

FROM FINITE TO INFINITE DIMENSION

YU-LIANG WU

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	The Large Deviation Principle in Infinite-Dimensional Spaces	1
1.1.	Varadhan's integral lemma	1
1.2.	Fenchel-Legendre transform	3
1.3.	Proof of the theorem	4
	References	4

1. THE LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE IN INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL SPACES

When establishing the Large Deviation Principle (LDP) for random vectors in infinite-dimensional spaces, a common strategy is to first establish the LDP for projections onto finite-dimensional subspaces and then lift these results to the original space. This approach is codified in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\{\mu_\varepsilon\}$ satisfies a weak LDP with a convex rate function I , and let \mathcal{X} be a locally convex Hausdorff topological vector space. Assume that for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*$, the limits $\Lambda_\lambda(t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \Lambda_{\mu_\varepsilon}(t\lambda/\varepsilon)$ exist as extended real numbers, and that $\Lambda_{\lambda(t)}$ is a lower semicontinuous function of $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If for every $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*$ and every $a \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\inf_{x: \langle \lambda, x \rangle > a} I(x) \leq \inf_{z > a} \Lambda_\lambda^*(z),$$

then $I = \Lambda^$, and consequently, Λ^* controls a weak LDP associated with $\{\mu_\varepsilon\}$.*

The ingredients for the proof are summarized in the following subsections.

1.1. Varadhan's integral lemma. In this subsection we assume \mathcal{X} to be a regular topological space.

Theorem 1.2 (Varadhan). *Suppose that $\{\mu_\varepsilon\}$ satisfies the LDP with a good rate function $I : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, and let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any continuous function. Assume further that either the tail condition*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon) \geq M\}} \right] = -\infty \quad (1.1)$$

or the following moment condition for some $\gamma > 1$ holds:

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\gamma \varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \right] < \infty. \quad (1.2)$$

Then,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \right] = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\varphi(x) - I(x)].$$

The theorem is a consequence of the following three lemmas.

Lemma 1.3. *If $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is lower semicontinuous and the large deviations lower bound holds with $I : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, then*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \right) \right] \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\varphi(x) - I(x)].$$

Lemma 1.4. *If $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an upper semicontinuous function for which the tail condition (1.1) holds, and the large deviations upper bound holds with the good rate function $I : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, then*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \right) \right] \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\varphi(x) - I(x)].$$

Lemma 1.5. *Condition (1.2) implies the tail condition (1.1).*

Proof of Lemma 1.3. Fix $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Since φ is lower semicontinuous, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists an open neighborhood G of x such that

$$-\varphi(x) \geq -\inf_{y \in G} \varphi(y) - \delta.$$

Using Markov's inequality and the lower bound of the LDP, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \right) &\geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{Z_\varepsilon \in G} \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{y \in G} \varphi(y) + \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mu_\varepsilon(G) \\ &\geq \inf_{y \in G} \varphi(y) - \inf_{y \in G} I(y) \geq \varphi(x) - I(x) - \delta, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the inequality since x and δ are arbitrary. \square

Proof of Lemma 1.4. Note that by the semicontinuity of φ and I , and the regularity of \mathcal{X} , for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and each $\delta > 0$, there exists an open neighborhood A_x such that

$$\inf_{y \in A_x} I(y) \geq I(x) - \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{y \in A_x} \varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x) + \delta,$$

which yields the local estimate $\mathbb{E} \left(e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_\varepsilon \in A_x\}} \right) \leq e^{\frac{\varphi(x) + \delta}{\varepsilon}} \mu_\varepsilon(A_x)$. For each $\alpha < \infty$, let $\{A_{x_i}\}_{i=1}^N$ be a finite cover of the compact set $\Psi_I(\alpha)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon) \leq M\}} \right] \\ &\leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \max \left\{ M - \alpha, \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} [\varphi(x_i) + \delta + \varepsilon \log \mu_\varepsilon(A_{x_i})] \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ M - \alpha, \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left[\varphi(x_i) + \delta - \inf_{x \in A_{x_i}} I(x) \right] \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ M - \alpha, \max_{x \in \Psi_I(\alpha)} [\varphi(x) - I(x) + 2\delta] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and then $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon) \leq M\}} \right] \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\varphi(x) - I(x)].$$

The proof is completed by using assumption (1.1), which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \right) \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \max \left\{ \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon) \leq M\}} \right], \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon) > M\}} \right] \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon) \leq M\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 1.5. The lemma follows from the observation that for any non-negative random variable X and any $\gamma > 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[X^\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \alpha\}} \right] = \alpha^\gamma \mathbb{P}(X \geq \alpha) + \int_\alpha^\infty x^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{P}(X \geq x) dx.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E} \left[X^\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \alpha\}} \right] \geq \alpha^{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[X \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \alpha\}} \right]$, which proves the lemma upon setting $X = \frac{\varphi(Z_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}$ and $\alpha = \frac{M}{\varepsilon}$. □

1.2. Fenchel-Legendre transform.

Theorem 1.6. *Let \mathcal{X} be a locally convex Hausdorff topological vector space. Assume that μ_ε satisfies the LDP with a good rate function I . Suppose in addition that*

$$\bar{\Lambda}(\lambda) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \Lambda_{\mu_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} \right), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*. \quad (1.3)$$

(1) *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \Lambda_{\mu_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} \right)$ exists, is finite, and*

$$\Lambda(\lambda) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\langle \lambda, x \rangle - I(x)].$$

(2) *If I is convex, then it is the Fenchel-Legendre transform of Λ , namely,*

$$I(x) = \Lambda^*(x) := \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*} [\langle \lambda, x \rangle - \Lambda(\lambda)].$$

(3) *If I is not convex, then Λ^* is the affine regularization of I , i.e.,*

$$\Lambda^* = \sup \{ f : f \leq I, f \text{ is convex} \}.$$

Proof. (1) Fix $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*$ and $\gamma > 1$. By assumption, Varadhan's lemma (Theorem 1.2) asserts that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \Lambda_{\mu_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} \right) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\langle \lambda, x \rangle - I(x)] < \infty.$$

Since Λ is convex and $\Lambda(0) = 0$, it follows that $\Lambda > -\infty$.

(2) This follows from the duality lemma (Lemma D.1).

(3) From part (1), we have

$$\Lambda^*(x) = I^{**}(x) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*} \inf_{y \in \mathcal{X}} [\langle \lambda, x - y \rangle + I(y)] \leq I(x).$$

By the Hahn-Banach separation theorem,

$$\sup \{ f : f \leq I, f \text{ is convex} \} = \sup \{ \lambda + c : \lambda + c \leq I, \lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*, c \in \mathbb{R} \}.$$

If $I \geq \lambda + c$, it is necessarily the case that $\inf_{y \in \mathcal{X}} [I(y) - \langle \lambda, y \rangle] \geq c$, or equivalently,

$$\inf_{y \in \mathcal{X}} [\langle \lambda, x - y \rangle + I(y)] \geq \langle \lambda, x \rangle + c,$$

from which the claim follows. \square

1.3. Proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\langle \lambda, x \rangle - I(x)] &\geq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{x: \langle \lambda, x \rangle > a} [\langle \lambda, x \rangle - I(x)] \\ &\geq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \left[a - \inf_{x: \langle \lambda, x \rangle > a} I(x) \right] \\ &\geq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \left[a - \inf_{z > a} \Lambda_\lambda^*(z) \right] = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} [z - \Lambda_\lambda^*(z)]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that Λ_λ is convex with $\Lambda_{\lambda(0)} = 0$ and is lower semicontinuous; therefore, it cannot attain the value $-\infty$. By the duality lemma (Lemma D.1), $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} [z - \Lambda_\lambda^*(z)] = \Lambda_\lambda(1) = \Lambda(\lambda)$, proving

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle - I(x)\} \geq \Lambda(\lambda).$$

By Lemma 1.3, we have

$$\Lambda(\lambda) \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} [\langle \lambda, x \rangle - I(x)].$$

Combining the above results gives $I^* = \Lambda$. Applying the duality lemma (Lemma D.1) again yields $\Lambda^* = I^{**} = I$. \square

REFERENCES

RESEARCH UNIT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF OULU, P.O. BOX 3000, 90014
UNIVERSITY OF OULU, FINLAND.
Email address: yu-liang.wu@oulu.fi
URL: s92077.github.io