

A NOTE ON THE UPPER BOUND FOR I.I.D. LARGE DEVIATIONS¹

BY I. H. DINWOODIE

Northwestern University

Let \bar{X}_n denote the mean of an i.i.d. sequence of random vectors X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots taking values in \mathbf{R}^d . If λ denotes the convex conjugate of the logarithm of the moment generating function for X_1 , then

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P(\bar{X}_n \in C) \leq -\inf\{\lambda(v) : v \in C\}$$

when $C \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ is closed and the moment generating function for X_1 is finite in a neighborhood of the origin. An example is given in which this upper bound fails for a certain closed set in \mathbf{R}^3 and the moment generating function for X_1 is not finite in a neighborhood of the origin. An example is also given in which this upper bound is valid for all closed sets but the moment generating function for X_1 is not finite in a neighborhood of the origin.

1. Introduction. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_\mu)$ be a probability triple on which is defined a sequence X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots of i.i.d. random vectors in $E = \mathbf{R}^d$ with common law μ . Define $\lambda_\mu : E \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$\lambda_\mu(v_0) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbf{R}^d} \left\{ \langle v_0, \xi \rangle - \log \int_E e^{\xi(v)} \mu(dv) \right\},$$

which is the convex conjugate of the logarithm of the moment generating function. Define $\Lambda_\mu(A) = \inf_{v \in A} \lambda_\mu(v)$ when $A \subset E$ and let $\bar{X}_n = n^{-1}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)$. It is known that

$$\liminf \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{X}_n \in U) \geq -\Lambda_\mu(U)$$

when $U \subset E$ is an open set. The lower bound in this generality is due to Bahadur and Zabell (1979) who also proved that if $C \subset E$ is compact or closed and convex, then

$$(1.1) \quad \limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{X}_n \in C) \leq -\Lambda_\mu(C).$$

It is a standard result in large deviations that if, for some $t > 0$,

$$(1.2) \quad \int e^{t\|v\|} \mu(dv) < \infty,$$

Received March 1990; revised August 1990.

¹Supported by an NSF Graduate Fellowship.

AMS 1980 subject classifications. Primary 60F10.

Key words and phrases. Large deviations, random vectors.

then the upper bound (1.1) holds for all closed sets $C \subset E$. A proof is given in Proposition 6.3 of Azencott (1980). The purpose here is to present an example for which (1.1) fails for some closed set C when (1.2) is not satisfied and also to present an example where (1.1) holds for all closed sets C when (1.2) is not satisfied.

It is known that the upper bound (1.1) does not always hold for open sets, even with condition (1.2). Our counterexample to (1.1) for a closed set C in \mathbf{R}^3 is based on Slaby's (1988) counterexample to (1.1) for an open set U in \mathbf{R}^2 .

2. Examples. Example 2.1 will use the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.1. *Suppose that Y_1, Y_2, \dots is an i.i.d. sequence of random vectors in \mathbf{R}^d with law μ defined on the probability triple $(\Omega_0, \mathcal{B}_0, P_\mu)$. If $A = \cup_{i \geq 1} C_i \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ is a countable union of closed sets such that $C_i \subset C_{i+1}$ and if*

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{Y}_n \in A) > -\Lambda_\mu(A),$$

then there exist an i.i.d. sequence X_1, X_2, \dots of random vectors in \mathbf{R}^{d+1} with law π defined on a probability triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P_\pi)$ and a closed set $C \subset \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$ such that

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_n \in C) > -\Lambda_\pi(C).$$

Furthermore, $E_\pi \|X_1\|^m < \infty$ if $E_\mu \|Y_1\|^m < \infty$, for $m \geq 1$.

REMARK. If

$$\liminf \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{Y}_n \in A) > -\Lambda_\mu(A),$$

then C can be chosen so that

$$\liminf \frac{1}{n} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_n \in C) > -\Lambda_\pi(C).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.1. Let $p_k = c \exp(-|k|^{1/2})$, for $k = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, where $c^{-1} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-|k|^{1/2})$. Let Z_1, Z_2, \dots be an i.i.d. sequence of real-valued random variables on a probability triple $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{B}_1, P_\nu)$ such that $P_\nu(Z_1 = k) = p_k$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P_\pi) = (\Omega_0 \times \Omega_1, \mathcal{B}_0 \times \mathcal{B}_1, P_\mu \times P_\nu)$ and let $X_i: \Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$ be defined by $X_i = (Y_i, Z_i)$. The law π on \mathbf{R}^{d+1} for X_1 can then be written $\pi = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} P_k \mu \circ f_k^{-1}$, where $f_k: \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$ is given by $f_k(x) = (x, k)$.

Let $A_k^\varepsilon = A \times \{x \in \mathbf{R}: |x - k| \leq \varepsilon\}$ for each $k = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, where $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. Now, using Chernoff's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_n \in A_k^\varepsilon) \\ &= \limsup \frac{1}{n} \log [P_\mu(\bar{Y}_n \in A) P_\nu(\bar{Z}_n \in [k - \varepsilon, k + \varepsilon])] \\ &= \limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{Y}_n \in A) \\ &> -\Lambda_\mu(A) + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

for some $\delta > 0$ suitably small. Now we will show that, for every $k \geq 1$,

$$(2.1) \quad \Lambda_\mu(A) = \Lambda_\pi(A_k^\varepsilon),$$

from which it will follow that

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_n \in A_k^\varepsilon) > -\Lambda_\pi(A_k^\varepsilon) + \delta.$$

To see (2.1), let $(x_0, r_0) \in A_k^\varepsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\pi(x_0, r_0) &= \sup_{(\xi, t) \in \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}} \left\{ \langle (x_0, r_0), (\xi, t) \rangle - \log \int_{\mathbf{R}^{d+1}} \exp \langle v, (\xi, t) \rangle \pi(dv) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{(\xi, t)} \left\{ \langle (x_0, r_0), (\xi, t) \rangle - \log \sum_{k=-\infty}^\infty e^{kt} \left[\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{\xi(x)} \mu(dx) \right] p_k \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can assume that $t = 0$, since otherwise the moment generating function is seen to be infinite; so

$$\lambda_\pi(x_0, r_0) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbf{R}^d} \left\{ \langle x_0, \xi \rangle - \log \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{\xi(x)} \mu(dx) \right\} = \lambda_\mu(x_0).$$

Thus $\Lambda_\pi(A_k^\varepsilon) = \Lambda_\mu(A)$ for any k , which proves (2.1).

Hence, for $k = 1$, there exists n_1 such that

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_{n_1} \in A_1^\varepsilon) > -\Lambda_\pi(A_1^\varepsilon) + \delta.$$

We continue and construct a sequence $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_{n_k} \in A_k^\varepsilon) > -\Lambda_\pi(A_k^\varepsilon) + \delta.$$

Let $C_{i,k} = C_i \times \{x \in \mathbf{R}: |x - k| \leq \varepsilon\}$. Then $C_{i,k} \subset C_{i+1,k}$ and $A_k^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} C_{i,k}$. Hence, for each $k \geq 1$, there exists some integer i_k such that

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_{n_k} \in C_{i_k,k}) > -\Lambda_\pi(A_k^\varepsilon) + \delta.$$

Let $C = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} C_{i_k, k}$. C is closed, and it is clear by construction that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_n \in C) &\geq \limsup_k \frac{1}{n_k} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_{n_k} \in C_{i_k, k}) \\ &\geq -\liminf_k \Lambda_\pi(A_k^\varepsilon) + \delta \\ &\geq -\Lambda_\pi\left(\bigcup_{k \geq 1} A_k^\varepsilon\right) + \delta \\ &\geq -\Lambda_\pi(C) + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{k=-\infty}^\infty |k|^m p_k < \infty$, for every $m \geq 0$, it follows that $E_\pi \|X_1\|^m < \infty$ if $E_\mu \|Y_1\|^m < \infty$. This proves the lemma. \square

EXAMPLE 2.1. There exist a closed set C in \mathbf{R}^3 and a probability π on \mathbf{R}^3 such that an i.i.d. sequence X_1, X_2, \dots in \mathbf{R}^3 with law π satisfies $E_\pi \|X_1\|^m < \infty$, for all $m \geq 1$, and

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P_\pi(\bar{X}_n \in C) > -\Lambda_\pi(C).$$

PROOF. Define μ on \mathbf{R}^2 as in Slaby (1988). Let $f(x) = x^2 \log \log(1/x)$ and let A_t be the set $\{(x, y): 0 < x \leq t, 0 \leq y \leq f(x)\}$. Lemmas 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of Slaby show that if Y_1, Y_2, \dots is an i.i.d. sequence of \mathbf{R}^2 -valued random vectors with common law μ and if $t > 0$ is small, then

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{Y}_n \in A_t) > -\Lambda_\mu(A_t).$$

It is clear that $A_t = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} C_i$, where $C_i = \{(x, y): t/i \leq x \leq t, 0 \leq y \leq f(x)\}$. Now we can apply Lemma 2.1. Since μ is a measure of compact support, it follows that $E_\pi \|X_1\|^m < \infty$, for every $m \geq 1$. \square

If $E = \mathbf{R}^1$, it is easily proved using the techniques of Bahadur and Zabell (1979) that the upper bound holds for all closed sets with no conditions on the law μ . Variations of the following example show that the upper bound can hold for all closed sets in \mathbf{R}^d for any $d \geq 2$ without (1.2). The example is of interest because although the moment generating function does not exist in a neighborhood of the origin, λ_μ is nevertheless not identically zero and so the upper bound (1.1) is nontrivial.

EXAMPLE 2.2. Let the law μ on \mathbf{R}^2 governing the i.i.d. sequence X_1, X_2, \dots be the product of the normal distribution and the Cauchy distribution and let $C \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ be a closed set. Then $\lambda_\mu(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}x^2$, and thus the set $\{v: \lambda_\mu(v) \geq \Lambda_\mu(C)\}$ is the union of two closed half spaces H_1 and H_2 such that

$$\Lambda_\mu(H_i) = \Lambda_\mu(C).$$

Now from Lemma 2.6 of Bahadur and Zabell (1979),

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{X}_n \in C) &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \limsup \frac{1}{n} \log P_\mu(\bar{X}_n \in H_i) \\ &\leq -\min_i \Lambda_\mu(H_i) = -\Lambda_\mu(C). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the upper bound holds for all closed sets, although (1.2) does not hold.

The preceding example is essentially one-dimensional since the set $\{v: \lambda_\mu(v) \geq \Lambda_\mu(C)\}$ can be written as the union of two closed half-spaces. We will give another example without this property in which (1.1) holds for all closed sets although (1.2) is not satisfied. Let P_1 be the normal distribution on \mathbf{R}^1 and let P_2 be the probability on \mathbf{R}^1 with density

$$f(y) = \begin{cases} y^{-2}, & y > 1, \\ 0, & y \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

The law μ on \mathbf{R}^2 will be the product of P_1 and P_2 . If $C \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ is closed, then one can show that for each $c < \Lambda_\mu(C)$, the set $\{v: \lambda_\mu(v) \geq \Lambda_\mu(C)\}$ is contained in a finite union of closed sets $\cup_{i=1}^k C_i$ such that $\Lambda_\mu(C_i) \geq c$ and such that each C_i is either compact or convex. This can be used to show (1.1) for the set C with Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 of Bahadur and Zabell (1979).

An open problem is to construct a counterexample to (1.1) in \mathbf{R}^2 . This will likely be more difficult than Example 2.1 since we avoided asymptotic calculations by using those of Slaby (1988) and stacking his example in \mathbf{R}^3 .

Acknowledgment. I would like to thank Professor S. L. Zabell for having suggested this problem.

REFERENCES

AZENCOTT, R. (1980). Grandes déviations et applications. In *Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour VIII—1978. Lecture Notes in Math.* **774** 1–176. Springer, New York.
 BAHADUR, R. R. and ZABELL, S. L. (1979). Large deviations of the sample mean in general vector spaces. *Ann. Probab.* **7** 587–621.
 SLABY, M. (1988). On the upper bound for large deviations of sums of i.i.d. random vectors. *Ann. Probab.* **16** 978–990.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 LUNT HALL
 NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
 EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60208