Linear response and moderate deviations: hierarchical approach. II

Boris Tsirelson

Abstract

The Moderate Deviations Principle (MDP) is well-understood for sums of independent random variables, worse understood for stationary random sequences, and scantily understood for random fields. An upper bound for a new class of random fields is obtained here by induction in dimension.
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1 Definition, and main result formulated

We examine a class of random fields $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^d}$, but we are interested only in integrals $\int_B X_t \, dt$ over boxes $B = [\alpha_1, \beta_1] \times \cdots \times [\alpha_d, \beta_d] \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (where $\alpha_1 < \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_d < \beta_d$) rather than “individual” random variables $X_t$. Similarly to [1] Sect. 1] we merely deal with a box-indexed family of random variables, denoted (if only for convenience) by $\int_B X_t \, dt$ and satisfying additivity:

\begin{equation}
(1.1) \quad \int_{[\alpha, \beta] \times B} X_t \, dt + \int_{[\beta, \gamma] \times B} X_t \, dt = \int_{[\alpha, \gamma] \times B} X_t \, dt \quad \text{a.s. whenever } -\infty < \alpha < \beta < \gamma < \infty,
\end{equation}
for all boxes $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$; this being additivity w.r.t. the first coordinate, the same is required for each coordinate. We say that $X$ is centered, if

$$
\mathbb{E} \left| \int_B X_t \, dt \right| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \int_B X_t \, dt = 0 \quad \text{for all boxes } B \subset \mathbb{R}^d.
$$

Two more conditions, stationarity and measurability, will be used in [2] when proving the moderate deviations principle. Stationarity means measure preserving time shifts that send $\int_B X_t \, dt$ to $\int_{B+s} X_t \, dt$. Measurability (under stationarity) is similar to [1, (1.2)]:

$$
\text{(1.3) the distribution of } \int_{[0,r_1] \times \cdots \times [0,r_d]} X_t \, dt \text{ is a Borel measurable function of } (r_1, \ldots, r_d).
$$

But for now, our goal being upper bounds, we need only (1.1) and (1.2), and call such $X$ a centered random field (on $\mathbb{R}^d$). The notions “independent” and “identically distributed” are interpreted for such processes similarly to [1, Sect. 1]. Sometimes, when convenient, we write $X(t)$ rather than $X_t$.

Splittability, defined in [1, Def. 1.4] for $d = 1$, will be defined here for all $d$.

First, given a centered random field $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^d}$, we define a split of $X$ as a triple of random fields $X^0, X^-, X^+$ (on some probability space) such that the two fields $X^-, X^+$ are (mutually) independent and the four fields $X, X^0, X^-, X^+$ are identically distributed. (Informally, a split is useful when its leak defined below is small.) Clearly, $X^0, X^-, X^+$ are centered (since $X$ is).

Second, given $r, a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < r < b$, and a split $(X^0, X^-, X^+)$ of $X$, we define the leak (of this split) along the hyperplane $\{r\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ on the strip $[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ as the random field $(Y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}}$ where

$$
Y(t_2, \ldots, t_d) = \int_a^r X^-(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d) \, dt_1 + \int_r^b X^+(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d) \, dt_1 - \int_a^b X^0(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d) \, dt_1
$$

in the sense that

$$
\int_B Y(t) \, dt = \int_{[a,r] \times B} X^-(t) \, dt + \int_{[r,b] \times B} X^+(t) \, dt - \int_{[a,b] \times B} X^0(t) \, dt
$$

for all boxes $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Clearly, $Y$ is also a centered random field. Similarly, for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ we define the leak along the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{r\} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-k}$.
\[ \mathbb{R}^{d-k} \text{ on the coordinate strip } \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times [a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-k}. \] (Different \( k \) and \( r \) need different splits, to be useful.)

Given \( X \), we need splits \((X_{k,r}^0, X_{k,r}^{-}, X_{k,r}^{+})\) of \( X \) for all \( k = 1, \ldots, d \) and \( r \in \mathbb{R}; \) and for all \( a \in (-\infty, r), b \in (r, \infty) \) we consider the corresponding leak \( Y_{k,r,a,b} \) of this split. For \( d = 1 \) the leak is just a single random variable
\[ Y = \int_{a}^{b} X^{-}(t) \, dt + \int_{r}^{b} X^{+}(t) \, dt - \int_{a}^{b} X^{0}(t) \, dt. \]

Accordingly, a family \((X_{i})_{i \in I}\) of random fields on \( \mathbb{R}^{d} \) leads to a family \((Y_{k,r,a,b,i})_{k=1,\ldots,d} a\leq r \leq b \in I\) of centered random fields on \( \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \).

Third, we consider a family of centered random fields \((X_{i})_{i \in I} = ((X_{t,i})_{t \in \mathbb{R}^d})_{i \in I} \) (the index set \( I \) being arbitrary) and define uniform splittability of such family. Then splittability of a centered random field appears as the particular case of a single-element set \( I \). We define uniform splittability by recursion in the dimension \( d = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \), treating a centered random field on \( \mathbb{R}^{0} \) as just a single random variable of zero mean.

1.4 Definition. A family \((X_{i})_{i \in I}\) of centered random fields \( X_{i} = (X_{t,i})_{t \in \mathbb{R}^d}\) is uniformly splittable, if either \( d = 0 \) and
\[ \exists \varepsilon > 0 \forall i \in I \ \mathbb{E} \exp \varepsilon |X_{i}| \leq 2, \]
or \( d \geq 1 \) and the following two conditions hold:
(a) there exist a box \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d} \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that
\[ \forall i \in I \ \forall s \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \ \mathbb{E} \exp \varepsilon \left| \int_{B+s} X_{i}(t) \, dt \right| \leq 2, \]
(b) there exist splits \((X_{k,r,i}^{0}, X_{k,r,i}^{-}, X_{k,r,i}^{+})\) of each \( X_{i} \), whose leaks are a uniformly splittable family \((Y_{k,r,a,b,i})_{k=1,\ldots,d} a\leq r \leq b \in I\).

We use volume and width of a box \( B = [\alpha_1, \beta_1] \times \cdots \times [\alpha_d, \beta_d] \subset \mathbb{R}^{d} \):
\[ \text{vol } B = (\beta_{1} - \alpha_{1}) \cdots (\beta_{d} - \alpha_{d}), \quad \text{width } B = \min(\beta_{1} - \alpha_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{d} - \alpha_{d}). \]

The theorem below applies first of all to a single random field (that is, a single-element set \( I \)); the general formulation enables the proof by induction in the dimension.

1.5 Theorem. For every uniformly splittable family \((X_{i})_{i \in I}\) of centered random fields \( X_{i} = (X_{t,i})_{t \in \mathbb{R}^d}\) there exists \( C \in (1, \infty) \) such that for every \( i \in I \), every box \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d} \) and every \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \),
\[ \text{if } C|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{\log^{d} \text{vol } B} \quad \text{and width } B \geq C, \quad \text{then } \]
\[ \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{B} X_{t,i} \, dt \leq C(\text{vol } B)\lambda^{2}. \]
(Of course, \( \log^d \text{vol} B \) is \((\log(\text{vol} B))^d \)). This theorem will be proved by induction in the dimension \( d = 1, 2, \ldots \). Throughout we assume that a uniformly splittable family \( (X_i)_{i \in I} \) of centered random fields \( X_i = (X_{t,i})_{t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \) is given. We assume that the theorem holds in dimension \( d - 1 \), unless \( d = 1 \); in the latter case the proof needs trivial modifications.

According to Def. 1.4 we have splits (of the fields \( X_i \)) whose leaks \( Y_{k,r,a,b,i} \) are a uniformly splittable family (in dimension \( d - 1 \)). Theorem 1.5, applied to this family, gives \( C_1 \) such that for all \( k, r, a, b, i \)

\[
\log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_B Y_{k,r,a,b,i}(t) \, dt \leq C_1(\text{vol} B) \lambda^2
\]

whenever \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \) is a box of width \( \geq C_1 \), and \( C_1 |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{\log^{d-1} \text{vol} B} \).

For \( d = 1 \) the leaks \( Y_{1,r,a,b,i} \) are just random variables; their uniform splittability means \( \exists \varepsilon > 0 \, \forall r, a, b \, \forall i \in I \, \mathbb{E} \exp \varepsilon |Y_{1,r,a,b,i}| \leq 2 \). By Lemma 1.8 below this implies \( \log \mathbb{E} \exp \varepsilon \lambda Y_{1,r,a,b,i} \leq \lambda^2 \) for \( \lambda \in [-1, 1] \). Taking \( C_1 = \max\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}, 1\right) \) we get for all \( r, a, b, i \)

\[
\log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Y_{1,r,a,b,i} \leq C_1 \lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever} \quad C_1 |\lambda| \leq 1,
\]

to be used for \( d = 1 \) instead of (1.6).

We borrow from [1, Lemma 2a8] a general fact.

1.8 Lemma. If a random variable \( Z \) satisfies \( \mathbb{E} \exp |Z| \leq 2 \) and \( \mathbb{E} Z = 0 \), then \( \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \leq \lambda^2 \) for all \( \lambda \in [-1, 1] \).

Theorem 1.5 is proved in Sect. 2 for \( \lambda = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\text{vol} B\right)^{-\frac{1}{d}} \log^{-(d-1)} \text{vol} B\right) \); larger \( \lambda \) are treated in Sect. 3. I still do not know, what happens when \( \lambda \) tends to 0 slower than \( \log^{-d} \text{vol} B \). This logarithmic gap between moderate and large deviations, is it a phenomenon or a drawback of my approach?

2 Far from large deviations

2.1 Proposition. There exists \( C \in (1, \infty) \) such that for every \( i \in I \), every box \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) of volume \( v \) and width \( \geq C \), and every \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\text{if} \quad C|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{v^{1/(2d)} \log^{d-1} v}, \quad \text{then} \quad \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_B X_i(t) \, dt \leq C v \lambda^2.
\]

Similarly to [1, Sect. 2a] we consider random variables

\[
S_{B,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{vol} B}} \int_B X_{t,i} \, dt
\]
their cumulant generating functions \( \lambda \mapsto \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda S_{B,i} \), and ensure shift invariance by taking the supremum over all shifts of a box:

\[
(2.2) \quad f_{B,i}(\lambda) = \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}^d} \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda S_{B,s+i}.
\]

Still, \( f_{B,i}(\lambda) \geq 0 \), since \( \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda S_{B,i} \geq \mathbb{E} (1 + \lambda S_{B,i}) = 1 \).

Further, we take the supremum over all \( i \) and all boxes of a given volume and width \( \geq C \):

\[
f_{B}(\lambda) = \sup_{i \in I} f_{B,i}(\lambda);
\]

\[
f_{v,C}(\lambda) = \sup_{\text{vol}(B)=v, \text{width } B \geq C} f_{B}(\lambda) \quad \text{for } v \geq C^d.
\]

All these functions map \( \mathbb{R} \) to \([0, \infty]\).

Denoting for convenience

\[
R(v) = v^{\frac{1}{d}} \quad \text{and} \quad S(v) = v^{\frac{d-1}{d}}
\]

we rewrite (not proved yet) Prop. 2.1 as follows.

2.3 Proposition. There exists \( C \in (1, \infty) \) such that

\[
f_{v,C}(\lambda) \leq C\lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever } C|\lambda| \leq \log^{-\frac{d}{d-1}} \frac{S(v)}{v} \quad \text{and } v \geq C^d.
\]

We generalize \([\text{[1]} \text{ Prop. 2a9(a)]}\). Given a box \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \) and a number \( r > 0 \), we consider two boxes \( B_1 = [0, r] \times B \) and \( B_2 = [-r, r] \times B \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Let \( v = \text{vol } B_1 \) and width \( B \geq C_1 \). For \( d = 1 \) we mean \( B_1 = [0, r] \) and \( B_2 = [-r, r] \); \( B \) disappears, as well as the condition on width \( B \); by convention, \( \log^{-(d-1)} \text{vol } B = 1 \), and (in the proof) \( \text{vol } B = 1 \).

2.4 Lemma. For all \( p \in (1, \infty) \) and \( \lambda \) such that \( C_1|\lambda| \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \sqrt{2v} \log^{-(d-1)} \text{vol } B \),

\[
f_{B_2}(\lambda) \leq \frac{2}{p} f_{B_1}(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}) + C_1 \frac{p}{p-1} \cdot \frac{\lambda^2}{2r}.
\]

Proof. Given \( i \in I \), we use the split \((X^0, X^-, X^+)\) of \( X_i \) whose leak \( Y = Y_{1,0,-r,r,i} \) on the strip \([-r, r] \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}\) satisfies \([\text{[1]} \text{ Prop. 2a7 and 2a9]}\). Similarly to \([\text{[1]} \text{ Prop. 2a7 and 2a9]}\), the random variables \( U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \int_{[-r,0] \times B} X^i_t \, dt \), \( V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \int_{[0,r] \times B} X^i_t \, dt \), \( W = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2v}} \int_{[-r,r] \times B} X^i_t \, dt \) and \( Z = -\int B Y_t \, dt \) satisfy \( Z = \sqrt{2v} W - \sqrt{v} U - \sqrt{v} V \) and, by \([\text{[1]} \text{ Prop. 2a9]}\), \( \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \leq C_1(\text{vol } B)\lambda^2 \) for \( C_1|\lambda| \leq \log^{-(d-1)} \text{vol } B \). Similarly to \([\text{[1]} \text{ Prop. 2a9]}\), by Hölder’s inequality, \( f_{B_2}(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2v}} \int_{B_2} X_{t,i} \, dt = \)
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log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda W = \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \left( \frac{U+V}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Z \right) \leq \frac{1}{p} 2 f_B \left( \frac{p}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + \frac{p-1}{p} \log \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda^2}{\sqrt{2}}.

The second term does not exceed \( \frac{p}{p-1} C_1 (\text{vol } B) \left( \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^2 = C_1 \text{vol } B \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda^2}{\sqrt{2}} \) for \( i \in I \).

For \( d = 1 \) the leak \( Y = Y_{1,0,-r,r,i} \), being a random variable, satisfies \( (1.7) \); \( Z = -Y \); \( \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \leq C_1 \lambda^2 \) for \( C_1 |\lambda| \leq 1 \) (and \( v = r \), of course). \( \square \)

### 2.5 Remark

Above, a box is halved (divided in two boxes) by the hyperplane \( x_k = c \) for \( k \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) and the appropriate \( c \).

Now we consider two boxes in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), \( B_0 = [0, r_1] \times \cdots \times [0, r_d] \) and \( B = [0, 2^{n_1} r_1] \times \cdots \times [0, 2^{n_d} r_d] \) for arbitrary \( r_1, \ldots, r_d \in [C, 2C] \) for some \( C \geq C_1 \), and arbitrary \( n_1, \ldots, n_d \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \).

### 2.6 Proposition

If \( C \) is large enough, then for all \( r_1, \ldots, r_d \in [C, 2C] \), \( \delta > 0 \) and \( \alpha \geq \frac{C}{\text{vol } B_0} \) satisfying

\[
\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_{B_0}(\lambda) \leq a \lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever } |\lambda| \leq \delta,
\]

where \( B_0 = [0, r_1] \times \cdots \times [0, r_d] \), there exists natural \( N \) such that the following holds for all \( n_1, \ldots, n_d \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \) satisfying \( n_1 + \cdots + n_d \geq N \):

\[
\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_{B}(\lambda) \leq 2a \lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever } |\lambda| \leq \Delta,
\]

where \( B = [0, 2^{n_1} r_1] \times \cdots \times [0, 2^{n_d} r_d] \) and \( \Delta = \frac{1}{C_1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{a} S(\text{vol } B) \log^{-(d-1)} S(\text{vol } B)} \).

(For \( d = 1 \), by convention, \( \log^{-(d-1)} S(\ldots) = 1 \), notwithstanding that \( S(\ldots) = 1 \).)

**Proof.** We take \( n = n_1 + \cdots + n_d \), \( B_n = B \), halve the longest side of \( B_n \), denoting the half of \( B_n \) by \( B_{n-1} \), and repeat this operation getting \( B_{n-2}, \ldots, B_0 \). For each \( k = 0, \ldots, n-1 \) we have \( \text{vol } B_{k+1} = 2^{k+1} \text{vol } B_0 \) and, assuming \( C \geq C_1 \),

\[
\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_{B_{k+1}}(\lambda) \leq \frac{2}{p} f_{B_k} \left( \frac{p}{\sqrt{2}} \lambda \right) + C_1 \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda^2}{\text{vol } B_{k+1}} \frac{1}{\text{vol } B_{k+1}^{k+1}} \frac{\lambda^2}{\sqrt{2}}.
\]

for \( C_1 |\lambda| \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \sqrt{\text{vol } B_{k+1} \log^{-(d-1)} S(\text{vol } B_{k+1})} \)

by Lemma 2.3 (and Remark 2.5), since (recall \( r \) and \( B \) of 2.3) the longest side \( 2r \) of \( B_{k+1} \) cannot be less than \( \text{vol } B_{k+1} \), and \( \text{vol } B = \frac{\text{vol } B_{k+1}}{2r} \leq S(\text{vol } B_{k+1}) \). (For \( d = 1 \) this is just \( 1 = \frac{2r}{2r} \leq 1 \).)
Given $A_k$ and $\Delta_k$ such that $f_{B_k}(\lambda) \leq A_k^2 \lambda^2$ for $|\lambda| \leq \Delta_k$, we denote $\frac{q}{x} = \frac{p}{p-1}$, $x = \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}}$ and get

$$f_{B_{k+1}}(\lambda) \leq \frac{2}{p} A_k^2 \left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2 + qx^2 \lambda^2 = (A_k^2 p + x^2 q)\lambda^2$$

for $|\lambda| \leq \Delta_{k+1}$, provided that $A_{k+1} = A_k + x = A_k + \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}}$ and

$$\Delta_{k+1} \leq \min \left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{p_k}} \Delta_k, \frac{1}{C_1 q} \sqrt{\text{vol} \ B_{k+1} \log^{-(d-1)} S(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}\right);$$

here $p_k = 1 + \frac{x}{A_k} = 1 + \frac{A_k}{x} = 1 + \frac{A_k}{\sqrt{C_1}} \sqrt{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}$.

We take $A_k = \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_0)}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2^{-\frac{i}{d}}$ (thus $A_{k+1} = A_k + \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}}$) and note that $A_k \uparrow A_\infty \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_0)}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{i}{d}} \leq \sqrt{2a}$ if $C$ is large enough (since $a \geq \frac{C}{R(\text{vol} \ B_0)}$). Also, $q_k \leq 1 + \frac{\sqrt{2a}}{C_1} \sqrt{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})} \leq \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{\lambda}} \sqrt{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}$ for all $k$, if $C$ is large enough (since $a \geq \frac{C}{R(\text{vol} \ B_0)}$ again). Assuming also $C_1 \geq 3$ (which is harmless) we introduce $M_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda}} S(\text{vol} \ B_k) \log^{-(d-1)} S(\text{vol} \ B_k)$, note that $M_{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{C_1 q_k} \sqrt{\text{vol} \ B_{k+1} \log^{-(d-1)} S(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}$ (since $q_k \leq \sqrt{aR(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}$), and replace the condition on $\Delta_{k+1}$ given above with the stronger condition

$$\Delta_{k+1} \leq \min \left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{p_k}} \Delta_k, M_{k+1}\right).$$

Now we note that $p_k - 1 = \frac{1}{A_k} \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}} \leq 1 \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{R(\text{vol} \ B_{k+1})}} \leq 2^{-\frac{k}{d}}$ if $C \geq C_1$, take integer $N$ such that $2^{-\frac{N}{d}} \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{d}} - 1$, and get $M_{k+1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2a}}{p_k} M_k$ for all $k \geq N$ (since $\frac{M_{k+1}}{M_k} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{d}}$ and $p_k \leq 1 + 2^{-\frac{N+1}{d}} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{d}}$). We choose $\Delta_k$ as follows:

$$\Delta_k = M_k \quad \text{for } k \geq N,$$

$$\Delta_k = \frac{p_k p_{k+1} \ldots p_{N-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{2} M_N \quad \text{for } k < N.$$

Clearly, $\Delta_{k+1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_k} \Delta_k$ for all $k$.

In order to obtain $f_{B_n}(\lambda) \leq 2a\lambda^2$ for $|\lambda| \leq M_n$ when $n \geq N$ it is sufficient to ensure that $\Delta_0 \leq \delta$ and $\Delta_k \leq M_k$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1$. We note that $p_0 \cdots p_{N-1} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{d}} \sqrt{\text{vol} \ B_N} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{d}} \sqrt{2^{\lambda} \text{vol} \ B_0}$, thus $\Delta_0 = p_0 \cdots p_{N-1} \cdot 2^{-\frac{N}{d}} M_N \leq (\exp \sum_k 2^{-\frac{k+1}{d}}) \cdot 2^{-\frac{N}{d}} \sqrt{\frac{C_1}{\lambda}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda} (2C)^d}$; by increasing $N$ as needed we get $\Delta_0 \leq \delta$. 
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It remains to ensure that $\Delta_k \leq M_k$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1$. We'll get a bit more: $\Delta_k \leq \frac{1}{C_\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{a} S(\text{vol } B_k) \log^{-(d-1)} S(\text{vol } B_N)}$, that is,

$$
p_k p_{k+1} \ldots p_{N-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \ldots \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{a} S(\text{vol } B_N)}.
$$

$p_k \ldots p_{N-1} \leq 2^{-\frac{N-k}{2}} \cdot 2^{-\frac{d-1}{2}(N-k)} = 2^{-\frac{N-k}{2}}$.

We may check it only for $k = 0$ and $k = N$ due to the fact that $p_k \ldots p_{N-1}$ is a logarithmically convex function of $k$ (since $p_k$ decrease). For $k = N$ it is just $1 \leq 1$. For $k = 0$ we need $p_0 \ldots p_{N-1} \leq 2^\frac{N}{2}$, which holds for $N$ such that $\exp \sum_k 2^{-\frac{k}{2}} \leq 2^\frac{N}{2}$.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{2.7 Remark.} & In the proof of 2.6 the restriction on $C$ depends only on $d$ and $C_1$. For large $d$, roughly, $C \geq O(d^2) C_1$. Also, the restriction on $N$ depends only on $d$, $C$ and $\delta$; roughly, $N \geq O(d) \log C + O(d) \log \frac{1}{\delta}$.
\hline
\textbf{2.8 Remark.} & In 2.7 $a$ and $\delta$ may depend on $r_1, \ldots, r_d$. Assume for a while that they do not; that is, the given $a$ and $\delta$ serve all $r_1, \ldots, r_d$ (for the given $C$). Then the conclusion (that $f_B(\lambda) \leq 2a\lambda^2$ whenever $|\lambda| \leq \Delta$) holds for all $B$ such that width $B \geq C$ and $\text{vol } B$ is large enough (namely, $\text{vol } B \geq 2^N (2C)^d$). We get, for all $v$ large enough,
\end{tabular}
\caption{Remarks on the bounds and restrictions.}
\end{table}
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{2.9 Lemma.} & For every uniformly splittable family $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ of centered random fields on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and every box $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $a, \delta > 0$ such that $f_B(\lambda) \leq a\lambda^2$ whenever $|\lambda| \leq \delta$.
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Lemma on the boundedness of multivariate polynomials.}
\end{table}
\end{footnotesize}

This lemma will be proved by induction in the dimension $d = 1, 2, \ldots$. As was noted near (1.6), the given family $X = (X_i)_i$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ leads to another family $Y = (Y_{k, r, a, b, i})$ on $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Both families of random fields lead to box-indexed families of functions $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$: $X$ leads to $(f_B)_{B \subset \mathbb{R}^d}$ as before; likewise, $Y$ leads to $(g_B)_{B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}}$. (For $d = 1$, just a single function $g$.)

Similarly to 1.2a9(b) and 2a10 we modify Lemma 2.4 as follows. Given a box $B_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and numbers $r, s > 0$, we consider three boxes $B_1 = [-r, 0] \times B_0, B_2 = [0, s] \times B_0$ and $B = [-r, s] \times B_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. 
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2.10 Lemma. For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f_B(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{p} f_{B_1} \left( \frac{p \lambda}{r+s} \right) + \frac{1}{p} f_{B_2} \left( \frac{p \lambda}{r+s} \right) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_{B_0} \left( \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{r+s}} \right);$$

$$f_B(\lambda) \geq pf_{B_1} \left( \frac{\lambda}{p} \sqrt{\frac{r}{r+s}} \right) + pf_{B_2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{p} \sqrt{\frac{s}{r+s}} \right) - (p-1)g_{B_0} \left( \frac{1}{p-1} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{r+s}} \right).$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of 2.4. Denoting $v = \text{vol} B_0$, the random variables $U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r+s}} \int B_1 X^- dt$, $V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r+s}} \int B_2 X^+ dt$, $W = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(r+s)v}} \int B X^0 dt$ and $Z = - \int B_0 Y_t dt$ satisfy $\sqrt{r+s} W = \sqrt{r} U + \sqrt{s} V + \frac{1}{\sqrt{r+s}} Z$. By Hölder’s inequality, $f_B(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda W$ for every $\lambda$, and in general, $f_B(\lambda)$ is written as $f_B(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda (r+s)$; supremum in $i$ gives the first inequality (the upper bound). The second inequality (the lower bound), being rewritten as $f_B(\lambda) \leq f_B(\lambda) \leq f_B(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{p} f_B(p\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_{B_0} \left( \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{r+s}} \right)$, follows by Hölder’s inequality from the relation $\sqrt{r} U + \sqrt{s} V = \sqrt{r+s} W - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r+s}} Z$. \hfill $\Box$

2.11 Remark. Above, a box $B$ is divided in two boxes $B_1, B_2$ by the hyperplane $x_1 = 0$. More generally, the same holds when $B$ is divided by another coordinate hyperplane $x_k = c$ for $k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and any appropriate $c$.

Let us call a box $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ good when there exist $a, \delta > 0$ such that $f_B(\lambda) \leq a \lambda^2$ whenever $|\lambda| \leq \delta$. Similarly, a box $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is good when $\exists a, \delta > 0, \forall \lambda (|\lambda| \leq \delta \implies g_B(\lambda) \leq a \lambda^2)$.

Existence of (at least one) good box follows from Item (a) of Def. 1.4 and Lemma 1.8. (For $d = 0$ the only “box” is good.)

In order to prove Lemma 2.9 we assume (the induction hypothesis) that all boxes in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ are good, and prove that all boxes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ are good.

By 2.10 $B$ is good if and only if $B_1, B_2$ are good. It follows that every box contained in some good box is good (turn from $B$ to $B_1$ or $B_2$, and iterate).

Thus, all boxes that are small enough are good. It follows that every box is good (divide it into small boxes).

Given a set of boxes, we say that these boxes are uniformly good when there exist $a, \delta > 0$ such that for every box $B$ of the given set, every $\lambda \in [-\delta, \delta]$ satisfies the inequality $f_B(\lambda) \leq a \lambda^2$ (or $g_B(\lambda) \leq a \lambda^2$, for $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$).

2.12 Lemma. Let $0 < c < C < \infty$. Then the boxes $[0, r_1] \times \cdots \times [0, r_d]$ for all $r_1, \ldots, r_d \in [c, C]$ are uniformly good.
Proof. Induction in the dimension $d$. The induction hypothesis gives $a_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that $g_{[0,r_1] \times \ldots \times [0,r_{d-1}]}(\lambda) \leq a_0 \lambda^2$ whenever $|\lambda| \leq \delta_0$ and $r_1, \ldots, r_{d-1} \in [c, C]$. (When $d = 1$, this holds for the single function $g$.) The box $[0,C]^d = [0, C] \times \cdots \times [0, C]$ being good by 2.9 we take $a, \delta > 0$ such that $f_{[0,C]^d}(\lambda) \leq a\lambda^2$ whenever $|\lambda| \leq \delta$. We use the second inequality of 2.10 for $p = 2$ (taking 2.11 into account):

\[
2 f_{[0,r_1] \times [0,C]^{d-1}} \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \sqrt[\lambda]{\frac{r_1}{C}} \right) \leq f_{[0,C]^d}(\lambda) + g_{[0,C]^{d-1}} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{C}} \right);
\]

\[
f_{[0,r_1] \times [0,C]^{d-1}}(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{2} f_{[0,C]^d} \left( \frac{2\lambda \sqrt[\lambda]{C}}{r_1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} g_{[0,C]^{d-1}} \left( \frac{2\lambda}{\sqrt{r_1}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} a \cdot 4a^2 C \frac{C}{r_1} + \frac{1}{2} a_0 \cdot 4\lambda^2 \frac{\lambda}{r_1} \leq \left( \frac{2a C}{c} + \frac{2a_0}{c} \right) \lambda^2
\]

for $|\lambda| \leq \min \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \sqrt[\lambda]{C}, \frac{2}{r_1} \sqrt{C} \right)$. Thus, the boxes $[0,r_1] \times [0,C]^{d-1}$ for $r_1 \in [c, C]$ are uniformly good. Now we divide the box $[0,r_1] \times [0,C]^{d-1}$ by the hyperplane $x_2 = r_2$, apply again the argument used above, and see that the boxes $[0,r_1] \times [0,r_2] \times [0,C]^{d-2}$ for $r_1, r_2 \in [c,C]$ are uniformly good. And so on. □

Proof of Prop. 2.3. We take $C$ large enough according to 2.6. By 2.12 the boxes $B = [0, r_1] \times \cdots \times [0, r_d]$ for all $r_1, \ldots, r_d \in [C, 2C]$ are uniformly good. We take $a \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $f_B(\lambda) \leq a\lambda^2$ for all these $B$ and all $\lambda \in [-\delta, \delta]$. Now 2.8 gives $V$ such that all $v \in [V, \infty)$ satisfy

\[
f_{v,C}(\lambda) \leq 2a\lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever } C_1|\lambda| \leq \sqrt[v]{\frac{1}{a} S(v) \log^{(d-1)} S(v)}.
\]

We take $M > 1$ such that $M \geq C_1 \sqrt{a}$, and get

\[
f_{v,M}(\lambda) \leq M\lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever } M|\lambda| \leq \sqrt[\log^{(d-1)} v]{S(v)} \quad \text{and } v \geq M^d,
\]

since $v > 1$, $\log^{(d-1)} S(v) \leq \log^{(d-1)} v$ (just $1 \leq 1$ for $d = 1$), $v \geq M^d \geq V$, $C_1|\lambda| \leq \frac{C_1}{M} \sqrt[\log^{(d-1)} v]{S(v)} \leq \sqrt[v]{\frac{1}{a} S(v) \log^{(d-1)} S(v)}$ and $f_{v,M}(\lambda) \leq f_{v,C}(\lambda) \leq 2a\lambda^2 \leq M\lambda^2$. □

Proposition 2.1 is thus proved.
3 Close to large deviations

In this section we denote by $C_2$ the constant given by Prop. 2.3, use the functions $f_{v,C}$ mostly for $C = C_2$, and denote $f_v = f_{v,C_2}$. By 2.3,

\[(3.1) \quad f_v(\lambda) \leq C_2 \lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever} \quad C_2|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{S(v)}}{\log^{d-1} v} \quad \text{and} \quad v \geq C_2^d.\]

We still use (1.6), (1.7) and $C_1$ therefrom; $C_1 \leq C_2$. By convention, \(\log^0 x = 1\) always (also if $x$ does not belong to $(1, \infty)$ or even is ill-defined).

3.2 Lemma. For all $p \in (1, \infty)$,

\[
f_{2v}(\lambda) \leq \frac{2}{p} f_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + C_1 \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda^2}{R(2v)}
\]

whenever $C_1|\lambda| \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \sqrt{2v} \log^{-(d-1)} S(2v)$ and $2v \geq (2C_2)^d$.

Proof. Given a box $B$ such that $\text{vol} \, B = 2v$ and width $B \geq C_2$, we halve the longest side $2r$ of $B$ and apply Lemma 2.4 (as we did in the proof of 2.6). Once again, $2r \geq R(\text{vol} \, B) = R(2v) \geq 2C_2$, thus a half of $B$ is still of width $\geq C_2$, and $\frac{2v}{2} \geq S(2v)$, thus 2.4 applies and gives $f_B(\lambda) \leq \frac{2}{p} f_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + C_1 \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{\lambda^2}{2r}$.

It follows that

\[
f_{2v}(\lambda) \leq \frac{2}{p} f_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + |\lambda| \frac{\sqrt{2v}}{R(2v)} \log^{-(d-1)} S(2v),
\]

since $\frac{p-1}{p} C_1|\lambda| \leq \sqrt{2v} \log^{-(d-1)} S(2v)$.

For convenience we denote

\[
\varphi_v(\lambda) = \frac{1}{|\lambda| \sqrt{v}} f_v(\lambda) \quad \text{for} \quad v \geq C_2^d \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \neq 0.
\]

3.3 Corollary. For all $p \in (1, \infty)$,

\[
\varphi_{2v}(\lambda) \leq \varphi_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{R(2v) \log^{d-1} S(2v)}
\]

whenever $0 < C_1|\lambda| \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \sqrt{2v} \log^{-(d-1)} S(2v)$ and $2v \geq (2C_2)^d$.

Proof. $\varphi_{2v}(\lambda) - \varphi_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) = \frac{1}{|\lambda| \sqrt{2v}} f_{2v}(\lambda) - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p |\lambda| \sqrt{v}} f_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda| \sqrt{2v}} \left(\frac{2}{p} f_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + \frac{|\lambda| \sqrt{2v}}{R(2v)} \log^{-(d-1)} S(2v)\right) - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p |\lambda| \sqrt{v}} f_v\left(\frac{p\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right) = \frac{1}{R(2v) \log^{d-1} S(2v)}.$
3.4 Corollary.

\[ \phi_{2v}(\lambda_1) \leq \phi_v(\lambda_0) + \frac{1}{R(2v) \log^{d-1} S(2v)} \]

whenever \(2v \geq (2C_2)^d\), \(\lambda_0 \lambda_1 > 0\) and

\[ \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{|\lambda_1|} - \frac{1}{|\lambda_0|} \geq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{v}} \log^{d-1} S(2v). \]

**Proof.** We take \(p = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_0}}{\lambda_1}\) and note that \(\lambda_0 = \frac{p \lambda_1}{\sqrt{v}}\) and \(\frac{p^{-1}}{\lambda_1} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_0}} \geq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{2v}} \log^{d-1} S(2v)\), that is, \(C_1 |\lambda_1| \leq \frac{p^{-1}}{\sqrt{2v}} \log^{2(d-1)} S(2v)\), thus 3.3 applies. \(\square\)

3.5 Corollary. Let numbers \(v_0, \ldots, v_n\) and \(\lambda_0, \ldots, \lambda_n\) satisfy

\[ v_{k+1} = 2v_k, \quad \lambda_k \lambda_{k+1} > 0, \quad \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{|\lambda_{k+1}|} - \frac{1}{|\lambda_k|} \geq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{v_k}} \log^{d-1} S(2v_k) \]

for \(k = 0, \ldots, n - 1\); and \(2v_0 \geq (2C_2)^d\). Then

\[ \phi_{v_n}(\lambda_n) \leq \phi_{v_0}(\lambda_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{R(2v_k) \log^{d-1} S(2v_k)}. \]

**Proof.** Just apply 3.4 \(n\) times. \(\square\)

We rewrite Theorem 1.5 in terms of \(f_v\).

3.6 Proposition. There exists \(C \in (1, \infty)\) such that for every \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\),

\[
\text{if } C|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\log^{d-1} v} \text{ and } v \geq C^d, \text{ then } f_{v,C}(\lambda) \leq C \lambda^2.
\]

Taking \(C \geq \max(C_2, e^{1/d})\) we see that the case \(C|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{S(v)}}{\log^{d-1} v}\) is covered by (3.1).

From now on we assume that \(v \geq C^d\) and

\[
(3.7) \quad \frac{\sqrt{S(v)}}{\log^{d-1} v} < C|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\log^{d-1} v};
\]

ultimately we’ll prove that \(f_{v,C}(\lambda) \leq C \lambda^2\) provided that the constant \(C\), dependent only on \(d, C_1, C_2\), is large enough.

We take integer \(n\) such that

\[
(3.8) \quad 2^{n-1} < M_d^{2d} \frac{(C|\lambda|)^{2d}}{v^{d-1}} \log^{2(d-1)} \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|} \leq 2^n
\]

(the constant \(M_d\), dependent on \(d\) only, will be chosen later).
3.9 Lemma. If $M_d \geq (2d)^{d-1}$ and $C \geq e$, then $n \geq 1$.

Proof. Assume the contrary: $M_d^{2d(C|\lambda|)^{2d}} \log^{2d(d-1)} \frac{C|\lambda|}{\sqrt{S(v)}} \leq 1$, that is,

$$M_d \frac{C|\lambda|}{\sqrt{S(v)}} \log^{d-1} \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|} \leq 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

For $d = 1$ it means $M_1C|\lambda| \leq 1$ in contradiction to $C|\lambda| > 1$ and $M_1 \geq 1$. Assume $d \geq 2$. Using (3.7),

$$\frac{\sqrt{S(v)}}{\log^{d-1} v} < C|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{M_d} \sqrt{S(v)} \log^{-(d-1)} \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|};$$

$$\log^{d-1} v > M_d \log^{d-1} \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|} \geq \left(2d \log \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|}\right)^{d-1};$$

thus, $\frac{1}{M_d} \log v > \log \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|}$, that is, $C|\lambda| > \sqrt{S(v)}$. Now (3.10) gives $M_d \log^{d-1} \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|} < 1$, which implies $M_d \log^{d-1} \log^d v < 1$ (since $C|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\log^d v}$ by (3.7)), and $2d \log \log^d v < 1$ (since $M_d \geq (2d)^{d-1}$). On the other hand, $v \geq C^d \geq e^d$ implies $\log v \geq d$ and $\log \log^d v = d \log \log v \geq d \log d$, thus $2d \log \log^d v \geq 2d^2 \log d \geq 8 \log 2 > 1$; a contradiction.

From now on we assume $M_d \geq (2d)^{d-1}$ and $C \geq e$ (thus, $n \geq 1$). We define $v_0, \ldots, v_n$ by

$$v_k = 2^{-(n-k)} v .$$

Below, “$y = O(x)$” means that $y \leq \text{const} \cdot x$ for some constant dependent on $d$ only.

3.11 Lemma. $n \leq \frac{\sqrt{v}}{2C^d|\lambda|} \log^{-(d-1)} v$ provided that $C$ is large enough.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $n = O(\log v)$; then, increasing $C$ as needed, we get $n \leq \frac{C}{2C^d} \log v \leq \frac{C}{2C^d|\lambda|} \log^{-(d-1)} v$ since $C|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\log^d v}$ by (3.7).

We have $\frac{1}{C^d|\lambda|} = O(1)$ (since by (3.7), $\frac{1}{C^d|\lambda|} \leq \frac{\log^{-d-1} v}{\sqrt{S(v)}}$, the latter being bounded in $v \in (1, \infty)$). Thus, $\log \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C^d|\lambda|} = O(\log v)$ (since $\log v \geq \log C^d \geq d \geq 1$). Also, $C|\lambda| \leq \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\log^d v} \leq \sqrt{v}$. Using (3.8),

$$2^n \leq 2M_d^{2d(C|\lambda|)^{2d}} \log^{2d(d-1)} \frac{\sqrt{v}}{C|\lambda|} = O(v \log^{2d(d-1)} v) = O(v^2),$$

which implies $n = O(\log v)$. \hfill $\square$
Having \( n \log^{d-1} v \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{|\lambda_0|} \) (ensured by Lemma 3.11), we define \( \lambda_0, \ldots, \lambda_n \) (either all positive or all negative) by

\[
\frac{\sqrt{2}}{|\lambda_{k+1}|} - \frac{1}{|\lambda_k|} = \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{v_k}} \log^{d-1} S(2v_k) \text{ for } k = 0, \ldots, n - 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n = \lambda.
\]

That is,

\[
\frac{1}{2^{k/2} |\lambda_{n-k}|} = \frac{1}{|\lambda|} - \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{v}} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log^{d-1} S(2^{-i} v);
\]

the right-hand side is positive, since

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log^{d-1} S(2^{-i} v) \leq k \log^{d-1} S(v) \leq n \log^{d-1} v \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2C_1 |\lambda|};
\]

moreover, for \( k = n \) we get

\[
(3.12) \quad 2^{n/2} |\lambda_0| \leq 2|\lambda|.
\]

3.13 Lemma. If \( C \) is large enough, then \( 2v_0 \geq (2C_2)^d \).

Proof. For \( C \) large enough we have \( \frac{x}{\log^{d-1} x} \geq M_d \sqrt{2C_2} \) for all \( x \in [(d \log C)^d, \infty) \).

We take \( x = \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda_0|} \); using (4.11), \( x \geq \log^d v \geq \log^d C^d = (d \log C)^d \),

\[
\frac{x}{\log^{d-1} x} \geq M_d \sqrt{2C_2}.
\]

Using (3.3), \( 2v_0 = 2^{-(n-1)} v > M_d^{-2d} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda_0|} [ \frac{\log (2^{d-1}) v}{\log (2^{d-1}) x} ]^{2d} \geq (\sqrt{2C_2})^{2d}.
\]

From now on we assume that \( C \) is large enough, so that \( 2v_0 \geq (2C_2)^d \). Now Corollary 3.5 applies:

\[
\frac{f_v(\lambda)}{|\lambda| \sqrt{v}} \leq \frac{f_v(\lambda_0)}{|\lambda_0| \sqrt{v_0}} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{R(2v_k)} \log^{d-1} S(2v_k).
\]

3.14 Lemma. If \( M_d \geq 2(2d)^{d-1} \), then \( C|\lambda_0| \leq \frac{\sqrt{S(v_0)}}{\log^{d-1} v_0} \).

Proof. Assume the contrary. Using (3.12), \( 2C^{-n/2} |\lambda| \geq C|\lambda_0| > \frac{\sqrt{S(2^{-n} v)}}{\log^{d-1} (2^{-n} v)} = 2^{-n/2} \cdot 2^{d} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda_0|} \log^{d-1} (2^{-n} v) \); using (3.3), \( M_d^{2d} \frac{|\lambda||\lambda|^{2d}}{v^{d-1}} \log^{2d(d-1)} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|} \leq 2^n < \frac{(2C^d)^{2d}}{v^{d-1}} \log^{2d(d-1)} (2^{-n} v) \) and \( (2d \log \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|})^{d-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} M_d \log^{d-1} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|} < \log^{d-1} (2^{-n} v) \).

For \( d = 1 \) it means \( 1 < 1 \). Assume \( d \geq 2 \). We have \( 2d \log \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|} < \log (2^{-n} v) \) and \( (\frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|})^{2d} < 2^{-n} v \), that is, \( 2^n < v \left( \frac{|\lambda|}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^{2d} = \left( \frac{|\lambda|}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^{2d} \). Using (3.3), \( M_d^{2d} \log^{2d(d-1)} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|} < 1 \), that is, \( M_d \log^{d-1} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{|\lambda|} < 1 \), which cannot be true, as was shown in the proof of Lemma 3.9. \( \square \)
From now on we assume that \( M_d \geq 2(2d)^{d-1} \), so that \( C|\lambda_0| \leq \frac{\sqrt{S(v_0)}}{\log^{d-1} v_0} \).

Also, \( v_0 \geq C_2^d \) by 3.13, and \( C_2 \leq C \). Now (3.1) applies: \( f_{v_0}(\lambda_0) \leq C_2 \lambda_0^2 \); and therefore,

\[
(3.15) \quad \frac{f_v(\lambda)}{|\lambda| \sqrt{v}} \leq \frac{C_2|\lambda_0|}{\sqrt{v_0}} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{R(2v_k) \log^{d-1} S(2v_k)}.
\]

**3.16 Lemma.** \( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{R(2v_k) \log^{d-1} S(2v_k)} = O\left( \frac{C|\lambda|}{\sqrt{v}} \right) \).

**Proof.** We rewrite the sum as \( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( \log^{-d} S(v_k) \right) \) \( (2v_0)^{-d} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k/d} \), note that \( \log^{-d} S(v_0) = O(1) \) (since \( C_2 > 1 \) and \( 2v_0 \geq (2C_2)^d \geq 2 \)) and see that the given sum is \( O((2v_0)^{1/d}) \). By (3.15), \( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{R(2v_k) \log^{d-1} S(2v_k)} \leq O(1) \), since the function \( x \mapsto \frac{\log^{d-2} |\lambda|}{\sqrt{v}} \) is bounded on \([1, \infty)\) and, using (3.7),

\[
\frac{C|\lambda|}{\sqrt{v}} \leq \frac{1}{\log^d v} \leq \frac{1}{(d \log C)^d} \leq \frac{1}{d^d} \leq 1.
\]

**Proof of Prop. 3.6.** By (3.15) and Lemma 3.16, \( \frac{f_v(\lambda)}{|\lambda| \sqrt{v}} \leq \frac{C_2|\lambda_0|}{\sqrt{v_0}} + N_d C|\lambda| \) \( \sqrt{v} \) for some constant \( N_d \) dependent on \( d \) only. By (3.12), \( \frac{|\lambda_0|}{\sqrt{v_0}} \leq \frac{2|\lambda|}{2^{2d} \sqrt{v}} = \frac{2|\lambda|}{\sqrt{v}} \).

Thus, \( f_v(\lambda) \leq |\lambda| \sqrt{v} (C_2 \frac{2|\lambda|}{\sqrt{v}} + N_d C|\lambda|) \) \( \sqrt{v} \) \( \leq (2C_2 + N_d C)\lambda^2 \). And finally, \( f_{v,2C_2+N_d C}(\lambda) \leq f_{v,C_2}(\lambda) = f_v(\lambda) \).

Theorem 1.5 is thus proved.
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