)**, and **(AΣ)**, there is a unique weak solution to (6.1) by [83, Lemma 1.1], which is thus a strong Markov process. We will thus always assume at least **(AΣ)**, **(Av1)** and **(Ac0)** in what follows.

For $t \geq 0$, we recall that $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ denotes the semigroup of the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$, that is $P_t(\mathsf{x}, A) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_t \in A)$, where $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $\mathsf{x} = (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. In the following, we denote by $(X_t^0(\mathsf{x}), t \geq 0)$ the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ when $X_0 = \mathsf{x}$. Let us also denote by

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{\Sigma^2(x,v)}{2}\Delta_v + v.\nabla_x - \nabla V(x).\nabla_v - c(x,v)v.\nabla_v, \tag{6.4}$$

the infinitesimal generator of the diffusion (6.1). Let us recall that $\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$ denotes the extended domain of the generator of the semigroup $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ of the process (6.1) (see (2.4) for the definition).

Let us check that the assumptions required to apply Theorem 2.2 are satisfied for the process (6.1) when $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ($\mathsf{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, see more precisely (6.25)), by prescribing if necessary, more assumptions on V, c, and ℓ_0.

6.2. **On the assumptions (C1)-(C5).**

6.2.1. *On the assumptions **(C1)** and **(C2)**.* One has the following result from [83].

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that V, c, and Σ satisfy respectively **(Av1)**, **(Ac0)**, and **(AΣ)**. Then, **(C1)** and **(C2)** are satisfied for the process* (6.1).

Proof. Let us first prove that $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ satisfies **(C1)**. Introduce the process $(X_t^0 = (x_t^0, v_t^0), t \geq 0)$ solution (in the strong sense) to the stochastic differential equation over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$:

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^0 = v_t^0 dt, \\ dv_t^0 = \Sigma(x_t^0, v_t^0) dB_t. \end{cases} \tag{6.5}$$

That is $(X_t^0, t \geq 0)$ is the process (6.1) when $V = 0$ and $c = 0$. Let $(P_t^0, t \geq 0)$ be the semigroup of process (6.5). Under **(AΣ)**, for $t > 0$, P_t^0 has a smooth density $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \mapsto p_t^0(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y})$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure $d\mathsf{y}$ by the Hörmander's theorem. Therefore, when $(\mathsf{x}_n)_n$ converges to $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ as $n \to +\infty$, $p_t^0(\mathsf{x}_n, \mathsf{y}) \to p_t^0(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y})$. Since for all n, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} p_t^0(\mathsf{x}_n, \mathsf{y}) d\mathsf{y} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} p_t^0(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) d\mathsf{y} = 1$, it follows by Scheffé's Lemma that $p_t^0(\mathsf{x}_n, \mathsf{y}) \to p_t^0(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y})$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, dy)$ as $n \to +\infty$. Hence for any $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, $P_t^0 f(\mathsf{x}_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(y) p_t^0(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) d\mathsf{y} \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(y) p_t^0(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) d\mathsf{y} = P_t^0 f(\mathsf{x})$. That is, P_t^0 is strong Feller for $t > 0$.

When V and c satisfy **(Av1)** and **(Ac0)**, using the same arguments as in the proof of [83, Proposition 1.2], we deduce that, for $t > 0$, P_t is strong Feller and thus satisfies **(C1)**.

Moreover, for any $T > 0$, the mapping

$$\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \mapsto \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot) \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{C}^0([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{2d}))$$

is continuous with respect to the weak convergence of measures on $\mathcal{C}^0([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ (equipped with the uniform convergence topology). Indeed, the weak limit of the weak solutions of (6.1) with starting point x_n converges to the solution of the martingale problem with starting point x, as $\mathsf{x}_n \to \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, by the continuity of the coefficients in (6.1) and the uniqueness of the weak solution of (6.1) (see [83, Lemma 1.1]). Thus **(C2)** is satisfied for the process (6.1). □

6.2.2. *On the assumption **(C3)**.* Let us define the following last assumptions on V and c.

(Av2) There exists a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function $G : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that G and ∇G are bounded over $\mathbb{R}^d$, and such that

$$\nabla V(x) \cdot G(x) \to +\infty \text{ as } |x| \to +\infty.$$

(Ac2) There exists some $\mathcal{C}^2$ lower bounded function $U : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sup_{x,v \in \mathbb{R}^d} |c^T(x,v) G(x) - \nabla U(x)| < +\infty.$$

Remark 6.3. Let us recall some examples of functions V and c satisfying **(Av1)**, **(Av2)**, **(Ac1)**, and **(Ac2)** ([83, Remark 3.2]):

(1) If the damping coefficient c satisfies **(Ac1)** with moreover

$$\sup_{x,v \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|c(x,v)\|_{\text{H.S}} < +\infty,$$

then **(Ac2)** is satisfied with $U = 0$.

(2) Assume that V satisfies **(Av1)** and that:

(a) $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} \frac{x\cdot\nabla V(x)}{|x|} = +\infty$. Then, **(Av2)** is satisfied with

$$x \mapsto G(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}(1-\chi),$$

where $\chi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$, has compact support, $\chi = 1$ in a neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

In particular, **(Av2)** and **(Ac2)** are satisfied when $V : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function such that $\nabla V(x)\cdot x \geq c_0|x|^{2k}$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $c_0 > 0$) outside a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $c(x,v) = c_1|x|^{2q}$ ($q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $c_1 > 0$) on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ (choose indeed G as above and $U(x) = c_1(1-\chi)|x|^{2q+1}/(2q+1)$).

(b) There exists $r > 0$, $|x| > r \mapsto \mathsf{e}_V(x) = \nabla V(x)/|\nabla V(x)|$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$, bounded, and with bounded derivatives, and $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} |\nabla V(x)| = +\infty$. Then, **(Av2)** is satisfied with

$$x \mapsto G(x) = \mathsf{e}_V(x)(1-\chi),$$

where $\chi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$, has compact support, and $\chi = 1$ on $B(0, r+1)$.

Notice that when $d = 1$, $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} \frac{x\cdot\nabla V(x)}{|x|} = +\infty$, **(Ac2)**, and $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} |\nabla V(x)| = +\infty$ are equivalent (under **(Av1)**).

(3) When $d = 1$, the case when there exist $c_1, c_2, w_0 > 0$, such that

$$\forall x, v \in \mathbb{R},\ c(x,v) = c_1x^2 - c_2 \text{ and } V(x) = \frac{1}{2}w_0^2x^2, \tag{6.6}$$

corresponds to the the noisy Van Der Pol oscillator. Then, **(Av1)**, **(Av2)**, **(Ac1)**, and **(Ac2)** are satisfied with $G(x) = x(1-\chi)/|x|$, and $U(x) = \big[c_1|x|^3/3 - c_2|x|\big](1-\chi)$, where $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$, has compact support, and $\chi = 1$ in a neighborhood of 0 (see [83, Section 5.3]).

The Hamiltonian of the process (6.1) is, for $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathsf{H}(x,v) = V(x) + \frac{1}{2}|v|^2.$$

Assume that **(AΣ)**, **(Av1)**, **(Av2)**, **(Ac1)**, and **(Ac2)** hold. Let us introduce for $(x,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, the modified Hamiltonian [83, Eq. (3.3)],

$$\mathsf{F}_1(x,v) = a\,\mathsf{H}(x,v) + v\cdot(b\,G(x) + \nabla\mathsf{w}(x)) + b\,U(x) \tag{6.7}$$

where G, U are as **(Av2)** and **(Ac2)**, $a > 0$, $b > 0$, and $\mathsf{w} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a compactly supported $\mathcal{C}^2$ function. Define, for all $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathsf{W}_1(x,v) = \exp\big[\mathsf{F}_1(x,v) - \inf_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \mathsf{F}_1\big] \geq 1. \tag{6.8}$$

We now give a concrete upper bound on W_1 which is useful to verify the integrability condition in Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 6.4. *Assume that V satisfies **(Av1)** and **(Av2)**. Then $\lim_{x\to+\infty} V(x) = +\infty$. Let c be such that **(Ac1)** and **(Ac2)** hold with $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} U(x)/V(x) = 0$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $R > 0$ such that if $|x| + |v| \geq R$, $\mathsf{W}_1(x,v) \leq e^{a(1+\epsilon)\mathsf{H}(x,v)}$.*

Proof. Let us prove that $\lim_{x\to+\infty} V(x) = +\infty$. Assume without loss of assumption that $V \geq 0$. Notice that (since G is bounded) there exists $C > 0$ such that $1/|G| \geq C$ over $\mathbb{R}^d$. In addition, in view of **(Av2)**, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $|G(x)| > 0$ for all $|x| \geq r_0$. Let $R_0 > r_0$ and $C_0 > 0$ be such that $\nabla V(y) \cdot G(y) \geq C_0$ for $|y| \geq R_0$ (see **(Av2)**). Consider for $|x| > R_0$, the curve $\gamma(x)$ solution to $\dot{\gamma}_t(x) = -G(\gamma_t(x))/|G(\gamma_t(x))|$ with $\gamma_0(x) = x$, for all $t \in [0, T_0(x)]$, where $T_0(x) = \inf\{t \geq 0, \gamma_t(x) = R_0\} \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \cup \{+\infty\}$. Notice that $T_0(x) \geq |x| - R_0$. It then holds, if $T_0(x) < +\infty$,

$$V(x) \geq \int_0^{T_0(x)} \frac{\nabla V(\gamma_s(x)) \cdot G(\gamma_s(x))}{|G((\gamma_s(x))|} ds \geq CC_0(|x| - R_0).$$

The case $T_0(x) = +\infty$ is not possible since it would imply that $V(x) \geq CC_0 t$, for all $t \geq 0$. Thus $\lim_{x\to+\infty} V(x) = +\infty$. The proof of the upper bound on W_1 is a consequence of the fact that, for any $a, b > 0$ fixed, $v \cdot (b\,G(x) + \nabla \mathsf{w}(x)) + b\,U(x) = o(a\mathsf{H}(x, v))$ as $|x| + |v| \to +\infty$. □

Let us mention that because $\mathsf{W}_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ (i.e. W_1 is $\mathcal{C}^1$ in the variable x and $\mathcal{C}^2$ in the variable v), $\mathsf{W}_1 \in \mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}\mathsf{W}_1 = \mathcal{L}_0\mathsf{W}_1$ quasi-everywhere (see (2.4)).

Let us now check that **(C3)** is satisfied for $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ under the above assumptions on V and c. This is the purpose of the next proposition.

Proposition 6.5. *Assume that Σ satisfies **(AΣ)**. Assume that:*

1. *The functions V and c satisfy **(Av1)**, **(Av2)**, **(Ac1)**, and **(Ac2)**. Then, for a well chosen function $\mathsf{w} \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, and well chosen constants $a > 0$ and $b > 0$ (see* [83, Eq. (3.4) → Eq. (3.9)] *for explicit conditions), Assumption **(C3)** is satisfied for the process* (6.1) *with the function W_1 defined in* (6.8).
2. *The functions c and V satisfy respectively* (6.2) *and* (6.3). *Then, Assumption **(C3)** is satisfied for the process* (6.1) *if*
$$\ell_0 < \mathsf{n}_0 - 2 \tag{6.9}$$
*with the continuous **bounded** Lyapunov function $\mathsf{W}_2 : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined below in* (6.12).

Let us mention that W_1 (see (6.8)) and W_2 (see (6.12)) in Proposition 6.5 are not unique by construction (see indeed [83, Eq. (3.4) → Eq. (3.9)] and the proof of item (2) of Proposition 6.5 below). Moreover, let us notice that W_1 is not bounded over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Concerning item (1) in Proposition 6.5, we also refer to [83, Section 5] for other Lyapunov functions in explicit examples like the noisy Van Der Pol oscillator.

Proof. Item (1) in Proposition 6.5 is proved in [83, Section 3] (see more precisely Eq. (3.9) there). Let us thus prove item (2) in Proposition 6.5. Assume that c and V satisfy respectively (6.2) and (6.3). Recall that the Hamiltonian of (6.1) is

$$(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \mapsto \frac{|v|^2}{2} + V(x).$$

The infinitesimal generator of the process (6.1) is in this case (see (6.4), (6.2), and (6.3)):

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{\Sigma^2(x, v)}{2}\Delta_v + v \cdot \nabla_x - \left[\nabla V(x) + |v|^{\ell_0} v\right] \cdot \nabla_v.$$

Let us construct a Lyapunov function for such a process. To avoid any problem of regularity at 0 in the upcoming computations, let us actually consider

$$(x,v)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}\mapsto \mathsf{H}_2(x,v)=\frac{|v|^2}{2}+V(x)+\mathsf{k}_0,$$

where $\mathsf{k}_0>0$ is such that $V(x)+\mathsf{k}_0\geq 1$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ (see (6.3)). Let

$$a>0,\ \alpha>0,\ b>0,\ \text{ and } \beta>0.$$

be positive real numbers. Assume that (recall $\mathsf{n}_0>2$),

$$0<\beta-\alpha\leq\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\mathsf{n}_0}, \tag{6.10}$$

so that the function

$$(x,v)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}\mapsto \mathsf{F}_2(x,v)=-a\mathsf{H}_2^{-\alpha}(x,v)+b\,x\cdot v\,\mathsf{H}_2^{\beta-\alpha-1}(x,v),$$

is bounded. Indeed, $a\mathsf{H}_2^{-\alpha}$ is a bounded function over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. For the other term, set $\lambda=\beta-\alpha$, and use Young's inequality with $q=2(1-\lambda)>1$ ($\lambda<1/2$, see (6.10)) and $p=q/(q-1)=2(1-\lambda)/(1-2\lambda)$, to get

$$\frac{|x\cdot v|}{\mathsf{H}_2(x,v)^{1-\lambda}}\leq\frac{x^p}{p\mathsf{H}_2(x,v)^{1-\lambda}}+\frac{v^q}{q\mathsf{H}_2(x,v)^{1-\lambda}}. \tag{6.11}$$

The function $x,v\mapsto|x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}_2(x,v)^{\lambda-1}$ is thus bounded if $p\leq\mathsf{n}_0(1-\lambda)$ (see (6.3)), that is $2(1-\lambda)/(1-2\lambda)\leq\mathsf{n}_0(1-\lambda)$ which writes $2\leq\mathsf{n}_0-2\lambda\mathsf{n}_0$ which is precisely (6.10). Then set, for $x,v\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(x,v)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}\mapsto \mathsf{W}_2(x,v)=\exp\big[\mathsf{F}_2(x,v)-\inf_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\mathsf{F}_2\big], \tag{6.12}$$

which belongs to $\mathcal{C}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ (thus $\mathsf{W}_2\in\mathbb{D}_e(\mathcal{L})$). For ease of notation, in the following, we will simply denote F_2 (resp. H_2, W_2) by F (resp. H, W). It holds, $\frac{\partial_x\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}}=\nabla_x\mathsf{F}$, $\frac{\partial_x\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}}=\nabla_x\mathsf{F}$, and $\frac{\Delta_v\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}}=\Delta_v\mathsf{F}+|\nabla_v\mathsf{F}|^2$. Thus, one has:

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}_0\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}}=\frac{1}{2}\Sigma^2\Delta_v\mathsf{F}+\frac{1}{2}\Sigma^2|\nabla_v\mathsf{F}|^2+v\cdot\nabla_x\mathsf{F}-\big[\nabla V+|v|^{\ell_0}v\big]\nabla_v\mathsf{F}, \tag{6.13}$$

where we recall that $\Sigma:\mathbb{R}^{2d}\to\mathbb{R}$ is smooth and bounded, by assumption. One has,

$$\nabla_x\mathsf{F}=a\alpha\nabla V\,\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}+bv\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-1}-b(\alpha+1-\beta)x\cdot v\nabla V\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2},$$

and

$$\nabla_v\mathsf{F}=a\alpha v\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}+bx\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-1}-b(\alpha+1-\beta)x\cdot v\,v\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2}.$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned}v\cdot\nabla_x\mathsf{F}-\big[\nabla V+|v|^l v\big]\nabla_v\mathsf{F}=\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}\Big[&-a\alpha|v|^{\ell_0+2}+b|v|^2\mathsf{H}^{\beta}-bx\cdot\nabla V\mathsf{H}^{\beta}\\&-b|v|^{\ell_0}x\cdot v\mathsf{H}^{\beta}+b(\alpha+1-\beta)x\cdot v|v|^{\ell_0+2}\mathsf{H}^{\beta-1}\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Moreover, it holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_v\mathsf{F}=&\,a\alpha\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}-a\alpha|v|^2(\alpha+1)\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-2}+b(\beta-\alpha-1)x\cdot v\,\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2}\\&-(d+1)b(\alpha+1-\beta)x\cdot v\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2}-b(\alpha+1-\beta)(\beta-\alpha-2)x\cdot v|v|^2\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-3}.\end{aligned}$$

The functions $(x,v)\mapsto a\alpha\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}$ and $(x,v)\mapsto |v|^2\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-2}$ are clearly bounded over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. In addition, since H^{-1} is bounded over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, there exist $C>0$, such that

$$|x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2}\leq C|x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-1}=C|x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}^{\lambda-1},$$

and from the analysis led in (6.11) above (see (6.10) and recall that $\lambda=\beta-\alpha$), $(x,v)\mapsto |x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2}$ is bounded over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Finally, $(x,v)\mapsto |x\cdot v||v|^2|\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-3}$ is also bounded over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ since (see also (6.11) and (6.10)), $|x\cdot v||v|^2\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-3}=|x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}^{\lambda-1}\times|v|^2\mathsf{H}^{-2}$. One then obtains that

$$\Sigma^2\Delta_v\mathsf{F}\text{ is bounded over }\mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

Similarly, the functions $|v|\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}$, $|x|\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-1}=|x|\mathsf{H}^{\lambda-1}$ (recall that $\lambda<(\mathsf{n}_0-1)/\mathsf{n}_0$ so that $\mathsf{n}_0(1-\lambda)>1$, see (6.10)), and $|x\cdot v||v||\mathsf{H}^{\beta-\alpha-2}=|x\cdot v|\mathsf{H}^{\lambda-1}\times|v|\mathsf{H}^{-1}$, are bounded, and then deduces that

$$\Sigma^2|\nabla_v\mathsf{F}|^2\text{ is bounded over }\mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

Consequently, from (6.13) and (6.14), one has, for some $C>0$ independent of x and v,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{L}_0\mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}}\leq C+\mathsf{H}^{-\alpha-1}\Big[&-a\alpha|v|^{\ell_0+2}+b|v|^2\mathsf{H}^\beta-bx\cdot\nabla V\,\mathsf{H}^\beta\\&-b|v|^{\ell_0}x\cdot v\mathsf{H}^\beta+b(\alpha+1-\beta)x\cdot v|v|^{\ell_0+2}\mathsf{H}^{\beta-1}\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{6.15}$$

Let us now give a lower bound on the term inside the bracket in (6.15), that we denote by M. Let us assume that

$$\beta<1.$$

Then, it holds, for all $s\geq 0$ and $t\geq 0$, $2^{\beta-1}(s^\beta+t^\beta)\leq(s+t)^\beta\leq s^\beta+t^\beta$. Since there exists $r_1>0$ such that so that for all $x,v\in\mathbb{R}$:

$$2^{\beta-1}V_0^\beta(x)+\frac{v^{2\beta}}{2}\leq\mathsf{H}^\beta(x,v)\leq V_0^\beta(x)+\frac{v^{2\beta}}{2^\beta},$$

where for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we set:

$$V_0(x)=V(x)+\mathsf{k}_0,$$

which satisfies (see (6.3)), for some $r>0$ and $C>0$, and all $|x|>r$,

$$C^{-1}|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0}\leq V_0(x)\leq C|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0}\text{ and }C^{-1}|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0}\leq x\cdot\nabla V_0(x).\tag{6.16}$$

Therefore, since $b(\alpha+1-\beta)>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{M}\leq&-a\alpha|v|^{\ell_0+2}+b|v|^2V_0^\beta+\frac{b}{2^\beta}|v|^{2+2\beta}-2^{\beta-1}b|x\cdot\nabla V_0|V_0^\beta-\frac{b}{2}|x\cdot\nabla V_0||v|^{2\beta}\\&+1_{x\cdot v\leq 0}b\,|x|V_0^\beta|v|^{\ell_0+1}+\frac{1_{x\cdot v\leq 0}}{2^\beta}b\,|x||v|^{\ell_0+1+2\beta}\\&+1_{x\cdot v\geq 0}b(\alpha+1-\beta)\frac{|x|V_0^\beta|v|^{\ell_0+3}}{V_0+|v|^2/2}+\frac{1_{x\cdot v\geq 0}}{2^\beta}\,b(\alpha+1-\beta)\frac{|x||v|^{3+\ell_0+2\beta}}{V_0+|v|^2/2}.\end{aligned}\tag{6.17}$$

Let us now find conditions such that $-a\alpha|v|^{\ell_0+2}$ and $-2^{\beta-1}bx\cdot\nabla V_0\,V_0^\beta$ are dominant in the right hand side of (6.17). From (6.16), for $|x|\geq r$,

$$C^{-1}|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0+\mathsf{n}_0\beta}\leq|x\cdot\nabla V_0(x)|V_0^\beta(x)=V_0^\beta(x)\,x\cdot\nabla V_0(x),\tag{6.18}$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of x. Assume that

$$\beta < \ell_0/2, \tag{6.19}$$

so that $|v|^{2+2\beta} = o(|v|^{\ell_0+2})$ as $|v| \to +\infty$. In addition, for $0 < \epsilon < \lambda_0$, using Young's inequality with $p_\epsilon = (\ell_0 + 2 - \epsilon)/2 > 1$ and $q_\epsilon = p_\epsilon/(p_\epsilon - 1) = 1 + 2/(\ell_0 - \epsilon)$:

$$|v|^2 V_0^\beta \leq p_\epsilon^{-1}|v|^{\ell_0+2-\epsilon} + q_\epsilon^{-1} V_0^{\beta(1+2/(\ell_0-\epsilon))}.$$

From (6.19), for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough $\beta < (\ell_0 - \epsilon)/2$ and thus $\mathsf{n}_0\beta(1 + 2/(\ell_0 - \epsilon)) < \mathsf{n}_0\beta + \mathsf{n}_0$. Then, for such $\epsilon > 0$, $|v|^{\ell_0+2-\epsilon} = o(|v|^{\ell_0+2})$ as $|v| \to +\infty$ and $V_0^{\beta(1+2/(\ell_0-\epsilon))} = o(|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0+\beta\mathsf{n}_0}) \to +\infty$ as $|x| \to +\infty$ (see (6.16)). For $\epsilon \ll 1$, using again Young's inequality with $p_\epsilon = (\ell_0 + 2 - \epsilon)/(\ell_0 + 1) = 1 + (1 - \epsilon)/(\ell_0 + 1) > 1$ and $q_\epsilon = p_\epsilon/(p_\epsilon - 1) = (\ell_0 + 2 - \epsilon)/(1 - \epsilon) = 1 + (\ell_0 + 1)/(1 - \epsilon)$:

$$|v|^{\ell_0+1}|x|V_0^\beta \leq p_\epsilon^{-1}|v|^{\ell_0+2-\epsilon} + q_\epsilon^{-1}|x|V_0^{\beta[1+(\ell_0+1)/(1-\epsilon)]}.$$

Let us check that $(1 + \mathsf{n}_0\beta)[1 + (\ell_0 + 1)/(1 - \epsilon)] < \mathsf{n}_0\beta + \mathsf{n}_0$. This is equivalent to $\mathsf{n}_0\beta < (\mathsf{n}_0 - 1)(1 - \epsilon)/(\ell_0 + 1) - 1$. Notice that from (6.9), $(\mathsf{n}_0 - 1)/(\ell_0 + 1) > 1$ and thus for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough $(\mathsf{n}_0 - 1)(1 - \epsilon)/(\ell_0 + 1) > 1$. Then, assume that

$$\mathsf{n}_0\beta < (\mathsf{n}_0 - 1)/(\ell_0 + 1) - 1 \tag{6.20}$$

so that for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, $|x|V_0^{\beta[1+(\ell_0+1)/(1-\epsilon)]} = o(|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0+\mathsf{n}_0\beta})$. Assume also that

$$\beta < 1/2 \tag{6.21}$$

so that, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, $p_\epsilon = (\ell_0 + 2 - \epsilon)/(\ell_0 + 1 + 2\beta) > 1$. Then,

$$|x||v|^{\ell_0+1+2\beta} \leq p_\epsilon^{-1}|v|^{\ell_0+2-\epsilon} + q_\epsilon^{-1}|x|^{(\ell_0+2-\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon-2\beta)}.$$

Assume that

$$\ell_0 + 2 < (\mathsf{n}_0\beta + \mathsf{n}_0)(1 - 2\beta),$$

which is satisfied if $\beta > 0$ is small enough since $\ell_0 + 2 < \mathsf{n}_0$ (see (6.9)). Then for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, $(\ell_0+2-\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon-2\beta) < \mathsf{n}_0\beta+\mathsf{n}_0$ and $|x|^{(\ell_0+2-\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon-2\beta)} = o(|x|^{\mathsf{n}_0\beta+\mathsf{n}_0})$. Moreover, for $\beta > 0$ small enough, it holds $\mathsf{n}_0/(1 + \mathsf{n}_0\beta) > 1$ and thus, $V_0 + v^2/2 \geq C^{-1}V_0^{1/\mathsf{n}_0+\beta}v^{3/2-2\beta}$, for some $C > 0$. Then, because $|x|V_0^{-1/\mathsf{n}_0}$ is a bounded function (see (6.16)), it holds for some $M > 0$ independent of x and v,

$$\frac{|x|^{1+\mathsf{n}_0\beta}|v|^{\ell_0+3}}{V_0 + v^2/2} \leq M|v|^{\ell_0+3/2+2\beta}. \tag{6.22}$$

If $\beta < 1/4$, then the left hand side of (6.22) is equal to $o(|v|^{\ell_0+2})$ as $|v| \to +\infty$. Finally, since $V_0 + |v|^2/2 \geq C^{-1}V_0^{1/\mathsf{n}_0}|v|^{2(\mathsf{n}_0-1)/\mathsf{n}_0}$, for some $M > 0$ independent of x and v,

$$\frac{|x||v|^{\ell_0+3+2\beta}}{V_0 + v^2/2} \leq M|v|^{\ell_0+1+2\beta+2/\mathsf{n}_0}.$$

Taking $\beta > 0$ such that $2\beta+2/\mathsf{n}_0 < 1$ (this is possible because $2/\mathsf{n}_0 < 1$ by assumption), the left hand side of the previous inequality is equal to $o(|v|^{\ell_0+2})$ as $|v| \to +\infty$. In conclusion, all the previous estimates together with (6.18) imply that there exists η (depending on ℓ_0 and n_0) such that if

$$0 < \beta < \eta, \tag{6.23}$$

then (recalling also that $0 < \alpha < \beta$ and $\eta \leq \ell_0$, see (6.10) and (6.19)), there exists $C > 0$ and a continuous function $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathsf{K}(x, v)$ such that (see (6.15))

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}_0 \mathsf{W}}{\mathsf{W}} \leq C - \mathsf{K}(x, v), \tag{6.24}$$

with $\mathsf{K}(x, v) \to +\infty$ if $|x| + |v| \to +\infty$. This ends the proof of Proposition 6.5. □

Let us now consider O, a nonempty subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ (not necessarily bounded), that is O is a connected open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. As explained in the introduction, we are interested, for applications in statistical physics, in the existence of quasi-stationary distributions for the processes (6.1) in

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{6.25}$$

Of course, other domains might be considered with our techniques. Recall that σ_D (see (2.1)) is the first exit time from $\mathcal{D}$ for the process (6.1):

$$\sigma_D(\mathsf{x}) = \inf\big\{t \geq 0, X_t(\mathsf{x}) \notin D\big\} = \inf\big\{t \geq 0, x_t(\mathsf{x}) \notin \mathsf{O}\big\}, \tag{6.26}$$

where we recall that $(X_t(\mathsf{x}), t \geq 0)$ stands for the process $(X_t, t \geq 0)$ when $X_0 = \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Let us now check the other assumptions on $(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}, t \geq 0)$ (the semigroup of the process (6.1) killed when exiting $\mathcal{D}$, see (2.2) and (6.26)) needed to apply Theorem 2.2.

6.2.3. *The semigroup $(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}, t \geq 0)$ is topologically irreducible.*

Lemma 6.6. *Assume that V, c and Σ satisfy **(Av1)**, **(Ac0)**, and **(AΣ)**. Then, $(P_t^{\mathcal{D}}, t \geq 0)$ is topologically irreducible. If the open set $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\mathsf{O}}$ is not empty, then for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} < t) > 0,$$

*which implies in particular that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} < +\infty) > 0$ (thus **(C5)** is satisfied for the process (6.1) when $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$).*

Proof. We will apply the Stroock-Varadhan support theorem.

Step 1: the case when $V = 0$ and $c = 0$.

Recall that the process $(X_t^0 = (x_t^0, v_t^0), t \geq 0)$ is the solution (in the strong sense) to the stochastic differential equation (6.5). Denote by $(X_t^0(\mathsf{x}), t \geq 0)$ the process $(X_t^0, t \geq 0)$ when $X_0^0 = \mathsf{x}$. Let $(P_t^{\mathcal{D},0}, t \geq 0)$ denote the semigroup of the process (6.5) killed when exiting $\mathcal{D}$. Denote by σ_D^0 the first time the process $(X_t^0 = (x_t^0, v_t^0), t \geq 0)$ exits $\mathcal{D}$ (see (6.26)). The stochastic differential equation (6.5) writes in the Stratonovich form

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^0 = v_t^0 dt, \\ dv_t^0 = -\dfrac{1}{2}\Sigma(x_t^0, v_t^0)\nabla_v \Sigma(x_t^0, v_t^0) + \Sigma(x_t^0, v_t^0) \circ dB_t. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ be a nonempty open subset of O and $\mathcal{O}_2$ be a nonempty open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consider $\mathsf{x}_0 = (x_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathsf{x}_1 = (x_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2$. Let $t > 0$ and $\gamma : [0, t] \to \mathsf{O}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^1$ and piecewise $\mathcal{C}^2$ curve such that $\gamma(0) = x_0$, $\dot\gamma(0) = v_0$, $\gamma(t) = x_1$, and $\dot\gamma(t) = v_1$. The construction of such a γ can be done by a local cubic interpolation in time as it

is done for instance in [54, Lemma 4.2] (their arguments also hold though O is not bounded[4]). For $s \in [0,t]$, set

$$\mathsf{Y}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{Y}_1(s) \\ \mathsf{Y}_2(s) \end{pmatrix} \text{ where } \mathsf{Y}_1(s) = \gamma(s) \text{ and } \mathsf{Y}_2(s) = \dot{\gamma}(s).$$

Then, define the piecewise continuous function $h : [0,t] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ by:

$$\mathsf{h}(s) = \frac{1}{\Sigma(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s))} \Big[\ddot{\gamma}(s) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) \nabla_v \Sigma(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) \Big], \ s \in [0,t].$$

Clearly, $\mathsf{h} \in L^2([0,t], \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathsf{Y}(0) = \mathsf{x}_0$, and for all $s \in [0,t]$,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathsf{Y}}_1(s) = \mathsf{Y}_2(s), \\ \dot{\mathsf{Y}}_2(s) = -\frac{1}{2} \Sigma(\mathsf{Y}_1(s), \mathsf{Y}_2(s)) \nabla_v \Sigma(\mathsf{Y}_1(s), \mathsf{Y}_2(s)) + \Sigma(\mathsf{Y}_1(s), \mathsf{Y}_2(s))\, \mathsf{h}(s). \end{cases}$$

By the Stroock-Varadhan support theorem [73] (see also [7, Theorem 4]), for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0} \Big(\sup_{s \in [0,t]} |X_s^0 - \mathsf{Y}(s)| < \varepsilon \Big) > 0.$$

Since for all $s \in [0,t]$, $\mathsf{Y}(s) = (\gamma^T(s), \dot{\gamma}^T(s))^T \in \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d = \mathcal{D}$ and O is open, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, if $\sup_{s \in [0,t]} |X_s^0 - \mathsf{Y}(s)| < \varepsilon$, then $X_s^0 = (x_s, v_s) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $s \in [0,t]$ (in particular $t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0$ by continuity of the trajectories), and $x_t \in B(x_1, 2\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{O}_1$ and $v_t \in B(v_1, 2\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{O}_2$. Thus

$$P_t^{D,0}(\mathsf{x}_0, \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0}(X_t^0 \in \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2, t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0} \Big(\sup_{s \in [0,t]} |X_s^0 - \mathsf{Y}(s)| < \varepsilon \Big) > 0,$$

which is precisely the topological irreducibility of $(P_t^{\mathcal{D},0}, t \geq 0)$. If the open set $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\mathsf{O}}$ is not empty, then choosing $\mathcal{O}_1$ such that $\mathcal{O}_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\mathsf{O}}$, one deduces with the same arguments as above[5] that for all $\mathsf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0 < +\infty) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0 < t) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}_0}(X_t^0 \in \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathbb{R}^d) > 0.$$

Step 2: the case when $V \neq 0$ and $c \neq 0$.

Let us now come back to the case when $V \neq 0$ and $c \neq 0$. Pick $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$. Since V and c satisfy **(Av1)** and **(Ac0)**, from [83, Lemma 1.1] (and the remark on page 7 there), for $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $t > 0$, the law of $(X_s(\mathsf{x}), s \in [0,t])$ is equivalent to the law of $(X_s^0(\mathsf{x}), s \in [0,t])$. In particular, for all $t > 0$ and all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_t \in \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2, t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}) > 0 \text{ if and only if } \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(X_t^0 \in \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2, t < \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0) > 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}} < t) > 0 \text{ if and only if } \mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0 < t) > 0.$$

[4]Let $\eta : [0,t] \to \mathsf{O}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^0$ curve such that $\eta(0) = x_0$ and $\eta(t) = x_1$ (O is path-connected because it is connected and locally path-connected, since it is open). Then, apply [54, Lemma 4.2] with (using the notation there) $K = \{\mathsf{x}_0, \mathsf{x}_1\}$, $\delta_K = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{dist}_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathrm{Ran}\ \eta, \partial\mathsf{O}) > 0$, $K' = \{(x,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathrm{dist}_{\mathbb{R}^d}(x, \mathrm{Ran}\ \eta) \leq \delta_K/2, |v| \leq \max(|v_0|, |v_1|)\}$ (which is a compact and connected subset of $\mathcal{D}$), and $\varepsilon = \delta_K/2$.

[5]In this case, consider $\gamma : [0,t] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth curve such that $\gamma(0) = x_0$, $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v_0$, $\gamma(t) = x_1$, and $\dot{\gamma}(t) = v_1$. Such a curve can be simply constructed by a (global) cubic interpolation in time.

This ends the proof of Lemma 6.6. □

6.2.4. *Weak Feller property of $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$.*

Proposition 6.7. *Assume that V, c, and Σ satisfy respectively the assumptions **(Av1)**, **(Ac0)**, and **(AΣ)**. Assume that O is a $\mathcal{C}^2$ subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\mathsf{O}}$ is nonempty. Then, for $t > 0$, $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is strong Feller on $\mathcal{D}$ (and thus weakly Feller on $\mathcal{D}$). Thus, assumption **(C4)** is satisfied for $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$.*

Proof. The proof of Proposition 6.7 is divided into several steps.

Step 1: properties of the process $(X_t^0, t \geq 0)$, see (6.5).

Step 1a: Proof of (6.27).

In this step, we prove that, for $\mathsf{y} = (x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) \in \partial\mathcal{D}$, if

$$\mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) \cdot v_\mathsf{y} \geq 0,$$

then almost surely, for all $t > 0$, there exists $u \in (0, t]$, such that

$$x_u^0(\mathsf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\mathsf{O}}. \tag{6.27}$$

Equation (6.27) has been very recently proved in [54, (i) in Proposition 2.8] for the process (6.1) when Σ is constant (that is, Σ is independent of x and v). The proof of (6.27) requires further analysis when Σ is not constant. When $v_\mathsf{y} \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) > 0$, the proof of (6.27) is straightforward. Indeed, because $\partial\mathsf{O}$ is $\mathcal{C}^2$, in a neighborhood U of $x_\mathsf{y} \in \partial\mathsf{O}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, O is given by $\{\Psi < 0\}$ for some $\mathcal{C}^2$ function $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) = \nabla\Psi(x_\mathsf{y})$ and $\partial\mathsf{O}$ is given by $\{\Psi = 0\}$. Then, for $t \geq 0$ (sufficiently small, say $t \leq t^*(\mathsf{y})$, so that $x_t^0(\mathsf{y}) \in \mathsf{U}$ for all $t \in [0, t^*(\mathsf{y})]$),

$$\Psi(x_t^0(\mathsf{y})) = \int_0^t \nabla\Psi(x_s^0(\mathsf{y})) \cdot v_s^0(\mathsf{y})\, ds.$$

In addition, since

$$\nabla\Psi(x_0^0(\mathsf{y})) \cdot v_0^0(\mathsf{y}) = v_\mathsf{y} \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) > 0$$

and because $s \geq 0 \mapsto \nabla\Psi(x_s^0(\mathsf{x})) \cdot v_s^0(\mathsf{x})$ is continuous almost surely, one deduces that for all $t > 0$ small enough,

$$\Psi(x_t^0(\mathsf{y})) > 0,$$

which concludes the proof of (6.27) when $v_\mathsf{y} \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) > 0$. Let us now prove (6.27) when $v_\mathsf{y} \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) = 0$. One has uniformly in $x \in \mathsf{U}$ (recall that $\nabla\Psi$ is of regularity $\mathcal{C}^1$),

$$\nabla\Psi(x) = \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) + O(|x - x_\mathsf{y}|),$$

so that, using in addition that $v_s^0(\mathsf{y}) \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_0^0(\mathsf{y})) = v_\mathsf{y} \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) = 0$, for $t \in [0, t^*(\mathsf{y})]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x_t^0(\mathsf{y})) &= \int_0^t \Big[v_\mathsf{y} + \int_0^s \Sigma((x_u^0(\mathsf{y}), v_u^0(\mathsf{y})))dB_u\Big] \cdot \big[\mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y}) + O(\underbrace{|x_s^0(\mathsf{y}) - x_\mathsf{y}|}_{=|\int_0^s v_u^0(\mathsf{y})du|})\big]\, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \mathrm{M}_s ds + O(t^2) \sup_{s\in[0,t]} |v_s^0(\mathsf{y})|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

where we set for $s \geq 0$,

$$\mathrm{M}_s = \int_0^s \Sigma(x_u^0(\mathsf{y}), v_u^0(\mathsf{y}))d\omega_u$$

and where $(\omega_u, u \geq 0)$ is a standard one dimensional Brownian motion ($\omega_u = B_u \cdot \mathsf{n}(x_\mathsf{y})$). Then, to prove (6.27) and in view of the previous estimate, we have to study the sign of $\int_0^t \mathrm{M}_s ds$ (for small $t > 0$). To this end, it is sufficient to show that

$$\limsup_{t \to 0^+} \frac{\int_0^t \mathrm{M}_s ds}{\mathsf{L}(T^{-1}(t))} > 0 \text{ almost surely,} \tag{6.29}$$

where $\mathsf{L}(r) = \sqrt{2/3}\, r^{3/2} \sqrt{\log\log(1/r)}$ (for $r > 0$), and where for $s \geq 0$,

$$T(s) = \int_0^s \Sigma^2(x_u^0(\mathsf{y}), v_u^0(\mathsf{y}))du,$$

which is (almost surely) a strictly increasing and continuously differentiable function from $\mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with $T(s) = \int_0^s \Sigma^2(x_u^0(\mathsf{y}), v_u^0(\mathsf{y}))du \geq \Sigma_0^2 \times s \to +\infty$ as $s \to +\infty$. Notice that because for all $s \geq 0$, $\Sigma_0 s \leq T(s) \leq \Sigma_\infty s$, it holds for all $u \geq 0$,

$$\Sigma_\infty^{-1} u \leq T^{-1}(u) \leq \Sigma_0^{-1} u.$$

Thus for some $C > 0$, it holds, for $t \geq 0$ large enough,

$$C^{-1}\mathsf{L}(t) \leq \mathsf{L}(T^{-1}(t)) \leq C\mathsf{L}(t).$$

Consequently, $t^2/\mathsf{L}(T^{-1}(t)) \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ and thus, in view of (6.28), (6.29) implies (6.27). Thus, let us prove (6.29). By assumption on Σ, $(\mathrm{M}_s, s \geq 0)$ is a continuous martingale and $[\mathsf{M}]_s = T(s) \to +\infty$ as $s \to +\infty$. Then, using the Dambis-Dubins-Schwarz theorem, there exists a standard one dimensional Brownian motion $(\mathrm{V}_t, t \geq 0)$ such that for all $s \geq 0$,

$$\mathrm{M}_s = \mathrm{V}_{[\mathsf{M}]_s}.$$

Since $(T^{-1})'(u) = 1/T'(T^{-1}(u)) = \Sigma^{-2}(x_{T^{-1}(u)}^0, v_{T^{-1}(u)}^0)$,

$$\int_0^t \mathrm{M}_s ds = \int_0^t \mathrm{V}_{T(s)} ds = \int_0^{T^{-1}(t)} \mathrm{V}_u\, \Sigma^{-2}(x_{T^{-1}(u)}^0(\mathsf{y}), v_{T^{-1}(u)}^0(\mathsf{y}))\, du. \tag{6.30}$$

Then, setting $\kappa = T^{-1}(t)$ $(t > 0)$, (6.29) is equivalent to

$$\limsup_{\kappa \to 0^+} \frac{\int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u \Sigma^{-2}(x_{T^{-1}(u)}^0(\mathsf{y}), v_{T^{-1}(u)}^0(\mathsf{y}))\, du}{\mathsf{L}(\kappa)} > 0 \text{ almost surely.} \tag{6.31}$$

The proof of (6.31) is the purpose of the next step.

Step 1b: Proof of (6.31).

By assumption on Σ and since $\nabla\Sigma^{-2} = -2(\nabla\Sigma)\,\Sigma^{-3}$, uniformly on $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, one has:

$$\Sigma^{-2}(\mathsf{x}) = \Sigma^{-2}(\mathsf{z}) + O(|\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{z}|).$$

Thus, using also that $x^0_{T^{-1}(u)}(\mathsf{y}) = x_\mathsf{y} + \int_0^{T^{-1}(u)} v^0_s(\mathsf{y})ds$ and $T^{-1}(u) \le T^{-1}(t) = \kappa$ (for $0 \le u \le t$), one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u \Sigma^{-2}(X^0_{T^{-1}(u)})\,du &= \Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) \int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u\,du \\
&\quad + O\Big(\int_0^\kappa |\mathrm{V}_u|\big[|x^0_{T^{-1}(u)}(\mathsf{y}) - x_\mathsf{y}| + |v^0_{T^{-1}(u)} - v_\mathsf{y}|\big]du\Big) \\
&= \Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) \int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u\,du \\
&\quad + \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u| O\Big[\int_0^\kappa |x^0_{T^{-1}(u)}(\mathsf{y}) - x_\mathsf{y}|du + \kappa \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y}) - v_\mathsf{y}|\Big] \\
&= \Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) \int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u\,du \\
&\quad + \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u|\, O\Big[\int_0^\kappa u \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y})|du + \kappa \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y}) - v_\mathsf{y}|\Big] \\
&= \Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) \int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u\,du \\
&\quad + \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u| \Big[\sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y})| O\big(\kappa^2\big) + \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y}) - v_\mathsf{y}| O\big(\kappa\big)\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $T^{-1}(u) \le \Sigma_0^{-1} u$. Using Watanabe's the law of the iterated logarithm [82] for $\int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u\,du$ (see also [50, (2) in Theorem 1]), it holds:

$$\limsup_{\kappa\to 0^+} \frac{\Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) \int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u\,du}{\mathsf{L}(\kappa)} = \Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y}) > 0 \ \text{ almost surely.}$$

Using Khinchin's law of the iterated logarithm of $\sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u|$ (see e.g. [41]), it holds:

$$\limsup_{\kappa\to 0^+} \frac{\sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u|}{\mathsf{P}(\kappa)} = 1 \ \text{ almost surely,}$$

where $\mathsf{P}(\kappa) = \sqrt{2\kappa}\sqrt{\log\log(1/\kappa)}$. Thus, since $\frac{\mathsf{P}(\kappa)}{\mathsf{L}(\kappa)} \sim \sqrt{3}/\kappa$, one has almost surely as $\kappa \to 0^+$:

$$\kappa \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y}) - v_\mathsf{y}| \frac{\sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u|}{\mathsf{L}(\kappa)} = \frac{\sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |\mathrm{V}_u|}{\mathsf{P}(\kappa)} \frac{\kappa \mathsf{P}(\kappa)}{\mathsf{L}(\kappa)} \sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y}) - v_\mathsf{y}| \to 0,$$

because almost surely, $\sup_{u\in[0,\kappa]} |v^0_u(\mathsf{y}) - v_\mathsf{y}| \to 0$ as $\kappa \to 0^+$. This concludes the proof of (6.31) (with more precisely $\limsup_{\kappa\to 0^+} \int_0^\kappa \mathrm{V}_u \Sigma^{-2}(X^0_{T^{-1}(u)})\,du/\mathsf{L}(\kappa) = \Sigma^{-2}(x_\mathsf{y}, v_\mathsf{y})$ almost surely), and thus of (6.29) and then of (6.27).

Step 1c: Proof of (6.32).

Let $(\mathsf{x}_n)_n$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathsf{x}_n \to \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ as $n \to +\infty$. Let us prove that for $t > 0$,

$$\text{as } n \to +\infty, \ \ 1_{t<\sigma^0_\mathcal{D}(\mathsf{x}_n)} \to 1_{t<\sigma^0_\mathcal{D}(\mathsf{x})} \text{ in } \mathbb{P}\text{-probability.} \tag{6.32}$$

Let us prove (6.32). Let us pick $t>0$ and a sequence $\mathsf{x}_n=(x_n,v_n)_n$ converging to some $\mathsf{x}=(x,v)\in\mathcal{D}$.

First of all, recall that under $(\mathbf{A}\Sigma)$, for $t>0$, P_t^0 has a density p_t^0 over $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. It then holds:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}=t)\leq\mathbb{P}_{\mathsf{x}}(x_t^0\in\partial\mathsf{O})=\int_{\partial\mathsf{O}\times\mathbb{R}^d}p_t^0(\mathsf{x},x,v)dxdv=0, \tag{6.33}$$

since $\partial\mathsf{O}$ has Lebesgue measure 0. Indeed, because $\partial\mathsf{O}$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$, for any $x\in\partial\mathsf{O}$, there exists $\varepsilon_x>0$, such that the open subset $\partial\mathsf{O}\cap B(x,\varepsilon_x)$ of $\partial\mathsf{O}$ has Lebesgue measure 0. Moreover these open subsets of $\partial\mathsf{O}$ clearly cover $\partial\mathsf{O}$ and because $\partial\mathsf{O}$ is Lindelöf (due to the fact that $\mathbb{R}^d$ is Lindelöf and $\partial\mathsf{O}=\overline{\mathsf{O}}\cap(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\mathsf{O})$ is closed), $\partial\mathsf{O}\subset\cup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}B(x_i,\varepsilon_{x_i})\cap\partial\mathsf{O}$. Thus $\partial\mathsf{O}$ has Lebesgue measure 0. This proves (6.33).

Let us come back to the proof of (6.32). For $n\geq 0$, denote by $\mathsf{d}_n(t)=\max\big\{|X_s^0(\mathsf{x}_n)-X_s^0(\mathsf{x})|,\ s\in[0,t]\big\}$. We have using [40, Lemma 3.3] (Assumption (A) there is satisfied for the process (6.5), see indeed $(\mathbf{A}\Sigma)$):

$$\text{for any } r>0,\ \lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathbb{P}(\mathsf{d}_n(t)>r)=0. \tag{6.34}$$

Let $\{n'\}\subset\mathbb{N}$ be a subsequence. By (6.34), $\mathsf{d}_{n'}(t)\to 0$ in $\mathbb{P}$-probability as $n'\to+\infty$, and thus there exists a subsequence $\{n''\}\subset\{n'\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathsf{d}_{n''}(t)=0 \text{ a.s. as } n''\to+\infty. \tag{6.35}$$

Let us prove that

$$\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})}\to\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})} \text{ a.s. as } n''\to+\infty. \tag{6.36}$$

In view of (6.33), we only have to prove (6.36) on the events $\{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})\}$ and $\{t>\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})\}$.

On the event $\{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})\}$, $x_s^0(\mathsf{x})\in\mathsf{O}$ for all $s\in[0,t]$. By (6.35) and since O is open, there exists n_0'' such that for all $n''\geq n_0''$, $x_s^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})\in\mathsf{O}$ for all $s\in[0,t]$. Thus, for all $n''\geq n_0''$, $t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})$. We have therefore proved that on the event $\{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})\}$, $\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})}\to 1=\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})}$ as $n''\to+\infty$.

Let us now prove (6.36) on the event $\{t>\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})\}$. In this case, necessarily, since $\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{D}$, it holds almost surely, $\mathsf{n}(x_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})}^0)\cdot v_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})}^0\geq 0$. Set $\alpha=(t-\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0)/2\in(0,t-\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0)$. Then, from (6.27), and by the strong Markov property of the process (6.1), there exists $u\in(0,\alpha]$ such that $x_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})+u}^0(\mathsf{x})\in\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\overline{\mathsf{O}}$. By (6.35) and since $\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\overline{\mathsf{O}}$ is open, there exists n_0'' such that for all $n''\geq n_0''$, $x_{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})+u}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})\in\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\overline{\mathsf{O}}$. Thus, by continuity of the trajectories of for the process (6.5), for all $n''\geq n_0''$, $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})+u<t$. We have proved that on the event $\{t>\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})\}$, $\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n''})}\to 0=\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})}$ as $n''\to+\infty$. This concludes the proof of (6.36).

We now conclude the proof of (6.32). If (6.32) does not holds, there exists $r>0$, $\gamma>0$, and $\{n'\}\subset\mathbb{N}$ such that for all n', $\mathbb{P}(|\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x}_{n'})}-\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^0(\mathsf{x})}|>r)>\gamma$. However, there exists $\{n''\}\subset\{n'\}$ such that (6.36) holds, a contradiction. The proof of (6.32) is complete.

Step 2: End of the proof of Proposition 6.7.

Pick $f : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ a measurable and bounded function (i.e. $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$). Extend f by 0 outside $\mathcal{D}$, so that $f \in b\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. From [83, Lemma 1.1], it holds for $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t > 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}}\big[f(X_t)\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[f(X_t^0(\mathsf{x}))\,\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma^0_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x})}\,\mathsf{M}_t(\mathsf{x})\big],$$

where

$$\mathsf{M}_t = \exp\Big[-\int_0^t \Sigma^{-1}(x_s^0, v_s^0)\big(c(x_s^0, v_s^0)v_s^0 + \nabla V(x_s^0)\big)dB_s \\ - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \big|\Sigma^{-1}(x_s^0, v_s^0)[c(x_s^0, v_s^0)v_s^0 + \nabla V(x_s^0)]\big|^2 ds\Big].$$

Let $(\mathsf{x}_n)_n$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathsf{x}_n \to \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ as $n \to +\infty$. Then, from the proof of [83, Proposition 1.2], $f(X_t^0(\mathsf{x}_n)) \to f(X_t^0(\mathsf{x}))$ in $\mathbb{P}$-probability and $\mathsf{M}_t(\mathsf{x}_n) \to \mathsf{M}_t(\mathsf{x})$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, as $n \to +\infty$. Then, using (6.32), in $\mathbb{P}$-probability,

$$f(X_t^0(\mathsf{x}_n))\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma^0_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x}_n)} \to \mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma^0_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathsf{x})} f(X_t^0(\mathsf{x})) \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty.$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}_n}\big[f(X_t)\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}\big] \to \mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}}\big[f(X_t)\mathsf{1}_{t<\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}\big]$ as $n \to +\infty$, that is $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$ is strong Feller for $t > 0$. This ends the proof of Proposition 6.7. □

Remark 6.8. If $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathsf{V}$, where V is a smooth bounded subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we refer to [13] for the strong Feller property of $P_t^{\mathcal{D}}$.

6.3. **Quasi-stationary distributions for hypoelliptic damped Hamiltonian systems** (6.1)**.** With all the previous results (see Lemma 6.2, Proposition 6.5, Lemma 6.6, and Proposition 6.7), one deduces from Theorem 2.2, the following theorem for the existence and uniqueness of the quasi-stationary distribution of the process (6.1) in $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 6.9. *Assume that Σ satisfies **(AΣ)**. Let O be a $\mathcal{C}^2$ subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{\mathsf{O}}$ is nonempty. Assume that*

*(1) The functions V and c satisfy **(Av1)**, **(Av2)**, **(Ac1)**, and **(Ac2)**. Then, there exist parameters $\mathsf{w} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $a > 0$, and $b > 0$ (see* [83, Eq. (3.4) → Eq. (3.9)] *for explicit conditions on w, a, and b) such that Theorem 2.2 is valid for the process* (6.1) *with $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and with the Lyapunov function W_1 defined in* (6.8)*. We refer to Remark 6.3 for concrete examples of functions V and c satisfying these assumptions, and to Lemma 6.4 for an upper bound on W_1.*

(2) The functions c and V satisfy respectively (6.2) *and* (6.3)*, and* (6.9) *holds. Then, Theorem 2.2 is valid for the process* (6.1) *with $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and with the bounded Lyapunov function W_2 defined in* (6.12)*. Let us emphasize that since W_2 is bounded (see item (2) in Proposition 6.5), item (b) in Theorem 2.2 holds and item (d) in Theorem 2.2 is satisfied for any initial distribution ν in $\mathcal{D}$.*

In other words, if **(AΣ)** holds, when $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{O} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (where O is as in Theorem 6.9), there exists a unique QSD in $\mathcal{D}$ for the process (6.1) in:

(1) For all $p > 1$, the space $\mathscr{M}_p = \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{D}), \nu(\mathsf{W}_1^{1/p}) < +\infty\}$ when **(Av1)**, **(Av2)**, **(Ac1)**, and **(Ac2)** hold. In addition, in this case, Equation (2.7) holds for all $\nu \in \mathscr{M}_p$.

(2) The whole space of probability measures $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{D})$ on $\mathcal{D}$ when (6.2), (6.3), and (6.9) hold. Moreover, in this case, (2.7) holds for all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{D})$.

Acknowledgement.
This work has been (partially) supported by the Project EFI ANR-17-CE40-0030 of the French National Research Agency. B.N. is supported by the grant IA20Nectoux from the Projet I-SITE Clermont CAP 20-25, and by the ANR-19-CE40-0010, Analyse Quantitative de Processus Métastables (QuAMProcs). The authors thank P. Cattiaux, T. Lelièvre, M. Ramil, and Y. Xiao for fruitful exchanges during the preparation of this work.

References

[1] A. Arapostathis, V.S. Borkar, and M.K. Ghosh. *Ergodic Control of Diffusion Processes*, volume 143. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
[2] D. Aristoff and T. Lelièvre. Mathematical Analysis of Temperature Accelerated Dynamics. *Multiscale Modeling and Simulation*, 12(1):290–317, 2014.
[3] E. Arjas, E. Nummelin, and R.L. Tweedie. Semi-Markov processes on a general state space: α-theory and quasi-stationarity. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 30(2):187–200, 1980.
[4] S. Armstrong and J.C. Mourrat. Variational methods for the kinetic Fokker-Planck equation. *Preprint arXiv:1902.04037*, 2019.
[5] D. Bakry, F. Barthe, P. Cattiaux, and A. Guillin. A simple proof of the Poincaré inequality for a large class of probability measures including the log-concave case. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 13:60–66, 2008.
[6] D. Bakry, P. Cattiaux, and A. Guillin. Rate of convergence for ergodic continuous Markov processes: Lyapunov versus Poincaré. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 254(3):727–759, 2008.
[7] G. Ben Arous, M. Gradinaru, and M. Ledoux. Hölder norms and the support theorem for diffusions. In *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 30, pages 415–436, 1994.
[8] M. Benaïm, N. Champagnat, W. Oçafrain, and D. Villemonais. Degenerate processes killed at the boundary of a domain. *Preprint arXiv:2103.08534*, 2021.
[9] M. Benaïm and B. Cloez. A stochastic approximation approach to quasi-stationary distributions on finite spaces. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 20:1–13, 2015.
[10] M. Benaïm, B. Cloez, and F. Panloup. Stochastic approximation of quasi-stationary distributions on compact spaces and applications. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 28(4):2370–2416, 2018.
[11] A. Binder, T. Lelièvre, and G. Simpson. A generalized parallel replica dynamics. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 284:595–616, 2015.
[12] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, and S.V. Shaposhnikov. *Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov Equations*, volume 207. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
[13] P. Cattiaux. Calcul stochastique et opérateurs dégénérés du second ordre. II: Problème de Dirichlet. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques (Paris. 1885)*, 115(1):81–122, 1991.
[14] P. Cattiaux, P. Collet, A. Lambert, S. Martínez, S. Méléard, and J. San Martín. Quasi-Stationary Distributions and Diffusion Models in Population Dynamics. *The Annals of Probability*, 37(5):1926–1969, 2009.
[15] P. Cattiaux and A. Guillin. Hitting times, functional inequalities, Lyapunov conditions and uniform ergodicity. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 272(6):2361–2391, 2017.
[16] P. Cattiaux, A. Guillin, F-Y. Wang, and L. Wu. Lyapunov conditions for super Poincaré inequalities. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 256(6):1821–1841, 2009.
[17] P. Cattiaux and S. Méléard. Competitive or weak cooperative stochastic Lotka–Volterra systems conditioned on non-extinction. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 60(6):797–829, 2010.

[18] N. Champagnat, K. A. Coulibaly-Pasquier, and D. Villemonais. Criteria for exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distributions and applications to multi-dimensional diffusions. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XLIX*, pages 165–182. Springer, 2018.

[19] N. Champagnat and D. Villemonais. Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution and Q-process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 164(1-2):243–283, 2016.

[20] N. Champagnat and D. Villemonais. Lyapunov criteria for uniform convergence of conditional distributions of absorbed Markov processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 135:51–74, 2021.

[21] N. Champagnat and D. Villemonais. General criteria for the study of quasi-stationarity. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28:1–84, 2023.

[22] J-R. Chazottes, P. Collet, and S. Méléard. Sharp asymptotics for the quasi-stationary distribution of birth-and-death processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 164(1-2):285–332, 2016.

[23] B. Cloez and M.N. Thai. Quantitative results for the fleming–viot particle system and quasi-stationary distributions in discrete space. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126(3):680–702, 2016.

[24] P. Collet, S. Martínez, S. Méléard, and J. San Martín. Quasi-stationary distributions for structured birth and death processes with mutations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 151(1-2):191–231, 2011.

[25] P. Collet, S. Martínez, and J. San Martín. *Quasi-Stationary Distributions: Markov Chains, Diffusions and Dynamical Systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[26] P. Del Moral and L. Miclo. Particle approximations of lyapunov exponents connected to schrödinger operators and feynman–kac semigroups. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 7:171–208, 2003.

[27] C. Dellacherie and P-A. Meyer. *Probabilités et potentiel*. Hermann, Paris, 1975. Chapitres I à IV, Édition entièrement refondue, Publications de l'Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Strasbourg, No. XV, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1372.

[28] C. Dellacherie and P-A. Meyer. Probabilités et Potentiel, chap. *V-VIII(vol. 2): Théorie des Martingales, Hermann, Paris*, 1980.

[29] G. Di Gesù, T. Lelièvre, D. Le Peutrec, and B. Nectoux. Jump Markov models and transition state theory: the quasi-stationary distribution approach. *Faraday Discussions*, 195:469–495, 2017.

[30] G. Di Gesù, T. Lelièvre, D. Le Peutrec, and B. Nectoux. Sharp asymptotics of the first exit point density. *Annals of PDE*, 5(2), 2019.

[31] G. Di Gesù, T. Lelièvre, D. Le Peutrec, and B. Nectoux. The exit from a metastable state: concentration of the exit point distribution on the low energy saddle points, part 1. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 138:242–306, 2020.

[32] P. Diaconis and L. Miclo. On times to quasi-stationarity for birth and death processes. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 22(3):558–586, 2009.

[33] P. Diaconis and L. Miclo. On quantitative convergence to quasi-stationarity. *Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, 24(4):973–1016, 2015.

[34] D. Down, S. P. Meyn, and R. L. Tweedie. Exponential and Uniform Ergodicity of Markov Processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 23(4):1671–1691, 1995.

[35] Y. Du. *Order Structure and Topological Methods in Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, volume 2. World Scientific, 2006.

[36] S. N. Ethier and T.G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, 1986.

[37] P. Ferrari and N. Maric. Quasi stationary distributions and fleming-viot processes in countable spaces. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 12:684–702, 2007.

[38] P.A. Ferrari, H. Kesten, S. Martinez, and P. Picco. Existence of quasi-stationary distributions. A renewal dynamical approach. *The Annals of Probability*, 23(2):511–521, 1995.

[39] G. Ferré, M. Rousset, and G. Stoltz. More on the long time stability of Feynman–Kac semigroups. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 9(3):630–673, 2021.

[40] A. Friedman. Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications, volume 1. Academic Press, New York- London, 1975. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Vol. 28.

[41] N. Gantert. An Inversion of Strassen's Law of the Iterated Logarithm for Small Time. *The Annals of Probability*, 21(2):1045–1049, 1993.

[42] G. Gong, M. Qian, and Z. Zhao. Killed diffusions and their conditioning. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 80(1):151–167, 1988.

[43] F. Gosselin. Asymptotic behavior of absorbing Markov chains conditional on nonabsorption for applications in conservation biology. *Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 261–284, 2001.

[44] G. He, G. Yang, and Y. Zhu. Some conditional limiting theorems for symmetric Markov processes with tightness property. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 24, 2019.

[45] A. Hening, Q. Qi, Z. Shen, and Y. Li. Quasistationnary distributions of multidimensional diffusion processes. *Preprint arXiv:2102.05785*, 2021.

[46] G. Hinrichs, M. Kolb, and V. Wachtel. Persistence of one-dimensional AR (1)-sequences. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 33(1):65–102, 2020.

[47] H.J. Hwang, J. Jang, and J.J.L. Velázquez. Nonuniqueness for the kinetic Fokker–Planck equation with inelastic boundary conditions. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 231(3):1309–1400, 2019.

[48] R. Khasminskii. *Stochastic Stability of Differential Equations*, volume 66. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.

[49] M. Kolb and D. Steinsaltz. Quasilimiting behavior for one-dimensional diffusions with killing. *The Annals of Probability*, 40(1):162–212, 2012.

[50] A. Lachal. Local asymptotic classes for the successive primitives of Brownian motion. *The Annals of Probability*, 25(4):1712–1734, 1997.

[51] C. Le Bris, T. Lelièvre, M. Luskin, and D. Perez. A mathematical formalization of the parallel replica dynamics. *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*, 18(2):119–146, 2012.

[52] D. Le Peutrec and B. Nectoux. Repartition of the quasi-stationary distribution and first exit point density for a double-well potential. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 52(1):581—-604, 2020.

[53] T. Lelièvre and F. Nier. Low temperature asymptotics for quasistationary distributions in a bounded domain. *Analysis & PDE*, 8(3):561–628, 2015.

[54] T. Lelièvre, M. Ramil, and J. Reygner. A probabilistic study of the kinetic Fokker–Planck equation in cylindrical domains. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 22(2):1–74, 2022.

[55] T. Lelièvre, M. Ramil, and J. Reygner. Quasi-stationary distribution for the Langevin process in cylindrical domains, part I: existence, uniqueness and long-time convergence. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 144:173–201, 2022.

[56] T. Lelièvre and G. Stoltz. Partial differential equations and stochastic methods in molecular dynamics. *Acta Numerica*, 25:681–880, 2016.

[57] M. Lladser and J. San Martín. Domain of attraction of the quasi-stationary distributions for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 37(2):511–520, 2016.

[58] L. Lorenzi and Marcello B. *Analytical Methods for Markov Semigroups*. Pure Apple. Math. (Boca Raton), volume 283, Chapman&Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2007.

[59] J.C. Mattingly, A.M. Stuart, and D.J. Higham. Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 101(2):185–232, 2002.

[60] S. Méléard and D. Villemonais. Quasi-stationary distributions and population processes. *Probability Surveys*, 9:340–410, 2012.

[61] P. Meyer-Nieberg. *Banach Lattices*. Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[62] F. Nier. *Boundary Conditions and Subelliptic Estimates for Geometric Kramers-Fokker-Planck Operators on Manifolds with Boundaries*, volume 252. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 2018.

[63] E. Nummelin. *General Irreducible Markov Chains and Non-Negative Operators*, volume 83. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[64] D. Perez, E. D Cubuk, A. Waterland, E. Kaxiras, and A.F. Voter. Long-Time Dynamics Through Parallel Trajectory Splicing. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 12(1):18–28, 2016.

[65] D. Perez, B.P. Uberuaga, Y. Shim, J.G. Amar, and A.F. Voter. Accelerated Molecular Dynamics Methods: Introduction and Recent Developments. *Annual Reports in Computational Chemistry*, 5:79–98, 2009.

[66] D. Perez, B.P. Uberuaga, and A.F. Voter. The parallel replica dynamics method–Coming of age. *Computational Materials Science*, 100:90–103, 2015.

[67] R.G. Pinsky. On The Convergence of Diffusion Processes Conditioned to Remain in a Bounded Region for Large Time to Limiting Positive Recurrent Diffusion Processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 13(2):363–378, 1985.

[68] M. Ramil. *Processus cinétiques dans les domaines à bord et quasi-stationnarité*. PhD thesis, Ecole des Ponts ParisTech, 2020.

[69] D.W. Sasser. Quasi-positive operators. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 14(3):1029–1037, 1964.

[70] H.H. Schaefer. Banach Lattices. In *Banach Lattices and Positive Operators*, pages 46–153. Springer, 1974.

[71] M.R. Sorensen and A.F. Voter. Temperature-accelerated dynamics for simulation of infrequent events. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 112(21):9599–9606, 2000.

[72] D. Steinsaltz and S.N. Evans. Quasi-stationary distributions for one-dimensional diffusions with killing. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 359(3):1285–1324, 2007.

[73] D.W. Stroock and S.R.S. Varadhan. On the support of diffusion processes with applications to the strong maximum principle. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971)*, volume 3, pages 333–359, 1972.

[74] M. Takeda. Existence and uniqueness of quasi-stationary distributions for symmetric markov processes with tightness property. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 32(4):2006–2019, 2019.

[75] D. Talay. Stochastic Hamiltonian systems: exponential convergence to the invariant measure, and discretization by the implicit Euler scheme. *Markov Processes and Related Fields*, 8(2):163–198, 2002.

[76] R.L. Tweedie. Quasi-stationary distributions for Markov chains on a general state space. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 11(4):726–741, 1974.

[77] R.L. Tweedie. R-theory for Markov chains on a general state space I: solidarity properties and R-recurrent chains. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 840–864, 1974.

[78] R.L. Tweedie. R-theory for Markov chains on a general state space II: r-subinvariant measures for r-transient chains. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 865–878, 1974.

[79] D. Villemonais. General approximation method for the distribution of Markov processes conditioned not to be killed. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 18:441–467, 2014.

[80] A.F. Voter. A method for accelerating the molecular dynamics simulation of infrequent events. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 106(11):4665–4677, 1997.

[81] A.F. Voter. Parallel replica method for dynamics of infrequent events. *Physical Review B*, 57(22):R13 985, 1998.

[82] H. Watanabe. An asymptotic property of Gaussian processes. I. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 148(1):233–248, 1970.

[83] L. Wu. Large and moderate deviations and exponential convergence for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 91(2):205–238, 2001.

[84] L. Wu. Essential spectral radius for Markov semigroups (I): discrete time case. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 128(2):255–321, 2004.

[85] K. Yosida. Functional analysis, 1980. *Spring-Verlag, New York/Berlin*, 1971.

[86] J. Zhang, S. Li, and R. Song. Quasi-stationarity and quasi-ergodicity of general Markov processes. *Science China Mathematics*, 57(10):2013–2024, 2014.

Arnaud Guillin. Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LMBP, F-63000 CLERMONT-FERRAND, FRANCE
Email address: arnaud.guillin@uca.fr

Boris Nectoux.Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LMBP, F-63000 CLERMONT-FERRAND, FRANCE
Email address: boris.nectoux@uca.fr

Liming Wu. Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LMBP, F-63000 CLERMONT-FERRAND, FRANCE, and, Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150001, China
Email address: Li-Ming.Wu@uca.fr